

# Public Comment

Proposed Division 4,  
Old Palm City Redevelopment Code, in Article 12, LDR  
and amendment of the Zoning Atlas

**From:** [Jordan Pastorius](#)  
**To:** [Dana Little](#)  
**Cc:** [Jessica Seymour](#); [Irene Szedlmayer](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Old Palm City NAC redevelopment code comments  
**Date:** Friday, August 23, 2019 1:31:00 PM

---

Dana and Jessie,

Please see Ken Natoli's comments below.

FYI, I will be sending all of OPC NAC members Division 1.

Thank you,

**Jordan Pastorius**

Sr. Project Manager, Office of Community Development  
Martin County Board Of County Commissioners  
2401 SE Monterey Road  
Stuart, FL 34996  
772-288-5497



**From:** Ken Natoli <kennatoli2@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, August 23, 2019 11:54 AM  
**To:** Jordan Pastorius <jpastori@martin.fl.us>; Susan Kores <skores@martin.fl.us>  
**Subject:** Re: Old Palm City NAC redevelopment code comments

Jordan, Susan,

Attached please find my comments on the draft proposed code.

Please note comments are based on the documents that were part of the agenda packet and the handouts at the meeting. It appeared the presentation had some additional pages (like the graphic for frontage styles). I'm sure they have corrected the tables that were labeled Rio instead of Old Palm City too.

**Specific code section comments:**

1. Need street regulating plan exhibit (was blank)
2. Table OPC-5:
  - Minimum lot area and width for detached zone are too big. Even existing platted lots in the CRA area are smaller than this.
  - There was no building height listed in multifamily zone
  - No building coverage and minimum open space in multifamily or detached

zones

- Why are office building types excluded from the industrial zone?

3. 12.4.05

Building types- the 80% frontage requirement might be a bit tough to work for small lots that need to have a driveway to access their back of lot parking. Maybe some easy option could be included to avoid having to go through formal alternative compliance for such instances.

4. Is there any side yard parking spaces permitted closer than the 30' parking setback? For instance, where a drive from the front is proposed to access rear parking could it have parking spaces on it? If so, limited to one row? Some clarification might be helpful on this.
5. I thought I noticed a reference to using a 6' front yard wall of fence to meet part of the frontage requirement in the agenda packet documents (don't see it in the handout). If still relevant, I think a smaller height for front yard walls or fences would be better.
6. Only the 'all yard house' graphic shows a garage. What about the placement of the garages on the other housing types shown? (particularly those without an alley) Also, although the blue buildable area in the graphic on the 'all yard house' shows the garage front setback greater than the house, I didn't see a reference to this in the data table. I believe this is important to specify to keep garages behind front facades. I also think it would be good to show front porches on all residential building type graphics as it might encourage all to build one.
7. I think 5' side setback for industrial parking would be better than zero, unless parking lots are connected to adjacent lots (this is probably relevant to all building types). I believe connected rear parking lots (or alleys) should be encouraged or required where feasible for all proposed parking lots in the Core, Corridor or industrial areas.
8. How about a 10' side building setback for tall (three story) industrial buildings instead of 5'?
9. OPC-11 (landscape area and tree planting) table is blank
10. Architectural standards- I think 20% transparent window covering facing streets or civic spaces is significantly too low a percentage for first floor commercial uses in Core or Corridor buildings. Also, some thought might be made to avoid users having opaque window shades closed all the time. This defeats the desired pedestrian friendly environment created by shopfront windows.

**General comments:**

Hopefully Alternative Compliance will still be an option. If so, it should be listed in the code somewhere.

Please reply or call with any questions or comments.

Thanks,  
Ken Natoli  
485-0711