

**CITY OF  
GAINESVILLE**

**INTER-OFFICE  
COMMUNICATION**

**DATE:** December 8, 2004  
**TO:** Economic Development/University Community Meeting  
**FROM:** Thomas D. Saunders, Community Development Director  
**SUBJECT:** City Government Subcommittee Recommendations on Development Review Process

---

At the October 5, 2004 special meeting of the Economic Development/University Community Committee, the Committee discussed the recommendations of the City Government Subcommittee of the Norfolk/New Haven Committee, and seemed interested in pursuing most of the City Government Committee's recommendations with certain modifications. Staff was requested to follow up in several areas. The recommendations of the City Government Committee and the follow-up can be summarized as follows:

**First Step – Provide additional information to first step applicants.** *Staff will formalize the provision of information to citizens participating in first step about what materials they should provide at first step. In the interest of flexible customer service, the materials will not be required. Building Inspections staff has created a list of what materials should be brought to first step. Planning staff has created a checklist about issues covered at the first step meetings. Does not require code changes, so being implemented administratively.*

**Create a cycle for minor review.** *This has been implemented. Planning staff has prepared a description of the process. Does not require code changes so implemented administratively.*

**Eliminate Neighborhood Meetings.** *The Economic Development/University Community Committee discussed the low attendance for most neighborhood meetings. Would require Commission action to initiate a petition to the City Plan Board to make this change in Chapter 30.*

**Create a consent agenda process applicable to the City of Gainesville Development Review Board (DRB) and Plan Board.** *Community Development/Planning staff discussed this with the City Attorney's office. A consent agenda could be created for the Development Review Board. It could be a way to handle mid-sized projects that require a full DRB hearing now. Backup would be provided to the DRB, and if pulled from*

---

Community Development Department  
P.O. Box 490, Station 11  
Gainesville, FL 32602-0490  
(352) 334-5022 – (352) 334-2282-fax

*consent by a DRB member upon request of a member (staff could make a recommendation when staff thinks there should be discussion rather than consent action), then the project would be heard as a discussion item. Would not be feasible for the Plan Board because of the Plan Board's statutory obligations to review land use and zoning matters.*

**Restructure the development review process as indicated.** *The Economic Development/University Community Committee members in attendance on October 5, 2004 appeared to generally support the recommendations of the City Government Committee but expressed some question about the extent of the increase in thresholds of projects and how few projects would end up going to the Development Review Board. Planning staff will provide a chart showing how many projects would have gone to the Development Review Board if the City Government Committee's recommendations were implemented. A more moderate increase in thresholds may be the best way to implement initially. A consent agenda for mid-sized projects may reduce meeting lengths and avoid the DRB discussing mid-sized site plans with no controversy or ambiguities.*

The Economic Development/University Community Committee suggested that staff be allowed to bump staff-level reviews up to DRB review if the petition in some way needed that level of review. Staff supports having this option and could prepare criteria.

The City Government Committee recommended that petitioners be required to meet with an architect and landscape architect at the Design Center for design suggestions only--not required changes to the project. Staff recommends this meeting be noticed.

The Economic Development/University Community Committee also discussed requiring concept review by the DRB for larger projects. If EDUCC includes this recommendation in its final recommendations to the City Commission, the same thresholds could be used for this as for the large projects required to go to DRB on the DRB discussion agenda.

The Economic Development Committee also recommended that the slotted positions for DRB should include a citizen at large position.

The referenced memos and chart (first step materials, minor reviews memo, chart showing how many projects would go to DRB under City Government Committee's recommended thresholds) will be distributed at the Economic Development/University Community Committee meeting.

cc: Ralph Hilliard, Planning Manager  
Lawrence Calderon, Chief of Current Planning  
Marion Radson, City Attorney  
Dana Crosby, Assistant City Attorney

# City Government Sub-Committee Recommendations

August 24, 2004

## Committee Members

Chair:

John Fleming

Staff Liaison:

Karen Slevin

Members

James Painter

Mike Castine

Ricardo Cavallino

Phil Emmer

James Stringfellow

Howard Wallace

John Hudson

Bill Warinner

Jack Hughes

Mike Warren

Warren Nielsen

# City Government Sub-Committee

Walter Nielsen

Jack Hughes

John Hudson

Mike Wilson

Bill Wilson

Bill Eubank

James Stauderlow

## Short Term Goals

3. Provide informational packages to all applicants requesting a First Step Meeting. These informational packages should include a checklist of items the applicant should bring to the meeting.



## **City Government Sub-Committee**

### **Short Term Goals**

7. Create a cycle for minor reviews.
8. Immediate elimination of the required “Neighborhood Meeting”.
9. Create a Consent Agenda process for the DRB and Plan Board in order to increase efficiency, and reduce delays caused by continued meetings.



## **City Government Sub-Committee**

### **Short Term Goals**

10. Restructure the development process in order to reduce time and costs to the developer, increase input from professionals resulting in higher standards of construction and design, and further empowering staff to make decisions regarding projects.

# City Government Sub-Committee

