

**CHARLOTTE COUNTY PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING**

Administration Center, 18500 Murdock Circle, Room 119, Port Charlotte, Florida

Board Members

Michael Gravesen, Chair
Doug Izzo
Stephen Vieira, Secretary
Phillip Smallwood
Clint Baker, Vice-Chair



District

District V
District III
District I
District II
District IV

**MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING**

March 10, 2025, at 1:30 P.M.

Call to Order

Chair Gravesen called the meeting to order at 1:30 pm

Roll Call

Upon the roll being called it was determined a quorum was present.

Approval of Minutes – February 10, 2025, Regular Meeting

The February 10, 2025, minutes were approved as circulated.

Announcements

Mr. Cullinan said item number 5 has been continued to a later date all proper advertising will be done when those come back before us.

Chair Gravesen said if you are here for item number 5 on the agenda that was postponed.

PETITIONS

1.) SV-25-01

Legislative

Commission District I

The applicant is requesting to vacate a portion of the undeveloped San Carlos canal basin behind their property located at lots 60 through 64, Block 191, of Harbour Heights Section Eleven Part Two, as shown on Plat Book 4, Pages 48A through 48G, of the Public Records of Charlotte County, Florida. The total area to be vacated contains 26,142.97± square feet and is generally located southwest of Neaptide Drive and northeast of San Carlos Drive, within the Mid-County area, and located in Commission District I.

Jenny Shao, Planner, provided the findings and analysis for Petition **SV-25-01** with a recommendation of approval based on the reasons stated in the staff report.

Questions for Staff

Mr. Vieira said in calculating the HCP is it calculated on square footage because there was no platted lot in the basin as a residential.

Ms. Shao said it is calculated based on the total square footage of the proposed area to be vacated.

Mr. Vieira said because there was never a residential component there.

Ms. Shao said yes.

Applicant's Presentation

Robert Berntsson, Big W Law Firm, representing the applicant, Jenny has covered it very well. This picture actually gives you the rationale behind, you can see the front end of the property on lot 61 and 62 is pretty heavily

wooded. Talks about the open area right along the existing property line by lot 60, 61, 62. The reason for the vacation is they intend to build their house in that open area. While maintaining the foliage and trees, there is some heritage trees they believe on site. So, this allows them to move the building envelope back into what would otherwise be the canal. Happy to answer any questions and reserve for rebuttal.

Public Input

None offered.

- **Mr. Baker** moved to close the public comment, second by **Mr. Vieira**, with a unanimous vote.

Discussion

None offered.

Recommendation

Mr. Vieira moved that **SV-25-01**, be sent to the Board of County Commissioners with a recommendation of Approval, based on the findings and analysis in the staff memo dated **February 28, 2025**, Charlotte County Comprehensive Plan along with the evidence presented at today's meeting, second by **Mr. Izzo**; and carried by a unanimous vote.

2.) SV-25-02

Legislative

Commission District I

Scott Andrew Ford Jr is requesting to vacate a portion of the undeveloped San Carlos canal basin behind his property located at 27048 San Carlos Drive, being lots 39 through 44, Block 191, of Harbour Heights Section Eleven Part Two, as shown on Plat Book 4, Pages 48A through 48G, of the Public Records of Charlotte County, Florida. The total area to be vacated contains 24,382.06± square feet and is generally located southwest of Neptide Drive and northeast of San Carlos Drive, within the Mid-County area, and located in Commission District I.

Jenny Shao, Planner, provided the findings and analysis for Petition **SV-25-02** with a recommendation of approval based on the reasons stated in the staff report.

Questions for Staff

None offered.

Applicant's Presentation

Scott Ford, the applicant, 27048 San Carlos Drive, I would like to build on the original parcels. Hopefully start construction this year, prior to me buying the properties it seems as though my property was used as a dumping ground. It is the same for the part that I am trying to vacate of the canal, this would allow me to go in there and basically clean up the area. Get rid of all the trash, scrap metal and invasive species of plants.

Chair Gravesen said do you accept the conditions that staff has placed.

Mr. Ford said I do.

Public Input

None offered.

- **Mr. Baker** moved to close the public comment, second by **Mr. Vieira**, with a unanimous vote.

Discussion

Mr. Vieira said in reading the documentation that was sent to us, there are some concerns by the county engineer. I know the canal is a non-developed canal it is not part of an MSBU, and it hasn't probably been dredged since it was dug. Her concern was that's a possibility that could happen in the future, and I see us moving along the canal

basin and we're vacating those parcels on the upper part of the basin wouldn't have access to the canal it seems like. I am concerned there is going to be no access for those other parcels to follow suit as to what we're discussing here today. Then be denied access to that canal if it should be developed in the future. So, I have a question about that and how the county intends to address that.

Ms. Shao said the counties planning division of the community development had requested a five-foot wide pedestrian walkway easement. It is shown in pink, so I know we don't have the map showing the petitions side by side. But that would be ten feet of access going from that not vacated portion of the canal to the canal.

Mr. Vieira said then with the twenty-foot canal on both applications, then give you a forty-foot canal easement so it would be navigable water there. Is that what the intension is here.

Ms. Shao said the canal maintenance easement is purely for maintenance of the canal, not necessarily access. But the pedestrian walkway should provide access for pedestrians to the canal.

Mr. Vieira said my concern is about future boater and that area having lived there for twenty-five years. That's an aera of the neighborhood that is seeing increased development. People are going to that area for obvious reasons. It is an undeveloped canal; my personal opinion is I don't think it will be an undeveloped canal for long. I am concerned about the people to the west, the northwest here which would be 45-51 and then on the other side of the basin 59-what ever the numbers are that go above there. Those folks wanted to come in and do a street vacation, they would be denied access to the canal. The way it appears right now, just because of these two petitions coming together and blocking that canal access.

Mr. Cullinan said no actually it would be the opposite, we would require every single other one of them to also provide the same five foot on each property abutting it. So, they would have a straight ten-foot-wide easement to be able to walk. The area was based on site conditions where basically it goes down to is where the water is that's why it's a weird shape around there. It is very swampy and very wet, so this would allow them as every other one comes in. They will have the same requirement for the five-foot pedestrian walkway easement. That will give all the upland people further up that ability to come down to what is currently water.

Mr. Vieira said from a pedestrian point of view but not from a navigable point of view, a discussion takes place with **Mr. Cullinan, Asst. Co. Atty. Thomas David, and Chair Gravesen**.

Recommendation

Mr. Vieira moved that **SV-25-02**, be sent to the Board of County Commissioners with a recommendation of Approval, based on the findings and analysis in the staff memo dated **March 2, 2025**, Charlotte County Comprehensive Plan along with the evidence presented at today's meeting, second by **Mr. Izzo**; and carried by a unanimous vote.

Kimberly Sargent swore in all persons who wished to provide testimony.

3.) PAS-24-04

Legislative

Commission District I

Pursuant to Section 163.3187, Florida Statutes, adopt a Small Scale Plan Amendment to change Charlotte County FLUM Series Map #1: 2030 Future Land Use, from Low Density Residential (LDR)(16.85± acres) and Commercial (COM) (16.81± acres) to LDR with an annotation to the 2030 Future Land Use Map stating that 1) the base density of the entire site is 16 units, and 2) the use of the entire site for a recreational vehicle park will be limited to 138 recreational vehicles and will not require a transfer of density; for subject property, including six parcels; five parcels are located at 2201, 2271, 2301, 2351 and 3011 Duncan Road (US 17), one parcel is generally located south of Sam Way, north of Taralane Drive, east of the Seminole Gulf Railway, and west of US 17, in the Punta Gorda area, containing 33.66± acres; Commission District I; Petition No. PAS-24-04; Applicant: Paradise Palms RV LLC; providing an effective date.

Jie Shao, Principal Planner, provided the findings and analysis for Petition **PAS-24-04** with a recommendation of approval based on the reasons stated in the staff report.

4.) PD-24-11

Quasi-Judicial

Commission District I

An Ordinance pursuant to Section 125.66, Florida Statutes, amending the Charlotte County Zoning Atlas from Residential Estate 1 (RE-1) (16.85± acres) and Commercial General (CG) (16.81± acres) to Planned Development (PD) to allow for a RV park to have recreational vehicles up to 138 units, and also adopt a General PD Concept Plan; for property, including six parcels; five parcels are located at 2201, 2271, 2301, 2351 and 3011 Duncan Road (US 17), one parcel is generally located south of Sam Way, north of Taralane Drive, east of the Seminole Gulf Railway, and west of US 17, in the Punta Gorda area, containing 33.66± acres; Commission District I; Petition No. PD-24-11; Applicant: Paradise Palms RV LLC; providing an effective date.

Jie Shao, Principal Planner, provided the findings and analysis for Petition **PD-24-11** with a recommendation of approval based on the reasons stated in the staff report.

Questions for Staff

None offered.

Applicant's Presentation

Robert Berntsson, Big W Law Firm, representing the applicant, have been sworn. I have the projects engineers with me if there are any questions you need for them to answer. This property is located on US-17 a major four lane highway. Approximately half of it is zoned residential estates, pretty much that you would want to put an estate lot on a four-way major highway. The other half of the property is zoned commercial general but there is no central water and sewer to serve the commercial general property. Which makes development of commercial project on that site very difficult. What you have before you is a great compromise for a upscale RV park. That will provide both protection to the environment through preservation of the wetlands and the scrub jay area. As well as an RV park to allow people to come and enjoy the area, the nature around it and the county in general. I know there is a number of people that stood up and got sworn in so I am going to reserve most of my comment for rebuttal.

Chair Gravesen said to Mr. Berntsson you may have to ask your engineers if you have to do onsite well and septic system.

Mr. Berntsson said yes.

Chair Gravesen said on the PD concept plan where is that located.

Mr. Berntsson said we can answer that can be answered when we come back up.

Public Input

Chris Frohlich, I currently have you can't really see from this photo, there is a residential street that goes off of US-17 called Sam Way. I have two parcels under contract to build residential property there. This came to my attention as a result of that contract. Let me start by saying I stand in opposition to this proposal for a number of reasons. One of the things I just heard from the applicant was that the last thing that anyone would want to build is a residential property along a highway. I am not sure that that's a decision applicant should be allowed to make. It goes a little deeper than that and talks about that is in flood zone X, and to the west of this property which is zoned RE-1 is approximately sixteen residential units there. You have a state preserve there and I forget how many acres it is, but it's hundreds of acres. So, there is essentially sixteen residential home sites that are outside of a flood zone that back up to a wildlife preserve in the east part of the county. I would say that is very desirable

property given what's happened in this community over the last couple of years in particular when it comes to floods. The other thing I want to point out which you can't see from the photo, and I think you are familiar with the property. This is what is called an emerging neighborhood, Sam Way and all the property to the east that's all Ridge Harbor. This property at least the residential part of this property there that is to the north is part of the RE-1 a maturing neighborhood by its definition is a neighborhood that is in the process of growing. This would essentially cut that off at its knees. An RV Park in that particular parcel would stop the neighborhood from maturing because we would have nothing but 138 transient RV units. Where we could have residential homes as well as the economics there to the south. Anyone that's familiar with this area, there is a certain type of person that wants to live out away from the amenities away from town. There is not a whole lot out there, you're far from the grocery store and everything else. There is about one commercial piece of property left that could be a restaurant, a gas station, a combination of things it's right there in the economic center. It would be a deprivation from the residents of this area to take away not only sixteen residential home sites that back up to a wildlife preserve. But also, the possibility of what is by the county's own definition an economic center. All we would be doing is putting something there, I got to be honest with you even the photo looks silly. It looks like a water park that backs up to a wildlife preserve and it just doesn't seem like it fits in that part of the county. I appreciate your time thank you!

Joe Schortz, live out in this neck of the woods it's well-off Washington Loop. We already have an RV Park that is going up 2.6 miles south of where the proposed entrance to this RV Park is going to go. We also have one within three miles north of that just across the other side of the DeSoto County line. I am not really sure the need, if any that we currently have for more RV Parks right there. We literally have one just down the road and it's considerably larger than this RV Park right here. To throw another one right here with all the traffic as well that's going up and down that corridor at this point it kind of seems a little backwards to me. I don't see the need for it and I hope that with the land behind it and the septic issues. How much would the septic cost to be able to put in this and make sure that we didn't have a flow over in the preserve with any kind of possible flooding from any storms. I was out here for when Milton came through and I know that the water came right up in front of Ridge Harbor which is across the street from there. That is all lower lying land on that side of the street so I just hope that we can choose another project that would be more logical for this location vs. an RV Park.

Justin Pase, much like the last two gentlemen just stated we have another development going in just down the road. Living in that area the way that this is already zoned I would much rather see the land used as it's owned now with sixteen estate homes built in there. With some hopes they would leave some of the woods own the land that backs up to that preserve. The fences don't keep all the animals on the preserve, they still use that land as well. With developing it or putting this RV Park in there, they are going to clear every tree on that property. I would rather see it used as it's owned now with people building homes on some acreage vs. 138 RV's being placed in there. On top of the issues with the water and sewer being next to the preserve.

Courtney Mason, I am here to speak on behalf of the Ridge Harbor and Washington Loop community. I know you guys don't make the final decisions; I want to state some concerns that we have. I am very there were not any gopher tortoises found on this property. I do wish that this property was purchased with HCP funds in the past just to preserve it and extend the preserve that's there already. I know you know that its too late for that. Scrub Jays continue to lose their habitat, the county is doing a wonderful job with their HCP program. Environmental may hate me right now but I got to tell them they're doing a great job. It is up to the public right now, I'm dealing with FWC officers with a neighbor that has did things with tortoises and scrub jay habitats. It never ends with the environmental thing; I just wish that you guys would keep in mind that these mass buildings of neighborhoods are quickly taking away their habitats. No matter how much you preserve for them. Punta Gorda doesn't have a hospital right now, there is no commercial areas out there other than the farm store that everybody gets their cigarettes and beers at, it's right next to Ridge Harbor. The fifty-foot distance from the wetlands for the private septic drain field. Are there studies that backs up that is a safe distance, is that something that I should look with the water management. I am just worried and would like to see some studies and how those fifty feet came up with. The last thing is, will the developer be responsible to put in a traffic light or assess the traffic, I haven't really

got a chance to see that. I know that the Washington Loop Road and the Ridge Harbor they all have to use that turning lane, it's already busy and dangerous cross section. I hope that everybody keeps that in mind.

Kasey Dewberry, I live off Washington Loop Road and I did read the staff report. I do want to express some concerns about that. Everybody said about the sewerage and draining, I agree with that being a concern as well with the fifty feet. Just because one of the drain field locations was pretty close bordering the wetland. Kind of backing up what Courtney had to say about why it's only a fifty-foot minimum in general to a wetland that's going to cause major issues. Also, one of the suggestions is a twenty-five-foot border or an eight-foot berm. I was kind of confused on which the deciding factor was going to be. In the sense of I feel like twenty-five-foot border is not enough for the wetland border with the road coming through. Then you have your stormwater management ponds. But then if you build an eight-foot berm you are kind of going to create the way the water flows. Because the wetland continues behind right, and it is a seventeen-acre wetland. So, you're either going to flood the wetland or you're going to flood the park. Just like they were saying with Hurricane Milton we saw water come up to the front of Ridge Harbor flooding. So, that water is just going to pool is my opinion. Also, the land surrounding this is all owned by the water management district. Essentially, you're just going to create more problems, it's all draining onto that property. To continue in the decision letter that in one of the engineer surveys that it is possible it's going to affect approximately .15th of an acre of a category two wetland. I still think that's an area of concern, why can't it just be all conserved together. Also, in the decision letter it was stated that they would have tree permits done, has that been done. Do we know and it also states that the department of health is in charge of the private, it's now taken over by the Department of Environmental Protection. Has DEP been met with, they tend to be more regulatory and stricter on items, has that been met with. I would really like to see the staff report be more current to be completely honest with you. Talks about the two closest hospitals, one is in Port Charlotte, and one is in DeSoto County. When you add a hundred and thirty-eight units ok you do four people on average, I think was in the staff report per RV. That's going to be over two hundred and fifty people possibly at one time plus staff. That is adding a large influx of possibility for emergency in my opinion. With the traffic it did say if needed a right-hand turning lane would be put in and to extend the left-hand turning lane where you would turn onto Washington Loop. I live on Washington Loop the influx of traffic that has come you can wait up to five-minutes with five vehicles behind you just trying to turn north onto 17. Considering these are going to be RV's these are going to be larger vehicles; you are going to have what either the RV's driven themselves or a truck towing them. You are adding two-hundred and seventy-six vehicles in that area, I know for a personal fact. Peace River Campground when they have big weekends like July fourth, you want to go with your family. They're turning in and blocking traffic on 70 because the line is so long. Talks about all of this and explains the different ways, second entrance, stormwater, septic and wildlife.

Camilla Spicer, lives off the Loop too and not educated about this particular request here for approval. Living in the neighborhood and taking the time it takes to drive here from there anymore. The county seems far away it used to be a twenty-minute drive, now an hour and ten. I don't think we need any more traffic on 17 from the loop I'm in and we still haven't seen the repercussions of the RV park that they are referring to. Like I said I haven't educated myself about this enough to go into details. I reiterate as a neighbor I'm against this, I appreciate and agree what the other neighbors had said.

John Martin, Washington Loop Road and I have been sworn in. I agree one hundred percent with everybody with what they've been saying so far. As far as all this development that's been going on. I am very proud of them two those are my kids, and I am glad to see they are in here fighting for what they grew up for and with. My daughter stated that there, which is agreeable, you have on little development not a big deal. Then we know there is two others in the works also ok with larger areas for homes and such. That puts a lot of pressure on highway 17, we all know that. The wetlands and I agree, what appears to happen is well we preserved this area, but we disturbed everything else. All the animals have moved somewhere else. Well now when we do a study those animals aren't there anymore. Look we can expand a little bit more ok it's nonsense we have got to slow this down. Sewerage and I am the current stages of building a house right now but my last house my well had to be seventy-five-feet from my septic tank. So, we are only going to put fifty feet here, that makes more sense, I don't think so. I agree

one hundred percent with everybody that's here and I disagree with the fact that the applicant gets to have the last word all the time. I disagree with that, and I don't think he has the right to make it a statement that who would want to build a house on a four-lane highway cause if you go just down the road there is plenty of houses on a four-lane highway.

- **Mr. Baker** moved to close the public comment, second by **Mr. Izzo**, with a unanimous vote.

Rebuttal

Rob Berntsson, I will start with calling up the project engineer to answer some of the questions that came up.

Reed McCowen with Southwest Engineering, first thing with the septic's we do show one within fifty foot and that will be moved. The state regulation on septic's are fifteen feet from dry retention which a wetland would be considered that, this one is normally dry. Then from wet ponds or streams, creeks, other things like that its seventy-five feet. So, we had this one place coordinates that regulations, but we will move it to meet the county fifty-foot setback that they put in place. Then we show our typical twenty-five-foot aqua wetland offset in that plan. We're not quite to fifty on that one, but we will meet all that. For the traffic impact statement according to ProTeam who we do the report for, the left turn lane will need to be extended forty feet. They are saying right now according to the traffic count they received we did not need a right turn lane. In 2026 when this project is expected to be completed, once maybe required just for safety reasons but not based on traffic volume alone. When we come in for final approval based on the age of the TIS it may be updated, and we will have a for sure answer then. With concern about the flooding with the eight-foot berm that was mentioned. It is going to be an eight-foot fence surrounding the property, and then our stormwater to the wetland will be managed at a rate that equals or is less than the rate going to the wetland right now. According to the SWFWMD guidelines you can't discharge more than your predevelopment addition and we're going to meet all of the state guidelines on this. Going back to the septic's one more time, even when the septic's were governed by the health department based on the flows that were expected from this it was going to be DEP anyways. I provided a wastewater narrative I believe it's page 134 in the staff report, and it talks about the flow that you could see on the existing zoning compared to the flow we will see here. With the existing commercial zonings go under the P that we are proposing are very much less impactful on the wastewater. We will meet all the requirements that the county set fourth and going to treat it at least to the state standards. We show our well west of the welcome center in that area. Once we come to the actual design if we need to move it we can, but that is the most logical place for us to have it. Other developments that are served by wells we are not expecting any adverse conditions from the well placement there. Another one of the issues was talking about expanding into the wetland, staff is requiring signage to be posted at certain intervals along the wetlands saying it is a wetland no dumping allowed. Also, along all of the preserve western and southern boundaries. Talking about the staging of the RV's I don't have the exact number off the top of my head, they would turn into the site, they would turn west on the image right now. There is room to stack a decent number of RV's before you would back up into the street.

Mr. Berntsson just a couple of things again remind you the existing zoning commercial would be very difficult to develop without central water and sewer available. Utility that is responsible for the area has indicated they do not have capacity to serve water and sewer. I will say personally I would not want to build a new home on a 1-acre estate lot on a four-way state highway in an area that's growing like this. The fact that there is other RV Parks in the area it just shows the popularity of RVs in this day and age, my generation that's getting to an age that are using the RV Parks. We don't deny something because we want to build a gas station and there is already another gas station on the other corner. There is always a lot of synergy between different uses, some people like the larger parks, some people might want a smaller park. With all of that I would respectfully request your recommendation of approval of both the comprehensive plan amendment and the rezoning keeping in mind most of what heard in opposition was opinion not factually competence substantial evidence.

Questions for Staff or the Applicants

Mr. Vieira said I am trying to see on this depiction where the actual sewerage treatment is going to be located. I see the drain fields but I'm trying to see where the sewerage treatment is going to be located.

Mr. Berntsson said there is not a central sewerage treatment plant there, individual septic systems shown in pink.

Mr. Vieira said it's gravity systems.

Mr. Berntsson said yes.

Mr. Baker said just a comment and observation, you mentioned the density units are exempt for these which is mind boggling to me that we do so much for our houses to restrict how many units can be on property. But when you get down to an RV which can be permanent, and not transient that we don't care other than just a planned development. So, Shaun you have to come in the county at this point and do a planned development is the only way to get an RV Park now. There is no area that is zoned, we don't have like multi-family, we have single-family we don't have an area of the county that is zoned for an activity like this do we.

Mr. Cullinan said we do we have RV Park, RVP zoning that they could have applied for as well. That is a straight zoning designation and so as you are well aware of the board as well as this board has like specificity likes to see things. With respect to why are transient parks like this not counted toward density even though there quasi residential we don't require permits for the parking of it. So, those other parks you speak of permanent, those would require permits. We do that in this sense because there are a lot of other state regulations regarding lengths of stay, can't stay more than I believe it's more than 180 days in the same spot. There are a lot of other regulations in place relating to RVs that are different from a mobile park or something where the vehicles or whatever you want to call them are staying in a static state. That is the difference between a house which is there permanently vs something that is transient such as this.

Mr. Baker said to clarify these RVs do have regulations on how long, so you could not put an RV there and leave it permanently.

Mr. Cullinan said no sir not today.

Mr. Baker said who regulates that.

Mr. Cullinan said we have regulations in the code, but the state also regulates that.

Ms. Shao said it is a PD condition also regulates.

Mr. Baker said right but if I left it there, we got county code drive through.

Ms. Shao said it is a code case

Deputy County Attorney Thomas David said it would be a code case and a discussion takes place.

Mr. Vieira said there is no residential component in this proposal, there is no casitas or anything of that nature proposed.

Ms. Shao said it's very specific on RVs, no casitas, only RVs, it's in the PD condition.

Mr. Smallwood said I have a question about the sewer. Don't state regulations say if there is sewer lines available within so many feet they have to hook up to that sewer plant or that sewer plant has to be expanded to meet the conditions of the new development.

Charlotte County Planning and Zoning Board Minutes Continued

Marc 10, 2025

Page 9 OF 10

Mr. Cullinan said I don't believe there are any conditions that a sewer plant has to be expanded but there are provisions in both code and statutes that if portable water and sanitary sewer become available to the site that they have 365 days to hook up to it.

Mr. Smallwood said the lines are already there.

Mr. Cullinan said no there are no lines, and a discussion takes place with Mr. Smallwood, Mr. Berntsson, Mr. Izzo and Mr. McCowen.

Mr. Izzo asks about the emergency access it was brought up are they required to have a secondary.

Mr. Berntsson said a condition of these projects goes on two parallel tracts. We applied for the comp plan and rezoning that comes through this board separately and before we can get here. They have to go through the staff development review committee for a review of the project. That took this project and places conditions on what you have to do when you come in for final. So, they will have an emergency secondary access most likely up at the northern portion of the property. We do everything based on the staff comments we redo it when we bring it in for final PD.

Mr. Vieira said I understand that the basis of the development is transient. Vehicles are going to come and go, I am looking at the aerial maps that were provided to us. I just happened to look at the Duncan Road north US 17 just at the intersection of Washington Loop Road and as far as I can see, it's zoned RMF-10. I just wonder allow about future development on that side of the road not being transient. But being a permanent situation and we would end up there. It's just food for thought, it doesn't influence my decision on what I am going to propose here. It's just an area that's open to development now and there is a lot of multi-family and commercial zoning along that corridor that were going to see I think a lot of in the future. Just food for thought it's there.

Chair Gravesen said someone in Public Comment talked about during Milton that the flooding came up to a spot I am assuming it covered some of this area. You are on the west side of 17, and 17 is kind of being the berm from storm water flooding up through here. On a positive note, what better to have in something that's kind of maybe flood than a RV that you can take and move to escape from the flooding than a permanent fixture. It's all economic driven by individuals.

Mr. Vieira said you know our decision here is just the first step in several other hearings that finally approve this and a lot of scrutiny too. So, with that I will make a motion.

Recommendation

Mr. Vieira moved that **PAS-24-04**, be sent to the Board of County Commissioners with a recommendation of Approval, based on the findings and analysis in the staff memo dated **February 26, 2025**, Charlotte County Comprehensive Plan along with the evidence presented at today's meeting, second by **Mr. Gravesen**; *motion passed with a 3-2 recommendation. (Mr. Vieira, Mr. Gravesen and Mr. Izzo voted yes to approve – Mr. Baker and Mr. Smallwood voted no against the approval).*

Recommendation

Mr. Vieira moved that **PD-24-11**, be sent to the Board of County Commissioners with a recommendation of Approval, with conditions "a" through "m" based on the findings and analysis in the staff memo dated **February 26, 2025**, Charlotte County Comprehensive Plan along with the evidence presented at today's meeting, second by **Mr. Gravesen**; *motion passed with a 3-2 recommendation. (Mr. Vieira, Mr. Gravesen and Mr. Izzo voted yes to approve – Mr. Baker and Mr. Smallwood voted no against the approval).*

Charlotte County Planning and Zoning Board Minutes Continued

March 10, 2025

Page 10 OF 10

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:50 p.m.

Accepted on behalf of the Charlotte County
Planning and Zoning Board

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael Gravesen", written over a horizontal line.

Michael Gravesen, Chair