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### I. ROLL CALL

Ms. Donalee Schmidt, Deputy Clerk, called the roll. Mr. Chris Williams was absent.
II. MINUTES

April 12, 2007

MR. NURREN BROCK MOVED approval of the Minutes.

Chairman Gallagher called on the motion; the vote was unanimous and the motion carried.

III. PROOFS

A. Proof of Publication

Proof of publication was noted.

B. Proof of Public Notice

Proof of publication was noted.

Ms. Schmidt swore in everyone who planned to present testimony.

IV. VARIANCE PETITIONS

1. Zoning

None Scheduled

2. Development Plans

a. Memorandum No.: DR07-1754
   Project Name: Panda Express
   Applicant: Panda Restaurant Group
   Proposed Development: Restaurant.
   Requested: Section 319.6.B.1., Interim Use, to permit installation of a five-foot landscape buffer within the transportation corridor.
   RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.
Ms. Cindy Jolly explained the request and spoke regarding the surrounding area. Staff recommended approval as long as all of the trees associated with the buffer remained on the applicant's property.

Mr. Jason King, representative, agreed with Staff’s recommendation.

There was no public comment.

Discussion followed regarding a prior approval on the site.

**MR. NURREN BROCK MOVED** approval of Staff’s recommendation.

Chairman Gallagher called on the motion; the vote was unanimous and the motion carried.

b. **Memorandum No.**: DR07-1787  
**Project Name**: Marine Institute  
**Applicant**: New Port Richey Marine Institute.  
**Proposed Development**: School  
**Requested**: Relief from Section 618.12, Cross-Access/Frontage/Reverse-Frontage Road, eliminating the required cross-access drive to the abutting commercial properties; and Section 602.7, Tree Mitigation, in lieu of replacing all required inches of trees, the developer is proposing to donate to the Tree Mitigation Fund.

**RECOMMENDATION**: Denial of variance from Section 618.12 and approval of variance from Section 602.7.

Ms. Jolly explained the request and spoke regarding the surrounding area. Staff recommended denial of the variance request from Section 618.12 to the east, and approval of the request to donate to the Tree Mitigation Fund payment.

Ms. Beth Harding, representative, requested relief from the Cross-Access Variance. She noted the Marine Institute was a minimum risk DJJ non-secure program; all of the youth enrolled in the program had criminal histories. Public Safety was their main concern. She spoke regarding increases in the gang population within the County and the need to limit access to the property.

Discussion followed between the applicant, the DRC, and Staff regarding: fencing of the property; the Staff had strict supervision; security on the site; the fencing could start
behind the interconnection on the site; driveway sharing; all of the property would be utilized; and the property depth was 250 feet.

Mr. Keith Bachman, representative for an adjacent property owner, spoke under public comment and felt the cross-access requirement should remain.

**MR. NURRENBROCK MOVED** approval of Staff’s recommendation.

Chairman Gallagher called on the motion; the vote was unanimous and the motion carried.

c. Memorandum No.: DR07-1841
   Project Name: Happy Tails Pet Lodge
   Applicant: May Leigh Anderson
   Proposed Development: Residence and pet-boarding kennel.
   Requested: Relief from Section 618.12, requiring a 24-foot cross access between the east and west adjoining properties.
   RECOMMENDATION: Denial.

Ms. Jolly explained the request and described the surrounding area. Staff recommended the interconnection be provided and agreed with that provision at a later date with the applicant reserving the right-of-way. Staff recommended denial of the variance request to eliminate the requirement to interconnect; however, Staff did not object to additional conditions which required the applicant to reserve the area and construct the connection at a later date when the sites beside them developed.

Discussion followed between the DRC and Staff regarding: possible bonding requirements, the approval would be recorded; development of the other properties; they could not condition denial; the site plan would be conditioned with the requirement; Ehren Cutoff and the future Collier Parkway extension; corridor preservation; a large home in the area; and future area development.

Mr. Chris Green, representative, spoke regarding the request. Items discussed included:

- The cross-access road would go through the property discussed with the large home.
- The cross-access road would only connect three parcels.
- A waterway ditch in the area.
- The corridor preservation.

There was no public comment.
Ms. Jolly stated Staff recommended denial of the applicant’s request, but as part of the site plan, Staff would require the applicant to reserve a 24-foot easement for the interconnection in a form acceptable to the County Attorney's Office, at the time of the development of the adjoining properties the interconnection shall be completed, and that the site plan approval and conditions would be recorded in the public record.

**MR. NURREN BROCK MOVED** approval as stated by Ms. Jolly.

Discussion followed regarding connection to residential properties.

Ms. Jolly clarified the connection would be at the time of development of adjoining parcels of anything other than one single family residence.

Chairman Gallagher called on the motion; the vote was unanimous and the motion carried.

d. **Memorandum No.:** DR07-1843  
   **Project Name:** CVS Pharmacy, S.R. 54 and Morris Bridge Road  
   **Applicant:** Principal Developers  
   **Proposed Development:** Pharmacy.  
   **Requested:** Relief from Section 618.12, requiring a 24-foot cross-access connection to the eastern adjacent property; Section 311, allowing interim use of the future right-of-way dedication for S.R. 54 and to allow permanent use in the Morris Bridge Road Transportation Corridor; Section 603.9.D.4, to allow reductions in the required “D” buffer width from 15 feet to 10 feet along the west property line adjacent to Morris Bridge Road and along the north property line adjacent to S.R. 54; and Section 603.9.D.2, to allow a reduction in the required “B” buffer width from 15 feet to 10 feet along the south property line adjacent to the residential property.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Continue to August 9, 2007, 1:30 p.m., Development Review Committee meeting in Dade City.
Ms. Jolly recommended the item be continued to August 9, 2007, at 1:30 p.m. in Dade City.

Ms. Elizabeth Ergman, representative, agreed with the continuance.

There was no public comment.

**MR. NURREN BROCK MOVED** to continue the item to August 9, 2007, at 1:30 p.m. in Dade City.

Chairman Gallagher called on the motion; the vote was unanimous and the motion carried.

e. **Memorandum No.**: DR07-1856  
   **Project Name**: U.S. 41 Daycare Center  
   **Applicant**: Creative Work Franchising  
   **Proposed Development**: A one-story, 11,960-square-foot daycare center.  
   **Requested**: Relief from Section 618.12 to provide cross connectivity to the north and south adjoining properties.  
   **RECOMMENDATION**: Denial.

Ms. Jolly explained the request and described the surrounding area. Staff objected to the granting of the variance as the applicant had not provided adequate evidence that special conditions or circumstances were involved. There was no physical impediment to provide the cross connection. Staff recommended denial of the variance request.

Mr. Jim Crest, representative, spoke regarding the request. Items discussed included:

- The method of operation of the day care.
- Safety and security would be a major concern with the cross connection.
- The property to the north was commercial with a large septic drain field.
- The cross connection requirement would cause the outdoor play area to be lost.
- The interconnection requirements of other developments.

He requested approval of the request.

Discussion continued between the applicant, the DRC and Staff regarding: the exhibit displayed; security of the site; the size of the building compared to the size of the land; required parking; the site was loaded; the building was too big; the parking area; the center’s Staff parking location; the parents were required to walk the children into the center; there would be 250 children at the facility; there would be approximately 20 Staff
members on site; the site was too small; this project would fail if they did not have adequate outside play area; the applicant was trying to get too much on this property; this was the Creative World cookie cutter site which had worked in multiple locations; development in the area; and the interconnect was crucial due to the nature of the corridor location.

Mr. George Clampton, adjacent property owner, spoke under public comment. Concerns included: safety; tractors trailers accessing the adjacent site delivering tile; the location of the septic tank on the adjacent property; and safety of the children.

Mr. Mike Williams, representative for Creative World, spoke regarding safety of the facility; the adjacent property; Swiftmud requirements; and felt a connecting road was not feasible.

Ms. Jolly stated if the request was denied, the applicant would need to redesign the property.

**MR. PARIKH MOVED** approval of Staff’s recommendation of denial.

Chairman Gallagher called on the motion; the vote was unanimous and the motion carried.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Memorandum No.:</th>
<th>DR07-1884</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Name:</td>
<td>Suojanen Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Continued from the June 21, 2007, Development Review Committee Meeting)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant:</td>
<td>Suojanen Enterprise, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Development:</td>
<td>The addition of 28,700 square feet of retail/warehouse to the existing 3,000-square-foot office and 11,200-square-foot warehouse, for a total of 42,950 square feet on the 4.99 acres site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested:</td>
<td>A variance from Section 602.7.C.2.e., Tree Removal/Replacement, which, if approved, would allow a monetary contribution to the Tree Mitigation Fund in lieu of replacement of all the trees removed for development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDATION:</td>
<td>Approval with conditions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ms. Jolly explained Staff had revised their recommendation from the previous meeting and now recommended approval of the variance request and payment into the tree
mitigation fund.

Ms. Elizabeth Ergman, representative, agreed with Staff’s recommendation and conditions.

There was no public comment.

**MR. NURRENBROCK MOVED** approval of Staff’s recommendation.

Chairman Gallagher called on the motion; the vote was unanimous and the motion carried.

g. Memorandum No.: DR07-1890  
Project Name: Keene Brother Salon  
(Continued from the June 21, 2007, Development Review Committee Meeting)  
Applicant: Robert Daniel Keene  
Proposed Development: The applicant is proposing to renovate an existing building (residence) to a hair/nail shop of 1,750 square feet.  
Requested: Variance from Sections 603.7, Building Perimeter; 603.9.D.2, Buffering and Screening; 615, On-Street Parking; and 319, Right-of-Way Dedication and Uses.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Denial.

Ms. Jolly recommended the item be continued to July 26, 2007, at 1:30 p.m. in Dade City.

Ms. Christie Zimmer, representative, agreed with the continuance.

There was no public comment.

**MR. NURRENBROCK MOVED** to continue the item to July 26, 2007, at 1:30 p.m. in Dade City.

Chairman Gallagher called on the motion; the vote was unanimous and the motion carried.
h. Memorandum No.: DR07-1819
   Project Name: Greenlaw Office Center
   (Continued from the June 21, 2007, Development Review Committee Meeting)
   Applicant: Brenda Scarborough
   Proposed Development: Office building addition.
   Requested: Variance from Section 615, Off-Street Parking, to reduce the required parking spaces.
   RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

Ms. Jolly explained the regarding and described the surrounding area. Staff recommended approval.

Mr. Jeremy Couch, representative, agreed with Staff’s recommendation.

There was no public comment.

MR. NURREN BROCK MOVED approval of Staff’s recommendation and corrected the agenda item to read Commission District 2.

Chairman Gallagher called on the motion; the vote was unanimous and the motion carried.

i. Memorandum No.: DR07-1892
   Project Name: Seven Springs Medical Park
   (Continued from the June 21, 2007, Development Review Committee Meeting)
   Applicant: Seven Springs Medical Park, Inc.
   Proposed Development: Approval previously received for preliminary/construction plan and Stormwater Management Plan and Report to subdivide 14 acres into seven lots.
   Requested: A variance from Section 602.7, Tree Removal, which, if approved, would allow for a monetary contribution to the Tree Mitigation Fund in lieu of the required tree replacement.
   RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.
Ms. Jolly explained the item and described the area. Staff recommended approval with conditions.

Mr. Paul Manuel, representative, agreed with Staff’s recommendation.

There was no public comment.

MR. NURREN BROCK MOVED approval of Staff’s recommendation.

Chairman Gallagher called on the motion; the vote was unanimous and the motion carried.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>j.</th>
<th>Memorandum No.: DR07-1921</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Name: Naglieri Building (Continued from the June 21, 2007, Development Review Committee Meeting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applicant: Anthony and Nancy Naglieri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Development: Office/warehouse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requested: Variance from 1) Section 603.6.C.2, requiring that existing structures or sites be brought into compliance with the Landscape and Buffering Ordinance to allow the existing buffers of six feet on the north, five feet on the east, zero feet on the south to suffice for the required buffers of ten feet along each property line; and 2) Section 618.12, requiring installation of a 24-foot interconnection between abutting properties to the north and south.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RECOMMENDATION: Deny the northern and cross-access and approve the southern and eastern buffer requests with conditions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ms. Jolly explained the request. Staff had not received any updated information from the applicant since the previous meeting. Staff recommended the variance request to not provide a cross-access to the north be denied; Staff recommended denial of the reduction of buffers to the north, but had no objection to the reduction of the southern buffer and eastern buffer.
Mr. Ray Gustavason, representative, spoke regarding the request. He noted revised drawings were provided last Monday. Items discussed included:

- There was no objection for the north access connection.
- The applicant wished to secure the site.
- Moving the access toward 19 would wipe out the existing parking.
- The loss of existing parking spaces.
- Past accidents at the access location.
- Grade differences in the adjacent parcels.
- A retaining wall would be needed along the north property line.
- A significant cut would be needed to build the project.
- Drainage on the site.
- When the property to the north developed they would also need to cut.

Discussion continued between the applicant, Staff and the DRC regarding: the location of the cross connection; the existing retention pond; elevation differences; future interconnections; the applicant did not want to raise the other two buildings; the entire site would be impervious surface; the retention would be vaulted; the cross-connections were needed on busy corridors; limited access crossings on 19; and the surrounding parcels.

There was no public comment.

Ms. Jolly reviewed the landscaping variance request.

**MR. NURREN BROCK MOVED** approval of Staff’s recommendation for the landscaping variance request.

Chairman Gallagher called on the motion; the vote was unanimous and the motion carried.

**MR. NURREN BROCK MOVED** to deny the variance and to require the interconnection to line up with existing drive aisle to the south.

Discussion followed regarding the location of the retention pond and the drainage behind the building.

Chairman Gallagher called on the motion; the vote was unanimous and the motion carried.

Mr. Nurrenbrock corrected the agenda item to reflect District 4.
k. Memorandum No.: PMA07-163  
Project Name: Wal-Mart (Holiday)  
Applicant: Wal-Mart Stores East, L.P.  
Proposed Development: 187,975-square-foot retail store.  
Requested: The applicant is requesting a variance from Section 618.7, Access Control.  
RECOMMENDATION: Continue to the August 23, 2007, 1:30 p.m., Development Review Committee meeting in New Port Richey.

Ms. Jolly recommended the item be continued to August 23, 2007, at 1:30 p.m. in New Port Richey.

Ms. Valerie Williams, representative, agreed with the continuance.

There was no public comment.

**MR. NURREN BROCK MOVED** to continue the item to August 23, 2007, at 1:30 p.m. in New Port Richey.

Chairman Gallagher called on the motion; the vote was unanimous and the motion carried.

**V. TRANSPORTATION CORRIDOR MANAGEMENT**

A. **Dedication Waiver**

None Scheduled

B. **Dedication Variance**

None Scheduled

**VI. APPEALS**

A. **Class I**

None Scheduled
B. **Class II**  
None Scheduled

C. **Class III**  
None Scheduled

D. **Class IV**  
None Scheduled

E. **Consistency**  
None Scheduled

VII. **PUBLIC NOTICE AGENDA**

A. **Class II**

1. **Memorandum No.:** DR07-1855  
   **Project Name:** Homewood Suites  
   **Proposed Development:** The developer is requesting preliminary/construction site plan approval for a four-story hotel and 105 rooms and amenities totaling 82,879 square feet. Also, variance requests from 1) Section 602.9.2.e, Tree Protection; 2) Section 319, Corridor Preservation; and 3) Section 603.9.d.4, Buffering and Screening.

   **RECOMMENDATION:** Approval of variances from Sections 602.9.2.e and 319 and preliminary construction site plan with conditions.

   Ms. Jolly explained the request and gave the location of the property. Staff recommended approval of the tree mitigation payment. Staff had no objection to 2.5
feet of the landscaping being placed in the transportation corridor; however, if DOT objected, Staff would recommend the buffer be reduced to 12.5. She noted the request had been sent to DOT, but Staff had not received an indication either way; it was not a County right-of-way.

Discussion followed regarding the buffer reduction; this involved DOT future right-of-way; and to go from 15 feet to 12.5 feet, placing the landscaping within the 12.5 feet.

Ms. Rene Ragerial, representative, spoke regarding the request. Items discussed included:

- The applicant had worked closely with FDOT regarding site issues.
- FDOT did not have any objections relating to the landscape issues.
- It would be easier to reduce the 15 foot buffer to 12.5 feet.

Mr. Johnson noted an e-mail was received from Ms. Rebecca Schafer.

Ms. Ruth Gibbs spoke under public comment. Items discussed included drainage and buffering.

Ms. Ragerial responded to the drainage concerns and explained the property would be graded to drain into the FDOT drainage area. Because of the grade differences, the applicant had added a small “knee wall” along the property line to further prevent any drainage problems for adjacent properties. A decorative fence would also be installed.

**MR. JOHNSON MOVED** to receive and file the e-mail from Ms. Rebecca Schafer and Ms. Ruth Gibbs.

Chairman Gallagher called on the motion; the vote was unanimous and the motion carried.

**MR. NURREN BROCK MOVED** approval of Staff’s recommendation for variance requests one and three.

Chairman Gallagher called on the motion; the vote was unanimous and the motion carried.
Ms. Jolly explained the item and gave the location of the property. Staff recommended approval with conditions. She recommended Condition 3 and Condition 16 be deleted as they were not applicable to stormwater drainage approvals.

Mr. Mark Siffert, representative, agreed with Staff’s recommendation.

Mr. Dewayne Milt spoke under public comment. Issues discussed included: the agenda description incorrectly stated the northwest quadrant of the intersection of Meadow Pointe Boulevard and 56, and it was actually the northeast quadrant; an existing fence between the subject parcel and Mr. Milt’s property would be removed; the fence should remain; a lease for cows; an existing drainage ditch; construction had already begun on site; the cleared area was encroaching into the north and encompassed part of the drainage ditch; and the drainage ditch was for the Fox Ridge Subdivision.

Ms. Jolly indicated Mr. Milt was correct and would revise the agenda description to read “northeast quadrant”.

Mr. Goldstein spoke regarding the Development Order requirement to connect Meadow Pointe Boulevard to the park site.

Ms. Siffert explained the mitigation was for the park site and spoke regarding the frontage road.

Discussion followed between the applicant, the DRC and Staff regarding: the area needed for the frontage road; the fence ran east/west and had been moved to the north; the ditch would be enhanced as part of the mitigation; the existing wetland; they would need to cross the wetland area; and the mitigation areas were outside the 30 foot frontage area.

**MR. PARIKH MOVED** approval of Staff’s recommendation contingent upon Staff determined whether the frontage road could be built, with the elimination of Comments 3 and 16, subject to the County Engineer’s review and approval.

Mr. Milt explained the portion of the fence that had been moved did not abut his property. There was another fence, east of that fence which had been moved that did
abut his property. That was the fence he was told would be taken down and would open up his property with the cows.

Mr. Siffert stated the applicant would block off Mr. Milt’s property with a fence.

Chairman Gallagher called on the motion; the vote was unanimous and the motion carried.

3. Memorandum No.: DR07-1862
   Project Name: RTD Construction Office
   Proposed Development: Two offices, a maintenance building expansion, and variances from Sections 603.9, Perimeter Landscape Buffers; and 618.12, Cross-Access/Frontage/Reverse-Frontage Roads.

   RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the preliminary/construction site plan and variance from Section 603.9 and denial of variance from Section 618.12.

Ms. Jolly explained the request. Staff recommended approval of the variance request regarding the landscaping; denial of the removal of the cross-access variance required; and approval of the site plan/construction plan and landscape irrigation variance with conditions. Conditions 2I (1) and 2I (2) were added which required the applicant to show on revised plans the location of the shrub and ground cover for the perimeter buffers and to revise the plan to indicate the locations of the 24 foot access drive to the north and south property lines.

Mr. Danny Jordan, applicant, explained the variance was requested due to material and heavy equipment that would be stored on the property. He was concerned with security of the site if there was a cross-access through the property.

Discussion followed between the applicant, the DRC and Staff regarding: the location of the proposed cross-access; future widening of Chancey Road; the amount of right-of-way needed; the possibility of moving the buildings on the site; an existing septic tank on the site; future developments plans; a possible two week continuance; and that the applicant owned the adjacent parcel.

Mr. Dan Peters, representative, explained this was not an engineering problem, but a safety concern. He spoke regarding the need for a secured area and the buffering requirements.
MR. JOHNSON MOVED to continue the item to July 26, 2007, at 1:30 p.m. in Dade City.

Chairman Gallagher called on the motion; the vote was unanimous and the motion carried.

4. Memorandum No.: DR07-1652
   Project Name: Russell Industrial Park
   Proposed Development: Two warehouses and a variance from Section 602.7, Tree Removal, which, if approved, would allow for a monetary contribution to the Tree Mitigation Fund in lieu of the required tree replacement.
   RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

Ms. Jolly explained the item. Staff recommended approval of the tree variance and approval of the project. A condition was added regarding the amount to be paid as the applicant’s proportionate share for improvements was $4,500.00 to be paid prior to the first C-O.

MR. NURRENBROCK MOVED to add the condition as stated Ms. Jolly and to receive-and file an e-mail.

Chairman Gallagher called on the motion; the vote was unanimous and the motion carried.

Mr. Mike Kelly, representative, agreed with Staff’s recommendation including the additional condition.

There was no public comment.

MR. NURRENBROCK MOVED approval of Staff’s recommendation.

Chairman Gallagher called on the motion; the vote was unanimous and the motion carried.
5. Memorandum No.: DR07-1661
Project Name: Storette Storage Expansion
Proposed Development: A 16,000-square-foot, two-story expansion for a self-storage warehouse.
Requested: Approval of the preliminary/construction plan with variances from Section 618.12, Cross-Access; and Section 603.9.D.1, Buffer.
RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the preliminary/construction plan and variance from Section 603.9.D.1 with conditions and denial of variance from Section 618.12.

Ms. Jolly explained the request and described the surrounding area. The property was granted a variance on the northern buffer in 2002 by the Board of County Commissioners. At that time the Board allowed the applicant to reduce the northern buffer, but no reduction was allowed along the southern boundary, nor was one requested. Staff had no objection to reducing the buffer to 5 feet or to granting the variance to the south. Staff recommended an interconnection be done to the north.

Mr. Will Matter, representative, distributed information to the Committee.

MR. NURRENBROCK MOVED to receive and file the information submitted by Mr. Will Matter.

Chairman Gallagher called on the motion; the vote was unanimous and the motion carried.

Mr. Matter reviewed the information distributed with the Committee Members. Items discussed included:

- The diagram of the site.
- The cross sections.
- Retaining walls.
- The site was enclosed for safety as a storage facility.
- The proposal included an expansion in the back.
- The applicant would provide an additional 27.5 feet of right-of-way to DOT along 301.
- There would be a located gate.
- Possible locations for the cross-access.

Discussion followed between the applicant, the DRC and Staff regarding the location of the retaining wall and possible future roadway widening.

DRC 07/12/2007
Page 18 of 34
There was no public comment.

Ms. Jolly recommended approval of the reduction of the landscaping to the back of the retaining wall.

**MR. NURRENBROCK MOVED** approval as stated by Ms. Jolly.

Chairman Gallagher called on the motion; the vote was unanimous and the motion carried.

Ms. Jolly recommended cross-access be provided to the north.

**MR. NURRENBROCK MOVED** to require the interconnect to the north, but to not require the interconnect to the south.

Chairman Gallagher called on the motion; the vote was unanimous and the motion carried.

6. **Memorandum No.:** DR07-1793
   **Project Name:** Suncoast Meadows Amenity Center
   **Proposed Development:** A one-story, 324-square-foot cabana with a pool, baseball and soccer fields, and an open play area on a 14.2-acre site.
   **RECOMMENDATION:** Approval with conditions.

Ms. Jolly explained the item. Staff recommended approval with conditions.

Mr. Lee Dowty, representative, agreed with Staff’s recommendation.

There was no public comment.

**MR. NURRENBROCK MOVED** approval of Staff’s recommendation.

Mr. Kennedy questioned if this was the landfill property.

Mr. Dowty stated they had worked out all of the issues.

Chairman Gallagher called on the motion; the vote was unanimous and the motion carried.
Ms. Jolly explained the request and gave the location of the property. Staff recommended approval with conditions.

Discussion followed between Staff and the DRC regarding the exact location of the request; the existing buffer area; a prior landscaping and setback agreement along Starkey Boulevard; and town homes in the development.

Mr. Steve Booth, representative, referred to the diagram and spoke regarding the agreement requirements.

Extensive discussion followed regarding the agreement.

Mr. Steve Wasson, representative, stated he did not remember anything in the agreement which affected an interior parcel within Longleaf.

Mr. Parikh suggested the alternative standards be approved and if they were in conflict with the existing agreement, the item would be brought back or comply with the agreement.

Mr. Booth requested the first page of the agenda item be corrected to read “apartments or condominiums”. Under Background, there should be an item 7 and he recommended they add the 2006 MPUD revisions that were not reflected within the background.

**MR. NURRENBROCK MOVED** approval of the corrections and addition of Condition 7 as verified by Staff.

Chairman Gallagher called on the motion; the vote was unanimous and the motion carried.

Mr. Booth agreed with Staff’s recommendation and conditions of approval.

Mr. Gary Lewis, Ms. Joanne Ryan, Ms. Tammy Suring, Mr. Andrea Barrygooth, Mr. George Albright, Ms. Katherine Beckett and Mr. Jonathon Brewer spoke under public comment. Items discussed included: originally the residents were told the Long Leaf Subdivision would be made up of 3 downtown areas, with 3 swimming pools, and 2 town halls; currently the residents had one pool, one town hall, and one partially completed downtown complex; this apartment complex would cause a hardship to the existing residents; parking problems due to narrow streets; rear alley garages;
apartments above the homes; on-street parking situations; the proposed development would have 3 buildings, with 21 of the vehicles parked outside the complex in the single-family area; use of the existing amenities; the developer wanted to use the existing amenities of Long Leaf; the proposed development should be scaled down to only 2 apartment buildings instead of 3 and to include amenities to serve the residents of Long Leaf; the neo-traditional concept; the residents had been blindsided by this project; every resident in the neighborhood had a garage and driveway; there were constant disagreements in the neighborhood over who should be using the street parking; the density of the proposed development; Starkey Boulevard; the developer should speak with the residents and address their concerns; the residents had a vested interested in Long Leaf; renters in the community; condos were okay; all of the traffic would go in and out one way; the buildings would be on Starkey, but the access would be on Marsha; changes in the market; safety concerns; maintenance of the streets; Long Leaf approved their own development agreement; Marsha Street was 22.5 feet wide; the need for a traffic study to be completed; the uncontrolled intersection; and the renderings and elevations were not appropriate compared to the development and improvement agreements signed by the residents.

Discussion followed between the DRC, the applicant and Staff regarding the 2006 MPUD approved revisions; this was a TND which the MPUD allowed on-street parking; the requirements of the On-Street Parking Ordinance; Long Leaf was allowed to count on-street parking as part of their MPUD; Long Leaf made their own development standards; there was never enough parking; there would be 2 spaces per unit; on site there would be 154 spaces, and on street 21 spaces were assigned to this project; the on street parking spaces were contiguous to the proposed development; the Code did not allow for on-street parking, but this MPUD did allow for on-street parking; the residents were upset about the MPUD changes; Staff notified the homeowners association; the density had been increased; and the new traffic study required a long list of improvements on Starkey Boulevard.

MR. NURREN BROCK MOVED to receive and file an item from Ms. Joanne Ryan.

Chairman Gallagher called on the motion; the vote was unanimous and the motion carried.

Mr. Booth responded to the concerns raised and stated the applicant would meet with the residents to discuss the issues. Much of this was approved in 1997 when Long Leaf first came in.

Chairman Gallagher questioned the parking requirements. He asked if the Ordinance which required 2 parking spaces per unit affected this project, and if they were unsure should the item be continued.

Ms. Jolly explained they could allow the applicant to start but to limit the amount of units, or continue the item to August 8th to allow the applicant to submit a variance.
Mr. Booth explained the street was made wider to facilitate the concept of the on-street parking. The standards were written by Long Leaf, but were approved by the County because there was not a TND Ordinance at the time. The concept throughout the development was for the allowance of on-street parking. He agreed with the requested continuance, but noted the MPUD was approved under specific standards. The representative from Crosland would also meet with the residents regarding their concerns.

Discussion followed regarding the traffic stacking; the location of the entrance; the idea of these communities was to live and work within the community; in the early stages, everyone lived there but nobody worked there; and this was not a typical community.

Ms. Jolly recommended the item be continued to August 23, 2007 in New Port Richey and noted a variance could also be advertised for that date.

Mr. Booth agreed with the continuance to August 23, 2007, but would not concede that a variance was needed and would explore the issue with Staff.

MR. JOHNSON MOVED to continue the item to August 23, 2007.

Chairman Gallagher called on the motion; the vote was unanimous and the motion carried.

Mr. Goldstein requested Staff also review the transportation issues.

8. Memorandum No.: DR07-1874
   Project Name: Wal-Mart (Holiday)
   Proposed Development: Preliminary site plan approval to construct a 189,975-square-foot retail building and a 15,129-square-foot garden center.
   RECOMMENDATION: Continue to the August 23, 2007, 1:30 p.m., DRC meeting in New Port Richey.

Ms. Jolly recommended the item be continued to August 23, 2007, at 1:30 p.m. in New Port Richey.

Ms. Valerie Williams, representative, agreed with the continuance.

There was no public comment.

MR. NURREN BROCK MOVED to continue the item to August 23, 2007, at 1:30 p.m. in New Port Richey.
Chairman Gallagher called on the motion; the vote was unanimous and the motion carried.

### B. Class III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Memorandum No.:</th>
<th>DR07-1895</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Name:</td>
<td>Jovita Hills Subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Continued from the March 29, 2007, and May 24, 2007, Development Review Committee Meetings)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Development:</td>
<td>Preliminary plan approval with variance requests to subdivide 39.01 acres into 39 single-family lots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variances requested:</td>
<td>1) Section 306.17, Dedication, which, if approved, would allow for privately maintained roadways and 2) Section 618.12, which, if approved, would relieve the applicant of providing an interconnecting roadway to the northwest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDATION:</td>
<td>Approval of the preliminary plan and variance from Section 306.17 with conditions and denial of variance from Section 618.12.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ms. Jolly explained the request and gave the location of the property. Staff recommended the applicant not be required to provide the interconnection to the north and that they be allowed to be privately maintained inside.

Mr. Ben Harrill, representative, explained they had provided access to the south. He spoke regarding Condition 35 and requested Condition 35(d) be amended to include “the developer’s proportionate share of this amount is $38,347.00” and the last sentence be amended to read “the developer’s proportionate share payments shall be made prior to record plat”. He stated with these revisions, the applicant was in agreement with Staff’s recommendation and would provide the southern interconnect.

Mr. Drew Pittman spoke under public comment and agreed to the location of the interconnection point.

**MR. NURREN BROCK MOVED** approval of Staff’s recommendation including the revisions to Condition 35 as read into the record by Mr. Harrill.
Chairman Gallagher called on the motion; the vote was unanimous and the motion carried.

2. Memorandum No.: DR07-1893
   Project Name: Outlaw Ridge, Phase II
   Proposed Development: Preliminary/construction plan and Stormwater Management Plan and Report approval with a variance request to subdivide 14.82 acres into eight single-family detached lots. Variance requested: Section 306.17, Dedication, which, if approved, would allow for privately maintained roadways.
   RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

Ms. Jolly explained the request.

Chairman Gallagher questioned the interconnection requirements.

Ms. Jolly explained access to this was by a private easement; Outlaw Ridge I was approved years ago. She requested Condition 38 be revised to require the installation of a streetlight at the intersection of Outlaw Way.

Mr. Robert Williams, representative, agreed with Staff’s recommendation. He submitted an Agent of Letter record.

There was no public comment.

Discussion followed regarding the surrounding area.

MR. JOHNSON MOVED to receive and file the Agent of Letter record submitted by Mr. Williams.

Chairman Gallagher called on the motion; the vote was unanimous and the motion carried.

MR. PARIKH MOVED approval of Staff’s recommendation including the revisions read into the record by Ms. Jolly.

Chairman Gallagher called on the motion; the vote was unanimous and the motion carried.
3. **Memorandum No.:** DR07-1894  
**Project Name:** Terra Bella Commercial Subdivision  
**Proposed Development:** Preliminary/construction plan, Stormwater Management Plan and Report with variances, and alternative standards request approval to subdivide 10.98 acres into four office/commercial lots. Variances requested: 1) Section 610.5A/B, Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities, which, if approved, would relieve the applicant of installing sidewalks and bike trails along the temporary (north-south) Livingston Road Extension, west of Lot 4A; 2) Section 610.3.I, Shoulders, which, if approved, would allow the applicant to install guardrails in lieu of providing the required eight-foot roadway shoulder along the western edge of the north-south, temporary Livingston Road Extension, west of Lot 4A; 3) Section 603.9.D, Landscape Buffering and Screening, which, if approved, would relieve the applicant of installing a Type D right-of-way landscape buffer along the west side of the temporary Livingston Road Extension, west of Lot 4A; 4) Section 618.12, Cross-Acces/Forwardage/Reverse-Frontage Road, which, if approved, would relieve the applicant from providing a 24-foot-wide interconnecting roadway to the west of the north-south temporary Livingston Road.  
**Alternative Standards requested:** Section 610.3.F, Right-of-Way, which, if approved, would allow for the reduction of Penner Road, a Type 1B roadway, from the required 60 feet of right-of-way to 50 feet of right-of-way.  

**RECOMMENDATION:** Approval with conditions.

Ms. Jolly explained the request.
Mr. Ben Harrill, representative, spoke regarding the request. Items discussed included:

- Access to the site.
- Straightening the intersection.
- The applicant met the minimum angle requirement for the traffic signal.
- Variances were requested for the sidewalk, the handrail and the shoulder.
- The applicant requested a 10-foot reduction in the right-of-way width for the reverse access road.

Discussion followed regarding surrounding roadways.

Mr. Harrill agreed with Staff’s recommendation and conditions.

There was no public comment.

**MR. NURREN BROCK MOVED** approval of Staff’s recommendation.

Chairman Gallagher called on the motion; the vote was unanimous and the motion carried.

**VIII. REGULAR AGENDA**

**A. Class II**

None Scheduled

**B. Class III**

1. Memorandum No.: GM07-445  
   Project Name: Heritage Pines MPUD Amendment  
   Proposed Development: Modifications to the currently approved conditions of approval which includes a change to the type of secondary access connection at County Line Road.  
   **RECOMMENDATION:** Approval with conditions.

Mr. Sam Steffey reviewed each of the amendments with the Committee members.

Discussion followed regarding notification of the residents.

Mr. Greg Brown, representative, was present.
Mr. Steffey added language to Condition 18 F to include that the developer make a contribution to the County for those improvements and if the contribution was not made by a time certain, building permits would not be issued and the current performance guarantee held by the County would not be released until payment was made.

Mr. Brown explained the problem with the condition was the requirement of an August 10th date certain to make the payment. He did not foresee a problem in making payment, but the County was required to provide the applicant the cost estimate for the off-site work.

Mr. Parikh confirmed the cost estimate was acceptable with 15 percent the cost for design. The amount would be $134,000.00 plus 15 percent.

Mr. Brown stated that amount was acceptable and was consistent with the cost estimate submitted for the current off-site work.

**MR. NURREN BROCK MOVED** approval of Staff’s recommendation with the changes as read into the record by Mr. Steffey.

There was no public comment.

Chairman Gallagher called on the motion; the vote was unanimous and the motion carried.

2. **Memorandum No.:** ZN07-401  
**Project Name:** Boyette Road MPUD  
**Proposed Development:** The applicant is requesting to amend the previously approved master plan by changing an allowable use from single-family detached to a church and day-care center on a total of 25 acres of the 29.1-acre site. The remaining 4.1 acres remains as single-family detached.  
**RECOMMENDATION:** Continue to the July 26, 2007, Development Review Committee meeting in Dade City.

Ms. Jolly recommended the item be continued to July 26, 2007, at 1:30 p.m. in Dade City.

There was no public comment.
MR. NURRENBROCK MOVED to continue the item to July 26, 2007, at 1:30 p.m. in Dade City.

Chairman Gallagher called on the motion; the vote was unanimous and the motion carried.

3. Memorandum No.: ZN07-415
   Project Name: Legacy MPUD Master Planned Unit Development
   (Continued from the May 24, 2007, Development Review Committee Meeting)
   Proposed Development: The applicant is requesting to rezone 534 acres from an A-C Agricultural District to an MPUD Master Planned Unit Development District to develop a maximum of 860 single-family detached dwellings and townhouses.
   RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

Ms. Jolly recommended the item be continued to July 26, 2007, at 1:30 p.m. in Dade City.

Mr. Ben Harrill, representative, agreed with the continuance.

There was no public comment.

MR. NURRENBROCK MOVED to continue the item to July 26, 2007, at 1:30 p.m. in Dade City.

Chairman Gallagher called on the motion; the vote was unanimous and the motion carried.

4. Memorandum No.: ZN07-416
   Project Name: Scarpo MPUD Master Planned Unit Development
   Proposed Development: Applicants are proposing to revise substandard road improvement conditions.
   RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.
Mr. Steffey gave the location of the project, explained the request and distributed information to the DRC. He corrected the item to read a 29-foot pavement width.

Mr. Jerry Figurski, representative, explained their biggest concern was safety and spoke regarding meetings held with Staff.

Mr. Mike Raysor, representative, referred to the diagram, explained the item, and spoke regarding the prior conditions of approval which included tree removal. Items discussed included:

- The substandard clear zone.
- Prior conditions of removal required removal of trees within 6 feet of the edge of pavement to meet the clear zone requirements.
- An alternative solution to meet the clear zone requirements of the County.
- By widening Cypress Creek Road the alignment would be shifted away from the trees.
- 10.5 foot travel lanes would be desired for this location.
- Speed issues.
- Proper transitions would be introduced onto the road through the new pavement markings.
- Swales along the roadway.
- Drainage easements.

Discussion followed between the applicant, the DRC and Staff regarding: the requirements of paragraph C; Mr. King’s property; and the maintained right-of-way lawsuit.

Chairman Gallagher felt the obligation of the development was being shifted to the County. He understood the developer was getting the needed right-of-way from Ms. Orsi.

Mr. Raysor explained the right-of-way from Ms. Orsi would accommodate the widening of the road; Mr. Figurski was referring to the repaving of the roadway. A portion of the road was currently on Mr. King’s property. The developer could not repave the portion of the roadway located on Mr. King’s property; however, the County had been maintaining the roadway for the past 10 years.

Mr. Parikh stated in light of the legal action against the County by Mr. King, the agenda item was withdrawn from the Board of County Commissioners meeting.

Mr. Henry King explained they were still waiting on discovery from the County.

Discussion continued regarding the issue.
Mr. King stated he objected to the approval of this change and the existing conditions of approval on the basis that the conditions of approval contain at least one provision which required the use of property he owned, and that neither the applicant nor the County had the right to use. He spoke regarding a possible cross connection to the north; the substandard road conditions; he was unable to convey land at this point because his zoning had been postponed; the structural number of the paving on Cypress Creek Road; the substandard road guidelines; the language of item 5 on page 3 of 3; the requirements of cross connections; frontage roads; and containment of runoff from the additional impervious surface.

Mr. Figurski requested the item be continued for two weeks to allow the applicant to address some of the concerns raised.

Mr. Goldstein asked when the condition was required to be completed; it stated they had to construct or pay but did not say when.

Mr. Figurski said the road had to be completed prior to site development permit.

Mr. Goldstein requested when the item came back, the requirement be clarified as to when the construction or payment needed to be made.

**MR. JOHNSON MOVED** to continue the item to July 26, 2007.

Chairman Gallagher called on the motion; the vote was unanimous and the motion carried.

C. **Class IV**

None Scheduled

IX. **DEVELOPMENT ISSUES DISCUSSION**

A. **Discussion of Policy Issues**

None Scheduled
B. Discussion

1. Sandy Lane Tower  
   Project: AA05-03

Ms. Jolly explained Mr. Tillman requested the item be placed on the agenda.

Mr. Tillman was not present.

Ms. Zampetti explained the issue was getting resolved. The bridge issue was the most important issue.

Chairman Gallagher requested the cell tower representative and Mr. Tillman be present to discuss the issue.

Ms. Zampetti noted the cell tower ownership had been turned over three times.

X. INFORMATION

None Scheduled

XI. NOTED ITEMS

Agenda items XI.A.1. through XI.F. were noted.

A. Class I Development Actions from June 22, 2007, to July 12, 2007:

1. Memorandum No.: DR07-1847  
   Project Name: River Ridge Substation  
   Applicant: Withlacoochee River Electric Cooperative, Inc.  
   Proposed Development: Preliminary/construction site plan approval for an electric substation.  
   Type of Action: Approval with conditions.  
   Date of Action: June 22, 2007.
2. Memorandum No.: DR07-1849  
   Project Name: Forster Medical Center  
   Applicant: George and Regina Forster  
   Proposed Development: The developers are requesting preliminary/construction plan approval for a two-story medical office with a total of 6,690 square feet.  
   Type of Action: Approved.  
   Date of Action: June 22, 2007  

3. Memorandum No.: DR07-1801  
   Project Name: CVS Pharmacy  
   Proposed Development: One-story, 13,397-square-foot pharmacy with drive-through.  
   Type of Action: Approved.  
   Date of Action: June 25, 2007  

4. Memorandum No.: DR07-1861  
   Project Name: Starbucks at Suncoast Crossing  
   Applicant: Burke, Hogue, and Mills Associates, Inc.  
   Proposed Development: Preliminary/construction site plan approval for a one-story, 2,100-square-foot coffee shop.  
   Type of Action: Approved.  
   Date of Action: June 28, 2007.  

B. Class IIIE Development Actions  

None Scheduled
C. **Class IIIMRS Development Actions**

1. **Memorandum No.**: DR07-1574  
   **Project Name**: Bellamy Estates  
   **Applicant**: Sandra L. Johnson  
   **Proposed Development**: The applicant is requesting to divide 9.88 acres into seven single-family detached lots.  
   **Type of Action**: Approved.  
   **Date of Action**: May 30, 2007

D. **Administrative Variance Actions**

   None Scheduled

E. **Class II Construction Plan Actions**

   None Scheduled

F. **Class III Construction Plan Actions**

   None Scheduled

THE COMMITTEE RECESSED AT 3:26 P.M. AND RECONVENED AT 3:41 P.M.
ADJOURN

The Committee adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

(SEAL)

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING
JULY 12, 2007

Prepared By: _________________________________

Donalee Schmidt, Deputy Clerk