

**FRANKLIN COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
PUBLIC HEARING  
COURTHOUSE ANNEX, COMMISSION MEETING ROOM  
JULY 25, 2025  
6:00 PM  
MINUTES**

Commissioners Present: Ricky Jones-Chairman, Jessica Ward-Vice-Chairman, Cheryl Sanders, Ottilie Amison, and Anthony Croom, Jr.

Others Present: Michael Shuler-County Attorney, Michael Moron-County Coordinator, Attorney David Theriaque, Allara Mills-Gutcher, Bre Robinson, Justin Stiehl

**Call To Order**

Chairman Jones called the meeting to order.

**Invocation and Pledge of Allegiance**

Chairman Jones led the Board in prayer followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

**Public Hearing**

**1. Allara Mills-Gutcher (Consultant) -- Draft Ordinance Review**

Chairman Jones speaking, again before I turn this over to Ms. Allara, thank you all for coming. I apologize that it takes a room full to understand what is going on. We are going to get to the bottom up tonight, I assure you. Ms. Allara speaking, thank you good evening. To refresh your memory, my name is Allara Mills Gutcher, and I am with the planning collaborative. I am based in Bay County, Florida. I am a land use planner. I have been in the profession for more than two decades, we will go that far, and I am certified by the American Institute of Certified Planners. I am what you might call a policy planner. I write comprehensive plans and land development regulations for local governments as part of what I do. Franklin County asked me about a year ago to help with the creation of a PUD enabling ordinance, and that is what we have before us today. If some of you remember, we had a few sessions last fall, starting in September, to have some listening opportunities to the citizens of Franklin County to get input and use that as part of the development of this ordinance. So, you will see some of those comments in this today. So, what we are trying to do is establish criteria and to establish a process that does not currently exist in Franklin County on the application of a PUD. So as a property owner would come forward to the county and make application for a development that has more than one use, which we would call a mixture of uses, they have an opportunity to use this tool, this PUD, to cater their development, and ask for the county commission permission in order to develop in the way that they propose. So, with that, I will go ahead and start. You might have in front of you the ordinance, the suggested language, and because Franklin County does not have a unified land development code, you have a zoning code. This language is written to be incorporated into that zoning code, which in a section you have called special districts. So, this language is all new. You might see it as an underlined version. That means it would be new language. Typically, we write these as breakthrough and underline, which means any language that is existing would be stricken through the middle of the word, and any language that is new would be underlined, as you see here. So, to recap, I know we heard this earlier this spring, and now we are here tonight to consider the adoption of this ordinance. So, the planned unit development starts with the purpose and what it is here for and what we are using it for. And in essence, again, this is a requirement for two or more uses, you have to have a minimum of two, and you can have more than two, but you cannot come in with a single-family subdivision and use the PUD ordinance. You have to have at least two uses, and that comes within this first portion of the ordinance. On the first page, as you see as we go down, we have written that the minimum acreage required for the PUD is five acres, and that came as part of the discussions that we had last fall, and listening to you all and what that those acreages could be, knowing that, you know, Franklin County has a lot of vacant area and a lot of ag land, but sometimes you might want to put a mixture of uses on something smaller than 20 acres, so we

settled on five acres. We also require that all property that are subject to the application be under a single ownership. So, it could be a single LLC that has multiple owners of that LLC, but the property has to be under the ownership of that LLC or person or corporation or whatever it might be. We also are going to require that the parcels be of sufficient length size so that they could be available to provide transportation connectivity. That means, if a roads coming by or coming in, we want to be able to connect to that roadway so that the transportation network is not necessarily congested on one certain avenue. But maybe there's other ways that we can connect in and maybe create a grid system to have alternate modes of access to the development. We also have written in that any property which has centralized public water or sewer that is located within one half mile radius of the project is required to connect all structures within the development to said water and sewer system. So, anything located within a half mile of existing services will be required to connect. Otherwise, they are allowed to develop on a well and septic system. Part D is what I was just mentioning earlier, where the PUD must have at least two different uses in it. And then we list these as one through nine, which can be residential, what we call commercial, which would include retail, restaurant, office. We could have public facilities, like, for example, some sort of government owned building. We can have recreational uses. We can have institutional uses, which includes churches, schools and medical facilities, anything that where people are housed is considered an institutional use, we can include that as one of those uses as recreational uses, which is what we would consider a park or some sort of recreational activity. And then there's other uses listed, including uses that are approved by the Board of County Commissioners. So that means that if somebody comes through with a residential use and has something that we're maybe not thinking of right here, because, you know, as time changes and as we move forward, there might be a new use that pops up that we're not thinking of today, that would be at the discretion of the county commissioners if they want to include that and consider that as a second use. But a minimum of two, there has to be two. So, there must be at least 5% of each use provided in the plan for approval. And so, then we talk about how we are measuring those. So, park and recreational spaces are measured by acreage, and other uses are measured by square footage of the structure. So, when we look at the site, we would measure how many square feet of non-residential or commercial uses there are, and how many square feet of park and recreation uses are there are, to determine whether that constitutes 5% of the total of the development to meet the right criteria to be two uses. No PUD shall restrict current publicly accessible shorelines to private access only. That means that if you have a property that is on the waterfront and it is a currently, currently public access, not currently private access, but currently public access, they will not be able to take that public access away. They will have to leave that as a public, publicly accessible spot to the water. A PUD must retain at least 30% of the existing native vegetation. This excludes any invasive species that might be located on the property. So, we want to, we heard that we want to maintain the look and feel of Franklin County and that we want to retain the vegetation. That is why we are here. We love the natural environment. So, there is a requirement to retain 30% of the existing native vegetation. Part H talks about as of April 11, 2025 (which we can talk about later if we want to keep that date. This was written when we thought we were going to adopt this in April, so that is why that date was chosen) says no new PUD shall be allowed on St George Island. Previously approved PUDs on St George Island shall be deemed legal and allowed to continue, or in the case of a natural disaster, rebuild to the parameters of the approved PUDs. So that is excluding new PUDs from St George Island. Part I, the PUD must provide or offer community benefits. And this is the important term. It is such as, so these are examples of what could be included or could be deemed a public benefit. And those include publicly accessible amenities, affordable housing or workforce housing to low-income residents, greater preservation of the natural environment for what otherwise is required in the code and or include redevelopment of blighted areas. So, these are just examples. Goals of what could be considered as a public amenity, that is something that would be processed through with the application and the hearing schedule and the discretion of the county commission as to what they want to consider as a public amenity. So now we are going into the development standards, which is Section S- 8.3 and the Board of County Commissioners here may approve a PUD with varying development street and roadway designs, signage, and buffered standards. So, PUDs are typically meant and created to offer a variety of types of development patterns or street widths or block sizes that may be already what is required by standard zoning. So, these tools, allow an innovative design that may not be allowed by your traditional standard, what we call Euclidean zoning. So, presenting to the county commission differing types of

developments, differing types of street with sometimes 60 feet, is a common right away requirement. So maybe they want something a little skinnier, things like that, that can come in and be proposed to the county commission as part of the process. That is these. These are what we can be done. We can look at these, however. We do have minimum and maximum densities and maximum intensities for the nonresidential uses. So, think of anything that can house a person to live in, that has a kitchen and a bathroom that is considered residential. Anything else is nonresidential. So, you really have two categories when we talk about residential and nonresidential. So, when we talk about density, we are talking about residential uses. So that is anything a person lives in independently from another facility. So, you do have a comprehensive plan, and that comprehensive plan has different land use categories in it, and those different land use categories do have density allowances. So, what we are seeing here is whatever the comprehensive plan says has to be followed in this PUD. So, if you have acreage that's agriculture, you have to follow the density that is required within that PUD. Now maybe you have 100 acres of agriculture, and you want to preserve part of that, and put your development in a corner of that 100 acres. This cut would allow you to move that density, if it is all under the same ownership, and put part of that into some sort of conservation easement or preservation easement, and put that density into a certain portion of that boundary so that it might be more efficient transportation wise, it might be more efficient water and sewer wise. And that is what this PUD would allow us, for you, to move that density over into one section of that as long as the rest of it is preserved in perpetuity, so that you are not able to develop the rest of it. But that density would be limited to the underlying future land use designation, so minimum density shall be limited to that which is required, other than that. So, if you have a well and septic system, the state health department, I think now it is the DEP handles those permits, will limit you to the size of your lot for a residential home based on well and septic and how that has to be separated. You do not want to contaminate a well with a septic tank. So, there are separation distances. I am fairly confident it is pretty common in Northwest Florida that is, that is a half-acre minimum sized lot. I think maybe farther up where we have more clay soils, like possibly Gadsden County, their lot sizes might be a little larger, but down here along the coast, I am pretty confident that all of ours are a half-acre minimum. So, if the DEP requires a half-acre lot, that is what your density, your minimum, your maximum density is going to be. We also have a provision in here that refers to Section 485 within the zoning code that talks about the coastal high hazard area. I think there might have been a handout, or we have a diagram that shows where that coastal high hazard area is, and the limitation there is one dwelling unit per acre, or one per lot of record, and that is in Section 485 of your zoning code. So, we do defer to that density if the property is in the coastal high hazard area. So maximum density for nonresidential uses shall be measured at the individual parcel level. So, we have a maximum of 1.0 floor area ratio for when centralized water and sewer is available, and a maximum of 1.25 floor area ratio, ratio where centralized water and sewer are available, and at least 15% of the total PUD acreage outside of the area calculated as part of the required mixture is used is designated for public open space. So, they are getting an incentive to be able to have more intent density, if they give more area for public open space, so that would be publicly accessible. We do have a maximum height in the next section of 47 feet. That is what you currently have in Franklin County as your maximum height. And that is measured from predevelopment grade, so before they touch anything, before they move any land before they move any dirt. We would look at that to see that is where you start your measurement from, at a 47-foot height limitation. We are saying that the height of a building inside of the PUD if it is a taller structure, we want that to be centrally located and not at the periphery, not at the border of the project. We are looking at compatibility with adjacent parcels. If an adjoining parcel is developed with a structure of three stories or greater than, the structures of similar or greater height may be located within the vicinity of that parcel. So, if we already have taller buildings outside of the PUD, we're saying you could locate taller buildings at the periphery, but only in that instance, if you have a taller building inside of the PUD that we are giving you allowance to locate that taller building outside of the central location, but only if it meets the equal to the height of the structure as a setback from the property line. So, if you are taller, you have to have a greater setback from adjacent structures. And then we are requiring the PUD to provide connectivity to adjacent uses. So, if there is a roadway, a trail, some sort of pedestrian access, or other types of mode of transportation, we are looking for the developer to connect to that. The next session talks about how we are approving these and we have a two-phase process. We have a conceptual approval process and the final approval process. However, we do

request that there is a pre-application meeting with the county so that we can go over this document with the applicant and any other information that they may need to know as to, for example, whether or not they're in a coastal high hazard area, or whether or not they're in the East Point area, so that they're aware of what their parameters are when they're putting their development together. So, after they have their pre application conference, they will come to the county for conceptual approval. Now you do have a local planning agency, which is your planning board. Is that what you call it locally, the planning board? Planning and Zoning Commission. So, the Planning and Zoning Commission is a recommending body to the county commission, and they hear cases like these, and make a recommendation as to whether or not it should be approved, approved with changes, are denied to the county commission, and then the County Commission has the final say. So, this will go before the county commission and before it goes to the Board of County Commissioners, so you have ample opportunity to come and make comments in the hearing process as these move forward. This, this first section right here, talking about the conceptual approval process. This part B1 on page three is basically a checklist of all of the information that we are requesting for the applicant to provide, and it is quite lengthy. We can take questions on that later, but there is a large amount of information that they have to provide to the county as part of this application, this would include a phasing schedule, a description of the public benefits they need to provide, a survey, all kinds of things that we need to look at as we are approving or looking at those. So that the general plan and any kind of phasing then goes to the planning commission. As we mentioned, it then goes to the county commission for consideration of the conceptual. Again, we are still at the conceptual stage, so that the applicant can get a great idea of what will be approved or could be approved down the line, so that they can come back and finalize their documents before coming back again for final approval. So, then the second phase, as we mentioned, was the final detailed PUD so this will be a detailed document. They have 60 days to submit that the plan to the county, to be heard before the local planning agency, your planning commission, between final and conceptual. And then we have a list of what the final PUD requires. And we get down into more detail, such as parking standards and development restrictions. And we want to know all the acreages of all the uses that they are going to submit for. And that is in part C1, on page four, if you want to look at that list. So then, after the local planning agency, we are again coming back to the county commission for final PUD approval. This will be a public meeting, just as it is tonight, for everyone to be able to come and make comments and hear the proposal from the applicant. Then once the final PUD is approved by the county commission, the applicant has 12 months to receive a development order for the first phase of the entire project, or the entire project, whichever is applicable. They might have a phase schedule they might be developing, or developing the project all-in one-time frame. So, there are timelines. It is not open ended. It is not like you can get a PUD and five years later you are going to start building it. That is not how we have it written. You do have time limitations. If there are any changes to the PUD, there is a threshold. So, if there is a substantial change, they would have to come back and go through the process again. Let us see. So, we are mentioning in here towards the end of the ordinance that we are not saying that any flood plain requirements are erased. Those are still requirements any flood damage prevention ordinances, or shoreline or well field protection regulations, or any anything that might be that might pertain to development that still applies. So, we are basically saying that right here in the ordinance, and then we were talking about the modifications, and this is substantial deviations, and that basically covers this ordinance. So, if you, I do not know if you want to proceed with questions or see if the commissioners had any questions. Of you first, sure commissioners, do you have any questions? Commissioner Amison, speaking, Mr. Chairman, I actually got a question. Shouldn't we establish some type of process for PUD review? I do not see that. Ms. Allara speaking, do you mean by staff? Commissioner Amison speaking, yes, yeah. Ms. Allara speaking, so, they would need to review all of these things that are mentioned in Section S8-2, that are presented before it goes to the planning commission and then ultimately to you. So, this is the checklist of what they are looking at to make sure that the application is complete, so that they can make an analysis on whether or not it is ready and ripe to come to the planning commission, and then ultimately you. Chairman Jones speaking, so that is not a process we currently have in place, is it? Ms. Allara speaking, so it is typically handled like you would handle any other application. Chairman Jones speaking, no one else before we go to public comment? Attorney Shuler speaking, Mr. Chair, just a few things for me. David Theriaque is available on Zoom. He may have something to say. Yes sir. Attorney Shuler speaking, um, a couple of

technical corrections. Laura had mentioned earlier the date of April 11<sup>th</sup>. Uh, those dates were still embedded in the ordinance, in the exhibit of the ordinance, so the if the board were to adopt this ordinance, you would need to change the date. For example, the last whereas in the body of the ordinance says it was a public hearing held on April the 11th, 2025. That date would need to be changed to today's date. And the exhibit to the ordinance, on page two, there is a reference to land development code, four to 1.2 point. Attorney Barbara Sanders brought to my attention today there is a typo there. It actually should say four to 5.2 points. It was just a typo on a substantive basis regarding the height. I know there has been some concern about the language that says that compatibility with adjacent parcels is when the adjacently joining parcel is developed with a structure or three stories or greater than structures of similar greater height may be located within the vicinity of that parcel. I know there has been some discussion that perhaps that allows people to build higher than the 47-foot height. And then I would ask that the board just consider for purposes of clarity, while I think the ordinance does not allow for any construction higher than 47 feet, you could add a comma after the word parcel and say not to exceed 47 feet from predevelopment grade. And that would, I think, resolve that issue. And the final substantive issue is, if the board is going to adopt this ordinance, I would recommend that the Board consider also removing the prohibition of a PUD on St George Island. The board, at one of the workshops, there was a discussion about prohibiting PUDs on Dog Island. The board then determined and discovered that there was an existing PUD on Dog Island, so you removed the prohibition of PUDs on Dog Island. There are already PUDs on St George Island, as there are throughout the county. So, I would respectfully request that the board consider that if you do adopt this ordinance, that you remove the prohibition for PUDs on St George Island as well, so that you are not undoing the restricting. Unknown member of the audience yells out inaudibly. Chairman Jones speaking, hey, do not do that. You will get escorted out. You will pay attention and you will be respectful. Attorney Shuler speaking, but just to be consistent with how we have been developing this ordinance of making that recommendation to the board for your consideration, that way, if the board gets a PUD from anywhere in the unincorporated area of the county, then the board would have the ability to consider it both St George Island, anywhere else. So that is my recommendation for the board's consideration if you adopt this ordinance. Chairman Jones speaking, earlier, Ms. Allara, when you were going through your presentation, you made reference to the coastal construction line, I think, or one of those areas is that on a map, the coastal high hazard? Justin speaking, Michael, can you pull up that map? Michael Moron speaking, this one? Justin speaking, this is a map of the coastal high hazard area. The high hazard area limits the amount of development in terms of density that can happen in that area to one unit per acre or one unit per lot of record. Chairman Jones speaking, so, here is my question with this map, even if we include it for St George Island, this will make it one per acre, would it not? Justin speaking, yes, sir. Okay, that is what I wanted to know. Are there any other questions, commissioners? Commissioner Sanders speaking, Mr. Chairman, I do have questions but I am going to hold off on mine to heard from the public.

Chairman Jones speaking, so, we will, at this time, go to public comments. If you would please raise your hand, come forward to be recognized. You are allotted three minutes and you do not have to have filled out a speaker card.

My name is Suzanne Woodcock. I live in 229 River Road in Carrabelle. I am as the consultant was a land use planner in Florida for about 30 years, and still do some consulting work. I was the planner for the state of Florida, for Panama City, and did Franklin County. I wrote grants with the Trust Republic lands, and I am here. This is the first time I have been before you, because I have concerns about this ordinance. And the first question is, why are you doing this ordinance? What is the purpose of it? You know what? Why did it come forward? Bay County is a mess. Panama City is a mess. And whether you think or not, Panama City has traffic gridlock. Its evacuation is a nightmare. So, when you take an ordinance and when you talk about Bay County and Panama City, it's like the one of the worst examples. And I was a land use planner all over Florida, did comprehensive plans, especially I know David Theriaque. I have worked on some cases. I have been an expert witness in land use planning in Florida. I think that the county has some serious concerns. Number one, why you are even doing this

ordinance? You do not have the staff to review these, these developments. The first part of the ordinance says that the property owner has to be on the property that the PUD is coming forward, and they have to be at the time of conceptual approval. But that does not mean that that person is, so they can hire a consultant. They can hire a lawyer. They can hire the developer, like they did with Family Dollar. It is a developer that would come in and develop it, a Walgreens or whatever they want to build a Family Dollar, a McDonald's. They would hire a consultant to get that conceptual approval, and then they would turn around and sell it or lease it to that property owner. And that is why you see abandoned property. So, I think that is really a key issue. Okay, the second thing is, you do not have the staff. Recently, in the last couple years, people have been coming to Franklin County and clear-cutting properties. One of the developers went to the county step, you know, and said, what do I do? I need a clear-cut permit, and you do need a permit. And they said, we do not have the staff to do it. Just do whatever. And the county I called trying to get a copy ordinance yesterday, and they said we only have one person. One person is out when we have a minute and we get time, we can give you a copy of the ordinance. You do not have the staff that can review plan unit developments. I have seen plan unit developments all over Florida. I was the key, one of the key people working with Saint Joe on the Southwood development in Tallahassee. Worked very closely with them this and one of the biggest things we said to them, you do not have the schools to service any new businesses. Franklin County does not have the schools that would attract new businesses. You do not have the medical facilities that would attract new businesses. So, I know Mr. Jones and you talked about in the commissioners want to attract new businesses to Franklin County until we have the school capacity and good schools that recognize businesses will not and we do not have and we have the medical facilities. Businesses have managers. They have executives. They have, you know, good paying people. They are not going to come to Franklin County until you fix those problems. So, I think that this PUD ordinance is premature for those key reasons, the staff you do not have, what will attract businesses. It says it is consistent with comprehensive plan. I spent; I worked my first comprehensive plan was Sanibel. And you know, we went through, I went through comprehensive plans in detail. I did not go through yours to see if this is consistent. But do you have an analysis that went through every policy in your comprehensive plan to see if this ordinance is consistent? And if you do not, you should have that done first and make sure it is consistent. Thank you. I have one other thing. Chairman Jones speaking, I am sure other people are going to speak too. Ms. Woodcook speaking, here is one other important item. It says it has to have two uses that one use can be 5%. 5% of a five-acre parcel is point .25 acres. Then the other use can be a 500-acre parcel. 5% is what you know, a small 25 acres. So, then the 475, acres, it could be a strip mall, it could do whatever, and you do not have the infrastructure that could handle that. So, I ask that you reconsider and do not adopt this ordinance and really look at it. Why you need it, and if you have the staff and the infrastructure to handle it. Thank you.

Someone inaudibly yelled out from the audience. Chairman Jones speaking that is the last time that is going to happen. Brandon, you, sir, and you need to help take whoever is going to try to interrupt this meeting out of the room. Who is next, who wants to speak? That is not what we are here for, guys. This is not high school. Please come forward. Mr. Russell.

My name is Russell Turner. I am from East Point, Florida. I just want to voice my concerns that the planned unit development PUD issue is being pushed against the wishes of Franklin County citizens. In my opinion, I asked Mr. Jones at a Republican executive committee meeting he attended would the Franklin County Board of Commissioners consider allowing the citizens of Franklin County to vote on the issue of planned unit development. Mr. Jones replied, absolutely no. Mr. Jones stated the cost was too high for the taxpayers of Franklin County to burden them with. The cost is roughly \$25,000 to \$35,000. Mr. Jones also stated more people have communicated to him, wanting the PUD than those coming to this type of meeting opposing the PUD. A few types of petitions were started recently, an online petition, a few paper petitions, as well as if I have called people from a republican party list for Franklin County districts one. Not one has I spoken with by phone, supported the planned unit development. That is close to 1000 people. We have been in contact with a Freedom of Information Act, the FOIA was requested for

the commissioner's emails showed there was not support, are, for that matter, much communication about a PUD at all. This data collected should show that the citizens of Franklin County, Florida do not support a PUD, a vote by citizens on the PUD will show clearly if the citizens in Franklin County support the PUD or not. If the commissioners do not approve and set aside money to have a county wide vote, at least. Give these good citizens behind me time, 60 days to raise the funds to pay for a county wide vote. By the way, they have already got pledges covering that amount. I have heard words of transparency, integrity and the best five commissioners ever from some of y'all. Prove that and allow the county wide vote for this PUD. Otherwise, there is just the empty words and hollow words. Thank you. Chairman Jones speaking, thank you. Mr. Russell speaking, and these are all the paper petitions.

Ms. Mel Kelly, 1306 Owens, Carrabelle. And before I start, I would like to thank the commissioners for providing the automatic entrance door to this building, which I requested some time ago and which I am very appreciative of seeing. Thank you so much for making it possible for people like me who need it. As a former local mayor and chairman member of the Carrabelle Planning and Zoning committee, I believe I have a good understanding of our area's community development. Several years ago, sitting county commissioners voted to refuse any further PUD developments by ordinance, and their good reasons for making that decision have not changed. To this interim additional tax monies are not a good enough reason to vote to change the nature of today's Franklin County. I believe the existing county ordinance must remain, prohibiting any further spread of planned unit developments on our very precious water bound and public forest bounded lands. Please think seriously about the dramatic changes that can result from any decision to allow further PUD development. As elected officials, I believe you have an obligation to respect the wishes of those who live here and who care deeply about their homes and the conditions surrounding them. You have heard numerous objections to the PUD proposals, including density, environmental impacts, infrastructure overload, over development of parcels, speculation, resale and financial concerns, limited control with conflict potentials within HOA fees and obstructive regulations, restrictive covenants, potential for poor mismanagement, increased noise, traffic congestion, storm water runoff, lack of centralized utilities for life services, plus financial risks and failures in the event of developer or owner defaults. But most important, I believe, will be any defeat of trustworthy local voices in the governing control of our county, any affirmative vote will permit unwanted changes to the character of existing neighborhoods. Geography clearly defines our communities within this county to create an island of specialized development such as exists within PUDs violates both those new owners within their HOA, as well as the existing neighbors who support their own surrounding homes. Chairman Jones speaking, Ms. Mel, please finish, other people are going to speak. Ms. Mel speaking, yes, sir, I have one sentence left, one paragraph, one sentence. This is such an important vote for the future of our county. You hold the destiny of Franklin County in your hands. I know it is an awesome responsibility. I hope that you will use it wisely and Commissioner, I did time my speech so I know that it was under the five minutes. Thank you. Chairman Jones speaking, three is what I said at the beginning of the meeting.

Chairman Jones speaking, anyone else? You are in the back, sir. I would remind you, as you are coming forward before, we started knowing that this is a room full of people, I had said more than once, you have a three-minute time limit. We want to give everybody a chance to speak. Go ahead, sir.

My name is Dan Floyd, and I live in East Point, and I have multiple properties. And so, my question is, as opposed to having a PUD ordinance, and let us say Lennar Homes, or DR Horton, HR Horton, whatever comes in, they buy 1000 acres, they come to the county, and they want to put up 1000 homes. What is that process look like? Chairman Jones speaking, well, if it says homes, it would be a subdivision. Mr. Floyd speaking, yeah. So actually, the PUD is actually okay. So, it is a mixed use, an option. But these property owners, because you own 100 acres and you want to develop it, you are not required to build a mixed use. Chairman Jones speaking, no. Mr. Floyd speaking, so I am just trying to figure out what the downside is, because actually what this is, is a blueprint for how to manage growth. Chairman Jones speaking, exactly. You are right. Mr. Floyd speaking, the blueprint for how to manage growth. If I had one question for you, would be the five acre. I do not see anybody doing a mixed use at five acres, a

commercial building and a residential necessarily, unless they are residential overhead commercial underneath. Chairman Jones speaking, well, that is what come forward in discussions we have had in previous public hearings with the public. But I would remind you, Franklin County is 92% ownership is the state and federal government. So, we have eight, 8% here is all we are living on. So, we did the five as a starting point, again, from residents' input. And you know, there is, there are not many, if there are, there are not many 100 Acre parcels left in Franklin County. If they are, they are definitely probably not usable. Mr. Floyd speaking, so currently, if a developer comes in, as long as they meet the maximum density requirement, they do not have to provide 30% vegetation, they do not have to provide street lighting and some of these other things. They do not have to provide common space, necessarily. They can go out here and build... Chairman Jones speaking, okay, address us. Mr. Floyd speaking, sorry. Chairman Jones speaking, please address us. Mr. Floyd speaking, well, about the crowd, just trying to figure the opposition. I am trying to figure out where the opposition is coming from. Chairman Jones speaking, I understand. Mr. Floyd speaking, that is where I am at. Chairman Jones speaking, thank you Mr. Floyd. Anyone else?

Ms. Allara speaking, Chairman, can I make a comment on just on the subdivision issue? I would like to just let you know that this year, the legislature has preempted local governments from public hearings on subdivision review. Now it must be 100% handled administratively, so we will not even see subdivisions anymore. Chairman Jones speaking, I did not know that. Attorney Shuler speaking so that is going to be on my report for next week.

Chairman Jones speaking, it is just, we will get to everyone. I promise we will not leave anybody out.

Mr. Al Stone from St George Island. Thank you all for all that y'all do. From the river to the sea is something we hear today in the news, free, free, but I say those words tonight to say, from the river the Apalachicola to the Gulf of America, keep St George Island free. Free, though many like Antifa Hamas and socialists and other divisive units want to divide our country and take away our freedoms. They do that with sowing fear and tactics of fear, it is called divide and conquer. But what stands in their way? The President of the United States, the governor of the state of Florida, our senator, Corey, our congressman, Neil, our state representative in Tallahassee, Jason, who all of these men seem to have one thing in common. They are disliked by many here tonight, but something else stands with you Miss Ward, the Constitution. It stands with you, Miss Cheryl, it stands with you, Ottice, and it stands with you Mr. Crooms, and no matter what people say about you, Mr. Ricky, it stands with you as well. The people of Franklin County are represented by you, not by how many people they can put in this room. It is represented by how many people they can put in a ballot box. Let the ballot box happen, if that is what needs, but as long as y'all, all I am asking you to do tonight is lead. Do not kick the can. Lead, please, though, me and you do not agree on everything, I think you are a great leader. I really do. I think you are a great leader. Miss Cheryl, I do not know you that well, but I know one thing about you. You are a leader, and even tonight and you Miss Ward, you are a leader, and your husband's a leader. Lead, our county. Lead do not kick the can down the road. Thank you. Thank you.

Chairman Jones speaking, anyone else?

I am Jeffrey Dickerson, 1235 Watkins Cove, St George Island. I was, I read the proposed change of this. And at first I was reading it, it seemed to make sense to me, you know, if you have a way of doing this, but the comment by the gentleman here about just saying, hey, let's just take the language for St George Island off, it got me to thinking is, you know, why would you take it off of, St George Island, like you said, Mr. Ricky, that it is all a coastal high hazard area. My question to you is, is they recently tried to get the St George landing, which is the big marina development that was, that they started to do if the PUD was approved, and what the gentleman says they removed St George Island. Would that be an avenue for that St George landing to be able to get approved to do what they want to do? Chairman Jones speaking, actually, we cannot discuss that. We are currently in a lawsuit. Oh, I can assure you this is not about them,

though. Mr. Dickerson speaking, would that PUD override the coastal high hazard requirement of residential? Chairman Jones speaking, no, that is what Ms. Mills said a while ago. Mr. Dickerson speaking, okay, so even if they had the PUDs, they still could not do that exceed that for those are one properties that are on St George Island. Coastal high hazard area is limiting the density allowed. I'm sorry, it limits how many dwellings per acre you can have on a specific parcel, and a PUD you could not override that. That is correct. Okay, that was my question. Yep, thank you.

Unknown speaker, Hey, good evening. Hope you guys are and ladies are all doing well. My comments and... Chairman Jones speaking, what is your name, sir? Unknown speaker, I am sorry, sorry about that. My name is Caleb. Okay. I have been living in St George Island for a little over a year now, and moved here from Atlanta, most for a little bit of context, my entire career for the past 15 years, has been being a pastor. I worked with youth and teenagers in the South and in the Midwest and from every point of across the country, working with teenagers, helping them to not only improve their lives spiritually, but to also enrich their lives in every area of their life. One of my biggest concerns is I have been to these meetings twice now, and both times that I have been at these meetings has been revolved around this PUD development. And why it strikes me as concerning is, as I have read over this PUD and I have listened to the last time we had this meeting and came here. It seems that the goal of this is about bringing money in, which can be good, depending on your point of view. But my concern is that it is so concerned, or it is so focused on bringing money in and not about the self-sustainability of the area that we live in. Specifically, my concern is always about young adults and teens. There is no point in talking about expansions if the people that live here are not properly equipped to be able to make this place self-sustaining. We know that most of the income brought into this island is primarily through tourism, but if we just capitalize on that in a time of economic uncertainty and all sorts of other confusing things going on in the world and in the country, it seems more prudent and necessary now more than ever, to be focusing on how we enrich and we bring every young person's life to the fullest, equipping them and empowering them. And so, the reason again, my concern is that the only news I have heard about gatherings, for locals such as myself, to hear about meetings, is about things, about PUDs and new developments and always trying to progress buildings and money and all of these things. Yet I have not heard a single meeting trying to gather to figure out how we are going to make this island and the residents within it in the next generation more self-sustaining. And so my reason for coming up here and commenting is hoping that we could have at least have more some transparency, or at least some more plans to focus more on our next generation and how we equip and empower them, and to also offer my services as somebody, not just in a religious way, but in every secular way as well, through being able effective communication, different things that I think can help enrich and empower our entire community to keep us united. And so again, my final comments are just figuring out how we are going to be more focused on meetings about making this area better for everyone who lives in it, and if necessary, that I can offer my services to anyone who wishes to contact me or to talk with me afterwards about next steps on how to practically do that. So, thank you. Chairman Jones speaking, I will tell you we do meet twice a month. We do talk about way more than just this potential PUD. And also, to make sure you are aware, and everybody here is aware, we have also hired Ms. Allara. If we ever get past this PUD thing, we are going to sit down and try to do the hard work of coming up with a special zoning district for St George Island so we can address some of its unique issues and characteristics and try to help that develop going forward that is currently on the table, perfect. Caleb speaking, well, then I guess my last comment on that would then just be finding efficient ways, because I did not even know you met twice a month as someone who is lived here for over a year. I have all sorts of comments, but I will get that. Thank you.

My name is Julie Busso, and I live in Carrabelle, and I am going to cut my speech quite short, because there have been some people here that have said things 10 times better than I can possibly do it, especially this first lady that talked about the issues that this county faces with implementing a PUD and especially Miss Kelly, who also made a very good statement about it. Miss Julie, can you move the microphone to you? Can you hear me now? I am adamantly opposed to PUDs. I do not believe that they are a fit for a unique rural county like ours. My husband and I have inherited a house in a Carrabelle, the workmanship

on the house is shoddy. The HOA is completely dysfunctional. The buildable lots were clear cut, contrary to codes. That is a real bug bear for me, no matter where you are in this county, people just like, like this lady said, we do not have enough staff to issue the permits. People will just go in and clear cut a lot. They will, they will add dirt, fill dirt to their lot. Nobody manages it. So, you are starting at a higher elevation than you should be doing, than your pre grade elevation. So there's all this stuff happening in the county that we can't even control now, and I don't think we'll be able to do it under a PUD, but Summer Camp and Gramercy Plantation are two of the nicer looking PUDs in this area, and they have a myriad of problems regarding mixed use and developer issues, and I know the residents there, especially at Summer Camp, are extremely unhappy about what's going on with their PUDs. And they are in Summer Camp people are in the middle of a lawsuit. So, my feeling is, we do not need any more PUDs in Franklin County. Please tell me why you are in such a hurry to pass this I know that this workshop has been going on. The workshops and hearings have been going on for a year, but I do not understand what the big pressure is to pass this PUD and what specific requirement for development are PUDs meeting that do not exist with our current existing ordinances. How will the PUDs benefit the taxpayers, residents, and visitors to Franklin County, and then, most importantly, I attended all the meetings, either via zoom or in person. Why did the P&Z board, I attended all those meetings, why did they unanimously vote to recommend PUDs in May 2025 after their resolute opposition to them at all of the previous workshops during the past year? How did that happen? What was that all about? So, I still do not have answers to these questions. I have been asking the same questions since we started this PUD discussion, and that's, I'm going to leave it at there. But I implore you that these PUDs are going to have huge negative ramifications on our county, and I implore you as our constitutionally elected officials to please represent the will of your constituents and vote against this PUD ordinance. Thank you.

Hi. My name is Dottye Thornburg, and I live on St George and have been happily there for 25 years. A lot of people say yikes. Are we putting the cart before the horse? No, not really, because we have no horse and we have no cart. Years of research have already proven that to have economic development success, you have to have two main features. And I know the first lady talked quite a bit about that, and she is correct. We have got to have good schools and dependable health care. We are just not there yet. It is very unlikely for any true big development to succeed without those two first but if we are looking at specific businesses like Mr. Ricky you were talking about on the WCTV interview, we used to have five pharmacies. Now we only have two. If we needed a specific business. Why didn't we, or why haven't we yet gone out and asked them to come in? We have tax breaks. We have state grant money that we already have for the Economic Empowerment Zone, which is Franklin County and specifically East Point. Why? Why haven't we invited them in if we needed a specific business? But just really take step back and take a look at our current capabilities. Our fire departments are all volunteer when the state gives us a grade like, for instance, the St George Island Fire Department has a number four grade. One is the best. Obviously, our fire insurance depends on that grade. That is how it goes up and down. Well, if we have an implosion of all these people or businesses or hotels, motels, condos, no matter what it is, a bigger development, we are actually putting our firefighters in danger. Our insurance will change, probably go up and I hate to say it, but probably it could affect the homes. If we do not, if we are. Our county is long and slender, our firefighters do the best job that I have ever seen, especially for volunteers. I mean, a number four rating is great for the state. But if we get bombarded with all these developments, I am afraid of what the houses, they just cannot get to them. And if somebody tells me that this statement does not increase the height, I am just not sure it is because the word structure is what I am thinking should be changed. Could be changed? Would it because it says here, if adjoining parcel is developed with a structure of three stories or greater, then structures of similar or greater height may be located. So, if we changed it to a building or a home because our codes, when we are listing even in our ordinances, our codes say this is a structure, church steeple, lighthouses, water towers, radio antennas, Duke Energy poles, so and then the 20 feet height. Why is that even in there? If we are absolutely secure in the fact that it is never going to go over 47 feet, I would like that whole number four statement stricken off of it. We already have regulations on our books for buildings, bridges, businesses, roads, residential neighborhoods, electrical, water, sewer,

hotel, motel, and condos. Why do we need a PUD ordinance anyway? I believe Franklin County deserve its best, and I do not think a PUD is the way to do it. Thank you.

Good evening. Miss George Finn from River Road, Carrabelle. Couple things I would like to say I appreciate the objections that have already been raised against the PUD so far. And also, with regard to the comments about St George Island, object to, if you did go forward to changing the language to allow PUDs in St George Island. Thirdly, route 67 is an approved evacuation route, right? Is that correct? Isn't that correct? Okay, and that just shows you how little we all know about how secure our evacuation routes are, so we do not need to increase the density of this county, because our evacuation zones are not safe. And I am here to tell you, because when Milton came through here, I evacuated about 12 hours before landfall, figuring plenty of time. No, sir, we got one week's worth of rain overnight. I know because I look at the water on my property. Okay, when my property it is high and dry, but when the rains come down, after about a week of rain, I will get some ponding. I got serious ponding on my property in just a few hours' time. When I left, it was 12 hours before landfall, and when I went out 67, I ran into an area that was completely flooded across about three, almost three feet high. And the sad part of it is none of y'all knew that this I was the one that had to call the sheriff and let them know where that spot was, because they did not know. They did not have it marked. They did not have anybody out there, and it was an extremely dangerous situation, okay? And when it comes to these, look at these storms that have happened. Look what is going on in Texas. I got a friend of mine who moved to Kerrville, Texas, okay? And he was right there. These things are happening at an alarming rate, and we need to be careful before we even think about increase in density in Franklin County, we need to start looking carefully at our evacuation zones because they are not safe. Thank you.

I am going to keep this short. My name is Donna Meyer Ingle. I started out my career in Apalachicola early 80s inspecting oyster and crab houses. The bay was fully functional. Then it is not now, because part of it is overfishing and increased development, we do not have the infrastructure. More density is going to cause more problems, and the millions of dollars that are being spent trying to restore this bay will be for naught. Thank you.

Hi Mike Thornburg, St George Island, couple of things. Of course, it seems like when we started this ordinance, we took the big city, Bay County, Gulf, Walton County, whatever, and dressed it up to fit our county. We should have started from ground zero and done our own PUD, not taking one from somebody else, and just started from ground up. But in five acres, I went, I have been part of all the meetings, but I never heard really five acres of where the majority of people ask for five acres of development, because that is like, that is very small for a PUD development. So, another thing is, when people buy, they come in and buy a property. You buy it. If it is on residential, then you can build a house on if it is on commercial, you can build a commercial business. When you come in and expect people to change, you know that you all have no obligation to change any zoning. They did a pretty good job when they laid out the island, when they laid out the lots, they laid out the business district. They laid out East Point, did the commercial business district in East Point? And I think they did a great job when we go to changing that. Like they tried to take the okay away and add, you know, use the old buzzword, workforce housing. Tried to get that rezone to residential when we have all this residential property, one of the things, and we support our businesses, and I know we want more businesses in town, but you know, we do not even make we do not even get with Ways and Google Maps and them and say, when people come out of Atlanta, we're sending them way out and drive in East Point, which is a road with no lines on it, no white lines on the side, no lines down the middle. And we send 1000s of cars down that way every day. We go to ways and then send them to East Point. You go buy businesses. You are in business there. We send all these people down going, Fisherman's Choice. They come in there and they say, how long y'all been here? 27 years. Well, I have been coming down here. I did not know y'all were here because they go down the road. They only know South Bay Shore to Apalachicola, Patton, drive to back to Atlanta. They do not go through the business district. We need to support our businesses, and I do not think it is a big deal to get them to say, you know, no through traffic. Send them the other way, because people come

through there with boats and campers and RVs, and it is very dangerous. I do it. I drive it all the time, so, but that is one of the main things. And this 47 feet in the structures, there should be zero language in this ordinance if it is approved, which I hope it is not, but there should be nothing about height limits. We have a 47-foot-high limit. What your intention is, is to, I am not sure, but it is, it is a lawyer lingo, I guess your intention is one thing, but the way it is written is, you there's room for adjustment in it. And just we got a 47-foot height in the county. Why are we addressing it in here? There is nothing says we need to; we do not need to address in, say, a structure and a setback. So just you should, that should not even be in the ordinance. Like I say, you buy a piece of property, develop it like it is. We do not need to change PUDs, and our infrastructure needs a lot of work before we do something. Chairman Jones speaking, so let me ask a question before you leave. One of you just help me out. Isn't it in our zoning code, orange steeples, cell phone towers, lighthouses, water towers, all special exceptions to the zoning code? So, they are granted as a special exception. Justin speaking, yes, sir, they are there. They would have to go before the board is a special exception. Chairman Jones speaking, so they would not be the same as a residence or a business that are beside them, Justin speaking, correct. Mr. Thornburg speaking, so but if they are but, I mean, we're addressing, but they, if they're there, it's a structure there. Chairman Jones speaking, well, I think we are fine with addressing the 47 feet, but when you are thinking of structures, and it does list church steeples and water towers and all that stuff, those are special exceptions in the zoning code, like a variance that they receive. They have to come in front of the county to even get that. Mr. Thornburg speaking, but you cannot raise our height limit because that is in front of it. Chairman Jones speaking, no, eight months ago, Mike, we as a board, voted to make it a super majority to ever change the height restriction. Now it will I take a 4/5 vote to ever consider changing the height restriction. So, we are definitely not trying to do that. Mr. Thornburg speaking, we do not need to change. Thank you.

Chairman Jones speaking, anyone else? Hold on, sir. There are other people that have not spoke that want to speak.

Hi Marilyn Bean, resident of St George Island for over 40 years. One thing we can all agree on is Franklin County is the crown jewel of Florida, and we need to do everything we can to keep it protected and love it. I think our county commission in 2018 gave us a gift of repealing the PUD ordinance, so let us not open Pandora's box and start all over with another PUD. Thank you.

Barbara Sanders, thank you. So, I would like to talk about how I think we got here. You had an application for a PUD on the island, and Rebecca Jetton and I met with Mark Curenton to find out what the rules were. How does one get a PUD? What do you have to check off? And he said, we do not have a PUD ordinance. I was like, you do not even have to know if they own all the land. I mean, can they just say they have 30 acres when they only have 20? Whatever. And so, then we sort of did the backwards research and realize that the ordinance, that is currently on the books, is that thou shalt not have any PUDs, period. I was like, well, that simplifies matters. But then we started talking about and Alan Pierce uses the word template. Do we need a template for if we decide you may have a pie? what are the rules? Do you have to own all the land, etc.? And these are the things I think your consultant has tried to put together, but the ordinance that you have before you have some language problems. We are going to change tonight, because a lot of people are like, well, it is not going to be allowed on the island, so we are not even going to come. And then tonight we are going to say, well, it could be on the island. And I get your point. That is coastal hazard zone. But when is that going to change? You know, there used to be coastal construction setback lines on St George Island. They vary all over the place, and now nobody enforces them. So, these are things that can change as time goes on, and if we are going to prohibit them on the island, we do not have to, unless the island disappears, which is a possibility now. So, in the ordinance itself, it seems to me, your planner is saying, well, if we have used the word putting in our comp plan, and so we should be consistent. Well, I did read the comp plan laboriously today, and the way it uses the word PUD or the print the PUD is that it says, if applicable. So, there is nothing in your comp plan that says you have to have a PUD. In fact, Alan's

story of the history was when you were an area of critical state concern, the governor and cabinet did not adopt your PUD ordinance. That is why Alan had recommended that it be repealed. So, there is nothing in your comp plan that requires a PUD number one. Number two, this PUD ordinance as drafted does not necessarily comply with your comp plan. There is nothing in here about traffic, other concurrency issues. There are a lot of things left out of it that your comp plan would require. Now, as I understand your consultant, you want to have a PUD so that if someone owns five acres, it is currently zoned residential or commercial, they can come in and say, we want you to rezone it as a PUD, and it can be two or more uses. Well, have a little ordinance that says that, and if have the public benefit part of that in there. What? Why should we treat you special, Mr. Owner of five acres? I mean, there's parcels on St George Island that are eight unit or eight acres, ten acres, some five acres on the east end. Why should you be different from everybody else? What is the public benefit? Make them tell you that specifically in this ordinance, you must take out that language that says and or water. The island has water. We do not have sewer. Take the and/or out. I know that might change 15 years from now. Maybe we will have sewer. I do not know. The other thing is, what is public mean? And I am not talking about public benefit, but public access. Does that mean free? Does it mean only that people that are in the little PUD area who are paying homeowners dues and have it is expensive to get in there, so you we use that word like little mom and dad and little baby are going to go to this public area and walk around in parks. And I do not think your ordinance clarifies that. I think public can mean not the specific owner. So, there are problems with the ordinance as drafted. Hopefully, you will listen to some of the people here, go back to the drawing board, try again. Thanks.

Hi, I am Marianne Fisher, and I live in Carrabelle. Here is a list of some of the failures of the Summer Camp PUD. The initial plan and pattern book was great, excellent house building landscaping. A few years ago, St Joe, who then controlled the HOA, changed the covenants, and sold lots to DR Horton. DR Horton then clear-cut lots, built duplicate houses that do not meet, that meet the original standard of the Florida cottage. Other builders-built housing just for the purpose of short-term rentals that can house 18 people and are not cottage style and have fake garages, which add to the number of people who can fit in space. The homes are supposed to be residential, not commercial, or rental properties. St Joe never maintained the development and suddenly turned over of the HOA and associated like this. Okay, sorry. Saint Joe never maintained the development and suddenly turned over the HOA and associated responsibilities to the home property owners with over \$500,000 worth of necessary maintenance. That is how the wrote the original documents, so that after certain number of properties were sold, the owners had to take responsibility. That meant the roads, the beach, the buildings, the pool, the water drainage systems were in great disrepair when they transferred the HOA to the owners. So now that area is suing St Joe to pay for the maintenance problems, they left with us. I am sure that costs a lot. PUDs require a commercial entity in the development. St Joe built a restaurant, which the initial tenant found out was too expensive water and electricity costs to make a profit. So, the restaurant building over there has been vacant for at least five years. A picture, this could happen in your new PUDs. We now have. They now have a very large empty building that they cannot afford to even renovate. In short, they created a PUD plan that looked great on the initial review, but they did not follow through with the pattern book they had used to sell the project. They eventually brought in mass poor quality build builders, DR Horton and I can go on and on about that, I will not today. Change the bylaws by allowing clear cutting and poorly constructed homes built on slabs, not the safer and more environmentally mentally sound posters, the development no longer follows the Apalachicola Riverkeepers guidelines. The homeowners are left in the expensive and unsightly mess that the developer created and have taken no responsibility to remedy. So, PUDs are created by the wealthy for profit, and you know, those that live in the PUDs, in the end could end up in a mess. And who is going to help them? And you do not want lots of those, you know, I already have some already so, and I know that you care about, you know, you have all grown up here. You care about your Forgotten Coast. I realize we are not forgotten anymore. Nobody wants it to be the Forgotten Coast. Maybe you can look into bringing in, you know, clean industry into the area, there's lots of clean industry that could get jobs for the people that graduate high school, and I honestly don't know if they don't have a parent that has a business where they're going to work, you don't need them working as a

waitress in some you know, outside restaurant that doesn't care about them and isn't going to give them benefits, going to cut their hours so they don't get benefits or taking off sheets in some hotel. It is not a great job. Done a lot of those jobs before in my life, and it is not fun. It is no way to, you cannot have a family and support it. So, thank you for listening. Appreciate your hard work. Thanks.

My name is Lyra Erath, and actually, now I live in Alligator Point, have lived there for many years, and I really have, really number one, I support a lot of what people are saying here tonight, absolutely, but I have more questions. If we currently, the map that went up the Coastal high hazard areas, I knew I was going to forget it. Coastal high hazard areas, if I saw that map correctly, does that mean that Alligator Point is exempted from this PUD because it looked like from the map that we our entire Cape was high hazard. That is a question, yes or? Ms. Allara speaking, so the coastal high hazard area limits the density. It does not exclude the ability to have a PUD. It just says you can only have a maximum of one dwelling unit per acre within the coastal high hazard area. Ms. Erath speaking, okay, so, because earlier, it was sort of intimated that if you were in a high hazard, it was all good that nothing this would not apply. These rules did not apply. Ms. Allara speaking, no, we were saying that within the HUD ordinance language, we refer to Section 485, of the zoning code, which mentions the coastal high hazard area density limitation, which is one dwelling unit per acre. Ms. Erath speaking, okay, but nothing about the height of the unit. Ms. Allara speaking. that is covered. So, I know there has been a lot of conversation and commentary about concurrency and transportation networks. This does not preclude any other regulation of the code; those still will apply. What it does allow is the flexibility of the developer to come in and kind of negotiate public amenity, public purpose with some different type of regulation. Standards that are proposed, and so that is a negotiation period through the process of the public hearing with the county commission as to what is the end result, Ms. Erath speaking, because we do not have the infrastructure for that out on our term. Ms. Allara speaking, that is why these are determined on a case-by-case situation, right. Ms. Erath speaking, so, and my next question is, if this is a beneficial thing for Franklin County, why is it not beneficial for St George Island? How are they different from any other beach community? Because we are a sand cape. I mean, we are nothing but a little I call it our sand bar. But why does not? Why wouldn't the same standards apply to St George? It is a question. Chairman Jones speaking, yeah, well, that is what the attorney brought up earlier when he said, what he said, that is what he was trying to address, is that, how are they different. Ms. Erath speaking, the main thing I found since I have lived in this county, which is beautiful, and we all do love it and we like it the way it is. That is why I moved here. Is that I believe that in Franklin County, enforcement is one of ours. We have the laws; we have the ordinances. They are just not being enforced. We do not have the staff and the infrastructure the people here, which would be jobs, but to enforce our current ordinances. I think that is just my personal Opinion is that enforcement is one of our weakest points, and further development and additional development is not going to change that or improve that, or our schools or our medical or our pharmacies, which are all things that are needed in one way, I am lucky. I live at the farthest end. I have access to Crawfordville and to Tallahassee. people in Apalachicola, my goodness, they have to go so far for different services and amenities. So before, I really believe that the infrastructure is one of the first things that we need to be attending to and not further unleash development. Thank you for your time.

Paul Riegelmayr, St George Island, I will be really brief. I urge you to not pass this ordinance. I do not know PUDs that do any good you look west of us, and I do not, you know, I do not want Franklin County to become that. I know you say it will not, you know, we will keep a lid on it. Developers have a way of subverting the intentions of their commission. Do not open the door. Please. We are counting on you to protect us, to keep us from becoming like Panama City, all the places west so please do not pass this ordinance. Thank you.

Teresa Spohrer, St George Island, I'd like to point out what makes St George Island different is we're completely surrounded by water and only have one way on and off. I wonder if y'all saw the island Fourth of July weekend, 1000s of people. Now, imagine a freaky storm blowing up and you have to

evacuate. That is what makes us different. We do not need more people crammed in there. Thank you.

Chris Crosby, Carrabelle. Most of y'all know me. Ricky, clear something up for me. You said a few minutes ago, it has got to be a 4/5 vote for anything like that to happen in the height restriction. Okay, as we all know, we live in a unique county, and we do not want no Panama City or Destin. I am sorry, as y'all know, we live in a unique County. We do not want nothing like that here, Panama City, Destin. We do not have the infrastructure. But most important, we just lost our bay. The FWC took our bay. If we have more infrastructure, we will not ever get that back. So, if you would think about this hard, thank you.

Joellen Pearman from St George Island, just very briefly, I found it worrisome here to say the developers would be responsible for their own infrastructure. There again, it has been meant, who is going to enforce it? What I mean? Why would they to do their own we do not have an infrastructure. We do not have anybody do it, who is going to make them responsible for their own infrastructure, I think is a disaster.

My name is Kathleen Ohman. I live in Carrabelle. I see everybody you want more businesses you want, you know, what you do not have is a decent, affordable housing for the workers who are going to work in these new businesses, we can keep teachers because they cannot get housing. Does this address our housing problem?

Gayle Riggle Meyer of St George Island full time in the 25 years that we have owned our home on St George Island, this is the most consequential public hearing I have ever attended, I have strong reason to believe that there are developers and private investors waiting in the wings watching to see what happens tonight. If this PUD enabling ordinance is approved, Franklin County will be inundated with requests to build high density luxury resort PUDs. Once upon a time, Destin used to be like Franklin County, a small, quaint, rural fishing village. What changed in Destin to make it what it is today, the city and county commissioners sold out Destin to developers. How did they do that? You ask, they did a lot of things, but among them was they created new zoning codes and ordinances that allowed high-density, mixed-use developments like PUDs only they gave them different names. One zoning category, and I can give you the name allowed for seven to 10 dwelling units per acre on one to three acres. Another other zoning codes there is two others that allowed very high density, 20 to 40 plus units per acre. An example is harbor village building with one of these within one of these zones, on a one-acre lot, it had 10 retail store fronts, two, two story, 10, two story apartments above and its total density was 20 total dwelling units on one-acre, minimal setbacks to maximize usable area. In April 2007, that was 18 years ago in Franklin County, another Franklin County Board of County Commissioners at that time approved Port Haven PUD on the north side of highway 98 in East Point, across from the East Point channel. The Port Haven PUD was to be built on land owned by different people who cobbled together their properties to create a 31-to-34-acre parcel and then sold it to developers. It was going to have houses of various sizes, storefronts mixed use with retail shops below liver living quarters above it was approved for 10 units per acre. Sound familiar? That is what happened in Destin. The proposed PUD enabling ordinance, language requiring only five acres per PUD. Can you just imagine the number of PUDs along Highway the quarter of highway 98 and inland from Apalachicola bridge all the way to summer camp area that developers will want to build. How many other property owners with smaller properties are going to cobble together their land to create larger parcels for even bigger PUDs? I cannot think of one good reason to have a PUD but I have heard these reasons given by others. Workforce housing. I am all for workforce housing, but we do not need PUDs to have them. Special districts can be created with specific rules applied to specific parcels of land. This is what was done on St George Island with the commercial district overlay ordinance. Chairman Jones speaking, yes, please wrap it up. Okay, well, all these excuses for allowing PUDs workforce housing, it is referenced in the comprehensive way. You have heard this from me before. 92% is owned by state and federal governments in the 25 years plus that I follow Franklin County, I sincerely think this is the best BOCC board we have had. However, I absolutely think that if this board

votes to approve the PUD enabling ordinance tonight, your individual and board legacy will go down in the history books of Franklin County as the board that set Franklin County on the same path to ruin as it is what happened in Destin. Thank you.

Hi, Angela Sims, I am on St George Island. One of my questions is, currently, has the board approved and or the Commission approved any PUDs on St George? Chairman Jones speaking, there are PUDs on St George, yes. Ms. Sims speaking, I mean that are pending. Chairman Jones speaking, no I am sorry, there is nothing pending. Ms. Sims speaking, okay, I echo a lot of what people have already said. One of my biggest concerns is the infrastructure, having had to evacuate two times this past year. We are just we have had a house here for five or six years, and then we moved here full time a year and a half ago. There the traffic going off the island can be a real problem, and I am very concerned that if we have more development on the island, and it is not just even St George, just getting out of the area, getting out of East Point, you have kind of two exits. You got to go up 65 or you go through Apalachicola and then go up and go north. It is not easy to get out. And so, we really need to think about that, the infrastructure of firefighting. We have had two fires, major fires on the island, we have great response, but we are adding more burden by creating more density, so just please consider those issues as you consider voting, I would recommend voting against this without at this point, unless you sit down, as other people have said, and really iron this out to be more controlled. Thank you.

Chairman Jones speaking, let us take a five-minute recess. This public hearing is now back in the session. You would please find your seats. Chairman Jones speaking, Mr. Moron, let us go do some of the ones that have their hands raised on Zoom.

Ms. Lynn Wilder, hi everyone, and thank you for allowing me to comment. I just want to say that our non-development is a plus and makes us unique. I have had home here since 2004. I moved into an existing home. I did not build one. I would like to know, will the new HUDs support jobs or is it for tourism? Please do not allow this. Our environment is so unique in North America and beyond, our environment is rare. Has species of plants and animals that are found only in our rivers, forests and bay and islands. Big development will adversely affect this. Do we have a plan for infrastructure? Do we need septic tanks that will affect our rivers and bay and our clean water? Can we handle more visitors on St George Island? Please visit in the afternoons on a weekend. What about our roadways? They are getting more and more congested. What do we want in Franklin County really? Do we want wildlife, fishing, dolphins, and rare plants, or do we want subdivisions? I think yes, voting yes for PUDs before we carefully consider and evaluate impacts will result in Mexico Beach, Panama City and more. We live here because we do not want to live there. Thank you.

Mr. John Berry good evening, Mr. Chairman, my quick question is to the consultant, and that is in section, it looks like 5-8.3, C3 on maximum height. Why is that statement even in there, if we are not ever going to allow a 47 anything above 47 feet in the first place? That is to the consultant. Ms. Allara speaking, we are affirming that the height limitation is 47 feet in Franklin County. Mr. Barry speaking, well, that does not sound like an affirmation statement. That sounds like if it happens, then they got the right to do it. Ms. Allara speaking, well, they have the right to do it today. Mr. Barry speaking, I did not think that right existed. Ms. Allara speaking, to 47 feet? Mr. Barry speaking, no, above 47 feet. Ms. Allara speaking, we are not allowing above 47 feet.

Mr. Barry speaking, no but it said in that statement, and just reading it says compatibility with adjacent parcels, if an adjoining parcel is developed with a structure of three stories or greater than the structures of similar greater height may be located within the vicinity of that parcel. Attorney Shuler speaking, Mr. Barry, this is Michael Shuler. Yes, at the beginning of the meeting, I had recommended two things the board to consider. One of those things was at the end of the word or the phrase, the vicinity of that parcel. In order to bootstrap, you know, belts and suspenders, remove the period, add a comma not to exceed 47 feet from predevelopment grade period. Mr. Barry speaking, thank you. I did

not pick up on that when I heard your statement.

Ms. Sheryl Claus speaking, I live on St George Island. I wanted to address a couple reoccurring themes that I have heard. First of all, we are friends and neighbors. That includes the people sitting up there who are doing this really, really difficult job, as well as the people in the room, as well as the people who are listening and everywhere around. But I am hearing some concerns. I am hearing concerns that we have had consistently, and I have been to almost, I think every meeting, maybe every meeting on this and there have been numerous. We do not have the staff and the ability to enforce the ordinance and rules we currently have. We do not have the infrastructure, the EMS, the fire, the deputy coverage to be able to cover our very long County and our very, you know, important areas as is. It is a very difficult way to do it, and it seems that what you are looking at is creating an economic opportunity for a few on the backs of the residents in this county. And I do not understand what the push is for that when we have not had enough time to vet this, to the point that at this meeting, which I believe is what the seventh, maybe eighth, Mr. Shuler is saying, well, let us just drop the entire no PUDs on St George Island thing. That is a suggestion. I know he has not been discussed. But why are we still having that suggestion at this point? The majority of the owners that I have heard in all of these meetings have seemed to not want this to go forward. And I do understand that people may not be speaking publicly or wanting to speak publicly, but it seemed like the FOIA did not show a lot of support of that either. And finally, I think that what you are doing is you are creating a case where you're saying you can decide these things on a case-by-case basis, but what you're creating is a bare minimum standard that if you then go back and you deny a PUD that's met the bare minimum standard, are we not opening ourselves up to litigation then, because they met the legal standard? I think a lot of people have. moved to this county for the character, for the look, for the lifestyle that we have. And I do think PUDs dramatically changed that visually, as well as just the character of the entire ethos of that we're going for in this county. And I really urge you to carefully think about the impact of this. Who is going to benefit, who is going to pay and how is it going to change what we all moved here for and have stood for and have worked for and fought for? Thanks for listening to me, and I appreciate your time working on this.

Yes, this is Krystal Shuler Hernandez. I want to first thank you for the hard job that you guys are having to do. I know that this is difficult. I am a fourth generation born, raised, mom here, raising my children here, and one of the reason I chose to stay here and build my family here is because of what a wonderful, small, beautiful place we have, and that is why so many people come here, because of the unique things that we have here. We have an ecosystem that is so rare, as Ms. Wilder said, and we have such a beautiful place. And I really just want to urge you all to even if it is just to postpone for a while. I do not know what the cost of this, financially, of some going forward with this to. I know that, you know, there's lawsuits threatened and stuff, but at the end of it, there's people that are going to get hurt by this big time, the people that live here, our infrastructure is already crumbling. Uh, you can see the water in Apalach. Our roads are not good. We have volunteer firefighters like we just, I just do not think that we can see that type of growth that the PUDs would bring right now. And I just urge you all to do the right thing, which I think is the right thing, is to not allow these and to put a pause on it and continue talking about it, because it seems like there is a lot of things that are just being figured out now in this meeting. So, I appreciate your time.

Hey, good evening, everybody. My name is Jason Timbert. I am the chief of the volunteer fire department for St George Island. You know, we all took an oath right to protect life and property for our great community and for the greater community of Franklin County. But any growth that is going to be fast and really ever-changing puts all my firefighters and the overall community into a hazard zone to where we may not be able to cover right what we have taken an oath to cover. So just want to put on record that I am against the PUD and I appreciate everybody who has spoken out tonight, and we look, we look forward to continuing to continue to serve our great community in Franklin County and thank you very much for my time tonight. Thank you.

Tonya Putnal from Lanark, I do not want to repeat what everybody has been saying. I just wanted to let everybody know and remind you of what is going on with our neighboring county to the east of us, the surge in residence, the surge in businesses, the flood of accidents and crime rate that has increased tremendously over just the past year. I do home health care in Wakulla County. I am on those roads on, you know, very often, and I am seeing massive housing complexes built, massive apartment complexes built just acres and acres of woodlands and wetlands being destroyed and cleared out and just box houses, cookie cutter houses that you know, one catches on fire, the next one is going to catch on fire, and it is just going to be a domino effect. They are not built very well. They are priced at \$400,000 to \$500,000. I do not see where that would be beneficial to anybody who lives or wants to live in Franklin County. And I just, I just think that we should be against it, all the franchise businesses that are going to come in and take down the mom-and-pop businesses that have been the heartbeat of Franklin County from the beginning. So, I really think y'all should think about this deeply we are a tourist state, but we would not be where we are if it was not for the people of Franklin County and what we stand for. So, thank you for your time. I got to get back to work and have a good night. Thank you.

Ms. Rebecca Jetton speaking, there appears to be a lot of confusion about this PUD ordinance, increasing density. This PUD ordinance uses the existing, future land use map, density, which has already been adopted by the county years ago. This is the only document in your zoning code which provides guidance for developers and employees regarding all the documentation which must be submitted for site plan review. It requires consistency with the density. It reinforces the density of the coastal high hazard zone. It allows flexibility for mixed use. It establishes minimum open space and retention of vegetation. Without this ordinance, developers will continue to approach the county and ask for approval, and incrementally, the development will be approved using site specific standards, not using an overarching guideline, such as what you find in this ordinance. Unlike everybody else tonight, I support adoption of this ordinance and feel that it is long overdue and it does not increase density. Thank you.

My name is Deborah Parker. I live in Summer Camp, and this is a letter I wrote to the commissioners earlier. Dear commissioners, I sadly believe that any attempt to again share with you my concerns about PUDs for Franklin County will fall to deaf ears yet again, I will try, because my voice is all I have. I have been to two of the workshop meetings and never heard a valid answer as to why we need a PUD. We love our county because of its quaint, small town, fishing, community, environment. Franklin County currently has a comprehensive plan, zoning and building ordinances and laws. The St Joe's PUD development, where I live, Summer Camp has been a disaster. Our county does not need more poorly managed and incomplete PUDs. We need a fire department. We need improved infrastructure. For example, the problem with Apalachicola is water and we need low-income housing. We do not need any big new developers abusing our beautiful natural environment. I do not know why you had the community meetings earlier this year about the PUDs, because you did not listen to, you did not educate us, nor indicate that you heard the concerns that so many citizens have. Respectfully. Deborah Parker.

Ms. Powell speaking, well, thank you for letting me, letting me speak. I appreciate that. I just want to say the sad situation is that the development community is well staffed and financially capable and organized and in comparison, currently, Franklin County is not staffed with personnel that are trained adequately to handle the PUD requests that will come in if this goes forward and is passed. So, on that basis, I strongly urge our commissioners not to pass this PUD ordinance now.

David Adlerstein speaking, I just have a request when you guys make your decision and you speak on the subject, and that is all these PUDs have referred to high end developments often, and how will this affect workforce housing? That is my ask here. Thank you.

Mr. Moron speaking, I am going to try Rex one more time. Mr. Chairman let us see if this is a charm. Hey, Rex, if you would unmute on your end, you can address the board, whether it is on your end. He must be having technical issues on his end. We will come back to him.

Chairman Jones speaking, so does anyone else in the room? I was not trying to go away from the people in the room, but they have been waiting just as much as everyone else has. So, do them by matter of course, is there anyone else in the room that wishes to speak? This is the public comment period.

Bobby Miller from Apalachicola speaking , appreciate the opportunity to come before y'all and speak tonight. And more importantly, I appreciate the opportunity to thank you again for the work you did on the height restrictions. I do not I was asked one time what I thought about a PUD and I really did not know. I just often wonder, is it, is it really that necessary to put these tools in your toolbox to be able to operate? Do you really need this? Have you asked yourselves, I have no doubt that you folks, the five of you sitting up there tonight, have the best intentions for Franklin County, that there is? What happens when y'all are no longer there and you have turned this PUD business over to the opposite person that has the opposite thinking that you have. They have the development mentality. Are they going to rip us apart with this PUD business? Have you thought about the downside to this, the unintended consequences? You have not been able to let your minds live on that side of the street because your focused on what you can do with this PUD. I would be very careful. Be very, very careful. If you must have a PUD, can you hear me? Please strike the part about the height. Get that mess out of that PUD. We do not need any confusion. You need very clear language. I asked somebody one time. I said, why is that guy so adamant about getting up here and arguing about this project? It was an ongoing project in Apalachicola. They said he has 13 million reasons to stand there and argue. And he did. \$13 million dollar tax credit, and he won. You are not going to be fighting just a lawyer on this stuff if you leave that sloppy language, I call it with all due respect, about the height that is involved in that PUD. That most definitely, at the very least, that needs to be gotten out of there, and in big bold print, nothing over 47 feet PUD or otherwise in Franklin County. Please do not let that slip by. You do not need there is no sense in leaving room for an argument there. You do not have to do that. You are in control. But please think about I have watched this commission change. I remember when Miss Cheryl's dad was on the commission. I have been here a couple of years, and I have watched this thing change. You are not going to always be there. Today you feel like you are, and we hope you will be there forever. But sadly, that is not going to happen. What is, what does a new what you going to do the day that you have a commission up there and you do not even know these people. They are not from here. You do not even know the name. Fortunately, we have all people up here. They are born and raised here. That is a wonderful thing, but it is not going to always be like that. What are the unintended consequences of you passing this PUD tonight? Think about it. Thank you.

Chairman Jones speaking, anyone else wishing to speak?

My name is Margaret Miller, new to town. I have a question I have not heard anybody mentioning. Are the people that get approved? Whoever they are, LLCs, group of neighbors, etc., other impact fees going to be put on them. Chairman Jones speaking, Franklin County charges no impact fees currently. Ms. Miller speaking, why would you not? Chairman Jones speaking, well, because we have not levied impact fees on anybody again, then why anyone else? Ms. Miller speaking, so, I am from Sarasota County, and they do nominal for functionary, but they are not enough to cover what will happen is developers come in. They get their systems; they get their stormwater off their property. They get they have to go out to the grocery store. They send their kids to our schools. They ride on our roads. They need patrolling by our officers. If they do not pay an impact fee, why are we giving them anything extra? Because they happen to have cobbled together five acres, I am just not sure why you would not just if you are going to approve it, why you would not then put a fee on them for what they are gaining,

which is to our loss. Chairman Jones speaking, we do not currently charge impact fees to anyone. So, the residents you got, if you were to come and you were building a home, we do not charge you \$15,000 for an impact fee. Ms. Miller speaking, no, I understand that. But Sarasota has a thing where they just charge it to these developers like Neil Holmes, your DNR guys, whoever they are, the guys that are left over from the general Development Corp. I have been here before, Mickey, charge them for it if they want that special permission and they are going to do something commercial. No, you do not impact everybody else. Write it the way that you need to them that is how you have lawyers and so that they would pay extra if they were going to get approved for anything. It just a suggestion. Chairman Jones speaking, yes, ma'am. Ms. Miller speaking, that is it.

Commissioner Ward speaking, if I could elaborate on that real quick. I did speak with county staff about impact fees, and unfortunately, legislatively, there has been some stuff at the legislature about impact fees, so we kind of just put a halt on that right now to see what they determine up there at the legislature about impact fees.

Chairman Jones speaking, anyone else that wishes to comment, everyone else online. I think he has put down his phone and walked away. Mr. Moron speaking, we are trying to get Rex to unmute. I saw Brooke Hunter, raise your hand, and lower it and raise your hand, lower it. So, I'm just trying to make sure you weren't having technical issues. Well, Brooke just raised her hand again, and Commissioner, I cannot get Rex to unmute his on his end.

Brooke Connor speaking, I know you are exhausted. I can see your faces. I want to say thank you to three of the commissioners who got back to me after 41 emails as a private citizen, to your staff who never got in touch with me over a question I had about buffer regulations between two properties. I began in January, and I went all the way to May. I gave up with the zoning and planning commissions. No one would get back with me. May, I finally heard from Commissioner Amison, and Commissioner Ward and Commissioner Croom. Two of them have come out to look at property that your staff was unable to look at with a problem. And the question being, what is the buffer regulations between two properties? How you could have a PUD start to come into existence when your staff cannot even handle something that a private citizen began asking question about in January of 2024 and the only way, I got anyone to listen to me was when I asked three of the commissioners who answered my emails back to send somebody from planning and zoning in June. I did hear from Ms. Bree Robinson, but the answers are not good to the problems that we are meeting. So, I please do not approve this. Go back and clean up your own house. Do something about your comprehensive plan and Commissioner Jones or Chairman Jones and Commissioner Sanders, I did send you emails, also did not hear back from either one of you. I actually fell taking audio on my phone of the problems we had of mud silt that came in from this problem that your own Franklin County zoning and planning regulations did not meet. That is enough. I know you are exhausted. Thank you for listening to me.

Mr. Moron speaking, I think that is it. On my end, no other hands raised. Chairman Jones speaking, all right, that is one more time. Are any more public comments in the room? Yes, come on, sir. Everyone else has had their chance, but you can come back again. It is all good. Thank you for your patience.

My name is Danny. I live in East Point. Does a PUD provide for increased density? Chairman Jones speaking, it does in some areas. Yes, they can ask for increased density. And I believe Eastpoint it is 10 per one acre, correct?

Ms. Allara, it can. You can allow the density that exists today, it is not increasing above what the Comprehensive Plan allows.

Danny speaking, okay, that answers my question, and I think that the impact fees are probably something to look at. Okay, thank you.

Ms. Allara speaking, and I do not know on that topic, if we are allowed to segue into something I wanted to demonstrate to you?

Chairman Jones speaking, we can, let us finish public comment first, though. Sir, keep it short. You have already been up here once. That is right, exactly.

Unknown speaker speaking, if anyone is concerned about doing anything to increase the revenue in this county, the most important thing all y'all can do is fight like hell for the organic industry of fishing in this industry, and get the bay open. That will, that will do more to make everybody in this room happy, bring more people into this county, and then anything else that can be done. So, appreciate all effort you can do to do that. Thank you.

Chairman Jones speaking, we have been. It would be nice to have this kind of audience. August the 13th and 14th up in Havana, when FWC is talking about either 14th, 14th about where they are actually going to open the bear that will keep it closed. Go ahead, ma'am.

Unknown speaker speaking, I know. I am not sure if this is in the ordinance you handed out today, but there is a provision that allows the county to meet privately with any entity's attorney regarding litigation. Chairman Jones speaking, what does that have to do with what we are talking about today? Unknown speaker speaking, well, it is in this ordinance. Chairman Jones speaking, okay? Unknown speaker speaking, it was at the end of the ordinance in one. Commissioner Ward speaking, I think she might be confused, so we did talk about that at a previous meeting, but not. Unknown speaker speaking, because I got a copy of the ordinance, and I did not see it in the new one, so I wondered if that was in. Chairman Jones yeah, that was something we actually was discussing at a previous meeting, but it is not a part of what we are looking at today. Unknown speaker speaking, okay, I just got that one a couple of days, so I was not sure. Okay, thank you.

Mr. Moron speaking, Michelle Hannock has her heard raised. Chairman Jones speaking, if you Mr. Russell. Mr. Russell speaking inaudibly. Chairman Jones speaking, no sir, can you come forward? Raise your hand, sir. That is, that is the process, process we are going to do.

Russell Turner speaking. I did not hear the date and time or place for that. Chairman Jones speaking, in Havana, they are going to post it. Should be posted by the seventh to be a week before. Mr. Turner speaking, where would they post it? Chairman Jones speaking, on the FWC website. Mr. Moron speaking, Mr. Russell, I will put it in county website also, when they send it out.

Commissioner Amison speaking, Mr. Chairman, while he is walking back with that right there, you'd usually give a time specific, like four days out, yeah, so that it just makes sure you're checking the proper website. It is about four days before that meeting. And for everybody, because I know most of y'all because I have been sitting here taking notes, is on that side of the river. Bears will be on the 13th, yeah? So, you might want to show up for that one too.

Cheryl speaking, hey, thank you. This is just actually a really quick question. All right, maybe it is a comment. When we think about density, we keep talking about housing density, and we keep thinking about PUDs in a predominant PUD that we are doing, as you know, putting in tiny homes or making, you know, another Summer Camp or whatever. But the density that we have to consider when we are looking at our tax infrastructure also includes business density. It includes if we set up, you know, if you think about the problems and a number of the calls that are St George Island Fire Department, which I have more familiarity with their calls than I do with other people's. But you know, most of the calls, a lot of the emergency calls, they get, are not from residents. It is from people visiting a business. We just had, I believe, on the island, somebody had come down for the day and was sitting at the Blue

Parrot and had a stroke. And that is still our fire department and our EMS and our services and our infrastructure that are handling that. It is our roads; it is our police officers. So, you know, I just want to, you know, make sure that when people are considering the idea of density, it is not simply housing density, it is if we are having businesses that are attracting people. And I also did want to make a quick comment. I did listen, Ricky, to your comments about, you know, about the drug stores. There used to be five, and now there is only two. How does a PUD help you get a drug store? I have never been to a CVS or anything where they needed a PUD to be built. It is a single business. Thank you for taking my comments. Chairman Jones speaking, so to answer that, Miss Cheryl, that is the one quote they used out of a 24-minute interview. Ms. Cheryl speaking, isn't that the way it goes face over what quote they want to use? Chairman Jones speaking, she had asked me specifically some examples of how things have changed from, because I told her I grew up here to now, and that was one of the illustrations I gave her in that interview. So, the way she put it, they did how they wanted to. Because they also said at the end of it that we want to be full in Franklin County, that was their slant, not mine, right? Ms. Cheryl speaking, and that is what could happen with the PUD. If you guys pass it, it is going to be another board that gets to enforce it. So, you always got to be careful about context. Thank you for the time.

Chairman Jones speaking, all right, so we are done with public comments, we are back to the board. Ms. Allara speaking, will you see if Justin can bring that up on the screen. I wanted to explain a little bit how this works. So, in Florida, we have a comprehensive plan, and attached to the Comprehensive Plan is a future land use map. So, this is the overarching guiding document we have, and we look at growth and development within any specific jurisdiction, and the land development regulation, or in your case, the zoning code, implements that comprehensive plan. And um, in your case, zoning and the zoning code has to be consistent with that future land use category. This is being considered as a special district, and as such, because it allows for a mixture of uses, it needs to be able to nest underneath a future land use category that allows for a mixture of uses, so your agriculture category is not going to suffice for the PUD. You have several future land use categories in your comprehensive plan, but when I read through this, I only see a couple or maybe three or four that would work for a PUD kept for a PUD tool special district that includes your mixed use residential, your mixed use commercial, which are both 4.3 dwelling units to the acre, and they both allow a variety of uses, not just a commercial use and not just a residential use. You also have a conservation residential, but that is at one dwelling unit per five acres. It does allow other uses, passive recreation, active recreational. So that could be your second use in that category. And what I was talking about earlier, where you could cluster and have smaller lots than one dwelling unit per five acres, as long as the overall parcel calculation is not more than one dwelling unit for five acres. So that would be another category you can consider a PUD in, and then you have got the Carrabelle East Village future land use category, and you have got a marina village center. So, it is not like this can go anywhere. If somebody wanted to apply this to a piece of property that did not allow for a mixture of uses by the future land use category, they would have to apply for a future land use map amendment in order for that PUD to work. So, if Justin can maybe explain some of these colors because I am not seeing the legend, but he can maybe show you where some of the mixed-use categories are in Franklin County.

Justin Stiell speaking, so currently, there are a few mixed-use categories. This is the only one on St George Island right now, excuse me, not the only one, but this is one of the mixed-use categories on St George Island. This is your rural village resort that is also on the island, and then further, these are those PUDs on Dog Island, along with another mixed-use residential category, parcel,

Ms. Allara speaking, so I just wanted to point that out so that you know it is not going to allow an explosion of PUDs throughout the county. You do have to have the approach appropriate future land use category first before you can use the PUD on that parcel.

Ms. Allara speaking, if there are any questions, I just wanted to make sure I hear a lot of concern about

increased density, increased development, but the comprehensive plan, you have to be consistent with your comprehensive plan in order for any development to occur in any jurisdiction in Florida.

Mr. Chairman, Attorney Shuler speaking, Mr. Theriaque, has unmuted his mic, and if you are ready to take his comments now, go ahead. Chairman Jones speaking, Mr. David go ahead.

Attorney Theriaque speaking, Mr. Chairman, county commissioners, good evening. It has been a long night for you all. Thank you for allowing me to share a few thoughts. I have worked with PUDs throughout the state of Florida. This is not the first one on behalf of local governments and also on behalf of applicants, the PUD ordinance is simply a tool. It is something that the county has at its disposal to approve. And I want to stress a couple points. The way this ordinance is drafted. It specifically states. I'm going to read the sentence. It's in two different sections, the Board of County Commissioners shall determine, in its sole discretion whether the proposed public benefits justify use of the PUD special district as an alternative to the development standards otherwise regulated by this code. We drafted that for a very specific purpose. There is no entitlement to a PUD. A property owner who desires some flexibility from your adopted standards has to demonstrate to the county commission that the public benefits that they are providing are sufficient and adequate enough that the county commission believes justifies some flexibility, and if the county commission believes that the public benefits that are being offered do not justify the flexibility that is being requested, then the County Commission has sole discretion to deny. And the beginning of the ordinance it is in Section s, Dash 8.2 I, provide some examples for public benefits. It is not exclusive. Says the PUD must provide or offer community benefits, such as publicly accessible amenities, affordable housing to low-income residents, greater preservation of the natural environment from what is otherwise required by this code and or include redevelopment of blighted areas. And those are just examples. And I will, I will tell you through PUDs, I have seen a developer, at the request of a local government dedicate beach access to the Gulf. I have seen a developer deed property in the development as a park on adjacent to a water body. I have seen developers provide additional landscaping far beyond what the code requires in an effort to get the flexibility. But at the end of the day, this ordinance does not provide any authority to the developer to demand the PUD, it is within the sole discretion of the county commission to determine whether the developer has offered enough to justify that flexibility. And as you just heard, the PUD does not alter density. So, the concern that somehow a developer is going to be able to use a PUD ordinance to get increased density. That cannot happen. And besides, even if there was an ability to do that, which there is not, the county commission has sole discretion to say no. And I respectfully submit that I support having the 47-foot height limitation in the PUD ordinance, so that it is clear that the PUD ordinance does not somehow create the ability to exceed 47 feet. Even though you have sole discretion, there might be a subsequent board that would say, well, it is a PUD we have flexibility. We are able to alter different limitations in our code. Well, by including it in this ordinance, you preclude the argument that the PUD ordinance gives flexibility to exceed 47 feet. So, it is purely your call on whether you want this tool to be available to the board, and you can say no to the first 10 that show up, or the first 15 that show up. You can say yes to the first one, if, to your satisfaction, they have provided enough public benefit to justify the flexibility. I would be happy to answer any questions.

Commissioner Sanders, Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question of the attorney, Commissioner Ward speaking, which one? Commissioner Sanders speaking, well, not David. David, you are good, but I do not need your answer. I need Mr. Shuler. Back in 2018, we the board at that time, and I, myself and Chairman Jones was on at that time, we did an ordinance repealing 87-4. Okay, I want to make sure I am right. And in there, you said the repeal of we would have to do the repeal of Saint George islands, the with the PUD we had to repeal that. We had to the prohibition on Saint George Island for, for the PUDs, right? Attorney Shuler speaking, well, that was not in the 2018 ordinance. That is a proposal for the ordinance that is before the board today, okay to consider. And what the ordinance today, as it's currently drafted, would provide an evaluation tool for PUDs throughout all of unincorporated Franklin County, other than the island. And my suggestion, the recommendation to the board, is, if you

should adopt this tool for your planners and for the public and for the landowners, that it should apply to all of unincorporated Franklin County, which would mean St George Island as well as dog Island, because there are preexisting PUDs own, you know, St George and dog Island. Again, that is purely at your discretion, whether you accept that recommendation or not. Commissioner Sanders speaking, I am wondering about that because this was the two of appeal. Let us see what was says five, that the repeal of ordinance 87-4, for the express purpose of eliminating plan unit development in Franklin County is appropriate to protect these health, safety and welfare, general welfare of its citizens. And I am reading only into it on all these ordinances, it has been, you know, 20-18 or 8-4. You know all kinds of numbers coming up here. You think it confuses y'all? Confuses us the same way, okay? Because I remember when we did this, the repealing of this, and this was county wide. I mean, I thought it was county wide. Attorney Shuler speaking, it is. Commissioner Sanders speaking, now let me ask a question, because I can only ask a question that I had been, I do not have to ask questions for what I have been part of. But between 2018 and 2022, were there any PUDs made in Franklin County, or any amendments to PUDs in Franklin County underneath, I am getting to a point, underneath the prohibition of PUD. Attorney Shuler speaking, Commissioner, to the best of my recollection and knowledge, there were two new PUDs that were adopted subsequent to the 2018 ordinance that you have referenced, and there were two amendments to two preexisting PUDs subsequent to the 2018 ordinance that you have referenced. Commissioner Sanders speaking, now my question is this, because I have talked to you about it before. If you had a prohibition on PUDs, how did those two PUDs get made? because I was not here, how did two PUDs get made if there were the prohibition? I am asking. Chairman Jones speaking, because it was in our comp plan. It is still in the comp plan. The ordinance you referred to commissioner, it has been said here tonight that that ordinance was to ban PUDs. That is not the language you read. It was to repeal, not to ban, yeah, yeah. But it was to repeal, not to ban, but it is so there was it was repealed in 4/2018 Serenity was approved 6/2019, St James Bay amendment 4/2021, St James Bay West was 8/22 and then there is an amendment for Serenity on 2/23. Commissioner Sanders speaking, so, it was not nothing wrong with y'all. I mean, I am asking because it was not here, so I am asking the question. So, it was okay for y'all to do the two PUDs then, according to whatever language is, so much stuff in here, floating around. What step floating around in here? Attorney Shuler speaking, from what I recall from the public hearing from 2018 and I can say with some certainty, not because I remember from seven years ago, but I have received and reviewed the video tape from that meeting Mr. Pierce, who has been your planner for 35 years. Although he was retired in 2018, he came and testified to the board. And Alan's approach to PUDs for decades had been since the 87 PUD evaluation ordinance, when we were in area of critical state concern. Alan has always taken the position that was not a valid or enforceable ordinance, because when we are area of critical state concern, the governor Cabinet had to approve our land use regulations, and they did not. So, he never used that evaluation tool in ordinance of the 1987 ordinance. He always did these PUDs on an ad hoc basis as they came forward, and when Allen made his presentation during the 2018 adoption, there is some language. I cannot remember the exact word, but something to the effect of we can adopt other PUD ordinances as they come along, or some words to that effect, I mean, the record says what it says, and you can listen to it for yourself, but I think that may be how that happened. I can tell you that personally, I just had no recollection of the ban. I have said that before several times, once this process started, I did not remember the ban. Honestly, just did not remember it. I mean, it was there, but I did not remember. I am not involved in the preparation and adoption of PUDs that those were always done by your planners, either Mr. Pierce or Mr. Currington, but I just did not remember it. I remember the repeal of the PUD ordinance, the PUD evaluation ordinance, from 1987 but the ban, I just had no recollection. Sorry. Commissioner Sanders speaking, my question is this, Mr. Chairman, you do not mind, Chairman Jones speaking, not at all. Commissioner Sanders speaking, because we are just, I mean, I am fact finding, because, like I said, it was not here. So, if, if you could go ahead and do everything that we did back in 2018 and all that, then when you had the two PUDs come up. You all approve it. Why we even looking at it? Because if y'all, did it while, while you know, if you already did two PUDs, and what we have now, why we even looking at it that you can, if you can do PUDs, Chairman Jones speaking, growth management, we are putting it on the books where the

starting point is not letting the developer come and ask for the world. Yeah, we are actually putting something there to regulate and to have to set the starting point and to be proactive instead of reactive. That is what we are trying. That is what we are after.

Attorney Shuler speaking, we also have new planners. I mean, Mark and Alan were very good planners for the county kept us out of lots of trouble. I mean, they do not get, they were both wonderful, but they both retired. We have new planners. And in talking with the planners and talking with David Theriaque, at this point, having an evaluation ordinance to give them a tool so they can evaluate PUD applications it is the appropriate industry standard. So that, in part, is why this ordinance has been prepared and presented to the county, or, as the Chairman said, for growth management, where the county is very clearly setting criteria and setting boundaries and setting limitations. So, when you receive a PUD application, it's evaluated based on the criteria that this board has approved and provided to the staff, the public and the property owners. So I would recommend adopting the criteria just because it gives your planners the necessary tools that they need. Commissioner Ward speaking, Mr. Chairman, I have the minutes from that that meeting. And Mr. Pierce did state that in the future, he basically explained that he had not had any PUD ordinance request in his tenure with the county at that time. And this was back in 2018 April 17, 2018, to be exact. And it says down here, and it says his words, Mr. Pierce explained, in the future, if there is a development that comes in and wants mixed use, the county can reimpose another PUD ordinance with the specific needs of the development. And it was, it was unanimously agreed to adopt the ordinance repealing but just to give a little background, that's kind of what started that. And there was some verbiage about the governor and the cabinet. I think we were an area of state of I think it was concern, critical concern, so at that, at that time, you know, that is what they decided. But here we are today, here now. And I just want to address a couple things, Mr. Chairman, if you do not mind, I know a lot of discussion was had about infrastructure and fire and EMS and law enforcement and things of that nature. Many of you, I do not know if you know, we had our budget hearings yesterday. Our county staff, we do run a shoestring, on the reason is nobody wants to come work for \$32 or \$35,000 a year. Okay, in order to us, for us to get staff or maintain staff, it costs money. With that money, our citizens have to bear that burden on their taxes. So yesterday, we were able to, if it is the same, go down on our millage because of the fact that we are trying to do the best for our citizens in terms of not making your taxes go up. But yet, we have our staff. Yeah, they are minimal, but they are mighty, and I have to give it to our county staff. They do a great job. The amount that there are, and I know, I think it was Miss Woodcock mentioned that she called about an ordinance. The good thing about since I became commissioner on board, I was very adamant about transparency, and I think was Mr. Caleb earlier that talked about that. We have a lot of our stuff online now so that you can from the comfort of your home Carrabelle, wherever it is, pull up an ordinance. Anything that we do, you could pull up the ordinance, or anything on your own computer, and yes, our staff is there, but they do have other things that they do. Speaking on code enforcement, we have come a long way with that. We now have a code enforcement officer, but again, it costs money to do that, so we were trying to come up with ways to not put the tax burden on our citizens, but yet we need staff. So, it is kind of a precarious issue. Same thing with the with law enforcement, EMS, you know, yeah, we need infrastructure. But I will be honest with you, it takes me lot longer to go from Apalachicola at East Point, or even Carrabelle, much, much longer than what it did, you know, 510, years ago, because we do have a lot of people come into our community now, they do. We are not the Forgotten Coast anymore. I You guys have to understand there is going to be growth with our county, whether we like it or not. Our job as a board is to try to hopefully control that in some instances, because I do not want a Panama City or Destin either. That is why we have these rules. That is why we have our comp plan, that is why we have our zoning regulations. I would never, as long as I am on this board say, okay, let us be like Destin or Panama City. I just do not want that either, but we have to have rules in place to hopefully prevent that from happening. And I feel like it is quite the opposite. I feel like having this helps that, and I have read all the social media stuff online, and honestly, if I read that and did not know any better, I would say, yeah, no, PUDs, but I spoke to our county staff. I have done my own independent research. I am an independent thinker, and, you

know, I have thought about this, I have researched it, and I am going to, with that, ask our county staff, our planners, and I spoke to them earlier today, so they are not deer in headlights now, given y'all's expertise, what are your thoughts on this ordinance and PUDs in general? How should we proceed?

Bre Robinson speaking, so I do view this as a tool towards responsible development right now, your comp plan does acknowledge PUDs, your zoning code does not, and unfortunately, that leaves room for interpretation, so I as a staff member would appreciate clear guidance. Think it would be good for the community as well. And at the end of the day, this draft ordinance does give you the county commissioners the discretion to decide whether the public benefits justify the flexibility.

Commissioner Ward speaking, Mr. Chairman, I will say if we do proceed with this today. I do agree with the height I do not want anything in this that is ambiguous, that could be construed in a court of law, that our height limit is exceeding is they are able to exceed 47 feet. We have that for a reason. I am going to be pretty, pretty stiff on that. I think that we should eliminate and omit any language that could give anybody missing misinterpretation of that. So that is my thought on that if, hypothetically, we do proceed with approving this today. But also, transparency. You know, we try to be as transparent as possible. We do a lot of stuff online. I personally post a lot of stuff to social media. So, to the ones out there that do not think there is, there's lack of transparency, I do not know how more transparent we can be. I mean, I really, really do not. So that is all I have to say. Commissioner Croom speaking, I agree with Commission Ward on the height, you know, we got to keep it in there. We would be more defined and say, you know what bold or underlying that is, that is the extent of the height. But it does need to be in there. We want you to take it out. So, first lady that spoke a little while ago, I was hoping she would stay, because I was going to bring her back up. But, you know, you mentioned about the west, so much I visit the west. Where can we have to go over there? Have any? Have any one of y'all ever look at the west zoning? I have. I have worked over there eight years. Part of my job was to look at zoning. If you look at the zoning of the west, the majority of it is commercial. It is zoned commercial, not PUD. So, I say that to say this, you know, before you, you know, start or people start jumping gun on things and or attacking people, you need to look at zoning. There's zoning here in our county that can build, stuff that you are against right now. So, you need to get educated. I was, I would caution you to get educated on looking at the zoning maps without mentioning anything else about that. So that goes from Walton County to Bay County, Mexico Beach, all the places y'all name of the west. Growth is upon us, whether we like it or not. Would you rather us manage the growth or let just anything go up? Well at you know, at the at the end of the day, growth is going to happen. But would you rather us be in the process of it? You know, keep our soil, preserve our resources, protect our coastal ecosystem in short of public benefit? Do you want us involved in it? And some of it, you know, control the density, as we mentioned so much, today, or tonight, tonight, now. Or do you really want to be? As some of y'all say, make Panama City, Franklin County, whatever that slogan is. I believe public comment is closed, but I am just laying some things out at you know, some misinterpretation has been said about PUDs versus commercial zoning. And the goal is not to bring money. It is about managing our growth. That is why we here is to manage our growth. This is going to happen. If you do not believe it, look around the room.

Commissioner Amison speaking, I know it is getting late, so I am going to keep it short, because I do not want to echo basically what some things were said. But I will tell you this, my wife hates it when I YouTube, but I'm the one that found that commission meeting from 2018, and I gave it to the attorney, and I gave it to Mr. Moron, and what confused me was because we had approved a PUD when I say we, I'm talking on behalf of the County, I wasn't here at the time, like Commissioner Sanders said, but post 18, we approved two PUDs. So, I am like, well, obviously the commission was not under the impression that there was a zero pot to PUD tolerance. So, it takes me back. So, I started doing, I start going down, you know, walk through history, if you will. Where Chairman Mosconis at the time, signed 87-4 PUD ordinance. Now, during that time frame, the county, according to the attorney, we were in multiple litigations. Is that, is that correct? 2018 was between 1987 to 2018 we were in

litigation a few times over, the PUD issue. Attorney Shuler, before 1987 the way Alan's always because I was not here either. Commissioner Amison speaking, no, I am just talking about between those time frames, and that's litigation. Attorney Shuler speaking, particularly with Capital City Bank that we had been in litigation with them, which included a number of claims, one of which was that we had violated our own ordinance by not following the 1987 evaluation ordinance that litigation ran from roughly 2012 or 2013 to right before, shortly before that 2018 ordinance was adopted, and you know, basically Alan wanted to get that 87 ordinance off the books. Commissioner Amison speaking, okay, so what I am assuming is, is this the Board of County Commission in 18 was entertaining this to repeal that, because they wanted to get us, you know, get us out from under potential future litigation, which even if we do not lose the lawsuit. And I know I have got some attorneys in here, and they love to argue and make money. I am looking at three of them. But even if we, you know, did not lose the lawsuit. It still cost us time, resources, and money to fight it. So that is, I am assuming, that is why the Board of County Commission in 18 entertained repealing 87-4. It is obvious because they approved four or two PUDs and two amendments post that. But before I am getting back to is, is the fact that there has been a false narrative spread through the community. Alright, we are not here inventing something. We are not here trying to create something. What we are trying to do is control something. When I campaigned, I ran on the fact that I was very clear about this. I grew up here. We are going to have growth. You are not going to stop it. If you put it in the corner and try to ignore it, it is going to become something you do not want. And that is why we have taken this approach to figure out how to manage this in a proper way. And to me, from what I am seeing with the PUDs, that is the only way that we actually have a definite hold on what it could look like if I do not like it. And Mr. Theriaque can probably chime in here, as well Ms. Allara. I do not have to approve it, but if it is something that is zoned for, and they fall within the setbacks and they are within the height limit, I can't tell them what to do with it. With this here, this county commission can say, you know what we you know, come in with a pub. We like that, but let us have some green space over here. Let us have, let us keep 40% of our vegetation. I mean, how many times we have been here listening to the fact that we do not like people cutting trees off the property, and I have heard people come in here and say, we want y'all to stop this and stop that, but that is starting to cross over to where you infringe it on somebody's rights with their property. Now I have an issue with that, and I am not it is somebody moves here and wants to cut trees off the property. I am not going to go in there and tell that owner, you know, I do not want to be that person to say, hey, I want to infringe on your property rights. As an American citizen, you cannot do whatever you want. This is what you are going to do. But with a PUD, we can actually say, hey, look,

we do not like that. I do not like the color of that really. But, you know, I am just being a little facetious there, but I am just saying, you know, to me, and I am one of five, but a PUD allows me and the Commission and future commissions to actually have control over what you're going to get. I believe a lot of people here thinks that we are, you know, if look at it like this, we have had PUDs since 87 ordinance all the way up till now. We just approved two years ago, three years ago, four years hell, it is getting away from I am sorry, I'm getting old, but what I'm saying is, is they hadn't. They have been here the whole time. What makes you think tomorrow that all of a sudden, we are going to have a line sitting down 98 wanting to walk in the building department and apply for PUDs? Man, they could have done that already. But what we are doing right here is, is we are going to tighten down on it potentially, and make sure that it's not something that we don't want. I do not like the idea if we go back to 18 on a case per case basis, because that right there, to me is like writing a blank check. I would rather have something in writing. I would rather have specific guidelines on what we want. That way a developer says, hey, look, we already know we are at 47 we already know this. You know, I am not saying a developer is not going to try to push. I mean, that is that everybody knows that everybody is going to try it. If you are not cheating, you are not trying. I had a drill sergeant tell me that one time. But if you get caught, you went trying hard enough so you are not doing it. And that is what you have elected officials for. That is what we are here for. But, but anyway, I am going to get off that soap box because I am hungry. But anyway, I appreciate everybody coming out here. I appreciate everybody's comments, but just know that you know we are here trying to make the best decision for the whole

community. And Miss Mel, can you hear me good? Yes, sir. I just want to make sure.

Chairman Jones speaking, commissioners forgive me, but Ms. Brenda Carline did send an email. She asked that it be included in the public record. She was opposed to adopting this ordinance for a lot of the reasons we have heard here tonight, but I did forget to do that earlier. I needed to take care of that.

Chairman Jones speaking, is there anything in this that would address what some of the residents have asked earlier, about speculation in our resale, trying to get it zoned for PUD and then turn around sell it. Isn't there a time frame that locks the middle net how long they have to develop? Ms. Allara yes, twelve months? but there is nothing, because a government cannot control the sale.

Chairman Jones speaking, oh, I know that. I definitely know that we have had that ask about us before, though, but I guess what I am saying is so if I had a piece of property, and I get this board to approve a PUD and I didn't start to do that development, I turned and tried to sell it with those rights already intact, you only have a certain time to file everything correct? That is something we did not have and do not have presently at all. Commissioner Amison speaking, we have a great example that right now. Chairman Jones speaking, all right, I just wanted to ask that.

Commissioner Ward speaking, I have a couple more. So obviously, our county, we have all said before, that a big bulk of it is owned by the state and federal government. So honestly, how much and Justin and Bre may know if y'all can answer this, really and truly, hypothetically, how much land do we have left where somebody could come in and actually do a PUD. I think you already kind of touched on that a little bit, but there is not really a lot left that. I mean, what I do not know, if the only person I know that that owns more than five acres in our county right now is the state and the federal government. Unknown speaker inaudible. Commissioner Ward speaking, sorry. What Marina? There is no marina on the island. Well, the St George Island overlay does not allow marinas, correct? Chairman Jones speaking, it does not allow some of the stuff with marinas. Yeah, we really do not need to talk about that. That is under litigation right now. Attorney Shuler speaking, we have received a Bert Harris notice of claim, which is a pre suit litigation notice and my recommendation is we will not discuss either prepending or pending litigation once it gets here. Commissioner Ward speaking, but that was not my question I was asking, that was brought from the audience. But Justin, how much land do we? Can you hypothetically throw something out there? Justin Stiell speaking, I could not even begin to assume how much land is out there. I would say that based on looking at the future land use map, any type of PUD that came before the board would first need to go through a land use amendment.

Commissioner Sanders speaking, where I am coming from is, if you already been doing PUDs, this is where I am coming from. Now, if you have already been doing PUDs, you can still continue to do PUD. But what, what you all are saying we need special language for is that? What y'all are saying. Chairman Jones speaking, well, we are saying we'd rather direct the language starting out the gate than let the developer direct the language. Commissioner Sanders speaking, well, if you, if you read what everybody else said, Theriaque and all the rest, they said Franklin County Commissioners have the ultimate control. So that is what I am saying. So that is just the reason why I said what I did. I still do not believe we need an ordinance. And, like I said, I just do not believe we do. I am going to go ahead and do this, and it can step out there, but I am going to go ahead and do it because it is what I feel like I need to do. Because I do. **Commissioner Sanders speaking, I am going to make a motion that we vote no or vote this down, and that is my motion.** Chairman Jones speaking, we have a motion to deny from Commissioner Sanders. Do we have a second? We do have a motion to deny. Do we have a second? Do we have a second to the motion to deny? **Motion has failed, for lack of a second.** What is the pleasure of the board? Approve or table? **Commissioner Amison speaking, I will make a motion that we approve.** Chairman Jones speaking, we have a motion to approve from Commissioner Amison. Commissioner Amison speaking, and the reason I am making this motion is I want to be

proactive with it and not reactive. If we move along with it is as it is at 18, that is going to it is going to be on a case-by-case basis. We do not have any specific guidelines, and I believe it is going to be more detrimental in the long run if we do it that way. Chairman Jones speaking, we have a motion to approve. Do we have a second?

Ms. Allara speaking, we have a couple of edits that we want to make sure those are captured. Yeah, yeah. Was that it? Attorney Shuler speaking, Mister Chairman? There were a lot of comments about, my words, not the commissioners, but to eliminate any language which, anyway, muddies the waters on the 47-foot height restriction. I think most of the commentary has been on paragraphs three and four at the top of page three, so I will read those as they are written. Paragraph three says compatibility with adjacent parcels if an adjoining parcel is developed with a structure of three stories or greater than structures of similar or greater height may be located within the vicinity of that parcel. Earlier, at the beginning of this I had requested and recommended the board consider adding language that says comma not to exceed 47 feet from predevelopment grade. So, does the board want to just eliminate paragraph three? Or do you want to add in that language which reaffirms the 47-foot height? Chairman Jones speaking, if it does not hurt, to eliminate it, just eliminate it.

Ms. Allara speaking, so, this is basically allowing a structure that is adjacent to the property line at the border of the PUD to be in line with the height of the structure that might be outside. Chairman Jones speaking, oh, okay, I did not understand that earlier. So, what you are saying is because there is, I think Michael wants to add, but not to exceed 47 feet from the pre grade. Attorney Shuler speaking, just belts and suspenders on the 47 feet. I do not think a developer could successfully argue that that language, as it is written, would allow something higher than 47 feet, but it doesn't hurt to have belts and suspenders just at the end of the word, the vicinity of that parcel, instead of a period put a comma not to exceed so 47 feet from predevelopment grade, that way it's hammering in twice. Commissioner Amison speaking, and that still has to be centrally located on the development right, the height. I mean. Ms. Allara speaking, so that is still, there is still a provision, excuse me, that taller structure shall be centrally located. But this is this number three is saying, if there are taller structures outside of the PUD, we can be in line with that same height. So, there is a three-story building outside of the PUD, we can have a three-story building adjacent or nearby to that three-story building outside. Commissioner Amison speaking, but does not that contradict where it says that the highest portion of it needs to be centrally located in the we are? Ms. Allara speaking, shall be centrally located, and not at the periphery. So that is not really mentioning a height limit. It is just saying that tallest one should focus center. Commissioner Amison speaking, I got clarity on it now. Attorney Shuler speaking, Ms. Allara, if you would address paragraph four as well as I believe there is some current concerns that that might also allow for development higher than 47 feet. Ms. Allara speaking, so if you had a, this is more along the line of setting back a taller building. So, if you had a shorter building outside of the PUD and you had a taller building inside the PUD, that just means you have a greater setback, that there is a big differential than the heights of construction. So essentially, if you have a 47-foot height building it should be in the center of the development, but if it is more than 20 feet of height than, say, a single-family home, then you have to have an additional setback from the structures.

Attorney Shuler speaking, commissioners if I could add a new sentence to the end of paragraph four, to the effect that nothing here in in this provision shall authorize construction exceeding 47 feet in height from the predevelopment grade, as was done with the prior. Is that satisfactory to the commissioners to include that as part of your motion? Commissioner Amison speaking, do you want me to amend my motion? Commissioner Amison amended his motion. Chairman Jones speaking, we have a motion that has been amended, we do not have a second. Attorney Shuler speaking, so that was one of the technical issues that I had mentioned to the board before, so I will go over all of them, and then if it meets with the board's approval, you can make one amendment to the motion and one amendment to the second. So, on page two, in the middle of the page, there's section 8.3, paragraph A sub paragraph one, there is a typo. The typo references section 421.2.C of the land development code. That is a

Scriveners error. It should reflect section 425.2.C. So that would be another amendment. And then in the body of the ordinance there is a reference to a public hearing being held on April the 11th. Obviously, today is July 25th so that would be another technical amendment. And then the final issue, part of our recommendation, the two recommendations I made to the board was, does the Board want to lead the prohibition of PUDs on St George Island, or allow this ordinance to govern and regulate all PUDs in unincorporated Franklin County. Commissioner Amison speaking, I amend my motion to make it county wide. I mean, we cannot very well do it for St George Island, an exclude Alligator Point and Dog Island. I mean, they are all islands, but we do not have the property over there to do anything so I do not see it. Attorney Shuler speaking, for the record, that would be to strike paragraph in Section 8.2, sub paragraph H will delete, as of April 11, 2025, no new PUDs shall be allowed on St George Island. Previously approved PUDs on St George Island shall be deemed legal and allowed to continue, or in the case of a natural disaster, rebuild of the parameters of the approved budget, your motion is to strike that and make it county wide for all of the unincorporated Franklin County. Okay, I think that covers everything that I so, all right, do you want to amend your motion? **Commissioner Amison amended his motion.** Chairman Jones speaking, so we do have an amended motion with all the language that has been discussed, by Commissioner Amison, do we have a second? **Commissioner Croom seconded the amended motion with comment.** I believe in being proactive, of course, being transparent, as we are. Therefore, I see that we need to manage growth in this county. Chairman Jones speaking, all right, any additional discussion before we vote? Seeing none. All in favor, any opposed, **Commissioner Sanders opposed. Motion carries 4-1.**

Chairman Jones speaking, any Commissioner comments before we adjourn? Commissioner Ward speaking, yes, Mr. Chairman, I will be brief. I just want to thank our county staff. I know they worked really hard on this. I want to thank Ms. Allara. I want to thank Mr. Attorney Theriaque and Attorney Shuler. I know this was not an easy task. I know we have been talking to you guys a lot and, on the phone, and y'all been working with us, and I appreciate it. This is a long process, but I just want to tell y'all I appreciate everything y'all done. Chairman Jones speaking, anyone else? Commissioner Ward speaking, you too Michael. Chairman Jones speaking, we have talked enough, haven't we? Meeting adjourned.

### **Adjournment**

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting was adjourned.

---

**Ricky Jones – Chairman**

**Attest:**

---

**Michele Maxwell – Clerk of Courts**

The audio is available upon request. Please e-mail [jgay@franklinclerk.com](mailto:jgay@franklinclerk.com), call 850-653-8861 to speak with the Administrative Assistant, or submit a request in writing to obtain audio of this meeting.