

GADSDEN COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING & PUBLIC HEARING
MINUTES

Thursday, January 15, 2015

6:00 PM

Board of County Commissioners Meeting Room
7 East Jefferson St
Quincy, Florida

Present: Commissioner Regina Davis, At - Large Member, Chair
Commissioner Edward Allen, Vice – Chair
Commissioner Dr. Gail Bridges – Bright (arrived late)
Commissioner John Youmans
Commissioner Gerald McSwain
Commissioner David Tranchand
Commissioner Frank Rowan
Commissioner William Chukes
Commissioner Edward J. Dixon (arrived late)
Commissioner Roger Milton, School Board Representative
David Weiss, County Attorney
Jill Jeglie, Senior Planner
Allara Gutcher, Planning & Community Development Director
Beryl H. Wood, Deputy Clerk

Absent: Commissioner Mari VanLandingham
Commissioner Catherine Robinson

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Davis called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. with a quorum and led in the Pledge of Allegiance to the U.S. flag.

2. INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS/ROLL CALL

Each member present stated his or her name and district for which they are appointed for the record.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Documents: October 23, 2014 Minutes

UPON MOTION BY COMMISSIONER CHUKES AND SECOND BY COMMISSIONER TRANCHAND, THE COMMISSION VOTED 8 – 0, BY VOICE VOTE, FOR APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 23, 2014 MINUTES.

Commissioner Dixon arrived at this juncture 6:03pm.

November 13, 2014

UPON MOTION BY COMMISSIONER ALLEN AND SECOND BY COMMISSIONER TRANCHAND, THE COMMISSION VOTED 9 – 0, BY VOICE VOTE, FOR APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 13, 2014 MINUTES.

Commissioner Dr. Bridges – Bright arrived at this juncture 6:05pm.

4. DISCLOSURES AND DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICT

There were no disclosures and declarations of conflict.

GENERAL BUSINESS

5. PUBLIC HEARING (Legislative) - Recommendation of an amendment to Section 7001.1, the Citizens Growth Management and Planning Bill of Rights (LDC-2015-01) of the Gadsden County Land Development Code.

Mrs. Gutcher gave a summary of the background on this item. The Planning Commission is asked to consider amendment of Chapter 7 of the Land Development Code regarding the Citizen’s Growth Management and Planning Bill of Rights with recommendation to the BOCC.

At the May 19, 2009 Gadsden County Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) meeting, the BOCC authorized the County Attorney to draft an ordinance reflecting the language proposed by the 1000 Friends of Florida in the model “Citizens’ Bill of Rights” drafted by that organization. At that time there were some proposed legislation talking about creating an avenue for all amendments to be decided by a referendum. There were several communities within the State that became concerned with that and the 1000 Friends of Florida helped facilitate a solution in which they created a model, the “Citizens’ Bill of Rights” as an avenue which would allow for Citizen’s to be heard in addition to the Public Hearings that already existed.

She provided the model language the 1000 Friends of Florida proposed, in addition to some proposed statutory language that at the time DCA proposed to be included in statute, that language was never adopted by the legislature, but it is in your package for reference. On February 11 and March 11, 2010 the Planning Commission considered the item drafted by the staff and the attorney. The draft created additional steps from the current county process for Large Scale Comprehensive Plan Amendments. It also, created a seven day cooling off period and required a super-majority vote from the BOCC for large scale comprehensive plan amendments. The Planning Commission made several changes from the Attorney and Staff model. They made recommendations to add small scale comprehensive plan amendments, variances, special exceptions and development orders to the language. They also recommended the insertion of the requirement that in order to change the ordinance, a super – majority vote would be required.

May 4, 2010, the Board of County Commissioners considered this item and adopted the version that is in place today as Ordinance 2010-005.

At the December 16, 2014 BOCC meeting, the BOCC requested that staff and the Planning Commission revise the requirements of the Citizen’s Growth Management and Planning Bill of Rights.

The current version of the Citizen’s Bill of Rights requires the following:

- A. A mandated citizen participation plan – this step requires public notice of property owners and neighborhood associations within one-half mile of the development site property boundaries.
- B. Neighborhood Participation – notification of neighborhood associations by county staff within 10 days of the filing of any application or proposal filed for comprehensive plan map amendment; requires a community meeting 30 calendar days prior to filing the application; requires a second community meeting 15 days prior to amendment adoption hearing of a plan amendment after review “by DCA”. *(Note: the timing of the second requirement in this subsection is not clear. Although the staff is required to notify the neighborhood associations of the filing within 10 days after filing with the county, the community meeting requirement 30 days prior to “submittal to DCA” (now DEO) is confusing. This timing should be based upon the Planning Commission hearing, not the submittal or filing date to DCA (now DEO) as that timing is more fluid.)*
- C. Seven day “cooling-off” period – plan amendments cannot be changed in the seven business days prior to the advertised public hearing. If revised within this period, then the hearing must be rescheduled.
- D. Super-majority vote – required for all comprehensive plan amendments, major land development reviews, variances, special exceptions, major site plans and major subdivision(s). A super majority vote is also required for amendment of this section.
- E. Requires all comprehensive plan map amendments and “site development applications” to protect environmental resources.

- F. No Free Density – when the conversion of land from residential or agriculture occurs to create “urban density”, proof must be made to show “land for significant public benefit is offered in fair and equitable exchange”.
- G. Requires the establishment of urban service boundaries by 2014.

The Board of County Commission requested that the Planning Commission hear this item and give a recommendation at their last meeting and consider this item for re-visit of amendment. You have the staff recommended version in your package. It basically is a proposal for discussion on what kind of recommendation you want to make to the County Commission.

Commissioner Allen said this went before the BOCC and he said there were no complaints. He then offered a motion for option 4: Recommend that the BOCC retain all of Section 70001.0 in its current form and find that it is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

The motion was held due to it being a Public Hearing for public comment by the Chair.

Public Comment:

Larry Ganus, 2174 Frank Smith Rd, commented this is an element of the planning process that is very important and his preference for options where 4,3,2,1 in the staff recommendations. He said people are interested in what’s going on in their immediate area and voiced they didn’t need to lose the Citizen’s Bill of Rights. He mentioned suggestions in staff analysis write-up that he provided for the Commission. He said in option 2 or 3 his suggestion would be to modify on page two of five the staff analysis under item d, Neighborhood Participation, change the wording about the sequence of the meetings. He said it could be between 15 days after filing the application and 30 days prior to the first public hearing by the Planning Commission. Have the second community meeting be optional, only required if there has been changes.

Also, under staff observations page 3 of 5 under Neighborhood Associations he said there is resistance about finding out where all the Neighborhood Associations are in the county. He suggested running advertisement in local newspaper and asked those that have active Neighborhood Associations to call the office and make a list of them. On the Proposed Language which was attachment 4.) Under subsection 1305 on page 1 of 2 I would omit the word additional in the first sentence of that. He said additional sounds negative like it’s a burden and I would omit it. 1305A I would add any application that requires type 2 reviews to fall under this criteria. He said that would take care of things that don’t come before the commission on a regular basis like variances. 1305 A items 3 and 5 a lot of information to gather for those that don’t understand the language. He asked what the Planning Department would assist in compiling. 1305B items 4-6, he felt the writer got the sooner and later reversed instead of using sooner suggested they use earlier than. Notification, he mentioned it was a pretty humongous task to have to have certified mail is a lot with the cost and it’s not time effective. He voiced he had other comments that he would type up and send to the Director.

Marion Lasley, 5 Dante Court, commented she was in favor of retaining option 4 as is. She stated if there were problems with the language, if there is a problem with an impacted area, if it's not clear it would be the ½ mile radius. She said it could read the impact area if a ½ mile radius around the project. She said this is for major land use changes and historically if they are good and appropriate developments in the right area next to things that it is compatible with, it's not hard to get four votes. It is the ones that are conservational. She recommended more notice would be better. A larger notice area is important for these large requests. She pointed out if there is definition needed for Environmental Resource they could give it a definition. She said she was not in favor of the return receipt requested, in the past they have had a list provided in the packets of all that mail was sent to with names and addresses. She said they could encourage more notification by offering the post office receipts for the stamps and the numbers should add up. Red sign should be included on page 2 of 2 on any land use change of a major development. She asked that on page 1 of 2 of proposed language that they define some things on Ordinance such as reserve on the top of 1301. On the ordinance as it stands it should be cleaned up and to make it more specific. She disclosed that a Marjorie Sims called her and each of the Commissioners and was opposed to any changes of the Ordinance.

Michael Dorian, 25 Alligator Rd, He said a lot of citizens didn't know what the Citizen's Bill of Rights was. He commented it should go through the Citizen Bill of Rights (CBOR) process. He then referenced the comments he turned into the Commission. He felt as if the Citizen's Bill of Rights was the most important document to come out the Board of County Commission. He pointed out some of pros and cons of the CBOR: citizens would be able to talk more than 3 minutes, unlike Planning or BOCC meetings. He said it would take the place of review, which the State use to do. He asked Mrs. Gutcher about the proposed change of registered letters.

Mrs. Gutcher stated there would be a record that notification had been sent to the surrounding property owners.

Sam Palmer, 1225 Berry St, commented the COBR should be repealed especially on the super-majority requirement. He referenced his handout and said they should go back to the old Ordinance. He mentioned businesses that wanted to come to Gadsden County and how the CBOR prohibited them.

Commissioner Allen asked about the 2 businesses Mr. Palmer referenced.

Mr. Palmer said the two businesses were Green Circle Bio-Energy and Wood Product. He noted one went to Liberty County and he was unsure of the other.

Charles Morris, 23201 Blue Star Highway, came before the Commission and stated there is a problem with the restrictive language that was added in 2010. His recommendations proposed was that language be stricken that required the three extra processes, a series of workshops to discuss the proper language that should be used with the Planning Commission facilitating and the county bare burdens like all the other counties. Finally, he asked that the super – majority requirement be removed.

Tyrone Smith, 878 Arlington Circle, addressed the Commission on the few business owners in Gadsden County and how extremely difficult the three additional requirements are on the citizens.

Anthony Thomas, 159 Strong Rd, commented he believed the elected officials had failed the citizens with the passing of the Ordinance for CBOR. He said he was in support of repealing the super – majority.

Chair Davis clarified and recapped some of the questions and suggestions posed.

- Definition of Reserve
- Number of recommended workshops
- Indication that they were in favor of going through the process of the CBOR itself
- Repeal of the Ordinance was suggested
- The idea that CBOR impacts residential homes, some people believe it does some don't. She said they would need clarification.
- Neighborhood Association
- Super – Majority
- Red - Signs placed
- In favor of CBOR

Mrs. Gutchler said the only time the CBOR would affect a single family dwelling is if they required a variance.

Commissioner Comments:

Commissioner Chukes stated his problem was people getting caught up with land that they can't do anything with. He said he was concerned with concerns heard by citizens.

Commissioner Allen offered a motion and it was seconded Commissioner Tranchand.

Commissioner Dr. Bridges – Bright voiced she was not opposed to having the COBR, but suggested it be tweaked.

UPON MOTION BY COMMISSIONER ALLEN AND SECOND BY COMMISSIONER TRANCHAND, THE COMMISSION VOTED 3 – 7, TO RECOMMEND OPTION 4 TO RETAIN ALL OF SECTION 7001.1 IN ITS CURRENT FORM AND FIND THAT IT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN. THE MOTION FAILED (Commissioner's Milton, Bright, Davis, Youmans, Dixon, McSwain and Chukes opposed the motion.)

Commissioner McSwain offered a motion and it was seconded by Commissioner Youmans, that the CBOR be repealed including Super Majority and sent back to the Planning Staff for a workshop.

Commissioner Dixon commented this is no longer affective. It cost Citizens to do business in their own county and the super majority vote is a bit much. He said the county should be in charge of notifications. Not in favor of anything that slows the development of Gadsden County.

Mrs. Gutcher wanted the PC to understand that two (2) mailed notices are required at the CBOR and for the Public Meeting.

UPON MOTION BY COMMISSIONER MCSWAIN AND COMMISSIONER YOUMANS, THE COMMISSION VOTED 7 – 3, BY VOICE VOTE, TO MAKE A RECOMMENDATION TO BOCCC TO REPEAL THE ORDINANCE ON CBOR AND ASK THE COUNTY COMMISSION TO SCHEDULE WORKSHOP WITH PC ON CREATING NEW LANGUAGE. THE MOTION PASSED. (Commissioner's Allen, Rowan and Tranchand opposed the motion.)

6. PUBLIC HEARING (Legislative) - Recommended transmittal of the Future Land Use Element (CPA-2015-01) Documents: Agenda Report and Attachments for the Transmittal of the Future Land Use Element (CPA-2015-01).

Mrs. Gutcher commented this hearing is set to offer a recommendation to the BOCC for the transmittal of the revised Future Land Use Element (FLUE) to the Department of Economic Opportunity for review as a more concise, understandable and defensible document with each land use category, and to the future growth of Gadsden County. She presented the current draft of the FLUE. She reminded them it was the same draft they saw back in December because they haven't had any type of meeting for you all to make motions to have changes. She pointed out that she had created some action requests generated from the October and December workshops. She pointed out one issue was whether are not to include silvi-culture activities in the agriculture land use category. In addition workcamp language in the silvi-culture under allowable uses was added but wasn't in the notes.

The Commission recessed for at 7:03p.m.and returned at 7:10p.m.

Once returning from break Mrs. Gutcher pointed out this was the third developmental update to the FLUE. She referenced the FLUE: Policy 1.1.1 B. Conservation – To determine whether or not to allow density in the Conservation category. She noted there was a lot of discussion between the difference in a Conservation Future Land Use Category and a Conservation Easement; it was her desire that it was clear and precise now. A Conservation Easement is generally a document or an agreement between the property owner and they would deed that easement to a state agency or a county or local government. She said it really didn't have any bearing over the development of the property other than what the easement restrictions are. Conservation Land Use Category is what is listed on page 2. The parameters of the Conservation Land Use Category match the brown of the map. Mrs. Gutcher said the discussion was whether or not to allow a density which is a dwelling inside of the brown which she pointed out on the map. She said the Commission needs to decide whether they want to allow 1 unit per 40 acres in the Conservation Future Land Use Category.

Commissioner Allen asked whether they allowed having 1 density per 40 acres in Conservation in the past.

Mrs. Gutcher said currently the Future Land Use Category allows a density of 1 per 40.

Commissioner McSwain asked how the land was zoned and he asked did citizens address this issue.

Mrs. Gutcher stated if you look at the Conservation it is one of the Land Use Categories and it is the dark brown you see on the map. She then said if you look at the Future Land Use Element, which is the text and you would look and read at one type of development and what kind of uses are allowed on the brown on the map. You can't have one without the other; you need the map to know where these apply.

Commissioner Youman asked had the language been changed in the Future Land Use Element from 1 unit per 40 acres.

Mrs. Gutcher said currently, the Future Land Use Element states that: The density allowed is 1 unit per 40 acres in the brown. The proposal is to create more of a conservation designation, which means more preservation, more than development. If you want to allow 1 unit per 40 acres in the brown then we need a motion to include that designation. She said as it stands it is proposed not to have a density.

Commissioner McSwain inquired about speakers that may have opposed this change.

Mrs. Gutcher said they did have public comment and there were no complaints off of her head, but would need to refer back to the minutes.

Chair Davis suggested they go through each of the issues listed below.

Mrs. Gutcher referenced highlighted changes of handout are what was discussed at the last workshop.

Commissioner Allen said at the last meeting he asked for a couple of statues to be placed in mining. He said earlier he was told that statues were a definition, not a regulation. He asked was there a reason a definition could not be put in the policy.

Mrs. Gutcher said the definition you referenced in the Florida Statues 380.04 is the definition of development, so the definitions are located in the Land Development Code. She said it was defined in chapter 384 of the Florida Statues. She said they already have it in place.

He then asked about Florida Statue 187.201 13 B5.

Mrs. Gutcher replied Florida Statute 187.201 is the State Comprehensive Plan. The State is required to follow their Comprehensive Plan is 187.201. She said both the state and local must be compatible and it won't be approved by Department of Economic Opportunity. They still have to review all amendments. She said they don't have to put in the policy.

Commissioner Allen asked about Ordinance 94-001, that references the Data Analysis Report.

Mrs. Gutcher said she believed that is what was given to her. She said this must have been Data and Analysis to a Comprehensive Plan back in 1994 that was either updated or adopted. This is data that is collected to support your policies. She said her assumption was this Data Analysis pertained to the Conservation Element, because it talked about slope forest and steepheads and map conservation – 11. With that being said, she suggested looking at this when they update the Conservation Element.

She then continued discussion of one outstanding issue, the Stipulated Settlement Agreement from 2008 regarding discussion that was never resolved at the last workshop in December. She said the question is to whether or not to retain it, leave it in the policy of the Comprehensive Plan or to pull out parts that were really important and include them in new policy in the Comprehensive Plan. She also suggested they could reference it by Policy.

Chair Davis asked about the Stipulated Settlement Agreement, was it still valid since DCA no longer exists, is it still binding.

Attorney Weiss explained the Stipulated Settlement Agreement was a result of this County adopting a number of amendments to the Future Land Use Map. He said it basically takes property from agriculture to rural residential to allow large scale developments. He said DCA objected to some of the amendments on certain grounds. The resolution was the Stipulated Settlement Agreement, which is where everyone came together and said you can make these amendments if you keep these stipulations as to what needs to be on the property when it's developed. With DCA being gone the Stipulated Settlement Agreement is a binding document that resolves litigation. It is not a document that is intended to bind the County discretion eternally. The County still has the ability to amend the Comprehensive Plan as long as it's in compliance with state statute and DEO will review to determine whether or not that is the case. DEO is now in DCA's place, the State Land Planning Agency. If we propose amendments they will go to DEO and they will let us know whether are not they are in compliance.

Commissioner Tranchand asked what happened to the Special Area Plans.

Mrs. Gutcher commented that she was not sure any of the information dealing with the Stipulated Settlement Agreement or the Ear-Based Amendments was ever transmitted to the Board of County Commission.

Commissioner Allen asked could they now adopt the Stipulated Settlement Agreement Special Area Plans.

Attorney Weiss stated that was an option, they could keep the individual policies in your Future Land Use Element if you want.

Chair Davis stated we will decide at a later time as a body what we will do as far as the Stipulated Settlement Agreement. On the other items brought forth we will decide tonight.

Commissioner Allen stated all this has been approved, but none went to the Board of County Commission.

Commissioner Dr. Bridges - Bright handled business before them tonight and as suggested the work that they had done previously on the Area Plans we will look at again and move it on to the County Commission.

Public Comments:

Mike Dorian, 145 Alligator Run: He stated he would like for this to be workshopped.

Marian Lasley, 5 Dante Court, referenced page 3 intensity and impervious area.

Mrs. Gutcher commented on trying to get developers to do centralized utilities.

Mrs. Lasley's discussion continued and she referenced page 4 in which she was in favor of retaining environmental sensitive lands. Page 10 Policy 1.3.2 voiced concern with (B) other impacts that could occur, needs other definition.

Mrs. Gutcher commented it is defined in the Land Development Code. She said she took out because it's not mapped.

Larry Ganus, 2174 Frank Smith Rd, said the first issue is to table until good information into the Comp Plan. He pointed out they should wait and look at both. I listed 6 Ordinances passed in 2008/09 he referenced the Overlay; it's not in the Stipulated Settlement Agreement -1.14.5 Comp Plan. The first page of the agenda report meeting was Dec. 11 not 9th. Pages 4 of 11 consider adding language from Ag to rural residential it is in Comp Plan and it would be left out. Page 10 of 11 discussed Large Scale.

Mrs. Gutcher stated it was a part of the Plan. We would still have to strike that language.

Chair Davis asked that option 3 is similar to what you are asking Mr. Ganus. How long would it take to put information together?

Commissioner Dixon voiced let's go ahead and move this down the road. He suggested having something to submit to BOCC.

Chair Davis asked for comments.

Commissioner Allen motioned to table and workshop in February.

Commissioner Dixon asked were the things in red what we the Commission asked for. He asked where there any new issues.

Mrs. Gutcher said the Stipulated Agreement was a major part of discussion at the last workshop.

Mrs. Gutcher commented the things in red are what the Commission asked for.

Commissioner Tranchand commented on Special Area Plan and all the work they had put into it, because it hasn't been covered.

Commissioner Dixon asked did they have the ability to add things to the Future Land Use Element.

Mrs. Gutcher responded yes.

UPON MOTION BY COMMISSIONER ALLEN AND SECOND BY COMMISSIONER TRANCAND, THE COMMISSION VOTED 4 – 6, BY VOICE VOTE, TO HAVE IT TABLED AND HAVE A WORKSHOP IN FEBRUARY. (Commissioner's Allen, Tranchand, Rowan and Chukes.) Motion failed.

UPON MOTION BY COMMISSIONER MILTON AND SECOND BY COMMISSIONER DR. BRIDGES – BRIGHT, THE COMMISSION VOTED 9-0, BY VOICE VOTE, TO MOVE OPTION 3 AND MOVE FORWARD WITH THE PUBLIC HEARING AND THE ADDITION WITH THE CHANGES IN RED.

Mrs. Gutcher pointed out there were things that needed to be voted on with the Commission that they needed to go through.

Motions:

- Allow density in the Conservation category. A density of 1 unit per 40 acres.
UPON MOTION BY COMMISSIONER DR. BRIDGES – BRIGHT AND SECOND BY COMMISSIONER DIXON, THE COMMISSION VOTED 10 – 0, BY VOICE VOTE, TO ALLOW DENSITY IN THE CONSERVATION CATEGORY, A DENSITY OF 1 UNIT PER 40 ACRES.
- Decide to allow workcamps in silviculture in allowable uses.
UPON MOTION BY COMMISSIONER DR. BRIDGES – BRIGHT AND SECOND BY COMMISSIONER DIXON, THE COMMISSION VOTED 10 – 0, BY VOICE VOTE, DECIDED TO ALLOW WORKCAMPS IN SILVICULTURE IN ALLOWABLE USES.
- Use better terminology to describe (change) the “grounds keeper quarters”, “Facility management quarters”.
UPON MOTION BY COMMISSIONER DIXON AND SECOND BY COMMISSIONER BRIDGES, THE COMMISSION VOTED 10 – 0, BY VOICE VOTE, TO USE BETTER

TERMINOLOGY TO DESCRIBE (CHANGE) THE “GROUNDS KEEPER QUARTERS”, TO FACILITY MANAGEMENT QUARTERS.

- E. Public/Institutional #3.) Change *of* to *or*.
UPON MOTION BY COMMISSIONER DR. BRIDGES – BRIGHT AND COMMISSIONER DIXON, THE COMMISSION VOTED 10 – 0, BY VOICE VOTE, TO CHANGE IN E. PUBLIC /INSTITUTIONAL #3.) CHANGE OF TO OR.
- F. Agriculture -1 #5.) Whether or not to include silviculture in allowable uses.
UPON MOTION BY COMMISSIONER DR. BRIDGES – BRIGHT AND COMMISSIONER DIXON, THE COMMISSION VOTED 10 – 0, BY VOICE VOTE, FOR F. AGRICULTURE – 1 #5.) TO INCLUDE SILVICULTURE IN ALLOWABLE USES.
- How to address the net density/ gross density calculations in rural residential. Whether to keep as is or include new language: Motion: It was moved by Commissioner Dr. Bridges - Bright to include the new language as stated to develop potential from defined environmentally sensitive areas, rather than from the overall net density calculation. It was seconded by Commissioner Dixon. He asked that it be amended to include the potential development of. (The motion was withdrawn for further discussion per the suggestion of Mrs. Gutcher.) **UPON MOTION BY COMMISSIONER DIXON AND SECOND BY COMMISSIONER YOUMAN, THE COMMISSION VOTED 10-0, BY VOICE VOTE, TO TABLE THIS DISCUSSION.**
- J on page 5 #7: Whether are not to leave at 10,000sqft. or change to 5,000 sqft.
UPON MOTION BY COMMISSIONER TRANCHAND AND SECOND BY COMMISSIONER DR. BRIDGES – BRIGHT, THE COMMISSION VOTED 10 – 0, BY VOICE VOTE, TO CHANGE TO 5,000sqft.
- Part K Commercial #6: To add mobile home parks to allowable uses
UPON MOTION BY COMMISSIONER DIXON AND SECOND BY COMMISSIONER CHUKES, THE COMMISSION VOTED 10 – 0, BY VOICE VOTE, TO ADD MOBILE HOME PARKS TO ALLOWABLE USES.
- Page 8 Policy 1.2.3: Whether are not to change 5 years to 3 years and change word the word *an* to *and*.
UPON MOTION BY COMMISSIONER TRANCHAND AND COMMISSIONER CHUKES, THE COMMISSION VOTED 10 – 0, BY VOICE VOTE, IN POLICY 1.2.3 TO CHANGE 5 YEARS TO 3YEARS AND CHANGE THE WORD AN TO AND.
- Page 10 of 11 Policy 1.3.2(last sentence) change con to non_conforming typographical error.
UPON MOTION BY COMMISSIONER DR. BRIDGES –BRIGHT AND SECOND BY COMMISSIONER CHUKES, THE COMMISSION VOTED 10 – 0, BY VOICE VOTE, IN POLICY 1.3.2 (LAST SENTENCE) CHANGE CON TO NON-CONFORMING.
- Policy 1.32. substantially changed, if that is only definition. Table issue in B per Dixon for further discussion on Lasley comments.
UPON MOTION BY COMMISSIONER DIXON AND SECOND BY COMMISSIONER ALLEN, THE COMMISSION VOTE 10 – 0, BY VOICE VOTE, IN POLICY 1.3.2 TO SUBSTANTIALLY CHANGE IF THAT WAS THE ONLY DEFINITION AND TO TABLE ISSUE IN B FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION OF LASLEY’S COMMENTS.

- Page 11 of 11: Consideration of inclusion of several policies to speak to the policies adopted in the 2008 Stipulated Settlement Agreement.

UPON MOTION BY COMMISSION DIXON AND SECOND BY COMMISSIONER MCSWAIN, THE COMMISSION VOTED 10 – 0, BY VOICE VOTE, FOR CONSIDERATION OF INCLUSION OF SEVERAL POLICIES TO SPEAK TO THE POLICIES ADOPTED IN THE 2008 STIPULATED SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT.

8. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Larry Ganus asked for action of his request on Rural Residential Land Use Amendments to be required to be adjacent to existing Rural Residential.

Chair Davis advised it would be heard at the next meeting.

9. DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS - Distribution of Housing Element Adopted by Ord. 2014-00.

Mrs. Gutcher discussed the Housing Element. She said it had been through the process and had been adopted by the County Commission and there were no objections. She instructed the Commission to replace the old element with the new one which she provided.

Mrs. Gutcher referenced County Commission Planning Schedule for the year 2015, which is pursuant to the County Code of Ordinances.

10. ADJOURNMENT

**THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS TO COME BEFORE THE COMMISSION, THE CHAIR
DECLARED THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:25 P.M.**

GADSDEN COUNTY, FLORIDA

REGINA DAVIS, CHAIR

ATTEST:

**BERYL H. WOOD, DEPUTY CLERK
For NICHOLAS THOMAS, CLERK
Gadsden County, Florida**