

**NEFRC Planning and  
Growth Management Policy Committee**

**Thursday, May 1, 2008**  
9:00 a.m.

**A G E N D A**  
(ADDED / MODIFIED ITEMS IN BOLD)

**TAB**

1. Call to Order, Roll Call, Introductions – Chairman Boyle
2. \*Approval of Minutes of April 3, 2008, Meeting – Chairman Boyle ----- 1
3. Comprehensive Plan Amendment Review – Ed Lehman ----- 2
  - \*a. Town of Hilliard Transmitted Amendment 08PEFE-1 – Ameera Sayeed ----- 3
  - \*b. Town of Hilliard Transmitted Amendment 08-1 – Ameera Sayeed ----- 4
  - \*c. Clay County Adopted Amendment 08-1 – Ed Lehman ----- 5
4. Intergovernmental Coordination and Review (IC&R) Report – Ed Lehman ----- 6
5. Development of Regional Impact (DRI)
  - \*a. Cedar Creek DRI Transportation Recommendation Report – Ed Lehman --- 7
  - b. DRI Report – Ed Lehman ----- 8
6. Other
7. Public Comment – **LIMITED TO 3 MINUTES PER SPEAKER**
8. Next Meeting Date and Location: **Thursday, June 5, 2008  
Northeast Florida Regional Council  
6850 Belfort Oaks Place  
Jacksonville, FL 32216**
9. Adjournment

**\*Denotes Action Item**

# Tab 1



## NEFRC Planning and Growth Management Policy Committee

Thursday, April 3, 2008

### MINUTES

The NEFRC Planning and Growth Management Policy Committee meeting was held on Thursday, April 3, 2008 at 8:45 a.m., at the Baker County School Board, Macclenny, Florida. Chairman Boyle called the meeting to order with the following members:

#### PRESENT

Commissioner Boyle (Chair)  
Vice-Mayor Lawson-Brown (arrived late)  
Commissioner Manuel  
Mr. Register  
Commissioner Rutledge (President)  
Mr. Spaeth  
Commissioner Stevenson  
Mr. Williams  
Mr. Sample for Ms. Burnette (Ex-officio)  
Mr. Parks (Ex-officio)

#### EXCUSED

Councilman Bue  
Vice Mayor Crichlow  
Commissioner Harris  
Mayor Leeper  
Ms. Vallencourt

#### ABSENT

Ms. Dungey  
Mr. Maxwell  
Mr. Strong (Ex-officio)

Others: Ed Preston, Janis Fleet, Tony Robbins, Ken Metcalf, Steve Fitzgibbons, Bernie O'Connor, Dan Chitwood, Paula Barton and others.

Staff Present: Ed Lehman, Brian Teeple, Guy Parola, Ameera Sayeed, Valerie Evans, Anna Shepherd, Margo Moehring, Sheron Forde, and others.

**Chairman Boyle stated that due to the lack of a quorum, the meeting will be held as a workshop until a quorum is obtained. At that time the Committee will take action on the items as needed. The Cedar Creek DRI recommendation report will be addressed first.**

Cedar Creek DRI Recommendation Report – Mr. Lehman provided an overview of the Cedar Creek development and its location in Baker County. He stated that this is a three-phase project with a total of 6,000 age restricted units. However, the Applicant has agreed to having some non-age restricted units, approximately 500 – 1,000 multi-family, included in the development. Mr. Lehman went on to provide an overview of the specifics of the project, such as 300,000 s.f. office space, 500,000 s.f. commercial space, 120 beds of an assisted living facility, a movie theater, post secondary education and golf course. Mr. Lehman reviewed the specific conditions and recommendations for issues 1 – 11 and 18 – 24, which are consistent with previously approved DRIs.

A brief discussion ensued on issue 22 regarding age restrictions. Mr. Lehman stated that the age restriction is 55. He added that it is up to the local government to determine how it will be restricted, but it must be provided in the Development Order (DO). Chairman Boyle inquired if one resident was 56 and the spouse was 48, would they be allowed based on the age restriction. Mr. Robbins stated they would be allowed. President Rutledge inquired about grandparents who become the primary caregivers for their grandchildren, will the school board be able to recoup the money for those children's school. Mr. Robbins stated that yes, they would be able to. However, this would need to be done via a county ordinance.

A quorum was still not achieved; therefore, the meeting continued as a workshop.

Mr. Lehman continued with staff's recommendations as follows: Issue 12, Transportation; there are three options that the Applicant, Baker County and the Town of Glen St. Mary can choose from to mitigate the impacts to C.R. 215. He provided an overview of the three options – a) parallel roadway, b) Glen St. Mary Bypass or c) by design, engineering and permitting, right-of-way acquisition and construction of the widening of C.R. 215 within phase 1 and U.S. 90 before phase 1. It is recommended that the developer be responsible for all necessary intersection improvements at the intersections of the By-pass Road at U.S. 90 as determined by Baker County and/or the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT).

Vice Mayor Lawson-Brown arrived at 9:25 a.m.

Commissioner Manuel arrived at 9:27 a.m.

Issue 13, Planning and Funding for Regional Roadway System; staff's recommendation included, but is not limited to, the need for a corridor study to be done prior to the completion of phase 1, and will also address the feasibility of extending the corridor through Nassau County and into Duval County. Baker County will need to amend their comprehensive plan to include a long-term plan for the construction of the roadway, addressing funding responsibilities, schedule and coordination with the various agencies and affected counties. Mr. Lehman stated that this would be addressed through the NOPC process where the DO is amended and reviewed by Baker County, Council and DCA staff.

Issue 14, Future Impacts to I-10 and Necessary Mitigation; the Applicant will need to conduct a traffic study to determine acceptable trip distribution and assignment percentages for Cedar Creek traffic and submit it to all of the transportation reviewing agencies. This recommendation is based on FDOT's cumulative proportionate share being estimated at \$84 million dollars and the Applicant's share being estimated at \$47 million. The main reason for this difference is the assignment of traffic to I-10. The Applicant is assuming 18 percent of the Cedar Creek traffic will utilize I-10, while FDOT is assuming 35 percent of the Cedar Creek traffic will utilize I-10.

Mr. Lehman concluded the Transportation section with an overview of issues 15 – 17, which are consistent with previously approved DRIs.

Following staff's recommendations, the Applicant's representative, Mr. Bernard O'Conner, distributed an alternate proposal for the Transportation language. He stated that having a fixed mitigation plan would offer the project more certainty; making it easier to plan the full project with less contingencies. It would also be easier to determine the financing if commitments of the project is known. The Applicant's consultants and Baker County's traffic consultants are in agreement on the analysis as presented in the sufficiency responses. However, FDOT is not in agreement with the distribution, which is the primary difference. It is the Applicant's belief that there will be a lower number of work trips because it is an age-restricted community and would be resolved in Baker County. As the project develops, it will provide more job opportunities, as well as more recreational opportunities, which would keep the trips low and may even lesson some of the current trips into Duval County.

Mr. O'Conner provided an overview of the Applicant's proposed alternate language, which strikes the preamble language under Transportation. Issue 13 – adds language that caps the amount of contributions that the project would make to the study and all the improvements they

would make on Baker County roads, except for I-10, at \$25.9 million. Issue 14 – strikes the last sentence and inserts fixed amounts for phase 2 and 3 that would be contributions to FDOT for I-10 that would be capped at \$21.4 million at the end of phase 3; totaling \$47.3 million in proportionate share as identified in FDOT's letter. Mr. O'Conner added that there is currently a variance proposal for I-10 that would lower the allowable level of service (LOS) on I-10 from LOS B to LOS D. The proposed alternative language would benefit all involved because the Applicant's analysis takes into account the existing LOS B criteria for I-10, thus providing a sense of certainty of what the mitigation for this project is.

Chairman Boyle inquired about the notation of 2007 dollars in the alternative language, Issue 13, but there is no notation as to what dollars are being used in Issue 14. Mr. O'Conner stated that this was just an oversight as there would have to be something in the DO that ties the cash contributions to the time the calculations are being made. Mr. Lehman added that this is a common practice as \$2 million in 2015 would have to be converted to 2007 dollars.

Mr. Robbins, applicant representative, stated that it would be unattainable for the Applicant to go through the DRI process with only entitlement for phase 1 of the development. The Applicant is proposing that, along with the regular monitoring of the DRI, there be something that sets up phase 1, 2 and 3 improvements; something that monitors and tracks it so if anything goes wrong, then it has to come back. However, to simply go forward with only phase 1 development rights is something that the developer is not able to move forward with and appreciates the Council's consideration of some alternatives.

Mr. Parks commented on his concerns; 1) it's the first time they're seeing it, 2) the whole purpose of the NOPC, as he understands it, is to determine what the impact is going to be after phase 1. He added that the applicant basically wants to cap what their numbers are right now. If their numbers are wrong, they're still only giving \$47 million. Therefore, what the study would do under the NOPC would make no difference as they would already have it capped.

Mr. Preston was asked if Baker County was agreeable with the County's portion of this closed language. Mr. Preston responded that the County negotiated in good faith the document that does not include the proposed alternate language and have not had an opportunity to review it as yet. Therefore, the County is not in a position to respond to the new proposed language.

Mr. Lehman stated that the issue of surety is heard all the time with monitoring and modeling. However, across the State it is typical to look back and reanalyze. This isn't outside of what is done in every other region. However, staff is not saying that we want more money from the Applicant. For example, if the study after phase 1 says their fair share is \$32 million, it's whatever the number is. What staff is saying is that we would like a study that says what it actually is and not some guesstimate. Staff would like a surer estimate of that number at phase 2, whatever it turns out to be. However, at this time, we are not able to tell the Committee what that number is.

Mr. Spaeth inquired when that number would be available. Mr. Lehman responded that it will be available, by staff's recommendation, prior to phase 2 so approximately 2013. There needs to be enough existing development in order to provide enough of a sample size to tell us what the actual impacts would be.

Mr. Parks commented on FDOT's disagreement with the traffic numbers and the cost mitigations; the U.S. 90 to I-10 – the bypass option would leave a gap on U.S. 90 from that

bypass over to the current four lane; Intersection improvements – what is not taken into account is the interchange at I-10, currently there is a two lane roadway on 125 going into I-10 interchange and there'll be a four lane roadway dumping into the I-10 interchange with no interchange improvements to I-10; the parallel study to U.S. 90 and I-10 going north from Macclenny into the Jacksonville area, FDOT is kicking off a study to look at that. He concluded that he is very concerned about the traffic analysis on I-10.

Mr. O'Conner responded to Mr. Preston's comments and stated that it is true it's the first time he's seen the language as it is written out. However, they have been working with Baker County utilizing the same number, \$47.3 million as their impact, for months. In regards to the items that Mr. Parks brought up, it is agreed that there is a need to do something at the I-10 and C.R. 125 interchange, which could be a very good place to apply the money that would be contributed from the project towards I-10 improvements. Finally, in terms of the proportionate share cost of the I-10 improvements, these were included in the calculations for the amount they arrived at, \$47.3 million. He concluded by thanking the Committee for their consideration of the project and the proposed alternate language.

Roll call was taken at this time. Having acquired a quorum, the following actions were taken:

\*Approval of Minutes

**Chairman Boyle called for a motion on the March 6, 2008, meeting minutes. Commissioner Manuel made a motion to approve, it was seconded by President Rutledge; Motion carried.**

Comprehensive Plan Amendment Review

Mr. Lehman stated there were 12 Comprehensive Plan Amendments reviewed during the month of March. Eleven (11) Transmitted Amendments are brought before the Committee. One (1) small scale amendments was received.

City of Green Cove Springs Transmitted Amendment (08PEFE-1) – Mr. Parola provided an overview of the transmitted amendment, which contains a new Public School Facilities Element (PSFE) and text amendments to the Intergovernmental Coordination Element (IGC) and the Capital Improvement Element (CIE). Staff recommends that the Planning and Growth Management Policy Committee approve this report for transmittal to the DCA.

**Chairman Boyle called for a motion on the City of Green Cove Spring's Transmitted Amendment 08PEFE-1. Commissioner Manuel made a motion to approve, it was seconded by Mr. Spaeth; Motion carried.**

Town of Glen St. Mary Transmitted Amendment (08PEFE-1) – Ms. Shepherd provided an overview of the transmitted amendment, which contains a new Public School Facilities Element (PSFE) and text amendments to the Intergovernmental Coordination Element (IGC) and the Capital Improvement Element (CIE). The applicant has revised the data and analysis; therefore, staff no longer has the concerns identified in the written report and recommends that the Planning and Growth Management Policy Committee approve this report for transmittal to the DCA.

**Chairman Boyle called for a motion on the Town of Glen St. Mary's Transmitted Amendment 08PEFE-1. Commissioner Manuel made a motion to approve, it was seconded by Mr. Spaeth; Motion carried.**

City of St. Augustine Beach Transmitted Amendment (08-1) – Mr. Lehman provided an overview of the transmitted amendment, which is basically addressing staff and DCA's comments on the Transmitted Amendment 07-2. Therefore, it is recommended that the DCA not review this amendment. Staff recommends that the Planning and Growth Management Policy Committee and the Council approve this report for transmittal to the DCA.

**Chairman Boyle called for a motion on the City of St. Augustine's Transmitted Amendment 08-1. Commissioner Manuel made a motion to approve, it was seconded by Commissioner Stevenson; Motion carried.**

City of Palm Coast Transmitted Amendment (08-1) – Mr. Lehman provided an overview of the transmitted amendment, which consists of two Future Land Use Map changes and one text amendment that addresses Coast High Hazard Areas. Staff comments that while they are not objecting to the language of the text amendment, they are offering alternative language to provide further clarity to the policy. Staff recommends that the Planning and Growth Management Policy Committee and the Council approve this report for transmittal to the DCA.

Commissioner Manuel inquired if this alternative definition will become the standard definition. Mr. Lehman stated that based on the language that is being proposed, if adopted, it could be a possibility.

**Chairman Boyle called for a motion on the City of Palm Coast's Transmitted Amendment 08-1. Commissioner Manuel made a motion to approve, it was seconded by President Rutledge; Motion carried.**

Town of Callahan Transmitted Amendment (08PEFE-1) – Ms. Evans provided an overview of the transmitted amendment, which contains a new public school facilities element and text amendments to the text of both the ICE and the CIE. Having no comments, staff recommends that the Planning and Growth Management Policy Committee and the Council approve this report for transmittal to the DCA.

**Chairman Boyle called for a motion on the Town of Callahan's Transmitted Amendment 08PEFE-1. Vice Mayor Lawson-Brown made a motion to approve, it was seconded by Commissioner Manuel; Motion carried.**

Nassau County Transmitted Amendment (08PEFE-1) – Ms. Evans provided an overview of the transmitted amendment, which contains a new Public School Facilities Element (PSFE) and text amendments to the Intergovernmental Coordination Element (IGC) and the Capital Improvement Element (CIE). Staff recommends that the Planning and Growth Management Policy Committee approve this report for transmittal to the DCA.

Commissioner Manuel inquired why the applicant chose to use 95 percent for the elementary schools. Ms. Fleet, school board consultant, replied that elementary schools never reach 100 percent. However, Nassau County has four facilities higher than the actual and believes they can maintain the 95 percent for elementary schools throughout the five-year planning period.

**Chairman Boyle called for a motion on the Nassau County's Transmitted Amendment 08PEFE-1. Commissioner Manuel made a motion to approve, it was seconded by Mr. Spaeth; Motion carried.**

City of Macclenny Transmitted Amendment (08PEFE-1) – Ms. Evans provided an overview of the transmitted amendment, which contains a new Public School Facilities Element (PSFE) and text amendments to the Intergovernmental Coordination Element (IGC) and the Capital Improvement Element (CIE). Staff has revised its comments to reflect that the plan is financially feasible and recommends that the Planning and Growth Management Policy Committee approve this report for transmittal to the DCA without comment.

**Chairman Boyle called for a motion on the City of Macclenny's Transmitted Amendment 08PEFE-1. Commissioner Manuel made a motion to approve, it was seconded by Mr. Register; Motion carried.**

City of Crescent City Transmitted Amendment (08PEFE-1) – Ms. Evans provided an overview of the transmitted amendment, which contains a new Public School Facilities Element (PSFE) and text amendments to the Intergovernmental Coordination Element (IGC) and the Capital Improvement Element (CIE). Having no comments staff recommends that the Planning and Growth Management Policy Committee approve this report for transmittal to the DCA.

**Chairman Boyle called for a motion on the City of Crescent City's Transmitted Amendment 08PEFE-1. Vice Mayor Lawson-Brown made a motion to approve, it was seconded by Commissioner Manuel; Motion carried.**

City of Fernandina Beach Transmitted Amendment (08PEFE-1) – Mr. Parola provided an overview of the transmitted amendment, which contains a new Public School Facilities Element (PSFE) and text amendments to the Intergovernmental Coordination Element (IGC) and the Capital Improvement Element (CIE). Having no comments, staff recommends that the Planning and Growth Management Policy Committee approve this report for transmittal to the DCA.

**Chairman Boyle called for a motion on the City of Fernandina Beach's Transmitted Amendment 08PEFE-1. Commissioner Manuel made a motion to approve, it was seconded by Commissioner Stevenson; Motion carried.**

Chairman Boyle called for a motion on the remaining agenda items. Commissioner Manuel made a motion to move agenda items 3j, k, 4a, b, 5 and 6b to the full board, it was seconded by Mr. Register; Motion carried.

Public Comments

There were no public comments.

Next Meeting Date

The next meeting will be held Thursday, May 1, 2008, at 9:00 a.m. at the Northeast Florida Regional Council.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 a.m.

# **Tab 2**

**NEFRC Planning and  
Growth Management Policy Committee**

**Thursday, May 1, 2008**  
9:00 a.m.

**A G E N D A**  
(ADDED / MODIFIED ITEMS IN BOLD)

**TAB**

1. Call to Order, Roll Call, Introductions – Chairman Boyle
2. \*Approval of Minutes of April 3, 2008, Meeting – Chairman Boyle ----- 1
3. **Comprehensive Plan Amendment Review – Ed Lehman ----- 2**
  - \*a. Town of Hilliard Transmitted Amendment 08PEFE-1 – Ameera Sayeed ----- 3
  - \*b. Town of Hilliard Transmitted Amendment 08-1 – Ameera Sayeed ----- 4
  - \*c. Clay County Adopted Amendment 08-1 – Ed Lehman ----- 5
4. Intergovernmental Coordination and Review (IC&R) Report – Ed Lehman ----- 6
5. Development of Regional Impact (DRI)
  - \*a. Cedar Creek DRI Transportation Recommendation Report – Ed Lehman --- 7
  - b. DRI Report – Ed Lehman ----- 8
6. Other
7. Public Comment – **LIMITED TO 3 MINUTES PER SPEAKER**
8. Next Meeting Date and Location: **Thursday, June 5, 2008  
Northeast Florida Regional Council  
6850 Belfort Oaks Place  
Jacksonville, FL 32216**
9. Adjournment

**\*Denotes Action Item**

# **Tab 3**



*Bringing Communities Together*

Baker • Clay • Duval • Flagler • Nassau • Putnam • St. Johns

## MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** April 17, 2008

**TO:** Northeast Florida Regional Council

**THRU:** Planning and Growth Management Policy Committee

**FROM:** Ameera Sayeed, Senior Regional Planner

**RE:** Town of Hilliard Transmitted Amendment 08PEFE-1

---

### Scope of Review

The Regional Council received the Town of Hilliard Transmitted Amendment 08PEFE-1. Pursuant to Chapter 163, Florida Statute and the contract between the Department of Community Affairs and the Regional Council, staff reviewed the Transmitted Amendment for adverse impacts to regional resources and facilities including any extra-jurisdictional impacts. Staff has prepared an Objection, Recommendations, and Comments report to send to the Department of Community Affairs upon approval by the Council.

### Amendment Summary

The transmitted amendment packet includes:

1. a new Public School Facilities Element (PSFE);
2. text amendments to the Intergovernmental Coordination Element (IGC);
3. text amendments to the Capital Improvements Element (CIE); and
4. the Inter-local agreement between the Putnam County School District, County, and applicable municipalities.

The proposed PSFE and corresponding text amendments to the IGC and CIE are mandated by State statute 163.3177(12) F.S. The Town of Hilliard adopted a level of service standard consistent with the County School district-wide standard

**Board Memorandum**

**April 17, 2008**

**Page 2**

for schools. This is based on permanent Florida Inventory of School Houses (FISH) capacity. The Town also adopted Concurrency Service Areas (CSA) based on the school district attendance zones. This amendment also contains the required goals, objectives and policies for PSFE.

*Staff has no comments regarding this amendment.*

**Recommendation**

**Staff respectfully recommends that the Planning and Growth Management Policy Committee and the Council approve this report for transmittal to the Department of Community Affairs.**

# **Tab 4**

## MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** April 21, 2008

**TO:** Northeast Florida Regional Council

**THRU:** Planning and Growth Management Policy Committee

**FROM:** Ameera F. Sayeed, Senior Regional Planner <sup>AS</sup>

**RE:** Town of Hilliard Transmitted Amendment 08-1

---

### Scope of Review

The Regional Council received the Town of Hilliard Transmitted Amendment 08-1 on April 21, 2008. The Town of Hilliard requested formal review by the Department of Community Affairs. Therefore, pursuant to Florida Statute Chapter 163 and the contract between the Department of Community Affairs and the Regional Council, staff reviewed the Transmitted Amendment for adverse impacts to Regional Resources and extra-jurisdictional impacts. Staff has prepared these Objections, Recommendations, and Comments report to send to the Department of Community Affairs upon approval by the Council.

### Amendment Summary

The Town of Hilliard Transmitted Amendment 08-1, which consists of several text amendments to the Future Land Use, Traffic Circulation, Public Facilities, Conservation and Capital Improvement Elements of the Comprehensive Plan. The text amendments assure that developments hook up to the Town's water and sewer facilities. The Town of Hilliard is not an Area of Critical State Concern.

**Board Memorandum**  
**April 21, 2008**  
**Page 2**

The Town of Hilliard has proposed policies that will allow development in those areas where the Town utility services are available or may be extended. The Town will seek the cost of the extensions to water and potable facilities be paid through developer agreements.

*Comment: Staff has no comments or concerns regarding any of the proposed text amendments.*

**Recommendation:**

**Staff respectfully recommends that the Committee and the Council approve this report for transmittal to the Department of Community Affairs.**

# Tab 5



*Bringing Communities Together*

Baker • Clay • Duval • Flagler • Nassau • Putnam • St. Johns

## MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** April 18, 2008

**TO:** Northeast Florida Regional Council

**THRU:** Planning and Growth Management Policy Committee

**FROM:** Edward Lehman, Director of Planning and Development

**RE:** Clay County Adopted Amendment 08-1

---

### Scope of Review

The Regional Council received the Clay County adopted amendment 08-1 on April 17, 2008. Pursuant to Florida Statute Chapter 163 and the contract between the Department of Community Affairs and the Regional Council, staff has reviewed the adopted amendment to determine whether it is consistent with the Goals, Objectives, and Policies of the Northeast Florida Strategic Regional Policy Plan. Staff has prepared this report to forward to the Department of Community Affairs upon approval by the Council.

### Amendment History

Clay County adopted Amendment 08-1 on April 8, 2008. The transmitted amendments that correspond to this adoption package were reviewed at the January, 2008 meeting of the Council, at which time the Committee and Council approved staff's recommendations with comments on the transmitted Amendment 08-1 (attached) for transmittal to Department of Community Affairs (DCA). After review of the transmitted amendment package, the DCA issued an Objections, Recommendations, and Comments report by letter dated February 8, 2008, and raised several objections and comments.

## Board Memorandum

April 18, 2008

Page 2

### Amendment Summary

Clay County Adopted Amendment 08-1 consists of three changes to the Future Land Use Map (FLUM), which are described in detail in the attached transmittal review memo, as well as a change to the text of the Future Land Use Element to limit residential densities along Kingsley Lake. The changes adopted by the County are as follows:

- 1) The amendment changes 3.5 acres from Rural Fringe to Commercial. The subject property is located on the southwest corner of the U.S. 17/Creighton Road intersection in the Fleming Island area of the County. Development of this parcel as commercial is consistent with the general development patterns in this area of Clay County, and represents infill development.
- 2) The second amendment changes 68.04 acres from Agriculture to Rural Residential. The subject property is located on the west side of U.S. 17 about six miles south of its intersection with S.R. 16. The parcel is presently used for silviculture purposes. The maximum potential development on parcel under the existing land use designation is 3 units, with the maximum potential development under the proposed land use designation is 68 units (with points). The Committee and Council expressed concerns about the increase in densities without central water and sewer service available in this area of the County.

*While evidence was presented in the adoption document to support the contention that the soils are appropriate for septic tanks, staff still has concerns about the increase in residential densities in an area of the County with no central water and sewer service. However, staff does not believe that there will be regional impacts from the potential 68 dwelling units that may occur as a result of this land use change.*

- 3) The next amendment changes 649.83 acres from Mining to Agriculture (349.84 acres) and Industrial (299.99 acres). The subject property is located 2.5 miles west of U.S. 17 about five miles south of its intersection with S.R. 16. The parcel is presently used for mining, and will be reclaimed. The land use changes to Agriculture represent the return of the parcels to the pre-existing land use designation, with the change to Industrial represent existing developments on the site.
- 4) The text amendment is in result of concerns about a previous land use change in the Kingsley Lake area. Policies 3.1 and 3.2 have been revised to add the provision that lands proposed for residential development within ½ mile of Outstanding Florida Water must have a minimum lot size of one (1) acre unless served by central water and/or sewer, to address citizens' concerns about increased densities along Kingsley Lake.

**Board Memorandum**

**April 18, 2008**

**Page 2**

**Recommendation:**


**Staff respectfully recommends that the Committee and the Council find Clay County Adopted Amendment 08-1 consistent with the Northeast Florida Strategic Regional Policy Plan.**

## MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** December 17, 2007

**TO:** Northeast Florida Regional Council

**THRU:** Planning and Growth Management Policy Committee

**FROM:**   
Edward Lehman, Director of Planning and Development

**RE:** Clay County Transmitted Amendment 08-1

---

### Scope of Review

The Regional Council received Clay County Transmitted Amendment 08-1 on December 10, 2007. Clay County requested formal review by the Department of Community Affairs. Therefore, pursuant to Florida Statute Chapter 163 and the contract between the Department of Community Affairs and the Regional Council, staff reviewed the Transmitted Amendment for adverse impacts to Regional Resources and extra-jurisdictional impacts. Staff has prepared this Objections, Recommendations, and Comments report to send to the Department of Community Affairs upon approval by the Council.

### Amendment Summary

Clay County Transmitted Amendment 08-1 contains three proposed changes to the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) and one text amendment. The changes transmitted by the County are as follows:

1. The amendment proposes to change 3.5 acres from Rural Fringe to Commercial. The subject property is located on the southwest corner of the U.S. 17/Creighton Road intersection in the Fleming Island area of the County. The parcel is presently undeveloped with the exception of one single-family home. The site is bordered on the

**Board Memorandum**  
**December 18, 2007**  
**Page 2**

north by a convenience store and gas station in Commercial land use, on the south by and FDOT retention pond, and on the east and west by single-family residential development in Rural Fringe land use. The maximum potential development on parcel under the existing land use designation is 6 units (with points and clustering), with the maximum potential development under the proposed land use designation is 60,984 square feet of commercial development (assuming development of the on-site wetlands). The developer has indicated that they intend to develop this property with 19,000 square feet of commercial development. Clay County Planning Department staff recommended transmittal of this amendment, stating that it represents infill development in this part of the County. There should be no regional impacts from this land use change.

**2.** The amendment proposes to change 68.04 acres from Agriculture to Rural Residential. The subject property is located on the west side of U.S. 17 about six miles south of its intersection with S.R. 16. The parcel is presently used for silviculture purposes. The site is bordered by Agriculture/Timberland land on three of the four borders, with wetlands located to the south. The maximum potential development on parcel under the existing land use designation is 3 units, with the maximum potential development under the proposed land use designation is 68 units (with points). Clay County Planning Department staff recommended that the County not transmit this amendment, stating concerns with the densities, and that consideration of the remaining acreage would best be done through the EAR-based amendment process.

*Comment: It should be noted that the developer of the parcel withdrew a portion of the parcel consisting of 500 acres. Nevertheless, both Clay County staff and the Clay County Planning Commission recommended to not transmit this amendment. Council staff has concerns about approval of the potential to develop 68 units in this area of the County, to be served by individual wells and septic systems.*

**3.** The amendment proposes to change 649.83 acres from Mining to Agriculture (349.84 acres) and Industrial (299.99 acres). The subject property is located 2.5 miles west of U.S. 17 about five miles south of its intersection with S.R. 16. The parcel is presently used for mining, and will be reclaimed. The site is bordered by mining land on all boundaries. The maximum potential development under the proposed land use designation is 299.99 acres of industrial (even though only 215.01 acres is proposed for development) and 5 dwelling units. According to the County's staff analysis, "the change into Industrial represents existing developments on site." Therefore, the proposed change is to bring existing land use into consistency with the Comprehensive Plan FLUM.

**Board Memorandum  
December 18, 2007  
Page 3**

4. The text amendment is in result of concerns about a previous land use change in the Kingsley Lake area. Residents believe that a previous change to Rural Fringe creates a precedent that will lead to additional requests for Rural Fringe land use around the lake, which could have an effect on Kingsley Lake. Policies 3.1 and 3.2 have been revised to add the provision that lands proposed for residential development within ½ mile of Outstanding Florida Water must have a minimum lot size of one (1) acre unless served by central water and/or sewer.

**Recommendation**

**Staff respectfully recommends that the Committee and the Council approve this report for transmittal to the Department of Community Affairs.**

# Tab 6



*Bringing Communities Together*

Baker • Clay • Duval • Flagler • Nassau • Putnam • St. Johns

## MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 22, 2008

TO: Northeast Florida Regional Council

THRU: Planning and Growth Management Policy Committee Chairman  
*Ed*

FROM: Ed Lehman, Director of Planning and Development

RE: Intergovernmental Coordination and Review (IC&R) Status Log and Report Activity for the Month of April 2008.

During the month of April 2008, 39 applications were received for the IC&R review process. Of these applications, 36 were exempt and sent through the local review process. Three non-exempt applications were sent through the state review process. The completed applications have been processed accordingly.

Regional completed application fund sources are broken down as follows:

	Current Month	Year to Date
Federal	\$5,692,610.00	\$7,956,422.27
State	0.00	\$143,100.00
Applicant	\$2,145,586.00	\$5,375,670.00
Other/Local	\$300,126.00	\$2,486,922.00
Totals	\$8,138,532.00	\$15,962,144.27

Each active and completed application is reported in the:

**MONTHLY IC&R REVIEW DATA BASE – April 1 - 30, 2008**

Apr-08

BAKER						
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
		Federal Asst.		FDOT		
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due	SCH Due	Status
CLAY						
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due	SCH Due	Status
DUVAL						
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
<a href="#">DV08-0080</a>			<a href="#">ERP - Silvertree Apartments</a>	Charter Landing Apts		
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due 4/21/08	SCH Due	Status
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
<a href="#">DV08-0081</a>			<a href="#">ERP - CSXT Fouraker Siding Project</a>	K. Brinker		
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due	SCH Due	Status
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
<a href="#">DV08-0082</a>			<a href="#">ERP - Marshside I &amp; II</a>	Flagler Dev. Co.		
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due 4/21/08	SCH Due	Status
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
<a href="#">DV08-0083</a>			<a href="#">ERP-Mt.Pleasant Creek Unit 3A</a>	FL Land and Timber Corp		
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due 4/21/08	SCH Due	Status
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
<a href="#">DV08-0084</a>			<a href="#">ERP-Porter Lakes Drive</a>	Stephen Carroll		
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due 4/21/08	SCH Due	Status
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
<a href="#">DV08-0085</a>			<a href="#">ERP - NAS Jax Patriot Point</a>	Andy Stone		
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due 4/21/08	SCH Due	Status
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
<a href="#">DV08 - 0086</a>			<a href="#">ERP - Naval Air Station Jax</a>	Andy Stone		
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due 4/21/08	SCH Due	Status
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
<a href="#">DV08 - 0087</a>	<b>FL200804024147C</b>		<a href="#">Nav Imp Study Jax Harbor</a>	Dept. of Army		
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due 4/25/08	SCH Due 5/2/08	Status
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
<a href="#">DV08 - 0088</a>			VA Homeless Grant	Community Rehab Center		\$8,138,592.00
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due 4/25/08	SCH Due	Status
\$5,692,610.00	\$2,145,856.00		\$300,126.00			
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
<a href="#">DV08-0089</a>			<a href="#">ERP-Waterleaf K-5</a>	DCPS		
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due 4/30/2008	SCH Due	Status
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
<a href="#">DV08-090</a>			<a href="#">ERP - Soutel Road</a>	JTA		
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due 4/30/2008	SCH Due	Status
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
<a href="#">DV08-0091</a>			<a href="#">ERP - Hogan's Corner</a>	D. Grubbs		
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due 4/30/2008	SCH Due	Status

NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
<a href="#">DV08-0092</a>			<a href="#">ERP - First Coast Med. Ctr.</a>	First coast Med. Plaze LLC		
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due	SCH Due	Status
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
<a href="#">DV08-0093</a>			<a href="#">ERP - Naval Station Mayport</a>	Naval Air Station Public Works Dept		
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due 4/30/2008	SCH Due	Status
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
<a href="#">DV08-0094</a>			<a href="#">ERP-Naval Station Mayport</a>	Naval Air Station Public Works Dept		
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due 4/30/2008	SCH Due	Status
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
<a href="#">DV08-0095</a>			<a href="#">ERP-Naval Station Mayport</a>	Naval Air Station Public Works Dept		
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due 4/30/2008	SCH Due	Status
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
<a href="#">DV08-0096</a>			<a href="#">ERP - Main Street Commerce Park</a>	Steven Cohen		
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due 4/30/2008	SCH Due	Status
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
<a href="#">DV08-0097</a>			<a href="#">ERP-Naval Station Mayport</a>	Naval Air Station Public Works Dept		
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due 4/30/2008	SCH Due	Status
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
<a href="#">DV08-0098</a>			<a href="#">ERP - CSXT East Pass Siding Project</a>	Environmental Remediation		
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due 4/30/2008	SCH Due	Status
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
<a href="#">DV08-0099</a>			<a href="#">ERP - Dixon Marble &amp; Tile</a>	Rosanna C. Dixon		
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due 4/30/2008	SCH Due	Status
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
<a href="#">DV08-0100</a>			<a href="#">ERP - Jax Inter'l Tradeport</a>	CTC Investments		
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due 4/30/2008	SCH Due	Status
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
<a href="#">DV08-0101</a>			<a href="#">ERP - Flagler Off. Park at Nocatee</a>	Flagler Dev. Reverse Exch		
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due 4/30/2008	SCH Due	Status
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
<a href="#">DV08-0102</a>			<a href="#">ERP- Jax VA National Cemetery</a>	Edison Circle		
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due 4/30/2008	SCH Due	Status
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
<a href="#">DV08-0103</a>			<a href="#">ERP- Rievreview Med. Center/Clinic</a>	Hilton T. Meadows		
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due 4/30/2008	SCH Due	Status
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
<a href="#">DV08-0104</a>						
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due 4/30/2008	SCH Due	Status

FLAGLER						
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
<a href="#">FL08-0013</a>			<a href="#">ERP-Harbor View Marina</a>	Graham PC		
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due 4/21/08	SCH Due	Status
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
<a href="#">FL08-0014</a>			<a href="#">ERP-Rymfire K-8 Addition</a>	Flagler County School Brd.		
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due 4/21/08	SCH Due	Status
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
<a href="#">FL08-0015</a>			<a href="#">ERP - Grand Reserve &amp; Golf Club Unit 2</a>	OB at Flagler LLC		
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due 4/30/2008	SCH Due	Status
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
<a href="#">FL08-0016</a>			<a href="#">ERP - Bunnell Industrial</a>	LG2 Environmental Solutions		
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due 4/30/2008	SCH Due	Status
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
<a href="#">FL08-0017</a>			<a href="#">ERP - PC Parkway Plaza</a>	PC Pkwy Investments		
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due 4/30/2008	SCH Due	Status
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due	SCH Due	Status
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due	SCH Due	Status

NASSAU						
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
<a href="#">NA08-0015</a>			<a href="#">ERP - CSXT Fouraker Siding Project</a>	K Brinker		
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due 4/21/08	SCH Due	Status
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
<a href="#">NA08-0016</a>			<a href="#">ERP - Livingwaters World Outreach</a>	Livingwaters World Outreach		
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due 4/30/2008	SCH Due	Status
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
<a href="#">NA08-0017</a>			<a href="#">ERP- Trevett Tradeplex</a>	Harry Trevett		
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due 4/30/2008	SCH Due	Status
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
<a href="#">NA08-0018</a>			<a href="#">ERP - Vystar Credit Union</a>	Vystar Credit Union		
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due 4/30/2008	SCH Due	Status
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
<a href="#">NA08-0019</a>			<a href="#">ERP - Owis Nest Court Borrow Pit</a>	Charles laskey		
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due 4/30/2008	SCH Due	Status
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
<a href="#">NA08-0020</a>			<a href="#">Wetland Determinination - Turkey Trot Trail</a>	Dynamic Envir. Assoc.		
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due 4/30/2008	SCH Due	Status

<b>PUTNAM</b>						
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due	SCH Due	Status

<b>ST. JOHNS</b>						
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
<a href="#">SJ08-0048</a>			<a href="#">ERP - Westminster Woods</a>	Steve Cook		
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due	SCH Due	Status
				4/21/08		
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
<a href="#">SJ08-0049</a>			<a href="#">ERP - SR 207</a>	FDOT		
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due	SCH Due	Status
				4/30/08		
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
<a href="#">SJ08-0050</a>			<a href="#">ERP - The Ranch I</a>	Tom Taran		
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due	SCH Due	Status
				4/30/08		
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
<a href="#">SJ08-0051</a>			<a href="#">ERP- Fdva Nursing Home</a>	Richard Arcurri		
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due	SCH Due	Status
				4/30/08		
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due	SCH Due	Status
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due	SCH Due	Status
NEFRC #	SAI#	Act.	Application/Project Title	Applicant	Cost Sorc.	Total Cost
Federal	Applicant	State	Other/Local	RPC Due	SCH Due	Status

ERP - No response letter required unless an objections to the project is received.

	Current Month	Year to Date
<b>Federal</b>	\$5,692,610.00	\$7,956,422.27
<b>State</b>	\$0.00	\$143,100.00
<b>Applicant</b>	\$2,145,856.00	\$5,375,670.00
<b>Other/Local</b>	\$300,126.00	\$2,486,922.00
<b>Totals</b>	\$8,138,592.00	\$15,962,114.27

# **Tab 7**

## **MEMORANDUM**

**DATE:** April 22, 2008

**TO:** Northeast Florida Regional Council

**THRU:** Planning and Growth Management Policy Committee

**FROM:** Edward Lehman, Director of Planning and Development

**RE:** Cedar Creek DRI Transportation Recommendations

---

Attached for your consideration are draft transportation conditions for the Cedar Creek DRI in Baker County. As you recall, the Council deferred action on the transportation conditions at the April meeting. After several negotiation meetings, FDOT staff, Baker County staff, the applicant, and Council staff have reached an agreement in principle on the attached transportation conditions, even though there may be refinements and minor modifications to these conditions presented at the May Board Meeting.

**Recommendation:**

**Staff recommends that Committee and Council approve the transportation conditions to be included in the recommendation report for the Cedar Creek DRI for transmittal to Baker County for their consideration when adopting the Development Order for this project.**

1 **Transportation**

2  
3 **ISSUE #12: Phase 1 Improvements to U.S. 90**

4  
5 U.S. 90 transitions from a four-lane divided arterial to a two-lane roadway within the  
6 Glen St. Mary Town limits. Traffic from Cedar Creek will have a significant and adverse  
7 impact on U.S. 90 between the project and C.R. 125 within Phase 1. U.S. 90 is a regional  
8 roadway that bisects Baker County in an east-west direction, and connects Glen St. Mary  
9 to Macclenny. In addition, U.S. 90 provides for an alternative east-west route to I-10,  
10 connecting Baker County to Lake City and points west, and to Jacksonville.

11  
12 **Recommendation #12:**

13  
14 The Developer, its successors or assigns shall be responsible for the design,  
15 engineering, and right-of-way acquisition and the construction of the widening of  
16 U.S. 90, including all necessary intersection improvements, to a 4-lane divided  
17 arterial meeting FDOT standards from the East Project Entrance to C.R. 125. No  
18 building permits for Phase 1 shall be issued unless this improvement is under  
19 construction. The Developer shall contribute any additional right-of-way necessary  
20 to facilitate construction of this improvement.

21  
22 Depending upon which option is selected in Recommendation 13 below, (A, B, C,  
23 or D), the Developer shall be responsible for all necessary intersection  
24 improvements at the intersections of U.S. 90 as determined necessary by Baker  
25 County and/or FDOT including, but not limited to, turn lanes (including right-of-  
26 way costs if necessary) and signalization when warranted. Specifically, if Option  
27 A is selected, the intersections with the Glen St. Mary Bypass and George Tabor  
28 Road; if Option B is selected the intersection with the Glen St. Mary Bypass; if  
29 Option C is selected the intersection with C.R. 125; and if Option D is selected, the  
30 intersection with Smokey Road. No permits for Phase 2 construction shall be  
31 issued until these necessary intersection improvements are constructed and  
32 operational.

33  
34 **ISSUE #13: Construction of Glen St. Mary Bypass/Improvements to C.R. 125**

35  
36 C.R. 125 is a two-lane roadway that provides a connection from I-10 to U.S. 90 through  
37 the Town of Glen St. Mary. Traffic from Cedar Creek will have a significant and adverse  
38 impact to C.R. 125 from U.S. 90 to I-10. There are several alternatives that, if  
39 implemented, will address the impacts from Cedar Creek and provide sufficient capacity  
40 to C.R. 125. The array of alternatives includes actual widening improvements to C.R.  
41 125 or parallel improvements that will provide relief to C.R. 125. The Developer must be  
42 subject on one of these improvement options in order to adequately mitigate significant  
43 and adverse impacts to C.R. 125.

44  
45 **Recommendation #13**

1 The Developer, Baker County, and the Town of Glen St. Mary shall coordinate  
2 and mutually agree upon one of the following four options (Option A, B, C, or D)  
3 below in order to mitigate impacts to C.R. 125 from this development. Any  
4 increase in the cost of the identified improvements in excess of the estimates used  
5 to calculate the Developer’s proportionate share shall be the Developer’s sole risk  
6 and shall not reduce or be offset against other proportionate share responsibilities  
7 of the Developer.

8  
9 Option A

10  
11 *Glen St. Mary Bypass (2 lanes) & George Tabor Road*

12  
13 The Developer, its successors or assigns shall be responsible for the design,  
14 engineering and permitting, right-of-way acquisition, and construction of a new  
15 north/south two-lane roadway with sidewalks and bikeways (Glen St. Mary  
16 Bypass) within adequate right-of-way for expansion to four lanes from U.S. 90 to  
17 C.R. 125, which will generally follow Nursery Road then swing east to connect to  
18 C.R. 125. In addition, the developer is responsible for improvements to George  
19 Tabor Road between U.S. 90 and C.R. 125 to meet Baker County classification  
20 standards for a two-lane collector road. No building permits for Phase 2 shall be  
21 issued until the project is under construction.

22  
23 *C.R. 125*

24  
25 The Developer, its successors or assigns shall be responsible for the design,  
26 engineering and permitting, right-of-way acquisition, and the construction of the  
27 widening of C.R. 125 from George Tabor Road to I-10 to a four-lane divided  
28 arterial. No building permits for Phase 2 shall be issued until the project is under  
29 construction.

30  
31 Option B

32  
33 *Glen St. Mary Bypass(4 lanes)*

34  
35 The Developer, its successors or assigns shall be responsible for the design,  
36 engineering and permitting, right-of-way acquisition, and construction of a new  
37 north/south four-lane roadway with sidewalks and bikeways (Glen St. Mary  
38 Bypass) within adequate right-of-way for expansion to four lanes from U.S. 90 to  
39 C.R. 125, which will generally follow Nursery Road then swing east to connect to  
40 C.R. 125. No building permits for Phase 2 shall be issued until the project is  
41 under construction.

42  
43 *C.R. 125*

44  
45 The Developer, its successors or assigns shall be responsible for the design,  
46 engineering and permitting, right-of-way acquisition, and the construction of the  
47 widening of C.R. 125 from the Glen St. Mary By-Pass to I-10 to a four-lane

1 divided arterial. No building permits for Phase 2 shall be issued until the project  
2 is under construction.

3  
4 Option C

5  
6 *C.R. 125*

7  
8 The Developer, its successors or assigns shall be responsible for the design,  
9 engineering and permitting, right-of-way acquisition, and the construction of the  
10 widening of C.R. 125 from U.S. 90 to I-10 to a four-lane divided arterial. No  
11 building permits for Phase 2 shall be issued until the project is under construction.

12  
13 Option D

14  
15 *Smokey Road Connector*

16  
17 The Developer, its successors or assigns shall be responsible for the design,  
18 engineering and permitting, right-of-way acquisition, and the construction of a  
19 new north-south two-lane roadway from U.S. 90 to C.R. 125 that will generally  
20 follow Smokey Road then swing east to connect to C.R. 125. No building permits  
21 for Phase 2 shall be issued until the project is under construction.

22  
23 *C.R. 125*

24  
25 The Developer, its successors or assigns shall be responsible for the design,  
26 engineering and permitting, right-of-way acquisition, and the construction of the  
27 widening of C.R. 125 from the Smokey Road Connector to I-10 to a four-lane  
28 roadway. No building permits for Phase 2 shall be issued until the project is  
29 under construction.

30  
31 **ISSUE #14: Planning and Funding for Regional Roadway System**

32  
33 I-10 and U.S. 90 are the two main east-west routes connecting Baker County to the  
34 Jacksonville Urbanized Area. Baker County has historically had little or no growth, with  
35 much of the growth that has occurred beginning a transition of Baker County as a  
36 bedroom community to Jacksonville. Cedar Creek is the first indication of an accelerated  
37 growth pattern in Baker County. While Cedar Creek is being developed as an active-  
38 adult community not in character with historical trends, the need for a parallel roadway  
39 system to I-10 and U.S. 90 will be accentuated by approval of this project and others  
40 anticipated to occur as growth pressures increase in Baker County.

41  
42 Recommendation #14

43  
44 The Developer will contribute \$250,000 by January 1, 2009 to the County for the  
45 completion by the County of a study/plan to determine the location of a corridor in  
46 North Baker County ("Thoroughfare Master Plan"), which has been included as  
47 part of the pipelining amount. The Thoroughfare Master Plan shall determine the

1 feasibility of extending the corridor through Nassau County and into Duval  
2 County, to connect to, at a minimum U.S. 301, and possibly east to a northern  
3 extension of the Outer Beltway in Duval County.  
4

5 The County shall amend its Comprehensive Plan to include a long-term parallel  
6 roadway implementation plan for designating the proposed roadways from the  
7 study on the long range transportation map, contain policies to address right-of-  
8 way acquisition coordination with FDOT and the FCMPO, and propose  
9 implementation strategies, in keeping with Rule 9J-5.019(5), F.A.C. The plan  
10 should include a policy to address development agreements and other strategies for  
11 implementing transportation improvements, in keeping with Rule 9J-5.019(4)(c)11,  
12 F.A.C. This implementation plan shall act as a direction-setting document that  
13 identifies the process for Baker County to follow in order to finance the various  
14 corridor study road improvements, not be a financially feasible capital  
15 improvements plan that specifies projects with schedules and assignment of  
16 funding sources.  
17

18 Prior to the issuance of any Phase 2 building permits, the Developer shall either (a)  
19 commence the planning, engineering, right-of-way acquisition, and construction of  
20 roadway improvement ("Thoroughfare Master Plan Improvements") valued at  
21 \$1,000,000 (2007 dollars) identified in the adopted Baker County Thoroughfare  
22 Master Plan ("Master Plan"), or (b) at the Developer's option contribute  
23 \$1,000,000 (2007 dollars) to Baker County for Thoroughfare Master Plan  
24 Improvements.  
25

26 Prior to the issuance of any Phase 3 building permits, the Developer shall either (a)  
27 commence the planning, engineering, right-of-way acquisition, and construction of  
28 Thoroughfare Master Plan Improvements valued at \$10,819,700 (2007 dollars)  
29 identified in the adopted Master Plan to be mutually agreed upon by Baker County  
30 and FDOT, or (b) at the Developer's option contribute \$10,819,700 (2007 dollars)  
31 to Baker County for Thoroughfare Master Plan Improvements, which shall be  
32 earmarked for one or more improvements, with the construction phase to be added  
33 to the Baker County Capital Improvements Plan.  
34

35 The selection of Thoroughfare Master Plan Improvements will be subject to the  
36 mutual agreement of the County and FDOT. The purpose of these improvement(s)  
37 will be to relieve traffic impacts on I-10, and the intention of the County and  
38 FDOT, as a first priority, is to identify Thoroughfare Master Plan Improvement(s)  
39 which facilitate the construction of parallel road(s) within the I-10 corridor located  
40 within Baker County. In the event the Master Plan does not provide an option to  
41 relieve traffic impacts to I-10 which are mutually agreeable to the County and  
42 FDOT, the County and FDOT shall identify and agree on an alternative roadway  
43 improvement(s) which shall be constructed within Baker County, and the  
44 construction phase of these alternative roadway improvements will be added to the  
45 Baker County Capital Improvements Plan.  
46

47 ISSUE #15 Future Impacts to I-10 and Necessary Mitigation

1  
2 I-10 is the primary east-west route that connects Baker County to western Jacksonville.  
3 I-10 will provide project traffic with access to Lake City and points west, as well as  
4 Jacksonville, Clay County and connections that lead to Gainesville and Nassau County to  
5 the east. Improvements to I-10 will be critical to moving project traffic and non-project  
6 traffic in this area of Baker County, and is an appropriate roadway to be subject to  
7 pipelining of Cedar Creek proportionate share.  
8

9 Recommendation #15A

10  
11 Within Phase 1, the Developer, its successors or assigns shall be responsible for  
12 completion of an Interchange Modification Report (IMR) for the C.R. 125  
13 interchange at I-10. The Developer shall be responsible for the design and  
14 construction of an overpass replacement, widening of C.R. 125 to 4-lanes, and  
15 ramp widening. No permits for Phase 2 construction shall be issued until these  
16 improvements are under construction.  
17

18 Recommendation #15B

19  
20 The Developer, its successors or assigns shall be responsible for the design,  
21 engineering, and construction of the widening of the auxiliary lanes to create 6  
22 lanes on I-10 from its interchange with S.R. 121 to its interchange with S.R. 228.  
23 No building permits for Phase 2 shall be issued unless this improvement is under  
24 construction.  
25

26 ISSUE #16: Application of Conversion Table

27  
28 Recommendation #16

29  
30 The Developer may increase or decrease the amount of a particular land use within  
31 the approved development program by using a conversion table that is based on  
32 equivalent peak hour trip ends. This table, when approved, shall be incorporated  
33 into the Development Order as an exhibit. Use of the conversion table may increase  
34 or decrease the total amount of each land use by no more than the amount allowed  
35 for in the substantial deviation criteria identified in Chapter 380.06(19)(b) 1-14 and  
36 380.06(19)(e)(5b), Florida Statutes. Conversion from age-restricted housing to  
37 primary housing may only be allowed for 500 additional units without a NOPC;  
38 however, any conversion that would result in more than 1,000 primary residential  
39 units and less than 5,000 age-restricted units will be required to go through the  
40 NOPC process to determine if the change will result in additional regional impacts  
41 and the need for a Substantial Deviation review.  
42

43 ISSUE #17: Transit

44  
45 The Developer is proposing to construct between 5,000 and 5,500 units of age-restricted  
46 housing. The percentage of residents that will be transportation disadvantaged in a  
47 project such as this is expected to be greater than in an average residential community.

1 The local transit provider will be required to accommodate transportation disadvantaged  
2 trips. Without adequate funding, the development will put a strain on the resources of the  
3 local transit developer.

4  
5 Recommendation #17

6  
7 Within each phase of Cedar Creek, the Developer, its successors or assigns shall  
8 contribute \$200,000 to the Baker County Council on Aging (or Community  
9 Transportation Coordinator if different from the COA) to support transit service  
10 to the transportation disadvantaged. This payment is due within two years of  
11 receipt of permits for development within that particular phase. The Developer  
12 will be credited against his proportionate share for this payment for transit.

13  
14 **ISSUE #18: Bicycle and Pedestrian Connections**

15  
16 A system of bicycle and pedestrian paths should be established within this part of the  
17 County to allow for alternative forms of transportation to reduce vehicle trips, as well as  
18 to allow for recreation.

19  
20 Recommendation #18

21  
22 In order to promote alternative forms of transportation, the Developer shall provide  
23 a comprehensive system of inter-connected bicycle paths and pedestrian walkways  
24 or multi-use trails throughout the Project. All residential development shall be  
25 connected to employment and shopping areas via this system.  
26

# Tab 8

## MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** April 21, 2008

**TO:** Northeast Florida Regional Council

**THRU:** Planning and Growth Management Policy Committee

**FROM:** Edward Lehman, Director of Planning and Development

**RE:** April Development of Regional Impact Report

---

The following report summarizes current DRI activity for the above-cited month. All additions and updates are *italicized*.

### **Cordova Palms**

The ADA for Cordova Palms was submitted on April 19. Cordova Palms was formerly known as Lemberg North. The pre-application conference for the DRI was held on October 25<sup>th</sup>. The project is located along the western side of U.S. 1 just west of the St. Augustine Airport. The master development plan calls for 1700 residential dwelling units, 600,000 square feet of retail, and 100,000 square feet of office development. First sufficiency review was transmitted to the applicant on May 22. The first sufficiency response was received on September 11. Second sufficiency review comments were transmitted to the applicant on October 11. The applicant recently requested and received a 90-day extension to the 120-day period to respond to the first sufficiency review. The applicant submitted the second sufficiency response on July 13, 2007. The County has been notified to set the public hearing for the D.O. The applicant has requested a waiver from the 90-day period to have the hearing to allow for the Comprehensive Plan amendment to be processed.

### **Durbin**

The pre-application conference for the Durbin DRI was held on December 6<sup>th</sup>. The Durbin DRI is located along I-95 at Racetrack Road in northern St. Johns County, along the Duval County line. The master development plan calls for 4,500 dwelling units,

**April DRI Report**  
**April 21, 2008**  
**Page 2**

1,700,000 square feet of office development, 3,000,000 square feet of retail development and 800 hotel rooms. The ADA for Durbin has been submitted. A sufficiency response was transmitted to the applicant on February 9. The applicant has requested an additional extension until the end of April in order to work with FDOT on alignments of roadway improvements.

**Elkton**

The Elkton DRI is a proposed multi-use DRI located in St. Johns County along S.R. 207 west of I-95. The pre-application conference was held on January 27<sup>th</sup>. The proposed development plan consists of a three-phase development, with 3600 dwelling units, 40,000 square feet of office, 140,000 square feet of retail, 40,000 square feet of medical, and 70,000 square feet of industrial. The sufficiency review for Elkton was transmitted to the applicant on Sept 13 – transportation comments were transmitted on Sept 27. The applicant has submitted the first sufficiency response. Second sufficiency review comments were transmitted to the applicant on February 2. The applicant has submitted the second sufficiency response, and the Council staff has notified St. Johns County to set the public hearing.

**Navona Creek**

The Navona Creek DRI is a proposed multi-use DRI located in Baker County just to the east of the proposed Cedar Creek DRI. The pre-application conference was held on August 10<sup>th</sup>. The proposed development plan consists of 5,913 single-family dwelling units, 4087 multi-family dwelling units, 1,500,000 square feet of business park development, 330,000 square feet of village center development, and a 120-bed hospital.

**Governors Park**

The Governors Park DRI is a proposed multi-use DRI located in Clay County just southwest of the City of Green Cove Springs. The property is located to the north and west of U.S. 17 adjacent to C.R. 15A on a portion of the Gustafson's Dairy Farm land. The pre-application conference was held on December 12<sup>th</sup>. The proposed development plan calls for four five-year phases and consists of 4,000 single-family dwelling units, 2,000 multi-family dwelling units, 2,000,000 square feet of industrial development, 700,000 square feet of office development, 840,000 square feet of commercial development, and 400 hotel rooms. The Governors Park ADA has been submitted and a first sufficiency review has been transmitted to the applicant.

**Old Brick Township**

The Old Brick Township DRI is a proposed multi-use DRI located in Flagler County in the northern portion of the County along the St. Johns County line. The property is located west of U.S. 1 and east of C.R. 13 (Old Brick Road). The pre-application conference was held on December 14<sup>th</sup>. The proposed development plan calls for three five-year phases and consists of 5,000 dwelling units, 1,000,000 square feet of industrial development, 50,000 square feet of office development, and 100,000 square feet of commercial development.

**Hunter's Ridge Substantial Deviation**

Hunter's Ridge is an approved DRI in Flagler County and Ormond Beach. As part of the settlement of an appeal of the D.O., in 1992 an area of Hunter's Ridge was determined to be a "Substantial Deviation Area." No development can occur until this area of the project goes through substantial deviation review. The pre-application conference was held on January 18 in Flagler County. The amount of development proposed within the Substantial Deviation Area consists of 849 single-family dwelling units, 69,900 square feet of office space, 52,580 square feet of retail space, and 58,520 square feet of light industrial space.

**The following is an estimate of the date for presentation of DRI projects to the NEFRC for consideration of staff recommendation:**

<u>Project</u>	<u>Date</u>
Durbin	October 2008
Cordova Palms	September 2008
Elkton	December 2008
Navona Creek	March 2009
Governors Park	March 2009
Old Brick Township	March 2009
Hunter's Ridge Substantial Deviation	October 2008