



## City of Alachua

ADAM BOUKARI  
CITY MANAGER

PLANNING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
DIRECTOR KATHY WINBURN, AICP

September 13, 2018

Ryan Thompson, AICP  
Project Manager  
CHW, Inc.  
132 NW 76<sup>th</sup> Drive  
Gainesville, FL 32607

Also submitted electronically to [ryant@chw-inc.com](mailto:ryant@chw-inc.com).

RE: Hearings to be scheduled for:  
- Highpoint Crossing Large Scale Comprehensive Plan Amendment (LSCPA)  
- Highpoint Crossing Site-Specific Amendment to the Official Zoning Atlas (Rezoning)

Dear Mr Thompson:

On September 4, 2018 the City of Alachua received your updated applications for the above referenced projects.

Based on review of the materials submitted, the City has determined that these applications can now be scheduled for hearings before the Planning and Zoning Board.

You must provide 13 *double-sided, three-hole punched, color sets* of the **complete** application packages and digital copies of all materials in PDF format on CDs *no later than 10 business days prior to the PZB Meeting at which your application is scheduled to be heard*. The application has been scheduled for the **October 9, 2018** Planning and Zoning Board meeting; therefore, the above referenced materials must be submitted to the City no later than **Monday, September 24, 2018**. Materials may be submitted earlier than this date.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact us at (386) 418-6100.

Sincerely,

Justin Tabor, AICP  
Principal Planner

Adam Hall, AICP  
Planner

c: Kathy Winburn, AICP, Planning & Community Development Director  
Project File

**BOARD MEMBERS**

April M. Griffin  
Robert P. Hyatt  
Leannetta McNealy, Ph.D.  
Gunnar F. Paulson, Ed.D.  
Eileen F. Roy



District Office  
620 East University Avenue  
Gainesville, Florida  
32601-5498

www.sbac.edu  
(352) 955-7300  
Fax (352) 955-6700

**SUPERINTENDENT**

Karen D. Clarke

*We are committed to the success of every student!*

Facilities Department \*\* 3700 N. E. 53<sup>rd</sup> Avenue \*\* Gainesville, Florida 32609 \*\* 352.955.7400

September 6, 2018

Justin Tabor, Principal Planner  
Planning & Community Development Department  
City of Alachua  
PO Box 9  
Alachua, FL 32616

RE: High Point Crossing CPA/ Rezoning including 157 single family units and 418 multi-family residential units. Tax Parcel: A portion of 03049-000-000.

Dear Mr. Tabor:

High Point Crossing CPA / Rezoning consists of 157 single family units and 418 multi-family units. The property is presently entitled for a maximum of 160 single family units and 288 multi-family units. Approval of the petition will result in a net decrease of 3 single family units and an increase of 130 multi-family units

Based on data provided by the City of Alachua, we have completed a School Capacity Review for the above referenced project. The review was conducted in accordance with the City of Alachua Public School Facilities Element as follows:

*POLICY 1.1.b: Coordinating School Capacity with Planning Decisions*

*The City shall coordinate land use decisions with the School Board's Long Range Facilities Plans over the 5-year, 10-year and 20-year periods by requesting School Board review of proposed comprehensive plan amendments and rezonings that would increase residential density. This shall be done as part of a planning assessment of the impact of a development proposal on school capacity.*

*POLICY 1.1.c: Geographic Basis for School Capacity Planning.*

*For purposes of coordinating land use decisions with school capacity planning, the School Concurrency Service Areas (SCSAs) that are established for high, middle and elementary schools as part of the Interlocal Agreement for Public School Facility Planning shall be used for school capacity planning. The relationship of high, middle and elementary capacity and students anticipated to be generated as a result of land use decisions shall be assessed in terms of its impact (1) on the school system as a whole and (2) on the applicable SCSA(s). For purposes of this planning assessment, existing or planned capacity in adjacent SCSAs shall not be considered.*

*POLICY 1.1.e: SBAC Report to City*

*The SBAC shall report its findings and recommendations regarding the land use decision to the City. If the SBAC determines that capacity is insufficient to support the proposed land use decision, the SBAC shall include its recommendations to remedy the capacity deficiency including estimated cost and financial feasibility. The SBAC shall forward the Report to all municipalities within the County.*

*POLICY 1.1.f City to Consider SBAC Report*

*The City shall consider and review the SBAC’s comments and findings regarding the availability of school capacity in the evaluation of land use decisions.*

This review does not constitute a “concurrency determination” and may not be construed to relieve the development of such review at the final subdivision or final site plan stages as required by state statutes and by the City of Alachua Comprehensive Plan. It is intended to provide an assessment of the relationship between the project proposed and school capacity – both existing and planned.

**TABLE 1: HIGH POINT CROSSING CPA/ REZONING– PROJECTED STUDENT GENERATION AT BUILDOUT**

	<b>ELEMENTARY</b>	<b>MIDDLE</b>	<b>HIGH</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>SINGLE FAMILY</b>	<b>0</b>			
<b>MULTIPLIER</b>	<b>0.15</b>	<b>0.070</b>	<b>0.09</b>	<b>0.310</b>
<b>STUDENTS</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>MULTI FAMILY</b>	<b>130</b>			
<b>MULTIPLIER</b>	<b>.08</b>	<b>.03</b>	<b>.03</b>	<b>0.14</b>
<b>STUDENTS</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>TOTAL STUDENTS</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>18</b>

Elementary Schools. The High Point Crossing CPA / Rezoning is situated in the Northwest Alachua Concurrency Service Area. The Northwest Alachua Concurrency Service Area currently contains three elementary schools with a combined capacity of 1,639 seats. The current enrollment is 1,355 students representing a 83% utilization compared to an adopted LOS standard of 100%. This utilization rate is projected to decrease to 70% in five years and to 72% in ten years.

Student generation estimates for the High Point Crossing CPA / Rezoning indicate that 10 elementary seats would be required at buildout. Level of Service projections indicate that this demand can be reasonably accommodated during the five year and ten year planning periods.

Middle Schools. The High Point Crossing CPA / Rezoning is situated in the Mebane Concurrency Service Area. The Mebane Concurrency Service Area contains one middle school (Mebane) with a capacity of 792 seats. The current enrollment is 376 students representing a 49% utilization compared to an adopted LOS standard of 100%. This utilization rate is projected to increase to 51% in five years and to 50% in ten years

Student generation estimates for The High Point Crossing CPA / Rezoning indicate that 4 middle seats would be required at buildout. Level of Service projections indicate that this demand can be reasonably accommodated during the five year and ten year planning periods.

High Schools. The High Point Crossing CPA / Rezoning is situated in the Santa Fe Concurrency Service Area. The Santa Fe Concurrency Service Area currently has a capacity of 1,402 seats. The current enrollment is 1,020 students representing a 73% utilization compared to an adopted LOS standard of 100%. This utilization rate is projected to increase to 76% in five years and to be 78% in ten years.

Student generation estimates for The High Point Crossing CPA / Rezoning indicate that 4 high school seats would be required at buildout. Level of Service projections indicate that this demand can be reasonably accommodated during the five year and ten year planning periods.

Summary Conclusion. Students generated by The High Point Crossing CPA / Rezoning at the elementary, middle and high levels can be reasonably accommodated for the five year and ten year planning periods.

This evaluation is based on best projections and upon the 2017-2018 Five Year District Facilities Plan adopted by the School Board of Alachua County. The High Point Crossing CPA / Rezoning is subject to concurrency review and determination at the final subdivision for single family and the final site plan for multi-family and the availability of school capacity at the time of such review.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Regards,



Suzanne Wynn  
School Board of Alachua County  
Director of Community Planning  
3700 NE 53 Avenue  
Gainesville, Florida 32609  
352-955-7400 ext. 1445

CC: Gene Boles



# City of Alachua

ADAM BOUKARI  
CITY MANAGER

PLANNING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
DIRECTOR KATHY WINBURN, AICP

August 22, 2018

Also sent by electronic mail to [ryant@chw-inc.com](mailto:ryant@chw-inc.com)

Ryan Thompson, AICP  
Causseaux, Hewett, & Walpole, Inc.  
11801 Research Drive  
Alachua, FL 32615

RE: Development Review Team (DRT) Summary for:  
- Highpoint Crossing Large Scale Comprehensive Plan Amendment (LSCPA)  
- Highpoint Crossing Site-Specific Amendment to the Official Zoning Atlas (Rezoning)

Dear Mr. Thompson:

The applications referenced above were reviewed at our August 22, 2018 Development Review Team (DRT) Meeting. Please address all insufficiencies outlined below in writing and provide an indication as to how they have been addressed by **4:00 PM on Tuesday, September 4, 2018**. A total of three (3) copies of each application package and CDs containing a PDF of each application and supporting materials must be provided by this date.

Upon receipt of your revised application, Staff will notify you of any remaining insufficiencies which must be resolved before the items may be scheduled for public hearings before the Planning & Zoning Board (PZB). Please note that if Staff determines that the revised submission(s) require(s) outside technical review by the City, your application(s) may be delayed in order to allow for adequate review time. You must provide 13 *double-sided, three-hole punched sets* of each application package and CDs containing a PDF of all application materials *no later than 10 business days prior to the PZB Meeting at which your applications are scheduled to be heard*.

As discussed at the DRT Meeting, please address the following insufficiencies:

## **Large Scale Comprehensive Plan Amendment**

### **1. Comprehensive Plan Consistency Analysis**

- a. In numerous places within the Comprehensive Plan Consistency Analysis, the applicant states the development "is a master planned development" or "will be master planned". Please clarify the meaning of this statement.
- b. In response to Policy 1.2.c of the FLUE, please clarify how the proposed High Density Residential land use category "...will provide a wide variety of residential housing options in the City of Alachua", particularly how this is supportive of the request.
- c. In response to Policy 1.3.d.1. of the FLUE, applicant states interconnectivity has been considered for internal connections and connection to the west, but does not indicate if the applicant has considered interconnectivity for property located to the north of the subject property.
- d. In response to Policies 1.3.d.6. and 1.4.f.6. of the FLUE, please clarify the statement that the development "...will not increase the impacts of lighting upon the surrounding area".

- e. In response to Objective 1.4. of the FLUE, please clarify how agricultural and office uses are compatible with one another. Response should also address other uses permitted within the Corporate Park FLUM Designation.
- f. In response to Policy 1.4.f1. of the FLUE:
  - i. Please clarify the reference to the “HighPoint Crossing master plan”.
  - ii. There is a typographical error in the final line of the response.
- g. In response to Policy 1.4.f.2. of the FLUE: Performance standard is intended to address buffering between the development and surrounding adjacent uses, but response primarily addresses internal compatibility.
- h. In response to Policy 1.4.f.12. of the FLUE the proposed area to be designated CP is less than the minimum required per Section 3.5.2(F)(2) of the LDRs to permit residential development.
- i. Please address the following GOPs, which are applicable to the subject property:
  - i. Objective 5.2, Policy 5.2.a, FLUE;
  - ii. Goal 9, Policy 9.1, Policy 9.2, FLUE; and,
  - iii. Objective 10.1 and Policies 10.1.a and 10.1.b, FLUE.

## 2. Concurrency Impact Analysis

- a. Existing Non-Residential Uses: The applicant presumes all area with an existing Commercial land use would be comprised of retail / shopping center uses. The Commercial land use category permits other various uses, including offices and business parks, which have a much lower trip generation rate than retail uses. Concurrency Impact Analysis should reflect a mix of potential commercial uses within the existing Commercial land use area.
- b. Proposed Maximum Permitted Intensity: Please clarify the proposed uses under CP are presumed, but actual uses and square footage of each may vary based upon the type of development proposed during site plan review.
- c. Impacts of Proposed FLUM Designation: Applicant has used the net increase/decrease in impacts to analyze potential impacts. This method does not provide a representative analysis of potential demand on public facilities. Impacts to transportation, potable water, sanitary sewer, solid waste, recreation, and public schools must consider the demand of proposed FLUM Designations. NOTE: Demand of existing FLUM Designations may be provided as additional information in the report, but should not be used to consider potential demand created by future development.
- d. Per Section 2.4.14(H)(2) includes all road segments within ½ mile of the development’s ingress/egress **and** those on which the development’s impacts are 5% or greater of the MSV of the roadway.
  - i. The impacts represented by the maximum development potential of the proposed FLUM designations (10,984 AADT), and the project’s impacts to each roadway segment (as presented on Illustration 6) would represent 5% of the MSV of the following roadways:
    - 1. CR 235A South;
    - 2. CR 241 (from south City Limit to CR 235); and,
    - 3. Segment 8 (SR 235 from 235/241 Intersection to US 441).
  - ii. Revise Projected Roadway Impact Tables to reflect impact of proposed FLUM designations on all affected roadway segments.
  - iii. Revise “Conclusion” on page 9 of report to consider the available capacity of affected roadway segments.
- e. References to “2.6 bedrooms per unit” in Tables 4 and 5 are not applicable to the formula/calculation. Revise accordingly.
- f. Verify projected sanitary sewer demand shown in Table 5.
- g. Conclusions (Potable Water, Sanitary Sewer, Solid Waste): Applicant’s statement references the impacts from the “intended residential development”. Application proposes both residential and nonresidential uses. Revise accordingly.

- h. Public Schools Conclusion: Applicant states the application would increase student stations. Demand created by proposed FLUM designations results in greater demand than existing FLUM designations. Revise accordingly.

3. Urban Sprawl Analysis

- a. Response to 163.3177(6)(a)9.a.(V): Applicant should further address how the application would “*protect agricultural areas, including... passive agricultural activities and dormant... farmlands...*”, particularly between the proposed Moderate Density and Corporate Park land uses and areas with an Agriculture land use to the north of the subject property.
- b. Response to 163.3177(6)(a)9.a.(IX):
  - i. Applicant should further address how the proposed amendment would “*provide a clear separation between rural and urban uses*”, particularly between the proposed Moderate Density and Corporate Park land uses and areas with an Agriculture land use to the north of the subject property.
  - ii. Applicant should clarify the statement that “*the city limits between Alachua and unincorporated Alachua County provide a clear separation (sic) between lands designated for rural and urban uses.*” The City municipal boundary does not serve as an urban boundary.
- c. Response to 163.3177(6)(a)9.a.(XIII): Please clarify response to the primary indicator which states that an amendment must not “result in the loss of significant amounts of functional open space.”
  - i. Applicant’s response states the site “*does not function as public open space*” (primary indicator does not address public or private ownership).
  - ii. Applicant’s response should consider functional connections which may or may not be present between the subject property and other areas of functional open space.

4. Needs Analysis

- a. In the Needs Analysis, the applicant states, “*... a similar realistic net increase in dwelling units is expected.*” Additionally, in response to Section 163.3177(6)(a)(8)c., F.S., the applicant states that the amendment would “*...provide a similar overall number of dwelling units.*” The application summary, however, notes the proposed FLUM designations would permit an additional 127 dwellings, which over 125% of that presently permitted.
- b. Applicant may wish to reference City of Alachua report entitled *Identifying Growth Trends and Population Statistics for the City’s Strategic Initiative to Develop a Long Range Plan of Alachua’s Future*, which provides population projections for the City of Alachua.
- c. Section 163.3177(6)(a)4., F.S., discusses the amount of land designated for residential uses to accommodate permanent and seasonal residents. The applicant’s response to Section 163.3177(6)(a)4., F.S., does not address this criteria. Please address.
- d. There is a typographical error two paragraphs above the matrix (“FLU”) on page 13.

5. Miscellaneous

- a. Please provide boundary sketches to accompany the legal descriptions of each proposed land use area.
- b. Figure 3 and Illustration 2b: Area in southeast corner of subject property labelled as “Medium Density Residential” is identified elsewhere in application materials as proposed to be “High Density Residential”.

---

## **Site-Specific Amendment to the Official Zoning Atlas**

### **1. Comprehensive Plan Consistency Analysis**

- a. In numerous places within the Comprehensive Plan Consistency Analysis, the applicant states the development “is a master planned development” or “will be master planned”. Please clarify the meaning of this statement.
- b. In response to Policy 1.2.c of the FLUE, please clarify how the proposed High Density Residential land use category “...will provide a wide variety of residential housing options in the City of Alachua”.
- c. In response to Policy 1.3.d.1. of the FLUE, applicant states interconnectivity has been considered for internal connections and connection to the west, but does not indicate if the applicant has considered interconnectivity for property located to the north of the subject property.
- d. In response to Policies 1.3.d.6. and 1.4.f.6. of the FLUE, please clarify the statement that the development “...will not increase the impacts of lighting upon the surrounding area”.
- e. In response to Objective 1.4. of the FLUE, please clarify how agricultural and office uses are compatible with one another. Response should also address other uses permitted within the Corporate Park FLUM Designation.
- f. In response to Policy 1.4.f.1. of the FLUE:
  1. Please clarify the reference to the “HighPoint Crossing master plan”.
  2. There is a typographical error in the final line of the response.
- g. In response to Policy 1.4.f.2. of the FLUE: Performance standard is intended to address buffering between the development and surrounding adjacent uses, but response primarily addresses internal compatibility.
- h. In response to Policy 1.4.f.12. of the FLUE the proposed area to be designated CP is less than the minimum required per Section 3.5.2(F)(2) of the LDRs to permit residential development.
- i. Please address the following GOPs, which are applicable to the subject property:
  1. Objective 5.2, Policy 5.2.a, FLUE;
  2. Goal 9, Policy 9.1, Policy 9.2, FLUE; and,
  3. Objective 10.1 and Policies 10.1.a and 10.1.b, FLUE.

### **2. Concurrency Analysis**

- a. Existing Non-Residential Uses: The applicant presumes all area with an existing Commercial land use would be comprised of retail / shopping center uses. The Commercial land use category permits other various uses, including offices and business parks, which have a much lower trip generation rate than retail uses. Concurrency Impact Analysis should reflect a mix of potential commercial uses within the existing Commercial land use area.
- b. Proposed Maximum Permitted Intensity: Please clarify the proposed uses under CP are presumed, but actual uses and square footage of each may vary based upon the type of development proposed during site plan review.
- c. Impacts of Proposed FLUM Designation: Applicant has used the net increase/decrease in impacts to analyze potential impacts. This method does not provide a representative analysis of potential demand on public facilities. Impacts to transportation, potable water, sanitary sewer, solid waste, recreation, and public schools must consider the demand of proposed FLUM Designations. NOTE: Demand of existing FLUM Designations may be provided as additional information in the report, but should not be used to consider potential demand created by future development.
- d. Per Section 2.4.14(H)(2) includes all road segments within ½ mile of the development’s ingress/egress **and** those on which the development’s impacts are 5% or greater of the MSV of the roadway.



- 
- ii. The impacts represented by the maximum development potential of the proposed FLUM designations (10,984 AADT), and the project's impacts to each roadway segment (as presented on Illustration 6) would represent 5% of the MSV of the following roadways:
    1. CR 235A South;
    2. CR 241 (from south City Limit to CR 235); and,
    3. Segment 8 (SR 235 from 235/241 Intersection to US 441).
  - iii. Revise Projected Roadway Impact Tables to reflect impact of proposed FLUM designations on all affected roadway segments.
  - iv. Revise "Conclusion" on page 9 of report to consider the available capacity of affected roadway segments.
  - e. References to "2.6 bedrooms per unit" in Tables 4 and 5 are not applicable to the formula/calculation. Revise accordingly.
  - f. Verify projected sanitary sewer demand shown in Table 5.
  - g. Conclusions (Potable Water, Sanitary Sewer, Solid Waste): Applicant's statement references the impacts from the "intended residential development". Application proposes both residential and nonresidential uses. Revise accordingly.
  - h. Public Schools Conclusion: Applicant states the application would increase student stations. Demand created by proposed FLUM designations results in greater demand than existing FLUM designations. Revise accordingly.
  - i. Include analysis demonstrating that impacts to improved passive park space will not degrade recreation level of service.
3. Standards for Site-specific amendments to the Official Zoning Atlas
- a. Response to 2.4.2(E) (1) (d), on Page 22 of Justification Report references "onsite premature development". Please clarify.
  - b. Please clarify/expand on the compatibility between the "A" Agriculture zoning district and "CP" Corporate Park zoning district (Response to Section 2.4.2(E) (1) (e)).
  - c. In response to 2.4.2 (E)(1)(j), on Page 24 of the Justification Report, improvements to public facilities may be required in order to adequately serve any proposed future development. Potential facilities that may be impacted include, but are not limited to: potable water, sanitary sewer, and roadways including intersections near subject property.
  - d. In response to 2.4.2 (E)(1)(k), on Page 24 of Justification Report, while there are no wetlands or floodplains on property, the applicable buffers as mandated by the City's Comprehensive Plan and Land Development Regulations would still potentially apply to the subject property.
4. Miscellaneous
- a. Please provide boundary sketches to accompany the legal descriptions of each proposed land use area.
  - b. Illustration 2b: Area in southeast corner of subject property labelled as "Medium Density Residential" is identified elsewhere in application materials as proposed to be "High Density Residential".

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact us at (386) 418-6100.

Sincerely,



Justin Tabor, AICP  
Principal Planner



Adam Hall, AICP  
Planner

c: Kathy Winburn, AICP, Planning & Community Development Director  
Project File





## City of Alachua

ADAM BOUKARI  
CITY MANAGER

PLANNING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
DIRECTOR KATHY WINBURN, AICP

August 6, 2018

Also sent by electronic mail to [ryant@chw-inc.com](mailto:ryant@chw-inc.com)

Ryan Thompson, AICP  
CHW, Inc.  
11801 Research Drive  
Alachua, FL 32615

RE: Completeness Review for:

- Highpoint Crossing Large Scale Comprehensive Plan Amendment (LSCPA)
- Highpoint Crossing Site-Specific Amendment to the Official Zoning Atlas (Rezoning)

Dear Mr. Thompson:

On July 31, 2018 the City of Alachua received your applications for the Highpoint Crossing LSCPA and Rezoning which proposes the amendment of the Future Land Use Map from Commercial, Medium Density Residential, and Moderate Density Residential to Commercial, Corporate Park, High Density Residential, and Moderate Density Residential on Parcel Nos. 03049-000-000 and 03049-003-000 and the amendment of the Official Zoning Atlas from Commercial Intensive (CI), Residential Multiple Family-8 (RMF-8), and Residential Single Family-4 (RSF-4) to Commercial Intensive (CI), Corporate Park (CP), Residential Multiple Family-15 (RMF-15), and Residential Single-Family -4 (RSF-4) on Parcel Nos. 03049-000-000 and 03049-003-000.

According to Section 2.2.6 of the Land Development Regulations (LDRs), upon receipt of an application, a completeness review shall be conducted to determine that the application contains all the necessary information and materials, is in proper form and of sufficient detail, and is accompanied by the appropriate fee. The Planning Department has reviewed the aforementioned application for completeness and finds that the application is complete, conditional upon submission of certain information found below. Please submit this information by 5 PM on **Monday, August 13, 2018** to ensure adequate staff time to review.

Please note, the comments below are based solely on a preliminary review of your application for completeness. The contents of the applications **have not** been thoroughly reviewed. An in-depth review of the content of the application will be performed subsequently and any further issues with content will be provided to you at the Development Review Team meeting, which will be scheduled separately from this letter.

Please address the following for the LSCPA application:

1. **CPA Attachment #4:** Needs Analysis.

**Action Needed to Address Deficiency:** Submit an analysis which addresses the necessity for an increase in proposed FLUM Designations. Reference § 163.3177(1)(f)3., §163.3177(6)(a)4., and §163.3177(6)(a)8., Florida Statutes.

2. **CPA Attachment #7: Mailing Labels.**

**Action Needed to Address Deficiency:** Mailing labels for the following parcels were not provided: 03053-020-064; 03053-020-067; 03053-020-069. Submit three (3) sets of mailing labels for the parcels identified above.

Please address the following for the Rezoning application:

1. **Rezoning Attachment #D.3: Concurrency Impact Analysis:**

a. Level of Service standard for potable water is 275 gallons per ERU per day.

**Action Needed to Address Deficiency:** Please revise analysis to meet or exceed this standard.

b. Level of Service analysis for recreation appears to be incomplete.

**Action Needed to Address Deficiency:** Please provide an analysis of recreational impacts and demonstrate Level of Service will be met.

2. **Rezoning Attachment #D.5.ii: Consistent with Ordinances:**

Per Section 2.2.17 of City of Alachua Land Development Regulations, subdivisions may not be processed concurrently with a site specific amendment to the Official Zoning Atlas. Portions of the property subject to the proposed zoning amendment are currently under review as a part of the Highpoint Crossing subdivision.

3. **Rezoning Attachment #6: Mailing Labels.**

**Action Needed to Address Deficiency:** Mailing labels for the following parcels were not provided: 03053-020-064; 03053-020-067; 03053-020-069. Submit three (3) sets of mailing labels for the parcels identified above.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact us at (386) 418-6100.

Sincerely,



Justin Tabor, AICP  
Principal Planner



Adam Hall, AICP  
Planner

c: Kathy Winburn, AICP, Planning & Community Development Director  
Project File