

WORKSHOP
APALACHICOLA CITY COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 23, 2023 – 5:00PM
BATTERY PARK COMMUNITY CENTER
1 BAY AVE., APALACHICOLA, FLORIDA 32320

Agenda

You are welcome to comment on any matter under consideration by the Apalachicola City Commission when recognized to do so by the Mayor. Once recognized please rise to the podium, state your name for the record and adhere to the three minute time limit for public comment. Comments may also be sent by email to the City Manager or to Commissioners.

- I. Call to Order**
- II. Agenda Adoption**
- III. Public Comment**
- IV. Discussion – Planning, Permitting, Building, Code Enforcement Department**

Any person who desires to appeal any decision at this meeting will need a record of the proceeding and for this purpose, may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceeding is made which includes testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is based. Persons with disabilities needing assistance to participate in any of these proceedings should contact the City Clerk's Office 48 hours in advance of the meeting.

Historic Apalachicola Partners for Preservation, Inc.
P. O Box 965
Apalachicola, Florida 32329

July 29, 2023

Mayor Brenda Ash
Commissioner Donna Duncan
Commissioner Despina George
Commissioner Anita Grove
Commissioner Adriene Elliott

Dear Mayor and Commissioners,

HAPPI is pleased to present the enclosed memo for your consideration in the Building Department Workshop scheduled for August 3, 2023. The success of historic preservation efforts is closely linked to the implementation of the City's Land Development Code in a way that promotes good decision-making and engenders the public's trust.

The recommendations in this memo are based on the collective legal experience accrued over many years in Florida administrative law, state administrative regulatory bodies, municipal government, and land-use law of HAPPI members and legal partners. They are also based on our collective years of close observation of the City of Apalachicola's City Commission, Planning and Zoning Board, and the Board of Adjustment. All of the recommendations are administrative changes in the process used by the Planning and Zoning Board and the Building Department to discharge their responsibilities under the City's Land Development Code. They would not cause the City to incur additional financial obligations or to alter the current provisions of the Code; nor would they place additional burdens on Staff, or P and Z board members. But if adopted, the recommendations would promote fundamental fairness and transparency in the process which will lead to better decisions and a renewal of the public trust in local government.

Sincerely,
Bonnie E. Davis

Bonnie E. Davis
HAPPI

CC: Planning and Zoning Board
Travis Wade, Bree Robinson, Dan Hartman

To: Apalachicola City Commission

CC: Planning and Zoning Board; Travis Wade; Bree Robinson; Dan Hartman

From: HAPPI

Date: July 29, 2023

Re: Recommendations for P and Z and Building Department Process for Consideration at the August 3, 2023 Workshop

Introduction

As we understand it the purpose of the workshop is to study and make recommendations for additions and improvements to the process followed by the City's Building Department, and to clarify the respective roles and responsibilities of the Planning and Zoning Board (hereinafter P and Z) and the Staff of the Building Department (hereinafter Staff). The goal is to take steps to ensure compliance with the City's Land Development Code (hereinafter the Code, or the City's Code) to promote good decision-making, and to make the process knowable and transparent to all concerned, the public, future applicants, the Commission, and Staff.¹

We offer our perspective on process and why it is important to good government. By process we mean the steps involved in receiving, reviewing, investigating, advising applicants, posting, recommending, deciding, and implementing decisions for any matter within the jurisdiction of P and Z or the Board of Adjustment that implements the City's Code. Our recommendations for improving the process concern both the P and Z Board and the Building Department, specifically the City Planner and the Building Inspector and what their respective roles and responsibilities should be.

Why Process Matters

Why is process so important? Process matters for two, interconnected reasons:

- **A good process yields better decisions.**
 - The Code, like many laws, does not inflexibly dictate an outcome in any case. Like any administrative proceeding every case will require the application of facts specific to that case to a set of criteria, or rules, set forth in the Code that must be considered when a decision is made whether the applicant's request should be granted.
 - A good process will make sure that all relevant facts are considered, and all legal requirements are met. Year over year a consistent process will yield better decisions than an ad hoc process that varies significantly from one case to the next.
- **A good process builds the public trust.**

¹ There are other issues facing P and Z worthy of workshop attention, specifically the need to revive the Architectural Review Board so it complies with Code requirements, and the conduct of quasi-judicial proceedings before city boards and the City Commission. Each of those topics deserves a workshop exclusively devoted to it, and in the interest of time and focus in this workshop, those subjects are not addressed in this memo.

- At its core the public trust is a widely held belief by the public that government has integrity. In essence, when the government transacts business for one, the public's interest in the matter is satisfied.
- Speaking in generalities, the public's interest can vary quite a bit from case to case. The public's interest in each type of case is defined in the Code by the criteria or rules that must be taken into account for that kind of case.² A good process that results in compliance with the Code in both letter and spirit demonstrates to the public that its interest in the matter has been satisfied.
- Public trust is earned when the process is shown to be followed on a **consistent** basis, so that similarly situated persons are treated **equally**.
- Public trust is also earned when the process is shown to be implemented **without favor or bias** – there is no predetermined outcome favoring one side or the other.

Hallmarks of a Good Process

- It is fundamentally **fair**:
 - Everyone who participates has an adequate, timely opportunity to prepare for the decision point.
 - the element of surprise is eliminated from the decision-making process.
 - the universe of documents on which a decision will be made is available to all participants on a timely basis. Corollary is the willingness to enforce delay- if important information is submitted out of time, then delay is a given.
 - There is an opportunity to be heard by the decision maker.
 - There is an opportunity to address the evidence.
 - The decision is based on evidence; materials in the record are identified that show support for compliance with each applicable element of the Code.
 - The decision complies with the law.
 - A record of the hearing is preserved.
- It is **transparent**:
 - The steps in the decision-making process are knowable by all.
 - The application of the process in a particular case is knowable by all.
 - The public is free to make its own judgments about what happened and why in a particular case; the public doesn't have to guess about what happened.

Fairness and transparency are the building blocks of a good process. A good process yields better decisions and earns the public trust. All of these elements are linked. To make good decisions and retain the public trust the process must be fair and transparent. All of the

² For example, the public's interest in an application to build a shed on residential property that meets all the criteria for setbacks, height, elevation, and lot density is met so long as those criteria are met. A request for a special exception to a zoning regulation, or a variance, or an encroachment, will require investigation into an expanded, unique set of criteria that will require a specific finding of public interest based on the case-specific facts.

specific recommendations which follow are made with the goal of improving the fairness and transparency of the process, emphasizing information availability, and consistency.

1. The City Should Reduce the Building Department Process to Writing and Adopt It as a Policy

The steps in the process by which the Building Department receives, reviews, investigates, advises applicants, posts, and recommends disposition of a case should be reduced to writing and approved as a City policy, published on the City's website, and made a part of the application. Doing so would produce a number of benefits:

- It would provide guidance to applicants.
- It would provide assurance to the public that the applicant has knowledge of the process and of applicant's responsibilities in the process.
- It would promote transparency to the public about the process.
- It would promote consistency in the treatment of applications.

Having a written policy would serve as a checklist of sorts that would lay to rest retrospective questions about who knew what, who did what, and when was something done. It would also provide decisionmakers with assurance that an application was complete, was completely reviewed, and was ready for a final decision.

To get the most benefits of a written process it should be:

- Published on the City's website.
- Included in the application forms with a statement that must be signed by the applicant certifying that the applicant has reviewed the process, understands it, and will follow it.

2. The Process Adopted by the City Should Eliminate the Element of Surprise

The goal of any process adopted for the Building Department should be the elimination of surprises to the Commission, Staff, the public, and the applicant. **Transparency cannot be achieved if it is accompanied by surprise.** An inconsistent process or the untimely submission of documents or other release of information causes much mischief. **Surprise causes the public perception of an unfair advantage,** sneaky tactics, dirty pool, whatever the name it is called, the public perception arises, whether it was intentional or not.

The requirements of the Land Development Code are clear and knowable; adoption of a written policy should make the process equally clear and knowable. There is no reason to tolerate the element of surprise in the process; doing so advances no policy value of the City. The process must include a method for dealing with changes to an application or the information submitted in response to it, but that need not result in surprise (see suggestion below).

A "no surprises" goal must include reasonable **deadlines that are enforced.** Enforcement means that delay will be imposed if deadlines are not met. If it was known that missed deadlines meant delay, the incentive to game the timing of an information release-surprise would be greatly reduced.

3. The City Should Establish an Agenda Packet Deadline for Special Meetings

The Commission has very recently established a good deadline for agenda submissions for regular meetings, but there is no deadline for submissions for special meetings. The notice for special meetings is typically so brief as to convey no real information beyond the topic. The materials to be considered at a special meeting should be submitted so that participants, Staff, and most importantly, Commissioners, have adequate time to give them thoughtful consideration. If that is not possible, or does not occur, absent a legal emergency, **the remedy is to reschedule the meeting**. Admittedly that may be a painful remedy. But again, when controversies surface at the last minute, and materials on which the decision is based are previously unknown, **the perception of dirty pool**, intended or not, arises, fairness and transparency go out the window, and public trust is lost.

4. The City Should Require Digital Submission of Materials and Post Them When Received

Adoption of a requirement that all **commercial** applications be submitted in paper and **digital formats would go a long way to promoting transparency and ensuring adequate, timely notice to participants**. A conscious effort by Staff --or a requirement-- that all documents supporting an application filed with the City be immediately posted on the City's website would also augment transparency and fairness. At first blush this made appear unduly burdensome to Staff, but a requirement that anything submitted to the City must also be presented in digital format would preclude additional burdens on Staff.³ This would **not be unduly burdensome** to the applicant as it is highly likely digital versions of documents ultimately submitted to the City are created for the applicant's internal dialogue and review. A degree of resolution should be specified so that when a document is reduced to a letter-sized page its details are legible.

It bears reflection that the goal here is to promote transparency and eliminate the element of surprise for the benefit of preserving the public's trust in local government. The suggestions made in this memo are **proactive small tasks that would yield big returns**. To take the attitude that if the public wants to know something, a public records request could be made, overlooks the delays involved in that process – in the experience of those who make such requests a delay of two to three days and longer if weekends or holidays are involved. Lee Mathes, in particular, does her level best to be responsive and get public record requests out the door as soon as she can, but if the staff person who will have to get the document to Lee is unavailable, inevitably there are delays.

The policy should apply for all commercial applications, and perhaps for residential applications that seek any sort of exception from the Code – i.e., variances, encroachments and the like. Where it is beyond the ken of the applicant to supply a digital version of the application, Staff

³ Many communities have adopted an on-line application process on a public website that completely eliminates any burden on Staff to post or provide access to the information. We encourage the Commission to investigate this alternative.

might be permitted to offer assistance, or direct the Applicant to the library which has an excellent business center and helpful Staff.

5. The Process Adopted by the City Should Close the Loop With P and Z for Variances and Encroachments

When applications indicate that a proposed project will require a variance or encroachment, the question becomes should the application go to P and Z first, or should the variance or encroachment be sought before coming to P and Z. The best course of action would be to first place the application with P and Z to review for completeness, (see Option 1 below) and then send it to the Board of Adjustment (variances) or the City (encroachments) who would exclusively address the variance or encroachment for which the standards and required findings are different than those considered by P and Z. The project would then come back to P and Z for a final review. **These steps would have to be completed before the project was eligible for a building permit.** This would eliminate a repeat of the situation the City recently found itself in where construction was quite advanced before the needed encroachment was sought and the pressure to grant the encroachment was greatly heightened, in addition to eliminating options that might have been considered before construction began.

6. The City Should Develop a Compliance Checklist and Require a Certification of Compliance to Issue a Building Permit

Perhaps the most useful tool to all concerned would be to develop and use a Compliance Checklist. A general checklist should include each element of the Land Development Code that all projects are required to comply with and leave space for project specific items as well. P and Z would grant **no final approval until the checklist was complete. Signature by a designated person, the city planner, the Chairman of P n Z, or both, certifying that all outstanding items – missing information, unresolved issues, etc.- had been resolved and the project, if built, would comply with all aspects of the Code should be required for issuance of a building permit.** This would help ensure that who was responsible for what was clear, and it would also ensure that the loop with P and Z was closed before a building permit was issued. There is nothing wrong with P and Z conducting a preliminary review of a project and identifying unresolved issues, deficiencies etc., but the project should come back to P and Z before for clearance of all issues before final approval is given. **The practice of issuing final approval with contingencies should be discontinued.** If this makes the process too long for the taste of some, then a special meeting of P and Z could be scheduled between regular meetings with the agenda limited to considering final approval for previously submitted applications.

7. Staff's Role Should Be Advisory

What should the role of Staff be in all of this? **The Staff's primary focus should be to prepare information and recommendations to allow the board it serves to make the best decision it can based on the evidence before it.** This involves a determination that every point of compliance with the Code has been considered and evaluated by Staff. Evaluations should be written and should link to specific documents in the case relied on by Staff to support their recommendations. Staff should also advise the applicant on any deficiency in their application and any other actions the applicant would need to take to make their application ripe for

decision. But ultimately **care should be taken by Staff to remain neutral** and avoid being, or giving the appearance of being, an advocate for or against the applicant. The Code makes clear that applicants, not Staff, bear the burden of proof to show they are entitled to the approval they seek.

8. The Process Adopted by the City Should Provide Options for Processing Applications

Applicants should have the choice of pursuing one of two paths to final approval.

Option One would allow an applicant to “test the waters” with P and Z by filing a conceptual-level application that could not be construed or used as final approval, or a commitment to final approval. Its purpose would be to allow the application to be examined for deficiencies, identify any need for further information, etc. In every case, this kind of review would be conducted by Staff, but if an applicant desired to have P and Z take an initial look at a proposed development, the option would be available. The point is it **would be non-binding on the applicant or P and Z and could not be the basis for issuance of a building permit**. The applicant would return to P and Z with an application for final approval when and if all issues were resolved to the satisfaction of P and Z. A Certification of Compliance as described above would be required. No building permit could be issued before that date.

Option Two would allow an applicant to ask for a final decision when first submitting their application. Under this option the application **must be complete in the first instance**, that is final plans, no contingencies, no changes, and specific linkage between each applicable Code requirement and the documents submitted in support of the application. If any deficiencies are found, the answer by P and Z must be deferral or no. If all is satisfactory final approval may be granted and the project would be certified as described above as ready for a building permit.

If the applicant does not accept the decision of P and Z then the case could be set for a quasi-judicial hearing.

9. The Process Adopted by the City Should Require Additional Review By P and Z for a Material Change in the Application or Variance in Construction

The City should decide as a matter of policy how it is going to handle changes in an application, which are inevitable in some instances. Perhaps the most important point is, **Staff should not be empowered to give binding approval for a change**. Why? Because staff is neither elected or appointed, and therefore should function only in an advisory capacity. The recommendation of Staff will of course be powerfully influential, but Staff should not be vested with the responsibility for final decision-making; that rests with the P and Z Board.

Material changes to matters approved by P and Z should come back to P and Z to be considered anew, that is insofar as the project changes, it should go through a thorough evaluation and recertification as eligible for a building permit. What is a material change? **One that would make a reasonable person consider a different outcome in the initial approval process, or one that clearly demonstrates noncompliance with the Code**. Who decides that a material change has occurred? The applicant can request approval of a change, it is the responsibility of the Building Inspector to monitor compliance with approved plans, and it is

possible under the Code for anyone to lodge a complaint with P and Z, who would then direct Staff to investigate.

What Happened

The project was approved by the P&Z board on January 10, 2022, with the following core deficiencies:

- Insufficient/conflicting guidance from the P&Z board
- The lack of information from the City's Building Department (BD) specifying what had been reviewed and approved as compliant i.e., the incomplete, difficult to comprehend parking plan had never undergone scrutiny by the BD. It was presented as legitimate and legal, and P&Z had no reason to suspect otherwise.
- Rigid, specific, unalterable City Land Development Code (LDC)
- Lack of historical projects of this magnitude to act as examples for guidance.
- Incorrect, missing, misleading, unreadable visuals and accompanying verbal statements from the presenter(s).
- The BD's omission of key project attributes that would have changed the approval criteria i.e., need for City Commission approval of sidewalk encroachment and 35' height exceedance's Architectural Review Board acceptance.

It appears the P&Z presentation was tailored for acceptance through misrepresentation and omission.

After approval, there was no other communication between the BD and the P&Z.

The BD received the final **Expansion Permit Drawings** in early June 2022 (my copy is dated 06/01/22 rev 0).

The BD received the final Gibson Inn **Architectural** Drawings in early September of 2022 (my copy is dated 09/02/22 rev 0).

The Building Permit was issued on 9 December 2022. There was plenty of time between the BD's receipt of the final engineering drawings and the building permit issuance to have added an agenda item to the P&Z schedule to address these latent issues.

Instead, the proper approvals were delayed until brought to the public's attention and/or construction would be affected. Note that on the day of the City Commission's balcony encroachment approval, the material for the balconies was already staged on the property and ready for assembly.

GIBSON INN ANNEX EXPANSION

AJI Rev 1 07/13/2023

The City's encroachment sign-off was never in doubt. The City Commission didn't learn of the need for an encroachment agreement on Ave D until its June meeting and in response selected a date for a special meeting. Days before the special meeting, they learned that an additional encroachment was being asked for on Market Street.

The 30-minute time allowance (why only 30 minutes?) was enforced giving Commissioner George, at the end of the 30-minute time limit, only 5 minutes to present her legitimate concerns.

Of the (8) bullet points constituting conditional approval on the P&Z Minutes 10 January 2022, (6) were not complied with at the time of issuance of the building permit.

Of note is that after the P&Z approval in January 2022, only the BD, with the final drawings, knew what was being constructed. In effect, P&Z, and by extension the public, had lost all oversight of the project.

Therefore, it was only through observation of the construction itself that the changes became apparent. I became aware driving by the site one day and seeing a large rectangular structure rising from the 35' roof pitch. This initiated my discovery of the situation.

WHY DID THIS HAPPEN

Because P&Z approved a FINAL DESIGN, which in reality was a PRELIMINARY DESIGN and there was no other remedy for changes except to bring them back to P&Z/Architectural Review Board for review and approval. This would have increased the time for construction and its cost. The BD had to decide, without precedent, as to how to proceed.

The result, regardless of how it came about, was to simply allow carte blanche construction to the plans and this would include changes, if any, to the rev 0 plans (the ones now in my possession after FOIA request). ***Remember, no one except the BD knew what was being constructed there because no one had been told.***

Therefore, we had mistakes made in the BD under unique circumstances without adequate guidance or oversight.

HOW TO PREVENT THIS FROM HAPPENING AGAIN

George Coons, a local architect who drew the original PRELIMINARY PLANS for the Gibson project, approached me several weeks ago and wished to discuss the P&Z approval process. He felt that there was room for improvement and after my discussion with him, was going to bring

GIBSON INN ANNEX EXPANSION

AJI Rev 1 07/13/2023

this up as an agenda item with P&Z, with a request for a motion to bring this to the City Commission. This didn't work out as planned.

The simple solution is as follows:

Apalachicola is a small coastal town and has never experienced the kind of growth seen in the last few years. The current P&Z approval process is based on small projects (homes, commercial buildings), where completed plans are submitted without further need for additional review and approval.

With large projects, the builder is not expected to complete all the required engineering for what may turn out to be a dead end. The St. Joe Company constructs large projects and has become quite knowledgeable on the most effective, efficient method of doing this.

St. Joe requires:

1. PRELIMINARY REVIEW and APPROVAL from their advisory board.
This approval allows the builder to continue with the required engineering while knowing that a similar form of the initial application will be allowed.
2. FINAL REVIEW and APPROVAL from their advisory board.
This includes all engineering documents.
3. No changes to FINAL APPROVAL without advisory board approval. Unapproved changes solicit fines and possible reversion to approved plans, regardless of cost.

Advantages to this method (for large projects):

1. No changes to BD or P&Z.
2. BD's only responsibility is ensuring that construction is to code and follows approved engineering documents.
3. Total transparency between P&Z, the public, and the builder since the construction documents are in the public domain.

Al Ingle

Sec. 109-48. - Procedures for site plan application, review and decision.

(1) *Pre-application conference.*

- a. It is recommended that the applicant meet with the city planner, building department and building official to discuss the proposed development prior to submitting a formal application. The purpose of this conference is to familiarize the applicant with minimum design guidelines and to minimize any potential adverse impacts of the proposed development on the city's natural or financial resources.

(2) *Application.*

- a. An approved site plan is required prior to the issuance of a building permit. It shall be considered unlawful for any person to construct, erect or alter a building or structure or to develop, change or improve land for which a site plan is required except in accordance with an approved site plan. Enforcement shall occur pursuant to Chapter III of this Code for failure to obtain a permit or for failure to follow a permit.
- b. The site plan shall be prepared in accordance with requirements contained in this section. For a plan to be placed on the agenda of the next planning and zoning board meeting, the plan must be received by the building department and considered complete no less than 30 days prior to the planning and zoning board meeting.
- c. The applicant shall submit four copies of all parts of the site plan. Electronic copies of site plans and building plans may also be submitted if available.

(3) *Review.*

- a. The city planner and building department shall review the site plan to determine whether all required information is included in the application. If any required information is missing, the building department shall inform the applicant of any information require to complete the application.
- b. All site plans for architectural compatibility shall be reviewed by the planning and zoning board sitting as the architectural review board.

(4) *Decision.*

- a. Based upon the information contained in the site plan application, the planning and zoning board shall approve, approve subject to stated conditions, or deny the site plan. Any person aggrieved by the decision of the planning and zoning commission may, in accordance with Chapter III, file a written appeal within the city commission.

(5) *Construction.*

- a. Upon site plan approval and issuance of a building permit, the development shall be built in accordance with the approved site plan and site regulations. Deviation from the approved site plan shall require the submission of an application for a revised site plan.

(Ord. No. 2020-03, § 2, 5-5-2020)

Editor's note— Ord. No. 2020-03, § 2, adopted May 5, 2020, amended provisions for § 109-48, pertaining to procedures for site plan approval and derived from LDC, art. VI(VII), § C.

Sec. 109-51. - Site plan requirements.

- (1) Site plans or any portion thereof involving engineering shall be certified, sealed, and prepared by and/or under the direct supervision of a professional engineer, qualified by training and experience into the specific technical field involved and registered or licensed to practice that profession.
- (2) Site plans shall contain documents and maps indicating:
 - a. General information:
 - i. Name of project.
 - ii. Intended use of site.
 - iii. Legal description of the property, size of parcel in acres or square feet and the linear dimensions of the property.
 - iv. Name, address and telephone number of the owner or owners of record.
 - v. Name, address and telephone number of the owner's designated agent or attorney.
 - vi. Names, addresses, signatures and registrations of the professionals preparing the plan.
 - b. Maps:
 - i. Vicinity map, showing relationship of proposed development to the surrounding streets, wetlands and surface water bodies at a scale of not less than one inch equals 2,000 feet.
 - ii. Site plan map with date and north arrow at a scale not smaller than one inch equals 50 feet.
 - iii. Elevation survey and topography at one foot contour intervals, existing and proposed.
 - iv. Building restriction lines (i.e., highway setback lines, easements, covenants, rights-of-way, and building setback lines, existing and proposed).
 - v. Location of existing and proposed building and structure footprints.
 - vi. Location, elevation, and dimensions and materials of existing and proposed drive areas, or other paving.
 - vii. Location of existing and proposed fences by type of material (e.g., wood or metal), type of design (open or closed) and height.
 - viii. Location of existing and proposed walls by type of material (e.g., brick or masonry).
 - ix. Location of each proposed, off-street parking space (regular and handicapped) and how they will be identified on site with paint or curb stops, including a diagram showing traffic circulation on site and access and egress to adjacent street.
 - x. Location of proposed, designated loading and unloading zones.
 - xi. Location of temporary and permanent structures and features proposed in the stormwater management plan.

- c. Proposed buildings and structures:
 - i. Number of stories.
 - ii. Square footage grosses each floor.
 - iii. Building height.
 - iv. Multi-family dwellings.
 - (i) Number and square footage of dwelling units and density (dwelling units per acre).
 - (ii) Calculation of off-street parking spaces required by supplementary parking section showing the number of dwelling units and spaces.
 - v. Commercial. Calculation of off-street parking spaces required by Chapter IV Zoning District supplementary parking section showing:
 - (i) Projected number of employees on peak shift.
 - (ii) If an eating and/or drinking establishment, seats and occupancy load and number of tables for service and number of stools at service counter.
 - (iii) If an office, studio or financial institution, floor space
 - (iv) If a retail establishment, floor space devoted to merchandising.
 - (v) If a child care center, floor space.
- d. Lot coverage allowed by the zone and calculations showing proposed lot coverage. Materials used to cover surface drive areas, walkways, patios and other areas counting as lot coverage.
- e. New multi-parcel (e.g., subdivision), commercial, and multi-family developments:
 - i. Existing infrastructure (on-site, adjacent to site, and across or opposite any public right-of-way.)
 - Surface drive areas and median/curb cuts to access driveways.
 - Sidewalks, streets, alleys, and easements (note widths and type).
 - Size and location of nearest water mains, valves, and fire hydrants.
 - Sanitary sewer systems (size and invert elevations).
 - Power, telephone and cable lines.
 - ii. Proposed streets, sidewalks, and surface drive areas:
 - If required, engineering plans and specifications including elevation and dimensions for streets, sidewalks, and surface drive areas (driveways, parking areas and storage areas).
 - Cross section of proposed street improvements
 - Fire lanes.

- Locations of proposed surface drive areas, curb or median cut(s) to access driveways.
 - Internal traffic circulation plan, including directional arrows and signs to direct traffic flow.
 - Location of traffic-control signs and signalization devices.
 - Locations of sidewalks.
 - Coordination of walkways and driveway and their elevations with facilities in adjacent developments, including the elevation of the crown of the most adjacent road to ensure that lot filling and hardened surfaces are not elevated higher than local streets.
 - Proposed streets and alleys.
 - When applicable, the location of service roads and access roads extended onto the site.
- iii. Proposed water and sewer facilities:
- Water. Size, material, and location of water mains, valves and fire hydrants. Engineering plans and specifications are required prior to the issuance of a building permit.
 - Sanitary sewer systems. Size, material, and location of lines. Engineering plans and specifications, with submittal of a profile where required, are required prior to the issuance of a building permit.
 - Any commitments, such as contributions to offset public facilities impacts.
 - Projected water usage in gallons per day, projected solid waste, projected number of school age children.
- f. Solid waste handling facilities. The location of the dumpster and access for refuse service collection, including dumpster pad screening, fencing and landscaping shall be identified.
- g. Dredge and fill. If any dredging or filling is intended in the development, a copy of the complete environmental resource permit application proposed for the Northwest Florida Water Management District shall be provided.
- h. Stormwater management plan requirements general:
- i. Sufficient information for the city to evaluate the environmental characteristics of the affected areas, the potential and predicted impacts of the proposed activity on wetlands and surface water, and the effectiveness and acceptability of those measures proposed for reducing adverse impacts.

- ii. If a State stormwater permit is required, the following shall be a part of the stormwater plan submitted to the city.
- iii. The design contained in any ten-two (10/2) self-certified general permit).
- iv. A design that treats run off from the 25 year-24-hour duration storm event and ensures that post development runoff rates, volumes and pollutant loads do not exceed pre-development conditions:

The design contained in a complete application proposed to a State agency for:

A general permit or;

An environmental resource permits.

For proposed development not requiring a State stormwater permit, a plan to control surface water runoff including:

Temporary sediment control barriers and vegetative cover;

Permanent best management practices.

(LDC, art. VI(VII), § F; Ord. No. 2020-03, § 2, 5-5-2020)