

**PINELLAS PLANNING COUNCIL
AGENDA MEMORANDUM**

AGENDA ITEM: II F.

MEETING DATE: April 18, 2007

SUBJECT:

Consent Agenda:

F. Correspondence

RECOMMENDATION:

Council Receive and Discuss as is Appropriate

BACKGROUND

Correspondence Includes:

1. PAC Minutes – April 9, 2007 (draft), March 12, 2007 (approved)
2. Letter received March 1, 2007 from Kirk R. Bogen, P.E., Project Development Engineer, Florida Department of Transportation, Re: Notice of Availability of the Draft Environmental Assessment WPI Segment No. 410755-1, S.R. 697 (Pinellas Bayway Structure E) at Intracoastal Waterway PD&E Study
3. Memorandum sent March 15, 2007 to the Board of County Commissioners in their capacity as the Countywide Planning Authority, Re: Proposed Outline for March 22, 2007 Workshop on Countywide Rule Amendment for Temporary Lodging (Hotels)
4. Memo sent March 16, 2007 to Bruce Bussey, Urban Development Manager, Pinellas County Community Development, Re: Affordable Housing Nexus Analysis Review
5. Letter received March 19, 2007 from Julie Weston, Director, Development Services Department, City of St. Petersburg, Re: Proposed Amendments to the City of St. Petersburg's Land Development Regulations
6. Received March 20, 2007, copy of letters sent March 16, 2007 to Mayor Jerry Beverland, City of Oldsmar, Mayor Beverley Billiris, City of Tarpon Springs, Mayor Frank Hibbard, City of Clearwater, and Paul Cassel, Director, Development Review Services, from Brian Smith, Planning Director, Pinellas County, Re: CPA actions taken on March 13, 2007

PINELLAS PLANNING COUNCIL ACTION:

COUNTYWIDE PLANNING AUTHORITY ACTION:

SUBJECT: Other Council Business - Correspondence

7. Letter sent March 22, 2007 to Mary Palmer, Town Clerk, Town of Redington Shores, Re: Multi-Family Use in the Commercial Tourist Facility Zoning Category
8. Letter sent March 22, 2007 to Patti Herr, Administrative Secretary, Town of Redington Shores, Re: Transmittal of Draft Revised Land Development Regulations
9. Letters sent March 23, 2007 to Mayors of local governments with cases on March 21, 2007 PPC Agenda, Re: PPC Meeting Follow-up
10. Letters sent March 23, 2007 to property owner/representative, Re: March 21, 2007 PPC Meeting Follow-up (Land Use Cases)
11. Copy of letter from Matt McLachlan, AICP, Community Development Director, City of Safety Harbor, to Ray Eubanks, Plan Processing Administrator, Florida Department of Community Affairs, received March 27, 2007, Re: Adopted City of Safety Harbor Evaluation and Appraisal Report
12. Letter sent March 29, 2007 to Nick Simons, Mayor, Town of Redington Beach, Re: Transmittal of Draft Memorandum of Understanding between the Pinellas Planning Council and the Town of Redington Beach
13. Letter dated March 30, 2007 received from Dave Goodwin, Director, Economic Development, City of St. Petersburg, Re: Notice of Public Hearing to Amend the Intown, Intown West, Bayboro Harbor, Tangerine Avenue, Sixteenth Street, and Dome Industrial Park Pilot Project Community Redevelopment Plans

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
MONDAY, APRIL 9, 2007
BANK OF AMERICA BUILDING
600 CLEVELAND STREET, SUITE 850, EIGHTH FLOOR
CLEARWATER, FLORIDA**

Members Present:

Fred Metcalf, Chairman
Rick MacAulay
Sharen Jarzen
Lauren Matzke
Jeff Dow
Catherine Porter
Ron Rinzivillo
Lynn Rosetti
Bob Klute
Marie Dauphinais
Steve Fairchild
Gordon Beardslee

City of Gulfport
City of St. Petersburg
City of Seminole
City of St. Pete Beach
City of Dunedin
City of Clearwater
City of Safety Harbor
City of Treasure Island
City of Largo
City of Oldsmar
Pinellas County Schools
Pinellas County

Also Present:

Bob Jeffrey
Michael Crawford
Michael Schoderbock
Ryan Brinson
Carolyn Shoemaker

City of St. Petersburg
Pinellas Planning Council
Pinellas Planning Council
Pinellas Planning Council
Pinellas Planning Council

Chairman Metcalf called the meeting to order at 1:30 P.M.

Minutes – Chairman Metcalf asked if there were any comments or corrections to be made to the minutes of the March 12, 2007, PAC meeting. Mr. MacAulay asked that the statement regarding the appeal process on page seven, be changed to reflect that it was made by Bob Jeffrey, not Rick MacAulay. It was also noted that Mr. Dow had notified PPC staff of a needed typographical correction prior to the meeting, which correction was made. Sharen Jarzen moved to approve the minutes as corrected; the motion was seconded by Catherine Porter and carried (vote 11-0).

Old Business – Chairman Metcalf stated he would be out of town at the time of the next Pinellas Planning Council meeting, and he noted that the PAC Vice Chairman Jerry Paradise is not present today and is no longer working for the City of Oldsmar. Chairman Metcalf asked for a volunteer to be available at the PPC meeting to discuss PAC's input, as necessary. Jeff Dow agreed to handle the Council meeting on behalf of the PAC.

Review of PPC Agenda for April 18, 2007, Meeting – Received.

Countywide Planning Authority Actions – March/April – Mr. Crawford summarized the actions of the CPA and the PAC then received the items. Mr. Crawford noted that the Board had approved the Final Draft of the Consistency Report at their April 3 meeting; however, the Board had concerns with some language in the report. Mr. Beardslee noted that the Board wanted to make it clear in the resolution that as the cities and the County go forward with amendments that there is room for negotiation on the solutions to those issues identified; and he stated that the resolution is being modified to reflect that. Mr. Crawford noted that the items submitted were suggested solutions and that they were not final solutions. He also noted that the PPC and the PPC staff wanted to ensure that there should be a clear and consistent means by which to handle the consistency issues that arise through the administration of local comprehensive plans and codes. He stated that this is another area that the Board had concern with.

Mr. Crawford then stated that staff will begin to work with the municipalities in the coming weeks to bring them into consistency, and that Pinellas Park has volunteered to be first (since they are redrafting their land development regulations).

Annexation Report – March 2007 – Michael Schoderbock summarized the report on voluntary annexations for the month of March. He stated that the Council received a total of 9 petitions for voluntary annexation review from the cities of Clearwater, Largo, and Pinellas Park. Of those 9 petitions reviewed, all were found to be in compliance. Existing uses found in the 9 petitions include 1 industrial parcel, 6 residential parcels, and 2 vacant parcels. These proposed annexations totaled 15.1 acres and approximately \$1.4 million in taxable value. Total Municipal Service Taxing Unit tax revenues from the \$1.4 million of taxable value are \$3,260 using the 2006/07 fiscal year tax rate. It is estimated that 11 residents will be affected by a change in jurisdiction. Annexation of three of the nine parcels being annexed will reduce enclaves in the County by 2.05 acres and annexation of one of the nine parcels will eliminate a 7.24-acre enclave.

Ron Rinzivillo entered at this time.

Annexation Report – Quarterly Summary – Mr. Schoderbock noted this report provides a synopsis of the staff limited administrative review of voluntary annexations for the second quarter of F.Y. 2006/07 in accordance with Pinellas County Ordinance No. 00-63, as well as details regarding other forms of annexation that have occurred over the past few years. He reported that Chart 1 provides acreage summaries, Chart 2 taxable value, and Chart 3 the percentage of acres annexed in enclaves, all for annexations reviewed in each fiscal year since adoption of Pinellas County Ordinance No. 00-63 through the second quarter of the current fiscal year, 2006/07. The acreage and taxable value for the second quarter F.Y. 06/07, January through March, were 58.30 acres and \$5,380,489 respectively. Twenty-one percent (12.5 acres) of the acreage annexed during the quarter reduced or eliminated an enclave.

Mr. Schoderbock stated that over the past 6 years, taxable value annexed averaged about \$56 million on average for the year; this year so far, there has been \$9 million in taxable value submitted for review, or about 16% of average. The same has been true with acreage – over the past six years there were approximately 335 acres annexed on average; this year in the first half, there has been about 75 acres or 22% of average. Staff also looks at the percentage of annexations in enclaves and has noticed an increase: on average, about 23% have been in enclaves; so far this year, it has been approximately 33%. It was also noted that there have been no referendums or involuntary annexations in this past quarter.

Local Assistance – Quarterly Status Report (Verbal) - Mr. Crawford presented this report noting that the Redington Shores Land Development Code re-write is in final editing; and that Larry Pflueger and Linda Fisher have been working with consultant Gail Easley and Associates to finish evaluation on local government Evaluation and Appraisal Reports (EAR's) and are awaiting comments from the Florida Department of Community Affairs.

PLAN AMENDMENTS

Subthreshold Amendment:

Case CW 07-13 – St. Petersburg - Mr. Brinson stated this 0.2-acre site is located 125 feet west of the southwest corner of 4th Street and 53rd Avenue and involves a request to change the designation from Residential Medium – RM to Residential/Office/Retail – R/O/R. This amendment will allow the property owner to combine the undeveloped subject property with the adjacent property to the east and redevelop the entire site with a commercial use.

Mr. MacAulay noted that the R/O/R line (from north to south) should be at 150 ft.; that this will be strip commercial and has been done well by utilizing design standards. In response to a query from a PAC member, he noted that the mobile home park is no longer there and is being redeveloped in its entirety.

Lynn Rosetti moved to approve staff recommendation of approval; the motion was seconded by Sharen Jarzen and carried (vote 12-0).

Regular Amendment:

Case CW 07-14 (3-203) – St. Petersburg – Mr. Crawford stated that this item involves the approval of a second phase of Countywide Plan Map amendments submitted by the City of St. Petersburg as part of efforts to administer their Vision 2020 Plan; that this is one of the final steps that must be taken to implement the major plan and code changes that the City adopted last year; and encompasses approximately 2,635 acres throughout the City of St. Petersburg. He noted that the first phase was heard by the Council at the March meeting and involved the new “Planned Redevelopment” Countywide Plan Map

categories; however, the amendments before the PAC today do not rely upon a Special Area Plan or the new Planned Redevelopment categories, but rather propose to utilize the "standard" Countywide Plan Map categories.

Ms. Rosetti stated that she owns property in Area 199 – and would want to abstain in voting on that item. Chairman Metcalf agreed that Area 199 could be removed in order that Ms. Rosetti could vote on the remaining items.

Mr. Crawford presented a summary of the staff's analysis, noting that there are 143 amendments before PAC today; that the figure had started with 203, but that a number were withdrawn prior to advertisement. He stated that the subthresholds are shaded on the spreadsheet; that there are 90 subthresholds or 64%, and that 52 or 36% are regular amendments, representing a total of 2,635 acres. He presented a summary analysis of the Relevant Countywide Considerations and concluded that the amendments are consistent with the Countywide Rules.

Those areas withdrawn include all or parts of areas 22, 52, 72, 70, 136, and 142. Discussion followed with regard to area 182 which includes Eckerd College property. For today's discussion Area 182 will remain in consideration. Staff will discuss further with St. Petersburg staff after today's meeting.

Mr. Crawford stated that the PPC staff recommends approval of the 143 amendments before PAC today.

Mr. Rinzivillo inquired as to whether the amendments are predicated on recognized existing land uses to which Mr. MacAulay stated they were and that Phase II is an opportunity to look at the entire City. Mr. MacAulay stated in summary that the City is undertaking this for four reasons – recognizing existing uses; providing consistency in terms of plan designation with existing development patterns; consistency with the City's desired redevelopment efforts – Vision 2020; and finally, the proposed designations are proper given the locational criteria set forth in the Countywide Rules. He stated that it is for either one or several of the four reasons that the amendments are being proposed.

Mr. MacAulay stated that the City will be preparing a "glitch" ordinance to take care of mapping errors or other mistakes and errors; that there are probably several hundred amendments which will come back starting perhaps in August; that they will go to the local planning agency, the City Council for first reading, and then through the PPC/CPA process. Mr. MacAulay added that the PPC staff has done an outstanding job on looking at these parcels and making necessary evaluations.

Mr. Rinzivillo inquired as to input from surrounding jurisdictions where appropriate to which Mr. Crawford noted that area 52 is the only one so affected, and it is a reduction in density and has no impact on the adjoining areas. Gordon Beardslee noted the County would like to see a change for what is being proposed on County-owned property at the entrance to Weedon Island – likely to the Preservation category if it qualifies - in areas 37

and 39 (for State owned land) both shown on Map 2-8. Gordon Beardslee asked that these two areas be removed from this consideration at this time so that County staff can meet and discuss further with City of St. Petersburg staff what the proper designations should be for this area.

After a full presentation of the report, Lynn Rosetti moved to approve all amendments minus Area 199, and others specifically mentioned to be withdrawn, to include all or parts of area 22, area 52, area 72, area 70, area 136, area 142, area 37, and area 39. Gordon Beardslee seconded the motion and it carried (vote 12-0).

The Chairman reiterated that the record should reflect that area 199 would be included in a separate motion in order that Lynn Rosetti could vote on this issue.

Gordon Beardslee moved to approve amendment 199, approximately 176 acres shown on Maps 2-45 and 2-46, as submitted; the motion was seconded by Sharen Jarzen and carried (vote 11-0 with Lynn Rosetti abstaining).

Sarasota County/City Interlocal Agreement – Mr. Crawford noted that in accordance with the Council's direction at the last meeting, the Joint Planning and Interlocal Service Boundary Agreement between the City of Venice and Sarasota County was provided for the information of, and discussion by, the Council.

The Agreement serves as an example of an instrument that may prove useful to address jurisdictional and service delivery issues between a county and its cities and that this was entered into under the new provisions of Chapter 171, Part II, Florida Statutes.

No discussion or comments were received.

Other PAC Business: None.

Mr. Crawford inquired as to the new process of presenting PAC agenda materials; PAC members indicated their support of the process and stated that they had no problems with receiving the agenda materials.

There being no further business, Lynn Rosetti moved to adjourn at 2:25 p.m.; the motion was seconded and carried (vote 12-0).

Respectfully submitted,

David P. Healey, Executive Director

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
MONDAY, MARCH 12, 2007
BANK OF AMERICA BUILDING
600 CLEVELAND STREET, SUITE 850, EIGHTH FLOOR
CLEARWATER, FLORIDA**

Members Present:

Fred Metcalf, Chairman	City of Gulfport
Dean Neal	City of Pinellas Park
Rick MacAulay	City of St. Petersburg
Sharen Jarzen	City of Seminole
Danny Taylor	City of Indian Rocks Beach
Lauren Matzke	City of St. Pete Beach
Jeff Dow	City of Dunedin
Catherine Porter	City of Clearwater
Ron Rinzivillo	City of Safety Harbor

Also Present:

Bob Jeffrey	City of St. Petersburg
Liz Freeman	Pinellas County
David Healey	Pinellas Planning Council
Michael Crawford	Pinellas Planning Council
Larry Pflueger	Pinellas Planning Council
Linda Fisher	Pinellas Planning Council
Michael Schoderbock	Pinellas Planning Council
Ryan Brinson	Pinellas Planning Council
Chris Mettler	Pinellas Planning Council
Carolyn Shoemaker	Pinellas Planning Council

Chairman Metcalf called the meeting to order at 1:30 P.M. In the absence of a quorum at the beginning of the meeting, the following items were taken out of agenda order.

Countywide Planning Authority Actions –February 20, 2007 – Mr. Crawford summarized the actions of the CPA and the PAC then received the item.

Annexation Report – February 2007 – Michael Schoderbock summarized the report on voluntary annexations for the month of February. He stated that the Council received a total of 11 petitions for voluntary annexation review from the cities of Clearwater, Largo, Oldsmar, Pinellas Park, and Tarpon Springs. Of those 11 petitions reviewed, all were found to be in compliance. Existing uses found in the 11 petitions include 1 institutional parcel, 9 residential parcels, and 1 vacant parcel. These proposed annexations totaled 8.5 acres and approximately \$1.4 million in taxable value. Total Municipal Service Taxing Unit tax revenues from the \$1.4 million of taxable value are \$3,242 using the 2006/07

fiscal year tax rate. It is estimated that 22 residents will be affected by a change in jurisdiction. Annexation of one of the 11 parcels being annexed will reduce an enclave in the County by 0.35-acres and another will eliminate a 0.37-acre enclave.

Composite Annexation Report: F.Y. 2000/01-2005/06

Michael Schoderbock stated this report is intended to provide a cumulative one-year update of the results of annexation in Pinellas County. He stated that the data is compiled and analyzed in two different ways: 1) data based on the Council's review of voluntary annexation in accordance with Pinellas County Ordinance No. 00-63; and 2) referendum annexation in accordance with Pinellas County Resolution No. 03-128.

Lauren Matzke arrived at this time.

After a complete outline and review of the PowerPoint presentation on this report, Mr. Schoderbock noted in summary that in Pinellas County annexation is occurring at a countywide average annual pace of some 1,200 acres – of which about 38% or 450 acres is through the voluntary annexation process and 62% or 750 acres is through the referendum process. The 6,925 acres annexed over the six-year period from F.Y.2001 to 2006 represent about 30% of the unincorporated area inside the annexation planning areas, with 11% of that annexed voluntarily and 19% by referendum.

Further observations were that after six years:

- On average \$335,000 per year of ad valorem tax revenue for annexed property is collected by the cities instead of the MSTU.
- The make-up of an area annexed relative to the type of use, population affected, and corresponding taxable value can cause a wide fluctuation in the basis for comparison (i.e., PCTV and PATV) from year to year.
- Voluntary annexations that reduce or eliminate enclaves have been on the increase the past two years. In F.Y. 2004/05, 48% of all approved voluntary annexations were inside of enclaves. Also, in the past six years no new enclaves have been created in Pinellas County.
- Overall, annexation has been declining. Voluntary annexation petitions submitted for review have been declining by 10% per year. Furthermore, only one referendum annexation has been initiated and approved by voters in the past three years.
- If annexation continued at the same rate it has over the past six years, it would take approximately 53 years to fill-in the current voluntary annexation planning areas by way of only voluntary annexations (assuming everyone ultimately chose to annex).
- On the basis of referendum/involuntary annexation alone, it would take approximately 71 years to fill in the voluntary annexation planning areas.
- With voluntary and referendum combined, it would take approximately 30 years to complete fill-in the voluntary annexation planning areas.

PAC members complimented staff on the report. Rick MacAulay moved to accept the Composite Annexation Report. The motion was seconded by Catherine Porter and carried (vote 8-0).

With a quorum present, the Chairman returned to the beginning of the agenda for consideration of the minutes of the February 12, 2007, PAC meeting.

Minutes – Chairman Metcalf asked if there were any comments or corrections to be made to the minutes of the February 12, 2007, PAC meeting. There being none, Dean Neal moved to approve the minutes; the motion was seconded by Sharen Jarzen and carried (vote 8-0).

Old Business – None.

PLAN AMENDMENTS

Subthreshold Amendments: None.

Regular Amendments:

Case CW 07-11 – Clearwater – Mr. Brinson stated that this 1.8-acre site is located at 2060 Evergreen Drive. The proposed amendment is from Residential Urban – RU to Residential Medium - RM.

Mr. Brinson reported that a portion of the site is developed with an unoccupied single-family home located at the northeast corner, but for the most part, the site is a vacant heavily wooded natural area, and that the proposed amendment to RM will permit residential development up to a maximum of 15 upa, which is double the existing residential development potential on the site.

Ron Rinzivillo entered the meeting at this time.

After a full outline of the current use of the area, Mr. Brinson stated that at last month's meeting of the Council, Case CW 07-09 was approved from I to RM just southeast of the subject site; that it appears this previous amendment area, along with the subject site, and in addition to other properties in the surrounding area, are interrelated with respect to ownership; and that this is brought to the PAC's attention because of concerns over the potential use of remaining density in addition to surplus density being garnered from other areas nearby that could be placed on the subject parcel or other undeveloped parcels in the area. This would result in a final configuration having a density significantly higher than what was intended with the requested RM Countywide Plan Map category.

The Council staff, therefore, has included the supplemental recommendation that the City analyze the Clearwater Village development, and other undeveloped areas that appear to

be related, in a holistic manner, so as to recognize surrounding low density residential uses and to ensure that the natural characteristics of the site and the surrounding area will be protected to the maximum extent possible.

Discussion followed concerning density averaging. Mr. Crawford noted that staff has discussed the issues with Clearwater, and Ms. Porter indicated that Clearwater has been working with the developer; that Clearwater has concerns as well, and has indicated to the developer that an overall plan is needed. Ms. Porter reiterated that Clearwater has no objection to the recommendation of staff as presented.

Mr. Brinson added that the RM classification would be inconsistent as applied to the site due to the natural characteristics of the site.

In response to further questions from PAC members, it was indicated by Clearwater staff that there has been no request on behalf of the developer for density averaging.

Rick MacAulay moved to approve staff recommendation to approve, including the supplemental recommendation as noted in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Jeff Dow and carried (vote 9-0).

Case CW 07-12 – Pinellas County – Mr. Brinson stated that this 0.2-acre site is located on the Northwest corner of County Road 1 and Sandra Drive. The proposed Countywide Plan Map amendment is from Residential Low Medium – RLM to Residential/Office General – R/OG.

Mr. Brinson noted that the subject site is designated RLM and is located on a Scenic/Non-Commercial Corridor (SNCC), County Road 1 (CR1); that it is vacant and the R/OG category will allow it to be developed with an office building.

After full presentation of the report, Mr. Brinson stated that staff has concluded that the requested R/OG category is a more appropriate designation for the following reasons: 1) the R/OG category will allow for development of an office use which is compatible with the adjacent residential, office, and commercial areas (located on the west side of CR1); 2) due to the site's direct access and location along CR1 which is a Minor Arterial road; and 3) due to the small and irregular size of the parcel. Additionally, before an amendment to a non-residential category can be approved, either the SNCC Subclassification must be amended (in this case from Residential to either a Mixed-Use or an Enhancement Connector) or an exception to the SNCC guidelines must be approved. Council staff has concluded that an exception can be justified in this instance because of the site's surrounding existing uses, current Countywide Plan Map designations, and diminimus lot size/configuration along CR1.

Mr. Brinson stated that the R/OG category will not significantly impact the City of Dunedin which is adjacent to the subject site to the south as they do not provide any

services to the subject area and because the uses associated with the R/OG category are consistent with uses in the CL category within Dunedin.

Sharen Jarzen moved to approve staff recommendation of approval including the separate additional recommendation; the motion was seconded by Rick MacAulay and carried (vote 9-0).

Case CW 07-10 – City of St. Petersburg Redevelopment Plan – Chairman Metcalf indicated that the City of St. Petersburg staff would be presenting first and then staff would respond.

Rick MacAulay presented an outline of the history of the Vision 2020 Special Area Plan, further noting that St. Petersburg staff will also be available at the Pinellas Planning Council meeting in order to answer any questions that may arise.

Mr. MacAulay stated that application of three of the four new Plan categories are being presented, as approved by the Pinellas Planning Council last summer.

Mr. MacAulay noted that primarily these changes will take place within the older traditional neighborhoods. It will allow them to construct and offer accessory units which they also believe will assist in meeting the demand for more workforce housing through these accessory units, such as garage apartments, especially in close proximity to the downtown areas.

Discussion continued on mix of uses, proximity to mass transit, affordable housing, activity center designations including Town Center, Tyrone Square Mall, Central Plaza, and a different set of regulations adopted for the Downtown area.

Mr. MacAulay stated that this Special Area Plan (SAP) was approved by the St. Petersburg City Council in October and then transmitted to the PPC. The City continues to modify it as feedback is received; one example was direction received from the School Board relating to school age population figures.

Discussion followed with regard to traffic concerns and Metropolitan Planning Organization levels of service; Mr. MacAulay noted that the new categories won't necessarily result in approval of site plans on those roadways; that there are some problematic areas and that through the City's concurrency management system, the City can control the ultimate site plan, or through mitigation require traffic studies.

Bob Jeffrey then made a presentation using a PowerPoint slide show. He detailed the many aspects of the plan as well as its implications to the city.

Mr. Neal inquired about evaluation of water, sewer and older infrastructure to which Mr. MacAulay stated that for the most part it has been determined plant capacities are adequate; they have identified some excess which will be taken into consideration

through development review. Mr. Jeffrey stated that part of the development requirements is that the developer must upgrade pipes as necessary. He noted that a couple of projects have stalled due to these concerns.

Mr. Jeffrey further noted that citizen committees have played a big role in the Vision 2020 concept process. There were over 525 participants in the committee review process.

Mr. Crawford noted that a complete review has been concluded of the Countywide Plan Map amendments associated with this SAP and that some 35,500 individual parcels have been involved in the Planned Redevelopment – Residential category. Of that, 22,000 qualify for garage/apartment use, but it is expected only some 5,000 of those will be built. Next is the Planned Redevelopment – Mixed Use category which includes over 1600 acres and approximately 3500 parcels; and approximately 740 parcels/owners fall within the Planned Redevelopment - Commercial category. He stated that the City of St. Petersburg started out with the Vision 2020 Plan and then retrofitted it to meet the SAP requirements in the Countywide Rules. He further stated that water demand showed a decrease; sewer showed an increase, but that all could be handled with the existing systems; and that traffic levels of service have been addressed. The City was asked to look at all corridors in the City and indicate on a segment by segment basis the impacts anticipated. Mr. MacAulay noted that the point the City wants to make is that, in total, they expect a reduction in city-wide trips as a result of these amendments.

Discussion followed with regard to the conditions placed on the approval of the amendments and SAP. Mr. Crawford stated that from a holistic view, staff feels it is an excellent plan and recommends approval; and that it meets all requirements for special area plans found in the Countywide Rules.

Discussion continued with regard to maximum ISR requirements, parking issues, etc. Mr. Jeffrey stated that the City is reinforcing the traditional solutions such as double-ribbon driveways, not allowing driveways in front yards in certain instances, and disallowing paving over green areas. Mr. Neal inquired as to a record or covenant that would keep from converting garages or storage areas to livable area to which Mr. Jeffrey stated the City is going to require that land area be at least 5800 square feet before an accessory unit could be constructed, and that the City will help with design process in order to try to assist people in accomplishing what they need.

In response to a question from Mr. Pflueger, Mr. MacAulay noted that City staff had worked extensively with the Florida Department of Community Affairs and the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council early on in the process and their plans were well received.

Liz Freeman, on behalf of Pinellas County, inquired as to zoning amendments, design guidelines and consideration of green building. Mr. Jeffrey stated that every area will have design guidelines – to include remodeling – and there will be incentives for green

building, but that they anticipate further addressing "green building" in the near future through the building code.

Sharen Jarzen inquired as to the status of design guidelines. Mr. Jeffrey noted that the appeal process is fairly flexible – staff can waive up to two requirements, then the POD (person officially designated) can waive a little more, and it is then appealable to the Community Preservation Commission if it goes that far. He stated that the fee schedule has not changed.

Upon conclusion of the presentation and discussion of the report, Dean Neal moved approval of staff recommendation of approval subject to the five conditions enumerated. The motion was seconded by Catherine Porter and carried (vote 9-0).

Other PAC Business: None.

There being no further business, Dean Neal moved to adjourn at 3:05 p.m.; the motion was seconded by Sharen Jarzen and carried (vote 9-0).

Respectfully submitted,


David P. Healey, Executive Director