



Agenda Item #1
June 12, 2006

TAMPA BAY REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL
CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council
Pinellas Park, FL 33782

September 26, 2005
9:30 a.m.

REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT:

Mayor Ward Friszolowski, City of St. Pete Beach
Reverend James T. Golden, City of Bradenton
Mr. Michael Guju, Pinellas County
Mr. Robert Kersteen, Pinellas County, Chair
Deputy Mayor Bob Langford, City of New Port Richey
Ms. Kathleen Wolf, Pasco County

REPRESENTATIVES ABSENT:

Mr. Richard Albrecht, Pasco County
Commissioner Bill Dodson, City of Plant City
Councilwoman Virginia Littrell, City of St. Petersburg
Mr. Kenneth Hoyt, Hillsborough County

OTHERS PRESENT:

Ms. Diane Chadwick - Wilson Miller
Mr. Caleb Grimes, Grimes Goebel
Mr. Brian Irsch
Mr. David Jellerson, Mosaic
Mr. Todd Pokrywa, SMR-Lakewood Center
Mr. Scott Swearnhen, Engelhardt-Hammer
Mr. Manny Pumariega, Executive Director, TBRPC
Mr. Roger Tucker, General Counsel, TBRPC
Mr. Avera Wynne, Planning Director, TBRPC
Mr. Gerald Smelt, Principal Planner, TBRPC
Ms. Suzanne Cooper, Principal Planner, TBRPC
Mr. John Meyer, Principal Planner, TBRPC
Mr. Randy Deshazo, Senior Planner, TBRPC
Ms. Sue Young, Secretary, TBRPC

Mr. Robert Kersteen called the meeting of the Clearinghouse Review Committee of the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council to order on September 26, 2005, at 9:38 a.m.

Agenda Item #1 - Minutes

Mr. Guju moved that the minutes of the August 22, 2005 meeting be approved. Deputy Mayor Langford seconded the motion; the motion passed.

Agenda Item #2 - Consent Agenda

Reverend Golden moved that the consent agenda be approved. Mr. Guju 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 #265 - Lakewood Centre, Manatee County

Mr. Meyer made the following presentation:

He reminded the committee that the purpose of the pre-application conference is an agreement between the review agencies and the applicant as to what the regional issues will be for the duration of the DRI review. In the folders are supplemental comments from TBRPC's transportation consultant, Mr. George Deakin. No other review agency comments had been received. Any subsequent comments received in a timely manner will be appended to the finalized version of the *Preapplication Conference Report*. Florida Administrative Code allows a period of approximately 50 days following this meeting for review agencies to identify any final issues.

It was noted that the Department of Community Affairs was not represented at this meeting.

The applicant is proposing a 695-acre mixed-use development located in southcentral Manatee County. The project is generally located along the north side of SR 70, east of Lakewood Ranch Boulevard and adjacent to other land holdings of the Schroeder-Manatee Ranch, including the University Lakes DRI, the Cypress Banks DRI and the proposed Northwest Sector DRI.

The exact location of project uses will be determined and refined as the DRI undergoes review. The resulting transportation analysis will dictate the location and extent of project uses. Built over three phases, the proposed mixture of uses will include 3,700 residential units, 1.85 million square feet of retail space and 1.56 million square feet of office space, with an anticipated final buildout year of 2019.

The project will be reviewed for consistency with the recently adopted *Strategic Regional Policy Plan* and the corresponding map series. *Natural Resources of Regional Significance* do exist on site. These resources are subject to groundtruthing. Council staff will seek to ensure that these resources and others detected during the DRI review and site visit are protected from significant impact.

The applicant has agreed to conduct the affordable housing analysis in accordance with East Central Florida Housing methodology with the exception of several deviations requested. Council staff is currently opposed to four of the requested modifications. All exceptions are detailed on pages 13 through 15 of the applicant's document, and the issues currently opposed

by Council staff are described on the bottom of Table 3, page 14 of the Council's report.

Upon approval of the pre-application conference report, the applicant will be encouraged to start to prepare the application for development approval if they have not already done so. The review agencies will be provided a period of about 50 days following this meeting to provide any final comments for incorporation into the pre-application conference report. Any comments received will be appended to the rear of the report.

The applicant is currently contemplating a Preliminary Development Agreement (PDA) which would allow the developer to go forward with a limited amount of development while the entire project undergoes DRI review. The amount of development must be less than the DRI threshold. If the Department of Community Affairs approves the PDA, that expedites the requirement for the submittal of the Application for Development Approval (ADA) to within a 3-month period. Otherwise, as agreed upon in the transportation methodology meeting, the ADA shall be submitted within one year from the transportation methodology meeting, which was held on August 24, 2005, or the project could be subject to a new transportation methodology meeting.

Ms. Diane Chadwick of Wilson Miller gave the following presentation.

Ms. Chadwick stated she would give an overview of the project. As far as the disagreements we have on the affordable housing, they have been talking with TBRPC staff and they are going to continue to work on that process. They would ask the Council's approval to continue that process.

Most of the land area is currently used for agricultural purposes. They are looking at about 3,700 dwellings; the majority of these will be multi-family, higher density, and some single family attached such as townhomes and villas. There will be a limited amount of single family homes in this area. They are looking at 1.8 million square feet of commercial and 1.5 million square feet of office.

The northern one-third of the site would be a high density residential area. The southern two-thirds of the site would be mixed-use. The applicant is considering a vertical mix of essentially commercial on the ground floor, some office, and then residential above that.

There was a PDA submitted to Council staff and DCA last week requesting expedited approval for 300 multi-family units and 105,000 square feet of commercial, which would include a recreational commercial type facility such as a very high end bowling alley.

The applicant expects the development to be a major employment center because of the significant amount of non-residential uses. Because of the design they expect it to be very walkable and very transit oriented; the employees can walk or bike to work.

She believes John has indicated that they are in agreement with the deletion of questions 31 through 38 because they don't apply to this project.

Questions and comments followed.

Ms. Wolf asked why schools (Question #38) do not apply when there are going to be over 3,600 residential units.

Ms. Chadwick stated they will definitely be responding to the education question (#27) and, in particular, the anticipated number of students generated by the project's residential component.

Ms. Todd asked for clarification on the education projection.

Ms. Chadwick stated that the requirement is that you show the projected number of school age students that will be generated by the project. This is done in conjunction with the School Board.

Ms. Todd asked if they anticipate actual construction of new schools.

Ms. Chadwick said that is correct.

Reverend Golden asked what the difference is between the methodology that they would like to employ with respect to determining affordable housing issues and the methodology of the East Central Florida Planning Council.

Mr. Caleb Grimes of Grimes Goebel Grimes et al stated that on page 14 of the staff report there is a list of four items. In addressing affordable housing, what applicants do is determine whether or not there is sufficient affordable housing to take care of the people who will be working in a particular DRI. They have been following the East Central Florida Planning Council guidelines. The current applicant has additional data which will help in addressing affordable housing and they want to work with Council staff to assure that affordable housing is addressed in a proper manner. One of the issues is that some published reports indicate that, rather than using a 10-mile/20-minute study area, a 11-mile/24.5 minute study area more appropriately reflects the current employment travel trends. If the applicant can not convince Council staff, and as John Meyer has indicated in the report, then the applicant will have to use the ECFRPC housing methodology. They believe that, based on where they are, that the 11 mile commute is more appropriate. In addition, the applicant wants to discuss the issue of "arms length transactions" with Council staff. The applicant is concerned with a blanket statement of removing all sales below the assessed value. The applicant wants to be sure that affordable sales are counted properly. The renter-occupied sales data is another issue the applicant wishes to discuss with Council staff.

Reverend Golden stated that it perhaps would make it easier if we were to adopt Schroeder-Manatee's methodology to meet the affordable housing commitment we would like to have at the regional planning council. What other options are available that the developer would be willing to make available to meet the affordable housing commitment and not change the methodology of the East Central Florida Regional Planning Council?

Mr. Grimes stated that by identifying affordable housing as a regional issue in this report, they recognize that they have to identify whether or not there is affordable housing available and, if not, how it is going to be properly mitigated.

Reverend Golden stated he knows there are efforts now to deal with increasing affordable housing stock. He is wondering if instead of making methodology adjustments by developer after developer in terms of the boundaries, if we could explore some possibility of providing mitigation in targeted areas for infill development or density transfer or some type of development. There is a lot of mitigation that could be done.

Mr. Grimes stated he thinks the main thing Schroeder-Manatee is asking for in this report is a recognition that there is a difference in these four items and that there be a recognition of the statement that they will using the East Central Florida as accepted here. Also, with these four items, they would like to be allowed to continue working with staff. If Council staff is convinced that the better approach is via the issues we raised, that we be allowed to do that. We don't have any disagreement on what the regional issues are, but we do have a question that we will continue to work with staff on just some minor things on the methodology. We ask that you give us a little leeway to work on that.

Mr. Randy Deshazo, TBRPC staff, stated that the previous Friday, Mr. Meyer and he discussed some of these issues with Wilson Miller and the only outstanding issue was non-arms length transactions. With respect to the 10-mile/20 minute rule, that rule is based on the transportation costs that apply when you have to keep on driving further and further out to find housing with respect to your work. A previous estimate was that this costs most people approximately \$200 per month in transportation costs. The further out you go, the more expensive it is. In fact, the 10-mile/20-minutes probably is the best solution to offer the applicant considering the rising transportation costs.

Reverend Golden noted that no matter how you contract or expand the arbitrary lines, the reality is people's living standards. If you get a job out there you're lucky. We need to look not in terms of just what is convenient for the developer. How do we develop a new methodology that takes into account the reality of people's lives? If he is understanding this methodology correctly, all it really says is that you go a 11-mile radius and determine whether there is or is not any affordable housing and you report that. You don't get to do anything about it. Something needs to be done about it because people still go out there to work, but they are not going to live out there. They can't afford it.

Mr. Guju stated that this project strikes him as very intensive. There is a lot of development in this area. There is a lot of infrastructure and there is a high school. Going back to education and infrastructure, he would like to emphasize that we take a look at the transportation as well as the education. Obviously, we are going to need elementary and middle schools. How close are these schools?

Mr. Grimes stated that what you don't get with this, because it is an isolated DRI, is that in this area, Schroeder-Manatee has been working with the School Board over many years. They worked to provide the Lakewood Ranch High School site. Currently there is a middle school and an elementary school constructed and another elementary school under construction.

Mr. Guju asked about transportation. State Road 70, on the south side of the project, is a major road.

Mr. Grimes stated that SR 70 is under construction as a 6-lane facility with Lakewood Ranch Boulevard, the north-south roadway adjacent to this proposed DRI, being the mid point. From there east is the first stage and from there west is the second. The first stage is about to be completed; the second stage is well underway. The applicant is preparing a traffic study to determine exactly what other roadways may need to be built. Once that transportation study is completed, that will dictate, in great part, exactly what we can and will build here.

Reverend Golden asked if Mr. Grimes would like to elaborate on the fact that Manatee County and the Manatee County School Board has requested to become a lead agency with respect to concurrency issues .. transportation and education in growth management... two pilot projects. A lot of the issues with respect to the transportation concurrency and the school concurrency issues and redevelopment are going to be addressed in the broader context of how the whole county has developed. So Manatee County, the school board, the City of Bradenton and the Water Management District are all coming together to try to deal with concurrency issues as we go along. A lot of the efforts are addressing concerns relative to education and transportation, not necessarily affordable housing.

Mr. Grimes noted that Manatee County has recently taken a very active role in assuring that there are sites for schools around the county. They have a very aggressive Impact Fee Ordinance for schools, which this project will be subject to.

Ms. Todd asked what has been identified as the environmental indicators on the property. Are there any areas of environmental concern you are planning to address? Have areas been identified that might require further EIS review?

Ms. Chadwick noted that all the wetlands have been identified; they have been mapped. Because this site has been farmed for so long, there are not any other significant habitats on this particular area.

Reverend Golden made a motion to approve the *Preapplication Conference Report*. Deputy Vice Mayor Langford seconded the motion and 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 10:20 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Young, Recording Secretary

Ms. Jill Collins, Chair