

## Adrienne Dessy

---

**From:** Suanne Thamm [szthamm@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 05, 2011 11:06 AM  
**To:** Adrienne Dessy  
**Subject:** HDC PAB Workshop

Adrienne, I thought this meeting went very well, thanks to all your hard work! I liked David's suggestion about adding "neighborhood" to "conservation district."

Some possible wordsmithing:

11.03.05: In following Chapter 11 of the Florida Building Code, the Building Official shall exercise the discretion granted under the code with respect to exempting designated historic structures from certain provisions. The Building Official must confer with staff and the Historic District Council prior to denying such exemptions.

11.03.13: The City recognizes the potentially historic importance of structures that are more than 50 years old and will strive to protect such structures as examples of the community's recent heritage.

**Adrienne Dessy**

---

**From:** l.kreger@comcast.net  
**Sent:** Monday, May 23, 2011 7:57 AM  
**To:** Kelly Gibson; Adrienne Dessy; Jennifer Gooding  
**Cc:** Marshall, D. McCrary  
**Subject:** Community Workshops, Plan Review Comments

A reminder that I will be able to attend all the Workshops this week, except tonight.

Some comments on Elements. I will forward as I complete reviews.

1. Capital Improvement Element comments were forwarded 13 May 2011
2. Conservation and Coastal Management Element: Policy 5.12.03 change Smurth Stone to the new company name.
3. Future Land Use Element:

Policy 1.06.03. Change wording to discourages demolition vice prevent. (Consistent with Housing Element)

Policy 1.07.03 and 1.07.04. "Non resident uses" must be defined. As you know this will be a big issue.

4. Housing Element:

Policy 3.01.04; Should add Promote and REQUIRE nondiscrimination.

Policy 3.02.01; .Recommend adding UPGRADE or eliminate substandard housing

Policy 3.06.06; Rehabilitation wording should be changed to read encouraged in all areas of the City

Len

**Kelly Gibson**

---

**From:** Mike Harrison [drmikeharrison@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 25, 2011 11:57 AM  
**To:** Adrienne Dessy; Kelly Gibson  
**Cc:** Marshall, D. McCrary  
**Subject:** RE: EAR-Based Amendments - Historic Preservation

Adrienne:

Let's meet and talk about this. Are you free this afternoon?

Mike

---

**From:** Adrienne Dessy [mailto:adessy@fbfl.org]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 25, 2011 10:01 AM  
**To:** Mike Harrison; Kelly Gibson  
**Cc:** Marshall, D. McCrary  
**Subject:** RE: EAR-Based Amendments - Historic Preservation

Good morning,

Thank you for your input that you'd like forwarded on to the PAB members.

Please allow me to point out, however, that I still haven't received any substantive information on what changes you are proposing. As the planner who worked on drafting this document, along with the HDC, I'd appreciate some specific information as to what types of changes you are suggesting. I think it is fair to give some more detailed idea of what you mean, as I'm still not clear on what you propose.

As I mentioned at the meeting Monday evening, I do feel that it is rather late in the game to now substantively change this document. We represented at the meeting that we are not putting forward any major changes in order to ensure continuity of staff-proposed drafts. I realize that you joined the PAB only recently, and were designated the element champion of an element much later than other PAB members; however, you were in attendance at an HDC workshop in May 2010 on this element over a year ago, and did not express any concerns at that time. The current version has not changed very much from that early draft. We also emailed you a version of the draft on 4/13/11 in advance of the joint PAB/HDC workshop, and didn't receive a response until 4/24/11. I responded to that email the following day asking for more clarification on your comments about substantial editing, and never received a reply. At the 5/4/11 joint workshop, you didn't make any comments that alluded to a substantial rewrite, and left the meeting early, so we didn't discuss anything afterwards. You have not contacted me at any other point about any major edits.

I have to say I was very surprised to hear your comments to the group on Monday evening about your concerns, and I would have appreciated your reaching out ahead of time to discuss those concerns. It's important that you advocate for this element to the PAB as the champion, not raise doubts about it, which could have and should have been addressed sooner. The HDC and PAB as a whole seem comfortable with this document, subject to the comments received at the joint workshop being included. I don't feel that it is appropriate to

alter it substantively at this time, after this version has already been vetted by staff, the HDC and the PAB to move forward for PAB consideration. But I do wish you had contacted me sooner, with more detailed information on what it is you would have liked to have seen, as it's a shame that you don't feel like you can fully stand behind this version.

Adrienne Dessy  
 Planner II  
 City of Fernandina Beach  
 Community Development Department  
 204 Ash Street  
 Fernandina Beach, FL 32034  
 P: 904.277.7325  
 F: 904.277.7324  
[adessy@fbfl.org](mailto:adessy@fbfl.org)  
[www.fbfl.us/cdd](http://www.fbfl.us/cdd)  
[www.fbfl.us/historicdistrict](http://www.fbfl.us/historicdistrict)  
[www.fbfl.us/sustainability](http://www.fbfl.us/sustainability)

Disclaimer: According to Florida Public Records Law, email correspondence to and from the City of Fernandina Beach, including email addresses and other personal information, is public record and must be made available to the public and media upon request, unless otherwise exempt by the Public Records Law. If you do not want your e-mail address released in response to a public records request, do not send electronic mail to this entity. Instead, contact this office by phone or in writing.

---

**From:** Mike Harrison [mailto:drmikeharrison@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 24, 2011 4:30 PM  
**To:** Kelly Gibson  
**Cc:** Adrienne Dessy; Marshall, D. McCrary  
**Subject:** EAR-Based Amendments - Historic Preservation

Hi Kelly:

Following on our discussions about the duties of 'Element Champions' last evening, please distribute the following to the members of the PAB prior to our meeting on May 31. If you or Adrienne have any comments or suggestions for corrections, please let me know before you distribute this email.

PAB Colleagues: I am a strong proponent of Historic Preservation, and I am honoured to have been asked to be the Element Champion on the PAB. Because of the importance of this element, I want to make sure that it is clear and easy to understand, so that it garners support from citizens and the City Commission. I am conscious that the Element will eventually be a significant legal document, parent to LDC's and we should therefore be at pains to make it as clear and unambiguous as possible. I find the current draft of the element to be unnecessarily long-winded and repetitive, and I will be happy to work with Staff on editing the final proposal to the PAB when all citizen and Board input has been received.

When I first reviewed the Element, I had a number of comments related to the wording of the Objectives and Policies. These were addressed - along with the comments of other Board members - at the joint meeting of PAB and HDC on May 4, 2011 and I look forward to seeing a revised draft which incorporates the modifications requested and agreed there. Of particular importance are those changes that emphasize education and promotion of

preservation as important duties of citizens, and the concept that neighborhoods are preservation units in their own right, and deserve as much attention as buildings included in them.

I have no hesitation in recommending the inclusion of the ideas included in this Historic Preservation Element to the PAB; but I do want to see the document edited, and the agreed changes included before the PAB meeting at which we vote on it. /Mike

Please make sure and include me on the distribution.

Thanks.

Mike

## Kelly Gibson

---

**From:** Mike Harrison [drmikeharrison@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 26, 2011 12:51 PM  
**To:** Kelly Gibson; david.beal@beal.com  
**Cc:** Adrienne Dessy; Marshall, D. McCrary  
**Subject:** Harrison Schedule

Kelly:

Please note that I will be out of the country from June 14 until September 2, and unable to attend PAB meetings. I know that you have Comprehensive Plan meetings scheduled in this period, and I would ask that the Historic Preservation Element be scheduled to be covered at meetings held before June 13 if this is possible.

May I also ask Adrienne to make send a printed copy of this email Ms. Cascone?

Thanks.

Mike

**Kelly Gibson**

---

**From:** Patricia Borns [patriciaborns@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 31, 2011 1:52 PM  
**To:** len kreger; ericbartelt@gmail.com; mharrison@iee.org; mark bennett; david beal; Kelly Gibson  
**Cc:** dwlott@bellsouth.net; ronaldmachado@comcast.net; joanaltman@mindspring.com  
**Subject:** Public comments - 2011 Comp Plan amendmets, HISTORIC PRESERVATION ELEMENT  
**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Red

Dear PAB members,

We are trying to wade through the many new comp plan elements and get written comments to you. In this e-mail, we would appreciate your consideration of the below comments on Chapter 11, Historic Preservation Element.

We are concerned property owners of developable vacant lands and a residence in a historic district.

While the element was authored by the HDC and that board's planning liaison, we hope it will receive the PAB's equal deliberation, as the board ultimately responsible for reviewing amendments to the comprehensive plan.

Respectfully,

Patricia Borns  
 Ronald Machado  
 314 New St.

1.  
**OBJECTIVE 11.02**

*"The City shall make all efforts to identify, preserve, and protect archaeological and paleontological resources within Fernandina Beach. ...*

**Policy 11.02.02** *Upon completion of the survey project, the City shall implement land development regulations addressing archaeological and paleontological protection. The regulations shall, at a minimum, provide for analysis of resources, and avoidance, minimization, and mitigation (in that order of preference) of adverse impacts when development involves properties that contain or have reasonable potential to harbor resources of archaeological significance. ...*

**Policy 11.02.03** *The City shall be responsible for insuring that any proposed development projects will not adversely impact a significant archaeological or paleontological site, and shall seek assistance from a professional*

*archaeologist or consulting firm in assessing the potential impacts of development projects. ...*

### **Policy 11.03.01**

*The City shall explore strategies for preservation of historic resources and properties, including, but not limited to: • Incentives for maintenance, restoration and rehabilitation, and stabilization of historic, cultural or archaeological resources; • Incentives for productive and adaptive reuse of historic structures; • Incentives for private ownership and responsible stewardship of these resources • Opportunities for acquisition and/or conservation by governmental entities, private interests, or non-profit organizations; and • Establishment of historic, archaeological, or conservation districts."*

**CONCERN:** The archaeological protection language overreaches the value of the city's resources and reasonable economic return, compared with the potential detriment to property owners' abilities to continue to own and develop their lands, including the ability to provide or improve infrastructure. Archaeological heritage tourism can and is being accomplished in Fernandina without further undue burdens.

### **DISCUSSION:**

In discussing the possible LDCs issuing from these policies, staff cited the City of St. Augustine.

For reference, see the St. Augustine LDCs at

[http://library.municode.com/index.aspx?](http://library.municode.com/index.aspx?clientId=10951&stateId=9&stateName=Florida)

[clientId=10951&stateId=9&stateName=Florida](http://library.municode.com/index.aspx?clientId=10951&stateId=9&stateName=Florida). Fernandina hasn't the archaeological resources of St. Augustine and therefore nowhere near the financial upside for modeling itself on that city's strict LDCs. But the proposed policies allow the option of adopting levels of enforcement against even a 3-inch ground disturbance -- less than needed to plant the average vegetable garden.

The city does not have the budget to be "responsible" for protecting archaeological resources as these policies propose. Therefore, the burden will fall on the property owner-developer, as it does in St. Augustine. The cost and time of archaeological reviews, site inspection, supervision, and in some cases liens and legal fees, will make development prohibitive, including the ability to undertake burying of utilities, and storm water and sewage improvements. This is in direct conflict with Chapter 1, p. 4, Policy 3.03.06: "The City shall maintain Land Development Code policies that minimize barriers to the development of existing vacant lots." The proposed archeological policies mandate new barriers to the development of existing vacant lots.

In some states such as Michigan and Texas, conservation districts have the statutory power of eminent domain within the context of their particular conservation goals. But even where not legislated at the state level, a local government can exercise powers of eminent domain as a result of its local archaeological ordinances. Miami/Dade did just that in the case of the Miami Circle.

(See <http://www.flheritage.com/archaeology/projects/miamicircle/Tour/modernTL.cfm>).

In this case, archaeological ordinances entitled local government to inspect and excavate private property, leading to its taking. Millions upon millions of dollars later, the authenticity of the resources are still debatable. We do not want that here.

Nowhere in Fernandina is this policy likely to retard property values and development more than in the Old Town Historic District, burdening current owners of its vacant lands and positioning them to be acquired by city designees under conservation districting. Old Town archaeological resources have already been surveyed, streets and easements have been graded in some cases by several feet, and the most important historical buildings have been demolished with HDC and staff approval, without the restraints now being proposed. Today's Old Town property owners deserve the full use of their property rights just as yesterday's have enjoyed.

**DESIRED OUTCOME/CHANGE:** Soften the policy language to an appropriate preservation level for Fernandina and private property owners. We would feel comfortable with:

#### **OBJECTIVE 11.02**

*"The City shall continue to make efforts to identify, preserve, and protect archaeological and paleontological resources within Fernandina Beach. ...*

**Policy 11.02.02** *The City may consider implementing development guidelines or land development regulations addressing archaeological and paleontological protection. Such regulations will be balanced with the City's redevelopment and infill goals and its policy to remove barriers to the development of vacant lots. [Delete policy specifics and leave them for the LDCs, if any.]*

**Policy 11.02.03** *Delete and leave for the LDCs, if any.*

#### **Policy 11.03.01**

*The City shall explore strategies for preservation of historic resources and properties, such as:* • Incentives for maintenance, restoration and rehabilitation, and stabilization of historic, cultural or *archaeological* resources; • Incentives for productive and adaptive reuse of historic structures; • Incentives for private ownership and responsible stewardship of these resources • *Opportunities for public/private partnerships to further historic preservation; and* • *Establishment of historic or conservation districts with neighborhood approval. [deleting archaeological]"*

## **2.**

### **POLICY 11.01.01, p. 1**

*"The City shall encourage the protection, preservation and conservation of districts, sites, landmarks and/or structures within the City that are included on the National Register of Historic Places to ensure their protection from demolition, deterioration, reconstruction or alteration."*

**CONCERN:** The policy removes protections for local historic districts currently contained in Policy 1.05. The new policy language protects only National Register properties/districts. The new policy also removes the Future Land Use overlay protection for historic districts that exists in 1.05.08 of our current comp plan.

**DISCUSSION:** OBJECTIVE 1.05. HISTORIC RESOURCES of our current comp plan states:

*"The City shall preserve and protect designated historic resources, including historically significant housing."*

This is a superior protection to the new policy because it includes both national and locally designated historic resources.

In our city and many cities, local and national historic districts do not always overlap one-for-one. For example, in Old Town one of the blocks facing 14th St. wasn't in the National Register nomination but was included in the local historic district because it contained historical peonia/media peonia lots and logically belonged to the district's boundaries, zoning and uses. Such cases exist in downtown as well as Old Town historic districts. Planning staff also wishes to create future districts to conserve 50-year-old neighborhoods whose properties may or may not be on the National Register. Reducing to only National Register protection is a weakening of the ongoing protection and development of historic districts generally. It is also unfair to existing local historic districts whose protections are being downgraded.

Another protection that has been removed is CURRENT POLICY 1.05.08: *"The FLUM shall depict the historic district as an overlay district. Areas delineated as being within the historic district shall be planned and managed using a regulatory framework designed to preserve the form, function, image, residential balance, and ambiance of historic Centre Street and surrounding area."* This language protects the historic districts as a future land use. To remove it exposes the historic districts to easier erosion through variances, non-conformities and rezonings that introduce one-off, incompatible developments and uses, that take their toll over time. If historic districts are not protected in the FLUM, who will want to invest in them?

**DESIRED OUTCOME/CHANGE:** We are simply asking the PAB to maintain the protections we have. Please carry over the language of 1.05 and 1.05.08 intact in the new plan. For 1.05.08, please reference both the historic districts, Old Town as well as downtown. Please note that the Future Land Use Element continues to be mandatory, while Chapter 11 Historic Preservation is not. Therefore, please cross-reference 1.05 and 1.05.08 in Chapter 1 and Chapter 11 to ensure current protections are continued.



## Kelly Gibson

---

**From:** David Lott [David.Lott@speerandassociates.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 31, 2011 9:46 AM  
**To:** 'David Beal'; Paul Condit ; mark.bennett@wellsfargo.com; 'Eric Bartelt'; 'Len Kreger'; Richard Bradford; Michael Harrison  
**Cc:** Marshall, D. McCrary; Kelly Gibson; Jennifer Gooding; Adrienne Dessy  
**Subject:** EAR Amendment Comments  
**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Red

I am out of town this week and unable to attend tonight's PAB special meeting. I have sent Staff some comments already which have been included in the documentation provided. While I am still finalizing all my comments from the EAR amendment documents and the review meetings held last week, I wanted to pass along my viewpoint on some of the major issues contained in the proposed draft with suggested revised language.

### **Goal 1 – Future Land Use Element**

Sections 1.07.03 (3) – Low Density Residential and 1.07.04 (e) – Medium Density Residential - Staff has suggested striking out language that specifically identifies non-residential uses including resort rentals. Staff's explanation was two-fold: to make the sections consistent with the others that do not contain such specificity by placing a general prohibition ("incompatible non-residential uses); and, to address previous discussions by the City Commission to examine the possibility of expanding resort rentals. I believe that such a language substitution will substantially weaken the Code and could lead to an expansion of resort rentals throughout the City given the recent legislation passed at the State level. This City has seen numerous times what happens when language that is vague or subject to individual interpretation is used (i.e. building 'height'). I would suggest either restoring the language that is in the current LDC for these items or modifying as such:

Section 1.07.03 (3)

*3. Prevent encroachment by commercial uses, including hotels, motels, bed and breakfast units, resort rentals, or other forms of transient accommodations; **and other incompatible non-residential uses.***

Section 1.07.04 (e)

*e. The medium density residential designation is intended to prevent **encroachment by commercial uses, including hotels, motels, bed and breakfast units, resort rentals, or other forms of transient accommodations; and other incompatible non-residential uses.***

Section 1.07.06 - I also have a concern about what appears to be an effort to greatly expand the amount of mixed-use areas in the City. I believe that such a designation is appropriate for certain areas such as central business district and other general commercial areas as a step-down to residential areas. While I agree with the "definition" of MU in this section, there are numerous references made throughout the document that I interpreted to be that as current residential areas are redeveloped there would be an emphasis to change them to MU. My general concern is heightened by the frequent use of such terms as "dense", "compact", "urban". Despite David Yulee's vision, FB is not Manhattan and I don't think a majority of its

current residents want to see a major urbanization effort,

### **Goal 2 – Multi-Modal Use Element**

Section 2.05.02 – Staff has proposed a degradation in level of service on City roads from a “C” to a “D”. This same language change is reflected in **Goal 8 – Capital Improvement 8.05.01**. We should not accept a lower level of service on our streets. If I understood Staff’s reason for this change, it was to “allow” funds collected under a transportation impact fee to be spent on alternative transportation methods. The City Attorney and City Manager have both written to me and said that the City already has the ability to spend any “transportation impact fees” collected on any type of transportation surface whether it be sidewalks, bike lanes, roadways, etc. I see no reason for the citizens to be subjected to a lower level of service.

### **Goal 4 – Public Facilities Element**

Section 4.01.01 – I want to know what the current response times are for the Police and Fire and how these compare to the times stated in the Draft. Staff thought that the actual service times currently experienced were meeting or better than the stated time. I am not sure of that information. It is also important to understand if the standard is “average” response time or 100% of every response will be under that timeframe.

Section 4.05.07 - Mandatory requirement for porous driveways / walkways on private property seems heavy handed, especially in re-development areas. Discounting of impact fees or some other incentive would seem to be a more City friendly way to handle this objective.

### **Goal 8 – Capital Improvements Element**

8.01.02 – I think some of the priority elements need to be adjusted. Please see my detailed comments

8.04.06 / 8.07.05 – I have some real concerns with the adoption of a 20 year CIP based on what is stated as the elements required in such a plan. While I see that large infrastructure projects have a horizon longer than the current 5 years; financial and needs assessments 5 years out are tricky enough and virtually impossible 20 years out due to changes in technology and costs. Additionally, under 8.07.05 it states that if there is any change to a CIP in terms of timing or removal/addition to the overall Plan, an amendment is required. This seems highly onerous especially know the number of changes that are likely to occur. If there is a need to extend the timeframe from the current 5 years, I would say it should be no longer than 10 years.

8.05.01 – While raising the ratio is good, I think our current ratio is substantially higher than 10:1 (someone remarked it could be 40:1 or higher). The ratio needs to be set, at a minimum, within 10% of the current ratio.

### **Goal 11 – Historic District Preservation Element**

11.01.07 bullet #7 The City shall continue delegating authority to the Historic District Council for decisions affecting the historic, cultural and archaeological resources of the City. The historic preservation ordinance shall continue to grant powers to the Historic District Council which may include, but are not limited to:

- Hearing variances for properties within historic districts, **neighborhood conservation districts**, or the Community Redevelopment Area; and

Not exactly sure of what a “neighborhood conservation district” is, but according to the current City land use map, there currently are no conservation areas located within the current boundaries of the City’s historic district. I don’t believe it is proper for the HDC’s powers to be expanded for any land areas outside of the boundaries of the historic district. Any

variances outside of the historic district should be heard by the Board of Adjustments.

Thanks for your consideration of these comments.  
Dave

**David W. Lott** | Senior Vice President | **Speer & Associates, Inc.**  
Cell: 904.415.6928 | Office: 770.396.2528 | [www.speerandassociates.com](http://www.speerandassociates.com)

This communication is intended only for the person to whom it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any retransmission, dissemination, use of, or taking any action in reliance upon this communication by persons other than the intended recipient(s) is prohibited and may be unlawful.

**Kelly Gibson**

---

**From:** Mike Harrison [drmikeharrison@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 02, 2011 7:41 PM  
**To:** Kelly Gibson  
**Cc:** Adrienne Dessy  
**Subject:** Historic Preservation Element  
**Attachments:** AD after HDCPAB GOAL 11.doc; MH changes GOAL 11.doc; Reordered.doc; Simplified.doc; MH proposed.doc

Kelly:

I still owe you the Talking Points e-mail on the HPE, which I will get to you by COB June 3.

I have spent much of the time since Tuesday's PAB meeting going through the element to present the themes in it in a clearer way. I am not sure that I have succeeded, but I want to share with you and Adrienne what I had hoped the HPE would contain. All of the points that were contained in Adrienne's latest draft (052711) have been carried forward to and still bear their source policy numbers (to #4). I have taken the opportunity to suggest changes using the same rubric as before. I do need to meet with Adrienne to discuss Sustainability.

Here is my methodology:

1. Convert the 052711 draft .pdf file to a Word file (AD after HDCPAB ...)
2. Add my edits (MH changes ...)
3. Summarize the theme of each Objective and include it as the Objective title. Cut and paste the policies, placing them under the Objective heading that best accomodates them. (Reordered ...)
4. Remove repetitions and inconsistencies (Simplified ...)
5. Remove editing marks, renumber, etc. (MH proposed ...)

I now have two ways to present the changes I'd like to make to the HPE to the PAB on June 8. I can either present 'MH changes', or I can present 'MH proposed'. I'd prefer to present 'MH proposed' as I believe it is a clearer document, but I'll appreciate your advice.

Thanks.

Mike

**Kelly Gibson**

---

**From:** Patricia Borns [patriciaborns@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 02, 2011 10:10 AM  
**To:** sjhaun@bellsouth.net  
**Cc:** joanaltman@mindspring.com; ronaldmachado@comcast.net; mharrison@iee.org; Kelly Gibson  
**Subject:** HP element comments, with thanks  
**Attachments:** Historic Preservation Element.pdf

Susan,

It's so appreciated when a board member takes time to listen. The willingness and ability to listen and hear are a rare commodities. Thank you for that.

Relative to our main concern -- to have the comp plan language accurately state the HDC's claimed intent not to unduly burden the value and development of private properties with St Augustine-like constraints and costs -- please take a look at my comments to the PAB below. Especially, you will see at the end that we are merely seeking a softening of the language and a more general statement of direction that is more appropriately specified in the LDCs. And honestly, throughout this element, the language is more specific than is warranted. It is local government's place, not the comp plan, to order city board responsibilities, and whether or not we should "encourage" having a historic preservation planner!

Also, attached is the most recent copy I can find of the HP element, which does not contain the changes from "shall" to "may" that you said the HDC requested. (I attended the PAB-HDC meeting as an observer and had the same understanding of the request.)

By the way, my neighbors who have more history in Old Town than most people have considerable knowledge of its archaeological resources and past surveys. For example, when you mentioned that "bodies are buried all over Old Town," the findings of the archaeologists involved in the only one that has been found here gave a predictive report based on well-established Indian burial patterns. Their report established the likelihood as concentrated in a single circular location between Amelia and Estrada on White Street. The city was involved in this finding, exchanged letters regarding it, and should have the same knowledge of the report. (They also know where the fort is. And the fact that this was a decaying soil and water settlement, not a coquina one. And how many feet were dug out of the ground to grade the streets.) The body find made the front page of the News Leader. Suanne Thamm was here at the time.

Again, thank you.

Patti

Patricia Borns  
(904) 491-5048  
(904) 556-3147 cell  
patriciaborns@comcast.net

## OBJECTIVE 11.02

"The City shall make all efforts to identify, preserve, and protect archaeological and paleontological resources within Fernandina Beach. ...

Policy 11.02.02 Upon completion of the survey project, the City shall implement land development regulations addressing archaeological and paleontological protection. The regulations shall, at a minimum, provide for analysis of resources, and avoidance, minimization, and mitigation (in that order of preference) of adverse impacts when development involves properties that contain or have reasonable potential to harbor resources of archaeological significance. ...

Policy 11.02.03 The City shall be responsible for insuring that any proposed development projects will not adversely impact a significant archaeological or paleontological site, and shall seek assistance from a professional archaeologist or consulting firm in assessing the potential impacts of development projects. ...

### Policy 11.03.01

The City shall explore strategies for preservation of historic resources and properties, including, but not limited to: • Incentives for maintenance, restoration and rehabilitation, and stabilization of historic, cultural or archaeological resources; • Incentives for productive and adaptive reuse of historic structures; • Incentives for private ownership and responsible stewardship of these resources • Opportunities for acquisition and/or conservation by governmental entities, private interests, or non-profit organizations; and • Establishment of historic, archaeological, or conservation districts."

**CONCERN:** The archaeological protection language overreaches the value of the city's resources and reasonable economic return, compared with the potential detriment to property owners' abilities to continue to own and develop their lands, including the ability to provide or improve infrastructure. Archaeological heritage tourism can and is being accomplished in Fernandina without further undue burdens.

### DISCUSSION:

In discussing the possible LDCs issuing from these policies, staff cited the City of St. Augustine.

For reference, see the St. Augustine LDCs at

<http://library.municode.com/index.aspx?clientId=10951&stateId=9&stateName=Florida>.

Fernandina hasn't the archaeological resources of St. Augustine and therefore nowhere near the financial upside for modeling itself on that city's strict LDCs. But the proposed policies allow the option of adopting levels of enforcement against even a 3-inch ground disturbance -- less than needed to plant the average vegetable garden.

The city does not have the budget to be "responsible" for protecting archaeological resources as these policies propose. Therefore, the burden will fall on the property owner-developer, as it does in St. Augustine. The cost and time of archaeological reviews, site inspection, supervision, and in some cases liens and legal fees, will make development prohibitive, including the ability to undertake burying of utilities, and storm water and sewage improvements. This is in direct conflict with Chapter 1, p. 4, Policy 3.03.06: "The City shall maintain Land Development Code policies that minimize barriers to the development of existing vacant lots." The proposed archeological policies mandate new barriers to the

development of existing vacant lots.

In some states such as Michigan and Texas, conservation districts have the statutory power of eminent domain within the context of their particular conservation goals. But even where not legislated at the state level, a local government can exercise powers of eminent domain as a result of its local archaeological ordinances. Miami/Dade did just that in the case of the Miami Circle. (See <http://www.flheritage.com/archaeology/projects/miamicircle/Tour/modernTL.cfm>). In this case, archaeological ordinances entitled local government to inspect and excavate private property, leading to its taking. Millions upon millions of dollars later, the authenticity of the resources are still debatable. We do not want that here.

Nowhere in Fernandina is this policy likely to retard property values and development more than in the Old Town Historic District, burdening current owners of its vacant lands and positioning them to be acquired by city designees under conservation districting. Old Town archaeological resources have already been surveyed, streets and easements have been graded in some cases by several feet, and the most important historical buildings have been demolished with HDC and staff approval, without the restraints now being proposed. Today's Old Town property owners deserve the full use of their property rights just as yesterday's have enjoyed.

**DESIRED OUTCOME/CHANGE:** Soften the policy language to an appropriate preservation level for Fernandina and private property owners. We would feel comfortable with:

**OBJECTIVE 11.02**

"The City shall continue to make efforts to identify, preserve, and protect archaeological and paleontological resources within Fernandina Beach. ...

Policy 11.02.02 The City may consider implementing development guidelines or land development regulations addressing archaeological and paleontological protection. Such regulations will be balanced with the City's redevelopment and infill goals and its policy to remove barriers to the development of vacant lots. [Delete policy specifics and leave them for the LDCs, if any.]

Policy 11.02.03 Delete and leave for the LDCs, if any.

**Policy 11.03.01**

The City shall explore strategies for preservation of historic resources and properties, such as:

- Incentives for maintenance, restoration and rehabilitation, and stabilization of historic, cultural or archaeological resources;
- Incentives for productive and adaptive reuse of historic structures;
- Incentives for private ownership and responsible stewardship of these resources
- Opportunities for public/private partnerships to further historic preservation; and
- Establishment of historic or conservation districts with neighborhood approval. [deleting archaeological]"

## Kelly Gibson

---

**From:** mark.bennett@wellsfargo.com  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 02, 2011 12:57 PM  
**To:** Kelly Gibson  
**Cc:** pcondit@comcast.net; dbradford@ameliaisland.com; david.beal@beal.com; mark.bennett@wellsfargo.com; len.kreger@rocketmail.com; ericbartelt@gmail.com; drmikeharrison@comcast.net; mharrison@iee.org; Teddyk1525@gmail.com; Marshall, D. McCrary; Adrienne Dessy; Jennifer Gooding; patriciaborns@comcast.net; David.Lott@speerandassociates.com  
**Subject:** Future Land Use Element and Historic Preservation  
**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Red

Kelly: I have again reviewed the above elements and have the same or added following comments.

Future Land Use Objective 1.05 - The City shall **permit the continuation of the structure until such time that it becomes hazardous or dangerous and shall seek to** eliminate ~~or reduce~~ nonconforming land uses. ~~and nonconforming structures.~~

Comment: I am not sure what a nonconforming land use is and note that language has been stricken from previous Drafts and think that language should be stricken here. The statement should read--- shall seek to eliminate nonconforming structures.

1.05.01 - **The City may utilize overlays or conservation districts.**

Comment: Add the word neighborhood prior to conservation.

1.06.09 – Comment: Delete Narrow, smaller lots;

1.07.16 – Comment: I am not sure why there was a reduction from 90% to 75% from the original Draft I reviewed, but assume there was a good reason.

1.08.02 & 1.02.08 – I am also concerned about the change from **stable to established** residential areas, mentioned by others. Maybe the answer here is to use both terms -- stable and/or established residential areas.

Historic Preservation Objective 11.0

11.01.01 - **The City shall encourage the protection, preservation and conservation of districts.**

Comment: Insert neighborhood before districts so it reads - **preservation and conservation of neighborhood districts.**

11.01.01 - I will once again comment on the **structures within the City that are included on the National Register of Historic Places.....**

Comment: I think the statement should read - **sites, landmarks and/or structures within the Local Historic Districts (Old Town Historic District, Downtown Historic District, Bosque Bello**

Cemetery) and those included on the National Register of Historic Places.....

11.01.07, 11.03.01, 11.08.06, 11.08.07 – Comment: All of the Policies shown discuss conservation districts. I think the word – neighborhood should be inserted before conservation so that it reads – neighborhood conservation districts.

11.01.07 - **The City shall continue delegating authority to the Historic District Council for decisions affecting the historic, cultural and archaeological resources of the City. The historic preservation ordinance shall continue to grant powers to the Historic District Council....**

Comment: I am not sure that the City has delegated authority to the Historic District Council for decisions affecting the historic, cultural and archaeological resources of the City. Furthermore, I don't believe that the Historical District Council has the knowledge, education, etc. to address the cultural and archaeological resources located throughout the City and think there is a possibility that additional Boards may be added in the future via the LDC's to address these specific issues. This entire Policy needs to be re-written since I believe it is inappropriate to specify a Board in this section with. Are these powers appropriate for a Board that deals with design standards in the Historic Districts?

11.01.08 – This should be deleted and dealt with in the LDC like other Boards.

11.03.05 - **The Building Official must confer with staff, the Historic District Council, or subsequent review body.....**

Comment: Historic District Council should be deleted - **The Building Official must confer with staff and the appropriate review body.....**

11.03.09 – Comment: Delete Historic District Council or subsequent review body and replace with - **subject to review by the appropriate review body.....**

11.03.10 – Comment: Historic District Council or any subsequent review body and replace with - - **subject to review by the appropriate review body.....**

I am available at any time to discuss the above.

Mark Bennett, MAI, CCIM  
Phone: 904 491-4912 or 904 489-5421  
Email: [mark.bennett@wellsfargo.com](mailto:mark.bennett@wellsfargo.com)

This message may contain confidential and/or privileged information. If you are not the addressee or authorized to receive this for the addressee, you must not use, copy, disclose, or take any action based on this message or any information herein. If you have received this message in error, please advise the sender immediately by reply e-mail and delete this message. Thank you for your cooperation.

**Kelly Gibson**

---

**From:** Patricia Borns [patriciaborns@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 03, 2011 11:47 AM  
**To:** Mike Harrison  
**Cc:** len kreger; ericbartelt@gmail.com; mark bennett; david beal; Kelly Gibson; ronaldmachado@comcast.net; jjoanaltman@mindspring.com; ronaldmachado@comcast.net  
**Subject:** Re: HISTORIC PRESERVATION ELEMENT - Definitions  
**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Red

Mike,

Media peonia definition aside, I continue to prefer to see protection for local historic districts in the Historic Preservation element. This protection and the medias aren't interchangeable. The FLUE Historic Objectives protect all historic district assets equally today, and those objectives were downgraded in the new plan. I would like to see those objectives returned so that Old Town and downtown are protected in their entirety, not only in terms of the OT basic buidling blocks, but also, in the transitional areas such as the "traingle." If you do not allow local protection, the excellent transition of OT-2 can become the non-excellent transition of MU. This kind of nipping at the edges benefits a handful at the expense of many. While you may have expressed the thought that the non-National Register piece of OT should be another zoning, the decision to keep the boundary whole was based on sound boundary decisions with the blessing of the commissioners and state, and I hope you decide in favor of keeping it.

While I don't know the boundaries and designations of downtown as well as Old Town, I know they do not align perfectly either in terms of local and National Register, and that the PAB is exposing fringe areas there as well to less compatible transitions if you exclude the local historic district protection.

I believe it is still in the best interest of all the local and national historic district assets to be protected in the HP element, so that they don't erode at the fringes. It's easy enough for one-off incompatibilities to find their way in as it is. Well ... perhaps not easy enough, or we wouldn't be having this tussle.

If you are asking, I would like to see protection for local historic districts in the HP element.

Thanks,

Patti

Patricia Borns  
(904) 491-5048  
(904) 556-3147 cell  
patriciaborns@comcast.net

----- Original Message -----

From: "Mike Harrison" <drmik eharrison@comcast.net>  
To: "Patricia Borns" <patriciaborns@comcast.net>

Sent: Friday, June 3, 2011 7:44:49 AM  
Subject: RE: HISTORIC PRESERVATION ELEMENT - Definitions

Patti:

Thanks. I take it that there is no wording that is needed in the Historic Preservation element to cover it.

Mike

---

**From:** Patricia Borns [mailto:patriciaborns@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 02, 2011 9:01 PM  
**To:** Mike Harrison  
**Cc:** ronaldmachado@comcast.net; joanaltman@mindspring.org; mark.bennett@wellsfargo.com  
**Subject:** Re: HISTORIC PRESERVATION ELEMENT - Definitions

Mike,

The current definition seems fine to me, but since you'll be voting before the definitions are released, here's a thought:

The media peonia definition references a policy in the current FLUE that reads:

"Existing platted lots of record that are located in Central Business District, Office Residential Mixed Use, Low, Medium, or High density residential land use districts shall not be prohibited from the construction of one residential unit due to a non-conforming lot size.

If the policy carries over to the new FLUE, the PAB could add to it:

"A Media Peonia does not constitute a platted lot of record for the purposes of this policy."

I would still define media peonias and peonias in definitions because they're not common terms. Maybe you should also define triangles :)

Thanks so much for asking ...

Patti

Patricia Borns(904) 491-5048  
(904) 556-3147 cell  
patriciaborns@comcast.net

----- Original Message -----

From: "Mike Harrison" <drmikeharrison@comcast.net>  
To: "Patricia Borns" <patriciaborns@comcast.net>  
Sent: Thursday, June 2, 2011 7:52:18 PM  
Subject: RE: HISTORIC PRESERVATION ELEMENT - Definitions

Patti:

What do you wording do you want to see in the HPE to cover this?

Mike

---

**From:** Patricia Borns [mailto:patriciaborns@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 01, 2011 7:20 PM  
**To:** mharrison@iee.org  
**Cc:** len kreger; ericbartelt@gmail.com; mark bennett; david beal; bellsouth.net; ronaldmachado@comcast.net; joanaltman@mindspring.com  
**Subject:** HISTORIC PRESERVATION ELEMENT - Definitions

Mike,

You and your fellow PAB members made an excellent point at your board meeting about being able to review the comprehensive plan in its entirety after the individual elements are reviewed, in case new concerns give the PAB second-thought.

One such possibility is the Historic Preservation Element. During last week's public workshop, staff responded to public comment from Mark Bennett that she would consider adding back protection for local as well as national register historic districts and places. However, the omission still stands, and the PAB and public will not know the magnitude of this omission until the definitions are released. This is because density and building lots in the Old Town Historic District hang on a single definition. Here it is, straight from the current comp plan:

*"Media Peonia -- One half (1/2) of a Peonia, measured as 46'6" by 46'6". A Media Peonia does not constitute a platted lot of record for the purposes of Policy 1.04.03."*

In other words, you can't build a dwelling on a media peonia in Old Town. You need a Peonia, or two Media Peonia lots.

If this definition is changed or removed, Old Town's only protection for its density and building lot size will be its LDCs -- its local historic district ordinances. Staff appears to be excluding local historic district protection. Will staff play the media peonia card in Old Town? We don't know. What we do know is that card can only be played if local historic district protections are removed from the comp plan -- which as of now they are.

If the PAB "overlooks" this protection and does not put it back, it may be exposing Old Town to a highly controversial change for which property owners will have little warning. I remember when the media peonia/density issue was hotly debated before the PAB in 2006, much as resort rentals were in your most recent meeting. Back then, property owners had much more information and forewarning to organize and make themselves heard. The current process gives them none.

I hope this helps increase the PAB's awareness of a decision it will be making based on incomplete information (the definitions), and the impact this uninformed decision may have.

Sincerely,

Patricia Borns  
3143 New Street

---

This email has been scanned by the MessageLabs Email Security System.  
For more information please visit <http://www.messagelabs.com/email>

---

## Kelly Gibson

---

**From:** Mike Harrison [drmikeharrison@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 03, 2011 2:54 PM  
**To:** Kelly Gibson  
**Cc:** Adrienne Dessy  
**Subject:** HPE - Talking Points  
**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Red  
**Attachments:** MH changes GOAL 11.doc; MH proposed(2).doc

Kelly:

Please distribute these Talking Points relating to the Historic Preservation Element to the PAB in preparation for the June 8th meeting.

1. The Historic Preservation Element is a new component in the Comprehensive Plan. We do not have an existing document to 'fine tune'; rather, we have a brand-new document which has been gathered from a variety of sources including those of other municipalities. In some cases it has been necessary to create Objectives to give justification to sections in the Land Development Code. I need to stress to my fellow PAB members that it will be very easy to introduce 'unintended consequences' through the use of this process. Particularly, we need to be careful that we do not unintentionally include in the new Comprehensive Plan provisions that are not in the existing Comprehensive Plan.

2. The document deserves our discussion of the following main topics. The changes to content that I suggest are reflected in the attached document 'MH changes' in which Adrienne's HDC/PAB document has been marked-up.

a) **HDC VARIANCES:** Section 11.01.07 of the new Element gives HDC the right to hear variances in the Historic Districts. This authority is not included in the current Comprehensive Plan, and is bestowed by the LDC's. There is a view that this decision should be re-visited where it relates to variances concerning the underlying land, as opposed to the design of the structure built upon it; the HDC is well-qualified to consider matters of building design and appearance, but the expertise for understanding the law of variances surrounding the land exists in the Board of Adjustments who hear variance applications in all but Historic districts. This debate should take place in the City's committees; I am not happy for the authority to be written into the Comprehensive Plan by the action of elevating LDC provisions and making them CP policies. My revised wording of the Comprehensive Plan takes out the mention of such specifics, while granting the HDC authority to deal with matters historic.

b) **BURDEN ON CITY:** The Element places a burden on the City to carry out strategies. In this regard, the Element may be seen as an 'Unfunded Mandate'. However, strategy documents are designed to communicate broad directions and are not normally fund-dependent. We may wish to discuss whether the financial burden of our recommendations should be considered when we make them.

c) **DOCUMENT STRUCTURE:** The Comprehensive Plan should be a 'high level' document that spells out strategic or policy issues. It is not the place for detailed instructions to the City as to how to do things. I have removed prescriptive policies that stem from the higher level objectives.

(See 3 below)

d) SUSTAINABILITY: I am having difficulty getting my head around the Sustainability section, and I'll meet with Adrienne before June 8. I will provide an update to these Talking Points as necessary after our meeting.

### 3. DOCUMENT STRUCTURE.

I have attempted to make the final document clearer and more readable in the belief that it will be more effective if people can understand it at first reading. My process involved making the needed changes policy-by-policy, then establishing 'Titles' for the main themes or Objectives in the Element. These are:

a) Data Collection, DataBases, Ordinances b) Outreach c) Neighborhoods d) Transition Areas e) Bosque Bello f) Disaster and Post-Disaster g) Sustainability and h) InterGovernment Coordination.

I then consolidated like policies and deleted redundancies.

The end-result is the document 'MH proposed(2)'.

At the June 8 meeting, I will be prompting the 'MH proposed(2)' document to the PAB as the Historic Preservation Element.

Later ...

Mike

**Kelly Gibson**

---

**From:** Patricia Borns [patriciaborns@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 13, 2011 2:00 PM  
**To:** mharrison@iee.org  
**Cc:** len kreger; ericbartelt@gmail.com; mharrison@iee.org; mark bennett; david beal; Kelly Gibson; dwlott@bellsouth.net; ronaldmachado@comcast.net; joanaltman@mindspring.com  
**Subject:** HP Element updates  
**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Red

Dear PAB members,

Below are some additional comments to the HP Element that escaped my notice earlier. Appreciate your consideration of these.

With thanks,

Patricia Borns  
(904) 491-5048  
(904) 556-3147 cell  
patriciaborns@comcast.net

Policy 11.08.05

The City shall involve [residents of neighborhoods](#) in any planning processes related to potential Land Development Code changes affecting their neighborhoods.

**Comment:**

The City needs to involve the [property owners](#) of the neighborhood, whether they are residents or not.

Policy 11.03.07

Any project sponsored by or under the authority of the City, either financially or administratively, which involves a site modification, rehabilitation of historic buildings, or construction of new buildings within a designated historic district or the Community Redevelopment Area shall adhere to appropriate historic preservation standards for such activity, shall be subject to review by the applicable review board, and [shall seek the assistance of design and build professionals specializing in historic preservation in the completion of the work.](#)

**Comment:**

Talk about adding to our development burden. We and many of our neighbors are proof that it doesn't take a fancy design/build professional to adhere to historic preservation standards and rehab or construct a historic district building, with results that equal or better those achieved by the "pros." We ask the PAB to reserve the right we currently enjoy to design our own sites, if we are so capable, and to act as our own GCs, if we are of a mind and pocket to do so. This policy is particularly onerous to elderly and low income property owners in the historic districts, as well as to talented, motivated, do it yourselfers. If the HDC feels that a particular case requires such assistance in order to pass muster, the LDC can authorize the HDC to make this request -- after the applicant

has been given the opportunity to prove that they can do a credible job on their own. Please.

#### Policy 11.08.07

The City shall involve the community and residents of the identified neighborhoods in planning processes related to identification of their neighborhoods as eligible to be a historic or neighborhood conservation district. **The City Commission shall use a public hearing process to establish any proposed historic district or neighborhood conservation district.**

#### Comment:

This seems to give property owners little say over what happens in their neighborhoods, for city commissioners routinely override the wishes of all but the most organized and powerful neighborhoods. If you did not buy into a designated historic district, why should you be forced to suddenly be in one based on a vote of city commissioners? Reportedly when the downtown district was drawn, property owners of record at the time decided whether they wanted in or out. Then, anyone who comes along after can decide to buy in or not, with knowledge aforethought. So everyone had/has a choice. Why not do the same for any future district - let the property owners decide.

#### Policy 11.06.05

**The City shall encourage placement of underground utilities in historic areas to protect the aesthetic character of the historic resources. If significant archaeological resources are present, the resources should be documented by an archaeologist and the impact of the utilities shall be mitigated per archaeological standards.**

#### Comment:

Fernandina has been surveyed sufficiently since the 1950s to show that "significant" is a relative term, for example, compared with St. Augustine, the nation's oldest city with substantial permanent settlements. In this case, when significant archaeological resources are present, documentation is sufficient. Remember that Florida statutes already protect human burial sites and remains, and that mitigation requires additional land area that may not be available. Mitigation also costs in the five and six figures, prohibitive for the city and the taxpayer unless grants are available. Even in St. Augustine, mitigation is only required in the largest of projects where a teardown will be succeeded by a condominium, apartment or similar development. While recording heritage, infrastructure and aesthetic improvements must be kept within the city's and taxpayer's reach. Please balance these goals with documentation only.

(904) 491-5048

(904) 556-3147 cell

patriciaborns@comcast.net

## Kelly Gibson

---

**From:** Paul Condit [pcondit@comcast.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 14, 2011 12:34 PM  
**To:** Kelly Gibson  
**Subject:** Fwd: Planning Board  
**Attachments:** Letter to Commissioners.docx; ATT02593.htm

Kelly

In my view we have already discussed and voted on this item.

Paul

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** [CF133@aol.com](mailto:CF133@aol.com)  
**Date:** June 14, 2011 11:01:54 AM EDT  
**To:** [pcondit@comcast.net](mailto:pcondit@comcast.net), [dbradford@ameliaisland.com](mailto:dbradford@ameliaisland.com),  
[david.beal@beal.com](mailto:david.beal@beal.com), [mark.bennett@wellsfargo.com](mailto:mark.bennett@wellsfargo.com),  
[len.kreger@rocketmail.com](mailto:len.kreger@rocketmail.com), [ericbartelt@gmail.com](mailto:ericbartelt@gmail.com),  
[mharrison@iee.org](mailto:mharrison@iee.org), [Teddyk1525@gmail.com](mailto:Teddyk1525@gmail.com), [kgibson@fbfl.org](mailto:kgibson@fbfl.org),  
[ssteger@fbfl.org](mailto:ssteger@fbfl.org), [echilders@fbfl.org](mailto:echilders@fbfl.org), [afilkhoff@fbfl.org](mailto:afilkhoff@fbfl.org),  
[tpoynter@fbfl.org](mailto:tpoynter@fbfl.org), [jbunch@fbfl.org](mailto:jbunch@fbfl.org)  
**Cc:** [CF133@aol.com](mailto:CF133@aol.com)  
**Subject:** **Planning Board**

Please see the attached letter!

Calvin J. Fenn, Sr.

5 Drake Place  
Bayville, NJ 08721  
732-608-0075 Home  
908-670-7866 Cell

June 12, 2011

Dear Planning Board members and Commissioners:

As a property owner in the Old Town Historic District, I urge you to oppose the proposed Comprehensive Plan policies regarding archaeological preservation. (11.02.02, 11.02.03, 11.03.01, 11.06.05.) These policies place an unfair burden on the exercise of my property rights. They add cost and complexity to the development of my land. Potentially, they allow the City to enter, test, and even take property. They certainly make the cost of Old Town infrastructure improvements prohibitive.

The city did an archeological survey of Old Town 15 years ago and did not need such policies to dig up the streets and encourage the build out of the historic lots. Surely we do not need such extreme policies now.

For example:

- The possible creation of an archaeology conservation district;
- Requiring mitigation for making street improvements on streets that have already been graded by several feet;
- Giving the city the authority to charge property owners for archeological services conducted on their properties.

City staff and HDC members say they “do not intend” for the policies to burden property owners, and “do not intend” to exercise eminent domain in their implementation. Yet they steadfastly refuse to modify the policy language to reflect more benign intentions. What does that say about their real intent?

Fernandina Beach is not St. Augustine. Whether in Old Town or any other neighborhood, the unfettered ability to own, develop and sell property is far more important to the city's current tax payers and future tax base than the possible discovery of Civil War buttons, Indian pottery shards or burial remains.

With these policies, the city is breaking its Comprehensive Plan mandate to "maintain Land Development Code regulations that minimize barriers to the development of existing vacant lots." (Policy 3.03.06.) I urge you to respect this important property right by assuring that the archaeological policies guarantee that I may own and develop my land at no added archeological cost.

Below, I offer suggested language that would accomplish this. Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Calvin J. & Regina Fenn  
5 Drake Place, Bayville, NJ 08721

**Property Owner in Old Town**

**Kelly Gibson**

---

**From:** Adrienne Dessy  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 14, 2011 11:33 AM  
**To:** Kelly Gibson; Marshall, D. McCrary; Jennifer Gooding  
**Subject:** RE: Planning Board

I expect some people will send in letters or sign the petition without having checked with staff first about Mr. Machado's statements.

I will be glad to go over these policies (again) with the PAB, and with the City Commission, should they have any concerns.

Adrienne Dessy  
Planner II  
City of Fernandina Beach  
Community Development Department  
204 Ash Street  
Fernandina Beach, FL 32034  
P: 904.277.7325  
F: 904.277.7324  
[adessy@fbfl.org](mailto:adessy@fbfl.org)  
[www.fbfl.us/cdd](http://www.fbfl.us/cdd)  
[www.fbfl.us/historicdistrict](http://www.fbfl.us/historicdistrict)  
[www.fbfl.us/sustainability](http://www.fbfl.us/sustainability)

Disclaimer: According to Florida Public Records Law, email correspondence to and from the City of Fernandina Beach, including email addresses and other personal information, is public record and must be made available to the public and media upon request, unless otherwise exempt by the Public Records Law. If you do not want your e-mail address released in response to a public records request, do not send electronic mail to this entity. Instead, contact this office by phone or in writing.

---

**From:** Kelly Gibson  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 14, 2011 11:26 AM  
**To:** Adrienne Dessy; Marshall, D. McCrary; Jennifer Gooding  
**Subject:** FW: Planning Board

FYI

Sincerely,

**Kelly N. Gibson**  
Senior Planner  
City of Fernandina Beach  
204 Ash Street  
Fernandina Beach, Florida 32034  
Phone: 904-277-7325  
Fax: 904-277-7324



