Planning Commission Agenda March 7, 2024 - 5:30 p.m.

Daniel Grannan – Chair Tonia Herring Richard Laxton Deborah MacArthur Anderson Karen Cunningham



Terry Thompson– Vice Chair Larry Schenavar Alternate 1 – Gregory Acker Alternate 2 – Kimberly Salter Chuck Dixon – School Board*

- 1) Call to Order
- 2) Roll Call
- 3) Moment of Silence
- 4) Pledge of Allegiance
- 5) Adoption of Agenda
- 6) Approval of Minutes: February 1st, 2024
- 7) Citizen Input: 3 minutes Public
- 8) Hearings: None
- 9) Training: **Quasi-Judicial Training** Conduct training on Quasi-Judicial Hearings. Training will be presented by Attorney Robert Batsel of Gooding & Batsel, PLLC., to highlight application of Quasi-Judicial function.
- 10.) Unfinished Business
- 11.) New Business
- 12.) Citizen Input: 5 minutes
- 13.) Staff Comments
- 14.) Commissioner's Comments
- 15.) Chairman's Comments
- 16.) Adjournment

*Appointed by School Board pursuant to §163.3174, Florida Statutes.

NOTICE TO PUBLIC

Any person who decides to appeal any decision of the Planning Commission with respect to any matter considered at this meeting will need a record of the proceedings and for such purpose may need to provide that a verbatim record of the proceeding is made, which record includes testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based. (Section 286.0105, Florida Statutes)

Planning Commission Draft Minutes February 1, 2024 - 5:30 p.m.

Daniel Grannan – Chair Tonia Herring Richard Laxton Deborah MacArthur Anderson Karen Cunningham



Terry Thompson– Vice Chair Larry Schenavar Alternate 1 – Gregory Acker Alternate 2 – Kimberly Salter Chuck Dixon – School Board*

- 1) Call to Order at 5:30 PM
- 2) Roll Call

Commissioners Present: Daniel Grannan, Terry Thompson, Richard Laxton, Deborah MacArthur Anderson, and Larry Schenavar,

Commissioners Absent: Karen Cunningham, Gregory Acker, Kimberly Salter, and Tonya Herring

Staff Present: Rob Batsel City Attorney, Troy Slattery Interim City Manager, Jenette Collins Growth

Management Director, Carly Hanson Assistant Growth Management Director, Heather Lacey Associate

Planner, and Sabrinna Utter Deputy Clerk

- 3) Moment of Silence was led by Chairman Grannan
- 4) Pledge of Allegiance was led by Chairman Grannan
- Adoption of Agenda Motion to adopt the agenda was made by Vice Chairman Thompson; seconded by Chairman Grannan. -- <u>Motion carried 5-0</u>
- Approval of Minutes: January 4th, 2024 Motion to approve the minutes of January 4th, 2024, was made by Commissioner Laxton; seconded by Chairman Grannan. <u>Motion carried 5-0</u>

Terry Thompson stated for the record the names of the council members in attendance. (Ken Frink and Robert Holmes).

- 7) Citizen Input: 3 minutes -- None
- 8) Public Workshop:

Draft Community Development Code – Conduct a workshop to solicit public input and receive

recommendations from the Planning Commission. A presentation will be made by Stringfellow Planning &

Design, serving as the city's planning consultant, to highlight the various design standards of the

proposed form-based code. This item will be scheduled for another workshop at a future City Council

NOTICE TO PUBLIC

Any person who decides to appeal any decision of the Planning Commission with respect to any matter considered at this meeting will need a record of the proceedings and for such purpose may need to provide that a verbatim record of the proceeding is made, which record includes testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based. (Section 286.0105, Florida Statutes)

meeting. The final adoption of the code will take place at future advertised public hearings before the Planning Commission and City Council.

Presentation: Staff member Jenette Collins introduced form–based code. Alex Stringfellow presented the draft of the proposed form-based code. Mr. Stringfellow indicated that the adoption of the new code would create a walkable downtown district for the City of Crystal River. Simon Hardt explained how hurricanes and FEMA regulations impact design standards and how this was considered when creating the proposed form-based code.

Commissioner Discussion: Commissioner Schenavar asked for a summary of changes, Mrs. Collins responded that there is no cross-out version at this time. Mr. Stringfellow also addressed the question. Commissioner Laxton presented concerns about the pitch of roofs on residential homes and porches, he also inquired about ADA accessibility. Mr. Stringfellow explained the roof height requirement and the benefit of porches. Commissioner Tompson also expressed concern about porches. Mr. Stringfellow explained the regulations, he added these items are in line with state statute. Commissioner Thompson expressed concern about 9-foot garage doors. Mr. Stringfellow explained garage requirements are no longer there. Commissioner Thompson requested the updated draft and Mr. Stringfellow explained that it was not available at this time. Commissioner Thompson asked if the size of the property would affect the zone, Mr. Stringfellow addressed how the new code would apply, and Attorney Batsel explained how city properties are maintained. Commissioner MacArthur Anderson advised she did not have any concerns at this time. Commissioner Thompson suggested private roads maintained by HOA. Mr. Stringfellow discussed how past studies had negative results.

Attorney Batsel inquired about PUD and conditional uses. Mr. Stringfellow offered to meet later to go over some research options.

City Council comment: Councilman Ken Frink explained the issues the city has with drainage. Councilman Robert Holmes asked about setbacks. Mrs. Collins explained the new setback standards and buffer requirements. Councilman Holmes asked about fill dirt requirements and possibly prohibiting the use of fill. Attorney Batsel replied he was unsure and that he would research the issue. Mrs. Collins explained FEMA regulations in regards to fill. Counselman Holmes inquired about heavy industrial zoning, and Mrs. Collins explained only light industrial zoning would be allowable. Councilmen Holmes inquired about tree surveys at the preliminary plat stage. Mrs. Collins indicated that this is required under the current code.

Public comment: Davis Dinkins discussed drainage requirements. Gerard Mulligan 203 NW Bay Path Dr rive, Crystal River FL 34428 expressed concerns about the ability to have a tower on homes.

NOTICE TO PUBLIC

Any person who decides to appeal any decision of the Planning Commission with respect to any matter considered at this meeting will need a record of the proceedings and for such purpose may need to provide that a verbatim record of the proceeding is made, which record includes testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based. (Section 286.0105, Florida Statutes)

- 9) Public Hearings: None
- 10.) Unfinished Business- None
- 11.) New Business- None
- 12.) Citizen Input: 5 minutes- None
- 13.) Staff Comments- Attorney Rob Batsel inquired about having a training at the next meeting. Mrs. Collins advised that there are no current applications for next meeting, therefore the training could occur.
- 14.) Commissioner's Comments- None
- 15.) Chairman's Comments- None
- 16.) Adjournment—Motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Vice chairman Thompson, seconded by Chair Grannan Motion Carried 5-0 Adjourned at 7:19 PM.

*Appointed by School Board pursuant to §163.3174, Florida Statutes.

ATTEST:

Recording Secretary Heather Lacey

Chairman Daniel Grannan

NOTICE TO PUBLIC

Any person who decides to appeal any decision of the Planning Commission with respect to any matter considered at this meeting will need a record of the proceedings and for such purpose may need to provide that a verbatim record of the proceeding is made, which record includes testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based. (Section 286.0105, Florida Statutes)

OUASI-JUDICIAL HEARINGS City of Crystal River Update March 7, 2024

> PRESENTED BY: ROBERT W. BATSEL, JR., ESQ. GOODING & BATSEL, PLLC 352.579.1290

LEGISLATIVE FUNCTION

- BASED UPON SEPARATION OF POWERS

1. FORMULATION OF POLICY

- CONSIDERS WHAT THE LAW SHOULD BE

AND

- CREATES OR IMPLEMENTS LEGISLATION (ORDINANCES)

QUASI-JUDICIAL FUNCTION

2. APPLICATION OF POLICY

- INTERPRETS & APPLIES EXISTING LAW (ORDINANCES) TO SPECIFIC FACTS PRESENTED AT HEARING

- KEY WORDS:

"INTERPRETATION" "APPLICATION" " SPECIFIC FACTS"

CONSTITUTIONAL MANDATES

- * DUE PROCESS
 - 5TH & 14TH AMENDMENT OF U.S. CONSTITUTION
 - Article I Sec. 9 FLORIDA CONSTITUTION

- (NO PERSON SHALL BE DEPRIVED OF LIFE, LIBERTY, OR PROPERTY WITHOUT DUE PROCESS OF LAW)

LEGISLATIVE FUNCTION

- MUST BE A RATIONAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE REGULATION AND A LEGITIMATE GOVERNMENT INTEREST

- REGULATION MAY NOT BE ARBITRARY, CAPRICIOUS OR UNREASONABLE

-IF FAIRLY DEBATABLE, WILL BE UPHELD

DEFINITION

- * Quasi-Judicial
 - Quasi = AS IF (SIMILAR TO)
 - -Judicial = JUDGING

ACTING AS A JUDGE AND JURY

JUDGING

CONSIDERING EVIDENCE (TESTIMONY AND DOCUMENTARY)

MAKING FINDINGS OF FACT DRAWING CONCLUSIONS OF LAW ISSUING ORDERS

IMPOSING CONDITIONS POSSIBLY IMPOSING PENALTIES

DUE PROCESS

- * PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS
- * USED IN QUASI-JUDICIAL HEARINGS
 - ADEQUATE NOTICE
 - OPPORTUNITY TO BE HEARD
 - FAIR AND IMPARTIAL TRIBUNAL (BOARD/COMM.)
 - JURISDICTION OVER SUBJECT MATTER

DUE PROCESS PROCEDURAL (CONT.)

* "APPEAL" TO COURT (CERTIORARI)

* COURT WILL CONSIDER THE RECORD FROM THE HEARING AND APPLY THE FOLLOWING STANDARDS:

COURT STANDARDS

WHETHER:

1. PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS WAS PROVIDED (Notice & Opportunity to be Heard)

2. THE LAW WAS CORRECTLY APPLIED (or stated conversely) THERE WAS A DEPARTURE FROM ESSENTIAL REQUIREMENTS OF THE LAW

COURT STANDARDS

3. THERE WAS ANY "COMPETENT SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE" IN THE RECORD TO SUPPORT THE BOARD'S DECISION

4. THE BOARD/COUNCIL WAS FAIR AND IMPARTIAL

LEGISLATIVE FUNCTION

- * AS PROVIDED BY LAW OR CODE - NEWSPAPER, LETTERS, POSTING
- * OWNER, APPLICANT, ADJACENT PROPERTY OWNERS
- * SPECIFIED TIME PRIOR TO HEARING

OPPORTUNITY TO BE HEARD

- * RIGHT TO TESTIFY-UNDER OATH
- * RIGHT TO PRESENT WITNESSES & DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE
- * SUFFICIENT TIME FOR PRESENTATION
- * RIGHT TO REASONABLE CROSS-EXAMINATION

QUASI-JUDICIAL

- * CORRECT APPLICATION OF LAW TO FACTS
- * LAW = PUBLISHED CRITERIA (ORDINANCE OR REGULATION)
- * USUALLY CALLED "STANDARDS"
- * IF STANDARDS ARE SATISFIED BY APPLICANT, PERMIT SHOULD BE APPROVED

QUASI-JUDICIAL (LAND USE)

* APPLICANT (PETITIONER) HAS BURDEN OF DEMONSTRATING THAT PROPOSED USE IS CONSISTENT WITH COMP PLAN AND LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE (PRIMA FACIE)

* IF PRIMA FACIE ENTITLEMENT IS SHOWN, BURDEN/ SHIFTS TO CITY TO SHOW THAT MAINTAINING EXISTING ZONING IS LEGITIMATE PUBLIC PURPOSE

COMPETENT EVIDENCE

* Real, fact based, material, reliable evidence that tends to prove points that must be proven and a reasonable mind would accept it as enough to support the proposed for conclusion.

* Not conjecture

* Not generalized opinion without support

IMPARTIAL TRIBUNAL

* IMPARTIAL = FREE FROM BIAS

* A fair trial in a fair tribunal is a basic requirement of due process. Fairness of course requires an absence of actual bias in the trail of cases. But our system of law has always endeavored to prevent even the probability of unfairness.

* In re Murchison. Cited by Goldberg v. Kelly U.S. Supreme Court

IMPARTIALITY - EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS

* EX PARTE = ONE-SIDED AND OUTSIDE-OF-HEARING COMMUNICATIONS

- PRESUMPTIVELY PREJUDICIAL

- EXCEPTIONS VIA STATUTES 286.0115 F.S.

- CITY CODE

EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS

* CITY CODE REQUIRES DISCLOSURE ON RECORD AT HEARING, BEFORE VOTE (TO ALLOW INQUIRY) OF:

- THE SUBSTANCE OF ANY COMMUNICATION AND IDENTITY OF ANY PERSON, GROUP OR ENTITY

- WRITTEN COMMUNICATION (TO BE READ OR PUT INTO RECORD)

- INVESTIGATIONS OR SITE VISITS; EXPERT OPINIONS RECEIVED

286.0115 F.S.

* RESPONSE TO JENNINGS V. DADE COUNTY ("EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS ARE PRESUMPTIVELY PREJUDICIAL)

* LEGISLATION ALLOWS THE LOCAL GOVERNMENTS TO REMOVE PRESUMPTION OF PREJUDICE

HEARING PROCEDURES

- 1. STAFF INTRODUCTION
- 2. PETITIONER PRESENTATION
- 3. COUNCIL QUESTIONS OF PETITIONER (STAFF MAY CROSS EXAMINE)
- 4. STAFF PRESENTATION
- 5. COUNCIL QUESTIONS OF STAFF (PETITIONER MAY CROSS EXAMINE
- 6. PUBLIC TESTIMONY
- 7. COUNCIL MAY ASK QUESTIONS OF PUBLIC

PROCEDURES (CONT.)

- 8. MAYOR/COUNCIL MAY ALLOW QUESTIONS OF PUBLIC TO BE POSED TO PARTIES
- 9. PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL EVIDENCE
- 10. CLOSING COMMENTS BY STAFF AND BY PETITIONER
- 11. COUNCIL DELIBERATION AND ACTION
- 12. MAYOR SIGNS AND FILES DEVELOPMENT ORDER WITH THE CLERK (USUALLY RESOLUTION OR COULD BE ORDINANCE)

EVIDENCE AT QJ HEARINGS

- * GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE RULE =
- * FORMAL RULES OF EVIDENCE SHALL NOT APPLY
- * HOWEVER, FUNDAMENTAL DUE PROCESS SHALL BE OBSERVED AND SHALL GOVERN THE PROCEEDINGS

EVIDENCE AT HEARING

- * HEARSAY EVIDENCE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED ONLY IF CORROBORATED BY TESTIMONY
- * (HEARSAY = LETTERS, STATEMENTS THROUGH 3RD PARTIES, ETC.)
- * COMPETENT EVIDENCE
 MATTERS REQUIRING EXPERTISE
 OPINION TESTIMONY BY PERSON WHO IS EXPERT

Recent Case

- Village of Palmetto Bay v. Palmer Trinity Private School
 So.3d____ (3DCA 7-5-2012)
- * Village council approved special exception but reduced number of students from 1150 requested to 900 at the final hearing.
- * Held: there was no competent substantial evidence to support the reduction.

Recent Case

- * Carillon Comm. Residential v. Seminole County 45 So.3d 7 (5th DCA 2010)
- * Issues: Due Process, Essential Requirements of Law

* Facts: Petition for PUD for mixed use UCF student housing. County Board approved.

* Neighboring Home Owners Assoc. challenged.

Carillon (cont.)

- * Circuit Court Upheld County decision.
 * HOA challenged in Court of Appeal.
- * Claim: Due Process denied because they were not allowed to cross examine witnesses at Board quasi-judicial hearing.

Decision:

- * Due process is flexible concept
- * Proceeding needs only to be "essentially" fair.
- * No single unchanging test to apply.
- * Balance private interest vs. public interest.
- * Public interest includes fiscal and administrative burdens.

CARILLON

- * PARTIES VS. PARTICIPANTS
- * PARTIES TO LAND USE CASE = PETITIONER & CITY
- Greater process due to parties than participants.

CARILLON

* Party-Direct interest affected by official action.

* Party must be able to present evidence, crossexamine witnesses and be informed of all facts upon which Commission acts.

* Public Interests / Rights – QJ hearings (such as rezonings) are open to public participation.

* A participant is entitled to some due process. How much depends upon function of proceeding and nature of interests affected.

* Florida law does not require that all participants be allowed to cross-examine witnesses.

- * Parties are the Petitioner and the Local Government.
- * Not adjoining land owners, neighbors or public at large.
- * Distinguishes Sorrento Ranches v. Venice where 2d DCA made broad statement that the property owners should have been allowed to cross-examine, because unclear whether they were adjoining or in area to be rezoned.

* Impractical to allow all 25 public speakers to cross-examine

* BCC had a procedure by which witnesses can be questioned.

2013 Law

* The law (s. 286.0114 F.S.) requiring public participation before taking action, does not apply to quasi-judicial hearings.

* Quasi-judicial hearings are already covered by their own due process rules (above).