



**Minutes
Town of Atlantic Beach
Town Council and Planning Board Joint Meeting
March 7, 2017**

Town Council Members

Present

Mayor Trace Cooper
Mayor Pro Tem Danny Navey
Harry Archer
Ann Batt
Eddie Briley
John Rivers

Town Council Members

Present

None

Staff Present

John Harrell, Inspections Director
Megan Hunter, Secretary
Arrington Moore, Management Assistant
Michelle Shreve, Planning Director
Derek Taylor, Town Attorney
David Walker, Town Manager

Planning Board Members

Present

Neil Chamblee
Llewellyn Ramsey
Rich Johnson
Steve Joyner
Norm Livengood
Curt Winbourne

Planning Board Members

Absent

Rich Porter

Others Present

Chad Meadows of CodeWright

CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Trace Cooper called the meeting to order at 6:00pm. Mayor Cooper briefly described the purpose of the joint meeting, which was to review Module Two of the Unified Development Ordinance.

APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 7, 2017 PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

Ramsey made a motion *to approve* the February 7, 2017 minutes. Seconded by Johnson. Vote was unanimous, 5-0. Motion carried.

COUNCIL ROLL CALL

Town Council roll call was conducted by Megan Hunter, Planning Board Secretary. All members were present.

PLANNING BOARD ROLL CALL

Planning Board roll call was conducted by Megan. All members were present, except for Rich Porter.

MOTION TO EXCUSE ABSENT PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS

Winbourne made a motion *to excuse* absent board member, Rich Porter, due to travel. Seconded by Joyner and Livengood. Vote was unanimous, 5-0. Motion carried.

CODEWRIGHT PRESENTATION OF UDO UPDATE PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT-MODULE TWO

Mayor Cooper stated that CodeWright was hired to reorganize and clarify our current UDO. Substantive rules are not being changed. Both the Council and the Board were meeting tonight to avoid duplicative meetings. Another joint meeting is scheduled for April 20. With approximately ninety percent of the Town already developed, any changes to the UDO need to lead to simplification of the document. Mayor Cooper commended Chad, Michelle and Arrington for their work on the UDO drafting. Mayor Cooper turned the meeting over to Chad Meadows of CodeWright.

Chad commented that he is pleased with the progress thus far and also commended the staff for helping CodeWright keep to their timeline. The changes that are being made are mainly in organization, not substance.

The current UDO has problems with language consistency, confusing terminology, procedural vagueness, and inconsistency with evolving state law. The project's goals include the following: to increase user-friendliness, enhance

predictability in development review, maintain consistency with state law, foster easier administration, and maintain legal defensibility.

The UDO has 10 articles. At the last meeting Articles 1, 2, 9, and 10 were discussed. At this meeting, Zoning, Use Standards, Nonconformities, and sections of Article 10 were discussed.

The Zoning Districts of the UDO include all things related to zoning districts, what you can do, how we decide what we can do, and the keeping of the map. The current regulations have all of this material, but CodeWright has reorganized it so it is easier to follow and use. CodeWright prepared new layouts and district names. Chad introduced the reorganization of the district information into table format. Brief discussion was held on the table formats, which are designed to show the code user how dimensional standards work and illustrates provisions. Chad suggested using a variety of photos in districts tables to help the code user better understand the character of the district. Any images added are not law, they are supplemental to the law and are intended to be visual aids only. Council suggested including the maximum density per acre provisions from the Land Use Plan into the zoning district dimensional standards.

Any district names that are changed are to be more intuitive to the character of the district. Changing the district names does not mean that dimensional standards are being changed. Mayor Cooper opened the floor for suggestions and comments for district name consideration.

Different zoning district names were suggested than those presented. Council & Planning Board agreed upon the following district name changes:

- Residential Districts
 - Residential single family – Conservation (R-1(C)) -> Residential Single-Family Conservation (RSC)
 - Residential single family – 7 (R-1(7)) -> Residential Single-Family Wide Yard (RSW)
 - Residential single family – 5 (R-1(5)) -> Residential Single-Family Narrow Yard (RSN)
 - Residential single family – Manufactured (R-1(M)) -> Residential Single-Family and Manufactured (RSM)
 - Residential single family and Duplex (R-2) -> Residential Single-Family and Duplex (RSD)
 - Residential multi-family (R3) -> Residential Multi-Family (RMF)
- Mixed-Use Districts
 - Resort Mixed Use (RMU) -> Mixed Use Neighborhood (MUN)
 - Resort Services (RS) -> Mixed Use High Intensity (MHI)
- Commercial Districts
 - Circle Development District (CDD) -> Commercial Circle (CIR)
 - Community Business (CB) -> Commercial Node (CND) (The Councilmembers and Board members were unsure about this name change, and agreed to think about it further to determine a better name for this district.)
 - General Business (GB) -> Commercial Corridor (COR)

The Consolidated Causeway Overlay District standard and the General Business District have parallel standards for neighboring sets of land. Chad suggested combining the two districts, with no standard change, to help further simplify the UDO.

Chad suggested the removal of the cluster residential provisions. It fosters single-use residential in mixed use areas and this provision is not likely to be used. General discussion was held on cluster residential and town homes. Council stated that they only wanted Townhouses to be permitted in the Resort Services district, because at the time that the Townhouse ordinances were put into effect, they agreed to limit the development type to this district.

Chad suggested integrating and simplifying the Circle Development District standards. Some amendments were that the density transfer provisions and density bonus system be removed. Council & Planning Board agreed that the Circle Development District provisions should remain as a sort of stand-alone district (density transfer, density bonuses, etc.) because the majority of this district is under redevelopment.

Relocation of dimensional standards and setback measurement provisions were discussed. Council and Planning Board liked the use of the term “street setback” instead of “front setback” to clarify the setbacks required for corner, through, and street-bound lots. Council and Planning Board agreed that the current manner of measuring the street setback of the

average of the two adjacent structures' setbacks could be changed. They agreed that utilizing the neighbors' setbacks helps the houses to line up over time, but that utilizing the smallest of the two adjacent structures' setbacks would be sufficient.

As discussion on Zoning Districts came to a close, Chamblee wanted to know if there were any more substantive changes that should be of note. Council and Planning Board requested a comprehensive list of substantive changes for each Module. Chad confirmed that all substantive changes will be noted and prefaced on its corresponding chapter of the UDO.

Chad discussed Standard Uses next. Some key changes were a reformatted summary table, new use classification system, procedure for unlisted uses, new uses and use standards, and separation of principal, accessory, and temporary uses. According to the reformatted summary table, no new mobile home parks are allowed. General discussion was held regarding mobile home parks.

The new use classification system is a three tiered system. Instead of different business uses list, the new UDO will only have three categories; otherwise there is duplication. An example of the simplification of uses types would be 1) Office: major, 2) Office: moderate, and 3) Office: minor. Chamblee inquired about the use of a one tiered system if the intention is to simplify the UDO as much as possible. General discussion of advantages of three tiered system was held.

Chad discussed further changes to Section 18.4 including a new procedure for classification of unlisted uses, the addition of prohibited uses, changes to specific principal uses, and new principal uses. Council and Planning Board suggested that staff consult with other department heads of the Town to determine if there are any additional prohibited uses that should be added to Section 18.4.1.D.2. General discussion is held regarding manufactured mobile home parks, which is one of the specific Principal Uses.

Key changes to Accessory Uses are separation from principal uses, new standards that address where they are allowed, new general standards for all accessory uses or structures, and specific standards for accessory uses. Much of what is currently in the UDO is being carried forward; it's simply being reorganized. Key changes to Temporary Uses are new general standards and conditions and new temporary uses such as health care structures and temporary wireless facilities.

Key changes to Nonconformities included a new purpose section and definition of "nonconformity", encouragement for maintenance of nonconformities, and a change of "nonconforming situations" language to nonconforming uses, structures, lots of record, signs, lighting, and sites, with standards for each type. The new UDO will allow the reestablishment of lawfully established damaged nonconformities without Board Of Adjustment approval and will remove lengthy provisions related to completion of development rendered nonconforming by changes to ordinance text.

The new set of provisions for addressing nonconforming sites allows redevelopment and renovation without triggering full code compliance. The established provisions are a disincentive for redevelopment. The amount of code compliance should be directly linked to the level of investment. A small investment should be linked to a small amount of compliances; a large investment should equal a long list of compliances.

Some additional changes to Section 18-8 are the simplification and condensation of information regarding triggering of compliance requirements for nonconformities. Also, the provisions related to reestablishment of small multi-family dwelling standards are relocated to this article. General discussion was held regarding more aggressive enforcement.

Chad presented changes to Article 10: Definitions and Measurements. Article 10 was updated with the drafting of Module 2 to include the rules of measurement used in the dimensional standards and an updated list of acronyms and definitions. Council and Planning Board suggested that the Building Code and other applicable documents be consulted for best definitions, and to ensure that problem terms from the past be properly defined, i.e. "significantly different vs substantially different", "townhouse", and "open space".

Chad discussed the rest of the schedule for the UDO revision which is as follows below:

- Planning Board and Town Council Joint Meeting to discuss Module 3: April 20, 2017
- Planning Board public hearing for recommendation: June 6, 2017
- Town Council adoption hearing: June 26, 2017
- Final Delivery: a week after adoption

Module Three will include the re-drafting on Article 18-5. Development Standards, 18-6. Environment, and 18-7. Subdivisions.

MAYOR/COUNCIL/PLANNING BOARD COMMENTS

Mayor Cooper commented on the density of the material discussed and suggested all Board and Council members forward all of their notes to Michelle for consolidation. He thanked Chad, Arrington, and Michelle for getting the Town this far with the UDO revision.

CITIZEN REQUESTS/COMMENTS

There were no citizen requests or comments.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business the meeting stood adjourned at 8:14pm.

These minutes were approved at the March 27, 2017 meeting of the Atlantic Beach Town Council.

TOWN OF ATLANTIC BEACH

ATTEST:


Megan Hunter - Planning Board Secretary


A. B. Cooper, III - Mayor