



MINUTES

Charlotte County Board of Zoning Appeals

Wednesday, April 10, 2024, 9:00 a.m. – Room 119

Charlotte County Administration Center
18500 Murdock Circle, Port Charlotte, FL 33948-1094

(These minutes are not official until they have been approved by the Charlotte County Board of Zoning Appeals)

Board Member:

Blair McVety, Chair
Steve Vieira, Vice-Chair
Nichole Beyer, Secretary
Turner Rouse
Andrew Filieo

Staff:

Shaun Cullinan, Planning/Zoning Official
Thomas David, Asst. Co. Attorney
Elizabeth Nocheck, AICP, Sr. Planner
Kimberly Sargent - Recorder

I. Call to Order

Chair McVety called the April 10, 2024, meeting of the Board of Zoning Appeals to order at 9:00 a.m.

II. Pledge of Allegiance

Chair McVety led the members and the audience in reciting the Pledge of Allegiance.

III. Roll Call

Roll call was taken; a quorum was present. Turner Rouse was absent from the meeting.

IV. Swearing In of Those Giving Testimony

Kimberly Sargent swore in all persons who wished to provide testimony.

V. Approval of Minutes

ACTION: A motion was presented by Mr. Filieo and seconded by Mr. Vieira to approve the minutes of March 13, 2024, meeting of the Board of Zoning Appeals which passed with a unanimous vote.

VI. Disclosure Statements

Ex-parte forms indicating site visits concerning the petitions being presented before the April 10, 2024, Board of Zoning Appeals meeting none were submitted.

VII. Introduction of Staff/Comments

Chair McVety introduced staff. Shaun Cullinan, Planning and Zoning Official, read the Zoning rules, Asst. County Attorney David, and Chair McVety made introductory remarks regarding the types of requests that the Board of Zoning Appeals would be reviewing and the standards which must be met, the notification process and how the Board of Zoning Appeals makes its decision.

VIII. New Business

The following petitions were advertised on March 26, 2024: VAR-24-004, SE-24-005, SE-24-006, and SE-24-007

SE-24-005

Michael Morris, representative for 4-M Trucking, Inc., is requesting a special exception to allow outdoor storage for a building trades contractor, in the Commercial General (CG) zoning district. The property is located at 1795 Cedarwood Street, in Port Charlotte, and is described as Lot 10, Block 657, of the Port Charlotte Subdivision, Section 41, located in Section 12, Township 40 South, Range 21 East. The Parcel ID for subject property is 402112408014.

Elizabeth Nocheck read into the record the staff report and staff findings for the petition.

Applicant Presentation

Michael Morris, representative for 4-M Trucking, Inc., said he was sworn in. Mr. Morris said I do a lot of work over here. I actually live in Highlands County and Sebring, right now I am using my sister's place that she lives right here in North Port to store all my stuff. She is wanting me to get out of her yard, so I would like the opportunity to do this and clean up everything around there also. Because if you walk in there is syringes, trash where people have been living on this property. I would like to go in there and underbrush it and get it all cleaned up. Hopefully you all will let me do what I need to do and there won't be that much stuff there. Culvert pipe won't be that tall because I only get a truck load at a time. So, I can keep it flat to the ground nothing would really be a nuisance and I'm not parking nothing big there.

Chair McVety said are you ok with Elizabeth said about what they would like you to do, the eight-foot fence?

Mr. Morris said yes sir.

Chair McVety opened the meeting to Public Comments.

Ms. Nocheck said Mr. Chair I did receive an email from an adjacent property owner. He is a dentist with an office 17840 Toledo Blade he had appointments today and could not attend. He sent in a letter of support. We will label this as Exhibit I for the record.

Public Input

No one spoke for or against this request.

There being no further requests to speak for or against the petition, Mr. Vieira moved to close the public comments, seconded by Mr. Filieo. The public comments was closed with a unanimous vote.

Elizabeth Nocheck presented the recommended conditions for the petition.

Board Member Comments and Questions

Mr. Vieira asks is there an exhibit for the email that we received.

Ms. Nocheck said yes that is exhibit I.

ACTION: A motion was presented by Steve Vieira and seconded by Nichole Beyer that Petition SE-24-005 be APPROVED based on the Community Development Staff Report dated April 3, 2024, the evidence and testimony presented at the hearing and finding that the applicant HAS MET the required criteria for the granting of the Special Exception with the eleven conditions recommended by staff.

Motion was approved with a unanimous vote with the following eleven conditions:

1. The Special Exception, as approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals, is to allow outdoor storage for a building trades contractor and extends only to the lands included in the Site Plans and legal description submitted with this application.
2. The Concept Plan submitted by the applicant, as part of the petition, is for illustrative purposes only. All applicable regulations of County Code shall apply to this development. The applicant shall obtain all necessary permits and approvals as applicable to this development, including but not limited to Site Plan Review, right-of-way access, vegetation removal, fencing, stormwater management, and landscape plan approval.
3. The storage of debris, semi-trucks, or hazardous materials is prohibited.
4. A "Type D" Landscape Buffer with an eight-foot-tall sight-obscuring (opaque) fence or wall, shall be constructed and planted around the perimeter of the area to be used for outdoor storage, as shown on the Concept Plan (Exhibit G), provided by the applicant. The use of chain link fencing as part of the required buffer is prohibited.
5. Materials stored in stacks or piles shall not exceed eight (8) feet in height.
6. Any perimeter outdoor lighting shall be directed towards the interior of the property.
7. Any future building(s) shall meet or exceed all applicable Commercial Design Standards set forth in Chapter 3-5, Article XXIV, as may be amended.
8. The outdoor storage use may not be used until all required improvements are completed, including the required buffers, and a Certificate of Occupancy has been issued.
9. The outdoor storage use shall be limited to vehicles, equipment, and materials owned by the business(es) operating on subject property. Storage spaces may not be leased or sold to other individuals or businesses.
10. This Special Exception is granted for a term of three (3) years from the date of approval from the Board of Zoning Appeals; however, the Special Exception shall not expire if the owner commences the proposed development on or before the Special Exception's term expires.
11. Any major changes or additions to this special exception shall require a modification of the special exception. A change in type of outdoor storage shall require a modification of the special exception. Minor changes or additions, such as accessory uses or structures, may be approved by the Zoning Official.

VAR-24-004

Robert Berntsson, representative for Donald & Gail Pearson, is requesting a variance to reduce the required 20-foot rear yard setback by 7 feet to allow a 13-foot rear yard setback, to allow an existing swimming pool and pool deck to remain "as-is" and to allow for a future screen enclosure, in the Residential Single-family-5 (RSF-5) zoning district. The property is located at 16740 Grande Quay Drive, in Boca Grande, and is described as Lot 7, of the Grande Quay II Replat of Grande Quay Subdivision,

located in Section 26, Township 42 South, Range 20 East. The Parcel ID for subject property is 42202651008.

Elizabeth Nocheck read into the record the staff report and staff findings for the petition.

Applicant Presentation

Robert Berntsson, representative for the applicants, said he was sworn in. Mr. Berntsson said we accept Elizabeth as an expert, and she has done an excellent job on the staff report. We join in the staff report and all of the findings that are made therein. The only issue that we have, this request went to the homeowner's association board for their review of the request. Their only concern was the pool cage. The applicants have no intention of building a pool cage it was just when we had our pre-app meeting. It was like you might as well throw that in maybe someday they'll want to put a pool cage in. Put it in and you don't have to worry about it. Since then, with the homeowner's associations concerns we would ask that you approve this request for a variance with the conditions as proposed. With a modification to condition number three, that would say a pool cage may not be constructed on the property. The owners would like that condition, they understand that limits the ability to do that in the future. But in order to comply with the request of the homeowner's association they would like that condition so that there is now question that there won't be a pool cage going in.

Mr. Vieira said I don't have any particular issue with the request for the variance. I am just curious as to when the home was purchased in 2019 that a title search didn't turn up the encroachment into the.

Mr. Berntsson said in my law firm, my partners do a lot of real estate transactions. You get a survey, and you get a title commitment that will basically say subject to things shown on the survey. But typically, they don't go into zoning in a title opinion. It's whether you own it and subject to the survey, unless you are aware of the requirements it wouldn't come up as a survey issue.

Chair McVety opened the meeting to Public Comments.

Public Input

No one spoke for or against this request.

There being no further requests to speak for or against the petition, Mr. Filieo moved to close the public comments, seconded by Ms. Beyer. The public comments was closed with a unanimous vote.

Elizabeth Nocheck presented the recommended conditions for the petition.

Board Member Comments and Questions

Chair McVety said can you pull up exhibit E5 the pictures of the pool. Shaun, I got a weird question, see the picture to far right. The pool deck is kind of levered, so if it's not really touching the ground. So, if it's not touching the ground does that count as being.

Mr. Cullinan said yes because even the posts are within that required setback. This was from the 90's I actually had to go back to the original engineer, with Johnson Engineering Mark Theis. But because the posts are encroaching as well, and both have a discussion.

ACTION: A motion was presented by Andrew Filieo and seconded by Nichole Beyer that Petition VAR-24-004 be APPROVED based on the Community Development Staff Report dated April 3, 2024, the evidence and testimony presented at the hearing and finding that the applicant HAS MET the required criteria for the granting of the Variance with number 1, 2, and 4 conditions recommended by staff.

Mr. Berntsson said I would ask that you specifically put that a pool cage may not be constructed on the property.

Mr. Filieo said it would be assumed Sir, that I did not include the required recommendations in totality that I omitted number three that that would not be included. Would that not be correct?

Mr. Berntsson said I don't think so, I think because a pool cage would then be allowed as a right according to what Ms. Nocheck has indicated.

Asst. County Atty. Thomas David said I think the motion should be that include conditions include one, two and four.

Ms. Nocheck they're asking for a condition to specifically prohibit the construction of a pool cage on the property.

Mr. Berntsson said on number three, it would read a pool cage may not be constructed on the property.

Asst. County Atty. Thomas David said then you could say number three is a pool cage is prohibited.

Mr. Berntsson said that is fine.

Chair McVety asks Mr. Filieo are you ok with that?

Mr. Filieo said I am ok with that.

Motion was approved with a unanimous vote with the following four conditions:

1. The variance, as approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals, is to reduce the required 20-foot rear yard setback by 7 feet to allow a 13-foot rear yard setback, to allow an existing swimming pool and pool deck to remain "as-is" in their current locations on subject property.
2. The variance shall apply only to the existing swimming pool and pool deck, as shown in the documents submitted with this application.
3. A pool cage is prohibited.
4. If the existing swimming pool or pool deck is removed or replaced, the variance shall expire and all future development must be constructed according to all applicable codes in existence at that time, unless a new variance is granted specific to the development proposed at that time. This condition shall not apply to removal or replacement caused by a natural disaster or involuntary destruction of the swimming pool or pool deck.

9:40 Five-minute recess.

9:45 Resume

SE-24-006

Robert Berntsson, representative for Doug & Sally Buuck, is requesting a special exception to allow the outdoor storage of non-commercial vehicles including boats, trailers, and recreational vehicles, as well as to allow outdoor storage for a building trades contractor's office, in the Commercial General (CG) zoning district. The property is located at 27761 Bermont Road, in Punta Gorda, and is described as Lots 11 and 14-29 of Tract C, Lots 1-3, 5, 6, and 10-12 of Block 39, of the Tee & Green Estates Subdivision, First Addition, located in Section 03, Township 41 South, Range 23 East. The Parcel ID for subject property is 412303226001.

Elizabeth Nocheck read into the record the staff report and staff findings for the petition.

Applicant Presentation

Robert Berntsson, representative for the applicant, said he was sworn in. Mr. Berntsson said he accepts Ms. Nocheck as an expert. We have no issues with any of the conditions, the only thing I wanted to add was just so the record is clear. There is a type O on the bottom page 2 where it says the building that is proposed is 270-foot by 50, it's actually 270 by 60 for a total of 16,200 square feet. But with that clarification we join in the staff report and we accept all of the recommended conditions as proposed.

Chair McVety asks do you know who owns those lots that they couldn't get that you're going around?

Mr. Berntsson said they're different owners, they're not all the same.

Mr. Vieira said future access would be by the road to the south of those lots that are impacted. They wouldn't be denied accessibility to their lots. A small discussion takes place with the three of them.

Mr. Vieira asks Mr. Cullinan we did approve the previous application correct and I know when I looked at it and I did the research it looked vaguely familiar to me. I was curious what restrictions we put on the wetland's jurisdiction on the previous application, do we know that?

Mr. Cullinan said I would have to go back into that previous application, I do not recall.

Mr. Vieira said I guess I'll ask this question then; it wouldn't be any less than wet than what we had proposed to the previous applicant would it? Both discuss this briefly.

Chair McVety opened the meeting to Public Comments.

Public Input

No one spoke for or against this request.

There being no further requests to speak for or against the petition, Mr. Vieira moved to close the public comments, seconded by Mr. Beyer. The public comments was closed with a unanimous vote.

Elizabeth Nocheck presented the recommended conditions for the petition.

Asst. Co. Atty. Thomas David said I looked at the petition from last time and those conditions are almost identical to what you did last time.

Board Member Comments and Questions

None

ACTION: A motion was presented by Andrew Filieo and seconded by Steve Vieira that Petition SE-24-006 be APPROVED based on the Community Development Staff Report dated April 3, 2024, the evidence and testimony presented at the hearing and finding that the applicant HAS MET the required criteria for the granting of the Special Exception with twelve conditions recommended by staff.

Chair McVety asks Mr. Cullinan if they bought that one additional lot in between, they have to come all the way back through the process?

Mr. Cullinan said that is correct yes, they discuss this.

Asst. Co. Atty. Thomas David said it would change the legal description.

Motion was approved with a unanimous vote with the following twelve conditions:

1. The Special Exception, as approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals, is to allow outdoor storage for building trades contractors' offices, outdoor storage of boats, trailers, and recreational vehicles, and light manufacturing and assembly in a completely enclosed building and extends only to the lands included in the Site Plans and legal description submitted with this application.
2. The Concept Plans submitted by the applicant, as part of the petition, are for illustrative purposes only. All applicable regulations of County Code shall apply to this development. The applicant shall obtain all necessary permits and approvals as applicable to this development, including but not limited to Site Plan Review, right-of-way access, vegetation removal, fencing, stormwater management, and landscape plan approval.
3. The storage of debris, semi-trucks, dump trucks, or hazardous materials is prohibited.
4. A "Type D" Landscape Buffer with an eight-foot-tall sight-obscuring (opaque) fence or wall, shall be constructed and planted around the perimeter of the area to be used for outdoor storage, as shown on the Concept Plans (Exhibit G), provided by the applicant. The use of chain link fencing as part of the required buffer is prohibited. A Type C buffer shall be required on the eastern half of the north property line where no outdoor storage is proposed.
5. Materials stored in stacks or piles shall not exceed eight (8) feet in height.
6. Any perimeter outdoor lighting shall be directed towards the interior of the property.
7. Any future building(s) shall meet or exceed all applicable Commercial Design Standards set forth in Chapter 3-5, Article XXIV, as may be amended.
8. The outdoor storage use may not be used until all required improvements are completed, including the required buffers, and a Certificate of Occupancy has been issued.
9. The outdoor storage use for the building trades contractors' office(s) shall be limited to vehicles, equipment, and materials owned by the business(es) operating on subject property. Storage spaces may not be leased or sold to other individuals or businesses.

10. The light manufacturing and assembly use shall be limited to the marine canvas business. A change in type of light manufacturing and assembly will require a modification of the special exception. All fabrication and repair work must be performed inside the fully enclosed building. Fitting of finished canvas tops on boats may be performed outdoors.
11. This Special Exception is granted for a term of three (3) years from the date of approval from the Board of Zoning Appeals; however, the Special Exception shall not expire if the owner commences the proposed development on or before the Special Exception's term expires.
12. Any major changes or additions to this special exception shall require a modification of the special exception. A change in type of outdoor storage shall require a modification of the special exception. Minor changes or additions, such as accessory uses or structures, may be approved by the Zoning Official.

SE-24-007

Robert Berntsson, representative for Punta Gorda RV Owner, LP, is requesting a special exception to modify conditions of approval of petition SE-23-025, to allow the outdoor storage of boats, trailers, recreational vehicles, and pod storage containers, in the Commercial General (CG) zoning district. The property is located at 4462 Duncan Road, in Punta Gorda, and is described as Parcels P 28-1, P 29, P 29-1, P 29-2, P 29-3, and P 45, located in Section 25, Township 40 South, Range 23 East. The Parcel ID for subject property is 402325328005.

Elizabeth Nocheck read into the record the staff report and staff findings for the petition.

Mr. Vieira asks could you show me where the RE1 zoning is, is it to the south of the site or is it just that specific lot?

Ms. Nocheck said it is all over.

Applicant Presentation

Robert Berntsson, representative for the applicant, I have been sworn in and accept Ms. Nocheck as an expert. Mr. Berntsson said this is a number of times you've seen this property. We actually did a special exception in the early 2000's for the middle portion where is says CG. Pretty much the 1234 central long rectangles, we did a special exception for a contractor's yard with outside storage. Subsequent to that we got approval from the zoning official at that time it was zoned commercial intensive. The zoning official at that time allowed for outdoor storage on commercial intensive lots and so it's been the central part there has been containing outdoor storage since the early 2000's. Along with the eastern most portion which was a separate outdoor storage facility. In 2000 a special exception application was submitted for the western portion of the property for outdoor storage by a different applicant and that was approved for outdoor storage. Then we came in and consolidated all of them for a special exception for outdoor storage. As the site design was done at that time the stormwater was intended to be on the western most portion of the property. The previous owner had cleared that area and put trailers there and they are the new owners are dealing with SWFWMD. Because of those clearing that place without the appropriate permits. Going through SWFWMD approval it was determined that the soils on the western most portion of the property were really not suitable for the stormwater area. So, the site was redesigned with the stormwater in a more appropriate suitable places. It is my recollection that the owner of the property to the immediate west spoke at the last

public hearing in favor of the applicant, application for a special exception. I know her personally and I know that she has supported these types of activities in the past. None the less my only concern was after we got the last special exception approved there was some concern that it was being interpreted that all of the historic non-conforming storage had to be removed until the site was brought into complete compliance. That was never my understanding in reading the condition at the time. But I have spoken with staff, and we are requesting an amendment to condition number eight. That I believe Mr. David had proposed language making it clear that, that portion that has been there historically grandfathered in can continue. The other areas can not be used until all of the buffering and permitting is complete. But with that we would join in the staff report, we accept all the conditions with the modified condition number eight.

Asst. Co. Atty. Thomas David said the new proposed language for condition eight is as follows. Current outdoor storage located on parcel P28-1 shall be removed no later than thirty days after adoption of this special exception. Existing outdoor storage on parcels P29-1, P29-2, P29-3 and P45 may remain in place during the installation of the additional outdoor storage contemplated by this special exception. However, the additional storage authorized by this special exception may not be leased or rented to the public until all required improvements are completed including the required buffers and a certificate of occupancy has been issued. That's what we discussed with Mr. Berntsson, and that's acceptable to the county, maybe that's not acceptable to the county.

Ms. Nocheck said I would like clarification on that, the way that it's worded it sounds like they can increase, they can add new storage to the site before they have any approvals. That's the way that it reads.

Asst. Co. Atty. Thomas David said I'll re-read it to you. Existing storage on the P29-1, 2, 3 and 45 may remain in place during installation of the additional outdoor storage contemplated by the special exception. However, the additional outdoor storage authorized by this special exception may not be leased or rented to the public until all required improvements are completed. Does that make sense?

Ms. Nocheck said the way that you read it, it sounds like you're allowing them to increase the outdoor storage on the center portion of the site prior to actually going through the DRC process and having all their landscaping installed.

Asst. Co. Atty. Thomas David said that's not what it says.

Mr. Berntsson said they have a legal non-conforming outdoor storage on that site, whether they have ten vehicles today or twenty tomorrow that's legal.

Mr. Cullinan said if I may make a quick, parcel 28-1 is the specific one where we want everything cleared out correct?

Ms. Nocheck said that is correct.

Mr. Cullinan said that is straight up illegal, that is not legally non-conforming that is not grandfathered in like the rest of the site is. Ms. Keiser had been using it historically for storage, parcel 28-1 was just blatantly, illegally cleared and used for storage.

Mr. Berntsson said by the prior owner.

Mr. Cullinan said correct, you are absolutely correct, and we have other issues with that prior owner, and we understand that they're trying to clear that up. But at the same time, they should not be allowed to continue and possibly even potentially increase the ability to use that which was illegally cleared with no previous non-conformities being in place.

Mr. Bertsson said I think that's what Mr. David's condition addresses.

Asst. Co. Atty. Thomas David said I've discussed it with council for the applicant, I believe my legal opinion is, this covers exactly what staff is saying that it wants to do. To not allow additional outdoor storage to be utilized until it's properly permitted. So, to remove the storage on 28-1 that's what it says Elizabeth, so I think we're good.

Chair McVety opened the meeting to Public Comments.

Public Input

No one spoke for or against this request.

There being no further requests to speak for or against the petition, Mr. Vieira moved to close the public comments, seconded by Mr. Filieo. The public comments was closed with a unanimous vote.

Elizabeth Nocheck presented the recommended conditions for the petition.

Asst. Co. Atty. Thomas David said I would request that when the motion is made that the maker of the motion include that condition number eight will be condition as read by the county attorney.

Chair McVety said Shaun on number four it says pod storage containers maybe stored but cargo containers can not what's the difference between a pod and cargo?

Mr. Cullinan said pods are just a different type of cargo container. The storage of them is different than them being used for storage if that's what you're referring to? But a pod, we just wanted clarifications because somebody might have a shipping container or some one of their uses maybe for pods or Red Rover or one of those other types of companies. Pods are typically smaller than shipping containers, but functionally they accomplish the same thing.

Chair McVety said is that temporary is that what you're saying because it's a pod. Isn't Pod just a name brand of a company that let's you store your stuff in their container while you're moving.

Mr. Cullinan said correct but and so that business could go in there and store like Red Rover or Pods or any other company like that. They could go to your house you load all your stuff in they drop it there and store it or this group could lease to a shipping company where they store shipping containers there. So, it's to address both items.

Chair McVety said I'm still confused.

Ms. Nocheck said I can clarify it, the primary intent of that was to prevent situations that we've had in other special exception hearings where the applicants are requesting to have a shipping container on site to act as their storage building. So that was the attempt to prevent, and they both discuss.

Asst. Co. Atty. Thomas David said I think Mr. McVety the staff has actually reviewed the difference between a pod container, and a storage or cargo container, and they believe there is enough of a difference between those two types of units that they will be able distinguish them in a code violation context. They both discuss this.

Board Member Comments and Questions

None

ACTION: A motion was presented by Steve Vieira and seconded by Andrew Filieo that Petition SE-24-007 be APPROVED based on the Community Development Staff Report dated April 3, 2024, the evidence and testimony presented at the hearing and finding that the applicant HAS MET the required criteria for the granting of the Special Exception conditions one through ten are included and condition number eight is modified as read into the record by the county attorney and recommended by staff.

Motion was approved with a unanimous vote with the following ten conditions:

1. The Special Exception, as approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals, is to modify conditions of approval of SE-23-025 and extends only to the lands included in the Site Plans and legal description submitted with this application.
2. The Concept Plan submitted by the applicant, as part of the petition, is for illustrative purposes only. All applicable regulations of County Code shall apply to this development. The applicant shall obtain all necessary permits and approvals as applicable to this development, including but not limited to Site Plan Review, right-of-way access, vegetation removal, fencing, stormwater management, and landscape plan approval.
3. The storage of construction materials, debris, or hazardous materials is prohibited.
4. Pod storage containers may be stored on site but shall not be stacked more than two containers high, must be located in the interior of the property, and shall not be visible from any property line. Storage of shipping or cargo containers shall not be permitted.
5. A "Type D" Landscape Buffer with an eight-foot-tall sight-obscuring (opaque) fence or wall, shall be constructed and planted around the entire perimeter of the site, as shown on the Concept Plan (Exhibit H), provided by the applicant. The use of chain link fencing as part of the required buffer is prohibited.
6. Any perimeter outdoor lighting shall be directed towards the interior of the property.
7. Any future building(s) shall meet or exceed all applicable Commercial Design Standards set forth in Chapter 3-5, Article XXIV, as may be amended.
8. Current outdoor storage located on parcel P28-1 shall be removed no later than 30 days after adoption of this special exception. Existing outdoor storage on parcels P29-1, P29-2, P29-3 and P45 may remain in place during installation of the additional outdoor storage contemplated by this special exception. However, the additional outdoor storage authorized by this special exception may not be leased or rented to the public until all required improvements are completed, including the required buffers, and a Certificate of Occupancy has been issued.
9. This Special Exception is granted for a term of three (3) years from the date of approval from the Board of Zoning Appeals; however, the Special Exception shall not expire if the owner commences the proposed development on or before the Special Exception's term expires.

10. Any major changes or additions to this special exception shall require a modification of the special exception. Minor changes or additions, such as accessory uses or structures, may be approved by the Zoning Official.

IX. Public Comments –
None

X. Staff Comments –
Ms. Nocheck said we will be doing the Sunshine Law video next meeting and at our next meeting we have six petitions and oops it's all variances.

XII. Next Meeting
*The next meeting of the Board of Zoning Appeals is scheduled for **Wednesday, May 8, 2024, at 9:00 a.m., in Room 119.***

There being no further business, the meeting **ADJOURNED** at 10:29 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Kimberly Sargent, Recorder
/kas



Blair McVety, Chair

Approval Date: _____

5-8-24