

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
MONDAY, DECEMBER 4, 2000
BANK OF AMERICA BUILDING
600 CLEVELAND STREET, SUITE 850, EIGHTH FLOOR
CLEARWATER, FLORIDA**

Members Present:

Jeff Dow	City of Dunedin
Mike Nadeau	Town of Indian Shores
Nick Staszko	City of Oldsmar
Tom Shevlin	City of Pinellas Park
Rick MacAulay	City of St. Petersburg
Gordon Beardslee	Pinellas County
James Miller	Pinellas County School Board

Also Present:

David Healey	Pinellas Planning Council
April Collins	Pinellas Planning Council
Mike Crawford	Pinellas Planning Council
Mark Ely	Pinellas Planning Council
Alisa Hartsfield	Pinellas Planning Council
Larry Pflueger	Pinellas Planning Council
Paula Davis	City of Largo

The regular meeting of PAC was called to order at 1:35 p.m. by Tom Shevlin.

Minutes – Nick Staszko made a motion to approve the minutes of the regular PAC meeting of November 6, 2000; the motion was seconded by Gordon Beardslee and the minutes were approved. (Vote 7-0)

Old Business – None.

At this time Dave Healey asked if the order of the agenda could be altered in order to present the Joint Redevelopment Issues – Progress Report first, so that he could leave in time to attend another meeting. The committee agreed to do so.

Redevelopment Issues – Progress Report – Dave Healey went over the materials from the Steering Committee meeting on November 27th. Mr. Healey would like to schedule a separate meeting following the regular PAC meeting in January to allow ample time to discuss what the status of the project to date, and to give PAC a chance to give input into

the process. At the last Steering Committee meeting, Mr. Healey stated that there were three specific items addressed. The first was to attempt to define redevelopment. The focus was to understand what people mean by “redevelopment” and whether “infill” is any different. The various thoughts of the Steering Committee were identified, including that redevelopment is related to a public purpose expressed in a plan or goals statement.

The second item was to address the issues that are involved with redevelopment. Mr. Healey referred to a chart that identified seven particular issue categories. (People, Standards, Procedures, Economic/Financial, Organization/Format, Costs, and External Agencies/Rules) Mr. Healey stated that there was a lot of time spent enumerating these issues and at the end of the exercise the consultant asked the Steering Committee to rank and prioritize these issues, which the consultant is in the process of tabulating.

The final item discussed was the results of the survey of development industry representatives. Mr. Healey stated that there were approximately twenty responses received from this survey as noted in the packet. He pointed to one issue in particular, which is, to what extent the elected officials would be comfortable in giving staff more decision-making discretion when it comes to redevelopment issues. Mr. Healey stated that these are just observations at this point and he wanted PAC to see where the Steering Committee was at this time with the project.

The next step is to discuss the project, with the consultant present, in a roundtable work session where PAC can provide its input and suggestions.

****Dave Healey left the meeting at this time, 1:45 p.m.****

Review of PPC Agenda for December 11, 2000 Meeting – Received.

Annexation Process – Follow-up – Mike Crawford stated that the voluntary annexation referendum passed on November 7th and that the next step involves the administration of the ordinance. He stated that there have been approximately 37 annexations received to date and that the review conducted is intended to be efficient. Staff completes a quick check of the annexation to make sure it’s within the local government’s Annexation Planning Area, is contiguous to existing city boundaries, is compact, and does not create any enclaves. (Mr. Crawford also mentioned as a follow-up to the annexation process, that maps are being printed to distribute to the PAC showing their respective Annexation Planning Areas.) If there is a problem with the proposed annexation not meeting the criteria, the Planning Council has 15 days to notify the community. Mr. Crawford then reviewed some of the questions that have been posed during the first few weeks of administering the ordinance.

The first question was, what is the effective date of the ordinance? Mr. Crawford was advised by Jewel Cole, Assistant County Attorney, that November 7th was the effective date. Any petitions for voluntary annexations received after this date are subject to the procedures of the ordinance. Completed petitions for annexation received or acted on by local government prior to this date are not governed by this process, but by Chapter 171, F.S.

The second question was, what qualifies as a petition to voluntarily annex? Mr. Crawford stated that a valid petition for voluntary annexation must include parcels that are deemed compact, contiguous, and do not create an enclave. Until a local government determines that the petition meets these criteria they need not send the proposed annexation to the Council.

The third question was, what will be relied upon by Council staff to describe the area intended to be annexed? The most inclusive of the legal description or map submitted by local government will be used to determine what is intended to be annexed. It was stated that if the legal description changed when an ordinance was later developed by the local government that this would need to be reviewed by the PPC against the criteria in the ordinance.

The fourth question was, which entities must be notified by the municipality of the petition to voluntarily annex? Mr. Crawford stated that within 5 days of receipt of a petition, the annexing municipality should notify the County, Council, and all parties affected. "Parties affected" are defined in the ordinance as governmental entities having jurisdiction over services or land. The PPC staff has developed a list of parties affected, which is attached to the staff report. Mr. Crawford suggests that parties affected be those whose millage rate or service would have the potential to be impacted by the annexation.

The fifth question is, who within the entity (party affected) should be notified? Mr. Crawford stated that notification to the County should be sent through the County Administrator's Office. In addition, it was suggested that annexations into areas served by Pinellas County Utilities, as an example, be sent to the County Administrator's Office also. Gordon Beardslee, the County's PAC representative agreed with this. Mr. Crawford also suggested that notification be sent to the head administrator or official in charge of the affected service. For example, if Oldsmar were to annex into Safety Harbor's Fire District, the Chief of the Fire Department would be notified. Mr. Crawford asked if there were any additions or suggestions to any of the procedures, or if there was anything that was misinterpreted. The committee responded by stating everything was straightforward and that they had no issues with what was presented by staff.

Larry Pflueger pointed out that Seminole should be added to the chart.

Gordon Beardslee requested that the cities continue to send their final ordinances to the County.

Case #CW00-52: - City of Treasure Island – This .36 acre parcel is located on the north side of 117th Avenue, 80 feet east of 1st Street East. The proposed amendment is from Recreation/Open Space to Resort Facilities Medium. Mark Ely presented an overview of the staff report recommending the proposed amendment to Resort Facilities Medium be approved pursuant to the Official Acceptance Process. PAC indicated they would not vote on subthreshold amendments unless there was an issue to be brought to the attention of the Council.

Case #CW00-49: - City of Largo – This 1.08 acre parcel is located on the south side of Haines Bayshore Road, 180 feet east of US Highway 19. The proposed amendment is from Residential Low; Transportation/Utility to Commercial General; Transportation/Utility Overlay. Mark Ely presented an overview of the staff report recommending the proposed amendment to Commercial General and Transportation/Utility Overlay be approved. Larry Pflueger added that the stretch of easement is scheduled for installation for the Pinellas Trail. Mr. Pflueger wanted to know what kind of possible impact this amendment would have on the installation of the trail. Gordon Beardslee stated that someone in his office has been working on this issue, but he has not had a chance to talk with them. Mr. Ely mentioned that he confirmed that this is an easement and not a right-of-way. Tom Shevlin questioned if this was a non-conforming use. Mr. Ely stated the approval of this amendment would ratify the non-conformity by putting the Utility Overlay on top of Commercial General, and it would ratify a portion of the existing sales and storage business. Mr. Ely stated the commercial business is non-conforming by virtue of the back portion of Residential Low and that the Transportation Utility sits on top of 1/3 of the property which would make it conforming. Rick MacAualy moved approval of the staff recommendation. The motion was seconded by Nick Staszko and approved. (Vote 7-0)

Case #CW00-50: - City of Clearwater – This 4.90 acre parcel is located on the west side of McMullen-Booth Road, 445 feet south of Drew Street, and is part of the Calvary Baptist Church property. The proposed amendment is from Recreation/Open Space to Institutional. Mark Ely presented an overview of the staff report recommending the proposed amendment to Institutional be approved, subject to and in reliance on the integration of the representations and recommendations in the traffic management study into the final site plan or like approval process within the City. The staff also recommends that the City give special consideration to the improvement of the site in relation to the proposed designation of this portion of McMullen-Booth Road as a Residential Subclassification of the Scenic/Non-Commercial Corridor consistent with the

buffering and landscaping guidelines of the Scenic/Non-Commercial Master Plan to the extent that may be required.

Mr. Ely stated that the traffic study has been modified to include at time of site plan that they will add a left turn stacking lane in front of one of the proposed entrances across from the E.C. Moore Park property. Mike Crawford stated that there currently is no designated right turn lane from southbound McMullen Booth to Drew Street. Mr. Crawford stated that the PPC wanted to know if the MPO had a desire to construct a right turn lane. He emphasized that this is not required as part of the development, and he will follow up with MPO by letter.

Gordon Beardslee mentioned that the County staff recommendation to the CPA for case #CW00-42, is not pro or con, but asking them to think through whether or not the traffic management plan will adequately address the traffic concerns. Mr. Beardslee stated that the County staff's main concern is that they didn't want anyone coming back later stating that they would have to make expensive improvements to the intersection because people can not get in and out of the church.

Tom Shevlin wanted to know if the church would pick up access to Cleveland Street. Mr. Ely stated that Cleveland Street does not go through.

Nick Staszko moved approval of the staff recommendation. The motion was seconded by James Miller and approved. (Vote 7-0)

Case #CW00-51: - City of Clearwater – This .56 acre parcel is located on the southeast corner of McMullen-Booth Road and Bay Lane. The proposed amendment is from Recreation Urban to Residential/Office Limited. Mark Ely presented an overview of the staff report recommending the proposed amendment to Residential/Office Limited be approved; and in accordance with Section 4.2.7.1.3 B of the Countywide Rules, an exception be granted to permit the residential subclassification of this portion of the corridor to remain so classified. Separately and in addition, staff recommends that the City give special consideration to the improvement of the site in relation to the designation of this portion of McMullen-Booth Road as a residential subclassification of the Scenic/Non-Commercial Corridor consistent with the buffering and landscaping guidelines of the Scenic/Non-Commercial Master Plan.

Tom Shevlin questioned if this was a recent annexation. Mr. Ely responded by saying it was. Mr. Shevlin also pointed out his concerns for setting a precedent for this type of case with respect to many similar situations existing throughout the entire county. Gordon Beardslee stated he could only support this if he could be assured it would not set a precedent for other residential areas. Mr. Ely stated that the staff had similar concerns.

Larry Pflueger wanted to know the problem with it being on a major road. Mr. Ely stated that the property owner must exit out on McMullen Booth Road as opposed to turning on an internal street. Mr. Pflueger also asked why the logic applied to this case could not be applied to many other arterial roadways which have similar residential lot frontages. Rick MacAulay wanted to know if anyone had seen the minutes from the City of Clearwater public hearing which would allow anyone within 200 feet of this property to make comments. Mr. Ely indicated that he was unaware of any complaints from neighboring property owners.

Mike Nadeau moved approval of the staff recommendation. Nick Staszko seconded the motion. (Vote 0-7) The motion failed and therefore the amendment was denied.

Case #CW00-46(4): - City of Madeira Beach – This .12 acre parcel is located on the south side of 144th Avenue, 150 feet east of Gulf Boulevard. The proposed amendment is from Residential/Office/Retail to Residential Medium. Mark Ely presented an overview of the staff report recommending the proposed amendment to Residential Medium be approved. Mr. Ely also mentioned that because of an error in advertising in November this consistency amendment had to be readvertised and brought back to the Council. Nick Staszko moved to approve the proposed amendment. The motion was seconded by Rick MacAulay and approved. (Vote 7-0)

PAC Membership Roster for 2001 – Received. Jeff Dow requested a change to Robert Ironsmith's title to Economic Development Director. Rick MacAulay announced that Dave Goodwin was promoted to Assistant Director Development Services Department.

Other PAC Business – Mike Crawford announced that a group photo would be taken at the close of this meeting for the annual report.

Larry Pflueger mentioned that PPC staff subscribes to the publication, The REG Files. It gives the new changes that are in the DCA rules. Nick Staszko asked if this information was available on the PPC website. Mr. Pflueger stated that it is not available as of now, but he will get with Linda Fisher to see if this is possible. Mr. Pflueger also mentioned that there might be copyright problems prohibiting posting on the website. Mr. Pflueger offered to xerox copies if anyone was interested. Mr. Pflueger added that the Department of State has enhanced their website to now include the Florida Administrative Code as well as the Florida Administrative Weekly.

A. November CPA Actions – Received.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

David P. Healey, Executive Director