

**AT A REGULAR MEETING AND WORKSHOP OF THE  
PLANNING COMMISSION HELD IN AND FOR GADSDEN  
COUNTY, FLORIDA ON AUGUST 22, 2019 AT 6:00 P.M.,  
THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDING WAS HAD, VIZ:**

Present: Libby Henderson, District 3  
Marion Lasley, District 5  
Doug Nunamaker District 3  
Lorie Bouie  
Steve Scott, School Board Representative  
Regina Davis, At Large  
Tracey Stallworth, District 2

Absent: Antwon McNeill

Staff Present: David Weiss, County Attorney  
Suzanne Lex, Growth Management Director  
Jill Jeglie, Senior Planner  
Ellen Andrews, Planner  
Muriel Straughn, Deputy Clerk

1. **With a quorum present the meeting was called to Order and the Pledge of Allegiance to the U. S. Flag was led by Vice-Chair Libby Henderson.**

2. **Introduction of Members and Roll Call**  
Roll Call was taken by Deputy Clerk, Muriel Straughn.

3. **Approval of the Agenda**  
Vice-Chair Henderson asked for a motion to approve the Agenda.

**MS. DAVIS MADE THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AND SECOND MADE BY MS. BOUIE, THE BOARD VOTED 7-0 BY VOICE VOTE TO APPROVE.**

4. **Approval of Minutes**  
Vice-Chair Henderson asked if there were any comments or concerns for the January 17, 2019 Minutes. Commissioner Lasley said on page 26, the word "sued" is used and it should be "used" and on page 50; the word "sue" should be changed to "use".

**MS. DAVIS MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES WITH THE GRAMMATICAL CHANGES BEING MADE AND MR. SCOTT MADE THE SECOND. THE BOARD VOTED 7-0 BY VOICE VOTE TO APPROVE.**

Vice-Chair Henderson asked if there were any comments concerning the February 14, 2019 Workshop Minutes. Ms. Lasley said on Page 9; midway down 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph 3<sup>rd</sup> line "Dental Water" should be "Central Water".

**UPON MOTION TO APPROVE WITH CHANGES BY MS. LASLEY AND SECOND BY MS. DAVIS, THE BOARD VOTED 7-0 BY VOICE VOTE TO APPROVE.**

Vice-Chair Henderson asked if there were any comments or corrections to the March 14, 2019 Workshop Meeting and there were no corrections.

**UPON MOTION BY MS. LASLEY AND SECOND BY MS. BOUIE, THE BOARD VOTED 7-0 BY VOICE VOTE TO APPROVE THE MINUTES.**

5. **Disclosures and Declarations of Conflict**

Vice-Chair Henderson asked if there were any conflicts that needed to be disclosed or declared and there were none.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

6. **Midway Business Park Final Plat Approval (Quasi-Judicial) (FP 2019-01)**

Vice-Chair Henderson introduced the above item.

Jill Jeglie, Senior Planner, was sworn in by Deputy Clerk, Muriel Straughn. Ms. Jeglie then gave a brief description of the Agenda item.

The Board of County Commissioners approved the conceptual and preliminary plats and the infrastructure was constructed in 2009. Florida Statutes require that the final plat be recorded with the Clerk of the Circuit Court.

This application is for final plat approval for the Midway Business Park Subdivision described by Tax Parcel Identification #:

- 4-16-1N-2W-0000-00140-0000 (Anderson Columbia 168.23 acres)
- 4-16-1N-2W-0000-00140-0100 (City of Tallahassee Utility, .31 acres)
- 4-15-1N-2W-0000-00233-0000 (Anderson Columbia 14.49 acres)
- 4-15-1N-2W-0000-00233-0200 (Smyrna Concrete Ready Mix, 6.78 acres)

Options:

1. Recommend to the BOCC to approve the Final Plat SD-2019-01 prepared by Moore Bass Consulting, Inc. with special conditions a – g in the attached agenda memorandum titled Agenda Item #6.  
amend special condition g – to refer to the recorded record plat Title book and page  
add” h” - should reference the platting agreement with City of Midway as to book and page # of the Clerk’s recording office.
2. Deny the final Plat with findings of facts.
3. Discretion of the Planning Commission.

Staff Recommendation: Option 1 as stated above.

Attachments:

1. Location Map
2. Final Plat & Application with Support Documents
3. Release, Waiver and Indemnity Agreement

4. Midway Business Park Platting Agreement with City of Midway
5. Florida Statutes 177 Part 1

Title Opinion (File 2061-3819652 by First American Title Insurance Co.) is on file along with the Declaration of Covenants, Conditions, Easements and Restrictions for Midway Business Park and is available for review with the subdivision application file at the Planning Division.

**Board Discussion:**

Ms. Lasley said there were dates starting in 2009 and in Chapter 7 of the Land Development Code (LDC) it stated if things have not happened in 180 days, the Development has expired and they have to start over. Ms. Jeglie said there were hurricanes and Statutory exemptions that would allow them to continue the plat. They did so, and made the request in writing and it was reviewed and approved. They have met all statutory requirements and BOCC requirements. She said there were special conditions they were working on to meet prior to the BOCC meeting.

Ms. Lasley said to make sure the allowed uses will be included in the plat. Ms. Jeglie answered that the information is recorded in the property owner's association documents and was available with the County.

Ms. Lasley also asked what happens with the 4 lots that are south to this property that will be accessed through this business part. Ms. Jeglie stated they would have whatever access they currently enjoy. When asked if it was part of that subdivision, Ms. Jeglie answered the roadway was part of the subdivision and that is the platting agreement. Portions of the lots are in the City of Midway and she deferred to Midway as far as what applications come in. She also stated she was sure they could not deny them access.

No other questions were presented for staff.

**Public Comments:**

Vice-Chair Henderson asked if anyone wished to speak on behalf of the Midway Business Park and a gentleman presented himself to answer questions if necessary and there were none.

**Action Taken:**

**UPON MOTION OF MS. DAVIS TO APPROVE STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR OPTION 1 WITH THE AMENDMENTS TO THE SPECIAL CONDITION TO "G" AND ADDITION OF "H" AND SECOND BY MS. BOUIE, THE BOARD VOTED 7-0 BY VOICE VOTE TO APPROVE.**

7. **Capital Improvement Element and Schedule (Legislative) (LSPA 2019-02)** – Public Hearing  
Vice Chair Henderson introduced the above item.

Ms. Jeglie said the Board of County Commissioners was required to adopt a Capital Improvements Schedule (CIS) annually pursuant to 163.3177(3)(b) FS. The CIS includes the list of capital projects that only impact the level of service capacity. It must include a list of

the publicly funded projects, projects costs and funding sources that impact the capacity LOS (level of service) on the five year horizon. (Roadway pavements and resurfacing, park maintenance, etc. are not included in the CIS.)

**Options:**

1. Recommend that the Board adopt the Capital Improvements Schedule of the Capital Improvements Element of the Comprehensive Plan.
2. Recommend that the Board transmit the Capital Improvement Element to the Florida Department of Economic Opportunity.
3. Recommend that the Board not adopt the Capital Improvements Schedule of the Capital Improvement Element of the Comprehensive Plan
4. Recommend that the Board not transmit the Capital Improvements Element of the Comprehensive Plan.
5. Planning Commission Direction.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Options 1 & 2 as stated above.

**Attachments:**

1. Strike Ad Version of the CIE  
Amendment to the level of service standards table on page 1 of Strike Ad. That refers to the appropriate policy in each element where the level of service standard is adopted. A majority of the deletions reflect language that has been removed from the comprehensive plan and/or to sections of the Florida Administrative Code that word like it in 2012.
2. Clean Version of the CIE
3. Florida Statutes pertaining to the Capital Improvement Element.  
It deletes the fiscal year 2018-2019 and adds 2023-2024. The information for the tables comes from the CRTA and FDOT, Dist 3, 5 year work plan, the Schools Facility comes from the schools Districts Facility Plans, the County Park Facilities comes from the County Parks and Rec. Department.

**Board Discussion:**

Ms. Davis asked what happened if Big Bend Transit went out of business. Ms. Jeglie answered there would be a contract negotiation and another company would take over; the CRTPA would amend their plan, the County would amend their plan. The plans were amended annually now.

Ms. Davis pointed out on Page 9 of 9 at the bottom there was a typo in the word "sie", it should read "site".

There were no other comments or questions by the Commissioners.

**Public Comment:**

There were no comments or questions by the public.

**Action Taken:**

**MS. LASLEY MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT AND TRANSMIT THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT ELEMENTS TO THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES AND SECOND MADE BY MR. SCOTT. THE BOARD VOTED 7-0 BY VOICE VOTE TO APPROVE.**

8. **Signs (Legislative) (LDR 2019-05) – Consideration of amendments to Section 5700, Signs of the Land Development Code. – Public Hearing**

Ms. Jeglie introduced the above item and stated the item requested consideration of amendments to Section 5700, Signs, of the Gadsden County Land Development Code (LDC) specifically that refers to Electronic Message Center (EMC) wall signs. She explained Subsection 5707.P of the LDC allowed EMC “as part of an on-site ground sign otherwise permitted under this Section” on properties located within the Commercial, Heavy Industrial, Light Industrial and Urban Service Area Future Land Use districts. EMC are restricted to properties located along and oriented to roadways designated as collector or arterials. She further explained details of the EMS’s and the proposed changes.

**Options:**

1. Find that the amendments to the Land Development Code are consistent with the Goals, Objectives, and Policies of the Comprehensive Plan and recommend that the BOCC adopt the changes to Section 5700 of the Land Development Code.
2. Find that the amendments to the Land Development Code are not consistent with the Goals, Objectives, and Policies of the Comprehensive Plan and recommend that the BOCC not adopt the changes to Section 5700 of the Land Development Code
3. Recommend that the BOCC adopt the proposed amendments with changes, and find that such changes are consistent with the Goals, Objectives, and Policies of the Comprehensive Plan.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Options 1 or 3.

**Attachments:**

1. Strike Ad Version, Section 5700
2. Clean Version, Section 5700

**Discussion:**

Ms. Lasley asked on Page 1 of the Sign Code with B,C and E, they all state that these are to be safe, no distractions to pedestrians, traffic, not to create visual light and in E, it was not to distract motorists or pedestrians. She felt they were going down the wrong path by creating more electronic message signs. She said she was very distracted by them when she was driving and was concerned the County may be liable in the future. She pointed out a typo on Page 2 of the proposed Ordinance “sings” should be “signs”.

Her next comment was on Page 3 in Subsection 5706: B2 at the bottom where it states; ‘The sign will not conflict with the principle permitted use of the site or adjoining sites.’ She asked what that meant.

Ms. Bouie stated the language had to be associated with the property or the business. Ms. Jeglie said yes and Ms. Bouie stated she could not advertise for tomatoes and be a pig farmer. Ms. Lasley said her concern was the two words 'adjoining sites' and if one person had a sign for their property, it might conflict with the adjoining sites and did not make sense to her. Ms. Jeglie said they could move to delete it.

Ms. Bouie said she understood it to mean she could not as a business negatively advertise on my sign for another business adjacent to her

Ms. Jeglie answered they could not regulate the content of signs. That maybe a holdover from that and it may refer to various signs overlapping and obstructing. She said she was not 100% sure.

Mr. Nunamaker asked Ms. Lasley if she was thinking about deleting all of number 2. She answered not the whole thing, just delete "or adjoining sites".

Mr. Nunamaker replied if a business wanted to advertise for something happening in the community why couldn't they put that on their electronic sign if it had nothing to do with their business?

Ms. Jeglie responded they did not allow off sight signs but could not regulate language on a sign constitutionally.

Mr. Nunamaker said number 2 was in conflict with what was just said because it said it couldn't conflict with the principle permitted use. Ms. Jeglie told Mr. Nunamaker there was a difference in principle permitted use and what the language on the sign may be.

Mr. Nunamaker says it needed to go away.

Ms. Bouie said they were regulating something they did not know what they were regulating and it could be later interpreted.

There was more discussion around the Board regarding this item. For more details, please see [www.gadsdenclerk.com](http://www.gadsdenclerk.com) and view the audio/video.

**Public Comments:**

**Bruce Strews, 5765 Mandy Lane, Tallahassee, FL 32304 representing Bill's Signs,** appeared before the Board. He wanted to address the safety issue that was raised earlier. Federal Department of Transportation has done numerous studies on electronic signs and the content and how they change. There are studies and there is no difference in accident rates before and after electronic signs were erected.

**Action Taken:**

Vice-Chair Henderson said the Staff Recommendation was Option 1 or 3 and knew Ms. Lasley proposed several changes. She asked if Ms. Lasley wanted to put forth a motion to include the changes.

**MS. LASLEY MADE A MOTION THEY APPROVE THE AMENDMENT WITH SPELLING CORRECTIONS ON PAGE 2 AND ON PAGE 3 THE DELETION OF 'ADJOINING SITES', ON PAGE 5 ADD NUMBER 5 'ALLOW ONLY 1 EMC PER PARCEL' IN D; ON PAGE 12 IN NUMBER 8, CHANGE 'DESIGNATED PROPERTIES' TO 'NON-RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES' AND MS. BOUIE MADE THE SECOND. THE BOARD VOTED 7-0 BY VOICE VOTE TO APPROVE THE MOTION.**

9. **Citizen's Growth Management and Planning Bill of Rights (LDR 2019-04) – Consideration of an Amendment to Section 7001.1, The Citizens Growth Management and Planning Bill of Rights and moving it to Chapter 1, Administration and Enforcement of the Land Development Code** (Ordinance 2010-005 adopted May 4, 2010)

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

Suzanne Lex, Growth Management Director appeared before the Board. This item has been heard a total of 17 times since being first adopted and the last time it was before the BOCC at a workshop, they asked Staff to review the regulations and directed Staff to have more involvement in the citizens meetings and indicated they wanted to retain the super-majority vote. She has brought back the item with changes, what the current Legislation said and what her recommendation was.

- A. **Mandated Citizen Participation Plan** - this step requires public notice to property owners and neighborhood association within one-half mile of the development site property boundaries. Staff was directed to retain this provision and to attend the Citizen Participation Meeting. In addition, the Planning Department staff will notice the subject property with a two-foot by two-foot sign no less than fifteen days prior to the Community Participation meeting. **Staff recommendation: Retain and revise this requirement.**
- B. **Neighborhood Participation** – notification of neighborhood associations by county staff within ten days of the filing of any application or proposal filed for comprehensive plan map amendment; requires a community meeting thirty (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 community neighborhood associations of the filing within 10 days after filing with the county, the community meeting requirement of 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.

**Staff Recommendation: Retain and revise this requirement.**

Ms. Lex recommended the retention of the future land use managements, small and large scale, for major sub-divisions and special exception uses. She said to the special exception use, they were currently working on zoning categories and in that, they would permit the uses. She said they talked about certain land uses that would be allowed but the Board made recommendations that if it was something such as a landfill, an incarceration facility,

things that could have significant impact, they identify them as being a special exception needing to go through this process and use the new zoning regulations as a tool to identify when they want to have that kind of participation with the community and hopefully find balance. She further explained a variance should be a criterion of hardship based on physical conditions of a property and cannot affect safety. They have strengthened their variance requirements. She said In the future, she would like to change the variances it so that they were noticing the impact of adjacent properties as they would be the ones looking at that kind of community character that would be affected. She also stated she believed if they proposed a very large sub-division, they would want to allow for input in terms of that development within the community.

She therefore recommended:

- 1). Retention of the citizen participation plan, however as a community meeting;
- 2) Remove the 7 day cooling off period. Nothing should be changed after that application is made its in process and it has been presented them and the BOCC, there are no changes.
- 3) Retain the requirement for the super majority vote for the three uses listed which are, Future land use maps amendments, major sub-divisions, and special exceptions.
- 4) Delete the requirement that Comprehensive Plan Amendments and site developments locations must protect environmental resources as there are regulations to protect the environmental resources at the local, State and Federal level.
- 5) No Free Density. She said there was no way to measure free density. If there was a request to convert agricultural land to residential, other than for 4 units, that would require a land use map amendment and would come before the Commission and the Board.
- 6) Remove the Establishment of Urban Service Boundaries. She explained it was a Stipulated Settlement Agreement and was part o the review team that worked with Gadsden County at that time and understood the language at that time. They no longer mandate such functions.

Mr. Nunamaker asked with the exchange, if somebody wanted to put in a 50 lot Sub-division in an Agriculture spot, they needed to have an equal number of open space or recreational area or protected area in exchange for the higher density in that same sub-division?

Ms. Lex explained no, they were looking at zoning categories now. If a person was in Agriculture and wanted to move to a residential zoning category, they look at the zoning categories to regulate the density. The density bonuses could be considered if there were certain measures taken, for example, create more open spaces, add more recreation amenities within that sub-division through zoning. Zoning should be the tool to get to where you need to be.

Ms. Bouie said historically, for her, Gadsden County failed the citizens in providing adequate and sufficient knowledge for citizens to be able to smoothly get anything approved, and by hiding behind this farce of a Citizen Bill of Rights, thought they were further complicating the issue and was disappointed. She stated she did not know who offered this supposed CBOR but in her mind a CBOR would **protect the governed**. To her,



this document was crossing regulations with stipulations of fear and future fear that if they could prevent something from happening by giving as many stipulations as possible, it would tire a citizen from using his property and eventually cause them to lose their property because they could not use it the way they intended to use it. She added this was a failure of monumental proportions in her mind. She further stated that Gadsden County had never been an easy place to get anything approved. She said she was saddened by the document and would encourage the citizens to propose a lawsuit. With this document, they were asking citizens to do something that the County has not done. They were asking citizens to come up with answers and responsibility and the County has no proposed responsibility in providing and protecting the citizens of this County. All this language is in the wrong place. The CBOR should protect the governed, simply. It should be a one page document that assures citizens that they are going to have the right to have their issues addressed. She stated she would like to see the County move in a direction where there was a document prepared that if a citizen or a business wanted to come to Gadsden County there was an outline of how it could be proposed and asked.

Ms. Lex said one of the things that she recommended being removed was that the Planning Commission and Board **SHALL** consider the issues brought up, that that should be the focus of the future public hearings in the previous language that mandated that the issues that shall be reviewed that should be the focus. She stated that should not be the focus and that has been removed. She said she respectfully understood Ms. Bouie's position and the Board requested this to be brought back with the super-majority and that has been done along with other recommendations. She said however, the focus moving forward after a community meeting should be how they could work together to get things approved. That should be the focus.

Ms. Bouie said that proposal should outline the protection of the governed and she did not see that, making a statement that the citizen should be heard, did not satisfy her and would rather see an outline of how to process in Gadsden County rather than the 'don'ts'.

Ms. Lasley asked on the proposed Chapter 7, page 1, in the first section major site plans were struck and Major site plans and have only left Major Sub-Divisions and was her understanding a subdivision was a residential thing and a site plan was a business project.

Ms. Lex responded saying a Major Site Plan is what is the use (of the project) not the site plan so they should use the zoning categories. Zoning should direct what should be done and what level of review there would be. They were not automatically saying Major Site Plans. She said to define that in their Zoning Code with the Special Exception.

Ms. Henderson asked for clarification. She said there was a different strikethrough that was handed to them at the meeting tonight. Ms. Lex told them the handout was for clarity, it did not change the substance of anything.

Vice-Chair Henderson asked which of the three proposals that was before them was the one Ms. Lasley was asking questions from and the different proposals were discussed.

Mr. Weiss appeared before the Board and said what was handed out this evening was a

clean copy of the entirety of the document that was supposed to be in the packet that somehow missed a page and his strikethrough redline of that clean copy. The purpose behind the revisions was for clarification of this Ordinance and was one of the issues trying to be addressed. He told them this was scheduled to be on the September 17<sup>th</sup> Agenda before the BOCC.

Ms. Bouie said if they take no action, she strongly recommended they be made aware of that.

Vice Chair Henderson stated for the record what Mr. Weiss has explained, the single clean copy they were handed (holding up a document) was a clean copy, the other document (being held up) was the red-line version of same and the third version (document also being held up) was the County Attorney's strike-through version of the clean copy. She asked for a motion.

There was discussion around the Board discussing tabling the item.

Ms. Bouie made a motion to table this for this meeting but agreed to take no action instead because it would be going to the Board in September.

Ms. Lex said when she brought this to them, she wanted to bring it as a Public Hearing. She said they sent something to the Board that was very different. The Board sent it back and said that was not what they wanted. It was brought back to you because, at the workshop, these were the changes we were instructed to be made. She stated she wanted to bring it back to the Planning Commission so they were aware of said changes and she understood their recommendations may be very similar to the ones made before.

Ms. Davis said they were volunteers and have presented to them before what they thought it should be. They sent it back to the Planning Commission because they did not like it. If this Board does not send anything, the BOCC will vote on what they want to do. With that said, she felt anything said here was a waste of time; therefore, she personally, would take no action.

Ms. Henderson asked of Ms. Davis was offering a friendly amendment to her tabling motion. Ms. Davis said she did not think she had a second and Ms. Bouie stated she was interrupted. Ms. Lasley stated she was interrupted in her discourse. Ms. Bouie said she would yield to Ms. Lasley but it would be a strong recommendation that the County prepare the document that reflected protection of the governed and not protection of the governing. Vice Chair Henderson said her question to Ms. Lasley, she has worked hard on making her comments on material she was given but if that was no longer the recommendation of staff, did it serve any of them to go through the changes to that document when it was no longer the recommended document or language.

Ms. Lasley said she did not think allowing the citizens an opportunity to have a one-on-one with the developer for 2 hours or an unlimited amount of time before a project was put in their neighborhood was a bad thing for the neighborhood and the County. This allows citizens to be notified that something was going on that would have a huge impact in their

neighborhood. If it is a good project there should not be a problem getting the super majority vote. Historically the BOCC approved all kinds of major sub-divisions in Gadsden County with a 3-2 vote and said there had been a lot of major land use changes (looking at the Zoning Map on the wall) in yellow made from those deals that was done without water and sewer in one acre lots.

Ms. Bouie asked was it a 3-2 vote or lack of provisions for the proper zoning. Ms. Lasley said no...

Ms. Bouie interjected and said she understood, they had to vote on it based on the information and the regulations that were provided on the books. If there were no regulations to protect the governed, then things would happen. It had nothing to do with a quorum or the number or super majority; it had to do with what was on the book that protected the governed. If there were zoning issues already on the book, then the number of the vote did not matter. She said the two needed to be separated, they did not need to put regulations in the CBOR and the super majority in the CBOR, there needed to be standards in place that protected the environment; it should be a separate document.

Vice Chair Henderson said the way she understood Staff explain things tonight, regardless of anyone's opinions on the super majority, the BOCC has indicated they intend to keep it. She felt perhaps that forum may best be raised at that point because what they did tonight, even if they came to an agreement, may make no difference.

Ms. Lasley stated historically, whoever the Planning Director was, used that gray area to throw what they wanted to into variances and a lot were approved for all types of issues and she was concerned that would not be part of the process.

Ms. Lex said they should develop standards that can be implemented and not that can be buried. She said they have strengthened the variance; there used to be wide latitude for variances. That is not the reason for a variance. There needs to be a significant hardship the property cannot be used for its intended use. She said, as she has emphasized, it needed to be bulk of regulations is not to allow more density, it's not to allow a subjective application such as, it would prohibit economic growth and that's what it used to say.

Ms. Lasley asked if she felt the developers would use a variance for issues that would impede their project and Ms. Lex said no, because if they were developing a project, it would need to meet the criteria. She added that the County Attorney's changes were nothing but editorial in nature, he strengthened what she recommended. She said the only other thing she felt important was if they were going to reach a super majority, was an applicant be allowed a continuance automatically if he has set a meeting and there are not five Board members present. If there are only four board members, it is an even greater hardship.

Ms. Davis said they had two choices, at first felt it was to take no action and the other was to test the pulse of the commission. She added if tabled, it would not be heard again until September.

Vice Chair Henderson said if they were to table it, it may be changed by the BOCC before meeting again.

**COMMISSIONER DAVIS MADE A MOTION TO TABLE THIS ITEM. MS. LASLEY HAD A QUESTION.**

Mr. Weiss reminded them it was a public hearing.

**Don Stewart, 102 Timber Run, Havana, FL** appeared before the Board. He said the CBOR was passed in 2010 and there was input and a public hearing and there were only four Commissioners on the Board at that time and it was a unanimous vote to pass the Ordinance. He said he has spoken with former Commissioners as to why they felt it important to have the CBOR and was told it was a way of checks and balances and said things similar to what was said by Ms. Lasley. There were things done before the CBOR requiring only three votes that were probably not in the best interest of the environment and County. He added that the super majority did add more protection and allowed neighborhood participation and protected the governed. He added even though he was only able to vote for "Dr. V", he considered all of the Commissioners his commissioner and was going to tell all what he felt was best. He said with the neighborhood participation, which did protect the governed. He added he loved the passion Ms. Bouie had and envisioned having green jobs, living wages in Gadsden County, and would like to find a way it could be had.

Vice Chair Henderson asked if there was a motion.

**MS. BOUIE MADE A MOTION TO...MS. LASLEY POINTED OUT THERE WAS A MOTION ON THE TABLE. MS. BOUIE ASKED THAT IT BE RESTATED AND VICE CHAIR HENDERSON SAID THEY NEVER CALLED FOR A SECOND. MS. DAVIS MADE A MOTION THE ITEM BE TABLED AND MS. BOUIE MADE THE SECOND WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THEY WERE SEEKING CLARITY. MS. LASLEY HAD A COMMENT.**

Ms. Lasley said what their other choices were.

**VICE CHAIR HENDERSON CALLED FOR THE VOTE. THE BOARD VOTED 7-0 BY VOICE VOTE TO APPROVE TABLING THIS ITEM.**

**MS. BOUIE MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN THIS PORTION OF THE MEETING AND MS. DAVIS MADE THE SECOND. THE BOARD VOTED 7-0 BY VOICE VOTE TO APPROVE THIS ITEM.**

The Meeting portion ended at 8:13 p.m. and the Workshop began.

**WORKSHOPS -**

Vice Chair Henderson and Ms. Davis announced they would be leaving the workshop. Ms. Lex asked if they would prefer to not go through the Agenda item as she would prefer to have input from the full Board. Ms. Bouie asked they address both Agenda Item 10 and 11 at that time. Ms. Davis asked if it were possible to have workshops separate from meetings and was told yes. Mr. Nunamaker asked if they could expect the next time they

met on items 10 and 11, they bring their handouts with them with the notes? Ms. Lex sad she would only recommend there would be changes to zoning eventually.

10. **Chapter 4, Land Use Categories (Legislative) (LDR 2018-05) – Consideration of amendments to Chapter 4, Land Use Categories of the Land Development Code focusing on residential future land use/zoning categories and referring development review levels to Chapter 7, Development Orders, Development Permits and Development Agreements.**
11. **Chapter 2, Definitions and Interpretations (Legislative) (LDR 2018-06) – Discussion of amendments to Chapter 2, Definitions and Interpretations of the Land Development Code.**

**GENERAL BUSINESS**

12. **Planning Commissioner Questions and Comments**
13. **Director’s and Planner Comments**

**Next Meeting – September 19, 2019 @ 6:00 p.m.**

14. **Adjournment**  
**THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS TO COME BEFORE THE BOARD, THE MEETING WAS DECLARED ADJOURNED AT 8:13 P.M. BY VICE CHAIR HENDERSON.**

---

**LIBBY HENDERSON, VICE-CHAIR  
GADSDEN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION**

**ATTEST:**

---

**NICHOLAS THOMAS, Clerk**