



applicant that the workshop has been cancelled due to a lack of participation by more than five of the notified property owners.

Sec. 30-350(b)(3)

The applicant must provide the opportunity for conduct a workshop to inform neighboring property owners of the proposed application. The workshop must be held in a location accessible to the public. The applicant must provide notification by mail to all owners of property located within 400 feet of the subject property and to all neighborhood associations registered with the city.

1. The applicant may provide the notification in the form of a workshop to be held if five or more meeting notices are returned to the applicant requesting the workshop, except for those developments proposed in any redevelopment district or any special area plan district. Any property owner may choose to hold the public workshop rather than scheduling the workshop based upon the number of workshop requests received.
2. If the proposed development is located in a community redevelopment district or in a special area plan district, there shall be a neighborhood workshop regardless of the number of workshop requests returned and the workshop shall be held at the Civic Design Center. Staff shall provide a regular meeting schedule for neighborhood workshops at the Civic Design Center and shall assist developers in scheduling their proposal on the Design Center agenda. These meetings may occur anytime after 5 p.m. until 10 p.m. A landscape architect or architect, designated by the City Manager, shall take neighborhood comment and offer design review of the proposal.

The city manager or designee shall provide mailing labels to the applicant. The applicant must mail these notices with proper postage at least 14 days before the workshop. In the event a workshop is cancelled due to lack of interest, the applicant shall provide a written cancellation to the four or fewer persons that may have responded. The applicant must also advertise the workshop in a newspaper of general circulation at least 14 days before the workshop. The City manager or designee will develop specifications for this advertisement.

### **Consent Agenda Process**

Sec. 30-348 prescribes the procedures for quasi-judicial hearings. Certain development plans, because of the scale of development and or a proposed location in areas remote from residential neighborhoods, when submitted in conformance with all the requirements of the City's Code of Ordinances, while properly before the board for a quasi-judicial proceeding, are straightforward and without controversy. These plans often do not require further board discussion. All of the development plans on the agenda are submitted to the board in written and graphic format and are, therefore, subject to review by each board member.

Staff may recommend to the board in preparing the draft agenda that certain plans may be approved by consent of the board as a group. This process would relieve the board of unnecessary discussion and, therefore, allow more discussion before the board of those plans for which there are concerns. A consent agenda process could allow any board member or any citizen to request that the board remove an item proposed for action by consent at the time of adoption of the agenda and for such item to be placed on the agenda for discussion at the board's discretion. The appropriate reviewing boards shall provide a procedure for review of development applications by consent of the board without further discussion when an application is deemed complete by the staff and the proposal falls within the scope of Minor Review II as prescribed in Sec. 30-159.

### **Notice of development plan review**

The proposed level of review for "Minor Review II" is proposed as a level of review that requires board approval. For this reason, Sec. 30-351(d)(1) should be amended to specifically identify notice for these items. The proposed notice would be the same notice for all other similar items for board review.

(1). Notice of development plan review shall include:

- a. Concept review;
- b. Preliminary plans and final review for intermediate and major development plans.
- c. Minor development II development plans.

### **Development Review Board Membership**

The City Government Sub-Committee recommended slotted positions for architect, landscape architect, finance/business, traffic engineer, urban planner, historic preservation specialist and engineer. The Economic Development Committee recommended that the slotted positions for the DRB include a citizen at large position.

In order to meet the committee's concerns, staff recommends that the desired members be amended to include an urban planner, a historic preservation specialist and a citizen at large. The position listed for the real estate or development category could be expanded to finance and business by simply listing that category as finance and business, which would include real estate and development.

(The second amendment by substitution motion on 1/24/05 stated that a natural scientist be included on the DRB, but that position is clearly identified in current code.)

Sec. 30-352(b)

*(b) Membership*

(1) The board shall have seven members appointed by the city commission. Any interested citizen may be appointed to the board, but, whenever possible, the board should include at least one from each of the following:

- a. An architect or landscape architect;
- b. A civil engineer;
- c. A person engaged in ~~real estate sales or development~~ business or finance;
- d. A professional with experience in natural or environmental sciences.
- e. An urban planner;
- f. A historic preservation specialist;
- g. A citizen at large.

**Impact on Affordable Housing**

None.

Respectfully submitted,



Ralph Hilliard  
Planning Manager

RH:CRM



# City of Gainesville

City Hall  
200 East University Avenue  
Gainesville, Florida 32601

## Master

**File Number: 040503**

**File Number:** 040503

**File Type:** Discussion Item

**Status:** To Be Introduced

**Version:** 0

**Reference:**

**Controlling Body:** City Commission

**File Name:** Development Review Process Recommendations (B)

**Introduced:** 1/24/2005

**Requester:**

**Cost:**

**Final Action:**

**Title:** Development Review Process - Special Meeting (B)

**Sponsors:**

**Notes:**

**Indexes:**

**Attachments:** 040503\_200501241300.pdf

### History of Legislative File

Version:	Acting Body:	Date:	Action:	Sent To:	Due Date:	Return Date:	Result:
0	Economic Development/University Community Com	10/5/2004	Discussed				



# City of Gainesville

City Hall  
200 East University Avenue  
Gainesville, Florida 32601

## Master

File Number: 040503

---

**Action Note:** The EDUCC discuss the City Government Committee's recommendations for Development Review Process (DRP).

1) The City Government Committee recommended that staff provide more information to citizens participating in the FIRST STEP Process about what materials they could bring to first step in order to have the most productive first step meeting. This has been implemented. The City Government Committee also recommended that staff develop a firm cycle for minor reviews (the staff-level reviews of smaller projects), with clear cut-off dates and turnaround times, just as the City has for larger projects that go to the Development Review Board (DRB). This has also been implemented.

2) Create a cycle for minor reviews.

Planning department developed a trial minor review cycle in July 2004, holding two minor review cycles a month.

3) The City Government Committee recommended eliminating neighborhood meetings. (The Committee is proposing a different type of informal early meeting on design input for projects in some areas.) The Committee recommended creating a consent agenda process for the Development Review Board, much like the City Commission has for items unlikely to generate controversy or need discussion.

4) Create a consent agenda process applicable to the City of Gainesville Development Review Board (DRB) and Plan Board.

The EDUCC has deferred decision to create a consent agenda process applicable to the City of Gainesville Development Review Board and Plan Board until the restructure of the DRP has been finalized.

5) The City Government Committee recommended that the development review process be restructured. The Committee's recommendation is that the City offer a FIRST STEP meeting continue to be at the beginning of the process. The Committee also recommended that thresholds be raised so that projects of considerably larger size be reviewed and approved administratively by staff, so that only projects of 20 houses or more, 50 multifamily units or more, 10,000 or more square feet of commercial, or 5 acres or more of industrial, go to the DRB for discussion and hearings. The City Government Committee recommends that projects in the urban core (those covered by the Special Area Plans or within the Community Redevelopment Agency districts) be required to meet with a landscape architect or architect (the City would probably need two of each on contract in order to avoid conflicts on specific projects) at the Florida Community Design Center. The meeting could take place prior to application, anytime up to staff's technical review of the application, at the petitioner's convenience as to when the input would be the most productive. The meeting would be suggestions-only. The petitioner could choose any of the meeting times which would be regularly scheduled and noticed, either once every two weeks or once a month at the Design Center, whichever the need turns out to be. Finally, the City Government Committee recommended slotted positions (particular backgrounds) for the DRB members.

EDUCC directed staff to submit recommendations and moved them forward to the City Commission.



# City of Gainesville

City Hall  
200 East University Avenue  
Gainesville, Florida 32601

## Master

File Number: 040503

---

1 City Commission 1/24/2005 Approved as shown above (Second Substitute Motion) Pass

**Action Note:** City of Gainesville Economic Development Director Erik Bredfeldt and Community Development Director Tom Saunders gave a presentation.

Chair Hanrahan recognized Developer John Hudson, Mark Goldstein and Joshua Shatkin who spoke to the matter.

FIRST MOTION: Commissioner Lowe moved and Commissioner Chestnut seconded to approve the Community Development Committee's recommendation.  
(NO VOTE)

AMENDMENT BY SUBSTITUTION MOTION: Commissioner Braddy moved and Commissioner Domenech seconded to: 1) Direct staff to initiate a petition to the City Plan Board to amend the Land Development Code to eliminate site plan review by the Development Review Board (DRB); and 2) direct staff to bring back a conceptual plan for reviewing projects by right, modeled on the County and many progressive cities.  
(VOTE: 2-5 - Commissioner's Braddy and Domenech - Yes; Commissioners Lowe, Chestnut, Nielsen, Bryant and Mayor Hanrahan - No, MOTION FAILED)

WAIVER OF RULES: Commissioner Chestnut moved and Commissioner Lowe seconded to waive the rules to extend the meeting to 11:30 PM.  
(VOTE: 6-1, Mayor Hanrahan - No, MOTION CARRIED)

Chair Hanrahan recognized DRB Member Joshua Shatkin who spoke to the matter.

SECOND AMENDMENT BY SUBSTITUTION MOTION: Commissioner Bryant moved and Commissioner Domenech seconded to adopt the Economic Development/University Community Committee's recommendation with two modifications: 1) Change recommendation 3 to "restructure" neighborhood meetings eliminating the newspaper advertisement and that a neighborhood meeting need not be held if there are not (at least) five responses of those interested in participating; and 2) that a natural scientist be included on the DRB.  
(VOTE: 4-3 - Commissioners Chestnut, Nielsen, Braddy and Bryant - Yes; and Commissioners Lowe, Domenech and Mayor Hanrahan - No, MOTION CARRIED)

Chair Hanrahan recognized Citizen Rob Brinkman who spoke to the matter.

---



# City of Gainesville

## Text File

City Hall  
200 East University Avenue  
Gainesville, Florida 32601

**Introduced:** 1/24/2005

**File Number:** 040503

**Version:** 0

**Status:** To Be Introduced

**..Title**

Development Review Process - Special Meeting (B)

**..Recommendation**

The EDUCC discuss the Inter City Committee's City Government Subcommittee recommendations for Development Review Process: 1) Provide additional information to First Step applicants; 2) Create a cycle for minor reviews; 3) Eliminate neighborhood meetings; 4) Create a consent agenda process applicable to the City of Gainesville Development Review Board (DRB) and Plan Board; and 5) Restructure the development review process as indicated.