

# **NEFRC**

**December  
PLANNING & GROWTH  
MANAGEMENT POLICY  
COMMITTEE  
Meeting**

**December 3, 2009  
9:00 a.m.**

**Northeast Florida Regional Council  
6850 Belfort Oaks Place  
Jacksonville, FL 32216**



***Bringing Communities Together***

Baker • Clay • Duval • Flagler • Nassau • Putnam • St. Johns

Date: December 1, 2009

To: NEFRC Planning and Growth Management Policy Committee

From: Margo Moehring   
Director, Planning & Strategic Initiatives

Re: **December 3, 2009 Committee Meeting - CANCELLED**

---

The Planning and Growth Management Policy Committee scheduled for

**December 3, 2009,  
has been CANCELLED**

**Northeast Florida Regional Council  
Planning and Growth Management Policy Committee**

**Thursday, December 3, 2009  
9:00 a.m.**

**AGENDA**

**TAB**

1. Call to Order, Roll Call, Introductions - Chair Brown
- \* 2. Approval of Minutes of November 5, 2009 meeting - Chair Brown..... 1
3. Comprehensive Plan Amendment Review – Margo Moehring ..... 2
  - \* A. City of Jacksonville Adopted Amendment 09-2ARA – Guy Parola..... 3
  - \* B. Clay County Adopted Amendment 09-1ER – Guy Parola ..... 4
  - \* C. City of Jacksonville Adopted Amendment 09CIE-1 – Ameera Sayeed ..... 5
  - \* D. Putnam County Adopted EAR – Guy Parola..... 6
4. Development of Regional Impact (DRI) Report - Ed Lehman ..... 7
5. Intergovernmental Coordination and Review (IC&R) Report - Ed Lehman ..... 8
6. Other
7. Public Comment - LIMITED TO 3 MINUTES PER SPEAKER
8. Next Meeting Date and Location: **Thursday, January 7, 2010  
Northeast Florida Regional Council  
6850 Belfort Oaks Place  
Jacksonville, FL 32216**
9. Adjournment

\*Denotes Action Item

# Tab 1

**MINUTES**

The NEFRC Planning and Growth Management Policy Committee meeting was held on Thursday, November 5, 2009 at 9:00 a.m., at the Northeast Florida Regional Council, 6850 Belfort Oaks Place, Jacksonville, Florida, 32216. **Chair Brown** called the meeting to order with the following members present representing a quorum:

**PRESENT**

Commissioner Crichlow  
Mr. Register  
Mr. Smallwood  
Mayor Robinson  
Mayor Graham  
Mr. Spaeth  
Ms. Andrews  
Commissioner Harris  
Mr. Larson  
Vice-Mayor Lawson-Brown  
Commissioner Bryan  
Ms. Stern  
Mr. Cole (Ex-Officio)  
Mr. Parks (Ex-Officio)  
Mr. Strong (Ex-Officio)  
Ms. Brown (Chair)

**EXCUSED**

Mr. Thompson  
Ms. Vallencourt  
Commissioner Stewart  
Commissioner Holland  
Commissioner Boyle  
Commissioner Stevenson

**ABSENT**

Commissioner Parsons

Others: Commissioner Laibl, Tony Robbins, Sarah Langieri, Steve Fitzgibbons, Kerry Laughlin, Geoffrey Sample, Dave Tillis and other members of the public.

Staff: Brian Teeple, Ed Lehman, Margo Moehring, Guy Parola, Ameera Sayeed, Jennifer Hewett-Apperson, Michael Calhoun, and Angela Giles.

**\*Approval of Minutes – Commissioner Bryan moved approval of the October 5, 2009 meeting minutes; seconded by Mr. Larson; motion carried unanimously.**

\*Commissioner Harris arrived at 9:05 am.

October Comprehensive Plan Amendment Review - Ms. Moehring stated that there were twelve (12) Comprehensive Plan Amendments that were reviewed during the month of October. There were two (2) transmitted amendments; one (1) adopted amendment and no Evaluation and Appraisal Reports (EARs) brought before the Committee and Board for review. The Small Scale Amendments have been reviewed by staff and are generally consistent with the Strategic Regional Policy Plan (SRPP).

\*City of Atlantic Beach Transmitted Amendment 09-1ER – Mr. Parola gave a brief overview of the amendment, stating that ER indicates that it corresponds to the Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR). Mr. Parola informed the members that the Regional Council contracted with the City of Atlantic Beach to give technical assistance with the City's EAR. Mr. Parola stated that Atlantic Beach

is largely built out, and that it became a Dense Urban Land Area (DULA) in 2009 through SB 360. Staff has one comment, which Mr. Parola read for the record:

*Staff encourages Atlantic Beach to include, as part of the adopted EAR Based or subsequent amendments, strategies that will address regional facilities within the TCEA or include stakeholders such as the Northeast Florida Regional Council and adjacent jurisdictions in the development of transportation and mobility strategies.*

Staff recommended that the Committee and the Council approve this report for transmittal to the Department of Community Affairs. **Mr. Larson moved approval of transmitting the City of Atlantic Beach Transmitted Amendment 09-1ER to DCA; seconded by Mayor Graham; motion carried unanimously.**

\*Town of Orange Park Transmitted Amendment 09-1ER – Mr. Parola provided an overview of the amendment, stating that Mr. Tony Robbins, of the consultant team, is in attendance for any questions that the Members may have. Mr. Parola informed the members that transportation would be the only concern with this Amendment, due to US 17 being a failing roadway through Orange Park, and is also constrained. Staff comments are:

*Orange Park is now, by statute, within a TCEA. Pursuant to s. 163.3179, F.S., Orange Park must "adopt into its comprehensive plan land use and transportation strategies to support and fund mobility within the exception area." In recognition of US 17 being a regional facility, staff encourages Orange Park to include, as part of the adopted EAR Based Amendments, strategies that will address regional facilities within the TCEA or include stakeholder such as the Northeast Florida Regional Council and adjacent jurisdictions in the development of transportation and mobility strategies.*

**Mr. Smallwood** stated that the Town only qualifies for in-fill, and that the Town Council must adhere to SB 360 regulations; they do not have the authority to do improvements on US 17. **Mr. Smallwood moved approval of transmitting the Town of Orange Park Transmitted Amendment 09-1ER to DCA; seconded by Commissioner Bryan; motion carried unanimously.**

\*City of Palm Coast Adopted Amendment 09-1 – Ms. Sayeed provided an overview of the amendment, stating that the changes resulted in an overall gain of conservation land. Commissioner Bryan asked if any endangered species would be affected; Ms Sayeed stated that none were noted.

**Mr. Register moved approval of The City of Palm Coast Adopted Amendment 09-1 as consistent with the Northeast Florida Strategic Regional Policy Plan (SRPP); seconded by Vice Mayor Lawson-Brown; motion carried unanimously.**

Development of Regional Impact (DRI) Report - Mr. Lehman stated that the DRI report is for information only and does not require an action. Mr. Lehman informed the members that Cordova Palms will go through the DRI review for changes. The Old Kings Park DRI has been withdrawn; the Watermark DRI ADA is being reviewed, and Neoga Lakes (Three Lakes) has submitted its first sufficiency response. Mr. Lehman also informed the members that Twin Creeks DRI Substantial Deviation may come before them in late 2010, or early 2011.

Intergovernmental Coordination and Review (ICR) – Mr. Lehman stated that during the month of October there were 18 applications for environmental permits and 1 application for grant requests. This is for information only and does not require an action.

#### Next Meeting Date

The next meeting will be held Thursday, December 3, 2009, at 9:00 am at the Northeast Florida Regional Council.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 9:25 a.m.


# **Tab 2**



*Bringing Communities Together*

Baker • Clay • Duval • Flagler • Nassau • Putnam • St. Johns

## MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** November 25, 2009  
**TO:** Northeast Florida Regional Council  
**THRU:** Planning and Growth Management Policy Committee  
**FROM:** Margo Moehring,   
Director of Planning and Strategic Initiatives  
**RE:** Comprehensive Plan Amendment Review: November, 2009

---

As of this date, during the month of November, 2009, Regional Council staff reviewed eight (8) comprehensive plan amendments. Three (3) adopted amendments and one (1) adopted Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR) are brought before the Committee and Board for review.

### **Transmitted Amendments**

None.

### **Adopted Amendments**

Clay County	Adopted Amendment 09-1ER
City of Jacksonville	Adopted Amendment 09CIE-1
City of Jacksonville	Adopted Amendment 09-2ARA

### **Evaluation and Appraisal Reports:**

Putnam County	Adopted EAR
---------------	-------------

### **Small-Scale Amendments\*:**

Putnam County	Ordinance 91-30
---------------	-----------------

- *Changes 4.80 acres from Agriculture to Commercial*

**Board Memorandum**

**November 25, 2009**

**Page 2**

City of Palatka

Ordinance 09-49

- *Changes 2.24 acres from Urban Reserve to Commercial*

City of Palatka

Ordinance 09-51

- *Changes 5.92 acres from Urban Reserve to Commercial*

City of Palatka

Ordinance 09-53

- *Changes 9.55 acres from Urban Reserve to Industrial*

St. Johns County

- *Changes 9.5 acres from Residential-B to Public*

\*The Small Scale Amendments are generally consistent with the Goals and Policies of the Northeast Florida Strategic Regional Policy Plan, and will not be brought to the Council for review.

# Tab 3



*Bringing Communities Together*

---

Baker • Clay • Duval • Flagler • Nassau • Putnam • St. Johns

## MEMORANDUM

**Date:** November 25, 2009

**To:** Northeast Florida Regional Council Board of Directors

**From:** Margo Moehring *Margo Moehring*  
Director of Planning and Strategic Initiatives

**Re:** City of Jacksonville Adopted Amendment 09-2ARA

---

Please note that Staff review of the City of Jacksonville Adopted Amendment 09-2ARA is NOT enclosed with this mail out. A copy of the review and recommendation will be provided via e-mail for your review prior to the December 3, 2009 Committee and Board Meetings.

# Tab 4

FORM C-7

**NORTHEAST FLORIDA REGIONAL COUNCIL**

**REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL  
AMENDMENT REVIEW FORM  
FY 2009-2010**

1. Local Government Name: Clay County
2. Amendment Number: 09-ER1
3. Is the RPC precluded from commenting on the proposed plan or element pursuant to s. 163.3184(5), F.S., or Rule 9J-11.0084, L.O.F.; or commenting on the proposed amendment pursuant to s. 163.32465(4)(b), F.S.? (YES) (NO)
4. Date DCA Notified RPC that Amendment Package was Complete, if Applicable: Not Received
5. Date Amendment Review must be Completed and Transmitted to DCA: December 5, 2009
6. Date the Amendment Review was transmitted to DCA: December 4, 2009
7. Description of the Amendment:

The amendment corresponds to the Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR) adopted by Clay County on February 27, 2007. Local governments are required to adopt an EAR once every seven years as stipulated in S. 163.3191, F.S. The EAR assesses the progress in implementing the local government's comprehensive plan and reviews the successes and shortcomings of the plan. During this process, recommendations for changes to the Comprehensive Plan are outlined.

Based on the findings in the EAR, the EAR-Based Amendments include updated policies based on current data; modified policies to better address local issues; deleted policies that are no longer relevant; and new policies that articulate recommendations in the EAR and that respond to changes in legislative requirements. Globally, the plan updated references to resources, documents and agencies as appropriate. All of the maps required have been updated based on new and relevant data and correlates with the Goals, Objectives and Policies.

In addition to changes to the text of the comprehensive plan, this adopted amendment includes substantial changes to the Future Land Use Map, as summarized in the Future Land Use Map table on the following page.

A more thorough summary of the changes are contained in the transmitted amendment to the Department of Community Affairs approved by the NEFRC Board on June 4, 2009 (attached).

*Note: Several acreage amounts for changes to the adopted Future Land Use Map are different from the acreage amounts transmitted for review. The adopted amounts are reflected in the table on the following page.*

Please complete the following table for each individual proposed amendment to the Future Land Use Map (**FLUM**) only:

Existing FLUM Category	Proposed FLUM Category	Existing Maximum Density (DU/Acre)	Proposed Maximum Density (DU/Acre)	Existing Maximum Intensity (FAR)	Proposed Maximum Intensity (FAR)	Net Increase or (Decrease) in Maximum Density	Non-Residential Net Increase or (Decrease) in Potential Floor Area
AG	IND	1/20	0	0	0.5	-2	1,633,500sqft
AG	CON	1/20	0	0	0	-24	0
AG	IND	1/20	0	0	0.5	-16	5.7mil/sqft*
AG	CON	1/20	0	0	0	-24	0
AG, CON, RR, MI	RF,RR,RS,AG,COM, IND,CON	.07/1	.74/1	0	.0036	4,198	1,365,000sqft**
AG	IND, COM, CON	1/20	0	0	0.5	-80	10,350,000sqft***
AG	AG/RES	1/20	1/10	0	0	3	0
UC	MU	1/16	1/15	0	.25	9****	64,577****
<b>Total Increase in Density</b>						<b>4,144</b>	
<b>Total Increase in Non-residential Floor Area</b>							<b>19,113,077</b>

UC = Urban Core, FF = Rural Residential, MI = Mining, RF = Rural Fringe, RS = Rural Reserve

\*limited thru site specific policy

\*\*limited thru site specific policy

\*\*\*limited thru site specific policy

\*\*\*\*limited thru site specific policy

8. Is the Amendment consistent with the Strategic Regional Policy Plan?

Generally, Amendment 09-ER1 is consistent with the Strategic Regional Policy Plan.

9. Applicable Strategic Regional Policy Plan Goals and Objectives:

This amendment is generally consistent with the following SRPP Goals and their corresponding objectives:

Regional Goal 2.3 *An environment that is conducive to the creation and relocation of new businesses as well as the expansion of existing businesses in the northeast Florida region.*

Regional Goal 4.1 *Improve water quality in surface waters identified as NRSS in the region to meet human and ecosystem needs, achieve state water quality standards.*

Regional Goal 4.2 *Assure and adequate supply of water both in quantity and quality for present and future human, economic development, and ecosystem needs.*

Regional Goal 5.1 *To develop a regional transportation system which optimizes the movement of citizens and goods in northeast Florida while protecting the environment.*

10. The effects on the Proposed Amendment on Regional Resources or Facilities Identified in the Strategic Regional Policy Plan:

No impacts to natural resources in addition to those identified later in this report were identified.

11. Extra-Jurisdictional Impacts that would be Inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan of the Affected Local Government:

No extra-jurisdictional impacts that would be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan of an affected local government were identified.

**Analysis of the effects of the proposed amendments on the following issues to the extent they are addressed in the Strategic Regional Policy Plan on:**

12. Compatibility among local plans including, but not limited to, land use and compatibility with military bases:

This amendment is compatible with local plans and military bases.

13. Impacts to significant regional resources and facilities identified in the Strategic Regional Policy Plan, including, but not limited to, impacts on groundwater recharge and the availability of water supply:

The amendment has some positive impacts on the resources identified in the Strategic Regional Policy Plan. The amendment contains water conservation and minimum open space requirements, including conformance to WaterStar<sup>SM</sup>. Additionally, the EAR based amendments contains policies that strengthen protection of surface waters (e.g., Community Facilities Element Policy 1.3 requires development to meet the requirements of the Surface Water Management System Environmental Resource Permit, Chapter 40C-4, F.A.C.)

14. Affordable housing issues and designation of adequate sites for affordable housing:

The amendment contains several changes to the Housing Element that have a positive effect on ensuring that there is safe and energy efficient affordable housing within the County. Specifically, the amendment contains requirements for:

- Reducing the amount of substandard housing by 10% (target year 2025)
- Developing a system to inventory housing that is viable for rehabilitation and those that are beyond repair
- Authorization and appropriation of revolving low-interest loans to rehabilitate existing and constructing new affordable housing
- Ensuring there is infrastructure and public facilities within the urban service area for mobile and manufactured homes
- Developing standards, plans and principles to address energy efficiency in the design and construction of new housing

15. Protection of natural resources of regional significance identified in the Strategic Regional Policy Plan including, but not limited to, protection of spring and groundwater resources, and recharge potential:

The EAR based amendments contains language that strengthens protection of Floridan Aquifer Recharge Areas within Clay County. By way of example, Community Facilities Element Policy 6.1 reads, in part: *Areas shown by the SJRWMD to potentially contribute 8 inches or more per year of recharge to the Floridan aquifer are designated as high recharge areas as shown on the Floridan Aquifer Recharge Map. An Aquifer Recharge Overlay Zone showing these high recharge areas shall be created in the land development regulations, and shall be protected from incompatible land uses to ensure adequate recharge rates and water quality maintenance. The County will coordinate with the St. Johns River Water Management District to review the recharge protection standards as new data becomes available.*

16. Compatibility with regional transportation corridors and facilities including, but not limited to, roadways, seaports, airports, public transportation systems, high speed rail facilities, and intermodal facilities:

Individually and combined, the FLUM amendments will, in the long-term, affect the following regional transportation facilities: US 17. Clay County recognizes that the analysis indicates that the adopted level of service standards for US 17 will be exceeded in the long-range planning horizon (i.e., beyond the 5-year planning horizon). To address this, the County has adopted site specific policies that limit and phase development in order to maintain adopted level of service standards in the 5-year planning horizon.

*Comment: Due to long-range impacts resulting from several of the adopted FLUM amendments to regional transportation facilities, particularly US 17, the Northeast Florida Regional Council recommended in its report issued at time of transmittal that the County work with the Regional Council to address the long-range transportation impacts. More specifically, the FLUM amendments in question were to be phased development plans, limiting maximum PM Peak Hour trips to maintain the adopted level of service standards within the 5-year planning horizon. However, the level of service standards in the long-range horizon would not be maintained. In the Objections, Recommendations, and Comments (O.R.C.) report issued by the Florida Department of Community Affairs (DCA), concerns about the long-term transportation impacts were echoed.*

*Clay County planners met with Regional Council staff to address our concerns. At that meeting, it was agreed that a policy or requirement would be included to mandate additional transportation analysis prior to development beyond the first phase of each FLUM amendment in question. Clay County has included the following language within the adopted amendment:*

Transportation Element Policy 6.1.6: Clay County shall continue to coordinate planning efforts with Jacksonville Transportation Authority, Northeast Florida Regional Council, Northeast Florida Transportation Planning Organization, and the Florida Department of Transportation to achieve a better transportation planning and a higher modal split.

For each of the phased land use amendments, the following language was adopted into Future Land Use Amendment, site-specific policies:

The remaining development (Phase 2) on the (Amendment Name) property is specifically conditioned upon and may not proceed until and unless:

- a) The developer demonstrates, through a traffic study approved by Clay County and FDOT in accordance with the requirements of Clay County's concurrency management system, that the impacted road segments will operate at an acceptable level of service; or
- b) The developer and Clay County enter into a proportionate fair share agreement pursuant to Sec. 163.3180(16), Florida Statutes, under which the development's impacts will be fully mitigated and FDOT concurs with the mitigation for impacts to facilities on the Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) as required by Sec. 163.3180(16)(e), Florida Statutes. Prior to any development in Phase 2, the five year schedule of capital improvements shall be amended to include any roadway improvements identified to be constructed under this subparagraph (b).

17. Adequacy and compatibility with emergency preparedness plans and local mitigation strategies including, but not limited to, the impacts on and availability of hurricane shelters, maintenance of county hurricane clearance times, and hazard mitigation:

Generally, the amendment is compatible with emergency preparedness plans and local mitigation strategies.

18. Analysis of the effects of extra-jurisdictional impacts which may be created by the amendment:

No extra-jurisdictional impacts in addition to those previously identified in this report were identified.

**Recommendation:**

**Staff respectfully recommends that the Committee and the Council find Clay County Adopted Amendment 09-ER1 consistent with the Northeast Florida Strategic Regional Policy Plan.**

Transmitted  

---

Amendment

## **MEMORANDUM**

**DATE:** June 5, 2009

**TO:** Northeast Florida Regional Council

**THRU:** Planning and Growth Management Policy Committee

**FROM:** Guy Parola, Planning Manager

**RE:** Clay County Transmitted 09EAR-1

---

### **Scope of Review**

The Regional Council received the Clay County EAR-Based Amendments on May 7, 2009. The Comprehensive Plan EAR-Based Amendments were prepared pursuant to the requirements of S. 163.3191, Florida Statutes, (F.S.). Pursuant to Section 163.3191(6), F.S., and the contract between the Department of Community Affairs (DCA) and the Regional Council, staff has reviewed the adopted amendment to determine whether it sufficiently addresses the Goals, Objectives, and Policies of the Northeast Florida Strategic Regional Policy Plan, as well the requirements of S. 163.3191(2), F.S. Staff has prepared this report to forward to the Department of Community Affairs upon approval by the Council.

### **EAR History**

The Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR) of the Clay County Comprehensive Plan was adopted by Clay County on February 27, 2007. Local governments are required to adopt an EAR once every seven years as stipulated in S. 163.3191, F.S. The EAR assesses the progress in implementing the local government's comprehensive plan and reviews the successes and shortcomings of the plan. During this process, recommendations for changes to the Comprehensive Plan are outlined. The local government then has 12 to 24 months, after adoption of the EAR, to adopt EAR-Based Amendments.

## **Board Memorandum**

**June 4, 2009**

**Page 2 of 8**

### **EAR-Based Amendment Summary**

The County prepared an update of the Comprehensive Plan based on the findings in the EAR. During the EAR process a number of major issues were developed for the County and these were used to evaluate the Goals, Objectives and Policies of the Comprehensive Plan (see attached Memo for reference). The EAR-Based Amendment extends the planning period to the year 2025.

The County conducted 13 Planning Commission workshops to obtain public input on the EAR-Based Amendments. These occurred between July 2008 and March 2009. Clay County Board of County Commissioners approved the transmittal of the EAR-Based Amendments at their meeting on April 28, 2009.

Based on the findings in the EAR, the EAR-Based Amendments include updated policies based on current data; modified policies to better address local issues; deleted policies that are no longer relevant; and new policies that articulate recommendations in the EAR and that respond to changes in legislative requirements. Globally, the plan updated references to resources, documents and agencies as appropriate. All of the maps required have been updated based on new and relevant data and correlates with the Goals, Objectives and Policies.

The following summary highlights the substantive changes to the Comprehensive Plan by Element:

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

- Strengthened policies to ensure public facilities and services are available to serve development.
- Incorporated future land use categories.
- Defined densities and intensities for future land use categories.
- Added stronger and more detailed policies regarding vested properties.
- Added policies to address 163.3177(6)(a), F.S. to establish green house gas reduction strategies.
- Created a new Mixed-Use land use category, with development parameters

#### **Housing Element**

- Modified a policy regarding mobile and manufactured homes to insure that infrastructure and public facilities are available.
- Added a policy to address energy efficiency in design and construction of new structures.

#### *Comment*

- *Policy 1.4.3 uses the concept of Urban Service Area. This was replaced with Centralized Water and Sewer Service Area in the Future Land Use Element.*

## **Board Memorandum**

**June 4, 2009**

**Page 3 of 8**

### **Community Facilities Element**

- Added additional permitting requirements for new and re-development relative to requirements in Chapter 40C-4 FAC and 40C-4o FAC dealing with surface water runoff.
- Added a policy to comply with the St. Johns River Water Management District (SJRWMD) 2008 Water Supply Assessment and the water supply planning requirements of Chapter 163 F.S. (s.163.3177 F.S.)
- Modified a policy regarding potable water resources and aquifer recharge areas consistent with 9J-5.011(2) (b) (2)(b) 4 and 5.
- Added an objective to address regulation of stormwater runoff and protect natural resources.

### **Conservation Element**

- Strengthened policies to promote reduction of pollution generated from automobiles.
- Added a policy to address Best Management Practices for golf courses, agricultural and silvicultural operations to include water protection and water conservation.
- Added policies to encourage additional water conservation and referenced Florida Water Star and Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) programs.
- Added policies to support the increase and protection of natural resource and conservation areas.
- Included open space requirements for new development.
- Added policies to address energy conservation and greenhouse gas emissions consistent with 163.3177(d) F.S.

### **Intergovernmental Coordination Element**

- Included additional agencies in interlocal cooperation efforts and included provision for school concurrency requirements.

### **Capital Improvements Element**

- Incorporated a Five-Year Educational Facilities Plan.
- Changed Level of Service (LOS) standard for solid waste from 3.43 to 3.99 pounds per capita per day.
- Changed definitions of roadway facilities and included Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) and Florida Intrastate Highway System (FIHS).
- Added policies to address improvement of constrained roadway facilities.
- Changed LOS standard for community parks from 1 acre per 2,000 persons to 1 acre per 500 persons.
- Changed LOS standard for boat ramps from 1 lane per 785 boats to 1 lane per 18,000 persons.

## Board Memorandum

June 4, 2009

Page 4 of 8

### Transportation Element

- Incorporated new maps to include: a 10-Year Transportation Plan/Future Traffic Circulation Map, a Bicycle/Pedestrian Facilities Map, a Public Transit Systems Map and a Ports, Aviation and Rail Map.
- Changed definitions of roadway facilities and included SIS and FIHS.
- Added policies to address improvement of constrained roadway facilities.
- Added policies to include criteria for vacating existing right-of ways.
- Changed reference from Urban Service Area to Centralized Water and Sewer Service Area.
- Added policies to address energy conservation and greenhouse gas emissions consistent with 163.3177(d) F.S.

### Historical Element

*No significant changes.*

### Recreation and Open Space Element

- Changed LOS standard for neighborhood parks from 1 acre per 1,500 persons to 1 acre per 2,100 persons.
- Changed LOS standard for community parks from 1 acre per 2,000 persons to 1 acre per 700 persons.
- Changed LOS standard for boat ramps from 1 lane per 785 boats to 1 lane per 25,000 persons.

#### *Comment*

- *The above changes to LOS standards are not consistent with the changes proposed in the Capital Improvements Element Policy 4.2. The references to LOS throughout the Comprehensive Plan should be modified for consistency.*
- Changed LOS standards for baseball, softball fields and basketball and tennis courts.
- Added reference to Clay County Manatee Protection Plan.
- Added provisions to develop a Parks and Recreation Master Plan to guide acquisition and development of a coordinated system.

### Economic Development Element

*No significant changes.*

### School Element

*No significant changes.*

In addition, the Clay County Comprehensive Plan includes the **Branan Field Master Plan** and the **Lake Asbury Master Plan**. Both of these plans were established to specifically address and guide development unique to these geographic areas within the County. Each provides detailed Goals, Objectives

## Board Memorandum

June 4, 2009

Page 5 of 8

and Policies relative to implementation of the Master Plan; implements a long-range, strategic approach to natural resource protection and transportation planning; defines the desirable development pattern and standards; and provides for the availability of infrastructure.

### **County Initiated Future Land Use EAR Based Amendments**

There were two large-scale, County initiated FLUM amendments that are included as part of the EAR based amendments. The first change involves the Branan Field Mixed Use project, which textually changes the designation from BF-MPC to the newly created Mixed-use category designation. Additionally, the long-term planning horizon has been extended through 2025.

The second County-initiated FLUM amendment submitted as part of this EAR based amendment involves 1,558 acres of what is currently designated as Agriculture near US 301, known within the EAR as the *301 Corridor Industrial Park Designation*. The Industrial Park designation is a newly created land use category, and seemingly lacks development standards (i.e., FARs). However, the proposed use of the development is as follows: 790 acres Industrial/Warehouse; 25 acres Commercial; and 10 acres of Commercial/Office. In addition to the aforementioned categories, 458 acres will be put into Conservation.

The development is proposed to occur in three phases: Phase 1: 2010-2015; Phase 2: 2015-2020; and Phase 3: 2020-2025. The phasing schedule, along with the required improvements identified in the supporting data and analysis (e.g., widening of CR 218 by Phase 2, potable water and sanitary sewer infrastructure, etc) are proposed to be enforced through an asterisk on the Future Land Use Map. It is important to note that, although the Clay County Utility Authority has agreed to service the area, they are requiring an executed Development Agreement to “underwrite the costs of the necessary facilities.”

*Recommendation: The County will work with the Regional Council to address the long-term impacts of the land use change.*

### **Individual Initiated Future Land Use EAR Based Amendments**

The EAR-Based Amendments include four (4) changes to the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) and one (1) text amendment. The following summary is provided for the transmitted large scale amendments as provided by the County.

**EAR-01:** The proposed land use changes 75 acres from Agriculture to AG/Residential. The subject property is located approximately 3 miles South of SR 16 – South of CR 226 and East of CR 209 – in the Green Cove Springs.

## Board Memorandum

June 4, 2009

Page 6 of 8

**EAR-02:** The proposed land use changes 1,018.83 acres from Agriculture (1 du/20 acre) to Industrial (An average 0.25 and a maximum of 0.5 FAR, total 525.31-acre) and Conservation (493.53-acre) with a maximum industrial cap of 1,144,125 square feet by year 2013, a total industrial developments of 5,720,517 square feet at build out, and a condition of providing Central Water and Sewer System by the Clay County Utility Authority. The subject property is located West of US 17 and North of Clay/Putnam County line in the Green Cove Springs.

The proposed change is consistent with the findings of Clay County EAR which concludes that additional employment generating land use should be added to the FLUM. The proposed development will utilize the existing CSX rail line and water and wastewater services will be provided incrementally by private investment. The development is intended to implement a planned and phased approach to the development.

There will be a cumulative increase in PM peak trips based on development phasing. Associated trip increase by the year 2013 is 923 additional trips on U.S. 17. U.S. 17 currently functions as a LOS B and has available capacity of 1,750 trips and will not fail with the 5-year planning horizon.

*Recommendation: The County will work with the Regional Council to address the long-term impacts of the land use change.*

**EAR-03:** The proposed land use changes 5.98 acres from Urban Core to Mixed-Use. The subject property is located south of Kingsley Avenue near Foxwood Drive. Current use of the property is an 80 unit, 9 building multi-family development constructed in 1971. The use proposed is 64,577 SF of non-residential with 89 residential units located above the non-residential units. The site will be served by central water and wastewater by existing facilities in the Orange Park Grid that have available capacity. Traffic generated by the site will increase by 429 PM peak trips meeting the definition of concurrency infill area.

**EAR-05:** The proposed land use changes 4,380 acres from *Agriculture, Rural Residential, Mining, and Conservation* to *Rural Fringe, Rural Reserve, Rural Residential, Ag/Residential, Agriculture, Conservation, Commercial, and Industrial*. The property is part of a larger 7,990 acre site located west of US 17 and is contiguous to the southern boundary of the Governors Park Development of Regional Impact.

## Board Memorandum

June 4, 2009

Page 7 of 8

Total current land use by acreage:

Agriculture	6,077
Conservation	401
Rural Residential	710
Mining	802

Total proposed land use by acreage:

Rural Fringe	1,089
Rural Residential	1,001
Rural Reserve	947
Ag/Residential	375
Commercial	50
Industrial	173
Agriculture	3,364
Conservation	991

Development of property is proposed to occur in two phases, which will be enforced through an asterisk on the Future Land Use Map. Total phase 1 development is approximately 1,000 single-family units; total maximum development in both phases is 5,932 residential units, 375,000 square feet of commercial, and 1,297,500 square feet of industrial.

It has been demonstrated that US 17 will not be failing within the 5-year planning horizon. As proposed, and that, due to phasing of the development, there will only be an increase of 865 PM peak hour trips by 2015. By 2025, however, total PM peak hour trips increase by 7,820 trips. A parallel road to US 17 within the development will connect to the Governors Park US 17 bypass, and eventually connect to US 17 as well. This roadway is not being adopted into the 5-year CIP, but is shown on the Clay County 10 Year Transportation Plan / Future Traffic Circulation Map within the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

The amendment will result in an increase in elementary school demand greater than can be accommodated. The County staff has recommended that school concurrency be satisfied through the collection of impact fees.

*Recommendation: The County will work with the Regional Council to address the long-term impacts of the land use change.*

### Text Amendment

**EAR-04:** A text amendment that proposes changes to Policy 1.7 of the Capital Improvement Element. This policy deals with construction of roadway segments that were identified as a condition of a stipulated settlement agreement between Clay County, DCA, and the Reinhold Corporation in 2005.

### **Background**

*The Reinhold Corporation filed an application of approximately 615-acre Business Park Land Use (Peters Creek) and it was adopted on June 24, 2003. The DCA found the amendment Not-In-Compliance because it was not supported by adequate public facilities.*

**Board Memorandum**

**June 4, 2009**

**Page 8 of 8**

*A revised traffic study dated May 5, 2005 was submitted to DCA for comment: At the direction of County Staff, the analyses reflected a planned road network based on pending Lake Asbury Master Plan. (LAMP was adopted on July 26, 2005 and the following Remedial Plan for issued Stipulated Settlement Agreement was adopted on November 14, 2005).*

Clay County has proposed to remove three of the roadway segments from the and amended the construction date from 2015 to as development occurs. Construction of these segments remains the developer/owner's responsibility. The table below indicates the proposed changes.

**Roadway Segment**

**Construction Date**

E-W Connector from the western  
Peters Creek property line to CR 315  
Connector

As development occurs

Peters Creek Internal Road from the  
property line to CR 218 Extension

As development occurs

**Recommendation:**

**Staff respectfully recommends that the Planning and Growth Management Policy Committee and the Council approve this report for transmittal to the Department of Community Affairs.**

# Tab 5

**FORM C-7**

**NORTHEAST FLORIDA REGIONAL COUNCIL**

**REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL  
AMENDMENT REVIEW FORM  
FY 2009-2010**

1. Local Government Name: City of Jacksonville
2. Amendment Number: 09CIE-1
3. Is the RPC precluded from commenting on the proposed plan or element pursuant to s. 163.3184(5), F.S., or Rule 9J-11.0084, L.O.F.; or commenting on the proposed amendment pursuant to s. 163.32465(4)(b), F.S.? (YES) (NO)
4. Date DCA Notified RPC that Amendment Package was Complete, if Applicable: Not Received To Date
5. Date Amendment Review must be Completed and Transmitted to DCA: December 18, 2009
6. Date the Amendment Review was transmitted to DCA: December 4, 2009
7. Description of the Amendment:

City of Jacksonville Adopted Amendment 09CIE-1 contains an update of the City Capital Improvement Element. SB 360 requires that each community annually adopt an update of a financially feasible Capital Improvements Plan. Updates to the Capital Improvements Element are exempt from the twice/year limit placed on large-scale Comprehensive Plan amendments. It also includes certain revisions to the text of the 2010 Comprehensive Plan's Capital Improvements Element (to be the "2030" Comprehensive Plan pursuant to the effective date of Ordinance 2009-791).

The CIE includes the City of Jacksonville projects, JTA projects, FDOT projects, the Florida Seaport Transportation and Economic Development Program (FSTED) projects, Public Schools Facilities projects, Potable Water and Sanitary Sewer projects, and a Long Range Transportation Plan.

Please complete the following table for each individual proposed amendment to the Future Land Use Map (**FLUM**) only:

Existing FLUM Category	Proposed FLUM Category	Existing Maximum Density (DU/Acre)	Proposed Maximum Density (DU/Acre)	Existing Maximum Intensity (FAR)	Proposed Maximum Intensity (FAR)	Net Increase or (Decrease) in Maximum Density	Non-Residential Net Increase or (Decrease) in Potential Floor Area

*There are no amendments to the Future Land Use Map.*

8. Is the Amendment consistent with the Strategic Regional Policy Plan?

Generally, the amendment is consistent with the Strategic Regional Policy Plan.

9. Applicable Strategic Regional Policy Plan Goals and Objectives:

This amendment is generally consistent with the following SRPP Goals and Objectives:

Regional Goal 4.2 *Assure an adequate supply of water both in quantity and quality for present and future human, economic development, and ecosystem needs.*

Regional Goal 5.2 *To protect the regions' investment in transportation facilities by managing growth to use exiting facilities and developing high-density multimodal corridors.*

Regional Goal 5.3 *To minimize transportation and land use planning barriers, maximize transportation funding efficiency, and achieve overall planning consistency.*

10. The effects on the Proposed Amendment on Regional Resources or Facilities Identified in the Strategic Regional Policy Plan:

There are no identified effects of the proposed amendments on Regional Resources or Facilities Identified in the Strategic Regional Policy Plan.

11. Extra-Jurisdictional Impacts that would be Inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan of the Affected Local Government:

There are no identified extra-jurisdictional impacts that would be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan of the Affected Local Government:

**Analysis of the effects of the proposed amendments on the following issues to the extent they are addressed in the Strategic Regional Policy Plan on:**

12. Compatibility among local plans including, but not limited to, land use and compatibility with military bases:

There are no identified compatibility issues among local plans including, but not limited to, land use and compatibility with military bases:

13. Impacts to significant regional resources and facilities identified in the Strategic Regional Policy Plan, including, but not limited to, impacts on groundwater recharge and the availability of water supply:

There are no identified impacts to significant regional resources and facilities identified in the Strategic Regional Policy Plan.

14. Affordable housing issues and designation of adequate sites for affordable housing:

There are no affordable housing issues raised by the amendment.

15. Protection of natural resources of regional significance identified in the Strategic Regional Policy Plan including, but not limited to, protection of spring and groundwater resources, and recharge potential:

There are no identified issues to Protection of natural resources of regional significance identified in the Strategic Regional Policy Plan.

16. Compatibility with regional transportation corridors and facilities including, but not limited to, roadways, seaports, airports, public transportation systems, high speed rail facilities, and intermodal facilities:

There are no identified compatibility issues with regional transportation corridors and facilities.

17. Adequacy and compatibility with emergency preparedness plans and local mitigation strategies including, but not limited to, the impacts on and availability of hurricane shelters, maintenance of county hurricane clearance times, and hazard mitigation:

There are no identified adequacy and compatibility issues with emergency preparedness plans and local mitigation strategies.

18. Analysis of the effects of extra-jurisdictional impacts which may be created by the amendment:

There are no identified extra-jurisdictional impacts which may be created by the amendment.

**Recommendation:**

**Staff respectfully recommends that the Committee and the Council find the City of Jacksonville Adopted Amendment 09CIE-1 consistent with the Northeast Florida Strategic Regional Policy Plan.**

# Tab 6

**MEMORANDUM**

**DATE:** November 19, 2009

**TO:** Northeast Florida Regional Council

**THRU:** Planning and Growth Management Policy Committee

**FROM:** Guy Parola, AICP

**RE:** Putnam County Evaluation and Appraisal Report

---

**Scope of Review**

The Northeast Florida Regional Council (Regional Council) received the Putnam County Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR) on November 2, 2009. The EAR was prepared pursuant to the requirements of Section (S.) 163.3191, Florida Statutes (F.S.). Pursuant to Section 163.3191(6), F.S., and the contract between the Department of Community Affairs and the Regional Council, staff has reviewed the EAR for consistency with the Northeast Florida Strategic Regional Policy Plan (SRPP) and the requirements of Section 163.3191 Florida Statutes and Chapter 2005-290, Laws of Florida. This assessment will be one of the bases used to assist the Department of Community Affairs (DCA) in making its findings of sufficiency pertaining to adopted EARs. A Regional Council finding of an EAR consistency, or non-consistency, with the SRPP, does not constrain Regional Council review of EAR based amendments as to SRPP consistency. Staff has prepared this report to forward to the Department of Community Affairs upon approval by the Regional Council.

**EAR History**

Section 163.3191, F.S., requires that "...each local government shall adopt an EAR once every seven years assessing the progress in implementing the local government's comprehensive plan." The EAR assesses the successes and shortcomings of the Comprehensive Plan (the Plan) and provides recommendations for changes. Putnam County adopted the EAR on October 27, 2009. The EAR-based amendments will be adopted 12 to 18 months after adoption of the EAR, at which time the Regional Council will review the amendments for consistency with the Strategic Regional Policy Plan (SRPP).

## **EAR Summary**

Putnam County held public workshops and hearings on the following dates:

<b>Meeting Date</b>	<b>Purpose</b>
Public Workshops	
March 27, 2008	Issue Identification
March 31, 2008	Issue Identification
April 2, 2008	Issue Identification
April 7, 2008	Issue Identification
April 10, 2008	Issue Identification
Scoping Meeting	
February 5, 2008	Coordinated Agency Meeting
Board of County Commissioners	
May 6, 2008	Issues Update and Authorization
Planning Commission (LPA)	
June 17, 2009	EAR Review
Board of County Commissioners	
July 21, 2009	EAR Review
Board of County Commissioners	
October 27, 2009	EAR Adoption

As part of the EAR process, Putnam County identified local major issues, and evaluated the objectives and policies within the Plan to determine whether Putnam County was successfully meeting the objectives and where the underlying policies are being adhered to. An inventory of rule and statutory changes since the last EAR was also performed.

### List of Local Major Issues and Issue Statements

The following local major issues are contained in the Major Issues Review section of the EAR.

#### **Issue #1: Rural Land Conversion to Urban Land Uses**

The EAR poses the question, "How successful have the policies in the Comprehensive Plan been in preserving, diversifying, and expanding Putnam County's active cropland and silviculture lands?"

The EAR determines that "Putnam County's policies have been successful in preserving, diversifying, and expanding active cropland and silviculture lands." Further, analysis of the future land use map amendments since 2005 shows a

decline in urban land use categories and significant increases in the amount of agriculture-designated lands.

The EAR does not contain any specific recommendations.

### **Issue #2: Protection of the Natural Environment**

The EAR poses the question, "How successful has the County's Comprehensive Plan been in addressing wildlife corridors, opportunities to implement programs, and land preservation of wildlife habitats?"

The EAR provides a discussion on existing conservation efforts and plans, such as a wildlife corridor connection from Rice Creek Swamp to the Ocala National Forest.

The EAR does not contain any specific recommendations.

### **Issue #3: Energy**

The EAR poses the question, "How effective has the Comprehensive Plan been in addressing energy and in encouraging related programs such as Energy Star?"

Currently the County's Comprehensive Plan does not address energy and there are no references to encourage related programs such as Energy Star. The adoption of HB 697 requires the County to amend its Future Land Use, Transportation, Housing, Infrastructure, and Conservation Elements for consistency with the new State legislation.

The EAR recommends that the County, within the EAR based amendments, include policies that address the requirements of HB 697.

### **Issue #4: Water**

The EAR poses the question, "How effective has the Comprehensive Plan been in addressing water conservation and in encouraging related programs such as Water Star?"

Putnam County supports the water conservation measures, such as restricted watering, enacted by the SJRWMD. The Putnam County Comprehensive Plan does not address water conservation or encourage programs such as WaterStar<sup>SM</sup>. However, the Land Development Code does require Xeriscaping techniques to be used in landscaping designs.

The EAR recommends that the County amend its Infrastructure Element and its Conservation Element to provide policies on water conservation measures, including encouragement of WaterStar<sup>SM</sup>.

### **Issue #5: Economic Development**

The EAR poses the question, "How has the County used land use policies and decisions to encourage economic development?"

The EAR provides discussion on the County's designation as a RACEC (Rural Area of Critical Economic Concern) county. Economic and population growth comparisons are made for the County, illustrating population, unemployment, and economic growth compared with the United States and Florida. The EAR concludes that the County has been aggressive in establishing future land use goals, objectives and policies to encourage economic development over the last seven years.

The EAR recommends that the County consider policies within the EAR based amendments that promote eco-tourism and other revenue generating industries.

### **Issue #6: Land Use and the St. Johns River**

The EAR poses the question, "How successful has Putnam County's Comprehensive Plan been in keeping appropriate land uses: (a) adjacent to the St. Johns River as well as other significant water bodies; and (b) public access using the Greenprint document?"

The EAR provides an overview of the St. Johns River Greenprint project initiated by the Putnam County Board of County Commissioners. The purpose of the project was to establish a vision for the St. Johns River corridor in Putnam County. The BOCC appointed a 45-member technical advisory committee to represent a variety of interests. "Through GIS mapping analysis, a composite map was developed that identified high-priority lands needed for providing public access to the river. Approximately 80% of lands identified are not protected.

The St. Johns River Greenprint Project recommended that the Comprehensive Plan be amended to adopt policies that will meet the State of Florida's funding criteria for land acquisition programs. In 2008, the County adopted amendments based on the recommendations of the St. Johns River Greenprint Project.

### **Issue #7: Open Space and Recreation**

The EAR poses the question, "How has the Comprehensive Plan addressed the acquisition of land for open space and recreation?"

In 2008, the County adopted text amendments to support acquisition of lands for open space (as previously discussed in Issue #6). The EAR determined that it is too early to gauge the success of the 2008 adopted amendments that were based on the recommendations of the St. Johns River Greenprint Project.

The EAR does not contain any specific recommendations.

**Issue #8: Transportation Issue**

The EAR poses the question, "How effective has the Putnam County's Comprehensive Plan been in addressing concurrency issues, especially on Strategic Intermodal System (SIS) facilities?"

The EAR determines that the Comprehensive Plan has been effective in addressing concurrency issues through maintaining level of service standards. The EAR states that, "Based on concurrency management system in place, none of the transportation facilities that are monitored within the system are operating over capacity. Putnam County shall continue to monitor the concurrency management plan through the guidelines outlined in the Goals, Objectives and Policies of the County's Comprehensive Plan."

The EAR does not contain any specific recommendations.

**Issue #9: Transportation Issue**

The EAR poses the question, "How effective are the Comprehensive Plan's policies in addressing the long-term transportation needs of Putnam County?"

Putnam County analyzed three transportation scenarios: existing conditions (2009), interim conditions (2014) and the long range needs (2030). Based on the traffic assessment, no roadways were determined to operate above the adopted capacity for the existing and interim conditions. However, the following outlines the roadways that operate above the adopted acceptable level of service for the future long range needs of the County (2030):

Roadway / Segment (2030)

Roadway	From	To
US Highway 17	Urban Boundary	SR 100
SR 100	Church Road	Urban Boundary
SR 100	CR 315	Church Road
Palmetto Bluff Road	CR 209/W River Rd	CR 209/W Tocci Rd
St. Johns Avenue	Palm Ave	SR 19

The EAR does not contain any specific recommendations.

**Issue #10: Infrastructure**

The EAR poses the question, "How successful has Putnam County's implementation of the Comprehensive Plan's policies been in achieving its potable water quantity and quality objectives (including stormwater drainage)?"

The EAR determined that Putnam County has been successful in implementing its potable water, groundwater, and surface water quantity and quality objectives. Although Putnam County is not within a *Priority Water Resource Caution Area*, the County and its municipalities prepared a countywide water supply plan. The water supply plan was created in order to address the St. Johns River Water Management District's Regional Water Supply Plan and the related water supply regulations.

The EAR does not contain any specific recommendations.

**Issue #11: Rural Centers**

The EAR poses the question, "To what extent are the existing Rural Centers still viable and should the County use this as a land use concept in Putnam County's Comprehensive Plan?"

According to the EAR, "The Rural Center [Future Land Use] category allows a mix of uses intending to serve as focal points of existing and future development in the rural areas of the County." Putnam County has 21 rural centers designated on their FLUM: the EAR contains a table listing of the Rural Centers, their existing land uses, and their acreages.

The EAR recommends that "the EAR-based amendments should determine whether this [Rural Center] future land use category be open to designation of undeveloped areas."

The following four potential opportunities were posed:

- (1) leave a Rural Center in its current configuration;
- (2) amend the current boundary and retain the Rural Center designation;
- (3) eliminate a Rural Center in its entirety and revert to a currently existing future land use category; or
- (4) eliminate a Rural Center in its entirety and designate a new future land use category that would better fit the existing and proposed future conditions.

**Issue #12: Land Use**

The EAR poses the question, "How has the Comprehensive Plan addressed land use allocation and the respective categories?"

The EAR determines that the County has been "able to retain large amounts of agriculture future land use categories." Much of this due to reclaimed mining lands. A loss of urban service and urban reserve future land use categories was identified, and attributed primarily as the result of annexations into the municipalities.

The EAR does not contain any specific recommendations.

**Issue #13: Capital Improvements**

The EAR assesses "the Capital Improvements Element (CIE) in regards to capital improvements that have been completed and how level of service standards in the CIE have been attained and maintained in a financially feasible capital improvement schedule during the planning horizon under review."

The EAR provides for a relatively detailed discussion of financial feasibility and the 5-year Schedule of Capital Improvements in the individual element summary section.

The EAR recommended that the Comprehensive Plan include new language to reflect the adoption of the proportionate fair share ordinance. Additionally, the EAR recommended that the Concurrency Management System be reviewed, and, if necessary, revised.

Based on analysis provided in the individual element section of the EAR, the following is a recommendation within the EAR that is of regional significance:

*Infrastructure Element*

- Revise Infrastructure Element to address revisions to Ch. 163.3177, F.S., regarding surface and groundwater resources and the St. Johns River Water Management District's Regional Water Supply Plan.

Special Topics

*Note: Special Topics are discussed within the individual element discussion of section 2 of the EAR.*

**1. School Location and Concurrency**

In 2008, the County adopted its Public School Facilities Element. The objectives of the Public School Facilities Element include providing school capacity at the adopted level of service, establishing public school concurrency service areas, establishing locational requirements for schools, and inclusion of the School District's annual update into the Five-Year Schedule of Capital Improvements.

**2. Coordination of Transportation Impact Methodologies**

The EAR states that, "Putnam County and neighboring jurisdictions are using professionally accepted methodologies for measuring traffic impacts of proposed projects for concurrency management. There are variations in the components of the methodologies. However, at this EAR period, Putnam County does not see a need to develop a common methodology for measuring impacts on transportation facilities for the purpose of implementing the County's concurrency management system."

**3. Water Supply Planning**

As previously mentioned, Putnam County is not within a *priority water resource caution area*. However, this may change by the time of the adoption of EAR based amendments. The County and its municipalities prepared a countywide water supply plan, in part to address the St. Johns River Water Management District's Regional Water Supply Plan and the related water supply regulations.

In order to address water consumption, the EAR recommends that the County amend its Infrastructure Element and its Conservation Element to provide policies on water conservation measures, including encouragement of WaterStar<sup>SM</sup>.

**4. Financial Feasibility**

Putnam County adopted a Five- Year Schedule of Capital Improvements that was consistent with the requirements of SB 360. Putnam County maintains and updates its Five-Year Schedule of Capital Improvements through the annual update process and as necessary with related future land use map amendments. An update of the schedule was adopted in November 2008.

## **5. Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

Currently the County's Comprehensive Plan does not address energy and there are no references to encourage related programs such as Energy Star. The Governor's approval of House Bill 7135 and 697 is a follow up to three executive orders signed in 2007.

The EAR states that, "Putnam County will amend the Comprehensive Plan to consider the new requirements and assess how the proposed amendments will comply during the EAR based amendments." Further, "The County will need to consider the following elements to address the State's energy policies.

The Future Land Use element may include the following provisions:

1. Discourage urban sprawl
2. Incorporate energy efficient land use patterns accounting for existing and future electric power generation and transmission systems
3. Incorporate greenhouse gas reduction strategies."

### **Comment:**

In the courtesy review provided to the County, NEFRC staff noted that, "the City of Palatka became classified as a *dense urban land area*, or 'DULA', community. As a DULA community, transportation concurrency no longer applies. However, transportation concurrency remains applicable to Putnam County."

While the EAR provides substantial discussion on transportation methodology consistency between adjacent local governments, the EAR does not specifically address the City of Palatka's DULA classification.

As a DULA community, the entire City of Palatka is within a *transportation concurrency exception area* or TCEA. By statute, the City of Palatka has two years (from July of 2009) to adopt a mobility plan. Staff encourages the County to actively engage the City of Palatka for the purposes of addressing County and State roadways that will be affected by the Palatka's DULA designation (e.g., US 17, SR 100, St. Johns Avenue), and to be an active participant while the City of Palatka develops its mobility plan.

**Board Memorandum**

**November 19, 2009**

**Page 10**

**Recommendation:**

**Staff respectfully recommends that the Committee and the Council recommend to the Department of Community Affairs that the Putnam County Evaluation and Appraisal Report is sufficient and consistent with the Northeast Florida Strategic Regional Policy Plan.**

---

**Disclosure:**

The Northeast Florida Regional Council   x   did    did not assist in the preparation of the Evaluation and Appraisal Report.

# **Tab 7**

## MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** November 24, 2009

**TO:** Northeast Florida Regional Council

**THRU:** Planning and Growth Management Policy Committee  
*EL*

**FROM:** Edward Lehman, Director of Transportation and Community Development

**RE:** November Development of Regional Impact Report

---

The following report summarizes current DRI activity for the above-cited month. All additions and updates are *italicized*.

### **Cordova Palms**

The ADA for Cordova Palms was submitted on April 19, 2006. Cordova Palms was formerly known as Lemberg North. The pre-application conference for the DRI was held on October 25<sup>th</sup>. The project is located along the western side of U.S. 1 just west of the St. Augustine Airport. The master development plan calls for 1700 residential dwelling units, 600,000 square feet of retail, and 100,000 square feet of office development. First sufficiency review was transmitted to the applicant on May 22, 2006. The first sufficiency response was received on September 11, 2006. Second sufficiency review comments were transmitted to the applicant on October 11, 2006. The applicant recently requested and received a 90-day extension to the 120-day period to respond to the first sufficiency review. The applicant submitted the second sufficiency response on July 13, 2007. The County has been notified to set the public hearing for the D.O. The applicant has requested a waiver from the 90-day period to have the hearing to allow for the Comprehensive Plan amendment to be processed. *Meetings are scheduled in early December to discuss a modification of the development plan and the completion of the review of the DRI.*

### **Durbin**

The pre-application conference for the Durbin DRI was held on December 6, 2006. The Durbin DRI is located along I-95 at Racetrack Road in northern St. Johns County, along the Duval County line. The master development plan calls for 4,500 dwelling units, 1,700,000 square feet of office development, 3,000,000 square feet of retail development and 800 hotel rooms. The ADA for Durbin has been submitted. A

**November DRI Report**  
**November 24, 2009**  
**Page 2**

sufficiency response was transmitted to the applicant on February 9. The applicant has requested an additional extension until August in order to work with FDOT on alignments of roadway improvements. The deadline for submittal has expired; the applicant is continuing to work with the agencies to address planning issues before further pursuing the project.

**Elkton**

The Elkton DRI is a proposed multi-use DRI located in St. Johns County along S.R. 207 west of I-95. The pre-application conference was held on January 27<sup>th</sup>. The proposed development plan consists of a three-phase development, with 3600 dwelling units, 40,000 square feet of office, 140,000 square feet of retail, 40,000 square feet of medical, and 70,000 square feet of industrial. The sufficiency review for Elkton was transmitted to the applicant on Sept 13 – transportation comments were transmitted on Sept 27. The applicant has submitted the first sufficiency response. Second sufficiency review comments were transmitted to the applicant on February 2. The applicant has submitted the second sufficiency response, and the Council staff has notified St. Johns County to set the public hearing.

**Old Brick Township**

The Old Brick Township DRI is a proposed multi-use DRI located in Flagler County in the northern portion of the County along the St. Johns County line. The property is located west of U.S. 1 and east of C.R. 13 (Old Brick Road). The pre-application conference was held on December 14<sup>th</sup>. The proposed development plan calls for three five-year phases and consists of 5,000 dwelling units, 1,000,000 square feet of industrial development, 50,000 square feet of office development, and 100,000 square feet of commercial development. The ADA was submitted for review, with the sufficiency response transmitted to the applicant on June 26. Staff participated in a May 27<sup>th</sup> meeting with City of Palm Coast staff at DCA to discuss this project as well as Three Lakes. Because Palm Coast is defined by SB 360 as a Dense Urban Land Area (DULA), the DRI developer has the option to opt out of DRI review. The sufficiency response was submitted for review in late August, indicating the applicant's intent to continue in the process. Second sufficiency review comments were transmitted to the applicant on September 25.

### **Hunter's Ridge Substantial Deviation**

Hunter's Ridge is an approved DRI in Flagler County and Ormond Beach. As part of the settlement of an appeal of the D.O., in 1992 an area of Hunter's Ridge was determined to be a "Substantial Deviation Area." No development can occur until this area of the project goes through substantial deviation review. The pre-application conference was held on January 18 in Flagler County. The applicant has indicated they intend to submit the ADA soon. Because no ADA was submitted within one year, a follow up pre-application meeting was held on April 14<sup>th</sup>. Agencies that participated were provided an overview of the changes to the plan that was reviewed in January, 2008, and provided comments on those changes and other proposed methodology changes. The amount of development proposed within the Substantial Deviation Area in the pre-application document consists of 849 single-family dwelling units, 69,900 square feet of office space, 52,580 square feet of retail space, and 58,520 square feet of light industrial space, however the applicant has indicated intent to increase residential development in the ADA. The ADA was submitted and the first sufficiency review was transmitted to the applicant on September 30.

### **Watermark**

The pre-application conference for Watermark, a proposed DRI in St. Johns County, was held on January 23<sup>rd</sup>. The proposed DRI is located in the northwest quadrant of the S.R. 206/I-95 interchange, and is consistent with the County's FLUM. The proposed amount of development consists of 4,900 residential dwelling units, 325,000 square feet of retail, 150,000 square feet of office, and 1,000,000 square feet of industrial development in three five-year phases. *The DRI ADA was received and is currently under sufficiency review.*

### **Neoga Lakes**

The pre-application conference for Watermark, a proposed DRI in the City of Palm Coast, is scheduled for April 3<sup>rd</sup>. The proposed DRI is located west of U.S. 1 just north of the Espanola area, just south of the proposed Old Kings Park DRI. The proposed amount of development consists of 7,000 residential dwelling units, 369,000 square feet of retail, 100,000 square feet of civic/office, and 1,870,000 square feet of industrial/office development in three six-year phases. The City of Palm Coast is scheduling a series of meetings to address need for coordination of this project and the Old Brick Township bordering to the north; in particular, the City wants to address concerns expressed by DCA over the location and need for these two DRIs. The City of Palm Coast has been designated a DULA in SB 360. However, the applicant has added land in Flagler County and, being located partially within a non-DULA community, the applicant is required to undergo DRI review. *The First Sufficiency review was transmitted to the applicant on November 25.*

**The following is a rough estimate of the date for presentation of DRI projects to the NEFRC for consideration of the staff recommendation:**

<u>Project</u>	<u>Date</u>
Durbin	December 2010
Cordova Palms	April 2010
Elkton	Unknown
Old Brick Township	June 2010
Hunter's Ridge Substantial Deviation	April 2010
Watermark	September 2010
Neoga Lakes	February 2010

# Tab 8

## MEMORANDUM

DATE: November 24, 2009

TO: Northeast Florida Regional Council

THRU: Planning and Growth Management Policy Committee Chairman

FROM: Debbie Balevre, Program Coordinator <sup>DB</sup>

RE: Intergovernmental Coordination and Review (IC&R) Status Log and Report Activity for the Month of November 2009.

Applications received for review through the IC& R process totaled 25. Below is a summary of IC&R activity for the month of November 2009 by category.

Environmental Permits: 25 Applications

Grant Requests: 0 Application

Application fund sources are broken down as follows:

	Current Month	Year to Date
<b>Federal</b>	\$18,217,183.00	\$40,217,409.80
<b>State</b>	13,488.00	67,9767.60
<b>Applicant</b>		38,604,237.00
<b>Other/Local</b>	13,488.00	17,102,545.36
<b>Totals</b>	\$134,880.00	\$102,771,863.76

All applications were reviewed internally and have been processed accordingly. Each active and completed application is reported in the: **MONTHLY IC&R REVIEW DATA BASE – October 22, 2009- November 24, 2009.**

Nov-09

<b>BAKER</b>						
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.		Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due	SCH Due	Status

<b>CLAY</b>						
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
CL-0015	<b>EXEMPT</b>	Clay Co. COA	Elderly & Persons w/ disabilities Program	Clay Co, COA		\$134,880.00
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due	SCH Due	Status
\$107,904.00		\$13,488.00	\$13,488.00	11/3/09		

<b>DUVAL</b>						
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
Federal	<b>EXEMPT</b>					
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due	SCH Due	Status

<b>NASSAU</b>						
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due	SCH Due	Status

<b>PUTNAM</b>						
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
Federal		Federal				
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due	SCH Due	Status

<b>ST. JOHNS</b>						
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
Federal	<b>EXEMPT</b>					
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due	SCH Due	Status

	Current Month	Year to Date
Federal	\$107,904.00	\$40,325,313.80
State	\$13,488.00	\$6,739,767.60
Applicant		\$38,604,237.00
Other/Local	\$13,488.00	\$17,102,545.36
Totals	\$134,880.00	\$102,771,863.76