



## **RENEW ARLINGTON CRA ADVISORY BOARD**

Hybrid Virtual & In-Person Meeting  
City Hall, 117 West Duval Street  
OED Suite 250, Large Conference Room  
Jacksonville, FL 32202  
Wednesday, February 11, 2026 – 3:30 p.m.

### **MEETING MINUTES**

**Location:** The RA/CRA Advisory Board meeting was held as a hybrid virtual and in-person meeting. The RA/CRA Advisory Board Members met in person at City Hall, 117 West Duval Street, OED Suite 250, Large Conference Room

**RA/CRA Advisory Board Members Present:** Advisory Board Chair Matt Tuohy, Advisory Board Vice-Chair Stephen Matchett, Advisory Board Members Monty Selim, Dedee Harper, and Trish Kapustka

**RA/CRA Advisory Board Members Not Present:** Advisory Board Member Ramsey Salem Bandele Onasanya, Danyuell Newkirk, Wade Alliance

**Staff Present:** Karen Nasrallah, Redevelopment Manager; Brian Wheeler, Renew Arlington Design Review (via zoom), and Krista Fogarty, CRA Coordinator

**Representing the Office of General Counsel:** Carla Schell

**Representing the Office of City Council:** Councilman Ken Amaro, District 1 and Councilman Ken Amaro's ECA Joe Johnson, District 1

**Others Present:** Kaysie Cox, Planning Department; Brenna Durden, Lewis, Longman & Walker, P.A.; JD Dulin, Exp Realty; Kimberly Robinson; Donna Dingle, BBIF; Ann Burt; Jurgen Cerri, Carroll's Meat Shoppe; Dorothy Fasbinder, Superior Saw & Small Engine; Ernest Smith;

#### **I. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair M. Tuohy called the meeting to order at 3:36pm, as an informational meeting. Due to lack of quorum at this time.

Chair M. Tuohy called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. for action items, a quorum was present.

#### **II. ACTION ITEMS**

#### **CONSIDERATION OF MEETING MINUTES FOR NOVEMBER 13, 2025**

**A MOTION WAS MADE TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 13, 2025, MEETING MINUTES AND PROPERLY SECONDED. THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED (5-0).**

### **ELECTION OF OFFICERS**

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY VICE CHAIR MATCHETT TO NOMINATE MATT TUOHY AS CHAIR. BOARD MEMBER MONTY SELIM SECONDED THE MOTION. MATT TUOHY ACCEPTED THE NOMINATION. THERE WERE NO OTHER NOMINATIONS. THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED (5-0).**

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY CHAIR TUOHY TO NOMINATE STEVE MATCHETT AS VICE CHAIR. BOARD MEMBER TRISH KAPUSTKA SECONDED THE MOTION. STEVE MATCHETT ACCEPTED THE NOMINATION. THERE WERE NO OTHER NOMINATIONS. THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED (5-0).**

### **CONSIDERATION OF ZONING APPLICATION FOR MINOR MODIFICATION TO A PUD Z-6806**

Ms. Cox gave background on the proposed Minor Mod application, noting that the original PUD was approved in 2001 for the CVS. The original PUD allowed for additional uses, if approved by a Minor Mod to the PUD, so that is what the applicant is proposing. The applicant is not planning on making any additional changes to the site.

Mr. Wheeler made comments regarding the Renew Arlington Overlay. The property has lost some of the understory landscaping materials, so it is not longer compliant with Part 12, or the original plan. The applicant is aware of this and it will need to be corrected before the COU is issued. There is also a chain-link fence on the property, which was not required by the PUD, so we are requesting that the chain-link is removed to be consistent with the overlay. There is also a dumpster enclosure with chain-link that would need to be removed for overlay consistency. The original PUD required a lighting plan and if that plan can't be provided, the site would need to meet the overlay's lighting requirements as well. The existing PUD allows for signage that is larger than within the overlay. Since the PUD pre-dates the overlay, those signs will apply, but they were focused on CVS branding. The existing signs can be re-used by not covering up the brickwork of the monument sign and focusing on the copy area on the top of the sign.

Ms. Durden spoke as the representative for the applicant. She stated that they are in agreement to eliminate the signage in the lower half of the two freestanding signs. She proposed the following language: "Signage shall comply with the dimension and locations shown on the sign plan Exhibit L, approved as part of the PUD Ord#2001-1233-E, except that signage located on the lower portion of each of the two freestanding signs (identified as "K") on said Exhibit L." They have no issue bringing the landscaping back up to the PUD standard. They agree to remove the chain-link fences, or replace with overlay compliant fencing. The Planning Department was unable to find the lighting plan originally approved with the PUD, but we know there is lighting in place on the site. The question becomes, is the lighting on site authorized, as it was part of the PUD, or does the lighting need to change to be consistent with the overlay? If they are still unable to locate the plan prior to the next Planning Commission meeting, the owner would need to have a lighting plan prepared to meet the overlay requirements, and Ms. Durden is a little concerned about this due to cost.

Vice Chair Matchett asked how long the CVS was in operation after the roundabout was installed. Ms. Durden stated that they only vacated the property on December 31, 2025. Vice Chair Matchett wanted to ensure there were no problems with site access due to roundabout and asked about the sign stand being maintained. Mr. Wheeler stated that the intent is for it be maintained as the freestanding sign it is and concentrate the new copy area on the upper portion of the sign.

Vice Chair Matchett asked what rights the site has to maintain the signs that are larger than permitted in the overlay. Mr. Wheeler explained that while the overlay says you can't use a PUD to circumvent the code, however, a PUD that is from before the establishment of the overlay, is a direct contract between the owner and City Council and that contract has vested rights that the new ordinance can't change. Vice Chair Matchett asked if the board can ask for additional beautification near the sign base. Mr. Wheeler explained that when the landscaping is brought back up to the PUD standard, as agreed to by the applicant, there will be much more substantial vegetation in that area.

Ms. Durden clarified the plans for the signage on the site and explained where in the overlay the PUD being able to keep the sign is located.

Board Member Selim asked if the drive through would remain. Ms. Durden states she was unsure if they would keep that, but did not expect them to use it as a drive through. Board Member Selim asked if sign G would remain. Ms. Durden stated that it won't say drive-through but they may want it to say something else. Mr. Wheeler pointed out that the directional signage on a site can't incorporate advertising or logos. Ms. Durden stated that will not be a problem, as far as the landowner is concerned.

Chair Tuohy stated that he wants to see more granularity that the site is following some sort of lighting plan. So, he would feel more comfortable if the site were following some sort of lighting plan. Ms. Cox explained what the original condition stated for the PUD and that the department was unable to locate a lighting plan. Chair Tuohy asked if this were not in a CRA, would you just use a standard commercial lighting plan? Ms. Cox agreed. Filling stations are the only use that has specific lighting requirements in the zoning code. Ms. Nasrallah stated that for consistency with other sites, we have recommended a lighting plan.

Ms. Durden agreed to the lighting plan and wanted to know if it's generally supposed to be brighter or less strong? Mr. Wheeler stated that it's a restriction for adjacent residential but then minimum requirements for other lighting. What's unique to this overlay is required building envelope lighting.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY VICE CHAIR MATCHETT TO APPROVE ZONING APPLICATION FOR MINOR MODIFICATION TO A PUD Z-6806 WITH THE CONDITIONS DISCUSSED REGARDING LANDSCAPING, FENCING, SIGNAGE, AND LIGHTING. BOARD MEMBER DEEDEE HARPER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY (5-0).**

**CONSIDERATION OF ZONING APPLICATION FOR REZONING TO A PUD Z-6769**

Mr. Wheeler explained the proposed PUD, which is to allow for the rezoning to allow for the existing use on the site, which is a barbeque restaurant which has been operating as food truck. The proposed plan would allow for an indoor/outdoor restaurant use.

Board Member Kapustka asked where the indoor dining is? Mr. Wheeler explained that it is a phased plan and it similar to a Congaree and Penn environment.

Vice Chair Matchett is concerned with the smoke smell in the area and has asked the Councilmember if anyone has complained. Councilmember Amaro stated that he hasn't heard of any concerns regarding the smell from the site. Vice Chair Matchett wanted to know how they were found out after 8 years? Ms. Nasrallah stated that he went from more of a food truck to more of a permanent use. Vice Chair Matchett believes that this would be legitimizing blight and he is concerned with the intensity of the use being dropped into the area. He asked Mr. Wheeler if additional aesthetic requirements could be placed.

Mr. Wheeler explained the buffers and landscaping on site and explained that the proposed PUD site plan fully meets the requirements of the overlay.

Board Member Kapustka asked if there was any timeline for the kitchen? Mr. Wheeler stated that there is not, but that could be a PUD condition, but there are issues meeting a timeline with other developments in the area, such as Town and Country.

Ms. Schell addressed that you can't use a new PUD to circumvent the overlay. The proposed site is meeting all the overlay requirements, but the PUD is being sought for the use on the site.

Vice Chair Matchett asked if the kitchen would have any seating. Mr. Wheeler explained that they would have tables and chairs on site, so they did the parking calculations based on a restaurant use. Vice Chair Matchett asked if we were essentially looking at a rezoning for a restaurant then. Mr. Wheeler agreed.

Chair Tuohy asked Mr. Wheeler to confirm that it was consistent with all the overlay standards that we've been asking of every other applicant. Mr. Wheeler agreed.

Board Member Kapustka asked if all the other requirements were required now, even before the kitchen gets built? Mr. Wheeler stated that all those provisions are going to be addressed through the grant program.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY BOARD MEMBER SELIM TO APPROVE ZONING APPLICATION FOR REZONING TO A PUD Z-6769, AS LONG AS THE SITE PLAN REMAINS CONSISTENT WITH THE OVERLAY. BOARD MEMBER TRISH KAPUSTKA SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED (4-1).**

## **GENERAL INFORMATION**

Vice Chair Matchett noted that Napoli's signs are down now. Ms. Nasrallah stated that the McDonald's sign is down too.

### **III. NEW BUSINESS**

Ms. Nasrallah updated the board on the Agency Board meeting. The College Park Economic Development Agreement was amended with date extensions.

### **IV. OLD BUSINESS**

Board Member Kapustka asked if there was any additional information on the small cell tower that came before the last board meeting.

Mr. Johnson stated that the work is being done on the site. They did due diligence on the project and found that there wasn't much that could be pushed back on even when digging into state code for this project. Councilmember Amaro agreed and confirmed that Dylan Reingold from OGC looked at it top to bottom.

### **VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Ann Burt spoke regarding the fence grant and the signage grant. Fence removal is covered by the grant, but because it is not required by the code, the grant will not replace it. For the signage grant, signs will be replaced, even though they are not required by the code. Ms. Burt believes this is a contradiction and an arbitrary selection of what will be paid for. Additionally, she believes the fencing requirements are rigid and arbitrary. New vinyl coated fencing was installed on her site, which she thought was compliant with the overlay, but she was cited for non-compliance with the overlay. This wasn't covered by the grant program and she and her husband paid for this out of pocket.

Chair Tuohy stated that this is not the correct body to address this issue to and asked staff where the best place to direct this information would be. Staff will find out who to refer Ms. Burt to.

Dorothy Fasbinder stated that she's in the process of getting her plans drawn up. She's asking for an additional public meeting to walk everyone through the later steps of the grant program, including reimbursement.

Ms. Nasrallah explained that she has sent the grant program process and reimbursement checklist to Ms. Fasbinder and that shows exactly what items are needed for reimbursement and the process.

Jurgen Cerri wants to find out who knows all the codes for the parking. He has spoken to the chief

engineer, the traffic engineer and both have said plans would pass for them, but somehow the plans continue to not pass. He also states that he was reimbursed for taking down and putting a fence back up, so Ms. Burt is being lied to. He knows another business owner who got their signs taken down and put back and paid for, which he states is also a lie. He has spent thousands of dollars on engineers, who based off Brian Wheeler's plans, modified them a tad bit, nowhere near what people think we modified it to, and it was denied. He went back and designed something himself, and sent it to the traffic engineer and the chief engineer and neither of them know what's going on. He expressed his frustration, because he has five additional projects to deal with and no one knows the codes. He used angled parking as an example and stated that you can have 30-degree parking, but he is being told that he can't have it. He expressed his frustration over the reduction of parking spaces due to the overlay. He said that emails don't get anywhere and no one is helping him. He needs to talk to people who know the code and he states that no one knows the code, even the chief engineer who does know the code doesn't know what's going on.

Ernest Smith asked if the board chair has the power to schedule a call meeting. Chair Tuohy asked for clarification on his question. Mr. Smith clarified, an off-cycle meeting. Ms. Lopera stated that while it is not prohibited, it presents its own logistical issues.

## **VII. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, Chair Tuohy adjourned the RA/CRA Advisory Board Meeting at approximately 4:57 p.m.

The written minutes for this meeting are only an overview of what was discussed. For verbatim comments of this meeting, an audio file of the meeting is available in its entirety and is available upon request. Please contact Karen Nasrallah at (904) 255-5449, or by email at [karenn@coj.net](mailto:karenn@coj.net).