

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW AND PERMIT PROCESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
(DRPPAC)

The Indian River County (IRC) Development Review and Permit Process Advisory Committee (DRPPAC) met at **10:00 a.m. on Wednesday, November 8, 2017**, in the County Administration Building, Building B, 1800 27th Street, Vero Beach, Florida. You may hear an audio of the meeting; review the agenda and the minutes on the IRC website – <http://www.ircgov.com/Boards/DRPPAC/2017.htm>

Present were: **Chairperson Debb Robinson**, District 1; **Vice Chairman Joe Paladin**, District 2; **Carter Taylor**, District 2; **Wes Mills**, District 3; **Bruce Redus**, District 4; **Robert Banov**, District 4; **Chuck Mechling**, District 5; **John Blum**, District 5; **Greg Burke**, **Christopher Murphy** and **Raymond Sheltra**, Members-at-Large; and **Stephen Melchiori**, Alternate.

Others present were **Jason Brown**, County Administrator, **Dylan Reingold**, County Attorney; **Bill DeBaal**, Deputy County Attorney; **John King**, Emergency Services Director; **Stan Boling**, Director Community Development; **Jesse Roland**, Utilities Plans Reviewer; **Rich Szpyrka**, Public Works Director; **Scott McAdam**, Building Official; **John McCoy**, Community Development Chief; **John Duran**, Fire Marshall; **Wesley Davis**, Indian River Auctions & Appraisals, **Helene Caseltine**, Indian River County Chamber of Commerce, Economic Development Director; and **Joe Schulke**, Schulke Bittle and Stoddard; **Richard Bialosky** and **David Ederer**, Interested Parties.

Absent was **Richard Brown**, District 3 (excused); and **Robin Raiff**, District 1 (unexcused).

Call to Order & Welcome – *No Action Required*

Chairperson Robinson called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m., at which time it was determined there was a quorum present.

Additions and Deletions to the Agenda

There was none.

Approval of Minutes of October 18, 2017 – *Action Required*

ON MOTION BY Mr. Paladin, SECONDED BY Mr. Taylor, the Committee voted unanimously (12-0) to approve the minutes of October 18, 2017.

New Business – Stan Boling, Community Development Director

a) Review of Process Flow Charts and Traffic Study Requirements – Action Required

Mr. Stan Boling, Community Development Director, reviewed his memorandum dated November 1, 2017, with Attachments 1 through 6; a copy is on file in the Commission Office. A Process Overview chart and site plan flow chart were provided as handouts to all in attendance. Mr. Boling focused on the first six steps of the Process Overview chart (Attachment 1), wherein he advised these steps were common to all review processes in obtaining staff approval. He pointed out if the project needed to move forward beyond the first six steps, i.e., to a Planning and Zoning Commission meeting, or a Board of County Commission meeting, the later steps indicated on the Process Overview chart were applicable.

Mr. Boling concentrated on the site plan flow chart, Attachment 2, and explained the pre-application process and submittal completeness for the Technical Review Committee's ("TRC") review. He pointed out the current Indian River County Code of Ordinances ("the Code") required 4 calendar days for sending out Comment Letters (Attachment 4) for both subdivisions and site plans; however, the actual time frame was running approximately 14 days. He said the current delay was generally due to an increased demand and low staffing level still in place from recession cut-backs. He stated the recently adopted 2017/2018 County budget would allow for the hiring of additional staff reviewers for current development, engineering and fire prevention to assist with the backlog and staff's slow response times.

Mr. Boling mentioned after a site plan was approved, there was a site plan release function where other permits (County or jurisdictional) had to be obtained before the site plan was released. He continued when the site plan was released, then a building permit may be issued and construction could begin. He also reminded the Committee the site plan submittal and approval process and the building permit submittal and approval process could run concurrently and at any point in time during the site plan review process, a building permit could be submitted for review of the vertical construction.

Mr. Boling stated the Committee could discuss restructuring the review process to allow additional time for the initial staff review and an upfront staff coordination meeting to work out any conflicting comments before the applicant appeared at the TRC meeting. He commented that process had been used in other jurisdictions with some success.

Mr. Boling suggested the Committee also discuss how to make staff comments to applicants more useful. He noted staff also had some suggestions on how to improve applicant responses and suggested making some types of routinely approved projects currently requiring Planning and Zoning Commission ("PZC") approval to become routine for staff level approval, taking 14-28 days out of the end of the process.

He also suggested the possibility of having some small level residential projects approved at a staff level instead of the current requirement of having anything over 3 units automatically go to the Planning and Zoning Commission for approval.

Chairperson Robinson agreed there was clearly an understaffing issue; however, the new position approved by the Commissioners, was expected to bring current development planning to an adequate level to meet the requirements of the Code. She agreed with Mr. Boling's suggestion to provide another week in the planning process before proceeding to the TRC, when staff would meet together to ensure before going to the TRC, that staff's comments and position were solid, eliminating extra back and forth time in the overall process for staff, as well as the applicant.

Mr. Chuck Mechling, District 5 Representative suggested considering the submittal of a traffic study prior to or at the pre-application conference (pre-app), to provide the applicant details of what could or could not be done before the TRC meeting.

Mr. John Blum, District 5 Representative stated until the applicant knew whether or not the project could be executed, there was no point in spending the money on the traffic study; therefore the traffic study should be incorporated and coordinated with the pre-app.

Mr. Boling reminded the committee the purpose of the pre-app was to provide basic information such as the zoning, the level, the scope, and what were the basic traffic needs. He welcomed the engineers and architects of the committee to comment whether or not the applicant knew enough coming away from the pre-app.

Mr. Blum mentioned differences between commercial and residential. He said in the pre-app there should be a clear indication of whether to move forward or not, whether the project was feasible. He continued, as far as the number of units, etc., it may vary with a residential project and a traffic study resulting in 3 or 4 fewer units, and that traffic study would be relevant and held true. He gave example of a commercial project with changing entitlements did not know details required for a traffic study before the TRC meeting.

Mr. Joseph Paladin, District 2 Representative questioned how concurrency would be known without a Traffic Study.

Mr. Blum stated a lot of the information would be provided at the pre-app before the Traffic Study was preformed, with the project going through traffic count, trips, reviewing link assignments, etc., wherein at that point, determination of whether the project would be impacted. He said he liked the idea of the "coordination meeting" proposed by staff and appreciated the current process of having pre-app comments before going through the major expense of a TRC submittal. He noted however, the dilemma was the level of details not submitted with the pre-app such as the location of utilities, drainage, etc.

Mr. Boling said currently, the idea was when the applicant/engineer came out of the pre-app, there was direction; the engineer knew of trouble spots. He continued staff's suggestion was to have a staff-coordination meeting before TRC to iron out any conflicts and to provide solid comments at the TRC meeting.

Mr. Chuck Mechling, District 5 Representative voiced his support for staff to have the extra time period before the TRC meeting; however, questioned when the applicant and the engineer would know how to proceed with development. He shared his thought with a residential concept, at the resubmittal time, the applicant would have the Traffic Study to know how many lots were allowable.

Chairperson Robinson asked Mr. Rich Szyrka, Public Works Director, with the understanding the Traffic Study could determine changes in driveway egress, etc., and would there be general direction from Public Works as to whether a Traffic Study was required at the formal submission?

Mr. Szyrka said it depended upon the level of information he was provided to make that decision. For him to make a decision, he would require the detailed information from the developer; however, that decision would be arbitrary and staff tried to stay away from arbitrary. He surmised perhaps the Code needed to be changed to require a traffic study before the post TRC resubmittal.

Chairperson Robinson asked Mr. Blum when he thought the Traffic Study should be completed, before the TRC meeting, or before resubmittal. Mr. Blum responded his opinion was to have the Traffic Study before resubmittal. Mr. Wes Mills, District 3 Representative agreed the Traffic Study should be required at the post TRC resubmittal because the Traffic Study would need to match the revised site plans.

Mr. Joe Schulke, Schulke Bittle and Stoddard shared his thought the formal traffic study should be able to wait for a resubmittal of the site plan; however, the Code required a traffic study methodology meeting prior to conducting the Traffic Study. He suggested requiring the methodology meeting prior to the formal TRC meeting submittal, providing staff and the applicant information going into the TRC meeting, so when staff held their coordination meeting, both parties had the same information.

Chairperson Robinson inquired whether the pre-app and the Traffic Study methodology could be done at the same meeting. Mr. Paladin responded the pre-app and Traffic Study covered different items.

Mr. John McCoy, Community Development Chief Planner stated he thought a civil engineer designing the project, whether it was a small subdivision, or a regional mall, would know whether a traffic engineer was needed to attend the pre-app based upon the project.

Mr. Mechling surmised the concept would be at the resubmittal, to have the full Traffic Study, making a change to the current Code. He also understood having the

methodology meeting would assist the applicant and his professional (an engineer or architect) in obtaining preliminary information allowing discussion with staff in a knowledgeable fashion. He commented it would rely upon the applicant to understand the magnitude of issues.

Mr. Paladin concurred a rough outline of the traffic due diligence period as far as concurrency, trips, appropriate intersections, etc., would provide a status of the plan.

Chairperson Robinson said if the Code was changed to resubmittal time, there would be nothing to preclude the applicant from providing the Traffic Study early, at the TRC meeting, as a part of the due diligence. She agreed the engineer should have a good concept of whether or not the Traffic Study would “sink the ship” before doing the project.

Mr. McCoy, said the methodology meeting with the Traffic Division would provide where and what the “skeletons” were, prior to refining project site plan design.

Mr. McCoy stated in support of Mr. Schulke’s idea of the initial submittal of the Traffic Study moved to the resubmittal of the formal Traffic Impact Statement, the developer would want the verification of the methodology meeting prior to the TRC meeting submittal. He continued this would allow Traffic Division to have an idea of what to expect, methodology-wise, because approaching the approval stage, the Traffic Division was required to sign off on the Traffic Study and approve the site plan, closing the gap and getting to the end result quicker.

Mr. Szyrka summarized there would be the pre-app conference to ensure the developer could do what they wish to do, then there would be a methodology meeting with the Traffic Division, having the information of what the developer thought could be accomplished, then the TRC meeting, allowing the comments to go back to the developer, then the full-blown Traffic Study with the resubmittal.

Mr. Greg Burke, Member at Large representative shared he thought it was a good idea for staff to see the project upfront in the planning stage and to ensure good understanding by inviting staff to be partners in the design of the project, which would save time.

ON MOTION BY Mr. Paladin, SECONDED BY Mr. Mechling, to shift the time frame where the Traffic Report was required to resubmittal.

UNDER DISCUSSION, Mr. Burke inquired about a timeline for the approval of the Traffic Study; depending upon the consultant providing the correct information.

Mr. Szyrka informed the committee, according to the current Code, the Public Works Director has 15 days in which to get the Traffic Study reviewed and back to the developer, and that time frame runs concurrently with the TRC, so when the TRC plan

was submitted with the Traffic Study, the reviewer has both in front of them. He stated by doing both at the same time, Public Works was following the TRC deadline, so the developer would get comments when the TRC comments went back out, eliminating wait time.

Chairperson Robinson noted if the developer wanted to turn the Traffic Study in for the first TRC meeting, it would be reviewed. Mr. Szyrka added, it would be reviewed as long as it came in with the plan. Mr. Boling clarified the motion, the recommendation for the Code change would be required by the second submittal; however, it would be allowed at the first submittal.

THE CHAIRPERSON CALLED FOR THE QUESTION and the vote was unanimous (12-0) in favor of the motion.

ON MOTION BY Mr. Melchiori, SECONDED BY Mr. Paladin, the Committee voted unanimously (12-0) to move the Traffic methodology pre-application conference before the TRC meeting.

ON MOTION BY Mr. Paladin, SECONDED BY Mr. Mechling, to add one week to the process timetable to allow staff to meet together to discuss and coordinate all comments prior to the TRC Meeting.

UNDER DISCUSSION, it was confirmed the number of days indicated in the timeline on Attachment 1, under pre-application conference, wherein the Code mandated 4 days, and actual staff time was 14 days; adding 7 days (staff's recommendation, with added county staff) would be enough time.

THE CHAIRMAN CALLED FOR THE QUESTION and the vote was unanimous (12-0) in favor of the motion.

Mr. Stephen Melchiori, Alternate Representative asked Mr. Boling what triggered change to the Code and how did a developer prevent relying on outdated or changed Code information. Mr. Melchiori suggested having direction or process for any changes to the standards in the Code, whether it was published online or on the County website, as it would assist developers in ensuring up-to-date changes were known before submitting site plans.

Mr. Boling replied it depended upon whether or not he is referring to a land development regulation change or a change to a technical specification standard such as a Utility Construction Standard. He reminded the Committee communication was a very important tool to utilize.

Chairperson Robinson agreed any new requirements as far as process should be on the County website, as a matter of uploading the information.

Mr. Mechling shared his concept of reinstating the Professional Services Advisory Committee (“PSAC”). He continued when PSAC was in place, should there be notable changes to the Code or technical standards, such as Utilities, it would go before the PSAC, where professional architects, engineers, and developers who were experts in the industry had the opportunity to review what was being considered before it went before the County Commissioners.

Chairperson Robinson suggested to wait and see what this committee could accomplish effectively, efficiently and as an asset to both staff and the County Commission. She reminded the committee of the specific direction for the present time from the Commission was to discuss the process of land development and construction as it related to working with the County and how to make it more effective, efficient and affordable. She suggested beginning a “Wish List” for the committee and placing PSAC as a future discussion topic.

Mr. Burke asserted the actual number of days involved in a given process exceeded a staffing level issue and if the professionals were not aware of what was required on the documents created additional cost, time and effort. He relayed his success in getting building permits in Indian River County for most of his projects under 5 days was largely due to relying on the Florida Building Code to provide everything needed for a project. He continued as long as the plans examiner was made aware of the project’s building design, the process moved quicker.

Mr. Burke mentioned a pilot program offered in Palm Beach County on January 1, 2018 and was expected to run for 4 month to test what 35 architects had been taught how to do a smaller project properly. He opined the same thing should apply to planning and site design and if the professionals were not giving staff what was expected, what was the problem with the applicant and why it was not being done. He stated he did not believe there should need to be multiple submittals because once a project came out of the TRC Meeting, the project’s questions and issues should have been addressed.

Mr. Mechling referred to Staff Suggestions on pages 3-4, Item 4a, and suggested review of the 7 suggestions.

1. Hiring and training additional review staff to address the current basic workload imbalance was already in progress.

Mr. Mechling asked whether Public Works had sufficient staffing levels for the review process. Mr. Boling responded he could not speak to Public Works budget; however, an additional Current Development Planner was budgeted for the Community Development Department. Mr. Szyrka advised from Public Works’ standpoint, there were 2 positions posted for the Land Development Division; however, the work load was so far behind, he was not sure if those 2 positions would be enough to keep up with the review timeframes.

Chairperson Robinson thought it was clear the time constraints were not going to be met overnight; however, the long-term goal was to ensure the process worked and projects were not just waiting for the date to turn in comments, but have adequate time within the process to comment.

2. Expanding staff-level approval authority for certain uses and smaller or more routine types of development project applications now requiring PZC approval (adds 14-28 days to approval).

Chairperson Robinson advised she discussed this item with Mr. Boling wherein he advised if the applicant did not like a staff-level decision, the applicant could appeal to the PZC. She shared her thought staff's suggestion would clear bottlenecks and save time.

Mr. Boling directed the Committee to the last page of the agenda packet, Item 4a, Attachment 6, for a list of examples of uses in the Code currently that had become routine in terms of PZC approval. He continued the same standards in the Code would apply, making no changes to the criteria; however, making the process shorter by 14 to 28 days by providing staff the ability to approve.

Mr. Boling referenced Item 2: Small residential projects that should have staff level approval. He pointed out small conventional residential projects over 3 units had become routine as a consent item on the PZC agenda. He continued allowing staff approval on certain items would save 14-28 days. He suggested Item 2 for further discussion because an idea was tying it to what required a Traffic Study or maybe a certain number of lots (units).

ON MOTION BY Mr. Paladin, SECONDED BY Mr. Mechling to approve routine administrative permit uses currently requiring Planning and Zoning Commission review and approval, such as Miniature Golf Course in CH; Building Material Sales in CG; Outdoor Storage in CH; Veterinary Clinic in CG and CH; Child Care/Adult Care in RM-8, RM-10, PRO, OCR, CN; Nursing Home in MED; Accessory single family dwelling in agricultural and residential districts; Drug store in CN and OCR; and Used Vehicle Sales in CH, should be changed to staff level approval .

UNDER DISCUSSION, Mr. Bruce Redus, District 4 Representative asked whether this only applied directly to a project meeting all the zoning criteria. Mr. Boling answered in the affirmative, adding no changes would be made to the zoning or use criteria.

Chairperson Robinson commented this change was a win-win with regard to the saving of an enormous amount of time preparing and awaiting for a Planning and

Zoning Commission meeting and the project did not lose any time options, the decision could still be appealed through the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Mr. Blum asked for confirmation the uses listed on Attachment 6, should have staff level approval including anything less than 150,000 square feet of commercial use. Mr. Boling confirmed; however, said the uses listed on Attachment 6 were administrative permit uses, which at the current time required Planning and Zoning Commission approval, even if the projects were small.

Mr. Taylor questioned in the list of uses on Attachment 6, were there any limits on sizes of the facility for Adult Care and Nursing Homes that would be approved by staff. Mr. Boling responded in the affirmative, a project of a certain size, larger than 150,000 square feet would require Planning & Zoning Commission approval regardless of the use.

THE CHAIRPERSON CALLED FOR THE QUESTION and the vote was unanimous (12-0) in favor of the motion.

3. Increasing traffic study requirement threshold of 100 daily trips to speed-up the submittal time frames for applicants of small projects and decrease costs for those applicants.

Chairperson Robinson directed the Committee Members to Attachment 6, Item 2 of the Staff Level Approvals, "Small residential projects that should have staff level approval".

Mr. Szpyrka opined the Traffic Study threshold of 100 daily trips appeared small and believed a threshold of 350-400 daily trips would benefit the smaller developments, as well as the smaller "mom and pop" shops, and staff's workload by not requiring a Traffic Study.

Mr. Taylor asked what percentage of the units constructed would be affected by the suggested rule change. Mr. Mechling pointed out the 350-400 trips would be a very small project; possibly a 10-acre tract under RS zoning with maybe 20 homes; 2 units to an acre. Mr. Taylor restated his question to what was the accumulative effect, and would the increased threshold create a problem later.

Mr. Boling remarked the change in the threshold would shift the traffic impact evaluation responsibility to County Traffic Engineering, which would look at where the trips were going, how many trips were generated and how to maintain the level of service. He explained no change would be made to traffic standards or requirements. He also noted if a developer did not like the evaluation by County Traffic Engineering, the developer may then decide to hire his own traffic engineer to evaluate traffic impacts and provide additional data and analysis to County Traffic Engineering.

ON MOTION BY Mr. Paladin, SECONDED BY Mr. Mechling, the Committee voted unanimously (12-0) to increase the Traffic Study threshold for small conventional residential projects (currently 100 daily trips equal 10 single-family units or 15 multi-family units with Planning and Zoning Commission approval) to a Traffic Study threshold of 400 daily trips.

ON MOTION BY Mr. Paladin, SECONDED BY Mr. Mechling, to amend the small residential projects to staff approval, coinciding with the 400 daily trips.

UNDER DISCUSSION, Mr. Bill DeBaal, Deputy County Attorney, asked about what type of notice would be provided to homeowners for staff-level approvals. Mr. McCoy said for conventional projects there would be no notice and currently there was only a posted sign notice for PZC meeting items. He also noted if a property owner was interested in a property, they may request a courtesy notice from Community Development.

Mr. Taylor expressed concern about the 3 units with a very low threshold up to 40 units with 400 trips, saying it was a big jump. The Committee's consensus was staff recommended the increase and was confident the increase was manageable and the developer saved time (staff too) and money.

Chairperson Robinson reminded everyone to recognize the end user was the person the developers were trying to get into a home and every step added to the process increased the cost, whether it was in delays due to having the financing ticket going or whether it was unnecessary burdens. She continued, the end result was attempting to provide affordable housing in this community, for everyone.

THE CHAIRPERSON CALLED FOR THE QUESTION and the vote was unanimously (12-0) in favor of the Motion.

4. Allowing the option of phone conference traffic methodology meetings to provide convenience and perhaps reduce timeframes for scheduling such meetings.

Mr. Boling advised the Code currently and specifically required the applicant to attend a meeting.

Mr. Szpyrka said approximately 70 to 85 percent of the meetings could be conducted by phone conference; as it was generally the reviewers preference.

Mr. Taylor asked if the County had video conference capability and if not, was it something to consider in the future?

Mr. Szpyrka expressed his opinion with the technical issues involved and ensuring parties were working from the exact same plans, it was necessary to review the plans in person in many cases and the Public Works Director should approve use of a telephone conference.

ON MOTION BY Mr. Paladin, SECONDED BY Mr. Taylor, the Committee voted unanimously (12-0) to approve the option of telephone conference traffic methodology meetings to provide convenience and perhaps reduce timeframes for scheduling such meetings, if approved by the Public Works Director.

6. Improving communication in response comments to quickly guide reviewers to plan revisions that address staff comments; and

7. Providing input to staff on how to make staff comments more useful to applicants.

It was the consensus of staff and the committee, any comments and/or additional details provided to staff and developer would save time and prevent misinterpretation between the parties.

Chairperson Robinson suggested in effort to working together with County Staff, having the issues separated by what was codified/required and what County staff would like to suggest. She continued by having the issues specifically separated with the Code reference, made the reference easier to explain and understand.

Mr. Boling suggested three categories of separation: Code Required; Advisory Comments, and Recommendations.

Mr. Melchiori suggested County staff submit the letter to the developer as a Word document to provide ease with cutting and pasting responses.

ON MOTION BY Mr. Paladin, SECONDED BY Mr. Taylor, the Committee voted unanimously (12-0) to approve staff's recommendation for improving communication in response to comments, to quickly guide reviewers to plan revisions addressing staff comments; and providing input to staff on how to make staff comments more useful to applicants.

Mr. Jesse Roland, Utilities Plans Reviewer asked what did the professionals expect from utilities comments. He said the majority of the time water and sewer was not shown on the plans; however, it may be helpful to have utilities locations, if available, at the pre-application meeting.

b) Determination of December 14, 2017 Meeting Topic(s) – Action Required

The Committee members agreed to begin the meetings at 9:00 a.m., beginning with Thursday, December 14, 2017.

Mr. Boling suggested for the December 14th meeting follow-up details (such as draft Code changes) for motions made at this meeting as well as discussion of submittal requirements, communication items, and a discussion on final plats.

Mr. Taylor voiced his interest in a future topic for discussing automation; specifically a survey of what type of appropriate technology and level of automation was accessible to staff to assist in reducing timelines through the introduction of software or change in the work process.

Mr. Mechling mentioned discussing zoning concept changes to re-identify RS-6, RS-3 zoning standards.

Chairperson Robinson shared her interest in reviewing the current process for duplication and/or necessity. She suggested Committee members email the Recording Secretary a list of specific focus areas of interest for a clear path of direction in future meetings.

Other Business

a) Discussion item: Timing of Fire Prevention Review Fee Payment

Mr. Paladin explained the Fire Prevention review fee was required to be paid in total, upfront. He would like to follow the same fee payment requirement/schedule as the building permit fee; half upfront when an application was submitted, and the remaining half due upon receiving the building permit.

ON MOTION BY Mr. Paladin, SECONDED BY Mr. Mechling, to move forward with changing the County Ordinance to reflect the Fire Prevention Review Fee payment requirement/schedule to reflect payment of half of the total fees due when application was made, with the remaining half of the total fee due upon issuance of the building permit.

UNDER DISCUSSION, Mr. Scott McAdams, Building Official, relayed the building permit fees was not half due upfront, half later. He stated the permit application fee was \$200.00, which included unlimited review, with the permit review fee due upon completion. Mr. John Duran, Fire Marshall said Fire Prevention would not review the plans until the review fee was paid upfront to cover staff time.

Mr. Jason Brown, County Administrator, explained the upfront cost was recognition of some plans not going forward after staff time had been spent reviewing plans. He told the Committee the requirement was via County Resolution versus County Ordinance, making the payment timing easier to change, without the scheduling of public hearings; however, a change would require going before the Board of County Commissioners.

Mr. Paladin restated his motion.

ON MOTION BY Mr. Paladin, SECONDED BY Mr. Mechling, to move forward with changing the payment schedule for the Fire Prevention Review Fee and broken down to reflect payment of half of the fee due when application was made, with the remaining half of the fee due upon issuance of a building permit.

THE CHAIRPERSON CALLED FOR THE QUESTION and the vote was unanimous (12-0) in favor of the motion.

Announcement of Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Development Review and Permit Process Advisory Committee is scheduled for **Thursday, December 14, 2017, at 9:00 a.m.**, in the Administrative Complex, Building B, First Floor, Conference Room B1-501, 1800 27th Street, Vero Beach, Florida.

Adjournment

There being no further business, Chairperson Robinson adjourned the meeting at 12:17 p.m.