

**SEMINOLE COUNTY
LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY/
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
COUNTY SERVICES BUILDING
1101 EAST FIRST STREET
SANFORD, FLORIDA
BOARD CHAMBERS, ROOM 1028**

**WEDNESDAY, MAY 1, 2024
6:00 PM**

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Present (4): Chairman Dan Lopez, Commissioner Brandy Ioppolo, Commissioner Richard Jerman, and Commissioner Carissa Lawhun

Absent (3): Vice Chairman Mike Lorenz, Commissioner Lourdes Aguirre, and Commissioner Tim Smith*

** Commissioner Lourdes Aguirre arrived at 6:35 PM*

ACCEPT PROOF OF PUBLICATION

A motion was made by Commissioner Richard Jerman, seconded by Commissioner Carissa Lawhun to approve the Proof of Publication. The motion passed unanimously.

Ayes (4): Chairman Dan Lopez, Commissioner Brandy Ioppolo, Commissioner Richard Jerman, and Commissioner Carissa Lawhun

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Commissioner Carissa Lawhun, seconded by Commissioner Richard Jerman to approve the April 3, 2024 Minutes, as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.

Ayes (4): Chairman Dan Lopez, Commissioner Brandy Ioppolo, Commissioner Richard Jerman, and Commissioner Carissa Lawhun

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

Rivas Commercial Rezone – Consider a Rezone from A-1 (Agriculture) to C-3 (General Commercial & Wholesale) on approximately 0.78 acres, located on the west side of W SR 426, approximately 500 feet north of Connection Point; (PMJS Development Solutions, LLC., Applicant) District1 - Dallari (**Joy Giles, Principal Planner**).

Joy Giles, Principal Planner, presented this item as stated in the Staff report. She further stated the subject site is currently developed as a single family residence under the existing A-1 zoning classification. The Applicant is requesting a rezone from A-1 to C-3 to re-develop the property from a single family residence to an undetermined commercial development in compliance with the C-3 (General Commercial & Wholesale) zoning regulations. The property has an existing Future Land Use of Industrial, which permits the requested C-3 zoning classification. The property has an existing access onto W SR 426, which is classified as an Urban Principal Arterial roadway. There is an existing fourteen (14) foot wide paved trail, known as the Cross Seminole Trail, located along the west side of W SR 426; therefore, the developer will not be required to construct a sidewalk along the right-of-way. At the time of Engineered Site Plan review, the development must meet all requirements for parking, access, maximum building height, minimum open space requirements, permitted uses, maximum F.A.R., and evaluated for buffer requirements at that time. The purpose and intent of the existing Industrial Future Land Use is to have a variety of heavy commercial and industrial land uses oriented towards wholesale distribution, storage, manufacturing, and other industrial uses. The land use should be located with direct access to rail systems, collector and arterial roadways, and as infill development where uses are established. As previously stated, SR 426 is an Urban Principal Arterial roadway, and as such, meets the intent of the Comprehensive Plan. Under Comprehensive Plan Policy FLU 17.5, Evaluation Criteria of Property Rights Assertions; the reasonable use of property is a use which does not adversely affect the public health, safety, morals, or welfare and is compatible with abutting or proximate properties and is otherwise a use that is consistent with generally accepted land use principles. Staff finds the requested rezone from A-1 to C-3 to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and compatible with the surrounding trend of development in the area. All of the properties on the west side of W SR 426, lying south of W Chapman Road and north of Aloma Woods, have an Industrial Future Land Use which allows for Industrial, Commercial, and Office uses, and permits the requested C-3 zoning district. Further, the properties to the west and south are zoned to permit C-1 (Retail Commercial), C-3 (General Commercial & Wholesale), and M-1A (Very Light Industrial) uses. Therefore, Staff requests approval of this request.

Commissioner Richard Jerman asked why this request is for a C-3 zoning when it is next door to C-1 zoning. Ms. Giles responded that C-3 is a permitted zoning under the Industrial Future Land Use and there are C-3 uses approved in the area. Therefore, Staff felt it was compatible, which is what the applicant requested.

Philip Hollis, PMJS Development Solutions, of New Smyrna Beach, Florida, stated that he is representing the applicant, Mr. Rivas. Mr. Hollis concurs with Staff's comments and is available to answer any questions from the Board.

Audience participation included the following in support of this request:

Brian Taylor, of Longwood, Florida, stated that he is in full agreement with the project and a thinks it is a great fit for what is occurring on Aloma. He is a next door adjoining property owner and thinks this request should be approved.

No one else from the audience spoke in support or in opposition to this request.

A motion was made by Commissioner Richard Jerman, seconded by Commissioner Carissa

Lawhun to **approve and refer** the Rivas Commercial Rezone to the Board of County Commissioners. The motion carried unanimously.

Ayes (4): Chairman Dan Lopez, Commissioner Brandy Ioppolo, Commissioner Richard Jerman, and Commissioner Carissa Lawhun

Lake Emma Self-Storage Small Scale Future Land Use Map Amendment and PD Rezone – Consider a Small Scale Future Land Use Map Amendment from Commercial to Planned Development, and a Rezone from C-2 (Retail Commercial) to PD (Planned Development) on approximately 1.26 acres, located on the east side of Lake Emma Road, approximately 250 feet south of Lake Mary Boulevard; (Huber Group, LLC., Applicant) District4 – Lockhart (**Joy Giles, Principal Planner**).

Joy Giles, Principal Planner, presented this item as stated in the Staff report. She further stated that the subject site is currently developed as a retail commercial center in compliance with the existing Commercial Future Land Use in the C-2 (Retail Commercial) zoning district. The Applicant proposes to re-develop the property from the 15,000 square foot multi-tenant commercial building to a self-storage facility with a Floor Area Ratio (F.A.R.) of 1.96, and a maximum building height of 50 feet. The Seminole County Land Development Code (SCLDC) classifies self-storage as an Industrial use, which is not permitted under the existing Commercial Future Land Use designation. The Commercial Future Land Use has a maximum Floor Area Ratio (F.A.R.) of 0.35, and the Industrial Future Land Use has a maximum F.A.R. of 0.65. Therefore, the Applicant is requesting a Future Land Use amendment to Planned Development, which provides for a variety of intensities and uses. The site is located within the Lake Mary Boulevard Gateway Corridor Overlay. The purpose and intent of the overlay is to provide uniform design standards to establish high quality and well landscaped development; prevent visual pollution of building heights that may not be compatible with the surrounding character of development; and maximize traffic circulation functions from the standpoint of safety, roadway capacity, and vehicular movements. The Overlay restricts the maximum building height for all structures to thirty-five (35) feet; requires a minimum fifteen (15) foot wide landscape buffer along the west perimeter adjacent to Lake Emma Road, with specific buffer components; and requires a minimum fifty (50) foot building setback. The Applicant is requesting a variance from the maximum building height and minimum landscape buffer requirement, through the PD rezone process, to allow for a maximum building height of fifty (50) feet and a reduced landscape buffer along Lake Emma Road to five (5) feet. The proposed Master Development Plan in the Board's agenda, as well as the agenda report, states that the Applicant is requesting a building setback of twenty-five (25) feet, which is also a variance from the required fifty (50) foot setback required in the Overlay. However, Staff had a discussion with the Applicant and are amenable to providing a fifty (50) foot building setback. The Applicant's justification statement for the requested PD zoning references three (3) existing commercial establishments for comparable building heights, as follows:

1. The Top Golf entertainment establishment is approximately ¼ mile south of the subject site and located in the City of Lake Mary;
2. The Academy Sports retail store is located in the shopping center directly behind the subject site and located in unincorporated Seminole County within the Lake Mary Boulevard Gateway Corridor Overlay;
3. The Hyatt Place Lake Mary hotel is located approximately ½ mile west of the subject

site and located in unincorporated Seminole County and within the Lake Mary Boulevard Gateway Corridor Overlay.

Staff has evaluated the justification statement and has determined the following:

- The Top Golf facility is within the City of Lake Mary's jurisdiction and not located within the Lake Mary Boulevard Gateway Corridor Overlay, therefore it is not required to meet the standards of the thirty-five (35) foot building height.
- The Academy Sports retail store is located in unincorporated Seminole County's jurisdiction and has a maximum building height of thirty-five (35) feet. It does have a parapet higher than that, but the building itself meets the thirty-five (35) foot requirement.
- The Hyatt Place Lake Mary hotel is located in unincorporated Seminole County's jurisdiction, which was approved in 1993, three (3) years after the Overlay was adopted, with a building height of 45 feet. The hotel was considered to be compatible with its height due to its proximity to the I-4 Ramp.

The development proposes to utilize the existing access onto Lake Emma Road, which is classified as an Urban Major Collector. Public Works has concerns about the existing access in relation to large moving trucks and trailer's ability to maneuver in and out of the site. If the proposed development is approved by the Board, the existing access and median will be further evaluated to determine if a left-turn median cut will need to be removed and re-designed to channelize traffic flow.

The Comprehensive Plan sets forth criteria to evaluate proposed Future Land Use Amendments for compatibility. These criteria include whether the character of the surrounding area has changed enough to warrant a different land use and intensity. The surrounding area along Lake Mary Boulevard from I-4 to Rinehart Road primarily consists of office and retail commercial development located in unincorporated Seminole County as well as the City of Lake Mary. Seminole County's Commercial Future Land Use limits the F.A.R. to 0.35 and does not permit Industrial uses such as Self-Storage. The Seminole County Land Development Code sets forth criteria for approving Planned Developments. The proposed development must be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and effectively implement the performance criteria contained therein. In addition, it must be determined that the proposed development cannot reasonably be implemented through existing provisions of the Land Development Code, and that the PD zoning would result in greater benefits to the County than that under a conventional zoning. While the proposed development meets the minimum required open space of twenty-five (25) percent for the PD zoning designation and proposed building setback in compliance with the Overlay, the Master Development Plan has not demonstrated how the PD zoning results in greater benefits to the County than development under conventional zoning as follows:

- The proposed five (5) foot wide landscape buffer along Lake Emma Road does not meet the minimum twenty-five (25) foot buffer requirement that our standard Land Development Code buffer ordinance would require, nor does it meet the minimum fifteen (15) foot wide buffer requirement of the Lake Mary Boulevard Gateway Corridor Overlay.
- The proposed building height of 50 feet is not in compliance with the overlay and is out of character for the area.

- The proposed F.A.R. of 1.96 is much more intense than the surrounding commercial developments with a maximum F.A.R. of 0.35.
- The Industrial use of self-storage is not consistent with the surrounding established commercial uses.

Staff finds the requested Future Land Use Amendment and PD Rezone to be:

- Inconsistent with Comprehensive Plan Policy FLU 2.9 Determination of Compatibility in the Planned Development Zoning Classification
- Inconsistent with Seminole County Land Development Code Part 25 - PD Planned Development Sec. 30.443 - Review Criteria
- Part 56 - Lake Mary Boulevard Gateway Corridor Overlay Standards Sec. 30.1065 - Building height
- Sec. 30.1066. - Required corridor buffer width
- Sec. 30.1066(b) - Required corridor buffer plantings and placement
- Sec. 30.1071 - Additional zoning variance criteria

Therefore, Staff requests that the Board of County Commissioners deny the requested Small Scale Future Land Use Map Amendment and concurrent Rezone as per the following:

- 1) Based on Staff's findings and the testimony and evidence received at the hearing, the Board finds the request does not meet the identified portions of the Comprehensive Plan and moves to deny the requested Small Scale Future Land Use Map Amendment from Commercial to Planned Development; and
- 2) Based on Staff's findings and the testimony and evidence received at the hearing, the Board finds the request does not meet the identified portions of the Seminole County Land Development Code and moves to deny the requested Rezone from C-2 (Retail Commercial) to PD (Planned Development), any associated Development Order and Master Development Plan.

Commissioner Carissa Lawhun asked what is on the site currently. Ms. Giles responded that it is currently a commercial center with a restaurant and vacant occupancy. Ms. Giles showed on the overhead map where the Corridor is located, which is west of I-4 to Markham Road and east to Sanford Avenue. She further stated that from the center line of Lake Mary Boulevard, the Corridor runs south and north 320 feet.

Commissioner Richard Jerman asked how many feet this proposed development is from the center line. Ms. Giles responded that it is 291 feet from the center line or approximately 29 feet away.

David Stokes, of Madden, Moorhead & Stokes in Maitland, on behalf of the applicant, the Huber Group, along with Alan Bradley with the Huber Group is also here tonight. Mr. Stokes stated the following:

- This property was established in the 1980's with retail and commercial uses.
- Access is through an easement that also serves an abutting gas station.
- The area has changed over the years, which he feels is important, as well as the specifics of some of the criteria.
- The initial submission by the applicant was a five (5) story, sixty (60) foot high building.

- Through the process and negotiating with Staff, it has been reduced to a four (4) story, fifty (50) foot high building.
- Some of the comments from the Staff report about building finishes, window treatments, etc. have been agreed to by the applicant, outside of the stone or brick criteria; as they don't feel that is applicable to the style of the self-storage project.
- The access and buffer along Lake Emma Road are tied together.
- Using slides shown on the overhead, Mr. Stokes showed the elevation of the building and exhibits also provided to Staff in their report.
- Regarding the distance from the Lake Mary Boulevard Gateway Corridor Overlay, being a 320 foot distance from the center line of Lake Mary Boulevard, the exhibit showed the building relative to that.
- The building itself is 304 feet from the center line.
- On the western side, the building is 312 feet from the center line.
- The Overlay states that any building within 320 feet has to comply with the Corridor criteria.
- They feel that what is important is that the property does not front Lake Mary Boulevard, it fronts Lake Emma Road and it has since the 1980's.
- The amount of encroachment as well as the proximity of how the property fronts matters, which is where the access is from.
- There is a gas station between them and the road and a large shopping center that surrounds them.
- From the standpoint of needing a larger buffer, they have two existing physical fixed points for vehicles to access the property; the easement and the existing gas station.
- This requires at entry to turn quickly north to get to the property.
- The ability to provide a fifteen (15) foot wide buffer would require moving the driveway that exists on someone else's property, which they can't control.
- They know the other properties they reference are a little far away, in terms of not being directly adjacent to the project, but they believe are still in the general area; the hotel, Academy retail store, and Top Golf.

Neysa Borkert, Deputy County Attorney, stated that this property is located in the Lake Mary Boulevard Gateway Corridor Overlay and the landscape buffers are required to be twenty five (25) feet. She understands the applicant's request is for a five (5) foot landscape buffer, but there is a provision of the Code that pertains to additional variance requirements, which allows for a ten (10) foot buffer minimum if you're less than 200 feet in depth, which this property is more than that. The applicant is requesting a reduction in buffer to five (5) feet in order to make the site work. She asked the applicant why they believe they can go to five (5) feet when the minimum is ten (10) feet. In her opinion, she states that they cannot go down to five (5) feet, because the minimum requires no less than ten (10) feet, providing the depth is less than 200 feet. Ms. Borkert asked the applicant if there was something more the applicant would like to add to their reason for a further reduction.

Mr. Stokes, for the applicant, responded that the reasons are because of the two existing easements and existing access points; 1) the driveway is fixed off of Lake Emma, and 2) the driveway to the north (of the adjacent property), is also fixed because they don't own or control that access. This reduction was prompted because of these restrictions.

Ms. Borkert asked how wide the access easement is and Mr. Stokes responded that the drive aisles are roughly twenty (20) feet wide.

Commissioner Jerman asked how much space is in-between the drive aisle and the proposed building. Mr. Stokes responded that the drive aisle (north/south portion) is roughly seventy (70) feet to the building. He further stated that on their plan they have parking spaces with a dividing island to separate the drive-through for the storage facility to accommodate those dropping off their storage items without restricting access through the easement to the north.

Additional discussion ensued regarding the proposed placement of the drive aisles, the landscape buffer, access, and the building.

**** Commissioner Lourdes Aguirre arrived at 6:35 PM during the presentation of this item***

Mr. Stokes showed a slide of the proposed plan with the addition of the future I-4 off-ramps, which will eventually, directly connect to Lake Emma Road. Mr. Stokes stated that today, the intersection of Lake Mary Boulevard and Lake Emma Road is a pinch-point and a challenging intersection. This ramp re-design improvement by the Department of Transportation (DOT) will funnel all trips that would be traveling on Lake Mary Boulevard and turning onto Lake Emma Road to funnel directly to Lake Emma Road. This change is in the works, but has not started yet.

Commissioner Jerman asked if they agreed to an additional building setback and Mr. Stokes responded yes, they do agree to that. He further stated that the plan already meets the building setback, as the building is set back more than the required fifty (50) feet, which they comply with.

Audience participation included the following speaker:

1. Steven Garcia, a tenant of the Shoppes of Lake Emma, Suite 109. Their business is called BLENDS at Lake Mary, which is a healthy café including protein shakes and donuts. They've been at this location for one (1) year. This proposed plan is new to them and they found out about one week ago when the placard sign went up. There is a lot of traffic on the roads in that area and it will be difficult to have this type of building at this location, which is out of character for this neighborhood. A storage unit at that location would hinder what is already there. They appreciate having the opportunity to be located in this area and serving the community.

No one spoke in favor of this project.

Commissioner Jerman asked Ms. Giles if she felt differently about Staff's recommendations, considering Mr. Stokes presentation and further discussion. Ms. Giles responded that it doesn't change Staff's recommendation, because it doesn't meet the requirements of the Overlay. She further stated that the only variance to the Overlay is what Neysa previously mentioned, which is the required landscape buffer can be reduced to a ten (10) foot buffer only if the depth of the lot does not meet the 200 foot minimum.

Commissioner Jerman asked Ms. Giles if she didn't like the compromise that Mr. Stokes was offering and Ms. Giles responded that she appreciates the compromise, but she has to look at the Code as it is stated and that's the only way the Overlay allows for the landscape variance. Commissioner Jerman stated that there is an easement that can't be planted in and no way to solve that problem. He further stated that anybody who builds there will have the same problem.

Neysa Borkert, Deputy County Attorney, stated that there are a couple of questions resulting from the applicant's presentation. One is whether or not the twenty (20) foot planting area can be utilized in the island, on the north side, and the south side depending on the width, to count toward the buffer. She further stated that in any case the Code does not allow for the applicant to go to five (5) feet. It provides for ten (10) feet if less than 200 feet, and they have approximately 219 feet in width. A variance can be conceivably granted between twenty-five (25) feet and ten (10) feet, for fifteen (15) feet, because fifteen (15) doesn't require the lesser width provision. In summary, no on the five (5) feet, they don't meet the ten (10) feet, but they could do something in-between 10 and 25 feet. Planning Staff would have to look at whether or not they could count the width and planting areas in the top and bottom towards the width, and maybe they could get there.

Ms. Giles stated that during review discussions with the applicant, Staff recommended that the existing retention pond along the west side be moved in order to provide buffer area and the applicant wanted to utilize the existing pond as it is and not use that for a buffer. Staff recommended that since the site is being re-developed, that it be re-developed all the way to provide the most space possible for the buffer area. Overall, they felt there was more room for give and take.

Commissioner Jerman stated that this Board use to get options for motions, such as deny or recommend approval, but in this request, Staff only included two motions to deny and nothing to approve it. He asked why this was changed.

Ms. Borkert responded that this requested action is Staff's recommendation, but Staff can still provide the Board with an alternate motion, which she's not sure why procedurally that changed. She continued by stating that the Board has a Staff report that recommends denial and therefore describes the evidence as to why the Board should deny the request and the applicant's testimony as to why it should be approved. Testimony is on the record from both sides. If the Board approves the request, then they have to make the approval based on the applicant's testimony and information provided and also since Staff is recommending denial of the request, there was no Development Order prepared, but the applicant did provide a Development Order. Therefore, the Board's recommendation for approval should include, not only the approval of the Comprehensive Plan, but also the rezoning with the PD Development Order that the applicant provided. If the Board wants changes to the provided Development Order, the Board would have to state that for the record in their motion.

Commissioner Jerman asked to speak to the applicant and stated that he thought there were things that could be worked out. He asked the applicant if they wanted to continue the item or do they want this Board to determine the action and move forward.

Mr. Stokes responded that the landscape buffer may make a difference. He further stated that the challenge in the buffer, as typically applied, would put the easement in the retention

pond. They would like the buffer language to be stated as follows, which would be reasonable to them:

- Allow, where not in conflict with the easement, trees be planted on the side slopes of the pond, and
- The pond is allowed within the buffer, and
- Allow plantings to be relocated to other areas of the property, such as in-between the building and Lake Emma Road, and
- Not counting it as a buffer, but rather say they can move plantings there, in order to achieve plant criteria that Staff and the buffer are asking for

Dale Hall, Planning & Development Manager, stated that there was a list of items that did not meet the criteria of our Code and the Comp Plan. The buffer width is one of the items, but there are still several issues with incompatibility, land use, rezoning, and building height that goes beyond just the landscape issues. (*Listed below are the items referenced on the overhead*):

Staff finds the requested Future Land Use Amendment and PD Rezone to be:

- Inconsistent with Comprehensive Plan Policy FLU 2.9 Determination of Compatibility in the Planned Development Zoning Classification.
- Inconsistent with Seminole County Land Development Code Part 25 – PD Planned Development Sec. 30.443 – Review Criteria
- And inconsistent with Part 56 – Lake Mary Boulevard Gateway Corridor Overlay Standards for the following sections:
 - Sec. 30.1065. - Building height
 - Sec. 30.1066. - Required corridor buffer width
 - Sec. 30.1066(b). - Required corridor buffer plantings and placement
 - Sec. 30.1071. – Additional zoning variance criteria

Commissioner Jerman commented that this is a very difficult property and what is there now could use some re-development and an improvement from what's there. He further stated that he doesn't think Staff took that into consideration to find ways to help this.

Alan Bradley, the applicant, stated he is with the Huber Group. He further stated that his company originally developed this Center in the 1980's and they've been landlords since then. A lot has changed since the 1980's. They're looking at a project that has lived its life and it's ready for a new life, as changes over time occur. There's not much language in Seminole County for infill re-development. Self-storage is not an Industrial use when you really touch and feel it. It's really a retail use and a use that is necessary for life changes. They follow community, families and homes. They don't build on the outskirts of town and wait for houses to follow. This is a unique opportunity for them in finding their way of how this meets the desires of Seminole County. They're providing a necessary service and do a lot of in-house studies of how they market, who they look for, and where they go. This area is greatly under-served for their product. Floor Area Ratio (F.A.R.) wants you to build a sea of parking with a tiny building that's only 30% of the whole lot. This land is a very small infill piece of land and under 1.5 acres. What is existing there now is a very large F.A.R. compared to what Code typically allows, but it's the typical 100 parking spaces and a tiny little building.

Today, they have a building that sits on the property line with minimal landscaping, maximal lot development. They're actually increasing open space with their proposed plan and decreasing parking. They're cutting their proposed trips – as trip generation is a big deal in heavily congested areas like this – and cutting them in half. When looking at square footage increasing, it's because this is a passive use and an extension of a home. This is something very necessary for a lot of the new development that comes into Seminole County. They feel they are providing something that is very compatible with the area. They're not proposing to build this in the middle of a residential part of Seminole County and they're not asking to build this on a two lane dirt road at a dead-end. They're asking to build this at a reasonable intersection that does not have residential uses adjacent to affect someone's life, but asking to use a Commercial use in place of a Commercial use. They're asking to decrease traffic on an already strained network, in exchange for that they're asking to build at a size that is appropriate for the area and economics, which is to be four (4) stories high and fifty (50) feet, of which is in character with waivers that have been granted in the past as they proved by the hotel to the west. They're on the outskirts of the Lake Mary Overlay, without fronting on Lake Mary Boulevard. They would like to breathe new life into this location to take a tired, blighted, and difficult to run shopping center and replace it with something that serves the community, brand new, looks great, and brings a lot more revenue to the tax role than what's currently there.

Chairman Dan Lopez commented that he likes Commissioner Jerman's suggestion of tabling this project to see if some of these items can be addressed.

Commissioner Jerman commented that they're close enough and the only couple of issues is that the building height, which they're getting penalized for, because they're twenty (20) feet inside some "phony-boloney" Overlay that doesn't really mean anything. They've worked out the building setbacks, which is okay. He thinks there is a resolution with the landscape buffer issue. He doesn't see any issues prohibiting this from moving forward. He stated that the Development Order will need to be reviewed again by Staff and they can make a recommendation for approval to the Board of County Commissioners.

A motion was made by Commissioner Richard Jerman, seconded by Commissioner Brandy Ioppolo to **approve and refer** the Lake Emma Self-Storage Small Scale Future Land Use Amendment and PD Rezone and Master Development Plan to the Board of County Commissioners; **to include the resolution of the buffer issue per the Applicant's recommendations and to work with Staff prior to the next BCC meeting.** The motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Carissa Lawhun stated that after reading through the agenda packet, she felt there were a lot of asks and little attempt at compliance. She didn't see much of a benefit to the community. Her position has been swayed by the applicant's statement and she supports the motion for approval.

Commissioner Lourdes Aguirre stated that she agrees, after Mr. Bradley's presentation, that times change and the need is there. She supports the motion for approval.

Ayes (5): Chairman Dan Lopez, Commissioner Lourdes Aguirre, Commissioner Brandy Ioppolo, Commissioner Richard Jerman, and Commissioner Carissa Lawhun

CLOSING BUSINESS

Dale Hall, Planning & Development Manager, stated that the next P&Z Commission meeting is scheduled for July 3, 2024. The following day is the July 4th holiday. Also, on September 4, 2024 is the P&Z Commission meeting, which is two days after the Labor Day holiday. He is bringing it up for the Commission to see if there are any potential conflicts with their schedules and if they would like to propose an alternate meeting date or keep it as scheduled. Commissioner Richard Jerman proposed moving the July 3, 2024 meeting to July 10, 2024. He doesn't feel the September 4, 2024 date needs to be moved.

A motion was made by Commissioner Richard Jerman, seconded by Commissioner Carissa Lawhun to move the regular meeting of the P&Z Commission from July 3, 2024 to July 10, 2024 at 6:00 PM. The motion passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

Having no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:08 P.M.