

PLANNING COMMISSION  
July 20, 2021

Meeting Minutes

The Planning Commission of Monroe County conducted a hybrid virtual and in-person meeting on **Tuesday, July 20, 2021**, beginning at 10:10 a.m.

**CALL TO ORDER** by Chair Scarpelli

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**ROLL CALL** by Ilze Aguila

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS**

Joe Scarpelli, Chair	Present
Bill Wiatt, Vice Chair	Present
Ron Demes	Present
George Neugent	Absent
David Ritz	Absent
Douglas Prior, Ex-Officio Member (MCSD)	Absent
Karen Taporco, Ex-Officio Member (NASKW)	Absent

**STAFF**

Emily Schemper, Sr. Director of Planning and Environmental Resources  
Cheryl Cioffari, Assistant Director of Planning  
Mike Roberts, Assistant Director of Environmental Resources  
Mayte Santamaria, Senior Planning Policy Advisor  
Bradley Stein, Development Review Manager  
Devin Tolpin, Principal Planner  
Corey Aitken, Environmental Planner  
Peter Morris, Assistant County Attorney  
John Wolfe, Planning Commission Counsel  
Ilze Aguila, Senior Coordinator Planning Commission

**COUNTY RESOLUTION 131-92 APPELLANT TO PROVIDE RECORD FOR APPEAL**

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

**SUBMISSION OF PROPERTY POSTING AFFIDAVITS AND PHOTOGRAPHS**

Ms. Ilze Aguila confirmed receipt of all necessary paperwork.

**SWEARING OF COUNTY STAFF**

County staff was sworn in by Mr. John Wolfe.

### **CHANGES TO THE AGENDA**

Ms. Emily Schemper stated that with only three Commissioners present, any applicants with variance items may elect to continue their application to the next meeting. Additionally, Agenda Item 4 had previously requested a continuance. Since the County Biologist, Mr. Michael Roberts, is handling this item and will be out of town during the August meeting, there is agreement to continue Item 4 to the September 29, 2021 meeting.

**Motion: Commissioner Wiatt made a motion to continue Item 4 to the September 29, 2021 meeting. Commissioner Demes seconded the motion. There was no opposition. The motion passed unanimously.**

Ms. Schemper then asked Mr. Jethon Williams, the Zoom Moderator, if any of the applicants were requesting a continuance due to only three Commissioners being present.

Ms. Devin Tolpin stated that Mr. Jack Bridges was present for Item 3, and both applicant and the agent for the applicant, Mr. Jack Bridges, did request a continuance to the August 25, 2021 meeting.

**Motion: Commissioner Wiatt made a motion to continue Item 3 to the August 25, 2021 meeting. Commissioner Demes seconded the motion. There was no opposition. The motion passed unanimously.**

Mr. Christopher Collins, representing Item 1, and Ms. Gelly Juvier, representing Item 2, both elected to proceed today.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**Motion: Commissioner Demes made a motion to approve the May 26, 2021, meeting minutes. Commissioner Wiatt seconded the motion. There was no opposition. The motion passed unanimously.**

### **DISCLOSURE OF EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS**

The three Commissioners present each indicated there had been no ex parte communications.

## **MEETING**

**1. KEY LARGO TREE, LLC, 101000 OVERSEAS HIGHWAY, KEY LARGO, MILE MARKER 101:** A PUBLIC HEARING CONCERNING A REQUEST FOR A VARIANCE TO ACCESS STANDARDS SET FORTH IN CHAPTER 114, ARTICLE VII OF THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE (LDC). APPROVAL WOULD RESULT IN TWO ACCESS DRIVES TO U.S. 1 ON THE SUBJECT PROPERTY THAT ARE SPACED 127.2 FEET FROM EACH OTHER. THE VARIANCE IS REQUESTED IN ORDER TO COMPLETE THE DEVELOPMENT OF A RESTAURANT AND COMMERCIAL RETAIL USE ON THE SUBJECT PROPERTY. THE SUBJECT PROPERTY IS LEGALLY DESCRIBED AS THAT PORTION OF LOT 8 IN SECTION 28, TOWNSHIP 61 SOUTH, RANGE 39 EAST, ON KEY LARGO, ACCORDING TO MODEL LAND COMPANY'S PLAT BY P.F. JENKINS, CIVIL

ENGINEER, RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 1 AT PAGE 68, OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF MONROE COUNTY, FLORIDA, LYING NORTHWESTERLY OF STATE ROAD NO. 5 (U.S. NO. 1), KEY LARGO, MONROE COUNTY, FLORIDA, HAVING PARCEL ID NUMBER 00087350-000000. (FILE 2019-231).

(10:19 a.m.) Ms. Devin Tolpin, Principal Planner, presented the staff report. This request is for a variance at property also known as the Key Largo McDonald's and Dollar Tree. The property is located in the SC Zoning District, designated as MUC on the FLUM. This variance is requested to complete the development of the commercial retail and restaurant use on the site. The Monroe County Development Code requires 400 feet between access drives unless it qualifies under the Florida Administrative Code which then allows for 245 feet between access drives. This application is requesting a variance in order to deviate from the 245 feet to allow 127.2 feet between two existing access drives on the property. Ms. Tolpin presented aerials of the property showing the current configuration of the access drives. In 2017, the Planning Commission had approved a variance to access standards allowing the developer to relocate that northern access drive further to the north, and then to deviate from the access standards to the northern street K Drive and the existing southern access drive. The property then received a MCU to complete the development of the McDonald's. This variance is to keep the access drives in their current configuration. The Planning Commission has the authority to grant a variance if and only if all eight of the necessary standards are met. Staff has found the applicant does meet all eight standards and is recommending approval. Staff requests that if the Planning Commission does approve this variance, that they also rescind the previous variance approval from 2017, number P0417.

Commissioner Wiatt confirmed with Ms. Tolpin that the Planning Commission had approved 248 feet in 2017, and that this would cut that in half to 127 feet which is what it was originally. Ms. Tolpin also stated that the access drives have not changed location. The applicant was originally going to relocate the access drives but is now asking to keep them in the existing configuration. Chair Scarpelli then asked if the applicant would like to speak.

Mr. Chris Collins of Urban Design thanked Ms. Tolpin for the presentation and stated he would be happy to answer any questions. Mr. Wolfe swore him in. The Commission indicated they had no questions. Chair Scarpelli asked for public comment. There was none. Public comment was closed.

**Motion: Commissioner Wiatt made a motion to approve, and to rescind the previous variance. Commissioner Demes seconded the motion. There was no opposition. The motion passed unanimously.**

**2. JAVIER TRUCKING, INC, 102091 OVERSEAS HIGHWAY, KEY LARGO, MILE MARKER 102:** A PUBLIC HEARING CONCERNING A REQUEST FOR A VARIANCE OF 15 FEET TO THE REQUIRED 25-FOOT FRONT SETBACK, WHICH IS ADJACENT TO OVERSEAS HIGHWAY, AND A VARIANCE OF 5 FEET TO THE REQUIRED 10 FOOT SIDE SETBACK LOCATED ON THE SOUTHWEST SIDE OF THE PROPERTY AND 5 FOOT SIDE SETBACK LOCATED ON THE NORTHEAST SIDE OF THE PROPERTY. APPROVAL WOULD RESULT IN A FRONT SETBACK OF 10 FEET AND SIDE

SETBACKS OF 5 FEET AND 0 FEET. THE REQUESTED VARIANCE IS REQUIRED FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE EXISTING AND PROPOSED TRUCKING AND GRAVEL BUSINESS ON SITE. THE SUBJECT PROPERTY IS LEGALLY DESCRIBED AS ALL OF LOT 13 AND THE NORTHEASTERLY ONE HALF OF LOT 14, TOGETHER WITH AN EASEMENT FOR INGRESS AND EGRESS ACROSS THE SOUTHEASTERLY 10 FEET OF SOUTHWESTERLY ONE HALF OF LOT 14, BLOCK 5, PAMELA VILLA, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF, AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 3, AT PAGE 125, OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF MONROE COUNTY, FLORIDA, HAVING PARCEL ID NUMBER 00464610-000000. (FILE 2020-144)

(10:25 a.m.) Mr. Corey Aitkin, Environmental Planner, presented the staff report. This property is located in the SC Land Use District on the ocean side of Overseas Highway, is adjacent to an Improved Subdivision location, and is one and-a-half lots. The applicant is requesting reduction of the front setback by 15 feet, and a reduction of both side setbacks by 5 feet. The resulting setbacks would be 10 feet on the front yard, 5 feet on the southwest side, and zero feet on the second northeast side. Land Development Code Section 131-1(a), and the SC Land Use District requires 25 feet from the front, 10 feet from the primary side, 5 feet from the secondary side, and 10 feet from the rear. Pursuant to Section 102-87(1), the Planning Commission is authorized to grant variances to front, side and rear yard non-shoreline requirements. Mr. Aitkin presented the site plan to show the entrance from Overseas Highway coming through the property to pick up gravel at locations on the north and northeast side, and then exiting through to the easement on the south side between this property and the Improved Subdivision location. On the primary side yard, the setback would allow for a small office to be placed, and the secondary side would be allowed to have locations to hold gravel for bulk sale. The parking requirement is satisfied. Planning staff was unable to locate a permit lawfully establishing a light industrial use on the subject property which would require a Minor Conditional Use within the SC Land Use District. The applicant has submitted a variance application and staff has found the following items not to be in compliance. The applicant is claiming hardship, which is not being caused by the County. Staff acknowledges this variance will not likely increase public expenses, however the light industrial use involving trucks entering from U.S. 1 and exiting adjacent to the residential neighborhood could pose a threat to public safety; and, the dust of gravel and the noise of trucks may pose a public nuisance. This site has no peculiar circumstances. The two contiguous properties do not have a deviation or variance. These parcels were developed prior to the Land Development Code so granting this would possibly change how it's been used. Granting the variance is not based on domestic difficulties of the applicant. Staff is recommending denial to the requested variance reductions. Standards that were deemed not in compliance were items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 7 as outlined on the variance application and covered in this presentation.

Mr. Peter Morris, Assistant County Attorney, asked Chair Scarpelli for the panel's indulgence to ask a few questions of Mr. Aitkin and the Ms. Schemper. Mr. Aitkin responded to Mr. Morris that he is an Environmental Planner, has been with the County for one year and ten months, has a master's degree in geology with a focus in GIS and coastal systems, and a bachelor's in marine science with a focus in policy management. Mr. Aitkin has previously presented prior Zoning and Comp Plan related applications such as this to various tribunals. Mr. Morris asked the Commission to recognize Mr. Aitkin as an expert in the field of planning. The Commission agreed.

Mr. Morris inquired of Ms. Emily Schemper, Senior Director of Planning and Environmental Resources. Ms. Schemper has been with the County for nine and-a-half years, has a master's degree in both urban planning and urban design, has AICP certification and is a Certified Flood Plain Manager. Ms. Schemper has presented many items before the Commission, has reviewed Mr. Aitken's staff report and concurs with all of Mr. Aitken findings, analyses and conclusions. Mr. Morris asked the Commission to recognize Ms. Schemper as an expert in the discipline of planning. The Commission agreed.

Chair Scarpelli asked Mr. Aitken if this property was not being used for an approved use. Mr. Aitken responded that staff had discovered no MCU or permit that would have allowed for a light industrial use on an SC District parcel. Chair Scarpelli asked if they could ask for a variance on a property that was not being used for an approved use. Ms. Schemper responded that it would be typical to first ask for the variance before the building permit to establish the use. Chair Scarpelli then asked if the applicant wished to speak.

Ms. Gelly Juvier, after being sworn in by Mr. Wolfe, stated that this plan has been with the County since 2019. She had first asked for a building permit to build the office, and was told the variance was required first for the reduction on the setbacks so the gravel could be stored on the setbacks. After receiving the variance, she will go back to Planning to get the building permit for the office. This property has been used since the nineties for storage and resale of gravel. The setbacks are only what is really needed to complete the whole project, to have the gravel to sell, and the office for clients to come in and pay with credit cards. When another hurricane hits and there is no internet or cell phone, the customers can come in and be put on the schedule. Javier Trucking is one of the biggest suppliers of gravel in the Upper Keys.

Ms. Juvier is not disputing that the planners have the credentials, but believes she may not have explained herself correctly on paper in order for them to understand the particular things on this lot. The reduction in front is for a place to put the gravel. The vents for the gravel are two feet wide and are being categorized as a fence. Ms. Juvier presented photographs of the concrete vents for the gravel. Dump trucks come in and out of the property and she is asking for the middle to be open so they can come in, turn around and leave through the easement. The previous owner did have a retail license to sell gravel from this lot. What she is adding is the office. The southeast property which is similar in size does not have big trucks coming in and out, and they do not have setbacks; rather the front of that property has driveways and parking spaces and they use the side property for storage. The other neighbor to the north also has no rear setbacks, uses the road as a parking space, and that house is actually two feet on the road. Chair Scarpelli stated that variances aren't granted on what other properties are doing illegally on their property. Ms. Juvier clarified that she believed one of the reasons for not granting her the setbacks was because she would be getting something the neighbors do not have, which they actually do have. Ms. Schemper stated that what Ms. Juvier is saying may be true but they may have been developed prior to the current setbacks being in place. Staff had not found any similar variances that had been granted to those properties. Ms. Juvier continued that approving the variance would not be different from her neighbors. She is leaving a rear setback of 20 feet, not the 15 feet required, because of the buffer for the residential area. Her request is for a small reduction in the front and sides, and the sides abut commercial properties. Regarding dust, she

already has a sprinkler system set up so that would not be an issue during the dry season. Dust has never been an issue in the past. The rear access has been the same since the 80s. Before purchasing the property, she was the entity providing the gravel for the previous owners and her trucks had been going in and out the same way. Ms. Juvier then presented photographs of the site, noting that she already has FDOT access to the site as FDOT had made the entrance for this business. Ms. Juvier presented photos of the gravel vents at the front and side of the property. Ms. Juvier added that she wants to create an office and bring everything up to code as it should be, and needs the reduction in the setbacks.

Chair Scarpelli asked if there were Commission comments or questions. There were none. Chair Scarpelli asked for public comment. There was none. Public comment was closed.

Commissioner Wiatt then asked if there was any history of the property as far as the structures on it which holds the gravel. Ms. Juvier responded that the vents are two feet wide, four feet long, and two feet high, and have been there since the 90s. Prior to that there were pavers and the trucks would come in and out to stock sand for the paver companies. Mr. Peter Morris interjected that according to the Property Appraiser's office and the Clerk of Court, this property was purchased by the current owner on or about March 16, 2017, as reflected in a warranty deed. That recorded deed stated that the conveyance was made subject to the Monroe County Comp Plan and Land Development Regulations, and the legal analysis of this item is correct. A party who purchases property with the opportunity to perform due diligence as to its permitted approval history and regulations cannot claim any factors which existed at the time of acquisition as a hardship. Ms. Juvier stated that she had been doing trucking in the Keys since 2000, and she knew what the property had been used for. The previous owner was Diego Castro and she had been his supplier for the gravel. The use of the property has always been to store gravel and has always been set up as it is now.

Ms. Schemper added that the analysis for the variance did not include a full review of the history of use on the property as she does not see any letter of development rights determination or letter of understanding previously done on this property. However, staff did a quick review of permits under this parcel ID number. Parcel ID numbers can change and she has seen evidence that at one time or another, this portion of the property may have been combined with the portion to the north and south. On page two of the staff report, the simple search that was done shows that in 1996 a building permit was issued for a fence for upland security only, and the permit specifically stated no authorization for storage. In 2003, an application was submitted for a power pole for underground power facility with a meter. The permit was never issued and a note in the file showed that it was because there was no principal use established. In 2018, a permit was issued for a new electric pole service to feed a security camera and one light, and it was specifically noted in the permit that Planning did not review it and it did not authorize any change of use. If there was history on this parcel that supported the existing use and supported its current configuration, if it had been there continuously and in the setbacks, it would be considered lawfully nonconforming to the setbacks and the variance wouldn't be needed unless they were doing something that triggered them coming into compliance such as a substantial

improvement. If the applicant believes there is an error in the analysis of whether it is a permitted use then that can be discussed afterwards but is separate from this variance request.

Chair Scarpelli asked if the office building would count as a substantial improvement to the property which would trigger compliance. Ms. Schemper stated that could be correct. Staff had found that officially, this is a vacant piece of property and looked at it as a brand new application with a new use. Mr. Morris added that he believes there has been a potential conflation in this back-and-forth that if there needs to be a finding or determination of the establishment of a lawful use as a predicate to considering a variance, there are processes for that in the Land Development Code such as a pre-application conference with a letter of understanding, or to apply for a vested rights determination from an Administrative Law Judge for recognition of a lawful nonconformity. This variance request seems to be morphing into an informal legal recognition that something has been there for an amount of time, and this is not the appropriate format for that type of finding. Ms. Juvier stated that Planning had been the one who recommended the variance in order to get the plans approved for the office, which have been in the system since 2019, two years, and she is still not close to building the office. Chair Scarpelli explained that staff is here to review what she provides them. There are people in the county that can help her navigate through these types of situations. There may be other avenues that can be explored besides trying to get a variance for setbacks.

Ms. Schemper explained that she is assuming staff let this owner know they would need a variance to put in the building and the gravel storage containers because of the evidence found in their review. If the applicant thinks there is additional information that changes that, it can be submitted, but staff did not see approvals for this use. Therefore, it needs to go through the approval process and in order to get approval for this layout, it needs a setback variance. She would not want to push the applicant to apply for another big process if staff is fairly confident it won't come up with anything, but that is still not the question today. The question is not whether the use is lawfully established at the site. The question at this time is if they want a permit for this layout, they need a variance to the setbacks. Commissioner Wiatt added that the Commission is only looking at the building and nothing else with respect to this variance. Chair Scarpelli noted that the variance also includes that these structures are in the setbacks which is why she needs the reduction. Ms. Juvier stated that the gravel is being categorized as storage and that's why she needs the reduction on the setbacks to keep the storage. The building is actually within the setbacks and will be fine. The only issue is the gravel storage. Chair Scarpelli interjected that the building is also in part of the setbacks. Mr. Aitken clarified that in the southwest corner, the building would be within the setback by five feet. Ms. Schemper detailed that the request is for a variance to the front yard and side yard for the storage bins, and to the southwest for the building.

Commissioner Demes stated he was ready to wrap this up. Getting back to the basics and listening to everything here, he is ready to move for disapproval. Chair Scarpelli added that he thought there would be a different way to configure the site, but that this variance, as is, cannot be approved. Ms. Juvier asked if parking could be put on the setbacks, and Ms. Schemper responded that someone would call her within the next two days on that question.

**Motion: Commissioner Demes made a motion to deny. Commissioner Wiatt seconded the motion. There was no opposition. The motion passed unanimously.**

**5. AN ORDINANCE BY THE MONROE COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS** ADOPTING AMENDMENTS TO THE MONROE COUNTY LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE TO AMEND: CHAPTER 114, ARTICLE I, SECTION 114-2 “LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARDS” TO UPDATE STORMWATER QUALITY PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND TO CORRECT A SCRIVENER’S ERROR; SECTION 114-3 “SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT CRITERIA” TO REQUIRE NET IMPROVEMENT IN STORMWATER QUALITY WHILE PROVIDING FLEXIBILITY IN ACHIEVING STORMWATER QUALITY STANDARDS AND PROVIDE UPDATES TO THE STORMWATER MANUAL AND LAYMAN’S BROCHURE TO INCORPORATE NEW APPROACHES FOR MANAGING STORMWATER; SECTION 114-13 “FENCES” TO REFINE CODE LANGUAGE TO BETTER CLARIFY REQUIREMENTS AND PROVIDE CRITERIA FOR RETAINING WALLS; SECTION 114-46 “POTABLE WATER CONSERVATION STANDARDS” TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL CONSERVATION INCENTIVES; CHAPTER 114, ARTICLE IV “LANDSCAPING” AND ARTICLE V “SCENIC CORRIDOR AND BUFFERYARDS” TO REFINE CODE LANGUAGE TO BETTER CLARIFY REQUIREMENTS, UPDATE LISTS OF SPECIES, PROVIDE ADDITIONAL LANDSCAPE INCENTIVES, AND PROVIDE ADDITIONAL CRITERIA FOR DISTRICT BOUNDARY BUFFERS, SCENIC CORRIDORS AND MAJOR STREET BUFFERS; SECTION 114-163 “WATERFRONT LIGHTING” TO REFINE CODE LANGUAGE TO BETTER CLARIFY REQUIREMENTS; AND, SECTION 114-164 “NONCONFORMING LIGHTING” TO REFINE CODE LANGUAGE TO BETTER CLARIFY REQUIREMENTS; 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 AND INCORPORATION IN THE MONROE COUNTY LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE; PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE. (FILE 2019-183)

(11:07 a.m.) Mr. Mike Roberts, Assistant Director, Environmental Resources, presented the staff report. The Planning Commission had originally heard these amendments at the April 28 meeting. Following staff presentation, public comment and Board discussion, the Commissioners made several recommendations to staff. Those recommendations were evaluated and some revisions were made as requested. Part of the discussion was on scenic corridor and buffer yards, and potable water supply. None of those items had been advertised in the public meeting process for the code amendments so, on advice of counsel, those amendments need to be withdrawn from this proposal. Therefore, Article V, Scenic Corridor and Buffer Yards, and Section 114-46 Potable Water Conservation Standards, are being withdrawn from this request and will be processed separately in the future. Commissioner Demes confirmed that this was in reference to items five and six in the Planning Commission Summary.

Mr. Roberts stated that he had parsed out the specific items that the Commission discussed rather than go back through the entire amendment but if there are portions of the chapter the Commission would like to revisit, staff is amenable to that. As to references to levels of service, there had been some comment that the code should reference the applicable State Statute or



Florida Administrative Code, and staff has added that reference which is 62-302.500. There was discussion on fences, walls and height. Currently, the code requires highest finished elevation. Staff's recommendation was lowest existing grade. The Commission's recommendation was to remain the same and measure from the highest finished elevation, so staff has made that change. In 114-100, there is a restriction on the use of turf in parking lot landscaping. The Commission asked for that restriction to be removed and staff has complied.

The remaining sections that are grayed out are sections discussed at length, but are either in Article V or they are part of the Water Conservation Standards and will not be pursued at this time. Prior to reaching the determination that the amendments should be withdrawn, staff did make comments or revisions with regard to cisterns in Item C. Staff is proposing, for when these items are revisited, in addition to the low-impact development strategies in 114-100, the addition of managed cisterns or rain barrels may be incorporated into the site's stormwater management facilities, and the site's stormwater retention requirements may be reduced by the capacity volume of plumbed managed systems that provide irrigation and/or other non-potable applications. Primarily, when discussing the addition of cisterns or other alternative water supply containers, staff wanted to ensure that rather than winding up with a situation where somebody built a rain barrel and got credit for it and then it either filled up and became a mosquito nursery or was removed, staff wanted to make sure that this is a plumbed and managed system that would get that credit. Then the buffer yard standards, plants should be evenly distributed in the buffer yard and that the purpose of the buffer was to visibly separate one use from another and to shield or block noise, lights or other nuisances. That is the definition from 101.1. These particular amendments and recommendations are not being pursued at this time and are part of the code amendments that are being withdrawn from this amendment at this time. There was some discussion for potable water conservation and again, this was the same criteria where a cistern was subject to being plumbed and managed. At this time, staff is recommending approval of the proposed amendment as revised to incorporate Planning Commission recommendations, and to remove amendments to Article V, and Section 114-46.

Chair Scarpelli asked for public comment. There was none. Public comment was closed. Chair Scarpelli asked for Commission discussion. Chair Scarpelli asked if a stormwater retention sheet for residents to do their own stormwater calculations would be provided. Mr. Roberts responded that that was absolutely correct, and it would be developed and available to the public prior to. Commissioner Wiatt noted staff had done a good job incorporating some of the previous concerns and questions.

**Motion: Commissioner Demes made a motion to approve, recognizing the removal of Article II and Article V. Commissioner Wiatt seconded the motion. There was no opposition. The motion passed unanimously.**

### **BOARD DISCUSSION**

There was no further Board discussion.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

The Monroe County Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 11:20 a.m.