

**MANATEE COUNTY AFFORDABLE HOUSING
ADVISORY COMMITTEE WORK SESSION
BRADENTON AREA CONVENTION CENTER, NORTH CENTER HALL
One Haben Boulevard
Palmetto, Florida
September 28, 2020**

Present were:

Charlie Kennedy, Chairman
Glen Gibellina, First Vice-Chairman
Frank Conorozzo, Second Vice-Chairman
George Kruse
Steve Rinehart
Sandra Suite, entered during the work session

Absent were:

Kenyatta Randall, Third Vice-Chairman
Erin Bodie
Amy Farrington
Vallerie Guillory

One seat is vacant

Also present were:

Geri Lopez, Redevelopment and Economic Opportunity Director
Denise Thomas, Redevelopment and Economic Opportunity Manager
Deborah Ash, Redevelopment and Economic Opportunity
Lisa Barrett, Building and Development Services
Bill O'Shea, Building and Development Services
Robin Toth, Deputy Clerk, Clerk of the Circuit Court

County Commissioner Misty Servia, representing District 4, was not present

AGENDA

HC20200928DOC001

I. CALL TO ORDER

 Chairman Kennedy called the work session to order at 2:06 p.m.

ADDED AGENDA ITEM - CORRESPONDENCE FROM MEMBER GIBELLINA

 Chairman Kennedy modified the agenda to add an item for discussion, relating to email correspondence from Member Gibellina, which led to a notice to Affordable Housing Advisory Committee (AHAC) members on adhering to Sunshine Law requirements. This matter would be discussed at the end of this work session.

II. DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO CURRENT LDC, SECTION 545 - STEVE RINEHART

 Member Rinehart shared hindrances experienced with the County in the development process for two residential developments in the Canal Road/Mendoza Road area (Maple Ridge, 221 units; Magnolia Ridge, 98 units).

Projects are entitled through a general rezone, or a Planned Development Rezone (PDR), which is more in depth and requires more information and a site plan prior to the rezone. The general rezone and PDR are two different development paths. The public is cautious and resistant to affordable housing and construes affordable housing and workforce housing as Section 8 (government assisted) housing.

Member Rinehart reviewed his working document of suggested changes to Land Development Code (LDC) Section 545 – Housing Program, in highlighted, strikethrough and underline format, with suggested modifications to Paragraph 5 regarding the reduction of single-family lot sizes to 3,500 square feet in the RSF-6/H and RSF-9/H zoning districts, and 4,000 square feet in the RSF-4.5/H district, and the addition of a new Table 5-7: Schedule of Bulk and Dimensional Standards for Single Family Residential Districts. Table 5-7 adds an RSF-4.5/H zoning district with minimum lot size of 4,000 square feet, minimum width of 40 feet, minimum front setback of 23.5 feet, minimum rear setback of 15 feet, and minimum five-foot side setbacks. He also suggested Paragraph 6. be deleted in its entirety, as it includes unclear definitions of the words “abutting” and “adjacent.” He also commented about current LDC Section 342.3, Review Criteria for Zoning Map Amendments. HC20200928DOC002

 Geri Lopez, Redevelopment and Economic Opportunity Director, agreed with Member Rinehart on the need for clarification of the words abutting and adjacent, and staff recommends a dialogue be held with planners. As a point of clarification, she stated the RSF-4.5/H is already in the zoning district for RES-3.

 Bill O’Shea, Building and Development Services, stated the standard setbacks for zoning districts are relied upon. Member Rinehart is asking for a reduction in the setbacks to be automatically built into that zoning.

 Member Rinehart explained he was not requesting changes to LDC Section 342.3, but requesting the RSF-4.5/H zoning district be clearly defined and delete Paragraph 6.a., b. and c. (i. and ii.) in its entirety.

 There was discussion that reduced side setbacks are determined based on the necessary space to accommodate utilities, reduced side and rear setbacks would make affordable housing more logical, compatibility review is not based on what is abutting or adjacent, an entire new process will be needed if the general rezone option is kept, and the LDC is set up for the PDR process.

 Lisa Barrett, Planning Section Manager, stated that staff was looking to create assurances for development to be consistent with what currently surrounds a site to mitigate impact. She endorsed minimum lot sizes suggested by Member Rinehart and the need for more enhanced buffers or landscaping. The intent of Paragraph 6.b. was to have smaller internal lots and larger perimeter lots. Density could only be obtained by going through the PDR process. Paragraph 6.b. was left open to approach design development on a case-by-case basis.

During the development of affordable housing language, staff knew it would be a challenge for the County Commission to review and approve a straight rezone, and they have been very reluctant to do so. Not every site is appropriate for affordable housing, and natural resources and wetlands limit the ability for higher density.

 Member Rinehart suggested a work session with the County Commission regarding LDC Section 342.3, Review Criteria for Zoning Map Amendments.

 As to the process for the AHAC to act on Member Rinehart’s suggested changes to LDC Section 545, Ms. Lopez stated the AHAC could recommend that staff review his changes and to accept or refine his suggestion for Paragraph 6. The polished language would be presented as an LDC Amendment to the Planning Commission to forward a recommendation to the County Commission for final adoption.

Discussion continued that the AHAC should take formal action on Member Rinehart's suggested changes, authorize staff to prepare documentation for the County Commission, and new incoming Commissioners might be very receptive to affordable housing.

There were no objections.

 Denise Thomas, Redevelopment and Economic Opportunity Manager, stated the AHAC could take action on Member Rinehart's suggested changes by formal vote, in the regular meeting that follows this work session. The suggested changes would be to make the suggested changes part of a recommendation to the County Commission for consideration.

 Member Conorozzo requested formal action be taken today at the regular meeting following this work session.

CORRESPONDENCE FROM MEMBER GIBELLINA (continued)

 Member Gibellina explained he emailed information to staff requesting that it be sent to Committee members. He received an email from Mitchell O. Palmer, County Attorney, that utilizing County staff to distribute subject matter to fellow Committee members outside of a duly noticed public AHAC meeting, could result in a violation of Sunshine Law. He requested the email correspondence be given to the keeper of the record. HC20200928DOC003

He emailed Mr. Palmer asking if he would attend the next Committee meeting to clarify the procedure concerning email communication between Committee members and staff. Mr. Palmer responded that he would be willing to speak to the Committee, but that the request for the services of his office would require formal action by vote of the Committee.

 Member Gibellina further explained it was his thought that in order to be time effective, AHAC members should be able to exchange ideas/suggestions and subsequently present them at a Committee meeting in an organized fashion.

 Chairman Kennedy stated the Committee could take formal action at the regular meeting following this work session, to ask Mr. Palmer to attend the October meeting. He asked Member Gibellina to speak about the content of his email he requested staff distribute to Committee members.

 Member Gibellina stated his email pertained to Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs), increase the maximum square footage of an ADU to 750-square-feet, with no limit on the number of bedrooms, and that porches not be included in the square footage. AHAC's recommendations should have been forwarded to the County Commission. He stated the Committee's recommendations to staff should be presented to the County Commission.

(Enter Member Suite)

 Mr. O'Shea stated AHAC's recommendations were presented to the County Commission at the October 4 work session. The Commission discussed air conditioned versus porch space, and this was part of their reason for increasing staff's proposed 500-square-foot ADU to 650 square feet. The Commission also agreed there should be a limit on the number of bedrooms. Though there has been much discussion on ADUs, the one point made clear from the beginning by the County Commission was that they wanted a reasonable starting point before making any changes to expand.

Staff followed the direction of the County Commission, but unfortunately, there was no action taken at the AHAC meeting prior to the October 4 Commission work session. The AHAC still has the opportunity to take formal action in the regular meeting following this work session, to send a letter to the County Commission.

 Member Gibellina pointed out that the 750-square foot ADU was never discussed at the October 4 County Commission work session on ADUs.

 It was noted the Committee could take formal action in the regular meeting following this work session, to send a letter to the County Commission.

III. **ADJOURN**

 Chairman Kennedy announced the regular AHAC meeting would be held following this work session.

There being no further business, Chairman Kennedy adjourned the work session at 2:56 p.m.

Minutes Approved: _____