



**City of Palm Coast
Minutes
Planning and Land
Development Regulation
Board**

City Hall
160 Lake Avenue
Palm Coast, FL 32164
www.palmcoastgov.com

***Chair Clinton Smith
Vice Chair Sandra Shank
Board Member James Albano
Board Member Charles Lemon
Board Member Christopher Gabriel
Board Member Hung Hilton
Board Member Suzanne Nicholson
Alternate Board Member Sybil
Dodson-Lucas
Alternate Board Member Larry
Gross
School Board Rep Patty Bott***

Wednesday, October 19, 2022

5:30 PM

City Hall-Community Wing

- Public Participation shall be in accordance with Section 286.0114 Florida Statutes.
- Public comment on issues on the agenda or public participation shall be limited to 3 minutes.
- Other matters of concern may be discussed as determined by Committee during the meeting.
- If you wish to obtain more information regarding the agenda, please contact the Community Development Department at 386-986-3736.
- In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and Section 286.26, Florida Statutes, persons needing a reasonable accommodation to participate in any of these proceedings or meeting should contact the City Clerk at 386-986-3713, at least 48 hours prior to the meeting.
- It is proper meeting etiquette to silence all electronic devices, including cell phones while meeting is in session.
- Any person who decides to appeal any decision with respect to any matter considered at this meeting will need a record of the proceedings, and for such purpose, may need to hire a court reporter to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based.

Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance

Chair Smith called the October 19, 2022 Planning and Land Development Regulation Board (PLDRB) meeting to order at 5:30pm.

Roll Call and Determination of a Quorum

Present and responding to roll call:

*Chair Smith
Vice Chair Shank*

Mr. Albano
Mr. Lemon
Mr. Hilton
Ms. Nicholson
Mr. Gabriel

Excused:
Ms. Bott

Approval of Meeting Minutes

**1 MEETING MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND LAND DEVELOPMENT
REGULATION BOARD SEPTEMBER 20, 2022 MEETING**

Pass

**Motion made to approve as presented by Board Member Nicholson and
seconded by Board Member Gabriel**

**Approved - 7 - Chair Clinton Smith, Board Member Charles Lemon, Board
Member Suzanne Nicholson, Vice Chair Sandra Shank, Board Member James
Albano, Board Member Hung Hilton, Board Member Christopher Gabriel**

Public Hearing

2 VARIANCE TO SIDE YARD SETBACK - 10 WHITTINGTON DRIVE

Pass

**Motion made to continue this item to the November 16, 2022 PLDRB
meeting at 5:30pm at City Hall Community Wing by Board Member
Nicholson and seconded by Board Member Albano**

**Approved - 7 - Chair Clinton Smith, Board Member Charles Lemon, Board
Member Suzanne Nicholson, Vice Chair Sandra Shank, Board Member James
Albano, Board Member Hung Hilton, Board Member Christopher Gabriel**

3 HARBORSIDE MPD – APPLICATION # 5132

*Ms. Neysa Borkert, City Attorney, addressed the PLDRB members and asked if
any member had ex parte communications on this matter. Ms. Nicholson stated
that she received an email from her residence's Homeowners' Association
(HOA) and that reading the cover letter urging the residents to attend tonight's
meeting, she did not read the attachments. She stated that this will not affect her
ability to be impartial on this matter.*

*Mr. Ray Tyner, Deputy Chief Development Officer introduced the history on this
item including that a Planned Unit Development (PUD) that was approved on
May 17, 2005 by City Council for a planned unit development that allowed for
182-unit Resort Condominium Hotel, 47,000 sq. ft. accessory use including
meeting, conference rooms, ballrooms, and hotel, etc. Mr. Tyner stated that*

there is an existing agreement in place specifically a Development Agreement which is a negotiated agreement between the City of Palm Coast and the applicant. So, what the applicant is requesting is a modification to the existing approved agreement. Mr. Bill Hoover, Senior Planner, AICP, gave a presentation which is attached to this record. Mr. Tyner read aloud from the City's Comprehensive Plan Policy section 1.1.2.2. in order to clarify the plan differences between the City and the applicant. Mr. Tyner read from the 2005 Public Meeting where the original Planned Unit Development (PUD) and the approved floor area ratio was approved as it was consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan Policy section 1.1.2.2. He explained if the applicant agreed to the City's proposed 8 items of the Development Order than the City would approve the 22% increase to the floor area ratio. Mr. Tyner discussed the benefits of each of the eight items that staff is recommending and how they are consistent with the approved Development Agreement which allows for 22% increase in the density. Mr. Tyner read the 8 staff recommended items and they would include a sit down restaurant, ship store, keep the marina open including fuel cell, allow for 25% wet slips to be allowed for transient use, slip space to accommodate commercial use, City would have first right of refusal if the owner sells the marina, maintain the "clean marina designation", keep the existing slip which would be used for access by emergency vehicles, applicant to construct interconnectivity accessibility to the restaurant and Palm Coast Pkwy. from the public trail, applicant to add a "Welcome to Palm Coast" signage along the Intracoastal.

Mr. Hoover reviewed the applicant's response to staff's 8 items which is attached to this record. He read each item and explained the applicant's additional number of units that each item would equate to in bonus units. He also referenced that the applicant has proposed a 432 cap of bonus units that the applicant is agreeing to in their response, which equates to a density of 25.5 units per acre.

Mr. Hoover referenced a modification to the PUD in 2007 which included a floor area ratio (FAR) increase of 22% from .55 to .67 and he stated that this 2007 PUD is still in effect and the developer can build the project as previously approved. Mr. Hoover referenced a 2005 Fishkind and Associates study that was done for a 2005 modification to the PUD that showed the economic impact of this project based on 2005 dollars.

Mr. Jay Livingston, Livingston & Sword, attorney for the owner JDI Palm Coast, LLC, gave a presentation which is attached to this record. Mr. Livingston prior to starting his presentation stated that no one was sworn in last meeting, referencing to a statement that Ms. Borkert made at the start of this item being heard. Ms. Borkert apologized she had some incorrect information about swearing in of those testifying during the last meeting. Mr. Livingston stated that he continued his objection from the last meeting to staff's explanation of the Land Development Code (LDC) section 3.05.3C mixed use density calculation and that during the last meeting this section was read into the record, however only the first half of the code was read and the 2nd part of the code provision states that the calculation for determining density will be made by administrative rule and that no administrative rule was ever established to determine the calculation methodology. So, the applicant continues to object to staff citing this

section of the LDC as no calculation methodology was ever created. He further stated that other mixed-use developments exist within the City.

Mr. Livingston stated that he and his clients believe their project meets the LDC. Mr. Livingston discussed the policy of a public benefit that would justify an increase in density (referencing Section 10 of the MPD agreement). Mr. Livingston discussed economic viability of the project. Comprehensive Plan Policy 1.1.2.2 checklist was discussed as it relates to each item's economic viability. Mr. Livingston discussed in detail the proposed list of 8 items that staff proposed and the applicant's response indicating the rationale for adding the density bonus to each item. Mr. Livingston clarified that it was never the applicant's intent to ask for over 1000 bonus units as it was always capped at 432 units. Mr. Livingston clarified that the intention about the transient boat slips to 21 it was unintended, it could be 2 transient boat slips. Mr. Livingston discussed the parking capacity regarding the negotiations with City staff. Restaurant discussion as compared to the original PUD. Mr. Livingston discussed Centex original plans for building setbacks.

Mr. Livingston discussed Policy 1.1.1.3 of the Comprehensive plan to arrive at a higher density within mixed use greater than 15 units per acre and then he discussed policy 1.1.2.2. which shows how to arrive at the higher density (bonus). 1.1.2.2 policy was used to construct the pond and the existing garage and condominium. Discussion of bonus units at 22% density moving from the PUD to the new proposed MPD. Mr. Livingston stated there would be a cap because you don't want to kill your own project. Mr. Livingston explained how the 432-unit number was reached showing 125 room hotel, transient slip, and boat ramp.

Mr. Lemon questioned whether the project is planned to have a boat ramp. Mr. Livingston stated there is a boat ramp, but it is closed. Mr. Livingston stated that it would not be a public boat ramp but would allow the marina to get boats in and out and would be available to City and County emergency services for access.

Mr. Livingston reviewed Section 10 responses to achieve no more than 432 units. Mr. Livingston addressed the path restoration which involves an existing drainage issue and Mr. Livingston recommended moving the path, however due to limited time to discuss this issue with the Condo owners' association prior to this meeting, this recommendation wasn't incorporated into the applicant's response and was removed from the applicant's response to the 8 item lists (section 10).

Mr. Tarik Bateh, applicant, addressed the pathway being a public pathway on private property on which the public would be traveling which can cause liability issues.

Mr. Hilton asked how the marina is operated now. Mr. Bateh stated it is currently operating with fuel sales. He is not aware of any short time leasing of the boat slips. Mr. Lemon stated that there are short term leases of the boat slips currently being offered.

Mr. Hilton asked if a condo hotel units could be used as a permanent residence. Mr. Tyner explained that the existing PUD agreement called for a condo hotel,

the current proposal is calling for multifamily. Mr. Bateh stated that Mr. Tyner's statement was correct. Mr. Hilton asked again if a condo hotel could be used as a permanent residence. Ms. Borkert stated that the existing PUD agreement was based on floor area ratio (FAR) which denotes not a residential use but a commercial use. The existing 72 units were approved and built as condominium hotel units not as residential condominium units. Mr. Bateh stated that the existing 72-unit residents had the ability to live there full time. Mr. Livingston stated that condo hotel is a condominium that are sold to the owner, and they can rent them out. Some condo hotels are more like a time share but he read the documents, but he can't see anything that indicates that the owners can't live there full time. Mr. Hilton asked for clarification on this existing PUD limitations for development moving forward asking what you want to build now that you can't under the existing PUD. Mr. Livingston stated that the approved Centex site plan would require certain buildings be located within the site. Mr. Bateh stated that he could build a restaurant and a hotel. But changes are needed to move the location of the site plan items (buildings) due to technical site plan requirements.

Ms. Nicholson asked for clarification on the first item - restaurant on the applicant's section #10. Is it to clarify that not only does the restaurant have to be built but must remain open? Mr. Hoover clarified that the intent is to build the restaurant and keep it operating. Ms. Nicholson asked regarding the ship store item is the intent to keep the existing building with all its existing services or rebuild it, also with those services. Mr. Bateh mentioned that it would most likely be rebuild and there would be a dock master office to manage the marina and in terms of the design and its related services are yet to be determined by the new marina operator. Ms. Nicholson asked if the marina is planned to remain operational. Mr. Bateh stated that it would stay open if it remains financially viable. Ms. Nicholson asked about 2nd egress and ingress as part of the agreement requirement. Mr. Bateh stated it is included in the draft master development agreement. Mr. Bateh stated that they have identified potentially a third egress and ingress locations. Plan A would be little bit north of the existing intersection at Club House Dr. and Palm Harbor Pkwy. 3rd access southeast of property requiring joint access. Option 2 would be to the left of the parking garage to the left along Palm Harbor Pkwy. there is some land that could punch through and may be an option. The 3rd option would be on the southeast corner of the site which would require cooperation with others. Ms. Nicholson asked if anything in this proposed agreement that allow for lots 2, 3, 4 or 5 to be sold to someone else to be developed. Mr. Bateh stated there is nothing to prohibit that so anything can be sold either prior to or after development of the site.

Vice Chair Shank referencing the prior month's PLDRB meeting where Vice Chair Shank asked how many of the existing 72 condo hotel units are homestead except as a primary residence. Mr. Bateh stated that the vast majority number of units are owner occupied and he isn't sure of their year-round occupancy (i.e., homestead exempt status). Vice Chair Shank asked if a market analysis study had been completed on this project for the rental units proposed. Mr. Bateh stated yes and that the analysis was done in-house. Vice Chair Shank asked if the report was available to justify the economic numbers. Mr. Bateh stated that the report isn't with him. He mentioned in last month's PLDRB meeting that the monthly average rent will be over \$2000.00 with some being over \$3000.00. Vice Chair Shank questioned that the economic conditions that

the developer is facing is very similar to the conditions that Centex faced in 2005 when their Development Order was issued. She then questioned what is to stop the project from being sold off again with its entitlements once this MPD agreement is approved. Mr. Batch stated that there is nothing to prohibit it and he went on to say that he has never seen a rezoning that prohibits a sale. Vice Chair Shank stated that there isn't an intent to prevent a sale but to determine what the true intent is of the MPD being proposed. Mr. Bateh stated that their true intent is to develop and own the residential property. Mr. Bateh stated that regarding the marina they wish to own but may bring in an operator to run the marina or they may sell off to a 3rd party expert. To the extent there is a hotel - similar situation they may sell to a 3rd party, even if sold we would still be a partner to them, either a neighbor to our residential property or a legal partner. The residential property would be owned and operator by us. The restaurant would be run by a 3rd party. The residential property would be run by a high-end management company. Vice Chair Shank asked if the project were to be developed today what is your cost per unit. Mr. Bateh stated the cost would be in the vicinity of how \$385,000 per unit (excluding land). Vice Chair Shank asked if when Mr. Bateh responded to the City's 8 items (attachment A) and attached the density bonuses to those items was that \$385,000 used as a value to the request of the 8 items. Mr. Batch did not include the development value in his response. He further stated his bonus units were based on a reasonable cost of the item vs. the approximate land value.

Mr. Albano asked how Mr. Bateh is related to the developer/applicant. Mr. Bateh stated they are partners. Mr. Albano referencing Mr. Bateh's business website you seem to be a transactional realtor more like refinance, equity, and debt. Mr. Albano then questioned Mr. Bateh if he and his partner(s) are looking to develop this project or are you looking to get approval and turn around this property as a pad ready saleable development. Mr. Bateh stated that the business website that Mr. Albano is referring to is a side business called Bateh Real Estate Advisors, LLC, it isn't involved in the sale of this property. Mr. Bateh stated that JDI is looking to raise capital and will develop each part of the project. Mr. Albano asked since this project is coming down to numbers what is the magic number of units that you wish to develop on this project. Mr. Bateh based on his history we don't ask for the moon and stars we are asking for 432 units of which 72 are built (360 new units). We believe this number is close to financial viability.

Chair Smith opened this item to public comment at 7:16pm.

Ms. Borkert stated for the benefit of the public that those who were present for the last PLDRB meeting and made comments, those comments are still valid.

Donna Beckley - Waterside Condos - referencing the condo association letter and its reference to traffic - traffic analysis was done in 2007 prior to RT. 95 addition of Matanzas' exit. Traffic backup over the bridge at the 4-way stop sign. She referenced the sewer gas problem and how it may be increased with another 432 new residents. She also questioned the lack of finished drawings provided for this project.

Celia Puglise - C section - discussed the original intent for the zoning. She questioned the Impact on traffic and the existing sewer system. She recommended keeping the zoning the same.

Jim Sullivan -Christopher Ct. – is concerned about sewer impacts - diversion of traffic onto Florida Park Drive which is already overloaded. He is in favor of the hotel to attract more visitors.

Joanne Murphy - 102 Jack Roberts - has Intracoastal waterways concerns about the narrow boat access and addition of opening a restaurant on the waterfront, questioned noise impacts as well as Mantee impacts.

Paul Bailey - Palm Coast Resort – Thanked the Planning staff and the PLDRB members we have a plan that has been good for 18 years (referencing the existing MPD agreement). Economic viability seems to be the only concern of the applicant. He cited density is a major issue regarding impact to traffic, compounding a problem for the existing emergency egress with the addition of the units.

Ken Pologuse- Palm Coast Resort- the project is too tall and too dense as he mentioned last month. Referenced during last month's PLDRB meeting Ocean Village project which was heard is an example of a well worked project. This project calls for apts. the original agreement called for condo units, which is a different product.

Robert Crocetta- President of the Waterside Condominium - Requested an update on environmental studies, traffic studies that would be required due to multiple traffic accidents. Most developers /most municipalities would require more detailed plans and studies at the time of the rezoning application. The application should also include any financial difficulties of the applicant.

Tom Frusco- Waterside Condo - He is a boat owner and has concerns about the marina and fueling station. He suggested that the City take over the marina. He expressed concerns about traffic on the intracoastal.

Lauren Rizzo - C section - She stated that she has waited in traffic 5-7 min. to get onto Palm Coast Pkwy. She questioned the type of 432 units type (condo or apts.) – and their impact on the school system - Old Kings elementary school is overcrowded now. Referenced the condo hotel located at the Hammock Condo Hotels and related to the transient nature of the guests. Traffic light at the existing 4-way stop sign is requested.

Rick Penson - 110 Clubhouse Dr. - Waterside Condo – he is 30-year resident - Referenced Sheraton Hotel location and suggested that a like type of development (restaurant) be placed in this location without the density proposed by the applicant. He recommended keeping the pedestrian access to the trail system.

Joe Cannon - Palm Coast Resort - He took offense to the PC Resort statement made by the applicant that they do not have a stake in the sidewalk. What is a reasonable density for this project? Suggested that they should know their numbers and communicate them.

Mark O'Leary - South Freemont Ct. – He questioned whether the environmental impact fees have been addressed. He is concerned about the need for a traffic light and the widening of the road - who is paying for this widening project at Clubhouse Dr. and Palm Harbor Pkwy. which would be required with the additional traffic from this project.

Mike Sclora- Cherry Ct.- He questioned whether the ship stores with showers, will continue to be available. He is concerned about the bridge widening and would prefer condos due to apt. residency turn over.

Nina Wyscoski - Crystal Bay - purchased her home to have a resort quality of life - she is concerned about traffic and school impacts. This property's use change will impact future tax revenues.

Jane Rotella - 146 Palm Coast Resort Blvd. - she stated that her background is as a school principal - concept plan has no guarantees nor has any engineer plans or details. She expressed concerns about the density and safety with the limited egress and ingress.

Dave Dunner- Clubhouse Dr. – he stated that the majority present at this meeting is against this application except 2 (referencing the applicant's team). He understands growth is necessary, but it should be in line with Palm Coast's character.

Stephanie Kay - Clubhouse Dr.- due to current employment concerns, she believes it would be hard retaining employees, she is not in favor of the development due to the impact on the quality of life in Palm Coast.

Ms. Borkart clarified for those present that there will be another opportunity to speak at the 2 City Council hearings.

Steve Riley- believes the plan is too large and the impact on traffic is too great.

Chair Smith closed this item to public comment at 7:52pm.

Vice Chair Smith asked Mr. Tyner to explain the difference between this rezoning application for the PUD vs. the detailed reports that are needed with another application type in the future.

Mr. Tyner stated that this is a rezoning, development agreement, this process is like a 35,000 ft. level review of the project. When the site plan is submitted it is reviewed by the City's Traffic Engineering to ensure the Level Of Service (LOS) is met, including the analysis of the need of a traffic light (working with FDOT). An environmental study is required, and water and sewer usages are reviewed at the time of technical site plan. Stormwater is reviewed by the City staff and St Johns River Water Management District (SJRWMD) during the technical site plan review. Mr. Tyner stated that impact fees are paid at the time of building permits. He stated that the City has an interlocal agreement with Flagler Schools when the site plan or plat application is submitted a mitigation agreement is required from the applicant with the Flagler school system. Mr.

Tyner also said that the PLDRB has a non-voting member from the Flagler Schools to ensure compliance with the interlocal agreement.

Mr. Livingston piggybacked on what Mr. Tyner stated in addition to those comments about additional reviews at the time of site plan, the City also has a requirement that any project of more than 100 residential units goes to PLDRB and City Council (2 public meetings) for approval, which involves a thorough study by staff, PLDRB and then City Council. Mr. Livingston stated that also if the project were to be built based on the current PUD it would require the same three meetings (PLDRB & City Council hearings) based on the size of the project in order to have a development order issued for the project.

The proposed MPD will be made up of fee simple townhomes - 5 units on a lot. The apartment units will be high-end units more akin to specialty market apartments.

Mr. Bateh stated that the applicant is trying to show the most accurate plan with their intent for this project however things can change during the development. Marina, ship store, potentially a hotel, residential consisting of multi-family (for rent or for sale) and town homes. The plan is for expensive high-end, luxury houses whether if for sale or rental. Mr. Bateh referenced Florida law that states that a governing body cannot discriminate against form or ownership whether it is for rent or for sale. He referenced uniform ownership leads to good neighbors. Mr. Bateh also stated that the project has already prepaid \$900,000 in sewer impact fees and that addition impact fees will be paid in the future.

Mr. Bateh stated the differences between the proposed MPD vs existing PUD are the following: views are materially better, lower scale development, lower light, less traffic trips, less height, preserve more views by locating the apts. on the east side. The applicant doesn't control waterway traffic. One quarter of the boat slips equals 21 slips would be set aside for transient use. He referenced Caps' on the water restaurant. In a maximum 10,000 ft. restaurant 21 slips is too many. He stated that the applicant will work with the ultimate restaurant operator to ensure slips on the water are made available. Mr. Bateh stated that the applicant would like to continue the marina operation on that location if it was viable. Mr. Bateh stated that the condominium residents have a say- so in the sidewalk and their comments have been incorporated in feedback from these residents. Mr. Bateh also stated that under the Comprehensive Plan we will only have to meet 1 of the conditions of 1.1.2.2 not all 5 conditions.

Mr. Tyner stated the traffic study wasn't received from the applicant so staff can't agree to whether they reduced the traffic level. He also stated that staff does not agree that the applicant has only to meet 1 of the 5 conditions. Staff has tried to be consistent with prior interpretations (of the code) and the proposed intensity increases are not in compliance with prior interpretations of the code.

Ms. Borkert spoke to Chair Smith about the order of the evidence provided at this public hearing, including closing statements that had been given by the applicant and the staff. She then asked Chair Smith if the item was now with the Board and he stated yes, it is with the board for any questions.

Vice Chair Shank asked for clarity on the boat slips (staff exhibit A - #3 - 25% of the boat slips would be reserved for non-transient use for the restaurant). Mr. Hoover explained that includes a typo and their intention was to have 25% of the boat slips be made available on a long-term basis to people who are not residents of the project, and this would include the restaurant users, leaving the other 63 boat slips available for residents (sell or rent to residents of the project).

Ms. Borkert explained that normally the board would review an MPD agreement that was a negotiated document however this agreement has many items that have been negotiated except for the fundamental issue regarding density. So, you would make a motion to either approve or deny the applicant's proposal.

Pass

Motion made to Deny Motion to recommend to City Council to rezone 17.64 +/- acres from Harborside Inn & Marina PUD to Harborside MPD application #5132 by Vice Chair Shank and seconded by Board Member Gabriel

Approved - 7 - Chair Clinton Smith, Board Member Charles Lemon, Board Member Suzanne Nicholson, Vice Chair Sandra Shank, Board Member James Albano, Board Member Hung Hilton, Board Member Christopher Gabriel

Chair Smith called for break at 8:20pm. Chair Smith reconvened this meeting at 8:28pm

4 A FUTURE LAND USE MAP AMENDMENT FOR 30+/- ACRES OF PROPERTY FROM FLAGLER COUNTY DESIGNATION OF AGRICULTURE & TIMBERLANDS AND CONSERVATION TO CITY OF PALM COAST DESIGNATION OF MIXED USE AND CONSERVATION

Mr. Papa, Senior Planner, stated that items #4 & #5 would be presented together, however they will be voted on separately. Public comment will be called on each item separately.

Ms. Borkert inquired if any of the PLDRB members had any ex-parte communications to which none of the board members responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Papa gave a presentation which is attached to this record.

Brian Mann, applicant, addressed PLDRB members and gave a presentation which attached to this record.

Ms. Nicholson asked about the for the agriculture area to the west of this property. Mr. Papa stated that it is part of the City, to be consisted with the existing development he could see it being developed for non-residential uses. More consumer commercial uses. Our policy is to not rezone prior to the owner approaching the City for a rezoning. This project is consistent with the development currently on the west side of US 1 - light industrial and commercial development. Ms. Nicholson asked about any concern about maintaining the tree line. Mr. Papa responded that as required by our Comprehensive Plan's

environmental section we will continue to preserve tree line within environmentally sensitive areas.

Chair Smith opened this item to public comment at 8:45pm and seeing no one approach the podium he closed this item to public comment at 8:46pm

Pass

Motion made to Recommend Approval finding the application #5190 consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and recommend that City Council approve the FLUM amendment from Agriculture & Timberlands, and Conservation (Flagler County Designations) to Mixed Use and Conservation (City of Palm Coast Designation) by Board Member Hilton and seconded by Board Member Lemon

Approved - 6 - Chair Clinton Smith, Board Member Charles Lemon, Vice Chair Sandra Shank, Board Member James Albano, Board Member Hung Hilton, Board Member Christopher Gabriel
Denied - 1 - Board Member Suzanne Nicholson

5 A ZONING MAP AMENDMENT FOR A 30+/- ACRE PARCEL FROM FLAGLER COUNTY DESIGNATION OF AGRICULTURE TO CITY OF PALM COAST DESIGNATION OF HIGH INTENSITY COMMERCIAL (COM-3) AND PRESERVATION (PRS)

This item was presented with agenda item #4.

Chair Smith opened this item to public comment at 8:48pm and seeing no one approach the podium he closed this item to public comment at 8:49pm

Pass

Motion made to Recommend Approval finding that the application #5192 is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and recommend that City Council approve the Zoning Map amendment from 177 Agriculture (Flagler County Designation) to High Intensity Commercial (COM-3) and Preservation (PRS) (City of Palm Coast Designation) by Board Member Hilton and seconded by Board Member Gabriel

Approved - 7 - Chair Clinton Smith, Board Member Charles Lemon, Board Member Suzanne Nicholson, Vice Chair Sandra Shank, Board Member James Albano, Board Member Hung Hilton, Board Member Christopher Gabriel

Board Discussion and Staff Issues

None

Adjournment

Motion made that the meeting be adjourned by Mr. Hilton and the motion was seconded by Vice Chair Shank. The meeting was adjourned at 8:50pm.

*Respectfully Submitted by:
Irene Schaefer, Recording Secretary*

Pass

Motion made to approve by Board Member Hilton and seconded by Vice Chair Shank

Approved - 7 - Chair Clinton Smith, Board Member Charles Lemon, Board Member Suzanne Nicholson, Vice Chair Sandra Shank, Board Member James Albano, Board Member Hung Hilton, Board Member Christopher Gabriel