



Agenda Item #1
CRC - 08/22/05

TAMPA BAY REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL
CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council
Pinellas Park, FL 33782

July 25, 2005
9:30 a.m.

REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT:

Mr. Robert Kersteen, Pinellas County, Chair
Commissioner Bill Dodson, City of Plant City
Reverend James T. Golden, City of Bradenton
Ms. Angeleah Kinsler, Hillsborough County
Deputy Mayor Bob Langford, City of New Port Richey
Councilwoman Virginia Littrell, City of St. Petersburg
Councilman Bob Matthews, City of Seminole

REPRESENTATIVES ABSENT:

Mr. Richard Albrecht, Pasco County
Mayor Ward Friszolowski, City of St. Pete Beach
Mr. Michael Guju, Pinellas County
Mr. Kenneth Hoyt, Hillsborough County
Ms. Kathleen Wolf, Pasco County

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mr. Roy Chapman, Florida Design Consultants
Mr. Richard E. Dons, Attorney
Mr. Todd Pakrywa, Schroeder-Manatee Ranch, Inc.
Ms. Cyndi Tarapani, Florida Design
Mr. Steve Wasson, Florida Design
Mr. Manny L. Pumariega, Executive Director, TBRPC
Mr. Roger Tucker, General Counsel, TBRPC
Mr. Avera Wynne, Planning Director, TBRPC
Ms. Suzanne Cooper, Principal Planner, TBRPC
Mr. John Meyer, Principal Planner, TBRPC
Mr. Randy Deshazo, Senior Planner, TBRPC
Ms. Bobbi Jaroy, Secretary, TBRPC

Mr. Robert Kersteen called the meeting of the Clearinghouse Review Committee of the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council to order on July 25, 2005, at 9:30 a.m.

Agenda Item #1 - Minutes

Deputy Mayor Langford moved that the minutes from the April 25, 2005 meeting be approved. Commissioner Dodson seconded the motion; the motion passed.

Agenda Item #2 - Consent Agenda

Councilman Matthews moved that the consent agenda be approved. Deputy Mayor Langford seconded the motion; the motion passed.

Agenda Item #3 - Items Removed From the Consent Agenda

None.

Agenda Item #4 - Developments of Regional Impact

A. DRI #261 - Ashley Glen, Pasco County

Mr. Meyer made the following presentation:

The pre-application conference is an agreement between the review agencies and the applicant as to what the regional issues will be until the development order is adopted. The applicant has not requested exemption from any of the required issues other than hurricane preparedness, based on the fact that the project is located far enough inland so as not to be vulnerable to storm surge from any future hurricane. There are some optional issues that do not pertain to this project that the applicant is also seeking to exempt.

The applicant is proposing a 260-acre mixed-use development located in south central Pasco County. The project is located at the northeast quadrant of the Suncoast Parkway and SR54, about 2-1/2 miles north of Hillsborough County. The project consists of several uses, including residential, office and resale with an anticipated build-out year of 2017. Upon build-out, the project will consist of 807 residential units, 800,000 square feet of office and 450,000 square feet of retail space.

No Natural Resources of Regional Significance are located on the project site, according to the most recently-adopted Council map. Council staff, however, will be reviewing the materials to determine if significant resources exist on site, and to ensure protection of the adjacent regionally significant resources. It is also noteworthy that approximately 50% of the project site is within the 100-year flood plain. Council staff will be interested in ensuring protection of the floodplain and compensation for the loss of the 100-year flood storage.

The applicant has agreed to provide affordable housing analysis in strict accordance with East Central Florida Regional Planning Council Housing Methodology.

Upon approval of the pre-application conference report the applicant will be encouraged to prepare the application for development approval in a timely manner. The review agencies have a period of approximately 50 days from today to provide any final comments regarding

methodologies or assumptions contained in this pre-application conference document. Comments received from the review agencies will be appended to the report.

As agreed upon in our transportation methodology meeting conducted in November of 2004, the applicant shall submit the application for development approval within one-year of that date. Therefore, the application for development approval must be submitted on or before November 16, 2005, or the project could be subject to a new transportation methodology meeting.

Mr. Roy Chapman, Florida Design Consultants, introduced the applicant and other members of the project team. He gave a presentation:

The project will develop in two phases; Phase One build-out is 2012, Phase Two is 2017. The breakdown will be 80 single-family homes, 327 attached single family homes and 400 multi-family units. Also, Phase One will have 225,000 square feet of retail and 155,000 square feet of office. Phase Two will have an additional 225,000 square feet of retail and 645,000 square feet of office.

Some portions of the project are in the 100-year flood plain and there will be flood plain compensation. According to the 2015 future land use map of Pasco, the current land use designation is Res 3. We have proposed a ROR designation. This will require a land use change to the Pasco County Comprehensive Plan, which will be tracked as part of this project.

The wildlife survey methodology will include a literature search, onsite field surveys and preparing the report. Methodology was submitted to the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission in June.

Questions and comments followed:

Reverend Golden asked, regarding the environmental impact of the project, of the six bullets three seem to relate to the management of water. How do you get from one part of the buildable project to the other part of the buildable project without crossing the floodplain? Mr. Chapman answered that there will be a spine road through the middle of the project. The developer will build a roadway through the floodplain. The developer will be compensating for the loss of flood storage, probably in the northern portion of the site.

Reverend Golden asked, regarding the proposed location of Ashley Glen Blvd, to compensate for the expected 50% loss of the 100-year flood storage volume, **is this what the dredge and fill permit is all about?**

Mr. Chapman stated they are not going to impact 100% of the floodplain; the developer will compensate for the areas that will be impacted.

Reverend Golden asked, if, by impacting this flood storage area, how much of the downstream flooding protection of the river would be involved?

Mr. Chapman stated that the way the agencies review this, the developer will not be able to have any more water coming out of the project in the future than is coming out currently. There cannot be any additional impacts coming out of the project. There will not be any change

downstream.

Reverend Golden asked why not fit the development to the land rather than fit the land to the development.

Mr. Chapman stated that would not be economically viable.

Councilwoman Littrell noted that she is from St. Petersburg and all of northeast St. Petersburg was a wetland at one time and now we keep changing our comprehensive land use plan because our preservation areas have been taken up by roads and development. **What was a vast wetland is now just a few acres of wetland.** Mitigation simply does not work. She knows that we have to support what is allowable by law, and she will do that, but she doesn't think the law is right. She asked who is conducting the archeological evaluation.

Mr. Chapman answered that **Marion Almy** (Archaeological Consultants, Inc.) is the principal consultant.

Councilwoman Littrell stated that Pasco County has done very little thus far in the way of documenting their archeological and historical resources. But if Marion Almy is on board, you are doing the right thing.

Deputy Mayor Langford stated he would like to follow up on the **floodplain mitigation**. There does seem to be an overwhelming amount of 100-year floodplain in the project.

Mr. Chapman stated he couldn't give a complete answer until all the analysis is done.

Deputy Mayor Langford asked what is being done regarding the school system.

Mr. Chapman stated they would be talking to the County and determine whether they need a school on this site. There are a number of other projects nearby, which hopefully will provide the schools for the area.

Mr. Meyer noted that education is one of the regional issues to be evaluated during the DRI review. The findings and recommendations of the School Board will be incorporated into the Development Order, as appropriate, and identified as part of the DRI review,

DCA question – Should the project be aggregated with the Grey Hawk at Lake Polo project immediately south of this project?

Mr. Chapman answered that the Grey Hawk at Lake Polo development is outside of the project site; it will not have a similar development program and it will not share resources. It is proposed that it will not be part of the Ashley Glen DRI.

Mr. Meyer stated that the applicant's response to Question #4 of Application for Development Approval (ADA) will be evaluated in order to determine the appropriateness of aggregation of the two parcels. There are five criteria which will be evaluated to make this determination, including: common ownership, common marketing/advertising, closeness in time and voluntary sharing of infrastructure.

Reverend Golden asked if this project comes to the final report stage and none of this has been done, or it is not to our satisfaction in terms of the mitigation, and we say “no,” what happens then?

Mr. Meyer said that, in that case, Council’s final report would be in the form of a recommendation that Pasco County issue a development order denying the project. Correspondence from the respective review agencies would also be part of to the report. Once a Development Order is issued, the parties with direct appeal authority are the county which issued the development order, the applicant, the Florida Department of Community Affairs and the State Attorney.

Commissioner Dodson made a motion to approve the pre-application conference report. Councilman Matthews seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Agenda Item #5 - Other Business - Chairman

None.

Agenda Item #6 - Announcement of Next Meeting Date

The next meeting will be announced as needed.

Agenda Item #7 - Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 10:05 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Young, Recording Secretary

Mr. Robert Kersteen, Chair