

**Gadsden County Board of County Commissioners
Planning Commission Regular Meeting**

MINUTES

**Thursday, November 14, 2013
6:00p.m.**

**Board of County Commissioners Meeting Room
7 East Jefferson Street
Quincy, Florida**

Present: Commissioner Regina Davis, At - Large Member, Chair
Commissioner Edward Allen, Vice – Chair
Commissioner Dr. Gail Bridges – Bright
Commissioner Diane Sheffield
Commissioner Larry Ganus
Commissioner Mari VanLandingham
Commissioner David Tranchand
Commissioner Frank Rowan
Commissioner William Chukes
Commissioner Ed Dixon (arrived late)
Commissioner Catherine Robinson
Commissioner Judge Helms, Acting School Board Representative
Allara Gutcher, Planning & Community Development Director
Willie Brown, Principal Planner
Beryl H. Wood, Deputy Clerk

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Davis called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. with a quorum and led in the Pledge of Allegiance to the U.S. flag.

2. INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS/ROLL CALL

Each member present stated his or her name and district for the record.

Chair Davis welcomed Allara Gutcher to the Planning Commission and read her biography into record.

3. Approval of Minutes:

September 9, 2013

UPON MOTION BY COMMISSIONER VANLANDINGHAM AND SECOND BY COMMISSIONER ALLEN, THE COMMISSION VOTED 12 – 0, BY VOICE VOTE, FOR APPROVAL OF SEPTEMBER 9, 2013.

4. **DISCLOSURES AND DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICT** – None

5. **Agenda**

Mr. Ganus commented on several hot issues on the agenda. He motioned to table item 6 and 7 to schedule a workshop for full and better understanding. He recommended they have separate workshops and it was seconded by Commissioner Sheffield.

Commissioner Bridges – Bright conveyed that item 6 has been discussed and she was in favor of work shopping item 7 only.

Commissioner Allen asked was this language not put into the EAR amendments.

Chair Davis said she was not in favor of tabling because people were here to speak and should be allowed that opportunity.

Chair Davis called the question.

UPON MOTION BY COMMISSIONER GANUS AND SECOND BY COMMISSIONER SHEFFIELD, THE COMMISSION VOTED 6 – 6, IN A MOTION TO TABLE ITEM 6 & 7 ON THE AGENDA FOR SEPARATE WORKSHOPS FOR FULL UNDERSTANDING. (Commissioner’s VanLandingham, Dixon, Davis, Chukes, Bridges –Bright & Helms.) The motion failed.

6. **ACCEPTANCE OF THE 2014 MEETING CALENDAR**

UPON MOTION BY COMMISSIONER VANLANDINGHAM AND SECOND BY COMMISSIONER GANUS, THE COMMISSION VOTED 12 – 0, BY VOICE VOTE, FOR APPROVAL OF THE ACCEPTANCE OF THE 2014 MEETING CALENDAR.

7. **PUBLIC HEARING (LEGISLATIVE) – FAMILY EXCEPTION (LDR-2013-01)** – Proposed Ordinance amending Chapter 6 of the Gadsden County Land Development Code to allow a parcel of land from a parent parcel to be conveyed for homestead purposes to an immediate family member for properties designated as Agricultural on the Future Land Use Map. (BOCC 12/17/2013)

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 6, SUBDIVISION OF LAND, OF THE GADSDEN COUNTY LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE, ADDING SECTION 6600, FAMILY EXCEPTION; A REVISION AND REPLACEMENT OF THE FORMER IMMEDIATE FAMILY HOMESTEAD EXCEPTION REGULATIONS, AS APPLICABLE; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Chair Davis reminded all, there are numerous amounts of speakers and asked that they please adhere to time restraints.

Allara Gutcher, Planning Director was sworn by deputy clerk. “This item reignited prior to my tenure here with the County.” In 2007, the Board of County Commissioners adopted Section 660 into the Land Development Regulations that enabled family members to deed a minimum of one acre of land and up to three parcels of land to defined immediate family members. The provision expired within eighteen (18) months of adoption.

This amendment would reintroduce the similar language into the Land Development Regulations, with no expiration or sunset date. One major change to the language is the prior to the sunset of the regulation; the grantor had a minimum restriction of one acre to be conveyed to the proposed family member. The proposed language requires a minimum of three acres to be conveyed to the family member. In no case shall a parent parcel or a conveyed parcel be less than three (3) acres in size.

The regulation still restricts the usage of this exception to those properties classified as Agriculture on the Future Land Use Map. In addition, the definition of the immediate family member retains that which is as defined in §163.3179, Florida Statutes.

Commissioner VanLandingham referenced Attachment 2, Chapter 6; subsection 6602(b) **Ownership. Each parcel created by Family Homestead Exception shall be owned and homestead by the grantees for at least three (3) years from the date of County approval.** “Does that actually mean prior to.”

Mrs. Gutcher said the issue raised when working on the language is the intent is not to deed a parcel to your child and then they flip it. They wanted the property owner to be related to the person and hold for a number of years, so they were avoiding the subdivision regulation.

Commissioner VanLandingham asked, “You aren’t saying that parcel had to be previously homestead for 3 years prior to it being.”

Mrs. Gutcher stated the grantee, the person who is receiving the parcel must own for 3 years before they can put it up for sale.

Commissioner VanLandingham posed additional question from subsection 6603 (A): **Previously platted parcels, lots or subdivisions. Family Homestead Exception subdivisions shall not be permitted from previously platted parcels, recorded plat (s), or subdivisions.** She said every parcel in this county has been platted.

Mrs. Gutcher said it was her understanding that a lot of the County was by leaps and bounds, not platted. If it is a platted subdivision wouldn’t be allowed to use this provision.

Commissioner VanLandingham pointed out, she also has unrecorded subdivisions that have been

platted, and so would they be excluded as well.

Mrs. Gutcher said yes, “anything that is previous platted parcels would be outside the regulations.”

Commissioner VanLandingham questioned if a plat was never vested, it was never developed. Would they be able to participate?

Mrs. Gutcher stated if they are in rural residential they aren’t allowed.

Commissioner Ganus asked would unrecorded subdivisions be included in this section. He said he lived in one of those subdivisions where the developers made it a plat with all the lots on it, but never recorded it. He said if he had a choice, he would like to see those recorded and unrecorded exempted out of this. That’s my preference.

Commissioner VanLandingham voiced she felt they should be able to participate if they wanted too. “If a plat was never vested those people should still be able to participate in the Family Exception if they are agriculturally zoned.”

Mrs. Gutcher replied if it’s platted, it should have been recorded. “The intent was if you’re a platted subdivision you have met the process and Code. The intent was not to supersede that.”

Commissioner Ganus said a lot of this was taking place before pre-comp planning days, when none of that had to be done. Everything was complied with what was on the book at the time.

Mrs. Gutcher stated again, if it’s a platted lot for leaps and bounds, it has to be a minimum of 6 acres. She asked was the lots in his subdivision that size. She said a 5 acre lot couldn’t take advantage because they need to have a minimum of 3 lots after revision.

Commissioner VanLandingham referenced same subsection (g): She asked for an example of how that would work non – conforming parcels.

Mrs. Gutcher explained if you have an Ag 2 category that requires 10 acres, but you only have 6, you aren’t conforming size to the Ag 2; you would be a non – conforming parcel.

She then asked would they be able to sell to an immediate family member are not. “This is where I got hung up at.”

Mrs. Gutcher replied only if they could maintain the 3 acre minimum.

Commissioner Tranchand asked why the change from 5 to 3 years.

Mrs. Gutcher stated it was recommended.

Mrs. Sheffield recalled the problems that the exception presented in the past. How much of a need is there to do this. It was unsettled for reasons.

Mrs. Gutcher said they have not done an analysis but, it was a number of requests from the County Commission.

Commissioner Sheffield referenced 6605 (A) Application (3) the draft deed restrictions.

Mrs. Gutcher said the restriction is in 6604 about the resale of the property.

Commissioner Sheffield then referenced subsection 6604 (A) the last word **and** should come out and replaced with a **period** after approval.

The Commission also noted the in 6604 (A) Resale the word **and** should be struck and replaced with **A**.

Commissioner Allen discussed the ownership in 6602 (B) and 6604 the resale: He said with the EAR Amendments he believes that put the language in at 5 years. He asked was it legal; “if I give my son or daughter a piece of property and they go through the process and get the titles, can it be restricted legally from doing whatever they want with the property.”

Commissioner Ganus spoke of time limit of one year with the old ordinance in the old ordinance it was a time limit of one year before homesteading of the land. He said he didn’t see where it mentioned the homesteading of the new piece of property. He added if there is not a time limit placed lots will stay their vacant. “What would happen if you would have land vacant for 3 years, then they could sell it. They would have a minor subdivision they could sell. The question is can we put a time limit on the homesteading of the land.”

Mrs. Gutcher asked for clarification on time limit when they homestead. 6602 (B) Ownership, after conversation with County Manager; his concern was the homestead portion because you can’t immediately require someone to homestead. He requested they take out homestead.

Commissioner Ganus then questioned 6603 (c) Minimum size: “What you are basically stating here is Ag3 land, 20 acres and converting it to Ag1 land. You can 4 parcels on one 20 acre lot is 5 acres. Would a 15ft size setback requirement, which means you could wake up one morning and have a minor subdivision of mobile homes 15 ft from your property line. That’s what I’m looking at. For those of you who don’t live in the Country you can’t appreciate what people can do around you that can affect your quality of life?” He said that was the reason he opposed this language. “The neighborhood would go to pods. There would be mobile homes everywhere. You will have urban sprawl and all of the other problems. I live on a private road, where we have to maintain our own road.” He said this was his personal point of view. There were questions regarding unrecorded subdivision. It destroys the Ag3 category and added it wasn’t fair. He referenced Ordinance 2013-004; if any of this changes then the

ordinance would have to be changed as well from 5 years to 3 years. He asked did that Ordinance reenact the Immediate Family Exception. Under 6605 the creation of lots, require a bunch of things, what if you have a case with someone who has a parcel of land that is not all buildable, it may have steep slopes and environmental sensible land in non-buildable areas. Will you allow clustering of the lots?

Mrs. Gutcher replied it must have 3 acres. This particular revision doesn't allow clustering. This is an Ordinance that will be adopted into the Land Use Development Regulations. The Comprehensive Plan that over arches the Land Development Regulations.

Commissioner Dixon spoke to the lot under the ordinance; "you would allow one lot per what period of time. How often could they petition for another for 3 acres?" He asked could a time period be added, so you can say you can only petition once every 3 years. He also commented on mobile homes. He asked for a definition of an unrecorded subdivision.

Mrs. Gutcher said until they reach the maximum 4 total. She responded to his question of added a time period, I wouldn't encourage you too. She said an unrecorded subdivision (plat) any description of a subdivision that has not been recorded with the County Clerk. "Individual lots may have been recorded by leaps and bounds, if any such document has been created prior to the adoption of this code by the date, and no lots have been purchased by that date it shall be considered invalid as a legal instrument."

Commissioner VanLandingham commented if you have unrecorded or undeveloped plat or subdivision that's basically farmland. I don't know if it would be fair to tell those people that they couldn't participate in the family exceptions.

Commissioner Dixon inquired how would you include them.

Commissioner VanLandingham responded by deleting that whole paragraph.

Commissioner Robinson referenced on the homestead where it spoke of the 3 years, what if they build a house there and live in, and the home is foreclosed.

Mrs. Gutcher responded if a person decides to sell it within 3 years, we don't monitor real estate transactions.

Commissioner Tranchand agreed with Commissioner Ganus stating that they need to set a time for families to start using the property. "We should have a timeframe of a year or something like that, where they actual begin the homestead. Important for this piece to have a start time, that they have to live on the property."

Commissioner Allen clarified if you look under 6603 (d) Maximum number of lots: "under this

exception no more than 4 lots shall be created in perpetuity including the original parent parcel. They can't create over 4 lots."

Commissioner Sheffield asked what reasons are for family members giving land for them to live on. They may want to come to county to get variance.

Mrs. Gutcher gave different scenarios for parents or grandparents in whom they may deed the property and they can't necessarily come and homestead the property right away.

Commissioner Bridges – Bright referenced section 6602 (b): ***Each parcel created by Family Homestead Exception shall be owned homesteaded by the grantee for at least three (3) years from the date of County approval.*** She said it states they don't have a lot of time to play around only from the date of approval of application.

Commissioner Ganus commented on page 2 (h) frontage requirements: ***All parcels must have frontage on an existing publicly maintained road, or:*** He asked does that mean a county maintained road. He asked would a private road be excluded.

Mrs. Gutcher said yes or state. She said if they aren't on a public road they have to go by a recorded easement for a joint driveway access to a public road, which shall be restricted to the use of two lots; or have obtained jointed access points Section 6003 (F)5 shall apply. The private roads have limitations; you can't do 4 lots off of a private road.

Commissioner Sheffield referenced subsections 6604 A. Resale: from what I understand they can only sell outside if they have homesteaded it for 3 years. If you look at resale (A) all it says is it prohibits the sale of created the lot outside the immediate family for the period of 3 years. It sounds like you can sell the lot that hasn't been homesteaded. She asked should it say prohibit the sale of the homesteaded lot.

Mrs. Gutcher called attention to 6602 (B) she said it would get caught under that section. She said it would require them to include in the deed restriction also, so it would be in writing.

Commissioner Sheffield said she would rather see it changed to homestead, because when I read just that it sounded like you can sell the lot without it every being homesteaded.

Chair Davis called for public comment. Each person that spoke before the Commission was sworn by the deputy clerk.

Michael Dorian, Alligator Run mentioned Mr. Ganus road. He said that it was a time when County Commissioners and Developers came in and they said the Homeowner Association would take care of the roads. He said he felt there was a prestigious in this County when related to newcomers. He discussed urban sprawl with half of homes taking advantage of this we are talking about increasing

traffic on Frank Smith Road. He also mentioned increase traffic, accidents, air pollution, and more police protection. We need economic development. There is a need for a committee.

Marion Lasley, 5 Dante Court “I’m concerned about this, any mechanism to prevent 4 acre subdivisions from happening. You will end up with rental problems.” She voiced 3 years is not enough time, she liked 5 years, the original. “I think people can set things up in the name of people, who are going to monitor homestead, will it be Property Appraiser. How will this be monitored, where is the mechanism to prevent minor subdivisions.” She said she was not in favor. “On the platted lots and subdivisions, it needs to be clear list what qualifies and doesn’t qualify for ordinances.”

Commissioner Bridges – Bright motioned that they accept the recommendation with the exception of the grammar and with the recorded and unrecorded plats being corrected. Commissioner Chukes seconded the motion.

Commissioner Sheffield asked about her suggestion to change to homesteaded lots instead of created lots.

Commissioner Bridges – Bright amended her motion to include homestead.

Commissioner Allen asked could they add no clustering. I know Mrs. Gutcher has said it’s not in there, therefore it doesn’t apply.” I would like to see it in there, so everybody knows that it does not apply.”

Mrs. Gutcher said, “if you would like to amend the motion to include a part I under 6603 Standards and Restrictions that would state something to the effect of: Provisions of this section do not allow for the clustering of. Clustering is taking the overall allowable density in putting it in a smaller portion of the development. They have to have a minimum of 3 acres; she asked what his concern was. I’m allowed to have one unit per acre. Clustering would be allowed to have half acre parcels on the same amount of acreage that would be required overall. That can’t happen here because they must have a minimum of 3 acres.”

UPON MOTION BY COMMISSIONER BRIDGES – BRIGHT AND SECOND BY COMMISSIONER CHUKES THE COMMISSION VOTED 5 – 7, FOR RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS THAT THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, AND ADOPT THE AMENDMENTS TO THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE, SECTION 6600, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE GRAMMAR AND WITH THE RECORDED AND UNRECORDED PLATS BEING CORRECTED, ALSO AMENDED TO HOMESTEAD. (THE MOTION FAILED. Commissioner’s Dixon, Chukes, Davis, Bridges-Bright and Robinson were in support.)

Mrs. Gutcher asked that they make a motion not to recommend, because she needed something to provide to the Board of County Commissioners.

UPON MOTION BY COMMISSIONER GANUS AND SECOND BY COMMISSIONER TRANCHAND, THE COMMISSION VOTED 8 – 4, TO RECOMMEND THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS NOT ADOPT THE AMENDMENTS TO THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE, SECTION 6600, AS PRESENTED.(Commissioner’s Dixon, Robinson, Davis and Bridges – Bright opposed the motion.)Motion passed.

Commissioner Gail Bridges - Bright and Commissioner VanLandingham left at this juncture of the meeting.

8. PUBLIC HEARING (Legislative) –Section 5800, Communication Towers; and Subsection 2101, Definitions, of the Land Development Code.)

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 5, SUBSECTION 5800, COMMUNICATION TOWERS, OF THE GADSDEN COUNTY LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE; PROVING FOR SEVERABILITY AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Mrs. Gutcher explained after recent requests for telecommunication tower development order approval, staff had realized that the current regulations in Section 5800 of the Land Development Code are challenging to the development and expansion of telecommunications services within Gadsden County. She also said there are some definition is 2101 that did pertain to the item that you just heard and if they need to make their motion a part of that she was making them aware. She says this clarifies some things that, a lot of it is reorganization, so it flows better. They have looked at what is existing against some other ordinances in the region; this current regulation follows the City of Tallahassee ordinance, which is a much denser, urbanized jurisdiction than Gadsden County. We are looking for some amendments to the ordinance. She referenced the analysis of changes to section 5800- communication towers.

She said right now they do not have setback from property line, unless it’s a residential structure on it. So if it was a site that was industrial next to a site that is commercial the set back is zero from the property line. This will create additional setbacks for property lines for any land use category that the tower would be located in. In addition, the item before you is adding mining, silviculture, and public to allowable land use categories for these towers. Commercial and Industrial are very similar to mining issue and silviculture is very close to an Ag issue. The thinking there is if they are already allowed in similar uses goes ahead and opens it up to silviculture mining in public. Another introduction is setbacks from each tower.

Other changes include changing the “camouflaged” tower language to “Alternate Tower Structure” to better identify the use of these types of towers, rearranging the order of the text to flow better, and language to exempt amateur radio antennas and temporary antennas from the requirements of a development order. Some of the reasons I’m hearing is from the industry as cell phones becoming smarter and less of phone and more of a computer you need to be closer together, so after a ½ mile smart phone want stream or receive the 4g network. As technology progresses there will be a need for

more towers. Setbacks from property structures are related to fall zone areas. We currently require a deviation from any tower that is lighted. FAA requires it; it's something that is not optional anything that is over 200ft has to have a light on top of it for safety reasons.

Commissioner Ganus stated they got their definition of a fall zone tonight. He said she mentioned one fall zone of a 100ft. Do you have a comprehensive list of fall zones by type of towers? He questioned subsection 5806 location of antenna, it mentioned use by right and he added he couldn't find the definition in the Land Development Code. He pointed out if it is a use by right it should be a type 1 review.

Mrs. Gutcher said she does not, because of the way it's structured. "We have to rely on information that's certified from a professional engineer. They are based on structure, it's based on local discretion. You can make recommendation to County on what setback that you prefer. She said in 5806 it was allowed by right and commercial, industrial, agriculture, mining and silviculture. That's why we are amending because we are rural."

Mr. Brown commented under the current old ordinance a use by right was a tower that meets the requirements and does not require deviation. That tower structure would be permitted within the designated permitted land use districts. The only time a class two review would be required is if the last meeting we held deviation was required, that required class two reviews to meet with the neighborhood and so forth. Anything that requires a class two review is not a use by right.

Commissioner Ganus commented the sentence should be changed, because it is contradicting itself. He commented that it was said earlier that this was patterned after Leon County and expressed concern in wanting to emulate them.

Mr. Brown agreed it should be further defined.

Mrs. Gutcher said it should be amended as well.

Commissioner Allen inquired didn't the Citizen's Bill of Rights do away with the use by right.

Mrs. Gutcher clarified a use by right is something that is allowed within the district that is being proposed to be developed in. A use by right in a rural residential is a residential structure.

Mr. Ganus stated it doesn't require a Type 2 Review. He asked that she look under definitions in Chapter 2 (t) under type review.

Commissioner Sheffield commented if you see how it was previous written. It says communication towers in those allowed zones are not subject to review by the Planning Commission.

Mrs. Gutcher agreed that is contradictory and should be a Type 1 Review.

Commissioner Ganus stated it couldn't be a Type 1 in industrial and commercial, they require a Type 2 Review regardless of what you do on that property.

Commissioner Dixon asked was the contradiction is that is should require a Type 1 Review unless deviations force it to require Type 2 Review.

Commissioner Ganus said that particular sentence had a mixture of things.

Commissioner Sheffield said a lot of towers would be located about a ½ mile apart from each other. A lot of items that were in the previous code have been taken out. I understand things need to change in code, because people work on their phones. Location for a tower, within a ½ mile from rural residential land use. I don't see anywhere where we put restrictions in on proximity to rural residential area.

Mrs. Gutcher commented correct. All setbacks are from property line rather than a land use category. She referenced the map, the dot line that's the ½ mile radius from rural residential, so you would be restricted from locating a tower within that area based on that ½ mile radius. The red outline is the corridor setback, we do have a setback from certain roads in the within the county. That would be restricted from locating a communication towers. What we didn't study was individual residential units, but we also have that setback based on the height of the tower from a residential structure. She said what she is hearing from the industry it's the residents that want the service, so if you're restricting yourself ½ mille from a rural residential area. I'm hearing you need that ½ miles in order for the 4g, streaming and you tube, etc. to work.

Commissioner Sheffield asked how close do towers need to be to have continuous streaming.

Mrs. Gutcher said she is hearing it has to be at least a mile for continuous service.

Public Comment

Marion Lasley, 5 Dante Court, the original language of the cell tower code was devised to protect the health, safety and mental, physical and financial welfare of adjacent and surrounding landowners. Nothing in this new proposed code protects the taxpaying citizens of the County. The proposed citing setback requirements are excessively lenient, so I propose we keep the original language. The issue of night time lighting is a nuisance. Metal tower 300ft to residence, safety and health, property value going down because of visibility. Deleted items in section 5801 need to be retained. Recommended all towers be type 2 reviews. Distances are close. Subsection on property lines should be redone. Don't delete lighting restrictions, would like to see old ordinance use.

A copy of all proposed by Marion Lasley dealing with the Cell Towers can be obtained from the Clerk's Office in detail.

Kathie Grow, Havana, FL agreed with the comments from Marion Lasley.

Michael Dorian, Alligator Run, Also stated he was on original committee. Page 6, 5806 (2); He said that is not right. The definition is not in the package on fall zone definition: Recommended workshop.

Fall Zone definition read into record: The area on the ground within a prescribed radius from the base of an antenna support structure facility. The fall zone is the area within which there is a potential hazard from falling debris or collapsing material. The fall zone shall be determined by a professional certified structural engineer.

Anthony Arnold, 28852 Blue Star Hwy, said he worked and was around on the original ordinance. He said they received a lot of complaints. They were told they could not consider health factors. They listened to citizens; he said primary concerns were with the rural character of Gadsden County being preserved. Visual impact and Visual Pollution were also important. He asked that it is workshopped.

Commissioner Dixon asked do you think we can find a happy median giving the frame work of the ordinance.

Mr. Arnold replied the main issue is setbacks, but yes you can. He recommended a workshop.

Additional comments were heard by Mr. Dorian.

UPON MOTION BY COMMISSIONER TRANCHAND AND SECOND BY COMMISSIONER ALLEN, THE COMMISSION VOTED 10 – 0, BY VOICE VOTE, TO RECOMMEND WORKSHOP COMMITTEE CONSIST OF 1 INDUSTRY PERSON, CITIZENS AND PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS.

(The motion passed.)

Mr. Tranchand asked that persons that spoke put concerns in writing.

UPON MOTION BY COMMISSIONER DIXON AND SECOND BY COMMISSIONER SHEFFIELD, THE COMMISSION VOTED 10 – 0, TO RECOMMEND THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS NOT ADOPT THE AMENDMENT, BUT RECOMMEND A WORKSHOP. Motion passed.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Workshop Date: January 9, 2014 at 6:00 p.m.

Economic Development

Michael Dorian, Alligator Run, discussed green technology. He thanked David Garner for all his help in support in helping bring the New Leaf 6th Annual Farm Tour to our area on October 19 & 20, 2013. The health food stores want to buy local and organic. We could be on the forefront of a whole new industry if we went organic. He spoke in support of county going green.

DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS

Mrs. Gutcher commented on the training webinar. She reminded them their chapter is Florida for 1 hour and ½ on Ethics and Quasi-Judicial Hearings.

Mrs. Gutcher reminded the Commission her door is always opened for any concerns or discussions.

ADJOURNMENT

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS TO COME BEFORE THE COMMISSION, THE CHAIR DECLARED THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:59 P.M.

GADSDEN COUNTY, FLORIDA

**REGINA DAVIS, CHAIR
PLANNING COMMISSION**

ATTEST:

**BERYL H. WOOD, DEPUTY CLERK FOR
NICHOLAS THOMAS, CLERK OF THE COURT
GADSDEN COUNTY, FLORIDA**