

**PINELLAS PLANNING COUNCIL
AGENDA MEMORANDUM**

AGENDA ITEM: II F.

MEETING DATE: December 5, 2007

SUBJECT:

Consent Agenda:

F. Correspondence for October and November

RECOMMENDATION:

Council Receive and Discuss as is Appropriate

BACKGROUND

In addition to material previously forward to the Council, Correspondence includes:

October Correspondence:

1. PAC Minutes – October 8, 2007 (approved)
2. Sample of letter sent October 2, 2007 to City/Town Managers, Re: Appointment confirmation of representative to the Planners Advisory Committee
3. Letter sent October 3, 2007 to Michael Reynolds, Planner III, City of Clearwater, Re: Review of Proposed Community Development Code Amendments (Ordinance No. 7835-07) for Consistency with the Countywide Rules
4. Memorandum sent October 4, 2007 to Commissioner Kenneth Welch, Chairman Lealman Special Fire Control District Task Force, Re: Annexations Relative to Taxable Value in Lealman Special Fire Control District
5. Memorandum sent October 5, 2007 to Commissioner Robert Stewart, Vice Chairman, Board of County Commissioners/Countywide Planning Authority, Re: Restrictions on Conversion of Hotel to Residential Use
6. Received October 9, 2007, copy of letters sent October 5, 2007 to Mayor Rick Baker, City of St. Petersburg, Mayor Frank Hibbard, City of Clearwater, Mayor Pat Gerard, City of Largo, Mayor Lynn Rives, City of Belleair Beach, and Paul Cassel, Director, Development Review Services, from Brian Smith, Planning Director, Pinellas County, Re: CPA actions taken on October 2, 2007
7. Letter sent October 10, 2007 to Danny Taylor, Planning & Zoning Director, City of Indian Rocks Beach, Re: Consistency Reconciliation Actions

PINELLAS PLANNING COUNCIL ACTION:

COUNTYWIDE PLANNING AUTHORITY ACTION:

SUBJECT: Other Council Business - Correspondence

8. Letter sent October 10, 2007 to Catherine W. Porter, Long Range Planning Manager, City of Clearwater, Re: Review of Proposed Community Development Code Amendments (Ordinance No. 7884-07) for Consistency with the Countywide Rules
9. Letter sent October 12, 2007 to Brian K. Smith, Director, Pinellas County Planning Department, Re: Review of Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments Consistency with the Countywide Rules
10. Letter sent October 18, 2007 to Robert M. Clifford, Department Head, Intermodal Systems Development, DOT District Seven, Re: Town of Redington Shores LDR Updating
11. Letters sent October 19, 2007 to Mayor Ward Friszolowski, City of St. Pete Beach, and Commissioner Ronnie Duncan, Chairman, Pinellas County Board of County Commissioners, Re: October 17, 2007 PPC Meeting Follow-up
12. Letters sent October 19, 2007 to property owner/representative, Re: October 17, 2007 PPC Meeting Follow-up (Land Use Cases)
13. Letter sent October 24, 2007 to Bob Klute, Acting Community Development Director, City of Largo Community Development Department, Re: Proposed Non-Voluntary Annexation – Advisory Review Findings on Blanchard/Touchton Annexation
14. Letter sent October 25, 2007 to Michele Parisano, Planning Administrator, City of Oldsmar, Re: Consistency Reconciliation Actions
15. Letter sent October 29, 2007 to Dave Goodwin, Economic Development Director, City of St. Petersburg, Re: Proposed Non-Voluntary Annexation – Advisory Review Findings for West Executive Drive Annexation
16. Letter sent October 30, 2007 to Commissioner Linda Chaney, City of St. Pete Beach, Re: Transmittal of October 17, 2007 PPC agenda items Coastal High Hazard Area Policy – Discussion Outline and Temporary Lodging Ordinance, per e-mail request to Board of County Commissioners
17. Sample of letter sent October 31, 2007 to all City/Town Managers, Re: Transmittal of Ordinance No. 07-50 (Temporary Lodging Amendment)

November Correspondence:

1. PAC Minutes – November 26, 2007 (draft)
2. Letter sent November 1, 2007 to Hoyt Hamilton, Re: Transmittal of Ordinance No. 07-50 – Temporary Lodging Amendment
3. Letter sent November 1, 2007 to Mike Meidel, Director, Pinellas County Economic Development, Re: Transmittal of Ordinance No. 07-50 – Temporary Lodging Amendment
4. Letter sent November 1, 2007 to D. T. Minich, Executive Director, St. Petersburg/Clearwater Area Convention and Visitors Bureau, Re: Transmittal of Ordinance No. 07-50 – Temporary Lodging Amendment
5. Letter sent November 7, 2007 to Mayor John Robertson, Town of Belleair Shore, Re: Consistency Reconciliation Actions
6. Letter sent November 7, 2007 to Nancy McCollum, City Manager, City of Belleair Beach, Re: Consistency Reconciliation Actions

SUBJECT: Other Council Business - Correspondence

7. Letter sent November 7, 2007 to Lorraine Huhn, President, SOLV (Save Our Little Village), Re: Special Area Plan submitted in support of Community Redevelopment District for portions of St. Pete Beach
8. Received November 13, 2007, copy of letters sent November 8, 2007 to Mayor Ward Friszolowski, City of St. Pete Beach, and Paul Cassel, Director, Development Review Services, from Brian Smith, Planning Director, Pinellas County, Re: CPA actions taken on November 6, 2007
9. Copy of letter dated November 7, 2007 to Ray Eubanks, Florida Department of Community Affairs from Matt McLachlan, City of Safety Harbor Community Development Director, received November 9, 2007, Re: 2007 City-Initiated Comprehensive Plan Amendments
10. Letter sent November 15, 2007 to Rick MacAulay, Acting Manager, Urban Planning, Design, and Historic Preservation Division, City of St. Petersburg, Re: Consistency Reconciliation Actions
11. Letter sent November 16, 2007 to Mary Palmer, Town Clerk, Town of Redington Shores, Re: Consistency Reconciliation Actions
12. Letter sent November 16, 2007 to Nancy Beelman, Town Clerk, Town of Kenneth City, Re: Consistency Reconciliation Actions
13. Letter sent November 16, 2007 to Micah Maxwell, City Manager, Town of Belleair, Re: Consistency Reconciliation Actions
14. Letter sent to Karl E. Holley, Director of Community Development, City of St. Pete Beach, Re: Review of Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment (Ordinance No. 2007-38) and Proposed Land Development Regulation Amendments (Ordinance Nos. 2007-39, 2007-40, 2007-41, and 2007-42) for Consistency with the Countywide Rules
15. Letter received November 26, 2007 from Joseph A. Jones, Chief, Planning Branch, Department of the Army, Charleston District, Corps of Engineers, Re: Shoreline stabilization at St. Petersburg/Clearwater International Airport (PIE)

**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	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
Marie Dauphinais	City of Oldsmar
Dean Neal	City of Pinellas Park
Danny Taylor	City of Indian Rocks Beach
Paul Geisz	City of St. Petersburg
Gordon Beardslee	Pinellas County
Jim Miller	Pinellas County School District
Lynn Rosetti	City of Treasure Island

Also Present:

John Cueva	Pinellas County Development Review Services
Bob Bray	City of Pinellas Park
Karl Holley	City of St. Pete Beach
Michael Crawford	Pinellas Planning Council
Ryan Brinson	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 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 4th 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 79th 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 (1/4) 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, NOVEMBER 26, 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
Marie Dauphinais	City of Oldsmar
Dean Neal	City of Pinellas Park
Danny Taylor	City of Indian Rocks Beach
Gordon Beardslee	Pinellas County
Jim Miller	Pinellas County School District
Lynn Rosetti	City of Treasure Island
Rick MacAulay	City of St. Petersburg
Bob Klute	City of Largo

Also Present:

John Cueva	Pinellas County Building & Dev. Review Svcs.
Dave Goodwin	City of St. Petersburg, Economic Dev. Dept.
Steven Kurcan	Grady Pridgen, Inc.
Michael Crawford	Pinellas Planning Council
Ryan Brinson	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 October 8, 2007, PAC meeting. There being none, Dean Neal moved to approve the minutes; the motion was seconded by Lynn Rosetti and carried (vote 11-0).

Old Business – none.

Review of PPC Agenda for December 5, 2007, Meeting – Received.

Countywide Planning Authority Actions – November – Mr. Crawford informed the PAC members that at their meeting on November 6, 2007, the Countywide Planning Authority approved subthreshold Case CW 07-27 - Pinellas County. The CPA also approved regular amendments for Case CW 07-28 - City of St. Pete Beach, Case CW 07-29 - Pinellas County, and Case CW 07-31 - Pinellas County. Case CW 07-30 - Pinellas County, was

deferred to January 8, 2008 at the applicant's request. The CPA also received the Quarterly Status Report on Annexation for receipt and filing.

Bob Klute entered the meeting at this time.

Annexation Report – October 2007 – Michael Schoderbock summarized the report on voluntary annexations for the month of October, noting that annexations received prior to October 17 were reviewed in accordance with Pinellas County Ordinance No. 00-63; annexations received subsequent to that date were merely tabulated for the purpose of tracking voluntary annexation activity.

He stated that the Council received a total of nine (9) petitions for voluntary annexation review in October from the cities of Largo and Pinellas Park. Of those nine (9) petitions reviewed, all were found to be in compliance. Existing uses that are within the nine (9) annexations include eight (8) residential parcels and one industrial parcel. He stated that these proposed annexations totaled 2.23 acres and approximately \$869,000 in taxable value. Total Municipal Service Taxing Unit tax revenues from the \$869,000 of taxable value are \$1,812 using the 2007/08 fiscal year tax rate. It is estimated that 17 residents will be affected by a change in jurisdiction and annexation of five of the nine parcels will reduce two enclaves in the county by 0.7 acres.

Mr. Schoderbock noted that of the nine parcels, four were received after Ordinance No. 00-63 and five were received before; that staff has not received many notifications after the invalidation of the ordinance; and he requested that the cities continue to send in the applications in order that staff can continue to track the trends in the county.

He also noted that the Board of County Commissioners and the Pinellas Planning Council have recommended reconstitution of the Subcommittee on Annexation; that this Committee is expected to reconvene after the first of the year; and that PAC will be kept informed regarding those meetings.

Ability to Serve Report No. 07-1: City of St. Petersburg (West Executive Drive Annexation) – Michael 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 10 acres or more as to the ability of the municipality to provide municipal services to the territory proposed to be annexed. He stated that the proposed annexation area is located north of Ulmerton Road, west of Heron Boulevard, and generally west-northwest of St. Petersburg's current boundaries. It is referred to by the City of St. Petersburg as the West Executive Drive Annexation Area, consisting of six parcels designated Commercial General on the Countywide Plan Map.

The existing uses are three hotels, a daycare facility, a restaurant, and an area of privately owned right-of-way and the area is approximately 11.8 acres in size. Mr. Schoderbock stated that the City has indicated in the submission material that it has the ability to provide municipal services to the area, that it is within St. Petersburg's municipal services planning area, and that the application meets all the requirements of Chapter 171.

After full presentation of the report, Dean Neal moved to approve staff recommendation to adopt a finding that the City of St. Petersburg has the ability to provide municipal services to this area and authorize this finding to be transmitted to the City of St. Petersburg. The motion was seconded by Lynn Rosetti and approved (vote 12-0).

Workforce Housing Plan: St. Petersburg – Receipt and Acceptance - Mr. Crawford stated the Countywide Rules provides that in order for a local government to utilize affordable housing density bonuses, the local government shall have an approved affordable housing plan and corresponding land development regulations which shall be filed with the Council.

In addition, the City has requested the Council consider the Workforce Housing Density Bonus Program as a minor amendment to the Vision 2020 Special Area Plan. The proposed code amendment describes what qualifies as affordable housing, the minimum standards for affordable housing, and the maximum number of bonus dwelling units allowable in specified zoning districts. It was noted that all bonus units are affordable.

Discussion followed with regard to floor area ratio bonuses and how these categories are set forth. Mr. MacAulay stated that the St. Petersburg City Council is scheduled to adopt this ordinance on November 29 at second reading.

Marie Dauphinais entered the meeting at this time.

Mr. MacAulay informed the PAC that Tom DeYampert, Manager of Housing & Community Development for the City of St. Petersburg, will be available at the December 5 PPC meeting to answer any questions that may arise with regard to the Workforce Housing Plan. He stated that the LDRs that the City adopted as result of the Vision 2020 Special Area Plan became effective September 10, 2007; that most zoning districts provided for additional density units for Workforce Housing; and that the proposed ordinance will become effective on January 1, 2008.

Dean Neal asked for clarification of the City's visibility ordinance to which Mr. MacAulay stated it is not to address parking, but has to do with Americans with Disabilities Act requirements.

School Board Representative Miller inquired with regard to the bonus provision, and whether it must be affordable housing units only, to which Mr. MacAulay responded in the affirmative; that once the site plan is approved, if units are built, they are required to be affordable. He stated that the City wants the units spread within the project and available at the same time the market rate units are available.

Gordon Beardslee inquired about the consideration for Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA) to which Mr. MacAulay stated that the City maintains a CHHA unit "pool" that was established in 1998; that the units would be pulled out of the pool; and that if the pool is empty, then the City would not approve increased density.

Mr. Beardslee inquired as to units per acre (upa) and floor area ratio (FAR) in the mixed-use category. Rick MacAulay stated that for those projects that are mixed-use in nature, FAR drives the development potential for the entire project; and that if workforce housing is requested, there is a bonus to FAR that will be added to the development potential.

Mr. Crawford requested additional clarification as to the calculation process for FAR which was provided by Mr. MacAulay who also stated that the site plan would be controlled by the overall FAR umbrella. Discussion followed to clarify use of the provision.

Mr. Crawford noted that St. Petersburg would likely opt out of the County's Inclusionary Housing ordinance to which Mr. MacAulay stated he was not ready to respond to that but it most likely would.

Dean Neal inquired as to methods of estimating traffic impact to which Mr. MacAulay stated no traffic analysis has been done per se on an existing apartment for instance, but the City is looking at all impacts that could be affected.

Mr. Crawford clarified that this item does not have to go to the Countywide Planning Authority for approval.

Dean Neal moved to approve staff recommendation to receive and file the City of St. Petersburg Workforce Housing Plan; the motion was seconded by Jim Miller and carried (vote 13-0).

Countywide Plan Map – Annual Update – Ryan Brinson explained that the Countywide Rules provide for the annual update and filing of the Countywide Plan Map. Consistent with the Countywide Rules, and in accord with the PPC interlocal agreement with the Pinellas County Property Appraiser's Office, the map has been updated to include all the amendments that have been approved from October 10, 2006, through the October 2, 2007, Countywide Planning Authority meeting. PPC staff recommends the Council approve Resolution No. 07-6, which will transmit the updated map to the Countywide Planning Authority for official acceptance and filing at the December 18, 2007, meeting.

Mr. Crawford stated that copies of a large 3000' scale map and individual map sets at 450' scale will be distributed to local governments in January 2008.

Lynn Rosetti moved approval of this item. The motion was seconded by Dean Neal and approved (Vote 13-0).

PLAN AMENDMENTS

Subthreshold Amendments:

CW 07-32 – Pinellas County – Mr. Brinson stated that this 0.4-acre site is located on the east side of 104th Street, 100 feet south of 118th Terrace North. He reported that the proposed amendment is from Commercial Recreation (CR) to Residential Urban (RU). The

amendment will allow the property to be developed with two single-family homes; that the subject site is considered to be surplus land, owned by the adjacent Orange Lake Civic Center (part of the Orange Lake Subdivision); and that the property owner intends to subdivide the property into two lots and subsequently sell them to raise money for future improvements to the Center.

CW 07-33 – Pinellas County – Mr. Brinson stated that this 0.2-acre site is located at 8143 – 49th Avenue North. The proposed amendment is from Commercial General (CG) to Residential/Office General (R/OG). County staff has indicated that the subject site, along with the parcel to the west, are both under the same ownership and will eventually be combined for the purposes of redevelopment. This amendment will allow the property to be developed with an office use. Staff did note that there will be no evaluation of the amendment pursuant to the criteria regarding the Scenic Non-Commercial Corridor as the SNCC will not be impacted.

CW 07-34 – Pinellas County – Mr. Brinson stated that this 0.2-acre site is located at 8137 – 49th Avenue North. The proposed amendment is from Commercial General (CG) to Residential Low Medium (RLM). This amendment will recognize the subject site's existing use, which is a duplex. Staff did not review within the purview of the SNCC criteria and is treating this as an exception.

CW 07-38 – City of Pinellas Park – Mr. Brinson stated that this 1.0-acre site is located at 10100 – 46th Street North. The proposed amendment is from Residential Urban (RU) to Recreation/Open Space (R/OS). This amendment from RU to R/OS will allow for the expansion of the adjacent Freedom Lake Park, which is to the west and south of the subject site.

Mr. Brinson noted that the park totals approximately 17.0 acres in size (excluding the lake) and is designated on the Countywide Plan Map as R/OS, Water, and RU. He stated that the area designated RU includes a long narrow parcel of land that extends south of the subject site along the east side of Freedom Lake Park (approximately 1.5 acres in size). A supplemental recommendation asking the City to initiate a map adjustment for the remaining RU designated area to R/OS is included in order to reflect the park on the Countywide Plan Map.

CW 07-39 – City of Clearwater – Mr. Brinson stated that this 0.1-acre site is located at 1520 Prospect Avenue. The proposed amendment is from Institutional (I) to Residential Urban (RU) and will recognize the site's existing single-family use.

After presentation and report on all subthreshold amendments, Lynn Rosetti moved approval of Case CW 07-32, Case CW 07-33, Case CW 07-34, and Case CW 07-39, and approval of Case CW 07-38 inclusive of the additional recommendation. The motion was seconded by Catherine Porter and approved (vote 13-0).

Regular Amendments:

CW 07-35 – Pinellas County – Mr. Brinson stated that this 2.8-acres site is located on the north side of Alderman Road, approximately 600 feet west of US Highway 19 North. The proposed amendment is from Residential Low Medium (RLM) to Residential/Office/Retail (R/O/R) and will allow the adjacent Wal-Mart Store to expand to include a grocery component.

Mr. Brinson reported that no development is proposed for the amendment area as it already contains access and parking for the Wal-Mart; that the amendment will allow for additional square footage on the adjacent site since under Pinellas County's requirements the development rights associated with the Wal-Mart Store, which is also designated R/O/R, have been almost fully utilized. He stated that when using the 0.40 (40%) floor area ratio associated with R/O/R, the amendment would permit the use of approximately 48,787 square feet of floor area to expand the adjoining Wal-Mart site; however, County staff indicates that the applicant, through the development agreement, intends to use 26,832 square feet to add a grocery component.

Mr. Crawford added that along the US 19 corridor, the FARs have to be reduced by 50%. Mr. Cueva, in response to Dean Neal's query, stated the development would be due west of the existing building; also there will be intersection improvements at Alderman with ingress/egress aisles to be improved, added turn lanes going south to west, and improvements to the "stacking" problem going south on US 19 then east on Alderman Road.

Rick MacAulay requested clarification regarding the SNCC to which Mr. Crawford stated the map will be amended if this gets approved.

After full presentation of the report, Dean Neal moved to approve staff recommendation of approval for Case CW 07-35, subject to the following conditions: 1) County approval of the accompanying development agreement; and 2) amendment to the Scenic/Non-Commercial Corridor Submap 1 to expand the Mixed-Use Subclassification to include the extent of this site along Alderman Road; and separately, and in addition, the recommendation 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. The motion was seconded by Sharen Jarzen and carried (vote 13-0).

CW 07-36 (A & B) – City of St. Petersburg - Mr. Brinson noted that this amendment was treated as "A & B" due to the amendment being located in two separate locations and that these two proposed amendments are as follows: (A) 0.2-acre located approximately 125 feet west of the southwest corner of 4th Street and 53rd Avenue, and (B) 3.0 acres located on the east side of 66th Street North between 9th Avenue and 13th Avenue, immediately south of the Crossroads Post Office. The proposed Countywide Plan Map amendment for each parcel is from Residential/Office/Retail R/O/R) to Planned Redevelopment – Mixed Use (PR-MU). The two proposed amendments (A&B) have been submitted by the City of St. Petersburg to recognize recent changes as part of the City's Vision 2020 Plan

implementation. The City's Vision 2020 Plan is embodied in a Special Area Plan that sets forth the basis for the amendment of the Countywide Plan Map to the proposed Planned Redevelopment – Mixed Use (PR-MU) category.

Mr. Brinson stated it is important to note that both of these parcels were amended to Residential/Office/Retail (R/O/R) earlier this year and were reflected on both the City of St. Petersburg's Future Land Use Map and the Countywide Plan Map. The City's approving ordinances stated that the R/O/R designations would eventually transition to the PR-MU category (once the category was approved and created in their Comprehensive Plan). However, the Countywide Rules do not provide for such a transition from one plan category to the next. Therefore, since a new category is being requested, both areas must be treated as an amendment to the Countywide Plan Map and are subject to review in accord with the Countywide Rules.

Specifically, the proposed Countywide Plan Map amendments will enable each parcel to utilize the PR-MU category and thereby will expand the previously approved PR-MU boundary that was established in April 3, 2007, by the Countywide Planning Authority (CW07-10).

- **Amendment Area A.):** is an undeveloped 0.2 acre parcel that is proposed to be assembled with the adjacent property to the east, which is already designated PR-MU. The properties are proposed to be redeveloped together with commercial uses.
- **Amendment Area B.):** is an undeveloped 3.0 acre parcel that is proposed to be redeveloped with limited retail commercial uses. This property is proposed to be combined with the immediate adjacent property to the east designated Residential Urban and the property to the south designated Residential/Office General. The previous case for these parcels is commonly referred to as the Diocese property. All three properties are associated with an approved development agreement and conceptual site plan. For the specific development restrictions for these properties refer to the development agreement found in Support Document 4.

Staff subjected this to the two conditions as noted in the report; these are the same conditions that were on the Diocese property as approved previously. Rick MacAulay explained that these were two private applications and that the City adopted them as "transition"; and noted that the Countywide Rules still required this extra process.

After full presentation of the report, Sharen Jarzen moved to approve the staff recommendation of approval for Case CW 07-36 (A & B), based on and correspondent with the City of St. Petersburg's Vision 2020 Special Area Plan, subject to the two conditions enumerated. The motion was seconded by Lynn Rosetti and carried (vote 13-0).

CW 07-37 – City of Pinellas Park – Mr. Brinson stated that this 9.2 acres site is located immediately west of 6240 – 39th Street. The proposed amendment is from Industrial

Limited and Water (IL and Water) to Recreation/Open Space and Water (R/OS and Water). The proposed amendment area is a wooded undeveloped site designated Industrial Limited (IL) and contains a lake located in the northwest corner of the property that is designated Water on the Countywide Plan Map.

The requested Countywide Plan Map amendment has been initiated by the City of Pinellas Park to allow for the expansion of an adjacent City-owned Youth Park, which is north and northeast of the subject site. The Water designation is not proposed to change with the amendment.

Presently, the Youth Park totals approximately 29.0 acres in size and is proposed to expand as a function of the amendment by 9.2 acres in size totaling 38.2 acres once amended. The current Youth Park is designated on the Countywide Plan Map as R/OS and Transportation/Utility and contains soccer fields, baseball fields, and both a Progress Energy right-of-way and an easement. Mr. Brinson noted that staff is making the Council aware with respect to the area to the northeast, that the Countywide Plan Map does not recognize the Progress Energy easement over the City-owned park parcel; therefore it is recommended that the City initiate a Countywide Plan Map amendment to T/U Overlay to recognize the utility easement.

The area to the east is developed as an industrial park and contains warehouses and office space. The area to the west is used as a landscaping business that has outdoor storage of heavy equipment and landscaping material. The area to the south is designated RM and is developed with a 210-unit multi-family apartment complex.

Staff has concluded that the site is not considered to be a viable industrial property when weighed against the advisory considerations in PPC Resolution No. 06-3; and that the proposed R/OS category is an appropriate category and will recognize the property's proposed park use and ownership. Also, the R/OS category is consistent with the purpose statement and the locational characteristics enumerated by the Countywide Rules.

Dean Neal requested clarification with regard to the supplementary recommendation to clarify that it is not a conditional requirement; Mr. Crawford responded staff is recommending that Pinellas Park look into initiating a Countywide Plan Map amendment to T/U Overlay for the Progress Energy easement on the City-owned property to the northeast; and that it is not a conditional requirement but a supplemental recommendation.

After full presentation of the report, Jim Miller moved to approve the staff recommendation of approval for Case CW 07-37 inclusive of the separate additional recommendation, that the City initiate a Countywide Plan Map amendment to Transportation/Utility Overlay for the Progress Energy Easement on the City-owned property to the northeast. The motion was seconded by Sharen Jarzen and carried (vote 13-0).

CW 07-40 – City of St. Pete Beach – Mr. Brinson stated that this 1.4-acre site is located on the southeast corner of Gulf Boulevard and Punta Vista Drive. The proposed amendment is from Commercial General (CG) and Residential Urban (RU) to Residential Medium (RM).