

CITY OF SEBASTIAN

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2040 FINAL DRAFT

OCTOBER 15, 2020

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION/LAND PLANNING AGENCY

**ATTACHMENT 1**

Approved meeting minutes, public comments, staff notations from PZ Commission/LPA presentations. Minutes contain comments providing reference to updates/additions in comp plan from public input.

## MEETING MINUTES FROM JUNE 18 PZ

### INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. Qizilbash inquired about the design criteria for this level of service and who is in charge of that, and who will decide the scale of the service. Mr. Vaudo replied that in relation to potable water, wastewater, and solid waste, the City is maintaining the County level of service for those particular services. Mr. Qizilbash also voiced concern regarding annexation of properties—who is in charge of deciding what is suitable for that area if the facilities are not available and the capacity is less, and the population growth is more. Ms. Frazier replied that when a development comes in, the developer/engineer will have to prove to the City that it can meet the level of service, and the capacity is available. They then get a capacity certificate from Indian River County stating that they have now reserved so much for their development. If a developer puts its reservation in with the County and pays for it, now it is set aside for that development. The County is to look at the land use for that particular area and determine capacity when they are doing future growth of a plant, future expansions of a plant or make some other modifications.

Mr. Christino commented that last year during the annexation hearing there was a difference of opinion with the County regarding the plans for the density of that project where they clearly stated that the capacity did not exist. That needs to be coordinated ahead of time before it is decided on how many units can be set within the City and make sure that we coordinate that properly.

Ms. Frazier stated that the County did not say they did not have capacity; they have available capacity. However, they do not want to allocate it for changes in land use because they have already done their buildout analysis based on existing land use, and they want to allocate it for some other developments, not new ones. The capacity is available. Mr. Christino stated the capacity would exist, but it was unfair for that one project to eat up that large a percentage of the available capacity for the entire county.

Mr. Roth stated that that is a concern that he has had also, that once you're in, you have it. But clearly he doesn't believe that to be the case. The capacity appeared to be there, but by different accounts it was not. He does not believe that is fair. That is why he brought up the question about meeting with the different groups and trying to make sure that there is a fair and equitable resolution, and it's not someone there with their thumb on the scale tipping it one way when they should not be doing that.

Ms. Kautenburg states she has concerns about solid waste. In reading the draft, she notes that the objectives are clear. She would presume that obtaining those objectives is related to things that the City Council would put into place. Her concerns are about solid waste regarding removal being voluntary in the City. She states she has seen issues where the dumping of solid waste takes place on any available vacant lot—and that is not a recent problem—that has been a problem over many years. She is of the opinion that the City should step forward and say \$35.00 a quarter is reasonable for anyone. She believes that if waste were picked up at every home, there would be a whole lot less dumping. She also has a concern about the handling of hazardous waste and storage at transfer facilities. She questions if that responsibility could be directed toward the entities that sell those hazardous waste items. A small fee is paid by the user for the proper disposal of those items. Her question is whether that problem reverts to the City Council to take care of those issues. Ms. Frazier stated her understanding of Ms. Kautenburg's question is that the City should beef up some of the City's policies regarding disposals illegal disposals and hazardous waste disposals—and the policy could state that: **"We shall explore the need to insure the proper disposal either of illegal dumping or**

**hazardous materials by incurring a fee.**" After the Comprehensive Plan is done, staff takes it and comes up with a policy and a resolution that says the City should assess fines for this. Then it goes to City Council. Ms. Kautenburg stated she gets concerned about having lofty objectives without having specific paths to reach them.

**Comment [VM1]:** Illegal dumping, management of hazardous waste, and development of additional regulatory measures are currently addressed in Infrastructure Element Policy 4-1.3.1.

Mr. Christino agreed with Ms. Kautenburg's concerns. He believes that the cost of recycling/garbage pickup here is extraordinarily low. He thinks it should be part of the future plan with development ahead on the horizon and existing problems that he sees. He believes it should be in the new Comp Plan that the City is going to require homes in the City to contract with Waste Management. That includes everything-yard pick-up, bulk pickup, recycling, etc.

**Comment [VM2]:** This would be City policy decision to require subscriptions to the private hauler and not within the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Carter's concern is on septic-to-sewer conversion. He considers it to be one of the most important issues over the next decade and further. He suggested something more robust in the City's Comprehensive Plan to address that issue. Not all the areas of Sebastian are addressed in this proposed Comprehensive Plan. He thinks that is something that needs to be considered sooner rather than later. This is affecting the quality of water in the river and the public's overall health. Ms. Frazier understood him to believe an additional policy should be included talking about the areas that currently do not have sewer available and saying that the City shall pursue other avenues. Mr. Carter stated that is his belief.

**Comment [VM3]:** Infrastructure Element Objective 4-1.2 and associated policies, and Conservation and Coastal Element Policies 5-1.4.13, 5-2.1.3, 5-2.1.4 support the conversion of septic tanks to connections with central wastewater and the extension of wastewater facilities.

Mr. Roth seconded that idea. That is a major concern that he has had all along. He feels this should be recommended to Council. People need to connect to the sewage, and the City needs to come up with a way to do it. He inquired if there is a map of the existing sewer lines in the City. Ms. Frazier stated yes, there is. Mr. Roth addressed the subject of solid waste level of service. He asked if the numbers in the proposed Plan were taken from recent data. Mr. Vaudo stated that that data was provided by Waste Management as of a month or so ago. So their capacity could be expanded.

**Comment [VM4]:** See note above related to policies addressing 'Septic to Sewer' conversion and expansion of wastewater infrastructure.

Ms. Kautenburg asked if the Super Fund is still available. Ms. Frazier stated she is not sure, as those were federal dollars for cleanup. Ms. Frazier stated there was a study for the County regarding ranking of areas within the County where they rate the different hot spots in the County that were contributing more pollutants than other areas based on septic. Putting sewer into these areas is incredibly expensive. Until the City comes up with some other alternatives, it will be very difficult to put everyone on sewer. She also reiterated that new developments within the City have to connect to the sewer line if they are within 500 feet of the sewer line.

**Comment [VM5]:** Infrastructure Element Policy 4-1.2.1 includes the 500-foot standard noted here.

Mr. Christino stated that the approximate 2,000 lots in the City have been platted for many years. They fall below the 2012 flood elevation maps. So the practice is to bring in several truckloads of fill. However, in the neighborhoods that utilize swales to remove stormwater, there is a steep grade to a lot of these lots. These neighbors fertilize, and these septic systems, if they are failing, accelerate the flow of the wastewater into these culverts. Perhaps there is a way to engineer the lots so that they level off more gradually than a steep drop, which allows waste or fertilizers to be absorbed into the soil instead of getting into the wastewater stream.

Mr. Hughan stated his concern is not only the Indian River, but, as the water table rises, that puts the septic tanks and the drain fields probably in the first layer of the aquifer. He knows it will be an astronomical figure to get rid of the septic tanks. The septic-to-sewer problem is his biggest concern.

## GOVERNANCE & IMPLEMENTATION

Ms. Kautenburg addressed the subject of funding. She read the section regarding special assessments being levied against residents, agencies or districts that directly benefit from the service or facility. She used the example of sidewalks. Currently, the whole community pays for a sidewalk wherever it is, even if it is not in everyone's neighborhood. In her view, a special assessment would be levied against the property that receives the benefit. She questioned whether that item is new or is that something that has not been done. Ms. Frazier stated she will look into that. Mr. Christino agreed with Ms. Kautenburg. Mr. Roth suggested holding this subject in abeyance until there is clarification. Ms. Frazier suggested that when the Mobility element is addressed, perhaps the sidewalk issue can be added in that element.

Mr. Christino addressed the roadways in the City. He states the roads are very narrow. He asked if there are any plans to widen the roadways. Ms. Frazier stated the standard for roadways in the City is 22 feet for two-way streets/roads. Mr. Christino feels the widening of the roads is a subject that needs to be addressed. Ms. Frazier stated that could be in the Transportation element, and widening roadways will be looked at, with consideration being given to bike lanes in new developments.

Mr. Roth called attention to Section 7-1.3.4 of the draft Plan where it mentions automobile occupancy rates. He wonders if the wording should include vehicles other than automobiles. Mr. Vaudo stated that will be looked at. Mr. Roth also questioned Section 7-1.8 done continuously. He also called attention to Section 7-1.8. He hopes that it is carried out.

Ms. Frazier reviewed Objective 7-1.2, which is the Land Use Intergovernmental Coordination. It was in the old document, but it never came to fruition. She wants to make sure it is still included in the document, which delineates the future of the County in cooperation with all of the municipalities. Mr. Roth and Mr. Christino think it is important that it be included.

## PUBLIC SCHOOL FACILITIES

Mr. Roth suggested that the acronyms be defined in an index or glossary. Mr. Vaudo stated that, once they are close to a final draft, they will be creating a definition system that will list acronyms and definitions of common terms that are listed. He referred to "colocation and community focal point." He asked for the meaning of this phrase. Mr. Vaudo explained this describes the City working with the School District to locate other community amenities adjacent to or with the school, with the intent of making the school a focal point of the neighborhood. Mr. Roth also asked if the State funds charter schools.

Ms. Frazier stated there is money that is allotted by the State and Federal Government.

Mr. Anon stated that charter schools are created by the state, and they do fund them.

Mr. Simmons stated it appears there was not a lot of coordination between the population projection and the number of students. Mr. Vaudo stated that data came from the School District. He will follow up on that. Mr. Christino shared Mr. Simmons' concerns regarding the projection of number of students.

Mr. Qizilbash addressed the burden to the school system because of new development. He wondered how that will be handled. Ms. Bosworth reviewed the process for when a new development comes in. There is a formula that is used for each single-family home that comes in. She reviewed those numbers in order to get a projection on how many

**Comment [VM6]:** Mobility Element Policy 2-1.1.8 supports the development of a Pedestrian Improvement Plan that would address sidewalks. Mobility Element Policy 2-1.1.9 supports conducting a sidewalk assessment/walking study. Mobility Element 2-1.1.11 supports standards within the LDC to address pedestrian infrastructure.

**Comment [VM7]:** Mobility Policies 2-1.1.11 and 2-1.1.12 support standards within the LDC to address roadway improvements and bicycle/pedestrian infrastructure. Mobility Policy 2-1.5.6 also addresses the consideration of roadway standards and bicycle/pedestrian facilities in the review of proposed development.

**Comment [VM8]:** After review and for clarity, the reference to automobile occupancy rates was removed from Policy 7-1.3.4.

**Comment [VM9]:** Our understanding of this comment was that Mr. Roth had particular interest in Objective 7-1.8: Conflict Resolution and expressed a desire that these policies and processes would be followed.

**Comment [VM10]:** Objective 7-1.2 and associated policies continue support the City's intent to maintain coordination related to land use with Indian River County and other municipalities, as required. Policy 7-1.2.3 specifically supports the establishment of an Interlocal Service Boundary Agreement.

**Comment [VM11]:** Definitions of acronyms are provided within the 'Acronyms and Definitions' section included after the Introduction and prior to the Land Use Element.

**Comment [VM12]:** Public School Facilities Element Policies 8-1.4.1 addresses the concept of collocation of community facilities and services within schools and school sites.

students will come from that development. If there is not enough capacity, the developer will have to pay for it.

**Graham Cox provided comments via email on June 22, 2020 following the meeting. The following is a summary of Mr. Cox's prominent points.**

1. Public input: We have to do a much better job of getting information to the city residents. He supplied a list of alternatives for consideration. He suggests compiling feedback information and saving. *Staff does this with all comments in the file and part of the document.*
2. Infrastructure: There is an alphabet soup of acronyms. They need to be listed up front. Need to include a serious discussion of the repair to the canal system, consider the canals and ponds as a city assets that are part of the green infrastructure and can increase property values for many residents if not all. He suggested that stormwater and utility staff assist in writing this section, *which was completed.*
3. **Septic systems and sewers:** The city must give much more attention to getting houses and commercial businesses hooked into main sewer lines.
4. Budget figures: Mr. Cox suggested being careful on stating cost projections.
5. Solid Waste: We have to step up recycling.
6. Coordination with other agencies: The long list of other state and local agencies and the many fees and taxes is staggering. In my opinion Sebastian residents do not pay nearly enough in various property taxes and our city roads, sidewalks, schools etc. all suffer from being short changed.
7. Schools: Decisions on schools are made at the county level but the city can do much to improve their functioning and their benefits to the community. They are a neighborhood asset, community attractions. Schools are focal points and as such we should be directing sidewalk improvements and wi-fi access to the schools and their students. Things are not walkable, not environmentally sound, not sustainable with respect to sidewalks and transporting students.
8. In the infrastructure section we need a much improved discussion of providing city-wide broadband free wi-fi access. The city should be wi-fi free so that all kids and families have computer access. This is one small way to improve student equality.
9. **Green infrastructure:** I am sure we will get to this with the sessions on parks, recreation, open space and coastal conservation, but it is important to include a green infrastructure section in the discussion on roads, sewers etc. This is all part of the discussion of a sustainable livable city.

**Comment [BA13]:** Policy 4-1.4.3; DIA pages 18-19

**Comment [BA14]:** Objective 4-1.2 and its Policies.

**Comment [BA15]:** Objective 4-1.3 and Policy 4-1.3.1

**Comment [BA16]:** Policy 4-1.1.11

**Comment [BA17]:** Conservation and Coastal Management Element Objective 5-1.9 and Policies. Green Infrastructure language and map added to Infrastructure DIA pages 18-19 and 21.

## **PZ COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES FROM JULY 30 2020**

### **LAND USE ELEMENT**

Another subject that was addressed was the industrial use of land within the City. Ms. Frazier explained several options for addressing the different classifications of industrial land use in Sebastian. She stated that City Council has recently asked staff to develop a change of use regarding heavy industrial property in the City to allow salvage yards. In the existing Comprehensive Plan regarding industrial use there is language that prohibits salvage yards. If the City allows salvage yards, there will need to be language to the effect that they will be allowed under the section describing recycling facilities with conditions, one of those conditions being that junk yards are prohibited.

**Comment [LF18]:** Staff will further determine Salvage Yards standards through the LDC process.

Mr. Reyes stated that he does not feel comfortable being told to get to an approval on the allowing of salvage yards. He stated he thinks this Commission is being forced to come

to a decision on something that has already been voted on.

Mr. Hughan commented regarding junkyards in the City. He is not in favor of them for the reason that they are environmental hazards regarding the liquids that are involved.

Mr. Christino commented regarding changes and strikethroughs, specifically protecting the environmentally sensitive land use in Comprehensive Plans, especially the wetlands. He thinks that the language contained in the existing Comprehensive Plan should be kept and not struck. Ms. Frazier stated that this subject will be addressed in the Conservation and Coastal Management Element, not the Land Use Element of the Plan, and that language will appear there. Mr. Klepper stated that this Committee will be reviewing the Coastal Management Element on August 20th. There has been a significant enhancement to the City's conservation components, from not only the wetlands and the native habitats, but also vegetative communities, etc.

**Comment [BA19]:** Staff will further determine Salvage Yards standards through the LDC process.

Ms. Kautenburg stated that with respect to the creation of junkyards, she does not have a problem with having a zoning district called heavy industrial, where that would be appropriate. She stated her problem with this suggestion is that the City does not presently have that type of land. She stated that if at some time in the future the City were to annex land, that type of land may be included. After reviewing the maps, she does not see anywhere that there is the type of land needed for salvage yards.

**Comment [BA20]:** Staff will further determine Salvage Yards standards through the LDC process.

Ms. Kautenburg also addressed the section on land use where there is a section on mobile homes in residential developments. She questioned if it would be possible to insert maintenance criteria for these mobile home parks. Mr. Klepper, in addressing Ms. Kautenburg's suggestion, stated those types of standards are typically found in the Land Development Code or in a companion with the Building Code, like a property maintenance component.

Ms. Kautenburg addressed the matter of limited commercial development, she asked if residences would be permitted in a limited commercial area. Mr. Klepper stated that commercial use should remain commercial, and mixed use would allow for commercial and residential under the one designation.

Mr. Simmons inquired whether the future land use maps that are shown include the existing annexations of property over the past couple of years. Ms. Frazier answered that they include the annexation titled "Spirit of Sebastian" and the 60+ acres north of Route 510. They do not include the current annexation under discussion with City Council.

Mr. Simmons also asked why the language describing residential density was changed which now refers to a specific number. Mr. Klepper stated that it was felt that that language was redundant.

Mr. Christino asked in follow-up to Mr. Simmons' question regarding the annexation along Route 510 if that land is designated as Commercial General. Ms. Frazier answered yes.

Mr. Christino asked if it would be within the City's purview to change that land's designation to institutional. Ms. Frazier stated that would not be possible unless the owners of the property would agree.

Mr. Roth asked for an explanation regarding the transfer of development rights in the Riverfront Mixed Use section. Ms. Frazier explained that that is an opportunity that is being presented within this land use category, and she explained how it is done. Mr. Roth asked who controls that activity. Ms. Frazier stated the City would have to approve those transfers. Mr. Klepper stated there is a formal process involved, and there could be an exchange of cash involved.

Mr. Roth had a question about the Objective of Annexation Studies section. He wondered if there must be an annexation study on each annexation. Mr. Klepper stated that was a recommendation by the Treasure Coast Regional Planning Council. There is the ability of the City to require one, and there is proposed language in the new Comprehensive Plan which designates what is required in the study.

Regarding the wording as to Community Appearance and Urban Design, he likes that section, but he wonders if it is actionable. He would like the City to inform developers what the City is looking for, i.e. the "Old Fishing Village" theme.

Mr. Reyes inquired about the statement that through incentives a developer can go from 8 units to 10 units on an acre lot. He is a little uncomfortable with that idea. Mr. Klepper explained that the areas where the density can be increased are the medium-density residential as well as the mixed-use areas. That would have to go through a formal process with the City.

**Comment [BA21]:** Acknowledged in Objective 1-3.1

Mr. Reyes is concerned about increasing the density by building up. Ms. Frazier stated that height limits are addressed in the Land Development Code, and that is not being proposed to be changed at this time. Mr. Klepper stated that the City does have the right to add something into the Land Development Code while addressing the new Comprehensive Plan.

**Comment [LF22]:** Density changes: Policy 1-1.1.4; 1-1.2.3; 1-1.3.6

Mr. Reyes called for input from the public.

- John Reilly, Sebastian. He is not in favor of increasing the density of units per acre. He also thinks TDRs is a terrible idea. He thinks four units per acre is plenty.

- Christopher Nunn, Sebastian. He asked where the area is located whose owner is asking for the heavy industrial designation. He is aware that this platform is not the place to bring that up, but he thinks the City should look at the situation and have a discussion about it. Mr. Christino stated the property is near the airport.

Mr. Reyes stated that this Commission has already voted on that.

- Sharon Herman, Sebastian. She agreed with what Mr. Nunn said about the heavy industrial question. She also wished the PowerPoint presentation had been included with the agenda for the public to see. Mr. Reyes stated making the PowerPoints available to the public will be looked at.

- Bill Flynn, Sebastian. He stated that part of his job with St. Lucie County Schools is fluid management. There are good practices that are regulated by both the State and the Federal Governments on how the fluids are handled by salvage/junkyards.

He is sure anyone in Sebastian would be following those regulations. As a community, it should be growing and allowing people to create jobs for the local community. Mr. Reyes asked Mr. Flynn how often the laws are violated regarding the fluids. Mr. Flynn said there was a problem in the past before the regulations were put in place.

**Comment [BA23]:** Staff will further determine Salvage Yards standards through the LDC process.

- Graham Cox, Sebastian (via Zoom). He agreed that it would be good to have the PowerPoint presentations available to the public, and to limit them to 15 minutes instead of 60 minutes. He also asked if the projection of 9,400 added to the population just addresses the population within the City limits or does that also include the population in the Graves Brothers annexed property. He also asked why it is desired to add 9,000-10,000 to the population. Residential costs more to develop, and commercial development provides more tax money for the City.

Mr. Reyes closed the Public Input and asked staff to move on to the next element of their presentation.

## HOUSING ELEMENT

Mr. Christino addressed the discrepancy on household size, being 2.24 versus 2.42 persons per owner. Mr. Klepper said he will doublecheck on which figures are correct. Ms. Kautenburg stated she is disappointed that the data used are so inaccurate. She emphasized that the median cost of a home in Sebastian as listed in the new Comprehensive Plan is not accurate. She opined that the rental rates and the mortgage rates are way off. She appreciates the efforts that the City is making to move forward, but she thinks it is necessary to have more accurate information. Mr. Klepper addressed her concerns by relating that there is professionally accepted information and that the multiple listing service has not been recognized to the best of his knowledge. He is aware that the data that have been used are somewhat dated. Staff will go back and confirm the data that have been used.

**Comment [VM24]:** Housing DIA has been updated to reflect 2.24 people per dwelling unit per BEBR.

**Comment [VM25]:** Housing DIA pg. 25

**Comment [VM26]:** Confirmed.

Mr. Roth addressed the section on affordable housing. He thinks if a proposed developer meets all the codes and requirements, it should not be dictated by the City to be developed otherwise. Mr. Klepper stated that when developers come into the City, they will be told what the development codes and policies are, and the developer can then decide whether to pursue development in Sebastian, whether it is affordable housing or something else.

Mr. Roth also addressed the accessory dwelling units (ADUs). He is concerned about the language that is proposed and whether it protects the homeowners. Mr. Klepper stated that the language used does not mean that these things are going to happen in all areas of the City. It means that the City is going to identify those areas in which ADUs can be used. Ms. Frazier added that the ADUs are becoming part of a solution to the problem of affordable housing. Mr. Roth stated that he is not against ADUs as long as there is a checkpoint to protect other homeowners.

**Comment [VM27]:** Addressed by Policy 3-1.4.2

Mr. Roth asked if there is any area in the proposed Plan that addresses tiny homes. Ms. Frazier stated that staff did not add that because there is not enough land available to support something like that. There is a higher density to accommodate those houses. She stated there have been some developers who showed interest in tiny home developments, but the density would not support those developments. She stated if the Commissioners would like staff to address that subject, they will look into it. Mr. Klepper read a section of the proposed Plan labeled Changing Conditions where it states, "The City shall undertake special housing studies as deemed necessary to develop specific local strategies for addressing housing conditions, market trends, and housing-related challenges." He said that under that language, the City could decide to study tiny houses.

**Comment [LF28]:** Density changes: Policy 1-1.1.4; 1-1.2.3; 1-1.3.6

Mr. Roth stated that if the City annexes additional land, the development of tiny home areas might be permitted. Mr. Klepper mentioned Sarasota County and the options they used to create tiny home developments.

**Comment [VM29]:** Addressed by Policy 3-1.4.2

Mr. Reyes is concerned with the ADUs turning into vacation rentals. He stated that energy-efficient housing, LEED, green space, and green products are a great idea, and there is not enough of that here. Those things should be pushed when developers come here.

**Comment [VM30]:** Addressed by Policy 3-1.4.2

**Comment [VM31]:** Addressed by Policy 3-1.8.1

Mr. Reyes asked what constitutes an historic structure. Mr. Klepper stated there is a definition through the State Department of Historic Resources as well as the federal standards. There are certain qualifications, and he thinks baseline is that the structure is 50 years old.

Mr. Reyes addressed the idea of streamlining the information in the Comprehensive Plan.

He opined that streamlining makes it harder for people to find the wording in the document if it is only in one place. He also stated the data that are used for the analyses should definitely be confirmed.

Mr. Reyes called for input from the public on the Housing Element.

• Sharon Herman, Sebastian. She inquired whether there is anywhere in this Plan that addresses the surface water issue. Ms. Frazier stated that stormwater is addressed in the Infrastructure section, and it is also addressed in the Conservation and Coastal Management section. Ms. Herman is also concerned about the affordable housing problem. She opined that this is becoming a community where the people who work in Sebastian cannot afford to live in Sebastian. She says it is sounding more and more like Sebastian is becoming more a community of the wealthy, supported by the outlying areas. She hopes that is not the way the City is headed. Regarding ADUs, she suggested keeping in mind that this is also a retirement community, and there might be more granny pods being erected.

**Comment [VM32]:** Affordable Housing addressed by Objective 3-1.2 and associated policies.

• Victor Young, Sebastian. He is also concerned about the lack of affordable housing in Sebastian. He specifically addressed those people whose income levels are too high to qualify for low-rent housing and yet are not high enough to afford other housing. He asked what the City is doing to try to address those people as well.

**Comment [LF33]:** Density changes: Policy 1-1.1.4; 1-1.2.3; 1-1.3.6

**Comment [VM34]:** See note above related to affordable housing and density.

Mr. Christino asked who sets the income limits for qualifying for affordable housing. Mr. Klepper stated that is based on the area median income, which is based on the metropolitan statistical area. Ms. Frazier stated that what Mr. Young is referring to is the "missing middle housing." It is the housing that our essential workers need, but they do not make enough to afford to live in this City. This is not isolated just to Sebastian. She understands the concern about increased density, but when developers come in and want to put in some type of relevant housing that the missing middle can afford, they have to do studies that will show them how much they have to sell the housing units for. Increasing density on the site brings down the cost of the house they are going to produce.

**Comment [VM35]:** This is a response from staff to public comment.

• Graham Cox, Sebastian. (Inaudible)

**Comment [LF36]:** Density changes: Policy 1-1.1.4; 1-1.2.3; 1-1.3.6

Mr. Reyes closed the Public Input and asked staff to move on to the next element of their presentation.

## TRANSPORTATION AND MOBILITY

• Victor Young, Sebastian. He thanked the Consultant and staff for going outside the City and looking at the surrounding areas when they drafted the proposed Plan. The plan of the County to connect 82nd Avenue to CR 510 is a good thing. He states it is crucial when that project is done the two quarries between 69th Street and Route 60 are considered. There is a lot of dump truck traffic, and there will be more dump trucks on 512 if that is connected over to the City. That will allow more dump truck traffic on 512. The subject of parking lots was brought up. He feels the problem is that the parking that is available presently is overflowing, and with another 10,000 increase in population over the next 20 years, many of whom will have boats, where will the additional parking come from.

• Christopher Nunn, Sebastian. Regarding the sidewalk along 512, he would like to see that whole row of trees removed, the area widened, and make it more of a bike path and a walking path. He thinks it would serve the community better as well as

being safer. He thinks most people are afraid to walk on that sidewalk because nobody can see they are there. He agrees that there should be more sidewalks in the City. Mr. Reyes said he thinks that the sidewalk along 512 is maintained by the County. If it were maintained better, there may be more people use that sidewalk

**Comment [VM37]:** Mobility Element Policy 2-1.1.8 supports the development of a Pedestrian Improvement Plan that would address sidewalks. Mobility Element Policy 2-1.1.9 supports conducting a sidewalk assessment/walking study. Mobility Element 2-1.1.11 supports standards within the LDC to address pedestrian infrastructure.

**Comment [VM38]:** Coordination with the County on bike/bed on CR 512 now addressed in Policy 2-1.1.6

## **PZ COMMISSION AUGUST 20, 2020**

### **CONSERVATION AND COASTAL MANAGEMENT**

Mr. Qizilbash:

- Asked, when a developer presents with a large project, who reviews the project to determine that these policies are adhered to. Mr. Klepper stated that a lot of these policies are enforced by the City's Land Development Code, which compliments the Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Frazier stated that it all depends on the project as to who is involved in making these decisions, and she cited examples.

Mr. Christino:

- Addressed Sebastian's waterfront, a lot of which is commercial, in the case of a catastrophic event and rebuilding in that area. He opined that there is a conflict with FEMA standards that would require that these buildings be raised, which is incompatible with the City's current height restrictions. He asked what system the City has to assist the business owners and homeowners with rebuilding in the event of a catastrophic event like a destructive hurricane. Ms. Frazier stated that the City would have to adhere to FEMA standards in a case like that. Mr. Anon agreed. Mr. Qizilbash opined that, if the structure has been grandfathered in, it can be rebuilt as it existed before the damage.
- Regarding the Land Use Element, the strikethroughs on the description of the soils that describe wetlands and vegetative species were discussed previously, and staff stated that that subject would be addressed in the Conservation and Coastal Management section of the Plan. He stated that the soil section in the proposed Plan is nowhere near as specific as what was struck out. He could not locate this subject in the Land Development Code. Ms. Frazier explained that the wetlands definition was established by the US Army Corps, and that same definition is used across the board. She stated that the wetlands are not regulated by the City but are handled at the state level. She also stated that the City demands a buffer between a development and the edge of the wetlands in order to preserve the wetland system. Mr. Christino stated that the language addressing the wetlands and the different soil types was set forth in much more detail in the 1999 Plan than what is in the proposed 2040 Comprehensive Plan, and he would like to see that same language in this 2040 Plan. Ms. Frazier stated staff will see to it that it is included.

**Comment [BA39]:** Policy 5-1.2.3; DIA Soils Section pg. 31-32.

**Comment [BA40]:** Policy 5-1.4.13

Commented on the septic-to-sewer situation. He opined that it is very important to the future of the City. He recalled that it was addressed in an earlier element. Mr. Klepper stated that it is addressed in the Infrastructure section, and there are also cross-references with Indian River County regarding that program. Mr. Carter stated he is glad to see that it is referenced in a couple different places, as it is a particularly important concern for the City going into the future.

**Comment [BA41]:** Policy 5-1.4.13

Ms. Kautenburg:

• Regarding how quickly technology is changing, she questioned if there is anything in the document that will allow for technologies that could supersede what is being done presently. Mr. Klepper stated that some of the references to specific technology were taken out of the proposed Plan for that very reason. Some of the technologies in the new Plan are addressed as "best management practices" and "low-impact development." He also stated there is nothing that says the City cannot review and update its Comprehensive Plan on an ongoing basis. Ms. Frazier cited examples.

**Comment [BA42]:** Best Management Practices discussed in Policy 5-1.4.2, 5-1.4.4, 5-1.4.10, 5-1.4.12, 5-1.7.1, and 5-2.2.1.

Mr. Roth:

• Regarding post-disaster redevelopment, he understands that there will be several people involved in the post-disaster redevelopment, including City, County, and even State officials. He questions how this will work and who will be the lead on it. Ms. Frazier stated there is already a post-disaster redevelopment plan in force in the City, as well as coordination with the County. She reviewed that City personnel from the City Manager on down will address what needs to be done. The wording in this proposed Plan is just summarizing what is already in place. Ms. Frazier will go back and ensure that this wording does not conflict with the City's emergency management plan.

**Comment [BA43]:** Policy 5-2.4.1

• In the section that mentions hurricane vulnerability zones, he is asking if manufactured homes should be listed in addition to mobile homes. Mr. Klepper stated staff will check the Code on that question and confirm it.

**Comment [BA44]:** Manufactured homes added on page 34.

• Addressing flood zones, he wonders if the crosshatched area discussed in the Plan is still in dispute. Ms. Bosworth reviewed that in 2012 when the new assessment map was received, there was a new levy policy. At that time, FEMA had not agreed on a levy policy. There is a levy in that area that goes into Vero Lake Estates that comes from some of the agricultural property, and that has been in dispute since 2012. They are close to coming to a decision on that, and they will be able to establish what zones are applicable. Ms. Frazier explained that when this Commission adopts the proposed Plan, it is not necessarily adopting the data. When it comes time to adopt the policies and objectives, the most current map will be used.

## PARKS RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE

Mr. Simmons:

• Regarding a change from Capital Improvements to what is entitled Governance and Implementation, he asked for a definition of Governance and Implementation. Mr. Klepper explained that Mr. Benton, Leisure Services Director, requested that be included in the proposed Plan so that any parks projects over a certain amount are included in the Capital Improvements Plan so that they are being tracked as a fiscal component.

• The section addressing access to the Indian River Lagoon and tributaries was crossed out. He questioned whether that subject is under another heading. Ms. Frazier stated that wording was moved. She stated she will verify that the language is contained in the proposed Plan and get back to the Commission on where it appears. Mr. Klepper added that staff is creating a tracking spreadsheet on every existing policy that is in place and where its disposition is in the proposed

Plan so that it can be presented to the State Land Planning Agency.

Ms. Kautenburg:

- Is happy to see the implementation of a master plan for parks.
- Regarding access to parks and facilities, although provisions have been made for the handicapped, those provisions are not always accessible. She suggested that more thought be given to this subject.

**Comment [BA45]:** Objective 5-1.6. and its policies address Public Access to Shoreline. Policy 5-1.6.3 addresses public access to Indian River Lagoon specifically. Policy 6-1.1.15 addresses access to Indian River Lagoon. Policy 6-1.6.3 addresses access to shorelines.

On the subject of citizen outreach, she suggested that online there be a facilities map of all the parks in the City, what might be available in any particular park, and where it is located so that the public is able to find where those different facilities are located.

**Comment [BA46]:** Policy 6-1.4.5, 6-1.4.6, and 6-1.4.7

• Regarding Hardee Park, she stated that park has practically no facilities, and she suggested that maybe the City needs to look at higher utilization of some of the parks in the City that are relatively unused.

**Comment [BA47]:** Policy 6-1.5.6

• When improving parks or facilities, she suggested installing native plants with nameplates identifying each plant in an effort to educate and encourage the public to utilize native plants.

**Comment [BA48]:** Policy 6-1.1.2

• Addressed the impact fees for every building or facility that is dedicated toward parks and recreation. She queried whether developers could get credits for things they might install in their own developments or encourage developers, rather than using their own property, to upgrade parks that are already present in the City. Ms. Frazier reviewed that there is already in the Land Development Code the condition that each developer needs to set aside a certain amount of land based on a formula for recreational purposes, and they do get credit for providing certain recreational facilities for the residents.

**Comment [BA49]:** Policy 6-1.1.14

Mr. Hughan:

- Regarding the boat ramps, there is wording in the document that assigns one boat ramp per 12,500 residents. He reviewed that Sebastian has 25,000 residents, and he questioned the wording in that section. Ms. Frazier explained that the state sets these standards, but she will look into the numbers that are set forth.
- Asked whether there is a plan to build another boat ramp along the river somewhere with parking. Ms. Frazier said that, to her knowledge, there is no plan for another boat ramp. Mr. Roth agreed that another boat ramp would be a great asset, but there is not much frontage along the lagoon. He suggested investigating the matter to see if another boat ramp would be possible without inconveniencing other citizens by adding to the parking on US-1.

Mr. Christino:

- Agreed wholeheartedly with Mr. Hughan regarding the boat ramps.
- Has had several requests for kayak launches in the City. He suggested that the Crabby Bill's property appears to have tremendous potential for that type of recreation activity
- Questioned the strikethrough where it stated, "The City shall promote the development and maintenance of the nature trails at..." and Schumann Drive is crossed off. "... and the City shall also provide receptacles for recycling at all City parks" has also been crossed off. He asked if the City is not maintaining the trails at Schumann Drive. Ms. Frazier explained that Schumann Drive Park is the same as Kildare Park. As to providing receptacles for recycling at all City parks, Ms. Frazier stated that is an expensive endeavor, so staff did not want to use the word "shall." She stated that

elsewhere in the document it is stated that the City will promote recycling. Staff will look into that as to where recycling is appropriate. There are recycling receptacles at Riverview Park. Mr. Christino suggested that signage with wording about not littering could be installed at the parks.

**Comment [BA50]:** Policy 6-1.1.14

Mr. Qizilbash:

- Reviewed that at a previous meeting on the Comprehensive Plan, infrastructure and the level of service standards were discussed for the parks. He would also like to see the level of service standards set forth as to sidewalks and streets.

**Comment [BA51]:** Policy 6-1.4.1, 6-1.4.3, and 6-1.4.4 Automobile and Pedestrian Access for Parks; Objective 2-1.3 and Policies discuss LOS standards for streets.

Mr. Roth:

- Is pleased with the way the Plan is written with regard to sustainable development concepts because that is where the City needs to be focusing.
- With regard to utilization and agreement with City and County schools and being able to have a joint-use agreement between the City and the Indian River County School Board, he is happy to see that addressed in this proposed Plan.

**Comment [BA52]:** Noted.

c. Public Input

Mr. Roth called for any public input regarding the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Element.

Victor Young, Ash Street, Sebastian.

- Is glad that there are different data being used for different facilities according to the population using those facilities. He discussed that there is a part of the City's population that is not being addressed, and that is handicapped children. There are no parks in the City that accommodate handicapped children using the swings or other facilities that are within the parks. He asked if that could be addressed.

**Comment [BA53]:** Policy 6-1.4.5, 6-1.4.6, and 6-1.4.7

Mr. Roth suggested that subject might fit in with the fact that Hardee Park is very large and has a great deal of wide-open space.

Dr. Graham Cox, Sebastian.

- Commented on the care and work that have gone into this proposed Comprehensive Plan regarding conservation and recreation issues. He addressed the use of native trees and plants at City Hall and at the Garden Club Park as setting a good example. He suggested encouraging the residents of the City to plant native species in their yards and replace their grass with native species.
- Regarding the schools and using the schools as community centers, he stated that the Pelican Island Audubon Society has been running programs in the south part of the County taking science to the schools by bringing students to Audubon House. The Society is looking for ways to get the students outdoors and is emphasizing the "nature deficit disorder." His group would be happy to work with the City in trying to implement more of that activity. The Audubon Society has teamed up with Pelican Island Elementary School to collaborate on designing a five-year environmental education action plan. All of these ideas go towards making Sebastian a livable, sustainable city.

## OLD BUSINESS

Ms. Frazier reviewed that at the last meeting of this Commission the members were concerned about the data that were presented in the proposed Comprehensive Plan. She explained where the data came from and what data are acceptable in a comprehensive plan in order to use as reference for the policies included. Ms. Frazier referred to the Land Use Element and Housing Element data which were included in the packet for this

evening's meeting. She also included Mr. Carter's input referencing Zillow and Realtor.com. Mr. Klepper added that after the prior meeting, his staff reached out to other colleagues across the state as well as current and former employees of the Department of Economic Opportunity regarding the use of Zillow and other services who stated that the use of those services could be used as supplemental data, but that information was not recognized methodology as it relates to housing. Ms. Frazier stated she would include that supplemental data in the proposed Plan if the Commissioners want. She stated that she has received input from members of the public who state that housing in Sebastian is not affordable for the "missing middle." She asked for direction from the Commissioners as to what they would like to see added to the document regarding affordable housing in Sebastian.

**Comment [BA54]:** Housing DIA pg. 25

Mr. Christino suggesting using the actual data from sales over the last year in the City. Mr. Klepper stated that the Property Appraiser does not look at sales but at the value of every single structure. He stated there are methods for getting affordable housing such as governmental programs, density, building heights, and thinking outside the box for land use as it relates to housing.

**Comment [BA55]:** Objective 3-1.2 and Policies; Density changes: Policy 1-1.1.4; 1-1.2.3; 1-1.3.6

Mr. Roth asked if using the market information from Zillow or others is going to cloud the issue in the Comprehensive Plan by putting another set of figures in with regard to the State reviewing it for approval. Mr. Klepper said that the State is going to be reviewing it from the goals, objectives, and policies set forth by using acceptable data. Ms. Frazier stated that the information contained in market analyses is used from the City as well as the surrounding area.

Ms. Kautenburg stated that if the data is used from outside the City's zip code, which is 32958, it is not relevant. She believes that auxiliary information should be used because it is her opinion that the approved information is categorically faulty. She gave examples of the price of housing and the cost of renting in Sebastian. She opined that there is not affordable housing in the City, and nothing has been done to obtain it, and if correct figures are not used, the City will never get it. Mr. Klepper stated there are different ways to obtain affordable housing in communities, and he cited some examples. After extended discussion, it was the consensus of the Commissioners that the supplemental data be included. Mr. Roth suggested that the staff put together a draft of the supplemental data and send it to all the Commissioners for their perusal.

**Comment [LF56]:** Density changes: Policy 1-1.1.4; 1-1.2.3; 1-1.3.6