The Florida Senate BILL ANALYSIS AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

(This document is based on the provisions contained in the legislation as of the latest date listed below.)

Prepared E	By: The Professional S		ubcommittee on Tr nt Appropriations	ansportation, Tourism, and Economic
BILL:	CS/SB 440			
INTRODUCER:	Community Affairs Committee and Senator Bennet			t
SUBJECT:	Initiatives and Ref	ferenda		
DATE:	January 17, 2012 REVISED:			
ANAL	YST ST	AFF DIRECTOR	REFERENCE	ACTION
. Hinton	Yea	tman	CA	Fav/CS
2. Martin	Mey	/er, R.	BTA	Pre-meeting
3.			BC	
4.				
5.				
5.				

Please see Section VIII. for Additional Information: A. COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE..... X Statement of Substantial Changes

B. AMENDMENTS.....

Technical amendments were recommended Amendments were recommended Significant amendments were recommended

I. Summary:

This committee substitute (CS) authorizes a local government to retain certain initiative or referendum process in regard to any development order or in regard to any local comprehensive plan amendment or map amendment which was in effect as of June 1, 2011.

This CS substantially amends s. 163.3167 of the Florida Statutes.

II. Present Situation:

Growth Management

The Local Government Comprehensive Planning and Land Development Regulation Act (the Act),¹ also known as Florida's Growth Management Act, was adopted by the 1985 Legislature. The Act requires all of Florida's counties and municipalities to adopt local government comprehensive plans that guide future growth and development. Comprehensive plans contain

¹ See Chapter 163, Part II, F.S.

chapters or "elements" that address future land use, housing, transportation, water supply, drainage, potable water, natural groundwater recharge, coastal management, conservation, recreation and open space, intergovernmental coordination, capital improvements, and public schools. The state land planning agency that administers these provisions is the Department of Economic Opportunity.

Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan

A local government may choose to amend its comprehensive plan for a host of reasons. It may wish to expand, contract, accommodate proposed job creation projects or housing developments, or change the direction and character of growth. Some comprehensive plan amendments are initiated by landowners or developers, but all must be approved by the local government. The first step in the process is for the local government to develop a comprehensive plan amendment proposal. Public participation is a critical part of the comprehensive planning process.² Citizens often want to be a part of planning their communities and landowners need to be aware of changes that could affect their property. A local government considering a plan amendment must hold at least two advertised public hearings on the proposed comprehensive plan or plan amendment. Notice must be published in a newspaper of general paid circulation in the jurisdiction of interest. The procedure for transmittal of a proposed or adopted comprehensive plan amendment requires the affirmative vote of a majority of the members of the governing body present at the hearing.

Referenda Approval of Amendments to Comprehensive Plans or Development Orders

During the 2011 Florida legislative session, the Community Planning Act (HB 7207) was passed.³ Within this new Florida growth management law was a provision altering the requirements for local governments to use the referendum process. Now, the statute states all initiatives or referendums on a development order or comprehensive plan amendment are prohibited. Previously, the prohibition only applied to those affecting five or fewer parcels.

Subsection 163.3167(8), F.S., prohibits a local government from adopting "an initiative or referendum process in regard to any development order or in regard to any local comprehensive plan amendment or map amendment."

Town of Yankeetown vs. Department of Community Affairs, et al.

The Town of Yankeetown, Florida, has sued the State of Florida regarding HB 7207 (Chapter 2011-139 Laws of Florida).⁴ The suit maintains several alleged violations. The essential complaints are: (1) the law contained too many subjects and was not properly titled, (2) there are vague terms in the law, and (3) the provision against public referenda on comprehensive plan amendments violates Yankeetown's Charter. Yankeetown seeks a declaratory judgment that it still be allowed to apply its referenda provisions, requiring voters to approve all comprehensive

² Section 163.3181, F.S., setting out the minimum requirements for public participation in the comprehensive planning process.

³ ch. 2011-139, L.O.F.

⁴ Yankeetown v. DCA (37 2011 CA 002036).

land use changes affecting more than five parcels, because they existed before HB 7207 was passed.

III. Effect of Proposed Changes:

Section 1 amends s. 163.3167(8), F.S., to allow an initiative or referendum process in regard to any development order or in regard to any local comprehensive plan amendment or map amendment which was in effect as of June 1, 2011, to be retained and completed.

Section 2 provides the CS shall take effect upon becoming law.

IV. Constitutional Issues:

A. Municipality/County Mandates Restrictions:

None.

B. Public Records/Open Meetings Issues:

None.

C. Trust Funds Restrictions:

None.

V. Fiscal Impact Statement:

A. Tax/Fee Issues:

None.

B. Private Sector Impact:

None.

C. Government Sector Impact:

None.

VI. Technical Deficiencies:

None.

VII. Related Issues:

None.

VIII. Additional Information:

A. Committee Substitute – Statement of Substantial Changes: (Summarizing differences between the Committee Substitute and the prior version of the bill.)

CS by the Community Affairs Committee on December 5, 2011:

- The CS clarifies the original proposed language allowing a local government charter provision for an initiative or referendum process regarding development orders or local comprehensive plan amendments or map amendments to be retained and implemented, if the provision was in effect as of June 1, 2011.
- B. Amendments:

None.

This Senate Bill Analysis does not reflect the intent or official position of the bill's introducer or the Florida Senate.