AGENDA AND SIGN-IN SHEET

1. CALL TO ORDER
   First Vice-Chairman Gibellina called the meeting to order at 3:01 pm.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE/ROLL CALL
   Members of the staff introduced themselves after the pledge of allegiance.

3. DECLARATION OF A QUORUM
   A quorum was declared.

4. MINUTES
   A motion was made by Member Servia, seconded by Member Green, and carried 10-0, with member Vengroff absent to approve the minutes of June 21, 2021.

5. INTRODUCTION OF ALL MEMBERS
   Members of the Affordable Housing Advisory Committee (AHAC) introduced themselves and spoke about the seat they represent.

6. ELECTION OF OFFICERS
   Vicki Tessmer, Board Records Supervisor, opened the floor for Nominations for Chairman.
August 30, 2021
(Continued)

Nomination - Chairman
Member Gibellina nominated by Member Maruca
Member Rinehart nominated by Member Servia
Member Guillory nominated herself

Motion was made by Member Glasgow, seconded by Member Servia, and carried 10-0, with member Vengroff absent, to close nominations. Steve Rinehart was appointed Chairman by majority vote.

Nominations - Vice-Chairman
Member Guillory nominated by Member Servia
Member Green nominated himself
Member Maruca nominated by Gibellina

Motion was made by Member Servia seconded by Member Dunlop and carried 10-0, with member Vengroff absent, to close nominations. Divina Westerfield-Maruca was appointed Vice-Chairman by majority vote.

AHAC COMMENTS ON REVISIONS TO SECTION 545

Member Gibellina shared his concerns as to why he does not feel comfortable with the revisions to Item J, because there is no timeline for the expansion to include for profit.

Denise Thomas, Redevelopment and Economic Opportunity Manager, clarified that any questions regarding Sections 545 of the Land Development Code be directed to William O'Shea, from Building and Development Services.

Mr. O'Shea expressed that the primary focus is cleaning up sections, clarifying, and including any recommendations of the Affordable Housing Advisory Committee (AHAC) for section 545. Emphasis language in item 1 will be taken out. Also, the housing and rapid response is consistent in changing from 10 to 25 percent.

Member Dunlap, questioned why the households of special needs was struck.

Mr. O'Shea responded the County has not been implementing it. Although there are other programs that do address those special needs populations. He also explained the 25 percent is an annual review and more appropriate for Redevelopment and Economic Opportunity (REO) to address. Anytime there is a rental situation REO will make sure that they are meeting their minimum numbers. Section 545.2b of the LDC is already being implemented even though the code does not allow it. Building and Development Services decided not to be in the position of refunding. Currently a new procedure is in the works for deferring permitting fees if the unit is completed as affordable or the number of units that are required in the rental development are provided. The fees that are mentioned are regarding building permits and review fees for developments.

Member Maruca questioned if there is any upfront fees that would not be deferred for preliminary meeting regarding a piece of property.

Mr. O'Shea responded that normally there is a pre-application fee, and an administration determination fee that would not be included in the fee reduction.
Ms. Thomas brought attention to the service of project scooping which is available free of charge, and staff provided an overview and insight on the details of a project. The application would have to be filed with a conceptual site plan. This service can be also done virtually.

Discussion ensued regarding the LDC, concerns with Director discretion regarding approvals, a County Attorney should be present at these meetings, the civility pledge; language in 545.b is in the LDC, there are other programs to assist residents with affordable housing, using the term deferral, once the changes are finalized the committee will finalize their recommendations, use “abate” or “waived” rather than “deferral”, 545.c was removed because there is no incentive, tree protection and environmental planning, tree trust fund and the ability to request replacement trees, and staff will review all the comments.

Mr. O'Shea stated that the tree trust fund has been used for street projects, but not for affordable housing projects, and 50 percent of those funds would be set aside for affordable housing. The balance depends on developers and trees that are not able to be replaced on site.

Ms. Thomas noted the tree trust fund is addressed in incentive L.

Mr. O'Shea discussed how the density bonus works. The goal is to clean up tables 5 and 6 to include every zoning district where the bonus is applicable. The table will consist specifically of the zoning districts that are for affordable housing. For those who do not have an affordable housing project, they would have to apply for a rezone. There are no stipulations for a straight rezone. Once approved for the affordable housing zoning, an administrative review will follow.

Discussion annotated whether the language in the example would be added to the LDC and if it is the only example given that cannot reach the maximum gross density per acre, and language will be updated in the LDC and for example Res 9, 12, and 16 that do not qualify for the maximum density bonus.

Mr. O'Shea shared Section 5 of the recommended changes had been taken out because of its duplicity. In the request for language regarding 40-foot rights of way and setbacks, can be accomplished in planned development. The intent of section 5 is to mitigate some issues that arise in straight rezones. Options are given on how lots are able to be located as well as providing some buffering to provide mitigation during the final site review.

Chairman Rinehart expressed concern regarding section 5 being problematic. He brought forth an example that if someone would have a 10 acre parcel and would like a straight rezone, they would not have to submit a site plan.

Mr. O'Shea explained that the review would be later in the process, and it would administrative when the preliminary site plat is submitted.

Discussion ensued regarding compatibility with smaller lots next to larger lots and affordable housing next to agricultural uses and rezoning individual parcels, language to Section 5 of LDC is being worked on, concern with the first sentence in Section 6.C, and using “shall” rather than “may”, and can smaller lots be placed in the interior of a development.
Mr. O’Shea confirmed that the standard could be met if a developer puts larger lots on the outside versus smaller lots, but this could create an internal marketing issue.

Discussion ensued regarding losing value due to setbacks, straight rezones do not accomplish the same goals as planned development, and is it possible to revert back to the five-foot setbacks.

Mr. O’Shea referenced table 5-7 of section 545 and which land uses allow a five-foot setback.

Member Servia suggested adding the word “planned development” after the word through (may require approval through a “planned development” public hearing).

Chairman Rinehart would like the Committee to review the new plan for the next month and then make a motion to recommend the changes at the next meeting.

Discussion ensued regarding rear setbacks being restrictive, clarification that the standard rule for front setbacks is 25 feet in order to prevent vehicles from parking on sidewalks, five-foot setbacks are normally seen in mobile home parks, single family subdivisions usually have a ten-foot wide utilities easement along the back and 15-foot setbacks to provide area for a swing sets or BBQ grills, concerns regarding setbacks can be addressed under the review of a planned development project, due to drainage ditches utility easements setbacks are common, zoning requirements for mobile homes, modular homes can be used for affordable housing, difference between modular and mobile homes, street and curb width, and the goal is to have an expedited review process for affordable housing.

Mr. O’Shea reviewed the standard zoning table, setbacks for mobile homes vs. single family, and zoning districts that have the letter H in them.

Member Maruca intends to add a table for modular and manufactured homes.

Mr. O’Shea explained Table 507 is specifically for single family zoning districts and not mobile homes. No change is needed, because affordable housing can still be developed using the standard zoning districts.

Discussion continued regarding the Housing and Urban Development (HUD) seal of approval is needed for a modular home which can be put on a residential lot while a manufactured home is placed in mobile home parks, a modular unit may include structural, electrical, plumbing, heating, ventilation, or other service systems built in manufacturing facilities for installation or erection as a finished building or part of a finished building, and modular dwelling units shall be deemed a single family unit and should not be deemed a manufactured home dwelling.

Ms. Thomas clarified that the recommended revision is based on what was determined last year. She encouraged all members to add any personal notes to include in the revision. The documents provided are a quick reference of what was determined from the previous recommendation. The column 2021 comments are for the board to input any recommended changes.

Mr. O’Shea clarified the black sentences in the document are already in the LDC. The strike outs or underlined texts are what is being added to address incentives A through K. Only the
LDC changes are being worked on. Incentive E was adopted by ordinance on August 19, to allow accessory dwelling units. Parking and setbacks in Incentive F are addressed in LDC Section 365. Street requirements are going to be on a case by case basis, because of having to involve public works and certain standards are established for road way construction.

Ms. Thomas suggested incorporating all document into one.

8. REVIEW OF INCENTIVES A THROUGH K
   The Incentives are to be discussed at the September 27, 2021, meeting.

9. MEETINGS
   The next meeting will be held on September 27, 2021, Manatee County Administration Building, Manatee Room – 5th Floor, 1112 Manatee Avenue West, Bradenton 34205.

10. MEMBER COMMENT
    Member Gibellina requested the Board review School Board impact fees, which are a flat fee and unjust. The School Board has offered a variance letter to either eliminate or reduce the fee.

    Member Servia clarified that the school district reviews all residential applications to see if there is capacity needed at affected schools. Impact fees are separate.

    Discussion ensued regarding the City of Bradenton and the School Board working together to forgive impact fees, the City of Bradenton does not have anything to do with school impact fees, and the impact fee tool should be offered during the permitting process.

11. PUBLIC COMMENT
    There being no public comment, Chairman Rinehart Closed comments.

12. ADJOURN
    There being no further business, Chairman Rinehart adjourned the meeting at 4:52pm. Minutes Approved: ________________