

**PINELLAS PLANNING COUNCIL  
AGENDA MEMORANDUM**

**AGENDA ITEM:** II F.

**MEETING DATE:** February 20, 2008

***SUBJECT:***

Consent Agenda:

F. Correspondence

***RECOMMENDATION:***

Council Receive and Discuss as is Appropriate

***BACKGROUND***

Correspondence Includes:

1. PAC Minutes – February 11, 2008 (draft), January 7, 2008 (approved)
2. Sample of letter sent January 10, 2008 to all municipality Clerks and Planners, Re: Transmittal of up-dated copies of FLUP Maps and the Scenic/Non-Commercial Corridor Map
3. Sample of letter sent January 10, 2008 to municipalities, Re: Annual Intensity Standards Adjustments - 2007
4. Letter sent January 10, 2008 to Michele Parisano, Planning Administrator, City of Oldsmar, Re: Consistency Reconciliation Actions
5. Letter sent January 10, 2008 to Renea Vincent, Planning and Zoning Director, City of Tarpon Springs, Re: Review of Land Development Code Amendments for Consistency with the Countywide Rules
6. Sample of Letter sent January 18, 2008 to property owner/representative, Re: January 16, 2008 PPC Meeting Follow-up (Land Use Cases)
7. Letters sent January 18, 2008 to Mayors of local governments with cases on January 16, 2008 PPC Agenda, Re: PPC Meeting Follow-up
8. Letter sent January 18, 2008 to Commissioner Robert Stewart, Chairman, Pinellas County Board of County Commissioners, Re: January 18, 2008 PPC Meeting Follow-up
9. Memorandum sent January 22, 2008 to Paul Cassel, Director of Building and Development Review Services, Re: Goodwill Industries

***PINELLAS PLANNING COUNCIL ACTION:***

***COUNTYWIDE PLANNING AUTHORITY ACTION:***

**SUBJECT: Other Council Business - Correspondence**

10. Letter sent January 22, 2008 to Larry Nayman, Building Official, Town of Indian Shores, Re: Consistency Reconciliation Actions
11. Memorandum sent January 23, 2008 to Fred Marquis, Interim County Administrator and to Pete Yauch, Assistant County Administrator, Re: Transmittal of Industrial Land Study – Preliminary Draft
12. Memorandum sent January 23, 2008 to Jewel White Cole, Managing Assistant County Attorney, Re: Development Agreements
13. Letter sent January 23, 2008 to Linda Hallas, City Attorney, City of South Pasadena, Re: Consistency Reconciliation Actions
14. Letter sent January 25, 2008 to Bill Foster, Attorney at Law, Foster & Foster, Re: Transmittal of photo/memento recognizing service on the Pinellas Planning Council
15. Memorandum sent January 25, 2008 to Jeffery Dow, Planner II, City of Dunedin, Re: Dunedin Corridor Studies – Consultant Expressions of Interest
16. Letter sent January 29, 2008 to Gina Clayton, Assistant Planning Director, City of Clearwater, Re: Consistency Reconciliation Actions
17. Letter sent January 29, 2008 to Renea Vincent, Planning and Zoning Director, City of Tarpon Springs, Re: Review of Comprehensive Plan Amendments for Consistency with the Countywide Rules
18. Memorandum sent January 31, 2008 to Fred E. Marquis, Interim County Administrator, Re: Transmittal of Industrial Lands Study for the Board of County Commissioners Meeting on February 19, 2008 – County Administrator Reports

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING  
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 2008  
BANK OF AMERICA BUILDING  
600 CLEVELAND STREET, SUITE 850, EIGHTH FLOOR  
CLEARWATER, FLORIDA**

Members Present:

Renea Vincent, Chairman	City of Tarpon Springs
Sharen Jarzen, Vice Chairman	City of Seminole
Fred Metcalf	City of Gulfport
Jeff Dow	City of Dunedin
Catherine Porter	City of Clearwater
Bob Bray	City of Pinellas Park
Gordon Beardslee	Pinellas County
Jim Miller	Pinellas County School District
Rick MacAulay	City of St. Petersburg
Bob Klute	City of Largo
Ron Rinzivillo	City of Safety Harbor
Danny Taylor	City of Indian Rocks Beach

Also Present:

Katie Cole	Johnson, Pope Law Firm
David Healey	Pinellas Planning Council
Michael Crawford	Pinellas Planning Council
Larry Pflueger	Pinellas Planning Council
Linda Fisher	Pinellas Planning Council
Michael Schoderbock	Pinellas Planning Council
Christopher Mettler	Pinellas Planning Council
Phyllis Fleming	Pinellas Planning Council
Carolyn Shoemaker	Pinellas Planning Council

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

Minutes – Chairman Vincent asked if there were any comments or corrections to be made to the minutes of the January 7, 2008, PAC meeting. There being none, Sharen Jarzen moved to approve the minutes; the motion was seconded by Rick MacAulay and carried (vote 10-0).

Old Business – none.

Review of PPC Agenda for February 20, 2008 Meeting – Received.

Countywide Planning Authority (CPA) Actions – January and February 2008 – Mr. Crawford summarized the actions of the CPA at their December 18, 2007, January 8 and February 5, 2008, meetings. The PAC then received the items.

Annexation Report – January 2008 – Michael Schoderbock summarized the report on voluntary annexations for the month of January.

He stated that the Council received a total of five (5) petitions for voluntary annexation review in January from the cities of Clearwater, Oldsmar, Safety Harbor, and Tarpon Springs. Existing uses that were within the five annexations include one institutional use and four residential uses. The proposed annexations totaled 18 acres and approximately \$727,742 in taxable value. Total MSTU tax revenues from the \$727,742 of taxable value are \$1,518 using the 2007/08 fiscal year tax rate. It is estimated that 19 residents will be affected by a change in jurisdiction. Annexation of one of the five parcels will reduce one enclave in the county by 1.10 acres.

Mr. Schoderbock noted that the Ability To Serve Report on Tierra Verde was brought before the Council in January; was continued to the February 20 PPC meeting; and subsequently has been withdrawn by the City of St. Petersburg.

\*\*\*Jim Miller and Ron Rinzivillo entered the meeting at this time.\*\*\*

Composite Annexation Report: F.Y. 2000/01-2006/07

Michael Schoderbock stated this report is intended to provide a cumulative update of the results of annexation in Pinellas County. He stated that the data is compiled and analyzed in two different ways: 1) data based on the Council's review of voluntary annexation in accordance with Pinellas County Ordinance No. 00-63 and referendum annexations (referendum annexations initiated after July 1, 2003, were reviewed in accordance with Pinellas County Resolution No. 03-128); and 2) data reflecting adopted voluntary and referendum annexations impacting one of the seven fiscal years in the report. He stated this distinction is necessary to reflect the separate timeframes involved – the first based on when an annexation request is received and processed, and the second when an annexation is recorded by the Property Appraiser by applicable fiscal year.

Referring to the power point presentation, Mr. Schoderbock noted this is the last FY staff is able to use Pinellas County Ordinance No. 00-63 which was invalidated in October 2007; that it reverts back to the Chapter 171, Florida Statutes requirements; and that the Joint PPC/CPA Annexation Subcommittee has been reconstituted to address these issues.

After full presentation of the report, Jim Miller moved to accept the Composite Annexation Report. The motion was seconded by Rick MacAulay and carried (vote 12-0).

PAC members complimented Mr. Schoderbock on the report and presentation.

Annual Countywide Plan Map Assessment – Status Report – 2007 - Mr. Mettler presented the report detailing how the Council's supplemental recommendations on Countywide Plan Map amendments have been addressed by the local government with jurisdiction. He stated that this year the report was expanded to include local jurisdiction approvals of

intensity standards adjustments exceeding the Countywide Rules standards, and a summary review of the year's Countywide Plan Map amendments.

Mr. Mettler noted that in 2007, the Council included supplemental recommendations with sixteen (16) Countywide Plan Map amendments. In addition to these cases, staff has also followed up on four (4) cases from 2006, five (5) cases from 2005, and four (4) cases from 2004 to determine if they have been addressed.

Overall, the supplemental recommendations appear to be moderately successful as a non-binding means of encouraging attention to certain site plan or plan amendment follow-up considerations. However, the responses provided to date have not provided a clear picture of how well the local governments have complied with the supplemental recommendations. The PPC staff would recommend that in preparing subsequent annual status reports, letters should be sent to the appropriate local contact (the planning director or building official) clearly outlining the recommendation and then requesting further detail on how the supplemental recommendations were being met. This information will provide the PPC with a better understanding of the effectiveness of the supplemental recommendations.

The Council staff has queried all twenty-five (25) local governments in Pinellas County as to whether any intensity standard adjustments were granted in 2007 (which exceeded the Countywide Rules standards). The Council staff sought this information for the purpose of assessing the standards contained in the Rules. To date, sixteen (16) of the twenty-five (25) local governments have responded, all indicating no such adjustments were granted in 2007. The Council staff interprets this information to suggest the current intensity standards contained in the Countywide Rules are satisfactorily broad or encompassing to allow development to occur and for local governments to administer their land development regulations (LDRs) within those parameters.

Four unusually significant plan amendment applications were submitted and approved in 2007: St. Petersburg submitted two applications seeking amendment on a total of approximately 10,354 acres, covering approximately 27% of the City's land area, as part of an effort to implement the sweeping future land use and zoning changes proposed in the City's Vision 2020 Plan. The County submitted an application on 418 acres recently acquired for the purpose of expanding the Brooker Creek Preserve, converting the acreage to the Preservation plan map category. St. Pete Beach submitted an application on 243 acres, seeking to amend the downtown-area Community Redevelopment District (CRD) to its earlier, multiple "standard" plan map category designations, to implement the results of a City-wide referendum that essentially voided their redevelopment plan.

Excluding the four cases noted above, the following Countywide Plan Map classification trends are noted: the Residential plan map classification saw a net loss of 11.33 acres, the Mixed Use plan map classification saw a net gain of 16 acres, the Commercial plan map classification saw a net loss of 1.3 acres, the Industrial plan map classification saw a net gain of 7.6 acres, and the Public/Semi-Public plan map classification saw a net loss of 15.17 acres. Finally, Mr. Mettler noted the fact that twenty-one cases, or just over half of the total forty cases, were on properties one acre or less in size.

## PLAN AMENDMENTS

### Subthreshold Amendments:

There were no subthreshold amendments on the agenda for February.

### Regular Amendments:

CW 08-03 – City of Belleair Bluffs (Areas 1-31) (continued from January 16, 2008) – Mr. Crawford stated that this proposed amendments are located throughout the City of Belleair Bluffs. The PAC acted upon these amendments last month; however, they were deferred at the January PPC meeting at the request of the City until the February PPC meeting. The staff expects to receive additional materials regarding this amendment from the City of Belleair Bluffs following their public hearing to be held this evening (February 11, 2008). The PAC will be updated regarding this amendment at their March meeting.

CW 08-09 – City of Tarpon Springs – Mr. Crawford stated that this amendment is being continued to the March 19, 2008, Council meeting at the request of the applicant. Gordon Beardslee moved to continue the amendment to the March 19 Council meeting; the motion was seconded by Catherine Porter and carried (vote 12-0).

CW 08-10 – City of Tarpon Springs – Mr. Crawford stated that this 10.6 acres site is proposed for amendment from Industrial Limited (IL) to Transportation/Utility (TU). The parcel is vacant with a small pond located on the southern property line. The amendment will allow for the construction of a reverse osmosis water treatment plan and for a fire station.

Mr. Crawford noted that the site is surrounded by property that is designated IL; that municipal facilities are permitted in IL; however, once such use exceeds 5 acres, an amendment to TU is required to recognize this distinct use.

Staff concluded that while the site is considered to be a viable industrial property when weighed against the advisory considerations in PPC Resolution 06-3, the municipal facilities expected to locate on-site will help to serve the existing and future industrial uses in the area, as well as other parts of the city and unincorporated areas north of the Anclote River. Staff believes the public interest is served through the amendment; and that had it not been for this public interest being served, the site should remain IL.

Mr. MacAulay requested clarification concerning the plan change amendment to which Mr. Crawford stated that if the request was above 10 acres (note: Countywide Rules Section 2.3.3.6.1 states that the acreage limitation is 5 acres), an amendment is required.

After full presentation of the report, Jim Miller moved to approve the staff recommendation of approval for Case CW 08-10. The motion was seconded by Gordon Beardslee and carried (vote 12-0).

CW 08-11 – City of St. Petersburg – Mr. Crawford stated that this 6.1 acre site is located East of San Fernando Boulevard NE, 180 feet south of Gandy Boulevard. The proposed amendment is from Residential Urban (RU) to Planned Redevelopment – Mixed Use (PR-MU). The amendment area is vacant (formerly the Pirate’s Cove Mobile Home Park). The proposed amendment has been submitted by the City of St. Petersburg as an amendment to their Special Area Plan entitled Vision 2020.

The proposed amendment will expand the previously approved PR-MU boundary that was approved last year along Gandy Boulevard by an additional 6.1 acres. The amendment is associated with a plan to redevelop this previously amended commercial area along Gandy Boulevard along with a former mobile home park (Pirate’s Cove) with a mixed use development, including a number of public amenities and improvements.

It should be noted that 0.6 acres of this amendment includes a small portion of the parcels on Gandy Boulevard in order to correct an error in a previous amendment (approved in March of 2007). As originally requested by the City, the previous amendment included the area along Gandy Boulevard south to a depth of 180 feet, but was only made to a depth of 136 feet. Staff has added the additional 44 feet of depth (from RU to PR-MU), or the 0.6 acres to this application totaling 6.1 acres.

The combined mixed-use project (the 5.5 acres from this amendment and the previously amended parcels on Gandy Boulevard) proposes 72,000 square feet of retail space and 21,000 square feet of restaurant space (3 restaurants), 120 residential units, and 45 boat slips.

Mr. Crawford outlined staff’s concerns over the impact to the segment of Gandy Boulevard to the west that is operating at a level of service “F.” He especially noted the potential for cumulative impacts from future developments that together would exceed the City’s mitigation threshold of 5% of the adjoining roadway’s capacity. Discussion followed with regard to traffic impact to which Mr. MacAulay noted that they came close to requiring mitigation; that the City is aware of the segment on Gandy; and that the City does not anticipate further plan changes for the area, but did acknowledge future development along Gandy.

Jim Miller and Gordon Beardslee inquired as to boat slips associated with the project to which Mr. MacAulay noted there are a certain number dedicated to the public as well as a proposed boardwalk around the commercial marina. He stated there is a percentage noted in the development agreement, not a set number; and that there are a total of 45 wet slips available.

Gordon Beardslee inquired as to the Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA) - the increase in the number of residential units. Mr. Beardslee inquired if any units out of the CHHA Unit Pool came from this area and whether there is a corresponding decrease any where in this vicinity. Mr. MacAulay noted that there is no decrease in this vicinity; that most came from the southern part of the City near Clam Bayou; that this plan amendment almost

depletes the pool - there will be 66 units left in the pool and, if this is approved, there will remain 25 units. Discussion followed with regard to DCA requirements; that the DCA had not allowed the County to "trade off" distant areas in a similar submittal.

Chairman Renea Vincent inquired whether the development agreement (DA) had been approved to which Mr. MacAulay stated that the City Council has approved it and the applicant has executed the DA; however, the City won't have executed it for the PPC meeting, but will for the CPA in March.

Sharen Jarzen inquired as to how many units were in the pool originally to which Mr. MacAulay stated approximately 400 were in the original pool in 1998.

After full presentation of the report, Fred Metcalf moved to approve the staff recommendation of approval for Case CW 08-11 subject to conditions noted. The motion was seconded by Catherine Porter and carried (vote 11-1, representative of Pinellas County dissenting).

CW 08-12 – City of Largo – Mr. Crawford stated that this 1.5 acres site is located at the northeast corner of Roosevelt Boulevard and Bradford Street. The proposed amendment is from Residential Low (RL) to Residential/Office Limited (R/OL). The amendment will allow the single family home to be redeveloped as a professional office complex.

The area to the west of the subject site is separated by a local road (Bradford Street) and is developed with a gas station and a commercial plaza, designated Commercial General (CG), while the area to the east immediately adjacent to the subject site and includes the Family Service Center of Pinellas County offering family counseling and other support services, designated Institutional. The property to the north is designated Residential Low (RL) and is developed with single-family homes. The area to the south (across Roosevelt Boulevard) is shared by two parcels, one of which is undeveloped designated R/OL, and the other one is developed with a triplex designated Residential Urban.

In summary, given the site's location on a Principal Arterial Roadway (Roosevelt Boulevard) the site's current RL designation is not the most appropriate designation for the subject. A more appropriate designation for the subject site would be the requested R/OL category which will allow for development of an office use, which is compatible with the surrounding adjacent residential, office, and commercial areas and because of its frontage along Roosevelt Boulevard, which is a Principal Arterial road.

After full presentation of the report, Gordon Beardslee moved to approve Case CW 08-12; the motion was seconded by Sharen Jarzen and carried (vote 12-0).

SAP Change 08-1 – City of St. Petersburg - Mr. Crawford reported that this is a substantive amendment to the Vision 2020 Plan, which is a Special Area Plan (SAP), on the Countywide Plan Map for a portion of the City of St. Petersburg. After providing background data on St. Petersburg's Vision 2020 Plan, he stated that the amendment being

reviewed in this case proposes an increase to the allowable transient accommodation use density allowed in the PR-MU future land use plan category.

The City of St. Petersburg proposes an amendment that would increase the maximum permissible density of transient accommodation uses in the PR-MU category from 24 to 45 units per acre (upa), a substantive change to an approved SAP. He stated that the analysis provided by the City indicates that the density of 24 upa as originally adopted was in error; that the PR-MU future land use plan category was intended to replace the Residential/Office/Retail category which had allowed transient accommodation use density at 30 upa; that the Vision 2020 Plan's PR-MU and Planned Redevelopment-Commercial (PR-C) categories were intended to permit development and redevelopment at a higher density and intensity than otherwise permitted in "standard" plan categories; and that the PR-C plan category, intended to be more intensive than the PR-MU plan category, allows transient accommodation use density at a maximum of 55 upa.

Discussion followed with regard to FAR limitations on the 45 upa to which Mr. Crawford responded it has to be under 0.55; that 45 hotel rooms per acre would be appropriate in view of recent Countywide Rules amendment regarding hotel density.

After full presentation of the report, Catherine Porter moved to approve the proposed amendment to the Vision 2020 SAP; the motion was seconded by Fred Metcalf and carried (vote 12-0).

La Entrada Master Plan - Mr. Crawford stated that the La Entrada Master Plan was submitted and considered by the Council at its December 5, 2007, meeting; that the Council had continued the Master Plan to its February 20, 2008, meeting, subject to the two conditions noted, neither of which has been satisfied. Staff is therefore recommending the Council deny without prejudice the earlier submission to remove it from further consideration at this time until the previously stated conditions have been addressed.

Mr. MacAulay noted at the bottom of page 3 of the staff report, as a point of clarification – application is in process to extend the development rights for the areawide DRI, but no application to add additional development rights to the development order. Rather, the development order must be extended instead.

Fred Metcalf moved approval of staff recommendation to deny without prejudice with condition noted; the motion was seconded by Jim Miller and carried (vote 12-0).

Industrial Lands Study – Follow-up – Mr. Healey noted that the PAC had received the preliminary draft of the ILS at their January 7, 2008, meeting and were asked to examine the study and provide PPC staff with comments prior to or at the February 11 PAC meeting. He also informed the members that the study will be discussed with the BCC/CPA at their meeting on February 19 and reviewed further with the Planning Council at their February 20 meeting.

Rick MacAulay stated the City of St. Petersburg Economic Development staff has reviewed the proposal and at this point, has presented no comments.

Renea Vincent stated that the City of Tarpon Springs has an area on the north side of the Anclote River which the City believes is not ideal for Industrial. Discussion followed with regard to these types of properties and how to make them more viable. Mr. Pflueger stated that as this type of land becomes rarer, they may become more attractive.

Mr. Healey stated that PPC staff will look at how we can better frame guidelines for evaluation of Land Use Plan amendments in these areas; that we will look at the new Employment Center Overlay plan category; and at some administrative processes that would allow Economic Development some flexibility in terms of use and intensity.

Mr. Rinzivillo stated that the cities receive requests to change land use from IL to Commercial and need tools to use when meeting with developers. Mr. Healey stated that the Industrial Land Study is an attempt to set some policies that elected officials are comfortable with for the long-term benefit of the economy.

Ms. Vincent inquired as to countywide assistance programs noting it is painful for property owners sitting on these lands; that they will need some kind of assistance with infrastructure or enterprise zones. Mr. Healey noted that this effort is a partnership between Economic Development and the Planning Council, and there is an entire section devoted to financial assistance and programs. Key recommendations have to do with infrastructure improvements and assembly of land. Other cooperative efforts that local governments can address include site plan standards, common stormwater management areas, and parking arrangements.

Ms. Jarzen noted there is concern over small parcels that might be more viable as Commercial. Mr. Healey stated that the point is recognized; that 94% of industrial-designated lands are in these concentrated areas. Discussion followed with regard to targeted employment and the overlay category to perhaps get higher floor area ratios and to allow additional uses that might not otherwise be allowed in that district.

The PAC gave its consensus of approval for the Industrial Lands Study.

Proposed Department of Community Affairs Legislation - Mr. Pflueger presented the PAC members with an update on the proposed Department of Community Affairs Legislation concerning five proposals to amend current state growth management law, specifically Chapter 163, Florida Statutes.

Discussion followed with regard to Alternative State Review procedure and reduction of timeframe from 9 months to roughly 6 months.

Annexation Subcommittee – Follow-up – Mr. Healey updated the PAC members concerning the actions to date by the Joint PPC/CPA Annexation Subcommittee and presented them with copies of the draft agenda for February 25, 2008. He stated that the

first order of business will be to review the actions from the Charter Review Commission and the subsequent Settlement Agreement; stated that the Committee established a one-year timeframe to accomplish their goals; and now have scheduled a second meeting for February 25, 10 a.m., at the St. Petersburg/Clearwater Airport. He reported that once received, the minutes of the January Subcommittee meeting will be posted on the PPC website along with the final agenda for the February 25 meeting.

Development Agreements – Follow-up – Mr. Healey provided copies of a memorandum from Jewel White Cole, Counsel to the Pinellas Planning Council, with regard to Development Agreements. Discussion followed with regard to Ms. Cole's 4-point approach as outlined in her correspondence (handed out to the members at the meeting).

The recommendation is that these provisions be implemented by a joint resolution of both the PPC and CPA and that the content ultimately be reduced to a rule amendment to be coordinated with the consistency review rule amendment this year.

Mr. Healey asked for comments and input from PAC noting that PPC Resolution 02-6 currently sets forth the conditions for site plans and development agreements submitted in support of plan amendments; and that staff will be rewriting those in a single joint resolution with the PPC/CPA.

Mr. Healey provided clarification as to the process for execution and filing of development agreements to be considered with plan amendments.

Other PAC Business:

Mr. Crawford introduced new Land Use Planner, Phyllis Fleming to the PAC members and gave a summary of her previous experience.

There being no further business, the PAC adjourned at 3:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

David P. Healey, Executive Director

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING  
MONDAY, JANUARY 7, 2008  
BANK OF AMERICA BUILDING  
600 CLEVELAND STREET, SUITE 850, EIGHTH FLOOR  
CLEARWATER, FLORIDA**

Members Present:

Sharen Jarzen, Vice Chairman	City of Seminole
Fred Metcalf	City of Gulfport
Jeff Dow	City of Dunedin
Catherine Porter	City of Clearwater
Marie Dauphinais	City of Oldsmar
Dean Neal	City of Pinellas Park
Gordon Beardslee	Pinellas County
Steve Fairchild	Pinellas County School District
Rick MacAulay	City of St. Petersburg
Bob Jarzen	City of Largo
Ron Rinzivillo	City of Safety Harbor

Also Present:

John Cueva	Pinellas County Building & Dev. Review Svcs.
Gary Jones	City of St. Petersburg Economic Development Dept.
Steve Williamson	Johnson Pope Law Firm
Jeanne Hoffmann	City of St. Petersburg
Matt McLachlan	City of Safety Harbor
Debra Sullivan	City of Belleair Bluffs
Robert David	City of Belleair Bluffs
David Healey	Pinellas Planning Council
Michael Crawford	Pinellas Planning Council
Larry Pflueger	Pinellas Planning Council
Linda Fisher	Pinellas Planning Council
Michael Schoderbock	Pinellas Planning Council
Christopher Mettler	Pinellas Planning Council
Carolyn Shoemaker	Pinellas Planning Council

Vice Chairman Sharen Jarzen called the meeting to order at 1:30 P.M. Mr. Crawford thanked her for chairing today's PAC meeting in the absence of Chairman Renea Vincent, who could not be at the meeting today due to holiday activities at the City of Tarpon Springs.

Minutes – Vice Chairman Jarzen asked if there were any comments or corrections to be made to the minutes of the November 26, 2007, PAC meeting. With the correction of two typographical errors, Dean Neal moved to approve the minutes; the motion was seconded by Catherine Porter and carried (vote 9-0).

Old Business – none.

Review of PPC Agenda for January 16, 2008 Meeting – Received.

Countywide Planning Authority (CPA) Actions – December 2007 – Mr. Crawford informed the PAC members that at their meeting on December 18, 2007, the CPA deferred the Master Development Plan Review for Industrial/Mixed Use Projects (La Entrada) to their March 11, 2008, meeting. The CPA also approved Resolution No. 07-197 accepting the updated Countywide Future Land Use Plan Map for filing as the official record copy; and the Board of County Commissioners appointed Commissioners John Morroni, Ronnie Duncan, and Susan Latvala to serve on the reconstituted Joint PPC/CPA Annexation Subcommittee. Mr. Crawford noted that the cases from the December meeting are scheduled to be heard by the CPA on January 8 and a report will be made at the next PAC meeting.

Annexation Report – November 2007 – Michael Schoderbock summarized the report on voluntary annexations for the month of November, noting that this was the first full month after the demise of Ordinance No. 00-63.

He stated that the Council received a total of two (2) petitions for voluntary annexation review in November from the City of Oldsmar. Existing uses that are within the two annexations include two residential parcels. The proposed annexations totaled 0.7 acres and about \$278,675 in taxable value. Total MSTU tax revenues from the \$278,675 of taxable value are \$581 using the 2007/08 fiscal year tax rate. It is estimated that 7 residents will be affected by a change in jurisdiction.

Annexation Report – December 2007 – Michael Schoderbock summarized the report on voluntary annexations for the month of December.

He stated that the Planning Council received a total of eleven voluntary annexation petitions in December from the cities of Clearwater, Largo, and Pinellas Park. Existing uses that are within the eleven annexations include one commercial parcel, eight residential parcels, and two vacant parcels. The proposed annexations totaled 4.2 acres and about \$3.2 million in taxable value. Total MSTU tax revenues from the \$3.2 million of taxable value are \$6,724 using the 2007/08 fiscal year tax rate. It is estimated that 21 residents will be affected by a change in jurisdiction. Annexation of eight of the eleven parcels will reduce five enclaves in the county by 1.69 acres.

\*\*\*Marie Dauphinais and Ron Rinzivillo entered the meeting at this time.\*\*\*

Annexation Quarterly Report – Mr. Schoderbock reported that this report provides a synopsis of staff receipt and tracking of voluntary annexations for the first quarter of Fiscal Year 2007/08, and it includes details regarding other forms of annexation that have occurred over the past few years.

Chart 1 provides acreage summaries, Chart 2 taxable value, and Chart 3 the percentage of acres annexed in enclaves, all for annexations reviewed in each fiscal year since 2000/01 through the first quarter of Fiscal Year 2007/08. The acreage and taxable value for the first

quarter of FY 07/08, October through December, were 7.1 acres and \$4,371,407 respectively. Thirty-four percent (2.4 acres) of the acreage annexed during the quarter reduced or eliminated an enclave.

Table 1 is a cumulative log of all voluntary annexation petitions received subsequent to Pinellas County Ordinance No. 00-63.

Table 2 is a list of successful referendum/involuntary annexations that have occurred in recent years. This table 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.

At this time, Vice Chairman Jarzen noted that there are a number of visitors at the PAC meeting today; that the PAC By-Laws do not allow non-PAC members to speak unless the members agree.

Ability to Serve Report No. 08-1: City of St. Petersburg (Tierra Verde North Commercial 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 west of Pinellas Bayway, north and south of Madonna Boulevard, and generally south of St. Petersburg's current boundaries. The area consists of ten parcels designated Commercial General, five vacant parcels designated Residential Low, and two parcels designated Water on the Countywide Plan Map. The existing uses are a marina, shopping center, yacht club, office building, convenience store, two areas of submerged land containing marina docks and the five vacant parcels. The area is approximately 31.2 acres in size, consisting of 17.3 acres of Commercial General, 1.0 acre of Residential Low and 12.9 acres of Water (submerged land). PPC staff has reviewed this annexation in accordance with Pinellas County Resolution No. 03-128, and issued a separate determination that the annexation meets the requirements of this resolution.

Mr. Schoderbock further stated that in accordance with the ability to serve review criteria of PPC Resolution No. 98-2, and based upon the accompanying data and analysis, staff submits the following findings for consideration:

- A. The subject area lies just outside, but adjacent to, the municipal services planning area for the City of St. Petersburg, as set forth in a Chapter 163, F.S., Interlocal Agreement with Pinellas County.
- B. The proposed annexation does not create any enclaves.
- C. The City has the ability to provide water, sewer, solid waste, law enforcement, fire, EMS, recreation, and library services through city departments, county services, or private contractors.
- D. With the exception of the fire district, the existing service districts will not change.

Mr. Schoderbock stated that staff found the area to be contiguous to City limits; to be compact; and that no enclaves will be created.

Gordon Beardslee referred to a letter that the County sent to the City of St. Petersburg noting objections to the proposed annexation. He stated the area is in the Tierra Verde Fire District and that those boundaries do not change with annexation. He stated that the County cannot tax the City; that the tax revenue raised by the County to fund the Tierra Verde Fire District would be reduced by \$42,000; and that it is not clear how the \$42,000 would be made up for the funding of that district. He also stated that the County does not agree that it is contiguous and reasonably compact.

Rick MacAulay asked that Gary Jones, City of St. Petersburg Economic Development Department, be allowed to address these issues. Dean Neal moved to allow Gary Jones to address the PAC; Rick MacAulay seconded and the motion carried (vote 11-0).

Mr. Jones referred to the report submitted by the City, agreeing with Mr. Beardslee on one point and stated that the report should properly refer to the Tierra Verde Fire District; but that the fire service will be provided by the City to the entire island including the annexed portion; that the City does believe the area is contiguous and referred to the map and boundaries; and that the City disagrees with the County in this finding.

Dean Neal asked for clarification regarding adjacent parcels to which Mr. Jones again referred to the map stating everything in gray on the map is incorporated. Mr. Neal referred to Chapter 189 inquiring if the District will still be funded to which Mr. Jones stated that was correct.

Mr. Beardslee stated the County wants assurance from the City of St. Petersburg because the remaining parcels in the fire district could be affected by higher rates for service if this \$42,000 is no longer available to the district.

After full presentation of the report, Fred Metcalf 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 Jeffery Dow and approved (vote 10-1 with the representative of Pinellas County casting the dissenting vote).

Local Assistance Quarterly Report – Mr. Crawford provided the PAC members with an update on local assistance for the last quarter. He informed them that the work to re-write the Town of Redington Shores land development regulations to include their recently adopted Urban Design Guidelines has been completed. Further, the reorganization and re-write of certain other sections of the Code was completed at the same time.

## PLAN AMENDMENTS

### Subthreshold Amendments:

The PAC members agreed to hear the three subthresholds as a group and make one motion.

CW 08-01 – Pinellas County – Mr. Crawford stated that this 0.5-acre site is located at 2701 Sunset Point Road. He reported that the proposed amendment is from Residential Medium (RM) to Residential/Office General (R/OG) and will allow the existing single-family home to be converted to an office use. The amendment qualifies as a “Type A” subthreshold amendment based on the amendment being one acre or less in size and is therefore eligible for approval under the official acceptance process.

CW 08-04 (A & B) – City of St. Petersburg – Mr. Crawford stated that this 1.2 acres site is located as follows: A.) Southwest corner of Cortez Way and Columbus Way and B.) South of the intersection of Columbus Way and Madrid Way S. The proposed amendment is from Recreation/Open Space (R/OS) to Residential Low (RL). One of the parcels is undeveloped and is part of a golf course, and one contains a single-family home. The amendment qualifies as a “Type C” subthreshold amendment. The requested Countywide Plan Map amendment has been initiated by the City of St. Petersburg to allow the subdivision of the two parcels into a total of five for the purpose of constructing residential dwelling units (single family).

CW 08-08 – City of Safety Harbor – Mr. Crawford stated that this 0.7 acre site is located on the Northwest corner of Martin Luther King, Jr. Street and Phillippe Parkway. The proposed amendment is from Residential Low and Water/Drainage Feature (RL and W/DF) to Residential/Office Limited (R/OL). The amendment area is vacant and will allow for development of a professional office use. Staff is asking that the Water/Drainage Feature be removed. The amendment qualifies as a “Type A” subthreshold amendment.

After presentation and report on the three subthreshold amendments, Gordon Beardslee moved approval of Case CW 08-01, Case CW 08-04 A & B, and Case CW 08-08. The motion was seconded by Bob Jarzen and carried (vote 11-0).

### Regular Amendments:

CW 08-02 – City of St. Petersburg (Areas 3-176) – Mr. Crawford stated that this area consists of approximately 214 acres throughout the City of St. Petersburg referring to Maps 2-1 through 2-20 in the report. Mr. Crawford stated that this proposal by the City of St. Petersburg is a part of a series of amendments proposed throughout the City that are to recognize changes to the City of St. Petersburg Comprehensive Plan (i.e., their Future Land Use Map) approved as part of the City’s Vision 2020 Plan implementation. Mr. Crawford noted that these amendments have been referred to as “glitch” amendments; that they are a series of amendments that were withdrawn from the City’s first set of amendments completed early in 2007 so that they could be further analyzed and brought back for approval if appropriate; and that they consist of amendments that utilize the standard Countywide Plan

Map categories and the relatively new ones included in the Planned Redevelopment series of categories.

Mr. Crawford referred to the table in Support Document 2 and Map 2-11 relating to the amendments from Industrial Limited (Area 78) and Industrial General (Area 74) to the Planned Redevelopment – Mixed Use categories. The area changing from Industrial Limited (IL) includes office buildings that were once owned by People's Gas. The current City zoning category for this area does not permit commercial uses, but rather office and residential only. No definite plan exists for the 5.5 acre amendment area, however the loss of the land designated Industrial Limited in this instance is inconsistent with the Countywide Rules and PPC Resolution No. 06-3. Rick MacAulay stated there is a vacant office building on the east and on the west side there are still offices utilized by the Gas Company. Mr. Crawford stated staff believes it is a prime industrial concentration area. Mr. MacAulay stated for the record that the City of St. Petersburg will withdraw Area 78 and provide a letter prior to the PPC meeting on January 16<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Beardslee inquired as to Area #7 noting the request was to amend from R/OG to RH and that it is in the Coastal High Hazard Area. Mr. MacAulay stated that it is located in the Gateway Center; that 30 units per acre (UPA) are possible under the land use plan designation; however, the City zoning caps it at 24 upa.

The Industrial General area (Area 74) includes a body shop associated with Carlisle Ford car dealership. The dealership was recently amended to PR-MU, and this parcel is part of the larger car dealership. The remnant IG parcel adjacent and east of the amendment area includes a storage area for the adjacent mobile home park.

Sharen Jarzen inquired as to whether property owners were notified to which Mr. MacAulay stated they were notified for the City's Local Planning Agency meeting as well as the City Council's first public hearing; and will be notified again for the 2<sup>nd</sup> City Council meeting at the end of February. Mr. Crawford stated that the PPC staff sent notices to all property owners.

After full presentation of the report, Fred Metcalf moved to approve staff recommendation of approval for Case CW 08-02, with the exception of Area 78 which is recommended for denial, subject to conditions noted. The motion was seconded by Catherine Porter and carried (vote 11-0).

CW 08-03 – City of Belleair Bluffs (Areas 1-31) – Mr. Crawford stated that this approximately 10.8 acres is located throughout the City of Belleair Bluffs and referred to the map attached to the staff report. Mr. Crawford stated that the proposed Countywide Plan Map amendments (Areas 1-31) have been approved as part of the City of Belleair Bluffs Comprehensive Plan Evaluation Appraisal Report process.

Mr. Crawford stated that with the exception of areas 1, 2, 13, 16, and 24, each of these amendments will likely cause either the use on the parcel to be deemed non-conforming, and/or the residential density to become non-conforming. The consultant helping the City

with the EAR amendments, Gail Easley and Associates, has stated that the data and analysis in the EAR-based plan amendment discusses redevelopment, and that the City is "committed to certain types of future development and specifically want to strongly encourage it through the land use designations." They are aware that these changes will cause many of the uses on each parcel to be deemed non-conforming, but they also stated that redevelopment will be proposed on many of the lots that are now developed and want to ensure that the redevelopment is for uses and intensities/densities that are in keeping with other stated goals, objectives, and policies. He stated that staff found no significant impacts to the surrounding communities.

Sharen Jarzen inquired as to whether all property owners had been notified individually to which Mr. Crawford responded in the affirmative.

After full presentation of the report, Rick MacAulay moved to approve the staff recommendation of approval for Case CW 08-03. The motion was seconded by Jeffery Dow and carried (vote 11-0).

CW 08-05 (A & B) – City of St. Petersburg – Mr. Crawford stated that this 15.7 acre site is proposed for amendment from Commercial General (CG) to Planned Redevelopment-Mixed-Use (PR-MU). The proposed amendments are to recognize changes to the City of St. Petersburg Comprehensive Plan (i.e., their Future Land Use Map) that have been approved as part of the City's Vision 2020 Plan implementation. These amendments are not associated with any existing or proposed redevelopment plan, but are rather intended to recognize the development on-site (a Homestead Suites hotel on the smaller parcel, offices and an Extended Stay America hotel on the larger parcel).

Gordon Beardslee inquired as to the floor area ratio (FAR) under the proposed zoning to which Mr. MacAulay stated it would be .55.

After full presentation of the report, Bob Jarzen moved to approve the staff recommendation of approval for Case CW 08-05 (A & B), subject to the condition that the City of St. Petersburg submit a modified infrastructure analysis by September 30, 2008, indicating the cumulative impacts expected from incremental Countywide Plan Map amendments to the Special Area Plan (SAP) and that updates all other relevant portions of the SAP, including but not limited to maps, acreage calculations, and other relevant analysis and discussion.. The motion was seconded by Fred Metcalf and carried (vote 11-0).

CW 08-06 - Pinellas County – Mr. Crawford stated that this 1.6 acres m.o.l. site is located at 7770 128<sup>th</sup> Street North. The proposed amendment is from Residential Suburban (RS) to Institutional (I). The parcel is developed with an assisted living facility.

Pinellas County has requested that the current RS category be changed to Institutional to recognize a 24-bed assisted living facility that has occupied the site for 10 years. Also, this proposed amendment, along with the attached development agreement (found in Attachment 2), will allow the assisted living facility to increase the number of beds on the site by 8, bringing the total number of beds to 32.