

**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 29, 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, Commissioner Jo Ann Mattick, Chair John Quam, Commissioner Dale Woodland, and Commissioner Harry Stoltzfus.

**P&Z Board Present:** Chair Randall Stover, Boardmembers Bob Barlow, Margaret Jenkins, Sandra Mattick, Jim Conoly, and Mike Yetter.

**Absent:** City Commissioner Jo Ann Mattick, and P&Z Boardmember Frank Pytel.

**Staff Present:** City Clerk Alice Baird, Building Official Bob Welch, City Planner Alan Garrett, Public Works Director George McKay, City Attorney Jim Dye, and Minutes Clerk Stacey Johnston.

**Press:** Sun and Islander.

**1. Amend Chapter 90 – Concept for Parking in ROR District.**

*Chair Quam* asked that a consensus be determined that “backing out onto sidewalks should be prohibited in the ROR for new development or redevelopment.”

*P&Z Chair Stover* said earlier that day he had observed that a vehicle had pulled straight-in into a Pine Ave. parking space, drove across the sidewalk, and parked on the building side of the sidewalk. When the vehicle backed out it was able to back out parallel without entering the street, and then able to pull out forward.

**ACTION:**       **It was the majority consensus that it be determined that backing onto sidewalks should be prohibited in the ROR for new development or redevelopment.**  
**Voting No were -       P&Z Boardmembers Barlow and Mattick and City Commissioner Webb**

*Chair Quam* informed that he had been visiting his son in West Palm Beach over the past two years. A new development in West Palm Beach has been transitioned by removing the slums and rebuilding it as a new commercial area.

The area has one main road very similar to Pine Ave. The speed limit is 25 M.P.H. and all parking is parallel parking. There are parking lots that are opened up for special events. Chair Quam said when visiting the area, he has seen no conflicts with the pedestrians on the sidewalks. All side streets allow for angled parking.

After considering the lack of conflicts in that area of West Palm Beach, ingress and egress, he thought of Anna Maria. Though he was not in favor of the initial parking proposal and drawing presented by Gene Aubry, he contacted Gene Aubry after his last visit to West Palm Beach and asked that a parking proposal be drawn up similar to that in West Palm Beach.

Chair Quam asked that Mr. Aubry present his proposed new plan for Pine Ave. only and explained that the property owners on Pine Ave. would all have to give the City authorized easements if the plan were implemented. As a result, if the Commission were to choose the proposed Pine Ave. Master Plan proposal, it could take several years to complete.

**Gene Aubry**, 410 Spring Ave, brought attention to his proposed plan for parallel parking on Pine Ave., and angled parking on the side streets, that was posted on the wall of the Commission Chambers. Prior to drawing the new concept, Mr. Aubry spoke with Dan Burden, a planner who has developed walkable streets all over the country - including the one referenced by Chair Quam. The walkable streets are all about the ability for people to walk, ride bicycles, streets with proper lighting and landscaping, and to solve parking problems in small towns.

Mr. Aubry explained that the proposed plan was a Master Plan and not an engineered drawing. The proposed parking concept allows for:

- 197 parking spaces - 10-ft wide by 25-ft long parallel spaces. He said the reason he developed the plan at that size and width was in order to deal with the handicap spaces.
- The size of the spaces will also allow for loading to take place at any of the spaces signed for loading.
- The angled parking spaces on the side streets are back-in angled parking rather than straight-in angled parking. Explanation followed.
- No spaces will violate the 45-degree angle at the corner.
- The plan allows for lighting and landscaping at all corners, along with required handicap notations at the end of the sidewalks.
- Area for walkers, bike riders, etc. to stand on the corners.
- Bus stops would be located at the corners.
- Provides for straight paved 6-ft wide sidewalks as required by ADA.
- Allow for enough parking to support 80,000 sq. ft of retail on Pine Ave.
- Ability to expand sidewalk width to 8-ft or wider.
- Walkways to be designated in the street.
- No need for numerous signs along the street, except for the handicap, loading, and bus stop signs.
- Parallel parking, versus on-site parking, will allow for additional green space. Trees can be added next to the parking on Pine Ave.
- The parking for properties providing residential would be placed on-site.
- Any development wishing to place their parking on-site could do so by indicating so on their Site Plan.
- The plan has been reviewed with Planner Garrett and City Attorney Dye.

*P&Z Chair Stover* suggested that the proposed plan be referred to as the "Parallel Plan."

*Chair Quam* stated that with the proposed plan, parking spaces would be required for residents on the property, and any property owner can still have on-site parking with a driveway if they chose. On-site parking would be required for restaurants, cafés, or coffee shops. Chair Quam said specific details for implementing the proposed plan could be discussed at a later date.

*P&Z Chair Stover* congratulated Chair Quam for being instrumental in ending the need for a moratorium and for leading the Commission toward a nice parking solution compromise. Chair Stover said he would like to see an 8-ft sidewalk. He noted that the P&Z Board will be discussing Segways and bicycles, and how they relate to traffic, at the next P&Z Board Work Session.

*Chair Quam* thanked Chair Stover and explained that the current setbacks would be retained. However, if there is a concern that all buildings will be built to the maximum 40% footprint, the height and setbacks could be reduced.

*P&Z Boardmember Mattick* said she liked Mr. Aubry's concept and noted that the proposed plan was the only plan providing a solution for the larger trucks and their loading/unloading concerns. Boardmember Mattick said though she voted No on the question of prohibiting back out parking on Pine Ave., she was actually opposed to back out parking. However, she did not want to see a quick fix take place. She said she would be opposed to changing the language until all the ramifications are addressed.

*P&Z Chair Stover* asked if the 197 proposed spaces would allow for all required parking in the event Pine Ave. was completely built out. He pointed out that no other establishment could build a restaurant, bar, or sell beer on Pine Ave. unless there was a Code change. Therefore, the restrictions for a restaurant, café, bar, etc. would not be possible.

*Gene Aubry* explained that the idea of a walkable community is that if a person would have to park and walk a ways to a specific business, they may decide to patronize and shop at additional merchants along the way.

*Commissioner Woodland* explained what concerns he had relating to the parking on Pine Ave. He noted that the proposed plan would eliminate his concern about backing out into the street and across the sidewalk, he sees no concern about the parking or pulling out of the space as blocking the flow of traffic, and did not see a problem with overflow into the residential area. Commissioner Woodland felt that the proposed plan would provide enough parking in general, and had no concern about the angled parking for the side streets.

Commissioner Woodland was unsure about his opinion relating to the City giving up their right-of-way so the property owners could comply with their parking requirements. He felt the plan was a real step forward and would resolve the impasse relating to the parking.

*Commissioner Webb* informed that his concern all along was that the City would lose green space if the parking was all onsite. It was his opinion that the proposed plan was a step in the right direction due to it allowing for increased open space and green space that would help control stormwater runoff.

Commissioner Webb explained that the entire Pine Ave. was known as the Anna Maria Beach Subdivision. The property owners on each side of Pine Ave. own to the center line of the road. The City/public has a special type of right-of-way easement. The property is allowed to be used by the property owners so long as it does not impede the City use.

Commissioner Webb compared the proposed plan to one in the downtown Boca Grande commercial district. The parking plan is very usable, solves the alleged safety problem (though he did not believe there actually is a safety problem), is a step forward, and an opportunity to resolve the parking issue.

*Planner Garrett* noted that the City is trying to develop regulations for encouraging someone to utilize the existing home on the property. He used the example of the three properties on N. Shore Dr. By requiring the parking to be on-site, the buildings had to be torn down. The Parallel Plan, however, would help prevent that from occurring.

Planner Garrett also noted that the Parallel Plan would allow for more of a village concept, allow for a walkable street, provide for more open space, would minimize impervious coverage, and allow for crosswalk areas that would allow for a greater

congregation of individuals at the crosswalks for the Trolley stops, etc. Parking at one location would allow for an individual to walk to several shops, versus the previous proposal of the individual parking lots on each parcel. On-site parking would mean that individual parking lots would be for each specific business only and that a customer would then be required to drive to the next parking lot in order to patronize another business. He stated that the Parallel Plan could encourage more of a pedestrian movement on Pine Ave.

Planner Garrett used the example of an area allowing for the combination of parallel parking and two establishments with on-site parking - and the shops having to be moved back due to a code change. As a result, it caused a lack of continuity. He pointed out that the proposed plan is found more in the village type atmosphere.

In answer to *Commissioner Webb's* question, *Planner Garrett* stated that his drawing showing the use of on-site parking could be referred to as Strip Development. He confirmed that the Comp Plan states that Commercial Strip Development should be discouraged. He further noted that if an individual were to pull into a parking lot that was full, there would be no opportunity to turn around - and the driver would be forced to back out of the lot.

*Commissioner Woodland* stated that the on-site parking, in many cases, would not work for the 50-ft interior lots on the north side of Pine Ave. *Planner Garrett* responded. *Commissioner Woodland* referred to the limited width on Pine Ave. He then questioned if the Parallel Plan would be a total solution to the parking on Pine Ave. and Gulf Dr. or would other plans still be considered.

Discussion followed. It was noted that if the majority of the City Commission and P&Z Board agreed to accept the Parallel Plan, the discussion on the on-site parking would cease. *Commissioner Webb* said he sees the plan serving as a phase-in project with each new development. The City would require the developer to meet that Master Plan. Compliance would not be mandatory; however, the option of the City installing the sidewalk could occur if the property owner chose to comply.

*Chair Quam* said he would not approve the concept if it was mandatory that everyone was required to place the sidewalks on their property. He felt it should be on a voluntary basis.

*Commissioner Stoltzfus* said the comment of being voluntary raised the issue that if everyone did not comply with the plan, the City would be back to backing out across sidewalks again. He stated that the City already has a Comp Plan that serves as a Master Plan of how the parking is handled in the ROR - and that it was on-site parking. He felt that the on-site parking addresses the safety issues. He stated that the Comp Plan encourages developers to build small buildings and the on-site parking would force that goal. The Parallel Plan would encourage the larger buildings and the City would be looking at the developers building to the maximum 40% coverage.

*Commissioner Stoltzfus* also did not feel the proposed plan encouraged mixed-use - only encouraged retail. He said he was opposed to Anna Maria be created as a tourist destination. He noted that Anna Maria was primarily a residential community and did not need to attract more people to the area. He stated that the concept of a walking district was not part of the Comp Plan and that it was a new idea by a certain group of developers that wants to build a certain type of development not necessarily compatible with the City.

Commissioner Stoltzfus said he was very disappointed with the larger buildings and felt that the parking restriction language in place should be tightened up – use the Master Plan in place – and stop wasting time over the parking. He noted that the moratorium in place was wisely dropped because they seemed to be making some progress with the parking. He voiced concern that if the proposed concept is adopted, discussions would continue for another two months - while additional Site Plans would be adopted and put into place prior to the new language being changed.

Commissioner Stoltzfus suggested that the current number of parking spaces on Pine Ave. be counted to see how many are being created or lost. He felt that the proposed plan would provide an additional 60 to 70 spaces and did not feel the City was satisfying the need for additional parking created by the development. He stated that he did not like the plan at all.

*Chair Quam* reiterated that the 40% footprint could be reduced if it was a concern. He then referred to the on-site parking being consistent with the Comp Plan. He said he reviewed the Comp Plan policies and on-site parking was only mentioned in Policy 1.3.7. *Chair Quam* read the Policy aloud. It was noted that the Policy referred to “on-street” and not “on-site.”

*City Attorney Dye* responded stating that the Comp Plan was designed to create a long-range plan to be enacted with the LDC. He said determining whether parking in the right-of-way would be determined on the street or off the street could be looked into. Examples followed explaining how the area between the roadway and sidewalk could be referred to as “off-street.” Separating pedestrian and vehicular traffic to determine what that is would need to be written into the regulations.

*Planner Garrett* said it would be difficult to determine the amount of additional parking spaces - considering that some of the property owners would not implement the Parallel Plan. He did feel, however, that a determination should be made as far as what the building and lot coverage should be in the event of build-out. The current calculations were based on some of the parking being on-site.

*P&Z Chair Stover* asked how many of the PAR projects had been submitted, noting they would need to follow the current Code requirements. He stated that if all the PAR projects had been submitted, changing Chapter 90 would not affect the properties built by PAR on Pine Ave. He said he was surprised that Commissioner Stoltzfus would oppose the new proposed plan - feeling it was exactly what Commissioner Stoltzfus had wanted. Discussion followed.

*Planner Garrett* reminded that the last two PAR Site Plans were approved with the stipulation that they could comply with any new regulations possibly without having to go through the Site Plan process again. Chapter 90 would still need to be addressed.

*Commissioner Webb* pointed out that the City did have an overall vision plan that was developed in 2002 – wanting mixed-use in the ROR and that the area remain as a village concept as it has always been. He felt that since the November 2009 discussions, the City was discussing the process by working on the details without first having an overall plan.

Commissioner Webb suggested that it be determined whether the vision is for an open space, walkable street that’s attractive to look at, or if it is for a strip center with parking lots in front of each building. He stated that the Comp Plan did not require on-site

parking and said sufficient parking could be provided on the street - which would open up more green space. It was his opinion that the Parallel Plan was the right direction to pursue.

*P&Z Boardmember Barlow* felt Mr. Aubry's plan was outstanding and would serve as a way to minimize the parking problem. The on-site parking plan, on the other hand, he believed would affect personal property rights. He noted that the current footprint is 40% and with the on-site plan, the footprint is reduced to 22.7%. Therefore, nearly 50% of the lot would be parking lot.

### **Public Comment**

**Tom Turner**, 815 N. Shore Dr, stated that the two completed PAR projects each have ten to twelve parking spaces. Considering the 197 spaces proposed with the Parallel Plan, he stated that approximately 400-ft of parking would be utilized just for the PAR projects.

Mr. Turner questioned if the residential property owners would be required to park on the street and possibly have to walk a distance to get to their residence. He noted that Gulf Dr. is also in the ROR and that there were many things that should be reconsidered. He also stated that it was very difficult for some people to park parallel and that the plan was not feasible.

Mr. Turner said he spent approximately four hours with the City Planner working on the on-site plan that he was in favor of. It was his opinion that adopting the Parallel Plan could cause Pine Ave. to look more like Bridge Street in Bradenton Beach.

**Mike Pescitelli**, 233 Gladiolus, complimented the Board and Gene Aubry for the new proposed parking concept.

Mr. Pescitelli questioned if the plan were adopted, if there would be a communal location for the trash containers and recycling to be placed for the Waste Management pickup. He noted that currently a trash container will take up a parking space and could eliminate that space for an entire day.

Mr. Pescitelli felt the proposed concept was feasible for Anna Maria.

**Gene Aubry** responded to Mr. Pescitelli's question, stating that the details could be worked out in the Master Plan.

**P&Z Boardmember Mattick** stated that the trash collection for all commercial establishments on Pine Ave. is picked up at the business itself and not at the road.

**Micheal Coleman**, Pine Ave. stated that the south side of Pine Ave. has fourteen lots that are currently in the process of being developed under the current Code provisions.

Mr. Coleman was in favor of the proposed plan and felt it would preserve property rights. He stated that PAR would adhere to the new parking concept not only with the projects currently in the pipeline, but also all projects that have already been built – resulting in compliance of 1,000-ft on Pine Ave. that could be implemented this summer. Mr. Coleman suggested that having PAR implement the plan would serve as a good way to test out the questions that would come up.

Mr. Coleman said PAR has been limited to approximately 30% to 32% coverage and that they have been encouraged to build smaller buildings. He suggested that the building coverage be changed from 40% to 35%.

**Nicky Hunt**, 303 Pine Ave, felt that the parallel parking would be more attractive than the angled parking but felt a huge number of parking spaces would be lost. She voiced concern relating to the Trolley stops and the loading zones.

Ms. Hunt was also concerned that the parallel parking plan would cause increased beach parking – which would be a negative to the commercial businesses since there would be no place for the customers to park.

Ms. Hunt stated that her husband and Terry Schaefer had researched the green area issue as it relates to the vegetation, shrubbery, etc.

**Mr. Hunt**, 303 Pine Ave, said the existing developer currently has eight parking spaces whereas the proposed parallel plan would only allow four spaces in front of the business. The 50-ft lots would only have two spaces. He pointed out that there were a lot of residences on Pine Ave. He felt that the number of parking spaces with the proposed plan would be very similar to the current number of spaces.

**Larry Albert**, 711 Gladiolus, agreed with Mr. Hunt relating to the large number of residences on Pine Ave. He questioned if the parking spaces would be signed for the residences. He also asked if the 197 spaces included the angled spaces on the side streets.

Mr. Albert stated that most of the businesses were located on the west end of Pine Ave, and the majority of the parking was on the east end of Pine Ave.

Mr. Albert felt that the loading zones would not be used by the large trucks and that they needed to be eliminated altogether.

The example of the traffic delays while waiting for a person to park parallel in Venice, FL was referenced by Mr. Albert.

**Bob Carter**, Willow, said he hoped the groups that have demonstrated they could not deal with this over the past five months because of extreme positions would take advantage of a compromise parking plan. Mr. Carter said he liked the proposed plan and if a compromise was not met, the issue could still be discussed for another six months.

#### **Commission Discussion Continued**

*Chair Quam* said he too was concerned about the beach parking - but it was difficult to control. Noting that parking for the City Pier was full on both sides of N. Bay Blvd, he said his biggest concern was at N. Bay Blvd. and Pine Ave. and when the six lots are developed. He did not see how on-street parking would handle the six lots if they were not individual homes.

*Commissioner Webb* stated that if there was an issue regarding beach parking, the City would be experiencing it currently on Gulf Dr. - which he has not seen.

Commissioner Webb then addressed Ms. Hunt's comment relating to green space and explained the difference between green space and open space. Green space relates to no impervious surface such as grass and vegetation. He said that the on-site parking diagrams maximize the coverage of the lots with impervious surfaces. The proposed plan lessens that by not having on-site parking.

*Commissioner Woodland* said his concern would be allowing for employee parking that may be parking all day on Pine Ave. - though wanting the spaces for customers.

*P&Z Chair Stover* asked how many parking spaces there currently were and how the 197 spaces were arrived at.

Chair Stover informed that Waste Management picks the trash up next to the home for his Mother-in-law because she is unable to take it to the street. He did not see the trash pickup on Pine Ave. creating any problems.

*Gene Aubry* explained how the 197 parking spaces were determined noting that the angled parking spaces on the side streets were included in that total. He noted that 20-ft parking spaces would allow for added parking spaces. He was uncertain how many parking spaces there presently were but that there were considerably less than the 197 due to the signage on Pine Ave., etc. He stated that the proposed plan was all about a walking street. Explanation followed.

***Micheal Coleman***, Pine Ave. said there were 169 10-ft x 20-ft designated parking spaces beginning at the Post Office plaza down to the Studio. Fifty of the spaces were in the Plaza parking lot and twenty-five in the Studio parking lot. It was his opinion that the proposed Parallel Plan would allow for more parking that would ever be used. He also felt that the proposed plan has the opportunity to provide a compromise.

*Planner Garrett* commented on how the parking for Bridge Street in Bradenton Beach was handled. He provided the option of establishing the length of the parking space at 25-ft – 20-ft for the parking space and 5-ft between the two spaces. Used in many other communities, it would allow more ease to pull in and out of the space.

*P&Z Boardmember Jenkins* suggested that the employee parking spaces could be placed on-site for the commercial businesses - which would allow for additional customer parking spaces.

*P&Z Chair Stover* said the plantings along Pine Ave. would be very nice. He pointed out that employees may walk the distance to their employment necessary - just to park in the shade.

**ACTION:** Chair Quam asked for a straw vote for whether or not the Commission and P&Z Board wished to pursue the on-site parking concept or the off-site parking concept as presented that evening for Pine Ave. only. By show of hands, the vote was 10 to 1 in favor of pursuing the off-site parking concept for Pine Ave. only. Commissioner Stoltzfus voted in favor of the on-site parking concept.

**It was agreed that the City Commission and P&Z Board will continue to meet for the reviewing and amending of Chapter 90, as required, in order to correspond with the proposed off-site parking concept. Planner Garrett and City Attorney Dye will meet prior to the next meeting regarding the legal aspects.**

*Planner Garrett* noted it would be a Commission policy decision whether or not the parking plan would be mandatory once it was adopted.

In response to *Chair Stover's* question, *Chair Quam* said it was his feeling that there would still be the option of implementing on-site parking.

*Commissioner Webb* pointed out that the policy issues still needed to be looked at.

**Next Meeting**

The next joint City Commission/P&Z Board Worksession will be held on Thursday, May 13, 2010, 6:00 p.m.

**Public and Press Comment on agenda items – None.**

**Adjournment**

**On motion made by Chair Quam and seconded by Commissioner Webb, the meeting was adjourned at 7:44 p.m.**

---

**Alice Baird, CMC, City Clerk**