

**LEGISLATIVE #**

**110076C**

Exhibit 1

**Timeline on Land Development Code Amendments to Protect Significant Environmental and Natural Resources**

Background and Timeline

1. In 2000, the City Commission directed staff to consider additional environmental regulations to protect significant environmental features.
2. In 2001, staff evaluated and ranked undeveloped parcels and created a staff report.
3. In 2004, the City Commission adopted code to create a Significant Ecological Communities overlay district (Legistar # 020697, Petition 22TCH-02 PB – as attached).
4. Between 2005 and 2007, various overlay rezonings occurred. However, legal issues arose with the existing Significant Ecological Communities overlay district:
  - a. The environmental evaluations done for the 2001 staff report were deemed not “competent and substantial evidence” as required to rezone properties into the overlay district, based on legal challenges.
  - b. Parcels were evaluated in groups, but rezoning based on these evaluations has been challenged because aggregation of parcels is not addressed in the current overlay district ordinance.
  - c. The code language allowing a property to be excluded from the overlay district may place an unreasonable burden on landowners by requiring them to prove a subjective criterion does not exist on their property.
  - d. The current ordinance is not clearly written.
  - e. Significant ecological features may occur on properties not ranked as high or outstanding. These features receive no additional protections under the current ordinance.
  - f. Protected features in the existing code are not adequately protected and additional resources should be added.
  - g. Newly annexed parcels within County Strategic Ecosystems are not addressed.
5. In February, 2009, staff presented a new concept for environmental protection of annexed strategic ecosystem areas to the City’s Community Development Committee (CDC), which was approved by the CDC and recommended to the City Commission (Legistar # 070604; minutes attached).
6. In April, 2009, staff presented the new concept to the City and County Commissions at a joint meeting. The concept was approved and staff was directed to move forward with draft ordinance language (Legistar # 070604 and Legistar # 081026; minutes attached).
7. During the summer and fall of 2009, staff drafted the proposed environmental and archaeological resources protection petition.

8. In September, 2009, staff presented the draft ordinance language to the Plan Board, which was approved and recommended to the City Commission (7-0) (Petition PB-09-125-TCH; minutes attached).
9. In December, 2009, staff was prepared to present the petition to the City Commission, however, the item was continued because the City Attorney's Office had not yet reviewed the draft language (Legistar # 090536, Petition PB-09-125 TCH; minutes attached).
10. During 2010, the City Attorney's Office and staff met to complete a draft petition.
11. On February 24, 2011, staff presented the petition to the Plan Board (Petition PB-10-143 TCH). The item was continued until March 2, 2011 for further clarification and to incorporate questions/comments from the Board and public.
12. At the continuation hearing of March 2, 2011, following presentations by staff and by Pete Wallace (biologist), Dink Henderson (property owner and engineer), and Gerry Dedenbach (planner, who represented both himself and the North Central Florida Builders Association), the Plan Board provided comments to staff on Petition PB-10-143 TCH and continued the petition to the March 24, 2011 Plan Board meeting. (Petition PB-10-143 draft minutes are in the on-line agenda materials for the March 24, 2011 City Plan Board meeting.)
13. There was a well-attended stakeholders meeting for further input on the environmental petition on March 9, 2011.
14. Petition PB-10-143 TCH was approved by the Plan Board with amendments at the March 24, 2011 Plan Board hearing.
15. After the Plan Board hearing, a second stakeholders meeting was held May 9, 2011 to further discuss concerns raised at the Plan Board meeting.
16. On June 9, 2011, Planning staff met with GRU staff to discuss their concerns related to the impacts of the proposed regulations on GRU facilities.
17. June 13, 2011, Planning staff finalized the proposed regulations to send to the City Commission for Public Hearing. Changes reflect corrections and clarifications made as a result of stakeholder, GRU, and Planning staff input.