

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
PINELLAS PLANNING COUNCIL
December 12, 2012

The Pinellas Planning Council (PPC) met in regular session in the County Commission Assembly Room, Pinellas County Courthouse, 315 Court Street, Clearwater, Florida, at 3:03 P.M. with the following members present:

Jim Ronecker, Chairman, City of Oldsmar Mayor
Jim Kennedy, Vice-Chairman, City of St. Petersburg Councilmember
John Morroni, Treasurer, County Commissioner
Linda S. Lerner, Secretary, School Board Member
David O. Archie, City of Tarpon Springs Mayor
Joe Ayoub, City of Safety Harbor Vice-Mayor
Dave Eggers, City of Dunedin Mayor
Patricia Gerard, City of Largo Mayor
Samuel Henderson, City of Gulfport Vice-Mayor
Doreen Hock-DiPolito, City of Clearwater Councilmember
Jerry Mullins, City of Pinellas Park Councilmember
Marvin Shavlan, City of St. Pete Beach Vice-Mayor

Not Present:

Joanne "Cookie" Kennedy, City of Indian Rocks Beach Commissioner

Also Present:

Michael C. Crawford, Interim Executive Director, PPC
Linda A. Fisher, PPC Staff
Michael D. Schoderbock, PPC Staff
Carolyn Shoemaker, PPC Staff
Jewel White, Managing Assistant County Attorney
Other interested individuals
Michael P. Schmidt, Board Reporter, Deputy Clerk

AGENDA

- I. CALL TO ORDER
 - A. Invocation and Pledge
 - B. Identification of Members Present
 - C. Recognition of Outgoing Members

- II. CONSENT AGENDA
 - A. Minutes of November 14, 2012 Council Meeting
 - B. Financial Statement for November 2012
 - C. Countywide Planning Authority (CPA) Actions – December 11, 2012
 - D. Annexation Report – November 2012
 - E. Preliminary January 2013 Agenda
 - F. October Correspondence

- III. PUBLIC HEARING – To begin at 3:00 P.M. or as soon thereafter as agenda permits
 - A. Public Hearing Format Announcement and Oath
 - B. Amendments to the Countywide Future Land Use Plan
 - Subthreshold Amendments
 - None
 - Regular Amendments
 - 1. Case CW 12-15: Town of North Redington Beach
 - 2. Case CW 12-16: City of Largo

- IV. REPORTS/OTHER ACTION
 - A. Countywide Plan Update – Verbal

- V. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ITEMS
 - A. PPC/MPO Unification Update – Verbal
 - B. PAC Membership Roster for 2013
 - C. Verbal Reports

- VI. OTHER COUNCIL BUSINESS
 - A. Chairman/Member Items
 - 1. Election of 2013 Officers

- VII. ADJOURNMENT

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Ronecker called the meeting to order at 3:03 P.M.

INVOCATION AND PLEDGE

The Invocation was given by Commissioner Morroni, following which he led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

IDENTIFICATION OF MEMBERS PRESENT

At the Chairman's request, a roll call was taken in which the members introduced themselves.

RECOGNITION OF NEW MEMBER

Chairman Ronecker welcomed Mayor Eggers as a new member of the Council.

RECOGNITION OF OUTGOING MEMBERS

Chairman Ronecker presented plaques to Mayor Bradbury, Mayor Gerard, and School Board Member Lerner, commemorating their years of outstanding service on the Council; whereupon, he expressed his appreciation, and wished them well in future endeavors.

CONSENT AGENDA – APPROVED

Chairman Ronecker presented the Consent Agenda items, as follows:

- A. Minutes of November 14, 2012 Council Meeting
- B. Financial Statement for November 2012
- C. Countywide Planning Authority (CPA) Actions – December 11, 2012
- D. Annexation Report – November 2012
- E. Preliminary January 2013 Agenda
- F. October Correspondence

Commissioner Morroni moved, seconded by Mayor Gerard and carried, that the Consent Agenda items be approved (Vote 12–0).

PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Public Hearing Format Announcement and Oath

Upon request by the Chairman, all persons planning to give testimony were duly sworn by the Deputy Clerk.

B. Amendments to the Countywide Future Land Use Plan

SUBTHRESHOLD AMENDMENTS – None

REGULAR AMENDMENTS

PUBLIC HEARING: CASE CW 12-15, PROPOSAL BY THE TOWN OF NORTH REDINGTON BEACH TO AMEND THE COUNTYWIDE FUTURE LAND USE PLAN FROM RESIDENTIAL HIGH (RH) WITH RESORT FACILITIES OVERLAY (RFO) TO RESIDENTIAL/OFFICE/RETAIL (R/O/R) – APPROVED

Pursuant to legal notice published in the November 24, 2012 issue of the *Tampa Bay Times* as evidenced by affidavit of publication filed with the Clerk, public hearing was held on Case CW 12-15, a proposal by the Town of North Redington Beach to amend the Countywide Future Land Use Plan from RH with RFO to R/O/R, re 1.8 acres m.o.l., located at 17307 Gulf Boulevard.

Mr. Schoderbock referred to a map and aerial photograph, pointed out the location of the subject area, described surrounding uses, and provided a brief overview of the proposal. He indicated that the site was the subject of a previous map amendment in December 2005; and that, during that timeframe, the PPC and CPA approved an amendment which allowed for a change in land use from R/O/R to RH with RFO in order to permit the construction of a hotel; whereupon, Mr. Schoderbock indicated that the proposed redevelopment never took place; that the Wine Cellar restaurant continues to operate on the site; that there is no change in the proposed use at the present time; that the proposed amendment is consistent with the Countywide Rules and with the surrounding land uses; that it meets the purpose and locational characteristics of the R/O/R category; and that staff recommends approval of the proposed amendment returning the site to its previous land use designation.

Planners Advisory Committee (PAC) Chairman Robert Klute indicated that Case CW 12-15 had been unanimously approved by the PAC.

December 12, 2012

In response to the Chairman's call for the applicant, Glenn Bailey, Pinellas County Planning Department, appeared in support of the proposed amendment, and presented further background information; whereupon, no one appeared in response to the Chairman's call for citizens wishing to be heard.

Thereupon, Commissioner Morroni moved, seconded by Mayor Gerard and carried, that Case CW 12-15 be approved as recommended by staff (Vote 12-0).

Following the vote, Commissioner Morroni related that while representing Pinellas County at the World Travel Market International Trade Show in London during the month of November, he had spoken with many people who asked if the Wine Cellar restaurant was closed; and that he will contact the Tourist Development Council to publicize that the restaurant remains open for business.

PUBLIC HEARING: CASE CW 12-16, PROPOSAL BY THE CITY OF LARGO TO AMEND THE COUNTYWIDE FUTURE LAND USE PLAN FROM RESIDENTIAL ESTATE (RE) AND RESIDENTIAL LOW MEDIUM (RLM) WITH RESORT FACILITIES OVERLAY (RFO) TO RESIDENTIAL HIGH (RH) – DEFERRED TO JANUARY 9, 2013 MEETING

Pursuant to legal notice published in the November 24, 2012 issue of the *Tampa Bay Times* as evidenced by affidavit of publication filed with the Clerk, public hearing was held on Case CW 12-16, a proposal by the City of Largo to amend the Countywide Future Land Use Plan from RE and RLM with RFO to RH, re 13.8 acres m.o.l., located at 2098 Seminole Boulevard and including the contiguous southern parcel.

Referring to aerial and ground level photographs and the Future Land Use Map, Mr. Schoderbock pointed out the location of the subject site and described surrounding uses, including a Lowes, a Home Depot, a Publix Shopping Center, the Seminole Mall, restaurants, commercial and office buildings, mobile home parks, apartments, condominium complexes, duplexes, triplexes, and single family homes. He indicated that the property is to the north of Ulmerton Road and to the west of Seminole Boulevard; that the site has two parcels, one of which contains the Briarwood Recreational Vehicle (RV) Park with approximately 138 RV lots and the other containing storage units of RV and other accessories.

Mr. Schoderbock indicated that the request is to develop the site with an apartment complex with a maximum of 19 units per acre, or 260 total units; that the site is located in what the City of Largo has recognized as an “Activity Center” around Largo Mall; that even though the amendment will impact Ulmerton Road, which is currently operating at 49 percent over capacity, or a Level of Service (LOS) F to the east and a LOS E to the west of Seminole Boulevard, work is underway which should improve the road to Levels of Service B and D to the west and to the east, respectively; and that there are currently two bus routes that serve the area, one along Ulmerton Road and one along Seminole Boulevard. He pointed out that while the Commercial General categories in the area allow 24 units per acre, they are not developed at that level.

Thereupon, Mr. Schoderbock indicated that the amendment is consistent with the Countywide Rules and meets the purpose and location characteristics for the Residential High category; and that staff recommends approval of the amendment and further recommends, separately and in addition, that the City of Largo restrict the site to a maximum of 19 residential dwelling units per acre.

Mr. Crawford discussed the concerns staff had with the amendment, and stated that the recommendation for approval was based on the Annexation Agreement between the City of Largo and the property owner limiting the amendment to 19 dwelling units per acre, or 260 total units; and that without the Annexation Agreement, staff would have recommended denial, as 30 dwelling units per acre would not be consistent with the Countywide Plan and would result in excessive density. Mr. Crawford pointed out the following:

- that the Annexation Agreement between the City of Largo and the property owner differs from a Development Agreement as Development Agreements carry more legal weight and, if amended at a later date, would have to come back before the Council for reconsideration, unlike an Annexation Agreement; and that the Countywide Rules recognize Development Agreements but not Annexation Agreements.
- that in making its recommendation for approval, PPC staff recognized Largo’s Urban Activity Center, which is not yet on the Countywide Map, and took into consideration that while density and intensity will significantly increase, Largo followed the type of local planning process that is being considered under the Countywide Plan update.
- that the recreational vehicle park on the site is non-conforming with respect to the density allowed in the current categories.

In response to queries by the members, Mr. Crawford indicated that the Residential Low Medium category allows 10 units to the acre; and that the time involved in the Largo Development Agreement process is likely the reason an Annexation Agreement was used; whereupon, Mayor Gerard stated that the project will have a Development Agreement later.

Chairman Ronecker noted that the Planners Advisory Committee approved the application by a vote of 10 to 0.

Jesus Niño, Principal Planner, City of Largo, indicated that the City restricted the dwelling unit intensity to 19 units per acre in the Annexation Agreement as it did not want 30 units per acre put on the property; that the Annexation Agreement was approved by the City Commission, which would have to approve any future changes; and that the Annexation Agreement runs with the land; whereupon, he clarified that a Development Order, not a Development Agreement, is forthcoming. Mr. Niño related that the City added a Comprehensive Development Code Amendment for Residential High to its Comprehensive Development Plan, adding development standards which restrict development to 24 units per acre, with anything above that requiring a Development Agreement; and that Largo commissioned a Largo Mall Activity Center market study, approved by the City Commission, which indicated that high-density, multi-family projects are appropriate for the Center.

Robert Pergolizzi, Gulf Coast Consulting, indicated that the Activity Center is slated to be an enhanced mass transit and bus network; and that in response to concerns of the neighbors, he had stated for the record at separate public hearings held by the City of Largo that the development would consist of market-rate apartments, not Section 8 or Low Income Tax Credit Housing; that the applicant is asking for a density of 18.9 units per acre, well below the 24 units per acre that would be allowed per City Code; and that if the amendment is approved, the Largo Development Order process would require a neighborhood compatibility meeting after the preliminary site plan is submitted, probably early next year.

Later in the meeting and in response to query by Mayor Gerard, Mr. Niño indicated that he understands that market-rate apartments will be built on the property, not low income or subsidized housing, but that even if such a restriction were included in the Development Order, the City cannot control what a future property owner does with the property.

Responding to the Chairman's call for people wishing to be heard, the following Largo homeowners from neighborhoods around the proposed project appeared and, being duly sworn, indicated their opposition to the application:

Barry Chase, President, Coastal Ridge Homeowners Association
 Joe Feraca
 Nancy Tice
 Stanley Brand
 Barry Smith (presented petition with 65 homeowner signatures)
 Thom Brown
 Jim Thompson
 George Worrall
 Patti Schwartzlow
 John Appel
 Charlotte Panzica
 Bill Mattingly
 Anita Mattingly
 Stephen Finney
 Greta Finney
 Kate Wilson
 Joe Panzica

* * * *

At this time, 3:52 P.M., Councilmember Hock-DiPolito left the meeting.

* * * *

The citizens voiced concern that although this is a planning commission, the Council is being asked to approve a project with no plans; that the presentation was biased in its representation of the types of homes in the neighborhood; that the public hearings are just a formality; that if this project with excessive density and intensity is approved, others will follow; that no entity will take responsibility for the project; that Pinellas County is being paved over; that the area is not appropriate for high density; that the Largo Activity Centers were approved without proper notice; and that information about the project has been withheld from the citizens, leading to a lack of public trust.

Traffic concerns brought out were that Seminole Boulevard and Ulmerton Road are already rated LOS F and would be rated even lower if a lower category existed; that the roads cannot absorb the expected 1,700 trips per day the project would generate if the higher, more intensive category is approved; and that many neighborhood streets will be adversely impacted. Safety issues included fire and emergency vehicles negotiating dead-end streets, ingress and egress, and the danger to pedestrians.

Several citizens expressed concern that high-rises would be built due to wetland mitigation, which would beget more high rises; that the project is not compatible, would lower

property values, and adversely affect the quality of life and privacy of the immediate neighborhood; and that federal housing projects look nice at first but are soon run down. Other concerns expressed were for the potential loss of wetlands, the loss of trees, flooding, drainage, the destruction of permeable area; and the protection of the natural habitat and local wildlife.

In response to the comments and concerns of the citizens, Mr. Crawford discussed the total units that would be allowed for the entire 13.8 acres, the LOS figures for Ulmerton Road and Seminole Boulevard, and the issues that the PPC looks at, noting that many of the concerns of the citizens are related to site plans and not usually addressed by the PPC, but could be if there were a Development Agreement. He referred to the site plans and indicated that the wetlands cited by the citizens are not shown on the Countywide Plan Map, and if it turns out that there are significant wetlands, the units per acre might increase; whereupon, he suggested that the Council mandate that it rehear the case should that occur, noting that a rehearing before the Council would not be automatic with the Annexation Agreement as it would be with a Development Agreement, and the Council would have to rely on the City of Largo to send the case back for review.

In response to query by Councilmember Mullins, Mr. Crawford indicated that without a Development Agreement, the PPC has no control over the height of the buildings. School Board Member Lerner expressed concern with the wetland issue, and recommended that the Council wait to act until the Development Agreement is available; whereupon, Mr. Crawford pointed out that Largo staff had stated that a Development Order is forthcoming, not a Development Agreement.

Mayor Archie commented on the limits of what falls under the purview of the PPC, and Mayor Eggers pointed out that Dunedin considers limiting density along transit corridors so as not to invade or intrude too far into residential communities; and that he sees the project as a huge intrusion into lower land use, noting that the property has limited frontage road and the development goes deep into the property. Vice-Mayor Henderson confirmed with Mr. Crawford that (1) the Council has no influence over whether new roads might be built or opened; (2) that there has not been a wetland delineation done on the property; (3) that whether subsidized housing will be built on the property is outside the Council's purview; and (4) that the current owner has more mobile units on the property than is allowed; whereupon, in response to the Vice-Mayor's queries, Mayor Gerard indicated that the Largo City Council voted unanimously to approve the project and that the citizens did express their concerns.

In response to Vice-Mayor Shavlan's queries as to whether a timeline exists that caused the project to be brought before the Council without a Development Agreement and over

objections of the neighbors, Mr. Niño clarified that notifications were sent to property owners abutting the property, the public hearing was advertised in the newspaper, a 24-inch by 36-inch metal sign was placed in front of the property announcing the public hearings, and it was posted on the website and at City Hall for public review; that there are no mobile homes on the property and the RVs have tags; that there will not be a site plan until the owner gets through the permitting process; that, when available, the site plan will be reviewed by the City's Design and Review Committee, the Southwest Florida Water Management District, and other outside agencies, and a neighborhood compatibility meeting will be required, at which time the item will be noticed again; that the site plan review will address issues such as buffers and setback and height issues; and that there are no plans to extend or open up any abutting roadways to the property.

Thereupon, Mr. Niño displayed photographs of similar developments, including the Crossroads Mall property, the Madison at Largo, Crosswinds at Brandon in Tampa, and Bayside Court. He indicated that the City has no plans to enter into a Development Agreement; that the project would be better described as "infill development," not "urban sprawl"; and that Largo requires heavy landscaping and many of the trees will be preserved; whereupon, in response to queries by Mayor Gerard, Mr. Niño indicated that the City of Largo Development Code does not have height restrictions, but would require, for instance, a four-story building that abutted single family homes to be stepped back.

In response to query by School Board Member Lerner, Mr. Niño described the notification process for land use changes, and indicated that property owners within approximately 500 feet of the property are normally noticed by letter; and in response to Chairman Ronecker's comment regarding the limited number of notices involved, Mr. Niño indicated that usually neighborhood associations are sent a letter to post, noting that residents have attended each public hearing held on this application.

In response to query by Councilmember Kennedy, Mr. Pergolizzi discussed the timeframe for the project, noting that the owner is trying to move as quickly as possible. He indicated that, depending on the outcome of today's hearing, the application would be considered at a Countywide Planning Authority (CPA) public hearing in January; that it would subsequently be reviewed at an adoption hearing in Largo; and that it would probably go through the Largo site plan process in February.

Commissioner Morroni indicated that the community's concern is troublesome; and suggested that Mr. Pergolizzi delay appearing before the Board of County Commissioners (BCC), acting as the CPA, until he has answers to the questions asked today; whereupon, Mr.

Pergolizzi revealed that the wetland delineation has been completed and shows that 1.9 of the total 13.8 acres are wetlands; that most of the wetlands are on the western end of the property; and that 38 apartment units would need to go elsewhere on the property. He stressed the importance of resolving the density issue, noting that the applicant is hesitant about spending thousands of dollars on reports and a tree survey without knowing whether he has sufficient density to build the apartment complex.

In rebuttal to queries and comments by the citizens, Mr. Pergolizzi indicated that the development would be classic urban infill rather than urban sprawl; that as many trees as possible would be preserved; that there would be no entrance or exit on Ulmerton Road due to the wetlands; and that fire trucks and emergency vehicles would continue to be able to access the property.

At the request of Councilmember Kennedy, Attorney White advised that a Development Agreement is used to restrict a use, density, or other type of development regulation on a property in a zoning or land use category where it might otherwise be allowed, is governed by Florida statutes, requires public hearings, and, if any change is made to the Agreement, is required by the Countywide Rules to come back to the PPC staff to determine if the change is significant enough to be brought back before the Council. She indicated that any changes to an Annexation Agreement would be handled by the local government; and that a Development Order is more of an all-encompassing permit for property and is issued by the local government, covers site-plan-type issues, and is part of the comprehensive planning process; whereupon, Chairman Ronecker added that Development Orders are often considered building permits, usually are not reviewed at public hearings, and do not usually involve the PPC.

Thereupon, Mr. Crawford indicated that he disagrees with the current project being described as classic urban infill, noting that classic urban infill would take place in a downtown area. Referring to Mr. Pergolizzi's announcement that there is a wetland delineation, he stated that what is now being presented to the Council would effectively change the overall density; and that while the total number of units would remain at 260, the overall acreage those 260 units would be built on would change, making it approximately 22 units per acre rather than the 19 stipulated in the separate and additional recommendation; whereupon, Mr. Crawford pointed out that the separate and additional recommendation is not a suggestion, but something that the City of Largo is being asked to do and upon which the recommendation for approval was based.

Stating that he is the owner of the property, has been in the development field for 40 years, and has won a national award, Stephen McConihay, BDC Investors, expressed his

surprise and consternation that the project is receiving such an in-depth review; whereupon, Mayor Gerard stated that she takes serious objection to restricting the acreage since, as a member of the PPC, she has voted for many projects with identified wetlands, noting that the objections were completely unexpected.

Mr. McConihay related that his goal, once the constraining factors are identified, would be to create a water feature; that the wetlands, the bus stop, and other factors will reduce the usable acreage; and that the density measurement must be in gross acres; and Mr. Pergolizzi concurred, stating that the request before the PPC is for approval of the Land Use Plan amendment, after which the owner will abide by the City of Largo codes.

School Board Member Lerner expressed her concerns that staff and Council were not informed earlier of the wetlands; and in response to her queries, Mr. Crawford explained staff's insistence on the 19 units per acre being the total number of units, pointing out the importance of the end product. He agreed that Mayor Gerard was right that exceptions are sometimes allowed, but pointed out that staff was originally uncomfortable with the request, and based its recommendation on the restriction in the Annexation Agreement; and that the information regarding the wetlands disclosed in today's hearing causes further concern; whereupon, in response to query by Commissioner Morroni, Mr. Crawford stated that the recommendation for approval hinges on keeping the density at 19 units per acre, regardless of what is developable; and that staff would prefer to look at the project again if the potential is for 22 units per acre.

In response to query by Councilmember Kennedy, Mayor Gerard indicated that the concerns expressed today were brought out at the public hearings in Largo, although fewer citizens appeared, and the City Commission did listen; and that the City Commission has made it very clear in numerous public meetings about the Activity Center that it would involve increasing densities and concentrating residential population around commercial, and she does not recall any negative comments; whereupon, she posed questions regarding the actual density of the mobile home parks there now.

Acknowledging the expense of developing a site without knowing the density, Mayor Archie moved, seconded by Mayor Gerard, that the PPC recommendation be approved with the 19 residential units per acre; and in response to query by Vice-Mayor Shavlan, confirmed that the intention of the motion is net acres, not gross acres. Discussion ensued regarding language in the Annexation Agreement, with Mr. Pergolizzi stating that the owner would like to build 260 units on the buildable areas, and Mr. Crawford pointing out that just

because the wetlands do not show up on the Countywide Land Use Map does not mean they can be developed, as the Map is general in nature, and Mr. Niño provided input.

In response to query by Vice-Mayor Henderson, Mr. Crawford indicated that staff can support the motion on the floor using the net acreage terminology, but would recommend denial of a request to build the 260 units on smaller acreage. Attorney White advised that the agenda item has been properly noticed and, based on the language advertised, the Council can vote on the motion on the floor, pointing out that the language in question is located on Page 2, Paragraph 2(e) of the Annexation Agreement.

Thereupon, Commissioner Kennedy made a substitute motion to defer the item to next month for further analysis, seconded by Vice-Mayor Shavlan, and discussion ensued. Commissioner Morroni indicated that he supports the deferral, as he does not think the BCC would approve the request; and suggested that the applicant work with the neighborhood and reconsider the number of units requested, and Councilmember Kennedy, Mayor Archie, and School Board Member Lerner concurred. Mayor Gerard indicated that she would not support the deferral, but would work with the neighbors to modify the project; whereupon, in response to her queries, Mr. Crawford explained why staff would recommend denial of a request for 22 units per acre, pointing out that the PPC staff originally thought 15 units per acre would be the appropriate number, but decided to support 19 units based on the property being located in the Activity Area and knowing that Largo has stringent design guidelines and works closely with the public during the site plan process.

Upon call for the vote, the motion to defer the application until the January meeting was approved 10 to 1, with Mayor Gerard dissenting.

REPORTS AND OTHER ACTION

A. Countywide Plan Update (Verbal) – Received

Mr. Crawford reported that he will provide a Countywide Plan Update and a PowerPoint presentation in January 2013; and that progress is being made regarding a more streamlined process.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ITEMS

A. PPC/MPO Unification Update – Received

B. PAC Membership Roster for 2013 – Received for Filing

Mr. Crawford referred to the 2013 Planners Advisory Committee roster included in the agenda packet, and indicated that Lauren Matzke, City of Clearwater, and Marie Dauphinais, City of Oldsmar, have been elected 2013 Chairman and Vice-Chairman, respectively.

C. Verbal Reports

Mr. Crawford reported that the Advisory Committee for Pinellas Transportation (ACPT) met on December 10, 2012; and that Brad Miller, Chief Executive Officer, Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority (PSTA), discussed local alternatives and the Alternatives Analysis with Federal Transit Administration (FTA) officials, who indicated that they were impressed by the information provided and emphasized the need for strong coordination among the partners; whereupon, he related that Mr. Miller had expressed his desire that the Advisory Committee meet on a monthly basis and propose actual recommendations to the PSTA versus only providing clearinghouse information.

Later in the meeting, Mr. Crawford indicated that City of St. Pete Beach Vice-Mayor Marvin Shavlan, representing Municipality Group A; City of Indian Rocks Beach Commissioner Joanne “Cookie” Kennedy, representing Municipality Group B; and City of Gulfport Vice-Mayor Samuel Henderson, representing Municipality Group C, were reappointed to the Pinellas Planning Council.

OTHER COUNCIL BUSINESS

A. Chairman/Member Items

1. Election of 2013 Officers – Recommendation of Nominating Committee Approved

Chairman Ronecker offered the following slate of officers for 2013 as determined by the Nominating Committee:

Chairman – Councilmember Jim Kennedy
Vice-Chairman – Mayor David O. Archie
Treasurer – Commissioner John Morroni
Secretary – Vice-Mayor Samuel Henderson

December 12, 2012

Mayor Gerard moved, seconded by Councilmember Mullins and carried, that the recommendation of the Nominating Committee be approved (Vote 11-0).

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:20 P.M.

Chairman