A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, NASSAU COUNTY, FLORIDA. FINDING THAT THE FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS FOR THE LONG POINT CLUB ARE CONSISTENT WITH THE DEVELOPMENT KNOWN AS PLM WEST, AMELIA ISLAND SOUTH (DRI), A.K.A. LONG POINT, AND THE CHANGES OF THE PROPOSED FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS ARE NOT A SUBSTANTIAL DEVIATION PURSUANT TO SECTION 380.06 (17) F.S.

WHEREAS, on the 11th day of June, 1985, the Board of County Commissioners of Nassau County passed and adopted Resolution 85-31 wherein they granted the application for development approval of PLM West, Amelia Island South (DRI), subject to certain conditions; and

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners of Nassau County subsequently passed and adopted Amendment Resolutions 85-36 on June 25, 1985, and Resolution 85-40 on July 31, 1985, wherein they corrected errors of omission discovered after review of said Resolutions for development approval of PLM West, Amelia Island South, (DRI); and

WHEREAS, final development plans have been submitted for a portion of the PLM West tract now known as the Long Point Club, and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has reviewed said final development plans for Long Point Club and found that the final development plans are not a substantial deviation.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT: THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF NASSAU COUNTY, FLORIDA, FINDS THAT THE FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS FOR THE LONG POINT CLUB ARE NOT A SUBSTANTIAL DEVIATION FROM THE REQUIREMENTS OF RESOLUTIONS 85-31, 85-36, AND 85-40 FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS:

- 1. There is no increase or decrease in the number of dwelling units since there are no dwelling units in the Long Point Club plans.
 - 2. There is no decrease in the area set aside for common open space.
 - 3. There is no increase in the area set aside for common open space.
- 4. There is no increase in the floor area proposed for non-residential use.
- 5. There will be no increase in the number of external vehicle trips generated by the development above that which was projected during the original development of regional impact review.
- 6. There has been no increase in the amount of acreage of the approved development of regional impact.

	7.	There h	ias been no	change i	n the area	s set as	ide for p	reservati	on,
buff	er and	d special	protection) .				•	
,	PASS	ED AND	ADOPTED	this 🔪	<u>25th</u> d	lay of _	Februar	. У	·
1986	•							•	
• •		,					,		•
			,		BOARD C	F COU	NTY COM	MISSION	ERS
	*)		· 0	- /

Attest:

J. Greeson Ex-Officio Clerk