

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING  
SPECIAL MEETING  
MONDAY, JANUARY 28, 2002  
BANK OF AMERICA BUILDING  
600 CLEVELAND STREET, SUITE 850, EIGHTH FLOOR  
CLEARWATER, FLORIDA**

---

Members Present:

Gina Clayton	City of Clearwater
Jeff Dow	City of Dunedin
Susanne Hicks	City of Gulfport
Katherine Burbridge	City of Indian Rocks Beach
Nick Staszko	City of Oldsmar
Tom Shevlin	City of Pinellas Park
Walter Fufidio	City of Tarpon Springs
Dave Goodwin	City of St. Petersburg
Gordon Beardslee	Pinellas County

Also Present:

David Healey	Pinellas Planning Council
Kristin Boesch	Pinellas Planning Council
Mike Crawford	Pinellas Planning Council
Linda Fisher	Pinellas Planning Council
Alisa Hartsfield	Pinellas Planning Council
Larry Pflueger	Pinellas Planning Council

The special meeting of PAC was called to order at 1:43 p.m. by Larry Pflueger.

Countywide Plan Follow-Up Discussion – Larry Pflueger opened the meeting by requesting comments to the responses from the three jurisdictions that submitted their comments in writing, regarding the draft document.

Jeff Dow questioned if the word “require” in “The Established Development Pattern” Strategy 2.1.3. would be appropriate. Larry Pflueger stated that staff’s position is not to force a jurisdiction to have these requirements, but they are necessary and beneficial components of higher-density developments and therefore *should* be required.

Gina Clayton expressed concerns of consistency between the Countywide Plan and local plans regarding the strategies. Larry Pflueger responded by stating that at the January 20<sup>th</sup> PPC meeting the pros and cons of including strategies in the plan were discussed and the Council directed staff to include them.

Ms. Clayton questioned if this document would be used for reviewing plan amendments. Mr. Pflueger responded by stating that appropriate amendment of the Rules would be considered to reflect the strategies and position statements.

David Healey added that if there is an amendment to a jurisdiction plan or code that would relate to some of these policies, staff would make appropriate comments when reviewing the proposed amendment. Mr. Pflueger reiterated that the countywide plan is a tool for local jurisdictions to use.

A discussion ensued regarding the process of reviewing amendments to the comprehensive plan.

Gordon Beardslee expressed his opinion on the use of strategies. He stated that in some cases strategies are counterproductive. Mr. Beardslee added that a good mechanism for using strategies is to develop a task force. In conclusion, he felt that strategies should be removed from the document.

David Healey stated that the bottom line is that there needs to be a current, relevant plan that provides meaningful direction.

Dave Goodwin asked if the purpose or the intent of the plan has been clearly identified. Larry Pflueger stated that this information could be located in the Introduction of the document. David Healey added that on page 5 of the document it defines what issues, position statements, and strategies are.

After observing much hesitation, Larry Pflueger asked PAC what their major concerns were and what their thoughts were with regard to the plan document. Several members responded by stating that they believed the Countywide Plan would require adoption of policies and regulations local jurisdictions would not approve of. Mr. Pflueger pointed out that there is a member from each jurisdiction on the Council that is directing PPC staff to go forward with the plan. Gordon Beardslee stated that it might be helpful if each board could receive separate reports from their staff and the PPC. Walter Fufidio noted that the intent and purpose of the plan is clearly stated in the introduction. David Healey added that from the Council's point of view, without the strategies, the plan would be very general.

A brief discussion continued regarding the use of strategies.

Nick Staszko, referring to a potential land use amendment, expressed his concern with mass transit service or the lack thereof, being used as criteria for approval or disapproval. He had a particular concern that the lack of mass transit would be used as a reason to recommend disapproval when a city has no responsibility for providing mass transit. Mr.

Pflueger stated that issues over which local governments have no control will not be used against them.

Dave Goodwin requested that the plan text be modified to include more explanation regarding how the plan would be implemented.

Walter Fufidio wanted to know if the strategies are local options or will become a permanent rule. David Healey responded that countywide plan is used in two ways: 1) to guide the future of the county as a whole and 2) for each jurisdiction to use as determined to be appropriate.

Gina Clayton questioned how often the countywide plan is used when reviewing land use amendments. Mr. Healey responded that PPC staff reviews every amendment in accord with the countywide plan policies to look for supporting information.

Mr. Healey stated that the language in the Introduction will be changed to clarify the utilization of strategies.

After a lengthy discussion of the meaning of industrial land, Larry Pflueger suggested adding a glossary to define the meaning of the terms being used.

Walter Fufidio expressed his opinion on some of the wording in Theme 3, Issue 2. In regards to this theme, he suggested to delete position statement 2.1.2, because it was too specific. David Healey suggested rewording the statement instead of eliminating it. He gave the following suggestion “Correlating the land development regulations that govern building height to better relate to density and pedestrian scale.”

In conclusion, the PAC reached consensus that a more expansive explanation of how the plan was to be used should be included in the Introduction as well as the future adoption instrument. Additionally, the definition of “strategy” should be amended to clarify its meaning for the PPC and local jurisdictions. Larry Pflueger thanked the PAC for their comments and suggestions and stated that required changes will be brought back to PAC for review.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

David P. Healey, Executive Director