

**CITY OF PALATKA**  
**PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**  
**February 2, 2016**



Call to Order: Members present: Chairman Daniel Sheffield, Vice-Chairman Joe Pickens, Tammy Williams, Anthony Harwell, Joseph Petrucci, Ed Killebrew, Earl Wallace (arrived prior to first case), George DeLoach (who also arrived prior to first case). Members absent: None. Staff present: Planning Director, Thad Crowe; Recording Secretary, Pam Sprouse and City Attorney, Donald Holmes.

**Motion** made by Mr. Killebrew and seconded by Mr. Pickens to approve January 5, 2015 meeting minutes. All present voted, the motion carried unopposed.

The Chairman then explained appeal procedures and requested that Board members express any ex-parte communication prior to hearing the case.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**Case 16-02** Request for conditional use for church within 300 feet of alcohol sales establishment.  
**Location:** 2000 Reid St. (Rochester Imports Building)  
**Owner:** Jennifer Rochester  
**Agent:** James Matthews, Sr.

Mr. Crowe mentioned that landscaping is almost non-existent and proposed some incremental landscaping to include two parking islands at the end of two parking rows with 1 shade tree in each and that will also provided for vehicular directional. Staff proposes working with the property owner to provide the two trees. He explained that the conditional use process is one of the few ways the City can improve these corridors. This would go a long way in helping improve the aesthetics of the Reid Street corridor. He recommended approval of the request to allow for a church at 2000 Reid St., with attendance capped by the Fire Marshall's occupancy limit and the following conditions:

1. Approval subject to and conforming with the site plan.
2. Within six months of approval, Applicant and City shall coordinate with the removal of pavement (by the Owner or Applicant) for two landscape islands as shown conceptually in Figure 4 of the staff report, and the City shall then provide and install one shade tree in each island.
3. Should they decide to pursue, the Conditional Use also authorizes a mural along the south side of the existing building, with design approval required by the Conlee-Snyder Mural Committee or the Planning Board.
4. All other applicable standards of the Municipal Code must be met, including any Building or Fire Code life and safety requirements required for places of assembly such as a church.

Mr. Petrucci asked if the business owner was responsible for the landscaping. Mr. Crowe explained that essentially the property owner is responsible, but he expected it to be a joint effort with the applicant and the City as well. Mr. Harwell asked who will oversee the landscape islands. Mr. Crowe said that Jonathan Griffith, City Project Manager would. Mr. Pickens commented he understands what staff is trying to accomplish, however he did not agree that it should be conditioned upon the applicant to improve the landscape, due to decades of neglect or lack of improvements, as the use would otherwise be allowed by right, except for the fact that they fall within the distance restriction of a convince store selling beer.

However, that the City is going to provide and install the trees makes a difference in case. He added that just because the City can require shrubs does not mean that it is fair to the applicant, giving the example; If this were a situation where the use may not be appropriate without a conditional use review, in his opinion that could be more germane to the use of the building. Mr. Crowe stated that regardless of the trigger, once it becomes a conditional use, the conditional use criteria must be met. Part of the conditional use criteria that are considered, really compel us (Staff and the Board) to make an effort to meet the code compliance to the greatest degree possible, when there is an opportunity to do so. Mr. Harwell, questioned if there was adequate parking. Mr. Crowe replied yes, that the requirement for parking for churches is one space per four seats and that number is set by the Fire Marshal, once their inspection is complete, we will true up the required number of spaces.

James Mathews Sr., 2000 Reid St. as the Pastor for the Church, spoke on behalf of the request. He stated that he is hoping for a maximum capacity of 150 persons. Mr. Killebrew asked if the congregation was going to have to bear the costs of installing the parking lot islands. Mr. Mathews said that he would work it out with the property owner.

**Motion** made by Mr. Pickens to approve the request as presented by staff and seconded by Ms. Williams. All present voted, motion carried unopposed.

## **5. OLD BUSINESS:**

### **Case 15-33** Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR), Comprehensive Plan

Mr. Crowe explained that this is an important element and there are big changes that need to be made to it. Currently, it is the old fashion the traffic circulation element. Road capacity and with improper or failing roadways, proportionate share enters into the equation and the Developer has to pay for the mitigation of the impacts of that development to the roadways. It is a complex system that all Cities and Counties are getting away from. Concurrency can actually work against re-development and create urban sprawl. The Legislature has worked on this for a long time, and has finely decided that they do not want to mandate concurrency. He shared an economic theory, that when you increase the supply of something - the result is more of the goods being consumed. In the case of traffic, when you build more roads, you attract more development, and at the end of the day, you have worse traffic than when you started. Mr. Crowe explained that with the adoption of Senate Bill 360 in 2009, Palatka became classified as a Dense Urban Land Area (DULA) community. The designation institutes a transportation concurrency exception area within the City. As part of the requirements for this exception area, the City is to adopt a mobility plan, with its next comprehensive plan overhaul, to include land use and transportation strategies to support and fund mobility within the exception area, including alternative modes of transportation. The alternative to the mobility plan would be to stay with the transportation concurrency system that is in place. However, retaining concurrency would require a burdensome process that could drive away new businesses, and could also commit the City to expensive and unneeded road improvements when roads fail. He gave an example of redevelopment along Reid St., which could trip the maximum capacity of this state road (even though much of this traffic is pass-through traffic), and require that the City commit funds for its improvement, or deny future redevelopment projects. He reviewed elements that the Complete Streets Program advocate (how all movement occurs within the City, not just paved roads). The City has been working with Putnam County Rails to Trails, FDOT and other groups in developing a mobility GAP plan which is essentially a guiding document that tells us what shape our roads are in, it looks at connectivity, sidewalks, and all these modes effectively. These are some of the kinds of things the City tries to work towards in the Comp. Plan and

develop a system of key developments to provide for a continuous flow of pedestrian bike traffic. Mr. Crowe asked the Board to share any comments or suggestions they may have.

Mr. Harwell asked if all the strikethroughs are the things that are being removed. Mr. Crowe explained that the Regional Council wrote this, it is bulky and the goal is to get rid of all of the extraneous stuff. Mr. Petrucci said that it would be good for the City to recommend to Ride Solutions about expanding their bus route, so that people can hop on the bus to get to work. This is done in larger cities as a way to reduce traffic,

Linda Crider, 116 Kirkland St. she stated that she was especially pleased that the city is taking this direction with the “mobility plan” and the concept of “complete streets.” She said that by having a plan in place it will give the city more leverage. Create a system plan for bicycle travel to connect to the spine off some of the larger streets and create additional space to east/west (such as Palm Av. and Moody Rd.) to connect to the trail systems. She stated that she worked for DOT for 18 years and as a Transportation planner at University of North Florida for 22 years.

Road Diet?? Mr. Crowe ended by saying that the street network itself is not what it could be, there are potential for using old RR row.

No action taken.

**Case 15-56** Administrative request to amend Zoning Code Sec. 94-149 (Intensive Commercial Zoning District) and Sec. 94, Division 3 (Supplementary District Regulations), allowing produce stands associated with convenience stores and grocery stores, and providing standards governing such uses (tabled from the January 5, 2016 meeting).

Mr. Crowe reviewed the proposed definition explaining the changes smaller size, cart with two or more wheels or stand with shelves.

Linda Crider asked if the allowance is only for existing grocery stores. Mr. Crowe explained that it is currently allowed.

**Motion** made by Mr. Petrucci and seconded by Mr. Killebrew to approve the amendment as submitted but also to include no prefabricated sheds allowed. All present voted, motion carried unopposed.

## 6. NEW BUSINESS:

**Case 16-01** Request to annex, amend Future Land Use Map from County UR (Urban Reserve) to RL (Residential Low-Density), and rezone from County R-1A (Residential Single-Family) to R-1A (Single-Family Residential).

**Location:** 1620 Husson Ave.

**Owner:** Terry White and Cherane Wilford

Mr. Crowe explained that this request is made by the property owner for the benefit of connecting to city utilities, that this property is contiguous to the City limits across the street and that the comprehensive plan requires annexation. This is located in a single family homes area and in not in conflict with the comp plan. He recommended approval of the request.

**Motion** made by Mr. Killebrew and seconded by Mr. Harwell to approve the request as submitted. All present voted, motion carried unopposed.

Mr. Sheffield asked if any variances have been granted by staff or the City Manager this past month. Mr. Crowe replied that there had not been any request.

Mr. Harwell asked how the architectural designs standards for downtown were enforced, referring to a project on 3<sup>rd</sup> and St. Johns Ave. Mr. Crowe replied that those standards are reviewed during the permit review period and further commented that the particular project he was inferring to was submitted and approved prior to the ordinance adoption.

With no further business, meeting adjourned at 5:05.