

MINUTES OF THE PLANNERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING  
MONDAY, JULY 6, 2009  
BANK OF AMERICA BUILDING  
600 CLEVELAND STREET, SUITE 850, EIGHTH FLOOR  
CLEARWATER, FLORIDA

Members Present:

Sharen Jarzen, Chairman	City of Seminole
Gordon Beardslee	Pinellas County
Dean Neal	City of Pinellas Park
Bob Klute	City of Largo
Lauren Matzke	City of Clearwater
Ron Rinzivillo	City of Safety Harbor
Rick MacAulay	City of St. Petersburg
Danny Taylor	City of Indian Rocks Beach
Lynn Rosetti	City of Treasure Island
Fred Metcalf	City of Gulfport
Greg Rice	City of Dunedin
Marshall Touchton	Pinellas County School Board, Ex Officio Member

Also Present:

Michael Crawford	Pinellas Planning Council
Michael Schoderbock	Pinellas Planning Council
Christopher Mettler	Pinellas Planning Council
Willie L. Brown, Jr.	Pinellas Planning Council
Carolyn Shoemaker	Pinellas Planning Council

PAC Chairman Sharen Jarzen called the meeting to order at 1:30 P.M.

Minutes – Chairman Jarzen asked if there were any comments or corrections to be made to the minutes of the June 8, 2009 Planners Advisory Committee (PAC) meeting. There being none, Fred Metcalf moved to approve the minutes; the motion was seconded by Danny Taylor and carried (vote 9-0).

Old Business – None.

At the request of Chairman Jarzen, Mr. Crawford gave PAC an update on the actions taken by the Council at this morning's special meeting regarding the budget. He stated that the Council voted to pursue a reduced budget from that considered by the Council in June; and that Mr. Healey will prepare the revised budget and accompanying resolution to be taken to the Council for approval on July 15.

Review of PPC Agenda for July 15, 2009 Meeting – Received.

Countywide Planning Authority (CPA) Actions - Mr. Crawford reported the CPA approved the four subthreshold and two regular cases heard by the Council in May. Greg Rice stated that the

City of Dunedin held the second reading on Case CW 09-09 (Fenway on the Bay) on July 2 and now awaits infrastructure and site plan reviews.

Annexation Report – June 2009 – Michael Schoderbock summarized the report on voluntary annexations for the month of June as follows:

He stated that the Council received a total of five voluntary annexation petitions in June from the cities of Clearwater, Largo, and Pinellas Park. The proposed annexations contain one commercial use and four residential uses. The proposed annexations totaled 11.24 acres and approximately \$15.2 million in taxable value. Total Municipal Service Taxing Unit revenues from the \$15.2 million of taxable value are \$31,679 using the 2008/09 fiscal year tax rate. It is estimated that about 13 residents will be affected by a change in jurisdiction. Two of the five annexations will reduce two enclaves in the county by 0.46 acre.

Annexation Report – Quarterly Summary, Third Quarter FY 2008/09 – Mr. Schoderbock provided a report for staff receipt and tracking of voluntary annexations for the third quarter of FY 2008/09. He noted that the acreage and taxable value for the quarter, April through June, were 13.59 acres and \$16,573,573 respectively; and that 10 percent or 1.39 acres reduced or eliminated an enclave.

Ability to Serve Report No. 09-3: City of Gulfport (Referendum Annexation Area) – Mr. Schoderbock stated that Section 5(12) of Chapter 88-464, Laws of Florida, as amended, requires the Council to review and make a recommendation to the affected municipality for each annexation of ten acres or more as to the ability of the municipality to provide municipal services to the territory proposed to be annexed. He stated that this proposed annexation is subject to a referendum pursuant to Chapter 171, F.S., and that the referendum is scheduled for November 3, 2009.

He stated that the proposed referendum area is located in the southwestern part of Pinellas County, bounded by the City of South Pasadena on the west, Gulfport Blvd. S. on the north, the City of Gulfport on the east and Boca Ciega Bay on the south; that the area consists of a mix of single-family subdivisions, condominiums, townhomes, and apartment complex, a commercial property, and a portion of the Pasadena Yacht and County Club; and that the total area of the proposed annexation is 171 acres.

Mr. Schoderbock stated that in accordance with review criteria of PPC Resolution No. 98-2, and based upon accompanying data and analysis, that PPC staff submits that the subject area is not located within an established planning area pursuant to Chp. 163 F.S.; that Gulfport has not established any planning areas pursuant to the Chp. 163 F.S. He also reported that the proposed annexation will not create any enclaves; that the city has the ability to provide water, sewer, solid waste, law enforcement, fire, EMS, recreation and library services through city departments, county services or private contracts; and that with the exception of the fire district, the existing service district boundaries will not change.

\*\*\*Lynn Rosetti and Ron Rinzivillo entered the meeting at this time.\*\*\*

Mr. Metcalf stated that Gulfport had the County staff review this as well; that there is still an outstanding issue of how much water and land acreage is quoted in the report; and that the City is changing this to match what the County has. He stated the City has 129 acres of recreation facilities; that 81 acres would be needed in total after the annexation and thus there is a surplus of 48 acres.

In response to a query from Mr. Touchton, discussion followed with regard to the potential handling of site plans should an area which may have made a submittal and then later became part of a new municipality. Gordon Beardslee stated that each jurisdiction will differ; that for purpose of school concurrency, they may have to resubmit but that school concurrency is done at site plan level.

Discussion followed with regard to population affected to which Mr. Metcalf stated there are approximately 1900 persons and that over 60% indicated interest in finding out more about the proposed annexation.

Gordon Beardslee noted that he had contacted Mr. Metcalf this morning and received an update on recreation concerns; that the county has concerns on the impact of the city having to acquire another rescue unit, and he would like an estimate of how much that would be. Mr. Beardslee also noted he is sending the application to the Public Works Department to address any potential major drainage area and infrastructure in the annexation area; specifically the outfall area for Bear Creek.

After full report and discussion, Bob Klute moved to recommend the Council adopt a finding that the City of Gulfport has the ability to provide municipal services to the area and authorize this finding to be transmitted to the City of Gulfport. The motion was seconded by Ron Rinzivillo and carried (vote 11-0).

Scenic/Non-Commercial Corridor (SNCC) Pilot Study – Mr. Crawford provided background regarding the adoption of the Countywide Scenic/Non-Commercial Corridor (SNCC) Element of the Countywide Plan in 1995 and that since adoption we have seen a variety of Countywide Plan Map amendments within these areas. Some of these amendments have been in response to road widening, some have been speculative, and some have been in response to actual development plans.

He stated that Curlew Road is among several major roadways in Pinellas County which were designated as SNCCs; that a number of these roadways, including Curlew Road, were subsequently expanded, affecting the uses along these corridors and generating a number of Countywide Plan Map amendments; and that absent an appropriate framework to deal with land use changes requested along this and other SNCCs, many Countywide Plan Map changes have resulted in a land use pattern that is disjointed, fails to adequately address adjacent/remaining single-family uses, and does not efficiently interface with the roadway network. It is important that a framework is established to address these circumstances consistently and comprehensively rather than on an ad hoc basis. He noted that approximately 40 amendments have been made since 2002, mostly on an ad hoc basis utilizing the “exception” process.

Mr. Crawford stated that the Council authorized the consulting firm of Tindale-Oliver and Associates to work with staff to conduct an analysis of the Curlew Road SNCC as a pilot study to develop recommendations and guidelines to be used in the future on this and other SNCCs that may be in transition.

After presentation of the study area and the current requirements in the Countywide Rules, Mr. Crawford discussed the exception process and how this was most often used during the Countywide Plan Map amendment process, as opposed to the wholesale change of the SNCC overlay. In part, because such change to the overall classification of the roadway would open up these Residential subclassified roadways to more intensive commercial, office, and residential uses, it was not the preferred route.

Mr. Crawford stated that the Study found that the subclassifications are not gradual and that there needs to be another subclassification between Residential and Mixed Use; and that a new "Transitional" subclassification has been recommended to address this issue. In addition, the Study concluded that locally adopted land development regulations (LDRs) addressing the issues raised when changing residential uses to nonresidential uses should be developed, or in the alternative, that conditions be placed on each Countywide Plan Map amendment. Either way, the Study recommends that these address compatibility issues with remaining and adjacent lower density residential areas, as well as issues raised with an associated roadway widening. Lastly, these LDRs or conditions should support and further the principles and objectives of the SNCC Element. He stated that the study included examples of LDRs that address some of the SNCC principles and objectives, and that in addition, the Study included portions of the SNCC Master Plan dealing with aesthetics along these roadways. The creation of a model set of LDRs for consideration by local governments was also recommended in the Study.

Mr. Crawford stated that the Study had additional recommendations, including further identification of corridors that might qualify as Transitional subclassified roadways and that some of the current Mixed Use and Enhancement Connector roadways might also qualify as Transitional segments.

Other recommendations from the pilot study were presented by Mr. Crawford, including the need for the coordination with the Metropolitan Planning Organization on future roadway widening and the review of the SNCC Element as part of the scheduled 5-year review of the Countywide Plan.

Discussion followed with Mr. MacAulay noting that this is a complicated problem dating back to the mid 90's; that he would suggest that a PowerPoint presentation be given by the consultant to present the number of instances where the SNCC subclassification was changed and the reasons why.

Discussion followed regarding the need for the new Transitional subclassification, coupled with LDRs addressing the issues associated with such an amendment to the SNCC subclassification wherein Mr. Beardslee stated that he did not agree with what he characterized