A. CALL TO ORDER
Vice-Chair Swingle called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM.

1. Pledge of Allegiance led by Mike Gautreaux

2. Roll Call
   Members Present:
   Lennie Arnold
   Thomas Broughton
   Susan Christman
   Todd Swingle, Vice-Chair
   John Byron, Chair

   Administrative Members Present:
   City Attorney Wade Vose
   City Manager James McKnight
   City Clerk Loredana Kalaghchy
   Development Services Director Randy Stevenson

B. PAST REVIEWS: Acknowledge Charter Review Committee review to date – Review of Preamble through Article V
Vice-Mayor Swingle acknowledged that the Committee had undertaken the review of the Preamble through Article V of the City Charter.

C. APPROVE THE AGENDA AND ORDER OF BUSINESS
MOTION BY BYRON/ARNOLD
I MOVE TO APPROVE THE ORDER OF BUSINESS.
VOICE VOTE ON THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

D. CONSENT AGENDA
MOTION BY BYRON/ARNOLD
I MOVE TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA.
VOICE VOTE ON THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
1. Approve the October 11, 2017 Minutes; Representative: City Clerk Department

E. BUSINESS TO BE CONDUCTED:
1. Review and Discuss Charter Sections/Topics. The Review process will be as follows:
   Presentations and Reports; Committee discussion; Public Comments; Final Committee discussion

   Vice-Chair Swingle pointed out that the Committee is scheduled to have three meetings on this section of the Charter. He noted that this meeting’s goals was to identify parking lot items that will need further discussion. Chair Byron was of the opinion that there was no need for three meetings, and suggested that rather than holding three meetings on this section, that the review be reduced to two meetings, extending the third meeting to April for review of the entire chapter.

   MOTION BY BYRON/CHRISTMAN,
   I MOVE TO DROP THE SECOND INTERNAL REVIEW MEETING, OF ARTICLE VI SCHEDULED FOR DECEMBER, AND MOVE THE REMAINING MEETINGS BACKWARD ONE MONTH, ALLOWING THE SCHEDULING OF A SECOND FINAL RECOMMENDATION MEETING IN APRIL, 2018.
a. Article VI – Planning, Zoning and Development

1, 6.01 Residential density limits

Section 6.01

At the request of Committee members, City Attorney Wade Vose discussed the primary State Statutes that deals with land use provisions, Florida Statutes section 163.3167(8). He read a portion of that section: “(8)(a) An initiative or referendum process in regard to any development order is prohibited. (b) An initiative or referendum process in regard to any local comprehensive plan amendment or map amendment is prohibited unless it is expressly authorized by specific language in a local government charter that was lawful and in effect on June 1, 2011.”

He reported that this Statute was a product of land use regulations in City Charters, litigation and the Florida legislation following a 2006 St. Pete Beach ballot initiative. He explained that this Statute deals with Florida Hometown democracy. He noted that ever since the St. Pete Beach initiative, the Legislature has been strengthening the provision of the Statutes that prohibit the referendum process for Comprehensive Plan, map amendments and development orders. He referred to a case dating back in 2011, a case in Volusia County where a referendum was proposed to amend their City Charter, imposing restrictions on property, something that could also be done by Comprehensive Plan. He explained that the referendum got challenged and the court ruled that imposing land use provisions by referendum on property violated the State prohibition. He noted that the question was imposed by a number of people on whether this State provision, put in by the Florida Legislature to stop restrictions on the use of land, if it did have the inverse effect of freezing in time in the Cocoa Beach City Charter, the land use provisions that made it in the Charter prior to 2011, or if the provisions were grandfathered in. He explained the reasons the Charter Review Committee and City Commission has a fair degree of latitude even under the Florida Statutes. He pointed out that there was little case law, and explained the handicap and the different scenarios with the review of the Charter. He noted that in reviewing the scenarios, the City Attorney’s office was not abdicating sides on the issues. He explained that, based on case law and statutes, in his opinion the cleanest type of revision and the most defensible action that could be done to Article VI, in particular to the density and height limits sections, was an outright removal of the sections from the Charter. He explained that the reason for his determination, and based on posing the counter argument, if amending the sections, the Committee would be doing something to either remove, argument, or make changes, the argument that would come from anyone challenging such ballot initiative, presumably making the restrictions less strict, or having different criteria by which to evaluate how things would occur, the argument would be that the City would be imposing a land use requirement in Charter, after the grandfather period. He explained that in effect, even if there are current restrictions in the Charter, by changing the restrictions, someone would not get the benefit of the old Charter requirement, and the City would be seen as imposing a new requirements. He explained that the counter argument was, if crafted appropriately, and with appropriate tweaks made to the Comprehensive Plan to make sure that they did not clash or interact, such as changing the height
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from 45 to 46 feet, if the prohibitions as stated now were changed, and the provisions within the Comprehensive Plan remained as they are for the time being, then the City Attorney's office could argue that the Charter amendment did not change a single word of the Comprehensive Plan. It would be subject to counter argument that what the City was doing was imposing land use restrictions, even if less strict than what existed before, and after the referendum date. He explained that in contrast, a complete repeal of the provisions to remove the height and/or density sections, would not have the effect of changing the restrictions currently in effect to anything other than what was stated in the Charter, and as they remains in the Comprehensive Plan. To remove the sections, would not change the performance metrics. Removing the provisions, the City was saying that all the City was doing was removing what is prohibited by legislation, except that it had been grandfathered in, prior to legislation. He noted that these were the dynamics that were being dealt with at this time of review of the Charter. He explained that offering the possible dynamics, offered an understanding about the amount of tools available for challenges. He noted that the City would be able to defend either scenario, if done correctly. He noted that the opponents would have more tools to fight, in particular if tweaking the sections. At inquiry by Mr. Broughton about leaving the sections as is, the City Attorney noted that this was a status quo. The City Attorney noted that his job was to handicap and minimize litigation risks.

Chair Byron noted that the Committee currently did not need to deal with these sections of the Charter, suggesting that the Committee take no position on decisions at this meeting, until community opinions are heard at the next meeting.

Ms. Susan Christman read two City Staff comments reflecting the following: delete the redundant words “the provisions for such variance shall be in accordance with” and the second suggesting was to delete the entire section, referencing the State Statute requirements.

Mr. Swingle mentioned that this section was a parking lot item.

Mr. Boris Pelakh noted that he participated in the process when the regulations were adopted. He noted that there was a wide range public support to retain the sections in the Charter. He noted that placement of this section in the Charter was the done intentionally, since the City Charter is hard to change. He explained that the City is mostly residential in nature, and the amount of tourist-related development was sufficient. He listed complications due to density increases such as traffic, evacuation time, stress on City services, and more extensive recovery time following weather-related events. He noted that space was limited on the island, and that the residents appreciate the City not adding stress to the systems. He noted that he did not wish to see Cocoa Beach turn into a Miami Beach or Fort Lauderdale.

Ms. Clarice Costello pointed out that the City had several elections on this particular issue and 70% voted to keep the City as is. She inquired on the reason changes to the section were being considered, noting that voices were clear and that residents did not want the height changed from 45 feet.

Mr. Connie Fichtl provided each Board member with spreadsheets of compiled data. She explained that the spreadsheet information that was being provided contained census data of Florida incorporated cities as of April 1, 2010. She noted that there were 416 city names, referenced by the Florida Legislative Office of Economic and
Demographic Research. She noted that four cities were governed by two counties, and to reduce duplication, the number of cities being accounted for in the spreadsheets was 412. She noted that 34% of the Cities (142) were coastal cities. She noted that 72% (140) of the 142 cities had populations of less than 20,000 people. Of the 100 cities, 23 (23%) of them had a residential maximum density of 10 units or less per acre. Of the 100 cities 24 (24%) of them have a residential maximum density of 11 to 15 units per acre. Of those 100 cities, 15 (15%) of them have a residential maximum density of 16 to 20 units per acre. Of those 100 cities, 26 (26%) of them have a residential maximum density of 21 to 109 units per acre. Of those 100 cities, 13 (13%) of them have a transient maximum density of 28 units or less per acre. Of the 42 cities, 7 (16.6%) of them have a transient maximum density of 29 - 35 units per acre. Of those 100 cities, 16 (16%) of them have a transient maximum density of 29 - 35 units per acre. Of those 100 cities, 3 (3%) have a transient maximum density of 101 to 109 units per acre. Of those 100 cities, 2 (2%) of them did not permit transient rentals. Of those 42 cities with more than 20,000 population, 4 (9.5%) have a transient maximum density of 28 units or less per acre. Of those 42 cities, 7 (16.6%) of them have a transient maximum density of 29 to 35 units per acre. Of those 42 cities, 18 (43%) of them have a transient maximum density of 36 to 100 units per acre. Of the 42 cities, 5 (12%) of them have a maximum density in excess of 100 units per acre. She noted that Florida coastal cities are being built out, and that there was little green space. She noted that a large number of citizens have stated that they did not want this for their community. In her opinion, there was no need to revisit this topic and this topic should not be removed from the Charter.

Mr. Mike Gautreaux noted that density limits was a controversial subject. The City gets rallied up when talking about changing what is in the Charter. He noted that when talking about options, of removing, leaving in place, or changing the Charter section, there was an intangible present. If looking at changes, the changes needed to make sense, listing as examples: FEMA codes, State regulations changes. He described the intangible as the impact on the City, if the City goes to battle all over again on this issue. He suggested looking at reasonable facts to affect changes that make sense. He suggested educating the voters on the reason for the changes, while retaining the intent of the original code.

Chair Byron pointed out that height and density were two separate issues. He noted that one or both might not be issues. He noted that these subjects define the character of the City. He referred to a shared sense that the City is a unique place, a special space that residents want to preserve. He noted the need to address deteriorating structures, and ways to address the tax base. He noted that there were two ways to improve the tax base, one was to increase taxes, and the other was to increase the value of properties. In his opinion, discussion needed to occur.

Mr. Lennie Arnold referred to the link to Section 6.09. He noted that Section 6.09 referred to rebuilding if a building is torn down. He inquired if there was a repeat in language in relation to other sections of the Charter. Chair Byron noted the need to look at sections 6.07 and 6.09.

Vice-Chair Swingle noted the need to be able to understand context of means, current density, and how it referred to carrying capacity and sustainability for the amount of existing area. The Committee needed a presentation on context on where the City stood in the density rules and how density fits with height rules.

Ms. Susan Christman requested expert advice on current building standards for November 8, 2017
ceiling height and building heights within the 45-foot limit, in term of stories.

The parking lot items that were listed for Section 6.01 were:
- Consider deleting the words due to redundancy “the provisions for such variance shall be in accordance with” (Secondary)
- Staff presentation of sources of the City tax base, and impacts.
- City Attorney report on links between Charter Section 6.01 in relation to Sections 6.07 and 6.09.
- Staff presentation on carrying capacity, sustainability, density rules, height rules, and relationships.
- Expert advice on current building standards for ceiling height and building heights within the 45-foot limit in terms of stories.

2. 6.02 Banana River access
Mr. Byron inquired about the difference of reference for “a navigable channel” and “a channel of the Banana River.”

There were no comments from public on this section.

The parking lot items that were listed for Section 6.02 were:
- Staff to report on the existence of beach access easements and provide expert advice.
- Determine if reference to easements needs to be included in this section.

3. 6.03 Atlantic Ocean beach-access
Mr. Broughton inquired if beach access easements needed to be included in this section. Possible examples of such easements were noted for Holiday Lane (International Palms Resort) and Surf Drive.

There were no public comments on this section.

The parking lot items that were listed for Section 6.03 were:
- Staff to report on the existence of beach access easements and provide expert advice.
- Determine if reference to easements needs to be included in this section.

4. 6.04 Building height limit
Ms. Susan Christman requested expert advice on ceiling height. She read recommendations from Staff: Mr. Torres recommended adding the number of stories in addition to the height limit noted in feet. Mr. Stevenson suggested deleting the section. Mr. Holland suggested defining the conditions for a special exception, sentence #3.

Chair Byron suggested that this item be a parking lot item. He recommended receiving City input directly from the City Manager, rather than through Staff. City Manager McKnight explained that Staff was available to provide information and expert advice and planned to stay away from opinions. Following some discussion Mr. McKnight noted that he preferred that staff-level comments to the Committee come through him.

Mr. Arnold commented that by putting an absolute number of 45 feet, in his opinion, had wide-ranging impacts, environmental impact, and property impacts. He explained that if a building can be constructed to one story, reducing the footprint of
the development and turn space into open space for filtering water, environmentally the City would be better off. He noted that the Committee needed to keep that concept in mind.

Chair Byron referred to comments made by Mr. Gautreaux that perhaps the referendums should be interpreted in an intelligent way that accomplishes goals. Vice Chair Swingle concurred with comments made by Mr. Byron, noting that the challenge was to agree on the objective of the referendums. His take included interpretation on the character, the nature of the community, and include comments on the environment, and stormwater storage. He inquired if height solely took the City to the balance. He noted that for him, what was important were topics that needed to be covered in order not to depart from the intent of the character of the community.

Mr. Roger Buckle (phonetically spelled) noted that the 45-foot limit was there as a solid number that was hard to change, with the intent that the residents do not want it to change. He noted that the variance procedure would allow for something for environmental review. He noted that in his opinion, if someone wants a variation in height, they could request a variance. In his opinion the limit should not be easy to change.

Mr. Bill Myers noted that he was involved in the height limit referendum and the SRA1A referendum. He noted that as a result of the six-lane of SR A1A opposition, a committee was formed called the Citizens Action Committee. He noted that the Committee also worked on the height limit referendum. He reported on the efforts undertaken to derive to the 45-foot height limit. In his opinion, it would be a mistake to place this subject on the ballot, noting that it will cause disruption in the City.

Ms. Connie Fichtl distributed information on height statistics. She noted that there were other cities that want to maintain low residential family oriented community standards. She noted the need to consider the data and preserve the community. Ms. Connie Fichtl provided each Board member with a spreadsheets of data compiled. She noted that the spreadsheet contained census data of Florida incorporated cities as of April 1, 2010. She noted that there were 416 city names referenced by the Florida Legislative Office of Economic and Demographic Research. She noted that four cities were governed by two counties, and in order to reduce duplication, the number of cities bringing the number of cities to 412. She noted that 34% of the Cities (142) were coastal cities. She noted that 72% (100) of the 142 cities had populations of less than 20,000 people. Of the 100 cities, 48 (48%) had a maximum allowable building height of 45 feet or less without variances. Of the 48 cities, 41 (85%) are less than 45 feet. She reported that for those populations with more than 20,000 people, eight (19%) had a maximum height of 45 feet or less; 16 (15%) have a maximum building height of 48 to 56 feet. She noted that the data showed that there were other coastal cities that want to maintain the low density and family resort community. She asked the Committee to consider the data and preserve the community.

Mr. Mike Gautreaux was of the opinion that the Committee was going through the review of the Charter in the right direction by bringing in the experts. He noted the need to define what makes better sense, in relation to what is in place now. He recommended looking at what makes sense and what the residents will vote for. He noted the need to work together as a community.

Mr. Boris Pelakh noted that measuring the height limit by feet, 45 feet, was well defined, as opposed to reference to four stories. He referred to revenue collecting
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by the City. He noted that his taxes were almost identical now, as they were in 1997. In his opinion, residents were lightly taxed, as compared to the national standard.

Ms. Harriet Fersh complimented the Committee, noting that she could see their dedication. She thanked Ms. Connie Fichtl for the research. She complimented Mr. Bill Myers for his past involvement in City referendums. She was not in favor of increasing density. She suggested the need to look at the breezeway effect, referring to a shed on the beach.

Mr. Rick Bastien noted that he was new to the area and that he had purchased property in 2013. He noted that his goal, since he retired, was to buy commercial property, and was now renovating property and adding two condos. He noted that he wished to increase the City's tax base and beautify the building. He noted that in his opinion, the best example of pros and cons discussion to the height limit question could be viewed at the September 2017 City Commission meeting. In his opinion, the 45-foot height limit was not the way to go for the future. In his opinion, the City could not live in the past, and allowing four story limit buildings, in his opinion would be a good limit to discuss, in order to better the City.

Mr. Matt Harrington encouraged the Committee to continue their review of the Charter. He noted the need to find the better opportunity, instead of the status quo. In his opinion, if something was not done, the City would run into terms of decay, dilapidated and destroyed buildings, with no business incentive to return to viable buildings. He noted that he wished to live in a family-fun oriented community.

Mr. Sam Meeks noted that he had owned his house since 1997. In his opinion, the City's density had already ski rocketed. In his opinion, the issue was about money not about building height. He noted that the City had financial troubles and was looking to solve the problem. In his opinion, the revenue issue was not tied to the height. In his opinion, raising the height and density limit would only benefit few people and not the majority of people.

Chair Byron noted that he respected those who were in the wars of past charter referendums. He pointed out that there was at least a dialogue forming about the potential for adjustment. He noted that there may be approaches that do not impose themselves on what the City wishes to protect. He pointed out that the ten largest taxpayers were in the hospitality-tourist industry. He noted that should a change be made, it needed to be conservative, well-balanced, so the community can decide. He noted that the voice of the voters moves with time. He noted that he wished to hear the voice of the voters now, on Charter referendums.

Vice-Chair Swingle noted that the Committee’s important role was to listen to the community. He pointed out that there was thought, passion and pride in the City. He pointed out that the Committee was in the process of identifying ideas on what to talk about at the next meeting. He noted that if a referendum question was to be crafted, it needed to be crafted intelligently in order to reflect the voice of the community. He asked the Committee’s input on what needed to be added to the next agenda.

Chair Byron suggested discussing the pros and cons on height. He noted that the Committee needed to hear from the people who wished to have the numbers changed, why they think it is a good idea and why they need to convince the community. He noted the need to also hear from the residents who say they do not want changes.
Vice-Chair Swingle noted the need for the City Attorney to explain the exemption process. He asked from the staff comments on environment challenges, permitting challenges, what has changed, regulatory building codes, considerations for flood elevations, things that may have impacted the ability to build within the height restrictions.

Mr. Broughton noted that it was hard to formulate questions. He sighted the City attorney’s comments on legal challenge if changes were to be made to this section. City Attorney Wade Vose noted that either changing, or not changing, this section of the Charter, in his opinion would not violate the State Statutes. He clarified that there would be substantial arguments that would be used by someone challenging to prove the City wrong.

Vice-Chair Swingle noted that it was the Committee’s challenge to come up with proposals, once enough information was gathered. Mr. Broughton noted that the only positive for change was the financial impact.

Chair Byron noted that an alternate approach the Committee could take was to recommend to the Commission taking out the section, and alongside develop the Land Development Code that would kick in, if the voters agreed to the removal of the section. He noted that he asked the City Attorney to look at that approach. City Attorney Vose explained that development of the Land Development Code was a general mechanism used in the past. Vice-Chair Swingle requested that the City Attorney offer alternate approaches in keeping with the Committee’s discussions, while keeping balance with comments offered.

The parking lot items that were listed for Section 6.04 were:
- discuss the pros and cons on height.
- need to hear from the people who wish to have the numbers changed.
- hear from the people who do not wish to make changes.
- City Attorney to explain the exemption process.
- Staff comments on environment challenges, permitting challenges, what has changed, regulatory building codes, considerations for flood elevations, things that may have impacted the ability to build within the height restrictions.
- City Attorney to present alternate approaches, including the recommendation to remove the section from the Charter, alongside with developing Land Development Code that would kick in, if voters agreed to the removal of this section.

5. 6.05 Construction constrained corridor (State Road A1A)

Chair Byron suggested retaining this section in its present form. At inquiry by the Board, City Attorney Wade Vose explained that the City could provide input and not prohibit FDOT from dealing with State roads. At inquiry from a resident, the City Attorney interpreted this section’s language as SRA1A having a total of four lanes.

Mr. Arnold inquired on the value of retaining this section in the Charter. Mr. Broughton pointed out that FDOT considers input from cities seriously. Mr. Arnold pointed out that FDOT was not bound to the City’s requests. Vice-Chair Swingle noted that retaining the section in the Charter was not causing an issue.

The parking lot items that were listed for Section 6.05 were:
- None

6. 6.06 Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) referendum requirement
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No comments from the public.

Mr. Arnold inquired if additional language needed to be added in reference to voters. The City Attorney noted that the term qualified voters was a clear term.

City Manager James McKnight suggested retaining this section in the Charter, explaining that residents voted to create the City’s CRA, placing the current CRA on more solid ground with the County’s desire to deal with CRAs.

The parking lot items that were listed for Section 6.06 were:
- None

7. 6.07 Comprehensive Plan adoption requirements
Chair Byron was of the opinion that this section needed to be in the parking lot. He noted that the City has a variance process, and that the process needed to be reviewed. He inquired if the requirement of four Commission votes was the right number. He noted concern that the section required five votes, absolute majority, leaving requests to change the Comprehensive Plan at the tyranny of one vote. He suggested that if the voting requirement was not changed, any change to height and density would be mute.

Vice-Chair Swingle inquired how this section and requirements correlate to the height and density charter components. City Attorney Wade Vose explained that he had been thinking through the intersection of this provision with other provisions. He explained that section 6.04 did not mandate, in any district, the ability to build to 45 feet. For example, he noted that the Comprehensive Plan could allow height to 30 feet; any change to that limit, requiring change in the Comprehensive Plan would require the affirmative vote of five Commissioners. He noted that he did not read that in the section that talks about “increasing permissible building and structure height or allowable development density and/or intensity,” the exception, that is not addressing the variance process, since the variance process was previously explained and required the vote of four Commissioners. He noted that this section was referring to changing the whole rule, applicable to everyone, or particularly to a given category, within the Comprehensive Plan.

Chair Byron restated that if this section did not change, the Charter review process might not be worth the efforts. He stated that he was not taking position to height and density. He explained that if the Committee will entertain ways to relax the height and density limits, in his opinion, the Committee will need to entertain amendments to this section at the same time.

At inquiry from Mr. Broughton on when the five votes is required, the City Attorney explained that was required when amending the Comprehensive Plan, in issues dealing with height and density limits.

There were no comment from the public.

The parking lot items that were listed for Section 6.07 were:
- Discuss voting requirement.

8. 6.08 Building height limit accommodations
Chair Byron pointed out that the principle embedded in this section bears to the height limits discussions in general. He noted that current measurements are 45 feet.
from the crown of the road, but no habitable space can occur the first few feet. This is a parking lot item with the requirement to measure where the State and the federal agencies measure. Vice-Mayor Swingle concurred that this section related to height and density.

No comments from the public.

The parking lot items that were listed for Section 6.08 were:
- Discuss measurements used by the State and federal agencies, other than the crown of the road.

9. 6.09 Non casualty loss rebuild

Chair Byron recommended no change. Mr. Arnold noted that in his opinion, if the height and density sections were removed from the Charter, then this section becomes mute. Chair Byron concurred with Mr. Arnold. The City Attorney noted that there would always be a clause for non-casualty loss rebuild, and that the Committee needed to be cognizant, if this should be an independent section. Vice-Mayor Swingle concurred noting that this section was not a parking lot item, but that discussion would be reactivated, if other sections of the Charter were amended.

The parking lot items that were listed for Section 6.09 were:
- None - unless other sections of the Charter, referring to height and density, are affected.

10. 6.10 Transfer or relinquishment of interest in real property in which city has legal interest

Chair Byron was of the opinion that this was parking lot item because of his objection to the requirement of a unanimous vote. City Attorney Vose explained that the application of interest included a code enforcement lien, that would need to be released by the Commission. In his opinion, this section was not interpreted for its original intent, and include items such as code enforcement liens.

Ms. Christman pointed out that Staff’s comment on this section mirrored comments made by the City Attorney.

Mr. Scott Cunningham inquired if transfer or relinquishment could include a park. At the City Attorney’s response, Mr. Cunningham noted that if the unanimous vote to dispose of a park was removed from the Charter, the action of relinquishment should be taken to referendum.

Ms. Harriet Fersh concurred with comments made by Ms. Cunningham in reference to transferring/relinquishing of a park.

Chair Byron noted that requiring a unanimous vote challenged representative government.

Mr. Broughton noted that there were some issues that were more important to the residents. He had no problem with setting higher standards for important items.

The parking lot items that were listed for Section 6.10 were:
- Discuss standards.
F. STAFF REPORTS
None

G. COMMITTEE MEMBER REPORTS
None

H. PUBLIC COMMENTS
Mr. Roget Buckle (phonetically spelled) referred to previous Committee comments in reference to Commission unanimous vote requirements, and suggestions for change to majority vote. He suggested not allowing the Commission to vote at all on important items, and request voters to vote on such issues.

I. ADJOURNMENT – Next Meeting: December 13, 2017, 6:30 PM
The meeting was adjourned at 8:25 pm.

Submitted by:

Loredana Kalaghchy, City Clerk
Todd Swingle, Vice-Chairperson