

**PINELLAS PLANNING COUNCIL  
AGENDA MEMORANDUM**

**AGENDA ITEM:** II F.

**MEETING DATE:** March 19, 2008

**SUBJECT:**

Consent Agenda:

F. Correspondence

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Council Receive and Discuss as is Appropriate

***BACKGROUND***

Correspondence Includes:

1. PAC Minutes – March 10, 2008 (draft), February 11, 2008 (approved)
2. Letter sent February 4, 2008 to Erin Moore, Pinellas County Property Appraiser's Office, Re: Interlocal Agreement
3. Letter sent February 7, 2008 to Catherine W. Porter, AICP, Long Range Planning Manager, City of Clearwater, Re: Review of Proposed Text Amendments to the Coastal Management Element of the Comprehensive Plan: CPA-2007-06004 (Ordinance No. 7917-08 for Consistency with the Countywide Rules
4. Letter sent February 7, 2008 to Mark Ely, Community Development Director, City of Seminole, Re: Review of Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments (Ordinance No. 10-2008) for Consistence with the Countywide Rules
5. Letter sent February 8, 2008 to Honorable Bill Queen, Mayor, Town of North Redington Beach, Re: Property located at 16811 Gulf Boulevard
6. Letter received February 11, 2008 from Mike Fasano, State Senator, District 11, Re: Acknowledging receipt of Pinellas Planning Council's 2006-07 Annual Report
7. Received February 13, 2008, copy of letters sent February 11, 2008 to Mayor Rick Baker, City of St. Petersburg, Mayor Andy Steingold, City of Safety Harbor, and Mayor Chris Arbutine, City of Belleair Bluffs, from Brian Smith, Planning Director, Pinellas County, Re: CPA actions taken on February 5, 2008

***PINELLAS PLANNING COUNCIL ACTION:***

***COUNTYWIDE PLANNING AUTHORITY ACTION:***

**SUBJECT:** Other Council Business - Correspondence

---

8. Received February 20, 2008, copy of memo sent February 11, 2008 to Paul Cassel, Director, Development Review Services, from Brian Smith, Planning Director, Pinellas County, Re: CPA actions taken on February 5, 2008
9. Letter sent February 14, 2008 to Gordon Beardslee, Planning Division Manager, Pinellas County Planning Department, Re: Consistency Reconciliation Actions
10. Thank You note received February 14, 2008, from State Representative Bill Heller, District 52, Re: Acknowledging receipt of Pinellas Planning Council's 2006-07 Annual Report
11. Letter sent February 19, 2008 to Jewel White Cole, Managing Assistant County Attorney, and Carl Brody, Assistant County Attorney, Re: Letter of appreciation for their participation during the In-Service Day Activities
12. Letter sent February 19, 2008 to Katherine Burbridge, AICP, Pinellas County Office Of Management and Budget, Re: Letter of appreciation for her participation during the In-Service Day Activities
13. Sample of letters sent February 22, 2008 to property owners, Re: February 20, 2008 PPC Meeting Follow-up for Land Use Case CW 08-03 (City of Belleair Bluffs)
14. Sample of letters sent February 22, 2008 to property owner/representative, Re: February 20, 2008 PPC Meeting Follow-up (Land Use Cases)
15. Letters sent February 22, 2008 to Mayors of local governments with items on February 20, 2008 PPC Agenda, Re: PPC Meeting Follow-up
16. Letter sent February 26, 2008 to Jim Millican, Lealman Fire District, Re: Request for public records submitted during the Joint PPC/CPA Subcommittee meeting
17. Letter sent February 26, 2008 to Renea Vincent, AICP, Planning and Zoning Director, City of Tarpon Springs, Re: Response to their letter dated February 25, 2008 regarding Industrial Land Study
18. Sample of letters sent February 26, 2008, from Mayor Robert Hackworth, Chairman, Joint PPC/CPA Annexation Subcommittee, to all Mayors, Re: Transmittal of Charter Review Settlement Agreement concerning Annexation Procedures
19. Letter sent February 26, 2008 to Steve Kurcan, Grady Pridgen, Inc., Re: Council's February 20, 2008 recommendation to deny without prejudice the proposed Master Plan for La Entrada

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING  
MONDAY, MARCH 10, 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
Jeff Dow	City of Dunedin
Catherine Porter	City of Clearwater
Gordon Beardslee	Pinellas County
Jim Miller	Pinellas County School District
Paul Geisz	City of St. Petersburg
Bob Klute	City of Largo
Lauren Matzke	City of St. Pete Beach
Marie Dauphinais	City of Oldsmar
Lynn Rosetti	City of Treasure Island

Also Present:

John Cueva	Pinellas County
Michael Crawford	Pinellas Planning Council
Linda Fisher	Pinellas Planning Council
Michael Schoderbock	Pinellas Planning Council
Phyllis Fleming	Pinellas Planning Council
Carolyn Shoemaker	Pinellas Planning Council
Renee Rood	Representative for Feather Sound
Tom Mohan	Representative for Feather Sound
Paul J. Wikle	Representative for Tarpon Springs
David Desiler	Lincks & Associates
Kam Ashley	EHP, Inc.
George Cantonis	Acme Sponge – Tarpon Springs
Ed Armstrong	Johnson Pope Law Firm

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 February 11, 2008, PAC meeting. There being none, Sharen Jarzen moved to approve the minutes; the motion was seconded by Jeffery Dow and carried (vote 6-0).

Old Business – none.

Review of PPC Agenda for March 19, 2008 Meeting – Received.

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

He stated that the Council received a total of twenty (20) petitions for voluntary annexation review in January from the cities of Clearwater, Largo, Pinellas Park, and Seminole. Existing uses that were within the 20 annexations include one office use, eighteen residential uses, and one vacant parcel. The proposed annexations totaled 5.8 acres and approximately \$2.6 million in taxable value. Total MSTU tax revenues from the \$2.6 million of taxable value are \$5,455 using the 2007/08 fiscal year tax rate. It is estimated that 43 residents will be affected by a change in jurisdiction. Annexation of six of the twenty parcels will reduce three enclaves in the county by 1.6 acres.

\*\*\*Lynn Rosetti entered the meeting at this time.\*\*\*

Due to the lack of a quorum, Chairman Vincent asked that Linda Fisher give the report on the Industrial Lands Study.

Industrial Lands Study – Final Draft – Linda Fisher reported to PAC members that the Final Draft Study will be presented to the Council for approval and to authorize its transmittal to the Countywide Planning Authority for their approval. PPC staff presented the study to the CPA at their February 19<sup>th</sup> meeting. The Study is now in final draft form and includes a name change to “Target Employment and Industrial Land Study for the Pinellas Community.” Other changes and edits are included in the addendum provided with the agenda item; and appendices are available on the PPC website.

\*\*\*Bob Klute, Marie Dauphinais, Jim Miller, and Catherine Porter entered the meeting at this time.\*\*\*

Sharen Jarzen moved to approve the Industrial Lands Study – Final Draft; the motion was seconded by Lynn Rosetti and carried (vote 11-0).

The PAC members returned to their regular agenda items as presented on the agenda.

## PLAN AMENDMENTS

### Subthreshold Amendments:

Case CW 08-13 - Pinellas County – Phyllis Fleming stated that this 0.2-acre site is located on the North side of Smith Street, 265 feet east of South Myrtle Ave. She reported that the proposed amendment is from Residential Urban (RU) to Residential/Office/Retail (R/O/R) and will permit the use of the site for automobile storage.

Case CW 08-15 – City of Dunedin – Phyllis Fleming stated that this 2.5 acre site is located at the Southeast corner of Martin Luther King Jr. Avenue and Howell Street. She reported that the proposed amendment is from Residential Medium (RM) to Residential Low

Medium (RLM) and will allow a maximum of 25 dwelling units. However, redevelopment of the site is proposed to include 19 Habitat for Humanity townhomes.

CW 08-17 – Pinellas County – Phyllis Fleming stated that this 0.2 acre site is located at 1515 Lakeview Road. The proposed amendment is from Residential Low (RL) to Residential/Office General (R/OG) and will permit the use of the site as a professional office.

After presentation and report on the three subthreshold reports, Lynn Rosetti moved to approve Cases CW 08-13, CW 08-15, and CW 08-17. The motion was seconded by Jeff Dow and carried (vote 11-0).

#### Regular Amendments:

Case CW 08-09: City of Tarpon Springs (continued from February 20, 2008) – Mr. Crawford stated that this 13.0 acres site is located at the northwest corner of East Pine Street and US Highway 19 North. The subject site is designated Industrial Limited (IL) on the Countywide Plan Map and is proposed to be amended to Commercial General (CG) to accommodate the construction of a Lowe's Home Improvement Store. He stated that a Development Agreement between Tarpon Springs and the property owner has been approved by Tarpon Springs; that the total site area under consideration in the Development Agreement is 18.8 acres; and that this extra 5.8 acres is IL as well and is proposed to include roadway realignment and the retention area for Lowe's.

Staff has reviewed the proposed amendment against the Countywide Rules and PPC Resolution 06-3. Mr. Crawford stated that staff submits the following findings:

- The subject site is consistent with the stated Purpose and Locational Characteristics for the IL category; and
- Amendment of the site to CG would not be consistent with the stated Purpose for the CG category.

He further noted that with regard to PPC Resolution No. 06-3, the proposed amendment fails to meet the criteria by which this amendment is to be evaluated as follows:

- Amendment from IL to CG would be inconsistent with the position statements and strategies of the Countywide Plan and the Economic Development and Redevelopment Plan for Pinellas County;
- The amendment does not increase, and in fact will diminish, the potential for this property to provide for target employment opportunities;
- There has been no showing that changed or changing conditions render the current industrial designation not viable for target employment; and
- There has not been established any compelling reasons in the public's interest to make the proposed amendment.

Finally, as to the Development Agreement, it addresses primarily the mechanics and responsibilities in relationship to the proposed amendment and does not of itself address in any affirmative way the criteria governing consideration of the amendment.

Mr. Crawford stated that staff believes that the CG is not consistent and discussed realignment of Live Oak and some improvements to US 19. He stated it is staff's position that even though the roadway improvements can be considered a public benefit, the amendment does not show the same valid public purpose outweighing the change from Industrial.

Ms. Vincent asked that Sharen Jarzen chair the meeting for this item in order that she could step down as Chairman and answer questions in the discussion of the case. Sharen Jarzen asked for a motion to receive input from the outside participants to which PAC members provided their consensus to allow them to speak.

In response to query, Mr. George Cantonis, owner of Acme Sponge, stated he is consolidating all of their operations into the southwest corner of the parent site (not part of the amendment area), and that no employment will be gained or lost from this amendment.

Renea Vincent stated the City feels the proposal complements the whole concentrated commercial uses in the area; that they believe the CG land use is appropriate and explained the background of the area. The City of Tarpon Springs understands the need to preserve industrial land, but believes that this amendment makes the land more viable. Ms. Vincent stated that the City has lost over 400 industrial-related jobs since 1990; and no large employers have come in to replace those jobs. The City, since 1990, has had a 1% absorption of industrial land or about 2.2 acres per year. She stated that with regard to public purpose, the City disagrees that the road improvements that will come along with this should not be considered. If you take Lowe's out of the equation and ask the City to come up with a way to justify a signalized intersection there, Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) will not agree.

Ms. Vincent referred to the letter in the back-up material (Attachment 2) from ABC Packaging Machine in support of the amendment, and noted that this is the type of target industry that the City is trying to keep and attract with high-paying skilled jobs.

She stated that the City believes this amendment, specifically the roadway improvements included in the Development Agreement, provides better access for the Sponge Docks as well as for the commercial and industrial area in other parts of the city.

Lastly, Ms. Vincent stated that even if the City could get FDOT to agree to allow a signal to go in without the warrants, the estimated costs of the improvements would be well over \$1 million; and that the City would not be able to construct them at that price.

Gordon Beardslee asked for clarification as to the commitment on FDOT's part to have the light put in to which Ms. Vincent stated they had committed and actually suggested the realignment down to Spruce Street. Mr. Beardslee inquired as to how this proposed change

would impact the remaining industrial property in the area to which Ms. Vincent stated the City believes it becomes more viable. The City does not disagree with the intent of the Industrial Land Study, but it may be years before another user comes in to rate the warrants for the traffic signal.

Sharen Jarzen inquired as to how firm FDOT's commitment to the traffic signal is to which the applicant's Traffic Engineer from Lincks & Associates, Dave Desiler, responded that they are favorable to moving it down to Spruce.

Paul Geisz inquired about the current signals in the area to which Ms. Vincent stated there is one at Tarpon Avenue and one at Beckett Way to the north; that there is good separation between them. In response to a question from Ms. Jarzen, Ms. Vincent stated that Lowe's will not go forward without approval for the light.

In response to a request from Mr. Crawford for clarification regarding the Development Agreement and traffic signal, Mr. Cantonis stated that the requirement for the light being in place is written into the sale contract for the land. Ms. Vincent stated that the City would withdraw and return the parcel to IL if the specifics of the amendment are not approved.

Lynn Rosetti inquired as to whether the City's Industrial Limited category would already allow for the Lowe's (i.e., without an amendment to CG), similar to a case in St. Petersburg. Ms. Vincent stated that their codes would not allow such to occur.

Mr. Crawford further addressed the issues of high-wage jobs being those that pay 130% above the average wage, and targeted industry, which is an industry that received 51% or more of its income from outside the county. The Lowe's met neither criteria. He also noted that the additional traffic from the amendment to CG would exacerbate congestion issues discussed earlier – that is, the congestion that pushes industry out of the area by making it more difficult to access their sites and to move products.

After full presentation of the report, Renea Vincent moved to approve the request as presented by the City of Tarpon Springs, which is to amend the subject area from IL to CG. The motion was seconded by Catherine Porter and carried (vote 8-3, representatives of Pinellas County, St. Petersburg, and Seminole dissenting).

Ms. Jarzen turned the meeting back over to Chairman Renea Vincent.

CW 08-14 – Pinellas County – Ms. Fleming stated that this 3.7 acres site is located 600 feet east of Park Street, between 46<sup>th</sup> Ave. N. and 48<sup>th</sup> Ave. N. The proposed amendment is from Residential Urban (RU) to Residential Low Medium (RLM) and includes a Development Agreement outlining an affordable housing density bonus for workforce housing. The site is vacant.

The RLM category permits up to 10 residential dwelling units per acre and with the 50% density bonus proposed, the request will permit 55 units of multi-family, workforce rental housing, effectively resulting in 15 units per acre. The Development Agreement that has

been submitted reflects that a minimum of 20% of the units will be affordable to households with annual incomes below 60% of the area median income (AMI).

It should be noted, that the proposed amendment area is located approximately 600 feet east of Park Street (refer to attached Map 6) and is therefore considered to be outside of the 500 foot boundary of a designated Scenic/Non-Commercial Corridor .

Ms. Fleming reported that as to the relationship of the proposed plan amendment to the Countywide Rules, staff submits the following findings:

- The subject site is consistent with the stated Purpose and Locational Characteristics for the RLM category; and
- The site is located in close proximity to Park Street, in an area that serves as a transition between low density residential areas to the east and high density commercial areas to the west.

Finally, as to the Development Agreement, it addresses the use of the property for affordable housing and standard housing as follows:

- The agreement continues in effect until terminated, but for a period not to exceed five (5) years; and
- A minimum of 20% of the units will be affordable to households with annual incomes below 60% of the area median income.

Ms. Fleming stated that if the developer obtains affordable housing financing from Pinellas County Community Development that this funding will require a different period of affordability than the 5 years reflected in the Development Agreement, and the Development Agreement would have to be amended.

After full presentation of the report, Sharen Jarzen moved to approve the staff recommendation of approval, subject to the accompanying Development Agreement, for Case CW 08-14. The motion was seconded by Paul Geisz and carried (vote 11-0).

CW 08-16 – City of Largo – Phyllis Fleming stated that this 7.3 acres site is located north of 1955 Belcher Road. The proposed amendment is from Residential Suburban (RS) to Institutional (I). The subject site is shown as being located on a Scenic/Non-Commercial Corridor (SNCC), Belcher Road; has been recently annexed, and the City of Largo has requested the amendment to accommodate the use of the parcel as parking for the adjacent St. Catherine’s Catholic Church.

Ms. Fleming noted that the area to the west, across Belcher Road, is designated RL and is developed with single-family homes; and that with the exception of the abutting church parcel to the south, the areas to the north, south and east are also RL and developed with single-family homes. However, there are several Institutional uses along Belcher Road.

Discussion followed with regard to landscape and buffer requirements to which Mr. Klute stated the applicant has been responsive and has submitted a site plan indicating larger buffers than the City's code requires.

After full presentation of the report, Jim Miller moved to approve the staff recommendation of approval for Case CW 08-16 with the separate additional recommendation that the City give special consideration to the improvement of the site with respect to the buffering and landscaping guidelines of the SNCC Master Plan. The motion was seconded by Lynn Rosetti and carried (vote 11-0).

Case CW 08-18 - Pinellas County - Ms. Fleming stated that this 6.4 acre site is located at 2201 Feather Sound Drive. She reported that the proposed amendment is from Commercial Recreation (CR) to Residential Low (RL).

Ms. Fleming stated that the site of the amendment request is the current location of a clubhouse (Parcel A) within the Feather Sound Master Plan; and that this request is to amend the Countywide Plan Map on this parcel from Commercial Recreation (CR) to Residential Low (RL). The applicant proposes to develop Parcel A (6.4 acres) with 71 condominium units, tennis courts, and parking.

She further noted that the request also involves two adjoining parcels, Parcel B and C. Although the intent of this request does not contemplate changing the Countywide Plan Map designation on Parcels B and C, the applicant proposes to average the density among parcels A, B and C and place some of the resulting residential units on Parcel A. Parcels B and C are designated Residential Low Medium (RLM) and are vacant. Parcels B and C have development entitlements (residential dwelling units) and if the amendment to Parcel A is granted, the applicant intends to extinguish all remaining development rights on Parcels B and C. The clubhouse area is not subject to this Countywide Map Amendment.

A Development Agreement between Pinellas County and the property owner has been executed by the property owner and submitted, detailing the intent of the property owner and applicant.

The requested amendment will result in two remnant CR areas on the Countywide Plan Map. Apparently, this is being done in order to address, or meet a Pinellas County Zoning limitation placed on the site relative to how much parking area can be included in the RL designation. However, the Countywide Rules contain no such limitation and therefore it will be recommended that the County amend the remnant CR area to RL or other appropriate designation once building permits are issued for the structures discussed in the Development Agreement.

John Cueva also stated that the County will be amending the land use on the two remaining parcels (B and C) as well; that essentially these are units left from the overall Master Plan; and that this will tie them up and then they are extinguished.

Mr. Crawford noted that this area is in the CHHA; and that the change will not place additional units in the CHHA.

After full presentation of the report, Bob Klute moved to approve staff recommendation of approval, subject to: 1) the accompanying Development Agreement; and 2) the density averaging requirements in Section 6.1.3 of the Countywide Rules, including written evidence of the averaging recorded in the public records; and separately and in addition, that the County amend the remaining Commercial Recreation areas to another appropriate designation once building permits are issued for the residential structures and clubhouse as defined in the Development Agreement. The motion was seconded by Marie Dauphinais and carried (vote 11-0).

Development Agreements – Proposed Joint PPC/CPA Resolution – Preliminary Draft – (Verbal) – Mr. Crawford stated that the proposed resolution has not been received from the County Attorney's office as yet, but essentially it would include the same items as was presented to PAC last month; that is requirement that a Development Agreement tied to a Countywide Plan Map amendment be approved at the local level prior to finalization of the amendment. He stated that following this resolution, there will likely be Countywide Rule amendments to codify the proposals.

Joint PPC/CPA Annexation Subcommittee – Follow-up – Mr. Crawford updated the PAC members concerning the actions to date by the Joint PPC/CPA Annexation Subcommittee and provided materials from their February 25 meeting.

He stated that the Subcommittee agreed upon the list of items in the Charter Litigation General Term Sheet were those agreed to by the County and cities in follow-up to the litigation following the Charter Review Commission process in 2006 and which were embodied in the Settlement Agreement. The Subcommittee also directed that a letter be sent to the Mayors in Pinellas County reminding them of the Settlement Agreement and asking for their assistance in following the items set forth in the Agreement. The Subcommittee identified the interlocal agreement process provided for under Chp. 171, Part II, F.S., as having the greatest potential to yield positive results and asked PPC staff and the County Attorney's office to prepare an outline of the requirements of that process for their next meeting as well as looking at service areas in relationship to the planning/annexation areas as they existed under Ordinance No. 00-63.

The Committee hopes to conclude in one year. Mr. Crawford noted that the next meeting of the Subcommittee has been set for Monday, March 31, 10 a.m., in the Clerk's Conference Room at the Pinellas County Courthouse; and that the agenda will be posted on the Pinellas Planning Council website once completed.

Renea Vincent inquired as to whether anyone from the Palm Harbor area had come to the meetings to which Mr. Crawford stated they had not to date.

Other PAC Business:

There being no further business, the PAC adjourned at 2:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

David P. Healey, Executive Director

Draft

**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 these 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 boats 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 anywhere 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