

**CITY OF ANNA MARIA
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD
PUBLIC HEARING – EAR AMENDMENTS
MEETING HELD AT HOLMES BEACH CITY HALL
5801 MARINA DRIVE, HOLMES BEACH, FL
TUESDAY, MARCH 6, 2007
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, Chair Doug Copeland, Frank Pytel, Doug Winton, and Jim Conoly.

ABSENT w/excuse: Boardmember Randall Stover.

Staff present: Consultant Tony Arrant, Mayor Fran Barford, City Commission Chair John Quam, City Commissioner Christine Tollette, City Commissioner Jo Ann Mattick, City Commissioner Dale Woodland, City Clerk Alice Baird, Building Clerk Diane Sacca, and Minutes Clerk Stacey Johnston.

Press present: Sun, Islander.

1. **Public Hearing regarding the Comprehensive Plan and the proposed updates to the plan.**

The purpose of this public hearing is to allow for the Local Planning Agency to receive public comments, suggestions, and concerns regarding the current Comprehensive Plan and the proposed updates to the plan, and to take action to recommend the proposed plan amendments to the City of Anna Maria City Commission.

Chair Copeland announced that the City of Anna Maria's Planning & Zoning Board serves as the Local Planning Agency and is a recommending body only. The purpose of the meeting was stated.

Proper Advertisement

Chair Copeland asked City Clerk Baird and Consultant Tony Arrant if the meeting had been properly advertised and if all materials were made available to the Public.

City Clerk Baird stated that materials were made available to the public from the first date of the advertisement. All who asked for copies did receive them.

Tony Arrant, Consultant, addressed the Board to clarify the process relating to the Public Hearing advertisement.

Mr. Arrant informed that State Statute requires that a ¼ pg display ad announcing the Public Hearing must be ran once in a paper of general circulation. The City of Anna Maria, however, chose to run it two times rather than just one.

The first publication ran on February 23, 2007 with the second one appearing on February 27, 2007.

In review of the second run it was noticed that above the photo of the map read the words “Herald File Photo - The Olympia Theater in Palmetto is at the center of an eminent domain dispute.” Recognizing this should not have been included in the display ad, the paper was notified and did run the current display ad an additional time that appeared on March 1, 2007.

Chair Copeland officially opened the Public Hearing for the purpose of hearing public comments, suggestions, and concerns for the record. He stated the hearing would begin by hearing comments relating to the Future Land Use and Map and then proceeding through the elements one by one.

Chair Copeland said he encouraged everyone to limit their comments to three to five minutes, however, will not limit anyone from speaking unless they went way beyond the five-minute time period. He stated at the end of the meeting he would read letters from those individuals requesting inclusion into the record.

Chair Copeland asked that those wishing to speak sign-in with their name and address prior to speaking.

FUTURE LAND USE AND MAP

- a. *Matt Taylor, Mackey Law Group, 1402 3rd Ave W, Bradenton, FL 34202 addressed the Board on behalf of LLB Realty, LLC, who owns the lots at 101, 103, 105, 107, and 109 N. Bay Blvd. Mr. Taylor pointed out on the enlarged map he brought with him exactly where the lots are located.*

Mr. Taylor said he was asking the City, in their proposed Comp Plan amendment, to modify it to allow those lots to be zoned back from Commercial to an ROR zoning.

He informed that the current land use and restrictions came about via a lawsuit by then owners the Kilpatrick’s, against the City of Anna Maria in the 1980’s. His clients purchased the property later and disagree with the Kilpatrick’s and feel as it is currently slated for future land use, it does not fit the Comp Plan, the village atmosphere, does not provide the proper buffering to residential uses around it, does not fit within the general future land use around it, and is a “sore thumb” in the area it is located.

Mr. Taylor handed out a three-page Comprehensive Plan Policies and Goals Land Use Comparisons table he had prepared.

He stated that in looking at the corridor of Pine Avenue, it consists of residential and retail use. The surrounding and the current and future land use adjacent to his client’s property is a church and buffered on the backside as residential. He said legally the City would want to insure the Comp Plan meets their goals and policies.

In referencing the handout, Mr. Taylor informed the table included a comparison in terms of future commercial venues versus ROR venues on the property and how the future ROR use meets and exceeds the goals of the Comp Plan.

Mr. Taylor discussed the first statement on the handout that related to ensuring and providing for adequate and appropriate buffering. Feeling that the separation and buffering concern was a big concern to the City, he pointed out that the ROR usage would serve as a buffer and a breakdown between strict commercial flowing into residential.

In conclusion, Mr. Taylor said the ROR land use, as set forth in his handout, would:

- Minimize any incompatibility.
- Would provide for mixed-use.
- Protects the single-family character of that neighborhood and the manner in which the residential use is going to continue in the future by providing the mixed-use and buffer to the residential and retail.
- Continues to ensure compatibility with the land use around it.
- Anchors the ROR corridor on Pine Avenue.
- Will protect Anna Maria’s unique village atmosphere.
- ROR use versus strictly Commercial would cut down traffic concerns.
- Better in concert with the Comp Plan.

- b.** *Tom Turner*, 850 N. Shore, said he did not feel that Section 1.2.1 should be in the Comp Plan, that with the use of more restrictive setbacks this would help in reducing the size of the building.

Mr. Turner felt Policy 1.2.3 of the proposed plan conflicts with the ROR and felt it was for the R1 districts only.

Referring to policy 1.3.4, he asked for clarification of the 60% 100% statement.

In policy 1.3.5, Mr. Turner suggested the following statement be added – “Owner or lessee must occupy the entire structure.” He felt the ROR District should allow for residences and also office or retail and did not think the section was clear. Explanation followed.

Mr. Turner pointed out that the comments on page 15 and on policy 1.3.5 of the proposed Plan should be the same.

- c.** *Liane Bennati*, 114 Palmetto, handed out a prepared statement for the record, requesting it be attached to the official minutes in support of the City keeping a residential future land use designation for the properties at 9702 Gulf Drive, 116 Palmetto Avenue, and 118 Palmetto Avenue. Also included was a five-page written opinion by Certified Planner, Sam Casella, and his resume, that were previously submitted at the July 10, 2006 Comprehensive Plan Public Hearing.

Ms. Bennati read the statement that supports the keeping of the Residential Future Land Use Map designations of 116 Palmetto Avenue, Lot 2, Block 31, 118 Palmetto Avenue (Lot 1 less N 62 ft. Block 31), and 9702 Gulf Drive (The N 62 ft. of Lot 1, Block 31).

Ms. Casella said she was grateful that the Future Land Use Map shows the three properties on Lots 1 and 2, Block 31 in the Residential category as they have been for many years.

- d. *Robin Wall*, 112 Palmetto Avenue, presented the Board and City Clerk with a prepared statement, copy of the Local Planning Agency’s January 6, 1987 minutes, copy of Ordinance No.’s 496 adopted June 12, 1989 and No. 523 adopted April 14, 1992, reference to page 9 of the City’s Future Land Use Map adopted April 1992, and an except from page three of Certified Planner Sam Casella’s July 5, 2006 opinion relating to the importance of residential character.

Ms. Wall stated in Policy 1.3.4, she felt changing residential uses may comprise up to “100%” of the category to “60%” was rather extreme.

Referring to Policy 1.3.5, Ms. Wall suggested that commercial use should be limited on an elevated floor to professional use or office use only and not retail. She was concerned that retail could be stretched to allowing for alcohol and it would be difficult to buffer elevated floors.

Ms. Wall said in Policy 1.3.6, relating to all commercial structures being limited to 27 feet in height, was too intense to go up to two elevated floors in order to preserve the small, beach-town feel.

Ms. Wall then read her prepared statement on behalf of herself and her husband Peter Wall.

- e. *Robin Wall*, appointed by Patrick Mullins, 111 Palmetto Avenue, read a letter in support of keeping the Residential Future Land Use Map designations for Lots 1 & 2, Block 31 at Gulf Drive and Palmetto Avenue.

Ms. Wall presented the Appointment of Spokesman and letter written and signed by Mr. Mullins to the Board and City Clerk for the record.

- f. *Robin Wall*, appointed by Joe and Dorothy Perricone, 117 Palmetto Avenue, read a letter in support of keeping the Residential Future Land Use Map designations for 9702 Gulf Drive, 116 Palmetto Avenue, and 118 Palmetto Avenue.

Ms. Wall presented the Appointment of Spokesman and letter written and signed by Mr. and Mrs. Perricone to the Board and City Clerk for the record.

- g. *Brendan Rowe*, Lobeck & Hanson Law Offices, 2033 Main St, Ste 403, Sarasota, FL 34237, addressed the Board on behalf of his clients Mr. and Mrs. Fred Nally, 110 Spring Avenue.

Mr. Rowe presented the Board and City Clerk a copy of the March 6, 2007 correspondence from him relating to the proposed Future Land Use Map amendments.

Pointing out that the Nally's property, currently designated as commercial, is also carried out on the proposed Land Use Map as Commercial. Mr. Rowe spoke requesting the property be changed to an ROR designation.

The remainder of Mr. Rowe's letter was read to the Board. Mr. Rowe voiced concern that as currently proposed he did not see how the Nally's would be able to re-build following any substantial destruction of their property.

He further stated that the Comp Plan, as currently exists, only provides for major disasters and not for damage by fire, etc.

- h. *Marie White*, 111 Spring Avenue, voiced her concern if a disaster occurred that they would not be able to re-build their home under the current Comp Plan and asked for clarification.

Chair Copeland explained that the current 1989 adopted Comprehensive Plan does not allow for the re-building of their home. However, the proposed Plan would allow for re-build.

Ms. White said she had documentation stating they were not allowed a variance and questioned if the current plan would not allow them to build on the property, then why were they allowed to.

She encouraged that the Board approve a ROR change at 110 Spring Avenue, pointing out there are only three homes on Spring Avenue and one commercial property.

- i. *Mike Eiffert*, CFO, Galati Marine, S. Bay Blvd, addressed Policy 1.3.6 regarding the proposed change limiting commercial structures from the current 37 feet height to the proposed 27 feet height.

Mr. Eiffert informed they want to build an additional building and if they can even get insurance it would be cost prohibitive. He said the effect of limiting the height to 27 feet would not allow it to be cost effective to build one working level in the commercial zone. He said therefore it would not be cost effective to build a commercial structure in the City of Anna Maria. It would cause commercial structures to be extinct and he did not feel that was the intent.

Mr. Eiffert further stated there are provisions in the Comp Plan that require consistency with floodplain policies and he believes building a commercial structure on the ground level would be inconsistent with public policy.

Mr. Eiffert then discussed parking under the elevated building spaces.

- j. *Mike Galati*, Galati Marine, S. Bay Blvd, said that approximately twenty years ago, he requested adding a 15' X 20' addition to their parts room. He said the challenge at that time was the ability to build to the existing level of their property.

He expressed his concern relating to the high insurance costs and felt it should be considered when adopting a plan that will be in existence for the next twenty years. It was his opinion that certain changes should be controlled in other arenas and not in the Comp Plan itself.

In referring to the proposed 27 feet height restriction, Mr. Galati felt it would restrict their ability to meet some of the City's Comprehensive Plan requirements in reference to density, specifically the parking.

Mr. Galati offered to present the Board with a copy of letters he received from their Insurance carriers relating to the cost-prohibitive issue.

Having facilities in other cities, Mr. Galati said if they were to remodel in the future, which they hope to do, they would be forced to remodel in one of the other locations.

- k. *John Jaeger*, property owner of 1000 and 1006 Gulf Drive, said he operates a business out of the buildings at that location and voiced his concern relating to the limiting of building heights to 27 feet.

- l. *John Cagnino*, property owner of 9007 Gulf Drive, concurred with Mr. Galati and did not feel it was fair to limit the height restriction to only 27 feet. Relying on sales taxes in the community, Mr. Cagnino felt the City would be eliminating commercial with the 27-foot restriction.

Mr. Cagnino then discussed Linda Cramer's property, Lots 1 and 2, Blk 31, stating he and his family were very familiar with the history behind that property. It was Mr. Cagnino's opinion that the property should be zoned as ROR and pointed out many of the properties located to the north and east of her property is Commercial / ROR.

Mr. Cagnino said he felt it was very unfair about what has happened to Ms. Cramer's property and how she had been totally ignored.

Mr. Cagnino further discussed his concern with language in Policies 1.2.2, 1.3.3, and 1.4.2 relating to ROR and felt the need to resolve the inconsistency between these sections was required.

TRAFFIC CIRCULATION - No public comments received.

HOUSING - No public comments received.

INFRASTRUCTURE - No public comments received.

COASTAL & CONSERVATION

- a. *Tom Turner*, 850 North Shore, stated more restrictive language should be further addressed in the Comp Plan that all land that is in the Preservation and Conservation area should not have any structures on it unless approved by the DEP and other State agencies. He did not feel the City should be put in the position of making the decisions; it should be forwarded to the State for their final determination.
- b. *John Cagnino*, 9007 Gulf Drive property owner, voiced concern relating to the late Dr. Walker property. The home had previously been torn down.

Mr. Cagnino informed that the entire property in the Future Land Use has been declared Coastal & Conservation and felt he did not know if Dr. Walker's heirs knew that occurred.

RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE - No public comments received.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION - No public comments received.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

- a. *Tom Turner*, 850 North Shore, did not feel the Capital Improvements Advisory Committee statement should be taken out and they should have an active part in the future planning of the City.

He felt the Planning & Zoning Board should have a five-year plan for the development of the City, however, the Planning & Zoning Board have been left out of the loop altogether. It was his opinion this should be addressed in the proposed Comp Plan.

OTHER -

LETTERS RECEIVED TO BE INCLUDED FOR THE OFFICIAL RECORD

The following letters were received by the Board and requested inclusion in the Public Record and attached to the official minutes. Chair Copeland read each letter in its entirety:

- *Richard and Shirley Martinez*, 111 Palm Avenue, wrote in full support of the Planning & Zoning Board keeping the properties at 9702 Gulf Drive, 116 and 118 Palmetto Avenue, in the Residential Future Land Use category on the Future Land Use Map.
- *Florian M. Predd*, 212 Palmetto Avenue, wrote in favor of keeping potential business uses out of existing residential areas by requesting that the Planning & Zoning Board recommend to the Commission a Future Land Use Map that keeps Lots 1 & 2, Block 31 in the Residential Land Use category.

- *Dr. Richard and Phyllis White*, 108 Palmetto Avenue, wrote requesting that the Future Land Use Map be sent to the State Agency showing a Residential Future Land Use designation for Lots 1 & 2, Block 31.
- *John R. and Barbara C. Kimberly*, property owners of 109 Palmetto Avenue, wrote urging the continuance to retain a Residential Future Land Use designation on the Future Land Use map for the lots on the 100 block of Palmetto Avenue so the single-family residential character of the neighborhood will be maintained and protected.
- *Marcia Brown*, owner with sister of 206 Palmetto Avenue, wrote encouraging the Planning & Zoning Board to keep the Residential Future Land Use status for Lots 1 & 2, Block 31.
- *Steven and Mary Stanley*, owners of 105 Palmetto Avenue, wrote to continue protecting the residential quality of life on the 100 block of Palmetto Avenue by maintaining a residential Future Land Use Map designation for Lots 1 and 2, Block 31.
- *Michael A. Connolly*, Fournier and Connolly, P.A., attorney of record for Linda Cramer, property owner of 9702 Gulf Drive, submitted a letter requesting clarification from the City of Anna Maria with regard to the current zoning of her property. She asked that the City of Anna Maria acknowledge that the official zoning map authorized by Ordinance No. 06-661 shows that Lot 1, Block 31 is zoned Commercial.

Also attached was a chronological history of the Zoning and Future Land Use Map designation of the subject property from the mid-1960's through the present.

Hearing no further public comment, Chair Copeland officially declared the Public Comment portion closed at 8:00 p.m.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Boardmember Mattick recommended the following changes be considered by the Board:

- Policy 1.2.2 – That the proposed deleted language “from the encroachment of incompatible activities; likewise, other land use areas shall be protected from the encroachment of incompatible residential activities” be put back into the final Comp Plan document. Boardmember Mattick used the Nally’s property as a perfect example for placing this language back into the Comp Plan.
- Policy 1.3.6 – Change commercial structures are limited to 27 feet in height back to the 37 feet in height. Boardmember Mattick requested this change due to insurance issues and felt the City owes this right to the commercial property owners. She suggested the parking issues, etc. be

addressed in the land development issues and not limit the height in the Comp Plan.

- Change lots owned by Linda Cramer at 9702 Gulf Dr., 116 and 118 Palmetto Avenue from Commercial to ROR.
- It was requested by Boardmember Mattick that Tony Arrant determine the current zoning designation of the Cramer property.
- Asked Tony Arrant to determine the Coastal & Conservation usage relating to the Galati property.

Boardmember Pytel asked Mr. Arrant if the P&Z Board and the City Commission were to make substantial changes to the Comp Plan, would it have to go to the DCA and then come back to both boards again.

Mr. Arrant explained that the Public Hearing that evening was the first step required - that the Plan had not been submitted to the DCA yet. After official adoption by the City Commission, it would then be submitted to DCA for their comments. The Plan will then be returned to the City for a final City Commission Public Hearing prior to official adoption.

Mr. Arrant responded to the question relating to the Cramer property. He stated he had never been asked to research that issue, that it was shown as proposed on the 1990 Land Use Map.

Mr. Arrant said there was no misunderstanding about what the land use is, the argument relates to the zoning and the confusion of what is on the zoning map. He stated the Board would need to determine what the best land use is for that lot. If rezoning the lot, a hearing would be required.

In response to the question relating to the Galati property, Mr. Arrant said the property is shown as directed by the Board and City as a Conservation Island. He confirmed that individuals can walk out on the Island, it just cannot be built on.

Boardmember Pytel asked for clarification on how the Coastal Conservation properties were determined.

Mr. Arrant informed that a LPA workshop was held. Both he and Chris Moore looked at the properties with the aerial photograph underneath it. Further explanation followed with Mr. Arrant stating he also wanted to make sure the new map was as close as possible to scale to what the current land use map is.

Mr. Arrant said that when the computer drew the map, houses were cut in to, therefore, it was required to take a portion of the Residential area further out to make it to scale.

Boardmember Winton asked for clarification relating to the area between Palmetto Avenue and Palm Avenue being zoned as one-half Residential and one-half as ROR.

Chair Copeland explained that according to the 1989 future Land Use Map, that block was designated that way then.

Boardmember Winton asked why one-half of the lots would be designated as Commercial in a Residential area.

Mr. Arrant stated for the record, the designation of those lots were voted on, adopted, and placed into law and were not a mistake. He stated there is no such thing as a scribe's error to a Comp Plan.

Boardmember Winton then questioned the property lines following the Coastal & Conservation area and asked if it was the taking of an individual's property without their knowledge.

Chair Copeland voiced agreement with Mr. Cagnino's prior comments relating to Dr. Walker's property and was concerned a Coastal & Conservation area may be placed on someone's private lots.

The P&Z Board then reviewed the existing land-use map to the proposed map. After comparison and discussion it was determined there may be a discrepancy and agreed that Mr. Arrant should investigate and resolve this issue.

Lengthy discussion followed on how to direct Mr. Arrant to research the issue, whether an additional public hearing would be required, and what official action should be taken. It was the consensus of the Board that after review of the maps, they were not comfortable with the map in relation to the Coastal & Conservation areas, as presented.

Boardmember Pytel said he was not comfortable with moving the Plan forward due to the following reasons:

- The map in relation to the proposed Coastal & Conservation area.
- The proposed elevations on commercial property.
- The recommended changes that have been suggested.
- Concern relating to the Palmetto Avenue lots being inconsistent with the Land Use along Gulf Drive.

Boardmember Conoly agreed that specific issues should be resolved before moving forward. His concerns included:

- The map in relation to the proposed Coastal & Conservation area should be clarified. He is in favor of directing Mr. Arrant to research the issue.
- In favor of approving Policy 1.3.6 that states all commercial structures are limited to 27-feet in height.
- Spoke in favor of the issue relating to the Cramer property to remain as proposed due to the number of letters and residents who have come forward.

Boardmember Jenkins, said she:

- Was in favor of having the properties checked by Mr. Arrant relating to the Coastal & Conservation areas.
- In favor of approving Policy 1.3.6 that states all commercial structures are limited to 27-feet in height.
- Felt the Cramer lots should remain as proposed.

After discussion, the following action was taken by the Board:

a. **MOTION:** **Boardmember Mattick moved that the proposed deleted language in Policy 1.2.2 “from the encroachment of incompatible activities; likewise, other land use areas shall be protected from the encroachment of incompatible residential activities” be put back into the final Comp Plan document.**

ACTION: **Motion died due to the lack of a second.**

b. **MOTION:** **Boardmember Pytel moved to approve Policy 1.2.2. as written. Boardmember Conoly seconded the motion.**

DISCUSSION

Boardmember Mattick said she did not understand why there was a willingness to add language to protect the residential but not for commercial.

ACTION: **Motion carried on a vote of 5-1 with Boardmember Mattick voting No.**

c. **MOTION:** **Boardmember Conoly moved to accept Policy 1.3.6 (relating to all commercial structures are limited to 27 feet in height), as written. Boardmember Jenkins seconded the motion.**

DISCUSSION

Boardmember Winton suggested this language should be adopted in the zoning regulations rather than the Land Use regulations. He said he was not in favor of the 27 feet height restriction.

Boardmember Pytel said he felt it important to adopt the 27 feet restriction. It was his opinion that the 27-foot height maximum was a way for controlling not only density but also intensity. The plan density limitation for residents is six units per acre while the limit for commercial units is nine per acre.

Further explanation followed relating to the differences between the intensity for land use allowed for residential versus that allowed for commercial. It was

Boardmember Pytel’s opinion that more intensity is allowed for commercial, additional employees, and also parking would be required. He gave the example of a current 1,000 sq. foot ground level commercial building replaced by a 37-foot building with ground level parking and 2,000 sq. feet of floor space on the second and third floors.

Boardmember Mattick responded that the 27 feet currently allows for two floors so there would not be more density and intensity. She pointed out that the parking regulations can be regulated in the LDR’s.

She reiterated how insurance-wise it would be cost prohibitive to build on the ground floor. It was her opinion that the current 37-feet be allowed and it can then be further regulated in the LDR’s.

Boardmember Winton said there is very little commercial land use designated property. He felt there are only a couple of pieces of property in question; including the Galati Marina that he felt was a very important amenity to the Island. He said he would like to be accommodating to them and was in favor of the height restriction remaining at 37 feet.

Boardmember Pytel said it was important that a method be in place for buffering businesses from residences. He felt it was much different to have residents on upper floors versus businesses that would be more noisy, cause more traffic congestion, would cause additional lighting, etc.

ACTION: The motion to accept Policy 1.3.6 as written was approved on a vote of 4-2 with Boardmembers Winton and Mattick voting NO.

d. **MOTION:** Boardmember Mattick moved to change the lots at 101, 103, 105, 107, & 109, Block 39, Anna Maria Beach Subdivision, from Commercial to ROR on the Future Land Use Map. Boardmember Winton seconded the motion.

ACTION: Motion carried – All Aye.

e. **MOTION:** Boardmember Mattick moved to extend the designation of ROR from Gulf Drive to Palmetto. Boardmember Winton seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION

Boardmember Conoly stated a large quantity of residents had come forward against changing those lots to a ROR designation and only two or three are in favor of its change. He said he has misgivings about changing any lot on Palmetto to ROR.

Boardmember Jenkins agreed and felt it was necessary to respect the wants of the residents.

Boardmember Pytel also agreed pointing out it had been residential for a long time.

Boardmember Mattick submitted that every commercial property had requested the maximum building height be maintained at 37 feet, however, the Board had ignored their wishes.

Boardmember Winton said he has concerns stating that the property immediately adjacent to the Cramer property is designated as ROR and is bothered most by the inconsistency.

ACTION: Motion failed on a vote of 2-4 with Boardmembers Mattick and Winton voting AYE and Boardmembers Conoly, Pytel, Copeland, and Jenkins voting NO.

f. MOTION: Boardmember Winton moved to change the designation of 110 and 111 Spring Avenue from Commercial to ROR.

DISCUSSION

Tony Arrant, said the intent of both the P&Z and the City Commission when going through the EAR was to make sure all structures could be rebuilt to their current use and their current footprint as long as they are non-voluntarily destroyed. Anyone voluntarily removing his or her home would be required to follow the newly adopted Comp Plan.

ACTION: Motion died due to the lack of a second.

g. MOTION: Motion was made by Boardmember Jenkins to direct Consultant Tony Arrant to investigate the lots in question at the end of the Gulf side, starting at Oak, Maple, Park, to Beach – that if in the current Land-Use Map they were designated as Residential that they would be so designated on the new Land-Use map. If there are lots not listed on the proposed map, those lots would remain as Residential. Boardmember Winton seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION

Tony Arrant informed he would go back to the Property Appraiser to research the issue. If there are no lots or structures at the questioned location, then the proposed map would be correct.

Boardmember Jenkins questioned if the owners should be contacted.
Mr. Arrant reminded that Public Notice had been provided.

ACTION: Approved – All Aye.

Mr. Arrant clarified that in Policy 1.3.10: Conservation Land Use Category, no development is allowed.

h. MOTION: Boardmember Winton moved to accept the Comprehensive Plan document for approval with the changes as noted with recommendation for approval to the City Commission. Boardmember Conoly seconded the motion.

ACTION: Approved – All Aye.

Chair Copeland announced that the Local Planning Agency has recommended approval of the Comprehensive Plan document with certain changes. Prior to the City Commission advertising their Public Hearing on the Comp Plan, the P&Z must first meet to approve the P&Z Public Hearing meeting minutes.

It was agreed that the next meeting would be scheduled for Tuesday, March 20, 2007 at 7:00 p.m. The agenda for that meeting will include approval of the January 11, 2007 minutes, the March 6, 2007 Public Hearing minutes, and the P&Z reorganization. The meeting will be held in the Holmes Beach Council Chambers.

Mr. Arrant informed he had a prior commitment on March 20 but it would not be necessary for him to be in attendance at the Planning & Zoning Board meeting.

Chair Copeland thanked Mr. Tony Arrant for an amazing amount of work in preparation of the Comprehensive Plan. He further thanked the citizens for their participation.

ADJOURNMENT

On motion made by Chair Copeland and seconded by Boardmember Pytel, the meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m. Motion carried – All Aye.

Alice Baird, CMC, City Clerk

MINUTES APPROVED:_____