

**PINELLAS PLANNING COUNCIL  
AGENDA MEMORANDUM**

**AGENDA ITEM:** II F.

**MEETING DATE:** October 17, 2007

**SUBJECT:**

Consent Agenda:

F. Correspondence for September

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Council Receive and Discuss as is Appropriate

***BACKGROUND***

In addition to material previously forward to the Council,

Correspondence Includes:

1. PAC Minutes – October 8, 2007 (draft), September 10, 2007 (approved)
2. Letter sent September 18, 2007 to Julie Weston, Director, City of St. Petersburg Development Services Department, Re: Review of Proposed Amendments to the City of St. Petersburg's Comprehensive Plan for Consistency with the Countywide Rules
3. Letters sent September 21, 2007 to property owner/representative, Re: September 19, 2007 PPC Meeting Follow-up (Land Use Cases)
4. Letters sent September 21, 2007 to Mayor Patricia Gerard, City of Largo, Mayor Lynn Rives, City of Belleair Beach, Mayor Rick Baker, City of St. Petersburg, Mayor Frank Hibbard, City of Clearwater, and Commissioner Ronnie Duncan, Chairman, Pinellas County Board of County Commissioners, Re: September 19, 2007 PPC Meeting Follow-up
5. Copy of letters to Jim Smith received September 24, 2007 from Joseph Modica, Re: Contesting assessed property value located at 308 Aristides St., Dunedin, Florida and at 414 N. Duncan, Clearwater, Florida
6. Transmittal letter sent September 27, 2007 to Matthew McLachlan, Community Development Director, City of Safety Harbor, Re: Executed copy of Interlocal Agreement for Planning Services

***PINELLAS PLANNING COUNCIL ACTION:***

***COUNTYWIDE PLANNING AUTHORITY ACTION:***

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING  
MONDAY, OCTOBER 8, 2007  
BANK OF AMERICA BUILDING  
600 CLEVELAND STREET, SUITE 850, EIGHTH FLOOR  
CLEARWATER, FLORIDA**

Members Present:

Fred Metcalf, Chairman  
Sharen Jarzen  
Lauren Matzke  
Jeff Dow  
Catherine Porter  
Marie Dauphinais  
Dean Neal  
Danny Taylor  
Paul Geisz  
Gordon Beardslee  
Jim Miller  
Lynn Rosetti

City of Gulfport  
City of Seminole  
City of St. Pete Beach  
City of Dunedin  
City of Clearwater  
City of Oldsmar  
City of Pinellas Park  
City of Indian Rocks Beach  
City of St. Petersburg  
Pinellas County  
Pinellas County School District  
City of Treasure Island

Also Present:

John Cueva  
Bob Bray  
Karl Holley  
Michael Crawford  
Ryan Brinson  
Michael Schoderbock  
Carolyn Shoemaker

Pinellas County Development Review Services  
City of Pinellas Park  
City of St. Pete Beach  
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 September 10, 2007, PAC meeting. There being none, Sharen Jarzen moved to approve the minutes; the motion was seconded by Jeff Dow and carried (vote 9-0).

\*\*\*Gordon Beardslee entered the meeting at this time.\*\*\*

Old Business – none.

Review of PPC Agenda for October 17, 2007, Meeting – Received.

Countywide Planning Authority Actions – October – Mr. Crawford informed the PAC members that at their meeting on October 2, 2007, the Countywide Planning Authority approved subthreshold Cases CW 07-19, CW 07-20, CW 07-21, CW 07-22, CW 07-23, and

CW 07-24. The CPA also approved regular amendments for Case CW 07-25 City of Clearwater and Case CW 07-26 (A & B) City of St. Petersburg. The CPA held the first of two scheduled public hearings on the proposed Countywide Rules amendment concerning Transient Accommodations. The second public hearing on this item will be October 16, 2007.

Annexation Report – September 2007 – Michael Schoderbock summarized the report on voluntary annexations for the month of September. He stated that the Council received a total of 18 petitions for voluntary annexation review in September from the cities of Clearwater, Largo, Pinellas Park, and St. Petersburg. Of those 18 petitions reviewed, all were found to be in compliance. Existing uses that are within the 18 annexations include three commercial parcels, two industrial parcels, twelve residential parcels, and one vacant parcel. He stated that these proposed annexations totaled 24.3 acres and approximately \$19.1 million in taxable value. Total Municipal Service Taxing Unit tax revenues from the \$19.1 million of taxable value are \$44,889 using the 2006/07 fiscal year tax rate. It is estimated that 36 residents will be affected by a change in jurisdiction and annexation of 13 of the 18 parcels will reduce four enclaves in the county by 8.1 acres.

\*\*\*Catherine Porter entered the meeting at this time.\*\*\*

Annexation Report – Quarterly Summary – Mr. Schoderbock reported on staff's limited administrative review of voluntary annexations for the fourth quarter of FY 2006/07 in accordance with Pinellas County Ordinance No. 00-63, including details regarding other forms of annexation that have occurred over the past few years.

Chart 1 of the report gives acreage summaries, Chart 2, taxable value, and Chart 3 the percentage of acres annexed in enclaves since adoption of Pinellas County Ordinance No. 00-63 through the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter. The acreage and taxable value (July through September) were 52.37 acres and \$26,393,864 respectively. Thirty-eight percent (19.8 acres) of the acreage annexed during the quarter reduced or eliminated an enclave. He noted that Table 1 is a cumulative log of all voluntary annexation petitions reviewed since the Planning Council began this process after November 7, 2000. Since that time, the PPC has reviewed 1,294 voluntary annexation petitions involving 2,171.9 acres. Table 2 is a list of successful referendum/involuntary annexations that have occurred in recent years. It includes taxable value of the area at the time it was annexed, the acreage of the annexation area, and the estimated population affected by the annexation.

Mr. Schoderbock reported to the PAC that as of October 17, 2007, Ordinance No. 00-63 will no longer be in effect; that the Council staff has sent out a letter to the Planning Directors and Clerks notifying them of the changes in the laws governing annexation and that Chapter 171, F.S. will be followed. He outlined the new procedures affected by this change and noted PPC staff requests the cities continue to forward information on annexations in order for PPC staff to maintain the statistics. He also pointed out that there is now a requirement to amend local future land use plan maps for each annexation. It appears as though Chapter 171 has no provision to allow interlocal agreements that bypass this

requirement. He stated that discussion will follow at the Council meeting to possibly reconvene the Annexation Subcommittee to look at some type of resolution to this and other issues that are expected to arise.

\*\*\*Danny Taylor entered the meeting at this time.\*\*\*

Gordon Beardslee noted that several of the cities have interlocal agreements with the County that allow annexation without individual amendments as long as the land use category is equal to or less intense as what is on the County Plan. Discussion followed with regard to possible conflicts with interlocal agreements under 171. Mr. Crawford reiterated the need for caution when relying on these agreements.

## PLAN AMENDMENTS

### Subthreshold Amendment:

CW 07-27 – Pinellas County – Mr. Brinson stated that this 0.6-acre site is located on the east side of Highland Avenue at the intersection of Flagler Drive. The proposed amendment is from Residential/Office General (R/OG) to Commercial General (CG). The amendment area is developed with an office building that was formerly used as a chiropractic clinic. This amendment from R/OG to CG will allow the property to be developed with a commercial use.

Sharen Jarzen moved to approve the staff recommendation of approval for Subthreshold Case CW 07-27. The motion was seconded by Jeff Dow and carried (vote 12-0).

Clarification was made that this was a mortgage company and the use is going to commercial.

### Regular Amendments:

CW 07-28 – City of St. Pete Beach – Mr. Brinson stated that this amendment involves 243.0-acres and is proposed to rescind a previous Countywide Plan Map amendment (April 8, 2005, CW 05-8) which established the Community Redevelopment District (CRD) and corresponding Special Area Plan (SAP) for two redevelopment areas of the City. He stated that the City submitted a SAP in February 2005 (also known as their Community Redevelopment Plan) for review by the PPC and CPA; however, this local CRD amendment and associated Community Redevelopment Plan were subsequently rescinded by a citizen initiated referendum in November 2006; therefore, to recognize referendum results the City of St. Pete Beach is requesting amendments to the Countywide Plan Map designations that were in effect prior to the 2005 amendment to CRD.

He stated that this amendment will affect approximately 243 acres including two areas formerly termed the Gulf Boulevard District and the Downtown District. All of the parcels

within these areas are currently designated CRD on the Countywide Plan Map and will be reassigned one of the Countywide Plan Map designations as noted in the staff report.

Mr. Holley concurred with the staff presentation and recommendation.

Chairman Metcalf asked if there was further input. There being none, Lynn Rosetti moved to approve the staff recommendation of approval for Case CW 07-28. The motion was seconded by Dean Neal and carried (vote 12-0).

CW 07-29 – Pinellas County - Mr. Brinson stated that this 4.4-acre site is located on the west side of East Lake Road, approximately 300 feet south of Kensington Trace. The subject site is designated Residential Rural (RR) on the Countywide Plan Map and is also shown as being located on a Scenic/Non-Commercial Corridor (SNCC) - East Lake Road.

The RR category is primarily a residential category allowing one dwelling per every two acres. Mr. Brinson stated that Pinellas County has requested that the current RR category be changed to Institutional (I) to recognize a 20-bed assisted living facility (ALF) that has occupied the site for over 12 years; that the proposed amendment with the attached development agreement will allow the ALF to increase the number of beds that exist on the site by 10. He noted that under the current RR designation that the ALF is permitted in both the County's Comprehensive Plan and the Countywide Rules; however, the number of beds that exist on the site (20) exceeds the limitations permitted in both the County's Comprehensive Plan and the Countywide Rules, each of which limit the number of beds to 3.0 per dwelling unit at 0.5 dwelling upa; and that since the site is 4.4 acres in size only 6 beds are permitted.

This inconsistency appears to be due to the County's Land Development Regulations allowing more beds than do the Comprehensive Plan and the Countywide Rules. He stated that this will be addressed through the Countywide Rule consistency review process at a later date. Per the Countywide Rules the Institutional category allows up to 12.5 dwelling units per acre and would potentially permit up to 165 beds onsite. However, the attached development agreement limits the number that could be developed on the site to 30 beds.

Mr. Brinson reported the area to the east of the subject site across East Lake Road is shared by two parcels designated Residential Suburban (RS) and Institutional (I). The parcel that is designated RS is being used as a wholesale nursery. The parcel that is I is developed with a public school. The area to the north is designated RR and is developed with a single-family home subdivision. The area to the south is a single-family home, designated RS.

Staff is recommending approval, subject to the accompanying development agreement being approved, and subject to an exception to the SNCC Rural/Open Space Subclassification for the portion of East Lake Road that serves this site. Separately, and in addition, staff recommends that the County give special consideration to the improvement of the site with respect to the buffering and landscaping guidelines of the Scenic/Non-Commercial Corridor Master Plan.

After full presentation of the report, Chairman Metcalf asked if there was further input. There being none, Sharen Jarzen moved to approve the PPC staff recommendation of approval inclusive of additional recommendations for Case CW 07-29. The motion was seconded by Jeff Dow and carried (vote 12-0).

CW 07-30 - Pinellas County – Mr. Brinson stated that this 9.3-acres site is located on the northeast corner of Roosevelt Boulevard and Bolesta Road. The requested amendment from Residential Low Medium (RLM) to Residential/Office General (R/OG) will allow the site, which is an unoccupied mobile home park (Shady Lane), to be redeveloped as an office complex. The site contains a few remnant mobile homes as depicted on the aerial map, but the site visit confirmed no one lives in the park.

Mr. Brinson noted the area to the west of the subject site which fronts onto Roosevelt Boulevard contains a variety of office uses, designated R/OG, while the area one block north of Roosevelt Boulevard is developed with single-family homes, designated Residential Urban (RU). The area to the east is developed with three large office buildings which make up the Digital Light Wave office complex, designated Commercial General. The area to the south is designated Industrial Limited and is shared by three parcels, one of which is undeveloped, and the other two which are across Roosevelt Boulevard, are developed with industrial and office uses. The area to the immediate north contains mobile homes designated RLM and RU.

Gordon Beardslee noted that the area does have some industrial to the south and commercial to the east; is very close to the industrial area associated with the airport; and the County believed it to be logical for the proposed use. The applicant is reducing curb cuts from 3-1; putting in sidewalks; and will improve pedestrian movement in the area.

After full presentation of the report, Chairman Metcalf asked if there was further input. There being none, Dean Neal moved to approve the PPC staff recommendation of approval for Case CW 07-30. The motion was seconded by Catherine Porter and carried (vote 12-0).

CW 07-31 - Pinellas County – Mr. Brinson stated that this 19.7-acres site is located on the south side of Park Boulevard, approximately 350 feet west of 79<sup>th</sup> Street North. He reported that this amendment has been submitted by Pinellas County and is proposed to rescind a previous Countywide Plan Map amendment (CW 06-9, April 4, 2006) which established the site's current Residential/Office/Retail (R/O/R) and the Residential Medium (RM) designations.

Mr. Brinson noted that the subject site which is also known as the Golden Lantern Mobile Home Park, totals 19.7-acres in size; the proposed amendment will reinstitute the previous and consistent Countywide Plan Map designation of RU on the entire site; and that it should be noted that a 1.3-acre man-made pond is also located on the subject site and is not included in the 19.7-acre amendment size and is denoted with the Water/Drainage Feature on the Countywide Plan Map.

Discussion followed with regard to the history of the Florida Department of Community Affairs (FDCA) objection with regard to the amendment. Gordon Beardslee responded to a query from Mr. Crawford with regard to possible interest on the site for redevelopment with affordable housing. He stated that the owner has submitted nothing specific at this time; and that litigation is continuing.

Chairman Metcalf called for any further discussion. There being none, Gordon Beardslee moved to approve the PPC staff recommendation of approval for Case CW 07-31. The motion was seconded by Paul Geisz and carried (vote 12-0).

Coastal High Hazard Area Policy – Discussion Outline – Mike Crawford opened the discussion noting that the new legislation requires all local governments having land within the Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA) to adopt the new definition in their comprehensive plan coastal management elements and to amend their future land use maps to depict the area by July 1, 2008. He noted that the new and amended policies are necessitated by the passage of HB 1359 in 2006. Section 163.3178(2)(h), Florida Statutes, of the legislation provides a new definition of the CHHA. Where previously the CHHA was defined as the category 1 evacuation zone, the new definition references the line created by the Sea, Lake and Overland Surges from Hurricanes (SLOSH) model.

Gordon Beardslee stated that the Regional Planners Advisory Committee (RPAC) convened a subcommittee that developed a report in May 2007 that was made as the basis for recommendations to amend the County's comprehensive plan. The SLOSH model is based on topographic features and does not include wave actions which can add additional feet to impact of the storm. He referred to a map developed to depict the new CHHA and the new CSA, noting velocity zones may not be picked up in the CHHA.

The Coastal Storm Area would be a composite of these areas:

The Coastal Storm Area shall be the area delineated in a (insert local plan policy or figure number) in the Coastal Management Element, which encompasses all of the following:

- 1) the Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA);
- 2) all land connected to the mainland of Pinellas County by bridges or causeways;
- 3) those isolated areas that are defined by the SLOSH model to be inundated by a category two hurricane or above that are surrounded by the CHHA or by the CHHA and a body of water; and
- 4) all land located within the Velocity Zone as designated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

Policies were developed towards directing populations away from the CSA and limiting infrastructure being developed; essentially the CSA is a better representation of most hazardous areas.

He noted that the County has to identify standards for out-of-county hurricane evacuation clearance times. Under the law now, if you use CSA, if any land use amendment would increase density, you have to compare against 2 things: 1) is your in-county evacuation time in excess of 12 hours (established by State Legislature) or; 2) is your out-of-county evacuation time less than or greater than a level of service that you established for out-of-county evacuation time. The County EMS personnel met with EMS from Clearwater and with TBRPC and came up with recommendation of 36 hours; that would be the earliest you could issue an evacuation order in Pinellas County. A Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council (TBRPC) Study has just been completed indicating out-of-county evacuation time would be 55 hours (for Category 5); and that we need to try and achieve a lower number.

Mr. Beardslee stated that if there were an amendment that would increase density, the developer would have to mitigate; that the best way to mitigate would be to use mitigation dollars for increasing shelters.

The County is modifying their policies for nursing homes, hospitals, and assisted living facilities, not allowing them in category 2, in addition to current regulations prohibiting them from category 1. County staff will be taking this to the Board of County Commissioners next week; then, if approved, it will be transmitted to the FDCA.

Discussion followed with regard to evacuation times and the issues that this does not take into consideration.

In response to query from Mr. Crawford, Mr. Beardslee noted that the CHHA becomes a subcomponent of the CSA and that it will be smaller.

Mr. Crawford questioned whether this would affect density only and no longer affect intensity. Mr. Beardslee noted the main concern and policies associated with this are directing populations away from CSA. He stated that the County is interpreting that transient units would have an evacuation plan that would evacuate prior to the general population.

Discussion followed with regard to shelters provided by the Pinellas County School System. Mr. Miller noted all schools are now being built to new building code standards and most are available as shelter spaces.

Mr. Crawford requested clarification of Policy 1.3.7 relating to TDR's. Mr. Beardslee stated that you cannot transfer outside the CSA into the CSA, but you can transfer if both are in the CSA.

Shelter spaces – Gordon noted that they will continue to work with the School District and that most of the current public shelters are schools; there is one church and a senior center. Mr. Miller noted the schools are now being used for pet shelters and critical care centers. Gordon stated that the State basis is 20 square feet per person. Mr. Crawford noted that

one-fourth (¼) of the population is proposed to be assisted through “host homes.” Mr. Beardslee indicated the County is emphasizing that as well.

Paul Geisz requested clarification about those communities who do not adopt the CSA and how they will be reviewed against the Countywide Plan. He stated that the Statutes require change in definition, new map and adoption of clearance time; so if you don't have a coastal area – what will you do? Mr. Crawford noted that review will still occur against the provisions of the Countywide Rules.

Mr. Beardslee stated he hopes to have the mapping done in the next couple of weeks and get them to the cities for their input.

Other PAC Business:

Mr. Crawford reminded the PAC members that the November/December PAC meeting will be combined, with the PAC meeting to be held on November 26, 2007, the PPC hearing date set for December 5, 2007, and CPA hearing date December 18, 2007.

Mr. Crawford also reminded PAC members that a group photo will be taken on November 26, 2007.

There being no further business, the PAC adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

David P. Healey, Executive Director

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING  
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 2007  
BANK OF AMERICA BUILDING  
600 CLEVELAND STREET, SUITE 850, EIGHTH FLOOR  
CLEARWATER, FLORIDA**

Members Present:

Fred Metcalf, Chairman	City of Gulfport
Sharen Jarzen	City of Seminole
Lauren Matzke	City of St. Pete Beach
Jeff Dow	City of Dunedin
Catherine Porter	City of Clearwater
Bob Klute	City of Largo
Marie Dauphinais	City of Oldsmar
Dean Neal	City of Pinellas Park
Danny Taylor	City of Indian Rocks Beach
Rick MacAulay	City of St. Petersburg
Gordon Beardslee	Pinellas County
Steve Fairchild	Pinellas County School District

Also Present:

John Cueva	Pinellas County Development Review Services
Michael Crawford	Pinellas Planning Council
Ryan Brinson	Pinellas Planning Council
Chris Mettler	Pinellas Planning Council
Larry Pflueger	Pinellas Planning Council
Michael Schoderbock	Pinellas Planning Council
Carolyn Shoemaker	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 July 9, 2007, PAC meeting. There being none, Dean Neal moved to approve the minutes; the motion was seconded by Jeff Dow and carried (vote 11-0).

Old Business – none.

Review of PPC Agenda for September 19, 2007, Meeting – Received.

Countywide Planning Authority Actions – August – Mr. Crawford informed the PAC members that at their meeting on August 7, 2007, the Countywide Planning Authority approved Cases CW 07-18, City of Largo, and CW 07-17, a Pinellas County case. The CPA also held the first of two scheduled public hearings on the proposed Countywide Rules Amendment concerning Hotel Density.

Mr. Crawford stated that the CPA on August 21, 2007, held the second of two scheduled public hearings regarding the Hotel Density ordinance. The Board directed that Alternative A – Option 1. be returned to the PPC for hearing at their September 19 meeting; and readvertised for the CPA for October 2 and October 16, 2007. He noted that a report on the Hotel Density issue will follow later in this meeting.

Annexation Report – July and August 2007 – Michael Schoderbock summarized the report on voluntary annexations for the months of July and August. He stated that the Council received a total of 14 petitions for voluntary annexation review in July and five for review in August from the cities of Clearwater, Dunedin, Largo, Pinellas Park, Seminole, and Tarpon Springs. Of those 19 petitions reviewed, all were found to be in compliance. He stated that these proposed annexations totaled 28.1 acres and approximately \$7.3 million in taxable value. Total Municipal Service Taxing Unit tax revenues from the \$7.3 million of taxable value are \$17,295 using the 2006/07 fiscal year tax rate. Mr. Schoderbock noted that one annexation was a mobile home park, and additionally, that the City of St. Petersburg had submitted an annexation request (non-referendum type), but withdrew the application last week and will resubmit it in another month or so in another form.

## **PLAN AMENDMENTS**

### Subthreshold Amendments:

CW 07-19 – Pinellas County – Mr. Brinson stated that this 0.2-acre m.o.l. site is located on the north side of 57<sup>th</sup> Avenue North, approximately 100 feet east of U.S. Highway 19. The proposed Countywide Plan Map amendment is from Residential Low (RL) to Commercial General (CG). The amendment area is vacant. This amendment from RL to CG will allow the property to be developed with a commercial use. Also, County staff has indicated that the property will be combined with the jointly owned adjacent parcels to the north and west (fronting on US 19) which are CG as well.

CW 07-20 – City of Largo – Mr. Brinson stated that this 0.3-acre m.o.l. site is located at 253-14<sup>th</sup> Street Northwest. The proposed Countywide Plan Map amendment is from Residential Medium (RM) to Residential/Office General (R/OG). This amendment from RM to R/OG will recognize the site's existing office use.

CW 07-21 – City of Largo – Mr. Brinson stated that this 0.3-acre m.o.l. site is located at 15733 Bedford Circle. The proposed Countywide Plan Map amendment is from Residential Low (RL) to Residential/Office General (R/OG). The subject site is vacant even though Map 3 illustrates the property is developed with a single-family home. This amendment from RL to R/OG will allow the property to be developed with a professional office.

CW 07-22 – City of Largo – Mr. Brinson stated that this 0.1-acre m.o.l. site is located on the southeast corner of Roosevelt Boulevard and Westminster Avenue. The proposed Countywide Plan Map amendment is from Residential Low Medium (RLM) to

Residential/Office General (R/OG). This amendment from RLM to R/OG will allow the vacant property to be developed with a commercial or office use. Mr. Brinson further noted that the proposed amendment was reviewed by the PPC at its November 16, 2006, meeting; that the original request was from RLM to CG (CW 06-48); and that during that meeting, the Council identified concerns with the requested CG category and recommended an alternative compromise recommendation to amend the site's current RLM designation to R/OG. Subsequently, the application was withdrawn on January 23, 2007, due to the City of Largo not accepting the Council's alternative recommendation. Mr. Brinson also noted that a similar amendment from RLM to R/OG has been requested on the adjacent parcels to the south and southeast, totaling 0.70 acre. This amendment appears on this month's agenda and has been assigned Case Number CW 07-23 as identified on Map 3.

CW 07-23 – City of Largo – Mr. Brinson stated that this 0.7-acre m.o.l. site is located between Westminster Avenue and Verona Avenue, approximately 200 feet south of Roosevelt Boulevard. The proposed Countywide Plan Map amendment is from Residential Low Medium (RLM) to Residential/Office General (R/OG). This amendment from RLM to R/OG could allow the vacant property to be developed with a commercial/office use as authorized per section 4.2.4.3 of the Countywide Rules.

\*\*\*Bob Klute entered the meeting at this time.\*\*\*

CW 07-24 – City of Belleair Beach – Mr. Brinson stated that this 0.4-acre m.o.l. site is located on the southeast corner of Causeway Boulevard and Cedar Drive. The proposed Countywide Plan Map amendment is from Recreation/Open Space (R/OS) and Residential Low (RL) to Institutional (I). This amendment from R/OS and RL to I will allow for the proposed expansion of the City's adjacent municipal complex located to the east.

Chairman Metcalf questioned Cases CW 07-22 and CW 07-23, noting both seem to be next to each other, and questioned the rationale for handling in this manner. Mr. Klute explained that the applicants want to consolidate those properties and they will come in with a joint development request.

Mr. Crawford inquired regarding the parcels facing Roosevelt as to whether the applicants will try to combine some of those as well. Mr. Klute responded in the affirmative. Mr. Crawford noted that Largo has their Code set up in such a way as to take advantage of the Countywide Rules in that the parcel is in "office" category, but can accommodate a commercial use with certain limitations.

Sharen Jarzen moved to approve the PPC staff recommendations of approval for Subthreshold Cases CW 07-19, CW 07-20, CW 07-21, CW 07-22, CW 07-23, and CW 07-24. The motion was seconded by Rick MacAulay and carried (vote 12-0).

## Regular Amendments:

CW 07-25 – City of Clearwater – Mr. Brinson stated that this 37.1-acres (m.o.l.) site is located on the southwest corner of Drew Street and Bayview Avenue. The proposed Countywide Plan Map amendment is from Residential Urban (RU) to Residential Medium (RM). This amendment involves a vacant piece of property which is owned by the Clearwater Housing Authority. The amendment area is to be developed jointly with an adjacent area that is 2.8 acres in size and designated Residential/Office/Retail (R/O/R) on the Countywide Plan Map. Both parcels are owned by the Clearwater Housing Authority and total 39.9 acres.

Mr. Brinson noted that the smaller parcel's Countywide Plan Map designation was amended by the Council in November of 2004 (CW 04-47) from Residential Urban (RU) to R/O/R. This previous amendment included the submission of a master site plan depicting a mixed-use affordable housing development (residential and non-residential uses) integrated with the larger RU parcel.

Mr. Brinson noted that the proposed amendment to RM will allow the site to be developed with 556 residential units at a maximum density of 15 upa which is double the residential development potential existing on the site since RU allows for a maximum of 7.5 residential upa or 278 units. He stated that after review, the proposed amendment was found to be appropriate and compatible with surrounding uses.

Responding to a query concerning the percentage of affordable units proposed, Catherine Porter stated she did not believe that had been addressed as yet. Mr. Crawford explained that due to market conditions that changed significantly after approval of the amendment, the project was determined not to be economically feasible, and therefore, was not constructed. He further noted that staff will discuss this with the applicant and will have a response for the Pinellas Planning Council on the 19<sup>th</sup>, including breakdown of rental units, etc.

After full presentation of the report, Chairman Metcalf asked if there was further input. There being none, Sharen Jarzen moved to approve the PPC staff recommendation of approval for Case CW 07-25. The motion was seconded by Jeff Dow and carried (vote 12-0).

CW 07-26 (A & B) – City of St. Petersburg - Mr. Crawford noted that this amendment was treated as "A & B" due to the amendment being part of the St. Petersburg Special Area Plan (SAP), which includes two pieces of property within the SAP. Mr. Brinson stated that these two proposed amendments are as follows: (A) 0.90 acre located on the northwest corner of 6<sup>th</sup> Street South and 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South, and (B) 0.10 acre located on the north side of 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue North, 90 feet west of 4<sup>th</sup> Street North. The proposed Countywide Plan Map amendment for each parcel is from Residential Medium (RM) to Planned Redevelopment – Mixed Use (PR-MU). The proposed plan map amendments will enable each parcel to utilize the PR-MU category and will expand the previously approved PR-MU boundary shown on the Countywide Plan Map that was established in April 2007 by the Countywide Planning Authority (CW 07-10).

- **Amendment Area A.):** is undeveloped and is 0.90 acre in size, proposed to be assembled with the adjacent property to the north (which is 0.40 acre in size) already designated PR-MU. These properties totaling 1.30 acres are proposed to be redeveloped with commercial uses that will become the entryway from 6<sup>th</sup> Street South into the multifamily residential project under construction to the west.
- **Amendment Area B.):** is developed with an apartment building and is 0.10 acre in size, proposed to be combined with the adjacent vacant property to the east which is already designated PR-MU. These properties are anticipated to be redeveloped with a commercial use.

Mr. Brinson stated that because this was a proposed expansion, the recommendation of approval stipulates a condition that within one (1) year from date of approval of this amendment, the City of St. Petersburg submit a modified infrastructure analysis that indicates the cumulative impacts expected from incremental Countywide Plan Map amendments, and that updates all other relevant portions of the Special Area Plan, including but not limited to: maps, acreage calculations, and other relevant analysis and discussions. Mr. MacAulay stated that the City of St. Petersburg supports this recommendation and noted that they are preparing a "glitch" package now to fix discrepancies from the previous extensive approval of the SAP; that they have identified about 1,000 parcels as part of that package and that they are updating the SAP now. The City Council expects to hold the first public hearing in December; the PPC should receive them in January, and the CPA in February.

After full presentation of the report, Chairman Metcalf asked if there were further input. There being none, Gordon Beardslee moved to approve the PPC staff recommendation of approval for Case CW 07-26 (A & B), subject to the condition that within one (1) year from date of approval of this amendment, the City of St. Petersburg submit a modified infrastructure analysis that indicates the cumulative impacts expected from incremental Countywide Plan Map amendments, and that updates all other relevant portions of the Special Area Plan, including but not limited to: maps, acreage calculations, and other relevant analysis and discussions. The motion was seconded by Catherine Porter, and carried (vote 12-0).

Mr. Crawford inquired whether the City of St. Petersburg had experience with how the Florida Department of Community Affairs (FDCA) will treat amendments within a SAP to which Mr. MacAulay noted thus far it has been very smooth; that no sort of extensive review has been conducted for proposals under 10 acres. He noted the FDCA understood the history of how St. Petersburg had gotten to where they are. During the "glitch" amendments coming up, they will be using the alternative review process and will remind them about the SAP, new LDR's, etc., but expect no objections. Mr. Crawford noted that the question was raised by Renea Vincent who could not be at PAC today due to a bicycle accident.

Temporary Lodging (Hotel) Density Ordinance – Revised – Mr. Mettler provided a brief history on this item, noting that at the August 21 hearing, the CPA directed that Alternative A – Option 1 be returned to the PPC for hearing on September 19, and readvertised for hearings by the CPA on October 2 and October 16, 2007. He stated that based on direction provided by the CPA at the August hearings, the Council staff has further amended the proposed Rule amendments by addressing three issues raised during the August public hearings: concurrency requirements, hurricane evacuation, and development agreement expiration dates. In addition a provision was added requiring a development agreement address compliance with hurricane evacuation provisions of Pinellas County Code, Chapter 34 Article III; that the proposed amendment requires a development agreement be recorded with the Clerk of the Circuit Court, and a copy submitted to the PPC and CPA for receipt and filing within fourteen days after recording.

He stated that due to concerns expressed by the CPA and the County Attorney's office about limited duration of development agreements, Council staff has further refined the proposal to include that the development limitations set forth in a development agreement must be memorialized in a deed restriction to be recorded in Official Records of Pinellas County prior to issuance of a building permit for the temporary lodging use. In addition, Coastal High Hazard Area language is being worked on in answer to additional concerns expressed; this will be included in the package to the PPC on September 19. Evacuation from temporary lodgings will be addressed in order that this is accomplished before permanent county residents have to start evacuating. A meeting is scheduled tomorrow with Emergency Management personnel to fine-tune and model this language after *Beach By Design*. Mr. Klute inquired whether density multipliers had changed in the new proposal to which Mr. Mettler indicated they had not.

Mr. Klute moved to approve the staff recommendation on this item; the motion was seconded by Sharen Jarzen and carried (vote 12-0).

EAR-Based Amendment Assistance – Status Report – Mr. Pflueger provided a status report noting that beginning in October 2005 PPC staff in conjunction with the Gail Easley Company provided a series of information workshops, and have been providing assistance to local governments with preparation of the comprehensive plan evaluation and appraisal reports (EAR) and with the EAR-based amendments (EBA). He stated that EAR assistance was provided to Belleair, Belleair Bluffs, Belleair Shore, Indian Shores, Kenneth City, Largo, Madeira Beach, Redington Beach, and Redington Shores; that all of those communities received a determination of EAR "sufficiency" from the Florida Department of Community Affairs regarding compliance with State Law. He stated that EBA assistance has been or will be provided to the above-named municipalities, excluding Belleair and Largo which are preparing their own amendments.

Consistency Process – Status Report – Mr. Mettler outlined the status report on Consistency determinations noting that at their meeting on April 3, 2007, the CPA adopted the resolution approving the report entitled, *Review of Local Government Future Land Use Plans and Land Development Regulations for Consistency with the Countywide Rules* (Consistency

Report). He stated that PPC staff is meeting with the 25 local governments to review relevant portions of the Consistency Report analysis, discuss specific recommendations, and to establish a timetable for implementing the necessary local plan and code amendments. Mr. Crawford noted that staff has met with approximately one-half of the local governments and anticipates having met with all by the end of October 2007. It is anticipated that local governments would initiate recommended local plan and regulatory amendments between March 2007 and March 2008, which timeframe may have to be adjusted.

The Consistency Report also identified amendments to the Countywide Rules that would be appropriate to consider in the interest of clarification and helping to achieve consistency between the Countywide Rules and local government plans and regulations. The report had recommended the PPC staff, in collaboration with the Planners Advisory Committee, identify the specific amendments to the Countywide Rules that are necessary or helpful to reconcile outstanding inconsistencies that are best addressed by a change to the Countywide Rules, and prepare Countywide Rule amendments to address the issues. Staff anticipates presenting preliminary Countywide Rule amendments at the October PPC meeting and asking for authorization to advertise for public hearings in November. Mr. Crawford noted these are "subject areas" that came out of the meetings with the 15 municipalities; 10 other communities will be visited, to include Indian Rocks and Belleair Shore this week.

Ms. Jarzen questioned item #14, inquiring about the meaning of "flexibility" to which Mr. Mettler stated in St. Petersburg's new Code, regarding the re-use of historic buildings, the question arose as to how flexible they could be. Mr. Crawford stated that St. Petersburg has a use they are contemplating that goes a little beyond what would be classified as "accessory" but short of a full-scale amendment of the Countywide Plan Map.

Ms. Jarzen questioned #19 – "Targeted" industry to which Mr. Crawford responded this would include "above average wage earner" type jobs. The term "Targeted Industry" came out of *Pinellas by Design*.

Mr. Beardslee inquired of item #7 – Clarification of the manner in which affordable housing density bonus units are calculated relative to the mixed-use density/intensity formula. Mr. Crawford noted that eventually staff will come back with something to address affordable housing more comprehensively in the Rules; however, right now it is unclear in the Rules how the current density bonus is applied.

Mr. Beardslee inquired as to the status of the Industrial Lands Study to which Mr. Pflueger provided an update, noting that staff expects the project to come forward in the next couple of months.

Inclusionary Housing (Verbal) – Mr. Crawford referred to the presentation on Inclusionary Housing presented to PAC at their last meeting, i.e., the Nexus Study, which will assist in determining what avenue the County pursues for an affordable housing ordinance. Mr. Crawford stated he has requested Mr. Bussey provide a little more time for PAC to make comments; and requested PAC members respond to Mr. Bussey by the end of this week if

possible. It appears it will go before the LPA in October and the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) in November/December. Right now the delay is because BCC staff is attempting to address the provision dealing with the administration of the ordinance with respect to cost and responsibility for follow-up. Lastly, next week Community Development staff will complete another draft of the ordinance and will send out to the PAC again by email for their input.

Mr. MacAulay inquired whether the ordinance would have an opt-in or opt-out clause to which Mr. Crawford stated he believed it would be an opt-out clause.

Other PAC Business:

Mr. Crawford reminded the PAC members that the November/December PAC meeting will be combined, with the PAC meeting to be held on November 26, the PPC hearing date set for December 5, and CPA hearing date December 18, 2007. Mr. Brinson will prepare an email for distribution to the PAC, as a reminder, including deadlines for submittal of amendments.

Larry Pflueger stated that on the 29<sup>th</sup> of August, the PPC staff participated in a FDCA audio conference, and that staff can make it available by either placing on the PPC's website or providing a CD if requested. This involves the comprehensive plan amendment review "Pilot Program" for FDCA and he stated that an item will be in the PPC agenda packet that summarizes the program. Mr. Crawford noted the process provides for comment towards the end of the review process, and the burden will be on the cities to prove compliance with the broader and more general comments expected from FDCA.

Mr. Crawford also discussed the American Institute of Certified Planners continuing education requirements; inviting PAC members to participate in the audio conferences PPC obtains in order to gain credit towards the requirement. Also, staff will continue to send email notification of these events to the PAC.

There being no further business, the PAC adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
David P. Healey, Executive Director