

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
JUNE 10, 2008**

1. ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 4:06 p.m. Committee members present were Chair Jeff Evans, Vice-Chair Sam Engel, Jr., Bob Breslau (arrived 4:08 p.m.), and Harry Venis. Also present were Planning and Zoning Manager David Quigley, Deputy Planning and Zoning Manager David Abramson, Planners Lise Bazinet and Ingrid Allen, and Secretary Lorraine Robinson recording the meeting. Casey Lee was absent.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: May 13, 2008

Mr. Venis made a motion to approve the minutes of May 13, 2008. The motion died for lack of a second. Vice-Chair Engel was not comfortable seconding the motion as he had not attended the meeting.

Mr. Venis made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Engel, to table to the next meeting. In a voice vote, with Ms. Lee and Mr. Breslau being absent, all voted in favor. **(Motion carried 3-0)**

3. SITE PLANS

Site Plan

3.1 SP 9-2-07, Commerce Bank, 2401 South University Drive (B-2) **(tabled from May 13, 2008)**

Ms. Bazinet advised that the petitioner had requested a tabling to July 8, 2008.

Mr. Venis made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Engel, to table this item to July 8, 2008. In a voice vote, with Ms. Lee and Mr. Breslau being absent, all voted in favor. **(Motion carried 3-0)**

4. OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business discussed.

5. NEW BUSINESS

5.1 Comprehensive Plan Update – Iler Planning Group

Martin Schneider and Todd Miller, representing the Iler Planning Group, advised that Comprehensive Plans were required of all municipalities throughout the State of Florida. The Plan defined the goals, objectives and policies of the Town in the areas of future land use, transportation, utilities, housing, public school facilities, parks, recreation, conservation, intergovernmental coordination and capital improvements. Mr. Schneider advised that Florida State Statutes required the Comprehensive Plan to be updated every five-to-seven years by means of an Evaluation & Appraisal Report (EAR). As the Town's EAR met sufficiency in July 2006, the deadline to submit amendments to the Comprehensive Plan would be July 11, 2008.

Mr. Schneider identified the major issues specific to the uniqueness of the Town as noted in the EAR. Mr. Miller discussed the significant changes that had been made to the major elements of the EAR. When he completed highlighting the new policies, both Mr. Schneider and Mr. Miller answered questions and discussed Committee members' concerns.

The future land use element "smart growth" was Mr. Breslau's first area of concern. He believed the principles were sound; however, condensed high density, shared parking and parking garages were all necessities to support the vision for the Regional Activity Center, Transit Oriented Corridor and the Community Redevelopment area to work. That would mean substantial rezoning, of which Council was not fond of doing. Without those supportive tools, he maintained the vision could not be built and the proposed policies would be worthless. Chair Evans agreed having had a project shut down by a few residents because they believed a two-story building was considered too tall. He understood how difficult it was to implement density where there was a rural mentality.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
JUNE 10, 2008**

Mr. Schneider explained how the proposal fit together in that the Comprehensive Plan document would set up the general guidelines which would then have to be adopted into the land development regulations.

Mr. Breslau reiterated that he hated to see the Town adopt the proposed policies and then have Council say that it did not want the density, did not want 50-units per acre, and did not want shared parking; all of which would make the policies worthless.

A lengthy discussion ensued and Committee members agreed that there were too many roadblocks preventing the comprehensive plan from being done. Mr. Breslau advised that he had recently attended meetings in Miami and Tampa regarding downtowns, urban infill, and mixed-use “stuff” and he found that the proposed parking regulations of 1.5 and 2.0 parking spaces per unit to be double Tampa’s and triple Miami’s parking regulations. Chair Evans understood that since Miami provided mass transit, it did not require the higher number of parking spaces per unit. He could not speak for Tampa.

Mr. Quigley advised that while some very good points had been raised regarding building constraints, the Committee should keep in mind that the Regional Activity Center and Transit Oriented Corridor were 50-year plans. Although there was no mass transit at this time, it might change and the regulations would be adjusted and the parking regulations reduced. It was meant to evolve over time as conditions changed.

Mr. Breslau believed that it had to be a “mind-set change” as it was one thing to have a rural concept out west which the Town would want to preserve; however, the Town was competing with central business districts all along the coast. From what he had gleaned from experienced residential developers who wanted to participate in providing affordable housing, increases in concentrated density and decreases in parking requirements were two necessary components for affordable/work force projects to be financially sound.

Regarding the infrastructure element and a concurrency requirement for potable water and for wastewater treatment, the Committee agreed that it would have to come from the State to say that the local drainage districts would have to work together in order to come up with a comprehensive plan that worked County wide. Vice-Chair Engel noted that there were three different drainage districts within the Town and that each had drastically different requirements. Mr. Miller indicated he would follow-up on that issue.

Mr. Breslau asked when this item was going before Council and if anyone was collecting and compiling comments from the Committee’s review as well as from other public reviews. Ms. Allen elaborated on the process and assured that comments and recommendations would be conveyed. Committee members agreed that it was all great stuff if only it could be implemented.

6. COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

There were no comments and/or suggestions made.

7. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business and no objections, the meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Date Approved: _____

Chair/Committee Member