

Rahman, Nousheen

From: info@forwardpinellas.org
Sent: Wednesday, September 29, 2021 7:30 AM
To: Rahman, Nousheen
Cc: Jablon, Tina
Subject: FW: Oldsmar density increase- the residents of Oldsmar voted NO

Nousheen

Good Morning... hope you are doing well.

I received two more this morning... I will send the other one momentarily.

Maria



**FORWARD
PINELLAS**



Maria Kelly
Secretary
Main: 727-464-8250
Direct: 727-464-5648
forwardpinellas.org

Forward Pinellas serves as the planning council and metropolitan planning organization for Pinellas County.

All government correspondence is subject to the public records law.

From: G A <6lorialynn@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2021 10:02 PM
To: info@forwardpinellas.org <info1@co.pinellas.fl.us>
Subject: Oldsmar density increase- the residents of Oldsmar voted NO

CAUTION: *This message has originated from outside of the organization. **Do not** click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.*

To Whom it May Concern:

I am writing to ask the boards looking at the Oldsmar density request to VOTE NO on granting the increase. I am a resident of Oldsmar and do not approve of any plan that seeks to double our density in order to build high-rise apartments or condos on CRA land purchased by taxpayers and set aside for community purposes. The plan being considered NOW for our small downtown lot is primarily a 5-story apartment complex with an 850-car parking garage. The sale would be to one developer who is primarily an apartment developer, and not a proper stakeholder/partner for creating a walkable downtown area for the people of Oldsmar. This is not the purpose of this land and the

citizens who have invested tax dollars for decades have not approved high density housing for their downtown land!

In fact, very few residents in Oldsmar are even aware of the density increase request and what this truly means for the community both short term and long term. At no time has the city discussed the consequences of this density increase to its citizens. You won't be receiving many letters because people don't know this is happening. This has not been an open and honest process, especially for the residents who live nearby the area in question.

It's also important for members of the different boards to know how the City of Oldsmar got to this stage of requesting a density change approval as it pertains to the Countywide Plan. For the past several years the city has been pursuing building a mixed-use downtown development to mirror its neighbors of Safety Harbor and Dunedin. Until last October the preliminary planning circled around building 2-3 story buildings that would have first floor commercial usage and the upper floors being residential. This type of development fit the current units per acre density codes, and more importantly patterned the look and feel of the existing Historic Oldsmar community. The city released an RFQ in May of 2020, to seek a designer firm to design such a scheme and construction oversight to the project. There were multiple responders, and they were all ranked through a three-month process by city staff.

However, the results of the RFQ and the design of a lower density development were abandoned in October 2020 when the city received an unsolicited letter of proposal from the Woodfield Development Firm to design and construct a 5 to 6 story multiuse residential complex of 316 units which would require the city to increase its unit per acre density codes by over 100% (from 30 to 65 units per acre). This in city staff words was a "change in strategy" to the CRA downtown development plan. This development would also require 85% (720) of the parking spaces in the 850-space parking garage the city planned for commercial downtown activity. Further, "the developer" would now own the parking garage leaving the city with no control of how those additional spaces are used in the future.

Also, important to note is that the city's own Advisory Planning Board **voted 6-0** in August 2021 to not recommend this density increase, mainly because the proposed increase went against the city's own precedent it has held other developers to in the past in requesting a density code change. The following reasons were discussed in that meeting and the following City Council meeting.

1. The City **has not** performed an in-depth study of how traffic will be affected, or how the added congestion will affect local, county, and state road traffic.
 - a. The potential 470 to 600 cars could create a bottle neck adjacent local street intersection at Washington St., Park St., and St. Pete drive in rush hour. Most importantly the effect on the access to CR 580, a county road.
 - b. How will this increase of density and traffic affect all Hurricane evacuation routes?

c. Can the two lane (20') State Street handle the 475-600 potential vehicles during rush hour and hold up under the increased traffic issue? The 475-600 comes from parking spaces designated by Woodfield for condos and future hotel. The additional traffic of 100 spots for employees and not to mention 150 cars hotel traffic? All flowing into county road 580.

2. The City had not identified ample hurricane shelters for 316-unit condos and 150 hotel rooms? $475 + 150 = 625$ potential people? Where are they being sheltered?

3. Storm water and flood plain issues.

- a. The need to raise the ground floor above flood plain.
- b. Existing height restrictions may be exceeded
- c. Increased water shed to 580? What is the design for flood control?
- d. Potential flood hazard to State Street SR 580 and surrounding areas?
- e. Has the City calculated how this additional watershed will affect hurricane evac routes and procedures?

4. The Oldsmar Planning Advisory Board stated emphatically in voting 6-0 not to approve the proposed density increase that the city is going against its own standards and precedent to not consider a density increase without an approved plan and development agreement in place first. The city's presentation to the planning board was incomplete for the purpose. Staff is appearing to be lacking the necessary experience and knowledge for such a development, and they are making multiple mistakes when it comes to sharing accountable information with citizens in regard to a Community Redevelopment Project. Developers made their first presentation to the city council in February 2021 workshop not promoted to the citizens. Council voted to move forward with negotiations with Woodfield on March 2nd without any public conversation. So just six months later without proper documentation, they approached the planning board asking for this increase. Planning board members and citizens have yet to see any formal study or in-depth research of the following:

- a. Proper research of how all traffic areas will be impacted
- b. Proper research of how this density increase will impact the Countywide stormwater and flood plan.
- c. Adherence to the Countywide Hurricane Evacuation Plan
- d. Environmental impact studies for the density increase.
- e. Long-term consequences of a density change should this deal with Woodfield fall through, or how other developers can use this to sue to the city.

Additionally, the city has not been proactive with sharing their "change in strategy" with citizens who are expecting shops and cafes. Those who have learned of the project are asking why the city is putting the cart before the horse, because residents haven't seen the plan for the apartments. I believe citizens have the right to ask questions before undertaking a large change such as doubling the density to make way for an apartment complex. In addition to traffic and environmental concerns, what about impacts to noise,

safety, law enforcement contracts, fire department capacity, and city services such as sewer and water. What about losing control of the land when it comes to cleanliness or upkeep for property that is adjacent to city hall? What about financial disclosure to citizens who invested in this land and how the new tax revenue will be used to their benefit?

Some citizens were able to speak out against this density increase at a city council meeting. They had just learned about the apartments/density issue and were ridiculed for being against development or for being too late to the conversation. City staff and city council members were defending the development and developer in a one-sided biased way that I believe was inappropriate at this stage of the project. Also, a couple hundred citizens signed a petition asking for more information from the city before moving forward. Citizens sent emails to the city council, made phone calls and had in-person meetings. Despite these requests to slow down the process, the city council, primarily the mayor have ignored the call of the people and are moving forward with this density increase. If a larger effort was mounted, you would see that a large number of citizens are indeed against this density increase for this downtown area. If you approve this density increase, then you too are going against the will of the citizens for a project that is not needed in our city.

Thank you for your time and for looking carefully at this project. Again, I urge you to vote NO and send the City of Oldsmar back to its citizens to create a project that is more suited to the land and the will of the people.

Sincerely,

Rahman, Nousheen

From: info@forwardpinellas.org
Sent: Wednesday, September 29, 2021 7:31 AM
To: Rahman, Nousheen
Cc: Jablon, Tina
Subject: FW: Oldsmar Density Request citizen letter

Here is the second one.

Enjoy your day...

Maria



Maria Kelly
Secretary
Main: 727-464-8250
Direct: 727-464-5648
forwardpinellas.org

Forward Pinellas serves as the planning council and metropolitan planning organization for Pinellas County.

All government correspondence is subject to the public records law.

From: Pamela Settle <PRSettle@msn.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2021 6:33 PM
To: info@forwardpinellas.org <info1@co.pinellas.fl.us>
Subject: Oldsmar Density Request citizen letter

CAUTION: *This message has originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.*

September 28, 2021

To Whom it May Concern:

I am writing to ask the county boards looking at the Oldsmar density request to **VOTE NO** on granting the increase. I am a resident of Oldsmar and do not approve of any plan that seeks to double our density in order to build high-rise apartments or condos on CRA land purchased by taxpayers and set aside for community purposes. The plan being considered NOW for our small downtown lot is primarily a 5-story apartment complex with an 850-car parking garage. The sale would be to one developer who is primarily an apartment developer, and not a proper stakeholder/partner for creating a walkable downtown area for the people of Oldsmar. This is not the purpose of this land and the

citizens who have invested tax dollars for decades have not approved high density housing for their downtown land!

In fact, very few residents in Oldsmar are even aware of the density increase request and what this truly means for the community both short term and long term. At no time has the city discussed the consequences of this density increase with its citizens. You won't be receiving many letters because people don't know this is happening. This has not been an open and honest process, especially for the residents who live nearby the area in question.

It's also important for members of the different boards to know how the City of Oldsmar got to this stage of requesting a density change approval as it pertains to the Countywide Plan. For the past several years the city has been pursuing building a mixed-use downtown development to mirror its neighbors of Safety Harbor and Dunedin. Until last October the preliminary planning circled around building 2-3 story buildings that would have first floor commercial usage and the upper floors being residential. This type of development fit the current units per acre density codes, and more importantly patterned the look and feel of the existing Historic Oldsmar community. The city released an RFQ in May of 2020, to seek a designer firm to design such a scheme and construction oversight to the project. There were multiple responders, and they were all ranked through a three-month process by city staff.

However, the results of the RFQ and the design of a lower density development were abandoned in October 2020 when the city received an unsolicited letter of proposal from the Woodfield Development Firm to design and construct a 5 to 6 story multi-use residential complex of 316 units which would require the city to increase its unit per acre density codes by over 100% (from 30 to 65 units per acre). This in city staff words was a "change in strategy" to the CRA downtown development plan. This development would also require 85% (720) of the parking spaces in the 850-space parking garage the city planned for commercial downtown activity. Further, "the developer" would now own the parking garage leaving the city with no control of how those additional spaces are used in the future.

Also, important to note is that the city's own Advisory Planning Board **voted 6-0** in August 2021 to **not recommend** this density increase, mainly because the proposed increase went against the city's own precedent it has held other developers to in the past in requesting a density code change. The following reasons were discussed in that meeting and the following City Council meeting.

1. The City **has not** performed an in-depth study of how traffic will be affected, or how the added congestion will affect local, county, and state road traffic.
2. The City had not identified ample hurricane shelters for 316-unit condos and 150 hotel rooms? $475 + 150 = 625$ potential people? Where are they being sheltered?
3. Storm water and flood plain issues.
 1. The need to raise the ground floor above flood plain.
 2. Existing height restrictions may be exceeded
 3. Increased water shed to 580? What is the design for flood control?
 4. Potential flood hazard to State Street SR 580 and surrounding areas?
 5. Has the City calculated how this additional watershed will affect hurricane evac routes and procedures?

4. The Oldsmar Planning Advisory Board stated emphatically in voting 6-0 not to approve the proposed density increase that the city is going against its own standards and precedent to not consider a density increase without an approved plan and development agreement in place first. The city's presentation to the planning board was incomplete for the purpose. Staff is appearing to be lacking the necessary experience and knowledge for such a development, and they are making multiple mistakes when it comes to sharing accountable information with citizens in regard to a Community Redevelopment Project.

Developers made their first presentation to the city council in February 2021 workshop not promoted to the citizens. Council voted to move forward with negotiations with Woodfield on March 2nd without any public conversation. So just six months later without proper documentation or public outreach, they approached the planning board asking for this increase. Planning board members and citizens have yet to see any formal study or in-depth research of traffic areas, stormwater and flood plan, adherence to the Countywide Hurricane Evacuation Plan, environmental impact studies for the density increase and long-term consequences of a density change should this deal with Woodfield fall through, or how other developers can use this to sue to the city.

Additionally, the city has not been proactive with sharing their "change in strategy" with citizens who are expecting shops, cafes and public gathering space. Those who have learned of the project are asking why the city is putting the density cart before the horse, because residents haven't seen the plan for the apartments. I believe citizens have the right to ask questions before undertaking a large change such as doubling the density to make way for an apartment complex. In addition to traffic and environmental concerns, what about impacts to noise, safety, law enforcement contracts, fire department capacity, and city services such as sewer and water. What about losing control of the land when it comes to cleanliness or upkeep for property that is adjacent to city hall? What about financial disclosure to citizens who invested in this land and how the new tax revenue will be used to their benefit?

I was there as a witness to see the citizens who came to the first city council meeting to protest the density increase. Those citizens had just learned about the apartments/density issue from neighbors and showed up angry. Instead of being validated, they were ridiculed for being against development or for being too late to the conversation. City staff and city council members were defending the development and developer in a one-sided biased way that I believe was inappropriate at this stage of the project. Also, a couple hundred citizens signed a petition asking for more information from the city before moving forward. Citizens sent emails to the city council, made phone calls and had in-person meetings. Despite these requests to slow down, the city council, primarily the mayor, have ignored the call of the people and are moving forward with this density increase anyway. If a larger citizen outreach effort was mounted, you would see that a large number of citizens are indeed against this density increase for this downtown area. If you approve this density increase, then you too are going against the will of the citizens for a project that is not needed, and not appropriate, for this location.

Thank you for your time and for looking carefully at this project. Again, I urge you to **vote NO** and send the City of Oldsmar back to its citizens to create a project that is more suited to the land and the

will of the people, especially considering it's a community redevelopment area in a vital part of downtown.

Sincerely,

Pamela Settle, 439 Lakeview Dr. Oldsmar, FL

September 27, 2021

info@forwardpinellas.org

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter is in reference to the density change currently being requested for the CRA area of downtown Oldsmar.

My name is Virginia (Ginger) Tatarzewski. I live in downtown Oldsmar at 303 Park Blvd. I have lived her for 13 years. I am quite active in city activities and go to as many city council meetings as I can.

Over the years I have seen and been present for many proposals for the downtown area. The city of Oldsmar is trying to create a downtown similar to Safety Harbor and Dunedin. The plans that I've seen have usually been 2-3 story mixed use buildings - until this latest proposal, which is a 5 story, 316 unit apartment building with an 850 car parking garage. This also may include a 150 unit hotel.

To the best of my knowledge, the city received this unsolicited plan from Woodfield Development, who specialize (their words) in apartment buildings. In order for the city to continue the proposal from Woodfield, they will require a density change from 30 upa to 65 upa, a substantial increase. In a meeting that I had with the assistant city manager, she also told me that according to current code any building/structure could take up 90% of the site.

There are several items that concern me about this plan:

1. I have not seen a comprehensive plan for the entire CRA section that runs from city hall to St Petersburg Dr. Therefore, the residents do not know what the city plans to do with for the rest of this area. Will there be additional requests for zoning changes? I don't see a way around presenting a comprehensive plan prior to approving any changes at all.
2. In reference to the above non-existent plan, I am concerned about two major items: flooding and hurricane shelter/evacuation plans. When any structure can take up to 90% of available site, it leaves little for drainage, access roads, lights and good flood control. As we move further and further into the future, flooding will

continue to be a major concern for coastal communities such as Oldsmar. Will this proposed structure change the drainage of SR 580 and Tampa Rd? Will it cause flooding on adjacent streets? Does the city already have a plan to increase sewer lines, flood control areas, retention ponds, etc?

3. The increase in traffic in this very small area is a recipe for disaster should we need to evacuate. Is it advisable to do a traffic study first? As it appears that the only access to this proposed complex will be from SR 580/Tampa Rd to Washington Ave, a very narrow street. Usually, cars that are approaching heading east on SR 580 and on to Tampa Rd are doing so at a high rate of speed. The right hand turn to Washington Ave is almost immediate – it seems like a no-win situation. This is important to me that the city and the state should form a plan for this before any density changes and contracts are signed. What if there is no good access points for the proposed building? Then what?

4. Other downtown Oldsmar streets that will bear the brunt of the traffic burden are not equipped to handle a possible increase in traffic of 600-900 cars in a 5 block area. These small streets such as Washington Ave, Dartmouth, Lee, Buckingham, and even Park Blvd are narrow streets – many with no curbs. If you took 6 giant steps, it could get you across the entire street. It would be prudent for the city to present their own infrastructure plan BEFORE a density increase. Will the city have the funds to handle road expansion, added sewers, etc? Will the residents who walk young children to elementary school (5 blocks away) be able to do so safely?

In my opinion, there is every reason to answer these very important questions and come up with a comprehensive plan BEFORE we should even consider a density change. If the city has such plans, the residents are unaware of them. I would ask you to return this proposed density increase to the City of Oldsmar until such time as all questions can be answered. We seem to be putting the cart before the horse for progress' sake.

I appreciate you listening to me!

Virginia (Ginger) Tatarzewski

September 28th, 2021

Forward Pinellas Board
310 Court St.
Clearwater, Florida 33756

Re: The City of Oldsmar request for approval for their Density increase of Oldsmar Local Ordinances

Dear Mr. Blanton,

I think it is important for the board to know how the City of Oldsmar got to where they are requesting a density change approval as it pertains to the Countywide Plan. For the past several years the City has been pursuing building a mixed use downtown development to mirror its neighbors of Safety Harbor and Dunedin. Until last October the preliminary planning circled around building 2-3 story buildings that would have first floor commercial usage and the upper floors being residential. This type of development fit the current units per acre density codes, and more importantly patterned the look and feel of the existing Historic Oldsmar community. The City released an RFQ in May of 2020, to seek a designer firm to design such a scheme and construction oversight to the project. There were multiple responders, and they were all ranked through a three-month process by City staff. However, the results of the RFQ and the design of a lower density development plans were abandoned in October when the City Manager received an unsolicited letter of proposal from the Woodfield Development Firm to design and construct a 5 to 6 story multiuse condominium of 316 units which would require the City to increase its Unit per acre density codes by over 100% (from 30 to 65 units per acre). This in City staff words was a “change in strategy” to the CRA downtown development plan. This development would also require 85% (720) of the parking spaces in the 850-space parking garage the City planned for commercial downtown activity. Further, “the developer” would now own the parking garage leaving the City with no control of how those additional spaces are used in the future?

First, it’s important to point out the City’s own Advisory Planning Board **voted 6-0 to not recommend** this density increase? Mainly because the proposed increase went against the City’s own precedent it has held other developers to in the past in requesting a Density Code Change. The following reason were discussed in that meeting and the following City Council meeting.

1. The City **has not** performed an in-depth study of how traffic will be affected, or how the added congestion will affect local, county, and state road traffic?
 - A. The potential 470 to 600 cars could create a bottle neck adjacent local street intersection at Washington St., Park St., and St. Pete drive in rush hour. Most importantly the effect on the access to 580 a county road.
 - B. In addition how this increase of density traffic effects all Hurricane evacuation routes. Bottle necks at intersections.
 - C. Can the two lane (20’) State Street handle the 475-600 potential vehicles during rush hour and hold up under the increased traffic issue? The 475-600 comes from parking spaces designated by Woodfield for condos and future hotel. The additional traffic of 100 spots for employees and not to mention 150 cars hotel traffic? All flowing onto SR 580 and St. Petersburg Drive during peak traffic times.
 - d. The fact that the parking garage will only have 15% (130) of the 850 spaces left for public parking, the surrounding local and County roads could be congested with illegal parking when

the mix-use businesses are open. This could drastically impact emergency response times and potentially larger evacuation plans. Just an example the City of Safety Harbor downtown has 1,000's of additional vehicles during daytime business hours and weekend nights. If what the City of Oldsmar develops just generates 1,000 vehicles, that means 870 vehicles will be congesting local and potentially county roads during peak business hours.

2. The City had not identified ample hurricane shelters for 316-unit condos and 150 hotel rooms? $475 + 150 = 775$ -1,000 potential people? Where are they being sheltered?

3. Stormwater and flood plain issues.

- a. The need to raise the ground floor above flood plain, and how that will affect stormwater runoff?
- b. Existing Height restrictions may be exceeded?
- c. Increased water shed to SR 580? What is the design for flood control?
- d. Potential rapid flood hazard to State Street SR 580 and surrounding areas during heavy rains and storms?
- e. Has the City calculated how this additional watershed will affect hurricane evac routes and procedures? For example, what happens if St. Petersburg Drive and Park Blvd flood? Two major traffic distribution roadways to SR 580?

4. The Oldsmar Planning Advisory Board stated emphatically in voting 6-0 not to approve the proposed Density increase that the City is going against its own standards and precedent to not consider a density increase without an approved plan and development agreement in place first. The City staff also provided a very cursory presentation to answer all questions above and below? Although the City staff may be dedicated, they are lacking the experience and knowledge of developing and relaying accountable information regarding a Community Redevelopment Project. The City Council has recklessly decided (ignoring their own Planning Advisory Board) in the last eight months to increase the density code ordinances without making a formal study or in-depth research of the following.

- a. Proper research of how all traffic areas will be impacted
- b. Proper research of how this density increase will impact the Countywide stormwater and flood plan.
- c. Adherence to the Countywide Hurricane Evacuation Plan
- d. Environmental impact studies for the density increase.

In a response to the City's plan to increase the Density Codes, over 300 signatures were placed on a petition to speak against the density increase. This request for an increase in density codes has recklessly been pushed through by the City Council with not one formal study and can have drastic negative impacts not only to the Citizens of Oldsmar but also to the rest of the County residents. The City's own Advisory Planning Board saw this, and my hope is that this informed and knowledgeable Board will agree.

Sincerely,

David McDonald
124 Shore Drive Place
Oldsmar, Florida 34677

From : Larry & Marcy Wing,
601 Oakleaf Blvd, Oldsmar, FL 34677

To:
info@forwardpinellas.org

Subject: Oldsmar Density Increase

To Whom it May Concern:

I ask you – the officials looking at this density request to VOTE NO.

We are long-time residents of Oldsmar and cannot agree with the plan that appears to double the population density to facilitate high-rise apartments or condos on land purchased by taxpayers and set aside for community purposes. The notion of a “walkable downtown Oldsmar”, was the basis for taxpayer purchase of the property in question. This is Citizen -owned land! Unfortunately, for the guy with a “Hammer”, everything looks like a “Nail”! For someone (corporation) that builds condos/apartments, etc, every piece of bare land looks like an “opportunity”.

From my perspective, the negotiations going on with Woodfield Development is nothing more than a major deviation from what many of the Oldsmar citizens understood to be the objective – a “walkable downtown’ to be enjoyed by many.

As I see it, the city is remiss in delivering on the plan that many of us thought was in place. Unfortunately, a clear vision for what a “Downtown Oldsmar” should look like has not been articulated, or adequately presented to the citizens. Authorization of the densities that would allow a Woodfield condo project to be built, would be almost the complete opposite of what has been presented/(promised?) by City government in the past.

From this citizen’s perspective, the city of Oldsmar (in the absence of a well-articulated Vision), would serve the community better by advancing a concept of a “Seed project” that would include the following:

- 1) A municipal parking garage;
- 2) A fine arts (music,drama, etc) facility
- 3) A museum to our name sake RE Olds;

These would be Citizen -owned facilities, but would also be “multi-use” and better serve the community, EVEN while, serving as a catalyst for drawing the kind of additional development ,on our city land, that would ultimately become the Downtown that many of us envision.

VOTE NO!!!

Thank you.

Oldsmar citizens

Larry & Marcy Wing

Rahman, Nousheen

From: info@forwardpinellas.org
Sent: Wednesday, September 29, 2021 7:30 AM
To: Rahman, Nousheen
Cc: Jablon, Tina
Subject: FW: Oldsmar density increase- the residents of Oldsmar voted NO

Nousheen

Good Morning... hope you are doing well.

I received two more this morning... I will send the other one momentarily.

Maria



**FORWARD
PINELLAS**



Maria Kelly

Secretary

Main: 727-464-8250

Direct: 727-464-5648

forwardpinellas.org

Forward Pinellas serves as the planning council and metropolitan planning organization for Pinellas County.

All government correspondence is subject to the public records law.

From: G A <6lorialynn@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2021 10:02 PM
To: info@forwardpinellas.org <info1@co.pinellas.fl.us>
Subject: Oldsmar density increase- the residents of Oldsmar voted NO

CAUTION: *This message has originated from outside of the organization. **Do not** click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.*

To Whom it May Concern:

I am writing to ask the boards looking at the Oldsmar density request to VOTE NO on granting the increase. I am a resident of Oldsmar and do not approve of any plan that seeks to double our density in order to build high-rise apartments or condos on CRA land purchased by taxpayers and set aside for community purposes. The plan being considered NOW for our small downtown lot is primarily a 5-story apartment complex with an 850-car parking garage. The sale would be to one developer who is primarily an apartment developer, and not a proper stakeholder/partner for creating a walkable downtown area for the people of Oldsmar. This is not the purpose of this land and the

citizens who have invested tax dollars for decades have not approved high density housing for their downtown land!

In fact, very few residents in Oldsmar are even aware of the density increase request and what this truly means for the community both short term and long term. At no time has the city discussed the consequences of this density increase to its citizens. You won't be receiving many letters because people don't know this is happening. This has not been an open and honest process, especially for the residents who live nearby the area in question.

It's also important for members of the different boards to know how the City of Oldsmar got to this stage of requesting a density change approval as it pertains to the Countywide Plan. For the past several years the city has been pursuing building a mixed-use downtown development to mirror its neighbors of Safety Harbor and Dunedin. Until last October the preliminary planning circled around building 2-3 story buildings that would have first floor commercial usage and the upper floors being residential. This type of development fit the current units per acre density codes, and more importantly patterned the look and feel of the existing Historic Oldsmar community. The city released an RFQ in May of 2020, to seek a designer firm to design such a scheme and construction oversight to the project. There were multiple responders, and they were all ranked through a three-month process by city staff.

However, the results of the RFQ and the design of a lower density development were abandoned in October 2020 when the city received an unsolicited letter of proposal from the Woodfield Development Firm to design and construct a 5 to 6 story multiuse residential complex of 316 units which would require the city to increase its unit per acre density codes by over 100% (from 30 to 65 units per acre). This in city staff words was a "change in strategy" to the CRA downtown development plan. This development would also require 85% (720) of the parking spaces in the 850-space parking garage the city planned for commercial downtown activity. Further, "the developer" would now own the parking garage leaving the city with no control of how those additional spaces are used in the future.

Also, important to note is that the city's own Advisory Planning Board **voted 6-0** in August 2021 to not recommend this density increase, mainly because the proposed increase went against the city's own precedent it has held other developers to in the past in requesting a density code change. The following reasons were discussed in that meeting and the following City Council meeting.

1. The City **has not** performed an in-depth study of how traffic will be affected, or how the added congestion will affect local, county, and state road traffic.
 - a. The potential 470 to 600 cars could create a bottle neck adjacent local street intersection at Washington St., Park St., and St. Pete drive in rush hour. Most importantly the effect on the access to CR 580, a county road.
 - b. How will this increase of density and traffic affect all Hurricane evacuation routes?

c. Can the two lane (20') State Street handle the 475-600 potential vehicles during rush hour and hold up under the increased traffic issue? The 475-600 comes from parking spaces designated by Woodfield for condos and future hotel. The additional traffic of 100 spots for employees and not to mention 150 cars hotel traffic? All flowing into county road 580.

2. The City had not identified ample hurricane shelters for 316-unit condos and 150 hotel rooms? $475 + 150 = 625$ potential people? Where are they being sheltered?

3. Storm water and flood plain issues.

- a. The need to raise the ground floor above flood plain.
- b. Existing height restrictions may be exceeded
- c. Increased water shed to 580? What is the design for flood control?
- d. Potential flood hazard to State Street SR 580 and surrounding areas?
- e. Has the City calculated how this additional watershed will affect hurricane evac routes and procedures?

4. The Oldsmar Planning Advisory Board stated emphatically in voting 6-0 not to approve the proposed density increase that the city is going against its own standards and precedent to not consider a density increase without an approved plan and development agreement in place first. The city's presentation to the planning board was incomplete for the purpose. Staff is appearing to be lacking the necessary experience and knowledge for such a development, and they are making multiple mistakes when it comes to sharing accountable information with citizens in regard to a Community Redevelopment Project. Developers made their first presentation to the city council in February 2021 workshop not promoted to the citizens. Council voted to move forward with negotiations with Woodfield on March 2nd without any public conversation. So just six months later without proper documentation, they approached the planning board asking for this increase. Planning board members and citizens have yet to see any formal study or in-depth research of the following:

- a. Proper research of how all traffic areas will be impacted
- b. Proper research of how this density increase will impact the Countywide stormwater and flood plan.
- c. Adherence to the Countywide Hurricane Evacuation Plan
- d. Environmental impact studies for the density increase.
- e. Long-term consequences of a density change should this deal with Woodfield fall through, or how other developers can use this to sue to the city.

Additionally, the city has not been proactive with sharing their "change in strategy" with citizens who are expecting shops and cafes. Those who have learned of the project are asking why the city is putting the cart before the horse, because residents haven't seen the plan for the apartments. I believe citizens have the right to ask questions before undertaking a large change such as doubling the density to make way for an apartment complex. In addition to traffic and environmental concerns, what about impacts to noise,

safety, law enforcement contracts, fire department capacity, and city services such as sewer and water. What about losing control of the land when it comes to cleanliness or upkeep for property that is adjacent to city hall? What about financial disclosure to citizens who invested in this land and how the new tax revenue will be used to their benefit?

Some citizens were able to speak out against this density increase at a city council meeting. They had just learned about the apartments/density issue and were ridiculed for being against development or for being too late to the conversation. City staff and city council members were defending the development and developer in a one-sided biased way that I believe was inappropriate at this stage of the project. Also, a couple hundred citizens signed a petition asking for more information from the city before moving forward. Citizens sent emails to the city council, made phone calls and had in-person meetings. Despite these requests to slow down the process, the city council, primarily the mayor have ignored the call of the people and are moving forward with this density increase. If a larger effort was mounted, you would see that a large number of citizens are indeed against this density increase for this downtown area. If you approve this density increase, then you too are going against the will of the citizens for a project that is not needed in our city.

Thank you for your time and for looking carefully at this project. Again, I urge you to vote NO and send the City of Oldsmar back to its citizens to create a project that is more suited to the land and the will of the people.

Sincerely,

Rahman, Nousheen

From: info@forwardpinellas.org
Sent: Wednesday, September 29, 2021 7:31 AM
To: Rahman, Nousheen
Cc: Jablon, Tina
Subject: FW: Oldsmar Density Request citizen letter

Here is the second one.

Enjoy your day...

Maria



Maria Kelly
Secretary
Main: 727-464-8250
Direct: 727-464-5648
forwardpinellas.org

Forward Pinellas serves as the planning council and metropolitan planning organization for Pinellas County.

All government correspondence is subject to the public records law.

From: Pamela Settle <PRSettle@msn.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2021 6:33 PM
To: info@forwardpinellas.org <info1@co.pinellas.fl.us>
Subject: Oldsmar Density Request citizen letter

CAUTION: *This message has originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.*

September 28, 2021

To Whom it May Concern:

I am writing to ask the county boards looking at the Oldsmar density request to **VOTE NO** on granting the increase. I am a resident of Oldsmar and do not approve of any plan that seeks to double our density in order to build high-rise apartments or condos on CRA land purchased by taxpayers and set aside for community purposes. The plan being considered NOW for our small downtown lot is primarily a 5-story apartment complex with an 850-car parking garage. The sale would be to one developer who is primarily an apartment developer, and not a proper stakeholder/partner for creating a walkable downtown area for the people of Oldsmar. This is not the purpose of this land and the

citizens who have invested tax dollars for decades have not approved high density housing for their downtown land!

In fact, very few residents in Oldsmar are even aware of the density increase request and what this truly means for the community both short term and long term. At no time has the city discussed the consequences of this density increase with its citizens. You won't be receiving many letters because people don't know this is happening. This has not been an open and honest process, especially for the residents who live nearby the area in question.

It's also important for members of the different boards to know how the City of Oldsmar got to this stage of requesting a density change approval as it pertains to the Countywide Plan. For the past several years the city has been pursuing building a mixed-use downtown development to mirror its neighbors of Safety Harbor and Dunedin. Until last October the preliminary planning circled around building 2-3 story buildings that would have first floor commercial usage and the upper floors being residential. This type of development fit the current units per acre density codes, and more importantly patterned the look and feel of the existing Historic Oldsmar community. The city released an RFQ in May of 2020, to seek a designer firm to design such a scheme and construction oversight to the project. There were multiple responders, and they were all ranked through a three-month process by city staff.

However, the results of the RFQ and the design of a lower density development were abandoned in October 2020 when the city received an unsolicited letter of proposal from the Woodfield Development Firm to design and construct a 5 to 6 story multi-use residential complex of 316 units which would require the city to increase its unit per acre density codes by over 100% (from 30 to 65 units per acre). This in city staff words was a "change in strategy" to the CRA downtown development plan. This development would also require 85% (720) of the parking spaces in the 850-space parking garage the city planned for commercial downtown activity. Further, "the developer" would now own the parking garage leaving the city with no control of how those additional spaces are used in the future.

Also, important to note is that the city's own Advisory Planning Board **voted 6-0** in August 2021 to **not recommend** this density increase, mainly because the proposed increase went against the city's own precedent it has held other developers to in the past in requesting a density code change. The following reasons were discussed in that meeting and the following City Council meeting.

1. The City **has not** performed an in-depth study of how traffic will be affected, or how the added congestion will affect local, county, and state road traffic.
2. The City had not identified ample hurricane shelters for 316-unit condos and 150 hotel rooms? $475 + 150 = 625$ potential people? Where are they being sheltered?
3. Storm water and flood plain issues.
 1. The need to raise the ground floor above flood plain.
 2. Existing height restrictions may be exceeded
 3. Increased water shed to 580? What is the design for flood control?
 4. Potential flood hazard to State Street SR 580 and surrounding areas?
 5. Has the City calculated how this additional watershed will affect hurricane evac routes and procedures?

4. The Oldsmar Planning Advisory Board stated emphatically in voting 6-0 not to approve the proposed density increase that the city is going against its own standards and precedent to not consider a density increase without an approved plan and development agreement in place first. The city's presentation to the planning board was incomplete for the purpose. Staff is appearing to be lacking the necessary experience and knowledge for such a development, and they are making multiple mistakes when it comes to sharing accountable information with citizens in regard to a Community Redevelopment Project.

Developers made their first presentation to the city council in February 2021 workshop not promoted to the citizens. Council voted to move forward with negotiations with Woodfield on March 2nd without any public conversation. So just six months later without proper documentation or public outreach, they approached the planning board asking for this increase. Planning board members and citizens have yet to see any formal study or in-depth research of traffic areas, stormwater and flood plan, adherence to the Countywide Hurricane Evacuation Plan, environmental impact studies for the density increase and long-term consequences of a density change should this deal with Woodfield fall through, or how other developers can use this to sue to the city.

Additionally, the city has not been proactive with sharing their "change in strategy" with citizens who are expecting shops, cafes and public gathering space. Those who have learned of the project are asking why the city is putting the density cart before the horse, because residents haven't seen the plan for the apartments. I believe citizens have the right to ask questions before undertaking a large change such as doubling the density to make way for an apartment complex. In addition to traffic and environmental concerns, what about impacts to noise, safety, law enforcement contracts, fire department capacity, and city services such as sewer and water. What about losing control of the land when it comes to cleanliness or upkeep for property that is adjacent to city hall? What about financial disclosure to citizens who invested in this land and how the new tax revenue will be used to their benefit?

I was there as a witness to see the citizens who came to the first city council meeting to protest the density increase. Those citizens had just learned about the apartments/density issue from neighbors and showed up angry. Instead of being validated, they were ridiculed for being against development or for being too late to the conversation. City staff and city council members were defending the development and developer in a one-sided biased way that I believe was inappropriate at this stage of the project. Also, a couple hundred citizens signed a petition asking for more information from the city before moving forward. Citizens sent emails to the city council, made phone calls and had in-person meetings. Despite these requests to slow down, the city council, primarily the mayor, have ignored the call of the people and are moving forward with this density increase anyway. If a larger citizen outreach effort was mounted, you would see that a large number of citizens are indeed against this density increase for this downtown area. If you approve this density increase, then you too are going against the will of the citizens for a project that is not needed, and not appropriate, for this location.

Thank you for your time and for looking carefully at this project. Again, I urge you to **vote NO** and send the City of Oldsmar back to its citizens to create a project that is more suited to the land and the

will of the people, especially considering it's a community redevelopment area in a vital part of downtown.

Sincerely,

Pamela Settle, 439 Lakeview Dr. Oldsmar, FL

From: info@forwardpinellas.org
To: [Rahman, Nousheen](#); [Fisher, Linda A](#)
Cc: [Chatman, Rodney S](#); [Jablon, Tina](#)
Subject: FW: Case CW 21-14 City of Oldsmar
Date: Monday, October 11, 2021 10:32:14 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)

Good Morning

Are you still collecting these? Is there anything to respond now that the item has been pulled?

Maria



Maria Kelly
Secretary
Main: 727-464-8250
Direct: 727-464-5648
forwardpinellas.org

Forward Pinellas serves as the planning council and metropolitan planning organization for Pinellas County.

All government correspondence is subject to the public records law.

From: Jenna Boyle <jennarmcgarry@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 11, 2021 10:30 AM
To: info@forwardpinellas.org <info1@co.pinellas.fl.us>
Subject: Case CW 21-14 City of Oldsmar

CAUTION: *This message has originated from outside of the organization. **Do not** click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.*

Hello,

My name is Jenna Boyle. I am a 34 year old lifelong resident of Pinellas County. I grew up in the Countryside area, and graduated from Countryside High School. My husband and I purchased a home in Oldsmar. We are hopeful that the downtown area will be developed in our own backyard.

I have seen St. Pete, Dunedin, and Safety Harbor develop and thrive over the years, and nothing would make me happier than to enjoy the same benefits right here in Oldsmar. I have a 2 year old son and we enjoy biking and walking. The proposed location to increase density would help encourage more of that.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Jenna Boyle
727-831-5077

From: info@forwardpinellas.org
To: [Rahman, Nousheen](#); [Fisher, Linda A](#)
Cc: [Chatman, Rodney S](#); [Jablon, Tina](#)
Subject: FW: Forward Pinellas case CW 21-15, Submitted by the City of Oldsmar
Date: Wednesday, October 6, 2021 10:55:22 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)

This notice is from the Mayor of Oldsmar, Eric Seidel.



Maria Kelly
Secretary
Main: 727-464-8250
Direct: 727-464-5648
forwardpinellas.org

“Live Simply, Love Generously, Care Deeply, Speak Kindly, and leave the rest to God”

Forward Pinellas serves as the planning council and metropolitan planning organization for Pinellas County.

All government correspondence is subject to the public records law.

From: Seidel, Eric <ESeidel@myoldsmar.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 6, 2021 10:51 AM
To: info@forwardpinellas.org <info1@co.pinellas.fl.us>
Subject: Forward Pinellas case CW 21-15, Submitted by the City of Oldsmar

CAUTION: *This message has originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.*

Dear Pinellas Planning Council members,

Thank you for reviewing this important change to the City of Oldsmar’s Comprehensive Plan. I appreciate your time and consideration.

The City of Oldsmar has been pursuing the redevelopment of its downtown since 1994, when it created its CRA for that purpose. Since then, the City has invested in several public anchors, such as the new Library, the reconstruction of the Oldsmar Bank Building, and street-cape to inspire private development. The City even purchased property adjoining City Hall to create a catalyst project. Since 2005, in collaboration with our residents, the City has created seven different concept plans composed of varying densities for the property next to City Hall. Each plan, while different, all contained residential, commercial, and public space components.

Over time, we learned that we need increased residential density to support a vibrant, walkable downtown. Having stated that, we only desire to increase residential density in combination with commercial/retail space in a mixed-use development to promote downtown

activity. Presently, we do not have the regulatory ability to encourage such development. While our Comprehensive Plan encourages denser commercial activity, it does not promote higher residential density, even as part of a mixed-use development. Encouraging high-density commercial activity may be fine for an office park, but it does not assist in the creation of a vibrant downtown. This amendment encourages residential growth in the desired type of development (a mixed-use development) at the right location in our downtown area. The area in question is located on a major corridor (Tampa Road and SR580) north of State Street, which creates a buffer between higher-density uses and lower-density residential neighborhoods.

In addition, Oldsmar needs a density incentive as part of a mixed-use development to help attract developers to build our desired retail off of the Tampa Road corridor. This incentive would provide an anchor to create a small walk-able downtown area, including more residents on location to help support those new businesses expected in the Oldsmar Town Center.

Not related specifically to the City's downtown redevelopment efforts, but vital to Oldsmar's strong business community is the lack of appropriate Class "A" apartments in the area to accommodate the Oldsmar's professional workforce. The closest inventory is available in Hillsborough County, and this is a consistent complaint of our larger employers when it comes to recruiting and retaining their workforce. Encouraging mixed-use development with a higher level of residential density will help build a long-awaited downtown and serve our important business foundation.

While the Countywide Rules allow for up to 90 residential units per acre in an Activity Center, we only ask for 65 units per acre. Further, this incentive would only be granted with a Development Agreement. The proposed density at 65 units per acre fosters a more modest development fitting of the Oldsmar culture. We also thought it was essential to add safeguards, like a Development Agreement requirement, to ensure that each specific development's impact is adequately assessed and mitigated at the time of development.

Lastly, being able to offer a density incentive will also save community taxpayers' dollars. This proposed density incentive can create a more favorable economic picture enabling the City to negotiate public benefits funded by Developers, such as expanded parking in a parking structure, active public park spaces, and other developer-funded infrastructure.

While I understand that your decision is based on demonstrating consistency to the Countywide Rules, thank you for letting me share Oldsmar's unique perspective and history. It has certainly been a long adventure.

Once again, thank you for your consideration of this important change, and we humbly request your support.

Best regards,

Mayor Eric Seidel
City of Oldsmar
100 State Street W
Oldsmar, FL 34677

From: info@forwardpinellas.org
To: [Rahman, Nousheen](#); [Fisher, Linda A](#)
Cc: [Chatman, Rodney S](#); [Jablon, Tina](#)
Subject: FW: Oldsmar Downtown
Date: Wednesday, October 6, 2021 11:44:43 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)

Here is another...



Maria Kelly
Secretary
Main: 727-464-8250
Direct: 727-464-5648
forwardpinellas.org

“Live Simply, Love Generously, Care Deeply, Speak Kindly, and leave the rest to God”

Forward Pinellas serves as the planning council and metropolitan planning organization for Pinellas County.

All government correspondence is subject to the public records law.

From: Doug Bevis <teambevis@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 6, 2021 11:41 AM
To: info@forwardpinellas.org <info1@co.pinellas.fl.us>
Subject: Oldsmar Downtown

CAUTION: *This message has originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.*

Good Morning All

I am a 21 year resident of Oldsmar and am in favor of the request for higher density. This type of vertically integrated mixed use is what is happening all over the country. The City of Oldsmar has been working on developing this property into a mixed use downtown area for over 20 years and would be a great addition to the area and would have less of an impact to the environment than an urban sprawl strip center and paved parking lot. The density request is also tied to "the developer" entering into a development agreement with the city. The project is proposed along a major transit corridor on Tampa Road and adjacent to the CSX rail. If mass transit were to happen along Tampa Road/CSX a higher density would be attractive for a transit stop. The requested higher density fits with the county transit map and is not at the Max density that could be requested.

--

Doug Bevis
Coastal Properties/ Christie's International
423 Mandalay Avenue #102
Clearwater Beach, Florida 33767
813-310-4454 (cell)
TeamBevis@gmail.com

September 27, 2021

info@forwardpinellas.org

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter is in reference to the density change currently being requested for the CRA area of downtown Oldsmar.

My name is Virginia (Ginger) Tatarzewski. I live in downtown Oldsmar at 303 Park Blvd. I have lived her for 13 years. I am quite active in city activities and go to as many city council meetings as I can.

Over the years I have seen and been present for many proposals for the downtown area. The city of Oldsmar is trying to create a downtown similar to Safety Harbor and Dunedin. The plans that I've seen have usually been 2-3 story mixed use buildings - until this latest proposal, which is a 5 story, 316 unit apartment building with an 850 car parking garage. This also may include a 150 unit hotel.

To the best of my knowledge, the city received this unsolicited plan from Woodfield Development, who specialize (their words) in apartment buildings. In order for the city to continue the proposal from Woodfield, they will require a density change from 30 upa to 65 upa, a substantial increase. In a meeting that I had with the assistant city manager, she also told me that according to current code any building/structure could take up 90% of the site.

There are several items that concern me about this plan:

1. I have not seen a comprehensive plan for the entire CRA section that runs from city hall to St Petersburg Dr. Therefore, the residents do not know what the city plans to do with for the rest of this area. Will there be additional requests for zoning changes? I don't see a way around presenting a comprehensive plan prior to approving any changes at all.
2. In reference to the above non-existent plan, I am concerned about two major items: flooding and hurricane shelter/evacuation plans. When any structure can take up to 90% of available site, it leaves little for drainage, access roads, lights and good flood control. As we move further and further into the future, flooding will

continue to be a major concern for coastal communities such as Oldsmar. Will this proposed structure change the drainage of SR 580 and Tampa Rd? Will it cause flooding on adjacent streets? Does the city already have a plan to increase sewer lines, flood control areas, retention ponds, etc?

3. The increase in traffic in this very small area is a recipe for disaster should we need to evacuate. Is it advisable to do a traffic study first? As it appears that the only access to this proposed complex will be from SR 580/Tampa Rd to Washington Ave, a very narrow street. Usually, cars that are approaching heading east on SR 580 and on to Tampa Rd are doing so at a high rate of speed. The right hand turn to Washington Ave is almost immediate – it seems like a no-win situation. This is important to me that the city and the state should form a plan for this before any density changes and contracts are signed. What if there is no good access points for the proposed building? Then what?

4. Other downtown Oldsmar streets that will bear the brunt of the traffic burden are not equipped to handle a possible increase in traffic of 600-900 cars in a 5 block area. These small streets such as Washington Ave, Dartmouth, Lee, Buckingham, and even Park Blvd are narrow streets – many with no curbs. If you took 6 giant steps, it could get you across the entire street. It would be prudent for the city to present their own infrastructure plan BEFORE a density increase. Will the city have the funds to handle road expansion, added sewers, etc? Will the residents who walk young children to elementary school (5 blocks away) be able to do so safely?

In my opinion, there is every reason to answer these very important questions and come up with a comprehensive plan BEFORE we should even consider a density change. If the city has such plans, the residents are unaware of them. I would ask you to return this proposed density increase to the City of Oldsmar until such time as all questions can be answered. We seem to be putting the cart before the horse for progress' sake.

I appreciate you listening to me!

Virginia (Ginger) Tatarzewski

September 28th, 2021

Forward Pinellas Board
310 Court St.
Clearwater, Florida 33756

Re: The City of Oldsmar request for approval for their Density increase of Oldsmar Local Ordinances

Dear Mr. Blanton,

I think it is important for the board to know how the City of Oldsmar got to where they are requesting a density change approval as it pertains to the Countywide Plan. For the past several years the City has been pursuing building a mixed use downtown development to mirror its neighbors of Safety Harbor and Dunedin. Until last October the preliminary planning circled around building 2-3 story buildings that would have first floor commercial usage and the upper floors being residential. This type of development fit the current units per acre density codes, and more importantly patterned the look and feel of the existing Historic Oldsmar community. The City released an RFQ in May of 2020, to seek a designer firm to design such a scheme and construction oversight to the project. There were multiple responders, and they were all ranked through a three-month process by City staff. However, the results of the RFQ and the design of a lower density development plans were abandoned in October when the City Manager received an unsolicited letter of proposal from the Woodfield Development Firm to design and construct a 5 to 6 story multiuse condominium of 316 units which would require the City to increase its Unit per acre density codes by over 100% (from 30 to 65 units per acre). This in City staff words was a "change in strategy" to the CRA downtown development plan. This development would also require 85% (720) of the parking spaces in the 850-space parking garage the City planned for commercial downtown activity. Further, "the developer" would now own the parking garage leaving the City with no control of how those additional spaces are used in the future?

First, it's important to point out the City's own Advisory Planning Board **voted 6-0 to not recommend** this density increase? Mainly because the proposed increase went against the City's own precedent it has held other developers to in the past in requesting a Density Code Change. The following reason were discussed in that meeting and the following City Council meeting.

1. The City **has not** performed an in-depth study of how traffic will be affected, or how the added congestion will affect local, county, and state road traffic?
 - A. The potential 470 to 600 cars could create a bottle neck adjacent local street intersection at Washington St., Park St., and St. Pete drive in rush hour. Most importantly the effect on the access to 580 a county road.
 - B. In addition how this increase of density traffic effects all Hurricane evacuation routes. Bottle necks at intersections.
 - C. Can the two lane (20') State Street handle the 475-600 potential vehicles during rush hour and hold up under the increased traffic issue? The 475-600 comes from parking spaces designated by Woodfield for condos and future hotel. The additional traffic of 100 spots for employees and not to mention 150 cars hotel traffic? All flowing onto SR 580 and St. Petersburg Drive during peak traffic times.
 - d. The fact that the parking garage will only have 15% (130) of the 850 spaces left for public parking, the surrounding local and County roads could be congested with illegal parking when

the mix-use businesses are open. This could drastically impact emergency response times and potentially larger evacuation plans. Just an example the City of Safety Harbor downtown has 1,000's of additional vehicles during daytime business hours and weekend nights. If what the City of Oldsmar develops just generates 1,000 vehicles, that means 870 vehicles will be congesting local and potentially county roads during peak business hours.

2. The City had not identified ample hurricane shelters for 316-unit condos and 150 hotel rooms? $475 + 150 = 775$ -1,000 potential people? Where are they being sheltered?

3. Stormwater and flood plain issues.

- a. The need to raise the ground floor above flood plain, and how that will affect stormwater runoff?
- b. Existing Height restrictions may be exceeded?
- c. Increased water shed to SR 580? What is the design for flood control?
- d. Potential rapid flood hazard to State Street SR 580 and surrounding areas during heavy rains and storms?
- e. Has the City calculated how this additional watershed will affect hurricane evac routes and procedures? For example, what happens if St. Petersburg Drive and Park Blvd flood? Two major traffic distribution roadways to SR 580?

4. The Oldsmar Planning Advisory Board stated emphatically in voting 6-0 not to approve the proposed Density increase that the City is going against its own standards and precedent to not consider a density increase without an approved plan and development agreement in place first. The City staff also provided a very cursory presentation to answer all questions above and below? Although the City staff may be dedicated, they are lacking the experience and knowledge of developing and relaying accountable information regarding a Community Redevelopment Project. The City Council has recklessly decided (ignoring their own Planning Advisory Board) in the last eight months to increase the density code ordinances without making a formal study or in-depth research of the following.

- a. Proper research of how all traffic areas will be impacted
- b. Proper research of how this density increase will impact the Countywide stormwater and flood plan.
- c. Adherence to the Countywide Hurricane Evacuation Plan
- d. Environmental impact studies for the density increase.

In a response to the City's plan to increase the Density Codes, over 300 signatures were placed on a petition to speak against the density increase. This request for an increase in density codes has recklessly been pushed through by the City Council with not one formal study and can have drastic negative impacts not only to the Citizens of Oldsmar but also to the rest of the County residents. The City's own Advisory Planning Board saw this, and my hope is that this informed and knowledgeable Board will agree.

Sincerely,

David McDonald
124 Shore Drive Place
Oldsmar, Florida 34677

From: [Doug Bevis](#)
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: Stop Oldsmar Density Increase
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 9:01:16 AM

CAUTION: *This message has originated from outside of the organization. **Do not** click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.*

Dear Oldsmar City Council,

NAME – Doug Bevis
ADDRESS – 359 Bay Arbor Blvd
CITY, STATE ZIP - Oldsmar

I am a 20+ year resident of Oldsmar and actually worked on the widening of Tampa Road years ago as it was a planned transit way. I fully support the density increase for this site for whoever the developer might be moving forward. Currently the city owns the property and has control over what goes on the site to some extent. If the city sells the property to a developer we will get whatever they want to put on it and we would have no say if it met the zoning for the property. We had many proposals before this one that had much higher density and taller buildings and residents never said a word.

Doug

Thank you.
Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: [Doug Bevis](#)
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: Stop Oldsmar Density Increase
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 9:01:11 AM

CAUTION: *This message has originated from outside of the organization. **Do not** click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.*

Dear Oldsmar City Council,

NAME – Doug Bevis
ADDRESS – 359 Bay Arbor Blvd
CITY, STATE ZIP - Oldsmar

I am for the density increase. I think it is vital to the development of a downtown. It fits within the county criteria and is right along a transit line. This has been in the works for over 20 years with designs that had a higher density than what is proposed.

From: [Sandie Grimes](#)
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: Stop Oldsmar Density Increase
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 8:54:19 AM

CAUTION: *This message has originated from outside of the organization. **Do not** click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.*

Dear Oldsmar City Council,

Sandie Grimes
616 Lake Cypress Circle
Oldsmar, FL 34677

I am a resident of Oldsmar and I am 100% in favor of the increase in density. I feel it is a step in the right direction towards building a viable downtown that does not place a tax burden on the residents. Without this increase our downtown will not come to fruition.

Please read my in favor of vote into record during the public comment portion of the December 7th , 2021 city council meeting or any future meeting date designated to discuss or vote on the proposed density increase amendment(s).

Thank you.

From: [Jason Sanders](#)
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: Stop Oldsmar Density Increase
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 9:21:10 AM

CAUTION: This message has originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Oldsmar City Council,

NAME - Jason Sanders
ADDRESS - 101 South Bayview Blvd
CITY, STATE ZIP - Oldsmar, FL 34677

I am a business owner within the City of Oldsmar I would like to state my support to the proposed density increase from 30 units per acre to 65 units per acre in the downtown (TCCR) area.

I believe in the responsible development of the downtown area and voting to increase the density allows for the City to better market and negotiate Oldsmar's vision of a downtown.

Please read my support into record during the public comment portion of the December 7th , 2021 City Council meeting or any future meeting date designated to discuss or vote on the proposed density increase amendment(s).

Thank you.

From: [Dawn Hunt](#)
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: Stop Oldsmar Density Increase
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 1:30:48 PM

CAUTION: *This message has originated from outside of the organization. **Do not** click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.*

Dear Oldsmar City Council, Dawn Hunt
308 Washington Ave
Oldsmar, FL 34677

I am a resident of the City of Oldsmar and I would like to register my sincere objection to the proposed density increase from 30 units per acre to 65 units per acre in the downtown (TCCR) area. I don't feel that adding a larger number of apartments in this area is as conducive to residential safety and stability in the same way a smaller number of condo units would be.

I believe in the responsible development of the downtown area keeping in line with the rich historic culture of our city; increasing the density in an already highly dense area is not in the best interests of the current homeowners and residents.

I am unable to attend the council meeting in person in Dec 7th so please read my objection into the record during the public comment portion of the December 7th , 2021 city council meeting or any future meeting date designated to discuss or vote on the proposed density increase amendment(s).

Thank you,
Dawn Hunt

From: [Nate Perrie](mailto:Nate.Perrie@myoldsmar.com)
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: Stop Oldsmar Density Increase
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 6:37:14 PM

CAUTION: *This message has originated from outside of the organization. **Do not** click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.*

Dear Oldsmar City Council,

NAME - Nate Perrie
ADDRESS - 202 Washington Ave.
CITY, STATE ZIP - Oldsmar, FL 34677

I am a resident of the City of Oldsmar I would like to state my sincere objection to the proposed density increase from 30 units per acre to 65 units per acre in the downtown (TCCR) area.

I believe in the responsible development of the downtown area keeping in line with the rich historic culture of our city.

Please read my objection into record during the public comment portion of the December 7th , 2021 city council meeting or any future meeting date designated to discuss or vote on the proposed density increase amendment(s).

Thank you.

Nate Perrie and family

From: [Kristen k](#)
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: Stop Oldsmar Density Increase
Date: Wednesday, November 17, 2021 4:33:37 PM

CAUTION: This message has originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Oldsmar City Council,

Kristen Kielich
612 Park Blvd
Oldsmar Fl 34677

I am a resident of the City of Oldsmar I would like to state my sincere objection to the proposed density increase from 30 units per acre to 65 units per acre in the downtown (TCCR) area.

I believe in the responsible development of the downtown area keeping in line with the rich historic culture of our city.

Please read my objection into record during the public comment portion of the December 7th , 2021 city council meeting or any future meeting date designated to discuss or vote on the proposed density increase amendment(s).

Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Jo Ann Kissel](mailto:JoAnn.Kissel@myoldsmar.com)
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: Stop Oldsmar Density Increase
Date: Thursday, November 18, 2021 12:30:58 PM

CAUTION: This message has originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Oldsmar City Council,

Jo Ann Kissel
3106 Phoenix Ave
Oldsmar, FL 34677

I am a resident of the City of Oldsmar I would like to state my sincere objection to the proposed density increase from 30 units per acre to 65 units per acre in the downtown (TCCR) area.

I believe in the responsible development of the downtown area keeping in line with the rich historic culture of our city.

Please read my objection into record during the public comment portion of the December 7th , 2021 city council meeting or any future meeting date designated to discuss or vote on the proposed density increase amendment(s).

Thank you.
Jo Ann Kissel

From: [Melissa Stanley-West](mailto:Melissa.Stanley-West@myoldsmar.com)
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: Stop Oldsmar Density Increase
Date: Thursday, November 18, 2021 3:50:06 PM

CAUTION: *This message has originated from outside of the organization. **Do not** click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.*

Melissa Stanley-West
311 Washington Ave
Oldsmar, FL 34677

Dear Oldsmar City Council,

I am a resident of the City of Oldsmar, and I would like to state my sincere objection to the proposed density increase from 30 units per acre to 65 units per acre in the downtown (TCCR) area.

I believe in the responsible development of the downtown area keeping in line with the rich historic culture of our city.

Please read my objection into the record during the public comment portion of the December 7th , 2021 city council meeting, or any future meeting date designated to discuss or vote on the proposed density increase amendment(s).

Thank you,

Melissa Stanley-West

From: [Debbie Roesch](mailto:Debbie.Roesch@myoldsmar.com)
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: Stop Oldsmar Density Increase
Date: Friday, November 19, 2021 2:55:29 AM

CAUTION: This message has originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Oldsmar City Council,

My name is Deborah Roesch and my address is 716 Shore Drive East, Oldsmar, FL 34677

I am a resident of the City of Oldsmar I would like to state my sincere objection to the proposed density increase from 30 units per acre to 65 units per acre in the downtown (TCCR) area. I believe in the responsible development of the downtown area keeping in line with the rich historic culture of our city. Please read my objection into record during the public comment portion of the December 7th , 2021 city council meeting or any future meeting date designated to discuss or vote on the proposed density increase amendment(s). Thank you.

Deborah Roesch

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Matt Shinn](#)
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: Stop Oldsmar Density Increase
Date: Friday, November 19, 2021 9:35:06 AM

CAUTION: *This message has originated from outside of the organization. **Do not** click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.*

Dear Oldsmar City Council,

Matthew Shinn
530 Lafayette Blvd
Oldsmar, FL 34677

I am a resident of the City of Oldsmar I would like to state my sincere objection to the proposed density increase from 30 units per acre to 65 units per acre in the downtown (TCCR) area.

I believe in the responsible development of the downtown area keeping in line with the rich historic culture of our city.

Please read my objection into record during the public comment portion of the December 7th , 2021 city council meeting or any future meeting date designated to discuss or vote on the proposed density increase amendment(s).

Thank you.
Matthew Shinn

From: [esther.cordero](mailto:esther.cordero@myoldsmar.com)
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: Stop Oldsmar Density Increase
Date: Saturday, November 20, 2021 7:30:27 AM

CAUTION: *This message has originated from outside of the organization. **Do not** click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.*

Dear Oldsmar City Council,

NAME -
ADDRESS -
CITY, STATE ZIP -

I am a resident of the City of Oldsmar I would like to state my sincere objection to the proposed density increase from 30 units per acre to 65 units per acre in the downtown (TCCR) area.

I believe in the responsible development of the downtown area keeping in line with the rich historic culture of our city.

Please read my objection into record during the public comment portion of the December 7th , 2021 city council meeting or any future meeting date designated to discuss or vote on the proposed density increase amendment(s).

Thank you.
Esther Cordero Santana
100 Shore Dr W
Oldsmar FL 34677

From: [Mechy Wright](#)
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: Stop Oldsmar Density Increase
Date: Saturday, November 20, 2021 11:33:01 AM

CAUTION: This message has originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Oldsmar City Council,

NAME - Jesse & Mechy Wright
ADDRESS - 600 Chestnut Street S
CITY, STATE ZIP - Oldsmar, FL 34677

We have been residents of the City of Oldsmar for 38 years, moving here for the warm neighborhood feel this beautiful historic City offers. We have always supported local businesses and anticipated, for many years, seeing our downtown revitalized with small shops, restaurants and public spaces where we could gather with neighbors and friends. Voting to increase the density to allow high rise residential buildings instead of developing public areas is not the answer. We would like to state our opposition to the proposed density increase, instead, we strongly support and encourage Council to focus on developing the downtown area with the purpose of enriching the historic culture of our city.

Please read our objection into record during the public comment portion of the December 7th , 2021 city council meeting or any future meeting date designated to discuss or vote on the proposed density increase amendment(s).

Thank you very much.

Jesse & Mechy Wright

Sent from my iPad

From: valorieperez7@gmail.com
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: Stop Oldsmar Density Increase
Date: Saturday, November 20, 2021 3:01:50 PM

CAUTION: This message has originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Oldsmar City Council,

NAME -
ADDRESS -
CITY, STATE ZIP -

I am a resident of the City of Oldsmar I would like to state my sincere objection to the proposed density increase from 30 units per acre to 65 units per acre in the downtown (TCCR) area.

I believe in the responsible development of the downtown area keeping in line with the rich historic culture of our city.

Please read my objection into record during the public comment portion of the December 7th , 2021 city council meeting or any future meeting date designated to discuss or vote on the proposed density increase amendment(s).

Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Mindy Norton](#)
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: Stop Oldsmar Density Increase
Date: Sunday, November 21, 2021 3:42:33 PM

CAUTION: *This message has originated from outside of the organization. **Do not** click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.*

Dear Oldsmar City Council,

NAME - Mindy Norton
ADDRESS - 559 Lake Cypress Cir
CITY, STATE ZIP - Oldsmar, FL 34677

I am a resident of the City of Oldsmar I would like to state my sincere objection to the proposed density increase from 30 units per acre to 65 units per acre in the downtown (TCCR) area.

I believe in the responsible development of the downtown area keeping in line with the rich historic culture of our city.

Please read my objection into record during the public comment portion of the December 7th , 2021 city council meeting or any future meeting date designated to discuss or vote on the proposed density increase amendment(s).

Thank you.

From: [William Ledger](#)
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: Stop Oldsmar Density Increase
Date: Monday, November 22, 2021 5:18:17 AM

CAUTION: *This message has originated from outside of the organization. **Do not** click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.*

Dear Oldsmar City Council,

NAME -
ADDRESS -
CITY, STATE ZIP -

I am a resident of the City of Oldsmar I would like to state my sincere objection to the proposed density increase from 30 units per acre to 65 units per acre in the downtown (TCCR) area.

I believe in the responsible development of the downtown area keeping in line with the rich historic culture of our city.

Please read my objection into record during the public comment portion of the December 7th , 2021 city council meeting or any future meeting date designated to discuss or vote on the proposed density increase amendment(s).

Thank you.

From: [Debbie Lundberg](mailto:Debbie.Lundberg@myoldsmar.com)
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: Stop Oldsmar Density Increase
Date: Tuesday, November 23, 2021 11:54:30 AM

CAUTION: This message has originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Oldsmar City Council,

NAME -
ADDRESS -
CITY, STATE ZIP -

I am a resident of the City of Oldsmar I would like to state my sincere objection to the proposed density increase from 30 units per acre to 65 units per acre in the downtown (TCCR) area.

I believe in the responsible development of the downtown area keeping in line with the rich historic culture of our city.

Please read my objection into record during the public comment portion of the December 7th , 2021 city council meeting or any future meeting date designated to discuss or vote on the proposed density increase amendment(s).

Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Becky Chartrand](#)
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: Stop Oldsmar Density Increase
Date: Tuesday, November 23, 2021 5:10:03 PM

CAUTION: This message has originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Oldsmar City Council,

NAME -
ADDRESS -
CITY, STATE ZIP -

I am a resident of the City of Oldsmar I would like to state my sincere objection to the proposed density increase from 30 units per acre to 65 units per acre in the downtown (TCCR) area.

I believe in the responsible development of the downtown area keeping in line with the rich historic culture of our city.

Please read my objection into record during the public comment portion of the December 7th , 2021 city council meeting or any future meeting date designated to discuss or vote on the proposed density increase amendment(s).

Thank you.

Hal and Rebecca Chartrand

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Becky Chartrand](mailto:Becky.Chartrand)
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: Stop Oldsmar Density Increase
Date: Tuesday, November 23, 2021 5:10:03 PM

CAUTION: This message has originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Oldsmar City Council,

NAME -
ADDRESS -
CITY, STATE ZIP -

I am a resident of the City of Oldsmar I would like to state my sincere objection to the proposed density increase from 30 units per acre to 65 units per acre in the downtown (TCCR) area.

I believe in the responsible development of the downtown area keeping in line with the rich historic culture of our city.

Please read my objection into record during the public comment portion of the December 7th , 2021 city council meeting or any future meeting date designated to discuss or vote on the proposed density increase amendment(s).

Thank you.

Hal and Rebecca Chartrand

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Tracy Anderson](#)
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: Stop Oldsmar Density Increase
Date: Sunday, November 28, 2021 2:41:11 PM

CAUTION: This message has originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Oldsmar City Council,

I am a resident of the City of Oldsmar I would like to state my sincere objection to the proposed density increase from 30 units per acre to 65 units per acre in the downtown (TCCR) area. I believe in the responsible development of the downtown area keeping in line with the rich historic culture of our city. Please read my objection into record during the public comment portion of the December 7th , 2021 city council meeting or any future meeting date designated to discuss or vote on the proposed density increase amendment(s).

Thank you.

Tracy Anderson & Robert Hamel

From: [Ashley DiGiacomo](#)
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: Stop Oldsmar Density Increase
Date: Sunday, November 28, 2021 3:32:38 PM

CAUTION: This message has originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Oldsmar City Council, I am a resident of the City of Oldsmar I would like to state my sincere objection to the proposed density increase from 30 units per acre to 65 units per acre in the downtown (TCCR) area. I believe in the responsible development of the downtown area keeping in line with the rich historic culture of our city. Please read my objection into record during the public comment portion of the December 7th , 2021 city council meeting or any future meeting date designated to discuss or vote on the proposed density increase amendment(s).

Thank you
Ashley Digiacomo
506 driftwood cir w
Oldsmar, FL 34677

From: lbw6303@gmail.com
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: Stop Oldsmar Density Increase
Date: Monday, November 29, 2021 2:07:04 PM

CAUTION: *This message has originated from outside of the organization. **Do not** click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.*

Dear Oldsmar City Council,

NAME – Larry & Marcy Wing
ADDRESS – 601 Oakleaf blvd – Harbor Palms
CITY, STATE ZIP – Oldsmar, Florida, 34677

I am a resident of the City of Oldsmar I would like to state my sincere objection to the proposed density increase from 30 units per acre to 65 units per acre in the downtown (TCCR) area.

I believe in the responsible development of the downtown area keeping in line with the rich historic culture of our city.

Please read my objection into record during the public comment portion of the December 7th , 2021 city council meeting or any future meeting date designated to discuss or vote on the proposed density increase amendment(s).

Objection summary as follows:

'If you don't know where you're going, ANY path will get you there'!! In other words, Council seems to have a blurry vision of what a successful implementation of "Downtown Oldsmar" looks like. You can't really characterize it. So, because all of the red tape with The County for population density and other related approvals is so cumbersome, it appears that Oldsmar City Council has decided to just get a higher density increase authorized by Pinellas County behind them, just in case they need it in for a future Development Agreement. We do not agree that an increase in population density is needed at this time. We have two primary points of contention ---

1) **You need to Define and characterize a Vision using a SYSTEM ENGINEERING APPROACH** - (with a Dynamic system simulation model – primarily for traffic flow). This will allow you to define and completely characterize what success should look like. In other words, this Downtown Development project is just SCREAMING for a "System Engineering approach". That approach should utilize a Urban design "Prime contractor" who would define, design and completely characterize the desired outcome using a dynamic system simulation model of primarily the 24/7 traffic flow;

2) **The Density increase doesn't appear to be needed** for the "Downtown" that is currently envisioned. So, either vote NO now, or if YES, give the Citizens a binding commitment for them to agree through referendum, or some other means, a higher population density, before it is ever included in ANY subsequent development agreement.

Thank you.

Larry & Marcy Wing

From: [Stef Z](#)
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: Stop Oldsmar Density Increase
Date: Monday, November 29, 2021 4:02:19 PM

CAUTION: *This message has originated from outside of the organization. **Do not** click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.*

Dear Oldsmar City Council,

My name is
Stephanie Zero
210 Arlington Ave East
Oldsmar FL 34677

I am a resident of the City of Oldsmar I would like to state my sincere objection to the proposed density increase from 30 units per acre to 65 units per acre in the downtown (TCCR) area.

I believe in the responsible development of the downtown area keeping in line with the rich historic culture of our city.

Please read my objection into record during the public comment portion of the December 7th , 2021 city council meeting or any future meeting date designated to discuss or vote on the proposed density increase amendment(s).

Thank you.

From: theadrock13@gmail.com
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: Stop Oldsmar Density Increase
Date: Wednesday, November 24, 2021 5:36:04 PM

CAUTION: This message has originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Oldsmar City Council,

I will personally work and donate to primary and replace every council member and the Mayor who goes against the will of the people by breaking the promises that were made regarding downtown. I will go so far as personally run for council if necessary to see all of you corrupt graft-takers replaced.
You are on notice and we won't forget.

NAME - Adam Tozser
ADDRESS - 315 Country Club dr
CITY, STATE ZIP - oldmar, 34677

I am a resident of the City of Oldsmar I would like to state my sincere objection to the proposed density increase from 30 units per acre to 65 units per acre in the downtown (TCCR) area.

I believe in the responsible development of the downtown area keeping in line with the rich historic culture of our city.

Please read my objection into record during the public comment portion of the December 7th , 2021 city council meeting or any future meeting date designated to discuss or vote on the proposed density increase amendment(s).

Thank you.

Adam Tozser
(Voter, tax payer, business owner)

From: kathy_graber
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: Stop Oldsmar Density Increase
Date: Tuesday, November 30, 2021 1:35:19 PM

CAUTION: This message has originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Oldsmar City Council,

NAME -
ADDRESS -
CITY, STATE ZIP -

I am a resident of the City of Oldsmar I would like to state my sincere objection to the proposed density increase from 30 units per acre to 65 units per acre in the downtown (TCCR) area.

I believe in the responsible development of the downtown area keeping in line with the rich historic culture of our city.

Please read my objection into record during the public comment portion of the December 7th , 2021 city council meeting or any future meeting date designated to discuss or vote on the proposed density increase amendment(s).

Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Tara Gibbons](#)
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: Stop Oldsmar Density Increase
Date: Friday, December 3, 2021 7:52:50 AM

CAUTION: This message has originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Oldsmar City Council,

NAME - Tara and Stephen Gibbons
ADDRESS - 412 Country Club Dr
CITY, STATE ZIP - Oldsmar, Fl 34677

I am a resident of the City of Oldsmar I would like to state my sincere objection to the proposed density increase from 30 units per acre to 65 units per acre in the downtown (TCCR) area.

I believe in the responsible development of the downtown area keeping in line with the rich historic culture of our city.

Please read my objection into record during the public comment portion of the December 7th , 2021 city council meeting or any future meeting date designated to discuss or vote on the proposed density increase amendment(s).

Thank you.

Tara Gibbons

From: info@forwardpinellas.org
To: info@forwardpinellas.org
Subject: FW: Stop Oldsmar Density Increase
Date: Monday, December 6, 2021 7:53:53 AM

-----Original Message-----

From: joe benson <stojo40@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 5, 2021 7:57 PM
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: Stop Oldsmar Density Increase

CAUTION: This message has originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Oldsmar City Council,

NAME -
ADDRESS -
CITY, STATE ZIP -

I am a resident of the City of Oldsmar I would like to state my sincere objection to the proposed density increase from 30 units per acre to 65 units per acre in the downtown (TCCR) area.

I believe in the responsible development of the downtown area keeping in line with the rich historic culture of our city.

Please read my objection into record during the public comment portion of the December 7th , 2021 city council meeting or any future meeting date designated to discuss or vote on the proposed density increase amendment(s).

Thank you.

-----Original Message-----

From: joe benson <stojo40@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 5, 2021 7:56 PM
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: Stop Oldsmar Density Increase

CAUTION: This message has originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Oldsmar City Council,

NAME -
ADDRESS -
CITY, STATE ZIP -

I am a resident of the City of Oldsmar I would like to state my sincere objection to the proposed density increase from 30 units per acre to 65 units per acre in the downtown (TCCR) area.

I believe in the responsible development of the downtown area keeping in line with the rich historic culture of our

city.

Being a resident for over 45 years city council has never approved nor should it ever be an increase like the one proposed.

Please read my objection into record during the public comment portion of the December 7th , 2021 city council meeting or any future meeting date designated to discuss or vote on the proposed density increase amendment(s).

Thank you.

From: [Paula Bacon](#)
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: Stop Oldsmar Density Increase
Date: Sunday, December 5, 2021 9:03:39 AM

CAUTION: This message has originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Oldsmar City Council,

NAME -
ADDRESS -
CITY, STATE ZIP -

I am a resident of the City of Oldsmar I would like to state my sincere objection to the proposed density increase from 30 units per acre to 65 units per acre in the downtown (TCCR) area.

I believe in the responsible development of the downtown area keeping in line with the rich historic culture of our city.

Please read my objection into record during the public comment portion of the December 7th , 2021 city council meeting or any future meeting date designated to discuss or vote on the proposed density increase amendment(s).

Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Carolyn Albertson](mailto:Carolyn.Albertson@myoldsmar.com)
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: Stop Oldsmar Density Increase
Date: Saturday, December 4, 2021 8:56:15 AM

CAUTION: *This message has originated from outside of the organization. **Do not** click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.*

Dear Oldsmar City Council,

Carolyn Albertson
1912 Peppertree Dr Oldsmar FL 34677

I am a resident of the City of Oldsmar I would like to state my sincere objection to the proposed density increase from 30 units per acre to 65 units per acre in the downtown (TCCR) area. That is outrageous to anyone with common sense.

I have been here over 40 years and always looked forward to the small town feel with shops and restaurants in our downtown area. I am still waiting.

Why do I have to go to surrounding small towns and put money in their coffers instead of my own town!

Please do not try to make a quick and easy buck for Oldsmar by giving us more people and traffic. Those residents will also end up going elsewhere to be served by our neighboring city's forward thinking planning for desirable local businesses.

Oldsmar can be a destination too. Have lunch, shop, enjoy walking through the area or sit on a bench and relax with an ice cream cone.

Don't take away our last hope of having a thriving and lovely downtown which we will be proud of and will gladly support.

Do Not approve a density increase, please. Give us a chance, probably our last chance.

Please read my objection into record during the public comment portion of the December 7th , 2021 city council meeting or any future meeting date designated to discuss or vote on the proposed density increase amendment(s).

Thank you.

From: [Ashley Inzinga](#)
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: Stop Oldsmar Density Increase
Date: Friday, December 3, 2021 1:55:31 PM

CAUTION: *This message has originated from outside of the organization. **Do not** click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.*

Dear Oldsmar City Council,

Larry Walters
133 Dolphin Dr. S
OLDSMAR FL 34677

I am a resident of the City of Oldsmar I would like to state my sincere objection to the proposed density increase from 30 units per acre to 65 units per acre in the downtown (TCCR) area.

I believe in the responsible development of the downtown area keeping in line with the rich historic culture of our city.

Please read my objection into record during the public comment portion of the December 7th , 2021 city council meeting or any future meeting date designated to discuss or vote on the proposed density increase amendment(s).

Thank you.

From: [Ashley Inzinga](#)
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: Stop Oldsmar Density Increase
Date: Friday, December 3, 2021 1:52:54 PM

CAUTION: *This message has originated from outside of the organization. **Do not** click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.*

Dear Oldsmar City Council,

Ashley Inzinga
1924 Peppertree Dr, Oldsmar, FL 34677

I am a resident of the City of Oldsmar I would like to state my sincere objection to the proposed density increase from 30 units per acre to 65 units per acre in the downtown (TCCR) area.

I believe in the responsible development of the downtown area keeping in line with the rich historic culture of our city.

Please read my objection into record during the public comment portion of the December 7th , 2021 city council meeting or any future meeting date designated to discuss or vote on the proposed density increase amendment(s).

Thank you.

From: [Tammy Money](#)
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: STOP OLDSMAR DENSITY INCREASE!!!!
Date: Monday, December 6, 2021 4:33:22 PM

CAUTION: *This message has originated from outside of the organization. **Do not** click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.*

Dear Oldsmar City Council,

NAME – Tammy Money
ADDRESS – 1662 Gray Bark Drive
CITY, STATE ZIP – Oldsmar, FL 34677

I am a resident of the City of Oldsmar I would like to state my sincere **objection** to the proposed density increase from 30 units per acre to 65 units per acre in the downtown (TCCR) area.

I believe in the responsible development of the downtown area keeping in line with the rich historic culture of our city.

Please read my objection into record during the public comment portion of the December 7th , 2021 city council meeting or any future meeting date designated to discuss or vote on the proposed density increase amendment(s).

Thank you.
Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: [Kevin Rose](#)
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: Stop Oldsmar Density Increase
Date: Monday, December 6, 2021 7:22:26 PM

CAUTION: This message has originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Oldsmar City Council,
I am against density increase in Oldsmar! Please do not do this to our town.

NAME - Kevin Rose
ADDRESS - 604 s. Bayview blvd
CITY, STATE ZIP - oldsmar, fl 34677

I am a resident of the City of Oldsmar I would like to state my sincere objection to the proposed density increase from 30 units per acre to 65 units per acre in the downtown (TCCR) area.

I believe in the responsible development of the downtown area keeping in line with the rich historic culture of our city.

Please read my objection into record during the public comment portion of the December 7th , 2021 city council meeting or any future meeting date designated to discuss or vote on the proposed density increase amendment(s).

Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Lengauer, Kyle
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: Stop Oldsmar Density Increase
Date: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 10:38:44 AM

CAUTION: This message has originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Oldsmar City Council,

NAME - Kyle Lengauer
ADDRESS - 2004 Saginaw Ct
CITY, STATE ZIP - Oldsmar, FL 34677

I am a resident of the City of Oldsmar I would like to state my sincere objection to the proposed density increase from 30 units per acre to 65 units per acre in the downtown (TCCR) area.

I believe in the responsible development of the downtown area keeping in line with the rich historic culture of our city.

Please read my objection into record during the public comment portion of the December 7th , 2021 city council meeting or any future meeting date designated to discuss or vote on the proposed density increase amendment(s).

Thank you.

Kyle Lengauer
Oldsmar Business Owner/Property Owner

This email, and any files transmitted with it, are confidential and is intended solely for the use of the individual(s) to whom it is addressed. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please contact the sender by reply email and delete this message from your system. Unless stated otherwise, any views or opinions presented in this email are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Triple T Transport, Inc.

From: [Pamela Settle](#)
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: Stop Oldsmar Density Increase
Date: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 2:58:13 PM

CAUTION: *This message has originated from outside of the organization. **Do not** click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.*

Dear Oldsmar City Council,

NAME - Pam Settle
ADDRESS – 439 Lakeview Dr
CITY, STATE ZIP – Oldsmar, FL 34677

As a resident of Oldsmar, I continue to be opposed to the density increase that makes way for the Woodfield proposal before all due diligence is complete and citizens are able to participate in town hall meetings where all aspects of this change to the CRA are discussed. Woodfield is requiring the density increase to move forward, yet at previous council meetings, citizens were told this density increase isn't linked to any particular project.

I was at the May 25th workshop at Tampa Armature Works and I heard Ms. Donnelly's presentation to the council. I have a copy of the handouts, including the density timeline. There is no question that this density increase is intended explicitly for this Woodfield proposal. There was no discussion about the "in general" need for this increase so that story is a lie. The handouts have images of the Woodfield plan and the goal was to get this density increase approved for them.

Despite residents being told that there is no approved plan, the renderings for the Woodfield plan were shared in the last Oldsmar city magazine. That plan includes 316 apartments and an 850 car parking garage, with allowance for a hotel to be added at a later time.

You need to be honest with citizens and let them know you are pursuing this project.

Yet, today, ABC news reported the city is considering 150 residences and Doug Bevis was quoted as saying the city needs workforce housing.

So which is it? A walkable downtown for all residents as promised in the CRA plan, or an apartment building because we need workforce housing? The city doesn't have a plan in place to address housing shortage issues so how would anyone know if this plan meets needs? I suspect it's a PR tactic using acceptable buzzwords to deflect attention away from the fact that the taxpayer's land is being hijacked by handful of people in the city and the chamber in favor of one out of state developer.

Speaking of mass produced apartments, seems their design is a popular cost-savings design being

utilized around the country. This video is eye opening, and makes me want to know the specs of their design. Are they proposing a wood frame for the upper floors? If so, this is not recommended for rainy and humid areas. <https://youtu.be/mrxZqPVFTag>

Oldsmar most definitely deserves much better planning and visioning for downtown, as well as better vetting and outreach for this proposal. Everything about this feels rushed, and somewhat suspect. As elected leaders, you are not advocates for a developer. You are representatives of the voters, however it seems some of you have a different idea about representative government. We don't need condescending parents or arrogant dictators. We need elected leaders who listen to the people who live here and pay taxes for the city to exist. You work for us, the people. Not the chamber.

Steve and Andrew, you were the last ones out there to actually campaign for office. Are you keeping your promises?????

This action requires a NO vote by any leader who cares about their citizens and proper process more than their ego.

Pamela Settle

From: [Daniel Leahey](#)
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: Stop Oldsmar Density Increase
Date: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 10:41:51 PM

CAUTION: *This message has originated from outside of the organization. **Do not** click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.*

Dear Oldsmar City Council,

NAME - Daniel Leahey

ADDRESS - 202 Arlington Ave E, Oldsmar, FL 34677

I am a resident of the City of Oldsmar I would like to state my sincere objection to the proposed density increase from 30 units per acre to 65 units per acre in the downtown (TCCR) area.

I believe in the responsible development of the downtown area keeping in line with the rich historic culture of our city.

Please read my objection into record during the public comment portion of the December 7th , 2021 city council meeting or any future meeting date designated to discuss or vote on the proposed density increase amendment(s).

Thank you.

From: [Sara Martin](mailto:Sara.Martin@myoldsmar.com)
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: Stop Oldsmar Density Increase
Date: Wednesday, December 8, 2021 12:01:55 PM

CAUTION: *This message has originated from outside of the organization. **Do not** click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.*

Dear Oldsmar City Council,

Sara Martin
410 Jefferson Ave S Oldsmar, FL 34677

After last night's meeting I have some thoughts, further objection and questions regarding the density increase.

I do not understand the talking point that businesses will not thrive without density increasing with residential units. When I moved here at 9 years old nobody knew where Oldsmar was. It was boring here until later on 580 was paved to Tampa rd, AMC 20, Walmart, a ton of shopping plazas popped up. People only came here for the Flea Market. We have plenty of thriving businesses. If it's built people will come. Not to mention every single person in Oldsmar (including those in support) continue to say they'd love a downtown to visit instead of going nextdoor to Safety Harbor or Dunedin. Sure the very few businesses that were once down there failed but can we really attribute that to ONLY density? Visibility, community awareness, business models, and marketing is a big part of anyone being successful. It's as though we should believe any and all business should automatically work just because of adding people to the mix.

Additionally, I feel gaslighted every time someone brings up "apartments" and tries to correct it to "mixed use". Apartments or dwellings are within mixed use. The density increase is in fact talking about increasing apartments or dwellings. That is the very issue myself and other residents are concerned about. Regardless of the size of the building already allowed within the zone.

I also see a developer in Safety Harbor was able to sue the city. Please see article. <https://safetyharborconnect.com/judge-awards-developer-more-than-16-million-in-safety-harbor-case>

What protections do we have in place if any to not fall into a similar path? Theoretically would a developer be able to sue the city if they were denied whether they meet certain criteria or not?

Thank you.

From: [Sean Kelly](#)
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com; info@forwardpinellas.org
Subject: Stop Oldsmar Density Increase
Date: Wednesday, December 8, 2021 12:33:35 PM

CAUTION: *This message has originated from outside of the organization. **Do not** click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.*

Dear Honorable Council Members,

My name is Sean Kelly and I reside at 203 Congress Street in Oldsmar, FL 34677. I attended the city council meeting last night regarding the density increase and related City of Oldsmar's Land Development (Town Center) Code and Comprehensive Plan. I really appreciate you all giving the opportunity to receive input from the residents of Oldsmar and for the work you are doing. As a longtime resident of Oldsmar and Tampa Bay area, I have seen huge changes over the years like some of the other people stated last night. It is really great how the City and Pinellas County are growing and developing the way they are; I am impressed with many projects that I believe have improved the area such as the widened sidewalks and park trails, for example. I do have some serious concerns with what is transpiring here with this matter specifically and, respectfully, did not appreciate the execution of communications nor the setup of this meeting.

First, the City of Oldsmar Government should work to ensure that meetings like this and other events have suitable space and seating for the people who wish to attend. During the meeting on December 7th, 2021, I did not have a reasonable space and had to stand out in the hallway as the meeting room was full. I ended up leaving after about two hours because of this, pretty much in frustration. That is unacceptable to me. In future, meetings at least related to issues such as this, should be greatly improved and put more thought into allowing people due ability to have a voice; I did not have any presentation prepared last night but I would have liked to potentially if I had a more comfortable space and more time if I had better notification. All residents who wish to participate and provide input should have the ability to attend and have a safe and more comfortable way to participate.

Having the ability to watch a YouTube video (streamed or recorded) of a council meeting is useful, however there were people watching it in the hallway with significant audio delays. During the entirety of the meeting, I could not adequately hear or understand what was being said in the council room. This was extremely distracting in addition to people around me who did not comply with social distancing in any way whatsoever and were talking loudly during many portions of the meeting. We are still in a pandemic period and this Government body did not assist with complying with the social distancing, if it still applies. Many attendees also were not wearing masks as well. I understand there is cost involved, but reasonable

improvements to audio and probably video should be made to improve these meetings.

With all due respect, I believe that this particular decision made to increase the density to that degree may prove to be a huge error in the future, albeit with some benefits. Although I do agree in continued development and ultimate changes for good, I do disagree with the decision and feel that there existed insufficient accommodations to provide residents reasonable time and also ability to properly participate in these matters. Unfortunately, I do say that I am disappointed in the manner in which this has been conducted and/or planned; I do understand and appreciate the work and effort that is involved in these efforts. I do not agree that simply putting more people in buildings will bring the desired effect. There must exist a multi-faceted (and intelligent) approach to this downtown development and I implore much greater effort to monitor what these developers are doing. They will most likely only care about their own profits, not the residents of Oldsmar. I have even witnessed this in the past, affected directly, how developers lack caring/concern about the residents surrounding homes where they are doing construction, not that I am saying all developers do this.

With this decision (to approve density increase), you may have just permanently removed or at least modified the small-time feel and unique quality which Oldsmar has possessed since its inception. I would be highly surprised if R.E. Olds would support any changes of this magnitude without the proper input, and conceptual application, of the community. What I suggest is to compromise here. There are aspects of how the City deals with properties that needs improvement where it seems people or companies own properties and do not even maintain their properties. There must be many changes made to improve how code enforcement works so that this does not occur and also that if these buildings are constructed, that they do not adversely affect surrounding properties and residents.

To my understanding, a significant number of ideas have been created and presented over the years to develop this area; I do not understand how increasing density to this degree will somehow make the downtown just happen. The reasoning does not make sense to me and seems that this is just being rapidly pushed forward. To sum up, I cannot fathom how these decisions can be made without great thought and discussion and concern with residents who will most likely be greatly impacted by this development. I say these things with the utmost respect; as a concerned citizen of the United States, I have a due right to express this and also attempt to better understand scopes of work. I ask that you please consider the words of residents and not just push through what you or businesses want. I must add that just because developers do not want to build existing ideas and concepts, should not be allowed to affect or force through what they want. Building without making substantial improvements to existing infrastructure, services, and communication mechanisms is very unwise, in my opinion, and not recommendable.

Thanks,

Sean Kelly
(727) 242-2279

From: [Ashley Hoak](mailto:Ashley.Hoak@myoldsmar.com)
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: Stop Oldsmar Density Increase
Date: Monday, December 13, 2021 6:43:10 AM

CAUTION: This message has originated from outside of the organization. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Oldsmar City Council,

Ashley Hoak
1751 Mapleleaf blvd
Oldsmar, FL 34677

I am a resident of the City of Oldsmar I would like to state my sincere objection to the proposed density increase from 30 units per acre to 65 units per acre in the downtown (TCCR) area.

I believe in the responsible development of the downtown area keeping in line with the rich historic culture of our city.

Please read my objection into record during the public comment portion of the December 7th , 2021 city council meeting or any future meeting date designated to discuss or vote on the proposed density increase amendment(s).

Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Erin Wilkinson](mailto:Erin.Wilkinson@myoldsmar.com)
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: [BULK] Stop Oldsmar Density Increase
Date: Tuesday, December 14, 2021 1:52:28 PM
Importance: Low

CAUTION: *This message has originated from outside of the organization. **Do not** click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.*

Dear Oldsmar City Council,

Erin Wilkinson-
302 Fairfield St. -
Oldsmar, FL 34677 -

I am a resident of the City of Oldsmar. I would like to state my sincere objection to the proposed density increase from 30 units per acre to 65 units per acre in the downtown (TCCR) area.

I believe in the responsible development of the downtown area keeping in line with the rich historic culture of our city.

Please read my objection into record during the public comment portion of the December 7th , 2021 city council meeting or any future meeting date designated to discuss or vote on the proposed density increase amendment(s).

From: [Kristi Fluck](#)
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: [BULK] Stop Oldsmar Density Increase
Date: Tuesday, November 23, 2021 1:54:24 PM
Importance: Low

CAUTION: *This message has originated from outside of the organization. **Do not** click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.*

Kristi Fluck
202 E Buckingham Ave
Oldsmar, FL 34677

Dear Oldsmar City Council:

I am a resident of the City of Oldsmar.
I would like to state my sincere objection to the proposed density increase from 30 units per acre to 65 units per acre in the downtown (TCCR) area.

My family, and I believe many others, moved to Oldsmar because of it's small-town appeal. I've seen many changes through the years, some good, but many changing our small town unfavorably.
Choices in this matter should not be dependent on a chamber of commerce that is predominantly based in another county, but on the people who live and work here, as I do.

I believe in the responsible development of the downtown area keeping in line with the rich historic culture of our city.

Please read my objection into record during the public comment portion of the December 7th , 2021 city council meeting or any future meeting date designated to discuss or vote on the proposed density increase amendment(s).

Thank you.

From: [Tom Price](#)
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: YES to Oldsmar Density Increase
Date: Thursday, November 18, 2021 8:20:49 AM

CAUTION: *This message has originated from outside of the organization. **Do not** click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.*

Dear Oldsmar City Council,

NAME – Tom Price
ADDRESS – 418 Arlington Ave E
CITY, STATE ZIP – Oldsmar, FL 34677

**YES to downtown and density
increase!**

Thank you.

From: [James Roesch](mailto:James.Roesch@myoldsmar.com)
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: Against the Density Increase
Date: Tuesday, December 7, 2021 12:57:09 AM

CAUTION: *This message has originated from outside of the organization. **Do not** click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.*

Dear Oldsmar City Council,

I, James Rutledge Roesch, reside in the city of Oldsmar at 717 Shore Dr. E. At the outset I would like to state my objection to the proposed density increase—30 units per acre to 65 units per acre in the TCCR area. Please read this into the record during as a public comment during the City Council's meeting on 12/7/2021. Thank you.

My family moved to Oldsmar from Safety Harbor in 1999. In 2015, I moved out of my parents' house on Shore Dr. E. and built a house on a vacant lot on Arlington Ave. E. Two years later, I got married and my wife moved in with me on Arlington. Three years after that, we welcomed our first child into our Arlington home. This year, we moved to our current address on Shore Dr. E. to be even closer to my parents. My wife's parents also bought two houses here in Oldsmar on Lexington St., both of which they have been leasing out and one of which they plan on moving into themselves next year. In short, we have committed to making a life and raising our family here in Oldsmar.

For as long as we've been living here, we've been hearing about plans to develop the Downtown: retail, restaurants, residences. Needless to say that virtually everyone is in favor of that. Yet the development that this density increase would allow doesn't look like the "Downtown" that we've been expecting. Residents of Oldsmar may be under the misapprehension that if they support the downtown redevelopment then they must support this density increase. Yet this density increase opens us up to plans which could permanently change the face of our city—I fear for the worse.

I understand that this vote is not a vote for any particular plan, but rather a vote for a density increase. I'm addressing the plans which could pass under this proposed density increase. My position is that the land should be developed as currently zoned and that rezoning it will ultimately result in development inconsistent with what it is we love about where we live. In other words, I don't see any compelling reason to rezone this and I expect that the only reason rezoning is being proposed is to enable the very kind of plans which we've been informed that this vote is not—not this vote but the next one, that is. I invite the members of the City Council to state for the record what development plans they would or would not accept, but in lieu of that, I feel that I don't have enough information to support a the proposed density increase. There are conceivable development plans under this density increase which I'd support, but there are also development plans under this density increase which I wouldn't support, and until I know what the City Council's plans are, I have to err on the side of caution.

I'm on the road for work most days, and I see brand-new mall-sized apartment buildings everywhere in this county and the state at large now—the sort of mall-sized apartment building which could be built under the proposed density increase. This density increase could allow development plans which would make Downtown Oldsmar look like everywhere/anywhere else. Is that what we want for our city? Developers just want to make money the quickest and easiest way possible, and that's by building apartments to capitalize on the unprecedented population growth in the area. When it comes to amenities for the people who already live here, however, we could end up with nothing but more vacant space.

We shouldn't be too hasty or too greedy, either. Let's not forget that Oldsmar has been developing at a healthy pace for many years now, and I reckon that most everyone is quite pleased with the way that Oldsmar has changed in our lifetime. When I moved here over 20 years ago, Oldsmar looked completely different. Many of the businesses that are here now—especially restaurants which draw in business from all over Upper Tampa Bay—didn't exist. Some of the parks that we may now take for granted didn't exist back then, either. Indeed, my wife and I rarely go outside of Oldsmar for anything that we need or even want to do. At the same time, there's been a lot of new residential construction in Oldsmar: New houses, and even whole new neighborhoods, keep being built. Let's continue to develop Oldsmar in this tradition—naturally, gradually, and responsibly—and not sell out to a developer whose interests are not our interests. Why try to rush this or force the continued development of our city with a density increase when all of the demographics and statistics are trending toward what we want? All that we have to do for a Downtown is patiently build on the progress that we've made and let experience be our guide.

Indeed, I'm wondering how the kind of development that may be planned under this proposed density increase could even be called a "Downtown." This density increase would permit what is essentially a shopping center adjacent or atop an apartment building—in no way a "town center" where anyone but residents of the apartment building are going to congregate. Would we seriously consider plopping a hideous, humongous apartment building right in the middle of our city just so that a few new restaurants may move in on the ground level or the rooftop? Oldsmar already has plenty of shopping centers with plenty of great places to eat, so I don't see what value this would add to the community. At best it's just going to cannibalize existing businesses—perhaps smaller and locally owned businesses which have been here for longer. Residences are necessary for a downtown, of course, but there's a way to develop them tastefully and in keeping with the look that we want for Oldsmar, and this density increase isn't it. Why potentially build another even bigger multi-use building on State St. when there's smaller multi-use buildings just down the street near St. Pete Dr. that remain vacant? What guarantee is there that, if businesses do lease the ground-level space on such an apartment building, they will be front-facing retail or restaurant businesses, and not more, say, healthcare businesses?

The Chamber of Commerce isn't lobbying on behalf of the interests of us, but on behalf of the interests of developers. To them, density increase in a community is always a good thing, no matter what other side effects it has, because higher density means more people, more people means more consumers, and more consumers which means more money.

Yet that which cannot be quantified—that is, the feeling of a family-friendly small town—still has value, even if the Chamber of Commerce doesn't count it.

I support the development of Downtown as much as anyone else who lives here, but I don't support this proposed density increase. Too many American communities, impelled by non-stop "progress" and "competition," end up self-destructing the very qualities which made them unique. There must be limits. We want our city to grow, of course, but we also want to preserve the quality of life for the people already living here.

James Rutledge Roesch
717 Shore Dr. E.
Oldsmar, FL 34677

James Roesch | Director of Special Services

Jani-King | DAZSER Management

2469 Sunset Point Road, Clearwater, FL 33765 | Office [\(727\) 797-7744](tel:7277977744)

jroesch@dazser.com



From: [Kathy Loud](#)
To: councilmembers@myoldsmar.com
Cc: anixon@myoldsmar.com
Subject: Stop Oldsmar Density Increase
Date: Sunday, January 9, 2022 6:05:08 PM

CAUTION: *This message has originated from outside of the organization. **Do not** click on links or open attachments unless you are expecting the correspondence from the sender and know the content is safe.*

Dear Oldsmar City Council,

NAME -Kathy Loud Wallace and Larry Wallace
ADDRESS -414 Arlington Ave E
CITY, STATE ZIP -Oldsmar, FL 34677

I am a resident of the City of Oldsmar I would like to state my sincere objection to the proposed density increase from 30 units per acre to 65 units per acre in the downtown (TCCR) area.

I believe in the responsible development of the downtown area keeping in line with the rich historic culture of our city.

Please read my objection into record during the public comment portion of the December 7th , 2021 city council meeting or any future meeting date designated to discuss or vote on the proposed density increase amendment(s).

Thank you. Kathy Loud I have been a resident of Oldsmar since 1973!
(49 Years, please save our town!!)

Please consider the following public comments in regard to the City of Oldsmar's request for a density change in their Downtown Development District.

In their May 4th, 2021 council meeting, City Council voted on the tentative May 18th meeting minutes, which included AIR-1492 Downtown Development.

The item AIR-1492 appeared to be intentionally taken off the May 18 City Council agenda without notice or discussion and quietly put it on the offsite (Tampa Armature Works) City Council workshop agenda for May 25. Council Member Saracki stated to me and others that the Mayor told the City Manager to make the change. Only one or two citizens attended this workshop and no media. There was no audio or video recording of the offsite meeting as is the standard for all City Council meetings (to be posted on the City's website). The council did not state verbally in the May 18 meeting that the agenda item about the Downtown Development (Woodfield) had been moved to the workshop. Citizens did not know, and it was not addressed. The agenda for the Tampa Workshop was not discussed or approved in the May 18th meeting.

This May 25th workshop included the **only** discussion about density increase needed in relationship to the Woodfield proposal in a meeting that included all the City Council members since the two prior approvals to negotiate a contract with Woodfield Development. The Asst city manager had a full packet of info and a timeline for the density increase ordinance change with steps and dates. This timeline was not made public prior to the meeting. This Meeting was held outside of the Oldsmar City limits and even outside of the County limits. According to a State's Attorney opinion in 2008, this type of City Council meeting is illegal? Please see the following link. It appears the Council reached a consensus to move forward with the Density increase initiative.

[Advisory Legal Opinion - City temporarily holding meetings outside city \(myfloridalegal.com\)](http://myfloridalegal.com)

"Therefore, based on constitutional and statutory considerations, as well as previous opinions of this office, it is my opinion that the Belleair Beach City Council may not temporarily relocate the site of public meetings to an adjacent municipality in the absence of state legislative authorization to do so." Bill McCollum Attorney General

I am making a formal complaint to the Florida Commission on Ethics, and the State's Attorney's office to get a ruling on the Oldsmar City Council Meeting held at "Tampa Armature Works" in May of last year, and previous meetings in previous years held outside of Oldsmar City boundaries?

The City Council had already voted to negotiate with Woodfield on their proposal and did so without discussion about the need to increase density (in their November 4, 2020, and March 2, 2021 meetings). So the first mention of the density increase need happened in this offsite workshop. Apparently, the developer has made the density increase a necessity before moving forward. In the Tampa meeting the Mayor called the Woodfield Developer a "partner", even though to date there has been no final agreement. This is alarming and gives the appearance of some non-public discussion and/or information. The results of this workshop clearly gives the Woodfield Developer an unfair advantage because it reduced potential backlash of citizen involvement. The Council did not discuss the library property proposal that was also approved on March 2nd at all. It appears it was intentional that the development update was all about Woodfield and the need to increase density. Based on Former

Attorney General McCollum's opinion, is the decision by the Council to move forward with the Density increase void? Furthermore, are all other Density actions that followed void as well?

You as the Forward Pinellas Board being made aware of this information, do you feel comfortable voting on this issue at this time, and/or moving it forward to the BOC acting as the Planning Council?

One of the pages in the handout package had a list of park amenities that were in the City's 2019 CRA plan. Felicia Donnelly (asst. City Manager) went through each of those items and had highlighted those that would not be included with the updated proposal by Woodfield (again this was not made available to the public prior to the meeting). The Mayor verbally called for a show of hands to approve the removal of the list of park amenities from the plan. The vote was unanimous without discussion.

Considering the public acknowledgment of the need to increase density could create a stir that would jeopardize this one proposal, I would say that it's a definite advantage to Woodfield to keep the need to increase density as quiet as possible. It was especially strategic in appearance to have the Density Increase discussed for the first time outside of the County. That includes not making minutes from the May 25 workshop (Tampa/Armature) available to the public until after the first planning board meeting two months later. It also includes not giving the planning board members information prior to the planning board meeting so that they would not begin to talk about it with their friends and neighbors. The agenda for that planning board meeting was not placed on the website for people to see until the very last minute. The Planning Board voted 6-0 not to approve the density increase.

It was the incorrect public hearing notice for this planning board meeting that required a start over process in September 2021.

Leading up to the first round of public hearings to authorize and read the density ordinance, information about the proposal was still not made public. It took citizens to share the photos on Facebook with fellow citizens to get people to come to those meetings. It was only after information about the density increase became more public, that the city updated the CRA webpages to include this new proposal and the changes (which is a CRA requirement). This was done after I started a Facebook page called "Oldsmar Comments" about the Downtown Development process. Although the City's CRA agreement mandates that they maintain current information about the CRA project and the TCCR district. I don't believe they met that criterion of adequately informing the citizens that the CRA plan was changing until after I created my Facebook page "Oldsmar Comments."

So all of the limited information regarding the CRA changes and density increase, combined, does give Woodfield an advantage because as I have seen and proven that the public is not approving of the density increases to make way for Woodfield apartment building. There have been hundreds of negative comments on the Facebook page "Oldsmar Comments" and the "Next-door" web page. There were 200-yard signs distributed through the website stopdensity.com., and over 140 people came to the Dec. 7th, 2021, council meeting to voice their opinion about the increase density proposal. A lot of those citizens were not able to even get into the public hearing room, due to lack of adequate meeting space. The mayor joked during the meeting about how some were having to open the bathroom doors to hear through the speakers in the bathrooms.

The Upper Tampa Bay Chamber of Commerce has also been heavily lobbying for this proposal. The City's former Mayor is Director of Government Affairs for the Chamber, and at hearings he has been urging

citizens to understand that this has always been part of the City's plan and that they should get on board. That same former Mayor, Doug Bevis, is a candidate for City Council at this time. It appears the president of the board for the chamber could benefit from the density increase, because he or his company owns land (multiple acres) within the TCCR boundary of the increase. This could be a conflict of interest, and again giving a preference to this one developer as the chamber uses its influence with the city council to lobby for Woodfield development and the Density Increase in front of citizens. This potential conflict is apparently not public knowledge.
In August 2021 the City Council.

This this past summer the City Council voted to instruct the city attorney to change the density/bonus ordinance from 30 to 65 units per acre. At that time the city attorney did change the **Density/Bonus** language to 65 units Per Arce and it passed two readings. Again, in the November 2nd City Council meeting, the City Council instructed the City Attorney to amend the Density/Bonus ordinance from 30 to 65 units per acre. However, when the proposed amended language came back to the Council on December 7th, the word "bonus" was change to "incentive"? No discussion was made during the City Council meeting about this word change, and I received in writing from Council Member Saracki that he was never brief or notified of the verbiage change prior to the meeting. Now there are two attorneys who sit as Council Members and they did not question or comment on this verbiage change? So, the questions are; why the change in verbiage? Who discussed it? Where? And who approved it prior to the December 7th council meeting to be presented to the board? More importantly does the wording change from the original instruction to the city attorney, negate the November 2nd vote of instruction? **Again, until an opinion or ruling from the Florida Commission on Ethics is obtained, I do not see how this board can consider approving the City of Oldsmar request on the Density Increase?**

Actual **qualified studies** that should have been presented to the City Council and at the very least presented here today to this Board by staff are:

1. What will be the impact to the local elementary school from the increased density?
2. Will the current City Water plant be negatively impacted?
3. Will the Sewer plant and collection system be able to accommodate this increased volume due to increased density?
4. How will the City's drainage and flood plan be impacted?
 - a. Will the current drainage systems handle the additional stormwater runoff?
5. What would be the environmental impacts? Looks to me like there is a chance of a historical wetland or waterflow through this property?
6. Increased traffic to the recreational and park systems.
7. Increased traffic on existing roads and intersections
8. Parking Garage below is an example of data needed to make a responsible decision in allowing a Density Increase

In the previous council meeting during the discussion of the density increase ordinance change our Mayor asked a question "does everybody agree that we need a parking garage?" You see this seems to be the attraction with the Woodfield development that they are going to build a "free" parking garage for the public. The City Council's contention is in order for us to have a viable walkable downtown, we will need public parking to accommodate those individuals coming to our downtown to either patronize the businesses or festivals that we will have in the downtown area. The Woodfield developer is proposing to build an 850-space garage for free? Let's look at the breakdown of what that 850-space

garage will entail. I have researched many municipal codes across the country (you are welcome to PM me if you want them) and the average spaces needed for an apartment building is two spaces per apartment. This does not include the needed visitor spacing for the people who live in the apartment complex. In the last council meeting, Vice Mayor Knapp said that the apartments were not going to be affordable housing but were designed to be workforce housing? If the design of 316 apartments is for workforce housing, they would assume that two people would need to be in each unit to afford the average \$2,058 a month rent (Apartmenthomeliving.com Tarpon Springs, FL) that the Woodfield development has on average in all of their existing or previous apartment complex projects. The average single workforce individual could not afford a rent of \$2,058. It would have to be a couple (requiring two cars)? City Council also agreed to let the Woodfield development encompass the existing employee parking lot and include those spaces in the parking garage. There were also plans to put a 150-room hotel in the TCCR district adjacent to the Woodfield Project, this hotel will require a "minimum" of 150 spaces. The Woodfield project is also marketed as a vertical mixed-use development, meaning there will be restaurants and shops on the bottom level. When you take into consideration the number of spaces needed for employee parking for businesses and hospitality it averages out to be like 2 (4 if a restaurant) spaces per 1000 square feet (this is a very conservative estimate). If you calculate a conservative space of 10,000 square feet of commercial and restaurant space, a bare minimum of 20 spaces would be needed to accommodate those businesses for employee parking. The need for more parking spaces would increase if those businesses were all bars coffee shops and restaurants which is what the people of Oldsmar expect when they are viewing or envisioning a walkable downtown area. So, let's do the math.

316 apartments x 2 = 632 spaces (not including maintenance, and visitor parking spaces)

City employee parking – 75 (minimum estimate)

Hotel spaces = 150 (minimum required)

10,000 sqft employee parking (again minimum) 20

Total spaces accounted for without and customer or "PUBLIC PARKING" = 877 spaces?

Again, Woodfield is proposing to build an 850-space parking garage and the center of their 316-apartment complex? So what benefit is the City of Oldsmar getting by Woodfield building this 850-space parking garage? Where are the additional 27 cars going to park? Where will the business customers park? How will that effect traffic? How will State Street feed the large potential traffic flow onto Tampa Road? Will it accommodate an 850-car evacuation during a hurricane?

All these things need to not only be considered but studied in depth before changing a City Density Code. In a Staff report dated August 20th, 2020, sent to Al Braitwaite for the Planning Board in regards to a similar zoning land/use application regarding the Flea market land which included an increase in Density. City Staff pointed out these issues, and the unknown impact of these issues forces them to not recommend approval. The staff report even states that if the developer does not have a plan and agreement with the city guaranteeing mixed land use, then the city can't approve the requested change.

We don't have a final plan? We don't have a signed agreement.

The council and Mayor have stated that more approval will be needed after an agreement is reached? So why make this change now? Will this change in density Codes open the city up for future lawsuits, regardless of a Woodfield agreement?

I and many other Oldsmar citizens are asking this Board to vote no, or defer a vote until all the above information is obtained or sorted out?

Thank you,

David McDonald
124 Shore Drive Place
Oldsmar, Florida 34677

Number: AGO 2008-01
Date: January 9, 2008
Subject: City temporarily holding meetings outside city

Mr. Paul J. Marino
City Attorney
City of Belleair Beach
Post Office Box 344
Indian Rocks Beach, Florida 33767

RE: MUNICIPALITIES - GOVERNMENT IN THE SUNSHINE - MEETINGS - whether city may temporarily locate official meetings to venue outside municipality. Art. VIII, s. 2(c), Fla. Const.; s. 286.011, Fla. Stat.

Dear Mr. Marino:

As City Attorney for the City of Belleair Beach, you have requested my opinion on substantially the following questions:

1. May the Belleair Beach City Council temporarily locate its chambers for public meetings in an adjacent municipality while a new city hall is being built, provided adequate notice is given to city residents?
2. If the answer to Question One is in the negative, may the Belleair Beach City Council enact an ordinance for a referendum to amend the city charter to allow the city council to meet outside its jurisdiction?

The City of Belleair Beach is in the preliminary stages of razing and reconstructing a new city hall on the site of the existing city hall, as it appears that the current structure does not meet building codes. You have advised this office that the City of Belleair Beach is a residential community without any commercial property within the city limits. According to newspaper reports, there are no large meeting facilities within the city. An additional consideration is that the city records its meetings for rebroadcast on television which requires sound and video recording and editing equipment in the meeting room.[1] You state that "there is no place within the corporate limits of the city where the city may lease a facility as a temporary city hall for the conduct of public meetings" and have asked for my opinion on whether the city may conduct public meetings outside its jurisdictional boundaries.

Article VIII, section 2(c), Florida Constitution, requires that the exercise of extra-territorial powers by a municipality shall be as provided by general or special law. This constitutional restriction is reflected in section 166.021(3)(a), Florida Statutes, in which the Legislature recognizes that municipalities are authorized to enact legislation concerning any subject matter upon which the state Legislature may act, except "[t]he subjects of annexation, merger, and exercise of extraterritorial power, which require general or special law pursuant to s. 2(c), Art. VIII of the State Constitution[.]" (e.s.)

Based on these constitutional and statutory provisions, this office in Attorney General's Opinion 75-139 concluded that, in the absence of a general or special law, a municipality had no authorization to exercise its legislative and governing powers, including the adoption of municipal ordinances, extraterritorially and had no authority to hold meetings at which official business is conducted outside the municipal boundaries. As that opinion points out, in the absence of such statutory authorization, acts and proceedings at meetings held outside the municipal jurisdiction are void unless such actions are statutorily authorized.[2]

Similarly, as recently as 2003, this office concluded that a municipality could not rely on the provisions of an interlocal agreement authorizing the city commission to conduct meetings at facilities outside its boundaries. The question in Attorney General's Opinion 2003-03 was asked by the Village of Highland Park, a municipality

with a population of approximately 150 residents and no municipal structures or real property in which to hold city commission meetings. The village approached the City of Lake Wales about entering into an interlocal agreement which would allow the village to use the city's commission chambers to hold its meetings. The city commission chambers were within five miles of the village's boundaries. The opinion discusses Attorney General's Opinion 75-139, Article VIII, section 2(c), Florida Constitution, relating to the exercise of extraterritorial powers, and the Government in the Sunshine Law. While recognizing that the statutes contain no prescribed place within a municipality for holding council meetings, the opinion concludes that in order for the village to act extraterritorially, it was required to seek legislative authorization.

You have also asked whether legislative authorization for conducting meetings outside the territorial jurisdiction of Belleair Beach may be accomplished by enactment of an ordinance for a referendum to amend the city charter. As discussed above, the Florida Statutes and the Florida Constitution require that the exercise of extraterritorial powers must be authorized by general or special law. The use of the phrase "by law" in the Florida Constitution has been determined to mean an enactment of the State Legislature and not local legislation enacted by a city commission, county commission, or other political body.[3] Thus, the reference in Article VIII, section 2(c), Florida Constitution, and implementing statutes, refers to and requires state legislative action. The City of Belleair Beach may not grant itself extraterritorial authority through local legislative action.

Therefore, based on constitutional and statutory considerations, as well as previous opinions of this office, it is my opinion that the Belleair Beach City Council may not temporarily relocate the site of public meetings to an adjacent municipality in the absence of state legislative authorization to do so. While your letter indicates that no *commercial* space is available for lease to the city for conducting these meetings, it may be possible for the city commission to hold meetings in a school auditorium, church fellowship hall, or the club house of a residential development located within the city on a temporary basis until construction of the new city hall is complete. Any of these venues might be available to the city and would meet the need for a short term location within the city limits at which to hold official meetings.

Sincerely,

Bill McCollum
Attorney General

BM/tgh

[1] See Belleair Bee, "Belleair Beach City Council looking for meeting place," dated November 14, 2007, and Clearwater Gazette, "Revised Steps Taken Toward Goal of Constructing New City Hall," dated November 8, 2007.

[2] See also Am. Jur. 2d *Municipal Corporations, Counties, Other Political Subdivision* s. 141, "[i]n the absence of statutory authorization, municipal councils may not hold meetings outside municipal limits and all acts and proceedings at such meetings are void." Cf. *Rhea v School Board of Alachua County*, 636 So. 2d 1383 (Fla. 1st DCA 1994) (school board workshop held outside county limits over 100 miles away from board's headquarters violates Sunshine Law).

[3] See *Grapeland Heights Civic Association v. City of Miami*, 267 So. 2d 321, 324 (Fla. 1972); *Broward County v. Plantation Imports, Inc.*, 419 So. 2d 1145 (Fla. 4th DCA 1982); *Ison v. Zimmerman*, 372 So. 2d 431 (Fla. 1979); Ops. Att'y Gen. Fla. 79-109 (1979), 84-51 (1984), and 87-36 (1987) (county legislation); 84-17 (1984), 84-39 (1984), and 84-85 (1984) (municipal legislation).