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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
Introduction

This report studies current parking supply and regulations in the St. Andrews neighborhood, with a focus on Downtown St. Andrews. It contains a review of good practices from other cities, analyzes future parking demand, and recommends reform supporting current and future businesses, residents and visitors. Extensive coordination occurred with Dover Kohl & Partners Neighborhood Planning effort. The downtown St. Andrews area is shown in Figure 1. The full parking Study Area is shown in Figure 2.

Executive Summary Outline

To determine the current state of parking in the neighborhood and develop a complete set of parking strategies as catalysts for economic development, this report has four sections as follows:

- Recommendations and Implementation
- Policy & Technology Review
- Current Conditions in St. Andrews
- Regulatory Review

Figure 1: Downtown St. Andrews
Figure 2. St. Andrews Neighborhood Plan Study Area
Recommendations and Implementation

The study resulted in 3 KEY STEPS Panama City should take to begin parking reform:

1. De-regulate parking (Section 3 below).
2. Pave the 12th and 13th Street parking lots (Section 5).
3. Implement a paid parking program with ParkMobile as provider (Section 5).

Following these steps, data and funds collected from the paid parking program will inform the city’s subsequent decisions on which other recommendations to adopt from this report’s THREE CORNERSTONE IDEAS. These should be seen as a package of policies to improve the experience of St. Andrew’s visitors and residents. Updates to the regulatory code are also needed to fulfill the St. Andrews Neighborhood Plan vision. Those recommendations can be found in the regulatory review section of the report.

Decrease Demand

- Improve Transit
- Cultivate Walking and Biking
- Launch Micromobility

Increase Supply

- Pave 12th & 13th Street Lots
- Construct 12th Street Garage as Needed

Manage Operations

- Explore Feasibility of Paid-Parking
- If Feasible, use ParkMobile software, T2 Systems Hardware

Figure 3: Recommendations - Three Cornerstone Ideas

Decrease Demand

Increase transit service in St. Andrews. In addition to working with Bay Area Transit to improve headways and arrival consistency, other services should be implemented. A parking circulator service between St Andrews downtown and the 13th Street lot and other surrounding areas. The Freebie Shuttle type service running in South Florida has great potential.

All streets need attention to walkability, especially Beck Avenue, per the Neighborhood Plan. Micromobility should be implemented on a trial basis with scooters, Freebie Shuttles and bike rentals.
Increase Supply

Parking Supply Recommendations

- Pave city-owned lots on 12th and 13th streets (D and G in the figure) with CRA TIF funding
- Enhance Beck between D & G lots with Shade Trees and bike and sidewalk upgrades
- Build parking garage on 12th street, after neighborhood plan implementation increases parking demand
- Implement marina improvements outlined in the St. Andrews Neighborhood Plan

Figure 4: Public Parking & Proposed 13th Street Lot
Paid Parking
As demonstrated by the reviewed case studies, the best parking management systems have these positive qualities:

- balanced supply and demand
- financial self-sufficiency
- operate with as little enforcement as possible

How are these qualities achieved? by pricing parking to match demand. We recommend partnering with ParkMobile for parking software management, and T2 Systems for hardware/kiosks.

Innovations in parking technology over the last fifteen years have revolutionized the way motorists use paid parking. With online accounts, smart cards and kiosks, the days of mandatory coins and rushing to add additional time are over. With kiosks such as the T2 Luke Cosmo, payments are made by either coins, credit card or smartphone. The station is 4G LTE wireless connected, and where lack of shade permits, can be solar powered, eliminating the need for underground power and internet infrastructure. Users can add more time directly from their phone and all parking reservations are recorded online with the city.

The T2 System’s pay station hardware can be easily integrated with ParkMobile’s mobile app software capabilities. ParkMobile is the most widely used parking software company in the US. ParkMobile also specializes in managing parking systems without any hardware pay stations, obviating the need to pay for T2’s physical stations should the city decide to go without them.

The money generated from parking should be invested back into the neighborhood from which it is raised. Revenue should be allocated to public improvements – sidewalks, landscaping and lighting, or the expansion of surface lots into parking garages. In this way parking programs are a package. While paying for parking, residents see improvements in public services and infrastructure. In turn, these improvements spur increased investment from the private sector. Paying for parking is investing in the neighborhood.
Policy and Technology Review

The parking study reviews four case studies from US cities to illustrate successful parking management systems.

**Pensacola**

Pensacola business and tourism customers contribute to the downtown economy. Total parking revenue for 2019 totaled $977k. An initial free parking period of 40 minutes to one hour helps encourage turnover and demonstrated a friendly parking policy. Parking payment kiosks and management applications are by the Flowbird company.

**Neptune Beach**

In house management of parking services in 2019 generated approximately $220k. Kiosks/pay stations were provided by Flowbird and Passport. Management of parking transactions is accomplished by Flowbird apps.

**Charleston**

The national scale of Charleston tourism calls for major parking programs tied to transit, technology, ridesharing, and walkability for convenience and functionality. Their parking study recommended a transit study. The Dash transit service now operates free, on 15 minute headways, transporting customers from lower cost parking lots to downtown.

A major cost increase in 2018 from $1 to $2 per hour combined with extension of meter ending time from 6pm to 10pm resulted in meter collections jumping from $1.45M in 2017 to $3.93M in 2018 (with only ½ year of increase). City collections from garages and lots totaled $19M and an additional $3.43M was collected from violations. System efficiency is far greater with license plate data and management software. These revenues kept property taxes from increasing steeply. Charleston’s digital meters are located at individual spaces.

**Traverse City, Michigan**

Traverse City’s Parking System helps with downtown economic development and is managed by the Downtown Development Authority. The system is self-sufficient, generating enough revenue to cover operations and maintenance costs. In addition to utilizing tax increment financing (TIF) to pay off two bonds for recent parking garages, Traverse City’s Parking System contributes to the City’s General Fund each year.

Traverse City does not have a per space parking requirement in the central business district. Instead, the City provides the public parking based on suggested, logical parking ratios. But developers/owners can work with their finance and real estate partners and come up with their

---

Parking Technology Providers:

**T2 Systems** – Parking Hardware & Pay Stations

**ParkMobile** – Parking Software / App
own number of required parking spaces if needed beyond the publicly provided spaces.

Traverse City, after analyzing the parking ratio of their central business district, found the ratio is 363 square feet of commercial space per parking space, or about three parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of commercial space. This is roughly the same rate provided in St. Andrews. So that’s how many?

Other Best Practices

Parking Management
Mature parking programs manage their limited on-street revenues to maximize their value:

- They effectively promote turnover, for greater customer services, or more parking options.
- Pensacola sets different pricing based on location and demand.
- In the busiest downtown streets and lots, prices are higher than lots located on the edge a few blocks away.
- This nudges residents towards cheaper lots, in walking distance.
- These specific rates also discourage circling for spots in the heart of downtown.
- Circling for spots is a key cause of traffic congestion.

Good parking management systems raise funds for reinvestment into the neighborhood, alleviate traffic congestion, and encourage parking turnover. These are just a few ways parking affects the broader economic health of a neighborhood.

Parking Design

Like the wrapped parking lot of this Tallahassee hotel on Gaines Street in Tallahassee’s pedestrian oriented CollegeTown district, parking should be designed to fit into the community and its streetscape. Other uses can be constructed above, below, on both ends, or wrapped around the parking structure. Whether it is a parking structure or a parking lot, vehicles should not be the main feature you see walking around.
Parking design should promote the community’s vision and quality of life. Parking can fit with, and/or promote other transportation options like bicycle parking, electric vehicle charging stations and bus passes for employees. Parking lots and structures can also provide today’s drainage solutions for storm water runoff, solar power, or green roofs. Parking also helps a bikeable and walkable community with on-street parking to manage vehicle speed and buffers pedestrians and bicyclists.

Current Conditions in St. Andrews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>On-Street Parking</th>
<th>Off-Street Parking</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marked</td>
<td>Unmarked</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Public Off-Street Spaces</td>
<td>397</td>
<td></td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Private Off-Street Spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing On-Street Spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Existing Spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITE Peak Parking Demand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Surplus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| No. of Spaces | 397 | 2,816 | 623 | 3,836 | 3,784 | 52 |

While the demand analysis currently shows a positive balance of parking supply compared to ITE demand projections, this is mainly due to an abundance of parking along US 98. Parking, especially public parking, is more difficult to find in Downtown St. Andrews, especially during hours of peak demand (11am – 1pm).

There is a trade-off between providing surplus off-street parking and a streetscape that is safe, enjoyable and pedestrian friendly. While 15th St./Highway 98 provides abundant parking, it does not provide a walkable streetscape. To realize the vision for Beck Avenue provided in the St. Andrews Neighborhood Plan, there needs to be a well-balanced public parking management system that grows and develops over time.

Estimated Future Demand for Parking

The chart below represents an analysis that extrapolates current conditions in St. Andrews through 2035 to provide a rough estimate of parking demand. It is based on a bold development scenario using future estimates from the St. Andrews Neighborhood Plan by the Dover Kohl & Partners team. Future parking analysis demonstrates how demand for parking decreases as the five recommendations of this report and the St. Andrews Neighborhood Plan are implemented. See full report and appendix for a breakdown of the methodology used to conduct this analysis.
It is important to consider the cost these additional spaces represent. WGI’s 2019 Parking Structure Cost Outlook estimates the average surface lot parking space costs between 5 and 10 thousand dollars for construction and maintenance over the course of its life. Structured parking costs more at $21,500 per space. For purposes of comparison, assuming the cost of a parking space in St. Andrews is $13,600 (average surface and structured costs), the difference between Scenario 1. Status Quo, and Scenario 6. All Interventions yields a construction cost savings of over $8,350,000.

Regulatory Review

Recommended Code Changes and Additions

Table 1. LDC Table 108-1, Downtown and Neighborhood District Parking Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context Classification</th>
<th>Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>C4R</strong></td>
<td>• Neighborhood Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C4</strong></td>
<td>• Neighborhood General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C5</strong></td>
<td>• Neighborhood Downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C3 Suburban</strong></td>
<td>• All other Districts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parking Context Requirements

All applications within **C4R, C4, and C5** districts SHALL BE EXEMPT from minimum parking requirements if they follow prescribed building design standards. These exemptions are not available in **C3 Suburban** contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Minimum Required</th>
<th>Maximum Permitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1 per unit</td>
<td>3 per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential Uses</td>
<td>1 per 800 sqft GFA</td>
<td>1 per 300 sqft GFA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommended changes to the Panama City Unified Land Development Code (LDC) minimum off-street parking requirements are summarized in Table 1. This table tells us *how much* parking Panama City would like to see. **If enacted, these changes will apply to the districts outlined in Table 1, not the city as a whole.** Design standards for these districts are being developed by Dover Kohl & Partners as part of the Envision Panama City neighborhood planning effort. Table 1 accomplishes three goals:

1. It simplifies minimum parking requirements.

2. It incentivizes development of building designs envisioned in the Panama City Downtown and Neighborhood plans by exempting those developments from the parking minimum.

3. It institutes a parking maximum.

This table is meant to be added to the LDC under section 108-1: Off-street Parking and Loading as a new type of special parking district. Development codes also complement Table 1 and should be enacted in conjunction with it. One of those codes gives the city council the ability to waive maximum parking limits on a case-by-case basis. These changes give more freedom to developers to decide how much parking they need.
St. Andrews Parking Study

Hall Planning & Engineering, Inc.

Panama City Neighborhood Plan for St. Andrews

Submitted January 31, 2021
Introduction

The purpose of this report is to study the current parking supply and existing parking regulations within the St. Andrews neighborhood study area, to review best practices from around the country and project future parking demand to support current and future business development, residents and visitors. This study is being conducted in concert with neighborhood planning efforts organized by Dover Kohl & Partners. The study area is shown in Figure 2.

Following Hurricane Michael in October of 2018, Panama City has been engaged in a process of recovery planning, economic development and master planning. After completion of the Strategic Vision for Panama City’s Historic Downtown and its Waterfront last year, Panama City engaged Dover Kohl & Partners planning team, with HPE, to begin a similar reimagining of areas east and west of downtown. The Neighborhood Plans for Glenwood, Millville and St. Andrews, require an understanding of parking to consider an idealized build out and development of the area. However, St. Andrews received the focus of this study.

Parking regulations are often overlooked in transportation and comprehensive plans. But those that support and shape the vision of the long-term plan bring parking skills to help realize a built environment that is attractive to residents, businesses and tourists. Based on research regarding several other cities of comparable size and characteristics, it is evident that an effectively implemented parking program can enhance growth, provide a more satisfying experience to users and result in a more profitable outcome for business owners in the area. Consequently, Panama City is interested in parking strategies that enhance the current experience and complement future development of the St. Andrews neighborhood.

This analysis will focus on the St. Andrews neighborhood, taking a specific look at Downtown St. Andrews, along the Beck Avenue corridor between 10th Street and 13th Street.

Section 1. Policy and Technology Review, utilizes case studies. Section 2. Supply and Demand Analysis, summarizes supply as well as the expected demand for parking. This analysis determines a baseline for understanding current conditions. Section 3. Regulatory Review, provides a review of the City’s existing regulatory framework as it relates to current and future parking requirements in the study area. Section 4. Public Input, analyzes key takeaways from the public survey (full survey results can be found in the Appendix). Section 5. Recommendations and Implementation completes the report.
Figure 6. Downtown St. Andrews
Context Classification

In July 2020, FDOT released the latest edition of its Context Classification Guide as a part of its Complete Streets Implementation Plan. Context Classification is used to determine criteria for roadway design elements. The use of context classification in street design is meant to incorporate urban to rural context, user needs, and transportation functions into the design process. When one uses context classification in the higher, urban ranges, priority is shifted away from roadway volume and capacity towards safety and livability. Panama City is adopting the context classification system, but replacing the “urban” terminology with “neighborhood”. Most of the St. Andrews study area is currently classified as C4-Neighborhood General (Figure 7). This classification is characterized by a mix of uses on small blocks with a well-connected street network.

The C4-Neighborhood General classification has two main consequences for parking. First, a C4 classification is meant to be not only walkable but enjoyable for walking and biking. Its roadway designs call for balancing of space allocation for, and between, multiple modes of transportation. Embracing C4 design standards will soften demand for parking as other modes of transportation become more accessible.

Secondly, the design standards emphasize on-street parking and screened off-street parking lots. Methods for concealing parking are described in the regulatory review section. The effect of these design changes is increased safety and livability within a streetscape that feels compact and cohesive. Policy changes and updates to the LDC outlined in the recommendations of this report and the St. Andrews Neighborhood Plan should employ both the 2020 FDOT Context Classification Guide and the complementary Access Management Guidebook as justification for both state streets and City streets.
Figure 7. FDOT Context Classification
Figure 8. Context Classification of St. Andrews from Panama City Development Services Dept.
Policy and Technology Review

This Review analyzes cities from around the country that have implemented parking as a successful economic development strategy. In coordination with Panama City staff, the sample cities of Pensacola, Florida; Charleston, South Carolina; Neptune Beach, Florida and Traverse City, Michigan, were identified for their parking strategies and/or their similarities with Panama City. The Panama City metropolitan area includes several coastal communities that together serve as a significant regional and national tourist destination attracting visitors from around the world. Table 2 shows the population of each city and their respective Metropolitan Statistical Areas as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau. Each case study city was reviewed for best practice strategies to determine how parking is used in promoting economic development. The two parking technology providers identified through these case studies are ParkMobile, T2 Systems, Flowbird and Passport.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan or Micropolitan Statistical Area</th>
<th>Population 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panama City</td>
<td>198,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensacola, Florida</td>
<td>481,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neptune Beach, Florida</td>
<td>7,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston, South Carolina</td>
<td>137,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traverse City, Michigan</td>
<td>150,653</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Population by City and Metropolitan or Micropolitan Statistical Area

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Pensacola, Florida

Pensacola, the Florida panhandle’s westernmost city, also has the largest metropolitan area of any Gulf Coast city between New Orleans and Tampa. This large metro area necessitates the use of private automobiles for almost all transportation and creates high demand for parking downtown. According to a 2020 parking report from the Downtown Improvement Board, Pensacola’s downtown can be characterized as a working downtown that is trying to transition into a live-work-play environment. In a working downtown, 9-5 offices are the predominant land use and demand for parking follows accordingly. Since the Downtown Improvement Board’s formation in 2008, Pensacola has been engaged in diversifying their downtown, inducing development of apartments, restaurants, and nightlife indicative of a live-work-play, mixed-use environment (Figure 9).

Parking Technology Providers:
Flowbird – Hardware & Kiosks
Passport – Parking App
In 2018 Pensacola brought management of its parking system in-house, a policy change from its previous contract with a private developer managing the Downtown Parking Management District (DPMD). The city hired additional staff and invested in training and licensing to do this. The new policy has increased control and lowered operating costs.

In Pensacola, 38% of all parking in downtown is public, compared to 28% in St. Andrews (including on-street spaces). Public parking is a mix of paid and free spaces, depending on day of week and time of day. One standard, however, is a period of free parking, usually 40 minutes to one-hour before parking is paid. This encourages parking turnover and is standard for similar cities in Florida, from Panama City Beach to Ft. Myers. There are also parking caps for longer-term stays.

In fiscal year 2019, Pensacola’s Downtown Parking Management District accrued $976,768.36. After expenses, the district turned a profit of $175,283.31. However, Pensacola states in its reports that public parking’s aim is not to become a profit center, but to steer parking habits and behaviors and offset system operational costs. Across downtown’s three parking garages, average length of stay...
was 221 minutes, or just over three-and-a-half hours. Despite these long stays the average amount paid per parking session was only $1.56.

As with Neptune Beach, covered below, Pensacola contracted Flowbird to install and manage parking kiosks, while Passport was tapped to provide mobile app payment services. This year however, the city’s contract with Passport expired and Pensacola chose Flowbird as a new parking app provider. According to Lissa Dees, Executive Director of the DPMD, Flowbird was chosen because it goes beyond just providing an app to pay for parking. Flowbird collects data on traffic and considers micromobility devices in addition to public transportation. Flowbird offered these additional services at a cheaper rate, 16 cents per transaction versus Passport's 18 cents.

Neptune Beach, Florida

Neptune Beach is a small city on the Atlantic coast nestled between larger Jacksonville Beach and Atlantic Beach. As a popular beach getaway both for Jacksonville residents and out-of-state tourists, Neptune Beach voted in 2017 to begin work on a parking management program to balance the transportation needs of local residents with economic benefits brought by visitors. The city sought to “create a data driven, market based, self-sustaining parking management program” for its town center.
Neptune Beach devised a pilot program that would run 18 – 24 months, modifying implemented policies and guidelines based on market data collected and analyzed in real time. The city engaged RTA consulting to spearhead nearly two-years of workshops, roundtables and city-council meetings, resulting in a proposed parking enforcement plan. The Mobility Management Program purchased software separately from Flowbird Group Technologies, and also from Passport & Flowbird combined. Flowbird launched and managed the mobile app, processing registrations and payments. Passport and Flowbird handled parking kiosks. Initial funding for purchases came from the Better Jacksonville ½ cent sales tax fund, but since early 2020, the program has been self-sufficient.

Total launch expenses of the Mobility Management Program amounted to $303,819.78. Since its soft-start in November of 2019, the program has returned a total of $220,200.84. This figure was less than projected because of implications of the COVID-19 pandemic, but even so the program has generated an average of $35,000 a month. While the program provides paid parking with pricing that responds to demand, it also provides some spaces free to local residents who register with the North Beaches Parking Program. A majority of revenues are gained from visitors to Neptune Beach.

Charleston, South Carolina

Charleston, South Carolina, shown in Figure 11, is located along the Atlantic Coast with deep roots in early American history. Charleston is a national leader in tourism management, boasting almost 5 million visitors in a tri-county area in 2012. Given the strong tourism industry in downtown, parking is identified as an issue in several plans. Using design-based codes, Charleston maximizes surface parking utility by adding mixed-use buildings whose fronts abut sidewalks, “wrapping” parking lots and concealing them from pedestrian view.

Figure 11. Downtown Charleston, South Carolina
The national scale of Charleston tourism calls for major parking programs tied to transit, technology, ridesharing, and walkability for convenience and functionality. Their parking study recommended a transit study. The Dash transit service now operates free, on 15 minute headways, transporting customers from lower cost parking lots to downtown.

Charleston’s Tourism Management Advisory Committee received survey results from the College of Charleston’s Office of Tourism Analysis in 2014 identifying vehicle congestion and lack of parking as continuing concerns. In response, the City updated their Tourism Management Plan in March of 2015. The plan produced numerous goals across five identified categories:

- Tourism Management and Enforcement
- Visitor Orientation
- Quality of Life
- Special Events
- Mobility and Transportation

Four of these five categories included goals related specifically to congestion and parking, including the following:

- reducing and managing congestion
- identifying parking assets to encourage pedestrian traffic
- increasing alternative modes to transportation including public transit
- increasing safety of pedestrians in a multi-modal transportation network
- providing a variety of parking options for residents and visitors
- developing park and ride lots

Seeing that congestion and parking were listed throughout the Tourism Management Plan's categories and goals, the city commissioned a comprehensive traffic and parking study. The Tourism Management Plan also established completion milestones with responsible parties listed for each recommendation.

As part of the 2015 tourism management plan and parking study, Charleston updated its outdated parking meters to accept credit cards and new city SmartCards. These SmartCards act like refillable parking gift cards, eliminating the need to carry coins. SmartCard technology also refunds unused parking time back into the card-holder’s account, thus, eliminating issues related to over-payment for parking.

A major cost increase in 2018 from $1 to $2 per hour combined with extension of meter ending time from 6pm to 10pm resulted in meter collections jumping from $1.45M in 2017 to $3.93M in 2018 (with only ½ year of increase). City collections from garages and lots totaled $19M and an additional $3.43M was collected from violations. System efficiency is far greater with license plate data and management software. These revenues kept property taxes from increasing steeply. Charleston’s digital meters are located at individual spaces. Charleston’s parking program generates roughly $30 million a year that is reinvested in streetscape improvements and alternative transportation options. One such service funded through the program is the free downtown shuttle, DASH.
Traverse City, Michigan

Traverse City, Michigan, shown in Figure 12, is also a coastal city located on Grand Traverse Bay off Lake Michigan. Traverse City’s Parking System plays a vital role in downtown’s economic development and is managed by the Downtown Development Authority. The system is self-sufficient, generating enough revenue to cover operations and maintenance costs. In addition to utilizing Tax Increment Financing (TIF) to pay off two bonds for recently constructed parking garages, Traverse City’s Parking System contributes to the City’s General Fund each year.

Traverse City’s Parking System instituted several strategies which improved customer services and generated income for maintenance and operation of the parking system:

- **Meter Rates**: Meter rates were increased to align with market rate, as determined by a comparison study conducted for the State of Michigan.
- **Meter Time Zones**: In specific locations throughout Traverse City, meter time zones accommodate a range of customers, including three-hour meters for visitors and four-to ten-hour meters for downtown employees.
- **Payment Options**: Customers can pay online, via mobile app, or at pay stations throughout downtown that accept cash, coins and credit cards.
- **Bicycle Parking**: The City assumed responsibility for on-street bike racks and expanded the number of racks available for use.
Traverse City does not have a parking requirement for development in the central business district. Instead, the City provides public parking utilizing optimal parking ratios to provide enough auto parking to serve existing businesses and accommodate planned growth. Traverse City conducted a parking ratio analysis of their central business district, finding the ratio is 363 square feet of commercial space per parking space, or about three parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of commercial space. This is also roughly the rate provided in St. Andrews. However, in Traverse City, parking is nearly all public and in garages separated from Main Street. This has enabled the city to preserve and promote its pedestrian Downtown. Main Street building facades are unbroken by parking lots and pedestrians are free from worrying about vehicles crossing sidewalks to access off-street lots. This design increases both safety and desirability of the area.

Traverse City realized its vision for a classic American main street through collaboration with landowners and developers. When new public garages opened, obviating the need for existing off-street lots, the city relaxed parking requirements. This allowed landowners freedom to redevelop their parking lots into much more profitable land uses.

Traverse City staff members Nick Viox and Rob Bacigalupi conducted the study “How Much Parking Is Enough?: A Comparison of Similar Small City CBDs” to determine the optimal level of car parking necessary to promote economic development, but not reduce quality of life in downtown with superfluous parking. They gathered data from peer cities with successful downtowns. They found an average of 330 commercial square feet per total parking space and 564 commercial square feet per public parking space.

Other Best Practices

Parking Management

Mature parking programs manage their limited on-street resources to maximize their value by more effectively promoting turnover, enhancing customer services and providing flexible parking options. Pensacola differentiates pricing schemes based on location and demand. In the busiest downtown streets and lots, prices are higher than lots located on downtown’s periphery a few blocks away. This nudges residents towards cheaper lots within walking distance and discourages circling for spots in the heart of downtown. Circling for spots is a key driver of traffic congestion. In this way, parking management systems raise funds for reinvestment into the neighborhood, alleviate traffic congestion and encourage parking turnover. These are just a few ways parking effects the broader ecosystem of a neighborhood. It is important to think of parking management as a powerful tool that can be leveraged to achieve development goals of a neighborhood.
Parking Design

Like the wrapped parking lot design shown in Figure 13, of this hotel on Gaines Street in Tallahassee’s pedestrian oriented CollegeTown district, parking should be designed to fit into the community and its streetscape. This can be done in several ways. Other uses can be constructed above, below, on both ends, or wrapped around the parking structure. Whether it is a parking structure or a parking lot, vehicles should not be the main feature. This can be accomplished through careful design and location of parking, landscaping and architecture.

Another feature of good parking design is the ability to provide for more parking with less pavement. Square footage is very valuable and in high demand in vibrant downtowns. Multi-storied parking structures inherently provide more parking per site square foot than surface parking lots. In these case studies, cities have financed parking structure construction via Tax Increment Financing (TIF) districts and municipal bonds. In St. Andrews, there remain city-owned, unpaved lots that are semi-separated from the Downtown St. Andrews commercial area. Until these lots are paved and then prove insufficient for public parking demand, it may be too soon to invest in structured parking.

Parking design should promote the community’s vision and quality of life. Parking facilities, both lots and structures, can accommodate and/or promote other transportation options through bicycle parking, electric vehicle charging stations and bus passes for employees. Parking lots and structures can also provide healthy solutions with pervious pavement for stormwater management, solar power, or green roofs. Parking can also encourage a bikeable and walkable community by providing on-street parking which manages vehicle speed and buffers pedestrians and bicyclists from moving vehicles.

How Should Future Parking Be Financed?

Building a parking garage is often a financial obstacle to overcome for local governments. Parking requirements are also major obstacles for developers. Having off-site parking available for lease or
purchase can help overcome this obstacle. Developers and local governments have many options for financing parking structures, such as those detailed below.

**Privately-Owned Parking**

Residential developers usually provide parking for their tenants and pay for it through increased fees or rent. Providing parking to tenants, however, encourages higher automobile ownership and discourages the use of transportation options such as biking, walking and transit. Developers could also lease, sell, or charge fees to parking structure users to pay for construction and operation of the facility. Alternatively, the local jurisdiction can reduce parking requirements, or provide real estate tax abatements.

**Publicly-Owned Parking**

Municipal bonds are most commonly used on publicly-owned parking structures. To benefit from a municipal bond’s tax-free interest income, 90% of the parking must be available to the general public, otherwise federal taxation rules apply. Alternate methods can be used to repay a municipal bond.

*• Revenue bonds* for parking facilities, use the parking fees, fines, leases or sales of spaces, development impact fees, or in-lieu fees as repayment. Because revenue bonds usually have a reserve fund that can be accessed if the facility does not generate sufficient funds, they have a risk associated with them.

*• General obligation bonds* are secured by the full faith and credit of the local jurisdiction and their taxing authority. The repayment on these types of bonds is usually through an ad valorem property tax used to fund public improvements.

*• Special assessment bonds* are very similar to general obligation bonds with the exception that those benefiting the most from the parking facility will be taxed.

*• Double-barreled bonds* are commonly used when the revenue from a facility is uncertain since these bonds are a combination of revenue bonds, general obligation bonds and special assessment bonds and can use multiple forms of repayment options.

*• Tax increment finance bonds* capture the increase of property taxes in a certain geography for a specified time period. Tax increment finance (TIF) bonds rely on the theory that the improvement being paid for will increase property values.

**Public-Private Partnerships**

Public-private partnerships are becoming more popular as both sides can share in the costs and benefits of financing, constructing and operating a new parking facility. The private entity can provide the needed source of initial funding that is often lacking in a public entity’s budget. The private entity can benefit from the tax-free interest income generated. Revenues from the parking facility can then be shared by both entities.

**Lease Purchase Financing**

Lease purchase financing is a financing method used by a private entity to lease parking spaces to a
public entity that makes payments, usually on a yearly basis, until repayment is reached. When repayment is reached the public entity will own the parking facility.

Other Methods

Parking utilization needs to be assessed throughout the Downtown St. Andrews area to gain a better understanding of which spaces are being utilized and which are not. Underutilized lots and/or garages can be converted to better uses or shared between multiple users based on time of day, such as employees during daytime business hours and downtown patrons in the evening.

A marketing campaign can help inform people of underutilized lots. Some cities use mobile phone parking applications that assist drivers in finding available parking. For example, Downtown Orlando’s “Orlando parkIN’” mobile app allows users to locate parking and find the fastest route to nearby garages and lots. Miami Beach’s “ParkMe” app goes one step further by providing users real-time occupancy information for selected facilities. Many mobile parking apps also allow users to pay for fee-based parking via phone.
Analysis

Hall Planning & Engineering conducted a review of parking supply (on-street, surface lots and parking structures) in July 2020. The boundaries of the study area are shown on Figure 2 and correspond to the St. Andrews neighborhood zone of the Neighborhood Plans for Glenwood, Millville and St. Andrews being developed by the Dover Kohl & Partners Planning team.

Methodology

Geographic Information Systems (GIS) shapefiles were created to represent parking supply (public and private, on-street and off-street) based upon data available from the County Tax Assessors Records, aerial imagery and Google Street View. For this study, **public parking** is considered any city or privately owned parking that is available to all drivers/riders. **Private parking** is city or privately-owned parking that is reserved for specific users such as business employees, customers or residents.

Residential parking supply for single-family units is excluded for study purposes. Most single-family residences within the study area include private driveways or garages, whereas most multi-family residences, which were inventoried in this study, include private parking lots/structures for resident and guest use only.

**On-Street Parking**

On-street parking spaces were readily identified via aerial imagery and Google Street View and were classified as either marked or unmarked parking.

**Marked on-street parking** includes spaces delineated by pavement markings, either sectioning off individual stalls (Figure 14) or a contiguous length of area where parking is permitted. Where individual stalls were not delineated, a standard 22-feet per parking space was used to estimate parking capacity.

*Figure 14. Marked On-Street Parking*

*Source: Google StreetView*
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As part of data collection, marked on-street parking was broken down further as follows:

- Free, Unrestricted – free parking with no posted day or time restrictions
- Reserved – Spaces limited to drivers working in or visiting a business or institutional use
- Permit Only – special permit required
- Accessible – disabled parking permit required

Unmarked on-street parking includes other feasible street parking areas without posted restrictions (Figure 15). The standard 22-feet per parking space was used to estimate parking capacity. Driveways and fire hydrant access points were excluded where visible.

Some streets included in the unmarked on-street parking count are narrow and experience very low parking use, but they do offer feasible capacity during popular downtown events.
Off-Street Parking
Off-street parking includes both public and private surface parking lots and parking garages. Single-Family Residential driveways and individual garages are excluded for study purposes.

As with on-street parking, aerial photography and Google Street View were used to collect parking space estimates for lots where data are not already available. Where individual parking stalls were not clearly visible from these sources, a standard 9-foot space width was used to estimate parking capacity.

Supply
Table 3 provides a summary of the study area’s (see Figure 2) current parking supply by parking type. In total, the study identified 3,904 spaces, including 577 marked on-street spaces, 46 unmarked on-street spaces, 397 public off-street spaces and 2,816 private off-street spaces.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Off-Street Parking</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marked</td>
<td>577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarked</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>2,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,836</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Single-Family Residential driveways and individual garages are excluded for study purposes.

On-Street Parking Supply
Of the 577 total marked on-street parking spaces identified within the study area, 82% are free and unrestricted. There are currently no on-street spaces in the study area with posted time of day restrictions or metered-pay parking. Permit-only parking accounts for 7% of all on-street spaces and handicap accessible parking for 3.5%. Table 4 summarizes distribution of marked on-street parking by type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area Zone</th>
<th>Free, Unrestricted</th>
<th>Free, Time/Day Restrictions</th>
<th>Pay to Park/Meter</th>
<th>Permit Only</th>
<th>Handicap Accessible</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Andrews</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>577</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Off-Street Parking Supply
Of 3,213 off-street parking spaces identified within the study area, approximately 532 spaces are publicly accessible to all users. The remaining spaces are considered private and are reserved for specific users.
### Table 5. Off-Street Parking by Type and Study Area Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area Zone</th>
<th>Off-Street Parking*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Andrews</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>2,816</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Single-Family Residential driveways and individual garages are excluded for study purposes.

Off-Street Public Parking Lots within Study Area:

- Lake Huntington Clubhouse/Lake Access – 20 Spaces
- St. Andrews Marina – 163 Spaces
- Bayview Ave. Municipal Parking – 45 Spaces
- 3011 12th Street W, Vacant Lot – 18 Spaces
- 2901 12th Street W, City Owned Parking Lot – 59 Spaces
- 163 10th Street Municipal Lot – 17 Spaces
- Oaks by the Bay Park – 15 Spaces
- Truesdell Park – 14 Spaces
Demand

For this analysis, St. Andrews is defined by Frankford Avenue to the east and Molitor Avenue/St. Andrews Bay to the west. St. Andrews Bay abuts the neighborhood to the south, while US Highway 98 provides its northern border. St. Andrews has a variety of land uses including retail, commercial, restaurants, office, and residential. To calculate parking demand, data were obtained for the study area from the Bay County Property Appraisers Office, including land use codes and square footages.

General Parking Demand was calculated using the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) publication Parking Generation, 3rd Edition, published in 2004. This publication represents a national standard for calculating parking demand based on selected land uses. This analysis utilizes ITE average weekday parking generation rates to determine general estimates of parking demand. Land uses identified in the data received from the County Tax Assessors files were matched with similar corresponding land uses in the ITE Parking Generation publication. These land uses were then aggregated into five general land use categories: Residential, Office, Retail/Commercial, Industrial, Hotel and Civic/Institutional.

This methodology calculates an estimate of parking demand needed to meet peak demand for all land uses within each zone regardless of time of day or utilization of shared parking. This initial estimate also reflects the suburban nature of locations where the ITE data were collected. The great Walkability desired by public participants in Panama City calls for adjustments to parking quantity and location to...
reflect the unique, salty nature of St. Andrews. In other words, people are willing to walk longer distances than in the corresponding suburban locations of ITE studies.

It should be noted that land use data used in this analysis do not account for office vacancy rates, therefore a 15.8% office vacancy rate was used. This was obtained from Commercial Real Estate Information (REIS 2013). A summary of demand compared to supply is shown in Table 6 and illustrates a current surplus of parking when comparing total supply of parking to ITE’s peak parking demand. These are counts for the entire study area (Figure 2).

Table 6. St. Andrew’s Current Parking Supply and Demand Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing Public Off-Street Spaces</th>
<th>Existing Private Off-Street Spaces</th>
<th>Existing On-Street Spaces</th>
<th>Total Existing Spaces</th>
<th>ITE Peak Parking Demand</th>
<th>Parking Surplus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Spaces</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>2,816</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>3,836</td>
<td>3,784</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While there is roughly the same amount of parking supply and demand across the entire St. Andrews study area, the supply may be short in areas where it is most needed.

Figure 17 compares total off-street parking spaces (supply) with ITE peak demand estimates by land use. It is useful to compare which land uses currently provide the most parking and where the gap between estimated demand and current supply is greater. From Figure 20 we can see St. Andrews currently over-prescribes office parking, while having a relative undersupply of residential and civic/institutional parking.
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**Analysis**

**Figure 17. Existing Parking Supply vs. Demand**

*Civic/Institutional parking includes on-street parking, all publicly owned parking spots and church parking, which falls under institutional use.*
Future Growth and Parking

Figure 18 below outlines infill development envisioned in the St. Andrews neighborhood plan between 2020 and 2035. This is not a forecast of development, but an optimistic, aggressive future scenario of potential development on underutilized lots, for purposes of analysis. Most significant is the growth of residential units in gold. These boxes represent 280,000 square feet of total residential development. Commercial development is red in color, amounting to an additional 50,000 square feet. The primary goal of these additional residential units is to foster the kind of live-work-play neighborhood where every day needs can be met with a short walk through Downtown St. Andrews. If the city is to realize this vision, today’s parking policies must be adapted to balance the needs of motorists, pedestrians, residents and visitors.

A significant portion of these residential units are considered as boutique hotels or short-term rentals that operate like Airbnb’s. For St. Andrews nearly 1.25 million visitors/year, this new development will offer a live work play environment where a car is optional.

The chart below represents an analysis that extrapolates current conditions in St. Andrews through 2035 to provide a rough estimate of parking demand. It is based on a bold development scenario using future estimates from the St. Andrews Neighborhood Plan by the Dover Kohl & Partners team. Future parking analysis demonstrates how demand for parking decreases as the five recommendations of this report and the St. Andrews Neighborhood Plan are implemented.
It is important to consider the cost these additional spaces represent. WGI’s 2019 Parking Structure Cost Outlook estimates the average surface lot parking space costs between 5 and 10 thousand dollars for construction and maintenance over the course of its life. Structured parking costs more at $21,500 per space. For purposes of comparison, assuming the cost of a parking space in St. Andrews is $13,600 (average surface and structured costs), the difference between Scenario 1. Status Quo, and Scenario 6. All Interventions yields a cost savings of over $8,350,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drive Alone</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit/Other</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To estimate how demand for parking will be effected by the policy recommendations of this report a multi-step model was created. The model first extrapolates how much parking will be needed to accommodate the development in Figure 18 if current conditions (GFA per space) do not change. The scenarios are created using commute data of our case study cities from the Census Bureau’s American Community Survey. Charleston, for example, utilizes all of the policy recommendations of this report. The “All Interventions” scenario uses Charleston’s commuting patterns to estimate what St. Andrews would look like with similar policies and growth patterns. Then, we estimate a 38% drop in driving alone to work represents 455 fewer spaces required when compared to the status quo scenario. The appendix contains copies of the spreadsheets used for calculations.
This analysis did not account for two significant trends that will gradually decrease demand for parking between today and 2035. First, self-driving vehicles are expected to reach a significant market share of ride-hailing fleets over the next 15 years. Many visitors now rely on ride-hailing apps to meet their transportation needs during their visit. As automated vehicles enter the ride-hailing market (Uber is already testing this technology on the streets of Dallas, DC and San Francisco) the demand for ride-hailing is expected to increase, while the rental car market and demand for parking is expected to continue to decline. Secondly, COVID-19 has rapidly accelerated the transition of white-collar jobs from cubicles to home offices. Working from home at least part-time is expected to become standard practice even after the pandemic is over. This will also decrease the share of commuters driving alone to work.

**Conclusion**

While the demand analysis currently shows a surplus of parking supply compared to ITE demand projections, this is mainly due to an abundance of parking along US 98, pictured below. Parking, especially public parking, is more difficult to find in Downtown St. Andrews. This is especially so during hours of peak demand (11am – 1pm).

![Picture of US 98 Parking Supply & Streetscape](Image)

There is a trade-off between providing surplus parking and a streetscape that is safe, enjoyable and pedestrian friendly. While 15th St./Highway 98 provides abundant parking, it does not provide a walkable streetscape. Perhaps more important than the amount of parking provided is parking type.

In this analysis, parking typology is split into three types, on-street (usually public), off-street private and off-street public. On-street parking is useful for calming traffic and serving as a barrier between pedestrians and the right-of-way. On-street parking would be a hazard on 15th Street/Highway 98, but it is quite useful in Downtown St. Andrews. Oversupply of off-street private parking is the result of: land development code requirements, perceived market preference for off-street parking by investors/developers, and a lack of understanding the benefits of on-street parking. Most cities draw their parking requirements from either the ITE manual used in this analysis, other city’s codes or ‘rules of thumb’ that have developed over many years. Lack of public parking options also pushes more
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businesses to oversupply private parking. For a pedestrian environment like the redesigned Beck Avenue to exist, Figures 22 & 23, there must be active partnerships between private developers, motorists and local officials. Private developers and motorists make investments necessary for development of public parking facilities. These facilities, ideally in the form of multi-level garages, minimize land area devoted to cars and maximize space available for pedestrians, bicyclists and businesses. In order for a vision like Beck Avenue to exist, there doesn’t have to be a lack of parking. There needs to be a well-balanced parking management system that grows and develops over time.

Figure 22. Vision for Beck
Figure 23. Vision for Downtown St. Andrews
Regulatory Review

Recommended Code Changes and Additions

The table below is a table of recommended changes to the Panama City Unified Land Development Code (LDC) minimum off-street parking requirements. This table tells us how much parking Panama City would like to see. **If enacted, these changes will apply to the districts outlined in Table 7, not the city as a whole.** Design standards for these districts are being developed by Dover Kohl & Partners as part of the Envision Panama City neighborhood planning effort. Table 7 accomplishes three goals. First, it simplifies minimum parking requirements. Second, it incentivizes development of building designs envisioned in the Panama City Downtown and Neighborhood plans by exempting those developments from the parking minimum. Third, it institutes a parking maximum. This table is meant to be added to the LDC under section 108-1: Off-street Parking and Loading as a new type of special parking district. Development codes on the following page complement table 6 and should be enacted in conjunction with it. One of those codes gives the city council the ability to waive maximum parking limits on a case-by-case basis. These changes give more freedom to developers to decide how much parking they need.

**Table 7. LCD Table 108-1, Downtown and Neighborhood District Parking Requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context Classification</th>
<th>Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C4R</td>
<td>Neighborhood Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Neighborhood General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>Neighborhood Downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 Suburban</td>
<td>All other Districts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Minimum Required</th>
<th>Maximum Permitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1 per unit</td>
<td>3 per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential</td>
<td>1 per 800 sqft GFA</td>
<td>1 per 300 sqft GFA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parking Context Requirements

All applications within C4R, C4, and C5 districts **SHALL BE EXEMPT** from minimum parking requirements if they follow prescribed building design standards. These exemptions are not available in C3 Suburban contexts.
In addition to enacting a parking maximum in Panama City’s LDC, the following codes are recommended additions to section 108-1 – Off-Street Parking and Loading. These codes are meant to adjust the arrangement of parking, incrementally shifting development in St. Andrews and Panama City toward the parking landscape envisioned in 2019’s Strategic Vision for Panama City’s Historic Downtown and Waterfront and 2020’s Neighborhood Plans for Panama City.

“These codes apply to development with primary entrance/frontage along C4 and C5 corridors as defined by FDOT’s latest context classification guide, or, Downtown, Neighborhood Downtown and Neighborhood General Zoning Districts.

Development Services staff reserves the ability to adjust parking requirements on a case-by-case basis in the downtown and neighborhood districts when such a development is in line with the specific neighborhood vision outlined in the Neighborhood Plan.

- Parking shall be setback 25ft from all public ROWs with the exception of alleys. The parking setback may be waived when a street wall or decorative fence and street trees planted at 30’ centers along the length of the proposed parking area between the parking and street wall or decorative fence is provided.

- For buildings changing uses, if the new use is contained within the same GFA, the new use shall be considered compliant with parking requirements.

- Any building replaced or enlarged to an extent less than 120% of the previous GFA and maintains an equivalent parking supply shall be considered compliant with parking requirements.
  - If the new development substitutes an equal amount of standard parking spaces with bicycle, motorcycle or compact car parking, pursuant to sections 108-4 and 108-5 of the LDC, it shall be considered compliant.”
Analysis of Current Parking Codes and Justification for Changes

Parking and Loading is regulated by Panama City’s Unified Land Development Code (LDC) in Chapter 108. The ability of the parking code to address the unique demands of Downtown St. Andrews built environment can strongly influence success of commercial, office and residential development. Parking codes have evolved beyond the notion that an overabundance of parking is required to keep a downtown economically viable. Developers and business know what their parking needs are to compete in the marketplace. The key is to ensure that with up-to-date parking requirements, the community remains vibrant with access to commercial, office and residential development though multiple modes of transportation (including walking, bicycling, transit and motor vehicles).

Panama City has modified their parking regulations in the Land Development Code through several mechanisms. The LDC uses defined special parking districts such as the Community Redevelopment Area (CRA) as a tool to relax parking requirements. This study proposes the creation of a similar special district designation for the St. Andrews, Glenwood, Millville and Downtown 2019 - 2020 planning areas. Updating and expanding the conditions under which off-street requirements can be relaxed is needed to accompany the St. Andrews Neighborhood Plan. Within the Downtown St. Andrews area, eliminating parking requirements, at least for smaller lots, will foster the development of local businesses.

Downtown St. Andrews is comprised of many older buildings that have changed uses over time. The LDC recognizes that initial site design may not fit the current parking requirements of a new use. However, there is no ‘grandfather clause’ allowing historic buildings with new uses to avoid adding off-street parking. The code states that when changes of use result in an increase in parking demand, the number of parking spaces “shall be increased” to meet parking demand. This additional cost and the lack of open space that often accompanies historic buildings may deter developers from utilizing these parcels. It can also lead developers to raze or replace historic buildings to meet new parking requirements.

In Pensacola, parking spaces are considered in compliance if the building was built prior to 1994 and the new use is maintained within the same building footprint. Applying realistic development code standards to old buildings means reducing costs to the private sector and increases investment in historic structures that are integral to community place-making. The LDC could allow for waiving parking requirements when it comes to building reuse. Adapting parking requirements to built environment realities of a historic downtown does not waive federal and state regulations regarding handicap accessibility.

As background information for design, the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, known as ADA, requires accessible parking spaces for each parking facility on a site, such as lots and garages. Requirements apply equally to public and employee or restricted parking. For sites with multiple parking facilities, the minimum number of accessible spaces must be calculated separately for each parking facility instead of on the combined total of parking spaces provided on site. See the space requirements in Figure 24. At least one of every 6 accessible spaces, or fraction of 6, in each parking facility must be sized with 96 inch access isles to accommodate vans.
### Minimum Number of Accessible Parking Spaces

**ADA Standards for Accessible Design 4.1.2 (5)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Parking spaces Provided (per lot)</th>
<th>Total Minimum Number of Accessible Parking Spaces (60” &amp; 96” aisles)</th>
<th>Van Accessible Parking Spaces with min. 96” wide access aisle</th>
<th>Accessible Parking Spaces with min. 60” wide access aisle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 to 50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 to 75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 to 100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 to 150</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151 to 200</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201 to 300</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301 to 400</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401 to 500</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 to 1000</td>
<td>2% of total parking provided in each lot</td>
<td>1/8 of Column A*</td>
<td>7/8 of Column A**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001 and over</td>
<td>20 plus 1 for each 100 over 1000</td>
<td>1/8 of Column A*</td>
<td>7/8 of Column A**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* one out of every 8 accessible spaces  
** 7 out of every 8 accessible parking spaces

---

Pay stations and other elements that serve accessible parking spaces must comply with requirements for operable parts (§309) and be served by an accessible route. Requirements for operable parts cover clear floor space, operating characteristics and location within accessible reach ranges.

Pay station access includes the following:

- Clear floor space for a forward or side approach (Section 309.2)
- Location within accessible reach ranges (Section 309.3)
- Display visible 3.3 feet from surface.
The Land Development Code allows parking beyond a single parcel to satisfy requirements for a proposed use as long as the parcel is within 500 feet of a parking lot owned by the same entity and there exist no unreasonable physical barriers between the lot and the structure. Parking may be on the same parcel as the building, adjacent to the parcel, or on another separate parcel owned by the same person.

There is also an opportunity to share parking facilities between two uses with different peak parking hours, such as with a law office and a theater. This is considered a best practice in parking policy. However, the current land code has several strict requirements for approval of shared parking. There must be no overlap in parking demand, demonstrated with “sufficient data.” This is a difficult bar to reach. There is almost always some level of overlap, and data required to demonstrate shared parking potential are ambiguous and expensive to collect. Each parcel owner must also submit a notarized agreement for shared parking to the city for approval. The lot on Beck Avenue and 12th street has potential of shared parking (Figure 26). This single lot, together with public on-street parking, serves the entire block running along Beck Avenue. When asked, the owner of Native Spirit Museum and Gallery (1001 Beck Avenue) said parking is rarely an issue for their business.
Finally, there is the ability for new construction, additions, or new use within the Saint Andrews CRA to comply with parking regulations through an in-lieu payment process. Through this strategy, the City collects money in lieu of a developer provided parking spaces, which is used for community-benefiting projects that eliminate potential hindrance to economic development in Downtown St. Andrews.

Developments that do not meet any of the exemption criteria must follow conventional parking requirements. There is not a maximum parking regulation which prevents developers from providing an excessive amount of parking that negatively impacts the built and pedestrian environment. Traverse City, Michigan, employs maximum parking limits in its downtown. While Panama City does incorporate some design standards, these pertain to the size and orientation of parking spaces. There are no design standards that would aid in minimizing parking’s adverse effects on the pedestrian and bicyclist environment, such as locating parking in the rear or side of the lot and breaking large parking lots into multiple smaller ones.

The availability of strategically located parking garages can condense parking into one location instead of having multiple surface level parking lots taking up valuable real estate. Multiple surface parking lots also create gaps in a dense, walkable downtown. Beyond the Harbor Village residential development, St. Andrews does not have any parking garages and there are no current plans for construction. While useful for consolidating parking and minimizing parking’s impact on the built environment, parking garages can also be unsightly and out of scale with their surroundings. Design standards where garages do not dominate street frontage are useful. Elements that characterize parking garages, such as ramps, must be screened from residential areas and garage openings must be designed to obscure parked vehicles. Perhaps most importantly, the ground floor must be architecturally designed to accommodate the pedestrian scale. Figure 27 illustrates an example of mixed-use parking garage design.
Panama City has taken steps in their development code to remove parking as a barrier to economic development. Absent from the LDC, however, is flexibility on the planning and development sides to assess construction on an individual project basis. There does not appear to be an ability to allow an applicant to justify a certain number of parking spaces based on the vision of the general plan and market drivers for such a use.

The LDC does include the opportunity to implement transportation management plans (TMPs) with businesses when there is new construction or a change in use as a part of the parking deferral process. TMP programs partner with the private sector to allow them an active role in improving downtown parking through employee transportation incentives and building modifications. The plans identify efforts to promote the use of transportation options such as walking, biking, and transit and may include required parking and/or payment to a local Parking Fund. This program can also open the door for public/private partnerships to build parking structures.

It is important to note that the LDC often includes detailed regulations to be enforced based on a vision put forth by comprehensive plan policies and long-range planning. In essence, city codes should be the result of an analysis based on future need and capacity. Parking is often overlooked or caught in limbo between long range transportation plans focusing on roads and comprehensive plans, focusing
on land use. Thus, it is important for a city’s master plan to consider idealized build out and develop parking regulations to support the long-term plan and create principles vetted by the community to shape downtown into a built environment that is attractive to residents, businesses, and tourists. Establishing a desired or recommended public parking supply will guide development while providing flexibility as to how it is accomplished. Development goals and smart growth that adhere to state and federal regulations and protect all members of society can be accomplished through best practices, partnerships and unique financing opportunities. Creating objectives and policies that address long term parking planning also demand that Panama City make parking investments on the front end of the process.
Public Input

Since Panama City and Dover Kohl & Partners began the neighborhood planning process for St. Andrews, Glenwood and Millville in April, the public has guided the planning process through charrettes, surveys and open houses. Covid-19 has created the opportunity for HPE to engage the public in a more encompassing manner as part of the post-Michael Neighborhood Visioning efforts as well as utilizing more intensive surveying techniques and observations made prior to the Covid-19 pandemic. On September 1st, a survey focused on parking was posted to the project website and sent by email to members of the public who had participated in the planning process. By September 14th, the survey had received 267 responses. The public input, analyzed below, will inform recommendations and conclusions in this report. Provided below is only a piece of the survey results. The full survey can be found in the Appendix.

“When I'm in other cities, I tend to use paid parking decks as it is generally safer, convenient enough and easy to find in unfamiliar areas. I particularly like the ones that have retail shops on bottom floor and parking above. The rent helps pay for maintaining the parking deck.”

“At my age with knee troubles I can't walk very far, so I try to get as close to the venue as possible. I visited more frequently before COVID. Every other week, coming from beach. For Mardi Gras or large events, trolley service from a more distant parking area would be nice.”

“Better signage for Parking lots with directional signage along Beck Avenue and signage at the lots. Lots could use better maintenance and landscaping, trash receptacles, lighting both aesthetic and safety, sidewalks with landscaping along the perimeters. More like a "park" for cars and not just a car lot.”
Figure 28-29. Transportation Patterns in Downtown St. Andrews

WHAT IS YOUR TYPICAL MEANS OF TRANSPORTATION TO AND FROM THE ST. ANDREWS AREA?
267 RESPONSES.

WHAT IS THE PRIMARY PURPOSE OF YOUR TRIPS TO DOWNTOWN ST. ANDREWS? (IF MORE THAN ONE, PLEASE EXPLAIN IN COMMENTS AT THE END OF SURVEY)
265 RESPONSES
From **Figures 28 - 29** above, we can see why parking is a contentious subject among visitors and residents of downtown St. Andrews. Nearly two-thirds of respondents travel to downtown at least once a week. This gives the neighborhood a dedicated customer base with a deep knowledge of its needs. Additionally, 80% say parking availability is an important aspect of their decision to visit. As we saw in our shared parking analysis above, parking availability varies by time of day and land use. In downtown St. Andrews, nearly 60% of trips are to restaurants, bars and entertainment. This leads to greater competition for spots during peak demand for food and dining. During weekdays this is around midday, when most boat trailers launched in the morning are still parked. While 9% of trips downtown were to the marina/boat ramp, boat trailer parking represents an outsize issue among public respondents.

There is opportunity to open up more parking downtown. 79% of respondents reported driving alone for their trips. While it is unclear to what extent COVID-19 and social distancing measures have increased rates of solo driving, there is clearly still opportunity to boost active transportation measures. The full St. Andrew’s Neighborhood Plan includes capital investments in streetscapes, with protected bike lanes and facilities and shade trees. Social activities like dining making up a clear majority of trips, it is likely drivers are driving alone to meet someone at their destination. If policies can be implemented to encourage drivers to carpool after COVID-19 distancing measures have ceased, a small increase can have a large impact on parking availability.
Figure 29. Parking

HOW IMPORTANT IS PARKING AVAILABILITY IN YOUR DECISION TO COME TO DOWNTOWN ST. ANDREWS? (FEEL FREE TO USE THE OPTION OTHER TO EXPLAIN IT)
267 RESPONSES

- Not important: 3%
- Somewhat Important: 8%
- Very important: 9%
- Avoid St. Andrews because of parking: 29%
- Other: 51%

DO YOU BELIEVE PARKING TIME LIMITS WOULD INCREASE PARKING AVAILABILITY?
261 RESPONSES

- Yes: 26%
- No: 66%
- Other: 8%
WHEN YOU DRIVE TO DOWNTOWN ST. ANDREWS WHERE DO YOU PREFER TO PARK? 
267 RESPONSES

WHO SHOULD PAY THE COST TO BUILD AND MAINTAIN PARKING FACILITIES? 
268 RESPONSES
The most significant finding from the responses above is the mismatch between the type of parking in most demand and the type of parking in most supply in St. Andrews. 65% of respondents prefer public or on-street parking that makes up just 28% of total spaces. Several complaints were made in the public survey by business owners who are concerned with cars parking in their private lots without visiting their business. It seems public parking has not kept pace with demand, putting pressure on private lots. 2/3 of respondents would find a parking lot more than 2 blocks away undesirable.

Of those who park in downtown St. Andrews, 30% park for less-than 2 hours, 52% for 2–4 hours, while only 18% park longer than 4 hours. This is an important consideration for any exploration of paid parking systems. As we see in our case studies, successful systems usually include free parking for shorter stays to encourage turnover. Also, free parking with time limits is an unpopular solution. It also has mixed results in practice.

Time limits for free spots act as a punitive policy. Visitors often stress over whether or not 5 minutes over time is enough to land them a hefty ticket. A parking ticket, even as a one-time experience, can deter visiting. Whereas, free parking for 1-2 hours before a modest rate of $1-2/hour applies, means an unexpected delay will cost a visitor less than $0.50. If a visitor decides to stay longer than initially planned, there’s no need to move the car or worry about a ticket. They’ll just pay the cost of a candy bar. Those staying longer than 4 hours for most trips are typically employees.
The study resulted in 3 KEY STEPS Panama City should take to begin parking reform:

1. De-regulate parking (Section 3 below).
2. Pave the 12th and 13th Street parking lots (Section 5).
3. Implement a paid parking program with ParkMobile as provider (Section 5).

Following these steps, data and funds collected from the paid parking program will inform the city’s subsequent decisions on which other recommendations to adopt from this report’s THREE CORNERSTONE IDEAS. These should be seen as a package of policies to improve the experience of St. Andrew’s visitors and residents. Updates to the regulatory code are also needed to fulfill the St. Andrews Neighborhood Plan vision. Those recommendations can be found in the regulatory review section of the report.

Next Steps for Implementation

In the short-term there are 3 steps Panama City can move quickly on to begin implementing these recommendations. First, implement the de-regulatory changes outlined in the executive summary and full report. This lifts of the burden of parking requirements for local businesses and new development. Second, pave the 13th Street parking lot (figure 5). This shows commitment by the city to deliver on requests to increase public parking supply. Third, implement a paid-parking pilot program through ParkMobile. The pilot program can be conducted with little to no public cost without the purchase of pay kiosks. ParkMobile specializes in phone-based app payment systems for parking. The 13th St. new lot should remain free to park to begin the pilot program. The data and funds collected from the pilot program will inform the city’s next steps regarding which recommendations from this report should be pursued.
Cornerstone I: Decrease Demand

Our public input survey shows 80% of trips to the St. Andrews area are made driving alone. Promoting and increasing the use of transportation options, such as transit, bicycling and walking, will reduce the demand for parking spaces. Transit and bicycle infrastructure can be strategically located throughout the study area to encourage these travel options. Reducing demand for parking in a downtown area does not mean decreasing the demand to visit downtown areas. High parking demand is a result of automobile dependence.
Transit

Transit in the downtown can provide “in-between” trips that are too far to walk, but too close to relocate a parked vehicle. Panama City’s Bay Town Trolley, route 4, runs through the center of Downtown St. Andrews, while route 6 runs along 15th St./Hwy 98. Currently however, the Bay Town Trolley does not publish timetables outlining when a bus will arrive at a specific stop. This is unusual for a system of this size and severely limits the ability of riders to plan their trips. Without the ability to coordinate parking with the arrival of a trolley, prospective riders may have to wait up to an hour for a ride. The city should work with Bay Area Transit to include timetables as a goal in their next Transit Development Plan. BAT is currently in the process of writing their next TDP, so this is time sensitive. These plans have 5-year timelines.

The neighborhood plan currently in development also recommends exploring options for a neighborhood circulator, conveying visitors to downtown from parking lots farther up Beck Avenue. A circulator should be owned and operated by the city, as opposed to Bay Area Transit, a county run agency. Similar to Charleston’s downtown shuttle system, DASH, the circulator should be free. This extends the range of viable downtown parking all the way up Beck Avenue to US 98.

Transit Recommendations:

- Urge Bay Area Transit to implement timetables for fixed-route service
- Establish a city-run neighborhood circulator to run on Beck Avenue between US 98 and the Marina

Figure 30. Charleston’s Downtown Circulator, DASH
Bicycling and Walking

Bicycling and walking result in many benefits not only to the individuals partaking in the activity, but also the businesses to which they walk or ride. Every individual who chooses to walk or bike to St. Andrews saves a parking space. The numerous benefits to individuals and communities with higher rates of walking and biking are well documented.\(^1\) Replacing automobile infrastructure for active transportation space is often a difficult issue with local business owners who fear decreased customer flow. Weather, also a factor, makes walking and cycling more difficult during the prime summer season for St. Andrews. Resolution of the summer heat issue centers on street trees providing shade on as many streets as possible. This was a routine solution for many southern cities in the pre-auto age. Panama City plans to resurrect this traditional design imperative of shady streets.

A growing number of studies\(^2\) have demonstrated that when street side parking is replaced by premium bicycle infrastructure, consumer spending stays constant or increases. Bicycle sharing programs are becoming popular in cities across the country because of these community benefits. In a comprehensive review of streetscape changes that resulted in greater walking and cycling, researchers found three common threads:

- **Improved accessibility and connectivity**
- **Improved traffic and personal safety**
- **Improved experience of walking and biking**

These three ideas are often self-reinforcing. A separated bicycle lane is safer for users, which improves the experience of cycling. The Dover Kohl Team has identified several corridors that — once improvements like shade trees and bicycle separated lanes are implemented — will stitch together a bicycle/pedestrian network for downtown St. Andrews. A snapshot of their framework is provided in Figure 34.

---

Micromobility

A relatively new option for personal transportation, Micromobility refers to a range of small, lightweight vehicles that operate at speeds less than 25mph. Most often pictured as electric scooters, micromobility options also include bicycles, electric pedal-assisted bikes, skateboards and other devices. Dockless ‘fleets’ of micromobility devices have gained much popularity in cities of all sizes over the last five years. These fleets operate by letting users view locations of vehicles, rent and park, all from a mobile phone app. Micromobility devices work best for short trips, under 2 miles. Respondents to our survey said they would be hesitant to walk more than two blocks between parking and destination. With a scooter or Ebike available, micromobility makes more distant parking lots much more accessible, solving transportation’s first/last mile gap.

In summer of 2019, Tallahassee engaged five different companies to participate in a micromobility pilot program for their downtown area. The pilot was successful, and the city voted to make the service a permanent program in January of 2020. To date there have been no serious injuries or accidents caused by the new mobility devices in the city. Tallahassee’s director of micromobility, Julie Christesen, is a great resource to contact about program implementation.

Figure 31. Micromobility Devices

Micromobility Recommendations

- Establish a micromobility pilot program for Panama City
Micromobility is a quickly evolving market. For communities with older populations or streets that would not accommodate scooters and bicycles well, Freebie shuttles have grown in popularity. Freebie shuttles are essentially large golf carts that circulate on a fixed route or pick up users wherever they are in a given service area. Because maintenance and operations costs are so low, the service is often provided for free, paid for by advertising along the vehicles sides. The shuttle provides an easy-to-use service that allows users to park farther from their destination, or ride between popular neighborhoods. Beach Drive would make for an especially scenic route for Freebie shuttle service between St. Andrews Historic Downtown and Harrison Avenue in downtown Panama City.

Figure 32: Freebie Shuttle Service Key Info
Figure 33. Dover Kohl & Partners, Street Improvements
Cornerstone II: Increase Supply

With the current high demand for parking in Downtown St. Andrews, there are several options for increasing parking supply. First, the city-owned parcels at Beck Avenue and 13th Street (labeled G), currently cleared but unpaved, are a prime location for a new 13th Street Parking Lot. The diagram below estimated there is enough space for approximately 140 additional public parking spaces across three adjacent city-owned lots. The diagram estimates each space is 9ft in width and 20ft in depth with a 24ft aisle in accordance with city requirements. Dover Kohl’s neighborhood plan envisions a development on the southwestern edge of the 13th street lot.

The Marina has the largest number of public parking spaces downtown. This vital public space serves multiple functions, one of which is accommodating boat trailers.

The St. Andrews Neighborhood Plan includes tentative plans for an improved marina that includes boat facilities, boat trailer and vehicle parking as well as improved pedestrian circulation and places for gathering with water views shown in Figure 35 below. The city plans to expand boat ramps in other areas of the city to enhance boat launch services overall. Once alternative boat ramps become available the city may limit parking at the St. Andrews Marina to single-axle trailers, and limit total trailer parking hours.

Parking Supply Recommendations

- Pave city-owned lots on 12th and 13th streets (D and G in the figure) with CRA TIF funding
- Enhance Beck between D & G lots with Shade Trees and bike and sidewalk upgrades
- Build parking garage on 12th street, after neighborhood plan implementation increases parking demand
- Implement marina improvements outlined in the St. Andrews Neighborhood Plan
Figure 34. Renovated Marina Design, 2020 St. Andrews Neighborhood Plan
Figure 35. Public Parking & Proposed 13th Street Lot

Off-Street Public Parking Spaces:

The 13th Street lot is important for its location, just 2 blocks away from most town center destinations between 10th and 12th Streets. Most survey respondents said they would be willing to walk a maximum of two blocks to their destination. In addition to standard parking, a new 13th Street Lot can increase its utilization through special services:

- Valet parking option
- Micromobility service
- Neighborhood transit circulator

With or without these services, the Beck Avenue streetscape improvements of expanded sidewalks, bike facilities, and shade trees specified in the neighborhood plan should be a high priority. Beck is a vital link in the overall plan for downtown St. Andrews. These improvements will make traveling to and from the 13th Street Lot a much more attractive option.

The second option for enhancing parking supply in downtown is paving the 12th street lot. This project should proceed in parallel to the 13th street lot improvements.

After both the 12th and 13th Street lots are in place, monitoring of growth in development and parking activity should guide the implementation of a garage structure built on the 12th and Chestnut city lot (item D noted above). This is an attractive location for expanded parking, but the cost of constructing a garage may be prohibitive in the short term. A paid parking system generating revenue for an eventual garage is necessary, but if parking revenues are not sufficient strategies for garage financing are outlined below. Design considerations for parking garages discussed in the regulatory review (Figure 13) should be incorporated into any garage design plans. The greatest benefit of public, structured parking is the ability to concentrate parking supply on a single lot, enabling infill development on currently existing private and public lots. We estimate a garage could hold roughly 250 spaces in 3 floors, or 320 spaces in 4 floors (the lot has 59 today). Traverse City’s Hardy garage was constructed in 2003 at a cost of $8,000,000 and is expected to be paid off in 2027.

Great care is required in implementing structured parking. Most estimates place the average cost of a surface-lot parking space between 5 and 10 thousand dollars. WGI’s 2019 Parking Structure Cost Outlook found the average cost of a parking structure was $21,500 per space (although this report only studied larger metros >1,000,000 people). It is important to prioritize the 13th street surface lot and Beck Avenue improvements from the St. Andrews neighborhood plan. Once these are underway the city can accurately judge whether development opportunity in downtown St. Andrews justifies the initial garage.

The land development code should be updated in concert with the improvement of either surface lot to enable developers to maximize the profitability of their land ownership. Mandated free parking is the least-lucrative form of land use. Revising the in-lieu parking payment system to increase transparency
and affordability of in-lieu parking options for developers enables them to maximize the usage of their land. In-lieu payments should be invested directly into parking infrastructure improvements.

For current landowners who have built private off-street lots according to code, an increase in public parking supply should accompany an option to pay the city for their parking obligations and sell or develop their current parking lot. This will enable current business owners to profit from these changes while increasing the infill development of the neighborhood. Infill development will create a more walkable, mixed-use environment for downtown.

3 https://scottjonesconsulting.com/project-experience
Cornerstone III. Manage Parking Demand

Paid-Parking

As demonstrated by the case studies reviewed for this report, the best parking management systems have these positive qualities:

- balanced supply and demand
- financial self-sufficiency with revenue stream
- operate with as little enforcement as possible

The best way to achieve this scenario is by pricing parking to match demand. We recommend partnering with ParkMobile for parking software management, and T2 Systems for hardware. The average surface parking spot in the US costs between 5 and 10 thousand dollars to build and maintain. When that cost isn’t paid for directly, it is incurred indirectly. We may not pay for parking as motorists, but we pay for it in nearly every other transaction we make. Residents pay for parking through higher housing prices, customers pay in the prices of their goods and services and entrepreneurs in the form of higher rents on larger lots than otherwise would be necessary. As parking proliferates, we require even more of it because all other forms of transportation become less viable. Additionally, excessive parking minimums often prove too high a price for small-businesses, while large companies have the capital necessary to absorb the cost. Panama City recently denied a license for a new restaurant/bar on Beck Avenue because the owners could not afford to meet parking minimums. A food truck at Bayview and Beck is facing difficulties for the same reason. St. Andrews prides itself in its local businesses, however, its parking codes make it more difficult to “keep St. Andrews salty”.

Innovations in parking technology over the last fifteen years have revolutionized the way motorists use paid parking. With online accounts, smart cards and kiosks, the days of mandatory coins and rushing to add additional time are over. With kiosks such as the T2 Luke Cosmo payments are made by coins, credit card or smartphone. Parking operators have the ability to configure the pay station between 3 settings for recording parking reservations: pay-by-display prints a receipt for users to place on their dashboard, pay-by-space is used for numbered parking spaces, users enter their space number, pay-by-license plate records reservations by plate number. The station is solar powered and 4G LTE wireless connected, eliminating the need for underground power and internet infrastructure. Users are able to add more time directly from their phone and all parking reservations are recorded online.

Parking Management Recommendations

- Work to determine political support for a paid parking system
- Explore paid parking system options with T2 Systems and ParkMobile
The T2 System’s pay station hardware can be easily integrated with ParkMobile’s mobile app software capabilities. ParkMobile is the most widely used parking software company in the US. It specializes in completely online parking systems, obviating the need to pay for physical stations should the city decide to go without. For enforcement a city employee, typically a police officer or dedicated parking enforcement officer, logs into a secure URL from a mobile device (phone or tablet). The officer is presented with a list of license plates that have expired time in alphabetical order. Each license plate also contains information on the location, make and model of the car to help the enforcement officer locate the vehicle. The city decides the details of enforcement, how often officers patrol, how much citations cost, etc.

ParkMobile is launching an innovative partnership by the end of 2020. Through an agreement with Google, parking zones will appear on Google maps. If you’re using Google maps you will be notified if you’ve parked in a pay zone. With non-Android phones, you’ll then be linked directly to the app to pay. If you’re using an Android device with credit card/payment info saved, you can register and pay for parking without even having to open the app. ParkMobile hopes to sign a similar agreement with Apple in the near future.

With market-rate parking, variable prices are set according to demand in public lots. Demand is typically defined as the price at which there one or two spaces open per block (occupancy rate about 85%). This ensures anyone who wants a spot can find one without circling and looking too hard. Prices change to adapt to time of day or seasons, to match changes in demand. Parking programs can also incorporate the differing needs of patrons and employees, as we saw with the specific meter zones in Traverse City. It is important that the money generated from parking be invested directly back into the neighborhood in which it is raised. Revenue should be allocated to public improvements – sidewalks, landscaping and lighting, or the expansion of surface lots into parking garages. In this way parking programs are a package. In exchange for paying for parking, residents see improvements in public services and infrastructure. And in turn, these improvements spur increased investment from the private sector. Paying for parking is investing in the neighborhood.
Conclusion

St. Andrews has experienced a number of events that have hampered development over the last few years. Hurricane Michael and the COVID-19 pandemic have been obstacles that the neighborhood is persevering through, to retain its identity and keep an eye towards the future. The neighborhood plan will continue to change the downtown landscape over the next decade, creating a more walkable and vibrant business and entertainment district. Parking is a vital component to both new and existing developments and this study’s assessment of current and future parking needs shows a need for additional parking solutions, particularly in Downtown St. Andrews.

To address current and future parking needs, the City is encouraged to take multiple approaches to solve the parking demand. Increasing vehicular parking supply is one solution, however, all transportation options should be supported within the City’s parking strategies. A holistic and continuous approach to parking will ensure that St. Andrews remains “salty”, as new developments evolve and the neighborhood plan comes to fruition.
The City of Panama City Planning Board met on the above date with the following members present:

Mr. Ray Dubuque, Chairman  
Ms. Mary Sittman, Vice Chairman  
Mr. James Barker  
Mr. Doug Crosby  
Mr. Brian Neubauer

Also present: Mike Lane, Planning Director  
Eric Pate, Senior Planner  
Tina Scibelli, Planner II  
Jacob Fredriksson, Planner I

Absent: Rebecca Ando, Administrative Assistant

Mr. Dubuque called the Planning Board Meeting of February 8, 2021 to order.  
If you will please take the roll.  
The roll was taken by Mr. Lane.

Are there are questions or changes to the minutes. Seeing none, do we have a motion to approve the minutes? Mr. Crosby made a motion to approve and Mr. Neubauer seconded the motion. Mr. Dubuque asked that the roll be taken. The roll was taken.

Any announcements or disclosures?

Mr. Dubuque went on to explain the how the meeting progresses. The Planning Board only makes recommendations to the City Commission. Variances are decided by the Planning Board and decided on and finalized by the Planning Board. Staff will make a presentation of the requests+, the board will have a chance to ask questions and at the end of the discussions the audience will be able to approach the podium and ask questions. Anyone who wants to speak, please come forward and state your name and address for the record. The first reading of the City Commission will be held Tuesday, March 9th and the final reading to be held on Tuesday, March 23, 2021 both at the Bay County Chambers on 11th Street. Requests one, two and four will be presented for review at the City Commission for the first reading on March 9th at 8AM at the county complex on 11th Street. The final reading of those items will be held Tuesday, March 23rd at 8AM at the same location.
Requests six, seven and eight will be presented at the first reading of the City Commission meeting on February 23rd at the county complex, this is a carry over from a previous meeting and already in the process. Public comment will be available on March 9th at the second City Commission meeting. Request three and five are variances and a decision will be made at this meeting. Variances do not proceed to the City Commission. With that we will proceed with request number one.

Mr. Fredriksson presented Request One:

**Request One: Request for rezoning of .482 acres from Residential 1, R-1 to Residential 2, R-2, 2501 E 6th St, GL Properties of Bay County Inc, owner and Gary Witham, applicant.**

Mr. Dubuque asked if the Board had any questions on this item? Seeing none, he asked if the applicant was available? Would you like to make any comments?

Gary Witham, of 303 W 11th St, Lynn Haven, FL wants to split the property and put two small houses on the property.

Calvin Bruner, of 606 N Center Ave asked if the houses would be detached or attached. Mr. Witham answered that the houses would be detached. Mr. Bruner said he was building a two-story house and the back balcony would overlook your property. Will they be rental property or owned? Mr. Bruner was happy to learn the would be sold, because they are trying to clean up Millville and have issues with rentals.

- **Current use of the property:** Vacant.
- **Proposed Use of the property:** To allow 2 detached single family dwellings.

**Directors’ Report:**

- **Utilities Director:** No comments.

**Comprehensive Plan Objectives and Policies:**

**Future Land Use Element**

Policy 1.1.1: The City shall regulate land use through designation of land use districts on a Future Land Use Map. The Future Land Use Map shall be used to determine the location and extent of development within the City consistent with conservation of natural resources, availability of public facilities and services, and compatibility of adjacent land uses. Land Use districts depicted on the Future Land Use Map shall be described as follows. (In the following descriptions of Future Land Use categories, density standards shall apply to residential development and intensity standards shall apply to non-residential development.)

**Sec. 104-38. Residential-2 (R-2) zoning district.**

The purpose of this zoning district is to provide for the preservation or development of residential neighborhoods consisting of dwelling units which may be attached or detached structures.
A. The following bulk regulations shall apply to property zoned as R-2:
   1. The impervious surface ratio (ISR) shall be no greater than 0.60 (or 60%) of the total parcel area.
   2. Have a density no greater than 10 dwelling units to the acre.
   3. All structures shall have a maximum height limitation of 50 feet above base flood elevation (BFE) or the crown of the road whichever is higher.
   4. Minimum setbacks shall be:
      i. 20 feet from the front parcel lines.
      ii. 20 feet from the rear parcel lines, except when adjacent to a land use category that allows for residential uses, then 25 feet is required.
      iii. 5 feet from the side parcel lines when:
         a. The structure contains multiple units under the same ownership; the side setback shall be from the footprint of the building as a whole and not each individual unit; and
         b. The structure has multiple units under one roof and individual ownership for each unit, side setbacks may be decreased to 0 feet only when there is a common wall between units.
   5. Have a minimum lot size of 5,000 square feet for detached single-family structures. A minimum lot size of 3,000 square feet shall be required for duplex, triplex, quadraplex, or other semi-detached row house-type structure with a common wall.
   6. Minimum lot frontage of:
      i. Detached Structures:
         a. square or rectangular lot: 50 feet
         b. corner: 60 feet
         c. cul-de-sac or corner: 20 feet
      ii. Attached Structures:
         a. 20 feet

B. The following uses are allowed in the R-2 zoning district; all other uses are prohibited:
   1. Single-family detached dwellings on individual parcels;
   2. Community residential homes shall be allowed when 6 or fewer residents are located in a single-family, residential dwelling provided that such homes are not located within 1,000 feet of one another and when the location of such homes does not substantially alter the nature and character of the area. Such use must be licensed by a state agency as listed in Section 419.001(1)(b) Florida Statutes.
   4. Public or noncommercial private recreation.
   5. Accessory uses or structures as set forth in Chapter 104, Article IV and V.
   6. Public utilities customarily found in residential areas;
   7. Family day care homes pursuant to Section 125.0109, Florida Statutes;
   8. Duplexes, triplexes, quadplexes, etc.; up to 5 units attached.

C. Additional Requirements
   1. Provide off-street parking as specified in Chapter 108.
   2. Conform to the landscaping and buffering requirements as specified in Chapter 107.

**Land Development Regulations:**
Section 102-82(e)

Stipulates that a land use change requires the Planning Board to determine a positive finding for the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment and/or rezoning request on the following four (4) criteria:

1. **Not degrade the established level of services in the Comprehensive Plan or the minimum concurrency requirements.**
   - This impact is de minimis, which is not subject to concurrency review.

2. **In harmony with the general intent of the Comprehensive Plan. (Goals listed as applicable.)**
   - The goal of the Future Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan (Goal 1A) is to establish a defined pattern of land use guiding the provisions of public facilities and providing predictability in managing development. This request fits within the general intent of this Element.
   - The goal of the Utilities Element, Sanitary Sewer Sub-Element (Goal 4A) is to provide adequate sewage capacity and collection facilities to accommodate anticipated population demand.
   - The goal of the Utilities Element, Solid Waste Sub-Element (Goal 4B) is to ensure that adequate and efficient solid waste collection is available for the City.
   - The goal of the Utilities Element, Potable Water Sub-Element (Goal 4D) is to provide adequate, safe and sanitary water distribution capability to accommodate existing and future demand. No level of service standards will be exceeded by this request.

3. **Not exceed traffic limitations, create a fire hazard, or a hazard to the public health, welfare and safety.**
   - This impact is de minimis, which is not subject to concurrency review.

4. **Compatible with adjacent land uses and districts, and not create a potential nuisance.**
   - The proposed zoning district is compatible with adjacent land uses in the City. The proposed zoning designation of R-2 is appropriate for the context of the site and will not create a nuisance.
   - While the rezoning would bring land use regulations into line with the current use of the property. This would be considered a “spot zoning” since all surrounding properties are within a Residential-1 district.

**Pursuant to Section 102-82(e):**

The Planning Board shall not recommend approval of a plan amendment unless it makes a positive finding, based on competent evidence, on each of the following:

1. The proposed plan amendment will not degrade level of service standards established in the comprehensive plan, or minimum concurrency requirements;

2. The proposed plan amendment is in harmony with the general intent of the comprehensive plan;

3. The proposed plan amendment will not exceed traffic limitations, cause a fire hazard, or create a hazard to the public health, welfare and safety;

4. Changes in land use designations or districts must be compatible with adjacent land uses and districts, and one that will not become a potential nuisance.

**Findings:** The request will not result in any deficiencies in concurrency standards. Existing development on the site is compatible with the development standards pertinent to the proposed zoning designation. The request meets all requirements of the Comprehensive Plan and the Land Development Regulations.
While the rezoning would bring land use regulations into line with the current use of the property, this would be considered a “spot zoning” since all surrounding properties are within a Residential-1 district.

Mr. Crosby made a motion to approve and Ms. Sittman seconded the motion. Mr. Dubuque asked that the roll be taken. The roll was taken. The motion was approved unanimously.

Ms. Scibelli presented Request Two:

Request Two: Request for annexation, land use change, and rezoning of 1.446 acres from Residential 1, R-1(Bay County) to Mixed Use 3, MU-3 (Panama City), 225 E Baldwin Rd, Hyatt Properties LLC Etal, owner and Amir Zafar, applicant.

Mr. Dubuque asked if there were any questions for staff? Seeing none, is the applicant here? Amir Zafar of 3538 Token Road, Panama City, Florida.
Mr. Dubuque asked how many units. Mr. Zafar said at this point we are just rezoning the property and once the city rezones we will decide how many units.
Ms. Scibelli stated that 20 units for acre were allowed for Mixed Use – 3. Thirty units for 1.446 acres.
Mr. Dubuque asked if there were any questions from the audience. David Smith of 1070 E Caroline Blvd. asked if it was ten or twenty units per acre. On the packet it says ten.
Mr. Lane said Mixed Use -2 is ten units per acre.
Ms. Scibelli said the sheets were updated where the handouts are available.
Catherine Neese of 116 Fox Ridge Road said her property backs up to the property 225 E Baldwin Road. The Mixed Use-3 is twenty units per acre. I’m concerned about how many people will be living behind me overlooking my fence. How can you annex something that you don’t know what they are going to build, townhouses etc. How many units, how many stories, if they are going to sell them or rent them. If it was medical offices I wouldn’t have problems with that.
Mr. Lane said this is generally how it works, anyone can apply for rezoning.
Mr. Zafar said they may build medical offices but they haven’t decided yet.
Ms. Neese said if it is townhouses I’m concerned. Ms. Neese said that there are so many townhouses being built in Bay County, that they may not be able to fill them. Privacy issues would be a problem.
Mr. Lane said they would have parking issues.
Ms. Neese said the surrounding properties are Lynn Haven and Bay County. Another issue is traffic and a new entrance for Premier estates. Seventy five percent of their property is in a flood zone. There are drainage issues and half my yard is flooded when it rains and I’m not in a flood zone yet my yard is the only yard that floods because the previous owner buried cinderblock wall and fill dirt so their property would not flood.
Mr. Dubuque asked why they asked for Mixed Use – 3 Zoning, if you are not sure what you are going to do with it.
Mr. Zafar said if you look at the aerial map there is commercial property all around the property. Stormwater will have to be addressed. He said we are allowed to put twenty houses, but we would have to put in two story. We don’t know 100 percent of what we will do. The City has codes and there are doctor’s offices there. If you look all around, you see townhouses. You can’t put fences around the entire property. We will take care of whatever the code is required for the City.

Ms. Sittman said she had a question for staff. Lynn Haven is to the south side of Baldwin and Lynn Haven is to the east and the county is everywhere else? Right?

Mr. Lane said on Harrison, the northwestern corner, we did annex that recently for a new Dollar General.

Ms. Scibelli asked if the street view map would be easier to view the zones.

Mr. Lane said what you are looking at is the zoning map, basically, but our GIS map does not show Lynn Haven, but what we can assure you is that right now the west side of Harrison and Baldwin is inside the City. Northwestern corner will be a Dollar General there. This is a General Commercial district. This runs out into the county.

Ms. Sittman said we have the county and Fox Ridge in between that we have Lynn Haven to the south and Lynn Haven to the east. How can we rezone it at all without creating a pocket? Mr. Lane said that with we can run out and get this one and work our way back similar to King’s Point area. When services are out there they can decide if they want to access services and annex into the city. This is a small section of the city and Lynn Haven annexed into this area of Baldwin and Hwy 77. Lynn Haven has aggressively annexed property in this area. This is annexation for city utilities.

Catherine Neese said her objection is to what they are going to build, on the property. They can build whatever they want in Mixed Use – 3. Brian Neubauer said the setbacks are 30 feet.

Mr. Slonina said Lynn Haven’s setbacks are less than the setbacks that are being proposed. There was very little water management thirty years ago when Premier was built. They can build up to 30 units.

Mr. Barker if there was a way to annex without rezoning the property? Mr. Lane said there has to be rezoning.

Ms. Sittman said she knew the Baldwin corridor was changing, but she would like to see the same zoning either attached to or adjacent to the properties and I have an issue with it backing up to residential property. She proposed a motion that the request be denied.
Mr. Dubuque asked for a second. He said without a second, the motion dies without a second.

Current use of the property: The property is vacant.

Proposed Use of the property: The applicant is requesting annexation, land use change and rezoning in order to access City services as well as to create more housing to better serve the needs of the community.

Directors’ Report:

Utilities Director: no comments

Comprehensive Plan Objectives and Policies:

Future Land Use Element

Policy 1.1.1: The City shall regulate land use through designation of land use districts on a Future Land Use Map. The Future Land Use Map shall be used to determine the location and extent of development within the City consistent with conservation of natural resources, availability of public facilities and services, and compatibility of adjacent land uses. Land Use districts depicted on the Future Land Use Map shall be described as follows. (In the following descriptions of Future Land Use categories, density standards shall apply to residential development and intensity standards shall apply to non-residential development.)

Mixed Use-3 (MU-3) zoning district.

The purpose of this zoning district is to provide areas for medium- to high-density residential development, in combination with professional offices, educational, and low-intensity, neighborhood commercial uses.

A. The following bulk regulations shall apply to property zoned as MU-3:

1. The impervious surface ratio (ISR) shall be no greater than 0.65 (or 65%) of the total parcel area.
2. The floor area ratio shall be not to exceed 0.65 or 65%.
3. Have a density no greater than 10 dwelling units to the acre.
4. All structures shall have a maximum height limitation of 65 feet above base flood elevation (BFE) or the crown of the road whichever is higher.
5. Minimum setbacks shall be:
   i. 15 feet from the front parcel line.
   ii. 20 feet from the rear parcel line.
   iii. 5 7 feet from the side parcel lines.
   iv. Side setbacks may be decreased to 0 feet only when there is a common wall between units.
6. Properties adjacent to an R-1 or R-2 zoning district shall be setback a minimum shall be setback a minimum of:
   i. 15 feet from the front parcel line.
   ii. 30 feet from the rear parcel line.
   iii. 12 feet from the side parcel lines.

B. The following uses are allowed in the MU-2 zoning district; all other uses are prohibited:

1. Single-family detached dwellings on individual parcels;
2. Community residential homes shall be allowed when 6 or fewer residents are located in a single-family, residential dwelling provided that such homes are not located within 1,000 feet of one another and when the location of such homes does not substantially alter the nature and character of the area. Such use must be licensed by a state agency as listed in Section 419.001(1)(b) Florida Statutes.


4. Public or noncommercial private recreation.

5. Accessory uses or structures as set forth in Chapter 104, Article IV and V.

6. Public utilities customarily found in residential areas;

7. Family day care homes pursuant to Section 125.0109, Florida Statutes;

8. Bed and Breakfast Inns;

9. Attached dwellings, up to 4 units attached.

10. Multi-family structures up to 15 dwelling units per acre.

11. Neighborhood-scale commercial uses, not to exceed 20,000 square feet of heated and cooled space in size per parcel. Such uses may include:
   i. Professional office and personal services.
   ii. Private child care or day care for children.
   iii. Commercial recreational facilities.
   iv. Grocery and convenience retail including, but not limited to, beauty parlor, barber shop, laundromat, dry cleaner, and other retail establishments meant to serve the immediate vicinity.
   v. Athletic clubs, dance or music studios.
   vi. Food establishments without a drive-through window.
   vii. Other similar uses serving the neighborhood area.

12. Uses with drive-through structural components, except for those uses associated with a restaurant business.

13. Retail business.

C. Additional Requirements

1. No more than 70% of this zoning district, in combination with the MU-3 zoning districts, may be used for commercial, and 50% for low density residential uses. This analysis shall be made on a continuous basis and shall be assessed district wide. Individual projects that contain a mix of two or more uses shall be exempt from the percentages.

2. Locate ingress and egress points to minimize traffic impacts to adjacent neighborhoods.

3. Provide off-street parking as specified in Chapter 108.

4. Conform to the landscaping and buffer requirements as specified in Chapter 107.

Land Development Regulations:

Section 102-82(e)

Stipulates that a land use change requires the Planning Board to determine a positive finding for the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment and/or rezoning request on the following four (4) criteria:

5. Not degrade the established level of services in the Comprehensive Plan or the minimum concurrency requirements.
   This impact is de minimis, which is not subject to concurrency review.

6. In harmony with the general intent of the Comprehensive Plan. (Goals listed as applicable.)
The goal of the Future Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan (Goal 1A) is to establish a defined pattern of land use guiding the provisions of public facilities and providing predictability in managing development. This request fits within the general intent of this Element.

The goal of the Utilities Element, Sanitary Sewer Sub-Element (Goal 4A) is to provide adequate sewage capacity and collection facilities to accommodate anticipated population demand.

The goal of the Utilities Element, Solid Waste Sub-Element (Goal 4B) is to ensure that adequate and efficient solid waste collection is available for the City.

The goal of the Utilities Element, Potable Water Sub-Element (Goal 4D) is to provide adequate, safe and sanitary water distribution capability to accommodate existing and future demand.

No level of service standards will be exceeded by this Future Land Use map amendment.

7. Not exceed traffic limitations, create a fire hazard, or a hazard to the public health, welfare and safety.

   This impact is de minimis, which is not subject to concurrency review.

8. Compatible with adjacent land uses and districts, and not create a potential nuisance.

   The proposed Land Use amendment/zoning change is not expected to create a nuisance to nearby homeowners.

**Pursuant to Section 102-82(e):**

The Planning Board shall not recommend approval of a plan amendment unless it makes a positive finding, based on competent evidence, on each of the following:

(5) The proposed plan amendment will not degrade level of service standards established in the comprehensive plan, or minimum concurrency requirements;

(6) The proposed plan amendment is in harmony with the general intent of the comprehensive plan;

(7) The proposed plan amendment will not exceed traffic limitations, cause a fire hazard, or create a hazard to the public health, welfare and safety;

(8) Changes in land use designations or districts must be compatible with adjacent land uses and districts, and one that will not become a potential nuisance.

**Summary of Findings:**

The request will not result in any deficiencies in concurrency standards. Proposed development on the site is compatible with the development standards pertinent to the proposed Land Use and zoning designations. The request meets all requirements of the Comprehensive Plan and the Land Development Regulations.

Is there another motion? Mr. Neubauer made a motion to approve the request.

Mr. Crosby made a motion for a second.

The request was approved.

Mr. Dubuque asked that the roll be taken. The roll was taken.

Please understand this is a recommendation to the City Commission.

Ms. Scibelli presented Request Three:
Request Three: Request to the City is to grant a variance to have a 9.4' front setback instead of 15' and a 4.7' rear setback instead of 20' for 300 W 23rd Pl. To have a 1.7' rear setback instead of 20' and a 4.4' side setback instead of 5' for 302 W 23rd Pl., Kalpesh Patel, owner and applicant.

Mr. Dubuque asked if there were questions for staff?

Mr. Barker asked if this was grandfathered in why should we have to change that.

Ms. Scibelli said the owner is trying to split the property.

Kalpesh Patel of 2709 Longleaf Road, Panama City, FL said there are two houses on the property and he is trying to sell the houses. He has someone interested in buying one house and needs the variance to have it split properly.

Proposed Use of the property: The applicant has requested annexation into the City for City services and land use /zoning change from agricultural and commercial to GC-2 for commercial businesses.

Directors’ Report:

Utilities Director: The City is entering into a contract with Bay County to provide water and sewer services to the referenced properties.

Comprehensive Plan Objectives and Policies:

Future Land Use Element

Policy 1.1.1: The City shall regulate land use through designation of land use districts on a Future Land Use Map. The Future Land Use Map shall be used to determine the location and extent of development within the City consistent with conservation of natural resources, availability of public facilities and services, and compatibility of adjacent land uses. Land Use districts depicted on the Future Land Use Map shall be described as follows. (In the following descriptions of Future Land Use categories, density standards shall apply to residential development and intensity standards shall apply to non-residential development.)

Sec. 104-38. - General Commercial -2 (GC-2) zoning district.

The purpose of this zoning district is to provide areas for neighborhood commercial activity including retail sales and services, professional offices and services, and other similar land uses.

A. The following bulk regulations shall apply to property zoned as GC-2:

1. The impervious surface ratio shall be no greater than 0.90 (or 90%) of the total parcel area.

2. The floor area ratio (FAR) may not exceed 3.0 (or 300%).
3. No maximum height.

4. Minimum setbacks shall be:
   i. 15 feet from the front parcel line.
   ii. 20 feet from the rear parcel line.
   iii. 57 feet from the side parcel lines.

5. Minimum setbacks for development adjacent to zoning districts that allow residential uses shall be:
   i. 15 feet from the front parcel line.
   ii. 30 feet from the rear parcel line.
   iii. 12 feet from the side parcel lines.

B. The following uses are allowed in GC-2 zoning districts; all other uses are prohibited:

1. All uses allowable in the GC-1 zoning district
2. Shopping centers.
3. Vehicle dealers and repair shops (excluding scooter rental/sales).
4. Adult entertainment subject to the requirements of Chapter 7, Article III of the Municipal Code.
5. Big box retailers.
6. Printing, publishing or other similar establishments.
8. Wholesaling, warehousing, and indoor storage of goods or materials.
9. Public utilities with exception to solid waste facilities and landfills.
10. Cannabis Dispensing Facilities, and
11. Other similar uses.

C. Additional Requirements.

1. Confine ground and building lighting to the property and without causing direct light to protrude on adjacent properties.
2. Screen garbage receptacles, trash containers, and dumpsters from public view, using opaque materials.
3. Provide off-street parking as specified in Chapter 108.
4. Conform to the landscaping and buffering requirements as specified in Chapter 107.
5. Not include any residential development.

6. The exterior of building facades visible from Highway 98 or Harrison Avenue shall not be constructed of metal unless:
   i. such wall is not visible by a pedestrian standing within the vehicular right-of-way of Highway 98 or Harrison Ave; or
   ii. such wall is completely covered by one or more of the following materials:
      - Brick
      - Stone
      - Stucco
      - Synthetic stucco
      - Cementitious materials
      - Exterior insulation
      - Wood siding, provided finish system that such siding is (EIFS) applied with no panel exceeding twelve (12) inches in height
      - Other non-ferrous material may be permissible, if determined by the Planning Dept. as a matter of fact to be aesthetically comparable and at least as opaque, weather resistant, and permanent as the materials listed above.

Land Development Regulations:

Section 102-82(e)

Stipulates that a land use change requires the Planning Board to determine a positive finding for the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment and/or rezoning request on the following four (4) criteria:

1. Not degrade the established level of services in the Comprehensive Plan or the minimum concurrency requirements.

   This impact is de minimis, which is not subject to concurrency review.

2. In harmony with the general intent of the Comprehensive Plan. (Goals listed as applicable.)
   - The goal of the Future Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan (Goal 1A) is to establish a defined pattern of land use guiding the provisions of public facilities and providing predictability in managing development. This request fits within the general intent of this Element.
   - The goal of the Utilities Element, Sanitary Sewer Sub-Element (Goal 4A) is to provide adequate
sewage capacity and collection facilities to accommodate anticipated population demand.

- The goal of the Utilities Element, Solid Waste Sub-Element (Goal 4B) is to ensure that adequate and efficient solid waste collection is available for the City.

- The goal of the Utilities Element, Potable Water Sub-Element (Goal 4D) is to provide adequate, safe and sanitary water distribution capability to accommodate existing and future demand.

No level of service standards will be exceeded by this Future Land Use map amendment.

3. Not exceed traffic limitations, create a fire hazard, or a hazard to the public health, welfare and safety.

This impact is de minimis, which is not subject to concurrency review

4. Compatible with adjacent land uses and districts, and not create a potential nuisance.

The proposed zoning district is compatible with adjacent land uses in the City. The proposed zoning designation of GC-2 is similar to the current zoning in the area.

Pursuant to Section 102-82(e):

The Planning Board shall not recommend approval of a plan amendment unless it makes a positive finding, based on competent evidence, on each of the following:

(1) The proposed plan amendment will not degrade level of service standards established in the comprehensive plan, or minimum concurrency requirements;

(2) The proposed plan amendment is in harmony with the general intent of the comprehensive plan;

(3) The proposed plan amendment will not exceed traffic limitations, cause a fire hazard, or create a hazard to public health, welfare and safety;

(4) Changes in land use designations or districts must be compatible with adjacent land uses and districts, and one that will not become a potential nuisance.

Summary of Findings:

The request will not result in any deficiencies in concurrency standards. Proposed development on the site is compatible with the development standards pertinent to the proposed Land Use and zoning designations. The request meets all requirements of the Comprehensive Plan and the Land Development Regulations.

Mr. Dubuque asked for a motion. Mr. Barker made a motion to approve and Ms. Sittman seconded the motion.
Mr. Dubuque asked that the roll be taken, the roll was taken.
The variance was approved. Three to two.

Ms. Scibelli presented Request Four:

Request Four: Request for land use change and rezoning of 2.066 acres from Residential 1, R-1 to Mixed Use 3, MU-3, 1111 Fortune Ave, Christine Bastek, owner and applicant.

Mr. Dubuque asked “Does anyone have any questions for the applicant?”

Proposed Use of the property: The applicant has requested annexation into the City for City services and land use/zoning change from agricultural and commercial to GC-2 for commercial businesses.

Directors’ Report:

Utilities Director: The City is entering into a contract with Bay County to provide water and sewer services to the referenced properties

Comprehensive Plan Objectives and Policies:

Future Land Use Element

Policy 1.1.1: The City shall regulate land use through designation of land use districts on a Future Land Use Map. The Future Land Use Map shall be used to determine the location and extent of development within the City consistent with conservation of natural resources, availability of public facilities and services, and compatibility of adjacent land uses. Land Use districts depicted on the Future Land Use Map shall be described as follows. (In the following descriptions of Future Land Use categories, density standards shall apply to residential development and intensity standards shall apply to non-residential development.)

Sec. 104-38. - General Commercial -2 (GC-2) zoning district.

The purpose of this zoning district is to provide areas for neighborhood commercial activity including retail sales and services, professional offices and services, and other similar land uses.

A. The following bulk regulations shall apply to property zoned as GC-2:

1. The impervious surface ratio shall be no greater than 0.90 (or 90%) of the total parcel area.
2. The floor area ratio (FAR) may not exceed 3.0 (or 300%).
3. No maximum height.
4. Minimum setbacks shall be:
   i. 15 feet from the front parcel line.
   ii. 20 feet from the rear parcel line.
   iii. 5 7 feet from the side parcel lines.

5. Minimum setbacks for development adjacent to zoning districts that allow residential uses shall be:
   i. 15 feet from the front parcel line.
   ii. 30 25’ feet from the rear parcel line.
   iii. 12 feet from the side parcel lines.

B. The following uses are allowed in GC-2 zoning districts; all other uses are prohibited:
   1. All uses allowable in the GC-1 zoning district
   2. Shopping centers.
   3. Vehicle dealers and repair shops (excluding scooter rental /sales).
   4. Adult entertainment subject to the requirements of Chapter 7, Article III of the Municipal Code.
   5. Big box retailers.
   6. Printing, publishing or other similar establishments.
   8. Wholesaling, warehousing, and indoor storage of goods or materials.
   9. Public utilities with exception to solid waste facilities and landfills.
   10. Cannabis Dispensing Facilities, and
   11. Other similar uses.

C. Additional Requirements.
   1. Confine ground and building lighting to the property and without causing direct light to protrude on adjacent properties.
   2. Screen garbage receptacles, trash containers, and dumpsters from public view, using opaque materials.
   3. Provide off-street parking as specified in Chapter 108.
   4. Conform to the landscaping and buffering requirements as specified in Chapter 107.
   5. Not include any residential development.
6. The exterior of building facades visible from Highway 98 or Harrison Avenue shall not be constructed of metal unless:

i. such wall is not visible by a pedestrian standing within the vehicular right-of-way of Highway 98 or Harrison Ave; or

ii. such wall is completely covered by one or more of the following materials:

- Brick
- Stone
- Stucco
- Synthetic stucco
- Cementitious materials
- Exterior insulation
- Wood siding, provided finish system that such siding is (EIFS) applied with no panel exceeding twelve (12) inches in height
- Other non-ferrous material may be permissible, if determined by the Planning Dept. as a matter of fact to be aesthetically comparable and at least as opaque, weather resistant, and permanent as the materials listed above.

Land Development Regulations:

Section 102-82(e)

Stipulates that a land use change requires the Planning Board to determine a positive finding for the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment and/or rezoning request on the following four (4) criteria:

1. Not degrade the established level of services in the Comprehensive Plan or the minimum concurrency requirements.

   This impact is de minimis, which is not subject to concurrency review.

2. In harmony with the general intent of the Comprehensive Plan. (Goals listed as applicable.)

   - The goal of the Future Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan (Goal 1A) is to establish a defined pattern of land use guiding the provisions of public facilities and providing predictability in managing development. This request fits within the general intent of this Element.

   - The goal of the Utilities Element, Sanitary Sewer Sub-Element (Goal 4A) is to provide adequate sewage capacity and collection facilities to accommodate anticipated population demand.
- The goal of the Utilities Element, Solid Waste Sub-Element (Goal 4B) is to ensure that adequate and efficient solid waste collection is available for the City.
- The goal of the Utilities Element, Potable Water Sub-Element (Goal 4D) is to provide adequate, safe and sanitary water distribution capability to accommodate existing and future demand.

No level of service standards will be exceeded by this Future Land Use map amendment.

3. Not exceed traffic limitations, create a fire hazard, or a hazard to the public health, welfare and safety.

This impact is de minimis, which is not subject to concurrency review.

4. Compatible with adjacent land uses and districts, and not create a potential nuisance.

The proposed zoning district is compatible with adjacent land uses in the City. The proposed zoning designation of GC-2 is similar to the current zoning in the area.

Pursuant to Section 102-82(e):

The Planning Board shall not recommend approval of a plan amendment unless it makes a positive finding, based on competent evidence, on each of the following:

(1) The proposed plan amendment will not degrade level of service standards established in the comprehensive plan, or minimum concurrency requirements;

(2) The proposed plan amendment is in harmony with the general intent of the comprehensive plan;

(3) The proposed plan amendment will not exceed traffic limitations, cause a fire hazard, or create a hazard to public health, welfare and safety;

(4) Changes in land use designations or districts must be compatible with adjacent land uses and districts, and one that will not become a potential nuisance.

Summary of Findings:

The request will not result in any deficiencies in concurrency standards. Proposed development on the site is compatible with the development standards pertinent to the proposed Land Use and zoning designations. The request meets all requirements of the Comprehensive Plan and the Land Development Regulations.

Mr. Barker made a motion to approve and Mr. Crosby seconded the motion.

Mr. Dubuque said with no further discussion, please take the roll.

The roll was taken.
The request was approved.

Ms. Scibelli presented Request Five:

Request Five: Request to the City is to grant a variance to have a 11.8’ front setback instead of 20’ and a 10’ rear setback instead of 25’ and a 4.8’ side setback instead of 20’ on the E 4th St side for 400 N MacArthur Ave, First United Methodist Church of Panama City FL, Inc, owner and Lavoy Anderson, applicant.

Ms. Scibelli said we had talked about this last Planning Board meeting regarding the stormwater pond and rezoning.

Proposed Use of the property: The applicant has requested annexation into the City for City services and land use /zoning change from agricultural and commercial to GC-2 for commercial businesses.

Directors’ Report:

Utilities Director: The City is entering into a contract with Bay County to provide water and sewer services to the referenced properties. Comprehensive Plan Objectives and Policies:

Future Land Use Element

Policy 1.1.1: The City shall regulate land use through designation of land use districts on a Future Land Use Map. The Future Land Use Map shall be used to determine the location and extent of development within the City consistent with conservation of natural resources, availability of public facilities and services, and compatibility of adjacent land uses. Land Use districts depicted on the Future Land Use Map shall be described as follows. (In the following descriptions of Future Land Use categories, density standards shall apply to residential development and intensity standards shall apply to non-residential development.)

Sec. 104-38. - General Commercial -2 (GC-2) zoning district.
The purpose of this zoning district is to provide areas for neighborhood commercial activity including retail sales and services, professional offices and services, and other similar land uses.

A. The following bulk regulations shall apply to property zoned as GC-2:

1. The impervious surface ratio shall be no greater than 0.90 (or 90%) of the total parcel area.
2. The floor area ratio (FAR) may not exceed 3.0 (or 300%).
3. No maximum height.
4. Minimum setbacks shall be:
   i. 15 feet from the front parcel line.
   ii. 20 feet from the rear parcel line.
   iii. 5 feet from the side parcel lines.
5. Minimum setbacks for development adjacent to zoning districts that allow residential uses shall be:
   i. 15 feet from the front parcel line.
   ii. 30 feet from the rear parcel line.
   iii. 12 feet from the side parcel lines.

B. The following uses are allowed in GC-2 zoning districts; all other uses are prohibited:

1. All uses allowable in the GC-1 zoning district
2. Shopping centers.
3. Vehicle dealers and repair shops (excluding scooter rental /sales).
4. Adult entertainment subject to the requirements of Chapter 7, Article III of the Municipal Code.
5. Big box retailers.
6. Printing, publishing or other similar establishments.
8. Wholesaling, warehousing, and indoor storage of goods or materials.
9. Public utilities with exception to solid waste facilities and landfills.
10. Cannabis Dispensing Facilities, and
11. Other similar uses.

C. Additional Requirements.

1. Confine ground and building lighting to the property and without causing direct light to protrude on adjacent properties.
2. Screen garbage receptacles, trash containers, and dumpsters from public view, using opaque materials.

3. Provide off-street parking as specified in Chapter 108.

4. Conform to the landscaping and buffering requirements as specified in Chapter 107.

5. Not include any residential development.

6. The exterior of building facades visible from Highway 98 or Harrison Avenue shall not be constructed of metal unless:
   i. such wall is not visible by a pedestrian standing within the vehicular right-of-way of Highway 98 or Harrison Ave; or
   ii. such wall is completely covered by one or more of the following materials:
      • Brick
      • Stone
      • Stucco
      • Synthetic stucco
      • Cementitious materials
      • Exterior insulation
      • Wood siding, provided finish system that such siding is (EIFS) applied with no panel exceeding twelve (12) inches in height
      • Other non-ferrous material may be permissible, if determined by the Planning Dept. as a matter of fact to be aesthetically comparable and at least as opaque, weather resistant, and permanent as the materials listed above.

Land Development Regulations:

Section 102-82(e)

Stipulates that a land use change requires the Planning Board to determine a positive finding for the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment and/or rezoning request on the following four (4) criteria:

1. Not degrade the established level of services in the Comprehensive Plan or the minimum concurrency requirements.
   This impact is de minimis, which is not subject to concurrency review.

2. In harmony with the general intent of the Comprehensive Plan. (Goals listed as applicable.)
   - The goal of the Future Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan (Goal 1A) is to establish a defined pattern of land use guiding the provisions of public facilities and providing predictability in managing development. This request fits within the general intent of this Element.
- The goal of the Utilities Element, Sanitary Sewer Sub-Element (Goal 4A) is to provide adequate sewage capacity and collection facilities to accommodate anticipated population demand.

- The goal of the Utilities Element, Solid Waste Sub-Element (Goal 4B) is to ensure that adequate and efficient solid waste collection is available for the City.

- The goal of the Utilities Element, Potable Water Sub-Element (Goal 4D) is to provide adequate, safe and sanitary water distribution capability to accommodate existing and future demand. No level of service standards will be exceeded by this Future Land Use map amendment.

3. Not exceed traffic limitations, create a fire hazard, or a hazard to the public health, welfare and safety. This impact is de minimis, which is not subject to concurrency review.

4. Compatible with adjacent land uses and districts, and not create a potential nuisance.

The proposed zoning district is compatible with adjacent land uses in the City. The proposed zoning designation of GC-2 is similar to the current zoning in the area.

Pursuant to Section 102-82(e):

The Planning Board shall not recommend approval of a plan amendment unless it makes a positive finding, based on competent evidence, on each of the following:

(1) The proposed plan amendment will not degrade level of service standards established in the comprehensive plan, or minimum concurrency requirements;

(2) The proposed plan amendment is in harmony with the general intent of the comprehensive plan;

(3) The proposed plan amendment will not exceed traffic limitations, cause a fire hazard, or create a hazard to public health, welfare and safety;

(4) Changes in land use designations or districts must be compatible with adjacent land uses and districts, and one that will not become a potential nuisance.

Summary of Findings:

The request will not result in any deficiencies in concurrency standards. Proposed development on the site is compatible with the development standards pertinent to the proposed Land Use and zoning designations. The request meets all requirements of the Comprehensive Plan and the Land Development Regulations.

Ms. Sittman made a motion to approve and Mr. Neubauer seconded the motion.

Mr. Dubuque asked that the roll be taken, the roll was taken.

The request was approved.

Ms. Scibelli presented Request Six:

Request Six: Request for annexation, land use change, and rezoning of 83 acres from Residential 1, R-1(Bay County) to Urban Residential 2.
Mr. Dubuque asked if there were questions for staff?

Mr. Jim Slonina of Panhandle Engineering, 600 E Ohio Avenue, Lynn Haven, FL.

This is one of three return events. You may recall this is a platted development/subdivision. The applicant owns all but two lots and the two lots were holding out for 2008 sales prices and they got it. We have unanimous consent to annex and rezone the acreage. This has been on hold for 10 years, and the water and sewer has been checked, roads corded, maintained and they are ready to move on with subdivision.

Mr. Dubuque said they have water and sewer and Mr. Slonina said this has been designed, permitted and constructed. It has been vandalized and left dark for twelve years.

We have flushed contained and videoed the sewer lines, cored the roads we have not hydrolyzed the water lines because we could not get water from the county. These are going to be residential single homes with exceptions of a couple tracks around the lake.

The City is working on the City water and roads.

Mr. Dubuque asked if there were any questions.

Proposed Use of the property: The applicant has requested annexation into the City for City services and land use/zoning change from agricultural and commercial to GC-2 for commercial businesses.

Directors’ Report:

Utilities Director: The City is entering into a contract with Bay County to provide water and sewer services to the referenced properties.

Comprehensive Plan Objectives and Policies:

Future Land Use Element

Policy 1.1.1: The City shall regulate land use through designation of land use districts on a Future Land Use Map. The Future Land Use Map shall be used to determine the location and extent of development within the City consistent with conservation of natural resources, availability of public facilities and services, and compatibility of adjacent land uses. Land Use districts depicted on the Future Land Use Map shall be described as follows. (In the following descriptions of Future Land Use categories, density standards shall apply to residential development and intensity standards shall apply to non-residential development.)

Sec. 104-38. - General Commercial -2 (GC-2) zoning district.

The purpose of this zoning district is to provide areas for neighborhood commercial activity including retail sales and services, professional offices and services, and other similar land uses.

A. The following bulk regulations shall apply to property zoned as GC-2:
1. The impervious surface ratio shall be no greater than 0.90 (or 90%) of the total parcel area.
2. The floor area ratio (FAR) may not exceed 3.0 (or 300%).
3. No maximum height.
4. Minimum setbacks shall be:
   i. 15 feet from the front parcel line.
   ii. 20 feet from the rear parcel line.
   iii. 5 7 feet from the side parcel lines.
5. Minimum setbacks for development adjacent to zoning districts that allow residential uses shall be:
   i. 15 feet from the front parcel line.
   ii. 30 25 feet from the rear parcel line.
   iii. 12 feet from the side parcel lines.
B. The following uses are allowed in GC-2 zoning districts; all other uses are prohibited:
   1. All uses allowable in the GC-1 zoning district
   2. Shopping centers.
   3. Vehicle dealers and repair shops (excluding scooter rental /sales).
   4. Adult entertainment subject to the requirements of Chapter 7, Article III of the Municipal Code.
   5. Big box retailers.
   6. Printing, publishing or other similar establishments.
   8. Wholesaling, warehousing, and indoor storage of goods or materials.
   9. Public utilities with exception to solid waste facilities and landfills.
   10. Cannabis Dispensing Facilities, and
   11. Other similar uses.
C. Additional Requirements.
   1. Confine ground and building lighting to the property and without causing direct light to protrude on adjacent properties.
   2. Screen garbage receptacles, trash containers, and dumpsters from public view, using opaque materials.
   3. Provide off-street parking as specified in Chapter 108.
   4. Conform to the landscaping and buffering requirements as specified in Chapter 107.
5. Not include any residential development.

6. The exterior of building facades visible from Highway 98 or Harrison Avenue shall not be constructed of metal unless:

i. such wall is not visible by a pedestrian standing within the vehicular right-of-way of Highway 98 or Harrison Ave; or

ii. such wall is completely covered by one or more of the following materials:

- Brick
- Stone
- Stucco
- Synthetic stucco
- Cementitious materials
- Exterior insulation
- Wood siding, provided finish system that such siding is (EIFS) applied with no panel exceeding twelve (12) inches in height
- Other non-ferrous material may be permissible, if determined by the Planning Dept. as a matter of fact to be aesthetically comparable and at least as opaque, weather resistant, and permanent as the materials listed above.

Land Development Regulations:

Section 102-82(e)

Stipulates that a land use change requires the Planning Board to determine a positive finding for the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment and/or rezoning request on the following four (4) criteria:

1. Not degrade the established level of services in the Comprehensive Plan or the minimum concurrency requirements.

   This impact is de minimis, which is not subject to concurrency review.

2. In harmony with the general intent of the Comprehensive Plan. (Goals listed as applicable.)

   - The goal of the Future Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan (Goal 1A) is to establish a defined pattern of land use guiding the provisions of public facilities and providing predictability in managing development. This request fits within the general intent of this Element.

   - The goal of the Utilities Element, Sanitary Sewer Sub-Element (Goal 4A) is to provide adequate sewage capacity and collection facilities to accommodate anticipated population demand.

   - The goal of the Utilities Element, Solid Waste Sub-Element (Goal 4B) is to ensure that adequate and efficient solid waste collection is available for the City.
No level of service standards will be exceeded by this Future Land Use map amendment.

3. Not exceed traffic limitations, create a fire hazard, or a hazard to the public health, welfare and safety.

This impact is de minimis, which is not subject to concurrency review.

4. Compatible with adjacent land uses and districts, and not create a potential nuisance.

The proposed zoning district is compatible with adjacent land uses in the City. The proposed zoning designation of GC-2 is similar to the current zoning in the area.

Pursuant to Section 102-82(e):

The Planning Board shall not recommend approval of a plan amendment unless it makes a positive finding, based on competent evidence, on each of the following:

(1) The proposed plan amendment will not degrade level of service standards established in the comprehensive plan, or minimum concurrency requirements;

(2) The proposed plan amendment is in harmony with the general intent of the comprehensive plan;

(3) The proposed plan amendment will not exceed traffic limitations, cause a fire hazard, or create a hazard to public health, welfare and safety;

(4) Changes in land use designations or districts must be compatible with adjacent land uses and districts, and one that will not become a potential nuisance.

Summary of Findings:

The request will not result in any deficiencies in concurrency standards. Proposed development on the site is compatible with the development standards pertinent to the proposed Land Use and zoning designations. The request meets all requirements of the Comprehensive Plan and the Land Development Regulations.

Ms. Sittman made a motion to approve and Mr. Crosby seconded the motion.

Mr. Dubuque asked that the roll be taken, the roll was taken.

The request was approved.

Ms. Scibelli presented Request Seven:

Request Seven: Request for annexation, land use change, and rezoning of 1.6 acres from Agriculture, AG-1 to Mixed Use 3, MU-3 (Panama City), 7040 Bass Warren Rd, John Michael Forbis, owner and James Slonina, applicant.
Mr. Slonina said the property is to provide exterior storage for the owners to have room
to store their boats, RV's etc. that don't fit on 50 ft. lots.

Mr. Dubuque asked if there were any other questions?

Proposed Use of the property: The applicant has requested land use/zoning change from agricultural to
MU-3 in order to build more housing.

Directors’ Report:

Utilities Director: The City is entering into a contract with Bay County to provide water and sewer
services to the referenced properties.

Comprehensive Plan Objectives and Policies: 2

Future Land Use Element

Policy 1.1.1: The City shall regulate land use through designation of land use districts on a Future Land
Use Map. The Future Land Use Map shall be used to determine the location and extent of development
within the City consistent with conservation of natural resources, availability of public facilities and
services, and compatibility of adjacent land uses. Land Use districts depicted on the Future Land Use
Map shall be described as follows. (In the following descriptions of Future Land Use categories, density
standards shall apply to residential development and intensity standards shall apply to non-residential
development.)

Sec. 104-32. - Mixed use-3 (MU-3) zoning district.

The purpose of this zoning district is to provide areas for medium- to high-density residential
development, in combination with professional offices, educational, and low-intensity, neighborhood
commercial uses.

a) Development on parcels designated as Mixed use-3 (MU-3) on the zoning map shall:

1) Have a density no greater than twenty dwelling units to the acre.

2) Locate ingress and egress to minimize traffic impacts to adjacent neighborhoods.

3) Have a mixture of two or more uses within the same development. Such uses must be of the
following categories: residential, office, retail, civic, educational, and light industrial.

4) Provide off-street parking as specified in chapter 108.

5) Conform to the landscaping and buffering requirements as specified in chapter 107.

b) The following bulk regulations shall apply to property zoned as MU-3:

1) All structures shall have a maximum height limitation of 65 feet above base flood elevation (BFE) or
the crown of the adjacent roadway, whichever is higher.

2) The impervious surface ratio shall be no greater than 0.75 of the total parcel area.

3) The floor area ratio shall not exceed 0.75.
4) Minimum setbacks shall be:

Fifteen feet from the front parcel line.

Twenty feet from the rear parcel line.

Five feet from the side parcel lines.

Side setbacks may be decreased to 0 feet only when there is a common wall between units.

Except, minimum setbacks for properties adjacent to an R-1 or R-2 zoning district shall be:

Fifteen feet from the front parcel line.

Thirty feet from the rear parcel line.

Twelve feet from the side parcel lines.

c) The following uses are allowed in the MU-3 zoning district; all other uses are prohibited:

1. Single-family detached dwellings on individual parcels;

2. Community residential homes shall be allowed when 6 or fewer residents are located in a single-family, residential dwelling provided that such homes are not located within 1,000 feet of one another and when the location of such homes does not substantially alter the nature and character of the area. Such use must be licensed by a state agency as listed in Section 419.001(1)(b) Florida Statutes.


4. Public or noncommercial private recreation.

5. Accessory uses or structures as set forth in Chapter 104, Article IV and V.

6. Public utilities customarily found in residential areas;

7. Family day care homes pursuant to Section 125.0109, Florida Statutes;

8. Bed and Breakfast Inns;

9. Attached dwellings, up to 5 units attached.

10. Multi-family structures up to 20 dwelling units per acre. 3

11. Neighborhood-scale commercial uses, not to exceed 20,000 square feet of heated and cooled space in size per parcel. Such uses may include:

   i. Professional office and personal services.
   
   ii. Private child care or day care for children.
   
   iii. Commercial recreational facilities.
   
   iv. Grocery and convenience retail including, but not limited to, beauty parlor, barber shop, laundromat, dry cleaner, and other retail establishments meant to serve the immediate vicinity.
   
   v. Athletic clubs, dance or music studios.
vi. Food establishments without a drive-through window.

vii. Other similar uses serving the neighborhood area.

12. Uses with drive-through structural components, except for those uses associated with a restaurant business.

13. Retail business

Land Development Regulations:

Section 102-82(e)

Stipulates that a land use change requires the Planning Board to determine a positive finding for the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment and/or rezoning request on the following four (4) criteria:

1. Not degrade the established level of services in the Comprehensive Plan or the minimum concurrency requirements.

   This impact is de minimis, which is not subject to concurrency review.

2. In harmony with the general intent of the Comprehensive Plan. (Goals listed as applicable.)
   - The goal of the Future Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan (Goal 1A) is to establish a defined pattern of land use guiding the provisions of public facilities and providing predictability in managing development. This request fits within the general intent of this Element.
   - The goal of the Utilities Element, Sanitary Sewer Sub-Element (Goal 4A) is to provide adequate sewage capacity and collection facilities to accommodate anticipated population demand.
   - The goal of the Utilities Element, Solid Waste Sub-Element (Goal 4B) is to ensure that adequate and efficient solid waste collection is available for the City.
   - The goal of the Utilities Element, Potable Water Sub-Element (Goal 4D) is to provide adequate, safe and sanitary water distribution capability to accommodate existing and future demand.

   No level of service standards will be exceeded by this Future Land Use map amendment.

3. Not exceed traffic limitations, create a fire hazard, or a hazard to the public health, welfare and safety. This impact is de minimis, which is not subject to concurrency review

4. Compatible with adjacent land uses and districts, and not create a potential nuisance.

   The proposed zoning district is compatible with adjacent land uses in the City. The proposed zoning designation of MU-3 is similar to the current zoning in the area.

Pursuant to Section 102-82(e):

The Planning Board shall not recommend approval of a plan amendment unless it makes a positive finding, based on competent evidence, on each of the following:4

(1) The proposed plan amendment will not degrade level of service standards established in the comprehensive plan, or minimum concurrency requirements;
(2) The proposed plan amendment is in harmony with the general intent of the comprehensive plan;

(3) The proposed plan amendment will not exceed traffic limitations, cause a fire hazard, or create a hazard to public health, welfare and safety;

(4) Changes in land use designations or districts must be compatible with adjacent land uses and districts, and one that will not become a potential nuisance.

Summary of Findings:

The request will not result in any deficiencies in concurrency standards. Proposed development on the site is compatible with the development standards pertinent to the proposed Land Use and zoning designations. The request meets all requirements of the Comprehensive Plan and the Land Development Regulations.

Ms. Sittman made a motion to approve and Mr. Crosby seconded the motion.

Mr. Dubuque asked that the roll be taken, the roll was taken.

Ms. Scibelli presented Request Eight:

**Request Eight: Request for annexation, land use change, and rezoning of 4.131 acres from Agriculture, AG-1 and Commercial, C-3A to General Commercial 2, GC-2 (Panama City), 7731 Hwy 231, 7735 Hwy 231, 7739 Hwy 231, John Michael Forbis, owner and James Slonina, applicant.**

Mr. Dubuque asked for any questions for staff.

Mr. Slonina said these are already commercial lots.

Proposed Use of the property: The applicant has requested annexation into the City for City services and land use /zoning change from agricultural and commercial to GC-2 for commercial businesses.

Directors’ Report:

Utilities Director: The City is entering into a contract with Bay County to provide water and sewer services to the referenced properties.

Comprehensive Plan Objectives and Policies:

Future Land Use Element

Policy 1.1.1: The City shall regulate land use through designation of land use districts on a Future Land Use Map. The Future Land Use Map shall be used to determine the location and extent of development within the City consistent with conservation of natural resources, availability of public facilities and services, and compatibility of adjacent land uses. Land Use districts depicted on the Future Land Use Map shall be described as follows. (In the following descriptions of Future Land Use categories, density standards shall apply to residential development and intensity standards shall apply to non-residential development.)
Sec. 104-38. - General Commercial -2 (GC-2) zoning district.

The purpose of this zoning district is to provide areas for neighborhood commercial activity including retail sales and services, professional offices and services, and other similar land uses.

A. The following bulk regulations shall apply to property zoned as GC-2:

1. The impervious surface ratio shall be no greater than 0.90 (or 90%) of the total parcel area.
2. The floor area ratio (FAR) may not exceed 3.0 (or 300%).
3. No maximum height.
4. Minimum setbacks shall be:
   i. 15 feet from the front parcel line.
   ii. 20 feet from the rear parcel line.
   iii. 5 feet from the side parcel lines.
5. Minimum setbacks for development adjacent to zoning districts that allow residential uses shall be:
   i. 15 feet from the front parcel line.
   ii. 30 feet from the rear parcel line.
   iii. 12 feet from the side parcel lines.

B. The following uses are allowed in GC-2 zoning districts; all other uses are prohibited:

1. All uses allowable in the GC-1 zoning district
2. Shopping centers.
3. Vehicle dealers and repair shops (excluding scooter rental/sales).
4. Adult entertainment subject to the requirements of Chapter 7, Article III of the Municipal Code.
5. Big box retailers.
6. Printing, publishing or other similar establishments.
8. Wholesaling, warehousing, and indoor storage of goods or materials.
9. Public utilities with exception to solid waste facilities and landfills.
10. Cannabis Dispensing Facilities, and
11. Other similar uses.

C. Additional Requirements.

1. Confine ground and building lighting to the property and without causing direct light to protrude on adjacent properties.
2. Screen garbage receptacles, trash containers, and dumpsters from public view, using opaque materials.

3. Provide off-street parking as specified in Chapter 108.

4. Conform to the landscaping and buffering requirements as specified in Chapter 107.

5. Not include any residential development.

6. The exterior of building facades visible from Highway 98 or Harrison Avenue shall not be constructed of metal unless:
   i. such wall is not visible by a pedestrian standing within the vehicular right-of-way of Highway 98 or Harrison Ave; or
   ii. such wall is completely covered by one or more of the following materials:
      • Brick
      • Stone
      • Stucco
      • Synthetic stucco
      • Cementitious materials
      • Exterior insulation
      • Wood siding, provided finish system that such siding is (EIFS) applied with no panel exceeding twelve (12) inches in height.

      • Other non-ferrous material may be permissible, if determined by the Planning Dept. as a matter of fact to be aesthetically comparable and at least as opaque, weather resistant, and permanent as the materials listed above.

Land Development Regulations:

Section 102-82(e)

Stipulates that a land use change requires the Planning Board to determine a positive finding for the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment and/or rezoning request on the following four (4) criteria:

1. Not degrade the established level of services in the Comprehensive Plan or the minimum concurrency requirements.

This impact is de minimis, which is not subject to concurrency review.

2. In harmony with the general intent of the Comprehensive Plan. (Goals listed as applicable.)

   - The goal of the Future Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan (Goal 1A) is to establish a defined pattern of land use guiding the provisions of public facilities and providing predictability in managing development. This request fits within the general intent of this Element.
- The goal of the Utilities Element, Sanitary Sewer Sub-Element (Goal 4A) is to provide adequate sewage capacity and collection facilities to accommodate anticipated population demand.

- The goal of the Utilities Element, Solid Waste Sub-Element (Goal 4B) is to ensure that adequate and efficient solid waste collection is available for the City.

- The goal of the Utilities Element, Potable Water Sub-Element (Goal 4D) is to provide adequate, safe and sanitary water distribution capability to accommodate existing and future demand.

No level of service standards will be exceeded by this Future Land Use map amendment.

3. Not exceed traffic limitations, create a fire hazard, or a hazard to the public health, welfare and safety. This impact is de minimis, which is not subject to concurrency review.

4. Compatible with adjacent land uses and districts, and not create a potential nuisance. The proposed zoning district is compatible with adjacent land uses in the City. The proposed zoning designation of GC-2 is similar to the current zoning in the area.

Pursuant to Section 102-82(e):

The Planning Board shall not recommend approval of a plan amendment unless it makes a positive finding, based on competent evidence, on each of the following:

(1) The proposed plan amendment will not degrade level of service standards established in the comprehensive plan, or minimum concurrency requirements;

(2) The proposed plan amendment is in harmony with the general intent of the comprehensive plan;

(3) The proposed plan amendment will not exceed traffic limitations, cause a fire hazard, or create a hazard to public health, welfare and safety;

(4) Changes in land use designations or districts must be compatible with adjacent land uses and districts, and one that will not become a potential nuisance.

Summary of Findings:

The request will not result in any deficiencies in concurrency standards. Proposed development on the site is compatible with the development standards pertinent to the proposed Land Use and zoning designations. The request meets all requirements of the Comprehensive Plan and the Land Development Regulations.

Mr. Crosby made a motion to approve and Ms. Sittman seconded the motion.

The request was approved.

Mr. Dubuque asked that the roll be taken, the roll was taken.

Mr. Dubuque adjourned the meeting at 4:48.
Staff findings of consistency with the pertinent Florida Statutes, the Community Planning and Land Development Regulations (hereafter referred to as the LDRs) and the Comprehensive Plan (hereafter referred to as the Comp Plan) along with the staff recommendations are as follows:

**Request One**

**Type of Application:** Annexation/SSLUA/Rezone  
**Case Number:** PB 21-63

**Applicant/Owner:** Malcom S. and Patricia G. Murphy, owner and applicant

**Location of Property:** 2931 N Jenks Avenue

**Parcel ID Numbers:** 12989-091-000

**Background:** The applicant wishes to annex into the city to have access to city services.

**Special Treatment Zone:** Not in any special treatment zones.

**Wetlands:** N/A

**Coastal High Hazard Area / Hurricane Vulnerability Zone:** N/A

**Flood Zone:** A *(Source: 2009 FEMA maps)*

**Area of Subject Property:** 0.505 acres *(Source: Bay County Property Appraiser).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change From:</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential (Bay County)</td>
<td>Residential 1 (R-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change To:</td>
<td>Residential (Panama City)</td>
<td>Residential-1 (R-1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Current use of the property:** The property currently has a single-family residence.

**Proposed Use of the property:** The applicant will continue to use the property for single-family dwelling.

**Directors’ Report:**

**Utilities Director:** Water and sanitary sewer is available to this property.
Comprehensive Plan Objectives and Policies:

Future Land Use Element

Policy 1.1.1: The City shall regulate land use through designation of land use districts on a Future Land Use Map. The Future Land Use Map shall be used to determine the location and extent of development within the City consistent with conservation of natural resources, availability of public facilities and services, and compatibility of adjacent land uses. Land Use districts depicted on the Future Land Use Map shall be described as follows. (In the following descriptions of Future Land Use categories, density standards shall apply to residential development and intensity standards shall apply to non-residential development.)

Sec. 104-32. – Residential-1 (R-1) zoning district.

The purpose of this zoning district is to provide areas for the preservation or development of residential neighborhoods consisting of detached single-family dwelling units on individual lots.

A. The following bulk regulations shall apply to property zoned R-1:
   1. The impervious surface ratio (ISR) shall be no greater than 0.60 (or 60%) of the total parcel area.
   2. Have a density no greater than 5 dwelling units to the acre.
   3. All structures shall have a maximum height limitation of 35 feet above base flood elevation (BFE) or crown of the adjacent roadway, whichever is higher.
   4. Minimum setbacks shall be:
      i. 20 feet from the front parcel line
      ii. 25 feet from the rear parcel line
      iii. 7 feet from the side parcel lines
      iv. 20 feet from road side on corner lots
   5. Have a minimum lot size of 6,000
   6. Have a minimum lot frontage of:
      i. square or rectangular lot: 60 feet
      ii. corner: 70 feet
      iii. cul-de-sac or corner: 20 feet

B. The following uses are allowed in the R-1 zoning district; all other uses are prohibited;
   1. Single-family detached dwellings on individual parcels;
   2. Community residential homes shall be allowed when 6 or fewer residents are located in a single-family, residential dwelling provided that such homes are not located within 1,000 feet of one another and when the location of such homes does not substantially alter the nature and character of the area. Such use must be licensed by a state agency as listed in Section 419.001(1)(b) Florida Statutes.
   4. Public or noncommercial private recreation.
   5. Accessory uses or structures as set forth in Chapter 110.
   6. Public utilities customarily found in residential areas;
   7. Family day care homes pursuant to Section 125.0109, Florida Statutes
Land Development Regulations:

Section 102-82(e)

Stipulates that a land use change requires the Planning Board to determine a positive finding for the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment and/or rezoning request on the following four (4) criteria:

1. **Not degrade the established level of services in the Comprehensive Plan or the minimum concurrency requirements.**

   This impact is de minimis, which is not subject to concurrency review.

2. **In harmony with the general intent of the Comprehensive Plan. (Goals listed as applicable.)**

   The goal of the Future Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan (Goal 1A) is to establish a defined pattern of land use guiding the provisions of public facilities and providing predictability in managing development. This request fits within the general intent of this Element.

   The goal of the Utilities Element, Sanitary Sewer Sub-Element (Goal 4A) is to provide adequate sewage capacity and collection facilities to accommodate anticipated population demand.

   The goal of the Utilities Element, Solid Waste Sub-Element (Goal 4B) is to ensure that adequate and efficient solid waste collection is available for the City.

   The goal of the Utilities Element, Potable Water Sub-Element (Goal 4D) is to provide adequate, safe and sanitary water distribution capability to accommodate existing and future demand.

   No level of service standards will be exceeded by this Future Land Use map amendment.

3. **Not exceed traffic limitations, create a fire hazard, or a hazard to the public health, welfare and safety.**

   This impact is de minimis, which is not subject to concurrency review.

4. **Compatible with adjacent land uses and districts, and not create a potential nuisance.**

   The site will be used for residential buildings and will not cause a nuisance.

**Pursuant to Section 102-82(e):**

The Planning Board shall not recommend approval of a plan amendment unless it makes a positive finding, based on competent evidence, on each of the following:

1. The proposed plan amendment will not degrade level of service standards established in the comprehensive plan, or minimum concurrency requirements;
2. The proposed plan amendment is in harmony with the general intent of the comprehensive plan;
3. The proposed plan amendment will not exceed traffic limitations, cause a fire hazard, or create a hazard to the public health, welfare and safety;
4. Changes in land use designations or districts must be compatible with adjacent land uses and districts, and one that will not become a potential nuisance.
Summary of Findings:
The request will not result in any deficiencies in concurrency standards. Proposed development on the site is compatible with the development standards pertinent to the proposed Land Use and zoning designations. The request meets all requirements of the Comprehensive Plan and the Land Development Regulations.

_____________________
June 16, 2021
Jacob Fredriksson
Planner I
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Staff findings of consistency with the pertinent Florida Statutes, the Community Planning and Land Development Regulations (hereafter referred to as the LDRs) and the Comprehensive Plan (hereafter referred to as the Comp Plan) along with the staff recommendations are as follows:

**Request Two**

**Type of Application:** LSLUA/Rezone                     **Case Number:** PB 21-64

**Applicant/Owner:** Corialis LLC owner and Jon LaPlante, applicant.

**Location of Property:** 1912, 1918, 1924, and 2002 Wilson Avenue

**Parcel ID Numbers:** 14418-000-000 / 14420-000-000 / 14419-000-000 / 14417-000-000

**Background:** The applicant is requesting land use change and rezoning in order to construct a multi-family development.

**Special Treatment Zone:** N/A

**Wetlands:** 14417-000-000 +/- 20%, 14419-000-000 +/- 55%, 14420-000-000 +/- 50%, 14418-000-000 +/- 45%

**Coastal High Hazard Area / Hurricane Vulnerability Zone:** N/A

**Flood Zone:** 14417-000-000 +/- 50% in Flood Zone AE (Source: 2009 FEMA maps), 14419-000-000 +/- 65% in Flood Zone AE (Source: 2009 FEMA maps), 14420-000-000 +/- 50% in Flood Zone AE (Source: 2009 FEMA maps), 14418-000-000 +/- 50% in Flood Zone AE (Source: 2009 FEMA maps).

**Area of Subject Property:** 15 +/- acres (Source: Bay County Property Appraiser).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change From:</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Commercial</td>
<td>General Commercial -2, GC-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change To:</td>
<td>Urban Residential</td>
<td>Urban Residential 2, UR-2(Panama City)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Panama City)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Current Use of the Property:** The property is currently vacant.

**Proposed Use of the Property:** The applicant is requesting land use change and rezoning in order to construct a multi-family development.
Directors’ Report:

Utilities Director: Water is available to this property. Sewer is currently not available on Wilson Avenue

Comprehensive Plan Objectives and Policies:

Future Land Use Element

Policy 1.1.1: The City shall regulate land use through designation of land use districts on a Future Land Use Map. The Future Land Use Map shall be used to determine the location and extent of development within the City consistent with conservation of natural resources, availability of public facilities and services, and compatibility of adjacent land uses. Land Use districts depicted on the Future Land Use Map shall be described as follows. (In the following descriptions of Future Land Use categories, density standards shall apply to residential development and intensity standards shall apply to non-residential development.)

Sec. 104-30. - Urban Residential -2 (UR-2) zoning district.
The purpose of this zoning district is to provide for the efficient use of land by combining high-density residential development and neighborhood commercial uses within the same development

A. The following bulk regulations shall apply to property zoned as UR-2: the following:
   1. The impervious surface ratio (ISR) shall be no greater than 0.75 (or 75%) of the total parcel area.
   2. The floor area ratio (F.A.R.) shall be no greater than 0.75 or 75%.
   3. Have a density no greater than 30 dwelling units to the acre.
   4. Height. No structure nor any part thereof shall exceed a vertical height of 120 feet from the pre-construction ground elevation of the site to the ceiling of the highest habitable unit, plus 25 feet for roof and mechanical elevations, provided the ground floor elevation is above the base flood elevation as determined by a Florida Registered Surveyor. Where the site has various elevations, the height of the structure shall be measured from the base flood elevation of the site or the averaged site elevation, whichever is greater.
   i. Height limit exception. The height limit of 120 feet may be exceeded if certain building and construction criteria are met, if recommended by the Board of Architects and approved by the City Commission. Under no circumstances shall the height of the structure exceed 150 feet from the pre-construction ground elevation to the ceiling of the highest habitable unit, plus 25 feet for roof and mechanical elevations.
      a. Height enhancement criteria shall include the following:
         (1) 3 feet of height for every one foot of additional side lot setback.
         (2) Not to exceed 10 feet of height for each public access lane having a minimum width of 10 feet to the estuary, if applicable, plus 5 feet of height, if maintained by the developer in perpetuity and recommended by the Planning Board and approved by the City Commission.
         (3) 5 feet of height for appropriate use of low water demand plants in all required buffer or landscaped areas.
         (4) 5 feet of height for the use of drip irrigation or other low water use methods, i.e., wastewater or gray water irrigation.
         (5) 10 feet of height for projects designed so as to provide a varied skyline to provide for light and wind dynamics on adjacent properties and natural systems.
(6) Not to exceed 10 feet of height based on a combination of unusual and unique architectural features; shoulder buildings below the maximum allowable height, public amenities associated with grounds or structures having public accessibility, but only if recommended by the Planning Board and approved by the City Commission.

(7) Not to exceed 10 feet of height based on a combination of the following, but only if recommended by the Planning Board and approved by the City Commission:
   i. Donation of environmentally sensitive lands to the city, subject to a conservation easement in perpetuity;
   ii. Donation of land of known archeological or historic value to the city, subject to a conservation easement in perpetuity;
   iii. Dedication of public space; iv. Public landscaping and maintenance off site; and
   v. Saving champion or heritage trees, or green area dedication to the public.

5. Minimum setbacks.
   i. For those developments with only a residential use shall be:
      a. 15 feet from the front parcel line.
      b. 20 feet from the rear parcel line.
      c. 5 feet from the side parcel lines.
      d. Side setbacks may be decreased to 0 feet only when there is a common wall between units.
   ii. For those developments that include a nonresidential use which is adjacent to residential uses shall be:
      a. 15 feet from the front parcel line.
      b. 30 feet from the rear parcel line.
      c. 12 feet from the side parcel lines.

6. Minimum Lot Size of 3,000 square feet.

B. The following uses are allowed in UR-2 zoning district; all other uses are prohibited:
   1. Single-family detached dwellings on individual parcels;
   2. Community residential homes shall be allowed when six (6) or fewer residents are located in a single-family, residential dwelling provided that such homes are not located within 1,000 feet of another and when the location of such homes does not substantially alter the nature and character of the area. Such use must be licensed by a state agency as listed in F.S. § 419.001(1)(b).
   4. Public or non-commercial private recreation.
   5. Accessory uses or structures as set forth in chapter 104, articles IV and V.
   6. Public utilities customarily found in residential areas.
   7. Family day care homes pursuant to F.S. § 125.0109.
   8. Bed and Breakfast Inns, not to exceed six rental rooms;
   9. Attached dwellings;
   10. Multi-family structures up to 30 dwelling units per acre;
   11. Neighborhood-scale commercial uses, not to exceed 20,000 square feet of heated and cooled space in size per parcel. Such uses may include:
      i. Professional office and personal services.
      ii. Private child care or day care for children.
      iii. Commercial recreational facilities.
      iv. Grocery and convenience retail including, but not limited to, beauty parlor, barber shop, laundromat, dry cleaner, and other retail establishments meant to serve the immediate vicinity.
      v. Athletic clubs, dance or music studios.
      vi. Food establishments without a drive-through window.
      vii. Other similar uses serving the neighborhood area.

C. Additional Requirements.
   1. Provide off-street parking as specified in Chapter 108.
   2. Conform to the landscaping and buffering requirements as specified in Chapter 107.
3. No more than 15% of this zoning district, in combination with the UR-2 zoning district, may be used for neighborhood commercial uses. This analysis shall be made on a continuous basis and shall be assessed on a city-wide basis.

4. Locate ingress and egress to minimize traffic impacts to adjacent neighborhoods.

Land Development Regulations:

Section 102-82(e)

Stipulates that a land use change requires the Planning Board to determine a positive finding for the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment and/or rezoning request on the following four (4) criteria:

1. *Not degrade the established level of services in the Comprehensive Plan or the minimum concurrency requirements.*

   This impact is de minimis, which is not subject to concurrency review.

2. *In harmony with the general intent of the Comprehensive Plan. (Goals listed as applicable.)*

   The goal of the Future Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan (Goal 1A) is to establish a defined pattern of land use guiding the provisions of public facilities and providing predictability in managing development. This request fits within the general intent of this Element.

   The goal of the Utilities Element, Sanitary Sewer Sub-Element (Goal 4A) is to provide adequate sewage capacity and collection facilities to accommodate anticipated population demand.

   The goal of the Utilities Element, Solid Waste Sub-Element (Goal 4B) is to ensure that adequate and efficient solid waste collection is available for the City.

   The goal of the Utilities Element, Potable Water Sub-Element (Goal 4D) is to provide adequate, safe and sanitary water distribution capability to accommodate existing and future demand.

   No level of service standards will be exceeded by this Future Land Use map amendment.

3. *Not exceed traffic limitations, create a fire hazard, or a hazard to the public health, welfare and safety.*

   This impact is de minimis, which is not subject to concurrency review.

4. *Compatible with adjacent land uses and districts, and not create a potential nuisance.*

   The proposed Land Use amendment/zoning change is not expected to create a nuisance to nearby homeowners or businesses.

Pursuant to Section 102-82(e):
The Planning Board shall not recommend approval of a plan amendment unless it makes a positive finding, based on competent evidence, on each of the following:

(1) The proposed plan amendment will not degrade level of service standards established in the comprehensive plan, or minimum concurrency requirements;
(2) The proposed plan amendment is in harmony with the general intent of the comprehensive plan;
(3) The proposed plan amendment will not exceed traffic limitations, cause a fire hazard, or create a hazard to the public health, welfare and safety;
(4) Changes in land use designations or districts must be compatible with adjacent land uses and districts, and one that will not become a potential nuisance.

Summary of Findings:
The request will not result in any deficiencies in concurrency standards. Proposed development on the site is compatible with the development standards pertinent to the proposed Land Use and zoning designations. The request meets all requirements of the Comprehensive Plan and the Land Development Regulations.

_____________________
June 1, 2021
Tina Scibelli       Date
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Staff findings of consistency with the pertinent Florida Statutes, the Community Planning and Land Development Regulations (hereafter referred to as the LDRs) and the Comprehensive Plan (hereafter referred to as the Comp Plan) along with the staff recommendations are as follows:

Request Three

**Type of Application:** SSLUA/Rezone  
**Case Number:** PB 21-65

**Applicant/Owner:** Eric Clausen, owner and applicant

**Location of Property:** 1814 St Andrews Blvd

**Parcel ID Numbers:** 13153-000-000

**Background:** The applicant wants to rezone to allow for a business and residence on the property.

**Special Treatment Zone:** N/A

**Wetlands:** N/A

**Coastal High Hazard Area / Hurricane Vulnerability Zone:** N/A

**Flood Zone:** X (Source: 2009 FEMA maps)

**Area of Subject Property:** 1.377 acres (Source: Bay County Property Appraiser).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change From:</strong></td>
<td>General Commercial</td>
<td>General Commercial-2(GC-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change To:</strong></td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>Mixed Use-2 (MU-2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Current use of the property:** Church and parsonage.

**Proposed Use of the property:** The applicant wants to rezone to allow for a business and residence on the property.

**Directors’ Report:**

**Utilities Director:** Water is available to this property. Sewer is only available by connecting a private pump station to force main.
Comprehensive Plan Objectives and Policies:

Future Land Use Element

Policy 1.1.1: The City shall regulate land use through designation of land use districts on a Future Land Use Map. The Future Land Use Map shall be used to determine the location and extent of development within the City consistent with conservation of natural resources, availability of public facilities and services, and compatibility of adjacent land uses. Land Use districts depicted on the Future Land Use Map shall be described as follows. (In the following descriptions of Future Land Use categories, density standards shall apply to residential development and intensity standards shall apply to non-residential development.)

Sec. 104-31 - Mixed Use-2 (MU-2) zoning district

1) The purpose of this zoning district is to provide areas for medium- to high-density residential development, in combination with professional offices, educational, and low-intensity, neighborhood commercial uses. Have a density no greater than twenty dwelling units to the acre.

A. The following bulk regulations shall apply to property zoned as MU-2:

1. The impervious surface ratio (ISR) shall be no greater than 0.65 (or 65%) of the total parcel area.
2. The floor area ratio shall be not to exceed 0.65 or 65%.
3. Have a density no greater than 10 dwelling units to the acre.
4. All structures shall a maximum height limitation of 65 feet above base flood elevation (BFE) or the crown of the road whichever is higher.
5. Minimum setbacks shall be:
   i. 15 feet from the front parcel line.
   ii. 20 feet from the rear parcel line.
   iii. 5 feet from the side parcel lines.
   iv. Side setbacks may be decreased to 0 feet only when there is a common wall between units.
6. Properties adjacent to an R-1 or R-2 zoning district shall be setback a minimum of:
   i. 15 feet from the front parcel line.
   ii. 30 feet from the rear parcel line.
   iii. 12 feet from the side parcel lines.

B. The following uses are allowed in the MU-2 zoning district; all other uses are prohibited:
1. Single-family detached dwellings on individual parcels;
2. Community residential homes shall be allowed when 6 or fewer residents are located in a single-family, residential dwelling provided that such homes are not located within 1,000 feet of one another and when the location of such homes does not substantially alter the nature and character of the area. Such use must be licensed by a state agency as listed in Section 419.001(1)(b) Florida Statutes.
4. Public or noncommercial private recreation.
5. Accessory uses or structures as set forth in Chapter 104, Article IV and V.
6. Public utilities customarily found in residential areas;
7. Family day care homes pursuant to Section 125.0109, Florida Statutes;
8. Bed and Breakfast Inns;
9. Attached dwellings, up to 4 units attached.
10. Multi-family structures up to 15 dwelling units per acre.
11. Neighborhood-scale commercial uses, not to exceed 20,000 square feet of heated and cooled space in size per parcel. Such uses may include:
   i. Professional office and personal services.
   ii. Private child care or day care for children.
   iii. Commercial recreational facilities.
   iv. Grocery and convenience retail including, but not limited to, beauty parlor, barber shop, laundromat, dry cleaner, and other retail establishments meant to serve the immediate vicinity.
   v. Athletic clubs, dance or music studios.
   vi. Food establishments without a drive-through window.
   vii. Other similar uses serving the neighborhood area.
12. Uses with drive-through structural components, except for those uses associated with a restaurant business.
13. Retail business.
C. Additional Requirements:
1. No more than 70% of this zoning district, in combination with the MU-3 zoning districts, may be used for commercial, and 50% for low density residential uses. This analysis shall be made on a continuous basis and shall be assessed district wide. Individual projects that contain a mix of two or more uses shall be exempt from the percentages.
2. Locate ingress and egress to minimize traffic impacts to adjacent neighborhoods.
3. Provide off-street parking, as specified in Chapter 108.
4. Conform to the landscaping and buffer requirements as specified in Chapter 107.

Land Development Regulations:

Section 102-82(e)

Stipulates that a land use change requires the Planning Board to determine a positive finding for the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment and/or rezoning request on the following four (4) criteria:

1. Not degrade the established level of services in the Comprehensive Plan or the minimum concurrency requirements.
   
   This impact is de minimis, which is not subject to concurrency review.

2. In harmony with the general intent of the Comprehensive Plan. (Goals listed as applicable.)

   The goal of the Future Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan (Goal 1A) is to establish a defined pattern of land use guiding the provisions of public facilities and providing predictability in managing development. This request fits within the general intent of this Element.

   The goal of the Utilities Element, Sanitary Sewer Sub-Element (Goal 4A) is to provide adequate sewage capacity and collection facilities to accommodate anticipated population demand.
The goal of the Utilities Element, Solid Waste Sub-Element (Goal 4B) is to ensure that adequate and efficient solid waste collection is available for the City.

The goal of the Utilities Element, Potable Water Sub-Element (Goal 4D) is to provide adequate, safe and sanitary water distribution capability to accommodate existing and future demand.

No level of service standards will be exceeded by this Future Land Use map amendment.

3. Not exceed traffic limitations, create a fire hazard, or a hazard to the public health, welfare and safety.

This impact is de minimis, which is not subject to concurrency review

4. Compatible with adjacent land uses and districts, and not create a potential nuisance.

The site is located adjacent to other residential, mixed use, and commercial zoned properties and the proposed Land Use amendment/zoning change is not expected to create a nuisance to nearby homeowners.

Pursuant to Section 102-82(e):

The Planning Board shall not recommend approval of a plan amendment unless it makes a positive finding, based on competent evidence, on each of the following:

(1) The proposed plan amendment will not degrade level of service standards established in the comprehensive plan, or minimum concurrency requirements;
(2) The proposed plan amendment is in harmony with the general intent of the comprehensive plan;
(3) The proposed plan amendment will not exceed traffic limitations, cause a fire hazard, or create a hazard to the public health, welfare and safety;
(4) Changes in land use designations or districts must be compatible with adjacent land uses and districts, and one that will not become a potential nuisance.

Summary of Findings:
The request will not result in any deficiencies in concurrency standards. Proposed development on the site is compatible with the development standards pertinent to the proposed Land Use and zoning designations. The request meets all requirements of the Comprehensive Plan and the Land Development Regulations.

_____________________
Tina Scibelli
Planner II
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Staff findings of consistency with the pertinent Florida Statutes, the Community Planning and Land Development Regulations (hereafter referred to as the LDRs) and the Comprehensive Plan (hereafter referred to as the Comp Plan) along with the staff recommendations are as follows:

**Agenda Item Four**

**Type of Application:** Creation of 3 new zoning districts

**Case Number:** PB 21-66

**Applicant/Owner:** City of Panama City

**Background:** The purpose of these zoning districts is to update zoning with the new neighborhood plans for St. Andrews, Millville, and Glenwood.

**Summary of Findings:**
The proposed language includes definitions, 3 new zoning districts, proposed signage for the downtown neighborhood districts, proposed design best practices, UDLC appendixes related to design best practices (masonry detailing, roofs and parapets. Frontage encroachments and lighting guidelines.

June 28, 2021

Tina Scibelli
Planner II
Add to **Definitions Sec 116-3** (to define Missing Middle housing types):

**Cottage Court**: A series of small, detached structures on a common lot providing multiple units arranged to define a shared court that is typically perpendicular to the street. The shared court takes the place of a private rear yard and becomes an important community-enhancing element.

**Courtyard Apartment**: A medium-sized structure that consists of multiple dwelling units accessed from a courtyard or series of courtyards. Each unit may have its own individual entry, or may share a common entry. The Courtyard Apartment is appropriately scaled to fit within Neighborhood Downtown or General areas and other similar walkable neighborhood districts.

**Live/Work Unit**: A mixed-use residential unit that is allowed to house a flexible combination of limited commercial functions and the primary residential function. The commercial function may be anywhere in the unit. It is intended to be occupied by a business operator or employee who lives in the same structure that contains the commercial activity or industry.

**Multi-plex: Small**: A medium-sized structure that typically consists of 3 to 6 side-by-side and/or stacked dwelling units typically with one shared entry or individual entries along the front. The Small Multi-plex has the appearance of a medium-sized family home and is appropriately scaled to fit within Neighborhood General and similar walkable neighborhood districts.

**Multi-plex: Large**: A medium-to large-sized structure that typically consists of 7 to 18 side-by-side and/or stacked dwelling units, typically with one shared entry. The Large Multi-plex is appropriately scaled to fit within Neighborhood Downtown areas, and other similar walkable neighborhood districts.

**Rowhouse**: A small-to medium sized attached structure that consists of 2 to 8 dwelling units placed side-by-side on either a single lot or individual lots. This type is typically located within Neighborhood Downtown or General areas, or other similar walkable neighborhood districts.
The purpose of this zoning district is to provide areas for the preservation and development of active and walkable neighborhood downtown areas within the city. These standards implement key provisions of the Strategic Vision established as part of the City’s Long Term Recovery Plan.

Neighborhood Downtown areas includes a mix of commercial, civic, and residential uses. Buildings may be attached or detached, and are typically built on or near the front property line to encourage pedestrian activity. Missing Middle housing types typical for this district include Duplex, Small Multi-plex, Cottage Court, Courtyard Apartment, Row-house, and Large Multi-Plex.

The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) has adopted a context classification system to plan and design streets in greater harmony with the surrounding land use characteristics. Streets that pass through Neighborhood Downtown areas should have a C5 (Urban Center) classification.

A. The following bulk regulations shall apply to property zoned Neighborhood Downtown (ND):

1. The impervious surface ratio (ISR) shall be no greater than 1.0 (or 100%) of the total parcel area.

2. The maximum building footprint per building shall be 25,000 square feet. An exception is made for civic uses including houses of worship and schools. Grocery stores may exceed this limit, with approval of the Development Services Director.

3. The maximum building frontage per building shall be 120 feet.

4. Height: All structures shall have a maximum height limitation of 4 stories plus an attic story.
   i. Building Heights shall exclude habitable attics and below grade parking.
   ii. Stories may not exceed 12 feet in height from finished floor to finished ceiling, except for a first floor commercial function which may be a maximum of 25 feet.
   iii. Heights shall be measured to the eave of the roof or roof deck (if flat).
   iv. The first finished floor in residential buildings shall be raised a minimum of 24" above the highest adjacent sidewalk grade.

### TABLE 104-X: Neighborhood Downtown Setbacks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Location</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front and Side/Street</td>
<td>0' min / 10' max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side/Mid-Block and</td>
<td>0' min / no max.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Setbacks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontage Occupancy</td>
<td>80% minimum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 104-X: Neighborhood Downtown Parking Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uses</th>
<th>Residential Uses</th>
<th>Non-Residential Uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 space per unit minimum / 3 spaces per unit maximum</td>
<td>1 space per 800 sq ft GFA minimum / 1 space per 300 sq ft GFA maximum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parking Exceptions:

1. All applications (for new development or building reuse) within the Neighborhood Downtown district that meet all standards of this district, including for building and parking location (Table 104-X) and building design (Sec 105-XX), shall be exempt from minimum parking requirements.
2. Exceptions to the maximum parking limits may be granted by the City Commission.
Sec. 104-3X. - Neighborhood Downtown (ND) zoning district.

5. Setbacks:
   i. Setbacks are summarized in Table 104-X.
   ii. There are no minimum setback requirements. The maximum setback from all public ROWs will be 10 feet unless subject to a Building Setback Zone identified on the zoning map. A Building Setback Zone on a corner lot shall apply at least 50 feet from the block corner.
   iii. Parking shall be setback 25 feet from all public ROWs with the exception of alleys. The parking setback may be reduced to 8 feet in locations at least 25 feet from a block corner where a garden wall or decorative fence is provided and street trees are planted at 30 ft centers along the length of the parking area between the parking and garden wall or decorative fence.
   iv. The Frontage Occupancy is the percentage of the total lot frontage width that is occupied by the primary building facade. A garden wall that meets the requirements of Sec. 105-XX may be used to meet this requirement with approval of the Development Services Director.
   v. All Neighborhood Downtown lots are subject to a 20' rear or side setback when sharing a common rear or side lot line with a property within a Neighborhood Residential (NR) district and require screening of a garden wall or solid fence four to eight feet in height within one foot of the common lot line. Trees from the city's approved tree list shall be planted at a maximum of 30 ft centers between 5 and 10 feet from this wall.

6. There are no minimum lot size requirements.

B. The following uses are allowed in the Neighborhood Downtown (ND) zoning district. All other uses are prohibited:
   1. All uses allowed in the Neighborhood General (NG) zoning district;
   2. Hospitals, medical offices, clinics, etc.
   3. Temporary commercial uses, including food trucks, pop-up retail, and similar uses.

C. Additional Requirements.
   1. Development shall conform to the Building Design Standards of Sec 105-XX,

2. Administrative Exceptions: The Development Services Director shall have authority to grant exceptions to certain specific standards of the ND zoning district as follows:
   i. The Setback and Frontage Occupancy requirements of Sec. 104-3X.A may be waived where development envisioned by the code is not feasible due to irregularly-shaped parcels or environmental constraints (such as flood plain or wetland areas, or existing trees); for building reuse where requirements are incompatible with the existing structure; or for civic uses including schools and houses of worship.
   ii. The Maximum Front Setback of Sec. 104-3X.A may be increased to allow for a new public green or plaza in front of the building facade.

2. Parking shall be provided as described in Table 104-X.

3. No landscape buffers are required in the Neighborhood Downtown zoning district, except where abutting a detached Single Family Dwelling. Streetscape plantings have a higher priority in the neighborhood districts than private landscaping. They provide a public benefit by establishing an environment that encourages and facilitates pedestrian activity and walkable streets that are comfortable, efficient, safe, and interesting; and they contribute to the overall neighborhood character by ensuring the coherence of the public realm. Fee-in-lieu payments for landscape requirements can be used to implement a comprehensive streetscape plan at the time of street rebuilding.

4. Credit shall be applied for existing impervious surface; provided the new development is built over the existing impervious surface. However, new development exceeding these areas or building in a different location on the property will be subject to the City’s stormwater requirements.

5. Ground and building lighting shall be confined to the property without causing direct light to protrude on adjacent properties.

6. Setbacks for visibility / sight triangle at intersections are not required in Neighborhood Downtown areas in order to encourage low travel speed and a walkable urban environment.
The purpose of this zoning district is to provide areas for the preservation and development of historic, traditional, and walkable mixed-use neighborhoods and corridors within the city. These standards implement key provisions of the Strategic Vision established as part of the City’s Long Term Recovery Plan.

Neighborhood General areas includes a mix of commercial, civic, and residential uses. Buildings are typically built on or near the front property line to encourage pedestrian activity. Missing Middle housing types typical for this district include Duplexes, Small Multi-plex, Cottage Courts, Courtyard Apartments, and Rowhouses.

The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) has adopted a context classification system to plan and design streets in greater harmony with the surrounding land use characteristics. Streets that pass through Neighborhood General areas should have a C4 (Urban General) classification.

A. The following bulk regulations shall apply to property zoned Neighborhood General (NG):

1. The impervious surface ratio (ISR) shall be no greater than 0.80 (or 80%) of the total parcel area.

2. The maximum building footprint per building shall be 10,000 sq ft. An exception is made for civic uses including houses of worship and schools. Grocery stores may exceed this limit, with approval of the Development Services Director.

3. The maximum building frontage per building shall be 80 feet.

3. Height: All structures shall have a maximum height limitation of 3 stories plus an attic story.
   i. Building Heights shall exclude habitable attics and below grade parking.
   ii. Stories may not exceed 12 feet in height from finished floor to finished ceiling.
   iii. Heights shall be measured to the eave of the roof or roof deck (if flat).
   iv. The first finished floor in residential buildings shall be raised a minimum of 24” above the highest adjacent sidewalk grade.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 104-X: Neighborhood General Setbacks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front and Side/Street Setbacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side/Mid-Block and Rear/Alley Setback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear/No Alley Setback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontage Occupancy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 104-X: Neighborhood General Parking Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 space per unit minimum / 3 spaces per unit maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential Uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 space per 800 sq ft GFA minimum / 1 space per 300 sq ft GFA maximum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parking Exceptions:
1. All applications (for new development or building reuse) within the Neighborhood General district that meet all standards of this district, including for building and parking location (Table 104-X) and building design (Sec 105-XX), shall be exempt from minimum parking requirements.
2. Exceptions to the maximum parking limits may be granted by the City Commission.

4. Setbacks:
   i. Setbacks are summarized in Table 104-X.
   ii. Side setbacks may be 0 feet for attached Rowhouse units.
   iii. Parking shall be setback 25 feet from all public ROWs with the exception of alleys. The parking setback may be reduced to 8 feet in locations at least 50 feet from a block corner where a garden wall or decorative fence is provided and street trees are planted at 30 ft centers along the length of the parking area between the parking and garden wall or decorative fence.
iv. The Frontage Occupancy is the percentage of the total lot frontage width that is occupied by the primary building facade. A garden wall that meets the requirements of Sec. 105-XX may be used to meet this requirement with approval of the Development Services Director.

5. There are no minimum lot size requirements.

B. The following uses are allowed in the Neighborhood General (NG) zoning district. All other uses are prohibited:

1. All uses allowed in the Neighborhood Residential (NR) zoning district, and:

2. Residential uses including single-family attached and detached dwellings, and multi-family units. Dwelling units may be located in mixed-use structures with commercial or other non-household living uses.

3. Live/work units.

4. Civic/Institutional uses including educational, healthcare, and religious uses.

5. Commercial office, retail, and entertainment uses.

6. Temporary Open Air Retail.

7. Hotels, Inns, and Bed and Breakfasts.

8. Small-scale manufacturing (all non-retail activities, such as storage, shall not be visible from the street).

9. Grocers, Restaurants (no drive-thru), Bars, and Breweries.


C. Additional Requirements.

1. Development shall conform to the building design standards of Sec 105-XX.

2. Administrative Exceptions: The Development Services Director shall have authority to grant exceptions to certain specific standards of the NG zoning district as follows:

i. The Setback and Frontage Occupancy requirements of Sec. 104-3X.A may be waived where development envisioned by the code is not feasible due to irregularly-shaped parcels or environmental constraints (such as flood plain or wetland areas, or existing trees) for building reuse where requirements are incompatible with the existing structure, or for civic uses including schools and houses of worship.

ii. The Maximum Front Setback of Sec. 104-3X.A may be increased to allow for a new public green or plaza in front of the building facade.

3. Parking shall be provided as described in Table 104-X.

4. No landscape buffers are required in the Neighborhood Downtown zoning district, except where abutting a detached Single Family Dwelling. Streetscape plantings have a higher priority in the neighborhood districts than private landscaping. They provide a public benefit by establishing an environment that encourages pedestrian activity and walkable streets that are comfortable, safe, and interesting; and contribute to the neighborhood character by ensuring the coherence of the public realm. Fee-in-lieu payments for landscape requirements can be used to implement a comprehensive streetscape plan at the time of street rebuilding.

5. Credit shall be applied for existing impervious surface; provided the new development is built over the existing impervious surface. However, new development exceeding these areas or building in a different location on the property will be subject to the City’s stormwater requirements.
The purpose of this zoning district is to provide areas for the preservation or development of the historic, traditional, and walkable neighborhoods of the city that include single-family detached and some Missing Middle housing. Missing Middle housing types typical for this district include Duplexes and Cottage Courts. These standards implement key provisions of the Strategic Vision established as part of the City’s Long Term Recovery Plan.

The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) has adopted a context classification system to plan and design streets in greater harmony with the surrounding land use characteristics. Streets that pass through Neighborhood Residential areas should have a C4 (Urban General) classification.

A. The following bulk regulations shall apply to property zoned Neighborhood Residential (NR):

1. The impervious surface ratio (ISR) shall be no greater than 0.60 (or 60%) of the total parcel area.

2. The maximum building footprint per building shall be 4,000 square feet. An exception is made for civic uses including houses of worship and schools.

3. Height: All structures shall have a maximum height limitation of 2 stories plus an attic story.
   i. Building Heights shall exclude habitable attics and below grade parking.
   ii. Stories may not exceed 12 feet in height from finished floor to finished ceiling.
   iii. Heights shall be measured to the eave of the roof or roof deck (if flat).
   iv. The first finished floor in residential buildings shall be raised a minimum of 24” above the highest adjacent sidewalk grade.

4. Setbacks:
   i. Setbacks shall be as summarized in Table 104-X.
   ii. Porches may extend up to 10 feet into setbacks provided they are at least 8 feet deep. Partial walls, screened areas, and railing on porches that extend into the setback may be no higher than 42 inches.

5. Minimum lot requirements:
   i. Minimum lot width of 40’ for square, rectangle, and corner lots.
   ii. There is no minimum lot size requirement.

| TABLE 104-X: Neighborhood Residential Setbacks |
| Building Location | Front and Side/Street Setbacks | 7’ min / 20’ max |
|                   | Side/Mid-Block                 | 5’ min / no max |
|                   | Rear Setback (primary building)| 15’ min / no max |
|                   | Rear/Side Setback (accessory building) | 3’ min / no max |
B. The following uses are allowed in the Neighborhood Residential (NR) zoning district. All other uses are prohibited:

2. Duplexes; up to 2 units attached.
3. Cottage Courts that meet the following conditions:
   i. Maximum cottage footprint of 800 square feet per building.
   ii. Maximum cottage height of one story plus an attic story.
   iii. The central court shall be a green space not more than 1/3rd paved, and at least 20’ in width (parallel to the street) and 40’ in depth (perpendicular to the street).
4. One Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) is allowed per lot.
5. Community residential homes shall be allowed when 6 or fewer residents are located in a single-family, residential dwelling provided that such homes are not located within 1,000 ft of one another and when the location of such homes does not substantially alter the nature and character of the area. Such use must be licensed by a state agency as listed in Section 419.001(1)(b) Florida Statutes.
7. Public or noncommercial private recreation.
8. Accessory uses or structures as set forth in Chapter 110.
9. Public utilities customarily found in residential areas.
10. Family day care homes pursuant to Section 125.0109, Florida Statutes.
11. Neighborhood Corner Stores are permitted with the following conditions:
   i. Neighborhood Corner Stores can be either a primary or accessory small-scale neighborhood-oriented commercial use such as a café, barber, salon, professional office, or convenience retail.
   ii. Neighborhood Corner Stores shall be allowed only on corner lots. No more than one corner store is allowed at an intersection.
iii. The maximum setback for a Neighborhood Corner Store is 10 feet from both streets with a minimum setback of 5 feet.
iv. Neighborhood Corner Store buildings are subject to Design Standards as specified in Sec 105-XX.
v. Off-street parking for a Neighborhood Corner Store is discouraged as they are intended to serve the needs of the surrounding neighborhood within walking distance; no minimum parking spaces are required. If off-street parking is provided, the Parking Setback requirements of the Neighborhood General district shall apply.

C. Additional Requirements.

1. Administrative Exceptions: The Development Services Director shall have authority to grant exceptions to certain specific standards of the NR zoning district as follows:
   i. The Setback and Frontage Occupancy requirements of Sec. 104-3X.A may be waived where development envisioned by the code is not feasible due to irregularly-shaped parcels or environmental constraints (such as flood plain, wetland areas, or existing trees); for building reuse where requirements are incompatible with the existing structure; or for civic uses including schools and houses of worship.
2. Parking shall be provided as specified in Chapter 108.
3. Development shall conform to the landscaping and buffering requirements as specified in Chapter 107.
III | BUILDING DESIGN STANDARDS

Sec. 105-XX. – Neighborhood Building Design Standards.

A. Purpose. The purpose of the Neighborhood Building Design Standards is to shape future development in walkable, mixed-use districts. These standards implement key provisions of the Strategic Vision established as part of the City’s Long Term Recovery Plan. The standards shall apply to the Neighborhood Downtown (ND) and Neighborhood General (NG) districts.

A. Building Facades

1. Fenestration. All building facades which face onto a street or public space shall meet the minimum fenestration requirements outlined below. The percentage of fenestration per story shall be calculated within the area between finished floor and finished ceiling and shall be a total percentage of doors and windows along that portion of the facade.
   i. Minimum building facade fenestration for ground story (retail use): sixty (60) percent
   ii. Minimum building facade fenestration for ground story (uses other than retail): thirty (30) percent
   iii. Minimum building facade fenestration for upper stories: twenty (20) percent

2. Centerlines. Centerlines serve to organize facade components.
   i. Structural centerlines are vertical lines not interrupted by fenestration. Facades shall feature alternating structural centerlines and fenestration centerlines.
   ii. These centerlines shall extend from the top of a mass to the bottom of a mass.
   iii. Multiple windows and/or doors may be grouped symmetrically around a single fenestration centerline.
   iv. The spacing of centerlines may be identical across a facade, or may vary.
   v. Each facade should be organized into a symmetrical rhythm of facade components grouped in vertical modules. Various patterns may be used, even identical modules.

3. Base, Body and Cap. These elements communicate height to the pedestrian. Expression lines can be used to distinguish between each component.
i. Expression Lines shall either be moldings extending a minimum of two inches, or jogs in the surface plane of the building wall greater than two (2) inches.

ii. An expression line may be used to delineate the base of the facade. An expression line shall be used at the top of shopfronts, which may incorporate a band for signage. For buildings three (3) stories or greater, the ground floor shall be differentiated from those floors above by an expression line in order to reinforce the pedestrian realm.

iii. The top of each building shall be emphasized with a projecting cornice. This cornice shall feature a deeper projection, and therefore stronger shadow line, than any other expression line on a facade.

iv. Facades may feature a change of colors, materials or textures at an expression line. Buildings should incorporate heavier materials (such as stone or masonry) in the base, below lighter materials (such as siding).

4. Liner Buildings. The character of some uses of land, such as parking structures or grocery stores, may preclude buildings from complying with the Building Facade requirements. Such buildings may be constructed in a manner that they are separated from adjacent streets (but not alleys) by liner buildings that meet the Building Facade requirements in the preceding subsection.

i. Liner buildings shall be at least two stories in height and fifteen (15) feet in depth;

ii. Liner buildings may be detached from or attached to the primary building;

iii. Liner buildings may be used for any purpose allowed on the lot on which they are located except for parking.

B. Building Wall Materials.

1. Permitted building wall materials include brick, stone or precast stone, stucco, horizontal lap siding (of wood, cementitious, or composition board, such as HardiPlank®), and pre-engineered metal and glass systems (for windows, doors, and shopfront conditions).

2. Other siding materials (which may include metal or cementitious panels for ornamentation) shall not be used as a primary building wall material.

3. Vinyl and aluminum siding are not permitted.

4. In Neighborhood Downtown areas, the above building wall material standards apply to primary and accessory buildings.

C. Garden Walls and Fences. A garden wall is a wall that defines the frontage line and/or the perimeter of a property. All garden walls or fences along property lines at public rights-of-way shall be a maximum of four (4) feet in height, and shall be constructed of brick, stone, masonry faced with stucco, wood, or metal. Chain link fences (or other rolled fencing) along public rights-of-way are not permitted.

D. Exceptions. Exceptions to the standards of Sec. 105-XX may be granted by the Development Services Director on the basis of architectural merit or where the requirements create undue hardship, such as for building reuse or additions in which required elements are incompatible with the existing structure.
V | PROPOSED SIGNAGE STANDARDS

Sec. 112-11-F. Permitted signs in the Downtown and Neighborhood Districts.

The following sign standards shall apply to commercial uses in Downtown, Neighborhood Downtown, and Neighborhood General districts. Signs not identified within this section are prohibited.

A. General Requirements.

1. The maximum total signage area allocated for each building shall be two square feet (2 sq. ft.) per linear foot of street facing building facade along a street frontage.

2. Buildings with a rear public entrance are allowed one flat wall sign to not exceed sixty square feet (60 sq. ft.) to be placed at the rear entrance.

3. Signs shall not obscure architectural details of the building.

4. Materials. All permanent, on-premises signs maybe be constructed of a rigid, weatherable material such as wood (painted or natural); metal (copper, brass, aluminum, galvanized steel); painted / engraved directly on facade surface; glass; or hard plastic. Canvas may be used for awning material. Vinyl may be used for windows signs.

5. Exceptions to the regulations of this section for civic or institutional uses may be permitted by the Development Services Director.

6. Exuberant or creative signage that does not fit the specific regulations of this section may be considered by the Development Services Director, based on its merits, as it relates to the unique architectural qualities of a building, a building’s historical significance, civic prominence, or unique configuration of existing conditions of a building, and the quality of design, construction, and durability of the sign.

7. Lighting and Illumination.

   i. Signs shall be externally lit from the front. Back lighting is permitted as an exception only for individual letters or numbers (panelized back lighting is prohibited).

   ii. External light sources used to illuminate signs shall be placed close to, and directed onto the sign, and shielded to minimize glare onto adjacent properties.

   iii. Neon may be used for lettering or as an accent.
### Awning Signs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Width (max)</th>
<th>75% of awning valence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>1 per shopfront</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i. Description: An awning sign is a type of building sign where graphics and symbols are painted, sewn, or otherwise adhered to the awning material as an integrated part of the awning itself.
ii. A maximum of one sign is allowed per shopfront and the area must not cover more than 75% of the awning valence.
iii. An awning sign may only be externally illuminated.

### Canopy Signs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thickness (max)</th>
<th>9 in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Height (max)</td>
<td>2 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width (max)</td>
<td>75% of canopy width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>1 per shopfront</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i. Description: A canopy sign is a type of building sign that is attached above, below, or to the face of a canopy.
ii. Canopy signs are limited to a maximum one sign per canopy face.
iii. Signs must not extend outside the length or width of the canopy and must not cover more than 75% of the canopy length or width.
iv. Depth of canopy signs must not exceed nine inches (9”).
v. Exposed raceways must not extend above height of letters.
vi. Cabinet signs are not permitted on canopy signs.

### Window Signs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area (max)</th>
<th>25% of window area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>1 per window</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i. Description: A sign intended to be painted on, applied to, or displayed in, a storefront window or door area.
ii. One window sign is permitted per shopfront.
iii. A maximum of twenty-five percent (25%) of a window can be used for window signs.

### Sidewalk Signs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area (max)</th>
<th>8 sf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Height (max)</td>
<td>4 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>1 per shopfront</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i. Description: Temporary sidewalk signs, such as A-frame sandwich boards, are signs placed within the public sidewalk displayed by retailers, restaurants, and cafes to advertise food or products sold within a business.
ii. Sidewalk Signs shall be no larger than eight square feet (8 sf) per face and four feet (4 ft.) in height.
iii. Sidewalk Signs shall be of quality design, materials and workmanship both to ensure the safety and convenience of users, and to enhance the visual and aesthetic quality of the urban environment.
iv. Sidewalk Signs are permitted on the public sidewalk adjacent to a business, must maintain a clear sidewalk path of a minimum dimension of five feet (5 ft.), and must be removed from the sidewalk when the establishment is closed for business.
v. The number of signs shall be limited to one per sidewalk per street-level business frontage.
vi. Sidewalk Signs shall not be placed within three feet (3 ft.) of an adjacent property line.
B. Sign Type Specifications.

### Wall Signs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area (max)</th>
<th>60 sf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thickness (max)</td>
<td>9 in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>1 per shopfront</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i. **Description.** A wall sign is a building sign that is attached flat to, mounted away from but parallel to, or painted on the building facade.

ii. One wall sign is permitted per each street-facing building frontage.

iii. Wall signs shall either be located above the storefront or at least twelve inches (12") from any eave, edge of building, or top of parapet.

iv. Wall signs must not project more than nine inches (9") from the building face.

v. Wall signs that are painted on the wall surface are eligible for a 200% bonus in area with approval of the Development Services Director.

### Projecting and Blade Signs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area (max)</th>
<th>12 sf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thickness (max)</td>
<td>18 in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (max)</td>
<td>6 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width (max)</td>
<td>5 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>1 per shopfront</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i. **Description.** A projecting sign is a type of building sign that projects outward from the facade, typically at a ninety-degree angle. Projecting signs are typically, but not always, vertically oriented, attached at two points, and generally mounted above the first floor. A blade sign is a type of sign mounted on a building facade, typically affixed at one point, and projected perpendicular to the normal flow of pedestrian traffic.

ii. Only one projecting sign up to twelve square feet (12 sf) is permitted per street-facing building front. Projecting signs mounted at the corner count for both street frontage/building elevations.

iii. Multiple projecting signs or blade signs of six square feet (6 sf) or less are permitted on one building side, but must be located below the second story windowsill.

iv. Maximum distance from building wall must not exceed one foot and six inches (1'-6").

v. Projecting signs shall not extend more than six feet (6 ft.) from the building wall and within two feet of the curb line.

vi. Maximum height of projecting sign shall be no greater than six feet (6 ft.) and extend no more than four feet (4 ft.) above eave or parapet of building.

vii. Signs must be stabilized so as not to swing. Signs must have a minimum clearance from the sidewalk of eight feet (8 ft.).

### Hanging Signs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area (max)</th>
<th>6 sf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thickness (max)</td>
<td>6 in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (max)</td>
<td>3 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width (max)</td>
<td>4 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>1 per shopfront</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i. **Description.** A hanging sign is typically attached to the underside of a soffit or awning, or projects outward, typically at a ninety-degree angle, and hangs from a bracket or support that is located over or near a building entrance.

ii. One sign per shopfront allowed.

iii. Signs shall not exceed six square feet (6 sf) in area and shall have an eight foot (8 ft.) minimum clearance from the sidewalk.

iv. Hanging signs cannot exceed four feet (4 ft.) in width and six inches (6 in.) in thickness.

v. Hanging signs should be mounted so that they do not swing.
Shopfront Design

These shopfront design best practices should apply to new or improved shopfronts in the neighborhood districts; the intent is to provide active building facades and support the pedestrian experience.

1. The top of all shopfront window sills should be between one (1) and three (3) feet above the adjacent sidewalk.
2. Shopfront windows should extend up from the sill at least eight (8) feet above the adjacent sidewalk.
3. Shopfronts should have a cornice or expression line above, between the first and second story.
4. Shopfront windows should not be made opaque by window treatments (excepting operable sunscreen devices within the conditioned space). Reflective and frosted glass should not be used on shopfronts.
5. Shopfront doors should contain at least sixty (60) percent transparent glass. Solid doors are discouraged.
6. A minimum of fifteen (15) feet of depth of habitable space should be provided behind each shopfront on the primary facade. This ensures that the area behind shopfronts is sufficient enough to be an actively used retail space.

Shopfronts in Panama City

Anatomy of a shopfront

CORNICE
Window Hoods/ Lintels
UPPER FACADE
Masonry Pier
EXPRESSION LINE
Transom
STOREFRONT
Display Window
Bulkhead
Masonry Detailing

These masonry detailing best practices should apply to the facades and building walls of all structures which are faced with brick masonry, stone, or cast stone.

1. **Headers**: A header is the horizontal member (or assembly of members) visibly spanning the top of an opening.
   - All openings in masonry construction should be spanned by a header. Permitted header forms should be the lintel, arch, and jack arch.
   - Headers may be composed of more ornate moldings or pediments. The header should visually appear able to carry the wall load above.
   - Headers may be comprised of a variety of materials, including: brick, stone, cast stone, cast concrete, wood, and metal.
   - All headers on a building should be of a matching style and material.
   - Headers should be wider than the opening they span.

2. **Sill**: A sill is the horizontal member (or assembly of members) at the base of a window or door opening.
   - All window and door openings in masonry construction should have a sill at their base.
   - Sills should be generally rectangular in form, and slope slightly away from the opening to shed water.
   - Sills may be comprised of a variety of materials. Permitted materials include: brick, stone, cast stone, and concrete.
   - All sills on a building should be of a matching style and material.
   - Sills should be a minimum of two (2) inches in height and should project from the wall surface a minimum of one half (1/2) inch.
   - Sills should be slightly wider than the opening.

3. **Cap**: A cap is the protective top layer of a masonry structure exposed to weather from above, such as a wall, parapet, or chimney.
   - A cap should protect the tops of all masonry structures exposed to the weather including: garden walls, stair treads, planter edges, parapets, and freestanding piers.
   - Caps should be comprised of stone, cast stone, brick, concrete, or slate.
   - The edges of caps may be rectangular, or may be more ornate.
   - Caps should project past the edge of the masonry structure below by a minimum of one half (1/2) inch.
Roofs and Parapets

1. Roofs should feature the following configurations:
   - Gabled
   - Hipped
   - Flat / Shed

2. Gabled and hipped roofs may either rise from a projecting cornice, or from behind a parapet. Visible gabled roof ends should be symmetrically pitched. Flat / Shed roofs should always be concealed behind a parapet.

3. The profile of parapets may be sculpted, with additional vertical emphasis corresponding to a prominent facade fenestration centerline.

4. A taller portion of a sculpted parapet may incorporate a signage panel.

5. All mechanical equipment placed on the roof should be set back from the roof line by a distance at least equivalent to the height of the screening in order to minimize visibility from surrounding streets.
Frontage Encroachments

The frontage elements described below may encroach forward of the building setback and into the public right-of-way with City approval. Encroachments should not extend within 2’ of the curb. In Neighborhood Downtown areas, properties subject to the Building Setback Zone should have an Awning/Canopy, Gallery, or Second-story Balcony extending over at least seventy (70) percent of the building facade, to provide shelter for pedestrians on the sidewalk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frontage Element</th>
<th>Conditions or Limits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canopy / Awning</td>
<td>A canopy is a structural cantilevered shed roof; an awning is canvas or similar material and may be fixed or retractable. Awnings or canopies over ground-story doors or windows should have a depth of at least five (5) feet and a clear height of at least eight (8) feet above the sidewalk. Back-lit, high-gloss, or plasticized fabrics are not desired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallery</td>
<td>A gallery should have a clear width from its support columns to the building’s primary facade of at least eight (8) feet and a clear height above the sidewalk of at least ten (10) feet. Support columns should be spaced no farther apart than they are tall and should be placed to allow at least two (2) feet and up to three (3) feet from their outer face to the curb. When a gallery extends over a public sidewalk, the property owner may be required to enter into a right-of-way agreement in a form acceptable to the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balconies</td>
<td>Second-story balconies that fulfill the shading requirements for properties with a special setback line should have a depth of at least 6 feet and a clear height below of at least ten (10) feet above the sidewalk. Balconies may have roofs but should be open toward the primary street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoops / Porches</td>
<td>Stoop stairs may be perpendicular or parallel to the building facade. Stoops extending into the right-of-way should maintain a 6’ min. clear zone for pedestrians on the sidewalk. When a stoop extends over a public sidewalk, the property owner may be required to enter into a right-of-way agreement in a form acceptable to the City. Porches may extend up to ten (10) feet into setbacks. Front porches, and side porches that extend into the setback, should be at least eight (8) feet deep. Partial walls, screened areas, and railing on porches should be no higher than forty-two (42) inches.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lighting Guidelines

1. Lighting should be designed in such a way as to prevent the direct view of the light source from neighboring residential areas.

2. To increase safety, help geographic orientation, and highlight the identity of an area, the following elements are encouraged to be lit:
   - Edges: Edges of a park or plaza should be lit to define and identify the space.
   - Architectural details: Lighting entrances, archways, cornices, columns, and so forth can call attention to the uniqueness of a building, or place. Lighting of building entrances also contributes to safety.
   - Focal points: Lighted sculptures, fountains, and towers in a neighborhood, especially those visible to pedestrians and vehicles, provide a form of wayfinding.
   - Public parking lots

3. **Lighting Types & Configurations:** Lighting fixtures should be appropriately chosen for the district within which they are located. Variety in character is good to establish identity and uniqueness. However, there should also be consistency within each district (coordinated by the City/CRA) in creating a unifying scheme of illumination that is appropriate to the scale of the street and the level of nighttime activity. Lamp styles should not be mixed along any one particular block of a street
   - Light fixtures should be downcast or low cut-off fixtures to prevent light pollution and reduce backlighting, uplighting, and glare.
   - In order to conserve energy and reduce long-term costs, energy-efficient lamps should be used.
   - Lighting should be shielded to prevent the direct view of the bulb or light source.

4. **Street Lights:**
   - Placement of street light fixtures should be coordinated with the organization of sidewalks, landscaping, street trees, building entries, curb cuts, signage, etc.
   - The height of light fixtures should be kept low (generally not taller than 15 feet) to promote a pedestrian scale to the public realm and to minimize light spill to adjoining properties. Light fixtures should be closely spaced (generally not more than 60 feet on center) to provide appropriate levels of illumination.
   - Light poles may include armature that allows for the hanging of banners or other amenities (e.g., hanging flower baskets, artwork, etc.).
Staff findings of consistency with the pertinent Florida Statutes, the Community Planning and Land Development Regulations (hereafter referred to as the ULDRs) and the Comprehensive Plan (hereafter referred to as the Comp Plan) along with the staff recommendations are as follows:

**Agenda Item Five**

**Type of Application:** Modification to the Panama City Unified Land Development Code Sec. 104-66 Gateway Overlay (GO) (Formerly known as the Tourist Corridor Overlay)

**Case Number:** PB 21-67

**Applicant/Owner:** City of Panama City

**Background:** Proposed Ordinance that revises and amends Sec. 104-66 Gateway Overlay (GO) (Formerly known as the Tourist Corridor Overlay) to update the text portion of **Recreational vehicle (RV) sales, storage, repair** and **Stand-alone car wash facilities** in the Prohibited uses list.

June 28, 2021
Tina Scibelli       Date
Planner I
Sec. 104-66. - Gateway Overlay (GO) (formerly known as the Tourist Corridor Overlay).

A. Purpose. The purpose of the Gateway Overlay (GO) is to promote the general health, safety and welfare of the community; to create a sense of place that is aesthetically appealing for those traveling through the city; to encourage innovative development projects that set standards for landscaping, community design and aesthetics; to establish consistent and harmonious design standards for public improvements and private property development along Highway 98 and parts of Harrison Avenue so as to unify the distinctive visual quality of the corridor.

B. District defined. The GO applies to non-residential land parcels of record within the city having frontage along major roadways of U.S. Highway 98/15th Street; Harrison Avenue; Highway 368/23rd Street; Business U.S. Highway 98; Highway 390; and Highway 77. The district applies to property within 400 feet of the roadway (on each side of the road).

No certificate of occupancy regarding any building permit or development order shall be granted prior to assurance that requirements of this chapter have been met.

C. Design requirements. Refer to chapter 105 for design requirements in the GO.

D. Prohibited uses:

1. The following uses are prohibited in the GO:
   i. Sale and use of mobile/manufactured homes;
   ii. Flea markets; bazaars, yard sales, or similar sales;
   iii. Any business commonly known as "check cashing," or any business which, as a material part of its services, provides future employment wages or other compensation (often known as "payday loans," or "payday advances");
   iv. Dating services, escort services, valet services;
   v. Pawnshops, as defined by F.S. § 539.001(2);
   vi. Bail bond agencies, as defined by F.S. § 648.25(1);
   vii. Palm readers, fortune tellers, tarot card readers, psychics, and similar businesses;
   viii. Bottle clubs;
   ix. Any business which, as a material part of its services, provides loans secured by vehicle titles (often known as "car-title loans");
x. Impound yards; automobile wrecking; recycling yards; and similar uses;

xi. **Recreational vehicle (RV) sales, storage, repair (except for projects approved by the City Commission):**

xii. **Stand-alone car wash facilities (excluding the express and conveyorized, automated tunnel car washes):**

xiii. Mobile home parks;

xiv. Heavy equipment sales, service, and storage;

xv. Self-service storage facilities;

xvi. Dispatch office and vehicle fleet parking, storage and maintenance;

xvii. Labor pools;

xviii. Adult entertainment;

xix. Manufacturing of chemical products;

xx. Contractor storage or salvage yard;

xxi. Towing service and

xxii. Window tinting.

E. **Transit facilities:**

1. Developments greater than 100,000 square feet shall designate a minimum 100 square foot area on the site plan as a transit stop if requested by the Bay Town Trolley.

F. **Seasonal sales:**

1. Seasonal sales items shall not occupy any required parking spaces, parking lot aisles, or required landscaping buffers or areas.

(Ord. No. 2675, § 1(Exh. A), 3-12-2019)