

## **DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**Tuesday, January 26, 2021**

### **MEETING MINUTES**

The Monroe County Development Review Committee conducted a virtual meeting on **Tuesday, January 26, 2021**, beginning at 1:01 p.m. at the Marathon Government Center, Media & Conference Room (1<sup>st</sup> floor, rear hallway), 2798 Overseas Highway, Marathon, Florida.

**CALL TO ORDER** by Emily Schemper

**ROLL CALL** by Ilze Aguila

#### **DRC MEMBERS PRESENT**

Emily Schemper, Senior Director of Planning and Environmental Resources  
Mike Roberts, Assistant Director, Environmental Resources  
Bradley Stein, Development Review Manager  
Devin Tolpin, Senior Planner  
Rey Ortiz, Assistant Building Official  
Judith Clarke, Engineering Department Representative  
Cassy Cane, Deputy Fire Marshal  
R.L. Colina, Fire Marshal  
Shereen Yee Fong, FDOT Representative  
Justin Stiell, Department of Economic Opportunity

#### **STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT**

Peter Morris, Assistant County Attorney  
Ilze Aguila, Senior Planning Commission Coordinator

#### **APPLICANTS & PUBLIC PRESENT**

Dottie Moses                      Orlando Perez

#### **CHANGES TO THE AGENDA**

There were no changes to the agenda.

#### **MINUTES FOR APPROVAL**

Approval of the meeting minutes for Tuesday, December 15, 2020, by Emily Schemper.

### **MEETING**

**1. RFC INVESTMENT, LLC, 116 OCEAN DRIVE, KEY LARGO, MILE MARKER 100:**  
A PUBLIC MEETING CONCERNING A REQUEST FOR A MINOR CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT. THE REQUESTED APPROVAL IS REQUIRED FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A PROPOSED MINI-STORAGE UNIT FACILITY CONSISTING OF FOUR (4) STORAGE UNITS. THE SUBJECT PROPERTY IS DESCRIBED AS PARCELS OF LAND LOCATED IN SECTION 33, TOWNSHIP 61 SOUTH, RANGE 39 EAST, KEY LARGO, MONROE

COUNTY, FLORIDA, HAVING PARCEL IDENTIFICATION NUMBER 00087600-000100.  
(FILE# 2020-143)

Ms. Emily Schemper noted that this item had been continued from the December meeting, and asked Ms. Tolpin to give a general summary of the proposal and how issues raised last month had been corrected.

Ms. Devin Tolpin, Senior Planner, presented the staff report. The applicant is requesting a minor conditional use permit to operate a light industrial use on the subject property which would allow for development of a mini storage facility consisting of four storage units. This property is in the SC zoning district. The primary reason this item was continued from the December DRC was to allow the applicant to add additional off-street parking spaces. Each of the four units proposed have a bathroom which is not necessarily consistent with the general use of a storage unit. This is why Ms. Schemper had requested that the applicant demonstrate compliance with off-street parking requirements for light industrial uses. The applicant has made the necessary revisions, and Ms. Tolpin presented the revisions to the proposed site plan. The plan included the ten-foot wide parking aisle adjacent to the storage unit doors as required by the Land Development Code for storage units, and five off-street parking spaces as required for industrial uses per Section 114-67. Staff is recommending approval.

Ms. Schemper asked for staff questions or comments. Mr. Rey Ortiz, Assistant Building Official, asked if the applicant had indicated what occupancy rating they would have. Ms. Schemper responded that that had not been provided to Planning. Mr. Ortiz stated that that was fine, but would be reviewed at time of permitting because the occupancy classification will trigger whatever needs to be done further. There were no further comments from the Development Review Committee. Ms. Schemper then asked for public comment.

Ms. Dottie Moses asked if the storage unit was elevated, and Ms. Schemper responded that it was not. Ms. Moses asked if there were only a total of five parking spaces. Ms. Schemper explained that there were four storage units and a small closet-type area. Based on the non-residential square footage of the building there is a parking requirement for industrial uses of two spaces per thousand square feet, which requires five spaces. Ms. Moses asked what had been done different from the prior month. Ms. Schemper further explained that the applicant had added parking. As self-storage units, the parking requirement is different, being one space and a ten-foot aisle. The parking requirement specific to self-storage units is based on the assumption that people are not spending time at the units. By adding a restroom, it implies there may be more time spent there than typical self-storage units. The parking requirement for self-storage units is much less than light industrial which allows for the restrooms. Hence, Ms. Schemper had requested the applicant provide additional parking to have the units approved for a general light-industrial use. It is not approved for commercial retail and if such a use were to go into one of these units, that would become a Code Enforcement issue. Ms. Moses confirmed there would be no outdoor storage, and that the maximum clearance for the sensitive hammock lot had been reached. Ms. Moses also suggested signage on the perimeter of the hammock conservation area to identify it as a conversation easement, as is done in certain areas in Islamorada. Ms. Schemper responded that that would need to be added to the code and is not presently a requirement. Though it may be helpful, it can't be imposed without a code change. Ms. Moses

expressed concern that renters may not be aware of the County code and when people start using these units there may be expansion of the footprint by possibly leaving boat trailers or other items out on the property. Ms. Schemper agreed it would be a good suggestion for the applicant to avoid any code compliance issues in the future to prevent additional clearing, or the applicant could perhaps get a permit for some sort of light fencing to protect the hammock area. Ms. Moses asked whether additional clearing would be allowed if the applicant later got a permit to install a perimeter fence. Ms. Schemper explained that a fence could not be installed in the conservation easement. Mr. Peter Morris, Assistant County Attorney, confirmed that structures are prohibited within a conservation easement area. Typical easements do contain allowances for de minimis signage, and typically contain language allowing for routine and periodic inspection by a County Biologist. There are a multitude of enforcement mechanisms. If there is any damage to a conservation area, at a minimum, the landowner is required to restore the easement to its preexisting hydrologic and natural condition. A fence could not be put within the easement, only on the perimeter just outside of it. Ms. Schemper also clarified that the signage required in the Village of Islamorada is for moderate or high-quality hammock, and not necessarily every conversation easement. If these code changes are something Ms. Moses would like to propose, there are public meetings coming up which would be the venue to make those suggestions.

There was no further public comment. Public comment was closed. There was no comment by the applicant.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The Development Review Committee meeting was adjourned at 1:15 p.m.