

CITY OF ATLANTIC BEACH LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE REWRITE

PROPOSED AMENDMENT MATRIX

(5/10/2019)

(*Note: Will need to verify all references to Sections once final blackline document is prepared)

| SECTION/REFERENCE | PAGE # | REASON FOR PROPOSED CHANGE | | PROPOSED CHANGE/ACTION | COMPLETE |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|----------|
| | | LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS REVIEW | | | |
| 1 | GENERAL | | Check all lists of permitted uses | Add uses that may not be included | ✓ |
| | GENERAL | | Preambles | Pay attention to Billiard halls, tattoo parlors, pawn shops, headshops, internet cafes, gambling parlor (some need to be permitted due to freedom of expression; vague references to hours of operation) | ✓ |
| 2 | Sec. 24-17 | 3 | Definitions need to be updated | Add definitions/use F.S. Definitions as a basis; add definitions for all zoning districts; reference that fences and walls to be used interchangeably as in Sec. 24-157; remove requirements within definitions | ✓ |
| 3 | Definitions | 9 | Garage apartments | Need to change reference to Sec 24-89 instead of Sec 24-88 | ✓ |
| 4 | Sec. 24-46 (d) | 29 | Waivers and variances are an issue | Revised so the process stops at the CDB; clarified difference between waiver and variance; added administrative amendment process; | |
| 5 | Sec. 24-47 | 30 | CDB | Give CDB as much authority as possible and allow CC to focus on implementation | ✓ |
| 6 | Sec. 24-63 | 45 | Use by Exception | Changed the process to go only to the CDB unless appealed to CC. This streamlines the process. Consider changing permitted use table to move some of the uses by exception to permitted uses with supplemental requirements | ✓ |
| 7 | Sec. 24.69 | 57 | Fees | Remove from adopted LDRs | ✓ |
| 8 | Sec. 24-82(c) | 61 | Height for non-conforming structures | Should not be addressed so strictly; revise | |
| 9 | Sec. 24-82(h) | 62 | Duplicates or externally similar dwellings | Review and revise as appropriate | ✓ |
| 10 | Sec. 24-82(j) | 62 | Remove FAR for residential units | Consider expressing residential density in terms of dwellings/acre; consider minimum square footage per unit | ✓ |
| 11 | Sec. 24-172(c) (3) | 63 | Required yards and permitted projections into required yards | Review this section | ✓ |
| 12 | Sec. 24-83(b) | 59 | Structural projections | What is considered a projection – clarify | ✓ |
| 13 | Sec. 24-83(c) | 63 | Mechanical equipment | Needs to be reviewed; hard to enforce; consider making it a specific measurement and not tied to living space | ✓ |
| 14 | Sec. 24-84 | 60 | Double frontage lots | Very restrictive/confusing; front yards of through lots need to be better defined | ✓ |
| 15 | Sec. 24-85 | 65 | Non-conforming lots, uses and structures | Consider streamlining this whole section; Per staff Section 85 and 86 contradict each other – consider code change that allows that if an addition conforms to the Code, no variance is required; add language regarding single owner; better define non-conforming lots, uses, and structures | ✓ |
| 16 | Sec. 24-85(b)(2) and (c)(1) | 65 & 66 | One deals with lots and the other structures but both cite structure expansion | Considered streamlining. One deals with lots of record which are afforded more flexibility; other deals with nonconforming structures. | ✓ |
| 17 | Sec. 24-85(b)(3) | 61 | Combining of lots | City wants to make it clear that lots that are combined that don't meet current code requirements if they were to be separated | ✓ |
| 18 | Sec. 24-85(c)(6) and (d)(4) | 66 & 67 | One deals with structures and the other lots but both cite structure reconstruction | Seems like (d)(4) should be combined with (c)(6) | ✓ |
| 19 | Sec 24-88 | 63 | Townhome Standards | These should be addressed for redevelopment, additions, grandfathering; consider adding language that indicates that if the original use of the structure remains, then the building is not considered non-conforming (Mark has draft language we can consider); keep architectural style and color – strike work “material” from list under 24-88(b) – it should be easy for the property owner to be able to upgrade his home if it is keeping with the character of the adjacent portion of the duplex | ✓ |

| | SECTION/REFERENCE | PAGE # | REASON FOR PROPOSED CHANGE | PROPOSED CHANGE/ACTION | COMPLETE |
|----|--------------------------------|-----------|--|--|----------------------------|
| 20 | Sec. 24-105 – Sec. 24-108 | 73-82 | Residential Zoning Districts | Densities permitted under the Comp Plan not reflected here; consider adding a table – need to add R-SM and TMP | ✓ need to have FAR for TMP |
| 21 | Sec. 24-109 – 24-112 | 82-95 | Commercial, professional office | Consider adding Comp Plan FARs here | ✓ |
| 22 | Sec. 24-117 | 96 | Special Planned Area District Defined | Move to definitions section; other districts are not defined in their respective sections | ✓ |
| 23 | Sec. 24-151(b)(1)c. | | Accessory Structures | Need to better clarify garage apartments (reconcile with Sec. 24-89) | ✓ |
| 24 | Sec. 24-151(f)(2) | | Shared Parking | Add Deed Language – coordinate with Brenna (city commission workshop #2) | |
| 25 | Sec. 24-152 | 103 | Child Care (Mark noted) | Make sure it complies with Florida Statutes | ✓ |
| 26 | Sec 24-157 | | Corner Lots | Needs to be addressed - research other communities to see what their definition of corner lot is – which side becomes the front; or consider giving staff the leeway to make interpretations; fence height | ✓ |
| 27 | Sec. 24-157(a) and (d) | 108 & 110 | Fences, Walls and Similar Structures – if fences and walls are to be used interchangeably in Section (a), why do we have walls restated in Section (d) | Define better. | ✓ |
| 28 | Sec. 24-158(d)(2) | 113 | Fees for Dog Friendly Restaurant Application | Review reference to fees being in Section 24-69 add to fee schedule. Fee schedule has been removed from the code. City staff needs to add fees for dog friendly restaurant applications the fee schedule, as it is missing. (KHA is not taking any action on this item.) | ✓ |
| 29 | Sec. 24-161(e) | 122 | Uses not specifically mentioned. | I haven't seen this before and am curious how often it comes up; refine – intended to provide flexibility | ✓ |
| 30 | Sec. 24-161 | 121 | Off-street parking and loading | Add landscape requirements or reference Sec. 24-177; define loading zone requirements | ✓ |
| 31 | Sec. 24-161(h) | 123 | Parking space requirements | Double check against latest ITE requirements; consider reducing parking amounts and/or shared parking; consider a more urban requirement than suburban; parking standards for warehousing is based on shift; include a parking standards table for ease of use | ✓ |
| 32 | Sec. 24-161(k) | 125 | Bicycle parking | Add quantity; also consider provide incentives to developments that include additional bicycle parking by reducing parking requirements – better clarify; add standards for bikes, golf carts, compact cars, diagonal parking | ✓ |
| 33 | Sec. 24-162(b) | 126 | Parking lots | For discussion, what if dwellings are built after parking lot? can it be measurable? Based on zoning, not land use | ✓ |
| 34 | Sec. 24-163(b)(4) | 127 | Typo | Uncapitalize "Lot" to "lot" | ✓ |
| 35 | Sec. 24-167 | 109 | Enforcement of buffers | | |
| 36 | Sec. 24-171 | 131 | Delineation of commercial corridors | Let's discuss leaving this definition here but also adding it to the Definitions section; also consider a map showing the locations | ✓ |
| 37 | Sec. 24-171(c)(3) | 132 | Typo | Uncapitalize "Building" to "building" | ✓ |
| 38 | Sec. 24-172 | 133 | Residential development standards | Unusual to have Comp Plan GOPS – consider removing especially considering the Comp Plan references are no longer accurate – reference Comp Plan don't reiterate language; reword purpose and intent; remove GOPs; reference current Comp Plan (2040?) | ✓ |
| 39 | Sec. 24-172 (a) Policy A.1.4.3 | 112 | Architectural features (Old Atlantic Beach standards) | Need to be clarified to reach the same result as is currently intended | |
| 40 | Sec. 24-172(b) | 134 | Applicability | Consider adding a map showing the locations – City has a map - just not in the LDRs | ✓ |
| 41 | Sec. 24-172(d)(2)(a) | 115 | Reconstruction after natural disaster | This section needs to be reviewed – what percent can be restored; add percentages to the landscaping that can be restored not just buildings; add language regarding if the use is the same as the original use, it can be rebuilt in its entirety | ✓ |
| 42 | Sec. 24-174(d) | 140 | Public docks and anchoring and mooring restrictions | Consider adding a map showing the locations – Is it in the text? | |
| 43 | Sec. 24-174(e) | 141 | Live-aboard vessels prohibited | Move definition to Definitions section | ✓ |
| 44 | Sec. 24-176 | 141 | Definitions | Move to Definitions section | ✓ |
| 45 | Sec. 24-179 | 150 | Florida-friendly landscaping defined | Move to Definitions section | ✓ |
| 46 | Sec. 24-180 | 150 | Definitions | Move to Definitions section | ✓ |

| | SECTION/REFERENCE | PAGE # | REASON FOR PROPOSED CHANGE | PROPOSED CHANGE/ACTION | COMPLETE |
|----|-------------------|--------|---|---|----------|
| 47 | Sec. 24-182 | 154 | Florida-friendly use of fertilizer on urban landscapes | Remove []; also consider revising this and not including "Findings;" move definitions to Definitions section | ✓ |
| 48 | Sec. 24-182 | 161 | Schedule of fines | Remove from LDRs and create stand-alone fine schedule | ✓ |
| 49 | Sec. 24-188 | 162 | Requirements for approval and recording of a final subdivision plat or replat | Review Chapter 177, Part I, F.S. and revise regulation accordingly to address what conditions and items need to be addressed on a plat; confirm if it can be an administrative function | ✓ |
| 50 | Sec. 24-190 | 163 | Multiple lots and parcels treated as a single development parcel | Review this and consider revisions; staff mentioned it as an issue | ✓ |
| 51 | Sec. 24-191 | | Impervious surfaces | City may address before we get to it. 1) redevelopment of lots have structures that are maxing out impervious area; 2) stormwater issues; 3) need ability to go on site, inspect and advise that a project doesn't match a permit (people are increasing impervious area without permission); consider a Deed Restriction or plat notation; taking by reduction in question | ✓ |
| 52 | Sec. 24-203 | 165 | Review of proposed plat or changes to a previously recorded plat | Review Chapter 177.091, F.S. – updated section to reflect current FS | ✓ |
| 53 | Sec. 24-203(e) | 167 | Typo | Uncapitalize "Improvement" to "improvement" | ✓ |
| 54 | Sec. 24-204 | 167 | Proposed plan review and approval | Review Chapter 177, Plat I, F.S. | ✓ |
| 55 | Sec. 24-221(d) | 170 | Definition | Delete definition of "drainage" and move to Definitions section | ✓ |
| 56 | Sec. 24-234(a) | 174 | Typo | Uncapitalize "Improvements" to "improvements" | ✓ |
| 57 | Sec. 24-251(b) | 175 | Typo | Uncapitalize "Lots" to "lots" | ✓ |
| 58 | Sec. 24-252(b)(1) | 175 | Arrangement of streets compliance with comp plan element | All development must conform to the comp plan – this doesn't need to be stated; this is a Comp Plan issue and can be removed from LDRs | ✓ |
| 59 | Sec. 24-255(b) | 181 | Block lengths | Is it necessary for greater block length approval to go to the CC? Plats go through CC in other municipalities | ✓ |
| 60 | Sec. 24-257(e) | 182 | Typo | Capitalize "Creation" | ✓ |
| 61 | Sec. 24-257 | 182 | Provision for required recreation | Clarify where this acreage is to go – is it intended to part of the subdivision? Can the developer pay the City in-lieu of providing on site so the City can do something elsewhere? | |
| 62 | Sec. 24-258 | 182 | Permanent reference markers | Verify against Section 177.091(7), F.S. – looks like legislation changed to no more than 1,400 feet instead of 2,000 feet | ✓ |
| 63 | Sec. 24-259 | 183 | Typo | Capitalize "The" | ✓ |
| 64 | Sec. 24-263 | 183 | Definitions | Move to Definitions section | ✓ |
| 65 | Sec. 24-264 | 184 | Establishing and mapping wellhead protection areas | Add the 500-foot radial setback distance for the size of the wellhead protection area as specified in the definitions; consider adding a map that shows location of wellfields and radial setback; reference map within Comprehensive Plan | ✓ |
| 66 | Sec. 24-265(d) | | Typo | Florida Department of Environmental Protection should be FDEP | ✓ |
| 67 | Sec. 24-266 | 187 | Prohibitions in wellhead protection areas | Verify prohibited actions Rule 62-521.400, FAC; a City of JAX permit is required; add St. Johns River Water Management District | ✓ |
| 68 | Sec. 24-267 | 187 | Requirements within wellhead protection zones | Should the first sentence be revised to include both the Floridan Aquifer and Hawthorne wells? | |
| 69 | Sec. 24-267(c) | 188 | Sanitary seal requirement | Should this be revised to state that all private wells after XXX date the LDR chapter was adopted must be configured with a sanitary seal etc. | ✓ |
| 70 | Sec. 24-270 | 189 | Protection of Wetland, Marsh and Waterway Resources | Need more details on how an impacted wetland is to be replaced; needs better clarity; no method to review – provide language | ✓ |
| 71 | Sec. 24-271 | 190 | Definitions | Move to Definitions section | ✓ |
| 72 | Sec. 24-271 | 190 | Environmental Assessment | Verify against Section 373.421, F.S. and Section 62-340.300 FAC | ✓ |
| 73 | Sec. 24-271 | 191 | Mean High Water Line | Verify against Section 177.26, F.S. (updated definition per current F.S.) | ✓ |
| 74 | Sec. 24-272 | 191 | Environmental Assessment Required | Add map from Comp Plan | ✓ |
| 75 | Sec. 24-273(b) | 194 | Purpose and Intent | Rule 9J-5 was repealed – delete reference; keep standard – remove reference | ✓ |
| 76 | | | 5-year water management plan | Check to see if we need to add anything about 5-year WMD plan (No requirement) | ✓ |
| | | | STAFF COMMENTS THAT STILL NEED TO BE SORTED | | |

| | SECTION/REFERENCE | PAGE # | REASON FOR PROPOSED CHANGE | PROPOSED CHANGE/ACTION | COMPLETE |
|---|---------------------------------------|--------|---|--|----------|
| 77 | 24-176 (c)(7)(b) | | Landscaping | Reduce landscaping requirements for commercial development | ✓ |
| 78 | 24-115(d)(2) | | Setbacks | Consider reducing in commercial (not an issue in residential) | ✓ |
| 79 | Def'ns | | Height | Make it clear how height is measured (currently has 3 options); may desire increase in commercial height (addressed in Charter); | ✓ |
| 80 | Def'ns; 24-113(c)(11) | | Pain management clinics | needs to be addressed | ✓ |
| 81 | GENERAL | | Add graphics and maps to help clarify regulations as appropriate | Graphics added as necessary throughout document | ✓ |
| 82 | Sec 24-161 | | Add Parking Requirements Table | Added City of Atlantic Beach Off-Street Parking Requirement Table | ✓ |
| 83 | Sec. 24-61 | | Create a process chart to clearly exhibit what goes to what board | Added Approval Authority Table (Figure 2) | ✓ |
| COMPREHENSIVE PLAN REVIEW | | | | | |
| 84 | FLUE Policy A.1.2.1 | A-4 | Replacement of impacted wetlands | LDR Section 24-270 needs more detailed standards for how this replacement is to occur <i>(action: no changes made)</i> | ✓ |
| 85 | FLUE Policy A.1.2.5 | A-4 | Post development runoff | Verify this is addressed in LDRs <i>(action: addressed in Sec. 24-687)</i> | ✓ |
| 86 | FLUE Policy A.1.5.8 | A-8 | Permitted Densities | Consider adding to the LDRs <i>(action: addressed in Sec. 24-102 (b))</i> | ✓ |
| 87 | FLUE Policy A.1.8.2 | A-10 | Cites opportunities for innovative land development practices in the LDR | Consider adding some innovative policies <i>(action: addressed by adding parking, bicycle, TMP)</i> | ✓ |
| 88 | FLUE Policy A.1.8.5 | A-11 | Prohibit increasing populations with special hurricane evacuation needs | What does this mean and how can the LDRs prevent this? Doesn't appear to be anything in the LDRs that references this. <i>(action: no changes made)</i> | ✓ |
| 89 | FLUE Policy A.1.11.1(a) | A-13 | Recreation uses | Note that this section limits us editing the same in the LDRs. <i>(action: no changes made)</i> | ✓ |
| STAKEHOLDER/BOARD/COMMISSION INPUT | | | | | |
| 90 | Sec 24.68 | | Impervious Surface Ratio | Addressed separately by City Staff in stormwater ordinance | ✓ |
| 91 | n/a | | Present history of LDR amendments to the community | I'm not sure that recreating this is possible under the scope of our work <i>(action: no changes made)</i> | ✓ |
| 92 | Sec. 24-175 | | Look at Mixed Use Criteria | Will be considered <i>(action: added Mayport Overlay ordinance)</i> | |
| 93 | Sec 24-65 | | Variances versus Use by Exception | Will be considered; consider measurable targets | ✓ |
| 94 | n/a | | Consider transition to adjacent municipalities (especially Complete Streets) | We will consider this <i>(action: no changes made)</i> | ✓ |
| 95 | n/a | | We need places for people to work | We will consider this as we address the other regulations <i>(action: no changes made)</i> | ✓ |
| 96 | Sec. 24-17 | | Definitions | We will be mindful of the use of definitions that are used in other areas of the City Code (i.e. if we change in Chapter 24 does it have unintended consequences elsewhere?) | ✓ |
| 97 | Sec. 24-61 | | Review what items can be done administratively versus having to go to CBD or CC | Will be considered <i>(Added Approval Authority Table (Figure 2))</i> | ✓ |
| 98 | n/a | | Preservation and conservation of wetlands – not through mitigation | Will be considered <i>(action: no changes made)</i> | ✓ |
| 99 | Sec. 24-68 | | Flooding of streets after heavy rain | Addressed in part separately by City Staff in stormwater ordinance | ✓ |
| 100 | Sec. 24-161(g)5 and 6; Sec. 24-161(o) | | Parking at beach and in town center – preference in parking needs to be given consideration | Updated Sec. 24-161 Off-street parking and loading | ✓ |
| 101 | n/a | | New building and/or redoing of existing homes should not impact our conservation/wetlands nor create flooding situations of streets | Will be considered | ✓ |
| 102 | n/a | | Tree canopy (though understand it is not part of Chapter 24) | Will not be considered as part of this project as it is not in Chapter 24 <i>(action: no changes made)</i> | ✓ |
| 103 | n/a | | Traffic | Comp Plan not LDR-related <i>(action: no changes made)</i> | ✓ |
| 104 | Sec. 24-161 | | Beaches Town Center Parking | Updated Sec. 24-161 Off-street parking and loading | ✓ |
| 105 | n/a | | No new development vs. want big box development | Will keep this in mind during the process <i>(action: no changes made)</i> | ✓ |
| 106 | Sec. 24-161(g)2 | | Shared parking | Updated Sec. 24-161 Off-street parking and loading | ✓ |
| 107 | Sec. 24-161(g)5 and 6 | | Parking discounts | Updated Sec. 24-161 Off-street parking and loading | ✓ |
| 108 | Sec. 24-161(l) | | Walkability | Updated Sec. 24-161 Off-street parking and loading | ✓ |
| 109 | n/a | | Cross-reference Comprehensive Plan with LDR | See Section above | ✓ |

| | SECTION/REFERENCE | PAGE # | REASON FOR PROPOSED CHANGE | PROPOSED CHANGE/ACTION | COMPLETE |
|-----|-------------------|--------|--|--|-----------------|
| 110 | Sec. 24-102 | | Land Use Matrix is important | Added FAR/Max density | ✓ |
| 111 | n/a | | Bike lanes and sidewalks needed on all streets | Probably not feasible on all streets but will be considered | ✓ |
| 112 | n/a | | Negative impacts | Use criteria and supplemental regulations | ✓ |
| 113 | n/a | | Form-based Codes | Can consider a hybrid (<i>action: not part of scope</i>) | ✓ |
| 114 | Sec. 24-68 | | Stormwater – French drains, SFR, swales | Addressed separately by City Staff in stormwater ordinance | ✓ |
| 115 | | | Commission can enforce topo & as-builts | Add a mechanism to the LDRs | ✓ |
| 116 | | | Swales and berms | Add language that they must be maintained | Need to address |
| 117 | | | Townhome design | Address building material use, consistency | ✓ |
| 118 | Sec. 24-84 | | Through Lots | Fence and accessory structures need clarification; see Section 24-84 Double Frontage lots | ✓ |
| 119 | Sec. 24-161(l) | | Bike Racks | Added language | ✓ |
| 120 | Sec. 24-116 | | Expand CDB | Added Traditional Marketplace (plan to create a new zoning district that transitions the CDB to the CG area that gently connects the two without an abrupt change) | ✓ |
| 121 | Sec. 24-175 | | Review Mayport Overlay | Determine maximum setbacks, cross-access requirements, | ✓ |

DRAFT