

**CITY OF ANNA MARIA
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MEETING
JUNE 6, 2006
7:00 P.M.**

CALL TO ORDER (7:00 p.m.)

PLEDGE TO THE FLAG

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

Absent with excuse: Frank Pytel

Also present: Facilitator Tony Arrant, Mayor SueLynn, Commissioner Liaison Dale Woodland, Building Department Administrative Assistant Diane Sacca

Press: Sun

1. Review Minutes from May 4th, 2006 Meeting

Chair Fran Barford confirmed that all members present had received the minutes from the last EAR meeting.

MOTION: Jim Conoly moved to approve the May 4th, 2006 Planning & Zoning Board Meeting Minutes, seconded by Vice-Chair Doug Copeland.

Vote: All Ayes. Motion carried.

2. Review Comp Plan Elements

a. Coastal Conservation Element (continued)

Chair Fran Barford referred to Page 6 of the proposed element revision, noting that the Board had approved *Policy 1.7.6* at the last meeting.

Chair Barford read *Policy 1.7.7, Policy 1.7.8, Policy 1.8, Policy 1.8.1, Policy 1.8.2, Policy 1.8.3, Policy 1.8.4, Policy 1.8.5, Objective 1.9, and Policy 1.9.1* aloud.

Margaret Jenkins noted, relative to Policy 1.8.4, that the City and Waste Management already provided public education, special collection and amnesty days for hazardous waste.

Relative to *Policy 1.9.1*, Randall Stover noted that the City of Anna Maria had been investigating possibilities for providing a bike path for two decades, and even had to turn away a grant that would have helped achieve this. He recommended removal of the language pertaining to bike paths.

Margaret Jenkins noted that some roads in the city had bike paths and indicated that she would like to see these extended. Vice-Chair Doug Copeland clarified that bicycle lanes and bike paths were two different systems. Tony Arrant pointed out that the language in the Policy simply stated that the City would *promote* [dedicated]

bike paths [which could also be lanes or routes], and did not indicate that they needed to be located anywhere or even that they were mandatory.

Chair Fran Barford took a straw vote and all members present, with the exception of Randall Stover, voted to leave the language in *Policy 1.9.1* as it stood.

Chair Fran Barford went on to read **Objective 1.10**, ***Policy 1.10.1***, and ***Policy 1.10.2*** aloud.

Margaret Jenkins said, relative to ***Policy 1.10.2***, that she felt that whether or not the other Island cities did these things would be their business. Tony Arrant explained that the language in this policy came straight from Florida Statute and as such, it would be everyone's business to comply.

Chair Fran Barford continued with reading ***Policy 1.10.3***, ***Policy 1.10.4***, ***Policy 1.10.5***, and ***Policy 1.10.6*** aloud, completing the section on **GOAL 1**.

Chair Barford read **GOAL 2**, **Objective 2.1**, ***Policy 2.1.1***, ***Policy 2.1.2***, ***Policy 2.1.3***, **Objective 2.2**, to the Board members present.

Relative to **Objective 2.2**, Vice-Chair Doug Copeland asked if it was not contradictory to direct people away from storm hazard areas when the entire Island was classified as one. Tony Arrant explained that the way the City would comply with this Objective by disallowing higher population densities, noting that the community is already built out.

Chair Fran Barford next read ***Policy 2.2.1***, ***Policy 2.2.2***, and ***Policy 2.2.3***.

Vice-Chair Doug Copeland asked, relative to ***Policy 2.2.3***, if the Board had not previously decided to eliminate the language pertaining to a "Recreation Trust Fund". Tony Arrant noted that the Comprehensive Plan Ad-Hoc Committee had discussed the trust fund at length, however the Local Planning Agency (LPA) [City of Anna Maria Planning & Zoning Board] had yet to address the issue. He indicated that the Recreation and Open Space Element, containing the adopted, 1989 defining language for the creation and implementation of a Recreation Trust Fund, was next on the Agenda for review at this evening's meeting.

*Chair Fran Barford stated that she also had flagged ***Policy 2.2.3*** for discussion, and recommended at this time that the Board return to address it when discussing congruent language in the Recreation & Open Space Element. **There was consensus to continue with review of the Coastal Conservation Element.***

Chair Barford read ***Policy 2.2.4***, **Objective 2.3**, ***Policy 2.3.1***, ***Policy 2.3.2***, ***Policy 2.3.3***.

Relative to **Policy 2.3.3**, Randall Stover asked who, specifically, was the City's Emergency Management Coordinator. Mayor SueLynn explained that she performed the functions described in this Policy, and confirmed for Tony Arrant that she was the City of Anna Maria designated contact person for the Manatee County Division of Emergency Management Plan. Randall Stover asked whether the words "the Mayor" should be contained in the Policy language, and Chair Barford expressed concern about being too specific, keeping in mind that this contact person may need to change [before the next regular review of the Comprehensive Plan]. Tony Arrant clarified that 'emergency management coordinator' is not an official title, and there was consensus to continue with the review of the Coastal Conservation Element Goals, Objectives and Policies.

Chair Barford next read **Objective 2.4**, **Policy 2.4.1**, **Policy 2.4.2**, **Policy 2.4.3**, **Policy 2.4.4**, **Policy 2.4.5**, and noted that the Ad-Hoc Committee had recommended the strikethrough of Policy 2.4.6.

Chair Fran Barford and Vice-Chair Doug Copeland questioned the clarity of the sentence embodied in **GOAL 3**. Tony Arrant indicated that this was probably a typographical error contained in the recommended language from the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Committee (TBRPC) and that **GOAL 3** should probably include the words "The City shall ensure..." **There was consensus to add these words to the beginning of GOAL 3.**

Chair Barford proceeded with the reading of **Objective 3.1** during which the Board noted another apparent omission. At the recommendation of Mayor SueLynn, there was consensus to add the words: 'The City shall'; there was further consensus to strike the letter 'd' from "continued".

Relative to **Policy 3.1.1**, Chair Fran Barford noted that an identifying number for the adopted Resolution was missing. Tony Arrant explained that the reference to a Resolution was probably boilerplate language from the TBRPC and recommended that it be stricken from the Policy. Mayor SueLynn indicated that the "Island-wide Post Disaster Redevelopment Plan for Anna Maria Island, Manatee County, Florida, dated May 1999 as prepared by the TBRPC" was outdated and in the process of being revised. **There was consensus to strike the words "as set forth in Resolution" since the revision of the Post Disaster Redevelopment Plan was yet to be completed and ratified.**

Chair Barford read **Policy 3.1.2**, **Objective 3.3**. At Tony Arrant's suggestion, **there was consensus among the Board members present to change the word "which" to 'shall' in Objective 3.3.**

Chair Barford next read **Policy 3.3.1**, and **Policy 3.3.2**, which concluded the Coastal & Conservation Element.

Tony Arrant mentioned that the Board had, at the last meeting, requested more information relative to ***Policy 1.5.1*** before deciding whether or not to approve it. Jim Conoly recalled that someone had mentioned that it was now illegal to collect turtle eggs and move them. Mayor SueLynn confirmed that this information was correct. Chair Barford recommended striking the language referring to the collection of eggs. Tony Arrant noted that during review of this Policy, there had also been some question as to the winter and spring months, as specified, were adequate. Mayor SueLynn confirmed that there were legal restrictions as to activity on the beach during turtle nesting season. Randall Stover and Margaret Jenkins said that the period to cover would be from May 1st to October 1st. Tony Arrant suggested the following language: ‘in the areas and during nesting periods’. Mayor SueLynn said the dates could be added upon confirmation with Turtle Watch director Suzy Fox. **Chair Barford recommended approval of the Element, to include the changes to *Policy 1.5.1* just mentioned by Tony Arrant, with the dates to be added to it upon confirmation from the Mayor, and there was consensus to do this.**

MOTION: Vice-Chair Doug Copeland moved to approve the revisions to the Coastal & Conservation Element, subject to adding the dates to *Policy 1.5.1* once confirmed the day following this evening’s meeting, seconded by Jim Conoly.
Vote: All Ayes. Motion carried unanimously.

b. Parks & Recreation & Open Space

Randall Stover referred to language in the Introduction of the Element pertaining to the lighted tennis courts, and during discussion, it was confirmed that these were located at, and maintained by the Community Center. **There was consensus to add the words ‘at the Community Center’ to the sentence referring to the tennis courts.**

Randall Stover drew the Board’s attention to language on Page 1, in the last sentence before section III, “based upon projected population, not necessarily of just OUR city”. He said he felt the small City of Anna Maria had a responsibility to prepare itself for someone’s idea of adequate facilities for other cities. Jim Conoly agreed that the City did not need to gear up for a population increase in the County. Tony Arrant explained that the language attempted to express that the Community Center is not only responsible for the resident population of the City of Anna Maria, but also its visitors, which form a part of its functional planning population. He described the functional population as being composed of three groups: residents, day visitors, and visitors from elsewhere that stay for a period of time in the city. **There was consensus to strike the words “not necessarily of just OUR city”.**

Tony Arrant drew the Board’s attention to language he had highlighted at the bottom of Page 12. He noted that there were some Policy implications associated with language contained in the data and analysis section of the Element. Mr. Arrant said that when the Board reviewed the Goals, Objectives and Policies for this Element, it would need to consider whether or not it still desired to this, or whether it

wished to adopt a simpler level of service standard. He noted that the current language did not have any financial obligation attached to it, and further that whether or not to implement it would be a policy decision on the part of the Board. Vice-Chair Copeland questioned the value of keeping the language in the data and analysis, when the City already had the facilities in place in Bayfront Park. **There was consensus to strike the entire paragraph.**

Vice-Chair Copeland drew the Board's attention to language under B. 1., on Page 13, relative to availability of parking along the streets near beach accesses. He asked if this was still true, given the newly adopted Parking Ordinance. Mayor SueLynn confirmed that parking was still available on such streets. Tony Arrant reminded the Board that it had just approved an Element containing a Policy that said that the City would protect and maintain the existing beach accesses, and would promote the creation of new ones from new development. He said that the Board should probably include a Policy in this, the Parks & Recreation and Open Space Element, that states that the City will maintain the 34 it has. Tony Arrant recommended striking the language pertaining to parking, since this is controlled by the Traffic Element. Jim Conoly asked Commissioner Liaison Dale Woodland if the 34 beach access points existed and were usable. Commissioner Woodland said that these accesses are designated on the Future Land Use Map submitted by the Ad-Hoc Committee. Jim Conoly maintained that he did not believe that all the beach accesses were actually usable.

Sandra Mattick said that she would like parking addressed, since beach access was not possible without parking. **There was consensus to strike "along the public streets" and to include the language: 'Parking shall be available for beach access.'**

Chair Fran Barford proceeded to Page 16, and read **GOAL 1**, and **Objective 1.1** aloud. Relative to **Policy 1.1.1**, Vice-Chair Doug Copeland recommended reviewing Table 2. During discussion, Tony Arrant noted that the LOS standards were high enough that the threshold [to initiate the requirement for a pool, for example,] would never be reached. He said it was important for everybody to agree and understand that the City's position is that none of these facilities will be required unless the population threshold is reached, therefore the Ad-Hoc Committee had decided to leave the language in.

Tony Arrant noted that pools and golf courses had a wide enough regional [service] surface area for facilities that could mean they would be located on the other side of the Interstate. He explained further that a toddler park is neighborhood oriented, while a boat ramp would be regional.

Tony Arrant pointed out the Policy had strong language referring to the establishment of a Trust fund, and the collection of money or land from new developers. He indicated that in his opinion, whoever wrote and adopted this Policy was very serious about its content. **There was consensus to strike Table 2.**

Chair Fran Barford read **Policy 1.1.2** and **Policy 1.1.3**. Relative to **Policy 1.1.2**, Randall Stover expressed the opinion that the language could be problematic if legally binding, since the City is dealing with a finite piece of land surrounded by water on all sides but one, that being another city's boundary. Tony Arrant noted that **Policy 1.5.1**, **Policy 1.5.2**, and **Policy 1.5.7** all contained language relative to the formation and funding of a Recreational Trust Fund for the sole purpose of recreational development. Mayor SueLynn confirmed that the City maintained no such fund, and Tony Arrant noted that Chuck White had brought this to the Board's attention at a previous meeting. Vice-Chair Doug Copeland pointed out that the question now at hand was whether or not the City wished to implement such a Trust Fund.

Randall Stover reiterated his position, relative to **Policy 1.1.2**. Tony Arrant clarified that the language stated that the parks and recreational lands shall be planned for multiple purposes, and not that the City shall be obligated to acquire more land. **Randall Stover suggested adding the words 'or maintained' after 'planned' and there was consensus to do so.** Vice-Chair Doug Copeland said he did see a problem, having seen the City miss multiple opportunities, such as Bean Point, the former Lardas property, the Pine Avenue marina property, because of the lack of funds. Vice-Chair Copeland expressed the opinion that such a fund was a very important thing for the City to have.

Chair Fran Barford took a straw vote to determine which Board members were in favor of the establishment of a Recreational Trust Fund, with the result that four members were in favor, and Randall Stover was against. *Chair Barford confirmed that the recommendation to establish a Recreational Trust Fund would be forwarded to the Commission.*

Chair Barford read aloud **Policy 1.1.4**, **Policy 1.1.5**, **Policy 1.1.6**, **Policy 1.1.7**, **Objective 1.2**, **Policy 1.2.1**, **Policy 1.2.2**, **Policy 1.2.3**, **Objective 1.3**, **Policy 1.3.1**, **Policy 1.3.2**, **Policy 1.3.3**, **Policy 1.3.4**, **Objective 1.4**, **Policy 1.4.1**, **Policy 1.4.2**, **Policy 1.4.3**, **Policy 1.4.4**, **Objective 1.5**, and **Policy 1.5.1**, along with its Editor's note. **There was consensus to strike the red language in the Editor's note.**

Chair Fran Barford proceeded to read **Policy 1.5.2**, **Policy 1.5.3**, **Policy 1.5.4**, **Policy 1.5.5**, **Policy 1.5.6**, aloud, noting that the Board had discussed **Policy 1.5.7** earlier in the meeting.

Chair Fran Barford concluded the review of the Parks & Recreation and Open Space Element by confirming that the Board had decided to preserve the fund generating options for a Recreational Trust Fund and to eliminate Table 2.

(continued)

MOTION: Randall Stover moved that the Board accept the Parks & Recreation and Open Space Element as revised, with the changes agreed upon at this evening's meeting. Vice-Chair Doug Copeland seconded the motion.

Vote: All Ayes. Motion carried unanimously.

Tony Arrant noted relative to the Capital Improvements Element, that **Objective 1.4, Policy 1.4.1**, remained to be approved by the Board, pending additional information relative to the AAA rating. Mayor SueLynn indicated that she had forwarded a memo in this regard, to be found as the last page on the left side in the meeting materials folders distributed to each member present. Vice-Chair Doug Copeland indicated that the cover letter did not seem to make sense. Chair Fran Barford and Randall Stover noted that ***Policy 1.4.4*** and ***Policy 1.4.5*** needed to be changed to reflect the change in allowable debt service from 10 percent to 15 percent of revenue. Tony Arrant noted also that the City Auditor had recommended striking the word "possible" and substituting 'applicable'. Jim Conoly said he was still not comfortable with the language, and Randall Stover agreed, saying that the key thought was that exposure to debt needed to be applied to a relationship with the City's revenues, and said that in his opinion, this needed to be annualized, otherwise this could mean a percentage of ten years' revenue. **There was consensus to request that the Mayor ask the City Auditor to consider the addition of the word 'annual' before "revenues" in Policy 1.4.5, and further consensus to adopt the language to Policy 1.4.4 as recommended.**

c. Future Land Use Map Review

Chair Fran Barford asked the members to examine the map to be sure that it reflected the changes that the Board had made.

Public Comment

Diane Harrison, P.A., and attorney for LBK Realty, took the floor and indicated that on July 21st, 2005, Mr. Kurzfeld presented a request that the properties from 101 to 109 North Bay Blvd. be changed to the ROR future land use designation. She noted that she had several conversations with Building Official Kevin Donohue, and remarked that the empty lots she referred to remained Commercial. Chair Barford noted that the Board had decided to leave the lots designated as Commercial. Sandra Mattick said she felt that the ROR designation would be more appropriate for these lots. Randall Stover said that caution needed to be exercised when reducing the already small amount and limited area designated for Commercial use. Jim Conoly said he felt that the figures involved in conducting a new Commercial enterprise in Anna Maria were not workable. Vice-Chair Doug Copeland noted that ground coverage and setback regulations would be different for an ROR property.

Another resident said that he owned the property across the street, and that he had been present at the July 21st, 2005 meeting. He said that his property was currently designated as Commercial, and that he wished to know what could be done on his property if it is designated ROR. The resident wanted to know if he could rent his lot for parking if it is designated for ROR use. Tony Arrant and Chair Barford noted that

the Map had yet to be ratified by the Commission, and that the resident could present his concerns at that time. He said he would like to have an ROR designation and continue to rent his property to Ed Chiles, as he did now.

Chair Fran Barford reiterated her opinion, expressed at previous meetings, that the Commercial future land use designation was an important one for the continued vitality. She asked the Board if it needed to make any changes to the Future Land Use Map as presented at this meeting.

Randall Stover explained the review process to those members of the public present at this meeting, and indicated that everyone concerned would be given the opportunity to speak at public hearings conducted by the City Commission.

Jim Conoly asked Robin Wall if she was satisfied with the Future Land Use Map as presented at this evening's meeting. Ms. Wall said that she would like to thank the Board for listening to all the public comment submitted and reviewing letters sent by several people living in the area of Lot 1 and Lot 2. She noted that the City's Zoning Map had not accurately updated to reflect the 1992 adopted Map and the designations for those lots.

Tony Arrant noted that the Board needed to advertise a public hearing and accept public comment relative to all eight elements and the proposed revisions contained in the EAR to the Comprehensive Plan as a whole before sending it to the Commission for its review and acceptance. Mr. Arrant said that the Commission would need to hold at least one public hearing before transmitting the EAR to the State for its review. He said another public hearing would need to be held by the Planning & Zoning Board relative to the proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan, comprising the eight Elements and the Future Land Use Map after the EAR is submitted to the State.

Vice-Chair Doug Copeland confirmed with Tony Arrant that the Board would have an opportunity to read a hard copy of the EAR prior to the public hearing. *Mayor SueLynn confirmed that Chair Barford could put review of the hard copy of the EAR on the agenda for the P&Z Board meeting scheduled for June 26th, 2006, if the Board received their copies on June 19th.*

DATE FOR THE PUBLIC HEARING ON THE EAR

July 10th, 2006, at 7:00 p.m.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Offered throughout the meeting.

PRESS COMMENT

None offered.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Margaret Jenkins moved to adjourn the meeting and Jim Conoly seconded the motion.

Vote: All Ayes. Motion carried.

Chair Fran Barford adjourned the meeting at 9:35 p.m.