

# **City of Gainesville**

*City Hall  
200 East University Avenue  
Gainesville, Florida 32601*



## **Meeting Minutes**

**Thursday, March 1, 2007**

**1:30 PM**

**City Hall, Room 16**

## **Community Development Committee**

*Commissioner Scherwin Henry, Chair  
Commissioner Jack Donovan, Member  
Mayor-Commissioner Pro Tem Craig Lowe, Member/Alternate*

*Persons with disabilities who require assistance to participate in this meeting are requested to notify the Office of Equal Opportunity at 334-5051 or call the TDD phone line at 334-2069 at least two business days in advance.*

## CALL TO ORDER

*The meeting was called to order at 1:30 PM.*

## ROLL CALL

Present: Craig Lowe, Jack Donovan and Scherwin Henry

## ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

*Approved with Modifications*

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

### 060953. Minutes of January 23, 2007 (B)

**RECOMMENDATION** *The Community Development Committee approve the minutes of January 23, 2007.*

**Approved as Recommended**

060953\_20070301.pdf

### 060954. Minutes of February 1, 2007 (B)

**RECOMMENDATION** *The Community Development Committee approve the minutes of February 1, 2007.*

**Approved as Recommended**

060954\_20070301.pdf

## DISCUSSION OF PENDING REFERRALS

### 060910. Temporary Signage at Car Dealerships (B)

*Tom Saunders, Community Development Director, stated that staff met with Ms. Amanda Garman from Sunrise Auto Sales. He explained that Ms. Garman expressed concerns about the City's restrictions on temporary signs, and off-premise signs. Ms. Garman would like the City to change the ordinance to allow more temporary signs during the year.*

*Mr. Ken Sumsmore, owner of a coffee shop, addressed the Committee. He stated that small businesses were the backbone of small communities in America, and that they could not afford most of the start-up costs associated with advertising campaigns. He suggested that new businesses should have a one to two-week reprieve from the sign ordinance in order to get their business up and running. He further suggested that*

*there be strict enforcement of those that abuse the Codes.*

*Chair Henry suggested that the City consider allowing a business to have temporary signs, suspect to standards.*

*Mr. Saunders indicated that relaxing the regulations would open the door to off-premise signs, and then billboards.*

*Tara Young, from Sunrise Auto Sale, addressed the Committee. She suggested that as long as temporary signs were on the owner's property they should be allowed. She noted many businesses have signs regardless of the regulations. She is suggesting that regulations should allow certain businesses to post temporary signs.*

*The owner of Sunrise Auto Sales stated that City regulations were too controlling.*

*Ron Nichols, citizen, stated that there was a purpose to the City's sign ordinance, and having a proliferation of small signs did not serve that purpose.*

*Mr. Goldstein, citizen, stated that the City has spent ten years controlling the problem of signs. He suggested that if the Sign Ordinance were changed, it would create a new set of problems.*

*Mr. Jim Garrett, Code Enforcement Manger, stated that inspectors spend at least ten-percent of their time removing private signs from rights-of-way.*

*Mr. Saunders stated that Code Enforcement has indicated that about 700 signs were removed or cited for violation last year. He explained that the time spent on enforcement would greatly increase if the ordinance were modified to allow temporary signs for more than the allowed days.*

*Marion Radson, City Attorney, noted that the Code did provide for special events and sale signs in some circumstances. He asked if that was sufficient to address the temporary sign issue.*

*Commissioner Donovan stated that he would like staff to provide the Committee with a list of the types of signs allowed and restricted, rationales for those allowances and restrictions, and a brief description of the options Code Enforcement Officers have in dealing with the matter.*

*Commission Lowe pointed out that other communities allowed snipe signs on properties and it was very cluttered. He noted that the proliferation made it difficult to determine which business each sign belonged to. He cautioned the Committee not to relax the standards, but to do what we can to support the citizens*

**RECOMMENDATION** *Staff to provide a report at the next meeting, and also notify the business owners.*

**Approved as Recommended**

060910\_20070301.pdf

**060666.****Building Height, Number of Stories and Special Use Permits (B)**

*Mr. Saunders explained that the Committee made a motion at their last meeting to send to the City Commission an agenda item on the maximum height per floor. He stated that another recommendation going forward to the City Commission is to adjust the heights allowed in UMU-1. He stated that the Committee asked staff to report back on special use criteria.*

*Commissioner Lowe stated that the City needed to be more specific in its Special Use Permit criteria. He suggested that standards should be consistent when applicable to building height. He stated that there are compatibility issues, especially when taller buildings were near single-family homes. He noted that such construction could drastically change the character of the area.*

*Commissioner Donovan asked why the City has Special Use Permits.*

*Mr. Saunders explained that the potential impact of some uses on surrounding neighborhoods is such that a Special Use Permit with specific conditions is required to mitigate that impact.*

*Mr. Radson explained the Special Use Permit process to the Committee.*

**RECOMMENDATION** *Hear a report from staff at the next meeting about height compatibility, and then issue a series of recommendations at the following meetings.*

**Approved as Recommended**

060666\_200611141730.pdf  
060666\_20070123.pdf  
060666\_20070301.pdf  
060666\_200703121300.pdf

**040912****Transportation Concurrency Exception Area (TCEA) Review (B)**

*Mr. Saunders stated that Planning staff attended a meeting with the Mayor, and discussed the amounts the City charges developers in the TCEA process. He stated that staff monitors Alachua County's impact fees.*

*Ralph Hilliard, Planning Manager, explained that the City charged more for commercial development than Alachua County. He noted that the County was reviewing their impact fees and considering a substantial increase. He indicated that this would bring them in line with the City TCEA. He stated that the City Manager was looking into hiring a consultant to review the proportionate fare share ordinance and the Mayor was satisfied that the City was moving in the right direction.*

**RECOMMENDATION** *Community Development Committee to the City Commission - remove this item from the referral list, and staff to continue to monitor Alachua County's impact fees in relation to the City's TCEA standards.*

**Approved as Recommended**

040912\_200712121700.pdf  
040912\_20070123.pdf  
040912\_20070301.pdf

**040180****Principles of Sustainability in Significant Decisions (B)**

**RECOMMENDATION** *Hear a report from staff on: 1) who the new Chair will be; 2) who will be representing GRU; 3) the PowerPoint that was previously given to the City Commission; 4) whether the new clearinghouse committee can provide sustainability goals; and 4) the possibility of a fiscal note on future City Commission agenda items referring to sustainability.*

**Continued**

040180\_20070123.pdf  
040180a\_20070301.pdf  
040180b\_20070301.pdf

**060854.****Healthy City, Healthy Region: An Update - Ten Years Later - January 2007 (B)**

*Commissioner Donovan stated that the Committee should talk about the Rusk Report as soon as possible. He explained that had been attending meetings with the MTPO Subcommittee dealing with the Urban Village. He cited a concern with the manner in which the County was proceeding with development and its impact on the City's plans for redevelopment. He suggested that the City could see deteriorating schools, downtown, housing stock, transportation systems, and property values if the County continued with their plans. Commissioner Donovan suggested that the City needed a dramatic strategy and the Rusk Report would be a stepping stone for those plans. He stated that at the next meeting of the MTPO Subcommittee, they would discuss the Urban Village and take steps on how to implement the plan.*

*Commissioner Lowe stated that the County-Wide and Visioning Planning Committee is the voice of all municipalities, and that there should be joint planning among the municipalities and the County. He stated that since the Urban Village is near the center of the City, it should be annexed into the City.*

*Mr. Saunders stated that staff would review the recommendations from the Rusk report. He noted that in 2004, there were 270 single-family and 180 multi-family units, totaling 450 units approved for construction in the City. He stated that in 2004, the County had 1,100 units. He indicated that, in 2005, the total number of units was 2,042 units, and that the unincorporated County only had 1,200 units. In 2006, the City generated 197 single-family units and 857 multi-family units, totaling 1,054 units (moving further eastward). The County had 1,098 units in 2006. He stated that the City was seeing more traditional urban housing infill on individual lots. He noted that the City has had a long history of making the City and neighborhoods attractive and has allowed a pattern of traditional infill in the City.*

*Dean Mimms, Chief of Comprehensive Planning, reviewed the Charlotte-Mecklenburg*

*joint-planning arrangement with the Committee. He explained that Charlotte-Mecklenburg has had a joint planning commission since 1954. He presented a map of annexation since that time and explained that the entire county was now either a municipality or its sphere of influence. He noted that the county was completely out of the business of planning and zoning. He explained that an area planner and transit planner would go before both City Council and County Commission.*

**RECOMMENDATION** *Staff report on the Rusk Report and flush out the six recommendations.*

**Approved as Recommended**

060854\_200701221300.pdf

## **NEW BUSINESS**

## **NEXT MEETING DATE**

*April 10, 2007 5:30 P.M.*

## **ADJOURNMENT**

*The meeting adjourned at 3:35 P.M.*