



DCSM/Zoning Ordinance Advisory Committee

- | | |
|--------------------|------------------|
| J. Wayne Barrett | Jonelle Cameron |
| Steve Mitchell | Jim Kreider |
| Jacob Giovia | John McBride |
| Michael Kitchen | Robert Sweeney |
| Carl Willis | Carmella Patrick |
| Mitchell Rachlis | Samantha Kearney |
| Emily McKeown | Erik Spencer |
| Paul Johnson | Rick Canizales |
| Jeff Warner | David McGettigan |
| Channing Blackwell | Tom Smith |
| Joe McClellan | Mandi Spina |

MINUTES

**Development Services Building
Conference Room 202A/B**

**January 25, 2024
Regular Meeting**

In Attendance: Wayne Barrett, Steve Mitchell, Jacob Giovia, Carl Willis, Mitchell Rachlis, Charles Grymes, Emily McKeown, Paul Johnson, Jeff Warner, Joe McClellan, Jonelle Cameron, Jim Krieder, John McBride, Carmela Patrick, Erik Spencer, Rick Canazales, David McGettigan, Dominique Ward, Mandi Spina. Staff members from DDS - Fadeley, Transportation – Belita, Barrett, Fire – Smolsky, and Planning – Wolfson, McCaskill.

- 1. Call to Order (McGettigan) 2:00 p.m.**
- 2. Roll Call/Quorum (Fadeley) Quorum present**
- 3. Approval of the agenda for the January 25, 2024, meeting with changes (McGettigan)**

Change: Insert DCSM Section 300 - Fire Systems Chief Smolsky presentation (#7).

Introduction: Charlie Grimes, new member – Gainesville District

APPROVED by Quorum.

- 4. Approval of Minutes from July 27, 2023:**
Motion to approve Carmela Patrick, Second Paul Johnson
APPROVED by Quorum, Charlie Grimes abstained.

- 5. Approval of Minutes from the October 26, 2023, meeting:**
Motion to approve Mitchell Rachilis, Second Paul Johnson

APPROVED by Quorum, Charlie Grimes abstained.

6. ZTA – Industrial Parking (Barrett)

Bryce Barrett (Transportation) – Presentation

Bryce: Coming back to DORAC for the second time to bring an update to the draft industrial parking ZTA. A brief background, it was initially directed by the Board based on community input and was initiated to move forward with an official zoning text amendment, on September 20, 2022. In the last meeting in October, we came to DORAC with two options, one was to create a new use in the zoning ordinance for fleet parking or revise the existing off-site parking section that is currently in the zoning ordinance. We received some feedback from the committee so there are a couple of key changes I want to highlight. We consolidated the language to move forward with the fleet parking use and added additional clarity to the language. One of the concerns was creating nonconforming uses, the definition said one or more vehicles and that potentially parking one car on private property would create a nonconformity. That wasn't the intent of the revision, this change was not for small amounts of parking, I can't image someone going forward with this process to only park two or three vehicles, so the language was changed to 5 or more and to include the M/T zoning district. The original directive said parking in M-1 and M-2, but what was initiated was parking in the industrial zoning districts. That allowed us to include the M/T zoning district. The revision still requires a special use permit to be associated with a primary use, allowed in M-1, M-2, and M/T, and includes general provisions for lighting and signage. Also, the parking would be in addition to the minimum parking allowance required on the principal site. See if there are additional questions.

Paul Johnson: If you have a fleet of 30 vehicles for the principal use, and a fleet of 20 that leaves before the facility is open are you now going to require 50 spaces, 20 for the fleet and 30 for the principal use even though they're not overlapping in parking need?

Bryce: No, we would require the minimum parking for the principal use per the DCSM requirement. This use is if the applicant asks for additional parking off-site to meet additional parking needs, there are no requirements except the minimum of 5 or more vehicles. The principal site would meet the minimum parking standards and then have the option of additional parking at an off-site location.

Joe McClellan: In your definition, I would suggest that you say off-site parking.

Bryce: It's deeper in the language, it does specify off-site. The current zoning ordinance has a provision for parking on an adjacent parcel next to the parcel with the principal use. This is for when the parcel is not adjacent to the use.

Joe: Why is it an SUP and not a site plan requirement?

Bryce: Our primary concern was to allow the review of off-site parking on a site-by-site basis to make sure that the impact of the use is mitigated. If you have a use with heavy traffic, like a distribution center, adding fleet parking off-site for that use could generate a lot of trips between the principal parcel and the fleet parking and we would like to have the opportunity to see if a TIA is necessary. Fleet parking use is allowed in M-1, M-2, and M/T, that's a broad range of industrial zoning districts with different uses so we want to review it site-by-site to evaluate the impact of the use on the surrounding areas.

Jonelle Cameron: My suggestion would be to make it by-right in M/T because M/T is already your heavy industrial that allows, for example, a truck terminal that allows for more parking than fleet parking, my preference would be that it be by-right based on what the characteristics of already are in that zoning district.

Bryce: Understood, we can look at that.

Joe: It seems ridiculous to do an SUP for 5 vehicles.

Bryce: That's the minimum. There isn't a capacity for this, so an applicant could come forward and request fleet parking for 200 vehicles.

Joe: Why not make a minimum of 10 or 20 for a SUP?

Jonelle: Right now, it's not permitted at all so whether it's 1 or 5 it's illegal. Are you suggesting that under a certain number of vehicles should be by right and over it should require a SUP?

Joe: Yes.

Bryce: We can consider that.

Joe: How often do fleet vehicles access the site, once in the morning and once in the evening, so that is two trips per vehicle, and if you have 5 vehicles that is 10 trips per day and not a traffic impact.

Jonelle: That is a valid point the application could take up to 18 months to get the SUP, who is going to do that for 10 vehicles, probably not. Maybe for 40.

Bryce: If there are no additional questions, I want to highlight the schedule. This input is valuable, and we'll go back and consider it. We are planning a PC Work session on February 14th. This will be the first time the PC will see the draft. Then sometime after that we'll put the draft into final form and go forward to the planning commission and then to the Board.

Paul Johnson: Are you bringing it back to our next meeting?

Bryce: We should have the final draft by the next meeting and will be happy to bring it back to DORAC next year.

7. ZTA - Commercial Signs (Hipski)

Yolanda Hipski – Presentation

Yolanda: Hello everybody, my name is Yolanda Hipski, I came here to the last meeting to talk about commercial signs. When we presented the last time four primary issues were presented by the DORAC group. The first was duration, the question regarding the duration of the time for the sign to remain on-site. At the DORAC meeting, the suggestion was made that the sign remains until after construction and the removal take place fourteen days after the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy, and in the case of “for sale” signs the removal is fourteen days after the sale of the property. The second issue was about properties with single-family homes and the concern about the minimum size sign allowed. The third issue was government signs and other warning signs, such as hard-hat area, and building permit display, DORAC suggested we make sure we have that in the ordinance. Finally, DORAC suggested we adjust the size of the signs to correspond to the size of standard plywood.

Next slide, this chart we presented originally to the Planning Commission, and in the red are the revisions we made based on the suggestions we received from DORAC. The size of “for sale or lease” signs was increased in the commercial, industrial, multi-family, and subdivisions, and we changed the duration to removal fourteen days after the issuance of a CO or the sale of a property. Questions?

Joe McClellan: On the CO issuance, on the multi-family is that the last CO?

Yolanda: Yes.

Carmela Patrick: I have a concern about the measurement of the sign, I know that you increased it to 32 square feet and 4 x 4, but what if I have a property with an average frontage of 100 linear feet, I will only get a 10 square foot sign. I’m confused by the 21 square feet per linear foot.

Yolanda: Different properties with different frontages, the more linear feet the larger the size, but that’s why we have the minimum size of 16 square feet.

Jonelle Cameron: So, could we just say 16 square feet or 21 square feet per linear foot of frontage up to the maximum of 32 square feet?

Yolanda: We could. This is not the text itself this is just a guide.

Jonelle: I assumed this was going to be in the sign chart.

Yolanda: The intent is to have a sign that is adequate for the site.

Jonelle: I think what Carmella is saying is that they want a 32-square-foot sign regardless of the frontage.

Yolanda: We are proposing to take this to the PC on February 28th.

Paul Johnson: Where do we fall in the approval process?

Jonelle: I thought it was before the Planning Commission meeting.

Paul: It was that way. We're hearing that a Planning Commission meeting has been scheduled. I would like to make sure this group's input has meaning and is set somewhere in the process.

David McGettigan: You're before the Planning Commission now, but we can send an email to the group with the language and get your final feedback through email. DORAC is advisory to the County Executive and to us, not advisory to the Planning Commission or the Board, I don't know that we need a final vote from the committee.

Jonelle: Does anyone know what was in staff reports in the past? I thought it said we went to DORAC, and they were generally supportive.

David: We never had votes or anything like that.

Mandi Spina: Typical language will note general support, no approval, but we got general support.

Carmella: There should be something in the staff report that says general support.

Mandi: David and I need to review to decide what is in the charter for this group.

Jonelle: We should be able to review the draft final language.

David: If we did that, we would have to bring it back to this group again.

Mandi: We could look at extra meetings.

Emilie: I understand the committee wants to provide feedback, but we are trying to move forward.

David McGettigan: The concerns that we have are moving to 32 square feet and not having 16 square feet. Why don't we write down your recommendations and take a vote on that and that will be the official stance? We'll send the final language, but this will be your decision.

Jonelle: The total maximum size permitted for signage shall not exceed 32 square feet for lots or developments with greater than 160 feet of linear street frontage and say the same thing for two and three.

Motion Approved

8. DCSM section 300 Fire systems

Chief Smolsky: Hello everybody and thanks for the opportunity. We started making changes and sent them to DORAC and CDC for comments. We took industry input and incorporated that into the documents and will have the final document out hopefully sometime next week. Chris Gardner, Chris Lemon, and Russ worked with us, and we got a lot of good input from Joe. We should be ready to go.

David: Are you presenting at the work session of the Planning Commission?

Chief Smolsky: I'll get with Mandi to determine.

David McGettigan: When will you have the final text?

Chief Smolsky: Hopefully, next week.

9. ZTA – Drive-thru Uses (Hipski)

Yolanda Hipski: Drive-thru and pick-up uses, I brought this to the committee last time. We are scheduling to take this to the PC in February as well. For drive-thru facilities, there are a significant number of components to the facility, like separate drive-thru lanes that can create vehicle backup, order boards, signage, and a lot more infrastructure. For curbside pick-up, these sites are not lit, there are no communication speakers, there are no windows, and other infrastructure so they are treated differently than drive-thru in the ordinance.

Joe McClellan: What is the difference between drive-thru and drive-in?

Yolanda: A drive-in is an establishment by design that serves the public while remaining in the vehicle. Curb-side pickup is an emerging business practice.

Paul Johnson: Now, you have two different signs, you're not separating any curbside pickup from one use to the other.

Yolanda: Curb-side pickup is designed a certain way.

Jonelle Cameron: I would like to increase signage square footage higher than two square feet as a recommendation. The size of minor signs is four square feet in the ordinance.

Yolanda: I based it on the handicapped signs.

Jonelle: I noticed the curbside pickup signs are larger.

Paul Johnson: I think too that it helps to identify that the space is for pickup and not for parking.

John McBride: Larger signs than the size of a handicap sign are needed.

David: If four square feet is good for you all then make a recommendation.

Yolanda: Add measurement in the ordinance.

Joe: In one of the sections, 32.280.41, you have excluded drive-thru? Why is it prohibited in a commercial district?

Yolanda: We changed the definition. What we used to call drive-in but now we're calling it drive-thru.

Joe: Why excluded from a commercial district?

Jonelle: It only applies to Town Centers.

Carmela: Already in the Zoning Ordinance that they are not allowed.

David: Is the group okay with that recommendation? If so, please signify by saying aye.

Approved - Quorum

10. DCSM Section 600 – Update (Belita)

Paulo Belita: I have a quick update. At the last meeting, we had a presentation by our consultant and a draft. We are trying to get through one more section and then we'll send it out. We plan to have it finalized by summer and envision it to be a one-year process. We're still on track with that. We'll send it out with a comment sheet.

Joe McClellan: Will you give us at least 30 days to get comments back to you?

Paolo: Yes, we're going to give you between early February and the next DORAC meeting to review it and get comments back to us.

Paolo: Another quick update, we've developed a policy for waivers to Section 600 and will get that out to you as well.

11. Data Center Ordinance Working Group – Update (Spina)

Mandi Spina: We have a consultant looking at the noise ordinance. We selected JMT to work through the noise ordinance. Wade is going to the BOCS for additional funding on February 20th. The second phase will be looking at the DCSM and the zoning ordinance. The team is scheduled to meet on January 31st.

12. Discussion on a revision of the Committee by-laws (Fadeley)

Joyce Fadeley: I provided you with a draft of the bylaws. We changed the membership to 18 voting members and 6 nonvoting members. Before we take any action on the new bylaws we have to go before the Board to revise the resolution.

Jonelle Cameron: I have one potential change where it says terms coterminous with those of the County Supervisors can it also say or until re-appointed?

David McGettigan: Yes. Also, for the non-voting members, the Directors, can it say or designee?

Joyce: Okay. No action can be taken on the revision until the resolution has been updated.

13. Discussion on the draft Virtual Participation Policy (Fadeley)

Joyce Fadeley: It's been scrapped, I'm working with the County Attorneys.

David McGettigan: There have been changes to the law recently, we had to change the Planning Commission policy as well. We have to rewrite it.

14. Agency Time

- Planning

Emilie Wolfson: We're having a work session on the Industrial Parking zoning text amendment on February 14, 2024. We're also doing an orientation with the Planning Commission on zoning text amendment in general, we're inviting you to the meeting as well. As far as the upcoming text amendments we are working on a comprehensive update to the zoning ordinance. If this group has suggestions on what you'd like to see in the Zoning Ordinance you can reach out to us.

David McGettigan: We're going to start getting a list together of what we need to look at, but it still needs to be initiated by the board. Also, we're having a planning office open house on February 22, 2024, with the planning staff and our new Planning Director, Tonya Washington, and you're all invited.

- Transportation

No Update

- Fire

No Update

- Environmental

No update

- Parks

Janet Bartnick: We're excited to be kicking off the Powell's Creek Crossing project.

15. Any Other Business

John McBride: AFDU?

David McGettigan: Hoping to get a draft out before the end of January. Looking at enabling legislation to allow incentive zoning.

16. Next Regular Meeting – Thursday, April 25, 2024, 2:00 pm – 4:00 pm

17. Meeting adjourned - 3:15 pm