

060234

Submitted by Peter Rebmann
on 10/9/2000 (KL)

My name is Peter Rebmann and I am speaking tonight as the president of the Northwest Gainesville Coalition of Homeowners Associations. At the plan board meeting on August 17th, Rory Causseaux advised the board members to concentrate on the facts rather than be swayed by opinion. We have taken his advice to heart and I am here tonight to present a list of facts that are relevant to this petition.

Fact: On 8/22/94 city ordinance 4000 amended the future land use element for the Gainesville North Community Activity Center and included a deadline of August 22, 1999 to obtain PD zoning on the activity center.

Fact: On 12/8/97, at a workshop before the city commission, the applicant's DRI team presented a synopsis and plan overview of the Greenways DRI. The synopsis included detailed maps and tables for the DRI.

Fact: On or about 12/17/97 the applicant's DRI team attended a preapplication conference at the regional planning council. This was the formal start of the Greenways DRI.

Fact: From 11/98 to 5/2000 the applicant sent five plan submissions to the regional planning council.

Each submission listed 17 land use categories, but from one submission to the next there were significant changes in no more than 6 of them. In particular, the totals for SF and MF housing never changed.

Fact: On 8/17/99 a letter, signed by Jan P. Brewer, from Florida DEP to Chuck Kiester of the regional planning council read in part, "suitability of the site for major development is in question" and "it is recommended that the density of development be decreased to lessen the amount of impervious area on the site."

Fact: On 8/20/99 a letter, signed by Lea Gabbay, from FDOT to Chuck Kiester included questions about traffic mitigation, project staging, and roadway improvement costs. "The Department is concerned that the mitigation plan will exclude necessary roadway improvements and will necessitate future state funding for such improvements." "It should be noted that Stage-1 of the development is only for a short period of time (from year 2000 to 2003) ... substantial change in traffic is not likely to occur in such a short time."

Fact: On 8/23/99 a letter, signed by James H. Sullivan, Jr., from Water and Air Research, Inc. to Chuck Kiester lists concerns with off-site stormwater runoff impacts. Regarding data provided by the DRI team, "In the absence of data to show otherwise, it is not at all obvious to us that an adequate stormwater management plan can be developed for this proposed development."

Fact: On 8/26/99 a letter, signed by Michael Drummond, from the Alachua County Department of Environmental Protection to Chuck Kiester said in part, "...it is our view that the density and intensity of development proposed is not appropriate for this site."

Fact: On 6/19/2000 a letter from FDOT to Chuck Kiester signed by Lea Gabbay reviewed the applicant's sufficiency response submittal of May 2000. "The applicant's analysis shows ... that a number of roadways will be needing additional capacity ... For example:

*** Segment #A-3, NW 43rd Street (from SR 26-NW 53rd Ave.): Create eight lanes of capacity;

*** Segment #S-24, NW 34th Street/SR 121 (from Archer Road to University Ave.): Create ten lanes of capacity.

*** Segment #S-15, SR 26 (from I-75 to NW 8th Ave.): Create twelve lanes of capacity."

I could go on but these facts will suffice for my purpose here tonight. What follows next is analysis, or if you prefer, opinion.

These facts form a pattern that appears to have two possible interpretations:

1. The applicant is engaged in a calculated ploy of delay and stonewalling with the expectation that this will somehow result in getting his plans approved without significant modification.
2. The applicant is bumbling and fumbling his way through the DRI process with no clear idea of what he is doing.

Neither interpretation inspires confidence and confidence in the applicant and in his willingness to accommodate his plans to the capacities of the land and of the surrounding infrastructure is at the heart of this deliberation.

The facts cited above show that in over six years, including nearly three years in the DRI process, the applicant has never offered to make a significant reduction in the intensity of his planned development to bring that development in line with what the review agencies have told him time and time again is the limited capacity of his land and of the surrounding infrastructure to sustain his planned level of development.

In view of our analysis of the facts here presented, we of the Northwest Gainesville Coalition of Homeowners Associations recommend that this petition be denied. However, we are not naïve about this process. We realize that, with the plan board's approval and with the approval of the city staff, in all probability this petition will be approved. In that event, we recommend that you add such conditions to your approval that the applicant will have no doubt that he is expected to come to the final public hearings with his plans significantly scaled down to a level that both the land and the surrounding infrastructure can sustain.

Finally, I would like to ask that a printed copy of my remarks along with the supporting documentation be made a part of the official record of this hearing.