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Background and the Panel’s Assignment

ANNA MARIA ISLAND (AMI) is a barrier island, seven miles long and located off the coast of Manatee County, Florida. Just to the north lies Tampa Bay, to the south is Longboat Key (also a barrier island); the Intracoastal Waterway and Anna Maria Sound lie to the east. AMI has three cities—Anna Maria to the north, Holmes Beach in the middle, and Bradenton Beach to the south. Each city has its own municipal government with some shared services among the three.

Over time, the desirability and exposure of AMI has increased—in 2013 AMI was chosen by Forbes magazine as “#3 Prettiest City” in the country, and in 2014 Condé Nast Traveler named it one of the “Top 30 Islands in the World”—and with that renown has come an influx of development, tourism, and demographic pressures and changes.

According to the U.S. Census Bureau’s 2015 estimates, the population of Manatee County was 345,867. Of that total population, 6,466 people live on AMI—1,444 in the city of Anna Maria, 1,183 in Bradenton Beach, and 3,839 in Holmes Beach. Major growth is projected for the region, which will undoubtedly affect AMI’s future development and overall growth patterns.

The Panel’s Assignment

As development patterns and population trends continue to evolve, AMI hopes to achieve a balance among its permanent and part-time residents, visitors, and businesses. The panel’s findings and recommendations, detailed throughout this report, aim to help AMI create the necessary plans and tools to ensure responsible change and preservation that balance the needs and wants of AMI’s permanent and transient populations and enhance the value of the character of the community.

The cities of Anna Maria Island asked ULI to look at the opportunities and challenges that face AMI and to provide specific recommendations and strategic advice on the following:

- Evaluate the redevelopment pressures facing AMI.
- Evaluate AMI’s positioning as an “Old Florida” beach community.
- Evaluate current land uses and public policy related to the “Old Florida” objective.
- How can the three cities leverage a shared vision?
- What are ways to improve connectivity between the AMI cities, the mainland, and Longboat Key?
- What design considerations can improve functionality and beauty of downtown shopping areas, beaches, bay side and its piers, and parks?
- How can the three cities gain efficiencies through combined or shared city services?
What could AMI look like ten, 20, or even 50 years from now?

Provide an action plan to help AMI better prepare for the future.

Summary of Panel Recommendations

The panel has been extremely impressed with the commitment and passion of AMI to retain its character and enhance its value by balancing the needs of all its populations. This objective cannot be achieved without the cities of AMI exercising an active voice at the planning and decision-making table.

This report begins with an overview of regional and local market conditions and the economic indicators that have helped inform the panel’s work and subsequent recommendations. Observations about AMI’s development and physical framework, unique character, and identity set the stage for the panel’s recommendations on overall planning, design, and infrastructure. Specific recommendations are then shared for action planning and implementation.

The panel strongly believes the cities of AMI are poised to chart their future and actively participate in welcoming both preservation and change to ensure AMI’s long-term success.

The panel suggests many bold ideas, including the following key observations and overarching recommendations:

- Development demand is not stopping. AMI must harness the market to meet its goals and control redevelopment.
- AMI has a finite amount of land and access to infrastructure capacity.
- Understanding community is key to AMI’s future.
  - Some of AMI’s most distinct features are its eclectic and small scale and its natural ecology.
  - AMI must continue its commitment to achieve balance between visitors and residents.
  - Good design means a population more vested in the process (place making).
- Use place making and zoning as tools to help manage development and shape future growth.
  - Good design can create emotional attachment even among short-term guests and visitors while preserving and enhancing the characteristics most valued by permanent residents.
  - Good design creates community identity that can be embraced by both resident and visitor populations.
- Define and designate areas of preservation and areas of change to plan where development can occur. This is AMI’s opportunity to reinforce its “Old Florida” character and manage growth in a desirable way.
- Stay funky and eclectic; this is part of AMI’s charm.
- AMI represents a model opportunity for sustainability, conservation, and resource management, which are key to long-term sustainability.
- Understanding the dual permanent and transient nature of AMI’s populations is key to optimizing access and circulation infrastructure—it is not necessarily about simply building more infrastructure to increase or control access and circulation.
There are enough cars.

- Make sure AMI has multiple safe and easy transportation options (automobile, trolley, pedestrian, bicycling, walking).
- Manage AMI’s circulation and systems.

Developing the island plan is key to achieving the results that AMI desires.

- Work together on implementing strategies, whether shared or merely separate and complementary.

- Discuss the cities’ shared needs and objectives, collaborate, evaluate the choices, make decisions, identify and flex the leverage the cities have, and implement action plans.
Study Area and Its Context

THE PANEL WAS ASKED TO EVALUATE the study area, which comprises the three cities of AMI: Anna Maria, Bradenton Beach, and Holmes Beach. Though adjacent to one another, each city has its own municipal government and unique character. The cities of AMI all have their own distinct commercial shopping nodes serving tourists and residents. Located along the Gulf of Mexico with a number of beaches and parks, AMI’s physical environment combined with its “Old Florida” architecture contributes to its unique identity. AMI has been, is today, and will likely continue to be a barrier island residential community and resort. Connected to the mainland by east–west bridges at Manatee Avenue and Cortez Road (both have one lane in each direction), AMI has key challenges and opportunities of infrastructure and planning for future growth.

One of AMI’s most impressive features is its natural landscape. AMI is home to a number of beaches and public parks, preserves, and sanctuaries. Coquina Beach encompasses 96 acres at the southern end of AMI; Manatee Public Beach, a seven-acre park with a sandy beach, and Bayfront Park at the northern tip of AMI are among many others. Commercial land use is typified by tourist-oriented and neighborhood-serving retail uses (e.g., grocery stores, drugstores) as well restaurants and real estate firms. Major employers include the Chiles Restaurant Group, Beach to Bay Construction, Publix Super Markets, Island Real Estate, Galati Yacht Sales and Marine Service, Air & Energy, Anna Maria Elementary School, LaPensee Plumbing and Pools, and Holmes Beach government.
Market Summary

AMI’S ECONOMIC FUTURE will offer numerous opportunities to both preserve its “Old Florida” character and accommodate increasing tourism demand. This section details demographic trends to highlight market opportunities that, if leveraged, will help AMI guide its growth and development.

Demographic Trends

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the cities of Anna Maria, Bradenton Beach, and Holmes Beach today have a permanent population of 6,466 people residing in 3,438 households. Since 1990, this permanent population base has declined by 1,761 people and 551 households at a rate of 70 people per year.

The distribution of the current population includes 1,444 people in the city of Anna Maria (22 percent), 1,183 in Bradenton Beach (18 percent), and 3,839 in Holmes Beach (60 percent). Of the total loss in the permanent population since 1990 on AMI, the city of Anna Maria has declined by about 239, Bradenton Beach by 510, and Holmes Beach by 1,012. Even though the permanent population has been declining over the past 25 years, the number of housing units has been increasing, which means the seasonal and short-term rental population is replacing the permanent residents.

Review of census data indicates that in 2000, AMI had 7,502 housing units, and by 2015, this number had increased to 7,919 total housing units. Of this total, 45 percent is occupied by permanent residents, 34 percent is seasonally occupied, and 21 percent is vacant or unclassified. In 2000, of the 7,502 units occupied on the island, 56 percent was occupied by permanent residents, 35 percent was seasonally occupied, and 9 percent was vacant or unclassified. Of the units occupied by permanent residents, today 29 percent caters to long-term renters.

Regarding age-level profile, AMI’s permanent population breaks down as follows:

- Under the age of 20: 9.8 percent;
- Age 20 to 54: 32.1 percent; and
- Over the age of 55: 58.1 percent.

In Manatee County as a whole today, just 38.1 percent of the permanent population is over 55 years of age. AMI’s population of seniors as a percentage of the total is 52 percent higher than that of the overall county.

The median household income is $61,744 in the city of Anna Maria, $41,627 in Bradenton Beach, and $52,928 in Holmes Beach. Overall on AMI, median household income is about the same as the overall median household income in Manatee County, $50,158.

In addition to this profile of the permanent population of AMI, understanding other aspects of island life is important. On an average day, AMI has 4,350 seasonal or other housing units, about 3,040 of which are occupied by more...
As demand for seasonal housing in resort communities and on AMI continues to grow, the island has the opportunity to plan for this growth.

than 10,000 people. Beyond permanent and part-time residents, AMI has about 600 hotel units that are occupied on an average day by 950 people. In total, AMI houses about 34,000 people, but the permanent population accounts for just 19 percent of the people on AMI on an average day.

**Construction**

On average since 1980, AMI has seen the construction of 112 single-family units and 40 multifamily units for a total of 152 units annually, a growth rate of 2 percent. During this 35-year period, the city of Anna Maria has averaged annually the construction of 95 units; Bradenton Beach, 19 units; and Holmes Beach, 38 units. In the last ten years, construction levels have fallen off dramatically on AMI with 53 single-family units built per year, a growth rate of just 0.7 percent. Of this total, 18 have been in the city of Anna Maria, seven in Bradenton Beach, and 28 in Holmes Beach. Because of the lack of vacant land, almost all of this new construction required the demolition of existing residential units.

### Anna Maria Island Commercial Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Square feet</th>
<th>Estimated employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Anna Maria</td>
<td>122,694</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradenton Beach</td>
<td>179,163</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes Beach</td>
<td>331,353</td>
<td>1,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total commercial</strong></td>
<td><strong>743,210</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,480</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic and other employees</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total employees</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,590</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Manatee County Property Appraiser.*

The panel believes that AMI could support as many as 2,000 units of employee housing that could also help mitigate traffic patterns and strengthen community capital.

Of the homes in the city of Anna Maria, 77 percent were built prior to 1980, compared with 66 percent in Bradenton Beach, 64 percent in Holmes Beach, and just 38 percent in Manatee County overall.

Beyond permanent and part-time residents, AMI has a substantial amount of commercial development. The Manatee County Property Appraiser estimates that commercial construction on the island accounts for 750,000 square feet (including retail, offices, restaurants, bars, motels, and hotels), with 2,480 employees (see figure above).

Typically, communities have 55 square feet of commercial space for each permanent resident. This would suggest that with 6,466 permanent residents, AMI could support about 355,630 square feet of commercial space. With an existing 743,210 square feet, as much as 80 percent of the business is supported by seasonal occupants or day-trippers.

Most of the workers have jobs that generate an annual income of less than $50,000, which would be sufficient to support only a home that costs less than $150,000. The average home on AMI sells for more than $600,000, requiring an annual income that exceeds $200,000. As a result of affordability constraints, most employees are
forced to find off-island housing. The estimated 38 percent of the permanent population comprising working residents largely commutes off-island to their jobs. This is an issue not only of affordability, but also of infrastructure, circulation, and traffic caused by the need to move workers on and off AMI on a daily basis. As a result of these dynamics, the island could support as many as 2,000 units of employee housing. With a strong employee housing pool, some of the community’s concerns over traffic (for which specific recommendations are detailed later in this report) and losing local community institutions, such as the elementary school, churches, and various retail stores, could be alleviated.

Although the existing socioeconomics of AMI, as described earlier, are important, even more important is to extrapolate from this information what AMI’s future will be. Current residents have expressed substantial concern with the changing profile of AMI, and statistics confirm that changes have indeed taken place. These changes (such as population growth and number of housing units) will likely accelerate in the future, and AMI will need to create plans and tools to deal with these changes to ensure that the pristine character of its community is preserved.

Seasonal Housing and Resort Communities

The demand for seasonal housing in resort communities is growing. Not only is the demand for seasonal housing growing nationally by a rate of 2.2 percent, or about 120,000 units per year, but to address affordability, seasonal units are being fractionalized into short-term rental increments of as little as one week. This situation creates the demand pressure that AMI’s residents are currently experiencing. This pressure is going to become even more severe because of the lack of nearby alternative locations with the appeal of Anna Maria Island, which was ranked as TripAdvisor’s Travelers’ Choice Destination winner in 2013 and 2014 and one of the Top 30 Islands in the World by Condé Nast Traveler. With increasing demand from national and international tourists (today the point of origin of short-term rentals includes 10 percent from Germany, 10 percent from the United Kingdom, and 6 percent from Canada), AMI needs to plan for growth that will occur at a faster pace than historically. With no vacant land to accommodate this growth, new construction can occur only when existing units are redeveloped.

Growth projections on AMI are amplified when the socioeconomic dynamics of the Tampa metropolitan area and Manatee County are explored. During the next decade, the six-county Tampa metroplex is projected to grow annually by almost 32,000 jobs; this growth will cause the current population of 3.6 million people to grow by 48,000 people in 19,000 households annually. Manatee County today has almost 346,000 people. Its job base of 167,000 employees is expected to grow by nearly 6,700 people per year in 2,750 households, a growth rate that is twice the national average.

“Manatee County will be one of the most active real estate markets in the United States, and a major playground for these residents and visitors is Anna Maria Island.”

—ULI panelist

With such growth dynamics in the region, AMI is estimated to average annually a demand for the construction of 80 to 90 single-family units and 20 to 30 multifamily units. Given the lack of vacant land, these units will replace existing housing. In addition, about 20,000 square feet of commercial construction will be needed annually along with 40 to 60 hotel rooms.

Overall, the panel has found that AMI’s economic future will be dynamic and offer many opportunities to both preserve the island’s character and accommodate the tourism demand (and resulting economic benefits) for AMI’s barrier island resort environment. As such, redevelopment demand will not wane. AMI needs visitors as much as visitors need AMI. The panel encourages AMI to harness the market opportunities to meet its objectives and goals for future growth, development, and preservation.
Community Character and Vision

**STRONG DEVELOPMENT PRESSURES** have resulted in changes to the AMI fabric that many residents consider out of character with the identity of the island. Regional economic growth and demographic changes mean that more demand on AMI to accommodate a shared permanent and transient population, and the varying physical developments and infrastructure associated with each, will continue. It will continue without direction if the community does not come together to address the challenges of increased development pressure and the traffic congestion that comes with it. These challenges present tremendous opportunity to establish a forward-thinking vision for the island’s future while remaining true to its historic roots.

AMI has long been resilient in the face of environmental, social, and market challenges. Only an integrated approach that results in a comprehensive and holistic response will provide benefits to both residents and visitors while not overtaxing the island’s natural systems.

**Identity**

What does “Old Florida” mean for AMI? The panel observed that it includes a laid-back quality of life, a focus on family-friendly amenities and accommodations, and the eclectic small-scale character of its built environment—all set in a well-preserved and beautiful natural environment. The unique culture that has been so well marketed is a concept in the memory of each AMI inhabitant or visitor, the essence of the place. A timeline of development on the island reveals that AMI has slowly evolved to integrate new residents by maintaining its careful balance of development and stewardship for the natural environment and accommodation of transient population demand.

This slow but constant change is similar to the dynamic quality of the ecology of the island itself. The community can learn from the resilience of the natural environment as it addresses changing demographics. AMI must move past nostalgia and look forward to build upon its many assets; it has used its “brain bank” (its residents) to manage current challenges, flag future concerns, and create positive outcomes for the community. Ultimately, AMI residents must decide what the island’s identity should be. With appropriate vision and planning, the AMI community can maintain its own unique version of “Old Florida” while allowing for evolution in response to future changes.

Today, part of Anna Maria Island’s changing community character is defined by its permanent, seasonal, and transient populations. AMI’s status as a barrier island largely defines its physical makeup and contributes to its unique “Old Florida” culture.
Community

The resort community of AMI includes and welcomes a diverse group of full-time residents, part-time residents, long-term visitors, and short-term visitors. As in any dynamic system, these demographics evolve and fluctuate over time. Do they require an intentional rebalancing? If so, what is the proper balance of residents and visitors today? To answer that question, many factors must be considered: the actual change being experienced compared to the perceived change over time; the environmental, economic, and social impacts of that change; and the residents’ vision of the future AMI community. The panel understands that the AMI community wants to encourage more permanent residents while remaining welcoming to visitors, who are vital to the local economy. To achieve this goal, the panel believes AMI must define and maintain its collective identity by providing for the following: effective leadership and management, empowered stakeholders, diverse livelihoods and employment, social stability and security, reliable communications and mobility, and continuity of critical services. Together, these will address the social and economic equity concerns that are vital to maintaining community character and authenticity.

Increasing property values, increased rental prices, and a greater number of units focused on shorter lengths of stay create a perception among AMI residents that they will be forced out over time by the transient population and its demands. To address this issue within the context of the region’s political and economic context, AMI must offer a greater variety of housing types, including workforce housing, which will help address infrastructure constraints, viability of AMI businesses, and overall housing affordability. Encouraging new typologies that integrate into the fabric of the island will require innovation in planning and building department regulations, but these types of smaller one- and two-bedroom units not only serve workers but also could serve annual renters. AMI’s leadership and stakeholders need to act with an entrepreneurial approach, taking the land cost out of the price equation in shaping development. For example, AMI could use surplus public land for building employee housing, and enlightened resort management could be encouraged to provide employee housing on site. Such policies would also help increase the active community on AMI.

Finally, integrating public facilities into a community development strategy could further benefit residents while serving visitors. New beachfront facilities as well as a re-invigorated community center could provide amenities and services for permanent and transient populations alike as part of a network of public spaces across AMI. The recommendations detailed throughout this section all endeavor to strike a strategic balance of residents and visitors that supports a resilient community.

Ecology

AMI has the potential to build upon current conservation efforts to become a model of sustainability and resilience (the ability to prepare and plan for, absorb, recover from, Some of the physical characteristics—a beautiful island community and habitat—that help create AMI’s identity.
The panel believes that as AMI continues to guide its future, it has the opportunity to become a model of sustainability and resilience for other barrier island communities.

Added development pressure will require a balance of economic development and conservation. Shoreline conservation—for example, the conservation of the Pao'o shoreline near Kohala, Hawaii—has proved to add value in coastal areas. The beaches and bays can create more value through connections such as pedestrian and bike trails to an islandwide park system that links fragmented components. Shoreline parks should connect directly to new public open spaces created in more developed areas of the island. The result would be an alternative mobility and habitat system, and such an open-space and park network would create equity by providing for an active lifestyle and reducing dependence on cars.

The panel encourages AMI to set environmental design standards for new and redeveloped properties on the island. Such standards should define and provide the approach to landscape design as informed by existing native landscapes. Specifically, existing vegetation and trees should be saved where possible. New landscapes should thoughtfully use locally adapted native plants. It is critical that these requirements apply to both public and private developments, including residential properties.

AMI should set rigorous ecological performance standards for new development. This encourages sustainable practices that learn from nature. For example, an islandwide rainwater-harvesting program along with permeable roadways and a watershed management system would improve conservation and reduce dependence on the mainland. These approaches would protect fragile water resources on the coast and reduce long-term management, maintenance, and reconstruction; they would be a win environmentally and economically. This commitment to stewardship will sustain the unique characteristics of coastal areas and the cherished character of AMI as a whole.

Development

An integrated development approach is necessary to address the needs of the entire AMI community. The island must carefully consider where and how new development should be encouraged and consider the adoption of improved policies for zoning regulations, ordinances, incentives, and most important—enforcement. This approach should include market-based incentives to shape appropriate development along with preservation tools to protect historic districts, individual properties, public accommodations, and sensitive environmental zones.

The panel proposes development opportunities organized into two distinct zones: zones of change and zones of preservation. Zones of change will primarily include commercial and hospitality land uses, whereas zones of preservation will largely include residential neighborhoods.

Commercial and Hospitality Development

Commercial zones should be redeveloped over time. This includes mixed-use centers that could integrate additional space programming, such as second- and third-level housing units above retail uses. These residential units
could serve the younger island population of teachers, municipal employees, and service workers, providing more affordable housing options so those who work in the community also have the option to live there.

The Holmes Beach and Bradenton Beach commercial centers offer opportunities for this strategy to develop over time. In addition, the Pine Avenue development provides a successful example of mixed use that, if incentivized, could provide these types of upper-floor employee housing.

Designated resort areas are another opportunity for redevelopment that reduces the development pressure on established residential neighborhoods. Historic hotel and condominium properties should be evaluated as potential redevelopment sites that would increase units and income for AMI property owners. Growth in this hospitality zone will require additional employees who will add to the resort community character if housing is available for them. The objective of both these strategies is to move development that is incompatible with residential neighborhoods into areas designated for commercial and resort typologies. Enhanced place making in both of these higher-density zones will enhance property values across AMI.

**Additional Considerations**

As redevelopment occurs, resilience best practices dictate that substandard development be replaced with hurricane- and storm-resistant development. However, Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) rules must not overwhelm the character of AMI; character and safety must be balanced. Planning regulations should encourage rather than discourage the renovation of historic single-family structures while ensuring that islandwide protection of property and emergency egress are addressed.

Using these strategies will create active areas designated for mixed-use commercial and resort uses. Residential neighborhoods, in turn, will focus on preservation, community, and safety. To support this vision, public and private collaboration will be necessary.
AMI IS CLEARLY LOVED by its residents. Its “Old Florida” charm is cited by most residents as one of the reasons they decided to move here. Part of that character has to do with how the community looks physically. By understanding those physical characteristics, AMI can ensure that the most critical characteristics are maintained even as redevelopment occurs over time.

Place Making

Many community stakeholders commented on their concern that recent reductions in owner-occupied homes and long-term tenancies have reduced social cohesion and led to fewer people being vested in the community and attached to the assets of the communities and the natural settings offered. The panel suggests that careful effort to create memorable public spaces and high-quality commercial cores through design and place making can create emotional attachment even among short-term guests and visitors.

Identifying exactly what the existing key characteristics are that make residents and visitors like a place is often difficult, and even more challenging is deciding how to ensure those characteristics are maintained in the future. Although change is inevitable, overly ambitious efforts to manage or control building design, public spaces, or streets can reduce the place’s diversity and quirkiness. As discussed earlier in this report, the panel strongly recommends distinguishing between areas of stability and preservation and areas of change. Most of the discussion in this section relates to carefully calibrated change in areas where change is desired; as well as the use of planning, zoning, design, and resilience to realize visions of change and stability.
The panel identified a few key place-making issues and opportunities for both those areas of change and those of preservation.

A number of opportunities exist within AMI’s three commercial nodes, such as branding, community identity, and other place-making efforts. For example, create gateways at the entry points of each of the three cities. The Holmes Beach commercial node does not provide a strong sense of place or walkability but does present a great opportunity for positive change.

In addition, streets as open spaces in their informality provide a sense of “Old Florida.” By building off these qualities—open section and uncurbed edges as well as stabilized and unstabilized shoulders that alter and vary within blocks—AMI can enhance and strengthen its network of streets and open spaces.

In areas of change, specifically in commercial nodes with high demands on street space, the public right-of-way needs to be carefully managed to optimize the use of the space and to make those sections remarkable and memorable. Specifically, in commercial core areas, streets need to be differentiated according to their function and importance. In change areas, streets need to be used as opportunities for place making through design, including lighting, landscaping, setbacks, gathering spaces, small plazas, gateways, and the like.

Even in preservation areas, streets and public rights-of-way need to be considered as parts of networks. A recreational circulation system with nodes of attractions, open spaces, and nodes of commercial activity should be created. Those active-mode (walking, hiking, biking, running) networks should span the entire island and be optimized for safety without unnecessarily burdening residential neighborhoods. Existing and new small pocket parks can be amenity spaces for neighborhoods or small nodes of rest in a larger recreational network.

Zoning and Building Codes: Issues and Opportunities

A city’s municipal codes are one tool that helps communicate the intentions of the community and a desired future to the developers who will build it. When well reasoned and clearly articulated, zoning and building codes can be the most effective means to create predictability while ensuring that change is well managed and contributes to, rather than detracts from, the community. AMI’s current zoning and building codes present some challenges that ought to be considered and addressed, both as individual municipalities as well as in a collaborative effort to serve the shared permanent/transient nature of AMI:

- Anna Maria and Bradenton Beach have no open-space category.
- Only Holmes Beach has a mixed-use category.
- No historic districts are designated either as national register districts or as local districts.
- R2, high density, and MF seasonal zoning districts are not effective in limiting intensive short-term seasonal “party houses.” These districts may need additional incentives to attract more desirable resort uses to areas where that use can be an asset, while other zones may need additional “teeth” in zoning to deter commercial and high-intensity residential uses such as “party houses.” Additional restrictions on intensive use can be drawn from resilience objectives, concerns about carrying capacity, or sustainability.
The AMI communities have the opportunity to translate current challenges into solutions. The panel encourages the municipalities to explore the following ideas and strategies to help guide future development, manage growth, and enhance AMI’s “Old Florida” character:

■ Create historic districts for preservation, and establish stronger design guidelines for new construction.

■ Create an open-space recreation network with clear distinctions among passive resource conservation, active recreational uses, and passive recreational uses.

■ Use tap fee and water meter permits to disincentivize increased water use.

■ Unify zoning and use categories for all three jurisdictions.

■ Consider the creation of a local rental licensing structure or use the local enforcement of rental licenses to get a robust annual building inspection going for full enforcement of all applicable housing, fire, and parking codes.

■ Explore whether the creation of bed taxes is legally possible.

■ Use resort management best practices to address the demand for and the needs of both short-term renters (less than 30 days) and long-term transient populations (more than 30 days).

■ Create enhanced stormwater management restrictions and requirements for on-site stormwater treatment to make high lot coverage less feasible.

■ Consider inclusionary zoning that requires affordable and workforce units for all developments over a certain number of dwelling units.

■ Consider creating tax benefit districts with specific target areas, such as mixed-use or resort areas, as well as special benefits for cleanup and amenities.

■ Develop and enforce open-space impact fees per dwelling unit similar to what has been created for Sanibel Island, Florida.

Mobility

Residents have spoken loudly about traffic and parking challenges on AMI. Little doubt exists that traffic currently stresses the island’s bridges and significant segments of its main road, Gulf Drive. People walking and cycling find themselves uncomfortably close to cars in many places. Trolley riders face slow rides on busy days when the service is most needed. Residents face growing parking demand in their neighborhoods from some rental units and from beach visitors. In short, a range of transportation problems is readily evident.

Island Accessibility Needs

Finding effective and appropriate solutions to transportation problems begins with gaining a clear understanding of current travel patterns. In resort communities, travel patterns differ significantly among permanent residents, vacation visitors, day-trippers, and employees. However, little information exists about their patterns. Although traffic and transit ridership counts are available, more information is needed about the following:

■ Where the trip starts and ends;

■ What purpose the trip serves; and

■ What mode of travel is used for the trip.

Notwithstanding limited travel data, the panel has developed rough estimates of travel demand by user group to see possible patterns (see figure on facing page).

On a busy day, rental visitors represent the largest population group on the island. However, they do not contribute significantly more car trips to the bridges than other users. Interestingly, most groups contribute roughly similar volumes. That characteristic implies that modest reductions in auto travel by each segment could achieve meaningful benefits for all and that big gains are unlikely to occur through action by any one group, with the exception of employees. If more employees can live on the island, their trips could be substantially reduced.
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The island functions at the limit of its access capacity of about 40,000 cars per day. Thus, it faces choices about how to handle its future:

- Should it provide alternatives to driving to the island if no new bridges are built?
- Should it add capacity with a third bridge?
- How can it enhance walking and cycling on the island?

AMI is populated by a diverse set of residents and visitors whose experiences and needs can be quite different. They include the following:

- **Daytime visitors from surrounding communities:** AMI’s beaches are an asset shared by all residents of Manatee County and even the surrounding communities. These visitors often encounter congestion along the Florida State Road 64 and Cortez Road bridges as they enter and leave the island. Depending on when they arrive, available parking near the beaches might also be limited (or difficult to find).

- **Longboat Key residents and visitors:** Because Longboat Key has no bridges directly to the mainland, many of the residents and employees on that island use AMI’s bridges and streets for access.

- **On-island trips:** Both residents of and visitors to AMI need to make trips to nearby destinations during the day. This may be a trip to the beach, a trip to the hardware store, a trip to eat dinner out, or a commute to a job on the island. The streets available to handle the interchange of these trips on the narrow island are very limited.

- **Island–mainland commuting:** Some of AMI’s residents have jobs on the mainland, and many (perhaps most) of the employees on AMI live on the mainland. All of these commuters need to make use of the two bridges, which can be very congested at peak times.

**AMI Transportation and Circulation**

Although these types of users and trip purposes are no different from those of many coastal communities, the limited number of streets to, from, and along AMI make meeting mobility needs a real challenge. Specifically, some of the challenges and opportunities include the following:

- Access is throttled by drawbridges, one-lane roads, and traffic signals and intersections at mainland and island sides of bridges, creating backups with long east–west queues along Manatee Avenue/State Road 64 and Cortez Bridge/State Road 684.

- Cortez Bridge traffic lands in downtown Bradenton Beach.

- Access to Longboat Key has to occur via AMI on State Road 789 through downtown Bradenton Beach.

- The main island road (Gulf Drive, also known as State Road 789, north–south) is heavily traveled and often congested because of limited width, trolley stops without pullouts, and crosswalks.

- The main island road does not have continuous sidewalks or bike lanes.

- Bike lanes are denoted on shoulders and are substandard in width.

- Public transit access to and from the island is limited (to Sarasota, one-hour headway).
Actual trolley headways are unpredictable because of congestion, backups, and very frequent stops.

AMI currently has no comprehensive bike map or clearly marked recreational bike routes.

Many streets lack sidewalks.

Resident mobility is impaired at peak hours of visitor influx or exit.

No connected open-space system bridges open spaces among the cities.

None of the cities has a fully walkable commercial node.

To focus on the types of solutions that the panel feels the AMI communities should consider, the panel outlined the following set of guiding mobility principles that would be consistent with AMI’s character and could lead to practical and effective solutions:

AMI is and should remain a complete community. AMI can be a place where the automobile is not required to meet daily needs.

Cars, though convenient, can negatively affect the residents of AMI. People driving on AMI should account for and compensate for any such negative impacts.

AMI is a compact place where short trips should be prioritized over long trips and high-capacity vehicles should be prioritized over low-capacity vehicles.

AMI’s beaches are an asset to be shared with all of the taxpayers of Manatee County. A fare-free and convenient way of accessing the beaches should be maintained.

Because AMI is a place where vulnerable users (pedestrians and cyclists) encounter cars, travel on AMI’s streets should be slow and safe.

An island offers the perfect opportunity for people to enjoy its amenities with minimal transportation impact. A variety of opportunities exist to improve island transportation, including the following:

Reduce car use where appropriate. AMI’s modest size, ease of walking and cycling, and proximity to the mainland could, for example, allow it to

Market itself to rental visitors as a car-free vacation. This entails creating a package of transportation services to renters, including providing airport transfers, making available bikes on the island, and pushing information on use of golf carts, shuttles, and regional transit.
Provide beach access with dedicated transit service. Consider creating park-and-ride locations on the mainland along Manatee Avenue and Cortez Road where visitors could park and get on a fare-free bus going directly to the beach. This service should be tied to implementation of paid parking on the beach. The combination of mass transit and paid beach-adjacent parking is an important tool to help manage demand and mitigate negative impacts of traffic, parking, and island circulation (discussed further in the subsequent “Approaches to Address Day-Trip Congestion” subsection).

Increase on-island shuttle capacity.

- Use low-floor buses with multiple doors for smoother loading and unloading and more passenger room. They would especially benefit people with limited physical mobility.
- Provide more frequent service to make the shuttle more attractive to potential riders.
- Revise routes to focus service on major trip patterns. For example, creating shorter loops on the island may make sense if most shuttle trips are relatively short.

Provide pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Dedicating space for people walking and cycling would increase safety and convenience, giving more people the confidence to walk and ride.

Reduce traffic backups. Fewer delays will keep shuttles on schedule, reduce fuel consumption, and lessen traveler frustration. Some delay is appropriate for a resort island, which is not supposed to be a hurried place, but miles-long backups do not contribute to a good island experience. Particular sources of traffic delay should be identified. One potential source is the pair of intersections on Manatee Avenue at Gulf Drive and at Fourth Street. Those locations should be investigated for their potential to reduce delay, possibly with the use of a roundabout design. Roundabouts, when properly designed, generally keep traffic moving even during busy periods.

- Thoroughly assess the benefits and disadvantages of a third bridge to relieve through-traffic use of AMI. Determining whether a realistic alignment exists for the bridge both environmentally and politically and evaluating how it could alter traffic patterns on AMI are important to that assessment and the ultimate decision-making process.

Approaches to Address Day-Trip Congestion

Parking spaces are not all created equal. Everyone knows that a parking space in just the right spot is worth more than other spaces. In areas of high demand such as the AMI beaches, pricing the good and bad spaces at exactly the same rate (free) creates some less-than-desirable outcomes. Because many people tend to be optimistic, in the absence of available information, many drivers will continue driving toward those premium spaces until they see for themselves that spaces are unavailable. Having every driver head to exactly the same spot creates a lot of congestion. By that point, any incentive to take some means other than driving to the beach is lost, and the next step is to circulate through the network looking for an elusive parking spot, thereby creating a lot more congestion.

Many cities facing similar dynamics have taken a three-pronged approach to incentivizing different driving behaviors. The panel encourages AMI to consider the following:

Provide good information. If drivers know that it is a crowded parking day, some will decide to come to the beach a different day, some will go to a less crowded parking area, and some will find a way to get to the beach without parking. Real-time mobile applications (such as that used in Santa Monica, California) can give people

Real-time mobile parking applications (similar to this application used by the city of Santa Monica, California) provide an easy and inexpensive solution to address parking issues and provide drivers with useful and real-time information.
Although finding that “rock star” parking space right next to where you are going is great, finding a free space that is almost as convenient can be pretty good motivation as well. Creating tiered parking pricing will allow people to head for the location that meets their pricing comfort zone (dispersing some of the car congestion). And although traffic management (rather than the revenue generated by the parking) is the reason for tiered pricing, the revenue can fund customer improvements such as real-time information applications and shuttles.

Create incentives to get out of the car sooner. Locating free parking in a place with very low impacts (maybe even an intercept lot off-island with a shuttle provided) may make sense. The idea of an intercept parking lot with a bus shuttle to the beach has been discussed before. This solution will not work for everyone—a family with a lot of children and beach gear to carry might not want to switch vehicles—but it can work for some people. However, nobody is likely to use this option if people believe they will get a free parking space right next to the beach.

One advantage of charging for the parking near the beach is that it makes a free intercept parking lot much more attractive. Providing this free parking and shuttle also gives all county residents a free and convenient option to visit the beach without causing nearly as much impact as the driving has on AMI and its congestion. The buses might also be given some distinct advantages over the car drivers. Bus-only “queue jump” lanes along the shoulders of the bridge approaches could let the buses drive right by the cars that are lined up to get into the parking lots—and might make some of those in the line consider the bus for their next trip to the beach. The island side of the bridge might have as much as three-quarters of a mile of space available for this type of lane.

Approaches to Address Intra-Island Mobility

Residents already know how to manage their lives to avoid the most congested areas and times of day. These patterns will always continue, but steps could be undertaken both to lessen the severity and frequency of these peak events and to create more options for managing around them.

Create safe bike/pedestrian networks. Outdoor active living is already a way of life for AMI residents. Although some progress has been made to create space for walking and biking, much room for improvement remains. Moving toward more properly sized sidewalks and bike facilities where they currently exist will help improve safety for those wanting to bike and walk. The panel believes that exploring secondary “low-stress” networks can create a real boom in the number of riders because, according to the panel, the biggest contingent of potential riders could be classified as “interested but concerned.” These people include families with children. They are generally uncomfortable or unwilling to ride along a busy street—even if narrow bike lanes are provided. Although AMI does not have a lot of alternatives, neighborhood greenways might be possible on parts of the island. These are low-traffic neighborhood streets that can be signed for bikes and outfitted with elements that move any through-drivers to another route.

A beachside trail around the island (similar to those stretching along the beach from the Palos Verdes Peninsula north through Santa Monica, California, or Miami Beach, Florida) should also be explored. This would attract recreational riders and be popular with island visitors and residents alike.

Creating these networks will likely have numerous benefits. Of course, anyone who shifts a trip from driving to walking or biking will help reduce car congestion up and down AMI. In addition, building this network will provide residents with a real driving alternative during those very congested periods. Perhaps most important, the panel strongly believes that people with access to active transportation infrastructure are healthier as a result of the recreational opportunities.
Improve trolley reliability. The free island trolley is extremely popular and well used. However, all AMI residents know that the trolley becomes frustrating or even useless when it is stuck in the same extreme congestion as the cars on the island. A few avenues should be explored to help improve the reliability of this service. First, the sorts of driving-reduction strategies outlined throughout this section should help alleviate the congested conditions somewhat for everyone, including trolley riders. It may also be possible to find some alternative route diversions on parts of the island with better networks (perhaps only to be used during congested times).

Provide bike facilities (racks, share stations, etc.). Although providing more bike systems and more low-stress bike facilities is a big part of attracting riders, end-of-trip facilities will help encourage and solidify riders’ decisions to use these systems. Places to park bikes, repair bikes, and even borrow bikes help add convenience and build an even bigger contingent of riders (who will also not be drivers). Create sharing options, such as the following:

- **Bike share**: Bike sharing is a transportation program for short-distance, point-to-point trips. It provides users the ability to pick up a bicycle at self-serve bike stations and return it to any other bike station located within the system’s service area.
- **Golf-cart share**: Short-term golf-cart rental represents a real opportunity to allow visitors to move about the island at safe speeds with low parking impacts.

Approaches to Address Resident and Employee Commuting

AMI is home to an estimated 4,500-plus jobs, most of which are staffed by people living on the mainland. Many of those living on the island, likewise, have jobs on the mainland. This situation creates a challenge if commuting hours correspond to the extreme beach-associated congestion periods. The following options might help improve these conditions:

- **Employee parking cash-out**: Sometimes paying an employee not to drive is cheaper than paying for a parking space. The cash-out these employees receive can be applied to a transit pass helping to get a car off the road and helping out that employee’s household finances. When real commute options are available, these programs can be very successful.
- **Workforce housing**: Very few of the island’s workers live on the island. Housing that could be rented by teachers, wait staff, or even police officers is simply not available anymore. If these housing types were provided, many trips could be eliminated and the household finances and quality of life for those employees could be improved tremendously.

Parking

As was the case in the previous subsection on mobility, the panel created a draft outline of guiding principles for parking to help guide the suggested practical and effective solutions:

- Parking cars consumes space that cannot be used for living, commerce, recreation, or aesthetics. Free parking in public spaces is not a right. The number of parking spaces is not a valid mechanism to define beach renourishment funding.
Residents of AMI should have the right to petition the city for relief from parking burdens imposed by adjacent properties or attractions.

Parking for bicycles or golf carts will be considered responsive in meeting commercial or beach parking obligations.

The cities, their businesses, and the county should actively pursue measures to cost-effectively reduce automobile trips through incentives and a planned mix of land uses.

Although the issues of parking are related to mobility, the former has separate causes and negative outcomes. Parking problems and traffic or mobility problems are often confused, so the two are treated separately in this report. Several types of parking challenges and opportunities are apparent on AMI:

- **Beach lot management**: Because it affects traffic on the bridges so dramatically, this topic was discussed in the previous mobility section. Large public surface beach parking areas (south to north) exist: Coquina and Cortez beaches, AMI Public Beach at Manatee Avenue, and smaller parking areas at Anna Maria Pier and Bayfront Park.

- **Beach spillover**: On busy days, after the designated beach parking lots are full, drivers can create a scramble to find on-street parking in AMI’s residential neighborhoods. Largely unregulated on-street parking is used, especially near beach access points. This neighborhood parking is generally legal, but it can be a nuisance to residents along the affected streets.

- **Resort underparking**: Neighbors of some of the short-term rental homes operating in single-family neighborhoods have reported a proliferation of parked cars along the streets or in nearby parking lots (such as churches).

- **Commercial parking**: Parking issues sometimes emerge in AMI’s commercial districts where employees, shoppers, diners, and others all congregate.

- **Parking regulation**: Parking is provided on and off street without charge and is unregulated regarding duration. Too much off-street parking exists, and too much sealed surface is devoted to cars.

The next sections discuss possible parking solutions.

**Beach Parking**

As detailed in the previous section on mobility, this strategy involves managing parking by pricing the premium locations, providing real-time information about availability, and providing shuttles from remote free lots.

**Neighborhood Beach Overflow**

The cities have explored neighborhood permit-parking programs. This is likely a good idea, but until now it seems to have been suggested as a one-size-fits-all solution. The problems on neighborhood streets, of course, are more diverse. Some streets next to beach parking have severe issues whereas others on the bay side are completely unaffected and do not wish or need to be constrained by new regulations to manage demand and mitigate nuisance. The panel recommends that a voluntary neighborhood parking-permit program be developed. Such a program would require that a street or set of streets apply for permit parking and that a percentage (often 60 percent) of street residents or owners sign a petition. Once that occurs, per-
mits (stickers or hang tags) are issued to allow parking on
the street, and signage is installed indicating non-permit-
holder parking is not permitted.

**Neighborhood Hospitality Parking**

The issue of parking overflow from rental properties could
be addressed in one of two ways. The cities could require
all properties to supply parking on site in proportion to the
number of bedrooms. The panel suggests that this ap-
proach is likely to backfire, resulting in unattractive house
configurations that detract from neighborhood character.
Extending the permit-parking approach discussed in the
previous subsection to these streets would likely be more
practical.

**Commercial District Parking**

Although parking in AMI’s commercial districts was not

cited by many as the most pressing parking issue on the

island, continued growth of the permanent and transient
populations’ demand to be on AMI is likely to put pres-
sure on this category. Setting policy now could help both
cut down the parking footprint (along with car trips) and
provide some mechanisms to protect adjacent neigh-
borhoods from any overflow issues. Several techniques are
recommended:

- **Mixed-use shared parking**: If these districts are re-
developed as mixed use, car trips can be converted to

walk trips and parking spaces with different peaks can
be shared. For example, residents and office workers
are often not in the same area at the same time, so two
spaces are not needed.

- **Unbundling**: Any workforce housing in these districts
should allow the option of not buying a parking space.
A walkable island such as AMI can allow for low- or no-
car households.

- **Bike and pedestrian facilities**: Giving people options other
than driving and parking will allow some to exercise
those options.

- **Discount transit passes**: As discussed previously, paying
someone not to drive is often cheaper than building a
parking space.

The panel recommends that AMI
consider a mixed-use shared-
parking strategy in certain parts
of the study area.

An example of sustainability
efforts already underway in
AMI, this informational signage
at the Annie Silver Community
Center shares information
about sustainable gardening

techniques.
Bike and golf-cart parking: These spaces take up less space and provide for more people.

Sustainability and Resilience

As a west coast barrier island, AMI is especially vulnerable to storms arriving from the Gulf of Mexico and the general rise of sea levels. A guiding principle of resilience is self-reliance and less dependence on intricate networks that either deprive other areas of valuable resources or are subject to destruction in the case of storms or hurricanes. Self-reliance on a barrier island is almost impossible, but 100 percent reliance on supply from the mainland—as is the case of drinking water, transportation, electricity, and natural gas—can and should be avoided. Drinking water, which is a statewide issue, must be addressed anywhere in Florida, but it is especially important on an island that may be cut off from the mainland after a natural disaster.

From the information the panel was provided with, the sewage system appears to function well and no overflows occur during storms. Treatment includes groundwater recharge and use of treated water for irrigation and storage, all exemplary steps toward decreased dependence on water supply from the mainland.

Stormwater is another matter. Not only does it create flooding during heavy precipitation, but the water cannot always be easily directed to the sea, especially when sea levels are elevated in storm conditions. A high rate of on-site stormwater absorption or storage is necessary; best practices for stormwater retention and management must become a requirement for any development and improvement on private and commercial areas in AMI. Reducing the amount of impervious surfaces on AMI should also become a goal, including pursuit of retrofits for existing conditions. One way to approach grandfathered conditions is through fees on impervious surfaces imposed on property owners, which are then used for stormwater management costs. The fees could be offset by individual payers through on-site best practices, such as increased pervious surfaces, bioretention, holding tanks, green roofs, and the like. Stormwater storage combined with treatment should also be used for irrigation, graywater systems, and drinking water supply—at least for emergency conditions. What materials constitute pervious surfaces needs to be carefully investigated. For example, sand lots, if constructed of compacted sand with binders, can become as impervious as asphalt and should not automatically be considered pervious.

Another item to consider is the beaches and dunes, which not only are the main attractions for visitors and residents, but also protect the island from waves and high water. As erosion occurs, beaches and dunes are regularly replenished through dredging and sand pumping. The panel cannot judge if the most scientifically advanced methods are used here and whether natural water flows and sand movements are sufficiently used to make the cycle as close to natural cycles as possible. Though the jurisdictions of AMI do not have control over natural cycles, they can be advocates for a more sound process to determine beach replenishment funding. As the panel understands, funding is currently calculated using a formula that hinges on the number of parking spaces. This formula has the unintended consequence of creating additional car congestion near beach access points and nearby residential neighborhoods. The panel strongly encourages AMI to take both short- and long-term actions to achieve a more resilient AMI:

- **Short term:** Evaluate and analyze the fee formulas to (in the short term) identify alternate ways to achieve the public access requirement including bicycle access, trolley access, small electric vehicle access (golf carts), and walking access from hospitality facilities near the beach access points.

- **Long term:** Lobby for amendment of and improvement to the current beach renourishment formula to find an alternative metric (to the number of parking spaces).
on which to base the calculation. Possible alternatives include the following:

- Increase requirements for on-site stormwater management through percolation, storage, and absorption.
- Consider stormwater runoff fees to incentivize retrofits on existing development.
- Use nonlinear fees (or fees that vary with changes in activity levels) to manage increasing sewage loads from properties with intensive use.
- Use the fee structure for water taps as a way to manage water consumption and high-intensity uses.
- Consider on-site drinking water facilities as backup or a step toward more self-reliance.
- Create strategically located local power generation abilities through fuel cells, diesel and natural gas generators, and solar panels, or with mini networks.
- Break the direct link between beach replenishment and parking.

Climate Adaptation and Coastal Resilience

As a coastal community, Anna Maria Island (AMI) is faced with the challenge of rising sea levels brought about by climate change. Rising sea levels exacerbate the frequency, intensity, and scope of devastation caused by natural hazards—particularly flooding, wave forces, and storm surges. Thorough implementation of proper adaptation and resilience strategies will help not only preserve, but also protect the community’s economy, habitat, people, and infrastructure.

Population growth and continued development expose AMI to more risk and will cause the cost of natural hazards to worsen. An appropriate climate adaptation and coastal resilience plan to protect the island minimizes flooding costs, lowers insurance premiums, and drives down the cost of doing business—all while enhancing economic development and improving quality of life. Preservation and protection of the waterfront mean that future generations can enjoy the community that locals take pride in and visitors have come to love.

To minimize the impact of sea-level rise, AMI must look to strategies focused on flooding, wave forces, and storm surges. The following are some strategies to consider:

- Research and understand new insurance requirements.
- Reestablish, maintain, and promote native vegetation along the coastline.
- Implement planning management tools such as setbacks, buffers, and zoning, plus development regulations and incentives.
- Improve access to education and information, particularly through coastal monitoring systems, advisory notices, and evacuation plans.
- Coordinate local plans with islandwide and regional strategies.
- Link outcomes of site analysis, vulnerability assessment, and resilience enhancements to the waterfront planning process.

For more information, see After Sandy, ULI’s report on lessons learned from Hurricane Sandy, at www.uli.org/wp-content/uploads/ULI-Documents/AfterSandy.pdf.
Action Plan and Implementation Strategies

IN THE PREVIOUS SECTIONS, the panel presented a number of proactive strategies and tactics to ensure that the high quality of life that characterizes AMI now will continue into the future while concurrently balancing the unique combined permanent and transient population demands on AMI. This section formulates corresponding actions to help realize a vision of managed and sustainable growth consistent with “Old Florida” values that were shared with the panel.

Action Planning

The community visions of the cities of Anna Maria, Holmes Beach, and Bradenton Beach are similar, with an emphasis on preserving and enhancing the quality of life of AMI’s inhabitants and visitors in a financially and environmentally responsible manner. In many areas, the realization of these visions would benefit from greater collaboration among the AMI communities.

However, in the absence of a plan of action, the likelihood of successfully protecting and preserving what is deemed most important to AMI is dramatically reduced. Winston Churchill once said, “Failing to plan is planning to fail.” Based on the panel’s observations throughout the week, clearly no one plans to see AMI fail. Planning alone is not enough, however. Long-term success requires implementation.

Before detailing specific recommended actions, understanding action plans is important. Simply stated, an action plan is a sequence or series of steps that must be taken to achieve the specific goals. It encourages action. What is the role of the AMI action plan? It helps identify and prioritize the action items that three communities and their citizens should consider when responding to the issues of concern and addressing the future needs of AMI. It provides organization and framework for future decision making.

Who needs to participate in the process of implementing AMI’s action plan? If AMI wants to ensure that the action plan has value and is not simply left on the shelf, the panel recommends that those groups, organizations, interests, and individuals who are most likely to be directly affected by the outcomes of the action plan—and those even indirectly affected by the outcomes of the plan—are included in the planning process.

The panel strongly recommends that AMI actively seek out and engage all island stakeholders, whether they are permanent, annual, or seasonal residents; community...
vendors; business organizations; city, county, and state officials; and regional partners. The panel strongly believes the greater the participation, the greater the likelihood of the success of implementing AMI's plan.

Shared AMI Vision

One of the panel's overarching recommendations is the development of the island plan so that all three communities develop mutually strategic approaches to maintain “Old Florida.” The following is a nonexhaustive list of tasks, many previously described throughout this report, that will be critical to the development of the island plan:

- Ensure consistency between island carrying capacity and adopted land use plans.
- Develop a unified position on bridges and mass transit options.
- Acknowledge that these are complicated issues, but that it is important for people to be able to come together with one voice.
- Create an island recreational circulation system as well as transportation plan.
- Unify zoning and use categories incorporating best-use practices.
- Introduce the select performance-based residential design standards to accommodate some of the prescriptive ones that exist.
- Accommodate aging in place (the ability to live in one's own home and community safely, independently, and comfortably, regardless of age, income, or ability level), thereby allowing elderly residents to remain in their homes as they age and making appropriate home improvements to accommodate their changing needs. Although some of the FEMA requirements are tougher for other housing typologies, such as the employee housing on top of residential, the preservation of some of the ground-level homes would help accommodate age-in-place features.

Additional components to explore as part of the island plan include the following:

- Zoning-incentivized employee housing: Each community needs to determine for itself what the appropriate pathway is, but the shared principle is that all three communities have businesses that generate the need for on-island employee housing and it is a shared responsibility and need for all three communities to accommodate.
- Historical designations to preserve community character: The panel is aware that some initial steps in this direction have been taken through the listing of significant properties, and therefore the panel’s recommendation is to continue with these efforts as they relate to the preservation of “Old Florida.”
- A commercial area redevelopment plan for Holmes Beach and Bradenton Beach: Referring to areas for change and areas of preservation, the panel additionally recommends comparing, adopting, and revising capital infrastructure plans for each of these commercial areas to ensure that efforts are coordinated and complementary.

Sustainability and Resilience Frameworks

Admittedly, sustainability and resilience will happen at different scales. Implementation recommendations are at
building scale, neighborhood and community scale, and island scale. Build onto what the panel has already seen in comprehensive plans and design standards to use the most stringent targeted rebuilding requirements—those making the most sense for AMI in the areas of water conservation, stormwater management, new construction, and improvements to existing structures.

At the neighborhood and community scale, plan for water harvesting (that is, accumulating and repositioning rainwater for reuse), on-site stormwater treatment, and potential off-grid power sources as previously discussed. At the island scale, realize opportunities to increase conservation areas, with low and active recreational opportunities that serve dual purposes—ecological and contributing to the enjoyment and health of island occupants.

**Advocacy**

With the hard work and the collaborative effort of these planning exercises, AMI will be better positioned to address its county and state colleagues with a unified voice. The challenges, opportunities, benefits, and consequences of community action and inaction are shared among the three municipalities and, relative to county and state colleagues, need to be addressed together (i.e., not as three separate cities with relatively individual voices). AMI should seek a unified approach to an eventual reformulation of the beach renourishment formula currently used by the county/state that would deemphasize the number of parked cars as a measure of beach use as AMI transitions toward increased use of alternative forms of transportation. AMI may want to consider the advantages of establishing business improvement districts in the main commercial corridors discussed as areas for more intensive redevelopment.

**Short-Term Actions**

**Marketing and branding.** Although the action planning and implementation tasks may seem overwhelming in scope and time frame, many actions can be taken now. Some of these relate to branding, marketing, and economic development. The panel recommends developing a brand for AMI that emphasizes its strengths, its abundant national resources, its ecological active-living cultures and family orientation, and the lifestyle opportunity. Proactively market this brand to targeted populations. Treat the commercial zones as the gateways as both islandwide and local branding opportunities while creating or building on AMI’s own business resources, such as the chamber of commerce. The panel also encourages AMI to consider hiring a shared executive director who is experienced in community branding and marketing, use of social media, communications, and business or economic development.

**Main Street designation.** Consider a Main Street designation. The Main Street Program, run by the National Main Street Center, a subsidiary of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, provides a great structure for community, business, and leadership engagement and is run by the state and provides resources such as matching grants for the implementation of new streetscapes, technical assistance, consultation on architectural standards, and the like.
Realize efficiencies in AMI’s governing structures.
Near-term opportunities can also be realized by AMI’s governments. The communities should explore pooling resources to hire a common dedicated planner, recognizing that land use development and management strategies in one jurisdiction affect the others. Other functions where opportunities exist to realize scale economies across the communities exist in policing, public works, and code enforcement. In these scenarios, each community would be able to retain culturally distinct attributes and approaches while realizing efficiencies (and avoiding unintended outcomes).

Use key parking and mitigation impact fees for strategic capital and operational improvements. Reevaluate and implement consistent rental management policies. And consider increasing terms for mayors and commissioners to four years, or explore the benefits of adopting the council-manager form of government. Despite the tremendous talent and experience AMI has, the panel has heard frustrations from community stakeholders that when things get going and people get used to what they are doing, then the next year those things change.

Identifying these past experiences as an opportunity to act differently might turn out to be a way to refocus efforts and to favor some of the implementation approaches that panel has recommended.

In conclusion, to help jump-start and continue these collaborative actions, the panel recommends the following activities:

■ Get together.
■ Develop a shared vision for AMI (plan for your future).
■ Use leverage where you have it.
■ Get moving!

Using Your Leverage: Systems Control
AMI has a number of systems for which no support control exists but where leverage to create solutions exists. AMI has the opportunity to optimize underused parking spaces for highest and best use and to address traffic control challenges during peak use. Short-term solutions such as directing traffic flows at congested intersections during those times at which traffic is most problematic could start to control frustrating traffic challenges.

Collaborate with Manatee County Tourism Development Council colleagues and advocate for additional trash and changing facilities at the beaches in those locations where they are most needed. To help create a cohesive system of mobility networks, add more bike facilities. AMI can begin this work now and start by making improvements to existing bicycle and pedestrian routes. In addition, add wayfinding maps for bicyclists and pedestrians across AMI.

Another short-term action is to add parking signage on streets to explicitly communicate parking rules. The panel heard from many stakeholders that understanding where on-street parking is allowed for nonresidents (employees, visitors, etc.) is very difficult to ascertain. Also improve trolley reliability, which may occur as a direct outcome of the other actions previously described.
THE PANEL HAS BEEN IMPRESSED by the commitment of AMI to make the island a better place and encourages AMI to continue taking advantage of this momentum as it continues to plan and shape the island’s future. Though numerous recommendations are described throughout this report, the panel believes the following are priority recommendations for AMI to begin work on immediately to guarantee the island’s ongoing and future success:

■ AMI must harness the market to meet its goals and manage redevelopment and future growth.

■ The guide to AMI’s future is to understand itself. AMI’s community—a balance of permanent and transient that will always be the island’s nature—is the road map to its future.

■ Embrace AMI’s most distinct features: it is eclectic and small scale and boasts a diverse natural landscape.

■ Continue commitment to achieve balance between visitors and residents.

■ Place making and zoning are tools that can help manage development and guide future growth.

■ Good design creates an emotional attachment to a place.

■ Good design can also help resident and visitor populations embrace their shared identity and community.

■ Designate areas of preservation and areas of change. AMI is composed of many areas to be preserved and some areas to plan for strategic and thoughtful development over time.

■ Stay funky and eclectic; this is part of AMI’s charm.

■ AMI has enough cars.

■ Make sure AMI has multiple safe and easy transportation options (automobile, trolley, pedestrian, bicycling, walking).

■ Manage the island’s circulation and systems.

■ Developing the island plan is key to achieving results.

■ Get together. Discuss the cities’ shared needs and objectives—and collaborate.

■ Develop a shared vision. Evaluate the communities’ choices, make decisions, flex AMI’s leverage, and implement action plans.

Conclusion
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