



MINUTES
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BOARD
February 14, 2018 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 February 14, 2018 at 6:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers.

Attendance

Board members in attendance:

Christopher Goodin, Chair
Tony Mazzola, Member
Diana Kelly, Member
Alan Martin, Member
Aaron Evens, Member
Nia Livingston, Alternate member
Colin Moore, Alternate member

Absent:

Ryan Dill, Vice-chair
Bob Frosio, Member

The following staff members were present:

Amanda Askew, Deputy City Manager and Community Development Director
Piper Turner, Administrative Assistant to the Building Official

Call to Order/Roll Call

Chair Goodin called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Minutes

Made by Martin, seconded by Evens.

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 10, 2018 MINUTES AS SUBMITTED.

APPROVED BY CONSENSUS

MOTION CARRIED

CDB 18-04
630 Atlantic Blvd
Suites 14 & 15
Seminole Shoppes

CDB 18-04 Application for a preliminary development permit and special exception as outlined in Chapter 27, Article 3 of the Unified Land Development Code of Neptune Beach for the property owner Neptune Square LV, LLC Et AL/Seminole Shoppes LLC for covered outdoor seating area for the property known as for 630 Atlantic Blvd. Suites 14& 15 (RE# 172394-1700).

Mr. Wade Olszewski of CPH, representing the property owners stated they would like to add offer outdoor dining at two new businesses. The space was originally designed for a medium retail store and has since been rented to Renna's Pizza and a take away restaurant to the east in suite 14. Suite 15 will be Renna's pizza and this unit approved to have a patio when the development order was requested and granted for the expansion of the center. Two tables with 2 seats each will be added in front of this business in order to accommodate customer looking for a quick meal.

Mrs. Askew, this property is in the C-3 zoning and was part of the expansion of the Publix shopping center. The seating will be in the north and west sides of the building. It is surrounding by commercial properties to the East, North and West sides. The South is residential however the seating will be a good distance away. During phase I of the construction the developer was required to add heavy landscaping on the west side as a buffer.

Chairperson Goodin opened the floor for public comments. There being no comments, the public hearing was closed.

Board discussion: What is the total number of outdoor seats being requested? Four for suite 14 and twenty-three for suite 15.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

- 1) The proposed use is consistent with the comprehensive plan.

Martin: Commercial property zoned.

Moore: Consistent with the comprehensive plan.

Kelly: Yes, consistent.

Evens: Consistent with code and shopping center.

Livingston: It is consistent w/the goals and purpose of the plan.

Mazzola: Proposed use is consistent with the comp plan.

Goodin: Consistent.

- 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.

Martin: Compatible use of commercial property, 0 issue in density.

Moore: Use is compatible-other outdoor seating in the area.

Kelly: Yes, compatible.

Evens: All of the above. No change except will be sitting outside.

Livingston: The proposed seating is consistent w/other outdoor seating in the area.

Mazzola: It is compatible.

Goodin: Similar to neighboring properties.

- 3) The proposed use would not have an environmental impact inconsistent with the health, safety, and welfare of the community.

Martin: No input on environment of the community.

Moore: No impact.

Kelly: No it would not impact environment.

Evens: Will not.

Livingston: It is built into already available space, no impact. Would meet ADA requirements.

Mazzola: No negative impact.

Goodin: No impact.

- 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.

Martin: No impact noted.

Moore: Outdoor seating would have no detrimental effect.

Kelly: No detriment to future development.

Evens: Same flow as before.

Livingston: This shopping cent already has excess parking.

Mazzola: No impact.

Goodin: Adequate parking/sidewalks.

- 5) The proposed use would not have a detrimental effect on the future development of the area as allowed in the comprehensive plan.

Martin: Area is built out.

Moore: Future development would not be affected.

Kelly: No detriment to future development.

Evens: Will benefit-more vibrant.

Livingston: There is enough of a buffer between use and undeveloped land zoned for residential.

Mazzola: No impact.

Goodin: No detrimental effect.

- 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.

Martin: No impact.

Moore: Excessive noise mitigated by buffer between restaurants and residential lots.

Kelly: Would not result in objectionable noise.

Evens: Will not.

Livingston: The area as of now consists of retail. The other side has a buffer of vegetation and trees.

Mazzola: Should be no impact due to the landscaping to the west.

Goodin: Similar to neighboring properties.

- 7) The proposed use would not overburden existing public services and facilities.

Martin: No burden on existing services.

Moore: Would not overburden.

Kelly: No, already in comp plan.

Evens: Accounted for in shopping center master plan.

Livingston: Public services already there for existing retail.

Mazzola: No impact.

Goodin: No significant increase.

- 8) The proposed use meets all other requirements as provided for elsewhere in this Code.

Martin: Commercial zoned property.

Moore: Meets requirements.

Kelly: Meets other required.

Evens: It does.

Livingston: Would meet ADA.

Mazzola: Meets all requirements.

Goodin: Consistent.

CONCLUSION ON REQUIRED FINDINGS
PURSUANT TO SEC. 27-160, ORDINANCE CODE

Sec. 27-160(1)	Positive 7-0
Sec. 27-160(2)	Positive 7-0
Sec. 27-160(3)	Positive 7-0
Sec. 27-160(4)	Positive 7-0

Sec. 27-160(5)	Positive 7-0
Sec. 27-160(6)	Positive 7-0
Sec. 27-160(7)	Positive 7-0
Sec. 27-160(8)	Positive 7-0

Made by Evens, seconded by Martin.

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE FINDING OF FACTS.

APPROVED BY CONSENSUS

MOTION CARRIED

Made by Evens, seconded by Mazzola.

MOTION: TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE SPECIAL EXCEPTION AND DEVELOPMENT ORDER FOR OUTDOOR SEATING FOR CDB 18-04.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: 7 -Evens, Kelly, Moore, Martin, Livingston, Mazzola, Goodin
Noes: 0

MOTION APPROVED.

The applicant was informed that the special exception request would be forwarded to City Council for their final review on Tuesday February 20, 2018 at 6:00 and that they should attend that meeting.

CDB 18-05 Special
Exception Craft and
Art Studio
1112 Third St.
Suites 11 & 12

CDB 18-05 Application for a special exception as outlined in Chapter 27, Article 3 of the Unified Land Development Code of Neptune Beach for the property owner 1112 Third Street, LLC and applicant Robin Shields for the property known as 1112 Third St. Suites 11 & 12 (RE# 172852-0000). The applicant is requesting a special exception to operate a craft and art studio/workshop.

Robin Shields, owner of Flow studios and applicant, stated they had a shop on Third Street in Jacksonville Beach. This new space will give them the ability to expand the business. This is more of a teaching facility than a retail shop. Usually there are 3 to 5 cars being driven to each class with 2 classes being done each day.

Mrs. Askew stated This is a multi-tenant office complex next to Jarboe Park in the C-1 zoning district. The applicant stated that class would be held Monday through Saturday for 10am to 5pm with up to 10 students. No wine is to be serviced.

Chair Goodin opened the floor for public comments. There being no comments, the public hearing was closed.

The board discussion: How is the parking calculated? Mrs. Askew stated that the parking required were figured when the buildings were constructed based on the use of offices which is lower than retail.

Who owns the land to the south of the paved parking? That is owned by the City and used by the Green Market on Saturdays.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

- 1) The proposed use is consistent with the comprehensive plan.

Martin: Commercial property use-retail/service use.

Moore: I believe the use is consistent.

Evens: Consistent.

Livingston: I believe it leans more towards offering a professional service.

Mazzola: The purpose use is consistent with the comp plan.

Goodin: Use by special exception.

- 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.

Martin: No change in building or property.

Moore: Art classes are consistent with other land use classification of business in Park Place.

Kelly: Yes, there are others tenants with similar characteristics.

Evens: Should flow with character of area and decrease parking demands.

Livingston: They aren't changing design, tenant before was a yoga studio.

Consistent w/ other tenants in offering a service. Not retail

Mazzola: It is compatible.

Goodin: Replaces existing property which had additional traffic.

- 3) The proposed use would not have an environmental impact inconsistent with the health, safety, and welfare of the community.

Martin: No impact on environment.

Moore: No impact this is inconsistent. Would provide positive impact.

Kelly: No negative impact. Positive.

Evens: May enhance.

Livingston: They are not asking to change anything that would negatively impact environment.

Mazzola: No environmental impact. .

Goodin: No negative impact.

- 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.

Martin: Parking is sufficient for proposed. Use.

Moore: Class sizes are small. No detrimental effect.

Kelly: Not generate vehicle /pedestrian movement conditions.

Evens: May enhance/decrease vehicle traffic.

Livingston: Parking for the building seems adequate to sustain these classes. 2 per day and only 1-10 people on average.

Mazzola: No negative impact.

Goodin: les than prior use.

- 5) The proposed use would not have a detrimental effect on the future development of the area as allowed in the comprehensive plan.

Martin: No future development.

Moore: No impact on future development.

Kelly: Not a detrimental on future development.

Evens: Will not.

Livingston: It is consistent w/types of services already being offered.

Mazzola: No impact.

Goodin: Less than prior use.

- 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.

Martin: Art studio.

Moore: Would not affect.

Kelly: Nothing objectionable.

Evens: None of the above mentioned.

Livingston: There is not going to be excessive noise, etc. Hours are 10-6pm.

Mazzola: No impact.

Goodin: Minimal.

- 7) The proposed use would not overburden existing public services and facilities.

Martin: No overburden.

Moore: Parking would not be overburden.

Kelly: Not over burden public services, etc.

Evens: Should decrease demand vs. previous tenant.

Livingston: Already exists, not adding a burden.

Mazzola: No impact.

Goodin:

- 8) The proposed use meets all other requirements as provided for elsewhere in this Code.

Martin: Meets all other requirements.

Moore: Meets requirements.

Kelly: Yes, meets requirements.

Evens: Does.

Livingston: All adhered to.

Mazzola: Meets all other requirements.

Goodin: Meets.

CONCLUSION ON REQUIRED FINDINGS
PURSUANT TO SEC. 27-160, ORDINANCE CODE

Sec. 27-160(1)	Positive 7-0
Sec. 27-160(2)	Positive 7-0
Sec. 27-160(3)	Positive 7-0
Sec. 27-160(4)	Positive 7-0
Sec. 27-160(5)	Positive 7-0
Sec. 27-160(6)	Positive 7-0
Sec. 27-160(7)	Positive 7-0
Sec. 27-160(8)	Positive 7-0

Made by Evens, seconded by Mazzola.

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE FINDING OF FACTS.

APPROVED BY CONSENSUS

MOTION CARRIED

Made by Mazzola, seconded by Evens.

MOTION: TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF CDB 18-05 FOR A SPECIAL EXCEPTION TO OPERATE A CRAFT AND ART STUDIO AT 1112 THIRD STREET SUITES 11 AND 12 TO CITY COUNCIL.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: 7-Evens, Kelly, Moore, Martin, Mazzola, Livingston, Goodin

Noes: 0 0

MOTION APPROVED.

The applicant was informed that the special exception request would be forwarded to City Council for their final review on Tuesday February 20, 2018 at 6:00 and that they should attend that meeting.

Proposed
Ordinance
Change to the
Sec. 27-15 for
Worship Facility

An Ordinance of the City of Neptune Beach Florida, Amending Chapter 27, Unified Land Development Regulations, Article I, Definitions, Section 27-15 for a Worship Facility.

Mrs. Askew explained that the Mayor asked that the Board look at the definition for Worship facilities. Beaches Chapel has open a second school in the 2000 block of Florida Blvd. for students from kindergarten to second grade. The Chapel would like to offer day care at this location without providing a chapel or sanctuary onsite. The current definition would not allow the day care unless services are also held there.

The board discussion:

Chair Goodin opened the floor for public comments. There being no further comments, the public hearing was closed.

Made by Evens, seconded by Livingston.

MOTION: TO RECOMMEND THE PROPOSED CHANGES AS WRITTEN.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: 5-Evens, Livingston, Moore, Mazzola, Goodin

Noes: 2-Kelly, Martin

MOTION APPROVED.

Chairperson Goodin stated that there has been a lot of special exception request for the C-1 zoning district coming before the board. Concerned about granting the request may over burden the area and asked the members if they had any thought on this? Landlords should control the density but they haven't been doing that. The demand for office space is lessening and retail is increasing. Should the board recommend changing the uses in C-1? If it was opened up, it could save applicants time and money if they did not have to go through the process.

The board did not come to a consensus or make a motion.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Chairperson Christopher Goodin

ATTEST:

Piper Turner, Board Secretary

Date