1/24/17 BELLE ISLE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION HEARING Daryl Carter

S1 = Chairman, Nicholas Foreaker

S2 = Daryl M. Carter S3 = Unidentified female S4 = Unidentified male

S5 = Also, Chairman, Nicholas Foreaker

S6 = Richard Weinsier
S7 = Debra Donham
S8 = Greg Gent
S9 = April Fisher
MS = Male speaker

FS = Female speaker

S10 = Chris Roper

| Speaker | Narrative |
|-----------------------|--|
| S1 Nicholas | Next item, number seven, is applicant Daryl M. Carter, Case No. 2016-12-001. |
| Foreaker | Pursuant to Belle Isle Code Section 42-64, the Board shall consider and take |
| | action on requested variance from Section 54-2(a), substandard lots of record to |
| | allow for each individual lot, lot 4 and lot 5, that comprises the currently |
| | developed parcel to be redeveloped as individual lots instead of being required to |
| | be aggregated as one tract and allow for a reduction from the Section 50-73 site |
| | and building requirements for the R1AA required minimum lot width of 85 feet in |
| | anticipation of a lot split request on the subject parcel that would result in the lot |
| | respectively retaining their historical substandard lot width of 70.06 feet |
| | submitted by applicant Daryl M. Carter located at 6820 Seminole Drive, Belle |
| | Isle, Florida 32812, also known as Parcel 29-23-30-4389-02-040. So is the |
| 60 | applicant here? |
| S2 | Yes, Mr. Chairman. |
| Daryl M. | |
| Carter S1 Nicholas | Okay. I read through the four primary criteria for a variance. Do I need to do that |
| Foreaker | again? |
| S2 | I don't think so, no. |
| Daryl M. | 1 don't tillink so, no. |
| Carter | |
| S1 Nicholas | Okay. Alrighty. On the previous issue. Okay, so go ahead and state your name |
| Foreaker | for the record and tell us what you got going. |
| S2 | Like for me to go first? Okay. |
| Daryl M. | Zine for me to go mot. Onay. |
| Carter | |
| S1 Nicholas | Yep. |
| Foreaker | |
| S2 | Thank you, Chairman and members of the Planning and Zoning Commission and |
| Daryl M. | staff. My name is Daryl Carter. I live at 1545 Conway Isle Circle here in |
| Carter | beautiful Belle Isle, Florida. I'm a lifelong pretty much lifelong I'm 54 years |

| Speaker | Narrative |
|--------------|--|
| - | old, I've been in Conway for about 52 or three of those years. I grew up here and |
| | I am a real estate investor and broker and went to Conway [2:24] three |
| | different elementary schools although I grew up in the same house, I got |
| | redistricted twice. I didn't get kicked out of different schools. But went to |
| | Conway, Kaley and Pershing all from the same house over on Erin Road and |
| | [2:37] High School. So is it okay to approach and give you some materials? |
| S1 Nicholas | Yes. Absolutely. |
| Foreaker | |
| S2 | How would you like me to do that? Do the whole stack or [2:44]? |
| Daryl M. | [2011]. |
| Carter | |
| S1 Nicholas | Or you can just distribute them. |
| Foreaker | of you can just distribute them. |
| S2 | Sure. |
| Daryl M. | |
| Carter | |
| S1 Nicholas | Saves us having to reach around. |
| Foreaker | but to us having to reach around. |
| S2 | [2:49]. |
| Daryl M. | |
| Carter | |
| S3 | [2:50]. |
| Unidentified | |
| female | |
| S2 | Sure. |
| Daryl M. | Duic. |
| Carter | |
| S3 | Thank you. |
| Unidentified | Thank you. |
| female | |
| S2 | So I'm not, you know, I'm not from out of town and I'm not unconcerned about |
| Daryl M. | Belle Isle and live around the corner and I'm sorry for the interruption. That was |
| Carter | my middle son coming here for to get money for Chipotle. Which happens |
| Carter | with terrible regulatory [3:13] wear me out. And Mrs. Weinsier's husband |
| | taught me math in junior high. So |
| S4 | [3:23]? |
| Unidentified | [J•2J]; |
| male | |
| S2 | Yes, sir. You were one of the best teachers I ever had. |
| Daryl M. | 1 co, sii. 1 ou were one of the best teachers I ever flau. |
| Carter | |
| S4 | [3:28]. |
| Unidentified | [J•20]. |
| | |
| male S2 | Vos sir Sura Of source Sura So I'm not riding into Della Isla just turing to |
| | Yes, sir. Sure. Of course. Sure. So I'm not riding into Belle Isle just trying to |
| Daryl M. | make a bunch of money without regard for the neighborhood [3:40] |

| Speaker | Narrative |
|----------------------------|--|
| Carter | property including the property across from the one Mr. Houlihan's [sp?] [3:47] wawa on we have the shopping center at the corner at Conway and Hoffner which when we bought it was which was a vacant Winn-Dixie had metal siding and was a disaster. We put Fellowship Church in there. We did the Starbucks. We that center and we're proud of what we were able to achieve there and it was a great blessing to us, too, to both personally and professionally we made some money along the way as well. And we're active and involved [4:16] properties in around South Orlando. I should say that Nicholas and I have a small investment property together over on the west side of town. I'm sure [4:28] but we are we did have a small investment together. |
| S1 Nicholas Foreaker | That's right. I did |
| S2 Daryl M. Carter | I didn't |
| S5 Nicholas Foreaker | No, that's okay. I've already talked to the Mayor and Yolanda that I have to recuse myself from voting. So Thanks for prompting that. |
| S2 Daryl M. Carter | Yes, sir. And I had to then communicate with P&Z [4:44] Counsel that has been [4:48] a couple, three or times [4:51]. So I don't want to bore you with a whole big, long presentation, but what I handed to you is there are a lot of 70 foot or smaller lots in our city. And so and in particular in the immediate neighborhood surrounding the Douglas' [sp?] property I'm the contract purchaser, by the way. I don't own the property yet. I hope to. So there are a number of houses or excuse me, lots in the neighborhood that are 70 feet or smaller and then the next there's a the first page shows you some of those lots and then an aerial that shows that as well. The third page in the handout is the historical plat. The historical plat allowed two lots on this particular property. The fact that there's one house built on it, that was in existence before the Douglase's bought the property. But it is consistent with the underlying plat. The Douglase's bought the property in '85 or '86 six yeah, '86. Belle Isle changed its whatever the proper code is [5:59] code or whatever it is that the official document or rules in 1992. So to me the hardship case, first of all, it's not detrimental to the neighborhood. We're going to wind up with two houses there. They're going to be new and increase the tax base. It's consistent with the neighborhood. I think to be fair, it's somewhat unfair to have to make all the property [6:24] reliance on the underlying plat which included two lots. The fact that the house is in the middle, I don't think this was the underlying plat and so to achieve the value that I'm planning to pay for the property, the only way to do that is to do a lot split into two lots. And so I just think [6:46] be able to rely on the underlying plat and the rules shouldn't change after somebody buys the property and is consistent with the neighborhood and it's not going to be detrimental. I appreciate you listening to me and I don't want to take up any more of your time. I'm cer |

| Speaker | Narrative |
|--------------|---|
| Foreaker | |
| S3 | Just real quick. |
| Unidentified | vast four quient |
| female | |
| S1 Nicholas | Sorry. Don't run away so fast. |
| Foreaker | Softy. Don't full away so fast. |
| S3 | I don't think I have a problem with the variance of the lot sizes. What do you |
| Unidentified | plan on building? |
| female | pian on bunding? |
| | Two houses [7-24] |
| S2 | Two houses [7:24]. |
| Daryl M. | |
| Carter | |
| S3 | [7:25]. |
| Unidentified | |
| female | |
| S2 | I'm not that far into the process yet. I own I live on Lake Conway. I live |
| Daryl M. | [7:29] on Lake Conway. I live in the Highlands at Lake Conway. So this would |
| Carter | be the third residence, one [7:35] be the fourth or fifth house. But |
| | something I think would be pretty and add value to the neighborhood. |
| | [7:45]. |
| S3 | No, that's fine. I was just curious. |
| Unidentified | |
| female | |
| S2 | I wasn't sure I was going to get this approved. |
| Daryl M. | |
| Carter | |
| S1 Nicholas | Alright. |
| Foreaker | |
| S4 | So you're not buying you're not buying the lot unless it's approved tonight, is |
| Unidentified | that correct? Are you going to be buying it [8:02]? Just curious. Are you |
| male | going to be buying the lot anyway? |
| S2 | We Mrs. Douglas and I have an understanding that if I don't get the lot split, I |
| Daryl M. | don't have to close. |
| Carter | |
| S4 | Okay. |
| Unidentified | |
| male | |
| S2 | So |
| Daryl M. | |
| Carter | |
| S3 | Due diligence. |
| Unidentified | |
| female | |
| S2 | Correct. Yes, ma'am. My appeal to you would be I think to be able to get the |
| Daryl M. | two lots back, if you will, is what creates the value for what I'm paying for the |
| Carter | property. Absent that, and I've said this to Becky and she's here and she can |
| | F-F |

| Speaker | Narrative |
|--------------------------|---|
| | verify what I'm saying, my professional opinion although she knows more about residential than I do, my professional opinion is it's that value is not there unless the two lots are approved. So if I didn't close, I think there will be there will be a diminution in value to their property. That's my opinion. But there are people in the audience who probably know more about residential than me. Do you want me to stay up here? |
| S1 Nicholas | Any other questions? |
| Foreaker | Tilly other questions: |
| S2 Daryl M. Carter | I'm here. So |
| S1 Nicholas Foreaker | Okay. Alright. So what we'll do then is we will open for public input. I hope we will get some because we didn't have anyone for any of the other things, so and there's a bunch of people here, so this must be the one. So, anyone that would like to say something, please state the name and address for the record and we would prefer if you went to the microphone because it helps our recorder keep minutes. |
| S6 Richard Weinsier | Richard Weinsier, 6824 Seminole Drive. My residence is directly to the west of the said lot [9:44]. |
| S1 Nicholas | You say it's directly to the west of this? |
| Foreaker | [0.50] |
| S6 Richard Weinsier | [9:50]. |
| S1 Nicholas | Alright, directly east. |
| Foreaker | Tinight, directly east. |
| S6 Richard | [9:53]. |
| Weinsier | |
| S1 Nicholas Foreaker | Yeah. Right. I was going to say, last time I saw it, that was vacant. |
| S6 Richard Weinsier | The lot that I'm on is the same size only because the same thing, the lot I bought was actually split the same way. And so I had a 70-foot lot which I built a very nice house on and it's improved along the way and I really have no problem with the other lot [10:18] that that sort of fits right in with the rest of the area. That they're all the single lots, one 70 feet wide, you can build a very nice house on it. What I hope does not happen and Daryl did not mention that [10:32] a few doors down, they split the lot the same way with the "L" shape thing [10:40] which looks kind of weird to me [10:44]. But I don't think I'd want that right next to mine if I can prevent that. But as far as the way the ordinance is read and related to asking for the variance, I really have no problem with it at this time. |
| S1 Nicholas Foreaker | Alright. Thank you. Any other comments? |
| S7 Debra Donham | Debra Donham, 6904 Seminole Drive. And I'm just in agreement with Richard about the because I'm right directly east of the one with the "L" shape. The other one. |
| S1 Nicholas | That puts you in lot 10? |

| Speaker | Narrative |
|-----------------|---|
| Foreaker | |
| S7 Debra | [11:18]. |
| Donham | |
| S1 Nicholas | Okay. So you have a single house on two lots at this point? |
| Foreaker | |
| S7 Debra | Yeah, I have two. Yeah, one's a duplex [11:26] house. |
| Donham | • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • |
| S1 Nicholas | Oh, okay, so [11:28]. |
| Foreaker | |
| S7 Debra | Mine's the oldest one on the street, the first one, built in the '40's. So I just |
| Donham | meant that design with that "L" shape and it was I didn't know what was the plan if he's doing it the 70 feet or is that in the plan or no? |
| S1 Nicholas | The way it's been presented to us is that it's just going to be two straight 70-foot |
| Foreaker | lots. |
| S7 Debra | Oh, okay. |
| Donham | |
| S1 Nicholas | Yeah. |
| Foreaker | |
| S7 Debra | Okay. |
| Donham | |
| S1 Nicholas | So any other are you is that it? Okay. |
| Foreaker | |
| S7 Debra | [11:58] see anything on here about the, you know |
| Donham | |
| S1 Nicholas | Yes. Yes, please. |
| Foreaker | |
| S8 Greg Gent | My name's Greg Gent, 2924 Nela. So you mentioned the empty lot on the other side of the [12:18] of the property in question. So, just a number of people here are familiar, some aren't. I'll give you a real quick update. About a year and a half ago, there was a fairly lengthy battle over that property. Like what was said earlier, that was originally lot 1, 2 and 3 in that subdivision going way, way back. And the prospective buyer wanted to buy that property and turn it into a gated subdivision. So there was a lot of disagreement by the community really that a subdivision, a deeded subdivision didn't really belong in that little section of Belle Isle. So based on the meeting here, this Board and also with counsel, it eventually was overruled and that was not allowed to go forward. So, it's still sitting empty updates are we're all still waiting for that to come to a conclusion with something built there. So I think all those people that were against that subdivision, really were in support of it reverting back to what could be three lots on that property, which is what they're selling for now, that vacant property. So those same people I think by that logic would support this, you know, going back to the original two lots. I don't think myself and I don't think any of those involved in that issue would have a problem. The only thing I would recommend just because of all the history because of the outcry, because of just the feelings that most of the community had and the numbers were very, very large, is to put a stipulation on that split that nothing could happen. That it couldn't be joined with |

| Speaker | Narrative |
|---------------------|--|
| • | that existing property to make that a larger property. That nothing other than just |
| | that split could occur if that split did occur. I don't know how that could happen, but I think there'd be a certain comfort level that to know that it really will be |
| | two houses when that split occurs. |
| S1 Nicholas | So to simplify what you're saying, you just want to ensure that they're not |
| Foreaker | aggregating the five parcels to come back and walk into a buzz saw with the |
| | community? |
| S8 Greg | Exactly. |
| Gent S1 Nicholas | Right. Gotcha. |
| Foreaker | Right. Gotena. |
| S8 Greg | I that probably is not true, you know. Belle Isle does get a lot of rumors going |
| Gent | around it. But there was some rumors going around that there was an attempt to |
| | combine the three empty with those two to fill you know, to have five and then |
| | to make something even larger than they attempted before. So that was a concern |
| | by myself and a lot not that, you know, throw numbers at you. But originally when we did this, there was 180 residents that petitioned, 119 households and the |
| | people that were participating had an average length of residency of 19 years. So |
| | these were people that lived here a long time, knew the neighborhood, knew the |
| | character of the neighborhood and that's really why there was so much |
| | involvement by the people. So But like I was saying, I'm for it if it's two |
| | houses, like it's stated. Fantastic. I think that'd be great. I just would like some |
| S4 | certainty that it really is definitely going to be that [15:45]. It's my opinion that for that to happen it would have to come back for us again. |
| Unidentified | it saily opinion that for that to happen it would have to come sack for as again. |
| male | |
| S3 | Again. |
| Unidentified | |
| female S4 | Voy know to mailet it into different you know units on something |
| Unidentified | You know, to replat it into different, you know, units or something. |
| male | |
| S8 Greg | Yeah. I understand. |
| Gent | |
| S4 | So it's not going to be if that were to occur, and I don't think it's going to |
| Unidentified male | happen because it has to come up from me. But it's I hear you. |
| S8 Greg | Yeah. I mean, as I say, it [16:10] makes sense to have an extra safeguard so |
| Gent | to not even to not even be able to bring it back to you. |
| S4 | Yeah, I don't know how we could throw that into a motion. |
| Unidentified | |
| male | F4.4.03 |
| S3 | [16:19] need to. |
| Unidentified female | |
| S1 Nicholas | I don't know that it's really necessary. |
| >1 1 1101101us | I don't mion that it broadly necessary. |

| Speaker | Narrative |
|--------------|---|
| Foreaker | |
| S4 | Yeah. I'm of the opinion on that, that it's necessary. Because if they have to |
| Unidentified | come before us to be replatted so you can make a mega mansion out there or |
| male | whatever you want to call it. |
| S1 Nicholas | Or even a neighborhood subdivision. |
| Foreaker | of even a neighborhood subdivision. |
| S4 | Right. |
| Unidentified | rught. |
| male | |
| S3 | Another |
| Unidentified | Allouici |
| female | |
| S1 Nicholas | Yeah. I don't think anybody would spend that money and time to come |
| Foreaker | 1 can. I don't tillink anybody would spelld that money and tille to come |
| | Vesh I don't think [16.44] but we have you |
| S4 | Yeah. I don't think [16:44] but we hear you. |
| Unidentified | |
| male | T4.7 AB3 |
| S8 Greg | [16:47]. |
| Gent | |
| S3 | Duly noted. |
| Unidentified | |
| female | |
| S1 Nicholas | April, do you have anything to add to the discussion? |
| Foreaker | |
| S9 April | Certainly not spilled water. Sorry, guys. The one thing that I would say I do |
| Fisher | think that your motion is thank you, sir that your motion is safeguarded |
| | because it's very specific about only applying to the historical configuration of the |
| | two lots and it's specific to those two lots. The interesting thing about the |
| MS Male | [17:16]. |
| speaker | |
| S9 April | Thank you. I'm sorry. The interesting thing about the three lots that were the |
| Fisher | issue before, they're actually zoned R2, so they have a different minimum lot |
| | width requirement. So anything that would possibly happen to combine, all that |
| | would definitely have to come back to this Board. |
| S1 Nicholas | [17:40] R2 zoning? |
| Foreaker | |
| S9 April | Correct. |
| Fisher | |
| S1 Nicholas | Yeah. That was even in question at the time. |
| Foreaker | |
| S9 April | Yeah. |
| Fisher | |
| MS Male | Whether that was allowed to happen back when it was still R2 because it went |
| speaker | against, you know, the City's covenants and plans. So there's a lot in question |
| _ | that you probably not completely we've got a packet here [18:04]. |
| S9 April | Okay. Alright. Thank you. |
| | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , |

| Speaker | Narrative |
|----------------------------|--|
| Fisher | |
| S1 Nicholas | Alright. Thank you. |
| Foreaker | 8 3 |
| MS Male | Thanks Greg. |
| speaker | |
| S1 Nicholas | Alright, next. |
| Foreaker | Tillight, hext. |
| MS Male | [18:12]. That's why we're here. |
| speaker | [10.12]. That 3 why we le here. |
| S10 Chris | I didn't know I was going to talk. My name's Chris Roper. I'm an attorney, land |
| Roper | use attorney with Akerman LLP. I was here not only because my firm represents[18:22]. |
| MS Male speaker | Chris, state your I'm sorry, state your address as a formality. |
| S10 Chris Roper | Okay, so my office address is 420 South Orange Avenue, Orlando, Florida 32801. And my firm represents Mattamy Homes so [18:33] asked me to come attend tonight. And coincidentally I moved into the City in September of last year so I'm a new resident. And further coincidentally, I moved into the Highlands of Lake Conway. So Mr. Carter's neighbor. So when I put on my citizen hat as opposed to my lawyer hat, I just want to say I would support this request. I like that there's a lot of amenities here in Belle Isle, especially like the restaurants. And I would love to see more people here to fill up the seats in those restaurants and it seems like this would be the right kind of housing type. So those are my two cents. |
| S1 Nicholas Foreaker | [19:17]. Thank you, Chris. We have anyone else? |
| S7 Debra Donham | I just have one more question. The lots that are next to me, which is lot 8 and 9, the two that make up that "L" shape, [19:29] variance. I thought it was 85 feet and that's why they did that because lot 8 is 85 feet upfront and then 55 out back and lot 9 is 55 out front [19:39]. |
| S1 Nicholas Foreaker | Unfortunately that [19:41]. |
| S7 Debra Donham | Did that change? |
| S4 Unidentified male | [19:43] people were on that Board when that was approved. If I were on it, I don't know, I don't see how I could approve that. |
| S7 Debra Donham | So is it 70 feet that you can have now to build on? |
| S1 Nicholas Foreaker | No, there's |
| S4 Unidentified male | 85. |
| S7 Debra Donham | It is 85? Okay. I just was wondering if that had gotten changed or not. That was my question. So |

| Speaker | Narrative |
|-------------------------|---|
| S1 Nicholas | Yeah, so anyhow, in order for this to go through we have to also grant the |
| Foreaker | variance on the width. |
| S7 Debra | Okay. |
| Donham | |
| S1 Nicholas Foreaker | So Okay, any other public input? Hearing none, I am going to close for public input and we will discuss this amongst ourselves here. The you know, the main of the four criteria, the one of the the hardship not being self-created is the one that's not really satisfied here because essentially the applicant is looking at a parcel that was designated a single lot because of the way that it was owned previously and is choosing that they want to subdivide it so they're creating the situation themselves. So that's the, you know, the main criteria that's not being met here. It's pretty clear that dividing it into the into two lots seems to be fitting with the harmony of the neighborhood because all the neighbors are saying yes, do it. So and the, you know so, well, that's basically my piece. So generally it fits the criteria with the exception of item, what is that? |
| MS Male | D. |
| speaker S1 Nicholas | D, E. So what was the rule in effect when the seller bought the property? Don't |
| Foreaker | know when the seller bought the property. |
| S9 (?)April | I think about [22:01] bought it in '92. Or it was purchased in '92. |
| Fisher | [22,01] coaght it in 32. Or it was parenased in 32. |
| FS Female | I bought my lot on the island. I bought my lot in '05 and it's a substandard size |
| speaker | lot, it was 70 feet and I had to do a title search on it and it had to have been platted prior to 1959 I think October 25, 1959. And as long as that had been platted prior to that, it was buildable. And so I did buy it. And I did build. I designed a house to build specifically on that lot. |
| S1 Nicholas Foreaker | And this original plat is dated 1922. |
| FS Female speaker | Okay. I may have the dates wrong. |
| S9 April Fisher | That's okay. If I may, Chairman, you're right in respect to there's a provision in the Code and it's October 7, 1957. So very close. And there's two provisions. One says that if there's a substandard lot with respect to width, that it was lot of records on or after October 7, 1957, that if they're under single ownership, so one owner owns two lots that it has to be considered aggregated as one tract. So the idea is that if it was on or after that date, you had to develop it as one parcel. If it was a standalone parcel and not two under single ownership, that just one was substandard, you had rights to develop that one substandard lot as a single family home. But if you owned both of them, you have to aggregate. |
| S1 Nicholas | Okay. Because I was trying to see if it was hardship to the seller, if they assumed |
| Foreaker | there was more value when they bought it because they could split the parcel. But |
| | you're saying that was not |
| S9 April | That was not the case in this situation because there is currently a single-family |
| Fisher | house on the property. |
| S1 Nicholas | Yeah, which straddles the property line, of course. |
| Foreaker | |

| Speaker | Narrative |
|--|---|
| S3 | It's still considered two lots. |
| Unidentified | |
| female | |
| S1 Nicholas | No. It's |
| Foreaker | 140. It 5 |
| S3 | It's aggregated as an |
| Unidentified | It's aggregated as one. |
| | |
| female | |
| S1 Nicholas | It's been aggregated as one. |
| Foreaker | |
| S9 April | Correct. |
| Fisher Price of the second sec | |
| S1 Nicholas | Yeah. And that's why he's here to try to get it considered if it was considered |
| Foreaker Property of the Prope | two lots then we wouldn't be here. So So that's basically |
| MS Male | So you're saying at the time of purchase, though, they couldn't have considered |
| <mark>speaker</mark> | that two lots the way the Code was? |
| S9 April | That's correct. So based on when the house was built and based on when it was |
| Fisher Fisher | under single ownership, then the Code requires that it's treated as one property, |
| | one lot, if you will. |
| S1 Nicholas | Has that house changed hands since it was built? |
| Foreaker | |
| S9 April | I don't know. |
| Fisher | T don't know. |
| FS Female | Yes. |
| speaker | |
| S9 April | It has. Okay. |
| Fisher | it has. Okay. |
| S1 Nicholas | Vest. So then that makes it years along that who even the callen is hought one let |
| the state of the s | Yeah. So then that makes it very clear that whoever the seller is bought one lot. |
| Foreaker | So |
| MS Male | I don't have a problem splitting it, |
| speaker | |
| FS Female | I don't either. |
| speaker | |
| S1 Nicholas | Well, I kind of fall into that same category. But if we were to stick to the |
| Foreaker Property of the Foreaker | requirements of allowing the variance, it says that all of these criteria these |
| | all four of these requirements need to be met. The alternative is, of course, is to |
| | appeal to the Commission and let them allow the split if we were to follow the, |
| | you know, the strict reading of the rules. |
| MS Male | I have a different opinion on that. |
| <mark>speaker</mark> | |
| S1 Nicholas | Okay. |
| Foreaker Foreaker | |
| MS Male | We're a Board and we can do whatever we want. |
| <mark>speaker</mark> | |
| S1 Nicholas | Okay. |
| Foreaker | |
| | |

| Speaker | Narrative |
|-------------------------|---|
| MS Male | Seriously. I mean, these are guidelines. And if we approve something, it's up to |
| <mark>speaker</mark> | the City Council to say no, if they don't like what we do [25:48]. |
| MS Male | Or neighbors have 15 days to appeal. |
| <mark>speaker</mark> | |
| MS Male | Yeah. So if we want to give them a split and make everything 75 feet on there, |
| <mark>speaker</mark> | we can. |
| S1 Nicholas | Alright. Do we have anyone want to make a motion? |
| Foreaker Toreaker | |
| MS Male | So then it doesn't hurt our future ability to reject something because of that |
| speaker | criteria, does it? |
| S1 Nicholas | No it does not. No. |
| Foreaker | |
| MS Male | Okay. |
| speaker | |
| S1 Nicholas | Anytime we do this, it does not create a precedent, okay? |
| Foreaker | |
| MS Male | [26:08]. |
| speaker | |
| S1 Nicholas | Each one is its own individual case. |
| Foreaker | |
| FS Female | And again this is presuming two homes will be built and it will not be a |
| speaker | continuance of the corner lots. |
| MS Male | Well that yeah. |
| speaker | X 1 C 11 11 '4 ' 1 4 'C' 2 1' 4 4 'C' 2 1 1 1 1 4 |
| S1 Nicholas Foreaker | Yeah. So we could add a criteria that if it's split that it's developed as two individual lots as part of the criteria. I could see that, you know, there's a |
| Toreaker | potential that, you know, you could get it split if it stays undeveloped, one of them |
| | gets sold to one property adjoining owner and one gets sold to the other one and it |
| | gets aggregated and we start all over again. |
| FS Female | Exactly. |
| speaker | Exactly. |
| S1 Nicholas | So But that would all have to go through the you know, because well at |
| Foreaker | least going one way it wouldn't. Yeah. Anyway, getting messy. So |
| MS Male | There is a section of the Code, you're probably familiar with this, that actually |
| speaker | says in Belle Isle code, that if a lot is split, it can never be split again. |
| FS Female | Okay. |
| speaker | |
| S1 Nicholas | Yeah, it's |
| Foreaker | |
| S9 April | Right. There's a lot split provision. |
| Fisher | |
| S1 Nicholas | Yeah, it's a single split provision that but we're not looking at that. We're not |
| Foreaker | looking at, you know, half a lot being split into half a lot. So, anyway. So does |
| | anyone want to make a motion? |
| MS Male | [27:42]. I am moving to approve. I move to criteria of Chapter 42, Article |
| speaker | III, Section 42-641 of the Belle Isle Plan Development Code has been met to |

| Speaker | Narrative |
|-------------------------|---|
| | approve their request for a variance from Section 54-2(a) substandard lots of record to allow for each individual lot, lot 4 and 5, that comprises the currently developed parcel to be redeveloped as individual lots instead of being required to be aggregated as one tract and allow for the reduction from Section 50-73, site and building requirements for the R-1-AA required minimum lot width of 85 feet in anticipation of a lot split request on the subject parcel that would result in each lot respectively retaining their historical standard lot width of |
| S1 Nicholas | Substandard. |
| Foreaker | |
| MS Male speaker | Substandard. I'm sorry. Substandard lot width of 70.06 feet on the property described as 6820 Seminole Drive, Belle Isle, Florida 32812, also known as Parcel number 29-23-30-4389-02-040. |
| S1 Nicholas Foreaker | Okay. Do we have a second? |
| FS Female speaker | I'll second it. |
| S1 Nicholas | Okay. And we have a second. My question is, that it's in that reading, it says that |
| Foreaker | the parcel to be redeveloped as individual lots. Does that sufficiently cover, you know, selling them off to other properties? |
| S9 April Fisher | It does officially cover it because it only speaks to those lots being configured as they were historically platted. |
| S1 Nicholas | Okay. Alright. Okay. So, any further discussion? Hearing none, we'll call the |
| Foreaker | question. All in favor? |
| | Aye. |
| S1 Nicholas Foreaker | Opposed? None. So motion passes. You have 15 days that you need to wait for any potential appeals. From what I can tell, you probably won't get any. So that takes care of that. Can we resurface the election. |
| FS Female speaker | Oh, I'm sorry. I was thinking about road resurfacing. |
| S1 Nicholas | Oh, no. |
| Foreaker | |
| FS Female | Yes, sir. We sure can. |
| speaker | |
| S1 Nicholas | Yeah. |
| Foreaker | |
| S2 | Thank you all very much. |
| Daryl M. | |
| Carter | |