

December 19, 2019

TRANSCRIPT OF THE MEETING OF THE
COLLIER COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
Naples, Florida, December 19, 2019

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 9:00 a.m., in REGULAR SESSION in Building "F" of the Government Complex, East Naples, Florida, with the following members present:

Mark Strain, Chairman
Karen Homiak, Vice Chair
Edwin Fryer, Secretary
Patrick Dearborn
Karl Fry
Stan Chrzanowski, Environmental
Joe Schmitt, Environmental

Tom Eastman, Collier County School Board Representative

ALSO PRESENT:

Raymond V. Bellows, Zoning Manager
Nancy Gundlach, Principal Planner
Jeffrey Klatzkow, County Attorney
Heidi Ashton-Cicko, Managing Assistant County Attorney

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Good morning, everyone. Welcome to the December 19th meeting of the Collier County Planning Commission.

If everybody will please rise for Pledge of Allegiance.

(The Pledge of Allegiance was recited in unison.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Thank you. Will the secretary please do the roll call.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Yes, sir.

Mr. Eastman?

(No response.)

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Mr. Chrzanowski?

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Present.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Mr. Fry?

(No response.)

COMMISSIONER FRYER: I'm here.

Chairman Strain?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Here.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Vice Chair Homiak?

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Here.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Mr. Schmitt?

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Here.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Mr. Dearborn?

COMMISSIONER DEARBORN: Here.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Chair, we have a quorum of six.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Thank you.

Addenda to the agenda: There's a couple things we need to talk about.

The first one is Item 9A1 is the request to do a transmittal hearing for the Innovation Zone Overlay at the Activity Center No. 9 at I-75 and Collier Boulevard.

After some discussions with the Manager's Office, there's been a request to continue this until the 16th. In some form or other it may come back. And one of the suggestions was that it might come back as a workshop for a discussion to try to figure out what's trying to be accomplished and maybe the best way to proceed.

As some of you may have discovered, the broadness of the request was concerning to at least myself, and I'm sure others and, for various reasons, it will be continued, or they're asking for the continuance to the 16th. I suggest we grant it with the proviso if it needs to be a workshop, it can go that route instead of a transmittal hearing, so...

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Chairman, would a workshop be back to us or the BCC?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: No. It would be to us. That was the suggestion, so that we can help form some ideas and limitations or whatever it would take to provide some of the uses that some people think are needed in that activity center.

Joe.

(Mr. Eastman and Commissioner Fry are now present in the boardroom.)

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Just a comment. When it comes back on the workshop, I really want a map that clearly defines those areas within that proposed innovation zone that already have uses on them, what the uses are, and how much of property are we really talking about that's going to be declared available for any type of innovation zone because, from my estimate, it was very little.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, I think it's already an innovation zone. What they're looking for -- from what I could tell, they're wanting to add some uses that were intended to be comparable and compatible to what's already there, but in looking and narrowing and boring down into the number of NAICS code references there were, it was clearly more than what I think was anticipated when we got into that.

So all that will come out in a workshop discussion, Joe, and we'll probably get an explanation of why that

area's even being considered for this, and we can certainly ferret out what properties will be beneficial or benefiting from it so that the public, especially there -- there's almost a dozen residential communities surrounding within that activity center.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Right.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: And they all need to be participatory in this.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Well, I'd always like to know, the property owners who have businesses in that area, what their positions are.

The other question I have, though, is we already have an ordinance that was passed that establishes a TIF, tax incremental financing. And from my colleagues on the Board, if you clearly understand what a TIF is, it's actually taking dollars that were supposed to go into the General Fund, they establish a base year, and then after the base year, every year thereafter, that incremental difference goes into a special fund. In essence, that means that the taxpayers make up the difference. And I'll use the word. To me it's nothing more than money laundering, and that's really what it is.

And I see that we've already passed the ordinance to establish a TIF, and it identified that money to be used to pay for impact fees, which was absolutely astounding to me. But that's a political decision, and I leave that to the Board.

The only thing I did not see in this was any type of advisory board like other elements within the county that have tax incremental finance. There was no identification within this ordinance or within the innovation zone that identified some kind of an advisory board.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: And I think, through the workshop process, all those questions will be better addressed.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Okay.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: This was -- the request for continuance is the only thing on the table right now. I don't necessarily disagree with some of your statements, but I think we could flesh all these issues out at the workshop.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Well, I just bring it up. I don't want an answer now. I just want staff to understand my concerns. Plus, I have about an hour more's worth of concerns, but I guess we'll get into that during of the workshop.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: I've move for continuance.

COMMISSIONER DEARBORN: Second.

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

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Aye.

COMMISSIONER FRY: Aye.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Aye.

COMMISSIONER DEARBORN: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion carries 7-0.

Somebody woke up and got in here this morning. Karl, welcome to the panel this morning. We were going to hold up, but we knew you overslept sometimes. But, you know, this is great.

COMMISSIONER FRY: I wanted Karen to have the satisfaction of beating me here.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Okay. Next year we'll see.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Mr. Pritt and people from the immediate neighbors, thank you for attending today. We'll look forward to hearing from you in the future.

COMMISSIONER FRY: Mr. Chairman, the TV screen says "the meeting will begin shortly." Is it --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: No. We were waiting -- Troy was even waiting for you. Everybody was

waiting for you. Now that you're here, they'll correct that.

COMMISSIONER FRY: I don't believe that for a second.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: And then the next item that's going to change was already changed on our agenda. We're adding Item 11A. It was added by email to us all. It's CU-PL20180002693. It's the Immokalee Guadalupe Center at Westclox Street about a half mile west of Carson Road. That was what we heard -- we're not going to -- that was what we heard two weeks ago. We did not vote to have it come back on consent because it wasn't that extensive, but in the review of the documents that they sent to be now added to or presented to the Board they added a couple items that -- or one item at least that needs to be signed off on, or at least discussed with us. They've come back, asked for that discussion, and they will be after our second thing on today's agenda, basically, under old business, so...

Stan.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: I don't know -- maybe we should take them before the other item.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Uh-uh.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: No?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: No, they're going to be 11A.

The next item on the agenda is 9A2, which is the cleanup item from the 11/21 meeting, which we've already reviewed it, so it should go pretty fast. I left that meeting a little bit early. I'm not sure why we're hearing it today. Now, we can get into -- let me go finish through the agenda. We'll get into Jeremy's explanation of it.

Which takes us to Planning Commission absences. We have no meeting on January 2nd, thankfully. Now, Karl, you can show up like you did last time. That's great.

COMMISSIONER FRY: I'll show up in the evening.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: The next meeting will be January 16th. Does anyone know if they're not going to make it to the 16th, okay?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. We'll have a quorum.

Approval of the minutes: We were sent our packages from November 21st. Does anybody have any corrections or changes? If not, is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Move approval of the minutes.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER DEARBORN: Second.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Discussion?

(No response.)

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

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Aye.

COMMISSIONER FRY: Aye.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Aye.

COMMISSIONER DEARBORN: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion carries 7-0.

BCC report and recaps, Ray?

MR. BELLOWS: Yes. On December 10th, the Board of County Commissioners approved the Lely Barefoot Beach PUD amendment on their summary agenda. That would be subject to Planning Commission recommendation; they also approved the Longview PUD amendment and the companion Orange Blossom

small-scale plan amendment. That was also approved on the summary agenda; as well as the Cayo Whippoorwill petition. The Rivergrass SRA was continued to the second meeting in January.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Wow.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Thank you.

That takes us to Chairman's report. The only thing I wanted to have a brief discussion on with all of you is back to this, and it's -- we've continued it, so that was what we wanted to do under addenda to the agenda, but a discussion on that item, which is 9A1, involving the innovation zone.

It was suggested to me maybe a workshop would be a way to approach it to kind of get all of the ideas and the thoughts and discussions kind of organized a little bit better. I think that's a great idea, but I wanted to see how you felt about having a 5:00 meeting for the workshop. There is 11 different communities around this -- that area, and it would be nice if they could come and participate since they're going to be the recipients of the changes in that activity zone.

The way it's proposed now, they may not -- they would not be individually notified on a case-by-case basis because it was going to be done as a zoning overlay. Now, I don't even know if that will be the outcome of the discussion in the end. But I would -- I don't know what you-all think. Is that something that is -- what do you think of that for an idea to have an evening meeting on that one? Does that cause anybody any heartache?

COMMISSIONER FRYER: It depends on the day only.

COMMISSIONER FRY: I'll be here anyway.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Whether we meet or not.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Stan, would that work for you?

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Well, when I -- next time I talk to the County Manager's Office and we think about -- we talk about scheduling the 16th, we'll see if we can schedule it possibly for an evening meeting or however that might work out.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Mark, could we -- are we going to get some kind of assurance that we're going to have folks involved in this participate? Other -- that being notice to them?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: It's kind of like the last one we heard. I was hoping that when Jeremy comes up and discusses, we could -- well, I'll ask Jeremy right now.

COMMISSIONER DEARBORN: Mr. Chairman, a quick point of clarification while we're waiting for Jeremy. If it is moved to the evening, that's okay, but it would be at a basketball game coaching a varsity basketball game.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Every night?

COMMISSIONER DEARBORN: No, the 16th.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Well, we'd have to see what date then.

COMMISSIONER DEARBORN: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: We already have a meeting in the morning of the 16th.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Yeah, we do. Yeah.

I was just trying to -- try to get to a workshop. If we're going to go and convert this to a workshop, then I would suggest -- I was just trying to see if a workshop would be better in the evening or the daytime.

And, Jeremy, I know you're not involved in transmittals as much as you are in the other things, but you're actually knowledgeable about this language that's been written.

The stakeholders involved in this activity center: We've got Golden Gate City; Golden Gate Estates; there are three or four projects within the activity that are gone residential; there's Saddlebrook Apartments and another residential there; there's Bay -- I mean, Cedar Hammock; and there's Glen Forest (sic). I mean, it's got a lot of folks. How did you notify the -- when you did the stakeholder meeting for the golf course thing, how did you arrange the notifications there so people knew it and got involved? And then was that an evening meeting as well?

MR. FRANTZ: For the golf course amendment that you-all recently heard?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Yeah.

MR. FRANTZ: Yeah. We sent out mailed notices. We put a sign -- a couple of variable message signs on the road. And I know that for this particular GMP amendment, David did hold a public information meeting, and that was held at night. Yeah, sorry, the golf course amendment was also held at night, that public meeting. So I think a night hearing would be beneficial for the community.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I would feel more comfortable if we sent something to the Board and we could tell them it did get vetted as typically done instead of a broadcast that not a lot of people pay attention to, as the paper ads are required.

Joe.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Just a question on this as well, and the boundaries shown -- would the -- and this is something we would address at the workshop. But would the -- would it have to be amended again once the interchange plan is completed and designs are completed? Because that's all in the works now for a major interchange at this -- at 75 and Collier.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: But those right-of-ways are what they would build within.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Yeah. All the right-of-ways already, I think, have been identified, and that certainly is going to change the boundaries again.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, actually, I don't think so, Joe. But, anyway, I've got the plans for the -- what the DOT's planning to do. They're going to a partial cloverleaf at I-75 and Collier Boulevard, and they're going to run a dual overpass at what is now Davis Boulevard where it intersects Collier Boulevard as well. What that will do is give them right-on and right-off of I-75 going north and south in all directions. But I think it's all, from what I can tell, in the existing right-of-way. Yeah.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: All within the existing, all right.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anyway, David, did you have something you wanted to add?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Jeremy, with that information, then, we'll -- as the staff or County Manager's Office decides how they want to proceed, at least we now know the possibility of a night meeting for us works. It seems to be well received by the attempts you've done in the past to get people involved quickly, and that might be a very positive way to look at this. So thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Chairman?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Go ahead. Ned, then Joe.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: May I say that I have got evening plans. I have daughters in town the 16th through the 19th, so that would be -- I might be constrained if it became an evening meeting during those dates.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, no. They're welcome. They can come here.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Oh. Well, I'll tell them that. They'll be delighted.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: That's what we'll work out. If it looks like an evening meeting might be more productive and if that's part of -- if that's the magnitude of the changes that we're going to have to do, it would dictate that, we'll just work a date that works for everybody. We're not locked into any date. But right now -- in fact, the continuance, it just might be simply pulled because it may come back as enough of a refined animal that they might want to readvertise it, so...

Okay, Joe.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Just to also include in your analysis the history of this 305 parcel. I have absolutely no idea what that is.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: It's called Melon property.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Other than you identified it. And there was nothing else in the documentation that described what it is or --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: It's a county-owned property. It's got a lot of core issues, so...

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: I'm well aware of the area. I just --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Well, with that, then we'll see how this gels up. And we've got the information we need to hopefully people listening so we can work on that.

Thank you, Jeremy.

That takes us -- we don't have any consent items. The public -- 9A1's been continued.

So, Jeremy, before you sit down, let's go to 9A2. Can you explain to us why we're here?

MS. ASHTON-CICKO: And just for clarification, you earlier continued the item as the public hearing, but you're also looking at scheduling a workshop.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Right. And what I was hoping is when all this gels up and the County Manager's Office takes a look at it, they prefer a way to go and we're able to do that. Do we need to restructure the motion on the 16th in order to assure we have enough -- we can modify it? Because if they decide -- for example, if they decide to approach this more definitively and they change the uses, narrow them down to items that are more compatible, that may take a workshop process to get there instead of the hearing on the 16th, and that may be delayed, then, until a future date, which I know, in my discussions that I've had, they would be readvertising it. So do we need to do anything at this meeting today to consider the 16th now or just leave it like it is and deal with it on the 16th?

MS. ASHTON-CICKO: I think you can leave it as-is where you've officially continued the item to the 16th. If the proposal gets modified to the extent that it's something you can vote on on the 16th, then you can proceed that way. You can also schedule the workshop and cancel the workshop if you need to.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay.

MS. ASHTON-CICKO: So it's just kind of leaving a couple options open at this point.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Thank you very much.

Oh, Ellen, you're going to take Jeremy's place, huh? Okay. What you got?

MS. SUMMERS: Yes. Good morning. For the record, Ellen Summers, senior planner.

We brought this LDC amendment before you-all on the November 21st meeting, and I believe you-all had a couple questions regarding the public notice procedures and asked that we continue this. So we're back here today to answer any questions, give you a little brief overview of the public notice procedures currently.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Because I left that one early, we had -- I thought we finished sections of it, so the only piece that's outstanding is the public notice?

MS. SUMMERS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: In the end did any of it get voted on, or is the whole thing held to vote for today meeting?

MS. SUMMERS: This amendment did get voted on. The rest of the amendments that were included --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: So the only thing we're here about is a clarification on this?

MS. SUMMERS: Correct.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Excellent. Thank you.

MS. SUMMERS: We just wanted to clarify. So we are amending the public notice procedures for a PUDA amendment, rezones, and Comprehensive Plan amendments for small-scale and site-specific. And to clarify, we are codifying what the current practice is for public-notice procedures.

So currently we send mail notices prior to the NIM before the first public hearing, and that's sent to property owners within the notification area, which may be 500 or 1,000 feet outside of the project boundary. Additionally, staff elects to include additional property owners that could be impacted by a PUD amendment or a rezone, as well as a site-specific Comp Plan amendment.

Additionally, we have a newspaper advertisement that gets sent out prior to each public hearing, so it gets sent before Planning Commission as well as the Board of County Commissioners.

And then we also have the signs posted. Signs are posted prior to the first Planning Commission meeting, and that sign will include the dates for the Planning Commission hearings as well as the Board of County Commissioners. And if there's any changes in those dates, staff did require the applicants to update those signs on the project perimeters.

And I think that was where some of the questions were coming from. This amendment proposes to remove a requirement that's been in the code for quite some time but it's not been implemented, and that's to send an additional mail notice prior to BCC. And the way that the code language reads, it states that the county shall

send those notices. Previously it stated that the Clerk would send those notices. But, again, historically, this is not a procedure that's been practiced. So we're just cleaning up.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: So the sending of the notices would only occur prior to the NIM and then prior to the Planning Commission meeting and basically the --

MS. SUMMERS: Correct.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: -- next step, being the BCC, would be probably discussed both at the NIM and the Planning Commission scheduling?

MS. SUMMERS: Correct.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay.

MS. SUMMERS: And, again, that mail notice that we're amending out states that the notice gets sent to the real property owners. In most cases the rezone or Comprehensive Plan amendments, the real property owners are a party to that petition. A PUD amendment's a little bit more of a unique situation which, you know, you'd have the developer.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody have any questions?

Ned.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: My concerns were allayed by the meeting I had with Ellen, so I'm satisfied with this. In essence, this is conforming the language to a long-time practice, and so it seems satisfactory to me.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Karl.

COMMISSIONER FRY: A common theme -- and my colleague Commissioner Fryer often brings up the fact that in the NIM audio recordings and the minutes, very often the speaker is not identified. And I wondered -- I do see requirements for the NIM in this -- you know, in this amendment. Would it be appropriate to add a requirement that there be an audio -- I don't see any requirement for there to be an audio recording provided or taken or that each speaker be identified. Is that something that should be formalized?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: It is, in the admin code. That was done before you got here, but we did -- we had put in the -- we clarified all that in the admin code.

COMMISSIONER FRY: Very good. Glad to hear it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Sorry. I just figured --

MS. SUMMERS: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FRY: Very good answer, Ellen.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: There was one missing step in the admin procedures, but it seems to have been fixed just by staff practice, and that is that the administrative procedures require the transcript go to staff. Then the missing piece was that staff would forward that as part of the record to us, but staff does that as a matter of practice, so I'm satisfied.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Anybody else have any questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Is there a motion, then, to approve this LDC segment?

COMMISSIONER DEARBORN: So moved.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Second?

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Second.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion made and seconded. Discussion?

(No response.)

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

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Aye.

COMMISSIONER FRY: Aye.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Aye.

COMMISSIONER DEARBORN: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion carries 7-0.

And, Ellen, that's it for your item today, right?

MS. SUMMERS: That's it.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Then now we're going to -- first of all, there's no new business listed, and we'll go into old business.

And this is a leftover item that came about for the -- and I'll read it. 11A would be Conditional Use PL20180002693, the Immokalee Guadalupe Center on Westclox a half mile west of Carson Road.

Heidi, do we need to have disclosures and swearing in on this one since it's a discussion on -- more like a consent?

MS. ASHTON-CICKO: It is more of a consent. You already had the hearing.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Your mic's not on.

MS. ASHTON-CICKO: I'm going to recommend that you do any disclosures if there's any supplemental disclosures from the last hearing.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Swearing in? It wouldn't hurt.

MS. ASHTON-CICKO: Yes.

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

(The speakers were duly sworn and indicated in the affirmative.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Disclosures: We'll start with Tom.

MR. EASTMAN: No supplemental disclosures.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Ditto.

COMMISSIONER FRY: Ditto.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: I had an additional meeting with staff.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: And as I did.

Karen.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Nothing since last time.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Joe.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: No additional disclosures.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Patrick.

COMMISSIONER DEARBORN: Same response as Stan.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: With that, we have a master plan that has a -- was -- had a slight change into it compared to what we talked about originally, and thanks to the County Attorney's Office in their review, it was caught before it got passed on to the Board.

And if you look closely, you'll see that there's been dumpster locations specifically located where before it was more of a generalized location within that rectangle area. And that was the piece that we're here for today.

And, Richard, do you want to have any input on this before we have a discussion on it or --

MR. YOVANOVICH: Mr. Chairman -- I have it, if you want me to put it up, Heidi. I will, yes.

For the record, Rich Yovanovich on behalf of the petitioner. Mr. English is here to address any engineering-related concerns. But I think as the Chairman pointed out, you wanted this to come back to identify where the dumpster locations may be when this property is ultimately developed, and that's what's on the master plan before you today.

I don't know that it warrants a big --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: They weren't --

MR. YOVANOVICH: -- involved discussion.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: -- on the original master plan, and that's kind of what --

MR. YOVANOVICH: Understood.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: -- sprung the discussion.

So from that viewpoint, I'll turn to the rest of the panel. And the reason the dumpster locations have always been an issue is because they're generally -- they can be operated early in the morning, dump trucks come in, and they'll raise up the load, which -- and make a lot of noise. The flaps will bang. And then at the same time they have backup -- backup cam -- not cameras, but what do you --

MR. YOVANOVICH: They beep.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: They deep. How's that?

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Beepers.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Backup signals. So with that in mind, we have many of the conditional uses or land-use actions that come through that have dumpster locations. We try to keep them as far away from the adjoining residential as possible.

In this case they're about -- they're on the side closest to some of the residential. Had that been on the original plan, it probably would have highlighted the issue and I would have, myself, suggested that they be put somewhere off the front where they're away from the residential further, because there's a lot of asphalt up front, and you could put them anywhere along those asphalt areas. I don't know the reasoning to put them here, but I'm sure there is reasoning. So if you guys want to explain it, I think it would certainly be appropriate at this point.

MR. ENGLISH: For the record, John English with Peninsula Engineering.

Yeah, that is the -- it has always been identified as the service area. All the deliveries, the areas where they're going to feed the children, all that are located at the terminus of that service area, so that's where the trash will be basically generated. So to move them around to the front, let's say, just could be problematic from just being a really long haul for employees.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well -- and, see, if you -- do you have the original master plan with you you could put on?

MR. ENGLISH: I don't have the original with me.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay.

MR. YOVANOVICH: Mr. Strain -- if you recall, you asked us to put up kind of the plan of --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Yes.

MR. YOVANOVICH: -- when we originally -- "what do we want to be when we grow up" plan with the future explanations and all that -- and I'm having trouble getting this to go the right way.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Yeah. I'm having trouble figuring it out, too, the way you're doing it.

MR. YOVANOVICH: Well, I was trying to get this to show.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Turn it to the left. That's where it showed -- that's what started the discussion, I believe.

MR. YOVANOVICH: But this is where the dumpster was located when we showed you the overall plan, and you asked us to come back with a plan that was consistent with what we had put on the visualizer.

Now, perhaps it didn't catch your attention or whatever, but I'm just saying when we came back in, we had come back with what we believed was the direction of bring a master plan back with how you really anticipate the development of the site to be, which is what we did, which was, in fact, different than what was attached to the original application because the original application was a bubble plan.

MS. ASHTON-CICKO: Ms. Gundlach has the master plan that was in your agenda packet --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I was just going to ask if somebody had that.

MR. YOVANOVICH: Which is a bubble plan. That raised the whole discussion of can you show us really where the buildings are going to be, et cetera, which resulted in this being presented.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Right. But, Rich, there's a difference between receiving a document early and allowing us a week to review it. That's probably why doing things on the fly is a little difficult. And I understand your -- I understand your point. We were shown this. We looked at it. I looked at it. I was concentrating on the orange areas and the building layout and the setbacks.

Honestly, if you put the other plan back on, Nancy, when that plan was shown with the refuge area, there's a little square notch up in the corner. I assumed you'd be -- all your -- it's like Costco and some of the other places where they collapse all their boxes. They have trash compactors. I thought the trucks would be

pulling in there, loading out the trash, and taking it away. And, honestly, had we -- had you shown those dumpsters on this plan and the location you proposed, it would have been highlighted immediately as an issue, and it still is.

Go ahead.

MS. ASHTON-CICKO: Ms. Gundlach's version does have a hand drawn of what looks like the dumpster that was not in the version that you reviewed in your agenda package.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Right. Yeah, that blue ink one?

MS. ASHTON-CICKO: Correct.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: So now when move it -- when you show it -- first of all, now you're not only not in the service and refuse area as it's shown on this plan, you're on the outskirts of the edges of it as close to the residential to the west that you could possibly be and still, you know -- other than being on the roadway.

I'm not saying -- I don't see how that's protecting that neighborhood. And I don't know why you can't move it to another area. I mean, I just -- I don't see the problem with that. We do this all the time, Rich. You know that's been one of our sensitive issues. It's noisy. A lot of times it's really early in the morning, and the residents next door who aren't expecting this, or who wouldn't have expected it, probably, when they moved in, have now got to deal with it 60 feet off their backyard.

MR. ENGLISH: For the record, John English.

I just have a question. So I understand every -- how we got to where we are today. I understand it completely.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Right.

MR. ENGLISH: What my observation is is that little notch that one might have, from the previous -- the original master plan might have thought was the dumpster location was roughly right there.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay.

MR. ENGLISH: We are now proposing to put it roughly right here.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: That's another 60 feet close.

MR. ENGLISH: I don't know why that's such a big difference.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, you know, first of all, in the plan that was provided to us, it showed the building surrounding the area, which would have provided some protection from the noise. And if you count parking spaces that you're moving it closer to the west than what that little square represents, you're about 60 feet closer, which is -- as much as you're away from the residential in that location, now you're taking 120 feet, cutting it down to 60. It's just the fact that it's going to be noisier for those neighbors.

MR. ENGLISH: And --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: And, John, let's think of a different way. What's wrong with putting it up front, other than you not wanting to do it?

MR. ENGLISH: That was the next point I was going to make right. Right, we don't want to do it.

So the people are getting deliveries back here. So vehicles are coming back here doing deliveries. The food service area for the children is right in here. So the waste is generated here. That's -- the waste -- the solid waste is going to have to somehow be moved all the -- I'm not sure exactly where it would be put that would be better.

We have residential on three sides of us. So what are we saying, somewhere over here? So somebody's going to have to move this stuff all the way over there and --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: If you keep it towards the back of that refuse area towards the east side instead of towards the west side, that may be all it takes.

And, Ned, you had a question?

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Yes. And this may be related to what you're raising, Chairman. But comparing the two site plans, the one we got first had verbiage that's been removed. It said 50-foot minimum building setback at the top of the drawing. At the bottom it said 30-foot minimum setback. So I took it from that that there was going to be less buffering or less separation between these dumpsters and the structures to the west.

MR. ENGLISH: So -- I don't know if I'm going to answer the question you're asking correctly, but I'll try. Our MCP always was a two-page document. I don't believe we've changed these setbacks. We probably changed the east/west/south -- we did change the principal setbacks because --

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Can you put the first site plan on.

MR. ENGLISH: You want the MCP or the site plan I was showing you?

COMMISSIONER FRYER: The one that we had in our initial materials.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Nancy's.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Nancy's, yeah.

See at the top it says 50-foot minimum setback; is that north/south?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Okay.

MR. ENGLISH: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Well, that answers that.

MR. ENGLISH: That's from Westclox.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: And then beneath the 30-foot minimum building setback, is that also north/south?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: It's east/west.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: That's east/west?

MR. ENGLISH: Right here; east.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: That's not -- the plan that they've got on the screen, you see the arrow where the 30 minimum points to it?

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: That arrow is where the -- that's the 30 feet. That double -- little double arrow down there between the two points, that's the distance. That's the direction. It's an east/west direction off the west property line.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Okay. But that's not on the second iteration of the site plan.

MR. YOVANOVICH: We're further back.

MR. ENGLISH: The microphone is dead, so I'm going to have to yell.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: No, you can't yell.

MR. ENGLISH: Yeah. The setbacks got larger. So based on the last meeting, we came in with 50 feet front, 30-foot side. Commissioner -- Chairman Strain asked, well, hey, I see you got your building footprint up here. Can you give yourselves a little room? We understand it's -- you're not to final design yet. Give yourself a little room. But can you set a more definitive box that's not -- traditionally these things are just setbacks directly of the property lines, and they're much more like what -- in line with what we had.

So, yeah, we went back, and we gave ourselves a little room, and those setbacks all increased. I think that side setback became 60 feet, let's say. The front setback that was 50 off Westclox became 175, something like that. I don't have it in front of me.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: All right. Well, why wouldn't then -- instead of removing the 30-foot minimum reference, why wouldn't you increase that to 60 if that's what it is?

MR. ENGLISH: On what we resubmitted it did, I think.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: No, I don't see it on there.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: They put it in the table. I'm not sure it made it --

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Oh, maybe it's on the table. It's not on the image.

MR. YOVANOVICH: If you see on the -- that's Page 2.

You just covered it up, John.

MR. ENGLISH: I know, but we took them off -- we took them off of Page 1 --

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Well, some of them you did. Not all of them. Okay. I see it. There it is.

MR. YOVANOVICH: It's there.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: It's there. You're right. Thank you.

The other -- were you finished with dumpsters?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: The other question I had had to do with the water management area. The initial site plan we had had curved lines, and then they were straightened in the second, and I just wondered if there was -- why that was. These are the two site plans; the one that Nancy put up, and then the latest one.

MR. ENGLISH: Right. So let's go back to a quick history. This was the original. That's the question I think you're basing your question on.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Yes.

MR. ENGLISH: So we have a lake, and then in the back we label this as dry detention. I'm really struggling with the direction of this, because I'm way over here with the microphone, but -- so together we had lake, dry detention in the back.

Let's go to what we have today. It's really the same thing. So lake, dry detention. The size changed because we went and met with the Water Management District who has the purview to manage drainage in Southwest Florida, and there were some issues we had to address, so we had to increase the size of the stormwater pond.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Okay. So the curved lines have been expanded to a larger out-boundary with the straight lines?

MR. ENGLISH: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: And they're engineers, so they only know how to do straight lines.

MR. ENGLISH: I completely agree. Perfect radii work, too.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Go ahead, Karl.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Just a quick note. I believe one of the other changes you made on here, correct me if I'm wrong, was to notate a little wider 15-foot maximum light pole height width that went all the way to the buildings, correct? So you actually expanded that area because the concern was that it did not extend all the way across the parking lot initially, but you corrected that in this version; is that accurate?

MR. ENGLISH: Yes, sir, you're correct. One of the results of our last meeting was we were asked to identify a corridor on that west property line, for which we would limit the height of the sight lights, and that's that hatched area there. And it is something along the lines of 70ish feet wide set back -- offset of the property line.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Got it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Could you move -- and I notice you got -- you started out with one dumpster. Now you've got four -- or two dumpsters.

MR. ENGLISH: Let me answer that one real quick, if I could. Those are options. So since we are -- we haven't designed that area in total. So I called the architect. They were throwing around ideas. And so rather than us put one on there, the two ideas/options we were looking at are right at that entrance so that we could get truck access. The two options we were looking at were as shown. And I didn't want to get stuck with one, if possible, if we were going to be agreeable with that general location.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: But couldn't you move those to the east side of that refuse area closer to the building? And that way the trucks would be somewhat shielded, the noise, because they'd be actually -- you've got building -- or they've got buildings on part of them, and -- so is that -- would that -- I mean, that might -- that would resolve it. They keep you in the area you want to be in, but it would just be further away from the houses.

MR. ENGLISH: I'm just pausing because just -- we haven't -- we're not to the point where that area's fully designed yet. So I'm sitting here running through my mind -- I'm thinking.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: If you put the plan on, Richard, with the parking spaces that you are using now, and you count the parking spaces at 10 foot each, you'd see you're almost 50 or 60 feet further than from the end of that refuse area than was shown. You just had a plan with some parking spaces. There you go. And the suggestion is to move it -- well, you've even got a notch where I had anticipated that little white square was up

in -- where that -- apparently to the -- keep going to the north, a little bit to the right, a little bit more. Right there. You can't park there.

MR. ENGLISH: Well, that's building right here.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Right. You're going to be loading -- it's a loading portion, so you'll be coming in straightforward, wouldn't you? You couldn't go around the corner to load.

MR. ENGLISH: Well, my view of this is, right now -- so one thing -- one thing that -- to give us some common point to look at, this playground area, the current location we showed is just touching that. So this is roughly where we have it shown on the new MCP, okay.

This building area has a -- by the way, this isn't final design. This is someone laying something out. The building has a canopy back here. That's roughly what that is equating to.

So the closest we could get back here would be somewhere back here. And the trucks -- it just makes -- you know, if that's -- if you think that makes a difference, I guess we have to consider that.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, farther to the east -- to the east you go, the better it would be. And it's unfortunate we didn't even -- we didn't see the diagram when we originally got the packet. I think it would be have been better timing. But as long as you can push it back further than what you're showing on the one you're showing us today, that certainly helps my concerns.

These have been a sore subject on every single layout we have that has residential along it, so -- I mean, that works a lot better. Is there a reason you can't do that?

MR. ENGLISH: Well, here's my thinking is, we'll -- we can do the best we can do. I don't -- not having the -- being able to work on it in front of me with the architect, it would be hard for me to commit to a certain distance, but we can try to go as far as we can, still have the truck access, still have the parking we need back there, et cetera.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: All I'm suggesting is if you can -- you've got that dark area that you're now looking at to be in alignment with the service and refuse area that we originally thought it was going to be. The dumpster enclosures are 10 feet deep. So if you had about -- if you were provided some flexibility to go within 40 feet of the rear of the service and refuse area as shown on the original plan, that would give you some flexibility to put it, it looks like, in the area you're talking about now, but you'd be a little bit further back than way up front by the main roadway. Is that that hard to do? And, Richard, you're looking --

MR. YOVANOVICH: I'm just trying to -- I go back to it's not like garbage trucks come every day. And I have a hard time believing that a 20- or 30-foot difference in between where we think it works best for the plan and getting another 20 or 30 feet is going to make a lot of difference from the sound generated from a dumpster truck dumping the stuff and the backup signal that occurs to have us have to come to that level of a commitment at this point in time for a not-for-profit organization trying to bring good services to the people of Immokalee.

So I would like us to be able to have the flexibility we've shown. It's not like it's going to happen every day at 6:00 a.m. or multiple times in the day. They are enclosed, and we would like to have the flexibility of putting it where -- John, where's your --

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Well, that's the question. You want the flexibility of what you showed us at the last Planning Commission meeting, or you want the flexibility of what you're showing us now? Because the refuse area's different in both plans.

MR. YOVANOVICH: What we're showing you right now is the flexibility we would like to have in those two locations. I think we're only going to have one. It will be an either/or, but that's the flexibility we would like to have.

If you ask the architect, he'd want to have what was on the plan that was originally shown, which was at kind of the end of the driveway in. We understand that that's probably a nonstarter.

So we'd like to -- I think that is a -- this is fair plan and a good plan for the services that we're providing to the community and with minimal impact to our neighbors.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Questions? Karl, then Ned.

COMMISSIONER FRY: Just curious, how often does -- would a trash truck come to this location?

MR. ENGLISH: It's not an engineering question, but my experience is this is going to be a --

MR. YOYANOVICH: Twice a week.

MR. ENGLISH: -- two times a week thing.

MR. YOYANOVICH: Yeah. I think they're just like the rest of us. We get service twice a week.

MR. ENGLISH: Which is a good point. The residents here all are getting their trash picked up twice a week, and instead of hearing it only once, they get to hear it as the truck goes up and down both sides of the road they live on. And it's going to happen somewhat on a frequency not all that unsimilar to lawn maintenance where you hear lawnmowers.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Leaf blowers.

MR. ENGLISH: Leaf blowers.

So I appreciate -- we always want to be good neighbors and, obviously, Guadalupe is trying to be an amazing presence in Immokalee. But we're right around 75 feet setback from a property line that has a Type B buffer and a fence. We're talking about something that everybody's having: Trash pickup. Same -- similar frequency.

I just -- I would -- I'm struggle here trying to identify a specific place we're trying to push this thing back in when I think you can understand we weren't that far with the building design. We've got a really good concept, but you can see we hadn't got down to nuts and bolts time yet.

And so I'm just -- I'm really, on behalf of my client, trying not to get, you know, set on a distance that's going to be very difficult for them later.

COMMISSIONER FRY: I would -- I mean, I remember seeing an arrow to a point that said, you know, service and refuse area, so I think -- you know, I was kind of prepared there would be dumpsters somewhere in that area. In an ideal world, that probably would not be immediately adjacent to that neighborhood, but we did -- we did approve the plan, basically, with -- knowing that it was in that general area.

Personally -- I'm not sure -- I'm not an engineer in terms of the sound travel, but would -- 30 or 40 extra feet, would it help it? Would it make a significant difference? The clanging of a dumpster is loud, and I think it travels an extra 30 feet at almost the same volume as it would travel 30 less feet, and on the backing up sound, that sound travels for blocks.

MR. YOYANOVICH: And that's what I was trying to say. I don't know that the 30 feet's going to make a real difference on those types of noises.

COMMISSIONER FRY: Well, it also might echo. If it's between the buildings, you can also get a little bit of an echo effect off of the buildings. So I don't know. You know, my opinion if -- the real issue would have been, you know, is that a good place for that service and refuse area? But that's -- that would require replanning or redesigning the whole facility to put it in a different area, and I can't see that as being practical.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Ned.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: The western boundary is a soft buffer; vegetation. Would there -- would it be possible to harden at least part of that with a wall?

MR. ENGLISH: Well, you've got a not-for-profit trying to build something in Immokalee, and we're asking them to spend -- you know, walls are not cheap.

MR. YOYANOVICH: And I don't -- honestly, I don't think you're going to get a real bang for the buck for putting, you know, a six-foot-tall wall there.

MR. ENGLISH: The problem is sound's going to travel over it.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Excuse me. To build a wall to reflect sound, you have to build a wall either very close to the source of the sound, or you have to build it very high. The farther you are away, the higher the wall has to be to reflect the noise back, so...

COMMISSIONER FRYER: All right. Well, that answers my question. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Are we done with discussion? Stan.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Just one comment about the lake. Maybe 20 years ago somebody from the Planning Department decided we should not have regular-shaped lakes. They were from up north where you do an impound and you have a lake that follows the bank of the river. And they decide that we

shouldn't have lakes that are square or circle. So they wrote something into the ordinance saying you're not allowed to put a straight bank on a lake.

I don't know if that ever was done away with. I argued against it at the time because it just makes no sense, because most of our lakes down here -- the natural lakes are sinkhole lakes, and they're perfect circles.

So if that exists, I want -- I have no problem with the shape of this lake right now, and I would like it part of the record that when we approve this drawing, we're approving the shape of the lake.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Oh, I don't want to lock them into that. Stan, what do we care?

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Well, that they can use a straight line in this instance rather than that scalloped edge.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: But, Stan, that's a deviation, which you don't do those during conditional uses. So they need a variance then. So I'd rather not dive into restricting them on things that we normally don't. They can go to the code and leave that flexibility for them. Because if you start looking at that as the potential deviation to the code, it can't be on a conditional-use process. We're going to have to do it by variance.

You guys want to go through a variance?

MR. ENGLISH: No, sir.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: I didn't think so. Let's just leave it.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Okay. I withdraw.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Well, right now, then, is there -- are we done with our discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Is there any public speakers? Anybody in the public wish to speak on this item?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Okay. Let's just close the public hearing. Is there a motion to either accept this as the plan that goes forward to the Board of County Commissioners or an alternative?

COMMISSIONER FRY: Move to approve.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Second.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion made and seconded. Discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: All those -- signify by saying aye.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Aye.

COMMISSIONER FRY: Aye.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Aye.

COMMISSIONER DEARBORN: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Motion carries 7-0.

Thank you.

MR. ENGLISH: Thank you.

MR. YOVANOVICH: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Staff, Ray, would you please make sure that from now on when staff brings a plan forward that has a layout that requires dumpsters, the specific location of the dumpsters is shown, not just the general location.

MR. BELLOWS: Yes. We usually make these moments a teachable moment for the rest of the staff, so this will be an item of discussion.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: It cost these folks having to come back, and I would rather that not have happened. We could have handled it all at the original meeting, so...

MR. BELLOWS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Thank you. That will take us to the most important item on the agenda. Is there any public comments?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: The second most important item on the agenda: Is there a motion to adjourn?

COMMISSIONER DEARBORN: So moved.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Could I ask something first?

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Hold on that, Patrick?

Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Ray, that LiDAR that you sent out for this Guadalupe Center, you're going to do that for every project from now on, right?

MR. BELLOWS: That was the direction at the last Planning Commission meeting. So when you request it, we'll send it to all the other commissioners.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: The reason I sent out that expanded LiDAR of all of Immokalee was because when they cut that LiDAR off, I had some questions about that depressed area off to the southern end, and you could see where the swale went down.

So if they could maybe go a little farther with the limits of -- we generally used to do a zoom-in of the site itself and then a zoom-out of the neighborhood, and I assume this is the zoom-out of the neighborhood. It just didn't go far enough to answer questions. So, you know, if you could, ask that they just run it a little farther maybe depending on how flat the ground is. They can use their judgment. I'll settle for that.

MR. BELLOWS: I'll bring it to their attention.

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Okay, thanks. That's it.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Now is there a motion to adjourn, Patrick? You're not going to make one now?
(No response.)

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: We're just sit here all day?

Go ahead, Ned. Do you want to make a motion?

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Move to adjourn.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Second? Joe?

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Yep.

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

COMMISSIONER CHRZANOWSKI: Aye.

COMMISSIONER FRY: Aye.

COMMISSIONER FRYER: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER HOMIAK: Aye.

COMMISSIONER SCHMITT: Aye.

COMMISSIONER DEARBORN: Aye.

CHAIRMAN STRAIN: We're out of here. Thank you.

Merry Christmas, everyone, and have a good holiday and New Year's.

And, Karl, I hope to see you at the right time at the next meeting.

December 19, 2019

There being no further business for the good of the County, the meeting was adjourned by order of the Chair at 9:49 a.m.

COLLIER COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION



MARK STRAIN, CHAIRMAN

These minutes approved by the Board on 2-6-20, as presented or as corrected _____.

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED ON BEHALF OF U.S. LEGAL SUPPORT, INC., BY
TERRI LEWIS, COURT REPORTER AND NOTARY PUBLIC.