



City of Anna Maria

P.O. Box 779 10005 Gulf Drive
Anna Maria, FL 34216-0779
(941) 708-6130 Fax (941) 708-6134
SUNCOM: 516-6740

**MINUTES
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD MEETING
CITY OF ANNA MARIA COMMISSION CHAMBERS
TUESDAY, MARCH 8, 2016 - 4:00 P.M.**

Pledge of Conduct: We may disagree, but we will be respectful of one another. We will direct all comments to the issues. We will avoid personal attacks.

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Crane called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

Introduction of New City Planner

Chair Crane introduced new City Planner Bruce McLaughlin. Planner McLaughlin provided the Board with his background.

ROLL CALL

Present: Boardmember Margaret Jenkins, Boardmember Carl Pearman, Boardmember Jim Conoly, Boardmember David Youngs, and Chair Jonathan Crane.

Also Present: Building & Planning Administration Char Patterson, City Planner Alan Garrett, and City Planner Bruce McLaughlin.

PUBLIC COMMENT – None.

OLD BUSINESS

1. Future Land Use Element of the City of Anna Maria's Comprehensive Plan

Planner Garrett noted the Board had been provided with the Future Land Use Element, and the changes agreed upon at the last meeting. He noted he would be still be employed with Anna Maria for the next two weeks.

Chair Crane recommended the Board review the entire Comprehensive Plan then discuss any changes at a later date.

Boardmember Youngs noted missing from the items discussed at the last meeting was the idea of adding "installation of high speed internet infrastructure" into the Comp Plan. He suggested language be added under the Future Land Use Element. Boardmember Youngs noted there are grants for small Cities to build high-speed infrastructures if there is something in the Comp Plan. He presented the Board with proposed sample language.

Chair Crane questioned if the Future Land Use Element was the appropriate location for said language.

Planner Garrett suggested it be placed in the Infrastructure Element of the Comp Plan.

Discussion followed regarding whether to continue discussion of the changes proposed for the Future Land Use Element – or to go back over all goals, objectives, and polices later.

Chair Crane pointed out the City is required to review its Comp Plan every five years – which is coming up the end of 2017. He preferred presenting the Commission with all recommendations - versus providing summaries along the way. Chair Crane has summarized the Comp Plan language changes and had redlined

proposed changes for the Board’s review. He had hoped the Board would have additional Workshops to review the Comp Plan. However, at the last P&Z Board meeting, the Board voted to address Comp Plan changes during their monthly meetings. It was noted that to date, the P&Z Board had reviewed the Comp Plan through page 12 of the Future Land Use Element. Comp Plan review continued as follows:

FUTURE LAND USE ELEMENT
GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND POLICIES

GOAL 3

Objective 3.1

- Policy 3.1.1: It was questioned whether or not the City subsidizes development. *Chair Crane* did not like the idea of subsidizing private property owners anywhere in the City.

After discussion, it was agreed Policy 3.1.1 would be removed.

FUTURE LAND USE MAP

- C. Local Use Categories

Chair Crane referred to the first paragraph “Although located on a barrier island, the City of Anna Maria has been able to avoid the development of a strong tourist attraction. Those individuals that are drawn to the City are either “day-trippers” from adjacent communities or counties or seasonal visitors. As a result, the City has become a predominantly single family detached residential community with limited commercial development.”

Chair Crane pointed out since the Tourist Development Council (TDC) began advertising the Island internationally for the past several years, the above statement in the Comp Plan is no longer true. It was noted the City Pier is the #1 tourist attraction, and since the Comp Plan was written in 2007, Anna Maria has become more of a tourist attraction - versus only attracting day-trippers and seasonal visitors.

It was agreed the first paragraph should be deleted in its entirety. No additional changes were recommended under the Future Land Use Map section of the Comp Plan.

- It was then agreed to review all redlined recommendations under FUTURE LAND USE GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND POLICIES where question marks were placed at the last meeting.

FUTURE LAND USE ELEMENT
GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND POLICIES

C. Local Goals, Objectives, and Policies

- Policy 1.1.2 - Seventh Bullet: After discussion, it was agreed no changes would be made.
- Policy 1.3.9: Recreation/Open Space Land Use Category

Chair Crane recommended the following additional language as it would relate to obtaining grants, development, etc.:

Where feasible, public and/or private development of open space shall accommodate the needs of bicyclists, pedestrians, self-propelled watercraft and handicapped access.

Planner Garrett recommended adding “Where feasible “and required by State and Federal law” ... Explanation followed.

Consensus to add suggested language.

➤ **Policy 1.5.1:**

Chair Crane recommended adding the following language:

“Areas located outside the Conservation Land Use areas, but which also contain environmentally sensitive conditions shall also undergo strict scrutiny in review of building permit applications and such applications may be rejected upon findings of unmitigated harm to soil, air, water, flora or fauna.”

Planner Garrett stated he felt comfortable the language as currently written would cover Policy 1.5.1. The City had worked hard to make sure both the Conservation Land and Preservation Land had been designated to cover all dune systems and environmental areas of the City. He pointed out an Environmental Impact Study is required in the Conservation Area whenever there is any development. Discussion and examples continued.

City Planner McLaughlin felt adding the new language to Policy 1.5.1 would provide additional support in enforcing that type of legislation. Discussion continued.

Consensus to add suggested language.

➤ **Motion: Move to approve the Future Land Uses Element as revised.**

Action: Approved. Moved by Boardmember David Youngs, Seconded by Boardmember Jim Conoly. Motion carried – All Aye.

NEW BUSINESS

2. Traffic Circulation Element of the City of Anna Maria’s Comprehensive Plan

**TRAFFIC CIRCULATION ELEMENT
GOALS, OBJECTIVES, POLICIES**

➤ **A. Introduction**

Chair Crane questioned the wording of the last sentence of the Introduction: “All Goals, Objectives, Policies are adopted by ordinance.” *Chair Crane* noted that phrase was not added to most of the elements and asked if it was something required by the Traffic Statutes. He suggested either striking it from the Traffic Circulation Element, or adding it to all introductory clauses in the Comp Plan.

Planner Garrett informed all Goals, Objectives, and Policies, as part of a Comprehensive Plan, are adopted by Ordinance. He was not sure, however, why it was referenced in the Traffic Circulation Element Introduction statement.

Consensus to strike reference to “All Goals, Objectives, Policies are adopted by ordinance” from all areas it is referenced in the Introduction clauses of the Comp Plan.

➤ **B. Nonapplicable Items:**

Chair Crane recommended and explained his reasoning for suggesting additional language under B. Nonapplicable Items.

Boardmember Youngs noted when the original Parking Plan was proposed for Anna Maria, one of the issues was to eliminate the parking in the right-of-way – which he believes is a problem in the neighborhoods since there’s nowhere else for visitors to park.

Chair Crane responded feeling someday the City may want to repurpose the right-of-way - and with the language added in the Comp Plan, would then have the authority to do so. Discussion followed relating to the Bike Path currently being proposed for the Island and Anna Maria. *Chair Crane* pointed out there was discussion that a portion of the Bike Path will travel through Bayfront Park.

Consensus to add the following bulleted item:

- *“Future ROW’S Repurposing – Notwithstanding the foregoing, the City is specifically authorized to repurpose existing Rights of Way as necessary to accomplish the Goals, Objectives and Policies set forth herein.”*

➤ Policy 1.1.1:

Boardmember Youngs stated other communities in Florida where he’s lived has a large amount of construction. As a result, the large trucks can damage the roads – yet there’s no penalty for them to pay for the costs of road deterioration. He suggested adding the following wording: “The City shall ~~continue the~~ develop an annual program of paving and maintenance of the City roadway system.”

Boardmember Jenkins suggested adding language that requires the contractors should have to pay for repairs. Property owners should have to pay their share of damages in conjunction with their new construction.

Boardmember Conoly also referred to the large delivery trucks, noting there are many streets too narrow for them to travel down. As a result, they will utilize the same routes over and over. He agreed it would require a pavement plan, along with enforcement of the plan.

After discussion, there was a consensus for no change to Policy 1.1.1. It was felt the concerns will be covered by the recommended changes in Policy 1.1.3.

➤ Policy 1.1.3:

Consensus for the Policy to read as follows:

“The City shall assess new development or redevelopment an equitable pro rata share of the costs to provide roadway maintenance and improvements to serve the development or redevelopment up to 100% of the cost.”

Chair Crane felt the TDC has shouldered a lot of the responsibility for the additional traffic on the streets, yet does not give the City back any of the bed tax money unless it specifically addresses additional tourism.

➤ Policy 1.2.3.

Chair Crane explained his reasoning for suggesting new Policy 1.2.3. After discussion, it was agreed the following Policy 1.2.3 be added:

“Policy 1.2.3 – Trees, shrubs and other ¹plants plants as well as non-organic materials placed in the right-of-way restriction and encroaching thereon may be removed by the City with the cost of said removal to be borne by the homeowner. Likewise unauthorized “no-Parking” signs may be removed at homeowner expense.”

➤ Policy 1.3.3

There was consensus Policy 1.3.3 be changed to read as follows:

“Bicycle storage parking areas at shopping and recreational areas shall be established.”

➤ **Motion: Move to approve the Traffic Circulation Element as revised.**

Action: Approved. Moved by Boardmember David Youngs, Seconded by Boardmember Margaret Jenkins.

Motion carried – All Aye.

¹ Correction made by P&Z Board at 4-12-16 meeting.

3. Discussion of proposed Ordinance 16-812 and future Public Hearing date

Planner Garrett informed Ordinance 16-812 was not advertised for Public Hearing that evening. It has, however, been advertised for Public Hearing on Tuesday, March 15, 2016, 4:00 p.m.

Discussion continued. It was determined there would be a quorum for the March 15 Public Hearing.

Boardmember Youngs commented that residents can have as many people in their home as they want – but rental properties cannot. He felt the law states the City was not supposed to differentiate between residential and rentals.

Planner Garrett said he did not know if that was the case – only that the City cannot address the frequency or duration of vacation rentals. He noted other communities with vacation rentals in Florida have regulated the maximum occupancy.

4. Future topics – No discussion.

ADJOURNMENT

On motion made by Boardmember Margaret Jenkins and Seconded by Boardmember Jim Conoly, the meeting was adjourned at 5:50 p.m. Motion carried – All Aye.



Diana L. Percycoe, CMC, City Clerk

Minutes approved: April 12, 2016