

City of Dade City

AGENDA MEMO

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Commission
From: Karla S. Owens, City Attorney/Community Development Director
Subject: Reassignment of Architectural Review Ordinance
Date: December 22, 2008

It is requested that the City Commission consider the following information and recommendation(s):

BACKGROUND:

As you know, the Architectural Design Guidelines were adopted in November 2007. Along with the guidelines, the Commission created the Architectural Review Board to meet monthly to review applications. One member was appointed by each Commission member and two additional members represent the Redevelopment Advisory Committee and the Historic Preservation Advisory Board.

ISSUES:

The City currently has at least 9 citizen advisory boards, 8 of which meet monthly. In addition, staff often has a problem obtaining regular attendance by board members. The Redevelopment Advisory Committee (RAC) is one of the boards which meet frequently. In addition, the RAC is comprised of a mixture of downtown business owners, citizens and representatives from the Chamber, Main Street and the Historic Board. The jurisdiction of the RAC is the CRA district which is the same area covered by the Architectural Design Guidelines. Of the five individuals appointed to the Architectural Review Board, two are also members of the RAC, one frequently cannot attend due to a conflict of interest (downtown developer) and one member has not attended any meetings at all since being appointed a year ago. Staff has spoken to the RAC board about taking on these additional responsibilities and they are willing to do so. For these reasons, then, staff recommends the current Architectural Review Board be replaced by the RAC board

ALTERNATIVES:

1. Authorize the City Attorney to amend Ordinance No. 2007-0968 to appoint the RAC as the board charged with implementing the Architectural Review Guidelines; or
2. Take no action and retain the existing Architectural Review Board; or

3. Direct staff to take some other action.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends Alternative No. 1 above.

FUNDING:

No funding is required for this item.