

**AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING
COMMISSION HELD IN AND FOR GADSDEN
COUNTY, FLORIDA ON JULY 12, 2018 AT 6:00
P.M., THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDING WAS HAD,
VIZ:**

Attendance:

Commissioner Edward J. Dixon, Chair
Commissioner Libby Henderson, Vice-Chair
Commissioner Regina Davis, At-Large Member
Commissioner Gail Bridges-Bright
Commissioner John Youman
Commissioner Marion Lasley
Commissioner Doug Nunamaker
Commissioner Lori Bouie – Arrived late
Commissioner William Chukes
Commissioner Antwon McNeil - Absent
Commissioner Gerald McSwain - Absent
Commissioner Audrey Lewis, School Board Representative
Jill Jeglie, Senior Planner
Roosevelt Morris, Planning Director
David Weiss, County Attorney
Beryl H. Wood, Deputy Clerk

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Dixon called the meeting to order and asked everyone to stand for a moment of silence and then led in the Pledge of Allegiance to the U.S. Flag.

He reminded the Commissioners if anyone had any ex-parte communications with anyone, phone calls or meeting they should disclose them at this time.

2. INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS/ROLL CALL

The roll was called by the deputy clerk, Beryl Wood.

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Commissioner Lasley commented on the Agenda the definitions in number 7 that dealt with the Comprehensive Plan should come after item 8. She then motioned that item 7 be changed to be heard before item 8 and it was seconded by Commissioner Davis.

**UPON MOTION BY COMMISSIONER LASLEY AND SECOND BY COMMISSIONER DAVIS,
THE COMMISSION VOTED 9 – 0, BY VOICE VOTE, FOR APPROVAL OF THE AMENDED
AGENDA AS STATED ABOVE.**

4. CITIZEN'S REQUESTING TO BE HEARD

There was no citizen's request to be heard.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

5. WHITE DOG PLANTATION, INC. Havana Springs Resort LLC (HAVANA SPRING RESORT LLC (SHADY REST) (Quasi-Judicial) (Tax Parcel ID #2-31-3N-2W-0000-00433-0100) – Consideration of a special exception use to allow the sale of alcoholic beverages at the existing facility utilized for the restaurant, lodging, and special events/gatherings.

All speakers were sworn by the deputy clerk as to their testimony.

Mrs. Henderson arrived at this juncture of the meeting at 6:04 pm.

Ms. Jeglie presented the consideration of a request for a recommendation of approval of 'Special Exception Use' (SEU) to allow alcoholic beverages to be served in the existing restaurant, lodging, and special event venue. The White Dog Plantation consists of a 38.9-acre parcel. Approximately 30± acres are designated as Commercial; 8.9± acres are designated as Rural Residential.

She said the subject property is owned by Lynn Badger, White Dog Plantation Inc. The current owner has contracted to sell the property to Jennifer and John Heal, Havana Springs Resort, LLC and is represented by Garvin Bowden. White Dog Plantation is located at 200 Coca-Cola Avenue, Havana, FL (Tax Parcel ID # 2-31-3N-2W-0000-0433-0100). The Heals intend to continue to host lodging in the cottages and events in the Shady Rest Event Center such as weddings, parties, corporate meetings, etc. The current owner has utilized outside caterers and beverages services. The Heals are asking for SEU approval to allow them to serve/sell alcoholic beverages to guests as part of their catering, special event service, and lodgings. They also intend to initially open the restaurant on a daily basis (Phase II). The SEU would allow alcoholic beverages to be served/sold to guests as opposed to by a visiting catering service as part of an event. No expansion is proposed to the existing structures.

Ms. Bouie arrived at this juncture of the meeting at 6:18 pm.

Jennifer and John Heal appeared before the Commission. They said they were formally from St. Louis and they were the new owners of the White Dog Plantation. They expressed they were happy to be in the area. Mrs. Heal said the community is very warm and they love the history of the property. She said they are excited and would be happy to entertain questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Nunamaker asked was there opposition and welcomed them to Gadsden County.

Commissioner Lasley asked about the property to the west. She said she was concerned about the adjacent neighbor. Mrs. Heal said Mrs. Nicholson was present at the CBOR meeting and she had no concerns.

Commissioner Lasley suggested that they add a buffer for the adjacent neighbors. She said her concern was in the driveway with headlights, so it won't be impacted. Mrs. Heal said they would be mindful of the neighbors.

Commissioner Chukes asked about the number of seating. Mrs. Heal said it would hold around 200, but they would keep it at 150 people for weddings, receptions, and special events. She said the restaurant wouldn't hold that much, around 50 at a time. She said employees would be around 20-30 depending on events. He asked was there any opposition and she responded there was none.

Chair Dixon called for public comment and there was none.

Commissioner Lasley asked about allowing alcohol on the premises.

Mrs. Heal said they would serve alcoholic beverages, in a relaxed environment.

Option 1: Recommend approval of the White Dog Plantation Inc. (Havana Springs LLC) Special Exception Use (SEU 2018 -1) to allow the expansion of the existing electrical substation based on the findings provided in this report and the testimony provided at the public hearing.

a.) Prior to issuance of a final development order, the applicant or representative shall meet on-site with the County Construction Compliance Officer to verify that the buffer meets opacity requirements and whether or where any additional plantings maybe required to be planted to comply with the opacity standards of the LDC.

UPON MOTION BY COMMISSIONER LASLEY AND SECOND BY COMMISSIONER NUNAMAKER, THE COMMISSION VOTED 10-0, BY VOICE VOTE, FOR APPROVAL OF OPTION 1 AS STATED ABOVE.

6. RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE ELEMENT (Legislative) (LSPA 2018-04) – Consideration of amendments to the Recreation and Open Space Element of the Comprehensive Plan. (Tabled from June 14th meeting).

Mrs. Allara Gutcher commented on the consideration of an amendment of the Recreation and Open Space Element of the Comprehensive Plan to update specific policies for clarification purposes. She said it was presented last month and was tabled and brought back tonight for their consideration.

The Recreation and Open Space Element was last updated/amended in February of 2016 as part of the recent overhaul of the Comprehensive Plan Elements. The Recreation and Open Space Element is the guiding policy language for those lands used for recreational purposes, and the areas the County deems important to retain as open space.

The item was continued from the June 14, 2018 public hearing at a request for more information. The additional information requested was regarding open space requirements as listed in the Land Development Code. This information is included at the end of the next section.

She discussed the three issues that she was asked to look at: 6.1.4 Ochlocknee River which was the policy that talked about coordinating with North West Florida Water Management District and the Department of Environmental Protection with protecting and preserving Lake Talquin and Ochlocknee River and Apalachicola River were also inserted as both are outstanding Florida water bodies and the recreational resources to ensure the quality of; 6.1.2 typo; 6.4.1 platted was included before the subdivision.

Chair Dixon held discussion from the Commission.

Commissioner Lasley asked about storm water areas in the open space. Mrs. Gutcher said it was a local policy decision, but if there was a storm water pond most were not included in the open space. She said it was a local decision. Commissioner Lasley said according to this language it would not be included. Mrs. Gutcher said that was correct. She then inquired about buffers. Mrs. Gutcher said buffers could be counted as open space.

Commissioner Nunamaker commented that when he was reading about the storm pond he felt it was left up to your own discretion. Commissioner Lasley stated she was of the opinion that it was a working area that had to be dealt with as part of the project. Mrs. Gutcher said the open space definition was something they would discuss later in Chapter 2.

Commissioner Lasley commented in this language would be included in open space. She asked if recreation would also be included in open space. Mrs. Gutcher asked which policy she was referring to. Commissioner Lasley asked in the calculation of open space which is being reduced from 20% to 10% if recreation was going to be accessed as open space. Mrs. Gutcher referred to the definition in Chapter 2. *She read into the record.* She said if they were asking her if a passive park area could be used for open space she responded it could be counted that way. Commissioner Lasley said they essentially could be the same. She said you could create a recreation area and that would count as your open space. She asked were they the same. Mrs. Gutcher responded not always, you could have a playground that might have a pervious surface that is not open space. Commissioner Lasley commented on Page 1: Sub 5102 in the middle of the page – part D. Where residential subdivision help provides at least 50% of the open space in upland areas that are suitable for recreation areas. Mrs. Gutcher said the attachment that starts

at the end of the recreation and open space element was provided to them for additional information that pertained to information in the Land Development Code that spoke to Open Space. Commissioner Lasley asked who this open space requirement was going to relate to that project, as it pertained to the Land Development Code with 50% Open Space. Mrs. Gutcher replied that Sub Section 5102 was a part of the Land Development Code which was not under consideration at this meeting. She said that they were only examples of what existed in the Code.

Commissioner Bouie commented on 6.3.8 recreational open space element, was it contingent *upon* or *until* it has been demonstrated. Mrs. Gutcher said it should be before the Final Development Order was issued.

Commissioner Nunamaker said it should read at the very end, instead of *shall be* it should be *has been* and it should read *system* instead of *systems*. He also pointed out in 6.4.8 the very end where it read then mitigation or avoidance of development that area shall be required. He said to remove the comma and the hyphen. It was determined that the language was correct as it read.

Commissioner Lasley commented on page 2 of 4, the very top Policy 6.2.2. She said a definition was needed for density bonuses. She said she didn't know what it meant or how it applied. She also asked for a definition of the fast-tracking of developments. She also asked about the dedication of land in lieu of fees. She asked was the mechanism somewhere because she had never seen that type of language before.

Commissioner Nunamaker said in *lieu -of -fees* shouldn't be hyphenated it should be *lieu of fees*.

Chair Dixon asked for further discussion.

UPON MOTION BY COMMISSIONER DAVIS AND SECOND BY COMMISSIONER BRIDGES – BRIGHT, THE COMMISSION VOTED 10-0, BY VOICE VOTE, FOR APPROVAL OF OPTION 1 WITH AMENDMENTS AS LISTED.

7. CHAPTER 2 OF THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE (Legislative) (LDR-2018-03) – Consideration of amendments to Chapter 2, Definitions and Interpretations of the Land Development Code

Mrs. Gutcher presented Chapter 2 of the Land Development Code. She said consideration of an amendment of Chapter 2 of the Land Development Code regarding the inclusion of new definitions to the document.

The Land Development Code (LDC) is the implementing document of the goals, objectives, objectives, and policies of the Comprehensive Plan. It is required b 163.3202, Florida Statutes

and provides specific standards to which all development within unincorporated Gadsden County must meet. Amendments to the LDC are made as legislative, local characteristics or other factors evolve and are updated.

Discussion occurred among the Commission.

Commissioner Nunamaker said **cost** instead of **coast** questions on re-subdivide/re-plat scratch and leave as a replat.

Commissioner Lasley recommended language of the Florida Statute for the family exemption. Mrs. Gutcher said they don't use family they use homestead exemption. Commissioner Lasley said homestead exemption was something else. Mrs. Gutcher responded that they don't have to identically match the statutes as long as they define it themselves. Chair Dixon said he thought it was something that required a local definition because of the way it was approached.

Mrs. Gutcher said they worked with Talquin Electric to define substations, the electrical and the different levels of substations, there were some that provide more power than others. She said the numbers were emailed and she inserted them into the definitions. She said the summary was that they were adding new definitions regarding substations. She said on page 28, they added the definition for warehouses and mini-warehouses and self-storage units. She said they also added a definition of zero lot lined house. She then referred to Mr. Weiss for page 27 concerning the definition for utilities/centralized utilities.

Mr. Weiss said he was not sure they were in agreement of it. Mrs. Gutcher said they would bring that back.

Commissioner Bouie commented on page 27 the sub-station definition. She said she was concerned about taking numbers from an entity. Mrs. Gutcher replied she emailed him numbers that she had found in her research and he tweaked them for her. She said she knows this is the correct terminology. She said it is not far from her research. Commissioner Bouie said she was only concerned that it may lock them in and the future use may not agree with. Mrs. Gutcher said by Florida Statute they were not allowed to regulate the location of substations, only setbacks and buffering.

Commissioner Nunamaker commented on a couple of grammatical errors. He said with zero lot lined on the last line where it read one or more side lot *lines* probably have no building setbacks. He commented on page 15 on Metes and Bound by compass bearings and distances from a nonpoint of reference.

Commissioner Lasley page 1 e section: should read *shall run until*; page 3 definitions on Agri-tourism, she said she would rather have the main points of the Florida Statute put in there instead of listing the Florida Statute. Mrs. Gutcher said she was not opposed to that and it was

at their discretion. She said the reason why sometimes it is referenced is that that statute has been changed. Commissioner Davis said she would like to keep information as is. Commissioner Lasley commented on the definition on page 17: Power plant/Electrical she said on the paperwork presented it read the Florida Statute and this definition and it needs to be about 3 sentences and use the language in the Florida Statute to make it clearer and say things specific.

Chair Dixon asked Commissioner Lasley what it should read.

Commissioner Lasley referred back to the Florida Statute. She said if you read it aloud it doesn't make sense. Mrs. Gutcher said the definition was a longer definition before Mr. Weiss reviewed and he recommended this definition.

Attorney Weiss said it could be reworded if that was the will of the Commission.

Commissioner Lasley commented on the zero lot lines – page 28, on zero lot line houses. She said currently they don't have this option and asked why it was in there. She asked where it would be used and what the plan was. Mrs. Gutcher said it was her understanding that the Urban Category allowed for higher density dwellings, so you might have a duplex, quadruplex or a row house that would have to have a zero lot line because they have a common law. She said they would own the property beneath their building but would have to have a common law; they would have to have a zero lot line to be able to be an attached structure on a duplex.

Chair Dixon commented on Agritourism that Commissioner Lasley felt it was an issue and some members felt it was not. He asked what the will of the Commission was. Commissioner Henderson said she would leave with the statute. The consensus was to leave as written. He discussed the deletion on page 19 on the Power Plant which was referred to the Attorney.

Mr. Weiss said this definition was taken from the statute. He said the definition and power plant siting act; it is specific to power plant siting. He said that is not what they were doing so he modified the definition to fit what they are talking about. He said if it is hard to understand and they would like to break it up, it was the will of the Board.

Commissioner Lasley said she found the statute and read the second sentence into the record. She said it was clearer than what was presented. She said you wouldn't need the second sentence and take out the confusing language. Commissioner Lasley said it also includes the site; facilities indirectly connected to the site, associated transmission lines and rights-of-ways and that there should be a period after nuclear material. Attorney Weiss said they may not want to include rights-of-ways. She said her concern was the eminent domain issue. She said two sentences like that would read clearer.

Commissioner Henderson said she agreed that the two sentences would read better and that's how she would have written it. She said her question would be if it included rights of ways. Mr.

Weiss responded that what they were including in their definition was any rights-of-ways. He said the reason why they all were included siting act because it was the option of the power plant. They could decide they want to site it that way, for various reasons.

Commissioner Nunamaker commented it should limit the definition to the bare necessity of the power plant. He said to end with a period after nuclear material.

UPON MOTION BY COMMISSIONER NUNAMAKER AND SECOND BY COMMISSIONER HENDERSON, THE COMMISSION VOTED 9-1, BY VOICE VOTE, TO APPROVE TO END WITH A PERIOD AFTER NUCLEAR MATERIAL. *Commissioner Lasley opposed the motion.*

Attorney Weiss returned with the Family Homestead definition, which he stated was really not a definition. He said what it stated was what government may include in its Comprehensive Plan, a provision allowing the use of a parcel of property solely as a homestead by individual who is a grandparent, parent, stepparent, adopted parent, sibling, child, stepchild...etc. He said it was actually elsewhere in the Code. He said they put all the language in there. He said what they are saying in the definition is that they were referring to what it is. He said what it is, is a way you can subdivide that is a separate, a different type of subdivision. He stated it made no sense to reference statute here because it's not a definition.

No additional public comments was heard.

UPON MOTION BY COMMISSIONER HENDERSON AND SECOND BY COMMISSIONER DAVIS, THE COMMISSION VOTED 10-0, BY VOICE VOTE, FOR APPROVAL WITH RECOMMENDATION OF CHANGES.

8. INFRASTRUCTURE ELEMENT (Legislative) (LSPA 2018-09) – Consideration of amendments to the amendments to Infrastructure Element of the Comprehensive Plan. (done before 7)

Mrs. Gutcher commented on the consideration of an amendment of the Infrastructure Element of the Comprehensive Plan to update the entire element. She said this was a total rewrite and consideration of the Comprehensive Plan to update the entire element.

The Infrastructure Element was last updated/amended in 2001. This element is in need of a considerable update to changing conditions and Florida statutory changes in the last seventeen years since the element was amended. According to §163.3177, F.S., and infrastructure element is required in the Comprehensive Plan. More specifically, Part (6) (c) of that section states:

“A general sanitary sewer, solid waste, drainage, potable water, and natural groundwater aquifer recharge element correlated to principles and guidelines for future land use, indicating ways to provide for future potable water, drainage, sanitary sewer, solid waste, and aquifer recharge protection requirements for the area.

She said this element was completely revised and reorganized. For better understanding, the entire element has been stricken, and a new element is proposed.

Chair Dixon stepped out at 6:47 pm returned at 6:50 pm.

Further discussion was heard by the Commission.

Commissioner Lasley commented on grants that were written by the County. She asked that there be language that the County would do anything. Ms. Gutcher said they can do without adding to the Comp Plan.

Chair Dixon said a lot is driven by the County and he was not sure of that language.

Commissioner Lasley commented on the solid waste issue and that she objected to the statement that they never had one. She said the county needed to address the trash issue and she mentioned that recycling was not mentioned. She said she felt this section on solid waste was very weak.

Debra Chatham, 6277 Flat Creek Rd, commented on Solid Waste. She said she served on a previous citizen committee about 10 years ago that was very resourceful. She said she felt strongly regarding recycling. She said with trash it needed a review. She commented it should be addressed in a focused manner and more education is needed on recycling and trash. Chair Dixon asked her if they added another line, what it should read. Mrs. Chatham said education is important and the advertising of Byrd Landfill would be helpful.

Commissioner Nunamaker asked how the household garbage worked. Mrs. Chatham said she doesn't have a contract with Waste-Pro, instead takes her household garbage to Byrd Landfill. She explained to her it was around \$10.00 for a truckload of garbage. She said the process was load, drive to the landfill, you weigh and pay, you go to the back and dump garbage and then you leave.

Thomas Pelham also appeared before the Commission in support of recycling.

There was no other public comment heard.

Commissioner Bridges-Bright asked if it was possible to add an educational component on recycling and something on solid waste.

Ms. Jeglie said the county shall promote educational awareness recycling and identify options to identify educational awareness regarding recycling and other waste and disposal opportunities.

Chair Dixon said it should read: The County shall promote educational awareness and opportunities for recycling, disposal, and other waste reduction opportunities.

Commissioner Davis asked were they creating a new policy or would this be a part of 4d.1.1.

Mrs. Gutcher said it would be a new policy 4d.1.4.

Commissioner Lasley commented in 4e1.1, the natural brown water protection recharge. She said they should add word *especially* in areas considered much vulnerable because otherwise any other area that discharges Floridian aquifer will not be counted in this. She said anything that disrupts the aquifer needs to be prohibited and not just the “most vulnerable areas.” She asked that the wording of *especially* be added. She said *especially in areas considered*.

Chair Dixon asked for additional public comment or Commission comments and there was none.

UPON MOTION BY COMMISSIONER BRIDGES–BRIGHT AND SECOND BY COMMISSIONER BOUIE, BY VOICE VOTE THE COMMISSION VOTED 9 -1, TO APPROVE WITH THE AMENDED LANGUAGE. COMMISSIONER LASLEY OPPOSED THE MOTION.

Public Hearing closed and Workshop opened

9. FUTURE LAND USE ELEMENT (Workshop) (LSPA – 2018-01) – Discussion of amendments to the Future Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

Mrs. Gutcher said the following issues were for discussion at this workshop. She said Talquin would like to have the ability to install smaller facilities in other land use categories. These would likely not exceed five acres in size. She said for discussion is the locations for solar-powered generation facilities. Policy 1.1.1H contains the following restrictions for SPGF. A.) Currently, SPGF is allowed in Agriculture -2 and -3 Future Land Use categories (which will be converted to zoning upon those amendments). B.) These facilities must be on parcels twenty (20) acres or greater in Ag-3 and 10 acres or greater in Ag-2 (Table 5203.2, Land Development Code).

Commissioner Bouie asked who they would consult as to tell them they are putting the proper wattage based on the land use size. She said she was in support of the solar.

Mrs. Gutcher said they would still have to apply for a Development Order and go through that process. She just as they do with any other Development Order, they rely on the information given to be accurate.

Commissioner Nunamaker asked why they were considering with language 75 megawatts.

Mrs. Gutcher responded the 75 megawatts is in the Florida Statutes that was not included in the definition. She said the definition of a power plant does not have the 75-watt threshold in it.

Chair Dixon said while he was not opposed, Talquin should have a full workshop instead of piece milling. “We aren’t just getting enough information.” He said he would like education on the possibilities of the future.

Commissioner Bouie said she too would like a better presentation.

Commissioner Nunamaker commented that he has solar panels and asked their opinion on residential solar panels. Chair Dixon expressed he was not opposed to it.

Commissioner Lasley said she would like for Talquin to come back and do a presentation maybe in the fall. Mrs. Gutcher said she would see if they could come to the August 16, 2018 meeting.

Commissioner Bouie asked what was in place to keep a company from coming in and leasing from Talquin and asking for rights. Mrs. Gutcher said there were territorial agreements. Commissioner Henderson stated the Public Service Commission keeps them from crossing over.

Commissioner Lasley stated was there something that would allow a private provider entity to come in. Mrs. Gutcher replied yes they would be allowed.

Commissioner Nunamaker said that Talquin was about profit.

Mrs. Gutcher said she would get with Talquin and bring them back on August 16th to present.

Mrs. Gutcher commented on the Livestock section 4202, allowable locations and acreage requirements. She said that she has been informed of Code Enforcement questions recently about where, how many acres and how many horses you could have per acre. She said this was currently a Land Development Code issue and not a Comprehensive Plan issue. She said subsection 4202 of the Land Development Code stated livestock shall be prohibited in residential areas where the keeping or use of any livestock destroys material and impairs the value of adjacent premises. She said it exempted horses and other equine specifics may be permitted on properties of less than 5 acres as a Special Exception. She said if they are going to have them on less than 5 acres they must have a Special Exception. She said it is not clear if they could have them on more than 5 acres in residential or if they wanted them in residential. She said there are many questions to ponder, such as do they want to limit to agriculture or how to determine if it’s a pet.

Commissioner Henderson mentioned one of her concerns was she did not know they were referred to as pets in the Land Development Code. She said in the State of Florida they are not defined as companion animals, they are defined only as livestock. She said it was her opinion

that asking County staff under any circumstances to determine if one is a pet or not was really difficult. She suggested for future discussion as they address this issue should be pulled out or reworded if it needs to be a Special Exception every time.

Chair Dixon asked that more information is brought back. He said horses in Gadsden County have been a problem for a very long time. Commissioner Henderson suggested that they inquire with surrounding rural counties and bring information back.

Commissioner Bouie inquired about the regulation of horses. Mrs. Gutcher said the information she provided was currently all they have for regulation in residential areas in the Code. Commissioner Henderson said the standard is 1 horse per every 2 acres. She said that is what is told if you are getting horses you should have. She said it's not just a Land Development issue if someone in the neighborhood has a concern that's also an Animal Control issue. She said it might be something the BOCC would need to take a look at in terms of Animal Control and welfare regulation as well. Mrs. Gutcher responded she believed they are looking at this issue. Commissioner Lasley asked how small the parcels are that have had complaints on them. Ms. Jeglie said since she has been here, it has been a variety. She said recently they had one that was 1 acre.

Chair Dixon asked for public comment.

Mrs. Chatham said she owns 3 horses and has 16.97 acres in Sycamore that is zoned rural residential. She said as a property owner, she felt it was wrong to take away her horses because of smell. She asked that they be careful about the language.

The consensus was to gather information from the surrounding counties.

Commissioner Lewis left at 8:17 pm. Commissioner Chukes left at 8:27 pm.

Mrs. Gutcher commented on 3. Creation of Zoning. She said the proposed zoning categories that are pretty much what they have as far as Future Land Use today. Commissioner Lasley asked if the definitions could be provided for the zoning categories. Mrs. Gutcher responded this simply shows what the categories would be named, definitions would be provided.

Mrs. Gutcher discussed the Future Land Use Element. She said she didn't have a lot to say, only that there would be a couple of new categories that are introduced. She said one was the Nature-Based Activities areas and the other is the Master Plan Community where it tries to address a development that might come in that might be an eco-tourism type development all along the lake. She said they would locate in a nature-based activity center or area. She said this language was requested by some of the County Commissioners. She said the Master Plan Community has a mixture of uses so that there would be a walkable community.

Commissioner Lasley asked about the infrastructure top half, how can it be supported. Mrs. Gutcher said they could build the infrastructure. She referenced when Ms. Elva Peppers came before the Council last with the request for the land change that policy today required them to have the package plant.

Mrs. Gutcher commented they are having a bit of a problem as they could see by the map where they have more than one Future Land Use Category assigned to a specific parcel id number. She said Policy 1.1.3: Is introduced to help solve the problem when there is a parcel that might be bisected by two different Future Land Use Categories and how to handle as far as development. She discussed page 10 of 18 Policy 1.24 and 1.25 have been included in Infrastructure Element and to avoid duplicates policies they are being deleted in that section. She said it was the same with Policy 1.2.8 she said that is in the Conservation Element, so it would also be deleted. She mentioned Policy 1.2.19 on page 12 of 18 would also be deleted. She said on page 13 of 18 Policy 1.3.6 is a new policy. She said they would be introduced at the next Planning Commission Meeting and she wanted them to review before the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Lasley commented on the agricultural land use, it appeared that she was getting rid of Ag 1 –Ag3. Mrs. Gutcher said when they go to zoning it would be Ag 1 -Ag3, just like Industrial will be Light and Heavy Industrial. She said in the Plan they would have a bigger scope of a category. She said the Plan has to accommodate every zoning issue. Commissioner Lasley had comments on the Light Industrial. Mrs. Gutcher said the Light Industrial and the Heavy Industrial terminology will be located in the Zoning Categories of the Land Development Code categories and it would be just industrial. Commissioner Lasley asked was it possible to get a Future Land Use Map of what really is on the ground. Mrs. Gutcher said that is a possibility, it was at the discretion of the County.

Dan Winchester, 842 Richbay Road, Future Land Use Element, Creative Planning Group, presented a handout pamphlet. He commented he decided to introduce to the Conservation Sub-Division Concept. He said it was both informational and educational and he would like to see a recommendation that is favorable to conservation in Gadsden County.

Chair Dixon asked Mr. Winchester to leave the handout and presentation with staff so that it could be reviewed at their leisure.

10. PLANNING COMMISSIONER QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

Chair Dixon said his goals are to try to get out of meetings at the proper time no later than 8 pm.

11. DIRECTOR'S/PLANNING COMMENTS

Ms. Jeglie presented the revised meeting dates for the Planning Commission for 2018. She announced the next regularly scheduled meeting is August 16, 2018, at 6:00 pm.

12. ADJOURNMENT

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS TO COME BEFORE THE BOARD, CHAIR DIXON DECLARED THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:52 P.M.

GADSDEN COUNTY, FLORIDA

EDWARD DIXON, CHAIR

ATTEST:

NICHOLAS THOMAS, CLERK