March 26, 2010

Ray Eubanks, Plan Processing Administrator
Florida Department of Community Affairs
Division of Community Planning – Plan Processing Team
2555 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2100

RE: Tampa Comprehensive Plan Transmittal of Plan Amendments under the
Alternative State Review Process (Pilot Program)
Local File Tampa #s CPA 09-06, CPA 09-07, CPA 09-08, CPA 09-09,
CPA 09-10, and CPA 09-11

Dear Mr. Eubanks:

The Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission (Planning Commission) is the officially designated Local Planning Agency for Hillsborough County and its jurisdictions. This letter serves to formally transmit, on behalf of the Tampa City Council, six proposed amendments to the Tampa Comprehensive Plan for comments under the “Alternative State Review Process/Pilot Program” pursuant to Chapter 163.32465, Florida Statutes.

Three copies of the proposed amendments and supporting documents are being transmitted to the Department of Community Affairs in this packet. Simultaneously, a copy of this letter and the proposed amendments and supporting documents are being transmitted directly to the Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Florida Department of Transportation District Seven, Department of State, Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council, Southwest Florida Water Management District, Planning and Growth Management Department of Hillsborough County, and the designee for the MacDill Air Force Base, for comments under the “Alternative State Review Process/Pilot Program”.

The Department of Community Affairs and other review agencies and local government are requested to submit their comments on the proposed amendments to the City of Tampa such that the comments are received by the City of Tampa no later than thirty days from the date on which the agency or government receives this amendment packet. The following information is provided:

1. The Planning Commission held public hearings on January 11, January 25, and February 8, 2010 regarding the proposed plan amendments. The Tampa City Council held the first public hearing (transmittal stage) regarding the proposed amendments on February 25, and March 11, 2010. At the conclusion of the public hearings, the Tampa City Council voted to transmit the amendments for state and regional review and comments.

A consolidated city-county agency serving the cities of Tampa, Temple Terrace, Plant City and the County of Hillsborough.
An Affirmative Action-Equal Opportunity Employer
2. A submittal package containing the same material as enclosed herein is being transmitted directly, on the same date as this packet, to the following agencies and departments:

Florida Dept of Environmental Protection
Attn: Jim Quinn, Environmental Manager
Office of Intergovernmental Programs
3900 Commonwealth Boulevard, Mail Station 47
Tallahassee, FL 32399-3000

Florida Dept of State
Attn: Susan Harp, Historic Preservation Planner
Bureau of Historic Preservation
500 South Bronough Street
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0250

Florida Dept of Transportation District Seven
Attn: Carol Collins, LGCP & CMS Coordinator
11201 North McKinley Drive
Mail Station 7-500
Tampa, FL 33612-6456

Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council
Attn: Jessica White, Principal Planner
4000 Gateway Centre Blvd., Suite 100
Pinellas Park, Florida 33782

Southwest Florida Water Management District
Attn: Roy Mazur, AICP, Planning Director
2379 Broad Street
Brooksville, Florida 34604-6899

Hillsborough County Planning & Growth Management
Attn: Peter Aluotto, AICP Director
601 E. Kennedy, 19th Floor
Tampa, Florida 33601-1110

MacDill Air Force Base
Attn: Ms. Christina Hummel, AICP
Base Community Planner
Chugach Mgt Svc, Inc, Contractor
6 CES/CEPP
7621 Hillsborough Loop Drive
MacDill AFB FL 33621-5323

This transmittal package includes summaries of each amendment, plan amendment reports with data, analysis and supporting background information; recommendations (resolutions) of the Planning Commission and motions of the Tampa City Council at the public hearings.

3. The Tampa City Council will hold a second public hearing for consideration of the adoption of these proposed amendments after state and regional comments are received.
The second and final public hearing is anticipated to be held in June or July 2010. These amendments shall not become effective until 31 days after adoption in accordance with provisions of Section 163.32465 (6) (g) Florida Statutes. If timely challenged, an amendment shall not become effective until the state land planning agency or the Administrative Commission enters a final order determining the adopted amendment to be in compliance.

4. For information concerning the proposed amendments or any of the material in this transmittal package, you may contact:

Stephen Griffin, Cities Group Leader  
Email: griffins@plancom.org
Phone: (813) 273-3774 ext. 353
Planning Commission
601 East Kennedy Boulevard, 18th Floor
P.O. Box 1110, Tampa, Florida 33601-1110
Fax: (813) 272-6258 or (813) 272-6255

OR

Tony Garcia, Principal Planner
Email: garciat@plancom.org
Phone: (813) 273-3774 ext. 332
Planning Commission
601 East Kennedy Boulevard, 18th Floor
P.O. Box 1110, Tampa, Florida 33601-1110
Fax: (813) 272-6258 or (813) 272-6255

5. The enclosed proposed amendments will be the first plan amendment submittal anticipated to be considered for adoption by the Tampa City Council in calendar year 2010 for which no exemption from the twice per calendar year limitation is claimed.

6. Please transmit all comments within thirty days to

Honorable Pam Iorio, Mayor
City of Tampa
306 East Jackson Street
Tampa, FL 33602

We appreciate the continued cooperation and assistance and look forward to receiving comments on the enclosed plan amendments under consideration for Calendar Year 2010 First Cycle to the Tampa Comprehensive Plan.

Sincerely,

Robert B. Hunter, FAICP, Executive Director

RBH/rmp
Enclosures

cc: Julia Cole, Assistant City Attorney, City of Tampa
    Randy Goers, Urban Planner Coordinator, City of Tampa

Enclosures for transmittal package: Tampa Comprehensive Plan Amendments under consideration for Calendar Year 2010 First Cycle (from August 2009 submittals)

- CPA 09-06 Transit Oriented Development (GOPs - Redevelopment Opportunities)
- CPA 09-07 Seminole Heights Neighborhood Vision (GOPs - Redevelopment Opportunities)
- CPA 09-08 Seminole Heights Neighborhood / Future Land Use Plan Map
- CPA 09-09 Courtney Campbell Causeway Scenic Corridor (GOPs)
- CPA 09-10 Central Park Redevelopment / Future Land Use Plan Map
- CPA 09-11 MacDill "48" Parkland / Future Land Use Plan Map
RESOLUTION

ITEM: Tampa: CPA 09-06, Transit Oriented Development Text Amendments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AYE</th>
<th>NAY</th>
<th>ABSENT</th>
<th>DATE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>February 8, 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bruce P. Cury, Chair
Terri G. Cobb, Vice-Chair
Frank M. Chilling, Member-at-Large
Jill Buford
Derek L. Doughty
Miller Q. Dowdy
Edward F. Giunta, II
Vivian M. Kitchen
Hung T. Mai
Gary D. Sears

Robert B. Hunter, FAICP, Executive Director


The following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission has developed a Comprehensive Plan for the City of Tampa entitled *Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy A Livable City*, pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 163.3161, Florida Statutes, which was adopted by Tampa City Council on February 9, 2009, as amended; and;

WHEREAS, Tampa City Council adopted the Procedures Manual for Amendments to the *Tampa Comprehensive Plan* on October 9, 1986 and subsequently amended; and

WHEREAS, the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission has initiated a petition for an amendment to Chapter 3 and the Definitions Section of the *Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy: A Livable City* by the August 2009 submittal deadline; and

WHEREAS, the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission has reviewed the request to amend the *Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy A Livable City* Future Land Use Plan; adding new language; goals, objectives and policies and associated tables and graphs (as attached) that outline and serve as the foundation for major planning strategies to implement Transit Oriented Development in the City of Tampa; and
WHEREAS, the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission has reviewed the proposal, as well as the adopted goals, objectives and policies of the Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy A Livable City as stated in the staff report as follows:

**Policy 2.1.1:** New development and redevelopment in downtown Tampa should be urban in character, compact, and dense, with efficient use of land and buildings.

**Policy 2.1.2:** Examine the development of rail connections, or other forms of mass transit, to improve connections between the downtown area, and other regional activity centers and outlying communities.

**Goal 14:** A city of compact, higher-density development within business districts, mixed use corridor villages and transit stations to conserve land resources, protect single family detached neighborhoods, natural habitat, support transit, reduce vehicle trips, improve air quality, conserve energy and water, and diversify Tampa’s housing stock.

**Policy 14.1.1:** The City shall encourage compact, higher density development that is compatible with its surrounding character.

**Policy 14.2.3** Mobility - Transit use will be promoted in the business centers through investing in improved levels of service, by encouraging new economic development to take place in a form and density that supports transit and by encouraging travel demand management measures.

**Policy 14.2.5** Mix of uses - The City shall promote through the redevelopment process, the introduction of mixed-use development into the city’s existing business centers as a means of enhancing retail viability, establishing truly pedestrian-oriented shopping districts, creating more attractive buildings and public spaces, supporting transit viability, and reducing vehicle trips.
Policy 15.1.2: **Mix of uses** - Urban villages contain most of the following uses which typically make up what is considered a traditional and livable community: single and multi-family residential, neighborhood serving commercial, schools, parks, a central gathering place, mass transit and safe, walkable pathways that connect people to all areas of the village. Work towards creating a mix and placement of these uses that works for the character of the village and creates a vibrant community setting.

Policy 15.1.4: **Mobility Choices** - The City shall ensure that redevelopment projects in urban villages are designated for pedestrian traffic and connect and support a citywide transit system.

Policy 16.1.5: **Corridor Transit** - The City shall encourage design and development along mixed use corridors that promotes the use of public transit, pedestrian and bicycle travel that maximizes personal safety through development features such as:

- Buildings oriented to the street and transit services;
- Safe and convenient access for pedestrians between buildings and transit stops;
- Support the Greenways and Trail Master Plan when applicable;
- Parking areas, and other buildings and facilities; and
- Roads designed for automobile use, efficient transit service as well as pedestrian and bicycle travel.

Objective 26.11: Transit oriented development and villages, with mixed-use development including housing, economic development, and social services.

Policy 26.11.1: Promote discussion and a regional commitment to goals for mixed-income and mixed-use housing development along transit lines in forums such as the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council of Governments.

Policy 26.11.2: Place new residential developments at locations that increase potential ridership on the regional transit system and support
the central business district (CBD) as the region’s employment and cultural center.

**Policy 26.11.3:** Establish development patterns that combine residential with other compatible uses in mixed-use areas such as the CBD, Business Centers, Urban Villages, Mixed-use Corridor Village and Transit Station.

**Policy 26.11.4:** Encourage the development of housing at transit-supportive densities near transit streets, especially where parks or schools are present, to ensure that the benefits of the public’s investment in those facilities are available to as many households as possible.

**Objective 46.4:** Encourage downtown revitalization, urban redevelopment, and infill development in a manner that supports the city form concepts articulated in the Comprehensive Plan, is consistent with objectives to provide adequate delivery of multimodal transportation system options, and mitigates adverse traffic impacts to neighborhoods.

**Goal 43:** Provide a safe, convenient, and efficient mass transit system to provide for mobility throughout the City and serve as a viable alternative to single-occupant vehicle to access the City’s Business Centers, Urban Villages, Mixed-Use Corridors, Rail Transit Stations and neighborhoods.

**Policy 43.1.7:** The City will coordinate with Hillsborough County for a countywide referendum to fund mass transit.

**Policy 43.3.1:** Where appropriate, the City of Tampa will work with FDOT, HART, the Hillsborough County MPO, other local governments and TBARTA to reserve a transit “envelope” along future rail corridors.

**Policy 43.3.2:** The City shall participate in the MPO/ TBARTA/ HART process to prioritize transit needs as well as roadway needs when reviewing all highway systems and right of way needs for proposed improvements including implementation of BRT facilities such as:

- Bus turn-outs and transit station areas
• Queue-jump lanes
• Dedicated transit thru-lanes/light rail facilities

Policy 43.3.4: The City shall coordinate with HART, TBARTA, and FDOT to identify and assist in the acquisition of rail transit corridor and station rights-of-way.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission finds the requested Tampa Comprehensive Plan Amendment 09-06, adding new language; goals, objectives and policies, tables and graphs that outline and serve as the foundation for major planning strategies to implement Transit Oriented Development in the City of Tampa, CONSISTENT with the Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy A Livable City and recommends Tampa Comprehensive Plan Amendment 09-06 be approved.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Meeting Date: February 8, 2010 Public Hearing
Agenda Item: City of Tampa: CPA 09-06
Transit Oriented Development

SUMMARY

The Planning Commission will be reviewing and making a recommendation to Tampa City Council on a proposed text amendment that will become part of the Tampa Comprehensive Building Our Legacy, A Livable City. The Planning Commission, pursuant to Florida Statutes, is required to make a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners on all proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan. This amendment is part of the August 1, 2009 Cycle of Plan Amendments.

BACKGROUND

This is a publicly initiated text amendment. The plan currently includes general language related to transit oriented development, associated with making the City “Transit-ready”. The new and revised language adding objectives, policies, associated language, graphics and tables is being proposed with the intent of providing greater specificity and support in guiding new development and redevelopment around future transit stations via the adoption of transit-oriented development concepts and principles. Station areas will become focal points for the community with a mix of uses providing opportunities for people to live, work and play, all in one location.

The proposed policies and related tables permit consideration of higher density and intensity of uses for properties within approximately ½ mile of a fixed guideway transit station. This will occur through the application of a Transit Oriented Development Overlay. This amendment outlines station typologies, density and intensity of uses, mix of uses, and design guidelines. The proposed amendment would require station area planning for that area and outlines the components to be considered in that plan.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Planning Commission approve the attached resolution finding the amendment CPA 09-06 CONSISTENT with the goals, objectives, and policies of the Tampa Comprehensive Building Our Legacy, A Livable City. and recommends APPROVAL to Tampa City Council.

Prepared by: T. Garcia, AICP
Date Prepared: January 26, 2010
The Tampa Comprehensive Plan currently has established policies that generally outline the concept of transit-oriented development (TOD) and some associated transit station guidelines. The proposed TEXT AMENDMENT request will further the livable city strategies of the Tampa Comprehensive Plan, Building Our Legacy: A Livable City that work in concert to realize fiscal efficiencies for the City of Tampa and other funding agencies and help achieve other public goals including efficient transit and a multi-modal approach to transportation.

The proposed text changes will strengthen existing objectives and policies, create new and more specific language and provide supporting tables and graphs into the Comprehensive Plan. The objective is to coordinate transit and land use planning via the use of transit-oriented development concepts and fixed guideway transit design guidelines. This will ensure that the City is properly prepared to accommodate the Plan’s projected future job and population growth efficiently and effectively.

The Planning Commission has been working with HART and the Metropolitan Planning Organization to update Hillsborough County’s and City of Tampa’s Comprehensive Plans to provide a framework for TOD in coordination with plans for rail transit. A Joint Land Use Working Group has been formulated with land use professionals from all four local governments, a number of local and regional agencies, and business and community representatives. This group has been meeting for the last eight months to discuss the issues associated with TOD and the needed changes to our Comprehensive Plans.

The result is a number of proposed text amendments to the Future Land Use Element relating to TOD, including supporting tables and graphics. The proposed amendments address the following:

- Unified Transit Station Typologies
- Density / Intensity of Uses
• Mix of Uses
• Community Design
• Mobility/Connectivity
• Establish “Floating” T.O.D Overlay
• Implementation through a Station Area Planning Process

**Tampa Comprehensive Plan Context**

*Tampa’s Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy: A Livable City* was adopted in February, 2009. The Plan articulates a vision for how Tampa will accommodate the growth of the city to include 92,000 additional residents and 132,000 new jobs over the next 20 years, while promoting the values of its citizens:

**LIVABILITY** (Tampa is a place where diverse people find it easy, safe and enjoyable to live.)

**PROSPERITY** (A Tampa that is focused on the quality of life for all its people must be a Tampa that is economically healthy, with a broad mix of good jobs.)

**RESPECT** (The living systems which support us are taken care of and passed on to future generations in better shape.)

**RESILIENCE** (The systems that support our day to day living can deal with uncertainty and cope with the shifts and shocks we face in the future.)

The Plan’s growth management strategy organizes the City into Planning Districts encouraging most new growth to locate in places designated as Business Centers, Urban Villages or Mixed Use Corridor Villages. Each Business Center and Urban Village has a secondary plan indicating the amount of growth the City is planning in the next 20 years. The Plan includes policies describing how the City intends to serve this growth with mobility options and other infrastructure facilities.

**Overall Context:**

**The “Big Picture” Tampa Vision Map:**

The proposed text amendments are consistent with the overall guiding strategies for creating a Livable City as defined in Chapter Two of the Tampa Comprehensive Plan. The strategy calls for redevelopment, infill, and new growth to be targeted into compact, mixed-use, and walkable villages that are connected to a regional transit system.

• **Strategy 1: Organizing Planning Districts – Getting Transit Ready**
• Strategy 2: Strengthening our Diverse Neighborhoods
• Strategy 6: Building on our Assets
• Strategy 7: Growing Economic Prosperity

Strategy 1: The Districts

Objective 1.1: Designate 5 planning districts: University, Central Tampa, Westshore, New Tampa and South Tampa as an opportunity to build a livable and sustainable city.

Policy 1.1.2: Foster a vibrant urban lifestyle through mixed use development with entertainment and cultural facilities.

Policy 1.1.11: Encourage transit oriented, pedestrian-friendly mixed-use development in the Westshore, Central Tampa and University planning districts.

Policy 1.1.12: The City shall consider the development of strategically located mixed-use neighborhood centers that accommodate local serving commercial, employment, and entertainment uses; provide diverse housing opportunities; and are efficiently served by transit in the New Tampa and South Tampa Districts.

Strategy 2: Strengthening our Diverse Neighborhoods

Objective 1.2: A City of diverse, distinct, and well-structured neighborhoods that meet the community’s needs for complete, sustainable, and high-quality living environments from the historic downtown core to the well-integrated new growth areas.

Policy 1.2.1: Recognizing Tampa’s neighborhoods are the basic living environments that make-up the City’s urban fabric, the City shall through its planning preserve and enhance all neighborhood’s distinctiveness, identity, and livability.

Strategy 6: Building on our Assets

Objective 11.1: A shared vision of broadening and sustaining wealth through stronger linkage and coordination among diverse assets across the city.
**Policy 11.1.1:** Recognize that Tampa’s assets are interconnected and range from our economic engines, our industrial lands, our historic areas, our neighborhoods, our children, the natural environment, and our infrastructure which includes parks.

**Strategy 7: Growing Economic Prosperity**

**Objective 12.1:** A positive business climate supported by adequate public infrastructure, including transportation and schools.

**Plan Amendment Impacts and Issues**

**Prospering Economic Activity**

The proposed changes offer new policies and guidelines that provide opportunities for compact mixed-use development via increased densities and intensities. The following policies generally outline the potential economic benefits transit-oriented development brings to a city or community.

**Objective 26.11:** Transit oriented development and villages, with mixed-use development including housing, economic development, and social services.

**Policy 26.11.1:** Promote discussion and a regional commitment to goals for mixed-income and mixed-use housing development along transit lines in forums such as the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council of Governments

**Policy 26.11.2:** Place new residential developments at locations that increase potential ridership on the regional transit system and support the central business district (CBD) as the region’s employment and cultural center.

**Policy 26.11.3:** Establish development patterns that combine residential with other compatible uses in mixed-use areas such as the CBD, Business Centers, Urban Villages, Mixed-use Corridor Village and Transit Station.

**Policy 26.11.4:** Encourage the development of housing at transit-supportive densities near transit streets, especially where parks or schools are present, to ensure that the benefits of the public’s investment in those facilities are available to as many households as possible.
Infill and Redevelopment

The anticipated growth of 92,000+ residents and more than 132,000+ additional employees over the next two decades will result in increased demand on City, County and State roadways. The City is nearly built-out and almost all anticipated growth is expected as either redevelopment or infill development. There are limited opportunities to widen roadway capacity to accommodate the increase traffic demand without severely impacting neighborhoods and the existing built environment.

The purpose of the Urban Redevelopment designation within the Transportation Concurrency Exception Area (TCEA) is to encourage redevelopment in and around the City’s Business Centers, and to create integrated communities that can be served by existing or planned multi-modal transportation facilities and services. The purpose of the TCEA is to delineate areas designed to reduce adverse transportation concurrency impacts that may hamper urban infill and redevelopment within the area.

**Policy 2.1.1:** New development and redevelopment in downtown Tampa should be urban in character, compact, and dense, with efficient use of land and buildings.

**Policy 2.1.2:** Examine the development of rail connections, or other forms of mass transit, to improve connections between the downtown area, and other regional activity centers and outlying communities.

**Objective 46.4:** Encourage downtown revitalization, urban redevelopment, and infill development in a manner that supports the city form concepts articulated in the Comprehensive Plan, is consistent with objectives to provide adequate delivery of multimodal transportation system options, and mitigates adverse traffic impacts to neighborhoods.

**Goal 43:** Provide a safe, convenient, and efficient mass transit system to provide for mobility throughout the City and serve as a viable alternative to single-occupant vehicle to access the City’s Business Centers, Urban Villages, Mixed-Use Corridors, Rail Transit Stations and neighborhoods.

**Policy 43.1.7:** The City will coordinate with Hillsborough County for a countywide referendum to fund mass transit.
Policy 43.3.1: Where appropriate, the City of Tampa will work with FDOT, HART, the Hillsborough County MPO, other local governments and TBARTA to reserve a transit “envelope” along future rail corridors.

Policy 43.3.2: The City shall participate in the MPO/ TBARTA/ HART process to prioritize transit needs as well as roadway needs when reviewing all highway systems and right of- way needs for proposed improvements including implementation of BRT facilities such as:

- Bus turn-outs and transit station areas
- Queue-jump lanes
- Dedicated transit thru-lanes/light rail facilities

Policy 43.3.4: The City shall coordinate with HART, TBARTA, and FDOT to identify and assist in the acquisition of rail transit corridor and station rights of- way.

Review requests were sent to the following Agencies/Departments, which either had no comments or comments of any significance.

City of Tampa – Land Development Coordination
City of Tampa – Solid Waste
City of Tampa – Stormwater and Sanitary Sewer
City of Tampa – Potable Water
City of Tampa – Transportation
The Environmental Protection Commission (EPC)
Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)
Hillsborough Area Regional Transit Authority (HART)
Hillsborough County School Board

Copies of external agency responses are included in Attachment C of this report

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan

Growth Management Solution

In keeping with the vision for a more Livable City, future growth will be steered to areas and locations that are well served by transit or the existing road network and which have a number of properties with redevelopment potential. Generally, growth areas are locations where transit access can be provided along bus and
future rail transit routes, and at future transit stations. The growth areas envisioned in this plan are:

- Business Centers
- Mixed use corridor villages
- Transit stations
- Urban Villages- limited growth

The role of these areas should ensure that spaces for economic activities are not displaced by residential development and that existing residential neighborhoods are not destabilized by inappropriate commercial encroachment.

**Urban Villages – Limited Growth**

Mixed use at a neighborhood scale of up to three stories and mixed use at a community scale from two to four stories will be allowed in designated areas.

**Goal 14:** A city of compact, higher-density development within business districts, mixed use corridor villages and transit stations to conserve land resources, protect single family detached neighborhoods, natural habitat, support transit, reduce vehicle trips, improve air quality, conserve energy and water, and diversify Tampa’s housing stock.

**Policy 14.1.1:** The City shall encourage compact, higher density development that is compatible with its surrounding character.

**Policy 14.2.3** Mobility - Transit use will be promoted in the business centers through investing in improved levels of service, by encouraging new economic development to take place in a form and density that supports transit and by encouraging travel demand management measures.

**Policy 14.2.5** Mix of uses - The City shall promote through the redevelopment process, the introduction of mixed-use development into the city’s existing business centers as a means of enhancing retail viability, establishing truly pedestrian-oriented shopping districts, creating more attractive buildings and public spaces, supporting transit viability, and reducing vehicle trips.
The proposed text amendments support the City of Tampa Comprehensive Plan through the development of **Urban Villages** using community planning through form based codes. Urban Villages function as villages within the larger city. Urban villages contribute to a livable City by supporting:

- Diverse housing and employment growth
- Pedestrian and transit oriented communities

**Policy 15.1.2:**  
**Mix of uses** - Urban villages contain most of the following uses which typically make up what is considered a traditional and livable community: single and multi-family residential, neighborhood serving commercial, schools, parks, a central gathering place, mass transit and safe, walkable pathways that connect people to all areas of the village. Work towards creating a mix and placement of these uses that works for the character of the village and creates a vibrant community setting.

**Policy 15.1.4:**  
**Mobility Choices** – The City shall ensure that redevelopment projects in urban villages are designated for pedestrian traffic and connect and support a citywide transit system.

**Mixed Use Corridors**

**Policy 16.1.5**  
**Corridor Transit** - The City shall encourage design and development along mixed use corridors that promotes the use of public transit, pedestrian and bicycle travel that maximizes personal safety through development features such as:

- Buildings oriented to the street and transit services;
- Safe and convenient access for pedestrians between buildings and transit stops;
- Support the Greenways and Trail Master Plan when applicable;
- Parking areas, and other buildings and facilities; and
- Roads designed for automobile use, efficient transit service as well as pedestrian and bicycle travel.

**Analysis and Conclusion**
The lack of rail transit is the most glaring deficiency in the city’s profile of mobility choices. No other system has the capacity to move more people faster and in a physical footprint that is so small by comparison to road based mobility options. Capacity can be readily expanded by adding more train cars. Presently, the development potential in the city’s business centers (Downtown, Westshore, USF) is restricted by the amount of people that can travel the roads that serve them. A rail-based transit system can increase the development potential of these areas - a key economic reason to build a new and different type of mobility system in this city.

The Tampa Comprehensive Plan has existing policies addressing the development of fixed-guideway transit. Current policies list station types generally and recommend future efforts to establish implementation strategies. Modifications are needed to make the Plan more “transit ready”, including adding specific densities and intensities for station area development, specific station area design characteristics and implementation framework.

The proposed text amendment outlines three major planning strategies to implement TOD in Hillsborough County, including establishment of a Transit Oriented Development Overlay, Station Area Planning, and Area-Wide rezoning. The policies call for each of these activities to be undertaken to implement transit supportive policies and support increased ridership and redevelopment along proposed transit corridors and station areas. As the development of a fixed-guideway transit system proceeds, it will be important to address land use policies within potential corridors to ensure that the appropriate land use framework is in place to encourage successful station area development.

The Comprehensive Plan mechanism that creates this opportunity is Transit Oriented Development Overlay (TOD Overlay), which will be floating until station area locations are determined by the transit agency. The initial designation includes all areas within a 0.5 mile radius of the station platform, which is called the Area of Influence. This will allow that area to be studied for the appropriate station area plan boundary and enable interim zoning options for properties within the initial area of influence.

There are seven basic station types, High Intensity Urban Node, Mixed Use Regional Node, Community Center, Neighborhood, Park and Ride, Employment Center, and Special. Characteristics of each station type are outlined in Table 2 of the proposed text amendment. Three of these station types (Mixed Use Regional, Community Center, and Neighborhood) include urban and suburban
characteristics which will be utilized depending on where the station is located within the City. In order to be granted the additional development potential, the TOD Overlay requires that a property be rezoned to a TOD zoning designation. This rezoning can occur either as an individual property, or as part of the implementation of an approved Station Area Plan.

The second step in the process includes determination and approval of specific Station Area Plan Boundaries for each station and development of Station Area Plans. The Station Area Plan Boundaries will become the fixed boundaries of the TOD Overlay. All areas within the TOD Overlay will be eligible for consideration of higher densities and intensities and a greater range of land uses, based on the station typologies. The proposed policies outline the components to be considered in the Station Area Planning Process. The applicability of those components will vary depending on the characteristics of each unique station location. Once Station Area Plans are adopted, the third step, area-wide rezoning, will occur to implement the plan recommendations.

Consistency with the *Tampa Comprehensive Plan: Building Our Legacy A Livable City*

- The Vision Plan furthers Strategy 1: Organizing Planning Districts – Getting Transit Ready
- The Vision Plan furthers Strategy 2: Strengthening our Diverse Neighborhoods
- The Vision Plan furthers Strategy 6: Building on our Assets
- The Vision Plan furthers Strategy 7: Growing Economic Prosperity

*Transit and transit-oriented development is promoted and supported by goals, objectives, and policies of the Comprehensive Plans which*

- Promote multi-modal strategies to improve mobility
- Focus growth along identified “Transit Emphasis Corridors”
- Promote transit in areas where infill development or redevelopment is desired and along deficient roadways by issuance of density and FAR bonuses and other incentives
- Designate high density and intensity activity center’s along transit emphasis corridors
- Establish and maintain a transit level of service
- Coordinate with local, regional and state agencies to implement strategies to plan for transit such as: the reservation of “transit envelopes”; identification
of transit corridors; provision for incentives to provide transit facilities; define transit districts

- Encourage compact and mixed-use development
- Coordinate and integrate land use and mobility facilities

**Recommendation**

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the attached resolution, finding the proposed *Comprehensive Plan Amendment CPA09-06, CONSISTENT* with the *Tampa Comprehensive Plan: Building Our Legacy A Livable City* and forward this recommendation to Tampa City Council.

**Prepared by T. Garcia, AICP, Principal Planner**

**Appendices**

- Attachment A – Proposed Text Amendments, Associated Tables and Graphs
- Attachment B – External Agency/Department Comments
- Attachment C – Joint Land Use Working Group Comments
Current language in plan deleted and replaced as noted:

The Following changes will be inserted immediately following the end of the Mixed Use Corridor Villages Goals, Objectives and Policies Section in Chapter 3, replacing the" Transit and Transit Stations" and “Transit Stations Goals. Objectives and Policies“ sections from pgs 69-74

Transit and Transit Stations Area Planning (Chapter 3 p. 69-74)

The development of a fixed-guideway mass transit system for the Tampa Bay region has been under consideration for several years. In 2002, the Hillsborough Area Regional Transit (HART) Authority completed a multi-year effort to examine the feasibility of a light rail system in Hillsborough County using CSXT rail lines and new track in other areas. A previous major investment study, “The Mobility Study,” identified a rail system that one day could connect Pinellas, Pasco, Hillsborough and Polk counties via CSXT lines. The HART Rail Study (Environmental Impact Study, Tampa Rail Project, 2002) refined the plans for the first phase of this system, examining lines in the most densely populated parts of Hillsborough. The first lines would link Downtown Tampa to the USF area and to the Westshore Business Area. The technical and planning information in the HART Rail Study has been integrated into current planning efforts.

In 2006, the Hillsborough County MPO commenced an MPO Transit Study to examine the county’s transit needs and choices to the year 2050. The MPO Transit Study responded to community values centered on sustainable growth, neighborhood preservation and economic vitality. A preferred transit concept for 2050 emerged from the study’s recommendations demonstrating how transit investments can influence countywide growth patterns, creating a more efficient use of land that in turn makes walking and transit more viable and desirable as real transportation options. The Study was approved by the MPO in December 2007. The preferred alignment for the MPO Transit Study is depicted on the Comprehensive Plan Vision Map.

These past efforts have been incorporated into the Hillsborough MPO 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), which serves as the primary transit and transportation plan for all of Hillsborough County. The adopted MPO Long Range Transportation 2035 Transit Needs Assessment map depicts the long range fixed guideway transit needs for Hillsborough County. As the development of a fixed-guideway transit system proceeds, it will be important to address land use policies within potential corridors to ensure that the appropriate land use framework is in place to encourage successful station area development. When investment plans are established and station sites are known, appropriate Future Land Use and zoning changes will need to take place to allow transit supportive infill development and redevelopment to occur. The Comprehensive Plan mechanism that creates this opportunity is the Transit Oriented
Development Overlay (TOD Overlay), which will be floating until station area locations are determined in accordance with the policies below.

The Goals, Objectives, and Policies within this section accomplish the following:

1. Create the Transit Oriented Development Overlay, and describe the process for its application
2. Permit, by Transit Station Area Typologies (Table 2), the necessary densities/intensities and land use characteristics needed for successful Transit Oriented Development.
3. Require the development of Station Area Plans for each station, which will at a minimum, include specific Components of Station Area (Table 3) and adhere to Transit Station Area Design Principles (Table 4).

The Goals, Objectives, and Policies within this section serve as the planning framework to guide the processes that will occur once station locations have been determined. The general steps of this process are listed below, in chronological order (an illustrative flow chart of the overall process is included below as Figure 1):

1. Designation of the area of influence/study area for the Transit Oriented Development Overlay (TOD Overlay) at the time a station location is determined by the transit agency (e.g. 0.5 mile radius from approved fixed-guideway station locations).
2. Determination and approval of specific Station Area Plan Boundaries for each station. This will be a modified version of the initially designated Area of Influence and will become the fixed boundaries of the TOD Overlay.
3. Adoption of Station Area Plans for each station. Implementation of these plans will include city-initiated area-wide rezonings.

The first step, designation of the area of influence for the Transit Oriented Development Overlay, occurs when the fixed guideway transit station location is determined by the local transit agency. The initial designation includes all areas within a 0.5 mile radius of the station platform, which is called the Area of Influence. This will allow that area to be studied for the appropriate station area plan boundary and enable interim zoning option for properties within the initial area of influence. Within this Area of Influence, the Comprehensive Plan allows for the consideration of higher density/intensity and a broader range of uses, as designated by station typology in Table 2.

There are seven basic station types, High Intensity Urban Node, Mixed Use Regional Node, Community Center, Neighborhood, Park and Ride, Employment Center, and Special, characteristics of each documented below in Table 2 (City of Tampa/Hillsborough County Fixed Guideway Transit Station Typologies). Three of these station types (Mixed Use Regional, Community Center, and Neighborhood) include urban and suburban characteristics which will be utilized depending on where the station is located within the City. In order to be granted the additional development potential, the TOD Overlay requires that a property be rezoned to a TOD zoning designation. This rezoning can occur either as a individual property, or as part of the implementation of an approved Station Area Plan.
The second step, determination and approval of specific Station Area Plan Boundaries for each station, occurs prior to end of the Preliminary Engineering Phase (see Figure 1). This process will be led by by agencies and organizations as documented in an executed interlocal agreement, and take into account specific station contexts to determine appropriate Station Area Planning boundaries. The Station Area Plan Boundaries will become the fixed boundaries of the TOD Overlay. All areas within the TOD Overlay are eligible for consideration of higher densities and intensities based on the Station Typologies in Table 2.

The third step, development and adoption of Station Area Plans, will occur no later than the end of Final Design of the fixed-guideway transit system (see Figure 1). Once Station Area Plans are adopted, area-wide rezonings will occur to implement the plan recommendations.

The following Goals, Objectives, and Policies allow for the flexibility and creativity needed to lead to successful Transit Oriented Development in and around future fixed-guideway transit stations. They represent the initial framework for realizing the transformative potential of the development of transit system.

Transit Stations Goals, Objectives and Policies

**Goal 17:** A transit system that supports our continued economic success, enhances livability, and promotes reductions in greenhouse gases through the use of alternative transportation modes.

**Objective 17.1:** To plan for a fixed-guideway transit system that creates connections throughout the City of Tampa and to locations throughout the Tampa Bay Region.

**Policy 17.1.1:** Prior to the commencement of Station Area Planning, an interlocal agreement will be executed defining specific roles and responsibilities for each of the responsible agencies (including but not limited to HART, TBARTA, Metropolitan Planning Organization, Local Planning Agency) and jurisdictions involved in the planning, design, and construction of the fixed-guideway transit system and its station areas.

**Policy 17.1.2:** The City of Tampa will continue to support the findings and recommendations of the approved HART Alternatives Analyses, and the TBARTA Master Plan, and the Hillsborough MPO 2035 LRTP in pursuing the development and implementation of a fixed guideway transit system.

**Policy 17.1.3:** The City shall coordinate with the Local Planning Agency (LPA), transit agency and the Metropolitan Planning Organization to recommend appropriate station typologies (Table 2) for designated station areas, considering the unique context of each station area within the entire transit corridor and the regional system.
Objective 17.2: To establish a Transit Oriented Development Overlay to be applied to fixed-guideway station areas.

Policy 17.2.1: The TOD Overlay can only be utilized within the Urban Service Area.

Policy 17.2.2: The specific density/intensity ranges and allowable uses for the TOD Overlay will be as listed in Table 2 Tampa and Hillsborough Fixed-Guideway Transit Station Area Typologies, which is adopted as part of this section.

Policy 17.2.3: When the fixed guideway transit station location and typology is determined by the local transit agency, the area of influence/study area for the TOD Overlay is automatically established, initially applying to an area measuring 0.5-mile radius from the center of the station platform. This allows that area to be studied for the appropriate station area plan boundary, according to Policies 17.3.1 and Policy 17.3.2.

Policy 17.2.4: The City of Tampa shall adopt TOD Zoning Designations, which will be utilized on lands that are designated under the TOD Overlay. If property owners within these designated areas wish to redevelop prior to the adoption of a Station Area Plan they can choose one of the following options:

- Develop consistent with the existing zoning designation on site, or
- Rezone the site utilizing an appropriate and applicable TOD zoning designation.

Objective 17.3: To efficiently plan for new development around transit stations by preparing Station Area Plans during the design phase of the fixed-guideway system.

Policy 17.3.1: Following the establishment of the initial area of influence/study area for the TOD Overlay at a determined station location, a specific Station Area Planning boundary for each station will be defined by the responsible entities as described in an executed interlocal agreement. The Station Area Planning boundary will include areas within a 0.5-mile walking distance from the transit station. In determining the specific Station Area Plan boundaries, physical, environmental, and community features, property boundaries, and borders shall be considered, allowing the appropriate expansion or contraction of the boundary.

Policy 17.3.2: Station Area Plan boundaries shall be approved by Tampa City Council. The approved station area plan boundaries become the fixed boundaries of the TOD Overlay. This enables interim zoning options for properties that are entirely within the initial area of influence, as outlined in Policy 17.3.3, consistent with the TOD design principles in Table 4.

Policy 17.3.3: The City of Tampa shall adopt TOD Zoning Designations, which will be utilized on lands that are designated under the TOD Overlay. If property owners within these designated areas wish to redevelop prior to the adoption of a Station Area Plan they can choose one of the following options:

- Develop consistent with the existing zoning designation on site, or
Policy 17.3.4: Station typology definitions included in Table 2 and a location-specific market study shall provide guidance for the Station Area Planning process.

Policy 17.3.5: Following the approval of the Station Area Plan boundary and prior to the end of the fixed guideway transit system preliminary engineering phase, the City of Tampa in coordination with HART shall begin preparation of priority Station Area Plans for each station. These plans will, at a minimum, consider those components identified in Table 3, which is adopted as part of this section. These plans will recognize the unsuitable inclusion of residential development in industrial and M-AP future land use designated areas and the community character of stable and historic neighborhoods where increased densities and intensities may be deemed inappropriate.

Policy 17.3.6: Pursuant to the local interlocal agreement (Policy 17.1.1), Station Area Plans shall be completed. These plans can either be publicly or privately funded, but their completion must be overseen by a public agency. At a minimum, these plans should address the components as listed in Table 3, to the extent feasible in each unique station area.

Policy 17.3.7: In addition to those Components of Station Areas documented in Table 3, the Transit Station Area Design Principles in Table 4, which is adopted as part of this section, should also be utilized as a guide in establishing station area plans.

Policy 17.3.8: Station Area Plans shall be based on a consistent methodology which is approved by the Local Planning Agency and the City of Tampa.

Policy 17.3.9: A public involvement program, that includes community stakeholders, public agencies, and private developers, shall be part of the Station Area Planning Process. This process shall include community design and public workshops.

Policy 17.3.10: Following the completion of a Station Area Plan and during construction of the fixed-guideway system, a city-initiated area-wide rezoning for parcels within station areas to transit supportive zoning categories (to be defined in the Land Development Code), will be completed.

Objective 17.4: Utilize the Transit Station Area Design Principles in Table 4 and subsequent policies listed below to guide the development of Station Area Plans.

Policy 17.4.1: Where applicable, Station Area Plans shall recognize neighborhood planning efforts adopted by the City of Tampa including, but not limited to, neighborhood plans, economic development plans, and community redevelopment area plans. These plans shall receive priority consideration in Station Area Plans. However, the existence of a current plan does not preclude change from occurring in station areas as opportunities for development and redevelopment will need to be reevaluated within station areas in order to encourage transit
supportive densities and intensities. In areas where Station Area Plans are in conflict with existing adopted plans, the Station Area Plan shall supersede.

**Policy 17.4.2:** Where Station Areas are located within or adjacent to Mixed-Use Corridor Villages (Objective 16 and associated policies), closely coordinate planning efforts to ensure consistency in approach and implementation strategies. Where feasible, combine Station Area Plan efforts with those for the surrounding or adjacent Mixed Use Corridor Village in order to streamline the process in order to encourage participation by stakeholders. Where form based codes are pre-exist the Station Area Planning process, amendments to the code may be required during the city-initiated rezoning phase to ensure that the specific target densities and intensities related to the station typologies will be accommodated.

**Policy 17.4.3:** Where the Transit Oriented Development Overlay covers areas that are designated with industrial or MA-P future land use categories, the existing categories’ prohibition to allowing residential development will remain in place with no modification. Increased intensity of non-residential uses may occur consistent with the Station Area Plan.

*To be added to the Definitions Section of the Plan:*

**Fixed-Guideway Transit** - Any transit service that uses exclusive or controlled rights-of-way or rails, entirely or in part. The term includes heavy rail, commuter rail, light rail, monorail, trolleybus, aerial tramway, inclined plane, cable car, automated guideway transit, ferryboats, that portion of motor bus service operated on exclusive or controlled rights-of-way, and high-occupancy-vehicle (HOV) lanes.

*To be added to as a footnote/asterisk to the Future Land Use Table 2, at the end of Chapter 3*

For properties that are located within 0.5 mile of a fixed-guideway transit station (light rail, bus rapid transit, etc.), the allowable densities/intensities and range of uses may be subject to the Goals, Objectives, and Policies related to Transit and Transit Station Area Planning (See Goal 17, Objectives 17.1-17.4 and related policies). The location and type of fixed-guideway transit stations can be found on the MPO Long Range Transportation 2035 Cost Affordable Transit System Map.
Table 4: Tampa and Hillsborough Fixed Guideway Transit Station Area Design Principles

**Land Use Principles**
Enhance transit ridership by concentrating supportive uses and increased density and intensity within Station Areas.

- **Supportive Land Use**
  - Encourage mixed-use projects by permitting FAR-based entitlement.
  - Require a market analysis for each Station Area Plan to identify the potential mix, mass, and mesh of proposed land uses.
  - Encourage, through incentives, a variety of housing types and price points, including attainable and workforce housing.
  - Preserve and protect existing stable and historic neighborhoods through land use transitions. These are especially important between 0.25 mile and 0.5 mile from stations.

- **Supportive Density & Intensity**
  - Require higher density/intensity projects within a 0.25-mile walk from stations with reduced densities/intensities adjacent to existing, stable, and historic neighborhoods.
  - Require minimum net densities for new residential projects within 0.5 miles walk from a station. These minimums shall exceed 20 units per acre for urban stations and 10 units or greater for suburban stations as appropriate.
  - Require minimum non-residential net intensities within 0.25 mile walk from a station. These minimums shall exceed 1.0 FAR for urban stations and 0.5 for suburban stations as appropriate.

**Connectivity Principles**
Enhance the existing transportation network by increasing pedestrian, bicycle, and transit connections within Station Areas.

- **Pedestrian and Bicycle System**
  - Establish direct and visible public connections for pedestrians and cyclists between stations and adjacent neighborhoods.
  - Provide linked on-site pedestrian circulation systems that are lighted to a level where employees, residents, and customers can safely use the systems at night.
  - Require public bicycle parking within 0.25-mile of stations and encourage the development of bicycle lanes on arterials and collector roads, bicycle boulevards, buffered bike lanes, and separated paths within station areas.
  - Ensure compatibility with Greenways and Trails Master Plans, where applicable.

- **Street Network**
  - Redesign public streets surrounding the station areas for increased multi-modal use, emphasizing pedestrian and bicycle circulation, and traffic calming.
  - Redesign street intersections for enhanced pedestrian and bicycle circulation protection.
  - Site the pedestrian network for the anticipated level of service needed.
  - Improve connectivity by encouraging the development of smaller block lengths.

- **Parking Accommodation**
  - Reduce the on-site minimum parking requirements in station areas where appropriate.
  - Consider the use of parking maximums for private parking and other solutions including public parking and parking districts.
  - Develop private area-wide parking strategies to minimize surface parking lots for private development and encourage off-site and shared parking facilities.
  - Develop and implement public parking strategies and funding mechanisms including creating on-street parking for business districts and structured parking for incentivized development attraction.

**Building & Site Design**

- **Community Design Principles**
  - Use urban design to enhance the community identity within station areas and to make them attractive to residents and businesses.
  - Design public streets using complete streets principles to encourage pedestrian activity and provide protection from vehicular movements.
  - Require streetscape elements such as street trees, pedestrian-scale lighting, wayfinding signage and seating.
  - Where feasible, place new development utilities underground.
  - Identify, fund, construct, and maintain urban public open spaces around stations as centers of activity.
  - Incentivize private development of additional public open spaces on all lots greater than 20,000 square feet through development incentives.
  - Seek architectural excellence in new buildings including design treatments that add to the urban character, advance the Station Area Plan tenets, encourage sustainability, and include public realm elements needed for livability of surrounding neighborhoods.
  - Include policies to ensure consistency with historic districts, if applicable.
  - Design active ground floor retail and office buildings fronting public streets, where feasible, to increase pedestrian activity along primary pedestrian connections to stations. Design parking structures to include ground floor active uses, where applicable.
  - Provide for pedestrian weather protection and visual interest in building design by providing awnings, arcades, and/or recessed entrances.

- **Pedestrian and Bicycle System**
  - Supportive Density & Intensity
  - Pedestrian and Bicycle System
  - Street Network
  - Parking Accommodation
  - Building & Site Design
  - Public Realm Design
  - Public Open Space

- **Land Use**
  - **Connectivity**
  - **Community**

**Public Parking Strategies**
Develop and implement public parking strategies and funding mechanisms including creating on-street parking for business districts and structured parking for incentivized development attraction.

**Public Realms**
Design public streets using complete streets principles to encourage pedestrian activity and provide protection from vehicular movements.

**Public Open Spaces**
Identify, fund, construct, and maintain urban public open spaces around stations as centers of activity.

**Public Parking Strategies**
Provide for pedestrian weather protection and visual interest in building design by providing awnings, arcades, and/or recessed entrances.

**Public Realms**
Design active ground floor retail and office buildings fronting public streets, where feasible, to increase pedestrian activity along primary pedestrian connections to stations. Design parking structures to include ground floor active uses, where applicable.

**Public Open Spaces**
Seek architectural excellence in new buildings including design treatments that add to the urban character, advance the Station Area Plan tenets, encourage sustainability, and include public realm elements needed for livability of surrounding neighborhoods.

**Public Parking Strategies**
Provide for pedestrian weather protection and visual interest in building design by providing awnings, arcades, and/or recessed entrances.

**Public Realms**
Design active ground floor retail and office buildings fronting public streets, where feasible, to increase pedestrian activity along primary pedestrian connections to stations. Design parking structures to include ground floor active uses, where applicable.

**Public Open Spaces**
Seek architectural excellence in new buildings including design treatments that add to the urban character, advance the Station Area Plan tenets, encourage sustainability, and include public realm elements needed for livability of surrounding neighborhoods.

**Public Parking Strategies**
Provide for pedestrian weather protection and visual interest in building design by providing awnings, arcades, and/or recessed entrances.

**Public Realms**
Design active ground floor retail and office buildings fronting public streets, where feasible, to increase pedestrian activity along primary pedestrian connections to stations. Design parking structures to include ground floor active uses, where applicable.

**Public Open Spaces**
Seek architectural excellence in new buildings including design treatments that add to the urban character, advance the Station Area Plan tenets, encourage sustainability, and include public realm elements needed for livability of surrounding neighborhoods.
Figure 1: Tampa and Hillsborough Fixed Guideway • Transit System/ TOD Planning

- **Transit Agencies**
  - Alternatives Analysis Begins
    - Selection of Fixed Guideway System Technology and Local Preferred Alternative
  - Development of LDR Framework
  - Adoption of LDR Framework
  - Preliminary Engineering Begins
    - NEPA Completion Process and Financial Plan Refinement
  - Final Design Begins
    - Adoption of LDR Framework
    - Development of Comprehensive Plan Policies
    - Interlocal Agreement to Determine Project Roles
    - Determination of Station Area Boundaries
    - Development of Station Area Plans and Market Studies
    - Station Area Capital Improvements
  - Operation Begins
    - Capital Improvement Program Funding/ Design Plans/ ROW Acquisition
    - System Construction and Station Area Capital Improvements

- **Local Government**
  - Alternatives Analysis Begins
  - Development of Comprehensive Plan Policies
  - Recommend Adoption of Comprehensive Plan Policies
  - Review Station Area Plans and Recommend Adoption

- **Local Planning Agency**
  - NEPA Completion Process and Financial Plan Refinement
  - Determination of Station Area Boundaries
  - Development of Station Area Plans and Market Studies
  - Station Area Capital Improvements
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Land Use</strong></th>
<th><strong>Design</strong></th>
<th><strong>Policy</strong></th>
<th><strong>Implementation Strategies</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Station Area Typology</td>
<td>Building Form, Massing, Setbacks, and</td>
<td>Station Development Evolution – Requirements, Triggers, and Thresholds</td>
<td>Capital Improvement Funding - Public Investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Redevelopment Vision</td>
<td>Site Design</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anchor Tenant Identification, where applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrounding Development</td>
<td>Alternative Development Standards</td>
<td>Incremental Parking Reduction Policies</td>
<td>Public/Private Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern and Community</td>
<td>(Vehicular/Bicycle Parking, Stormwater,</td>
<td>Workforce and Affordable Housing</td>
<td>Joint/Shared Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td>etc.)</td>
<td>Land Use Flexibility</td>
<td>Property Aggregation, where appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location Based Station</td>
<td>Public Realm, Streetscape, and Open</td>
<td>Housing Mix</td>
<td>Regulatory Changes (e.g. Form Based Code, Overlays, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Market Analysis</td>
<td>Space</td>
<td></td>
<td>Development Incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Assessment for Near</td>
<td>Transitions to/Compatibility with</td>
<td></td>
<td>Location-Specific Market Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Intermediate</td>
<td>Surrounding Development Patterns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Projections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Vertical) and Mix of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density/Intensity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimums (where</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appropriate) and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maximums</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified Growth and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 2: Tampa and Hillsborough Fixed Guideway • Transit Station Area Typologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station Type</th>
<th>Net Density</th>
<th>Net FAR</th>
<th>Building Heights</th>
<th>Desired Land Use</th>
<th>Housing Mix</th>
<th>Transit System Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Intensity Urban Station</td>
<td>CBD: Guided by FAR</td>
<td>CBD: Any FAR is acceptable if market feasible</td>
<td>FAA Height Limits</td>
<td>Office, Retail, Residential, Entertainment, Public / Semi-Public</td>
<td>High-rise and mid-rise apartments and condos</td>
<td>Intermodal facility/transit hub. Major regional inter-regional destination with high quality local transit feeder connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use Regional Stations</td>
<td>Guided by FAR</td>
<td>Range: 2.5-7.5</td>
<td>FAA Height Limits</td>
<td>Office, Retail, Residential, Entertainment, Public / Semi-Public</td>
<td>High-rise and mid-rise apartments and condos</td>
<td>Regional Destination. Linked with high quality local transit feeder connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD: Any FAR</td>
<td>Range: 1.5-3.5</td>
<td>3-12 stories</td>
<td>Retail, Office, Educational, Institutional, Medical, Residential</td>
<td>Mid-rise apartments, condos, and apartment complexes</td>
<td>Regional Station. Will be served by Park-n-Ride facilities and local high quality transit feeder connections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center Stations</td>
<td>CBD: Any FAR</td>
<td>Range: 1.5-3.0</td>
<td>2-8 stories</td>
<td>Office, Retail, Residential, Entertainment, Public / Semi-Public</td>
<td>Low to mid-rise apartments, condos, and townhomes</td>
<td>Walk-Up Station with potential for localized parking and will utilize local transit connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD: any FAR</td>
<td>Range: 1.0-2.5</td>
<td>2-8 stories</td>
<td>Office, Retail, Residential, Entertainment, Public / Semi-Public</td>
<td>Low to mid-rise apartments, condos, and townhomes</td>
<td>Walk-Up Station with strong potential for Park-n-Ride and will require local transit connections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Stations</td>
<td>CBD: any FAR</td>
<td>Range: 1.0-2.5</td>
<td>2-5 stories</td>
<td>Office, Retail, Residential, Public / Semi-Public</td>
<td>Low-rise, townhomes, attached and small lot detached residential</td>
<td>Local transit feeder system with walk-up stops with limited or no parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD: any FAR</td>
<td>Range: 0.5-1.5</td>
<td>2-3 stories</td>
<td>Office, Retail, Residential, Public / Semi-Public</td>
<td>Low-rise, townhomes, attached and small lot detached residential</td>
<td>Local transit feeder system. Walk-up stops with parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Center Stations</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Range: 0.6-3.0</td>
<td>3-12 Stories</td>
<td>Office (general, medical, R&amp;D), flex space, support retail, restaurant, lodging, Public / Semi-Public</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Regional Destination. Linked with high quality local transit feeder connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Stations</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park and Ride Stations</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Average: 0.5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Office / Retail</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Capture station for in-bound commuters. Large Park-N-Ride with Local and Express bus connections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Net Density refers to the number of dwelling units per net developable acre.  
2. Net FAR refers to the Floor Area Ratio per net developable acre.  
3. The Net Density/Intensity, building heights, and the housing mix illustrated in this table are for guidance purposes. Specific requirements will be documented in the Station Area Plans, and/or City and County Land Development Regulations.  
4. Recommended station area land use mix guided by Station Area Plan Location-Based Station Area Market Analysis and Assessment for Near and Intermediate Development Projections to Identify Intensity and Land Use Mix with a Mile of Stations and any subsequent provision developed during the Station Area Planning Process.  
5. Maximum Density/Intensity ranges can be exceeded through the use of bonus density or other incentive provisions.

Photo Reference (from top to bottom): Tampa, FL: CBD; Denver, CO; Tampa: University of South Florida; Portland, OR; Arlington, VA; Portland, OR; Hillsborough County: West Park Village; Tampa, FL: Met West Development; Tampa, FL: Tampa International Airport; Tampa, FL: USF.
Attachment B

External Agency/Department Comments
Date: November 6, 2009

To: Sam Dennis, Planning Commission

From: Gordon A. Leslie, Jr., EPC

Subject: EPC Review of the Below-Listed Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments for the August 2009 Cycle:

PA 09-05: Future Land Use Map Change – Rocky Point

PA 09-06: Text Changes to the Tampa Comprehensive Plan-Transit Oriented Development

PA 09-07: City of Tampa Comprehensive Plan – Text Amendment – Greater Seminole Heights Vision Plan

CPA 09-08: City of Tampa Comprehensive Plan – Map Amendment – Seminole Heights Urban Village

PA 09-09: City of Tampa Comprehensive Plan – Text Amendment – Courtney Campbell Scenic Highway Corridor

PA 09-10: City of Tampa Comprehensive Plan – Map Amendment – Central Park Community Redevelopment Area

EPC staff has reviewed the above-referenced Comprehensive Plan Amendments, which primarily pertain to community planning, proposed development and redevelopment activities, and transportation oriented development initiatives, within portions of the City of Tampa. EPC staff offers no specific comment on the subject amendments at this time.

We appreciate the continued opportunity to work with the Planning Commission, and other reviewing departments, on these and other plan amendments as they come forward.
Staff has reviewed the proposal requesting text amendments to the City of Tampa’s Comprehensive Plan relating to Transit Oriented Development.

The proposed amendment, in and of itself, will not change transportation impacts. However, additional transportation improvements might require amendments to the Long Range Transportation Plan and the Comprehensive Plan Capital Improvements Element.

Inclusion of these improvements in the Long Range Transportation Plan Cost Affordable Plan will depend on priorities relative to other transportation needs and available revenues.

Transit Oriented Development policies were used to support policies included in the update of the Long Range Transportation Plan.
Memorandum

TO: Mr. Samuel Dennis, Senior Planner
    Hillsborough County Planning Commission

FROM: Linda Walker, Planner II
      Hillsborough Area Regional Transit Authority (HART)

DATE: October 27, 2009

RE: PA 09-06
    Transit Oriented Development

HART has reviewed the request to amend the goals, policies, objectives, and development regulations relating to Transit Oriented Design. On June 2009, the HART Board authorized the Chief Executive Officer to award a contract for Alternatives Analysis update work on the Northeast and West Corridors of the Tampa Rail Plan to the team led by PB Americas, Inc. The staff of PB Americas, Inc. reviewed the proposed Transit Oriented Development goals, objectives, and policies of the Comprehensive Plans for the City of Tampa and Hillsborough County. The goals, objectives and policies were reviewed for compliance with the guidelines of Federal Transit Administration for the New Starts application submittal as well as for effectiveness in encouraging transit oriented design outcomes.

Attached are the comments HART received from GB Arrington, of PB America on September 16, 2009.
November 9, 2009

TO: Melissa Zornitta, Planning Commission

FROM: Gloria Moreda, Manager
       Catherine Coyle, Zoning Administrator
       Randy Goers, Urban Planning Coordinator
       Mike Callahan, Urban Design Coordinator

RE: Comments on Proposed TOD Policies

Comments have resulted from a coordinated review by the above City staff. The following are related to the draft TOD policies for the Comprehensive Plan.

Overview of some of the key issues:

1. The purpose of the TOD Floating Overlay Designation needs to be clarified, i.e., is it a planning boundary, regulatory mechanism, etc.? 

2. Ensuring consistency between the Zoning Code, Station Area Plans, and the Future Land Use Map needs to be further discussed.

3. Roles and responsibilities need to be mutually agreed upon by all parties and better clarified. Some policies refer to an unnamed entity. If the roles/responsibilities cannot be determined or agreed upon, the reference to the various agencies should be removed. An interlocal agreement or a follow-up plan implementation Memorandum-of-Understanding may
provide options.

4. Additional discussion is needed on the overall planning concept. Are the various jurisdictions responsible for their own station area plans? Or is there an overall program that traverses jurisdictional lines? Are the stations plans viewed as individual plans, or is the strategy to look at a corridor and plan the various stations concurrently (as a unified element)? The answers to these questions will help in the roles / responsibilities area.

5. Some policies are ambiguous, wordy and redundant. Additional editing is required. Some suggestions are provided, but even these suggestions could use further refinement.

6. Objective 17.4 refers to Transit Oriented Design Principles. The Planning Commission staff also submitted an attachment named Transit Station Area Design Principles. There is significant overlap between the two sources. One recommendation would be to delete the policies under 17.4 and add a policy establishing the Attachment as the Transit Station Area Design Principles. This would eliminate confusion, and in case of future amendment, eliminate creation of possible conflicts.

7. Page 1 – Why the change from rail to fixed guideway transit? Is there a definition of fixed guideway? Does this broader term potentially allow for rail to be dropped from the proposal?

8. Page 5 – On pg 1 Station Area FLU TOD Floating Designation is used as a term. On pg 5, 7 and 11 you use TODFLU Floating Designation. In other location it is a Floating Overlay. The term needs to be consistent throughout the plan, and need to be defined.

9. Generally, it would seem a clearer and better defined bridge needs to be formed between these policies, Table 2, and the actual future land use categories. This could be accomplished with text inserted in the FLU table for each category that clearly states the possibility of TOD and the allowed thresholds, if designated. (ex.: “R-10” with asterisk “*” and footnote stating only R-10 in designated TOD area allowed up to CN uses with .75 FAR, 15 units per acre).

10. Recommend not using “encouraging” and “promoting” in all of these policies. Example: Policy 17.4.7 If the purpose of this policy is to list the general amenities necessary to support the ½ mile radius of the Station Area through pedestrian connections and bike lanes, then direct the development of LDR’s and direct the inclusion of these items in the plans. These policies, as with all policies of the Comp Plan, need to be measurable (per State Statute 163.3181) and give clear guidance to those who must implement them through development of plans, codes, and individual site developments.

11. Attached are more specific comments.
Transit and Transit Stations Area Planning (Chapter 3 p. 69-74)

The development of a fixed guideway mass transit system for the Tampa Bay region has been under consideration for several years. In 2002, the Hillsborough Area Regional Transit (HART) Authority completed a multi-year effort to examine the feasibility of a light rail system in Hillsborough County using CSXT rail lines and new track in other areas. A previous major investment study, “The Mobility Study,” identified a rail system that one day could connect Pinellas, Pasco, Hillsborough and Polk counties via CSXT lines. The HART Rail Study (Environmental Impact Study, Tampa Rail Project, 2002) refined the plans for the first phase of this system, examining lines in the most densely populated parts of Hillsborough. The first lines would link Downtown Tampa to the USF area and to the Westshore Business Area. The technical and planning information in the HART Rail Study has been integrated into current planning efforts.

In 2006, the Hillsborough County MPO commenced an MPO Transit Study to examine the county’s transit needs and choices to the year 2050. The MPO Transit Study responded to community values centered on sustainable growth, neighborhood preservation and economic vitality. A preferred transit concept for 2050 emerged from the study’s recommendations demonstrating how transit investments can influence countywide growth patterns, creating a more efficient use of land that in turn makes walking and transit more viable and desirable as real transportation options. The Study was approved by the MPO in December 2007. The preferred alignment for the MPO Transit Study is depicted on the Comprehensive Plan Vision Map.

The MPO Transit Study will support and facilitate decision-making relative to the update of the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and the development of a rail fixed guideway transit system for the City of Tampa and Hillsborough County. Once completed, the MPO Long Range Transportation 2035 Transit Needs Assessment map depicts the long range fixed guideway transit needs for Hillsborough County.

As the development of a rail fixed guideway transit system proceeds, it will be important to address land use policies within potential rail corridors so that development considered during the life of this comprehensive plan can support future rail fixed guideway transit. This can be accomplished by transitioning certain areas to a more compact, higher intensity, mixed-use pattern of development with a mix of uses. When rail investment plans are established and station sites are known, a Station Area Overlay Future Land Use Transit Oriented Development Future Designation will be established, which will serve as the impetus for Station Area planning to begin. During this planning process, which is outlined in Objective 17.3 and associated policies, it will be important to provide appropriate transit supportive and pedestrian oriented policies to guide development within ½ mile around each site.

Transit Station Area Considerations

1 The LRTP will be adopted in December. This paragraph can either be deleted or updated to reflect exactly what the LRTP says.

2 Purpose of the Floating Designation is to set the stage for developing specific station area plans. Overlay has no other purpose other than to trigger a planning purpose? If so, what is it?
This section provides a tool for assessing the transit supportive density for new development. The floor area ratios (FAR), job density measures and residential densities in Table 2 below set a measurable standard for predominately office, mixed use or predominately residential development. In order to maximize the success of any fixed-guideway transit system, new development within ½ mile of planned rail transit stations and in areas that are planned to be rail transit supportive (e.g. downtown Tampa) need to meet the density/intensity thresholds described below for one of the categories; employment, mixed use and residential and nonresidential. The densities are expressed as net density.

There are four six basic station types, High Intensity Urban Node, Mixed Use Regional Node, Community Center, Neighborhood, Park and Ride, and Special, characteristics of each which are documented below in Table 2 (City of Tampa/Hillsborough County Fixed Guideway Transit Station Typologies). Three of these station types (Mixed Use Regional, Community Center, and Neighborhood) include urban and suburban characteristics which will be utilized depending on where the station is located within the City. Once a station type and location is chosen, a Station Area Plan will guide the specific development characteristics within the station area, though the information in Table 2 below will generally apply that should have different land use policies applied to the area of influence around a station. They include:

**High Intensity Urban Stations** refers to stations located in the Central Business District (CBD) of Tampa. Land use should include government centers with adjacent high intensity commercial and office uses. Highest intensity uses should be located in close proximity to the stations, while still providing good light and air quality at street level. The functional relationship of structures close to stations should have strong aesthetic considerations that will complement station design. Pedestrian networks, separated from vehicular traffic, and mixed use of land should be encouraged.

**Appropriate Transit Supportive Density**
- Greater than 3.0 floor area ratio Employment: More than 150 jobs/acre Mixed Use: More than 20 dwelling units/acre and more than 50 jobs/acre Residential: More than 50 dwelling units/acre

**Mixed Use Regional Stations** would be located in regional shopping, office centers and medium to high density residential communities. Residential development adjacent to stations should be planned at appropriate densities. The location of offices within close proximity to the stations and protection of adjacent lower density residential uses should be stressed. The Westshore Business District area is an example of an appropriate location for a mixed use regional station.

**Appropriate Transit Supportive Density**
- Greater than 2.0 floor area ratio Employment: More than 100 jobs/acre Mixed Use: More than 12 dwelling units/acre and more than 40 jobs/acre or More than 20 dwelling units/acre and more than 30 jobs/acre Residential: More than 35 dwelling units/acre
Community Center Stations would function as a center of activities for surrounding neighborhoods. A “sense of community” should be pursued in these station locations including encouraging gathering places, such as restaurants, parks, other public and private recreational facilities and residential support uses. Development plans for the areas adjacent to stations should provide places to live, work, and shop with a variety of public facilities and services, and supportive office activities.

Appropriate Transit Supportive Density
Greater than 1.0 floor area ratio Employment: More than 20 jobs/acre Mixed Use: More than 8 dwelling units/acre and 10 jobs/acre Residential: More than 12 dwelling units/acre

Neighborhood Center Stations should serve low to medium density residential neighborhoods in both urban and suburban areas. Protection of adjacent neighborhoods from commercial or industrial development is stressed. Neighborhood Center Stations are appropriate in more urbanized residential neighborhoods where concern for negative impacts might be an important consideration.

Appropriate Transit Supportive Density
Greater than 0.75 floor area ratio Employment: More than 10 jobs/acre Mixed Use: More than 6 dwelling units/acre and more than 5 jobs/acre Residential: More than 8 dwelling units/acre

The purpose of the land use policies in this section proposed for the station areas is to give the City a tool within the broad framework of the Comprehensive Plan to deal in the future with important land use issues related to stations. Objective 17.2, Objective 17.3, and Objective 17.4, with associated policies, serve as the planning framework to guide the processes that will occur once a station area has been determined. These policies help to ensure that the areas surrounding the new stations develop as a mixed use, as transit supportive neighborhoods that allows a variety of employment, retail, and residential opportunities.

Actual The Station Area Transit Oriented Development Future Land Use Floating Designation overlay districts, as documented in Objective 17.2 is the land use mechanism that ensures that those areas around newly located and designated stations begins undergo a Station Area Planning process that will allow for an increase in density and intensity for future Transit Oriented Development (T.O.D.), while ensuring that viable existing neighborhood context is protected and enhanced as a result of future transit connections. Surrounding stations with appropriate regulations to implement the broad policies should be developed in conjunction with the plans for the mass transit system. The policies that have been cited should provide the framework to accomplish this future task. There is no timetable for implementing these plan provisions. Their implementation is contingent upon local government approval to build a fixed guideway, mass transit rail system.

3 Reference to a planning process (or processes), as opposed to a regulatory framework that is being established via these policies.

4 First time that a regulatory implication is made, referring to density/intensity increase within the overlay. No change in use is mentions.
Light Rail will provide flexible service that will navigate along existing rail corridors, transition to share surface streets with cars, and accommodate tighter turns and changes in elevation. Transit station spacing averaging one to two miles apart would serve a wide range of transit trip types, including work, shop, recreation and special events, while connecting key activity centers with predictable destination-to-destination travel times. Additional express service could provide reduced travel times during peak periods.

Light Rail will include park-and-ride, kiss-and-ride, bus feeder and circulator services with supportive station area development. Key bus-to-rail and rail-to-rail transfer stations provides convenient, reliable end-to-end service.

Collectively, these policies will allow for station area development will help to maximize the transit investment with good pedestrian access to the transit facilities, provide a compact, vibrant user experience and, in turn, allow transit to support both employment and housing development. In addition to specific station areas, these policies also begin to address the it is important to address land use policies within potential rail corridors so that development considered during the life of this comprehensive plan can support future fixed guideway transit. This can be accomplished by transitioning certain areas to a more compact, higher intensity, mixed-use pattern of development complete with a mix of uses. When rail investment plans are established and station sites are known, it will be important to provide appropriate transit supportive and pedestrian oriented overlay policies to guide development within the ½ mile around each site.
### Table 2: City of Tampa/Hillsborough County Fixed Guideway Transit Station Typologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station Type</th>
<th>Suggested Project Target Net Density</th>
<th>Suggested Project Target FAR</th>
<th>Proposed Scale</th>
<th>Desired Land Use</th>
<th>Housing Mix</th>
<th>Transit System Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Intensity Urban Node</td>
<td>CBD: Guided by FAR</td>
<td>CBD: Any FAR is acceptable, if market feasible</td>
<td>FAA Height Limits</td>
<td>Office, Residential, Entertainment, Civic/Governmental</td>
<td>High-rise and mid-rise apartments and condos</td>
<td>Intermodal facility/transit hub. Major regional inter-regional destination with high quality local transit feeder connections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use Regional Node Stations</td>
<td>Guided by FAR</td>
<td>Range: 2.5-7.0</td>
<td>FAA Height Limits</td>
<td>Office, Retail, Residential, Entertainment, Public/semi-public</td>
<td>High-rise and mid-rise apartments and condos</td>
<td>Regional Destination. Linked with high quality local transit feeder connections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>40-50 du/ac</td>
<td>Range: 1.5-3.0</td>
<td>3-12 stories</td>
<td>Retail, Office, Entertainment, Educational, Institutional, Medical, Residential</td>
<td>Mid-rise apartments, condos, and apartment complexes</td>
<td>Regional Destination. Will be served by Park-N-Ride facilities and local high quality transit feeder connections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>15-40 du/ac</td>
<td>Range: 1.0-2.0</td>
<td>2-6 stories</td>
<td>Office, Retail, Residential, Entertainment</td>
<td>Low to mid-rise townhomes</td>
<td>Walk Up Station. Potential for localized parking and will utilize local transit connections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center Stations</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>40-50 du/ac</td>
<td>Range: 1.5-2.5</td>
<td>2-6 stories</td>
<td>Office, Retail, Residential, Entertainment</td>
<td>Low to mid-rise townhomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Stations</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>20-30 du/ac</td>
<td>Range: 1.0-2.0</td>
<td>2-5 stories</td>
<td>Office, Retail, Residential</td>
<td>Low to mid-rise townhomes, attached dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>10-20 du/ac</td>
<td>Range: 0.5-1.0</td>
<td>2-3 stories</td>
<td>Office, Retail, Residential</td>
<td>Low rise, townhomes, attached and small lot detached residential</td>
<td>Local transit feeder system. Walk-up stops with limited parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park and Ride</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Average: 0.5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Office/Retail</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Capture station for in-bound commuters. Large Park-N-Ride with Local and Express bus connections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special*</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Net Density refers to the number of dwelling units per net developable acre.
*Net FAR refers to the Floor Area Ratio per net developable acre.
*Recommended station area land use mix guided by Station Area Plan, Location-Based Station Area Market Analysis and Assessment for Near and Intermediate Development Projections to identify Intensity and Land Use Mix within 1/4 Mile of Station. Must be balanced against any subsequent provision developed during the Station Area planning process.
*Residential uses will not be permitted in areas where underlying Future Land Use is Light Industrial, Heavy Industrial, or MA-P.
*TBD-based on location. Note: Representative Location Column was removed from the table.

**Table 2 Comments:**
- In header row:
  - strike the word “suggested” in the first 2 columns
  - change “Proposed Scale” to “Project Target Building Height” as “scale” is actually a proportion of mass and height
- Under Desired Land Use column:
  - Clarify the difference between “civic/governmental” and “public/semi-public”; definition may be needed for “civic/governmental”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Transit Stations Goals, Objectives and Policies</strong></th>
<th><strong>Comment</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 17:</strong> A transit system that supports our continued economic success.</td>
<td>Goal is okay, but only seems to focus on economic success. Seems like the goal should also include something about improving mobility, reducing greenhouse gas, improving our livability, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 17.1:</strong> To efficiently and effectively plan the land uses around anticipated and proposed transit stations to support the vitality of a rail transit system, for a fixed guideway transit system that creates connections throughout the City of Tampa and to locations throughout the Tampa Bay Region.</td>
<td>The objective establishes the intergovernmental coordination framework for the development and implementation of a fixed-guideway transit system. Framework is needed and is supported by the policies. No changes recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 17.1.1:</strong> The City of Tampa shall coordinate with the Tampa Bay Regional Transportation Authority (TBARTA), Hillsborough Area Regional Transportation (HART), the Hillsborough Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), Hillsborough County Aviation Authority (HCAA), the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) and other regional transit agencies regarding the provision of fixed guideway transit corridors and station locations.</td>
<td>This is a general coordination policy to ensure all of the key stakeholders are involved in the development of the fixed-guideway plan, including the identification of the station locations. No recommended changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 17.1.2:</strong> Transit overlay standards shall be developed to address density and intensity ranges for land development and shall reflect the intent of the transit technology, station type, expected population growth and market conditions. Overlay standards should cover density, height, appropriate uses, setbacks, building orientation and design, parking requirements, streetscape elements and signs.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 17.1.12:</strong> The City of Tampa will continue to build upon the findings and recommendations of the Tampa Rail Project (HART, 2002), and the MPO Transit Study (MPO, 2002), and the TBARTA Master Plan in pursuing the development and implementation of a fixed-rail guideway transit system.</td>
<td>While these studies served their purpose to get the rail effort to this point, it seems that moving forward HART’s Alternatives Study would be more relevant. Also, if not mistaken, the Long-Range Transportation Plan, once adopted in December, should supersede these plans. <strong>REFERENCE UPDATED PLANS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 17.1.3: The City shall coordinate with the Planning Commission Local Planning Agency (LPA), and the Metropolitan Planning Organization to recommend appropriate station types and locations and development characteristics for future station stops and areas desired to be supportive of major transit investments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment:</strong> The City will approve station locations, types and development characters. It is unclear as to how the recommendation will come to the City, considering the various entities involved in the process at this point. Additional clarification is needed. Coordination is important but who gets the recommendation and who makes the decision? City Admin &amp; Council have to factor in…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy 17.1.5: Land use decisions shall remain flexible to encourage complementary projects to foster station development. The location of the station and the function of the proposed station shall dictate the development policy in the area of influence. Requirements for station development should be flexible enough to support optimal residential, office/commercial and mixed use projects.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment:</strong> The City will approve station locations, types and development characters. It is unclear as to how the recommendation will come to the City, considering the various entities involved in the process at this point. Additional clarification is needed. Coordination is important but who gets the recommendation and who makes the decision? City Admin &amp; Council have to factor in…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 17.2: To establish a Transit Oriented Development Future Land Use Floating Designation Overlay to be applied to fixed guideway station areas.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment:</strong> Define the purpose of the TOD Overlay. Is it a regulatory mechanism or a planning boundary? The boundary is really part of the overall process to develop station area plans, which will then be used to guide development and improvements around each station. Consider deleting the objective and incorporating Policy 17.2.1 as part of Objective 17.3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy 17.2.1: Within three months of the transit or transportation agency’s designation of the station type and the physical location of a new fixed guideway transit station, the Tampa City Council, on recommendation from the Local Planning Agency, will apply a TOD Future Land Use Station Area Overlay Floating Designation initially measuring 0.5-mile radius from the center of the station platform will be created.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment:</strong> Appears to be inconsistent with Policy 17.1.3. Policy 17.2.1 indicates that a transit/transportation agency will be responsible for designating the station type and location. Policy 17.1.3 indicates that the LPA &amp; MPO will recommend station locations, types and development character. Policies should be consistent. If actual roles and responsibilities are not yet defined, then perhaps the entities should be removed from the policy and placed in the plan implementation section or added later. The policy is also a little “wordy”, when the intent is to have City Council approve a ½ mile planning area around the stations. Note the purpose of the TOD Floating Designation still needs to be articulated. <strong>Comment:</strong> Page 7 – Policy 17.2.1 – Not clear what Council action is needed or implied. Will Council have the ability to change the boundary or station type or location? It seems that what this PA is doing is that once the Transit Authority approved the station locations, the ½ mile study is...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested Revision: The Tampa City Council shall hold a public hearing to approve T.O.D. Future Land Use Floating Designation initially measuring 0.5-mile radius from the center of the station platform.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where does City Planning/Admin fit into this policy/process/decision? Once the line and station type is “fixed,” is it really “floating” at that point?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 17.3: Station Area Plans will be prepared prior to system construction, and during the design phase of the fixed guideway system, to efficiently and effectively plan the land use around proposed fixed guideway mass transit stations. Station Area Plan overlay plan districts meeting the following policies shall be created for use around the station stops. (Source: Objective 43 - Hills. Co. Comp Plan)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suggested Revision: To efficiently and effectively plan for new development around proposed transit stations by preparing Station Area Plans during the design phase of the fixed-guideway system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective is written like a policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy 17.3.1: Upon the Once the Station Area Transit Oriented Development Future Land Use Overlay Floating Designation is put in place around a designated station, and prior to the end of the fixed guideway transit design phase, the Local Planning Agency (LPA), in coordination with the City of Tampa, HART, Hillsborough MPO, and other related agencies, will conduct a detailed study and determine specific Station Area Plan boundaries, which will, at a minimum, include all areas within a 0.5-mile walking distance from the transit station. In determining the specific Station Area Plan boundaries, physical, environmental, and community features, boundaries, and borders shall be considered. Once determined, the Station Area Plan boundaries will be approved by Tampa City Council.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment: The intent of this policy is a little unclear, but it seems to call for a refinement of the ½-mile radius planning area to an area that is more specifically defined by ½-mile pedestrian walking distance. The analysis should be rather straight-forward. Suggest adding a new policy calling for a City Council approval of the boundary just to separate the actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: Policy 17.3.1 – The way this is written, it does not appear that Council will be able to make changes to the LPA determination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested Revision:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy 17.3.1: Upon the Once the Station Area Transit Oriented Development Future Land Use Overlay Floating Designation is put in place around a designated station, and prior to the end of the fixed guideway transit design phase, the Local Planning Agency (LPA), in coordination with the City of Tampa, HART, Hillsborough MPO, and other related agencies, will conduct a detailed study and determine specific Station Area Plan boundaries, which will, at a minimum, include all areas within a 0.5-mile walking distance from the transit station. In determining the specific Station Area Plan boundaries, physical, environmental, and community features, boundaries, and borders shall be considered. Once determined, the Station Area Plan boundaries will be approved by Tampa City Council.
The Planning Commission, the Local Planning Agency (LPA), in coordination with the City of Tampa, HART, Hillsborough MPO, and other related agencies, will conduct a detailed study and determine specific Station Area Plan boundaries.

Following the adoption of a TOD Future Land Use Floating Designation, a Station Area Planning Boundary for each station will be defined, which will, at a minimum, include all areas within a 0.5-mile walking distance from the transit station. In determining the specific Station Area Plan boundaries, physical, environmental, and community features, boundaries, and borders shall be considered. Once determined, the Station Area Plan boundaries will be approved by Tampa City Council.

**Policy 17.3.2:** Station Area Planning boundaries shall be approved by the Tampa City Council.

*Change “once determined” to “once prepared”*

*Also careful with the “will” – it almost reads as though Council is obligated to approve – Council should have some discretion…*

**Policy 17.3.3:** Following the designation of a Station Area Plan boundary, and prior to the end of the fixed guideway transit system design phase, a Station Area Plan, a redevelopment plan, where increased densities and intensities are desired, will be created. This plan will recognize the unsuitable inclusion of residential development in industrial and M-AP future land use designated areas and the community character of stable and historic neighborhoods where increased densities and intensities may be deemed inappropriate.

*Comment:* The intent of this policy is to require a Station Area Plan. Everything else in the plan is either not needed or redundant with other policies. The revision below is shorter.

**Suggested Revision:**

**Policy 17.3.3:** Following the designation of a Station Area Plan boundary, the City of Tampa shall direct the preparation of a Station Area Plan for each station.

**Policy 17.3.4:** Station Area Plans shall be completed by

*Comment:* This policy is difficult to follow. It also raises critical questions.
public/governmental agencies, and funded through the entity responsible for designating and constructing the fixed guideway transit corridors or through entities with development interests. As an option, private development interests can fund the Station Area Plan and work in close coordination with the Local Planning Agency (LPA). Where the Station Area Plan process is sponsored by government agencies, the LPA will lead the process, in close coordination with the City, and the appropriate transit agencies. At a minimum these plans should address:

Station Area Typology and Redevelopment Vision
• Surrounding Development Pattern and Community Character
• Location Based Station Area Market Analysis and Assessment for Near and Intermediate Development Projections to Identify Intensity and Land Use Mix within ½

Regarding funding and responsibility for the preparation of Station Area Plans. Can those decisions be made now and agreed upon by all of the entities? Should the local governments retain the responsibility? How will consistency and quality control of the various station plans be handled – both within the jurisdiction and across jurisdictional lines? Is the intent to complete individual station plans, or is it to complete a corridor plan comprised of related station area plans? Could make a difference in how the plans are produced and scheduled. The minimum requirements of a Station Area Plan should be placed in another policy.

Potential Alternatives for Discussion:

Policy 17.3.: Station Area Plans may be completed by the City of Tampa, or upon approval by the City of Tampa, transit agencies, the Local Planning Agency, private development interests or other public/governmental entities.

Policy 17.3.: Station Area Plans shall be funded by the entity responsible for constructing the fixed-guideway system, or by the private development interest requesting the study and development of the Station Area.

Policy 17.3.: Station Area Plans shall be based on a consistent methodology, which is approved by the Local Planning Agency and the City of Tampa.

Policy 17.3.: The process of developing a Station Area Plan shall commence following the designation of a Station Area Plan boundary being completed and prior to the end of the fixed guideway transit system design phase.

Comment: Care should be taken not to make the requirements of a station area plan too onerous without knowing the potential cost and time requirements. In the Comprehensive Plan, suggest a more generalized list, which can be then expanded or refined later when more information is available.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mile of Stations</th>
<th>Potential Alternative for Discussion:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Land Use</td>
<td><strong>Policy 17.3.7:</strong> At a minimum, Station Area Plans shall be based on the Station Area Typology (Table 2) for each station, the Transit Station Area Design Principles (Objective 17.4) and shall specify the appropriate development densities, intensities, land uses, development character, transportation and streetscape design, capital improvements and implementation strategies necessary to support transit oriented development in the Station Area Planning Boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Policy 17.3.5:</strong> Regardless of how the Station Area Plan is funded, a public involvement program, that includes community stakeholders, public agencies, and private developers, shall be part of the Station Area Planning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Comment: The first part of the policy referring to funding is not needed, but it doesn’t detract from the main intent of the policy. No changes recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Building Form, Setbacks, and Site Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Building Heights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public Realm, Streetscape, and Open Space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transitions to/Compatibility With Surrounding Development Patterns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Alternative Development Standards (Vehicular/Bicycle Parking, Stormwater, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public Parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• LEED or Other Sustainable Design Principles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Roadway Typical Sections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Housing Mix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Workforce and Affordable Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Incremental Parking Reduction Policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Land Use Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Station Development Evolution / Timed Requirements/Triggers and Thresholds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regulatory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public Private Partnerships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Joint/Shared Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Capital Improvement Funding/Public Investment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Property Aggregation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Anchor Tenant Identification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process. This process shall include community design and public workshops.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 17.3.6:</strong> Where appropriate, mixed use development incentives and density incentives shall be developed and encouraged to implement the intent of the station type.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Comment:** If this policy is desired, it should be made part of the station area plans.  
**Suggested Revision:**  
**Policy 17.3.6:** Station Area Plans shall include recommendations for Where appropriate, mixed use development incentives and density incentives shall be developed and encouraged to implement the intent of the station type. |
| **Policy 17.3.7:** Following the completion of a Station Area Plan and during construction of the fixed guideway system, a city-initiated area-wide rezoning for parcels within station areas to transit supportive zoning categories (to be defined in the Land Development Code), will be completed. Area-wide rezonings will be funded through the entity responsible for designating and constructing the fixed guideway transit corridors. |
| **Comment:** Do Station Area Plans have to be found consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and approved by the Tampa City Council? If so, a policy to that effect should be considered.  
The key question that needs to be further discussed is how the City achieves and ensures consistency between the zoning code and the comprehensive plan, particularly where a Station Area Plan recommends a land use that is not allowed in a Future Land Use Plan Category. Additional discussion is needed on this point. Some sort of consistency matrix or cross-reference table may be needed. **Policy should also state a requirement to develop transit-supportive LDR's (focus on Urban Design and tie back to Comp Plan), not just zoning categories.** |
| **Objective 17.4:** Utilize Transit Oriented Development (T.O.D) design principles focused on neighborhood context, connectivity, public realm improvements, and site development standards where appropriate. |
| **Comment:** The principles articulated by the policies under objective 17.4 are not consistent with the Transit Station Area Design Principles provided in an accompanying handout. They should be consistent.  
**Potential Alternatives for Discussion:**  
1) Replace the policies under 17.4 with the same language shown in the Transit Station Area Design Principles.  
2) Delete the policies under 17.4 and adopt one policy that establishes the table containing the Transit Station Area Design Principles as the guiding principles for station area planning.  
3) Some of the policies under 17.4 are not principles, but are really requirements of a Station Area Plan. They should be deleted or
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy 17.4.1: Redevelopment within the Station areas shall maintain the character and be complementary to adjacent, stable residential areas. (Source: Objective 43.7 Hillsborough County Comprehensive Plan)</th>
<th>Comment: Delete and refer to the Transit Station Area Design Principles.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy 17.4.2: Station Areas shall ensure that there is a transition in scale between the redevelopment/infill development proximate to the new stations and surrounding lower-density residential areas. This transition will typically occur within the 0.25-mile to 0.5-mile radius from the station platform.</td>
<td>Comment: Delete and refer to the Transit Station Area Design Principles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 17.4.3: Station Area Plans shall include policies to ensure consistency with the scale and architectural style of local historic districts, if applicable.</td>
<td>Comment: Delete and refer to the Transit Station Area Design Principles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 17.4.4: Where applicable, Station Area Plans shall take into consideration neighborhood planning efforts adopted by the City of Tampa including, but not limited to, neighborhood plans, economic development plans, and community redevelopment area plans. Sound planning practices typically include a review or consideration of all past planning efforts, including those that are adopted and those that are not. The review identifies constraints, requirements, limitations and potential opportunities that should be considered in the development of the current plan. Comment/Suggested Revision: Where applicable, Station Area Plans shall take into consideration neighborhood planning efforts adopted by the City of Tampa including, but not limited to, neighborhood plans, economic development plans, and community redevelopment area plans. These plans shall receive priority consideration in Station Area Plans. However, the existence of a current plan does not preclude change from occurring in station areas as opportunities for development and redevelopment will need to be reevaluated within station areas in order to encourage transit supportive densities and intensities. In areas where Station Area Plans are in conflict with existing adopted plans, the Station Area Plan shall supercede.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 17.4.5: Where Station Areas are located within or adjacent to Mixed-Use Corridor Villages (Objective 16 and associated policies), closely coordinate planning efforts to ensure consistency in approach and implementation strategies. Where feasible, combine Station Area Plan efforts with those for the surrounding or adjacent Mixed Use Corridor Village in order to streamline the process in order to encourage participation by stakeholders. Where form based codes are pre-exist the Station Area Planning process, amendments to the code may be required during the city-initiated rezoning phase to ensure that the specific target densities and intensities related to the station typologies will be accommodated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment:</strong> This Policy raises some questions relating back to Policy 17.3.7 regarding plan consistency. An existing Form-Based code implements the Comprehensive Plan. If a Station Area Plan is in conflict with a form-base code regulation, then chances are, the station area plan is not consistent with the comprehensive plan. <strong>Comment/Suggested Revision:</strong> Where Station Areas are located within or adjacent to Mixed-Use Corridor Villages (Objective 16 and associated policies), closely coordinate planning efforts to ensure consistency in approach and implementation strategies. Where feasible, combine Station Area Plan efforts with those for the surrounding or adjacent Mixed Use Corridor Village in order to streamline the process in order to encourage participation by stakeholders. Where form based codes are pre-exist the Station Area Planning process, amendments to the code may be required during the city-initiated rezoning phase to ensure that the specific target densities and intensities related to the station typologies will be accommodated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 17.4.6: Improvements proposed to typical roadway sections within Station Area Plans design elements, such as those as advocated for by the National Complete Streets Coalition should be considered.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment:</strong> Delete and refer to the Transit Station Area Design Principles. If strongly desired, consider amending the principles in the table.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Policy 17.4.7: Station Area Plans shall improve bicycle and pedestrian connectivity through the following:  
Requiring direct pedestrian routes within station areas. Sidewalk locations and widths should be based on the anticipated level of service needed within 0.5-mile walking distance from all station locations.  
Encourage the construction of sidewalks in excess of minimum width requirements, pedestrian plazas, and other amenities that will enhance the pedestrian environment in and around transit stations.  
Encourage the development of bike lanes on arterial and collector roadways transversing the Station Area.  
Ensure consistency with the City of Tampa Greenways and Trails Master Plan, and the Westshore Pedestrian Plan. | Comment: Not a principle - This policy is calls for a requirement in a station area plan. If the requirement is strongly desired, it should be moved to the list of items to be addressed in Station Area Plans. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy 17.4.8: Within Station Area Plans, specific guidelines shall be created that address streetscape design to encourage pedestrian activity and protection. These elements may include elements such as public art, street trees, pedestrian-scale lighting, arcades, awnings, wayfinding signage, and benches.</td>
<td>Comment: Not a principle - This policy is calls for a requirement in a station area plan. If the requirement is strongly desired, it should be moved to the list of items to be addressed in Station Area Plans. Also, we no longer develop “guidelines,” rather we create “standards” or “requirements” for design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 17.4.9: The City shall encourage, either through public investment, policy requirements or development incentives, publicly accessible open spaces around transit stations. Public open spaces shall be designed to be centers of activity within the Station Area Plans with programming of diverse activities encouraged.</td>
<td>Comment: Delete and refer to the Transit Station Area Design Principles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 17.4.10: Landscaping materials for areas included in Station Area Plans, both within and outside of public rights of way, shall be chosen to support local native ecosystems and minimize water usage.</td>
<td>Comment: This requirement is advocated in the City’s comprehensive plan, through other policies. Not necessary here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 17.4.11: Developers and the city shall consider designating publicly accessible spaces that could be utilized as urban gardens in the proximity of station locations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 17.4.12:</strong> In order to create an inviting pedestrian environment and an attractive street, encourage placement of new buildings along public streets or publicly accessible open spaces, with windows and doors at ground level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment:</strong> Delete and refer to the Transit Station Area Design Principles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 17.4.13:</strong> Where feasible, locate surface parking lots behind new buildings. Entrances to surface parking lots or garages should be placed on secondary side streets, minimizing conflicts on preferred pedestrian routes, especially those offering direct connections to station stops. In addition, active ground floor uses in liner buildings should be considered for stand alone garages. Driveways shall be designed to minimize adverse impacts to single family detached neighborhoods.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment:</strong> Delete and refer to the Transit Station Area Design Principles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 17.4.14:</strong> Building heights for new construction shall be regulated within approved Station Area Plans, and will be generally consistent with Station Typology characteristics as shown in Table 2. Generally building heights will be higher proximate to stations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment:</strong> Delete and refer to the Transit Station Area Design Principles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 17.4.15:</strong> Where appropriate, All new developments within station areas shall be required to place utilities underground.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment:</strong> Delete and refer to the Transit Station Area Design Principles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 17.4.16:</strong> Where the Transit Oriented Development Floating Designation covers areas that are designated with industrial or MA-P future land use categories, the existing categories will remain in place with no modification.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It may not be prudent to establish this policy before Station Area Plans are even initiated. In some instances, it may be in the best interest to recommend a land use change. Such changes could be problematic with this policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This policy indicates some confusion as to the regulatory impact of the TOD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Floating Zone. Again, consistency with the comprehensive plan needs to be further discussed.

**Comment/Suggested Revision:** Where the Transit Oriented Development Floating Designation covers areas that are designated with industrial or MA-P future land use categories, the existing categories prohibition to allowing residential development will remain in place with no modification. Increased intensity of non-residential uses may occur consistent with the Station Area Plan.
Melissa Zornitta

From: Aluotto, Peter [AluottoP@HillsboroughCounty.ORG]
Sent: Friday, December 18, 2009 2:51 PM
To: Melissa Zornitta
Cc: Harvey, Paula
Subject: T.O.D.
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Melissa: I have reviewed the proposed T.O.D. comp plan language as well as the C.O.T.’s comments. In general, I think many of the City’s points are valid but unlike the City, I will not comment line by line. Instead, I would prefer to give my understanding of what has been written and how I think it might be improved.

1. It was my understanding that the principle purpose of this exercise was to lay the groundwork in the comp plan for achieving T.O.D. within a generalized corridor without the need for a specific comp plan amendment each and every time. Much like the way we are treating I-4, when a station location is selected, the T.O.D. would plop down around it and a station area planning process would begin. Am I right so far?

2. Next, depending upon where those station locations are, a prototypical development style or pattern would be invoked and the land development regulations would be written accordingly. How am I doing?

3. When the station area plans and the land development regulations are adopted, the plans are implemented through the application of various incentives and/or development review procedures.

4. If I am correct on these points, then I recommend that the T.O.D. comp plan amendment focus more on defining what T.O.D. is, describing the prototype developments and developing the criteria for site selection and less on specific site details. It would be an improvement for me, if this amendment made clear that the first priority of T.O.D. is attracting transit ridership. In my opinion, if we fail to attract ridership, we will have failed our mission. If we accept the notion that this is about transit first and foremost, then we need to make sure that locations are selected that will accommodate the riders. This is where I think the Planning Commission can be of most help. Develop the criteria for the selection of those locations (just like I-4). Since this will probably not be the only line ever built, it makes good sense to come up with a reasonable guide for future lines.

5. We all know that development around the stations is important. This is why great care must be taken in site selection. There must be plenty of room for parking lots, drive aisles, stormwater, landscaping, and of course, buildings. As you have heard me say previously, in order to make this magic happen all within the 1/4 mile maximum distance that people are willing to walk in 90-degree heat, we must amend rules which require parking and retention on every single site. If and when we do that, we must either supply these commodities publicly or create a regulated enterprise to supply them.

6. The prototype chart is probably O.K. with a tweak or two here and there. But please don't put the "Table of Contents" of future station-area plans in the T.O.D. comp plan amendment. There is no reason that I can think of to tie your hands or ours once we get down to specific cases. Once we know the actual geography we are dealing with, we can better focus on the details.

7. Finally, when it comes to design elements, let's all try to remember that if we are successful, there will be neighborhood impacts. We can't increase densities, FAR's, and traffic in all directions within 1/2 mile of a station and not expect there to be neighborhood impacts. Those policies need to be re-examined. Similarly, we can't increase densities around the stations high enough to make transit successful with only neighborhood riders.
That's my story. Hope it helps. I'd be interested in your thoughts. -P

THINK AT THE SINK!
During this ongoing drought, every drop of water counts.
Learn how you can cut water use at http://www.hillsboroughcounty.org/water/conserve
Section IV

Joint Land Use Working Group Comments on Amendment Drafts
Agency | City Policy # | County Policy # | Comments / Recommended Revisions | Response
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Planning Commission | Table 2 | Add a footnote to the Station Typology table that allows for density bonuses and other incentives to be applied to a project to exceed the density/intensity range. | Goal has been added. | City Planning Center Station type has been added. 
City of Tampa | 17.0.0 Comment: Goal: locakay, but only seems to focus on economic success. Seems like the goal should also include something about improving mobility, reducing greenhouse gas emissions, improving livability, etc. | Goal has been edited to read: “A transit system that supports continued economic success, enhances livability, and promotes reductions in greenhouse gas emissions through use of alternative transportation modes.” | Goal has been added. | 
City of Tampa | 17.1.0 Comment: the objective establishes the intergovernmental coordination framework for the development and implementation of a fixed-guideway system. It is needed and allows for the policies to be supported by the uploaded tables. | Comment Noted. | Comment Noted. | 
City of Tampa | 17.1.1 Comment: This is a general coordination policy to ensure all the key stakeholders are involved in the development of the fixed-guideway system, including the identification of the station locations. No recommended changes. | Policy has been updated to include references to updated plans including the HART Alternatives Analysis and the Hillsborough MPO 2035 URP. | Policy has been updated to include references to updated plans including the HART Alternatives Analysis and the Hillsborough MPO 2035 URP. | 
City of Tampa | 17.1.2 Comment: While these tools served their purpose to get to this point, it seems that moving forward HART's Alternatives Study would be more relevant. Also, if not mistaken, the long-range Transportation Plan, once adopted in December, should supersede these plans. | Reference to updated HART Alternatives Study. | Reference to updated HART Alternatives Study. | 
City of Tampa | 17.1.3 Comment: The City will approve station locations, types and development characteristics. It is unclear as to how the recommendation will come to the City, considering the various entities involved in the process at this point. Additional clarification is needed. | City/County Policies have been modified to reflect that the City and the MPO will determine station area development characteristics, not the station locations themselves. | The City/County Policies have been modified to reflect that the City and the MPO will determine station area development characteristics, not the station locations themselves. | 
Joint Land Use Working Group | 17.2/ 17.3.0 51.1 / 52.1 | City/County Policies have been modified to include a practice statement that better defines what the designation is and how it operates. Objective 17.2 was left in the draft GOPs. | The Planning Commission has met with the DCA to discuss the proposal has largely been positive. The Planning Commission will continue to work with DCA to ensure that policies are appropriate. | 
City of Tampa | 17.2.0 | | | 
Joint Land Use Working Group | 17.2/ 17.3.0 51.1 / 52.1 | City/County Policies have been modified to include more clearly reflect roles in determining station area boundaries | | 
PCC | 17.2/17.2.1 51/51.1 Objective 51 & Policy 51.1 (Hillsborough), Objective 17.2 & Policy 17.2.1 (Tampa): I concur that some type of floating future land use designation is appropriate for transit station area planning. I do have a question, however, about whether this concept has been adequately vetted with DCA. Are they supportive of a floating designation as proposed by Hillsborough County and Tampa? Are they likely to place significant conditions on its use, and if so, will communities with fewer planning resources be able to meet those conditions? | City/County Policies have been modified to reflect that the City and the MPO will determine station area development characteristics, not the station locations themselves. | The Planning Commission has met with the DCA to discuss the proposal has largely been positive. The Planning Commission will continue to work with DCA to ensure that policies are appropriate. | 
City of Tampa | 17.2.1 Comment: What is the role of the TOD Overlay, is it a regulatory mechanism or a planning boundary? The boundary is easily part of the overall process to develop station area plans, which will then be used to guide development and improvements around each station. Consider deleting the objective and incorporating Policy 17.2.1 as part of Objective 17.3. | | | 
City of Tampa | 17.2.1 Comment: Objective 17.2.1 is duplicative and should be removed. The City and or County should consider modifying the objectives to reflect that the City Council will hold a public hearing to approve the TOD. Future land use floating designation initially requires land use either in the TOD or the TOD boundary. | The Local Planning Agency will make a recommendation to City Council for approval. It is expected that City Staff will review and make recommendations to City Council. | The Planning Commission has met with the DCA to discuss the proposal has largely been positive. The Planning Commission will continue to work with DCA to ensure that policies are appropriate. | 
Joint Land Use Working Group | 17.2/ 17.3.0 51.1 / 52.1 | City/County Policies have been modified to include more clearly reflect roles in determining station area boundaries | | 
City of Tampa | 17.2.1 Comment: Objective 17.2.1 is duplicative and should be removed. The City and or County should consider modifying the objectives to reflect that the City Council will hold a public hearing to approve the TOD. Future land use floating designation initially requires land use either in the TOD or the TOD boundary. | The Planning Commission has met with the DCA to discuss the proposal has largely been positive. The Planning Commission will continue to work with DCA to ensure that policies are appropriate. | The Planning Commission has met with the DCA to discuss the proposal has largely been positive. The Planning Commission will continue to work with DCA to ensure that policies are appropriate. | 
City of Tampa | 17.2.1 Comment: The designation remains “floating” because it can be applied to both zoning and rezone actions. | | | 
HART | 17.2.1 | Policy 17.2.1 – establishing a TOD floating zone for ½ mile of the station is appropriate. As a general rule ½ mile works well for residential, it should not apply to retail or office where it should extend a minimum of more than ½ mile. See the recommendations for some additional ideas on distance. | The policy has been modified to reflect the recommendations. | 
City of Tampa | 17.3.0 Objective 17.3 – preparing station area plans before construction is appropriate. Given the FTA New Start process plans ought to be underway well before construction. We recommend the planing be underway by the time you respond to enter PE. | The objective has been edited to reflect the recommended edits. | The objective has been edited to reflect the recommended edits. | 
PCC | 17.3.0 S2 Objective 51.5 & 51.5.1 (Tampa) - ridge to ridge floating zones will be determined based on the Ministry of Transportation (MTO) flood risk. | | | 
City of Tampa | 17.3.1 Comment: The intent of this policy is a little unclear, but it seems to call for removal of the former zoning planning area to an area that is more specifically defined by future station planning area definition. This change should be either drafted forward. Suggest adding a new policy calling for a City Council approval of the boundary just to separate the actions. | The Planning Commission has met with the DCA to discuss the proposal has largely been positive. The Planning Commission will continue to work with DCA to ensure that policies are appropriate. | The Planning Commission has met with the DCA to discuss the proposal has largely been positive. The Planning Commission will continue to work with DCA to ensure that policies are appropriate. | 
PPC | 17.3.1 | Policy 17.3.1 - the way this written, it does not appear that Council will be able to make changes to the UPA determination. | |
Following the adoption of a TOD Future Land Use Floating Policy 17.3.4 has been modified and Table 3 has been added.

Policy 17.3.2: Station Area Planning boundaries shall be approved by the Tampa City Council.

Policy 17.3.3: “once determined” to “once prepared” – Change "will" – it almost reads as though Council is obligated to approve – Council should have some discretion…

Policy 17.3.4: “once determined” to “once prepared” – Change "will" – it almost reads as though Council is obligated to approve – Council should have some discretion…

Policy 17.3.5: The intent of this policy is to require a Station Area Plan. Everything else in the plan is either not needed or redundant with other policies. The revision below is shorter.

Policy 17.3.6: The process of developing a Station Area Plan shall commence following the designation of a Station Area Plan boundary. The City of Tampa shall direct the preparation of a Station Area Plan for each station.

Policy 17.3.7: This policy places the financial requirement for public TOD planning on HART. In practice the most successful plans are ones where the local planning agency is also contributing funding. In private lead TOD planning there should also be a requirement to involve the transit agency in the planning. The list of activities for station area planning is non-exhaustive. The narrative has a tone of maximization of which is partners is for a "TOD policy, intent and minimums (where appropriate), incremental parking, reduction policies, station design evolution / timed requirements. Certainly those.

Policy 17.3.8: The policy refers to funding by the local agency as well as contributions by the transit agency. This is a more realistic requirement for public TOD planning on HART. In practice the most successful plans are ones where the local agency is also contributing funding. In private lead TOD planning there should also be a requirement to involve the transit agency in the planning. The list of activities for station area planning is non-exhaustive. The narrative has a tone of maximization of which is partners is for a "TOD policy, intent and minimums (where appropriate), incremental parking, reduction policies, station design evolution / timed requirements. Certainly those.

Policy 17.3.9: The first part of the policy referring to funding is not needed, but it doesn’t detract from the main intent of the policy. No changes recommended.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>City Policy #</th>
<th>County Policy #</th>
<th>Comments / Recommended Revisions</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Tampa</td>
<td>17.3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment: If this policy is desired, it should be made part of the station area plans. - Suggested Revision: Policy 17.3.6 is renumbered to be consistent with similar-use development incentives and density incentives are required and relocated to implement the intent of the station area plans.</td>
<td>Policy has been removed. Incentives are noted in Table 3 as a possible implementation strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HART</td>
<td>17.3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy 17.3.6 may be premature to determine whether you need development and density incentives. The market works in 17.3.4 is certainly ahead of, and regional, in that sense.</td>
<td>Policy has been removed. Incentives are noted in Table 3 as a possible implementation strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Tampa</td>
<td>17.3.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment: The key question that needs to be further discussed is how the City achieves and ensures consistency between the zoning code and the comprehensive plan, particularly where a station area plan recommends land use that is not allowed in a future land use plan category. Additional discussion is needed on this point. Some sort of consistency matrix or cross-reference table may be needed. Policy should also state a requirement to develop transit-supportive LDR’s (focus on Urban Design and tie into the Comprehensive Plan).</td>
<td>Station Area Plans will be consistent as they will be created following the guidelines adopted into the Comprehensive Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Tampa</td>
<td>17.4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment: Policies listed under Objective 17.4 are not consistent with the Transit Station Area Design Principles provided in an accompanying handout. They should be consistent.</td>
<td>Where appropriate, policies listed under Objective 17.4 have been moved to the Transit Station Area Design Principles Table, which is now referenced in Objective 17.4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Tampa</td>
<td>17.4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment: Potential Alternatives for Discussion:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.4.0</td>
<td>1) Replace the policies under 17.4 with the same language shown in the Transit Station Area Design Principles.</td>
<td>Objective 17.4 has been modified to reference the Transit Station Area Design Principles. Any overlap between the Design Principles and those under 17.4 has been removed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.4.0</td>
<td>2) Delete the policies under 17.4 and adopt one policy that establishes the Attachment as the Transit Station Area Design Principles. This would eliminate confusion, and in case of future amendment, eliminate creation of possible conflicts.</td>
<td>Where appropriate, policies listed under Objective 17.4 have been moved to the Transit Station Area Design Principles Table, which is now referenced in Objective 17.4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Tampa</td>
<td>17.4.0</td>
<td>3) Some of the policies under 17.4 are not principles, but are really requirements of a Station Area Plan. They should be deleted or moved.</td>
<td>Policy has been deleted and moved to Table 4 - Transit Station Area Design Principles. Reference to Complete Streets has been added.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Tampa</td>
<td>17.4.1</td>
<td>Comment: Delete and refer to the Transit Station Area Design Principles.</td>
<td>Policy has been deleted and moved to Table 4 - Transit Station Area Design Principles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.4.10</td>
<td>Comment: This requirement is advocated in the City’s comprehensive plan, through other policies. Not necessary here.</td>
<td>Policy has been deleted and moved to Table 4 - Transit Station Area Design Principles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Tampa</td>
<td>17.4.12</td>
<td>Comment: Delete and refer to the Transit Station Area Design Principles.</td>
<td>Policy has been deleted and moved to Table 4 - Transit Station Area Design Principles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HART</td>
<td>17.4.12</td>
<td>17.4.12 - “ensuring placement” of new buildings to create an active environment by placing things is likely to result in good outcomes. Building placement is a critical issue in TOD, this is an important area to increase the impact of the policies.</td>
<td>Policy has been deleted and moved to Table 4 - Transit Station Area Design Principles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Tampa</td>
<td>17.4.13</td>
<td>Comment: Delete and refer to the Transit Station Area Design Principles.</td>
<td>Policy has been deleted and moved to Table 4 - Transit Station Area Design Principles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HART</td>
<td>17.4.13</td>
<td>17.4.13 - locating parking to the side or behind buildings is a key design principle for TOD. Guidance to so “where feasible” seems overly weak.</td>
<td>Policy has been deleted and moved to Table 4 - Transit Station Area Design Principles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Tampa</td>
<td>17.4.14</td>
<td>Comment: Delete and refer to the Transit Station Area Design Principles.</td>
<td>Policy has been deleted and moved to Table 4 - Transit Station Area Design Principles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Tampa</td>
<td>17.4.15</td>
<td>Comment: Delete and refer to the Transit Station Area Design Principles.</td>
<td>Policy has been deleted and moved to Table 4 - Transit Station Area Design Principles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPC</td>
<td>17.4.15</td>
<td>53.14 Typologies Tables (both communities): Policy 53.14 (Hillsborough), Policy 17.4.15 (Tampa): I notice that the City of Tampa version of the typologies table has the footnote, “Residential Uses will not be permitted in areas where underlying future land use is light industrial, heavy industrial, or MA-P.” but the Hillsborough County version does not. In addition, Policy 17.4.15 (Tampa) states that industrial future land use categories will remain in place with no modification, but Policy 53.14 (Hillsborough) more ambiguously states that “industrial future land use categories are protected and do allow residential land use” (emphasis mine). Given that most of the typologies, objectives, and policies are identical between the two jurisdictions, these differences are striking. Are they intentional? If so, are these underlying reasons for the different approaches to industrial land retention, or simply community preference? Either way, since preservation of industrial land is an issue that we have struggled with in Hillsborough County, I would be interested to hear more about the decision-making that went into the policy. It would be helpful to have the same conversation on a region-wide basis since the potential benefits of preserving industrial land may not be understood by every community.</td>
<td>Table 2 has been edited for both City and County to note that residential uses will not be allowed within industrially designated Station Areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>City Policy #</td>
<td>County Policy #</td>
<td>Comments / Recommended Revisions</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPC</td>
<td>17.4.15</td>
<td>53.14</td>
<td>Policy 53.14 (Hillsborough): The first sentence of this policy states, “Allowable land uses defined in the underlying future land use categories cannot be changed through the station area planning process.” It’s sufficient simply to change the words and inten...</td>
<td>Policy has been edited to be consistent with City of Tampa Policy 17.4.3. The intent of the policy is to prohibit exiting allowable uses from being developed... The designation increases the available uses for underlying land use categories, with the exception of industrial land use categories which are prohibited from conversion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Tampa</td>
<td>17.4.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>It may not be prudent to establish this policy before Station Area Plans are even initiated. In some instances, it may be in the best interest to recommend a land use change. Such changes could be problematic with this policy.</td>
<td>This policy was added at the request of the Aviation Authority and the City of Tampa to ensure that industrial lands are protected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Tampa</td>
<td>17.4.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>(policy indicates some confusion as to the regulatory impact of the TOD Planning Area. Again, consistency with the comprehensive plan needs to be further discussed)</td>
<td>Comment Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Tampa</td>
<td>17.4.16</td>
<td></td>
<td>(The county land use policy itself contains the error. I recommend that the TOD Planning Area sections be changed to reflect the underlying land use categories, with the exception of industrial land use categories which are protected from conversion.)</td>
<td>County policy has been added to reflect that residential uses are not permitted in industrial future land use areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Land Use Working Group</td>
<td>17.4.16</td>
<td>53.14</td>
<td>The County land use policy itself contains the error. I recommend that the TOD Planning Area sections be changed to reflect the underlying land use categories, with the exception of industrial land use categories which are protected from conversion.)</td>
<td>County policy has been edited to reflect that residential uses are not permitted in industrial future land use areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple Terrace</td>
<td>17.4.16</td>
<td>53.13</td>
<td>There are several policies where the TOD Planning Area sections need to be changed. These changes need to be made in alignment with other City of Tampa policies.</td>
<td>County policy has been edited to reflect that residential uses are not permitted in industrial future land use areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Tampa</td>
<td>17.4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy 17.4.2 - protecting stable neighborhood character is always a good idea. Distance-based requirements such as 500’ are too far; Transit-Oriented Development provides increasing transition from the TOD boundary up to 15% of the TOD area.</td>
<td>Policy has been deleted and moved to Table 4 - Transit Station Area Design Principles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HART</td>
<td>17.4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy 17.4.2 - protecting stable neighborhood character is always a good idea. Distance-based requirements such as 500’ are too far; Transit-Oriented Development provides increasing transition from the TOD boundary up to 15% of the TOD area.</td>
<td>Policy has been moved to Table 4 and edited to allow for more flexibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPC</td>
<td>17.4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy 53.2 (Hillsborough). Policy 17.4.2 (Tampa): I’m pleased to see that there is a policy requiring transition between TODs and surrounding densities annually. I wonder if placing the transition between 0.15 and 0.5 miles from the station is appropriate. If we want true TOD to extend outward than 0.5 mile radius, shouldn’t the transition zone typically occur between 0.5 and 0.75 mile?</td>
<td>Policy has been moved to Table 4 and edited to allow for more flexibility in transition depending on context. However the 0.25-0.5 guidance remains in the policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Tampa</td>
<td>17.4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy 17.4.4 - sound planning practices typically include a review or consideration of all past planning efforts, including those that are adopted and those that are not. The review identifies policy, requirements, limitations, and potential opportunities that should be considered in the development of the current plan.</td>
<td>Policy has been moved to Table 4 Transit Station Area Design Principles. Reference to Complete Streets has been added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Tampa</td>
<td>17.4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sound planning practices typically include a review or consideration of all past planning efforts, including those that are adopted and those that are not. The review identifies policy, requirements, limitations, and potential opportunities that should be considered in the development of the current plan.</td>
<td>Policy has been moved to Table 4 Transit Station Area Design Principles. Reference to Complete Streets has been added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Land Use Working Group</td>
<td>17.4.4</td>
<td>15.34</td>
<td>Sound planning practices typically include a review or consideration of all past planning efforts, including those that are adopted and those that are not. The review identifies policy, requirements, limitations, and potential opportunities that should be considered in the development of the current plan.</td>
<td>Policy has been moved to Table 4 Transit Station Area Design Principles. Reference to Complete Streets has been added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Tampa</td>
<td>17.4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sound planning practices typically include a review or consideration of all past planning efforts, including those that are adopted and those that are not. The review identifies policy, requirements, limitations, and potential opportunities that should be considered in the development of the current plan.</td>
<td>Policy has been moved to Table 4 Transit Station Area Design Principles. Reference to Complete Streets has been added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Tampa</td>
<td>17.4.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sound planning practices typically include a review or consideration of all past planning efforts, including those that are adopted and those that are not. The review identifies policy, requirements, limitations, and potential opportunities that should be considered in the development of the current plan.</td>
<td>Policy has been moved to Table 4 Transit Station Area Design Principles. Reference to Complete Streets has been added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Land Use Working Group</td>
<td>17.4.6</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>Policy 53.5 (Hillsborough), Policy 17.4.6 (Tampa): I’m not entirely clear on what this policy means. What are the “typical roadway sections”? What types of improvements are being contemplated? Perhaps a better way to put this is if “correctly understood the intent” would be to say something like, “Special Area Plans should require roadways to be improved according to high-amenity design standards, such as those recommended by the National Complete Streets Coalition.”</td>
<td>Comment Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPC</td>
<td>17.4.6</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>Policy 53.5 (Hillsborough), Policy 17.4.6 (Tampa): I’m not entirely clear on what this policy means. What are the “typical roadway sections”? What types of improvements are being contemplated? Perhaps a better way to put this is if “correctly understood the intent” would be to say something like, “Special Area Plans should require roadways to be improved according to high-amenity design standards, such as those recommended by the National Complete Streets Coalition.”</td>
<td>Comment Noted. Policy has been edited and moved to Table 4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HART

17.4.7 - Policy has been deleted. Comment Noted

17.4.8 - Policy has been deleted. Comment Noted

17.4.9 - Policy has been deleted. Comment Noted

City of Tampa

General

50.1 - The broader term allows for other fixed-guideway systems (e.g. BRT) to be considered, though not directly addressed in the current legislation. Comment Noted

Charlotte Planning Director General

50.1 - The broader term allows for other fixed-guideway systems (e.g. BRT) to be considered, though not directly addressed in the current legislation. Comment Noted

City of Tampa

General

Page 1 – Why the change from rail to fixed guideway transit? Is there a definition of fixed guideway? Does this broader term potentially allow for rail to be dropped from the proposal? Comment Noted.

City of Tampa

General

Page 8 – On pg 5 Station Area FLU TOD Floating Designation is used as a term. On pg 8, 7 and 11 you use TODFLU Floating Designation. In other location it is a Floating. The term needs to be consistent throughout the plans. Comment Noted.

HART

General

Many of the issues on the TOD policy drop back to the question of how far is Tampa willing to go along the continuum of: 1) allowing TOD to happen; 2) encouraging TOD to happen; 3) incentivizing TOD to happen; 4) requiring TOD to happen. Comment Noted.

Hillsborough County Planning and Growth Management

General

The proposed framework tends to use the elected language (e.g., encourage, where feasible) when addressing development forms which are transit supportive. For example: “encourage pedestrian activity,” “encourage placement of new buildings along the street,” or “where feasible locate surface parking lots behind buildings.” The stringent language (shall and will) directs that a plan be done and in seeking to limit the impact of TOD. For example: “station area plans will be prepared” and the plans “shall protect” and “will encourage community character.” A too in the water’s progress, it will be important to take targeted steps to strengthen the policy. As currently drafted the policy was unlikely to score well on a TPA rating into solve Tampa very far down the path toward winning TOD on the ground. Comment Noted.

Hillsborough County School District

General

The impact of the proposed amendment on school enrollment cannot be determined until station areas have been identified and plans for the station areas have been prepared. Comment Noted.

Joint Land Use Working Group

General

Make terms consistent - Future Land Use designation vs. TOD designation. Terms have been made consistent throughout both City and County Policies. Comment Noted.

Joint Land Use Working Group

General

Clarify the purpose of the Future Land Use designation and how it is defined. Purpose of the designation has been included in the opening narrative. A specific definition for the TOD Floating Designation has been added.

Joint Land Use Working Group

General

Clarify roles and responsibilities between different agencies involved. Comment Noted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>City Policy</th>
<th>County Policy</th>
<th>Comments / Recommended Revisions</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint Land Use Working Group</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clarify/Define the City of Tampa’s role throughout process.</td>
<td>Comment Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Land Use Working Group</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td>The City is implementing form based codes - these are transit supportive and should be considered during the SAP.</td>
<td>Comment Noted - Input text code has been added as a regulatory tool in the Station Area Planning Components.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Land Use Working Group</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehensive Plan language can be changed over time, as needed.</td>
<td>Comment Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Land Use Working Group</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td>May we address pilot density and housing density.</td>
<td>Comment Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Land Use Working Group</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td>Need to reinforce transit support.</td>
<td>Comment Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Land Use Working Group</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td>Will need to advise PMK of Tampa’s comprehensive planning framework in application.</td>
<td>Comment Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Land Use Working Group</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td>Best practice drafting small documents from the context of the 2009 PMK guidelines - need to make sure we are using language that supports meeting these guidelines.</td>
<td>Comment Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Land Use Working Group</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td>The region needs a complete transit system.</td>
<td>Comment Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Land Use Working Group</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td>City is implementing form based codes - these are transit supportive and should be considered during the SAP.</td>
<td>Comment Noted - Form Based code has been added as a regulatory tool in the Station Area Planning Components.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Land Use Working Group</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum density is controversial in the City – it may not be the right time.</td>
<td>Per discussions with the Planning Commission and City of Tampa Staff, minimum densities are required in the Station Area Plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Land Use Working Group</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum densities and other more restrictive regulations should be considered closer to the station (1/4 miles, 1,000’, 500’, etc.).</td>
<td>Per discussions with the Planning Commission and City of Tampa Staff, minimum densities are required in the Station Area Plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Land Use Working Group</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum densities should be discussed in a political forum.</td>
<td>Comment Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Land Use Working Group</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td>Capital should be tied to developer.</td>
<td>Comment Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Wanch</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Parking is going to be needed in order to make the project work.</td>
<td>Comment Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Planning Organization</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td>The revised transit development text redefines multiple of the goals and principles of the Long Range Transportation Plan including Goal II: Promote Accessibility &amp; Mobility Options Available to People or Freight, and Enhance the Integration and Connectivity of the Transportation System Principle 2.3: Maximize Access to the Transportation System and Improve the Mobility of the Transportation Disadvantaged • Provide facilities and amenities that support transit uses, bicyclists, pedestrians, and the transportation disadvantaged. • Improve or expand the transportation disadvantaged system to encourage development. • Promote pedestrian and alternative services where development patterns do not support fixed route transit. Principle 2.2: Decrease Reliance on Single Occupancy Vehicles • Plan and develop a &quot;transit friendly&quot; highway system. • Promote transit services that are competitive with automobile travel. • Increase the percentage of nonmotorized alternative modes especially during peak hours.</td>
<td>Comment Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Chen (COT)</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Provide public parking as incentive (VA Beach Town Center - Identify Location and Incentivize Redevelopment - Branded Parking</td>
<td>Comment Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Chen (COT)</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Parking Density - Planning Density - Parking Density</td>
<td>Comment Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Chen (COT)</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Consider multiplier for underlying density criteria based on index.</td>
<td>Comment Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPO Transportation Section</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff has revised the proposal to modify and add policies related to Transit Oriented Development in the Future Land Use Element. The proposed amendment, in and of itself, will not change transportation impacts. However, additional transportation improvements might require amendment to the Long Range Transportation Plan and the Comprehensive Plan Capital Improvements Element. Inclusion of these improvements in the Long Range Transportation Plan Cost Affordable Plan will depend on priorities relative to other transportation needs and available revenues. Transit Oriented Development policies were used to support policies included in the update of the Long Range Transportation Plan.</td>
<td>Comment Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Kelly</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Public Private Partnerships – make sure that developers don’t have to go back for additional approvals</td>
<td>Comment Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Kelly</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Land Assemblage Land Use – In general, if people act at various levels, sector by sector by a real density bonus</td>
<td>Comment Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Smith (COT)</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Allow Parking Variable – Allow for Regulatory Flexibility - Joint Tower Date</td>
<td>Comment Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Smith (COT)</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Capital should be tied to a density bonus</td>
<td>Comment Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td>There needs to be a policy clause that clearly defines the rationale of the arbitrary ½ mile radius referred to within these policies. It also needs to be tied in with the surrounding corridor land use policies.</td>
<td>Narrative edits clarified process for adoption of TOD FLU Floating Designation and Station Area Plans. Much of descriptive narrative has been removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td>The narrative needs to explain these geographical location areas. Determine areas in which transit is clearly evident for planning purposes, but that the actual station plan could be much smaller, predicated on a number of factors, down to the point station itself and a park and ride. If you clearly establish the rationale, it will make the policies fit. Consider a policy stating that all of the City stations will be located within the Metroman Area Group.</td>
<td>Narrative has been edited to clarify.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provisions for the inclusion of land use incentives paragraph that these policies were also clearly stated to the transit line operators. Local cooperation in the county and regionally and ensure that a clear process has been developed allowing land use and transit to work in harmony.</td>
<td>Narrative has been edited.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Narrative has been edited to clarify.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>City Policy</th>
<th>County Policy</th>
<th>Comments / Recommended Revisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPC</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>PPC</td>
<td>Typologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It is in the interest of the region to have coordinated TOD policies and standards, and a common vocabulary to describe them, both for purposes of intergovernmental coordination, and to maximize our competitiveness for FTA funds. Assuming that Hillsborough's typologies will likely be adopted in their current form or something close to it, I concur that it would be best if the remaining communities in the TBARTA system were to use the same typologies or some that are very similar. The ranges of allowable dwelling units per acre, FAR, and height limits appear to me to be broad enough to accommodate the needs of a variety of communities. However, I know that in actual practice, there will almost certainly be requests for customization at the local level. Perhaps it would be appropriate to create a set of &quot;regional typologies&quot; that correspond to the Hillsborough set, but have broader ranges of densities, intensities, height limits, and allowable uses that communities can fit within. This would allow some customization for local character, but still provide a regional policy framework for FTA purposes. If deemed necessary, an additional category or two could even be added to accommodate station areas in more rural communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPC</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>PPC</td>
<td>Comment Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Setting broader ranges will require input from local jurisdictions, to find out what sort of densities and intensities they would consider appropriate and acceptable for their communities. However, it should be noted that, given the generally lower-density character of the established communities of the Tampa Bay region, and the preference of many citizens to maintain that character, there will likely be pressure to significantly decrease the lower ends of the ranges. It should be made clear to local government officials and staff that the ranges cannot be lowered dramatically, or they will no longer effectively support transit. Conveying this message will likely require some educational outreach at the local government level. Although this issue is probably less critical, another concern is that some communities may be unhappy with the typology names, particularly smaller jurisdictions who may want a &quot;Downtown&quot; or &quot;Town Center&quot; category. When describing the heart of one's community, &quot;Mixed Use Regional Node&quot; doesn't have quite the same cachet. I think it will be important, if not to integrate &quot;Downtown&quot; or &quot;Town Center&quot; directly into the names of corresponding typologies, at least to use the terms prominently in the descriptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPC</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>PPC</td>
<td>Comment Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>These typologies, objectives, and policies were developed by Hillsborough County and Tampa for use in their own jurisdictions. It is natural that other communities will have different priorities, which should be addressed in any set of model policies developed for the region as a whole. For example, the laws of intergovernmental coordination and economic development are critically important to Pasco County and the larger Tampa Bay region. I would suggest the addition of the following policies in the regional policy framework: Ensure that TOD planning is closely coordinated among local jurisdictions, including those in different counties. When a TOD is designated, assure that the potential for accommodating high-wage jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Jones (Newland)</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Land assemblage is a big factor in some areas (example was East Tampa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Jones (Newland)</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Accelerate development process if zoning is in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Jones (Newland)</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Focus on design and density - it can be dense but well executed - increased distance to parking could work with other amenities in place (top-of-the-line rentals, high-end retail, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBARTA LUWG</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>What do you like about the Tampa &amp; Hillsborough Station Area Typologies &amp; Design Principles? Design Principles are informative and well put together. Under Community Design Principles, it would be beneficial to mention concepts such as CPTED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBARTA LUWG</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>How could these be used in the TBARTA TOD Resource Guide (the &quot;toolbox&quot; of model policies and ordinances)? By providing a framework for zoning ordinances and regulations supportive of, and designed for TOD projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment Noted
The decisions have not been made to see if the tracks would be in the street or on exclusive right-of-way. In some areas it will probably have to be in the street. Hillsborough Area Regional Transit is studying the issue right now with their Alternatives Analysis. We’ve interviewed people around the county to see what worked and how system was set up. Train do slow down in downtown areas, but people know that a train is coming. For them it is a different experience, but not a problem.

An agency policy states: The use of ‘encourage’ before mass transit, mixed-use development, pedestrian and bike facilities, and other features vital to TOD. Train oriented development may not occur if it is encouraged rather than mandated. Though these policies are meant to be flexible they should include some parameters. Removing light terms such as “encourage” from several policies may provide better control over development types.

Several policies use the term “encourage” before mass transit, mixed-use development, pedestrian and bike facilities, and other features vital to TOD. Train oriented development may not occur if it is encouraged rather than mandated. Although these policies are meant to be flexible they should include some parameters. Removing light terms such as “encourage” from several policies may provide better control over development types.

On the topic of market analysis of station area, the analysis should be the first piece of the puzzle. Can the station be economically viable? We need to look at the area context, not only station area.

In the TOD Principles, Land Use Policies:

- The narrative on densities seems a little inconsistent on what it expects between ¼ and ½ mile. Residential can extend to ½ mile; non-residential should be no more than ¼ mile or even tighter.
- Encouraging a variety of housing types and price points makes sense, whether incentives are necessary needs to be better understood. In many communities affordable and work force housing are part of this conversation. Is that intended here?
- A minimum of 5 FAR for ½ mile from the station seems high.
- Encouraging FAR based entitlements for mixed-use needs to be linked to stronger design principles than the draft includes - building to the

Joint Land Use Working Group

Table 2

Remove the word “suggested” from Table 2.

*Suggested* has been removed from Table 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>City Policy #</th>
<th>County Policy #</th>
<th>Comments / Recommended Revisions</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HART</td>
<td>TOD Principles</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Connectivity Principles:</strong></td>
<td>Where appropriate, Transit Station Area Design Principles have been modified to reflect this comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOD Principles</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduced parking through maximums is an effective strategy, waiting until there are “certain development thresholds” is a weak and uncertain way to get there. You could consider parking districts, and disconnecting parking from individual building along with maximums as a better way to address phasing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOD Principles</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Community Design Principles:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOD Principles</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Think some clarification is needed on “permit TOD rezoning” ... once FTA has issued a ROD. By the time you ask for a ROD you want rezoning recommended and well underway.</td>
<td>Where appropriate, Transit Station Area Design Principles have been modified to reflect this comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOD Principles</td>
<td></td>
<td>•设置一个中间的政策是将政策的中间部分设置为：</td>
<td>Where appropriate, Transit Station Area Design Principles have been modified to reflect this comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOD Principles</td>
<td></td>
<td>• The middle ground I’d recommend in modifying the policy is:</td>
<td>Where appropriate, Transit Station Area Design Principles have been modified to reflect this comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOD Principles</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Density higher than the community average</td>
<td>Where appropriate, Transit Station Area Design Principles have been modified to reflect this comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOD Principles</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. A mix of land uses create an active place</td>
<td>Where appropriate, Transit Station Area Design Principles have been modified to reflect this comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOD Principles</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Reducing and managing parking</td>
<td>Where appropriate, Transit Station Area Design Principles have been modified to reflect this comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOD Principles</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Street, building and site orientation to favor pedestrians</td>
<td>Where appropriate, Transit Station Area Design Principles have been modified to reflect this comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOD Principles</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>City of Tampa</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOD Principles</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendation for encouraging and promoting TOD at these sites. Example Policy 14.4.4. (the proposal in Appendix I is at the general assembly necessary to support the ½ mile radius of the Station Area through pedestrian connections and bike lanes, then direct the development of the TOD and the inclusion of these in the plans. These policies, as well as policies of the Comp Plan, need to be measurable (per State Statute 163.388) and give clear guidance to those who must implement them through development of plans, codes, and individual site developments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOD Principles</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Planning Commission</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy 43.26: It is currently also required that the Local Planning Agency (LPA) work with the Transit Agency and Hillsborough County (HCC) Metropolitan Planning Organization to determine station locations, station types, and development characteristics for each of the proposed station stops.</td>
<td>Policy has been added to reflect that the Transit Agency or Metropolitan Planning Organization will determine station type and location, and the County will determine development characteristics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy 53.1: Change to address interface agreement on station area planning responsibilities. Allow for private entities to advance the funding for planning for an area.</td>
<td>Policy has been added requiring an interface agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy 53.2: Change to allow for regional agreements on station area planning responsibilities. Compare the policy with general station planning policy – boundary will be part of the station area planning process; not a separate step.</td>
<td>Policy has been changed to reconfigure the interface agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy 53.3: Regardles of how the Station Area Plan is funded, a public involvement program led by a public agency, that includes community stakeholders, public agencies, and private developers, shall be part of the Station Area Planning Process. This process shall include community engagement and public workshops.</td>
<td>Policy has been modified to reflect recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy 53.4: Add policy on how station area plan is adopted.</td>
<td>Policy has been added noting that Station Area Plans are adopted based on local government and the local planning agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy 53.5: Improvements proposed to typical roadway sections within Station Area Plans design elements, such as those advocated for by the National Complete Streets Coalition, shall be considered.</td>
<td>Policy has been modified with some additional provisions that are required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy 53.6: Surface parking lots shall be located behind new buildings. Entrances to surface parking lots or garages should be placed on side streets, minimizing conflicts with preferred pedestrian routes, especially those offering direct connections to station stops. In addition, active ground floor uses in lower buildings should be considered for parking garages.</td>
<td>Policy has been moved to Transit Station Area Design Principles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy 53.7: Surface parking lots shall be located behind new buildings.</td>
<td>Policy has been modified per this comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy 53.14: Allowable land use defined in the underlying land use categories cannot be changed through the station area planning process. Industrial future land use categories are protected and do not allow residential land uses.</td>
<td>Policy has been modified per this comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy 53.15: Improvements proposed to typical roadway sections within Station Area Plans design elements, such as those advocated for by the National Complete Streets Coalition, shall be considered.</td>
<td>Policy has been modified per this comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Planning Commission</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy 53.3: Station Area Plans shall improve bicycle and pedestrian connectivity through the following:</td>
<td>Policy has been modified per this comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Requiring direct pedestrian routes within station areas. Sidewalk locations and widths shall be based on the anticipated level of service needed within public rights of way 0.5-mile walking distance from all station locations.</td>
<td>Policy has been modified per this comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3.7</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Planning Commission</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy 53.7: Within Station Area Plans, specific guidelines shall be created that address streetscape design to encourage pedestrian activity and protection. These elements may include design elements such as public art, street trees, pedestrian-scale lighting, awnings, wayfinding signage, and benches. Active edges are required in all buildings within 0.5 miles of the station.</td>
<td>Policy has been moved to Transit Station Area Design Principles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Planning Commission</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional discussion centered on the overall planning concept. Are the various policies responsible for the overall station area plan? Of these, an overall program that ties everything into a TOD program? Are the station area plans reviewed as part of the county transportation plan?</td>
<td>Comment Noted. Narrative has been edited to reflect this recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Planning Commission</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td>Need to change the County Policy Number throughout Staff with Objective Study Policies will be 53.53</td>
<td>Comment Noted - County Policy numbering has been changed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Planning Commission</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td>New definition for feed gateway island</td>
<td>Definition has been provided for TOD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>City Policy #</td>
<td>County Policy #</td>
<td>Comments / Recommended Revisions</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td>Add policy that stations will be located within the Urban Service Area.</td>
<td>Policy has been added to the City and County Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reframe area of influence that goes into place for purpose of Station Area Plan study – occurs automatically once locally preferred alternative is chosen. No need for BOCC or City Council action at this point since it is just outlining the area to be studied really.</td>
<td>City has requested Council Action. Have left BOCC action within the policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td>Table 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>[In Station Typology Table under Mixed Use Regional Suburban,] Why is medical called out specifically? It would be covered under the office category.</td>
<td>Medical was requested specifically in comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td>Table 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Address how design chart fits in – we want to include that as an adopted piece of the policies.</td>
<td>Object 57 references the design plan guide table.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td>Table 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Look at TOD Employment Center for I-4 corridor for how to address the employment type stations.</td>
<td>Employment center station designation has been added to the Station Typology Table.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBARTA</td>
<td>Policy 53.14 (p. 12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Address how design chart fits in – we want to include that as an adopted piece of the policies.</td>
<td>Comment Noted. Policy has been edited for clarity. The intent was to expand upon existing allowable uses through the TOD FLU Floating Designation. The Station Area Planning process will modify the uses and densities/intensities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment C

Joint Land Use Working Group Comments
MEMORANDUM

TO: Melissa Zornitta, AICP, Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission
    Tony Garcia, AICP, Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission

FROM: Michael English, AICP
      Neale Stralow, ASLA, AICP
      Evan Johnson, AICP, LEED AP

DATE: January 19, 2010

RE: Transit Oriented Development Policies – Response to Final Comments

Introduction

Following the Joint Land Use Working Group (JLUWG) presentation on January 6, 2010, additional comments were submitted on the final version of the TOD Comprehensive Plan Policies. These comments and recommendations are listed below for review and use to complete final policy edits.

Comment Responses

1. Michael Chen – City of Tampa Economic and Urban Development Department
   a. In your definition of "Fixed Guideway", it seems there should be some distinction between actual rail of any kind and a dedicated bus corridor - the path of the rail cannot be changed without significant capital investment, which is not the case for a fixed bus route.

   Comment Response: In the memorandum submitted on September 21, 2009, there were two potential definitions of fixed-guideway included for review. These definitions are as follows:

   **TBARTA** Defines a fixed-guideway transit system as follows:
   A system of vehicles that can operate only on its own guideway (for example, rapid rail, light rail, bus rapid transit in exclusive lanes).

   The **Federal Transit Administration** defines a fixed guideway as follows:
   A “fixed guideway” refers to any transit service that uses exclusive or controlled rights-of-way or rails, entirely or in part. The term includes heavy rail, commuter rail, light rail, monorail, trolleybus, aerial tramway, inclined plane, cable car, automated guideway transit, ferryboats, that portion of motor bus service operated on exclusive or controlled rights-of-way, and high-occupancy-vehicle (HOV) lanes. (Defined in the description of the Rail and Fixed Guideway Modernization Grant Program (49 U.S.C 5309) at [http://www.fta.dot.gov/funding/grants/grants_financing_3558.html](http://www.fta.dot.gov/funding/grants/grants_financing_3558.html))

   The concern raised by the comment is that if the definition does not differentiate between possible fixed-guideway technologies, significant changes to the land use policies made be changed in and around new stations even if the investment in transportation infrastructure might not be sufficient to encourage TOD.
In order to ensure that the TOD policies (and their associated density/intensity increases) only become in effect as a result of a desired transit investment, it may be beneficial to make the definition more restrictive to ensure that the level of land use policy change is consistent with the level of transit investment being made. An alternative definition of Fixed-Guideway transit that may more closely meet this goal is as follows:

**Fixed Guideway (FG)**
A public transportation facility using and occupying a separate right-of-way (ROW) or rail for the exclusive use of public transportation and other high occupancy vehicles (HOV) or a fixed catenary system useable by other forms of transportation (National Transit Database Glossary [http://www.ntdprogram.gov/ntdprogram/Glossary.htm#F](http://www.ntdprogram.gov/ntdprogram/Glossary.htm#F))

b. The policy that "qualifies" properties within 0.5 miles of a fixed guideway station, does this require the entire property to be within 0.5 miles, or just some of the property? Example: Say you have a 10-acre site with unified ownership (although multiple folios are likely) where only the edge of the land is within 0.5 miles, does the whole site qualify?

**Comment Response:** The intent of this provision is that when the TOD FLU Floating Designation “lands” it will require the use of TOD zoning categories for redevelopment. These new zoning districts will help to ensure that new development/redevelopment is becoming more transit supportive even in advance of a Station Area Plan being completed.

It may be appropriate to consider clarifying this process further in the policies by defining more clearly which properties are to be included within the TOD FLU designation, and which are not. One possible way of doing this would be to include all properties that are at least 75% within the TOD Area of Influence (1/2 Mile from station) while allowing the possibility of properties that are less than 75% within the TOD Area of Influence to be included as part of an approved Station Area Plan boundary. This will allow City Council or the Board of County Commissioners to approve this expanded area in a public hearing.

c. I like the floating designation concept (I suggested this in my interviews with the MPO). However, the concept needs to include a "buffer zone" at its perimeter to reduce the possibility of drastically different densities/scales with adjacent properties just outside the TOD perimeter. Potential example: create a 200ft (?) perimeter (maybe inside the floating TOD area) where the densities are the average of the TOD and existing neighborhood and uses are restricted to those in the existing neighborhood.

**Comment Response:** This is a good point, and it will be important to ensure that the TOD zoning districts and the subsequent Station Area Plans are sensitive to surrounding conditions. The suggestion is potentially a workable one, and a policy like the one suggestion would likely help in ensuring that the neighborhood context is respected. However, since the objective is to keep the Comprehensive Plan policies as flexible as possible, another approach may be to encourage that this issue of transition to existing uses be considered in the drafting of TOD zoning categories. It should also be noted that in the current concept, there is a clear differentiation between the first ¼ mile radius, and the 2nd, in which densities and intensities are already expected to be moderated where appropriate to create a gradual transition of intensity back into the adjacent areas.

2. Linda Fisher, Pinellas Planning Council
   a. The original intent of the TOD Floating FLU Designation, as described to the Land Use Work Group, was that it would be adopted into the plan with the original round of
amendments, and then automatically applies to the station areas once their locations were identified, without requiring a further approval process by the local government. This no longer seems to be the case. Why did the approach change?

Comment Response: The process described in the comment is still the one intended. Following the approval of the amendments and the adoption of station locations the TOD FLU Designation will "land" and take effect. The policy needs to be edited to reflect this fact.

b. Policies 17.2.3 (Tampa) states that a public hearing will be required to apply the TOD Floating FLU Designation, but Policy 55.3 (Hillsborough) lacks this language. Will application of the TOD Floating FLU Designation require a public hearing? If not, what sort of approval process will be required?

Comment Response: The application of the TOD FLU Floating Designation will not require a public hearing to take effect. However, the subsequent rezoning to a TOD zoning category or the adoption of a Station Area Plan as a zoning overlay will require a public hearing. The policies will need to be edited to reflect that a public hearing is not required for the TOD FLU Floating Designation to "land".

c. What will happen if a local government chooses not to approve the TOD Floating FLU Designation in a given station area?

Comment Response: By approving the Comprehensive Plan Amendment, the local government is allowing for the TOD FLU Designation to be applied at the time when a fixed-guideway station locations are approved. However, the local government will have the opportunity to approve any interim rezonings to TOD districts (prior to the approval of a Station Area Plan), prior to the approval of the Station Area Plans, and the area-wide rezonings that will occur following the completion of a Station Area Plan.

d. Will the Planning Commission draft TOD zoning regulations for use by the local governments, as it has done with the comprehensive plan amendments?

Comment Response: The local governments will be drafting the changes to their Land Development Codes. The Planning Commission has created a Comprehensive Plan framework (only) to guide these changes to the Land Development Code, and the zoning-related changes will be made by the local governments.

e. It was indicated verbally at the last Land Use Work Group meeting that some type of interim TOD zoning regulations may be drafted for use during the transitional stage before a Station Area Plan is adopted. How would these differ from the final regulations? Who would draft them?

Comment Response: The intent has been that the City and the County draft TOD zoning categories that could be used prior to the completion and adoption of a Station Area Plan. It is foreseen that the final regulations would likely be modified versions of the interim TOD zoning designations. These generic TOD zoning designations may be modified as needed to fit the requirements of a Station Area Plan, and will be adopted as part of an Area Wide rezoning.

f. Policy 17.3.1 (Tampa), Policy 56.1 (Hillsborough), and the supporting text indicate that final Station Area Planning Boundaries will be defined for each station area by responsible entities designated in the interlocal agreement. What will happen if a local government chooses not to approve the boundaries as recommended?
Comment Response: The local governments will be presented with recommended Station Area Plan boundaries, but do have the discretion to modify the recommended boundaries in a public hearing if they determine that local conditions justify such a change.

g. What is the ballpark timeframe for the final Station Area Plans to be completed and approved?

Comment Response: As illustrated in Figure one, the goal is to have the Station Area Plans developed once Preliminary Engineering has begun, and approved prior to the beginning of system construction.

h. Will approval of the final Station Area Plans also require a public hearing process?

Comment Response: Yes final approval of the Station Area Plans will require a public hearing with the Planning Commission for recommendation and the local governments (Board of County Commissioners or City Council) for approval for what will effectively be area-wide rezonings.

3. Kami Corbett – NAIOP

a. I did have a question for you about the TOD zoning districts. It is not clear to me when those will be established. It looks like they come in after the Floating Designation but maybe before the Station Area Boundaries are set and certainly in advance of the SAP itself.

Comment Response: In support of this TOD Comprehensive Plan amendment process, it is expected that the City of Tampa Land Development Coordination and Hillsborough County Planning and Growth Management will have the opportunity to craft general TOD zoning designations that will be available for property owners to utilize following the designation of an area under the TOD FLU Floating Designation. If a property owner wishes to rezone prior to the completion/adoption of a Station Area Plan, they will be able to utilize one of the TOD districts. Otherwise, once the Station Area Plan process is complete, properties contained within will be part of an area-wide rezoning that will act as the implementation mechanism for the recommendations found within the Station Area Plan.

b. What is the thought process on what those Districts will look like?

Comment Response: At this time, it is not known how these TOD districts may look, as it is up to the local governments to determine what works best and where they are moving with regulations in the future. For example, the City of Tampa may choose a form-based code solution in order to make the TOD regulations more consistent with their efforts. It is anticipated, however, that the interim TOD districts will follow the intent of the goals and objectives of the station area planning process.

c. It seems to me that establishing the District before the Station Area Plan could lead to development that is inconsistent with a specific area plan.

Comment Response: If a property owner, prior to the adoption of a Station Area Plan, rezones his/her property using a TOD district, this existing condition will have to be
recognized and addressed in the Station Area Plan. The purpose of the interim TOD designations is to minimize the occurrence of development that is not supportive of transit. By requiring use of a more transit supportive zoning district, the outcomes will likely be better than utilizing existing zoning districts for the interim period. Again, it is anticipated that the interim TOD districts will follow the intent of the goals and objectives of the station area planning process.

d. How do we avoid a conflict between TOD zoning districts and the specific overlay districts for the station area plans?

Comment Response: See comment response above. The purpose of the interim TOD zoning districts is to reduce the likelihood of development occurring within a station area that is inconsistent with transit supportive land use patterns.

4. Nadine Jones HCAA
   a. The only comment I would offer (outside of retaining the language pertaining to M-AP/SP1-AP airport district zoning’s residential restrictions and land use approval involvement by the Aviation Authority, etc.) is that a marketing study should define the boundaries around the stations not the “responsible entities” (p.8, 17.3.1).

Comment Response: It is expected that the market study for a station area, or possibly a local group of station areas, will guide the densities/intensities that are articulated in the Station Area Plans for the entities preparing those plans as laid out in the interlocal agreement (including, but not limited to Planning Commission, HART, City of Tampa, Hillsborough County, Hillsborough County MPO, etc.), and approved by the local governments at public hearings. This process has been designed as such to allow market realities and realistic forecasts to guide the overall development potential of station areas while also allowing the concerns of existing neighborhoods to be addressed.

5. Jennifer Willman, TBARTA
   a. Is there a way to add something about corridor strategies? That was one thing that seemed to be missing that’s included in the TBARTA TOD Guiding Principles under Coordination #2 “Recognize that each TOD is different, and each development is located within its own unique context and serves a defined purpose in the context of the corridor and the regional system.” The principles are attached, hoping you have reviewed them for consistency with Planning Commission TOD policies. We would like to be able to show that the intent of each principle is met with a policy.

Comment Response: Provision #2 listed under the Coordination, Economic Development, and Implementation portion of TBARTA’s Transit Oriented Development Guiding Principles refers to the need to analyze each proposed corridor to determine the appropriate station types and character of development. This comment could be addressed in several different ways.

Provision #2 reads:

Recognize that each TOD is different, and each development is located within its own unique context and serves a defined purpose in the context of the corridor and the regional system.

First, a policy could be crafted to encourage HART to coordinate closely with the land use agencies (Planning Commission, City of Tampa, and Hillsborough County) to
analyze each corridor for the determination of station location and typology. This would ensure that a “one size fits all” approach is not utilized.

A second option could be, through the completion of the interlocal agreements for station area planning, to ensure that this collaborative corridor-level planning process is occurring, and recognizing the unique qualities of each corridor and station area.

6. GB Arrington

a. A floating zone has no legal authority until it is mapped or as you put it locked down. In my opinion, having the floating zone will help with FTA even before it's mapped since it shows the region has taken a positive and meaningful step. In Miami and Portland the floating zones were set-up to be locked down once the project was "real". Parsing what real means is the key here. To me "real" means you have a ROD, local funding and probably a full funding grant agreement. I think you want a high standard for when it becomes real in part because we are seeking a high standard from land use surrounding stations in responding to transit. Putting land use restrictions in place with an FFFGA still means you are a number of years ahead of operations, which is a good thing. Politically you should be able to argue the higher standard is appropriate at that time because the is real so the shift in land use policy is appropriate.

Comment Response: Currently, the Floating Designations, with the force of law upon adoption into the respective comprehensive plans, becomes in effect (lands) at the time of station location in the Locally Preferred Alternative. At the time of designation, alternative zoning designations will become mandatory for all rezonings that occur within the ½ mile radius of a designated station. This would effectively “raise the bar” for development standards prior to the adoption of a local funding referendum, a Record of Decision (ROD), or an approved Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA) from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA).

The recommendation in the comment above is that regulations requiring TOD development become active at the time of the ROD or at the time of an approved FFGA. As the policies have been written now, the Station Area Plans will be completed prior to the issuance of a ROD. However, the implementation of those plans will not occur until after the ROD has been executed through the adoption of area-wide rezonings connected with the Station Area Plans.

The issue is identifying the most appropriate trigger for the Floating Designation to “land” and when the new zoning requirements will take effect. It is recommended that the zoning designations be developed in conjunction with the Station Area Plans, and implemented at the time of ROD.

City of Tampa Comprehensive Plan Amendments

b. Figure 1: Transit System/TOD Planning

The chart provides a very useful framework to show the sequencing and interplay between the refinement of design for the transit system and undertaking TOD planning for the areas around stations. The importance of the chart is to help illustrate the ballet between land use and transit decision making – as the transit project becomes more “real” so do the land use requirements.

An important milestone in the land use part of the dance is the point at which the “Future Land Use Floating Designation” changes its status, gets mapped and guides land use decisions. Our advice based on experience in other communities is to map and apply the
zone once the transit project becomes “real” from a procedural and funding perspective. Most observers would agree the likelihood of the project being built significantly increases once you have a combination of a Record of Decision (ROD), local funding is in place and a full funding grant agreement (FFGA).

Figure 1 includes the step “apply TOD Floating Designation” during AA, in my opinion that is premature assuming that is the point where the floating zone gets mapped and applies legally. A more appropriate time is at the end of PB. This lines up with the ROD and a FFGA. At that point there will be enough certainty about the project to require future development to be transit-supportive.

Comment Response: On September 16, 2009 comments were received on the DRAFT Comprehensive Plan policies from PB Americas and HART. Within these comments it was recommended that Station Area Planning begin during the Preliminary Engineering stage of the New Starts process. The comment above argues that the regulatory requirements should not go into place until such time that the project has passed certain hurdles. As discussed in the comment above, it is recommended that the TOD zoning designations be developed in conjunction with Station Area Plans, but that they not take effect until the ROD is issued at the end of Preliminary Engineering.

c. Page 2 - The Goals, Objectives, and Policies are intended to accomplish three things. The second states, “Permit, by Transit Station Area Typologies (Table 2), the necessary densities/intensities and land use characteristics needed for successful Transit Oriented Development.” Because density/intensity is an essential component for TOD, this should say “require”. It is understood that “requiring” specific land use characteristics (mix) may be too prescriptive and “permit” could continue to apply to this part of the statement.

Comment Response: This language is in the narrative prior to the Goals, Objectives, and Policies (GOPS), and is meant to summarize the intent of the GOPS. If it is agreed that the timing for implementing the TOD requirements should move to when a Record of Decision is issued, then it would be appropriate to change the language noted above to state that the necessary densities and intensities be required.

d. The next Goals, Objectives, and Policies section related to the planning framework has a third item addressing plan adoption and rezoning. It should also indicate that design guidelines, consistent with organization shown Table 3 and the principles in Table 4 will also be implemented.

Comment Response: This recommendation is probably a moot point since within the Goals, Objections, and Policies there are already references to how the Station Area Plans should include the components outlined in Table 3 and follow the Design Principles as shown in Table 4.

e. Page 8 - Policy 17.2.2 and the accompanying Table 2 should clarify that the density ranges are required, not recommended. This would be consistent with the Land Use Principles presented in Table 4.

Comment Response: The specific range of density/intensity is to be determined during the Station Area Planning process. Language could be added to this policy that requirements for increased densities/intensities (and minimum densities as illustrated in Table 4) to be implemented during the Station Area Planning phase.

f. Figure 1 - This figure presents the information very well. The following amendments are recommended:
i. Between Final Design and Construction Begins, the Local Planning Agency role should say “Review Station Area Plans, Develop Implementing Regulations and Guidelines, and Recommend Adoption. This would include an arrow pointing up to the Local Government bubble regarding Capital Improvement Program, etc.

ii. Between Final Design and Construction Begins, the Local Government role should add “Adopt” before Station Area Plans/Areawide Rezonings.

iii. Between Construction Begins and Operation Begins a new bubble for Local Planning Agency should be added that says, “Development Approval Based on Adopted Station Area Plan Policies and Requirements”

Comment Response: These changes seem appropriate, especially since it is noted in the GOPS that Figure 1 is for illustrative purposes only.

g. Table 4 - The principles presented here are very sound and comprehensive. Two minor amendments are recommended for the Connectivity Principles:

i. Bicycle improvements mentioned should not be limited to bike lanes on major streets. While these improvements are very important, other types of bicycle facilities, such as bicycle boulevards (interconnected routes that utilize low traffic streets), buffered bike lanes (bike lanes with a buffer strip adjacent to the travel lane), and separate pathways should also be included as options.

ii. The street networks should note the importance of smaller block lengths and block perimeters.

Comment Response: These seem like good additions to the Design Principles Table as long as they are clarified to be optional and not as requirements.
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h. Page 4 - At the top of this page regarding Goals, Objectives, and Policies to accomplish the following, I have the same comment as the top of page 2 of the city’s amendments. Minimum densities should be “required”, not just “permitted.”

Comment Response: See comment response to item c. above.

i. The next Goals, Objectives, and Policies section related to the planning framework has a third item regarding plan adoption and rezoning. Similar to the city’s comparable statement, it should also indicate that the design guidelines in Table 3 and principles in Table 4 will also be implemented.

Comment Response: See comment response to item d. above.

j. Page 15 (Labeled Page 1) - The Residential Gross Density column should be modified in two places:

i. Residential uses “shall”, not “may”, be allowed because residential uses are highly desirable or necessary ingredients for the four station types listed.

ii. Residential density ranges should be “required”, not “allowed.”

iii. The last sentence in the Maximum Floor Area Ratio or Square Feet column should be amended to “require” rather than “allow” 0.5-7.0 FAR.

k. Figure 1 and Table 4 - The comments made regarding the city’s Figure 1 and Table 4 apply here as well.

Comment Response: See City of Tampa policy responses.
7. Cathy Coyle – City of Tampa Land Development Coordination

a. Objective 17.1: There seems to be a word or 2 missing. To ??? for a fixed-guideway transit system that creates connections throughout the City of Tampa and to locations throughout the Tampa Bay Region.

Comment Response: In the clean version of the policies, the Objection reads "To Plan for a fixed guideway transit system...". This is the appropriate wording.

b. Policy 17.1.1: change "no later than the beginning of Preliminary Engineering" to "no later than approval and issuance of local and federal funding for the fixed-guideway transit system".

Comment Response: This change is appropriate given the proximity that we are already to the beginning of Preliminary Engineering. However, Station Area Planning should not begin until after this Interlocal Agreement has been approved.

c. Policy 17.1.2: Might want to add "approved" prior to HART Alternatives Analysis to show that we're supporting the study that will eventually be approved by the FEDS. Policy is strangely stated, though, with phrase "build upon" - not sure what this means other than "continue to support".

Comment Response: Agreed that the world “approved” should be added in front of HART Alternatives Analysis. Other recommendation is semantics – either wording is appropriate.

d. Policy 17.1.3: Policy is poorly written - tho whom do we recommend?? Why is HART not part of the coordination?? It seems that there is a missing piece at the end of the policy that should clearly state that this coordination and recommendation happens as part of the Station Area Planning process.

Comment Response: This policy should be modified to state that the coordination shall take place with HART as well. Note: This may be a good policy to include some of the language from TBARTA’s comment above. HART, LPA, MPO, and the City should coordinate on this issue.

e. Policy 17.2.3: Policy not needed - Council is making the general policy decision on the floating designation when they adopt the overall language - there is no need for an additional public hearing - it causes confusion.

Comment Response: As discussed during the Joint Land Use Working Group, this policy should be removed.

f. Policy 17.2.4: Change "Rezone the site utilizing one of the TOD zoning designations" to "Rezone the site utilizing an appropriate and applicable TOD zoning designation"

Comment Response: Proposed language is acceptable and better articulates the intent of the original policy.

g. Policy 17.3.4: Clarify the timing on the "designation of the Station Area Boundary" to include "approval and issuance of local and federal funding for the fixed-guideway transit system". Also add "the City of Tampa in coordination with HART, shall begin preparation of priority Station Area Plans" on the 2nd and 3rd line.
Comment Response: This comment is consistent with the recommended change in timing that was noted in the PB/HART Comments. The trigger, whether the completion of the Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA) or the Record of Decision (ROD), needs to be consistent throughout the policies.

8. JLUWG Notes January 6, 2010

a. 17.4.1 /57.1 – There were questions of the priority of SAP over existing community neighborhood plans. In the County, Community Plans should get precedence over the Station Area Plans. At the very least there should be a dispute resolution process if there are still conflicts.

Comment Response: There may be a need for language within this policy that more clearly articulates how the Community Plans will be addressed. During the JLUWG we discussed the fact that many of the Community Plans that will likely be affected are already planning for a more transit supportive land use pattern, and we also discussed the importance of the proposed transit investment and the potential need for some changes to be made in order to make the system successful.

b. Decision making bodies need to make a determination as to which plans take precedence.

Comment Response: During the public hearings for these amendments, the City Council and Board of County Commissioners will be deciding if they wish to accept the amendment as is or make modifications.

c. Typo - (extra periods) in Future of Hillsborough Land Use Classification TOD Future Land Use Floating Designation, Typical Uses and Specific Intent columns

Comment Response: Comment noted. Typographical error should be completed.

d. 57.4 – Change wording in policy to community plans "shall" be updated.

Comment Response: Agree with recommended change.

e. Need to define the "others involved" in station selection process, interlocal agreement.

Comment Response: The purpose of not including the specific names within the policies was to allow for some flexibility in determining the appropriate agencies and entities that need to be involved. Recommend that the policy does not change.

f. How compliant are local community plans with TOD provisions. Again who resolves future issues?

Comment Response: As discussed and noted in the comment response above, the Station Area Planning process will recognize adopted community plans, where applicable. During that process, it is envisioned that if necessary, amendments may be recommended to the Community Area Plans to ensure that the land use patterns around proposed stations are transit supportive.

g. 17.3.1 - Planning boundary determined by "responsible entities" – Who are these entities?
**Comment Response:** See comment above. The Station Area Planning boundaries will be drafted by land use and transportation agencies, and brought to the local government for adoption at public hearing.

h. 17.2.3 – There isn’t a need to have City Council or the BOCC Approve the ½ mile Area of Influence. By approving the amendment they are supporting the concept of a floating designation. The action will be needed to approve the final Station Area Plan boundaries, and to adopt the Station Area Plans.

**Comment Response:** Agreed. Recommend removing policy from both City and County Comprehensive Plans.

i. 55.4 - County PGM questioned how the interim TOD zoning is supposed to work. If there aren’t yet TOD categories, should PD zoning be required?

**Comment Response:** This is a possible solution, though if implementation timing changes consistent with the recommendations from PB Americas above, then it likely won’t be needed. If the implementing regulations are put into effect following the Record of Decision, the County will have had ample opportunity to develop specific zoning designations to be adopted with Station Area Plans.

j. When will the station types be identified? Who will participate in that process?

**Comment Response:** Station area types will be identified prior to completion of the Alternatives Analysis process. HART is currently working with the Local Planning Agency, the City of Tampa, and Hillsborough County to determine what the station types should be. HART will be holding a series of workshops for public input in this process as well.

k. HART - Economic development and land use extremely important to federal process.

**Comment Response:** Comment noted.

l. County PGM asked whether the potential for rezoning consistent with existing FLU will be allowed prior to an Area of Influence being defined?

**Comment Response:** Prior to the TOD FLU Floating Designation “landing”, properties will be allowed to rezone consistent with their Comprehensive Plan FLU designations.

m. Difference between city/county on the conversion of industrial land/uses. The County stated that that residential should be allowed, and that residential is less of a threat than commercial uses, which are already allowed in Industrial designated areas.

**Comment Response:** The City does not want interference with industrial land use categories, and wishes to continue the prohibition of residential uses. This is a County PGM decision as to how they wish to deal with industrial Future Land Use designations.
RESOLUTION

ITEM: Tampa: CPA 09-07, The Greater Seminole Heights text amendments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AYE</th>
<th>NAY</th>
<th>ABSENT</th>
<th>DATE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bruce P. Cury</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>January 25, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terri G. Cobb</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank M. Chillura</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member-at-Large</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Buford</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek L. Doughty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller Q. Dowdy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward F. Giunta, II</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivian M. Kitchen</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hung T. Mai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary D. Sears</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On motion of Commissioner Jill Buford, Seconded by Commissioner Terri G. Cobb

The following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission has developed a Comprehensive Plan for the City of Tampa entitled Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy A Livable City, pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 163.3161, Florida Statutes, which was adopted by Tampa City Council on February 9, 2009, as amended; and;

WHEREAS, Tampa City Council adopted the Procedures Manual for Amendments to the Tampa Comprehensive Plan on October 9, 1986 and subsequently amended; and

WHEREAS, the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission has received a City-initiated petition for amendment to the Future Land Use Map of the Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy: A Livable City by the August 2009 submittal deadline; and

WHEREAS, the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission has reviewed the request to amend the Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy A Livable City Future Land Use Plan; to adopt the attached objectives and policies and associated text acknowledging the Greater Seminole Heights Vision Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission has reviewed the proposal, has considered existing and expected
future development patterns and community facilities in the respective area, as well as the adopted goals, objectives and policies of the Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy A Livable City as stated in the staff report as follows:

Objective 23.5: The future of community planning will utilize form based code initiatives to assist in the development of a Vision Plan and creation of a community-specific Form Based Code for each Community Planning area.

Policy 23.2.2: The City shall create area specific Vision Plans, based on the Community Planning method, for the Greater Seminole Heights, Tampa Heights, and 40th Street Community Planning Areas by 2015, that clearly document and describe community assets, opportunities and challenges, community, character, conceptual street cross-section designs, and basic building forms for residential, non-residential, and mixed use.

Objective 15.1: Support the Urban Village designations that produce a distinctive, high-quality built environment whose forms and character respect Tampa’s unique historic, environmental, and architectural context, and create memorable places that enrich community life.

Policy 15.1.2: Mix of uses - Urban villages contain most of the following uses which typically make up what is considered a traditional and livable community: single and multi-family residential, neighborhood serving commercial, schools, parks, a central gathering place, mass transit and safe, walkable pathways that connect people to all areas of the village. Work towards creating a mix and placement of these uses that works for the character of the village and creates a vibrant community setting.

Policy 15.1.3: Economic Opportunity – Recognize that urban villages are very livable and sustainable form of development. Continue to emphasize the compact and mixed use nature of
these villages. Look for ways to make it easier to create this type of development pattern.

**Policy 15.1.4:** *Mobility Choices* – The City shall ensure that redevelopment projects in urban villages are designated for pedestrian traffic and connect and support a citywide transit system.

**Policy 15.1.9:** *Choice of Lifestyle* – Mixed use projects that integrate different classifications of uses (e.g. commercial and residential) are preferred over single use projects, and will be incentivized.

**Objective 16.1:** The transformation of major corridors to include a broader mix of uses, both horizontal and vertical, that provides opportunities for medium and higher density housing, while also addressing local and citywide demand for retail and services.

**Policy 16.1.1:** *Redeveloping Automobile-oriented Corridors* – The City shall promote redevelopment of existing automobile-oriented corridors and the upgrading of existing commercial development to create vibrant, mixed-use boulevards that balance efficient movement of motor vehicles with the creation of attractive pedestrian-friendly districts that serve the adjoining neighborhoods as well as passing motorists.

**Policy 16.1.3:** *Higher Intensity Nodes* – The City shall support proposals to convert non-residential properties along mixed use corridors, between major intersections, to residential or mixed use residential uses and ensure the development is compatible with surrounding land uses and has adequate access to transit services and community services.

**Policy 16.1.4:** *Sidewalks and Pedestrian Amenities* – The City shall require that sidewalks along mixed-use corridors are wide enough to accommodate significant pedestrian traffic and the integration of public amenities and landscaping.
Policy 16.1.5: Corridor Transit – The City shall encourage design and development along mixed use corridors that promotes the use of public transit, pedestrian and bicycle travel that maximizes personal safety through development features such as:

- Buildings oriented to the street and transit services;
- Safe and convenient access for pedestrians between buildings and transit stops;
- Support the Greenways and Trail Master Plan when applicable;
- Parking areas, and other buildings and facilities; and
- Roads designed for automobile use, efficient transit service as well as pedestrian and bicycle travel.

Policy 16.1.6: Visual and Physical Character – The City shall ensure that the introduction of higher-density mixed-use development along major arterial corridors is compatible with adjacent land uses, particularly residential uses by requiring such features as:

- Buildings setback from rear or side yard property lines adjoining single family residential uses;
- Building heights stepped back from sensitive adjoining uses (including historic districts) to maintain appropriate transitions in scale, massing and height and to protect privacy and solar access;
- Landscaped off-street parking areas, loading areas, and service areas screened from adjacent residential areas, to the degree feasible and;
- Lighting shielded and directed downward to minimize impacts on adjacent residential uses.

Policy 16.1.7: Differentiation of the Corridors – The long-term development direction is to create linear mixed use villages in these corridors. Three types of mixed use corridor villages are defined and they are based on the scale of the development pattern to be expected – suburban mixed use scale corridor village (refer to the SMU-6 plan category for more detail); community mixed use scale corridor village
Policy 16.1.9: Redevelopment – The City shall promote redevelopment patterns and streetscape improvements that transforms the visual and physical character of these corridors by the following:

- Put buildings close to the sidewalk. This will create a consistent “street wall”, will allow through traffic to see shops and will make it interesting for people to walk through the corridor;
- Introduce taller buildings consistent with the underlying plan category;
- Consider placing parking in the rear of the building;
- Create and attractive front and rear façade and entry for pedestrians;
- Create pedestrian pathways between the uses in the corridor and the neighborhood behind;
- Reduce visual clutter of signs through a consistent sign program;
- Remove utility poles and put utilities underground;
- Plant street trees and provide street furniture; and
- Always try to diversify the types of uses.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission finds the requested Tampa Comprehensive Plan Amendment 09-07 to add goals, objectives, policies and strategies included in the attached document to the Tampa Comprehensive Plan to further the implementation of the Greater Seminole Heights Vision Plan CONSISTENT with the Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy A Livable City and recommends Tampa Comprehensive Plan Amendment 09-07 be approved.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
Meeting Date: January 25, 2010 Public Hearing
Agenda Item: Tampa: CPA 09-07 Greater Seminole Heights Vision Plan Text Amendment

SUMMARY
The Planning Commission will be reviewing and making a recommendation to Tampa City Council on a neighborhood vision plan and text amendments to be part of the Tampa Comprehensive Plan. The amendments were initiated by the City of Tampa to add goals, objectives, policies, and strategies regarding the Seminole Heights Vision Plan.

BACKGROUND
The Planning Commission is required to make recommendations to the Tampa City Council on all proposed changes to the Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy: A Livable City pursuant to Chapter 163, Part II, Florida Statutes and Chapter 97-351 Laws of Florida, as amended.

Pursuant to Goal 22, Objective 22.1, Policy 22.1.2, and Goal 23, Objective 23.5, Policies 23.2.1 through 23.2.14, the Greater Seminole Heights Vision Plan has been developed as the Community Plan for the area. The Vision Plan, as well as the proposed objectives and policies, shall be used to guide the future growth, land development through the utilization of form-based codes, public improvements, and decision-making of the designated community planning areas.

The amendment recognizes the assets of the area and will further the strategies set out within the goals, objectives and policies of the Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy: A Livable City.

RECOMMENDATION
It is recommended that the Planning Commission APPROVE the attached resolution finding the amendment CPA 09-07 CONSISTENT with the Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy: A Livable City and forward this recommendation to the Tampa City Council.

Prepared By: Tony LaColla, AICP, Senior Planner
Date Prepared: January 12, 2010
Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy: A Livable City

Comprehensive Plan Amendment Report CPA 09-07
Seminole Heights Vision Plan Text Amendments

Plan Amendment Description

The Tampa Comprehensive Plan establishes policies calling for the development of form based community plans and subsequent regulating plans. The proposed TEXT AMENDMENTS request will further the intent of the comprehensive plan by incorporating objectives and policies into the Tampa Comprehensive Plan, Building Our Legacy: A Livable City, for the purpose of facilitating the implementation of the Greater Seminole Heights Vision Plan.

- See Attachment A for proposed text amendments
- See Attachment B for Greater Seminole Heights Vision Plan

Tampa Comprehensive Plan Context

Tampa’s Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy: A Livable City was adopted in February, 2009. The Plan articulates a vision for how Tampa will accommodate the growth of the city to include 92,000 additional residents and 132,000 new jobs over the next 20 years, while promoting the values of its citizens:

LIVABILITY (Tampa is a place where diverse people find it easy, safe and enjoyable to live.)
PROSPERITY (A Tampa that is focused on the quality of life for all its people must be a Tampa that is economically healthy, with a broad mix of good jobs.)
RESPECT (The living systems which support us are taken care of and passed on to future generations in better shape.)
RESILIENCE (The systems that support our day to day living can deal with uncertainty and cope with the shifts and shocks we face in the future.)

The Plan’s growth management strategy organizes the City into Planning Districts encouraging most new growth to locate in places designated as Business Centers, Urban Villages or Mixed Use Corridor Villages. Each Business Center and Urban Village has a secondary plan indicating the amount of growth the City is planning
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in the next 20 years. The Plan includes policies describing how the City intends to serve this growth with mobility options and other infrastructure facilities.

Overall Context:

The core Seminole Heights historic area was born in 1911 by T. Ray Young who owned 40 acres of land and dreamed of developing Tampa’s first suburb three miles north of downtown. The majority of development around the original Seminole Heights development came during the “Florida Boom” years (1919-1929). Today Seminole Heights is considered one of Tampa’s oldest residential areas and is home to two national historical districts and one local historic district. Greater Seminole Heights covers 4.74 squares miles and is comprised of three stable single family neighborhoods with a population of 22,026 (2007 Planning Commission estimate), with 9,884 households (2007 Planning Commission estimate).

Historic bungalows have been restored, parks cleaned, and residential areas made into safe and inviting places once again through a reduction in crime and sense of personal ownership for the neighborhood. The area offers cultural and historical resources, a diverse population, a defined and well-traveled street grid, multiple bus lines, stable residential areas, eclectic architecture, an integrated park system, natural resources, and linear commercial corridors. Its proximity to the City center coupled with a limited diversity in commercial businesses creates an excellent redevelopment opportunity.

Three active neighborhood associations, respected crime watch organizations, and a strong business guild have created a cohesiveness between residents who are determined to see Seminole Heights continue to redevelop and prosper. Working together with the City of Tampa, residents and business owners continue their improvements.

While residential areas have seen substantial investment, the commercial corridors and neighborhood activity centers have seen little redevelopment. Uses in place three decades ago have changed little despite major economic and demographic shifts in the surrounding residential areas. An overabundance of auto repair facilities, used car lots, and office uses brings very little commercial diversity to the areas residents and existing businesses. Residents must travel to other parts of the city for amenities typically found within stable neighborhoods. Seminole Heights lacks neighborhood amenities such as restaurants, cafes, dry cleaners, entertainment venues, retail, or professional services such as doctors, lawyers, and
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banking. Few people from other neighborhoods travel to Seminole Heights other than to use its major thoroughfares.

For several years, residents and business owners requested a neighborhood plan that could not only continue revitalization of residential areas, but also kick start revitalization of commercial corridors. In early 2008, the City of Tampa initiated a form based design planning effort for the Greater Seminole Heights Area, comprised of three neighborhood associations: Old Seminole Heights, South Seminole Heights, and Southeast Seminole Heights. This community-wide exercise involved stakeholders of the area consisting of: property owners, residents, business owners and other parties interested in establishing a vision for Seminole Heights.

Based upon requests from the local associations the City chose Greater Seminole Heights to be part of its initial form based planning initiative. The area was chosen due to its strategic location and unique physical characteristics which include: an existing historic residential district; being bisected by four major arterial roads and interstate; having the Hillsborough river serve as its northern and western boundaries; its proximity to the downtown core and, most importantly, proactive neighborhood associations.

The “Big Picture” Tampa Vision Map:

The Greater Seminole Heights Vision Plan and proposed map and text amendments are consistent with the overall guiding strategies for creating a Livable City as defined in Chapter Two of the Tampa Comprehensive Plan. The strategy calls for redevelopment, infill, and new growth to be targeted into compact, mixed-use, and walkable villages that are connected to a regional transit system.

- **Strategy 1:** Organizing Planning Districts – Getting Transit Ready
- **Strategy 2:** Strengthening our Diverse Neighborhoods
- **Strategy 6:** Building on our Assets
- **Strategy 7:** Growing Economic Prosperity

*Strategy 1: The Districts*

**Objective 1.1:** Designate 5 planning districts: University, Central Tampa, Westshore, New Tampa and South Tampa as an opportunity to build a livable and sustainable city.

*Greater Seminole Heights Vision Plan*
Policy 1.1.1: Recognize the Central Tampa District as the primary urban core, civic and cultural center.

Policy 1.1.2: Foster a vibrant urban lifestyle through mixed use development with entertainment and cultural facilities.

Policy 1.1.3: Protect and build upon the heritage assets found in the diverse neighborhoods in the district.

Policy 1.1.11: Encourage transit oriented, pedestrian-friendly mixed-use development in the Westshore, Central Tampa and University planning districts.

The plan amendment area is located within the Central Tampa District; that has the Central Business District-Downtown as its business center.
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The Central Tampa District is the hub of the region’s economic, governmental and cultural center. The District includes economic engines such as the Port of Tampa, Tampa General Hospital and the University of Tampa, each of which supports a dynamic downtown and is critical to the health of the City.

This area also includes significant clusters of historic Urban Villages neighborhoods that are ethically, racially, and economically diverse, and are places of heritage that add character, appeal and interest to the City. The district offers many opportunities to become a more livable, sustainable part of the City.

Opportunities – within the Central Tampa District

1. Improving Mobility
2. Attracting Private Investment
3. The District’s Historic Character
4. Providing Needed Infrastructure to Support Redevelopment
5. Stable single family neighborhoods that enhance the District’s housing choices

Strategy 2: Strengthening our Diverse Neighborhoods

Objective 1.2: A City of diverse, distinct, and well-structured neighborhoods that meet the community’s needs for complete, sustainable, and high-quality living environments from the historic downtown core to the well-integrated new growth areas.

Policy 1.2.1: Recognizing Tampa’s neighborhoods are the basic living environments that make-up the City’s urban fabric, the City shall through its planning preserve and enhance all neighborhood’s distinctiveness, identity, and livability.

Policy 1.2.3: The City shall promote the design of complete and well-structured neighborhoods whose physical layout and land use mix promote walking, biking, and transit; reduce vehicle trips; foster community pride; enhance neighborhood identity; ensure public safety; and are family-friendly and address the needs of all ages and abilities.
Strategy 6: Building on our Assets

Objective 11.1: A shared vision of broadening and sustaining wealth through stronger linkage and coordination among diverse assets across the city.

Policy 11.1.1: Recognize that Tampa’s assets are interconnected and range from our economic engines, our industrial lands, our historic areas, our neighborhoods, our children, the natural environment, and our infrastructure which includes parks.

Policy 11.1.2: Build leadership, networks, and capacity to develop and advance asset building policies.

Policy 11.1.3: Increase community capacity to plan and implement wealth creation strategies.

Strategy 7: Growing Economic Prosperity

Objective 12.1: A positive business climate supported by adequate public infrastructure, including transportation and schools.

Policy 12.1.2: Recognize the contribution of cultural resources, such as public art and historic resources to the strength of Tampa’s economy.

The Tampa Comprehensive Plan: Building our Legacy a Livable Plan encourages growth within the City’s Urban Service Area in order to discourage urban sprawl, reduce development pressures on rural lands, maximize the use of existing public facilities and centralize commercial, governmental, retail, residential, and cultural activities. The Vision Plan area is within the City’s Urban Service Area.

The “small picture” Urban Villages and Sustainable Neighborhoods

Combined with the Tampa Comprehensive Plan’s Urban Design Vision and the Urban Village Concept, the Seminole Heights Vision Plan and proposed amendments create the building blocks for a livable city including economic opportunity, a sense of place and community, attractive setting, choice of lifestyles, mobility options, safety, mix of uses, and ample healthy open space.

Greater Seminole Heights Vision Plan
Urban Villages are diverse and provide goods, services, housing, and employment to Tampa’s residents and are the key to Tampa’s livability. Urban villages contribute to a livable City by supporting:

- Diverse housing and employment growth;
- Pedestrian and transit-oriented communities;
- Provision of services and infrastructure targeted to support sustainable redevelopment; and
- Enhancements to the City’s cultural diversity.

An urban village designation recognizes the contributions a particular area makes to the City and provides guidance regarding the intended function, character, intensity, type and degree of growth anticipated for an area.

Seminole Heights is a neighborhood with ample opportunities for sustainable redevelopment through form based planning. The area offers cultural and historical references, a diverse and stable population, a defined and well traveled street grid, multiple bus transit lines (including planned bus rapid transit), eclectic architecture, an integrated park system, significant natural resources including the Hillsborough River, many tree canopied residential streets, and linear commercial corridors. It’s proximity to the city center and other urban villages, coupled with limited diversity in current commercial businesses, creates an excellent redevelopment opportunity.

The Seminole Heights Vision Plan and proposed text amendments meet Goals 13-21 of the Tampa Comprehensive Plan which set forth the City Form Components, namely Urban Villages, Mixed-Use Corridor Villages, Bus Transit/Rapid Transit Stations, Traditional Neighborhoods, and the Hillsborough River Waterfront. The proposed text and map amendments further the goals, objectives and policies of the Comprehensive Plan by encouraging increased densities and intensities through development incentives and design-oriented land development regulations.

The Seminole Heights Vision Plan and proposed text amendments meet Goals 22-24 and 27-31 of the Tampa Comprehensive Plan which describe Building Sustainable Neighborhoods. The Seminole Heights Vision Plan Map, objectives, and policies include provisions for wide sidewalks, bike lanes, improved connections between public parks, schools, community assets, and ultimately linking the east and west side of the community through physical and social
connections. Furthermore, the amendments recognize historical development patterns and continue to preserve the integrity of the national and local historic districts in the area.

### Plan Amendment Impacts and Issues

**Impacts:**

The Greater Seminole Heights Vision Plan calls for maximization of uses/intensities along the identified commercial/mixed-use corridors and at key intersections throughout the neighborhood. Redevelopment of major corridors and key activity centers will benefit the community by facilitating redevelopment that will encourage badly needed neighborhood services. The Greater Seminole Heights Vision Plan also calls for creating better connectivity and traffic circulation while protecting environmental and natural resources.

**Prospering Economic Activity**

Most people from other neighborhoods travel “through” Seminole Heights rather than “to” Seminole Heights. Current residents and businesses generally travel outside of the neighborhood to access daily services such as banks, pharmacies, shopping, restaurants, etc. The concentration of intense and diverse uses in neighborhood nodes and along transportation corridors, as outlined in the Greater Seminole Heights Vision Plan and proposed amendments, is seen as a means to stimulate economic activity, promote retail development, allow for the more efficient provision of daily services and encourage pedestrian activity. Redevelopment will be compact and dense with an effective mix of vertically integrated uses along its corridors and at designated nodes.

**Preserving Historic Character**

Tampa is home to several locally and nationally designated historic neighborhoods that have seen transition though time. Each new wave of redevelopment brings with it challenges for preserving the historic character of a neighborhood. Infill of vacant lots and redevelopment of historic structures could potentially change the look and feel of a historic area. The Comprehensive Plan and proposed amendments work to ensure potential increases in densities and intensities are appropriately scaled and well designed. The Comprehensive Plan sets forth guidelines to protect historic neighborhoods and structures during redevelopment.

**Greater Seminole Heights Vision Plan**
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Issues:

*Mobility: Infill and Redevelopment*

The anticipated growth of 92,000+ residents and more than 132,000+ additional employees over the next two decades will result in increased demand on City, County and State roadways. The City is nearly built-out and almost all anticipated growth is expected as either redevelopment or infill development. There are limited chances to widen roadway capacity to accommodate the increase traffic demand without severely impacting neighborhoods and the existing built environment.

The proposed plan amendment site is located within the Urban Redevelopment Area of the City’s Transportation Concurrency Exception Area (TCEA). The purpose of the Urban Redevelopment designation within the TCEA is to encourage redevelopment in and around the City’s Business Centers, and to create integrated communities that can be served by existing or planned multi-modal transportation facilities and services. The purpose of the TCEA is to delineate areas designed to reduce adverse transportation concurrency impacts that may hamper urban infill and redevelopment within the area.

In order to accommodate additional growth the Greater Seminole Heights Vision Plan calls for strengthening the existing street grid, giving high priority to the pedestrian and bicycle environment, integration of on-street parking, establishment of a multi-modal transportation system, improvement in bus service, and implementation of traffic calming mechanisms.

*Aging Infrastructure*

The City of Tampa’s potable water mains and wastewater collection facilities are aging. The City is updating its assets data to have a comprehensive inventory of the replacement and rehabilitation needs. The aging infrastructure together with increased redevelopment and infill development has reduced water pressure in some areas of the City. The concern of aging infrastructure is also faced by other utility departments, such as Stormwater due to the age of the City and historic development patterns. Aging infrastructure requires frequent maintenance to repair leaks and breaks which create the potential for risks to the environment and public health.

Greater Seminole Heights Vision Plan
Redevelopment in Greater Seminole Heights will provide a catalyst for upgrades in infrastructure, particularly stormwater facilities, as new developments will be required to meet current regulations.

Copies of agency responses are included in Attachment C of this report. Agencies/Departments with comments to the proposed amendment are as follows:

City of Tampa – Water Department
City of Tampa – Wastewater Department
City of Tampa – Solid Waste Department
City of Tampa – Stormwater Department
City of Tampa – Transportation Department
City of Tampa – Parks and Recreation Department
The Environmental Protection Commission (EPC)
Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)
Hillsborough Area Regional Transit Authority (HART)
Hillsborough County School Board

According to comments provided by the City of Tampa and other agencies the provision of public facilities will not be adversely affected by the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment.

### Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan

#### Vision Plans

The Comprehensive Plan calls for the creation of a Seminole Heights Vision Plan by 2015 using Form Based Codes. This Vision Plan meets the Community Planning Method and addresses required aspects of the document.

**Objective 23.5:** The future of community planning will utilize form based code initiatives to assist in the development of a Vision Plan and creation of a community-specific Form Based Code for each Community Planning area.

**Policy 23.2.2:** The City shall create area specific Vision Plans, based on the Community Planning method, for the Greater Seminole Heights, Tampa Heights, and 40th Street Community Planning Areas by
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2015, that clearly document and describe community assets, opportunities and challenges, community, character, conceptual street cross-section designs, and basic building forms for residential, non-residential, and mixed use.

As Seminole Heights continues to grow, the Vision Plan, working as a guide in conjunction with the Comprehensive Plan, will provide a framework for new development. The Vision Plan will provide guidance in creating the regulating plan and associated land development regulations (form based codes) for the area to assure the community’s vision is achieved.

**Growth Management Solution**

In keeping with the vision for a more Livable City, future growth will be steered to areas and locations that are well served by transit or the existing road network and which have a number of properties with redevelopment potential. Generally, growth areas are locations where transit access can be provided along bus and future rail transit route, and at future transit stations. The growth areas envisioned in this plan are:

- Business Centers
- Mixed use corridor villages
- Transit stations
- Urban Villages- limited growth

The role of these areas should ensure that spaces for economic activities are not displaced by residential development and that residential neighborhoods are not destabilized by inappropriate commercial encroachment.

**Urban Villages – Limited Growth**

To achieve redevelopment of commercial corridors, the Seminole Heights Vision Plan, establishes land use categories specific to Seminole Heights which allow increases in intensity of future development particularly along major corridors and in identified nodes. General land use categories laid out in the Seminole Heights Vision Plan call for traditional single family and attached family parcels. Land uses in specifically identified areas will allow stacked residential units up to four stories, office/live-work units, and office/institutional uses. Mixed use at a neighborhood scale of up to three stories and mixed use at a community scale from two to four stories will be allowed in designated areas.

**Greater Seminole Heights Vision Plan**
Goal 14: A city of compact, higher-density development within business districts, mixed use corridor villages and transit stations to conserve land resources, protect single family detached neighborhoods, natural habitat, support transit, reduce vehicle trips, improve air quality, conserve energy and water, and diversify Tampa’s housing stock.

Policy 14.1.1: The City shall encourage compact, higher density development that is compatible with its surrounding character.

Policy 14.1.4: Use limited land resources more efficiently and pursue a development pattern that is more economically sound by encouraging infill development on vacant and underutilized sites.

The proposed text and map amendments support the City of Tampa Comprehensive Plan through the development of Urban Villages using community planning through form based codes. Urban Villages function as villages within the larger city. Urban villages contribute to a livable City by supporting:

- Diverse housing and employment growth
- Pedestrian and transit oriented communities
- Provision of services and infrastructure targeted to support sustainable redevelopment; and
- Enhancements to the City’s cultural diversity

Objective 15.1: Support the Urban Village designations that produce a distinctive, high-quality built environment whose forms and character respect Tampa’s unique historic, environmental, and architectural context, and create memorable places that enrich community life.

Objective 15.1 strives to support urban villages and create a city of distinctive and memorable places through valuing areas of heritage, promoting a mix of uses, providing economic opportunity, and providing choices in mobility and lifestyle.

Policy 15.1.2: Mix of uses - Urban villages contain most of the following uses which typically make up what is considered a traditional and livable community: single and multi-family residential, neighborhood
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serving commercial, schools, parks, a central gathering place, mass transit and safe, walkable pathways that connect people to all areas of the village. Work towards creating a mix and placement of these uses that works for the character of the village and creates a vibrant community setting.

**Policy 15.1.3:** Economic Opportunity – Recognize that urban villages are very livable and sustainable form of development. Continue to emphasize the compact and mixed use nature of these villages. Look for ways to make it easier to create this type of development pattern.

**Policy 15.1.4:** Mobility Choices – The City shall ensure that redevelopment projects in urban villages are designated for pedestrian traffic and connect and support a citywide transit system.

**Policy 15.1.9:** Choice of Lifestyle – Mixed use projects that integrate different classifications of uses (e.g. commercial and residential) are preferred over single use projects, and will be incentivized.

**Mixed Use Corridors and Connectivity**

The Plan focuses on development of Mixed Use Corridors with excellent Community Circulation (i.e. Transportation) emphasizing use of transit, walking and bicycling to move around. The Mixed Use Corridor villages are identified as Nebraska Avenue, Florida Avenue, Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard and Hillsborough Avenue. These are areas with the greatest opportunity to support the gradual transformation of road corridors where intensification is possible and encouraged to create new housing and job opportunities while improving the pedestrian environment, the look of the street, shopping opportunities and transit service for community residents.

**Objective 16.1:** The transformation of major corridors to include a broader mix of uses, both horizontal and vertical, that provides opportunities for medium and higher density housing, while also addressing local and citywide demand for retail and services.

**Policy 16.1.1:** Redeveloping Automobile-oriented Corridors - The City shall promote redevelopment of existing automobile-oriented corridors and the upgrading of existing commercial development to create vibrant,
mixed-use boulevards that balance efficient movement of motor vehicles with the creation of attractive pedestrian-friendly districts that serve the adjoining neighborhoods as well as passing motorists.

**Policy 16.1.3:** *Higher Intensity Nodes* – The City shall support proposals to convert non-residential properties along mixed use corridors, between major intersections, to residential or mixed use residential uses and ensure the development is compatible with surrounding land uses and has adequate access to transit services and community services.

**Policy 16.1.4:** *Sidewalks and Pedestrian Amenities* – The City shall require that sidewalks along mixed-use corridors are wide enough to accommodate significant pedestrian traffic and the integration of public amenities and landscaping.

**Policy 16.1.5:** *Corridor Transit* – The City shall encourage design and development along mixed use corridors that promotes the use of public transit, pedestrian and bicycle travel that maximizes personal safety through development features such as:

- Buildings oriented to the street and transit services;
- Safe and convenient access for pedestrians between buildings and transit stops;
- Support the Greenways and Trail Master Plan when applicable;
- Parking areas, and other buildings and facilities; and
- Roads designed for automobile use, efficient transit service as well as pedestrian and bicycle travel.

**Policy 16.1.6:** *Visual and Physical Character* – The City shall ensure that the introduction of higher-density mixed-use development along major arterial corridors is compatible with adjacent land uses, particularly residential uses by requiring such features as:

- Buildings setback from rear or side yard property lines adjoining single family residential uses;
- Building heights stepped back from sensitive adjoining uses (including historic districts) to maintain appropriate transitions in scale, massing and height and to protect privacy and solar access;
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• Landscaped off-street parking areas, loading areas, and service areas screened from adjacent residential areas, to the degree feasible and;
• Lighting shielded and directed downward to minimize impacts on adjacent residential uses.

Policy 16.1.7: **Differentiation of the Corridors** – The long-term development direction is to create linear mixed use villages in these corridors. Three types of mixed use corridor villages are defined and they are based on the scale of the development pattern to be expected – suburban mixed use scale corridor village (refer to the SMU-6 plan category for more detail); community mixed use scale corridor village (refer to the CMU-35 and CC-35 plan categories for more detail); and the urban mixed use scale corridor village (refer to the UMU-60 plan category for more detail).

Policy 16.1.9: **Redevelopment** – The City shall promote redevelopment patterns and streetscape improvements that transforms the visual and physical character of these corridors by the following:

• Put buildings close to the sidewalk. This will create a consistent “street wall”, will allow through traffic to see shops and will make it interesting for people to walk through the corridor;
• Introduce taller buildings consistent with the underlying plan category;
• Consider placing parking in the rear of the building;
• Create and attractive front and rear façade and entry for pedestrians;
• Create pedestrian pathways between the uses in the corridor and the neighborhood behind;
• Reduce visual clutter of signs through a consistent sign program;
• Remove utility poles and put utilities underground;
• Plant street trees and provide street furniture; and
• Always try to diversify the types of uses.
While commercial corridors and identified neighborhood and community nodes call for more intensive development, the Vision Plan works to **protects single family residential** portions of the area, ensuring sensitive transition of uses.

**Policy 13.3.9:**  
*Transitions in Scale.* The City shall require that the scale and massing of new development in higher-density centers and corridors provide appropriate transitions in building height and bulk that are sensitive to the physical and visual character of adjoining neighborhoods that have lower development intensities and building heights.

**Environmental and Historic Resources**

The Seminole Heights Vision Plan and proposed amendments also seek to **preserve the natural environment and historic resources.**

**Objective 38.2:**  
The City shall continue to review all land development applications and to apply land development regulations to ensure the protection of the attributes, functions and amenities of the natural environment in a manner that continues to ensure a net environmental benefit under all projected scenarios.

**Objective 27.1:**  
*Preserve Tampa’s historic resources.*

**Policy 27.1.2:**  
*Support historic preservation in neighborhoods.*

**Analysis Conclusion**

The proposed text amendments reflect the intent of the Greater Seminole Heights Vision Plan. The Tampa Comprehensive Plan supports the intent of the Greater Seminole Heights Vision Plan throught the following objectives and policies:

- Policy 23.2.2 of the *Tampa Comprehensive Plan* calls for an area specific Vision Plan, based on the Community Planning Method for Greater Seminole Heights by 2015.
- Objective 23.5 calls for utilization of form based code initiatives to assist in the development of a Vision Plan and creation of a community-specific Form Based Code for each Community Planning area. The Seminole Heights Vision Plan incorporates form based code initiatives.

**Greater Seminole Heights Vision Plan**
• The Seminole Heights Vision Plan contains five guiding principles including Urban Form/Mixed Use Development, Community Circulation (Transportation), Connectivity/Integration, Environment/Natural Resources, and Historic Preservation. Goal 15 of the Tampa Comprehensive Plan and its objectives and policies relating to Urban Villages support these guiding principles.

• A number of other policies are particularly relevant to the Seminole Heights Vision Plan and its principles including those related to a mix of uses (Policy 15.1.2), mobility choices (Policy 15.1.4), open space (Policy 15.1.10), adaptive reuse of existing structure (Policy 15.1.8).

• A major component of the Seminole Heights Vision Plan is redevelopment of major corridors into mixed use corridors. The Seminole Heights Vision Plan supports Goal 16 of the Tampa Comprehensive Plan particularly as it relates to the Comprehensive Plan policies focused on redeveloping automobile oriented corridors (Policy 16.1.1 and Policy 16.1.2), developing higher intensity nodes (Policy 16.1.3), providing for sidewalks and pedestrian amenities (Policy 16.1.4), improvement of transit (Policy 16.1.5), promoting visual and physical character (Policy 16.1.6), defining specific mixed use corridors (Policy 16.1.13).

Therefore the Greater Seminole Heights Vision Plan and proposed text amendments further the goal of creating a Livable City as defined by the Tampa Comprehensive Plan.

• The Vision Plan furthers Strategy 1: Organizing Planning Districts – Getting Transit Ready
• The Vision Plan furthers Strategy 2: Stengthening our Diverse Neighborhoods
• The Vision Plan furthers Strategy 6: Building on our Assets
• The Vision Plan furthers Strategy 7: Growing Economic Prosperity

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the attached resolution, finding the proposed Plan Amendment PA09-07, CONSISTENT with the Tampa Comprehensive Plan: Building Our Legacy A Livable City and forward this recommendation to Tampa City Council.
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Appendices

- Attachment A - Proposed Tampa Comprehensive Plan Text Amendments
- Attachment B - Seminole Heights Vision Plan
- Attachment C - Agency Comments
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Proposed amendments:

Add a new header “Role of Community Plans” after “Role of Existing Neighborhood Plans” and before the Sub-header “Opportunities”.

Role of Community Plans

The City has embarked on an innovative and progressive approach to community planning by creating the Community Planning through Form-Based Codes Program. Reaching out and engaging citizens to help shape the look and feel of their communities is vital to the success of this program. A Community Plan will be created for each community based on this program. Many of the objectives and polices in this chapter guide this program, and helped form the associated planning process.

The Community Plans that are derived from the Community Planning through Form-Based Codes Program, shall be used to guide future decision-making for these specific areas of the City. Each plan will references in the Community Planning section of this Chapter, in order to ensure that future growth in these communities meets the overall intent of this chapter, to “Build Sustainable Neighborhoods, A City of Neighborhoods”.

1. Insert proposed text and graphics on Page 153, after Policy 23.2.14 and prior to “Traditional Neighborhood Plans”:

“Community Plans – Visions for the Future

Pursuant to the Goals, objective, and policies of this Chapter, Community Plans that are derived from the Community Planning through Form-Based Codes Program, shall be used to guide future decision-making for these specific areas of the City, and may be referenced within the appendices of the non-adopted section of the Comprehensive Plan or the City of Tampa Code of Ordinances

Greater Seminole Heights Vision Plan

Pursuant to Goal 22, Objective 22.1, Policy 22.1.2, and Goal 23, Objective 23.5, Policies 23.2.1 through 23.2.14, the Greater Seminole Heights Vision Plan has been developed as the Community Plan for this area. The Vision Plan, as well as the following objectives and policies, shall be used to guide the future growth, development, public improvements, and decision-making of the designated community planning areas.
Seminole Heights Urban Village (a.k.a. Greater Seminole Heights Planning Area)

The City facilitated planning charrettes and visioning sessions with area property owners and stakeholders to generate a community-driven Vision Plan. The planning area is comprised of three (3) neighborhood associations and one (1) business guild, all of which are well organized and engaged with City government. The Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission completed a strategic business plan in 2005 in coordination with area businesses. This visioning process expands on the ideas of the 2005 study and encompasses the collective voices of these groups, further developed in concert with input and guidance from both public sector and private sector professionals.

The planning area is a blend of several key components that make up the larger city form of Tampa. The area offers cultural and historical references, a diverse population, a defined and well-traveled street grid, multiple bus transit lines (including the planned Bus Rapid Transit), stable/traditional residential areas, a complete public school system, eclectic architecture, an integrated parks system, significant natural resources, and linear commercial corridors. Its proximity to the City center, coupled with limited commercial business diversity along the corridors, creates excellent redevelopment opportunity for neighborhood serving uses and the evolution of improved activity nodes. The nodes identified on the Vision Plan Map form a “ladder”, which over time will serve to bridge the physical and social divide caused by the interstate system, and ultimately reconnect the community.

Objective 23.6: Develop objectives and policies that guide reuse, redevelopment, and infill development in the Seminole Heights Urban Village that meet the Vision Plan of the community and associated Vision Plan Map.

Policy 23.6.1: The Vision Plan and associated Vision Plan Map shall be used as guides for any Comprehensive Plan text amendments or proposed changes to the future land use map, to achieve the vision of the area, consistent with the goals, objectives and policies of the Tampa Comprehensive Plan.

Policy 23.6.2: The City shall use the Vision Plan Map as the guide to create the Regulating Plan and associated land development regulations (form-based code) for the area to ensure the community’s vision is achieved.

Policy 23.6.3: All amendments to the Comprehensive Plan, Future Land Use Map, amendments to land development regulations, rezoning,
and development of land that may affect a historic district or landmark structure, must adhere to the goals, objectives, and policies contained in the Comprehensive Plan, including but not limited to those set forth in this Chapter, and all applicable land development regulations related to historic preservation.

**Objective 23.7:** Develop land development regulations for the Seminole Heights Urban Village that focuses redevelopment and infill development to specific nodes and corridors by allowing potential increases in densities and intensities for well-designed, and appropriately scaled reuse, redevelopment, and infill development projects in those areas.

**Policy 23.7.1:** Development within boundaries of designated nodes may be eligible for an increase in density and/or intensity above the maximum land use category threshold, subject to criteria in the land development regulations. Designated nodes are measured on a radius from the center point of roadway intersection and include a “Neighborhood Node” (1/4 mile radius) and a “Community Node” (1/2 mile radius).

The “Neighborhood Nodes” are as follows:
- Intersections of Florida Avenue with Broad Street, Sligh Avenue, Hanna Avenue, Hillsborough Avenue, Osborne Avenue, and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard;
- Intersections of Nebraska Avenue with Broad Street, Hanna Avenue, Osborne Avenue;
- Intersections of 15th Street with Hanna Avenue and Osborne Avenue;
- 22nd Street and Sligh Avenue;
- Boulevard and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard.

The “Community Nodes” are as follows:
- Intersections of Nebraska Avenue with Sligh Avenue, Hillsborough Avenue, and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard.

**Policy 23.7.2:** Detached residential (single-family) uses located immediately adjacent to and with vehicular access to collector or arterial roads may be used for an office/live-work use, subject to criteria and definitions set forth in the land development regulations.
Objective 23.8: Within the Seminole Heights Urban Village, focus both public and private planning and financial resources to create tangible, functional, and sustainable connections between nodes, commercial areas, public uses, and residential areas, through the installation of wide sidewalks, bicycle lanes, and on-street parking, where appropriate.

Policy 23.8.1: When designing improvements to the existing street grid, target available public and private funds to create necessary connections between community assets, as depicted in the Vision Plan, by including bicycle lanes, sidewalks, street and pedestrian lighting, and on-street parking.

Policy 23.8.2: When designing improvements to the existing street grid, target available public and private funds to install necessary traffic calming mechanisms.

Policy 23.8.3: When designing improvements to the existing street grid, target available public and private funds to the restoration of existing brick streets.”
Attachment B
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“Vision without action is a dream. Action without vision is simply passing the time. Action with Vision is making a positive difference.”

- Joel Barker, Corporate Trainer
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INTRODUCTION

The Greater Seminole Heights (GSH) planning area is comprised of three (3) neighborhood associations and one (1) business guild, all of which are well organized and engaged with City government. The Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission completed a strategic business plan in 2005 in coordination with area businesses. This visioning process expands on the ideas of the 2005 study and encompasses the collective voices of these groups, further developed in concert with input and guidance from the public sector.

The planning area is a blend of several key components that make up the larger city form of Tampa. The area offers cultural and historical references, a diverse population, a defined and well-traveled street grid, multiple bus transit lines (including the planned Bus Rapid Transit), stable residential areas, eclectic architecture, an integrated parks system, significant natural resources, and linear commercial corridors. Its proximity to the City center coupled with the limited diversity in current commercial businesses along the corridors creates excellent redevelopment opportunity for neighborhood serving uses and the evolution of improved activity nodes.
Tampa’s comprehensive vision for the city at-large is founded on four (4) core values that will advance the long-term sustainability of the city and its citizenry.

The four values are derived from the set of collective community values. When balanced, they can lead toward a shared community commitment to being a Livable City. The values are:

- **Livability**: Tampa is a place where diverse people find it easy, safe, and enjoyable to live

- **Prosperity**: Tampa is focused on the quality of life for all its people and must be economically healthy, with a broad mix of good jobs

- **Respect**: The living systems that support us are revered and conferred to future generations in better condition than today

- **Resilience**: The ability of the systems that support our day to day living to recover from misfortune, handle uncertainty, and adjust easily to change

**NATURAL RESOURCES**

The City receives almost 50 inches of rainfall in a typical year with frequent seasonal rainstorms during the months of May through November, which is more than enough to meet the needs of most landscapes. However, the timing of this rainfall can cause problems.

Unfortunately, most of the runoff from this period flows from rooftops onto driveways and lawns picking up fertilizer and other pollutants, which finds its way into ponds, rivers, and Tampa Bay. Through the use of various collection methods such as rain barrels, cisterns, rain gardens, and roadside swales to capture and store stormwater runoff, coupled with the planting of vegetation adapted to the seasonal rains, it is possible to severely reduce the amount of water that is used for irrigation. The benefits of these example methods are as follows:

- Rain barrels and cisterns limit stormwater runoff and reduce the amount of potable water used for irrigation and outdoor needs;

- Florida-friendly landscaping and the installation of rain gardens create a beautiful landscape, require less watering, and can generally tolerate both extreme drought and wet conditions.

- Roadside swales may not be as visually attractive as a rain garden; however, when maintained properly a swale can capture stormwater runoff and minimize the transport of pollutants onto adjacent property or water systems.
TAMPA’S URBAN DESIGN VISION

Urban design encompasses multiple elements that can enhance the physical characteristics of both residential and commercial areas. Quality urban design promotes Livability by reinforcing a sense of city identity. Tampa has a defined vision for urban design, which translates well in this unique planning area. The building blocks for sound urban design include:

1. Economic Opportunity
2. A Sense of Place and Community
3. Attractive
4. A Choice of Lifestyles
5. Mobility Options
6. Feels Safe
7. A Mix of Uses
8. Retain Healthy Open Space

TAMPA’S URBAN VILLAGE CONCEPT

A distinguishing characteristic of Tampa is the presence of a successful and diverse mix of neighborhoods in close proximity to each other.

This variety of urban environments provides people with a choice of lifestyles, and retaining and enhancing these distinctive community characteristics will ensure that they remain vital and successful communities. Tampa has approximately ten (10) distinct Urban Villages, and Seminole Heights is within a 4-mile radius of nine (9) of them.

Urban villages are diverse and provide goods, services, housing, and employment to Tampa’s residents and are the key to Tampa’s livability. Urban villages contribute to a Livable City by supporting:

1. Diverse housing and employment growth;
2. Pedestrian and transit-oriented communities;
3. Provision of services and infrastructure targeted to support sustainable redevelopment; and
4. Enhancements to the City’s cultural diversity.
BACKGROUND & HISTORY

HISTORY OF GREATER SEMINOLE HEIGHTS

This historic area was born in 1911. T. Roy Young had 40 acres and a dream to develop Tampa’s first suburb three miles north of downtown. He called it Seminole Heights. Ten years earlier, Tampa’s total population had reached 26,000. A trolley line (streetcar) connected Sulphur Springs (north of Seminole Heights) to downtown, making travel to the suburbs inviting. The streetcar made it possible to live in one area of town and work in another. Young recognized this potential. His Seminole Development Corporation property encompassed a rectangle bordered by Hillsborough Avenue, Central Avenue, Wilder Avenue and Florida Avenue. The houses built here were mostly small single-family dwellings, oriented east-to-west and started at $5,000. Other developments quickly followed.

By 1912, the Mutual Development Company owned by Milton and Giddings Mabry and the Dekle Investment Company owned by Lee and James Dekle surveyed and platted land adjacent to Seminole Heights forming the Suwanee Heights subdivision. Bounded by Henry Avenue, Hillsborough Avenue, Central Avenue and Florida Avenue, Suwanee Heights was also a restricted subdivision. Like the original Seminole Heights, houses required the same east-to-west orientation but started at $1,400.

During the “Florida Boom” years (roughly 1919-1929) more development came to areas north and east of the original subdivisions. Of course, with this development came the merchants seeing an opportunity to provide welcome goods and services to the residents. Some of those early businesses have faded away. However, many current Seminole Heights businesses have been open for more than 50 years.

Seminole Heights is now considered one of Tampa's oldest and most stable residential areas. It is home to two (2) nationally designated historical districts and one (1) locally designated historic district: Seminole Heights and Hampton Terrace. The area has again attracted young professionals, families, and artists, who are very active in the community. "Porch parties" have become quite popular among residents, as well as two (2) annual home tours.

NEIGHBORHOODS

There are three (3) distinct Neighborhoods with Common Threads in their histories and development patterns. They are as follows:

- Old Seminole Heights (pop. 15,062)
- South Seminole Heights (pop. 3,160)
- Southeast Seminole Heights (pop. 3,384)
In comparatively recent history, these three (3) separate and distinct areas have united to form a collective voice to bring change and improvement to the area.

SCHOOLS / PUBLIC SPACES

According to Hillsborough County School Board - there are 4 elementary, 2 middle, and 1 high school. The most notable historic school building, among the most notable building in all of Tampa, is Hillsborough High School.

Hillsborough High School is in the heart of the planning area and is the oldest high school in Tampa. It is home to the State of Florida’s 1st High School Newspaper. The land for the school was purchased in 1925 and the cornerstone was laid January 28, 1927. This massive red brick building was designed in the Gothic Revival style by local architect Francis Kennard.

The stained-glass windows in the auditorium were added in the 1950’s, and in 1976 the building was remodeled to allow for central air conditioning. The walls, buttresses, spires, and tracery of the arched stained-glass windows are decorated in cast stone.

In September 1928 the first classes were enrolled. It was dedicated in December of that year, and was one of the four largest high schools in the South.
CHRONOLOGY OF BUILT ENVIRONMENT

Structures in the area were built between 1883 and the present. The majority of buildings (67%) were constructed between 1900 and 1950. Thirteen percent (13%) of this majority were built in 1925 alone.

RESIDENTIAL ARCHITECTURE

Although over twenty (20) distinct architectural styles can be found throughout the planning area, the following are most prominent:

- **Craftsman:** Low-pitched, gabled roof with wide, unenclosed eave overhang; roof rafters usually exposed; decorative beams or braces commonly added under gables; porches, either full- or partial-width, with roof supported by columns; columns or pedestals frequently extend to ground level.

- **Minimal Traditional:** Simplified form omitting most traditional detailing.
- **National Folk**: A basic dwelling type that originated from the need for shelter with little regard for changing fashion. However, this ‘style’ of architecture has become extremely popular across the county and owes its design details more to its location than to any particular architectural fashion.

- **Spanish Eclectic**: Low-pitched to flat roof, usually with little or no eave overhang; red tile roof covering; typically with one or more prominent arches placed above door or principal window, or beneath porch roof; wall surface usually stucco; facade normally asymmetrical.

- **Ranch**: One-story houses with very low-pitched roofs and broad, rambling facades. Most have decorative shutters, porch-roof supports, loosely based on colonial precedents.

- **Contemporary Modern**: Occurs in two distinctive subtypes based on roof shapes: flat or gabled. The flat-roofed subtype is a derivation of the earlier International Style and house of this subtype are sometimes referred to as American International. The gabled subtype is more strongly influenced by the earlier modernism of the Craftsman and Prairie styles. It features overhanging eaves, frequently with exposed roof beams.
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INVENTORY & ANALYSIS

Communities are more than a collection of buildings and uses of property. The core of any community is people. The following data cover many key components of the community such as income, education, and land values:

LAND
- Hillsborough County Land Area: 1072 sq miles
- City Land Area: 178 sq miles
- Planning Area
  - 4.74 sq miles
  - 0.44% of County Land Area
  - 2.66% of City Land Area

PEOPLE
- Households: 9,884 (2007 Planning Commission estimate – household count)

MOBILITY
- Six (6) major bus transit routes
- # major stops with benches/shelters
- Primary intersection of new ‘Bus Rapid Transit’ lines intersects in center of planning area (Nebraska avenue & Hillsborough avenue)

INCOME
- 1999 Median Household Income Estimate by Census Block: $32,750 +/-
- 2006 Median Household Income Estimate by Census Block: $41,250 +/-

SCHOOLS
- Four (4) Public Elementary Schools: 1774 Total Student Population
- Two (2) Middle Schools: 1681 Total Student Population
- One (1) High School: 1936 Total Student Population

GREATER SEMINOLE HEIGHTS VISION PLAN – July 2009
US BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

- Averages by Consumer Unit (dwelling) based on 2006 median income:
  - # of persons: 2.5
  - # of vehicles: 1.9
- 68% home ownership (42% with mortgages)
- 58% college educated

- Average annual expenditures by Consumer Unit (dwelling) based on 2006 median income:
  - Food: 13.5% ($5,330)
  - Alcohol: 1.1% ($427)
  - Apparel/footwear: 4.0% ($1,573)
  - Entertainment: 4.7% ($1,864)
  - Personal care products & services: 1.2% ($481)
  - Tobacco products & supplies: 0.9% ($364)
  - Miscellaneous: 1.5% ($584)

TABLES / GRAPHS

- Existing Conditions: Land areas by future land use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FLU</th>
<th>SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-10</td>
<td>74,343,125.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-20</td>
<td>3,811,812.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-35</td>
<td>900,455.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMU-6</td>
<td>23,125.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMU-35</td>
<td>3,096,636.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC-35</td>
<td>7,045,935.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/SP</td>
<td>4,242,304.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/OS</td>
<td>1,923,298.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>95,386,694.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Assets / Attractors located within:
  - 2 miles: Lowry Park Zoo
  - 3 miles: Ybor City
  - 4 miles: Union Station
    Busch Gardens
    Raymond James Stadium
    Legends Field
    Central Business District
    Channel District
    University of Tampa
    Univ. of South Florida
  - 5 miles: Tampa Internl. Airport
    Florida State Fairgrounds

GREATER SEMINOLE HEIGHTS VISION PLAN – July 2009
## 2007 Land Values & Sales Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2007</th>
<th>Seminole Heights</th>
<th>City of Tampa</th>
<th>Hillsborough County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean $/SF</td>
<td>$152.19</td>
<td>$189.89</td>
<td>$153.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale Count</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>5480</td>
<td>17686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg Assessed Value</td>
<td>$136,604.00</td>
<td>$208,138.00</td>
<td>$190,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Assessed Value</td>
<td>$1,349,917,176</td>
<td>$26,022,608,002</td>
<td>$84,049,764,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean $/SF</td>
<td>$188.62</td>
<td>$203.64</td>
<td>$217.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale Count</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg Assessed Value</td>
<td>$269,413.00</td>
<td>$1,000,102</td>
<td>$1,136,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Assessed Value</td>
<td>$150,332,249</td>
<td>$9,078,925,407</td>
<td>$22,089,465,869</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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MAP OF AREA – EXISTING CONDITIONS

See Appendix B for large format map of Existing Conditions, including Future Land Use, Zoning / Historic Districts, Building Footprints, Transit Routes, Parks, and Schools.
GREATER SEMINOLE HEIGHTS AS A LIVABLE PLACE

KEY COMPONENTS OF A LIVABLE PLACE

- Feels safe
- Offers economic opportunity
- Is attractive
- Values its natural areas and areas of heritage
- Supports a choice of lifestyles
- Integrates a complete mix of uses
- Provides mobility options
- Fosters a sense of place and community

The vision and principles for this community were drawn from a series of interactive charrettes and working sessions with area residents, property owners, and industry experts.

VISION STATEMENTS

1. Create a neighborhood with an integration of land uses, serving both the immediate residents and surrounding City, which focuses on pedestrian connectivity and instills ‘walkability’ throughout design

2. Create attractive, multi-use destinations that attract people and keep them there

3. Protect/Capitalize on existing character of single family residential portions of the area (seen as the area needing the least amount of change, one of their greatest assets)

4. Develop mixed use corridors with centralized structured parking to move away from the approach that all zoning lots have to be self-contained and provide all parking on site; adopt creative parking strategies to serve the area

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

- Urban Form/Mixed Use Development (i.e. Commercial Redevelopment)

  o Focus on the maximization of uses/intensities along the identified commercial/mixed use corridors, including establishment of key intersections as community
and/or neighborhood activity centers

o Foster the development of mixed use projects including the integration of neighborhood serving uses

o Ensure the sensitive transition of uses from the core commercial areas into the surrounding stable neighborhoods

o ‘Incentivize’ the transition of single use corridors to mixed use/community-neighborhood serving uses

- Community Circulation (i.e. Transportation)

o Strengthen and maintain existing street grid (strong community asset) including use and improvement of alleys

o Pedestrian/Bicycle Environment as high priority, overall protection of pedestrian activity throughout community
  ▪ Safe integration of pedestrian traffic (bicycle and on-foot)
  ▪ Inclusion of ADA Accessibility
  ▪ Improvement to street lighting
  ▪ Establishment of bike lanes

o Integration of on-street parking where feasible

o Establishment of a multi-modal transportation system, consider establishment of trolley service

o Improvement of bus service, including route locations, frequency of service, and adequate shelters

o Implementation of traffic calming mechanisms

o Restoration of brick streets

- Connectivity/Integration and the Public Realm

o Establish a pedestrian friendly environment, including enhanced
  ▪ streetscape, connected greenways and a complete sidewalk system throughout the area

- Environment/Natural Resources

o Protect and enhance the area’s tree canopy

o Improve existing stormwater conditions through the installation of drains, curbing, etc.
- Incorporate sustainable design elements
- Historic Preservation
  - Maintain inventory of historic structures both residential and commercial
  - Develop more structured guidelines for residential and commercial properties with a means of enforcement

GENERAL LAND USE CATEGORIES

1. Use categories in the Vision Plan represent future development patterns. Each of the categories is generally described as follows:

   **Detached Residential (all types)**
   Single-family detached units, varying lot widths; riverfront estate lots created to preserve character of large lots along Hillsborough River. ‘Granny-flats’ may be permitted in areas where a predominant development pattern of such form occurs. Development Height: 1 to 3 stories (35’ max) for 40’, 50’, and 75’ lots; 1 to 3 stories (45’ max) for Riverfront Estate lots.

   **Attached Residential**
   Single-family attached units; can be attached by side and/or rear walls; detached units may be built as well. This category has been introduced to create areas of transition from mixed use intensities to single-family detached areas. Development Height: 1 to 3 stories (40’ max).

   **Stacked Residential**
   Dwelling units that are ‘stacked’ one on top of another and may have side and/or rear wall connections; detached and attached units may be built as well. This category has been introduced in moderate clusters to provide a mix of housing types near or in proximity to higher intensity areas; may have been introduced in lesser intensity areas to recognize existing developments as well. Development Height: 2 to 4 stories (45’ max).

   **Office/live-work**
   Must be occupied as a residence and may be used as office space (up to 50% of the total floor area including accessory structures) by the resident(s) only, with no more than 2 employees not in residence; office uses include professional services such as architecture, accountancy, engineering, beauty salon (3 chairs maximum), educational (no more than 10 students per day), law, real estate, and mental health counseling (no more than 5 patients per day). Form of dwelling units may be detached or attached – not stacked. Development Height: 1 to 3 stories (35’ max).

   **Office/Institutional**
   Business or medical office uses, private schools, daycares. Development Height: 1 to 3 stories (40’ max).
Mixed Use – Neighborhood Scale*
May contain a mixture of non-residential and residential uses. Non-residential uses are limited to neighborhood serving and general commercial uses, such as office, retail, and restaurant.
Development Height: 1 to 3 stories (45’ max).

Mixed Use – Community Scale*
May contain a mixture of non-residential and residential uses. Non-residential uses may be a broader range of commercial uses, such as office, retail, restaurant, and automobile related services.
Development Height: 2 to 4 stories (55’ max).

Village Center (Phase II ‘B’ Map only)*
Must contain a mixture of non-residential and residential uses. Non-residential uses are limited to neighborhood serving and general commercial uses, such as office, retail and restaurant.
Development Height: 3 to 6 stories (75’ max).

*Those lands that are currently designated HC-24 or CC-35, which allows more intensive commercial use, shall retain those rights through and after the transition to either of the proposed Phase Maps.
MAPS OF AREA – VISION CONCEPT MAPS

See Appendix C for large format of Vision Concept Maps, including Conceptual Land Use patterns for a mid-range (10 year) and long range (20 year) view and Connectivity (bicycle & pedestrian priorities). The final Conceptual Land Use pattern map was divided into two (2) versions, based on the input from the public.

LAND USE PATTERN MAP (mid-range 10 years)

The 10-year map provides for a moderate change in land use patterns, by shifting 4% of the residential land use to a mixed-use land use category, which will provide for additional redevelopment opportunities at the three (3) major nodes along Nebraska Avenue, and several minor nodes along Florida Avenue.
LAND USE PATTERN MAP (long-range 20 years)

The 20-year map provides for a more aggressive, long range change in land use patterns, by shifting 8% of the residential land use to a mixed-use land use category, adding a wider variety of residential densities, and intensifying portions of Florida Avenue and its nodes.
CONNECTIVITY MAP

While all paths are important, this vision concept focuses on providing vital pedestrian and bicycle connections between parks, schools, the waterfront, business areas, and to surrounding communities.
Land use patterns and connectivity are blended in the final vision maps. This blended approach creates activity nodes, both neighborhood and community scale. These nodes are linked by roadways with planned pedestrian and bicycle connections. Visually, the connections create a “ladder” that bridge the divide caused by the interstate system and will ultimately reconnect residents and businesses both physically and socially.

Neighborhood Nodes maintain a radius of 1/4 mile for potential increased development intensities and densities. The influence of these nodes could reach up to 1/2 mile by providing a mixture of services and daily goods for residents in the immediate area.

Community Nodes maintain a radius of 1/2 mile for potential increased development intensities and densities. The influence of these nodes could reach up to 2 mile by providing a mixture of services and goods for residents in the immediate area, as well as typical pass-through traffic via bicycle, transit, and passenger vehicle from the larger community.
CONCEPTUAL STREET DESIGN GRAPHICS

- Typical Street Sections
  
  o 50’ Typical Street Cross Section
- 65' Typical Street Cross Section

Right-of-Way: 65' Undivided 2-Lane with Parallel Parking and Bike Lanes
80' Typical Street Cross Section
o 100’ Typical Street Cross Section

Right-of-Way: 100’ Divided 4-Lane with Parallel Parking and Bike Lanes
Example Street Redesign (Osborne Avenue between Florida Avenue & Central Avenue):
- Conceptual Design Scenarios (Major Nodes)
- Conceptual Design Scenarios (Major Nodes)
- Example Redevelopment Scenarios (Osborne Avenue & Florida Avenue)
- Conceptual Design Scenarios (Osborne Avenue and Nebraska Avenue)
NEXT STEPS

Short Term Priorities (0-5 years)

1. Process amendments to Future Land Use Map
   - Submit Mid-Range Map (10-years) for August 2009 Cycle with Planning Commission
   - Tentative adoption by July 2010

2. Finalize new land development regulations for Planning Area
   - Complete and submit for January 2010 Cycle with City Council
   - Tentative adoption by July 2010

3. Explore special assessment districts for public realm improvements within City ROW’s using design templates from Vision Plan

4. Explore options for capital improvement grants to secure proposed public realm improvements

5. Continue to coordinate with FDOT for public realm improvements within state controlled roads
   - Potential on-street parking on 1-way segment of Florida Avenue during off-peak hours to stimulate commercial redevelopment opportunities
   - Additional bicycle lanes on major corridors
   - Increased sidewalk widths on major corridors
   - Improved streetscaping on major corridors

Long Term Priorities (5+ years)

1. Review progress of Phase I Future Land Use Map

2. Review land development regulations

3. Continue to evaluate funding sources for public realm improvements

4. Continue to coordinate with FDOT for public realm improvements within state controlled roads
APPENDICES

A
A: Planning Area Map

B
B: Existing Conditions Map
   - Future Land Use
   - Zoning / Historic Districts
   - Building Footprints
   - Transit Routes, Parks, Schools

C
C: Visions Concepts Map
   - Phased Approach to Changes in Land Use Patterns
     o C-1: Mid-Range View (0-10 years)
     o C-2: Long Range View (10-20 years)
   - Roads, Infrastructure, Ped- & Bikeways
     o C-3: Connectivity/Infrastructure Map
   - Final Vision Plan Map (C-4)

D
D: Resources
A

Planning Area Map
B

Existing Conditions Map
C-1

Vision Concepts Maps

C-1: Mid-Range View (0-10 years)
C-2

Vision Concepts Maps

C-2: Long Range View (10-20 years)
C-3

Vision Concepts Maps

C-3: Connectivity/Infrastructure Map
Resources

1 Tampa Comprehensive Plan – 2009 – Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission

2 City of Tampa Water Department:  
   http://www.tampagov.net/dept_Water/  
   University of Florida Extension  
   http://hillsborough_fyn.ifas.ufl.edu

3 [Source: About.com (http://tampa.about.com/od/realestateapartments/p/seminoleheights.html)]

4 Hillsborough County School Board
Attachment C

Agency Comments
2009 August Plan Amendment Cycle

PA09-05: Map Amendment: 3075 North Rocky Point Drive (R-35 to CMU-35)
PA09-06 Text Amendment: Transit Oriented Development
PA09-07: Text Amendment: Seminole Heights Vision Plan
PA09-08 Map Amendment: Seminole Heights Areawide Map Amendment
PA09-09 Text Amendment: Courtney Campbell Scenic Corridor
PA09-10 Map Amendment: Central Park CRA Areawide Map Amendment
PA09-11 Map Amendment: MacDill Avenue Map Amendment
PA09-07

Text Amendment

Seminole Heights Vision Plan

City Staff Recommendations

The City Staff has no objections to the proposed amendment, but does offer the following comments.

1. **Wastewater** - This plan amendment is a proposed text change to incorporate goals, objectives and policies needed to implement “The Greater Seminole Heights Vision Plan”. It is our understanding that this change will not impact the level of service established in the Wastewater Element of the City’s Comprehensive plan. We have no objections to this amendment.

2. **Solid Waste** - At the time of a zoning, variance, or incremental review, as well as permitting, the following provisions of the City of Tampa Code for refuse collection services will need to be met. Section 27-130. Buffers and screening. (1) Buffers required. (a) (b), Section 27-132. Solid Waste. (a) (b) (c) 1. 2. 3. 4. (d) (e) (f) (g) (h), Section 27-248(4). Off-Street Parking Space Standards and Section 27-324. General requirements. (1) Development standards. d. Refuse stations, storage areas and off-street loading areas. 1. Location. 2. Screening.

3. **Water** – No Objections

4. **Stormwater** - The Stormwater Department recommends that the properties identified by the Stormwater Department on the Red-Line List be provided special consideration in future land use planning. The Red-Line List is available for reference from the Stormwater Department or the Construction Services Department.

5. **Parks and Recreation** – No Objections.
In response to your request from 10/14/2009, please see below.

Date: November 6, 2009

To: Sam Dennis, Planning Commission

From: Gordon A. Leslie, Jr., EPC

Subject: EPC Review of the Below-Listed Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments for the August 2009 Cycle:

PA 09-05: Future Land Use Map Change – Rocky Point

PA 09-06: Text Changes to the Tampa Comprehensive Plan-Transit Oriented Development

PA 09-07: City of Tampa Comprehensive Plan – Text Amendment – Greater Seminole Heights Vision Plan

CPA 09-08: City of Tampa Comprehensive Plan – Map Amendment – Seminole Heights Urban Village

PA 09-09: City of Tampa Comprehensive Plan – Text Amendment – Courtney Campbell Scenic Highway Corridor

PA 09-10: City of Tampa Comprehensive Plan – Map Amendment – Central Park Community Redevelopment Area

EPC staff has reviewed the above-referenced Comprehensive Plan Amendments, which primarily pertain to community planning, proposed development and redevelopment activities, and transportation oriented development initiatives, within portions of the City of Tampa. EPC staff offers no specific comment on the subject amendments at this time.

We appreciate the continued opportunity to work with the Planning Commission, and other reviewing departments, on these and other plan amendments as they come forward.
1. PA 09-05: Future Land Use Map change. 3075 North Rocky Point Drive East – Chase Suites Hotel occupies the site.

Request: Proposed land use plan designation change of 4.4 acres of land from Medium Density Residential-35 (R-35) to Community Mixed-Use-35 (CMU-35). The subject’s property is located at 3075 North Rocky Point Drive East in the Westshore Planning District.

Comments:
The requested plan changes will increase the possibility of a range of users depending on future development. Users may include tourists or office workers or residents on the site. The possibility of residential or tourists in an area that provides retail goods and services increases the need to ensure that access to a range of safe transportation modes is addressed. This stretch of Courtney Campbell Causeway has recorded an occurrence of pedestrian crashes due to the victims’ desire to access the services available along the south side of Courtney Campbell.

Bicycles: The 2025 Long Range Transportation Plan identifies a bicycle level of service “E”. (see attached graphic). The poor bicycle level of service grade suggests that the road will need other improvements (in addition to shoulders) to help more bicyclists feel comfortable using the corridor. This roadway is characteristic of high-volume, high-speed motor-vehicle traffic and frequent conflicts that make this roadway highly inadequate for users other than the automobile. The city of Tampa is a Transportation Concurrency Area and as such should carefully assess the potential change and its impact on its future transportation planning. At a minimum, all roadways should be targeted to maintain a minimum bicycle and pedestrian LOS D. A Higher LOS standard may be desirable for locations near schools, central-city districts, activity centers, and other traffic generators.

Transit: The Long Range Transportation Plan shows that Transit is offered as “Peak Hour Service”. Transit is an option for a particular trip. Whether or not a passenger will decide to use transit will depend on the comfort and convenience of the service relative to competing modes such as the automobile. The frequency of service greatly impacts choice of mode, therefore it is recommended that the change be assessed relative to the city and Transit providers long range
plans to promote travel options and the impact such development may otherwise have on the transportation network.

Other Comments: Additionally, the amendment should be assessed against the proposed amendment PA 09-09 relating to the Courtney Campbell Scenic Highway Corridor.

MPO staff review included assessment of the following goals and principles of the Long Range Transportation Plan:

Goal II: Promote Accessibility & Mobility Options Available to People or Freight, and Enhance the Integration and Connectivity of the Transportation System

Principle 2.2 Decrease Reliance on Single-Occupancy Vehicles

Goal III: Protect the Environment, Promote Energy Conservation, Increase Safety, Enhance Security, and Improve the Quality of Life

2. PA 09-07: City of Tampa Comprehensive Plan - Text Amendment: This plan-text amendment is initiated by the City of Tampa. The primary purpose of the amendment is to incorporate goals, objectives and policies on form-based design planning into the Tampa Comprehensive Plan to implement “The Greater Seminole Heights Vision Plan”. The Tampa Comprehensive Plan establishes policies calling for the development of form-based community plans and subsequent regulating plans.

Comments:
The proposed vision for this amendment is stated in the text as a focus on pedestrian connectivity and instills “walkability” throughout design, to create a neighborhood with an integration of land uses and multi-use destinations that attract people.

Bicycle: The Long Range Transportation Plan identifies a bicycle level of service of “D” (see attached graphic) along the major roadways within Seminole Heights. These roadways are adequate for high skilled riders. Bicyclists can anticipate a moderate to high level of interaction with motor vehicles. These roadways may or may not provide an on-street bicycle facility. Crash data shows the occurrence of both pedestrian and bicycle crashes along these corridors. A Higher LOS standard may be desirable for locations near schools, central-city district, activity centers, and other traffic generators.
**Transit:** Transit Levels of Service along Florida and Nebraska Avenues are good and excellent. Transit offers numerous economic, social, and environmental benefits the presence of transit may lead to more efficient land use patterns which can lead to other benefits. The applicant should consider capitalizing on this asset to reinforce its vision, an example of this would be to tie additional density and intensity bonuses to transit.

To achieve a community that is truly pedestrian – friendly community, the proposed goal and objectives should be carefully assessed to ensure that the desired outcome is clearly articulated. For example, using the transportation hierarchy suggests that safety, accessibility, connectivity and walkability should be the first principles that will then lead to the need for a mixed use environment.

![Transportation Hierarchy](image)

Pedestrians and cyclists are given the highest priority because of the vitality they add to the public realm and because of their low environmental impact. Further, pedestrians feed into the transit system. Transit is given a high priority because of its ability to move people directly and efficiently with a low environmental impact. Commercial vehicles and trucks, including emergency vehicles, are a higher priority than personal vehicles because of the essential services they provide to the economic life and safety of the city. Single occupant vehicles are placed at the bottom of the hierarchy because of their significant environmental impact and high physical space needs per person served.

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) was enacted in 1990 to ensure people with disabilities have equal opportunities and access to public spaces as those who do not have disabilities. People with disabilities may have diminished mobility, limited vision, or reduced cognitive skills. In some instances, individuals may experience a combination of disabilities, which is more common as a person grows older. A person may experience a disability on a
permanent or temporary basis. Without accessible pedestrian facilities, people with disabilities will have fewer opportunities to engage in employment, school, shopping, recreation, and other everyday activities. New or altered facilities must provide access for all pedestrians. This also needs to occur when implementing all the tools and treatments that are being considered in this amendment.

Street designs that accommodate people with disabilities create a better walking environment for all pedestrians.

While improvements for persons with disabilities were mandated by the Federal Government to ensure access and mobility for physically-challenged pedestrians, most of these improvements benefit all pedestrians. Some of the items that will be presented in this guide, such as adequate time to cross streets, well-designed curb ramps, limited driveways, and sidewalks that are wide and clear of obstructions and have minimal cross-slope, are examples of design features that will accommodate pedestrians with disabilities, persons using strollers, and indeed, all pedestrians.

It is recommended that the following standards are considered for integration into the proposed amendment:

Safety
Create a safe pedestrian network free of barriers and tripping hazards, that has sufficient street crossings, buffer pedestrians from vehicles and has facilities wide enough to accommodate peak pedestrian use.

Accessibility
Make facilities accessible to pedestrians of all abilities and meet all local, state and federal requirements.

Connectivity
Develop a complete pedestrian network that provides direct and convenient connections for neighborhoods, employment centers, transit stations, public places and community destinations.

Walkability
Create pedestrian facilities that offer amenities to encourage usage and to enhance the pedestrian experience. Pedestrian facilities include sidewalks, traffic calming features, crossings and accessibility features such as signals, curb ramps and signage.

Other Comments:
It is important that careful analysis of the impacts of the transportation system that ensures that the following goals and principles of the Long Range Transportation Plan are addressed:
MPO staff review included assessment of the following goals and principles of the Long Range Transportation Plan:

**Goal II: Promote Accessibility & Mobility Options Available to People or Freight, and Enhance the Integration and Connectivity of the Transportation System**

**Principle 2.1 Maximize Access to the Transportation System and Improve the Mobility of the Transportation Disadvantaged**
- Provide facilities and amenities that support transit users, bicyclists, pedestrians, and the transportation disadvantaged.
- Improve or expand the transportation disadvantaged system to encourage ridership.
- Promote paratransit or alternative services where development patterns do not support fixed route transit.

**Principle 2.2 Decrease Reliance on Single-Occupancy Vehicles**

**Goal III: Protect the Environment, Promote Energy Conservation, Increase Safety, Enhance Security, and Improve the Quality of Life**

3. **CPA 09-08 City of Tampa Comprehensive Plan – Map Amendment:** The City of Tampa requests for a plan-map amendment to implement “The Greater Seminole Heights Vision Plan.” This plan-map amendment request is considered along with a comprehensive plan-text amendment (CPA 09-07) to incorporate “The Greater Seminole Heights Vision Plan” into the Tampa Comprehensive Plan.

**Comments:**
The following comments are made without the benefit of a map or an explanation of the desired outcome for the amendment.

**In addition to the comments included in the review of PA 09-07, the following is offered for consideration:**

**Urban Form:**
The layout of our city has a major influence on the walkability of our neighborhoods. Certain types of land use mixtures, densities and the configuration of our streets can dramatically affect the amount of pedestrian activity found within a community.
Urban form (street layouts) is a major factor in determining walkability

- Urban land use and the distance between these land uses is another major factor in determining walkability
- Short block lengths set on a grid with a broad mixture of land uses and a distributed circulation network are more walkable than long blocks set in a curvilinear fashion with isolated land uses and hierarchical circulation

Pedestrian improvements are likely to provide the most benefit in areas with higher densities, higher transit use, lower vehicle ownership rates, and a variety of walking-distance destinations near residences.

The city of Tampa is a Transportation Concurrency Area and as such should carefully assess the potential change and its impact on its future transportation planning. At a minimum, all roadways should be targeted to maintain a minimum bicycle and pedestrian LOS D (see attached graphic). A Higher LOS standard may be desirable for locations near schools, activity centers, and other traffic generators.

MPO staff review included assessment of the following goals and principles of the Long Range Transportation Plan:

**Goal II: Promote Accessibility & Mobility Options Available to People or Freight, and Enhance the Integration and Connectivity of the Transportation System**

**Principle 2.2 Decrease Reliance on Single-Occupancy Vehicles**

**Goal III: Protect the Environment, Promote Energy Conservation, Increase Safety, Enhance Security, and Improve the Quality of Life**

**4. PA 09-09 City of Tampa Comprehensive Plan - Text Amendment:** This plan-text amendment is initiated by the City of Tampa. The primary purpose of the text amendment is to incorporate goals, objectives and policies relating to the **Courtney Campbell Scenic Highway Corridor** into the Tampa Comprehensive Plan.

The **Courtney Campbell Scenic Highway Corridor** policy amendment complements the West Central Florida MPO Chairs Coordinating Committee’s regional multi use trails top 10 priority list of projects. Planning Activities include a feasibility study for a 12 foot paved bicycle pedestrian trail that will connect to Pinellas County and in the future to the city of Tampa’s
West Tampa Greenway. PA 09-05 should be assessed in regards to this amendment to explore the possibility of providing city assistance to moving the project forward. The amendment is consistent with and furthers many of the goals and principles of the 2025 Long range Transportation Plan, including:

Goal II: Promote Accessibility & Mobility Options Available to People or Freight, and Enhance the Integration and Connectivity of the Transportation System

Principle 2.1 Maximize Access to the Transportation System and Improve the Mobility of the Transportation Disadvantaged

- Provide facilities and amenities that support transit users, bicyclists, pedestrians, and the transportation disadvantaged.
- Improve or expand the transportation disadvantaged system to encourage ridership.
- Promote paratransit or alternative services where development patterns do not support fixed route transit.

5. Description of Request: This is a City of Tampa initiated plan amendment involving 41.81 acres of selected public and private land in the Central Park Community Redevelopment Area (CRA). The request involves a change in the City of Tampa’s Comprehensive Plan Map from Central Business District-CBD, Regional-Mixed Use-100 (RMU-100), Community-Mixed Use-35 (CMU-35) and High Density Residential-83 (R-83) to Urban-Mixed Use-60 (UMU-60) and Recreational/Open Space (R/OS). Central Park CRA is located in the Central Tampa Planning District.

Comments:
The requested plan changes will increase the possibility of a range of users depending on future development. Users may include tourists or office workers or residents on the site.

Transit: Public transit stimulates development and redevelopment. The Transit level of service for Nebraska is “B” which is good. Additionally, a new transit service known as “MetroRapid” is planned to begin in 2011. The service will increase the speed of transit, improve service reliability and make it easier for people to use transit. The Urban Mixed Use plan category describes standards that should promote complementary transit development which include:

- Populates and activates neighborhoods during both day and evening hours
- Increases housing options for more household types
- Reduces need to use a car for every trip
- Reduces traffic congestion and pollution
- Creates vibrant communities

**Bicycle:** The 2025 Long Range Transportation Plan identifies a bicycle level of service “E” (see attached graphic). The poor bicycle level of service grade suggests that the road will need other improvements (in addition to shoulders) to help more bicyclists feel comfortable using the corridor. This roadway is characteristic of high-volume, high-speed motor-vehicle traffic and frequent conflicts that make this roadway highly inadequate for users other than the automobile. The city of Tampa is a Transportation Concurrency Area and as such should carefully assess the potential change and its impact on its future transportation planning. At a minimum, all roadways should be targeted to maintain a minimum bicycle and pedestrian LOS D. A Higher LOS standard may be desirable for locations near schools, central-city district, activity centers, and other traffic generators. This amendment has the potential to improve the environment for bicyclists and pedestrian including a well-connected system of sidewalks.

MPO staff review included assessment of the following principles of the Long Range Transportation Plan:

**Goal II: Promote Accessibility & Mobility Options Available to People or Freight, and Enhance the Integration and Connectivity of the Transportation System**

**Principle 2.1 Maximize Access to the Transportation System and Improve the Mobility of the Transportation Disadvantaged**
- Provide facilities and amenities that support transit users, bicyclists, pedestrians, and the transportation disadvantaged.
- Improve or expand the transportation disadvantaged system to encourage ridership.
- Promote paratransit or alternative services where development patterns do not support fixed route transit.

**Principle 2.3 Support an Integrated System with Efficient Connections between Transportation Modes**
- Develop a transportation system that integrates all modes of transportation.
- Encourage development of multi-modal terminals in major activity centers.
- Provide appropriate highway, public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian links to airports, seaports, rail facilities, major transit terminals/stops, theme parks, and other major tourist destinations.
- Promote transit circulator, bicycle and pedestrian systems serving major activity centers, such as hospitals, educational facilities, malls, and other major commercial centers.
- Support improvements to significant point structures such as major intersections and movable bridges that serve vehicular traffic and other modes.
6. PA 09-11: Future Land Use Map change. As required by the Florida Communities Trust's Parks grant program, a change to the most restrictive land use category is required as a condition for the acquisition of this site which is currently owned by the City of Tampa. Therefore, the City of Tampa is requesting a 47.17-acre parcel to be amended from Low Density Suburban Neighborhood (R-6) to Recreational/Open Space (R-OS). The primary purpose of this public-initiated plan amendment request is to promote outdoor recreation and natural resource protection needs identified in the City of Tampa’s comprehensive plan.

Comments:
One purpose of this amendment request is to promote outdoor recreation.

Bicycle: The Long Range Transportation Plan identifies MacDill Avenue as having a level of service as LOS D (see attached graphic). The roadway is adequate for high skilled riders. Bicyclists can anticipate a moderate to high level of interaction with motor vehicles. Crash data shows the occurrence of both pedestrian and bicycle crashes along these corridors. A Higher LOS standard may be desirable for locations near schools, activity centers, and other traffic generators. The city of Tampa is a Transportation Concurrency Area and as such should carefully assess the potential change and its impact on its future transportation planning with an eye on improving the environment for bicyclists and pedestrian.

Transit: The transit level of service along MacDill is “E”. The designation indicates that the reliability of transit service is such that passengers must allow extra time for irregular service. An attractor such as a park should be accessible by transit in a city that is designated a Transportation Concurrency Area.
FIGURE 4-1: EXAMPLES OF BLOS FOR URBAN ROADWAYS
Summary of Events for Proposed Future Land Use Map Changes for CPA 09-08

The Seminole Heights proposed Future Land Use Map changes were based on the associated community plan, developed by stakeholder input of the Greater Seminole Heights Area. Therefore, since the initial proposal was developed via public input, any subsequent requests for omissions from the map were honored.

1. On January 25th, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on CPA09-08, Seminole Heights Future Land Use Map changes for approximately 213 acres. During the public comment part of the hearing, various parcels were recommended for omission from the proposed request based on citizen comments. Planning Commission staff noted the aforementioned land parcels which were then attached to the Planning Commission recommendation for Tampa City Council’s consideration.

2. On February 25th, at a Tampa City Council Public hearing during public comment, additional parcels were recommended for omission in addition to the parcels brought up at the prior Planning Commission Public hearing.

- All recommended changes were recorded, noted and agreed upon by all to be deleted from the final proposed future land use request.
- The result was the omission of 54 parcels, a reduction of approximately 20 acres, creating a new total of approximately 193 acres.
- There are two PROPOSED future land used maps included in the map series of this report:
  - One is the original map proposed by staff at the Planning Commission meeting
  - The other larger map reflects the omission of the 54 parcels

The following table is a summary of the adjusted redevelopment potential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential change in density based on the proposed future land use changes for 213 acres</th>
<th>+5,685 units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amended density figures based on 193 acres</td>
<td>+3,052 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential change in intensity based on the proposed future land use changes for 213 acres</td>
<td>+10,112,009 sq. ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amended intensity figures based on 193 acres</td>
<td>+8,892,990 sq. ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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RESOLUTION

ITEM: Tampa: CPA 09-08 Greater Seminole Heights Map Amendment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AYE</th>
<th>NAY</th>
<th>ABSENT</th>
<th>DATE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>January 25, 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bruce P. Cury, Chair
Terri G. Cobb, Vice-Chair
Frank M. Chillura, Member-at-Large
Jill Buford
Derek L. Doughty
Miller Q. Dowdy
Edward F. Giunta, II
Vivian M. Kitchen
Hung T. Mai
Gary D. Sears

Robert B. Hunter, FAICP, Executive Director

On motion of Commissioner Buford, Seconded by Commissioner Dowdy,

WHEREAS, the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission has developed a Comprehensive Plan for the City of Tampa entitled Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy A Livable City, pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 163.3161, Florida Statutes, which was adopted by Tampa City Council on February 9, 2009, as amended; and;

WHEREAS, Tampa City Council adopted the Procedures Manual for Amendments to the Tampa Comprehensive Plan on October 9, 1986 and subsequently amended; and

WHEREAS, the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission has received a City-initiated petition for an amendment to the Future Land Use Map of the Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy: A Livable City by the August 2009 submittal deadline; and

WHEREAS, the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission has reviewed the request to amend the Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy A Livable City future land use map with a series of land use changes in the Greater Seminole Heights area in order to facilitate implementation of the Greater Seminole Heights Vision Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission has reviewed the proposal, has considered existing conditions,
and expected mobility and development patterns in the respective area, as well as the adopted goals, objectives and policies of the Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy A Livable City as stated in the staff report as follows:

**Policy 23.2.2:** The City shall create area specific Vision Plans, based on the Community Planning method, for the Greater Seminole Heights, Tampa Heights, and 40th Street Community Planning Areas by 2015, that clearly document and describe community assets, opportunities and challenges, community, character, conceptual street cross-section designs, and basic building forms for residential, non-residential, and mixed use.

**Objective 23.5:** The future of community planning will utilize form-based code initiatives to assist in the development of a Vision Plan and creation of a community-specific Form Based Code for each Community Planning area.

**Goal 15:** Create a city of distinctive and memorable places.

**Objective 15.1:** Support the Urban Village designation that produce a distinctive, high-quality built environment whose forms and character respect Tampa’s unique historic environment, and architectural context, and create memorable places that enrich community life.

**Policy 15.1.2:** Mix of Uses – Urban villages contain most of the following uses which typically make up what is considered a traditional and livable community: single and multi-family residential, neighborhood serving commercial, schools, parks, a central gathering place, mass transit and safe, walkable pathways that connect people to all areas of the village. Work towards creating a mix and placement of these uses that works for the character of the village and creates a vibrant community setting.

**Policy 15.1.3:** Economic Opportunity – Recognize that urban villages are very livable and sustainable form of development. Continue to emphasize the compact and mixed use nature of these villages. Look for ways to make it easier to create this type of development pattern.

**Policy 15.1.4:** Mobility Choices – The City shall ensure that redevelopment projects in urban villages are designated for pedestrian traffic and connect and support a citywide transit system.
Policy 15.1.9: Choice of Lifestyle – Mixed use projects that integrate different classifications of uses (e.g. commercial and residential) are preferred over single use projects, and will be incentivized.

Mixed Use Corridor Villages

Goal 16: Mixed Use Corridor Villages - Major corridors transformed into vibrant pedestrian-friendly environments that serve as gathering places for adjacent neighborhoods.

Objective 16.1: The transformation of major corridors to include a broader mix of uses, both horizontal and vertical, that provides opportunities for medium and higher density housing, while also addressing local and citywide demand for retail and services.

Policy 16.1.1: Redeveloping Automobile-oriented Corridors - The City shall promote redevelopment of existing automobile-oriented corridors and the upgrading of existing commercial development to create vibrant, mixed-use boulevards that balance efficient movement of motor vehicles with the creation of attractive pedestrian-friendly districts that serve the adjoining neighborhoods as well as passing motorists.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission finds the recommended changes to the Future Land Use Map made by the applicant, in addition to changes agreed upon during the course of public comment at this public hearing (attached), for Tampa Comprehensive Plan Amendment 09-08 from: Residential-10, Residential-20, Suburban Mixed Use-6 and Public/Semi-Public to Residential-20, Residential-35, Community Mixed Use-35 and Community Commercial-35, CONSISTENT with the *Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy A Livable City* and recommends Tampa Comprehensive Plan Amendment 09-08 be approved.
Attachment
Properties Omitted From Future Land Use Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folio Number</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Existing FLU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>162182.0000, 162199.0000</td>
<td>6304 Otis Avenue, Tampa, Fl 33604</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164830.0000</td>
<td>5009 N. Central Avenue Tampa, Fl 33614</td>
<td>SMU-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150353.0000</td>
<td>1502 E. Hanna Avenue, Tampa, Fl 33610</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150356.0000</td>
<td>1506 E. Hanna Avenue, Tampa, Fl 33610</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150354.0000</td>
<td>6205 N. 15th Street, Tampa, Fl 33610</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150355.0000</td>
<td>6209 N. 15th Street, Tampa, Fl 33610</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150355.0600</td>
<td>1501 E. Jean Street, Tampa, Fl 33610</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150297.0000</td>
<td>1501 E. Hanna Avenue, Tampa, Fl 33610</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150298.0000</td>
<td>1503 E. Hanna Avenue, Tampa, Fl 33610</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150295.0000</td>
<td>1505 E. Hanna Avenue, Tampa, Fl 33610</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150300.0000</td>
<td>1507 E. Hanna Avenue, Tampa, Fl 33610</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150296.0000</td>
<td>5919 N. 15th Street, Tampa, Fl 33610</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150314.0000</td>
<td>5917 N. 15th Street, Tampa, Fl 33610</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150317.0000</td>
<td>5915 N. 15th Street, Tampa, Fl 33610</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170449.0000</td>
<td>1421 E. Hanna Avenue, Tampa, Fl 33610</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170448.0000</td>
<td>1419 E. Hanna Avenue, Tampa, Fl 33610</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170446.0500</td>
<td>1417 E. Hanna Avenue, Tampa, Fl 33610</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170450.0000</td>
<td>1424 E. Paris Street, Tampa, Fl 33610</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170451.0000</td>
<td>1422 E. Paris Street, Tampa, Fl 33610</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170452.0000</td>
<td>1420 E. Paris Street, Tampa, Fl 33610</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170453.0000</td>
<td>1418 E. Paris Street, Tampa, Fl 33610</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170705.0000</td>
<td>1422 E. Hanna Street, Tampa, Fl 33610</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170704.0000</td>
<td>1420 E. Hanna Street, Tampa, Fl 33610</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170706.0000</td>
<td>1418 E. Hanna Street, Tampa, Fl 33610</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170703.0000</td>
<td>1419 E. Jean Street, Tampa, Fl 33610</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170702.0000</td>
<td>1417 E. Jean Street, Tampa, Fl 33610</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170701.0000</td>
<td>1415 E. Jean Street, Tampa, Fl 33610</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170700.0000</td>
<td>1413 E. Jean Street, Tampa, Fl 33610</td>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Current Future Land Use Category that will be retained on FLUM
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Meeting Date: January 25, 2010 Public Hearing
Agenda Item: Tampa: CPA 09-08 Greater Seminole Heights Map Amendment

SUMMARY

The Planning Commission will be reviewing and making a recommendation to Tampa City Council on proposed amendments to the Future Land Use Map of the Tampa Comprehensive Plan. The map amendment recommendations were submitted by the City of Tampa to facilitate the implementation of the companion Seminole Heights Vision Plan Text Amendment.

BACKGROUND

The Planning Commission is required to make recommendations to the Tampa City Council on all proposed changes to the Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy: A Livable City pursuant to Chapter 163, Part II, Florida Statutes and Chapter 97-351 Laws of Florida, as amended.

Pursuant to the Tampa Comprehensive Plan Goals, Objectives and Policies, the Greater Seminole Heights Vision Plan has been developed as the Community Plan for the area. As part of the planning process, in order to implement the Community Plan via the City’s regulatory process through form-based codes, it was determined that changes were needed to the future land use map. Subsequently, recommendations were made by the City’s Land Development Coordination Department for consideration by the Planning Commission.

The proposed land use changes recognize the assets of the area, setting a framework to implement a form-based code for land development and will overall further the strategies set out within the goals, objectives and policies of the Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy: A Livable City.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Planning Commission APPROVE the attached resolution finding the amendment CPA 09-08 CONSISTENT with the Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy: A Livable City and forward this recommendation to the Tampa City Council.

Prepared By: T. Garcia, AICP, Principal Planner                        Date Prepared: January 12, 2010
Plan Amendment Description

This is a City of Tampa initiated plan amendment involving approximately 213 acres of selected parcels of land in the Greater Seminole Heights Area, which is comprised of three (3) neighborhood associations: Old Seminole Heights; South Seminole Heights and Southeast Seminole Heights. The request involves a change in the City of Tampa’s Comprehensive Plan Map from Community Commercial-35, Community-Mixed Use-35 (CMU-35), Residential-35, Residential-20, Residential-10 and Recreational/Open (R/OS) to Community Commercial-35, Community-Mixed Use-35 (CMU-35), Residential-35, and Residential-20.

This amendment is one of two associated plan amendments needed to facilitate the implementation of the Greater Seminole Heights Vision Plan as the part of the City of Tampa’s efforts towards establishing community planning, city-wide, via a form-based codes approach. One is this proposed map amendment, CPA 09-08, for those selected parcels within the Greater Seminole Heights Area. The associated text amendment CPA 09-07 which consists of goals and policies that encapsulate the Greater Seminole Heights Vision Plan’s key ideals and principles.

Seminole Heights was chosen by the City of Tampa as the pilot program to initiate community planning as it was viewed as a neighborhood with ample opportunities for redevelopment through a form-based plan. The area offers cultural and historical references, a diverse and stable population, a defined and well traveled street grid, multiple bus transit lines (including planned bus rapid transit), eclectic architecture, an integrated park system, significant natural resources including the Hillsborough River, and linear commercial corridors. It’s
proximity to the city center and Interstate coupled with limited diversity in current commercial businesses creates excellent redevelopment opportunities. The Vision Plan is the result of over two (2) years of meetings and workshops with the stakeholders of the Seminole Heights Community to establish a vision and associated plan for the community that will facilitate redevelopment, attract private-sector investment and encourage new higher-density mixed-use projects with the goal of creating a truly sustainable neighborhood

### Future Land Use Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recreation-Open Space</th>
<th>Form Guidelines</th>
<th>Use Density/Intensity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide for the preservation, continued growth and enhancements of Tampa’s rich resource of parklands, recreational areas, and surrounding open spaces.</td>
<td>Parks (such as pocket, neighborhood, community, and Regional parks); and Greenways and trails; and natural parks, woodlands, habitat, floodplains, and areas with permanent open spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Residential-10        | Single family detached permitted; limited townhomes considered; Accessory second units considered; Limited neighborhood-serving commercial uses consistent with Locational Criteria for Neighborhood Commercial and Residential Office uses Compatible public, quasi-public, and special uses (for example churches, schools, recreational and daycare facilities are allowed consideration; Lot coverage that generally does not exceed 49%| • 0-9 Dwelling Units per gross acre  
• 0-10 Dwelling Units per gross acre with performance standards met  
• 0.50 Floor Area Ratio                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |

Seminole Heights Map Amendment  
August 2009 Cycle  
Tampa CPA 09-08
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential-20</th>
<th>Form Guidelines</th>
<th>Use Density/Intensity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Small-lot single family units (duplexes, condominiums, townhomes); Multifamily dwellings; Limited neighborhood-serving commercial uses consistent with Locational Criteria for Neighborhood Commercial and Residential Office uses Compatible public, quasi-public, and special uses (for example churches, schools, recreational and daycare facilities) are allowed consideration; Lot coverage that generally does not exceed 65%;</td>
<td>• 0-18 Dwelling Units per gross acre  • 0-20 Dwelling Units per gross acre with performance standards met  • 0.50 Floor Area Ratio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential-35</th>
<th>Form Guidelines</th>
<th>Use Density/Intensity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Small-lot single family units (duplexes, condominiums, townhomes); Multifamily dwellings; Limited neighborhood-serving commercial uses consistent with Locational Criteria for Neighborhood Commercial and Residential Office uses Compatible public, quasi-public, and special uses (for example churches, schools, recreational and daycare facilities) are allowed consideration; Lot coverage that generally does not exceed 70%;</td>
<td>• 0-30 Dwelling Units per gross acre  • 0-35 Dwelling Units per gross acre with performance standards met  • 0.60 Floor Area Ratio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suburban Mixed Use 6</th>
<th>Form Guidelines</th>
<th>Use Density/Intensity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Single family detached and multifamily permitted; Limited neighborhood commercial, residential office and general commercial uses; Compatible public, quasi-public, and special uses allowed;</td>
<td>• 0-6 dwelling units per net acre;  • 0.35 Floor Area Ratio  • Neighborhood and General Commercial uses allowed; FAR may guide residential development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Mixed Use 35</td>
<td>Form Guidelines</td>
<td>Use Density/Intensity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed-use development at intersections with stepped down residential between;</td>
<td>• 0-30 dwelling units per acre;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buildings sited up to the corridor to create a consistent street wall;</td>
<td>• 30-35 dwelling units per acre with performance standards met;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heights are generally 2 to 5 stories;</td>
<td>• 2.0 Floor Area Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entrances that directly address the street;</td>
<td>• Neighborhood and General Commercial uses allowed; FAR may guide residential development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian-oriented uses such as outdoor cafes; integrated residential and non-residential uses;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attractive pedestrian streetscape.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Commercial 35</th>
<th>Form Guidelines</th>
<th>Use Density/Intensity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provides for horizontal and vertical mixed-use development</td>
<td>• 0-30 dwelling units per acre;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single-use commercial and residential development that includes:</td>
<td>• 30-35 dwelling units per acre with performance standards met;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Intensive and general commercial, service, office, ; and</td>
<td>• 2.0 Floor Area Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Residential uses (by either density or floor area ratio)</td>
<td>• Neighborhood and General Commercial uses allowed; FAR may guide residential development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Gathering places such as a plaza, courtyard, or park;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Compatible public, quasi-public, and special uses; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Development should include a mix of non-residential and residential uses with more intense development near major intersections.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Areawide mix of uses 70% residential, 100% non-residential.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tampa Comprehensive Plan Context

Tampa’s Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy: A Livable City was adopted in February, 2009. The Plan articulates a vision for how Tampa will accommodate the growth of the city to include 92,000 additional residents and 132,000 new jobs over the next 20 years, while promoting the values of its citizens:

LIVABILITY (Tampa is a place where diverse people find it easy, safe and enjoyable to live.)
PROSPERITY (A Tampa that is focused on the quality of life for all its people must be a Tampa that is economically healthy, with a broad mix of good jobs.)
RESPECT (The living systems which support us are taken care of and passed on to future generations in better shape.)
RESILIENCE (The systems that support our day to day living can deal with uncertainty and cope with the shifts and shocks we face in the future.)

The Plan’s vision articulates the growth management strategy by first organizing the City into Planning Districts and encouraging most new growth to locate in places designated as Business Centers, Urban Villages or Mixed Use Corridor Villages. Each Business Center and Urban Village has a secondary plan that indicates the amount of growth the City is planning in the next 20 years. The Plan also includes policies that describe how the City intends to serve this growth with mobility options and other infrastructure facilities.

The “Big Picture” Tampa Vision Map:
The integration of transit and land use planning is illustrated by the Vision Map. This map identifies existing and community plan designated business centers, urban villages and mixed use corridor villages that are along the region’s higher frequency existing and planned transit services. Implementation of the City’s growth strategy is dependent upon the close coordination of land use and transportation planning. The strategy calls for redevelopment, infill, and new growth to be targeted into compact, mixed-use, and walkable villages that are connected to a regional transit system.

Strategy 1: The Districts
Objective 1.1: Designate 5 planning districts: University, Central Tampa, Westshore, New Tampa and South Tampa as an opportunity to build a livable and sustainable city.

Policy 1.1.1: Recognize the Central Tampa District as the primary urban core, civic and cultural center.

Policy 1.1.2: Foster a vibrant urban lifestyle through mixed use development with entertainment and cultural facilities.

Policy 1.1.3: Protect and build upon the heritage assets found in the diverse neighborhoods in the district.

Policy 1.1.11: Encourage transit oriented, pedestrian-friendly mixed-use development in the Westshore, Central Tampa and University planning districts.

The plan amendment area is located within the Central Tampa District; that has the Central Business District-Downtown as its business center.
The Central Tampa District is the hub of the region’s economic, governmental and cultural center. The District includes economic engines such as the Port of Tampa, Tampa General Hospital and the University of Tampa, each of which supports a dynamic downtown and is critical to the health of the City.

This area also includes significant clusters of historic Urban Villages neighborhoods that are ethnically, racially, and economically diverse, and are places of heritage that add character, appeal and interest to the City. The district offers many opportunities to become a more livable, sustainable part of the City.

Opportunities – within the Central Tampa District

1. Improving Mobility
2. Attracting Private Investment
3. The District’s Historic Character
4. Providing Needed Infrastructure to Support Redevelopment
5. Stable single family neighborhoods that enhance the District’s housing choices

Strategy 2: Strengthening our Diverse Neighborhoods

Objective 1.2: A City of diverse, distinct, and well-structured neighborhoods that meet the community’s needs for complete, sustainable, and high-quality living environments from the historic downtown core to the well-integrated new growth areas.

Policy 1.2.1: Recognizing Tampa’s neighborhoods are the basic living environments that make-up the City’s urban fabric, the City shall through its planning preserve and enhance all neighborhood’s distinctiveness, identity, and livability.

Policy 1.2.3: The City shall promote the design of complete and well-structured neighborhoods whose physical layout and land use mix promote walking, biking, and transit; reduce vehicle trips; foster community pride; enhance neighborhood identity; ensure public safety; and are family-friendly and address the needs of all ages and abilities.

Strategy 7: Growing Economic Prosperity
Objective 12.1: A positive business climate supported by adequate public infrastructure, including transportation and schools.

Policy 12.1.2: Recognize the contribution of cultural resources, such as public art and historic resources to the strength of Tampa’s economy.

The “Small Picture” Urban Villages and Sustainable neighborhoods:
Urban villages function as villages within the larger city. Designated urban villages have had some type of adopted secondary planning process that is being used to guide or inform the future of that area. In the case of Seminole Heights, identified as an Urban Village in the Tampa Comprehensive Plan, that secondary guide will be the Greater Seminole Heights Vision Plan.

Examples of urban villages abound in the Central Tampa District. The villages are diverse and provide goods, services, housing, and employment to Tampa’s residents and are the key to Tampa’s livability. Urban villages contribute to a livable City by supporting:
- Diverse housing and employment growth;
- Pedestrian and transit-oriented communities;
- Provision of services and infrastructure targeted to support sustainable redevelopment; and
- Enhancements to the City’s cultural diversity.

An urban village designation recognizes the contributions a particular area makes to the City and provides guidance regarding the intended function, character, intensity, type and degree of growth anticipated for an area.

The Greater Seminole Heights area is comprised of three (3) neighborhood associations and one (1) business guild, which are well organized and engaged with City government. The Seminole Heights residential areas have seen an enormous amount of investment and renovation over the past two decades, featured by the historic bungalows which grace the area and are part of the fabric of its two historic districts. Older homes have been refurbished, parks cleaned up, and residential areas made into safe and inviting places once again through a reduction in crime and sense of personal ownership for the neighborhood.

While residential areas have seen substantial investment and prospered, the commercial corridors have not shared a similar success. Their commercial character, prevalent as far back as five decades ago, has changed very little, offering poor commercial opportunities for the area’s residents and existing
businesses. Consequently, residents in the area have no recourse but to travel to other parts of the city for those neighborhood amenities woefully deficient along their commercial corridors such as restaurants, cafes, dry cleaners, entertainment venues, specialty retail businesses, or professional services.

Most people from other neighborhoods travel “through” Seminole Heights rather than “to” Seminole Heights either accessing its major thoroughfares or the interstate that split the neighborhood.

### Plan Amendment Impacts/Issues

The tables below summarize the potential impacts of the changes from Residential-10, Residential-20, Suburban Mixed Use-6, Community Mixed Use-35 and Public/Semi-Public to Residential-20, Residential-35, Community Mixed Use-35 and Community Commercial-35.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From: Recreation Open Space (R/OS)</th>
<th>To: Residential-20 (R-20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Density</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum # of units using density calculations based on 0.15 acres</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum square footage of building based on 0.15 acres</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Floor Area Ratio (ratio of building to land; 10,000 sq. ft. of building on 10,000 sq. ft. of land equals an FAR of 1.0)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>From: Residential -10 (R-10)</th>
<th>To: Residential-20 (R-20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Density</td>
<td>10 DU/gross acre</td>
<td>20 DU/gross acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum # of units using density calculations based on 117.1 acres</td>
<td>1,171 Units</td>
<td>2,342 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum square footage of building based on 117.1 acres</td>
<td>1,785,306 sq. ft.</td>
<td>2,550,438 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>From: Residential-10 (R-10)</th>
<th>To: Residential-35 (R-35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Density</td>
<td>10DU/gross acre</td>
<td>35 DU/gross acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum # of units using density calculations based on 12.19 acres</td>
<td>121units</td>
<td>426 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum square footage of building based on 12.19 acres</td>
<td>185,848 sq. ft</td>
<td>318,597 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From: Residential-10 (R-10)</td>
<td>To: Community Mixed Use-35 (CMU-35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Density</td>
<td>10 DU/gross acre</td>
<td>35 DU/gross acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum # of units using density calculations based on 68.1 acres</td>
<td>681 units</td>
<td>2,383 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum square footage of building based on 68.1 acres</td>
<td>1,038,252 sq. ft.</td>
<td>5,932,872 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Floor Area Ratio (ratio of building to land; 10,000 sq. ft. of building on 10,000 sq. ft. of land equals an FAR of 1.0)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>From: Residential-10 (R-10)</th>
<th>To: Community Commercial-35 (CC-35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Density</td>
<td>10 DU/gross acre</td>
<td>35 DU/gross acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum # of units using density calculations based on 1.82 acres</td>
<td>18 units</td>
<td>63.7 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum square footage of building based on 1.82 acres</td>
<td>27,747 sq. ft.</td>
<td>158,558 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From:</td>
<td>To:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential-20 (R-20)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Community Mixed Use-35 (CMU-35)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Floor Area Ratio</th>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>2.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Density</td>
<td>20 DU/gross acre</td>
<td>35 DU/gross acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum # of units using density calculations based on 11.29 acres</td>
<td>225 Units</td>
<td>395 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum square footage of building based on 11.29 acres</td>
<td>245,896 sq. ft.</td>
<td>963,584 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Floor Area Ratio (ratio of building to land; 10,000 sq. ft. of building on 10,000 sq. ft. of land equals an FAR of 1.0)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From:</th>
<th>To:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential-20 (R-20)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Community Commercial-35 (CC-35)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Floor Area Ratio</th>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>2.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Density</td>
<td>20 DU/gross acre</td>
<td>35 DU/gross acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum # of units using density calculations based on 1.58 acres</td>
<td>31 Units</td>
<td>55 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum square footage of building based on 1.58 acres</td>
<td>34,412 sq. ft.</td>
<td>137,649 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From: Suburban Mixed Use-6 (SMU-6)</td>
<td>To: Community Mixed Use-35 (CMU-35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Density</td>
<td>6DU/gross acre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum # of units using density calculations based on 0.54 acres</td>
<td>3 Units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum square footage of building based on 0.54 acres</td>
<td>11,761 sq. ft.</td>
<td>47,044 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Floor Area Ratio (ratio of building to land; 10,000 sq. ft. of building on 10,000 sq. ft. of land equals an FAR of 1.0)

**Issues:**

**Land Use Compatibility and Transition of Uses**

Increases in the level of intensity and density around major and minor commercial intersections and along major corridors have been recommended to accommodate the targeted growth patterns identified in the Seminole Heights Vision Plan, with the intent of further protecting the stabilized single-family areas of the community from future increases.

The targeted growth at these commercial “nodes” focuses higher intensities and densities where transit is available and readily used, and keeps this level of increase to classified, often used roadways, as opposed to local streets, ensuring sensitive transition of uses.

Increases in density outside of the intersections have been recommended to both recognize existing development patterns that pre-date today’s land use and zoning designations, and to allow larger parcels of land to potentially provide infill housing stock in locations with close proximity to transit, schools, and infrastructure.

The proposed map changes provide for a moderate alteration in land use patterns, shifting approximately 4% of the residential land use to a mixed-use category, which will provide for redevelopment opportunities at the 3 major commercial intersections along Nebraska and several minor commercial intersections along Florida.
Mobility; Infill and Infrastructure

The anticipated growth of 92,000+ residents and more than 132,000+ additional employees shall result in increased demand on City, County and State roadways. The City is nearly built-out and almost all of the anticipated growth is expected as either redevelopment or infill development. Since the City is nearly built-out there are limited chances to widen roadway capacity to accommodate the increased traffic demand without severely impacting neighborhoods and the existing built environment.

The proposed plan amendment site is located within the Urban Redevelopment Area of the City’s Transportation Concurrency Exception Area (TCEA).

The purpose of the Urban Redevelopment designation within the TCEA is to encourage redevelopment in and around the City’s Business Centers, and to create integrated communities that can be served by existing or planned multi-modal transportation facilities and services.

The purpose of the Transportation Concurrency Exception Area is to delineate areas designed to reduce adverse transportation concurrency impacts that may hamper urban infill and redevelopment within the area. (See Attachment B for City of Tampa TCEA map)

Villages should increase personal transportation choices and minimize transportation impacts through design that pays attention to the needs of people traveling by transit, foot, and bicycle, as well as the automobile. Focused development and density adjacent to transit stops and stations helps make transit convenient for more people, and allows for amore cost-effective expansion of transit services. Housing in mixed-use commercial areas provides opportunities for people to live near their place of work, and helps support the use of neighborhood shops and services. The Livable City land use pattern is a transportation as well as a land use strategy.

Neighborhoods also benefit from the transportation/land use strategy as a result of: the overall increase of transit service and roadway improvements increased accessibility to regional employment areas; citywide improvements to foster walking and bicycling; and, citywide multi-modal transportation improvements in conjunction with development.
Aging Infrastructure

The City of Tampa’s potable water mains and wastewater collection facilities are aging. The City is updating its assets data to have a comprehensive inventory of the replacement and rehabilitation needs. The majority of the aging infrastructure is located in South Tampa, Westshore and Ybor City which are targeted as redevelopment areas. The aging infrastructure together with increased redevelopment and infill development has reduced water pressure in some areas of the City. The concern of aging infrastructure is also faced by other utility departments, such as Stormwater due to the age of the City and historic development patterns. Aging infrastructure requires frequent maintenance to repair leaks and breaks which create the potential for risks to the environment and public health.

Infill and Redevelopment

Continued development and redevelopment is vital to the future stability and vitality of the City of Tampa. Redevelopment and revitalization brings with it new homes, jobs and economic development, which, in turn, helps to increase overall tax revenues to fund needed capital projects and important government services, such as police and fire services.

It is therefore, critical, that policies in the Comprehensive Plan provide a framework that will eliminate unnecessary barriers and encourage long-term redevelopment. Redevelopment via the proper implementation of the Vision Plan will provide an economic catalyst for improvements and upgrades to the infrastructure.

Copies of agency responses are included in Attachment A of this report. Agencies/Departments with comments to the proposed amendment are as follows:

City of Tampa – Water Department
City of Tampa – Wastewater Department
City of Tampa – Solid Waste Department
City of Tampa – Stormwater Department
City of Tampa – Transportation Department
City of Tampa – Parks and Recreation Department
Hillsborough County School Board
The Environmental Protection Commission (EPC)
Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)
Hillsborough Area Regional Transit Authority (HART)
According to comments provided by the City of Tampa and other agencies the provision of public facilities will not be adversely affected by the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment.

### Relationship to the Tampa Comprehensive Plan

#### Growth Management Solution
In keeping with the vision for a more Livable City, future growth will be steered to areas and locations that are well served by transit or the existing road network and which have a number of properties with redevelopment potential. Generally growth areas are locations where good transit access can be provided along bus and future rail transit route, and at future transit stations. The growth areas envisioned in this plan are:

- Business Centers
- Mixed use corridor villages
- Transit stations
- Urban Villages- limited growth

The role of these areas should ensure that spaces for economic activities are not displaced by residential development and that residential neighborhoods are not destabilized by inappropriate commercial encroachment.

**Urban Villages-limited growth:**

Urban Villages function as villages within the larger city. Urban villages contribute to a livable City by supporting:

- Diverse housing and employment growth
- Pedestrian and transit oriented communities
- Provision of services and infrastructure targeted to support sustainable redevelopment; and
- Enhancements to the City’s cultural diversity.

An Urban Village designation recognizes the contributions a particular area makes to the City and provides guidance regarding the intended function, character, intensity, type and degree of growth anticipated for an area.
Seminole Heights is an Urban Village in the Central Tampa District which offers many opportunities to becoming a more livable and sustainable part of the city including improving mobility, attracting private investment, historic character, providing needed infrastructure, and stable single family neighborhoods.

The Seminole Heights Vision Plan supports the City of Tampa Comprehensive Plan through the development of Urban Village Neighborhood and Community Nodes as well as the development of Mixed Use Corridor Villages using community planning through form-based codes.

**Goal 15:** Create a city of distinctive and memorable places.

**Objective 15.1:** Support the Urban Village designation that produce a distinctive, high-quality built environment whose forms and character respect Tampa’s unique historic environment, and architectural context, and create memorable places that enrich community life.

**Policy 15.1.2:** Mix of Uses – Urban villages contain most of the following uses which typically make up what is considered a traditional and livable community: single and multi-family residential, neighborhood serving commercial, schools, parks, a central gathering place, mass transit and safe, walkable pathways that connect people to all areas of the village. Work towards creating a mix and placement of these uses that works for the character of the village and creates a vibrant community setting.

**Policy 15.1.3:** Economic Opportunity – Recognize that urban villages are very livable and sustainable form of development. Continue to emphasize the compact and mixed use nature of these villages. Look for ways to make it easier to create this type of development pattern.

**Policy 15.1.4:** Mobility Choices – The City shall ensure that redevelopment projects in urban villages are designated for pedestrian traffic and connect and support a citywide transit system.

**Policy 15.1.9:** Choice of Lifestyle – Mixed use projects that integrate different classifications of uses (e.g. commercial and residential) are preferred over single use projects, and will be incentivized.
Mixed Use Corridor Villages

To achieve redevelopment of commercial corridors, the Seminole Heights Vision Plan, establishes land use categories specific to Seminole Heights which allow for increases in intensity of future development particularly along the major corridors and in identified nodes through Goal Chapter 3, Goal 16 of the City of Tampa Comprehensive Plan.

**Goal 16: Mixed Use Corridor Villages** - Major corridors transformed into vibrant pedestrian-friendly environments that serve as gathering places for adjacent neighborhoods.

**Objective 16.1:** The transformation of major corridors to include a broader mix of uses, both horizontal and vertical, that provides opportunities for medium and higher density housing, while also addressing local and citywide demand for retail and services.

**Policy 16.1.1: Redeveloping Automobile-oriented Corridors** - The City shall promote redevelopment of existing automobile-oriented corridors and the upgrading of existing commercial development to create vibrant, mixed-use boulevards that balance efficient movement of motor vehicles with the creation of attractive pedestrian-friendly districts that serve the adjoining neighborhoods as well as passing motorists.

The Plan focuses on development of mixed use corridor villages with excellent community circulation (i.e. Transportation) emphasizing use of transit, walking and bicycle to move around.

The plan also seeks to preserve the natural environment as well as historic resources.

**Analysis and Conclusion**

The proposed map amendment to the Future Land Use Map within the Central Tampa Planning District reflects the intent of the Greater Seminole Heights Vision Plan. The *Tampa Comprehensive Plan* supports the intent of the Greater Seminole Heights Vision Plan through the following goals, objectives and principles:

- Policy 23.2.2 - calls for an area specific Vision Plan, based on the Community Planning Method for Greater Seminole Heights by 2015.
Objective 23.5 - calls for utilization of form-based code initiatives to assist in the development of a Vision Plan and creation of a community-specific Form Based Code for each Community Planning area. The Seminole Heights Vision Plan incorporates form-based code initiatives.

The Seminole Heights Vision Plan contains five guiding principles including Urban Form/Mixed Use Development, Community Circulation (Transportation), Connectivity/Integration, Environment/Natural Resources, and Historic Preservation. Goal 15 of the Tampa Comprehensive Plan and its objectives and policies relating to Urban Villages support these guiding principles.

A number of other policies are particularly relevant to the Seminole Heights Vision Plan and its principles including those related to a mix of uses (Policy 15.1.2), mobility choices (Policy 15.1.4), open space (Policy 15.1.10), adaptive reuse of exiting structure (Policy 15.1.8).

A major component of the Vision Plan is redevelopment of major corridors into mixed use corridors. The Vision Plan supports Goal 16 of the Tampa Comprehensive Plan particularly as it relates to the Comprehensive Plan policies focused on redeveloping automobile oriented corridors (Policy 16.1.1 and Policy 16.1.2), developing higher intensity nodes (Policy 16.1.3), providing for sidewalks and pedestrian amenities (Policy 16.1.4), improvement of transit (Policy 16.1.5), promoting visual and physical character (Policy 16.1.6), defining specific mixed use corridors (Policy 16.1.13).

Therefore the proposed map amendment would further the following provisions:

- The amendment furthers Strategy 1: Organizing Planning Districts – Getting Transit Ready
- The amendment furthers Strategy 2: Strengthening Our Diverse Neighborhoods
- The amendment furthers Strategy 7: Growing Economic Prosperity
- The amendment also furthers the Growth Management Solution

**Recommendation**

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the attached resolution, finding the proposed land use designation change for Plan Amendment CPA 09-08, CONSISTENT with the *Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy: A Livable City* and forward this recommendation to Tampa City Council.
Attachment “A”

Agency and Department Comments

City Staff Recommendations

The City Staff has no objections to the proposed amendment, but does offer the following comments.

1. **Wastewater**: This plan amendment involves changes to the future land use of several parcels. With the current land use for these parcels, the estimated wastewater generated from the parcels will be 0.79820 MGD. Based on the potential build-out allowed under the proposed land use categories, the estimated wastewater generated will be 1.38575 MGD, which will result in a net increase of 0.58755 MGD. The wastewater from these parcels will discharge into the West River/Downtown District. The current available capacity for this District is 36.9 MGD. The proposed amendment will not impact the level of service established in the Wastewater Element of the City’s Comprehensive plan. There is adequate capacity in the existing facilities near these parcels for the potential build-out of the individual parcels. These locations will be specified individually, for each project, when commitments for wastewater service are granted by the Wastewater Department.

2. **Solid Waste**: At the time of a zoning, variance, or incremental review, as well as permitting, the following provisions of the City of Tampa Code for refuse collection services will need to be met. Section 27-130. Buffers and screening. (1) Buffers required. (a.) (b.), Section 27-132. Solid Waste. (a) (b) (c) 1. 2. 3. 4. (d) (e) (f) (g) (h), Section 27-248(4). Off-Street Parking Space Standards and Section 27-324. General requirements. (1) Development standards. d. Refuse stations, storage areas and off-street loading areas. l. Location. 2. Screening.

3. **Stormwater**: Recommend that the properties identified by the Stormwater Department on the Red-Line List be provided special consideration in future land use planning in Seminole Heights. The Red-Line List is available for reference from the Stormwater Department or the Construction Services Department.

4. **Water**: No objections.

5. **Parks & Recreation**: No objections.

6. **Transportation**: No objection to the plan amendment, however a traffic analysis maybe required during rezoning.
School Board Comments

Schools serving the Seminole Heights neighborhood or located within it include Hillsborough High School, Memorial Middle School, Sligh Middle Magnet, Broward Elementary School, Cleveland Academy, and Seminole Elementary School. All the potentially impacted schools have sufficient capacity to accommodate increased student enrollment at this time. However, the impact on school enrollment will be determined on a project specific basis as development is considered for proposed residential density bonuses. It is possible that sufficient capacity may not be available in the schools that may serve the proposed residential development eligible for density bonuses at the time they are proposed.

EPC – No comments
COASTAL HIGH HAZARD AREA (CHHA) DISCLAIMER:
Source: Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council, January 2000. The Coastal High Hazard Area, as shown on the Future Land Use Map (FLUM), is a general depiction of the area defined in the most current regional hurricane evacuation study as requiring evacuation during a category one hurricane. More specific information can be obtained by reviewing the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council's Hurricane Evacuation Map.

MAJOR ROADS: See Adopted MPO Long Range Transportation Plan for specific improvements.

DATA SOURCES: Basemap, roads, water (1985 aerials, as updated) from Hillsborough County Engineering Services. Parcel lines and data from Hillsborough County Property Appraiser. Wetlands from SWFWMD, Significant Wildlife Habitat from Planning and Growth Management based on satellite imagery. Only Wetlands greater than 40 acres are depicted.

REPRODUCTION: This sheet may not be reproduced in part or full for sale to anyone without specific approval of the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission.

ACCURACY: It is intended that the accuracy of the base map comply with U.S. national map accuracy standards. However, such accuracy is not guaranteed by the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission. This map is for illustrative purposes only for the cities of Tampa, Temple Terrace, and Plant City.

LEGENDS: The Future Land Use designations on this legend depict valid land use colors and codes for UNINCORPORATED HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY only. The incorporated area colors do not correspond with the legend. Please contact the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission for specific Future Land Use maps of the cities.

INSET ON COUNTYWIDE: EGMONT KEY is not shown in exact location.
RESOLUTION
ITEM: Tampa: CPA 09-09 Courtney Campbell Causeway Scenic Corridor
  text amendment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AYE</th>
<th>NAY</th>
<th>ABSENT</th>
<th>DATE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>January 11, 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bruce P. Cury
Chair

Terri G. Cobb
Vice-Chair

Frank M. Chillsura
Member-at-Large

Jill Buford

Derek L. Doughty

Miller Q. Dowdy

Edward F. Giunta, II

Vivian M. Kitchen

Hung T. Mai

Gary D. Sears

Robert B. Hunter, FAICP
Executive Director

Robert B. Hunter, Executive Director

On motion of Commissioner Chillura Seconded by Commissioner Giunta.
The following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission has developed a Comprehensive Plan for the City of Tampa entitled "Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy A Livable City," pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 163.3161, Florida Statutes, which was adopted by Tampa City Council on February 9, 2009, as amended; and;

WHEREAS, Tampa City Council adopted the Procedures Manual for Amendments to the "Tampa Comprehensive Plan" on October 9, 1986 and subsequently amended; and

WHEREAS, the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission has received a City-initiated petition for amendment to the Future Land Use Map of the "Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy: A Livable City" by the August 2009 submittal deadline; and

WHEREAS, the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission has reviewed the request to amend the "Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy A Livable City" to further implementation of the State of Florida's Scenic Highway Corridor Management Plan (CMP) for the Causeway, by adding goals, objectives, policies and strategies to the Tampa Comprehensive Plan; and
WHEREAS, the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission has reviewed the proposal, has considered existing conditions and expected mobility and development patterns in the respective area, as well as the adopted goals, objectives and policies of the Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy A Livable City as stated in the staff report as follows:

**Scenic Transportation Corridors**

**Objective 20.2:** Include general, community appearance guidelines into the development review process described in the land development regulations.

**Policy 20.2.1:** The City shall enhance the appearance and function of roadways through the designation and establishment of scenic transportation corridors in the City of Tampa. Criteria for the identification and establishment of scenic corridors shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

- To create a boulevard system of roadways to connect different neighborhoods within the City of Tampa;
- To protect existing roadways that exhibit attractive or scenic characteristics;
- To preserve and enhance the aesthetic appearance of roadways through the use of landscaping and buffering;
- To protect existing and future collector and arterial roadways that have residential characteristics that are considered desirable to preserve;
- To use street tree planting as a means to unify and beautify existing and future neighborhoods that are linked or crossed by scenic corridors;
- To protect roadways, where significant tree coverage and landscaping already exist, from unplanned future commercial development; and
- To lessen the impact on existing and proposed neighborhoods from the building of new roadways and the rebuilding of existing roadways through residential areas.

**Policy 20.2.2:** Roadways not designated for scenic corridors, but serving as gateways into the City of Tampa, shall be considered eligible for landscaping, buffering, and street tree plantings (similar to scenic corridors) by the City that will unify and enhance their identity as gateway areas.

**Policy 20.2.3:** All plans for designating scenic corridors or gateways and their related landscaping plans shall be developed and/or approved by the City only after participation and input from affected citizens, private groups, City departments and agencies, Hillsborough County, and the Florida Department of Transportation.

**Policy 20.2.4:** Encourage affected people in these redevelopment areas to organize. Wherever possible, representation should include, but is not limited to, commercial property owners, business tenants, neighborhood associations, residential property owners and renters.
Assets
Goal 19: To maintain and enhance Tampa’s character as the City grows and changes by building upon its assets. Tampa’s character includes its built environment: large areas of detached single-family houses both inside and outside of urban villages, many thriving multifamily areas, mixed-use commercial areas, industrial areas, major institutions, and a densely developed downtown with surrounding medium to high-density neighborhoods. Tampa’s character also includes its setting on the Bays, the Hillsborough River, lakes, natural areas, parks and open spaces.

Public Land
Objective 21.2: Protect open space for its recreational, safety, and environmental value and provide adequate parks and open space areas throughout the City.
Policy 21.2.1: The City shall place a high priority on acquiring and preserving open space lands for purposes of recreation, habitat protection and enhancement, flood hazard management, public safety, and water resources protection for the overall benefit of the community.

Open Space and Aesthetics
Objective 32.2: Establish and preserve an appropriate open space system to protect public health, safety and welfare, and assure retention of aesthetic and environmental amenities.

Land Stewardship
Objective 32.4: The City will strive to utilize best practices for land stewardship and management. The proper management of parklands, especially those that are environmentally sensitive, is an ongoing challenge. Proper stewardship requires long range planning, beyond basic park maintenance.

Greenways
Policy 33.4.11: Utilize future parkland and open space acquisition opportunities to connect the City’s existing parkland and open space into a coordinated system.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission finds the requested Tampa Comprehensive Plan Amendment 09-09 to add goals, objectives, policies and strategies to the Tampa Comprehensive Plan to further implementation of the State of Florida’s Scenic Highway Corridor Management Plan (CMP) for the Courtney Campbell Causeway Scenic Corridor CONSISTENT with the Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy A Livable City and recommends Tampa Comprehensive Plan Amendment 09-09 be approved.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
Meeting Date: January 11, 2010 Public Hearing
Agenda Item: Tampa: CPA 09-09 Courtney Campbell Causeway Scenic Corridor text amendment

SUMMARY
The Planning Commission will be reviewing and making a recommendation to Tampa City Council on a text amendment to the Tampa Comprehensive Plan. This amendment was initiated by the City of Tampa to add goals, objectives, policies, and strategies regarding the Courtney Campbell Causeway Scenic Corridor.

BACKGROUND
The Planning Commission is required to make recommendations to the Tampa City Council on all proposed changes to the Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy: A Livable City pursuant to Chapter 163, Part II, Florida Statutes and Chapter 97-351 Laws of Florida, as amended.

In 2005, a comprehensive plan amendment was adopted by the Tampa City Council (PA04-14 Ord. No. 2005-318) which included the Courtney Campbell Causeway as a potential scenic corridor having state-wide significance. Subsequently, the Florida Department of Transportation designated the Courtney Campbell as a scenic highway, the 14th in the state and the first in Hillsborough County. To implement the State of Florida's Scenic Highway Corridor Management Plan (CMP) for the Causeway, goals, objectives, policies and strategies are proposed to be added to the Tampa Comprehensive Plan.

The amendment recognizes the assets of the area and will further the strategies set out within the goals, objectives and policies of the Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy: A Livable City.

RECOMMENDATION
It is recommended that the Planning Commission APPROVE the attached resolution finding the amendment CPA 09-09 CONSISTENT with the Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy: A Livable City and forward this recommendation to the Tampa City Council.

Prepared By: Rose Petrucha, Principal Planner

Date Prepared: December 30, 2009
This proposed amendment has been initiated by the City of Tampa. In 2005, a comprehensive plan amendment was adopted by the Tampa City Council (PA04-14 Ord. No. 2005-318) which included the Courtney Campbell Causeway as a potential scenic corridor having state-wide significance. Subsequently, the Florida Department of Transportation designated the Courtney Campbell as a scenic highway, the 14th in the state and the first in Hillsborough County.

To implement the State of Florida’s Scenic Highway Corridor Management Plan (CMP) for the Causeway, goals, objectives, policies and strategies are proposed to be added to the Tampa Comprehensive Plan as follows:
Courtney Campbell Causeway Scenic Corridor

Objective: The natural, recreational, scenic, historic, and cultural resources of the Courtney Campbell Causeway shall be preserved and enhanced for the City of Tampa’s residents.

Policy: The City shall support the mission and goals, objectives and strategies of the Courtney Campbell Causeway Florida Scenic Highway designation for the causeway located between McMullen Booth Road and Veteran's Highway.

Policy: The City shall support efforts to retain the current physical cross sectional character of the causeway reminiscent of its historic origin.

Policy: The City shall participate in efforts to maintain the natural environment by supporting a coastal-style, native Florida landscape and promoting community partnerships to control litter on the causeway.

Policy: The City shall support FDOT’s pedestrian, bicycle and transportation initiatives for the causeway including safety enhancements.

Policy: The City shall continue to participate with the Corridor Management Entity (CME) as an ongoing and effective sponsor and advocate for the Scenic Highway designation process and implementation of improvements.

Policy: The City shall continue to cooperate with intergovernmental coordination efforts as one of the four governmental entities that include City of Clearwater, Pinellas County, City of Tampa and Hillsborough County.

Policy: The City shall support the education program efforts for promoting the location and features of the causeway.

Policy: The City shall support the maintenance and enhancements of the Causeway as a tourist point of interest.

Policy: The City shall cooperate with FDOT's enhancement efforts to improve the visual appearance of the causeway.
Tampa Comprehensive Plan Vision and Context:

*Tampa’s Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy: A Livable City* was adopted in February, 2009. The Plan articulates a vision for how Tampa will accommodate the growth of the city to include 92,000 additional residents and 132,000 new jobs over the next 20 years, while promoting the values of its citizens:

- **LIVABILITY** (Tampa is a place where diverse people find it easy, safe and enjoyable to live.)
- **PROSPERITY** (A Tampa that is focused on the quality of life for all its people must be a Tampa that is economically healthy, with a broad mix of good jobs.)
- **RESPECT** (The living systems which support us are taken care of and passed on to future generations in better shape.)
- **RESILIENCE** (The systems that support our day to day living can deal with uncertainty and cope with the shifts and shocks we face in the future.)

Plan Amendment Issues:

The Courtney Campbell Causeway Scenic Corridor Advocacy Group (CAG), which is made up of public and private organizations, was responsible for the application to the Florida Department of Transportation for the designation of the Courtney Campbell Causeway, by the State of Florida, as a scenic highway.

The inclusion of the proposed language in the *Tampa Comprehensive Plan* would allow the City of Tampa to partner with the State of Florida and the Corridor Advocacy Group on potential improvements to designated scenic corridors. Scenic Corridor designation would allow for consideration of certain state and federal grants, such as for landscaping or recreational amenities, which are specifically available for scenic corridors. It would not preclude future road widening or other future adjustments deemed necessary by the Department of Transportation.

The Tampa Bay Area has historically developed around activity centers which are linked by transportation corridors. The Courtney Campbell Causeway is not only a gateway to the City of Tampa but also links the major activity centers of Westshore and Clearwater.
The proposed amendment, as submitted by the City of Tampa for inclusion into the Comprehensive Plan was reviewed by various agencies and copies of agency responses are included in the Attachment A to this report. Agencies/Departments with comments to the proposed amendment are as follows:

City of Tampa – Water Department
City of Tampa – Wastewater Department
City of Tampa – Solid Waste Department
City of Tampa – Stormwater Department
City of Tampa – Transportation Department
City of Tampa – Parks and Recreation Department
Hillsborough County School Board
The Environmental Protection Commission (EPC)
Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)
Hillsborough Area Regional Transit Authority (HART)

No major impacts were identified by the agency comments.

**Relationship to the Tampa Comprehensive Plan:**

In reviewing the proposed amendment with the *Tampa Comprehensive Plan*, the following Goals, Objectives, and Policies are relevant:

**Scenic Transportation Corridors**

*Objective 20.2:* Include general, community appearance guidelines into the development review process described in the land development regulations.

*Policy 20.2.1:* The City shall enhance the appearance and function of roadways through the designation and establishment of scenic transportation corridors in the City of Tampa. Criteria for the identification and establishment of scenic corridors shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

- To create a boulevard system of roadways to connect different neighborhoods within the City of Tampa;
- To protect existing roadways that exhibit attractive or scenic characteristics;
- To preserve and enhance the aesthetic appearance of roadways through the use of landscaping and buffering;
- To protect existing and future collector and arterial roadways that have residential characteristics that are considered desirable to preserve;
- To use street tree planting as a means to unify and beautify existing and future neighborhoods that are linked or crossed by scenic corridors;
- To protect roadways, where significant tree coverage and landscaping already exist, from unplanned future commercial development; and
- To lessen the impact on existing and proposed neighborhoods from the building of new roadways and the rebuilding of existing roadways through residential areas.

**Policy 20.2.2:** Roadways not designated for scenic corridors, but serving as gateways into the City of Tampa, shall be considered eligible for landscaping, buffering, and street tree plantings (similar to scenic corridors) by the City that will unify and enhance their identity as gateway areas.

**Policy 20.2.3:** All plans for designating scenic corridors or gateways and their related landscaping plans shall be developed and/or approved by the City only after participation and input from affected citizens, private groups, City departments and agencies, Hillsborough County, and the Florida Department of Transportation.

**Policy 20.2.4:** Encourage affected people in these redevelopment areas to organize. Wherever possible, representation should include, but is not limited to, commercial property owners, business tenants, neighborhood associations, residential property owners and renters.

**Assets**

**Goal 19:** To maintain and enhance Tampa’s character as the City grows and changes by building upon its assets. Tampa’s character includes its built environment: large areas of detached single-family houses both inside and outside of urban villages, many thriving multifamily areas, mixed-use commercial areas, industrial areas, major institutions, and a densely developed downtown with surrounding medium to high-density neighborhoods. Tampa’s character also includes its setting on the Bays, the Hillsborough River, lakes, natural areas, parks and open spaces.

**Public Land**

**Objective 21.2:** Protect open space for its recreational, safety, and environmental value and provide adequate parks and open space areas throughout the City.

**Policy 21.2.1:** The City shall place a high priority on acquiring and preserving open space lands for purposes of recreation, habitat protection and enhancement, flood hazard management, public safety, and water resources protection for the overall benefit of the community.
Open Space and Aesthetics

Objective 32.2: Establish and preserve an appropriate open space system to protect public health, safety and welfare, and assure retention of aesthetic and environmental amenities.

Land Stewardship

Objective 32.4: The City will strive to utilize best practices for land stewardship and management. The proper management of parklands, especially those that are environmentally sensitive, is an ongoing challenge. Proper stewardship requires long range planning, beyond basic park maintenance.

Greenways

Policy 33.4.11: Utilize future parkland and open space acquisition opportunities to connect the City’s existing parkland and open space into a coordinated system.

Analysis and Conclusion:

The proposed plan amendment promotes public and private agencies to work together to develop recreational opportunities for the citizens of Florida, support efforts to increase the opportunity for residents and tourists to have unique outdoor experiences and promotes the unique nature of the Courtney Campbell Causeway. The proposed plan amendment is consistent with the strategies, goals, objectives, and policies to recognize and promote the city’s assets, preserve an appropriate open space system for the public’s health, safety, and welfare, and assure retention of aesthetic and environmental amenities. The proposed plan amendment also provides the opportunity to foster and improve mobility and sustainability for the community at large.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission find the proposed Plan Amendment CPA 09-09, CONSISTENT with the Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy: A Livable City and forward this recommendation to Tampa City Council.
# ATTACHMENT A

## Agency Comments
Tampa Comprehensive Plan
Proposed Plan Amendments

Staff Report

2009 August Plan Amendment Cycle

PA09-05: Map Amendment: 3075 North Rocky Point Drive (R-35 to CMU-35)
PA09-06 Text Amendment: Transit Oriented Development
PA09-07: Text Amendment: Seminole Heights Vision Plan
PA09-08 Map Amendment: Seminole Heights Areawide Map Amendment
PA09-09 Text Amendment: Courtney Campbell Scenic Corridor
PA09-10 Map Amendment: Central Park CRA Areawide Map Amendment
PA09-11 Map Amendment: MacDill Avenue Map Amendment

Land Development Coordination Division
Growth Management and Development Services Department
November 12, 2009
City Staff Recommendations

The City Staff has no objections to the proposed amendment, but does offer the following comments.

1. Wastewater: The text amendment does not impact the level of service established in the Wastewater Element of the City’s Comprehensive plan. No objections to this amendment.

2. Solid Waste: No objections.

3. Stormwater: The Stormwater Department does not object to the proposed policies; however, in regard to the second policy relating to the natural cross-sectional character of the Causeway, the Department cites other objectives in the Comprehensive Plan that need to be considered. Particularly, actions that will improve water quality treatment of stormwater runoff into Tampa Bay, restore natural water currents or improve the circulation of water within the bay should also be allowed when planning and designing improvements of the Courtney Campbell Causeway.

MEMORANDUM

To: Samuel Dennis, Senior Planner

From: David Borisenko, AICP
Manager, Planning and Facilities Siting

Date: November 3, 2009

Re: City of Tampa Plan Amendments
Second Cycle 2009

The School District offers the following summary comments on each of the requested amendments.

PA 09-05
The proposed amendment would change the existing Land Use Plan designation from Medium Density Residential-35 (R-35) to Community Mixed-Use-35 (CMU-35). There does not appear to be any potential impact on school enrollment based on residential density.

PA 09-06
The proposed amendment makes text changes regarding Transit Oriented Development provisions in the Tampa, Comprehensive Plan, Building our Legacy, a Livable City. It will not be possible to determine the impact of the proposed amendment on school enrollment until station areas and their designations have been identified.

PA 09-07
The proposed amendment would adopt the Greater Seminole Heights Vision Plan. Schools serving the Seminole Heights neighborhood or located within it include Hillsborough High School, Memorial Middle School, Sligh Middle Magnet, Broward Elementary School, Cleveland Academy, and Seminole Elementary School. All the potentially impacted schools have sufficient capacity to accommodate increased student enrollment at this time. However, the impact on school enrollment will be determined on a project specific basis as development is considered for proposed residential density bonuses. It is possible that sufficient capacity may not be available in the schools that may serve the proposed residential development eligible for density bonuses at the time they are proposed.
PA 09-08
The proposed map amendment establishes boundary of the Seminole Heights Urban Village. No changes to land use designations are proposed. Therefore, it appears that the proposed amendment will not impact school enrollment at this time.

PA 09-09
The proposed text amendment incorporates goals, objectives and policies referring to the Courtney Campbell Scenic Highway Corridor and has no impact on school enrollment.

PA 09-10
The proposed map amendment would change the City of Tampa Comprehensive Plan Map from Central Business District (CBD), Regional Mixed Use-100 (RMU-100), Community Mixed Use 35 (CMU-35), and High Density Residential-83 (R-83) to Urban Mixed Use-60 (UMU-60) and Recreational/Open Space (R/OS). There appears to be no impact on school enrollment.

PA 09-11
The proposed map amendment would change the City of Tampa Comprehensive Plan Map from Low Density Suburban Neighborhood (R-6) to Recreational/Open Space (R/OS). There appears to be no impact on school enrollment.
From: Leslie, Gordon [LeslieG@epchc.org]
Sent: Thursday, November 12, 2009 3:32 PM
To: Sam Dennis
Subject: CPAs - August 2009 Cycle

In response to your request from 10/14/2009, please see below.

Date: November 6, 2009
To: Sam Dennis, Planning Commission
From: Gordon A. Leslie, Jr., EPC
Subject: EPC Review of the Below-Listed Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments for the August 2009 Cycle:

PA 09-05: Future Land Use Map Change – Rocky Point

PA 09-06: Text Changes to the Tampa Comprehensive Plan-Transit Oriented Development

PA 09-07: City of Tampa Comprehensive Plan – Text Amendment – Greater Seminole Heights Vision Plan

CPA 09-08: City of Tampa Comprehensive Plan – Map Amendment – Seminole Heights Urban Village

PA 09-09: City of Tampa Comprehensive Plan – Text Amendment – Courtney Campbell Scenic Highway Corridor

PA 09-10: City of Tampa Comprehensive Plan – Map Amendment – Central Park Community Redevelopment Area

EPC staff has reviewed the above-referenced Comprehensive Plan Amendments, which primarily pertain to community planning, proposed development and redevelopment activities, and transportation oriented development initiatives, within portions of the City of Tampa. EPC staff offers no specific comment on the subject amendments at this time.

We appreciate the continued opportunity to work with the Planning Commission, and other reviewing departments, on these and other plan amendments as they come forward.
DATE: November 13th, 2009

TO: Rose Petrucha, Principal Planner

FROM: Bud Whitehead, Transportation Section

RE: CPA 09-09 – City of Tampa Comprehensive Plan – Text Amendment - Courtney Campbell Scenic Highway Corridor

Staff has reviewed the proposal requesting a text amendment to incorporate the Courtney Campbell Scenic Highway Corridor into the Tampa Comprehensive Plan.

The proposed amendment, in and of itself, will not change transportation impacts. However, any additional transportation improvements might require amendments to the Long Range Transportation Plan and the Comprehensive Plan Capital Improvements Element.

Inclusion of these improvements in the Long Range Transportation Plan Cost Affordable Plan will depend on priorities relative to other transportation needs and available revenues.
CPA 09-09 City of Tampa Comprehensive Plan - Text Amendment: This plan-text amendment is initiated by the City of Tampa. The primary purpose of the text amendment is to incorporate goals, objectives and policies relating to the Courtney Campbell Scenic Highway Corridor into the Tampa Comprehensive Plan.

The Courtney Campbell Scenic Highway Corridor policy amendment complements the West Central Florida MPO Chairs Coordinating Committee’s regional multi use trails top 10 priority list of projects. Planning Activities include a feasibility study for a 12 foot paved bicycle pedestrian trail that will connect to Pinellas County and in the future to the city of Tampa’s West Tampa Greenway. PA 09-05 should be assessed in regards to this amendment to explore the possibility of providing city assistance to moving the project forward. The amendment is consistent with and furthers many of the goals and principles of the 2025 Long range Transportation Plan, including:

Goal II: Promote Accessibility & Mobility Options Available to People or Freight, and Enhance the Integration and Connectivity of the Transportation System

Principle 2.1 Maximize Access to the Transportation System and Improve the Mobility of the Transportation Disadvantaged
• Provide facilities and amenities that support transit users, bicyclists, pedestrians, and the transportation disadvantaged.
• Improve or expand the transportation disadvantaged system to encourage ridership.
• Promote paratransit or alternative services where development patterns do not support fixed route transit.
Memorandum

TO: Mr. Samuel Dennis, Sr. Planner
Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission

FROM: Linda Walker, Planner II
Hillsborough Area Regional Transit Authority (HART)

DATE: November 3, 2009

RE: PA 09-09
Courtney Campbell Scenic Highway Corridor
Text Amendment

HART has reviewed the text amendment to incorporate goals, objectives and policies relating to the Courtney Campbell Scenic Highway Corridor into the Tampa Comprehensive Plan. HART supports the proposed policies. If transit is one of the priorities for this community, the following considerations should be included in the policies that are mentioned below.

*The City shall support FDOT’s pedestrian, bicycle, and transportation initiatives for the causeway including safety enhancements.*

FDOT provides operation funds for Route 200X (Clearwater Express) that travels on the highway during weekday peak periods. The City should also support transit enhancements for the transit stops on Courtney Campbell Highway.

*The City shall continue to participate with the Corridor Management Entity (CME) as an ongoing and effective sponsor and advocate for the Scenic Highway designation process and implementation of improvements.*

The City should advocate improvements that would enhance alternative transportation options on the Highway. The enhanced revenue plan of HART’s Transit Development Plan includes a Westshore Area Circulator. Although the destinations have not been determined, designing a highway that would accommodate pedestrian/ADA connections to transit and creating areas to accommodate vehicle turn around would make this a compatible location for a circulator.
RESOLUTION

ITEM: Tampa: CPA 09-10 a map amendment located in the Central Park Community Redevelopment Area (CRA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AYE</th>
<th>NAY</th>
<th>ABSENT</th>
<th>DATE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>January 11, 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bruce P. Cury, Chair
Terri G. Cobb, Vice-Chair
Frank M. Chillura, Member-at-Large
Jill Buford
Derek L. Doughty
Miller Q. Dowdy
Edward F. Giunta, II
Vivian M. Kitchen
Hung T. Mai
Gary D. Sears
Robert B. Hunter, FAICP, Executive Director

On motion of Commissioner Terri G. Cobb Seconded by Commissioner Jill Buford

The following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission has developed a Comprehensive Plan for the City of Tampa entitled Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy A Livable City, pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 163.3161, Florida Statutes, which was adopted by Tampa City Council on February 9, 2009, as amended; and;

WHEREAS, Tampa City Council adopted the Procedures Manual and Fee Schedule for Amendments to the Tampa Comprehensive Plan on October 9, 1986 and subsequently amended; and

WHEREAS, the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission has received a City-initiated petition for amendment to the Future Land Use Map of the Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy: A Livable City by the August 2009 submittal deadline; and

WHEREAS, the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission has received and has reviewed a request to amend the Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy A Livable City Future Land Use Plan Map from Central Business District, Regional Mixed Use-100, Community Mixed Use-35, and Residential-83 to Urban Mixed Use-60 and Recreational/Open Space
in the vicinity of Nebraska Ave, east of I-275 and Orange Street, north of Cass Street and south of E. 11th Avenue (on approximately 41.33 acres); and

WHEREAS, the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission has reviewed the proposal, has considered existing and expected future development patterns and community facilities in the respective area, as well as the adopted goals, objectives and policies of the Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy A Livable City as stated in the staff report as follows:

**Strategy 1: The Districts**

**Policy 1.1.1:** Recognize the Central Tampa District as the primary urban core, civic and cultural center.

**Policy 1.1.2:** Foster a vibrant urban lifestyle through mixed use development with entertainment and cultural facilities.

**Policy 1.1.11:** Encourage transit oriented, pedestrian-friendly mixed used development in the Westshore, Central Tampa and University planning districts.

**Strategy 2: Strengthening Our Diverse Neighborhoods**

**Policy 1.2.3:** The City shall promote the design of complete and well-structured neighborhoods whose physical layout and land use mix promote walking, biking, and transit; reduce vehicle trips; foster community pride; enhance neighborhood identity; ensure public safety; and are family-friendly and address the needs of all ages and abilities.

**Strategy 7: Growing Economic Prosperity**

**Objective 12.1:** A positive business climate supported by adequate public infrastructure, including transportation and schools.

**Goal 14:** A city of compact, higher-density development within business districts, mixed use corridor villages and transit stations to conserve land resources, protect single family detached neighborhoods, natural habitat, support transit, reduce vehicle trips, improve air quality, conserve energy and water, and diversify Tampa’s housing stock.
Goal 15: Create a city of distinctive and memorable places.

Objective 15.1: Support the Urban Village designation that produce a distinctive, high-quality built environment whose forms and character respect Tampa’s unique historic environment and architectural context and create memorable places that enrich community life.

Policy 15.1.3: Economic Opportunity – Recognize that urban villages are very livable and sustainable form of development. Continue to emphasize the compact and mixed use nature of these villages. Look for ways to make it easier to create this type of development pattern.

Goal 16: Mixed Use Corridor Villages - Major corridors transformed into vibrant pedestrian-friendly environments that serve as gathering places for adjacent neighborhoods.

Objective 16.1: The transformation of major corridors to include a broader mix of uses, both horizontal and vertical, that provides opportunities for medium and higher density housing, while also addressing local and citywide demand for retail and services.

Policy 16.1.10: Promote densities, mixes of uses, and transportation improvements that support walking and use of public transportation.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission finds the requested Plan Amendment 09-10 from Central Business District, Regional Mixed Use-100, Community Mixed Use-35, and Residential-83 to Urban Mixed Use-60 and Recreational/Open Space, in the vicinity of Nebraska Ave, east of I-275 and Orange Street, north of Cass Street and south of E. 11th Avenue CONSISTENT with the Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy A Livable City and recommends Plan Amendment 09-10 be approved.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
Meeting Date: January 11, 2010 Public Hearing
Agenda Item: Tampa: CPA 09-10 a map amendment located in the Central Park Community Redevelopment Area (CRA)

SUMMARY
The Planning Commission will be reviewing and making a recommendation to Tampa City Council on an amendment to the Future Land Use Map. The City of Tampa initiated amendment proposes to change the current land use designations from Central Business District (CDB), Regional Mixed Use-100 (RMU-100), Community Mixed Use-35 (CMU-35), and Residential-83 (R-83) to Urban Mixed Use-60 (UMU-60) and Recreation Open Space (R/OS) in order to achieve the intent of the Central Park CRA Plan.

BACKGROUND
The Planning Commission is required to make recommendations to the Tampa City Council on all proposed changes to the Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy: A Livable City pursuant to Chapter 163, Part II, Florida Statutes and Chapter 97-351 Laws of Florida, as amended.

The amendment is located west of Nebraska Avenue, east of I-275 and Orange Street, north of Cass Street and south of E. 11th Avenue and is identified as an Urban Village and Mixed Use Corridor Village. The City is requesting to change the land use designation on approximately 41.3 acres. The request has been initiated to implement the approved Central Park CRA. The amendment will change the various land use classifications to set the framework for achieving CRA Plan objectives. The request to Urban Mixed Use – 60 and Recreation/Open Space will allow for consideration of a commercial, residential or mixed use along with providing public recreational opportunities furthering the intent of the Urban Village and Mixed Use Corridor Village and furthering the Growth Management Solution set out within the goals, objectives and policies of the Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy: A Livable City.

RECOMMENDATION
It is recommended that the Planning Commission APPROVE the attached resolution finding the amendment CPA 09-10 CONSISTENT with the Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy: A Livable City and forward this recommendation to the Tampa City Council.

Prepared By: Stephen B. Griffin, AICP
Date Prepared: December 30, 2009
Plan Amendment Description

This is a City of Tampa initiated plan amendment involving 41.81 acres of selected public and private land in the Central Park Community Redevelopment Area (CRA). The request involves a change in the City of Tampa’s Comprehensive Plan Map from Central Business District-CBD, Regional-Mixed Use–100 (RMU-100), Community-Mixed Use-35 (CMU-35) and Residential-83 (R-83) to Urban-Mixed Use-60 (UMU-60) and Recreational/Open (R/OS).

The Central Park Community Redevelopment Area is an urban neighborhood. The area is bounded to the south by the Downtown Community Redevelopment Area, to the east by the Ybor City Community Redevelopment Area, to the northwest by the Tampa Heights neighborhood and to the northeast by the East Tampa Community Redevelopment Area. The area consists of approximately 158 acres of public and private land, including right-of-way. There are approximately 114 acres of developable land in the Central Park CRA.

The proposed map amendment to the selected parcels within the Central Park CRA is part of the City of Tampa’s efforts to facilitate redevelopment, attract private-sector investment, encourage new higher-density mixed-use projects and to eliminate conditions of blight found to exist within the Central Park CRA, as identified in the “Central Park Village Study Area: Existing Conditions Report.” The 41.81 acres of land under request for plan-map amendment involve 111 parcels of public and private land.

There are currently four land-use categories covering the Central Park CRA. These are Community Mixed-Use-35 (CMU-35), Regional Mixed Use-100 (RMU-100), Recreational and Open Space (R/OS) and Residential-83 (R-83). The CMU-35, RMU-100 and R-83 plan designations allow for residential and commercial development to occur on a comparatively intense urban scale.

However, the Central Park CRA and its surrounding area are currently not developed to the level of density and intensity envisioned in the Tampa Comprehensive Plan.
The area envisions an infill development pattern of mixed uses and higher densities more appropriate for its location within the CBD Periphery and the Enterprise Zone.

Central Park Village and the adjacent Perry Harvey Sr. Park are located within the Central Park CRA that was once the heart of the African-American life in Tampa. In recent years, tribute to the history through public art and historical markers has been expressed, but the neighborhood itself has continued to suffer economic distress. Central Park Village is located within a portion of Tampa historically known as the Scrub. Named for the natural conditions of the land, the Scrub began as a settlement for African-American lumber mill workers and became a vibrant African-American community, with a business district along Central Avenue, at its heart. The area had its own schools, newspapers, churches, social organizations, and culture. Central Avenue and the surrounding neighborhoods have a long and important history in the City of Tampa. The history is one of change, in the urban form and development patterns, and the economic and cultural realities of a separate, prosperous African-American enclave, which still evokes emotion, inspiration and pride within the larger Tampa community.

### Future Land Use Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential-83</th>
<th>Form Guidelines</th>
<th>Use Density/Intensity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-family dwellings</td>
<td>• 0-75.0 Dwelling Units per gross acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited neighborhood-serving commercial uses consistent with Locational Criteria for Neighborhood Commercial and Residential Office Uses</td>
<td>• 0-83.0 Dwelling Units per gross acre with performance standards met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compatible public, quasi-public and Special uses are allowed</td>
<td>• 0.65 Floor Area Ratio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recreation-Open Space</th>
<th>Form Guidelines</th>
<th>Use Density/Intensity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide for the preservation, continued growth and enhancements of Tampa’s rich resource of parklands, recreational areas, and surrounding open spaces.</td>
<td>Parks (such as pocket, neighborhood, community, and Regional parks); and Greenways and trails; and natural parks, woodlands, habitat, floodplains, and areas with permanent open spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Mixed Use 35</th>
<th>Form Guidelines</th>
<th>Use Density/Intensity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed-use development at intersections with stepped down residential between; Buildings sited up to the corridor to create a consistent street wall; Heights are generally 2 to 5 stories; Entrances that directly address the street; Pedestrian-oriented uses such as outdoor cafes; integrated residential and non-residential uses; Attractive pedestrian streetscape.</td>
<td>• 0-30.0 dwelling units per acre; • 30-35.0 dwelling units per acre with performance standards met; • 2.0 Floor Area Ratio • Neighborhood and General Commercial uses allowed; FAR may guide residential development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Mixed Use 60</th>
<th>Form Guidelines</th>
<th>Use Density/Intensity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Areawide mix of uses 50% residential, 60% non-residential; Buildings heights that generally range from 4 to 10 stories; Buildings sited at or near the sidewalk along the primary street frontage and typically abut one another with limited side yard setbacks; Building entrances set at the sidewalk along the primary street frontage;</td>
<td>• 0-50.0 dwelling units per acre; • 60.0 dwelling units per acre with performance standards met; • 2.0 Floor Area Ratio • 2-3.5 Floor Area Ratio with performance standards met; • General and Intensive Commercial uses allowed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Mixed Use 100</td>
<td>Form Guidelines</td>
<td>Use Density/Intensity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Areawide mix of uses 50% residential, 75% non-residential;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A mix of low-, mid-, and high-rise buildings (5 to 24 stories) that creates a varied and defined skyline;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buildings that are sited to positively define the public streetscape and civic spaces;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building entrances facades and entrances that directly address the street and have a high degree of transparency on street frontage facades;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vertical and horizontal integration of residential uses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 0-75.0 dwelling units per acre;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 100.0 dwelling units per acre with performance standards met;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 3.5 Floor Area Ratio with performance standards met;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• General and Intensive development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• High density residential (by either density or the floor area ratio (FAR), whichever calculation is more beneficial to the development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central Business District</th>
<th>Form Guidelines</th>
<th>Use Density/Intensity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixture of mid- and high-rise buildings that create a varied and dramatic skyline with no height limits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building that are sited to positively define the public streetscape and civic spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building facades and entrances that directly address the street and have a high degree of transparency on street-fronting facades</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vertical and horizontal integration of residential and commercial/office uses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Side or rear access to parking and Service functions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual developments of 120 feet in height or less are permitted in the Central Business District upon administrative review of site plan, and urban design standards. Projects greater than 120 feet can be permitted upon site plan review and urban design review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Tampa Comprehensive Plan Context**

*Tampa’s Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy: A Livable City* was adopted in February, 2009. The Plan articulates a vision for how Tampa will accommodate the growth of the city to include 92,000 additional residents and 132,000 new jobs over the next 20 years, while promoting the values of its citizens:

**LIVABILITY** (Tampa is a place where diverse people find it easy, safe and enjoyable to live.)

**PROSPERITY** (A Tampa that is focused on the quality of life for all its people must be a Tampa that is economically healthy, with a broad mix of good jobs.)

**RESPECT** (The living systems which support us are taken care of and passed on to future generations in better shape.)

**RESILIENCE** (The systems that support our day to day living can deal with uncertainty and cope with the shifts and shocks we face in the future.)

The Plan’s vision articulates the growth management strategy by first organizing the city in Planning Districts and encouraging most new growth to locate in places designated as Business Centers, Urban Villages or Mixed Use Corridor Villages. Each Business Center and Urban Village has a secondary plan that indicates the amount of growth the City is planning in the next 20 years. The Plan also includes policies that describe how the City intends to serve this growth with mobility options and other infrastructure facilities.

**The “Big Picture” Tampa Vision Map:**

The integration of transit and land use planning is illustrated by the Vision Map. This map identifies existing and community plan designated business centers, urban villages and mixed use corridor villages that are along the region’s higher frequency existing and planned transit services. Implementation of the City’s growth strategy is dependent upon the close coordination of land use and transportation planning. The strategy calls for redevelopment, infill, and new growth to be targeted into compact, mixed-use, and walkable villages that are connected to a regional transit system.

**Strategy 1: The Districts**

**Objective 1.1:** Designate 5 planning districts: University, Central Tampa, Westshore, New Tampa and South Tampa as an opportunity to build a livable and sustainable city.

**Policy 1.1.1:** Recognize the Central Tampa District as the primary urban core, civic and cultural center.

**Central Park Area**
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Policy 1.1.2: Foster a vibrant urban lifestyle through mixed use development with entertainment and cultural facilities.

Policy 1.1.3: Protect and build upon the heritage assets found in the diverse neighborhoods in the district.

Policy 1.1.11: Encourage transit oriented, pedestrian-friendly mixed-use development in the Westshore, Central Tampa and University planning districts.

Central Tampa Planning District

The plan amendment area is located within the Central Tampa District; that has the Central Business District-Downtown as its business center.

The Central Tampa District is the hub of the region’s economic, governmental and cultural center. The District includes economic engines such as the Port of Tampa, Tampa General Hospital and the University of Tampa, each of which supports a dynamic downtown and is critical to the health of the City.

Central Park Area
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This area also includes significant clusters of historic Urban Villages neighborhoods that are ethically, racially, and economically diverse, and are places of heritage that add character, appeal and interest to the City. The district offers many opportunities to become a more livable and sustainable part of the City.

**Opportunities – within the Central Tampa District**

1. **Improving Mobility**
2. **Attracting Private Investment**
3. **The District’s Historic Character**
4. **Providing Needed Infrastructure to Support Redevelopment**
5. **Stable single family neighborhoods that enhance the District’s housing choices**

**Strategy 2: Strengthening our Diverse Neighborhoods**

**Objective 1.2:** A City of diverse, distinct, and well-structured neighborhoods that meet the community’s needs for complete, sustainable, and high-quality living environments from the historic downtown core to the well-integrated new growth areas.

**Policy 1.2.1:** Recognizing Tampa’s neighborhoods are the basic living environments that make-up the City’s urban fabric, the City shall through its planning preserve and enhance all neighborhood’s distinctiveness, identity, and livability.

**Policy 1.2.3:** The City shall promote the design of complete and well-structured neighborhoods whose physical layout and land use mix promote walking, biking, and transit; reduce vehicle trips; foster community pride; enhance neighborhood identity; ensure public safety; and are family-friendly and address the needs of all ages and abilities.

**Strategy 3: A Vibrant Central Downtown**

**Policy 2.1.1:** New development and redevelopment in downtown Tampa should be urban in character, compact, and dense, with efficient use of land and buildings.

**Policy 2.1.2:** Maintain the heritage of Tampa’s Central Business District by adaptive reuse and sensitive rehabilitation of existing structures and districts that contribute to the character of downtown.

**The “Small Picture” Urban Villages:**

**Central Park Area**
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Urban Villages function as villages within the larger city. Designated urban villages have had some type of secondary planning process that is being used to guide or inform the future of the area. Some of those secondary planning process include: neighborhood plans, economic development plans, community redevelopment area plans, and historic district plans. Future growth in urban villages is directed by the future land use plan categories each village presently has and future change in urban villages is informed by the secondary plan for that village. Some urban villages may see substantial growth and change because of what is directed within the secondary plans. Other urban villages will see only modest change because their secondary plans do not call for increased growth and change. Central Park is designated as an Urban Village which went through a secondary planning process to develop the Central Park Community Redevelopment Area Plan, May 2006.

The opportunities within the Central Tampa District can in part be realized through the implementation of the Urban Villages strategy. An urban village designation recognizes the contribution a particular area makes to the City and provides guidance regarding the intended function, character, intensity, type and degree of growth anticipated for an area. The Central Park Village is one of several urban villages contained within the Central Tampa District. Additionally, Central Park is within the Tampa’s Enterprise Zone that is an area designated within Tampa, which approximately 19.81 square miles. The major focus of the areas designated as Enterprise Zones is economic development to increase employment growth and decrease poverty levels, with a secondary focus on human/social programs.

**Strategy 7: Growing Economic Prosperity**

**Objective 12.1:** A positive business climate supported by adequate public infrastructure, including transportation and schools.

**Policy 12.1.2:** Support the economic health and importance of Downtown Tampa as the economic center of the city and the region

**Policy 12.1.2:** Recognize the contribution of cultural resources, such as public art and historic resources to the strength of Tampa’s economy.
Plan Amendment Impacts/Issues

Surrounding Area – To the north and west of the map amendment area are existing residential neighborhoods that are separated by I-275 North/I-4 East, while to the south is the Tampa Housing Authority’s property designated as the “Encore” project, and to the east is the Tampa Park Plaza along with various commercial properties, a school site, the Tampa Park Apartments, the office facilities of K-Force, TECO and the historic Ybor City neighborhood.

The tables below summarize the potential impacts of the change from CBD, RMU-100, CMU-35 and R-83 to UMU-60 and R/OS plan categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From: Recreation Open Space (R/OS)</th>
<th>To: Urban Mixed Use-60 (UMU-60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Density</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum # of units using density calculations based on 0.54 acres</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum square footage of building based on 0.54 acres</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From: Residential-83 (R-83)</th>
<th>To: Urban Mixed Use-60 (UMU-60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Density</td>
<td>83 DU/gross acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum # of units using density calculations based on 10.63 acres</td>
<td>882 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum square footage of building based on 10.63 acres</td>
<td>300,977 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Floor Area Ratio (ratio of building to land; 10,000 sq. ft. of building on 10,000 sq. ft. of land equals an FAR of 1.0)
### Central Park Area
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From: Community Mixed Use-35 (CMU-35)</th>
<th>To: Urban Mixed Use-60 (UMU-60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Density</td>
<td>35 DU/gross acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum # of units using density calculations based on 21.04 acres</td>
<td>736 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum square footage of building based on 21.04 acres</td>
<td>916,502 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From: Regional Mixed Use-100 (RMU-100)</th>
<th>To: Urban Mixed Use-60 (UMU-60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Density</td>
<td>100 DU/gross acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum # of units using density calculations based on 0.41 acres</td>
<td>41 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum square footage of building based on 0.41 acres</td>
<td>62,508 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From: Central Business District (CDB)</th>
<th>To: Recreation Open Space (R/OS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Density</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum # of units using density calculations based on 8.71 acres</td>
<td>Individual developments of 120 feet in height or less are permitted in the CDB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum square footage of building based on 8.71 acres</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Floor Area Ratio (ratio of building to land; 10,000 sq. ft. of building on 10,000 sq. ft. of land equals an FAR of 1.0)
**Issues:**

**Mobility: Infill and Redevelopment**
The anticipated growth of 92,000+ residents and more than 132,000+ additional employees shall result in increased demand on City, County and State roadways. The City is nearly built-out and almost all of the anticipated growth is expected as either redevelopment or infill development. Since the City is nearly built-out there are limited chances to widen roadway capacity to accommodate the increased traffic demand without severely impacting neighborhoods and the existing built environment.

The proposed plan amendment site is located within the Urban Redevelopment Area of the City’s Transportation Concurrency Exception Area (TCEA). The purpose of the Urban Redevelopment designation within the TCEA is to encourage redevelopment in and around the City’s Business Centers, and to create integrated communities that can be served by existing or planned multi-modal transportation facilities and services. The purpose of the Transportation Concurrency Exception Area is to delineate areas designed to reduce adverse transportation concurrency impacts that may hamper urban infill and redevelopment within the area. (See Attachment B for City of Tampa TCEA map)

**Aging Infrastructure**
The City of Tampa’s potable water mains and wastewater collection facilities are aging. The City is updating its assets data to have a comprehensive inventory of the replacement and rehabilitation needs. The majority of the aging infrastructure is located in South Tampa, Westshore and Ybor City which are targeted as redevelopment areas. The aging infrastructure together with increased redevelopment and infill development has reduced water pressure in some areas of the City. The concern of aging infrastructure is also faced by other utility departments, such as Stormwater due to the age of the City and historic development patterns. Aging infrastructure requires frequent maintenance to repair leaks and breaks which create the potential for risks to the environment and public health.

Copies of agency responses are included in the Attachment A to this report. Agencies/Departments with comments to the proposed amendment are as follows:

City of Tampa – Water Department  
City of Tampa – Wastewater Department  
City of Tampa – Solid Waste Department  
City of Tampa – Stormwater Department

**Central Park Area**
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According to comments provided by the City of Tampa and other agencies the provision of public facilities will not be adversely affected by the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment.

### Relationship to the Tampa Comprehensive Plan

**Growth Management Solution**

In keeping with the vision for a more Livable City, future growth will be steered to areas and locations that are well served by transit or the existing road network and which have a number of properties with redevelopment potential. Generally growth areas are locations where good transit access can be provided along bus and future rail transit route, and at future transit stations. The growth areas envisioned in this plan are:

- Business Centers
- Mixed use corridor villages
- Transit stations
- Urban Villages- limited growth

The role of these areas should ensure that spaces for economic activities are not displaced by residential development and that residential neighborhoods are not destabilized by inappropriate commercial encroachment.

**Goal 14:** A city of compact, higher-density development within business districts, mixed use corridor villages and transit stations to conserve land resources, protect single family detached neighborhoods, natural habitat, support transit, reduce vehicle trips, improve air quality, conserve energy and water, and diversify Tampa’s housing stock.

**Policy 14.1.1:** The City shall encourage compact, higher density development that is compatible with its surrounding character.
Policy 14.1.4: Use limited land resources more efficiently and pursue a development pattern that is more economically sound by encouraging infill development on vacant and underutilized sites.

**Urban Villages-limited growth:**

Urban Villages function as villages within the larger city. Urban villages contribute to a livable City by supporting:

- Diverse housing and employment growth
- Pedestrian and transit oriented communities
- Provision of services and infrastructure targeted to support sustainable redevelopment; and
- Enhancements to the City’s cultural diversity.

An Urban Village designation recognizes the contributions a particular area makes to the City and provides guidance regarding the intended function, character, intensity, type and degree of growth anticipated for an area.

**Goal 15:** Create a city of distinctive and memorable places.

**Objective 15.1:** Support the Urban Village designation that produce a distinctive, high-quality built environment whose forms and character respect Tampa’s unique historic environment, and architectural context, and create memorable places that enrich community life.

**Policy 15.1.2:** Mix of Uses – Urban villages contain most of the following uses which typically make up what is considered a traditional and livable community: single and multi-family residential, neighborhood serving commercial, schools, parks, a central gathering place, mass transit and safe, walkable pathways that connect people to all areas of the village. Work towards creating a mix and placement of these uses that works for the character of the village and creates a vibrant community setting.

**Policy 15.1.3:** Economic Opportunity – Recognize that urban villages are very livable and sustainable form of development. Continue to emphasize the compact and mixed use nature of these villages. Look for ways to make it easier to create this type of development pattern.
Policy 15.1.4: **Mobility Choices** – The City shall ensure that redevelopment projects in urban villages are designated for pedestrian traffic and connect and support a citywide transit system.

Policy 15.1.9: **Choice of Lifestyle** – Mixed use projects that integrate different classifications of uses (e.g. commercial and residential) are preferred over single use projects, and will be incentivized.

Central Park Village is an area that has the capacity to evolve into a vibrant mix use neighborhood due to its proximity to Downtown, Historic Ybor City and Tampa Heights. This area has sufficient land to provide new employment opportunities through increased office development. Additionally, the area is adjacent to established residential neighborhoods along with emerging new housing opportunities through the development of the Tampa Housing Authority’s ENCORE project to the south of the plan amendment area. Central Park Village has underutilized land ripe for redevelopment activity that could occur through various economic development initiatives undertaken by City to attract private development. These redevelopment opportunities are anticipated to occur with the implementation of several transportation system improvements planned in the Central Park CRA area beginning along Nebraska Avenue where the Hillsborough Area Regional Transit (HART) is planning a Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system, additionally a proposed Light Rail system is in the planning stages that may be within a ½ mile of Central Park CRA and there is the proposed Florida’s High Speed Rail/Station that would also be in close proximity.

**Mixed Use Corridor Villages:**

The Mixed Use Corridor villages are identified as areas with the greatest opportunity to support the gradual transformation of road corridors where intensification is possible and encouraged to create new housing and job opportunities while improving the pedestrian environment, the look of the street, shopping opportunities and transit service for community residents.

**Goal 16:** **Mixed Use Corridor Villages** - Major corridors transformed into vibrant pedestrian-friendly environments that serve as gathering places for adjacent neighborhoods.

**Policy 16.1.3:** **Higher Intensity Nodes** – The City shall support proposals to convert non-residential properties along mixed use corridors, between major intersections, to residential or mixed use residential uses and ensure the development is compatible with surrounding land uses and has adequate access to transit services and community services.
Policy 16.1.4:  
**Sidewalks and Pedestrian Amenities** – The City shall require that sidewalks along mixed-use corridors are wide enough to accommodate significant pedestrian traffic and the integration of public amenities and landscaping.

Policy 16.1.5:  
**Corridor Transit** – The City shall encourage design and development along mixed use corridors that promotes the use of public transit, pedestrian and bicycle travel that maximizes personal safety through development features such as:
- Buildings oriented to the street and transit services;
- Safe and convenient access for pedestrians between buildings and transit stops;
- Support the Greenways and Trail Master Plan when applicable;
- Parking areas, and other buildings and facilities; and
- Roads designed for automobile use, efficient transit service as well as pedestrian and bicycle travel.

Policy 16.1.6:  
**Visual and Physical Character** – The City shall ensure that the introduction of higher-density mixed-use development along major arterial corridors is compatible with adjacent land uses, particularly residential uses by requiring such features as:

- Buildings setback from rear or side yard property lines adjoining single family residential uses;
- Building heights stepped back from sensitive adjoining uses(including historic districts) to maintain appropriate transitions in scale, massing and height and to protect privacy and solar access;
- Landscaped off-street parking areas, loading areas, and service areas screened from adjacent residential areas, to the degree feasible and;
- Lighting shielded and directed downward to minimize impacts on adjacent residential uses.

Policy 16.1.7: **Differentiation of the Corridors** – The long-term development direction is to create linear mixed use villages in these corridors. Three types of mixed use corridor villages are defined and they are based on the scale of the development pattern to be expected – suburban mixed use scale corridor village (refer to the SMU-6 plan category for more detail); community mixed use scale corridor village (refer to the CMU-35 and CC-35 plan categories for more detail); and the urban mixed use scale corridor village (refer to the UMU-60 plan category for more detail).

Policy 16.1.9: **Redevelopment** – The City shall promote redevelopment patterns and streetscape improvements that transforms the visual and physical character of these corridors by the following:

- Put buildings close to the sidewalk. This will create a consistent “street wall”, will allow through traffic to see shops and will make it interesting for people to walk through the corridor;
- Introduce taller buildings consistent with the underlying plan category;
- Consider placing parking in the rear of the building;
- Create and attractive front and rear façade and entry for pedestrians;
- Create pedestrian pathways between the uses in the corridor and the neighborhood behind;
- Reduce visual clutter of signs through a consistent sign program;
- Remove utility poles and put utilities underground;
- Plant street trees and provide street furniture; and
- Always try to diversify the types of uses.

Central Park is along the Mixed Use Corridor Village of Nebraska Avenue that is serviced by HART Route #2 and Route #12 which provides north/south service to two different transfer centers which provide 20 connections within the transit system. Mixed Use Corridor Villages support the Livable City’s goal of becoming transit ready and supporting existing and future transit.

**Central Park Area**
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Each corridor is different in terms of lot sizes and configurations, street widths, existing uses, neighborhood uses, neighboring uses, transit services and streetscape potential. Nebraska Avenue has seen improvement in streetscape through the roadway reconfiguration by restriping and crosswalks have been constructed along much of the roadway leading to and from Downtown. However there is no uniform program for transforming the corridor villages. A framework of change will be tailored to the individual corridors through studies and or “community planning through form-based code” processes that involve local residents, businesses and other stakeholders. Each framework will show:

- How the public realm - streetscape and pedestrian environment can be improved;
- Where public open space can be created and existing parks improved;
- Where trees could be planted; and
- How transit service can be enhanced and the roadway optimized;
- Opportunity to create new housing and jobs.

These changes to benefit new and existing residents may be gradually implemented as funding and opportunities present themselves and development proceeds.

**Policy 16.1.5:**

**Corridor Transit** - The City shall encourage design and development along mixed use corridors that promotes the use of public transit, pedestrian and bicycle travel that maximizes personal safety through development features such as:

- Buildings oriented to the street and transit services;
- Safe and convenient access for pedestrians between buildings and transit stops;
- Support the Greenways and Trail Master Plan when applicable;
- Parking areas, and other buildings and facilities; and
- Roads designed for automobile use, efficient transit service as well as pedestrian and bicycle travel.
These roadways are transit emphasis corridors and are suitable for redevelopment and intensification. Redevelopment of these corridors should be supported by quality transit services, combined with urban design standards to promote safe, comfortable and attractive streets.

Mobility seeks to further the attainment of a balanced, multi-modal transportation network the provides choices, and minimizes environmental and neighborhood impacts. Tampa is nearly built out and almost all of the anticipated growth is expected to occur as either redevelopment or infill development. If not properly addressed, increased growth and increased traffic demands can lead to impacts that threaten neighborhood quality of life.

Policy 16.1.10: Promote densities, mixes of uses, and transportation improvements that support walking and use of public transportation.

The City has designated the area south of Fletcher Avenue a Transportation Concurrency Exception Area and is encouraging new development to occur in the following areas; Downtown, Westshore and USF Business Centers and along Mixed-Use Corridor by designating areas appropriate for Downtown Revitalization and Urban Redevelopment.

Additionally, the Tampa Comprehensive Plan: Building our Legacy a Livable City encourages growth within the City’s Urban Service Area to discourage urban sprawl, reduce development pressures on rural lands, maximize the use of existing public facilities and centralize commercial, governmental, retail, residential, and cultural activities.

The amendment is within the City’s Urban Service Area. The amendment will allow consideration of infill redevelopment which can facilitate better use of land and infrastructure systems, enhance the livability of the city, and facilitate a mix of living, working, shopping and recreational activities.

Analysis and Conclusion

The proposed map amendment to the Future Land Use Map within the Central Tampa Planning District reflects the intent of the Central Park Community Redevelopment Area (CRA) Plan. The Central Park CRA Plan was completed in 2006 for the purpose of providing a strategy to eliminate conditions of blight found to exist within the Central Park Village Study Area.
The objectives of the Plan are to eliminate the conditions of blight identified in the area, achieve an economically sustainable level of redevelopment and restore a safe and pleasant living environment for area residents, visitors and business community.

The CRA Plan focus is to leverage the positive impact of key public sector initiatives by the Tampa Housing Authority (ENCORE project), improving the transportation system, replacing infrastructure and improving the quality of life for the current area residents, property owners, business and visitors to the Central Park CRA. This City initiated amendment to the Future Land Use Map is being proposed to provide enhancements to the land use classification within the Central Park CRA that will set the foundation for achieving the CRA Plan’s objectives that includes:

- Attracting private sector investment
- Encourage new higher-density mixed-use development
- Connecting the area into the larger urban fabric
- Improving infrastructure, safety and urban design

The proposed map amendment in the Central Park CRA is uniquely positioned to take advantage of both public and private sector redevelopment initiatives occurring to the east in Ybor City, such as the TECO and K-Force office facilities, to the north in the Tampa Heights neighborhood with the on-going revitalization activities as well as the GTE Federal Credit Union office facility within the Central Park CRA.

Additionally, the proposed plan amendment site is within the Central Business District (CBD) Periphery boundaries. Projects that are located within boundaries may be considered for density and intensity bonuses in Tampa’s Comprehensive Plan. By being within the CDB periphery boundaries there are increased opportunities to encourage infill and redevelopment activity with mixed-use projects. The proposed map amendment in the Central Park CRA is along Nebraska Avenue a transit-emphasis corridor that is planned to have enhanced transit service through the implementation of the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system by Hillsborough Area Regional Transit (HART) Authority.

There are other planned transit enhances that may be implemented over the next decade that includes a High Speed Rail system and a regional light-rail system both of which will be in close proximity to the Central Park CRA. These planned transit system enhancements will provide the catalyst for redevelopment activity through mixed-use projects which can become focal points in Central Park.

Although the Central Park CRA Plan had recommended the more dense and intense land use designation of Regional Mixed Use – 100 for most of the Central Park CRA, the Urban Mixed Use - 60 would still be consistent with the Central Park CRA Plan’s

**Central Park Area**

**Tampa CPA 09-10**
objectives to provide for higher density redevelopment and would be at an appropriate density that would respect the Ybor City Historic District along with curbing urban sprawl. Therefore the proposed map amendment to UMU-60 would further the following provisions:

- The amendment furthers Strategy 1: Organizing Planning Districts – Getting Transit Ready
- The amendment furthers Strategy 2: Strengthening Our Diverse Neighborhoods
- The amendment furthers Strategy 3: A Vibrant Central Downtown
- The amendment furthers Strategy 7: Growing Economic Prosperity
- The amendment furthers the Growth Management Solution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the attached resolution, finding the proposed land use designation change for Plan Amendment CPA 09-10, CONSISTENT with the *Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy: A Livable City* and forward this recommendation to Tampa City Council.
ATTACHMENT A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


PA09-10
Future Land Use Map Amendment
Area-Wide Change in Use (multiple parcels)
Central Park CRA: 41.81 acres

City Staff Recommendations

The City Staff has no objections to the proposed amendment, but does offer the following comments.

1. Wastewater: This plan amendment involves future land use changes to several parcels. With the current land use for these parcels, the estimated wastewater generated form the parcels will be 0.78400 MGD. Based on the potential build-out allowed under the proposed land use categories, the estimated wastewater generated will be 0.52275 MGD, which results in a net decrease in flow of 0.26125 MGD. The wastewater generated will discharge into the Downtown/West River District. The current available capacity for this District is 36.9 MGD. The proposed amendment will not impact the level of service established in the Wastewater Element of the City’s Comprehensive plan. There is adequate capacity in the existing facilities near these parcels for potential build-out.

2. Solid Waste: At the time of a zoning, variance, or incremental review, as well as permitting, the following provisions of the Tampa Code for refuse collection services will need to be met. Section 27-130. Buffers and screening. (1) Buffers required. (a.) (b.), Section 27-132. Solid Waste. (a) (b) (c) 1. 2. 3. 4. (d) (e) (f) (g) (h), Section 27-248(4). Off-Street Parking Space Standards and Section 27-324. General requirements. (1) Development standards. d. Refuse stations, storage areas and off-street loading areas. l. Location. 2. Screening.

3. Stormwater: The City is requesting this amendment to accommodate the Central Park Community Redevelopment Area (CRA). The Department recommends allowance for the establishment of a special assessment district or revenue funding entity for the operation and maintenance of the development’s infrastructure over and above City standards once the CRA is allowed to terminate.

4. Water: The water demands will increase with more intense development. The CRA is located within the Downtown and South Tampa Contribution in Aid of Construction (CIAC) area and will be subject to CIAC fees with water service connections. Additionally, water distribution mains must be installed to provide water service. The area requires a network of 12-inch water mains.

5. Parks & Recreation: No objections.

6. Transportation: No objection to the plan amendment, however a traffic analysis maybe required during rezoning.
MEMORANDUM

To: Samuel Dennis, Senior Planner

From: David Borisenko, AICP
Manager, Planning and Facilities Siting

Date: November 3, 2009

Re: City of Tampa Plan Amendments
Second Cycle 2009

The School District offers the following summary comments on each of the requested amendments.

PA 09-05
The proposed amendment would change the existing Land Use Plan designation from Medium Density Residential-35 (R-35) to Community Mixed-Use-35 (CMU-35). There does not appear to be any potential impact on school enrollment based on residential density.

PA 09-06
The proposed amendment makes text changes regarding Transit Oriented Development provisions in the Tampa, Comprehensive Plan, Building our Legacy, a Livable City. It will not be possible to determine the impact of the proposed amendment on school enrollment until station areas and their designations have been identified.

PA 09-07
The proposed amendment would adopt the Greater Seminole Heights Vision Plan. Schools serving the Seminole Heights neighborhood or located within it include Hillsborough High School, Memorial Middle School, Sligh Middle Magnet, Broward Elementary School, Cleveland Academy, and Seminole Elementary School. All the potentially impacted schools have sufficient capacity to accommodate increased student enrollment at this time. However, the impact on school enrollment will be determined on a project specific basis as development is considered for proposed residential density bonuses. It is possible that sufficient capacity may not be available in the schools that may serve the proposed residential development eligible for density bonuses at the time they are proposed.
PA 09-08
The proposed map amendment establishes boundary of the Seminole Heights Urban Village. No changes to land use designations are proposed. Therefore, it appears that the proposed amendment will not impact school enrollment at this time.

PA 09-09
The proposed text amendment incorporates goals, objectives and policies referring to the Courtney Campbell Scenic Highway Corridor and has no impact on school enrollment.

PA 09-10
The proposed map amendment would change the City of Tampa Comprehensive Plan Map from Central Business District (CBD), Regional Mixed Use-100 (RMU-100), Community Mixed Use 35 (CMU-35), and High Density Residential-83 (R-83) to Urban Mixed Use-60 (UMU-60) and Recreational/Open Space (R/OS). There appears to be no impact on school enrollment.

PA 09-11
The proposed map amendment would change the City of Tampa Comprehensive Plan Map from Low Density Suburban Neighborhood (R-6) to Recreational/Open Space (R/OS). There appears to be no impact on school enrollment.
From: Leslie, Gordon [LeslieG@epchc.org]
Sent: Thursday, November 12, 2009 3:32 PM
To: Sam Dennis
Subject: CPAs - August 2009 Cycle
In response to your request from 10/14/2009, please see below.

Date: November 6, 2009
To: Sam Dennis, Planning Commission
From: Gordon A. Leslie, Jr., EPC
Subject: EPC Review of the Below-Listed Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments for the August 2009 Cycle:

PA 09-05: Future Land Use Map Change – Rocky Point

PA 09-06: Text Changes to the Tampa Comprehensive Plan-Transit Oriented Development

PA 09-07: City of Tampa Comprehensive Plan – Text Amendment – Greater Seminole Heights Vision Plan

CPA 09-08: City of Tampa Comprehensive Plan – Map Amendment – Seminole Heights Urban Village

PA 09-09: City of Tampa Comprehensive Plan – Text Amendment – Courtney Campbell Scenic Highway Corridor

PA 09-10: City of Tampa Comprehensive Plan – Map Amendment – Central Park Community Redevelopment Area

EPC staff has reviewed the above-referenced Comprehensive Plan Amendments, which primarily pertain to community planning, proposed development and redevelopment activities, and transportation oriented development initiatives, within portions of the City of Tampa. EPC staff offers no specific comment on the subject amendments at this time.

We appreciate the continued opportunity to work with the Planning Commission, and other reviewing departments, on these and other plan amendments as they come forward.
1. PA 09-05: Future Land Use Map change. 3075 North Rocky Point Drive East – Chase Suites Hotel occupies the site.

Request: Proposed land use plan designation change of 4.4 acres of land from Medium Density Residential-35 (R-35) to Community Mixed-Use-35 (CMU-35). The subject’s property is located at 3075 North Rocky Point Drive East in the Westshore Planning District.

Comments:
The requested plan changes will increase the possibility of a range of users depending on future development. Users may include tourists or office workers or residents on the site. The possibility of residential or tourists in an area that provides retail goods and services increases the need to ensure that access to a range of safe transportation modes is addressed. This stretch of Courtney Campbell Causeway has recorded an occurrence of pedestrian crashes due to the victims’ desire to access the services available along the south side of Courtney Campbell.

Bicycles: The 2025 Long Range Transportation Plan identifies a bicycle level of service “E”. (see attached graphic). The poor bicycle level of service grade suggests that the road will need other improvements (in addition to shoulders) to help more bicyclists feel comfortable using the corridor. This roadway is characteristic of high-volume, high-speed motor-vehicle traffic and frequent conflicts that make this roadway highly inadequate for users other than the automobile. The city of Tampa is a Transportation Concurrency Area and as such should carefully assess the potential change and its impact on its future transportation planning. At a minimum, all roadways should be targeted to maintain a minimum bicycle and pedestrian LOS D. A Higher LOS standard may be desirable for locations near schools, central-city districts, activity centers, and other traffic generators.

Transit: The Long Range Transportation Plan shows that Transit is offered as “Peak Hour Service”. Transit is an option for a particular trip. Whether or not a passenger will decide to use transit will depend on the comfort and convenience of the service relative to competing modes such as the automobile. The frequency of service greatly impacts choice of mode, therefore it is recommended that the change be assessed relative to the city and Transit providers long range
West Tampa Greenway. PA 09-05 should be assessed in regards to this amendment to explore the possibility of providing city assistance to moving the project forward. The amendment is consistent with and furthers many of the goals and principles of the 2025 Long range Transportation Plan, including:

**Goal II: Promote Accessibility & Mobility Options Available to People or Freight, and Enhance the Integration and Connectivity of the Transportation System**

**Principle 2.1 Maximize Access to the Transportation System and Improve the Mobility of the Transportation Disadvantaged**
- Provide facilities and amenities that support transit users, bicyclists, pedestrians, and the transportation disadvantaged.
- Improve or expand the transportation disadvantaged system to encourage ridership.
- Promote paratransit or alternative services where development patterns do not support fixed route transit.

5. **Description of Request:** This is a City of Tampa initiated plan amendment involving 41.81 acres of selected public and private land in the Central Park Community Redevelopment Area (CRA). The request involves a change in the City of Tampa’s Comprehensive Plan Map from Central Business District-CBD, Regional-Mixed Use-100 (RMU-100), Community-Mixed Use-35 (CMU-35) and High Density Residential-83 (R-83) to Urban-Mixed Use-60 (UMU-60) and Recreational/Open Space (R/OS). Central Park CRA is located in the Central Tampa Planning District.

**Comments:**
The requested plan changes will increase the possibility of a range of users depending on future development. Users may include tourists or office workers or residents on the site.

**Transit:** Public transit stimulates development and redevelopment. The Transit level of service for Nebraska is “B” which is good. Additionally, a new transit service known as “MetroRapid” is planned to begin in 2011. The service will increase the speed of transit, improve service reliability and make it easier for people to use transit. The Urban Mixed Use plan category describes standards that should promote complementary transit development which include:

- **Populates and activates neighborhoods during both day and evening hours**
- **Increases housing options for more household types**
- **Reduces need to use a car for every trip**
- **Reduces traffic congestion and pollution**
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• Creates vibrant communities

**Bicycle:** The 2025 Long Range Transportation Plan identifies a bicycle level of service “E” (see attached graphic). The poor bicycle level of service grade suggests that the road will need other improvements (in addition to shoulders) to help more bicyclists feel comfortable using the corridor. This roadway is characteristic of high-volume, high-speed motor-vehicle traffic and frequent conflicts that make this roadway highly inadequate for users other than the automobile. The city of Tampa is a Transportation Concurrency Area and as such should carefully assess the potential change and its impact on its future transportation planning. At a minimum, all roadways should be targeted to maintain a minimum bicycle and pedestrian LOS D. A Higher LOS standard may be desirable for locations near schools, central-city district, activity centers, and other traffic generators. This amendment has the potential to improve the environment for bicyclists and pedestrian including a well-connected system of sidewalks.

MPO staff review included assessment of the following principles of the Long Range Transportation Plan:

**Goal II: Promote Accessibility & Mobility Options Available to People or Freight, and Enhance the Integration and Connectivity of the Transportation System**

**Principle 2.1 Maximize Access to the Transportation System and Improve the Mobility of the Transportation Disadvantaged**

- Provide facilities and amenities that support transit users, bicyclists, pedestrians, and the transportation disadvantaged.
- Improve or expand the transportation disadvantaged system to encourage ridership.
- Promote paratransit or alternative services where development patterns do not support fixed route transit.

**Principle 2.3 Support an Integrated System with Efficient Connections between Transportation Modes**

- Develop a transportation system that integrates all modes of transportation.
- Encourage development of multi-modal terminals in major activity centers.
- Provide appropriate highway, public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian links to airports, seaports, rail facilities, major transit terminals/stops, theme parks, and other major tourist destinations.
- Promote transit circulator, bicycle and pedestrian systems serving major activity centers, such as hospitals, educational facilities, malls, and other major commercial centers.
- Support improvements to significant point structures such as major intersections and movable bridges that serve vehicular traffic and other modes.
FIGURE 4-1: EXAMPLES OF BLOS FOR URBAN ROADWAYS
The revisions do not affect our comments on the plan amendment, however, we would like to emphasize the following which was included in our comments:

A Higher LOS standard may be desirable for locations near schools, central-city district, activity centers, and other traffic generators. This amendment has the potential to improve the environment for bicyclists and pedestrian including a well-connected system of sidewalks.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and should you have any questions, please feel free to ask. Peace.

Attached are a memorandum and a summary with a corrected chart on city-initiated plan amendment (PA 09-10).
Transportation Analysis

What is the adopted level of service for roadway facilities in this area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>From – To</th>
<th>Adopted LOS Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska Avenue</td>
<td>Scott St. to Henderson Ave.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska Avenue</td>
<td>Henderson Avenue to 7th Avenue</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska Avenue</td>
<td>7th Avenue to Palm Avenue</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Avenue</td>
<td>Florida Avenue to Nebraska Avenue</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Avenue</td>
<td>Florida Avenue to Nebraska Avenue</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is the current LOS for roadway facilities in the area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>From – To</th>
<th>Current LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska Avenue</td>
<td>Scott St. to Henderson Ave.</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska Avenue</td>
<td>Henderson Avenue to 7th Avenue</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska Avenue</td>
<td>7th Avenue to Palm Avenue</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Avenue</td>
<td>Florida Avenue to Nebraska Avenue</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Avenue</td>
<td>Florida Avenue to Nebraska Avenue</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information: *City of Tampa Inventory of Roadway Conditions*

Is there available capacity on the facilities in the area?

Access to the site is from Nebraska Ave. Palm Ave. or 7th Ave.

Nebraska Ave. from Scott St. to Henderson Ave. had an available PM Peak Hour Capacity of **0 vehicles** as a 2 lane divided facility.

Nebraska Ave. from Henderson Ave. to 7th Ave. had an available PM Peak Hour Capacity of **533 vehicles** as a 2 lane divided facility.

Nebraska Ave. from 7th Ave. to Palm Ave. had an available PM Peak Hour Capacity of **0 vehicles** as a 2 lane divided facility.

Palm Ave. from Florida Ave. to Nebraska Ave. had an available PM Peak Hour Capacity of **251 vehicles** as a 4 lane undivided facility.

7th Ave. from Florida Ave. to Nebraska Ave. is not listed in the *City of Tampa Inventory of Roadway Conditions*.

This indicates that, in this area, additional traffic can be accommodated on one of the three segments of Nebraska Avenue and Palm Avenue.
Are there any Planned improvements in the area?

The current Long Range Transportation Plan does not show any improvement to any roadways in this area.

Are there any Programmed improvements in the area?

The current 5 year Transportation Improvement Program does not include any capacity improvements in this area.

What is the impact of the proposed plan amendment?

The proposal is to change approximately 41.81 acres from CBD, RMU-100, CMU-35, and R-83 to UMU-60 and R/OS.

- **Existing Scenario Maximum Buildout: CBD, RMU-100, CMU-35, and R-83**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Allowed - Existing Category</th>
<th>PM Peak Hr Dir Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>154 Th. Sq. Ft. of General Office Building (ITE 710) and 540 Th. Sq. Ft. of General Office Building (ITE 710) and 800 Dwelling Units of High-Rise Condo/Townhouse (ITE 710)</td>
<td>1,339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Proposed Scenario: UMU-60 and R/OS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Allowed - Proposed Category</th>
<th>PM Peak Hr Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>154 Th. Sq. Ft. of General Office Building (ITE 710) and 1475.442 Th. Sq. Ft. of General Office Building (ITE 710) and 820 Dwelling Units of Mid-Rise Apartment (ITE 223)</td>
<td>2,749</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based upon maximum buildout scenarios, the existing land use category could generate up to 1,339 PM Peak Hr Trips with CBD, RMU-100, CMU-35, and R-83.

Based upon maximum buildout scenarios, the proposed land use category could generate up to 2,749 PM Peak Hr Trips with UMU-60 and R/OS.

The maximum trips generated by the above scenarios would cause Nebraska Ave. and Palm Ave. to operate at a deficient level of service.
Memorandum

TO: Mr. Samuel Dennis, Sr. Planner
    Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission

FROM: Linda Walker, Planner II
       Hillsborough Area Regional Transit Authority (HART)

DATE: November 5, 2009

RE: PA 09-10
    Central Park Community Redevelopment Area (CRA)

HART has reviewed the request for a plan map amendment to change the designated land uses from Central Business District, Regional Mixed Use – 100, Community Mixed Use-35, and High Density Residential-83 to Urban Mixed Use -60 and Recreational/Open Space. The Urban Mixed Used designation is compatible with future transit plans for this area.

Five routes travel within the Central Park CRA boundaries. See the attached map. Three of the routes provide late night service though midnight. The following describes the routes that travel within the planning area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nebraska Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>40th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Progress Village/ Brandon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>15th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>22nd Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The routes connect to other HART routes at the following major transfer locations.

- Downtown Tampa Marion Transit Center
- University Area Transit Center
- Yukon Transfer Center
- Westfield-Brandon Transfer Station

Developers met with HART to determine the bus circulation for future development within the redevelopment area. Transit service with stops and amenities will be included on the future designated main streets. Future bus circulation within the development will provide a direct connection to twenty-eight routes at the Marion Transit Center.

HART is seeking an alternative funding source for enhanced revenue. The enhanced revenue plan of HART's Transit Development Plan includes the following improvements for the community area.

- Increasing the frequencies on Routes 2, 9, 12, and 8.
- Nebraska Avenue MetroRapid (BRT north-south corridor)
The addition of the Metro Rapid Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) will improve travel along Nebraska Avenue by increasing the speed of transit. The BRT will connect to the Downtown Central Business District, Hidden River Business Park and Telecom Business Park.

HART is conducting a Northeast and west corridors Alternative Analysis (A.A.), for the federal New Starts process, to address transportation needs in a study area that includes the Central Park Community Redevelopment Study Area. See the attached map. The Central Park Village Community Redevelopment Vision includes concentrated pedestrian emphasis on a proposed town square that is conducive to transit that could factor into the A.A.

If you have any questions concerning HART comments, please contact me at (813) 223-6831, or send email to walkerl@gohart.org.

Attachment:  HART service in the Central Park Redevelopment Area- CRA  
Northeast & West Corridors Alternative Analysis (New Starts Transit Project)
Central Park Area
Tampa CPA 09-10
ATTACHMENT C

Land Use Map Series
CITY OF TAMPA
ADOPTED 2025 FUTURE LAND USE
PA 09-10

U.S. map accuracy standards. However, such accuracy is not warranted for purposes of determining specific property locations or determining the boundaries of any parcel. The information in this map is intended to be used for general planning purposes only and should not be relied upon to determine specific property locations or boundaries. Please contact the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission for specific property information. 


CHHA: Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council, June 12, 2006. The Coastal High Hazard Area as shown on the Future Land Use map is a general depiction as per HB1359, which is the area below the elevation of the category 1 storm surge line as established by the SLOSH computerized storm surge model. More specific information can be obtained by reviewing the TBRPC's computerized storm surge model.

URBAN SERVICE AREA BOUNDARIES: Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission. Effective to Present.


ACCURACY: It is intended that the accuracy of the base map comply with U.S. map accuracy standards. However, such accuracy is not warranted for purposes of determining specific property locations or determining the boundaries of any parcel. The information in this map is intended to be used for general planning purposes only and should not be relied upon to determine specific property locations or boundaries. Please contact the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission for specific property information.

REPRODUCTION: This sheet may not be reproduced in part or full for sale to anyone without specific approval of the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission.
COASTAL HIGH HAZARD AREA (CHHA) DISCLAIMER:
Source: Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council, January 2000. The Coastal High Hazard Area, as shown on the Future Land Use Map (FLUM), is a general depiction of the area defined in the most current regional hurricane evacuation study as requiring evacuation during a category one hurricane. More specific information can be obtained by reviewing the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council's Hurricane Evacuation Map.

MAJOR ROADS: See Adopted MPO Long Range Transportation Plan for specific improvements.

DATA SOURCES: Basemap, roads, water (1985 aerials, as updated) from Hillsborough County Engineering Services. Parcel lines and data from Hillsborough County Property Appraiser. Wetlands from SWFWMD, Significant Wildlife Habitat from Planning and Growth Management based on satellite imagery. Only Wetlands greater than 40 acres are depicted.

REPRODUCTION: This sheet may not be reproduced in part or full for sale to anyone without specific approval of the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission.

ACCURACY: It is intended that the accuracy of the base map comply with U.S. national map accuracy standards. However, such accuracy is not guaranteed by the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission. This map is for illustrative purposes only for the cities of Tampa, Temple Terrace and Plant City.

LEGENDS: The Future Land Use designations on this legend depict valid land use colors and codes for UNINCORPORATED HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY only. The incorporated area colors do not correspond with the legend. Please contact the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission for specific Future Land Use maps of the cities.

INSET ON COUNTYWIDE: EGMONT KEY is not shown in exact location.
CITY OF TAMPA
PROPOSED 2025 FUTURE LAND USE
PA 09-10
FROM: MAJOR RECREATION/OPEN SPACE, RESIDENTIAL 83, COMMUNITY MIXED USE 35 & REGIONAL MIXED USE 100
TO: URBAN MIXED USE 60


CHHA: Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council, June 12, 2006. The Coastal High Hazard Area as shown on the Future Land Use map is a general depiction as per HB1359, which is the area below the elevation of the category 1 storm surge line as established by the SLOSH computerized storm surge model. More specific information can be obtained by reviewing the TBRPC’s computerized storm surge model.

URBAN SERVICE AREA BOUNDARIES: Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission. Effective to Present.


ACCURACY: It is intended that the accuracy of the base map comply with U.S. map accuracy standards. However, such accuracy is not guaranteed by the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission.

REPRODUCTION: This sheet may not be reproduced in part or full for sale to anyone without specific approval of the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission.
RESOLUTION

ITEM: Tampa: CPA 09-11 MacDill “48” Parkland map amendment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AYE</th>
<th>NAY</th>
<th>ABSENT</th>
<th>DATE:</th>
<th>January 11, 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bruce P. Cury, Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert B. Hunter, Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On motion of Commissioner Giunta Seconded by Commissioner Dowdy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission has developed a Comprehensive Plan for the City of Tampa entitled *Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy A Livable City*, pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 163.3161, Florida Statutes, which was adopted by Tampa City Council on February 9, 2009, as amended; and;

WHEREAS, Tampa City Council adopted the Procedures Manual for Amendments to the *Tampa Comprehensive Plan* on October 9, 1986 and subsequently amended; and

WHEREAS, the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission has received a City-initiated petition for amendment to the Future Land Use Map of the *Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy: A Livable City* by the August 2009 submittal deadline; and

WHEREAS, the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission has reviewed the request to amend the *Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy A Livable City* Future Land Use Plan Map from Residential-6 and Residential-20 to Recreational and Open Space in the area south of Interbay Boulevard, west of South MacDill Avenue, east of Himes Avenue, and north of West Napoleon Avenue, approximately ¼ mile north of MacDill Air Force Base (on approximately 48 acres); and
WHEREAS, the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission has reviewed the proposal, has considered existing and expected future development patterns and community facilities in the respective area, as well as the adopted goals, objectives and policies of the *Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy A Livable City* as stated in the staff report as follows:

**Strategy 1: The Districts**

**Goal 1:** Tampa: A Livable City of diverse communities and neighborhoods interconnected through walking, bicycling, and transit, where public spaces are beautiful, and well designed, the economy thrives and our heritage is celebrated.

**Objective 1.1:** Designate 5 planning districts: University, Central Tampa, Westshore, New Tampa and South Tampa as an opportunity to build a livable and sustainable city.

**Policy 1.1.3:** Protect and build upon the heritage assets found in the diverse neighborhoods in the district.

**Strategy 2: Strengthening our Diverse Neighborhoods**

**Objective 1.2:** A City of diverse, distinct, and well-structured neighborhoods that meet the community’s needs for complete, sustainable, and high-quality living environments from the historic downtown core to the well-integrated new growth areas.

**Policy 1.2.1:** Recognizing Tampa’s neighborhoods are the basic living environments that make-up the City’s urban fabric, the City shall through its planning preserve and enhance all neighborhood’s distinctiveness, identity, and livability.

**Policy 1.2.3:** The City shall promote the design of complete and well-structured neighborhoods whose physical layout and land use mix promote walking, biking, and transit; reduce vehicle trips; foster community pride; enhance neighborhood identity; ensure public safety; and are family-friendly and address the needs of all ages and abilities.

**Neighborhood**

**Goal 18:** Every neighborhood will be a desirable place to live.

**Objective 18.1:** To preserve and enhance neighborhood distinction, identity, and livability.
Policy 18.1.1: Recognize that every neighborhood has assets that identify that neighborhood and contribute to the well being of the people that live there. Understand what those are and look for opportunities to enhance them and leverage them for neighborhood improvement. Assets include trees, large yards, schools, people and independent businesses.

Assets
Goal 19: To maintain and enhance Tampa’s character as the City grows and changes by building upon its assets. Tampa’s character includes its built environment: large areas of detached single-family houses both inside and outside of urban villages, many thriving multifamily areas, mixed-use commercial areas, industrial areas, major institutions, and a densely developed downtown with surrounding medium to high-density neighborhoods. Tampa’s character also includes its setting on the Bays, the Hillsborough River, lakes, natural areas, parks and open spaces.

Public Land
Objective 21.2: Protect open space for its recreational, safety, and environmental value and provide adequate parks and open space areas throughout the City.
Policy 21.2.1: The City shall place a high priority on acquiring and preserving open space lands for purposes of recreation, habitat protection and enhancement, flood hazard management, public safety, and water resources protection for the overall benefit of the community.

Open Space and Aesthetics
Objective 32.2: Establish and preserve an appropriate open space system to protect public health, safety and welfare, and assure retention of aesthetic and environmental amenities.

Tree Canopy
Objective 32.3: Mature tree canopy is a vital community and environmental asset that is appreciated and desired by residents in new and established neighborhoods alike. The protection and supplementation of this tree canopy is a necessity in order to sustain the resource and maintain the environmental benefits, such as cooler temperatures, that the mature canopy provides.

Land Stewardship
Objective 32.4: The City will strive to utilize best practices for land stewardship and management. The proper management of parklands, especially those that are environmentally sensitive, is an ongoing challenge. Proper stewardship requires long range planning, beyond basic park maintenance.
Policy 32.4.1: The City shall develop management plans for all properties acquired through the ELAPP and state acquisition programs. These management
plans shall provide for the conservation and protection of the natural resources of the site per the management goals and objectives of the acquisition program utilized for purchase.

Greenways
Policy 33.4.11: Utilize future parkland and open space acquisition opportunities to connect the City’s existing parkland and open space into a coordinated system.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission finds the requested Tampa Comprehensive Plan Amendment 09-11 from Residential-6 and Residential-20 to Recreational and Open Space, in the area south of Interbay Boulevard, west of South MacDill Avenue, east of Himes Avenue, and north of West Napoleon Avenue, approximately ¼ mile north of MacDill Air Force Base CONSISTENT with the Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy A Livable City and recommends Tampa Comprehensive Plan Amendment 09-11 be approved.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
Meeting Date: January 11, 2010 Public Hearing
Agenda Item: Tampa: CPA 09-11 MacDill "48" Parkland map amendment

SUMMARY
The Planning Commission will be reviewing and making a recommendation to Tampa City Council on an amendment to the Future Land Use Map. This amendment was initiated by the City of Tampa to change the land use designations from Residential-6 and Residential-20 to Recreation and Open Space.

BACKGROUND
The Planning Commission is required to make recommendations to the Tampa City Council on all proposed changes to the Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy: A Livable City pursuant to Chapter 163, Part II, Florida Statutes and Chapter 97-351 Laws of Florida, as amended.

The subject site was acquired by the City of Tampa with funds from the Hillsborough County Environmental Lands Acquisition and Protection Program (ELAPP) and the Florida Communities Trust (FCT) acquisition programs. As required by the Florida Communities Trust grant program, a change to the most restrictive land use category was required as a condition for the acquisition of this site. The request for the approximate 48 acres of publicly-owned land is to amend current Future Land Use designations of Residential 6 and Residential-20 to Recreation and Open Space. The site is located south of Interbay Boulevard, west of South MacDill Avenue, east of Himes Avenue, and north of West Napoleon Avenue, approximately ¼ mile north of MacDill Air Force Base. The primary purpose of the request is to fulfill the requirements of the acquisition grants and to promote outdoor recreation and natural resource protection needs as identified in the Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy: A Livable City.

RECOMMENDATION
It is recommended that the Planning Commission APPROVE the attached resolution finding the amendment CPA 09-11 CONSISTENT with the Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy: A Livable City and forward this recommendation to the Tampa City Council.

Prepared By: Rose Petrucha, Principal Planner
Date Prepared: December 30, 2009
This proposed amendment to the Future Land Use Plan Map has been initiated by the City of Tampa. The subject site was acquired by the City of Tampa with funds from the Hillsborough County Environmental Lands Acquisition and Protection Program (ELAPP) and the Florida Communities Trust (FCT) acquisition programs. As required by the Florida Communities Trust grant program, a change to the most restrictive land use category was required as a condition for the acquisition of this site.

The request for the approximate 48 acres of publicly-owned land is to amend current Future Land Use designations of Low Density Suburban Neighborhood (Residential-6) and Low Medium Density Residential (Residential-20) to Recreation and Open Space (R-OS). The site is located south of Interbay Boulevard, west of South MacDill Avenue, east of Himes Avenue, and north of West Napoleon Avenue, approximately ¼ mile north of MacDill Air Force Base. The primary purpose of the request is to fulfill the requirements of the acquisition grants and to promote outdoor recreation and natural resource protection needs as identified in the Tampa Comprehensive Plan.

Planning District/location: The site is located in the South Tampa Planning District, within the Interbay neighborhood. Folio# 135951.000 (Section 15, Township 30, and Range 18)

Tampa’s Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy: A Livable City was adopted in February, 2009. The Plan articulates a vision for how Tampa will accommodate the growth of the city to include 92,000 additional residents and 132,000 new jobs over the next 20 years, while promoting the values of its citizens:
**LIVABILITY** (Tampa is a place where diverse people find it easy, safe and enjoyable to live.)

**PROSPERITY** (A Tampa that is focused on the quality of life for all its people must be a Tampa that is economically healthy, with a broad mix of good jobs.)

**RESPECT** (The living systems which support us are taken care of and passed on to future generations in better shape.)

**RESILIENCE** (The systems that support our day to day living can deal with uncertainty and cope with the shifts and shocks we face in the future.)

The Plan’s vision articulates the growth management strategy by organizing the City in Planning Districts and encouraging most new growth to locate in places designated as Business Centers, Urban Villages or Mixed Use Corridor Villages.

**Strategy 1: Organizing Planning Districts**

**Goal 1:** *Tampa: A Livable City of diverse communities and neighborhoods interconnected through walking, bicycling, and transit, where public spaces are beautiful, and well designed, the economy thrives and our heritage is celebrated.*

**Objective 1.1:** Designate 5 planning districts: University, Central Tampa, Westshore, New Tampa and South Tampa as an opportunity to build a livable and sustainable city.

**Policy 1.1.3:** Protect and build upon the heritage assets found in the diverse neighborhoods in the district.

The plan amendment area is located in the South Tampa District. Defined by water, this District consists of Tampa’s Interbay Peninsula, generally described as south of Kennedy Boulevard and lying between Old Tampa Bay and Hillsborough Bay. Predominately single family residential, the area has many strong and recognized neighborhood associations. South of Gandy Boulevard, they include: Port Tampa, Ballast Point, Gandy Civic Association, Guernsey Estates, Interbay and South Westshore. The area also contains MacDill Air Force Base, a major employment center and economic engine for the City and region. The district offers many opportunities to become a more livable and sustainable part of the City.

**Opportunities – within the South Tampa District**

1. **Maintaining Neighborhood Stability**
2. **Fostering Compatible Infill to Improve Mobility and Sustainability**
Strategy 2: Strengthening our Diverse Neighborhoods

Objective 1.2: A City of diverse, distinct, and well-structured neighborhoods that meet the community’s needs for complete, sustainable, and high-quality living environments from the historic downtown core to the well-integrated new growth areas.

Policy 1.2.1: Recognizing Tampa’s neighborhoods are the basic living environments that make-up the City’s urban fabric, the City shall through its planning preserve and enhance all neighborhood’s distinctiveness, identity, and livability.

Policy 1.2.3: The City shall promote the design of complete and well-structured neighborhoods whose physical layout and land use mix promote walking, biking, and transit; reduce vehicle trips; foster community pride; enhance neighborhood identity; ensure public safety; and are family-friendly and address the needs of all ages and abilities.

South Tampa District

The plan amendment, located in the South Tampa District, provides an opportunity to promote Tampa’s Interbay residential neighborhood by providing open space and...
tree canopy for the area’s wildlife and furthering the livability and identity of the neighborhood.

**Plan Amendment Impacts/Issues:**

The amendment area lies adjoining residential neighborhoods and a park. The amendment area has remained undeveloped for many years and is noted for its trees and natural environmental conditions. The amendment, if approved, will reduce the development potential of the site by approximately 330 residential dwelling units. The table below summarizes the potential impacts of the change from R-6 and R-20 to R/OS plan categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>From: Residential-6 (R-6)</th>
<th>To: Recreation Open Space (R/OS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Density</td>
<td>6 DU/gross acre</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum # of units using density calculations based on 45 acres</td>
<td>270 units</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum square footage of building based on 45 acres</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>From: Residential-20 (R-20)</th>
<th>To: Recreation Open Space (R/OS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Density</td>
<td>20 DU/gross acre</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum # of units using density calculations based on 3 acres</td>
<td>60 units</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum square footage of building based on 3 acres</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Copies of agency responses are included in the Attachment A to this report. Agencies/Departments with comments to the proposed amendment are as follows:

- **City of Tampa – Water Department**
- **City of Tampa – Wastewater Department**
- **City of Tampa – Solid Waste Department**
- **City of Tampa – Stormwater Department**
- **City of Tampa – Transportation Department**
No major impacts were identified by the agency comments.

Comments from HARTline did note the opportunity to provide a bus stop and linking the recreation/open space site with the South Tampa Greenway Trail. If the interconnection could be made with the trail, a future multi-purpose shelter could be designed for the location to serve as a trail head facility and a passenger waiting area. Future bike paths and pedestrian paths could then be planned to connect to the transit stop.

### Relationship to the Tampa Comprehensive Plan:

In reviewing the proposed plan amendment with the *Tampa Comprehensive Plan*, the following Goals, Objectives, and Policies are relevant:

**Neighborhood**

**Goal 18:** Every neighborhood will be a desirable place to live.

**Objective 18.1:** To preserve and enhance neighborhood distinction, identity, and livability.

**Policy 18.1.1:** Recognize that every neighborhood has assets that identify that neighborhood and contribute to the well being of the people that live there. Understand what those are and look for opportunities to enhance them and leverage them for neighborhood improvement. Assets include trees, large yards, schools, people and independent businesses.

**Assets**

**Goal 19:** To maintain and enhance Tampa’s character as the City grows and changes by building upon its assets. Tampa’s character includes its built environment: large areas of detached single-family houses both inside and outside of urban villages, many thriving multifamily areas, mixed-use commercial areas, industrial areas, major institutions, and a densely developed downtown with surrounding medium to high-density neighborhoods. Tampa’s character also includes its setting on the Bays, the Hillsborough River, lakes, natural areas, parks and open spaces.

**Public Land**

**Objective 21.2:** Protect open space for its recreational, safety, and environmental value and provide adequate parks and open space areas throughout the City.

**Policy 21.2.1:** The City shall place a high priority on acquiring and preserving open space lands for purposes of recreation, habitat protection and enhancement, flood hazard
management, public safety, and water resources protection for the overall benefit of the community.

**Open Space and Aesthetics**
**Objective 32.2:** Establish and preserve an appropriate open space system to protect public health, safety and welfare, and assure retention of aesthetic and environmental amenities.

**Tree Canopy**
**Objective 32.3:** Mature tree canopy is a vital community and environmental asset that is appreciated and desired by residents in new and established neighborhoods alike. The protection and supplementation of this tree canopy is a necessity in order to sustain the resource and maintain the environmental benefits, such as cooler temperatures, that the mature canopy provides.

**Land Stewardship**
**Objective 32.4:** The City will strive to utilize best practices for land stewardship and management. The proper management of parklands, especially those that are environmentally sensitive, is an ongoing challenge. Proper stewardship requires long range planning, beyond basic park maintenance.
**Policy 32.4.1:** The City shall develop management plans for all properties acquired through the ELAPP and state acquisition programs. These management plans shall provide for the conservation and protection of the natural resources of the site per the management goals and objectives of the acquisition program utilized for purchase.

**Greenways**
**Policy 33.4.11:** Utilize future parkland and open space acquisition opportunities to connect the City’s existing parkland and open space into a coordinated system.

### Analysis and Conclusion:

The proposed plan amendment is consistent with the strategies, goals, objectives, and policies to strengthen Tampa’s diverse neighborhoods, maintain neighborhood stability, recognize and promote the city’s assets, preserve an appropriate open space system for the public’s health, safety, and welfare, and assure retention of aesthetic and environmental amenities. The proposed plan amendment also provides the opportunity to foster and improve mobility and sustainability for the community at large.

### Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission find the proposed land use designation change for Plan Amendment CPA 09-11, CONSISTENT with the *Tampa Comprehensive Plan Building Our Legacy: A Livable City* and forward this recommendation to Tampa City Council.
ATTACHMENT A

Agency Comments
Tampa Comprehensive Plan
Proposed Plan Amendments

Staff Report

2009 August Plan Amendment Cycle

PA09-05: Map Amendment: 3075 North Rocky Point Drive (R-35 to CMU-35)
PA09-06 Text Amendment: Transit Oriented Development
PA09-07: Text Amendment: Seminole Heights Vision Plan
PA09-08 Map Amendment: Seminole Heights Areawide Map Amendment
PA09-09 Text Amendment: Courtney Campbell Scenic Corridor
PA09-10 Map Amendment: Central Park CRA Areawide Map Amendment
PA09-11 Map Amendment: MacDill Avenue Map Amendment

Land Development Coordination Division
Growth Management and Development Services Department
November 12, 2009
PA09-11
Future Land Use Map Amendment
From R-6 to R/OS
MacDill Avenue: 47.17 acres

City Staff Recommendations

The City Staff has no objections to the proposed amendment, but does offer the following comments.

1. Wastewater: With the current land use for this property, the estimated wastewater generated from the parcels will be 0.08773 MGD. Based on the proposed land use, the area will be open space and no wastewater service will be required. The proposed amendment will not impact the level of service established in the Wastewater Element of the City's Comprehensive plan.

2. Solid Waste: At the time of a zoning, variance, or incremental review, as well as permitting, the following provisions of the City of Tampa Code for refuse collection services will need to be met. Section 27-130. Buffers and screening. (1) Buffers required. (a.) (b.), Section 27-132. Solid Waste. (a) (b) (c) 1. 2. 3. 4. (d) (e) (f) (g) (h), Section 27-248(4). Off-Street Parking Space Standards and Section 27-324. General requirements. (1) Development standards. d. Refuse stations, storage areas and off-street loading areas. 1. Location. 2. Screening.

3. Stormwater: The Stormwater Department has no objections to this amendment and recommends any development of this parcel be done with consideration of the Comprehensive Plan Objectives providing responsible management of stormwater quality and quantity.

4. Water: The water demands will likely decrease with this plan amendment. If water service is required for the future park/recreational area, CIAC fees will be applicable. There is 12-inch water main along MacDill Avenue.

5. Parks & Recreation: This amendment is needed to comply with provisions of the Florida Communities Trust Grant Program, which provided funding to acquire the parcels.
MEMORANDUM

To: Samuel Dennis, Senior Planner

From: David Borisenko, AICP
Manager, Planning and Facilities Siting

Date: November 3, 2009

Re: City of Tampa Plan Amendments
Second Cycle 2009

The School District offers the following summary comments on each of the requested amendments.

PA 09-05
The proposed amendment would change the existing Land Use Plan designation from Medium Density Residential-35 (R-35) to Community Mixed-Use-35 (CMU-35). There does not appear to be any potential impact on school enrollment based on residential density.

PA 09-06
The proposed amendment makes text changes regarding Transit Oriented Development provisions in the Tampa, Comprehensive Plan, Building our Legacy, a Livable City. It will not be possible to determine the impact of the proposed amendment on school enrollment until station areas and their designations have been identified.

PA 09-07
The proposed amendment would adopt the Greater Seminole Heights Vision Plan. Schools serving the Seminole Heights neighborhood or located within it include Hillsborough High School, Memorial Middle School, Sligh Middle Magnet, Broward Elementary School, Cleveland Academy, and Seminole Elementary School. All the potentially impacted schools have sufficient capacity to accommodate increased student enrollment at this time. However, the impact on school enrollment will be determined on a project specific basis as development is considered for proposed residential density bonuses. It is possible that sufficient capacity may not be available in the schools that may serve the proposed residential development eligible for density bonuses at the time they are proposed.
PA 09-08
The proposed map amendment establishes boundary of the Seminole Heights Urban Village. No changes to land use designations are proposed. Therefore, it appears that the proposed amendment will not impact school enrollment at this time.

PA 09-09
The proposed text amendment incorporates goals, objectives and policies referring to the Courtney Campbell Scenic Highway Corridor and has no impact on school enrollment.

PA 09-10
The proposed map amendment would change the City of Tampa Comprehensive Plan Map from Central Business District (CBD), Regional Mixed Use-100 (RMU-100), Community Mixed Use 35 (CMU-35), and High Density Residential-83 (R-83) to Urban Mixed Use-60 (UMU-60) and Recreational/Open Space (R/OS). There appears to be no impact on school enrollment.

PA 09-11
The proposed map amendment would change the City of Tampa Comprehensive Plan Map from Low Density Suburban Neighborhood (R-6) to Recreational/Open Space (R/OS). There appears to be no impact on school enrollment.
From: Leslie, Gordon [LeslieG@epchc.org]
Sent: Thursday, November 12, 2009 3:32 PM
To: Sam Dennis
Subject: CPAs - August 2009 Cycle

In response to your request from 10/14/2009, please see below.

Date: November 6, 2009
To: Sam Dennis, Planning Commission
From: Gordon A. Leslie, Jr., EPC
Subject: EPC Review of the Below-Listed Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments for the August 2009 Cycle:

PA 09-05: Future Land Use Map Change – Rocky Point

PA 09-06: Text Changes to the Tampa Comprehensive Plan-Transit Oriented Development

PA 09-07: City of Tampa Comprehensive Plan – Text Amendment – Greater Seminole Heights Vision Plan

CPA 09-08: City of Tampa Comprehensive Plan – Map Amendment – Seminole Heights Urban Village

PA 09-09: City of Tampa Comprehensive Plan – Text Amendment – Courtney Campbell Scenic Highway Corridor

PA 09-10: City of Tampa Comprehensive Plan – Map Amendment – Central Park Community Redevelopment Area

EPC staff has reviewed the above-referenced Comprehensive Plan Amendments, which primarily pertain to community planning, proposed development and redevelopment activities, and transportation oriented development initiatives, within portions of the City of Tampa. EPC staff offers no specific comment on the subject amendments at this time.

We appreciate the continued opportunity to work with the Planning Commission, and other reviewing departments, on these and other plan amendments as they come forward.
Transportation Analysis

What is the adopted level of service for roadway facilities in this area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>From – To</th>
<th>Adopted LOS Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MacDill Ave.</td>
<td>Interbay Blvd. to MacDill AFB</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interbay Blvd.</td>
<td>Dale Mabry Hwy. to Bayshore Blvd.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is the current LOS for roadway facilities in the area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>From – To</th>
<th>Current LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MacDill Ave.</td>
<td>Interbay Blvd. to MacDill AFB</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interbay Blvd.</td>
<td>Dale Mabry Hwy. to Bayshore Blvd.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information: *City of Tampa Inventory of Roadway Conditions*

Is there available capacity on the facilities in the area?

Access to the site is from MacDill Ave. or Interbay Blvd.

MacDill Ave. had an available PM Peak Hour Capacity of 432 vehicles as a 2 lane undivided facility.

Interbay Blvd. had an available PM Peak Hour Capacity of 734 vehicles as a 2 lane undivided facility.

This indicates that, in this area, additional traffic can be accommodated on MacDill Ave. and Interbay Blvd.
**Are there any Planned improvements in the area?**

The current Long Range Transportation Plan does not show any improvement to any roadways in this area.

**Are there any Programmed improvements in the area?**

The current 5 year Transportation Improvement Program does not include any capacity improvements in this area.

**What is the impact of the proposed plan amendment?**

The proposal is to change approximately 47.17 acres from Low Density Suburban Neighborhood (R-6) to Recreational/Open Space (R-OS).

- **Existing Scenario Maximum Buildout:** Low Density Suburban Neighborhood(R-6)
  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Allowed - Existing Category</th>
<th>PM Peak Hr Dir Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>283 Dwelling Units of Single Family Detached Housing (ITE 210)</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Proposed Scenario:** Recreational/Open Space (R-OS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Allowed - Proposed Category</th>
<th>PM Peak Hr Trip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47.17 Acres of County Park (ITE 412)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based upon maximum buildout scenarios, the existing land use category could generate up to 286 PM Peak Hr Trips with Low Density Suburban Neighborhood(R-6).

Based upon maximum buildout scenarios, the proposed land use category could generate up to 3 PM Peak Hr Trips with Recreational/Open Space (R-OS).

The maximum trips generated by the above scenarios would not cause MacDill Ave. or Interbay Blvd. to operate at a deficient level of service.
CPA 09-11: Future Land Use Map change. As required by the Florida Communities Trust’s Parks grant program, a change to the most restrictive land use category is required as a condition for the acquisition of this site which is currently owned by the City of Tampa. Therefore, the City of Tampa is requesting a 47.17-acre parcel to be amended from Low Density Suburban Neighborhood (R-6) to Recreational/Open Space (R-OS). The primary purpose of this public-initiated plan amendment request is to promote outdoor recreation and natural resource protection needs identified in the City of Tampa’s comprehensive plan.

Comments:
One purpose of this amendment request is to promote outdoor recreation.

Bicycle: The Long Range Transportation Plan identifies MacDill Avenue as having a level of service as LOS D (see attached graphic). The roadway is adequate for high skilled riders. Bicyclists can anticipate a moderate to high level of interaction with motor vehicles. Crash data shows the occurrence of both pedestrian and bicycle crashes along these corridors. A Higher LOS standard may be desirable for locations near schools, activity centers, and other traffic generators. The city of Tampa is a Transportation Concurrency Area and as such should carefully assess the potential change and its impact on its future transportation planning with an eye on improving the environment for bicyclists and pedestrian.

Transit: The transit level of service along MacDill is “E”. The designation indicates that the reliability of transit service is such that passengers must allow extra time for irregular service. An attractor such as a park should be accessible by transit in a city that is designated a Transportation Concurrency Area.
FIGURE 4-1: EXAMPLES OF BLOS FOR URBAN ROADWAYS
Memorandum

TO: Mr. Samuel Dennis, Sr. Planner
Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission

FROM: Linda Walker, Planner II
Hillsborough Area Regional Transit Authority (HART)

DATE: November 5, 2009

RE: PA 09-11
MacDill “48” Park
Folio No. 135950.000, 135952.0000, & 135951.0000

HART has reviewed the proposed land use plan designation change from Low Density Suburban Neighborhood (R-6) to Recreational/Open Space (R-OS). HART provides service to this area on Route 4 (Palma Ceia/ MacDill) and Hurricane Emergency Evacuation Route “G”. A bus stop is located at the front of the property on MacDill Avenue. Route 4 travels to the Britton Plaza Transfer Center and the Downtown Tampa Marion Transit Center to provide connections to other HART routes. Increased frequencies on Route 4 are targeted for fiscal year 2025 in the Enhanced Revenue Plan of HART’s Transit Development Plan.

The stop will continue to serve the surrounding neighborhood with the R-OS land use designation. If the park will link into the South Tampa Greenway Trail, a future multipurpose shelter could be designed for the location to serve as a trail head facility and a passenger waiting area. Future bike paths and pedestrian paths should connect to the transit stop.
ATTACHMENT B

Maps

CHHA: Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council, June 12, 2006. The Coastal High Hazard Area as shown on the Future Land Use map is a general depiction as per HB1359, which is the area below the elevation of the category 1 storm surge line as established by the SLOSH computerized storm surge model. More specific information can be obtained by reviewing the TBRPC's computerized storm surge model.

URBAN SERVICE AREA BOUNDARIES: Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission. Effective to Present.


ACCURACY: It is intended that the accuracy of the base map comply with U.S. map accuracy standards. However, such accuracy is not guaranteed by the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission.

REPRODUCTION: This sheet may not be reproduced in part or full for sale to anyone without specific approval of the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission.
COASTAL HIGH HAZARD AREA (CHHA) DISCLAIMER:
Source: Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council, January 2000. The Coastal High Hazard Area, as shown on the Future Land Use Map (FLUM), is a general depiction of the area defined in the most current regional hurricane evacuation study as requiring evacuation during a category one hurricane. More specific information can be obtained by reviewing the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council's Hurricane Evacuation Map.

MAJOR ROADS: See Adopted MPO Long Range Transportation Plan for specific improvements.

DATA SOURCES: Basemap, roads, water (1985 aerials, as updated) from Hillsborough County Engineering Services. Parcel lines and data from Hillsborough County Property Appraiser. Wetlands from SWFWMD, Significant Wildlife Habitat from Planning and Growth Management based on satellite imagery. Only Wetlands greater than 40 acres are depicted.

REPRODUCTION: This sheet may not be reproduced in part or full for sale to anyone without specific approval of the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission.

ACCURACY: It is intended that the accuracy of the base map comply with U.S. national map accuracy standards. However, such accuracy is not guaranteed by the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission. This map is for illustrative purposes only for the cities of Tampa, Temple Terrace, and Plant City.

LEGENDS: The Future Land Use designations on this legend depict valid land use colors and codes for UNINCORPORATED HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY only. The incorporated area colors do not correspond with the legend. Please contact the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission for specific Future Land Use maps of the cities.

INSET ON COUNTYWIDE: EGMONT KEY is not shown in exact location.
CITY OF TAMPA
ADOPTED 2025 FUTURE LAND USE
PA 09-11


CHHA:  Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council, June 12, 2006. The Coastal High Hazard Area as shown on the Future Land Use map is a general depiction as per HB1359, which is the area below the elevation of the category 1 storm surge line as established by the SLOSH computerized storm surge model.  More specific information can be obtained by reviewing the TBRPC's computerized storm surge model.

URBAN SERVICE AREA BOUNDARIES:  Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission.  Effective to Present.


ACCURACY:  It is intended that the accuracy of the base map comply with U.S. map accuracy standards.  However, such accuracy is not guaranteed by the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission.

REPRODUCTION:  This sheet may not be reproduced in part or full for sale to anyone without specific approval of the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission.
CITY OF TAMPA
PROPOSED 2025 FUTURE LAND USE
PA 09-11
FROM: RESIDENTIAL 6 & RESIDENTIAL 20
TO: RECREATION/OPEN SPACE

CITY OF TAMPA

BURAL ESTATE - VI (RE-10) (25 FAR)
LOW DENSITY SUBURBAN NEIGHBORHOOD (R-3) (25 FAR)
LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (R-10) (35 FAR)
LOW MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (R-25) (50 FAR)
LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL - 150 (60 FAR)
MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (R-20) (60 FAR)
HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (R-65) (65 FAR)
SUBURBAN MIXED USE - 3 (25 FAR)
SUBURBAN MIXED USE - 6 (30 FAR)
GENERAL MIXED USE - 50 (1.5 FAR)
URBAN MIXED USE - 60 (3.25 FAR)
COMMUNITY MIXED USE - 35 (2.0 FAR)
REGIONAL MIXED USE - 100 (3.5 FAR)
AIRPORT COMPATIBILITY

COMMUNITY COMMERICAL - 35 (2.0 FAR)
LIGHT INDUSTRIAL (1.5 FAR)
HEAVY INDUSTRIAL (1.0 FAR)
MAJOR RECREATIONAL/OPEN SPACE
MAJOR PUBLIC/SEMI - PUBLIC
MAJOR ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE AREAS
CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT
MACDILL AIR FORCE BASE
WATER
RIGHT OF WAY

TRANSITIONAL AREA (DUE TO ANNEXATION)

ROADS AND BOUNDARY LINES
COUNTY BOUNDARY
JURISDICTION BOUNDARY
TAMPA SERVICE AREA
URBAN SERVICE AREA
EXISTING MAJOR ROAD NETWORK
LIMITED ACCESS ROADS
COASTAL HIGH HAZARD AREA BOUNDARY
PLAN AMENDMENT AREA


CHHA: Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council, June 12, 2006. The Coastal High Hazard Area as shown on the Future Land Use map is a general depiction as per HB1359, which is the area below the elevation of the category 1 storm surge line as established by the SLOSH computerized storm surge model. More specific information can be obtained by reviewing the TBRPC’s computerized storm surge model.

URBAN SERVICE AREA BOUNDARIES: Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission. Effective to Present.


ACCURACY: It is intended that the accuracy of the base map comply with U.S. map accuracy standards. However, such accuracy is not guaranteed by the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission.

REPRODUCTION: This sheet may not be reproduced in part or full for sale to anyone without specific approval of the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission.
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3. File No. E2010-47 (AKA PA09-07) - (See Item No. 4) Transmittal public hearing on a text amendment to the Tampa Comprehensive Plan, Future Land Use Element, to incorporate goals, objectives and policies relating to the Greater Seminole Heights Vision Plan into the Tampa Comprehensive Plan.
   • Motion: (Saul/Sena-Miranda) That said public hearing be continued to March 11, 2010 at 5:01 p.m. to permit the verbal and written changes specified by Catherine Coyle, Land Development Coordination, to be incorporated with the associated map amendment (File No. PA09-08) prior to transmittal. Motion carried.
   • Letter from Robert Hunter, Executive Director of the Planning Commission, transmitting the Planning Commission’s recommendations regarding said text amendment.
   • Motion: (Miranda-Saul/Sena) That said letter be received and filed. Motion carried.

4. File No. PA09-08 - (See Item No. 3) Transmittal public hearing on an amendment to the Tampa Comprehensive Plan, Future Land Use Element, Future Land Use Map, in the following general area: for property located in the general vicinity of the Hillsborough River to the north and west, Martin Luther King Boulevard to the south, and North 15th Street, Hillsborough Avenue and North 22nd Street to the east in the Seminole Heights area, from Residential-10, Residential-20, Suburban Mixed Use-6 and Public/Semi Public to Community Commercial-35, Community Mixed Use-35, Residential-20 and Residential-35.
   • Motion: (Saul/Sena-Miranda) That said public hearing be continued to March 11, 2010 at 5:01 p.m. to permit the verbal and written changes specified by Catherine Coyle, Land Development Coordination, to be incorporated prior to transmittal of said map amendment. Motion carried.
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Letter from Robert Hunter, Executive Director of the Planning Commission,
transmitting the Planning Commission’s recommendations regarding said map
amendment.
Motion: (Miranda-Saul/Sena) That said letter be received and filed. Motion carried.
Motion: (Miranda-Saul/Sena) That the letters and e-mails presented by Chair Scott
from neighbors expressing support, concerns or opposition to said petition be
received and filed. Motion carried.
Motion: (Miller-Miranda) That the copy of a Powerpoint presentation submitted by
Catherine Coyle, Land Development Coordination, regarding said matter be
received and filed. Motion carried.
Motion: (Miller-Miranda) That the memorandum submitted by Catherine Coyle,
Land Development Coordination, from Dennis Fernandez, Historic Preservation &
Urban Design Manager, regarding said matter be received and filed. Motion
carried.
Motion: (Miller-Miranda) That the e-mail submitted by Catherine Coyle, Land
Development Coordination, regarding folios to be excluded from said map
amendment be received and filed. Motion carried.
Motion: (Miller-Miranda) That the list of parcels to be omitted from said map
amendment, with associated land use map, submitted by Catherine Coyle, Land
Development Coordination, be received and filed. Motion carried.
Motion: (Miller-Miranda) That the petition submitted by Janet Altman expressing
opposition to said petition be received and filed. Motion carried.
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2. File No. E2010-47 - (A/K/A PA09-06) Transmittal public hearing on a text amendment to the Future Land Use Element to add objectives, policies, associated language, graphics and tables relating to the Transit Oriented Development.
   • Motion: (Miller-Saul/Sena) That said public hearing be closed. Motion carried.
   • Motion: (Miller-Saul/Sena) That Council approves the transmission of said text amendment to the Department of Community Affairs. Motion carried with Caetano and Dingfelder being absent and Mulhern voting no.
   • Letter from Robert Hunter, Executive Director of the Planning Commission, transmitting the Planning Commission’s recommendation regarding said text amendment. Motion: (Miller-Miranda) That said letter be received and filed. Motion carried.

3. File No. E2010-47 - (A/K/A PA09-09) Transmittal public hearing on text amendment to the Future Land Use Element to add an objective and policies designating the Courtney Campbell Causeway as a Scenic Corridor.
   • Motion: (Miller-Miranda) That said public hearing be closed. Motion carried.
   • Motion: (Saul/Sena-Miranda) That Council approves the transmission of said text amendment to the Department of Community Affairs. Motion carried with Caetano and Dingfelder being absent.
   • Letter from Robert Hunter, Executive Director of the Planning Commission, transmitting the Planning Commission’s recommendations regarding said text amendment. Motion: (Miller-Miranda) That said letter be received and filed. Motion carried.

4. File No. PA09-10 Transmittal public hearing on an amendment to the Tampa Comprehensive Plan, Future Land Use Element, Future Land Use Map, bounded by Interstate 275 and Orange Avenue on the north and west, Cass Street on the south and Nebraska Avenue on the east, from
Central Business District (CDB), Regional Mixed Use-100 (RMU-100), Community Mixed Use-35 (CMU-35), and Residential-83 (R-83) to Urban Mixed Use-60 (UMU-60) and Recreation Open Space (R/OS).

- **Motion:** (Miranda-Mulhern) That said public hearing be closed. Motion carried.
- **Motion:** (Miranda-Mulhern) That Council approves the transmission of said map amendment to the Department of Community Affairs. Motion carried with Caetano and Dingfelder being absent.
- **Letter** from Robert Hunter, Executive Director of the Planning Commission, transmitting the Planning Commission’s recommendations regarding said text amendment. **Motion:** (Miller-Miranda) That said letter be received and filed. Motion carried.

5. **File No. PA09-11 Transmittal public hearing** on amendment to the Tampa Comprehensive Plan, Future Land Use Element, Future Land Use Map, for the property located in the general vicinity south of Interbay Boulevard, west of South MacDill Avenue, east of Himes Avenue and north of West Napoleon Avenue from Low Density Suburban Neighborhood (Residential-6) and Low Medium Density Residential (Residential-20) to Recreation and Open Space (R-OS).

- **Motion:** (Miranda-Mulhern) That said public hearing be closed. Motion carried.
- **Motion:** (Miranda-Mulhern) That Council approves the transmission of said map amendment to the Department of Community Affairs. Motion carried with Caetano and Dingfelder being absent.
- **Letter** from Robert Hunter, Executive Director of the Planning Commission, transmitting the Planning Commission’s recommendations regarding said text amendment. **Motion:** (Miller-Miranda) That said letter be received and filed. Motion carried.


- **Motion:** (Miranda-Saul/Sena) That said public hearing be closed. Motion carried.
- **Motion:** (Miranda-Mulhern) That Council approves the transmission of said text amendment to the Department of Community Affairs. Motion carried with Caetano and Dingfelder being absent.

7. **File No. PA09-08 Continued transmittal public hearing** from February 25, 2010 on an amendment to the Tampa Comprehensive Plan, Future Land Use Element, Future Land Use Map, in the following general area: for property located in the general vicinity of the Hillsborough River to the north and west, Martin Luther King Boulevard to the south, and North 15th Street, Hillsborough Avenue and North 22nd Street to the east in the Seminole Heights area, from Residential-10, Residential-20, Suburban Mixed Use-6 and Public/Semi Public to Community Commercial-35, Community Mixed Use-35, Residential-20 and Residential-35.

- **Motion:** (Miranda-Saul/Sena) That said public hearing be closed. Motion carried.
- **Motion:** (Miranda-Mulhern) That Council approves the transmission of said map amendment to the Department of Community Affairs. Motion carried with Caetano and Dingfelder being absent.