

**CITY OF ANNA MARIA
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING HELD AT ANNA MARIA COMMISSION CHAMBERS
10005 GULF DRIVE – ANNA MARIA, FL
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 2008
7:00 P.M.**

CALL TO ORDER

Planning and Zoning Chair Doug Copeland called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

PLEDGE TO THE FLAG

ROLL CALL: Boardmembers Margaret Jenkins, Sandra Mattick, Mike Yetter, Chair Doug Copeland, Frank Pytel, Randall Stover, and Jim Conoly.

Staff present: City Clerk Alice Baird, City Planner Alan Garrett, Mayor Fran Barford, City Commission Chair John Quam, City Commission Dale Woodland, and Minutes Clerk Stacey Johnston.

--Chair Copeland welcomed new member Mike Yetter to the P&Z Board. Boardmember Yetter will be serving the unexpired term of former Boardmember Doug Winton.

1. Discussion: Land Development Regulation Update

Second Workshop to continue Discussions of Chapter 114 Area, Yard, Bulk, Regulations in the R-1, R-2, C-1, ROR, PSP, and PRA Zone Districts.

City Planner Alan Garrett reviewed the consensus relating to setback issues agreed upon by the Board at the January meeting. He noted that there was no conclusion relating to building and lot coverage and that those items would be discussed that evening. The March workshop will cover the types of impervious coverage in order to get a better understanding of the types allowed.

Building & Impervious Coverage – In referencing the Matrix, *City Planner Garrett* addressed the current requirements relating to the Building Coverage and total Impervious. He explained in detail how the impervious coverage takes into account the building and lot coverage. He pointed out that in regards to building coverage, a roof overhang can be extended up to 2-feet and it would not count towards the building coverage. The building coverage is based on what touches the ground. Explanation followed.

Boardmember Conoly asked what was to stop a person from having a holding pond for drainage in their front yard.

Planner Garrett responded that in the future it may be required that the City will no longer be able to accept everyone's runoff water. New construction will be required to provide for their runoff. He stated that if a holding pond is available it might allow for more impervious coverage.

Boardmember Yetter asked why residential impervious surface had a limit of 40% requirement versus commercial at 60%.

Planner Garrett explained that the 60% commercial venture involves a parking requirement versus residential that only require two parking spaces.

Lot Coverage

Planner Garrett addressed the issue of Lot Coverage and the current requirements in the ROR District. Residents and City Staff had discussed that the requirements should be more equitable. It is unknown the history of the current provision that a single-family residential takes 7,500 sq. feet, whereas, office or retail only require 5,000 sq. feet. He pointed out that the parcels on the north side of Pine Ave. are 5,000 sq. feet and those on the south side of Pine Ave. are 7,500 sq. feet.

City Commissioner Dale Woodland addressed the Board referring to a July 1, 2002 memo from him regarding the Proposed Lot Coverage Scale for R-1 Zoning.

Commissioner Woodland explained that his sliding scale of coverage percentages proposal was based as an effort to limit the size of a single structure that could be built on a large lot or multiple lots.

Explanation and examples followed by Planner Garrett.

Boardmember Yetter questioned if there were any legal issues associated with a sliding scale of lot coverage percentages.

Planner Garrett stated there should be no problem as long as substantial use per parcel of land is provided and that it has not been restricted so much that a person could not gain value from their land.

Planner Garrett further stated he felt there were enough elements in the Comprehensive Plan, policies addressing intensity and density accepted by the State of Florida, etc. that would allow for the power to control the regulations and hold up in a court of law.

Boardmember Mattick stated she would be in favor of a sliding scale in the R-1 and pointed out that regulations were already in place relating to Commercial.

Discussion Relating to Future Development Along Pine Ave Front-yard Setbacks

Planner Garrett informed that Micheal Coleman was asked to look at how two parcels of land would meet the parking and loading requirements; height issues, residential requirements, and front-yard setbacks.

Mr. Coleman looked at the common setbacks along Pine Ave. Some of the new homes on Pine Ave. meet the 20-foot front-yard setback rather than the 29-foot. Other examples included The Historical Society having a 12-foot setback, Betsy Hills Real Estate only meeting a 15-foot setback, and Roser Cottage having a 16-foot setback. Others do meet the 29-foot setback.

Planner Garrett stated that Mr. Coleman would address the Board to discuss that by allowing a 20-foot setback for those properties that remain under two levels of construction, the property owner would be able to gain a bit while remaining consistent with the overwhelming majority of properties in the district. Mr. Coleman encourages construction of only two levels – one level of retail and one level of residential. By doing so, the property owner would be allowed a 20-foot setback as opposed to a 29-foot if the parcel is less than 140-feet in depth. If the parcel were 140-feet or greater in depth a 35-foot setback would be required.

Micheal Coleman, 311 Pine Ave., addressed the Board and spoke relating to the future development of Pine Ave. and his January 30, 2008 memo to Planner Garrett relating to the ROR Zoning District Land Development Regulations.

Mr. Coleman discussed the 24 lots he had measured along Pine Ave. and that of the 24 lots measured, only four had setbacks of 29-feet or greater and only one (his personal home) was at 35-feet.

Mr. Coleman suggested that in order to create incentives for property owners to maintain the historic cottage character in the district why not allow for increased building coverage, not to exceed total allowable lot coverage, for those who limit construction to two levels. Explanation and examples followed.

Mr. Coleman's "Proposed Design at 315 Pine Ave." was also referenced and discussed.

Boardmember Pytel informed he had researched the records at City Hall and found many lots with 35-foot setbacks. He agreed with a 35-foot setback feeling Pine Ave. was a barren street and not currently business user or residence friendly. It was his opinion a 35-foot setback would allow opportunity for parking, loading, and planting of trees.

Mr. Coleman suggested the need to determine what problem needed solved. He felt the City wanted sidewalks and covered walkways to allow for a walking district. The further back they were placed off the street, the less ambiance they would have.

Discussion followed relating to grandfathered setbacks.

Boardmember Stover gave examples of parking issues along Pine Ave. He felt Mr. Coleman's parking proposal that allowed for a person to back out into traffic would be a serious logistic problem.

Mr. Coleman responded pointing out his obligation was to provide a site plan consistent with the current zoning ordinances. He did not feel there was so much a parking issue as it having to do with the traffic flow.

Planner Garrett informed that currently the ROR District mandates parking of 90-degrees face-in across the front of the parcel.

Planner Garrett pointed out that an existing structure can be grandfathered, however, all new additions would have to meet the new setbacks. If a structure is demolished the new setbacks would be required.

Planner Garrett asked for a consensus relating to the following:

- Does the City retain the 29-foot front-yard setbacks for ROR and C-1 for parcels of 140-feet or less in depth and retain the 35-foot setback for parcels that are greater than 140-feet in depth, or
- Combine so that all ROR and C-1 parcels would be a 29-foot setback requirement.

In answer to *Boardmember Stover's* question, Planner Garrett pointed out there is no front-yard landscaping requirement. Parking must be provided head-in, 20-foot length. There are no other front-yard requirements.

ACTION: It was the consensus of the Board that building in the ROR and C-1 be built at 29-feet. All Boardmembers voted in favor of the 29-foot setback except for Boardmember Pytel who was in favor of retaining the 29-foot and 35-foot requirement.

It was agreed that public input should be received prior to determining whether or not to restrict to two levels of height allowing for 20-foot setbacks.

Planner Garrett stated the Building Coverage and Impervious Coverage would be addressed at the March Work Session with the Parking requirements to follow. Examples of research of different types of impervious materials will be provided. He pointed out that in his research Paver Brick only yields about 9 – 11% absorption and the Board may want to look at other types of materials. The material examples will be available one week prior to the March meeting for the Boardmembers review.

2. Approve Minutes of January 8, 2008.

Corrections were made to the minutes as follows:

- Pg. 1 – 10-foot X 10-foot space corrected to 10-Foot X 20-foot
- Pg. 5 – Lot Area – For office and residential – corrected to For office and *retail*,....

MOTION: On motion made by Boardmember Mattick and seconded by Boardmember Jenkins, the January 8, 2008 Minutes were approved as corrected. Motion carried – All Aye.

3. Old/New Business – No discussion

4. ADJOURNMENT

On motion made by Boardmember Mattick and seconded by Boardmember Jenkins, the meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m. Motion carried – All Aye.

The next regular meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, March 4, 2008, 7:00 p.m.

Alice Baird, CMC, City Clerk

MINUTES APPROVED: _____