

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA STATEMENT



Meeting Date: September 14th, 2021
To: Honorable Mayor and Council Members
From: Brian Shea, Planning Director
Through: George Garrett, City Manager

Agenda Item: **Resolution 2021-78**, A Request For A Conditional Use And Plat Approval Permit Pursuant To Chapter 102 Article 10 And Article 13 Of The City Of Marathon Land Development Regulations (LDRs) Entitled “Subdivision Of Land/Plats And Re-Plats,” And “Conditional Use Permits” Respectively, For A Plat And Site Plan Approval As Submitted By Seaview Commons II For Vacant Land On The Corner Of Avenue A (Pescayo Avenue) And Avenue B, Which Is Described As Lots 5 And 6 Of Block 6, Coco Plum Beach Subdivision, Fat Deer Key, Marathon, Monroe County, Florida, Having Real Estate Numbers 00363550-000000 & 00363560-000000. Nearest Mile Marker 54.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the project with the recognized conditions and limitations.

APPLICANT/ OWNER: Seaview Commons II, LLC

AGENT: Brian Schmitt / Barbara Mitchell

LOCATION: The project site is located on two properties on the south side of Pescayo Avenue and near the intersection with Avenue B.

REQUEST: Approval of a Conditional Use Permit for development of the subject properties (RE No 00363550-000000 & 00363560-000000), providing for construction of units as follows:

Affordable Units: 60 multi-family residences
Market Rate Units: Six (6) Market Rate Residential Units
Leasing Office: 1 Site Managers Office

The site is currently vacant and largely scarified (cleared of exotic vegetation).

Figure 1 Project Site Survey





Figure 2
Project Site Aerial



FUTURE LAND USE MAP DESIGNATION:
Residential High (RH). See Figure 2 A & B.

Figure 3 A & B
Future Land Use & Zoning Maps



LOT SIZE:
Total acreage: 5.10 acres or 222,156 square feet

| RE Number | Upland Acres (Sq. Ft.) | Submerged Acres (Sq. Ft.) | TOTAL |
|-----------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| 00363550-000000 | 1.78 (77,537) | 0.30 (13,080) | 2.08 (90,617) |
| 00363560-000000 | 2.07 (90,169) | 0.95 (41,167) | 3.02 (131,336) |
| TOTAL | 3.85 (167,706) | 1.25 (54,247) | 5.10 (222,156) |

SURROUNDING ZONING AND USES:

| | <u>FLUM</u> | <u>Use</u> |
|--------------|-------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| North | RH / MU-M | Pescayo – Vacant Land / Commercial Fishing / Marine Industry |
| East | RH & RM | Multi-family / Condominium / Affordable (Approved) |
| West | RH | Vacant Lands & Pescayo Village Plat (SFRs) |
| South | Water | Bonefish Harbor Channel / KCB |

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The project site consists of two (2) parcels. The two parcels have been previously cleared of exotic vegetation. There are some remaining native hammock trees and palm trees. Approximately twenty-five percent (24.5 %) of the projects site consists of submerged land at the perimeter of the Bonefish Harbor Channel.

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

Affordable Units: 60 multi-family
Market Rate Units: 6 Market Rate residential units

Leasing Office: 1 Site Managers Office

BACKGROUND:

The proposed project consists of a development of two properties on Pescayo Avenue in Coco Plum Subdivision

The proposed project will include a total of sixty-six (66) residential units: 60 apartments plus 6 single family residences along the waterfront. ~~The buildings will range from two-story eight-plexes to two-story six-plexes above parking.~~ Through a minor amendment of the Conditional Use, the 8 buildings were joined together to create 2 buildings.


All structures will be elevated to meet minimum flood requirements and to accommodate parking under the structure. The project will provide for limited site amenities but proposes a play area for residents. The project applicant proposes in addition, a robust vegetative buffer which exceeds City Code between the building site area and Coco Plum Road.

The project is proposed to meet workforce housing needs within the City and immediately surrounding County, including the provision of housing for Essential Personnel as recognized by the Florida Legislature in its 2018-2019 Legislative Session. This project will establish a “set aside” number of units, based on demand for Essential Personnel. Essential Personnel include but are not limited to teachers, fire fighters, police, other law enforcement and emergency personnel.

In addition, the project will include six (6) single family residences on the waterfront.

See Figure 4. Figure 5 is the amended site plan. Figure 6 is the proposed plat of the parcels.

Figure 4
Proposed Development Site Plan
Pescayo Avenue




CONDITIONAL USE PLAN SEAVIEW COMMONS II - AVE. A

JOB #19-0095

DATE: 03-25-2020

DDAI
 A Subsidiary of Carolco
 11600 Dames & Moore Blvd, Suite 200, Memphis, TN 38197
 Ph: (901) 517-6488

Figure 5 Proposed Development Site Plan Pescayo Avenue



POH GROUP
ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES
DESIGN-BUILD SERVICES
4141 Gulfport Drive East
Jacksonville, Florida 32216
(904) 224-0001 www.poh.com

ARCHITECT

DATE: MM/DD/YYYY


JOB NO: 71003

SEAVIEW COMMONS APARTMENTS
VESTICOR
COCO PLUM KEY
MONROE COUNTY, FLORIDA

ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN
SEAVIEW COMMONS I

SHEET ID:
AS101

**Figure 6
Plat
Pescayo Avenue**



All conditions of the Conditional Use approval will have to be met before any building permit will be approved.

EVALUATION FOR COMPLIANCE WITH THE LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS:

The criteria for evaluating a Conditional Use Approval are outlined in Chapter 102, Article 13, Conditional Use Permits, in the City of Marathon Land Development Regulations.

CRITERIA

A. The proposed use is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and LDRs.

The proposed development project is located within the Residential High (RH) Zoning District. Per Chapter 103, Article 2, Section 103.09 of the Land Development Regulations, the district “is intended to establish areas of high-density residential uses characterized by multi-family dwellings and mobile homes designated within the Residential High (RH) future land use category on the Future Land Use Map (FLUM).”

The proposed project consists of the creation of affordable housing and is consistent with the Residential High Zoning District. Section 103.15 establishes whether specific uses are allowed as of right, limited, accessory or conditional uses, through Table 103.15.2. That table shows that Multifamily Residential uses are allowed by Conditional Use Permit in the Residential High district. Conditional Use review is intended to allow a broader view of the potential impacts of a project on adjacent uses and on City concurrency related resources such as road capacity, solid waste, sewer, and potable water availability.

Table 103.15.2 in the Land Development Regulations establishes constraints on density and intensity allowed in the RH district based on the types of uses proposed. Assuming that the number of market rate units is static. This site has the potential for six (6) market rate residential units and from 46 to 77 affordable residential units (based on an allowed range in the Residential High FLUM of from 15 to 25 units per acre). The applicant is proposing 60 affordable workforce housing units. The calculation is based on an allowed affordable residential density within the Residential High zoning district.

The project as proposed meets the basic definition of development in the RH zoning district and will not exceed any density constraints imposed on the type of residential construction proposed.

The Applicant cites the City Comprehensive Plan in the following Goals, Objectives, and Policies as justifying the case for the approval of this project:

Chapter 1 – Future Land Use Element

Goal 1-1 Manage Growth

Objective 1-1.1 Protect Community Character

Policy 1-1.1.1 Enhance and Preserve Existing Community Character

To enhance and preserve the existing community character, the City shall adopt Land Development Regulations to reflect the following desired development patterns that:

- a. Protect and enhance the “small town” atmosphere;

- b. Encourage mixed-use development patterns;
- c. Protect, enhance, and acknowledge the commercial fishing industry and its historical contributions to the City;
- d. Protect and enhance the “Keys” character; and
- e. Protect, enhance, and increase the number of affordable housing units.

Goal 1-2 Adequate Public Facilities and Services

Objective 1-2.1 Ensure Levels of Service

Policy 1-2.1.2 Ensure Availability of Public Facilities and Services

The City shall not issue a development order or permit for any development unless the applicant provides narrative and graphic information demonstrating to the satisfaction of the City that the public facilities required by the subject development shall be in place concurrent with the impacts of development. Furthermore, the applicant shall assure that the facilities operate at or above adopted level of service (LOS) standards. The applicant's narrative and graphic information shall also demonstrate that the subject development shall not reduce the levels of service for public facilities serving the development below adopted LOS standards.

1-3 Manage Growth

Objective 1-3.1 Managing Future Development and Redevelopment through Future Land Use Designations

Policy 1-3.1.4 Future Land Use Categories

The following land use categories, depicted on the *Future Land Use Map*, describe the type and extent of land use permitted in specified locations in the City. The Land Development Regulations will contain more detail about permitted land uses within the Future Land Use categories.

Residential High

The principal purpose of the Residential High land use category is to provide for high-density single-family, multi-family, and institutional residential development. The Residential High land Use category is characterized by high density compact development on lots with disturbed or scarified vegetation and areas that are appropriate for infill development and that are served by existing infrastructure. Lawfully established RV parks where a majority of the recreational vehicles have been converted into permanent structures are also allowed within the residential high land use category (See Objective 1-3.3 and 1-3.4 and the Policies therein.) The minimum lot size/density/intensity identified in Table 1-1 shall not preclude the continued use or redevelopment of existing commercial, if applicable, or residential uses on a smaller lot where such lot or parcel was platted or otherwise of record prior to the adoption of this Plan. Additionally, the application of the height and lot coverage limitations contained in the Plan and the Land Development Regulations shall not preclude the repair or reconstruction of any structure or portion thereof which is damaged by any natural disaster or other casualty as provided for in Objective 1-3.4 and Policies therein. 9J-5.006(3)(c)1 and 7

Objective 1-3.2 Regulate Density and Intensity

Policy 1-3.2.1 Allocated Density Defined

Allocated densities for the Future Land Use districts, as shown in Table 1-1, are the number of residential units allocated per gross acre of land pursuant to the Plan.

SEE TABLE 1-1 / Future Land Use Densities and Intensities*

| TABLE 1-1 Future Land Use Densities and Intensities* | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Future Land Use Category | Permitted Residential Density (Units per acre) | | | Hotel/Motel/RV Spaces (Units per acre) | Maximum Intensity (floor area ratio) | Minimum Open Space Ratio |
| | Market Rate | Affordable | Licensed Mobile Home or RV Parks | | | |
| Airport (AD) | 0 | | 0 | N/A | 0.15 - 0.50 | 0.2 |
| Conservation (C) | 0.1- 0.25 | | 0 | N/A | 0.05 - 0.10 | 0.5 |
| Industrial (I) | 0 | | 0 | N/A | 0.85 | 0.2 |
| Mixed Use Commercial (MUC) | 2 – 6 | 10 – 15 | 10-25 | 5 - 25 | 0.15 - 0.60 ⁴ | 0.2 |
| Public Facilities (PF) | 0 | | 0 | 3 – 25 | 0.15 - 0.75 | 0.2 |
| Recreation (R) | 0.25 | | 0 | 5 – 15 | 0.15 - 0.50 | 0.2 |
| Residential High (RH) | 8 | 15 - 25 | 15-25 | 0 | 0 | 0.2 |
| Residential Medium (RM) | 5 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.2 |
| Residential Low (RL) | 0.5 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 |

Note:

1. See Objective 1-3.9 and subsequent policies.
2. The allocated and maximum net densities for submerged lands shall be 0.
For properties consisting of hammocks, pinelands, or disturbed wetlands within the Mixed-Use Commercial future land use categories, the floor area ratio shall be 0.10 and the maximum net residential density shall be 0.
Opens space shall be increased based upon the requirement for a habitat evaluation and shall conform to Table 4-1 of the Coastal and Conservation Element.
The FAR in Mixed Use developments may be increased to .75 if mitigated by the development of affordable/workforce housing is provided.

*All development and redevelopment shall comply with this Plan and the Land Development regulations.

Chapter 3 – Infrastructure Element

Goal 3-1 Provide Need Public Facilities

Objective 3-1.1 Adopt Level of Service Standards

Policy 3-1.1.1 Adopt Wastewater Management System(s) Level of Service Standards

The City hereby adopts the LOS standards for wastewater management systems as currently required by Federal and State regulations as follows:

| TABLE 3-1: Florida Statutory Treatment Standards | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|------------|-----------|-----------|
| | Mg/L | | | |
| | BOD | TSS | TN | TP |
| On-Site Systems (BAT) Community Wastewater Collection and Treatment Systems | 10 | 10 | 10 | 1 |
| Design flows less than or equal to 100,000 gpd (BAT) | 10 | 10 | 10 | 1 |
| Design flows greater than 100,000 gpd (AWT) | 5 | 5 | 3 | 1 |

Source: Draft Monroe County Sanitary Wastewater Master Plan, CH2MHill, March 2000

Policy 3-1.1.2 Adopt Stormwater Management Level of Service Standards

The City hereby adopts LOS standards for stormwater management as currently mandated by State agencies, as defined in the City’s adopted Stormwater Management Master Plan as follows:

- a. Post development runoff shall not exceed the pre-development runoff rate for a 25-year storm event, up to and including an event with 24-hour duration;
- b. Stormwater treatment and disposal facilities shall be designed to meet the design and performance standards established in Chapter 62-25, Section 25.025, FAC, with treatment of the runoff from the first one inch of rainfall on-site to meet the water quality standards required by Chapter 62, Section -302.500, F.A.C; and
- c. Stormwater facilities which directly discharge into ‘Outstanding Florida Waters’ (OFW) shall provide an additional treatment pursuant to Chapter 62-25.025 (9), FAC. Stormwater facilities must be designed so as to not degrade the receiving water body below the minimum conditions necessary to assure the suitability of water for the designated use of its classification as established in Chapter 62-302, F.A.C.

Policy 3-1.1.3 Adopt Potable Water Level of Service Standards

The City hereby adopts LOS standards for potable water as follows:

| TABLE 3-2 Potable Water LOS | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Measure | LOS Standard |
| Residential LOS | 66.5 gal/cap/day |
| Non-Residential LOS | 0.35 gal/sq. ft./ day |
| Overall LOS | 100 gal/cap/day |
| Equivalent Residential Unit | 149 gal/day |
| Minimum Pressure | 20 PSI at customer service |
| Minimum Quality | Shall be as defined by the USEPA (part 143 National Secondary Drinking Standards, 40 CFR 143, 44FR 42198) |

Source: Monroe County 2010 Comprehensive Plan

Policy 3-1.1.4 Adopt Solid Waste Level of Service Standards

The City hereby adopts LOS standards for solid waste management as follows:

| TABLE 3-3 Solid Waste LOS | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Measure | LOS Standard |
| Residential Collection Frequency | Minimum 1 time/2 weeks for Domestic refuse Minimum 1 time/2 weeks for Yard trash |
| Disposal Quantity | 5.44 lbs./capita/day or 12.2 lbs./day/ ERU (equivalent residential unit) 6.37 pounds/acre/day (non-residential unit) |

Goal 7-1 Provide Motorized and Non-motorized Transportation Systems

Objective 7-1.1 Adopt Level of Service Standards for City Roads

Policy 7-1.1.1 Adopt Level of Service Standards

For all City roads, the City hereby adopts a minimum peak hour level of service (LOS) standard of D, based on the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) methodology for determination of LOS, as measure by peak hour traffic volume. The City shall maintain the level of service on City roads with five percent (5%) of LOS D.

City staff concurs with the applicant that they have acknowledged the appropriate project standards and that they have been met as iterated above and that the proposed development is in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan and the Land Development Regulations. Further, the Standards have been met well within the density limits prescribed in the City of Marathon Comprehensive Plan. Therefore, the request is in compliance with the requirements of this section and the Goals, Objectives, and Policies noted.

B. The proposed use is compatible with the existing land use pattern and future uses designated by the Comprehensive Plan.

The proposed project is located within the Residential High Future Land Use District. Policy 1-3.1.4 of the City of Marathon Comprehensive Plan states that “the principal purpose of the Residential High land use category is to provide for high-density single-family, multi-family, and institutional residential development. The Residential High Land Use category is characterized by high density compact development on lots with disturbed or scarified

vegetation and areas that are appropriate for infill development and that are served by existing infrastructure.

The existing land use pattern in the project vicinity consists of multi-family residential development to the North on Avenue D and South across Coco Plum Road on Avenue C (west side). Further, there is a mixed residential, commercial, and marine development pattern on Coco Plum Road leading to the East.

Further to the east, on Avenue E and beyond, the development is characterized by Single Family residences. Avenue E is isolated from Avenue D by a 200-foot-wide canal.

To the West lies vacant properties and the small single-family residential subdivision of Pescayo Village.

This project is consistent with allowed densities on Pescayo Avenue, Avenue C. (west side) and Ave D. The project, as proposed, is well under the allowed densities for an affordable housing project by as much as eighteen (18) affordable residential units. Staff believes that the density of the project is consistent with the FLUM and Zoning and the general character of development in the immediate surrounding area, including the previously approved redevelopment of Seaview Commons I. The proposed project density is approximately 17 units per acre overall. By comparison, the following developments have established residential densities as follows (Seaview Commons I Redevelopment is included in the table):

| Development | Acres | No of Units | Density (Units / Acre) |
|---------------------------|--------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|
| Coco Plum Terraces | 1.90 | 42 | 22.2 |
| Sunset Courts | 0.38 | 8 | 21.1 |
| Seaview Commons (Current) | 0.40 | 8 | 20 |
| Seaview Commons I | 2.69 | 64 | 23.8 |
| Bonefish Marina Condo | 3.28 | 83 | 25.3 |
| Bonefish Towers | 2.16 | 75 | 34.7 |
| | | | |

The development of the site will result in significant new development on Pescayo Avenue, including landscaping, the further removal of invasive species, stormwater management, wastewater, and creation of an aesthetic architecture. The improvements will add new affordable housing units to the City. The proposed development will be similar in character to that of the adjacent areas to the east (Bonefish Towers, Condos, and the marina condo). Certainly, the project will contrast somewhat with the development associated with the Pescayo Village plat. That said, the proposed project will provide a mix of affordable housing and waterfront single-family residences.

Therefore, the request is ***in compliance*** with the requirements of these sections.

C. The proposed use shall not adversely affect the health, safety, and welfare of the public.

The proposed use is the development of a mixed market rate / affordable residential use which as proposed should have no adverse impact to the health, safety, and welfare of the public. The project will incorporate the required standards of landscape and open space by the City of Marathon, as well as the requirements set forth by Florida Housing Finance Corporation (FHFC) for Low Income Housing Tax Credit Projects (LIHTC).

Stormwater will be managed on-site, and the project will connect to the City wastewater treatment system, thus alleviating any potential for water quality impacts.

Some concern has been raised that the number of approved or proposed units for the Coco Plum area may be too large for the character of the area, including some potential for significant traffic impacts. Those issues are addressed below. From the standpoint of on-site impacts, there do not appear to be any significant life-safety

impacts.

Plans submitted with the project are suitable for Conditional Use Permit approval as they relate to Chapter 107, Article 12, 100 Year Floodplain. Final review of floodplain compliance will occur as part of building permit process and issuance.

Therefore, the request is **in compliance** with the requirements of these sections.

D. The proposed conditional use minimizes environmental impacts, including but not limited to water, air, stormwater management, wildlife, vegetation, wetlands, and the natural functioning of the environment.

The existing conditions maps indicate the subject area is designated as Disturbed / Undeveloped Land. The FEMA_FWS Species Focus Area Maps indicate that the property is characterized by Exotics and mangroves at the canal edge. More recent and detailed assessments indicate that most of the property as indicated is characterized by exotics with mangroves at the waters wedge, but that there are quite a few native trees as well. The site has been recently cleared of all exotic vegetation. The proposed development will increase the native vegetation on site as part of the landscaping plan.

Site landscaping will be selected from Table 107.68.1, Appendix A, Article 8, Section 107 of the City of Marathon Code of Ordinances. The native vegetation will improve the environmental quality of the site and reduce irrigation needs.

Further improvements to water quality are expected to arise from stormwater improvements to the site, which should provide up-to-date treatment and eliminate any existing discharges to surface waters. The applicant has submitted preliminary stormwater plans suitable for the Conditional Use Application, and final plans are required prior to building permit issuance.

Further improvements to water quality are expected to arise from wastewater improvements to the site when the project connects to the City's wastewater utility.

Therefore, with conditions, the request is **in compliance** with the requirements of these sections.

- Existing native canopy and understory trees should be transplanted if possible or mitigated for if necessary, within the proposed and finally approved landscape plan.
- If the redevelopment is found to have any effect on the Eastern Indigo Snake, then the prescribed protection measures must be undertaken, and the information poster posted on site.
- The project shall be required to develop on-site stormwater controls which help to improve nearshore water quality
- The project will be required to connect to the City's wastewater utility, similarly helping to improve nearshore water quality.

E. Satisfactory provisions and arrangements have been made concerning the following matters, where applicable:

1. Ingress and egress to the property and proposed structures thereon with particular reference to automotive, bicycle, and pedestrian safety and convenience, traffic flow and control and access in cases of fire or catastrophe.

The applicant has provided a breakdown of the proposed occupancy of the onsite buildings. The "Trip Generation Analysis" schedule provided in the Traffic Study indicates that there will be an increase in trip generation based on

the addition of sixty-six (66) residences to the area.

The traffic study determined that a level 2 traffic study was required based on the expected trip generation for the project. The study finds that the proposed increase in units will not have a significant adverse impact on the operating characteristics of either Pescayo Avenue or Coco Plum Drive, nor will it inhibit the safe flow of traffic traveling through the City of Marathon. Below are the calculations used to determine trip generation as established through the ITE Trip Generation Manual. The largest portion of all trips will leave Pescayo Avenue or Avenue B traveling toward U.S. 1 and then return to those streets. Very few trips will be generated to and from Coco Plum Road traveling east.

Ingress and egress to the properties is currently proposed to be from Pescayo Avenue and Avenue B. Visibility in either direction from Pescayo to Coco Plum Drive is reasonable. With speeds limited to 30 miles per hour on Coco Plum Drive, staff believes that ingress and egress from Pescayo Avenue can be accomplished safely. The addition of caution signs for the curve at Coco Plum Drive is probably warranted.

Trip Generation
 Vehicular trip ends generated by the proposed project were calculated by OTISS software based on methodology provided by Trip Generation Manual of the Institute of Transportation engineers (10th edition, 2018).

| Proposed OTISS Input – Average Vehicle Trips | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|---------|----------|----------------|---------------|----------|----------------|---------------|
| ITE Land Use Code | Description | Variable Input | Weekday | AM Total | AM Entry Trips | AM Exit Trips | PM Total | PM Entry Trips | PM Exit Trips |
| 220 | Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise) | 60 Dwelling Units | 412 | 30 | 7 | 23 | 38 | 24 | 14 |
| 210 | Single Family Detached Housing | 6 Dwelling Units | 78 | 9 | 2 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 3 |

Print outs of the trip generation by OTISS for this use are attached.

Therefore, with conditions, the request is **in compliance** with the requirements of these sections.

- Caution signs during left or right turns at the Coco Plum Drive intersection with Pescayo Avenue and Avenue B.
- As part of the permit application, all conditions of the Fire Marshal regarding ingress and egress must be met prior to permit issuance. In addition, all fire hydrants must be in place prior to any of the proposed buildings “going vertical.”

2. Off-street parking and loading areas where required, with particular attention to item 1 above.

Parking requirements are outlined in Section 107.46 (Parking Schedule). The applicant has proposed parking spaces to be located primarily under the townhome structures. The applicant proposes approximately 120 off street parking spaces for tenants under the proposed apartment buildings (2 spaces per tenant) and the proposed addition of six (6) market rate units on the water amounting to twelve (12). In addition, the Applicant has proposed visitor parking and adequate ADA parking. All tenant parking will reside under each residential building.

Section 107.52 includes a requirement that one handicapped space be provided for every 25 spaces required. For 120 required spaces, 5 handicapped spaces are required. The additional ADA spaces must be designated on the final site plan. Parking space sizes are 9’ x 18’ for 90-degree parking, and handicapped spaces are 12’ x 22’ required by Code.

The Code also requires bicycle parking to be provided for educational facilities, multifamily dwellings, commercial, institutional, and industrial uses, as well as all developments adjacent to a bike path, at a rate of one space for every ten parking spaces, per Section 107.48. The bike racks must be shown on the permit application site plan.

Therefore, with the conditions below, the request is ***in compliance*** with the requirements of these sections.

- Sufficient parking for two spaces per unit and additional visitor parking.
- City approval is required for ADA compliant parking spaces prior to Building Permit Approval.
- City approval is required for bike racks prior to Building Permit Approval.

3. The noise, glare, or odor effects of the conditional use on surrounding properties.

The proposed project consists of development of a residential use on an existing site that is mostly vacant. The proposed use does not have any adverse effect through noise, glare, or odors; therefore, the proposed density increase should have a de minimis impact.

Therefore, the request is ***in compliance*** with the requirements of this section.

4. Refuse and service areas, with particular reference to locations, screening, and Items 1 and 2 above.

Section 107.39 requires that all dumpsters and recycling bins be fully enclosed and screened. The site plan indicates that the dumpsters will be screened and located for easy access and waste removal.

Therefore, the request is ***in compliance*** with the requirements of this section.

5. Utilities, with reference to location and availability;

Chapter 107, Article 13, establishes the City's Concurrency Management and certification requirements. This Conditional Use constitutes the City's Concurrency Level of Service Certificate, as follows:

- Wastewater: The applicant will provide wastewater and sewage collection and disposal through cooperation with the Utilities Department. This project will constitute a minor expansion, resulting in a de minimis impact.
- Water: The Florida Keys Aqueduct Authority will provide potable water for the facility.
- Solid Waste: Marathon Garbage Service will provide solid waste disposal.
- Surface Water: The applicant has provided stormwater design information suitable for the Conditional Use application review which demonstrates compliance with City standards. However, a final stormwater plan will be required for building permit issuance.
- Recreation and Open Space: This redevelopment will have a de minimis impact on recreation and open space.
- Roadways: The applicant is redeveloping the site with a higher intensity than was contained within the prior development; therefore, a traffic study was completed to analyze the impact on transportation facilities.
- Educational Facilities: This redevelopment will have a de minimis impact on educational facilities since existing uses are being replaced in kind.

At this juncture, all necessary initial letters of coordination have been received.

Therefore, with conditions, the request is ***in compliance*** with the requirements of these sections.

- City approval is required for the stormwater management system prior to Building Permit Approval.
- Applicant must obtain all outside agency approvals, this includes but is not limited to SFWMD, FDOT, ACOE, and DEP.

- City approval of the connection to the City Wastewater Utility will be required.
- A Unity of Title will be required for these parcels prior to Building Permit Approval. Additionally, if the six market rate sites are anticipated for potential platting, that may be accomplished at a future date.
- The Conditional Use Development Order will constitute the Certificate of Concurrency for the project. The determination will be valid for one year.

6. Screening and buffering with reference to type, dimensions and character;

Table 107.66.1 establishes project boundary buffer standards applicable to the project. The subject parcel is zoned RH and is bordered to the West by properties zoned Residential High (RH) and properties to the north zoned RH as well. The zoning across Coco Plum to the east is Residential Medium (RM). There is a medium project boundary buffer requirement for portions of the project area adjacent to parcels zoned RH. The final landscape plans must be approved by the City Biologist.

| Buffer Type | Minimum Width | Canopy Tree | Understory Tree | Non-Deciduous | Shrub | Screening |
|-------------|---------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------|-------|-----------|
| M-Medium | 15 feet | 4 | 2 | 2 | 16 | No |

Section 107.71 A. requires that all multifamily residential developments provide Type 1 Streetscape buffer along the entire street frontage. The project is adjacent to Coco Plum Road and Avenue D. The final landscape plan must show compliance with the buffer standards. Current site plan graphics exceed the required standard.

Table 103.15.2 outlines setback requirements in the RH district as follow: front yard 10 feet'; side yards 5 feet; and rear setbacks have a 20' setback from the property line, or Mean High Water Line, or landward extent of the mangrove root system. The Applicant has complied with all setback standards.

| Setback | Required | Required Landscape | Proposed | Compliant |
|---------|----------|--------------------|----------|-----------|
| Front | 10 | 20 | >20 | Yes |
| Side | 5 | 15 | >15 | Yes |
| Rear | 200 | NA | >20 | Yes |

Parking area landscaping is required by Section 107.66 of the Code. Proposed parking area landscaping meets the standards set forth in the code.

Therefore, with conditions, the request is ***in compliance*** with the requirements of these sections.

- A Final Landscape Plan must be submitted showing the proper treatments and buffers, including the appropriate treatment types and trees.
- A Final Site Plan must be submitted showing the buildings meeting the required setbacks, parking locations, and access drives.

7. Signs, if any, and proposed exterior lighting with reference to glare, traffic safety and compatibility with surrounding uses.

A review of sign requirements at this stage in development approval is not necessary; however, signs for the project will be reviewed prior to issuance of a building permit according to Chapter 107, Article 7, Signs.

Article 107.54 establishes criteria for lighting, including light pole light limitations and other technical criteria. Final lighting plans will be submitted along with final landscaping plans and will include verification from the landscape architect that all provisions of the article are met.

Therefore, the request is **in compliance** with the requirements of these sections.

- All signs will be reviewed and approved for compliance with the City of Marathon LDR's.

8. Required yards and other open space.

Section 106.16 established required open space for the project. The site is characterized by exotics and some native hammock species; therefore, a twenty percent open space requirement applies. According to calculations provided by the applicant far exceeds the open space requirement.

Therefore, the request is **in compliance** with the requirements of these sections.

9. General compatibility with surrounding properties; and

The project is the development of affordable housing in an area of the City which is relatively intense in residential and light industrial/marine uses. A development of new residential units is expected to be fully compatible with the surrounding uses. The proposed project represents improvement to the current state of prior development and is expected to increase compatibility with surrounding properties.

Section 107.40 restricts the height of buildings to 42' as measured from the crown of the roadway or unimproved grade. The site plans show that buildings are below 42'.

Therefore, the request is **in compliance** with the requirements of these sections.

10. Any special requirements set forth in the LDRs for the particular use involved.

Section 104.48 Residential Dwelling Units contains special requirements. Additionally, the project must meet all criteria of Section 104.03 pertaining to affordable housing. These conditions must be met to receive FHFC funds.

The following criteria are applicable to this proposed development:

- Two (2) side yards are required for stacked duplexes.
- Townhouses are limited to ten (10) dwelling units per row, except for affordable housing.
- The private yard area for rooftop balcony dwelling is provided by the roof or balconies of the structure.
- The total area of the mixed-use or commercial apartments, including patios and access way shall not exceed the area covered by the ground floor and any covered walks or arcades.
- Each unit shall have access to a balcony or patio that is separate from the access to the unit, provides adequate privacy and the size shall be two-tenths (2/10) of unit floor area or a minimum of 60 square feet in size.
- The patio area may be wholly or partially replaced by the provision of a recreation yard provided on site. Recreational yards shall be a minimum one-tenth (1/10) of unit floor area.

The proposed development meets all applicable criteria set forth in this section. Therefore, the request is **in compliance** with the requirements of these sections.

Regarding workforce and affordable housing, Chapter 2 – Housing Element, addresses the absolute need for

workforce and affordable housing within the City and County in general. The proposed project seeks to support those Goals and Objectives as noted in Goals and Objectives highlighted below:

GOAL 2-1 CONSERVE HOUSING STOCK

To achieve a balanced and affordable range of housing stock; to encourage the diversification and distribution of the housing stock; to eliminate substandard structures; and to conserve good quality housing stock. §163.3177(6)(f). F.S.

Objective 2-1.1 Develop a Housing Program

Within one year of the effective date of the Plan, the City provide the framework for a housing program that encourages the creation and preservation of affordable housing for all current and anticipated future residents of the City. §163.3177(6)(f) F.S.

Objective 2-1.2 Provide Information

The City shall provide for exchange of information related to job training, job creation and economic solutions in an effort to improve access to affordable housing. §163.3177(6)(f)4. F.S.

Objective 2-1.3 Improve Housing Conditions

The City shall continue to eliminate substandard housing and blighted areas and shall continue to improve structural and aesthetic housing conditions. 163.3177(6)(f)1 & 3.

Objective 2-1.5 Ensure Adequate Housing Sites

Through the Land Development Regulations, the City shall ensure distribution of adequate housing sites for all residents of Marathon, including very low, low, moderate, and market income housing through the implementation of the following policies. 163.3177(6)(f)1 & 3.

It has been suggested that the City of Marathon has no further need for workforce or affordable housing units. In a corollary to that suggestion, it has been suggested that we no longer need workforce / affordable housing units in the Extremely Low-, Very Low- or Low-income categories.

First, staff wants to make clear what those HUD limits are for 2021.

HUD income limits for FY 2021 and the associated maximum rental prices:

| FY 2021 Income Limit | Persons in Household | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|----------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Middle Income (160%) | \$113,900 | \$130,200 | \$146,500 | \$162,700 | \$175,800 | \$188,800 | \$201,800 | \$214,800 |
| Mil Monthly Rent | \$2,848 | \$3,255 | \$3,663 | \$4,068 | \$4,395 | \$4,720 | \$5,045 | \$5,370 |
| Moderate Income (120%) | \$85,425 | \$97,650 | \$109,875 | \$122,025 | \$131,850 | \$141,600 | \$151,350 | \$161,100 |
| Mol Monthly Rent | \$2,136 | \$2,441 | \$2,747 | \$3,051 | \$3,296 | \$3,540 | \$3,784 | \$4,028 |
| Median Income (100%) | \$71,188 | \$81,375 | \$91,563 | \$101,688 | \$109,875 | \$118,000 | \$126,125 | \$134,250 |
| MI Monthly Rent | \$1,780 | \$2,034 | \$2,289 | \$2,542 | \$2,747 | \$2,950 | \$3,153 | \$3,356 |
| Low Income (80%) | \$56,950 | \$65,100 | \$73,250 | \$81,350 | \$87,900 | \$94,400 | \$100,900 | \$107,400 |
| LI Monthly Rent | \$1,424 | \$1,628 | \$1,831 | \$2,034 | \$2,198 | \$2,360 | \$2,523 | \$2,685 |
| Very Low Income (50%) | \$35,600 | \$40,700 | \$45,800 | \$50,850 | \$54,950 | \$59,000 | \$63,100 | \$67,150 |
| VLI Monthly Rent | \$890 | \$1,018 | \$1,145 | \$1,271 | \$1,374 | \$1,475 | \$1,578 | \$1,679 |
| Ext. Low Income (30%) | \$21,350 | \$24,400 | \$27,450 | \$30,500 | \$32,950 | \$35,580 | \$40,120 | \$44,660 |
| ELI Monthly Rent | \$534 | \$610 | \$686 | \$763 | \$824 | \$890 | \$1,003 | \$1,117 |

For a single individual, Extremely Low Income equates to a maximum income of \$21,350 per year. At the upper limit, the Low-Income category equates to a maximum income for a single individual of \$56,950 per year. This range of incomes covers the majority of the City’s work force. To the extent that Habitat For Humanity of the Middle Keys can qualify individuals and build their homes, the Low-Income category of individuals (80% of Median Income) actually qualifies for home ownership in this County because of how high the Median Income is at

\$71,188 per individual per year.

The City of Marathon solicited an affordable housing study of Florida International University in 2015. The resulting report (Workforce/Affordable Housing Assessment & Action Study) came to several very strong conclusions about the need for workforce housing and the specific gaps that the city has to workforce housing.

At the time there were gaps for all HUD Income Limits categories to home ownership (See Table 4.3 excerpted from the Report). Across all income categories there was a gap of 1,618 units – Demand VS Surplus market rate housing. Presumably, the “Demand” was satisfied through rental of available housing at that juncture. In three HUD Income categories (Extremely Low-, Very Low-, and almost, Low-) there was a gap of 321 units for rent – Demand VS Availability. (See Table 4.4 excerpted from the Report).

Table 4.3: City of Marathon Affordable Housing Supply/Demand Analysis: Owner Housing

| | HH Income Category | Total Households (Demand) | Home Purchase at Affordable Price Levels | | Number of Owner Units Within Affordable Price Range (Supply) | Surplus/Gap within Affordable Price Range |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------------|-------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| | | | 0% Median | 30% Median | | |
| Extremely Low Income | 0-30% Median | 398 | 0% Median | 30% Median | 0-30% Median 116 (5.8%) | (282 units) |
| | \$0-\$14,122 | | \$0 | \$35,305 | | |
| Very Low Income | 31-50% Median | 362 | 31% Median | 50% Median | 31-50% Median 214 (10.7%) | (148 units) |
| | \$14,592-\$23,537 | | \$36,480 | \$58,843 | | |
| Low Income | 51-80% Median | 550 | 51% Median | 80% Median | 51-80% Median 68 (3.4%) | (482 units) |
| | \$24,007-\$37,658 | | \$60,018 | \$94,145 | | |
| Median Income | 81-100% Median | 295 | 81% Median | 100% Median | 81-100% Median 51(2.5%) | (244 units) |
| | \$38,129-\$47,073 | | \$95,323 | \$117,683 | | |
| Moderate Income | 101-120% Median | 251 | 101% Median | 120% Median | 101-120% Median 90 (4.5%) | (161 units) |
| | \$47,544-\$56,488 | | \$118,860 | \$141,220 | | |
| Middle Income | 121-160% Median | 447 | 121% Median | 160% Median | 121-160% Median 146 (7.3%) | (301 units) |
| | \$56,958-\$75,317 | | \$142,395 | \$188,293 | | |

Source: 2009-2013 ACS; table and calculations by FIU Metropolitan Center.

Obviously, a great deal has happened since the date of the FIU Report – notably the impacts of Hurricane Irma (Sept. 2017) and COVID 19 (February 2020 to the present). On the one hand, it has been said that many people have left town – therefore housing demand may be lower. On the other hand, four (4) hotels have opened which carry a high staffing demand. And Hurricane Irma destroyed an estimated 394 homes which were assessed just post storm. Since that time, the City has been able to better catalogue the replacement of these homes through the building permit process. At this juncture, the City has seen the replacement of 507 residential units in single and multi-family settings. The replacement units at \$200 to \$300 per square foot typically will not be any more affordable or available to the City’s workforce.

So, staff believes that there is still a significant need for workforce housing, regardless of the number of units and projects that have some before the City recently and are either built or in various stages of construction. The Attached table documents (Attachment D) the current number of deed restricted workforce units. In the past five (5) years, the City has approved the construction of quite a number of workforce units. Leaving Seagrape Apartments and other previously existing projects, out of that equation, the City has approved 173 workforce residential units

which are in various stages of construction. In addition, including the present project the City has approved or (in this instance) may approve another 265 deed-restricted workforce residential units. Assuming all of these go to completion, the number sums to a total of 438 new deed restricted workforce residential units. This number is well within, and certainly does not exceed, the defined demand for units within the City. The largest demand is in the lower income categories, but the demand stretches across the range of HUD categories.

Table 4.3: City of Marathon Affordable Housing Supply/Demand Analysis: Owner Housing

| | HH Income Category | Total Households (Demand) | Home Purchase at Affordable Price Levels | | Number of Owner Units Within Affordable Price Range (Supply) | Surplus/Gap within Affordable Price Range |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------------|-------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| | | | 0% Median | 30% Median | | |
| Extremely Low Income | 0-30% Median | 398 | 0% Median | 30% Median | 0-30% Median | (282 units) |
| | \$0-\$14,122 | | \$0 | \$35,305 | 116 (5.8%) | |
| Very Low Income | 31-50% Median | 362 | 31% Median | 50% Median | 31-50% Median | (148 units) |
| | \$14,592-\$23,537 | | \$36,480 | \$58,843 | 214 (10.7%) | |
| Low Income | 51-80% Median | 550 | 51% Median | 80% Median | 51-80% Median | (482 units) |
| | \$24,007-\$37,658 | | \$60,018 | \$94,145 | 68 (3.4%) | |
| Median Income | 81-100% Median | 295 | 81% Median | 100% Median | 81-100% Median | (244 units) |
| | \$38,129-\$47,073 | | \$95,323 | \$117,683 | 51(2.5%) | |
| Moderate Income | 101-120% Median | 251 | 101% Median | 120% Median | 101-120% Median | (161 units) |
| | \$47,544-\$56,488 | | \$118,860 | \$141,220 | 90 (4.5%) | |
| Middle Income | 121-160% Median | 447 | 121% Median | 160% Median | 121-160% Median | (301 units) |
| | \$56,958-\$75,317 | | \$142,395 | \$188,293 | 146 (7.3%) | |

Source: 2009-2013 ACS; table and calculations by FIU Metropolitan Center.

Table 4.4: City of Marathon Affordable Housing Supply/Demand Analysis: Renter Housing

| | HH Income Category | Total Renter Households (Demand) | Affordable Rent Levels | | Number of Renter Units Within Affordable Price Range (Supply) | Surplus/Gap within Affordable Price Range |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| | | | 0% Median | 30% Median | | |
| Extremely Low Income | 0-30% Median | 248 | 0% Median | 30% Median | 0-30% Median | (222 units) |
| | \$0-\$14,122 | | \$0 | \$353 | 26 (2.1%) | |
| Very Low Income | 31-50% Median | 189 | 31% Median | 50% Median | 31-50% Median | (97 units) |
| | \$14,592-\$23,537 | | \$365 | \$588 | 92 (7.6%) | |
| Low Income | 51-80% Median | 271 | 51% Median | 80% Median | 51-80% Median | 56 units |
| | \$24,007-\$37,658 | | \$600 | \$941 | 327 (27.2%) | |
| Median Income | 81-100% Median | 97 | 81% Median | 100% Median | 81-100% Median | 163 units |
| | \$38,129-\$47,073 | | \$953 | \$1,177 | 260 (21.6%) | |
| Moderate Income | 101-120% Median | 79 | 101% Median | 120% Median | 101-120% Median | 103 units |
| | \$47,544-\$56,488 | | \$1,189 | \$1,412 | 182 (15.1%) | |
| Middle Income | 121-160% Median | 158 | 121% Median | 160% Median | 121-160% Median | (7 units) |
| | \$56,958-\$75,317 | | \$1,424 | \$1,883 | 151 (12.6%) | |

Source: 2009-2013 ACS; table and calculations by FIU Metropolitan Center.

Based on this review of the available information, City staff indicates that the project meets the obligation to help establish necessary workforce and affordable housing within the city. Therefore, with the conditions noted throughout, the request is ***in compliance*** with the requirements of this section.

CONCLUSION:

The Conditional Use Approval is intended to allow for the integration of certain land uses and structures within the City of Marathon based on conditions imposed by the Council. Review is based primarily on compatibility of the use with its proposed location and with surrounding land uses. Conditional uses shall not be allowed where the conditional use would create a nuisance, traffic congestion, a threat to the public health, safety, or welfare of the community.

The proposed development consists of the development of sixty (60) new workforce and six (6) market rate residential units in a residentially zoned neighborhood, zoned Residential High (RH). As such the development, including the overall upgrading and improvement of the site, furthers the policies for development in the City and is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and Land Development Regulations. The project is compatible with surrounding uses, and is not expected to create a nuisance, traffic congestion or threat to public, health, safety, or welfare.

RECOMMENDATION:

Planning staff recommends approval with Conditions.

Conditions of Approval

- 1) Ingress and egress shall only occur from Pescayo Avenue and Avenue B.
- 2) As part of the permit application, all conditions of the Fire Marshal must be met prior to permit issuance, and hydrants must be operational prior to buildings going vertical.
- 3) City approval is required for ADA compliant parking spaces prior to Building Permit Approval.
- 4) Bike racks must be shown on the final site plan and approved prior to Building Permit Approval.
- 5) City approval is required for the stormwater management system prior to Building Permit Approval.
- 6) Applicant must obtain all outside agency approvals prior permit issuance and prior to project initiation.
- 7) City approval of the final engineering and connection to the City Wastewater Utility will be required.
- 8) ~~A Unity of Title will be required for the two parcels subject to this review and approval prior to Building Permit Approval.~~ If platting of the six (6) market rate residential sites is contemplated that can happen prior to the initiation of construction on those units
- 9) A Final Landscape Plan must be submitted showing the proper treatments and buffers, including the appropriate treatment types and trees. Since additional buffering was required and agreed to by the applicant, this additional buffering must also be reviewed and approved by the City prior to final project approval.
- 10) A Transplantation / Mitigation plan must be approved for any native trees destroyed as part of proposed construction. This Plan must be provided and approved prior to the initiation of site development.
- 11) If the redevelopment is found to have any effect on the Eastern Indigo Snake, then the prescribed protection measures must be undertaken, and the information poster posted on site.
- 12) A Final Site Plan must be submitted showing the buildings meeting the required setbacks, parking locations, and access drives.
- 13) Sufficient parking for two spaces per unit and additional visitor parking.
- 14) City approval is required for ADA compliant parking spaces prior to Building Permit Approval.
- 15) City approval is required for bike racks prior to Building Permit Approval.
- 16) Caution signs during left or right turns at the Coco Plum Drive intersection with Pescayo Avenue and Avenue B.
- 17) All signs will be reviewed and approved for compliance with the City of Marathon LDR's.
- 18) Applicant must obtain all outside agency approvals, this includes but is not limited to SFWMD, FDOT, ACOE, and DEP.
- 19) Affordable Housing Deed Restrictions must be filed prior to building permit issuance. Said deed restrictions shall be provided in a form acceptable to the City and shall be filed with the Monroe County Clerk of Court and shall run with the land for a period of ninety-nine (99) years.
- 20) The Applicant must obtain a minimum of six (6) market rate and sixty (60) affordable residential allocations to be transferred via the Transfer of Building Rights (TBR's), BPAS process, or any other legally established process prior to building permit issuance. **THE APPROVAL OF THE REQUESTED CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT AMENDMENTS DO NOT CONVEY OR GRANT A VESTED RIGHT OR ENTITLEMENT TO FUTURE ALLOCATIONS BY THE CITY OF ANY AFFORDABLE RESIDENTIAL UNITS NOT CURRENTLY IN POSSESSION BY THE APPLICANT AS REFERENCED IN THE PROPOSED CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT.**
- 21) The Conditional Use Development Order will constitute the Certificate of Concurrence for the project. The determination will be valid for one year.

ANALYSIS OF PLAT APPROVAL REQUEST:

The standards for re-plat approval are established in Chapter 102, Article 10 of the Land Development Regulations. The application for the preliminary plat approval is being simultaneously reviewed per Section 102.45.D.2. through the Conditional Use process. Pursuant to the Code, the Planning Commission and City Council shall give due consideration to the evaluation criteria addressed within this report as well as the Conditional Use when rendering a decision to grant or deny the requested permit.

Per code streets, internal park and open space areas, recreation space, protected habitat areas requiring conservation easements may all be the basis for density reductions in the platted lot area if they are included in the overall density calculations for the subdivision and subsequent plat. Such reductions shall be noted in the plat and a complete accounting of acreage respective of allowed densities shall be made in the plat document. Equally, if lot area reductions are allowed as part of the subdivision and platting process, the plat documents shall clearly indicate that no future subdivision shall be allowed of any area accounted for in density calculations.


RECOMMENDATION:

With the following conditions, the Planning staff recommends approval of the proposed final plat.

Conditions:

1. Final plat shall include language regarding owner-signed consent and acknowledgement for wastewater and stormwater assessment for future development of the properties.
2. All utility and right-of-way permits shall be obtained and issued prior to final plat approval.
3. Applicant shall provide form of guarantee for necessary utility construction.
4. Reductions shall be noted in the plat and a complete accounting of acreage respective of allowed densities shall be made in the plat document.
5. Plat documents shall clearly indicate that no future subdivision shall be allowed of any area accounted for in density calculations
6. All conditions of the Conditional Use must be met prior to building permit issuance.

Attachments:
Attachment A & B – Elevation and Site Plan




ZONING EXHIBIT
JOB # 19-0095

SEAVIEW COMMONS II - AVE A

DATE: 04-14-2020

DDAI

A Subsidiary of Centrico
11400 Commerce Highway, Suite 208, Northon, FL 32564 Ph: (905) 817-6469



CONDITIONAL USE PLAN SEAVIEW COMMONS II - AVE. A

JOB #19-0095

DATE: 03-25-2020



4. Subdivisor of Carolina
 11400 Overseas Highway, Suite 205, Miramar, FL 33029 Ph: (305) 877-6689

Attachment
Attachment C – Traffic Impact Statement:



a Subsidiary of CARDNO

SERVING S.W. FLORIDA SINCE 1996

CIVIL ENGINEERS

LAND PLANNERS

CONTRACT ADMINISTRATORS

Traffic Impact Statement

For

Seaview Commons II – Avenue A

*Sec 05 Twp 66 Rng 33
Block 6, Lots 5 & 6 Avenue A
Marathon, Florida 33050*

Prepared for:

*Seaview Commons, LLC
c/o Brain Schmitt
11100 Overseas Highway
Marathon, Florida 33050*

Prepared by:

Victoria Crouthamel, E.I.

DDAI Job #19-0095
March 2020

1821 VICTORIA AVENUE, FORT MYERS, FLORIDA 33901
11400 OVERSEAS HIGHWAY, SUITE 208, MARATHON, FLORIDA 33050

PH. 239-337-3330
PH. 305-517-6469

WEB: WWW.DDAI-ENGINEERS.COM

Project Description

The proposed project will be for a sixty (60) unit multi-family community along with six (6) single family lots. The project will also incorporate all associated infrastructure and a new private roadway for the single family residences. The 2.40 +/- acre site will have frontage on Avenue A (Pescayo Avenue) and Avenue B on Coco Plum. The following Traffic Impact Statement will be for the proposed development.

Project Identification and Location

Project Name: Seaview Commons II – Avenue A
 S/T/R: 05 / 66S / 33E
 Street Address: BK 6 Lt 5 & 6 Avenue A, Marathon
 RE No.(s): 00303560-000000 & 00363550-000000

Project Traffic Distribution

The subject property will have three (3) entry/exit points to Avenue A (Pescayo Avenue) and two (2) entry/exit points to Avenue (Reference Exhibits 2 & 3). Directional splits onto the adjacent roadways are based on the property’s geographic location and anticipated vehicle movements. It is assumed that the distribution of traffic will be 100% of vehicle trips entering from and exiting to the East towards Coco Plum Drive.

Abutting Roadway Information

| Road | Ownership | Access Classification | Posted Speed | AADT |
|------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|--------------|---------|
| Avenue A (Pescayo Ave) | Public | Local | 20 MPH | Unknown |
| Avenue B | Public | Local | 20 MPH | Unknown |

Trip Generation

Vehicular trip ends generated by the proposed project were calculated by OTISS software based on methodology provided by Trip Generation Manual of the Institute of Transportation engineers (10th edition, 2018).

| Proposed OTISS Input – Average Vehicle Trips | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|---------|----------|----------------|---------------|----------|----------------|---------------|
| ITE Land Use Code | Description | Variable Input | Weekday | AM Total | AM Entry Trips | AM Exit Trips | PM Total | PM Entry Trips | PM Exit Trips |
| 220 | Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise) | 60 Dwelling Units | 412 | 30 | 7 | 23 | 38 | 24 | 14 |
| 210 | Single Family Detached Housing | 6 Dwelling Units | 78 | 9 | 2 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 3 |

Print outs of the trip generation by OTISS for this use are attached.

Summary

Based upon the expected traffic to be generated for the proposed residences and location of the project along Coco Plum Drive, the proposed residential development should not have an adverse impact on the operating characteristics, Level of Service of Avenue A (Pescayo Ave.) or Avenue B. The proposed project is combatable with the residential area and will not have adverse effects or impacts.



SERVING S.W. FLORIDA SINCE 1996
CIVIL ENGINEERS
LAND PLANNERS
CONTRACT ADMINISTRATORS

a Subsidiary of CARDNO

Appendix A

- Project Location Map
- Traffic Distribution Diagrams

Appendix B

- Proposed Multifamily and Single Family Residence
OTISS Traffic Software Output
ITE Code: 220 & 210
Independent Variable: Dwelling Units

1821 VICTORIA AVENUE, FORT MYERS, FLORIDA 33901
11400 OVERSEAS HIGHWAY, SUITE 208, MARATHON, FLORIDA 33050

PH. 239-337-3330
PH. 305-517-6469

WEB: WWW.DDAI-ENGINEERS.COM



a Subsidiary of CARDNO

SERVING S.W. FLORIDA SINCE 1996
CIVIL ENGINEERS
LAND PLANNERS
CONTRACT ADMINISTRATORS

Appendix A.1

1821 VICTORIA AVENUE, FORT MYERS, FLORIDA 33901
11400 OVERSEAS HIGHWAY, SUITE 208, MARATHON, FLORIDA 33050

PH. 239-337-3330
PH. 305-517-6469

WEB: WWW.DDAI-ENGINEERS.COM



FILE : H:\MARATHON-OFFICE-PROJECTS\2018\110056 SAA\CADD\DWG\XX-19-0056-TIS.DWG

DATE : 03/31/20
 SCALE : N.T.S.
 DESIGN: VJC
 CAD : VJC

| NO. | REVISION |
|-----|----------|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

DAVID DOUGLAS ASSOCIATES, INC.
 CIVIL ENGINEERS - LAND PLANNERS - CONTRACT ADMINISTRATORS
 11400 Overseas Hwy, Suite 208 Marathon, FL 33050
 Ph: 305-517-6469
 Web: www.ddai-engineers.com
 Florida Certificate of Authorization # 7568



LOCATION MAP
 SEAVIEW COMMONS II
 TRAFFIC STUDY
 BK 6 LOT 5&6 AVE. A
 MARATHON, FLORIDA

EXHIBIT
 1
 DDAI JOB
 NUMBER
 19-0056



a Subsidiary of CARDNO

SERVING S.W. FLORIDA SINCE 1996

CIVIL ENGINEERS

LAND PLANNERS

CONTRACT ADMINISTRATORS

Appendix A.2


1821 VICTORIA AVENUE, FORT MYERS, FLORIDA 33901

11400 OVERSEAS HIGHWAY, SUITE 208, MARATHON, FLORIDA 33050

PH. 239-337-3330

PH. 305-517-6469

WEB: WWW.DDAI-ENGINEERS.COM



FILE : H:\MARATHON-OFFICE-PROJECTS\2019\160086 SAA\CA\DD\DWG\XX-19-0086-TIS.DWG

| | | |
|-----------------|-----|----------|
| DATE : 03/31/20 | NO. | REVISION |
| SCALE : 1"=80' | | |
| DESIGN : VJC | | |
| CAD : VJC | | |


DAVID DOUGLAS ASSOCIATES, INC.
 CIVIL ENGINEERS - LAND PLANNERS - CONTRACT ADMINISTRATORS
 11400 Overseas Hwy, Suite 208 Marathon, FL 33050
 Ph. 305-517-8469
 Web: www.ddai-engineers.com
 Florida Certificate of Authorization # 7588



AM TRIP DISTRIBUTION
SEAVIEW COMMONS II
TRAFFIC STUDY
BK 6 LOT 5&6 AVE. A
MARATHON, FLORIDA

EXHIBIT
2
 DDAI JOB
 NUMBER
 19-0086

↙ 0 TRIPS (EN)
 ↘ 24 TRIPS (EN)
 ↗ 14 TRIPS (EX)
 ↖ 0 TRIPS (EX)



↗ 4 TRIPS (EN)
 ↘ 0 TRIPS (EN)
 ↖ 3 TRIPS (EX)
 ↙ 0 TRIPS (EX)

FILE : H:\MARATHON-OFFICE-PROJECTS\2018\180086 SAA\CA\DD\DWG\XX-18-0086-TIS.DWG

| | | |
|-----------------|-----|----------|
| DATE : 03/31/20 | NO. | REVISION |
| SCALE : 1"=80' | | |
| DESIGN : VJC | | |
| COND : WJC | | |

DAVID DOUGLAS ASSOCIATES, INC.
 CIVIL ENGINEERS - LAND PLANNERS - CONTRACT ADMINISTRATORS
 11400 Overseas Hwy, Suite 208 Marathon, FL 33050
 Ph: 305-517-6459
 Web: www.ddai-engineers.com
 Florida Certificate of Authorization # 7588



PM TRIP DISTRIBUTION
SEAVIEW COMMONS II
TRAFFIC STUDY
BK 6 LOT 5&6 AVE. A
MARATHON, FLORIDA

EXHIBIT
3
DDAI JOB
NUMBER
19-0095



a Subsidiary of CARDNO

SERVING S.W. FLORIDA SINCE 1996
CIVIL ENGINEERS
LAND PLANNERS
CONTRACT ADMINISTRATORS

Appendix B

1821 VICTORIA AVENUE, FORT MYERS, FLORIDA 33901
11400 OVERSEAS HIGHWAY, SUITE 208, MARATHON, FLORIDA 33050

PH. 239-337-3330
PH. 305-517-6469

WEB: WWW.DDAI-ENGINEERS.COM

PROJECT DETAILS
 Project Name: 19-0095 Schmitt-Ave A
 Project No: 19-0095
 Country: USA
 Analyst Name: David Douglas
 Date: 4/1/2020
 State/Province: Florida
 Analysis Region:
 Type of Project: Residential
 City: Marathon
 Built-up Area(Sq.ft):
 Clients Name: Seaview Commons II
 ZIP/Postal Code: 33050
 No. of Scenarios: 3

SCENARIO SUMMARY

| Scenarios | Name | No. of Land Uses | Phases of Development | No. of Years to Project Traffic | User Group | Entry | Exit | Total |
|--------------|-----------|------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|------------|-------|------|-------|
| Scenario - 1 | AM Trip | 2 | 1 | 0 | | 9 | 30 | 39 |
| Scenario - 2 | PM - Trip | 2 | 1 | 0 | | 28 | 17 | 45 |
| Scenario - 3 | Weekday | 2 | 1 | 0 | | 245 | 245 | 490 |

Scenario - 2

Scenario Name: PM - Trip
 Dev. Phase: 1
 Analyst Note:
 Warning:

User Group:
 No. of Years to Project Traffic: 0

VEHICLE TRIPS BEFORE REDUCTION

| Land Use & Data Source | Location | IV | Size | Time Period | Method | Entry Split% | Exit Split% | Total |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|------|------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------|-------------|-------|
| 220 - Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise) | General | Dwelling Units | 60 | Weekday, Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, | Best Fit (LOG) | 24 | 14 | 38 |
| Data Source: Trip Gen Manual, 10th Ed | Urban/Suburban | | | | $Ln(T) = 0.99Ln(X) - 0.02$ | 63% | 37% | |
| 210 - Single-Family Detached Housing | General | Dwelling Units | 6 | Weekday, Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic, | Best Fit (LOG) | 4 | 3 | 7 |
| Data Source: Trip Gen Manual, 10th Ed | Urban/Suburban | | | | $Ln(T) = 0.96Ln(X) + 0.20$ | 63% | 37% | |

VEHICLE TO PERSON TRIP CONVERSION

BASELINE SITE VEHICLE CHARACTERISTICS:

| Land Use | Baseline Site Vehicle Mode Share | | Baseline Site Vehicle Occupancy | | Baseline Site Vehicle Directional Split | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------|---------------------------------|------|-----------------------------------------|----------|
| | Entry (%) | Exit (%) | Entry | Exit | Entry (%) | Exit (%) |
| 220 - Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise) | 100 | 100 | 1 | 1 | 63 | 37 |
| 210 - Single-Family Detached Housing | 100 | 100 | 1 | 1 | 63 | 37 |

ESTIMATED BASELINE SITE PERSON TRIPS:

| Land Use | Person Trips by Vehicle | | Person Trips by Other Modes | | Total Baseline Site Person Trips | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------|-----------------------------|----------|----------------------------------|-----------|
| | Entry | Exit | Entry | Exit | Entry | Exit |
| 220 - Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise) | 24 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 14 |
| 210 - Single-Family Detached Housing | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 |
| TOTAL | 28 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 17 |

NEW VEHICLE TRIPS

| Land Use | New Vehicle Trips | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------|
| | Entry | Exit |
| 220 - Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise) | 24 | 14 |
| 210 - Single-Family Detached Housing | 4 | 3 |
| TOTAL | 28 | 17 |

RESULTS

| Site Totals | Entry | Exit | Total |
|--------------------------------|-------|------|-------|
| Vehicle Trips Before Reduction | 28 | 17 | 45 |
| External Vehicle Trips | 28 | 17 | 45 |
| New Vehicle Trips | 28 | 17 | 45 |

Scenario - 3
 Scenario Name: Weekday
 Dev. Phase: 1
 Analyst Note:
 Warning:
 User Group:
 No. of Years to Project: 0
 Traffic: 0

VEHICLE TRIPS BEFORE REDUCTION

| Land Use & Data Source | Location | IV | Size | Time Period | Method | Entry | Exit | Total |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|------|-------------|--------------------------------------------------------|-------|------|-------|
| 220 - Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise) | General | Dwelling Units | 60 | Weekday | Rate/Equation Best Fit (LIN) T = 7.56(X) - 40.86 | 206 | 206 | 412 |
| Data Source: Trip Gen Manual, 10th Ed | Urban/Suburban | | | | | 50% | 50% | |
| 210 - Single-Family Detached Housing | General | Dwelling Units | 6 | Weekday | Best Fit (LOG) Ln(T) = 0.92Ln(X) + 2.71 | 39 | 39 | 78 |
| Data Source: Trip Gen Manual, 10th Ed | Urban/Suburban | | | | | 50% | 50% | |

VEHICLE TO PERSON TRIP CONVERSION

BASELINE SITE VEHICLE CHARACTERISTICS:

| Land Use | Baseline Site Vehicle Mode Share | Baseline Site Vehicle Occupancy | Baseline Site Vehicle Directional Split |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| 220 - Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise) | Entry (%) 100 | Entry 1 | Entry (%) 50 |
| 210 - Single-Family Detached Housing | Exit (%) 100 | Exit 1 | Exit (%) 50 |

ESTIMATED BASELINE SITE PERSON TRIPS:

| Land Use | Person Trips by Vehicle | | Total Baseline Site Person Trips | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------|----------------------------------|-----------|
| | Entry | Exit | Entry | Exit |
| 220 - Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise) | 206 | 206 | 206 | 206 |
| 210 - Single-Family Detached Housing | 39 | 39 | 39 | 39 |
| NEW VEHICLE TRIPS | 78 | 78 | 78 | 78 |

NEW VEHICLE TRIPS

| Land Use | Entry | Exit | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------|------|-------|
| 220 - Multifamily Housing (Low-Rise) | 206 | 206 | 412 |
| 210 - Single-Family Detached Housing | 39 | 39 | 78 |

RESULTS

| Site Totals | Entry | Exit | Total |
|--------------------------------|-------|------|-------|
| Vehicle Trips Before Reduction | 245 | 245 | 490 |
| External Vehicle Trips | 245 | 245 | 490 |
| New Vehicle Trips | 245 | 245 | 490 |

ATTACHMENT D
2020 List of Affordable Housing Units / Projects

| Affordable Housing Project | Units in Place | Units in Process | Units Approved | Units Sought |
|-------------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|--------------|
| Anchor Inn (Habitat) | 7 | 4 | | |
| Aquarium Encounters | | | | 7 |
| Royal Crest | | 4 | | |
| Boat Works | | | 52 | |
| Centennial Bank | 5 | | | |
| Captain Pip's | | | | 1 |
| Coral Construction | | | | 14 |
| Coral Lagoon | 2 | | | |
| Crain (Individuals) | 3 | | | |
| Crystal Cove Affordables | 46 | | | |
| Marathon Affordables | 55 | | | |
| Diaz | | 4 | | |
| Eastwind Apartments | 130 | | | |
| Fair Acre | | 1 | | |
| Ferrucci | 6 | | | |
| GEM (250 Gulf Terrace) | | | | 9 |
| Gunnar Holdings | | 4 | | |
| Halioua | | | | 8 |
| Holiday Inn Express | | 2 | | |
| Hyatt | 14 | | | |
| Isla Bella | 70 | | | |
| Louisa St (D'Asign Source) | 1 | | | |
| Marlin Bay | 8 | | | |
| Overseas Village | 4 | | | |
| Overseas Village | 9 | | | |
| Overseas Highway (Individual) | 1 | | | |
| Pelican Pond | 8 | | | |
| Sea Grape | 84 | | | |
| Seacrest Apartments | 14 | | | |
| Seaview Commons II | | | | 64 |
| Seaview Commons II | | | | 60 |
| Seaward | 45 | | 8 | |
| Sunset Bay (Individuals) | 2 | | | |
| Serenity Cove | | | | 42 |
| Tarpon Harbor | 62 | | | |
| Tingler Ln (Individual) | 1 | | | |
| Tranquility Bay | 2 | | | |

| Affordable Housing Project | Units in Place | Units in Process | Units Approved | Units Sought |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Tropical Isle | 23 | | | |
| Wolfe Storage | 1 | | | |
| 24 th St (Individuals) | 1 | | | |
| 50 th St (Individuals) | 3 | | | |
| 52 nd St (Individual) | 3 | | | |
| 63 rd St (Individual) | 1 | | | |
| 64 th Street (Habitat) | 6 | | | |
| 64 th St. (Individuals) | 2 | | | |
| 65 th St (Individual) | 2 | | | |
| 73 rd St (Habitat) | 4 | | | |
| 73 rd St. (Individuals) | 2 | | | |
| 73d St (Keys Affordables) | 57 | | | |
| 74 th St (Individual) | 1 | | | |
| 76 th St (Individuals) | 4 | | | |
| 80 th St (Individuals) | 2 | | | |
| 91st St | | 3 | | |
| 107 th St (Individuals) | 2 | | | |
| 123rd St (Habitat) | 4 | | | |
| 123 rd St (Individual) | 1 | | | |
| | | | | |
| Total | 698 | 22 | 60 | 205 |
| GRAND TOTAL | 698 | 720 | 780 | 985 |

PUBLIC COMMENT LETTER

George Garrett

From: savecocolum@aol.com
Sent: Wednesday, June 3, 2020 11:34 AM
To: George Garrett
Subject: AWHousing

Dear George:

We are inundated with concerned calls about Seaview Commons-II. There is grave concern about the public safety and the impact of 130 unit increase on our community character. Is the end of Build Out time rapidly approaching? How many permits, are in progress for Coco Plum? What is the AWH density per acre for Seaview I and II?

I wish to speak at the June 15 Hearing. Of interest is a reliable assessment of the number of very low, low, middle and high income or Affordable Workforce Housing Units in place in Marathon. What do we have? What do we need? How will they impact community safety and character?

My latest number is 974 AWH units but I have no breakdown of the income levels and rents for the Seaview Projects.

Cheers,
Lynda Berrigan

George Garrett

From: Ramon Cue <rcue1@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 11, 2020 10:49 AM
To: Planning; Council
Subject: Seaview Commons II, -PUBLIC HEARING- Application # DP2020-0043

This letter is directed to the Marathon Planning Commission and City Council regarding the proposed Seaview Commons II, -PUBLIC HEARING- Application # DP2020-0043

As an owner of a unit at Bonefish Towers Condominium I am writing you to express my concerns over the proposed project

Unfortunately, I will not be able to attend the scheduled meeting on June 15th, but felt compelled to let my voice be heard via e-mail.

It is important to note that I have nothing against low income housing, I just don't feel this is the right location for it.

According to the Florida Housing Finance Corporation who controls the development of low income housing in the state of Florida, there are a number of requirements needed in order for a project like this to qualify as low income. Their proximity to Food Stores, Pharmacy, Public Transportation, Schools, and Medical Centers. The proposed location does not allow for any of these.

By approving this project you will be doing a disservice to the local community and the proposed project residents. Adding more traffic to an already dangerous situation, and far from most working destinations for proposed residents.

I would like to think that the city is concerned for the safety of its residents, and the wellbeing of its workers.

Thanking you in advance,
Ramon Cue
Bonefish Towers Unit 302
Marathon, Florida

A SIMPLE REQUEST: If you forward this email, please delete the forwarding history. Erasing the history helps prevent spammers and hackers from mining email addresses and propagating destructive viruses.

June 11, 2020

Marathon City Council
City of Marathon Planning Commission
Via email

Ladies/Gentlemen:

I am a homeowner in Bonefish Yacht Club, at 95 Coco Plum Drive, #5E. I also happen to be a member of the homeowners' association board of directors.

We were recently notified that Seaview Commons II is planning a development abutting our property. While we were to have received a certified letter regarding the project, I did not receive it.

There are several concerns that I have with this project.

Please note,

- It is acknowledged that there is a need for additional affordable housing in Marathon. In that there is no doubt. However, the addition of so many units within a dense space seems ill-advised.
- There is a very precarious curve in the road, where the ingress/egress to our property exists and the ingress/egress to Seaview Commons II will be. As Seaview will add some 66 to 130 or so vehicles to the traffic load, this portion of Coco Plum Drive will become even more dangerous and congested if the project is built. Additionally, Seaview Commons I will result in ingress/egress a block or so away from the curve, for a similar number of vehicles. The impact between the two communities could be 250 or so additional vehicles.
- The bridge on Coco Plum Drive is in need of repairs, repairs that were scheduled prior to the building of Seaview Commons I, that have not been commenced (same goes for other road improvements).
- Density – Between Seaview I and Seaview II additional density will approximate 130 units, which will result in additional noise, traffic, congestion and access to the pedestrian walkway/bike path will result.
- While these are the primary issues, there are others.

I'm asking that, at a minimum, the development of Seaview Commons II be delayed, until at least the impact of Seaview Commons I can be assessed via a formal study and that the scheduled road and bridge improvements be implemented prior to the development of Seaview Commons I, as planned.

Sincerely,



Elaine M Hill

George Garrett

From: Joseph J. Hill <jjhill@ceisreview.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 11, 2020 2:09 PM
To: Planning; Council
Cc: joel deshane
Subject: Seaview Commons II / June 15 Meeting

I live in Bonefish Yacht Club ("BYC").

I am aware of the intended residential development to occur along the Coco Plum Drive Road. My understanding is that there is approved for Seaview Commons 1 development of 64 units that will be across the street from my home in BYC. Also, there is now in consideration an additional 66 units i/n/o Seaview Commons II that will be adjacent to BYC.

I have no issue with affordable housing but I do have issue with the combined increase in living units that will be brought to the immediate area if all developments are approved with the parameters apparently approved and/or in consideration.

Considering that the proposed density will clearly bring a substantial increase in traffic on a road and bridge that is in serious need of attention regarding width and surface; the heightened potential for traffic accidents due to the curve of Coco Plum Drive beginning at Pescaya Avenue / Avenue A and continuing past Avenue D and C; elevated risks with having egress and ingress on two relatively sizeable new developments coupled with that of the existing BYC, likely increased vehicular noise; and worrisome increase in danger to pedestrians that are walking, running, and riding bikes.

We would appreciate if the City would reconsider the density matter relative to the concerns expressed in this email. My request is at a minimum for an impact study be completed prior to proceeding and made available for reading; clearly development of the dimension that is under consideration warrants such a study by a party (firm) that is independent of the City of Marathon and the developer.

Appreciate your consideration.

Thank you,
Joe Hill

Thank you and Best Regards,



Joseph J. Hill

CEIS Review Inc.

75 Broad Street, Suite 820
New York, NY 10004

☎888.967.7380 (Toll Free)

☎212.967.7380 • 📠212.967.7365

Consulting Services to the Financial Community

This electronic message contains information that may be legally confidential and/or privileged. The information is intended solely for the entity named above and by anyone else is unauthorized if you are not the intended recipient, and any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of the contents of this information is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this electronic transmission in error, please reply immediately to the sender that you have received this message in error, and delete it.

June 11, 2020

City Council
Marathon FL

To whom it may concern:

I am writing because of the proposed project Seaview 2.

1. Adding 3 new entrances off of Coco Plum Drive at the extreme curve will be a safety hazard. People make the turn now at a reckless speed and this all occurs as people are walking on the path. Adding more vehicles to this already well-traveled road is a bit reckless on the part of the village.
2. To add another 130 units after putting in the other Seaview is rather extreme. How many people can this area hold safely?
3. The current condition of Coco Plum Drive and the spalling on the bridge have not been addressed and the gravel that has been laid on the road is stupid and a hazard. You can see tire tracks as people swerve going around the curve now.
4. We realize that Marathon needs affordable housing but I think Coco Plum has already done a good share of the load. Please delay passing this until impact studies and assurances can be made.

Sincerely,

Diane E. Merna
Bonefish Tower
Marathon, FL

**CITY OF MARATHON, FLORIDA
RESOLUTION 2021-78**

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MARATHON, FLORIDA, APPROVING THE REQUEST BY SEAVIEW COMMONS II LLC FOR A RE-PLAT PURSUANT TO CHAPTER 102, ARTICLE 10 OF THE CITY OF MARATHON LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS (LDRS) ENTITLED “SUBDIVISION OF LAND/PLATS AND RE-PLATS,” PARTICULARLY, LOTS 5 AND 6 OF BLOCK 6, COCO PLUM BEACH SUBDIVISION, FAT DEER KEY, MARATHON, MONROE COUNTY, FLORIDA, HAVING REAL ESTATE NUMBERS 00363550-000000 & 00363560-000000. NEAREST MILE MARKER 54.

WHEREAS, Seaview Commons II LLC filed an Application on April 14, 2020 for approval to Re-Plat property located on Avenue B and Pescador Avenue, having Real Estate Numbers 00363550-000000 & 00363560-000000, into six (6) single family residential lots, and one (1) multifamily lot, pursuant to Chapter 177, Florida Statutes and Chapter 102, Article 10, of the City of Marathon Land Development Regulations (LDRs); and

WHEREAS, on the 15th day of June, 2020 the City of Marathon Planning Commission (the “Commission”) reviewed and recommended approval of the final re-plat with several conditions; and

WHEREAS, on the 14th day of July 2020, the City Council (the “Council”) reviewed the Applicant’s proposal finding that the final Re-plat documents were compliant with the terms of Chapter 177, Florida Statutes and the Chapter 102, Article 10 of the City LDR’s; and

WHEREAS, due process was afforded to the parties, the essential requirements of law were adhered to and competent and substantial evidence was presented, the Council voted to approve the Final Re-Plat; and

WHEREAS, the purpose of the Final Plat assures that Seaview Commons II LLC has complied with all subdivision and plat filing requirements of Chapter 102, Articles 10 and Florida Statutes Chapter 177.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MARATHON, FLORIDA, THAT:

Section 1. The above recitals are true and correct and incorporated herein.

Section 2. The final plat, an unsigned copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit “A”, is hereby approved for signature and recordation and otherwise has complied with or must meet all conditions of the re-Plat as follows:

1. Final plat shall include language regarding owner-signed consent and acknowledgement for wastewater and stormwater assessment for future development of the properties.
2. All utility and right-of-way permits shall be obtained and issued prior to final plat approval.
3. Applicant shall provide form of guarantee for necessary utility construction.
4. Reductions shall be noted in the plat and a complete accounting of acreage respective of allowed densities shall be made in the plat document.
5. Plat documents shall clearly indicate that no future subdivision shall be allowed of any area accounted for in density calculations
6. All conditions of the Conditional Use must be met prior to building permit issuance.

Section 3. This resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

PASSED AND APPROVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MARATHON, FLORIDA, THIS 14th DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2021.

THE CITY OF MARATHON, FLORIDA

Luis Gonzalez, Mayor

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

ATTEST:

Diane Clavier, City Clerk

(City Seal)

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND LEGALITY FOR THE USE AND RELIANCE OF THE CITY OF MARATHON, FLORIDA ONLY:

Steven T. Williams, City Attorney

