

**FRANKLIN COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
PUBLIC HEARINGS  
FRANKLIN COUNTY COURTHOUSE ANNEX  
APRIL 17, 2007  
3:00 PM**

**MINUTES**

**Call to Order (3:00 PM)**

Chairman Crofton convened the Public Hearing at 3:00 PM.

**Public Hearings**

Mr. Pierce recommended addressing Item 4 first; the Board agreed.

**Item 4 (3:03 PM)**

Amending Policy 8.8 of the Future Land Use Element to change the intensity of development within the Eastpoint Urban Service Area. The specific change proposed is, "Within the Eastpoint USA densities as high as 15 units per acre and urban scale of commercial use shall be allowed so long as the property has adequate access to hurricane evacuation routes, and is sited on property with the appropriate soil types, topography, and drainage such that the development does not impact the Apalachicola Bay. Development shall also have to be served by paved roads. Within those areas of Eastpoint USA allowed to have densities as high as 15 units per acre and urban scale of commercial use, a mixed-use Planned Unit Development (PUD) may be approved. Such PUDs would be subject to the following: (1) The mixed-use development shall not exceed 15 units per acre. (2) The ratio of non-residential space to residential units shall be not less than 100 square feet of non-residential space per one residential unit and not more than 800 square feet of non-residential space per one residential unit. (3) Floor-to-Area (FAR) shall not exceed 1.0. (4) Policy 8.7 notwithstanding open space requirements shall not be less than 20%. (5) The amount of PUD space within Eastpoint USA as a whole which may be developed in this manner shall be subject to the provisions for high density areas in Eastpoint USA named in Policy 8.10."

Amending Policy 8.10 of the Future Land Use Element to limit the amount of land in the Eastpoint Urban Service Area designated high density. The specific change proposed is, "The County shall limit land designated high density in the Eastpoint USA to no more than 40 3% of the area outside of the Coastal High Hazard Zone."

Mr. Pierce stated the reason for both of these Future Land Use Element amendment requests.

Mr. Dirk Van Veen of Growth Group Development, who is the project developer, introduced himself and Ms Judy Walden of Walden Heels Group of Denver, Colorado who wanted to discuss the positive effect this project could have on tourism in the County.

Ms. Walden during her discussion stated that Eastpoint is an excellent location to develop “heritage” tourism.

Mr. Veen then proceeded with his PowerPoint presentation of his proposed project, Port Haven. Mr. Veen stated during his presentation that the architectural style of his project will resemble downtown Apalachicola, most of the open space will be on the water with a seafood market, a restaurant, and public access for seafood workers. Mr. Veen stated that he highly recommended mixed use development and even though the County currently allows for 15 units per acre it not allow for mixed use or any provisions in the Comp Plan for higher density development to be mixed. Mr. Veen said that on 4/19/05 the property was zoned for 12.5 units per acre but Port Haven is only asking for 11.3 units per acre. Mr. Veen also pointed out the potential environmental and economic benefits of the project including the creation of approximately 613 jobs with an average salary of \$28,000 per person. Mr. Veen also stated that this project would add about 2.05 million dollars to the County’s ad valorem taxes or an approximate 13.2% increase, and that the projects 5 to 7 year build out would create additional jobs.

Chris Brooks of the Department of Agriculture read the following statement which was distributed to the Board:

*Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, my name is Chris Brooks; I work with the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services. Thank you for the invitation to present technical assistance.*

*Agriculture Commissioner Charles Bronson respects local rule and we understand that land use planning is the responsibility of local government. You have a difficult job, balancing competing interests. We are not here to tell you what you need to do. We are not experts in planning.*

*The mission of the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services is to ensure the safety and wholesomeness of food products through inspection and testing. This is what we do to regulate the harvesting of oysters and hard clams in Florida and in Franklin County. Based on water quality concerns we classify shellfish harvesting waters for the suitability for human consumption.*

*In general, it is probably no surprise that coastal development negatively impacts shellfish harvesting waters. Development activities such as domestic wastewater treatment facilities with surface water discharges and marinas and docking facilities will cause us to close shellfish harvesting waters. Other factors we must consider that may cause us to close shellfish harvesting waters are:*

- (1) storm water impacts,*
- (2) on-site sewage disposals systems (septic systems),*
- (3) domestic wastewater treatment facilities that do not discharge directly to surface waters,*
- (4) domestic animals, and*
- (5) wildlife impacts,*

*The type of proposed project that brings me here today is a proposed development in*

*Eastpoint, Florida. After meeting jointly with the both the developer and county planning staff, it is our understanding that this proposed project:*

*-Will not have a marina or docking facility as defined in the National Shellfish Sanitation Program Model Ordinance. While this proposal would allow for up to 10 boats moored along the shore, this is under the threshold of greater than 10 slips.*

*-Will collect and handle stormwater according to state requirements.*

*-Will make use of the existing domestic wastewater treatment facility.*

*In coastal planning and permitting decisions we do not make recommendations "for" or "against" any specific project. However, based on what we currently know about this proposal, this project, by itself will not require us to close any additional shellfish harvesting waters. We are however, concerned that future development build out at this density will result in cumulative impacts that will impact shellfish waters.*

*I will be happy to try to answer your questions and please do not hesitate to call on us at anytime. I can be reached at (850) 488- 4033 and at brooksc@doacs.state.fl.us.*

Mr. Bruce Millender, a partner in the Port Harbor project, asked Mr. Brooks to comment on a similar project in Cedar Key that increased productivity in that area.

Mr. Brooks stated that there was such a project but there was no additional development, and if there was the Department would have to look at the specifics of any proposed development.

Commissioner Sanders thanked Mr. Brooks and reminded the Board that these comments were almost similar to the comments received for the Phoenix Harbor project.

Mrs. Doris Pendleton, the County's Property Appraiser, stated that she was asked by the developer to present the following information on projected figures regarding this project and the County's tax base:

*I am here as a messenger not in support of this project or to oppose this project.*

*I was asked as Property Appraiser to calculate some numbers for projected tax revenue based on the 2006 millage rate and the taxable values provided by the Porthaven project; as a public servant I have an obligation to do this.*

*In the year 2008, estimated tax value of the project is \$9,536,181.00. Based on the current millage of 3.8437 this would bring \$36,654.00 tax dollars.*

*In the year 2009, estimated tax value of the project is \$95,361,811.00. Based on the same millage rate, this would generate \$366,542.00 tax dollars.*

*In the year 2010, estimated tax value of the project is \$196,278,680.00. Based on the same millage rate, this would generate \$754,437.00 tax dollars.*

*In the year 2011, estimated tax value of the project is \$302,750,605.00. Based on the same millage rate, this would generate \$1,163,683.00 tax dollars.*

*In the year 2012, estimated tax value of the project is \$424,777,586.00. Based on the same millage rate, this would generate \$1,594,281.00 tax dollars.*

*In the year 2013, estimated tax value of the project is \$532,359,626.00 based on the same millage rate, this would generate \$2,046,230.00 tax dollars.*

*These are calculations for a projected seven year build out. Based on the same type of information, a projection of a 20 year build out would be valued at \$10,406,639,436.00 bringing in additional tax revenue of \$40,000,000.00. The build out threshold in this 20 year period is approximately 13.2% increase over the current tax revenue of 15.8 million. As I said before I am the messenger, not promoting or opposing this project.*

*I want to re-emphasize the numbers calculated above are based on the projected numbers provided b Porthaven development group and the adopted millage rate of the County for the 2006 year.*

*I would like to talk about the areas surrounding this project. All homestead properties in this area will still have the homestead protection; however non homestead properties are still open market. The Senate has been tossing around a bill which proposes tax relief for mom and pop business. I would like to urge you to contact your local representatives and senators to encourage them to pass this bill which will somewhat serve as the same protection the SOH does for homestead.*

Willard Vinson asked Mrs. Pendleton if this project would increase his property taxes. Mr. Veen told Mr. Vinson if he is currently homesteaded, he would only be subject to the 3% cap.

Frank Segree spoke in favor of the project suggesting a referendum, and stated that the Bay should be continually tested for quality. Mr. Segree also stated that Eastpoint needs to move forward because there won't be anymore oyster houses built, but this project will not hurt the Bay.

Ricky Busby stated that he thinks this project will bring much needed jobs to the area, which would allow some of the residents to stay in the County.

Mary Lou Short expressed her support for the project because she feels that the PUD process will help monitor the Bay and will help with some of the economic issues. Ms Short stated that a balance with decision making is necessary because there are other livelihoods in the County besides the seafood industry and asked Chairman Crofton to pass the gavel which would allow him to make a motion if necessary.

Billy Granger felt that the project would kill the Catpoint oyster bar and damage other oyster bars in the County and asked the Board to vote against this project.

Bruce Rotella stated that the 15 units per acre discussed was too much density for that area.

Curtis Nowling stated that the issue he has with the project is the proposed size and is concerned about not having anywhere to launch his oyster boats.

Bruce Millender expressed his desire to make sure that the seafood industry remains in Eastpoint and agreed to provide stipulations in the plan that would provide space for boat launching and ensure that the waterfront remains for the use of the people of Eastpoint.

Jean Creamer spoke against the project stating that only people with money would benefit, locals won't be able to purchase any of these homes, and the seafood industry will be gone.

Caroline Ilardi stated that a \$28,000 job isn't good especially without benefits like insurance and asked if any of the projects money was earmarked for job training.

Frank Venable spoke against the project stating that he was appealing to common sense and honesty. Mr. Venable said that people have the right to sell their property but buyers did not have the right to decide on developments and asked the Board to adhere to the current rules. Mr. Venable expressed his concerns of inadequate space for parking, Franklin County attaining the "Destin" look, stormwater runoff, this project adding to the already large amount of unsold units in the County, the type of jobs that will be created, the effect on the wetlands, and the possible congestion around the proposed restaurant area.

Bonnie Segree agreed with the comments made by Mary Lou Short and said that Eastpoint deserved something that would boost the economy and improve the look of the area. Ms. Segree also stated that the seafood industry is being hurt by the State and natural disasters, this project will not hurt the Bay but will create jobs.

Dawn Shiver spoke in favor of the project and stated that the developers proposed plan of creating jobs with an average salary of \$28,500 will be good paying jobs.

Billy Dalton asked what contingency plan the Board or the developer would put in place to provide work for the seafood workers that would be displaced if this development harms the Bay.

Joyce Estes stated that she supports saving the Bay, but this project provides for a seafood market and boat launching so she also supports this project. Ms. Estes also stated that the Board can put measures in place that would ensure the protection of the Bay.

Katie Green read from a book entitled "Planning Local Economic Development". Ms. Green stated that the developers could not say what the rent will be for the shops, asked what type of jobs would actually be created, and asked the Board to look at the intent of the Eastpoint Urban Service Area.

Dewey Shiver stated that he is not satisfied with the look or condition of Eastpoint. Mr. Shiver expressed his support for the project and stated that this project will not hurt the Bay, storms and hurricanes continue to hurt the Bay.

Art Riccard expressed his support for the project and stated that the project will provide better opportunities for the youth of the County.

Dave McLain stated that he is concerned that if the Board allows an increase in the density, a precedent would be set that would harm the Bay. Mr. McLain stated that he was told the developer was not willing to deed the waterfront property to the County, so as required by a Planned Unit Development, what would be the public benefit of this project. Mr. McLain expressed his concerns of the type jobs that would be created by this development and thinks that the units would be too expensive for the locals of the County.

Andy Walley expressed his concerns of the stormwater run-off this development would create.

George Pruett, of the Eastpoint Fire Department, stated that any 3 story buildings could affect the fire department's ratings and insurance, and that the fire department is not equipped or trained to fight those type of fires.

Hank Garrett stated that the Board has denied projects in the past that could have helped Franklin County, and if this project was also denied, the Board should provide some alternatives to help the County. Mr. Garrett stated that he thought that this is a good project for the County, in spite of how many jobs it will produce, and was in favor of removing the septic tanks on properties located on the Bay.

Richard Harper expressed his concerns about the high density factor of this development and the proposed changes to the comprehensive plan. Mr. Harper also stated that all developers should comply with the development rules the County currently have in place.

Willard Vinson stated that he could not support this project because he was against Eastpoint becoming another Mexico Beach or Destin.

Renee Griffin stated that Mr. Vinson is a correction officer and that there is another man, who spoke this evening, who regularly attends the Board's meetings but dumps his trash in Eastpoint. Ms. Griffin said that Eastpoint deserves better including a viable, working community, but there are only a few good jobs now in the community. Ms. Griffin asked the Board to "think outside the box", and use this opportunity, along with the new consolidated school, to create new revenues for the County. Ms. Griffin said even if the units stay empty, revenue will be generated thru taxes, and Eastpoint wants the same opportunities St. George Islands has had by allowing spot developments.

John Golden said that if project is not approved, Eastpoint will be lines of shotgun houses 10 years from now.

Lynn Martina said the process of shucking seafood is on its way out; 95% of the business in the County is tourism and this development will bring more people to the County. Ms Martina said that she is not against seafood and she thinks that this development would provide more choices for the local people.

Andy Smith, of the Apalachicola Bay and River Keepers, quoted a statute relating to the Eastpoint Urban Service Area. Mr. Smith said that the demand for real estate has decreased and the Board should develop a Planned Unit Development ordinance and abide by it.

Abby Shiver stated that she did not like the current look of Eastpoint and thinks that since this project has a Planned Unit Development it would help clean up Eastpoint and the Bay and was in favor of the development. Ms. Shiver hopes that the revenue from this development would help to ease the burden of the current taxpayers.

Paula Luberto asked what would happen if the development was not approved. Mr. Pierce explained that the developer could build 8 units per acre on 10 to 12 acres, and since the other property is either commercial or residential he can build 1 unit per acre or 1 unit on a lot of record. Mr. Pierce said that the developer also had approval for a 200 unit hotel or condo.

Ms. Luberto also expressed her concerns of the south side property.

Mr. Pierce said that the south side is zoned C1 and is restricted.

Ms. Luberto said that if the development is denied there is the possibility that access to the water for the seafood workers could be blocked but thinks that the developer would give back to the community.

William Otman, of Barbers Seafood, stated that if the project does keep the Bay clean he is in favor of different job opportunities.

Mr. Pierce explained the procedure whereby the proposed change for the Comp Plan would require transmittal to the Department of Community Affairs for comments and approval and the Board would have to schedule another public hearing.

Commissioner Putnal stated that the County's Comp Plan currently has density restrictions in place to protect landowners, the general public, and the environment, and adjusting the restriction for every developer would create problems for the County, so developers should comply with the County's current rules and policies. Commissioner Putnal stated that this projects density is too high, and the Board should not raise the County's density restrictions because others will want the same in the future.

Commissioner Crofton stated that he was also concerned about pollution in the Bay but didn't think this development would pollute the Bay because water and sewer was being provided, which would eliminate the need for septic tanks, and a stormwater plan was in place. Commissioner Crofton said that approving this density request would affect other areas with the 15 units per acre restriction but new jobs would be created which is needed, no matter what type of job. Commissioner Crofton also stated that this

modification to the Comp Plan would not pollute the Bay and it is the responsibility of the Board to make sure any Planned Unit Development would protect the Bay in the event of any change. Commissioner Crofton continued and stated that Eastpoint needs some sort of revitalization, and promotion of any of the two major industries in the County, seafood and tourism, should not be to the detriment of the other, and the project should get Planning and Zoning approval.

Commissioner Lockley asked if Eastpoint Water and Sewer had the capacity to handle this development.

Hank Garrett, of Eastpoint Water and Sewer, stated that they did not have the capacity but would depend on the developer to contribute to increase the capacity.

Mr. Van Veen said the Eastpoint Water and Sewer District currently had enough taps to complete Phase I of his project which would use about 80,000 gallons of water.

Commissioner Parrish expressed his concerns with the proposed increase in the density, which would be four times more than what it is now. Commissioner Parrish also stated that he didn't think the project would impact the Bay if water and sewer and stormwater run-off would be provided by the developer. Commissioner Parrish said that he has discussed his density concerns with the developer but has not received any productive response.

Commissioner Crofton stated that if this development is approved it will only apply to 34 more acres in Eastpoint.

Commissioner Sanders expressed her concerns regarding the density that 300 + units on 31 acres are too much. Commissioner Sanders stated that she and the Board have tried to negotiate with the developers asking for a reduction to 8 to 10 units per acre, with no positive feedback.

Mr. Van Veen stated that in April of 2005 the Board approved 12 units per acre for 17.92 acres and there are 3 other projects in Eastpoint approved at 15 units per acre and perhaps more through out the County. Mr. Veen also stated that the project could not support the retail area without the density.

Commissioner Sanders stated that the 11.3 units per acre was the biggest concern. Bruce Millender stated that the developer was giving waterfront property for public access, for the oystermen to load and unload, and besides the density was only in the downtown area. Mr. Millender stated that 12.5 units were already approved for hotel/condo and marina use, and if the project as proposed was not approved, all of the privately owned waterfront property would be closed off from the seafood workers. Mr. Millender continued by saying that this project would expand the availability of water and sewer, and provide jobs in Eastpoint. Mr. Millender suggested that the Board approve this development while some of the best people in the County are involved, but if this project is denied the Board is actually saying no to providing funding for the schools, police departments, and other important services in the County. Mr. Millender stated he didn't think that the project should be denied because of 1 unit per acre, and the "blood" of the people of Franklin County would be on the Board's hand.



Mr. Pierce reminded everyone that the previous approval for 12.5 units per acre was not for residential units.

Commissioner Crofton stated that only 34 other acres could be developed at 15 units per acre.

Commissioner Lockley asked why a Planned Unit Development was done in 1990.

Mr. Pierce said developments were not being considered at that time.

Bonnie Segree asked the Board not to “stick” with decisions that were made years earlier and asked Commissioner Parrish to represent the people.

Bruce Millender informed the Board that 269 petitions were signed in favor of the project.

**Commissioner Crofton, Chairman, asked Commissioner Lockley, Vice-Chairman, to take over the responsibilities of Chairing the meeting.**

**Motion by Crofton, to authorize transmittal of the amendment to Policy 8.8 of the Future Land Use Element to change the intensity of development within the Eastpoint Urban Service Area. The specific change proposed is, "Within the Eastpoint USA densities as high as 12 units per acre and urban scale of commercial use shall be allowed so long as the property has adequate access to hurricane evacuation routes, and is sited on property with the appropriate soil types, topography, and drainage such that the development does not impact the Apalachicola Bay. Development shall also have to be served by paved roads. Within those areas of Eastpoint USA allowed to have densities as high as 12 units per acre and urban scale of commercial use, a mixed-use Planned Unit Development (PUD) may be approved. Such PUDs would be subject to the following: (1) The mixed-use development shall not exceed 12 units per acre. (2) The ratio of non-residential space to residential units shall be not less than 100 square feet of non-residential space per one residential unit and not more than 800 square feet of non-residential space per one residential unit. (3) Floor-to-Area (FAR) shall not exceed 1.0. (4) Policy 8.7 notwithstanding open space requirements shall not be less than 20%. (5) The amount of PUD space within Eastpoint USA as a whole which may be developed in this manner shall be subject to the provisions for high density areas in Eastpoint USA named in Policy 8.10", and to amend Policy 8.10 of the Future Land Use Element to limit the amount of land in the Eastpoint Urban Service Area designated high density. The specific change proposed is, "The County shall limit land designated high density in the Eastpoint USA to no more than 3% of the area outside of the Coastal High Hazard Zone"; Motion failed due to a lack of a second.**

**Motion by Crofton, seconded by Parrish, to authorize transmittal of the amendment to Policy 8.8 of the Future Land Use Element to change the intensity of development within the Eastpoint Urban Service Area. The specific change proposed is, "Within the Eastpoint USA densities as high as 10 units per acre and urban scale of commercial use shall be allowed so long as the property has adequate access to**

**hurricane evacuation routes, and is sited on property with the appropriate soil types, topography, and drainage such that the development does not impact the Apalachicola Bay. Development shall also have to be served by paved roads. Within those areas of Eastpoint USA allowed to have densities as high as 10 units per acre and urban scale of commercial use, a mixed-use Planned Unit Development (PUD) may be approved. Such PUDs would be subject to the following: (1) The mixed-use development shall not exceed 10 units per acre. (2) The ratio of non-residential space to residential units shall be not less than 100 square feet of non-residential space per one residential unit and not more than 800 square feet of non-residential space per one residential unit. (3) Floor-to-Area (FAR) shall not exceed 1.0. (4) Policy 8.7 notwithstanding open space requirements shall not be less than 20%. (5) The amount of PUD space within Eastpoint USA as a whole which may be developed in this manner shall be subject to the provisions for high density areas in Eastpoint USA named in Policy 8.10", and amending Policy 8.10 of the Future Land Use Element to limit the amount of land in the Eastpoint Urban Service Area designated high density. The specific change proposed is, "The County shall limit land designated high density in the Eastpoint USA to no more than 3% of the area outside of the Coastal High Hazard Zone"; Motion carried 5-0.**

**Commissioner Crofton resumed as Chair of the meeting.**

**Recess (6:15 PM)**

Commissioner Crofton recessed the meeting for 15 minutes.

**Item 3 (6:28 PM)**

Amending Policy 2.2 (g) of the Future Land Use Element to change the intensity of development within the commercial area of St. George Island. The specific change proposed is, "The intensity standard for commercial land shall be a floor-to-area ratio (FAR) of not more than 0.50. On St. George Island the floor-to-area ratio shall not exceed 1.0, except in Block 6 East where the floor-to-area ratio shall not exceed 2-0, as long as the following four criteria are met: (1) at least 33% of the floor area will be strictly commercial space. (2) this 2.0 floor-to-area ratio shall not be applied to waterfront property. (3) the advanced wastewater treatment plant to serve the development will be constructed above the Category 4 storm surge elevation, and (4) all stormwater must be contained and treated on site."

Olivier Monod, the applicant, discussed this request.

Chairman Crofton opened the floor for public comment.

Andy Smith, of the Apalachicola Bay and River Keepers, expressed some concerns and asked for additional information.

Paul Riegelmayr asked if the project would allow for adequate parking.

Mr. Monod and Mr. Pierce addressed both Mr. Smith and Mr. Riegelmayr concerns.

**Motion by Sanders, seconded by Parrish, to authorize transmittal of the amendment of Policy 2.2 (g of the Future Land Use Element to change the intensity of development within the commercial area of St. George Island. The specific change proposed is, "The intensity standard for commercial land shall be a floor-to-area ratio (FAR) of not more than 0.50. On St. George Island the floor-to-area ratio shall not exceed 1.0, except in Block 6 East where the floor-to-area ratio shall not exceed 2-0, as long as the following four criteria are met: (1) at least 33% of the floor area will be strictly commercial space. (2) this 2.0 floor-to-area ratio shall not be applied to waterfront property. (3) the advanced wastewater treatment plant to serve the development will be constructed above the Category 4 storm surge elevation, and (4) all stormwater must be contained and treated on site"; Motion carried 5-0.**

**Item 5 (6:42 PM)**

Proposed Amendment to Future Land Use Map: Change 86 acres on Crooked River Road in Section 6, Township 7 South, Range 3 West, as shown in the attached map, from Public Facilities to Mixed Use Residential.

Mike Schebelli of PBSJ, representing the applicant, stated that they are considering building a nursing home as well as assisted living and independent residential components.

Mr. Pierce stated that the developer would be responsible for improving the road.

Chairman Crofton opened the floor for public comment.

Andy Smith, of Apalachicola Bay and River Keepers, expressed some concerns of future problems the granting of this request might cause.

**Motion by Putnal, seconded by Lockley, to approve transmittal of the following amendment to the Future Land Use Map, changing 86 acres on Crooked River Road in Section 6, Township 7 South, Range 3 West from Public Facilities to Mixed Use Residential; Motion carried 5-0.**

**Item 6**

Proposed Amendment to Future Land Use Map: Change 45.51 acres north of Carrabelle in Section 8, Township 7 South, Range 4 West, as shown in the attached map, from Agricultural to Residential.

Commissioner Sanders stated that a rezoning of 9.9 acres was done in 2003 for Mr. Meeks.

Gene Langston stated that Mr. Johnson bought Gary Skipper's property for this development.

Elva Peppers gave some specific information on this proposed project.

Mr. Langston stated that the developer would be responsible for maintaining the road and would add lime-rock to help stabilize the road. Mr. Langston assured Commissioner Sanders that even though the change could allow more than 7 units the development would only be for only 7 units with some lots being less than 5 acres.

Ms Peppers stated that there were "pine" wetlands included in this project and access to some of the uplands might require a wetland access permit.

Mr. Langston discussed water and sewer for this project.  
Chairman Crofton opened the floor for public comments.  
Andy Smith, of the Apalachicola Bay and River Keepers, got confirmation from Ms. Peppers that there were jurisdictional wetlands on the property.

**Motion by Putnal, seconded by Sanders, to approve transmittal of the following amendment to the Future Land Use Map, changing 45.51 acres north of Carrabelle in Section 8, Township 7 South, Range 4 West, as shown in the attached map, from Agricultural to Residential.**

**Item 7 (7:13 PM)**

Proposed Amendment to Future Land Use Map: Change 15.32 acres on Mill Road in Section 13 and 14, Township 7 South, Range 5 West, as shown in the attached map, from Agricultural to Residential.

Dan Garlick stated that this project would be 15, 1 acre lots.  
Chairman Crofton opened the floor for public comments.

**Motion by Putnal, seconded by Sanders, to approve transmittal of the following amendment to the Future Land Use Map, changing 15.32 acres on Mill Road in Section 13 and 14, Township 7 South, Range 5 West, as shown in the attached map, from Agricultural to Residential; Motion carried 5-0.**

**Item 8 (7:17 PM)**

Review of proposed Housing Element Objectives and Policies  
John Sink, Chairman of the Housing Board, discussed the Housing Board's role in this issue.

**Motion by Sanders, seconded by Putnal, to continued this Public Hearing until May 1, 2007 at 11AM which would allow Mr. Pierce and Attorney Shuler to provide some additional recommendations to the Board; Motion carried 5-0.**

**Item 1 (7:32 PM)**

A Small Scale Land Use Change as provided in F.S. 420.615, which allows a density bonus associated with the donation of land for affordable housing. Property being considered is approximately 799 acres in Sections 4, 32, and 33, Township 8 South, Range 8 West, west of Apalachicola, Franklin County, Florida, as shown on the attached map, to be changed from Agricultural to Residential.

**Mr. Pierce addressed both Items 1 & 2 together.**

**Commissioner Parrish stated that he was declaring a conflict of interest on these items but was reserving his right to comment on these items.**

Mr. Pierce stated that the developer was willing to donate 30 acres of land for affordable housing, which would allow 30 units at 1 unit per acre, and in turn would build 190 units for their development, a 3 to 1 ratio.

Chairman Crofton opened the floor for public comment on Items 1 & 2.  
Commissioner Sanders thanked Mr. Ward for his donation of property for affordable housing.

**Motion by Lockley, seconded by Sanders, to approve the requested small scale land use change, as provided in F.S. 420.615, to allow a density bonus associated with the donation of land for affordable housing, which is approximately 799 acres in Sections 4, 32, and 33, Township 8 South, Range 8 West, west of Apalachicola, Franklin County, Florida, to be changed from Agricultural to Residential; Motion carried 5-0.**

**Item 2 (7:32 PM)**

An Ordinance Rezoning 799 acres in Sections 4, 32 and 33, Township 8 South, Range 8 West, west of Apalachicola, Franklin County, Florida, as shown on the attached map, to be changed from A-2 Agricultural to R-1 Single Family Residential, R-1A Single Family Residential Subdivision and R-3 Single Family Estate Residential.

**Motion by Putnal, seconded by Lockley, to approve the Ordinance rezoning 799 acres in Sections 4, 32, and 33, Township 8 South, Range 8 West, west of Apalachicola, Franklin County, Florida as shown on the attached map, to be changed from A-2 Agriculture to R-1 Single Family Residential, R-1 Single Family Residential, R-1A Single Family Residential Subdivision and R-3 Single Family Estate Residential; Motion carried 5-0.**

**Adjourn (7:57 PM)**

**There being no further business, Chairman Crofton adjourned the Public Hearing at 7:57 PM.**

---

G. Russell Crofton, Chairman FCBCC

Attest:

---

Marcia M. Johnson, Clerk of Courts