

PROPERTY APPRAISAL ADJUSTMENT BOARD

AUGUST 28, 1978

The Property Appraisal Adjustment Board of Manatee County, Florida, met in the Court House in Bradenton, Florida, Monday, August 28, 1978, at 9:00 a.m.

Members Present were:

L. H. Fortson, Jr., Chairman	)	Representing Board of
Louis E. Driggers	)	County Commissioners
Lamar S. Parrish	)	
Ed Dick	)	Representing School
Elizabeth Nevin	)	Board

Also present were

E. N. Fay, Jr., County Attorney  
Ralph Umana, Deputy Clerk  
Archie B. Powell, Manatee County Property Appraiser  
Larry Coleman, Attorney for Property Appraiser.

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman.

HOMESTEAD EXEMPTIONS: Notices of Disapproval of Applications by the Property Appraiser.

<u>Petition HE-1 Charlie H. Adams</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-2 Cindy Alfonso</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-3 Sueayn Backus</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-4 Martha T. Bell</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-5 Mattie Blackman &amp; Dorothy Winbush</u> Ms. Blackman explained that she had gone to Georgia and had rented the property during the time she would be away. She was unaware that this would affect her homestead exemption.	
<u>Petition HE-6 Paul L. &amp; Lessi Blackmon</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-7 Richard F. &amp; Gisela C. Boyce</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-8 Jean C. &amp; G. Brunnhoeffler</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-9 Eleanor Cook</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-10 Ruby Neal, Elisha &amp; Clara Cotton</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-11 Alfonso Crawford</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-12 William C. &amp; Opal W. Crews</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-13 Janet R. Criswell</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-14 Muriel Daugherty</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-15 Carmen &amp; Emerencian A. DeCenteno</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-16 David K. &amp; Marie L. Deitrich</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-17 George &amp; Ruby S. Driver</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-18 Fred Dunn</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-19 Margaret I. Fox L/E</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-20 Jerry and Linda Getch</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-21 Louise S. Gould L/E</u>	-Not present

\*\*\*\*\*  
Court Reporter: Billie Crowell  
Carpenter Court Reporting  
2051 Main Street  
Sarasota, Florida 33577

AUGUST 28, 1978

Cont'd

PROPERTY APPRAISAL ADJUSTMENT BOARD

<u>Petition HE-22</u>	<u>Stephen L &amp; Patricia A. Gragg</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-23</u>	<u>Roger M. Grimes</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-24</u>	<u>Florence E. Hagle L/E</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-25</u>	<u>P. B. Hamilton</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-26</u>	<u>James D. &amp; Joyce M. Haney</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-27</u>	<u>Ronnie and Mary Harber</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-28</u>	<u>Austin Hart L/E</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-29</u>	<u>Dorothy &amp; J. C. Hester</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-30</u>	<u>Walter &amp; Lucile Ingram, Jr.</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-31</u>	<u>Helen G. Jacks</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-32</u>	<u>Grace E. Jacobs</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-33</u>	<u>Dorothy Johnson</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-34</u>	<u>Lillie Mae &amp; Charles E. Johnson</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-35</u>	<u>Harry V. Jones</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-36</u>	<u>Katherine D. Keitel L/E</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-37</u>	<u>Francis H. Kerrick</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-38</u>	<u>Sarah W. Kershaw</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-39</u>	<u>Timothy C. Kirkman</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-40</u>	<u>Steven K. Kochis</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-41</u>	<u>Mark A. &amp; Kathy S. Kirkpatrick</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-42</u>	<u>Juanita C. Knutsen</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-43</u>	<u>Helen M. Kremis</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-44</u>	<u>Constantina Lardas</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-45</u>	<u>Martha Larsen</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-46</u>	<u>Bobby E. Lewis</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-47</u>	<u>Geraldine Lincoln</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-48</u>	<u>Albert Loredo, Jr. &amp; Eduvina Perez</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-49</u>	<u>Nick P. &amp; Marie N. Manteris</u>	
	Mr. Manteris stated that he had been denied the Homestead Exemption due to the fact that his property had been rented. The property in question is his home and he does not rent it ordinarily. It was rented at this particular time for a four month period to help defray the cost of his trip to Hawaii to visit his son.	
<u>Petition HE-50</u>	<u>Louise D. Munford</u>	-Not present
<u>Petition HE-51</u>	<u>Edith B. McDonald</u>	-Not present

PROPERTY APPRAISAL ADJUSTMENT BOARDPetition HE-52 William L. & Mary R. McGroaty

Ms. McGroaty explained that her husband passed away in February 1977 and there was some confusion as to whether she was listed as the legal owner of the property. By the time this was resolved and her application submitted, the expiration date for filing had passed. Her application was postmarked three days late.

Petition HE-53 Dorothy Nevins -Not present

Petition HE-54 Jerry A. & Deborah Noll -Not present

Petition HE-55 Thomas N. Olsen -Not present

Petition HE-56 Robert S. & June M. Patience -Not present

Petition HE-57 Edward M. & Marie Pearsons -Not present

Petition HE-58 Estelle Perry -Not present

Petition HE-59 Frank C. Perry -Not present

Petition HE-60 Robert R. & Barbara D. Ramsey -Not present

Petition HE-61 Thomas & Debra K. Reyes, Jr. -Not present

Petition HE-62 Helen T. Ripley -Not present

Petition HE-63 Nathaniel & Carrie Louise Sanders -Not present

Petition HE-64 David B. Schamber -Not present

Petition HE-65 Emma L. Sherman -Not present

Petition HE-66 Benjamin & Amanda Smith -Not present

Petition HE-67 Gladys V. Sornsen

Ms. Sornsen testified that she had been ill and was not aware of the due date for filing for Homestead Exemption. She had received the exemption the prior year for the first time. Mr. Powell responded that she had been sent a renewal notice and a second reminder in February.

In response to request for review of reassessment of her property, the Chairman advised that her oral request could not be considered in lieu of a formal petition.

Petition HE-68 Alma Sue Stancil -Not present

Petition HE-69 June Spencer Steinbrenner -Not present

Petition HE-70 Sara Jane Stephens

Ms. Stephens stated that she was appealing the denial of her Homestead Exemption due to late filing based on personal difficulties she was experiencing at that particular time. She was confident she had submitted the first form and did not respond to the reminder notice until it was too late. Her application was postmarked March 5th.

Petition HE-71 Leroy L. & Billie Sue Stone -Not present

Petition HE-72 J. H. & Peggy Thomas -Not present

Petition HE-73 Gary E. & Sylvia G. Walters

Mr. Walters requested reconsideration of denial of his Homestead Exemption due to late filing. When he purchased his property in February 1977, he was of the opinion that the deed had been recorded by his attorney; upon learning it had not, he had it recorded in June 1978. The Property Appraiser advised that the exemption had been denied because Mr. Walters was not the owner of record as of January 1, 1978.

AUGUST 28, 1978

(Cont'd)

PROPERTY APPRAISAL ADJUSTMENT BOARD

<u>HE-74 Sam &amp; Edith Washington, Jr.</u>	-Not present
<u>HE-75 Dessie Watson</u>	-Not present
<u>HE-76 D. B. Whittle L/E; Ruthe E. Dailey</u>	-Not present
<u>HE-77 Melvin P. &amp; Mamie H. Woith</u>	-Not present
<u>HE-78 Edith Cotten Woods</u>	-Not present
<u>HE-79 Georgia M. Woods</u>	-Not present
<u>HE-80 James E. &amp; Eleanor M. Wren</u>	-Not present

The following individuals appeared to express comments regarding their Homestead Exemption applications:

Lee & Frances Watts

Mr. Watts complained regarding the procedures of the Property Appraiser's office of not forwarding his notice for renewal to his new address. He has lived in the County for 13 years and moved to his new address in October 1977. He contends that he was deprived of his right to receive notice of renewal as provided under Florida Statute 196.111.

The Property Appraiser explained that notices are not sent on properties which have been sold. That a new homeowner must come down to the Property Appraiser's office and apply in person to have the Homestead Exemption transferred.

Florian Winter

Mr. Winter stated that he had received his Homestead Exemption but had not received the over 65 exemption which he applied for at the same time. He had called the Property Appraiser's office to inquire as to what verification would be required to qualify for the exemption and appeared in person to fill out the application with the assistance of a member of their staff. He was of the opinion that all requirements had been met to qualify him for the over 65 exemption. Since Mr. Winter did not recall filling out the affidavit for the over 65 exemption, Mr. Powell believed he had not applied for that part of the exemption.

There being no one else to speak on the Homestead Exemption petitions, the Chairman called the first petition on assessments.

Prior to hearing the first petition, the Chairman referred the late-filed petitions to the County Attorney for a recommendation on whether or not they should be heard.

78-1 Bradenton Teamsters Building Corporation, Inc.  
Appeal of disapproval for Ad Valorem Tax exemption.

There was no appearance on behalf of the petitioner. Mr. Coleman cited Chapter 196.1985 of the statutes which provides that Labor Organizations are entitled to exemption on the real property that they own and use for a predominant educational purpose. Based upon the application from the petitioner and upon investigation of the premises by the Property Appraiser, there was no evidence that the property is being used for educational purposes.

78-2 The United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America Local Union 2340 (Roderick W. Fass, Agent)  
Appeal of disapproval for Ad Valorem Tax exemption.

In response to questions from Michael Canar of Dent and Flugner, Roderick W. Fass testified that he is Business Representative for the Union and the premises is used to educate its members as to where to seek employment and to give instruction to the apprentices in unionism. Approximately 90 percent of the time is spent on instruction. Upon question by Mr. Coleman, Mr. Fass testified that he is the sole instructor, that there are no formal programs, and that the instruction consists of relating everyday change in technology in the construction business.

PROPERTY APPRAISAL ADJUSTMENT BOARD

- 78-3 Dolphin Aviation Inc., Lessee  
Appeal of disapproval for Ad Valorem Tax exemption.

William R. Korp, Esq., attorney for petitioner, presented testimony of Ed Denim, President of Dolphin Aviation, regarding functions performed on the property leased from the Bradenton-Sarasota Airport Authority. It was Mr. Korp's contention that Dolphin Aviation, Inc. performs a public service or function and is entitled to an exemption on their leasehold interests and property located thereon.  
Exhibits: #1 Lease Agreement, #2 Lease Modification, #3 Photos (2 thru 9)

- 78-4 Harold G. & Elisabeth Hindman  
Appeal of the disapproval of application for agricultural classification.

Mr. Hindman has had the greenbelt classification since 1972 and was denied this year for the first time. He presently has 17 acres of land on which he raises cattle, hogs, chickens and harvests approximately 5,000 bales of hay each year. He also leases property in addition to his own for grazing cattle.

(Recess)

- 78-5 Walter L. Haines  
Appeal of the disapproval of application for agricultural classification.

Mr. Haines has eighteen and one-half acres on which he previously had the greenbelt classification. He has a horse and raises cattle. In addition, one acre is in citrus. Mr. Powell stated that according to his personal property return which shows one bull, one horse, and three cows, he does not have a bona fide agricultural operation.

- 78-6 Harbor Ventures (Scheduled for P.M. Session)

- 78-7 Martin D. Alden  
Appeal of the disapproval of application for agricultural classification.

Mr. Alden has a 40-acre tract which he bought in 1962 at \$165 per acre for agricultural use and has had the greenbelt classification since that time. He sold all but six head of cattle and is presently raising hay (pangola grass) from which he hopes to realize a better profit. The full tract is in hay with the exception of five acres which is too wet.

- 78-8 Claflin Garst, Jr.  
Appeal of the disapproval of application for agricultural classification.

Mr. Garst was unable to be present and submitted a letter in support of his petition. Review of his personal property return revealed nine cows and one bull as of January 1st. Mr. Powell said there is a landing strip and a hangar also located on the property.

- 78-9 (See Homestead Exemption 78-19 - Letter read into the record)

- 78-10 James G. Gordon -WITHDRAWN

- 78-11 Lillian & Sydney R. Newman -WITHDRAWN

- 78-12 Richard G. Vorce  
Appeal of the disapproval of application for agricultural classification.

Mr. Vorce has 80 acres on the Myakka River on which he raises cattle. He had the greenbelt classification previously. Over 50 percent of the property is improved and in addition he has recently improved and cross-fenced a heifer pasture. He presently has fourteen cows and three heifers. The assessment was increased from \$35,000 in 1977 to \$118,000 in 1978.

AUGUST 28, 1978

(Cont'd)

PROPERTY APPRAISAL ADJUSTMENT BOARD

78-13 Elmon L. Salyer  
Appeal of the disapproval of application for agricultural classification.

Mr. Salyer testified that he bought his property in 1948 for \$5,000. Except for two years, he has had the agricultural classification. The property is cross-fenced and used for raising cattle and hay. Denial of the agricultural classification has raised his assessment from \$79,860 to \$197,650.

78-14 Stella Watson Courtney, et al  
Appeal of the disapproval of application for agricultural classification.

Ms. Courtney appeared with her son Duke. The property purchased in 1937 has been broken up into four parcels and deeded to the children. The character and use however has not changed. The portion on which agricultural classification is being applied for is on 12.32 acres which is used for cattle raising (presently, nine cows, one heifer, seven calves, one steer, and one bull). The income from this property is used to supplement Ms. Courtney's social security income.

78-15 Beker Phosphate Corp. (See September 25, 1978)

(Recess) The Chairman called a recess at 12:10 p.m. and the Board reconvened at 1:10 p.m. with all members present.

78-6 Harbor Ventures  
78-209 Lillian M. Newman, Richard Morton & Stanley Sachs, trustees  
78-210 Harbor Ventures, Inc. & Suncoast Realty Co., Inc.  
Appeal of the disapproval of application for agricultural classification and seeking review and adjustment of the assessed value.

Dale Price, Esquire, represented the petitioners on these properties located west of 34th Street. Don Clark, President of Clark Seed Company, and lessee of the property, testified that he has been in the sod and seed business for 15 years and in 1968 entered into a ten year lease on the property at the rate of \$6,000 per year. Mr. Price referred to maps of the properties and discussion followed as to the use of various parcels and acreage. Uses included seed and sod, vegetable farming, cattle (40 - 60 head), and hay. It was pointed out that this property has been rezoned from agricultural to P.U.D. (Planned Unit Development) but it is the contention of the petitioners that the property has continued to be used for agricultural purposes and is entitled to the agricultural classification. (Conflict of Interest declared by Ed Dick.)

LATE-FILED PETITIONS

Motion was made by Mr. Parrish that petitions post-marked August 17, 1978 be heard and hearing dates set, and those filed or post-marked after that date not be considered. Motion was seconded by Mr. Dick. Voting "Aye" were Board Members Parrish, Dick, Fortson, and Nevin. Mr. Driggers voted "Nay." Motion carried. As a point of clarification Mr. Driggers stated that he felt all the petitions should be heard.

78-16 Karl and Margaret Ebner -Withdrawn

78-17 Iley Conley  
Appeal of the disapproval of application for agricultural classification.

Roger P. Conley, Esquire, on behalf of his father, stated that this 20-acre tract was purchased in 1973 with the intent of maintaining a small cattle operation. The agricultural classification was denied this year for the first time. The operation began on a small scale and each year increased in size. Extensive improvements have been made and the cattle have been sold. Six Angus calves have since been purchased which will be used for breeding purposes. Income from the farm operation was reviewed as reported on returns filed since 1975.

Exhibits: #1 Bill of Sale for 6 Angus Calves #2 Affidavit of Jack Groover re purchase and sale of hay and cattle.

AUGUST 28, 1978

PROPERTY APPRAISAL ADJUSTMENT BOARD

78-18 Alfred R. Reid  
Appeal of the disapproval of application for agricultural classification.

Mr. Reid testified that his 40-acre tract was in citrus until 1971 when the freeze killed a good portion of the trees. He began a cattle operation in 1974, fenced the entire property, cross-fenced a portion, and in 1975, due to malignant indemia, lost about half of his herd. He is increasing the size of his herd, has 16 acres in grass, and is in the process of bringing the small grove back into production.

78-19 Heidi H. & Harry J. Boothe (See September 20, 1978)

78-20 Charles A. Wickersham III  
Appeal of the disapproval of application for agricultural classification

Mr. Wickersham has 40 acres in Oneco which he purchased in 1963 for \$18,000. He raises cattle and maintains 18-40 head at any given time. Ten acres of land is leased to Florida Power and Light which cannot be built on and can only be used for agricultural purposes. Thirty acres are in pasture.

78-21 James T. Christian Jr.  
Appeal of the disapproval of application for agricultural classification

Mr. Christian purchased this 16-acre tract for use in conjunction with his Dairy business in Parrish. The property is fenced into three pastures which is used for starting dairy replacement heifers. He has had cattle on it for the past four to five years. The Property Appraiser advised that since he was not the owner of record as of January 1st he was not eligible for the greenbelt classification.

78-22 Robert E. Anson -Withdrawn

78-23 Ronnie Conner  
Appeal of the disapproval of application for agricultural classification and seeking review and adjustment of the assessed value.

Mr. Connor appealed denial of agricultural classification on three parcels of his 131 acre ranch: (1) home site, (2) two acres classified as homesites, and (3) the portion of his property on which the landing strip is located. It was his contention that the home-site is an integral part of his ranching operation and should receive the agricultural classification. The two acres classified as homesites contains one trailer which takes up about one-quarter of an acre. The landing strip which consists of six acres is not fenced off from the rest of the ranch, cannot be used commercially, provides a community service, and his cows graze there. It is not separate from the ranch, but is a part of his ranching operation. Exhibits: #1 Airport Master Record, #2 Letter dated April 3, 1975 from Planning and Development, #3 Letter dated March 6, 1975 from Sheriff Weitzenfeld, #4 U.S. Census Bureau Report dated May 18, 1978, and #5 Acreage/Value Chart

78-24 Adrian B. Rhodes (See September 15, 1978)

78-25 E. S. Reasoner  
Appeal of the disapproval of application for agricultural classification and seeking review and adjustment of the assessed value.

(Recess)

Mr. Reasoner's petition was presented in two parts, the first being a portion of his nursery in Oneco, and the second the nursery operation on 14th Street. The four parcels located in

AUGUST 28, 1978

PROPERTY APPRAISAL ADJUSTMENT BOARD

Oneco were broken down as follows: Parcel #16824 - purchased for use as entrance on 53rd Avenue; present entrance taken by DOT for four-laning of US 301. Parcel #16827 - was an old grove which he is in the process of planting with nursery trees. Parcels 16830 and 16831 have houses on them which are or will be occupied by employees managing the property. Mr. Reasoner had no objection to the assessment of the houses, only to the assessment of the land which he felt should have the agricultural classification since it is a part of the nursery operation.

The remaining parcels: 53932.1005, 54001, 54003 and 54005, are a part of the nursery which fronts on 14th Street. This was virgin property purchased twenty-five years ago which was cleared for the nursery operation and has never been used for any other purpose. When zoning was initiated, the first 300 feet fronting on 14th Street was zoned commercial, the remaining portion was zoned residential. He was later advised to have the portion zoned residential rezoned to commercial, which he did. However, it is his contention that the property has never been used for any purpose other than the nursery and should have the agricultural classification.

78-26 Polly Corrigan  
Seeking review and adjustment of the assessed value.

Ms. Corrigan appeared regarding the increased assessment (from \$15,000 to \$78,000) on three acres of commercially zoned property located off of Cortez Road. She leases the building to an auto body shop for \$140 per month plus \$60 per month for a tower. Over half of the property is low and unusable in its present state.

78-27 Albert G. & Louise Abdulla  
Seeking review and adjustment of the assessed value.

There was no appearance on behalf of the petitioner. Mr. Powell stated that this 14.7 acre tract was assessed at \$2,500 per acre which was based on sale of adjoining property which sold for \$3,000 per acre.

78-28 Casto Developers  
78-29 Seeking review and adjustment of the assessed  
78-30 value.

Petitioner was not present. The Property appraiser stated that an adjustment had been made and the petitioner had advised that he would be withdrawing his appeal.

78-60 Harley B. & Ethel R. Hartzog (Originally scheduled for August 29, 1978). Seeking review and adjustment of the assessed value.

Ms. Hartzog stated that her three acres of property, located on a canal across from Coral Shores, had been assessed at \$170 per front foot. Her assessment had increased from \$13,460 to \$54,210. There are no improvements on the property with the exception of a shed, no road to the property and no seawall.

78-58 Dr. Lino S. Cortes (Originally scheduled for August 29, 1978)  
Seeking review and adjustment of the assessed value.

Dr. Cortes testified that he purchased this 5.7 acre tract in November of 1977 and applied for a special exception to use the property for a nursery operation. This was granted in January, 1978, and Mr. Cortes thought this entitled him to the agricultural classification. The Property Appraiser advised that since the special exception was not in effect on January 1st, he did not qualify for the agricultural assessment.



AUGUST 28, 1978

PROPERTY APPRAISAL ADJUSTMENT BOARD

LATE-FILED PETITIONS/NOT NOTARIZED

Motion was made by Mr. Driggers that the Board not consider the two petitions post-marked August 17, 1978, but not notarized and duly filed: Petitions 78-426 Walter and Jeannette Langford and 78-434 Wesley and Alice Gallentine. Motion was seconded by Mr. Dick and carried unanimously.

TENTATIVE DECISIONS

Due to the number of petitions and lengthy hearing schedule, the Chairman recommended that tentative decisions be made on petitions at the end of each day, then ratified and confirmed on the final day of hearing. There were no objections.

HOMESTEAD EXEMPTIONS

Motion was made by Mr. Dick to sustain the decisions of the Property Appraiser on Homestead Exemption Petitions HE-1 through HE-80, including Lee and Frances Watts, but with the exception of Florian Winter. Motion was seconded by Ms. Nevin and carried unanimously.

PETITIONS OTHER THAN HOMESTEAD

Motion was made by Mr. Driggers to tentatively deny Petition Nos. 78-1, 78-2, and 78-3. Motion was seconded by Ms. Nevin and carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Mr. Driggers to deny Petition No. 78-4. Motion was seconded by Mr. Parrish. Voting "Aye" were Board Members Driggers, Nevins, Parrish and Fortson. Mr. Dick voted "Nay." Motion carried.

Motion was made by Mr. Driggers to grant Petition NO. 78-5. Motion died for lack of a second.

Motion was made by Mr. Dick to deny Petition No. 78-5. Motion was seconded by Ms. Nevin. Voting "Aye" were Board Members Dick, Parrish, Nevin, and Fortson. Mr. Driggers voted "Nay." Motion carried.

Motion was made by Mr. Parrish to grant Petition No. 78-7. Motion was seconded by Mr. Dick and carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Mr. Dick to deny Petition 78-8. Motion was seconded by Ms. Nevin and carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Mr. Parrish to grant Petition 78-12. Motion was seconded by Mr. Driggers and carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Mr. Dick to deny Petition 78-13. Motion was seconded by Ms. Nevin. Voting "Aye" were Members Dick and Nevin. Members Driggers, Parrish and Fortson voted "Nay." Motion did not carry.

Motion was made by Mr. Driggers to grant Petition 78-13. Motion was seconded by Mr. Parrish. Voting "Aye" were Members Driggers, Parrish, and Fortson. Members Dick and Nevin voted "Nay." Motion carried.

Motion was made by Mr. Driggers to grant Petition 78-14. Motion was seconded by Mr. Dick and carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Mr. Dick to sustain the Property Appraiser and deny Petition Nos. 78-6, 78-209, and 78-210. Motion was seconded by Mr. Driggers and carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Mr. Driggers to deny Petition 78-17. Motion was seconded by Mr. Parrish. Voting "Aye" were Members Driggers, Parrish, and Dick. Members Nevin and Fortson voted "Nay." Motion carried.

AUGUST 28, 1978

(Cont'd)

PROPERTY APPRAISAL ADJUSTMENT BOARD

Motion was made by Mr. Driggers to grant Petition 78-18. Motion was seconded by Ms. Nevin and carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Ms. Nevin to grant Petition 78-20 for greenbelt. Motion was seconded by Mr. Parrish and carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Mr. Dick to sustain the Property Appraiser and deny Petition 78-21. Motion was seconded by Ms. Nevin and carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Mr. Parrish to sustain the Property Appraiser and deny Petition 78-23. Motion was seconded by Mr. Dick and carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Mr. Dick to deny Petition 78-25 on parcels 53932.1005, 54001.0000, 54003.0000, and 54005.0000. Motion was seconded by Mr. Driggers and carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Ms. Nevin to grant Petition 78-25 and allow the greenbelt on parcels 16824 and 16827 and deny the greenbelt on parcels 16830 and 16831. Motion was seconded by Mr. Dick and carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Ms. Nevin to deny Petition 78-26. Motion was seconded by Mr. Dick and carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Mr. Dick, seconded by Ms. Nevin, to deny Petition 78-27. Motion carried unanimously.

Action on 78-28, 78-29, and 78-30, was deferred.

Motion was made by Mr. Dick to deny Petition 78-60. Motion was seconded by Mr. Driggers and carried unanimously.

Motion was made by Mr. Parrish to deny Petition 78-58. Motion was seconded by Mr. Dick and carried unanimously.

RECESS

The Chairman declared the Property Appraisal Adjustment Board in recess until 9:00 a.m., Tuesday, August 29, 1978.

=====
AUGUST 29, 1978

The Property Appraisal Adjustment Board of Manatee County, Florida, reconvened in the Courthouse in Bradenton, Florida, Tuesday, August 29, 1978, at 9:05 a.m.

Members present were

- L. H. Fortson, Jr., Chairman )
Louis E. Driggers ) Representing Board of
Lamar S. Parrish ) County Commissioners
Ed Dick ) Representing School
Elizabeth Nevin ) Board

Also present were

- E. N. Fay, Jr., County Attorney
Ralph Umana, Deputy Clerk
Archie B. Powell, Manatee County Property Appraiser
Bill Kersey and Roy Haggard, Asst. to the Property Appraiser

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman.

\*\*\*\*\*
Court Reporter: Billie Crowell
Carpenter Court Reporting