



## **RENEW ARLINGTON CRA ADVISORY BOARD**

Hybrid Virtual & In-Person Meeting  
City Hall, 117 West Duval Street  
OED Suite 250, Large Conference Room  
Jacksonville, FL 32202  
Wednesday, June 12, 2024 – 3:30 p.m.

### **MEETING MINUTES**

**Location:** The RA/CRA Advisory Board meeting was held as a hybrid virtual and in-person meeting. The RA/CRA Advisory Board Members met in person at City Hall, 117 West Duval Street, OED Suite 250, Large Conference Room

**RA/CRA Advisory Board Members Present:** Advisory Board Chair Matt Tuohy, Advisory Board Members Bandele Onasanya, Ramsey Salem, and Monty Selim

**RA/CRA Advisory Board Members Not Present:** Advisory Board Vice-Chair Stephen Matchett, Advisory Board Members Wade Alliance, DeDee Harper, Danyuell Newkirk, and Cantrece Jones

**Staff Present:** Ed Randolph, Executive Director; Karen Nasrallah, Redevelopment Manager; Brian Wheeler, Renew Arlington Design Review; and Michelle Stephens, Recording Secretary

**Representing the Office of General Counsel:** Carla Lopera

**Representing the Office of City Council:** Councilman Ken Amaro, Council District 1 and his ECA Joe Johnson

**Others Present:** Bruce Lewis, Planning Department; Steve Diebenow, and others representing DMH&D.

#### **I. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair M. Tuohy called the meeting to order at 3:34 p.m. A quorum was not present.

Chair M. Tuohy advised that the agenda would be taken up out of order reviewing the Jacksonville Classical Academy East PUD before the action items.

Steve Diebenow advised that he was representing the Jacksonville Classical Academy East. At the last meeting he shared a Site Plan in order to gain the ability to move forward in the process with the rezoning application. Basically the question was whether the application was sufficient to move forward.

Mr. Diebenow noted that the school has changed hands from one of his clients to a joint use agreement with the Boys and Girls Club and eventually to the Jacksonville Classical Academy who owns and operates the school today.

Mr. Diebenow commented that he was going to provide an overview of the specific issues that the Advisory Board had concerns about at the last meeting.

- 1) Access to the adjacent parcel to the East. He noted that they amended their Site Plan to show a potential future connection if the adjacent property ends up being a school or an expansion of the school adding that the potential future connection will almost certainly be used. If the parcel to the east is a commercial parcel it probably will not be used because the school will not want to mix traffic with commercial.
- 2) Reported flooding observed between the building and where the portables are shown. The flood condition was addressed when the school was bought by the new owner adding that they spent several thousand dollars addressing the flood condition.
- 3) Fencing along the retention pond to the far south. In talking with the folks who run the school, the reason the chain link fence is preferred is because it provides a visual of what is going on near the retention pond versus the view being blocked from the school side due to the remote possibility of someone getting over the fence and not being able to see them. He noted that the fence that is between the school property and the homes to the south is an existing 6 foot tall wood fence that is 95% opaque and will be maintained as it is today.
- 4) Landscaping and the possibility of adding a row of trees. He commented that they think the existing natural landscaping that is there now is adequate and does not see that an additional row of trees will add anything to the experience. They are open to keep talking about it.
- 5) On the western side of the property in the proximity of the portables and the side yard they do not see a way to make that condition better. There is already an existing 6 foot wood fence on that side, which has a separation between the back yards of the properties to the west and the school property. Maybe there is a way to add some additional landscaping on the western side. There isn't really a way to reconfigure the portables to move them away for example from that side.
- 6) The portable materials come from the manufacturer in different ways. There are prohibitions on what it cannot be. Corrugated metal is something that is not permitted. They confirmed that the portables will not be made out of the materials that are prohibited by the Overlay. We can make them match the color of the existing school. He commented

that he does not think they can get that type of material but they can definitely make it look in appearance similar to the school itself even though the siding will not be hardy board. It will be one of the materials that the manufacturer uses.

Mr. Wheeler commented that he does not know if there is a scrivener's error between the original application and some of the exhibits. The Site Plan provided has a date of January 2022 and the Site Plan that is actually in the PUD package that came from the Planning Department is the old original one not the one we looked at last time. He noted in the application there are still both parcel numbers and legal descriptions over the commercial track. He asked if they were just focusing on the school or requesting to rezone the commercial.

Mr. Diebenow commented that for now they are not going to mess around with the commercial parcel at all. He is not sure if the driveway maybe requires them to include the commercial parcel. The school use is permitted on the commercial parcel already. As long as we can clarify that we can keep the portables on the other parcel then we do not intend to fill it up with portables as long as we can use those over there. He added that they will confirm the dates on the Site Plan and the other changes discussed adding that they are not changing any commercial uses.

Mr. Wheeler replied, if we are going to rezone the commercial parcel you would need to be able to show that you can comply with all of the CRA Overlay Ordinance on that parcel. That would have to be written into this and blanket criteria for the commercial. Typically we would want to see a Site Plan. He commented that we need the rest of the application package from the Planning Department to catch up.

Mr. Wheeler commented that because the parcel only allows a school it is exempt from many of the local governmental regulations. There needs to be a catch all if the charter school were to go away, or the business model changes by a future owner and they decide they are no longer going to be a charter school, they would just be an existing could be a commercial school of welding or adapted for some other school related use, but not an official charter school. They would lose some of the criteria that they are exempt from and have to comply with the CRA Ordinance standards for any expansion, renovations, etc. that needs to be built in as a potential future condition.

Mr. Diebenow replied that he will get with his team to discuss.

Mr. Wheeler added that typically we have a set of performance standards that are referenced 656.399.62 in each section those would need to be referenced where you reference it in the PUD or take it out because the school is not asking for any performance standards such as holiday sales in the parking lot, etc.

Mr. Diebenow responded that you are saying that the provisions in 656.399.62 need to be addressed in the description?

Mr. Wheeler replied or just eliminate them from the written description because you say we are not going to have any use other than a school. If you are going to try and use the parking lot for other things, then it needs to meet the CRA standards because those supersede the city standard.

Mr. Diebenow replied that he was not sure of their plans, but asked as an example if they were to sell Christmas Trees in the parking lot. Mr. Wheeler replied than leave it in.

Mr. Wheeler commented that we may be making some modifications to the definitions in the ordinance it would be helpful to indicate that design criteria in the RA Overlay it refers to a public right of way or collector roadway shall apply on Fort Caroline Road.

Mr. Wheeler responded frontage requirements for some there is a portion of those that go away because you are not doing commercial. If we are restricting it to only charter school use, but if other uses were to creep in then it addresses building typology, modulation setback, frontage requirements building mass, all those types of things. Mr. Diebenow asked if that is if there is a

Councilmember K. Amaro referencing Steve's comment that the trees are not adding anything. The reason is that he thinks it is not only aesthetics, but it also reduces noise for the adjacent community and provides a visual barrier. He thinks there should be some trees along that line. For the fencing, the fencing is clearly the subdivision's fencing. The last time he visited the campus it looked like it was an aged wooden 8 foot fence, which means in five years it will probably have holes in it, etc. He stated that it would accomplish a visual and a noise barrier between the school community and the subdivision when school is in session as well as provide noise reduction and a more pleasing aesthetic.

Advisory Board Member Ramsey Salem commented regarding the portables that there was discussion last month that we were going to put a five or seven year limit on the existence of the portables and asked if that could be incorporated into the PUD. He asked about the retention pond that is there now, in the PUD on the map you have the whole thing as a PUD including the retention pond that goes out in the property behind where you have the original commercial. If you put commercial on the wooded lot, is the existing retention pond big enough. Mr. Diebenow responded that he thinks it is big enough but he will have to check.

Mr. Diebenow commented that currently the commercial parcel is already PUD zoning. If its school use that potential future connection will probably be utilized because it will be connecting two school uses. If it is commercial, that potential future connection would probably not be used.

Mr. Diebenow responded to the portable question by saying that the intent was not to have them there forever. He is not sure if they agreed to a limit but he will find out.

Mr. Wheeler pointed out that the FL Building Code considers four years to be the limitation for portables. More than four years it is a permanent addition to the building and requires overhead connectivity. His understanding is that all of that is basically controlled at the state level and local government does not have a role in deciding permanent portables or not.

Advisory Board Ramsey Salem commented that they cannot be added to the PUD is that what you are saying. Mr. Wheeler concurred.

Advisory Board Member M. Selim asked about the dimension on the west side between the property line and the portables. Mr. Diebenow responded seven feet. He asked if that could be landscaped with trees or buffered as well. Mr. Diebenow commented that he will see what he can come up with for that.

Councilmember K. Amaro asked about a portable becoming a permanent structure after four years. He asked about it requiring a connecting cover, etc. so should these classrooms go beyond four years? Who is going to make that determination?

Mr. Diebenow responded that he will get clarification.

Mr. Diebenow wanted to point out that the current PUD did not have a specific Site Plan on the commercial portion of it. If commercial ever was developed, he thinks the department would require what is called a minor modification which would go through a public hearing, get noticed because we don't have a specific Site Plan, we would ask for something specific to make sure it complies with the CRA guidelines at that time.

Karen noted that the next meeting of the Advisory Committee is not until August 14<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Diebenow added that they are going to the Planning Commission on September 5th. Mr. Diebenow commented that he is going to provide an updated Site Plan and written description to Brian.

## **II. ACTION ITEMS**

### **CONSIDERATION OF MEETING MINUTES FOR MAY 8, 2024**

A quorum was not present for the meeting and the approval of the May 8, 2024 Meeting Minutes were deferred to the next meeting.

### **CONSIDERATION TO AMEND THE MCGP GOALS, POLICIES AND GUIDELINES TO ADJUST PRICING FOR FENCING/SIGNAGE MINIMUM STANDARDS**

Ms. Nasrallah reviewed a memo dated June 12, 2024 addressed to the Advisory Board related to the rising costs of materials and inflation to property owners participating in the RA MCGP and the additional costs the property owners are having to spend out of pocket. She noted staff is proposing raising the minimum standard allowable to property owners for fencing and signage given the high cost of materials based on inflation and supply chain issues.

In reply to a question from Chair Tuohy, Ms. Lopera commented that the increase would only apply to new applicants and not any applicants in the que that already have contracts executed.

Ms. Nasrallah noted that because a quorum is not present, they can move the item forward to the Agency Board without a vote of the Advisory Board.

### **III. NEW BUSINESS**

No New Business was discussed.

### **IV. OLD BUSINESS**

No Old Business was discussed.

### **VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no comments from the public.

### **VII. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, Chair M. Tuohy adjourned the RA/CRA Advisory Board Meeting at approximately 4:04 p.m.

The written minutes for this meeting are only an overview of what was discussed. For verbatim comments of this meeting, an audio file of the meeting is available in its entirety and is available upon request. Please contact Karen Nasrallah at (904) 255-5449, or by email at [karenn@coj.net](mailto:karenn@coj.net).