|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
|  | **MINUTES****COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BOARD****NOVEMBER 4, 2020 AT 6:00 P.M.****COUNCIL CHAMBERS** **116 FIRST STREET****NEPTUNE BEACH, FLORIDA 32266** |
|  | Pursuant to proper notice a public hearing of the Community Development Board for the City of Neptune Beach was held on November 4, 2020 at 6:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers. |
|  |  |
| Attendance | Board members were in attendance: Christopher Goodin, Chair Charles Miller, MemberW. Jeremy Randolph, MemberBob Frosio, MemberAaron Evens, MemberJonathan Raitti, Alternate MemberGreg Schwartzenberger, Alternate Member |  |
|  | The following staff members were present:Stefen Wynn, City Manager |
|  |  | Zachary Roth, City AttorneyKristina Wright, Community Development DirectorPiper Turner, Code Compliance Supervisor |
|  |  |
| Call to Order/Roll Call | Chair Goodin called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.  |
|  |  |
| Disclosure of ex-parte communications | Mr. Frosio, Mr. Schwartzenberger, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Miller, Mr. Raiti, Mr. Goodin and Mr. Evens spoke to the applicants for 109 North and 1414 First Street. |
| Minutes | Made by Evens, seconded by Randolph. |
|  |  |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **MOTION:** | **TO APPROVE OCTOBER 14, 2020 MINUTES AS SUBMITTED.**  |
|  |
|

|  |
| --- |
| Roll Call Vote: |
|  Ayes: |  7-Miller, Randolph, Schwartzenberger, Evens, Raitti, Frosio, Goodin |
|

|  |
| --- |
| Noes: |

 |  0 |

 |
|  |
| **MOTION CARRIED** |

 |
|  |  |
| CDB20-06 Application for Replat 1004 and 1006-1008 First Street, (RE# 172840-0000 & 172842-0000) | CDB20-06 Application for Replat as outlined in Chapter 27, Article 3 of the Unified Land Development Code of Neptune Beach. The property is currently known as for 1004 and 1006-1008 First Street, (RE# 172840-0000 & 172842-0000). The subject property is located on the west side of First Street between Bay and Magnolia in the R-4 zoning district. The applicants are requesting to demolish the existing buildings and replat the properties into two conforming lots. The request is to remove 19 feet from the parcel know as 1006 First (RE#172842-0000) and added it to the parcel 1004 First (RE#172840-0000). The granting of the replat would not create any additional lots. |
|  | Kristina Wright, Community Development Director, stated that the applicants are requesting to modify the lot lines of the subject properties to make the 1004 1st Street lot 62 feet wide (from north to south) by removing approximately 19 feet of width from 1006 1st Street and adding such width to 1004 1st Street. This would make 1006 1st Street 110 feet deep and 1004 1st Street 62 feet wide by 100 feet deep. The requested change will not create any additional lots and therefore the request is not prohibited by the Temporary Moratorium set forth in Section 27-110. Applicants will demolish the buildings with the addresses of 1004 1st Street and 1006 1st Street as a condition of the modification to the lot lines.Staff recommends approval of application CDB20-06 for 1004 and 1006 First Street subject to the demolition and removal of the existing structures at 1004 1st Street and 1006 1st Street |
|  | Mr. Ian McKillop, co-owner of the property, the plan is to take 19 feet from 1006 First Street which is a very large lot that is 129 feet wide. The 19 feet will be added to 1004 First Street making it 62 feet wide which is currently 43 feet wide. The existing structures will be demolished to build new homes for our families. The current structures are not compliant with the current codes. They were built a very long time ago and 1004 was built way back on the property. 1006 is all the way to the front of the lot. The new building, of course, will have to meet the current setbacks and the minimum requirements. We think that’s going to be a new benefit to the area. Taking three properties down to 2. We understand that the moratorium is in place right now, as far as splitting lot. That’s not what we’re doing there, this is more of distribution of land.  |
|  |  |
|  | Chairperson Goodin opened the floor for public comments. There being no comments, the public hearing was closed.  |
|  |  |
|  | Made by Evens, seconded by Miller.  |
|  |  |  |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **MOTION:** | **TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO CITY COUNCIL FOR CDB20-06 SUBJECT TO THE DEMOLITION AND REMOVAL OF THE EXISTING STRUCTURES AT 1004 FIRST STREET AND 1006-1008 FIRST STREET.**  |
|  |
| Roll Call Vote: |
| Ayes: | 7-Miller, Randolph, Evens , Raitti, Frosio, Schwartzenberger, Goodin |
| Noes: | 0 |
|  |
| **MOTION APPROVED.**  |
|  |

 |
|  | The applicants were informed this would be forwarded to City Council. The next Council meeting would be on December 7, 2020 at 6:00 pm and the applicant should attend that meeting. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| V20-05 Application for varianceMelinda Monti 109 North Street | V20-05 Application for variance as outlined in Chapter 27, Article 8 of the Unified Land Development Code of Neptune Beach for Melinda Monti for the property known as 109 North Street (RE#173131-0000). The request is to vary section Table-27-229-1 for the front and east side yard and increase the floor area ratio and lot coverage to rebuild a single-family house with a 2nd story deck. Variance was previously granted to expand the non-conforming structure and add on in with the same footprint and setbacks as being requested.  |
|  | Kristina Wright, Community Development Director, stated : On July 8, 2020 the Board voted to approved with conditions variance application V20-03 for 109 North Street subject to the following: **Projection of the balcony four feet into the front yard and projections no greater than 4.3 feet on the west side and up to 12 feet maximum on the east side to the best maintain consistency with the intent of the code and to preserve the oceanfront views of all residents as best as possible.** Staff received a call indicating that the house was complete gone. Staffed contacted the applicant and the contractor. The contractor indicated that he had spoken with the Building Department and had received what he thought was the necessary approvals to proceed. A remodel permit with a valuations of $625,000 was issued on 9/15/2020.New variance request to remedy structural removal following the initial variance approval: The original approval was based on the renovation of an existing 1937 structure with nonconforming side setbacks and to allow for a projection into the front yard setback for a balcony that would exceed the additional 4 foot allowance by code. The applicant is still requesting to add the second story deck that will project into the front yard by an additional .3 feet beyond the 4 feet allowed on the west side . They are also seeking to reconstruct the original house so that they could enclose what was once the carport and east side upper porch, rear upper and lower porches to create additional habitable space. Staff recommends approval of variance application V20-05 with the same conditions as the original variance approval. Staff also recommends for the remodel permit application to be reclassified as new construction.  |
|  |  |
|  | Mr. Rusty Fisette, contractor, addressed the board. On September 19th they had completed the demolition phase of construction and uncovered an unsafe foundation and footers. The intent was to tie into the original foundation and pour a new monolithic slab over the original slab. This would have been unsafe. The west exterior wall of the house was designed to remain and be incorporated into the new exterior walls. The building department was informed that we could not use the existing footer due to the deterioration and unsafe condition. Permission was given to remove this one remaining wall and pour a new footer as long as I stayed in the same “approved” footprint.  |
|  |  |
|  | Chairperson Goodin opened the floor for public comments.  |
|  |  |
|  | Diane Kelly, 207 Walnut St, asked where the code says you can not pour a new slab. Somethings can not be seen until you start work. A compromise would be the deck setback.  |
|  |  |
|  | There being no comments, the public hearing was closed. |
|  |  |
|  | Made by Evens, seconded by Frosio.  |
|  |  |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **MOTION:** | **TO APPROVE V20-05 FOR 109 NORTH STREET WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:****THE BALCONY ON THE WEST SIDE MAY NOT PROJECT MORE THAN FOUR FEET INTO THE FRONT YARD AND THE PROJECTION ON THE EAST SIDE MAY BE NOT BE MORE THAN 8.8 FEET IN ORDER TO REBUILD THE STRUCTURE TO CONFORM WITH THE BUILDING CODE AND THE CONTRACTOR IS OBTAIN A NEW PERMIT AND THE WORK IS TO BE RECLASSIFY THE PERMIT AS NEW CONSTRUCTION.**  |
|  |
| Roll Call Vote: |
| Ayes: | 7-Miller, Randolph, Schwartzenberger, Evens, Raitti, Frosio, Goodin |
| Noes: | 0 |
|  |
| **MOTION APPROVED.**  |
|  |

 |
|

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| V20-06 Application for variance2110 First StConnor Family Trust | V20-06 Application for variance as outlined in Chapter 27, Article 3 Division 8 of the Unified Land Development Code of Neptune Beach for Connor Family Trust for the property known as 2110 First Street (RE#173749-5000). The request is to vary Table 27-229-1-Rear and side yard setback to enclose the existing carport. |
|  | Kristina Wright, explained, the applicant is seeking to enclose an existing carport area due to her own safety concerns. The application requires a variance since the existing carport area is within the required setbacks. Accessory structure setbacks are 3.5 feet and 4 feet at the points closest to the rear lot line. Accessory structure setbacks are at least 7.1 feet at the minimum point form the side yard. The separation from the principal structure is currently 1.4 feet on the south end and 4.5 feet on the north with a separation of 1.2 feet from the attached structure. The applicant has agreed to fire rating the walls to enclose the existing carport space. The Fire Marshal does have concerns about fire department access around the garage once the carport is enclosed. There is 42 inches between the fence and the front column of the carport. The fence would have to be removed as it would block the fire department access to the rear and side of the house once the carport is enclosed. Structures closer than 3 feet to the property line would be required to be constructed with a one-hour fire resistive rating with not projections allowed. Staff recommends approval with the following conditions: 1-Remove the short fence section. 2-Of the exterior wall without overhangs is 3 feet or more from the property line, then the exterior wall will not require fire rating. Closer than 3 feet would be required to be constructed with a one-hour fire resistant rating. There would be no projections allowed. Jane Lynch, agent for the owners, stated that the property owner was scared about driving down the alley and would prefer to drive directly the garage. The carport was built with a variance in 2000. |
|  | Peggy Cornelius, Contractor, stated the exterior wall would be wood with siding and fire code sheet will be installed.  |
|  | **Required findings needed to issue a variance in Section 27-147 explain the following** 1. **How does your property have unique and peculiar circumstance, which create an exceptional and unique hardship? Unique hardship shall be unique to the parcel ant shared by other property owners. The hardship cannot be created by or be the result of the property owner’s action.**

The property has a unique and peculiar hardship since the carport is at the end of a dark alleyway. The carport is visually exposed from Hopkins Street, and the applicant has safety concerns and desires an enclosed garage at the end of the back alleyway.1. **How is the proposed variance the minimum necessary to allow reasonable use of the property?**

The proposed variance is the minimum necessary to allow reasonable use of the property since the carport is already in existence and the applicant is seeking to enclose the existing carport area to ensure safety within a back alleyway. 1. **Indicate how the proposed variance will not adversely affect adjacent or nearby properties or the public in general.**

The proposed variance will not adversely affect adjacent or nearby properties or the public in general since the carport is already in existence and the applicant is seeking to enclose the existing carport area for safety and security reasons. Which will not adversely affect adjacent or nearby properties or the public in general. 1. **Indicate how the proposed variance will not diminish property values nor alter the character of the area.**

The propose variance will not diminish property values nor alter the character of the area since the house is at the back of the alleyway and the carport already existing. By the enclosing the carport area the applicant will have additional security. 1. **Explain how the proposed variance is in harmony with the general intent of the Unified Land Development Code.**

The proposed variance is in harmony with the intent since the carport is already in existence. The applicant is requesting to enclose the space. A more secure enclosure will provide improvement. 1. **Explain how the need for the proposed variance has been created by you or the developer?**

The carport is already in existence. 1. **Indicate how granting of the proposed variance will not confer upon any special privileges that is denied by the code to other lands, building or structure in the same zoning district.**

The property is unique as it is at the end of an alleyway with an exposed carport that already exists. The applicant believes that when it comes to safety if someone else is in her same situation that they should be allowed to enclose their carport as well. Chairperson Goodin opened the floor for public comments.Diane Kelly, 207 Walnut Street, this is a setback issue. It is too tight and too close. If safety is a concern, add a motion light and remove the fence to the west. There being no further comments the public hearing was closed.  |
|  | Made by Frosio, seconded by Evens.  |
|  |  |  |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **MOTION:** | **MOVE TO APPROVE VARIANCE REQUEST V20-06 FOR 2110 FIRST STREET.**  |
| Roll Call Vote: |
| Ayes: | 2-Schwartzenberger, Frosio  |
| Noes: | 5-Miller, Evens, Raitti, Randolph, Goodin |
|  |
| **MOTION FAILED AND VARIANCE DENIED.**  |
|  |

 |
|  |  |
| V20-07 Application for variance 1414 First Street1414 NB, LLC | V20-07 Application for variance as outlined in Chapter 27, Article 3 Division 8 of the Unified Land Development Code of Neptune Beach for 1414 NB, LLC for the property known as 1414 First Street (RE#173027-0000). The request is to vary Table 27-229-1 side yard setback to build a new single-family dwelling. |
|  | Kristina Wright, explained, the applicant is seeking to redevelop the property with a single-family residence. The existing structure has side yard setbacks of 2.4 feet on the north boundary and 8.3 feet on the southern boundary. The applicant is requesting a side setback variance from the required 7 feet to the proposed 3 feet on the north side which is a gain of .6 feet and is requesting to increase the southern side yard setback from 83 feet to 10 feet which is a gain of 1.7 feet.  |
|  |  |
|  | **Required findings needed to issue a variance in Section 27-147 explain the following** 1. **How does your property have unique and peculiar circumstance, which create an exceptional and unique hardship? Unique hardship shall be unique to the parcel ant shared by other property owners. The hardship cannot be created by or be the result of the property owner’s action.**

The existing residence was built with a 2.4-foot north side yard and dual driveways along the north and south boundaries resulting in 2 separate curb cuts. Seeking to improve by redeveloping a single-family residence with a 3-foot north yard setback and parking in the rear of the property with a single access point to First St. 1. **How is the proposed variance the minimum necessary to allow reasonable use of the property?**

The new residence and garage have been designed to comply with the front, rear and south side yard setbacks as well as lot coverage and height. In order to facilitate the redevelopment of a comparable sized residence that satisfies the criteria and allows for the proposed rear yard parking, the maximum side yard setback that can be provided along the northern property line is 3 feet. This is an increase from the current 2.4 feet. 1. **Indicate how the proposed variance will not adversely affect adjacent or nearby properties or the public in general.**

The request will improve safety form pedestrians and vehicles by eliminating the dual curb cuts. Parking will behind the residence. 1. **Indicate how the proposed variance will not diminish property values nor alter the character of the area.**

The request will be consistent with the development pattern in the area in terms of side yard setbacks on improve upon the existing conditions of the property access and parking. 1. **Explain how the proposed variance is in harmony with the general intent of the Unified Land Development Code.**

Greater overall compliance with the zoning code and provides safety through better vehicle access and storage. Reinforces Neptune Beach as a residential community and improve property values. 1. **Explain how the need for the proposed variance has been created by you or the developer?**

Seeks to redevelop the property with a single-family residence that is consistent with the established development pattern and greater compliance with the zoning code. 1. **Indicate how granting of the proposed variance will not confer upon any special privileges that is denied by the code to other lands, building or structure in the same zoning district.**

Far from conveying a special privilege, the setback variance will result in maintain the status que for the neighborhood. Staff recommends approval of V20-07. |
|  | Steven Diebow, representing the property owners, stated the pedestrian traffic on First St is heavy. Having the cars parked in the rear is attractive. The plan is to have a front yard with a large porch while parking the cars in the rear behind the house. The house will be 2640 square feet, two-story with porches and 500 sf detached garage.  |
|  |  |
|  | Chairperson Goodin opened the floor for public comments. |
|  |  |
|  | Shellie Thole, 217 Oleander St, against the variance request because the setback is 3 feet. There is no hardship. Granting the side yard setback variance could result in others to ask for the same thing.  |
|  | Diana Kelly, 207 Walnut St, they could build without a variance. There being no further comments the public hearing was closedBoard discussion: It seems like they are fitting the lot to the house, instead of fitting the house to the lot. By adjusting the size of the house, you could meet the setbacks. Having parking in the rear does get the cars off the street. The asked Mr. Diebow if they would be agreeable to making the north setback 4 feet. This would give the neighbor to the north a bit more room and the exterior wall of the house would no longer be required to have a one-hour fire resistive rating. Mr. Diebow was in agreement with the 4-foot north side yard setback.   |
|  | **MOTION:**  | **MOVE TO APPROVE V20-07 FOR 1414 FIRST STREET WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:****1-THE NORTH SIDE YARD SETBACK WOULD BE 4 FEET** **2-THE DETACHED GARAGE MUST BE BUILT AND REMAIN A GARAGE IN THE FUTURE WITH NO RESIDENTIAL COMPONENTS.**  |
|  |  |
|  | Made by Randolph, seconded by Evens. |
|  |  |
|  | Roll Call:  |
|  | Ayes: | 5- Randolph, Schwartzenberger, Evens, Frosio, Goodin |
|  | Noes: | 2- Miller, Raitti |
|  |  |  |
|  | **MOTION APPROVED.** |
|  |  |
| V20-10 Variance Application for 601 Bowles Court | V20-10 Application for variance as outlined in Chapter 27, Article 3 Division 8 of the Unified Land Development Code of Neptune Beach for Anne Cruddas for the property known as 601 Bowles Street (RE#173403-0064). The request is to vary Table 27-229-1-Rear setback to build an addition on the rear of the house. |
|  | Ms. Wright explained the applicant is seeking relief from the current 30-foot rear yard setback requirement to construct a bedroom and bath addition to her house for her father who requires continuous care. The setbacks on all sides of the home exceed the required minimum s except the rear yard which requires 30-feet and is both currently and proposed to be at 15.1 feet. **Section 27-147 Required Findings Needed to Issue a Variance:**1. **How does the property have unique and peculiar circumstances, which create an exceptional and unique hardship? Unique hardship shall be unique to the parcel and not shared by other property owners**). **The hardship cannot be created by or be the result of the property owner’s own action.**

The applicant’s home is on a corner lot that faces Fifth Street that has a driveway accessible from Bowles Court. The was constructed and set back both 30 feet from Bowles Court as well as 30- feet from Fifth Street. These measurements both greatly exceed whit is required and the existing nonconformity of the 15.1 feet setback will not be exacerbated since the proposed addition will mirror the existing side of the house. 1. **How is the proposed variance the minimum necessary to allow reasonable use of the property?**

Because of the layout of the home and driveway, the only possible location of the addition is to the rear-west side of the property. 1. **Indicate how the proposed variance will not adversely affect adjacent or nearby properties or the public in general.**

The proposed variance will not adversely affect the adjacent property or any properties in the area or the public. The addition will not hinder or impact neighbor’s view. 1. **Indicate how the proposed variance will not diminish property values nor alter the character of the area.**

The addition will be constructed out of the same materials and the overall height of the existing home will not create a negative visual impact to the neighbors nor decrease property values. 1. **Explain how the proposed variance is in harmony with the general intent of the Unified Land Development Code*.***

Meets all setback requirements is seeking to mirror the existing year yard setback nonconformity of 15.1 feet. 1. **Explain how the need for the proposed variance has not been created by you or the developer.**

The proposed variance has not been created by the applicant since all setbacks have been met except the existing rear yard. The property has a greater than 30-foot setback on the north and east sides, which exceeds the ULDC. 1. **Indicate how granting of the proposed variance will not confer upon you any special privileges that is denied by the code to other lands, buildings or structures in the same zoning district.**

Granting the variance would not confer any special privileges yet it would allow the applicant to mirror the existing conditions while meeting or exceeding all the other minimum setback requirement.  |
|  |  |
|  | Staff recommends approval of application V20-10 for 601 Bowles Court. |
|  |  |
|  | Mrs. Cruddas, property owner, and Mr. Quinn Hagerty, contractor, stated the addition would be used to add a space for her father. Due to how the house sets on the lot there is no other place to add on.  |
|  |  |
|  | Chairperson Goodin opened the floor for public comments. There being no further comments the public hearing was closed |
|  |  |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **MOTION:** | **TO APPROVED V20-10 FOR 601 BOWLES COURT.**  |
|  |  |
| Made by Schwartzenberger, seconded by Miller.  |
|  |  |
| Roll Call: |  |
| Ayes: | 6-Miller, Randolph, Schwartzenberger, Raitti, Frosio, Goodin |
| Noes:  | 1-Evens, |

 |
|  |  |
|  | **MOTION APPROVED.** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| V20-11 Variance Application for 224-226 Oleander St | V20-11 Application for variance as outlined in Chapter 27, Article 3 Division 8 of the Unified Land Development Code of Neptune Beach for Kerry & Renee Mowlam for the property known as 224-226 Oleander Street (RE#173492-0000). The request is to vary section 27-328(a)(3)-Other Accessory Structures to build a 14-foot tall detached garage with vertical exterior wall height to exceed eight feet. |
|  | Ms. Wright explained the applicant is requesting to have higher exterior wall on their 2-car detached garage. The propose project complies with lot coverage, setbacks and over height for Sec. 27-328(a)(3) for accessory structures. However, the code anticipates a pitched room with an eight-foot exterior wall limit with an over height limit of 14 feet. The applicant is proposing a flat, slightly slanted roof that meets the overall height limit but not the exterior wall limit due to the design of the roof. Overall, the design and layout of the garage will be complementary to the future design of the renovated home. **Section 27-147 Required Findings Needed to Issue a Variance:**1. **How does the property have unique and peculiar circumstances, which create an exceptional and unique hardship? Unique hardship shall be unique to the parcel and not shared by other property owners**). **The hardship cannot be created by or be the result of the property owner’s own action.**

The applicants ae converting the existing duplex into a single-family residence over the next 12 months. This will include an exterior upgrade as well as updating the driveway with paver to improve drainage and appearance. The hardship arises in terms of the code limits that appear to anticipate a pitched roof on a 2-car garage in lieu of the flat, tillite roof that will complement the house. 1. **How is the proposed variance the minimum necessary to allow reasonable use of the property?**

The aesthetics of the garage will reflect the house. The garage will complement the home.1. **Indicate how the proposed variance will not adversely affect adjacent or nearby properties or the public in general.**

Will not decrease the value of nearby properties. 1. **Indicate how the proposed variance will not diminish property values nor alter the character of the area.**

The applicants believe that these renovations will help adjacent and nearby properties and will not adversely affect these properties due to the proposed renovations and improvement that will revitalize the property and increase comparable values in the surrounding area. 1. **Explain how the proposed variance is in harmony with the general intent of the Unified Land Development Code*.***

It does meet the height requirement and all other requirement except the outer wall height limit. 1. **Explain how the need for the proposed variance has not been created by you or the developer.**

Seeking to construct a high quality, modern garage that is complementary to the propose renovations.1. **Indicate how granting of the proposed variance will not confer upon you any special privileges that is denied by the code to other lands, buildings or structures in the same zoning district.**

The request is to create a higher vertical exterior wall not a higher roof peak.  |
|  |  |
|  | Staff recommends approval of application V20-11 for 224-226 Oleander Street.  |
|  |  |
|  | Chairperson Goodin opened the floor for public comments. |
|  | Mr. Nick Beck, 222 Oleander St, recently purchased the house next door and asked the board not to approve the request. There is no hardship.  |
|  | Shellie Thole, 217 Oleander, lives across the street and there is no hardship.  |
|  | There being no further comments the public hearing was closed |
|  |  |
|  | The board discussed the need for the addition wall height.  |
|  |  |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **MOTION:** | **TO DENY VARIANCE REQUEST V20-11 FOR 224-226 OLEANDER ST.**  |
|  |  |
| Made by Evens, seconded by Miller. |
|  |  |
| Roll Call: |  |
| Ayes: |  6-Miller, Randolph, Schwartzenberger, Evens, Raitti, , Goodin |
| Noes:  | 1- Frosio |

 |
|  |  |
|  | **MOTION APPROVED AND VARIANCE DENIED.** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| Vision Plan Round Table discussion  | Chairperson Goodin opened the floor to the public and asked anyone want to speak to come up to the podium state their name and address before addressing the board. Scott Holechek, 1710 Lighty Lane, liked the improved beach access, bike accessibility, marsh access from Seagate Ave to the other end of Seagate. Does not want a kayak launch at Lighty Lane. Asked how you would get bikes across traffic if there was a roundabout at the 5 points? Would like to see wider sidewalks on Penman Road all the way down to Seagate Ave. Larry Mays, 1701 Lighty Lane, has lived in his house at the corner of Lighty Lane and Penman Road for 43 years and is against having a kayak launch or fishing across from his house. People use the area to fish now and use his driveway to turn around their trucks and trailers. The kayak launch would be right at the stop sign. Keith Baker, 628 Second St, traffic will increase with the public parking at the beach access. People who live east of Third will be inundated with more visitors. Beaches goes will park in residential area. The board discussed the strengths of the plans:Pathway connectionsgolf cart access to Jacksonville Beach from Seagate Forest.Crossings for pedestrians from the west side of Third to the beachTraffic improvementsAdded tree coverage Traffic calming improvements to slow people down without using speed bumpsLandscaping buffers between people and cars along Third StFirst St being bike friendlySafer ways to cross Third StInfrastructure improvements and sidewalks  |
|  |  |
| Open Discussion | The next board meeting will be February 10, 2021 at 6:00 pm.  |
|  |  |
| Adjournment | There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:28 p.m. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  Christopher Goodin , Chairperson |
|  | ATTEST: Piper Turner, Board Secretary |  |

 |
|  |

 |