

**CITY OF TREASURE ISLAND, FLORIDA  
PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD  
July 17, 2008**

**1. ROLL CALL:**

Lynn Dayvault	Present
Susan Givens	Present
Daniel Helton	Absent
Heidi Horak (Chair)	Present
Kevin Johnson	Present
Pam MacIntyre	Present
Joel Manings	Absent
Bill McAlduff	Present
Kathy McCreary	Absent (arrived 2:05 pm)
Frank McConnell	Absent
Susan Reiter	Present
Joe Roberts	Present
Robert Shogren	Present
Christopher Sierra (Vice-Chair)	Present
Ruthie Starkey	Present

Chair Heidi Horak called the meeting to order at 2:03 pm and noted that the City Attorney, Maura Kiefer, the City Planner, Lynn Rosetti and the Planning Associate Steve DeMerritt were present.

It was noted that Mr. Manings and Mr. McConnell phoned to report their absence.

New member Bill McAlduff was duly sworn by the City Attorney.

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Motion was made by Ms. Givens and seconded by Ms. Starkey to approve the minutes of the meeting of June 19, 2008 as printed. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

7/17/08

**3. EXPARTE COMMUNICATION:**

No Exparte Communication was reported. All applicants, witnesses, members of staff and other persons wishing to address any item before the Board of a quasi-judicial nature were duly sworn at this time.

**4. ITEMS OF BUSINESS:**

**[PZ-2007-15-SR-M – Site Plan Modification] – Zarmar Limited Partnership, 290 107<sup>th</sup> Avenue is requesting a site plan modification to allow the construction of a 31-unit hotel. *Resort Facilities Medium (RFM-30)***

The City Planner offered a brief review of the additional information pertaining to the site plan that was requested by the Board at the June 19<sup>th</sup> meeting. The information requested was an accurate construction elevation, accurate artist rendering of elevation and accurate rendering of pole sign.

The City Planner stated that since this is a continuance she will not review the case a second time.

New Board member Bill McAlduff will abstain from voting on this case since he was not present to hear the case as it was presented at the last meeting.

The applicant's representative, Mr. Dillon Alderman, Waterfield Design Group, addressed the Board and reviewed the additional information provided at the request of the Board. Mr. Alderman offered a brief review of the changes that have been submitted and noted that they do meet zoning requirements. Mr. Alderman displayed a new construction sheet, color elevations, side elevations and a pole sign color image.

Mr. Roberts questioned Mr. Alderman if a traffic study has been considered. Mr. Roberts stated that after appearing before the Board four times he likes what he sees and went on to say that there are 7 criteria the Board must consider when reviewing a site plan.

The Chair requested that Mr. Roberts provide the section he is referring to that lists the 7 criteria. Ms. Horak then read Section 70-31 (b) for clarification of site plan review criteria.

7/17/08

Ms. Reiter questioned the lighting of the pole sign and stated that she appreciates the work that was done in providing the requested information.

Ms. Starkey questioned the planned railing material and the finish of the glass.

Ms. MacIntyre questioned the roof line and the need for the cut out.

The Chair questioned the columns and also the reflections from the railings.

Mr. Alderman stated that he is willing to pursue a low reflective glass.

Ms. Reiter questioned the height of the pole sign and felt it will be very unattractive coming over the bridge.

Mr. Roberts questioned the number of signs proposed.

The Chair then read Article 2, Site Plan Review, Section 70-31, Section C, Architectural Considerations which pertains to the exterior of the building and also requested criteria for signs.

The City Planner noted that in the Site Plan Review section, Submission Requirements, Section 70-52 (q), is the criteria for signage.

Mr. Sierra suggested the placement of the sign on the SW corner of the property.

There were no public comments.

**Board Discussion:**

Mr. Roberts stated that the third sign is unnecessary.

Ms. Givens stated that the Board is again trying to dictate to the property owner.

Mr. Johnson felt that there was no need for a pole sign.

**ACTION:**

Motion was made by Ms. Starkey to approve the site plan with the following conditions: (1) low reflective glass (2) non-glaring metal (3) sign at the SW corner of the property

Mr. Sierra requested that the motion include the conditions stated by staff and Ms. Starkey indicated she had no problem including staff conditions in the motion.

7/17/08

The City Planner noted that the SW corner is where the dumpster will be placed and thought the Board intended the sign to be on the SW corner east of the driveway.

Mr. Sierra seconded the amended motion.

Ms. MacIntyre reminded the Board that a traffic study may be desired as a condition of approval.

The City Planner explained that the property has received a concurrency exemption and further stated that when the property comes in it must have a concurrency review and Chapter 68-151 deals with the concurrency management plan. Ms. Rosetti explained the analysis for traffic study during the site plan process.

The Chair requested an amendment to the motion to state other railing treatment instead of matte finish.

Ms. Starkey will restate her motion but noted that she will not include a traffic study in the motion. The motion is to approve the site plan with staff conditions and in addition the conditions of (1) low reflective glass or other treatment on the railing (2) non-glaring metal on the railing and (3) the pole sign be moved to the SW corner east of the driveway

Mr. Roberts suggested using the word *finish* in place of metal in condition number 2.

The Chair suggested that *or other less intense sign configuration* be added to number 3.

Ms. Starkey again restated her motion to approve the site plan with staff conditions and also the conditions (1) low reflective glass or other treatment which is preferable (2) non-glaring finish on the railing (3) and the sign be moved to the SW corner of the property east of the driveway or a less intense sign or no sign at all.

Mr. Sierra seconded the amended motion.

Upon roll call the vote to approve was 8 ayes and 3 nays and 1 abstention as

7/17/08

follows:

Lynn Dayvault	aye	Joe Roberts	nay
Susan Givens	aye	Robert Shogren	aye
Heidi Horak	aye	Christopher Sierra	aye
Kevin Johnson	nay	Ruthie Starkey	aye
Pam MacIntyrenay		Bill McAlduff	abstained
Kathy McCreary	aye		
Susan Reiter	aye		

**[PZ-2008-14-VR – Variance] – Gulf Golf Development, LLC 11605 Gulf Boulevard is requesting a variance relating to the maximum size allowed for on-site directional signs, Section 73-33 (10) Resort Facilities Medium (RFM-30)**

The City Planner offered a verbal and video presentation and answered questions of the Board.

Ms. Givens stated that she sees no need for a sign at 117<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

Mr. Sierra questioned the reason for the requested size of the sign.

The developer, Mr. Bill Edwards, addressed the Board and explained the situation which he stated is caused by the one-way streets surrounding the hotel.

Mr. Matt Weildon of International Signs addressed the Board and discussed the proposed signage.

The architect, Mr. Matta, addressed the Board and explained the need for the signage.

There were no public comments.

Ms. MacIntyre questioned the need for lighted signage.

Mr. Johnson agreed with the need for signage.

Ms. Starkey questioned the signs already in place designating one-way status.

The Chair preferred to eliminate the sign on the NW corner.

7/17/08

**ACTION:**

Motion was made by Mr. Sierra and seconded by Mr. Roberts to grant the variance with staff recommendations.

The Chair requested clarification from the City Attorney regarding the ability to change conditions of a variance.

The City Attorney stated that as long as the recommended conditions comply with the code they may be changed.

Ms. Reiter questioned if the applicant has been informed of staff recommendations.

Mr. Edwards stated that he is more than happy to work with staff and that the request for the signage is mostly a safety issue.

Upon roll call the vote to approve was 8 ayes and 4 nays as follows:

Lynn Dayvault	aye	Joe Roberts	aye
Susan Givens	nay	Robert Shogren	aye
Heidi Horak	aye	Christopher Sierra	aye
Kevin Johnson	nay	Ruthie Starkey	nay
Pam MacIntyre	aye	Bill McAlduff	aye
Kathy McCreary	aye		
Susan Reiter	aye		

**5. CITY PLANNER REPORT/COMMENTS:**

The City Planner offered a brief review of upcoming workshops that she plans to attend. Ms. Rosetti informed the Board that the Development Agreement has been approved by the City Commission.

**6. CITY ATTORNEY REPORT/COMMENTS:**

No Report.

**7. OLD BUSINESS:**

7/17/08

The Chair instructed the Board to cross off item (a) on the LPA agenda and stated that it will be considered under P & Z Old Business.

Amended Rules of Procedure: Discussion began with the items placed on the agenda and it was suggested that the sentence read: Any Board member may request that an item be placed on the agenda **under the appropriate category** for discussion.

The Chair suggested that the Last sentence read: The City Planner working with the Chairman **in their discretion** shall set forth the agenda for all meetings of the Board.

**ACTION:**

Motion was made by Mr. Sierra and seconded by Ms. Starkey to approve the Rules of Procedure as presented and the first sentence amended to read: Any Board member may request that an item be placed **under the appropriate category** for discussion.

Upon roll call the vote to approve was passed unanimously.

**8. NEW BUSINESS:**

There was no new business.

**9. ADJOURNMENT:**

. The Chair declared the meeting adjourned at 3:55 pm.

The next meeting of the Planning and Zoning Board will be Thursday, August 21, 2008 at 2:00 pm.

---

A J. Sarko  
Recording Secretary

---

Heidi Horak  
Chair