



MINUTES
PLANNING DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
APRIL 21, 2009 AT 6:00 P.M.
CITY HALL, 116 FIRST STREET
NEPTUNE BEACH, FLORIDA

Pursuant to proper notice a meeting of the Planning and Development Review Board for the City of Neptune Beach was held April 21, 2009 at 6:00 p.m. in the Neptune Beach Council Chamber 116 First Street Neptune Beach, Florida.

The following Board members were in attendance:

Kerry Chin, Chairperson
Richard Arthur, Vice-Chair
Amy Cole, Member
Joanne Doherty, Member
Todd Bosco, Member
James Niss, Member
J. B. McLeroy, Alternate

Staff members in attendance:

Amanda Askew, Community Development Director
Piper Turner, Administrative Assistant to the Building Official

Call to Order Chairperson Chin called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Approval of Minutes Motion: **TO APPROVE THE MARCH 17, 2009 MINUTES, AS SUBMITTED.**

Moved by Doherty, seconded by Arthur.

APPROVED BY CONSENSUS

PDRB09-03 Special
Exception
Christ United
Methodist Church

PDRB09-03 Application of Christ United Methodist church for a special exception as defined by Division 9 of the ULDC and Table 27-226-1. The special exception is to operate a school for the property located at 400 Penman Road.

Robin Muller, Director of the pre-school, made the presentation. Currently there are 49 students attending pre-school and they would like to increase their enrollment to 220 students. The Church would be operating a school from pre-k to 12 grades. The property has 2 entrances and exits, one set on the north side and the other on the south side. Drop off and pickup traffic would not be a problem. The Church has 4-5 acres undeveloped property behind the church however the proposed school will be operated in the existing buildings.

Questions from the Board: Would the high school students be driving? Any student who drives to the school will have to have special permission from the school's administrator prior to doing so.

Chairperson Chin opened the public hearing, there being no comments the hearing was closed.

April 21, 2009

FINDINGS OF FACTS

- 1) The proposed use is consistent with the comprehensive plan;
Cole: Pre 1990 church and school.
Doherty: Presently used for a school.
Chin: 1990 comp plan "Church includes school"
Arthur: Designated church/school.
Niss: No change in exterior.
McLeroy: Current use is church and school-no change.
- 2) The proposed use would be compatible with the general character of the area, considering the population density; the design, density, scale, location, and orientation of existing and permissible structures in the area; property values; and the location of existing similar uses;
Cole: No expansion of facility to impact referenced character and other items listed.
Doherty: No change in use.
Chin: 1990 comp plan "Church includes school"..
Arthur: Already a school.
Niss: No real change in usage.
Bosco: No change.
McLeroy: Compatible use-no changes
- 3) The proposed use would not have an environmental impact inconsistent with the health, safety, and welfare of the community;
Cole: Same as above.
Chin: Meets concurrency standards.
Arthur: Not building and more, using same footprint.
Niss: No significant impact.
Doherty: No change in use.
Bosco: No new construction outside of existing space.
McLeroy: Consistent with concurrency.
- 4) The proposed use would not generate or otherwise cause conditions that would have a detrimental effect on vehicular traffic, pedestrian movement, or parking inconsistent with the health, safety, and welfare of the community;
Cole: Does not cross threshold for impact and subsequent study.
Doherty: No change in use.
Chin: Meets concurrency standards.
Arthur: Concurrency in place-no new trips generated.
Niss: No study completed or needed.
Bosco: Should not.
McLeroy: No negative impact.
- 5) The proposed use would not have a detrimental effect on the future development of the area as allowed in the comprehensive plan;
Cole: Works with 1990 Comp plan.
Doherty: No change in use.
Chin: No change from current usage.
Arthur: No.
Niss: Would require additional approvals.
Bosco: It will not.
McLeroy: No negative impact.
- 6) The proposed use would not result in the creation of objectionable or excessive noise, light, vibration, fumes, odors, dust or physical activities inconsistent with existing or permissible uses in the area;
Cole: Use proposed doesn't change from existing.
Doherty: No change in use.
Chin: No change from current usage.
Arthur: No.
Niss: No impact.
Bosco: It will not add to current use.
McLeroy: Consistent, no negative impact.
- 7) The proposed use would not overburden existing public services and facilities; and in

April 21, 2009

this Code.
 Cole: Meets concurrency.
 Doherty: Meets currency.
 Chin: Meets concurrency.
 Arthur: No.
 Niss: No major increase in traffic.
 McLeroy: No negative impact.

8) The proposed use meets all other requirements as provided for elsewhere in the code.

Cole: None identified.
 Doherty: Meets currency.
 Chin: Meets concurrency.
 Arthur: Yes.
 Niss: Would meet code for school
 McLeroy: Meets requirements.

Made by McLeroy, seconded by Doherty .

Motion: TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF PDRB09-03 FOR THE SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO OPERATE A SCHOOL AT THE CHRIST UNITED METHODIST CHURCH WITH THE CONDITION THAT THERE WOULD BE A MAXIMUM OF 220 STUDENTS.

Roll Call:

Ayes 7—Doherty, Bosco, Cole, Niss, McLeroy, Arthur, Chin
 Noes: 0

MOTION APPROVED.

Applicant informed that their application would be forwarded to the City Council for final decision on May 4, 2009 and that applicant must attend this meeting.

V09-05 Variance
 Request 630-668
 Atlantic Blvd
 Lakeshore Village

V09-05 Variance Request of Lakeshore Village aka M & P Shopping Centers for the property located 630-668 Atlantic Blvd. to section 27-229-1 minimum lot width for street frontage for proposed Lot 2.

<u>Request</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Requesting</u>	<u>Leaving</u>	<u>Required</u>
#2) Lot Width for Lot 2 for frontage	27-229-1	100 feet	0 feet	100 feet

Chairperson Chin opened the public hearing.

There being no further comments from the public, the public hearing was closed.

FINDINGS OF FACTS

1) The property has unique and peculiar circumstances, which create an exceptional and unique hardship. For the purpose of this determination, the unique hardship shall be unique to the parcel and not shared by other property owners in the same zoning district.

Written comments of the board:

Chin: Land locked
 Arthur: Unique to this parcel.
 Niss: Economic conditions.

2) The proposed variance is the minimum necessary to allow the reasonable use of the parcel of land.

April 21, 2009

this Code.
 Cole: Meets concurrency.
 Doherty: Meets currency.
 Chin: Meets concurrency.
 Arthur: No.
 Niss: No major increase in traffic.
 McLeroy: No negative impact.

- 8) The proposed use meets all other requirements as provided for elsewhere in the code.
 Cole: None identified.
 Doherty: Meets currency.
 Chin: Meets concurrency.
 Arthur: Yes.
 Niss: Would meet code for school
 McLeroy: Meets requirements.

Made by McLeroy, seconded by Doherty .

Motion: **TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF PDRB09-03 FOR THE SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO OPERATE A SCHOOL AT THE CHRIST UNITED METHODIST CHURCH WITH THE CONDITION THAT THERE WOULD BE A MAXIMUM OF 220 STUDENTS.**

Roll Call:

Ayes 7--Doherty, Bosco, Cole, Niss, McLeroy, Arthur, Chin
 Noes: 0

MOTION APPROVED.

Applicant informed that their application would be forwarded to the City Council for final decision on May 4, 2009 and that applicant must attend this meeting.

V09-05 Variance
 Request 630-668
 Atlantic Blvd
 Lakeshore Village

V09-05 Variance Request of Lakeshore Village aka M & P Shopping Centers for the property located 630-668 Atlantic Blvd. to section 27-229-1 minimum lot width for street frontage for proposed Lot 2.

<u>Request</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Requesting</u>	<u>Leaving</u>	<u>Required</u>
#2) Lot Width for Lot 2 for frontage	27-229-1	100 feet	0 feet	100 feet

Chairperson Chin opened the public hearing.

There being no further comments from the public, the public hearing was closed.

FINDINGS OF FACTS

- 1) The property has unique and peculiar circumstances, which create an exceptional and unique hardship. For the purpose of this determination, the unique hardship shall be unique to the parcel and not shared by other property owners in the same zoning district.

Written comments of the board:
 Chin: Land locked
 Arthur: Unique to this parcel.
 Niss: Economic conditions.

- 2) The proposed variance is the minimum necessary to allow the reasonable use of the parcel of land.

April 21, 2009

Written comments of the board:

Chin: Needs it to be platted.

Arthur: Yes.

Niss: Holds lot.

3) The proposed variance would not adversely affect adjacent and nearby properties or the public inn general.

Written comments of the board:

Chin: No effect.

Arthur: No.

Niss: No affect.

4) The proposed variance will not substantially diminish property values in, nor alter the essential character of the area surrounding the site.

Written comments from the board:

Chin: No effect.

Arthur: No, will improve.

Niss: No affect.

5) The effect of the proposed variance is in harmony with the general intent of the ULDC and the specific intent of the relevant subject area of the ULDC.

Written comments from the board:

Chin: Yes, but only that this situation not addressed in ULDC.

Arthur: Yes.

Niss: In harmony.

6) The need for the variance has not been created by the actions of the property owner or developer nor is the result of mere disregard for the provision from which relief is sought.

Written comments from the board:

Chin: Unique situation.

Niss: Amendment to cover access.

7) Granting the variance will not confer upon the applicant any special privilege that is denied by the ULDC to other lands, buildings, or structures in the same zoning district.

Written comments from the board:

Chin: Unique situation.

Arthur: No.

Niss: No transference.

**CONCLUSION ON REQUIRED FINDINGS
PURSUANT TO SEC. 27-147, ORDINANCE CODE**

Sec. 27-147(1)	Positive 7 to 0
Sec. 27-147(2)	Positive 7 to 0
Sec. 27-147(3)	Positive 7 to 0
Sec. 27-147(4)	Positive 7 to 0
Sec. 27-147(5)	Positive 7 to 0
Sec. 27-147(6)	Positive 7 to 0
Sec. 27-147(7)	Positive 7 to 0

Moved by Doherty, seconded by Bosco.

Motion: **TO APPROVE THE FINDING OF FACTS**

April 21, 2009

APPROVED BY CONSENSUS

Moved by Arthur, seconded by Bosco.

Motion: **TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF V09-05 FOR VARIANCE REQUEST #2 SECTION 27-229-1 NOT TO REQUIRE THE 100 FOOT LOT WIDTH ADJACENT TO THE PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY WITH THE CONTINGENCY THAT LOT 2 REMAINS WITH ITS OWN INGRESS AND EGRESS EASEMENT.**

Roll Call:

Ayes 7—McLeroy, Bosco, Cole, Niss, Doherty, Arthur, Chin
 Noes: 0

MOTION APPROVED.

PDRB09-04 Replat
 630-668 Atlantic
 Blvd Lakeshore
 Village

PDRB09-04 Application for Replat of property associated with PDRB09-06 (630-668 Atlantic Blvd.) described as a part of section 20 and 21 Township 2 South, range 29 East. The request is to divide the large parcel into 3 smaller parcels.

Tom Fleming, Regency Center, presented the proposal to the board. Publix is the major anchor store. The Blockbuster will remain for now, originally a bank was planned in the area but the bank has since been placed on hold. Phase two includes the junior anchor attached to the main structure, the building adjacent to Atlantic Blvd. between Blockbuster and KFC, and the Blockbuster site.

The old building will be demolished once final construction documents have been completed. The entire parking lot and landscaping will be completed in Phase one even though the junior anchor and out building will not be built until a later date. Landscaping and grass will be placed in these areas which can be easily removed once construction starts.

Made by Cole, seconded by Arthur.

Motion: **TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF PDRB09-04 REPLAT FOR LAKESHORE VILLAGE TO DIVIDE ONE PARCEL OF LAND INTO THREE PARCELS WITH THE CONTINGENCY OUTLINED IN VARAINCE V09-05 REQUEST #2 TABLE 27-229-1(B).**

Roll Call:

Ayes 7—Doherty, Bosco, Cole, Niss, McLeroy, Arthur, Chin
 Noes: 0

MOTION APPROVED.

V09-05 Variance
 Request 630-668
 Atlantic Blvd
 Lakeshore Village

V09-05 Variance Request of Lakeshore Village aka M & P Shopping Centers for the property located 630-668 Atlantic Blvd. to section 27-229-1 setbacks, section 27-540 off-street parking and 27-457 landscaping requirement for vehicular use areas.

Chris Ruen, Regency Center, presented the elevations to the board and audience and explained the landscape plan.

Chairperson Chin opened the public hearing.

There being no further comments from the public, the public hearing was closed.

<u>Request</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Requesting</u>	<u>Leaving</u>	<u>Required</u>
#1) Maximum	Table 27-229-1	5%	80%	75%

April 21, 2009

Lot Coverage

#5) Minimum Landscape	27-455(b)	1%	21%	20%
-----------------------	-----------	----	-----	-----

FINDINGS OF FACTS

1) The property has unique and peculiar circumstances, which create an exceptional and unique hardship. For the purpose of this determination, the unique hardship shall be unique to the parcel and not shared by other property owners in the same zoning district.

Written comments of the board:
 Chin: Unique situation, hybrid lot.
 McLeroy: Existing configuration or property is useless.

2) The proposed variance is the minimum necessary to allow the reasonable use of the parcel of land.

Written comments of the board:
 Chin: Unique situation, hybrid lot.
 McLeroy: Minimum for reasonable use.

3) The proposed variance would not adversely affect adjacent and nearby properties or the public in general.

Written comments of the board:
 Chin: No effect.

4) The proposed variance will not substantially diminish property values in, nor alter the essential character of the area surrounding the site.

Written comments from the board:
 Chin: No effect.

5) The effect of the proposed variance is in harmony with the general intent of the ULDC and the specific intent of the relevant subject area of the ULDC.

Written comments from the board:
 Chin: Complies when considered as a whole.

6) The need for the variance has not been created by the actions of the property owner or developer nor is the result of mere disregard for the provision from which relief is sought.

Written comments from the board:
 Chin: Unique situation.

7) Granting the variance will not confer upon the applicant any special privilege that is denied by the ULDC to other lands, buildings, or structures in the same zoning district.

Written comments from the board:
 Chin: Unique situation.
 Niss: No impact.

**CONCLUSION ON REQUIRED FINDINGS
 PURSUANT TO SEC. 27-147, ORDINANCE CODE**

Sec. 27-147(1)	Positive 7 to 0
Sec. 27-147(2)	Positive 7 to 0
Sec. 27-147(3)	Positive 7 to 0
Sec. 27-147(4)	Positive 7 to 0

April 21, 2009

Sec. 27-147(5) Positive 7 to 0
 Sec. 27-147(6) Positive 7 to 0
 Sec. 27-147(7) Positive 7 to 0

Moved by Doherty, seconded by Cole.

Motion: **TO APPROVE THE FINDING OF FACTS**

APPROVED BY CONSENSUS

Moved by Cole, seconded by Doherty.

Motion: **TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF V09-05 FOR VARIANCES TO REQUEST # 1 AND 5 FOR 27-229-1 WHICH INCLUDES MAXIMUM LOT COVERAGE AND MINIMUM 20% LANDSCAPE AREA.**

Roll Call:

Ayes 7-McLeroy, Bosco, Cole, Niss, Doherty, Arthur, Chin
 Noes: 0

MOTION APPROVED.

<u>Request</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Requesting</u>	<u>Leaving</u>	<u>Required</u>
#3) Setbacks Lot 2	27-229-1	Waive setbacks	0 0	Various
#4) Side Yard Lot 3	27-229-1	West Side Yard 20	0	20
#6) Perimeter landscape area for Lot 2	27-457(2)(a)(1)	No shade trees	0 shade trees	Shade trees within buffer
#8) Shade trees in buffer	27-459(3)(a)(1)	0 shade trees	0 trees in buffer	One shade tree every 50 feet in 9 foot buffer

FINDINGS OF FACTS

1) The property has unique and peculiar circumstances, which create an exceptional and unique hardship. For the purpose of this determination, the unique hardship shall be unique to the parcel and not shared by other property owners in the same zoning district.

Written comments of the board:

Chin: Unique situation hybrid lot, plus it's landlocked.

2) The proposed variance is the minimum necessary to allow the reasonable use of the parcel of land.

Written comments of the board:

Chin: Unique situation hybrid lot, plus it's landlocked.

3) The proposed variance would not adversely affect adjacent and nearby properties or the public inn general.

Written comments of the board:

Chin: No effect.

4) The proposed variance will not substantially diminish property values in, nor alter the essential character of the area surrounding the site.

Written comments from the board:

April 21, 2009

Chin: No effect.

5) The effect of the proposed variance is in harmony with the general intent of the ULDC and the specific intent of the relevant subject area of the ULDC.

Written comments from the board:

Chin: Complies when considered as a whole plus it is landlocked.

6) The need for the variance has not been created by the actions of the property owner or developer nor is the result of mere disregard for the provision from which relief is sought.

Written comments from the board:

Chin: Complies when considered as a whole plus it is landlocked.

7) Granting the variance will not confer upon the applicant any special privilege that is denied by the ULDC to other lands, buildings, or structures in the same zoning district.

Written comments from the board:

Chin: Complies when considered as a whole plus it is landlocked.

**CONCLUSION ON REQUIRED FINDINGS
PURSUANT TO SEC. 27-147, ORDINANCE CODE**

Sec. 27-147(1)	Positive 7 to 0
Sec. 27-147(2)	Positive 7 to 0
Sec. 27-147(3)	Positive 7 to 0
Sec. 27-147(4)	Positive 7 to 0
Sec. 27-147(5)	Positive 7 to 0
Sec. 27-147(6)	Positive 7 to 0
Sec. 27-147(7)	Positive 7 to 0

Moved by Cole, seconded by Doherty.

Motion: **TO APPROVE THE FINDING OF FACTS**

APPROVED BY CONSENSUS

Moved by Cole, seconded by Doherty.

Motion: **TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF V09-05 FOR VARIANCES REQUEST # 3, 4, 6 AND 8 WHICH INCLUDED 27-229-1 TO NOT REQUIRE FRONT, REAR OR SIDES SETBACK, SECTION 27-229-1 NOT TO REQUIRE WESTERN SIDE SETBACK LOT 2, SECTION 27-457 ITEM 2(A)(1) NOT TO REQUIRE PERMANENT LANDSCAPING IN THE LANDSCAPE AREA AND SECTION 27-459(3)(A)(1) TO OMIT THE SHADE TREES IN THE 9 FOOT LANDSCAPE BUFFER CONTINGENCE UPON THE PRELIMINARY LANDSCAPE AND DEVELOPMENT PLAN PRESENTED TO THE PLANNING BOARD TODAY.**

Roll Call:

Ayes 7-McLeroy, Bosco, Cole, Niss, Doherty, Arthur, Chin

Noes: 0

MOTION APPROVED.

<u>Request</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Requesting</u>	<u>Leaving</u>	<u>Required</u>
#7) One shade tree every 50 feet in vehicular use area	27-457(5)(b)	Palm trees instead of shade trees	Date Palms	One shade tree every 50 feet in vehicular use area

April 21, 2009

FINDINGS OF FACTS

1) The property has unique and peculiar circumstances, which create an exceptional and unique hardship. For the purpose of this determination, the unique hardship shall be unique to the parcel and not shared by other property owners in the same zoning district.

Written comments of the board:
Chin: For general safety and security.

2) The proposed variance is the minimum necessary to allow the reasonable use of the parcel of land.

Written comments of the board:
Chin: For general safety and security.

3) The proposed variance would not adversely affect adjacent and nearby properties or the public in general.

Written comments of the board:
Chin: No effect.

4) The proposed variance will not substantially diminish property values in, nor alter the essential character of the area surrounding the site.

Written comments from the board:
Chin: No effect.

5) The effect of the proposed variance is in harmony with the general intent of the ULDC and the specific intent of the relevant subject area of the ULDC.

Written comments from the board:
Chin: For general safety and security.

6) The need for the variance has not been created by the actions of the property owner or developer nor is the result of mere disregard for the provision from which relief is sought.

Written comments from the board:
Chin: For general safety and security.

7) Granting the variance will not confer upon the applicant any special privilege that is denied by the ULDC to other lands, buildings, or structures in the same zoning district.

Written comments from the board:
Chin: For general safety and security.

**CONCLUSION ON REQUIRED FINDINGS
PURSUANT TO SEC. 27-147, ORDINANCE CODE**

Sec. 27-147(1)	Positive 7 to 0
Sec. 27-147(2)	Positive 7 to 0
Sec. 27-147(3)	Positive 7 to 0
Sec. 27-147(4)	Positive 7 to 0
Sec. 27-147(5)	Positive 7 to 0
Sec. 27-147(6)	Positive 7 to 0
Sec. 27-147(7)	Positive 7 to 0

Moved by Cole, seconded by Doherty.

Motion: **TO APPROVE THE FINDING OF FACTS**

April 21, 2009

APPROVED BY CONSENSUS

Motion: **TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF V09-05 FOR REQUEST # 7 TO SECTION 27-457(5)(B) TO SUBSTITUTE PALMS FOR SHADE TREES CONTINGENT ON THE PRELIMINARY LANDSCAPE PLAN AS PRESENTED TO THE BOARD WITH REGARD TO QUANTITY AND LOCATIONS OF SUBSTITUTIONS.**

Roll Call:

Ayes 7-McLeroy, Bosco, Cole, Niss, Doherty, Arthur, Chin
 Noes: 0

MOTION APPROVED.

<u>Request</u>	<u>Section</u>	<u>Requesting</u>	<u>Leaving</u>	<u>Required</u>
#9) Increase the maximum number of parking spaces for shopping centers	Table 27-540(c)	Increase parking by 127 spaces	401 spaces	244 spaces

FINDINGS OF FACTS

1) The property has unique and peculiar circumstances, which create an exceptional and unique hardship. For the purpose of this determination, the unique hardship shall be unique to the parcel and not shared by other property owners in the same zoning district.

Written comments of the board:

Chin: Existing agreement with # of adjacent businesses to share parking.

2) The proposed variance is the minimum necessary to allow the reasonable use of the parcel of land.

Written comments of the board: none

3) The proposed variance would not adversely affect adjacent and nearby properties or the public in general.

Written comments of the board:

Chin: No effect.

4) The proposed variance will not substantially diminish property values in, nor alter the essential character of the area surrounding the site.

Written comments from the board:

Chin: No effect.

5) The effect of the proposed variance is in harmony with the general intent of the ULDC and the specific intent of the relevant subject area of the ULDC.

Written comments from the board:

Chin: Improves traffic handling.

6) The need for the variance has not been created by the actions of the property owner or developer nor is the result of mere disregard for the provision from which relief is sought.

Written comments from the board:

Chin: See answer to first finding.

April 21, 2009

7) Granting the variance will not confer upon the applicant any special privilege that is denied by the ULDC to other lands, buildings, or structures in the same zoning district.

Written comments from the board:

Chin: See answer to first finding.

**CONCLUSION ON REQUIRED FINDINGS
PURSUANT TO SEC. 27-147, ORDINANCE CODE**

Sec. 27-147(1)	Positive 6 to 1
Sec. 27-147(2)	Positive 6 to 1
Sec. 27-147(3)	Positive 6 to 1
Sec. 27-147(4)	Positive 7 to 0
Sec. 27-147(5)	Positive 6 to 1
Sec. 27-147(6)	Positive 6 to 1
Sec. 27-147(7)	Positive 6 to 1

Moved by Doherty, seconded by Cole.

APPROVED BY CONSENSUS

Moved by Cole, seconded by Doherty.

Motion: **TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF V09-05 FOR ITEM 9 SECTION 27-540(C) A VARIANCE TO INCREASE THE MAXIMUM NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES TO 127 OVER THE MINIMUM REQUIREMENT OF 244 CONTINGENT UPON THE PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN AS PRESENTED BEFORE THE BOARD TODAY.**

Roll Call:

Ayes 6-McLeroy, Bosco, Cole, Doherty, Arthur, Chin

Noes: 1- Niss

MOTION APPROVED.

PDRB 09-06
Preliminary
Development Order
630-668 Atlantic
Blvd.

PDRB09-06 Application for a Preliminary Development Order as outlined in Chapter 27, Article 3 of the Unified Land Development Code of Neptune Beach for Lakeshore Village aka M & P Shopping Centers. The property is currently known as Neptune Square 630-668 Atlantic Boulevard and is listed as parcel number 172392-0000 in the records of the Property Appraiser of Duval County. The request is to construct a total of 93,244 square foot retail shopping center with an existing 5,000 square foot outparcel (Blockbuster) on a total of three parcels.

The proposed timeline for demolition of the existing building is 90 to 120 days after final approval. Construction of Phase one should be completed sometime late 2010. Phase one is the Publix and adjacent retail shops. Phase two will be the junior anchor and out building along Atlantic Blvd between Blockbuster and KFC. Regency Centers will have architectural approval over the junior anchor and this area will match the rest of the center. The proposed Publix is 54,340 square foot the current Publix in Atlantic Beach is 40,142 square feet.

Chairperson Chin opened the public hearing.

There being no further comments from the public, the public hearing was closed.

Moved by Doherty, seconded by Cole.

Motion: **TO APPROVAL PDRB09-06 FOR THE PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT ORDER FOR LAKESHORE VILLAGE FOR 630 ATLANTIC BLVD**

April 21, 2009

**REGENCY CENTER/SEMINOLE SHOPPES AND RECOMMEND
APPROVAL OF THE FINAL DEVELOPMENT ORDER TO CITY COUNCIL.**

Roll Call:

Ayes 7--Bosco, Cole, Niss, McLeroy, Doherty, Arthur, Chin

Noes: 0

MOTION APPROVED.

Applicant informed that their application would be forwarded to the City Council for final decision on May 4, 2009 and that applicant must attend this meeting.

Next Meeting

May 19, 2009.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

Kerry Chin, Chairperson