



**CITY OF OKEECHOBEE, FLORIDA
PLANNING BOARD & WORKSHOP MEETING
JANUARY 21, 2021
SUMMARY OF BOARD ACTION**

- I. CALL TO ORDER**
Chairperson Hoover called the regular Planning Board & Workshop meeting for the City of Okeechobee to order on Thursday, January 21, 2021, at 6:25 P.M. in the City Council Chambers, located at 55 Southeast Third Avenue, Room 200, Okeechobee, Florida.
- II. ATTENDANCE**
Roll was taken by Board Secretary Patty Burnette. Chairperson Hoover, Board Members Karyne Brass, Rick Chartier, Felix Granados, Mac Jonassaint were present. Alternate Board Members Joe Papasso and Jim Shaw were present. Vice Chairperson Doug McCoy and Board Member Phil Baughman were absent without consent. Chairperson Hoover moved Alternate Board Members Papasso and Shaw to voting positions.
- III. AGENDA**
 - A. There were no items added, deferred, or withdrawn from the agenda.
 - B. Motion by Board Member Brass, seconded by Board Member Jonassaint to approve the agenda as presented. **Motion Carried Unanimously.**
- IV. ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON AND VICE CHAIRPERSON**
 - A. Chairperson Hoover opened the floor to receive nominations for Chairperson.
 - B. Motion by Board Member Chartier, seconded by Board Member Brass to appoint Dawn Hoover to serve a two-year term beginning January 21, 2021. **Motion Carried Unanimously.**
 - C. Chairperson Hoover opened the floor to receive nominations for Vice Chairperson.
 - D. Motion by Board Member Brass, seconded by Board Member Granados to appoint Doug McCoy to serve a two-year term beginning January 21, 2021. **Motion Carried Unanimously.**
- V. MINUTES**
 - A. Motion by Board Member Brass, seconded by Alternate Board Member Papasso to dispense with the reading and approve the November 19, 2020, Regular Meeting & Workshop minutes. **Motion Carried Unanimously.**
- VI. CHAIRPERSON HOOVER OPENED THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 6:28 P.M.**
 - A. **1.** City Planning Consultant Mr. Ben Smith of LaRue Planning and Management Services reviewed the Planning Staff Report explaining at one time, the City's Land Development Regulations (LDR's) contained regulations for the development of properties zoned Holding. However, several years ago, the Holding District regulations were removed from the LDR's. Currently, if any property owner of land zoned Holding is seeking to develop that property, a rezoning must be performed first. There are currently 55 parcels of land within the City that are partially or entirely zoned Holding. Some of these parcels are developed, though most are undeveloped or used for agricultural purposes. Most of the Holding parcels are designated as Single Family Residential on the Future Land Use Map, though there are two with Commercial designations and one with Mixed Use Residential.

As members of the City Council and Planning Board have pointed out, the rezoning process can be an uncertain and cost prohibitive process for some property owners and prospective property buyers. If the goal of the City is to encourage owners of Holding properties to rezone, then the City may consider instituting a temporary program that provides some incentivization to rezone by reducing the requirements, lowering the application fee, and providing more certainty to the outcome of the rezoning process. As was initiated by the Planning Board at the August 2020 workshop and as discussed at multiple subsequent workshops, the purpose of this proposed Ordinance is to implement a program to incentivize owners of properties zoned Holding to request a rezoning to another zoning district. It provides eligible property owners an opportunity for reduced application requirements, reduced application fees, official rezoning recommendations and mailed notification of the program.

VI. PUBLIC HEARING ITEM A. CONTINUED

2. Mr. Dowling Watford Jr., 701 Northeast 5th Street, Okeechobee, Florida, inquired as to what happens should property owners elect not to participate in the program. In this case, the property designation of Holding would remain. Mr. Steven Dobbs, 209 Northeast 2nd Street, Okeechobee, Florida, commented a client of his is preparing to submit an application to request rezoning of approximately 54± acres located in the Northeast section of the City to the East of the Riven Run Resort Mobile Home Park, which is identified in the Planner's Staff Report as Map ID Numbers 33 and 35.
3. No Ex-Parte disclosures were offered.
4. Motion by Board Member Brass, seconded by Board Member Jonassaint to recommend to the City Council approval of the Holding Property Rezoning Incentivization Program as outlined by Planner Smith in his Staff Report noting the following changes: add a location map and affidavit attesting to the completeness and accuracy of the list of surrounding property owners, as required submittal items on the proposed application; revise item number 4, Legal Description, on the application submittal checklist to read, required, but may be included with survey or warranty deed; and on the proposed notification letters make two minor corrections. **Motion Carried Unanimously.**

CHAIRPERSON HOOVER CLOSED THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 6:53 P.M.

VII. CHAIRPERSON HOOVER RECESSED THE REGULAR MEETING AND CONVENED THE WORKSHOP AT 6:53 P.M.

- A. City Planning Consultant Smith briefly reviewed the Staff Report regarding parking reduction requests. LDR Sections 90-483 through 90-485 provide for requests to reduce the amount of parking that is required according to Section 90-512. However, it does not provide application requirements, an application fee, or a clear review process. Currently, should an applicant request approval for a parking reduction, the City charges the same fee for a parking reduction request as a site plan review. In situations where the parking reduction request is concurrent with the site plan review, this is appropriate. However, in the case of a change of use where no site plan review is occurring, it may not be appropriate to charge a site plan review fee which is a minimum of \$1000.

Previously, this Board recommended approval to the City Council for a new application and fee schedule of \$250 for these types of requests. However, the City Council brought up some issues with the proposed application requirements and asked for those to be revised. Planner Smith is proposing amending Section 90-483 in its entirety. Currently a parking study is a requirement. The proposed revisions would allow for applicants to request approval of a parking reduction by providing a less formal demonstration than a full parking study, while still allowing the Administrator to require a parking study should it be warranted for a particular project. In addition, which body should review the requests, the Technical Review Committee (TRC), the Board of Adjustment, the City Council, or a combination of the three. To keep costs at a minimum, he recommends having one body and that being the TRC. Lastly, the current LDR's place limits on the maximum amount of parking reduction that can be approved in the Commercial and Public Use Zoning Districts. He attached proposed LDR revisions to include limits for the other zoning districts as well as a prohibition on reducing parking requirements for single-family homes, mobile homes, and duplexes. A revised Appendix A, (Form 19), and C were presented as well.

After much discussion the consensus of the Board was, they agreed with the Planner's recommendations as listed in his Staff Report. Chapter 90, Article IV, Division 2, Section 90-483, Modification of parking and loading space requirements to read as: parking reduction requests to provide less parking and/or loading spaces than is required by Sections 90-512 and 90-513 may be submitted, reviewed, and approved by the Technical Review Committee as follows:

- (1) Applicants that submit site plans for review by the Technical Review Committee may request approval of parking reduction concurrently with site plan approval.

VII. WORKSHOP ITEM A. CONTINUED

No additional application or application fees are required if the request is submitted for consideration in conjunction with the site plan submittal package.

(2) For owners of existing developments where a proposed change of use would require more parking than is currently present on site, a parking reduction request application may be submitted for consideration by the Technical Review Committee. Please see parking reduction application in Appendix A and the associated fee in Appendix C.

(3) Applicants that submit PUD-M and PUD-R petitions may request approval of parking reduction concurrently with PUD approval. No additional application or application fees are required if the request is submitted for consideration in conjunction with the PUD petition package.

(4) Applicants shall demonstrate that the reduction request is appropriate, justified and in the public interest through one or several of the following. At the discretion of the Administrator, a parking study may be specifically required.

a. Submittal of a parking study demonstrating that the proposed use or combination of uses will have a peak parking demand less than the requirements of Sections 90-512 and/or 90-513.

b. The location, design and proposed uses of the site provide for and encourage exceptional pedestrian and bicycle access.

c. The site will contain multiple uses with opportunities for internal capture and shared use of parking facilities, and the hours of peak demand for two or more of the proposed uses do not normally overlap.

d. Public street parking is located adjacent to the site.

e. Drive through service is available and adequate space for stacking of vehicles is provided. Designated stacking lanes shall be designed to minimize congestion associated with internal circulation as well as site ingress and egress.

f. The subject property and/or building is in an historic district or is of historic interest.

(5) In the CBD zoning district, the number of parking spaces shall not be reduced by more than 80 percent.

(6) In the RSF-1, RSF-2, RMH, RMF, CPO, CLT and CHV zoning districts the number of parking spaces shall not be reduced by more than 20 percent.

(7) In PUB and IND zoning districts, the number of parking spaces shall not be reduced by more than 50 percent.

(8) No parking reductions shall be approved for single-family residences, mobile homes, or duplexes.

Chapter 90, Article IV, Division 2 Section 90-484 Reduction of paved parking spaces requirements to read as:

a. The number of paved spaces may be reduced upon demonstration by the applicant that the proposed use normally would have a demand for the total required parking spaces only on one or two days a week.

CHAIRPERSON HOOVER ADJOURNED THE WORKSHOP AND RECONVENED THE REGULAR MEETING AT 7:15 P.M.

VIII. Chairperson Hoover adjourned the meeting at 7:15 P.M.

Submitted by:

Patty M. Burnette

Patty M. Burnette, Secretary

Please take notice and be advised that when a person decides to appeal any decision made by the Planning Board with respect to any matter considered at this proceeding, he/she may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceeding is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based. General Services' media are for the sole purpose of backup for official records.