

17. The Florida Supreme Court in *DeGroot* 95 So. 2d 912, 916 described “competent substantial evidence” as follows:

We have used the term ‘competent substantial evidence’ advisedly. Substantial evidence has been described as such evidence as will establish a substantial basis of fact from which the fact at issue can be reasonably inferred. We have stated it to be such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind would accept as adequate to support a conclusion. *Becker v. Merrill*, 155 Fla. 379, 20 So.2d 912; *Laney v. Board of Public Instruction*, 153 Fla. 728, 15 So.2d 748. In employing the adjective ‘competent’ to modify the word ‘substantial,’ we are aware of the familiar rule that in administrative proceedings the formalities in the introduction of testimony common to the courts of justice are not strictly employed. *Jenkins v. Curry*, 154 Fla. 617, 18 So.2d 521. We are of the view, however, that the evidence relied upon to sustain the ultimate finding should be sufficiently relevant and material that a reasonable mind would accept it as adequate to support the conclusion reached. To this extent the ‘substantial’ evidence should also be ‘competent.’ Schwartz, *American Administrative Law*, p. 88; *The Substantial Evidence Rule* by Malcolm Parsons, *Fla. Law Review*, Vol. IV, No. 4, p. 481; *United States Casualty Company v. Maryland Casualty Company*, Fla.1951, 55 So.2d 741; *Consolidated Edison Co. of New York v. National Labor Relations Board*, 305 U.S. 197, 59 S.Ct. 206, 83 L.Ed. 126.

18. Given the foregoing examples of incomplete studies and/or those not yet performed, all of which which were necessarily required prior to approval of the Application, as well as there being clear indication that future study remains necessary, it cannot be said that there is competent substantial evidence supportive of the decision to approve the Application.
19. Given the foregoing findings that procedural due process regarding notice was not accorded to Petitioners, that the essential requirements of applicable law were not observed, and that the quasi-judicial judgment to approve the Application was not supported by competent, substantial, evidence, it is, therefore

ORDERED and ADJUDGED that the Petition for Writ of Certiorari is GRANTED and the approval of the Application to which it is directed is