Steve Kreidt Chair

Ryan Santurri Vice-Chair

PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING
City Hall - Council Chamber 405 Bagshaw Way, Edgewood, Florida Monday, March 14, 2022 at 6:30 PM

| David Gragg | David Nelson | Melissa Gibson |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Board Member | Board Member | Board Member |

## AGENDA

WELCOME! We are very glad you have joined us for today's Planning and Zoning meeting. The Planning and Zoning Board is an advisory board to City Council comprised of citizen members who voluntarily and without compensation devote their time and talents to a variety of zoning and land development issues in the community. All P\&Z recommendations are subject to final action by City Council. The results of today's meeting will be presented at the noted City Council meeting for approval of recommended actions. Any person desiring to appeal a recommended action of the Board should observe the notice regarding appeals below. CAUTION: Untimely filing by any appellant shall result in an automatic denial of the appeal.

## A. CALL TO ORDER

B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
C. ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM
D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. February 14, 2022 P\&Z Meeting Minutes (pages 3-6)
E. NEW BUSINESS
2. Details of March 14, 2022 Meeting (pages 7-8)
3. Variance 2022-02-535 Mandalay Rd. - Home Addition (pages 9-17)
4. Proposed Replat and Variance 2022-01-506 \& 512 Linson Ct. (pages 18-49)
5. Holden Avenue PD/Haven Oaks Development Plan/Preliminary Subdivision Plan (pages 50-77)
6. Ordinance 2022-01 - County Zoning to City Zoning (pages 78-106)
7. Ordinance 2022-02 - Window Sign Change (pages 107-111)
F. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
G. COMMENTS/ANNOUNCEMENTS
H. ADJOURNMENT

## UPCOMING MEETINGS

Tuesday, March 15, 2022
March City Council Meeting
Monday, April 11, 2022
April Planning \& Zoning Meeting

## General Rules of Order

You are welcome to attend and express your opinion. The Board is pleased to hear non-repetitive comments related to business before the Board; however, a five (5) minute time limit per person has been set by the Board. Large groups are asked to name a spokesperson. If you wish to appear before the Board, please fill out an Appearance Request Registration Form and give it to the City Clerk. When recognized, state your name and speak directly into the microphone. The City is guided by Roberts Rules of Order in governing the conduct of the meeting. Persons with disabilities needing assistance to participate in any of these proceedings should contact the City Clerk at (407) 851-2920 at least 24 hours in advance of the meeting.

We ask that all electronic devices (i.e. cell phones, pagers) be silenced during our meeting!
Thank you for participating in your government!

## Appeals

According to Edgewood City Code Section 26-24 (2), "any person aggrieved by any recommendation of the Board acting either under its general powers or as a Board of Adjustment may file a notice of appeal to the City Council within seven (7) days after such recommendation is filed with the City Clerk. Per Section 286.0105, Florida Statutes state that if you decide to appeal a decision made with respect to any matter, you will need a record of the proceeding and may need to ensure that a verbatim record is made.

## Americans with Disabilities Act

In accordance with the American Disabilities Act (ADA), if any person with a disability as defined by the ADA needs special accommodation to participate in this proceeding, he or she should telephone the City Clerk at (407) 851-2920.

## CALL TO ORDER

Vice-Chair Santurri called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm and led everyone in the Pledge of Allegiance.

## ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

The following Planning and Zoning and staff members were present.

## Board Members:

Steve Kreidt, Chair
Ryan Santurri, Vice-Chair
David Gragg, Board Member
David Nelson, Board Member

## Absent:

Melissa Gibson, Board Member

## Staff:

Sandra Riffle, Deputy City Clerk
John Freeburg, Police Chief
Drew Smith, City Attorney
Jim Winter, RLA, CPH
Ellen Hardgrove, AICP City Planner

## Applicants:

Nelson Lerma, Mecato's Bakery \& Cafe
Edwin Lurduy, Mecato's Bakery \& Cafe

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. January 10, 2022 Planning and Zoning Meeting Minutes

Board Member Nelson made a motion to approve the January 10, 2022 Planning and Zoning Meeting Minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Board Member Santurri. Approved (4/0).

## NEW BUSINESS

1. Mecato's Bakery and Café- Waiver Request Section 134-471(2)e

Planner Hardgrove opened the site plan and waiver request review and explained that the applicant proposes to enlarge and retrofit the existing building. She reviewed City Council's approval of the waivers to the ECD that the Planning and Zoning Board recommended approval for on January 10, 2022. Council accepted P\&Z's recommendation except that related to the required wall along the Hoffner Avenue right-of-way where parking is proposed. Council denied this requested waiver,
without prejudice. Attorney Smith said that City Council wants to see more information about the concept, and they were specific about leaving the door open to consider the waiver.

She reviewed what was in the packet for P\&Z's consideration including: the submitted plans, photometrics, and a boundary survey. She also stated staff is still requesting twenty-six items that still need to be corrected but believes those items will not affect the site plan layout, and staff is confident these modifications can be accomplished prior to City Council's review. Discussion ensued relative to the waiver requested.
Attorney Smith noted that the plans show the required wall without the waiver. If the waiver is approved, the street wall can be removed.

Applicant Nelson Lerma said they added car stops to protect the wall, but it is still possible that it could be bumped by a vehicle. He stated concern that there is not enough space between the parking lot and the property line for a wall, a tree, and shrubbery. The tree roots could lift the sidewalk and influence the wall.

Discussion about the sustainability of landscaping with the wall continued.
Board Member Gragg noted that he thought Planning and Zoning's solution on January 10, 2022, to have the wall along Hansel turn and front the first couple of spaces fronting Hoffner and landscaping the remainder of the Hoffner frontage was good. He thinks the property would look better with the landscaping and does not see the need for a continuous wall.

Board Member Santurri said that the wall would take up space that could be used for environmental-friendly natural materials.

Chair Kreidt said he likes the wall and thought it would enhance the southern entrance into the City.

Mr. Lerma said that he would prefer P\&Z's original recommendation. What people can see at the traffic light would have the same effect without the 200 feet of wall.

Board Member Santurri said the wall would appear, from that location, to go up the street.

Chair Kreidt said he would be more concerned about what people would see coming from Belle Isle. Board Member Santurri responded that it is a standalone blank wall from the stairs to the sidewalk. Planner Hardgrove said the People Space was envisioned for the main roads of the ECD, including Gatlin and Hoffner Avenues. City Council had a concern about setting precedent should this waiver be approved. Treating this portion of Hoffner Avenue as a side street rather than a main road would be a policy decision.

Board Member Nelson said people would be at the intersection to see the Edgewood Central District concept.

There was no public comment.

Chair Kreidt made a motion to recommend denial of the waiver request. Board Member Nelson seconded the motion.

Board Member Santurri said that he thought that the same goal could be accomplished by a hedge, offsetting the wall expense and providing a more environmental-friendly buffer.

Board Member Nelson said the 2-foot distance between vehicles' front bumpers and the proposed wall will likely not sustain landscaping, even if it is groundcover. He said they could put in pine straw or mulch between the wheel stops and the wall because you will not see it.

Board Member Gragg said he thought it would be unreasonable to require groundcover in that location.

Board Member Nelson said it would be a logical way to offset some of the cost.

Discussion ensued about the waiver approval criteria and the fact that the request was an applicant preference instead of a technical reason that the wall could not be provided. Landscape Architect Winter stated the land between the wall and the sidewalk could sustain understory trees and ground cover.

There was no public comment.

The motion was approved by roll call vote (3/1):

| Board Member Gragg | Favor |
| :--- | :--- |
| Board Member Nelson | Favor |
| Chair Kreidt | Favor |
| Board Member Santurri | Opposed |
| Board Member Gibson | Absent |

2. Mecato's Bakery and Café- Site Plan Review

Chair Kreidt made a motion to recommend approval of the site plan conditioned on the completion of the 26 items recommended by staff, to be submitted by February 28, 2022, to maintain City Council meeting March 15, 2022 agenda space. Board Member Nelson seconded the motion.

The motion was approved by roll call vote Approved (4/0).:

| Chair Kreidt | Approve |
| :--- | :--- |
| Board Member Santurri | Approve |
| Board Member Gragg | Approve |
| Board Member Nelson | Approve |
| Board Member Gibson | Absent |

## UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

## COMMENTS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

None

## ADJOURNMENT

Board Member Santurri made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:15 pm; seconded by Chair Kreidt. Approved (4/0).

Steve Kreidt, Chair

Sandra Riffle, Interim City Clerk

## Memo

To: Planning and Zoning Board Members
CC: Sandy Riffle, Drew Smith, Ellen Hardgrove, David Mahler, Allen Lane, Jim Winter

From: Brett Sollazzo, Administrative Assistant
Date: March 9, 2022
Re: New Business Items Planning and Zoning Meeting March 14, 2022

For the March 14, 2022 Planning and Zoning Board meeting, the following is provided in your agenda packet for your review and consideration.

1. Variance 2022-02 (Sec. 134-579) - 535 Mandalay Road Home Addition

- City Engineer report dated 3/4/2022
- Variance application and plans dated 2/16/2022

The notice of Public Hearing was mailed on Thursday, March 3, 2022 to those property owners within 500 feet of the subject property regarding Variance 2022-02. There were 41 notices provided by U.S. Mail. Zero notices were returned as undeliverable, and no objections were received at City Hall as of the date of this memo.

The City Engineer has no objections to the variance and is prepared to respond to any questions you may have regarding the variance request.
2. Proposed Replat - 506 \& 512 Linson Ct.

Variance 2022-01 (Sec. 126-168(8))

- Combined staff report dated 3/2/2022
- CPH Plat review and checklist dated 2/28/2022
- Preliminary subdivision application and plans dated $1 / 11 / 2022$
- Variance application and plans dated $2 / 2 / 2022$

A legal advertisement was placed in the Orlando Sentinel on Thursday, March 3, 2022, to advertise the proposed replat and variance.

The notice of Public Hearing was mailed on Thursday, March 3, 2022 to those property owners within 500 feet of the subject property regarding the proposed replat and Variance 2022-01. There were 39 notices provided by U.S. Mail. Zero notices were returned as undeliverable and no objections were received at City Hall as of the date of this memo.

The City Planner and City Engineer support the approval of the proposed replat, with conditions. They also support the approval of the requested variance. Both the City Planner and City Engineer are prepared to respond to any questions you may have regarding the proposed replat and variance request. The applicant/representative for 506/512 Linson Ct will also be in attendance.

## 3. Holden Avenue PD/Haven Oaks Development Plan/Preliminary Subdivision Plan Review

- City Planner report dated 3/7/2022
- Landscape Architect report dated 3/8/2022
- City Engineer report dated 3/4/2022
- Development plans dated 2/28/2022 and 3/4/2022

The City Planner, City Engineer, and Landscape Architect are prepared to respond to any questions you may have regarding the Haven Oaks Development Plan. The applicant/representative(s) for Haven Oaks will also be in attendance.
4. Ordinance 2022-01 - County Zoning to City Zoning

- County Zoning to City Zoning Ordinance
- Rezoning staff report dated 2/21/2022

A display advertisement was placed in the Orlando Sentinel on Friday, March 4, 2022, to advertise the notice of consideration of ordinance amending chapter 134 code of ordinances to create new zoning districts. No comments were received at City Hall as of the date of this memo

The City Planner is prepared to respond to any questions you may have regarding the County Zoning to City Zoning Ordinance.
5. Ordinance 2022-02 - Window Sign Change

- Window Sign Ordinance

The City Planner is prepared to respond to any questions you may have regarding the Window Sign Ordinance.

March 4, 2022
Mr. Brett Sollazzo
Phone: 407.425.0452
Administrative Assistant
City of Edgewood
405 Bagshaw Way
Edgewood, FL 32809-3406
RE: 535 Mandalay Road - home addition Application review
CPH Project number E7601
Dear Brett,
We are in receipt of the revised plans and application, received March 4, 2022, for the proposed home addition for the above address. The submittal was in response to our February 21, and March 2, 2022 review letters. No response letter was provided with the submittal. We reviewed the application and plans to verify all our plan review comments have been addressed.

All our comments have been addressed. We do not have any objections to the Town approving this set of plans. We also do not have any objection to the requested variance for encroachment into the side yard setback as described in our previous variance application review letter (attached).

Please be reminded, final approval of the application by the City of Edgewood does not grant authority to alter other portions of this property, nor does it waive any permits that may be required by Federal, State, or County agencies which may have jurisdiction.

Sincerely,
CPH, Inc.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Allea C Tane fo } \\
& \text { Allen C. Lane, Jr., P.E. } \\
& \text { Sr. Project Manager } \\
& \text { CC: File }
\end{aligned}
$$

j:le7601\civilldocuments\city plans-application review\535 mandalay rd office addition\letter\535 mandalay road office addition review 3-4-22.docx

Mr. Brett Sollazzo

Fax: 407.648.1036
Administrative Assistant
City of Edgewood
405 Bagshaw Way
Edgewood, FL 32809-3406

## RE: 535 Mandalay Road - home addition Application review

CPH Project number E7601
Dear Brett,
We are in receipt of the plans for the proposed home addition for the above address. The application included an Application for Variance, Justification for Variance response, and two plan sheets showing the proposed improvements. We reviewed the application and plans to verify the proposed request. We also searched this property on the Orange County Property Appraisers (OCPA) web site. Per the web site the lot is zoned R-1AA. Below are our comments.

Plan review comments:

1. The plan sheets were submitted as 11 " $x 17$ ". When plotted, they do not print to the scale listed on the drawing. Please check the scale and drawing size.
2. Both plan sheets are numbered CV and are listed as "Cover Sheet." Please revise the second sheet number and name accordingly.
3. Plan Sheet CV (the cover sheet with notes) lists the property zoning as Residential - R3. As noted above, the OCPA website lists the zoning as R-1AA. Please verify and revise as necessary.

Variance application review and summary:
4. The side setback is called out as 10'. The proposed addition will encroach in the setback by $1^{\prime}-1$ ", leaving $8^{\prime}-11^{\prime \prime}$ from the corner of the addition to the side lot line. A variance will be required.
5. The applicant submitted an Application for Variance and provided a response to the Justification for Variance. We reviewed the response to the questions, which are summarized below.
A. Response 1 - the applicant stated the special condition is due to being required to work from home. The need is to add additional living space to replace the area being used for a new home office.
B. Response 2 - The applicant stated the special condition is due to being required to work at home.
C. Response 3 - The applicant stated this variance will not allow the applicant any special privilege. The request will provide this specific home a privilege of building into the setback. Other home owners will be afforded the same opportunity to request a variance should they require a similar condition. As an added note, this home already encroaches into the setback on the south side of the lot. This appears to have been a construction condition and not a previous variance request.
D. Response 4 - the applicant referenced the needed extra space while allowing the applicant to have the needed office space to work from home.
E. Response 5 - This is the minimum variance requested while allowing the addition to encroach into the setback 1'-1".
F. Response 6 - the applicant did not confirm the encroachment would not be detrimental to the public or injurious to the neighborhood. Based on the engineering review by CPH, we do not see where the encroachment will be injurious to the neighborhood.
G. Response 7 - the applicant reference "improving" the exterior appearance of the building. The City comprehensive plan also makes reference to maintaining the appearance of the home.

We reviewed the response to the Justification items in the Variance checklist. Based on our review of the application and the review of the existing plat for the development, we do not have any objections to approving the request.

This completes our review of the submitted plans. Please have the applicant make the necessary changes to the plans noted in the comments above, and resubmit the revised plan sheets along with a response letter addressing the comments.

Please be reminded, final approval of the application by the City of Edgewood does not grant authority to alter other portions of this property, nor does it waive any permits that may be required by Federal, State, or County agencies which may have jurisdiction.

## Sincerely,

CPH, Inc.

## Allar CTanefo

Allen C. Lane, Jr., P.E. Sr. Project Manager

## CC: File

j:le7601\civilldocuments\city plans-application review\535 mandalay rd office addition\letter\535 mandalay road office addition review 2-21-22.docx

## APPLICATION FOR VARIANCE

Reference: City of Edgewood Code of Ordinances, Section 126-588
REQUIRED FEE: $\$ 350$ RESIDENTIAL $\$ 750$ COMMERCIAL
(Plus Applicable Pass-Through Fees - Ordinance 2013-01)

| Please note this fee is non-refundable |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Office Use Only: | $2 / 16 / 2022$ | Variance Application \#: | $2022-$ VAR -02 |
| Received Date: |  | Received by: | BreH Solla22s |
| P\&Z Meeting Date: |  | City Council Meeting Date: |  |

IMPORTANT: A COMPLETE application with all required attachments and ten (10) copies must be submitted to the City Clerk $\qquad$ days before the next Planning \& Zoning meetings. No application shall be deemed accepted unless it is complete and paid for. Notarized letter of authorization from Owner MUST be submitted if application is filed by anyone other than property owner.

Please type or print. Complete carefully, answering each question and attaching all necessary documentation and additional pages as necessary.


The applicant hereby states that this request for Variance does not violate any deed restrictions on the property. Application must be signed by the legal owner, not agent, unless copy of power of attorney is attached.

## To justify this variance, applicant must demonstrate the following (Sec. 134-404 (3)(b):

1. That special conditions and circumstances exist which are peculiar to the land, structure, or building involved and which are not applicable to other lands, structures or buildings in the same zoning district.
2. That the special conditions and circumstances do not result from the actions of the applicant
3. That approval of the variance requested will not confer on the applicant any special privilege that is denied by this chapter to other lands, buildings or structures in the same zoning district.
4. That literal interpretation of the provisions contained in this chapter would deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same zoning district under the terms of this chapter and would work unnecessary and undue hardship on the applicant.
5. That the variance approved is the minimum variance that will make possible the reasonable use of the land, building or structure.
6. That approval of the variance will be in harmony with the general intent and purpose of this chapter and that such variance will not be injurious to the neighborhood or otherwise detrimental to the public welfare.
7. That the variance sought will be consistent with the Edgewood Comprehensive Plan.

## Applicant must agree that:

1. In granting any variance, the City may prescribe appropriate conditions and safeguards in conformity with the Ordinances, and any regulations enacted under its authority. Violation of such conditions and safeguards, when made a part of the terms under which the variance is granted shall be deemed a violation of Edgewood ordinances.

2. The variance recommended by the Planning and Zoning Board and approved by the City Council shall expire in 12 months in accordance with Chapter 134-104 (3) (e). AGREE:
The applicant hereby states that the above request for Variance does not violate any deed restrictions on the property.

| Applicant's Signature: |  | Date: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Applicant's Printed Name: | $\text { Fric Date: } 2 / 16 / 2022$ |  |  |
| Owner's Signature: |  |  |  |
| Owner's Printed Name: |  |  |  |

Please submit your completed application to City Hall via email at bmeeks@edgewood-fl.gov or sriffle@edgewood-fl.gov, via facsimile to 407-851-7361, or hand deliver to City Hall located at 405 Bagshaw Way. For additional questions, please contact City Hall at 407-851-2920.

1. That special conditions and circumstances exist which are peculiar to the land, structure, or building involved and which are not applicable to other lands, structures, or buildings in the same zoning district.

Due to covid the applicants job requires working from home going forward. We are turning a closet into a home office and adding a new closet to replace the one being turned into an office. By seeking this variance, we are choosing the design that least effects the look of the house and makes it aesthetically pleasing.
2. That the special conditions and circumstances do not result from the actions of the applicant.
Due to covid the applicant's job is now a home based position as dictated by her employer.
3. That approval of the variance requested will not confer on the applicant any special privilege that is denied by this chapter to other lands, buildings, or structures in the same zoning district.
This variance will not allow the applicant any special privilege. It is allowing the owner to maintain much needed storage space while allowing them to work from home as instructed by applicant's employer.
4. That literal interpretation of the provisions contained in this chapter would deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same zoning district under the terms of this chapter and would work unnecessary and undue hardship on the applicant.
The granting of this variance would allow the homeowner to maintain much needed storage space in a home that is already one of the smallest on the street while allowing the applicant to have the needed office space to work from home.
5. That the variance approved is the minimum variance that will make possible the reasonable use of the land, building, or structure.
The variance requested sits $1^{\prime}-1^{\prime \prime}$ into the allowed setback of $10^{\prime}$. By allowing the variance the applicant will be able to square off the side of the house and make it more visually pleasing to the community.
6. That approval of the variance will be in harmony with the general intent and purpose of the chapter and that such variance will not be injurious to the neighborhood or otherwise detrimental to the public.
Approval of this variance will improve the look of this structure and therefore add aesthetic value and create a more cohesive design to the structure.
7. That the variance sought will be consistent with the Edgewood comprehensive plan. By improving the exterior appearance of the building the applicant is staying consistent with the Edgewood comprehensive plan.




Date: March 2, 2022
To: Planning and Zoning (P\&Z) Board
From: Ellen Hardgrove, City Planning Consultant
Allen Lane,, City Engineering Consultant
XC: Sandy Riffle, Interim City Clerk
Brett Sollazzo, Administrative Assistant
Drew Smith, City Attorney
Re: Proposed Replat of Lots 14 and 15, Block A, Oak Lynn Second Plat, Plat Book W, Page 97

This is a review of a proposed replat of two lots of the Oak Lynn Second Plat: Lots 14 and 15 Block A as recorded in Plat Book W, Page 97, as copied to Exhibit 1. No additional lots are proposed; the proposal is a change in the lot lines of Lots 14 and 15 to provide Lot 14 (new Lot 1) with lake frontage as shown in Exhibit 2.

Exhibit 1 - Subject Property/Oak Lynn Second Replat (platted in 1958)


Code Section 126-61 provides an exemption to the full subdivision review process when no new streets, water, sewer or drainage structures are involved. Such is the case for the proposed replat. The proposed preliminary and final subdivision plan (the plat) can be considered simultaneously by the Planning and Zoning Board followed by City Council's consideration of approval.

Exhibit 2 - Proposed Replat


Lot 14 is currently 16,528 square feet and proposed to be, as Lot 1 , increased to 23,081 square feet; Lot 15 is currently 19,654 square feet and is proposed to be, as Lot 2, decreased to 13,108 square feet. Both are zoned R1AA. Both new lot configurations meet the R1AA minimum lot area ( 10,890 square feet).

A house exists on each lot. The proposed new lot line will clip two corners of the house on existing Lot 15 (to become Lot 2), as shown in Exhibit 3. The applicant has stated that the existing house will be demolished if the replat is approved.

Exhibit 3 - New Lot Line Clips Existing House


A new house can be constructed to meet the minimum R1AA site standards, which are shown in the table below.

| R1AA Site Standards |  | Proposed Lot 14 | Proposed Lot 15 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Minimum Lot Size | 10,890 square feet | 23,081 square feet | 13,108 square feet |
| Minimum Lot Width | 90 feet | No change | No change |
| Minimum Front Yard | 30 feet* | No change | Will be able to meet |
| Minimum Rear Yard | 35 feet | No change | Will be able to meet |
| Minimum Side Yard | 10 feet | No change | Will be able to meet |
| Minimum House Size | 2,200 square feet | No change | Will be able to meet |
| Maximum Impervious <br> Surface | $45 \%$ | Existing impervious surface <br> percentage decreases with new <br> lot area | Can be met while meeting the <br> minimum house size |
| Minimum setback from <br> Normal High Water <br> Line (NHWL) | 50 feet | Existing house exceeds the <br> minimum | An effective building envelope <br> is possible outside the NHWL <br> minimum setback |

*Per Code Sec. 126-168(8), for Lot 15, the front building setback is the distance required to meet the minimum lot width of the zoning district since it is an irregular shaped lot.

As part of this replat application, a variance is being requested as to how the front yard setback will be applied for the new construction on new Lot 2 . When lots do not meet the minimum lot width requirement at the street, the setback line is where the lot meets the minimum lot width required as measured perpendicular to a line drawn from the midpoints of the front and rear property lines. For new Lot 2, that setback line would be at an unusual location as shown in Exhibit 4.

Exhibit 4 - Estimated Front Yard Setback of New Lot 2


Furthermore, the new house would be atypically situated compared to the houses built on the surrounding lots, including houses built on irregular shaped lots. The applicant is requesting the
front setback be measured as a standard R1AA lot would be measured; i.e., 30 feet from the front property line.

Staff supports this request. The subdivision was platted in 1958, prior to City subdivision regulations requiring a different method of determining front setback for irregular shaped lots. Had the lot line not moved, a newly constructed home could have been built at the 30 foot setback without the need for a variance. Such was the case on the other houses on irregular lots on Linson Court, including the house directly to the east. The standards for granting a subdivision variance have been met. Granting the variance would make possible the reasonable use of the land, would be in harmony with the general purposes and intent of subdivision rules, and will not be injurious to the surrounding territory or otherwise be detrimental to the public welfare.

The City Engineer and CPH Surveyor have reviewed the submitted survey and plat and have identified several changes that need to be corrected prior to City Council approval (see attached Boundary Survey dated Received $2 / 2 / 22$, Reviewed Plat, and City of Edgewood Record Plat Review Check Sheet signed February 28, 2022). With these changes, the plat will be in conformance with City Code Section 126-190 and Chapter 177, Florida Statutes.

Suggested Motions:

1. Approval of the Subdivision Plan and Plat, after the following changes are made and conditioned on delay in the recording of the final plat until the existing house on existing Lot 15 (new Lot 2) is demolished to avoid creating a nonconforming side setback and encroachment into new Lot 1 .
A. Changes to Survey: Add title information
B. Changes to Plat:

- (4) All Mortgages listed in Title Certificate need to be referenced on Plat.
- (19) Correct the typo in the "Certificate of Approval by Municipality" block. It should read, "the City of Edgewood" not "the City County of the".
- (20) Correct the credentials of the "Certificate of Approval by Reviewing Surveyor."
- (25) Provide Joinder or separate filing notice.
- (46) Illustrate the location/width of the existing 10 feet wide drainage easement along southerly property lines.
- (53) Label or note radial lot lines (Directions of nonradial lines shall be indicated) as noted on the reviewed plat.
- Rectify dimensions of the existing plat with that proposed as noted on the reviewed plat.
- Add a bearing from the plat for a tie in as noted on the reviewed plat.
- Capitalize the W as noted in General Notes \#1 shown corrected on the reviewed plat.

2. Approval of a variance in measuring the front building setback. The standard front R1AA building setback shall be applied as measured from the front property line.
END

# CITY OF EDGEWOOD RECORD PLAT REVIEW CHECK SHEET 

NAME OF PLAT: Linson Homestead
DATE REVIEWED: February 28, 2022 REVISED
REVIEWED BY: Randall L. Roberts, RLS

### 177.041 - Boundary Survey and Title Certification Required

1. Signed and Sealed Boundary Survey prepared by Professional Surveyor and Mapper submitted.

】APPROVED
$\square$ FAILED
2. Title Opinion or Property Information Report prepared by Attorney, Abstractor, or Title Company.

ØAPPROVED
$\square$ FAILED
3. Title Certificate Legal Description exactly matches Plat Legal Description.

APPROVED as to parent parcels Overall plat description not in Title
$\square$ FAILED
4. All Mortgages listed in Title Certificate are referenced on Plat.

APPROVED
ØFAILED
5. All Easements listed in Title Certificate are shown on Plat.

】APPROVED
$\square$ FAILED -
6. Title Opinion or Property Information Report addressed to the City of Edgewood.

APPROVED
FAILED

# CITY OF EDGEWOOD RECORD PLAT REVIEW CHECK SHEET 

### 177.051 - Name of Subdivision

7. Name of Subdivision is not a duplicate of any other subdivision except if it is another phase of existing Plat.

APPROVED
$\square$ FAILED
8. The words "the", "replat" or "a" may not be used as first word of Subdivision's primary name.
$\triangle$ APPROVED
$\square$ FAILED
9. All words in the name are of the same size and type of font. (No hand lettered additions)

APPROVED
$\square$ FAILED
10. The subdivision name must be recited in the Owner's dedication.

APPROVED
$\square$ FAILED
11. Subtitle of plat states the Section, Township, Range, County, City (if inside corporate limits) and State.

】APPROVED
FAILED -
12. If this is a replat, Subtitle must state that this is a replat and must quote the full name and recording data.

】APPROVED
$\square$ FAILED

# CITY OF EDGEWOOD RECORD PLAT REVIEW CHECK SHEET 

### 177.061 - Qualification of Person filing Plat

13. Plat was prepared by a Professional Surveyor licensed in accordance with Chapter 177 and the Boundary Survey was prepared by a Professional Surveyor licensed in accordance with Chapter 472, Florida Statutes

】APPROVED
FAILED
14. Plat contains the printed name of the Surveyor of Record.

APPROVED
$\square$ FAILED
15. Plat contains the full address of the Surveyor of Record.

APPROVED
FAILED
16. Plat contains the registration number of the Surveyor of Record

## APPROVED

FAILED
17. Plat contains the certificate of authorization number of the Company if applicable.

ØAPPROVED
FAILED
18. Signing surveyor must state that the plat was prepared under his/her direction and complies with all survey requirements of F.S. 177 Part I.

APPROVED
$\square$ FAILED

# CITY OF EDGEWOOD RECORD PLAT REVIEW CHECK SHEET 

## 177．071－Approval of Plat by Governing Bodies

19．Municipality Approval checked for form and spelling．
$\square$ APPROVED
区FAILED typo

20．Planner＇s Approval checked for form and spelling．
$\square$ APPROVED－
区FAILED Printed Name

21．Surveyor＇s Approval checked for form and spelling．
ØAPPROVED
$\square$ FAILED－

22．Mayor，City of Edgewood Acceptance checked for form and spelling．
】APPROVED
FAILED

23．Clerk of the Court＇s Approval checked for form and spelling．
】APPROVED
FAILED

### 177.081 －Dedication and Approval

24．Dedication executed by all owners．Dedicates streets，alleys，and easements．
$\square$ APPROVED
$\square$ FAILED
N／A－Not Final Submittal
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# CITY OF EDGEWOOD RECORD PLAT REVIEW CHECK SHEET 

NAME OF PLAT: Linson Homestead
25. Mortgagee(s) executed joinder to the Dedication on face of Plat.
$\square$ APPROVED
ØFAILED - No Joinder or separate filing notice

### 177.091 - Plats made for Recording

26. Index or key map required for multiple sheet plats.

ХAPPROVED N/A
$\square$ FAILED
27. All matchlines are clearly labeled, if applicable.

ØAPPROVED N/A
FAILED -
28. Scale and font size sufficient to show all detail. The minimum recommended text height is $0.07^{\prime}$ at $1^{\prime \prime}=1 "$

APPROVED
$\square$ FAILED
29. Scale shall be stated and graphically shown on every sheet showing any portion of the lands being platted.

【APPROVED
$\square$ FAILED
30. Name of the subdivision shown on all sheets in the same size and type of font.

】APPROVED
$\square$ FAILED

# CITY OF EDGEWOOD RECORD PLAT REVIEW CHECK SHEET 

31．Name of Surveyor or legal entity，street and mailing address shown on all sheets．
】APPROVED
$\square$ FAILED

32．Prominent North Arrow on all sheets showing any portion of the lands being platted．
】APPROVED
$\square$ FAILED

33．Basis of Bearing referenced to a well－established and monumented line stated on all sheets．
ヌAPPROVED
$\square$ FAILED

34．Permanent Reference Monuments（PRM＇s）placed at each corner or change in direction of the plat boundary．
（May not be more than 1400 feet apart and must be set prior to acceptance of the plat．Cannot be bonded．）
ØAPPROVED Per Legend
FAILED

35．Inaccessible PRM＇s offset within the boundary of the plat and the offset properly noted．
APPROVED
$\square$ FAILED－

36．Registration number for found previously set PRM＇s noted or，if un－numbered，shall be so noted．
ØAPPROVED Per Legend
FAILED

# CITY OF EDGEWOOD <br> RECORD PLAT REVIEW CHECK SHEET 

37. Permanent Control Points (PCP's) set on centerline at the intersection and terminus of all streets, all changes of direction and not more than 1000 feet apart. (Must be set within one year of the plat acceptance or, if bonded, must be set prior to the expiration of the bond)

ØAPPROVED None
$\square$ FAILED
38. Monumentation set at all lot corners, points of intersection, and changes of direction of lines within the subdivision which do not require a PRM or PCP. (Must be set before the transfer of any lot or, if bonded, must be set prior to the expiration of the bond.)

【APPROVED - per plat legend $\square$ FAILED -
39. Section, Township and Range stated immediately under the name of the subdivision on each sheet along with the name of the appropriate city, town, village, county and state in which the plat is situated.

APPROVED
FAILED
40. Description is complete, exactly matches the title opinion and accurately depicts the lands being platted.

【APPROVED Subject to City Attorney review of overall plat description $\square$ FAILED
41. All dedications and approvals required by ss.177.071 and 177.081 are shown.

APPROVED
$\square$ FAILED
42. The Clerk of the Court's and Professional Surveyor's seal and certification shown.

## $\square$ APPROVED

FAILED

> N/A - Preliminary Copy

# CITY OF EDGEWOOD RECORD PLAT REVIEW CHECK SHEET 

## NAME OF PLAT：Linson Homestead

DATE：February 28， 2022

43．All section lines and quarter section lines occurring within the subdivision are shown．
】APPROVED
$\square$ FAILED

44．All information in the legal description is shown．（Point of Commencement，Point of Beginning，etc．）
ØAPPROVED
$\square$ FAILED（Not in title description）

45．Location，width，and names of all streets waterways or other right－of－ways shown．
】APPROVED
$\square$ FAILED

46．Location，width，and purpose of all existing and proposed easements shown．（Recording information for all existing easements required．）
$\square$ APPROVED
ХFAILED－Existing 10＇Drainage Easement

47．All contiguous properties identified by subdivision title，plat book and page，or if unrecorded，noted as such．
【APPROVED
$\square$ FAILED

48．If a replat，sufficient ties to controlling lines on the previous plat to allow an overlay to be made．

```
】APPROVED
\(\square\) FAILED
```


# CITY OF EDGEWOOD RECORD PLAT REVIEW CHECK SHEET 

49．All lots numbered progressively or，if in blocks，progressively within the blocks．
【APPROVED
$\square$ FAILED

50．Sufficient survey data to accurately describe the bounds of every lot，block，street，easement，tract，etc．
ØAPPROVED
$\square$ FAILED－

51．All distances to the nearest hundredth of a foot．
】APPROVED
$\square$ FAILED－

52．Curvilinear lot lines shall show as a minimum，the radii，arc distances and central angles．
】APPROVED
$\square$ FAILED

53．Radial lot lines shall be so designated．Directions of nonradial lines shall be indicated．
$\square$ APPROVED
$\boxtimes$ FAILED－Label or note

54．All angles，bearings，or azimuths to the nearest second of arc．
【APPROVED
$\square$ FAILED

55．Centerlines of noncurved streets dimensioned with distances together with either angles，bearings or azimuths．

```
ØAPPROVED
```

$\square$ FAILED
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# CITY OF EDGEWOOD <br> RECORD PLAT REVIEW CHECK SHEET 

56．Centerlines of curves streets dimensioned with arc distances，central angles，radii，chord distances，and chord bearings or azimuths．

【APPROVED
$\square$ FAILED

57．Parks and recreations areas so designated．
ØAPPROVED－N／A
$\square$ FAILED

58．All excepted parcels labeled as＂Not a part of this plat．＂
ØAPPROVED－N／A
$\square$ FAILED

59．The purpose of all dedicated blocks，tracts or parcels shall be clearly stated．
ØAPPROVED N／A
$\square$ FAILED－

60．If line or curve tables are used，the tabular data must appear on the sheet to which it applies．
】APPROVED－
$\square$ FAILED

61．The plat shall include in a prominent place the following statement：
NOTICE：This plat，as recorded in its graphic form，is the official depiction of the subdivided lands described herein and will in no circumstances be supplanted in authority by any other graphic or digital form of the plat． There may be additional restrictions that are not recorded on this plat that may be found in the public records of this county．

】APPROVED
$\square$ FAILED

# CITY OF EDGEWATER RECORD PLAT REVIEW CHECK SHEET 

62. All platted utility easements shall provide that such easements are for the construction, installation, maintenance, and operation of cable television.
63. A legend of all symbols and abbreviations shall be shown.

ХAPPROVED
$\square$ FAILED -

## COMMENTS:

Minor comments as shown on pdf.
Also this is from a surveying review and other staff comments including City Attorney and Engineer may affect final review

## CERTIFICATION:

I HEREBY CERTIFY that this plat has been reviewed for the conformity to the requirements of Chapter 177, Part I of Florida Statutes. No confirmation of mathematical closure or the placement of PRM's and PCP's in the field was made in this review.

CPH, Inc. LB\#7143

For the Firm
By: Randall L. Roberts, R.L.S.
Date: February 28, 2022
Florida Registration Number 3144

RECEIVED
1/11,2gétion E, Item 3.

## Application for Preliminary Plan for Subdivision Approval

Reference: City of Edgewood Chapter 126 - Subdivisions

> PLANNING \& ZONING BOARD/CITY COUNCIL MAKE PAYMENTS TO: CITY OF EDGEWOOD FEE: \$500-RESIDENTIAL $\quad \$ 1,000$ COMMERCIAL Please note this fee is nonrefundable.

Please type or print. Complete carefully, answering each question and attaching all necessary documentation and additional pages as necessary.

| PLANNING \& ZONING MEETING DATE: | $3 / 14 / 2022$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| CITY COUNCIL DATE: | $4 / 19 / 2022$ |

A COMPLETE APPLICATION WITH ALL REQUIRED ATTACHEMENTS AND TEN (10) COPIES MUST BE SUBMITTED TO THE CITY CLERK 40 DAYS BEFORE THE NEXT PLANNING AND ZONING MEETING. NO APPLICATION SHALL BE ACCEPTED UNLESS IT IS COMPLETE AND THE REQUIRED FEE IS PAID.

| Applicant's <br> Name: | John \& Julie Mezzina | Owner's <br> Name: | John \& Julie Mezzina |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Address: | 506 Linson Ct. Orlando, FL 32809 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Email: | jcocktails@aol.com |  |  |
| Telephone: | $407-810-2753$ | Telephone: | $407-509-7376$ |
| Parcel ID: | 13-23-29-6056-01-150 |  |  |
| Zoned: | R1-AA |  |  |

The applicant hereby states that the above request for Lot Split does not violate any deed restrictions on the property.

| Applicant's Signature: | John दै Gulie Mezzina | Date: | 1/01/2022 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Applicant's Printed Name: | Yohn \& Julie Mezzina |  |  |
| Owner's Signature: | John द́ Gulie Mezzina | Date | 1/01/2022 |
| Owner's Printed Name: | Yohn \& Julie Mezzina |  |  |

## APPLICATION MUST INCLUDE:

1. A scaled drawing showing the lot size, location of the proposed buildings, location of easements, names of bordering streets, building setbacks, names and locations of all bodies of water, marshlands, drain fields, and all other waterways and watercourse abutting or encroaching upon subject property. The drawing must show existing buildings and lot dimensions. The scaled drawing must coincide with the certified boundary survey required below prepared by a licensed professional surveyor or mapper.
2. A brief description of all utilities and city or county services, including sewer, potable water facilities, fire hydrants, electric and telephone poles, streetlights, storm drains and any other utilities or services relevant to the maintenance of subject properties.
3. A listing of the names and addresses for abutting property owners
4. A certified boundary survey of the land subject to this procedure both as existing (i.e. prior to the proposed lot split) and as proposed (i.e. after proposed lot split), performed and prepared under the responsible direction and supervision of a licensed professional surveyor and mapper. Surveys shall include the depiction of existing improvement thereon.

## Sec. 126-94. - Submission and review.

The final plans and supporting data required for approval shall be prepared as specified in sections 126190 through 126-199. The final plat and all other materials required by sections 126-90 through 126199 shall be submitted to the office of the mayor. Review procedures shall be the same as for preliminary plans. A public hearing will not be required for final approval by the city council. The office of the mayor shall forward the final engineering plans and cost estimate to the city engineer and the planning and zoning board for review. The departments shall report within 15 working days on whether the final plans comply with requirements established in this chapter.
(Code 1985, § 21-41; Ord. No. 17-1A-8-78, Art. VI, § 6.3.2, 10-17-1978)

## Sec. 126-95. - Action by council.

The final plans, supporting data, and reports from the planning and zoning board and reviewing agencies may be submitted to the city council at any regular meeting. The council shall approve the final plans and plat if it complies with this chapter and is in substantial conformity with the approval preliminary plan. In disapproving any final plans, the council shall provide reasons for such action making reference to specific sections in this chapter. The city council shall have the final authority to approve, approve subject to conditions or disapprove the final plans and plat.
(Code 1985, § 21-42; Ord. No. 17-1A-8-78, Art. VI, 6.3.3, 10-17-1978)

## Sec. 126-96. - Recording of final plat.

The office of the mayor shall submit the approved final plat to the comptroller of the county for recording. Such plats shall comply with section 126-190 and F.S. ch. 177, and be accompanied by two paper prints. No plat of lands in the county subject to this chapter shall be recorded, whether as an independent instrument or by attachment to another instrument entitled to record, unless and until such plat has been approved by the council. (See Appendix 1, on file in the city clerk's office). In addition, all fees incidental to recording will be paid by the subdivider.
(Code 1985, § 21-43; Ord. No. 17-1A-8-78, Art. VI, § 6.4, 10-17-1978)

Please submit your completed application to City Hall via email at bmeeks@edgewood-fl.gov or sriffle@edgewood-fl.gov, via facsimile to 407-851-7361, or hand deliver to City Hall located at 405 Bagshaw Way. For additional questions, please contact City Hall at 407-851-2920.

| Office Use Only: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Rec'd Date: | $1 / 11 / 2022$ |
| Rec'd By: | Brett Sollazzo |
| Forwarded to: | Ellen Hardgrove - City Planner |
| Notes: |  |

From: jcocktails jcocktails@aol.com
Date: January 10, 2022 at 2:32 PM
To: Sandy Riffle sriffle@edgewood-fl.gov
Cc: bmeeks@edgewood-fl-gov
City of Edgewood,
My family and I have been residents of Edgwood for the last 14 years and presently reside at 506 Linson Ct. (aka Lot 14 as seen on the attached survey). The immediate property to our east at 512 Linson Ct. (aka Lot 15 on the attached survey) has been in need of extreme maintenance and repair for many years prior to us taking residence and remains in extremely poor condition presently. We recently had the opportunity to purchase this property and are excited to bring this property back to a more aesthetically pleasing and safer condition that will meet and continue to positively enhance our neighborhoods appearance while preserving our home values.

Please find the 6 attachments below:

1) Application for Approval,
2) list of abutting property owners,
3) drawing detailing the proposed lots sizes and available area to build on Lot 15.
4) drawing detailing the proposed new south lot line for Lot 15 and the lot line that will be removed between Lot 14 and 15 .
5) one survey detailing both Lots 14 and 15 as they are today.
6) a second survey detailing Lot 14 and 15 as they would appear after the proposed lot reconfiguration of the south property line of Lot 15 with a sample 2400sq ft. home within the 3920 sq ft . buildable area.

To observe and maintain the required building set backs, the present home on Lot 15 will be entirely or partially demolitioned. In addition, the proposed plan would allow Lot 14 to gain access to Little Lake Conway, while leaving Lot 15 also with lake frontage and ample square footage for construction of a new home that meets all R-1-AA requirements. Lot 15 will be 13,108 square feet or .30 acres ( $10,890 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ required). Lot 15 will also allow for an approximately $3,902 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ new home ( $2,200 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ required) while maintaining all set backs. Please note that the proposed survey shows a sample new home of 2,400 sq ft single story home within the required set backs.

After many years of anticipation and planning for the purchase of this property, we are excited to move forward. With your help and approval, we look forward to completing this project.
Thank you in advance for you assistance,
John \& Julie Mezzina
506 Linson Ct.
Edgewood, FL 32809
c. 407-810-2753
e. Jcocktails@aol.com

# ARNOLD, MATHENY \& EAGAN, P.A. ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW 605 E. ROBINSON STREET, SUITE 730 <br> ORLANDO, FLORIDA 32801 <br> www.ameorl.com <br> E-Mail: labrams@ameorl.com 

W.W. Arnold (1915-2006)

Randolph Y. Matheny, (1918-1995)
TELEPHONE (407) 841-1550

Lehn E. Abrams, Esquire William W. Eagan, Retired

FACSIMILE (407) 841-8746

February 24, 2022
City of Edgewood
405 Bagshaw Way
Edgewood, FL 32809

## Re: 506 Linson Court, Edgewood, FL 32809 / Plat-Pre-App

To Whom It May Concern:
In connection with the above referenced property, I have examined the title to the property above and the legal description and give the following opinion:

1. Title is vested in:

John C. Mezzina and Julie B. Mezzina by Warranty Deed recorded in O.R. Book 9804, Page 7557, Public Records of Orange County, Florida.
2. The land referred to in this opinion:

Lot 14, Block A, Oak Lynn Second Replat, according to the map or plat thereof as recorded in Plat Book W, Page 97, Public Records of Orange County, Florida.
3. Mortgages:
a. Mortgage to Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems, Inc., as nominee for Citizens Bank, N.A., mortgagee(s), recorded in Clerk's File Number 2021-738338, Public Records of Orange County, Florida.
4. The land is subject to the following matters:
a. All matters contained on the Plat of Oak Lynn Second Plat, as recorded in Plat Book W, Page 97, Public Records of Orange County, Florida.
b. Bill of Sale recorded in O.R. Book 2015, Page 87, Public Records of Orange County, Florida.

City of Edgewood
February 24, 2022
Page 2
5. Taxes and assessments for the year 2021 have been paid. Gross amount is $\$ 4,872.28$. Parcel ID \#13-23-29-6056-01-140.

This property information report is made for purpose of furnishing the information required for the filing of the above referenced subdivision plat in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 177.041 of the Florida Statutes and the requirements of the City of Edgewood and Orange County Land Development Code. It has been prepared expressly for the appropriate governing body as defined by Chapter 177.041 (FS) and it is not to be relied upon by any other group or person for any other purpose.

Very truly yours,
ARNOLD, MATHENY \& EAGAN, P.A.


BY: LEHN E. ABRAMS
FL BAR NUMBER: 0178398

# ARNOLD, MATHENY \& EAGAN, P.A. <br> ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW <br> 605 E. ROBINSON STREET, SUITE 730 <br> ORLANDO, FLORIDA 32801 <br> www.ameorl.com <br> E-Mail: labrams@ameorl.com 

W.W. Arnold (1915-2006)

Randolph Y. Matheny, (1918-1995)
TELEPHONE (407) 841-1550

Lehn E. Abrams, Esquire
William W. Eagan, Retired
FACSIMILE (407) 841-8746

February 24, 2022
City of Edgewood 405 Bagshaw Way Edgewood, FL 32809

## Re: 512 Linson Court, Edgewood, FL 32809 / Plat-Pre-App

To Whom It May Concern:
In connection with the above referenced property, I have examined the title to the property above and the legal description and give the following opinion:

1. Title is vested in:

Julie Mezzina and John Mezzina by Warranty Deed recorded in Instrument Number 20210721536, Public Records of Orange County, Florida.
2. The land referred to in this opinion:

Lot 15, Block A, Oak Lynn Second Replat, according to the map or plat thereof as recorded in Plat Book W, Page 97, Public Records of Orange County, Florida.
3. Mortgages:
a. None.
4. The land is subject to the following matters:
a. All matters contained on the Plat of Oak Lynn Second Plat, as recorded in Plat Book W, Page 97, Public Records of Orange County, Florida.
b. Bill of Sale recorded in O.R. Book 2015, Page 87, Public Records of Orange County, Florida.

City of Edgewood
February 24, 2022
Page 2
5. Taxes and assessments for the year 2021 have been paid. Gross amount is $\$ 5,562.38$. Parcel ID \#13-23-29-6056-01-150.

This property information report is made for purpose of furnishing the information required for the filing of the above referenced subdivision plat in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 177.041 of the Florida Statutes and the requirements of the City of Edgewood and Orange County Land Development Code. It has been prepared expressly for the appropriate governing body as defined by Chapter 177.041 (FS) and it is not to be relied upon by any other group or person for any other purpose.

Very truly yours, ARNOLD, MATHENY \& EAGAN, P.A.


BY: LEHN E. ABRAMS
FL BAR NUMBER: 0178398









## APPLICATION FOR VARIANCE

City of Edgewood Code of Ordinances, Section 126-588
REQUIRED FEE: \$350 RESIDENTIAL \$750 NONRESIDENTIAL (Plus Applicable Pass-Through Fees - Ordinance 2013-01)

Please note this fee is non-refundable

| Office Use Only: |  | Variance Application \#: | VAR-2022-01 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Received Date: | $2 / 2 / 2022$ | Received by: | Brett Sollazzo |
| P\&Z Meeting Date: | $3 / 14 / 2022$ | City Council Meeting Date: | $4 / 19 / 2022$ |

IMPORTANT: A COMPLETE application with all required attachments and ten (10) copies must be submitted to the City Clerk $\qquad$ days before the next Planning \& Zoning meeting. No application shall be deemed accepted unless it is complete and paid for. Notarized letter of authorization from Owner MUST be submitted if application is filed by anyone other than property owner.

Please type or print. Complete carefully, answering each question and attaching all necessary documentation and additional pages as necessary.

| Applicant's Name: | John Mezzina | Owner's Name: | John Mezzina |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Address: | 506 Linson Ct. Edgewood, FL 32809 512 Linson Ct. Edgewood, FL 32809 | Address: | 506 Linson Ct. Edgewood, FL 32809 512 Linson Ct. Orlando FI, 32809 |
| Phone Number: | 407.810.2753 | Phone Number: | 407.810.2753 |
| Fax: | N.A. | Fax: | N.A. |
| Email: | Jcocktails@aol.com | Email: | Jcocktails@aol.com |
| Legal Description: | Parcel 13-23-29-6056-01-140 Parcel 13-23-29-6056-01-150 |  |  |
| Zoned: | R1-AA |  |  |
| Location: | See above address |  |  |
| Tract Size: | $36,189 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{Ft} / .83$ acres |  |  |
| City section of the Subdivision Regulations (Chapter 126) from which Variance is requested: |  | ction 126-168(8) |  |
| Request: |  | A variance from Code Section 126-168(8) to allow a front setback of 30 feet from the front property line, regardless of the irregular shape of Lot 15. |  |
| Existing on Site: |  | One (1) SFR on each lot |  |

The applicant hereby states that this request for Variance does not violate any deed restrictions on the property. Application must be signed by the legal owner, not agent, unless copy of power of attorney is attached.

## Sec. 126-588 - Variances.

(a) The council may grant a variance from the terms of this chapter when such variance will not be contrary to the public interest and where, owing to special conditions, a literal enforcement of the provisions of this chapter would result in unnecessary hardship. Such variance shall not be granted if it has the effect of nullifying the intent and purpose of this chapter. Furthermore, such variance shall not be granted by the council unless and until:
(1) A written application for a variance is submitted demonstrating that:
a. Special conditions and circumstances exist which are peculiar to the land, structures or required subdivision improvements involved and which are not applicable to other lands, structures, or required subdivision improvements;
The subdivision was platted in 1958, prior to City subdivision regulations requiring a different method of determining front setback for irregular shaped lots. Consequently, the houses that were built on the irregular shaped lots, including those lots on Linson Court, are built at the minimum zoning setback: 30 feet. The proposed new subdivision is not creating a new lot, rather it is an adjustment of the property lines. Thus, the code requirement to calculate the front setback of an irregular lot should not apply
b. A literal interpretation of the provisions of this chapter would deprive the applicant of right commonlyenjoyed by other properties with similar conditions;
The other houses on irregular lots on Linson Court were allowed to be built at the standard front setback without the need for a variance.
c. The special conditions and circumstances do not result from the actions of the applicant; The subdivision was platted in 1958 prior to our ownership and
d. The granting of the variance requested will not confer on the applicant any special privilege that is denied by this chapter to other lands, structures or required subdivision improvements under similar conditions. No pre-existing conditions on neighboring lands, which are contrary to this chapter, shall beconsidered grounds for the issuance of a variance.
The request is to meet the standard front setback of the zoning district.
(2) The council shall make findings that the requirements of this section have been met.
(3) A public hearing of the proposed variance shall be held. The public hearing may be held prior to orsimultaneously with the public hearing for approval of the preliminary plan.
(4) The council shall further make a finding that the reasons set forth in the application justify the granting of the variance that would make possible the reasonable use of the land, buildings or other improvements.
(5) The council shall make further finding that the granting of the variance would be in harmony with the general purposes and intent of this chapter, will not be injurious to the surrounding territory or otherwise be detrimental to the public welfare.
(b) In granting any variance, the council may prescribe appropriate conditions and safeguards in conformity with this chapter. Violation of such condition and safeguards when made a part of the terms under which the variance is granted shall be deemed a violation of this chapter.
(Code 1985, § 21-195; Ord. No. 17-1A-8-78, Art. X, § 10.1, 10-17-1978)

## Applicant must agree that:

In granting any variance, the City may prescribe appropriate conditions and safeguards in conformity with the Ordinances, and any regulations enacted under its authority. Violation of such conditions and safeguards, when made a part of the terms under which the variance is granted shall be deemed a violation of Edgewood ordinances.


Please submit your completed application to City Hall via email at bmeeks@edgewood-fl.gov or sriffle@edgewoodfl.gov, via facsimile to 407-851-7361, or hand deliver to City Hall located at 405 Bagshaw Way. For additional questions, please contact City Hall at 407-851-2920.


## 



Date: March 7, 2022
To: Planning and Zoning Board
From: Ellen Hardgrove, City Planning Consultant
XC: Sandy Riffle, Interim City Clerk
Brett Sollazzo, Administrative Assistant
Drew Smith, City Attorney
Re: Holden Avenue PD Development Plan/Preliminary Subdivision Plan

## Agenda Item Description

The Holden Avenue PD Land Use Plan was approved February 16, 2021. The Development Agreement was recorded 3/22/2021 (DOC \#202110162289). Per Code Section 134-458, the next phase of the PD process is approval of the Development Plan (DP), which typically is also the Preliminary Subdivision Plan (PSP).

The applicant has submitted the "Holden Avenue PD - Haven Oaks Development Plan/ Preliminary Subdivision Plan" dated "Received February 28, 2022" submitted by AVCON, along with landscape plans from Daly Design Group (ddg) dated "Received February 28, 2022," and a comprehensive sign plan for the DP/PSP dated "Received March 7, 2022."

## DP/PSP Consistency with Development Agreement

Generally, the DP/PSP is consistent with the Development Agreement; however, it should be noted that there has been a significant change in the subdivision's lot size composition.

As allowed for in Development Agreement, some of the 60 feet wide lots shown on the Land Use Plan can be exchanged for 50 feet wide lots if competent substantial evidence is shown that the reduction of lot size allows for preservation of historic or specimen trees that would not otherwise have been preserved or expansion of the recreation area. The table below summarizes the change.

|  | Number of Lots |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lot width | Per Development Agreement | Approved Land Use Plan | As currently proposed |
| 50 feet | Maximum 3 | $3(6.9 \%)$ | $20(46.5 \%)$ |
| 60 feet | Minimum 36 | $36(83.7 \%)$ | $19(44.2)$ |
| 70 feet | Minimum 4 | $4(9.3 \%)$ | $4(9.3 \%)$ |
| Total | 43 | 43 | 43 |

Also to be noted was a discussion item at the Development Review Committee related to the proposed "recreation area." The submitted plans show 0.821 acre of recreation area in two tracts, meeting the minimum required area of 0.775 acre ; however, there was question as to whether the "recreation tracts" are recreational areas or simply open space. Furthermore, there was a recommendation that a covered pavilion/area be added to the playground area to provide a shelter from the sun or to accommodate a neighborhood event or birthday party for their child. The applicant has chosen to move forward with only including a pavilion on Tract E and a playground on Tract F.

There is the potential that when construction drawings are finalized, recreation tracts or the number of parking spaces in the lot near the proposed lift station would be reduced. Should this occur below that required by the Development Agreement or the parking spaces reduced below that shown on the Land Use Plan, the DP/PSP approval should be reconsidered.

While the DP/PSP is generally consistent with the Development Agreement, there is a minor change that needs to be made prior to the City Council public hearing. Sheet C-300 Note 9 inaccurately identifies the Development Agreement's limit on 50 feet wide lots and minimum 60 feet wide lots. The limit of 50 feet wide lots is three (3), not ten (10), and the minimum number of 60 feet wide lots is 36 , not 29 .

## Proposed Signage

In addition to the approval of the DP/PSP, the applicant has submitted an application for a comprehensive sign plan as presented in the ddg plans. The request is made to allow flexibility in sign design.

Whereas the proposed subdivision sign could be placed on the perimeter wall and meet the City sign requirements, the applicant has requested approval of a more creative sign to improve the aesthetics: freestanding signs constructed in front of the perimeter wall on both sides of the entrance road. That proposed will have a positive impact on the aesthetics, and will enhance community character and individual property values.

The proposed eight (8) feet high sign is will be in front of and parallel to the six (6) feet high perimeter wall.

## Recommended Motions from a Land Planning Perspective

I. Approval of the Holden Avenue PD Development Plan/Preliminary Subdivision Plan, known as Haven Oaks DP/PSP, which include the AVCON plans dated "Received February 28, 2022" and Daly Design Group Landscape Plans dated "Received 28, 2022," conditioned on the following:

1) The DP/PSP will be revised prior to Council's public hearing to correct Sheet C-300 Note 9 related to the correct number of permissible 50 fee and 60 feet wide lots;
2) A requirement that the DP/PSP be revised and resubmitted through the approval process should the preliminary construction drawings demonstrate the need to a) reduce the recreation areas below the minimum required per the Development Agreement or b) reduce the number of parking spaces shown on the Land Use Plan; and,
3) Any other conditions the Planning and Zoning Board would recommend related to issues identified in the City Engineer's and Landscape Architect's reports.
II. Approval of the Comprehensive Sign Plan included in the Daly Design Group plans dated "Received March 7, 2022" including the color illustration.

Brett Sollazzo<br>Administrative Assistant<br>City of Edgewood<br>405 Laure Avenue<br>Edgewood, FL 32809-3406

Re: Holden Ave PD/Haven Oaks, February 21, 2022 Development Plan Exhibit by Avcon Inc.
CPH Project \# E7601- Landscape Architecture Services

After reviewing the referenced site plan, I have the following comments and or suggestions for consideration.

## DEVELOPMENT PLAN

1. RECREATION AREA - REPEAT COMMENT: In over 40 years of park and recreation planning, I have learned from public meeting input, that the number 1 thing parents want at the playground, beyond the play equipment is shade and shelter. Based on my experience, I continue to highly recommend that the tot lot be near the pavilion.
2. REPEAT COMMENT: The previously identified swales in the Holden Avenue Tract H and Tract I north of the buffer wall has been removed from the civil and landscape drawings, so conformance with the previous request to move the west swale (in Tract I) to the north cannot be determined.
3. The 4' sidewalk into the playground approaches the playground at a bench location. Please relocate the bench or change the alignment of the walk.

## LANDCAPE PLAN

1. Tree Removal Permit, Condition of Approval - As per Development Agreement 5.0., the tree removal application per Chapter 130 is required to be submitted concurrently with the Development/Subdivision plan. This has yet to be submitted and staff recommends that if P\&Z recommends approval at the March hearing, that a condition of moving forward to City Council be that the tree removal permit be submitted at least two weeks prior to the Council public hearing submittal deadline, where the DP/PSP approval will be considered to ensure staff has adequate time for review.
2. Provide sidewalk protection where oaks are provided at the entrance or propose evergreen understory trees.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this submittal. Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions or comments.

Sincerely,
CPH, Inc.


James K. Winter RLA
Vice-President

Ms. Sandy Riffle, CMC<br>Deputy City Clerk<br>City of Edgewood<br>405 Bagshaw Way<br>Edgewood, FL 32809-3406

## RE: Holden Avenue PD - app - revised plan review CPH Project No. E7601

Dear Ms. Riffle;
We are in receipt of the revised plans, received on February 28, 2022, for the above listed project. The submittal includes development plans, landscape plans and a response letter to previous City and CPH comments. The response letter is referencing our comment letters from July of 2021 and September 28, 2021.

Please see our comments below that are a compilation from previous reviews:
A. The DA states that a maximum of 3 lots shall be allowed to have a minimum lot width of 50 feet, unless specific conditions are met and approved by the City at Development Plan review and if the Developer shows evidence that the reduction of lot sizes allows for historic tree preservation. The plans show 2050 -foot lots. That is an increase of 17 lots. The Developer will need to provide additional justification in written form for the increase in the number of 50 foot lots. The written response letter only notes that a change in the number of lots is allowable and the Developer needs to show by competent, substantial evidence that the reduction of lot sizes allows for preservation of historic or specimen trees.
B. The DA also states there shall be a minimum of 3660 -foot lots. The plans show a total of 1960 -foot lots. That is a reduction of 17 lots. As noted in comment 1 above, this needs to be justified by the Developer. Is the Developer proposing to amend the DA or request a waiver of this DA requirement? Once resolved, please review and correct note \#9 on sheet C-300.

1. Sheet C-000 - the legal description does not match the one shown on the Boundary Survey. There are six parcel ID numbers listed in the title area, but the legal description only lists two parcels.
2. Sheet C100 - Sheet 1 of Boundary Survey - the survey datum is not stated.
3. Sheet C101 - what is the developer's position on the gap between the parcels and what is being done to resolve?
4. Sheet C300 - with the configuration for the parking lot on the southern end of the site. Will there be sufficient room for lush landscaping and a fence between the sidewalk
and the lot line for Lot 21? Will there need to be some sort of "soft" buffer between the home and the parking lot and sidewalk?
5. Sheet C300 -The tot lot and the covered pavilion are not in the same tract and are on opposite ends of the development. These two features should be adjacent with each other. As an example, if a resident wishes to hold a birthday party for their child, will it be at the tot lot or the pavilion? At either location, they will not have the advantage of the other feature.
6. Sheet C301 - arrows to be provided per the requirements of OCPW review for proposed bidirectional turn lane.
7. Sheet C301-A swale will now be collecting all the runoff from the south half of Holden Avenue and conveying the runoff into the on-site storm water pond. Is that the intent? We will need to see the storm water calculations with the construction plans as part of the review of the pond design and discharge.
8. Sheet C302 - cul-de-sac will need to be larger to ensure that the fire trucks can maneuver without having to climb the curb.
9. Sheet C302 - the corner at the exit will need to be softened to allow the fire truck to exit without climbing the "pointed" curb and the median curb.
10. Sheet C305 - The first lot at the entrance is a 50 -foot wide lot. This lot will be considered a corner lot and will need to meet the setback requirements on two sides. Will this lot be large enough for a home to fit? The corner lot, side setback is 15 feet. That leaves 30 feet of width upon which to build.
11. Sheet C400 - where do the stormwater ponds discharge or do they retain the 100year storm event?
12. Sheet C500 - recommend that the water main be extended farther around the cul-desac to eliminate all the water service lines crossing the cul-de-sac.

This completes our review of the plan sheets.
Sincerely,
CPH, Inc.

> Ilea Cane or

Allen C. Lane, Jr., P.E.
Project Engineer
CC: James Winter, CPH
Ellen Hardgrove, City Planner
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# AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF EDGEWOOD, FLORIDA, AMENDING CHAPTER 134 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES TO CREATE NEW ZONING DISTRICTS; PROVIDING FOR PERMITTED, AND PROHIBITED USES WITHIN THE NEW ZONING DISTRICTS; PROVIDING FOR DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS AND REGULATIONS WITHIN THE NEW ZONING DISTRICTS; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; PROVIDING FOR CODIFICATION, CONFLICTS, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE. 

WHEREAS, the City has annexed land into the jurisdictional boundaries of the City; and

WHEREAS, some of the lands annexed have not been assigned City zoning districts and have retained their Orange County zoning designations; and

WHEREAS, properties that retain Orange County zoning designations create multiple inefficiencies for the property owners and the City; and

WHEREAS, the City Council is also mindful of not creating nonconformities upon developed properties as a result of changing from Orange County to City zoning designations; and

WHEREAS, creation of new zoning districts are needed to allow property owners of developed land to continue to use site standards of the County zoning that existed prior to annexation while allowing the City to properly assess and advise as to future use and development activities; and

WHEREAS, within this Ordinance, deletions are identified by strikethrough text, additions are identified by underline text, and portions of the Code that remain unchanged and which are not reprinted here are indicated by ellipses ( ${ }^{* * *)}$.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF EDGEWOOD, FLORIDA, AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION ONE. The findings set forth in the recitals above are hereby adopted as legislative findings of the City Council pertaining to this Ordinance.

SECTION TWO. Chapter 134, "Zoning," Article IV, "District Regulations," is hereby amended as follows:

Sec. 134-221. R-1AA-CA and R-1A-CA Intent and purpose.
The R-1-AA-CA and R-1-A-CA single-family dwelling districts are exclusively for land that has been annexed from the County and developed under County site standards.

## Sec. 134-222. R-1AA-CA and R-1A-CA Uses permitted.

The permitted uses within the R1AA-CA and R1A-CA districts shall be the same as the permitted uses set forth for R-1-AA and R-1-A zoning districts in Section 134-219.

## Sec. 134-223. R-1AA-CA and R-1A-CA Special exceptions.

The special exception uses within the R1AA-CA and R1A-CA districts shall be the same as the special exception uses set forth for R-1-AA and R-1-A zoning districts in Section 134-220.

Sec. 134-224-R-1AA-CA and R-1A-CA Site Standards.

|  | $\underline{\text { R-1AA-CA }}$ | $\underline{\mathrm{R}-1 \mathrm{~A}-\mathrm{CA}}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\underline{\text { Minimum Lot Area }}$ | $\underline{10,000 \text { square feet }}$ | $\underline{7,500 \text { square feet }}$ |
| Minimum Living Area | $\underline{1,200 \text { square feet }}$ | $\underline{1,200 \text { square feet }}$ |
| $\underline{\text { Minimum Lot Width }}$ | $\underline{85 \text { feet }}$ | $\underline{75 \text { feet }}$ |
| $\underline{\text { Minimum Building Setback }}$ |  |  |
| $\underline{\text { Front Yard }}$ | $\underline{25 \text { feet }}$ | $\underline{25 \text { feet }}$ |
| $\underline{\text { Rear Yard }}$ | $\underline{30 \text { feet }}$ | $\underline{30 \text { feet }}$ |
| $\underline{\text { Side Yard }}$ | $\underline{7.5 \text { feet }}$ | $\underline{7.5 \text { feet }}$ |
| $\underline{\text { Maximum Height }}$ | $\underline{35 \text { feet }}$ | $\underline{35 \text { feet }}$ |
| $\underline{\text { Maximum Impervious Surface }}$ | $\underline{45 \%}$ | $\underline{45 \%}$ |

*     *         * 

Sec. 134-284. -R-3-CA Intent and purpose.

The R-3-CA district is exclusively for land zoned R-3 at the time of annexation into the City.

## Sec. 134-285. R-3-CA Uses permitted.

Only the following uses shall be permitted within any R-3-CA district:
(1) Any use permitted in the R-2 district, pursuant to Section 134-255, provided the density does not exceed that allowed by the property's comprehensive plan future land use designation.
(2) Multiple-family dwellings, provided the density does not exceed that allowed by the property's comprehensive plan future land use designation.
(3) Kindergarten and day nurseries.

## Sec. 134-286. R-3-CA Special exceptions.

The special exception uses within the R-3-CA district shall be the same as the special exception uses set forth for the R-2 district in by Section 134-256.

## Sec. 134-287. - R3-CA Site development standards.

Site development standards within the R3-CA district shall be the same as required for the R3 district set forth in Section 134-579 with the exception of impervious surface maximum for lots with a one family building (aka single family dwelling). For a one family building lot, a minimum of $40 \%$ private open space shall be provided on each lot. Residential private open space for this section is defined as the usable open space on individual lots maintained by the required front, rear and side yards of the residential zoning district and excluding paved driveways, principal and accessory structures; but recreational structures such as, but not limited to, pools, tennis courts and porches can be included in calculating residential open space.

*     *         * 


## Sec. 134-439- IND-CA Intent and purpose.

The IND-CA district is exclusively for land that has been annexed from the County and developed under County Ind-3 site standards.

## Sec. 134-440. - Uses permitted.

The following uses shall be permitted with the IND-CA district:
(1) Any use permitted in the C-3 wholesale commercial district as set forth in Section 134-403.
(2) Any other use when, after a review of an application, the city council finds as a fact that the proposed use is consistent with the general zoning plan and with the public interest. Determination shall be after public notice and public hearing.

## Sec. 134-441. - Uses prohibited.

The following uses are expressly prohibited in the IND-CA district:
(1) Non-medical marijuana sales.
(2) Cannabis farm.

## Sec 134.442. - Performance standards.

All uses in the IND-CA district shall conform to the standards of performances described below in addition to those standards contained in Article VII of this chapter and shall be so constructed, maintained, and operated as not to be injurious or offensive to the occupants of adjacent premises by reason of the emission or creation of noise, vibration, smoke, dust or other particulate matter, toxic or noxious waste materials, odors, fire and explosive hazard or glare.
(1) Floor area ratio (FAR) shall not exceed 0.75 .
(2) Front yards: Twenty-five (25) feet.
(3) Side yards: Fifteen (15) feet.
(4) Rear yards: Ten (10) feet.
(5) Rear yards and side yards may be reduced to zero when the rear or side property lines abut the boundary of a railroad right-of-way, but only in those cases where an adjacent wall or walls of a building or structure are provided with railroad loading and unloading capabilities; however, no trackage shall be located nearer than three hundred (300) feet from any residential district.
(6) Setbacks shall be a minimum of fifty (50) feet from the normal high water elevation on every natural surface water body.
(7) Maximum building height: Fifty (50) feet, except thirty-five (35) feet within one hundred (100) feet of any residential use or district.
(8) Driveways, streets, and facilities for routing traffic shall be designed in such a manner that entrances and exits to public streets are not hazardous and that traffic congestion is minimized. Furthermore, no entrances or exits shall direct traffic into adjacent residential districts.
(9) The open storage of equipment, materials or commodities may be permitted, provided such storage shall not be located within any required front or buffer yard; shall be screened from all public streets; and, when located on a lot adjacent to a residential district, shall be screened from such residential district. Such screens may be in the form of walls, fences or landscaping; shall be at least six (6) feet in height; and shall be at least fifty (50) percent opaque as viewed from any point along the public street, right-of-way, or the residential district boundary. When landscaping is used for screening, the height and opacity requirements shall be attained within eighteen (18) months after open storage uses are established.
(10) The parking of commercial vehicles, such as trucks, cargo trailers and tractors may be permitted on hard surface lots, provided such lots shall not be located in any required landscaped area/buffer yard or within the front fifty (50) percent of any required front yard. Furthermore, such commercial vehicles, when located on a lot abutting a residential district, shall be screened from the residential district. Such screen may be in the form of walls, fences or landscaping; shall be at least
six (6) feet in height; and shall be at least fifty (50) percent opaque as viewed from any point along the residential district boundary. When landscaping is used for screening, the height and opacity requirements shall be attained within eighteen (18) months after commercial parking lots are established.
(11) The parking of passenger vehicles shall be permitted in any required yard except the front fifty (50) percent of required front yards and portions of the landscaped areas/buffer yards as otherwise required by Chapter 114.
(12) An increased setback not less than sixty (60) feet in width shall be provided along each I-CA industrial district boundary line which abuts any residential zoning district. Specific landscaping within the setback area shall be in accordance with Chapter 114 of this Code. That portion of the setback area that is not required to be landscaped shall not be used for processing activities, buildings or structures other than fences, walls or off-street parking.
(13) Within 300 feet of a residential district, all processes and storage, except of passenger vehicles, shall be in completely closed buildings. Processes and storage located at a greater distance shall be effectively screened by a solid wall or fence at least eight feet in height, but in no case lower in height than the enclosed process or storage. (THIS IS FROM THE CITY)
(14) Fire and safety hazard. Each use shall be operated so as to minimize the danger from fire and explosion.
a. All uses storing, processing or producing free or active burning material shall be located entirely within buildings or structures having exterior incombustible walls, and all such buildings shall be set back at least 250 feet from all lot lines.
b. All materials or products which produce flammable or explosive vapors or gases under ordinary weather conditions shall not be permitted within 100 feet of any lot line.
c. All buildings and structures containing explosives shall be set back from all property lines at least 100 feet.
(15) Electrical disturbance and radioactivity. Each use shall be so operated as to prevent the emission of quantities of radioactive materials in excess of limits established as safe by the United States Bureau of Standards.

## Sec. 134-443. Other Ind-3-CA requirements.

(1) Landscaping/buffer yards/open space. As set forth in the City Code, Chapter114 (Landscape and Buffer Regulations).<br>(2) Parking. As set forth in the City Code, Chapter 134, article V (Parking Standards).<br>(3) Signage. As set forth in the City Code, Chapter 122 (Sign Regulations).

## (4) Development permits. As set forth in the City Code, Chapter 134, Article II, Division 4 (Site Plan Review).

*     *         * 

SECTION THREE. The provisions of this Ordinance shall be codified as and become and be made a part of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Edgewood.

SECTION FOUR. If any section, sentence, phrase, word or portion of this ordinance is determined to be invalid, unlawful or unconstitutional, said determination shall not be held to invalidate or impair the validity, force or effect of any other section, sentence, phrase, word or portion of this Ordinance not otherwise determined to be invalid, unlawful or unconstitutional.

SECTION FIVE. All ordinances that are in conflict with this Ordinance are hereby repealed.

SECTION SIX. This Ordinance shall become effective immediately upon its passage and adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this $\qquad$ day of $\qquad$ , 2022, by the City Council of the City of Edgewood, Florida.

## PASSED ON FIRST READING:

$\qquad$
PASSED ON SECOND READING: $\qquad$

Richard A. Horn, Council President

ATTEST:

Sandra Riffle<br>Interim City Clerk
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## City Boundary History

The city was officially incorporated November 5, 1965. The original city limits (in black) compared to the current limits are shown in Exhibit 1. As can be seen, the city has grown significantly since 1965.

Exhibit 1 - Original City Limits Compared to Current City Limits


## Need for Rezoning

With the exception of establishing ECD along the Orange Avenue corridor, city zoning was not established for the annexed land. Per Code Section 134-172, all territory which is annexed to the city is considered to be zoned in the same manner as existed when under the county zoning classification unless such classification is affirmatively changed by the city. The lack of establishing a City zoning district has created confusion of development standard application.

Staff recommends rezoning most of the annexed land to newly created zoning districts with the intent of using these new districts to provide the property owner use of the same development standards as allowed in the County, while providing the City the control of the permitted uses. Generally, the new districts would apply to land that was zoned R1AA, R1A, R3, and Ind-3 at the time of annexation. The proposed new districts are R1AA-CA, R1A-CA, R3-CA and Ind-CA; the CA signifies to "County Annexed." The new districts are detailed in the proposed ordinance included in the appendix of this report.

Nearly all property that was zoned PO, C1 and C3 at the time of annexation is recommended to be rezoned to the same City district as the County and City site standards for these districts are the same.

In one instance, staff is recommending the annexed land be assigned a "Holding" district since the County zoning conflicts with the City's comprehensive plan and the property is undeveloped. This would require the creation of the "H-Holding" district; the new district would require a City zoning classification to be established prior to any development being approved for the property.

Finally, staff is recommending a change to Code Section 134-172 to require either City zoning be established at the time of annexation or the property assigned the H -Holding district to avoid future confusion of the applicable zoning district.

The following report sections summarize the annexed land and the recommended zoning.

## Rezonings to New Districts

R1AA-CA and R1A-CA
The areas where the R1AA-CA district would be established are identified in the Exhibit 2.
Exhibit 2 - Proposed R1AA-CA Areas


Annexed by Ordinance 8-7-70; 86-321; 86-322; and 91-377


Annexed by Ordinances 8-1-69 and 8-12-71


Annexed by Ordinance 93-388


Annexed by Ordinances 2-12-76 and 95-408


Annexed by Ordinances 1990-355 and 91-373


Annexed with Ordinance 95-415 and 2010-03

The areas where R1A-CA district would be established are identified in the Exhibit 3.

## Exhibit 3 - Proposed R1A-CA Areas



Annexed with Ordinance 85-264
As can be seen in the proposed ordinance, the R1AA-CA and R1A-CA uses mirror the City's R1AA and R1A districts, respectively, while retaining the County's site standards. Exhibits 4 and 5 provide a comparison of the proposed site standards and the City standards.

Exhibit 4 - Site Standards Comparison Proposed R1AA-CA and Existing City R1AA

|  | R1AA-CA | City R1AA |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Minimum Lot Area | 10,000 square feet | 10,890 square feet |
| Minimum Living Area | 1,200 square feet | 2,200 square feet |
| Minimum Lot Width | 85 feet | 90 feet |
| Minimum Building Setback |  |  |
|  | Front Yard | 30 feet |
|  | Rear Yard | 35 feet |
|  | Side Yard | 7.5 feet |
| Maximum Height | 35 feet | 35 feet |
| Maximum Impervious Surface | Not Identified | 10 feet |

Exhibit 5 - Site Standards Comparison Proposed R1A-CA and Existing City R1A

|  | R1A-CA | City R1A |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Minimum Lot Area | 7,500 square feet | 9,000 square feet |
| Minimum Living Area | 1,200 square feet | 1,800 square feet |
| Minimum Lot Width | 75 feet | 85 feet |
| Minimum Building Setback |  |  |
|  | Front Yard | 25 feet |
|  | Rear Yard | 30 feet |
|  | Side Yard | 7.5 feet |
| Maximum Height | 35 feet | 35 feet |
| Maximum Impervious Surface | Not Identified | 10 feet |

To note, the County's R1AA and R1A district does not establish a maximum impervious surface. Discussion is needed as to whether the City's R1AA/R1A 45\% maximum impervious surface should be added to the proposed new districts. $45 \%$ maximum impervious surface is a standard in all Edgewood's single family zoning districts.

## R3-CA

There are two areas of the City zoned County R3 as shown in Exhibit 6; one east of Hansel Avenue the other on the west side of the city. Development under this district would be significantly restricted due to the properties' future land use designations, which by state statute takes precedent over zoning.

The area east of Hansel Avenue has a future land use designation of Low Density Residential, where, by policy, density cannot exceed four (4) dwelling units per acre. The area on the west side of the city has a future land use designation of Medium Density Residential, where, by policy, density is to be greater than 4 dwellings units per acre and not exceed 7 dwelling units per acre. The proposed R3-CA district stipulates that the permitted use must be consistent with the property's city future land use designation.

## Exhibit 6 - County Zoned R3 Areas



Annexed by Ordinances 87-330 and 91-374 (lakefront lot)


Annexed by Ordinance 95-415
The area east of Hansel includes the Edgewood Village on Lake Conway subdivision plus two parcels on the north side of the subdivision. Both the subdivision and the two parcels are developed consistent with the Low Density Future Land Use designation.

The subdivision was platted after annexation with the lot sizes and widths consistent with the County's R-3 zoning district for single family detached homes, which are identical to the City's R3 district. The City approved a variance for building setbacks allowing zero on one side, 15 feet on the other and 15 feet front and rear. The only site standard difference between the County and City R3 districts for this subdivision would be maximum impervious surface. Whereas the City restricts impervious surface to a maximum of $45 \%$, the County does not have this restriction. The County, however, requires a minimum of $40 \%$ private open space on each single family lot. Residential private open space is defined as the usable open space on individual lots maintained by the required front, rear and side yards of the residential zoning district and excluding paved driveways, principal and accessory structures; but recreational structures such as, but not limited to, pools, tennis courts and porches can be included in calculating residential open space. The proposed ordinance allows the property owner to continue to use the County open space requirement.

The second area with County R3 zoning is owned by Randallmade Corp and is undeveloped. The City future land use designation with the new R3-CA district would result in a subdivision of 5,000 square feet single family lots or multifamily buildings at a density not to exceed 7 dwelling units per acre.

## Ind-3-CA

The City's Industrial district is basic compared to the County Ind-3 district; the City's Industrial district is essentially the City's C3 district, requiring the same site standards and allowing the
same uses as the City C3 district. Only one area of the City is zoned County Ind-3; i.e., the Force Four Subdivision, which is shown in Exhibit 7.

Exhibit 7 - Existing County Ind-3 within City Limits


The Force Four subdivision was developed prior to annexation with the exception of the miniwarehouses on Lots 9 and 10, which were developed in the City in 1988. The proposed district requirements are in the proposed ordinance. The district resembles the City's Ind district with the exception of retaining the County's Ind3 performance standards.

## Rezonings to Existing City Districts

## County PO to City PO

There is only one parcel with County PO in the city, which is shown in Exhibit 8. The County and the City PO districts are identical with the exception the city's increased side setback for buildings that are more than two stories (two feet for each additional story). Since the development on the PO zoned property meets the City's standards, staff recommends a new district not be created and to formerly rezone the subject property to City PO.

## Exhibit 8 County PO to City PO



Annexed by Ordinance 87-330

## County C1 to City C1

Similarly, rezoning from County C1 to City C1 is appropriate since the City's and County's C1 site standards are nearly identical. This would apply to the Oakwater Professional Center as shown in Exhibit 9.

Exhibit 9 County C1 to City C1


Annexed 2020

## County C3 to City C3

Likewise, rezoning from County C3 to City C3 for the land in Exhibit 10 is appropriate since the City's and County's C-3 site standards are nearly identical. The minor differences include
location of outdoor storage and maximum impervious surface. Related to outdoor storage, the County's C3 district prohibits open storage in the required front yard ( 25 feet). The City's allows outdoor storage within the back 10 feet of the front 25 feet setback.

## Exhibit 10 County C3 Zoning within City Limits



Annexed by Ordinance 97-85


Boise area annexed 8-6-1973, and by Ordinances 1980-219 (strip), 82-234 and 94-403.
Forrestal Warehouse was annexed by Ordinance 85-299.

## County R1AA to City R1AA

There two areas, as shown on Exhibit 11, where a rezoning from County R1AA to the new R1AA-CA district is not recommended. Instead a rezoning to the City R1AA is recommended. The land use on these relatively large parcels is either undeveloped or contains development that is consistent with the City R1AA site standards, thus, a rezoning to the City R1AA district causes no disadvantage to the property owner.

Exhibit 11 County R1AA to City R1AA


Annexed with Ordinance 95-415


Annexed by Ordinance 95-415

## County R1A to City R1A

Similarly, a rezoning from County R1A to City R1A is recommended for the parcels of Exhibit 12.

Exhibit 12 County R1A to City R1A


Annexed with Ordinance 95-415


Annexed with Ordinance 2002-15

## Recommendation for No Change

There is one area where zoning to a City district is not recommended, which is shown in Exhibit 13. The property, owned by Randallmade Corp, is undeveloped and currently zoned County C-1 - Retail Commercial. This district is inconsistent with the City's Future Land Use Map, which shows the majority of the property designated for Medium Density Residential. Prior to any development on the property either a rezoning must occur that is consistent with the future land use designation, or a future land use map amendment must be proposed and approved. If the latter is chosen, the appropriate type of land use can be debated during the future land use amendment process.

Exhibit 13


## Appendix

Proposed Ordinance for Chapter 134 - Zoning Amendment

ORDINANCE NO. 2022-XX


#### Abstract

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF EDGEWOOD, FLORIDA, AMENDING CHAPTER 134 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES TO CREATE NEW ZONING DISTRICTS; PROVIDING FOR PERMITTED, AND PROHIBITED USES WITHIN THE NEW ZONING DISTRICTS; PROVIDING FOR DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS AND REGULATIONS WITHIN THE NEW ZONING DISTRICTS; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; PROVIDING FOR CODIFICATION, CONFLICTS, AND AN EFFECTIVE DATE.


WHEREAS, the City has annexed land into the jurisdictional boundaries of the City; and

WHEREAS, some of the lands annexed have not been assigned City zoning districts and have retained their Orange County zoning designations; and

WHEREAS, properties that retain Orange County zoning designations create multiple inefficiencies for the property owners and the City; and

WHEREAS, the City Council is also mindful of not creating nonconformities upon developed properties as a result of changing from Orange County to City zoning designations; and

WHEREAS, creation of new zoning districts are needed to allow property owners of developed land to continue to use site standards of the County zoning that existed prior to annexation while allowing the City to properly assess and advise as to future use and development activities; and

WHEREAS, within this Ordinance, deletions are identified by strikethrough text, additions are identified by underline text, and portions of the Code that remain unchanged and which are not reprinted here are indicated by ellipses $\left({ }^{* * *}\right)$.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF EDGEWOOD, FLORIDA, AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION ONE. The findings set forth in the recitals above are hereby adopted as legislative findings of the City Council pertaining to this Ordinance.

SECTION TWO. Chapter 134, "Zoning," Article IV, "District Regulations," is hereby amended as follows:

Sec. 134-221. R-1AA-CA and R-1A-CA Intent and purpose.

The R-1-AA-CA and R-1-A-CA single-family dwelling districts are exclusively for land that has been annexed from the County and developed under County site standards.

## Sec. 134-222. R-1AA-CA and R-1A-CA Uses permitted.

The permitted uses within the R1AA-CA and R1A-CA districts shall be the same as the permitted uses set forth for R-1-AA and R-1-A zoning districts in Section 134-219.

## Sec. 134-223. R-1AA-CA and R-1A-CA Special exceptions.

The special exception uses within the R1AA-CA and R1A-CA districts shall be the same as the special exception uses set forth for R-1-AA and R-1-A zoning districts in Section 134-220.

Sec. 134-224-R-1AA-CA and R-1A-CA Site Standards.

|  | $\underline{\text { R-1AA-CA }}$ | $\underline{\text { R-1A-CA }}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Minimum Lot Area | $\underline{10,000 \text { square feet }}$ | $\underline{7,500 \text { square feet }}$ |
| Minimum Living Area | $\underline{1,200 \text { square feet }}$ | $\underline{1,200 \text { square feet }}$ |
| $\underline{\text { Minimum Lot Width }}$ | $\underline{85 \text { feet }}$ | $\underline{75 \text { feet }}$ |
| Minimum Building Setback |  |  |
|  | $\underline{\text { Front Yard }}$ | $\underline{25 \text { feet }}$ |
| $\underline{\text { Rear Yard }}$ | $\underline{30 \text { feet }}$ | $\underline{25 \text { feet }}$ |
| $\underline{\text { Side Yard }}$ | $\underline{3.5 \text { feet }}$ | $\underline{7.5 \text { feet }}$ |
| Maximum Height | $\underline{35 \text { feet }}$ | $\underline{35 \text { feet }}$ |
| Maximum Impervious Surface | $\underline{45 \%}$ | $\underline{45 \%}$ |

Sec. 134-284. -R-3-CA Intent and purpose.

The R-3-CA district is exclusively for land zoned R-3 at the time of annexation into the City.

Sec. 134-285. R-3-CA Uses permitted.

Only the following uses shall be permitted within any R-3-CA district:
(1) Any use permitted in the R-2 district, pursuant to Section 134-255, provided the density does not exceed that allowed by the property's comprehensive plan future land use designation.
(2) Multiple-family dwellings, provided the density does not exceed that allowed by the property's comprehensive plan future land use designation.
(3) Kindergarten and day nurseries.

## Sec. 134-286. R-3-CA Special exceptions.

The special exception uses within the R-3-CA district shall be the same as the special exception uses set forth for the R-2 district in by Section 134-256.

Sec. 134-287. - R3-CA Site development standards.
Site development standards within the R3-CA district shall be the same as required for the R3 district set forth in Section 134-579 with the exception of impervious surface maximum for lots with a one family building (aka single family dwelling). For a one family building lot, a minimum of $40 \%$ private open space shall be provided on each lot. Residential private open space for this section is defined as the usable open space on individual lots maintained by the required front, rear and side yards of the residential zoning district and excluding paved driveways, principal and accessory structures; but recreational structures such as, but not limited to, pools, tennis courts and porches can be included in calculating residential open space.

*     *         * 

Sec. 134-439- IND-CA Intent and purpose.

The IND-CA district is exclusively for land that has been annexed from the County and developed under County Ind-3 site standards.

Sec. 134-440. - Uses permitted.
The following uses shall be permitted with the IND-CA district:
(1) Any use permitted in the C-3 wholesale commercial district as set forth in Section 134-403.
(2) Any other use when, after a review of an application, the city council finds as a fact that the proposed use is consistent with the general zoning plan and with the public interest. Determination shall be after public notice and public hearing.

## Sec. 134-441. - Uses prohibited.

The following uses are expressly prohibited in the IND-CA district:
(1) Non-medical marijuana sales.
(2) Cannabis farm.

## Sec 134.442. - Performance standards.

All uses in the IND-CA district shall conform to the standards of performances described below in addition to those standards contained in Article VII of this chapter and shall be so constructed, maintained, and operated as not to be injurious or offensive to the occupants of adjacent premises by reason of the emission or creation of noise, vibration, smoke, dust or other particulate matter, toxic or noxious waste materials, odors, fire and explosive hazard or glare.
(1) Floor area ratio (FAR) shall not exceed 0.75 .
(2) Front yards: Twenty-five (25) feet.
(3) Side yards: Fifteen (15) feet.
(4) Rear yards: Ten (10) feet.
(5) Rear yards and side yards may be reduced to zero when the rear or side property lines abut the boundary of a railroad right-of-way, but only in those cases where an adjacent wall or walls of a building or structure are provided with railroad loading and unloading capabilities; however, no trackage shall be located nearer than three hundred (300) feet from any residential district.
(6) Setbacks shall be a minimum of fifty (50) feet from the normal high water elevation on every natural surface water body.
(7) Maximum building height: Fifty (50) feet, except thirty-five (35) feet within one hundred (100) feet of any residential use or district.
(8) Driveways, streets, and facilities for routing traffic shall be designed in such a manner that entrances and exits to public streets are not hazardous and that traffic congestion is minimized. Furthermore, no entrances or exits shall direct traffic into adjacent residential districts.
(9) The open storage of equipment, materials or commodities may be permitted, provided such storage shall not be located within any required front or buffer yard; shall be screened from all public streets; and, when located on a lot adjacent to a residential district, shall be screened from such residential district. Such screens may be in the form of walls, fences or landscaping; shall be at least six (6) feet in height; and shall be at least fifty (50) percent opaque as viewed from any point along the public street, right-of-way, or the residential district boundary. When landscaping is used for screening, the height and opacity requirements shall be attained within eighteen (18) months after open storage uses are established.
(10) The parking of commercial vehicles, such as trucks, cargo trailers and tractors may be permitted on hard surface lots, provided such lots shall not be located in any required landscaped area/buffer yard or within the front fifty (50) percent of any required front yard. Furthermore, such commercial vehicles, when located on a lot abutting a residential district, shall be screened from the residential district. Such screen may be in the form of walls, fences or landscaping; shall be at least six (6) feet in height; and shall be at least fifty (50) percent opaque as viewed from any point along the residential district boundary. When landscaping is used for screening, the height and opacity requirements shall be attained within eighteen (18) months after commercial parking lots are established.
(11) The parking of passenger vehicles shall be permitted in any required yard except the front fifty (50) percent of required front yards and portions of the landscaped areas/buffer yards as otherwise required by Chapter 114.
(12) An increased setback not less than sixty (60) feet in width shall be provided along each I-CA industrial district boundary line which abuts any residential zoning district. Specific landscaping within the setback area shall be in accordance with Chapter 114 of this Code. That portion of the setback area that is not required to be landscaped shall not be used for processing activities, buildings or structures other than fences, walls or off-street parking.
(13) Within 300 feet of a residential district, all processes and storage, except of passenger vehicles, shall be in completely closed buildings. Processes and storage located at a greater distance shall be effectively screened by a solid wall or fence at least eight feet in height, but in no case lower in height than the enclosed process or storage. (THIS IS FROM THE CITY)
(14) Fire and safety hazard. Each use shall be operated so as to minimize the danger from fire and explosion.
a. All uses storing, processing or producing free or active burning material shall be located entirely within buildings or structures having exterior incombustible walls, and all such buildings shall be set back at least 250 feet from all lot lines.
b. All materials or products which produce flammable or explosive vapors or gases under ordinary weather conditions shall not be permitted within 100 feet of any lot line.
c. All buildings and structures containing explosives shall be set back from all property lines at least 100 feet.
(15) Electrical disturbance and radioactivity. Each use shall be so operated as to prevent the emission of quantities of radioactive materials in excess of limits established as safe by the United States Bureau of Standards.

## Sec. 134-443. Other Ind-3-CA requirements.

(1) Landscaping/buffer yards/open space. As set forth in the City Code, Chapter114 (Landscape and Buffer Regulations).
(2) Parking. As set forth in the City Code, Chapter 134, article V (Parking Standards).
(3) Signage. As set forth in the City Code, Chapter 122 (Sign Regulations).
(4) Development permits. As set forth in the City Code, Chapter 134, Article II, Division 4 (Site Plan Review).

*     *         * 

SECTION THREE. The provisions of this Ordinance shall be codified as and become and be made a part of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Edgewood.

SECTION FOUR. If any section, sentence, phrase, word or portion of this ordinance is determined to be invalid, unlawful or unconstitutional, said determination shall not be held to invalidate or impair the validity, force or effect of any other section, sentence, phrase, word or portion of this Ordinance not otherwise determined to be invalid, unlawful or unconstitutional.

SECTION FIVE. All ordinances that are in conflict with this Ordinance are hereby repealed.

SECTION SIX. This Ordinance shall become effective immediately upon its passage and adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this $\qquad$ day of $\qquad$ , 2022, by the City Council of the City of Edgewood, Florida.

PASSED ON FIRST READING: $\qquad$
PASSED ON SECOND READING: $\qquad$

Richard A. Horn, Council President
ATTEST:

[^0]ORDINANCE NO. 2022-02


#### Abstract

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF EDGEWOOD, FLORIDA, RELATING TO SIGNS; AMENDING CHAPTER 122 OF THE CITY OF EDGEWOOD CODE OF ORDINANCES RELATING TO WINDOW SIGNS; PROHIBITING WINDOW SIGNAGE; PROVIDING AN EXCEPTION FOR ONE WINDOW SIGN NO LARGER THAN FIVE SQUARE FEET IN COPY AREA; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; PROVIDING FOR CODIFICATION, CONFLICTS, AND EFFECTIVE DATE.


WHEREAS, the regulation of signs is necessary to protect the public health, safety and welfare of the citizens, businesses and visitors to the City of Edgewood ("the City"); and

WHEREAS, during the implementation of new sign regulations, the City has monitored the effectiveness and efficiency of said regulations; and

WHEREAS, the City continues to face challenges in effectively controlling window signage in a manner that avoids sign clutter and aesthetic impacts to buildings; and

WHEREAS, some businesses continue to abuse the allowances for window signage the City has tried to maintain; and

WHEREAS, as building practices evolve and more glass and windows are used in buildings, the challenges presented by window signage become more significant; and

WHEREAS, in order to avoid sign clutter and protect the aesthetic beauty of the City of Edgewood, the City Council finds it appropriate and necessary to further restrict the usage of window signage within the City of Edgewood.

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that this Ordinance is concerned with the secondary effects of speech including but not limited to aesthetics and traffic safety, and are not intended to regulate viewpoints or censor speech, and for those and other reasons that the foregoing provisions are not subject to, or would not fail, a "prior restraint" analysis.

## NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF EDGEWOOD, FLORIDA, AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION ONE. The findings set forth in the recitals above are hereby adopted as legislative findings of the City Council pertaining to this Ordinance.

SECTION TWO. Chapter 122, "Signs," of the City of Edgewood Code of Ordinances is hereby amended as set forth as follows (note: additions are indicated by underline, deletions are indicated by strikethrough, and portions of the Code that remain unchanged and which are not reprinted here are indicated by ellipses ( ${ }^{* * *)}$ :

## Sec. 122-10. Prohibited signs.

(23) Window signage that exceeds 25 percent of the total glass area of all windows and 333 glass doors except as expressly allowed within this Chapter. Window signage lawfully existing as of shall be allowed to remain until the earlier of: 1) voluntary removal of the window signage or 2) a change of occupancy in the unit upon which the window signage is located.

## Sec. 122-13. Signs subject to permitting.

## (b) Non-residential.

***
(4) Subject to the maximum total copy area, the following signs shall be permitted in all non-residential zoning districts:
a. Ground signs. Ground signs shall be permitted pursuant to the following:

1. One low-profile sign, one tall-profile sign, consistent with the definitions for same, or one electronic changeable message sign consistent with the requirements in subsection 122-13(b)(4)a. 5 below, shall be allowed along each public road right-of-way the parcel abuts.
2. On multi-occupant parcels at least five acres in size with at least 375 feet of parcel depth measured from the front property line to the rear property line, one large parcel sign, consistent with the definition for same, shall be allowed in lieu of a low-profile, tall-profile, or electronic changeable message sign.
3. On parcels abutting multiple public road rights-of-way, one additional ground sign shall be allowed per secondary road frontage. The sign location along the secondary frontage shall be at least 100 feet from the point of road intersection with the primary road, as measured along the right-of-way. The secondary frontage shall be the road with the lowest traffic count.
***
b. Attached signs. The following attached signs shall be permitted:
4. One wall sign, one projecting sign, or one hanging sign shall be allowed per principal building façade facing a public road right-of-way for each principal building located on a parcel; such sign or signs allowed herein do not have to be located on the building façade facing the public road right-of-way, but only one such sign shall be allowed per building façade.
i. No wall sign or supporting structure for a wall sign shall project more than 12 inches from the wall of a building nor over any public right-of-way. Wall signs may not disrupt architectural features of the building and must be architecturally compatible and consistent with the building. Further, no wall sign shall extend above the roofline except where an exterior parapet wall projects above the roofline, in which case such sign may extend to the top of such wall.
ii. No projecting sign shall extend beyond three feet beyond the face of the building. No sign face of any projecting sign may be greater than six square feet in area. A projecting sign shall be hung at a $90-$ degree angle from the face of the building and the bottom of the projecting sign shall be at least seven feet above grade.
iii. The edge of any hanging sign furthest from the building shall not extend beyond the edge of the roofline. No sign face of any hanging sign may be greater than six square feet in area. A hanging sign shall be hung either parallel to or at a 90-degree angle from the face of the building. The bottom of the hanging sign shall be at least seven feet above grade.
5. One awning sign shall be allowed per awning installed upon the principal buildings located upon the premises.
c.. Window Signs. One window sign not exceeding 5 square feet in copy area. Window signs shall be counted in the total copy area allowed. and shall be limited to an area that does not exceed 25 percent of each window area. The remaining $75 \%$ of the windows shall remain transparent. A glass door shall be categorized as a window for this regulation
d. One fuel pump sign with copy area no greater than two square feet located upon a functional and properly licensed fuel pump. Fuel pump signs shall not be included in the calculation of maximum total copy area.
e. Governmental right-of-way signs.
(5) In addition to the maximum number of signs and total square footage allowed per parcel, each business location located within a multiple-occupant building with an individual exterior entrance location, shall be permitted one attached sign consistent with subsection 122-13(b)(4)b. and one window sign not exceeding 5 square feet in copy area, located proximate to the primary entrance to such business location. Such multiple-occupant signage shall be subject to the following:
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a. The total maximum copy area available for such multiple-occupant signage per parcel shall be two square feet of copy area for each linear foot of building frontage of the building. If the building has multiple stories which are utilized for business locations, then the width of each additional story shall be utilized in ealeulating the building frentage. Each occupant of the building shall then be allocated sign square footage based on their rental (or owned) square footage percentage of the total available square footage in the building. In no event, however, may any one business location exceed a maximum of 100 square feet of total copy area except as otherwise authorized for an anchor tenant.
b. Anchor tenants upon a multiple-occupant parcel shall be allowed an additional one square foot of copy area for each linear foot of building frontage of that portion of the building occupied by the anchor tenant over 100 linear feet. Said additional copy area shall not exceed 200 square feet of copy area per anchor. The copy area allowed within this paragraph shall be wall signage, awning signage, or a combination thereof.

SECTION THREE. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, word or provision of this Ordinance is for any reason held invalid or unconstitutional by any court of competent jurisdiction, whether for substantive, procedural, or any other reason, such portion shall be deemed a separate, distinct and independent provision, and such holding shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this Ordinance.

SECTION FOUR. It is the intent of the City Council of the City of Edgewood that the provisions of this Ordinance shall be codified. The codifier is granted broad and liberal authority in codifying the provisions of this Ordinance.

SECTION FIVE. This Ordinance shall take effect immediately upon adoption as provided by the Charter of the City of Edgewood.

PASSED ON FIRST READING THIS $\qquad$ DAY OF $\qquad$ , 2022.

PASSED AND ADOPTED THIS $\qquad$ DAY OF $\qquad$ , 2022.

CITY OF EDGEWOOD, FLORIDA
CITY COUNCIL

Richard A. Horn, Council President

## ATTEST:

158
159 160

Sandra Riffle, Interim City Clerk
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[^0]:    Sandy Riffle
    Interim City Clerk

