

**CITY OF PANAMA CITY BEACH
PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
December 8, 2021
MINUTES TO THE REGULAR MEETING**

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Wakstein at 1:00 p.m. and Ms. Chester was asked to call the roll. Members present were Mr. Scruggs, Mr. Johns, Mr. Hodges, Mr. Morehouse, Ms. Simmons, and Chairman Wakstein. Mr. Caron was absent. Mr. Scruggs led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ITEM NO. 3 Approval of the November 10, 2021, Planning Board Meeting Minutes

Chairman Wakstein asked if there were any comments or corrections to the meeting minutes. Mr. Johns made a motion to approve, and it was seconded by Mr. Scruggs. Ms. Chester called the roll.

Mr. Johns	Yes	Mr. Morehouse	Yes
Ms. Scruggs	Yes	Chairman Wakstein	Yes
Ms. Simmons	Yes		

Mr. Hodges arrived late.

ITEM NO. 4 Public Comments – Non-Agenda Items

There were no public comments. Chairman Wakstein announced the resignation of Mr. Caron from the board for personal reasons.

ITEM NO. 5 Charlotte Newby is requesting approval for a De-Annexation Small-Scale Plan Amendment and Future Land Use map change from Tourist to Bay County designation. The parcel located at 8711 Thomas Drive and is approximately 0.46 acres. The Planning Board will hold a public meeting to consider the request.

Chairman Wakstein read aloud the request and referred to city attorney, Cole Davis for an explanation of the request. Mr. Davis stated the property meets the qualifications for a de-annexation request according to FL Statutes, outlined in the analysis. Mr. Leonard explained the history of the property and how it came to be a part of the city limits. He also commented about the confusion for first responders when responding to emergency calls; therefore, supports the request for the de-annexation.

Mr. Hodges made a motion to approve the applicant's requests and it was seconded by Mr. Scruggs. Ms. Chester called the roll.

Mr. Johns	Yes	Mr. Morehouse	Yes
Mr. Scruggs	Yes	Mr. Hodges	Yes
Ms. Simmons	Yes	Chairman Wakstein	Yes

Ms. Chester commented the applicant's request for a de-annexation is recommended to City Council for approval.

ITEM NO. 6 Tapestry Park PUD Master Plan Modification. Yerway, LLC is requesting approval to modify the approved Tapestry Park Village portion of the PUD. The Planning Board will hold a public meeting to consider the request.

Chairman Wakstein read aloud the proceedings for a quasi-judicial hearing; all participants identified as affected parties were sworn in for testimony. Mr. Silky acknowledged that all the requirements of the application notices were satisfied. Ms. Chester was asked to call Jennings Act.

Mr. Johns, nothing to disclose. Mr. Scruggs, nothing to disclose. Ms. Simmons visited the property and spoke to a resident of Tapestry Park. Mr. Morehouse attended the community meeting but did not participate in the discussion. Mr. Hodges, nothing to disclose. Chairman Wakstein is a resident of the community and had spoken with the HOA President and had knowledge that some residents supported the modification request, and some residents opposed the modification.

Wayne Ritenour of Yerway, LLC explained they wanted to make the Village area more compatible with the Tapestry Park neighborhood and the surrounding area and consistent with the current market conditions. He stated the current approved plan allows for a parking garage, hotel, condominium, and retail, but their modifications would decrease the density, explaining their plan was to provide a gated luxury multi-family, public park areas open to the public, and a business

component, which would all connect through gates for the Tapestry Park residents to utilize from the walkable trails throughout.

The board had the following questions for the applicant regarding the modification:

Describe the landscape buffering from the proposed development to the existing neighborhood and the specific of the landscape and tree sizes.

Mr. Ritenour explained the buffering would be fifteen (15) feet of to include an eight (8) foot fence and mature landscape, which they would work with the Tapestry Park HOA on the type of trees and the type of privacy fence. He also stated the separation distance between the buildings and the property within the neighborhood would be approximately seventy (70) feet.

Describe how many stories for the multi-family and the location of the windows on the building.

Describe the type of lighting used on the rear of the buildings facing the neighborhood.

Mr. Ritenour explained the multi-family was four stories and the windows would be located on the rear of the buildings with the balconies located on the front, therefore providing privacy to the neighborhood homes. He stated the lighting would be like the turtle lighting and would only be on the front of the buildings facing toward Hutchison Boulevard.

Describe the connections between the neighborhood and the proposed development. Describe the lighting on the rear of the buildings into the neighborhoods. Can the parking in the front of the buildings move to the rear to maximize the distance between the multi-family and the neighborhood.

Mr. Ritenour and Mr. Harper explained there was a current plan to have several connections, such as a walking path and one road for vehicular travel on the rear side of the development. Mr. Ritenour explained the connections were required by the LDC. Mr. Harper explained to move the parking would change the direction of the city utilities that are in the front of the buildings.

Chairman Wakstein asked for staff comments. Mr. Silky commented there is a decrease in the density from the approved plan on record. He stated they have the required landscape buffering and controlled lighting from the existing development. He commented the parking requirements would be reviewed and satisfied in the final development plan. He added they had met the requirements of the two access points to the existing development, one vehicular and a walkable/cycle path. Discussion ensued on the use of low-speed vehicle on the connections. Chairman Wakstein opened the meeting up for public comment, affected parties.

Tucker Painter, 301 Geneva Avenue HOA President commented he was directly impacted from the development. He explained the neighborhood did not desire a vehicular access from this development into the existing, adding it would increase more traffic into their community. He stated there was currently an access from Lyndell and two from Clara Avenue. Mr. Painter stated the neighborhood would prefer having restricted pedestrian style access as discussed. He reiterated the existing neighborhood did not want visitors from the commercial sites nor the multi-family sites, an access would only provide another cut through. Mr. Painter commented the more landscape that can be provided the better to maintain the current outdoor privacy for the neighbors abutting this new development, suggesting eliminating windows on the rear of the multi-family.

Debby Hove, 406 Liverpool Avenue commented she had lived in the community for eight years and loved her neighborhood. Ms. Hove commented she could not understand the necessity multi-family in a residential neighborhood when there is an adequate number of apartments already in proximity to this area. She named the three current developments of multi-family within a 2.5-mile radius: Clara Avenue, Panama Flats and Breakfast Point.

Chairman Wakstein asked the applicant to respond to the comments. Mr. Harper commented the accessibility is a city requirement and could be limited for residents connecting to the park only. Ms. Jenkins, City Engineer commented the city would not object to a gate. Discussion ensued on different variations of channeling traffic through the neighborhood, orienting the park in a different area, restricting access from the proposed Village area into the neighborhood thru gated access from Cicero Street and Columbus Street.

Thomas Plunkett, 211 Cicero asked if the gates would be maintained by the city, residents, or the developer, stating they were not able to gate the neighborhood since the roads were public. Chairman Wakstein explained the gates they were discussing were on the property of the Village and not located on the public roads.

Mr. Tucker, HOA President commented that he was in favor of the idea of gates and the proposal for access from Cicero to Hutchison for neighborhood residents only and for an alleyway from Cicero to Columbus but would need to share this idea with the homeowners. Mr. Ritenour commented they would be willing to collaborate with the HOA on the access points of Cicero and Columbus and take ownership and maintenance of the gates located within the Village.

Mr. Davis suggested for the applicant to move forward with the modification request would the board agree to allow the Tapestry Park homeowners and the applicant submit an access plan to staff and then the Order could be issued, and staff will approve the board's revisions with the submittal, the board agreed.

Chairman Wakstein closed the public portion of the meeting and the board continued with discussion of conditions to the submittal. The board provided the following conditions:

- a.) Install and maintain a masonry or composite privacy fencing at least eight (8) feet in height along all property lines abutting the Tapestry Park neighborhood.
- b.) A vegetative buffer consisting of species approved in the LDC, Section 4.06.02 with a minimum size of four (4) inches caliper shall be established along all property lines abutting the Tapestry Park neighborhood.
- c.) Exterior lighting along all property lines abutting the Tapestry Park neighborhood shall be the dark sky lighting.

Mr. Hodges made a motion to approve the Tapestry Park PUD Modification with the stated revisions and it was seconded by Ms. Simmons. Ms. Chester was asked to call roll.

Mr. Johns	Yes	Mr. Morehouse	Yes
Mr. Scruggs	Yes	Mr. Hodges	Yes
Ms. Simmons	Yes	Chairman Wakstein	Yes

ITEM NO. 7 Capital Improvement Schedule

Mr. Silky introduced the item and explained this was a yearly report required by the State and the information included was provided from the different departments; Public Works, Utilities, and CRA. Mr. Morehouse asked for an update on the Breakfast Point roundabout. Ms. Jenkins explained the phases of the project, bidding the job and acquiring "Safety Money" to help fund the project. Mr. Leonard explained that some of the projects on the lists were prioritized by City Council and that currently they were exploring for a new consultant team to come aboard and manage the CRA. Discussion ensued regarding the projects noted.

Mr. Scruggs made a motion to approve the Capital Improvement Schedule and it was seconded by Mr. Johns. Ms. Chester was asked to call roll.

Mr. Johns	Yes	Mr. Morehouse	Yes
Mr. Scruggs	Yes	Mr. Hodges	Yes
Ms. Simmons	Yes	Chairman Wakstein	Yes

ITEM NO. 8 Discussion of Chapter 7 – LDC 7.02.03 Front Beach Overlay District Standards

Chairman Wakstein commented that he would like for the board to review Chapter 7 of the standards for the Front Beach Overlay District. He stated that he felt the standards were difficult, limited, increase the cost to build and reduced the functionality of the property. Chairman Wakstein asked the board to review the chapter and be prepared for discussion at the next meeting; front yard setbacks, parking on the side and in the rear of the property, and the building types allowed would be among standards to discuss. The board agreed to begin the discussion of standards at the next meeting.


ITEM NO. 9 Code Enforcement Update

Mr. Tindle provided an overview of the report for the board.

The meeting adjourned at 3:26 pm.

DATED this 9th day of February, 2022.


Josh Wakstein, Chairman

ATTEST:

Andrea Chester, Secretary