

**AT A WORKSHOP OF THE PLANNING  
COMMISSION HELD IN AND FOR GADSDEN  
COUNTY, FL ON MAY 11, 2023 AT 6:00 P.M., THE  
FOLLOWING PROCEEDING WAS HAD, VIZ:**

**Present:** Rev. Dr. Joe Parramore, Chair, District 5  
Lori Bouie, Vice-Chair, District 5  
Eugene Sherman III, District 1  
William Chukes, District 1, Not Present  
Tracey Stallworth, District 2  
John Youmans, District 2  
Mark Moore, District 3  
Wayne Williams, District 3  
Charles Roberts, District 4  
Karema Dudley, School Board Representative, Not present

**Staff Present:** Justin Stiell, Planning and Zoning Director  
Ellen Andrews, Senior Planner  
Clayton Knowles, County Attorney  
Adriana Quijada, Deputy Clerk

**1. CALL TO ORDER, INVOCATION, AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Chair Parramore called the workshop to order at 6:01 pm. Commissioner Roberts led the Pledge of Allegiance to the U.S. Flag and Commissioner Sherman provided invocation.

**2. INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS – ROLL CALL**

No roll call was done.

**3. AMENDMENT AND APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

Chair Parramore entertained a motion to approve the agenda as it was before them.

**A MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AS IS WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER MOORE AND SECOND BY COMMISSIONER STALLWORTH. THE MOTION PASSED 6 TO 0.**

**4. CITIZENS REQUESTING TO BE HEARD ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

The Gadsden County Board of County Commissioners welcomes and encourages public participation at all meetings of the Board. Citizens are free to speak for up to three (3) minutes on non-agenda items. Public comments and participation are also encouraged for items on the agenda. Additionally, if you are unable to attend a meeting in person, comments from the Public can also be submitted via email to [CitizensToBeHeard@gadsdencountyfl.gov](mailto:CitizensToBeHeard@gadsdencountyfl.gov) until noon on the date of the meeting. Comments submitted after the deadline, but prior to the meeting, will be added to the official record, but the County cannot guarantee that Commissioners and staff will have adequate time to review comments prior to the meeting. Citizens are further encouraged to participate via Zoom using the credentials on the County's website. The Board's meetings are also broadcast live on the Board's Facebook page.

Chair Parramore read aloud the above statement.

*Commissioner Bouie stepped in at 6:02 pm.*

### **GENERAL BUSINESS**

#### **5. Presentation- Gadsden County Planning: Comprehensive Plan and Land Development Code**

Mr. Stiell came before the Board to discuss the above item. He stated the purpose of this workshop was to familiarize the Planning Commission with the Comprehensive Plan and Future Land Use Map and planning functions. Also, to detail the relationship between the Comprehensive plan and Land Development Code, present the types of development applications, and identify county specific land use issues and challenges.

Mr. Stiell stated the goal of the Comprehensive Plan was to provide the principles, guidelines, standards and strategies for the orderly and balanced future economic, social, physical, environmental, and fiscal development of an area that reflects community commitments to implement the plan and its elements. It was required by Statute (163.3174 F.S.) for all 67 counties and 412 municipalities. It must be evaluated and updated on a periodic basis (at least once every seven years).

Mr. Stiell stated the Future Land Use Map and Future Land Use Element are one section of the Comprehensive Plan. It involves policies which guide the physical and economic development of the County and reflects County vision and goals.

Mr. Stiell stated the Land Development Code specified that within 1 year after submission of its new or revised Comprehensive Plan, each county shall adopt or amend and enforce land development regulations that are consistent with and implement its adopted Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Stiell stated the Planning Division was responsible for

- Ensuring all development applications are reviewed with respect to the Comprehensive Plan and LDC.
- Preparation of the Comprehensive Plan an LDC.
- Make recommendations to the governing body regarding the adoption or amendment of the plan, LDC, and proposed developments.
- Hold public hearings, with public notice, on the proposed plan and LDC, and proposed amendments.
- Monitor and oversee the effectiveness and status of the Comprehensive Plan.
- Appointment of Planning Commission members and facilitation of PC meetings to elicit recommendations for Board consideration.

Mr. Stiell stated the Planning Commissioner was made up of 12 members and appointed by County Commissioners. They make recommendations to the BOCC regarding:

- Adoption of Comprehensive Plan and periodic updates to the plan.
- Review proposed land development regulations, land development codes, or amendments thereto, and consider consistency of the proposal with the adopted Comprehensive Plan.

- Review of development applications, requests for changes in future land use designation, and requests for variances or waivers to the conditions of development as described in the Land Development Code and Comprehensive Plan.
- Host public hearings for legislative matters, as well as quasi-judicial matters.

Development types and approval processes

- Administrative – Staff level
- Legislative Actions --PC and BOCC
- Quasi-Judicial – PC and BOCC

Chair Parramore asked regarding Class 1 Commercial, if there were specific sizes for like a hotel or Motel. Mr. Stiell stated yes, he was going to get more into that later. He stated if there was a grocery store greater than 10,000 sq ft, then it would have to come before the planning commission.

Commissioner Roberts went back to the Land Development Code. He read aloud from page 6: “Within 1 year after submission of its new or revised comprehensive plan, each county shall adopt or amend and enforce land development regulations...” He asked what happens after that? Do they have to wait another 6 years? Or was there a process to interject before? Mr. Stiell stated no, the Land Development Code was like a mechanism which they enforce the regulations in the Comprehensive Plan, so if they have the Comprehensive Plan, they have that requirement into their Code. They would need to adopt amendment into their Land Development Code, but there would be no penalty if they do not.

Chair Parramore stated he knew there had been talk about revisiting the Land Development Use Map and updating it. He asked where were they at in this process. Mr. Stiell stated last year they started with kickoff meetings and getting some public input regarding what they want to see in the future and how to go about amending the Comprehensive Plan. The next step would be to start contacting land owners and making general announcements regarding any future Comprehensive Plan amendments.

Commissioner Stallworth asked how the conversations had been regarding citizen buy in. Mr. Stiell stated he has not had any negative comments.

Chair Parramore asked if they have an anticipated time frame for when it might be completed. Mr. Stiell stated the goal was by the year 2025.

Commissioner Sherman asked for clarity if that was the data gathering or the revision. Mr. Stiell stated it would be the revision.

Commissioner Sherman stated they have had recent discussion about parks and mobile home parks. He asked if they were they in compliance with the requirements as far as Quasi-Judicial. Mr. Stiell stated yes, he believed Commissioner Sherman was referring to the previous meeting about the RV park.

Commissioner Sherman asked if they were in compliance in the discussion with a project, he could not remember the name of. Chair Parramore stated that was the project off Reynolds Road

and McCall Bridge Road. Mr. Stiell stated that project required several different things. First thing was a Land Use Map Amendment. It was completed and got approved for the Land Use Amendment. The next step was to come in for the Special Exception Use and then after that they move on to the site plan process.

Commissioner Roberts asked if there was a possibility that someone would have to do separate ends or RV park as a whole. Mr. Stiell stated generally in RV parks they are allowed one residential caretakers cottage. There's a square foot maximum that they could not go above. That was all included in the review for the site plan.

Chair Parramore stated there was also language presented that this would be more than a caretaker's cottage and more than a laundromat that they would actually be some sort of retail sales or re-sales like a convenient store that those using the RV park could take advantage of. Mr. Stiell stated if he remembered correctly, that was only a laundromat connected to the caretaker's cottage. He wanted to double check with Ms. Ellen. Ms. Ellen stated at one point she believed they were considering a camp store. She was not currently seeing what they are proposing. Mr. Stiell stated as long as it was associated with the RV park, then it would be ok. As long as they stayed underneath that square footage.

Commissioner Sherman stated he wanted to verify that they were in compliance with what they were tasked with doing; given the number of things that were still yet to be defined. He asked if there were other actions that this Commission should take to make sure that they were in alignment with what their tasks were. Mr. Stiell asked for clarification on which project. Chair Parramore stated they were still on the Reynolds Road project.

Commissioner Roberts stated the issue the neighbors had was the bolt slips. Chair Parramore stated there was a number of issues brought up at the time regarding wetland preservation regarding the setbacks from the neighboring trailer park that the property backs up to. He stated they did their due diligence on voting on what they were required to vote on and then it went to the County Commission. They were in the second phase of that process to see what they bring back to them as a site plan/site use.

Mr. Stiell stated they had not received anything officially regarding the project. He stated it would come back before them again as a special exception use, depending on what they choose to do. It could also come back to them as a Class II or Class I.

Chair Parramore stated for clarity purposes, it will not be to re-discuss and re-litigate what was already taken place. Mr. Stiell stated correct.

Commissioner Bouie asked in the event that a person comes before the County Commission and all requirements were met, if they have a room full of residents in that community and they do not want the project, were they allowed to vote with the citizens? Mr. Stiell stated the requirement for Quasi-Judicial was to take into consideration of what evidence was provided and the consistency with the Land Development Code and Comprehensive Plan.

Attorney Knowles stated when dealing with Quasi-Judicial, they needed to make sure the Commission looks at all the evidence and makes a decision based on the evidence provided.

Commissioner Bouie asked if all the neighbors were present and they signed saying they did not want the project in their community, was that considered evidence? Attorney Knowles stated that would be one piece of evidence, but advised to not make the decision based solely upon that.

Chair Parramore asked Attorney Knowles if it was safe to say that in the Quasi-Judicial hearings, this commission could bet safely on if they made judgements based within the confines of statute and the Land Development Code and County Ordinances, it would be their safe space. Attorney Knowles stated correct. The neighbors could not like it, but it could be reasonable.

Chair Parramore asked if in a case where he was drawn in by public sympathy and empathy, outside of what the Land Development Code and County Ordinances are, and he did not feel like he could vote appropriately, was it appropriate to recuse himself from that vote? Attorney Knowles stated no because recusal was more of a conflict.

Chair Parramore stated if he was correct, when they vote on a Quasi-Judicial issue, they have to state specifically what that decision is and what supports that decision. Attorney Knowles stated yes, expanding on why they make a decision. He encouraged for them to have more participation than less.

Commissioner Sherman stated if there was an overwhelming objection from the neighborhood, but the law written does not present a method to further that objection, it sounds like their hands were tied. But, reaching out to the citizens, what mechanisms would they have? Attorney Knowles stated in a Quasi-Judicial, it was not required but advised to let it be known on the record that they had a conversation with the applicant for instance. He stated they were able to have conversations with the citizens.

Commissioner Roberts asked regarding page 16 under Institutional, it stated nursing home and under Commercial, it stated adult daycare or living facilities. He asked if they had a written definition of what each one of those are. Mr. Stiell stated yes, it should be in the Land Development Code under the definition chapter.

Commissioner Moore asked to go back to Quasi-Judicial. He stated it was mentioned that they need to make a public statement that they had talked to citizens. If people call him and it was something that they knew would come up to the Board, should they ignore those conversations or if they should have them and when it comes time for the hearing, they said they had those conversations with citizens? Attorney Knowles stated in Quasi-Judicial, if they had a conversation with the applicant then they would announce that. Neighbors are not the issue in Quasi-Judicial, just the folks applying for whatever they were trying to do.

Commissioner Bouie stated when she received phone calls, she would announce that she received them. She would listen to every citizen. She asked in the lack of a good application, were they required to vote in favor of a bad application or applicant. Mr. Stiell stated what the staff presents to them are the facts from the case. It was up to the Commissioners to make the decision.

Commissioner Bouie stated in the past, County Commissioners had tried to protect citizens by granting temporary permit. She asked how do they offer protection for their citizens. Mr. Stiell

stated that went back to the conversation with their neighborhood compatibility. They were granting them an opportunity to change to whatever they want to change it to once they change the Land Use. As long as they met all the other requirements, then they would have to look at the site plan and make a decision based on the evidence.

Chair Parramore stated he would like to thank Mr. Stiell and Staff for this presentation. He stated he was the one who requested this workshop from the last meeting. He stated it was good to have a refresher.

**6. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS**

No comments.

**7. PLANNING COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS**

Commissioner Sherman stated the more training and refreshers they had the better they are as far as their role to the citizens.

Commissioner Stallworth asked Mr. Stiell if there were any monies allocated for them to go to a workshop in another area. Mr. Stiell stated currently there was no funding for Planning Commissioners to travel. They were looking to bring some people in for training. Commissioner Stallworth asked in order for them to get funding to travel, who did they need to talk to? Mr. Stiell stated they were working on that and they had a conversation on this a couple meetings ago. They have talked to their Budget Director and are looking at what they could do as an alternative. Commissioner Stallworth stated he had spoken to a commissioner and they indicated that there was some funding. He would love for the commissioners to be able to travel to get some training. Commissioner Bouie stated if they could, she could make them aware of where the conferences are and the proposal of the costs and present it to the County Commission to ask them to make it available for them to travel. She stated the same funding they would use to bring a professional in, they could use it for travel.

Commissioner Bouie also asked about FLUM. She stated she heard comments about the County to remain Agricultural, but there are only 3 major farmers in Gadsden County. She stated it would be a disservice to the County since there are only 3. She hoped that they would be open to other uses of FLUM other than farming. Commissioner Roberts stated he agreed with Commissioner Bouie about there only being 3 major farmers, but the residential portion and rural areas want to keep it that way, instead of having pop up business in their communities.

Chair Parramore stated obviously they have to respect those land owners. There was no authority for the County to just go in and start yanking property and change the land use. He did not know if there was a solution to what Commissioner Roberts brought up. Mr. Stiell stated that was why it was not a quick turnaround.

Commissioner Bouie stated in the past, the Planning Director hired the only organization that opposed the State of Florida to create their land and zone policies. There were policies that restricted local land owners. She stated the restrictions that were in place should not come from a Miami based firm that has no idea what Gadsden County looks like. Mr. Stiell stated the majority of the policies that he has seen in the Comprehensive plan are supported by state statute. He was not sure what policies Commissioner Bouie was referring to. Commissioner

Bouie stated not being able to subdivide a property and needing a certain size of property. There were also issues with giving kids equal portions of land. Those were just some examples.

Chair Parramore and the Commissioners thanked Mr. Stiehl for his time. Chair Parramore stated the next meeting will be June 15<sup>th</sup> at 6 pm.

**8. MOTION TO ADJOURN**

Chair Parramore ended the workshop at 7:10 pm.

**The next regularly scheduled meeting is June 15<sup>th</sup>, 2023 at 6:00 pm.**

**GADSDEN COUNTY, FLORIDA**

---

**JOE PARRAMORE, Chair**  
**Gadsden County Planning Commission**

**ATTEST:**

---

**NICHOLAS THOMAS, Clerk**