# City of Jacksonville, Florida

Lenny Curry, Mayor

City Hall at St. James 117 W. Duval St. Jacksonville, FL 32202 (904) 630-CITY www.coj.net

January 21, 2021

The Honorable Tommy Hazouri, President The Honorable Michael Boylan, LUZ Chair And Members of the City Council 117 West Duval Street Jacksonville, Florida 32202

#### RE: Planning Commission Advisory Report / Ordinance No. 2020-750/Application No. L-5469-20C

Dear Honorable Council President Hazouri, Honorable Council Member and LUZ Chairman Boylan and Honorable Members of the City Council:

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 650.405 *Planning Commission* Advisory *Recommendation and Public Hearing*, the Planning Commission **APPROVED** Ordinance 2020-750 on January 21, 2021.

P&DD Recommendation

**DENY** 

PC Issues:

Two speakers attended the meeting and spoke in opposition to the amendment raising concerns about incompatibility with abutting single-family, flooding/drainage issues, non-residential traffic and the fact that the amendment does not result in a logical transition from the shopping center to the single-family neighborhood.

The Commission found that the amendment was appropriate as the site is already entitled for non-residential uses and because Appleton Avenue already connects to the rear of the shopping center. The Commission also identified that the property to the south is developed with a business.

#### PC Vote:

#### 6-0 APPROVE

| Joshua Garrison, Chair  | Absent |
|-------------------------|--------|
| Dawn Motes, Vice-Chair  | Absent |
| David Hacker, Secretary | Aye    |
| Marshall Adkison        | Aye    |
| Daniel Blanchard        | Aye    |
| an Brown                | Aye    |
| Alexander Moldovan      | Aye    |
| Jason Porter            | Aye    |

Planning Commission Report January 21, 2021 Page 2

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Kristen D. Reed

Kristen D. Reed, AICP
Chief of Community Planning Division
City of Jacksonville - Planning and Development Department
214 North Hogan Street, Suite 300
Jacksonville, FL 32202
(904) 255-7837
KReed@coj.net

## Report of the Jacksonville Planning and Development Department

## <u> Small-Scale Future Land Use Map Amendment – January 15, 2021</u>

Ordinance/Application No.: 2020-750/L-5469-20C

Property Location: 4529 Roosevelt Boulevard

Real Estate Number(s): a portion of 093305 0000

Property Acreage: 0.38 of an acre

Planning District: District 4, Southwest

City Council District: District 14

Applicant: Beth Whitney, Mark Dowst and Associates, INC.

Current Land Use: Residential-Professional-Institutional (RPI)

Proposed Land Use: Community/General Commercial (CGC)

Current Zoning: Commercial Residential Office (CRO)

Proposed Zoning: Commercial Community/General-1 (CCG-1)

**Development Boundary:** Urban Area

RECOMMENDATION: DENY

# APPLICANT'S JUSTIFICATION FOR THE LAND USE MAP AMENDMENT

The request is to convert a 0.40 Acre area to the same land use as the 28 acre shopping center. Changing the land use will allow the owner to use his land to construct and employee parking lot and dense landscape buffer.

# **BACKGROUND**

The 0.38 of an acre subject site is an undeveloped portion of a larger parcel, which contains the adjacent Roosevelt Square shopping center. The applicant is proposing a Future Land Use Map (FLUM) amendment from Residential-Professional-Institutional (RPI) to Community/General Commercial (CGC) and a companion rezoning (Ordinance 2020-751) from Commercial Residential Office (CRO) to Commercial Community/General-1 (CCG-1) in order to use the property as additional employee parking for the shopping center.

The adjacent land use categories, zoning districts and property uses are as follows:

North: Land Use: Medium Density Residential (MDR)
Zoning: Residential Medium Density-B (RMD-B)

Property Use: Single-family

South: Land Use: RPI, Low Density Residential (LDR)

Zoning: CRO, Residential Low Density-60 (RLD-60)

Property Use: Single-family, Medical office

*East:* Land Use: LDR, MDR, RPI

Zoning: RMD-B, RLD-60, CRO Property Use: Single-family

<u>West:</u> Land Use: Regional Commercial (RC)

Zoning: CCG-1

Property Use: Roosevelt Square Shopping Center

#### **IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

Potential impacts of a proposed land use map amendment have been analyzed by comparing the Development Impact Standards for the subject site's existing vs. proposed land use categories unless maximum density/intensity is noted on the Annotated FLUM or is in a site specific policy. Development Impact Standards are detailed in FLUE Policy 1.2.16, *Development Standards for Impact Assessment*. These standards produce development potentials as shown in this section.

Where there is not an associated site specific policy or note on the annotated FLUM, the impact assessment incorporates supplemental information for non-residential land use categories that permit residential uses in order to assess the potential impacts. Supplemental information related to these impacts are depicted as scenario 2 in the Impact Assessment Baseline Review Table and, as relevant, in the analysis following the table.

**Impact Assessment Baseline Review** 

| Development Analysis                         |                                     |                                       |
|----------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Development Boundary                         | Urban Area                          |                                       |
| Roadway Frontage Classification / State Road | Appleton Avenue – Local Road        |                                       |
| Plans and/or Studies                         | Southwest Vision Plan               |                                       |
| Site Utilization                             | Current:<br>Undeveloped             | Proposed:<br>Parking                  |
| Land Use / Zoning                            | Current:<br>RPI/CRO                 | Proposed:<br>CGC/CCG-1                |
| Development Standards for Impact Assessment  | Current:<br>Non-residential 0.5 FAR | Proposed:<br>Non-residential 0.35 FAR |

| Development Analysis                          | <del>-</del>                                   | 1                                             |  |
|-----------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|--|
|                                               | Residential 23 DU/Acre                         | Residential 30 DU/Acre                        |  |
| Development Potential                         | Current:                                       | Proposed:                                     |  |
|                                               | Scenario 1: 8,276.4 Sq. Ft.                    | Scenario 1: 5,793.5 Sq. Ft.                   |  |
|                                               | Scenario 2: 827.6 Sq. Ft.                      | Scenario 2: 1,158.7 Sq. Ft.                   |  |
|                                               | and 7 DUs                                      | and 9 DUs                                     |  |
| Net Increase/Decrease in Maximum Density      | Scenario 1: Not applicable                     |                                               |  |
|                                               | Scenario 2: Increase of 2 D                    |                                               |  |
| Net Increase/Decrease in Potential Floor Area | Scenario 1: Decrease of 2,482.9 Sq. Ft.        |                                               |  |
|                                               | Scenario 2: Increase of 331                    |                                               |  |
| Population Potential                          | Current:                                       | Proposed:                                     |  |
|                                               | Scenario 1: Not applicable                     | Scenario 1: Not applicable                    |  |
|                                               | Scenario 2: 16 people                          | Scenario 2: 21 people                         |  |
| Special Designation Areas                     |                                                |                                               |  |
| Aquatic Preserve                              | No                                             |                                               |  |
| Septic Tank Failure Area                      | No                                             |                                               |  |
| Airport Environment Zone                      | 300' Height Zone                               |                                               |  |
| Industrial Preservation Area                  | No                                             |                                               |  |
| Cultural Resources                            | No                                             |                                               |  |
| Archaeological Sensitivity                    | Low                                            |                                               |  |
| Historic District                             | No                                             |                                               |  |
| Coastal High Hazard/Adaptation Action Area    | No                                             |                                               |  |
| Groundwater Aquifer Recharge Area             | Discharge                                      |                                               |  |
| Wellhead Protection Zone                      | No                                             |                                               |  |
| Boat Facility Siting Zone                     | No                                             |                                               |  |
| Brownfield                                    | No                                             | No                                            |  |
| Public Facilities                             |                                                |                                               |  |
| Potential Roadway Impact                      | Scenario 1: 157 net new daily trips            |                                               |  |
|                                               | Scenario 2: 56 net new daily trips             |                                               |  |
| Potential Public School Impact                | Scenario 1: Not applicable                     |                                               |  |
|                                               | Scenario 2: De minimis                         |                                               |  |
| Water Provider                                | JEA                                            |                                               |  |
| Potential Water Impact                        | Scenario 1: Decrease of 291.1 Gallons Per Day  |                                               |  |
|                                               | Scenario 2: Increase of 469.9 Gallons Per Day  |                                               |  |
| Sewer Provider                                | JEA                                            |                                               |  |
| Potential Sewer Impact                        |                                                | Scenario 1: Decrease of 218.3 Gallons Per Day |  |
|                                               | Scenario 2: Increase of 352.39 Gallons Per Day |                                               |  |
| Potential Solid Waste Impact                  | Scenario 1: Decrease of 3.97 Tons Per Year     |                                               |  |
|                                               | Scenario 2: Increase of 5.73 Tons Per Year     |                                               |  |

| <b>Development Analysis</b>                          |                                                                            |  |
|------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| Drainage Basin/Sub-basin                             | Ortega River Basin and Sub-basin                                           |  |
| Recreation and Parks                                 | Lakeside Park I and II                                                     |  |
| Mass Transit Access                                  | JTA Routes 16, 80, 201 are within approximately 0.18 of a mile of the site |  |
| Natural Features                                     |                                                                            |  |
| Elevations                                           | 1-3 Feet                                                                   |  |
| Land Cover                                           | 1400: Commercial and Services                                              |  |
| Soils                                                | 72: Urban Land-Ortega-Kershaw complex<br>69: Urban Land                    |  |
| Flood Zones                                          | 0.2 Percent Annual Chance Flood Hazard Flood Zone                          |  |
| Wetlands                                             | No                                                                         |  |
| Wildlife (applicable to sites greater than 50 acres) | Not applicable                                                             |  |

#### **Utility Capacity**

The calculations to determine the water and sewer flows contained in this report and/or this spreadsheet have been established by the City of Jacksonville Planning and Development Department and have been adopted by JEA solely for the purpose of preparing this report and/or this spreadsheet. The method of calculating water and sewer flows in order to properly size infrastructure shall continue to be based on JEA's Water, Sewer and Reuse for New Development Projects document (latest edition).

#### **Future Land Use Element**

#### **Policy 1.2.9**

Require new development and redevelopment in the Central Business District, Urban Priority Area, Urban Area, and Suburban Area to be served by centralized wastewater collection and potable water distribution systems when centralized service is available to the site. New septic tanks in this area maybe permitted only as interim facilities pursuant to the requirements of the Sanitary Sewer Sub-Element.

#### **Transportation**

The Planning and Development Department completed a transportation analysis, which is on file with the Department, and determined that the proposed amendment from Residential Professional Institutional (RPI) to Community/General Commercial (CGC) has an existing development potential under scenario 1 as 100% non-residential and under scenario 2 as 90% residential with 10% non-residential uses and a proposed development potential under scenario 1 as 100% non-residential and under scenario 2 as 80% residential with 20% non-residential uses . If the land use is amended to CGC, development could result in an increase of 157 net new daily trips under scenario 1 or

56 under scenario 2. Trips generated by the new development will be processed through the Concurrency and Mobility Management System Office.

#### **Transportation Element**

**Policy 1.2.1** 

The City shall use the Institute of Transportation Engineers *Trip Generation Manual*, latest edition, to determine the number of trips to be produced or attracted to a particular land use when assessing a traffic impact.

#### Capital Improvements Element

**Policy 1.6.1** 

Upon adoption of the Mobility Plan implementing ordinance, the City shall cease transportation concurrency and use a quantitative formula for purposes of assessing a landowner's mobility fee for transportation impacts generated from a proposed development, where the landowner's mobility fee shall equal the cost per vehicle miles traveled (A); multiplied by the average vehicle miles traveled per Development Area (B); multiplied by the daily trips (C); subtracted by any trip reduction adjustments assessed to the development.

#### Supplemental Transportation Information

**Objective 2.4** of the Transportation Element (TE) of the 2030 Comprehensive Plan requires that the City shall coordinate the mobility circulation system with the future land uses shown on the Future Land Use Map series in order to ensure that roads, road improvements and other mobility alternative improvements are provided as necessary to support development in an economically efficient and environmentally sound manner.

**Policy 2.4.2** of the TE of the 2030 Comprehensive Plan requires that the City shall amend the adopted Comprehensive Plan to incorporate the data and analysis generated by a periodic regional transportation model and study and facilitate the implementation of the study recommendations.

These two Comprehensive Plan policies ensure that the transportation impact related to land use amendments are captured in the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) that is conducted every 5 years. This analysis includes the cumulative effect of all land use amendments that were approved within this time period. This plan identifies the future transportation needs and is used to create cost feasible roadway needs that can be funded by the City's Mobility Strategy Plan.

Mobility needs vary throughout the city and in order to quantify these needs, the city was divided into 10 Mobility Zones. The Mobility Strategy Plan identifies specific transportation strategies and improvements to address traffic congestion and mobility needs for each mode of transportation. The project site is located in Mobility Zone 7.

Subject site is accessible via Appleton Avenue, an unclassified roadway. Annual traffic volumes are not maintained for Appleton Avenue. The proposed development will have insignificant impacts on the roadway network.

#### **School Capacity**

While the proposed amendment could include a residential component, the site would generate fewer than 20 residential units. Therefore, the proposed development would have a de minimis impact on school capacity.

#### **Archaeological Sensitivity**

According to the Duval County Archaeological Predictive Model, the subject property is located within an area of low sensitivity for the presence of archaeological resources. If archaeological resources are found during future development/redevelopment of the site, Section 654.122 of the Code of Subdivision Regulations should be followed.

#### **Historic Preservation Element**

Policy 1.2.6

The Planning and Development Department shall maintain and update for planning and permitting purposes, a U.S.G.S. series of topographic maps upon which recorded archaeological sites are shown.

#### **Airport Environment Zone**

The site is located within the 300 foot Height and Hazard Zone for the Jacksonville Naval Air Station (NAS-Jax). Zoning will limit development to a maximum height of less than 300 feet, unless approved by the Jacksonville Aviation Authority or the Federal Aviation Administration. Uses located within the Height and Hazard Zone must not create or increase the potential for such hazards as electronic interference, light glare, bird strike hazards or other potential hazards to safe navigation of aircraft as required by Section 656.1005.1(d).

#### **Future Land Use Element**

Objective 2.5

Support and strengthen the role of Jacksonville Aviation Authority (JAA) and the United States Military in the local community, and recognize the unique requirements of the City's other airports (civilian and military) by requiring that all adjacent development be compatible with aviation-related activities.

#### Flood Zones

The entire subject site is located within the 0.2 Percent Annual Chance Flood Hazard flood zone. Flood zone designations are assigned by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). FEMA defines the various flooding characteristics of different lands based on a 100-year storm. The 100-year storm or Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) refers to a flood occurring from a storm event that happens an average of every 100 years. This does not mean that a storm of this type will happen every 100-years. There is a 1-percent chance that a storm of this magnitude will occur in any given year.

The 0.2 PCT Annual Chance Flood Hazard flood zone is defined as an area within the 500-year floodplain and outside of the SFHA. Flood insurance is not mandatory within these flood zones. The areas are deemed to be subject to moderate flood hazards. Any

development within the floodplain will be required to comply with Chapter 652, the Floodplain Management Ordinance.

Conservation /Coastal Management Element (CCME)

- Policy 1.4.4 The City shall require all development within the 100-year flood plain to be in strict conformance with all applicable federal, State, regional and local development regulations.
- Policy 2.7.1 The City shall continue to define the surface hydrology of the area to determine flood plain vulnerability and sensitivity, and will determine appropriate protection measures.
- Policy 2.7.3 The City shall protect appropriate floodplain areas for the public benefit and restore degraded floodplain areas by:
  - A. Land acquisition or conservation easement acquisition;
  - B. Regulation, including setbacks, buffer zones, designated wildlife corridors, low density zoning, performance standards and open space requirements; and
  - C. Incentives, including tax benefits and transfer of development rights.

#### PROCEDURAL COMPLIANCE

Upon site inspection by the Planning and Development Department on January 4, 2021, the required notices of public hearing signs were posted. Forty-eight (48) notices were mailed out to adjoining property owners informing them of the proposed land use change and pertinent public hearing and meeting dates.

The Citizen Information Meeting was held on January 4, 2021. One member of the public attended to find out more information about the proposed amendment.

# **CONSISTENCY EVALUATION**

Consistency with 2030 Comprehensive Plan Goals, Objectives and Policies

## Future Land Use Element (FLUE)

Development Area

Urban Area (UA): The UA is the second tier Development Area and generally corresponds with the densely developed portions of the City that have been in residential or employment generating uses prior to consolidation. It also includes major corridors which connect the other Development Areas. Similar to the Urban Priority Area (UPA), the intent of the UA is to encourage revitalization and the use of existing infrastructure through redevelopment and infill development, but at moderate urban densities which are transit friendly. Also similar to the UPA, the UA is intended to support multi-modal transportation and the reduction of per capita greenhouse gas

emissions and vehicle miles traveled. Development is encouraged to employ urban development characteristics as further described in each land use plan category.

Goal 1

To ensure that the character and location of land uses optimize the combined potentials for economic benefit and enjoyment and protection of natural resources, while minimizing the threat to health, safety and welfare posed by hazards, nuisances, incompatible land uses and environmental degradation.

- **Policy 1.1.5**
- The amount of land designated for future development should provide for a balance of uses that:
- A. Fosters vibrant, viable communities and economic development opportunities;
- B. Addresses outdated development patterns;
- C. Provides sufficient land for future uses that allow for the operation of real estate markets to provide adequate choices for permanent and seasonal residents and businesses and is not limited solely by the projected population.
- Policy 1.1.21

Future amendments to the Future Land Use Map series (FLUMs) shall include consideration of their potential to further the goal of meeting or exceeding the amount of land required to accommodate anticipated growth and the projected population of the area and to allow for the operation of real estate markets to provide adequate choices for permanent and seasonal residents and business consistent with FLUE Policy 1.1.5. The projected growth needs and population projections must be based on relevant and appropriate data which is collected pursuant to a professionally acceptable methodology. In considering the growth needs and the allocation of land, the City shall also evaluate land use need based on the characteristics and land development pattern of localized areas. Land use need identifiers include but may not be limited to, proximity to compatible uses, development scale, site limitations, and the likelihood of furthering growth management and mobility goals.

Goal 3

To achieve a well-balanced and organized combination of residential, non-residential, recreational and public uses served by a convenient and efficient transportation network, while protecting and preserving the fabric and character of the City's neighborhoods and enhancing the viability of non-residential areas.

Objective 3.1

Continue to maintain adequate land designated for residential uses which can accommodate the projected population and provide safe, decent, sanitary and affordable housing opportunities for the citizens. Protect single-family residential neighborhoods by requiring that any other land uses within single-family areas meet all applicable

requirements described in the Development Areas and the Plan Category Descriptions of the Operative Provisions of the 2030 Comprehensive Plan and Land Development Regulations.

- Policy 3.1.2 The City shall eliminate incompatible land uses or blighting influences from potentially stable, viable residential neighborhoods through active code enforcement and other regulatory measures.
- Policy 3.1.3 Protect neighborhoods from potential negative impacts by providing a gradation of uses and scale transition. The Land Development Regulations shall be amended to provide for an administrative process to review and grant, when appropriate, relief from the scale transition requirements.
- Policy 3.2.7 The City shall implement the locational criteria of this element for commercial and industrial uses consistent with the character of the of the areas served, availability of public facilities, and market demands.

According to the Future Land Use Element (FLUE), Residential Professional Institutional (RPI) is a category intended to provide for compact medium density development. Development which includes medium density residential and professional office uses is preferred. Limited commercial retail and service establishments which serve a diverse set of neighborhoods are also encouraged in order to reduce the number of Vehicles Miles Traveled.

The Community/General Commercial (CGC) land use category is intended to provide compact development in nodal and corridor development patterns, while promoting the advancement of existing commercial land uses and the use of existing infrastructure. Development that includes residential uses is preferred to provide support for commercial and other uses. Plan amendment requests for new CGC designations are preferred in locations which are supplied with full urban services and which abut a roadway classified as an arterial or higher on the Functional Highway Classification Map.

The 0.38 of an acre subject site is an undeveloped portion of a larger parcel, which contains the adjacent Roosevelt Square shopping center. The applicant is proposing a Future Land Use Map (FLUM) amendment from RPI to CGC to allow for use of the property as additional employee parking for the shopping center. The area surrounding the subject site to the north and east contains single-family residential uses. Directly south of the subject site across Appleton Avenue is a complex of medical offices and west of the subject site is the Roosevelt Square shopping center, designated as Regional Commercial (RC). While the proposed amendment to CGC would be compatible with the commercial uses to the west, it would be inconsistent with the existing residential development pattern in the area. Further, the proposed change to CGC would be intrusive and incompatible with the single-family uses within the surrounding residential neighborhood and set a precedent for commercial

encroachment. Therefore, the proposed amendment is inconsistent with FLUE Goals 1 and 3 and Objective 3.1. Additionally, the encroachment of commercial uses into the residential neighborhood could result in a potentially blighting influence in the area. Thus, the amendment is also inconsistent with Policies 3.1.2 and 3.1.3 of the FLUE.

According to the category description for the CGC land use category, CGC is preferred in areas which abut a roadway classified as an arterial or higher. The site is located along Appleton Avenue, which is a local road. Although the applicant has indicated the intent to use the site as employee parking for the adjacent shopping center, the proposed amendment still has the potential to encourage use of local roads for non-residential traffic. As such, the proposed amendment is inconsistent with Policy 3.2.7 of the FLUE.

The proposed small scale amendment would have a negligible impact on the amount of RPI and CGC designated land throughout the City. Thus, the proposed amendment is consistent with FLUE Policies 1.1.5 and 1.1.21.

#### **Vision Plan**

The subject property is located within the boundaries of the *Southwest Vision Plan*. The subject site is located within the area of the plan called the Traditional Building Area. Theme 1, Option 2 states, "In the traditional building area, focus on protecting the neighborhood." The proposed amendment to CGC could result in a potentially blighting influence in the area by allowing commercial encroachment into the existing neighborhood. As such, the proposed amendment is inconsistent with the Southwest Vision Plan.

#### **Strategic Regional Policy Plan**

The proposed amendment is inconsistent with the following policies of the Strategic Regional Policy Plan, Communities and Affordable Housing:

- Policy 3: Local governments are encouraged to offer incentives or make development easier in areas appropriate for infill and redevelopment.
- Policy 8: The Region values the availability of lifestyle and livelihood choice, including agricultural, rural, suburban, and urban.

The proposed land use amendment is inconsistent with Policies 3 and 8 of the Northeast Florida Regional Council's Strategic Regional Policy Plan as it promotes incompatible, commercial use in a residential area and would likely reduce the quality of life for residents in the vicinity.

# LAND USE AMENDMENT FIELD / LOCATION / CURRENT LAND USE MAP

