

Local Planning Agency  
Pinellas County  
January 14, 2026 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 9:02 AM on this date in the County Commission Assembly Room at the Pinellas County Courthouse, 315 Court Street, Clearwater, Florida.

Present

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

Others Present

Michael Schoderbock, Division Manager, Zoning and Project Management  
Scott Swearngen, Planning Section Manager  
Derrill McAteer, Senior Assistant County Attorney  
Ashley Pabilonia, 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 February 17, 2026; and that any documents needing to be reviewed by the BCC should be submitted to the Zoning Section seven days prior to the BCC meeting.

**QUASI-JUDICIAL STATEMENT**

Attorney McAteer noted that the following hearings are 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 OF THE DECEMBER 10, 2025 MEETING**

Mr. Hamilton made a motion to approve the minutes as submitted. The motion was seconded by Ms. Johnson and carried unanimously, with Chairman Jahn abstaining.

### **PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

Legal notice having been published for the items on the agenda, as evidenced by affidavit of publication filed with the Clerk, public hearings were held for 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 RESOLUTIONS AMENDING THE ZONING ATLAS AND PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMENDING THE FUTURE LAND USE MAP**

#### Case No. ZON-25-06

APPLICATION OF MABANI, LLC, THROUGH HOUSH GHOVAEE, REPRESENTATIVE, FOR A ZONING ATLAS AMENDMENT FROM RESIDENTIAL AGRICULTURE (R-A) TO SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL (R-2)

A public hearing was held for the above application regarding an approximately 0.5-acre portion of a 2.56-acre parcel located at 620 County Road 1 in Palm Harbor. One letter of concern and a petition requesting clean-up of the subject property, which contains ten signatures, have been received.

Chairman Jahn indicated, for the record, that she previously worked with Housh Ghovae; and that she currently has no business dealings with him; whereupon, in response to a query by Attorney McAteer, she confirmed that she would have no pecuniary gain or loss depending on the outcome of the cases before the Board.

Referring to a PowerPoint presentation containing photographs and maps, Mr. Schoderbock indicated that the proposed use for the 0.5-acre portion of the subject property is a single-family home. He pointed out the location of the subject property, described its Future Land Use Map (FLUM) designation and the current and proposed zoning categories, and provided details regarding the land use and zoning classifications of surrounding parcels; whereupon, Mr. Schoderbock related that staff finds that the proposed zoning change is consistent with the surrounding single-family neighborhood developments, the Comprehensive Plan, and the Future Land Use designation of Residential Low; and that staff recommends approval.

Responding to queries by Ms. Johnson and Mr. Oliveri, Mr. Schoderbock provided information regarding the number of residential units that can be built on each portion of the subject property, a previous request to construct a ten-unit subdivision, which was denied, and standards for improvement of the access road to the subject property.

Upon the Chairman's call for the applicant, Sandra Bradbury, Clearwater, appeared and indicated that she is with Northside Engineering; whereupon, in response to a query by Mr. Hamilton, she clarified that while the applicant was previously interested in constructing several single-family homes on the subject property, his current intention is to build one single-family home. Mr. Schoderbock also noted that the proposed zoning classification does not allow multi-family residential uses.

No one appeared following Chairman Jahn's call for proponents.

Upon the Chairman's call for opponents, the following individuals appeared and expressed their concerns related to the application:

Barbara Sundberg, Palm Harbor  
Kellie Clark, Palm Harbor  
Laura Dangelo, Palm Harbor  
Melanie Harvey, Palm Harbor

In rebuttal, Ms. Bradbury provided clarifying details regarding the applicant's intent to build a single-family home with driveway access onto Wexford Lane and procedures associated with relocating any gopher turtles on the subject property; whereupon, responding to comments and queries by Ms. Johnson and Messrs. Hamilton and Brito, Ms. Bradbury provided additional information regarding necessary improvements for the access road. She also clarified that while Northside Engineering has not hosted any meetings with neighbors, she will ask if the applicant would like to do so; and that the subject property is not part of a homeowners' association.

Referencing concerns expressed by one of the opponents regarding the potential for the applicant to construct an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) on the subject property, Mr. Schoderbock clarified that ADUs can be constructed on any single-family residential property if there is enough space; and that the applicant would be allowed to construct one ADU on the subject property. He also briefly discussed maximum building height and restrictions against multi-family uses in the proposed zoning classification; whereupon, Mr. Schoderbock noted that, for the portion of the subject property that will remain under the R-A zoning classification, another single-family home could be constructed.

In response to comments and queries by Chairman Jahn, Mr. Schoderbock provided additional clarifying details regarding access from Wexford Lane, subject property specifications which would likely prevent it from being platted into additional lots, and the applicant's previous request to construct ten units on the subject property, which was denied by the LPA.

Thereupon, following the Chairman's call for a motion, Mr. Cataldo made a motion to approve Case No. ZON-25-06. The motion was seconded by Mr. Brito and was carried unanimously.

Case Nos. FLU-25-06 and ZON-25-04

APPLICATIONS OF VASANTHA, LLC AND GREEN ENERGY TRANSPORT, LLC, THROUGH CRAIG TARASZKI AND GEORGE PAPPAS, REPRESENTATIVES, FOR THE FOLLOWING:

- (FLU-25-06) FUTURE LAND USE MAP (FLUM) AMENDMENT FROM COMMERCIAL NEIGHBORHOOD (CN) AND EMPLOYMENT (E) TO COMMERCIAL GENERAL (CG) AND INDUSTRIAL GENERAL (IG)

and

- (ZON-25-04) ZONING ATLAS AMENDMENT FROM NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL (C-1) AND EMPLOYMENT 1 (E-1) TO EMPLOYMENT 2 (E-2) AND HEAVY INDUSTRY (I), WITH A DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT

A public hearing was held for the above applications regarding approximately 1.87 acres located at 6201 150th Avenue North and 15097 63rd Street North in unincorporated Largo. No correspondence has been received.

In response to a query by Chairman Jahn, Mr. Schoderbock indicated that Case Nos. FLU-25-06 and ZON-25-07 will be presented together; and that a separate motion will be taken for each case.

Mr. Swearngen related that Case Nos. FLU-25-06 and ZON-25-04 were previously heard by the LPA in November 2025, at which time the Board granted a continuance to today's meeting and instructed the applicant to review the accompanying development agreement prior to the meeting.

Referring to a PowerPoint presentation containing photographs and maps, Mr. Swearngen indicated that the current use for a 0.69-acre portion of the subject property is a solid waste transfer station with accessory uses, which the applicant is proposing to expand into a 1.18-acre portion of the subject property; whereupon, he noted that a

development agreement included with the zoning request would impose the following restrictions:

- The property shall be developed substantially in conformance with the Conceptual Site Plan.
- The property shall be limited to a solid waste transfer station and outdoor sales and parking.
- The operation shall include asbestos prevention and particulate matter controls.
- All associated truck queuing will take place on the site.

Mr. Swearengen noted that the latter two restrictions were added since the Board last reviewed these cases in November 2025; whereupon, he pointed out the location of the subject property and provided information pertaining to its current and proposed FLUM and zoning categories, surrounding land uses and zoning classifications, potential traffic impacts, and the low flood risk on the subject property.

Thereupon, Mr. Swearengen indicated that staff finds that the proposed land use and zoning amendments, including the development agreement, are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and are compatible with the surrounding area's industrial, heavy commercial, and mixed-use character; that the amendments would allow the site to be redeveloped to meet the County's development regulations in a more appropriate manner; and that staff recommends approval.

In response to a query by Ms. Johnson, Mr. Swearengen clarified that, according to the concept plan, the 1.18-acre portion of the subject property would be used for outdoor sales purposes; whereupon, during discussion, Mr. Schoderbock, with input from Mr. Swearengen, responded to comments and queries by the members and provided information regarding various topics, including previously non-conforming uses on the subject property, the proposed development agreement, and requirements associated with stormwater ponds and driving areas.

Mr. Hendricks expressed concern regarding the dispersal of dust containing asbestos and lead paint on the subject property; whereupon, Mr. Schoderbock provided brief comments related to mitigation measures associated with water runoff filtration and outdoor storage and clarified that monitoring of pollutants is conducted by the County's Public Works Department. Further discussion ensued, with input by Messrs. Swearengen and Schoderbock and Attorney McAteer, regarding various topics, including the use of the site plan process and a binding concept plan to address various requirements and non-

conforming uses, State and County requirements associated with pollution monitoring and mitigation, and the Board's purview relative to these cases.

Mr. Hamilton noted that members were required to declare whether they had visited the subject properties associated with the cases heard during the December LPA meeting; and that he visited the subject properties affiliated with today's cases; whereupon, Attorney McAteer explained the purpose of the visitation disclosure. In response to a query by Chairman Jahn, Attorney McAteer agreed to include an opportunity for member disclosures during the opening statement portion of each meeting. Thereupon, Mr. Hendricks related that he also visited the subject property.

*The meeting was recessed at 10:22 AM and reconvened at 10:27 AM.  
During the recess, Mr. Brito left the meeting.*

Upon the Chairman's call for the applicant, Craig Taraszki, St. Petersburg, appeared. Referring to a blueprint and various documents, he provided additional background information regarding the request before the Board and indicated that the applicant is proposing to bring the existing legal, non-conforming transfer station, located on the 0.69-acre portion of the subject property, into legal conformance by establishing the correct zoning and future land use designations; that the 1.18-acre portion of the subject property, which is currently vacant, is proposed to be used as an outdoor sales and parking area; and that expansion of the transfer station into the 1.18-acre portion of the property is prohibited under the proposed development agreement and the requested zoning classification.

Mr. Taraszki discussed the applicant's efforts to address concerns related to asbestos and lead, including random sample testing and the addition of development agreement language pertaining to handling of asbestos and compliance with requirements established under Rule 62-701.300(15) of the Florida Administrative Code. He indicated that the proposed site plan has been revised to add a requirement that all drive aisles and parking areas must be paved in conformance with the County Code; and that, during the County permitting process, staff will be able to verify the site's compliance with requirements associated with paving and surface water management, which includes a water quality component.

Responding to a query by Mr. Hendricks, Mr. Taraszki confirmed that Section 6.1.3.2 of the proposed development agreement can be amended to reflect that, in addition to asbestos, lead will also be prevented from entering the waste stream at the solid waste transfer station; whereupon, in response to further queries by Messrs. Cataldo and Hendricks, he provided information regarding procedures for identifying asbestos and lead.

In response to a query by Ms. Johnson, Mr. Schoderbock provided clarifying details regarding the Land Development Code's five-year limit on development agreements and related that development restrictions and covenants must be recorded during the site plan process, which then ties development agreement restrictions to the subject property; and that a development agreement extension can be requested if development does not take place within five years; whereupon, in response to comments and queries by Chairman Jahn, Mr. Schoderbock, with input from Attorney McAteer, briefly discussed the process associated with reverting a property to its original zoning and land use classifications if development does not take place within five years and a development agreement extension is not requested.

Responding to an additional query by Chairman Jahn, Mr. Taraszki, with input from Mr. Schoderbock, provided clarifying information pertaining to paving of drive aisles and parking areas; whereupon, no one appeared following Chairman Jahn's call for proponents.

Upon the Chairman's call for opponents, the following individuals appeared and expressed their concerns related to the applications:

Steve Kawohl, Treasure Island (submitted documents)  
Darlene Shirley, Clearwater

In rebuttal, Mr. Taraszki addressed concerns expressed by one of the opponents regarding surface water management and indicated that a significant portion of the 1.18-acre portion of the subject property is occupied by stormwater retention; and that the new development would need to meet current County Code requirements. Mr. Taraszki also introduced John King, Clearwater, and noted that he represents the operator, Green Energy Transport; whereupon, Messrs. King and Taraszki addressed concerns conveyed by the opponents regarding dust and provided information related to dust control measures, including sprinklers, water cannons, and surface pavement.

Responding to queries by Mr. Hendricks, Messrs. King and Taraszki provided details related to water supply for the spraying mechanisms and locations where spray downs are conducted on the site.

In response to comments and a query by Ms. Johnson, Mr. Taraszki clarified that there is a stormwater retention pond in the site plan, which is separate from the areas where paving is intended to occur; whereupon, responding to a comment by Chairman Jahn, Mr. Schoderbock provided information related to measuring and capturing stormwater runoff based on the amount of impervious surfaces on the site.

Responding to a query by Ms. Shirley, Mr. Taraszki confirmed that the site will be fenced; and that County requirements for fencing will be met.

Upon Chairman Jahn's call for a motion for Case No. FLU-25-06, Mr. Hamilton made a motion for approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Oliveri and failed by a vote of 3 to 3, with Messrs. Cataldo and Hendricks and Ms. Johnson dissenting.

Attorney McAteer indicated that an amendment to the development agreement regarding lead was proposed. In response to comments by Chairman Jahn, Mr. Schoderbock confirmed that the applicant's expressed intent to use pavement in place of a dirt surface for drive aisles and parking areas was previously added to the development agreement and does not require inclusion in the motion; whereupon, Ms. Johnson made a motion to recommend denial of Case No. FLU-25-06, which was seconded by Mr. Cataldo.

Mr. Hamilton indicated that he is uncomfortable with attempting to dictate operations on the subject property; and that the applicant's proposal addresses stormwater, impervious surfaces, and dust control; whereupon, Mr. Cataldo related that he does not believe that this is the appropriate time to have this conversation.

Responding to queries by Chairman Jahn and Ms. Johnson, Attorney McAteer indicated that the LPA is a land use board, not an environmental, permitting, or contaminant board; that the LPA's mission statement is to find whether or not something is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and Land Development Code; and that while the members are also voting on the development agreement, the restrictions within it are negotiated points to which the applicant has agreed in order to address the Board's concerns.

In response to a query by Chairman Jahn, Mr. Schoderbock provided brief comments regarding Code requirements for non-conforming uses; whereupon, Chairman Jahn indicated that while she is sensitive to potential asbestos and lead contamination, she is bound by the law and can only consider aspects such as water runoff and dust generation in the context of compatibility; and that she sees controls for water runoff and dust emission as part of the applicant's proposal.

Upon the Chairman's call for a motion regarding Case No. FLU-25-06, Mr. Oliveri made a motion to approve. Attorney McAteer related that there is already a motion on the floor; whereupon, Mr. Hamilton noted that the motion was for denial. Upon the Chairman's call for the vote, the motion failed by a vote of 3 to 3, with Chairman Jahn and Messrs. Hamilton and Oliveri dissenting.

Mr. Taraszki indicated that, in light of the split votes, he would like to request a continuance of one month in order to, hopefully, have another Board member in



attendance; whereupon, following Chairman Jahn's call for a motion to continue for one month, Mr. Oliveri made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Cataldo and carried unanimously.

Responding to a query by Mr. Hamilton, Attorney McAteer indicated that Case No. ZON-25-04 must also be continued since it cannot be presented to the BCC without a future land use case; whereupon, Mr. Hamilton made a motion to continue Case No. ZON-25-04 to the February LPA meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Johnson and carried unanimously.

Thereupon, Mr. Schoderbock noted that the February LPA meeting is scheduled for February 11.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Schoderbock welcomed Mr. Oliveri as the newest member of the LPA.

Upon the Chairman's call for a motion to adjourn, Ms. Johnson made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Hamilton and carried unanimously; whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 11:11 AM.