

Clements, Jeff

From: JOHN D WEBB <gatorwebbs@bellsouth.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 01, 2020 12:05 PM
To: Eden Reynolds; Tanya Hughes
Cc: Cassandra; Boylan, Michael; CCMEETING09082020; Gaffney, Reginald; Freeman, Terrance; Bowman, Aaron; Diamond, Rory; Ferraro, Albert; White, Randy; Lewis, Bruce; William Herron; caroladonofrio@gmail.com; Wesolowski, Rosemary; christinebenhamrealestate@gmail.com; anabelacu@gmail.com; langleyb301@comcast.net; leighannmluttrell@gmail.com; jomansell@comcast.net; hubbs_seaward@yahoo.com; ranaysemail@gmail.com; gka2000@hotmail.com; les@parkerandcompany.net; d.b.gager@gmail.com; Edward Morgan; alcoff1984@yahoo.com; Mike Herzberg; Roland Heintze; greg_mansell@comcast.net; koala7@comcast.net; racefan1@gmail.com; tscott0625@gmail.com; teresaakel@gmail.com; akintoker@aol.com; floridamargo@aol.com; kigelsrud@aol.com; mswrigley@hotmail.com; george_lytle@hotmail.com; Elizabeth Wilde; Caryn Herzberg; myrick308@att.net; timsoles@bellsouth.net; flyerbill@yahoo.com
Subject: Re: ORD 2020-0098 and ORD 2020-0307 for LUZ meeting 9/1/2020

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 day, all --

So many others have cited very specific and compelling reasons to disapprove of this rezoning and I want to add our voices to theirs. Jack and I chose Mandarin as our home nearly 26 years ago and have owned a home on Aladdin Rd. for 17 years. We feel so blessed to have raised 3 children among such natural beauty and wildlife and to be a part of the rich history of this area. Jack was honored to represent District 6 on the City Council from 2007-2011 and we understand these decisions are difficult. However, although we entirely understand the desire for managed growth, such growth should be in keeping with the character of the area and only done with respect of this rich history and natural beauty and wildlife habitats for which Mandarin is known. Sadly, this respect has dwindled over the past decade, and our little corner of Mandarin has been experiencing death by a thousand cuts. Too many concessions have led to some of that character being irretrievably lost. We implore you to deny this rezoning request so that we can hold onto the beauty of what remains in our little neck of the woods. Once it is gone, it is gone forever. Our hope is that a new generation of children will have the opportunity to share in this natural beauty and Mandarin lifestyle. Please vote no.

Regards,

Elizabeth Webb
12380 Aladdin Rd.

On Tuesday, September 1, 2020, 11:26:35 AM EDT, Tanya Hughes <hughestanya69@gmail.com> wrote:

Please do **not** approve this rezoning for all the reasons everyone listed.

Be better - be STRONG! Make a stand! You can do it, not just for the current residents, but for our futures.

Thank you -
Tanya and Harold Hughes
8 years on Shady Creek
In Mandrain since 1987

On Tue, Sep 1, 2020 at 9:23 AM Eden Reynolds <edensutter.reynolds@gmail.com> wrote:
Hello Honorable Council Members and fellow neighbors,

My family has lived in our Julington Landing home for 22 years this November. As young twenty somethings from Pennsylvania, my husband and I fell in love with the neighborhood and our home immediately, and we weren't even house hunting. Within a month we moved in and we have been in love with our surroundings since that time.

Our home backs up to the creek where it is navigable. We canoe this creek, maintain it when trees come down, and we enjoy the peace and abundant wildlife that live on the creek. I can provide you with photos of barred owls, turkeys, river otters,

kingfishers, blue herons, deer, and much more - my hobby is photographing the nature we are so lucky to have close by. We feel fortunate to have this piece of heaven in our backyard.

As for the proposed zoning change, I do have major concerns about Increased creek flow, negative impacts to wildlife, and the preservation of Mandarin as a place that is unique. The zoning does not fit with the current home culture of our Mandarin area.

Please consider the people who live here and love this area. Consider the land. Consider the wildlife. And please, consider the future of Mandarin. We cannot go back once the negative impact has occurred. Lessen that impact and vote no on rezoning to PUD. I applaud the rezoning to CC for the 16 acres, but please maintain the RR zoning for the other land.

Thank you.

Eden Reynolds
4049 Shady Creek Lane
Mandarin, FL 32223

On Sep 1, 2020, at 1:00 AM, cassandra@thecomputer.com wrote:

Honorable Council Members,

Something CM Boylan said at the meeting on 8/18/2020 summarized my thoughts on the matter of ORD 2020-0098 and ORD 2020-0307 pretty well.

It went something like this:

I promised my constituents to manage growth. Growth in our community is inevitable. We have to understand and appreciate that this is a growing community.

Mandarin is a very popular area right now. Mandarin is not available to many people because there aren't many available homes in our community.

There is an interest not only in this development [ORD 2020-0098] but also for three of four others in this area [including ORD 2020-0307].

I am sensitive to invite more people to live in the Mandarin area.

Yes, I agree, because I love it here.

I am sensitive to manage growth that preserves Mandarin for what it is, and not let it become just like "anywhere and everywhere."

Growth can be achieved while preserving character - as it was done for the neighborhood I currently live in - Julington Landing.

I chose to move to the Mandarin Julington Creek area a year and a half ago.

When the real estate person suggested Mandarin, I said, no it's either too congested or too expensive, because all I'd seen was San Jose and Mandarin Rd and houses worth half a million and up, which I and most people I know, can't afford.

She told me she knew of an affordable home with majestic oaks draped with spanish moss.

We headed down Loretto to Aladdin to Julington Creek to Shady Creek to a tabby coated mid-century modern house on over half an acre, that I live in today.

Some people told me I really needed to check out Nocatee because new houses are better, and the lifestyle there was fantastic. I took a drive and saw the sun baked cookie cutter houses with bland grass lawns. The houses were so close together, walking around the side you could see clearly into the next house. That is certainly some people cup of tea, but I very quickly left.

Every night at home now, I hear owls.

This past weekend, a pileated woodpecker was swaying back and forth while opening and closing its wings, apparently to distract a hawk sitting nearby.

A great heron landed in a tree and walked across a thick branch.

This past spring turkeys clomped across my roof before launching into the wetland in the back yard.... A few weeks later I heard their chicks growing up.

I am sensitive to invite more people to live in what Harriet Beecher Stowe, author of "Uncle Tom's Cabin" and previous resident, called "a tropical paradise."

I would love to invite more people to enjoy the beautiful experiences I have had in a neighborhood of unique

homes that were carefully crafted around mature oaks.

I virtually walked the Council down my street to see the houses under the grand tree canopy on 8/18/2020.

Sometimes I like to drive down dead end roads to admire the mid-century modern designs.

So many of the new homes going in look like you could pick them up and be anywhere. How sad.

"Mandarin is a very popular area right now. Mandarin is not available to many people because there aren't many available homes in our community."

When I look on Zillow or Realtor.com there are over a hundred homes nearby, and yet, people would really like to be in Mandarin.

Mandarin is not like "everywhere else."

I keep hearing that the proposed PUDs are consistent with land use "in the area."

I'm given numbers, ratios, percentages, and black and white lot maps as "evidence" of the consistency.

I'm told that if I can't see a neighborhood from the main road, it doesn't matter what's back there.

I wonder if they've ever sat on their back porch listening to baby turkeys.

My brow furrows as I ponder - do they not understand the spirit that moved City officials to codify Municipal Ordinances Article 25 or Subpart N?

Section 25.01. - Findings, intent and purpose.

The loss of mature and maturing tree species during the clearing of land for development has an adverse effect on the environment.... The presence of trees aids in energy conservation by cooling the atmosphere, reduces air pollution by removing particulates such as dust and pollen, increases oxygen production, slows surface water runoff, reduces soil erosion, provides food, nesting sites and protection for wildlife, enhances scenic beauty, and provides other environmental benefits.

SUBPART N. - MANDARIN OVERLAYS

Sec. 656.399.10. - Mandarin Road Overlay.

The Council finds that the properties within the Mandarin Road Overlay, as visually depicted in the Mandarin Road Overlay map following this section, are predominantly developed at a density of one unit per acre or larger. Therefore, the following additional criteria shall be considered... when evaluating any land use or zoning application within the Mandarin Road Overlay, to protect the character of the Overlay area and protect the health, safety, and welfare of the residents therein....

ORD 2020-0307 shows almost 2 lots for every one lot across the north border. I was told that PUD ORD 2020-0098 is very similar to my neighborhood - but without preserving the trees, and with houses twice as big, and much closer together, and costing nearly twice as much, as the one I live in.... How is that similar? A site plan is provided as "evidence," but it clearly shows lots smaller than any lot on the other side of the border, all the way around, with some big oddly shaped lots in the middle to bring up the average, so the numbers look good.

But I live on the *east* side of Oldfield Creek, which is the Julington Creek neighborhood - that's the smaller lots, running over to Saddle Ridge. But even those homes don't compare to the proposed PUDs because they were built around mature trees and are widely spaced.

The proposed PUD ORD 2020-0098 is going in off Aladdin, on the *west* side of the creek, a detached section of old Mandarin, where the last remnants of the Rural Residential houses are.

ORD 2020-0307, also westward, even contains a registered historic landmark.

Both proposed PUDs are in Rural Residential areas that are becoming increasingly fragmented as the City allows big houses on little lots to slowly chip away at the area.

Frighteningly I'm told that the PUDs that have encroached the area are justification for consistency to allow more PUDs. Seriously.

Attached is my map, with colors, that shows the Rural Residential areas that are currently endangered by accelerated growth, and for comparison, the area covered by the Mandarin Overlay (Subpart N).

Gosh, I wonder if that's similar to why Subpart N needed to be codified to protect the character of the old Mandarin coast.

ORD 2020-0098 and ORD 2020-0307 are in the last holdout for where we could invite people that want to live the Mandarin lifestyle of big oak tree filled lots with widely spaced homes.... or we could let cookie cutter houses go in until there's nothing left of what people want to come to Mandarin for.

Nocatee at least has recreation facilities. If we allow what makes Mandarin unique succumb to a black and white numeric definition of consistency, what are we going to do when people don't want to come specifically here anymore, because it's just like everywhere else?

If you are thinking about voting yes to approve a PUD that has a minimum lot size of 80x120 and that plans on cutting the mature trees and replacing them with 2 to 4 inch baby trees, please come stop by my house first. Please visit the people that live off Aladdin directly. Please visit anyone currently living in the Rural Residential area off Aladdin shown on my attached map first.

If you are seriously considering voting yes to either ORD 2020-0098 or ORD 2020-0307 then you will DEPRIVE the people that want to come to Mandarin of the Mandarin they want to come to, and you're gonna give them "anywhere" instead, and then they won't want to stay once the houses get older, because there will be newer houses somewhere else.

If you preserve the Rural Residential zoning people selling their land will still make plenty of money, developers will still make money, you'll be inviting the people that have been searching for the unique woodland charm of Mandarin, and you'll be giving people homes they will want to live in even when the homes are older. Invite people that want to come to a home with a big yard and big trees, and they will stay because there won't be any where else like that to go to anymore anywhere pretty soon.

Please manage growth with sensitivity to why people want to come to Mandarin so that you can invite them to *Mandarin*, and not allow Mandarin to become somewhere like everywhere else.

Please deny rezoning for ORD 2020-98 and ORD 2020-307 and preserve the Rural Residential for development for the people that are right now desperately searching for a big lot with big trees in a city full of big houses on little lots with little trees.

Thank you,
Cassandra Goodwin
Shady Creek Dr 32223

<Mandarin - what is consistent.jpg>

--
Tanya Hughes

Clements, Jeff

From: cassandra@thecomputer.com
Sent: Tuesday, September 01, 2020 11:42 AM
To: Boylan, Michael; CCMEETING09082020; Gaffney, Reginald; Freeman, Terrance; Bowman, Aaron; Diamond, Rory; Ferraro, Albert; White, Randy; Lewis, Bruce
Cc: willherron@att.net; caroladonofrio@gmail.com; Wesolowski, Rosemary; christinebenhamrealestate@gmail.com; anabelacu@gmail.com; langleyb301@comcast.net; leighannmluttrell@gmail.com; jomansell@comcast.net; edensutter.reynolds@gmail.com; hubbs_seaward@yahoo.com; ranaysemail@gmail.com; gka2000@hotmail.com; les@parkerandcompany.net; d.b.gager@gmail.com; egmorgan@earthlink.net; alcoff1984@yahoo.com; mherzberg@sleiman.com; rheintze@linux.com; hughestanya69@gmail.com; greg_mansell@comcast.net; gatorwebbs@bellsouth.net; koala7@comcast.net; racefan1@gmail.com; tscott0625@gmail.com; teresaakel@gmail.com; akintoker@aol.com; floridamargo@aol.com; kigelsrud@aol.com; mswrigley@hotmail.com; george_lytle@hotmail.com; lizwilde3@gmail.com; carynherzberg@yahoo.com; myrick308@att.net; timssoles@bellsouth.net; flyerbill@yahoo.com
Subject: ORD 2020-0098 and ORD 2020-0307 for LUZ meeting 9/1/2020
Attachments: Mandarin - what is consistent.jpg

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 the LUZ meeting minutes on 9/1/2020 regarding both ORD 2020-0098 and ORD 2020-307 if I am unable to attend.
(I tested it at just under 3 minutes at a normal cadence.)

Honorable Council Members,

To *paraphrase* statements by CM Boylan:

I promised my constituents to be sensitive to manage growth that is inevitable to invite more people into the popular Mandarin area.

I agree and invite others to enjoy the beauty of life in Mandarin, and hope City Planning does not allow it become like "anywhere and everywhere."

Growth can be achieved while preserving character - as it was done in Julington Landing where I live.

I moved here a year and a half ago, after saying no to Nocatee with it's sardine packed houses with bland grass lawns and no tree canopy.

Harriet Beecher Stowe, author of "Uncle Tom's Cabin" and previous resident, called Mandarin "a tropical paradise."

I keep hearing that PUDs are consistent with land use "in the area" and are similar to my neighborhood. But without preserving trees, closer together on small lots, and costing nearly twice as much, as mine. I'm given ratios, percentages, and black and white site plans as "evidence" of the consistency with my neighborhood.

If you allow what makes Mandarin unique succumb to a black and white numeric definition of consistency, what are we going to do when people don't want to come specifically here anymore because it's just like everywhere else?

On Zillow or Realtor.com there are hundreds of PUD homes in Jacksonville, and yet, Mandarin is in demand because it is not like "everywhere else."

Please understand the spirit that moved City officials to codify Municipal Ordinances Article 25 and Subpart N?

Paraphrased for time:

Section 25.01.....

The loss of... [mature trees from]... clearing... for development has an adverse effect on the environment.... The presence of trees... [provides a list of benefits for clean air and water, as well as]... food, [and] nesting sites... for wildlife, [etc.].....

SUBPART N. - MANDARIN OVERLAYS

The Council finds that... the Mandarin Road Overlay... [is mostly] developed at a density of one unit per acre or larger. Therefore,... additional criteria shall be considered... to protect the character of the... area....

I live on the *EAST* side of Oldfield Creek, with smaller lots but carefully crafted around mature trees. The *WEST* side of the creek is predominantly Rural Residential.

Both proposed PUDs are on the *west* side of Oldfield creek, in the last remnants of old Mandarin. ORD 2020-307 contains a registered historic landmark.

The map attached includes the Mandarin Overlay area for comparison.

Frighteningly I'm told that PUDs that fragment the remaining Rural area are justification for consistency to allow more PUDs. Seriously?

City officials get to choose how much *Mandarin* will be left for people to come to.

Or let cookie cutter PUDs go in until there's very little left of what people want to come to Mandarin for.

People selling their land and developers will still make plenty of money under Rural Residential zoning.

If you vote yes to the proposed PUDs, then you will DEPRIVE the people of the *Mandarin* they want to live in.

Thank you,

Cassandra Goodwin

Shady Creek Dr 32223

On 2020-09-01 01:00, cassandra@thecomputer.com wrote:

Honorable Council Members,

Something CM Boylan said at the meeting on 8/18/2020 summarized my thoughts on the matter of ORD 2020-0098 and ORD 2020-0307 pretty well.

It went something like this:

I promised my constituents to manage growth. Growth in our community is inevitable. We have to understand and appreciate that this is a growing community.

Mandarin is a very popular area right now. Mandarin is not available to many people because there aren't many available homes in our community.

There is an interest not only in this development [ORD 2020-0098] but also for three of four others in this area [including ORD 2020-0307].

I am sensitive to invite more people to live in the Mandarin area.

Yes, I agree, because I love it here.

I am sensitive to manage growth that preserves Mandarin for what it is, and not let it become just like "anywhere and everywhere."

Growth can be achieved while preserving character - as it was done for the neighborhood I currently live in - Julington Landing.

I chose to move to the Mandarin Julington Creek area a year and a half ago.

When the real estate person suggested Mandarin, I said, no it's either too congested or too expensive, because all I'd seen was San Jose and Mandarin Rd and houses worth half a million and up, which I and most people I know, can't afford.

She told me she knew of an affordable home with majestic oaks draped with spanish moss. We headed down Loretto to Aladdin to Julington Creek to Shady Creek to a tabby coated mid-century modern house on over half an acre, that I live in today.

Some people told me I really needed to check out Nocatee because new houses are better, and the lifestyle there was fantastic. I took a drive and saw the sun baked cookie cutter houses with bland grass lawns. The houses were so close together, walking around the side you could see clearly into the next house. That is certainly some people cup of tea, but I very quickly left.

Every night at home now, I hear owls.

This past weekend, a pileated woodpecker was swaying back and forth while opening and closing its wings, apparently to distract a hawk sitting nearby.

A great heron landed in a tree and walked across a thick branch.

This past spring turkeys clomped across my roof before launching into the wetland in the back yard.... A few weeks later I heard their chicks growing up.

I am sensitive to invite more people to live in what Harriet Beecher Stowe, author of "Uncle Tom's Cabin" and previous resident, called "a tropical paradise."

I would love to invite more people to enjoy the beautiful experiences I have had in a neighborhood of unique homes that were carefully crafted around mature oaks.

I virtually walked the Council down my street to see the houses under the grand tree canopy on 8/18/2020.

Sometimes I like to drive down dead end roads to admire the mid-century modern designs.

So many of the new homes going in look like you could pick them up and be anywhere. How sad.

"Mandarin is a very popular area right now. Mandarin is not available to many people because there aren't many available homes in our community."

When I look on Zillow or Realtor.com there are over a hundred homes nearby, and yet, people would really like to be in Mandarin.

Mandarin is not like "everywhere else."

I keep hearing that the proposed PUDs are consistent with land use "in the area."

I'm given numbers, ratios, percentages, and black and white lot maps as "evidence" of the consistency.

I'm told that if I can't see a neighborhood from the main road, it doesn't matter what's back there.

I wonder if they've ever sat on their back porch listening to baby turkeys.

My brow furrows as I ponder - do they not understand the spirit that moved City officials to codify Municipal Ordinances Article 25 or Subpart N?

Section 25.01. - Findings, intent and purpose.

The loss of mature and maturing tree species during the clearing of land for development has an adverse effect on the environment.... The presence of trees aids in energy conservation by cooling the atmosphere, reduces air pollution by removing particulates such as dust and pollen, increases oxygen production, slows surface water runoff, reduces soil erosion, provides food, nesting sites and protection for wildlife, enhances scenic beauty, and provides other environmental benefits.

SUBPART N. - MANDARIN OVERLAYS

Sec. 656.399.10. - Mandarin Road Overlay.

The Council finds that the properties within the Mandarin Road Overlay, as visually depicted in the Mandarin Road Overlay map following this section, are predominantly developed at a density of one unit per acre or larger.

Therefore, the following additional criteria shall be considered... when evaluating any land use or zoning application within the Mandarin Road Overlay, to protect the character of the Overlay area and protect the health, safety, and welfare of the residents therein....

ORD 2020-0307 shows almost 2 lots for every one lot across the north border. I was told that PUD ORD 2020-0098 is very similar to my neighborhood - but without preserving the trees, and with houses twice as big, and much closer together, and costing nearly twice as much, as the one I live in.... How is that similar? A site plan is provided as "evidence," but it clearly shows lots smaller than any lot on the other side of the border, all the way around, with some big oddly shaped lots in the middle to bring up the average, so the numbers look good.

But I live on the *east* side of Oldfield Creek, which is the Julington Creek neighborhood - that's the smaller lots, running over to Saddle Ridge. But even those homes don't compare to the proposed PUDs because they were built around mature trees and are widely spaced.

The proposed PUD ORD 2020-0098 is going in off Aladdin, on the *west* side of the creek, a detached section of old Mandarin, where the last remnants of the Rural Residential houses are.

ORD 2020-0307, also westward, even contains a registered historic landmark.

Both proposed PUDs are in Rural Residential areas that are becoming increasingly fragmented as the City allows big houses on little lots to slowly chip away at the area.

Frighteningly I'm told that the PUDs that have encroached the area are justification for consistency to allow more PUDs. Seriously.

Attached is my map, with colors, that shows the Rural Residential areas that are currently endangered by accelerated growth, and for comparison, the area covered by the Mandarin Overlay (Subpart N).

Gosh, I wonder if that's similar to why Subpart N needed to be codified to protect the character of the old Mandarin coast.

ORD 2020-0098 and ORD 2020-0307 are in the last holdout for where we could invite people that want to live the Mandarin lifestyle of big oak tree filled lots with widely spaced homes.... or we could let cookie cutter houses go in until there's nothing left of what people want to come to Mandarin for.

Nocatee at least has recreation facilities. If we allow what makes Mandarin unique succumb to a black and white numeric definition of consistency, what are we going to do when people don't want to come specifically here anymore, because it's just like everywhere else?

If you are thinking about voting yes to approve a PUD that has a minimum lot size of 80x120 and that plans on cutting the mature trees and replacing them with 2 to 4 inch baby trees, please come stop by my house first. Please visit the people that live off Aladdin directly. Please visit anyone currently living in the Rural Residential area off Aladdin shown on my attached map first.

If you are seriously considering voting yes to either ORD 2020-0098 or ORD 2020-0307 then you will DEPRIVE the people that want to come to Mandarin of the Mandarin they want to come to, and you're gonna give them "anywhere" instead, and then they won't want to stay once the houses get older, because there will be newer houses somewhere else.

If you preserve the Rural Residential zoning people selling their land will still make plenty of money, developers will still make money, you'll be inviting the people that have been searching for the unique woodland charm of Mandarin, and you'll be giving people homes they will want to live in even when the homes are older. Invite people that want to come to a home with a big yard and big trees, and they will stay because there won't be any where else like that to go to anymore anywhere pretty soon.

Please manage growth with sensitivity to why people want to come to Mandarin so that you can invite them to *Mandarin*, and not allow Mandarin to become somewhere like everywhere else.

Please deny rezoning for ORD 2020-98 and ORD 2020-307 and preserve the Rural Residential for development for the people that are right now desperately searching for a big lot with big trees in a city full of big houses on little lots with little trees.

Thank you,
Cassandra Goodwin
Shady Creek Dr 32223

Clements, Jeff

From: Tanya Hughes <hughestanya69@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 01, 2020 11:26 AM
To: Eden Reynolds
Cc: Cassandra; Boylan, Michael; CCMEETING09082020; Gaffney, Reginald; Freeman, Terrance; Bowman, Aaron; Diamond, Rory; Ferraro, Albert; White, Randy; Lewis, Bruce; William Herron; caroladonofrio@gmail.com; Wesolowski, Rosemary; christinebenhamrealestate@gmail.com; anabelacu@gmail.com; langleyb301@comcast.net; leighannmluttrell@gmail.com; jomansell@comcast.net; Hubbs_seaward@yahoo.com; ranaysemail@gmail.com; gka2000@hotmail.com; Les@parkerandcompany.net; d.b.gager@gmail.com; Edward Morgan; Alcott1984@yahoo.com; Mike Herzberg; Roland Heintze; greg_mansell@comcast.net; Elizabeth Webb; koala7@comcast.net; racefan1@gmail.com; tscott0625@gmail.com; teresaakel@gmail.com; akintoker@aol.com; floridamargo@aol.com; kigelsrud@aol.com; mswrigley@hotmail.com; george_lytle@hotmail.com; Elizabeth Wilde; Caryn Herzberg; myrick308@att.net; timsolles@bellsouth.net; flyerbill@yahoo.com
Subject: Re: ORD 2020-0098 and ORD 2020-0307 for LUZ meeting 9/1/2020

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 do **not** approve this rezoning for all the reasons everyone listed.

Be better - be STRONG! Make a stand! You can do it, not just for the current residents, but for our futures.

Thank you -
Tanya and Harold Hughes
8 years on Shady Creek
In Mandrain since 1987

On Tue, Sep 1, 2020 at 9:23 AM Eden Reynolds <edensutter.reynolds@gmail.com> wrote:
Hello Honorable Council Members and fellow neighbors,

My family has lived in our Julington Landing home for 22 years this November. As young twenty somethings from Pennsylvania, my husband and I fell in love with the neighborhood and our home immediately, and we weren't even house hunting. Within a month we moved in and we have been in love with our surroundings since that time.

Our home backs up to the creek where it is navigable. We canoe this creek, maintain it when trees come down, and we enjoy the peace and abundant wildlife that live on the creek. I can provide you with photos of barred owls, turkeys, river otters, kingfishers, blue herons, deer, and much more - my hobby is photographing the nature we are so lucky to have close by. We feel fortunate to have this piece of heaven in our backyard.

As for the proposed zoning change, I do have major concerns about Increased creek flow, negative impacts to wildlife, and the preservation of Mandarin as a place that is unique. The zoning does not fit with the current home culture of our Mandarin area.

Please consider the people who live here and love this area. Consider the land. Consider the wildlife. And please, consider the future of Mandarin. We cannot go back once the negative impact has occurred. Lessen that impact and vote no on rezoning to PUD. I applaud the rezoning to CC for the 16 acres, but please maintain the RR zoning for the other land.

Thank you.

Eden Reynolds
4049 Shady Creek Lane
Mandarin, FL 32223

On Sep 1, 2020, at 1:00 AM, cassandra@thecomputer.com wrote:

Honorable Council Members,

Something CM Boylan said at the meeting on 8/18/2020 summarized my thoughts on the matter of ORD 2020-0098 and ORD 2020-0307 pretty well.

It went something like this:

I promised my constituents to manage growth. Growth in our community is inevitable. We have to understand and appreciate that this is a growing community.

Mandarin is a very popular area right now. Mandarin is not available to many people because there aren't many available homes in our community.

There is an interest not only in this development [ORD 2020-0098] but also for three of four others in this area [including ORD 2020-0307].

I am sensitive to invite more people to live in the Mandarin area.

Yes, I agree, because I love it here.

I am sensitive to manage growth that preserves Mandarin for what it is, and not let it become just like "anywhere and everywhere."

Growth can be achieved while preserving character - as it was done for the neighborhood I currently live in - Julington Landing.

I chose to move to the Mandarin Julington Creek area a year and a half ago.

When the real estate person suggested Mandarin, I said, no it's either too congested or too expensive, because all I'd seen was San Jose and Mandarin Rd and houses worth half a million and up, which I and most people I know, can't afford.

She told me she knew of an affordable home with majestic oaks draped with spanish moss.

We headed down Loretto to Aladdin to Julington Creek to Shady Creek to a tabby coated mid-century modern house on over half an acre, that I live in today.

Some people told me I really needed to check out Nocatee because new houses are better, and the lifestyle there was fantastic. I took a drive and saw the sun baked cookie cutter houses with bland grass lawns. The houses were so close together, walking around the side you could see clearly into the next house. That is certainly some people cup of tea, but I very quickly left.

Every night at home now, I hear owls.

This past weekend, a pileated woodpecker was swaying back and forth while opening and closing its wings, apparently to distract a hawk sitting nearby.

A great heron landed in a tree and walked across a thick branch.

This past spring turkeys clomped across my roof before launching into the wetland in the back yard....

A few weeks later I heard their chicks growing up.

I am sensitive to invite more people to live in what Harriet Beecher Stowe, author of "Uncle Tom's Cabin" and previous resident, called "a tropical paradise."

I would love to invite more people to enjoy the beautiful experiences I have had in a neighborhood of unique homes that were carefully crafted around mature oaks.

I virtually walked the Council down my street to see the houses under the grand tree canopy on 8/18/2020.

Sometimes I like to drive down dead end roads to admire the mid-century modern designs. So many of the new homes going in look like you could pick them up and be anywhere. How sad. "Mandarin is a very popular area right now. Mandarin is not available to many people because there aren't many available homes in our community."
When I look on Zillow or Realtor.com there are over a hundred homes nearby, and yet, people would really like to be in Mandarin.
Mandarin is not like "everywhere else."

I keep hearing that the proposed PUDs are consistent with land use "in the area."
I'm given numbers, ratios, percentages, and black and white lot maps as "evidence" of the consistency. I'm told that if I can't see a neighborhood from the main road, it doesn't matter what's back there. I wonder if they've ever sat on their back porch listening to baby turkeys.
My brow furrows as I ponder - do they not understand the spirit that moved City officials to codify Municipal Ordinances Article 25 or Subpart N?

Section 25.01. - Findings, intent and purpose.

The loss of mature and maturing tree species during the clearing of land for development has an adverse effect on the environment.... The presence of trees aids in energy conservation by cooling the atmosphere, reduces air pollution by removing particulates such as dust and pollen, increases oxygen production, slows surface water runoff, reduces soil erosion, provides food, nesting sites and protection for wildlife, enhances scenic beauty, and provides other environmental benefits.

SUBPART N. - MANDARIN OVERLAYS

Sec. 656.399.10. - Mandarin Road Overlay.

The Council finds that the properties within the Mandarin Road Overlay, as visually depicted in the Mandarin Road Overlay map following this section, are predominantly developed at a density of one unit per acre or larger. Therefore, the following additional criteria shall be considered... when evaluating any land use or zoning application within the Mandarin Road Overlay, to protect the character of the Overlay area and protect the health, safety, and welfare of the residents therein....

ORD 2020-0307 shows almost 2 lots for every one lot across the north border. I was told that PUD ORD 2020-0098 is very similar to my neighborhood - but without preserving the trees, and with houses twice as big, and much closer together, and costing nearly twice as much, as the one I live in.... How is that similar? A site plan is provided as "evidence," but it clearly shows lots smaller than any lot on the other side of the border, all the way around, with some big oddly shaped lots in the middle to bring up the average, so the numbers look good.

But I live on the *east* side of Oldfield Creek, which is the Julington Creek neighborhood - that's the smaller lots, running over to Saddle Ridge. But even those homes don't compare to the proposed PUDs because they were built around mature trees and are widely spaced.

The proposed PUD ORD 2020-0098 is going in off Aladdin, on the *west* side of the creek, a detached section of old Mandarin, where the last remnants of the Rural Residential houses are.

ORD 2020-0307, also westward, even contains a registered historic landmark.

Both proposed PUDs are in Rural Residential areas that are becoming increasingly fragmented as the City allows big houses on little lots to slowly chip away at the area.

Frighteningly I'm told that the PUDs that have encroached the area are justification for consistency to allow more PUDs. Seriously.

Attached is my map, with colors, that shows the Rural Residential areas that are currently endangered by accelerated growth, and for comparison, the area covered by the Mandarin Overlay (Subpart N).

Gosh, I wonder if that's similar to why Subpart N needed to be codified to protect the character of the old Mandarin coast.

ORD 2020-0098 and ORD 2020-0307 are in the last holdout for where we could invite people that want to live the Mandarin lifestyle of big oak tree filled lots with widely spaced homes.... or we could let cookie cutter houses go in until there's nothing left of what people want to come to Mandarin for. Nocatee at least has recreation facilities. If we allow what makes Mandarin unique succumb to a black and white numeric definition of consistency, what are we going to do when people don't want to come specifically here anymore, because it's just like everywhere else?

If you are thinking about voting yes to approve a PUD that has a minimum lot size of 80x120 and that plans on cutting the mature trees and replacing them with 2 to 4 inch baby trees, please come stop by my house first. Please visit the people that live off Aladdin directly. Please visit anyone currently living in the Rural Residential area off Aladdin shown on my attached map first.

If you are seriously considering voting yes to either ORD 2020-0098 or ORD 2020-0307 then you will DEPRIVE the people that want to come to Mandarin of the Mandarin they want to come to, and you're gonna give them "anywhere" instead, and then they won't want to stay once the houses get older, because there will be newer houses somewhere else.

If you preserve the Rural Residential zoning people selling their land will still make plenty of money, developers will still make money, you'll be inviting the people that have been searching for the unique woodland charm of Mandarin, and you'll be giving people homes they will want to live in even when the homes are older. Invite people that want to come to a home with a big yard and big trees, and they will stay because there won't be any where else like that to go to anymore anywhere pretty soon.

Please manage growth with sensitivity to why people want to come to Mandarin so that you can invite them to *Mandarin*, and not allow Mandarin to become somewhere like everywhere else.

Please deny rezoning for ORD 2020-98 and ORD 2020-307 and preserve the Rural Residential for development for the people that are right now desperately searching for a big lot with big trees in a city full of big houses on little lots with little trees.

Thank you,
Cassandra Goodwin
Shady Creek Dr 32223

<Mandarin - what is consistent.jpg>

--
Tanya Hughes

Clements, Jeff

From: Matthews, Jessica
Sent: Tuesday, September 01, 2020 10:26 AM
To: Valerie Britt; CCMEETING09082020
Cc: Boylan, Michael; Bowman, Aaron; White, Randy; Freeman, Terrance; Gaffney, Reginald; Diamond, Rory; Ferraro, Albert; Eller, Shannon
Subject: RE: 2020-342: FOR SEPT 1 LUZ HEARING ON ORD 2020-342 (CD1, George Ct)

Received And printed and file into the record,thankyou.

From: Valerie Britt [mailto:valeriebritt76@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 01, 2020 10:18 AM
To: CCMEETING09082020
Cc: Matthews, Jessica; Boylan, Michael; Bowman, Aaron; White, Randy; Freeman, Terrance; Gaffney, Reginald; Diamond, Rory; Ferraro, Albert; Valerie Britt; Eller, Shannon
Subject: 2020-342: FOR SEPT 1 LUZ HEARING ON ORD 2020-342 (CD1, George Ct)

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.

RE: Rezoning Ordinance 2020-342 for George Court (128192-0000)

LUZ COMMITTEE MEMBERS & JACKSONVILLE CITY COUNCIL:

Because of the conflicts created by the written description, I continue to recommend DENIAL of rezoning 2020-342. However, I re-submit my recommendations for revision of the written description for the PUD.

Regarding the Georgian Villas PUD, I agree with the Planning Commission recommendation that the Georgian Villas development in MDR FLUM shall be limited to a maximum of 48 dwelling units and that the limitation may only be changed through a rezoning. I respectfully request that limitation be adopted by LUZ as a recommendation for a condition of the Ordinance and by City Council enactment as a condition of the Council Ordinance.

Limiting the number of units by enforceable condition of Council is important because various other unit numbers have been given including allowing for 80 units by RMD-D and advertising that a site plan is available for 72 units.

Please refer to the June 4 Written Description —which is the same wording as the Feb description initially submitted with the application for Ord 2020-342. I recommend that provisions which are incompatible and inconsistent with that 48 unit limit and inconsistent with the site plan be removed from the written description. It is important that verification of substantial compliance of the PUD be required.

To improve the integrity of the Quad-Pods PUD at George Ct in Arlington in Council District 1, the disputed language listed here is recommended for removal from the Georgian PUD Written Description:

***Remove:** “Multifamily residential units: Up to 20 units per acre.”

***Remove:** “The Property may be developed in accordance with the RMD-D development standards, in which event the PUD Site Plan will not apply and no verification of substantial compliance will be required....”

***Remove:** “with either the RMD-D development standards, or”

* **Change Section K to read** “Amendment to this PUD district may be accomplished by a rezoning.” (i.e., Delete by administrative and minor modification)

* **Remove:** “this PUD allows for building permits for up to six (6) buildings to be obtained prior to plat approval,” and, concurrently, remove “building permits for the construction of six (6) buildings within the PUD may be obtained prior to the recordation of the plat(s), if any”

The applicant was made aware of those concerns early in the process.

Two story Quadplexes limited in unit number can be a better fit for the MDR site than a conventional apartment building because the property is next to one story single family homes. I am just asking consideration for revising the written description to match the condition of Council recommended by the Planning Commission.

As this matter is being heard after continuances, please also refer to my initial comments submitted by email and hard copy for noticed hearings. Those previous communications were timed for the original series of noticed hearings and some are included here by a combination of reference and attachments.

To reintroduce myself, I am a Duval County resident. My primary interest here is related to my service on the Steering Committee for the Old Arlington Neighborhood Action Plan (NAP), Council District 1, Planning District 2. In addition, I participated in citizen workshops & attended meetings during the proceedings that led to the Planning District 2 Vision Plan, as a property owner in Planning District 2. I have been a member of the American Planning Association for about 20 years; and, I hold memberships in the Virginia, North Carolina and Florida Chapters of APA.

Thank You,
Valerie Britt
PO Box 49209
Jacksonville Beach, FL 32240
valeriebritt76@yahoo.com

SEE ATTACHMENTS

Copy of communication with applicant:

From: Valerie Britt <valeriebritt76@yahoo.com>

Date: August 30, 2020 at 11:21:37 AM EDT

To: wduggan@rtlaw.com

Cc: JoyceMorgan@coj.net, CAikens@coj.net, Rosemary@coj.net, blewis@coj.net, LRansom@coj.net, Valerie Britt <valeriebritt76@yahoo.com>

Subject: 2020342.pdf (TO WYMAN DUGGAN, Agent 2020-342)

To Wyman Dugan, Agent Of Record, Georgian Villas PUD, Ord 2020-342

RE: Continued request for written description changes

Hello Wyman,

This is to followup my August 18 communication to you regarding Ord 2020-342.

1. **Condition:** First, I agree with the recommendation to limit the Georgian Villas PUD development to a maximum of 48 units with that limitation one that can only be changed by a rezoning. It is my understanding that was recommended by both staff and the Planning Commission, that you did not object to that recommendation, and that the unit limitation will be before LUZ and City Council to be adopted as a condition of Council, as a condition of the PUD ordinance. **That is not a condition that can just be incorporated into the written description; the number limitation needs to be a condition of the Ordinance.**

The site plan which shows 48 units is already consistent in numbers with that maximum unit limitation.

2. **Written Description:** While I approve of the unit limitation being a condition of the Ordinance itself, there still needs to be changes in the written description. Without a revised written description, there will remain inconsistencies among the parts of the PUD. (Please see my previous emails to you and the Public Comments made previously to Council which you received by copy. See attachment here)

Surely Mr. Blanchard as a Planning Commission Member himself would not want to leave Council District 1 in Arlington with unique confusion of enforcement for this relatively new type of product in Jacksonville? **If this is to be voted on as unique and as a PUD, the written description should not provide for it reverting to an apartment complex rezoning, building before platted, and not going through PUD compliance verification.**

I agree that a multi family PUD can be appropriate at George Rd because the subject site was confirmed by staff to already be MDR FLUM and RMD-C & RMD-D zoning districts and the site meets many of the locational requirements at a shopping center, transit, library, etc. to be so. Again, I am not opposing “multifamily” at the site. Instead, I am objecting to specific language in the written description.

The disputed language listed here is recommended for removal:

***Remove:** “Multifamily residential units: Up to 20 units per acre.”

***Remove:** “The Property may be developed in accordance with the RMD-D development standards, in which event the PUD Site Plan will not apply and no verification of substantial compliance will be required...”

***Remove:** “with either the RMD-D development standards, or”

* **Change Section K to read** “Amendment to this PUD district may be accomplished by a rezoning.” (i.e., Delete by administrative and minor modification)

* **Remove:** “this PUD allows for building permits for up to six (6) buildings to be obtained prior to plat approval,” and, concurrently, remove “building permits for the construction of six (6) buildings within the PUD may be obtained prior to the recordation of the plat(s), if any”

I was on the Old Arlington NAP Steering Committee and know Arlington homeowners have long had a multitude of issues with some of the many apartment complexes located in Arlington. Consideration needs to be given to the fact that the pretty, treed acreage on George Ct. was at one time planned to be just another single family court of single family homes in the single family neighborhood. The George Ct property borders existing one story single family homes. If this is indeed an honest effort for Mr.

Blanchard to offer a different multifamily product than an apartment complex as I presume it to be, your consideration of revising conflicting language will be appreciated.

In summary, for the PUD to have integrity, the written description must be clear that what is proposed is a quad pod project with a maximum of 48 units. I agree the 48 unit maximum should be a condition of the Ordinance; concurrently, the written description must be changed because it should ***not*** retain the back doors for “RMD-D” (where currently lower intensity RMD-C exists) or “20 units per acre” and it must eliminate the option by text that “no verification of substantial compliance will be required.”

Thank You,
Valerie Britt

Attachment: Resend of Previous Public Comment

cc CM Joyce Morgan, CD 1
cc PUD FILE 2020-342 via Bruce Lewis
cc CPAC via Rosemary, Neighborhood Services
cc Lisa Ransom, NAP

LUZ & CC FILEs 2020-342 Georgian Villas PUD

Clements, Jeff

From: Valerie Britt <valeriebritt76@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 01, 2020 10:18 AM
To: CCMEETING09082020
Cc: Matthews, Jessica; Boylan, Michael; Bowman, Aaron; White, Randy; Freeman, Terrance; Gaffney, Reginald; Diamond, Rory; Ferraro, Albert; Valerie Britt; Eller, Shannon
Subject: 2020-342: FOR SEPT 1 LUZ HEARING ON ORD 2020-342 (CD1, George Ct)
Attachments: 2020342.pdf; 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.

RE: Rezoning Ordinance 2020-342 for George Court (128192-0000)

LUZ COMMITTEE MEMBERS & JACKSONVILLE CITY COUNCIL:

Because of the conflicts created by the written description, I continue to recommend DENIAL of rezoning 2020-342. However, I re-submit my recommendations for revision of the written description for the PUD.

Regarding the Georgian Villas PUD, I agree with the Planning Commission recommendation that the Georgian Villas development in MDR FLUM shall be limited to a maximum of 48 dwelling units and that the limitation may only be changed through a rezoning. I respectfully request that limitation be adopted by LUZ as a recommendation for a condition of the Ordinance and by City Council enactment as a condition of the Council Ordinance.

Limiting the number of units by enforceable condition of Council is important because various other unit numbers have been given including allowing for 80 units by RMD-D and advertising that a site plan is available for 72 units.

Please refer to the June 4 Written Description —which is the same wording as the Feb description initially submitted with the application for Ord 2020-342. I recommend that provisions which are incompatible and inconsistent with that 48 unit limit and inconsistent with the site plan be removed from the written description. It is important that verification of substantial compliance of the PUD be required.

To improve the integrity of the Quad-Pods PUD at George Ct in Arlington in Council District 1, the disputed language listed here is recommended for removal from the Georgian PUD Written Description:

***Remove:** “Multifamily residential units: Up to 20 units per acre.”

***Remove:** “The Property may be developed in accordance with the RMD-D development standards, in which event the PUD Site Plan will not apply and no verification of substantial compliance will be required....”

***Remove:** “with either the RMD-D development standards, or”

* **Change Section K to read** “Amendment to this PUD district may be accomplished by a rezoning.” (i.e., Delete by administrative and minor modification)

* **Remove:** “this PUD allows for building permits for up to six (6) buildings to be obtained prior to plat approval,” and, concurrently, remove “building permits for the construction of six (6) buildings within the PUD may be obtained prior to the recordation of the plat(s), if any”

The applicant was made aware of those concerns early in the process.

Two story Quadplexes limited in unit number can be a better fit for the MDR site than a conventional apartment building because the property is next to one story single family homes. I am just asking consideration for revising the written description to match the condition of Council recommended by the Planning Commission.

As this matter is being heard after continuances, please also refer to my initial comments submitted by email and hard copy for noticed hearings. Those previous communications were timed for the original series of noticed hearings and some are included here by a combination of reference and attachments.

To reintroduce myself, I am a Duval County resident. My primary interest here is related to my service on the Steering Committee for the Old Arlington Neighborhood Action Plan (NAP), Council District 1, Planning District 2. In addition, I participated in citizen workshops & attended meetings during the proceedings that led to the Planning District 2 Vision Plan, as a property owner in Planning District 2. I have been a member of the American Planning Association for about 20 years; and, I hold memberships in the Virginia, North Carolina and Florida Chapters of APA.

Thank You,
Valerie Britt
PO Box 49209
Jacksonville Beach, FL 32240
valeriebritt76@yahoo.com

SEE ATTACHMENTS

Copy of communication with applicant:

From: Valerie Britt <valeriebritt76@yahoo.com>
Date: August 30, 2020 at 11:21:37 AM EDT
To: wduggan@rtlaw.com
Cc: JoyceMorgan@coj.net, CAikens@coj.net, Rosemary@coj.net, blewis@coj.net, LRansom@coj.net, Valerie Britt <valeriebritt76@yahoo.com>
Subject: 2020342.pdf (TO WYMAN DUGGAN, Agent 2020-342)
To Wyman Dugan, Agent Of Record, Georgian Villas PUD, Ord 2020-342
RE: Continued request for written description changes

Hello Wyman,

This is to followup my August 18 communication to you regarding Ord 2020-342.

1. **Condition:** First, I agree with the recommendation to limit the Georgian Villas PUD development to a maximum of 48 units with that limitation one that can only be changed by a rezoning. It is my understanding that was recommended by both staff and the Planning Commission, that you did not object to that recommendation, and that the unit limitation will be before LUZ and City Council to be adopted as a condition of Council, as a condition of the PUD ordinance. **That is not a condition that can just be incorporated into the written description; the number limitation needs to be a condition of the Ordinance.**

The site plan which shows 48 units is already consistent in numbers with that maximum unit limitation.

2. **Written Description:** While I approve of the unit limitation being a condition of the Ordinance itself, there still needs to be changes in the written description. Without a revised written description, there will remain inconsistencies among the parts of the PUD. (Please see my previous emails to you and the Public Comments made previously to Council which you received by copy. See attachment here)

Surely Mr. Blanchard as a Planning Commission Member himself would not want to leave Council District 1 in Arlington with unique confusion of enforcement for this relatively new type of product in Jacksonville? **If this is to be voted on as unique and as a PUD, the written description should not provide for it reverting to an apartment complex rezoning, building before platted, and not going through PUD compliance verification.**

I agree that a multi family PUD can be appropriate at George Rd because the subject site was confirmed by staff to already be MDR FLUM and RMD-C & RMD-D zoning districts and the site meets many of the locational requirements at a shopping center, transit, library, etc. to be so. Again, I am not opposing “multifamily” at the site. Instead, I am objecting to specific language in the written description.

The disputed language listed here is recommended for removal:

***Remove:** “Multifamily residential units: Up to 20 units per acre.”

***Remove:** “The Property may be developed in accordance with the RMD-D development standards, in which event the PUD Site Plan will not apply and no verification of substantial compliance will be required...”

***Remove:** “with either the RMD-D development standards, or”

* **Change Section K to read** “Amendment to this PUD district may be accomplished by a rezoning.” (i.e., Delete by administrative and minor modification)

* **Remove:** “this PUD allows for building permits for up to six (6) buildings to be obtained prior to plat approval,” and, concurrently, remove “building permits for the construction of six (6) buildings within the PUD may be obtained prior to the recordation of the plat(s), if any”

I was on the Old Arlington NAP Steering Committee and know Arlington homeowners have long had a multitude of issues with some of the many apartment complexes located in Arlington. Consideration needs to be given to the fact that the pretty, treed acreage on George Ct. was at one time planned to be just another single family court of single family homes in the single family neighborhood. The George Ct property borders existing one story single family homes. If this is indeed an honest effort for Mr. Blanchard to offer a different multifamily product than an apartment complex as I presume it to be, your consideration of revising conflicting language will be appreciated.

In summary, for the PUD to have integrity, the written description must be clear that what is proposed is a quad pod project with a maximum of 48 units. I agree the 48 unit maximum should be a condition of the Ordinance; concurrently, the written description must be changed because it should ***not*** retain the back doors for “RMD-D” (where currently lower intensity RMD-C exists) or “20 units per acre” and it must eliminate the option by text that “no verification of substantial compliance will be required.”

Thank You,
Valerie Britt

Attachment: Resend of Previous Public Comment

cc CM Joyce Morgan, CD 1
cc PUD FILE 2020-342 via Bruce Lewis
cc CPAC via Rosemary, Neighborhood Services
cc Lisa Ransom, NAP

LUZ & CC FILEs 2020-342 Georgian Villas PUD

Clements, Jeff

From: Matthews, Jessica
Sent: Tuesday, September 01, 2020 10:13 AM
To: Valerie Britt; CCMEETING09082020
Cc: Eller, Shannon; Huxford, Folks; Ferraro, Albert
Subject: RE: Ord 2020-0027: FOR SEPT 1 LUZ HEARING & CC 9/8 (Land Dev Reg)

Received and printed for file thankyou.

From: Valerie Britt [mailto:valeriebritt76@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 01, 2020 10:00 AM
To: CCMEETING09082020
Cc: Valerie Britt; Eller, Shannon; Huxford, Folks; Ferraro, Albert; Matthews, Jessica
Subject: Ord 2020-0027: FOR SEPT 1 LUZ HEARING & CC 9/8 (Land Dev Reg)

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.

LUZ COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL AND JACKSONVILLE CITY COUNCIL:

Ordinance 2020-27 would change the City's residential zoning code with risk that the expansion of rights may inadvertently come with unintended consequences.

The preliminary marked agenda stated the amendment "**Permits fences up to six feet in height in a required front yard on single family lots in RR-Acre when there is a residential subdivision on the adjacent property with a fence at least six feet in height along a collector road or higher.**"

The staff's comment was "My intention was for this to apply to property with frontage along roadways classified as collector or higher based on Section [656.1222\(c\)](#). That language needs to be added for clarity, and doing so should greatly reduce the number of properties impacted by this bill."

The notation of the revised agenda adds the word "functional" and I have questioned the purpose & meaning.

This expansion could allow out-of-subdivision rural lots to piggyback on a subdivision's approved perimeter or buffer fence plans, yet the subdivision's HOA would have no control over the unplanned fence of the neighboring rural residential property.

In this supplemental code that is in addition to un-cited & un-referenced sections and already filled with notwithstanding, ifs, except, and furthers, **the specific location** of any amended language to be inserted in the otherwise unchanged existing code impacts interpretation. Therefore, the proposed code as it will read with the **underlined text addition** needs to be disclosed before a vote.

For over 30 years, I have owned single family residential property that is subject to the land development regulations of Jacksonville's CH 656. I own land in a subdivision that borders RR-Acre which borders a gated community. Also related to my interests here, I have previously lived on fenced-in, multi-acre rural properties in rural areas. I have

farmed vegetables & various crops, livestock, Christmas trees, and pine trees for pulpwood. Although opposed to this legislation, I am very supportive of protecting existing rural residential rights.

Truly rural areas in the County that have long had rural fences & rural buildings that were *legal when built* and rural activities *lawful when begun* have come under siege as suburban uniformity standards are newly applied. Using “lining up” aesthetics as justification here to change local law is suburbanite rationale—not change effectively driven by rural needs. No uniform alignment goal is achieved, mooted rationale given.

I don’t believe there has been adequate public disclosure or that a need for the code change has been adequately identified. Language has not been sufficiently vetted in context of the land development regulations or the Comprehensive Plan nor carefully reviewed as to intended and unintended consequences.

Therefore, for lack of appropriate study and some of the violations it may inappropriately cover, I can not support this change in the land development regulations.

I am a +/- 20 year member of the American Planning Association and hold memberships in the Virginia, North Carolina & Florida Chapters of APA.

Thank You,

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

cc FILES 2020-0027

Existing Local Code:

- **PART 4. - SUPPLEMENTARY REGULATIONS**

SHARE LINK TO SECTIONPRINT SECTIONDOWNLOAD (DOCX) OF SECTIONSEMAIL SECTION

- **SUBPART A. - PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA**

- **Sec. 656.401. - Performance standards and development criteria.....**

Sec. 656.402. - Residential districts.

SHARE LINK TO SECTIONPRINT SECTIONDOWNLOAD (DOCX) OF SECTIONSEMAIL SECTION

In addition to other provisions of the Zoning Code, the following supplementary regulations shall apply to all residential districts:

.....

“(b) Notwithstanding other provisions of the Zoning Code, fences, walls and hedges may be permitted in a required yard; provided, however, that no fence or wall in excess of eight feet in height shall be permitted in a residential district; and provided further, that no fence in excess of four feet in height shall be permitted in a required front yard in a residential district except that a fence up to eight feet in height may be allowed in one required front yard of a lot with more than one front yard if such fence is approved as part of the site plan or sketch plan approval pursuant to [Section 656.404](#) or [Chapter 654](#)(Subdivision Regulations). Notwithstanding, a fence up to six feet in height shall be allowed in one required front yard of a corner lot if such fence is along a street, road or roadway classified as a collector or higher, and provided that the principal structure is facing a street, road or roadway that is not classified as a collector or higher. Such fence shall not be located forward of the front plane of the principal structure as further illustrated below in Figure A. This provision shall not be construed to supersede the requirements of [Chapter 804](#) and, in the case of conflict, the more restrictive requirement shall apply. The height of a fence shall be measured from the existing grade to the top of the fence, excluding pilasters or other architectural features, on the property owner's side of the fence.”

Clements, Jeff

From: Valerie Britt <valeriebritt76@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 01, 2020 10:00 AM
To: CCMEETING09082020
Cc: Valerie Britt; Eller, Shannon; Huxford, Folks; Ferraro, Albert; Matthews, Jessica
Subject: Ord 2020-0027: FOR SEPT 1 LUZ HEARING & CC 9/8 (Land Dev Reg)

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.

LUZ COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL AND JACKSONVILLE CITY COUNCIL:

Ordinance 2020-27 would change the City's residential zoning code with risk that the expansion of rights may inadvertently come with unintended consequences.

The preliminary marked agenda stated the amendment **“Permits fences up to six feet in height in a required front yard on single family lots in RR-Acre when there is a residential subdivision on the adjacent property with a fence at least six feet in height along a collector road or higher.”**

The staff's comment was “My intention was for this to apply to property with frontage along roadways classified as collector or higher based on Section [656.1222\(c\)](#). That language needs to be added for clarity, and doing so should greatly reduce the number of properties impacted by this bill.”

The notation of the revised agenda adds the word “functional” and I have questioned the purpose & meaning.

This expansion could allow out-of-subdivision rural lots to piggyback on a subdivision's approved perimeter or buffer fence plans, yet the subdivision's HOA would have no control over the unplanned fence of the neighboring rural residential property.

In this supplemental code that is in addition to un-cited & un-referenced sections and already filled with notwithstanding, ifs, except, and furthers, **the specific location** of any amended language to be inserted in the otherwise unchanged existing code impacts interpretation. Therefore, the proposed code as it will read with the **underlined text addition** needs to be disclosed before a vote.

For over 30 years, I have owned single family residential property that is subject to the land development regulations of Jacksonville's CH 656. I own land in a subdivision that borders RR-Acre which borders a gated community. Also related to my interests here, I have previously lived on fenced-in, multi-acre rural properties in rural areas. I have farmed vegetables & various crops, livestock, Christmas trees, and pine trees for pulpwood. Although opposed to this legislation, I am very supportive of protecting existing rural residential rights.

Truly rural areas in the County that have long had rural fences & rural buildings that were ***legal when built*** and rural activities ***lawful when begun*** have come under siege as suburban uniformity standards are newly applied. Using “lining up” aesthetics as justification here to change local law is suburbanite rationale—not change effectively driven by rural needs. No uniform alignment goal is achieved, mooted rationale given.

I don't believe there has been adequate public disclosure or that a need for the code change has been adequately identified. Language has not been sufficiently vetted in context of the land development regulations or the Comprehensive Plan nor carefully reviewed as to intended and unintended consequences.

Therefore, for lack of appropriate study and some of the violations it may inappropriately cover, I can not support this change in the land development regulations.

I am a +/- 20 year member of the American Planning Association and hold memberships in the Virginia, North Carolina & Florida Chapters of APA.

Thank You,

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

cc FILES 2020-0027

Existing Local Code:

- **PART 4. - SUPPLEMENTARY REGULATIONS**

SHARE LINK TO SECTIONPRINT SECTIONDOWNLOAD (DOCX) OF SECTIONSEMAIL SECTION

- **SUBPART A. - PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA**

- **Sec. 656.401. - Performance standards and development criteria.....**

Sec. 656.402. - Residential districts.

SHARE LINK TO SECTIONPRINT SECTIONDOWNLOAD (DOCX) OF SECTIONSEMAIL SECTION

In addition to other provisions of the Zoning Code, the following supplementary regulations shall apply to all residential districts:

.....

“(b) Notwithstanding other provisions of the Zoning Code, fences, walls and hedges may be permitted in a required yard; provided, however, that no fence or wall in excess of eight feet in height shall be permitted

in a residential district; and provided further, that no fence in excess of four feet in height shall be permitted in a required front yard in a residential district except that a fence up to eight feet in height may be allowed in one required front yard of a lot with more than one front yard if such fence is approved as part of the site plan or sketch plan approval pursuant to [Section 656.404](#) or [Chapter 654](#)(Subdivision Regulations). Notwithstanding, a fence up to six feet in height shall be allowed in one required front yard of a corner lot if such fence is along a street, road or roadway classified as a collector or higher, and provided that the principal structure is facing a street, road or roadway that is not classified as a collector or higher. Such fence shall not be located forward of the front plane of the principal structure as further illustrated below in Figure A. This provision shall not be construed to supersede the requirements of [Chapter 804](#) and, in the case of conflict, the more restrictive requirement shall apply. The height of a fence shall be measured from the existing grade to the top of the fence, excluding pilasters or other architectural features, on the property owner's side of the fence.”

Clements, Jeff

From: Eden Reynolds <edensutter.reynolds@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 01, 2020 9:23 AM
To: cassandra@thecomputer.com
Cc: Boylan, Michael; CCMEETING09082020; Gaffney, Reginald; Freeman, Terrance; Bowman, Aaron; Diamond, Rory; Ferraro, Albert; White, Randy; Lewis, Bruce; willherron@att.net; caroladonofrio@gmail.com; Wesolowski, Rosemary; christinebenhamrealestate@gmail.com; anabelacu@gmail.com; langleyb301@comcast.net; leighannmluttrell@gmail.com; jomansell@comcast.net; Hubbs_seaward@yahoo.com; ranaysemail@gmail.com; gka2000@hotmail.com; Les@parkerandcompany.net; d.b.gager@gmail.com; egmorgan@earthlink.net; Alcoff1984@yahoo.com; mherzberg@sleiman.com; rheintze@linux.com; hughestanya69@gmail.com; greg_mansell@comcast.net; gatorwebbs@bellsouth.net; koala7@comcast.net; racefan1@gmail.com; tscott0625@gmail.com; teresaakel@gmail.com; akintoker@aol.com; floridamargo@aol.com; kigelsrud@aol.com; mswrigley@hotmail.com; george_lytle@hotmail.com; lizwilde3@gmail.com; carynherzberg@yahoo.com; myrick308@att.net; timsoles@bellsouth.net; flyerbill@yahoo.com
Subject: Re: ORD 2020-0098 and ORD 2020-0307 for LUZ meeting 9/1/2020

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 Honorable Council Members and fellow neighbors,

My family has lived in our Julington Landing home for 22 years this November. As young twenty somethings from Pennsylvania, my husband and I fell in love with the neighborhood and our home immediately, and we weren't even house hunting. Within a month we moved in and we have been in love with our surroundings since that time.

Our home backs up to the creek where it is navigable. We canoe this creek, maintain it when trees come down, and we enjoy the peace and abundant wildlife that live on the creek. I can provide you with photos of barred owls, turkeys, river otters, kingfishers, blue herons, deer, and much more - my hobby is photographing the nature we are so lucky to have close by. We feel fortunate to have this piece of heaven in our backyard.

As for the proposed zoning change, I do have major concerns about increased creek flow, negative impacts to wildlife, and the preservation of Mandarin as a place that is unique. The zoning does not fit with the current home culture of our Mandarin area.

Please consider the people who live here and love this area. Consider the land. Consider the wildlife. And please, consider the future of Mandarin. We cannot go back once the negative impact has occurred. Lessen that impact and vote no on rezoning to PUD. I applaud the rezoning to CC for the 16 acres, but please maintain the RR zoning for the other land.

Thank you.

Eden Reynolds
4049 Shady Creek Lane
Mandarin, FL 32223

On Sep 1, 2020, at 1:00 AM, cassandra@thecomputer.com wrote:

Honorable Council Members,

Something CM Boylan said at the meeting on 8/18/2020 summarized my thoughts on the matter of ORD 2020-0098 and ORD 2020-0307 pretty well.

It went something like this:

I promised my constituents to manage growth. Growth in our community is inevitable. We have to understand and appreciate that this is a growing community.

Mandarin is a very popular area right now. Mandarin is not available to many people because there aren't many available homes in our community.

There is an interest not only in this development [ORD 2020-0098] but also for three of four others in this area [including ORD 2020-0307].

I am sensitive to invite more people to live in the Mandarin area.

Yes, I agree, because I love it here.

I am sensitive to manage growth that preserves Mandarin for what it is, and not let it become just like "anywhere and everywhere."

Growth can be achieved while preserving character - as it was done for the neighborhood I currently live in - Julington Landing.

I chose to move to the Mandarin Julington Creek area a year and a half ago.

When the real estate person suggested Mandarin, I said, no it's either too congested or too expensive, because all I'd seen was San Jose and Mandarin Rd and houses worth half a million and up, which I and most people I know, can't afford.

She told me she knew of an affordable home with majestic oaks draped with spanish moss.

We headed down Loretto to Aladdin to Julington Creek to Shady Creek to a tabby coated mid-century modern house on over half an acre, that I live in today.

Some people told me I really needed to check out Nocatee because new houses are better, and the lifestyle there was fantastic. I took a drive and saw the sun baked cookie cutter houses with bland grass lawns. The houses were so close together, walking around the side you could see clearly into the next house. That is certainly some people cup of tea, but I very quickly left.

Every night at home now, I hear owls.

This past weekend, a pileated woodpecker was swaying back and forth while opening and closing its wings, apparently to distract a hawk sitting nearby.

A great heron landed in a tree and walked across a thick branch.

This past spring turkeys clomped across my roof before launching into the wetland in the back yard.... A few weeks later I heard their chicks growing up.

I am sensitive to invite more people to live in what Harriet Beecher Stowe, author of "Uncle Tom's Cabin" and previous resident, called "a tropical paradise."

I would love to invite more people to enjoy the beautiful experiences I have had in a neighborhood of unique homes that were carefully crafted around mature oaks.

I virtually walked the Council down my street to see the houses under the grand tree canopy on 8/18/2020.

Sometimes I like to drive down dead end roads to admire the mid-century modern designs.

So many of the new homes going in look like you could pick them up and be anywhere. How sad.

"Mandarin is a very popular area right now. Mandarin is not available to many people because there aren't many available homes in our community."

When I look on Zillow or Realtor.com there are over a hundred homes nearby, and yet, people would really like to be in Mandarin.

Mandarin is not like "everywhere else."

I keep hearing that the proposed PUDs are consistent with land use "in the area."
I'm given numbers, ratios, percentages, and black and white lot maps as "evidence" of the consistency.
I'm told that if I can't see a neighborhood from the main road, it doesn't matter what's back there.
I wonder if they've ever sat on their back porch listening to baby turkeys.
My brow furrows as I ponder - do they not understand the spirit that moved City officials to codify
Municipal Ordinances Article 25 or Subpart N?

Section 25.01. - Findings, intent and purpose.

The loss of mature and maturing tree species during the clearing of land for development has an adverse effect on the environment.... The presence of trees aids in energy conservation by cooling the atmosphere, reduces air pollution by removing particulates such as dust and pollen, increases oxygen production, slows surface water runoff, reduces soil erosion, provides food, nesting sites and protection for wildlife, enhances scenic beauty, and provides other environmental benefits.

SUBPART N. - MANDARIN OVERLAYS

Sec. 656.399.10. - Mandarin Road Overlay.

The Council finds that the properties within the Mandarin Road Overlay, as visually depicted in the Mandarin Road Overlay map following this section, are predominantly developed at a density of one unit per acre or larger. Therefore, the following additional criteria shall be considered... when evaluating any land use or zoning application within the Mandarin Road Overlay, to protect the character of the Overlay area and protect the health, safety, and welfare of the residents therein....

ORD 2020-0307 shows almost 2 lots for every one lot across the north border. I was told that PUD ORD 2020-0098 is very similar to my neighborhood - but without preserving the trees, and with houses twice as big, and much closer together, and costing nearly twice as much, as the one I live in.... How is that similar? A site plan is provided as "evidence," but it clearly shows lots smaller than any lot on the other side of the border, all the way around, with some big oddly shaped lots in the middle to bring up the average, so the numbers look good.

But I live on the *east* side of Oldfield Creek, which is the Julington Creek neighborhood - that's the smaller lots, running over to Saddle Ridge. But even those homes don't compare to the proposed PUDs because they were built around mature trees and are widely spaced.

The proposed PUD ORD 2020-0098 is going in off Aladdin, on the *west* side of the creek, a detached section of old Mandarin, where the last remnants of the Rural Residential houses are.

ORD 2020-0307, also westward, even contains a registered historic landmark.

Both proposed PUDs are in Rural Residential areas that are becoming increasingly fragmented as the City allows big houses on little lots to slowly chip away at the area.

Frighteningly I'm told that the PUDs that have encroached the area are justification for consistency to allow more PUDs. Seriously.

Attached is my map, with colors, that shows the Rural Residential areas that are currently endangered by accelerated growth, and for comparison, the area covered by the Mandarin Overlay (Subpart N).

Gosh, I wonder if that's similar to why Subpart N needed to be codified to protect the character of the old Mandarin coast.

ORD 2020-0098 and ORD 2020-0307 are in the last holdout for where we could invite people that want to live the Mandarin lifestyle of big oak tree filled lots with widely spaced homes.... or we could let cookie cutter houses go in until there's nothing left of what people want to come to Mandarin for. Nocatee at least has recreation facilities. If we allow what makes Mandarin unique succumb to a black and white numeric definition of consistency, what are we going to do when people don't want to come specifically here anymore, because it's just like everywhere else?

If you are thinking about voting yes to approve a PUD that has a minimum lot size of 80x120 and that plans on cutting the mature trees and replacing them with 2 to 4 inch baby trees, please come stop by my house first. Please visit the people that live off Aladdin directly. Please visit anyone currently living in

the Rural Residential area off Aladdin shown on my attached map first.

If you are seriously considering voting yes to either ORD 2020-0098 or ORD 2020-0307 then you will DEPRIVE the people that want to come to Mandarin of the Mandarin they want to come to, and you're gonna give them "anywhere" instead, and then they won't want to stay once the houses get older, because there will be newer houses somewhere else.

If you preserve the Rural Residential zoning people selling their land will still make plenty of money, developers will still make money, you'll be inviting the people that have been searching for the unique woodland charm of Mandarin, and you'll be giving people homes they will want to live in even when the homes are older. Invite people that want to come to a home with a big yard and big trees, and they will stay because there won't be any where else like that to go to anymore anywhere pretty soon.

Please manage growth with sensitivity to why people want to come to Mandarin so that you can invite them to *Mandarin*, and not allow Mandarin to become somewhere like everywhere else.

Please deny rezoning for ORD 2020-98 and ORD 2020-307 and preserve the Rural Residential for development for the people that are right now desperately searching for a big lot with big trees in a city full of big houses on little lots with little trees.

Thank you,
Cassandra Goodwin
Shady Creek Dr 32223

<Mandarin - what is consistent.jpg>

Clements, Jeff

From: Ron Burke <ronburke76@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 01, 2020 9:18 AM
To: CCMEETING09082020
Subject: ORD#2020-002

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.

LUZ & All Council Member's

We are Ron and Marion Burke 4704 Cedar Point road.

WE are in opposition of this request to change land use from AGR to RR.

The RE# 159855-0500 known as ORD#2020-002 Contains HSW/SWAMP - PRODUCTIVE as does some of the adjacent land parcels. (RE#159742-0010, RE#159875-0006 & RE#159869-0000 .) Total would come close to 160 acres. One could follow the other (president.)

STJRWM surrounds them with 1,847.26 acres & additional 16 acres across Cedar pt . Representative for this Ord. has clearly stated that they have no intention in development On RR , they intend to follow with a companion PUD.

A profitable PUD will not include 90' lots or larger. Tide Water has 90' lots only in phase two.

Any future development must be consistent with the area & offer harmony for the COJ 7 CREEKS 7 TRAILS NOT TO MENTION BOGGY CREEK AND PRESERVATION.

The foreseeable impact of this type of change & or PUD STANDS TO UNDERMINE THE GOAL, TIME AND INVESTMENT OF COJ , NUMEROUS DEPARTMENTS AND THE LAND OWNERS .

WE respectfully request for you to stand in opposition of ORD#2020-002.

THANK YOU,
RONALD & MARION BURKE

Clements, Jeff

From: greg_mansell@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, September 01, 2020 8:05 AM
To: cassandra@thecomputer.com; Boylan, Michael; CCMEETING09082020; Gaffney, Reginald; Freeman, Terrance; Bowman, Aaron; Diamond, Rory; Ferraro, Albert; White, Randy; Lewis, Bruce
Cc: willherron@att.net; caroladonofrio@gmail.com; Wesolowski, Rosemary; christinebenhamrealestate@gmail.com; anabelacu@gmail.com; langleyb301@comcast.net; leighannmluttrell@gmail.com; jomansell@comcast.net; edensutter.reynolds@gmail.com; hubbs_seaward@yahoo.com; ranaysemail@gmail.com; gka2000@hotmail.com; les@parkerandcompany.net; d.b.gager@gmail.com; egmorgan@earthlink.net; alcoff1984@yahoo.com; mherzberg@sleiman.com; rheintze@linux.com; hughestanya69@gmail.com; gatorwebbs@bellsouth.net; koala7@comcast.net; racefan1@gmail.com; tscott0625@gmail.com; teresaakel@gmail.com; akintoker@aol.com; floridamargo@aol.com; kigelsrud@aol.com; mswrigley@hotmail.com; george_lytle@hotmail.com; lizwilde3@gmail.com; carynherzberg@yahoo.com; myrick308@att.net; timsoles@bellsouth.net; flyerbill@yahoo.com
Subject: RE: ORD 2020-0098 and ORD 2020-0307 for LUZ meeting 9/1/2020

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 all,

It is certainly significant and important that Cassandra has referenced the following:

"do they not understand the spirit that moved City officials to codify Municipal Ordinances Article 25 or Subpart N?"

These municipal codes are on the books for very good reason. They are for Jacksonville's LUZ council members to honor and abide by with regard to our city's land use and zoning.

Thank you once again Cassandra for notifying the council about the many important factors that must be considered in declining a rezoning from existing RR to PUD.

Greg Mansell

Shady Creek Drive, 32223
15-year Mandarin Resident

Sent from my T-Mobile 4G LTE device

Clements, Jeff

From: cassandra@thecomputer.com
Sent: Tuesday, September 01, 2020 1:00 AM
To: Boylan, Michael; CCMEETING09082020; Gaffney, Reginald; Freeman, Terrance; Bowman, Aaron; Diamond, Rory; Ferraro, Albert; White, Randy; Lewis, Bruce
Cc: willherron@att.net; caroladonofrio@gmail.com; Wesolowski, Rosemary; christinebenhamrealestate@gmail.com; anabelacu@gmail.com; langleyb301@comcast.net; leighannmluttrell@gmail.com; jomansell@comcast.net; edensutter.reynolds@gmail.com; hubbs_seaward@yahoo.com; ranaysemail@gmail.com; gka2000@hotmail.com; les@parkerandcompany.net; d.b.gager@gmail.com; egmorgan@earthlink.net; alcoff1984@yahoo.com; mherzberg@sleiman.com; rheintze@linux.com; hughestanya69@gmail.com; greg_mansell@comcast.net; gatorwebbs@bellsouth.net; koala7@comcast.net; racefan1@gmail.com; tscott0625@gmail.com; teresaakel@gmail.com; akintoker@aol.com; floridamargo@aol.com; kigelsrud@aol.com; mswrigley@hotmail.com; george_lytle@hotmail.com; lizwilde3@gmail.com; carynherzberg@yahoo.com; myrick308@att.net; timssoles@bellsouth.net; flyerbill@yahoo.com
Subject: ORD 2020-0098 and ORD 2020-0307 for LUZ meeting 9/1/2020
Attachments: Mandarin - what is consistent.jpg

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.

Honorable Council Members,

Something CM Boylan said at the meeting on 8/18/2020 summarized my thoughts on the matter of ORD 2020-0098 and ORD 2020-0307 pretty well.

It went something like this:

I promised my constituents to manage growth. Growth in our community is inevitable. We have to understand and appreciate that this is a growing community.

Mandarin is a very popular area right now. Mandarin is not available to many people because there aren't many available homes in our community.

There is an interest not only in this development [ORD 2020-0098] but also for three of four others in this area [including ORD 2020-0307].

I am sensitive to invite more people to live in the Mandarin area.

Yes, I agree, because I love it here.

I am sensitive to manage growth that preserves Mandarin for what it is, and not let it become just like "anywhere and everywhere."

Growth can be achieved while preserving character - as it was done for the neighborhood I currently live in - Julington Landing.

I chose to move to the Mandarin Julington Creek area a year and a half ago.

When the real estate person suggested Mandarin, I said, no it's either too congested or too expensive, because all I'd seen was San Jose and Mandarin Rd and houses worth half a million and up, which I and most people I know, can't afford.

She told me she knew of an affordable home with majestic oaks draped with spanish moss.

We headed down Loretto to Aladdin to Julington Creek to Shady Creek to a tabby coated mid-century modern house on over half an acre, that I live in today.

Some people told me I really needed to check out Nocatee because new houses are better, and the lifestyle there was fantastic. I took a drive and saw the sun baked cookie cutter houses with bland grass lawns. The houses were so close together, walking around the side you could see clearly into the next house. That is certainly some people cup of tea, but I very quickly left.

Every night at home now, I hear owls.

This past weekend, a pileated woodpecker was swaying back and forth while opening and closing its wings,

apparently to distract a hawk sitting nearby.
A great heron landed in a tree and walked across a thick branch.
This past spring turkeys clomped across my roof before launching into the wetland in the back yard.... A few weeks later I heard their chicks growing up.

I am sensitive to invite more people to live in what Harriet Beecher Stowe, author of "Uncle Tom's Cabin" and previous resident, called "a tropical paradise."
I would love to invite more people to enjoy the beautiful experiences I have had in a neighborhood of unique homes that were carefully crafted around mature oaks.
I virtually walked the Council down my street to see the houses under the grand tree canopy on 8/18/2020.

Sometimes I like to drive down dead end roads to admire the mid-century modern designs.
So many of the new homes going in look like you could pick them up and be anywhere. How sad.
"Mandarin is a very popular area right now. Mandarin is not available to many people because there aren't many available homes in our community."
When I look on Zillow or Realtor.com there are over a hundred homes nearby, and yet, people would really like to be in Mandarin.
Mandarin is not like "everywhere else."

I keep hearing that the proposed PUDs are consistent with land use "in the area."
I'm given numbers, ratios, percentages, and black and white lot maps as "evidence" of the consistency.
I'm told that if I can't see a neighborhood from the main road, it doesn't matter what's back there.
I wonder if they've ever sat on their back porch listening to baby turkeys.
My brow furrows as I ponder - do they not understand the spirit that moved City officials to codify Municipal Ordinances Article 25 or Subpart N?

Section 25.01. - Findings, intent and purpose.
The loss of mature and maturing tree species during the clearing of land for development has an adverse effect on the environment.... The presence of trees aids in energy conservation by cooling the atmosphere, reduces air pollution by removing particulates such as dust and pollen, increases oxygen production, slows surface water runoff, reduces soil erosion, provides food, nesting sites and protection for wildlife, enhances scenic beauty, and provides other environmental benefits.

SUBPART N. - MANDARIN OVERLAYS

Sec. 656.399.10. - Mandarin Road Overlay.

The Council finds that the properties within the Mandarin Road Overlay, as visually depicted in the Mandarin Road Overlay map following this section, are predominantly developed at a density of one unit per acre or larger. Therefore, the following additional criteria shall be considered... when evaluating any land use or zoning application within the Mandarin Road Overlay, to protect the character of the Overlay area and protect the health, safety, and welfare of the residents therein....

ORD 2020-0307 shows almost 2 lots for every one lot across the north border. I was told that PUD ORD 2020-0098 is very similar to my neighborhood - but without preserving the trees, and with houses twice as big, and much closer together, and costing nearly twice as much, as the one I live in.... How is that similar? A site plan is provided as "evidence," but it clearly shows lots smaller than any lot on the other side of the border, all the way around, with some big oddly shaped lots in the middle to bring up the average, so the numbers look good.

But I live on the *east* side of Oldfield Creek, which is the Julington Creek neighborhood - that's the smaller lots, running over to Saddle Ridge. But even those homes don't compare to the proposed PUDs because they were built around mature trees and are widely spaced.

The proposed PUD ORD 2020-0098 is going in off Aladdin, on the *west* side of the creek, a detached section of old Mandarin, where the last remnants of the Rural Residential houses are.
ORD 2020-0307, also westward, even contains a registered historic landmark.
Both proposed PUDs are in Rural Residential areas that are becoming increasingly fragmented as the City allows big houses on little lots to slowly chip away at the area.
Frighteningly I'm told that the PUDs that have encroached the area are justification for consistency to allow more PUDs. Seriously.
Attached is my map, with colors, that shows the Rural Residential areas that are currently endangered by accelerated growth, and for comparison, the area covered by the Mandarin Overlay (Subpart N).

Gosh, I wonder if that's similar to why Subpart N needed to be codified to protect the character of the old Mandarin coast.

ORD 2020-0098 and ORD 2020-0307 are in the last holdout for where we could invite people that want to live the Mandarin lifestyle of big oak tree filled lots with widely spaced homes... or we could let cookie cutter houses go in until there's nothing left of what people want to come to Mandarin for. Nocatee at least has recreation facilities. If we allow what makes Mandarin unique succumb to a black and white numeric definition of consistency, what are we going to do when people don't want to come specifically here anymore, because it's just like everywhere else?

If you are thinking about voting yes to approve a PUD that has a minimum lot size of 80x120 and that plans on cutting the mature trees and replacing them with 2 to 4 inch baby trees, please come stop by my house first. Please visit the people that live off Aladdin directly. Please visit anyone currently living in the Rural Residential area off Aladdin shown on my attached map first.

If you are seriously considering voting yes to either ORD 2020-0098 or ORD 2020-0307 then you will DEPRIVE the people that want to come to Mandarin of the Mandarin they want to come to, and you're gonna give them "anywhere" instead, and then they won't want to stay once the houses get older, because there will be newer houses somewhere else.

If you preserve the Rural Residential zoning people selling their land will still make plenty of money, developers will still make money, you'll be inviting the people that have been searching for the unique woodland charm of Mandarin, and you'll be giving people homes they will want to live in even when the homes are older. Invite people that want to come to a home with a big yard and big trees, and they will stay because there won't be anywhere else like that to go to anymore anywhere pretty soon.

Please manage growth with sensitivity to why people want to come to Mandarin so that you can invite them to *Mandarin*, and not allow Mandarin to become somewhere like everywhere else.

Please deny rezoning for ORD 2020-98 and ORD 2020-307 and preserve the Rural Residential for development for the people that are right now desperately searching for a big lot with big trees in a city full of big houses on little lots with little trees.

Thank you,
Cassandra Goodwin
Shady Creek Dr 32223

Clements, Jeff

From: Bill F <flyerbill@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, August 31, 2020 7:26 PM
To: Boylan, Michael; CCMEETING09082020
Cc: Gaffney, Reginald; Freeman, Terrance; Bowman, Aaron; Diamond, Rory; Ferraro, Albert; White, Randy; Lewis, Bruce
Subject: ORDINANCE 2020-307 aka Melcon Farms

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 for 9/1/2020 for ORD 2020-307

My name is William Farrell and I live in the Wilderness Subdivision at 12218 Mesa Verde Trail, 32223.

I have lived in Jacksonville since 1998. Our family moved to The Wilderness in 2015 to enjoy the quiet natural surroundings away from the cookie cutter subdivisions.

I'm writing to you in adamant opposition to ORDINANCE 2020-307 (aka Melcon Farms) which requests the rezoning of a 17 acre property located at 3320 Oconnor Road, immediately adjacent to my neighborhood, from RR-Acre to PUD, in order to accommodate 38 new homes in a location that previously, over the last 29 years, has had only one active household.

My objections are several -

1. Drainage - I live at the base of Travertine and Mesa Verde. During heavy thunderstorms in summer, the roads are already like rivers. The creek behind my house which was roughly 2 feet wide when we moved in five years ago has greatly widened since Matthew and Irma. In short there are already existing drainage issues in this subdivision. Replacing undeveloped land with blacktop and roofs will only exacerbate the issue.
2. Traffic - With OConnor Road the only entry/exit for this subdivision, adding that many more cars to Wilderness subdivision traffic is not only a quality of life concern but a safety concern.
3. Wildlife - Clearcutting and removing trees, digging retention ponds, and the use of heavy machinery will greatly impact the birds, turtles and other wildlife we moved to The Wilderness to enjoy.
4. Home Valuation - I fail to see how shoehorning in a cookie cutter development on such small lots will do anything but cause my home valuation to drop.

Thank you for your time.

Bill Farrell
The Wilderness

Clements, Jeff

From: Susan <susaninflorida@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 31, 2020 5:05 PM
To: CCMEETING09082020
Subject: please make this part of the record for the Rules Committee meeting on September 1

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 vote no on 2020-518. Naming parks can be a way to fundraise for the maintenance of the parks.

Philanthropists are encouraged to give to the community when they somehow personally benefit. I hope you'll encourage philanthropists to commit to a yearly contribution to maintain a park in exchange for naming or renaming a park. There should also be a rule to automatically rename the park after the street it is on if the yearly contribution should end.

Thank you,
Susan Aertker

2020-0518
Ordinance

Title:ORD Establishing a Moratorium of 2 Yrs on the Renaming of Public Parks, Public Bldgs, Recreational Facilities, & Public Streets; Providing that the Moratorium Remain in Effect from Enactment until 8/11/2022 or Until a Uniform Procedure or Policy for Renaming is Implemented by Council; Req Emerg Passage Upon Intro. (Johnston) (Introduced by CM Diamond) 8/25/20 CO Introduced: NCSPHS, R, SJCIC 8/31/20 NCSPHS Read 2nd & Rerefer Public Hearing Pursuant to Chapt 166, F.S. & CR 3.601 – 9/8/20 On agenda:9/1/2020Final action:

On Mon, Aug 31, 2020 at 4:27 PM Susan <susaninflorida@gmail.com> wrote:

>
> I urge you to vote yes on 2020-0326. People shouldn't be hitting other people in city hall.
>
> I understand that this ordinance is limited to the issue of people hitting other people in city hall.
> However, I still want to mention that there is much evidence that hitting children is harmful.
> The links don't need to be read into the record, but please make this available to anyone interested.
> Here are a few links to articles about the dangers to hitting children:
> <https://www.apa.org/monitor/2012/04/spanking>
> https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2028343
> <https://www.cmaj.ca/content/161/7/805.short>
> <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/development-and-psychopathology/article/spanking-in-the-home-and-childrens-subsequent-aggression-toward-kindergarten-peers/A7885BAC743099CD174689E11D0428A7>
> <https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamapediatrics/article-abstract/51845>
> 8 <https://pediatrics.aappublications.org/content/125/5/e1057.short>
> <https://pediatrics.aappublications.org/content/101/4/723.full>

>
> Thank you,
> Susan Aertker

>
> 2020-0326
> RESO Supporting the Passage of a Policy Designating City Hall as a

- > "Hit Free Zone," Training of Employees for an Appropriate Response, &
- > Posting Signage at City Hall Identifying Property as a "Hit Free Zone"
- > Area; Urging Creation of a Pilot Program. (Johnston) (Introduced by CM
- > Dennis) 6/9/20 CO Introduced: NCSPHS, R 6/15/20 NCSPHS Read 2nd &
- > Rerefer 6/16/20 R Read 2nd & Rerefer 6/23/20 CO Read 2nd & Rereferred;
- > NCSPHS, R

Clements, Jeff

From: Susan <susaninflorida@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 31, 2020 4:55 PM
To: CCMEETING09082020
Subject: please make this a part of the Rules committee meeting on Tuesday September 1

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 was appalled that 2020-418 was approved by the social justice committee. It makes me doubt that the 5 people, who voted yes, have a commitment to reducing inequality in the city. No mention of allocating funds to reduce inequality was mentioned in the bill. Admittedly I am not in the preconsolidation boundary and see no need for that section of the city to have a target 33% of the capital improvement plan budget. Thank you,
Susan Aertker
32257

Regarding this bill:

ORD-MC Amend Sec 106.109 (Capital Improvemnt Funding), Pt 1 (General Provisions), Chapt 106 (Budget & Accounting Code), Ord Code, to Estab a Target of Least 33% of the Capital Improvemnt Plan Budget, as Defined in 122.602(c), be Allocated for Capital Improvemnts in the Pre-Consolidation City Boundary; Providing for Pre-Consolidation City Boundary Map. (Sidman) (Introduced by CM Carlucci) 7/28/20 CO Introduced: F, R 8/4/20 F Read 2nd & Rerefer 8/4/20 R Read 2nd & Rerefer 8/11/20 CO PH Read 2nd & Rereferred;F,R Public Hearing Pursuant to Chapt 166, F.S. & CR 3.601 - 8/11/20

Clements, Jeff

From: Susan <susaninflorida@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 31, 2020 4:28 PM
To: CCMEETING09082020
Subject: please make this part of the record for the Rules Committee meeting on September 1

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 urge you to vote yes on 2020-0326. People shouldn't be hitting other people in city hall.

I understand that this ordinance is limited to the issue of people hitting other people in city hall.

However, I still want to mention that there is much evidence that hitting children is harmful.

The links don't need to be read into the record, but please make this available to anyone interested.

Here are a few links to articles about the dangers to hitting children:

<https://www.apa.org/monitor/2012/04/spanking>

https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2028343

<https://www.cmaj.ca/content/161/7/805.short>

<https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/development-and-psychopathology/article/spanking-in-the-home-and-childrens-subsequent-aggression-toward-kindergarten-peers/A7885BAC743099CD174689E11D0428A7>

<https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamapediatrics/article-abstract/518458>

<https://pediatrics.aappublications.org/content/125/5/e1057.short>

<https://pediatrics.aappublications.org/content/101/4/723.full>

Thank you,
Susan Aertker

2020-0326

RESO Supporting the Passage of a Policy Designating City Hall as a “Hit Free Zone,” Training of Employees for an Appropriate Response, & Posting Signage at City Hall Identifying Property as a “Hit Free Zone” Area; Urging Creation of a Pilot Program. (Johnston) (Introduced by CM Dennis) 6/9/20 CO Introduced: NCSPHS, R 6/15/20 NCSPHS Read 2nd & Rerefer 6/16/20 R Read 2nd & Rerefer 6/23/20 CO Read 2nd & Rereferred; NCSPHS, R

Clements, Jeff

From: Susan <susaninflorida@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 31, 2020 3:37 PM
To: CCMEETING09082020
Subject: please make this a part of the Finance committee meeting on Tuesday September 1

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 was appalled that 2020-418 was approved by the social justice committee. It makes me doubt that the 5 people, who voted yes, have a commitment to reducing inequality in the city. No mention of allocating funds to reduce inequality was mentioned in the bill. Admittedly I am not in the preconsolidation boundary and see no need for that section to have a target 33% of the capital improvement plan budget.

Thank you,
Susan Aertker
32257

Regarding this bill:

ORD-MC Amend Sec 106.109 (Capital Improvemnt Funding), Pt 1 (General Provisions), Chapt 106 (Budget & Accounting Code), Ord Code, to Estab a Target of Least 33% of the Capital Improvemnt Plan Budget, as Defined in 122.602(c), be Allocated for Capital Improvemnts in the Pre-Consolidation City Boundary; Providing for Pre-Consolidation City Boundary Map. (Sidman) (Introduced by CM Carlucci) 7/28/20 CO Introduced: F, R 8/4/20 F Read 2nd & Rerefer 8/4/20 R Read 2nd & Rerefer 8/11/20 CO PH Read 2nd & Rereferred;F,R Public Hearing Pursuant to Chapt 166, F.S. & CR 3.601 - 8/11/20

Clements, Jeff

From: Krista E. Burby <KBurby@drivermcafee.com>
Sent: Monday, August 31, 2020 3:16 PM
To: CCMEETING09082020
Cc: Cyndy K. Trimmer
Subject: Speaker for September 1, 2020 LUZ Meeting (2020-0390 - Hudmon/1521 Margaret Street)

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,

Please allow this email to serve as notice the Cyndy Trimmer will speak on behalf of the applicant for 2020-0390 at tomorrow's LUZ Committee 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

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 31, 2020 11:50 AM
To: CCMEETING09082020
Cc: Cyndy K. Trimmer; Steve Diebenow
Subject: Speaker for September 1, 2020 LUZ Meeting (2020-0485 - Augustine Dev./404 N Julia)

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,

Please allow this email to serve as notice the Cyndy Trimmer will be available for questions only on behalf of the applicant for 2020-0485 at tomorrow's LUZ Committee 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

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 31, 2020 11:26 AM
To: CCMEETING09082020
Cc: Cyndy K. Trimmer
Subject: Speaker for September 1, LUZ Committee (2020-0290 and 2020-0291 - Cali/0Philips Highway)

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,

Please allow this email to serve as notice the Cyndy Trimmer will speak on behalf of the applicant for 2020-0290 and 2020-0291 at tomorrow's LUZ Committee meeting.

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

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

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: Tanya <tanya@jamwings.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 25, 2020 6:35 PM
To: CCMEETING08252020
Subject: 2020 - 332 and 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.

My name is Tanya Bolden. My husband Gregory Umberger and I bought our house at 555 Lancaster St. in 1994. Several of our neighbors are participating in this meeting as well, and no one who lives in a direct impact zone of this proposal is happy about what is happening. I wish that everyone who is voting on an issue that could literally change the quality of our daily lives could come to our neighborhood in the evenings to see what a peaceful area it is. I realize that we are within a few blocks of restaurants and shops, however, the Lancaster Street/Memorial Park neighborhood is filled with homes and condominiums. I understand that the location for the restaurant was in fact an office building, however it was a Monday through Friday 8 to 5 operation. When it was an office they did not have 200+ patients at a time. My son was a patient so I've been in the waiting room. With the number of patients they had, Lancaster Street, both of their parking lots, as well as Memorial Park Drive were usually full. When people came home from work the patients had already cleared the streets so the residents could easily find parking. There was no traffic for those offices on evenings, weekends or holidays. Although this proposal might look good on paper, which I don't agree with, it will do absolutely nothing to improve the quality of the neighborhood for those of us who live here. Councilman Ferraro said just because you can do something doesn't mean you should. I couldn't have said it any better. This is exactly how we feel!
Thank you

Sent from an undisclosed location

Clements, Jeff

From: Greg Gimbert <greg@southeasternlightingsolutions.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 25, 2020 5:20 PM
To: CCMEETING08252020
Cc: Samantha Gensler; Walt Cox
Subject: 2020-396 (SW-2020-04)

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 evening,

I am writing on behalf of the Circle K request for variance on their sign placement. I was attending via Zoom from the beginning to speak on behalf of the applicant, under the sign in Samantha Gensler.

Unfortunately we were never called on.

Can you please allow me to present to the council?

Greg Gimbert
Director of Project Management



Phone: 386-238-1711 ext 107
Cellular 386 852-0751
Fax: 386-238-1300
Toll Free: 1-866-322-6366

Visit us online at www.SELightingSolutions.com

Don't forget to check us out on Facebook! www.facebook.com/Southeastern.Lighting.Solutions

This e-mail is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking any action in reliance upon, this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this message in error, please contact the sender immediately and delete this message and its content.

Clements, Jeff

From: Susan Ober <susandober@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 25, 2020 5:19 PM
To: CCMEETING08252020
Subject: The Riverside Village Project

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 Members:

Too late I have come to understand that my presence alone at a meeting is not sufficient; to raise my voice several times before is not sufficient. I am a reluctant letter writer and so I usually count on someone else to do it, thinking that what I have to say will make little or no difference.

I am at this moment listening in to the council meeting underway. I was cut out of the visual connection to the meeting when I opened another window to my browser in order to write to you now. It is very frustrating to discover that the access to the council meeting is so truncated compared to my previous experience with the zoning meetings. I learned late that I would not be able to speak up today.

I should have written to you sooner, but I will say now that I have agreed with everything that my neighbor Dennis Harkins has so eloquently voiced, with his voice and his writing. I share his concerns about safety, traffic, parking and noise that is inevitable if The Riverside Village Project goes forth as planned. I also agree with his proposal that steps be taken to mitigate issues related to:

1. adequate parking for Memorial Park,
2. a sidewalk next to the park,
3. pedestrian safety at the corner of Riverside Avenue and Memorial Park Drive,
4. Resident Only parking on Lancaster Street and Lancaster Terrace,
5. noise abatement from outside dining, and
6. traffic congestion.

For 21 years I have lived in a house at the corner of Lancaster Street and Lancaster Terrace. I have seen what a struggle it can already be for residents to find reasonable parking for access to their homes. I do not see how anyone can think it is reasonable to allow and encourage such an incursion of traffic and pedestrian safety to this neighborhood.

Thank you for your time in reading this. I am sorry that I did not try sooner to find my voice.

Sincerely,

Susan Ober

Clements, Jeff

From: Permitting Account <permits@southeasternlightingsolutions.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 25, 2020 5:16 PM
To: CCMEETING08252020
Subject: 2020-396

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.

Looking to speak for this permit

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)