



**CITY OF PALATKA  
PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES  
August 7, 2012**

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Carl Stewart at 4:00 pm. **Other members present:** Earl Wallace, George DeLoach, Anthony Harwell, Daniel Sheffield, Lavinia Moody and Judith Gooding. Joseph Petrucci came in late. **Members absent:** Joe Pickens. **Also present:** Planning Director Thad Crowe and Recording Secretary Deena McCamey.

Mr. Crowe welcomed Ms. Moody and Ms. Gooding as new board members.

**Motion** made by Mr. DeLoach and seconded by Mr. Sheffield to approve the minutes as submitted for the June 5, 2012 meeting. All present voted affirmative, motion carried.

Chairman Stewart read the appeal procedures and requested that disclosure of any ex parte communication be made prior to each case.

### **OLD BUSINESS**

**Case 11-31** Administrative request to amend Comprehensive Plan Public Facilities Element Policy D.1.2.1 to provide for exceptions, based on economic development and system efficiency considerations, to the requirement that properties receiving City water or sewer that are contiguous to the city limits be annexed, and the requirement that properties receiving City sewer service be within the City limits (tabled from the June meeting).

Mr. Crowe asked the board to table this for another month until the City Manager has been able to review this and make his comments.

**Motion** made by Mr. Sheffield and seconded by Ms. Moody, to table until the September meeting. All present voted affirmative, motion carried.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

**Case 12-37** Request to annex, amend the Future Land Use Map from County CR (Commercial) to COM (Commercial) and to rezone from County C-2 (Commercial, Light) to C-1 (General Commercial)  
**Location:** 102 Phillips Dairy Rd.  
**Owner:** Kenneth W. & Diane M. Schwing  
**Applicant:** Eddie Stovall

Mr. Crowe told the board this is a combination of annexation, amendment of the future land use map, and rezoning. The applicant wants the ability to connect to the City's utilities and plans to open a combination take-out restaurant and barbershop at this location. This building is currently being renovated and has been permitted through Putnam County's building department. Once the property is annexed, the City will allow the County to finish the permitting process but our inspectors will be closely involved making sure the renovations conform to the City's codes. Parking will be required and the property must be buffered from the neighboring single-family residence. He said this property is contiguous to the City limits because when the Sheriff's Department annexed into the city in 1987 the city then annexed the right of way of SR 19 from Reid Street to N Hwy 17.

Since the request met relevant criteria, he recommended approval of the request to annex, rezone the property to C-1 (General Commercial), and amend the Future Land Use Map to COM (Commercial).

Mr. Stewart closed the public hearing.

**Motion** made by Mr. Sheffield to approve staff recommendation, seconded by Mr. DeLoach. All members present voted affirmative, motion carried.

**Case 12-38** Administrative request to amend Zoning Code Sec. 94-145, 94-146, 94-148, 94-149, 94-150, 94-152, 94-154, 94-155, to provide for height limits in various zoning districts, and to revise height limit for Planned Industrial Development District (Sec. 94-163).

Mr. Crowe said currently the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code height limits contradict each other, but reiterated the Comprehensive Plan takes precedence. He said staff wanted to provide uniform height limits in the zoning code and not have them in the comp plan. During agency review of the companion Comprehensive Plan amendment to eliminate height limits in Future Land Use Map categories, the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) raised a concern about potential impacts of the amendment to state roads; they believe that the Comprehensive Plan should include measurable development standards so that FDOT and other agencies can determine potential development and traffic impacts on state roads. He recommended tabling until the next meeting so staff can work out these issues with FDOT.

**Motion** made by Ms. Gooding to table until the next meeting, seconded by Mr. Petrucci. All members present voted affirmative, motion carried.

**Case 12-39** Administrative request to amend Zoning Code Sec. 94-159 to allow for aviation-related manufacturing in AP-2 (airport related zoning district) as permitted principal use, and non-aviation-related manufacturing as permitted additional use when approved by airport advisory committee and airport manager.

Mr. Crowe said the airport zoning categories are peculiar since they were developed by a consultant who made these zoning categories specific and detailed. The AP-1 district is exclusively for runway and taxiways and AP-2 includes everything else at the airport including public and private lands. The airport manager has met with a business owner who manufactures and repairs airplanes, and this individual would like to locate his business at the municipal airport. Staff proposes allowing manufacturing in the AP-2 zoning as it is compatible with the intensive activities at the airport and the change would attract new businesses to the city. He recommended amending the Zoning Code to allow aviation-related manufacturing as a permitted use and to allow non-aviation-related manufacturing with the approval of the Airport Advisory Committee and the airport manager. An additional recommendation was to also adopt standards to require exterior lighting be shielded downwards and prohibit blinking, flashing or distracting lights, intended to enhance pilot safety.

Mr. Petrucci asked what would be considered to be non-aviation manufacturing.

Mr. Crowe said anything that processes or any kind of light processing of assembly of products not related to airplanes.

Mr. Petrucci said he was concerned about encroachment of non-aviation-related businesses at the airport.

Mr. Crowe said the Airport Advisory Committee and airport manager will approve such uses and they will look out for the Airport's best interests.

Mr. Harwell asked who the airport committee is made up of.

Mr. Crowe said mostly airport or aviation-people and one city commissioner. This committee is appointed by the city commission.

The board discussed requiring conditional use approval for non-aviation-related manufacturing.

Mr. Sheffield said he had a problem with requiring applicants go to an extra committee, having an extra expense and slowing down potential businesses wanting to come in. He said since there is an airport committee already established let them make the decisions.

**Motion** made by Mr. Petrucci to approve aviation-related manufacturing as a permitted use in the AP-2 zoning district, and non-aviation-related manufacturing as a conditional use, seconded by Mr. Harwell. Motion carried with five Yeas and one Nay.

**Case 12-40** Administrative request to amend Zoning Code Sec. 94-261(c)(2) to allow for exceptions to the requirement that all parking and loading areas be paved.

Mr. Crowe said this came up with a permit application for Jerry's Drive-In's renovation. The unpaved parking lot for this business is "pre-Water Management District" and does not have any functional stormwater retention areas. The Zoning Code "grandfathers" businesses from a parking lot paving requirement for a six month period, but after that paving is required. The new owner's of Jerry's did not apply for permits within that six month period and were thus subject to the paving requirement. The parking lot is a low area and has historically held water from rain events. Staff made the determination, based on past flooding incidents in the area, that if the parking lot was paved stormwater would flow onto neighboring properties, Crill Avenue, Geary Avenue and other properties and flooding would worsen. Staff believes that amending the zoning code, to relax the paving requirement, would help with other properties with similar circumstances and would help small businesses that have minimum resources for expensive site improvement. Mr. Crowe added that there would be a tradeoff for not paving parking lots, as properties receiving this exemption would have to meet the landscape code, not normally required of new businesses coming into existing buildings. Landscape areas would provide for some stormwater retention and also beautify the site. He said that the amendment met the Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Element policies encouraging infill development, encouraging the use of existing commercial areas, encouraging flexibility of site design, and the standard requiring that stormwater runoff not exceed what was there before. He recommended approval of changing the code to an exemption to the paving requirement with a building or parking area increase of less than ten percent, with an engineer's certification that paving would negatively impact adjoining properties, and requiring an engineer to provide recommendations for mitigating flooding, and meeting the landscape code.

Mr. Harwell asked why there is a code requirement for paving parking lots.

Mr. Crowe said it's basically because the city does not want to have wood chips or that type of material causing erosion or clogging up the city's drainage system.

**Motion** made by Mr. DeLoach to approve staff's recommendation, seconded by Mr. Sheffield. All members present voted affirmative, motion carried.

**Case 12-42** Administrative request amend the Future Land Use Map from RL (Residential, Low Density) to PB (Public Buildings and Grounds)  
**Location:** 301 River St. (Riverfront Park)  
**Owner:** City of Palatka  
**Applicant:** Building & Zoning Dept.

Mr. Crowe said this was a housekeeping Future Land Use Map amendment. The single-family land use on the property does not allow any other uses in the park except single family homes there. This needs to be amended to the Public Building and Grounds (PB) category.

The board members discussed what is and what is not allowed in the PB category. They discussed whether they should require the park be a Planned Unit Development (PUD) zoning so the board can have some input on what uses and improvements would be allowed. By consensus the Board recommended that staff come back with suggestions for a possible PUD.

Mr. Crowe said he planned to bring the other lot located at 100 N 1<sup>st</sup> Street currently designated Commercial to the board for the same amendment to the PB. He recommended that the Board table this item until the next meeting.

**Motion** made by Mr. Sheffield to table the item until further research can be done, seconded by Ms. Moody. All members present voted affirmative, motion carried.

**OTHER BUSINESS** – Mr. Crowe reminded the board there is need of a new vice chairman as the current vice chairman had rejected his appointment and recommended they think about who to nominate for the next meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT-** With no further business, meeting adjourned.