

CITY OF ST. AUGUSTINE

Planning and Zoning Board Regular Meeting November 5, 2024

The Planning and Zoning Board met in formal session Tuesday, November 5, 2024, at 1:00 p.m. in the Alcazar Room at City Hall. The meeting was called to order by Christina Tucker, Chairperson and the following were present:

1. Roll Call: Christina Tucker, Chairperson
Charles Pappas
Carl Blow
Matthew Shaffer
Susan Johns

Absent Mike Davis (Excused)
Ashleigh Barnes, Vice- Chairperson (Excused)

City Staff: Amy Skinner, Director, Planning & Building Department
Jacob Fredriksson, Planning & Building Planner
Sarah Daugherty, Senior Planner
Isabelle Lopez, City Attorney
Michele Fudo, Recording Secretary

2. General Public hearings for Items Not on the Agenda

None

3. Approval of Minutes

MOTION

Mr. Shaffer MOVED to APPROVE the October 1, 2024 minutes as presented. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Johns. The MOTION PASSED by UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

4. Modification and Approval of Agenda

Item 5.b had requested a continuance to the December 3, 2024 PZB Meeting.

Item 8.c. requested to be moved later in the agenda after item 8.d.

MOTION

Ms. Tucker MOVED to APPROVE the Agenda with the following modifications: Item 5.b would be continued to the December 3 regular meeting and item 8.c would be heard after item 8.d. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Blow and PASSED by UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE.

5. Variance

5. (a) PZB2024- 0071 – Chad Ruziskey c/o All Angles Construction– Applicant Thomas McKnew– Owner 2 Luwanna Circle

To approve a variance request to reduce the side yard setback requirement to allow for the construction of additional habitable space.

Mr. Fredriksson read the staff report and said based on a review of Sec. 28-29 staff finds that the Board may APPROVE, CONTINUE, or DENY the variance request to reduce the

minimum side yard setback at 2 Luwanna Circle / PID 221470-0060

Chad Ruziskey reviewed the application.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

11 certified notices were sent, 2 were returned in favor, 0 were returned opposed and 0 had comments.

Public hearing was opened.

Katherine Burtin asked how close the proposed structure would be to the property line, and after viewing the site plan, she had no objection.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Proposed addition used the same footprint
- For the record, there was no issue with this application; however, there were times when there could be because of the change from an accessory structure to a living space
- Reasonable space between the neighboring property
- Neighbors did not have an issue with this application

Mr. Blow had visited the site and asked about the appearance of a second story already in place.

Mr. Ruziskey said that the timing of the demolition and the delivery of the supplies allowed the framers to start work prior to the permit being issued. He said he would need to file for an after the fact review.

MOTION

Mr. Pappas MOVED to APPROVE application PZB2024-0071 for the ten- and

one-half foot set back. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Shaffer.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Pappas, Shaffer, Johns, Blow, Tucker

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. (b) PZB2024- 0079 – Edward Bowman– Applicant & Owner **21 Miruela Avenue**

To approve a variance request to reduce the side yard setback requirement.

This item was continued to the December 3, 2024 PZB meeting. See item 4.

5. (c) PZB2024- 0080 – John Reynolds c/o JHR Consultants, Inc– Applicant **Jacqueline Petty– Owner** **7 Beacon Street**

To approve a variance request to reduce the side yard setback requirement and increase the maximum lot coverage.

Mr. Fredriksson read the staff report and said based on a review of Sec. 28-29 staff finds that the Board may APPROVE, CONTINUE, or DENY the variance request to reduce the minimum side yard setback at 7 Beacon Street / PID 151070-0000

John Reynolds reviewed the application.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

18 certified notices were sent, 2 were returned in favor, 0 were returned opposed and 0 had comments.

Public hearing was opened; however, there was no response.

The Board discussed:

- No objections from neighbors
- Met the four criteria

- Consistent with what had been approved in the past
- The addition did not extend any further into the setback
- Letters from the adjacent property owners were helpful
- Reasonable request that was in line with the city goal of allowing residents to expand and modernize to maintain residency
- There would be a mobility fee with this application

MOTION

Mr. Pappas MOVED to APPROVE application PZB2024-0080 request to reduce the side yard setback and increase the maximum lot coverage. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Shaffer.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Pappas, Shaffer, Johns, Blow, Tucker

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

**5. (d) PZB2024- 0082 – Stephen Bradshaw
c/o Honey Tree Properties– Applicant
Jim & Deborah Craggs– Owner
402 Old Quarry Road**

To approve a variance request to reduce the side yard setback requirement, increase the maximum lot coverage and increase the guest house square footage limitation.

Mr. Fredriksson read the staff report and said based on a review of Sec. 28-29 staff finds that the Board may APPROVE, CONTINUE, or DENY the variance requests to reduce the minimum side yard setback, increase lot coverage, and exceed the maximum size of a guest house at 402 Old Quarry Road / PID 164420-0010

Steve Bradshaw reviewed the application.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

10 certified notices were sent, 0 were returned in favor, 0 were returned opposed and 0 had comments.

Public hearing was opened.

Traci Evling spoke in favor of the new structure.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- The existing garage would be demolished
- The structure could not be moved because of the placement of the septic system
- Jim Craig was sworn in for the record to answer questions regarding the septic system
- Confirmed that there would be living space above the proposed garage
- Wanted to maintain the same footprint
- It would be difficult to access the second floor from the outside with only three and half feet
- Drainage could be significant from the second floor
- There was an eight-foot wall on the property that maintained privacy
- Aesthetically nicer but needed to be mindful of the code allowances
- Needed to compromise on the asks in the application
- Lot coverage okay
- Current structure was not over 500 sq ft.
- Needed more information to include a survey for trees and septic
- No impervious calculations provided
- Felt that there was justification for the variance request for the set back
- Would like to see a modified request for the increased square footage for the guest house

Ms. Tucker advised the applicant what would need to be provided and asked if a continuance would be acceptable.

MOTION

Mr. Blow MOVED to CONTINUE application PZB2024-0082 to the December 3, 2024 meeting of the PZB. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Tucker.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Blow, Tucker, Johns, Shaffer, Pappas

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. Variance and Conservation Overlay Zone Development

6. (a) PZB2024-0077 – Chad Ruziskey c/o All Angles Construction – Applicant Gregory Leo Sr. – Owner 30 Davis Street

To approve a variance request to the required side and rear yard setbacks and to approve the removal of trees within Conservation Overlay Zones 2 & 3.

Mr. Fredriksson read the staff report and said Review of Section 11-29 is the responsibility of the Planning and Zoning Board for the proposed development within Conservation Overlay Zones 2 and 3 at Davis Street PID / 119921-0001. Based on a review of Sec. 28-29 staff finds that the Board may APPROVE, CONTINUE, or DENY the variance request to reduce the minimum rear yard setback at 30 Davis Street / PID 119921-0001.

Chad Ruziskey reviewed the application and presented an arborist report for the board to review.

Ms. Lopez clarified the request for the change in the setback from 10 to 7 feet.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

12 certified notices were sent, 0 were returned in favor, 0 were returned opposed and 0 had comments.

Public hearing was opened.

BJ Kalaidi was concerned about the removal of trees that may have an effect on the canopy in the west city.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- This lot was difficult to develop any other way than was proposed
- The trees noted for removal were within the footprint of the proposed structure
- Accepted the arborist report regarding the removal of trees
- Supported the request
- Confirmed that the lots had been replatted in the recent past
- The owner had split one lot into 2 separate lots
- Preserving the large live oak was justification for the request
- Reviewed the health of the trees listed on the arborist report that were to be removed

MOTION

Mr. Blow MOVED to APPROVE application PZB2024-0077 for the tree removal and the modification to the rear setback to seven feet off the property line. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Shaffer

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Blow, Shaffer, Johns, Tucker

NAYES: Pappas

MOTION CARRIED 4/1

7. Use by Exception

7. (a) PZB2024-0084 – Olga Holly c/o Moultrie Montessori School – Applicant Jeannie Biskirk – Owner

37 S. Dixie Highway / PID 123950-0000 & 123960-0000 and 27 Spencer Street / PID 123940-0000

To approve a use by exception for a Montessori school.

Mr. Fredriksson read the staff report and said based on a review of Sec. 28-29 staff finds that the Board may APPROVE, APPROVE with conditions, CONTINUE, or DENY a school use by exception at 37 S. Dixie Highway and 27 Spencer Street / PID 123950-0000, 123960-0000, & 123940-0000.

Olga Holly reviewed the application and asked if the application was approved, would she be able to use a different name.

Ms. Lopez advised that the name would be what was on the application. She said that if there was a change in ownership, than the Use by Exception would have to change to accomadate the new owner/operator.

A discussion followed to determine what special conditions had been in place for the school under the previous use by exception, and to clarify the application request to use the name of the applicant as the Montessori School name.

Mr. Fredriksson advised that the use by exception request was generated because of the change in operator.

Ex Parte Communication: none

20 certified notices were sent, 0 were returned in favor, 0 were returned opposed and 0 had comments.

Public hearing was opened.

Jeannie Biskirk spoke to the comment regarding the special conditions that had been mentioned in the previous discussion.

BJ Kalaidi addressed dropping off and picking up students. She asked if it would still be a Montessori School. She also noted that

it would be very close to Back 40 Urban Cafe which might sell alcohol.

Public hearing was closed.

Ms. Holley confirmed that the school was Montessori and would have two classrooms. She said the number of students would not change.

Mr. Fredriksson said that the Back 40 Urban Cafe would not be an issue

The Board discussed:

The Board determined that there were no code enforcement issues found, thus creating consensus with the Board for approval.

MOTION

Ms. Tucker MOVED to APPROVE application PZB2024-0084 to approve a use by exception for a Montessori School. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Blow

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Tucker, Blow, Johns, Shaffer, Pappas

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. Conservation Zone Development

8. (a) PZB2024-0061 – Ryan Carter c/o Carter Environmental Services – Applicant

William Wolkoff – Owner

186 Pelican Reef Drive / PID 158573-0130

Continued from the October 1 2024 Meeting

To approve a request to construct a bulkhead and dock within Conservation Overlay Zones 1 & 2.

Ms. Daugherty read the staff report and said review of Section 11-29 is the responsibility of the Planning and Zoning Board for the

proposed development within Conservation Overlay Zone 1 and 2. This application is for the construction of a bulkhead single-family home and the removal of significant trees at 186 Pelican Reef Drive / PID 158573-0130.

Because the application is inconsistent with requirements of Chapter 25, staff recommends CONTINUATION for additional information or RECONSIDERATION or DENIAL of the application.

Ryan Carter reviewed the application.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

Public hearing was opened; however, there was no response.

The Board discussed:

- After the fact requests were not preferred
- A flood plain permit was issued on May 14, 2024
- Fill was placed on the property in September

Amy Skinner explained the process of the flood plain permit and how it did not allow for tree removal.

- Concerned with the pool's proximity to the wetland line
- The application was for the construction of a bulkhead and a dock

For clarification, Mr. Carter explained to the Board the processes that had been enacted on this property prior to this meeting to discuss the construction of a dock and bulkhead.

- No issue with the changes for the dock
- Any action for the tree removal that had not been approved would have to go through Code Enforcement
- PZB code would have to be applied
- The grade level was low in the Pelican Reef area

- When fill was added, trees would have to be removed
- Needed clarification for the correct drainage plan for the site. There were two in the packet
- There was a wall already existing on the adjacent parcel.
- Storm drain with backflow into the wetlands was in the approved flood plain permit
- The landscape plan met the mitigation requirements
- Suggested a continuance to allow for clarity in the reports provided for review by the Board

Mr. Shaffer said that the case had not been made for the trees to be removed from the property; however, there were no trees to look at, unless there was an old survey that had that information on it.

Ms. Lopez advised that regardless, the fill would have to come onto the property to get to the finished floor height and that would likely destroy any trees that were within the fill.

Mr. Pappas said a good faith effort would be to replace the trees that had been removed.

MOTION

Mr. Blow MOVED to CONTINUE application PZB2024-0061 to the December 3, 2024 meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Tucker.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Blow, Tucker, Johns, Shaffer, Pappas

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. (b) PZB2024-0081 – Ryan Carter c/o Carter Environmental Services – Applicant
35 Mulberry LLC – Owner
35 Mulberry Street

To approve a request to construct a dock within Conservation Overlay Zones 1 & 2.

Ms. Daugherty read the staff report and said review of Section 11-29 is the responsibility of the Planning and Zoning Board for the proposed development within Conservation Overlay Zone 1 & 2. This application is for the construction of a dock at 35 Mulberry Street / PID 195790-0000.

Ryan Carter reviewed the application.

Ex Parte Communication: none

21 certified notices were sent, 0 were returned in favor, 2 were returned opposed and 2 had comments.

Public hearing was opened; however, there was no response.

The Board discussed:

- The proposed changes would not impede navigation on the waterway
- There was already an encroachment on riparian rights that belong to the city

Ms. Lopez told the Board that the decision had been made to come to the PZB first to determine if the seventeen criteria had been met and any issues regarding the riparian rights would come later. The motion would be conditioned on the city commission not having an objection with the addition coming further into the riparian lane.

- Regarding the criteria scenic view shed no issues
- If the Board were to approve the application it would have to go before the city commission
- Unless staff was directing the board to not look at #2 of the criteria, felt that it would be relevant
- Was there another way to accomplish the goals of the applicant
- Agreed that it was not a good idea to build on a mistake

- Equitable apportionment related to riparian rights would require more research
- The boat lift was already in place and appeared to have met the seventeen criteria
- Mr. Carter requested a continuance

MOTION

Mr. Pappas MOVED to CONTINUE application PZB2024-0081 35 Mulberry Street to the December 3, 2024 meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Tucker.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Pappas, Tucker, Johns, Shaffer, Blow

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. (c) PZB2024-0085 – Kevin Marks c/o Shoreland Home Builders– Applicant Mark & Janice Matrazzo – Owner 171 Inlet Drive

To approve the construction of a retaining wall within Conservation Overlay Zones 2 & 3.

Ms. Daugherty read the staff report and said review of Section 11-29 is the responsibility of the Planning and Zoning Board for the proposed development within Conservation Overlay Zones 2 and 3. This application is for the construction of a retaining wall and associated fill at 171 Inlet Drive / PID 213920-0070.

Kevin Marks reviewed the application.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

9 certified notices were sent, 1 were returned in favor, 0 were returned opposed and 1 had comments.

Public hearing was opened.

Dan Burkhardt asked how the building height was determined.

Ms. Daugherty explained that the building height was measured from the free board requirement, which was one foot above the base flood elevation and the highest point on the roof.

BJ Kalaidi asked for the comparison in the heights of the fill on the adjacent property to this application.

Public hearing was closed.

The Board discussed:

- Proposed structure was at a finished floor height of fifteen feet on a stem wall
- The dirt around the house would be twelve feet and would taper down to the stem walls, out to the street which would be nine feet and then down to eight feet from the driveway
- The house was under the limits for the maximum buildable height
- Different style of construction; auger cast concrete pilings
- The foundation was a system of pilings
- Proposed retaining wall would accommodate the fill
- The drainage easement between the lots was helpful
- The proposed stem wall construction was good; however, there was a significant amount of fill compared to the neighbors
- The twelve foot retaining wall would provide protection from storm surge
- Needed to know what an acceptable finished floor level would be
- The survey showed a proposed wall on the east side that appeared to be on the property line
- West side wall potentially would run the length of the property
- Utilize the space between the properties as a swale for drainage on the east side of the property
- There was an existing wall on the right
- With the proposed wall in place, there would be a gap between the two properties
- That gap would extend from the water to the street and would potentially be unattractive
- The space between the proposed structure and the wall would be green space
- Most of the seawalls have been raised to a height of eight to eight- and one-half feet
- It was not always necessary to fill to the height of the seawall
- The retaining wall stops at the seawall
- Current seawall was easily breached in the last storm event
- Decision to have the property raised to fifteen feet was an engineering process
- The process by which the elevations were determined was to use the NOAA Surface, Ocean, Lake, Wave Action Model
- Thought that the height was too much compared to the current grade on the property
- LIDAR information was presented for the Board to review
- Advised the applicant that a better site plan showing the walls and the proposed elevations as well as the additional information Mr. Blow had requested
- Finished floor elevations needed to be determined
- Wanted to see finished floor for this application between ten and eleven feet to allow for the grade to be brought down lower

Mark Matrazzo was sworn in for the record and said he wanted to work with the board to determine what would be an acceptable height for the finished floor as well as the retaining walls and the grade.

Mr. Marks asked for guidance regarding the elevations for grade to be ready for the December meeting.

MOTION

Mr. Shaffer MOVED to CONTINUE Conservation Overlay Zone Development PZB2024-0085 at 171 Inlet Drive to the December 3, 2024 meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Blow

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Shaffer, Blow, Johns, Tucker

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. (d) PZB2024-0087 – Tom Bartlett c/o Matthews | DCCM – Applicant Agan Prameshuber – Owner 173 Inlet Drive

To approve the construction of a retaining wall within Conservation Overlay Zones 2 & 3.

Ms. Daugherty read the staff report and said review of Section 11-29 is the responsibility of the Planning and Zoning Board for the proposed development within Conservation Overlay Zone 2 and 3. This application is for the construction of a retaining wall and associated fill at 173 Inlet Drive / PID 213831-0010.

Tom Bartlett reviewed the application.

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

10 certified notices were sent, 1 was returned in favor, 0 were returned opposed and 0 had comments.

Public hearing was opened; however, there was no response.

The Board discussed

- Proposal was contrary to runoff or water flow according to the staff report
- Fill level was inconsistent
- Proposed fill height was thirteen feet and was four feet over the required height
- Other properties had tow walls up to eight feet

- For the property to be safely developed, it would have to be at the proposed height
- The code referred to the natural flow for the neighborhood, not just hurricane storm surge
- Each application was being reviewed on an individual basis
- Did not appear the best way to build on the shoreline
- Needed clarification of what exactly the flood plain height
- The city required that new construction be one foot above FEMA height
- Proposed construction was helical piles with a slab
- Retaining walls were necessary because of the fill
- Property to the east had a wall at twelve feet high
- Felt that the fill height could have a negative effect on the neighboring properties
- The ranking system was an attempt to help the Board to balance the impact in overlay zones, the least impactful would be to build the house on piers or piles
- The landscape plan was presented
- Tucker

Ms. Skinner advised that the building official and the flood plan coordinator had reviewed the Lidar data and had determined that based on the proposed application it would be about eight feet higher than the adjacent property. She said that the objective was to create a plan regarding retaining walls and building on the upland portion of these properties.

- Felt that this was adding a significant amount of fill and was out of character for the area
- This project would interrupt drainage patterns
- The house should use piers or piles as a construction method
- Thirteen feet was excessive
- Finished floor elevation at thirteen feet was not objectionable

- The fill had to be managed at a lower level
- Scale and impact on neighboring properties had to be taken into consideration
- Would the valuation of a home that was next to a house that is constructed at a higher level be affected
- Would it devalue the house at the lower level
- Could have the potential to negatively impact the value
- Easement on the west side of the lot was at five feet
- There was a catch basin on the front in the street
- Needed to take into consideration the age of the existing infrastructure

MOTION

Ms. Tucker MOVED to CONTINUE application PZB2024-0087 at 173 Inlet to the December 3, 2024 meeting. The motion was SECONDED by Mr. Pappas.

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Tucker, Pappas, Johns, Shaffer, Blow

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY¹

8. (e) PZB2024-0086 – Brad Beach c/o New Day Design Company, LLC – Applicant Daniel and Barbara Burkhardt – Owner 189 Inlet Drive / PID 213780-0000 and 191 Inlet Drive / PID 213770-0000

To approve the removal of a significant tree, modify the existing bulkhead and construct a single-family home within Conservation Overlay Zones 1, 2 & 3.

Ms. Daugherty read the staff report and said review of Section 11-29 is the responsibility of the Planning and Zoning Board for the proposed development within Conservation Overlay Zone 1 and 2. This application is for

the removal of one significant tree, to modify the existing bulkhead, and construct a single-family home within Conservation Overlay Zone 1, 2 and 3 at 189 and 191 Inlet Drive / PID 213770-0000 and PID 213780-0000.

Brad Beach and Matt Laude reviewed the application

The Board presented their Ex Parte Communication.

8 certified notices were sent, 0 were returned in favor, 1 was returned opposed and 1 had comments.

Public hearing was opened; however, there was no response.

The Board discussed:

- A landscape plan was presented
- Tree credits had been mitigated
- Drainage plan looked good
- Storm water would be retained on site
- The grading was back down to natural grades
- Bulkhead would be no higher than seven-and one-half feet.
- Wall would turn back on to the property
- The swale would address the flooding issue
- The house would be built on stem wall, which would help
- The exposed bars would be repaired, and the extension would be built down into the existing wall
- The height of the bulkhead was driven by the bulkhead on the adjacent property

MOTION

Mr. Shaffer MOVED to APPROVE application PZB2024-0086 Conservation Overlay Zone Development at 189 and 191 Inlet Drive. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Tucker.

¹ Break 4:28 – 4:48 pm, Mr. Pappas left the meeting

VOTE ON MOTION:

AYES: Shaffer, Tucker, Johns, Blow

NAYES: NONE

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. Rezoning

9. (a) PZB2024-0066- James G. Whitehouse, Esq. c/o St. Johns Law Group – Applicant

St. Augustine Marine Center Partners, LLC – Owner

404 Iberia Street

Second Hearing from the October 1, 2024 Regular Meeting

To rezone approximately 30.15 acres of property from Industrial and Warehousing: IW to the San Sebastian River – St. Augustine Marine Center Planned Unit Development: PUD

Mr. Fredriksson read the staff report and said the Board is tasked with making a recommendation to the city commission which shall show that the Board has studied and considered:

- 1) No adverse effect finding:
 - a) The proposed PUD does not adversely affect the orderly development of the city, the health and safety of residents in the area, the natural environment, the use and development of adjacent properties or the general neighborhood.
- 2) Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and PUD regulations finding:
 - a) The proposed PUD is consistent with the comprehensive plan and meets the intent and criteria of section 28-286 through 28-292, as applicable.
- 3) Need and justification finding:
 - a) In order to permit the use of more flexible land use regulations and the most advantageous techniques of land development, the PUD must affirmatively comply with each applicable PUD regulation found in this section and clearly identify the need and justification for rezoning to

PUD. The objective of a PUD is to encourage ingenuity, imagination and design efforts on the part of builders, architects, site planners and developers to produce residential, commercial, industrial or institutional developments, or combinations thereof, that effectively integrate existing historic and neighborhood patterns, or effectively transition between adjacent development uses.

Given the scale and complicated nature of PUDs, the PZB shall require review of a planned unit development final development plan, and narrative requirements with at least two (2) public hearing(s) in an effort to garner as much information and public input as possible, as well as, to finalize any recommendations to the city commission.

James Whitehouse reviewed the application.

Ms. Lopez asked for a clear definition of clubhouse, as well as an explanation of whether there would be restaurants or hotels/special event venues on the site.

Mr. Whitehouse said that those items were excluded as an allowable use for the site.

Ex Parte Communication: none

17 certified notices were sent, 0 were returned in favor, 0 were returned opposed and 0 had comments.

Public hearing was opened; however, there was no response.

The Board discussed:

- Wanted to confirm that the language “but not limited to” would be stricken from the text regarding hotels, etc.

A brief discussion followed to shape the language to include in the PUD text regarding allowable uses in the PUD. There was consensus with the Board to make a recommendation to the city commission.

MOTION

Ms. Tucker MOVED to RECOMMEND application PZB2024-0066 to the City Commission for APPROVAL as it did not adversely affect the development of the city or the health and safety of the residents in the area and was consistent with the comprehensive plan. The motion was SECONDED by Ms. Johns.

VOTE ON MOTION

AYES: Tucker, Johns, Shaffer, Blow

NAYES:

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

10. Other Business

10. (a) Information and discussion related to the update of the 2014 Vision Plan.

Amy Skinner gave an update to the Board for the 2014 Vision Plan and advised the Board that demographic information had been provided and the meetings and surveys had been received well by the public. She said there was one more meeting for public comment.

10. (b) Reminder of the joint PZB meeting scheduled with the HARB and the CRC for Wednesday, December 11, 2024 at 9:00 am.

11. Adjournment

Having no further business, Ms. Tucker adjourned the meeting at 6:40 P.M.²


Christina Tucker, Chairperson

² Transcribed by Michele Fudo