



Martin County

Administrative Center
2401 SE Monterey Road
Stuart, FL 34996

Meeting Minutes

Local Planning Agency

Niki Norton, Chair, District 1, 11/2024
Thomas Campenni, District 2, 11/2026
Bob Thornton, District 3, 11/2024
James Moir, District 4, 11/2026
Rick Hartman, Vice Chairman, District 5, 11/2024
Juan Lameda, School Board Liaison, 12/2024

Thursday, August 15, 2024

7:00 PM

Commission Chambers

CALL TO ORDER

Niki Norton, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm. A quorum was present.

ROLL CALL

Present: Niki Norton, Chair
Rick Hartman, Vice Chair
Bob Thornton
James Moir
Thomas Campenni
Juan Lameda – School Board Liaison

Staff Present:

Deputy County AttorneyElysse Elder
Growth Management Director.....Paul Schilling
Comprehensive Planning Administrator.....Clyde Dulin
Environmental Administrator.....Darryl Deleeuw
Senior Planner, Growth Management.....Jenna Knobbe
Principal Planner, Growth Management.....Samantha Lovelady
Principal Planner, Growth ManagementBrian Elam
Agency Recorder/Notary..... Rebecca Dima

MINU APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MINU-1 JULY 18, 2024

The Board is asked to approve the minutes from July 18, 2024

Agenda Item: 24-1181

MOTION: A Motion was made by Mr. Moir to approve staff’s recommendation of approval;
SECONDED by Mr. Thornton. The Motion **CARRIED** 5-0.

QJP-1 QUASI-JUDICIAL PROCEDURES

Quasi-Judicial procedures apply when a request involves the application of a policy to a specific application and site. It is a quasi-judicial decision. Quasi-Judicial proceedings must be conducted with more formality than a legislative proceeding. In Quasi-Judicial proceedings, parties are entitled – as a matter of due process to cross-examine witnesses, present evidence, demand that the witnesses testify under oath, and demand a decision that is based on a correct application of the law and competent substantial evidence in the record.

Agenda Item: 24-1181

NEW BUSINESS

NPH-1 PEPPERWOOD ASSEMBLAGE PUD ZONING MASTER/FINAL (C178-002) (QUASI-JUDICIAL)

This is a request by HJA Design Studio, LLC on behalf of JAMSZ Properties Inc. for approval of a Planned Unit Development (PUD) zoning agreement including a Maser and Final site plan for an approximate 29.23-acre property located between SE Cove Road and SE Salerno Road, west of Legacy Cove and south of Fern Creek. Included is a request for a Certificate of Public Facilities Reservation.

Requested by: Michael Houston, HJA Design Studio, LLC

Presented by: Brian Elam, PMP, Principal Planner, Growth Management Department

Agenda Item: 24-1187

***For the Record:**

LPA: Ex-parte communication disclosures: None. Intervener(s) present: None.

Mr. Hartman will be abstaining from the vote.

All persons wishing to speak on Quasi-Judicial agenda item(s) were sworn in.

STAFF: Mr. Elam presented.

LPA: Mr. Moir stated that the Staff Presentation stated that the intermodal pathway would connect Salerno to Cove, however, he does not believe that is accurate. He does not believe the applicant is proposing that but will wait to hear from the Applicant.

STAFF: Mr. Elam stated that there is a road from Salerno down to Pepperwood, the Applicant is not constructing the path all the way up to Salerno, but right now there is no path through Pepperwood down to Cove road, by opening that up there is an access for people on Salerno to come all the way down the existing road.

LPA: Mr. Campenni asked if that was what is being considered part of the Public Benefit.

STAFF: Mr. Elam stated that the multimodal path shown is.

LPA: Ms. Norton stated that that was a sidewalk.

LPA: Mr. Campenni stated that that was not the proposed sidewalk that would go to Salerno.

LPA: Both Mr. Moir & Mr. Campenni stated that there is nothing there and further stated that that cannot be called part of the Public Benefit as nothing is there.

STAFF: Mr. Elam explained that the Applicant is proposing to construct the path as shown and that it is a Public Benefit along with the removal of exotics and planting native plants at the Staff's direction and creating that pathway down to Cove.

STAFF: Mr. Schilling explained that the Applicant is opening the ROW with the opportunity for the multimodal path and that there are existing facilities to the North that will provide a pedestrian access that does not exist at the moment.

LPA: Mr. Moir asked what the \$6,000 traffic controlling device being provided by the Applicant is.

STAFF: Mr. Elam stated that he believes it to be a device that the Fire Department uses that interacts with the traffic system.

LPA: Mr. Moir asked if it was a gate opener.

STAFF: Ms. Elder stated that it changes the actual traffic light when they drive by; she further clarified that the Applicant is donating the device to the Fire Department to be used in the area and will not be used solely in that development, therefore it is a Public Benefit.

LPA: Mr. Thornton commented that Cove Road is already a disaster and stated that the school was expanding.

LPA: Mr. Moir stated that it (Cove Road) was a terrible place and that this was right across from Anderson Middle School.

LPA: Mr. Hartman asked if because the road is not where it needs to be in a serviceable way you are going to tell the property owner, they cannot do what they want to do, the road is not the property owners fault it is the Counties fault for not planning ahead.

LPA: Mr. Moir stated yes.

LPA: Mr. Thornton suggested when an owner wants to develop a property, they have to pay a stamp tax that will go to develop the roads the way they should be.

LPA: Mr. Campenni suggested they get back to the project.

STAFF: Ms. Elder stated that under Florida Law a local government cannot deny an application just because a road is failing; they cannot require an applicant to bring a road up to standard. They can only require the applicant to pay its proportionate share. Therefore, if a road is failing that is not sufficient cause to deny and application.

LPA: Mr. Campenni asked if the road was considered failing.

STAFF: Mr. Schilling stated he is unaware of the road failing.

STAFF: Ms. Elder clarified that she was not stating that that road was failing, she was just clarifying the law.

LPA: Mr. Moir stated that the road was a D minus.

LPA: Mr. Campenni said under Florida Law it is does not mean it is failing, correct?

LPA: Mr. Moir stated that concurrency no longer seems to exist.

LPA: Ms. Norton asked the Applicant to please introduce themselves.

APPLICANT: Ms. Beitler with HJA Designs Studio presented and stated that they have been working diligently on this project for two years. She stated that regarding the multimodal path it is just expanding the opportunity for the existing road and the neighborhoods to the North to have access pedestrian-wise to Cove Road, it will increase the safety for the kids that are going to Anderson now and the ability for the parents/guardians to be able to pick them up in a productive way rather than limiting the road usage of Cove Road. People living in the northern neighborhoods would not have to get on to Cove Rd. per se. they would have a safe access to pick up the kids. She further explained the utilities that would be extended.

LPA: Mr. Campenni asked how many existing houses there are.

APPLICANT: Ms. Beitler asked him if he meant proposed.

LPA: Mr. Campenni stated that the Applicant had said they would be helping the existing houses, and asked how many existing houses there are.

APPLICANT: Ms. Beitler stated she was unsure of the exact numbers.

STAFF: Ms. Elder asked the Applicant if they had their notices to turn in.

APPLICANT: Ms. Beitler turned in the notices to surrounding properties and stated that they met the 14-day requirements.

LPA: Mr. Moir asked the Applicant for more information regarding their plans to improve the drainage in the area. He stated that this is the headwaters of Fern Creek which is already constrained and is already an area prone to flooding and that he believes it is getting worse. He stated that some of the information in the report indicated to him that there was going to be some reconstruction of the wetlands as well as just removing the exotics and asked for more details about that.

APPLICANT: Ms. Beitler explained that she was not the Environmental PE on this, but she is aware

that there is a perimeter berm in the back of the lots to keep the drainage in and not going into the wetlands. She presented a graphic from her presentation to clarify this further. She further explained that they will have signage and upkeep to the area and that there will be no public access to those areas.

LPA: Mr. Moir asked if the Preserve Area Management Plan (PAMP) goes into the areas that are not shaded on the graphic.

APPLICANT: Ms. Beitler stated that yes, the existing wetland areas will have exotic plan removal, however, she does not have the PAMP in front of her.

LPA: Mr. Moir stated that in the document it was indicated that there was going to be substantial re-planting not only in the upland areas but also in the wetland's areas, however, he did not see a planning guide and that is often a part of the PUD agreement.

APPLICANT: Ms. Beitler stated that they could have their Environmental Consultant put in a graphic of the typical planting as necessary.

PUBLIC: The following people spoke regarding this item: None.

LPA: Ms. Norton noted that there was a written comment received and that all Board Members had reviewed it.

MOTION: A Motion was made by Mr. Moir to deny staff's recommendation of approval; **SECONDED** by Mr. Campenni.

LPA: Mr. Hartman asked Mr. Moir to explain why he made the motion to deny.

LPA: Mr. Moir Stated that he does not think it serves enough public purpose and he thinks the damage to Fern Creek would be substantial and that he does not think any development in this area is a good idea and that Cove Road has been allowed to become the problem that it is because these developments have been permitted. He further stated that he has been clear for several years that he will only approved developments on Cove Road if they meet very high standards and he does not believe that this one does.

LPA: Mr. Campenni stated that he is not talking about whether you can develop here, he thinks you can. However, he seconded the motion to deny because he believes the presentation was a very poor one. No questions that Mr. Moir or himself asked could be answered and he does feel comfortable in supporting something where he does not have the answers to his questions.

LPA: Mr. Hartman stated that he cannot vote on this and there is public comment stating that his son was part of the sale and that they thought that would impact his vote and he found that ridiculous.

STAFF: Ms. Elder stated the conflict would have been declared even if they did not have Public Comment.

LPA: Mr. Hartman stated that he spent a lot of money removing pepper trees and if you've ever tried to walk through there you cannot get through peppers. If they get rid of the peppers and make the water flow easier and better that is a big environmental impact and if you get kids that can come from the north and walk through all the way down to Cove Road and go across and get people off of Cove Road that's a good benefit. Also, as far as holding the water, he kind of knows the engineer on this and believes that this will improve Fern Creek. He stated that Mr. Campenni and himself were not engineers.

LPA: Mr. Campenni said that was correct but that there was no engineer here and he does not see anything that would make him want to vote on this now.

LPA: Ms. Norton called for not having opinions at the moment and to allow Mr. Schilling to speak.

STAFF: Mr. Schilling stated that he wanted to make clear that this application is in order and qualifies for an action of approval. It has gone through the full development review process for two years with multiple rounds of reviews and has been reviewed by all agencies of the county with compliance findings.

LPA: Mr. Hartman asked Mr. Schilling to clarify that engineering studies have been done and that the County Staff believes this is a good thing as far as the environment, and waterflow.

STAFF: Mr. Schilling stated that the Development Review Team has analyzed this application and found it in compliance, there are no unresolved issues associated with it, and that's why it is here tonight.

LPA: Mr. Campenni stated that the reason why the Board is here is to look at things and not just staff, otherwise it would be an administrative review, therefore, he believes that Mr. Moir has a very good point, and he (Mr. Campenni) cannot support something when he does not understand how it got here, except to be told it was done.

LPA: Mr. Hartman asked Mr. Campenni if he does not trust staff.

LPA: Mr. Campenni stated it was not about trust or not; it's why the Board is here, to check staff to be sure all the boxes were checked, and he does not know if all the boxes were checked.

LPA: Mr. Schilling stated that they have a full team that looks at these applications. The County Engineer and their whole operation that have reviewed the stormwater, done the stormwater analysis, done the traffic analysis. We have environmental scientists that have signed off on the Preserve Area, if there are areas that are devoid of vegetation in association with the removal of the invasive materials then those areas will be revegetated as standard throughout the county. The Utilities Department have reviewed this application, the whole team has reviewed this application, He does not want it to be construed as if something is amiss here; the application is in order. He acknowledges that it is at the Boards discretion because it is a PUD. There isn't typically the 12-20 people involved in an application at the LPA meeting to testify, however, he suggests that by Mr. Elam and his own testimony show that the application is in order.

LPA: Mr. Thornton stated that he does not think that anyone is saying that it is not in order. He thinks that there is a major storm outside these doors in the community regarding all the yellow signs going up. This is great to put this in to get a sidewalk but believes we could probably put a sidewalk in for those kids ourselves.

LPA: Ms. Norton stated that she is not an Engineer, but she is an Architect and if you have ever been through a pre-application you know that when you go in front of staff, it's 12 plus staff members that give you a report, some conflict some do not and you would not be able to move forward with something like this if you did not meet those requirements. She Stated that she is not approving or denying this per se but knows the regiment and regulations that have to be met to get through the process to meet the requirements. The requirements in place require an applicant to do these things that you are looking at. Ms. Norton asked the staff if Cove Road was a Martin County Roadway or an FDOT.

LPA: Mr. Schilling stated he believes it is a county roadway.

LPA: Ms. Norton stated that she knows traffic studies have to be done and asked Mr. Schilling to confirm this.

STAFF: Mr. Schilling confirmed that there was a full traffic analysis that was analyzed as part of this application which was signed and sealed by a PE and reviewed by the county engineer's office.

STAFF: Ms. Elder explained that it was up to the Boards discretion as to whether to allow the Applicant to come back up to answer questions as the Board was in the middle of a vote.

LPA: The Board agreed to allow the Applicant to introduce themselves and confirm they were sworn in.

APPLICANT: Donald Barnes, JAMZ Property, Inc., owner of the property, confirmed he had been sworn in. He stated that he is a professional engineer. He stated that the discharge would be reduced and cleaned up through the project and that they are doing substantial work in the wetlands to clean them up as they are currently impassible. The traffic report denotes that their contribution to Cove Road would be de minimis, there would be a very few units pushing out on Cove and that mathematically Cove Road is not over burned at the moment; he does understand what goes on with the schools but adding these units out there would not be overburdening the roadway. He stated that they are proposing less units than what is allowed by current code. He feels they have been good neighbors, worked well with staff for two years and thinks it's a good project and doing more good than harm and urges the Board to reconsider.

LPA: Mr. Moir stated that he thinks removing the exotic invasives is something that is necessary. He thinks that those places where exotic invasive are natural there is some benefit that those natural system provide whether they are exotic invasive or not. He said he does not know how to quantify the negative impacts of development verses leaving an area natural. He thinks that there are ways of estimating those natural services, but it has been a systematic drainage problem and none of the new improvements out there have done beneficial things for Fern Creek drainage nor for the water quality of the outfall to the

St. Lucie River.

LPA: Mr. Hartman stated that what is trying to be figured out is if this is a project that really works and does some good; and cleaning out the exotics would improve the water flow. He stated that what is important to remember is that what the community thinks is not what's legal, and that as an applicant working with the county is difficult.

LPA: Ms. Norton asked the Applicant what the retention requirements on the site are as required by the county to retain the outflow of stormwater on the site.

APPLICANT: Mr. Barnes asked Ms. Norton if she was talking about cubic feet per second?

LPA: Mr. Moir stated it was the 25 years storm - three days.

LPA: Mr. Campenni stated that the board is here to make a decision based on the evidence before them. If the evidence isn't there, then they shouldn't be making a decision just because they are told it has been looked at and it is great. The Applicant should have come tonight with his experts to answer the questions and or with their studies and he saw none of that. So, he does not know whether what the Applicant said is true. He does believe that the Applicant has the absolute right to develop the property and has the absolute right to put more units on there is they so desire, but he cannot support something without the evidence.

STAFF: Ms. Elder reminded the Board that this is a PUD agreement and not straight zoning, therefore there is discretion because they are agreeing to the terms of what the Applicant is proposing.

LPA: Mr. Campenni asked to have it clarified that a yes vote is for denial in this case.

LPA: Ms. Norton confirmed this, as based on the motion that was made.

MOTION: The Motion to deny CARRIED 3-1: Mr. Thornton, Mr. Moir and Mr. Campenni voted Aye, Ms. Norton opposed, Mr. Hartman abstained.

NPH-2 LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATION 24-06, ARTICLE 6, IMPACT FEES

A proposed text amendment to Chapter 2, Overall Goals and Definitions of the Comprehensive Growth Management Plan, Martin County Code, based on the 2024 Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR).

Requested by: Martin county Growth Management Department

Presented by: Clyde Dulin, AICP, Comprehensive Planning Administrator, Growth Management

Agenda Item: 24-1184

STAFF: Mr. Dulin and Ms. Samantha Lovelady presented.

LPA: Mr. Moir asked for clarification of the 50% term for allowances regarding impact fees and asked

when the last impact fees study was done.

STAFF: Ms. Elder explained that we are allowed to increase fees once every 4 years and that the increase can only be 50% of what is currently being charged. This is breaking up the increase over four years. Mr. Dulin stated that last full study was done in 2013.

LPA: Mr. Moir stated that we are behind on collecting impact fees by a lot, is there a recommendation in here to do whatever study is required to be sure we can increase our impact fees as much as we possibly can in the next cycle.

STAFF: That is not our recommendation at this time. Our current recommendation is the fees that you see in the attached schedules, that will allow us to go forward and then four years from now do another study to try to cover any deficiencies at that point.

LPA: Mr. Moir said he understands the requirement of the State Statute but feels that we are not doing our Citizenry the justice they deserve if we are not recommending to the county that they do the impact study as fast as they possible can so that we are not perpetually 25% behind ourselves.

STAFF: Mr. Dulin stated that could be conveyed if that is a recommendation of the LPA, however, the downside to that is the threshold to go above 50% is an extraordinary lift and would require starting all over again. Ms. Lovelady noted that she believes statute requires an extraordinary circumstance.

LPA: Mr. Campenni stated that since a study has to be done to raise fees anyway there is no reason to cloud this Article with a requirement and should be up to Staff to recommend to the Commission and the Commission should vote yes or no.

STAFF: Mr. Dulin continued his presentation showing that there are various increases and decreases across the board.

LPA: Mr. Moir asked when the impact fees are collected?

STAFF: Mr. Dulin answered that they are collected at the time of Building Permit issuance. He further explained that a change to the LDR is that previously some impact fees were collected at the time of the Final Site Plan approval and others were collected at Building Permit. Florida Statute changed a few years ago and Martin County is already doing what is required, therefore, some changes being made now are just catching up with the changes that had to be done to be in compliance with Fl. State Statute. Mr. Dulin then concluded his presentation and asked that the LPA approve Staff's recommendation for approval. He noted that January 1st has been set as the start date for changes. This is scheduled to go before the BOCC on Sept. 10, 2024.

LPA: Mr. Campenni asked if there was another way that to collect impact fees beside the current way, for example could we say in a PUD that we want X to do this...or is that against Statute.

STAFF: Mr. Dulin stated that he was unsure, however, there is nothing in the Florida Statute to guide us on that. Ms. Lovelady noted that with a PUD, some developers may be issued a credit for impact fees

because they are providing a Public Benefit, i.e., a Park, etc.

LPA: Mr. Campenni clarified his question saying for example if we need a traffic light because a project is going to impact the roadway, is there a mechanism as part of the PUD to have them pay for it, can we *require* that?

STAFF: Ms. Elder stated it would depend on the traffic study. Mr. Schilling stated that yes, there could be a fee collected, historically that has been associated with a PUD.

LPA: Mr. Campenni clarified that he was wanting to get confirmation that there was a mechanism in place under the PUD for the County to say, “we will need this because of your impact” and we can charge something else in addition to impact fees.

STAFF: Mr. Schilling confirmed this.

LPA: Mr. Moir commented that the essence of a PUD is a negotiated agreement, and Ms. Norton agreed with that statement. Mr. Moir also asked further questions regarding Single Family Residence (SFR) impact fees and if credits can be moved within the different sq footages.

STAFF: Mr. Dulin said no.

LPA: Mr. Campenni asked if a home is already on a property do impact fees apply.

STAFF: Mr. Schilling stated that impact fees run with the land, for example, if there was already a SFR on the property and you demolish it and build a new home the impact fees run with the land in perpetuity.

LPA: Ms. Norton asked for clarification regarding square footage of the homes, for example if you knock down a 2000 sq. foot home and build a 5000 sq. foot home you will need to pay the difference in the impact fees, correct?

STAFF: Ms. Lovelady stated that no, that is no longer the case. You could knock down an 800 sq. foot home and build a 10,000 sq. foot home and the impact fees already paid are not changed.

LPA: Mr. Campenni asked if that was because of State Statute or is that just the way we do it.

STAFF: Ms. Lovelady stated that there is an exemption that allows that in Article 6. Mr. Schilling said it is part of current code.

LPA: Mr. Campenni asked if there was a reason why we should not change that, as the impact of an 800 sq. foot home is different from a 5,000 sq. foot house.

STAFF: Mr. Dulin said it is not proposed for change in the LDR, but if that is your recommendation it can be noted.

LPA: Mr. Campenni said he would hold his recommendations for the vote. Ms. Norton asked how transportation and mobility fees were being handled with the adjacent Counties and Cities.

STAFF: Mr. Dulin explained that each Municipality sets up their own mobility fees; ours are not set up to work as a mobility fee, they are set up to work for roads and mutli-modal paths etc. A percentage of County impact fees are retained by the Municipalities and can be applied to their Mobility planning. Ms. Lovelady further explained how the inter-local agreement for fees are managed for parks, etc.

LPA: Mr. Hartman commented regarding the adverse effects of County and School Impact fees on young, first-time home buyers and asked if that could be softened in any way.

STAFF: Mr. Dulin stated that the only deferral on impact fees available is for Affordable Housing. Mr. Dulin also noted that the fees in Staff's presentation are the County impact fees, the School District impact fees are on top of those.

PUBLIC: The following people spoke regarding this item: None.

MOTION: Mr. Campenni made a Motion to accept Staff's recommendation with a request to have a review done at some point regarding the Impact Fees for cases in which a SFR already exists and is replaced with a larger SFR. Mr. Thornton Seconded Mr. Campenni's Motion.
The Motion CARRIED 5-0.

NPH-3 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT 24-02, OVERALL GOALS AND DEFINITIONS

A proposed text amendment to Chapter 2, Overall Goals and Definitions of the Comprehensive Growth Management Plan, Martin County Code, based on the 2024 Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR).

Requested by: Paul Schilling, Growth Management Department Director

Presented by: Jenna Knobbe, Planner, Growth Management

Agenda Item: 24-1180

STAFF: Mr. Dulin introduced the item, Ms. Knobbe presented.

LPA: Mr. Campenni asked where did the resiliency policy come from that is being implemented?

STAFF: Mr. Dulin said more details will be noted in next agenda item, and the Board considered an agenda item back in 2021 which initiated the amendment to Chapter 8 of the Comprehensive Plan.

LPA: Mr. Campenni asked if it was only an internal study that was used?

STAFF: Mr. Dulin said he believes a consultant was used.

PUBLIC: The following people spoke regarding this item: None.

MOTION: A Motion was made by Mr. Campenni to approve staff's recommendation of approval;
SECONDED by Mr. Moir. The Motion CARRIED 5 - 0.

NPH-4 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT 24-08 COASTAL MANAGEMENT ELEMENT

A proposed text amendment to Chapter 8, Coastal Management Element of the Comprehensive Growth Management Plan, Martin County code, based on the 2024 Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR).

Requested by: Paul Schilling, Growth Management Department Director

Presented by: Amy Eason, Environmental Resource Engineer, Public Works

Darryl Deleeuw, Environmental Administrator, Growth Management

Clyde Dulin, Comprehensive Plan Administrator, Growth Management

Agenda Item: 24-1182

STAFF: Mr. Dulin introduced the item and Mr. Deleeuw presented.

LPA: Mr. Moir asked questions and commented on some of the language in the Chapter.

STAFF: Mr. Deleeuw took note of his comments.

LPA/STAFF: Mr. Moir, Mr. Deleeuw and Mr. Dulin discussed language in Chapters regarding Seawalls, Near Shore, Seagrasses, etc.

LPA: Mr. Moir made a statement regarding concerns arising if they are just talking about resiliency in sea level rise and the concern that it misses a lot of other issues that have to do with climate change.

LPA/STAFF: Ms. Norton, Mr. Moir and Mr. Deleeuw discussed the statement made by Mr. Moir.

PUBLIC: The following people spoke regarding this item: None.

MOTION: A Motion was made by Mr. Hartman to approve staff's recommendation of approval;
SECONDED by Mr. Thornton. The Motion CARRIED 5-0.

NPH-5 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT 24-09 CONSERVATION AND OPEN SPACE ELEMENT

A proposed text amendment to Chapter 9, Conservation and Open Space of the Comprehensive Growth Management Plan, Martin County code, based on the 2024 Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR).

Requested by: Paul Schilling, Growth Management Department Director

Presented by: Darryl Deleeuw, Environmental Administrator, Growth Management

Clyde Dulin, Comprehensive Plan Administrator, Growth Management

Agenda Item: 24-1182

LPA: Mr. Moir stated that most of his comments from the last section will apply here.

STAFF: Mr. Dulin introduced the item and Mr. Deleeuw presented.

LPA: Mr. Moir asked if the Hydric Soils map will remain.

STAFF: Mr. Deleeuw explained what maps will remain and what is changing.

LPA: Mr. Hartman asked why the County was so involved in this if the SFWM certifies the Wetlands.

STAFF: Mr. Dulin stated they are backing away from the involvement but are clarifying the use of the data sources to be sure people can find the right information. He and Mr. Deleeuw further explained the intricacies of the current County maps.

PUBLIC: The following people spoke regarding this item: None.

MOTION: A Motion was made by Mr. Campenni with a note regarding the element conservation space as requested by Mr. Moir to approve staff's recommendation of approval; **SECONDED** by Mr. Hartman. The Motion **CARRIED** 5-0.


COMMENTS:

1. **PUBLIC** – None.
2. **STAFF** – Mr. Schilling polled the LPA Members regarding their attendance for the upcoming Sept. 12, 2024, meeting.
3. **LPA** – Mr. Moir & Mr. Campenni said they would not be available for the Sept. 12, 2024, meeting. Ms. Norton, Mr. Thornton & Mr. Hartman said they can attend.

ADJOURN:

The Local Planning Agency meeting of August 15, 2024, adjourned at 8:43 pm.

Respectfully Submitted:




 Rebecca Dima
 Growth Management Department
 Agency Recorder/Notary

9/19/2024

 Date Signed

Approved by:



 Niki Norton, Chair ←
 Tom Campenni for