

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE, PASCO COUNTY, FLORIDA

MINUTES

**THE MINUTES WERE PREPARED
IN AGENDA ORDER AS
PUBLISHED AND NOT IN THE
ORDER THE ITEMS WERE HEARD**

JANUARY 14, 2010

**1:30 P.M. – Historic Pasco County Courthouse, Board Room, 2nd Floor
37918 Meridian Avenue, Dade City, FL 33525**

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE

ADVISORY STAFF

John J. Gallagher
County Administrator
Michael Nurrenbrock
OMB Director
Daniel R. Johnson
Assistant County Administrator
(Public Services)
Bruce E. Kennedy, P.E.
Assistant County Administrator
(Utilities Services)
Bipin Parikh, P.E.
Assistant County Administrator
(Development Services)
Chris Williams – **Absent. Mr. Richard Tonnello present.**
District School Board of Pasco County

Cynthia M. Jolly, P.E. – **Absent**
Development Director
Richard Gehring
Growth Management Administrator
James C. Widman, P.E - **Absent**
Engineering Services Director
Debra M. Zampetti
Zoning/Code Compliance
Administrator

LEGAL COUNSEL

David A. Goldstein
County Attorney

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Gallagher called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Ms. Beverly Beeson, Deputy Clerk, called the roll. Mr. Williams was absent, but Mr. Richard Tonnello was present.

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

The proof of publication was provided to the Clerk.

MINUTES

**M1 October 22, 2009, - DRC Minutes-DRC – DRC Minutes for Approval
Memorandum ZN10-96
Recommendation: Approve
Comm. Dist. All**

MR. NURRENBROCK MOVED approval of the October 22, 2009 minutes.

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

Mr. Richard Gehring introduced two new members of his Staff to the Board; Mr. Alberto Vargas as the Senior Planner and Mr. William Lamboy as Planner II.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

VARIANCE PETITIONS

OTHERS

**P1 Class III, Ashley Lakes Commercial Subdivision (SDU09-006),
Preliminary/Construction Stormwater Management Plan & Report
w/Variance & Alternative Standards Request-Nap Gunn 54, LLC-Location:
Southeast corner of S.R. 54 and Gun Hwy; Section 27, Twn 26 S, Rng 17 E
Memorandum: ZN10-047
Recommendation: Approval with conditions
Comm. Dist. 3**

Ms. Debra Zampetti, Zoning/Code Administrator, read the item into the record. Staff recommended approval subject to placement of a public easement over the ROW. She noted that another alternative standard was needed to go along with this and the applicant would maintain the roadway within the 44 feet. Staff recommended approval

of those two requests. The applicant also requested a variance for pedestrian facilities and Staff requested they provide an 8 foot sidewalk. Staff recommended approval of the two variances subject to providing an 8 foot sidewalk/bicycle path on the west side of Ashley Loop. Staff also recommended the developer provide a payment to the sidewalk fund in the amount of \$20,760.00 for that portion of required sidewalk along SR 54.

Mr. Mark Turner, representative for the developer, agreed with Staff's recommendation.

There was no public comment.

MR. PARIKH MOVED approval of Staff's recommendation.

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

**P2 Class II, Bay Care Pasco, (f.k.a. Charter Medical Hospital) IIPR89-007, Variance Request-Sunshine Holding, LLC-Location: On the south side of S.R. 54 and east of Land O' Lakes Boulevard; Section 25, Twn 26 S, Rng 18 E
Memorandum ZN10-081
Recommendation: Approval with conditions
Comm. Dist. 2**

Ms. Zampetti read the item into the record and explained the two requested variances for remodeling. Staff recommended approval provided the applicant used the required amount of landscaping. The other variance was from a Type D buffer and Staff recommended approval.

Mr. Doug Cattrell, representative for the applicant, agreed with Staff's recommendation.

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.

**R1 Rezoning Petition for Pasco Commerce Center MPUD-Pasco Industrial, Inc. –Pasco Industrial is requesting to rezone approximately 168.4 acres from an A- C Agricultural Zoning District to an MPUD to allow 1,200,000 square feet of industrial/commercial; On the east and west sides of Pasco Road, east of I-75, and approximately one-quarter mile north of S.R. 52, Sections 04, 05, and 09, Twn 25 S, Rng 20 E
Memorandum ZN10-098
Recommendation: Continuance Requested
Comm. Dist. 1**

Ms. Zampetti requested a continuance to January 28, 2010, at 1:30 p.m. in New Port Richey.

Mr. Ben Harrill, representative for the applicant, agreed to the continuance.

MR. PARIKH MOVED to continue the item to January 28, 2010, at 1:30 p.m. in New Port Richey.

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

**R2 CPAL10-1(07) Large Scale Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment-Mitchell U.S. 41/S.R. 52 (f.k.a. CPAL09-1(03))-From AG/R and RES-1 to RES-3, OFF, IL, and CON
Memorandum PGM10-65
Recommendation: Approve
Comm. Dist. 2**

Ms. Carol Clarke, Growth Management, read the item into the record and explained the amendment. Staff recommended approval of the proposed amendment to the LPA.

Mr. King Helie, representative for the applicant, said he agreed with Staff's recommendation.

There was no public comment.

Discussion followed regarding if Exhibit 9 was Staff's write-up or the applicant's; no mention of the ultimate plan which would take several wastewater treatment plants from the west coast offline and shipping them to Shady Hills; the omission of that statement was misleading without the knowledge of the diverting flow; and clarification was recommended to be added to the paragraph for a complete picture.

MR. NURRENBROCK MOVED approval of Staff's recommendation.

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

**R3 CPAL10-1(01) Staff Initiated Comprehensive Plan Amendments-Market Area Package-DRC Review and Recommendation
Memorandum PGM10-69
Recommendation: Approve
Comm. Dist. All**

Ms. Clarke explained that Ms. Hu would present the updated changes to the plan since the last meeting.

Ms. Quinlan Hu, Growth Management, gave a presentation utilizing the overhead projector of the changes made since the last update.

Discussion followed regarding the mixed use development areas between US 41 and the Suncoast Parkway; the area was still located in the Central Market area, but added policy to recognize the area; Staff explained the map and the intensity for Employment Center use; the policy was added to the package regarding this area; how far along in the process of identifying how much room was needed along the corridors in order to accomplish these plans; in this particular corridor it utilized the existing rail ROW for transit; and there would be no designated lanes on US 41.

There was no public comment for Market Area Number Three.

MR. NURRENBROCK MOVED to approve the changes made to Market Area Three.

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

Ms. Hu noted the second revision was the addition to both the West and South Market Areas energy efficient land use patterns.

Discussion followed regarding what policy was being deleted; how would number two be accomplished; having mixed land uses was a way to increase energy efficiency; the reduction of green house gas emissions; a House Bill that established this as a requirement to be looked at in the Comp Plan; having mixed land uses; and to have people closer to work and not on the road, which would cause less pollutants.

Mr. Nurrenbrock asked if it would be a problem to include "that we did strategies to decrease trip lengths to promote energy efficiencies."

Ms. Clarke suggested adding "to decrease trip length, increase energy efficiency and reduce green house gas emissions."

Chairman Gallagher found both suggestions as being too specific.

Mr. Goldstein suggested adding the statement, "by establishing the west and south market areas we have done this."

There was discussion regarding the appropriate language to be included in the Comp Plan.

Ms. Clarke and Mr. Goldstein agreed to meet to further discuss an appropriate statement.

There was no public comment for Market Area Two.

MR. PARIKH MOVED to approve the additional conversations on how to meet the goals of energy and green house case emissions.

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

Mr. Nurrenbrock requested clarification that the motion was in the West and South Markets and was not in Area Two.

Chairman Gallagher asked Mr. Parikh to repeat his motion without stating Market Area Two so that discussion for Market Area One could begin.

MR. PARIKH RESTATED his motion to approve Staff's recommendations with the understanding that the Attorney's office would work with Staff on the language for the green house case emissions.

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

Ms. Clarke clarified what had occurred because the amendments were heard out of order. She noted they were trying to show the Board the changes that had been made to the whole market area concept since the December 17th meeting. Staff established five market areas with a proposed vision and mission for each of them. Market Area One was the West Area. The three changes that have been made to the packet were: adding the policy in the Central Market Area between US 41 and Suncoast; the energy efficiency policies to be added to the West and South; and the deletion of the policy for SR 54. She asked to confirm that the motions previously made dealt with the changes that were proposed.

Ms. Barbara Wilhite asked a question regarding the boundaries for Market Area One, the West and the North policies 8.1.5b on page 106; Pasco County should preserve world life styles. She was worried about the gap between the rural character line that was established in the current Comp Plan and now where Staff has the west located. In

the gap there were urban intensities, she thought maybe Staff meant to fix the gap by bringing the west over to the rural line in the current Comp Plan as opposed to having it in the middle where it was not rural, but Staff was placing rural policies on it.

Discussion followed regarding what Staff was trying to reflect in the existing Comp Plan policies that relate to specific areas; not the idea of expanding northeast Pasco to northwest Pasco; if that was the concern then Staff would clarify the language; the need to look at fixing the line in the Hudson area north of Denton; the line was placed at Coyote and was studied; Staff was asked to look at keeping that as the rural line for the north market area, and bringing the west to the east to the rural character line which was the one that was studied.

Chairman Gallagher directed Staff to look at that issue.

Ms. Clarke said she would review it and noted that it has implications in terms of other amendments in regard to the urban service area and that she did want to say it was appropriate to amend the west and north boundaries. She would make clarifications to this particular policy.

Ms. Wilhite asked Staff to place some policy in recognizing the urban uses. She suggested adding "Central" in the area west of Coyote because it went with the Central area policies.

MR. PARIKH MOVED approval as recommended by Staff of the entire item with the caveat that they look at the policies on energy, efficient land use pattern, and would be in consultation with Ms. Wilhite in terms of the issues about the north market area and clarifying that policy and looking at the boundary.

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

R4 CPAL10-1(04) Staff Initiated Comprehensive Plan Amendments – Planned Development Open Space, Wetland Mitigation, and FLU Subarea-DRC Review and Recommendation

Ms. Clarke explained the item was a series of proposed amendments to clean up existing policies. At the December 17th DRC meeting the Chairman had raised the question about the Employment Center future land use category that he had received a number of concerns about whether the concurrent rezoning was burdensome. After review and consultation with Ms. Zampetti, Staff proposed to eliminate that requirement; it did not need to be done simultaneously with a request for a Comp Plan amendment.

Mr. Alberto Vargas, Growth Management, gave the formal presentation utilizing the overheads projector.

Discussion followed regarding what percentage was residential on the map shown; what the percentage was for open space; regional and neighborhood parks; if there were regulations established for open space; and there was more than 25% open space.

Ms. Barbara Wilhite asked Staff to think about adding another potential policy. When she worked on the Comp Plan there was no commercial and no office in residential land uses. There used to be flexibility in the plan that allowed for those uses to be zoned at the discretion of the Board such as MPUDs.

Discussion followed regarding the County had amended the Comp Plan previously; there were provisions within residential land use categories that were eliminated; town center EC and Comp was put in its place; need to apply policies to allow flexibility back in; if the land use was not changed to commercial, DCA counted it as residential in the needs analysis; an advantage to the County to change the Comp Plan to match what was actually there; a large scale amendment; did Staff eliminate under ten acres; and there was a limit to how much could be done in a year.

Chairman Gallagher asked Ms. Wilhite to e-mail him her concerns.

Mr. Richard Riley asked if it was required to go through all three stages for public comment on the planned development component. His concern was that the public would not be informed.

Mr. Goldstein said yes that it would have to go through all three stages. He explained the process.

MR. NURRENBROCK MOVED approval of Staff's recommendation.

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

**R5 CPAL10-1(09) Pasadena Hills Area Plan Amendment-DRC-January 14, 2010,
1:30 p.m., DC
Memorandum PGM10-81
Recommendation: Approve
Comm. Dist. 1**

Ms. Clarke explained the item and read it into the record.

Ms. Quinlan Hu, Growth Management, gave a presentation utilizing the overhead projector in conjunction with the property owners.

Mr. Joel Tew, co-council for the Pasadena Hills property group, noted they had an executed Memorandum of Understanding from the property owners group; noted for the record the property owners group and Staff mutually agreed to jointly conduct a

community meeting scheduled before the end of this month; notices would be sent out as soon as they could advertise it; and it was proposed to hold the meeting in the Historic Courthouse in Dade City.

There was no public comment.

Discussion followed regarding the difference between the original road map and the one proposed; the North/South and Silverado Roads; the elimination of the East/West Road; the alignment of roads for the wetlands; the financial plan; the most significant change was the reduction of the total number of residential units; the increase in the amount of office space; the DRC would make the decisions regarding entitlements within the villages; the items were reviewed that were different from the last approval; trade-offs approved with no adverse impact on the financial plan; a new surcharge plan would be given to the Board before approval; how light industrial and university uses relate to the surcharge; clarification of subsidized or surcharge uses; would not be able to adopt the final Ordinance that imposed a surcharge until the financial plan document was completed; question regarding a separation requirement of one mile; what happened if Zephyrhills or St. Leo annexed land, who would get those entitlements; the suggestion to add "as determined by the County" into the document; discussion regarding Village Centers and adding language about the combination of commercial centers; and village and commercial separation requirements.

MR. PARIKH MOVED approval of Staff's recommendation to include changes as discussed.

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

**R6 CPAL10-1(03), Staff Initiated Comprehensive Plan Amendments – Transit Oriented Development-CPA10-1(03) Staff Initiated – DRC: January 14, 2010, 1:30 p.m., New Port Richey
Memorandum PGM10-85
Recommendation: Approve
Comm. Dist. All**

Ms. Justyna Buszewski, Growth Management, gave a presentation of the item utilizing the overhead projector.

Discussion followed regarding that in the LRTP there was an express bus shown on US 19 but not on Little Road; and the rationale of other inconsistencies shown in the presentation that were not in the LRTP.

Mr. Goldstein requested the conceptual lines to be shown in a different color; to make sure it was clear to the public and the Board as to what part the County could afford;

what the conceptual long term lines were; and the express bus on I75 and the Suncoast should be shown on the map and part of LRTP.

Discussion regarding future jobs in the urbanized corridor; projecting a future north/south and east/west corridor in the Comp Plan; all things proposed were consistent with the LRTP; creating a mobility fee to stay competitive with surrounding counties; amenities need to come before the employment centers; restaurants and services need to be available to employees; create an urban service area and reduce the red tape by eliminating an onerous process; great benefit because clients could afford to do better planning; rooftops bring jobs and retail; need to have a certified site review process; the timing and long term goals; floating stations and a half mile spacing between them; feeder bus systems to get to transit stations; and Staff's enhancements of the TBARTA transit plan.

Mr. Goldstein asked about the map that was distributed regarding the "Park-N-Ride" located on the Suncoast and not on 41. Ms. Buszewski noted the error and said that would be changed.

Mr. Goldstein said he believed all of the building and site design requirements in the TOD were examples of what he was talking about in the green house gas emission policy. He noted that since Staff was requiring the stations to comply with all of these issues he believed that the County has met the intent of the policy.

Discussion followed regarding incentives to get people to come to Pasco County; millage rates were incentives for developers; impact fees; lower taxes; lowest mobility fee in the transit stops; and the wording of the amendment regarding floating land use.

MR. NURRENBROCK MOVED approval of Staff's recommendation.

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

**R7 CPAL10-1(8) Comprehensive Plan Amendment – Mixed Use Western Hub Classification – CPAL10-1(8) Future Land Use Map Amendment for approximately 1,133 acres
Memorandum PGM10-98
Recommendation: Approve
Comm. Dist. 3**

Ms. Clarke explained that Staff had made internal modifications for internal consistency to the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Goldstein had a concern that additional language was needed that would cover the rest of the County as it related to replacing the existing system with a mobility fee, because it appeared that it was only being done in the urban service area.

Ms. Clarke said that she and Mr. Goldstein would need to meet and talk about the changes that would be necessary to achieve that.

Mr. Goldstein said he was suggesting more generic language so that when they adopted the County-wide mobility fee, assuming that State Law authorized it to replace concurrency, they would not have to go back and amend the Comp Plan. His fear was if it did not get into the next two cycles, they may have an issue.

Ms. Clarke suggested they explore whether there was openness to doing that, because at this point they did not have a mobility fee, but did have concurrency requirements the same as the State. She agreed to talk this over with him.

There was no public comment.

MR. NURRENBROCK MOVED approval of Staff's recommendation.

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

**R8 CPAL10-1(8) Comprehensive Plan Amendment-Mixed Use Western Hub Classification - CPAL10-1(8) Future Land Use Map Amendment for approximately 1,133 acres
Memorandum PGM10-98
Recommendation: Approve
Comm. Dist. 3**

Ms. Clarke explained the item was for two amendments; the creation of the mixed use western hub future land use classification and the application.

Ms. Justyna Buszewski, Growth Management, gave a presentation utilizing the overhead projector.

Discussion followed regarding the amendment had draft written across it and would be forwarded to the LPA unless changes were made by the Board; questioned if the map used for the conceptual plan was reflected in the plan amendment; and the conceptual plan shown could not be done under the current Comp Plan.

Mr. Ben Harrill, representative for the applicant the Mitchell family, agreed with Staff's recommendation.

Chairman Gallagher asked Staff if there was a map with the current plan use classification on the property and a map showing what it would be changed to. He directed Staff to make those changes.

Discussion followed regarding what the dotted line was from the old IH up to SR 54 in the conceptual plan; the line was the potential rail location connecting the transit stops; question regarding TOD and wanting more intense residential near that line; the near term versus the long term mix; how to transition from the existing land use rights to a TOD site; the version on the screen was from King Helie; working between hybrids for a transit stop; western hub category and rights; TOD strategies; both TOD plans show multi family and large retail type office uses around each of the transit stops; a transition into the urban density; all of the plans were trying to make the connections to relate to existing uses; two big projects were going to go through transitions to put transit corridors into their plans; need to restructure their plans; a generic category designed with sub-area policies; a modified special PD for the Mitchell property; and it was another category that would allow those conceptual plan to happen which could not happen under the current categories.

There was no public comment.

MR. JOHNSON MOVED approval of Staff's recommendation.

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

**R9 NOTED ITEM – Class I, Dobies Crematory Addition (IPR09-033), Preliminary/Construction Site Plan and Stormwater Management Plan and Report-Thomas B. Dobies-Location: On the southwest corner of Hudson Avenue and Hicks Road; Section 26, Twn 24 S, Rng 16 E
Memorandum ZN10-209
Recommendation: Not Applicable
Comm. Dist. 5**

The item was noted.

**R10 NOTED ITEM – Class I, Radiant Convenience Store (IPR09-036), Preliminary/Construction Site Plan and Stormwater Management Plan and Report-The Radiant Group, LLC-Location: On the northeast corner of C.R. 54 (Wesley Chapel Boulevard) and Oakley Boulevard; Section 12, Twn 26 S, Rng 19E
Memorandum ZN10-039
Recommendation: Not Applicable
Comm. Dist. 1**

The item was noted.

R11 NOTED ITEM – Class III, Columns at Bear Creek, Phase II, (SDU08-021), Subdivision Construction Plan and Stormwater Management Plan and Report- 52 Associates, LLC-Location: On the south side of S.R. 52, approximately one-half mile east of Little Road: Section 07, Twn 25 S, Rng 17 E
Memorandum ZN10-069
Recommendation: Not Applicable
Comm. Dist. 4

The item was noted.

R12 NOTED ITEM – Class II, Hays Town Center (IIPR09-019), Construction Plan and Stormwater Management Plan and Report-Dunphy Properties-Location: On the northwest corner of Hays Road and S.R. 52; Section 11, Twn 25 S, Rng 17 E
Memorandum ZN10-087
Recommendation: Not Applicable
Comm. Dist. 2

The item was noted.

ADJOURN

MR. NURRENBROCK MOVED to adjourn.

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

The Committee adjourned at 3:46 p.m.

(SEAL)

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING
JANUARY 14, 2010

Office of Paula S. O'Neil, Clerk and Comptroller

Prepared By: _____
Beverly Beeson, Board Clerk
Board Records Department