

TOWN OF LONGBOAT KEY  
PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD  
MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING

\*\*\*AUGUST 16, 2011\*\*\*

The special meeting of the Planning and Zoning Board was called to order at 9:00 AM.

Members Present: Chair BJ Webb, Secretary John Wild, Members Walter Hackett, Leonard Garner, George Symanski

Members participating by phone: Members Phineas Alpers, Laurin Goldner

Absent: Vice Chair Allen Hixon, Member Jack Daly,

Also Present: Nancy Stroud, Special Counsel; Kelly Martinson, Assistant Town Attorney; Monica Simpson, Planning, Zoning & Building Director; Steve Schield, Planner; Ric Hartman, Planner; Donna Chipman, Office Manager

AGENDA ITEM #1  
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS

Monica Simpson, Planning, Zoning & Building Director, referred to her memorandum noting it provided all the objectives and policies in the Transportation Element, Future Land Use Element, Capital Improvements Element, and Intergovernmental Coordination Element that may have been impacted by the board's previous discussion and direction provided to staff and the consultants in regards to transportation and changes that were desirable as a result of the changes and requirements initiated by the state. She commented that the board did not have other non-policy changes that would be provided as part of the complete package for the September 13, 2011 meeting. For this meeting, she only wished to provide policy-driven objectives and policy changes.

Nancy Stroud, special counsel, explained that the policies would move the Town away from the old growth management concurrency-based transportation plan to a plan that embraced a multi-modal approach to transportation planning. She noted it would also state the Town would not have a transportation concurrency system, but would look towards a transportation planning effort. She believed Longboat Key was the first to take advantage of this since the new legislation had passed.

Objective 1.1

Attorney Stroud pointed out that this objective reiterated that the Town was developing a multi-modal transportation system. The legislation states that even if they did not have a concurrency system, the Town was required to adopt a level of service (LOS).

### Policy 1.1.1

Attorney Stroud noted that this policy tweaked the LOS to bring it up to date and include an intersection standard.

### Policy 1.1.3

Attorney Stroud reviewed this policy noting that Longboat Key would not continue with transportation concurrency, but would look at impacts on transportation in a multi-modal way. This policy anticipates that the Town would develop a multi-modal plan, which was the next step if the Town adopted this approach.

Mr. Symanski commented when he read the policy he believed the language seemed somewhat permissive, and skewed towards approving an application, but then informing the applicant what they could do to improve. Mr. Garner believed it was a good idea to have a policy, as well as the objectives, to encourage applicants to submit their creative thoughts while retaining the opportunity for the community to deny something, because it had an impact greater than the Town felt should be imposed on Longboat Key. He encouraged the board to follow that philosophy. He believed there was sufficient language to allow the reviewers to deny, if required, certain parts of any application while retaining the opportunity for the applicant to bring back some new ideas. Mr. Symanski noted his concern was that if the Town denied a plan, and the applicant sued, the Town could not use their plan as effectively to note it was a violation of the plan. Attorney Stroud commented staff would go back and review the policies to ensure there was the ability to do that in the appropriate circumstance. She noted that one of the advantages of moving away from the state's concurrency system was that the Town could not say 'no' under the concurrency system.

Attorney Stroud continued with reviewing Policies 1.1.4 and 1.1.5. Concerning Policy 1.1.5, she commented that the state had said that it was only concerned about important state facilities. She was not sure whether the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) considered Gulf of Mexico Drive (GMD) an important state facility, but staff believed it was important as it was a state road, an evacuation route, and the main route on/off the key.

### Policy 1.1.6

Attorney Stroud pointed out this policy set out more standards for the 'Traffic Context Study,' which was for all development order applications that generated 50 peak hour trips or greater.

### Policy 1.1.7

Attorney Stroud noted this policy, and its sub-policies, outlined in detail what the study would need to include. She commented it also anticipated that there would be guidelines that would be developed and maintained by the Town's Planning Department.

Chair Webb discussed connectivity to GMD, and asked where possible, when there was a development site that had the potential, to include connectivity to eliminate unnecessary trips. Attorney Stroud referred to Policy 1.1.9, but noted it was referring to connectivity to the public right-of-way and adjacent sites. She believed it could include a broader use of the term, because it had an understood transportation meaning.

Mr. Garner referred to Policy 1.1.6 and asked how they could make the determination of the anticipated trips; what criteria would be used without a traffic study. Attorney Stroud responded that they would utilize the standard trip generation tables as an initial threshold start, and because the Town has a transportation consultant, they would receive expertise in that regard. Mr. Garner asked if they should include something that described who made that decision. Chair Webb asked if there were charts currently in place. Ms. Simpson noted there were charts in the Land Development Regulations (LDRs), and because the ITE transportation manuals were updated periodically, that reference was in the LDRs; she did not wish to include in the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Symanski voiced his concern in Policy 1.1.7 with the word 'reduce,' believing it provided a lot of flexibility. Attorney Stroud suggested the word 'reduce' could be removed from the language, or modify it to show it was not any reduction, but an adequate or sufficient reduction. Mr. Garner asked if the words 'satisfactorily reduce' would be sufficient. Chair Webb questioned the definition of 'satisfactorily.' Attorney Stroud responded there would be a need for descriptive language. Mr. Symanski suggested "unacceptable traffic impacts, *if possible*." Mr. Garner recommended removal of the entire sentence. Attorney Stroud noted it was clear that the board wished to address negative traffic impacts that were below the standard. She anticipated that the Town would develop a 'mobility fee' as a potential way to mitigate impacts. She commented if the Town did collect the mobility fees, there was an action that required the Town to document how they spend the fees and the Town Commission would need to approve the project. She continued with reviewing Policy 1.1.7(2)

#### Policy 1.1.8

Attorney Stroud reviewed this policy noting it exempted development proposals that generated less than 50 cumulative peak hour trips from the requirement to provide the Traffic Context Study, with the idea that the project was minimal and should not have the burden for the applicant to go through the study process. Mr. Wild requested an example. Attorney Stroud replied a single-family home. Ms. Simpson pointed out that a development with less than ten units would not be heard by the P&Z Board as it was administratively approved by staff.

Attorney Stroud noted the second paragraph in the policy further explained that if activities changed, and the project would generate more than 50 trips, then they would be required to go through the study process.

#### Objective 1.2

Attorney Stroud explained this objective recognized that Gulf of Mexico Drive was congested and it may worsen, and the Town wished to work with adjacent governmental agencies to improve GMD. Mr. Symanski noted that he was not sure it was a good idea to be this specific. Chair Webb was not sure she agreed, because she did not see GMD as a seriously congested road most of the time, unless there were issues when the bridges were up and the traffic was backed up. Attorney Stroud responded that the focus might need to shift, not to the interior development on the island, but working with adjacent governments to relieve the congestion that was occurring from outside. Mr. Garner questioned the reason for the objective and what necessity required the objective to be in the Comprehensive Plan. Attorney Stroud explained that the original objective basically said the Town would work with adjacent governments. Policy 1.2.2 tried to continue to prioritize those projects that the Town believed would be most successful at relieving whatever congestion that existed on GMD.

Mr. Garner asked why the Town needed to suggest there was congestion. Chair Webb suggested they eliminate the first sentence of Objective 1.2, and begin with "*The Town will work closely with appropriate governments and agencies to implement future improvements on Gulf of Mexico Drive;*" however, there needed to be an additional sentence that related to the access points on and off Longboat Key and acknowledged the transportation component without setting up the language that noted the congestion. Mr. Garner believed it was an improvement, and he would find it encouraging. He suggested instead of the words, "improved safety and traffic flow," it state "maintain the safety and traffic flow." Mr. Wild noted they could not really improve it, because there were limitations as to what they could do to the road. He believed they should be looking at "less being more." Mr. Symanski would state "maintain or improve." Attorney Stroud noted staff would add the words "and maintain" after 'approve'.

Attorney Stroud continued with a brief description of Policy 1.2.4, Objective 1.11, Policy 1.11.1, Policy 1.11.2, and Policy 1.1.2. She noted that once changes were made in the transportation plan, other elements would need to be changed to be consistent, such as the Capital Improvements Element (CIE).

#### Objective 1.4

Attorney Stroud explained this policy was amended to make clearer that concurrency would continue for other facilities, but not for transportation facilities.

#### Objective 1.5

Attorney Stroud discussed there were two alternatives that staff developed to restate this policy. The CIE should recognize the necessity for adequate facilities for existing populations, not just future populations.

Mr. Garner referred to Policy 1.3.1 under the CIE, concerning the LOS for wastewater and potable water, and questioned their origination. He believed since the board's message concerned conservation, that the policy should include conservation figures. Ms. Simpson explained staff would need to bring back those elements as the Public Works Director, Juan Florensa, would need to address those issues. The focus for this meeting was on transportation related issues.

Concerning Objective 1.5, Chair Webb commented she was assuming when the board had in-depth discussion on this item that the Finance Director would be able to inform the board that the CIE policy was functional and realistic, and the Town did not just draft a CIE budget that had nothing to do with facts. She noted that if the board was tasked with establishing a draft policy on fiscal and financial resources to fund the implementation of the five year schedule of Capital Improvements, she would like to know how the Capital Improvements budget had worked over the last 20 years. Attorney Stroud noted that staff would meet with the Finance Director and discuss that issue.

### Intergovernmental Coordination Element

#### Policy 1.3.5

Attorney Stroud pointed out a few of the policies had been updated, and this policy was only a grammatical change. Mr. Symanski referred back to Objective 1.5, and pointed out that the word 'growth' was added.

He asked why it was added as it sounded like the Town was planning to do something, and believed the word was not necessary. **There was consensus to remove the word 'growth.'**

Policy 1.4.1

Attorney Stroud mentioned this policy stated the Town would coordinate with the relevant agencies to engage their participation and input into the development of a multi-modal transportation mobility plan. Chair Webb voiced concern when it states "we will," as she wished to ensure the Town was a part of the discussions of the issues that impacted Longboat Key. Ms. Simpson noted that it specifically related to the development of the Town's Comprehensive Plan and the Town seeking advice and concurrency from the outside entities.

Policies 1.3.7 and 1.3.8

Attorney Stroud noted these policies were the same as the transportation policies in looking at the impacts on development outside the borders of the Town, and being a part of the discussions.

Policy 1.4.1

Attorney Stroud commented that it recognized that on multi-modal transportation LOS, there was still a need to develop them. There were no ITE tables that were similar to vehicle trips on the road. Chair Webb would like to know quantifiable numbers of how many people were on the trolley or bus on an hourly basis. Mr. Hackett asked if traffic counts were addressed. Attorney Stroud responded if they were included, then they would be part of the Data & Analysis (D&A), and were not specific in any policy. Ms. Simpson commented that she understood that the Chamber of Commerce was suppose to update the Town Commission on ridership of the trolley/bus, but there was a delay in that presentation. Attorney Stroud noted there was a transit LOS in the Transportation Element, but there were no numbers.

Attorney Stroud discussed other subjects that would be coming before the board for discussion.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:05 am.

---

John Wild, Secretary  
Planning and Zoning Board