

**1. CALL TO ORDER 3:01pm**

**2. ROLL CALL/DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

In attendance: Mark Bennett, Jamie Morrill, Len Kreger, Adrienne Burke

Not in attendance: Chip Ross

Guest: Nick Gillette, Doug McDowell (County Planning), Eric Bartelt

Audience: Phil Scanlan, RJ Sicre

Ms. Burke summarized the Land Development Code and Economic Development working group goals, the basis of which is that the comp plan directs that we start to look at all commercial corridors for revitalization, 14<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup>, Sadler Road and Main Beach. *[The 8<sup>th</sup> Street Land Development Code and Economic Development Working Group met from March 2014-March 2015 to bring forward ideas for updating the LDC to the PAB. The PAB elected to establish a subcommittee to review the proposals.]* The working group chose 8<sup>th</sup> street for their first focus. Ms. Burke sent out the working group's website ([www.fbfl.us/LDCED](http://www.fbfl.us/LDCED)) to sub-committee members in advance to review for today's meeting.

The goal for today's meeting is to discuss the topics as listed on the agenda, assign champions to take on the individual issues, and do homework on the topics, then bring back feedback to the next meeting. The 8<sup>th</sup> Street Land Development Code working group that met over the last year created an outline of major topics for reference. The next step is for the Planning Advisory Board (PAB) subcommittee to hash out the details and pull together a formal submittal for a code change to the LDC to bring back to the full PAB.

**3. NEW BUSINESS**

**3.1. Discuss Draft Land Development Code Language for 8th Street**

Assign research tasks based on initial draft language from Land Development Code and Economic Development Working Group:

- Density/Intensity
- Height
- Land Uses
- Design
- Streetscape/Landscape
- Incentives

Ms. Burke commented that the working group discussed adding density to 8<sup>th</sup> Street; currently there is no allowance for residential or mixed use in the C-2 zoned part of 8<sup>th</sup> Street, which has been identified as a major inhibitor. It has been suggested to increase height and allow going up to 3-4 stories as an incentive. A question is how this design will impact neighbors on 7<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> Streets. Ms. Burke showed some examples of developments with density of 30 units per acre.

Mr. Bennett stressed that instead of dictating a specific use, the idea is to open up to more potential uses, which could create an environment to improve the area. It was rediscussed that the area of discussion as identified is between 7<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> Streets.

Mr. Morrill asked - is one of the threshold questions whether there is going to be residential development on 8<sup>th</sup> Street? Feedback from the group was that yes, this is the consensus and recommended proposal. Mr. Morrill asked if we could start off with this as a recommendation and build from there.

Ms. Burke shared that the LDC working group looked at whether we would do an overlay or create an entirely new zoning district. The consensus from the 8<sup>th</sup> Street working group was to not create an overlay which is useful but not user friendly; and instead look at re-FLUMing (create new future land use) and creating a new urban mixed use zoning category. The group reviewed the current zoning map and what is now zoned C-2 and MU-1 and identified potential areas of change. The discussion is not proposing new commercial in residential, but proposing a residential allowance where commercial exists now. Language can be built into the code to encourage good design. The group emphasized good access to 7<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> street to encourage walkability.

The group talked about a six foot access easement to be dedicated by property owners along 8<sup>th</sup> Street, which if granted could earn an incentive of a density bonus or additional height. The easement could be used to expand pedestrian area and for landscaping. The other option would be to require a six foot setback landscape buffer applicable upon redevelopment. Ms. Burke expressed concern about a height increase and impacts on adjacent neighborhoods.

Mr. Kreger reminded the group that they are not making decisions here; rather, the subcommittee is going to make a recommendation to the full PAB. He would like to look at the entire City, reminding the group about vacancies in strip malls. He agrees with making changes for 8<sup>th</sup> Street. He brought up creating incentives for affordable housing with the increase of density. The group discussed the difference between “affordable” and “workforce” housing, which use different definitions based on state or federal language. The consensus was the incentive would be for workforce housing.

Nick Gillette, Engineer, who was a part of the original working group, made comments about the challenges of trying to do a project on 8<sup>th</sup> Street today. In order to incentivize, he noted, you have to offer a variety of products. Mixed-use is the perfect vehicle, but you still have to provide parking. Landscaping and design standards would be encouraged. Rear load parking from 7<sup>th</sup> or 9<sup>th</sup> Street came up as an option. Stormwater should be not an issue because of previously developed sites, landscaping and parking become the bigger issues.

Ms. Burke pointed out that this is setting the stage, people are interested in doing things on 8<sup>th</sup> Street. They have approached the City or professionals like Mr. Gillette, but projects they want to do are not allowable under the current code. Mr. Gillette stated no one is going to come in and spend the money if the allowable density is not there.

Mr. Bennett wants to ensure we tie 8<sup>th</sup> street into downtown and make the whole area walkable. He said we have to provide incentives for design. Ms. Burke emphasized his point and asked, how do we want it to look? This has to be figured out and then build things into the code. Everyone agrees that trucks are a deterrent. Designs can be incorporated so that people have good access to 7<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> street for walking and biking.

Eric Bartelt provided a summary of streetscaping ideas he is working on with the 8<sup>th</sup> Street Streetscape and Improvement Group. The right of way is limited. What we end up with is a sidewalk that runs 12 blocks, with

small patches of grass on both sides. To overcome these limitations, it would be good to obtain additional space through the six foot easement or setback, and create islands where sidewalk can go in and make it more interesting. Of course, buy in from property owners for landscaping is required. The idea is that the City would install and maintain landscaping. Ms. Burke asked whether the consensus is to add available incentive if a property owner is willing to do the six foot easement or is it to require a six foot setback (no easement)? Doug McDowell noted that for the County A1A overlay he believes there are enhanced setbacks and a landscape buffer. The county does not have landscape requirements there.

Mr. Bennett pointed out we do not want to create a tunnel effect on 8<sup>th</sup> Street with height and buildings. Mr. Gillette noted if you do ground floor commercial, you wouldn't likely then do 2<sup>nd</sup> floor commercial. The acreage of a block on 8<sup>th</sup> St is approximately 1.87 acres per block.

Ms. Burke reiterated concerns about the height and adjacent neighborhoods and shared the proposed illustration with different heights. Mr. Kreger noted there are lots that back up to 9<sup>th</sup> St and considering height.

A question about parking came up. Ms. Burke noted that parking is addressed in LDC Chapter 7 and the standards have been changed fairly recently to allow more flexible parking options. This section may need to be looked at again to help with 8<sup>th</sup> street improvements. On the side streets, there is enough space to do angled parking in the right-of-way which could be a credit to on-street parking allowances.

Mr. Bartelt asked what is reasoning to include west side of 9<sup>th</sup>? It is MU-1 now and being proposed for MU-2. Ms. Burke noted that for ease of mapping and logistics, the proposed MU-2 follows the existing zoning district boundaries of MU-1, C-2 and a little bit of R-2 in the northeast section. Mr. Gillette stated including the west side of 9<sup>th</sup> incentivizes to make lots combined and larger. Mr. Gillette suggested a proposed step down in height on 9<sup>th</sup> Street. Mr. Kreger suggested parking area underneath. Phil Scanlan noted that a higher density and height of 55 feet be on the 8<sup>th</sup> street side only. Ms. Burke mentioned the MU-1 height limit is currently 35 feet. C-2 is 45 feet. Mr. Bartelt suggested 55ft on 8<sup>th</sup> Street.

Mr. Kreger asked what can we do with parking to encourage people? Offer one parking space per unit. Phil Scanlan suggested you could reduce parking to one per unit and increase bike racks.

Mr. Kreger suggested creating a point system for incentives similar to the CRA Density Bonus. With an increase in density, this could create incentive for workforce housing. Mr. Bennett stated qualifications are based upon income-40-60%. Ms. Burke said there are thresholds set by the state the state for affordable housing.

Mr. Kreger said we have to make options lucrative for people, trucks are not going away so we may want to look at comp plan to change something with 8<sup>th</sup> Street, which has a state designation of a Strategic Intermodal System. He reiterated we will have to give a bunch of incentives to encourage people to build. Mr. Bennett encouraged under building parking and the importance of allowing noise to dissipate. Mr. McDowell thinks it is a good idea to increase density. Ms. Burke referred to the map. She mentioned CRA design guidelines as a model. Mr. Gillette emphasized parking is going to be issue, it's possible we will not be able to fit enough stalls to accommodate increased density. Mr. Gillette reminded the group that Mr. Bartelt mentioned on street parking.

The consensus of the group was to allow density up to 30 units per acre as a bonus, 25 as the standard.

The group discussed a 45 foot maximum height. Ms. Burke noted R-2 is 35 ft max, looking at the area around Beech St. Grill. Businesses would not likely want more than 45 ft. Mr. Gillette and the group discussed step down height on 9<sup>th</sup> street. Mr. Kreger asked for a larger redevelopment areas, create a communal parking lot?

Ms. Burke asked about land uses, noting the working group talked about inserting MU-2 into the Table of Land Uses and what kind of land uses it should allow. The major change was taking out, she believed, auto repair stores. With the addition of residential density, more land uses have really been added. She would like someone to look at the draft land use chart with an “outside eye”. **Mr. Morrill volunteered to look at land uses.**

**Mr. Kreger will look at matrix for incentives for height, density, parking, and easement.**

**Ms. Burke will do a little more work on design section and bring ideas to next meeting with more options.** Streetscape improvements tie into design.

Mr. Kreger commented that workforce will move to 8<sup>th</sup> Street. All will be dependent on what the marketplace drives. He noted the CRA density matrix was completed years ago, but no one has utilized. But it’s about creating the opportunity for people to come.

RJ Sicre, a representative of FPU, noted utility facility needs to be added as a supplemental allowance under the proposed MU-2.

Mr. Bennett over time if 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> are developed, you will see retail and mixed use development. You will have the advantage of people walking. Mr. Morrill noted there is not a business requirement on 9<sup>th</sup> and it could go to 45 feet high. There was discussion about height allowances – up to 55 feet high as a bonus (45 feet as the standard) for 7<sup>th</sup> Street south of Fir and east and west sides of 8<sup>th</sup> Street and west side of 9<sup>th</sup> Street. The rest of the area would be a max of 45 feet.

Ms. Burke mentioned the working group discussed a policy of making side streets one way to help better direct traffic, but there was no group decision on this.

Ms. Burke asked Mr. McDowell if proposed changes as discussed by the group could continue to county section of 8<sup>th</sup> Street. He responded that here may be some threads that could be utilized, but likely not in the entirety because of different circumstances in the County portion of 8<sup>th</sup> Street.

Ms. Burke shared with the group that remaining abandoned signs on 8<sup>th</sup> Street are now down.

RJ Sicre suggested looking at the density of Amelia park condos and townhouses to give people a sense of the type of density being suggested.

Mr. Kreger suggested proposal go to the August PAB meeting. Ms. Burke stated that due to staff workload this would not be possible. It was agreed that the goal would be the September PAB meeting.

### **3.2. Determine Future Meeting Dates and Times**

The next meeting will be Thursday, July 2<sup>nd</sup> at 3pm at City Hall.

**4. COMMENTS BY THE PUBLIC - Members of the public are invited to address the PAB on items of concern not listed on the agenda.**

There were no comments.

**5. ADJOURNMENT 4:17pm**

DRAFT