MINUTES OF THE COLLIER COUNTY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES ADVISORY COMMITTEE LAND DEVELOPMENT REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

Naples, Florida, May 25, 2022

LET IT BE REMEMBERED, the Collier County Development Services Advisory Committee-LDR Subcommittee, in and for the County of Collier, having conducted business herein, met on this date at 1:00 P.M. in SPECIAL SESSION at the Collier County Growth Management Department Building, Conference Room #609/610, 2800 N. Horseshoe Drive, Naples, Florida, with the following members present:

Chairman: Clay Brooker
Robert Mulhere
Mark McLean
Jeff Curl
Blair Foley

ALSO PRESENT: Richard Henderlong, Principal Planner
Eric Johnson, LDC Planning Manager
Sean Kingston, Senior Planner
Zachary Karto, Principal Planner
Ellen Summers, Hole Montes Inc.

Any persons in need of the verbatim record of the meeting may request a copy of the audio recording from the Collier County Growth Management Department.

1. Call to Order - Chairman

Chairman Brooker called the special meeting to order at 1 p.m. A quorum consisting of five members was convened.

2. Approval of Agenda

Mr. Curl made a motion to approve the agenda. Second by Mr. Foley. Carried unanimously, 5-0.

3. Old Business

Mr. Foley said he wanted to talk about the landscape issue and SDPI they talked about at the full DSAC meeting earlier this month, when they agreed it would come back:

- He spoke with Mark Templeton on some issues, such as the length of the SDPI.
- There was some discussion that the length of the SDPI was three years and was an extension of what SDP lengths are, or SDPAs.
- There's been thought that there is no expiration to an SDPI because nothing is written on the document or evident in the Land Development Code.
- When there are landscape issues, how do we handle those?
- Is there a timeframe?
- A DSAC discussion suggested it might be beneficial to have a separate process. We have too many processes and don't need to promulgate more rules or LDC amendments.
- It's the right mechanism to review landscaping because SDPIs are an extension of SDPs or SDPAs, so they require landscape plans.
- He has an issue with arbitrarily selecting how long it should take, so we could consider putting stipulations in SDPI letters; they're common in SDP and SDPA letters.
- Is the conservation easement recorded before the CO or before the pre-construction meeting?
- Stipulations are usually driven by staff only, without any input from applicants, which is a concern because landscape improvements could be minor or take much longer.
- This subcommittee needs to come up with recommendations.

Mr. Johnson said the reason we didn't put it on this meeting's agenda is because staff wanted to look into it more and provide some more backup material. He left a detailed voicemail for Jeff today, indicating that staff is going to meet, collaborate and possibly schedule this for the June 15th meeting.

A discussion ensued and the following points were made:

- This occurs a lot and it's going to happen more often.
- Oak trees that were planted in late 1999 and 2000-2005, are now destroying curbing and sidewalks because they were planted up against houses, literally within five feet of a garage.
- This can be discussed at the next meeting and staff can provide options.
- Staff will meet with Code Enforcement and Zoning staff to come up with more information in order to have a more intelligent future discussion.

Mr. McLean said he has a conflict of interest and can't vote on 4.a.i., Offsite Boat Storage, and also has to leave at 1:30 pm. He asked to hear the second item first.

Mr. Johnson said his fear is that they won't have a quorum later in this meeting and won't have a quorum for item No. 1 if they switch.
Mr. Mulhere noted that No. 1 had been around for a long time and they could continue it to the June 15 meeting.
Mr. Foley said they should stick with the agenda order the way it was approved.

4. New Business

a. LDC Amendments

i. PL20210000766 – Off-Site Boat Storage in C-4

[Ellen Summers, Senior Planner, Hole Montes)

Mr. Johnson said a two-page document in the agenda packet details this privately initiated amendment and the petitioner is here to give a presentation.

Mr. Mulhere said he submitted a recusal form at the prior meeting and is re-submitting it now. He asked Ms. Summers from his office to go through a brief PowerPoint presentation. He has at least one comment on the staff version in front of DSAC-LDR.

Ms. Summers said this privately initiated Land Development Code amendment is related to offsite boat storage and to amend LDC section 5.05.02, supplemental standards for specific uses:

- We're ultimately seeking to permit offsite boatyards and storage of boats, boat trailers, and other vessels in relation to or in conjunction with a marina or a public boat-ramp facility.
- They would only be permitted if certain conditions are met.
- Her client has a C-4 property and has been working to get this use developed for five or six years.
- In 2017, they submitted for a Zoning Verification Letter and the ZVL said they need to go through a Comparable -Use Determination.
- The next year, they applied for the Comparable-Use Determination and because marinas are subject to Manatee Protection Plans, they were informed new marinas would not be permitted due to MPP and siting requirements at this location.
- This current request was submitted around this time last year, after they were asked to add outdoor storage yards to C-4 Zoning Districts, limiting them to boats, boat trailers and trailer vessels. The amendment request has evolved after working with stall and their client.

Mr. Foley stated that the Manatee Protection Plan in 2018 said this wouldn't be allowed and asked, How do you sit with the requirement today?

Ms. Summers said it's been determined for this type of use, it would not be required as it's not a marina, located on the water. We can't really require adjustments and a Manatee-Protection Plan for a site that's not on the water.

Mr. Mulhere said C-5 allows it, but C-4 does not and the Manatee Protection Plan doesn't apply to boat storage yards, just sites with direct water access. It doesn't even apply to a boat ramp for people coming to a park and removing a boat from a trailer.

Mr. Johnson said staff determined it's not subject to the Manatee Protection Plan.

Ms. Summers said the Land Development Code is set up for a list of permitted uses. Marinas are identified with an SIC code under the list of permitted uses, which also lists boatyards, boat storage, and those types of uses within the SIC code website. The Land Development Code defines marinas as subject to the Manatee Protection Plan, which caused the complication.

Mr. Johnson said to clarify, the public boat ramp is a different property than the one Mr. Mulhere is representing. The offsite storage of boats on the subject site does not trigger MPP requirements.

Mr. Mulhere said there are limitations on that marina that are imposed by the Manatee Protection Plan that do not apply to a boat ramp because they can't control how many boats people drop off at a boat ramp. They apply to wet slips and dry slips at a marina and are the limitations of the Manatee Protection Plan. When there's a boat ramp, you can have high demand or low demand. The one on 951 has very high demand. We had Tim Hall prepare an analysis and staff agreed.

Mr. Foley said the point of bringing it up was to put it on the record. The points were clear. It looked like you had a problem in 2018, but you don't have it now.

Mr. Mulhere said the mistake we made that we should do a Comparable-Use Application, comparing the use to a marina because it's similar to a marina, but it's not a marina because it's not on the water. We were 1½ years to two years into the process when it was decided that the MPP would apply and that no more impacts under the MPP could occur in this location. They have a limit on wet and dry slips. That's what the LDC amendment said.

Mr. Johnson read 3.2 of the Marina Siting of the Manatee Protection Plan, second paragraph: "For the purposes of this plan, marina facilities include wet-slip marinas, boatyards with water access and multi-slip residential facilities. Dry-storage facilities are only considered in this plan if they have water frontage and the capability of launching vessels into those waters."

Ms. Summers said at the subject site, at Port of The Islands, which is far down on the East Trail, it is within C-4 zoning, and noted the following zoning on their slide:

- Blue areas are Residential Districts.
- The property east of the subject site is zoned Residential-Tourist.
- Marinas are a conditional use within that zoning district.
- To the South, about 450 feet from the subject site, is RMF-12 Zoning District.
- The green area is Agriculturally Zoned lands.
- The LDC amendment proposes 660 feet from the corner of the subject site's property line to the corner of the property line where the public boat ramp is located.

Mr. Mulhere said half of the middle piece closest to the RMF-12 District, a piece below the subject site, is owned by the County and zoned C-4.

Ms. Summers said they're amending the marina section of the code to establish:

- It's basically a parking lot area.
- It's re-titled to Marinas and Boat-Launching Facilities, so it won't strictly be related to marinas.
- A new section to allow offsite boatyards, storage of boats, boat trailers and other types of related vehicles or vessels, but only in connection with a marina or an existing public boat-ramp facility.
- It allows the parking area/storage area to be off-site.

- A required Site Development Plan to show what marina or public boat ramp this new construction relates to.
- It is not subject to Manatee Protection Plan requirements.
- It is only related to the non-contiguous lot for which the use is being developed on.
- Use of this boat yard is limited to the C-4 Zoning District and will require Conditional-Use Approval through the Board of Zoning Appeals.
- Additionally, to increase the mail-notice requirements were proposed by staff for this type of conditional use. Typically, mail-notice requirements for Conditional Use are 500 feet within an urban area (that may have gone up to a mile in the Estates and 1,000 feet for all others).
    - Many of these standards will get reviewed at the Conditional-Use time.
    - The non-contiguous lot cannot be located farther than 660 feet from a marina or boat-launching facility as measured from property line to property line and demonstrated on the SDP.
- In consideration of the other residentially zoned districts, this lot shall be no closer than 100 feet from a residentially zoned parcel, excluding the Residential-Tourist District, which permits marinas as a conditional use.

Ms. Summers continued, stating the following:

- This non-contiguous lot has a roadway separating off-site storage from the marina/boat ramp.
- This is only permitted if the roadway is a local and not a collector or arterial roadway that separates the off-site lot with a marina or public boat ramp.
- The zoned building height for principal and accessory structures will have a maximum-height of 35 feet, which is more restrictive than the 75-foot for the C-4 District requirement.
- The 35-foot height is also related to vessels that are onsite for storage and goes beyond structures.
- The minimum setback requirement is 20 feet from property lines, with a 25-foot setback from the public street.
- An additional screening provision requires an opaque wall or fence, 8 feet in height or less, with an exception for necessary ingress and egress.
- There will be a second row of trees staggered with the existing first row required by the Landscaping Code section.
- Tree heights have a minimum height of 14 feet, which is above the code requirement of 10 feet at time of installation and spacing requirements are no more than 30 feet on center

Ms. Summers said the last provision is to ensure it is not construed to be any type of junk or scrap yard or salvage operation, and the amendment is intended for boat trailers and vessels in active use and not in disrepair.

Mr. Mulhere said he spoke to Eric about the height restriction on the storage of vessel structures. We have no problem limiting that to 35 feet. But the way this is written means my client, with a C-4 property, can't build any of the other permitted uses that aren't restricted above 35 feet, which doesn't make sense. The height and zoning district for any permitted use is 75 feet. If you want to restrict this new use, we don't have an objection. We have an objection to anything that could be construed to restrict the height of any currently permitted use. This is all under the Conditional-Use for boat storage. It should read: "Zoning for a building associated with the storage of boat trailers, trailer vessels or other related vehicles on the non-contiguous lot shall not exceed 35 feet."

Mr. Curl said absolutely.

Mr. Johnson said he has no problem with that language.

Mr. Brooker said inclusive of the boat, so if you have a boat rack and put a 34-foot Contender on the top of the rack, that's a 12-foot structure of a boat.

Mr. Mulhere said his client only intends surface storage that might affect someone else.

Mr. Curl said he agreed with Clay. How do you measure the boat? Do we count the GPS and antennas?

Mr. Brooker said the structure of the rack itself should be no higher than 35 feet and you can put a boat on top of that.

Mr. McLean asked what if you built a 75-foot structure to store boats?

Mr. Mulhere said you can't. You're limited to 35 feet.

Mr. McLean said you could still do a three-story boat storage and stack boats.

Mr. Mulhere said it says structures, so we just strike through "inclusive of the boats, boat trailers, trailer vessels or other related vehicles," and if you say, "associated with the storage of boats, boat trailers, trailer vessels and other related vehicles," that's fine and limits it to 35 feet. Those are the uses allowed under this Conditional-Use process. The other issue that was raised was the 1,000-foot public notice requirement. Someone suggested we should notify everybody in the developments on that side of the street. There aren't many on the other side, but there are a lot of condos, single-family homes, and residents at the end.

He doesn't object to that and gave a resident his word that they'd notify everybody. Eric proposed a revised notice requirement of one mile. There is really no one within a mile, other than residents living there. We did research on the number of C-4 parcels in Collier County adjacent to a marina or a boat ramp that could take advantage of this.

Mr. Johnson said the way it's worded, this parcel and the one to the south are the only affected parcels.

Mr. Mulhere said it's overkill. We excluded the City of Marco and the City of Naples. We looked at unincorporated Collier County, including Goodland. There may have been a potential lot there.

Mr. Johnson said there is a lot in Chokoloskee. You've included the Residential-Tourist District and that closed the loop on that one.

Mr. Mulhere said there are not a lot of uses that are going to occur on a C-4 Zoned piece of property at Port of the Islands. When we met with the residents two or three years ago, many asked to let them know when it's coming because they want to put their boats there. This is going to reduce the volume of traffic trailering vessels on U.S. 41 to get to this boat ramp. Some people will store their boats there.

The County has a Comprehensive Plan policy that says the County will maximize the opportunities for the public to access navigable waters. This furthers that it is an appropriate use in this location and has many restrictions placed on it.

Mr. Johnson said that because this is a privately initiated amendment, staff would have to make a recommendation. It's not one that's directed by the Board.

Mr. Curl said the double-row tree landscape buffer basically puts trees 15 feet on center. It's too dense.

Mr. Mulhere said that occurred because neighbors were concerned with the two sides they see as they drive by, on the east and north along 41, and the entry road. They wanted an enhanced buffer. There is no reason to put an enhanced buffer between C-4 and C-4, or against agricultural land to the west.

Mr. Curl said it seems like overkill. He worked with a former client on that, but he doesn't own it anymore. He questioned the double row of trees, noting that when trees are overplanted, we have to come back in with tree-removal permits 20 years later. It's unsustainable.

Mr. Mulhere said there isn't room for a hedge in a typical Type-D buffer.

Mr. Curl said there is enough room on a Type-D buffer, but that the hedge requirement is 36 inches tall.

Mr. Mulhere said what if we did a Type-B hedge, 60-inch, which would provide more screening?

Mr. Curl said in a Type B-buffer, trees are spaced 25 feet, versus 30 feet on a Type-D buffer, so maybe it's a Type D modified. A double row of trees is not going to work for a period of over five years.

Mr. Mulhere said he'll take his advice on that and hopefully staff will. Instead of a double row of trees, we can go with a 60-inch row of hedges at the time of planting.

Mr. Curl said a Type B Buffer is a good model.

Mr. Johnson asked if he's proposing a 60-inch hedge.

Mr. Curl said a D Buffer is one tree every 30 feet. A 2-foot hedge at the time of planting needs to be 36 inches. He also suggests that same row of trees, potentially at 25 feet on center, like a Type B Buffer, with a 60-inch hedge, as in a Type-B buffer. That 60-inch hedge would be 4 feet on center.

Mr. Johnson confirmed that they wanted a 60-inch hedge, as well as trees that are 14-feet tall at installation, 25 feet on center.

Mr. Mulhere said it needs to say, "Where a Type B Buffer is required." That's any yard that's adjacent to a right-of-way. The buffer shall include 14-foot trees spaced 25 feet on center and a minimum 10-gallon, 60-inch-tall hedge at time of planting.

Mr. Curl disapproved of the requirement. If it's 35 feet tall, people will want security lighting. It should be full cut-off, so it shines down, not out. No flood packs on the side shining toward residential units immediately to the south.

Mr. Mulhere said Norm provided Dark Sky Compliant language, fully shielded, and he can adhere to that.

Ms. Summers said they're going through a Conditional-Use process and there are other standards.

Mr. McLean advised against using the term, "Dark Sky Compliant." From an architectural standpoint, it only allows for a handful of light fixtures.

Mr. Johnson asked about wall packs.

Mr. Curl said that's because they shine horizontally.

Mr. McLean said there is other verbiage they could use.

Mr. Mulhere said onsite lighting should be shielded and directed so it won't have spillage on adjacent properties.

Mr. Curl said if neighbors are going to get involved, he understands the double row of trees might come back and he'd yield to that.

Mr. McLean said he must abstain or vote no, and it would be a conflict for him to vote no, so he will abstain.

[Mr. McLean left the meeting at 1:39 p.m.]

A discussion ensued about the prior condition requiring an opaque fence or a wall:

- Within a certain distance of a right-of-way, it needs to be screened.
- The LDC requires at least a 7-foot-tall fence or wall.
- This is a commercially zoned property, so the maximum height of a fence is 8 feet.
- The intent is to screen the chain-link fence from the public's view and to place landscaping on the outside so the fence/wall is obscured from motorists.
- That's also under Type-B Buffer language.

A discussion ensued about the one-mile public notice requirement versus 1,000 or 500 feet:

- The public notification area for these properties would normally be 500 feet.
- This amendment only deals with two properties, but doesn't preclude others from rezoning a property to C-4 to receive this benefit.
- The one-mile public notification requirement will capture all properties on Newport Drive.
- The distance from the subject parcel to the bottom of the entire developed area is more than 1,000 feet and more than one-quarter mile, about 3,000 feet; a mile is 5,280 feet. A mile public notification requirement is used elsewhere in the LDC.
- Mr. Mulhere already committed to notifying all the area residents.
- This applies to other potential properties, one of which the County owns.

- The one-mile notification ensures they reach all the people affected because this isn't as populated as other urban areas.
- If there is an HOA, the HOA would notify condo owners.
- Developers are required to notify everyone within a PUD depending on whether you're amending the PUD and the scope of that amendment.
- If you're an adjacent C-4 property near a PUD you're only required to notify the people within the prescribed distance.

Mr. Johnson said they came up with one mile as the requirement, because they needed to come up with a definitive number, something that was more objective and not "at the discretion of the County manager or designee," because that would have raised legal concerns. One mile captures all properties at the south end of this development.

Mr. Brooker recalled a previous DSAC meeting about whether the County needs to expand the public notification distance for properties in the Estates, and he expressed a concern about the future of public noticing to other types of applications.

Mr. Johnson: Staff recommends that the DSAC subcommittee recommend approval of the petition, subject to changing that one item from 1,000 feet to one mile; that the Neighborhood Information Meeting that is associated with the Conditional-Use Application shall occur between November 1st and April 1st; and that a Letter of No-Objection from the Public Services Department shall be required as part of the Conditional-Use Process, not as part of the Land Development Code process, to ensure that associated impacts will not cause the public boat ramp to fall below an acceptable level of service.

Mr. Curl said he's against all of that, calling it onerous.

Mr. Mulhere said it's overkill. Why would they be treated any differently? He'll agree, but you cannot say you have to get a Letter of No Objection. You can notify them, and they can show up and say they don't support it. But if they're to be part of the review process for Conditional Use, send them the application. He could then talk to them. If their objection makes no sense, wouldn't he get the right to argue against it?

Mr. Foley said he's also against all three. We already have a commitment from the applicant that he's going to notify everyone. As an engineer with Site Development Plans, we often have to obtain Letters of No Objection. He advises clients to avoid any impact that would require getting a Notice of No Objection because we can't get one. If we do, we don't know what it's based on. It is onerous. If you want it in the review process, it's easy to include them.

Mr. Brooker asked Mr. Johnson to explain the third bullet point from staff's perspective.

Mr. Johnson said the petitioner is getting a use that would not ordinarily be allowed on the subject site, C-4, which does not allow for boatyards. He noted that:

- It allows for an indoor storage facility.
- If the petitioner wanted to have air-conditioned indoor storage of boats, they would go through a Conditional-Use process.
- Within a certain distance from the subject site, there is a County facility, a public boat ramp, and this property owner is getting a benefit from such facility.

- Staff wants to ensure that the public boat ramp could accommodate any additional boats that may be using the facility.
- A Letter of No Objection is another way of saying that the Public Services Department, which oversees the Parks & Recreation Department, is OK with the Land Development Code amendment and, subsequently, the conditional use.
- If there is an objection from the Public Services Department, they can communicate with us, and they also want a petitioner to communicate with them.

Mr. Brooker asked if staff would be amenable to simply notifying the Public Services Department of a conditional use application under this particular provision, so that they can be given the opportunity to comment.

Mr. Johnson confirmed it would be acceptable.

A discussion ensued and the following points were made:

- A Letter of No Objection wields a lot of power.
- The Public Services Department could be notified about Conditional-Use Applications under this provision so it can comment. Requiring a Letter of No Objection is a problem. Mr. Mulhere met with the Public Services administrator, who did not have an objection. It was revealed to Mr. Mulhere that the current boat ramp may require repairs at some point. Mr. Mulhere opined that repair to the boat ramp should be paid for by taxes, and he suggested that the amendment, as proposed, gives the County the leverage to ask a petitioner to make repairs to the boat ramp. Mr. Mulhere opined that the vast majority of boat traffic using the boat ramp is already using the boat ramp.
- These standards are not applicable to and do not restrict public boat ramps (Collier County assets).
- There is no definition in the LDC related to "boat launching facility."
- LDC amendments do not require public notification to specific segments of the population and cited the LDC amendment that was applicable to Goodland as an example of one such LDC amendment that garnered much public interest. Mr. Mulhere reminded the Subcommittee that he is proposing the boat storage as a conditional use. Mr. Brooker responded by saying that the LDC amendment involving Goodland was also proposed as a conditional use. Mr. Henderlong clarified that the LDC amendment for Goodland was proposed for an Overlay and not specific to a subject property. He said the Board of County Commissioners requested the Conditional Use to come back (as a companion to LDC amendment) in order to get the additional public notice. Mr. Brooker acknowledged that the subject LDC amendment before the Subcommittee could potentially be applicable countywide and drew a definite distinction between the shellfish amendment and this proposed LDC amendment. Mr. Brooker rhetorically asked whether the public on the Port of the Islands would be interested in this LDC amendment if they were notified about it.
- The intent of the subject LDC amendment is to prohibit a non-contiguous C-4 zoned lot from developing into a boat storage if such site is located within 100 feet from a residentially zoned parcel, including residential parcels in PUDs. The only zoning district excluded from the "residentially zoned parcel" is the RT. Mr. Brooker was in favor of including language in the LDC amendment to help clarify the 100-foot separation from any parcel in a PUD upon which residential development can occur (excluding RT).
- Mr. Brooker commented about the applicant's justification (Exhibit B) regarding the Manatee Protection Plan, specifically the statement of not increasing usage of the boat ramp.

- This client intends to use the site for surface boat storage. Mr. Johnson commented about including the vessels in the height measurement (as it relates to maximum height) to minimize visual impacts. Mr. Brooker felt that boat lifts will not lift large boats due to the possibility of both falling over and that that including the vessels in the maximum height limitation in the LDC amendment could create Code Enforcement issues. Ms. Summers questioned if there is such a height limitation applicable to boat sales, which are also conditional uses in the C-4.
- If boats are stored within an air-conditioned building, then the use would qualify as a conditional use in the C-4 and be eligible for a 75-foot-tall building. Mr. Mulhere suggested changing it so that any multi-tiered storage shall be within a full enclosed structure. Mr. Johnson clarified that boat storage can occur inside a 75-foot-tall building in the C-4 as a conditional use and commented about no public notice requirements for privately-initiated LDC amendment, except through the stakeholder email distribution list.

Mr. Brooker made a motion to recommend approval of the LDC amendment with the following revisions:

1) Eliminate "boat launching facilities" as a term, maybe just call it "marinas and off-site boat yards";

2) Clarify LDC section 5.05.02 A., where it states, "These standards are not applicable to public boat ramps," so we understand exactly what is meant by it;

3) Indicate under LDC section 5.05.02 G.5., the zoned building height of all principal and accessory structures associated with the off-site boat storage shall be limited to 35 feet. Eliminate the "inclusive of boats" language;

4) Clarify under LDC section 5.05.02 G.7 that the screening, either the wall or fence goes on the inside (or landward/lot line side vs. streetside) of the required vegetation;

5) Under LDC section 5.05.02 G.8., eliminate the double row of trees in favor of a single row, all of which 25 feet on center, and hedges to be 60 inches in height (10- to 15-gallon containers, depending on what the "B" Buffer requirements says) on the outside of the fencing here

6) Any lighting on the premises shall be shielded so as not spill upon adjoining properties or beyond the property lines; and

7) Everything else in the LDC amendment as proposed by the applicant remains and the three bullet point recommendations by staff are not recommended in my motion.

Mr. Foley seconded it. The motion passed 3-0; Mr. Mulhere abstained.

Mr. Johnson said this item is scheduled for the June 1 DSAC meeting and they will have to incorporate those changes at that time.

[Mr. Mulhere and Mr. Foley left the meeting at 2:17 p.m., leaving no quorum.]

ii. Discussion of Automobile Parking for Single-Family Dwelling Units
This item was moved to the June 15 meeting due to lack of a quorum.

Mr. Johnson introduced Zach Karto, who took over Mr. Johnson's former position as principal planner.

5. Public Comments

None

6. Adjourn
Next meeting dates:
September 21, 2022
December 14, 2022

There being no further business for the good of the County, the meeting was adjourned by the order of the chair at 2:21 p.m.

COLLIER COUNTY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES ADVISORY COMMITTEE
LAND DEVELOPMENT REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE

Clay Brooker

Chairman: Clay Brooker

These minutes were approved by the subcommittee/chairman on Aug 3, 2022, (check one) as presented ✓, or as amended _____.