

PLANNING COMMISSION
August 28, 2019

Meeting Minutes

The Planning Commission of Monroe County conducted a meeting on **Wednesday, August 28, 2019**, beginning at 10:00 a.m. at the Marathon Government Center, 2798 Overseas Highway, Marathon, Florida.

CALL TO ORDER by Chair Werling

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL by Debra Roberts

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS

Denise Werling, Chair	Present
Tom Coward	Present
Ron Miller	Present
Joe Scarpelli	Present
William Wiatt	Present

STAFF

Cheryl Coffari, Acting Senior Director of Planning and Environmental Resources	Absent
Steve Williams, Assistant County Attorney	Present
John Wolfe, Planning Commission Counsel	Present
Mike Roberts, Senior Administrator, Environmental Resources	Absent
Bradley Stein, Development Review Manager	Present
Brittany Burtner, Senior Biologist	Present
Devin Rains, Planning and Development Permit Services Manager	Present
Tiffany Stankiewicz, Development Administrator	Present
Liz Lustberg, Planner	Present
Corey Aitken, Planner	Present
Debra Roberts, Sr. Planning Coordinator	Present

COUNTY RESOLUTION 131-92 APPELLANT TO PROVIDE RECORD FOR APPEAL

County Resolution 131-92 was read into the record by Mr. Wolfe.

SUBMISSION OF PROPERTY POSTING AFFIDAVITS AND PHOTOGRAPHS

Ms. Debra Roberts confirmed receipt of all necessary paperwork.

SWEARING OF COUNTY STAFF

County staff was sworn in by Mr. Wolfe.

CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

There was a request to move Item 6 to be heard third on the agenda. The Commission ultimately decided to hear the item fourth on the agenda.

Motion: Commissioner Scarpelli made a motion to move Item 6 to be heard fourth on the agenda. Commissioner Wiatt seconded the motion. There was no opposition. The motion passed unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion: Commissioner Wiatt made a motion to approve the July 31, 2019 meeting minutes. Commissioner Coward seconded the motion. There was no opposition. The motion passed unanimously.

MEETING

1. A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER AND FINALIZE THE RANKING OF APPLICATIONS IN THE DWELLING UNIT ALLOCATION SYSTEM FOR APRIL 13, 2019, THROUGH JULY 12, 2019, ROGO (Quarter 4, Year 27). ALLOCATION AWARDS WILL BE ALLOCATED FOR ALL UNINCORPORATED MONROE COUNTY. (FILE 2018-128)

(10:02 a.m.) Ms. Tiffiany Stankiewicz presented the staff report for ROGO allocations. The Planning Department is recommending approval for Lower Keys applicants Ranked 1 through 16; Big Pine and No Name Key applicants 2 and 3, subject to mitigation availability at the time of permitting; and, Upper Keys applicants 1 through 14. There were no affordable housing applicants. All other applicants roll over to the next quarter.

Chair Werling asked for public comment. There was none. Public comment was closed.

Commissioner Scarpelli noted that he would abstain from voting on this item as one applicant was a client of his office.

Commissioner Miller asked how many Tier I allocations were left for the Upper Keys. Ms. Stankiewicz responded that all Tier I allocations had been used for this year.

Commissioner Coward asked if this would be an appropriate time to discuss the allocation of affordable ROGOs in terms of categories. There are 332 affordable ROGOs left of which over 200 are classified as moderate and 100 are classified as very low, low or median, and he would like to discuss tweaking those percentages. Mr. Stein responded that though could be commented on, this may not be the appropriate time to discuss it. Mr. John Wolfe suggested discussing this at the end of the meeting under Board Discussion.

Motion: Commissioner Wiatt made a motion to approve Item 1. Commissioner Miller seconded the motion. There was no opposition. The motion passed unanimously.

2. A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER AND FINALIZE THE RANKING OF APPLICATIONS IN THE NON-RESIDENTIAL ALLOCATION SYSTEM FOR APRIL 13, 2019, THROUGH JULY 12, 2019, NROGO (Quarter 4, Year 27). ALLOCATION AWARDS WILL BE ALLOCATED FOR ALL UNINCORPORATED MONROE COUNTY. *Pursuant to Monroe County Code Section 138-53(e)(14), the Planning and Environmental Resources Department is providing a notification to the general public of the NROGO account balances. The balances are as follows: (Refer to chart included on agenda.) (FILE 2018-129)*

(10:06 a.m.) Ms. Stankiewicz had no presentation, stating that this was placed on the agenda for informational purposes only. No action was taken.

3. AN ORDINANCE BY THE MONROE COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS AMENDING THE MONROE COUNTY TIER OVERLAY DISTRICT MAP FROM TIER I TO TIER III AS REQUESTED BY RAFAEL AND GLORIA GONZALEZ FOR A PARCEL OF VACANT LAND LEGALLY DESCRIBED AS BLOCK 3 LOT 15 LARGO HI-LANDS, PLAT BOOK 4 PAGE 89, KEY LARGO, HAVING REAL ESTATE NO. 00533190-000000; AS PROPOSED BY THE MONROE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; PROVIDING FOR REPEAL OF CONFLICTING PROVISIONS; PROVIDING FOR TRANSMITTAL TO THE STATE LAND PLANNING AGENCY AND THE SECRETARY OF STATE; PROVIDING FOR AMENDMENT TO THE TIER OVERLAY DISTRICT MAP; PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE. (FILE #2019-071)

(10:07 a.m.) Ms. Brittany Burtner, Senior Biologist, presented a 2018 aerial of the parcel outlined in blue that was proposed to be changed from Tier I to Tier III. An environmental consultant, Susan Sprunt of Environmental Consulting Systems, Inc., had done a vegetative analysis and the majority of the canopy on site was found to be non-native vegetation with poinciana and Brazilian pepper trees, the vegetative cover within this parcel being greater than 40 percent non-native. This parcel does not meet Tier I criteria and staff is recommending it be changed to Tier III based on data updates.

Commissioner Miller asked if the parcel had changed since it was designated Tier I. Ms. Burtner explained that the 1986 conditions had this parcel mapped as developed land. The neighborhood had changed very little since that time and she does not believe Tier I is appropriate. Commissioner Miller then asked if it is not appropriate now or wasn't appropriate in the past. Ms. Burtner responded that based on the information available, she does not know why it was ever designated Tier I. Commissioner Miller thought there was something in the Code that prohibits the Commission to downgrade the designation of a lot that has become denigrated. Ms. Burtner stated that the past information is also current information and this parcel does not meet the criteria to make it Tier I. Even if this property were restored, it would still not be valuable as Tier I as it is in the middle of a neighborhood and would have very little ecological value. Commissioner Coward expressed concern that the entire section would potentially become Tier III, recognizing there is development already present and that the section would probably not change. Ms. Burtner added that this parcel is one parcel amidst houses adjacent to a strip mall and she did not believe a precedent would be set that would chip away at the entire area.

Chair Werling asked if the applicant wished to speak. Ms. Gloria Gonzalez stated she believed Ms. Burtner had been thorough. Chair Werling asked for public comment. There was none. Public comment was closed.

Motion: Commissioner Coward made a motion to approve Item 3. Commissioner Wiatt seconded the motion. There was no opposition. The motion passed unanimously.

Item 6 was then heard out of order.

6. STOCK ISLAND MARINA VILLAGE, 7001-7075 SHRIMP ROAD, STOCK ISLAND, MILE MARKER 5: A PUBLIC HEARING CONCERNING A REQUEST FOR A VARIANCE OF 22 FEET, 9 INCHES TO THE REQUIRED 25-FOOT FRONT NON-SHORELINE SETBACK, WHICH IS ADJACENT TO SHRIMP ROAD. APPROVAL WOULD RESULT IN A SETBACK OF 2 FEET, 3 INCHES. THE REQUESTED VARIANCE IS REQUIRED FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A PROPOSED PARKING LOT LIGHTING. THE SUBJECT PROPERTY IS DESCRIBED AS A PARCEL OF LAND IN SECTION 35, TOWNSHIP 67, RANGE 25, STOCK ISLAND, MONROE COUNTY, FLORIDA, HAVING PARCEL ID NUMBERS 00123761-000600, 00123761-000700, 00123761-000800. (FILE 2019-117)

(10:14 a.m.) Ms. Liz Lustberg, Planner, presented the staff report explaining that this is a variance for Stock Island Marina Village and presented photographs of the complete parcel with three of the lots being the subject of the proposed variance. Both the public road and segment of private road fronting the property was described in the visuals. The relevant setback is the 25-foot front-yard setback. The lighting proposed that is closest to the front-yard setback is two foot, three inches from the property line. The farthest one is 22 feet from the property line. So the lighting is proposed to be staggered within the first 25 feet. There are 42-inch bollard lights being proposed. Staff is recommending approval since the review indicates that all eight requirements are met. Ms. Lustberg pointed out that staff is proposing an extra condition stating that the variance is only for the placement of lighting to make it extra clear that this is only for lighting; and, one condition that states, “This variance does not grant any waiver to compliance with the lighting regulations in the Land Development Code Section 114-160 through 114-161.”

Mr. Bart Smith spoke on behalf of the applicant and showed a current view of the property, stating that the Code allows for sidewalks within the front-yard setback but no lighting. There is no room for a sidewalk on the roadway so the applicant decided to put in a sidewalk so people wouldn't be walking down the roadway. There are dangers with walking down a sidewalk at night without light, hence the request for lighting. Mr. Smith then presented photos showing how dark the area is at night, the idea being to provide safety and security that would light the pathway right in front of the parking area.

Chair Werling asked for public comment.

Mr. Owen Trepanier, representing Key Cow, LLC, located on Cow Key, the adjacent property owner, was sworn in by Mr. Wolfe. Mr. Trepanier stated that his client is requesting this item be postponed until a complete and compliant application is filed, and the applicant and Key Cow

can resolve their concerns. It is impossible to accurately determine the effects of the variance request as the application does not meet the minimum requirements. The adjacent neighbor is a bee farm and studies show that improper lighting has deleterious effects on bee farming and the neighbor is concerned about the impact this lighting would have on their beekeeping activities. Key Cow is asking the applicant to work with them to evaluate the lighting prior to approving this variance. Mr. Trepanier explained that the applicant is basing the need for the variance on the fact that the adjacent roadway is private. The wording of the application leads him to believe that the road is not owned by or accessible to Longstock, LLC. However, Mr. Smith's firm and Longstock have both made claims that Longstock owns this road by threatening lawsuits and stating in writing that they own the road. Mr. Smith's law firm also prepared, recorded and filed a quit-claim deed in 2018 with the Property Appraiser declaring ownership of the road. Longstock has produced various title work claiming they own the road. Key Cow is confused and would like to know whether the applicant believes they own the road.

Mr. Trepanier continued, none of this information was in the application. The application leads to an understanding that Longstock does not own the road and are relying on this understanding as the basis for granting of this variance. The variance application itself is insufficient. A signed and sealed copy of a boundary survey is a requirement and there is not one included. There is an unsigned, unsealed copy of the 2015 Condominium Declaration, which doesn't show the elevations, locations and dimensions of all structures, paved areas and utility structures as required. Since 2015, Longstock has been granted seven building permits so those structures would not show on the Declaration documents, and the Condo Declarations do not show the total acreage by land use or habitat by acreage as required. As a professional planner, Mr. Trepanier would expect any variance requesting a 92-percent variance to setbacks to meet the minimum application requirements. The agent authorization for Mr. Smith was notarized by Mr. Smith, which is a potential violation of Florida Statute 117.107(12). The variance rationale is based on a concept that the road is private and cannot be encroached upon, and also leads to the understanding that Longstock does not claim ownership to the road which they actually do. For these reasons, Mr. Trepanier is requesting this item be postponed indefinitely to allow the applicant to file a complete and compliant application, allow time for the two parties to resolve these outstanding issues, and then bring it back before the Commission with full support.

Mr. Charles Weitzel, CPA, after being sworn in by Mr. Wolfe, stated that his office is located at Safe Harbor Marina on Front Street directly across the harbor on Shrimp Road. He personally knows this road and stated it is a hazard and a dangerous place to walk because of the lack of light. Lighting is greatly needed in that area. Without lighting, someone is eventually going to be hurt. Mr. Weitzel urged the Commission not to postpone and to approve this variance.

There was no further public comment. Public comment was closed.

Commissioner Coward asked if the property where the bees are located could be shown in relation to the subject property. Mr. Smith presented photographs and indicated the bees were quite a distance from the subject property. Mr. Smith also stated that for a land condo, the survey is actually the Condominium Declaration and that Mr. Trepanier's point was legally baseless. Approximately 90 percent of the adjacent area is the County road which starts as a sliver and gets to about four to five feet wide so the disputed area is a minimal portion. The

lighting proposed is downward-facing bollards that are 42 inches high for a sidewalk to provide safety. All criteria have been met and the application is complete, and he requests the Commission grant the variance.

Commissioner Scarpelli asked staff about the claim that the application was incomplete. Mr. Stein responded that staff can actually waive some provisions of the application and still consider it to be complete, and staff considers this application to be complete. Ms. Lustberg added that the issue of the signature was noticed at completion review and the property owner then signed to list Mr. Smith as agent. In terms of the boundary survey, Ms. Lustberg would need to look again at the file. Commissioner Miller expressed confusion with the two feet, three inches on the variance. Ms. Lustberg explained that one light would be two feet, three inches from the property line and she had looked at the light closest to the property line to define the degree of the variance, which would be the most amount of the variance. Mr. Stein added that the conditions are based off the site plan as well. Commissioner Miller asked about the 92-percent variance. Ms. Lustberg responded that though she would have to do the math, it is a significant variance. Mr. Smith interjected that the lighting is directly adjacent to the sidewalk already approved and permitted and being put in. Commissioner Miller asked if the ownership of the property is being disputed, and Mr. Smith responded that it is not. The ownership of the roadway is disputed for a portion of it, but most of the portion abutting this property is County roadway. Ms. Lustberg clarified that the dispute over the road became news to her just a minute ago. The name of the owner for the portion of the road in discussion is in a different name than the applicant but she did not pursue a more in-depth review of the road ownership. Mr. Wolfe interjected that there is no dispute as to the ownership of the property itself. Commissioner Miller then confirmed that there was no dispute that all of the bollard lighting would be on the applicant's property. Mr. Stein added that the variance is considered to the property line. Commissioner Coward commented that it is dark out there and dangerous, adding that the lighting would certainly be helpful. Commissioner Wiatt agreed.

Mr. Trepanier asked to speak again as to the beekeeping question. The Commission allowed him to speak. Mr. Trepanier stated that the bees move around the property daily and also go off of the property. For the record, Mr. Trepanier wanted to clarify that the County did waive the requirement for a signed and sealed copy of a survey for elevations, locations of structures, and the land use and habitat by acreage. He also noted that the ownership of the road is a basis for nearly every approval. Commissioner Wiatt asked how close the hives are to the land owned by the applicant. Mr. Trepanier guessed they were 1,000 to 2,000 feet away. Commissioner Miller asked for the scientific information on bollard lighting on bees. Mr. Trepanier responded that there is a lot of studied material on artificial lights affecting bees, but he did not have it with him today because the policy of the Commission is that evidence not be entered at the time of the hearing, which is why he's requesting this be postponed. Commissioner Scarpelli asked if any other developments in the area had been spoken against, as there was a lot of development with lighting much higher than the 42-inch bollards. Mr. Trepanier did not know.

Chair Werling asked for further public comment. There was none. Public comment was closed.

Commissioner Wiatt commented that based on staff's representation that the application was complete and the nearest hive being over 1,000 feet away, he thinks upholding the staff's

decision in this case would be appropriate. Commissioner Coward asked what the impact would be of delaying this item for three months. Mr. Smith responded that the sidewalk would be completed in less than 30 days so there would be a sidewalk with no light. Further, he does not believe it would be resolved in three months, and based on the beekeeping being 1,000 to 2,000 feet away is not a sign of this coming towards resolution. The safety issue is a bigger concern.

Motion: Commissioner Scarpelli made a motion to approve Item 6. Commissioner Wiatt seconded the motion. There was no opposition. The motion passed unanimously.

4. ROBERT AND LOURDES VILA, 27146 SHANNAHAN ROAD, RAMROD KEY, MILE MARKER 27: AN APPEAL, PURSUANT TO SECTION 102-185 OF THE MONROE COUNTY LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE, BY THE PROPERTY OWNER TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION CONCERNING THE DENIAL OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE VARIANCE TO THE FRONT YARD SETBACK, BY THE SENIOR DIRECTOR OF PLANNING & ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES. THE SUBJECT PROPERTY IS LEGALLY DESCRIBED AS LOT 12, BLOCK 5, RAMROD SHORES MARINA SECTION ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF, AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 6, AT PAGE 22, OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF MONROE COUNTY, FLORIDA, HAVING PARCEL ID NUMBER 00210811-005800. (FILE 2019-111)

(10:43 a.m.) Mr. Steve Williams, Assistant County Attorney, first explained to the Commission that included in their packet for Item 4 is the staff report and the application, but the basis for the appeal indicates only a checkmark for economic hardship. The County has not received any further basis for this appeal from the applicant. Not knowing the basis makes it tough to present information to the Commission as staff does not know why they are appealing other than the fact that they received a denial. Ms. Lustberg is available and staff has presented a lot of information, but in a traditional appeal the burden is on the applicant to present substantial, competent evidence as to why staff committed an error. Staff does not know which windmill they're jousting with and are walking into this a bit blind.

Ms. Lustberg then explained that this is an appeal to a variance denied by the Planning Director. The appeal is for the front yard setback variance. Ms. Lustberg presented photographs showing the parcel with the house and the surrounding property. The original building permit shows the front deck originally complied with the front-yard setbacks but the house changed over time. The applicant did work on the house and then came in for an after-the-fact permit. The Planning Department was able to permit all of the modifications to the house except for the work in the front setback area, at which point the applicant applied for the variance. The variance did not meet all of the criteria and was denied. Staff recommends upholding the decision of the Planning Director.

Commissioner Miller asked if the variance was only for where the house was situated. Ms. Lustberg responded that the variance is for the portion of the current structure that is within the front setback. Commissioner Scarpelli added that he would like to ask a question but doesn't know what the grounds for appeal are.

Mr. Jim Reynolds of Reynolds Engineering Services was sworn in by Mr. Wolfe. Mr. Steve Williams interjected that he did not know that there was an agent authorization for anyone to represent the applicants, and that Mr. Reynolds is not an attorney who could represent someone in an appellate capacity. Ms. Lourdes Vila, the applicant, was sworn in by Mr. Wolfe. Ms. Vila explained that she was not aware that she had to provide something as to why she was appealing and is confused as to why the requested variance was denied. Ms. Vila stated she is willing to write a letter to explain the reasons for the appeal, but she was not aware that it was required and apologized. Commissioner Miller asked if Ms. Vila could withdraw the appeal and come back. Mr. Williams responded that because appeals have time frames, withdrawing would likely put her outside of the prescribed time frame. Should a continuance be sought and granted by the Planning Commission that would be at the Commission's discretion if the applicant desires. However, it says point blank on the back page of the application that a basis for appeal must be stated, and it was signed by Ms. Vila, dated June 7, 2019.

Mr. Wolfe explained to the applicant that she may want to ask for a continuance to comply with the requirements, providing a realistic time frame to provide information to staff and for staff to respond. Ms. Vila indicated that desire. After discussion, the next meeting for this item was set for October 30, 2019.

Motion: Commissioner Scarpelli made a motion to approve the continuance of Item 4 to October 30, 2019. Commissioner Coward seconded the motion. There was no opposition. The motion passed unanimously.

5. WINN-DIXIE STORES LEASING, LLC, 105300 OVERSEAS HIGHWAY, KEY LARGO, MILE MARKER 105: A PUBLIC HEARING CONCERNING THE REQUEST FOR A 3 BPS ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE USE PERMIT, WHICH WOULD ALLOW FOR BEER, WINE, AND LIQUOR PACKAGE SALES FOR OFF PREMISES CONSUMPTION. THE SUBJECT PROPERTY IS LEGALLY DESCRIBED AS A PARCEL OF LAND LYING IN SECTION 1, TOWNSHIP 61 SOUTH, RANGE 39 EAST, KEY LARGO, MONROE COUNTY, FLORIDA, BEING A PORTION OF LOT 21 OF THE MODEL LAND CO. PLAT AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 1 AT PAGE 68 OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF MONROE COUNTY, FLORIDA HAVING PARCEL IDENTIFICATION NUMBER 00084260-000300. (FILE #2019-120)

(10:55 a.m.) Ms. Devin Tolpin, Senior Planner presented the staff report. The applicant is Shutts and Bowen on behalf of Winn Dixie Stores Leasing and is requesting approval of a 3 BPS Alcoholic Beverage Special Use Permit which would allow for package sales of beer, wine and liquor for off premises consumption at the property located at 105300 Overseas Highway in Key Largo. Ms. Tolpin presented a location map for reference showing the subject property located within the Urban Commercial Zoning District. The community character in the immediate vicinity is institutional, residential and conservation land. The site is currently developed with an existing grocery store which has been operating with a 2 APS Alcoholic Beverage Permit since 1986, which allows for package sales of beer and wine for off premises consumption. Ms. Tolpin also presented a floor plan for the existing grocery store, with the proposed liquor store area highlighted in red. The application is in compliance with Section 36-E of the Monroe

County Code and has been determined to be in compliance. Staff recommends approval with the general conditions laid out in the staff report.

Chair Werling asked if the applicant would like to speak.

Mr. Tim Gillis of Shutts and Bowen, spoke on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Gillis presented the history of Winn Dixie in the Keys, indicating there have been five stores in the Keys for nearly 50 years, and they represent good corporate citizens and intentions. This is the fifth store that Winn Dixie has remodeled in the Keys over the last three years, having invested \$13.7 million. Winn Dixie is a big part of the Keys, donating disaster relief and general support to the community. Mr. Gillis also introduced Mr. Georgie Lago, the District Manager for Southeastern Grocers which is the holding company for Winn Dixie Stores.

Commissioner Miller asked how many Winn Dixie Stores had similar licenses in the Keys. Mr. Wolfe then swore in Mr. Lago. Mr. Lago responded that there are two current liquor stores, one in Key West and one in Big Pine. Commissioner Coward noted that the one in Key West is in a separate location, while this request is to have it within the confines of the existing store. Commissioner Coward asked if the location would be in the very front of the store, and Ms. Tolpin indicated that was correct.

Chair Werling asked for public comment. There was none. Public comment was closed.

Motion: Commissioner Wiatt made a motion to approve Item 5. Commissioner Scarpelli seconded the motion. There was no opposition. The motion passed unanimously.

BOARD DISCUSSION

(11:02 a.m.) Commissioner Coward asked when, how, and if the Planning Commission could reallocate the proportion of affordable ROGOs. There are 332 total ROGOs, of which over 200 are going to moderate, which as the Commission has discussed are actually market level ROGOs based on reality in the community. Commissioner Coward believes that most of those should go to low, very low and median, and asked how the Commission can make that happen. Chair Werling pointed out that the school and police departments are looking to build their own housing. Commissioner Wiatt stated that after the last meeting, he had researched this and stands by the idea that moderate and median are at or even above market rate. The University of Florida did a study in 2016 that described rental rates in Monroe County and they were at or above moderate and median. The County needs affordable to be affordable housing, not market rate affordable housing which is not needed, adding that he welcomes the discussion.

Mr. Stein recommended enough time be given to staff to put together the information and properly advertise it to get everyone to the table, asking if the Commission had a specific date in mind. Commissioner Coward thought the sooner the better, but would leave it to staff as to when that could be prepared. Chair Werling agreed. Mr. Stein thought potentially the October or November meeting. The Commission agreed overall with Commissioner Coward noting that time is of the essence as the ROGOs are being rapidly allocated. Commissioner Wiatt commented that there were big projects asking for huge numbers, and the Commission struggles

to get 50 percent low, which sends the incorrect message to both the developer and the public. Commissioner Miller asked if there was a way to study the 75,000 people actually living in the Keys and that number is not so huge that this couldn't be put under a magnifying glass to get down to the nitty-gritty of what is actually needed. He also believes the Commission should be very judicious with the allocations left. There are studies saying affordable housing is needed, but that's been being said forever and will continue to be in the future. Commissioner Wiatt also asked for some data or a review of what market rate actually is in Monroe County to compare to the numbers for low, median and moderate. He is not asking for money to hire a consultant to get this number, but at least have some sort of cursory review to get an idea of what the current market rate is for housing. Commissioner Wiatt believes those numbers will indicate that they have been allowing 50 percent of the ROGOs go at market rate. He understands making the projects work on a budget, but if the school district, police and fire departments want to do some of their own projects, they may not be able to if there are no allocations left. Also, the idea of hotels doing on-site affordable housing has been discussed and agreed that it's a great idea.

Commissioner Miller stated he understands the developer's point of view of trying to make money, but giving out the additional density, that argument doesn't hold water the way it would if there was less density on these properties. Developers are saying they still have to build moderate after adding all of the extra density. Developers should be required to provide more information rather than just saying they can't do this. Perhaps the County could state what it may cost to give the Commission an idea. Chair Werling added that her concern is that everyone wants more and more with the actual type of affordable being lost.

ADJOURNMENT

The Monroe County Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 11:15 a.m.