I. **ROLL CALL**

Ms. Donalee Schmidt, Deputy Clerk, called the roll. All Committee Members were present.
II. MINUTES

June 21, 2007
September 13, 2007

MR. NURRENBROCK MOVED approval.

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

III. PROOFS

A. Proof of Publication

Ms. Schmidt noted proof of publication.

B. Proof of Public Notice

Ms. Schmidt noted proof of publication.

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

IV. REGULAR AGENDA

A. Class III

1. Memorandum No.: ZN08-187
   Project Name: Citrus Ridge
   (Continued from the September 27, 2007, Development Review Committee Meeting)
   Proposed Development: The applicant is proposing to rezone 112 acres from A-R Agricultural-Residential and R-3 Medium Density Residential to MPUD Master Planned Unit Development for 450 residential units.
   RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.
Ms. Debra Zampetti explained the request and gave the location of the property. She gave a history of the project and noted the property was originally in the Dade City Annexation Area. The Dade City Commission voted to reject the land use change to 4.6 units per acre. The County’s Comprehensive Plan stated there were certain criteria and standards for the Dade City transition area. This was located in the transition area; the request was urban in nature. Dade City had taken a lot of interest in this matter because it was in their annexation area and their services would be utilized. She noted Dade City had submitted a Resolution which requested 2 units per area. Staff recommended approval of 224 units.

Mr. Joel Tew, representative for the applicant, distributed an evidence binder to the Committee and gave an extensive presentation regarding the item. Items discussed included: the applicant’s experience with village centers, town centers, TND, and Smart Growth communities; Staff’s recommended density for the project was 2 units per acre which would result in 224 dwelling units; the property already had existing, approved, vested zoning for 330 units; the future land use map showed the property as Res-3 and Res-6 which would allow 550 units; this project was originally taken to the City of Dade City because it was located in a potential annexation area; reasonable efforts were made to allow the City the opportunity to annex the property; the City’s Planning Expert found in writing and recommended to the City Commission that the proposed development of 550 units was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, compatible with the existing neighborhood, and should be approved; the applicant reduced the application from 550 to 450 units in a good faith effort to compromise with the City; the small commercial parcel which the City objected to had been eliminated; the applicant committed to a smart growth, TND style development; the City requested the applicant not make a connection to the existing grid system in Tank Hill; the applicant would do as requested by the Committee regarding the interconnection requirement; this property was not located within the Northeast Pasco Area; and this property was not located within the rural transition area adopted as part of the Northeast Pasco Plan. He requested the Committee review the density limitation proposed by Staff which the applicant felt was unreasonable and had no basis; changes in lot sizes the applicant was willing to make; and the lot development standards. He felt Staff had inserted boiler plate subdivision lot setback and lot criteria for a typical "cookie cutter" community. If they were going to adopt a smart growth community, they should also adopt zoning criteria and standards that were consistent with that smart growth community. He reviewed exhibits, aerials, and future land use maps contained within the evidence binder that was distributed and noted the City had annexed properties around the subject property at higher densities. The applicant voluntarily reduced the density application to 450 units. The City had approved zonings and development north of this project for over 10 units per acre apartment complex, and over 5 units per acre duplex project. The Interlocal Agreement contemplated this area may ultimately be annexed into the City. This request was a logical extension of the historic pattern in the area.

Discussion followed between the Committee Members, Staff, and Mr. Tew regarding the diagrams displayed; consistency with the Comp Plan; it was feasible in R-3 without
infrastructure to have 5.8 units per acre; under the Res-6 cap, there could be 330 units; the height limitation would be two-stories; and the existing densities approved by the City.

Mr. Tew continued with his presentation and spoke regarding: the topography of the area; there would be terraced blocks; the Pasadena Hills project; the applicant had agreed to delete retail from the project; the proposed housing products with porches in the front and alleys in the back; the applicant proposed no more than 60 multi-family units, 390 single-family unit, and granny flats. He referred to a memo included within the evidence binder from Ms. Karla S. Owens, Community Development Director, to the Mayor and City Commission dated March 23, 2006, which found the proposed density of 550 units to be consistent with the adopted Comprehensive Plan and the existing pattern of development in the area and would promote public facilities and services by using innovative, land development techniques. The memo further stated the applicant’s proposed construction of a maximum of 480 units reduced the potential density for the property and as it was contiguous to the existing City boundaries, there was no increased burden to the provision of City services. He spoke regarding area roadways including St. Joe Road and Blanton Road, peak hour trips and projected increases in traffic. He spoke further regarding the memorandum. He noted the only conditions he wished to discuss involved the density cap, the elimination of 40 foot lots which the applicant had agreed to, and that the applicant was willing to negotiate a limitation on the number of the 50 foot lots. He spoke regarding multiple meeting with residents and City representatives.

Mayor Hutch Brock explained this was a unified effort. He felt there appeared to be a misconception of what had been presented. He met with the developer and his representatives on many occasions and they had also come to the City to propose the project. The Commission expressed great reluctance at this type of project at that location. The project was enviable, but was not the right fit at this location. The consistent concern of the Commission involved the density and the overall project at this location. As a result of those concerns, the City opposed the project as presented. He spoke regarding the surrounding densities. He felt development in Dade City had shifted where the City encouraged as much commercial as possible. He spoke regarding the City’s expansion efforts and meetings held with County Staff regarding “border issues”. He spoke regarding conversations held with the developer regarding the project. After the hearing, there was silence from the developer and then they were told the County was reviewing the project. Both Staffs met regarding the project and came to a mutual agreement regarding the appropriate use of the property. County Staff developed recommendations which the City could “live with and agree with”. He spoke regarding property rights and felt an appropriate number of homes or units could be identified for the area. He felt 224 units was an appropriate number.

Ms. Karla Owens, Dade City Attorney and Community Development Director, explained the City was pleased with the TND design and the effort made by the developer regarding the architectural design type conditions. She spoke regarding the memorandum discussed by Mr. Tew and noted the memorandum was done for the
purposes of transmitting bi-annual amendments. This parcel was included as a map amendment proposed in that cycle. She spoke about the Annexation Interlocal Agreement between Dade City and Pasco County regarding the densities and explained the County had specific categories where the City gave a range. When items were transmitted to DCA the City would often cap the density. The memorandum was done to transmit a Comprehensive Plan; the proposed density was consistent with what the County had placed on the property. This project was located within the Dade City Service Area; there were utility problems in this area and extensive off-site and site related utility improvements might be needed. She spoke regarding the level of service and noted the issue involved the fact that there was no other access proposed other than St. Joe Road. She spoke regarding the configuration of the intersection of St. Joe Road and 21st Street and noted it was “dysfunctional at best”. The intersection needed to be reconfigured. At the time the memo was to be transmitted, this project was to be a PUD. She spoke regarding the surrounding area; annexations into the City; the existing densities in the area; the design was not the problem; the examples shown by the developer were from downtown Clearwater which did not have 5 foot setbacks as recommended by the developer; the proposed lot widths; there was only one development in the City with 40 foot lots that was allowed due to the project’s extensive park system; 40 foot lots were not compatible with what existed within the City; and the issue was the density. The site plan proposed by the developer had changed very little since it appeared in front of the City of Dade City.

Mr. Sumner spoke regarding the recommended density of 224 units.

Discussion followed regarding the densities within the City of Dade City; annexations into the City; the average density within the City was 3.2 units per acre; water pressure in the area; the Tank Hill area; lot sizes within the area; and lots bordering the property.

Chairman Gallagher suggested the project be allowed the average density of the City which was 3.2, and to meet with the applicant to determine how to spread the densities so that they were compatible with the surrounding area.

Mr. Nurrenbrock spoke regarding recent annexations in the area, interconnections, and multi-family in the area.

Ms. Barbara Jones, Ms. Peggy Woods, Mr. Glen Thompson, Ms. Susan Dowling, Ms. Nancy Hazewood, Mr. Richard Riley, Ms. Sally Redden, Ms. Pat Carver, Mr. Philip Barber, Mr. Otto Bikesonhorm, Mr. Martin Harm, Ms. Carol Cruz and Ms. Barbara Barber spoke under public comment in opposition to the request. Issues discussed included: the neighborhood was very hilly; homes located on St. Joe Road; this was a rural area; the Blanton Road neighborhood; the number of residents currently in the area; increased traffic; impacts to the schools; the density within Dade City; the future land use was not an entitlement but strictly a maximum use for the land; transitioning to the rural area; densities within the area; the transportation problems were considerable; elevations in the area; water service in the area; the topography of the area; the failed intersection; off-site improvements; the proposed road widening; quality of life; the water
basin area; impervious surfaces; the additional density from Citrus Ridge; stormwater concerns; drainage from the development; most of the traffic from the project would use St. Joe Road or S.R. 52; St. Joe Road was designated as a protected rural road and was intended to stay 2 lanes; there were already too many approved housing developments awaiting financing or development orders in Central Pasco; the City should be commended for reiterating their concerns; County Staff should be commended for recommending the elimination of small lots and reducing the density; the applicant did not understand their plan was not approvable; there was no vested right for the developer to receive the maximum density; protection of the present residents; dense developments that were 3.2 homes per acre; this project was not what the County or City planned for this rural transition area; 2 homes per acre would be very dense, but was a compatible transition; the road infrastructure was not adequate; unimproved properties in the area would eventually be developed; composite effects of growth in the area; the road network was not adequate to support the proposed density; the 2002 traffic study addressed the service level at failing conditions and inadequate road conditions; the newly proposed density was alarming; the Meridian intersection was identified as a failing intersection; there had been no improvements on the roadways since the study was completed; adding this amount of density would violate the concurrency requirements; the Dade City Commission felt strongly that the density of Citrus Ridge should be limited to 2 units per acre; the City did not want 450 homes at the City limit; a 2nd fully functioning entrance was needed at 21st Street; Staff’s recommendation should be supported; preservation of residential or historical character of a neighborhood; compliance with Growth Management laws; the County was 646 percent over allocated; why continue to approve densities that would forever alter Pasco County; they were not anti-development; this was a wonderful concept; Dade City had clear defined lines; property rights; this project was out of character; issues would need to be addressed if density was granted for the site; additional car trips per day; flooding issues; the entrance off of St. Joe would not be enough; access to the property; proposed ordinances; and dangerous roadway situations.

Mr. Sumner clarified the project was located in the transition area. The stipulation in the Comp Plan stated that by December 2007 they would adopt an Ordinance to establish the criteria that would be used in determining the compatibility of properties being developed within that area. An Ordinance to implement that had not yet been adopted.

Ms. Zampetti felt putting a TND here violated the spirit and intent of the Comp Plan.

Chairman Gallagher spoke regarding efforts made by the County in going through the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map. They spent 2 years going through the hearings and someone should have focused on that. The residents had an opportunity during the hearings to tell the County Commission and the Committee that was set up that they wanted it reduced. The County spent a lot of money to obtain public input.
Mr. Nurrenbrock moved to receive and file the evidence binder submitted by Mr. Joel Tew.

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

Mr. Tew responded to comments made and noted there had been no expert testimony from anyone qualified regarding traffic, planning, drainage or substantive issues. He spoke regarding the memo written by Ms. Owens. He felt there was no compatibility issue. He noted Ms. Owens was the only person who testified in opposition who could be deemed an expert. Items discussed included: the City’s recent approval of “a pocket” project which contained 40 foot lots included 392 40-foot lots, 200 50-foot lots, over 100 35-foot lots and townhouses; last year the City approved a development plan at 6 units per acre, with 35, 40, and 50 lots for a total of 1,100 lots; the apartment site on the northern boundary; originally the applicant had submitted a small commercial portion and the City requested it be removed; the City made the applicant delete the connection through Tank Hill; the applicant had been limited by Staff based upon Dade City objections to use the northern connection to Mitchell for emergency only; stub outs for the grid system; there was a direction connection to Blanton; there was an approved Traffic Impact Study which confirmed there was an acceptable level of service; the applicant had an existing zoning for 330 units; the majority of the property had Res-6; and the requested 450 units equated to 4.02 units per acre. He stated the applicant would agree to 400 units rather than 450 units, if there was a recommendation for approval, which would total 3.58 units per acre. The applicant would also agree to delete the 40-foot lot widths, have nothing smaller than a 50-foot lot, and would limit the 50-foot lots to no more than 150 lots. If he did not get a recommendation of approval at those proposed numbers, he would reserve his right to the 450 units applied for by the applicant. The applicant agreed to 80-foot lots to transition down from the 100-foot lots. The applicant also agreed to a minimum of 65-foot lots along the southern boundary next to the Greenfelder property. The perimeters were buffered. There was a break between the subject property and Tank Hill in terms of transition and buffering. He referred to the diagram and spoke regarding the location of the neighborhood park. He requested the DRC recommend approval to the County Commission, to change the density to not less than 400 units, and then they could address specific conditions which would need to be modified.

Chairman Gallagher recommended the density be addressed and spoke regarding the transition area.

Mr. Parikh asked if there was a capacity issue over 224 units.

Ms. Owens stated not at the immediate moment; they went on a “first come, first serve basis”. Currently, they would be able to serve both water and sewer, but a utility service agreement would be necessary for off-site improvements.
Mr. Johnson asked Ms. Zampetti if she was in agreement that the applicant was entitled to 330 units.

Ms. Zampetti said if the property was developed out Euclidian, there was a GIS Map which did state 330 units. Forty-five acres consisted of R-3 which were lots that were 75-foot in width. Once the infrastructure, ponds and streets were installed, they would have approximately 230 units. It could be a little higher depending upon the number of ponds needed.

Discussion followed regarding possible impediments; Euclidian zonings; determination of the amount of units; this was a single-family detached housing district; the units could not be stacked; duplexes could be allowed with a Special Exception; and the Dade City density.

Mr. Nurrenbrock explained by using the MPUD the applicant had come up with what he would have been able to get out of the property anyway. He felt the interconnect was critical.

Mr. Williams noted 450 units by the current student generation rates would generate 163 K through 12 students on average. On average, 400 units would generate 144 students, K through 12. Currently, they did not have capacity available for the elementary or the high school students. He noted 224 units would generate approximately 76 students.

Mr. Kennedy felt the density issue would drive all of the other factors. He was particularly concerned about the traffic issues and access.

Chairman Gallagher noted the traffic study was based upon 450 units. If there were less units, the traffic study would need to be modified.

Mr. Sumner noted they had not reviewed any approvals or indication of approvals of what type of water retention areas or drainage plans for the project. The drainage issue would need to be resolved by Swiftmud because of the elevations of the property and would be stringent to keep the water on the property. The Committee could place reasonable conditions on the property. He felt the problem was the Staff report was written based upon 450 units, but listed a cap of 224 units. He could not see where any real analysis had been done to indicate a 224 unit cap. He recommended if they did not come up with something the developer agreed to, that they deny the project. He did not feel the project could be limited without the Developer’s consent for less than what he had agreed to.

Chairman Gallagher questioned if they were to agree to a certain number of units and then ask the developer and Staff to go back and provide a new layout based upon the number of units.
Mr. Sumner stated that was acceptable; they would still be working with the developer to work through the project.

**MR. NURRENBROCK MOVED** approval of 400 units, with an additional condition regarding a second access to Blanton through Mitchell.

Discussion followed regarding the number of units; the transition area; other developments approved by Dade City had higher densities; and average citizens could give factual testimony that could be interpreted in any way.

Chairman Gallagher called on the motion; the motion failed with Mr. Williams, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Parikh, and Chairman Gallagher voting nay.

**MR. KENNEDY MOVED** to cap the number of units at 350.

Chairman Gallagher asked Mr. Kennedy if he would amend the motion to 358 units which equaled the 3.2.

**MR. KENNEDY AMENDED THE MOTION** to 3.2 units per acre which calculated to 358 units.

Discussion included a conceptual agreement; the applicant would either agree or not agree with the conditions; and items Mr. Tew had suggested.

**MR. KENNEDY AMENDED THE MOTION** to include the elimination of 40-foot lots and the need for some direct access to Blanton Road.

Chairman Gallagher felt there were more issues than what were stated today that should be taken into consideration.

Chairman Gallagher called on the motion; the motion carried with Mr. Williams and Mr. Johnson voting nay.

Ms. Zampetti asked if the Committee wished to have another conceptual plan come before the DRC.

Chairman Gallagher stated yes.

Mr. Tew clarified the motion was for 3.2 units per acre to equal 358 units, to eliminate the 40-foot lots, make the Mitchell Road connection to Blanton, to bring the conceptual plan back, and to work on the conditions with Staff. He asked when would the item be brought back.

Chairman Gallagher recommended the item be brought back on January 24, 2008, at 4:00 p.m. time certain in Dade City.
V. VARIANCE PETITIONS

1. Zoning

   a. Petition No.: V1946 (Memorandum No. ZN08-1946)
      Applicant: Michael P. Flanagan Revocable Trust
      Requested: A variance for a reduction in the required minimum front setback from 15 feet to 10.2 feet and a reduction in the required minimum west-side setback from 5 feet to 3 feet from the proposed side lot line, for a detached two-car garage on a small lot of record.

      RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

      Mr. Lee Millard explained the item. Staff recommended approval with conditions.

      Mr. Michael P. Flanagan, applicant, agreed with Staff’s recommendation.

      There was no public comment.

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

      Discussion followed regarding the small lot of record; enforcement on the rental property of no parking in the right-of-way; enforcement would be up to the landlord; the garage could not be moved farther back; the renovation may require the applicant to elevate; the value of the home; and the variance request.

      Chairman Gallagher called on the motion; the motion carried with Mr. Johnson and Chairman Gallagher voting nay.

   b. Petition No.: V1947 (Memorandum No. ZN08-1947)
      Applicant: Daniel T. Hunnewell, Jr., and Sharon Hunnewell-Johnson
      Requested: A variance for a reduction in the minimum lot width from 125 feet to 85’9” and a reduction in the required minimum side setbacks from 25 feet to 12 feet.

      RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

      Mr. Millard explained the item. Staff recommended approval with conditions.
Discussion followed regarding the drainage easement and that no structures would be placed within the easement.

Mr. Daniel T. Hunnewell agreed to give the easement and indicated he understood no structures would be placed within the easement.

There was no public comment.

MR. NURREN BROCK MOVED approval of Staff’s recommendation with approval contingent upon the applicant granting a drainage easement prior to the building permit.

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

c. Petition No.: V1948 (Memorandum No. ZN08-1948)
   Applicant: Citizen Center, LLC
   Requested: A variance for an increase in the maximum-allowed building height from 35 feet to 55 feet.
   RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

Mr. Millard explained the item. Staff recommended approval with conditions.

Mr. Umbralio Rojales, representative, agreed with Staff’s recommendation.

There was no public comment.

MR. JOHN SON MOVED approval of Staff’s recommendation.

Ms. Jolly noted the layout was not being approved, just the variance regarding the height. Staff was looking for a stub-out to the north for connection with Ross Lane.

Mr. Rojales indicated he understood.

MR. JOHN SON MOVED approval of Staff’s recommendation.

Mr. Nurrenbrook spoke regarding parking issues and noted extra parking might be necessary. The proposed tenant on the first floor of the building was Social Security.

MR. JOHN SON AMENDED THE MOTION to include additional parking would be necessary.

Chairman Gallagher called on the motion; the vote was unanimous and the motion carried.
d. Petition No.: V1949 (Memorandum No. ZN08-1949)
Applicant: Billy L. Smith
Requested: A variance for a reduction in the required minimum north-side setback from 5 feet to 1.3 feet for a screened room addition.

RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

Mr. Millard explained the item. Staff recommended approval with conditions.

Mr. Billy Smith, applicant, was present.

Mr. Craig Latimer spoke under public comment and indicated he was a neighbor and in agreement with the request.

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

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

e. Petition No.: V1950 (Memorandum No. ZN08-1950)
Applicants: Frank J. and Angela M. Ambrogio
Requested: A variance for a reduction in the required minimum west-front setback from 25 feet to 18.3 feet for an attached garage on a small lot of record.

RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

Mr. Millard explained the item. Staff recommended approval with conditions.

Discussion followed regarding ownership of the surrounding lots.

Mr. Charles Savio, representative, referred to the diagram and showed which lots the applicant owned. There was no objection from the neighbors.

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.
f. Petition No.: V1951 (Memorandum No. ZN08-1951)
Applicant: Anthony J. Verzi, Jr.
Requested: A variance for a reduction in the required minimum east-front setback from 10 feet to 5.5 feet for an attached garage.

RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

Mr. Millard explained the item. Staff recommended approval with conditions.

Mr. Anthony Verzi, applicant, was present.

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.

2. Development Plans

a. Memorandum No.: DR08-283
Project Name: Badcock Furniture Addition
(Continued from the September 27, 2007, Development Review Committee Meeting)

Applicant: Michael L. Scott
Proposed Development: Warehouse addition for Badcock Furniture.
Requested: To eliminate the required 24-foot interconnection to the east and west sides of the property, Section 618.12.

RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

Ms. Jolly explained the item. Staff recommended approval.

Mr. Raleigh Dove, representative, agreed with Staff’s recommendation.

Discussion followed that there was no sewer in the area.

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.

b. Memorandum No.: DR08-312
   Project Name: Publix at Summertree Plaza
   Applicant: Century Companies
   Proposed Development: Grocery/retail center
   Requested: Relief from the Land Development Code, Section 618.12, Cross-access/Frontage/Reverse Frontage Road.
   RECOMMENDATION: Withdrawn by applicant.

The item was withdrawn by the application; no action was taken.

c. Memorandum No.: PMA08-061
   Project Name: Pickert Lane Gate
   Applicant: Pickert Lane Subdivision Homeowners’ Association
   Proposed Development: Construction of entrance gate.
   Requested: A variance from Section 618.7.C to install a gate less than the required 75 feet from the right-of-way line.
   RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

Mr. Jim Widman explained the item. Staff recommended approval with additional conditions that the applicant shall acknowledge the approval was subject to BOCC approval of the request that Pickert Drive be made a private street. He explained the gate would require a mechanism compatible with EMS, Fire and the Sheriff and approval of the mechanism would also need to be obtained.

Mr. Herb Moss, applicant, explained they had been working with Staff and had submitted letters from all of the neighbors who had agreed to take back the road.

Mr. Sumner explained the gate could not be installed until they had received final approval of the roadway becoming a private street.

Mr. Moss noted they had contracted with a gate contractor.
Mr. Johnson clarified they would also include any future replacement of the gate; it had to be compatible with Fire Rescue.

Mr. Moss stated he understood.

There was no public comment.

**MR. JOHNSON MOVED** approval of Staff’s recommendation including an additional condition regarding Emergency Services approval.

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

**VI. TRANSPORTATION CORRIDOR MANAGEMENT**

**A. Dedication Waiver**

None Scheduled

**B. Dedication Variance**

1. **Memorandum No.:** PMA08-062  
   **Project Name:** Kossik Road Extension  
   **Applicant:** Primerica Group One  
   **Proposed Development:** Construction of Kossik Road.  
   **Requested:** Variances from Sections 319.8 and 618.7.  
   **RECOMMENDATION:** Withdrawal of the variance from Section 319.8 and approval of the variance from Section 618.7.

Mr. Widman explained the item. Staff recommended approval of the variance request for 120 feet as outlined.

Mr. Larry Gearin, representative, was present.

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.
2. Memorandum No.: PMA08-063  
Project Name: Bexley/Tower Road  
Applicant: NNP-Bexley  
Proposed Development: Construction of Tower Road.  
Requested: A variance from Section 319.8.  
RECOMMENDATION: Approval.

Mr. Widman explained the item.

Discussion followed regarding the drainage; the location of the recorded utility easement; it was not practical to move the utility lines; and there would be a very wide corridor.

Mr. Parikh clarified the Tower Road Extension within the applicant’s property would have 142 feet.

Mr. Brian Surack, representative, stated that was correct, the portions of Tower Road that were not located between the pipelines would be to County standards.

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.

3. Memorandum No.: PMA08-064  
Project Name: Commonwealth Center II  
Applicant: Commonwealth Center II, LLC  
Proposed Development: 15,275-square-foot retail building.  
Requested: A variance from Section 319.8.  
RECOMMENDATION: Denial.

Mr. Widman explained the item. The applicant had demonstrated that the site could comply with the applicable Ordinances after the additional right-of-way had been provided. Staff did not feel there was a need for the variance and recommended denial.

Mr. Wayne White, representative, spoke regarding the request. The request was submitted prior to Wisteria Loop being added to the preservation corridor. He wished to have use of the additional parking in the preservation corridor. The applicant met the minimum parking requirements, but wished to have the additional parking.

Chairman Gallagher noted this type of request had been allowed before because in the past the applicant had no other choice.
Mr. Parikh spoke regarding the preservation corridor and noted a larger corridor was never intended for Wisteria Loop. The corridor was sufficient.

There was no public comment.

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

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

### VII. 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
VIII. PUBLIC NOTICE AGENDA

A. Class II

1. Memorandum No.: DR08-286
   Project Name: C.R. 54/I-75 Commercial Site
   (Continued from the November 8, 2007, Development Review Committee Meeting)
   Proposed Development: Retail/restaurants.
   RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

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

Mr. Ben Harrill, representative, 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.

2. Memorandum No.: DR08-210
   Project Name: Columns at Cypress Pointe Amendment
   (Continued from the October 25, 2007, Development Review Committee Meeting)
   Proposed Development: To amend Condition of Approval No. 44
   RECOMMENDATION: Denial.

Ms. Jolly recommended the item be continued to January 10, 2008, at 1:30 p.m. in New Port Richey.

There was no public comment.

MR. NURRENBROCK MOVED to continue the item to January 10, 2008, at 1:30 p.m. in New Port Richey.

Chairman Gallagher called on the motion; the vote was unanimous and the motion carried.
Ms. Jolly explained the item. She explained when the item was approved, a condition was added which required the applicant to install a double row of 10-foot red cedars or an alternative species accepted by the DRD along the northern and southern landscape buffer to aid in muffling some of the sounds. The applicant requested an amendment to the preliminary plan condition to allow a double row of 6-foot wax myrtles in lieu of the red cedars. She spoke regarding problems in obtaining 10-foot red cedars, but noted 6-foot red cedars or 6-foot wax myrtles were obtainable. Staff supported allowing the applicant to install the 6-foot red cedars.

**MR. NURREN BROCK MOVED** to modify the condition to read 6-foot red cedars.

Ms. Jolly spoke regarding problems regarding the project and stated Staff had received complaints regarding use of the site. She referred to the applicant’s website which included information regarding parking and a campground. Staff recommended Condition 7 be added which would state “there shall be no campground operation without compliance with the Land Development Code, Section 530.13”. This Section addressed the size, space, and dumping facilities which this plan did not meet.

Chairman Gallagher referred to a newspaper article which indicated the gentleman had been operating without all the proper items for awhile. He questioned why the applicant was not shut down.

Ms. Jolly noted the applicant had been cited; she was not sure of the follow up of the citation through Code Compliance.

Mr. Bob Wood, applicant, explained there was a misunderstanding. He thought after the last hearing that everything had been approved. He was aware of problems with the plans regarding the landscaping. He asked Staff if he was allowed to use the track for practices and was told that was acceptable as long as an event was not scheduled. Their Club was using the practice track only.

Discussion followed regarding the approved rezoning and included: the use was for his personal use and practice; and a limited time frame of certain days and hours for practice.

Chairman Gallagher stated he was under the impression that Mr. Wood need to comply to the conditions of approval before he began practicing.

Ms. Jolly explained Mr. Wood did not comply to the conditions of approval placed by the DRC before he started the events. The landscaping had not be installed or bonded. The issue before the DRC involved the red cedars, and to add a condition that there
shall be no camping. The applicant had advertised the site as a campground, but he did not have a campground.

Mr. Wood stated he had not had any events, only practice. He spoke regarding RVs on the property.

Mr. Milliard explained if RVs were on site, they would have to meet the requirements for an RV park or campground which included: lot sizes, dump stations, buffers, and site plan approval.

Ms. Jolly referred to the advertisement for the site which stated “156 camp sites at $20.00 per night” which Staff was in objection.

Mr. Nurrenbrock referred to training facilities listed on the advertisement which was not represented to the Board.

Ms. Jolly referred to the original conditions of approval.

Mr. Wood responded to concerns raised regarding items listed on the website.

Chairman Gallagher stated under the conditions of approval the items listed were not allowed.

Mr. Johnson explained when the item came up for approval he understood practice was for Mr. Wood and his family.

Discussion continued between the Committee Members regarding the difference between events and practices; the applicant’s website; the approval was outlined in the document given to the applicant; the applicant was doing what he wanted and waiting for Government to catch him; and taxpayers’ money was being wasted chasing after the applicant.

Mr. Wood stated the landscaping had not been completed and spoke regarding advertising.

Chairman Gallagher explained to Mr. Wood he needed to come into conformance with the approved documents or Staff would be instructed to shut him down.

Discussion followed regarding the amount of people allowed to practice as stated at previous hearings.

Mr. Ken Knoll and Mr. Leonard Johnson spoke under public comment in opposition to the request. Concerns discussed included: the conditions of approval had been violated; the time restrictions were not being followed; no barriers had been installed; the entrance to the site had not been moved; the noise was atrocious; normally there were 15 to 20 cars on site with 3 to 4 bikes per car; it was a madhouse; the Conditional
Use approval; the water sprinklers were going 24 hours before they started racing; it was not an agricultural type usage for the water; monitoring wells in the area; a lack of faith in the applicant following the rules; the request should be denied; the applicant had done nothing that was required; this was a Conditional Use which could be pulled; proper notification to adjoining land owners; the original presentation given was that this request was for family members; this was far and above anything that was contemplated before the County Commission; and this should be redone.

Chairman Gallagher explained the request before the Committee involved the landscaping buffer.

Discussion followed regarding the Larkin property.

Mr. Wood felt he had done everything he was told to do. He told the Commission he wanted to open a motorcycle track with 20 people on the track at one time. He felt it did not make sense for him to have a double row of trees.

Ms. Jolly explained Staff requested a staggered double row of trees.

MR. NURREN BROCK CLARIFIED the motion was for 6-foot red cedar trees to substitute for the 10-foot red cedars in the original approval.

Chairman Gallagher stated the trees would be in a double row.

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

4. Memorandum No.: DR08-148
   Project Name: Millpond Professional Center
   Proposed Development: Preliminary/construction site plan approval for 10 one-story office buildings totaling 24,200 square feet on a 2.75-acre project site.

   Variances: 1) Section 603.9.D.2, Buffer Types, to reduce the 15-foot Type B landscape buffer to a minimum of seven feet on the northeast corner due to wetland buffer constraints as it is abutting the wetland/lake/drainage area of Millpond Estates; and 2) Section 603.9.D.2, Buffer Types, to reduce the
15-foot Type B landscape buffer along the east to nine feet due to the landscape buffer abutting the wetland/lake/drainage area of Millpond Estates.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Approval with conditions.

Ms. Jolly recommended the item be continued to December 6, 2007, at 1:30 p.m. in Dade City.

There was no public comment.

**MR. NURREN BROCK MOVED** to continue the item to December 6, 2007, at 1:30 p.m. in Dade City.

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

5. **Memorandum No.:** DR08-183  
**Project Name:** Validus - S.R. 54 Commercial Development  
**Proposed Development:** 13,500 square feet of office buildings.  
**RECOMMENDATION:** Approval.

Ms. Jolly explained the request. Staff recommended approval of the variance request for the tree mitigation and of the project with conditions. A condition was added to require the applicant to provide an interconnection or to seek a variance.

Discussion followed regarding the interconnection.

Mr. Jerry English, applicant, spoke regarding the interconnection and noted access to the site.

Ms. Jolly clarified the applicant would either interconnect, prove that piece was not going to be used for another building, or obtain a variance.

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

Chairman Gallagher called on the motion; the vote was unanimous and the motion carried.
B. **Class III**

1. **Memorandum No.:** DR08-257  
   **Project Name:** Lake Padgett Reserve Subdivision  
   **Proposed Development:** The applicant is requesting approval of a preliminary/construction plan and Stormwater Management Plan and Report to subdivide 7.84 acres into five single-family detached lots.  
   **RECOMMENDATION:** Continue to the December 20, 2007, 1:30 p.m., Development Review Committee meeting in New Port Richey due to the public notice requirements of a new variance request.

Ms. Jolly recommended the item be continued to December 20, 2007, at 1:30 p.m. in New Port Richey.

There was no public comment.

**MR. NURREN BROCK MOVED** to continue the item to December 20, 2007, at 1:30 p.m. in New Port Richey.

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

2. **Memorandum No.:** DR08-258  
   **Project Name:** Tucker Woods Subdivision  
   **Proposed Development:** The applicant is requesting approval of a preliminary/construction plan and Stormwater Management Plan and Report to subdivide 14.03 acres into 14 single-family detached lots, with a variance request from Section 602.7, Tree Plan, which, if approved, would allow for a monetary contribution to the Tree Mitigation Fund for all required trees unable to be replaced due to area constraints.  
   **RECOMMENDATION:** Approval with conditions.

Ms. Jolly explained the item. Staff recommended approval of the variance request and the project with conditions.
Mr. Andy Saeger, representative, was present.

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

There was no public comment.

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

3. **Memorandum No.: ZN08-208**
   **Project Name:** Hillcrest Preserve MPUD Master Planned Unit Development
   **Proposed Development:** The Zoning/Code Compliance Department has received a formal request from the applicant, Hillcrest Property, LLP, to amend the existing Hillcrest Preserve Conditions of Approval to extend the build-out date as provided for in Condition of Approval No. 32 from December 31, 2007, to December 31, 2008.

   **RECOMMENDATION:** Approval with conditions.

Ms. Zampetti explained the item. Staff recommended approval.

Mr. Biff Crane, representative, agreed with Staff’s recommendation.

Mr. David Roberts spoke in support of the extension. He requested that so long as the final plat had been recorded, the conditions would not be imposed upon them, unless they sought a substantial modification.

Ms. Zampetti stated that was correct; this request was a minor modification.

Mr. Roberts clarified the only way this modification would effect the residential component, which had recorded plats and a bond for the associated improvements, was if the residential sought a substantial change.

Ms. Zampetti stated that was also correct.

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.

IX. REGULAR AGENDA

A. Class II

1. Petition No.: GM08-105
   Applicant: District School Board of Pasco County
   (Continued from the November 8, 2007, Development Review Committee Meeting)
   Proposed Development: Elementary School “T”
   Requested: Consistency Determination
   RECOMMENDATION: Approval.

Ms. Jolly recommended the item be continued to January 10, 2008, at 1:30 p.m. in New Port Richey.

There was no public comment.

Discussion followed regarding the continuance date.

MR. NURRENBROCK MOVED to continue the item to January 10, 2008, 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

1. Memorandum No.: ZN08-221
   Project Name: Triple J MPUD Master Planned Unit Development Amendment and Alternative Standards Request
   (Continued from the November 8, 2007, Development Review Committee Meeting)
Proposed Development: The developer is requesting a reduction in the total number of units, elimination of attached units, and a reduction of the right-of-way width of the main access road.

RECOMMENDATION: Approval with conditions.

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

Ms. Shelly Johnson, representative, agreed with Staff’s recommendation. She requested the language in Condition 29 which referenced the developer or the homeowners’ association assuming the liability or carrying insurance on a public facility be stricken.

Ms. Zampetti agreed with the revision.

MR. NURREN BROCK MOVED approval of the revision to Condition 29 as outlined.

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

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

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

C. Class IV

None Scheduled

X. DEVELOPMENT ISSUES DISCUSSION

A. Discussion of Policy Issues

None Scheduled

B. Project Discussion

1. Memorandum No.: ZN08-179
   Project Name: Sandy Lane Cell Tower
Ms. Zampetti explained the issue involved a tier two tower that had been approved as an administrative decision. The decision was appealed and heard by the DRC who affirmed the decision that it was a tier two tower. At that time, the DRC attached conditions, including a condition which required the bridge on Sandy Lane, which provided access to the site, be maintained and improved during construction to upgrade its existing condition and to accommodate construction traffic. Complaints had been received concerning whether the bridge could accommodate the type of traffic associated with a tower.

Mr. Michael Brooks, representative, explained Crown Castle purchased this tower earlier this year; they were not the original constructor. An engineering analysis had been completed on the bridge. This was an old bridge. The analysis concluded it was not “HC15” vehicle rated at this point; the tower constructors did not cause damage to the bridge. There was an access issue for everyone in the area. If they needed to bring construction equipment back on site, they would need to be consistent with the order, Condition 4, and temporarily brace the bridge in order to get the construction equipment across. Currently, there was no construction activity on site. He did not feel they were in violation of any order.

Chairman Gallagher read the requirement into the record. He asked if the bridge was upgraded during construction.

Mr. Brooks explained it was temporarily upgraded for the purpose of accommodating the construction traffic.

Ms. Zampetti stated that was correct; they stabilized the bridge underneath.

Mr. Brooks explained an engineer’s letter was provided to the County at the time which referenced bracing that had been recommended. He noted he had recently been obtained by the applicant.

Ms. Zampetti noted there were also some landscaping issues that were held in abeyance. Crown Castle had been very cooperative, but the landscaping had been put on hold to resolve the issue with the bridge.

Mr. Brooks acknowledged the landscaping needed to be completed. He did not feel at this point they were in non-conformance. They would find a way to safely cross the ditch. The bridge was the only way to get to the tower and residences in the area; 4 properties accessed the bridge.

Mr. Sumner clarified the obligation was to fix the bridge during construction; it was not for them to construct a bridge.

Chairman Gallagher asked when would the landscaping be installed.
Mr. Brooks explained in order to accommodate the landscaping trucks, additional bracing or a temporary bridge system would be needed.

Chairman Gallagher disagreed and felt the intent of the condition was to repair the bridge while they were under construction.

Mr. Brooks stated he was unsure what would be required for the landscaping, but a detailed structural analysis would be done before a vehicle needed to cross the bridge at that time. The obligation was not to build a new bridge. At one point the landscaping had been installed, but it had died.

Mr. John Tillman spoke under public comment regarding the issue. He objected to the tower 2 years ago and had pointed out the bridge concerns. This was the only access to his home. The applicant was required to strengthen and improve the bridge during construction. He displayed photographs of the bridge and improvements. He spoke regarding companies located on the tower; the fire department was unable to cross the bridge; a 40-ton crane used the bridge to change the antenna arrays; Staff tried to stop traffic on the bridge until the issue was resolved; the company did what they wanted; and the foliage of the tower trees.

Chairman Gallagher asked if Staff felt the applicant was in compliance with the conditions.

Ms. Zampetti felt the improvement had to be something permanent. They were not required to replace the bridge, but to improve the bridge.

Chairman Gallagher directed Staff to review the engineering report and to determine if the applicant had met the intent of the condition.

Mr. Widman felt the bridge needed to be analyzed by a structural engineer to calculate the appropriate rating. If the rating was not sufficient to handle trucks, then should be improved.

**MR. NURREN BROCK MOVED** to receive and file photographs submitted by Mr. John Tillman.

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

Chairman Gallagher recommended the item be placed on the January 24, 2008, agenda to review the issues.

Ms. Edna Boucheau spoke under public comment. She noted she owned the property the tower was built on and originally was in favor of the project. The branches were falling off. The bridge was never a problem until it was being used by the tower company.
Mr. Brooks explained there did not appear to be any ownership of the bridge or of the land underneath the bridge.

Mr. Widman requested it be properly analyzed by a structural engineer for the appropriate rating. They would not be able to solve the problem until the official rating was determined.

**MR. NURRENBROCK MOVED** to require the report described by Mr. Widman be provided to Mr. Widman 5 days before the January 24, 2008, meeting to allow Mr. Widman to review the report.

Discussion followed regarding the report provided to Staff.

Ms. Jan Beaudall, property specialist for Crown Caste, explained the branches that were falling off would be addressed. She noted Crown Caste did not construct the tower so they were not sure what kind of branches they were.

Ms. Zampetti explained Staff would bring back the specifications.

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

### XI. INFORMATION

None Scheduled

### XII. NOTED ITEMS

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

#### A. Class I Development Actions from September 26, 2007, to November 29, 2007:

1. **Memorandum No.:** DR07-2349  
   **Project Name:** Pasco County Fire Station No. 16  
   **Applicant:** Pasco County Facilities Management Department  
   **Proposed Development:** A 7,123-square-foot fire station.  
   **Type of Action:** Approved.  
   **Date of Action:** September 26, 2007
2. Memorandum No.: DR08-235
   Project Name: Holiday Free Methodist Church
   Applicant: Holiday Free Methodist Church, Inc.
   Type of Action: Approved with conditions.
   Date of Action: November 19, 2007

3. Memorandum No.: DR08-250
   Project Name: Pumpco
   Applicant: K & L Holdings, LLC
   Proposed Development: One-story 8,100-square-foot office/warehouse.
   Type of Action: Approved with conditions.
   Date of Action: November 20, 2007

B. **Class IIIE Development Actions**

   None Scheduled

C. **Class IIIR Development Actions**

   None Scheduled

D. **Administrative Variance Actions**

   None Scheduled

E. **Class II Construction Plan Actions**

   None Scheduled

F. **Class III Construction Plan Actions**

   None Scheduled
RECESS

THE COMMITTEE RECESSED AT 3:00 P.M. AND RECONVENED AT 3:05 P.M. ALL COMMITTEE MEMBERS WERE PRESENT.

THE COMMITTEE RECESSED AT 4:27 P.M. AND RECONVENED AT 4:31 P.M. ALL COMMITTEE MEMBERS WERE PRESENT.

ADJOURN

The Committee adjourned at 6:16 p.m.