



**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BOARD  
May 21, 2013**

**1. CALL TO ORDER. - 6:02pm**

Chair Brea Paul verified the presence of a quorum with the attendance of Jason Burgess, Kelly Elmore, Kirk Hansen, Brea Paul, Sylvia Simmons, and Patrick Stratton. The meeting was called to order at 6:02pm. Also present was Principal Planner Erika Hall. Board member Harley Parkes was absent.

**2. ADOPTION OF MEETING MINUTES – APRIL 16, 2013.**

Ms. Paul called for a motion to approve the minutes of the May 21, 2013 regular meeting. Mr. Hansen requested, for a point of clarification, that the minutes be amended to note that he serves on the Board of Directors for the Selva Marina Country Club, Inc, and that he is a participant in the LLC providing bridge financing to the Club. However, since nothing decided by the CDB would affect his financial interests, he declared he had no conflict of interest and therefore would not recuse himself from taking part in the public hearing and vote. Mr. Elmore moved that minutes be approved, with the modification as requested by Mr. Hansen. Mr. Hansen seconded the motion and it carried by a vote of 6-0.

**3. OLD BUSINESS. *None.***

**4. NEW BUSINESS.**

**A. REZ-13-00100052, 1 Fleet Landing Boulevard [Kami Corbett, Foley & Lardner, LLP, and Brian Burke, Brian Burke Associates, on behalf of Naval Continuing Care Retirement Foundation Inc (Fleet Landing)]**

***Public Hearing - Request to modify the existing Fleet Landing Planned Unit Development (PUD) as approved by Ordinance No. 90-88-135 and amended by Ordinance No. 90-90-152, to incorporate an additional 2.06 acres and reconfigure the Master Development Plan to allow the relocation of the existing maintenance facility and the construction of a new Memory Care Center.***

***Staff  
Report***

Ms. Hall explained that Fleet Landing was originally approved as a Planned Unit Development in 1989, and later amended in 1990 for the inclusion of an additional 1.7 acres and relocation of certain previously approved facilities in 1990. She said that amendment was similar to the request before the Board today, explaining that Naval Continuing Care Retirement Foundation, Inc, as the owner of Fleet Landing, has recently acquired a two-acre parcel with

frontage on Mayport Road, and they now wish to incorporate that parcel which also abuts the existing Fleet Landing property, into the PUD and relocate the maintenance facilities from the current location in the northwest corner of the property to the new parcel. Doing so would allow the construction of a specialized skilled nursing facility – called the Nancy House, for the treatment of Alzheimer’s patients – directly adjacent to the existing skilled nursing facility.

Ms. Hall noted that the approved PUD allowed up to a maximum of three hundred twenty-four (324) independent dwellings and eighty-eight (88) skilled nursing beds, for a total of four hundred twelve (412) units. Of those, three hundred twenty (320) independent dwellings and eighty (80) beds, for a total of four hundred (400) units, have been constructed, meaning that there are twelve (12) additional units still available that could be constructed. The proposed modification calls for the use of eight (8) of those unconstructed units held in reserve, and the relocation of sixteen (16) beds from the existing skilled nursing facility, leaving four (4) units in reserve for future use.

Ms. Hall stated that the proposed modification, including the rezoning of the new parcel from Commercial General (CG) to Planned Unit Development (PUD) is entirely consistent with the underlying Future Land Use designation of Commercial (CM). Also, she said the proposed modification is generally consistent with the description of a minor deviation, as provided in Section 24-124 of the Land Development Regulations, particularly noting that there was no proposed change in use, as both skilled nursing and maintenance facilities are provided on the approved site development plan; that there is no plan to increase building height, density or intensity, and that the addition of 2.06 acres actually resulted in a slight decrease in density; that there is no decrease in buffers or open space proposed; and that there are no changes to the existing access points or driveways.

***Applicant  
Comment***

Kami Corbett, an attorney with Foley & Lardner, LLP (Tampa office), said she represented Fleet Landing in this matter. Ms. Corbett said that she had reviewed the staff report and agreed with the position that the request was supportive of the Comprehensive Plan and consistent with the Land Development Regulations. She introduced Brian Burke, of Brian Burke Associates (Atlantic Beach) as the Planner on the project, and said that Mr. Burke would address any questions regarding the proposed modification to the

site development plan. Mr. Burke displayed exhibits showing the location of the new parcel, and explaining the plan to relocate the existing maintenance facilities and construct the new Memory Care Center. He noted that the new maintenance facilities would be located 150-200 from the front property line, and therefore would be out of the delineated Mayport Road Commercial Corridor, and that front area would be preserved as a wooded area, possibly for future development. He added that the new parcel would be fenced and there would be a right-in only access from Mayport Road, but it would be gated and secured.

***Public  
Comment***

No one from the audience came forth to give comment on the request.

***Board  
Discussion***

Mr. Hansen asked why the additional parcel was needed, why they had not used undeveloped space within the existing PUD, to which Mr. Burke responded that any perceived “undeveloped” space within the existing PUD was actually designated as required buffer and/or open space. Additionally, relocation of the maintenance facility was a logistic decision. Relocation of the maintenance facility to the new parcel would allow direct access via Mayport Road, thus removing delivery traffic and relieving congestion at the primary entrance on Fleet Landing Boulevard.

Mr. Stratton stated that he wished to disclose that while he has no financial interest in Fleet Landing, his parents have lived there for more than twenty years.

Mr. Elmore stated that he had no issues with the proposal, recognizing this as more of a matter of house-keeping. He congratulated the consultants on a job well done and thanked them for providing a succinct and well-organized application and presentation. Mr. Burgess concurred.

***Motion***

Mr. Elmore moved that the Community Development Board recommend approval of the Fleet Landing PUD Modification (Application REZ-13-00100052) to the City Commission, for the lands described within said application, approving the incorporation of an additional 2.06 acres into the Planned Unit Development and revision of the site development plan, and adopting the application and supporting documents, and all terms and conditions set forth therein, subject to conditions enumerated, and providing the following findings of fact: (1) The request for PUD Modification, including rezoning of 2.06 acres from Commercial General (CG) to Planned Unit Development (PUD), has

been fully considered after public hearing with legal notice duly published as required by law; (2) The proposed PUD Modification, specifically the rezoning of 2.06 acres from Commercial General (CG) to Planned Unit Development (PUD), is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the Future Land Use Designation of Commercial (CM); (3) The proposed PUD Modification is consistent with the Land Development Regulations, specifically Article III, Division 6, establishing standards for modification to previously approved Planned Unit Developments; (4) The requested rezoning and the proposed site development plan are consistent with the stated definition, intent and purpose of Planned Unit Developments; (5) The zoning district classification of Planned Unit Development, and the specific uses and special conditions as set forth therein, are consistent and compatible with surrounding development. Mr. Burgess seconded the motion and it passed unanimously, 6-0.

**5. REPORTS.** *None.*

**6. ADJOURNMENT - 6:16 PM**

---

**Brea Paul, Chair**

---

**Attest**