

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MEETING OF THE  
COLLIER COUNTY HEARING EXAMINER  
Naples, Florida  
April 10, 2014

LET IT BE REMEMBERED, that the Collier County Hearing Examiner, in and for the County of Collier, having conducted business herein, met on this date at 9:00 a.m., in REGULAR SESSION at 2800 North Horseshoe Drive, Room 609/610, Naples, Florida, with the following people present:

HEARING EXAMINER MARK STRAIN

Also Present: Heidi Ashton-Cicko, Managing Assistant County Attorney  
Ray Bellows, Zoning Manager  
Mike Sawyer, Senior Planner

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: Good morning, everyone. Welcome to the April 10th meeting of the Collier County Hearing Examiner's Office.

If everybody will please rise for Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance was recited in unison.)

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: Thank you.

For some housekeeping announcements, individual speakers will be limited to five minutes unless otherwise waived by the Hearing Examiner.

All materials used during presentation at the hearing will become a permanent part of the record.

Decisions of the Hearing Examiner are final, unless appealed to the Board of County Commissioners.

And the Hearing Examiner will render a decision within 30 days.

The review of the agenda, we have two items. One is a continuation from our last meeting. We have one new item. Nothing to be changed on that.

Approval of the prior meeting minutes, March 13th, 2014. I reviewed them, so they're acceptable for recording.

We'll move right into our first advertised public hearing. It's for Petition No. PDI-PL20130002079, continued from the March 27th, 2014 meeting, the Artesia Naples Master ASLI VI, LLLP, Lands End Preserve Residential Planned Unit Development.

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

(All speakers were duly sworn.)

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: Thank you.

There are two exhibits and probably more will be added as we go through the meeting. But I wanted to make sure the first two are announced early.

Exhibit A will be the legal advertisement. Exhibit B will be the complete staff report.

For the applicant, I know this is your first time in front of this office. And having both of the applicant's representatives, I've worked with you for what, 13 years now, you do know I read everything, so in your discussion or presentation you don't have to be redundant on what's in the staff report unless you want to add additional things to the record. That's purely up to you.

And I do have some questions and discussion from my reading of the application. So with that, Wayne or Richard?

MR. ARNOLD: Good morning. Wayne Arnold with Grady Minor, representing the petitioner.

With me is Rich Yovanovich, land use attorney. We have Barry Ernst from WCI Communities; Jim Banks from Transportation Engineering; and Mike Delate from Grady Minor is the civil engineer that's been working on the project.

Mr. Strain, we don't have -- we're in agreement with the staff report. We've had discussions and provided additional exhibits in the past week to Ms. Deselem and Mr. Bellows that made some refinements to the master plan, and we also provided additional documentation with reference to the recreational tract and the intended land uses for that tract.

And I believe you have those in your set of materials. I brought extra copies on an 11-by-17 size, in case the 11 -- or the 8 and a half by 11's were not legible.

Heidi, you want me to give you a set of those?

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: One thing the new office is lacking is an overhead projector. That is being worked on, so eventually we'll have that resolved.

You did -- I did get the new site plan with the revised date of March of 2014. And that is the site plan that will be submitted as Exhibit C.

MR. ARNOLD: Mr. Strain, I do have additional copies if anybody in the -- I didn't notice when I stood up and was sworn if any members of the public are here. I've got additional copies, if needed.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: Do you have -- the copy you have that you're passing out, does it have the small correction we talked about yesterday?

MR. ARNOLD: No, it does not.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: Okay. I have the copy for the record right here then for the

court reporter. This will be Exhibit C.

There will be one correction noted that will come out in the final decision on this.

Also, this project involved a prior zoning verification letter dated September 12, 2013. That will also be entered into the record as Exhibit D, because it has a bearing on the outcome of this case.

And with that, Wayne, is that the comments you want to make at this time?

MR. ARNOLD: I think that's fine. Like I said, I didn't notice if any of the members of the public -- because I'm happy to provide a summary of the petition if necessary for the audience. If not, I think that staff and our team and yourself are all well versed on the few changes that we're proposing.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: Okay. And we do have -- I do have quite a bit of discussion to get into on some of the issues.

The first one, I would like Mr. Podczewinsky, who is our staff representative for transportation, to come up.

(Speaker was duly sworn.)

MR. PODCZERWINSKY: Good morning, Mr. Strain.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: Good morning, John.

Hey, I sent you two emails yesterday. One with the two site -- with the language requesting you to review the language that was being deleted or modified. And I know that you have a staff report that says you had no -- and it was a recommendation for approval. Is that still consistent?

MR. PODCZERWINSKY: Yes, sir.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: Okay. And the second one I sent you were the two differences between the platted plan and the master plan being proposed. And in the past the Planning Commission has -- and I know this isn't the Planning Commission but since I'm chair of that commission as well, I know the history there pretty good. We have looked at things differently, depending on the type of configuration of the internal road system.

What they are proposing in the plats and zoning documents that I've seen -- and Exhibit E will be an overall site plan with general notes that was submitted as part of a zoning document from Grady Minor for the future platting and current platting of the property. And Wayne had sent this to me as well with a -- to show how this new site plan was going to fit in for the rec. area.

But what's different on there, and it's extensively different than the master plan that is part of the PUD, is the cul-de-sacs and the dead end streets versus the loop system that was on the original one.

Does that pose any change from transportation?

MR. PODCZERWINSKY: In particular, no, it does not at this point. We will review it when it comes time to plat that. But typically it's a commonly allowed deviation in most PUDs. It's not something that poses a particular safety hazard.

What we do review the long cul-de-sacs for in compliance with the code is typically to see if they're going to be a long drag strip type cul-de-sac that would entice people to go and have a place to do illegal things.

And in this case this is a long, curvy road, it's going to be a platted development, it's not going to be a long dead-end street, per se. And as long as it meets the fire code, the State Fire Code, transportation will be satisfied with that design.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: And this plat doesn't request a deviation, or they couldn't actually request a deviation through the plat process.

MR. PODCZERWINSKY: Correct.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: So when you said deviation, what did you mean by that?

MR. PODCZERWINSKY: Typically the deviations are sought through the PUD process for the length of these cul-de-sacs.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: Right.

MR. PODCZERWINSKY: Again, it's something that we commonly allow. Transportation staff really does not have an objection to the longer cul-de-sacs. Typically it does refer back to the fire code.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: Did you review the PUD to see if they had asked for a deviation for the length of these cul-de-sacs, or have you reviewed it enough to know if they even need one?

MR. PODCZERWINSKY: I did not rereview the PUD in this case but I am familiar with the site,

and I don't believe that they need a deviation for this.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: Okay, I'm sure staff will check the length of the cul-de-sacs when it comes in for platting.

MR. PODCZERWINSKY: Yes.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: Thank you, John, I appreciate it.

MR. PODCZERWINSKY: Yes, sir.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: This is the plan that will be Exhibit E.

And that brings up a comment that I found in the right -- matter in this. It's Page 3, top of Page 3, the staff report. There's an italicized paragraph. And the last line of that paragraph discusses that the insubstantial change application offers an opportunity for the property owner to make the change and have the conceptual master plan more closely match the intended development scenario.

I took a look at the master plan that was previously approved by the ordinance; the master plan that has been revised and that Wayne sent me. I pulled up the plats on the project and I pulled up the what's called the zoning concept plan that I just provided similar to Exhibit E.

They're not similar. And I would caution staff in the future that these are not -- I mean, if you look at the master plan that's part of the PUD, it does not resemble the -- closely the platted -- the plat that was submitted for approval. And I don't know how that is reviewed by staff, but I would suggest that we try to make the master plans more consistent with the plats when the known plats are already out there.

So for this meeting today, the master plan could have resembled much more closely to what has been already supplied to the county. We could have had a more accurate master plan. So in the future maybe we ought to look at that, not just for this office but for the Planning Commission as well.

Also, because of the prior zoning verification letter which we've entered into exhibit, the size of the recreation area was responded to in regards to a three-acre size, and so part of the discussion that I've had with the applicant was to provide at least a minimum of three acres for this recreation center.

And I believe, Wayne, you said that you had no objection to that?

MR. ARNOLD: That's correct. The master plan we submitted to you indicates that the physical land area would be three plus or minus acres. And one of the discussion points I think is the reference to delete the plus or minus, that it will be at least three acres.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: Right.

MR. ARNOLD: And we're okay with that.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: And because of your announcement during the neighborhood information meeting, the minimum rec. center provisions will be for a clubhouse, a tennis component and a resort style pool.

You also indicated that the facility will be opened in 2015. So the requirement to have it open by 2016 or no further building permits will be issued after that date until it is open, in talking with you yesterday, you thought that would be acceptable?

MR. ARNOLD: From a timing standpoint that's not a problem. I would -- in reference to the tennis component, the plan we provided to you and that we intend to submit to the county for our site plan for the recreation tract labels the court component as a multipurpose court because it's envisioned to be striped for potential multipurpose use, including pickle ball, which is a form of tennis. I don't know that it's going to be set up to be a full tennis court. And if we could reference it as a racket court of some sort, that would give us a little more flexibility.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: Okay. Is there going -- would you be able to play some form of tennis on it?

MR. ARNOLD: You want to answer that?

MR. YOVANOVICH: Pickle ball is basically a form of tennis. It's not tennis in the, you know, strictest application of the tennis rules and size of the court, but it's a similar type of a sport.

And we talked about this briefly, it seems to be very popular, and that's what's anticipated to be put in this facility.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: You just reminded me of something. Sometimes that's good and sometimes that's bad.

MR. YOVANOVICH: I don't know.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: In this case it's okay.

My disclosures on the part of this -- I should start out every hearing with those disclosures. I have talked with Rich Yovanovich, Wayne Arnold and various members of staff in the County Attorney's Office prior to today's hearing.

So now that that's out of the way.

Ray, from your perspective, would the reference to a tennis component at a NIM sufficiently be covered by the description we've just heard from Mr. Yovanovich?

MR. BELLOWS: It could. But I think if they're looking at multiple type of related activities, maybe multipurpose courts, I think is also adequate.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: Okay. So what they're proposing as far as the multipurpose court works for --

MR. BELLOWS: Yes, I believe so. Because pickle ball may be popular now, but there may be something else more popular and they could still play in that same facility or that same area.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: Okay. In the previous -- or in the staff report on Page 5, there's an item H. And in that -- in the staff report it said that the acreage of the recreational tract will be reduced.

Well, that is inconsistent with the rest of the findings. So I talked to Kay and she said that should say be reconfigured.

Now, the idea of reducing it from 12 acres to now three was done previously by a zoning verification letter. Ray, was that challenged at all or is that part of --

MR. BELLOWS: That has not been challenged, so it's valid.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: It's valid.

So this office is somewhat remiss in being able to change that.

I do want to point out that in reviewing the insubstantial and substantial changes that staff is allowed to provide, I didn't find where that is an -- where that reduction was something that necessarily was spelled out clearly in the substantial and insubstantial change section of our code. In fact, it says there are three types of changes to a PUD ordinance: Substantial, insubstantial and minor. And under the substantial changes, if there is a proposed decrease in preservation, conservation, recreation or open space areas within the development, not to exceed five percent of the total acreage previously designated as such or five acres in area. If that occurs it's a substantial change.

If there's a change in traffic circulation, it's a substantial change. I don't know if the change from loop roads to cul-de-sacs would be considered a substantial change based on transportation, but I think that's something staff ought to look at.

Additionally then what happens is anything that's not a substantial change is an insubstantial change or a minor change. Staff can do minor changes. Insubstantial changes have to go through this process.

One of the minor changes that are allowed is the internal realignment of rights-of-way. Again, I don't know if that contradicts the circulation referenced in the substantial change section, but I think staff ought to look at that closely.

And Ray, I can't find in the minor change section other than this reference where a reduction in the size of the uplands area would have been something that should have not gone through this process.

A relocation of swimming pools, clubhouses or other recreation facilities when such location will not affect adjacent property -- land uses.

It does not say you cannot provide a 75 percent size reduction by a minor change to the PUD. So as we go forward, we may want to look at those a little more differently than we have in the past.

MR. BELLOWS: You make a good point. And we'll make that part of our next staff meeting agenda for more detailed discussion and setting of policy.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: I think we ought to explore it before we go off too far.

Did you have something to say, Richard?

MR. YOVANOVICH: If it's okay, I'm not sure about the process, so --

I would just like to point out in the existing PUD two things. First of all, what you have regarding the cul-de-sac is for purposes of a platting only. It's a temporary cul-de-sac until we do the next set of plats, next

phase.

And also the PUD itself, at Page 2-3, and Section 2.4(B)(1)(b) already provides that we can exceed the 1,000 foot cul-de-sac length. So I think we're covered both ways: One, that it's a temporary cul-de-sac; and two, we do have the ability to do that. So we're not making any changes to the road system that's allowed.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: I wish we had an overhead, because the master plan --

MR. YOVANOVICH: I understand.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: -- that was provided shows a looped road system.

MR. YOVANOVICH: And it will be looped. It's just that, you know, platting occurs in phases. And the fire department wanted a cul-de-sac in that phase until we make the actual looped connection.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: Okay. So the phase that I'm talking about show three terminal points for cul-de-sacs that are lengthy. I'm not sure how you're going to connect them. But if you are connecting, that would maybe take away the concern over the traffic circulation requirement to trigger a substantial change to the PUD.

Go ahead.

MR. ARNOLD: Mr. Strain, Wayne Arnold, for the record.

I would just simply say that we're dealing with a 2003, 2004 conceptualized zoning master plan. The document that is the ordinance for the PUD provides a lot of flexibility for this to be conceptual and the specifics to be determined at the time of plat. And there are exceptions which are now called deviations that were also permitted at that time.

And we believe we're consistent with the proposed plat. I mean, part of this property has already been platted and we will be continuing with plats. And the internal road network may change, but I think from the county's perspective we're going to have that engineering review at the time of plat review and will be consistent with fire codes and the PUD and whatever other standards that the county may require us to be.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: Well, I realize you will be. And that wasn't -- the point of my discussion was that we have a master plan that is not as close as it could be to the actual platting that's taken place to date and that seems to be proposed by the zoning document, zoning data sheet that I've provided -- or that you provided to me with the last go around.

And I'm suggesting to staff in the future when someone comes in for a map change and when there's that much difference, we clean them up at these meetings.

MR. ARNOLD: And I don't disagree that that may be possible. And in this case because there's been certain properties sold to individual homeowners, a large portion of the undeveloped property's still controlled by one entity.

And I agree with you, in that case it probably can't be done. But there are a lot of other projects where there have been so many multiple ownerships that you may not be able to start affecting other parts of a master plan that you don't control. That would be my only caution to staff as they look for a future process.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: And again, for those parts that are controlled and that we know there's going to be differences, to the extent they are on this one we need to show them on the master plan. It will make it easier for you when you come in for a building permit or an SDP to have your plan match up. Because I can probably assure you that we'll be looking at them a little differently as we go forward from now on.

Also, the reduction of the recreation area was the reason this meeting was continued. To go from 12 acres to three and to go from a golf community to primarily a residential community, I understand the reasoning for that. I needed assurance that you could get their amenities that you told the public you would provide on that three acres. You've provided that.

At the same time, you have committed in your neighborhood information meeting or in the minutes of this meeting -- not minutes, I'm sorry, the staff report -- that you're going to provide additional recreational opportunities to the underwater portion of the former rec. area.

And do you have any objection in listing those as a requirement for that area to be utilized in the future?

MR. ARNOLD: No, we have no objection.

And if I could just further add, the current language in the PUD under the recreation center language

indicates that all the acreages were approximate and that they would be -- they're based on conceptual designs at the time that this was originally proposed. And that it provides for actual acreages to be determined at the time of plat.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: Right, but --

MR. ARNOLD: And I understand this is a reconfiguration. And we do believe in all honesty that a portion of the recreation tract that would include lake area will provide recreational opportunities for our residents.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: And one of them was they can observe wildlife.

MR. ARNOLD: Correct.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: Well, how nice. They can do that from the roadway too.

MR. ARNOLD: They could, but --

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: So you want to -- I mean, I think that's a little disingenuous to use that as a reason for a recreational tract reduction.

But Wayne, the point is you guys said approximately 13 acres. That's 75 percent -- I mean, the reduction you're asking for is not approximately 12 acres, it's 75 percent less than 12 acres.

If this facility was supposed to have a golf course and others in more of an amenity area, I think it would be a problem.

I concur with your site plan, and based on the prior zoning verification letter we've accepted the three acres, but I don't think three acres is approximate to 12. Not 75 percent.

So just for future reference, if we go this route again, I hope we don't, we'll be looking at it a little differently.

The tower -- the sign location that you want off Tower Road on the -- I don't know whose property it is, but that will be subject to getting an agreement worked out with the property owner. I'm assuming that's a given, but I want to make sure you're aware of that.

Let me make sure I've got all my questions on the table.

Deviation number three in the PUD section that was provided had some strike-through on it that shouldn't have been there, so that will be cleaned up. And that needs to be removed before recordation.

I assume you sent us the clean copy without -- you know what I'm talking about?

MR. ARNOLD: Yes. It was one of the two transportation conditions that had a strike reference.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: No, deviation three was for the sign that you're asking for.

MR. ARNOLD: Oh, correct.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: The off-site sign, apparently you created some draft language that wasn't part of the PUD to begin with, but you just struck it out and included it in the deviation number three request to look like it was part of the PUD. It wasn't. So that needs to be removed.

MR. ARNOLD: Yes, I'm aware of that one. Thank you.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: And that's the last questions I have at this point.

Ray, do you have any comments that you have as a staff report?

MR. BELLOWS: Yes, I -- for the record, Ray Bellows, Zoning Manager.

I've been working with Kay Deselem on this project and filling in for her while she's on vacation.

The staff that has reviewed this petition, staff is in -- recommending approval of this PDI. The revised plan submitted, staff finds them acceptable and we're recommending approval.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: Thank you.

That's all the questions I have.

Is there any members of the public or anyone else that would like to speak on this matter?

(No response.)

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: Okay, with that --

MS. ASHTON-CICKO: Mr. Chair?

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: Yes, go ahead.

MS. ASHTON-CICKO: Based on what you said about deviation number three, I'd recommend that the -- after Exhibit B it says subject to owner's permission in the form of an agreement or easement would be inserted.

There's a typo under 6.7 to change adding to just add, which you can fix.  
And then you would delete on Page 3 of 3 the amendment to add Exhibit B. Because it's already included under the first Section 2.16.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: Ray, did you make note of those? If not, let's get it clarified and we'll have the applicant provide the new text.

MR. BELLOWS: Yes, so remove it on page --

MS. ASHTON-CICKO: On 3.3, the whole amendment to add Exhibit B, we'll delete that, because it's referenced as an exhibit under 2.16.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: Thank you, Heidi.

Is that all?

MS. ASHTON-CICKO: (Nods head affirmatively.)

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: Any objection to those changes from the applicant?

MR. YOVANOVICH: No.

Can you hear me?

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: I can hear you now. Use the microphone next time.

With that --

MR. ARNOLD: I did have one clarification.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: Go ahead.

MR. ARNOLD: The reference to Exhibit B from the County Attorney, where was this change to the exhibit letter?

MS. ASHTON-CICKO: Well, you called it Exhibit B in your document.

MR. ARNOLD: Where is it referenced? Just so I can --

MS. ASHTON-CICKO: Let me just show you where I'm talking about.  
Over here.

MR. ARNOLD: Thank you. Got it.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: Wayne, will you be able to get these corrected documents -- how long will it take you to get those back to Kay so she can submit them to my office?

MR. ARNOLD: I'm sure we can have those back to you today.

MR. BELLOWS: Then submit it to me then.

MR. ARNOLD: To Ray.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: To Ray.

MS. ASHTON-CICKO: And copy Mr. Stone.

MR. ARNOLD: Gotcha. Will do.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: My decision will be issued within 30 days. Usually it's a lot faster, but it's dependent on when I get those documents. Because they'll be -- some of those will be used as backup to the decision form.

MR. YOVANOVICH: So format-wise we don't get a decision today subject to it being received in written form?

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: No, you'll get a recorded written -- you'll get a copy of a recorded written form probably by next week. We have 30 days by statute to get that to you.

MR. YOVANOVICH: No, I was just curious as to the process. So you don't say it's approved subject to a recent order? Okay.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: I will be working on this today and tomorrow, and you'll have a written response hopefully next week. It depends a lot on when I get your corrections.

So with that, that will be the end of this discussion on this case. And it will be -- a response will be -- a decision will be rendered within the 30-day time frame.

MR. ARNOLD: Thank you.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: Thank you, Wayne.

\*\*\*Next petition is the Petition No. PDI-PL20130002234, Minto Sable Bay, LLC, requesting an insubstantial change to the Sable Bay Mixed Use Planned Unit Development.

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



(All speakers were duly sworn.)

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: As far as my disclosures, I've met with staff, in particular our sign coordinator. And I think that's all. I don't think anybody else and I have talked on this.

So with that, I have read your -- the staff report. The exhibits for this hearing, this particular case will be -- Exhibit A will be the legal ad; Exhibit B will be the staff report.

And since I have read everything, it's your discretion how much more you feel you need to put on record.

MR. CALE: I just want to let you know I'm Brian Cale with Minto Communities and I'm here to --

THE COURT REPORTER: May I have the spelling of your last name?

MR. CALE: Brian Cale, C-A-L-E.

And I'll answer any questions.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: I have none.

I think your application was clean and to the point, so I've got no issues with it.

Does staff have a staff report or any comments?

MR. SAWYER: Good morning, Chair -- Hearing Examiner. I'm still getting used to that one.

You do have the staff report that was last revised March 26th, 2014. We are recommending approval of the PDI.

At the County Attorney's suggestion, we do have the findings for the PUD and the rezone from the original approval of the Sable Bay PUD. We've read through those and we do find that the proposed changes are consistent and remain consistent with those findings. I've got copies of those if you wish to include those with this hearing.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: Yes, I'd like to make those Exhibit C. And if you've got a copy for the court reporter, that will work fine.

Heidi, did you have any comments?

MS. ASHTON-CICKO: No, sir.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: Okay. Looked like you had, that's why -- okay, and for the benefit of the public, this particular petition was to provide some exceptions to our sign code for the interior of the project. Basically flag pole signs be internal to the development. And to modify a development standard that wasn't as clear as it should have been regarding the setbacks to lake maintenance easements, but for accessory structures.

Other than that, is there anything else -- that's basically the gist of the application from my understanding.

Did you have anything you wanted to add to it?

MR. SAWYER: No. Correct, that's exactly what we reviewed.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: Okay. Is there any members of the public wish to speak on this item?

(No response.)

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: Hearing none, we will close this hearing and a decision will be rendered within 30 days by statute, but probably a lot quicker than that.

MR. CALE: Thank you very much.

HEARING EXAMINER STRAIN: Thank you, sir, appreciate your time.

That takes us to the end of our meeting. There is no other business, so this meeting is adjourned.

\*\*\*\*\*

April 10, 2014 HEX Meeting

There being no further business for the good of the County, the meeting was adjourned by order of the Hearing Examiner at 9:32 a.m.

COLLIER COUNTY HEARING EXAMINER



MARK STRAIN, HEARING EXAMINER

ATTEST:  
DWIGHT E. BROCK, CLERK

These minutes approved by the Hearing Examiner on 5-13-14 as presented  or as corrected .

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED ON BEHALF OF  
GREGORY COURT REPORTING SERVICES, INC.  
BY CHERIE' R. NOTTINGHAM, CSR, COURT REPORTER AND NOTARY PUBLIC