



**Planning and Zoning Board Meeting Minutes**  
**April 26, 2021**  
**6:30 pm**

**Call to Order**

Chair Kreidt called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm and gave an invocation, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

**Roll Call and Determination of Quorum**

The following Planning and Zoning and staff members were present.

**Board Members:** (Quorum)

- Steve Kreidt, Chair
- Ryan Santurri, Vice-Chair
- David Gragg, Board Member
- David Nelson, Board Member
- Melissa Gibson, Board Member

**Staff:**

- Sandra Riffle, Deputy City Clerk
- Mike Fraticelli, Police Sergeant
- Drew Smith, City Attorney
- Ellen Hardgrove, AICP, City Planner

**DISCUSSION ITEMS**

Comprehensive Plan (CP) and Evaluation and Appraisal (EAR)

Comprehensive Plan

Planner Hardgrove explained the statutory requirements for content of the Comprehensive Plan. State legislation requires an evaluation of the City's CP at least once every seven (7) years. This evaluation must include a review by the local government on whether changes are needed to meet state laws and a local assessment of needed changes. For compliances with statutory changes, the local government must amend the plan within one year of the evaluation to reinstate compliance. The most recent evaluation was in July 2019; with the only necessary amendments to the plan being those needed to address changes in state requirements.

Planner Hardgrove explained the CP is the foundation for all development decisions. In 2011, the Florida legislature amended concurrency requirements for development. " Concurrency is the

requirement that public services and facilities are available "concurrent" with the impacts of development. The 2011 legislature eliminated the requirements for transportation and parks concurrency. State law requires a financial commitment to maintain the adopted level of service if concurrency remains in a local government's comprehensive plan. All Edgewood roads and parks are county or state; we have no leverage over them to make necessary improvements. In addition to staff recommended changes related to the state law changes, staff is recommending changes related to local growth management strategies.

There are some things Edgewood needs to change.

1. Future Land Use Policy 1.1.8 - Public schools that meet zoning code, "may" be permitted in any Future Land Use class rather than "shall".

In response to Board Member Gragg, Attorney Smith said OCPS relied on the "shall" which limited Edgewood decisions.

2. The CP limits density to 25 units per acre, which is suburban. For the ECD and to support commuter rail, Edgewood needs higher density residential along the corridor. Planner Hardgrove's recommendation is to increase to 80 units per acre within the Commercial future land use category.

Most of Edgewood's commercial future land use is down Orange Avenue. Transportation and schools need to be available. Planner Hardgrove asked if this is what Edgewood wants.

3. Solid waste is listed as two times per week; this limits Edgewood's negotiations with franchise contracts and we do not need that measurement.

In general discussion, Chair Kreidt shared concerns about increased density. There are apartments going up without roads which may sacrifice mobility. Planner Hardgrove responded that density is needed to support the restaurants that we want as well as more mass to support public transit.

In response to Chair Kreidt, Planner Hardgrove said a location could be south of Holden Avenue if Gatlin Avenue is realigned. Attorney Smith added that most traffic does not originate in Edgewood, but rather runs through it.

Board Member Nelson suggested that regarding Objective 2.1, to add "appropriate" rather than "all" modes of travel on the roads.

ECD

**Tab 1 Tree/furnishings/sign/area**

Planner Hardgrove explained currently there is 25 feet from the property line to the build line; There is also a requirement for 14 feet in the right of way (ROW): 6 feet of pervious area separates traffic from the 8-foot sidewalk. The pedestrian zone should be included in the Tree/furnishings/sign area definition and the requirement should be for 8 feet of unobstructed sidewalk.

She continued that the pedestrian zone is measured from the back of the curb.

Planner Hardgrove confirmed to Board member Gibson this is to ensure we have the 8 ft. sidewalk and to encourage the goal of Orange Avenue to be more pedestrian oriented.

Board Member Nelson commented that a 5-inch caliper tree is good. Planner Hardgrove said the landscape architect has some flexibility with type of trees.

In response to Chair Kreidt's concerns about overhead lines, Planner Hardgrove said the high-rise oak has a cone shape and they are required to be set back from the utility lines.

She further added to Vice-Chair Santurri that she spoke to Duke Energy, and it is expensive to put the wires underground. Attorney Smith added that Maitland requires lines to be buried but offers a waiver for small properties until there is enough development to do it.

**Tab 2. Incentive for adaptive re-use.**

Planner Hardgrove Recommends adding a new section to ECD to provide an incentive to change the heavy commercial uses to a use envisioned for the Orange Avenue corridor. Such incentives would include reduced parking requirements. Businesses interested in a parking reduction would submit a site plan with requirements including cross-access and compliance with the ECD.

Conversation ensued regarding meeting parking demand on small lots and providing documentation of a parking plan and how the applicant will meet the requirement. Attorney Smith said there is market incentive to be able to support the reduction. Requirements such as an affidavit from the property owner/lessee acknowledging that the Edgewood Police Department has the authority to tow vehicles that are not in an approved parking space will help to preserve the public's health, safety, and welfare.

In response to Vice-Chair Santurri, Planner Hardgrove said it would not be a waiver, it would be included as a right. Attorney Smith added the applicant for the adaptive reuse change must make the case for providing parking less than 100% of the standard required by code.

Attorney Smith said that Flagler Beach restaurants that wanted to expand but could not meet the parking requirements opted to move their business. The heavy commercial uses may not be able change their use because of parking requirements. Conversation ensued related to the percentage of allowable parking quantity reduction; The consensus was to leave it as a 70% reduction.

**Tab 3 Expansion of Existing Buildings**

Planner Hardgrove said the existing regulation is unclear as to how to measure a building's square footage when expansion is planned and recommends a definition of determining of a building for this determination: building's square footage is defined as the area under the roof of a building enclosed by four walls and served by all the following services water, sewage, disposal, and electricity. The area does not include the area beyond the structural supports. Outdoor patios are not counted.

Planner Hardgrove continued and said current code favors expansion of buildings on large parcels. The most you can get is up to 40%. Thus, for a small building, such as one of 1400 square feet, the allowable expansion is very limiting; e.g., 560 square feet and this would require conformance with most of the ECD design standards. In contrast, a large building (e.g., 70,000 square feet shopping center) could expand up to 7,000 square feet and the only ECD requirement would be to park fleet vehicles in the rear.

In addition to the vague process of determining the existing building expansion, clarity is needed related to if the allowable expansion square footage for one building onsite is based on the total of all buildings onsite. The recommendation is that the you can only count the square footage of the building you are expanding.

Further discussion included meeting ECD site standard requirements such as parking of fleet vehicles, tree furnishing zone, customer parking on the side or rear of properties.

Planner Hardgrove said there is concern that some parcels cannot meet building to lot width ratio. To Board Member Nelson, Planner Hardgrove said she does not want to compromise landscaping and there are landscape incentives that already exist in the ECD.

Board Member Nelson said there is an ECD requirement with a threshold for anything past a 10% expansion.

Planner Hardgrove added you get to keep your building and expand it but expansion could delay accomplishing the ECD.

Board member Gibson commented that there are fewer parcels left to develop and the City can be pickier about what we get thus, getting more of the desired development.

Planner Hardgrove added that desired targeted uses can change.

Board member Gibson said there has been 20 years of talking. We cannot flip a switch and there must be fluidity with development and have flexibility to get on the path.

Planner Hardgrove said we are starting to see it.

#### **Tab 4 Lighting**

Discussion included electronic signs, which are not allowed in the City.

Planner Hardgrove said she recommends that there be no string lights around windows or doors to which Board Member Nelson suggested adding a roof restriction.

#### **Tab 5 - Parking Lot Design/Street Wall**

Planner Hardgrove said that she recommends the street wall be three feet in height above grade of the parking lot rather than four feet.

In response to Board Member Nelson, the Board can discuss shrubbery with Landscape Architect Winter when he comes to the meeting.

Other points Planner Hardgrove discussed:

- Lighting will be required for parking lots due to the change of parking behind buildings.
- At least 10% of the interior of parking lots shall be landscaped consistent with Code Section 114. Landscape requirements should be part of the ECD rather than change Chapter 114 in Code.
- The current maximum parking spaces in a row is ten cars and the recommendation is a maximum of 15 spaces before a landscape break; with this recommendation the landscape break minimum width will be 15 feet wide. The 15 feet would give the required evergreen shade tree more room.

In response to Vice-Chair Santurri, the sidewalk is a requirement to connect the parking lot to primary entrance.

- **Tab 6 – Building Placement/Design**
  - The ECD currently does not specify color for a wall; only states opaque brick. The new suggestion is for specific colors normally found in manufactured fired brick.
  - Another recommendation is for windows on the stories above the ground level floor shall match the vertical and horizontal character of ground level windows.
- **Tab 6 - Reduced Parking For Proximity To Transit**
  - Recommendation to clarify how the ¼ mile is measured to receive the 5% parking space reduction: as measured along the public sidewalk from the bus stop to the primary entrance to the building.
- **Tab 6 – Bicycle Parking Recommendations**
  - Minimum horizontal rows separation between racks: horizontal rows: 48 inches on center to allow enough room for two bicycles to be secured to each rack element.
  - Minimum aisle separation between rows of parked bicycles: 60 inches.
- **Tab 6 - Development Bonuses**
  - Adding opportunities for public/private partnerships
- **Tab 7 - Signage**

Planner Hardgrove said that as buildings are brought to the road, there is less need for ground signs. Every commercial property is allowed to have up to 100 square feet of signage. She asked if wall sign square footage should be limited and discussion ensued regarding scale of signage to building, and lighting.

In response to Board member Gibson, Attorney Smith said industry may have standard sizes, but local government codes are not standard.

In response to Planner Hardgrove, Attorney Smith said sign regulations can be the same but more targeted such as a wall sign can be no more than 50% of building frontage.

In response to Planner Hardgrove, Attorney Smith said the allowable 25% of windows signage was brought down from 50%. Planner Hardgrove said but then, window signage was part of the entire sign calculation. Now it is a free 25%.

Chair Kreidt commented that window signage gets the corridor looking tacky and Board Member Gibson said she would like to see some continuity but not have it be “Stepford”.

Chair Kreidt added that today people rely more on their phones than signage. He would support a smaller maximum copy area and that windows would count towards the calculation. He gave the example of window signage at Versailles Plaza.

Board Member Gragg said he does not think the allowable sign area is too big.

- **Tab 8 - Color Palettes/facade building materials.**

Discussion ensued regarding a color palette requirement. Attorney Smith said that colors cannot be arbitrary and to think about large franchises that want colors. After discussion it was decided not to regulate color but to keep the day-glow prohibition.

Attorney Smith said this will be in Ordinance form and ready for recommendation to City Council.

There were no public comments.

Board Member Gragg said that he will not be able to attend the next meeting.

***Chair Kreidt made the motion to adjourn the meeting; second by Board Member Gragg. The motion was approved (5/0).***

The meeting adjourned at 8:23 pm.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair Kreidt Kreidt, Chair

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Sandra Riffle, Deputy City Clerk