

**CITY OF ANNA MARIA
CITY COMMISSION/PLANNING & ZONING BOARD WORKSESSION
MEETING HELD AT ANNA MARIA COUNCIL CHAMBERS
10005 GULF DRIVE – ANNA MARIA, FL
THURSDAY, JANUARY 14, 2010
6:00 P.M.**

CALL TO ORDER

City Commission Chair John Quam called the Work Session to order at 6:00 p.m.

PLEDGE TO THE FLAG

ROLL CALL:

City Commission Present: Mayor Fran Barford, Commissioner Jo Ann Mattick, Vice-Chair Dale Woodland, Chair John Quam, Commissioner Chuck Webb, and Commissioner Harry Stoltzfus.

P&Z Board Present: Boardmembers Margaret Jenkins (6:40 p.m.), Sandra Mattick, Mike Yetter, Vice-Chair Frank Pytel, Randall Stover, Jim Conoly, and Bob Barlow.

Staff Present: Building Department Administrative Assistant Diane Sacca, Administrative Assistant Ann Marie Thorpe, City Attorney Jim Dye, Building Official Bob Welch, City Planner Alan Garrett, and Minutes Clerk Stacey Johnston.

Press: Sun and Islander.

Pledge of Conduct: Read by Chair Quam.

1. Review of Site Plan Procedures – Sec. 74-350/358.

Chair Quam stated that the most recent Ordinance was amended July 2007. All members were asked to refer to the suggestions drafted by Building Official Welch. Each line would be reviewed by the City Commission and P&Z Board for any recommended changes. The draft was reviewed and changes were suggested as follows:

- Line 5 - Add “be” – planning shall “be” of such character....
- Lines 30 to 32 – Discussed the need to add a definition of “residential”. *Building Official Welch* had suggested that “structure” be changed to “commercial” as a clarification (ref Comment BW2). However, after discussion it was agreed that the current code language would not be changed.
- Line 45 – *Planning and zoning board approval.*
Chair Quam said that during his recent campaigning he heard numerous concerns questioning why the City Commission was not involved in all Site Plan processes. He asked the boardmembers to consider if the City Commission should be involved, and if so - how.

P&Z Boardmember Pytel said he had a real concern regarding the P&Z process. He stated that the P&Z Board was an advisory board only and felt that the Site Plan process should be re-evaluated.

Boardmember Pytel pointed out that the P&Z Board was a non-elected board and that the citizens could not remove a P&Z Boardmember. If a Site Plan was denied, an applicant had the opportunity to present the denial to the City Commission for their consideration. However, if a Site Plan was approved and a neighbor was opposed to the approval, their only method would be to proceed through the court system. He stated that staff first evaluates and determines if a Site Plan is consistent with all requirements. He felt the P&Z Board should only review the Site Plan as an advisory board and then forward their recommendations to the City Commission for their final approval.

Commissioner Woodland agreed with Boardmember Pytel. He discussed why the change was originally made – cost savings and time element for all parties - that gave the P&Z Board authority to approve the Site Plans.

Commissioner Woodland suggested that ways to reduce the cost and time element be determined.

P&Z Boardmember Mattick disagreed feeling that the current method is working well. She did not feel that the City Commission would have made any different decisions than the P&Z Board had made. She pointed out that the City staff advised the P&Z Board on the compliance requirements. She was also concerned about the extra cost it would be for the applicant.

Boardmember Mattick noted that the City Commission had passed an Ordinance that authorizes the P&Z Board to be the final authority and if the P&Z Board had concerns they did have the ability to forward it on to the City Commission. She asked for an example of any case that was approved by the P&Z Board that the City Commission objected to.

Commissioner Mattick stated that the LDR's need to be clear so all parties would know what to expect and what procedures to follow. She felt if the City Commission were to be the final authority on all Site Plans, then it would be best for them to go directly to the City Commission and that there would be no need to go before the P&Z Board at all.

Commissioner Stoltzfus also heard citizen concerns during his campaigning about the City Commission not approving all Site Plans. There were also concerns that some of the Site Plan approvals had gone through too quickly.

P&Z Boardmember Barlow commented that both the P&Z and the City Commission followed the same Comp Plan and same set of LDR's. He stated that the Ordinance adopted in 2007 took approximately two to three years of review. It was then adopted unanimously by the City Commission. He suggested that improvements be made regarding any terminology for clarification purposes, but he would not be supportive of any major changes to the Ordinance due to the City's current cost constraints.

Chair Quam said the City Commission currently has no say in the approval of Site Plans and felt that the residents would feel more comfortable with the City Commission making the final decisions.

P&Z Boardmember Stover questioned what the role of the P&Z Board was. He said if the P&Z Board was not going to thoroughly evaluate the Site Plans, then why have a P&Z Board at all.

Chair Quam responded that the P&Z Board serves as a recommending board for all land use issues that must go through the P&Z Board process and then final action is taken by the City Commission.

P&Z Boardmember Pytel said code language was subject to interpretation. The citizens were unhappy that the City Commission did not have the final authority and they were not able to remove a P&Z Boardmember. Therefore, he felt final action should be taken by the City Commission.

Commissioner Mattick responded that it should not be an objective decision. She said she had total confidence in the P&Z Board.

Commissioner Webb discussed the three levels of review as stated in the current code language. He proposed that the City Commission review those Site Plans that would have a major impact on the community. Scoping would be needed. He suggested that the language relating to the Administrative review not be changed. Language could be added relating to those Site Plans that the P&Z Board had the authority to approve – and that the City Commission could request that any project be pulled up and reviewed by the City Commission. The City Commission would, however, have final authority to approve all Site Plans having a major impact.

Boardmember Conoly asked that if any votes were taken that evening, that the record specifies how each Boardmember votes.

Discussion followed as how major impact projects would be determined. *Commissioner Stoltzfus* suggested that any project in the ROR require City Commission review.

Commissioner Webb provided examples of why he disagreed. He noted that it was very costly for an applicant to go through a Site Plan process.

Planner Garrett informed that the majority of Site Plan reviews fell under the third development category – “Any change of use of a lot or parcel or intensity of use of a structure of land or alteration of a structure, which change or alteration requiring a permit that will affect the characteristics of a lot or parcel in terms of:

- a. The addition of five or more parking spaces;
- b. The addition of a loading space;
- c. Access, an increase in post-development drainage; or
- d. Buffering or utilities.

It was noted that the 305 Pine Ave Site Plan fell under the above category.

Building Official Welch explained that the 305 Pine Ave Site Plan was brought before the P&Z Board as a temporary Site Plan in order to make changes. After final completion, it will be brought back to the P&Z Board for final action.

P&Z Boardmember Mattick pointed out that if the City Commission were to be the final authority for the third development categories, they would be taking final action of all of the Site Plans. She felt that some were trying to prohibit any new construction on Pine Ave. She reminded that all P&Z Board votes had been mostly all unanimous and to her knowledge the City Commission had no issue about the votes that the P&Z Board had taken.

Commissioner Woodland said he could see the City Commission taking back the role of approving all Site Plans and noted that the Site Plan review process was a very important function of the City. He stated that many residents felt that the City Commission should be involved and many expressed opinions that the P&Z should not be involved. Commissioner Woodland felt that a second set of eyes reviewing the projects would be best for making a better decision. He reiterated the need to review the time and cost factors.

Chair Quam noted that the Site Plan fee was \$3,000 and felt that fee should cover both the P&Z Board and City Commission reviews.

Planner Garrett suggested that in order to reduce costs for the applicant, only one advertising is required that would include the meeting notices for both the P&Z Board and City Commission hearings.

Chair Quam then took a straw vote on the following:

Should the P&Z Board be authorized to be the final authority on Site Plans?

P&Z Board –

Yetter, Mattick, Barlow – Yes

Stover, Pytel, Conoly – No

Should the City Commission approve all Site Plans?

City Commission –

Stoltzfus, Quam, Woodland, Webb – Yes

Mattick – No

It was agreed that the issue would be discussed at a later date. A decision will be made as to whether or not some Site Plans would be considered at the City Commission level and if a scope would be established of those Site Plans that would be approved at the P&Z Board level.

- Line 60 – add “not” – or “not” exempt from site plan approval.
- Line 67 – No change.
- Line 81 – Sec. 74-354. Site Plan application process. *Building Official Welch* informed that often the applicant requests more than one conference with staff. The Commission may wish to consider a fee for the additional conferences as the applicant has not yet paid the application fees that cover the cost of the Planners services.

Boardmember Conoly asked if an applicant was required to make an appointment with staff.

Building Official Welch explained that staff must be user friendly. He suggested, however, that an applicant contact the City if wanting to meet with staff to ensure staff availability.

- Line 93 – *Building Official Welch* suggested that a definition of survey should be included in Chapter 70.
- Line 96 – No change.
- Line 106 – Change as indicated on Comment [BW13].
- Line 109 – Change as indicated on Comment [BW14].
- Line 119 & 120 – It was pointed out that calculations and percentages were needed.
--Line 119 – Change to: c. Calculations of building lot coverage.
--Line 120 – Change to: d. Calculations of total impervious surfaces.
- Lines 121 to 130 – *Commissioner Stoltzfus* said he had reviewed the list of items that are to be shown on the Site Plan and felt that driveways should be included.

Building Official Welch referred to Line 137 (9) Off-street parking and loading layout including size and number of spaces; provision for pedestrian access including handicap accessibility, bicycle parking location and design and location of outdoor and exterior seating and exterior lighting facilities.

P&Z Boardmember Mattick suggested that “driveways” be replaced with “accessways”.

Building Official Welch explained that the P&Z, at their October 6, 2009 work session, had begun reviewing revisions to Section 90. That was review was not yet completed.

Building Official Welch further agreed with the comments made by *P&Z Boardmember Stover* relating to Line 121 & 127. He agreed that it would allow to more quickly proceed through the process.

- Line 126 – Change to:
j. Number of seats in a restaurant “including both indoor and outdoor”.
- Line 152 – *Building Official Welch* pointed out that the City had recently adopted a Landscaping Ordinance and that it should now be referred to. The language will be changed as indicated on Comment [BW18].
- Line 153 – After discussion, it was agreed that the language be changed as follows:
(17) Location of trash disposal.
It was noted that any standards will be referenced in another section of the Code.
- Line 159 – In response to *Commissioner Stoltzfus*, *Building Official Welch* and *Planner Garrett* discussed the compliance and completion review process.
- Line 178 – *City Attorney Dye* suggested that it may be a benefit to the City that the applicant notifies the City in writing. After discussion, it was agreed that the language be changed as follows:
(6) This process continues until the application is deemed complete. If an applicant decides it has submitted all required information, the applicant “should notify the city in writing if they” choose to proceed with the review, or it may choose to withdraw its application.

Building Official Welch informed that the \$3,000 Site Plan review fee has been sufficient.

- Line 207 -209 – Add “be” –
Notice and procedures shall be given in accordance with section 114-76 except that mailed notice shall “be” given to all property owners within 500 feet of the subject property, not 350 feet.

Planner Garrett reminded that the City previously required the applicant mail notices by Certified Mail/Return Receipt Requested. That requirement has since been changed to only require a Certificate of Mailing.

- Line 205 - *Commissioner Stoltzfus* suggested that “Upon acceptance of the Site Plan” be added. Explanation of the process followed by *Planner Garrett* and *City Attorney Dye*.
- Line 211 – (2) The purpose of the hearing is to review the preliminary site plan application and the written analysis.

Planner Garrett informed that some jurisdictions do not want a recommendation. It was noted that Line 179 also addresses written analysis language. City Planner clarified.

- Line 226 – 255 - *Commissioner Stoltzfus* said he flowcharted the procedure and it did not make sense.

Building Official Welch felt there was a possible Municode Scribner error and he would review the language and rework it for clarification.

The following language was suggested:

- (1) Upon completion of the “staff” written analysis, the city shall schedule a public hearing on the application before the planning and zoning board for the next available hearing date. Site plan approvals by the city commission shall “first” be subject to a review by the planning and zoning board.
- Line 242 – Change “it” to “its”.
- Line 255 – “form of a written order”.

City Attorney Dye informed that several different "form of written orders" had been used over the years. He suggested that a written order be defined and felt that a Resolution served as the best written order and tracking mechanism.

- Line 264 – *Commissioner Mattick* asked if "architecture" should be removed since there was no Architectural Review Board.

Commissioner Webb pointed out there was no architectural standards in the Code. He suggested that a different term be used or that architecture be defined.

- Discussion followed relating to the Site Plan application. *Commissioner Woodland* felt it would be helpful to know what Ordinance was relative to each section. He suggested that the site, chapter, and verse (as recommended by *City Attorney Dye*) be included in the written analysis.

Planner Garrett informed that the City was currently providing that information.

Commissioner Stoltzfus felt it would be more streamlined and simpler for the applicant if there was a check-off list for Site Plans.

Building Official Welch further suggested there be a review at each level – administrative, Planning & Zoning, and City Commission. The check-off review list would then be attached to the completed application. Discussion followed.

- Lines 277, 278, 282, & 283 – *Commissioner Stoltzfus* felt the Code language on these lines would be the focus of discussion at the next several meetings. He made reference to the safety issues on Pine Avenue and the driveway ingress and egress issues. He stated that the language in these sections were different than that in Chapter 90.

Discussion followed relating to the standard process language versus the procedural ordinance and Chapter 90.

- Line 349 – Change "on" to "of" – site plan is valid, the final site plan shall expire and be "of" no further effect.
- Lines 377 through 417 – *Planner Garrett* recommended that Sec. 74-357 and Sec. 74-358 be deleted. All Boardmembers agreed.
- *Boardmember Mattick* made reference to the one-way e-mails sent by Commissioner Stoltzfus. She stated that she would like to see the one-way communications stopped prior to discussion by the boards.

Public Comment

Attorney Jeremy Anderson addressed the boardmembers:

- Stated that his clients were supportive of having the City Commission approve the Site Plans.
- Recommended that the P&Z Board have legal counsel in attendance at all Public Hearings. He pointed out that the City Commission has the assistance of legal counsel at each of their meetings.
- Suggested that examples of other jurisdiction's Code language relating to the Site Plan review be obtained and referenced.
- Explained that his firm recently litigated a case against the City of Venice. He suggested that the Anna Maria staff not advocate for or against an application.
- Suggested cost savings is pursued in regard to the City Planner and City Attorney fees.

Mike Selby, 812 N. Shore Dr., made reference to the recent P&Z Board appointment recommended by the Mayor. He felt that the City Commission should oversee these type recommendations rather than "making the Mayor so powerful."

Tom Aposporos said he was not sure that all decisions should be approved by the City Commission – that doing so could become very political. He was intrigued by the level of Site Plan approval as suggested earlier by Commissioner Webb.

Mr. Aposporos stated that numerous jurisdictions are facing the same issue of whether or not the P&Z Board should approve Site Plans. Many of the jurisdictions like the P&Z Board making the decisions. He pointed out that the City Commissioners and Mayor have the opportunity to go before the P&Z Board to make their arguments for or against a case. Mr. Aposporos suggested that more thought be given on the issue.

Cathy Stoltzfus, 411 Poinsettia, stated that the City Commission was elected by the people to make the decisions for them.

Micheal Coleman, 311 Pine, applauded the City Commission and P&Z Board for clarifying the Code language.

Mr. Coleman stated that the City Commission had a professional staff to review Site Plan applications and determine if they are in compliance. The application then goes before the P&Z Board who reviews it to insure it is in compliance with the law. He felt if the City Commission where to then find it was not in compliance, the City would have a significant problem.

Mr. Coleman reminded that the cost for extending the Site Plan process was very costly for both the applicant and the City. He pointed out that the meeting that evening, for example, was costly to the City.

Mr. Coleman suggested that if the City Commission agreed to approve all Site Plans, that an Ordinance be created that states all Site Plans be considered under the Consent Agenda with the option of it being pulled off if requested.

Nicky Hunt, Pine Ave., informed that she had a Site Plan approved by the P&Z Board and then later denied by the City Commission. However, she was in favor of all Site Plans going before the City Commission for final approval.

Ms. Hunt suggested that the opinion of an outside consultant be obtained.

City Commission/P&Z Board Discussion – Continued

Commissioner Woodland suggested that all recommendations be presented to the Commission for their consideration – for example – placing the Site Plan approval on the consent agenda, options regarding expense and time involvement, applicant choosing to notify of Public Hearings in one advertisement, etc.

It was agreed that the title of the amended Ordinance that would incorporate the changes agreed upon that evening would be placed on the City Commission's January 28, 2010 meeting agenda for First Reading.

Chair Quam asked City Attorney Dye to comment in regard to one-way communications.

City Attorney Dye informed that one-way e-mails were legal under the Sunshine Law.

2. Old/New Business Items

Next Joint Meeting Date

The next City Commission/P&Z Board Joint Work Session will be held on Thursday, February 11, 2010, 6:00 p.m. *Commissioner Stoltzfus* said he hoped to address the specifics relating to driveways at the February 11 Work Session.

Public and Press Comment on agenda items – None.

Adjournment

On motion made by Chair Quam and seconded by Commissioner Woodland, the meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

The next joint work session is scheduled for Thursday, February 11, 2010, 6:00 p.m.



Alice Baird, CMC, City Clerk



#1

City of Anna Maria

January 11, 2010

MEMORANDUM

Re: Site Plan Review

The accompanying documents are for use in the discussion at the January 14th 2010 joint meeting of the City Commission and the Planning and Zoning Board. The documents provided consist of:

- A work-up of Chapter 74 site plan review requirements with comments;
- A definition of Survey suggested for inclusion in Chapter 74 of the Code of Ordinances;
- A copy of the Site Plan review application.

Clarence Bob Welch, Jr. CBO CFM
Building Official

Alan Garrett A.I.C.P.
City Planner

Attachment:

Definition of "Survey" suggested for Chapter 70.

The survey of the property shall show the following: a complete legal description of property including: section, township, range, lot, block, parcel #, and subdivision name as applicable, property lines, location and width of Streets and Rights of Way and, easements; Improvements such as buildings or structures, existing utility locations, drainage features, water features e.g. (MHWL and location of seawalls and/or rip-rap), topographical elevations at a minimum of five spots and the crown of the road, protected trees, vegetation or mangroves, and the boundaries of any environmentally sensitive lands abutting the property. Flood zone lines and distance from the Coastal Construction Control Line must be shown also.

Development Site Plan Review Application

Applicants must make an appointment with the Building Official in order to submit this application

NAME OF PROJECT _____

On that property located at (street address) _____

Property ID# _____

The undersigned hereby petitions the City of Anna Maria for Site Plan Approval under the applicable City Code of Ordinances and that the necessary reviews/hearings are conducted by the Staff and Planning and Zoning Board to allow:

(I) (We) are the (check one): (Owners) (Lessee) (Contract Purchaser) (Trustee) (other) (please specify)

Of the above named property.

Record owner of property _____

Mailing address _____ Phone _____

Occupant of property _____

Mailing address _____ Phone _____

4. The undersigned is aware that the Planning and Zoning Board may stipulate or require that the petitioner exercise the approval as granted within a specified time period.

5. The undersigned is aware that if approval is granted by the Planning and Zoning Board, they may stipulate such conditions and require some modifications as they deem necessary to accomplish the proper and orderly development of this proposal.

6. I hereby certify that the information submitted pursuant to this application is true and correct, to the best of my knowledge.

Signed _____ Owner of record or his authorized agent Petitioner
(ATTACH NOTARIZED AGENCY FORM)

NOTE: Attach THREE (3) sealed surveys/legal descriptions of subject property; signed, complete site plan approval checklist, and FIFTEEN (15) **sealed** and **FOLDED** copies of the proposed site plan

Received by _____ Fee Paid: _____ Receipt # _____

SITE PLAN APPROVAL CHECKLIST

The following checklist is designed to assist petitioners in preparing required materials for review. The petitioner should check off each item to ensure that it is included. A more detailed list is contained in the City of Anna Maria Code of Ordinances under chapter 74-354 (c). **ITEMS OMITTED WILL DELAY REVIEW PROCEDURES.** Utility plans, landscaping plans, architectural elevations, etc. may be shown on separate sheets. The following items are required as part of a complete site plan approval application.

1. Certificate of title executed by a reputable title insurance company or an attorney licensed to practice law in the State of Florida, stating that the property described in the survey supplied with the application is owned by the petitioner. If not all of the property is owned by the petitioner, a letter of authorization by each property owner who has an interest in the property for which the approval is being sought shall be required prior to processing the application.
2. Three (3) detailed, professionally signed and sealed site plans drawn to scale on 24" x 36" sheet size and folded to 9" x 12" and a minimum of one 11" by 17" copy of the site plan.. An engineering scale with adequate resolution for verification of measurements should be used. The site plan shall include the following:
 - a) Name and address of owner, applicant, and person preparing the site plan.
 - b) Title and/or project name, project address and developer/builder.
 - c) Date, location map, north arrow, and graphic scale. The location map and site map should be oriented to same north arrow.
 - d) Location sketch showing property line, the property in relation to adjacent area, watercourses, and other essential features
 - e) Site data, including: zoning and Comprehensive Plan designation of the site and adjoining properties, acreage of site, square footage of structures, floor area ratio (FAR), proposed and maximum permitted height of structures, parking calculations (required and proposed), green and open space as well as proposed water and sewer usage
 - f) Proposed/existing lot and building site lines.
 - g) Proposed and required minimum setback line.
 - h) Density and number of proposed dwelling units (residential only).
 - i) Accessory structures and dimensioned waste/storage collection point(s).
 - j) Available water lines, wells and sewer lines.
 - k) Proposed location of sidewalks, bike paths, bike rack, litter containers, dumpster, curbs, gutters, water mains, sanitary sewers, storm drains, manholes, inlets, seawalls or wells.
 - l) Existing and proposed fire hydrants
 - m) Landscape yards, irrigation system, or treatment of perimeter areas such as fences, walls or berms.
 - n) Width and location of existing or proposed public or private streets and easements.
 - o) Complete dimensioning of driveways and aisles, vertical clearance and intersection radii.

SITE PLAN APPROVAL CHECKLIST (Cont'd)

- p) Drawing details of regular and handicapped parking stalls.
 - q) Drawing details of dumpster enclosure or can storage.
 - r) Phasing of the site including any temporary landscaping/accesses.
 - s) Location, percentage, and size of areas to be conveyed, dedicated or reserved as open space, public parks, recreational, and similar uses.
 - t) Areas of site indicated as potential conservation or preservation areas under the Comprehensive Plan.
 - u) Name of adjoining property owners or development projects.
3. Where a site plan covers only a part of real property owned by the applicant, a master phasing plan shall be provided.
 4. Three (3) typed and sealed 8-1/2"x14" legal descriptions and three (3) sealed surveys (including crown of road elevation prepared by a registered land surveyor).
 5. Preliminary design of bridges or culverts as may be required.
 6. An existing vegetation survey; if property is located next to an E-1 or E-2 Zoning District
 7. Planning Advisory Review (PA) comments checklist.

Please meet with your project planner about one week prior to formal submittal to ensure that the information, drawings, etc., are complete. We will not process any applications until all pertinent information has been received and determined to be complete

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE SITE PLAN INFORMATION SUBMITTED IS COMPLETE, ACCURATE AND CORRECT, TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE

Signed: _____

Date: _____

ARTICLE XIII. DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PROCEDURES

Sec. 74-350. Purpose.

(a) The purpose of this chapter is to ensure that the development of property through site planning shall of such character as to harmonize with the neighborhood, to accomplish a transition in character between areas of unlike character, to protect property values, to preserve and enhance the appearance and beauty of the community and to avoid an adverse impact on adjacent land uses.

(b) Approval of a site plan is approval of the development as presented in the site plan and subject to any conditions or stipulations attached to the site plan and made part of the approval. Deviation from an approved site plan is not authorized except pursuant to an amendment as authorized in this chapter. (Ord. No.07-680, § 1, 9-18-07)

Comment [BW1]: See line 379

Sec. 74-351. Site plan approval required.

Applicability. No building permit may be issued without conformance to this section. Site plan approval by the city in accordance with this section is required for the proposed use or changes in use of land, buildings and other structures. The term "city" shall mean the building official or such person as designated by the mayor.

Application required. An application is required to be submitted to the city for all site plans.

(a) *Exemption.* The following developments are exempt from the requirements of this section. Exemptions will be strictly construed and any doubt or ambiguity regarding whether a development is subject to site planning will be resolved in favor of the development undergoing site plan approval:

(1) Applications for and issuance of permits for personal wireless service facilities shall be processed in accordance with sections 114-551 through 114-557 of this Code.

(2) Building permits for a one and two family dwelling and their accessory structures where the use is permitted.

(3) Any change in use of a structure and land and or alterations of a structure requiring a building permit that will not affect the characteristics of a lot or parcel in terms of parking spaces, loading, access, drainage or utilities, or buffering.

(b) *Administrative approval.* The following developments are subject to final approval through administrative review of the site plan:

(1) In any district, a subdivision plat consisting of a maximum of two lots.

(2) The addition of four or less parking spaces to an existing approved site plan parking area within any 12-month period.

(3) The addition of bicycle parking, paved surfaces and pedestrian walks.

(4) The repaving of an impervious surface with a porous material.

(5) An addition or other change to a structure which results in adding no more than a ten percent increase in the square footage of a structure. The addition or change must be in compliance with all setback, parking and bulk regulations. A property can add no more than one such addition or change within any 12-month period.

Comment [BW2]: I suggest the word Commercial be added here as clarification

Comment [BW3]: This mainly occurs on the larger metes and bounds properties that have not been included in a platted subdivision.

47 (c) *Planning and zoning board approval.* The following developments are subject to
48 ~~final~~ approval by the planning and zoning board:

49 (1) A greater than ten percent increase in total floor area located on the entire subject
50 parcel.

51 (2) The reconstruction of any non-conforming ~~structure~~.

52 (3) Any change of use of a lot or parcel or intensity of use of a structure or land or
53 alteration of a structure, which change or alteration requiring a permit that will affect the
54 characteristics of a lot or parcel in terms of:

55 a. The addition of five or more parking spaces;

56 b. The addition of a loading space;

57 c. access, an increase in post-development ~~drainage~~; or

58 d. Buffering or utilities.

59 (4) Any development not subject to administrative approval, city commission approval
60 or exempt from site plan ~~approval~~.

61 (d) *City commission approval.*

62 The following developments are subject to final approval by the city commission:

63 (1) The subdivision of land into three or more lots.

64 (2) Variances.

65 (3) Rezoning.

66 (4) Appeal by the applicant of an administrative or planning and zoning board site plan
67 ~~decision~~.

68 (5) Any amendment to a site plan previously approved by the city commission.

69 (6) Any site plan application for a property which property is already subject to a site
70 plan previously approved by the city commission.

71 (Ord. No. 07-680, § 1, 7-26-07; Ord. No. 08-690, § 1, 9-25-08)
72 Sec. 74-352. Reserved.

73
74 Sec. 74-353. Review fees may be established.

75 The city shall establish a permit fee schedule to cover the cost of the review by the city
76 and its professionals. The applicant shall be responsible for making timely payment of all
77 said permit and consulting fees. Failure to do so will result in the city being relieved of its
78 obligation to continue processing the application.

79 (Ord. No. 07-680, § 3, 7-26-07)
80

81 Sec. 74-354. Site plan application process.

82 (a) *Pre-application conference.* An applicant seeking site plan approval shall request an
83 ~~informal~~ conference with the administrative staff. The pre-application conference shall be
84 informal and its purpose is to discuss the proposal prior to the preparation of a detailed
85 site plan and to advise the applicant as to the applicable city codes, offer advice where
86 possible, on federal, state and county regulations, and to discuss potential impacts and
87 other concerns to be addressed by the site plan process. In order to accomplish these
88 objectives, the applicant shall provide at the pre-application conference the following:
89
90
91
92

Comment [BW4]: The word review should be inserted

Comment [BW5]: Again the word Commercial should be added as conforming residential one and two family structures may be rebuilt within the original footprint if destroyed by natural causes. (see non-conformities section of Chapter 114)

Comment [BW6]: This should be an Administrative approval as it is more of a Public Works/Building Department issue than a Planning/Development one.

Comment [BW7]: I am not sure why an exempt project would require the approval of the Planning and Zoning Board.

Comment [BW8]: This could be clarified to reflect that these appeals are limited to decisions made during the Site Plan approval process.

Comment [BW9]: Normally the applicant requests more than one conference. The Commission may consider a fee for additional conferences as the applicant has not yet paid the application fees that covers the cost of the Planners services.

93 (1) Current ~~survey~~ and/or a site plan showing the proposed development, with setback
 94 requirements, the zoning district and locations and dimensions of parking areas, signage,
 95 existing and proposed vegetation and other planned features.
 96 (2) The plan should depict adjacent properties and adjacent buildings.
 97 (3) The location of nearby street rights-of-way, properties, easements and other
 98 pertinent features.
 99 (4) Where applicable, the features proposed to comply with storm water mitigation and
 100 management and
 101 (5) A list, if any, of the site plan regulations in this article from which the applicant is
 102 requesting a variance and the justification for the variance(s).
 103 (b) *Application for preliminary site plan approval.* The city commission is authorized
 104 to promulgate by resolution from time to time a fee(s) schedule for review of site plan
 105 applications.
 106 (c) *Required information on the site plan.* ~~The~~ At the time of application for
 107 preliminary site plan review the following information is to be provided on the site plan,
 108 either graphically or as a notation;
 109 (1) North arrow, scale, bar scale and date. ~~One~~ Three original 24" X 30" site plan and all
 110 other submissions on 11 x 17 paper.
 111 (2) Street address, title of the drawing, including the name and address of the applicant
 112 and the person responsible for preparation of such drawing, including a professional
 113 engineer (PE), registered architect (RA) and/or licensed surveyor (LS) seal.
 114 (3) Project Data Block showing tabulation of existing and proposed features.
 115 (4) Boundaries of the property plotted to scale with the following features/information
 116 shown,
 117 a. Streets, alleys, and rights-of-way.
 118 b. Lot size.
 119 c. Building lot coverage ~~calculations~~.
 120 d. Total impervious surfaces ~~calculations~~.
 121 e. Number of units and use.
 122 f. Parking spaces.
 123 g. Loading spaces.
 124 h. Floor area for each use.
 125 i. Number of employees.
 126 j. Number of seats in a restaurant.
 127 k. Zoning designation.
 128 l. Number of habitable floors.
 129 m. Height of building.
 130 n. Setbacks.
 131 (5) Present zoning designation of all adjacent property;
 132 (6) Existing uses on all adjacent property;
 133 (7) Existing buildings and adjoining structures;
 134 (8) Location and size of all existing and proposed buildings and structures, labeled with
 135 permitted use, distance to all property lines and between buildings, exterior dimensions of
 136 all buildings and type of flood-proofing.

Comment [BW10]: A definition of survey should be included in Chapter 70, see attached.

Comment [BW11]: I suggest that the word or be removed. A current survey of the property is in my opinion always required. I suggest to add a minimum requirement description for the information to be included on the survey.

Comment [BW12]: Add and the uses located on those properties.

Comment [BW13]: "At the time of application for site plan review" should be added before "the"

Comment [BW14]: A minimum of three originals at a 24 inch by thirty inch minimum size need to be provided.

Comment [BW15]: Clarification

Comment [BW16]: Clarification

Comment [BW17]: Clarification

- 137 (9) Off-street parking and loading layout including size and number of spaces; provision
 138 for pedestrian access including handicap accessibility, bicycle parking location and
 139 design and location of outdoor and exterior seating and exterior lighting facilities.
 140 (10) Proposed storm water management plan with grading and drainage plan showing
 141 existing and proposed contours and all soil erosion control plans.
 142 (11) Location of outdoor storage areas and outdoor vending machine locations.
 143 (12) Location of fire hydrants.
 144 (13) Location, design and construction materials of all energy-distribution facilities,
 145 including electrical, gas and solar energy including meters, and valves. Description of the
 146 method of securing water supply and of sewage disposal and the location, design and
 147 construction materials of such facilities.
 148 (14) Location, size and design and type of construction of all proposed signs.
 149 (15) Location, design and construction materials of all existing or proposed site
 150 improvements and fences.
 151 (16) Location of existing and proposed ground cover and buffer areas, including
 152 ~~identification of grass, plants, shrubs and trees~~ a landscaping plan.
 153 (17) Location of trash disposal, appropriately screened, covered and located in the rear
 154 of the structure (property), if appropriate.
 155 (18) Identification of any federal, state or county permits required for the project's
 156 execution.
 157 (19) Copies of application for and/or approval of necessary federal, state, or county
 158 permits.
 159 (d) *Site plan submission and completeness review.* Upon receipt of the preliminary site
 160 plan application, the city shall review said application for completeness pursuant to the
 161 following:
 162 (1) The city shall strive to complete this review within five working days of receipt of
 163 the application, but the city shall be entitled to extend this time if necessary to provide a
 164 thorough review.
 165 (2) Following completion of the city's review, the city shall provide a written
 166 determination of the application's sufficiency.
 167 (3) If additional information is required, the city shall notify the applicant of the
 168 deficiencies in the application. The applicant shall then provide the additional
 169 information for another sufficiency review as discussed above.
 170 (4) The applicant shall respond to the completeness information within 30 calendar days
 171 of the request. If the applicant does not respond within the time frame set forth above, the
 172 application shall be deemed withdrawn.
 173 (5) This time limit may be extended for good cause by the city. A request for extension
 174 of time must be filed in writing with the city prior to expiration of the time in which to
 175 respond. The request shall set forth the applicant's reasons for the extension. A properly
 176 filed request for extension of time shall extend the validity of the application until the
 177 request for extension has been acted upon.
 178 (6) This process continues until the application is deemed complete. If an applicant
 179 decides it has submitted all required information, the applicant may choose to proceed
 180 with the review, or it may choose to withdraw its application.

Comment [BW18]: clarification

Comment [BW19]: Due to extended meetings to clarify the City's requirements this may take several meetings with the applicant. These meetings should occur after the pre-application process and after the fees are paid. (Line 82 pre-application)

181 (7) Once the application is deemed complete, the application shall be reviewed to
182 determine compliance with city codes and regulations in accordance with the standards
183 for review provided below.

184 (8) The city shall strive to prepare a written analysis within ten working days of the
185 completeness determination, but the city shall be entitled to extend this time if necessary
186 to provide a thorough analysis.

187 (9) This analysis shall explain the issues raised by the application in light of the
188 requirements of federal, state and local laws and regulations governing the application.

189 (10) The analysis shall contain a recommendation for approval, approval with
190 conditions or denial.

191 (e) *Administrative procedure.*

192 (1) Upon completion of the written analysis, the city, within five working days, shall
193 forward the analysis to the applicant via first class mail the analysis for approval or
194 approval with conditions, or denial to the applicant.

195 (2) If the applicant accepts the recommendation, including any conditions attached
196 thereto, the city shall issue the appropriate permits within seven working days. If the
197 applicant disagrees with the analysis including its recommendations, it may request in
198 writing review by the city commission in accordance with section 74-351.

199 (3) If the written analysis recommends denial, the city, within five working days, shall
200 forward via first class mail, the analysis to the applicant. The applicant may chose to
201 accept the denial and revise the application and re-commence the process or request, in
202 writing that the application be reviewed by the city commission in accordance with the
203 procedure set forth in section 74-351.

204 (f) *Planning and zoning board procedure.*

205 (1) Upon completion of the written analysis the city shall schedule a hearing on the
206 application before the planning and zoning board for the next available hearing date.
207 Notice and procedures shall be given in accordance with section 114-76 except that
208 mailed notice shall given to all property owners within 500 feet of the subject property,
209 not 350 feet.

210 (2) The purpose of the hearing is to review the preliminary site plan application and the
211 written analysis.

212 (3) The hearing will include opportunity for public comment on the application.

213 (4) Following the close of the public hearing, the planning and zoning board shall
214 determine whether the proposed site plan complies with the city comprehensive plan,
215 codes, regulations and the standard for review set forth below.

216 (5) The planning and zoning board shall approve, approve with conditions or deny the
217 preliminary site plan application.

218 (6) If the application is recommended for approval or approval with conditions, the city
219 shall issue an approval in the form of a written order within seven working days.

220 (7) If the planning and zoning board denies the request, the applicant may ask for an
221 appeal, in writing within 30 calendar days, by having the recommendation forwarded to
222 the city commission for a public hearing.

223 (g) *City commission procedure.* Site plan applications which require city commission
224 approval or which have been forwarded to the city commission for review following the
225 decision of another board or agency, shall be reviewed in accordance with this section.

Comment [BW20]: After the analysis is complete the application is scheduled for a hearing.

Comment [BW21]: Sections "e" "f" and "g" set forth the procedures for each of the various types of approval and the appeals process. These sections compliment the types of approval required under 74-351 (b) (c))d) lines 33, 47 & 61

Comment [BW22]: The hearing must take place staff cannot deny the application and refuse a hearing.

Comment [BW23]: The exact form of this order has not been defined. Several forms have been used over the years. Discussion may be required.

226 (1) Upon completion of the written analysis, the city shall schedule a public hearing on
227 the application before the planning and zoning board for the next available hearing date.
228 Site plan approvals by the city commission shall be subject to a review by the planning
229 and zoning board. The planning and zoning board, following its review shall recommend
230 approval, approval with conditions, or denial of the application. Notice and procedures
231 shall be given in accordance with section 114-76 except that mailed notice shall be given
232 to all property owners within 500 feet of the subject property, not 350 feet.
233 (2) The purpose of the hearing is to review the site plan application and the written
234 analysis.
235 (3) The hearing will include opportunity for public comment on the application.
236 (4) Following the close of the public hearing, the planning and zoning board shall
237 determine whether the proposed development complies with the city comprehensive plan,
238 codes, regulations and the standard for review set forth below.
239 (5) The planning and zoning board shall recommend approval, approval with conditions
240 or denial of the preliminary site plan application to the city commission.
241 (6) The planning and zoning board shall transmit to the city commission its written
242 recommendation including discussion of any significant issues underlying it
243 recommendation.
244 (7) The planning and zoning board is authorized to continue its hearing to a time and
245 date certain in order to prepare its written recommendation.
246 (8) After the planning and zoning board transmits its recommendation, a public hearing
247 before the city commission shall be scheduled at its next available hearing date, where
248 the chair has determined the availability of time on the agenda, to consider the
249 application.
250 (9) The city commission shall conduct a public hearing in accordance with its rules of
251 procedure.
252 (10) Following the close of the public hearing, the city commission shall approve,
253 approve with conditions, or deny the application for preliminary site plan approval.
254 (11) The city commission's approval, or approval with conditions, or denial shall be in
255 the form of a written order within seven working days.
256 (h) *Standards for review.* When determining as to whether the preliminary site plan
257 application should be approved, approved with conditions or denied, the planning and
258 zoning board and city commission, at their respective public hearings, shall consider to
259 the extent to which the application is consistent with the following standards where
260 applicable.
261 (1) Whether the proposed development, design and layout is compatible with the
262 surrounding land uses with respect to location of use(s), intensity, density, and scale;
263 building size, mass, bulk, height and orientation; lot coverage; lot size/configuration;
264 ~~architecture; screening; buffers; setbacks; signage; lighting; loading areas; operating~~
265 ~~hours; noise; odor; and other factors of compatibility;~~
266 (2) Whether the proposed development, design and layout retains the natural features
267 and characteristics of the land, including but not limited to the regard given to existing
268 trees, watercourses, sand dunes and similar natural features that would protect or add
269 attractiveness to the property and environs if they were maintained, natural drainage
270 systems, natural buffering, and the use of other techniques for the maintained and
271 enhancement of the physical environment;

Comment [BW24]: The exact form of this order has not been defined. Several forms have been used over the years. Discussion may be required.

Comment [BW25]: The reviewing Board has leeway to examine the plan for reasonable compatibility. Substantive evidence is required for disapproval.

Comment [BW26]: The reviewing Board has leeway to examine the plan for reasonable compatibility. Substantive evidence is required for disapproval.

272 (3) Whether the proposed development states adequate control not only of the
273 development but also on the control, use and permanent maintenance of common open
274 space, common facilities, or common lands to ensure preservation of such lands and
275 facilities for their intended purpose and to ensure that such common facilities will not
276 become a future liability of the city;

277 (4) Whether ingress and egress to the development and the proposed structures thereon
278 is designed so as not to impede safe and adequate visibility;

279 (5) Whether ingress and egress is of sufficient width so as to provide for servicing of
280 utilities and refuse collection, and access for emergency vehicles such as fire, police and
281 ambulance;

282 (6) Whether the off-street parking and off-street loading facilities are located to avoid
283 hazardous automotive and pedestrian traffic patterns and to ensure access by emergency
284 vehicles;

285 (7) Whether the proposed screening and buffers intended to maintain compatibility with
286 uses outside the proposed development are consistent with the zoning regulations;

287 (8) Whether drainage on the property has been designed in accordance with applicable
288 city runoff retention and attenuation requirements and shall be designed to avoid flooding
289 or erosion damage to adjacent property and the city drainage system and to avoid the
290 creation of stagnant pools that would encourage mosquito breeding;

291 (9) Whether utilities are available with sufficient capacity for the intended uses;

292 (10) Whether recreation facilities and open spaces are located to avoid the creation of
293 nuisance conditions affecting adjacent and nearby properties.

294 (Ord. No. 06-653, § 1, 3-23-06; Ord No. 07-680, § 4, 7-26-07)

295
296 Sec. 74-355. Final site plan approval.

297 (a) After receiving preliminary site plan approval the applicant must obtain all other
298 permits required by other governmental agencies before receiving final site plan approval
299 for a major development.

300 (b) The applicant shall have 12 months from the issuance of the order granting
301 preliminary site plan approval to obtain the final site plan approval for the subject major
302 development. An applicant may request up to six additional months for compliance with
303 this requirement at the time of preliminary site plan approval. If final site plan approval is
304 not obtained within the timeframe set by this section, or by the order granting preliminary
305 site plan approval, as the case may be, the application for the proposed major
306 development shall expire and be of no further effect. The body granting preliminary site
307 plan approval may grant a single six-month extension of this time frame for good cause.
308 The applicant must file a request for extension of time with the city no less than thirty
309 days before expiration of the time granted for approval of the preliminary site plan. The
310 request for extension shall contain the applicant's grounds for extension. The request for
311 extension of time shall be heard by the body granting the original approval. A request for
312 extension of time properly filed with the city shall extend the validity of the preliminary
313 site plan approval until such time as the approving body shall act on it.
314
315
316
317

Comment [BW27]: This passage
deserves clarification

Comment [BW28]: Access for
emergency vehicles is normally reviewed
with the fire department and does not
affect properties that do not have interior
parking access lanes.

Comment [BW29]: The reviewing
Board has leeway to examine the plan for
reasonable compatibility. Substantive
evidence is required for disapproval.

Comment [BW30]: It should be
discussed whether to allow a final site
plan approval in lieu of a preliminary
approval if all pre-requisites for a final
approval are in place.

318 (c) After receiving all necessary permits from other governmental agencies, the
319 applicant shall submit to the city a final site plan showing all necessary changes to the
320 development along with true and accurate copies of those other governmental permits.
321 The city may require copies of any of the applications for other governmental permits.
322 An applicant may choose to apply for final site plan approval prior to receipt of all other
323 approvals, but under no circumstances shall a final site plan be approved prior to receipt
324 of all other approvals. Additionally, all applications for final site plan approval shall be
325 subject to revisions depending on other agency approvals, and an application for final site
326 plan approval shall not create in an applicant any form of vested rights.

327 (d) Upon receipt of a final site plan application and all required permits and supporting
328 applications, the city administration shall review the final site plan application, the other
329 governmental permits and their applications to determine whether the final site plan is
330 substantially in compliance with the approved preliminary site plan and complies with all
331 city codes. If the city administration determines that the final site plan is in substantial
332 compliance, a public hearing shall be scheduled before the body approving the
333 preliminary site plan and duly noticed. The city administration shall note any
334 discrepancies between the preliminary site plan approval and the requested final site plan
335 and shall present its report to the body approving the final site plan.

Comment [BW31]: The final site plan must be brought back to the board that approved the preliminary site plan.

336 (e) If, after holding a duly noticed public hearing, the approving body finds that the final
337 site plan substantially complies with the approved preliminary site plan and with all city
338 codes, the final site plan shall be approved.

339 (f) Should the final site plan be found to not substantially comply with the approved
340 preliminary site plan or any city code as a result of a change required by another
341 government agency or because of a voluntary change made by the applicant, the
342 approving body shall deny the final site plan.

343 (Ord. No. 04-619, § IV, 3-25-04; Ord. No. 06-653, § 5, 3-23-06; Ord. No. 08-690, § 2, 9-
344 25-08)

345
346 Sec. 74-356. Building permit.

347 (a) A final site plan is valid for 12 months, or for such other time set by the approving
348 body at time of final site plan approval. If a building permit is not issued while the final
349 site plan is valid, the final site plan shall expire and be on no further effect. The building
350 official may extend the length of time a final site plan is effective for good cause. An
351 applicant may request an extension of time by filing an application for extension of time
352 with the city no less than 30 days prior to expiration of the final site plan. The request
353 shall contain the grounds for the extension. Once it is properly filed, it shall be reviewed
354 by the building official. A properly filed request for extension of time shall extend the
355 validity of the final site plan until such time as the building official has acted on the
356 request.

357 (b) The final site plan shall be vested for so long as an active building permit is issued
358 and the project is proceeding forward in good faith. For purposes of this section, "good
359 faith" shall mean that building permits have been issued while the final site plan approval
360 is valid and substantial, meaningful work pursuant to the issued building permits is
361 proceeding at the site. Should good faith work cease for a period of six months, the final
362 site plan shall expire six months after cessation of good faith work and lose any vesting it
363 may have under this section. (continued)

Comment [BW32]: The period of time is not given.

364

365 The building official may extend the period of time a site plan remains valid following
366 issuance of a building permit. Any request for extension of time under this subsection
367 shall be filed with the city no less than thirty days prior to expiration of the site plan. The
368 request for extension shall be in writing and state the applicant's good cause reasons for
369 extension. A properly filed request for extension of time shall extend the validity of the
370 final site plan until such times the building official has acted on the request. Should the
371 final site plan expire pursuant to this paragraph or the building official find that the
372 request for an extension of time is not merited, the site shall then be subject to additional
373 review under the city ordinances and codes as they exist at that time.
374 (Ord. No. 04-619, § IV, 3-25-04; Ord. No. 06-653, § 8, 3-23-06; Ord. No. 08-690, § 2, 9-
375 25-08)

376

377 Sec. 74-357. Amendment of approved final site plans.

378 (a) Certain minor changes to approved final site plans may be approved administratively
379 without the need for additional public hearings. An application for an administrative
380 approval shall be presented with a letter clearly explaining the specific changes to the
381 approved site plan, and shall include drawings and graphics sufficient to identify the
382 amendment to the approved drawing.

383 (b) Any changes must be in accordance with city ordinances as they exist at time of the
384 request for amendment.

385 (c) The following are presumed minor changes and may be processed in accordance
386 with this section. The facts of any particular situation revealing that a proposed minor
387 change is in fact major, shall rebut the presumption and subject the application to non-
388 administrative review.

389 (1) Any change results in less than ten percent increase in required parking spaces.

390 (2) Building or structure changes constituting less than a ten percent increase in square
391 footage of building area, and is in compliance with all setback and bulk regulations.

392 (3) Minor changes to comply with life safety or technical codes which do not otherwise
393 affect the approved layout to such a degree as to adversely affect surrounding properties.

394 (d) Changes to approved final site plans which are unable to meet these standards shall
395 be subject to the application and review process as for a new application but the review,
396 including additional public hearings before the planning and zoning board and city
397 commission, shall be focused on the changes and the impact of the changes on the
398 approved plan.

399 (Ord. No. 06-653, § 6, 3-23-06)

400

401 Sec. 74-358. Notice of hearings.

402 Notice for planning and zoning board hearings and city commission hearings for site plan
403 approval pursuant to this section shall be in accordance with the following:

404 (1) *Posting property.* A property subject to either a preliminary or final site plan
405 application which requires a public hearing for approval shall be posted a minimum of 14
406 calendar days before the hearing before the planning and zoning board and a minimum of
407 14 calendar days before the city commission hearing. The posted notice shall be on a
408 form supplied by the city. The notice shall be a minimum of six square feet in size. The
409 notice shall contain lettering of sufficient size and contrast with its background to be

Comment [BW33]: This is a large sign.

410 readable from the adjoining public way. The notice shall contain basic information on the
411 application, including file number, public hearing location, date, and time, and a brief
412 description of the proposed project. A city telephone number for additional information
413 shall also be listed. The applicant shall be responsible for posting the property.
414 (2) *Posting notice.* The city shall post a notice at city hall and any other regular location
415 advising of a public hearing on the application for approval. The notice shall follow the
416 same time frame and contain the same language as is required in subsection (1) above.
417 (Ord. No. 06-653, § 7, 3-23-06)
418

**CITY COMMISSION
OLD/NEW BUSINESS ITEMS**

January 14, 2010

>>>New Business

- 1. Site Plan Procedure Review (Sec.74-350-358) (Jan. 14)**
- 2. Internal Traffic Circulation and Access (Chapt.90).**
- 3. Ref. Comm. Stoltzfuz e-mail dated Dec. 29(See attachment).**

4. Fee Schedule Review

5 4. City Pier Repairs

>>>Old Business

- 1. Chapter 74 Revisions.**
- 2. Personal Wireless Service Facility (PWSF) Ordinance Review.**
- 3. Potential (Short/Long Term) Safety Hazards for Pedestrian, Bicycle, Segway and Motorized Three-Wheelers Traffic, Resulting from Vehicles Exiting Parking Spaces Across Sidewalks ---in ROR District. Committee to Study and Report.**