



MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD

August 11, 2020

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairperson Paul Ritz, Board Member Grundhoefer

MEMBERS VIRTUAL: Vice Chairperson Larson, Board Member Murphy, Board Member Powell, Board Member Sampson

MEMBERS ABSENT: Board Member Wiggins

STAFF PRESENT: Assistant Planning Director Cannon, Senior Planner Statler, Assistant City Attorney Lindsay (virtual), Historic Preservation Planner Harding, City Surveyor Odom, City Engineer Hinote, Councilwoman Myers, Network Engineer Johnston, Digital Media Coordinator Rose

OTHERS VIRTUAL: Mitchell Hubbell, Shadia Jaramillo

AGENDA:

- Quorum/Call to Order
- Approval of Meeting Minutes from July 14, 2020.
- **New Business:**
 1. **657 Aragon St – Gateway Review District – New Two Story S/F Residence**
 2. **671 Centros St – Gateway Review District – New Two Story S/F Residence**
 3. **PROPOSED LDC AMENDMENTS - SEC. 12-2-27 (D)(2). - BAYOU TEXAR SHORELINE PROTECTION DISTRICT. SEC. 12-2-27 (F). - BAYOU TEXAR SHORELINE PROTECTION DISTRICT. SEC. 12-3-3 (G). - PARKING LOTS. SEC. 12-9-4. - EXEMPTIONS. SEC. 12-9-6 (E). - DESIGN STANDARDS FOR STORMWATER MANAGEMENT SYSTEM.**
- Open Forum
- Discussion on the Proposed Amendment to the Tree Ordinance
- Adjournment

Call to Order / Quorum Present

Chairperson Ritz called the meeting to order at 2:00 pm with a quorum present and explained the procedures of the virtual Board meeting.

222 West Main Street Pensacola, Florida 32502

www.cityofpensacola.com

Approval of Meeting Minutes

Board Member Larson made a motion to approve the July 14, 2020 minutes, seconded by Board Member Powell, and it carried unanimously.

New Business

657 ARAGON ST – GATEWAY REVIEW DISTRICT – NEW TWO STORY RESIDENCE

Chairperson Ritz stated he had no problem with the designs submitted by Mr. Sallis and had no input except to say he appreciated the design effort.

Mr. Sallis presented to the Board and stated his client was moving here from Mississippi, and they had received approval from the Aragon committee. They hoped to begin construction in the fall of 2020. Chairperson Ritz explained this project would fill in an empty spot along this roadway, and Board Member Grundhoefer advised it looked very attractive. He explained this Board depends on the Aragon ARB for their knowledge, and this project had received their preliminary approval.

Board Member Grundhoefer made a motion to approve, seconded by Board Member Larson, and it carried unanimously.

671 CENTROS ST – GATEWAY REVIEW DISTRICT – NEW TWO STORY RESIDENCE

Mr. Sallis presented to the Board and explained this project had been before the Aragon ARB and received preliminary approval. Chairperson Ritz again appreciated the design which played off the existing structures already in Aragon.

Board Member Larson made a motion to approve, seconded by Board Member Powell, and it carried unanimously. Mr. Sallis was excited to see new faces on the Board and thanked them for their service.

PROPOSED LDC AMENDMENTS

Proposed LDC Amendments - Sec. 12-2-27 (D) (2). - Bayou Texar shoreline protection district. Sec. 12-2-27 (F). - Bayou Texar shoreline protection district. Sec. 12-3-3 (G). – Parking lots. Sec. 12-9-4. – Exemptions. Sec. 12-9-6 (E). - Design standards for stormwater management system. Sec. 12-8-2. – Prohibition. Sec. 12-8-3. – Procedure for subdivision approval. Sec. 12-8-8. Preliminary plat. Sec. 12-8-9. Final plat. Sec. 12-8-10. Final approval. Appendix A Design Standards.

Chairperson Ritz appreciated the amendments bringing the Code in line with the neighboring jurisdictions and saw it as a housekeeping effort to codify several items so that developers coming before the City had a better series of rules with which to operate. Assistant Planning Director Cannon stated normally changes were indicated in a strike-through underline format, but in this case, nothing was struck through.

In Sec. 12-2-27 (F) (d), Board Member Murphy asked the meaning of the “greatest extent possible.” City Engineer Hinote stated the intent of the language was ultimately to collect and retain fertilizers from the adjacent yards; the intent was to allow alternatives to retain nutrients before discharging into the bay. Board Member Murphy asked if there was a technology-based standard for the City. Mr. Hinote advised that sediments were collected on site and (e) addressed the size of the pond required which was a technology-based standard. He also noted these standards applied only to the Bayou Texar District – shoreline waterfront property. Board Member Murphy referenced a section outside of this district and wanted to know if this language could be a protection standard. Chairperson Ritz advised the Board could not go to a parcel specific addition since this was not advertised, but it could be a future agenda item.

Board Member Powell addressed Sec. 12-2-27 (D) (2) (c) “meeting City standards” and asked if applicants would go through the permitting process. Mr. Hinote stated if you install 1500 sq. ft. or less, they would not have to hire a civil engineer for a pond, but they would still need erosion control, and a building permit would be required.

Board Member Grundhoefer stated in 12-2-4 (B), the 1500 sq. ft. looked like this was an exemption. Mr. Hinote advised this was intended to be a cumulative calculation. Staff advised any amendments were always brought to Legal before presentation to the Board. Chairperson Ritz explained the language could be revised, and Board Member Grundhoefer suggested sending it back to staff to clarify that language.

Board Member Grundhoefer addressed 12-3-3 (G) parking lots. Mr. Hinote stated most of the time, the intent of gutter pan was to allow flow of water. Parking cars in it would not allow flow as it was intended. Board Member Grundhoefer addressed the sod at the pond bottom, noting the City did not want sod but the County did. Mr. Hinote explained with sod, you end up with a thick clay layer at the bottom of the pond which will not allow water to percolate. Chairperson Ritz clarified that sod could bring in other elements which would not allow water percolation. Regarding the 1500 sq. ft. language, Board Member Grundhoefer explained Engineering would probably like some leeway, but did not believe they should be able to “waive” the requirement. Chairperson Ritz stated other Board members seemed to prefer to strike the word “waive.” **Board Member Murphy made a motion to change the language and return the document at the September meeting. The motion was seconded by Board Member Larson. Staff confirmed the changes to include “cumulative not to exceed 1500 sq. ft.,” which would be filtered through Legal; also, to omit the word “waive” to state “that the City Engineer may increase this requirement as warranted.”**

Board Member Powell addressed 12-2-27 (D) (2) with the “1500 sq. ft. which are not part of a larger development” for clarification. She thought it might be a loophole for someone to say it was 1500 sq. ft. but not a part of the larger project. Board Member Murphy addressed 12-9-4 (B) “Projects that include the addition of 1500 sq. ft.” Board Member Grundhoefer stated this referred to additional square footage after the already permitted project development. Mr. Hinote wanted to clearly distinguish that 12-9 is specific to commercial development and what would allow them to become exempt (parking lots, hospitals, etc.) For example, to add two additional parking spaces would not require a civil engineer. Exemption was to allow additional impervious surfaces without having to add a retention pond. He stressed a single home residence has no requirement for stormwater treatment or attenuation. He explained the City’s stormwater attenuation requirements are more stringent (requiring 100 year attenuation) than the Northwest Florida Water Management District.

Chairperson Ritz clarified that the 1500 sq. ft. involved the Bayou Texar shoreline protection district, and parking lots with the 1500 sq. ft. exemption. Senior Planner Statler advised Mr. Hinote used the parking lot as an example; currently, they would have to hire a civil engineer to add two parking spaces, and the intent was to allow them to have an exemption. Mr. Hinote advised modifying that language of 1500 sq. ft. could be done. Chairperson Ritz explained modifying it to 2000 would be too much 1500 was more reasonable. Board Member Grundhoefer asked if language could be revised to state that with the impervious area being added, the runoff would be directed toward the existing pond. Mr. Hinote explained that was already noted in a different section of the LDC and could be cited. Board Member Powell advised the language to indicate where the water must go could possibly be in 12-2-27 (D).

The motion then carried unanimously. Chairperson Ritz explained the proposed amendments would be sent back to Engineering staff for further clarification and brought back at a later Planning Board meeting.

Open Forum – None

Discussion on the Proposed Amendment to the Tree Ordinance

Board Member Murphy advised they were working on ways to conduct public meetings versus zoom meetings requiring computer technology. Possible amendment modifications would be coming to the Board in September. Staff explained the public could still participate in meetings virtually; however due to Covid they would not be permitted to attend in person. Chairperson Ritz explained Board Member comments or suggestions would be furnished to staff for dissemination.

Adjournment – With no further business, Chairperson Ritz thanked the Board for its patience with the change in methods of physical and virtual participation and adjourned the meeting at 3:20 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Cynthia Cannon, AICP
Assistant Planning Director
Secretary to the Board