

August 18, 2011

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MEETING OF THE
COLLIER COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Naples, Florida, August 18, 2011

LET IT BE REMEMBERED, that the Collier County Planning Commission, in and for the County of Collier, having conducted business herein, met on this date at 8:30 a.m. in REGULAR SESSION in Building "F" of the Government Complex, East Naples, Florida, with the following member present:

CHAIRMAN: Mark Strain
Melissa Ahern
Donna Reed-Caron
Diane Ebert
Karen Homiak
Barry Klein
Paul Midney
Brad Schiffer

ALSO PRESENT:

Heidi Ashton, Assistant County Attorney
Jamie French, Growth Management Division/Planning & Regulation
Ray Bellows, Zoning Manager
Thomas Eastman, Real Property Director, CC School District

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Good morning, everyone. Welcome to the August 18th meeting of the Collier County Planning Commission.

If you'll all please rise for pledge of allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance was recited in unison.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, will the secretary please do the roll call.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Mr. Eastman?

MR. EASTMAN: Here.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Ms. Ahern?

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Here.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Mr. Schiffer?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I'm here.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Mr. Midney is absent or not here, I don't know which.

Ms. Caron?

COMMISSIONER CARON: Here.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: He'll probably come in late.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Mr. Strain?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Here.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Ms. Homiak is here.

Ms. Ebert?

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Here.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: And Mr. Klein?

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Here.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Thank you.

***Addenda to the agenda. I guess now is as good a time as any to discuss Item 9.A.

We're not going to be calling it because the petitioner's here to request a continuance.

Mr. Mulhere?

MR. MULHERE: Thank you, Mr. Strain.

Yes, we were unable to get with the bank, which was the reason that we continued in the first place, and schedule a meeting. We do have one scheduled. It's tomorrow. And we did send them a rendering, a couple of -- and a conceptual site plan so they could have a chance to review that before we meet with him. So we're meeting tomorrow, I think it's at 10:30 or 11:00, and so we respectfully request that we be continued so we continue to work with them.

We'd like to come back on September 1st, which doesn't require readvertising yet at this point, so --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, anybody have any concerns?

COMMISSIONER CARON: No, I'll make that motion.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I'll second it.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion made by Ms. Caron, seconded by Mr. Schiffer.

Discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: All in favor, signify by saying aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

COMMISSIONER CARON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

MR. MULHERE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion carries 8-0 (sic).

Thank you, Bob.

***Okay, Planning Commission absences. Our next meeting is September 1st. Does anybody know if they're not going to be here?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, looks like we'll have a quorum.

***Approval of minutes. We received the July 21st, 2011 minutes electronically.

Anybody have any corrections, additions or changes to the minutes?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: If not, is there a motion to approve?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I'll make that motion.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Made by Commissioner Schiffer.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Second.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Seconded by Commissioner Homiak.

Discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: All in favor, signify by saying aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

COMMISSIONER CARON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: The motion carries 8-0 (sic).

***Ray, any BCC report?

MR. BELLOWS: No report, since the Board of County Commissioners is on vacation.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Yeah, it's been quiet.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Would that be eight or seven? I thought you said --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Oh, seven, you're right, the count of the commission vote. I forgot, Paul isn't here yet.

***Okay, Chairman's report. Nothing new, so we'll just move right into the -- there's no consent agenda item, so we're right into the remaining advertised public hearings.

Just so the record's clear, the first public hearing, which was PUDA-PL2011-703, the Pine Ridge Center West PUD --

(At which time, Commissioner Midney enters the board room.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: -- was continued until September 1st.

***The next item up is -- actually, these two are going to be heard -- we'll discuss them together; I'll read them for the record together. They happen to be adjoining PUDs. They're coming in for some joint interconnections. Two of the PUDs we'll be discussing are PDI-PL2011-0462, Bucks Run PUD. And PDI-PL2011-0794, the Mission Church PUD.

All those wishing to testify on behalf of this item, please rise to be sworn in by the court reporter.

(Speakers were duly sworn.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Discussion on the part of Planning Commission.

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I had an e-mail from Michael Fernandez's office requesting a meeting, but after reading the documents there really wasn't a need to have a meeting, so we didn't.

Michael, it's all yours.

MR. FERNANDEZ: Good morning, Commissioners. Michael Fernandez, representing the Diocese of Venice.

As you can see, this is a relatively minor amendment. It's a -- just an amendment to the master plan. Both churches are now owned; both parcels are owned by the same entity. The Diocese purchased the property to the north. And what we're doing is just facilitating an interconnection between the two properties for vehicular use and for pedestrians. And we're doing it compliant for fire access as well.

This will facilitate the movement between the properties. It's something that actually was desired by the county at the time these properties were originally permitted.

So hopefully -- if you have any questions, I'll be happy to answer them, but it's pretty innocuous. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Questions?

Ms. Caron.

COMMISSIONER CARON: Yeah, I had just one, Michael.

When I'm looking at the exhibit for the Mission -- yeah, Mission, are we losing lake area and preserve area? I mean, we've got to be losing preserve area, because that's where you're driving through here now.

MR. FERNANDEZ: We are losing preserve area. However, the requirement for preserves is 15 percent, or 5.33 acres. Even after removal of the preserve area, we'll be in excess of the requirements.

COMMISSIONER CARON: What will you have in the end? I can't read it.

MR. FERNANDEZ: All we're committing to in the PUD is the 15 percent. We didn't modify that. The PUD required 5.33. We will still have 5.33 as a minimum.

But on the SDP, our calculations indicate that we'll be above that requirement. So there's no loss in preserves relative to the zoning document itself.

COMMISSIONER CARON: Okay. And what about the lake area?

MR. FERNANDEZ: The lake areas were conceptual. As it turned out, there aren't any lake areas on the property. Because of the rock elevation we weren't able to build lakes, and so those became water management marshes. Those were permitted by the South Florida Water Management District. We have excess capacity on the property. There's no changes to the water management that's proposed as a result of what we're doing.

COMMISSIONER CARON: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Does anybody else have any questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Thank you, Michael.

MR. FERNANDEZ: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Staff report?

And I'm assuming your presentation was for both PUDs simultaneously?

MR. FERNANDEZ: Yes.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: And maybe you could do the same thing, Nancy.

MS. GUNDLACH: Yes. Good morning, Commissioners. For the record, I'm Nancy Gundlach, Principal Planner with the Department of Land Development Services.

And staff is recommending approval of the Bucks Run PUD and Mission Church PUD PDIs this morning.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Thank you.

Any questions of staff?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I have one.

I notice Nick couldn't be here, he probably had another important engagement, windsurfing or something, but Jamie is.

And the only thing I'd like to ask is that as staff goes through the changes to the admin. code and other documents that are amending the need for a, let's say, a drawn-out public hearing, that they look at issues like this to include in things that can be done administratively.

This is an encouragement by our codes to have interconnections. There is no compatibility issues with their location to surrounding properties outside the properties in which are owned by the applicant. So I

really think that in the future we could save a lot of time and money if we just simply looked at that administratively with those kinds of criteria. And if that applied, I don't -- I mean, I would hope that we could find a way to not bring these things into this kind of a hearing.

So anyway, it's a suggestion. I know you're making a list out, and so maybe you could throw that into the mix.

Any other questions or comments?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, we need to take them both separately. And with all the stipulations that we have, I'll read off the first one and then ask for a motion.

Oh, Ray, are there any public speakers?

MR. BELLOWS: Not on this item.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody in the public wish to speak on this item?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, then we'll close the public hearing, entertain a motion on PDI-PL2011-0462, the Bucks Run PUD.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: I'll make a motion.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Melissa made a motion --

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Second.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: -- to approve, seconded by Commissioner Ebert.

Discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: All in favor, signify by saying aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

COMMISSIONER CARON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: The motion carries 7-0 -- or 8-0, Barry. Paul's here.

Hi, Paul.

The second motion would be on PDI-PL2011-0794, the Mission Church PUD.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: I'll make a motion.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion made by Melissa.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Second.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Seconded by Ms. Ebert.

I'm assuming in all cases the motion is to recommend approval.

With that in mind, all those in favor, signify by saying aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

COMMISSIONER CARON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion carries 8-0.

Cherie', I told you this -- we're going to be moving here today.

So I'm not sure about the next one, though. We got some time on this one.

***So the next item coming up is our last hearing for the day, it's a conditional use. It's CU-PL2011-579, the Garden Street -- it's actually recycling -- or metal collection and transfer station off of Airport Road.

All those wishing to testify on behalf of this item, please rise and be sworn in by the court reporter.

(Speakers were duly sworn.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Disclosures on the part of Planning Commission?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I got the same disclosure I had on the last one with Michael's office by e-mail.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: We received an e-mail I believe from a neighboring property.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I got something in our packet. I'm not sure if it came in e-mail. But yeah, I saw that. Okay, you're right. But that's in the packets as well, I think. Maybe it is.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: I received it I think yesterday.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Did you? Okay.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: It was in the packet too.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Was it?

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: At the bottom.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Michael, it's all yours again.

MR. FERNANDEZ: Good morning, again, Commissioners. It's Michael Fernandez, representing Naples Lumber.

This is an existing property that has been developed. It was developed in about 2000. It's permitted throughout the South Florida Water Management District. It's compliant.

We have gone and looked at the property. It's still consistent with the approvals that were given at the time.

Until fairly recently it was used as a truss plant for Naples Lumber. As you -- let me put the master plan on the viewer.

As you take a look at this master plan, basically we're just overlaying an existing -- the existing survey of the property. There's two large buildings there that are largely open, basically covered areas. And most of the property is impervious. The public park is to the north, facing the roadway. And then there's a perimeter buffer.

To the south of the property there's a Water Management District canal. That's part of the overall water management system for the industrial park.

The improvements that are required to the property to facilitate a relocation of the existing facilities that this -- that the future user has on Shirley Street right now. It's a much smaller facility they'll be relocating here. And in anticipation of future growth, they figure we've got a down turn right now, it's a good time to come back and get ready for the future.

This will allow them to increase their capacity for acceptance of metals and other recycling materials.

This facility will be used as a transfer station. They do know there's a prohibition in our agreement of no shredding. And essentially all the work in terms of shredding and other change of materials, if you will, will be done in their facility, as it is now in Fort Myers. And there they have a large shredder and they process the materials and then ship them out for reuse. So essentially it's a transfer station.

We don't believe that this is any more intensive of a use than other uses in the adjacent areas, and no more intensive than the uses that were on the property previously that did not require a conditional use.

Additionally, the applicant has agreed to additional restrictions, including no outside storage that would be higher than the buffers or walls that are required around the perimeter south of and along the facade of the front building. So to the public, nothing will be in view, other than the structures themselves.

Additionally, they've agreed to add a facade to the front elevation of the building to give it a more architectural appearance, if you will.

The parking will -- the public parking and use areas will remain north or forward of the building. So we believe that those additional restrictions provide for compatibility with adjacent neighbors.

I mentioned that this is the relocation. The existing facility on Shirley Street has been operating under a conditional use since 1993. A search of the records and talking to staff and adjacent neighbor shows that it's been a good neighbor. There was one small blemish on the record relative to signage that was put out, a sandwich sign. It was removed immediately as soon as they were notified that that was in violation.

There's an existing county facility immediately adjacent to their existing facility on Shirley Street that hasn't reported any issues as well.

With that, I'll be happy to address any questions you may have.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Questions of the applicant?

Brad?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Michael, the only concern I have is storing maybe too close to the street. And I know you want to start being able to pile outside storage in line with the front facade, correct?

MR. FERNANDEZ: That's correct. But those areas will be shielded south of that facade and south of those entry gates. In other words, we're going to come back, you can see by the drawing that we've committed to providing the same height buffer. So if it's eight feet, we'll have eight feet of buffer and landscaping that will basically create an enclosure except for the driveway where of course there is no storage.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Right. But wouldn't I be able to look across the parking and see that stuff? I mean, you're going to put it on the -- what would be the eastern and western parking places that you no longer need; is that right?

MR. FERNANDEZ: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I mean, would it be a big problem to move it back a little further? Because it will be visible from the street. I know if you did a straight-on elevation maybe not, but people driving down the street will look across the parking and see it.

MR. FERNANDEZ: We can probably agree to move it back to those first two islands.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Okay. That would be nice.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Brad, just so we get this stipulation right that needs to be added, they're going to move what back to the first two islands?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: There will be no outdoor storage northward of the first island in the parking lots on the east and west boundary.

I mean, if you want to, too, you can move the barrier back there too. Well, that would mess up the island, don't do that.

MR. FERNANDEZ: Well, I think they're going to have security too, and I think that's part of it, so --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Could you point to the location that he's referring to on this master plan?

MR. FERNANDEZ: Here and here.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay.

And I'll let staff figure out -- or probably stipulate that as an addition to the motion, but I'll let staff figure out how to word it so it correlates with the master plan, or maybe show it as a dotted line in addition to the master plan, so it's clear.

MR. FERNANDEZ: If we could just stipulate that it will be located at the island. It's depicted to the east or west. I think that will define it at this time, and that way we don't have to make any changes.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, the only thing I want to make sure that we understand is that through the SDP process I'm not sure these islands have been calculated out through the widths needed to get there, so

--

MR. FERNANDEZ: They are. In fact, those are existing islands right now, and they're to remain.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, good.

Does anybody else have anything?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. My questions, I just got a couple of staff when we get to the staff report. Why don't we do that now then.

Thank you, Michael.

MR. FERNANDEZ: You're welcome.

MS. GUNDLACH: Good morning. For the record, I'm Nancy Gundlach, Principal Planner with Land Development Services.

And we are recommending approval of this petition, and I'd be happy to answer any questions you might have.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody have anything of staff?

COMMISSIONER EBERT: No.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Nancy, let's start with the master plan. The notation right at the bottom of the page where it says approximate location of northern outdoor storage screen. Screen shall be a hedge, wall or opaque fencing or a combination of these screens.

What determines what scenario is used?

MS. GUNDLACH: It means they could use one of the three.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Right. But is there a reason why they would have to use any one of the three over any other? Is there an opacity that has to be reached or something like that?

MS. GUNDLACH: They would just have to have 100 percent opacity --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: They would have --

MR. GUNDLACH: -- in order to meet the outdoor --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, so that's already --

MR. GUNDLACH: -- screening requirements.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: -- in our code?

MS. GUNDLACH: Yes, that would be per LDC.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. If you go and move that plan -- maybe Ray could do that for you -- so we can see the general condition notes up on the upper right-hand corner of the plan, and maybe bring those up a little closer. There you go.

There's seven notes here. Is there a reason why one through six need to be on this plan? And the reason I'm asking the question is because they're either, from what I can understand, all subject to Land Development Code issues, Water Management District issues, and having them on this plan could only confuse the issue in the future. So why do we need them here?

MS. GUNDLACH: You can remove them, if you'd like.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: One through six. I think seven's fine, no on-site shredding of metal. Although the exhibit to the conditional use says that. But, I mean, I don't care if that one's on there. But one through six I think could be a contradictory point in the future in someone reading this.

For example, number two, stormwater management permitted through that permit. Well, what if they have to change the perimeter and modify it to make it better or standards change? Well, they're locked into -- this locks the CU into that. And I'd just as soon provide the flexibility on both sides to make sure we're not locked into something that could get better in the future.

So I would suggest we drop the one through six from this plan as general comments.

MS. GUNDLACH: Okay. We can do that.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. And I think that's the only questions I had.

And I did read the letter we've gotten from the one neighbor. Every one of his issues, from as best I can tell, would be better addressed at SDP level. And they're all addressed by current requirements within the code.

So did you read it and have the same conclusion?

MS. GUNDLACH: I had that same conclusion, but also they mentioned something about EPA. And please keep in mind that that is -- the Environmental Protection Agency is a federal agency, so they would be responsible for their regulations.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Anybody else have any questions of staff?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Michael, did you have something?

MR. FERNANDEZ: I did happen to speak to the gentleman. His property is actually not abutting

this, it's actually on the block to the north of us, so it doesn't abut. His concerns mainly stem from the fact that he is lower in elevation, and he's had flooding issues.

And I did talk to the Water Management District. They did confirm that our property is downstream. So what we're doing won't affect him, and our proposal does not increase our impervious area. I explained that to him. And his was more concerns as opposed to an objection.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, even -- I mean, I know what you just said. But even downstream facilities, if they tend to create more pervious area -- or impervious area so that you have less percolation, you could end up backing up as it moves south.

So, I mean, I understand South Florida's comment, but at the same time I think he does have a relevant concern. But I do believe that's handled in the SDP process, so thank you.

Okay, anybody else?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Ray, do we have any public speakers?

MR. BELLOWS: No one has registered.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Does anybody from the public wish to speak on this item?

Sir, if you wish to speak, come on up and identify yourself on the microphone and tell us what's on your mind. You need to -- were you sworn in when we started the meeting?

MR. SIMMONDS: No, I just arrived.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Then you'll have to raise your right hand, this lady will swear you in.

(Speaker was duly sworn.)

MR. SIMMONDS: I came in in the middle of this, and I want to make sure we're talking about the Garden Street --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Yes, sir.

MR. SIMMONDS: Okay, that was the last thing on the agenda, so I wanted --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: We move fast.

MR. SIMMONDS: I've been property owner and businessman on -- at Metro Park since '92. And during that course of time I've seen and met and had a lot of people that also are property owners there and small business owners, and they're furniture makers and cabinetmakers and furniture designers. And they have and I have a very strong stand against this because of the amount of dust and congestion that this is going to add to the already busy road. We have the Waste Management's trucks, probably 40 or 50 trucks a day. We have trucks from the Peluso Movers. We have trucks from the Collier tire place that are continuously up and down there. And on that road there's -- there is industry, but there isn't any trash transfer or there isn't any refuse storage or junkyard or scrapyards.

Now, there is some of that further up in the north end of this project. And of course a good place for this would be at the landfill.

But getting back to my particular location. And the people that are around me have very strong concerns that there's going to be an unnecessary, or a very large influx of trucks, roll-off trucks that create dirt and mud and dust going up and down the road.

And it's very, very evidenced by going to the transfer site or the CD operation that's in our same project up to the north. We live on a -- we're on a road that has no direct access from Airport Road, it has no direct access from Livingston Road, and it just seems like this is not the best location, if we're looking out for the community and for the people that are already there and that have been there for these years. And everybody here is faced with a struggle just to stay alive.

But for the sake of the county is concerned, there shouldn't be a -- it's not any better for the county to have it on Enterprise or Exchange or Shirley Street than it would be to have it out at the landfill, because the revenues are still going to be there. So I think it's important that we think about the people that are already there.

The truss plant, which closed down a couple of years ago due to the economic situation, produced a lot of truck traffic, and that was able to be dealt with. But this is going to be a lot, lot heavier.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Sir, couple comments.

You had mentioned that this doesn't have direct access to Airport Road. Actually, it's midway in the

park between Livingston Road and Airport Road, so it has access to both.

MR. SIMMONDS: Yeah, but there's no traffic signal. And there's -- they can only turn one way to get out. And they can only really get in with no signal. So this is just going to increase the amount of congestion there at that turn point.

And it's the same way on the other end, but only -- actually worse, because it has to go out on Industrial, is it, or Commercial and make a zigzag.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: There are various signals sporadically along Livingston going in and out of the park.

MR. SIMMONDS: Right. But nothing on this --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: But nothing on that -- I understand that.

MR. SIMMONDS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: And the other thing is the truss plant that operated there --

MR. SIMMONDS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: -- they built wood trusses, which means they had a lot of saws. And they're triple axle trucks. Ones that would deliver to my sites were substantial in length, forklifts and cranes to move stuff around.

MR. SIMMONDS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I'm trying to understand why you think the sorting of the metal would be --

MR. SIMMONDS: Well, because --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: -- more intrusive than that was --

MR. SIMMONDS: Yeah, that truss plant had a delivery or a pickup once a day. This is going to be a continuous thing. This is going to be continuous from the time they're open till the time they're closed.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, when you load trusses you load one set on the truck at a time. If you're going out for five houses, 10 houses a day, one an hour, you're going to have more than one truck a day. You're loading out for every house you take a load out to.

MR. SIMMONDS: Right, right. Well, one load takes up -- could be 10 houses, depending on the size of the house.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: No, trucks don't load it like that.

But Michael -- and I appreciate your time.

Anybody have any questions of this gentleman?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Thank you, sir.

Michael, do you have any rebuttal you'd like to make a note of?

MR. FERNANDEZ: Well, just that based on the analysis that we've made, talking to the owner of the former truss plant and also looking at their facility off Shirley Street, there'll actually be less vehicles at this site or moving in and out of this site than the existing lumber yard -- or the truss plant. So we don't see that it's going to be an uptick in the amount of traffic that will be generated.

MR. SIMMONDS: Well, there's zero trucks moving in and out now.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Sir, appreciate your time. Thank you, sir.

Anybody else have any questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, with that, we'll close the public hearing and entertain a motion. Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I'll make it.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Mr. Schiffer?

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I move we forward with the stipulations and the additional stipulations with a recommendation of approval.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER AHERN: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Seconded by Melissa.

Okay, the motion was for recommendation of approval. The stipulations were involving the forward

distance of where things can be stored as we discussed involving those islands and the removal of the general conditions one through six that are shown on the master plan.

Is that consistent for the motion maker --

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: -- and the second?

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: Aye.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER EBERT: Aye.

COMMISSIONER KLEIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER MIDNEY: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

COMMISSIONER CARON: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion carries 8-0.

Okay, thank you, appreciate your time today.

***Old business? Any brought forward?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: ***New business?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody from -- any other comments from the public?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay, with that, we'll seek a motion to adjourn.

COMMISSIONER AHERN: So moved.

COMMISSIONER SCHIFFER: I'll second.

There being no further business for the good of the County, the meeting was adjourned by order of the Chair at 9:30 a.m.

COLLIER COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION


MARK STRAIN, Chairman

These minutes approved by the board on 10-6-11 as presented or as corrected .

Transcript prepared on behalf of Gregory Reporting Service, Inc., by Cherie' R. Nottingham.