

1. Call To Order / Roll Call
2. Approval Of Meeting Minutes
3. Changes Or Deletions To The Agenda
4. Requests
 - 4.a. Request Appeal Of An Administrative Decision To Allow Single Family Homes To Be Constructed On Each Lot At 1003, 1005, 1007 & 1009 West 10th Court. (Consider "Lots Of Record" By The Planning Director).

Documents:

[W 10TH CT BACKGROUND.PDF](#)

5. Adjourn

Mr. Carl Russ, a property owner in the West 10th Court area, visited the Planning staff a week or so after Hurricane Michael. His house had been badly damaged during the hurricane and he was interested in selling the property so he could move away. His 0.8 acre property consisted of four lots that were platted as part of Bayside Subdivision (Block E, Lots 7 thru 10), Map Book 1, Page 77 of the Bay County Clerk of Court Records.

The question that Russ posed to the staff was whether the City would allow a house to be built individually on each lot. For the Planning staff, this seemed like a simple yes, since the staff considered lots that were platted prior to August, 1981 as "lots of record". ***See Section 104-40 (c) (2)***

Each lot was over 8,000 square feet in size.

Determining density: Because his property was 0.8 acres, he was allowed by the zoning regulations to have 4 lots (0.8 acres x 5 units/acre = 4 lots).

The only requirement that was questionable was Sec. 104-27. a) 4) which states a minimum lot frontage of 85 feet. Because the property was already platted and the Director has interpreted this 85' to be applied to new subdivision lots, there was no concern.

Mr. Russ subsequently sold his property to Southern Coastal Homes, Inc. A representative, John Southwell, submitted a development order application for four new homes ranging in size from 2,466 S.F. to 2,786 S.F. Each single family home was proposed to be 2 stories. In addition, Southern Coastal Homes, Inc. paid water and sewer impact fees from \$4,270 to \$4,833 for each home and were issued development orders for each.

It should be noted that before a development order was issued for any of these homes, multiple neighbors argued that the City was wrong for allowing these homes in this neighborhood, since the bulk of the homes in the neighborhood sit on multiple lots. In their minds, these homes would not be compatible with the neighborhood. They argued that the Comprehensive Plan policies refer to compatibility and that because these new lot sizes were incompatible with the neighborhood that the City should not issue a development order for any of the new homes.