

**CITY OF ANNA MARIA  
CITY COMMISSION WORK SESSION  
MEETING HELD AT ANNA MARIA COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
10005 GULF DRIVE – ANNA MARIA, FL  
THURSDAY, MARCH 13, 2007  
7:00 P.M.**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Quam called the Work Session to order at 7:00 p.m.

**ROLL CALL:** Commissioner Jo Ann Mattick, Commissioner Dale Woodland, Chair John Quam, Deputy Chair Christine Tollette, and Commissioner Duke Miller.

**Absent w/excuse:** Mayor Fran Barford.

**Staff present:** City Clerk Alice Baird, Deputy City Clerk/Director of Finance Diane Percycoe, Public Works Director George McKay, City Attorney Jim Dye, Building Officials Steve Gilbert and Tom Welch, City Engineer Tom Wilcox, and Minutes Clerk Stacey Johnston.

**Press present:** Sun, Islander.

**1. Review Proposed Increased/Added Schedule of Fees;**

- **Planning and Land Use Fees**
- **Gas, Plumbing, Mechanical, and Electrical Permit Fees**
- **Code Enforcement Fees/fines**
- **Residential - Single Family Buildings Permit Fees**
- **Commercial Buildings Permit Fees**
- **Administrative Fees**
- **Zoning Permitting and Fees**
- **Public Works Permit Fees**

*Building Official Steve Gilbert* introduced Mr. Bob Welch who will be working directly for the City of Anna Maria. Mr. Welch previously worked for the City of Anna Maria and said he was glad to be back.

Mr. Gilbert informed he had been working with Mr. Welch relating to the proposed schedule of fees. In discussions with Finance Director Percycoe and City Clerk Baird, it was suggested that a meeting be scheduled with the City's Auditor Ed Leonard for a better idea of where to go with the fees. He informed that he, Bob Welch, Mayor Barford, and Mr. Leonard would be meeting.

**ACTION:** The schedule of fees will be placed on the April 10, 2008 Commission Work Session agenda for discussion.

**2. Stormwater utility Fee – Presentation of Engineering Study that Established an Equivalent Stormwater Unit (ESU); Discuss Proposed Budget and Fee to Charge Per Unit; Resolution for an Appeal Process; and Ordinance No. 08-684.**

*City Engineer Tom Wilcox* addressed the Commission relating to the proposed Equivalent Stormwater Units (ESU). He informed that according to the Manatee County Appraiser's database, there are presently 1,618 separate parcel ID

numbers in Anna Maria and they have been broken down into the various zoning types. He asked for guidance on how to handle those parcels that are vacant pieces of ground. He suggested that the vacant lots should be required to pay some portion of the stormwater utility fee since vacant lots often do not have the grass coverage and will have other water runoff issues.

Detailed explanation of how the ESU is determined followed by Mr. Wilcox.

*Commissioner Miller* agreed that vacant lots should have some sort of assessment since they would also benefit from the stormwater improvements, plus it would add value to the lot.

*Commissioner Woodland* stated he looked at vacant lots as being unimproved that already improve the City's drainage by holding a lot of water. He did not feel it was right to charge a stormwater utility fee on vacant lots.

City Engineer Wilcox replied that many of the unimproved lots do not hold water and will drain into the road. He suggested an ESU of .21.

Engineer Wilcox explained the appeal process. A property owner will have the right to an appeal process by their proving their property has no runoff or erosion.

*Commissioner Mattick* said she did not feel the stormwater utility fee would be burdensome to the property owner and was in favor of the .21 ESU for the vacant lots.

**ACTION: It was the consensus of the majority of the Commission that vacant lots are assessed the Stormwater Utility Fee.**

Engineer Wilcox explained that Ordinance 08-684 serves as a tool to create the utility. A Resolution will be adopted annually determining what the Stormwater Utility Fee charge will be. After its adoption it will be sent to the County Appraiser's office for assessing the property owner the approved fee. The County will collect a 7% surcharge.

Discussion followed relating to determining the ESU and amount to be collected.

*Chair Quam* pointed out the Commission had previously discussed the amount of \$50 per unit.

Lengthy discussion followed relating to the costs allowed to be taken from the Stormwater Utility budget for the purpose of administrative costs, equipment, etc.

*Director of Public Works George McKay* spoke to the Commission and referenced a draft budget he prepared for the Stormwater Utility program. The draft budget addressed those costs needed to maintain the existing stormwater drainage system, Phase I & II, and other categories that serve as part of the City's drainage system. He informed that all mowing, trimming, and taking care of the storm valves will be handled internally, however, the flushing and

sweeping would be outsourced. An approximate \$50,000 per year is required to maintain the swales..

Engineer Wilcox informed he would be looking over the numbers and working with Mr. McKay to obtain a more accurate bottom line figure. He estimated the total annual expense at \$80,000 to \$90,000.

*Commissioner Woodland* asked that the City provide the Commission with an accurate accounting each year in order to determine whether the ESU should be adjusted up or down. He asked that at the end of the fiscal year Finance Director Percycoe provide detailed information of what has been spent on maintenance and what portion of that amount was taken from the stormwater utility fund.

*Deputy City Clerk/Director of Finance Percycoe* informed there is a separate Stormwater Utility budget. Some of the administrative costs could be taken out of that fund along with the remaining from the General Fund.

Engineer Wilcox explained that the stormwater utility is an enterprise fund and that it can be reevaluated on an annual basis. Examples include the need for outsourcing some of the maintenance, adding an additional employee, etc.

**ACTION:** After discussion it was agreed that Ordinance 08-684 would be considered for 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading at the March 27, 2008 regular Commission meeting. Resolution R-08-634 that establishes the appeal procedures will also be considered for adoption at the March 27, 2008 meeting.

**Public Comment** – None.

**3. Review Draft Ordinance that Defines the Terms ‘Lot/Structure’ in Policy 1.3.5 of the Comprehensive Plan.**

*City Attorney Jim Dye* reviewed the changes in the proposed Ordinance that includes the addition of language “All development or redevelopment in the ROR district is limited to one dwelling unit per buildable lot or parcel. Additionally, no structure within the ROR district shall contain more than one dwelling unit.”

In answer to *Commissioner Mattick’s* question, City Attorney Dye stated the Comprehensive Plan states there can be only one building / structure per lot. If the Commission wants more than one structure per lot, the Comp Plan would need to be amended. He confirmed that the Planning & Zoning Board, prior to final consideration by the City Commission, would review the Ordinance.

Commissioner Mattick spoke in regard to the following items she felt were ambiguous in the current code and needed addressed:

Sec. 113-281

- (b) (1) Single-family detached dwellings.

- Suggested (2) b. Antique shops along with prohibiting Secondhand merchandise establishments should both be removed. Commissioner Mattick used the example of Rosser Cottage and the Historical Society, which she felt fell under the definition of antique, and Ginny & Jane E's falling under the definition of a secondhand merchandise establishment.
- (3) a. Such unit is occupied by the owner or tenant of the associated retail, service or office use; - Commissioner Mattick felt the owner or tenant may not occupy the unit and suggested the language be removed.
- Swimming pools as an accessory use to single family detached dwellings.
- Prohibiting Wholesale establishment. Commissioner Mattick suggested a "wholesale establishment" be defined and clarified.
- Prohibiting Package sales – should be removed. It was noted that the General Store sells beer and wine of which are both packaged goods.
- Prohibiting Commercial radio and television broadcast studios and antennas. This language should be removed due to falling under the definition of cell towers.

City Attorney Dye stated that the entire ROR section as a whole needed to be revised.

*Commissioner Tollette* said she had been following the Town of Longboat Key's issues relating to their Comprehensive Plan adopted in 1984. Due to their many restrictions adopted in their original Comp Plan they are now having to address some of the originally adopted restrictions. She said she did not want Anna Maria to adopt regulations that cannot be easily changed.

*Commissioner Woodland* said his main concern relates to intensity and density. He gave the example of a mall area built in California as an example and was concerned there may be an increased interest in doing the same thing if the Commission agreed to allow more than one unit or more on one lot.

Commissioner Mattick pointed out there was currently nothing in the Code that would prohibit the buying of several lots and building a strip mall. She did not think, however, that building over and combing two lots would be a determinant – that it would allow for a property owner to live and operate a business at the same location and also provide for the appropriate parking. She said she sees the currently parking situation as a real hazard and felt it would be a big mistake if the lots cannot be joined. She agreed with having residences over business.

*Commissioner Miller* gave an example of three lots, three buildings, and building up to the 37-feet. He felt it was a good idea to limit the building height to 27-feet.

**Public Comment**

**P&Z Boardmember Sandy Mattick**, 307 Pine, agreed with the suggested changes and felt the Ordinance should first go before the P&Z Board.

Ms. Mattick said it was her understanding that the City Attorney was asked to define “structures.”

She pointed out that strip malls are prohibited in the Comprehensive Plan and further suggested that a “strip mall” be defined.

Ms. Mattick said she did not feel the building height in ROR could be limited to 27-feet. However, incentives could be allowed whereas a person could build over two lots if they limit their building to 27-feet. She suggested if someone is allowed to join lots, parking could be allowed on the sides or back of the property.

Ms. Mattick also felt that the parking in ROR should be addressed.

**Michael Coleman**, 311 Pine Ave., distributed a black and white rendering relating to the proposed Pine Avenue Restoration Project. He said he had spoke to each Commissioner individually and felt he has received support of the project.

The rendering was one of that proposed on Pine Ave. He said he currently has not had to ask for any variances, etc. and has been able to pursue the project within the current code. However, the proposed ordinance language would not allow it. He did not recommend changing the Comp Plan.

Mr. Coleman felt the new Ordinance language did not fix the issue and that if approved would not allow the proposed Pine Ave. structures to be built. He suggested looking for ways to give incentives for downsizing. He gave the example if keeping construction at two habitable levels then a person can build across two building lots.

Mr. Coleman agreed the issue should go before the Planning & Zoning Board.

**ACTION: A joint meeting of the City Commission and Planning & Zoning Board will be scheduled.**

**4. Notice of Pre-Budget Meeting.**

A pre-budget meeting for the purpose of presenting the Commission with a new budget format was scheduled for Monday, April 7, 2008 at 11:00 a.m. It was noted that Commissioner Miller would be unable to attend.

**5. Review Old/New Business Items – No discussion.**

**Public Comments on agenda items only – None.**  
**Press Comment – None.**

**ADJOURNMENT**

**The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m. on motion made by Commissioner Miller and seconded by Commissioner Tollette. All Ayes.**

---

**Alice Baird, CMC, City Clerk**