approved 2/10-14

Town of Callahan
Planning Commission Meeting
Minutes
January 13, 2014

Pledge of Allegiance

Opening Prayer – Buford Howard

Meeting opened with approval of minutes from October 14, 2013 meeting.

Carrie – Request of landscaping information from previous meetings to continue on at February 10, 2014 meeting.

Request of Planning Boards email addresses for future correspondence.

Reference to the town's Comprehensive Plan and the maps within our plan specifically FLUM.

The Town does not currently have any Historical designations identified within our Comprehensive Plan.

The Town needs to identify historical districts or homes within our town limits. A copy of the

Fl Statute 267.061 – Historical Properties and National Register for Historical Resources issued to board members for review.

Caleb – If a historical home is need of renovation can the homeowner perform those upgrades.

Carrie – Yes. The benefit with historical homes or districts. The state has grants for assistance in the preservation of the homes or sites. I will research the benefits to property owners for having home designated as historical.

Caleb – used example of Savannah and their stringent ruling on what can be done within historical site or district.

Carrie – We first need to identify the areas / sites that we want to propose as historical to council. We will need to notify the property owners of the proposed designation. The proposal will be addressed with Council for approval. Once that has been approved we submit the information to the State of Florida, where our information will go before their review board and then onto the Historical Registry.

The Town can then determine how we would like to handle the asthetics of the historical district / sites. Fernandina, for example, only certain colors for the historical homes can be used. All and any structural work to be performed at the site, interior or exterior, must be reviewed by their Planning Board. These things can be determined by the Town later down the road.

Howard – Confirms that public hearing with property owners will be done previous to being issued to State.

General discussion between members of which areas / homes that might be considered.

Armstrong home, corner of 301 and Mickler Street, original Elementary School.
Buford and Ted Howards home. Brandies Ace Hardware buildings, Fachko house, Sherry Graham home, Bob Holland home on Booth St, Patricia Thomas home on Green St., Betty Ray.

Carrie – 2nd order of discussion is placing some kind of regulation on the number of sheds, constructed or metal building, carport or lean-tos on RSF lots. A sub-tructure of this type can be located 5' from property line. The home should be 10' from property line. There is no size designation and from what I understand is not included as part of the 50% lot coverage, which is only specified in new residential construction.

Kirk – What is bringing this to our attention?

Carrie – I have received a number of complaints in regards to Historical Society. The Historical Society has placed two portables; they obtained from school board, on their property. They recently placed an additional structure on their property, which they created to look historical. But, it is not historical and all of these sub-structures are taking away from the Historical intent of the property. So, at some point where is the limit.

Kirk – "I agree, I have received a number of complaints also".

Howard – Building behind Callahan Barbecue should be considered a nuisance.

Carrie – The property owner of The Gables has been notified, several times through Code Enforcement, on the debris behind his shopping center.

General discussion of overall building coverage allowed on RSF parcels. This should be based off a 7500' parcel. Consideration of increasing structural lot coverage from 50% to 60%, to include any sub-structure the property owner may consider adding to his property. Even on a larger or smaller parcel, the percentage should be same and will be proportional.

Howard – Example: average lot size is 7500'. Say a home is built and uses 30% of its lot coverage. A new RSF home cannot exceed 50% lot coverage. If we increase the lot coverage to 65%, to include all sub-structures, this means that 10 - 10' sheds can be purchased and placed on the lot and still be within percentage required. So, the Ordinance should state, the percentage of lot coverage remaining after the home is built, cannot exceed two sub-structures.

Carrie- Mr. Branham can assist with defining what is considered a sub-structure.

I will email you what is found on tax advantage on Historical Sites.

Meeting closed.