

ABBREVIATED MINUTES
 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
 FEBRUARY 20, 2008

The City of Bradenton Planning Commission met on Wednesday, February 20, 2008 at 2:00 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers.

ATTENDANCE

Planning Commission Members (Shaded area indicates absence, *Indicates non-voting):

Diane Barcus	Chair <i>Lucienne Gaufillet</i>	Vice-Chair Allen Yearick	Allen Prewitt
Carlos Escalante	Adam Buskirk	Vacancy	
Alternate Brady Cohenour	Alternate O.M. Griffith	Alternate Vacancy	Alternate Joseph Thompson

City Staff:

Development Services	Public Works	Fire	Police
Director Tim Polk	Arlan Cummings	Kenny Langston	
Assistant Director Tom Cookingham			
Dev. Review Mgr. Ruth Seewer			
Review Coordinator Susan Kahl			

PRELIMINARIES

Meeting called to order by Chairman Lucienne Gaufillet at 2:00 p.m.

- 1) Pledge of Allegiance was recited.
- 2) The Chair presented a Certificate of Appreciation to Diane Barcus who had served as Chairman of the Planning Commission for five years.
- 3) Ms. Kahl swore in Adam Buskirk as a new Planning Commission Member.
- 4) Ms. Barcus moved, with a second by Mr. Yearick, to approve the Minutes of January 16, 2008. Motion carried unanimously.
- 5) Ms. Kahl swore in all those wishing to speak before the Commission.
- 6) The Chair advised that with the exception of variance requests all items being considered at this meeting would be heard by City Council at its regularly scheduled meeting on Wednesday, March 12, 2008 at 8:30 a.m. The Chair advised that another exception was

item SU.08.0050 dealing with the public boat ramp which would be heard by the City Council at its February 27, 2008 meeting at 6:00 p.m.

OLD BUSINESS

SU.07.0049 WARD 5 NEIGHBORHOOD 1.03/104 RS

Request of Dexter N. McDonald, agent for Community Outreach, owner, for Special Use approval of a day care center for property located at 650 27th Street East (Zoned PDP)

Ms. Seewer read the request advising that the application had come in too late for review; therefore, she requested that it be continued until the March 19, 2008 meeting.

Public Hearing:

The Chair stated that since the request was still open, she asked whether there were any individuals wishing to speak for or against, and no one appeared. The Chair continued the public hearing until the March.

Planning Commission Attendance

Mr. Yearick stated that he wished to bring up the matter of Planning Commission attendance under Old Business since it had been discussed at the last meeting. He suggested that the Members contact Ms. Kahl indicating attendance or lack thereof.

The Chair recommended that a Member contact Ms. Kahl only in the event he or she would not be present.

Mr. Yearick noted that although Mr. Thompson was an Alternate he always attended the meetings, and he suggested that Mr. Thompson be made a regular Member.

The Chair stated that a formal letter should be sent to the Mayor in this regard.

NEW BUSINESS

VA.08.0045 WARD 2 NEIGHBORHOOD 15.01 RS

Request of Jeffrey Drapala, owner, for Variance for fence height increase for property located at 704 33rd Street Court West (Zoned R1C)

Ms. Seewer read the request.

Jeffrey Drapala, 704 33rd Street Court West, stated that he installed a fence without a permit due to his ignorance, and he was informed by Code Enforcement that a variance request was needed because of the height of his fence.

Ms. Barcus stated that Mr. Drapala's letter of request indicated that the Bradenton Police Department has had to chase people out of his yard. She asked how many times this occurred.

Mr. Drapala responded about four times and in the most recent case an arrest was made.

Ms. Barcus asked how many times Mr. Drapala had to chase people himself.

Mr. Drapala stated that he had to chase students who were in his pool during school hours and after school about three different occasions.

Mr. Yearick noted that Mr. Drapala was requesting an increase in the fence height, and he asked whether Mr. Drapala was putting in an entire new fence or just replacing part of a fence that was already there.

Mr. Drapala explained that the job was already done. He stated that there had been a four foot chain link fence at that stretch which he increased to a six foot PVC fence matching another part of the fence near the house, not the street.

Ms. Seewer responded the hardship was that the property had two technical front yards.

Public Hearing:

The Chair opened the Public Hearing for those wishing to speak for or against, and no one appeared. The Chair closed the Public Hearing.

Public Works -

Mr. Cummings stated he had no objections.

Fire Department -

Fire Marshal Langston stated he had no objections.

Staff Report-

Ms. Seewer stated that staff recommended approval of the fence, as installed, based on the double frontage as a hardship. She said that the request was specifically for two panels, six foot in length and a 12 foot double gate which were minimal to keep people out.

Mr. Yearick asked whether there was a sign on the fence that stated "private property – no swimming".

Mr. Drapala commented that Mr. Yearick's idea was a good one.

Ms. Barcus moved, with a second by Mr. Thompson, to accept staff's recommendation and approve VA.08.0045 for the fence, as installed, at a height of six feet, the hardship being the double frontage lot at property located at 704 33rd Street Court West. Motion carried unanimously with a vote 5-0.

SU.07.0044 WARD 4 NEIGHBORHOOD 7.03 RS

Request of Darrell L. Reha, owner, for Special Use approval for a hotel known as the Riverpark Grande for property located at 309 10th Street West (Zoned C1/UCBD)

Ms. Seewer read the request.

Darrell Reha, 359 MacArthur Avenue, Sarasota, President of Riverpark Grande Development Corporation, requested approval for a Special Use permit for a 140 unit hotel. He reviewed the background as to when the project was first brought forth which started as a condominium with first floor retail. Mr. Reha explained that the condominium market went soft and the project went south. He stated he had worked hard with City staff trying to find the right use for the building and was happy to announce that several national franchise hotel operators had expressed interest. Mr. Reha stated that as of today Joe McClash was facilitating a buyer from Miami looking to do a high end, luxurious hotel. He said that the plan was for a 140 units, but whether that number would be achieved depended on the architects, but he felt they would end up with a very unique, high style hotel complex. He discussed hotel amenities, garage space and landscaping, and answered questions of the Commission.

Ms. Barcus commented that she had a question for Mr. McClash since he was representing the buyer. She asked how many rooms would be lost as rentals if the second and third story rooms abutting the parking garage were used for storage and employee service areas.

Joe McClash, 711 89th Street Northwest, clarified that the first and second floors would be utilized for typical restaurant, hotel lobby, hotel operations and the second floor which would lend itself to banquet facilities. He said from the third floor up would be the hotel rooms. Mr. McClash advised that the parking facilities were three stories and the fourth story was actually the pool.

Mr. Polk remarked that he liked to refer to parking not as a story, but as a parking tier.

Public Hearing:

The Chair opened the public hearing for those wishing to speak in favor or against, and no one appeared. The Chair closed the public hearing.

Public Works -

Mr. Cummings stated he had no objections.

Fire Department -

Fire Marshal Langston stated he had no objections.

Staff Report-

Ms. Seewer stated that staff recommended approval with five stipulations. She read the stipulations as follows:

1. The 3-tier parking garage will be constructed prior to issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy as per the plans approved by the Architectural Review Board. Any deviation in the plans determined to be significant by the Building Official will require additional review by the Architectural Review Board.
2. The applicant will work with City staff for design and construction to incorporate their proposed water amenities with the city docking facility located east of the railroad tracks.
3. The approval is for 140 rooms or suites.
4. The owner/developer will make every attempt to encourage franchise retail establishments.
5. Provide planters, to be approved by the Planning and Community Development Director, along the existing building frontages on 10th Street and 4th Avenue.

Ms. Barcus asked about the stipulation relating to extensive landscaping of the Architectural Review Board, and Ms. Seewer advised that the applicant would still have to comply with that stipulation.

The Chair stated for the record that the amenities package was definitely very attractive and would be a great boon to the City as a viable public/private partnership that would be mutually beneficial. Ms. Gauffillet encouraged City Council and whoever would be involved in the future to explore it.

Mr. Yearick moved, with a second by Mr. Thompson, to approve SU.07.0044 with the following stipulations:

1. The 3-tier parking garage will be constructed prior to issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy as per the plans approved by the Architectural Review Board. Any deviation in the plans determined to be significant by the Building Official will require additional review by the Architectural Review Board.
2. The applicant will work with City staff for design and construction to incorporate their proposed water amenities with the city docking facility located east of the railroad tracks.

3. The approval is for 140 rooms or suites.
4. The owner/developer will make every attempt to encourage franchise retail establishments.
5. Provide planters, to be approved by the Planning and Community Development Director, along the existing building frontages on 10th Street and 4th Avenue.

Motion carried unanimously.

MA.08.0021 WARD 4 NEIGHBORHOOD 1.01 RS

Request of Bradenton Riverfront Partners II, LLC, owner, for approval of a Planned Development Major Amendment for an updated mix of uses for a project known as Promenade at Riverwalk located at 714 3rd Avenue West (Zoned PDP)

Ms. Seewer read the request.

Ed Vogler, Esquire, 1771 Manatee Avenue West, stated that he was present as a principal of one of the developers and also in his capacity as a Land Use Attorney. He presented a modification of the existing approved plan changing one building from 15 stories to five stories and allowing for the immediate development of a high-end senior apartment building with construction expected to commence in April, 2008. Mr. Vogler said they were re-adding a hotel to this project. He commented that a hotel was originally planned on the site now occupied by the Manatee Players so it had to be relocated. He remarked that they were also planning for the eventual relocation of Art Center of Manatee from the current building on the corner of 9th Street and 3rd Avenue to a new building next to the Manatee Players. He reviewed the history of the site.

Ron Allen, 1001 3rd Avenue West, Suite 600, partner in Riverfront Partners, presented a site plan of what had occurred on the site to date as well as a plan with the proposed changes. He explained that all the infrastructure, water, sewer, and storm had been completed other than those specific to each of the buildings. Mr. Allen noted that the central lake functioned as the storm water retention on the property.

Bob Hatfield stated that he was a joint venture partner with Jan Smith in developing the 216 unit apartments called Main Street Apartments and a 36 unit, five story condo building called Main Street Condos. He said they were developing a 115 unit condo building called River Dance and the next phase, Parc Riverwalk, would be developed with the joint venture partner, Parc Communities from Atlanta, Georgia. Mr. Hatfield advised that it was a subsidiary of John Williams, who started Post Properties, a New York Stock Exchange REIT, which provided a very high-end apartment community for active seniors. He showed renderings of what the project would look like.

Jan Smith, Suite 300, 1001 3rd Avenue West, was sworn in by Ms. Kahl. He stated that as a local person, he was proud of what had been done. Mr. Smith said that they had the financing, they had the partner, and they were ready to go. He commented that they just needed the Planning Commission's help, and he asked for its approval.

Mr. Vogler said that getting Parc Communities was a major coup for Bradenton. He remarked that there were considerable amounts of wealth in this community looking to stay here and not leave to St. Petersburg or Sarasota. Mr. Vogler opined that in addition there were people of means who would like to live this lifestyle who would locate to Bradenton. He commented that Manatee Players were happy with the land given to them and for putting into place what could be some of its strongest and most dedicated patrons. He advised that the units would rent from \$2,900.00 to \$4,500.00 a month and included most of the meals as well as the recreational amenities within the building which were very high end and would be a credit to the project. Mr. Vogler said they were collaborating with the Art Center of Manatee which was difficult because fund raising was hard for "not for profits". He noted that their company, Bradenton Riverfront Partners, and the Art Center

had collaborated with Fawley Bryant Architects to develop an initial concept plan and schematic for what the building could look like and how it would interrelate as a cultural center. He noted that that footprint was reflected on the plan next to the Players building. He remarked that readily accessible parking was needed, and as a result of a three party agreement that existed with the City, the Riverfront Partners and the Manatee Players, the City committed to build an event parking facility to support the cultural center with 130 parking spaces east of the railroad tracks. He stated that under that agreement the event parking would be made available for the Manatee Players which were typically evening events, except for Sunday matinees, and for the off times to provide public parking for Rossi Park and Monument Park. Mr. Vogler discussed a study done by Urban Resource Group and its recommendations. He stated they were now in a position to go forward with the retail which included restaurants, office components and a bank building.

Mr. Vogler answered questions of the Commission regarding the design of the storm water pond, the infrastructure, the concept rendering of the bank building, and functional open space.

The Chair asked who owned the land where the Art Center sat and what would become of it. Ms. Gaufillet remarked that it was a prime location being a gateway to the City.

Mr. Vogler advised that the land was owned by the City and leased to the Art Center for one dollar a year. He said there were twenty-two years left on the lease. Mr. Vogler stated that after that lease went away, the land was leased to Riverfront Partners. In other words, Mr. Vogler explained that the City owned the land; the land was leased to Riverfront Partners subject to the rights of the Art Center of Manatee to stay there for the balance of its lease term.

The Chair asked when Mr. Vogler would take over that lease, the end of the twenty-two years or upon completion and relocation of the new Arts Center.

Mr. Vogler responded the only expectation was that Riverfront Partners would get the lease after twenty-two years; anything else required the consent of the Art Center. Mr. Vogler noted that the lease extended all the way to the central driveway.

Ms. Barcus asked that after the Arts Center's lease was up, whether Mr. Vogler's group would get the lease for one dollar a year.

Mr. Vogler responded in the negative. He added that he was in the middle of negotiations with the Art Center which would give the Art Center the land at the corner of 7th Street and 3rd Avenue for the new building and hundreds of thousands of dollars as a contribution toward fund raising; but, he interjected that the Art Center needed to raise a lot more money to build the type of building it wanted. Mr. Vogler remarked that the long term design for that corner would be to integrate that entry into the project to Old Main Street. He explained that it had to work so that pedestrians could come up and down Old Main Street, come down 3rd, pass the hotel, enter in a very convenient way to the project and come down into the Beer Garden and Entertainment Center and end up at the Players. He said the whole concept of new urbanism was summed up in one phrase, "park once". He stated that individuals should be able to park once and walk to the things they enjoyed.

Responding to Ms. Gaufillet's comments, Mr. Vogler stated that there would be two buildings, one already existing, which would face Rossi Park. He remarked that he was in a unit on the fourth floor of River Dance Condominiums and he watched. He noted that most of the pedestrian activity occurred along the Promenade. Mr. Vogler pointed out that the sidewalk ran along the River and then there was grass which had been graded, planted and treed all the way up to the project boundary. He did not concur with Ms. Gaufillet's statement that the public was intimidated about coming through the grassy area. He said if that were true, he could visualize a solution by a meandering sidewalk where people would be invited to walk from the clock tower area, from the

lake area, and through the grass which had little elliptical curve outs for benches. He said there was no impediment whatsoever for the public to walk in this area; if so, it was a concern in someone's mind and such concerns should be resolved by design. Mr. Vogler commented that the amphitheater was there, and he could not understand how anyone would not think it was not a public facility.

Ms. Gaufillet commented that she understood Mr. Vogler's view, but she felt it was unclear to the average user that the grass area was not associated with the residents only.

Mr. Vogler said he would work with the City to make sure that was not the case, but the reality was that there had not been a lot of use and it had not been tested. He commented that if the entertainment complex was created in the center of the project, it would draw the people right down the sidewalks to the heart of the project. He stated it was important that it was inviting for the public to come through whether they walk over the grass or walk on the sidewalks because they were trying to put retailers in the middle of the project who would want to sell to the public. Mr. Vogler remarked everything that had been done, had been done to be sensitive to the public.

The Chair noted that angled parking spaces were proposed on one of the main drive aisles. Ms. Gaufillet stated that many times this Planning Commission had not supported those. She said that there was a stipulation stating that a parking plan would be provided and approved by the City. The Chair asked staff whether those angled spaces would be addressed as part of that stipulation.

Ms. Seewer responded that parking was staff's only concern which was the reason for the stipulation so staff could meet with the applicant's team and come to a consensus. She said staff was opposed to parking on the 7th Street entrances. Ms. Seewer commented that staff was presently leaning toward not allowing parking on the east side but allowing it on the west side. She noted where a vehicle came out was not as crucial, and there would not be a problem with stacking because a vehicle could go out another way. Ms. Seewer pointed out that this was an evolving plan. She advised that the applicants would come back building by building, and the ratios would change on open space and recreation. She remarked that many things the Commission saw on the plan today would not look like that on the next plan. Ms. Seewer stated as far as the plan itself, she felt the "ducks were in a row", and the applicants were in a hurry to get approval to get the project moving. She said that staff worked with the applicants daily.

The Chair said she wanted it made known on the record that she was quite opposed to that parking because she did not feel it was the safest situation. Ms. Gaufillet stated that the last thing any project of this caliber needed, which had the potential of being fabulous, was to put a dark cloud over it, and she felt that was what those parking spaces did.

Mr. Buskirk inquired about the covered walkways on major streets.

Mr. Vogler stated that the company to which he was a part, Bradenton Riverpark Partners, was the master developer of this site. He said the reason he took so much time in showing the planning studies, goals and themes was because they would have control over the whole site and would require all users to comply with their design criteria. He pointed out that one of the criteria was that they have livable, walkable roadways with a significant portion of them covered with shelters.

Public Hearing:

The Chair opened the public hearing for those wishing to speak in favor or in opposition, and the following individual appeared:

Scott Hahlen, 3302 67th Street West, stated that he had a lot of questions having followed this project for years. Mr. Hahlen said he owned his property for 40 years. He remarked that he

wanted to see the project succeed and to move forward as soon as possible, but from what he had heard, there did not seem to be enough land for all the things that were planned west of the railroad track. He said originally he heard the hotel was going to be out by 301/41 and it had been moved over here. Mr. Hahlen questioned the necessity for a bank when Wachovia was one-half block away. He opined that he could not see all this being opened to the public because he did not see how anyone could get in and out because the area was very user unfriendly now. He remarked that he resented the 4th of July fireworks display because there was a security force around the condo, and one man almost got arrested for trying to use the restroom. He stated that did not seem user friendly to him. Mr. Hahlen said the plan was wonderful with a lot of ideas but he did not see how all those ideas could be crammed in there.

There being no further individuals wishing to speak, the Chair closed the Public Hearing.

Public Works -

Mr. Cummings stated that Public Works staff met with the engineer and the developer and worked out some issues with the relocation of the lift station. He noted there were some concerns about traffic circulation, some of which have been resolved, but on-street parking was a problem which he would like to see remedied, and sanitation service would have to be addressed with the new construction plans.

The Chair asked Mr. Cummings if he were responding to all on-street parking.

Mr. Cummings responded he was just referring to the entry of 7th Street.

Fire Department -

Fire Marshal Langston stated that most of the Fire Department issues have been addressed and others would be addressed at construction. He advised that he had a meeting scheduled with the architect and engineer to go over some further changes in the plan for fire protection.

Staff Report-

Ms. Seewer stated that Planning and Community Development was originally recommending a continuance because of some issues it had when going over the plan; but, consensus was reached so that staff could recommend approval with stipulations. She pointed out that any stipulation relating to parking had been eliminated so that they could get together and do the parking at one time. Ms. Seewer read the stipulations as follows:

1. The Building 8 setback area shall be planted with enhanced landscaping to assure compatibility with the adjacent waterfront park. The exterior of Building 8 shall be approved by the Administrative Official in his/her reasonably exercised discretion for exterior building finishes, materials, and articulation of elevations.
2. Building 8 shall be used for independent living, senior residential housing only. The use may only be changed upon demonstration to the Administrative Official and receipt of his/her approval that not less than 2.1 parking spaces per unit are provided. During the period that Building 8 is used for independent living, senior residential housing only, Building 8 shall provide not less than one (1) parking space per unit or one hundred forty eight (148) parking spaces.
3. Landscape treatments shall exceed the minimum requirements of the LUDR and meet the approval of the Administrative Official, and will be required around all building footprints and the perimeter of the project. A final landscape plan shall be submitted with construction drawings for approval.

4. A hurricane evacuation plan has been submitted. Prior to issuance of a building permit for any individual residential building, the hurricane evacuation plan must be approved by Emergency Management.
5. Sewer and water utility manholes and valves shall not be located under parking spaces. To the extent possible (excluding existing), sewer and water utility lines shall not be located under parking spaces. Drainage pipes and conveyances shall be permitted to be constructed under parking spaces.
6. The hotel pool and deck area along 3rd Avenue West shall maintain a setback of not less than ten (10) feet from the south property line.
7. Non-internal dumpster locations for each building shall be approved as part of the site improvement permit. Location and configuration of dumpster sites must provide reasonable collection vehicle access.
8. The fire protection systems for Building 8 shall be enhanced in lieu of providing additional access through the park. Such systems shall be approved by the fire marshal as part of the issuance of a building permit.
9. A temporary stabilized emergency access with controlled access barrier shall be provided through the cul de sac area with connection to 9th Street West. Such connection may be removed when other acceptable emergency circulation is established to the satisfaction of the fire marshal.
10. The parking area south of Building 11 shall be redesigned to provide 9 x 18 parking spaces with a stop or curb, and a minimum aisle width of 24 feet.
11. An access drive shall be provided on the east side of the parking garage adjacent to the sewer lift station to provide access for service to the sewer lift station.
12. The proposed parking garage will be co-designed with the residential building.
13. The applicants will meet with staff to review and finalize an overall parking plan prior to the City Council meeting.
14. The park acreage will be removed, or identified as "Park Easement Area".

Ms. Seewer stated that she realized the stipulations were not supposed to deal with parking, but the reason it was addressed in stipulation #2 was that they were required to have one space per unit for senior housing. She noted that part of the parking discussion they were going to have was how the applicants were going to regulate parking. She said it was going to be monitored, and if a parking problem arose, the applicants verbally committed to adding additional parking.

The Chair commented that a ten story reduction was a lot of density left on the table.

Ms. Seewer stated that the density was the same. She said it was not changing and that was why the building footprint was taking up so much more room. She commented that 148 units had been proposed for the 15 story and there would still be 148 units, but they would be smaller and spread out a little more.

Ms. Barcus moved, with a second by Mr. Yearick, that MA.08.0021 be approved with the following 14 stipulations:

1. The Building 8 setback area shall be planted with enhanced landscaping to assure compatibility with the adjacent waterfront park. The exterior of Building 8 shall be approved by the Administrative Official in his/her reasonably exercised discretion for exterior building finishes, materials, and articulation of elevations.
2. Building 8 shall be used for independent living, senior residential housing only. The use may only be changed upon demonstration to the Administrative Official and receipt of his/her approval that not less than 2.1 parking spaces per unit are provided. During the period that Building 8 is used for independent living, senior residential housing only, Building 8 shall provide not less than one (1) parking space per unit or one hundred forty eight (148) parking spaces.
3. Landscape treatments shall exceed the minimum requirements of the LUDR and meet the approval of the Administrative Official, and will be required around all building footprints and the perimeter of the project. A final landscape plan shall be submitted with construction drawings for approval.
4. A hurricane evacuation plan has been submitted. Prior to issuance of a building permit for any individual residential building, the hurricane evacuation plan must be approved by Emergency Management.
5. Sewer and water utility manholes and valves shall not be located under parking spaces. To the extent possible (excluding existing), sewer and water utility lines shall not be located under parking spaces. Drainage pipes and conveyances shall be permitted to be constructed under parking spaces.
6. The hotel pool and deck area along 3rd Avenue West shall maintain a setback of not less than ten (10) feet from the south property line.
7. Non-internal dumpster locations for each building shall be approved as part of the site improvement permit. Location and configuration of dumpster sites must provide reasonable collection vehicle access.
8. The fire protection systems for Building 8 shall be enhanced in lieu of providing additional access through the park. Such systems shall be approved by the fire marshal as part of the issuance of a building permit.
9. A temporary stabilized emergency access with controlled access barrier shall be provided through the cul de sac area with connection to 9th Street West. Such connection may be removed when other acceptable emergency circulation is established to the satisfaction of the fire marshal.
10. The parking area south of Building 11 shall be redesigned to provide 9 x 18 parking spaces with a stop or curb, and a minimum aisle width of 24 feet.
11. An access drive shall be provided on the east side of the parking garage adjacent to the sewer lift station to provide access for service to the sewer lift station.
12. The proposed parking garage will be co-designed with the residential building.
13. The applicants will meet with staff to review and finalize an overall parking plan prior to the City Council meeting.
14. The park acreage will be removed, or identified as "Park Easement Area".

Motion carried unanimously by a vote of 5-0.

Mr. Yearick left the meeting.

SU.08.0050 WARD 1 NEIGHBORHOOD 12.04 RS

Request of City of Bradenton, owner, for Special Use approval for a public boat ramp to be located at Manatee Avenue West and Palma Sola Causeway

Ms. Seewer read the request.

Seth Kohn, City Engineer, presented the proposal advising that the City and County were involved in a joint partnership to beautify the Palma Sola Causeway. He noted that this was being facilitated by the Palma Sola Scenic Highway Corridor Management Entity. Mr. Kohn requested approval of construction of the boat ramp, dock, and parking lot. He advised that it had been approved by the Board of County Commissioners on February 12, 2008. Mr. Kohn commented that the County was willing to provide up to \$70,565.00 which would be well in excess of what it cost to build. Mr. Kohn remarked that the City's contribution would be the construction and maintenance of a parking lot. Mr. Kohn pointed out that the problem was getting it done expediently because of the winter tides. He said it would be built according to Florida Department of Transportation standards and all the environmental permits were in place.

Ms. Barcus asked when the northeast boat ramp would be discontinued.

Mr. Kohn stated that this boat ramp would probably be constructed first and then the northeast boat ramp would be taken out. He said part of the agreement was for the City to remove the northeast boat ramp.

The Chair asked whether Mr. Kohn anticipated that people would still try to use it.

Mr. Kohn said he did not give that much thought, but he could see signage and bollards placed there so people would get it pretty quick. He said it would also be well publicized.

Mr. Buskirk asked about water safety provisions for swimmers, such as, buoys stating no swimming within a certain radius, etc.

Mr. Kohn remarked that Mr. Buskirk had a good point which he would certainly take into consideration.

Public Hearing:

The Chair opened the Public Hearing for those wishing to speak, and the following appeared:

Ingrid McClellan, P. O. Box 14426, Bradenton, Florida 34280, Executive Director of Keep Manatee Beautiful and the Chairperson of the Palma Sola Scenic Highway Corridor Management Entity, explained that the latter designation was given by the Florida Department of Transportation. She pointed out that once a highway received a scenic highway designation, the body that implemented its concept was called a corridor entity and the name of the scenic highway preceded it. Ms. McClellan explained that method was universal in Florida. Ms. McClellan said that in response to Mr. Kohn's comments, bollards would be placed on the northeast shoreline as part of the landscape which was in progress now to prevent drivers to go beyond the trees, and signage for safety would be included. Ms. McClellan read a letter of support from the Palma Sola Scenic Highway Corridor Management Entity.

There being no further individuals wishing to speak, the Chair closed the Public Hearing.

Public Works -

Mr. Cummings said he was okay with it.

Fire Department -

Fire Marshal Langston stated he had no objections.

Staff Report-

Ms. Seewer stated that staff recommended approval.

Ms. Barcus stated that she would like to clarify that when the Causeway was built by the Department of Transportation, it was not built as a beach even though it was continuously used as such. She said it was built as a roadway, not a swimming hole, and she favored the cautionary signs about swimming.

The Chair opined that the traffic design was lacking. She stated she felt a refuge lane was needed in the middle of the road or else accidents would be invited; however, for the greater good and need for a boat ramp so it shall be.

Ms. Barcus moved, with a second by Mr. Thompson, to approve SU.08.0050. Motion carried unanimously by a vote of 4-0.

Ms. Barcus left the meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

CP.08.0024 AMENDMENTS TO EAR BASED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Ms. Seewer advised that this area of the Agenda had been set for citizen comments for the Comprehensive Plan which would be considered for incorporation to the EAR Based Comprehensive Plan. She stated that an adoption date of October, 2008 was anticipated for the revised Comprehensive Plan. Next month, Ms. Seewer noted the Design Element and perhaps the Public Transportation Element would be presented. No one appeared to make a comment.

Ms. Seewer introduced Karen Ahaira, Mr. Polk's new assistant.

COMMISSION COMMENTS

Green Building

The Chair stated that she owed Mr. Yearick a plug for the information incorporated into the Commission Members' packets relating to green building and development.

Mr. Polk said there was a large amount of support for green building from City Council already. He commented that it appeared to be a national goal, and it would be part of the Comp Plan Design Element.

Ms. Seewer advised that a resolution would have to be passed to allow the City to start the process to become green certified. She said it was very extensive and would take a lot of work and man power which was why the City was waiting until the Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Regulations were done before working on green certification.

The Chair said she hoped the City would look into economic incentives that could be provided.

Mr. Polk replied that was being considered.

Other

The Chair stated that not having a full board or strong membership was becoming a point of contention with some of the Commission Members.

Ms. Seewer stated that she would look over the By-Laws as it pertained to missed meetings.

Mr. Polk commented that he was more used to the Planning Commission being more of the process and providing leadership with regard to what the trends were and where the City needed to go and then advising City Council of those trends.

Adjournment

Mr. Thompson moved, with a second by Mr. Buskirk, to adjourn the meeting at 4:45 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Lucienne Gaufillet
Chairman

PURSUANT TO FLORIDA STATUTE 286.0105, IF ANY PERSON DECIDES TO APPEAL ANY DECISION MADE BY THE BOARD, COUNCIL, AGENCY OR COMMISSION AT THIS MEETING, SUCH PERSON WILL NEED A RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS, AND FOR SUCH PURPOSE, MAY NEED TO WHICH THE APPEAL IS TO BE BASED.

Note: This is not a verbatim record. A recorded CD is available upon request for a \$10.00 <i>service charge</i> .
--