

Ryan Miller asked Tablada if she meant like the individual wall signs for the tenants. Tablada stated that she would like to try to get a feel for what it would look like. Miller stated that those would be permitted by the individual tenants. Tablada stated that she knows Miller probably has the sign ordinance from the standpoint of height. But is she going to let them comply with whatever the site and the sign....Miller stated that he would be a little more restrictive to that, too. The type of signs that they will allow and they will develop a sign criteria that goes along with Roswell's ordinance. There will not be any exposed raceway signs like are out there currently or internally lit channel letters like at Twisted Taco or at Lonzell's that are typical of a strip mall. The signs that they use are either individual letters that are halo lit from behind or are a panel sign that is face lit using the goose neck so it is a little more traditional. These are a couple of actually pretty good examples of typical signs that one might see or would be allowable but it is not going to be that exposed raceway typical of strip mall signs.

Sonya Tablada stated that was her concern. She knows they are not really signs but on the other hand they are. It is part of the look so she was kind of wondering what the look was going to be.

John Carruth thanked Miller.

At this time the Board took a five minute break.

DISCUSSION ITEM

12-0005

RZ12-03

Text amendment to approve the Grove Way Community Hybrid Form-Based Code

Brad Townsend, planning and zoning director presented the application. He thanked the Board for volunteering and stated that he appreciates what they go through every month.

RZ12-03 is a new code amendment that is being processed. The short timeline is it has been through about 12 to 16 months of a community review with stakeholders in the Grove Way area. It has been put together initially by the Atlanta Regional Commission under a contract related to the LCI development, which started about three years ago in the South Atlanta Street. This is a directive from mayor and city council to provide some alternatives to development dealing with the Grove Way.

Just to generalize. Grove Way is really to their east and south. It is from this building down to Oxbo. It is all east of SR 9. It is back to the housing authority and includes Pleasant Hill Church, Mt. Zion Church. Those are kind of the parameters. It goes actually up to Norcross.

As Monica Hagewood mentioned there was a directive from mayor and city council to actually include north of Norcross, the Frazier Street Apartment area, the old Southern Skillet Shopping Center. So, that triangle that kind of completes with Norcross, Frazier Street, Atlanta Hwy.

The form based code is designed with two distinctive overlays. To give one a generalized control of how this is happening, these pieces of property have underlying zonings of mostly a C-1, which is a general commercial or an industrial or a residential designation. That is their underlying zoning.

Some of the properties are in the historic district so they have an historic district overlay. Some of them would be coming to the Design Review Board for review because they are not in the historic area so they would require DRB approval if they wanted to redevelop.

The objection of the form based code is to aesthetically determine what the buildings would look like without controlling the uses. What the directive from council was to create a hybrid of that. They still want to control some of the uses. So, on Page 9 and 10 of the draft ordinance one will see a list of uses. The new directive from council to staff was of these 72 uses 34 of them were conditional, which requires another approval process through mayor and city council to even get them. They have asked staff to come back and reduce that number and make a lot of the conditional uses permitted as right for a building to be able to do that.

So, for this evening the guidance that Townsend is looking for from the Board and he talked a little bit with John Carruth, it is in front of the Board as a guidance discussion item tonight. It is going to the Historic Preservation Commission tomorrow night. Townsend stated that he will be there presenting at the same. It will be presented to the Planning Commission on the 21st of this month. It will be in front of mayor and city council for the first reading in March 2012.

So, staff is looking for the Board to provide them with guidance on probably mostly things that their Board is aesthetically charged with. Because what is changing is from those standard zoning codes usually requires a minimum building front setback. What this form based code is saying is they want one to move the building closer to the street. If one looks at page 16, 17 and 18 those are the pages that say how they want a new building to represent to the street.

The one big advantage that this code is providing in essence as an incentive for redevelopment is height. Most of their zoning codes have a pretty limited height criteria, C-1 he thinks is 30 feet and the industrial district he does not think has a very tall height. The height allowed for someone choosing to redevelop in this overlay is allowed to go 66 feet in the air. So one is talking probably a five-story building.

John Carruth added on the order of what the city of Woodstock.

Brad Townsend agreed that it would be that scale of that dimension. So, if one pushes a four-story, five-story building to a street he is definitely creating a different street look than their single story retailers that are pushed two or three car rows back from the street. So, when one looks through page 16, 17 and 18 the design that says that the storefront standards should be a minimum of five feet, that the height should be a minimum eight feet above grade, that between 30 inches and eight inches there should be some change in the façade. \

What staff is looking for from the Board as experts in Townsend's opinion, because he is not an architect. He is a planner by trade and will claim no architectural design. Does that criteria that we have established here make sense for what they want to be striving for, for the look of the buildings.

Then, one of the other criteria is dealing with actual building details which starts on page 24, actually 23 and 24, when they talk about building materials, building details and there is a section on page 27. As Roberto Paredes was talking earlier tonight, how do they want to change the pedestrian feel of a building when they move it in and out? How do they want to change it? Like John Carruth was talking earlier, if they paint the brick all one color is that the look that they are going for? They are actually looking for them to say, "No, every 30 feet one needs to change it." If one has a 300 foot building, the maximum he can maintain that is he believes 100 feet or less than 100 feet.

So, the document given to the Board is a real work in progress for the past couple of months. Townsend's expectation is any feedback that the Board can give to him tonight would be fabulous. Any feedback that they feel after they have re-looked at it again in a week or two if they chose to, his email address is Btownsend@Roswellgov.com. And he has a card that he can give the members of the Board this evening, and John Carruth has it on speed dial.

That is where they are at, at this point. Townsend stated that he was present to take notes, to take whatever suggestions the Board feels are appropriate. Those he will be included in a document that ends up as part of his final report that goes to the Planning Commission as well as to mayor and city council.

Townsend thanked the Board for their time at this point.

Roberto Paredes asked Townsend if he is developing in this location, he has the zoning ordinance. So in the case for example of building height, which one is the one that governs them? The overlay over the zoning?

Brad Townsend explained the trade off. One can't remove the underlying zoning. The red areas, which is the mixed use section, and the blue areas, which is the neighborhood residential section, if one chooses to redevelop in a manner with

these guidelines they are forcing the building to move up. They are forcing the parking to be hidden. They are describing how one will exteriorly break up the building with window treatments and canopies and awnings and things of that nature. If one chooses to choose to develop with this overlay, he gets the additional height.

Roberto Paredes clarified that he could still develop it under just the zoning. Townsend stated that he could. They cannot remove that from that. And he could develop it with the historic district if he is within the historic district.

Monica Hagewood asked if there was a plan in the future to remove the zoning as this goes forward. Because in order to really get this walkable sense, doing it on one project and then not two more is not going to feel the same way.

Brad Townsend stated that there is a desire, the city of Roswell in conjunction with, this has been started a couple of months ago, they are in the process right now of...the term one is going to start hearing is a Unified Development Code in which he has to look at the current zonings of all of the districts and say, "Okay, when this was put in place in 1958, in 1960, it doesn't work today." They need to re-establish what a C-1 district should be or what a C-3 district should be as they want to promote redevelopment in what areas. They are looking at that process taking another 18 months to do that whole approval process. And that is another, something that staff...and they are hiring a consultant and it is in the mid-year budget to do that.

Roberto Paredes stated that the other question he has is the illustrations basically show the relationship of the building to the sidewalk. But they show basically just a two-story building in the diagrams. In reality Townsend is saying that that would be applicable to potentially a five-story building.

Brad Townsend stated that if one could get that at 66 feet, yes. Roberto Paredes stated or a four-story building. Townsend stated that was correct.

Monica Hagewood clarified that on the 66 feet it talks about five-story buildings should be located along primary streets only, But she can't find anything in the rest of it that says...Brad Townsend stated that it is limited there, there isn't anything. Hagewood clarified that there was nothing. Townsend stated that there was not. Hagewood stated that really, in theory according to this, one could do 66 feet anywhere. Townsend stated that was correct. There is nothing that limits it to not being utilized in the complete red area of the district. Hagewood clarified that those are considered effectively primary streets. Townsend stated that was correct.

Sonya Tablada asked how tall the building is in downtown Woodstock. That one that is right up? Townsend asked the multi-family one behind the railroad tracks. Tablada stated that was correct do they know how high that is? She thinks

Townsend has a picture of it here. It is on page 21. That is five stories but Tablada was just wondering? Townsend stated that was correct and it looks like the first level was probably a 12 or 16 foot height because it is probably the retail or office type use. And then above that are standard residential spans.

Monica Hagewood clarified that obvious it is in here that is kind of what they are looking for. Townsend stated that was the look they were going for.

John Carruth stated that actually he does not think that this has enough articulation and façade movement that this proposal would require. Brad Townsend stated that he thinks the proposal has a little bit more. Carruth stated that one wouldn't get that long of a flat façade. Townsend stated that was correct.

Monica Hagewood stated that one of the things it also has is on-street parking and that is consistent with a walkable community. It is contrived to put all of their parking, although she really likes it for the grocery store to have to do that. But on-street parking is consistent unless one has such an entertainment focus like Canton Street. They have taken a lot of that out. Is there any consideration for...maybe she didn't get into the detail in here but is there any available...

Brad Townsend stated that there wasn't any current but that doesn't mean someone who brought a development in could not come to the city and say in conjunction with where he wants to put the sidewalk he wants to put parallel on-street parking and then the city would have to determine if the roadway is sufficient to do that. Maybe the roadway is only 35 or 40 feet of width now. Maybe they need to dedicate 10 feet of right-of-way and that ends up being part of the on-street parking design that is put in.

Monica Hagewood stated that she thinks about old town Alexandria as one. It is mature and all that. It has a lot of that.

Sonya Tablada that for her it is raising that thing of zoning and this and still having that mix rather than having one thing controlling it. And then are they going to have the hodgepodge. Her other one is the height, she looks at the ones that are on page 22 that are more of a three-story or a three-and-a-half-story. It looks like it may be three-story with maybe some skylight type things or 14-foot roofs or something.

Brad Townsend stated that it almost looks like a fourth story pushed back. Tablada stated that it was hard to tell. That would work.

Monica Hagewood stated that she thinks the developers have to have an incentive to foot the additional cost that these criteria call for. There has to be a balance where they can make it. If it is not financially viable no one is going to do it. Hagewood asked if that is why they are saying that it is five feet. That five-foot building, the five stories in Woodstock just looks overwhelming.

Sonya Tablada stated that it has not been successful. Townsend stated that it had not. Tablada asked if it was in foreclosure, which to her tells a lot.

Monica Hagewood stated that it came on line right at the bust. It really got slammed timing-wise, delivery to the market. Horrible timing.

Sonya Tablada stated that the retailers when she has been in there get amazing traffic considering. Those restaurants have done fabulous. Townsend agreed.

Monica Hagewood stated that the residential is not doing so well. Tablada stated that she has not reviewed it in a while but it could not have come on at a worst time. Tablada stated that was true, but condos went down in favor back in 2006.

Brad Townsend stated that he thinks that is one of the objectives of council is to say when they don't have a lot of things happening or going on; do they need to change their rules to be ready? Do the rules foster someone saying that he has been fixing BMW's on this site for the last 35 years, maybe it is time for him to take something else with this piece of property and what is someone willing to hand him dollar wise. The objective and really the hope is one has to do some assemblage. If he can get a whole square of assemblage, get four streets; create something with some synergy that says okay, he now has a critical mass to be able to redevelop something that is storage buildings and automotive repair and things of that nature. They are trying to say that they are putting something on the books that gives it that spark and gives it that desire to be able to happen?

Tom Flowers inquired if the ultimate goal was to improve the aesthetics only Brad Townsend stated to improve the aesthetics definitely by saying that they want one to be more pedestrian oriented towards the street, instead of three rows of parking and then his building pushed back in a way. Hide the parking in the back; hide the parking in the building.

Tom Flowers stated that there is a movement in his particular discipline and industry of this urbanization that Townsend is talking about. It is called Urban Ecology and it is the interaction of plants, animals and humans with themselves and how they work. While sustainable is a buzz word that is used a lot this is a little more bio-diverse and it is not dealing with the aesthetics, which this does. He is more than glad to review it. It is pretty tough to ask a Board that has limited time to review it. He is more than glad, but it has been two or three hours reviewing the aesthetic and he is sure that anyone who wanted to offer that up and send Townsend an email on these buildings.

Brad Townsend stated that that would be fabulous.

Tom Flowers stated that taking in to natural features that are there or diverse systems that are there, roads, play areas, offices, is that all built into this in the urbanization plan? Is urban ecology considered?

Brad Townsend stated that was the objective. He thinks they are looking at one of the bigger players in this whole thing is the Housing Authority, which has some serious plans for how they want to redevelop their property. They have some real ecology-type slope terrain locational. They probably have some of the best views the community could ever have when one looks across their piece of property to the national forest type of thing. So, how are they going to utilize pedestrian-wise connect them, automobile-wise connect them and there is some desire to diversify them from their current spot into the community more. So it is not this big housing authority connection.

Monica Hagewood asked if they were not shifting it to a mixed-income. She does not know the details. Brad Townsend stated that their desire is to mix their use up a little bit.

Tom Flowers stated that he does not know how it would shake out because when one talks about LEEDs and other product, he actually pays more for that product and it is not as aesthetically desirable because it must use sustainable, local materials that may even cost one more and so far they have not found people willing to pay generally that up-charge particularly in the current economy to start moving towards that type of product. Flowers is with them. He thinks it is a tough challenge. The long-term planning is great. Eventually something has to be done.

Roberto Paredes stated that his only concern and he doesn't know what...he thinks they or he expressed his concern on of sort of the charrettes that took place last year or so. The places, and it is in Atlanta if one goes to Glenwood Park for example, which there are a lot of pictures of to use as a model. The reality is that they are almost a little on the too dense or too tight edge and architects and planners are always very quick to jump on the latest bandwagon. In looking at the diagrams, they are all very nice and very pretty but is that really the character that this neighborhood really wants. He does not know if they really know what they are getting into is what his concern is. Because this defines a fairly dense, tight environment and that neighborhood, if it is going to go to the next level of development, maybe it doesn't want to get that close to the limit so to speak. It is very hard to define what that is but just to give an example in Paredes' mind and this is a very personal opinion. If one looks at what happened at Peachtree Street or Peachtree Road in the last 25 years or the last 30 years where now based on the new urbanism and the new regulations, now Peachtree, pretty much if one goes to mid-town, it looks like any other city, USA. Whereas Peachtree used to have a character that the buildings and the big homes sat back and there were trees and it was a fairly green street. It has all disappeared. Now, that is not contrary to higher density necessarily because there are some examples and they are very few. 12th Street and 10th Street that some developers

actually put the density but they broke the mass where only the lower two floors come close to the street and the towers are pushed back. It does have a nicer feeling. But that was not a zoning driven...they could have put the building right up smack to the building line and then....Peachtree now, it is to Paredes goes to Denver, DC, Philadelphia, they are all the same. And Peachtree had this character of the trees and the buildings slightly set back and it is gone. That is the one thing that he is concerned about a zoning like this. It treats every street the same when in reality they are not. There are a couple of streets that are in terms of hierarchy, they are more important than others and it is not recognized. That is Paredes' concern. And he knows it kind of a very loose kind of...

Brad Townsend stated that there was some try; he would say a very good attempt. When one looks at this map, the green dots are to identify some high visibility street corners. It is the objective okay that one turns his building to the corner, the desire is he pushes the building a little back from the corner but it is to the corner and he puts his public art, he puts his plaza. That is identified to the corner. So there is some objectives to understanding that the darker line are the primary streets. What does one want to do with his primary streets? There is some desire to have some of that type of feel and intent. Does the document completely get there? Townsend stated that he can't answer that one way or the other. They are attempting the best they can at this point and they are looking for any guidance or any feedback that they can get and they will take that through the process. They are hoping it gets utilized. He and John Carruth will be sitting there in 10 years and saying nothing got built in mid-town for the last decade. What is happening for Grove Way? Hopefully they will have gotten something that at least changes. There is going to be change.

Tom Flowers asked Townsend if he had an as-built of this area.

Monica Hagedwood asked if it is going to be good change.

Brad Townsend stated that was correct. Does he have an as-built? No.

Tom Flowers stated that the way he could review it best would be with an as-built. To follow what Paredes is saying, why push a square peg into a round hole? Why not take what are already the best features that are unique within an area, find out what are the negative impacts in the area and enhance that with complimenting this. Then one would take a migration of what is already sacred about the space and they are bio-diverse and he starts augmenting that as time goes on because...

Brad Townsend stated that he could tell Flowers what is sacred out there. Two big African-American churches. They are not touching either of them and they are not going away.

Tom Flowers stated that there might be off-site views. There may be more than out of the box that someone may be able to see. To take that and like Townsend said, the churches and use that and start instead of a radical departure taking what is...he never likes pushing a square peg into a round hole so to say. The land wants to be this, let it be that. And this feels a little bit like they are trying to take it and impose it. If Peachtree Street was already a peach tree lined boulevard and it was wonderful because it evolved that way, it also feels better to move in that direction. So someone qualified to find out what those diversities and interactions can be within the current space and move towards that with an overlay than trying to mirror something that has been done in downtown Canton it feels like to Flowers may not be the best approach.

Brad Townsend stated that he thinks that one of the...through the document, Rich Dippolito, one of the council members as well as Dr. Price who was here this evening wanted to hear this conversation but felt that the night was a little long for her too. The objective was they have a pretty good grid system pattern of streets. This is one of the locations in which the community currently has it. So, is there a way to utilize that grid pattern and foster redevelopment in some manner, in some form?

Monica Hagewood stated that she did not want to drag it on but one of things is she thinks Townsend's point is that it does have a grid pattern. What she was hearing about this earlier is it is consistent with feeding off some of the neighborhoods behind Canton Street. It is not like they are just dropping something that is not indigenous to the area. Her concern when she looks at this area is generating incentive to re-invest into the area. If it is easier to re-invest up on an already cleared place up on SR 9 making it easier to come back in here and reinvest and put residential...she thinks residential, there is a lot of residential that is not in the red area, the mixed use area. So it really is introducing an opportunity. Right now she does not believe that one can put residential.

Brad Townsend stated that was correct. Some of it is commercial or industrial. It doesn't allow the residential component.

Monica Hagewood stated that it allows that flexibility where they haven't had it before. She applauds the intent. Her recommendation and she thinks it is consistent with what Roberto Paredes is talking about too is that one has to do a little bit tighter definition on some of those prime...one can't have a whole place five stories. There has got to be some delineation and focus, three stories on some of the ones backing up to the more residential area. She does not know. That is her concern is that she does not think they are going to get a bunch of developers in here wanting to do five-story buildings. But maybe the kind of set back that lets the light in that one is seeing. It would be helpful if they could add that.

Monica Hagewood stated that she remembers the bad part of Peachtree Street that she used to drive down when she moved here. She wondered why all of this blank land is here and no one is doing anything with it? So there is that other section that no one did anything with until this trend came along of residential in the mid-town area. Some of those areas were not pretty.

Laura Hamling stated that she has clients who drive into Roswell and look around and say, "There are an awful lot of condos, an awful lot of apartments." Because that is the first thing they see when they go up the hill. Frankly, she would like to see more single-family homes rather than five-story buildings. She does not know if this is what Townsend wants to hear from the Board. Brad Townsend stated that he would take all of the input that he can. Hamling stated that she feels like they are going to lose a lot of Roswell, the old Roswell by putting the Woodstock-type five-story buildings in here. It could be done well but from what she sees, the people she talks to and those are the people, she is a real estate agent, and they are her clients. And that is the one complaint that they have about Roswell. Once they get out in Roswell and they see all of the other developments it is fine. But the first impression is driving around and seeing a lot of condos and a lot of apartments. And so, if they do this, they are going to just have more.

Brad Townsend agreed that they would have more. Laura Hamling asked if that is what they want. That is not what her clients want. They like the old Roswell, the Canton Street, the square, the look that she would like to see the Board incorporate into this and make it....

Brad Townsend stated that he would like to give Hamling another big piece of that picture. For the last two decades Roswell has notoriously over-retailed and there is a planning term. It is called "pruning retail". What retail does one need to get rid of and what do they replace it with? The jargon today is one replaces it with mixed use. Which means more units, more condos, more town homes and a lot of people like to hear this but for their current retail and any future retail to survive they need more population. Or there is a desire to have a grocery store in this immediate area. They need more seats and more bedrooms in this immediate area to support that because a corporate entity will look at how many roof tops are within a quarter mile, which a mile, within a three-mile radius. So, to do that they are taking something that doesn't have a place where somebody lives and putting that there. So what style does one want to put it?

This document is trying to get that "this is the style we will accept", at this point. That is kind of the bigger, broader picture. That city of Roswell is going through a strategic economic plan. Townsend is sure some of the Board members have heard some of that discussion and talk. They have gotten some very serious numbers as to okay, the apartment complexes at GA 400 and Holcomb Bridge Road, what do those pieces of property need to redevelop as for an economy

scale to happen? It is more units. And it is not a lot more retail and it is not a lot more office.

Monica Hagewood added that it is not a lot more single-family homes.

Brad Townsend agreed because when one has a piece of property of 40 acres sitting there with 400 rental apartments that are at 98-99 percent leased out that are absolutely making millions for that land owner right now, what switches him to say, "economically I will tear this down. I will build something new because I will be able to sell it for how many more millions?" Those are some of the economics of scale that they are trying say and that is what they will be going through with their unified development code. What codes do they need to have in the future for those entities to try to redevelop? Because the desire is for those apartment buildings to go away but there hasn't been a desire to create a category which makes it economically feasible for them to go away. Because four or five years ago when they were sitting at 60 percent occupancy, they were fine. They were saying, "Okay we need to bulldoze these and move them on." Today, they are sitting at 95-98 percent occupancy and they are just rolling over and rolling over and they will repaint them and they will put in some funny new landscaping, they will change the signage, they may do some standard maintenance and that's it. Maybe they will go in and redo one building one year and another building the next year furbish-wise, and guess what? That only lends itself to where one was charging \$850 a month, now he can charge \$1150 because he put the new washer and the dryer and the other new stuff in it.

Brad Townsend apologized for editorializing. Monica Hagewood stated she gets his point.

Roberto Paredes stated that he was not really that concerned about the detached single-family. People that are going to be buying, the guys that are in their 20s and 30s these days are not really that interested in the single-family detached. They had much rather be in a much closer knit environment. He is talking about couples. They both work. They may have one child. The idea of the 2.5 kids is really disappearing. And again this is all speculation but the new millennium kids and then the man with the ex-wife, baby boomers and now there are two others. And as long as there are good schools that is what they are looking for. That transition is going to take probably five, 10 years to be really fully felt in the marketplace.

Tom Flowers clarified that they are looking for places to put bodies. What they will want to move into and incentivize the property owners to make this change over.

Brad Townsend stated that was the big picture objective.

Laura Hamling stated that the thing is just looking at to her though, she looks at Roswell...like one goes to Aspen and there is the residential and then they come in with the two and three-story and they are set back in the street. For her that is what Roswell more is. If one goes to Franklin, TN which is a suburb of Nashville and their development of downtown and it is gorgeous. Her husband is looking for a reason to move to Franklin, TN. But it is all three-story. The scale of it, she looks at that and she thinks of Virginia Highlands. Virginia Highlands she thinks with the five-story has changed Virginia Highlands. To her the scale of Virginia Highlands has gotten so tall and cold. It doesn't feel like Virginia Highlands. To her the height of it is the big deal. To Hamling, the scale of Roswell is smaller scale and it just doesn't feel tall.

Tom Flowers stated that the shorter two or three-story doesn't give one the density. The numbers don't work. Brad Townsend agreed that the numbers don't work. Monica Hagewood asked whose numbers won't work. Flowers stated the developer's to incentivize him to move it over. He won't tear down two stories.

Laura Hamling stated that since they really don't know the height of the one at Woodstock, which she would really like to know. She knows that it is five stories but as she looked at some property over in Decatur and their upper units have these 12-foot ceiling and that is the way one gets a higher priced unit with less square footage. You get something grand you get some festoons, you have some outdoor space where one could pull it back and go up and have a rooftop garden, etc.

Monica Hagewood stated that it was kind of like Vinings. Tom Flowers stated that just spread the geographic area. When one goes to the other side of the river and claim that as theirs down to Sandy Springs.

Brad Townsend asked that the Board please take the document with them. If they think of anything they have his email address. They are going through the month process. If there are any other things this evening that they feel Townsend needs to know. He is not looking to shut them down but he knows they have had a long day, too like everyone else here.

Brad Townsend stated that they won't rezone anything. They will use this as an overlay in which the owner would be able to choose which path he wants to go through. If they actually do that, that will probably be 18 months from now when they decide that underlying C-1 is going to be completely changed to something else and that would be a complete rezoning. And that would be city wide in dealing with their whole zoning code.

John Carruth thanked Brad Townsend for allowing the Board this opportunity to give him input.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Sonya Tablada made a motion to approve the minutes of the last January board meeting. Laura Hamling seconded the motion.

The minutes were approved 5-0-1. Roberto Paredes abstained from voting.

ADJOURN:

The meeting adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

John Carruth, Chairman

CC: mayor and city council
community development
applicant's files