



Legislation Details (With Text)

**File #:** 24-384      **Version:** 1      **Name:**

**Type:** Agenda      **Status:** Agenda Ready

**File created:** 7/2/2024      **In control:** City Council

**On agenda:** 7/9/2024      **Final action:**

**Title:** Request to Postpone Consideration of a Zoning Map Amendment consistent with Appendix A, Zoning, Article XXI, to change the Zoning Map designation of eleven parcels totaling 1.39 acres, with the address 301 S. Cocoa Blvd., from C-P, Commercial Parkway, to C-N, Neighborhood Commercial to the July 23, 2024 City Council Meeting. (City Manager)

**Sponsors:**

**Indexes:**

**Code sections:**

**Attachments:** 1. 301 S Cocoa Blvd Location.pdf, 2. 301 S Cocoa Blvd FLU.pdf, 3. 301 S Cocoa Blvd Zoning.pdf, 4. Exhibit D Relevant Excerpt Comp Plan Data and Analysis 2010 (1), 5. Exhibit E - City of Cocoa Entry Signs.pdf, 6. Exhibit F - Relevant Excerpt Cocoa Redevelopment Agency Minutes 5-2002 (1).pdf, 7. 24-0200001 Application ZMA 301 S Cocoa Blvd.pdf, 8. FLU MAP FROM 2010 EAR.pdf, 9. P&Z Legal Ad Feb 7\_final.pdf

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
------	------	-----------	--------	--------

**CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM**

**Memo Date:** July 2, 2024  
**Agenda Date:** July 9, 2024  
**Prepared By:** Stephen Noto, AICP - Planning Consultant  
**Through:** Stockton Whitten - City Manager  
**Requested Action:**

Request to Postpone Consideration of a Zoning Map Amendment consistent with Appendix A, Zoning, Article XXI, to change the Zoning Map designation of eleven parcels totaling 1.39 acres, with the address 301 S. Cocoa Blvd., from C-P, Commercial Parkway, to C-N, Neighborhood Commercial to the July 23, 2024 City Council Meeting.

**BACKGROUND:**

The applicant, Ms. Mary D. Solik, Esq., on behalf of the property owner, Biscaya Holdings, LLC., is requesting to amend the Zoning Map designation of eleven parcels totaling 1.39 acres, with the address 301 S. Cocoa Blvd., from C-P, Commercial Parkway, to C-N, Neighborhood Commercial. The eleven parcel ID numbers that encompass the Subject Property, as part of the Laphams Subdivision as recorded in 1912, are as follows:

- 24-36-33-31-A-5 • 24-36-33-31-C-1 • 24-36-33-31-\*-R.1 • 24-36-33-31-\*-R.2 •
- 24-36-33-31-D-11 • 24-36-33-31-D-12 • 24-36-33-31-\*-R.3 • 24-36-33-31-\*-R.4 •
- 24-36-33-31-D-13 • 24-36-33-31-C-2 • 24-36-33-31-\*-R.5

The reason for the requested change is the applicant has identified that the existing zoning district of C-P is not an applicable zoning district with the current Future Land Use (FLU) designation of MU, Mixed Use, per Figure FLU-1 of the Future Land Use Element. The applicant is planning to redevelop the property in the future but is pursuing this step prior to the formal site plan submittal. While not made part of this submittal package, based on recent discussions with the application, the desire is to develop a “retail automotive gasoline/fuel sales as an accessory use to convenience store”, which would be a special exception use subject to certain conditions in the C-N if the rezoning were approved. However, the applicant has not identified an intended use of the property in the rezoning application. A more detailed analysis of the zoning and FLU applicability issue will be provided later in this staff report.

The subject property has had the current FLU Designation of MU, Mixed Use, since 2010. The City adopted EAR Based Amendments via Ordinance 11-2010, which included the creation of the MU Policies and Map M-I-7: Future Land Use Map. That map, which is attached to this report as a reference, shows the subject property having MU FLU.

In 2022, ModWash, LLC, applied for a Zoning Map Amendment (ZMA) and Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment (CPA) for the subject property. The CPA was to amend the future land use designation from MU, to COMM, Commercial. The ZMA request to rezone the subject property was from C-P, to C-G, General Commercial. The purpose of the requests was in order to construct a 4,320 sq. ft. self-serve carwash with amenities.

F  
 or a variety of factors, staff at that time recommended denial of both requests, and the project did not move forward past the May 4, 2022 Planning & Zoning Board Meeting. Some of the facts of that case are similar in this scenario, and may also be touched upon in this staff report.

**Future Land Use Designation:** Current: MU, Mixed Use

**Zoning District:** Current: C-P, Commercial Parkway  
 Proposed: C-N, Neighborhood Commercial

**Existing Land Use:** Commercial Related Amenities, Vacant Commercial Land

**Council District:** District 1 - Councilmember Goins

**Legal Ad Date:** January 23, 2024

**Overview of Surrounding Area:**

	Future Land Use Designations	Zoning Districts	Land Uses
North	MU, Mixed Use	PUD, Planned Unit Development; C-N, Neighborhood Commercial	Used Automobile Sales

<b>South</b>	COMM, Commercial	RU-1-7, Single-Family Residential District	Garage/Auto-Body/Auto Paint Shop
<b>East</b>	MU, Mixed Use; COMM, Commercial	RU-2-15, Multiple Family Dwelling	Commercial Related Amenities/Dealership Sales/Service Center/Vacant Commercial Land/Parking Lot Commercial
<b>West</b>	MU, Mixed Use	RU-1-7, Single-Family Residential District	FEC Railroad/Recreation Hall/Vacant Commercial Land/State Owned Land-Vacant

**I. Rezoning Analysis**

The Planning & Zoning Division staff have addressed the criteria contained in Appendix A of the City of Cocoa, Article XXI, Section 1(G) as follows:

- a. *The proposed change is contrary to the established land use pattern.*

Staff Finding: The City’s FLU Map provides for a Mixed-Use (MU) FLU Corridor on the south side of SR520/King St. that extends from S. Fiske Blvd. east to Cocoa Village/Riveredge Blvd. This area falls within parts of both the Diamond Square CRA and the Cocoa CRA. As shown on the Cocoa CRA map, the MU FLU extends north at the intersection of SR520/King St. and US 1. There are a number of zoning and FLU applicability conflicts within this corridor, as many parcels have C-G and C-P zoning, which are not applicable with the MU FLU, as noted in Figure FLU-1 in the Future Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

As a result of these consistency and applicability issues, the City is embarking on a Visioning Study to best determine how to manage and direct the needed zoning changes along the corridor, while also meeting the intent of the MU FLU designation, which is copied for convenience below:

“Per Policy 1.1.2.6: Mixed-Use (MU). The Mixed-Use land use category is intended to provide a mixture of residential, commercial, office, recreational and institutional uses along the major transportation corridors (such as SR 520 and US 1). The mixed-use could be developed as single uses on separate parcels or as a mixture of uses within a single development. Based on current land use trends, the City estimates that the mix of uses in the mixed-use category will be 50 percent residential and 50 percent non-residential. The Floor Area Ratio (FAR)

measure shall not be applied to residential developments, or the residential portion of a mixed-use building or development. The following criteria shall be used for determining appropriate locations for mixed-use land use areas.

- A. Areas within a quarter mile walking distances of public transit stations, transitional areas between high and low intensity uses, and areas adjacent to major corridors within the City are appropriate for Mixed-Use category.
- B. The land development regulations implementing this category shall encourage a compact and walkable environment to reduce vehicle miles of travel and encourage use of public transit.
- C. Development within mixed-use shall be encouraged to follow Transit Oriented Design (TOD) principles.
- D. Unified architectural and streetscape themes are encouraged for all developments within the Mixed-Use category.
- E. Mixed use buildings within a single development will be highly encouraged in this category.
- F. For a mixed-use building, only retail sales, offices and services and restaurants are permitted on the ground floor.
- G. If residential housing units are developed as part of a vertical mixed-use project a bonus of up to 5 units per acre may be achieved.
- H. For the purposes of analyzing public facilities impacts of proposed Future Land Use Map amendments, a mix of 50% residential and 50% non-residential land area split shall be utilized.”

As part of the Visioning Study, it is possible that different performance standards may be implemented within the corridor to protect neighboring uses from more intense commercial uses, such as enhanced landscape or setback standards, architectural standards, or lot design standards. Given the vision of the MU FLU designation, it is clear that a different type of development environment is desired in the area that incorporates Transit Oriented Design principles, unified architectural and streetscape themes, and encourages vertical mixed-use development, which may also impact the allowed zoning districts in the MU FLU designation and the permitted and special exception uses within those applicable zoning districts.

The City recently released RFP # P-24-04 COC, Professional Services for New Community Redevelopment Plan Update. This RFP was issued by the Cocoa Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA), the Diamond Square Community Redevelopment Agency, and the City, in

order to review and update both the CRA Plan for the Cocoa CRA and the Diamond Square CRA. Of note from this update is that not only is the subject property located within the Cocoa CRA, but it is also directly adjacent to the Diamond Square CRA. Additionally, one of the Visioning and Revitalization Efforts required of the RFP includes both CRA Districts with a “particular focus on the SR 520 and US 1 corridors”.

In the Data and Analysis of the City’s Comprehensive Plan from 2010, as prepared by Land Design Innovations, a number statements were made, which were subsequently adopted by the City, related to mixed use development, the need for high quality redevelopment, and the City’s vital corridors. The following excerpts from said document are provided for context when considering the intent of the MU FLU designation and the surrounding land use patterns of the subject property:

1. The intent of the category is to *encourage the development of compact mixed-use centers and avoid a strip commercial development pattern*. This category is not intended to require a mix of uses for each site, but rather to achieve an area-wide mix of uses.

Staff Note: The intent of the MU designation may not be fully realized through the existing land use pattern, given that the zoning districts that are currently compatible with it, per the Comprehensive Plan, allows for use types that generally are part of strip commercial development. This is one of several reasons why the City is taking on additional Visioning reviews, and why this specific request and application is not timely.

2. The Mixed-Use land use is applicable to areas generally along SR 520 (King Street) and US 1. The FLUM shows 120 acres of Mixed-Use. The City anticipates that by 2020, the mix of uses in the Mixed-Use land use category will be about 50% nonresidential and 50% residential.
3. Weaknesses identified in 2004 Analysis of Economic Development Environment in the City by the University of Florida:
  - a. Too many greyfields, brownfield areas and distressed commercial corridors in the City. The U.S. 1 corridor has many vacant strip malls, which are considered unsightly and a deterrent for businesses.
  - b. Need for continued and stricter aesthetics and design standards for the corridors. The buildings on the commercial corridors lack quality architecture design and landscaping and streetscape features.
  - c. Lack of quality affordable housing and diversity of housing choices for middle and | upper income home buyers.
  - d. Negative self-image and lack of an articulated and shared community vision of the City.

Staff Note: As seen in 3b, 3c, and 3d, above, there remains a need for the City to incorporate aesthetic and design standards for its vital corridors. While the City has taken significant efforts to assist with this effort, such as the gateway corridor signage that was installed at the intersection of SR 520 and US1, more work is required for the City to realize its ultimate goals

and objectives. Without this work, the proposed rezoning would not be consistent with the established land use pattern as envisioned by the City's Comprehensive Plan.

4. SR 524, US 1, SR 501, and SR 520 are the major commercial corridors of the City. They consist primarily of auto-oriented strip shopping centers that lack adequate pedestrian and bicycle access. The developments along these corridors also lack quality architectural design and adequate landscaping and are generally poorly maintained.
5. The City adopted a Vision Plan in June 1996 to guide the future development of the City. The plan included the analysis of the physical, social and economic conditions of the City. The plan identified two primary challenges facing the City - improving the general image of the City and diversification and strengthening of the City's economic base. The Vision Plan included economic, land use, urban design, infrastructure and governmental and administrative strategies for future development, including a conceptual long range master land use plan and an action plan to implement the vision.
6. Both the 1996 vision plan and the 2006 workshop identified similar issues including lack of identity, economic development and affordable housing. The City has consistently taken efforts to address and overcome these issues by implementing the goals and objectives of the vision plan and will continue these efforts.
7. SR 520, U.S. 1, SR 524, Dixon Boulevard and Fiske Boulevard (SR 519) are the major commercial corridors in Cocoa. These major corridors should be developed as mixed-use corridors.

Staff Note: This observations of 4-7 further emphasizes the great need for thoughtful design standards to be applied to the corridor.

The above information provides context to the historical policy direction of the City, and how additional work is needed to ensure that these policies are seen through. The existing land use pattern of the area can be generally described as strip commercial that has either gone through multiple generations of re-use or been redevelopment in a manner that is not realizing the full desire of the mixed-use policies or desires of the City that have been consistent for close to thirty years. It would be of great benefit to the City that this vital corridor, which impacts both the Diamond Square and Cocoa CRA's, as well as the Cocoa Village, be development in a manner that meets the full intent and requirements of the code.

As mentioned above, there is one structure of significance north of this site in the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) right-of-way (ROW). The structure is one of the four "Cocoa" signs as depicted in Exhibit E. The four corners of the major arterial intersection are the western historical entrance to Cocoa Village and the Cocoa Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA). The work to make the intersection prominent began in May of 2002 when the Cocoa Redevelopment Agency voted to start the process to vacate Stone Street and to acquire the needed properties for the sign. See Exhibit F. Cocoa Redevelopment Agency minutes show the desire to redevelop the land at this intersection since 2002. It is important that this prominent corner, announcing the entrance to downtown Cocoa, be developed consistently with the City's expressed long -term land use goals and vision for the corridor, which is a mixed-use center.

As such, the permitted uses in the C-N should be analyzed in light of mixed-use center policies of the City Council and the existence of the “Cocoa” sign directly in front of the subject property, making it one of the most prominent gateways of the City. The C-N district would allow:

- (1) Retail stores, sales and display rooms (except automotive) and similar uses, including places such as bakeries in which goods are produced and sold at retail upon the premises.
- (2) Personal service establishments such as beauty and barbershops, laundry and dry cleaning pickup stations, tailor shops and similar uses.
- (3) Professional offices, studios, clinics, laboratories, general offices and similar uses.
- (4) Restaurants, subject to the following:
  - a. Outdoor entertainment shall be prohibited;
  - b. The restaurant shall be required to close no later than 10:00 PM on Sunday through Thursday and no later than 12:00 AM on Friday and Saturday; and
  - c. Walls and/or opaque vegetative screening buffers shall be required between the restaurant and adjacent properties with residential zoning designations.
- (5) Multiple-family and single-family residences as regulated in section 5, RU-2-15 District.
- (6) Financial institutions.
- (7) Pharmacy, medical marijuana treatment center dispensing facilities, apothecary and optical services. Medical marijuana treatment center dispensing facilities shall not be located within five hundred (500) feet of the real property that comprises a public or private elementary, middle or secondary school, unless the city council approves the location at a public hearing and determines that the location promotes the public health, safety, and general welfare of the community, or as otherwise provided in F.S. Ch. 381, as may hereafter be amended.
- (8) Child care centers, day nurseries of kindergartens.
- (9) Package store, beer and wine.

In addition, special exception uses that would be permitted include bars and lounges, with or without a package store; package stores; and retail automotive gasoline/fuel sales as an accessory use to convenience stores, with certain conditions.

Many of these uses may not be desirable at the most prominent gateway to the City nor consistent with the mixed-use vision, including pharmacies and medical marijuana treatment center facilities, package stores, and bars and lounges.

*b. The proposed change would create an isolated district unrelated to adjacent and nearby districts.*

Staff Finding: As seen on the City’s zoning map, the corridor in general is a mix of C-G, C-P, and C-C zoning. The closest parcels with C-N zoning are at the intersections of Blake Ave. and Bernard St., the western terminus of Whaley St. (Emma Jewel Charter Academy), and a parcel at the termini of Bernard St./Thomas Ln./Pineapple Ave. that is owned by the City. None of those parcels have the MU FLU designation, however. Other C-N parcels are generally located on Peachtree St. between Pineda St. and Prospect Ave., as well as a portion of the northeast side of the City along SR 524, 501, Dixon Blvd. and US 1. The locations, however, have FLU designations of Neighborhood Commercial (NCOMM) or Commercial (COMM). None of the properties with a current C-N zoning district have frontage along SR 520 or are located in the SR 520 corridor. The closest C-N zoned property is located 0.35 miles away, which would result in an isolated zoning district were the subject property be rezoned as C-N.

Additionally, the locations of said existing parcels with C-N zoning better meet the intent of the C-N district as defined in Section 11: “The provisions of this district are intended to apply to an area adjacent to major arterial streets and convenient to major residential areas. The types of uses permitted are intended to serve the consumer needs of nearby residential neighborhoods as well as the commercial needs of the motorist. Lot sizes and other restrictions are intended to reduce conflicts with adjacent residential uses to minimize the interruption of traffic along thoroughfares.”

Access to nearby neighborhoods is very complex in this area. Due to the vacation of Stone St., and subsequent lack of pedestrian connectivity to the Diamond Square neighborhood to the west, accessibility to the site is limited to mainly vehicular use. While there are multiple curb-cuts and access points from SR 520/King St. and the prior Stone St. right-of-way (ROW) curb cut on U.S. 1 east of the railroad tracks, it is very unclear how the intent of both the MU FLU designation and C-N zoning will be met. In fact, for all of the aforementioned existing properties with C-N zoning, they each are located directly adjacent to property that is zoned for residential purposes, such as RE (Residential Estate), RU-1-7 (Single Family Residential), RU-2-15 (Multiple Family Dwelling District). These locations are consistent with the intent of the C-N district to be located “convenient to major residential areas.”

In this case, the proposed C-N rezoning would not be located conveniently to a major residential area as it is separated from the Diamond Square residential community by the railroad tracks as well as both C-W and C-G zoned property lining the railroad tracks on the western side.

Based on an analysis of both the zoning and FLU maps, there does not appear to be one parcel within the City that has the MU FLU and the C-N zoning designation. As part of the applicant’s petition, they noted that adjacent and nearby properties all have commercial zoning (none neighborhood commercial). While there is a mixture of commercial zoning districts in the area, the application did not provide the additional detail that the C-G and C-W parcels to the west, on the southside of SR520/King St., and the C-P parcels in the immediate area, are not applicable with the MU FLU designation as shown in Figure FLU-1 of the Future Land Use Element. As previously noted, the City has identified these inconsistencies and has begun a Visioning study to determine the most appropriate manner to encourage consistency between the zoning categories and the Comprehensive Plan, as well as two CRA studies to best determine the appropriate redevelopment strategies of the SR 520 and US 1 corridor.

- c. *The proposed change would materially alter the population density pattern and thereby increase or overtax the load on public facilities such as schools, utilities, streets, access, etc.*

Staff Finding: The proposed change has the potential to alter the population density pattern. While the application has stated that no residential development is proposed, the application also did not provide a conceptual plan to detail what the proposed development is. As such, the proposed zoning district of C-N, Neighborhood Commercial, does allow, by right, multiple-family and single-family residences, as regulated in Section 5, RU-2-15 District. The RU-2-15 district allows a maximum of 15 dwelling units per acre, which could yield a maximum of 21 dwelling units on the Subject Property. As previously noted, impacts to the streets and access are also unknown due to the existing curb cuts on SR 520/King St., US 1, and Stone St. Without a full analysis, the impact to public facilities is unknown.



d. Existing district boundaries are illogically drawn in relation to existing conditions on the property proposed for change.

Staff Finding: The existing boundaries are not illogically drawn in relation to existing conditions on the property. The property is currently vacant. While rezoning it to C-N would resolve the applicability and consistency with the MU FLU, as previously noted, there are no other C-N properties in the area, and would therefore create an isolated district that is illogically drawn. The existing C-P zoning district is consistently found on the four corners of the U.S.1 and SR 520 intersection and south of the subject property.

By contrast, were the property to be rezoned to C-N, the intent of the district would not be met based on the location and conditions of the existing property due to its lack of convenience to adjacent neighborhoods.

e. The proposed change would be contrary to the Future Land Use Map and would have an adverse effect on the Comprehensive Plan.

Staff Finding: The existing FLUM designation of the subject property is MU. The proposed rezoning would be consistent with Figure FLU-1 of the Future Land Use Element as C-N is identified as an applicable zoning district within the MU designation.

The MU district is detailed as follows:

Policy 1.1.2.6: Mixed-Use (MU). The Mixed-Use land use category is intended to provide a mixture of residential, commercial, office, recreational and institutional uses along the major transportation corridors (such as SR 520 and US 1). The mixed-use could be developed as single uses on separate parcels or as a mixture of uses within a single development. Based on current land use trends, the City estimates that the mix of uses in the mixed-use category will be 50 percent residential and 50 percent non-residential. The Floor Area Ratio (FAR) measure shall not be applied to residential developments, or the residential portion of a mixed-use building or development. The following criteria shall be used for determining appropriate locations for mixed-use land use areas.

A. Areas within a quarter mile walking distances of public transit stations, transitional areas between high and low intensity uses, and areas adjacent to major corridors within the City are appropriate for Mixed-Use category.

B. The land development regulations implementing this category shall encourage a compact and walkable environment to reduce vehicle miles of travel and encourage use of public transit.

- C. Development within mixed-use shall be encouraged to follow Transit Oriented Design (TOD) principles.
- D. Unified architectural and streetscape themes are encouraged for all developments within the Mixed-Use category.
- E. Mixed use buildings within a single development will be highly encouraged in this category.
- F. For a mixed-use building, only retail sales, offices and services and restaurants are permitted on the ground floor.
- G. If residential housing units are developed as part of a vertical mixed-use project a bonus of up to 5 units per acre may be achieved.
- H. For the purposes of analyzing public facilities impacts of proposed Future Land Use Map amendments, a mix of 50% residential and 50% non-residential land area split shall be utilized.

The application that was provided noted that the proposed uses on the property are “Commercial uses consistent with C-N zoning”. The applicant has had at least two pre-application meetings with the City in order to redevelop the property with what the Code defines as “Retail automotive gasoline/fuel sales as an accessory use to convenience stores”. That said use is a Special Exception within the C-N zoning district. In the event the applicant does pursue such a use, they will be required to meet the five (5) conditions for Retail automotive gasoline/fuel sales as an accessory use to convenience stores as detailed in Section 11(C)(10), and Article XVII, Section 2.

In addition, as mentioned earlier, the City is undertaking multiple studies to determine the best path forward to bring parcels that are not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan in to compliance, as well as how to manage the existing CRA’s. This may include further modifications to the Land Development Code having to do with design, uses, and other bulk regulations as detailed above in subsection (a).

**f.** *Changed or changing conditions make the passage of the proposed amendment necessary.*

Staff Finding: The existing zoning district is not compatible with the FLU designation of the subject property. As a matter of consistency and compatibility, a property should have a zoning district that is compatible with the FLU designation. However, the corridor has not seen significant change that would make the proposed amendment necessary. The MU FLU was established in 2010 in an effort to promote mixed-use developments. As previously noted in the report, this specific intersection is seen as having high importance to the Diamond Square CRA, Cocoa CRA, SR 520/US1 intersection, and the Cocoa Village. A more appropriate zoning strategy should be undertaken to support redevelopment on the subject property, that is consistent with the vision and possible changing conditions in the corridor.

**g.** *The proposed change will adversely influence living conditions in the neighborhood.*

Staff Finding: The Subject Property was previously developed with commercial uses with curb cuts on SR520/King St. and US1. The impact to the surrounding neighborhoods is unknown as a final use is unknown. The applicant or eventual developer of the subject property will be required to meet or exceed the requirements of the Land Development Code and Comprehensive Plan.

- h. The proposed change will create or excessively increase traffic congestion or otherwise affect public safety.*

Staff Finding: The proposed change may impact traffic congestion and flow, however the full impacts will not be fully reviewed until site planning when a traffic study is reviewed. It is anticipated that the number of curb cuts will be modified to better limit access.

- i. The proposed change will create a drainage problem.*

Staff Finding: No drainage problems are anticipated as a result of the rezoning. Any new construction would be required to comply with all applicable regulations and permitting requirements.

- j. The proposed change will seriously reduce light and air to adjacent areas.*

Staff Finding: Any new construction is required to meet the requirements of the City Code to ensure light and air to adjacent areas are not reduced. It is not anticipated that this project will bring such negative impact.

- k. The proposed change will adversely affect property values in the adjacent areas.*

Staff Finding: It is not anticipated that property values would be affected by the proposed rezoning. Uses that are similar in nature generally have a positive value impact upon each other.

- l. The proposed change will be a deterrent to the improvement or development of adjacent property in accord with existing regulations.*

Staff Finding: It is not anticipated that the proposed rezoning would be a deterrent to the improvement or development of adjacent property. Development of the property will be self-contained, which will result in little to no impact on the improvement or development of other properties but result in an overall negative impact to the MU FLU vision.

- m. The proposed change will constitute a grant of special privilege to an individual owner as contrasted with the public welfare.*

Staff Finding: The proposed change will not constitute a grant of special privilege to the property owner of the subject property as contrasted with the public welfare.

- n. There are substantial reasons why the property cannot be used in accord with existing zoning.*

Staff Finding: The existing C-P zoning is not compliant with the existing FLU designation of MU, Mixed Use. A zoning change is required to redevelop the property. However, as noted previously, greater coordination is needed between the applicant and the City to maximize the existing growth policies, existing vision, and visioning scopes that will impact the development potential of the property.

- o. Whether the change suggested is out of scale with the needs of the neighborhood of the city.*

Staff Finding: The proposed rezoning creates a situation whereby the zoning category that is requested would be the only property with the requested category of C-N. The impacts of such a change is unknown and as a result, the City is beginning a visioning exercise of the corridor to better understand how to bring the zoning and FLU designations in to compliance. That action will be provide better direction and understanding of what the needs of the neighborhood and City are.

- p. It is impossible to find other adequate sites in the city for the proposed use in districts already permitting such use.*

Staff Finding: The applicant has stated on the application that without the change, the property owners are deprived of any use of their property.

As explained above, the City is embarking on a Visioning Process to ensure that an appropriate zoning designation with design standards and regulations consistent with the MU FLU will be applied as soon as possible. The application further details that the proposed use is “Commercial uses consistent with C-N zoning”. As previously noted, the applicant has had multiple pre-app meetings outlining their intent to construct a “Retail automotive gasoline/fuel sales as an accessory use to convenience stores”. There are many other sites where such a use could occur, though the applicant does not own those parcels.

### **Consistency with Comprehensive Plan Policies and Objectives**

The proposed C-N zoning is applicable with the MU FLU designation per Figure FLU-1 in the Comprehensive Plan. However, there are concerns with some of the uses of C-N and their consistency with MU Policy 1.1.2.6.

As has been noted in the staff report, the City is undertaking significant visioning studies to manage the zoning and future land use consistency issues along the SR520 and US 1 corridor. Such efforts are supported by the Comprehensive Plan via the following policies:

- FLU Element, Objective 1.1.10: The City shall maintain, amend and develop land development regulations that guide future growth and development, discourage the proliferation of urban sprawl and implement the goals, objectives and policies of this comprehensive plan.
- Policy 1.1.10.7: Existing land uses which are incompatible or inconsistent with the City's Future Land Use Map will continue to be identified and addressed.
- Policy 1.1.10.8: Within three years after the adoption of the comprehensive plan update, the City shall have eliminated all inconsistencies between the Official Zoning Map and the Future Land Use Map.
- Policy 1.1.10.9: The City shall consider conducting a survey to identify the incompatible uses

in the CRAs and major commercial corridors.

- Policy 1.1.10.10: The City shall review the non-conforming section of the land development code to ensure its effectiveness.
- Policy 1.1.10.11: Land development regulations must be made consistent with updates to the comprehensive plan within one year of the plan amendment submittal, as required by F.S.

It is noted that time has passed since certain comprehensive plan policies have been adopted, which is why the City is aggressively moving forward to rectify zoning and FLU inconsistencies.

### **Concurrency Management/Adequate Public Facilities**

*Section 15-22 of the City Code provides for a concurrency management system to ensure public facilities and services needed to support development are available concurrent with the impacts of such development and that development orders and development permits are not issued in a manner that will not result in a reduction in the levels of service below the adopted level of service standards adopted by the City for public facilities and services, as contained in the City's adopted Comprehensive Plan.*

Consistent with the requirements of Article IV (Concurrency Management System), Chapter 15 of the Code of the City of Cocoa, the applicant/developer will be required to submit a final application for concurrency review prior to issuance of any City of Cocoa permits. If capacity issues relating to any public facilities or services regulated by the City of Cocoa adopted Comprehensive Plan is identified, necessary and appropriate mitigation will be required to be addressed prior to construction. However, because the maximum density remains unchanged, no further impact to public facilities is anticipated.

### **STRATEGIC PLAN CONNECTION:**

N/A

### **BUDGETARY IMPACT:**

N/A

### **PREVIOUS ACTION:**

On February 7, 2024 the Planning and Zoning Board recommended denial to City Council.

### **RECOMMENDED MOTION:**

Request to Postpone Consideration of a Zoning Map Amendment consistent with Appendix A, Zoning, Article XXI, to change the Zoning Map designation of eleven parcels totaling 1.39 acres, with the address 301 S. Cocoa Blvd., from C-P, Commercial Parkway, to C-N, Neighborhood Commercial to the July 23, 2024 City Council Meeting.