

**CITY OF ANNA MARIA
COMMISSION WORK SESSION
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
AUGUST 21, 2006
10:00 A.M.**

CALL TO ORDER

PLEDGE TO THE FLAG

ROLL CALL: Mayor SueLynn, Commissioner Christine Tollette, Commissioner Dale Woodland, Commission Chair John Quam, Deputy Commission Chair Linda Cramer, Commissioner Duke Miller

Also present: Tony Arrant, AICP – Institute of Government, Florida State University (Facilitator & Planning Consultant); City Clerk Alice Baird

Press: Islander (2:40 p.m.)

1. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN REVIEW

a. Review Traffic, Housing, Infrastructure, Conservation, Recreation & Open Space, Intergovernmental Coordination and Capital Improvement Elements

Tony Arrant indicated that he did not have his three-ring binder containing his hard copy, and therefore would need notes to make any changes made at today's meeting. He reminded the Commissioners that proposed revised language is shown in the strike-through / redline, according to State requirements. The Facilitator described the two-part structure of the Comprehensive Plan Elements, the first being the data and analysis, and the next section, critical to the process, deals with the goals, policies, and objectives (GOPs).

Mr. Arrant said that he would welcome input from the Commissioners regarding any substantive additions or changes to the data and analysis. He indicated he did not believe it would be necessary to cover it line by line in these meetings.

Traffic

Tony Arrant explained that each member of the Comprehensive Plan Ad-Hoc Committee had taken an Element to review, however, no one had volunteered to do the Traffic Element. He said that this original draft had been written by a graduate student, and edited by the Committee and himself.

Tony Arrant noted that the Commissioners had in their binders a hard copy of the Future Traffic Circulation Map, compiled using GIS software. He

indicated that Gulf Drive and Pine Avenue were the only roadway segments that the State recognizes on the Island, and that the level of service (LOS) standards on Gulf Drive are essentially the only ones being considered.

Mr. Arrant informed the Commissioners that the end of the Element would contain a series of database spreadsheets showing historical traffic counts and operational levels of service for Gulf and Pine, and including projections to the year 2020. He noted that the City of Anna Maria was very fortunate because it had no concurrency or LOS problems, in neither the current nor the projected data. The Facilitator pointed out that the LOS is the central traffic issue.

Tony Arrant gave the Commission the definition in F.A.C. 9-J5 of the word “Goal” as the long-term vision statement for where the community wanted to be at the end of the planning horizon. He indicated that in Florida, this horizon needed to be at least ten years out, noting that most communities were planning to the year 2020. Mr. Arrant also noted that the City must have a financially feasible five-year planning horizon, past the current budget year. He explained that ‘financially feasible’ according to Senate Bill 60, meant that everything the City said it was going to do in the Plan could be paid for with today’s revenue.

The Facilitator went on to define “Objectives” in the Florida Code as the short-term intermediate steps that the City intends to take toward achieving the stated Goal. He said that by law, an objective must be measurable and specific enough for its achievement to be clearly recognized. The pertinent questions Tony Arrant asked the reviewing Committee were:

- Did you do this?
- If not, why?
- Is this still a desirable objective?
- Do you wish to pursue it?
- Does it need to be re-written to be more achievable?

Tony Arrant said that “Policies” are defined in law as being action steps or programs the City implements to ensure achievement of its objectives.

Mr. Arrant noted that the first series of changes to the data and analysis section of the Traffic Element had to do with amendments to the Statute and the Administrative Code that had taken place since 1985.

Referring to Page 3, and the classification, according to the Federal Highway Commission’s Highway Capacity Manual of LOS from “A” (the best) to “F” (no flow). He defined an LOS standard as a unit of capacity per demand for a physical, hard infrastructure facility, such as roads, potable water systems, sewer systems, solid waste collection and disposal, and

recreation and open space. Tony Arrant indicated that since the City is part of a metropolitan planning organization (MPO), it also needed to address mass transit. He explained that the State of Florida requires urban communities to maintain any roads the State recognizes as being part of the intra-state system at LOS “B”, while rural communities must maintain LOS “C”.

Addressing the process of updating the data and analysis of traffic needs, Tony Arrant went on to observe that when the process began, the statistics available to the Ad-Hoc Committee were current as of 2003, and projections were then made from the analysis for the years 2010, 2015, and 2020. He noted that the City of Anna Maria has an agreement to receive this information from the Manatee/Sarasota Metropolitan Planning Organization.

Moving on to Page 6, relative to Issues and Opportunities, Tony Arrant said that based on the adopted LOS standards for roadway capacity in the City of Anna Maria through the year 2020, the City does not have a fiscal obligation for roadway construction as it pertains to Gulf Drive and Pine Avenue.

Commissioner Duke Miller asked why the remainder of the initial paragraph, under *Issues and Opportunities*, had been stricken. In the discussion that followed, Tony Arrant indicated that any substantive changes from today’s meeting would need to be noted and brought up again at the first public hearing.

Commissioner Christine Tollette asked if ***Policy 1.1.1*** existed when the Plan was initially adopted, noting that the City did not now have an annual program. Tony Arrant observed that this was true, noting that Senate Bill 360 now requires the City to send a formal annual review of its roads to the Department of Community Affairs (DCA) in Tallahassee. He indicated that this would become an annual amendment to the Comprehensive Plan, with the first one being due in December 2008. Mr. Arrant recommended that the City plan to begin working on it in March or April 2008, since the amendment process takes six to eight months. Mayor SueLynn noted that the 07/08 City budget would need to include funds for this process.

Tony Arrant explained that any deficiencies, maintenance or paving identified in the City’s roads would need to be line items in the five-year schedule of capital improvements, in which the City must also show how it intends to pay for them.

In response to a question from Commissioner Duke Miller relative to ***Policy 1.1.2*** in the Future Land Use Element, Tony Arrant explained that the F.A.S. Chapter 380-04 and 360-06 definition of ‘development’ eliminates the need to specify whether development is public or private.

Discussion followed relative to **Policy 1.4.5** and driveway access points, as well as **Policy 1.5.1** and trolley service.

Tony Arrant noted that the City had achieved Goal 2, along with its objectives and policies, and this remains in place. He said that he would put a note in the summary of the EAR that the City therefore no longer needed this as a goal.

Following a comment by Commissioner Woodland, there was further discussion relative to the trolley service and its negative impact on the flow of traffic. Mayor SueLynn indicated that this was an important topic to many residents in the City, especially during ‘season’. She said that she would like to see the ‘Trolley Turn-Off’ item put on the New Business list of Commission meeting agenda items.

Commissioner Linda Cramer indicated an interest in addressing residential side streets, and public parking, as possible objectives and policies, as well as driveway access points and traffic flow.

Housing

Tony Arrant noted that Charles Canniff, as part of the Ad-Hoc Committee, had done the research and revisions. He observed that although the law requires cities to address affordable housing, the City of Anna Maria was not able to provide this. He noted that there were no homes in the city accessible for purchase by a family with the County’s median income.

Mr. Arrant said that the State recognizes problems that are market driven, as well as factors such as the city’s location on a barrier island, and its almost built-out status. He noted that the City did not propose any increase in density, nor did it expect any large employment basis, such as a mall or commercial complex.

Relative to **GOAL 1**, Tony Arrant said that he hoped the State would agree with the rewording, however, it may possibly ask that the word ‘affordable’ be reintroduced, since this is State law.

Commissioner John Quam asked for an explanation of **Objective 1**. Mr. Arrant responded that this basically was explained in **Policy 1.1.1**, where the City will provide information and technical assistance to the private sector.

Commissioner Dale Woodland asked for clarification of **Policy 1.1.3**. Tony Arrant indicated that the City had no choice but to only allow residential densities and housing types that are consistent with the Future

Land Use Element. Commissioner Woodland drew attention to the language ‘to provide housing in a wide range of types and costs’. Mr. Arrant indicated that this language came straight from law. He explained that Anna Maria’s wide range of types and costs was whatever financing and the market was willing to pay for properties. The Facilitator said that the City of Anna Maria was not going to get into the housing construction business, and that it would not be subsidizing the market.

Commissioner Christine Tollette asked about **Objective 1.4**, and the language, ”protect historically and architecturally significant structures”. Tony Arrant responded that he was informed that the City does not have any identified historical structures that are residential housing units. Commissioner Linda Cramer indicated that she felt it could be beneficial to recognize certain properties, such as Roser Cottage, that are historical, as well as some of the older homes in the city, by way of an ordinance.

Charles Canniff recalled that when working on this objective, he had become aware of the importance of architectural significance, noting that there were homes in the city that were almost a hundred years old, but had no architectural significance.

Mayor SueLynn noted that the Commission had passed a Resolution identifying the Historical Park and Belle Haven as historic properties.

Commissioner John Quam asked about the words ‘financial assistance’ in **Policy 1.5.2**. Tony Arrant noted that this language came straight out of Statute, and that the information the City could provide would possibly be relative to companies operating in the area that provide mortgages and local agencies that provide mortgage assistance.

Commissioner Duke Miller referred to **Table 5**, and suggested that, for consistency and accuracy, perhaps the table should reflect County tax rolls as opposed to building permits, because these permits have nothing to do with ad valorem taxes. Charles Canniff pointed out that the table does not reflect the average sales price of a new home, but rather the average cost of a new home. Commissioner Miller said that building permits did not reflect costs, but the County tax rolls did list the improved values of properties.

Charles Canniff noted, relative to the way finances are dealt with by government, that the median income of Manatee County is the income midway between the top and the bottom, not the arithmetic mean, or average, which actually is roughly ten thousand dollars less. He said the numbers may not seem realistic to many people, but are a result of the differences in the way government looks at finance and the way private individuals do.

Infrastructure

Tony Arrant noted that this Element had been reviewed by Doug Copeland and approved by both the Ad-Hoc Committee and the LPA [P&Z Board]. He said that this was a very important element, especially considering the changes made with Bill 360. Mr. Arrant noted that this Element covered central potable water systems, central sanitary sewer systems, and solid waste removal and disposal. He observed that the County owns, operates, and provides the water systems and solid waste disposal sites for the City.

The Facilitator said that the City still needed to adopt, implement, and maintain a level of service standard for infrastructure services provided by the County. He said that the data and analysis section provides information relative to the interlocal and contractual agreements necessary to effect the services. Tony Arrant reminded the Commissioners that the only entity authorized to issue building permits was the City, and as such the City is the only entity that could implement the Comprehensive Plan.

Discussion followed between Commissioner Duke Miller, Tony Arrant and Mayor SueLynn relative to Page 4, the soil survey and septic tanks. It was observed that several properties in the city still operated septic tanks, and that this had been a result of a dispute regarding the easement necessary to install sewer service. The Mayor noted that the City was in communication with the County regarding this problem.

Commissioner Dale Woodland and the rest of the Commissioners noted that they were missing Pages 19 through 25. Commissioner Miller requested that hard copies of the missing pages be brought to the next meeting on the Comprehensive Plan, and there was consensus among the Commissioners for this.

Commissioner John Quam asked, if the solid waste contract was altered from being with Waste Management, Inc., if the City would then need to change the Comprehensive Plan. Tony Arrant responded that this would only be a problem if there were an objective or a policy that indicated the name of the contracting company.

Commissioner Duke Miller confirmed with Tony Arrant that there was a Policy in this Element addressing the need to immediately begin renegotiating the County contract for potable water, since it would be expiring in 2011, which is apparently also the same year that the County would be running out of potable water necessary for the City's LOS.

Commissioner Quam recessed the meeting for a twenty-minute break.

Tony Arrant referred to copies of the Future Needs Standards ‘A’ through ‘D’ and addressed level of service standards (LOS). He noted that some of the LOS’s had changed, and that this was reflective of changes that had been made to the Manatee County Comprehensive Plan. The Facilitator indicated that Manatee County had the model for effective solid waste systems for the entire state.

Mr. Arrant continued with the review of the Goals, Objectives and Policies of the Element. He explained *Policies 1.1.1* through *1.1.6* for the Commissioners.

Relative to the master drainage plan, Tony Arrant recommended that the Island cities participate together in negotiations with the County, noting that an agreement that would cover them through the year 2020.

He pointed out that the City needed to tell the State that it had not done a master drainage study, describe the recommendations for the City by the City Engineer, and indicate how it intended to proceed.

In discussion regarding stormwater runoff, Mr. Arrant noted that only a civil engineer could provide a level of service standard for stormwater drainage. Discussion continued relative to pervious and impervious coverage of lots, and Mayor SueLynn noted that the City needed to reclaim the rights-of-way for drainage. Tony Arrant noted that stormwater remained an unresolved issue.

Coastal and Conservation

Tony Arrant pointed out, relative to *Policy 1.4.1*, the requirement for developers to preserve 25% of the native vegetation on their sites, and indicated that there should be a checklist for development of land to make sure that developers are complying with the LOS. He said this important to document that the City is acting in a manner consistent with the goals, objectives, and policies of its Comprehensive Plan. Commissioner Woodland noted that *preservation* of 25% of native vegetation could be impractical, depending on where this vegetation is found on the site.

Discussion followed relative to *Policy 1.5.1*, beach renourishment, and turtle season.

Relative to *Policy 1.6.3*, Tony Arrant noted that yard and grass cuttings not only presented a particulate problem, but also one related to pesticides and other chemicals. Commissioner Quam indicated he felt this was an important issue to monitor.

Mayor SueLynn said, relative to **Policy 1.6.4**, that she would need to check that intergovernmental coordination had been implemented. Tony Arrant noted that the State assumes that the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council had been formed solely for intergovernmental coordination.

Tony Arrant said that he highlighted **Policy 1.7.5** because he felt that primary dune preservation was important, noting that this needed to be addressed in the City's land development regulations. He pointed out that the wording had been changed from 'established' to 'implemented', and that he was not sure this had been done. Commissioner Christine Tollette asked if the primary dune system had ever been mapped out for preservation. *Tony Arrant responded to a question from Commissioner Linda Cramer, relative to budgeting money for mapping the primary dune preservation zone, that the person responsible would need to be familiar with working with the DEP.*

Discussion followed relative to the creation and collection of monies for the Recreation and Conservation Trust fund. City Clerk Alice Baird noted that no monies had been collected for this purpose. Tony Arrant explained that the trust fund revenue is an assessment relative to development and re-development, and is more like a tax than a fee.

Mayor SueLynn pointed out, relative to **Policy 2.3.1**, that the entity should be called the "Manatee County Emergency Operations Center", and Tony Arrant made that change. She also noted, relative to **Policy 2.3.3**, that the City did not have an Emergency Management Coordinator, since this is a function she performs. *Mayor SueLynn drew the Commission's attention to the need, relative to **Policy 2.4.2**, to put the Mayor's designation on the Consent Agenda of a future Commission meeting, in order to formalize the assumption that the Mayor performs this function.*

*Relative to **Policy 3.1.2** and **Policy 3.1.3**, the Mayor indicated that she would check into the implementation of the Island-wide post disaster redevelopment plan prepared by the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council.*

Recreation and Open Space

Tony Arrant noted that a developer either needed to build recreation facilities on land in the subdivision or give money to the City to make sure existing facilities can service those living in the development.

Commissioner Duke Miller suggested, relative to **Policy 1.2.1**, that the City Council should be the designated Parks & Recreation Board. *Tony Arrant said that he could re-write the policy to say that the City Council would continue to function as the Parks & Recreation Board.*

There was consensus to strike language in parentheses in the data and analysis relative to setting aside areas.

There was consensus, at the suggestion of Commissioner John Quam relative to *Policy 1.4.4*, to strike “will be” and replace this with “shall be”.

Commissioner Quam questioned on Page 23, second paragraph, relative to plan implementation, whether what was stated was true relative to the \$8,000 contract. Tony Arrant said that he had recommended striking this language, however, the Ad-Hoc Committee felt that the City needed to find resources in addition to the trust fund. He noted that this was in the data and analysis, and that it would have no policy implication. Mr. Arrant pointed out that plan implementation was really a wish list.

Commissioner Miller questioned *Policies 1.5.1, 1.5.5, and 1.5.6*, and language pertaining to actions the City would take to fund acquisition of properties and construction for parks and recreation.

Tony Arrant explained that unless a facility is being newly created, it is not a capital improvement.

c. Public Comment

None offered.

DATE FOR NEXT MEETING

September 27, 2006 from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

The Commission noted that at the Special Commission meeting to be held on October 3, 2006 at 4:00 p.m., Public Comment would be held at the end of the meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Commissioner Cramer moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Commissioner Tollette.

Vote: All Ayes. Motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 3:14 p.m.