

**AT A REGULAR MEETING AND WORKSHOP
OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION HELD IN AND
FOR GADSDEN COUNTY, FLORIDA ON
NOVEMBER 14, 2019 at 6:00 P.M.. THE
FOLLOWING PROCEEDING WAS HAD, VIZ:**

Present:

Commissioner Libby Henderson, Vice-Chair
Commissioner Regina Davis, At-Large Member
Commissioner Marion Lasley
Commissioner Doug Nunamaker
Commissioner Lori Bouie
Commissioner Tracey Stallworth
Commissioner Steve Scott, School Board Representative

Absent:

Commissioner Gail Bridges-Bright
Commissioner John Youman
Commissioner William Chukes
Commissioner Antwon McNeil
Commissioner Gerald McSwain

Staff Present:

Jill Jeglie, Senior Planner
Suzanne Lex, Planning and Community Development Director
David Weiss, County Attorney
Marcella Blocker, Deputy Clerk

1. **Pledge of Allegiance**
With a quorum present the meeting was called to order at 6:05 P.M. and the Pledge of Allegiance to the U.S Flag was led by Vice Chair Henderson.
2. **Introduction of Members-Roll Call**
Roll call was conducted by Deputy Clerk Marcella Blocker
3. **Approval of the Agenda**
MS. DAVIS MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA WITH A SECOND BY MS. BOUIE. THE BOARD VOTED BY VOICE VOTE 7-0 TO APPROVE.
4. **Disclosures and Declarations of Conflict**
Vice Chair Henderson asked if there were any conflicts that needed to be discussed or declared and there were none.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

5. **ROBERT F. MUNROE SCHOOL SPECIAL EXCEPTION USE (SEU 2019-01) (Quasi-Judicial)-**

Consideration of a Special Exception Use to allow a phased plan for a PreK-12 grade school with accessory uses including administrative offices, gymnasiums, cafeteria, baseball and football fields, stadium, concession, swimming pools, outdoor tennis and sport courts, playground, dormitories and staff residences.

Jill Jeglie was sworn in by Marcella Blocker and she then gave a brief description of the Agenda item. She stated the site consisted of two parcels to be unified totaling 39.53 acres and located on the south side of Blue Star Highway and west of Lanier Road South.

She stated a 5 phase development plan was proposed. The proposed development was located in rural residential.

1. Compatibility for the proposed special exception use with the adjacent and nearby uses in terms of use, scale, character, height, setbacks and open space.
2. General compatibility with adjacent and nearby properties.
3. The noise glare or odor effects of the use on surrounding areas.
4. The impacts of refuse and service areas, with particular reference to location and screening in relation to adjacent uses.
5. The impacts of off-street parking and loading areas on adjacent uses.
6. The impacts of signs and proposed exterior lighting if any with reference to glare, traffic safety and compatibility with adjacent and nearby properties.
7. The impacts of transportation access and location with respect to abutting transportation facilities particularly in reference to automotive, bicycle, pedestrian, public service and fire safety, convenience, traffic flow and control.
8. Utilities, with reference to location and availability.
9. The adequacy of buffers with reference to type, dimensions and character.
10. The impacts of hours of operation and the frequency and duration of special events.
11. The adequacy of setbacks and buffers in screening and insuring compatibility with adjacent properties.

The applicant has indicated that site was designed to reduce the impact on surrounding residential properties. With the exception to the gymnasium, the majority of the off hour activities are located on the northern portion of the site.

Procedures

A special exception use requires approval as a quasi-judicial action in conjunction with the advertised public hearing per Subsections 1303 through 1305 of the LDC.

Findings

With conditions, the proposed special exception use was in compliance with the Gadsden County Comprehensive Plan, The Land Development Code.

Options

1. Recommend approval for the Robert F. Munroe School Special Exception (SP 2019-01) with the following conditions and find that the application with conditions was consistent with the Gadsden County Comprehensive Plan and the Land Development Code (LDC).
2. Recommended denial of the Robert F. Munroe School Conceptual and Preliminary Site Plan (SP2019-01) application and provide findings in support of this decision.
3. Discretion of the Planning Commission.

Planning Recommendation

Recommendation was Option 1.

Mr. Nunamaker said he saw dormitories were proposed and asked if that meant overnight students on property. Ms. Jeglie said she assumed so but would let the applicants address the question.

Ms. Lasley asked if anybody used Reese Lane. Ms. Jeglie said yes. She then asked would it then be cut off from the people who use that street. Ms. Jeglie replied that it was not proposed to be vacated but to be improvements made. Ms. Lasley stated people get to their homes by Reese Lane and they would just continue to drive through the middle of the school. Ms. Jeglie answered yes.

Ms. Lasley said the Comp plan stated that Policy 1.1.1(i) schools must be located on a collector or arterial roadway and her impression would be that traffic would be using collector or arterial roadway and not the local county roads and unimproved roads and it did not make sense to allow the ingress and egress on Lanier Road which was not a collector or arterial road. She stated she did not understand why they could not access from Highway 90. Ms. Jeglie stated she would let the applicant address that. She further stated an alternative was looked into and this was the design they thought was the better. Ms. Lasley stated her other concerns was the housing proposed and one was for the Administrator and would they be boy and girl dorms and if this would be a day school, she assumed the dorms would be a tax-exemption project.

Ms. Davis requested the applicant answer some of the board's questions.

Sean Marston of Urban Catalyst Consultants, Inc. appeared before the Board and was sworn in by the Deputy Clerk to address questions. He started with the connection to South Lanier Road and stated there was already a full access median opening at the intersection of South Lanier and Highway 90, which would make for better traffic flow

for people coming into the school when coming from the north. Another median opening was not permitted.

Dr. Adam Gaffey appeared before the board and was sworn in by the Deputy Clerk, he stated dorms would be available for some students to live on campus and dorms would only be available for students.

Ms. Lasley asked for the time frame of sports. Mr. Gaffey stated at any given time they could have only two sports, one of which was a team sport that would entail a lot of people being at the facility at one time so those sports are spread out throughout the year. The athletic events happen outside of school hours as indicated in the application. Between 4 P.M. and 7 P.M. were the typical times of sports activities but there were always exceptions, answering that they did not go until midnight as asked by Ms. Lasley but may go until 10 P.M. Ms. Lasley asked if other entities would be able to rent the facility and Mr. Gaffey stated there were no plans set for that to happen.

Mr. Nunamaker asked what would happen with the current school in Mt. Pleasant and asked if it would be abandoned and he responded that they had not decided what would be done with that facility at this time but he doubted it would be abandoned.

Ms. Lasley asked if the Director/Administrator would have a house on campus. Mr. Gaffey said yes if there was a dorm program then there would be an Administrator that would oversee the dorm program.

Ms. Lasley asked if there was someplace else dumpster could go, further away from the residences. Mr. Marston said they could find a place for the dumpster away from the residents and the plan had it boarded by a buffer and a proposed 8' wall. Mr. Stallworth suggested maybe coordinating a time with the dumpster facility for a time of pick up. Mr. Gaffey stated sanitation pick up would not have access to the facility dumpster on off hours so disturbing the public with early/late hours of pick up would not be a problem.

Ms. Lasley asked if they had considered a one-way road. Mr. Marston stated they are willing to sit with Jill Jeglie and explore it further.

Ms. Bouie asked what parties were involved in {inaudible} Mr. Gaffey stated there was one resident behind the facility that was served by Reeves Road and they had met with them and they seemed fine with it. He stated they gave them paperwork to give access and they accepted the paperwork but had not signed or returned it and they needed to move forward. Mr. Marston further stated they kept {inaudible} open for continued use but also with the possibility in the future of relocating it if that would become acceptable to everybody.

Ms. Lasley said she had looked at the elevation map and she would like to see storm water retained on-site and not drained into the slopes. Mr. Marston stated it will have ponds that meet State and County requirements as far as discharge and water quality treatment. Ms Lasley also noticed Jill recommended moving some of the buildings because of the protected trees (laurel oaks) and would like to see them dug up and live oak be replanted because they live longer. Mr. Marston wanted to point out that a large portion of the property was planned to remain natural and there were a significant

number of trees in that area.

Ms. Davis stated this meeting was for the special exception use and she was hearing information on the site plan. Vice Chair Henderson said she was correct.

Mr. Nunamaker asked if there were any negative responses from public meetings and Mr. Marston said no negative response was heard, they had the site plan out to discuss and the meeting lasted about 1 hour. He stated 5 other sites in Gadsden County were evaluated and this was the best site and had talked with Talquin and they will make their site into a regional lift station site and will help the area.

Mr. Nunamaker thought it was an outstanding site and proposal with no negative feedback from surrounding neighborhoods and neighbors.

Ms. Bouie said her only concern was Reeves Lane because those people use that lane for access to their property. Mr. Gaffey assured them they would never be cut off from their property and will forever have access.

Mr. Nunamaker asked if there were any plans for a traffic light and Mr. Marston said application had not yet been put in with DOT but they had planned to do that in the next week and will do a study to reduce the speed in that area during school hours. At this point no traffic light was being discussed.

Ms. Bouie asked if all traffic coming out of the school would be made to turn to the right only and not able to go to the left.

Ms. Davis asked the Vice Chair, on the interest of time, that they stay on point which was whether or not they will approve the special use exception.

Vice Chair Henderson said there was a recommendation for Option #1.

MS. BOUIE MADE A MOTION TO ACCEPT STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR OPTION 1 WITH A SECOND BY MR. SCOTT, THE BOARD VOTED 7-0 BY VOICE VOTE TO APPROVE.

6. **Robert F. Munroe School Site Plan (Class III, Type II), SP 2019-01) (Quasi-Judicial)- Consideration of a Site Plan to allow a phased plans PreK-12 grade school with accessory uses including administrative offices, gymnasiums, cafeteria, baseball and football fields, stadium, concession, swimming pools, outdoor tennis and sport courts, playground, dormitories and staff residences.**

Vice Chair Henderson reminded everyone that Ms. Jeglie was still under oath and she introduced the above item.

Ms. Jeglie stated the proposed development complies with the required setbacks for non-residential uses. She further stated parking for Phase 1 totals 72 parking spaces. 104 were proposed and an additional 32 parking spaces proposed to address parking demand for Phase II gymnasium/cafeteria.

Ms. Jeglie stated there were no credits for replacement of protected trees. Table 4

shows list of protected trees and Ms. Jeglie said there was no objection to replanting of laurel oak. She agreed, if they wanted, to remove laurel oaks from protected list and replace with oak trees.

Options:

1. Recommend approval for the Robert F. Munroe School Conceptual & Preliminary Site Plan (SP 2019-01) with conditions is consistent with the Gadsden County Comprehensive Plan and the Land Development Code (LDC)
2. Recommend denial of the Robert F. Munroe School Conceptual & Preliminary Site Plan (SP 2019-01) application and provide findings in support of this decision.
3. Discretion of the Planning Commission.

Planning Recommendation

Recommendation was Option 1

Discussion

Suzanne Lex, Gadsden County Planning Director, appeared before the Board and was sworn in by the Deputy Clerk. She said they have reached out to FDOT on a number of occasions to get a formal response as a part of the application. She stated coordination had occurred regarding traffic study and FDOT will determine when they want to do a traffic study to determine if it was warranted.

Mr. Nunamaker said he joined Ms. Bouie in thinking an acceleration lane when exiting the school would benefit the drivers, without that he believes it to be an accident waiting to happen. Ms. Lex stated that would have to be coordination with FDOT and if the applicant wanted to make such improvements and DOT would approve it, then they would permit such improvements to be allowed.

Ms. Lasley said the right-turn lane onto Lanier to get onto Highway 90, if most traffic was crossing 90 could the turn lane be made longer to hold all the cars that will be waiting. Ms. Lex answered if there was sufficient area the applicant would be addressed that issue.

Ms. Lasley said the endangered species study that was done on January 3rd, encouraged them to have students study those areas because if study was done that time of year, plants and amphibians that were not around that time of year.

Ms. Lasley stated for the record she was concerned with some of the buffer plants mentioned because they were deciduous and not a good winter buffer.

Mr. Marston reappeared before the Board to address the acceleration lane. He stated that DOT had already built a right turn lane. Leaving the site was limited right-of-way on

Lanier Road and there was an acceleration lane.

He then addressed two of the conditions he wanted to meet with the County on one-way drive-way. The turn lane operation study added a note that all the traffic improvements must be done before a certificate of occupancy was issued. He said it was being done in phases. He would like it amended to say prior to completion or before Phase II starts.

Ms. Lex said they have not received any correspondence from DOT, she suggested as long as they were compliant and as long as DOT and County requirements were met it should be okay.

Ms. Lasley encouraged them to be good neighbors regarding the dumpsters or lighting and said this was a huge project and Gadsden County needed this.

Vice Chair Henderson said recommendation from staff was to approve option 1 with conditions. Ms. Jeglie said there was an amendment to K that said applicant will work with County to come up with an agreeable solution to revise the plans to indicate a one way driveway with angle parking; turn lane; applicable improvements as per FDOT; protected trees on E, 117, 118, 130.

MS. BOUIE MADE A MOTION TO ACCEPT STAFF RECOMMENDATION OF OPTION 1 WITH AMENDMENTS WITH A SECOND BY MR. NUNAMAKER, BY VOICE VOTE, THE BOARD VOTED TO APPROVE 7-0.

PUBLIC PORTION OF THE MEETING WAS CLOSED AND A BREAK WAS TAKEN BEFORE THE WORKSHOP.

WORKSHOP

7. Chapter 4, Land Use Categories (Legislative) (LDR 2018-05)-Continuation of discussion to consider amendments to Chapter 4, Land Use Categories of the Land Development Code focusing on agriculture zoning categories.

Suzanne Lex appeared before the Board and introduced the above item and discussed the changes.

Recommendations:

1. No recommendation is provided as this is a Workshop and seeks the Planning Commissions and public input.

Ms. Lasley asked about number 10. She asked if they were intended to be special exceptions and Ms. Lex said they had not and asked if anyone had any feelings regarding that. Ms. Lasley suggested changes. Change 10 as 9 and change E to read 8-10.

Ms. Bouie asked how to address concerns for nuisance when you are allowing the breeding/boarding of dogs. Ms. Lex said if that was something that should be gone

through as a use of a special exception.

Vice Chair Henderson said those things are expected in AG 2 and 3 were the appropriate place.

Ms. Lasley said if dog kennels was deleted and someone came to you, then it would trigger the special exception. Ms. Lex stated you could say with an increased buffer. Conditions could be made. Ms. Lasley said her point was when you have something that could be a nuisance and no regulations in the office people will go to the board and not the people because they did not have to. Is a dog kennel more of a threat than a horse facility was her statement.

Mr. Nunamaker asked what qualified as dog kennel to start with because his neighbor had approximately 20 dogs. He asked if there was a number that could be put on to keep owners in check. Ms. Lex suggested moving dog kennels to be part of the raising, breeding and rescue facilities.

Ms. Lasley said she would feel ok with that. Adding dog kennel to raising, breeding or the rescue facilities.

Mr. Nunamaker stated he thought dog kennels do not belong right next to a riding/boarding stable and were a class of their own.

Mr. Stallworth asked the definition of a dog kennel. He stated he looked it up and a kennel was a structure or shelter for dogs or cats.

Ms. Lex stated you could not regulate personal pets and it would be an animal control regulation. Ms. Jeglie stated years ago the County looked at making a nuisance section and the room was packed with hunters and it was very controversial.

Ms. Bouie asked at what point it became an environmental impact with all the waste from the animals confined to one area. Ms. Lex said with private property owners there was no right for regulation.

Ms. Bouie stated she thought it should be two different documents.

Amendment to K that applicant will work with County to come up will angle parking; turn lane; applicable improvements as per FDOT; protected trees on E 117, 118, 130 Vice Chair Henderson asked if the board was happy with the way the proposed language was for the immediate family exception.

Ms. Lasley said no and she thought it was going from bad to worse. Going from 3 acres to 2 ½ and now ½ acre and she did not see it happening in the County.

Ms. Lex stated she had no specific proposed changes other than the 2 ½ acres and that was to make the subdivision of the 5 acres. She explained what some other Counties have for regulations.

Ms Lasley said just because ½ acre or 1 acre was set it did not mean that it needed to apply to the others. She stated that with 10 acres why would you want to create a bunch of ½ acre lots all over the county and stated that you give a family member a parcel to a qualified family member they could not do anything with the property again with a onetime split exception. Once subdivided they could not be divided again and a maximum number of lots to be created.

Ms. Bouie stepped out at 8:12p.m.

Ms. Bouie returned at 8:13 p.m.

Ms. Bouie said if building a home, it would remain a home and be homesteaded. Have it qualified that it be family. Strongly suggesting families should be able to give what was permissible if they wanted to give family member property to build a house, whether it is ¼ acre or ½ acre and be environmentally friendly.

Mr. Nunamaker said he agreed a lot with what Ms. Bouie was saying but with no regulations/restrictions on number of homes that could be put on Ag 2 which was 1-10. He stated if you move to the County and buy 10 acres next to other 10 acre lots and one lot wants all their kids to build on that property, there would be a problem.

Ms. Lex said she would recommend predictability. It was better when a person could look at a regulation and it was predictable. When you subdivide between 4 or 5 you really are creating something that was outside of the family exception.

Ms. Lasley said family exception stated, including the parent parcel, the maximum lots to be created was 4 lots including the parent parcel. She would agree with 3 acre minimum for Ag 2 and 3 and if something for Ag1 was being looked at it was fine and it may be a onetime X number of acres but she would not apply what was decided for Ag 1 to all of the parcels in Ag 2 and 3. She stated she thought it should be 1 acre not ½ ace to give people space to move around.

Ms. Lex asked what direction the Planning Commission wanted to go, keep at what it was or reduce the lot size. She would go back to the 2 ½ acres and if the Planning Commission directed her to go ahead and bring a change forward to the family exception she would but she was not hearing a unanimous response.

Ms. Davis left meeting at 8:34 p.m.

Ms. Bouie stated she would be the advocate for the people who may not have 10 acres. She said she was thinking about the people who could not afford 10 plus acres but they still made this County what it was and struggled to hold on to their property to be able to give to their children to build homes on.

Mr. Nunamaker stated it was not just Agriculture it had to do with an expectation of a neighborhood. When you buy in a 5 acre lot neighborhood you do not want to drive past 5 homes on what was supposed to be a 1 home, 5 acre lot and now had 5, 1 acre lots. Further discussion about the split of parcels continued.

Ms. Bouie left meeting at 8:40 p.m.

Don Stewart addressed the board. He said Comprehensive Plan would have to be changed before they changed anything. It specifies 3 acres and would have to go to the County Commission for a super majority vote.

Mr. Weiss stated the Comprehensive Plan did specify 3 acres and it would have to be changed.

GENERAL BUSINESS

- 8. 2020 Planning Commission Calendar-Distribution of Draft 2020 Planning Commission Meeting Calendar for consideration at the December 12th Planning Meeting**
- 9. Planning Commissioner Questions and Comments**
- 10. Director's/Planner Comments**
- 11. Adjournment of Meeting**
THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS TO COME BEFORE THE BOARD, VICE CHAIR HENDERSON DECLARED THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:43 P.M.

LIBBY HENDERSON, Vice-Chair
Planning Commission

ATTEST:

NICHOLAS THOMAS, Clerk