

SCHOOL PLANNING WORKGROUP
April 25, 2008
10:00 AM in the Pinellas County Planning Dept. Conference Room
7th Floor, 600 Cleveland Street
Clearwater, FL

MEETING SUMMARY

Gordon opened the meeting by welcoming all in attendance and with an overview of the agenda.

- A.** Discussion began on the draft Land Development Regulations (LDRs) and Gordon explained the changes that had occurred since the draft was sent to the Workgroup members a few days before. Those changes were shown in strike-through/underline format. Gordon opened the floor for comments. Steve Fairchild suggested that the LDRs related to sidewalks be more specific and more specifically reflect the language of the policy included in the PSFE. Gordon stated that we are going to be sending the draft LDRs to the Collaborative next Thursday and requested that any additional comments be sent to the County Planning Department staff before Wednesday for incorporation into the final draft.

Larry Pflueger stated that there are a number of references to the “application” throughout the LDRs. The group may want to consider changing these references to “the project” or the “development” instead as these may be more appropriate. Paul Geisz questioned the latitude that each local government had to customize the LDRs to fit their individual processes. It was noted that as long as the intent of the Interlocal Agreement and the PSFE were not compromised, and that all of the local governments’ LDRs remained consistent, customization and procedural was appropriate. Mitigation was cited as one place where the procedures will vary. It was mentioned that standard forms may be developed for each different type of mitigation to help each local government during the mitigation process.

Further discussion ensued regarding the mitigation process and procedures. The subject of using charter schools for mitigation was brought up, in light of the fact that charter schools are not included in the Five-Year Work Program and the ILA states that mitigation must be included in the Work Program. Mitigation could be worded that it is contingent upon the amendment of the Work Program, given that the Work Program is only amended once annually. It was also questioned that if a developer chose to mitigate with a charter school, would the funds be paid to the School District or the charter school itself, as Florida Statutes require charters be able to be used for capacity. Discussion continued about how charter schools operate within the context of school capacity.

- B.** Juan Butler went over the Business Requirements document he prepared for the Development Tracking System. It was brought up that the group still needs to determine how to deal with the issue of capacity, as it is supposed to include the capacity for the next three years of the Five-Year Work Program. As Pinellas County is in a period of declining school enrollment and capacity, this will need to be handled differently than other local governments may be handling it.

Juan then discussed the data field requirements for the tracking system. How to collect the data was discussed, and the group will still need to determine at what intervals the data will be uploaded and refreshed within the system. Gordon brought up the digitizing of locations, and that we will try to operate the system without maps for the time being, but we may require maps of the locations in the future in order to accurately determine the location of a project and the corresponding building permits for that site.

The topic of when concurrency is issued was raised and discussed by the group. It was determined that concurrency can be issued at any stage of the site plan approval process, and the ultimate date can be left up to the local government and the developer. The approval will only be valid for a period of 24 months, so if a developer would like to get an approval upfront and then take the full two years in order to begin the project-that is possible. However, if a developer would like to wait until the last possible moment before the final site plan is approved, in order to ensure that the full 24 months is available after the site plan approval for the project to begin, that is possible as well. Each local government will be able to discuss these things with each developer and determine which course of action may be best for each project. Marshall suggested that a timeline of the site plan approval process may be helpful, showing where each step takes place, as well as where the school concurrency approval can fit into the existing process.

The issue of credits was also raised. Gordon mentioned that credits have been addressed in the draft LDRs and that they are similar to the handling of transportation credits. The intent is for the credits to run with the land in perpetuity from the Effective Date. Further discussion of this topic is going to be required before any final decisions can be made.

- C.** Marshall gave a brief overview of the new student assignment plan for the School District. In discussions with County staff, it was determined that it will make more sense for the current CSA boundaries to remain. The new student assignment program will take a number of years to be fully implemented, as it includes grandfathering provisions for many students.

In light of this, the school attendance boundaries are likely to change over the coming years. Marshall recommended that the current CSA boundaries remain intact, at least for the next few years, until the School District is able to see the impacts of the new attendance areas.

- D. Gordon brought the Procedural Manual up for discussion, stating that it cannot proceed much further until the development tracking system becomes more defined. Many of the outstanding details have to do with tracking system itself, and until the system is developed, many of those details will be unknown. Also, the manual is quite extensive and it was drafted in order to outline all aspects of school concurrency. For the manual to be useful for the front-end staff that will be responsible for the day-to-day operations of school concurrency, each local government will have to customize sections of the manual to make it relevant to their specific operations procedures. Juan mentioned that he is planning on meeting with each of the local governments after the Collaborative meeting, so that he can get more information about each government's site plan processes and computer systems and proceed with the detail surrounding the development tracking system.

All of the documents presented at the meeting today, with the exception of the Procedural Manual, will be sent to the Collaborative for their review. Gordon asked that any comments on those documents be passed along to the County Planning staff early next week, as the Collaborative packet will be mailed next Thursday. The schedule is to have the LDRs adopted and in place by September, and school concurrency implemented by late September, ideally around the same time as the final student enrollment counts are completed.

The Meeting concluded at 12:00 p.m.

In Attendance:

Derek Kilborn; City of St. Petersburg
Paul Geisz; City of St. Petersburg
Sandra Herman; City of Clearwater
Marshall Touchton; PCSB
Jeffery Dow; City of Dunedin
Steve Fairchild; PCSB
Robert Jarzen; City of Largo
Larry Pflueger; PPC
Jason Graziano; Pinellas County IS
Juan Butler; Pinellas County IS
Gordon Beardslee; Pinellas County Planning
Liz Freeman; Pinellas County Planning
Chelsea Ross; Pinellas County Planning