

**From:** Art Woodworth, Jr. [mailto:Art\_TRG@embarqmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 22, 2009 11:48 AM  
**To:** Debra M. Zampetti  
**Cc:** Cindy Jolly; Michele Baker  
**Subject:** LDC Rewrite

Debra:

Good morning. Good meeting yesterday; however, that facility, while very nice in structure and setting, it was very difficult for spectators to hear the discussion amongst the stakeholder members. The air handler is way too noisy.

I had some follow-up comments I wanted to share and get clarity where noted.

1. Because it was difficult to hear and I did not want to constantly interrupt, I was not clear if the committee ever designated "(P) Permitted" for cemeteries in any of the zoning classifications. If so, as someone that lives in the NE rural Pasco Community, I want to make sure that any land use outside agriculture/rural S-F residential is not "Permitted" without special process. Like those in the urban/suburban environments we had reasonable expectations when we purchased our property.
2. You may want to consider distinguishing "Animal Enclosures/Structure(s)" between commercial operations where such operations as dairy cows, pigs, chickens and the like are concentrated in enclosures that can truly pose a nuisance to their neighbors, and more traditional grazing operations where fenced pastures and corrals for inoculating and treating animals exist. The former are typically grain fed operations vs. the latter grazing operations. Other "structures" with roofs should be subject to the setback performance criteria required in their respective zoning district.
3. I am very concerned about the proposal to require 13' for pool setbacks. Restrictive Euclidean criteria always has a tendency to creep into government's mindset when reviewing more creative options under a PD proposal. If staff wants to limit the number of variances relating to pool enclosures they need to think about how to deal with that when issuing a permit to build the pool. I would think putting the pool builder and homeowner on notice of pool enclosure setback requirements, at the time of pool permitting, is sufficient to not approve future variances. If that homeowner subsequently sells the home then he and/or she have a responsibility to the buyer to disclose those restrictions; it should not be the county's problem. On a larger front, the county should not be looking for ways to make its life easier by legislating more restrictive performance criteria. While no one knows exactly what our future holds with regards to housing, I feel safe in suggesting that we will be looking for innovative ways to pack a great deal more into a smaller package (i.e. footprint). As the ULI pointed out, we need more density in our PD's (where future land use supports the same) in order to limit our infrastructure spending, lessen our footprint on the land, limit our commutes, provide for growth of efficient mass transportation, etc. Let's not legislate

more restrictive criteria and thereby stifle creative solutions to the foregoing ends. THIS IS A BIG PICTURE CONCERN.

4. From a "zoning" perspective, I believe wastewater treatment facilities should be a C (condition use) in all zoning categories. The utilities department (and DEP) has (have) criteria in place for permitting such facilities when the county cannot otherwise provide wastewater service. Technology is ever evolving in the area of treating wastewater and "zoning" should not close the door on application of wastewater facilities where the requirements of the utilities department and permitting agencies are met.

Thank you and staff for all your good work on this rewrite. I appreciate your open-mindedness and acceptance to audience comments. I am enjoying the process.

Best regards, Art

Art Woodworth, Jr.  
TETRA ROUGE GROUP, INC.  
P.O. Box 789  
San Antonio, FL 33576  
Voice 813.335.1518  
Fax 352.521.5684

Email: [Art\\_TRG@embarqmail.com](mailto:Art_TRG@embarqmail.com)