

**Local Planning Agency
Pinellas County
August 13, 2025 Meeting Minutes**

The Pinellas County Local Planning Agency (LPA) met in regular session (pursuant to Section 134-12 of the Pinellas County Land Development Code, as amended) at 9:00 AM on this date in the County Commission Assembly Room at the Pinellas County Courthouse, 315 Court Street, Clearwater, Florida.

Present

Mattaniah Jahn, Chairman
Carlos Brito
Stanley Cataldo
Hoyt Hamilton
John Hendricks
Trish Johnson (non-voting School Board Representative)

Not Present

Rodney Collman, Vice-Chairman
Lari Johnson

Others Present

Michael Schoderbock, Division Manager, Zoning and Project Management
Derrill McAteer, Senior Assistant County Attorney
Tammy Burgess, Board Reporter, Deputy Clerk
Other interested individuals

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Jahn called the meeting to order and reviewed the procedure for public hearings, indicating that today's cases will be heard by the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) on October 21, 2025; and that any documents needing to be reviewed by the BCC should be submitted to the Zoning Section 15 days prior to the BCC meeting.

QUASI-JUDICIAL STATEMENT

Attorney McAteer noted that the zoning matter on today's agenda is quasi-judicial; and that only competent, substantial, fact-based testimony or evidence may be considered in

the decisions made by the Board; whereupon, he provided information regarding the types of evidence that are considered as such.

MINUTES FOR THE JUNE 11, 2025 MEETING

In response to Chairman Jahn's call for a motion, Mr. Hamilton made a motion to accept the minutes as submitted. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hendricks and carried unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

Legal notice having been published for the items on the agenda, as evidenced by affidavit of publication filed with the Clerk, a public hearing was held on the following items. All correspondence provided to the Clerk's Office has been filed and made a part of the record. All persons planning to give testimony were duly sworn by a Deputy Clerk.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDING THE FUTURE LAND USE MAP AND PROPOSED RESOLUTION AMENDING THE ZONING ATLAS

Case Nos. FLU-25-05 and ZON-25-03

APPLICATIONS OF KEVIN MCANDREW, PINELLAS COUNTY BUILDING AND DEVELOPMENT REVIEW SERVICES (BDRS), FOR THE FOLLOWING:

- (FLU-25-05) FUTURE LAND USE MAP (FLUM) AMENDMENT FROM INSTITUTIONAL (I) TO RESIDENTIAL RURAL (RR)

and

- (ZON-25-03) ZONING ATLAS AMENDMENT FROM LIMITED INSTITUTIONAL – WELLHEAD PROTECTION OVERLAY (LI-W) TO RESIDENTIAL AGRICULTURE – WELLHEAD PROTECTION OVERLAY (R-A-W)

A public hearing was held for the above applications regarding approximately 4.08 acres located in the southwest corner of Keystone Road and Woodfield Boulevard in East Lake.

Referring to a PowerPoint presentation containing photographs and maps, Planning Section Manager Scott Swearengen indicated that the subject property is in the same area as the County's only Wellhead Protection Overlay; and that there are regulations and policies that guide development in a Wellhead Protection Overlay District; whereupon, he noted that while the applicant's desired future use for the subject property

is to construct one or two single-family homes, that is not part of the cases before the Board today.

Mr. Swearengen provided historical information regarding the subject property, including details related to Case No. Z/LU-14-6-15, noting that it was a combined land use and zoning case that involved a parking variance, changes to future land use and zoning, and a development agreement allowing for an 80-bed assisted living facility. He indicated that the development agreement allowed for a five-year extension, upon application by the property owner, if development did not occur; and that while an extension was requested in 2020, the development agreement is set to expire in 2025; whereupon, Mr. Swearengen related that if the agreement expires, the land use and zoning will revert to the original categories that existed in 2015.

Mr. Swearengen also provided information regarding the current and proposed land use and zoning classifications, allowable uses, and surrounding properties, indicating that the property owner is not opposed to the property being reverted to the zoning designation that existed in 2015.

He also related that the request is consistent with the East Lake Tarpon Community Overlay District; that Keystone Road is a Scenic, Non-Commercial Corridor with a secondary designation of Rural/Open Space; and that traffic impacts would be negative; whereupon, Mr. Swearengen noted that the property is not located within the Coastal Storm Area nor the Coastal High Hazard Area, but that a portion of it lies within Flood Zone A.

Mr. Swearengen indicated that staff finds that the proposed land use and zoning amendments are compatible with the surrounding development and consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and Countywide Plan Map; and that staff recommends approval.

Responding to a query by Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Schoderbock, with input by Attorney McAteer, provided brief comments regarding the development agreement and the process necessary for reverting the land use and zoning designations; whereupon, Mr. Schoderbock noted that the property owner does not wish to pursue the 80-bed assisted living facility.

Responding to comments by Chairman Jahn, Attorney McAteer indicated that this Board is created by State statute to review various items, including Comprehensive Plan amendments.

No one appeared in response to the Chairman's call for proponents or opponents.

Mr. Schoderbock indicated that a separate motion is needed for each case; whereupon, in response to the Chairman's call for a motion, Mr. Hamilton made a motion to approve Case No. FLU-25-05, based on the presented evidence. The motion was seconded by Mr. Brito and carried unanimously.

Thereupon, Mr. Hendricks made a motion to approve Case No. ZON-25-03, as written by staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Brito and carried unanimously.

DISCUSSION ITEM – VIRTUAL PARTICIPATION OPTION

Mr. Schoderbock provided background information related to virtual participation at public hearings, noting that the BCC recently adjusted its virtual participation language to encourage in-person appearance; and that each hearing body has the option of whether or not to allow virtual participation; whereupon, he indicated that while the Board of Adjustment and Appeals voted against allowing post-pandemic virtual participation, it is currently allowed by both the LPA and the BCC; and that the topic is being presented at today's meeting to determine whether the members would like to continue allowing virtual participation at LPA meetings.

Brief discussion ensued, with input by Attorney McAteer and Mr. Schoderbock, regarding benefits and challenges associated with virtual participation, details related to the BCC's virtual participation language, and options for instances when an applicant has difficulty with attending their hearing due to unforeseen circumstances; whereupon, Attorney McAteer expressed concern regarding the LPA potentially having a virtual participation policy that is different from the BCC's since the LPA is a statutorily mandated recommendation Board that ties directly to the BCC.

During discussion, Mr. Hendricks indicated that he believes that virtual participation should no longer be an option; and that individuals should attend in-person if they want to voice their opinion; whereupon, in response to his query, Attorney McAteer explained that the weight given by the members to the interrelationship between the LPA and BCC is at their discretion; and that the LPA has the right to end online participation via a vote.

Chairman Jahn expressed support for being consistent with practices utilized by the BCC; whereupon, Mr. Brito made a motion that the LPA follow the virtual participation language approved by the BCC. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hamilton and carried by a vote of 4 to 1, with Mr. Hendricks dissenting.

ADJOURNMENT

In response to a query by Chairman Jahn, Mr. Schoderbock confirmed that there will be an LPA meeting in September.

Upon the Chairman's call for a motion to adjourn, Mr. Hamilton made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Brito and carried unanimously; whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 9:37 AM.