

# Minutes Regular Meeting of the St. Johns County PLANNING AND ZONING AGENCY

## Thursday, April 6, 2023 at 1:30:00 PM

The regularly scheduled public meeting of the St. Johns County Planning and Zoning Agency was held on Thursday, April 6, 2023 at 1:30 p.m. in the County Auditorium at the St. Johns County Administrative Complex located at 500 San Sebastian View, St. Augustine, Florida.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Gregory Matovina, District 1 Chair

Elvis G. Pierre, District 2 Vice Chair Dr. Richard A. Hilsenbeck, District 3

Henry F. Green, District 5 Eugene Wilson, District 3

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** 

Meagan Perkins, District 4,

Jack Peter, District 4

**STAFF PRESENT:** Lex Taylor, Sr. Assistant Attorney; Christine Valliere, Sr. Asst. County Attorney; Michael Roberson, AICP, Director, Growth Management; Teresa Bishop, AICP, Planning Division Manager; Hali Barkley, GIS Technician; Dominique Wintons, Application Review Technician, Thomas Stalling, Communications Specialist and Marie Colee Assistant Program Manager.

- Call meeting to order at 1:30 pm
- Pledge of Allegiance
- Reading of the Public Notice statement by Pierre
- Public Comments: None
- Note: At the time of writing these minutes, NO transcript was available. Hence minutes have been written from the sound video.

#### **AGENCY ITEMS:**

District 1

1. COMPAMD 2022-06 The Landings at St. Johns (Active Adult). Transmittal hearing for a Large-Scale Comprehensive Plan Amendment that seeks to change the Future Land Use Map designation of approximately 581 acres of land, located south of Greenbriar Road and west of Longleaf Pine Parkway, from Rural/Silviculture (R/S) to Residential-B (ResB), with a site specific text amendment stating that in locations where the subject property is contiguous to The Landings at Greenbriar site, no Development Edges will be required.

Staff - Justin Kelly, Senior Planner

**Presenter: Ellen Avery Smith, Esq.** (Rogers Towers, P.A. 100 Whetstone Place, Suite 200, St Augustine Fl) presented the request for a Large Scale Comprehensive Plan Amendment along with three other specialists working on The Landings at St. Johns (Active Adult) project. Explained that this is the transmittal hearing only. Provided an overview of the project and explained that there will be four applications proposed.

The Landings at Greenbriar (382 acres) with:

- 1. Small Scale Comprehensive Plan Amendment.
- 2. Planned Unit Development.

The Landings at St Johns (581 acres) with:

- 3. Large Scale Comprehensive Plan Amendment.
- 4. Planned Unit Development (Active Adult).

Explained that the Landings at Greenbriar only needs a Small Scale Plan Amendment. So it only requires two hearings instead of four, and does not need a transmittal hearing.

Explained they had a concurrency agreement for the Landings at Greenbriar with a school district. Explained that no school concurrency agreement is required for The Landings at St Johns (Active Adult) as people under 19 are not allowed to reside there. Hence it is exempt from school requirements.

Presented a visual map of The Landings at St Johns where it is surrounded by properties on all sides.

**Presenter: Casey Dendor** (ETM Surveying & Mapping, 14775 Old St Augustine Rd. Jacksonville) explained that the existing zoning is Open Rural (OR) and Residential Single Family (RS-2) and is mostly surrounded by PUD zoning such as County Park (Helow Park), and School owned property. The proposed zoning for the combined two developments would allow for 49 percent open space and recreation. This will consist of 302 acres for wetland preservation, 146 will be upland preservation and 24.6 acres will be parks.

The Active adult housing will be for those who are 55 years of age and older. Those under the age of 19 years are prohibited from occupying the homes. These homes have no impact on the schools, yet continue to pay the ad valorem school tax revenue each year. They also have a reduced roadway trip generation by at least 45 percent. There will be fully amenitized programming on-site.

The history of the property is that it was used by the Navy for more than 20 years as a Switzerland airfield. At the time that the Navy sold the property it was used as bonified agricultural uses.

(17:09)

**Presenter: Ellen Avery-Smith,** explained they had conducted two community meetings related to this project. As in all projects, from the past couple of years, local residents are concerned about transportation and schools.

Presented the active and funded road widening projects in the project area, such as CR 210, Longleaf Pine Parkway, Veterans Parkway, Greenbriar Road, Shearwater Parkway and First Coast Expressway.

Presented the proposed improvements on Greenbriar Road and Longleaf Pine parkway intersection. Also proposes to spend almost \$1 million improvements on the entrances and turn lanes to Switzerland Point Middle School and Hickory Creek Elementary school as well as improvements to Bartram Trail High School turn lane.

Explained that The Landings at St John's project is expected to spend \$11.5 million to widen to four (4) lanes from just East of the Long Leaf Pine Parkway and Greenbriar Road intersection back to the project entrance. This includes design, permitting and construction of that road. This is set out in the Concurrency and Impact Fee Credit Agreement that is in the public record for this project for the non-restricted age agreement. There will be a companion agreement for the age restricted. The construction for this \$11.5 million road section must commence before this project gets approved for the first Plat and has to be completed within a two year period of commencement. This road will be built upfront. It will take time for Pulte Homes to design its project internally to do the horizontal construction and to get any homes out of the ground. Expected to be a 2.5 year timeline from the approval.

The school access improvements at Switzerland Point and Hickory Creek on Green Briar Road is where the project will be adding "slip" lanes for parents to wait on the side of the road to drop children off or pick them up. That is approximately a \$600,000 improvement. No road impact fees from the County that will be awarded for these improvements. It is simply a public benefit that is being offered by Pulte Homes for this project. These road improvement plans have been offered to the School Board and Pulte Homes is in discussion with them to see if they will approve these lanes.

The cost to lengthen the Bartram Trail High School access is approximately \$280,000. This will allow more students to get out of the 4 lane highway of Long Leaf Parkway and have all the travel lanes clear. This will help get the students out of the flow of traffic both in coming and outgoing from the school. There will also not be any road impact fee requirements from the County. So in total with the other two schools there will be almost a \$900,000 road improvement public benefit paid for by Pulte Homes.

Explained current project is age restricted. The companion project in the future is NOT age restricted. Presented a map showing where the future schools will be located and their expected opening dates.

The project will not be putting any children into the schools from approximately 2.5 years from approval. Three new K-8 schools will be opening before the project will be putting children into schools.

Non age restricted portion also pays schools proportional share for capital improvements as per Florida law. The age restricted area will be paying \$10.4 million in proportionate share.

Explained that all the land surrounding this project has a Residential B zoning. This is what this project is requesting.

(30:00)

Further discussion occurred with the Agency and the Presenter with regard to schools and transportation.

Rajesh Chindalur PE, PTOE, (Chindalur Traffic Solutions, Inc, 8833 Perimeter Park Blvd, Suite 103, Jacksonville Fl 32216) Explained that in the age restricted development, people are 55 plus maybe working and will be travelling at different times of the day to those who are living in the single family homes and have children.

Agency and the applicant had further discussion with the regard to the Landings at Greenbriar generating a lot more traffic than this project. Presenter explained that the project will take 10 or more years to build out, hence the maximum peak hour traffic is not expected to be reached until then.

Further discussion occurred around the current deficient road system and mentioned that the need to correct these road systems amount to \$115 million. It was explained by the applicant that there is about \$36 million committed already by developers.

Discussion occurred between the Agency and the applicant around the original use of the property by the Navy as a bombing range, and that the site had been cleaned up. This created a lot of site disturbance. After all the digging and removal was completed the vegetation started growing back.

Discussion occurred with regard to whether or not there will be interconnectivity between neighborhoods. Applicant confirmed there will only be one main entrance to and from this project. They conducted two community meetings where local residents were opposed to connectivity with other projects. Applicant explained there is a provision in the land development code to install a traffic signal if traffic safety and volumes warranted that.

Justin Dudley (Pulte Homes, 12724 Grand Pay Parkway) Confirmed the site had been cleaned up multiple times when the Navy left the site. Quoted from various documented findings that the site was cleaned of ordinances and high explosives. One report, that was concluded for the Bartram Ranch Project by Toll, stated that a million pounds of metal had been moved from the site. That the site is now suitable for residential land use.

**Dave Jeff** (Carter Environmental Services, 42 Masters Drive, St. Augustine Fl 32084) Explained the mitigation plan for the project. There would be on site preservation and off site mitigation bank credits within the drainage basin, that would be reviewed under the water management governmental agencies.

Further discussion occurred between the Agency and the Applicant with regard to density bonuses, and lot widths.

Discussion occurred between the Agency and the Applicant with regard to the project being "Age Restricted" and whether or not it required an amendment to the plan. Agency suggested that this application wording be clarified with the client prior to the Board of County Commissioners meeting.

(1:14:50)

**Staff: (Valliere)** With regard to Agricultural enclave, wanted to clarify that the applicant first brought that up yesterday. The amendment application did not include a reference to the statute pertaining to agriculture uses that being 163.31.62 which provides the rebuttable presumption if they meet the definition of Agricultural enclave. Since it only came up recently, Staff doesn't have any

verification that they do actually meet the definition which has five (5) criteria. That can be addressed between now and the Board of County Commissioners meeting.

The Application also includes a text policy amendment that is on your Staff report pdf page 25. That text amendment discusses development edges between the Landings at St Johns development and the Landings at Greenbriar. That includes references to parcel ID numbers which we discovered yesterday which includes more property than what is in both projects. So between now and the Board of County Commissioner's meeting the Applicant will be working to revise the references in that proposed text policy.

# (1:16:09)

**Applicant: Ellen Avery-Smith.** Aware of those changes to be made to the text policy and with regard to Agricultural enclave. Advised they are not seeking to go through that formal process. Was simply pointing out what the statute says. Was able to verify yesterday with Staff that there should be just one parcel number. It will be corrected before the Board of County Commissioners.

## (1:17:11)

# Speakers:

Christine Mullis (805 Nottage Hill Street, St Johns Fl 32259) OPPOSED, for three reasons.

- 1. Inadequate infrastructure to support the expansion area. SR 13 is protected and can only be 2 lane and not made into 4 lanes. That road is currently deficient by 125 percent. There will be more cars added from this project especially in peak times.
- 2. Proposed lot sizes are smaller and out of character with all the other existing neighborhoods. The other lots sizes have an average size of a quarter acre. Requesting that this project increase their lot sizes.
- 3. Protection of the wetlands. Requesting that the County monitor the wetlands during the development phase.

Al Abbatiello (1133 River Birch Rd, St Johns) OPPOSED. Concerned about additional traffic on SR 13 and its impact on the scenic highway. Developers continue to make amendments to the Comprehensive Plan. Why do we have a comprehensive plan if it is continually being amended. St. Johns County appears to lack a strategic plan as to how they are going to achieve their goals of St Johns County. People move to Jacksonville for quality of jobs, yet live in St Johns County for the quality of schools. District 1 of the St. Johns County is becoming very congested. Too many people are compacted into this small area. Questioned how people plan to get out of this area to get to the job market. Mentioned they will be using SR13, US1, 2209 and I95. Urged the Agency to reject this plan and not transmit it to the BCC.

**Chuck Labanowski** (1748 N. Cappero Drive, St Augustine) OPPOSED. Likes that the developers are putting in \$11.5 million into the roads to improve them, yet the road only goes to their entrance. Concerned that the local road systems will not handle the increased traffic coming out of this development.

**Lois Eget-Lau** (191 Morning Mist) OPPOSED. There is over crowding already in the schools. Daughter was physically attacked and robbed at Bartram High School. Placing more students at overcrowded schools is not going to help. Questioned if an EIS was performed. Concerned about the lot sizes being too small, hence more density.

5|Page PZA 04/06/2023

Nancy Tray (25 Crawford Court, Saint Johns Fl 32259) Community needs a TIMELINE to fix things at schools, and the roads, before new developments are commenced. Lives in the Reserve at Green Briar, across from the proposed development. Increased traffic is a major concern as currently has difficulties to turn out of her street. Has children at all three schools closest to this development, Bartram, Switzerland and Hickory. Classes are overcrowded in each school. They don't have enough teachers. At Bartram they are proposing lecture style classes for up to 90 students. Son came home yesterday from school to report an autistic student was beaten at lunch in front of the students. The schools are not keeping up with all the developments and increase in school aged children. Local parents are sending out 10,000 flyers today to alert the community about the overcrowding in the schools and the lack of teachers. Not opposed to developments. Needs a timeline to work with the schools to improve the situation before any new projects are up and running.

**Applicant (Ellen Avery Smith).** Was invited to present a rebuttal. Mentioned that there was no evidence presented by the speakers today of any one representing a large group. Requested that be noted for the meeting by the Agency.

Stressed that the project being presented today is "age restricted". That today the Agency is only voting on The Landings at St Johns (Active Adult). That it does not generate school aged children. The Agency is only considering a recommendation for the Board of County Commissioners to transmit this Large-Scale Comprehensive Plan Amendment application to the State agencies. There are no impacts on the schools, yet a million dollars a year will be paid to the schools in ad valoram taxes.

Referred again to the Concurrency and Impact Fee Credit Agreement that is in draft form and with Staff for their review. Applicant referred to the proportional share payments for the Aged Restricted. That the applicant is going to build an expansion of Green Briar Road from two lanes to four lanes. It also says "In the event the actual cost of the road is more than the engineering cost estimate, the applicant shall make such improvements and receive dollar for dollar impact fee credits in the amount of the difference of the cost." So the applicant is going to build this road, and Mr. Lebanowski can obtain a copy, as it is a public record. "That the applicant will commence construction of the road prior to the County's approval of the first Plat, and they have to complete construction of the road within 2 years of approval, that in no event later than the County's approval of a Plat containing the 300 first residential unit". This language was put in there specifically to make sure this road was constructed at the developer's expense and risk up front.

The document is in the record. It is not final. It is subject to Staff review still. A companion document, once legally filed, will be filed in relation to the application for the "age restricted".

**Applicant representative:** Rajesh Chindalur Explained the traffic going to SR 13, based on the models they had run, and Staff have approved it, that more than 74 percent is anticipated to go East. By the time traffic goes to SR 13 only 10 percent is anticipated to go to the North and 12 percent to the South. Those roads will not be impacted as there is sufficient capacity. Explained there is no need for further widening due to this project coming on board.

**Presenter: (Casey Dendor);** Explained that the density of this project when approved for Residential B allows for 2 dwellings per acre. The Comprehensive Plan does not limit the lot limit

6 | Page

requirement. That is something that would come before the Agency with the planned unit development. The two dwellings per acre that is proposed is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. There are communities nearby that do have smaller lot sizes, that are not quarter acre with 80 feet lot widths. River Town has some 32 feet and communities to the North that have 63 feet, and 70. The 50 foot proposed and 40 foot proposed is consistent with all of that. Consistency is not the same as, it is similar. Density is lower closer to the river and becomes higher density when going closer internal to the development, closer to the East.

Further discussion occurred between the Agency and the applicant with regard to the enforcement of "age restricted".

Applicant: (Ellen Avery-Smith) Explained that before the School Board will deem a project exempt from concurrency that the School Board staff and attorney reviews the Declaration of Restrictive Governance for that community. That Declaration of Restrictive Governance has to say within it that no one under 19 years of age can live within that home along with other specific criteria within that document. That document gets recorded against the title to the property. The Homeowners Association is the governing body, after turn over from the declarant, which is the developer. Then the Homeowners Association is charged with ensuring that no one under 19 is allowed to live in that community. There are no exceptions or exemptions for hardships.

A question arose with regard to the list of names and address that a Speaker mentioned they were representing.

Staff: (Valliere): The County does not have that list of names and addresses listed for the record.

**Applicant: (Ellen Avery Smith)** Pointed out that the document with the list of names and addresses would be a violation of the client's due process rights to have that document entered into at this late hour. Would appreciate if the speaker would provide the document list of names and addresses for the County Commission. So it can be verified between now and the Board of County Commission hearing.

Further discussion ensured between the Agency.

(1:44:00)

Motion by Pierre, seconded by Green, carries 4/1 (dissent Dr. Hilsenbeck) to recommend approval of the transmittal of COMPAMD 2022-06 The Landings at St. Johns (Active Adult) based upon 4 findings of fact as provided in the Staff Report.

# **FINDINGS:**

- 1. The proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment was fully considered after public hearing pursuant to legal notice duly published as required by law.
- 2. The proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment is consistent with the St. Johns County Comprehensive Plan, Ordinance No. 2010-38, as amended, the Northeast Florida Strategic Regional Policy Plan, the Community Planning Act and Land Development Regulation Act (Chapter 163, Florida Statutes), subject to further assessment at the adoption hearing.

7|Page PZA 04/06/2023

- 3. The proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment is procedurally consistent with Part 9.05.00 of the Land Development Code, subject to further assessment at the adoption hearing.
- 4. The amendment is consistent with the Goals, Objectives, and Policies of the St. Johns County Comprehensive Plan, including Policies A.1.2.5, A.1.2.7, A.1.3.11, A.1.15.2, and with other provisions provided during the hearing.

(1:50:48)

Recess: 9 minutes

District 4

**2. ZVAR 2023-01 Stamps Screen Enclosure (054807-0050).** Request for a Zoning Variance to Section 6.01.03.H.3 of the Land Development Code to allow a Rear Yard setback of one foot, two inches (1'2") in lieu of the required five (5) feet in Residential General (RG-1) zoning to accommodate a replacement pool enclosure.

Staff - Trevor Steven, Planner

No ex parte communication declared by the Agency.

**Presenter:** Mary Stamps presented the request for a zoning variance to accommodate a replacement pool enclosure. Also presented three letters of approval from her neighbors.

(1:53:57)

Motion by Green, seconded by Wilson, carries 5/0, to approve ZVAR 2023-01 Stamps Screen Enclosure (054807-00500, based on seven (7) conditions and five (5) findings of fact as provided in the Staff Report.

## FINDINGS:

- 1. The request is in compliance with Article XII of the Land Development Code, defining a Zoning Variance. Competent substantial evidence has been submitted to support a hardship as defined by the Code.
- 2. The request is not contrary to the public interest and is not in conflict with surrounding development.
- 3. The request meets the criteria established by Section 10.04.02 of the Land Development Code.
- 4. The request is not in conflict with the Future Land Use designation of Residential-C.
- 5. The applicant, at the public hearing, has stated no objections to the proposed conditions.

# **CONDITIONS:**

1. The Variance may be transferable and apply only to the construction of the home as submitted for this approval. Should the property be conveyed, the requested relief will run with the property as commenced.

- 2. The approval of the Variance does not release the project from compliance with all relevant requirements of the St. Johns County Land Development Code, Comprehensive Land Use Plan, or any other Agency having jurisdiction.
- 3. Development shall be consistent with improvements depicted on the site plan labeled Exhibit B submitted by the applicant and made a part of this Order. Encroachment is limited to the footage depicted.
- 4. The approval requested within this application is limited to the requested relief from the specific provisions of the Land Development Code. Approval of this request shall not operate as approval or waiver of any other provision of the Land Development Code or Comprehensive Plan. Representations and depictions within the application materials shall assist Staff in the interpretation of the requested relief but shall not operate as approval of, or as a determination of compliance with, any other provision of the Land Development Code or Comprehensive Plan.
- 5. The Variance shall commence within one (1) year of the signing of the Final Order. Failure to commence within the prescribed time shall render the Order invalid and all rights granted herein shall become null and void. Commencement shall be defined as issuance of a Development Permit by the St. Johns County Operations Division.
- 6. This approval of the Zoning Variance may be revoked by the County Administrator or designee, at his/her sole discretion, upon a determination of violation of the conditions set forth herein or a violation of any Federal, State, or Local law or regulation. Appeals of decisions by the County Administrator may be appealed to the Board of County Commissioners.
- 7. The application, supporting documents, conditions and limitations offered within the application and at the public hearing by the applicant (or representative) will be incorporated herein and shall become part of the Final Order, except as may be modified by preceding conditions and limitations

District 4

**3. MINMOD 2022-22 Fairfield Ponte Vedra Point Café/Coffee Company.** Request for a Minor Modification to the Fairfield at Ponte Vedra PUD (Ordinance 1984-29, as amended) to allow for a drive-through ATM to be converted to a drive-through café/coffee company, located at 860 A1A N. **Staff: Sloane Stephens**, Planner

Ex parte communication declared by the Agency: **Dr. Hilsenbeck** spoke with Mr. Burnett earlier in the day.

**Presenter: Douglas N. Burnett,** St. Johns Law Group (104 Seagrove Main Street, St Augustine Fl 32080) presented the request for a minor modification.

Minor discussion occurred between the Agency, Applicant and Staff with regard to meeting provisions.

(1:58:42)

Motion by Green, seconded by Dr. Hilsenbeck, carries 5/0, to approve MINMOD 2022-22 based on seven (7) findings of fact and subject to seven (7) conditions, as provided within the Staff Report.

## FINDINGS:

- 1. The request for this Minor Modification has been fully considered after public hearing with legal notice duly published as required by law.
- 2. The Minor Modification complies with the Land Development Code, Section 5.03.05, which provides criteria for Minor Modifications.
- 3. The proposed Minor Modification is not contrary to the public interest and is not in conflict with the surrounding development.
- 4. The request is consistent with applicable portions of the St. Johns County Comprehensive Plan.
- 5. The request complies with Part 6.08.16 of the Land Development Code regarding Drive-Through Restaurants.
- 6. The request is not in conflict with the Commercial Future Land Use Map designation.
- 7. The applicant, at the public hearing, has stated no objections to the proposed conditions.

#### CONDITIONS:

- 1. Approval of the Minor Modification will be non-transferable and will apply only to the proposed use as described in the attached Master Development Plan Text labeled "Exhibit B".
- 2. Approval of the Minor Modification does not release the project from compliance with all relevant requirements of the St. Johns County Land Development Code, Comprehensive Land Use Plan and any other Agency having jurisdiction.
- 3. The Minor Modification shall commence within one (1) year of the signing of the Resolution. Failure to commence within the prescribed time shall render the Resolution invalid and all rights granted herein shall become null and void. Commencement shall be defined as issuance of a Development Permit by the St. Johns County Operations Division.
- 4. The Master Development Plan Text labeled "Exhibit B" shall be made a condition of approval. Any change or variation shall constitute a violation of the Minor Modification approval in accordance with LDC, Section 5.03.05.
- 5. The approval requested within this application is limited to the requested relief from the specific provisions of the Land Development Code. Approval of this request shall not operate as approval or waiver of any other provision of the Land Development Code or Comprehensive Plan. Representations and depictions within application materials shall assist Staff in the recommendation and interpretation of the requested relief but shall not operate as approval of, or as a determination of compliance with any other provision of the Land Development Code or Comprehensive Plan.
- 6. The application, supporting documents, conditions and limitations offered within the application and at the public hearing by the applicant (or representative) will be incorporated herein and shall become part of the Resolution, except as may be modified by preceding conditions and limitations.
- 7. The applicant at the public hearing has stated no objections to the proposed conditions.

District 4

**4. MINMOD 2022-23 Nelson Pool.** Request for a Minor Modification to the Lakes at Ponte Vedra PUD (ORD. 2015-37) to allow for a five (5) foot Rear Yard setback in lieu of the required ten (10) feet to accommodate placement of a swimming pool.

Staff: Evan Walsnovich, Planner

No ex parte communication declared for Item 4.

**Presenter: Eric Nelson**, (245 Marsh Cove Drive, Ponte Vedra Beach, Florida) owner of the property presented the request.

(2:02:23)

Motion by Pierre, seconded by Green, carries 5/0, to approve MINMOD 2022-23 Nelson Pool based on seven (7) findings of fact and subject to seven (7) conditions, as provided within the Staff Report.

## FINDINGS:

- 1. The request for this Minor Modification has been fully considered after public hearing with legal notice duly published as required by law.
- 2. The Minor Modification is in compliance with Land Development Code, Section 5.03.05.
- 3. The proposed Minor Modification is not contrary to the public interest and is not in conflict with the surrounding development.
- 4. The request is consistent with applicable portions of the St. Johns County Comprehensive Plan.
- 5. The request is not in conflict with the Residential-D Future Land Use designation.
- 6. The applicant, at the public hearing, has stated no objections to the proposed conditions.
- 7. The proposed Minor Modification is in compliance with Part XII of the Land Development Code, defining a Zoning Variance. Competent substantial evidence has been submitted to support a hardship as defined by the Code.

### **CONDITIONS:**

- 1. Approval of the Minor Modification will be transferable and will run with title to the property.
- 2. Approval of the Minor Modification does not release the project from compliance with all relevant requirements of the St. Johns County Land Development Code, Comprehensive Land Use Plan and any other Agency having jurisdiction.
- 3. Approval pursuant to the site plan labeled as Exhibit B submitted by applicant and made a part of this application.
- 4. This approval of the Minor Modification may be revoked by the County Administrator or designee, at his/her sole discretion, upon a determination of violation of the conditions set forth herein or a violation of any Federal, State, or Local law or regulation. Appeals of decisions by the County Administrator may be appealed to the Board of County Commissioners.
- 5. Minor Modification shall commence within one (1) year of the signing of the Resolution. Failure to commence within the prescribed time shall render the Resolution invalid and all

- rights granted herein shall be come null and void. Commencement shall be defined as issuance of a Development Permit/Clearance Sheet by the St. Johns County Operations Division.
- 6. The approval requested within this application is limited to the requested relief from the specific provisions of the PUD and Land Development Code. Approval of this request shall not operate as approval or waiver of any other provision of the PUD, Land Development Code or Comprehensive Plan. Representations and depictions within the application materials shall assist Staff in the interpretation of the requested relief but shall not operate as approval of, or as a determination of compliance with, any other provision of the PUD, Land Development Code or Comprehensive Plan.
- 7. The application, supporting documents, conditions and limitations offered within the application and at the public hearing by the applicant (or representative) will be incorporated herein and shall become part of the Resolution, except as may be modified by preceding conditions and limitations.

District 3

**5. REZ 2022-28 Douglas Business Park.** Request to rezone approximately 5.6 acres of land from Open Rural (OR) to Industrial Warehousing (IW); subject property is located at 125 Douglas Park Drive.

Staff: Saleena Randolph, Planner

Ex parte communication declared by the Agency.

Green: Spoke to Mr. Douglas of Douglas Park and undertook a site visit.

**Presenter:** Bart Gast (54 Ocean Boulevard) presented the rezoning request. Discussion occurred with the Agency and the presenter with regard to a wall being extended.

(2:0547)

Motion by Pierre, seconded by Wilson, carries 5/0, to recommend approval of REZ2022-28 Douglas Business Park, based upon four (4) findings of fact as provided in the Staff Report.

## FINDINGS:

- 1. The request for rezoning has been fully considered after public hearing with legal notice duly published as required by law.
- 2. The rezoning to **Industrial Warehousing (IW)** is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, in that:
  - a) The rezoning is compatible and complementary to conforming adjacent land uses. (Objective A.1.3.11)
  - b) The rezoning encourages an efficient and compact land use pattern and supports balanced growth and economic development. (Objective A.1.11)
  - c) The proposed project is consistent with the goals, policies, and objectives of the 2025 St. Johns County Comprehensive Plan.
- 3. The rezoning to **Industrial Warehousing (IW)** is consistent with Part 2.02.00 of the St. Johns County Land Development Code.
- 4. The zoning district of **Industrial Warehousing (IW)** is consistent with the land uses allowed in the land use designation of **Mixed-Use District** as described in Policy A.1.11.1(m) of the

2025 St. Johns County Comprehensive Plan and as depicted on the 2025 Future Land Use Map.

**6. COMPAMD 2022-07 Workforce Housing - (Adoption).** Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment - Adoption Hearing The attached draft ordinance proposes modifications to the text of A - Future Land Use Element (Policy A.1.11.1.m) of the Comprehensive Plan. These amendments amend Policy A.1.11.1.m regarding the required percentage of Workforce Housing units within the Workforce Housing Zoning designation

Staff: Amy Ring, Special Projects Manager

**Presenter: Amy Ring**, Special Projects Manager presented the proposed modifications to the text as recommended by the Board of County Commissioners.

## Presenter:

**Bob Porter** (4220 Race Track Road, St Johns 32259) representing NEFBA (North East Florida Builders Association). SUPPORTS amendments for various reasons.

- 1. Reduces the required percentage of Work Force Housing units to 30% to match other counties of similar size and wealth.
- 2. Adds affordable rental units.
- 3. Modifies the maximum cost point. After this increase St Johns County will still be 30% lower than Sarasota and Martin Counties, which are very similar in size and wealth.
- 4. Allows builder to pay qualified closing costs on behalf of buyers.
- 5. Adds a category for Duplex homes.
- 6. Extends the time for start of development from 2 to 3 years.

Stressed that the NEFBA are trying to provide affordable WFH without asking for any subsidies from St. Johns County. Explained how the builders will pay qualified closing costs upfront on behalf of buyers, so they can afford to buy the home. Yet the buyer will still pay for the closing costs as an add on to the mortgage cost of the home.

Various discussion occurred between Mr. Porter and the Agency with regard to density and rentals.

(2:20:00)

Motion by Pierre, seconded by Green, carries 5/0, to recommend approval of Comprehensive Plan amendment revising Policy A.1.11.1(m), subject to three (3) findings of fact.

# FINDINGS:

- 1. The proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment was fully considered after public hearing pursuant to legal notice duly published as required by law.
- 2. The proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment is consistent with the St. Johns County Comprehensive Plan, Ordinance No. 2010-38, as amended, the Northeast Florida Strategic Regional Policy Plan, the Community Planning Act and Land Development Regulation Act (Chapter 163, Florida Statutes).
- 3. The proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment is procedurally consistent with Part 5.11.00 of the St. Johns County Land Development Code.

Agency Report: None

Clerk, Growth Management