

Roland, Margie L.**050158e**

From: Bob Cohen [bobcohen@ivs.edu]
Sent: Sunday, July 17, 2005 8:04 PM
To: Mimms, Dean L.; Roland, Margie L.
Subject: FW: Plan Board Meeting Thursday 7/21 6:30--Please distribute

Dean

I received this email from my neighborhood association. Since the matter is coming up at the Plan Board I thought I should share this with you for consideration of sharing with other plan board members. I did not attend the neighborhood association meeting for the discussion of this topic.

Bob

From: JASlib@cs.com [mailto:JASlib@cs.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 17, 2005 5:25 PM
To: dhurtak@ufl.edu; booksinc@bellsouth.net; schnell@ufl.edu; hdavis@nersp.nerdc.ufl.edu; MarkGoldstein@gru.net; dellam@ufl.edu; dcw@math.ufl.edu; sheajoy.net@netscape.net; bstudy@gator.net; bishopcj@gru.net; cdenny@pandionsystems.com; acupam@bellsouth.net; bhaktic@bellsouth.net; bobcohen@ivs.edu; twitchell@law.ufl.edu; pdonnelly@laborattorneys.org
Cc: thibeau48@bellsouth.net; rebmann@bellsouth.net; PTWHE1122@aol.com; piano@ufl.edu; penny@gru.net; susan@sugarfoot.org; MaggieAUSA@MAIL.sfcc.net; Cravehy@aol.com; EDWAR66@attglobal.net; ldavid@english.ufl.edu; emilch1053@yahoo.com; gbswest@fdt.net
Subject: Plan Board Meeting Thursday 7/21 6:30--Please distribute

Dear Concerned Citizens:

The Plan Board will consider Petition 107TCH-05PB (see attached summary) this Thursday and will likely make a recommendation to the City Commission, who will eventually vote on it as well.

This collection of changes to the City's Development Review process includes raising thresholds (e.g., square feet, # of units, etc.) of projects that will be considered "administratively by staff" instead of going to the Development Review Board for consideration. See Page 2 of the summary for these specific proposed changes.

The petition also significantly diminishes the neighborhood workshop requirement (see discussion beginning on Page 4 of the attachment). The University Park Neighborhood Association (UPNA) is most concerned about this particular proposal (see our November 04 letter to the Commission pasted below).

There are also proposed changes to the Development Review Board (starting on Page 6).

These are major changes in the way citizens can have input on development going on their neighborhoods and around the City. I urge you to attend or contact the Plan Board or the Commission with your concerns. Please share with other concerned individuals and neighborhoods.

Clerk's Office:

Phone: 334-5015
 Fax: (352) 334-2036
clerks@cityofgainesville.org

City Commission:

CityComm@cityofgainesville.org (same phone and fax as above)

Thanks,

7/18/2005

Joe Schmid

November 16, 2004

07-13-05A08:45 RCVD

Mayor Hanrahan
Commissioners Braddy, Bryant, Chestnut, Domenech, Lowe, Nielsen
City of Gainesville
P.O. Box 490, Station 19
Gainesville, Florida 32602-0490

Dear Mayor and Commissioners:

This is to request that you support neighborhood/developer workshops. Recommendations currently being considered by the Economic Development/University Community Committee to "streamline" and accelerate Gainesville's development procedures proposes to cut neighborhoods out of the planning and implementation process for new developments.

This would be a stunning setback for every residential section of the city.

There is considerable evidence that our current ordinance is working well. Developers are required to have a meeting with the neighborhood to discuss their plans. This process has proven its worth both to neighborhoods, the city and surprisingly to developers. The meeting our neighborhood and others have had with apartment and commercial developers have been useful and cordial, resulting in a better understanding of the plan and useful input resulting often in voluntary modifications that benefit all concerned.

For example, recently a major creek and lineal park running along NW 8th Avenue was preserved by neighborhood efforts with the developer and city. We would not have known of the plans had it not been for the required neighborhood workshop. In other workshops with developers, local roads were protected from unnecessary traffic, parking plans were improved, and traffic flow and signalization was proposed and adopted. Many other small but meaningful changes have been adopted as a direct result of the required workshops.

We understand that some developers would like do away with this requirement. We also understand that some developers have criticized the required workshops as poorly attended and of little use. In fact neighborhood boards may only send a few representatives to the meeting but they are usually well informed, positive in their attitude toward well-thought-out development, and always report back to the residents.

We know that there is an expense to have a meeting with an affected neighborhood or their leaders. But it can be far more expensive to eliminate communication with affected parties. Homeowners can be confused and even antagonized when they become aware, after-the-fact, of changes that impact their homes and lives. Even when a neighborhood meeting does not result in consensus, the feeling is that city hall respects its neighborhoods.

Neighborhood/developer meetings are not a problem in our town. There is strong evidence to demonstrate that fact.

Sincerely,

Diane Hurtak
President

7/18/2005

July 21, 2005

Dear Plan Board Members:

I write to you this evening as a DRB member, but not in representation of the Board itself. I would like to share some thoughts with you regarding Petition 107TCH-05PB:

This Petition would remove certain developments from automatic DRB review. While at first glance, this may seem like an obvious, streamlining measure, it is important to note that as development within the City limits becomes increasingly "infill," a relatively small development can have a disproportionately large impact on surrounding properties. I have no objection to certain items being placed on a Consent Agenda; however, I want the DRB to retain the ability to pull any item off that agenda if any member believes that more discussion is in order.

This Petition would also restructure the neighborhood workshops. I believe that newspaper notice is very important to maintain citizen input into the development of their neighborhoods. Granted, many projects elicit no interest, but the public needs to be well informed in order to be heard on matters that are of great importance. I do agree that if there are very few citizens willing to attend a workshop, that there is no reason to hold a meeting to an empty room, but conversely, a well-attended neighborhood work shop can help the developer identify potential issues before they even come before the DRB.

I believe that citizen participation in the development process should remain a high priority of the City of Gainesville.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

Laura L. Collopy, MSW
Development Review Board Member.

Memo

To: Chair, City Plan Board
From: Michael Castine, Land Planner *MC*
CC: Ralph Hilliard,
Date: July 21, 2005
Re: Consent Agenda Recommendations



As the City Plan Board reviews the proposed text amendment regarding the development review process, the following recommendations are offered to help implement the City Commission's direction regarding the restructuring of the development review process.

Recommendations for Plan Review Consent Agenda

- Because most plans reviewed by staff include conditions, all plans for review by the Plan board should be placed on the consent agenda by default, whether or not conditions are recommended, when applicant and staff agree on the recommendations and proposed conditions.
- If an applicant or Plan Board member wishes to discuss conditions, the item is moved to the regular agenda at the beginning of the meeting when the plan will be reviewed and discussed by the Plan Board.
- If a member of the public has notified staff of specific objections to the conditions recommended for a project, or has requested a formal quasi-judicial hearing, the item is moved to the regular agenda at the beginning of the meeting when the plan will be reviewed and discussed by the Plan Board.

Aug 12, 2005

Dear Mayor and Commissioners,

The DRB feels strongly that our voice should be heard in the evaluation of the development review process. We are concerned about some of the proposed changes which we feel will reduce the level of participation by citizens and protection of our existing neighborhoods and environment. We feel that you need to be very careful in adopting proposed changes to the process. Below are our comments.

Monica Cooper, chair DRB

Restructuring Development Review

DRB Comments:

- 1) The DRB is in agreement with using a consent agenda for all projects less than 10,000 square ft and all multi-family projects of more than 5, but less than 50, units;**
- 2) We disapprove of the 5-acre threshold proposed for " Industrial" projects, and feel that they should be classified by the nature of each operation, by SIC Code, realizing that smaller operations often make greater impact on an area than some larger scale projects;**
- 3) The DRB recommends the review process be changed to include, from the point of initial submittal to the city, a digital submission for a Planning Department-controlled web site. The web site presentation could solicit public review and comment of specific plans in the development review process. The DRB believes a web-based approach could enhance changes proposed to neighborhood meetings and encourage timely receipt of public comment;**
- 4) Signage should be placed at the project site within one day of the filing of an application, and should include a site plan and web site address for the proposed development to benefit neighbors and interested citizens.**

2. **Petition 107TCH-05 PB**

City of Gainesville. Amend the City of Gainesville Land Development Code by creating criteria for level of review for minor plans that will be subject to the consent agenda process of the Development Review Board and amending thresholds that determine level of review; restructure the neighborhood workshop requirements; eliminate the requirement for an advertisement in a newspaper of general circulation and add an architectural/design consultant procedure for development located in community re-development areas; revise the background and expertise requirements of the persons who may serve as development review board members; and amend notice of development plan review to provide notice for certain minor plans, and definitions, creating a definition for developed industrial areas.

Mr. Tom Saunders, Director of Community Development, was recognized. Mr. Saunders explained that the City Commission and a number of civic and business leaders went to the City of Norfolk and looked at various development models. He indicated that they then formed the City Government Committee, an Ad Hoc committee to review the current development review process in the City, and made recommendations for changes. He explained that the City Government Committee made recommendations to the Economic Development Committee, a standing committee of the City Commission. He indicated that the Economic Development Committee reviewed the development process, as did the Community Development Committee, also a standing committee. Mr. Saunders explained that some of the changes in the process had already been implemented. He noted that the committees also reviewed the neighborhood notification process. He indicated that a major change was a proposed consent agenda process for the Development Review Board on mid-sized projects. He noted, however, any board member could remove an item from the consent agenda and bring it to the regular agenda for discussion. Mr. Saunders described the existing development process and noted that a major change was that the thresholds for petitions coming to the Development Review Board regular agenda would be much higher. He explained that in the Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) areas or special area plan areas, the current neighborhood meeting process would change to a meeting with an architect and landscape architect for advisory only design input. Mr. Saunders reviewed the recommendations of the Economic Development Committee and Community Development Committee. He noted that, outside the redevelopment and special area plan areas, the neighborhood workshop requirements would remain, except that the developer would have the option to not hold a meeting if fewer than 5 persons responded to the notification provided for property owners within 400 feet. He explained that, if fewer than 5 persons requested a meeting, the meeting would not have to be held. Mr. Saunders indicated that the biggest change was the thresholds of projects that would go to the Development Review Board for discussion and how mid-sized projects would be placed on the consent agenda. He noted that there were also recommendations about the professional designations of Development Review Board members. He stated that the main goal was to simplify the process.

Mr. Cohen asked if there could be a consent agenda for the Plan Board.

Mr. Saunders explained that Florida State Statutes required a local planning body to review land use and zoning petitions as a citizen's advisory review. He indicated that the Development Review Board was a creation of the community. He noted that there were a number of communities that had boards like the Development Review Board and others did not. He explained that Alachua County had a staff review committee rather than a Development Review Board.

These minutes are not a verbatim account of this meeting. Tape recordings from which the minutes were prepared are available from the Community Development Department of the City of Gainesville.

Mr. Cohen asked where the proposal requiring that 5 persons respond for a neighborhood meeting to be held originated.

Mr. Saunders indicated that it was a compromise. He explained that there was some discussion as to whether the neighborhood meetings were positive. He noted that the average attendance at neighborhood meetings was 5 or 6 people, and many meetings had no attendees. He agreed that many times one person would represent many others.

Mr. Cohen noted that he had attended meetings representing his neighborhood, as did others who represented many people.

Mr. Saunders suggested that many developers would continue to hold the meetings because of the delay waiting for responses under the new system.

Mr. Cohen asked why there was a proposal to eliminate the required newspaper ad for neighborhood meetings.

Mr. Saunders indicated that it was primarily a cost issue. He noted that the mailing and newspaper ad could run \$300 to \$600.

Mr. Reiskind asked the history of requiring notification for property owners within 400 feet, and if the distance was a national standard.

Mr. Saunders indicated that he was not familiar with the origin in Gainesville of using 400 feet.

Mr. Gold asked about the composition of the City Government Sub-Committee. He pointed out that the members listed in his information packet consisted of many developers. He stated that it appeared that the entire petition was designed to facilitate the process for developers. He asked if there were any citizens or people who were not involved in development on any of the committees.

Mr. Saunders explained that the Economic Development/University Community Committee (EDUCC) was a standing committee of the City Commission, and made up of 3 City Commissioners. He noted that the recommendations came to the EDUCC and the Community Development Committee, which was also a standing committee. He noted that the City Government Sub-Committee was made up of various developers and non-voting City staff.

Mr. Gold reiterated that most of the people on the committees appeared to be involved with the development industry, and it appeared that the entire project was geared to facilitate their development.

Mr. Tecler asked if the public was noticed of the meetings of the committees. He also asked the time between the start of a development project and when it came before the board, and if there was an opportunity for citizens to speak on the matter.

Mr. Saunders stated that the committee meetings were noticed. He explained that the public process took place from approximately July 2004 to the City Commission meeting in January. He noted that staff was