

**CITY OF ANNA MARIA
PLANNING & ZONING BOARD WORKSHOP
MEETING HELD AT ANNA MARIA COUNCIL CHAMBERS
10005 GULF DRIVE – ANNA MARIA, FL
TUESDAY, MARCH 16, 2010
6:30 P.M.**

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Stover called the Meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

PLEDGE TO THE FLAG

ROLL CALL: Boardmembers Margaret Jenkins, Sandra Mattick, Mike Yetter, Frank Pytel, Bob Barlow, Jim Conoly, and Chair Randall Stover.

Staff Present: Building Department Administrative Assistant Diane Sacca, Building Official Bob Welch, City Planner Alan Garrett, and Minutes Clerk Stacey Johnston.

Also Present: City Commissioners Mattick and Stoltzfus. Court Reporter not paid by City.

Press: Sun and Islander.

1. Discussion of Planning Commission Role – Discussion of the organization of the Planning and Zoning Board with a possible name modification to the Planning and Development Board. Discussion of future goals and tasks, along with a discussion of future meeting times and topics.

Chair Stover informed that the meeting that evening would be for discussion purposes only and that there would be no public comment. He stated there were numerous issues that the P&Z Board needed to address in the Sunshine and that they needed time to do so.

Chair Stover said he felt as Chair it was his responsibility to serve as the leader and for the Board to participate and bring ideas to the table to make the City better.

Chair Stover explained that the following issues needed to be addressed by the P&Z Board:

- Review of the 302 current definitions in the LDR's and an additional 15 needing to be defined.
- Determine how often the P&Z should meet for regular meetings and for workshops.
- Determine what the P&Z Board feels they want to accomplish.

It was the majority consensus of the P&Z Board that the following issues be addressed and/or implemented:

- Official P&Z Regular Meetings will continue to be held on the third Tuesdays of each month as required.
- P&Z Workshops will be held the second Tuesdays of each month as needed.
- In order to improve communication between the P&Z Board and the City Commission, the P&Z minutes will be forwarded to the City Commission, along with a written report/summary of each P&Z Board meeting from the Chair.
- Requested that City Commission meeting minutes be forwarded to the P&Z Board for their review.
- The P&Z Board will utilize Robert's Rules of Order for the purpose of making the meetings more efficient.
- Discussed changing the name of the Planning & Zoning Board to the Planning & Development Board – as adopted in Bradenton Beach and as recommended by Chair Stover. *Boardmember Mattick* said she would agree to adding "Development" to the name and *Boardmember Jenkins* suggested that "Zoning" be removed from the name. After discussion, it was the consensus that the name not be changed and would continue as Planning & Zoning Board.
- *Boardmember Mattick* asked that one-way memos be discussed. It was noted that the City Attorney has informed that one-way memos are legal, however, only

the Boardmembers receive a copy and the public were not provided the information unless they were to review the City's Read File. It was agreed that whenever a one-way memo was sent, it would then be copied and provided to the public at the next meeting.

- Lengthy discussion was held relating to whether the P&Z should be pro-active in bringing issues forward or to address issues as they are sent to them by the City Commission. It was *Chair Stover's* opinion that the P&Z Board serves as the planning body for the City and felt they should be more proactive in their approach.

Boardmember Mattick noted that Code Enforcement had never forwarded any issues or concerns to the P&Z Board for their review.

Boardmember Pytel felt that the City Commission and Mayor should be the ones to prioritize the issues that come before the P&Z for their discussion. He did not feel the P&Z Board should go out looking for issues to discuss unless the majority of the Board was in agreement. He suggested that "New Business" always be placed on the Agenda. If new ideas were brought up they would then be forwarded to the City Commission to determine whether or not they would like the P&Z Board to pursue. *Boardmember Pytel* noted he had been trying to raise the issue and discussion relating to "Super Majority" for some time now and that the P&Z Board had not yet discussed the issue.

Boardmember Barlow gave the example of a citizen having a concern – and that he felt the proper channel was that the City Commission would forward the topic, if they agreed, to the P&Z Chair to present to the P&Z Board for their review at a future Workshop.

Boardmember Conoly also was opposed to the P&Z Board looking for issues to discuss. He felt that the roll of the P&Z Board was to make recommendations and that the operating of the City was the responsibility of the Mayor, staff, and City Commission.

Chair Stover disagreed feeling that the P&Z Board should not just wait for their next assignment.

- The P&Z Board agreed that the City Commission/P&Z Board joint meetings were not as productive and the independent meetings. Discussion followed relating to Boardmembers not feeling comfortable in the joint meetings, P&Z Board not having the ability to vote on various issues, very little getting accomplished, too many opinions are given, and that the P&Z Boardmembers may not be providing any meaningful dialog at the meetings.
- It was agreed that "homework" was important and was needed for each P&Z Boardmember. Also, each agenda item should be read and understood prior to it being discussed at the meeting.

Planner Garrett informed that the P&Z Board will be responsible for holding a Public Hearing to hear the Moratorium Ordinance and forwarding their recommendation to the City Commission.

2. Discussion Relating to Parking and Loading in the C-1 and ROR Districts – Discussion of seven potential parking alternatives for existing development and "build-out" development within the districts, including discussion relating to loading spaces and future permitted uses within the districts.

Boardmember Mattick felt it would be hard for the P&Z Board to forward a recommendation to the Commission. She suggested that the problem be truly defined –

if there is a safety issue for pedestrians and bicyclist – and then move forward to determine the best solution that makes it the safest. She did agree, however, that if angled parking was implemented - that the cars should not be right on the road.

Boardmember Pytel recommended, as an alternative, that the following clarifying language be added to the Code:

“Sec. 90-3. Off-street parking requirements

(e) *Access to street.* All required off-street parking spaces, except for single-family uses and individual duplex units, shall have unobstructed access from the street. *Backing out over the sidewalk from business or mixed business of residential parking areas is prohibited. Entry exit from such parking areas must be via a driveway and curb cut.”*

Boardmember Pytel felt if a new plan was implemented, it would have consequences on other sections of the LDR's.

Boardmember Mattick noted that if that language were implemented, every lot would have half of their lot as a driveway with cars coming and going and handicap having to go up and down a ramp on every lot. She felt the best solution was to move the sidewalks in front of the vehicles.

Boardmember Pytel noted that the current loading zones were not being used as intended – thus 250-ft of space not currently being utilized. Explanations, including a drawing, included. A loading zone alternative was suggested by Boardmember Pytel by widening the sidewalk inward with pavers to allow the parallel use of the right-of-way.

Boardmember Mattick noted there were utility accesses in those locations and also that ADA requires a minimum of 5-foot for the sidewalk. She stated that the smaller delivery trucks would fit in the regular parking spaces; however, the tractor trailers will take up almost the entire lot. She again stated that the safest way was to move the sidewalks forward in front of the cars and closer to the business entrances.

Boardmember Jenkins presented a proposal for parallel parking – one row against the building and one row against the sidewalk. Explanation followed.

Boardmember Barlow pointed out there had been numerous proposals presented by the Parking Safety Committee. He suggested that rather than making a decision on a specific proposal, that the P&Z Board review each proposal and make a list of the advantages, disadvantages, the possibilities available for each, etc. and forward that information on to the City Commission for their further recommendation on how they want the LDR's written.

Chair Stover agreed and felt the P&Z Board needed to make a determination based on each separate proposal and then recommend the proposal that made the most sense.

Chair Stover stated that at least 50% of the citizens in Anna Maria drive over a sidewalk every day.

Boardmember Pytel felt the Board should look at determining how to solve the current issue by recommending clarifying language changes to the existing Code and then to look at Boardmember Barlow's recommendation to looking at a longer term plan. He noted that grandfathering could be implemented as needed and suggested that language be addressed relating to the issue of parking areas (areas with three to five cars as opposed to only one or two) and how they could not back out over the sidewalk.

Boardmember Mattick agreed that the P&Z Board should have a consensus and move it forward to the City Commission. She discussed how the on-site parking recommendation would reduce the size of the building that could be built on the property. She still felt that Gene Aubry's proposal was the best plan and noted that PAR has agreed to implement the proposed changes on their current properties. She felt his plan would add a lot to the City by increasing the foot traffic and make it a pleasant walkable area. In turn, it would allow the businesses to thrive. She noted that none of the Boardmembers were experts and that an entire business district plan should be pursued by someone who was an expert.

Boardmember Barlow stated he had read the Parking Safety Committee's meeting conclusions signed by four of the six members and they had concluded that there was not any short-term or long-range safety concern. Therefore, he felt the P&Z Board stating there was a safety concern would go against the Parking Safety Committee's conclusions.

Chair Stover stated that the current development on Pine Ave. is minimal – only six lots. The total additional parking spaces on Pine Ave. were estimated at one-hundred. He felt if only the six lots were fixed, the City would be hard pressed to say that the safety issue had been solved. Therefore, the future safety issue should be solved.

Boardmember Conoly remembered that Sgt. Turner had indicated to the Parking Safety Committee that there was a safety issue and later addressed the Committee to clarify there was a safety concern on Pine Ave. He felt the legality issue needed to be clarified; that the P&Z Board not ignores that there may be a safety problem, and the unreasonableness of mandating the Pine Ave. property owners as to what is required on their property should be addressed.

It was *Chair Stover's* opinion that the City had not had a safety issue but they should not think there would never be one. The Segways and bicycle traffic were examples of issues that need to be addressed. He said he would like to see more specialty shops along Pine. He then discussed examples of different parking alternatives such as parking on the church property and being shuttled to the business area. Chair Stover said he would like to see each person who had submitted a proposal to work on the other proposals.

Hearing no further P&Z Board comments, Chair Stover stated that the Board would address the issue again at a future meeting.

3. Discussion of LDR Definitions – Discussion of existing and needed definitions with the LDR Section 70.

Chair Stover informed that there were 302 definitions in the LDR Section 70 that needed to be reviewed and an additional 15 that the Building Official felt should be added. He suggested giving each P&Z Boardmember 50 of the terms and then each Boardmember would bring their recommended changes back to the P&Z Board.

Boardmember Pytel felt they needed to be careful how the definitions were changed and noted the change may have some unintended consequences.

Boardmember Mattick noted that the P&Z Board had not been directed by the City Commission to review the definitions but did not feel it would be a difficult task.

Boardmember Barlow suggested first addressing the 15 terms that the Building Official suggests be added - and then address the current definitions. Boardmembers Pytel and Conoly agreed.

Boardmember Yetter questioned what role the City staff played in revising the LDR's. He felt that staff had the expectation to go through the definitions and then bring their recommendations back to the P&Z Board.

City Planner Garrett responded. He noted that it should be a shared responsibility and that it would not be a bad idea for the P&Z Boardmembers to also review the definitions.

Discussion followed as to how vague the City's current Code language is and how the various Attorneys will each interpret the language differently. The P&Z Board was cautioned by Building Official Welch to realize that the definitions are used several times throughout the Code.

After discussion, *Chair Stover* received Board consensus that each Boardmember would review 50 definitions and determine if the definition should stay, be removed, or changed. Chair Stover would be responsible for recommending definitions for the new terms recommended by staff. After each Boardmember completes their review, their specific list of terms will be brought back and switched with the next Boardmember for their review until all segments have been reviewed by all Boardmembers.

Discussion followed again about the Joint City Commission/P&Z Board Workshops.

Boardmember Mattick felt that the Chair, or the Chair's designee, presenting the Board's recommendations to the City Commission would be much more effective than all the P&Z Boardmembers being in attendance.

Boardmember Mattick asked what each of the Boardmembers felt was the best parking solution. As a result, *Chair Stover* asked each Boardmember if they were to own property on Pine Ave. how they would prefer their property and parking. The following responses were provided:

Boardmember Conoly – Would prefer mixed-use, parking in the back, and no swimming pools.

Boardmember Pytel - Would build a home to the limits allowed by Code and agreed with mixed-use.

Boardmember Barlow - Prefers Gene Aubry's streetscape. Felt it added ambiance to the City and lends very well to future projects. He felt the Comp Plan should be followed for mixed-use.

Boardmember Yetter - Said he would build whatever the law allowed.

Boardmember Jenkins - Prefers parking in the back.

Boardmember Mattick - Felt parking in the back was ideal, however, residents on Spring Ave were opposed to it. She agreed with mixed-use. She noted that her question was actually how to fix the issue of driving over a sidewalk.

Chair Stover felt the City was months away from a final solution. It was his opinion that Chapters 91, 92, and 93 that are currently reserved in the Code need to be completed.

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Stover at 8:35 p.m.

Chair Stover reopened the Planning & Zoning Board Workshop at 8:37 p.m.

ACTION: It was agreed that City Planner Garrett would work with Chair Stover to assign approximately 50 words and definitions to each P&Z Boardmember. Chair Stover will review the 15 new terms presented by Building Official Welch. After review, each Boardmember will bring back their recommendation as to whether the definition should remain as is, needs to be stricken, or needs to be changed. Each Boardmember will switch their list with the next Boardmember until all seven Boardmembers have reviewed all definitions. After completed, the Planner, Building Official, and City Attorney will be asked to review the P&Z Board's definition recommendations.

Adjournment.

The meeting was officially adjourned by Chair Stover at 8:38 p.m.

Alice Baird, CMC, City Clerk