LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY
THURSDAY, MAY 21, 2026 – 2:00 PM
10451 GULF BOULEVARD TREASURE ISLAND, FL 33706

MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

This meeting will immediately follow the Planning and Zoning Board Meeting

1. **MEETING CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDING OFFICER**
2. **PLEDGE ALLEGIANCE**
3. **CELL PHONE ANNOUNCEMENT**
4. **ROLL CALL**
5. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

   5.A Approval of the following Local Planning Agency Minutes: March 12, 2026 and April 16, 2026
   03.12.2026 LPA Minutes.pdf
   04.16.26 LPA Minutes.pdf

6. **PRESENTATION OF ITEMS**

   6.A Review of Ordinance 2026-15 - Recommending Exemption from Site Plan Review for City Infrastructure Projects
   Resolution 2026-02 City Infrastructure Exemption (2026-15).docx
   Ordinance 2026-15 City Infrastructure Projects.docx
   Business Impact Estimate - Ord 2026-15 City Infrastructure.docx

7. **LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY ISSUES, COMMENTS, OR DISCUSSION**
8. **REPORTS OF CITY ATTORNEY, STAFF AND BOARD MEMBERS**
9. **NEXT LPA MEETING**
10. **PUBLIC COMMENTS**
11. **ADJOURNMENT**

AGENDA ITEM NO. 5.A

Item Cover Page

LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY AGENDA ITEM REPORT

DATE:	May 21, 2026
SUBMITTED BY:	Tia Payton, Administration
ITEM TYPE:	Minutes
AGENDA SECTION:	APPROVAL OF MINUTES
SUBJECT:	Approval of the following Local Planning Agency Minutes: March 12, 2026 and April 16, 2026
BACKGROUND:	Minutes of public meetings are governed by Florida Statute 286.011. The minutes are not required to be verbatim. Minutes will, however, include: the location, time and duration of the meeting; identification of attending Commission Members; titles of topics that were considered; action taken, in the form of motions, seconds, and votes on the motions. The City Clerk's office recognizes the historical value of providing context. To that end, the City Clerk's office may add a summary of discussions and additional details.
POLICY/PURPOSE:	The purpose of this item is to review and approve the following minutes: March 12, 2026 and April 16, 2026
STRATEGIC PLAN RELEVANCE:	.
ANALYSIS/DISCUSSION:	.
FUNDING:	There is no cost associated.
MOTION:	I move to approve the minutes, as presented.

ATTACHMENTS:
03.12.2026 LPA Minutes.pdf
04.16.26 LPA Minutes.pdf

LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY
THURSDAY, MARCH 12, 2026 – 6:00 PM
10451 GULF BOULEVARD TREASURE ISLAND, FL 33706

Minutes

1. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDING OFFICER

Chair Harris called the meeting to order at 6 p.m.

2. PLEDGE ALLEGIANCE

Chair Harris led in the pledge of allegiance.

3. CELL PHONE ANNOUNCEMENT

Chair Harris asked all in attendance to silence their cellphones.

4. ROLL CALL

Present:

Richard Harris, Chair
Ross Sanchez, Vice Chair
Valerie Acree
Daniel Billingsley
Chris Downing
Marvin Shavlan
Grant Smith
Mark Zdrojewski

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - None

6. PRESENTATION OF ITEMS

6.A Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment Resolution

Chair Harris noted Planned Development (PD) had been talked about before but there was no PD category in Treasure Island and many other municipalities had PD categories, wanted to do the framework alongside the Master Plan, named a few areas which could benefit from PDs and explained developers would be able to apply but the Commission would have to approve the application.

Mr. Downing inquired about what the LPA could or could not do in connection with PDs. Chair Harris explained the LPA resolution would be a recommendation to the City Commission and said the letter sent by City Manager Charlie Van Zant was superseded by further instruction. Attorney Brookes noted the City Manager was present to address the letter. City Manager Van Zant explained he had approached the City Commission in two meetings for height and density increases and the Commission responded with wanting to have a master planner review the changes and said he would give a report on the outcome of the meeting.

Mr. Shavlan explained the document prepared was to start a conversation. Attorney Brookes explained a PD enabling section would need to be added to the code first. Mr. Shavlan inquired if it would be included in the Land Development Regulations (LDR). Attorney Brookes confirmed that it would and said it did not need to be in the Comprehensive (comp) plan. Mr. Shavlan asked if the PD enabling section was not in the comp plan then could be challenged. Attorney Brookes explained that it would have to state that the PDs would have to be in compliance with the comp plan. Mr. Shavlan suggested putting the enabling PDs in the comp plan. Chair Harris explained that each developer would need to put in an application and must comply with the comp plan and explained if the developer would like to modify the comp plan then an application must be put in to do so. Mr. Shavlan asked if they would be amending it for that property. Attorney Brookes answered the PD created the enabling and rezone, then if they go over their current planned land use they would have to apply to amend the comp plan. He then explained once recommended to the City Commission they would have to approve it, the ordinance would have to go to LPA for review then to forward Pinellas/county and said that it could be passed and entered by the end of May. Mr. Shavlan inquired if developers would have to wait for the Master Plan to be done to apply. Attorney Brookes answered yes. Mr. Downing explained implementing PDs gave the Commission the ability to create zoning districts, said it gave a lot of power to the City Commission. Attorney Brookes noted the developer would be limited by the comp plan. Mr. Grant inquired about the pd process and the criteria for it, asked if it would make sense to create the application process before anything else. Attorney Brookes noted a development agreement could be required. Mr. Grant explained the criteria should be made while creating the enabling section. Attorney Brookes explained that the criteria would be included in the PD enabling section. Mr. Grant asked if the developer would have to ask for public input. Attorney Brookes explained there would be public comment during LPA and the two commission meetings, noted the developer may have to put a notice out, and the board could add additional criteria. Vice Chair Sanchez inquired if the comments could be called out and noted the process was difficult for developers. Attorney Brookes explained there would be more flexibility for developers and compatibility for residents. Attorney Brookes further explained the developer could be asked to provide public benefits. Discussion continued how PDs benefited the public. Chair Harris would like to discourage bubble plan PDs. Attorney Brookes agreed with Chair Harris statement. Chair Harris noted the more detailed the PD the better. Mr. Shavlan asked if the board would require detailed plans. Mr. Grant inquired if the individuals' seeking changes for height and density would the comp plan be changed for one proposal or would it be a permanent change to the comp plan. Attorney Brookes explained PDs would have to

stay within the comp plan, a comp plan amendment would be needed for any PDs outside of what the comp plan allows, said a change future land use or for map amendment would affect that particular property only.

Attorney Brookes explained developers could ask for small scale plan amendment which would just be for 50 acers or less and said small scale plan amendments that have an expedited process. Mr. Shavlan inquired if a small-scale plan amendment would only apply to that one parcel. Attorney Brookes answered yes. Mr. Downing warned the board that this would give too much power to the Commission. Mr. Shavlan explained PDs would give an opportunity for developers and expressed heigh and density needed to be raised. Mr. Downing does not agree with the approach. Mr. Grant explained the property tax revenue was small. Chair Harris called for public comment.

Mr. Mark Hohe, 225 104th Ave, explained the Reddington's did not have PDs, and asked who would negotiate for the public benefit.

Mr. Erikk Norri, resident, was in favor if it could make it more efficient for developers then he was in favor for it. Chair Harris explained PDs would have a lot of requirements for developers but would offer flexibility.

Mr. Shawn Byrnes, Pirate Square, explained

Ms. Diana Crabill, District 2, thanked the attorney for his expertise, would like LPA to make the decision for PDs, and suggested safety nets for protecting what the residents want.

Mr. Robert Bozo, District 1, expressed concerns about giving a lot of power to the Commission and noted the Master Plan would guide the PDs.

Ms. Sara Pennington, District 2, stated the Master Plan would give the data the city needs to make proper decisions and expressed concerns about having an unbiased Commission to approve PDs.

Mr. Gillie Thunderbird, explained the Master Plan would be finished in 1.5 to 2 years, explained it would take 3 years for something to happen if PDs are put in place but with the master plan could take up to 5 years. Chair Harris encouraged the Thunderbird to be as detailed as they can.

Chair Harris read a letter from Mr. Alan Biltz, closed the public hearing, and stated his support for PDs.

Vice Chair Sanchez inquired if negotiations would it come through the LPA board. Attorney Brookes explained the applicant would propose it and then LPA and Commission would review it. Vice Chair Sanchez explained that PDs would be a benefit to residents.

Discussion continued. Mr. Downing explained he was positive towards PDs that had guard rails on it, heard the Commission has asked the board to not makes plans until the Master Plan was done, and said the board could not force the issue. Mr. Smith noted he would like

to see if height and density would need to be raised by the Master Plan. **Mr. Shavlan moved to recommend to planned development enabling ordinance in parallel with the recommendation of the master plan; Seconded by Ross Sanchez and passed five to one.**

Chair Harris called for a 10-minute recess.

Chair Harris called the meeting back in order at 7:45 pm.

6.B TI Commercial Activity Update

Economics Director Joan Goodrich presented as detailed in the background material. Vice Chair inquired what the Tahitian permit was for. Director Goodrich explained the Treasure Island Plaza was waiting for an electric permit and tenants. Director Goodrich continued the presentation. Mr. Shavlan asked how foot traffic was measured. Director Goodrich answered through an AI tool based off GPS location on phones and then continued the presentation. Mr. Downing inquired about the unified messaging. Director Goodrich explained it was in development. Vice Chair Sanchez inquired if there were any discussion with developers and property owners. Director Goodrich explained there were no updates. Vice Chair Sanchez asked about if Director Goodrich had spoken to TI Club and noted the property current state. Director Goodrich answered she has not spoken to them and noted CDD was having conversations with all property owners out of compliance. Vice Chair Sanchez asked the process for code compliance. Assistant Director Maryellen Edwards explained the code compliance process. Vice Chair Sanchez inquired if Director Goodrich had a plan for the space on 108th. Director Goodrich noted that private partnerships were being considered. Mr. Downing noted some of the property on 108th would be added to Master Plan. Chair Harris inquired where office space was. Director Goodrich answered there were various small office spaces. Vice Chair Sanchez received confirmation the economic dashboard would be given quarterly. Director Goodrich would be giving an update quarterly. Attorney Brookes noted Director Goodrich was a part of the Master Plan team.

7. LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY ISSUES, COMMENTS, OR DISCUSSION

Mr. Shavlan would like to have an LPA meeting every month, even if there are no items.

Mr. Byrne questioned what the price per square foot was for the properties in Director Goodrich's presentation, questioned the

Ms. Donna would like to know of current projects underway.

8. REPORTS OF CITY ATTORNEY, STAFF AND BOARD MEMBERS - None

9. NEXT LPA MEETING

Vice Chair Sanchez informed the board of his absence at the next Planning and Zoning meeting.

10. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Robert Bozo, District 1, said the meeting was informative.

11. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:18 pm.

_____
Richard Harris, Chair

Attest:

_____
Tia Payton, Deputy City Clerk

LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY
THURSDAY, APRIL 16, 2026
10451 GULF BOULEVARD TREASURE ISLAND, FL 33706

MINUTES

1. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER BY PRESIDING OFFICER

Chair Harris called the meeting to order at 5:02 pm.

2. PLEDGE ALLEGIANCE- None

3. CELL PHONE ANNOUNCEMENT

Chair Harris asked all in attendance to silence their cellphones.

4. ROLL CALL

Present:

Richard Harris- Chair
Ross Sanchez- Vice Chair
Valerie Acree (arrived at 5:30 p.m.)
Daniel Billingsley
Chris Downing
Marvin Shavlan
Grant Smith

Absent:

Mark Zdrojewski

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - None

6. PRESENTATION OF ITEMS

6.A Review of Ordinance 2026-10 Planned Development (PD)

Interim Community Development Director Maryellen Edwards read the ordinance by title only and began a presentation, as detailed in the background materials. During discussion, Mr. Downing asked for clarification on the term “consistent,” to which Interim Director Edwards explained that a PD rezoning must comply with the City’s Comprehensive Plan (CP). Chair Harris stated his preference for allowing developers to submit site-specific land use plans. Mr. Downing reiterated that although PDs must remain consistent with the CP, applicants could request allowances beyond it. Attorney Stuparich clarified that the Local Planning Agency’s (LPA) role was to ensure that the

Land Development Regulations (LDRs) were consistent with the CP, noted PDs must align with the CP and County regulations, explained that enabling PDs would require a CP amendment and that the Board's task was to determine whether the ordinance itself was consistent with the CP and appropriate to forward to the City Commission. Mr. Shavlan questioned why there was no mechanism for prior approval of increased height and density, and Attorney Stuparich responded that CP amendments were separate from PD applications. Chair Harris described the ordinance as an enabling document to establish PDs. Mr. Downing expressed concern that developers could circumvent existing LDRs.

Mr. Shavlan asked what options developers would have if seeking additional height and density, and Attorney Stuparich explained they could apply for both a PD and a small-scale CP amendment. Vice Chair Sanchez noted that height was not specifically addressed in the CP and emphasized that the proposed language was intended to facilitate discussions between developers and staff. Mr. Downing preferred delaying action until completion of the master plan, whereas Vice Chair Sanchez argued that PDs could proceed concurrently. Chair Harris agreed, stating he did not want to wait for the master plan. Discussion continued, including Vice Chair Sanchez's question about how the City could encourage development and confirmation that PD applications would come before the LPA.

Ms. Acree arrived at 5:30 p.m. Chair Harris acknowledged the complexity of the PD process. Mr. Downing and Mr. Smith both emphasized the importance of resident input, particularly regarding height and density. Vice Chair Sanchez asked whether residents would have a role in PD decisions. Mr. Grant responded that the ordinance did not include a requirement for applicants to adhere to resident input. Chair Harris called for public comment.

Mr. Mark Hohe, 225 104th Avenue, submitted a document for the record and questioned the reintroduction of RFM-30 into the ordinance, expressing concern about unelected officials making changes. Chair Harris explained that residential areas were excluded, stated opposition to limiting properties under one acre, and confirmed RFM-30 had been added. Board members indicated the Commission had not directed its removal.

Mr. Shawn Byrnes, Pirate Square, discussed density, noting 22 units per acre and questioning community understanding of existing density standards and development goals.

Ms. Lauren Rubenstein requested to speak after the City's presentation.

Ms. Sarah Pennington, District 2, raised concerns about moving ahead of the master plan, potential impacts of County maximums, and the need to take resident concerns seriously.

Mr. West Evans, Isles of Palms, voiced opposition to maximum allowances and expressed distrust, prompting clarification from Vice Chair Sanchez. Chair Harris responded to accusations against Board members and reiterated that the ordinance would only enable PDs.

Donna Jollimore, Thunderbird Hotel Manager, referenced the master planner's support for PDs and recited Raftelis believed PDs could be run alongside the master plan.

Interim Director Edwards continued the presentation. Vice Chair Sanchez asked whether development agreements were standard with PDs. Attorney Stuparich confirmed they generally were, though not always, required. Mr. Downing asked whether development agreements could be implemented without PDs. Attorney Stuparich said they could, depending on the project. Further discussion addressed the relationship between the City and County CPs, with Chair Harris asking

about small-scale land use amendments. Attorney Stuparich explained that consistency with the County did not automatically determine CP compliance and that proposed rezonings must be evaluated for conflicts with the CP. As Attorney Stuparich reviewed the ordinance and redline changes, Mr. Smith sought clarification that consistency meant developments could not exceed County limits but may be less intense. Attorney Stuparich confirmed and added that applicants must follow the City's CP. Attorney Stuparich further explained that while height was not specified in the CP and deviations could be requested, density must remain consistent. Additional discussion covered design guidelines and applicability to smaller PDs. Vice Chair Sanchez suggested including all elements except ground-floor activation, while Mr. Downing noted that some items could be incorporated into the CP. Attorney Stuparich stated such elements could instead be added to the ordinance.

Chair Harris then called Lauren Rubenstein for public comment, and she expressed support for the PD ordinance, citing its flexibility. In closing, Chair Harris stated he would not support heights exceeding an additional 20 feet but supported recommending the ordinance to the City Commission. Mr. Downing opposed moving forward. Mr. Smith expressed concern about vague and unmeasurable language**. Mr. Shavlan moved to recommend approval of 2026-10 to the City Commission, seconded by Vice Chair Sanchez, and carried five to two; Mr. Downing and Mr. Grant voted no.**

7. LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY ISSUES, COMMENTS, OR DISCUSSION – Not covered.

8. REPORTS OF CITY ATTORNEY, STAFF AND BOARD MEMBERS – Not covered.

9. NEXT LPA MEETING

The next LPA meeting would follow the Planning and Zoning meeting on May 21, 2026. Vice Chair Sanchez requested Economic Development Director Joan Goodrich attend the next LPA agenda and expressed concerns about the dumpsters at the Treasure Island Yacht Club.

10. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Harris called for public comment with no response.

11. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:20 pm

_____
Richard Harris, Chair

Attest:

_____
Tia Payton, Deputy City Clerk

AGENDA ITEM NO. 6.A

Item Cover Page

LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY AGENDA ITEM REPORT

DATE: May 21, 2026

SUBMITTED BY: Maryellen Edwards, Community Development

ITEM TYPE: Ordinances

AGENDA SECTION: PRESENTATION OF ITEMS

SUBJECT: Review of Ordinance 2026-15 - Recommending Exemption from Site Plan Review for City Infrastructure Projects

BACKGROUND:

Chapter 70 of the City of Treasure Island Code of Ordinances establishes site plan review requirements for development and redevelopment activities within the City. Section 70-33 currently identifies several categories of improvements that are exempt from formal site plan review due to their limited land use impacts or routine nature.

Municipal infrastructure and public works projects are often undertaken to maintain essential public services, improve resiliency, address aging infrastructure, respond to emergency conditions, or meet capital improvement and grant funding timelines. Many of these projects occur within existing public rights-of-way, easements, or publicly owned property and typically do not involve changes in land use, density, or intensity.

Under the current regulations, some municipal infrastructure projects may still require site plan review even when the projects are operational, maintenance-related, or necessary to protect public infrastructure and public safety. The site plan review process can increase administrative processing time, delay construction schedules, and create additional project costs without providing substantial land use review benefits for

these types of public infrastructure improvements.

The proposed ordinance adds exemptions for qualifying municipal infrastructure and resiliency projects while clarifying that projects remain subject to applicable engineering review, permitting requirements, and other code-related approvals.

POLICY/PURPOSE:

The purpose of this ordinance is to streamline the construction, maintenance, repair, and upgrade of essential municipal infrastructure projects by exempting qualifying public infrastructure improvements from formal site plan review requirements. The ordinance promotes efficient government operations while maintaining applicable engineering, permitting, environmental, and safety review requirements.

STRATEGIC PLAN RELEVANCE:

Bold Action 1: Perform a review of local ordinances and Land Development Regulations
Bold Action 2: Update the City's Comprehensive Plan, local ordinances and Land Development Regulations

ANALYSIS/DISCUSSION:

Following discussions with the Public Works Director, staff drafted the proposed ordinance, which is intended to provide administrative efficiency for routine and necessary municipal infrastructure projects that primarily serve a governmental or public utility function.

By exempting qualifying municipal infrastructure projects from site plan review, the City may reduce project delays, improve coordination of capital improvement projects, and more effectively respond to infrastructure failures, storm recovery efforts, resiliency initiatives, and grant funding deadlines.

The ordinance maintains important safeguards by limiting the exemptions primarily to public infrastructure projects and excluding new principal occupied governmental buildings intended for administrative, office, or public assembly purposes. In addition, exempted projects remain subject to applicable engineering standards, construction permitting requirements, environmental regulations, and other technical reviews required by the City Code.

	Overall, the ordinance is consistent with the City's goals of maintaining critical infrastructure, improving resiliency, supporting efficient government operations, and protecting the public health, safety, and welfare of the community.
FUNDING:	No funding is requested.
MOTION:	I move to approve Resolution 2026-02 recommending approval of Ordinance 2026-15 to the City Commission.

ATTACHMENTS:
Resolution 2026-02 City Infrastructure Exemption (2026-15).docx
Ordinance 2026-15 City Infrastructure Projects.docx
Business Impact Estimate - Ord 2026-15 City Infrastructure.docx

LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY
RESOLUTION NO. 2026-02

A RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY OF TREASURE ISLAND CITY COMMISSION FOR THE APPROVAL OF AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF TREASURE ISLAND, FLORIDA, AMENDING CHAPTER 70, "PLANNING AND ZONING" OF THE CITY OF TREASURE ISLAND CODE OF ORDINANCES BY REVISING SECTION 70-31 "EXEMPTIONS FROM SITE PLAN REVIEW" BY ADDING AN EXEMPTION FOR CITY INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS FROM SITE PLAN REVIEW REQUIREMENTS"

WHEREAS, Section 163.3174, Fla. Stat., provides for the establishment of a "local planning agency"; and

WHEREAS, Section 163.3174, Fla. Stat., describes the duties and responsibilities of a Local Planning Agency, which include preparing and making recommendations of comprehensive plan amendments and proposed land development regulation amendments; and

WHEREAS, on May 21, 2026, the Planning and Zoning Board, sitting as the Local Planning Agency, reviewed the proposed amendments provided herein and found the amendments consistent with the Treasure Island Comprehensive Plan and its elements; and

WHEREAS, on May 21, 2026, the Planning and Zoning Board, sitting as the Local Planning Agency, held a public hearing on Ordinance 2026-15 amending Chapter 70, Planning and Zoning and has considered the information received at said public hearing; and

WHEREAS, on May 21, 2026, the Planning and Zoning Board, sitting as the Local Planning Agency, recommended approval of Ordinance 2026-15 to the City Commission; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Local Planning Agency of the City of Treasure Island, Florida, in a public meeting assembled:

The City of Treasure Island Local Planning Agency hereby transmits to the City Commission the proposed amendments to the Land Development Regulations, as set forth in Exhibit "A", Ordinance 2026-15, with the recommendation to approve said amendments.

PASSED AND DULY ADOPTED BY THE CITY OF TREASURE ISLAND LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY, 21st Day of May 2026.

TREASURE ISLAND LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY

_____ _____
Richard Harris, Chair Date
Local Planning Agency

ATTEST:

_____
Tia Payton, Deputy City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND LEGAL SUFFICIENCY

_____
Vose Law Firm, City Attorney

ORDINANCE 2026-15

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF TREASURE ISLAND, FLORIDA, AMENDING CHAPTER 70, "PLANNING AND ZONING" OF THE CITY OF TREASURE ISLAND CODE OF ORDINANCES BY REVISING SECTION 70-31 "EXEMPTIONS FROM SITE PLAN REVIEW" BY ADDING AN EXEMPTION FOR CITY INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS FROM SITE PLAN REVIEW REQUIREMENTS; PROVIDING FOR CONFLICT, PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY, PROVIDING FOR CODIFICATION, AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, Chapter 70, Section 70-33 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Treasure Island ("Code"), Florida, identifies improvements that are exempt from site plan review; and

WHEREAS, certain municipal infrastructure projects are essential to the protection of public health, safety, and welfare, including but not limited to utility improvements, drainage facilities, roadway improvements, pump stations, water and wastewater infrastructure, resiliency projects, and other government-owned infrastructure improvements; and

WHEREAS, the application of formal site plan review requirements to routine or necessary municipal public works and infrastructure projects may create unnecessary administrative delays, increase project costs, impede timely construction, and adversely affect the City's ability to respond to infrastructure needs, grant funding deadlines, emergency conditions, resiliency initiatives, and capital improvement schedules.

WHEREAS, exempting qualifying municipal public works and infrastructure projects from site plan review requirements, while maintaining compliance with applicable engineering, environmental, construction permitting, and safety standards, promotes efficient government operations and serves the public interest; and; and

WHEREAS, the City Commission finds that this Ordinance is in the best interests of the citizens of the City of Treasure Island, Florida.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF TREASURE ISLAND:

Section 1. The recitals set forth above are true and correct and adopted herein by reference as legislative findings by the City Commission of the City of Treasure Island, Florida, for the adoption of this Ordinance.

Section 2. Chapter 70, Section 70-33 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Treasure Island, Florida, is hereby amended and shall read as follows:

(Underlined terms are additions; ~~stricken~~ terms are deletions from the original text)

Sec. 70-33. – Exemptions from site plan review.

(a) No site plan review shall be required under this article for the following improvements:

(1) All single-family and duplex dwellings that are a permitted use in that zoning category, except those sites abutting the Gulf of Mexico or the public beach adjacent thereto.

(2) Changes in plant species, increases to landscaped and/or pervious area.

(3) Decks or walkways which do not exceed 12 inches above existing grade and do not reduce the landscaped or pervious area below the minimum requirements.

(4) Utility sheds which shall not exceed 100 square feet (one shed per property).

(5) Fences.

(6) Flag poles.

(7) Docks, davits, boat lifts and seawalls.

(8) Interior modifications to existing structures, provided that there is no change in land use classification or zoning district or increase in density or intensity of use.

(9) Exterior modifications to existing structures, such as repainting, changes in façades or signage, etc., provided that there is no change in the land use classification zoning district or increase in density or intensity of use.

(10) Swimming pools and spas.

(11) Construction, replacement, repair, maintenance, upgrade, or relocation of public infrastructure located within existing public rights-of-way, easements, or publicly owned property, including but not limited to roads, drainage facilities, utilities, lift stations, pump stations, seawalls, beach stabilization, and similar public works infrastructure.

(12) Public stormwater management, drainage, flood control, and resiliency projects.

(13) Development of local municipal infrastructure projects, excluding new principal occupied governmental buildings intended primarily for administrative, office, or public assembly purposes.

(14) Routine maintenance, rehabilitation, resurfacing, or replacement activities that do not substantially alter the approved use of the property or materially increase impacts to adjacent properties.

(15) Projects exempted under this section shall remain subject to applicable engineering review, permitting requirements, and other approvals required by this Code.

(~~15~~) Exemptions to site plan modifications set forth in section 70-151.

(b) When the project or improvement is otherwise subject to site plan review, then the items listed in subsection (a) are not eliminated from that site plan review.

The planning and zoning board shall have the authority to waive site plan requirements for modifications to existing structures that are necessary in order to comply with the requirements of this Code.

Section 3. All ordinances in conflict herewith are repealed to the extent necessary to give this ordinance full force and effect.

Section 4. Should any section, paragraph, clause, sentence, item, word or provision of this Ordinance be declared invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of this Ordinance as a whole or any part hereof, not so declared to be invalid.

Section 5. It is the intent of the City Commission that the provisions of this Ordinance shall become codified and made a part of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Treasure Island, Florida, and the sections cited in this Ordinance may be renumbered, reformatted or re-lettered to accomplish such intention.

Section 6. This Ordinance shall become effective immediately upon its passage.

CITY OF TREASURE ISLAND, FLORIDA

FIRST READING and PUBLIC HEARING on the ____ day of _____, 2026.

SECOND READING and PUBLIC HEARING on the ____ day of _____, 2026.

PUBLISHED in the Tampa Bay Times on the ____ day of _____, 2026.

_____
John Doctor, Mayor

Attest:

_____
Lisa-Marie V. Kennedy, Clerk

Approved as to Form:

_____
Vose Law Firm, City Attorney

City of Treasure Island
Business Impact Estimate

Proposed ordinance's title/reference:

ORDINANCE 2026-15

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF TREASURE ISLAND, FLORIDA, AMENDING CHAPTER 70, "PLANNING AND ZONING" OF THE CITY OF TREASURE ISLAND CODE OF ORDINANCES BY REVISING SECTION 70-31 "EXEMPTIONS FROM SITE PLAN REVIEW" BY ADDING AN EXEMPTION FOR CITY INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS FROM SITE PLAN REVIEW REQUIREMENTS; PROVIDING FOR CONFLICT, PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY, PROVIDING FOR CODIFICATION, AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Business Impact Estimate is provided in accordance with section 166.041(4), Florida Statutes.

Question 1. Does the proposed ordinance meet one or more of the exceptions listed below? If so, then please check the applicable exception below and move to Question 2. If one or more boxes are checked below, this means the City is of the view that a business impact estimate is not required by section 166.041(4), Florida Statutes, for the proposed ordinance. If there is no applicable exception, proceed with completing the business impact estimate at Question 3.

☐ The proposed ordinance is required for compliance with Federal or State law or regulation;

☐ The proposed ordinance relates to the issuance or refinancing of debt;

☐ The proposed ordinance relates to the adoption of budgets or budget amendments, including revenue sources necessary to fund the budget;

☐ The proposed ordinance is required to implement a contract or an agreement, including, but not limited to, any Federal, State, local, or private grant or other financial assistance accepted by the municipal government;

☐ The proposed ordinance is an emergency ordinance;

☐ The ordinance relates to procurement; or

☐ The proposed ordinance is enacted to implement the following:

a. Development orders and development permits, as those terms are defined in section 163.3164, Florida Statutes, and development agreements, as authorized by

the Florida Local Government Development Agreement Act under sections 163.3220-163.3243, Florida Statutes;

b. Comprehensive plan amendments and land development regulation amendments initiated by an application by a private party other than the City;
c. Sections 190.005 and 190.046, Florida Statutes, regarding community development districts;
d. Section 553.73, Florida Statutes, relating to the Florida Building Code; or
e. Section 633.202, Florida Statutes, relating to the Florida Fire Prevention Code.

Question 2. Based on the exception you selected above and in accordance with the provisions of the controlling law, please provide an explanation below of why the ordinance meets the exception(s).

N/A

Question 3. If there is no applicable exception, proceed with completing the below Business Impact Estimate. This Business Impact Estimate may be revised following its initial posting. In accordance, the City hereby publishes the following information:

A. Summary of the proposed ordinance (must include a statement of the public purpose to be served by the proposed ordinance, such as serving the public health, safety, morals and welfare of the City): The proposed ordinance amends Chapter 70 of the City of Treasure Island Code of Ordinances to exempt certain municipal infrastructure and public works projects from site plan review requirements. The exemption applies to qualifying City infrastructure improvements, including public works projects within rights-of-way, stormwater management projects, utility improvements, roadway improvements, drainage facilities, resiliency projects, and other government-owned infrastructure projects, excluding buildings.

The public purpose of the ordinance is to promote the health, safety, and welfare of the City by allowing important infrastructure projects to move forward more efficiently and without unnecessary administrative delays. The ordinance is intended to improve the City's ability to respond to infrastructure needs, storm recovery efforts, emergency conditions, resiliency initiatives, and capital improvement schedules while continuing to require compliance with applicable engineering, environmental, permitting, and safety standards.

B. An estimate of the direct economic impact of the proposed ordinance on private, for-profit businesses in the city, including the following, if any:

(1) An estimate of direct compliance costs that businesses may reasonably incur if the ordinance is enacted; The proposed ordinance is not expected to create direct compliance costs for private businesses because the exemptions apply only to qualifying municipal infrastructure and public works projects undertaken by the City.

(2) Identification of any new charge or fee on businesses subject to the proposed ordinance, or for which businesses will be financially responsible; The proposed ordinance does not create any new charges or fees on private businesses.

(3) An estimate of the City's regulatory costs, including an estimate of revenues from any new charges or fees that will be imposed on businesses to cover such costs. The proposed ordinance is expected to reduce administrative review and processing costs associated with site plan review for qualifying municipal infrastructure projects. The ordinance does not establish any new charges or fees and is not expected to generate additional revenue.

(4) Any other direct economic impacts of the proposed ordinance on private, for-profit businesses in the City that are not covered by (1), (2), or (3):

C. Good faith estimate of the number of businesses likely to be impacted by the ordinance: The ordinance is not expected to directly impact private businesses because it applies to City infrastructure and public works projects. However, contractors and consultants working on municipal projects may indirectly benefit from reduced project review timelines and more efficient project delivery.

D. Additional information the governing body deems useful (if any): The ordinance is intended to streamline the delivery of municipal infrastructure improvements and reduce delays associated with routine site plan review processes for public projects. The exemption is limited to municipal infrastructure projects and does not eliminate the need to comply with applicable engineering, environmental, construction permitting, or public safety requirements.