

**Board of Adjustment and Appeals
Pinellas County
March 4, 2026 Meeting Minutes**

The Board of Adjustment and Appeals (BAA) met in regular session at 9:00 AM on this date in the County Commission Assembly Room at the Pinellas County Courthouse, 315 Court Street, Clearwater, Florida.

Present

Alan C. Bomstein, Chair
Jason Holloway, Vice-Chair
Andrew Hunsicker
Luis Serna (alternate)
Alonda Vaughan
Deborah J. White

Not Present

Jose Bello
Robert Warner

Others Present

Michael Schoderbock, Division Manager, Zoning and Project Management
Maria White, Assistant County Attorney
Eric Jewett, Code Enforcement Supervisor
Tammy Burgess, Board Reporter, Deputy Clerk
Other interested individuals

All documents received by the Clerk have been filed and made a part of the record.

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Bomstein called the meeting to order at 9:00 AM, confirmed the presence of a quorum, and provided an overview of the hearing process; whereupon, he requested that the members disclose if they have visited the subject property as each public hearing begins.

QUASI-JUDICIAL STATEMENT

Attorney White noted that the following hearings are quasi-judicial; and that only competent, substantial, fact-based testimony or evidence may be considered in the

decisions by the Board; whereupon, she provided information regarding the types of evidence that are considered as such.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Due notice having been given to interested persons pursuant to Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance No. 90-1, public hearings were held for the following applications. All persons planning to give testimony were duly sworn by a Deputy Clerk.

Case No. VAR-25-18

APPLICATION OF ROBERT J. AND KATHLEEN A. WARREN, THROUGH CYNDI H. TARAPANI, REPRESENTATIVE, FOR TWO AFTER-THE-FACT VARIANCES

A public hearing was held on the above application for the following after-the-fact variances requested for the R-A zoned property located at 1051 East Lake Drive in East Lake Tarpon. A portion of the request includes modifications to variance case No. VAR-24-13, approved in July 2024.

1. A variance to allow for an accessory residential building to remain having a two-foot rear setback from the eastern property line, where a 13-foot setback is required per VAR-24-13, and a side setback of 5.2 feet from the southern property line, where a six-foot setback is required per VAR-24-13.
2. A variance to allow for a pool screen enclosure on top of a six-foot-tall wall to remain having a zero-foot side setback from the northern property line, where 5 feet is required.

Mr. Schoderbock introduced the case and presented the following staff recommendation:

Recommend Conditional Approval. Staff recommends conditional approval of this request as it appears to meet the Criteria for Granting Variances found in Section 138-231 and the provisions for an After-The-Fact Variance found in Section 138-232 of the Pinellas County Land Development Code. The subject property is developed with a single-family home. This request involves several recent additions, including an attached garage, a covered patio, an accessory building, and a pool screen enclosure (Construction is finished, awaiting Certificate of Occupancy).

On July 3, 2024, the Board of Adjustment and Appeals conditionally approved the following variances for the subject property: 1) A variance to allow for the construction of an approximately 676 square foot-attached

garage having a 10-foot front setback from the western property line, where 25 feet is required. 2) A variance to allow for the construction of an approximately 338 square foot detached accessory structure having a 6-foot side setback from the southern property line, where 15 feet is required and having a 13-foot rear setback from the eastern property line, where 20 feet is required. 3) A variance to allow for the construction of a pool screen enclosure on top of a six-foot-tall wall having a 3-foot rear setback from the eastern property line, where 5 feet is required. After receiving Board approval, the applicant's contractor submitted for building permits, utilizing private provider review and inspection services for all building trades. County staff only reviewed both permits referenced below for zoning and drainage.

The applicant secured a building permit (BR-ADD-24-00167) for construction of the building addition on December 9, 2024, which included a site plan that confirmed adherence to all building setbacks per VAR-24-13, resulting in the building permit's issuance. During the final drainage inspection, county staff noticed that the building addition did not match the approved site plan and appeared to encroach into the side and rear setback, and the roof overhang appeared to project over the property line. An as-built survey was provided which confirmed the setback and property line encroachment. A building violation was issued on November 19, 2025, notifying the owner that the structures were not built to the approved permit plans. It should be noted that all building inspections were conducted by the owner's private provider, not county building inspectors.

Additionally, the applicant secured a building permit (BR-ALM-25-00122) for construction of a pool screen enclosure on April 4, 2025, which included a site plan that confirmed adherence to all building setback regulations, resulting in the building permit's issuance. During the final drainage inspection, county staff noticed that the screen enclosure did not match the approved site plan and appeared to encroach into the north side setback. An as-built survey was provided which confirmed the setback encroachment. A building violation was issued on November 19, 2025, notifying the owner that the structure was not built to the approved permit plans. It should be noted that all building inspections were conducted by the owner's private provider, not county building inspectors.

At the February 9, 2026, DRC meeting, the applicant presented a couple of options to solve the building setback and roof encroachment issues on the south side which would not involve removal of any structures. These include

easements or acquiring a portion of the property to the south to meet setbacks. The easement option was deemed not appropriate, however, acquiring enough property to meet the setback requirements was an option staff had a favorable opinion on. On February 23, 2026, the applicant provided recorded deed documents and an updated survey showing the new property line on the south and east that mitigate that portion of the setback encroachment in request #1.

Staff has determined both situations above align with the Variance Criteria in Sec. 138-231 and the objectives of the after-the-fact variances outlined in Sec. 138-232 of the Land Development Code.

Approval should be subject to the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall submit revised plans to correct the permits and pay all applicable fees.
2. All roof drainage systems shall be designed in such a manner so that water runoff from the roof of the structure is not directed onto neighboring properties.
3. All other setback requirements shall be met.

Mr. Holloway arrived at 9:07 AM.

In response to Chair Bomstein's call for the applicant, Cyndi Tarapani, Tarpon Springs, appeared and related that she is the applicants' representative; whereupon, referring to photographs and an as-built survey, Ms. Tarapani provided details regarding the applicant's efforts to ensure that the subject property complies with the variance approved in 2024. She indicated that since the applicant purchased a portion of land from an adjacent property owner, the accessory structure and shed now meet the previously approved setbacks; and that the subject property is now in compliance with the variance approved in 2024 for two of the three issues.

Ms. Tarapani also described the circumstances surrounding the third issue with regard to the variance, including that, due to conflicting information, a contractor built a pool screen enclosure in the incorrect location along the northern property line of the subject property; and that the applicant believes that it would be difficult and economically impractical to resolve the issue.

Responding to comments and queries by Chair Bomstein, Ms. Tarapani, with input from Mr. Schoderbock, provided clarifying details regarding a block wall on the subject

property, complications associated with potential relocation of the pool screen enclosure, and ownership of abutting properties; whereupon, in response to an additional query by Chair Bomstein, Mr. Schoderbock confirmed that building inspections on the subject property were conducted by a private provider.

Ms. Tarapani related that the applicant believes that the application meets the criteria for after-the-fact variances; whereupon, she provided brief comments regarding the application's compliance with Code requirements.

Upon Chair Bomstein's call for opponents, Beverley Downing, Tarpon Springs, appeared and expressed her concerns; whereupon, in rebuttal, Ms. Tarapani provided additional brief comments in support of the application and confirmed that the subject property is a nonconforming lot of record due to its inclusion within the Residential Agriculture zoning classification, which has a two-acre minimum lot size.

In response to a comment and query by Chair Bomstein, Mr. Schoderbock confirmed that two of the three Code violations on the subject property have been mitigated through the applicant's acquisition of additional property. He also clarified that the application is before the BAA today since the approved setbacks were based on property lines which have since changed due to the property acquisition; and that the pool screen enclosure is the only unresolved issue.

In response to comments and queries by the members, Mr. Schoderbock and Ms. Tarapani, with input from Chair Bomstein, provided clarifying information regarding the allowable use of private providers for review and inspection, County staff's role in zoning and engineering review, the contractor's responsibility for the improper placement of the pool screen enclosure, and the basis for the prior variance approved for the subject property; whereupon, Ms. White made a motion for staff's recommendation of conditional approval in accordance with the findings of fact as outlined in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Ms. Vaughan and carried by a vote of 5 to 1, with Mr. Hunsicker dissenting.

Thereupon, Chair Bomstein pointed out that the Board will now act in its capacity as an appeals board with regard to the following appeal cases.

Case No. APL-26-01

APPLICATION OF FLORIDA DREAM CENTER, INC., THROUGH JOHN LANDON AND KATIE COLE, REPRESENTATIVES, FOR AN APPEAL

A public hearing was held on the above application for an appeal of the denial of a request for an Administrative Waiver (AAW-25-00126) of sidewalk requirements in Section 154-

125 of the Pinellas County Land Development Code for the property located at 4017 56th Avenue North in Lealman.

Mr. Schoderbock introduced the case, which includes the following staff recommendation:

Recommend Denial. Pursuant to Section 138-66(c)(2) and Table 138-77 of the Pinellas County Land Development Code (LDC), the Board of Adjustment and Appeals (BAA) has the authority to review appeals of Administrative Waiver request decisions. Staff recommends that the BAA deny the appeal in this case, finding that the Department of Public Works has correctly determined that sidewalk along both property frontages will be a benefit for the property and surrounding pedestrian connectivity and should be required.

The subject property is the Florida Dream Center at the northwest corner of 40th Street and 56th Avenue in Lealman. The applicant submitted a Waiver Request to eliminate the requirement to install sidewalk on both property frontages in October 2025; this request was denied on January 23, 2026.

The Florida Dream Center provides a variety of community services in Lealman. The applicant, through their recent Board of Adjustment and Appeals case, was approved for additional uses on the site, and indicated that many of the community services are intended for “walk-up” customers. Likewise, the applicant, through their Parking Analysis, determined that the number of on-street parking spaces could be accommodated on site – this would free the space to be used for sidewalk.

The requested waiver of the sidewalk requirement along either property frontage will create multiple traffic safety and operational issues, including:

- Requiring citizens walking to and from the Dream Center to interact with parked vehicles while accessing the site. This would create unnecessary and dangerous conflicts with motor vehicles.
- Eliminates the possibility of continuous sidewalk connections along 40th Street and 56th Avenue. This is in direct conflict with Pinellas County practice of installing sidewalks where necessary to create safe and continuous walking paths and closing gaps in existing networks, the goal of the Linking Lealman Plan, and best practices of clearly separating pedestrians and motor vehicles.

- With the existing entrance along the east side of the building and a planned entrance along the west side of the building inside the fence, safe pedestrian access is warranted. This is not feasible with vehicle parking in the same footprint as the sidewalk.
- Several properties along the west side of 40th Street to the north of the Florida Dream Center are being required to install sidewalk along their east frontage to support a continuous sidewalk along the west side of 40th Street. When finished, a complete sidewalk segment will exist between 58th Avenue and 54th Avenue along the west side of 40th Street.
- Lealman Elementary School is located just 2 blocks directly north of the Florida Dream Center – students have been observed walking to and from the school along 40th Street and 56th Avenue.

The criteria for granting a waiver are found in Table 138-231.a of the LDC. These criteria are:

- (a) **Special conditions** – *that special conditions and circumstances exist which are peculiar to the land, structure, or building involved;*
- (b) **Unnecessary hardship** – *that literal interpretation of the provisions of this Code would deprive or make it practically difficult for the applicant to achieve the same proportion of development potential commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same zoning district under the terms of this chapter. The hardship shall not be self-imposed; and*
- (g) **Detriment to public welfare** – *that such request will not be injurious to the area involved or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare.*

These waiver criteria have not been met as the request for not installing sidewalk is not due to a special condition on the property, the denial does not create a hardship, and a lack of sidewalk at this location will create a detriment to public welfare by requiring pedestrians to walk in the street or between parked vehicles, creating multiple traffic safety concerns for motorists and pedestrians in the vicinity of the site.

The applicant has not met the County Code waiver criteria, and the County Staff's denial of the waiver request to not install sidewalk along both property frontages should be upheld.

Public Works Director Kelli Hammer Levy appeared, introduced herself and Transportation Division Director Tom Washburn, and provided brief comments regarding their experience with the County; whereupon, referring to a PowerPoint presentation containing maps and photographs, she indicated that the criteria utilized by staff to review sidewalk waiver requests are special conditions, unnecessary hardship, and detriment to public welfare. She also listed the specific sections of the County Code for which the applicant is seeking a waiver.

Ms. Levy pointed out the location of the subject property and indicated that, in addition to the Code, staff considers the desires and feedback of residents related to what they would like to see in the community; that, as part of the Linking Lealman Action Plan's adoption in 2019, sidewalks were identified as the community's most requested category of improvement; and that overall recommendations derived from the Plan included adding sidewalks to create safety benefits, fill gaps, connect community assets, and leverage existing projects; whereupon, she provided information regarding existing and recently completed County projects aimed at improving mobility within the community through enhancements to roads, trails, and sidewalks.

Noting that connecting community centers is critical, Mr. Washburn reviewed the existing sidewalk inventory in the vicinity of the Florida Dream Center and provided details regarding planned sidewalk improvements in the area; whereupon, he related that, upon completion of the planned improvements, a complete sidewalk segment will exist on both sides of 40th Street from 58th Avenue to 54th Avenue, except for the segment in front of the Florida Dream Center.

Mr. Washburn referenced the Linking Lealman Action Plan and pointed out that it depicts 56th Avenue as an area in need of sidewalks. He also referenced demolition and site plans for a property located along 40th Street and 58th Avenue and noted that, with the removal of existing parking from the right-of-way and the addition of sidewalks, the site plan has been approved and construction will soon begin; whereupon, Mr. Washburn indicated that while parking has historically been available along 40th Street and 56th Avenue, the parking area was never permitted and is located within a County right-of-way. He also related that, by design, the Center services a large walk-up population; that the property lacks a safe walkway along the property's frontages; and that there is not enough space to include both a sidewalk and parking.

In response to queries by Chair Bomstein, Mr. Washburn indicated that staff has not looked into whether parallel parking could be permitted along the sides of the building or on the street side of where a sidewalk would be placed; whereupon, he referenced a proposed site plan provided by the applicant and indicated that a parking study was conducted which demonstrated that all parking could be accommodated on-site; and that

this would provide the necessary space for a sidewalk along the property frontages. Mr. Washburn also noted that while the Florida Dream Center has indicated that another building entrance would need to be added, staff does not agree since it is not a requirement of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

Responding to a query by Chair Bomstein, Mr. Schoderbock confirmed that the site plan referenced by Mr. Washburn is the same site plan which was presented to the BAA in October 2025; whereupon, Mr. Washburn discussed the County's findings from conducting field observations at the Florida Dream Center and indicated that an unsafe situation exists where pedestrians are frequently walking behind vehicles.

Ms. Levy related that denial of the waiver is consistent with the aforementioned sections of the County Code. She referenced the criteria considered by staff while reviewing the waiver request and indicated that a special condition does not exist since the site plan reflects that all parking can be accommodated on-site; that there is no unnecessary hardship since the hardship cannot be self-imposed; and that granting the waiver would be a detriment to public welfare since the sidewalk would be beneficial for the community and is consistent with the County Code and the Linking Lealman Action Plan.

In response to Chair Bomstein's call for the applicant, Katie Cole, Clearwater, appeared and noted that the two appeals before the Board include four requests related to sidewalks and right-of-way parking; and that her presentation includes information pertaining to all four requests; whereupon, in response to a query by Ms. Cole, Chair Bomstein indicated that while the Board likely needs to act on the items separately, the applicant can present information for both items at the same time.

Referring to a PowerPoint presentation containing maps and photographs, Ms. Cole provided historical information regarding right-of-way parking on the subject property and discussed additional details pertaining to the requests before the Board. She also provided brief comments related to the layout of the subject property, including that while the site plan reflects that parking would be located in the rear, the ADA-compliant access point to the building is currently located at the front of the building; whereupon, in response to comments by Chair Bomstein, she provided brief comments regarding the location of an accessible parking space.

Ms. Cole noted that the Florida Dream Center sustained significant damage from recent storms; and that while the Center received a substantial amount of American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds for repairs, that work has been placed on hold pending approval of the site plan; whereupon, in response to comments by Chair Bomstein, she briefly discussed the County's purview over on-street parking. Ms. Cole also related that the Sheriff's Office confirmed that there have been no accidents in the vicinity over the past 10 years.

Ms. Cole displayed several photographs of the existing parking at the front entrance to the Florida Dream Center and opined that there is enough space for pedestrians to walk between the parking spaces and the building's entrance, although it is not sufficient to accommodate a standard-sized sidewalk.

Upon introduction by Ms. Cole, John Landon, Palm Harbor, appeared and indicated that he is a civil engineer with approximately 50 years of experience; whereupon, he discussed the potential to shift parking at the building's front entrance closer to the right-of-way, which may allow for a sidewalk near the building's entrance instead of along the street. Mr. Landon also discussed the applicant's efforts to remove parking from the right-of-way and related that it is not practical to locate an ADA parking space at the building's rear since traffic access to the Florida Dream Center is located at the front; and that displacing activities currently conducted at the rear of the building would have a major impact on the Center.

Ms. Cole described the sidewalk inventory surrounding the subject property and indicated that the main concern regarding installation of a sidewalk connection is that it would require the removal of all on-street parking; whereupon, she noted that the requests related to parking and sidewalks are intertwined; and that the applicant is open to solutions.

In response to comments and queries by Chair Bomstein, Ms. Cole explained that Volunteers of America of Florida is the new operator of the Florida Dream Center; that operations will remain the same under the new operator; and that there is a desire to continue on-site forklift training, which would be impacted if parking was relocated to the rear of the building; whereupon, in response to an additional query by Chair Bomstein, Mr. Landon indicated that while it may be possible to provide 2 to 3 parallel parking spaces in front of the building, including an accessible parking space may not comply with ADA requirements.

Responding to queries by Mr. Hunsicker, Ms. Cole confirmed that the setback from the building to the property line is significantly less than 12 feet with a five-foot aisleway, which is required for ADA parking spaces. She also indicated that while no other parking options were discussed with staff during the site plan review process, the applicant would appreciate some flexibility; and that the Florida Dream Center wants to provide safe access to visitors and the neighborhood.

In response to comments by Chair Bomstein, Mr. Landon provided brief comments regarding an alternative parking solution involving the installation of a three-foot sidewalk, which would not comply with Code requirements; whereupon, Ms. Cole emphasized that providing handicap access to the front of the building is extremely important.

Responding to a query by Chair Bomstein, Mr. Schoderbock indicated that while two votes will likely be necessary, the presentation for the second appeal may be heard at this time. Attorney White concurred; whereupon, Chair Bomstein directed staff to conduct their presentation for the second appeal at this time.

Case No. APL-26-02

APPLICATION OF FLORIDA DREAM CENTER, INC., THROUGH JOHN LANDON AND KATIE COLE, REPRESENTATIVES, FOR AN APPEAL

A public hearing was held on the above application for an appeal of the denial of a request for an Administrative Waiver (AAW-25-00127) of parking/access requirements in Section 154-198 of the Pinellas County Land Development Code for the property located at 4017 56th Avenue North in Lealman.

Mr. Schoderbock introduced the case, which includes the following staff recommendation:

Recommend Denial. Pursuant to Section 138-66(c)(2) and Table 138-77 of the Pinellas County Land Development Code (LDC), the Board of Adjustment and Appeals (BAA) has the authority to review appeals of Administrative Waiver request decisions. Staff recommends that the BAA deny the appeal in this case, finding that the Department of Public Works has correctly determined that parking along the property frontage is not necessary and introduces safety and operational impediments to the transportation system.

The subject property is the Florida Dream Center at the northwest corner of 40th Street and 56th Avenue in Lealman. The applicant submitted a Waiver Request to allow parking to remain along both property frontages in October 2025; this request was denied on January 23, 2026.

The Florida Dream Center provides a variety of community services in Lealman. The applicant, through their recent Board of Adjustment and Appeals case, was approved for additional uses on the site, and indicated that many of the community services are intended for “walk-up” customers – the County confirmed this through field observations. Likewise, the applicant, through their Parking Analysis, determined that the number of on-street parking spaces could be accommodated on site, and provided a site plan demonstrating this could be accomplished – this would free the right of way to be used for sidewalk.

The addition of sidewalk along both property frontages is critical to provide a safe walking area for patrons of the Florida Dream Center, to facilitate sidewalk connectivity consistent with the Linking Lealman Plan, which far outweighs the reasoning provided by the applicant that the existing parking has been in place for a number of years. There is not enough room along the property frontages to accommodate the parking and sidewalk.

The request to allow parking to remain along the property frontages within the County right-of-way creates multiple traffic safety and operational issues, including:

- Requiring citizens walking to and from the Florida Dream Center to interact with parked vehicles while accessing the site. This would create unnecessary and dangerous conflicts with motor vehicles, as the parking layout requires vehicles to complete a backing maneuver, either while parking or leaving the site.
- Eliminates the possibility of continuous sidewalk connections along 40th Street and 56th Avenue. This is in direct conflict with the goal of the Linking Lealman Plan and best practices of clearly separating pedestrians and motor vehicles. There is not enough room to accommodate both parking and the necessary sidewalk. Several properties along the west side of 40th Street to the north of the Florida Dream Center are being required to install sidewalk along their east frontage to support a continuous sidewalk along the west side of 40th Street. When finished, a complete sidewalk segment will exist between 58th Avenue and 54th Avenue along the west side of 40th Street.
- With the existing entrance along the east side of the building and a planned entrance along the west side of the building inside the fence, safe pedestrian access is warranted. This is not feasible with vehicle parking in the same footprint as the sidewalk.
- **Sec. 154-198. – General access standards.** – (e) Off-street parking shall be designed to ensure that all vehicles leaving or entering the public street right-of-way shall be traveling in a forward motion, except driveways serving single-family, attached, detached, two-family, and three-family dwellings.

The criteria for granting a waiver are found in Table 138-231.a of the LDC. These criteria are:

- (a) **Special conditions** – that special conditions and circumstances exist which are peculiar to the land, structure, or building involved;
- (b) **Unnecessary hardship** – that literal interpretation of the provisions of this Code would deprive or make it practically difficult for the applicant to achieve the same proportion of development potential commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same zoning district under the terms of this chapter. The hardship shall not be self-imposed; and
- (g) **Detriment to public welfare** – that such request will not be injurious to the area involved or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare.

These waiver criteria have not been met as the request for allowing the parking to remain is not due to a special condition on the property, the denial does not create a hardship, and allowing the parking to remain will create a detriment to public welfare by requiring pedestrians to walk in the street or between parked vehicles, creating multiple traffic safety concerns for motorists and pedestrians in the vicinity of the site.

The applicant has not met the County Code waiver criteria, and the County Staff's denial of the waiver request to allow the parking to remain along both property frontages should be upheld.

Referring to a PowerPoint presentation containing maps and photographs, Mr. Washburn indicated that this item relates to the parking waiver appeal. He related that while staff utilized the same waiver criteria as the previous item, the County Code sections for which the applicant is seeking a waiver are different; and that a key consideration is minimizing vehicles backing into the public right-of-way; whereupon, Mr. Washburn provided information regarding a parking study provided by Mr. Landon in July 2025 and noted that it is staff's opinion that the sidewalk addition should be the most important and deciding factor in the Board's decision.

Ms. Levy reiterated the need to remove the existing on-street parking from the right-of-way to improve pedestrian safety and to allow for sidewalk connectivity; whereupon, she provided brief supportive comments regarding the services provided by the Florida Dream Center and indicated that her goal is to make sound decisions that promote public safety and meet the community goals of connectivity and the ability to travel in a safe manner.

Ms. Cole indicated that, in an effort to resolve the issue, Ms. Levy has committed to reviewing ADA options along 40th Street and 56th Avenue; whereupon, she requested

that the hearing be continued to allow the applicant and County staff to discuss the issue and to provide the applicant an opportunity to submit a more refined request.

In response to a query by Chair Bomstein, Mr. Schoderbock referenced Case No. TY2-25-05, which was the applicant's Type 2 Use request heard by the Board in October 2025, and indicated that the Board approved the request with the condition that the applicant would seek administrative waivers for parking and sidewalk requirements; and that, if the waivers were denied, the following conditions would apply:

- All parking and loading must be provided in designated spaces on-site.
- Sidewalk must be installed along both frontages.
- All marked parking spaces in the adjacent right-of-way must be removed.

Responding to a comment by Mr. Hunsicker, Mr. Schoderbock noted that the applicant would be responsible for complying with the above-listed conditions of the Type 2 Use approval if the Board denies the waiver appeal.

In response to queries by Mr. Holloway and Chair Bomstein, Attorney White, with input from Mr. Schoderbock, indicated that it is within the Board's discretion to approve or deny staff's recommendation or to continue the cases; whereupon, responding to a query by Chair Bomstein, Ms. Cole confirmed that she is requesting a 30-day continuance for both cases.

Mr. Holloway made a motion for a continuance for both matters, which was seconded by Ms. White; whereupon, Chair Bomstein confirmed that the motion is to continue Case Nos. APL-26-01 and APL-26-02. Attorney White requested that the appeals be continued to a date certain. Thereupon, in response to a query by Chair Bomstein, Ms. Cole confirmed that she is amenable to the cases being continued to the April meeting.

Upon the Chair's call for public comment, David Lee, St. Petersburg, and Jeremy Heath, Clearwater, appeared and expressed their concerns; whereupon, following the Chair's call for the vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Later in the meeting, and in response to queries by Chair Bomstein, Mr. Schoderbock, with input from Ms. Cole and Levy, provided brief comments regarding next steps and clarified that the applicant may withdraw their appeals if a solution is presented prior to the April meeting.

MINUTES FOR THE FEBRUARY 4, 2026 MEETING

Mr. Holloway made a motion to approve the last meeting's minutes. The motion was seconded by Ms. White and carried unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:21 AM.