

**CITY OF ANNA MARIA  
CITY COMMISSION/PLANNING & ZONING BOARD WORKSESSION  
MEETING HELD AT ANNA MARIA COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
10005 GULF DRIVE – ANNA MARIA, FL  
THURSDAY, APRIL 8, 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:** Commissioner Chuck Webb (6:20 p.m.), Commissioner Jo Ann Mattick, Commissioner Dale Woodland, Chair John Quam, and Commissioner Harry Stoltzfus.

**P&Z Board Present:** Chair Randall Stover (6:21 p.m.), Boardmembers Sandy Mattick, Frank Pytel, Bob Barlow, Margaret Jenkins, Mike Yetter, and Jim Conoly.

**Staff Present:** City Clerk Alice Baird, Finance Director/Deputy City Clerk Diane Percycoe, Building Official Bob Welch, City Planner Alan Garrett, City Attorney Jim Dye (6:42 p.m.), and Minutes Clerk Stacey Johnston.

**Press:** Sun and Islander.

*Chair Quam* informed that the joint meeting was called to discuss the draft prepared by Planner Garrett as a result of the last City Commission/P&Z Board Worksession and for discussion of the parking plan. Chair Quam asked that each member keep in mind that the plan must be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, to minimize the safety hazards for pedestrian and bicycle traffic, that there is a workable plan for development and redevelopment, and that it is acceptable to the residents of the community.

*Planner Garrett* summarized the changes and proposals made as a result of the previous City Commission and P&Z Board comments, Planner Garrett's comments, and also comments suggested by resident Tom Turner. A summary of the changes were presented by Planner Garrett. (The City Commission and P&Z Board discussion that followed is referenced.)

**1. Chapter 70 – Definitions.**

**Sec. 70-1 - Add definition of *Curb Cut*.**

- **Sec. 70-1 - Add definition of *Driveway*. “*Driveway provides vehicular access for all uses between an abutting street and a vehicular parking area.*”**

*Commissioner Mattick* asked if driveway would refer to the residential driveways also.

*Planner Garrett* clarified that the driveway was the area between the street and the parking space – connects the abutting street from where a vehicle is parked for residential, industrial, commercial, churches, etc.

*Commissioner Woodland* did not feel the proposed definition of driveway was clear. He suggested that the ASHTO (American Association of State of Highway Transportation Officials) definition be used.

*Commissioner Stoltzfus* agreed with Commissioner Woodland noting that after an individual were to enter their property, they could be in a general parking area and not necessarily in a driveway.

*Building Official Welch* said if it was agreed to split the definition into parts, there was a clear definition of the “driveway apron” and the other portion could be defined as the “drive aisle.”

*Planner Garrett* suggested using the terminology of “drive isle”. He read the ASHTO definition as follows:

**ASHTO definition – a driveway is an access constructed within the public right-of-way, connecting the public roadway with adjacent properties.**

*Planner Garrett* explained that the ASHTO definition would mean that the driveway is always within the public right-of-way – therefore, from the edge of the pavement to where the property line begins. Once on the property, there would no longer be a driveway. He said he had no objection to utilizing the ASHTO definition.

*P&Z Boardmember Mattick* said she would be opposed to any intention of making every parking spot – trying to define as a driveway – getting into every parking spot currently on Pine Ave.

*Planner Garrett* asked that a straw vote be taken to establish a consensus relating to the definition of a driveway.

**ACTION:** *Chair Quam* called for the following straw vote:

- **Planner Garrett’s proposed definition of driveway – 5 votes.**
  - **ASHTO definition of driveway – 7 votes. – MAJORITY CONSENSUS.**
- Planner Garrett agreed to include the ASHTO definition in the next draft.**

*Building Official Welch* stated that the ASHTO definition was the State’s definition and that the State is only concerned about the State roads. He suggested it be defined as a “driveway apron.”

## **2. All Chapter 90 – Parking.**

- **Sec. 90-2. (2) (b) (1) Private roads – Change Private roads to Driveways.**
- **Sec. 90-2 (2) Curb cuts – Change to: Curb Cuts/driveways - and reference both throughout.**

*Commissioner Mattick* used her residence as an example noting that there were three adults in her family and that the Code only allowed for one two-way curb cut or driveway opening on a street frontage. She said there a need for a much wider access to the street than what the proposed Code language would allow.

*Commissioner Webb* felt that the different uses and different zonings should each have their own separate requirements for driveways. He felt the section should be tailored and then indicated in each separate zoned classification. He provided the example of Residential with less than 75-ft frontage having one driveway versus a corner lot having two driveways.

*Commissioner Stoltzfus* agreed with tailoring the regulations based on intensity. He noted that the City presently only requires residences to accommodate two parking spaces.

*Planner Garrett* informed that Gulf Dr. is referred to as a collector in the Comp Plan - and Pine Ave. is a collector in the LDR’s. *P&Z Boardmember Mattick* asked if a corner parcel on Pine Ave. would require access on the side street. *Planner Garrett* said they would. Explanation followed.

P&Z Boardmember Mattick cautioned about making certain changes until there was an idea of how the parking should look like. She noted that there was discussion at the last joint Worksession of allowing for a mixture of parking types along Pine Ave.

*Chair Stover* agreed with Commissioner Webb's comments that each zoning area should have their own regulations. He pointed out that the Comp Plan has three unused sections - # 91, # 92, and # 93 that could be utilized - rather than placing the details in each separate zoning section.

In referencing Sec. 90-1 (2) *Curb cuts / driveways*, Commissioner Stoltzfus suggested that "Curb cuts / driveways" not include the "/" in order to distinguish they are two separate entities.

He further referred to Sec. 90-1 (2) b. and suggested the language be changed

From: "may have two curb cuts or driveway openings on that street."

To: "No lot that has 75 feet or more frontage shall have more than two curb cuts."

Commissioner Stoltzfus asked for clarification relating to Sec. 90-1 (2) b. "Corner parcels on collectors shall provide one of the accesses by way of the intersecting local street."

*Planner Garrett* explained that the restriction would only apply to a lot of 75-ft or more in frontage. The provision would not apply to corner parcels less than 75-ft. On the other hand, small corner parcels have to come in off the side street. Wider parcels allowing for two driveways off the parcel would result in one on the side street and one off the frontage.

*Commissioner Stoltzfus* asked that the section be reworded for clarification.

*P&Z Boardmember Mattick* asked if a curb cut referred to handicap accessibility.

*Planner Garrett* agreed explaining that the definition of curb cuts often referred to pedestrians and handicap. He suggested changing the definition of curb cut to reflect a vehicular access or vehicular ramp.

Planner Garrett agreed to separate the requirements per zoned district and clarify the language as requested.

*Commissioner Webb* suggested that rather than "requiring" two driveways on the larger parcels, that flexibility be allowed so the Site Plan can be tailored by giving an "option" to have two driveways.

*Commissioner Mattick* reminded that there had been discussion about parcels on the side streets having the ability to back out of their driveways.

*Commissioner Stoltzfus* was in disagreement feeling that corner parcels have enough flexibility already due to having access to two streets. He referred to the ASHTO definition relating to minimizing traffic conflicts. He further stated that the Comp Plan requires that safety be considered when dealing with traffic circulation. He said adding driveways to collectors, where sidewalks are required to be built, increases the number of conflict between vehicles, pedestrian, and bicycle traffic – that every time a driveway is created, a conflict point is created.

*Commissioner Webb* stated that ASHTO referred to State roads and was designed with standards for State roads such as Highways 301 and 41. It was not designed for the streets in Anna Maria. He felt flexibility should be allowed.

*Planner Garrett* asked that a straw vote be taken to establish a consensus relating to whether or not flexibility should be allowed.

**ACTION:**     *Chair Quam* called for the following straw vote:

- **Remove the provision – Corner parcels on collectors shall provide access by way of the intersecting local street.**
- **Allow for flexibility that the driveway can either be located on either the side street or on the collector street. – MAJORITY CONSENSUS.**

*Commissioner Woodland* asked for clarification relating to “Curb cuts or driveways shall not be located closer than five feet to a property line...” He suggested that the requirement be eliminated.

*Building Official Welch* stated that the purpose for the separation requirement to a property line was to allow for run-off not having to go onto the neighboring property.

- **Sec. 90-2 (2) d. –**  
    **Change from: “Maximum curb cuts or driveways for all uses from not exceeding 24 feet in width at the property line”**

**To – “Not exceeding 20 feet in width at the property line.”**

*Planner Garrett* noted that the two residential districts could be one class, C-1 and ROR could be combined, and the PSP and PRA could be combined. He asked if the Boardmembers wished to limit the width of a residential driveway.

Discussion followed as far as what the present requirements were regarding “driveways for all other uses shall not exceed 24 feet in width at the property line.” *Building Official Welch* explained that a residential 50-ft wide lot is allowed one driveway. A 75-ft lot or larger is allowed to have two driveways.

*P&Z Boardmember Jenkins* was opposed to restricting how a person was to park on their private property.

*Commissioner Webb* said he would not want to see parking across the entire frontage of a residential and noted that lot coverage could limit the amount of access to a residential lot. Discussion followed relating to packed shell being impervious.

*Planner Garrett* suggested the width be no more than a certain percentage of the frontage. He agreed to leave a blank area in the proposed Code changes for the Commission to make a determination at the next Worksession.

- **Sec. 90-2 d. (3) Separation of vehicular and pedestrian traffic**

*Commissioner Woodland* asked for clarification relating to Sec. 90-2 d. (3).

*Planner Garrett* suggested that the language be changed to read:

“(3) *Separation of vehicular and pedestrian traffic.* Streets, drives, alleys, parking areas, loading areas, aisles or other vehicular use areas and pedestrian walks or paths shall be designed as integral parts of an overall development plan. ~~and shall be property related to existing and proposed buildings.~~ *Planner Garrett* noted that other Codes address this issue better and he would reword the section for better clarification.

- **Sec. 90-2 (3) (c) Clear visibility triangles. (1) Street corners** – add: “On a corner lot there shall be no parking space, loading space, signage....”
- **Sec. 90-2 d. (2) (d) (1) b. Width and location** – Change sidewalk width from a minimum of four feet to a minimum of five feet.
- **Sec. 90-2 (3) Separation of vehicular and pedestrian traffic (c) Clear visibility triangles. (2)** – add Curb cut to heading – *Curb cut or driveway intersections.*

**Add:** “At the intersection of curb cut or driveway with a street right-of-way-line, there shall be no loading space, signage.”

*Commissioner Stoltzfus* did not feel parking should be allowed in the visibility triangle. He felt that “parking space” and also the “collector” language should be added to this section. Discussion followed.

- **Sec. 90-2 (3) Separation of vehicular and pedestrian traffic (d) (1) Sidewalks. b. Width and locations.** – change width of sidewalks from a minimum of four feet wide to a minimum of five feet wide.
- **Sec. 90-3 (f) Parking space dimensions (1)** – Change Head-in parking spaces shall be a minimum of ten feet wide by 20 feet long to – nine feet wide by 19 feet long.  
*Planner Garrett* responded to *P&Z Boardmember Mattick’s* question about angled parking. He stated that angled parking has only been allowed in Site Plans.
- **Sec. 90-3 g. Aisles and driveways.**  
*Commissioner Mattick* asked if the parking lots could be made narrower.

*Planner Garrett* said he will utilize a turning template to determine.

*Commissioner Woodland* asked if “Aisles” should be included.

*Building Official Welch* informed that private roads are normally the widths of drive aisles.

*Chair Quam* asked that “reservoir” be added to the definitions.

- **Sec. 90-3 (h) – Parking Facility Dimensions Table Inset – Dimensions adjusted accordingly based on parking spaces being 9-feet wide by 19-feet long.**  
*Planner Garrett* said he did not believe all the table listings were necessary and suggested they be eliminated. He explained that a diagram serves as reference on the Table Inset of A through L. *Commissioner Webb* asked that the diagram be cross-referenced if the Table will be left in the Code.

For clarification purposes, *Commissioner Stoltzfus* asked that the symbol for degrees be included after the numbered dimensions in the Table Inset.

- **Sec. 90-3 (h) Parking Facility Dimensions – Add – There shall be a twelve (12) foot long and twenty (20) foot wide turning area beyond the last parking stall in any dead end drive aisle, to allow proper maneuvering of a vehicle backing out of the last parking stall.**  
*Planner Garrett* did not feel this section related to single-family.

- **Sec. 90-3 Commercial uses (l) Table Inset** – The following to be removed from the table:  
“Each machine (laundromat, etc.)”  
“apartment” – currently referenced with Each sleeping unit, and  
“Each chair (barbershop, beauty shop, etc.)”  
**Each person regularly employed to be changed from 0.75 to 0.50**  
*Planner Garrett* informed that most County and City Codes require four parking spaces per 1,000 sq. ft – one parking space for 250 sq. ft of retail. *Anna Maria* states one parking space per 400 sq. ft of retail.
- **Sec. 90-3 (l) Commercial uses (3) single-family and duplex uses** - change to read ‘Single-family and duplex units having individual driveways may fulfill such requirement by including spaces located in the driveway behind and not part of the street right-of-way line.’
- **Sec. 90-3 (l) Commercial uses** – Add (5) **Tandem Parking**. All single-family dwelling units (including manufactured housing), upper-story residential and two-family dwelling units may provide required parking for up to two vehicles in tandem spaces. Such spaces shall be no less than nine feet in width and a minimum of 38 feet in depth for the pair of vehicles. Such tandem parking shall not extend over the right-of-way, sidewalk or otherwise interfere with pedestrian or vehicular movement.
- **Sec. 90-3 (l) Commercial uses (m) General design standards**. – Reformatted and reworded subsection for clarity and add – “e. be so arranged so that no vehicle shall be required to back from such facilities directly into Pine Avenue or Gulf Drive.”  
*Chair Quam* asked that including the right-of-way parking in front of the parking be discussed. (Ref: Sec. 90-3 (m) a. be located solely on the subject property.)

*Planner Garrett* explained that if the Commission approved – a person having a piece of property on Pine Ave. would have the ability to park two or three vehicles parallel between the pavement and right-of-way edge of the road on the City’s right-of-way if there is enough room. He gave the example of being required ten parking spaces to comply with the parking requirements and using seven of those spaces on site and working with the City for a right-of-way use permit to allow the other three spaces parallel in the right-of-way. He stated that allowing parking in the right-of-way would assist in reducing the pervious coverage on the site and to give more open space as indicated in the Comp Plan.

*Commissioner Mattick* asked City Attorney Dye for the definition of the City’s right-of-way.

*City Attorney Dye* informed that the legal definition of a right-of-way is an easement granted to the public by the City. The ownership resides in the adjoining property owner. The property remains with the adjoining property owner until such time the local government gives up the public rights – at which time the public rights in the right-of-way go away and the adjoining property owner gets the use of the property again – unless their neighbor needs to use it to get to and from the nearest public street.

However, *City Attorney Dye* said on a practical level that the City has the right to manage and use the right-of-way as it sees fit. He noted the City already allows parking on the right-of-way.

*Commissioner Mattick* agreed that since there is such limited parking space, the City should allow parking in the right-of-way.

*P&Z Boardmember Mattick* questioned how to keep trucks and vehicles from parking on the sidewalk. Discussion followed.

*Commissioner Stoltzfus* addressed the safety issue and felt the City would need to do a better job of accommodating Segways, golf carts, bicycles, etc. on Pine Ave. He noted that in the meantime, a developer has been allowed to count parallel parking spaces as part of the required number of spaces for his development. He questioned where the parking spaces would be moved to if a bike path is built. It was Commissioner Stoltzfus' opinion that allowing any right-of-way for a developer's parking area is a huge mistake and that the City would have nothing to gain.

*P&Z Chair Stover* stated that no one could stop him from parking in front of his business. He reminded that the City had turned down a \$300,000 bike path grant. He did not feel the issue was about safety on Pine Ave. – and rather it was about backing out. He felt the sidewalks were too close to the street and suggested that the sidewalks be widened to 5-ft towards the business to allow SUV's etc. to park.

*Chair Quam* said he hoped that the right-of-way could continue to be utilized – that the question would be if the spaces could be counted towards the total parking requirements for a development.

*Commissioner Mattick* reiterated she felt the right-of-way should be utilized. She pointed out that for many years the City has discussed not placing a bike path on Gulf Dr. or Pine Ave. due to not wanting any more impervious surface – and therefore, the issue of a bike path would have no bearing in the future as far as parking.

*P&Z Boardmember Pytel* felt it was discriminatory to certain business owners if they could use City right-of-way for parking spaces. Other businesses do not have the same opportunity to meet the parking requirements. He felt parking should be on the property only.

*Commissioner Woodland* said he currently has no objection to parking in the right-of-way but could see how that could change if the commercial activity were to increase. He was opposed, however, to allowing the right-of-way to be calculated towards the total parking space requirements for the business owner and felt the City should take control of the right-of-way. Commissioner Woodland said he was in favor of creating a pedestrian area 6 to 8-ft wide.

*P&Z Boardmember Mattick* said it was much easier to park on the right-of-way and felt that Gene Aubry's plan should be considered.

*Planner Garrett* said in a lot of jurisdictions, it was not uncommon for the actual sidewalk to be located on the private property where the property owner has given the jurisdiction an easement for the sidewalk.

*Planner Garrett* asked that a straw vote be taken to establish a consensus relating to whether or not parking on the right-of-way, if available, should be allowed towards the total calculation of required parking spaces.

*P&Z Boardmember Pytel* discussed requiring a loading zone noting that the delivery trucks were parking in the right-of-way and on a portion of the street. He said widening

the sidewalks towards the business owner's property would allow the Segways, etc. to ride in front of the vehicles.

**ACTION:**     **Chair Quam called for the following straw vote:**

- **If a business owner has the ability to provide parallel parking on public right-of-way within the front of the lot or parcel, should they be allowed to do the parallel parking on the public right-of-way and that the parallel parking be counted as a portion of the required number of parking spaces.**  
       **5 voted in opposition and 7 voted in favor.**  
       *Chair Quam* asked that the issue be discussed at the next meeting.

In answer to *Commissioner Woodland's* question *Planner Garrett* said that:  
"With the exception of single-family or two family uses,..." could be changed to  
"With the exception of residential uses,..."

*P&Z Boardmember Barlow* stated that the various changes proposed for Chapter 114, and by utilizing the drawing prepared by *Planner Garrett*, would reduce the footprint down to about 22.7%. He questioned if the reduction would be a "taking" by the City in excess of what it should be.

*P&Z Boardmember Barlow* referenced *City Attorney Dye's* December 3, 2009 e-mail relating to the proposed Code changes creating a large number of non-conforming uses. He asked what efforts would be made to alleviate the nonconforming uses.

*City Attorney Dye* responded. His email stated that though the backing out had been a long standing practice, if the Commission no longer felt the current Code language was desirable, rather than reinterpreting the existing Code language that had been in place for many years, to revise the Code explicitly to state what was or was not allowed. Also, the non-conforming should be dealt with.

*City Attorney Dye* did not feel that a change in traffic regulations would create a taking of property.

*Commissioner Stoltzfus* referred to subsection "d. be designed to provide safe and convenient circulation in accordance with commonly accepted traffic engineering practices; and" and said he was opposed the use of the term "commonly accepted traffic engineering practices." He asked that it be replaced by guidelines or specifics.

*Commissioner Stoltzfus* also asked that the following change be made:  
"e. Be so arranged so that no vehicle shall be ~~required~~ able to back from such facilities directly into Pine Avenue or Gulf Drive."

*P&Z Chair Stover* said he felt it should be recognized that six properties out of one hundred on Pine Ave. were the reason for the changes. Noting that every property currently backs out and crosses sidewalks into the street, the remaining properties would have to bring their property up to Code prior to making any changes. The proposed Code changes would cause a huge percentage of the establishments to become nonconforming.

*Planner Garrett* noted that a reference could be made in the Code that parking as it exists at a current date would be conforming. A determination would need made,

however, about what the Code would require if one chose to make changes to their property.

*P&Z Boardmember Mattick* suggested the removal of wording as follows:

“(m) General *design standards*. With the exception of single-family or two-family uses, all off-street parking areas, ~~including all areas for maneuvering,~~ shall comply with the following

She further noted that the proposed subsection e. would completely eliminate the ability to utilize Gene Aubry’s plan. She asked if that section could be removed.

*City Planner Garrett* felt the section could be removed.

- **Sec. 90-3 (l) Surfacing – Add “(n) Building separation. No parking space or drive aisle shall be located closer than five feet to any building unless it is completely under the building, an attached carport, an enclosed garage, or at a drive-thru service land.”**
- **Sec. 90-4. Off-street loading requirements. (a) Generally. – Change “shall” to “may” and change “accessways” to “driveways.”**

*P&Z Boardmember Pytel* asked to address the off-street loading requirements. *Planner Garrett* clarified the interpretation of the Code as proposed.

*P&Z Boardmember Pytel* said he strongly disagreed with making the loading requirements in the Commercial district voluntary. He proposed the following language:

“Each ROR district, for every commercial enterprise or other nonresidential use requiring loading or unloading of vehicle supplies and materials either shall have:

- a. One or more off-street loading/unloading so any vehicles so engaged will not encroach on or interfere with public use of the streets or pedestrian traffic, or
- b. Provide an additional parking space.

He felt that all current regulations should remain for the Commercial district. He gave the example of large trucks at the area in front of Galiti’s having to back down the street in order to turn around.

*Commissioner Woodland* felt that the loading zones in the ROR should be removed stating that the Commercial district would more likely have the bigger delivery trucks.

*Planner Garrett* stated that if a loading zone is required, it should be required for both the Commercial and ROR districts. *Planner Garrett* pointed out that some Site Plans require loading zones. He stated that from a planning standpoint, he did not feel the ROR and Commercial could be separated with different regulations. He noted that some Site Plans mandate loading zones and suggested if those having mandates would like to make changes, then a Site Plan amendment would be required.

Discussion followed relating to whether or not loading/unloading spaces should be required. It was noted that the current loading zones were not being utilized. Suggestions included:

- If loading zones were required and not used, the truck should be ticketed
- Base the requirement of a loading zone on the square footage
- Basing the requirements of a loading zone on intensity.

*Planner Garrett* suggested that the issue be discussed at the next joint meeting.

- **Remove Sec. 90-4 (b) through (c) (3).**

### **3. Chapter 114 – ROR Setbacks.**

- **Sec. 114-282 (4) *Setback requirements a. Dimensions* – Table Inset Adjust footage to allow flexibility with an incentive relating to the Setback requirements. Details followed.**

*Planner Garrett* explained that the proposed language allows for flexibility that if building is no taller than 27-ft then the front yard setback can be reduced to 5-ft and 10-ft street side yard.

Discussion followed as to whether or not setbacks should even be required. *Planner Garrett* informed that some City's do not have setbacks – only fire code separation. Explanation followed. *Commissioner Woodland* asked that *Planner Garrett* provide information relating to other Cities for the next meeting. The following suggestions were made:

- Provide alternatives to the 27-ft height requirement and suggested 32-ft.
- Allow flexibility for some of the lots to be utilized for historic preservation purposes.
- If a 5-ft setback is implemented, parking should be required in the rear.
- Allow for flexibility on the side-yard setbacks, yet allow for neighbor consideration.
- Discussion relating to hardship parking allowances.

### **4. Chapter 114 – Landscaping.**

- **Sec. 114-420 (d) – Remove “*commercial*” and add “*retail/office*”.**
- **Sec. 114-420 – Add “(5) In addition to the above, a five-foot street buffer is required to be planted with \_\_\_\_\_.”**

### **Public Comment**

**Lizzie Thrasher** stated there had been a lot of energy spent on the safety issue and felt that a professional who fully understands safety and parking issues should be hired. It was her opinion that the proposed curb cutting would be disastrous to the pedestrian safety and bicycle traffic. She agreed that the City needed to reduce the number of times that vehicles pass over sidewalks. She felt the best solution was to relocate the sidewalks up against the storefronts and was in favor of utilizing Gene Aubry's plan.

Ms. Thrasher asked if a professional demographic study projecting the future changes would be conducted.

**John Cagnino**, 9807 Gulf Dr., was opposed to approving language that would create strip centers on Pine Ave. and to reduce the footprint down to 22%. He noted that it would result in a 50% reduction on the first floor causing a massive reduction in property values. He felt the City would be looking at litigation and a “taking” due to a business not being able to support their debt.

**Tom Aposporos**, Crescent Dr., voiced concern and suggested that consideration be placed on the impact on the commercial streets and how it would effect the residential. He supported asking for a professional study.

Mr. Aposporos referenced the Walkable Communities brochure and stated there were areas of the brochure that conflicted with the discussion that evening. Examples followed.

**Gene Aubry**, 410 Spring, informed that the City had 4-ft wide sidewalks and not 5-ft handicap sidewalks, had 8-ft of space, and 24-ft roads. He said if the sidewalks are widened, the cars would not fit.

Mr. Aubry suggested that the drawing presented by Planner Garrett that evening include a proper turning radius to indicate they would physically work. He did not feel the drawing as shown would work. He agreed that if the proposal is approved, there would be a row on strip centers - which he felt would be a disaster.

Mr. Aubry said he was willing to assist in any way.

**Janet Aubry**, 410 Spring, suggested that Anna Maria be left alone. She stated there was a perceived safety issue. She said a new Commissioner on the Commission, in order to get after a developer, had proposed a safety issue. Ms. Aubry did not feel the proposals addressed safety.

**Dan Gagney**, 214 Pine, said as proposed, it would not be possible on a 50-ft lot to get to the back yard for parking.

**Micheal Coleman**, Pine Ave., stated that one of the Comp Plan goals was "to encourage mixed-use development" and the objective was "shall encourage mixed-use development." He did not feel Planner Garrett's drawing encouraged mixed-use development noting it was drawn on two 52-ft. x 145-ft corner lots, referred to a 7-11 type plan, and was designed for suburban communities having three times as much land. He reviewed the existing corner lots and noted none of the lots would fit the proposed configuration. He asked where the plan was that would show what happens on a 52-ft x 100-ft lot.

Mr. Coleman did not feel a professional corridor study was needed. Instead, he suggested walkable communities be researched on Google and used as a reference.

Mr. Coleman stated that Gene Aubry's plan would address every concern discussed that evening. Explanation and examples followed.

*Chair Quam* asked Planner Garrett to provide drawings showing that the parking would be workable and that the footprint could include building 40%.

**Commissioner Mattick** asked that Gene Aubry's drawings be reviewed again due to it solving all the issues.

*Chair Quam* said new drawings would be made and reviewed for the next meeting and if not workable Mr. Aubry's plan may be reviewed again.

**Commissioner Stoltzfus** asked that Planner Garrett meet with Dan Gagney relating to his comments and concerns.

**Next Meeting**

The next joint City Commission/P&Z Board Worksession will be held on Thursday, April 29, 2010, 6:00 p.m.

**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 8:42 p.m.**

---

**Alice Baird, CMC, City Clerk**