

From: ann kelley <bettyannkelley@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2020 12:01 PM  
To: CCMEETING08252020; DeFoor, Randle; ann kelley  
Subject: Riverside Village PUD

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This email originated from a non-COJ email address. Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Committee Members,

In reference to the Riverside Village PUD, please consider the potential burden to the surrounding residents when making a decision regarding developer variance requests. I am in agreement with the position of RAP that limits restaurant capacity. The issue that is most problematic is traffic, parking, and early morning deliveries on formerly quiet, residential streets. The traffic issue will involve restaurant patrons driving around the block several times to find an open space during busy periods, requiring them to enter Riverside Ave near a dangerous turn multiple times. This circling can be observed for patrons of 1661 Riverside and the surrounding restaurants such as Black Sheep, at the Shops of Avondale and of course, 5-points. Consider that the residents that use on-street parking on Lancaster will find themselves with no place to park on peak nights. Memorial Park guests already have very limited spaces to park. I imagine that a tow company will be making good money in the overflow street parking at the two towers. Further, the large delivery trucks serving these before-mentioned congested areas are both noisy as well as have no regard for the safety of other drivers when they block entire lanes for extended periods. Historic brick May St. is now a frequent parking lot for 18-wheel food delivery trucks which often block driveways, handicap spaces and cars parked on the street. Please consider that the comprehensive plan for the city and our community was created as a means to ensure prudent planning of growth that benefits neighborhoods and citizens, rather than place undue hardship on existing residents in favor of developers. Please reject this application as written.

Thank you.

Ann Kelley

Clements, Jeff

---

From: Huxford, Folks  
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2020 11:58 AM  
To: Valerie Britt; Ferraro, Albert  
Cc: Eller, Shannon; Clements, Jeff  
Subject: RE: Rationale for fence height bill? [2020-0027]  
Attachments: 2020-0027 PC Book.pdf

Valerie – We picked up on that in review. Please see the attached staff report.

---

From: Valerie Britt <[valeriebritt76@yahoo.com](mailto:valeriebritt76@yahoo.com)>  
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2020 9:38 AM  
To: Ferraro, Albert <[Ferraro@coj.net](mailto:Ferraro@coj.net)>  
Cc: Huxford, Folks <[FHUXFORD@coj.net](mailto:FHUXFORD@coj.net)>; Eller, Shannon <[SEller@coj.net](mailto:SEller@coj.net)>; Clements, Jeff <[JEFFC@coj.net](mailto:JEFFC@coj.net)>  
Subject: Re: Rationale for fence height bill? [2020-0027]

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This email originated from a non-COJ email address. Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

AGR isn't a residential district.

On Aug 16, 2020, at 8:51 PM, Valerie Britt <[valeriebritt76@yahoo.com](mailto:valeriebritt76@yahoo.com)> wrote:

Council Member Ferraro:

I am seeking help understanding your pending Ord 2020-0027.

On first glance, I didn't think I would be supportive of your proposal if it is to change the code to *newly* allow for 6' height in required front residential yards, if allowing an height increase there in both. On my second reading, I realized I have no clue the effect of passage or specifically what would *change*. What is it currently that causes a problem for the City— or specifically for someone —that triggers your determination this change is needed and how would this bill resolve that problem you have identified?

What does this mean: “**Thus**, the fence can be up to eight feet in height.” I don't follow a whereas to “thus.” Is this increasing or reducing fence height and is that in certain circumstances or in certain but not other districts?

I respectfully request information of why this bill was introduced, including, but not limited to (1) a specific parcel number of example, (2) an example physical address, (3) current zoning district for which it was requested (4) the name of the agent /lobbyist/homeowner who triggered your interest in sponsoring this bill.

If your bill passes as written, specifically what would be different with passage from what the code currently does or does not do? What would be different in AGR? AGR isn't considered to be a “residential” district, is it? What would be different with passage in “residential” districts? Would the effect of this bill be different in “AGR” vs residential districts?

Do you think there is a reason why I as a single family residential property owner would want to support this bill? Would single family residential homeowners contiguous to AGR be likely to support or oppose

this change?

Sincerely,

Valerie Britt

<2020-0027 Bill Summary.pdf>

Clements, Jeff

---

From: Eller, Shannon  
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2020 10:39 AM  
To: Boylan, Michael; CCMEETING08252020  
Cc: rheintze@linux.com  
Subject: RE: Regarding ORD 2020-98 in LUZ 8/18 and/or 9/1 meeting

Confirmed received and forwarded to the official CCMEETING email address for tracking.

Shannon K. Eller, Esq.  
Chief, Land Use Division  
Regulatory & Constitutional Law Department  
117 West Duval Street, Suite 480  
Jacksonville, FL 32202  
(904) 255-5084 (Direct)  
(386) 747-6164 (Cell)  
<http://generalcounsel.coj.com>

CONFIDENTIAL NOTICE: This electronic message is intended to be viewed only by the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. It may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. Any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited without expressed permission herein. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, or if you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail and delete the original message and any copies of it from your computer system.

---

From: Boylan, Michael  
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2020 10:37 AM  
To: Eller, Shannon  
Cc: rheintze@linux.com  
Subject: FW: Regarding ORD 2020-98 in LUZ 8/18 and/or 9/1 meeting

Ms. Eller – Could you please make certain this email is included in the record and read at the next LUZ meeting scheduled for 9/1/20 when we take up 2020-0098. – Michael

Michael T. Boylan  
Council Member – District 6  
City of Jacksonville  
[mboylan@coj.net](mailto:mboylan@coj.net)  
(904) 255-5206

---

From: [Roland Heintze](#)  
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2020 10:32 AM  
To: [Boylan, Michael](#)  
Cc: [Bowman, Aaron](#); [Diamond, Rory](#); [Ferraro, Albert](#); [Freeman, Terrance](#); [White, Randy](#); [newstips@news4jax.com](mailto:newstips@news4jax.com); [info@nflt.org](mailto:info@nflt.org); [kbirdseve@nrdc.org](mailto:kbirdseve@nrdc.org); [Shannon@stjohnsriverkeeper.org](mailto:Shannon@stjohnsriverkeeper.org); [R4-WetlandsRegulatory@epa.gov](mailto:R4-WetlandsRegulatory@epa.gov); [public.services@dep.state.fl.us](mailto:public.services@dep.state.fl.us); [frazier@ufl.edu](mailto:frazier@ufl.edu)  
Subject: Regarding ORD 2020-98 in LUZ 8/18 and/or 9/1 meeting

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This email originated from a non-COJ email address. Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

I would like this email read into the record:

Following the research & following up on evidence provided by other members of the community I am extremely concerned that the planned development is in violation of Federal and State Environmental, Land Disturbance and Resource Protection statutes as well as in violation of the protections afforded Endangered Species by the Fish and Wildlife Service. EPA provides funding to the Florida DEP, who then funds local governments to enforce the above statutes and regulations. They are the basis for local zoning and enforcement authorities. Proceeding with the planned development so close to Oldfield Creek and literally in the watershed of this and the St Johns River is in violation of established law. It will definitely cause or exacerbate the current pollution, erosion, and flooding issues. There are no provisions for protecting the two sighted endangered species (the Sherman Fox Squirrel & Gopher Tortoise) or for any kind of mitigation of the certainty that increased runoff from the development would increase the flooding, erosion and pollution into the adjacent waterway and into the river and ocean. I have copied and will call EPA Region 4, the FDEP and St. John's and Duval County contacts to assess the level of violation if this goes forward and impose penalties as authorized.

I have attached some resources that give scientific background to the situation, by scientists and regulators without financial or political agendas.

<https://www.coj.net/departments/regulatory-compliance/environmental-quality/enforcement/srr-epb2014-081514.aspx>  
<https://www.nfwf.org/sites/default/files/coastalresilience/Documents/jacksonville-and-lower-st-johns-river-watersheds-coastal-resilience-assessment.pdf>  
[https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-09/documents/regulation\\_cef.pdf](https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-09/documents/regulation_cef.pdf)

FWC's Gopher Tortoise Conservation Rep: Eric Seckinger (850) 921-1029

<https://www.floridastateparks.org/learn/gopher-tortoise>

<https://www.floridastateparks.org/learn/shermans-fox-squirrel>

[http://www.leg.state.fl.us/statutes/index.cfm?App\\_mode=Display\\_Statute&URL=0300-0399/0379/Sections/0379.2291.html](http://www.leg.state.fl.us/statutes/index.cfm?App_mode=Display_Statute&URL=0300-0399/0379/Sections/0379.2291.html)

LUZ Committee: <https://www.coj.net/city-council/standing-committees/luz>

Original Planning Committee: <https://www.coj.net/departments/planning-and-development/planning-commission>

Follow-up for news & regulatory agencies:

This ordinance was passed by the Jacksonville Planning Commission with a 5 to 3 vote despite over 100 letters, personal accounts, & pleas from the surrounding area's residents to \*not\* pass the rezoning application. As well as one of the opposing commissioners, Marshall Adkinson, stating on the record "This is about money, let us not kid ourselves about that. I do not think that it is worth selling our souls over." I know that it is a relatively small plot in the grand scheme of Jacksonville but it is up to all of us to do our absolute best to preserve the symbiotic relationship we have with the local wildlife & beautiful wetlands. Furthermore the decision has been kicked back, recycled, & deferred upon many times. When members of the public are allowed to speak they are only given 3 minutes & the developer, Nate Day, is allowed to comment on remarks at the end. Often he does not address the remarks or will specifically change his verbiage, ie "consistent with the area" changes to "consistent with other rezonings of the area". The format & constantly changing schedule I can only interpret as a blatant misuse of our democratic process & exploitation of the current pandemic situation.

--

Best Regards,

**Roland Heintze**  
**Sr Software Engineer**  
p. 404.210.9883  
e. [rheintze@linux.com](mailto:rheintze@linux.com)

Clements, Jeff

---

From: Wyman Duggan <WDuggan@rtlaw.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2020 10:32 AM  
To: CCMEETING08252020  
Cc: Eller, Shannon  
Subject: 2020-135  
Attachments: 20081810\_27\_58.pdf

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This email originated from a non-COJ email address. Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Please place the attached documents in the record for Item #10, Ord. 2020-135, for tonight's LUZ meeting, and disseminate to committee members who will not be attending the meeting in person. I will have hard copies to pass out at the meeting. Thank you.  
Wyman

Wyman R. Duggan | Shareholder



Rogers Towers, P.A. | 1301 Riverplace Blvd., Suite 1500 | Jacksonville, Florida 32207  
Direct 904.346.5502 | Fax 904.396.0663 | Internal 5502 | [WDuggan@rtlaw.com](mailto:WDuggan@rtlaw.com) | [View Attorney Bio](#) | [www.rtlaw.com](http://www.rtlaw.com)

**CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:** This email is from the law firm of Rogers Towers, P.A. (“Rogers Towers”) and the information in this email and all attachments to this email (the “Information”) are intended solely for the intended recipient(s). The Information may be legally privileged and confidential. If you are not an intended recipient or you believe that you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately, delete the email from your computer, and do not review, use, disseminate, distribute or copy this email or the Information. Please also take the necessary steps to permanently remove any copies of the Information from your system and do not retain any copies, whether in electronic or physical form or otherwise. If you are not an existing client of Rogers Towers, do not construe anything in this email to create an attorney-client relationship between you and Rogers Towers unless the email contains a specific statement to that effect and do not disclose anything to Rogers Towers in reply that you consider confidential.

Clements, Jeff

---

From: Cassandra <cassandra@thecomputer.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2020 10:17 AM  
To: CCMEETING08252020  
Subject: Re: LUZ Meeting "Save Barkowsie Rd" Update - ORD 2020-135

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This email originated from a non-COJ email address. Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Update: the following is in regard to  
ORD 2020-135.  
Please see email below.

Thank you,  
Cassandra

On August 18, 2020 9:48:31 AM EDT, Cassandra <cassandra@thecomputer.com> wrote:  
Please read into meeting minutes regarding proposed quad on Barkowsie Rd (sorry I do not have ORD number):

Please deny the quad housing development on Barkowsie Rd as it is inconsistent with the existing residents in the area. That type of housing is consistently associated with high turnover, rental property, and crime. Please keep coming as is for office use or convert to single family ownership.

Further in any development, all mature oaks should be preserved as they are the defining characteristic of Mandarin.

I drive past this site frequently. Consistent, expected traffic from office use is more acceptable than sporadic traffic for 48 families which would directly add to congestion associated with the nearby school.

The residents of Barkowsie need the protection of the City to maintain their investment in their community to retain home values for both financial, psychological, and aesthetic consistency.

Thank you,  
Cassandra Goodwin  
12460 Shady Creek Dr  
32223



Clements, Jeff

---

From: Valerie Britt <valeriebritt76@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2020 10:12 AM  
To: CCMEETING08252020  
Cc: Boylan, Michael; Gaffney, Reginald; Bowman, Aaron; Freeman, Terrance; Diamond, Rory; Ferraro, Albert; White, Randy; Brown, Cheryl; Valerie Britt  
Subject: 2020342.pdf FOR LUZ MEETING 8/18/2020  
Attachments: 2020342.pdf

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This email originated from a non-COJ email address. Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Clements, Jeff

---

From: Cassandra <cassandra@thecomputer.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2020 9:49 AM  
To: CCMEETING08252020  
Subject: LUZ Meeting "Save Barkowsie Rd"

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This email originated from a non-COJ email address. Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Please read into meeting minutes regarding proposed quad on Barkowsie Rd (sorry I do not have ORD number):

Please deny the quad housing development on Barkowsie Rd as it is inconsistent with the existing residents in the area. That type of housing is consistently associated with high turnover, rental property, and crime. Please keep coming as is for office use or convert to single family ownership.

Further in any development, all mature oaks should be preserved as they are the defining characteristic of Mandarin.

I drive past this site frequently. Consistent, expected traffic from office use is more acceptable than sporadic traffic for 48 families which would directly add to congestion associated with the nearby school.

The residents of Barkowsie need the protection of the City to maintain their investment in their community to retain home values for both financial, psychological, and aesthetic consistency.

Thank you,  
Cassandra Goodwin  
12460 Shady Creek Dr  
32223

Clements, Jeff

---

From: John Carter <johnqcarter@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Tuesday, August 18, 2020 5:02 AM  
To: CCMEETING08252020  
Subject: Riverside Village PUD

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This email originated from a non-COJ email address. Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Committee Members,

The zoning applications for PUD 2020-332 and 2020-333 set to go before the LUZ Committee today, August 18th, represent the classic bait-and-switch tactic used by developers to manipulate zoning regulations. The applications depict a development much larger in scale than what was presented by the developer in February. The development as currently proposed would create unreasonable traffic, parking, and noise problems for the neighboring residents. The restaurants would be receiving frequent food deliveries from semi-tractor trailers with nowhere to park, and guests of the restaurants would be parking all over the neighboring residential streets, taking up spaces used by residents and visitors, to include visitors of Memorial Park. Please represent the residents of this neighborhood by opposing these applications.

Respectfully,  
John Carter  
Riverside Ave, Resident & Property Owner

Clements, Jeff

---

From: Valerie Britt <valeriebritt76@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2020 2:45 PM  
To: CCMEETING08252020  
Cc: valeriebritt76@yahoo.com; info@hsmith-inc.com; Boylan, Michael; Gaffney, Reginald; Bowman, Aaron; Freeman, Terrance; Diamond, Rory; Ferraro, Albert; White, Randy  
Subject: Procedures 2020-0098

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This email originated from a non-COJ email address. Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

**To LUZ Committee 8/17/2020 Agenda Meeting**  
**RE: 2020-0098 PROCEDURAL ISSUES (Aladdin Rd)**

**Procedural Concerns with 2020-0098 Process:**

In noticing that 2020-0098 is on the preliminary agenda tomorrow for a public hearing and vote, please clarify what will properly be before the LUZ Committee for 8/18 including the date of written description, date of legal description, date of site plan, and issuing date of written staff report. Please clarify whether there is an amendment to that which can be properly considered on 8/18. If there is an amendment to be considered, please provide a copy. It is unclear to me if a conventional CVS rezoning and a PUD can be enacted for the subject site in this single bill as appears to be proceeding. I am not an attorney.

Since Nate Day is listed as agent on the agenda for Ord 2020-0098 in which the proposed action may or may not be to amend, yet Nate Day was listed in the minutes as speaking in "opposition" at the 8/5 Special Hearing on the amendment, it is unclear from the record exactly what is to be considered before LUZ at the 8/18/2020 hearing, and, if no amendment is now before LUZ, what is in a proper posture to be considered at LUZ 8/18 if there is to be a vote on an unamended bill. I respectfully request that LUZ and staff review with your land use counsel the process and the record tracking prior to a final LUZ vote. It appears this may need to be re-referred to have staff review and a staff report and PC vote specifically issued for the proposed 8/5/2020 PUD if that is to be before LUZ for a vote. Again, it is unclear what proposal is actually before LUZ in what form and what that is based on in the process.

**General Position:**

Going into the agenda meeting with process questions and unclear on what is properly before LUZ for a vote 8/18/2020, my preliminary, general position on Ord 2020-0098 addresses wetlands: I am in support of CVS zoning for **all** of the wetlands. CVS appears mandatory for approximately 12 acres of wetlands based on CHHA/AAA designation. The remaining wetlands must be provided strong protections from flooding and environmental degradation in the rezoning and by a combination of measures such as conservation easement, identification on plat, deed restriction, addressed in governing documents of the HOA. But I prefer the CVS zoning be in a CSV FLUM. It is unclear to me if any proper rezoning is before Council that can achieve the wetlands protections needed in a single bill. At this point, I oppose the bill on the grounds it is not a proper location for compact development and I don't agree with increasing density before clustering. I would prefer RLD-A or RLD-100 but could absolutely not support more than an absolute maximum of 40 properly located residences which address site issues.

**Original Bill Introduced & Assigned Feb 11, 2020: AN ORDINANCE REZONING APPROXIMATELY 16.42 ACRES OF UPLANDS AND 24.22 ACRES OF WETLANDS LOCATED IN COUNCIL DISTRICT 6 OFF OF ALADDIN ROAD, NORTH OF JULINGTON CREEK ROAD AND SOUTH OF TAR KILN ROAD, AS DESCRIBED HEREIN**

Current Bill Identification: ORD-Q Rezoning off of Aladdin Rd (40.64± Acres) N. of Julington Creek Rd & S of Tar Kiln Rd – RR to PUD & CSV – Crawford L. Johnston Trust, ET AL. (Dist. 6-Boylan) (Abney) (LUZ)(PD & PC Apv) (**SECPAC Deny**)(Ex-Parte: CM Hazouri, Bowman, Boylan, Freeman, Ferraro, White, Gaffney)

Respectfully Submitted,  
Valerie Britt

cc Nate Day, Agent

File 2020-0098

Clements, Jeff

---

From: Krista E. Burby <KBurby@drivermcafee.com>  
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2020 12:51 PM  
To: CCMEETING08252020  
Cc: Cyndy K. Trimmer  
Subject: Speaker for August 18 LUZ Meeting (2020-0045-Klotz/Morrocco)

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This email originated from a non-COJ email address. Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Good afternoon,

Please allow this email to serve as notice that Cyndy Trimmer will speak on behalf of the applicant for 2020-0045 at the August 18, 2020 LUZ meeting.

For the record her address is One Independent Dr., Ste 1200, Jacksonville, FL 32202 (904) 301-1269. She is in support of this application.

Sincerely,

Krista Burby  
Paralegal



Driver, McAfee, Hawthorne & Diebenow, P.L.  
One Independent Drive, Suite 1200  
Jacksonville, Florida 32202  
Direct: (904) 807-8213  
Fax: (904) 301-1279  
E-Mail: [kburby@drivermcafee.com](mailto:kburby@drivermcafee.com)

This e-mail is intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential or otherwise exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this e-mail is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify us immediately by telephone and return the original e-mail to us at the listed e-mail address. Thank you.

Clements, Jeff

---

From: Krista E. Burby <KBurby@drivermcafee.com>  
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2020 12:51 PM  
To: CCMEETING08252020  
Cc: Cyndy K. Trimmer  
Subject: Speaker for August 18 LUZ Meeting (2020-0279 - Diamond Timber/Trails)

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This email originated from a non-COJ email address. Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Good afternoon,

Please allow this email to serve as notice that Cyndy Trimmer will speak on behalf of the applicant for 2020-0279 at the August 18, 2020 LUZ meeting.

For the record her address is One Independent Dr., Ste 1200, Jacksonville, FL 32202 (904) 301-1269. She is in support of this application.

Sincerely,

Krista Burby  
Paralegal



Driver, McAfee, Hawthorne & Diebenow, P.L.  
One Independent Drive, Suite 1200  
Jacksonville, Florida 32202  
Direct: (904) 807-8213  
Fax: (904) 301-1279  
E-Mail: [kburby@drivermcafee.com](mailto:kburby@drivermcafee.com)

This e-mail is intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential or otherwise exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this e-mail is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify us immediately by telephone and return the original e-mail to us at the listed e-mail address. Thank you.

Clements, Jeff

---

From: Valerie Britt <valeriebritt76@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Sunday, August 16, 2020 8:52 PM  
To: Ferraro, Albert  
Cc: Huxford, Folks; Eller, Shannon; Clements, Jeff; Valerie Britt  
Subject: Rationale for fence height bill? [2020-0027]  
Attachments: 2020-0027 Bill Summary.pdf

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This email originated from a non-COJ email address. Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Council Member Ferraro:

I am seeking help understanding your pending Ord 2020-0027.

On first glance, I didn't think I would be supportive of your proposal if it is to change the code to *newly* allow for 6' height in required front residential yards, if allowing an height increase there in both. On my second reading, I realized I have no clue the effect of passage or specifically what would *change*. What is it currently that causes a problem for the City— or specifically for someone —that triggers your determination this change is needed and how would this bill resolve that problem you have identified?

What does this mean: “**Thus**, the fence can be up to eight feet in height.” I don't follow a whereas to “thus.” Is this increasing or reducing fence height and is that in certain circumstances or in certain but not other districts?

I respectfully request information of why this bill was introduced, including, but not limited to (1) a specific parcel number of example, (2) an example physical address, (3) current zoning district for which it was requested (4) the name of the agent /lobbyist/homeowner who triggered your interest in sponsoring this bill.

If your bill passes as written, specifically what would be different with passage from what the code currently does or does not do? What would be different in AGR? AGR isn't considered to be a “residential” district, is it? What would be different with passage in “residential” districts? Would the effect of this bill be different in “AGR” vs residential districts?

Do you think there Is a reason why I as a single family residential property owner would want to support this bill? Would single family residential homeowners contiguous to AGR be likely to support or oppose this change?

Sincerely,

Valerie Britt



Clements, Jeff

---

From: susienschott@aol.com  
Sent: Saturday, August 15, 2020 2:33 PM  
To: CCMEETING08252020  
Subject: 2020-307  
Attachments: Arpen House Melcon Farms PUD Itr.docx

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This email originated from a non-COJ email address. Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Respectfully submitted for the Administrative Record for this rezoning application.

*Susie Scott*

President

Mandarin Community Club

Clements, Jeff

---

From: John Montgomery <jaxguy14@gmail.com>  
Sent: Saturday, August 15, 2020 9:45 AM  
To: CCMEETING08252020  
Subject: RE: Riverside Village PUD 2020-332 and 2020-333

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This email originated from a non-COJ email address. Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

To Whom It May Concern:

As a 35 year resident of The San Juline Condominiums, I am in extremely close proximity to the above referenced zoning change.

Allow me to go on the record as vehemently opposed to this application. I contend that the current zoning represents a tolerable outline of what will fit into the fabric of the area.

As a retired architect with a master degree in Historic Preservation, I am well-trained in the impact of aesthetics, scale and traffic, both pedestrian and vehicular, in a historic neighborhood. This project is out of balance with the surrounding community and is destined to create an unwelcome bottleneck for the nearby residents and visitors. Just the parking issue alone, complicated by the existing Memorial Park parking problems, would be a constant issue...people endlessly circling the area hunting for a space.

Please do the right thing for my neighborhood and deny this zoning change!

John L. Montgomery  
619 Riverside Avenue  
Jacksonville, FL 32204  
(904) 655-7431 cell

Clements, Jeff

---

From: RALPHYVONNE KENNEDY <rjspikke@att.net>  
Sent: Saturday, August 15, 2020 8:47 AM  
To: CCMEETING08252020  
Subject: MTG. TIME

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This email originated from a non-COJ email address. Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

TIME OF MEETING PLS.

Clements, Jeff

---

From: Maggie Thoeni <mbt00@mac.com>  
Sent: Friday, August 14, 2020 7:45 PM  
To: CCMEETING08252020  
Subject: Riverside Village PUD 2020-332

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This email originated from a non-COJ email address. Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Please read aloud at the meeting:

We are residents in the Saint Johns Quarter, one block East of Memorial Park. We fully support RAP's recommendations and specifically oppose the idea of a third restaurant without public review, expanded restaurant seating and hours and the possible intention to turn this area into another 5-Points commercial district.

This is a residential, pedestrian area and can be an asset to Riverside as long as its developers maintain reasonable size and traffic flow. Imagine an artist's colony with coffee houses and a boutique restaurant - a place that draws pedestrians, Arts Market and Cummer patrons, an area that adds elan to Riverside. This is what could work here and be valued by residents and visitors.

Please don't destroy the ambiance of Memorial Park and pedestrian Riverside by thinking that any new development is good. We have many good restaurants in Riverside. There's no reason that a new venture can't also flourish even without extensive seating or hours (possibly a more exclusive environment could be better). But they need to earn it.

With respect,  
Drew and Maggie Thoeni  
[2136 Saint Johns Ave](#)  
32204

Clements, Jeff

---

From: Maggie Thoeni <mbt00@mac.com>  
Sent: Friday, August 14, 2020 7:10 PM  
To: CCMEETING08252020  
Subject: PUD 2020-332 Riverside Village

EXTERNAL EMAIL: This email originated from a non-COJ email address. Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Please read aloud at the meeting:

We are residents in the Saint Johns Quarter, one block East of Memorial Park. We fully support RAP's recommendations and specifically oppose the idea of a third restaurant without public review, expanded restaurant seating and hours and the possible intention to turn this area into another 5-Points commercial district.

This is a residential, pedestrian area and can be an asset to Riverside as long as its developers maintain reasonable size and traffic flow. Imagine an artist's colony with coffee houses and a boutique restaurant - a place that draws pedestrians, Arts Market and Cummer patrons, an area that adds elan to Riverside. This is what could work here and be valued by residents and visitors.

Please don't destroy the ambiance of Memorial Park and pedestrian Riverside by thinking that any new development is good. We have many good restaurants in Riverside. There's no reason that a new venture can't also flourish even without extensive seating or hours (possibly a more exclusive environment could be better). But they need to earn it.

With respect,  
Drew and Maggie Thoeni  
2136 Saint Johns Ave  
32204

Clements, Jeff

---

From: Maggie Thoeni <mbt00@mac.com>  
Sent: Friday, August 14, 2020 7:08 PM  
To: CCMEETING08252020  
Subject: PUD 2020-332 Riverside Village

EXTERNAL EMAIL: This email originated from a non-COJ email address. Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Please read aloud at the meeting:

We are residents in the Saint Johns Quarter, one block East of Memorial Park. We fully support RAP's recommendations and specifically oppose the idea of a third restaurant without public review, expanded restaurant seating and hours and the possible intention to turn this area into another 5-Points commercial district.

This is a residential, pedestrian area and can be an asset to Riverside as long as its developers maintain reasonable size and traffic flow. Imagine an artist's colony with coffee houses and a boutique restaurant - a place that draws pedestrians, Arts Market and Cummer patrons, an area that adds elan to Riverside. This is what could work here and be valued by residents and visitors.

Please don't destroy the ambiance of Memorial Park and pedestrian Riverside by thinking that any new development is good. We have many good restaurants in Riverside. There's no reason that a new venture can't also flourish even without extensive seating or hours (possibly a more exclusive environment could be better). But they need to earn it.

With respect,

Clements, Jeff

---

From: Wilkes, Melanie  
Sent: Friday, August 14, 2020 4:40 PM  
To: CITYC  
Subject: RE: Staff Reports? 2020-277

Good afternoon,

The below email correspondence has been posted to the 8/25/20 City Council Meeting InSite webpage:  
<https://jaxcityc.legistar.com/MeetingDetail.aspx?ID=794254&GUID=7206D5D5-DCC9-4DDE-A6DC-07569330F589&Options=&Search=>

Best Regards,

Melanie Wilkes, Information Systems Administrator  
Jacksonville City Council  
117 West Duval St, Ste. 425  
Jacksonville, FL 32202  
904.255.5182 / [MWilkes@coj.net](mailto:MWilkes@coj.net)

\*\*\*Please note that under Florida's very broad public records law, e-mail communications to and from city officials are subject to public disclosure.\*\*\*

---

From: Brown, Cheryl  
Sent: Friday, August 14, 2020 10:25 AM  
To: SEC; ccmeeting08252020@coj.net; Clements, Jeff; Eller, Shannon  
Subject: FW: Staff Reports? 2020-277

File permanent file..public comment  
Ccmeeting08252020@coj.net

----- Original message -----

From: Valerie Britt <valeriebritt76@yahoo.com>  
Date: 8/14/20 9:45 AM (GMT-05:00)  
To: CCMEETING08252020 <CCMEETING08252020@coj.net>, Mayor Lenny Curry <MayorLennyCurry@coj.net>  
Cc: "Killingsworth, William" <BILLK@coj.net>, "Sales, Patricia" <PMacer@coj.net>, "Brown, Cheryl" <CLBROWN@coj.net>, "Reed, Kristen" <KReed@coj.net>, mmoehring@nefrc.org, Valerie Britt <valeriebritt76@yahoo.com>  
Subject: Staff Reports? 2020-277

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This email originated from a non-COJ email address. Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Ord. 2020-277: Concerns, questions and objections

ORD Apv 2020B Series Text Amendmnt to Future Land Use Element (FLUE) & Transportation Element of 2030 Comp I  
**Business District (CBD)** Future Land Use Category within FLUE & Amend Objectives & Policies of FLUE & Transport  
Growth & Developmnt in Downtown for Transmittal to State of FL's Various Agencies for Review; Providing Disclaimer  
Transmitted herein Shall Not be Construed as Exemption from Any Other Applicable Laws. (Parola) (Request of Mayor)  
Introduced: LUZ 6/16/20 LUZ Read 2nd & Rerefer 6/23/20 CO Read 2nd

To the City of Jacksonville:  
Attention: LPA, City Council, Planning Department, Mayor Curry

First, I repeat my general recommendation that the City of Jacksonville needs to separate the Planning Commission into two decision making bodies so that critical Comprehensive Planning matters are given the attention they require instead of merely an after thought by the body functioning as a Board of Adjustments making quasi judicial decisions on variances, exceptions, minor modifications, and hearing appeals of administrative deviations. Perhaps the Planning Commission's roles as the Local Planning Agency, Land Development Regulation Commission and in Community Planning are not their priorities?

All meetings of the Local Planning Agency are required to be public meetings.

**FS 163.3181 Public participation in the comprehensive planning process; intent....**

“(1) It is the intent of the Legislature that the public participate in the comprehensive planning process to the fullest extent possible. Towards this end, local planning agencies and local governmental units are directed to adopt procedures designed to provide effective public participation in the comprehensive planning process ....”  
There should be public access to Planning from the ground up, to participate in planning workshops, to be heard and not just to react to developers' applications. While in its role as LPA, the Planning Commission is designated to “prepare” the Comprehensive Plan and Plan amendments, I rarely hear anything other than approval of what applicants put before them through the Planning Department's reports of approvals. Is there any indication Planning Commissioners are really involved in “preparing” anything? “During the preparation of the plan or plan amendment and prior to any recommendation to the governing body, the local planning agency shall hold at least one public hearing, with public notice, on the proposed plan or plan amendment. “ Yet, The Notice Of Public Hearing of a FLUM Amendment before the LPA states “Opportunity to speak at the discretion of the Chairman.”

Then, according to Florida Statutes, “...final recommendation of the adoption of such plan or plan amendment to the governing body shall be the responsibility of the local planning agency.” For that important LPA role in City policy, why is there not a separate decision making body than the one consumed for lengthy time periods on many quasi judicial board of adjustment items at the beginning of every meeting?

Over the last year, transparency and public access to the Planning Commission has been substantially reduced. The public record “books” provided to the Planning Commission Members in advance of LPA meetings are no longer posted. P  
The archives have been removed from the public site, even though some items continue on agendas for months. The once standard practice of posting transcripts and access to multiple meeting agendas has ended. Access to results agendas are not timely available before the items go to the LUZ Committee.

Changes to the Comprehensive Plan for the benefit of the community overall are not emphasized and go unnoticed. Land use attorneys for private applicants have admitted to proposing text amendments for their clients. Residents and neighborhoods have little or no opportunity to identify Planning needs to be translated into text. Formal exercises of visioning are Vision Plan books shelved and issued identified never addressed. Jacksonville needs a Community Development Board or a Local Planning Agency separate from its board of adjustments focus of the Planning Commission.



As to 2020-277, I am unclear of the rationale for the bill or it's full implications.

It appears to be a transmittal with an opportunity to seek additional information and provide comments.

"Approve?" The bill title fails to specifically state approved only for "**transmittal**"

But, it does mention transmittal **later in the title**. Please confirm there will be an adoption round of hearings and votes required for the proposed text amendment and that the application of the text will be limited to the designated Central Business District?

The summary uses the terms "approves" and "amends" as though final City action. Is it?

The bill title of 2020-277 gave me no indication of the laundry basket nature of this bill!

In fact, it gave the impression it was the Mayor's request limited to facilitation of needed development of the CBD which I would generally support. The legislative summary described it as a bill related to "downtown." But I now question if this bill applies to the entire county, including to the recent trend of increasing density in thousands of acres of wetlands without even CSV designations of the most sensitive areas, failing to even attempt to facilitate clustering of existing rights but to increase them. Approvals are being given for density increases on the whole or large acreages and I want to know if this bill will have any impact on that objectionable practice.

What is meaning of "vetted" as to reports and recommendations?

**No Planning staff or LPA reports of recommendation were included in the legislative materials as typical before enactment.**

i.e., there did not appear to be a Staff report or an LPA recommendation filed with the text "approval" (for transmittal) Ordinance.

Again, the bill title and legislative summary may be *misleading* in giving the appearance this is a Central Business District bill if it is not so limited.

This language among others for the text is objectionable (specific highlights added):

"When a specific maximum development density or intensity is not stated on the Annotated Future Land Use Map or in a site-specific policy, the City of Jacksonville shall use the following as the *assumptions* for maximum development when analyzing the impacts of amendments to the Future Land Use Map (FLUM). The following development impact standards **do not limit** the development potential of any site. For the purposes of this policy, Floor Area Ratio (FAR) is defined as the ratio of gross floor area of all structures on a lot to gross lot area."

"ASSUMPTIONS?"

Do not limit development potential?

What kind of language is that for land use Planning?

I remember decades ago when DCA filed objections warning of creating universal categories and language was not adopted!

I was unable to obtain before the LPA meeting the information the LPA would have received on the plan issues because that information is no longer provided online, it was denied me from my request of the staff who prepares the books for the PC/LPA and public records requests made through the City's cumbersome process can not be processed in time to have them in advance of the PC/LPA Meeting.

Unfortunately, the City does not provide for citizens being on the same correspondence to receive LPA/PC agenda books as done by the Regional Council and by other cities, even though that's public record.

Date of Waterways Commission meeting and recommendation? Please provide.

The City has long needed review and improvement of its CCME to better *protect* the wetlands, marshes and provide better for flood controls and evacuation issues. Much of the Plan's wording has been tweaked over years to enable all development as "economic" development at the expense of protecting and improving neighborhoods and with little protection of the environment. I am concerned when anything related to development there in wetlands seems to be quietly slipped into a bill that does not name categories.

Therefore, I specifically question the “AGR” category information and request information on the impacts of this text amendment. Large areas of salt marshes have been quietly subdivided and sold off, such as at the ICW. The old paper maps often didn’t even have real estate numbers on marshes that everyone presumed were truly undevelopable wastelands. It has been impossible to follow the trail of some of the activity in highly sensitive marshes where new homes seem to just be added on to PUD’s without an identifiable process.

Salt Marshes and high functioning wetlands were apparently given AGR in Jacksonville instead of appropriately designated CSV too many times. Protecting them is critical. Hurricane evacuation clearance for the county and locational and site specifics including SFHA must be considered. Yet, the CCME is deficient in policies to apply to protect wetlands, CHHAs, marshes. Staff reports often fail to adequately address highly sensitive areas while density increases are readily given.

While the City has given lip service to flooding and resiliency, private applications have been approved for large parcels of wetlands to be granted higher density categories by private applications for development. Large acreages of AGR lands are being positioned for development. Rural and farming areas are being changed to facilitate 60’ lot car dependent zoning districts in isolation of mixed uses. If the text of the plan is to be changed to apply to AGR, that should be specifically clear in a bill title and analysis.

This appears to be a transmittal that will return for adoption. Is that correct?  
However, if this is intended to be an “adoption” bill, please provide links, references, or documents that provide for a single cycle.

If so, what relationship and effect was intended?

I own property in Planning District 2 in a marsh front neighborhood that borders AGR designated wetlands. I was a party in the challenge of the “Moody” plan amendment at the ICW, am involved in the Pablo Point Community Wildlife Habitat Project, and have been a member of the American Planning Association for about 20 years (currently VA, NC, FL chapters).

Valerie Britt  
P.O. Box 49209  
Jacksonville Beach, FL. 32240

Clements, Jeff

---

From: Wilkes, Melanie  
Sent: Friday, August 14, 2020 4:36 PM  
To: CITYC  
Subject: RE: Text Transmittal Bill 2020-277

Good afternoon,

The below email correspondence has been posted to the 8/25/20 City Council Meeting InSite webpage:  
<https://jaxcityc.legistar.com/MeetingDetail.aspx?ID=794254&GUID=7206D5D5-DCC9-4DDE-A6DC-07569330F589&Options=&Search=>

Best Regards,

Melanie Wilkes, Information Systems Administrator  
Jacksonville City Council  
117 West Duval St, Ste. 425  
Jacksonville, FL 32202  
904.255.5182 / [MWilkes@coj.net](mailto:MWilkes@coj.net)

\*\*\*Please note that under Florida's very broad public records law, e-mail communications to and from city officials are subject to public disclosure.\*\*\*

---

From: Brown, Cheryl  
Sent: Friday, August 14, 2020 10:24 AM  
To: SEC; ccmeeting08252020@coj.net; Clements, Jeff; Eller, Shannon  
Subject: FW: Text Transmittal Bill 2020-277

Permanent file.....and public comments ccmeeting08252020@coj.net

----- Original message -----

From: Valerie Britt <valeriebritt76@yahoo.com>  
Date: 8/14/20 9:55 AM (GMT-05:00)  
To: Mayor Lenny Curry <MayorLennyCurry@coj.net>  
Cc: "Killingsworth, William" <BILLK@coj.net>, "Sales, Patricia" <PMacer@coj.net>, "Brown, Cheryl" <CLBROWN@coj.net>, "Reed, Kristen" <KReed@coj.net>, "Johnston, Paige" <PJohnston@coj.net>, "Eller, Shannon" <SEller@coj.net>, Valerie Britt <valeriebritt76@yahoo.com>, CCMEETING08252020 <CCMEETING08252020@coj.net>, mmoehring@nefrc.org  
Subject: Text Transmittal Bill 2020-277

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This email originated from a non-COJ email address. Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Ord. 2020-277: No staff report subsequent to and specific to bill introduction?

ORD Apv 2020B Series Text Amendmnt to Future Land Use Element (FLUE) & Transportation Element of 2030 Comp I  
**Business District (CBD)** Future Land Use Category within FLUE & Amend Objectives & Policies of FLUE & Transport  
Growth & Developmnt in Downtown for Transmittal to State of FL's Various Agencies for Review; Providing Disclaimer  
Transmitted herein Shall Not be Construed as Exemption from Any Other Applicable Laws. (Parola) (Request of Mayor)  
Introduced: LUZ 6/16/20 LUZ Read 2nd & Rerefer 6/23/20 CO Read 2nd

To the City of Jacksonville:  
Attention: Mayor Curry, City Council, LPA, Planning Department

**A February staff report referencing the abandonment of the downtown DRI does not really appear to me to match up with the contents of the bill's transmitting text amendment or the bill title. The transmittal bill was not introduced until June and no staff report has been located dated after the June introduction. There does not appear to be a staff report making recommendations on the actual bill.**

I own property in Planning District 2 in a marsh front neighborhood that borders AGR designated wetlands. I was a party in the challenge of the "Moody" plan amendment at the ICW, am involved in the Pablo Point Community Wildlife Habitat Project, and have been a member of the American Planning Association for about 20 years (currently VA, NC, FL chapters).

Valerie Britt  
P.O. Box 49209  
Jacksonville Beach, FL. 32240

Clements, Jeff

---

From: Matthews, Jessica  
Sent: Friday, August 14, 2020 3:34 PM  
To: CCMEETING08252020; carnell oliver  
Cc: Matthews, Jessica  
Subject: FW: The sheriff's budget

Correspondence received and submitted to City Council email [ccmeeting08252020@coj.net](mailto:ccmeeting08252020@coj.net).

---

From: Carnell Oliver [mailto:[carnelloiver3836@gmail.com](mailto:carnelloiver3836@gmail.com)]  
Sent: Friday, August 14, 2020 3:11 PM  
To: Matthews, Jessica  
Subject: The sheriff's budget

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This email originated from a non-COJ email address. Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

I want to know what's portion of the finance committee hearing was catered to the sheriff's budget I don't want to sit there and listen to a bunch of talk I want to get focus more on the sheriff's budget I want to know what he's asking for Jessica help me out with this narrow it down to the Pacific through the conversations that will help with the finance committee with the sheriff's budget

Clements, Jeff

---

From: Brown, Cheryl  
Sent: Friday, August 14, 2020 10:25 AM  
To: SEC; ccmeeting08252020@coj.net; Clements, Jeff; Eller, Shannon  
Subject: FW: Staff Reports? 2020-277  
Attachments: 2020-277 Bill Summary.pdf

File permanent file..public comment  
Ccmeeting08252020@coj.net

----- Original message -----

From: Valerie Britt <valeriebritt76@yahoo.com>  
Date: 8/14/20 9:45 AM (GMT-05:00)  
To: CCMEETING08252020 <CCMEETING08252020@coj.net>, Mayor Lenny Curry <MayorLennyCurry@coj.net>  
Cc: "Killingsworth, William" <BILLK@coj.net>, "Sales, Patricia" <PMacer@coj.net>, "Brown, Cheryl" <CLBROWN@coj.net>, "Reed, Kristen" <KReed@coj.net>, mmoehring@nefrc.org, Valerie Britt <valeriebritt76@yahoo.com>  
Subject: Staff Reports? 2020-277

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This email originated from a non-COJ email address. Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Ord. 2020-277: Concerns, questions and objections

ORD Apv 2020B Series Text Amendmnt to Future Land Use Element (FLUE) & Transportation Element of 2030 Comp P  
**Business District (CBD)** Future Land Use Category within FLUE & Amend Objectives & Policies of FLUE & Transport  
Growth & Developmnt in Downtown for Transmittal to State of FL's Various Agencies for Review; Providing Disclaimer  
Transmitted herein Shall Not be Construed as Exemption from Any Other Applicable Laws. (Parola) (Request of Mayor)(  
Introduced: LUZ 6/16/20 LUZ Read 2nd & Rerefer 6/23/20 CO Read 2nd

To the City of Jacksonville:  
Attention: LPA, City Council, Planning Department, Mayor Curry

First, I repeat my general recommendation that the City of Jacksonville needs to separate the Planning Commission into two decision making bodies so that critical Comprehensive Planning matters are given the attention they require instead of merely an after thought by the body functioning as a Board of Adjustments making quasi judicial decisions on variances, exceptions, minor modifications, and hearing appeals of administrative deviations. Perhaps the Planning Commission's roles as the Local Planning Agency, Land Development Regulation Commission and in Community Planning are not their priorities?

All meetings of the Local Planning Agency are required to be public meetings.  
**FS 163.3181Public participation in the comprehensive planning process; intent....**

“(1) It is the intent of the Legislature that the public participate in the comprehensive planning process to the fullest extent possible. Towards this end, local planning agencies and local governmental units are directed to adopt procedures designed to provide effective public participation in the comprehensive planning process ....” There should be public access to Planning from the ground up, to participate in planning workshops, to be heard and not just to react to developers’ applications. While in its role as LPA, the Planning Commission is designated to “prepare” the Comprehensive Plan and Plan amendments, I rarely hear anything other than approval of what applicants put before them through the Planning Department’s reports of approvals. Is there any indication Planning Commissioners are really involved in “preparing” anything? “During the preparation of the plan or plan amendment and prior to any recommendation to the governing body, the local planning agency shall hold at least one public hearing, with public notice, on the proposed plan or plan amendment. “ Yet, The Notice Of Public Hearing of a FLUM Amendment before the LPA states “Opportunity to speak at the discretion of the Chairman.”

Then, according to Florida Statutes, “...final recommendation of the adoption of such plan or plan amendment to the governing body shall be the responsibility of the local planning agency.” For that important LPA role in City policy, why is there not a separate decision making body than the one consumed for lengthy time periods on many quasi judicial board of adjustment items at the beginning of every meeting?

Over the last year, transparency and public access to the Planning Commission has been substantially reduced. The public record “books” provided to the Planning Commission Members in advance of LPA meetings are no longer posted. P The archives have been removed from the public site, even though some items continue on agendas for months. The once standard practice of posting transcripts and access to multiple meeting agendas has ended. Access to results agendas are not timely available before the items go to the LUZ Committee.

Changes to the Comprehensive Plan for the benefit of the community overall are not emphasized and go unnoticed. Land use attorneys for private applicants have admitted to proposing text amendments for their clients. Residents and neighborhoods have little or no opportunity to identify Planning needs to be translated into text. Formal exercises of visioning are Vision Plan books shelved and issued identified never addressed. Jacksonville needs a Community Development Board or a Local Planning Agency separate from its board of adjustments focus of the Planning Commission.

As to **2020-277**, I am unclear of the rationale for the bill or it’s full implications. It appears to be a transmittal with an opportunity to seek additional information and provide comments. “Approve?” The bill title fails to specifically state approved only for “**transmittal**” But, it does mention transmittal **later in the title**. Please confirm there will be an adoption round of hearings and votes required for the proposed text amendment and that the application of the text will be limited to the designated Central Business District?

The summary uses the terms “approves” and “amends” as though final City action. Is it?

The bill title of 2020-277 gave me no indication of the laundry basket nature of this bill! In fact, it gave the impression it was the Mayor’s request limited to facilitation of needed development of the CBD which I would generally support. The legislative summary described it as a bill related to “downtown.” But I now question if this bill applies to the entire county, including to the recent trend of increasing density in thousands of acres of wetlands without even CSV designations of the most sensitive areas, failing to even attempt to facilitate clustering of existing rights but to increase them. Approvals are being given for density increases on the whole or large acreages and I want to know if this bill will have any impact on that objectionable practice.

What is meaning of “vetted” as to reports and recommendations?

**No Planning staff or LPA reports of recommendation were included in the legislative materials as typical before enactment.**

i.e., there did not appear to be a Staff report or an LPA recommendation filed with the text “approval” (for transmittal) Ordinance.

Again, the bill title and legislative summary may be *misleading* in giving the appearance this is a Central Business District bill if it is not so limited.

This language among others for the text is objectionable (specific highlights added):

“When a specific maximum development density or intensity is not stated on the Annotated Future Land Use Map or in a site-specific policy, the City of Jacksonville shall use the following as the *assumptions* for maximum development when analyzing the impacts of amendments to the Future Land Use Map (FLUM). The following development impact standards **do not limit** the development potential of any site. For the purposes of this policy, Floor Area Ratio (FAR) is defined as the ratio of gross floor area of all structures on a lot to gross lot area.”

“ASSUMPTIONS?”

Do not limit development potential?

What kind of language is that for land use Planning?

I remember decades ago when DCA filed objections warning of creating universal categories and language was not adopted!

I was unable to obtain before the LPA meeting the information the LPA would have received on the plan issues because that information is no longer provided online, it was denied me from my request of the staff who prepares the books for the PC/LPA and public records requests made through the City’s cumbersome process can not be processed in time to have them in advance of the PC/LPA Meeting.

Unfortunately, the City does not provide for citizens being on the same correspondence to receive LPA/PC agenda books as done by the Regional Council and by other cities, even though that’s public record.

Date of Waterways Commission meeting and recommendation? Please provide.

The City has long needed review and improvement of its CCME to better *protect* the wetlands, marshes and provide better for flood controls and evacuation issues. Much of the Plan’s wording has been tweaked over years to enable all development as “economic” development at the expense of protecting and improving neighborhoods and with little protection of the environment. I am concerned when anything related to development there in wetlands seems to be quietly slipped into a bill that does not name categories.

Therefore, I specifically question the “AGR” category information and request information on the impacts of this text amendment. Large areas of salt marshes have been quietly subdivided and sold off, such as at the ICW. The old paper maps often didn’t even have real estate numbers on marshes that everyone presumed were truly undevelopable wastelands. It has been impossible to follow the trail of some of the activity in highly sensitive marshes where new homes seem to just be added on to PUD’s without an identifiable process.

Salt Marshes and high functioning wetlands were apparently given AGR in Jacksonville instead of appropriately designated CSV too many times. Protecting them is critical. Hurricane evacuation clearance for the county and locational and site specifics including SFHA must be considered. Yet, the CCME is deficient in policies to apply to protect wetlands, CHHAs, marshes. Staff reports often fail to adequately address highly sensitive areas while density increases are readily given.

While the City has given lip service to flooding and resiliency, private applications have been approved for large parcels of wetlands to be granted higher density categories by private applications for development. Large acreages of AGR lands are being positioned for development. Rural and farming areas are being changed to facilitate 60’ lot car dependent zoning districts in isolation of mixed uses. If the text of the plan is to be changed to apply to AGR, that should be specifically clear in a bill title and analysis.

This appears to be a transmittal that will return for adoption. Is that correct?

However, if this is intended to be an “adoption” bill, please provide links, references, or documents that provide for a single cycle.



If so, what relationship and effect was intended?

I own property in Planning District 2 in a marsh front neighborhood that borders AGR designated wetlands. I was a party in the challenge of the “Moody” plan amendment at the ICW, am involved in the Pablo Point Community Wildlife Habitat Project, and have been a member of the American Planning Association for about 20 years (currently VA, NC, FL chapters).

Valerie Britt  
P.O. Box 49209  
Jacksonville Beach, FL. 32240

Clements, Jeff

---

From: Brown, Cheryl  
Sent: Friday, August 14, 2020 10:24 AM  
To: SEC; ccmeeting08252020@coj.net; Clements, Jeff; Eller, Shannon  
Subject: FW: Text Transmittal Bill 2020-277  
Attachments: 2020-277 Bill Summary.pdf

Permanent file.....and public comments ccmeeting08252020@coj.net

----- Original message -----

From: Valerie Britt <valeriebritt76@yahoo.com>  
Date: 8/14/20 9:55 AM (GMT-05:00)  
To: Mayor Lenny Curry <MayorLennyCurry@coj.net>  
Cc: "Killingsworth, William" <BILLK@coj.net>, "Sales, Patricia" <PMacer@coj.net>, "Brown, Cheryl" <CLBROWN@coj.net>, "Reed, Kristen" <KReed@coj.net>, "Johnston, Paige" <PJohnston@coj.net>, "Eller, Shannon" <SEller@coj.net>, Valerie Britt <valeriebritt76@yahoo.com>, CCMEETING08252020 <CCMEETING08252020@coj.net>, mmoehring@nefr.org  
Subject: Text Transmittal Bill 2020-277

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This email originated from a non-COJ email address. Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Ord. 2020-277: No staff report subsequent to and specific to bill introduction?

ORD Apv 2020B Series Text Amendmnt to Future Land Use Element (FLUE) & Transportation Element of 2030 Comp P  
**Business District (CBD)** Future Land Use Category within FLUE & Amend Objectives & Policies of FLUE & Transport  
Growth & Developmnt in Downtown for Transmittal to State of FL's Various Agencies for Review; Providing Disclaimer  
Transmitted herein Shall Not be Construed as Exemption from Any Other Applicable Laws. (Parola) (Request of Mayor)(  
Introduced: LUZ 6/16/20 LUZ Read 2nd & Rerefer 6/23/20 CO Read 2nd

To the City of Jacksonville:  
Attention: Mayor Curry, City Council, LPA, Planning Department

**A February staff report referencing the abandonment of the downtown DRI does not really appear to me to match up with the contents of the bill's transmitting text amendment or the bill title. The transmittal bill was not introduced until June and no staff report has been located dated after the June introduction. There does not appear to be a staff report making recommendations on the actual bill.**

I own property in Planning District 2 in a marsh front neighborhood that borders AGR designated wetlands. I was a party in the challenge of the "Moody" plan amendment at the ICW, am involved in the Pablo Point Community Wildlife Habitat Project, and have been a member of the American Planning Association for about 20 years (currently VA, NC, FL chapters).

Valerie Britt  
P.O. Box 49209  
Jacksonville Beach, FL. 32240

Clements, Jeff

---

From: Valerie Britt <valeriebritt76@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Friday, August 14, 2020 9:55 AM  
To: Mayor Lenny Curry  
Cc: Killingsworth, William; Sales, Patricia; Brown, Cheryl; Reed, Kristen; Johnston, Paige; Eller, Shannon; Valerie Britt; CCMEETING08252020; mmoehring@nefrc.org  
Subject: Text Transmittal Bill 2020-277  
Attachments: 2020-277 Bill Summary.pdf

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This email originated from a non-COJ email address. Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Ord. 2020-277: No staff report subsequent to and specific to bill introduction?

ORD Apv 2020B Series Text Amendmnt to Future Land Use Element (FLUE) & Transportation Element of 2030 Comp P  
**Business District (CBD)** Future Land Use Category within FLUE & Amend Objectives & Policies of FLUE & Transport  
Growth & Developmnt in Downtown for Transmittal to State of FL's Various Agencies for Review; Providing Disclaimer  
Transmitted herein Shall Not be Construed as Exemption from Any Other Applicable Laws. (Parola) (Request of Mayor)(  
Introduced: LUZ 6/16/20 LUZ Read 2nd & Rerefer 6/23/20 CO Read 2nd

To the City of Jacksonville:  
Attention: Mayor Curry, City Council, LPA, Planning Department

**A February staff report referencing the abandonment of the downtown DRI does not really appear to me to match up with the contents of the bill's transmitting text amendment or the bill title. The transmittal bill was not introduced until June and no staff report has been located dated after the June introduction. There does not appear to be a staff report making recommendations on the actual bill.**

I own property in Planning District 2 in a marsh front neighborhood that borders AGR designated wetlands. I was a party in the challenge of the "Moody" plan amendment at the ICW, am involved in the Pablo Point Community Wildlife Habitat Project, and have been a member of the American Planning Association for about 20 years (currently VA, NC, FL chapters).

Valerie Britt  
P.O. Box 49209  
Jacksonville Beach, FL. 32240

Clements, Jeff

---

From: Valerie Britt <valeriebritt76@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Friday, August 14, 2020 9:46 AM  
To: CCMEETING08252020; Mayor Lenny Curry  
Cc: Killingsworth, William; Sales, Patricia; Brown, Cheryl; Reed, Kristen; mmoehring@nefrc.org; Valerie Britt  
Subject: Staff Reports? 2020-277  
Attachments: 2020-277 Bill Summary.pdf

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This email originated from a non-COJ email address. Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Ord. 2020-277: Concerns, questions and objections

ORD Apv 2020B Series Text Amendmnt to Future Land Use Element (FLUE) & Transportation Element of 2030 Comp P  
**Business District (CBD)** Future Land Use Category within FLUE & Amend Objectives & Policies of FLUE & Transport  
Growth & Developmnt in Downtown for Transmittal to State of FL's Various Agencies for Review; Providing Disclaimer  
Transmitted herein Shall Not be Construed as Exemption from Any Other Applicable Laws. (Parola) (Request of Mayor)(  
Introduced: LUZ 6/16/20 LUZ Read 2nd & Rerefer 6/23/20 CO Read 2nd

To the City of Jacksonville:  
Attention: LPA, City Council, Planning Department, Mayor Curry

First, I repeat my general recommendation that the City of Jacksonville needs to separate the Planning Commission into two decision making bodies so that critical Comprehensive Planning matters are given the attention they require instead of merely an after thought by the body functioning as a Board of Adjustments making quasi judicial decisions on variances, exceptions, minor modifications, and hearing appeals of administrative deviations. Perhaps the Planning Commission's roles as the Local Planning Agency, Land Development Regulation Commission and in Community Planning are not their priorities?

All meetings of the Local Planning Agency are required to be public meetings.

**FS 163.3181Public participation in the comprehensive planning process; intent....**

“(1) It is the intent of the Legislature that the public participate in the comprehensive planning process to the fullest extent possible. Towards this end, local planning agencies and local governmental units are directed to adopt procedures designed to provide effective public participation in the comprehensive planning process ....”  
There should be public access to Planning from the ground up, to participate in planning workshops, to be heard and not just to react to developers' applications. While in its role as LPA, the Planning Commission is designated to “prepare” the Comprehensive Plan and Plan amendments, I rarely hear anything other than approval of what applicants put before them through the Planning Department's reports of approvals. Is there any indication Planning Commissioners are really involved in “preparing” anything? “During the preparation of the plan or plan amendment and prior to any recommendation to the governing body, the local planning agency shall hold at least one public hearing, with public notice, on the proposed plan or plan amendment. “ Yet, The Notice Of Public Hearing of a FLUM Amendment before the LPA states “Opportunity to speak at the discretion of the Chairman.”

Then, according to Florida Statutes, “...final recommendation of the adoption of such plan or plan amendment to the governing body shall be the responsibility of the local planning agency.” For that important LPA role in City policy, why is there not a separate decision making body than the one consumed for lengthy time periods on many quasi judicial board of adjustment items at the beginning of every meeting?

Over the last year, transparency and public access to the Planning Commission has been substantially reduced. The public record “books” provided to the Planning Commission Members in advance of LPA meetings are no longer posted. P

The archives have been removed from the public site, even though some items continue on agendas for months. The once standard practice of posting transcripts and access to multiple meeting agendas has ended. Access to results agendas are not timely available before the items go to the LUZ Committee.

Changes to the Comprehensive Plan for the benefit of the community overall are not emphasized and go unnoticed. Land use attorneys for private applicants have admitted to proposing text amendments for their clients. Residents and neighborhoods have little or no opportunity to identify Planning needs to be translated into text. Formal exercises of visioning are Vision Plan books shelved and issued identified never addressed. Jacksonville needs a Community Development Board or a Local Planning Agency separate from its board of adjustments focus of the Planning Commission.

As to **2020-277**, I am unclear of the rationale for the bill or it’s full implications.

It appears to be a transmittal with an opportunity to seek additional information and provide comments.

“Approve?” The bill title fails to specifically state approved only for “**transmittal**”

But, it does mention transmittal **later in the title**. Please confirm there will be an adoption round of hearings and votes required for the proposed text amendment and that the application of the text will be limited to the designated Central Business District?

The summary uses the terms “approves” and “amends” as though final City action. Is it?

The bill title of 2020-277 gave me no indication of the laundry basket nature of this bill!

In fact, it gave the impression it was the Mayor’s request limited to facilitation of needed development of the CBD which I would generally support. The legislative summary described it as a bill related to “downtown.” But I now question if this bill applies to the entire county, including to the recent trend of increasing density in thousands of acres of wetlands without even CSV designations of the most sensitive areas, failing to even attempt to facilitate clustering of existing rights but to increase them. Approvals are being given for density increases on the whole or large acreages and I want to know if this bill will have any impact on that objectionable practice.

What is meaning of “vetted” as to reports and recommendations?

**No Planning staff or LPA reports of recommendation were included in the legislative materials as typical before enactment.**

i.e., there did not appear to be a Staff report or an LPA recommendation filed with the text “approval” (for transmittal) Ordinance.

Again, the bill title and legislative summary may be ***misleading*** in giving the appearance this is a Central Business District bill if it is not so limited.

This language among others for the text is objectionable (specific highlights added):

“When a specific maximum development density or intensity is not stated on the Annotated Future Land Use Map or in a site-specific policy, the City of Jacksonville shall use the following as the ***assumptions*** for maximum development when analyzing the impacts of amendments to the Future Land Use Map (FLUM). The following development impact standards ***do not limit*** the development potential of any site. For the purposes of this policy, Floor Area Ratio (FAR) is defined as the ratio of gross floor area of all structures on a lot to gross lot area.”

“ASSUMPTIONS?”

Do not limit development potential?

What kind of language is that for land use Planning?

I remember decades ago when DCA filed objections warning of creating universal categories and language was not adopted!

I was unable to obtain before the LPA meeting the information the LPA would have received on the plan issues because that information is no longer provided online, it was denied me from my request of the staff who prepares the books for the PC/LPA and public records requests made through the City's cumbersome process can not be processed in time to have them in advance of the PC/LPA Meeting.

Unfortunately, the City does not provide for citizens being on the same correspondence to receive LPA/PC agenda books as done by the Regional Council and by other cities, even though that's public record.

Date of Waterways Commission meeting and recommendation? Please provide.

The City has long needed review and improvement of its CCME to better *protect* the wetlands, marshes and provide better for flood controls and evacuation issues. Much of the Plan's wording has been tweaked over years to enable all development as "economic" development at the expense of protecting and improving neighborhoods and with little protection of the environment. I am concerned when anything related to development there in wetlands seems to be quietly slipped into a bill that does not name categories.

Therefore, I specifically question the "AGR" category information and request information on the impacts of this text amendment. Large areas of salt marshes have been quietly subdivided and sold off, such as at the ICW. The old paper maps often didn't even have real estate numbers on marshes that everyone presumed were truly undevelopable wastelands. It has been impossible to follow the trail of some of the activity in highly sensitive marshes where new homes seem to just be added on to PUD's without an identifiable process.

Salt Marshes and high functioning wetlands were apparently given AGR in Jacksonville instead of appropriately designated CSV too many times. Protecting them is critical. Hurricane evacuation clearance for the county and locational and site specifics including SFHA must be considered. Yet, the CCME is deficient in policies to apply to protect wetlands, CHHAs, marshes. Staff reports often fail to adequately address highly sensitive areas while density increases are readily given.

While the City has given lip service to flooding and resiliency, private applications have been approved for large parcels of wetlands to be granted higher density categories by private applications for development. Large acreages of AGR lands are being positioned for development. Rural and farming areas are being changed to facilitate 60' lot car dependent zoning districts in isolation of mixed uses. If the text of the plan is to be changed to apply to AGR, that should be specifically clear in a bill title and analysis.

This appears to be a transmittal that will return for adoption. Is that correct?

However, if this is intended to be an "adoption" bill, please provide links, references, or documents that provide for a single cycle.

If so, what relationship and effect was intended?

I own property in Planning District 2 in a marsh front neighborhood that borders AGR designated wetlands. I was a party in the challenge of the "Moody" plan amendment at the ICW, am involved in the Pablo Point Community Wildlife Habitat Project, and have been a member of the American Planning Association for about 20 years (currently VA, NC, FL chapters).

Valerie Britt  
P.O. Box 49209  
Jacksonville Beach, FL. 32240

From: ITD Notifications  
Sent: Thursday, August 13, 2020 12:07 PM  
To: ITD Notifications  
Subject: Planned Maintenance for COJ Internet on Sunday, 8/16/2020 from 9:00PM - Monday, 8/17/2020 at 1:00AM  
Importance: High



ITD would like to inform you of the upcoming planned maintenance:

Service(s): External Access to all COJ Websites and Applications

Date/Time: Sunday, August 16th at 9:00 PM to Monday, August 17<sup>th</sup> at 1:00 AM

Service Availability: Intermittent external access to COJ Internet (Websites and Applications)

Details: ITD will be performing system maintenance to infrastructure hardware.

During this period, you may have intermittent external access to all COJ Websites and Applications:

- If you are connecting remotely, you may have intermittent access to all COJ Websites and Applications.
- If you are on the internal COJ network, you may have intermittent access to the Internet.

Questions? ITD is here to help. Please contact the ITD Service Desk at 255-1818.



Clements, Jeff

---

From: Amy Cole <amy@clarkadv.com>  
Sent: Wednesday, August 12, 2020 4:07 PM  
To: CCMEETING08252020  
Subject: August 8, 2020 Resiliency Meeting

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This email originated from a non-COJ email address. Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

The password posted keeps telling me it is not correct (027257) Meeting ID: 941 5620 4683

Amy Cole  
Clark Advisory Services  
C. 904.449.6889  
O. 904.834.9373

**CLARK ADVISORY SERVICES**

PLAN. EXECUTE. DELIVER.

Clements, Jeff

---

From: Amanda Marron <amanda.l.marron@gmail.com>  
Sent: Wednesday, August 12, 2020 12:10 PM  
To: CCMEETING08252020  
Subject: 2020-0357 Comment  
Attachments: Amanda Marron - JWJ Testimonial.docx

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This email originated from a non-COJ email address. Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Good Morning!

I apologize for my delay in email. I had a power outage and the loss of my modem last night due to the storm and wasn't able to get my email in before the public comment for 2020-0357. I just wanted to add it in now for public record if it isn't too late.

Thank you very much!

Amanda Marron  
544 West 17th Street, Unit 1  
Jacksonville, FL 32206

Clements, Jeff

---

From: Wilkes, Melanie  
Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2020 8:54 PM  
To: CITYC  
Subject: FW: Metro Park Bill 2019-0555. Pls withdraw.

Good evening,

The below email has been posted to the 8/11/20 City Council Meeting InSite webpage:

<https://jaxcityc.legistar.com/MeetingDetail.aspx?ID=794251&GUID=BF4F0DF1-EA9F-4750-93F5-B592B3E94786&Options=&Search=&Refresh=1>

Best Regards,

Melanie Wilkes, Information Systems Administrator  
Jacksonville City Council  
117 West Duval St, Ste. 425  
Jacksonville, FL 32202  
904.255.5182 / [MWilkes@coj.net](mailto:MWilkes@coj.net)

\*\*\*Please note that under Florida's very broad public records law, e-mail communications to and from city officials are subject to public disclosure.\*\*\*

---

From: Brown, Cheryl  
Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2020 12:06 AM  
To: Roberta Thomas; Curry, Lenny; Matthews, Jessica; Hazouri, Thomas; Newby, Samuel; Danford, Joyce; Ron Salem; DeFoor, Randle; White, Randy; Pittman, JuCoby; Jackson, Brenda; Ferraro, Albert; Bowman, Aaron; Freeman, Terrance; Cumber, LeAnna; Carlucci, Matthew; Becton, Daniel; Diamond, Rory; Dennis, Garrett; CITYC; Clements, Jeff; CCMEETING08112020  
Subject: RE: Metro Park Bill 2019-0555. Pls withdraw.

Added to Public Comments 08.11.202

----- Original message -----

From: Roberta Thomas <[robertajaxfl@gmail.com](mailto:robertajaxfl@gmail.com)>  
Date: 8/10/20 9:58 PM (GMT-05:00)  
To: "Curry, Lenny" <[LCurry@coj.net](mailto:LCurry@coj.net)>, "Matthews, Jessica" <[JMatthews@coj.net](mailto:JMatthews@coj.net)>, "Brown, Cheryl" <[CLBROWN@coj.net](mailto:CLBROWN@coj.net)>, "Hazouri, Thomas" <[THazouri@coj.net](mailto:THazouri@coj.net)>, "Newby, Samuel" <[SNewby@coj.net](mailto:SNewby@coj.net)>, "Danford, Joyce" <[JoyceMorgan@coj.net](mailto:JoyceMorgan@coj.net)>, "Newby, Samuel" <[SNewby@coj.net](mailto:SNewby@coj.net)>, Ron Salem <[ron.salem@pharmerica.com](mailto:ron.salem@pharmerica.com)>, "DeFoor, Randle" <[RDefoor@coj.net](mailto:RDefoor@coj.net)>, "White, Randy" <[RandyWhite@coj.net](mailto:RandyWhite@coj.net)>, "Pittman, JuCoby" <[JPittman@coj.net](mailto:JPittman@coj.net)>, "Jackson, Brenda" <[BPJackson@coj.net](mailto:BPJackson@coj.net)>, "Ferraro, Albert" <[Ferraro@coj.net](mailto:Ferraro@coj.net)>, "Bowman, Aaron" <[ABowman@coj.net](mailto:ABowman@coj.net)>, "Freeman, Terrance" <[TFreeman@coj.net](mailto:TFreeman@coj.net)>, "Cumber, LeAnna" <[LCumber@coj.net](mailto:LCumber@coj.net)>, "Carlucci, Matthew" <[MCarlucci@coj.net](mailto:MCarlucci@coj.net)>, "Becton, Daniel" <[DBecton@coj.net](mailto:DBecton@coj.net)>, "Diamond, Rory" <[RDiamond@coj.net](mailto:RDiamond@coj.net)>, "Dennis, Garrett" <[GarrettD@coj.net](mailto:GarrettD@coj.net)>  
Subject: Metro Park Bill 2019-0555. Pls withdraw.

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This email originated from a non-COJ email address. Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello, Council Members--Please vote to withdraw this bill that would pay back one of the original grants received to establish Metropolitan Park. This decision should be made with public involvement. Please call for a special meeting of the City Council to fully vet what is being proposed.

Thank you,  
Roberta Thomas  
member of Greater Arlington Civic Council

president of Fort Caroline Club Estates South Civic Assoc, Inc.

Clements, Jeff

---

From: Matthews, Jessica  
Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2020 7:44 PM  
To: CCMEETING08252020; carnell oliver  
Subject: Fwd: General election voting box

Correspondence received thankyou

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** carnell oliver <carnellooliver1985@gmail.com>  
**Date:** August 11, 2020 at 7:43:06 PM EDT  
**To:** "Matthews, Jessica" <JMatthews@coj.net>  
**Subject:** General election voting box

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This email originated from a non-COJ email address. Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

I would like my comments read into the record about drive-thru voting boxes for the general election in which the Duval supervisor of election can come through and pick up all absentee ballots in the November election or mail-in ballot and I understand that mr. Michael Boylan sex on the election canvassing board and I would like an effort put into having something like this constructed for the general election in November because I am concerned about the United States postal service not being able to collect individual citizens ballot

Clements, Jeff

---

From: eks89@comcast.net  
Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2020 5:24 PM  
To: CCMEETING08252020  
Cc: eks89@comcast.net  
Subject: Public Comment for city council meeting on 8.11.20

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This email originated from a non-COJ email address. Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear City Council,

I would like to introduce myself. I am Eric Stupski, a native Jacksonvillian and licensed CPA. In my 31 years I have lived in Jacksonville for 28 of those years. I am not going anywhere as I am now a home owner. I am writing to you today to request an amendment me made to the city regulations. As you know the Mayor can issue executive orders, which has penalties of jail time and fines. However these executive orders are not voted on by members of the City council or the voting public on election day. As such I am requesting the following amendment to the city's regulations.

Any executive order issued by the mayor office has a default 30 day expiration. In order to renew the executive order for an additional 30 days a majority approval of the city council is required. For any additional 30 day extension a unanimous approval is required.

The objective is to have a system of checks and balances the can check the mayors power in issuing executive orders that can in theory last for years. I have spoken about this resolution with my representative Danny Becton.

I am reaching out to all city council members to get the needed votes in order to pass this legislation.

Eric Stupski