



**Places of Assembly Forum
Tuesday, December 5, 2006
Minutes**

Meeting began at 2:05 p.m.

Mr. MacGillis, Zoning Director, began the meeting by requesting that staff and the attendees introduce themselves. Mr. MacGillis pointed out that staff had prepared an agenda to keep the discussion ongoing. He mentioned that this second meeting served as a follow up to the October 26, 2006 meeting and noted that the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) had directed staff to continue the dialog related to Places of Assembly (POA).

The BCC, he stated, had directed staff to remove the square footage and seating limitations from the proposed language (ULDC amendment). These directives were subsequently completed and adopted by the BCC, and also included changes related to parking, collocated uses, and definitions. Mr. MacGillis pointed out that about a year ago staff had recommended amendments to the ULDC. These recommendations did not come directly from the BCC, but was just part of his responsibility as the zoning director to make general maintenance modifications to the ULDC. He stated that zoning's first attempt was to look at the ongoing conditions that were being put not only on churches but also on any POA, which includes nonprofit assembly uses. He reiterated that the intent was to work with the county attorney's office to make sure all three uses were treated consistently and fairly in the ULDC.

Mr. MacGillis went on to say that there were ongoing negotiations with architects, neighbors, pastors, BCC, and staff, regarding various applications and whether or not they meet the intent of the ULDC. Based upon those discussions, staff proposed the amendments and presented them to the BCC for their consideration. He further stated that staff should have advised the public of the proposed changes. He asked if there was some way to come up with standard regulations that would allow for increased setbacks and buffering based upon the size of the lot and surrounding uses. These requirements would allow an applicant to proceed with more confidence by addressing possible areas of concern prior to application submittal. The purpose and intent of the ULDC, he said, is to sufficiently address issues so that staff does not have to add numerous conditions and to limit the amount of public opposition from neighbors. Ms. Kwok, Chief Planner, followed up on that issue and said staff is still addressing some issues such as traffic, access points, egress and ingress, lighting, height, and locating churches on major collector or arterial streets. She also mentioned that each site plan is different and that our job is to treat each site plan fairly.

Mr. MacGillis suggested that a memo be prepared to go before the BCC in February to discuss whether or not there will be any further need to amend the ULDC. He pointed out that he would like to go back to the BCC and inform them that there is no need for further ULDC amendments. His intent is to see if there are some supplementary requirements that can be agreed upon. Staff would like to inform the BCC that

compatibility is still an issue that needs to be addressed and to look into ways of addressing this issue without limiting the seats or the square footage.

Mr. McGinley (agent) referred to a statement he made at the previous meeting and said it was incorrectly reported. He wished to clarify the fact that he suggested that churches be prohibited from being built on local streets, and encouraged the structures to be built on streets such as Military Trail. He believed that would be the perfect solution.

Suggestions from Public:

- The ULDC should have standard conditions that apply to all churches to make it easier for staff and public.
- Staff should review setbacks, tier systems, and buffers to meet the wide variety of different kinds of property in the County.
- Staff should come up with some type of protection for site plans that are now approved but will expire shortly.
- Send out an email to the public and inform them there will be another meeting mid-January and the sub-committee should bring two bullets with concerns or suggestions.

Suggestions from Staff:

- Staff could look at amending the ULDC to require POAs proposed in residential areas be subject to certain performance standards. Those proposed in non-residential areas would be subject to existing ULDC provisions. Mr. MacGillis stated he would inform the BCC that there are still applications in the system that are costing the applicant money and consuming staff time with issues of compatibility, which should be our focus.
- Mr. MacGillis suggested drafting a letter recapping input from this meeting and asked if anyone would like a follow-up meeting and present an outline of issues raised before the BCC in February. He would let them know that several meetings have been held and we are still in open dialog to come up with standards. He further stated that he would like to receive ideas from the public focusing on landscaping and setbacks. The public was asked to have these ideas by mid January.

Meeting Adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Paula Pritchard, Secretary

<http://www.pbcgov.com/pzb/Zoning/code/newsrelease/>