

**CITY OF ANNA MARIA
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MEETING
MARCH 27, 2006
7:00 P.M.**

CALL TO ORDER (7:15 p.m.)

PLEDGE TO THE FLAG

ROLL CALL: Margaret Jenkins, Chair Fran Barford, Vice-Chair Doug Copeland, Frank Pytel, Randall Stover, Jim Conoly

Also present: Facilitator Tony Arrant, Mayor SueLynn, City Clerk Alice Baird, Minutes Clerk Sylvie Reichmann

Press: Sun, Islander

1. Review February 26th meeting minutes

Chair Fran Barford called the meeting to order and asked for a motion to approve the February 26th, 2006 meeting minutes, as there had not been a quorum to do so at the last meeting.

MOTION: Margaret Jenkins moved to approve the February 26th, 2006 Planning & Zoning Board Meeting Minutes, seconded by Vice-Chair Doug Copeland.

Vote: All Ayes. Motion carried.

Chair Barford asked for and received consensus to address the Traffic, Housing and Infrastructure Elements before Agenda Item #2.

Margaret Jenkins indicated that she wished to change her vote taken as part of a consensus relative to the Future Land Use Map at the last meeting.

3. Review Comprehensive Plan Elements

a. Traffic

Chair Fran Barford asked Tony Arrant to review any possible issues raised by the language in the element. Tony Arrant reminded those present that the red underlined language was new, while the blue strikethrough language is recommended for removal. He said that an intern had been hired to write the data and analysis and do the map.

Tony Arrant said that the revisions basically updated the Comprehensive Plan to reflect current legislative, statutory, and administrative language. City Clerk Alice Baird explained that the handwritten dates at the bottom of the pages were a method of tracking revisions, noting that this element had been turned over to the P&Z Board by the Ad-Hoc Committee on 8-10-05, and this was its first review by the Board.

Vice-Chair Doug Copeland noted on Page 2, "there are 'not' traffic lights" should read 'no'. Tony Arrant made the change.

Mr. Arrant noted that the Ad-Hoc Committee had made the change relative to angle parking. He reminded those present that he was not hired to write the document and one of the purposes of having a citizen-drafted comprehensive plan is for the administrators and legislators to better understand it. He asked the Board to stop him with any questions, because the goal was for those responsible for adopting the Plan to understand it in its entirety.

Tony Arrant noted that the city only had one road subject to segment level of service (LOS) standards, that being Gulf Drive. He explained the level of service (LOS) designations were calculated units of capacity per demand.

- A = free flowing rural road, no traffic
- B = standardized major rural road, free flowing traffic
- C = standard urban roadway, free flowing traffic
- D = standard urban roadway, heavy traffic, frequent stops and queuing times
- E = standard urban roadway, traffic capacity problem
- F = traffic does not flow

Tony Arrant clarified that the distinction between 'urban' and 'rural' was calculated by how many hubcaps were on a road segment at any given time, the speed, the queuing time, and the number of stops within a segment. He said that the City was considered an urban area because it belonged to a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). Mr. Arrant said that current data available shows that the roads in the city are still operating at Level B at peak hours. He explained how traffic flow is measured, and noted that the inconvenience of queuing behind the trolley could not significantly affect the LOS. In conclusion, Tony Arrant said there would probably never be a capacity problem for the LOS on the one roadway (Gulf Drive) on which the City is mandated to maintain that LOS. He said that all streets but Gulf Drive are considered local streets, and the City could adopt its own local LOS standards. Tony noted the Comprehensive Plan states that the City has adopted Level D for its local streets, noting that if there were ever a capacity problem in the city, it would show up on Gulf Drive first.

Tony Arrant explained to Frank Pytel that the City would not be committed to providing trolley service; the Objective simply mentioned it. He confirmed to Jim Conoly that the Charter granted the authority to protect the general health, safety and welfare of the community, and because of 'home rule', a municipality could adopt any ordinance to protect the general health, safety and welfare of the community, as long as it did not conflict with any State rule.

Tony Arrant explained that when he drafted the transmittal he would write to the DCA when the final revisions are sent to them, and he would need to provide rationale for the change in a goal, objective, or policy. He said that under Goal 2, he would have a note that said the City had already accomplished this and therefore it was redundant in the Comprehensive Plan.

Tony Arrant asked the Board to make sure it understood the concepts of levels of service and concurrency as it moved forward to review the Infrastructure Element. He noted that the City needed to stay on top of the interlocal and service agreements for water and sewer and would also need to consider how to handle inadequacies in the drainage system.

The Facilitator said that if the County ran out of drinking water in 2010, the City would be responsible to its own citizens.

Tony Arrant verified that traffic maps were included in the Board members' copies of the Traffic Element.

b. Housing

Tony Arrant noted that Charles Canniff had written the revision using federal, state, and county data.

The Facilitator noted that according to State statute, the City must supply adequate available and affordable housing for future and existing residents, both permanent and seasonal. Tony Arrant said that the revision language tried to show the limitations on the local government's ability to provide such housing and stated that since it was already a built-out community, with limited opportunities for expansion and where densities cannot be increased due to state and federal law, no future need would be created for more housing. He noted it stated further that, based upon market driven conditions beyond the control of the City, there is no ability to provide housing that could meet the definition of being affordable.

Tony Arrant noted that the free trolley is a mitigating factor for low-income access to the city.

The Facilitator noted that **Goal I** was commendable but might require re-writing, since it did not appear to be realistic. Tony Arrant suggested a more generic goal that addressed the three criteria (adequate, available, and affordable) to meet the needs of the current and future residents of the City of Anna Maria.

There was consensus to change Goal I. *Tony Arrant said that he would look into the statutes to see if he could come up with language regarding affordability.*

Tony Arrant noted that the change in language in **Policy 1.1.2** was to make it proactive. He noted also that **Policy 1.1.4** had been re-written, and that the law states that mobile homes could not be put in high hazard areas.

Tony Arrant continued with the review of the Objectives and Policies. He noted that there is a requirement to protect and inventory all cultural and historic sites. The Facilitator pointed out that all structures over fifty years old are historic, but are not considered historically significant unless the government designates them as such.

He asked the Board if the City had an inventory of historic buildings, and indicated the need to also be looking for archaeological and cultural sites.

The Facilitator noted that the City had never adopted a local historical resource ordinance that would designate something local as being historic. Margaret Jenkins asked if Roser Cottage was not a designated historic building. Mayor SueLynn said that she did not think this was registered, however, Belle Haven Cottage had been designated by the City as being historic.

Continuing with the review, Tony Arrant noted that in Florida, eminent domain could only be done in a blighted area in Anna Maria and Anna Maria was unlikely to have any blighted areas.

Chair Fran Barford confirmed with Tony Arrant that he would bring the revised language for **Goal I** to the next meeting.

c. Infrastructure

Not addressed at this meeting.

2. Presentation of Final Draft Land Use Map

Chair Fran Barford noted for the record that Margaret Jenkins wished to withdraw her vote taken for consensus on the draft Future Land Use Map. Jim Conoly indicated that he also wished to withdraw his affirmative vote.

In response to a question from Frank Pytel, Margaret Jenkins stated that her rationale for changing her mind on the consensus was that if she owned land on Gulf Drive where it was designated as Preservation on the west side, she would be very upset.

Chair Barford asked Jim Conoly to state his position. He responded that if people who bought the property referred to by Margaret Jenkins had purchased it as residential property, and had made it known to the Board that they did not wish to see the property re-designated, their wishes should be considered. Margaret Jenkins indicated that she had received several letters from concerned citizens in this regard.

Frank Pytel said that he had joined the affirmative consensus because the designation had more symmetry. He said that he now believed there was a great deal of validity to what the residents had said and that the Board should rethink its consensus.

Vice-Chair Doug Copeland asked how the two Commercial land use lots behind the ROR on Magnolia had appeared. He said it would make no sense to put two Commercial lots in behind the ROR. Tony Arrant indicated that this could have been a mistake. Mr. Copeland asked further why another lot, the old IGA property, had still not been designated ROR, and the Board agreed that they had made that decision at a previous meeting.

Chair Fran Barford said that the Board had identified obvious issues with the draft Future Land Use Map.

Randall Stover said he had not realized the two Commercial lots would be there, and that he thought the best use of ROR would be for development, which he would like to see kept on Pine Avenue.

Jim Conoly asked for the proper lot ID for the Commercial lots in question.

Chair Fran Barford noted the need by the Board for further clarification relative to the proposed Future Land Use Map. She acknowledged for the record a letter received from Commissioner Linda Cramer supporting the ROR land use designation along Gulf Drive to Palmetto.

Public Comment

Robin Wall of 112 Palmetto Avenue said the lots under discussion had been identified as Lots 1 & 2, Block 31. She requested that the lots be returned to original land use designation, indicating that she would like to see Commercial land use in the city to remain where it exists today. Ms. Wall noted that she had many letters from concerned citizens in this regard.

Chair Fran Barford assured Robin Wall that all the letters addressed to the Board are read. She reminded those present that if this were a public hearing, the people involved would either need to be in attendance or to have formally appointed someone to speak on their behalf.

Chuck White of noted that under Goal I, the City is mandated to “assist” by the word “shall” and asked what such assistance would consist of.

Jim Gardner of 114 Laurel Avenue said that he had sent an E-mail to the Board stating his position in support of keeping the property under discussion Residential.

John Cagnino confirmed that the old IGA property would be designated in the ROR category. He confirmed with Chair Fran Barford that the height limit for ROR had been left at 37 ft. from the crown of the road and that no architectural limitations had been imposed.

Tony Arrant indicated to Frank Pytel that the 2003 Property Appraisal records of Manatee County were the basis for the lot boundaries shown.

Tom Turner of 850 North Shore addressed landlocked lots. He cautioned against putting height restrictions in the Comprehensive Plan, indicating that this would be best controlled through the land development regulations (LDR's).

Chair Barford indicated that there were corrections to be made and the Map would need to be revisited at the next meeting. *She asked Tony Arrant to provide a large version of the amended draft.*

There was consensus to designate the two lots behind the ROR for Residential land use instead of Commercial.

MOTION: Frank Pytel moved to change the three properties on the West Side of Gulf Drive on Palmetto to Residential land use, seconded by Vice-Chair Doug Copeland.

Vote: All Ayes. Motion carried.

Randall Stover asked for and received consensus to remove the two mistaken Commercial lots that are the third lot west of Magnolia, north and south of the street, and to designate them as Residential. He received further consensus to designate the old IGA property for the ROR category.

4. Schedule Public Hearing for P&Z Draft Comprehensive Plan

Mayor SueLynn confirmed that she would seek a 7th member for the Board for the next meeting, noting that she had not intended to replace that member until it was decided by the Commission how to proceed.

There was consensus to schedule a Public Hearing for Monday, April 10th, 2006 at 7:00 p.m.

PRESS COMMENT

None offered.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Chair Doug Copeland moved to adjourn the meeting and Margaret Jenkins seconded the motion.

Vote: All Ayes. Motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.