

City of Jacksonville, Florida
911 EMERGENCY ADDRESSING ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
Wednesday, October 5, 2022
Ed Ball Building, 1st Floor Training Room
10:00am-12:00pm

Summary of Meeting Minutes

Members Present

Tanja McCoy – Chairwoman JPDD
Phyllis Leonard- JSO
James VanGorder – JSO
William Green – JFRD
Kimberli Moreland - JFRD
Savannah Marti – ITD/JaxGIS
Brandi W. Knoepfel – JSO
Chuck Gibson – BID

Members Not Present

Thomas Register – MCC
Amanda Douglas – USPS
Joyce Smith – PAO

Staff Present

Cherry Pollock – OGC
Connor Tomlin – City Planner I
Stephen Nutt – City Planner I
Evan Brown – GIS Specialist
Rodney Ford – JSO

Public Speakers

Roshanda Shine, City Council
CM Reggie Gaffney – City Councilmember
Staci Rewis – Driver, McAfee, Hawthorne, & Diebenow – Representing Iguana Investments LLC in renaming of Gator Bowl Blvd.
Alex Harden – DMHD – representing Iguana Investments LLC
Madison Ferra – Owner of 333 Bay St.
Mike Herzberg – Representing 333 Bay St.

Call to Order

The Chairwoman McCoy called the meeting to order

Verification of Quorum – Quorum Met

The Chairwoman McCoy asked if there was a quorum, Ms. Pollock OGC confirmed a quorum with eight (8) members present.

Approval of Meeting Minutes

Committee member William Green moved to approve the August 3rd, 2022,

meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Committee Member Phyllis Leonard, then approved unanimously.

Gator Bowl Blvd Street Renaming

Stephen Nutt provided a brief overview of the proposal to change the name of Gator Bowl Blvd. to E. Bay St. First providing an extent map showing the full extent of Gator Blvd. to be changed, starting at A Philip Randolph, and ending at Haines Street. Stephen Nutt explained that the proposed change would affect approximately 8 property owners, and that the majority of the 8 properties are owned by the City of Jacksonville, except for Shipyards Hotel LLC property. William Green asked why the applicant was seeking to rename the street. Public Speaker Staci Rewis, on behalf of Iguana investments clarified street name change would extend from A Philip Randolph to Hart Bridge On ramp. Gator Bowl would remain the name on the second half of the road from the Hart Bridge on ramp to Haines St. Staci Rewis described the history of Bay Street and the intent of the rename, citing new development along the E. Bay Street corridor. Cherry Pollock asked to clarify whether to rename to end at the Hart Bridge on ramp. Staci Rewis provided a map of the new extent to committee members. Cherry Pollock asked the number of property owners that would be affected, Stephen Nutt clarified that less property owners would be affected. Phyllis Leonard asked if the "East" portion of Bay Street was necessary. Stephen Nutt clarified that the dividing line was Main Street and the policy states that directionals may be added to a street name if the street crosses into another addressing quadrant. East Bay Street would follow this policy. Chairwoman Tanja McCoy called for a motion to vote to approve the renaming of Gator Bowl Blvd. from A Philip Randolph Blvd. to Hart Bridge on ramp to E. Bay Street. William Green moved, and Phyllis Leonard seconds the motion and the committee unanimously vote in approval of the renaming of Gator Bowl Blvd. to E. Bay Street, extending from A Philip Randolph Blvd. to Hart Bridge on ramp.

Addressing Policy Change Proposal

Connor Tomlin begins presenting amendments to the Addressing policy, to change the street naming portion of the policy. The change proposal outlined when a roadway would be required to be named. A street should be named if it meets at least one of the following conditions: If the roadway is proposed to be located on a public or private right of way, if a designed short cul de sac (or bubble street) provides access to four or more lots that use the cul-de-sac exclusively for their access, If a designed and engineered internal driveway within a campus or town center style commercial development or where the internal driveway provides the primary means of access to two or more principal structures or separate parcels that do not front on a named roadway. Connor went on to describe that streets would be named during the subdivision process. The developer shall propose the naming of all streets within a new subdivision at the time of the civil engineering review. The City of Jacksonville Planning and Development Department will review the proposed street names for conformance with the Street Naming Policy at this time. Once the street names have been

approved, they will be reserved upon receipt of the the second review of the civil plans that shows the geometry of the streets with the approved street names labeled on the plans. If the development project is a phased project, the developer will need to provide a site plan for the current phase as well as an overall site plan of the entire subdivision that shows what the ultimate street configuration will be. Connor Tomlin went on to describe a new addition to the policy regarding naming existing shared accessways. Existing Unnamed Shared Accessways may be named for the purpose of ensuring the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of Jacksonville. The City may pursue the naming of an Unnamed Shared Accessway to ensure the timely and efficient provision governmental services, including emergency response, or when property owners request the naming of an Unnamed Shared Accessway. An Unnamed Shared Accessway for this purpose may be identified as an unapproved private road, a public unmaintained road, an unopened unmaintained public right of way, or a recorded access easement. The naming of an Unnamed Shared Accessway is strictly for the purpose of providing improved emergency response and does not indicate a change in the maintenance status of the accessway, or any requirements based in Chapter 656, Ordinance. Connor Tomlin describes how the Addressing section will identify unnamed shared accessways. The following conditions may require an unnamed shared accessway to be formally named: The E-911 Coordinator becomes aware of a problem in locating properties in an area and determines that the naming of a accessway relieves the problem and improves location identification of properties in the area. This would require written documentation to the Addressing Section to request that the accessway be named. The Addressing Section, identify or receives notification of a nonconforming addressing issue, determines that the most appropriate solution to resolve the issue is to name an Unnamed Shared Accessway. A property owner requests the establishment of a road name on their private accessway. When this occurs, the establishment of a road name requires consent from 100% of the owners of property along the private accessway and/or the property owners that own the land on which the accessway exists. William Green asks to clarify that it will need 100% consent from the owners of property along the private accessway, Cherry Pollack confirms that this is new language and will require 100% consent. Connor Tomlin describes factors for establishing a road name on an unnamed shared accessway: the Unnamed Shared Accessway provides the primary means of access to two or more principal structures that do not front on a named roadway. The location and geometry of the Unnamed Shared Accessway is formally established through plat, dedication of right of way, recorded deed or recorded easement or has been established for the purpose of ingress and egress which provides vehicular access or passage. A street name sign can be placed. Connor Tomlin goes on to discuss the steps required for naming unnamed shared accessways: 1) Within 30 days of a determination to name an Unnamed Shared Accessway, the Address Section will mail notification letters to affected property owners and/or owners of property where the accessway is located. The letter will include an explanation for why the accessway has been selected for naming and include a road naming form. The form will provide three spaces for listing road name suggestions. 2) Property owners are allowed 30 days to complete and return the road naming form. When property owners fail to participate in the road naming procedure within the specified 30-day time period, the Addressing Section shall provide a name for the accessway without input from the property owners. 3) Once the deadline for road name submittal has elapsed, the Addressing Section will review any submitted names for consistency with the City's Street Naming Policy and will mail a second letter to the property owners with an approved list of road names. 4) Property owners will be allowed 15 days to vote for their preferred street name. The road name with the most votes will be the name

selected. In the event of a tie, the Addressing Coordinator will make the final selection. 5) Once the road name is selected, notification letters are mailed to property owners to identify their new road name and their new address assignment. 6) Although there is no provision for an administrative review associated with a decision to name an Unnamed Shared Accessway, a private property owner or tenant may request an administrative review concerning their new address assignment. A request for administrative review must be submitted within 14 days from the date of new address notification letter. The administrative review process is outlined in the "Nonconforming Street Address Corrections" section of the Policy. Connor Tomlin clarifies that there will be no changes to the "Renaming Streets" and "Street extensions" portions of the Addressing Policy. Connor moves on to proposed changes to Chapter 745 of the municipal code, section 745.101. (a) will not be changed. 745.101 (b) would now read "Definitions. The following terms, phrases, words, and their derivations, as listed in alphabetical order herein, shall have the meaning contained below when referenced within Chapter 745 or the Street Naming and Addressing Policy unless otherwise described within specific Sections." No changes to 745.101(b)(1) and (2). A (3) would be added stating "Approved Private Road shall either mean a privately owned and maintained roadway that meets the same construction and design standards of a public road as established in the Subdivision Code, or shall mean any privately owned and maintained thoroughfare that has been designated as an "Approved Private Road" by the Director of Public Works." (6) would be stricken from the code. (7) would be added, stating "Public Maintained Road shall mean any publicly maintained thoroughfare which is located on a formal dedicated public right of way.", the language of (8) would read that "Public right-of-way shall mean any formal dedicated right of way that is established for the purpose of allowing vehicular access or passage" (11) would now read "Unnamed Shared Accessway shall mean any unapproved private road, public unmaintained road, unopened public right of way, or any recorded easement that has been established for the purpose of providing vehicular access or passage that functions as the primary access route to more than one dwelling or business related building." (12) would not change, (13) would be stricken from the policy. Cherry Pollock asks if it would be clearer to keep (13) Tanja explains that it was stricken due to a new definition of "accessway" to replace this verbiage. (14) would remove the verbiage "If a pre-street direction is used, it is the first element of the street name." (15) and (16) would not change. (17) would be added with the verbiage "Unapproved Private Road shall mean any privately owned and maintained road that fails to meet the construction and design standards of a public road as established in the Subdivision Code and/or has not received (or maintained) a designation of "Approved Private Road" from the Director of Public Works." (18) would now read "Unopened right of way shall mean any formal dedicated public right of way that is established for the purpose of allowing vehicular access or passage, but that the City has no record or evidence of use or construction." Connor Tomlin goes on to describe proposed changes to Sec. 745.106. (a) would now include the phrase "Unnamed Shared Accessways" in both (a) and (b). (c) and (d) would be stricken and replaced. (c) would now read "Existing private streets or shared unnamed accessways may be named in accordance with the requirements and procedures identified within the Street Naming Policy for the naming of Unnamed Shared Accessways. These streets are named in order to ensure a timely and efficient provision of emergency response in locations where properties do not directly front on an existing named roadway." (d) would now read "Any decision by the City to name a private street or a shared unnamed accessway as identified under Sec.745.106 (c) includes a requirement for the placement of a street name sign in order to identify the location of the named accessway. The City's Traffic Engineering Division is responsible for placement and

maintenance of these street signs when they are located within a public right of way.” € would be added, stating “Where the City determines that a privately owned Unnamed Shared Accessway must be name for health and safety reasons and the required street naming sign is to be posted on private property, the accessway may be named after the property owner(s) who reside on the Unnamed Shared Accessway have granted an easement which is adequate to establish the location and boundaries of the accessway and the location where the sign is to be posted. The City will provide a street sign blade and post at no cost to the property owner(s). The placement and maintenance of the sign will be the responsibility of the private property owners whose address has been assigned from the newly Named Shared Accessway. The City will ensure that adequate funds are made available to the Traffic Engineering Division for this purpose.” (f) would be added and state “Street name signs approved by the City’s Traffic Engineering Division are required on all private streets and newly Named Shared Accessways.” (g) would now include “or unnamed shared accessway” in the verbiage. Connor moves on to describe changes to Sec. 745.107, which would strike 745.107(c) from the code. Chairwoman Tanja Mccoy asks to open up discussion with the committee. William Green clarifies that these will in fact be the new changes to the policy and ordinance code. Tanja McCoy and Cherry Pollock confirm that these will be the new changes to the policy. The committee discusses the changes to the policy, including the naming of private accessways and easements, including potential emergency issues that may arise from unnamed roadways. William Green makes a motion to approve changes to the street naming and addressing policy as well as Chapter 745 of the municipal code. Savannah seconds the motion to approve. The committee votes unanimously to approve the changes to the policy.

333 E. Bay St

Evan Brown presented 333 E. Bay St is all one building and goes into the background of the addressing of the building. He explained that addressing staff has received an application requesting one address with multiple unit numbers as a revised plan for building addressing. He further described the background of the previous applications submitted and mentions that the applicant has requested an additional review of the application for address change by the 911 Advisory Committee. Evan Brown discussed the requirements for an address change and points out that there have been no address issue complaints from emergency services currently. Evan Brown explains the reasonings for an additional review of the most recently submitted application for address change. Evan Brown explains that addresses can be cleaned up so that addressing reflects current building scheme. Additionally, it is explained that new addresses are assigned during construction of new spaces and not before. Evan Brown stated that no plans have been submitted for the building renovations, only a floor plan and a rendering of the façade. Evan Brown continues, showing the proposed and current layout of the building which was derived from a site visit to the premises including business locations and ingress/egress corridors within the building. Evan Brown presents the staff recommendation to leave the addressing as is, as there are individual businesses requiring separate addresses. Evan Brown provides the Google Street View to see imagery of the building at the street level. Evan Brown shows the outside view of the building within Google Street View, explaining that each business has its own shopfront and individual addresses. William Green asks what the doors on Bay Street access. Evan Brown explains that you can only access the first floor through said doors and not the second except by other means. James VanGorder explains to the committee what doors are accessways to what part of the building. William Green and James VanGorder

discuss the building layout more in-depth. Chuck Gibson asks about the nature of the parcel. Lori Leonard asks about the ownership of the building and states that she agrees with the owners' proposal. Tanja McCoy allows the guest speakers to speak. Mike Herzberg begins presenting on the building pointing various things regarding regulations and the layout of the building and brings up specific points about the building such as addresses, permits, and safety. James VanGorder and William Green bring up the subject of access to the building from various locations. Mike Herzberg continues to explain the access plans. William Green asks about the access of the second floor. Madison Ferra confirms that there are multiple ways to access the second floor as Mike Herzberg explained. Cherry Pollock asks about the nature of the demolition process of the building and asks about any delay of emergency services. John Herzberg says only one 911 call was made and no one showed. Madison Ferra says it was the non-emergency number. William Green asks why Live Bar has two addresses. Mike Herzberg explains that that's how the GIS was done. Cherry Pollock asks about the historical businesses that remain on Google Street view. Mike Herzberg says that they have not been there for some time. Savannah Marti explains that street view imagery is out of date. Mike Herzberg explains that the DIA is influencing the design of the façade of the building. Councilmember Reggie Gaffney states his support for the change of addressing to the building. CM Reggie Gaffney brings up the old Ford plant and how the city has lost multi-million dollar deals because of the plant. CM Reggie Gaffney says it's hard to do anything until you get the correct addresses. CM Reggie Gaffney explains why it's important to get addresses correct to keep things simple and for the businesses to thrive. Tanja opens the topic up to the committee for discussion. Chuck Gibson explains that the addressing scheme doesn't matter to the building department. Lori Leonard says that it would be less confusing if they had individual unit numbers. William Green expresses concern about accessing the second-floor units. Tanja McCoy informs the committee that it is an issue because no detailed plans have been submitted. Lori Leonard brings up how they addressed the Avenues Mall. Tanja McCoy explains that it was done during the civil review phase and that the change for 333 E. Bay St would be premature. William Green says that clear unit numbering signage is a must. Lori Leonard recommends that the subject be tabled until permits are acquired since the addressing does not affect getting the permits. Brandi Knoepfel asks what happens when buildings are consolidated for the permitting process. Tanja McCoy explains that the permitting can be done without having the one physical address and that they can apply for one address after they have submitted their plans. James VanGorder asks if they are done with the demolition and how the addresses will be done. Mike Herzberg confirms that they are done and that they have plans that can be sent over. Tanja McCoy confirms that the addressing will be determined by the plans that are sent over. Cherry Pollock mentions that address changes occur when there is a non-conforming address and asks the committee if there are any emergency related issues with the current addressing of the building. William Green brings up that with the demolition that happened, a nonconforming address was created. Tanja McCoy says that those addresses can be changed to clean them up and re-added if there is a new tenant. Chuck Gibson asks if Fire and Rescue can determine the difference between upstairs and downstairs address numbers. William Green confirms that that would be an issue and says it would be easier with unit numbers. Lori Leonard asks why the addressing must change right away without the permits. Tanja McCoy informs her that it doesn't have to change right away and that once the permit is received, the addresses can change. Lori Leonard suggests that unit numbers would make the most sense once development services receive the permits. Tanja McCoy explains the process of permits and what's necessary for the address change to occur. William Green suggests that the topic be tabled

until further action is required, if any. Tanja McCoy confirms that the topic should be tabled until further action is taken. Mike Herzberg asks if they can bring the plans to development services and asks if addressing can work with said plans for the time being. Tanja McCoy suggests that they wait until they are done with the DIA process and that once they are in the building review process addresses can be assigned. Mike Herzberg informs the committee that they are trying to keep all paperwork and other things under one address. Chuck Gibson informs the applicants that they need one permit application per address and asks if everything is included and asks if the permits are full architectural permits. Mirk Herzberg informs the committee that they need the one address for all the state agency filings. Cherry Pollock asks if they cannot get permits because of the DIA process. Mike Herzberg confirms they cannot because of the DIA Process. Cherry Pollock asks if they can provide everything documented with the DIA and the plans and suggests the topic be tabled until Development Services receives everything from the applicant. Lori Leonard brings up that 911 address changes won't happen until its approved by addressing staff because of the complications it could cause. Tanja McCoy again suggests tabling the topic. The topic is tabled.

11247 San Jose Blvd – Waterford Apartments

Evan Brown provides a brief overview of an addressing issue at 11247 San Jose Blvd (Waterford Apartments) which had been previously tabled. The issue reported by Addressing staff would potentially affect 500 addresses. Waterford Apartments are addressed currently off San Jose Blvd, but Old River Rd East is the road of access used to gain entry in Waterford Apartments complex. Waterford apartments were addressed in 1988 by addressing staff. Old River Rd East was recognized as a private road in 1989/1990. Evan Brown discusses the addressing policy and ordinance that justifies bringing the address change to the 911 committee. Evan Brown discusses the orientation of the club house and that it falls on the even side of the street. Evan Brown recommends that a new address of 3070 Old River Rd E be the new address if changed as Montage apartments also share an address of 3050 Old River Rd E. Evan Brown then discusses the topic of the new building/unit numbering scheme. Evan Brown quotes the addressing policy about building/unit numbering. Evan Brown informs the committee that there are two existing developments now with five-digit unit numbering. Evan Brown goes into detail about sign postings that were discovered on a site visit including a main sign with large letters that's lit and additional permanent signs along Old River Rd E pointing towards Waterford Apartments. Chaya Starker begins speaking about the nature of Old River Rd E and how that street is maintained by the apartment complex and continues by saying that it would be a hardship to change the address. Tanja McCoy opens the topic to the committee for discussion. Cherry Pollock inquires about the nature of the signage. Evan Brown explains to the committee that besides the vegetation overgrowth the signage is visible both day and night. Chaya Starker explains all the additional signage that was added. Lori Leonard says the signage is pretty much established. Kimberli Moreland says that the only issue with JFRD would be with someone new, but that others in the crew would know the location and area. William Green asks if this would be an issue with conforming to the addressing policy. Cherry Pollock states it is a non-conforming address but given all the clear signage and the thousands of numbers of addresses that will be impacted, the current address could remain. Tanja McCoy brings the address change to a vote to remain the same

under the condition that all signage is maintained by the owners of Waterford Apartments. Lori Leonard motions to not change the address of the complex based on the condition that signage must be maintained, and under the condition of how many current addresses would be affected and remove vegetation covering the sign. William Green seconds the motion. The committee passes the notion to leave the address the same.