

CBIA-CCGM Development Review Meeting
Meeting Notes: 11/20/15

The following discussion areas were brainstormed by the group. The group then discussed each issue for clarification and relativity to the level of work it would require to accomplish.

***Highlighted in blue were deemed easy fixes.**

***Highlighted in red are of medium difficulty in solving.**

***Most difficult and challenging to solve.**

***1. Review times for re-submittals:** It was suggested that a qualitative discussion take place. Re-evaluate current quality control which is in place. Currently, a minor submittal is defined as two departments or less needing to review. Maybe this could be re-evaluated to be more extensive. A meeting at re-submittal was discussed as a potential solution but participants felt this would take too much time away from other pressing work by staff members especially those plans that have repetitive and common insufficiencies. Simon shared that he could develop automatic reports in CityView if given the specific criteria needed. See #5. Below.

***2. Administrative-submittals, copies, package requirements:** Matt will work with staff to determine how many hard copies are actually needed and let us know. Currently 6 copies are needed at the end of the final approval (approval sets). No matter what, there will always be a requirement for hard copies when multiple departments and fire are involved. It was suggested that we reach out to Lee County as they are now requiring only one copy.

***3. Reviewer familiarity, cross training:** training should entail both county staff and individuals who may be new to local firms and require training. Kathy Curatolo (CBIA) and Brent Addison (local Professional Engineers Chapter) will work with Matt to determine training topics, date/location/time and arrange/communicate to members.

***4. Electronic Submittal Process:** Electronic permitting is being phased in throughout 2016. The first phase is building, followed by site/subdivision permitting then zoning. The County will keep us abreast of the timelines for #2 and #3 once the first phase is completed which is anticipated to be in late January.

***5. Skilled Project Liaison:** This issues ties into #1. The suggestion was made that a skilled project liaison could facilitate client throughout the process including review plans upfront to identify insufficiencies at initial submittal.

***6. SDP's/SDPA's Signing and Sealing of Plans:** There is no flexibility as all plans need to be signed and sealed according to statute.

***7. Multiple Application timing (PUD/SDP/Simultaneous Review) Applications timing coordination:** This is a long-term process and classified as difficult.

***8. Re-evaluation of ICP thresholds/modifications.** Consider changing the way we currently classify what is allowed by an insubstantial change and timing. Include in discussion what may not be needed anymore (SF example)

***9. Application forms-ease of use...Example given that some spacing locks, not enough room for what needs to be included.** Develop a small task force among staff and representatives attending this meeting, review application package and recommend improvements and communicate changes through various networks.

***10. Application Thresholds % of random value (SDP's):** The suggestion was made to use a percentage rather than square footage. Matt's team will look into this and report back to the group.

11. Review amendment changes for SDP's and SDPA's: Need to determine what is insubstantial, what is an amendment. This was identified that it would require code changes and may be a difficult, lengthy process.

12. Completeness of Application package –County finding less than comprehensive packages taking away resource time: See #1 as participants determined this concept should be in combination with #1.

***13. Outline of commonly rejected items for new staff members:** Produce a list of common rejections and communicate through various private sector networks including CBIA, local chapter of the Florida Engineering Society.

***14. Training new staff in the private sector:** Kathy Curatolo, Brent Addison and Matt McLean will work on topics/date/time/location and invitations.

***15. Streamline LDC changes:** Limited to amendments beyond land changes because these changes do not have the same rigid statutory requirements. These should be identified by a small group among us and categorized in an amendment cycle. **Review how LDC cycles currently take place.**

***16. Broaden definition of redevelopment and communicate to private sector:** This can only be accomplished through political pressure. What we need to do is create a team to determine the basis and how to best maneuver through the politics to ensure this is accomplished. Tout the significant benefits of the Hearing Examiner." Mark Strain can be helpful.

***17. RAI's quality control review:** This is something that has to be handled on a case-by-case basis generally speaking. The County would welcome help from industry as the quality control process is improved. From industry perspective, it would be helpful to have consistency and specificity in review. If/when possible smaller issues should be communicated to industry representatives to avoid the re-submittal process.