Rezoning Application:	PD 22-0684	Hillsborough
Zoning Hearing Master Date:	September 19, 2022	Hillsborough County Florida
BOCC Land Use Meeting Date:	November 3, 2022	Development Services Department

1.0 APPLICATION SUMMARY

Applicant:	Raymond G. Savoie, as Trustee of the Raymond G. Savoie Living Trust
FLU Category:	OC-20
Service Area:	Urban
Site Acreage:	0.59+/-
Community Plan Area:	Brandon
Overlay:	SR 60 Overlay



Introduction Summary:

The applicant seeks to rezone a parcel zoned Commercial General (CG) to Planned Development (PD) to allow an existing auto repair shop to be developed with specific development standards. The project is located on the NE corner of SR 60 and Ridgewood Ave. in Brandon. The site is subject to the Brandon SR60 Overlay requirements of the suburban sector.

Zoning:	Existing	Proposed	
District(s) CG		Planned Development	
Typical General Use(s)	General Commercial, Office and Personal Services	General Commercial, Office and Personal Services (Auto Repair Shop)	
Acreage	0.59	0.59	
Density/Intensity	0.27 FAR	0.75 FAR	
Mathematical Maximum*	6,900 sq. ft.	19,200 sq. ft.	

* number represents a pre-development approximation

Development Standards:	Existing	Proposed			
District(s)	CG	PD			
Lot Size / Lot Width	10,000 sf / 75'	10,000 sq ft / 75'			
	30' Front	65' Front (South) 9' (West)			
Setbacks/Buffering and Screening	6' Rear	0' Rear			
	6' Sides	0' Sides			
Height	50'	25'			
Additional Information:					
PD Variation(s)	LDC Part 6.06.00	LDC Part 6.06.00 (Landscaping/Buffering)			
	Vehicular Use Are	Vehicular Use Areas			
Waiver(s) to the Land Development C	To Section 3.14.0	6:			
	Reduce the requi	Reduce the required 30-foot buffer along SR60.			

Planning Commission Recommendation:	Development Services Recommendation:
Consistent	Approvable, subject to proposed conditions

2.0 LAND USE MAP SET AND SUMMARY DATA

2.1 Vicinity Map



Context of Surrounding Area:

The project is located at the NE corner of SR60 and Ridgewood Ave. in Brandon. Area mostly consists of non-residential uses including retail, grocery stores, restaurants, gas stations, a private school and church.

2.0 LAND USE MAP SET AND SUMMARY DATA

2.2 Future Land Use Map



Subject Site Future Land Use Category:	OC-20
Maximum Density/F.A.R.:	General 0.75 FAR up to a maximum of 600,000 square feet, however, the commercial component cannot exceed 350,000 square feet, subject to applicable land development regulations. Additionally, all development which exceeds .35 FAR must be for office or residential support uses, not retail. 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 Fixed-Guideway Transit (See Objectives 54-57 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. The Future Transit Envelope can be found on the Future Transit Envelope Map that is adopted as part of the Future Land Use Map Serie
Typical Uses:	Community commercial type uses, office uses, mixed use developments, and compatible residential uses. Agricultural uses may be permitted pursuant to policies in the agricultural objective areas of the Future Land Use Element.

2.0 LAND USE MAP SET AND SUMMARY DATA

2.3 Immediate Area Map



Adjacent Zonings and Uses					
Location:	Zoning:	Maximum Density/F.A.R. Permitted by Zoning District:	Allowable Use:	Existing Use:	
North	CG,	0.27 FAR	Commercial/Office	Parking Lot	
South	RSC-6	6 Du/ac	Single Family Detached, residential support	School/Church	
East	CG	0.27 FAR	Commercial/Office	Restaurant	
West	CG, PD 78-0122	0.25 FAR	Commercial/Office/Store	Grocery Store	

2.0 LAND USE MAP SET AND SUMMARY DATA

2.4 Proposed Site Plan (partial provided below for size and orientation purposes. See Section 8.0 for full site plan)



ZHM HEARING DATE:

PD 22-0684 September 19, 2022

3.0 TRANSPORTATION SUMMARY (FULL TRANSPORTATION REPORT IN SECTION 9 OF STAFF REPORT)

Adjoining Roadways (check if applicable)					
Road Name	Classification	Current Conditions	Select Future Improvements		
Brandon Blvd	FDOT Principal Arterial - Urban	8 Lanes □ Substandard Road □Sufficient ROW Width	 Corridor Preservation Plan Site Access Improvements Substandard Road Improvements Other 		
Ridgewood Ave	County Local - Urban	2 Lanes ⊠ Substandard Road □ Sufficient ROW Width	 Corridor Preservation Plan Site Access Improvements Substandard Road Improvements Other 		

Project Trip Generation D Not applicable for this request					
	Average Annual Daily Trips A.M. Peak Hour Trips P.M. Peak Hour Trips				
Existing	753	26	71		
Proposed	170	12	17		
Difference (+/-)	-583	-14	-54		

*Trips reported are based on net new external trips unless otherwise noted.

Project Boundary	Primary Access	Additional Connectivity/Access	Cross Access	Finding
North		None	None	Meets LDC
South	Х	None	None	Meets LDC
Fast		Nono	Vehicular &	MeetsLDC
East		None	Pedestrian	Meets LDC
Most		Vehicular &	Dedestrier Mestel DC	
West		Pedestrian	Pedestrian	MeetsLDC
Notes:	÷	-	•	•

Design Exception/Administrative Variance 🛛 Not applicable for this request				
Road Name/Nature of Request Type Finding				
Choose an item. Choose an item.				
Choose an item. Choose an item.				
Notes:				

4.0 Additional Site Information & Agency Comments Summary				
TransportationObjectionsConditionsAdditionalRequestedInformation/Comments				
 Design Exception/Adm. Variance Requested Off-Site Improvements Provided 	□ Yes □N/A ⊠ No	⊠ Yes □ No	See Staff Report.	

4.0 ADDITIONAL SITE INFORMATION & AGENCY COMMENTS SUMMARY

INFORMATION/REVIEWING AGENCY				
Environmental:	Comments Received	Objections	Conditions Requested	Additional Information/Comments
Environmental Protection Commission	⊠ Yes □ No	□ Yes ⊠ No	□ Yes ⊠ No	
Natural Resources	□ Yes ⊠ No	□ Yes □ No	□ Yes □ No	
Conservation & Environ. Lands Mgmt.	□ Yes ⊠ No	□ Yes □ No	□ Yes □ No	
Check if Applicable: Vetlands/Other Surface Waters Use of Environmentally Sensitive Land Credit Wellhead Protection Area Surface Water Resource Protection Area	 Potable Water Wellfield Protection Area Significant Wildlife Habitat Coastal High Hazard Area Urban/Suburban/Rural Scenic Corridor Adjacent to ELAPP property Other 			
Public Facilities:	Comments Received	Objections	Conditions Requested	Additional Information/Comments
Transportation Design Exc./Adm. Variance Requested Off-site Improvements Provided	⊠ Yes □ No	□ Yes ⊠ No	⊠ Yes □ No	
Service Area/ Water & Wastewater ⊠ Urban □ City of Tampa □ Rural □ City of Temple Terrace	⊠ Yes □ No	□ Yes ⊠ No	□ Yes ⊠ No	
Hillsborough County School Board Adequate □ K-5 □ 6-8 □ 9-12 ⊠ N/A Inadequate □ K-5 ⊠ 6-8 ⊠ 9-12 ⊠ N/A	□ Yes ⊠ No	□ Yes □ No	□ Yes □ No	
Impact/Mobility Fees Auto-Repair Facility (Per 1,000 s.f.) Mobility: \$10,535 Fire: \$313 Project Summary/Description: Urban Mobility, Central Fire - After the fact expansion of	f Auto Repair facility tha	at was unpermitted		
Comprehensive Plan:	Comments Received	Findings	Conditions Requested	Additional Information/Comments
Planning Commission □ Meets Locational Criteria ⊠ N/A □ Locational Criteria Waiver Requested □ Minimum Density Met ⊠ N/A □ Density Bonus Requested	⊠ Yes □ No	□ Inconsistent ⊠ Consistent	□ Yes ⊠ No	

5.0 IMPLEMENTATION RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Compatibility

The property's existing use is a motor vehicle repair, major, on the southern portion of the site, along Brandon Blvd (SR 60), and an office on the northern portion of the parcel. The surrounding area consists of commercial and office uses. A private school and church are located to the south, across the road.

The site has experienced several building expansions since its original configuration in 1961. In the 60's site was developed as a gas station, with a gas pump canopy in its frontage. The building in the back, utilized today as a hair salon, was established in the mid-1920, according to HC Property Appraiser records. The gas station had two driveway connections on SR60 and one to Ridgewood Dr. The building in the back also maintained access from Ridgewood Dr. Throughout the years, the gas station site was improved. Records show that the gas pumps canopy has been in existence in its current location/configuration since at least in 1988. By the late 1990's, impervious areas were added on both sides of the gas station building. During the widening of SR60 in the 1990s, FDOT took the corner of the Property along SR60 and Ridgewood Ave. The westernmost access driveway along SR60 was eliminated.

According to the project narrative submitted as part of this RZ application from Commercial General (CG) to Planned Development (PD), The Applicant constructed an expansion of the existing 1960s-era former gas station building without permits. The Property is not currently under code enforcement action. However, the Applicant acknowledges the need to rectify the situation and obtain zoning approval and after-the fact building permits to bring the Property into compliance. The auto repair shop, Huff Muffler, has been in operation at this location since 2012. The business initially operated with only two service bays in the original 1960s gas station building. Since 2012, the Applicant expanded the business by adding two pre-fabricated metal structures: one on the eastern side of the original building ("Eastern Expansion") and one on the western side of the original building ("Western Expansion"). A gas station canopy, which was constructed in the 1980s, remains on the Property today.

The site is within the SR60 Overlay District, Suburban Sector. This sector does not require building design standards or parking placement requirements. Instead, it requires the provision of a 30-foot wide, landscaped buffer along SR60, vehicular use area buffering in accordance with the LDC, building facades architecturally finished and specific monument sign design standards. Some of these requirements are triggered when a site undergoes building expansions or renovations, and the cost of such works exceed certain percentage thresholds compared to the value of existing buildings on site (LDC Sec. 3.14.06). As noted, since 2012, the building on site has been expanded, with additional repair bays added east and west of the original structure, without building permits. While staff is unable to determine the true cost of the works compared with the value of the building(s) existing prior to the improvements, given the extent and scale to which the building has been expanded, the materials and workmanship of the new repair bays and area covered by the additions, the site is being subject to the requirements of the SR Overlay District mentioned above, in addition to stormwater facilities located behind the buildings. The applicant, consequently, as part of this PD rezoning, is requesting a wavier to reduce the buffer area along SR60, and PD variations to eliminate vehicular use area buffers. Other standards of the SR60 Overlay District will be met.

Through this PD rezoning, the applicant proposes significant changes, in addition to maintaining the current building expansions, to bring the Property closer to compliance with the SR 60 Overlay standards. The proposed changes to the Property as it currently exists today includes:

- Removal of the 1980s gas canopy;
- Removal of non-conforming pole sign and installation of new conforming monument sign;
- Addition of architectural finishing on all structures;

ZHM HEARING DATE:September 19, 2022BOCC LUM MEETING DATE:November 3, 2022

Case Reviewer: Israel Monsanto

- Removal of the two access points along Ridgewood Ave, thereby limiting access to just one point along Ridgewood, with the access aligning with the shopping center to the west, thereby increasing pedestrian and traffic safety;
- Addition of vehicular and pedestrian stub outs to the adjacent parcel;
- Addition of a 10' landscaped buffer along SR 60 frontage (with a waiver request);
- Addition of an 8' landscaped buffer along Ridgewood Ave (where southern access point is currently located);
- Removal of the hair salon building to allow for the relocation of the stormwater management facility;
- Addition of ADA accessible ramp and pedestrian path from a public sidewalk to both the main entrance and rear entrance;
- Removal of crushed asphalt in favor of pavement;
- Addition of parking islands.

Since the landscaped buffer area along SR60 will be only 10 feet wide, the PD petition includes a waiver request from LDC Sec. 3.14.06.2.a: For projects east of Kingsway Road, a buffer area with a minimum width of 30 feet shall be provided along the entire length of the parcel's frontage on State Road 60.¹

The waiver requests a variation of 20 feet and associated plantings to reduce the landscaped buffer from 30 feet to 10 feet. In summary, the applicant has provided the following justification:

- Due to the widening of SR60 in the 1990s, FDOT took the corner of the Property along SR60 and Ridgewood Ave. Accordingly, it is now nearly impossible for the site to meet the required 30' landscaped buffer due to the configuration of the front Property line while maintaining adequate traffic circulation for the auto-oriented use.
- Imposition of the 30-foot landscaped buffer would result in an almost complete elimination of the existing front parking lot. The landscaped buffer would effectively shutter the small business as it would be unable to meet the required parking demands of the business or the necessary traffic circulation among the service bays.
- Nearby properties do not comply with this requirement or have been granted variances to reduce the required 30 foot buffer.
- As the Property currently exists, there is no buffer on the Property along SR 60. The Applicant is proposing to add a 10 foot landscaped buffer along SR 60 to meet the intent of the Code.
- Plantings are proposed in proportion to the buffer being provided, i.e. 1/3 of the plantings required in the 30 foot buffer will be provided for within the new 10 foot buffer. As a result, the proposed 10 foot buffer with plantings is a significant improvement from the existing conditions.

Staff has evaluated the applicant's justifications to reduce the buffer from 30 feet to 10 feet reasonable. The site has been in operation since the 1960 with a canopy area and parking spaces serving the site in front of the building. Compared to the current site conditions, no buffer is provided between the parking areas and canopy, and the front property line. Additionally, the applicant has modified the request compared to the original site plan showing 8 feet of front buffer area and has added 2 more feet. The applicant has also made site modifications to move parking spaces to the back of the building in order to accommodate more buffer area along the frontage. Moreover, the applicant proposes to finish the facades of the building with Hardie board-style siding along the top and stone or brick along the bottom, replace the signage to meet SR60 overlay conformance and remove the gas canopy from the site. These site improvement actions in combination with the 10-foot landscaped buffer would enhance the appearance of the site and bring it closer to the intent of the Suburban Sector of the SR 60 overlay.

In addition to the waiver request to the SR60 overlay requirement, the applicant has included the following two PD Variation requests:

¹ The applicant submitted this waiver request as PD Variation #1; however, this is a request to waive a requirement from the LDC that is not found in LDC Parts 6.05.00-Parking and Loading, 6.06.06-Buffer and Screening or 6.07.00-Fences and Walls and is not a PD Variation per LDC Sec. 5.03.06.C.6. Therefore, it is being reviewed as a waiver request.

APPLICATION NUMBER:	PD 22-0684
ZHM HEARING DATE:	September 19, 2022
BOCC LUM MEETING DATE:	November 3, 2022

1. Section 6.06.04.E. requires a 6-foot landscaped buffer between the vehicle use areas and any property boundary not fronted by a right-of-way. However, a landscaped buffer is not required if a 6-foot buffer and required screening are provided on the adjacent property along said boundary. This PD Variation (#2) pertains to the eastern Property line. A 6-foot buffer appears to be provided on the adjacent property to the east, 704 E Brandon Blvd. A survey accepted by the County in connection with NCG-17454 was provided by the applicant. The applicant requests to reduce the 6-foot buffer along the eastern parcel line of the subject property to 1 foot.

The applicant provides the following justifications:

- The variation is necessary to accommodate the redevelopment and revitalization of the existing 1960's gas station structure while allowing for reasonable business expansion. The redevelopment utilizing the existing structure is creative and innovative. Strict adherence to the 6 foot buffer requirement cannot be accommodated on this Property.
- The Property was originally developed with asphalt or concrete up to the eastern property line, along the southern portion of the Property. No buffer ever being utilized along the east property line. A 1993 FDOT survey shows the curb of the parking area still being utilized today.
- Despite this Property's long history, there has never been a 6 foot buffer to the east along vehicle use areas. As mitigating measures, the Applicant is proposing to architecturally finish all structures on the Property, including the original 1960's structure, in compliance with the SR 60 Overlay standards. The Applicant is also proposing to remove the gas canopy and the nonconforming pole sign in favor of a compliant monument sign, thereby further beautifying the area and meeting the intent of the Code. Further, the Applicant is proposing to close the two existing southernmost access points along Ridgewood and replacing such access points with more landscaped green space.

2. Similar to the above request, the other PD Variation (#3) pertains to the northern Property line. A 6-foot buffer appears to be provided on the adjacent property to the north, 704 E Brandon Blvd. A survey accepted by the County in connection with NCG-17454. The applicant requests to reduce the 6-foot buffer along the northern parcel line of the subject property to 3 feet.

The applicant provides the following justifications:

- It is necessary to accommodate the redevelopment and revitalization of the existing 1960's gas station structure while allowing for reasonable business expansion. The redevelopment utilizing the existing structure is creative and innovative. Strict adherence to the 6-foot buffer requirement cannot be accommodated on this Property.
- Currently, the Property has no buffer along the northern property line. The Applicant is proposing to remove the structure containing the hair salon and northern drive aisle to increase the current buffer from 0 feet to 3 feet.
- Further, the 3-foot limitation is only along a very small portion of the northern Property line. Also along the northern Property line is the stormwater management facility, a 7-foot parking island, and a vehicular stub out for interconnectivity with the parcel to the north.
- As mitigating measures, the Applicant is proposing to remove the structure containing the hair salon and northern drive aisle to increase the current buffer from 0 feet to 3 feet, architecturally finish all structures on the Property, including the original 1960's structure, in compliance with the SR 60 Overlay standards.
- The Applicant is also proposing to remove the gas canopy and the non-conforming pole sign in favor of a compliant monument sign, thereby further beautifying the area and meeting the intent of the Code. Further, the Applicant is proposing to close the two existing southernmost access points along Ridgewood and replacing such access points with more landscaped green space.

The applicant has submitted a letter of support for the requested PD rezoning from the eastern property owner, who is the most impacted neighbor.

APPLICATION NUMBER:	PD 22-0684	
ZHM HEARING DATE: BOCC LUM MEETING DATE:	September 19, 2022 November 3, 2022	Case Reviewer: Israel I

Staff has reviewed the buffer variation justifications submitted by the applicant per LDC Section 5.03.06.C.6 and finds they meet the criteria for approval. Staff notes that while the adjacent property to the north and east appears to be furnishing a 6-foot landscaped buffer, the required landscaping is not sufficient, and thus is not in full compliance with LDC 6.06.04.E. The PD Variation request by the applicant is therefore consistent with LDC Sec. 5.03.06.C.6. The justifications provided by the applicant are reasonable. The proposed site design will increase green areas to accommodate more landscaping and open space is being added along the north, where a building exists today. Additionally, the adjacent parcel north and east also consists of commercial uses. The affected property owner of the parcel surrounding the subject site to the north and east does not object to the PD rezonoing. The hearing master's recommendation for this application is required to include a finding on whether the requested variations meet the criteria for approval.

Monsanto



Overall existing site conditions

APPLICATION NUMBER:	PD 22-0684		
ZHM HEARING DATE:	September 19, 2022		
BOCC LUM MEETING DATE:	November 3, 2022		

Compared to the current site conditions and design, the proposed improvements to the use would provide for an overall site that is significantly closer to the intent of the SR60 (Brandon Blvd) Overlay District. The intent of the SR overlay is *to improve the appearance of new and existing development along State Road 60 between Interstate 75 and Dover Road by enhancing landscaping, building and sign requirements*. The site does not have a buffer along SR60 today; however, the proposed project will provide at least 10 feet of buffer along its frontage. Other comparable nearby commercial sites do not provide the required 30-foot buffer or 10 feet of green space in their frontages. The 10-foot buffer area will include landscaping and requires at least 1/3 of the number of plantings per the LDC Sec. 3.14.06.2.a. The applicant is also committed to improve the existing building with architecturally finished façades with Hardie board-style siding and stone or brick (initially, the applicant requested this requirement to be waived). Stormwater ponds will be placed behind the buildings, in accordance with the SR60 overlay regulations. Additionally, the impervious surface of the parcel is being reduced, providing for more green space. Lastly, site signage will be brought to compliance with SR60 overlay design standards.

Planning Commission has found the request consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The subject site meets the intent of the Urban Center Character District of the Brandon Community Plan. The Urban Center Character District is intended for the most intense land uses in the area and an auto repair use is not out of character for the surrounding area. Overall, the proposed Planned Development would allow for development that is consistent with the Goals, Objectives and Policies of the Future of Hillsborough Comprehensive Plan for Unincorporated Hillsborough County and is compatible with the existing and planned development pattern found in the surrounding area.

No Design Exceptions or Administrative Variances were requested for Transportation staff review. Staff does not object the request and has provided transportation conditions for site access and cross access.

No objections were received by any reviewing agency. The proposed project will be subject Site Development regulations and after the fact building permits will be required if the PD request is approved under the proposed conditions.

5.2 Recommendation

Based on the above considerations, staff recommends approval with conditions.

6.0 PROPOSED CONDITIONS

Prior to PD Site Plan Certification, the applicant shall revise the PD General Site Plan:

- 1. Prior to PD Site Plan Certification, the applicant shall revise the PD Site Plan to: -Revise "Vehicle Stub out" Label on the north side of the site to read "Cross Access"
- 2. Add a note in the data table: "the building is subject to architectural finishes. Refer to conditions of approvals".

Approval - Approval of the request, subject to the conditions listed below, is based on the general site plan submitted August 30, 2022.

- 1. The project shall be limited to a Motor Vehicle Repair, Major, with up to 5,400 sq. ft. of building size.
- 2. Development standards shall be as indicated in the General Site Development Plan and as follows:

Maximum building height	25 feet
Minimum front yard setback	30 feet along SR60; 9 feet along Ridgewood Ave.
Maximum impervious area	75%

- 2.1 Buildings shall be Architecturally finished on all sides. The following materials shall be provided: Hardie board-style siding with stone or brick along the base of the buildings. Paint shall not be considered an architectural finish.
- 2.2 Upon re-development of the site, the gas pump canopy along the southern frontage, and the Personal Services building on the northern portion of the parcel, shall be removed, as indicated in the General Site Plan.
- 2.3 Stormwater retention facilities shall be located at the rear of all principal buildings on the development parcel, as shown in the General Site Plan.
- 3. A minimum of 10 feet of landscaped buffer shall be maintained along SR60, as indicated in the General Site Plan. Plantings within this buffer shall be in accordance with LDC Sec. 3.14.06.2.a. The developer shall be permitted to provide at least 1/3 of the required plantings within the buffer area along SR60, subject to Natural Resources review and approval. All other Vehicular Use Area buffers shall be as shown on the General Site Plan.
- 4. Site signage shall be in accordance with the Article VII and the SR60 Overlay requirements found in LDC Part 3.14.00.
- 5. Approval of this re-zoning petition by Hillsborough County does not constitute a guarantee that the project will receive approvals/permits necessary for site development as proposed will be issued, nor does it imply that other required permits needed for site development or building construction are being waived or otherwise approved. The project will be required to comply with the Site Development Plan Review approval process in addition to obtain all necessary building permits for on-site structures.
- 6. Notwithstanding anything herein these conditions or on the PD site plan to the contrary, bicycle and pedestrian access may be permitted anywhere along the project boundaries.

- 7. The project shall be served by, and limited to, one (1) access connection to Brandon Blvd. and one (1) access connection to Ridgewood Ave. as shown on the PD site plan. All other existing access connections shall be closed and the applicant shall install curbing, sod and/or extend sidewalks, as appropriate.
- 8. The developer shall construct a vehicular and pedestrian cross-access stub out along as generally shown on the PD site plan.
- 9. If the notes and/or graphic on the site plan are in conflict with specific zoning conditions and/or the Land Development Code (LDC) regulations, the more restrictive regulation shall apply, unless specifically conditioned otherwise. References to development standards of the LDC in the above stated conditions shall be interpreted as the regulations in effect at the time of preliminary site plan/plat approval.
- 10. The Development of the project shall proceed in strict accordance with the terms and conditions contained in the Development Order, the General Site Plan, the land use conditions contained herein, and all applicable rules, regulations, and ordinances of Hillsborough County.

Zoning Administrator Sign Off:	J. Brian Grady Mon Sep 12 2022 11:37:26
SITE, SUBDIVISION AND BUILDING CONSTRUCT & BUILDING REVIEW AND APPROVAL.	TION IN ACCORDANCE WITH HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Approval of this re-zoning petition by Hillsborough County does not constitute a guarantee that the project will receive approvals/permits necessary for site development as proposed will be issued, nor does it imply that other required permits needed for site development or building construction are being waived or otherwise approved. The project will be required to comply with the Site Development Plan Review approval process in addition to obtain all necessary building permits for on-site structures.

7.0 ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND/OR GRAPHICS

Current Site Aerial – HC Property Appraiser



ZHM HEARING DATE: BOCC LUM MEETING DATE: September 19, 2022 November 3, 2022

8.0 PROPOSED SITE PLAN (FULL)



APPLICATION NUMBER:	PD 22-0684
ZHM HEARING DATE:	September 19, 2022
BOCC LUM MEETING DATE:	November 3, 2022

9.0 FULL TRANSPORTATION REPORT (see following pages)

AGENCY REVIEW COMMENT SHEET

TO: Zoning Technician, Development Services Department

REVIEWER: Alex Steady, AICP, Senior Planner

PLANNING AREA/SECTOR: Brandon/ Central

DATE: 9/09/2022 AGENCY/DEPT: Transportation PETITION NO: RZ 22-0684

	This agency has no comments.
	This agency has no objection.
Х	This agency has no objection, subject to the listed or attached conditions.
	This agency objects for the reasons set forth below.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

- 1. Notwithstanding anything herein these conditions or on the PD site plan to the contrary, bicycle and pedestrian access may be permitted anywhere along the project boundaries.
- 2. The project shall be served by, and limited to, one (1) access connection to Brandon Blvd. and one (1) access connection to Ridgewood Ave. as shown on the PD site plan. All other existing access connections shall be closed and the applicant shall install curbing, sod and/or extend sidewalks, as appropriate.
- 3. The developer shall construct a vehicular and pedestrian cross-access stub out along as generally shown on the PD site plan.

Other Conditions

- Prior to PD Site Plan Certification, the applicant shall revise the PD Site Plan to:
 - Revise "Vehicle Stub out" Label on the north side of the site to read "Cross Access"

PROJECT SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS

The applicant is requesting to rezone one parcel, totaling ± -0.59 ac., from Commercial General (CG) to Planned Development (PD). The proposed PD is seeking entitlements for a 5,384 sf of auto repair facility. The applicant is proposing to demolish the smaller structure used as a hair salon on the northern side of the property as well as the existing gas canopy on site. The applicant is also proposing a variety of access changes, which are further described in the "Site Access" section of this report hereinbelow.

As required by the Development Review Procedures Manual (DRPM), the applicant submitted a trip generation for the proposed project. The applicants submitted trip generation did not exceed the 50 peak hour trips that would require detailed analysis.

Staff has prepared a comparison of the trips potentially generated under the existing and proposed zoning designations, utilizing a generalized worst-case scenario. The information below is based on data from the Institute of Transportation Engineer's <u>Trip Generation Manual</u>, 11th Edition.

Approved Uses:				
	24 Hour Two	Total Peak		
Zoning, Land Use/Size	24 Hour Two- Way Volume	Hour Trips		
	way volume	AM	PM	
CG, 6,900 sf Pharmacy/Drugstore with Drive -				
Through Window	753	26	71	
(ITE Code 881)				

Proposed Uses:

. **1 T** T . . .

Zoning, Land Use/Size	24 Hour Two- Way Volume	Total Peak Hour Trips	
	way volume	AM	PM
PD, 5,384 sf Automobile Care Center (ITE Code 942)	170	12	17

Trip Generation Difference:

Zoning, Land Use/Size	24 Hour Two- Way Volume	Total Peak Hour Trips	
		AM	PM
Difference	-583	-14	-54

TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE SERVING THE SITE

The site has frontage on Brandon Blvd and Ridgewood Ave. Brandon Blvd is an 8-lane divided FDOT maintained principal Arterial Roadway characterized by +/- 12-foot-wide travel lanes. The roadway lies within a +/- 188-foot-wide right-of-way in the vicinity of the proposed project. There are bicycle facilities, sidewalks and curb and gutter on both sides of the roadway in the vicinity of the project.

Ridgewood Ave. is a 2-lane, undivided, publicly maintained, substandard, local roadway characterized by +/- 12-foot-wide travel lanes. There are no bicycle facilities present along Ridgewood Ave in the vicinity of the proposed project. There are sidewalks and curb on the east side of Ridgewood Ave in the vicinity of the project.

SITE ACCESS AND CONNECTIVITY

<u>Generally</u>

The applicant is proposing two access connections to serve the proposed project. Both proposed access points are existing. One existing full access on to Brandon Blvd is proposed. The second proposed access is on the northwest side of the project to Ridgewood Ave. The Applicant is proposing to remove the existing southernmost access on to Ridgewood Avenue due to LDC corner spacing requirements.

Cross Access

The PD site plan is showing vehicular and pedestrian cross access stub out to the parcel to the east, as required pursuant to Sec. 6.04.03.Q. of the LDC.

ROADWAY LEVEL OF SERVICE

Level of Service (LOS) information for adjacent roadway section(s) is reported below.

Roadway	From	То	LOS Standard	Peak Hour Directional LOS
SR 60/ BRANDON BLVD	KINGSWAY RD	VALRICO RD	D	С

Source: Hillsborough County 2020 Level of Service Report.

3.0 TRANSPORTATION SUMMARY (FULL TRANSPORTATION REPORT IN SECTION 9 OF STAFF REPORT)

Adjoining Roadways (check if applicable)			
Road Name	Classification	Current Conditions	Select Future Improvements
Brandon Blvd	FDOT Principal Arterial - Urban	8 Lanes □Substandard Road □Sufficient ROW Width	 Corridor Preservation Plan Site Access Improvements Substandard Road Improvements Other
Ridgewood Ave	County Local - Urban	2 Lanes ⊠ Substandard Road □ Sufficient ROW Width	 Corridor Preservation Plan Site Access Improvements Substandard Road Improvements Other

Project Trip Generation	■ □Not applicable for this request		
	Average Annual Daily Trips	A.M. Peak Hour Trips	P.M. Peak Hour Trips
Existing	753	26	71
Proposed	170	12	17
Difference (+/-)	-583	-14	-54

*Trips reported are based on net new external trips unless otherwise noted.

Connectivity and Cross Access Not applicable for this request				
Project Boundary	Primary Access	Additional Connectivity/Access	Cross Access	Finding
North		None	None	Meets LDC
South	Х	None	None	Meets LDC
East		None	Vehicular & Pedestrian	Meets LDC
West		Vehicular & Pedestrian	Pedestrian	Meets LDC
Notes:	•	·	•	•

Design Exception/Administrative Variance ⊠Not applicable for this request			
Road Name/Nature of Request Type Finding			
	Choose an item.	Choose an item.	
	Choose an item.	Choose an item.	
Notes:	·		

4.0 Additional Site Information & Agency Comments Summary			
Transportation Objection		Conditions Requested	Additional Information/Comments
 Design Exception/Adm. Variance Requested Off-Site Improvements Provided 	□ Yes □N/A ⊠ No	⊠ Yes □ No	See Staff Report.

COUNTY OF HILLSBOROUGH LAND USE HEARING OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

Application number:	RZ-PD 22-0684
Hearing date:	September 19, 2022
Applicant:	Raymond G. Savoie
Request:	Rezone to Planned Development
Location:	702 E. Brandon Boulevard, Brandon
Parcel size:	0.59 acres +/-
Existing zoning:	CG
Future land use designation:	OC-20
Service area:	Urban Services Area
Community planning area:	Brandon Community Plan

A. APPLICATION REVIEW

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES STAFF REPORT APPLICATION REVIEW SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION

Rezoning Application:	PD 22-0684	Hillsborough
Zoning Hearing Master Date:	September 19, 2022	Hillsborough County Florida
BOCC Land Use Meeting Date:	November 3, 2022	Development Services Department

1.0 APPLICATION SUMMARY

Applicant:	Raymond G. Savoie, as Trustee of the Raymond G. Savoie Living Trust
FLU Category:	OC-20
Service Area:	Urban
Site Acreage:	0.59+/-
Community Plan Area:	Brandon
Overlay:	SR 60 Overlay



Introduction Summary:

The applicant seeks to rezone a parcel zoned Commercial General (CG) to Planned Development (PD) to allow an existing auto repair shop to be developed with specific development standards. The project is located on the NE corner of SR 60 and Ridgewood Ave. in Brandon. The site is subject to the Brandon SR60 Overlay requirements of the suburban sector.

Zoning:	Existing	Proposed
District(s)	CG	Planned Development
Typical General Use(s)	General Commercial, Office and Personal Services	General Commercial, Office and Personal Services (Auto Repair Shop)
Acreage	0.59	0.59
Density/Intensity	0.27 FAR	0.75 FAR
Mathematical Maximum*	6,900 sq. ft.	19,200 sq. ft.

 ${}^* {\rm number}\ {\rm represents}\ {\rm a}\ {\rm pre-development}\ {\rm approximation}$

Development Standards:	Existing	Proposed		
District(s)	CG	PD		
Lot Size / Lot Width	10,000 sf / 75'	10,000 sq ft / 75'		
	30' Front	65' Front (South) 9' (West)		
Setbacks/Buffering and Screening	6' Rear	0' Rear		
	6' Sides	0' Sides		
Height	50'	25′		
Additional Information:				
PD Variation(s)	LDC Part 6.06.00	LDC Part 6.06.00 (Landscaping/Buffering)		
	Vehicular Use Are	Vehicular Use Areas		
Waiver(s) to the Land Development Co	To Section 3.14.0	To Section 3.14.06:		
	Reduce the requi	Reduce the required 30-foot buffer along SR60.		

Planning Commission Recommendation:	Development Services Recommendation:
Consistent	Approvable, subject to proposed conditions

2.0 LAND USE MAP SET AND SUMMARY DATA

2.1 Vicinity Map



Context of Surrounding Area:

The project is located at the NE corner of SR60 and Ridgewood Ave. in Brandon. Area mostly consists of non-residential uses including retail, grocery stores, restaurants, gas stations, a private school and church.

2.0 LAND USE MAP SET AND SUMMARY DATA

2.2 Future Land Use Map



Subject Site Future Land Use Category:	OC-20
Maximum Density/F.A.R.:	General 0.75 FAR up to a maximum of 600,000 square feet, however, the commercial component cannot exceed 350,000 square feet, subject to applicable land development regulations. Additionally, all development which exceeds .35 FAR must be for office or residential support uses, not retail. 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 Fixed-Guideway Transit (See Objectives 54-57 and related policies). The location and type of fixed-guide way transit stations can be found on the MPO Long Range Transportation 2035 Cost Affordable Transit System Map. The Future Transit Envelope can be found on the Future Transit Envelope Map that is adopted as part of the Future Land Use Map Serie
Typical Uses:	Community commercial type uses, office uses, mixed use developments, and compatible residential uses. Agricultural uses may be permitted pursuant to policies in the agricultural objective areas of the Future Land Use Element.

2.0 LAND USE MAP SET AND SUMMARY DATA

2.3 Immediate Area Map



	Adjacent Zonings and Uses				
Location:	Zoning:	Maximum Density/F.A.R. Permitted by Zoning District:	Allowable Use:	Existing Use:	
North	CG,	0.27 FAR	Commercial/Office	Parking Lot	
South	RSC-6	6 Du/ac	Single Family Detached, residential support	School/Church	
East	CG	0.27 FAR	Commercial/Office	Restaurant	
West	CG, PD 78-0122	0.25 FAR	Commercial/Office/Store	Grocery Store	

2.0 LAND USE MAP SET AND SUMMARY DATA

2.4 Proposed Site Plan (partial provided below for size and orientation purposes. See Section 8.0 for full site plan)



ZHM HEARING DATE:

PD 22-0684 September 19, 2022

3.0 TRANSPORTATION SUMMARY (FULL TRANSPORTATION REPORT IN SECTION 9 OF STAFF REPORT)

Adjoining Roadways (check if applicable)					
Road Name	Classification	Current Conditions	Select Future Improvements		
Brandon Blvd	FDOT Principal Arterial - Urban	8 Lanes □ Substandard Road □Sufficient ROW Width	 Corridor Preservation Plan Site Access Improvements Substandard Road Improvements Other 		
Ridgewood Ave	County Local - Urban	2 Lanes ⊠ Substandard Road □ Sufficient ROW Width	 Corridor Preservation Plan Site Access Improvements Substandard Road Improvements Other 		

Project Trip Generation 🗌 Not applicable for this request			
	Average Annual Daily Trips	A.M. Peak Hour Trips	P.M. Peak Hour Trips
Existing	753	26	71
Proposed	170	12	17
Difference (+/-)	-583	-14	-54

*Trips reported are based on net new external trips unless otherwise noted.

Project Boundary	Primary Access	Additional Connectivity/Access	Cross Access	Finding
North		None	None	Meets LDC
South	Х	None	None	Meets LDC
F		None	Vehicular &	MeetsLDC
East		None	Pedestrian	Meets LDC
West		Vehicular &	Dedectrian	MeetelDC
WEST		Pedestrian	Pedestrian	MeetsLDC
Notes:				

Design Exception/Administrative Variance 🛛 Not applicable for this request		
Road Name/Nature of Request Type Finding		
	Choose an item.	Choose an item.
	Choose an item.	Choose an item.
Notes:		

4.0 Additional Site Information & Agency Comments Summary			
Transportation	Objections	Conditions Requested	Additional Information/Comments
 Design Exception/Adm. Variance Requested Off-Site Improvements Provided 	□ Yes □N/A ⊠ No	⊠ Yes □ No	See Staff Report.

4.0 ADDITIONAL SITE INFORMATION & AGENCY COMMENTS SUMMARY

INFORMATION/REVIEWING AGENCY				
Environmental:	Comments Received	Objections	Conditions Requested	Additional Information/Comments
Environmental Protection Commission	⊠ Yes □ No	□ Yes ⊠ No	□ Yes ⊠ No	
Natural Resources	□ Yes ⊠ No	□ Yes □ No	□ Yes □ No	
Conservation & Environ. Lands Mgmt.	□ Yes ⊠ No	□ Yes □ No	□ Yes □ No	
Check if Applicable: Vetlands/Other Surface Waters Use of Environmentally Sensitive Land Credit Wellhead Protection Area Surface Water Resource Protection Area	 Potable Water We Significant Wildlife Coastal High Hazar Urban/Suburban/R Adjacent to ELAPP Other 	e Habitat d Area ural Scenic Corrido		
Public Facilities:	Comments Received	Objections	Conditions Requested	Additional Information/Comments
Transportation Design Exc./Adm. Variance Requested Off-site Improvements Provided	⊠ Yes □ No	□ Yes ⊠ No	⊠ Yes □ No	
Service Area/ Water & Wastewater ⊠ Urban □ City of Tampa □ Rural □ City of Temple Terrace	⊠ Yes □ No	□ Yes ⊠ No	□ Yes ⊠ No	
Hillsborough County School Board Adequate □ K-5 □ 6-8 □ 9-12 ⊠ N/A Inadequate □ K-5 ⊠ 6-8 ⊠ 9-12 ⊠ N/A	□ Yes ⊠ No	□ Yes □ No	□ Yes □ No	
Impact/Mobility Fees Auto-Repair Facility (Per 1,000 s.f.) Mobility: \$10,535 Fire: \$313 Project Summary/Description: Urban Mobility, Central Fire - After the fact expansion o	f Auto Repair facility tha	at was unpermitted	<u>.</u>	·
Comprehensive Plan:	Comments Received	Findings	Conditions Requested	Additional Information/Comments
Planning Commission □ Meets Locational Criteria ⊠ N/A □ Locational Criteria Waiver Requested □ Minimum Density Met ⊠ N/A □ Density Bonus Requested	⊠ Yes □ No	□ Inconsistent ⊠ Consistent	□ Yes ⊠ No	

5.0 IMPLEMENTATION RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Compatibility

The property's existing use is a motor vehicle repair, major, on the southern portion of the site, along Brandon Blvd (SR 60), and an office on the northern portion of the parcel. The surrounding area consists of commercial and office uses. A private school and church are located to the south, across the road.

The site has experienced several building expansions since its original configuration in 1961. In the 60's site was developed as a gas station, with a gas pump canopy in its frontage. The building in the back, utilized today as a hair salon, was established in the mid-1920, according to HC Property Appraiser records. The gas station had two driveway connections on SR60 and one to Ridgewood Dr. The building in the back also maintained access from Ridgewood Dr. Throughout the years, the gas station site was improved. Records show that the gas pumps canopy has been in existence in its current location/configuration since at least in 1988. By the late 1990's, impervious areas were added on both sides of the gas station building. During the widening of SR60 in the 1990s, FDOT took the corner of the Property along SR60 and Ridgewood Ave. The westernmost access driveway along SR60 was eliminated.

According to the project narrative submitted as part of this RZ application from Commercial General (CG) to Planned Development (PD), The Applicant constructed an expansion of the existing 1960s-era former gas station building without permits. The Property is not currently under code enforcement action. However, the Applicant acknowledges the need to rectify the situation and obtain zoning approval and after-the fact building permits to bring the Property into compliance. The auto repair shop, Huff Muffler, has been in operation at this location since 2012. The business initially operated with only two service bays in the original 1960s gas station building. Since 2012, the Applicant expanded the business by adding two pre-fabricated metal structures: one on the eastern side of the original building ("Eastern Expansion") and one on the western side of the original building ("Western Expansion"). A gas station canopy, which was constructed in the 1980s, remains on the Property today.

The site is within the SR60 Overlay District, Suburban Sector. This sector does not require building design standards or parking placement requirements. Instead, it requires the provision of a 30-foot wide, landscaped buffer along SR60, vehicular use area buffering in accordance with the LDC, building facades architecturally finished and specific monument sign design standards. Some of these requirements are triggered when a site undergoes building expansions or renovations, and the cost of such works exceed certain percentage thresholds compared to the value of existing buildings on site (LDC Sec. 3.14.06). As noted, since 2012, the building on site has been expanded, with additional repair bays added east and west of the original structure, without building permits. While staff is unable to determine the true cost of the works compared with the value of the building(s) existing prior to the improvements, given the extent and scale to which the building has been expanded, the materials and workmanship of the new repair bays and area covered by the additions, the site is being subject to the requirements of the SR Overlay District mentioned above, in addition to stormwater facilities located behind the buildings. The applicant, consequently, as part of this PD rezoning, is requesting a wavier to reduce the buffer area along SR60, and PD variations to eliminate vehicular use area buffers. Other standards of the SR60 Overlay District will be met.

Through this PD rezoning, the applicant proposes significant changes, in addition to maintaining the current building expansions, to bring the Property closer to compliance with the SR 60 Overlay standards. The proposed changes to the Property as it currently exists today includes:

- Removal of the 1980s gas canopy;
- Removal of non-conforming pole sign and installation of new conforming monument sign;
- Addition of architectural finishing on all structures;

ZHM HEARING DATE:September 19, 2022BOCC LUM MEETING DATE:November 3, 2022

Case Reviewer: Israel Monsanto

- Removal of the two access points along Ridgewood Ave, thereby limiting access to just one point along Ridgewood, with the access aligning with the shopping center to the west, thereby increasing pedestrian and traffic safety;
- Addition of vehicular and pedestrian stub outs to the adjacent parcel;
- Addition of a 10' landscaped buffer along SR 60 frontage (with a waiver request);
- Addition of an 8' landscaped buffer along Ridgewood Ave (where southern access point is currently located);
- Removal of the hair salon building to allow for the relocation of the stormwater management facility;
- Addition of ADA accessible ramp and pedestrian path from a public sidewalk to both the main entrance and rear entrance;
- Removal of crushed asphalt in favor of pavement;
- Addition of parking islands.

Since the landscaped buffer area along SR60 will be only 10 feet wide, the PD petition includes a waiver request from LDC Sec. 3.14.06.2.a: For projects east of Kingsway Road, a buffer area with a minimum width of 30 feet shall be provided along the entire length of the parcel's frontage on State Road 60.¹

The waiver requests a variation of 20 feet and associated plantings to reduce the landscaped buffer from 30 feet to 10 feet. In summary, the applicant has provided the following justification:

- Due to the widening of SR60 in the 1990s, FDOT took the corner of the Property along SR60 and Ridgewood Ave. Accordingly, it is now nearly impossible for the site to meet the required 30' landscaped buffer due to the configuration of the front Property line while maintaining adequate traffic circulation for the auto-oriented use.
- Imposition of the 30-foot landscaped buffer would result in an almost complete elimination of the existing front parking lot. The landscaped buffer would effectively shutter the small business as it would be unable to meet the required parking demands of the business or the necessary traffic circulation among the service bays.
- Nearby properties do not comply with this requirement or have been granted variances to reduce the required 30 foot buffer.
- As the Property currently exists, there is no buffer on the Property along SR 60. The Applicant is proposing to add a 10 foot landscaped buffer along SR 60 to meet the intent of the Code.
- Plantings are proposed in proportion to the buffer being provided, i.e. 1/3 of the plantings required in the 30 foot buffer will be provided for within the new 10 foot buffer. As a result, the proposed 10 foot buffer with plantings is a significant improvement from the existing conditions.

Staff has evaluated the applicant's justifications to reduce the buffer from 30 feet to 10 feet reasonable. The site has been in operation since the 1960 with a canopy area and parking spaces serving the site in front of the building. Compared to the current site conditions, no buffer is provided between the parking areas and canopy, and the front property line. Additionally, the applicant has modified the request compared to the original site plan showing 8 feet of front buffer area and has added 2 more feet. The applicant has also made site modifications to move parking spaces to the back of the building in order to accommodate more buffer area along the frontage. Moreover, the applicant proposes to finish the facades of the building with Hardie board-style siding along the top and stone or brick along the bottom, replace the signage to meet SR60 overlay conformance and remove the gas canopy from the site. These site improvement actions in combination with the 10-foot landscaped buffer would enhance the appearance of the site and bring it closer to the intent of the Suburban Sector of the SR 60 overlay.

In addition to the waiver request to the SR60 overlay requirement, the applicant has included the following two PD Variation requests:

¹ The applicant submitted this waiver request as PD Variation #1; however, this is a request to waive a requirement from the LDC that is not found in LDC Parts 6.05.00-Parking and Loading, 6.06.06-Buffer and Screening or 6.07.00-Fences and Walls and is not a PD Variation per LDC Sec. 5.03.06.C.6. Therefore, it is being reviewed as a waiver request.

APPLICATION NUMBER:	PD 22-0684
ZHM HEARING DATE:	September 19, 2022
BOCC LUM MEETING DATE:	November 3, 2022

1. Section 6.06.04.E. requires a 6-foot landscaped buffer between the vehicle use areas and any property boundary not fronted by a right-of-way. However, a landscaped buffer is not required if a 6-foot buffer and required screening are provided on the adjacent property along said boundary. This PD Variation (#2) pertains to the eastern Property line. A 6-foot buffer appears to be provided on the adjacent property to the east, 704 E Brandon Blvd. A survey accepted by the County in connection with NCG-17454 was provided by the applicant. The applicant requests to reduce the 6-foot buffer along the eastern parcel line of the subject property to 1 foot.

The applicant provides the following justifications:

- The variation is necessary to accommodate the redevelopment and revitalization of the existing 1960's gas station structure while allowing for reasonable business expansion. The redevelopment utilizing the existing structure is creative and innovative. Strict adherence to the 6 foot buffer requirement cannot be accommodated on this Property.
- The Property was originally developed with asphalt or concrete up to the eastern property line, along the southern portion of the Property. No buffer ever being utilized along the east property line. A 1993 FDOT survey shows the curb of the parking area still being utilized today.
- Despite this Property's long history, there has never been a 6 foot buffer to the east along vehicle use areas. As mitigating measures, the Applicant is proposing to architecturally finish all structures on the Property, including the original 1960's structure, in compliance with the SR 60 Overlay standards. The Applicant is also proposing to remove the gas canopy and the nonconforming pole sign in favor of a compliant monument sign, thereby further beautifying the area and meeting the intent of the Code. Further, the Applicant is proposing to close the two existing southernmost access points along Ridgewood and replacing such access points with more landscaped green space.

2. Similar to the above request, the other PD Variation (#3) pertains to the northern Property line. A 6-foot buffer appears to be provided on the adjacent property to the north, 704 E Brandon Blvd. A survey accepted by the County in connection with NCG-17454. The applicant requests to reduce the 6-foot buffer along the northern parcel line of the subject property to 3 feet.

The applicant provides the following justifications:

- It is necessary to accommodate the redevelopment and revitalization of the existing 1960's gas station structure while allowing for reasonable business expansion. The redevelopment utilizing the existing structure is creative and innovative. Strict adherence to the 6-foot buffer requirement cannot be accommodated on this Property.
- Currently, the Property has no buffer along the northern property line. The Applicant is proposing to remove the structure containing the hair salon and northern drive aisle to increase the current buffer from 0 feet to 3 feet.
- Further, the 3-foot limitation is only along a very small portion of the northern Property line. Also along the northern Property line is the stormwater management facility, a 7-foot parking island, and a vehicular stub out for interconnectivity with the parcel to the north.
- As mitigating measures, the Applicant is proposing to remove the structure containing the hair salon and northern drive aisle to increase the current buffer from 0 feet to 3 feet, architecturally finish all structures on the Property, including the original 1960's structure, in compliance with the SR 60 Overlay standards.
- The Applicant is also proposing to remove the gas canopy and the non-conforming pole sign in favor of a compliant monument sign, thereby further beautifying the area and meeting the intent of the Code. Further, the Applicant is proposing to close the two existing southernmost access points along Ridgewood and replacing such access points with more landscaped green space.

The applicant has submitted a letter of support for the requested PD rezoning from the eastern property owner, who is the most impacted neighbor.

APPLICATION NUMBER:	PD 22-0684	
ZHM HEARING DATE: BOCC LUM MEETING DATE:	September 19, 2022 November 3, 2022	Case Reviewer: Israel Monsanto

Staff has reviewed the buffer variation justifications submitted by the applicant per LDC Section 5.03.06.C.6 and finds they meet the criteria for approval. Staff notes that while the adjacent property to the north and east appears to be furnishing a 6-foot landscaped buffer, the required landscaping is not sufficient, and thus is not in full compliance with LDC 6.06.04.E. The PD Variation request by the applicant is therefore consistent with LDC Sec. 5.03.06.C.6. The justifications provided by the applicant are reasonable. The proposed site design will increase green areas to accommodate more landscaping and open space is being added along the north, where a building exists today. Additionally, the adjacent parcel north and east also consists of commercial uses. The affected property owner of the parcel surrounding the subject site to the north and east does not object to the PD rezonoing. The hearing master's recommendation for this application is required to include a finding on whether the requested variations meet the criteria for approval.



Overall existing site conditions

APPLICATION NUMBER:	PD 22-0684
ZHM HEARING DATE:	September 19, 2022
BOCC LUM MEETING DATE:	November 3, 2022

Compared to the current site conditions and design, the proposed improvements to the use would provide for an overall site that is significantly closer to the intent of the SR60 (Brandon Blvd) Overlay District. The intent of the SR overlay is *to improve the appearance of new and existing development along State Road 60 between Interstate 75 and Dover Road by enhancing landscaping, building and sign requirements*. The site does not have a buffer along SR60 today; however, the proposed project will provide at least 10 feet of buffer along its frontage. Other comparable nearby commercial sites do not provide the required 30-foot buffer or 10 feet of green space in their frontages. The 10-foot buffer area will include landscaping and requires at least 1/3 of the number of plantings per the LDC Sec. 3.14.06.2.a. The applicant is also committed to improve the existing building with architecturally finished façades with Hardie board-style siding and stone or brick (initially, the applicant requested this requirement to be waived). Stormwater ponds will be placed behind the buildings, in accordance with the SR60 overlay regulations. Additionally, the impervious surface of the parcel is being reduced, providing for more green space. Lastly, site signage will be brought to compliance with SR60 overlay design standards.

Planning Commission has found the request consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The subject site meets the intent of the Urban Center Character District of the Brandon Community Plan. The Urban Center Character District is intended for the most intense land uses in the area and an auto repair use is not out of character for the surrounding area. Overall, the proposed Planned Development would allow for development that is consistent with the Goals, Objectives and Policies of the Future of Hillsborough Comprehensive Plan for Unincorporated Hillsborough County and is compatible with the existing and planned development pattern found in the surrounding area.

No Design Exceptions or Administrative Variances were requested for Transportation staff review. Staff does not object the request and has provided transportation conditions for site access and cross access.

No objections were received by any reviewing agency. The proposed project will be subject Site Development regulations and after the fact building permits will be required if the PD request is approved under the proposed conditions.

5.2 Recommendation

Based on the above considerations, staff recommends approval with conditions.

6.0 PROPOSED CONDITIONS

Prior to PD Site Plan Certification, the applicant shall revise the PD General Site Plan:

- 1. Prior to PD Site Plan Certification, the applicant shall revise the PD Site Plan to: -Revise "Vehicle Stub out" Label on the north side of the site to read "Cross Access"
- 2. Add a note in the data table: "the building is subject to architectural finishes. Refer to conditions of approvals".

Approval - Approval of the request, subject to the conditions listed below, is based on the general site plan submitted August 30, 2022.

- 1. The project shall be limited to a Motor Vehicle Repair, Major, with up to 5,400 sq. ft. of building size.
- 2. Development standards shall be as indicated in the General Site Development Plan and as follows:

Maximum building height	25 feet
Minimum front yard setback	30 feet along SR60; 9 feet along Ridgewood Ave.
Maximum impervious area	75%

- 2.1 Buildings shall be Architecturally finished on all sides. The following materials shall be provided: Hardie board-style siding with stone or brick along the base of the buildings. Paint shall not be considered an architectural finish.
- 2.2 Upon re-development of the site, the gas pump canopy along the southern frontage, and the Personal Services building on the northern portion of the parcel, shall be removed, as indicated in the General Site Plan.
- 2.3 Stormwater retention facilities shall be located at the rear of all principal buildings on the development parcel, as shown in the General Site Plan.
- 3. A minimum of 10 feet of landscaped buffer shall be maintained along SR60, as indicated in the General Site Plan. Plantings within this buffer shall be in accordance with LDC Sec. 3.14.06.2.a. The developer shall be permitted to provide at least 1/3 of the required plantings within the buffer area along SR60, subject to Natural Resources review and approval. All other Vehicular Use Area buffers shall be as shown on the General Site Plan.
- 4. Site signage shall be in accordance with the Article VII and the SR60 Overlay requirements found in LDC Part 3.14.00.
- 5. Approval of this re-zoning petition by Hillsborough County does not constitute a guarantee that the project will receive approvals/permits necessary for site development as proposed will be issued, nor does it imply that other required permits needed for site development or building construction are being waived or otherwise approved. The project will be required to comply with the Site Development Plan Review approval process in addition to obtain all necessary building permits for on-site structures.
- 6. Notwithstanding anything herein these conditions or on the PD site plan to the contrary, bicycle and pedestrian access may be permitted anywhere along the project boundaries.

- 7. The project shall be served by, and limited to, one (1) access connection to Brandon Blvd. and one (1) access connection to Ridgewood Ave. as shown on the PD site plan. All other existing access connections shall be closed and the applicant shall install curbing, sod and/or extend sidewalks, as appropriate.
- 8. The developer shall construct a vehicular and pedestrian cross-access stub out along as generally shown on the PD site plan.
- 9. If the notes and/or graphic on the site plan are in conflict with specific zoning conditions and/or the Land Development Code (LDC) regulations, the more restrictive regulation shall apply, unless specifically conditioned otherwise. References to development standards of the LDC in the above stated conditions shall be interpreted as the regulations in effect at the time of preliminary site plan/plat approval.
- 10. The Development of the project shall proceed in strict accordance with the terms and conditions contained in the Development Order, the General Site Plan, the land use conditions contained herein, and all applicable rules, regulations, and ordinances of Hillsborough County.

Zoning Administrator Sign Off:	J. Brian Grady Mon Sep 12 2022 11:37:26	
SITE, SUBDIVISION AND BUILDING CONSTRUCTION IN ACCORDANCE WITH HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN & BUILDING REVIEW AND APPROVAL.		

Approval of this re-zoning petition by Hillsborough County does not constitute a guarantee that the project will receive approvals/permits necessary for site development as proposed will be issued, nor does it imply that other required permits needed for site development or building construction are being waived or otherwise approved. The project will be required to comply with the Site Development Plan Review approval process in addition to obtain all necessary building permits for on-site structures.
B. HEARING SUMMARY

This case was heard by the Hillsborough County Land Use Hearing Officer on September 19, 2022. Mr. Brian Grady of the Hillsborough County Development Services Department introduced the petition.

Applicant

Mr. Jake Cremer spoke on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Cremer presented the rezoning request and provided testimony as reflected in the hearing transcript, a copy of which is attached to and made a part of this recommendation.

Mr. Justin Wright spoke on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Wright provided testimony and answered the hearing officer's questions as reflected in the hearing transcript, attached to and made a part of this recommendation.

Ms. Amanda Wright spoke on behalf of the applicant. Ms. Wright provided testimony as reflected in the hearing transcript, attached to and made a part of this recommendation.

Mr. Cremer provided further testimony related to a revised condition.

Development Services Department

Mr. Israel Monsanto, Hillsborough County Development Services Department, presented a summary of the findings and analysis as detailed in the staff report previously submitted into the record. Mr. Monsanto asked that the applicant clarify that the reduction of the State Road 60 Overlay from 30 feet to 10 feet will be in the Subject Property's direct frontage and due to the FDOT clipping the diagonal section will be 3 feet.

Planning Commission

Ms. Jillian Massey, Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission, presented a summary of the findings and analysis as detailed in the Planning Commission report previously submitted into the record.

Proponents

The hearing officer asked whether there was anyone at the hearing in person or online to speak in support of the application.

Ms. Janet Lorton stated she was speaking as a private citizen and not in her role or official capacity at EPC. Ms. Lorton provided testimony in support of the rezoning request as reflected in the hearing transcript attached to and made a part of this recommendation. Ms. Lorton raised concerns with the Brandon State Road 60 Overlay requirements, particularly the valuation threshold that resulted in the Subject Property being subject to the overlay requirements.

Opponents

The hearing officer asked whether there was anyone at the hearing in person or online to speak in opposition to the application. There were none.

Development Services Department

Mr. Grady stated Development Services Department had nothing further. The hearing officer asked Mr. Monsanto to restate the issue Development Services Department asked the applicant to confirm. Mr. Monsanto asked the applicant to verify that the 30-foot buffer reduction is along the Subject Property's frontage and at the corner, which was reduced by an FDOT taking, the buffer would be reduced to 3 feet. He stated this is reflected in the applicant's site plan, but the applicant should confirm this verbally on the record.

Applicant Rebuttal

Mr. Cremer confirmed the buffer reduction request is 10 feet along the Subject Property's south boundary fronting State Road 60 and 3 feet on the diagonal area at the corner that was subject to the FDOT taking.

The hearing officer asked Mr. Cremer to conform the applicant understands if the PD rezoning is approved the applicant must still obtain after-the-fact permits for the building expansions. Mr. Cremer confirmed the applicant understood this and that would be the next step. Mr. Cremer provided further summary testimony as reflected in the hearing transcript attached to and made a part of this recommendation.

The hearing officer closed the hearing RZ-PD 22-0684

C. EVIDENCE SUMBITTED

Mr. Cremer submitted into the record at the hearing copies of the applicant's revised Condition no. 3. and copies of support letters from owners of nearby properties and clients of the applicant's business.

D. FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1. The Subject Property consists of approximately 0.59 acres at 702 E. Brandon Boulevard in Brandon.
- 2. The Subject Property is designated OC-20 on the Future Land Use Map and is zoned CG.
- 3. The subject Property is located within the boundaries of the Brandon Community Plan and is within the Urban Services Area.
- 4. The area surrounding the Subject Property generally consists of non-residential uses including retail, grocery stores, restaurants, gasoline stations, a private school, and a church.

- 5. During a widening of State Road 60 in the 1990s, FDOT took a portion of Subject Property's southwest corner at State Road 60 and Ridgewood Avenue.
- 6. The Subject Property is improved with an auto repair facility, formerly a gasoline station, and a building currently used as a hair salon. The Hillsborough County Property Appraiser's website shows the auto repair facility was built in 1961, the hair salon building was built in 1924, and a gasoline station canopy was added in 1986.
- 7. The applicant has operated an auto repair shop in the former gasoline station building since 2012 and has made substantial additions to the original structure without obtaining permits.
- 8. The Subject Property is within the State Road 60 Overlay District, Suburban Sector. The overlay sector requires a 30-foot-wide landscaped buffer along State Road 60, vehicular use area buffering, architecturally finished building façades, and specific monument sign design standards. The LDC at section 3.14.06 provides these overlay requirements are triggered when a property undergoes improvements, and the cost of the improvements exceeds certain percentage thresholds compared to the value of existing improvements.
- 9. Based on the extent of the unpermitted improvements to the existing former gasoline station building on the Subject Property, Development Services Department staff determined the Subject Property is subject to the State Road 60 Overlay District, Suburban Sector requirements.
- 10. The applicant is requesting to rezone the Subject Property to a Planned Development to allow the existing 5,384-square-foot auto repair facility to continue, to obtain after-the-fact permits for the unpermitted improvements, and to bring the Subject Property into compliance with current zoning and overlay regulations to the maximum extent practicable.
- 11. The applicant proposes significant changes to the Subject Property's existing development, including: removal of the gasoline station canopy; removal of the non-conforming pole sign; installation of a conforming monument sign; architectural finishing of all structures; removal of two access points on Ridgewood Avenue; addition of vehicular and pedestrian stub outs to the adjacent parcel; addition of a 10-foot landscaped buffer along State Road 60 frontage; addition of an 8-foot landscaped buffer along Ridgewood Avenue; removal of the hair salon building; relocation of the stormwater management facility; addition of an ADA accessible ramp and pedestrian path; replacement of crushed asphalt with pavement; and addition of parking islands.

- 12. The applicant is requesting a waiver from LDC section 3.14.06.2.a., which requires a 30-foot buffer along frontage on State Road 60. The applicant is requesting to reduce the buffer area along the direct frontage on State Road 60 to 10 feet, and to 3 feet at the corner of State Road 60 and Ridgewood Avenue where FDOT took a portion of the Subject Property. The applicant provided justification for the waiver, including: it is nearly impossible for the Subject Property to meet the required 30foot landscaped buffer and maintain adequate traffic circulation due to the configuration of the front property line as a result of the FDOT taking; the 30-foot landscaped buffer would almost completely eliminate the existing front parking lot and effectively shutter the small business; nearby properties do not comply with the 30-foot landscaped buffer requirement; with the existing improvements the Subject Property has no buffer along State Road 60 and the applicant is proposing to add a 10-foot landscaped buffer to comply with the intent of the LDC; and the applicant is proposing landscape plantings in proportion to the buffer being provided, which is a significant improvement over existing conditions.
- 13. Staff found the applicant's waiver justifications reasonable considering the proposed improvements and addition of a 10-foot landscaped buffer, where the existing site conditions provide no buffer.
- 14. The applicant is also requesting the following two PD variations:
 - a. A variation for a 5-foot reduction to the 6-foot landscaped buffer required by LDC section 6.06.04.E. between vehicle use areas and a property boundary not fronted by a right-of-way to allow a buffer of 1 foot along the Subject Property's eastern boundary.
 - b. A variation for a 3-foot reduction to the 6-foot landscaped buffer required by LDC section 6.06.04.E. between vehicle use areas and a property boundary not fronted by a right-of-way to allow a buffer of 3 feet along the Subject Property's northern boundary.
- 15. The applicant submitted a letter from the owner of the adjacent property to the north and east of the Subject Property in support of the proposed rezoning.
- 16. Development Services Staff found that the proposed rezoning and improvements would provide for an overall site that is significantly closer to the intent of the State Road 60 Overlay requirements.
- 17. Planning Commission staff found the proposed Planned Development meets the intent of the Urban Center Character District of the Brandon Community Plan and would allow development that is consistent with the comprehensive plan and compatible with the existing and planned development pattern of the surrounding area.

- 18. Findings on variations pursuant to LDC section 5.03.06.C.6.:
 - (1) The variation is necessary to achieve creative, innovative, and/or mixed use development that could not be accommodated by strict adherence to current regulations.

Variation for a 5-foot reduction to the 6-foot landscaped buffer required by LDC section 6.06.04.E. between vehicle use areas and a property boundary not fronted by a right-of-way to allow a buffer of 1 foot along the Subject Property's eastern boundary. Yes. The Subject Property is constrained by its size, shape, historical development, and the configuration of the existing improvements. The significant site changes the applicant has proposed will greatly improve the current conditions on the Subject Property and will more closely comply with the intent of the LDC. However, even with the proposed significant changes, strict adherence to the 6-foot buffer requirement cannot be accommodated on the Subject Property without losing parking spaces and a portion of the auto repair building. Therefore, the record supports a finding that the variation is necessary to achieve creative, innovative, and/or mixed-use development that could not be accommodated by strict adherence to current regulations.

Variation for a 3-foot reduction to the 6-foot landscaped buffer required by LDC section 6.06.04.E. between vehicle use areas and a property boundary not fronted by a right-of-way to allow a buffer of 3 feet along the Subject Property's northern boundary. Yes. The Subject Property is constrained by its size, shape, historical development, and the configuration of the existing improvements. The significant site changes the applicant has proposed will greatly improve the current conditions on the Subject Property and will more closely comply with the intent of the LDC. However, even with the proposed significant changes, strict adherence to the 6-foot buffer requirement cannot be accommodated on the Subject Property. There is currently no buffer along the Subject Property's northern boundary and the applicant is proposing to remove hair salon building and northern drive aisle to increase the current buffer from 0 feet to 3 feet along a portion of the northern boundary. The applicant is also proposing a stormwater management facility, a 7-foot parking island, and a vehicular stub out for interconnectivity with the parcel to the north. Therefore, the record supports a finding that the variation is necessary to achieve creative, innovative, and/or mixed-use development that could not be accommodated by strict adherence to current regulations.

(2) The variation is mitigated through enhanced design features that are proportionate to the degree of variation.

Variation for a 5-foot reduction to the 6-foot landscaped buffer required by LDC section 6.06.04.E. between vehicle use areas and a property boundary not fronted by a right-of-way to allow a buffer of 1 foot along the Subject Property's eastern boundary. Yes. The applicant is proposing significant changes to the Subject Property's existing development, including: removal of the gasoline station canopy; removal of the non-conforming pole sign; installation of a conforming monument sign; architectural finishing of all structures; removal of two access points on Ridgewood Avenue; addition of vehicular and pedestrian stub outs to the adjacent parcel; addition of a 10foot landscaped buffer along State Road 60 frontage; addition of an 8-foot landscaped buffer along Ridgewood Avenue; removal of the hair salon building; relocation of the stormwater management facility; addition of an ADA accessible ramp and pedestrian path; replacement of crushed asphalt with pavement; and addition of parking islands. Therefore, the record supports a finding that the variation is mitigated through enhanced design features that are proportionate to the degree of variation.

Variation for a 3-foot reduction to the 6-foot landscaped buffer required by LDC section 6.06.04.E. between vehicle use areas and a property boundary not fronted by a right-of-way to allow a buffer of 3 feet along the Subject <u>Property's northern boundary</u>. Yes. The applicant is proposing significant changes to the Subject Property's existing development, including: removal of the gasoline station canopy; removal of the non-conforming pole sign; installation of a conforming monument sign; architectural finishing of all structures; removal of two access points on Ridgewood Avenue; addition of vehicular and pedestrian stub outs to the adjacent parcel; addition of a 10foot landscaped buffer along State Road 60 frontage; addition of an 8-foot landscaped buffer along Ridgewood Avenue; removal of the hair salon building; relocation of the stormwater management facility; addition of an ADA accessible ramp and pedestrian path; replacement of crushed asphalt with pavement; and addition of parking islands. Therefore, the record supports a finding that the variation is mitigated through enhanced design features that are proportionate to the degree of variation.

(3) The variation is in harmony with the purpose and intent of the Hillsborough County Land Development Code.

Variation for a 5-foot reduction to the 6-foot landscaped buffer required by LDC section 6.06.04.E. between vehicle use areas and a property boundary not fronted by a right-of-way to allow a buffer of 1 foot along the Subject Property's eastern boundary. Yes. The proposed Planned Development represents a significant improvement to the existing development and will bring the Subject Property more closely into compliance with the LDC. The record supports a finding that the variation is in harmony with the purpose and intent of the LDC to foster and preserve public health, safety, comfort

and welfare, and to aid in the harmonious, orderly, and progressive development of the unincorporated areas of Hillsborough County.

Variation for a 3-foot reduction to the 6-foot landscaped buffer required by LDC section 6.06.04.E. between vehicle use areas and a property boundary not fronted by a right-of-way to allow a buffer of 3 feet along the Subject Property's northern boundary. Yes. The proposed Planned Development represents a significant improvement to the existing development and will bring the Subject Property more closely into compliance with the LDC. The record supports a finding that the variation is in harmony with the purpose and intent of the LDC to foster and preserve public health, safety, comfort and welfare, and to aid in the harmonious, orderly, and progressive development of the unincorporated areas of Hillsborough County.

(4) The variation will not substantially interfere with or injure the rights of adjacent property owners.

Variation for a 5-foot reduction to the 6-foot landscaped buffer required by LDC section 6.06.04.E. between vehicle use areas and a property boundary not fronted by a right-of-way to allow a buffer of 1 foot along the Subject Property's eastern boundary. Historically there has been no 6-foot landscaped buffer between vehicle use areas and the Subject Property's eastern boundary. There is no evidence of any objection by the owner of the adjacent property, and the applicant submitted into the record a letter from the adjacent property owner supporting the requested Planned Development. The proposed Planned Development represents a significant improvement to the existing development and will bring the Subject Property more closely into compliance with the LDC. Therefore, the record evidence supports a finding that the variation will not substantially interfere with or injure the rights of adjacent property owners.

Variation for a 3-foot reduction to the 6-foot landscaped buffer required by LDC section 6.06.04.E. between vehicle use areas and a property boundary not fronted by a right-of-way to allow a buffer of 3 feet along the Subject Property's northern boundary. Historically there has been no 6-foot landscaped buffer between vehicle use areas and the Subject Property's northern boundary. There is no evidence of any objection by the owner of the adjacent property, and the applicant submitted into the record a letter from the adjacent property owner supporting the requested Planned Development. The proposed Planned Development represents a significant improvement to the existing development and will bring the Subject Property more closely into compliance with the LDC. Therefore, the record evidence supports a finding that the variation will not substantially interfere with or injure the rights of adjacent property owners.

E. FINDINGS OF COMPLIANCE OR NON-COMPLIANCE WITH COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The proposed Planned Development rezoning request is in compliance with, and does further the intent of the Goals, Objectives, and Policies of the *Future of Hillsborough Comprehensive Plan for Unincorporated Hillsborough County*.

F. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

A development order is consistent with the comprehensive plan if "the land uses, densities or intensities, and other aspects of development permitted by such order...are compatible with and further the objectives, policies, land uses, and densities or intensities in the comprehensive plan and if it meets all other criteria enumerated by the local government." § 163.3194(3)(a), Fla. Stat. (2020). Based on the evidence and testimony submitted in the record and at the hearing, including reports and testimony of Development Services Staff and Planning Commission staff, applicant's testimony and evidence, there is substantial competent evidence demonstrating the requested Planned Development rezoning is consistent with the *Future of Hillsborough Comprehensive Plan for Unincorporated Hillsborough County*, and does comply with the applicable requirements of the Hillsborough County Land Development Code.

G. SUMMARY

The applicant is requesting to rezone the Subject Property to a Planned Development to allow the existing 5,384-square-foot auto repair facility to continue, to obtain after-the-fact permits for the unpermitted improvements, and to bring the Subject Property into compliance with current zoning and overlay regulations to the maximum extent practicable.

The applicant is requesting a waiver from LDC section 3.14.06.2.a., which requires a 30foot buffer along frontage on State Road 60. The applicant is requesting to reduce the buffer area along the direct frontage on State Road 60 to 10 feet, and to 3 feet at the corner of State Road 60 and Ridgewood Avenue where FDOT took a portion of the Subject Property. The applicant provided justification for the waiver.

The applicant is also requesting the following two PD variations:

- a. A variation for a 5-foot reduction to the 6-foot landscaped buffer required by LDC section 6.06.04.E. between vehicle use areas and a property boundary not fronted by a right-of-way to allow a buffer of 1 foot along the Subject Property's eastern boundary.
- b. A variation for a 3-foot reduction to the 6-foot landscaped buffer required by LDC section 6.06.04.E. between vehicle use areas and a property boundary

not fronted by a right-of-way to allow a buffer of 3 feet along the Subject Property's northern boundary.

H. RECOMMENDATION

Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, this recommendation is for APPROVAL of the Planned Development rezoning request subject to the required revisions and conditions set forth in the Development Services staff report based on the applicant's general site plan submitted August 30, 2022.

Pamela Oo Hatley Pamela Jo Hatley PhD, JD

Land Use Hearing Officer

10-10-2022 Date:

	Page 1 SBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA D OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
IN RE: ZONE HEARING MASTI HEARINGS)) ER)))
	NG HEARING MASTER HEARING I OF TESTIMONY AND PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE:	PAMELA JO HATLEY Land Use Hearing Master
DATE:	Monday, September 19, 2022
TIME:	Commencing at 6:00 p.m. Concluding at 8:34 p.m.
PLACE:	Robert W. Saunders, Sr. Public Library Ada T. Payne Community Room 1505 N. Nebraska Avenue Tampa, Florida 33602
Reported via	Cisco Webex Videoconference by:
Exe Ulr 13555 2	hristina M. Walsh, RPR cutive Reporting Service merton Business Center Automobile Blvd., Suite 130 Clearwater, FL 33762 (800) 337-7740

	Page 76
1	HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
2	ZONING HEARING MASTER HEARINGS
3	September 19, 2022
4	ZONING HEARING MASTER: PAMELA JO HATLEY
5	
6	D4: Application Number: RZ-PD 22-0684
7	Applicant:Raymond G. SavoieLocation:702 E. Brandon Blvd.
8	Folio Number:069067.0000Acreage:0.59 acres, more or less
9	Comprehensive Plan: OC-20 Service Area: Urban
10	Existing Zoning: CG
	Request: Rezone to Planned Development
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Executive Reporting Service 27 of 53

Page 77 1 MR. GRADY: The next item is agenda item 2 Again, application D-3 was continued at the D-4. 3 beginning of the hearing. So begin the next item is application number D-4, Rezoning-PD 22-0684. 4 5 The request is to rezone from Commercial 6 General to Planned Development. Israel Monsanto will provide staff recommendation after 7 8 presentation by the applicant. 9 MR. CREMER: Thank you. For the record, Jay Cremer with Stearns Weaver Miller, 401 East Jackson 10 11 Street, No. 2100. We have a brief presentation. 12 Madam Hearing Officer, we also have a red 13 line of some conditions we've been working on with 14 staff, as well as some support letters, if I may. 15 HEARING MASTER HATLEY: Thank you. 16 MR. CREMER: Thank you. Again, Jay Cremer 17 for the record. Next slide, please. So the property is really right in the heart 18 19 of the Brandon Boulevard corridor. Next slide. CG 20 zoning, OC-20 Future Land Use. We are within the 21 Urban Service Area. We are within the Brandon 22 Community Plan, and we are within the Brandon State 23 Road 60 Overlay. Next slide, please. 24 The Brandon Overlay is really what we had to 25 work on the hardest with staff on this application,

Executive Reporting Service 28 of 53

Page 78 and we'd like to thank them. Believe it or not, 1 2 it's been a two-and-a-half-year journey to get 3 here. We've worked really, really hard. We were 4 dealing with a 1920's structure, a 1960's gas 5 station, and a 1980's gas pump canopy. 6 And so the site was essentially completely 7 paved, and we really had to work hard to figure out 8 how can we come as close as possible so that this family can expand their business and -- and also 9 10 meet the intent of the overlay. So this list -- I won't belabor the point. 11 12 This goes into the staff presentation, but the big 13 things we're doing is we're removing that ugly gas 14 canopy. We're removing the outdated pole sign on 15 the property. 16 We did -- unfortunately, we are going to 17 have to remove the 1920's home that's now used as a 18 hair salon. Unfortunately, with everything we had 19 going on with the property, we weren't able to 20 retain that. Next slide, please. 21 So here you can see the existing site 22 conditions. You can see the canopy up front. You 23 can see the secondary business in the rear, and you can see a number of access points that we're 24 25 reconfiguring, and as you can see here, there's

Executive Reporting Service 29 of 53

virtually no buffering to any of the streets. Next slide, please.

3 So on the proposed site plan, you can see 4 we've really worked hard to add buffering. We've 5 really worked hard to make the site work internally 6 much better. I think ultimately it's going to be 7 much safer for the owner, for the public visiting, 8 and pedestrians that are walking around the site. 9 Next slide, please.

As far as compatibility, just to point out a few of the neighboring businesses, I mean, this is an auto repair facility. There's a Jiffy Lube right down the road. There's a Nativity Catholic Church across the street. We do have a support letter that I passed out from there.

16 Crafty Crab owns the property to the east 17 and north adjacent on both sides. We have a 18 support letter from them as well. Next slide. So 19 as you can see the staff report, you know, the staff pointed to a number of policies that are 20 21 focused on revitalizing older commercial areas, and 22 we believe we're taking advantage of those policies 23 to effectuate this project. Next slide. So we're requesting one waiver and two 24 25 variations. Again, these go to the history of the

Executive Reporting Service 30 of 53

1

2

Page 79

Page 80 historic nature of the property. They go to the 1 2 fact that a small portion of the property was taken 3 when Brandon Boulevard was expanded a number of 4 years ago and trying to rehabilitate them for 5 current use. Next slide. The PD waiver this is for the front of the 6 7 property fronting Brandon Boulevard. We're 8 requesting a reduction essentially from 30 feet down to 10 feet. 9 Now, we have worked with Natural Resources 10 11 staff, and we are going to be able to effectuate 12 all of the plantings except for a small reduction 13 in the number of trees just because we physically 14 can't fit them. Next slide, please. 15 Variation -- the first variation request is 16 for the east side of the property. There has not 17 been a landscape buffer on the east side of the 18 property historically. 19 We did review county records and determined that the Crafty Crab property does have the 20 21 6 feet -- the 6 feet of buffering. However, 22 because it's an older property, they don't have the 23 number of plantings that would be required today. 24 As mitigation, we proposed to add a great 25 deal more greenery around the property. And,

Executive Reporting Service 31 of 53

Page 81 again, they are supporting this application. 1 Next 2 slide, please. Similar story on the variation request on the north. However, there we were able 3 to squeeze in 3 feet of buffer rather than the 4 5 6 feet. Again, that property owner is in support 6 of the application. Next slide. 7 So as far as transportation and 8 connectivity, I really feel like we -- this is -again, this is going to be a much safer site. 9 So 10 we have reduced the number of access points to the west to make them safer and further away from the 11 12 light. 13 We have added cross -- pedestrian cross 14 access to the east, to the restaurant, and 15 vehicular cross access or stub-out will be to the 16 north. So, again, this site, I think, is going to 17 work much, much better in the long run. Next 18 slide, please. Next slide. 19 So, again, in conclusion, we have 20 neighborhood support, including the church, 21 including Crafty Crab. We have staff 22 recommendations of approval. 23 And I think I have a few extra minutes left. 24 So my clients would like to say a couple of words. 25 Thank you.

Executive Reporting Service 32 of 53

HEARING MASTER HATLEY: Okay. Thank you.
 MR. WRIGHT: Good evening. My name is
 Justin Wright. I reside at 13421 Glen Harwell
 Road.

I'm here asking for approval for rezoning of my automotive business, Huff Automotive. I'm requesting rezoning so that I may continue my family business, which started with my father opening a location in Plant City 49 years ago.

I'm hoping to pass it down to my children one day. I have grown up my whole life around the industry and know nothing different. I opened my location and started my 15 years ago and have outgrown my shop.

My shop was an eyesore for the greater part of 20 years in the Brandon area. When I was able to purchase the property, I started fixing it up and doing so, I received many complements from not only customers but neighbors in the area on how well-maintained the building and the property has become.

I'm asking for your support and approval so that I may continue to support my family and my employees as well. Thank you for your time. HEARING MASTER HATLEY: What's your name

Executive Reporting Service 33 of 53

5

6

7

8

9

Page 83 1 again, sir? 2 MR. WRIGHT: Justin Wright. 3 HEARING MASTER HATLEY: Mr. Wright --4 MR. WRIGHT: Yes, sir -- yes, ma'am. 5 HEARING MASTER HATLEY: -- are you in title 6 of the property now or are you purchasing --7 MR. WRIGHT: Deed for contract. 8 HEARING MASTER HATLEY: I understand. Okay. 9 MR. WRIGHT: And that was six years ago, I 10 believe. Six or seven years ago. HEARING MASTER HATLEY: I understand. All 11 12 right. Thank you. Please sign in with the clerk's 13 office. 14 MS. WRIGHT: Hi. Good evening. My name is 15 Amanda Wright and I reside at 13421 Glen Harwell 16 Drive in Dover. 17 I'm here for our business, Huff Automotive, 18 which is located at 702 East Brandon Boulevard in 19 Brandon. I'm here tonight to ask for your approval 20 of our rezoning of the business. To say this has 21 been a very long and tedious process would be an 22 understatement. 23 We have been diligently and willingly 24 working with staff for a little over two years now 25 to meet County regulations and develop a site plan

Executive Reporting Service 34 of 53

Page 84 with their recommendations and suggestions so that 1 2 we may get their approval on this plan. 3 The countless hours spent on this project 4 along with the tremendous expense of legal fees, 5 surveys, traffic analysis, engineer drawings, and 6 numerous site plans have caused more stress on our 7 family than I would have ever wanted to endure. 8 This business is our livelihood. This business supports multiple families that rely on us 9 to put roofs over their head and food on their 10 11 table. What that being said, we have even proposed 12 to tear down one business, which is my salon, in 13 the rear of the property to make this plan work. 14 Those sacrifices have been a hard pill to 15 swallow, but again, we have been working hard with 16 staff and willing to make these changes. We are 17 just a small family business trying to live the 18 American dream, work hard to instill in our 19 children what good work ethic is. Provide honest, 20 affordable service to the public and continue to support our community in which you'll see we've 21 22 submitted some letters from our neighboring school 23 and church. 24 Our hope is that you will consider and 25 support this rezoning. Thank you.

Executive Reporting Service 35 of 53

Page 85 1 HEARING MASTER HATLEY: Thank you, 2 Ms. Wright. MR. CREMER: Thank you. Jay Cremer again. 3 I realize that I didn't explain to you the revised 4 5 condition No. 3. The intent of the condition is exactly the 6 7 same. This was simply some language we worked out 8 with Natural Resources because we wanted to make it clearer for the reviewers exactly how many trees 9 10 and plantings would occur there. So -- and my understanding is that Natural 11 12 Resources and Development Services are both in 13 agreement with this revised condition. So with 14 that, as you can tell, we worked hard on this 15 application. 16 I really think that the Brandon Overlay --17 hopefully, somebody will take a look at it at some 18 point because it's very, very difficult for these 19 rehabilitation projects. 20 But with that, we would just ask for your 21 approval, and our expert team is here if you have 22 any questions. 23 HEARING MASTER HATLEY: All right. Thank 24 you. 25 MR. CREMER: Thank you.

Executive Reporting Service 36 of 53

Page 86 1 HEARING MASTER HATLEY: All right. 2 Development Services. 3 MR. MONSANTO: Good evening. Israel 4 Monsanto, Development Services. 5 As stated by the applicant, the request 6 tonight is to rezone a parcel from Commercial 7 General to a Planned Development district to allow 8 the continuation of a motor vehicle repair use on the site with modifications to the site design. 9 The parcel is within the State Road 60 10 Brandon Boulevard Overlay district. Specifically, 11 in the suburban sector. Currently, the motor 12 13 vehicle repair building is located on the southern 14 portion of the site on Brandon Boulevard and an 15 office is located in the northern portion of the 16 parcel. 17 Surrounding areas consists today of 18 Commercial and Office uses. A private school and 19 church are located directly south. 20 The site has experienced several building 21 expansions since its original configuration in 22 1961. In the '60s, it was developed for gas 23 station with a gas pump, canopy in its frontage. 24 The building in the back utilized today as a hair 25 salon was established in the mid-1920s, according

Executive Reporting Service 37 of 53

Page 87 to Hillsborough County Property Appraiser records. 1 2 The gas station had two driveway connections 3 to State Road 60 and one to Ridgewood Drive. The 4 building on the back also maintained an access from 5 Ridgewood Drive. Throughout the years, the gas 6 station site was improved. 7 The records show the gas pumps canopy has 8 been in existence in its current location/configuration since at least 1988. 9 By the late 1990s, the impervious areas were added on both 10 11 sides of the gas station building and during the 12 widening of State Road 60 in the 1990s, FDOT took 13 the corner of the property along State Road 60 and 14 Ridgewood Avenue. The westernmost access driveway 15 along State Road 60 was eliminated. 16 According to the property -- to the project 17 narrative, the applicant constructed an expansion 18 of the existing 1960 former gas station building 19 without permits. 20 The property is not currently under Code 21 Enforcement action. However, the applicant intends 22 to rectify the situation and obtain zoning approval 23 and after-the-fact building permits to bring this 24 property into compliance. 25 The auto repair shop, Huff Muffler, has been

Executive Reporting Service 38 of 53

Page 88 in operation in this location since 2012. 1 The 2 business initially operated with only two service bays. Since 2012, the applicant expanded the 3 4 business by adding two prefabricated metal 5 structures; one on the eastern side of the original 6 building and the other one on the western side. 7 The gas station canopy, which was 8 constructed in the '80s, remains on the property today. The suburban sector of the State Road 60 9 10 Overlay District does not require building design 11 standards or parking placement requirements. 12 Instead, it requires the provision of a 13 30-foot-wide landscaped buffer along State Road 60, 14 vehicular use area buffering in accordance with the 15 Code. Building facades architecturally finished 16 and specific monument sign design standards. 17 Some of these requirements are triggered 18 when a site undergoes building expansions or 19 renovations, and the cost of such works exceed 20 certain percentage threshold compared to the value 21 of existing buildings on-site. 22 Based on the scale and level of building 23 expansions and renovations since 2012 to date, the 24 site has been subject to the suburban overlay 25 requirements.

Executive Reporting Service 39 of 53

Page 89 The applicant consequently as part of this 1 2 PD rezoning proposes significant changes in addition to maintaining the current building 3 4 expansions to bring the property closer to compliance with the overlay standards and is 5 6 requesting waiver to reduce the buffer area along 7 State Road 60. PD variations to eliminate vehicular use 8 areas are reviewed and are also being requested. 9 10 Other standards of the overlay district will be met. As noted in the project narrative and our 11 12 staff report, there are some changes deemed 13 proposed to the site. 14 So staff removal of the gas canopy. Removal

14 So stall removal of the gas canopy. Removal 15 of noncompliance pole signs. Addition of 16 architecturally finished -- finishes on all the 17 structures. Removal of two access points along 18 Ridgewood Avenue.

19Additional vehicular and pedestrian20stub-outs to adjacent parcels. Addition of a2110-foot landscape buffer along State Road 60.22Removal of the hair salon building to allow the23relocation of the stormwater facilities.24Since the landscape buffer along State Road2560 will be reduced, the PD petition includes a

Executive Reporting Service 40 of 53

waiver request from Section 3.14.06.2. The waiver
requests a variation of 20 feet and associated
plantings to reduce the landscape buffer from
30 feet to 10 feet in the direct frontage of that
parcel.

6 Staff has avoided the applicant 7 justifications to reduce the buffer as reasonable 8 as noted in our staff report. The site has been in 9 operation since the '60s with a canopy area and 10 parking spaces serving the site in front of the 11 building.

12 It has been also subject to FDOT takings, 13 and compared to the current site conditions, no 14 buffer is provided between the parking areas and 15 canopy and the front property line.

Additionally, the applicant has modified the request compared to the original site plan showing 8 feet of front buffer areas and has added two more feet. The applicant has also made modifications to move parking spaces to the back of the building in order to accommodate more buffer area along the frontage.

In addition to the waiver requests to the overlay requirements, the applicant has included two PD variations from Section 6.06.04.E, which

Executive Reporting Service 41 of 53

Page 91 requires 6-foot landscape buffers between vehicular 1 2 use areas and properties adjacent. In this case, the buffer areas are being 3 reduced from 3 feet to the north and one -- to 4 5 1-foot to the east. Staff has reviewed the buffer variation 6 7 justifications submitted by the applicant per LDC 8 Section 5.03.06.C.6 and finds they meet the criteria of approval. The justification provided 9 10 by the applicant -- by the applicant are reasonable. 11 12 Proposed site design, again, will increase 13 green areas to accommodate more landscaping and 14 opening spaces being added to the north where a 15 building exists today. Additionally, adjacent 16 parcels to the north and east also consists of 17 commercial uses. 18 The affected property owner of the parcel 19 surrounding the site, it does not object to this PD 20 rezoning. And similar to the justification for the 21 30-foot waiver request, the proposed alternative 22 and site design by the applicant mitigate the 23 variations being requested. 24 Your recommendation for this application is 25 required to also include a finding on whether the

Executive Reporting Service 42 of 53

Page 92 requested variations meet the criteria of approval 1 2 as part of your final recommendations. To conclude, compared to the current site 3 4 conditions and design, the proposed improvements to 5 the use would provide for an overall site that is 6 significantly closer to the intent of the Brandon 7 Boulevard Overlay District. 8 The intent of this district is to improve the appearance of new and existing development 9 10 along State Road 60 between I-75 and Dover Road by 11 enhancing landscaping, building and sign 12 requirements. 13 The site does not have a buffer today along 14 State Road 60. However, the proposed project will 15 provide 10 feet in direct frontage. Other 16 compatible nearby sites do not provide this buffer. The 10-foot buffer area will include 17 18 landscaping as proposed by Natural Resources. The 19 applicant is also committed to improve existing 20 building with architecturally finished façades as 21 included in the proposed conditions. Stormwater 22 ponds will be placed behind the buildings in 23 accordance with the overlay. 24 And additionally, the impervious surface of 25 the parcel is being overall reduced provided for

Executive Reporting Service 43 of 53

more green space.

1

2 The Planning Commission has found the 3 request consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. No 4 design exception or administrative variances were 5 requested for Transportation Staff review, and they 6 do not object to this request. No objections were received by any reviewing agencies. 7 8 The project will be subject to site development regulations and after-the-fact building 9 10 permits and will be required if the PD is approved 11 under the proposed conditions. 12 As the applicant has stated, we did receive 13 a proposed change to condition No. 3. Natural 14 Resources and Development Services agree with those 15 changes. They will provide for more specificity 16 for the planting along State Road 60. 17 Also, I want to have the applicant clarify 18 that the reduction of the State Road 60 Overlay from 30 feet to 10 feet will be in the direct 19 20 frontage, but due to the FDOT clipping, the 21 diagonal section will be 3 feet. 22 HEARING MASTER HATLEY: Okay. 23 MR. MONSANTO: That concludes my 24 presentation. 25 HEARING MASTER HATLEY: Okay. Thank you

Executive Reporting Service 44 of 53

afe53043-74de-4111-b4a4-eddc1a622eb4

very much, Mr. Monsanto.

1

2

Planning Commission.

MS. MASSEY: Hi. This is Jillian Massey
with Planning Commission staff.

5 The site is designated as Office 6 Commercial-20 or OC-20. It's in the Urban Service 7 Area, and it's within the Urban Center Character 8 District of the Brandon Community Plan.

9 OC-20 surrounds the subject site on all
10 sides. Residential-4 is located further north.
11 Residential-6 is located further to the south.

12 The proposed rezoning meets the intent of 13 the OC-20 category as it is an anticipated use in 14 this corridor and this Future Land Use Category 15 has -- the proposal is -- has an FAR of 0.22.

Planning Commission staff believes that this proposal is sensitive to the existing character of the area, which is already prominent -- a prominent commercial corridor in the county where similar and complementary uses already exist.

The proposal meets the intent of Policy 1.4 of the Future Land Use Element. The proposed rezoning also meets the intent of the neighborhood protection policies of Objective 16 and Policy 16.1, 16.2, 16.3, 16.5, 16.10, and 17.7.

Executive Reporting Service 45 of 53

1 The development pattern of the surrounding 2 area has a concentration of the most intense uses 3 along State Road 60 and decrease of intensity 4 further up along Ridgewood Avenue into the 5 residential areas.

6 Similarly, the applicant has designed the 7 site so that the internal arrangement of the uses 8 also reflects this pattern. The Community Design 9 Component provides guidance on commercial 10 developments. Goal 17 encourages developments that 11 improve the ambience of commercial development in 12 the county.

Objective 17-1 and Policy 17.1-4 seeks to facilitate patterns of development that are organized and purposeful. The internal arrangement of the site is such that it complements the character of the surrounding area in terms of the scale and intensity of the uses.

19The subject site meets the intent of the20Urban Center Character District of the Brandon21Community Plan. The Urban Center Character22District is intended for the most intense land uses23in the area and an auto repair use is not out of24character for the surrounding area.25Based on these considerations, the Planning

Executive Reporting Service 46 of 53

Page 96 Commission staff finds that the proposed Planned 1 2 Development is consistent with the Future of 3 Hillsborough Comprehensive Plan for unincorporated 4 Hillsborough County subject to the conditions 5 proposed by the Development Services Department. 6 Thank you. HEARING MASTER HATLEY: All right. 7 Thank 8 you. 9 Is there anyone here or online who wishes to speak in support of this application? 10 11 MS. LORTON: Good evening. For the 12 record -- hold on a minute. Good evening, 13 Ms. Hatley and staff. My name is Janet Lorton, and I'm here today as a private citizen. I'm not in my 14 15 role or official capacity at EPC. 16 I've known Mr. and Mrs. Wright, Amanda and 17 Justin, for a long time. They're just the greatest 18 people. They're a young couple with young 19 children. And as Amanda said, just trying to live 20 the American dream, and they've been at this for 21 several years, and I do commend them for what 22 they've achieved working with staff. 23 But I do have some concerns. I am in 24 support of this rezoning, in support of the staff 25 recommendation. As the Planning Commission just

Executive Reporting Service 47 of 53

1 said, it is consistent with what you're trying to 2 achieve in overlay district. But the overlay 3 district is where I think there's -- maybe needs to 4 be revisited.

5 One of the things about revisiting this was 6 there are projects within the overlay district. 7 You saw one of them, Jiffy Lube, that went through 8 a variance and literally is not meeting the same 9 criteria that they are.

And there's other projects within, you know, several blocks, you know, that, again, don't meet what they have to meet in this request. And the one of the things that Mr. Israel was saying is there's two -- actually two overlay districts from for most restrictive of those.

17 One of the things that I think should be 18 revisited was what triggered this process with a 19 threshold. A threshold of what the building was 20 worth to the property value.

21 And the reality was that was that came up 22 from staff. And they proposed a third-party 23 evaluation -- property evaluation and that -- that 24 just wasn't considered. And I think maybe moving 25 forward, those things should be considered to find

Executive Reporting Service 48 of 53

solutions.

1

2 As she said, they've gone through many iterations with staff, and I'm glad that we've 3 finally come to some kind of sensible conclusion. 4 5 But, you know, it costs a lot of money with lawyers 6 and engineers that she said. But the target kept moving and I talked to 7 8 Amanda every month. Sometimes more than once a month. We're friends. And I would ask her how 9 10 things were going, and she would say, This is what 11 we have to do, and then this is what we have to do, and then that's what we have to do. 12 13 So maybe moving forward, just tell an 14 applicant what they need to do so they can achieve 15 what that is instead of spending a lot of money and 16 time. Let's see if there's anything else I wanted 17 to get on the record. 18 They've been strong supporters of the 19 community. And they have lots of referral letters.

20 But again, employing people -- and I think that's 21 one of the things that I think in this solution was 22 to capitulate and get rid of one business and get 23 rid of those employees.

24That seemed a pretty hard solution to me for25having to get to an acceptable outcome, but again,

Executive Reporting Service 49 of 53

Page 99 I am in support of what they want and what they 1 2 want for their business, but I think back to the '92 gravel business that came forward with the 3 4 family. Didn't have any staff approval, and it was 5 approved by the BOCC, because, again, these 6 businesses were there or the structures were there 7 from 1925 and 1960. So maybe that needs to be 8 looked at for grandfathering. Again, I'm in support. I think they have 9 one of the nicest-looking businesses. 10 I think they're some of the hardest working people and 11 12 they're good community partners. And I hope you 13 will approve this application as it comes to you 14 today. Thank you. 15 HEARING MASTER HATLEY: Thank you, 16 Ms. Lorton. Be sure and sign in with the clerk, 17 please. Thank you. 18 Is there anyone else who wishes to speak in 19 support of this application? 20 All right. Is there anyone here or online 21 who wishes to speak in opposition to this 22 application? I do not hear anyone. 23 All right. Development Services? 24 MR. GRADY: Nothing further. 25 HEARING MASTER HATLEY: Mr. Monsanto stated

Executive Reporting Service 50 of 53

Page 100 that he wished the applicant to confirm they 1 2 understood something specific, and I didn't catch exactly what that was. 3 4 Maybe we need to restate that and have the 5 applicant's representative confirm that. 6 MR. MONSANTO: Yes. Israel Monsanto, Development Services. 7 8 Yes. We want the applicant to verify that the 30-foot buffer reduction is exactly along the 9 10 frontage of the parcel because there's a click that was taken by the FDOT that's reduced to 3 feet, 11 12 which is not exactly (unintelligible). I just want 13 them to put on the record because that's what's in 14 the proposed site plan. 15 MR. CREMER: Jay Cremer for the record. 16 Could you clarify the question or I'm 17 just -- I'm not understanding what the -- what 18 you're --MR. MONSANTO: Yeah. So the 30-foot buffer 19 20 reduction is 10 feet on the frontage, and there is 21 a 3-foot buffer on the diagonal corner of the 22 parcel, which is the area where the FDOT clipped 23 the parcel, which is 3 feet. 24 So I just wanted to clarify that. The 25 reduction is going to be 10 feet on the south

Executive Reporting Service 51 of 53

Page 101 frontage and then 3 feet on that diagonal area. 1 So 2 that's the buffer approval in that clip from that 3 diagonal area. 4 MR. CREMER: Yes, that's correct. 5 HEARING MASTER HATLEY: Okay. Thank you. 6 Development Services, thank you. 7 Applicant, in your rebuttal and summation, 8 just also clarify or confirm that the applicant understands if they -- if the PD rezoning is 9 approved, they still have to obtain after-the-fact 10 11 permits for those building expansions. MR. CREMER: Yes, ma'am. Again, Jay Cremer 12 13 for the record. 14 We do understand that, and our intent is if 15 this is approved, that will be our next step. 16 Again, the -- you know, the applicant is -- it's 17 been a long journey, and we think we've come up 18 with a good proposal to meet in the middle with staff. 19 You know, as one of the -- as the public 20 comments were mentioned, we didn't always 21 22 necessarily agree with staff on which -- which 23 provisions of the overlay applied because the 24 Brandon Overlay, it has something I've never seen 25 before, which is the more improvements you do to

Executive Reporting Service 52 of 53
Page 102 your property, the more restrictions kick in. 1 2 And so it actually ends up being a pretty 3 big distance in it for property owners on the 4 existing structures to improve them. But be 5 that -- you know, be that as it may, we worked 6 really hard with staff. 7 We're comfortable. We've, you know, come to a good middle ground, and I think the community's 8 9 going to be really proud of this facility. So 10 thank you. 11 HEARING MASTER HATLEY: Thank you, 12 Mr. Cremer. 13 All right. That will close the hearing on Rezoning-PD 22-0684. 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25



Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission

Unincorporated Hillsborough County Rezoning				
Hearing Date: September 19, 2022 Report Prepared: September 7, 2022	Petition: PD 22-0684 702 East Brandon Boulevard Within the northeast quadrant of the East Brandon Boulevard (State Road 60) and Ridgewood Avenue intersection.			
Summary Data:	·			
Comprehensive Plan Finding:	CONSISTENT			
Adopted Future Land Use:	Office Commercial-20 (20 du/ga; 0.75 FAR)			
Service Area	Urban			
Community Plan:	Brandon			
Requested Zoning:	Commercial General (CG) to a Planned Development (PD) for 5,384 square feet of auto repair uses.			
Parcel Size (Approx.):	0.56 acres +/- (24,393 square feet)			
Street Functional Classification:	East Brandon Boulevard/ SR 60 – Arterial Ridgewood Avenue - Local			
Locational Criteria	N/A			
Evacuation Zone	None			



Plan Hillsborough planhillsborough.org planner@plancom.org 813 – 272 – 5940 601 E Kennedy Blvd 18th floor Tampa, FL, 33602

Context

- The approximately 0.56 +/- acre subject site is located at 702 East Brandon Boulevard (State Road 60) on the north side of East Brandon Boulevard/SR 60, east of Ridgewood Avenue. The subject site is located within the Urban Service Area and is within the limits of the Brandon Community Plan, in the Urban Center Character District.
- The subject site's Future Land Use classification is Office Commercial-20 (OC-20) on the Future Land Use Map. Typical uses of OC-20 include: Community commercial type uses, office uses, mixed use developments, and compatible residential uses. OC-20 surrounds the subject site on all sides. Residential-4 (RES-4) is located further to the north. Residential-6 (RES-6) is located further to the south.
- The subject site is currently developed with light commercial uses, auto repair uses and a hair salon. There are light commercial uses along the north side East Brandon Boulevard/ State Road 60 as it is a commercial corridor. A church is located to the south of the site, across SR 60. There are a number of grocery stores and restaurants in the surrounding area and a pocket of multi-family uses to the southwest and northeast of the site. Single Family residential uses are located further north and south of SR 60.
- The subject site is currently zoned as Commercial General (CG). CG zoning is located to the north, east and west of the subject site. Planned Development zoning is located to the northwest and further northeast of the subject site. Residential Single-Family Conventional-6 (RSC-6) is located to the south, north and further northwest of the subject site. Business Professional Office (BPO) is located to the northwest of the side. Along SR 60, there are pockets of Commercial Neighborhood (CN) zoning districts to the west. Residential Duplex Conventional-12 (RDC-12) is located to the northeast of the subject site. Residential Multifamily Conventional-12 (RMC-12) and Residential Multifamily Conventional-16 (RMC-16) is located to the northwest of the site.
- The applicant is requesting to rezone the subject site from Commercial General (CG) to a Planned Development (PD) to allow for 5,384 square feet of auto repair uses.

Compliance with Comprehensive Plan:

The following Goals, Objectives, and Policies apply to this rezoning request and are used as a basis for a consistency finding.

Future Land Use Element

Urban Service Area (USA)

Objective 1: Hillsborough County shall pro-actively direct new growth into the urban service area with the goal that at least 80% of all population growth will occur within the USA during the planning horizon of this Plan. Within the Urban Service Area, Hillsborough County will not impede agriculture. Building permit activity and other similar measures will be used to evaluate this objective.

Policy 1.4: Compatibility is defined as the characteristics of different uses or activities or design which allow them to be located near or adjacent to each other in harmony. Some elements

affecting compatibility include the following: height, scale, mass and bulk of structures, pedestrian or vehicular traffic, circulation, access and parking impacts, landscaping, lighting, noise, odor and architecture. Compatibility does not mean "the same as." Rather, it refers to the sensitivity of development proposals in maintaining the character of existing development.

Relationship to Land Development Regulations

Objective 9: All existing and future land development regulations shall be made consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, and all development approvals shall be consistent with those development regulations as per the timeframe provided for within Chapter 163, Florida Statutes. Whenever feasible and consistent with Comprehensive Plan policies, land development regulations shall be designed to provide flexible, alternative solutions to problems.

Policy 9.1: Each land use plan category shall have a set of zoning districts that may be permitted within that land use plan category, and development shall not be approved for zoning that is inconsistent with the plan.

Policy 9.2: Developments must meet or exceed the requirements of all land development regulations as established and adopted by Hillsborough County, the state of Florida and the federal government unless such requirements have been previously waived by those governmental bodies.

Neighborhood/Community Development

Objective 16: Neighborhood Protection The neighborhood is a functional unit of community development. There is a need to protect existing neighborhoods and communities and those that will emerge in the future. To preserve, protect and enhance neighborhoods and communities, all new development must conform to the following policies.

Policy 16.1: Established and planned neighborhoods and communities shall be protected by restricting incompatible land uses through mechanisms such as:

- a) locational criteria for the placement of non-residential uses as identified in this Plan,
- b) limiting commercial development in residential land use categories to neighborhood scale;
- c) requiring buffer areas and screening devices between unlike land uses;

Policy 16.2: Gradual transitions of intensities between different land uses shall be provided for as new development is proposed and approved, through the use of professional site planning, buffering and screening techniques and control of specific land uses.

Policy 16.3: Development and redevelopment shall be integrated with the adjacent land uses through:

- a) the creation of like uses; or
- b) creation of complementary uses; or
- c) mitigation of adverse impacts; and
- d) transportation/pedestrian connections

Policy 16.5: Development of higher intensity non-residential land uses that are adjacent to established neighborhoods shall be restricted to collectors and arterials and to locations external to established and developing neighborhoods.

Policy 16.10: Any density increase shall be compatible with existing, proposed or planned surrounding development. Compatibility is defined as the characteristics of different uses or activities or design which allow them to be located near or adjacent to each other in harmony. Some elements affecting compatibility include the following: height, scale, mass and bulk of structures, pedestrian or vehicular traffic, circulation, access and parking impacts, landscaping, lighting, noise, odor and architecture. Compatibility does not mean "the same as". Rather, it refers to the sensitivity of development proposals in maintaining the character of existing development.

Policy 17.7: New development and redevelopment must mitigate the adverse noise, visual, odor and vibration impacts created by that development upon all adjacent land uses.

Community Design Component

4.3 COMMERCIAL CHARACTER

GOAL 9: Evaluate the creation of commercial design standards in a scale and design that complements the character of the community.

Policy 9-1.2: Avoid "strip" development patterns for commercial uses.

7.0 SITE DESIGN

7.1 DEVELOPMENT PATTERN

GOAL 17: Develop commercial areas in a manner which enhances the County's character and ambiance.

OBJECTIVE 17-1: Facilitate patterns of site development that appear purposeful and organized.

Policy 17-1.4: Affect the design of new commercial structures to provide an organized and purposeful character for the whole commercial environment.

Livable Communities Element - Brandon Community Plan

Goal 6: Re-establish Brandon's historical, hospitable, and family oriented character through thoughtful planning and forward thinking development practices by concentrating density in certain areas to preserve the semi-rural lifestyle of other areas. Attempt to buffer and transition uses in concentric circles where possible with most intense uses in an area at a node (intersection) and proceeding out from there. Create a plan for how areas could be developed and redeveloped for the future. Each of these areas would have potential for different building heights, parking configurations, fencing, buffering, landscape requirements, special use limitations, and design standards. These standards apply to new construction on infill property, redevelopment of undesirable areas and renovation of existing buildings. The primary consideration of all changes should be compatibility with existing structures to ensure neighborhood preservation.

3. Implement Brandon Character Districts to protect established neighborhoods and historic patterns of development.

5. General design characteristics for each Brandon Character District are described below. The design characteristics are descriptive as to the general nature of the vicinity and its surroundings and do not affect the Future Land Use or zoning of properties in effect at the time of adoption of the Brandon Community Plan. Any proposed changes to the zoning of property may proceed in accordance with the Land Development Code.

a. Urban Center -- This area contains the most intense land uses and includes regional shopping areas and the State Road 60 Overlay District. Commercial and mixed-use developments will be encouraged with varying building heights between 3-10 stories.

Staff Analysis of Goals, Objectives and Policies

The 0.56 acre subject site is located at 702 East Brandon Boulevard, on the north side of East Brandon Boulevard/ State Road 60 (SR 60), and east of Ridgewood Avenue. The site is in the Urban Service Area and is within the limits of the Urban Center Character District of the Brandon Community Plan. The subject site's Future Land Use Classification on the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) is Office Commercial-20 (OC-20). The applicant is requesting to rezone the subject site from Commercial General (CG) to a Planned Development (PD) to permit 5,384 square feet of auto repair uses.

According to Appendix A of the Future Land Use Element (FLUE), the intent of the OC-20 category is "to recognize existing commercial and office centers and provide for future development opportunities. New retail development should be part of a mixed-use development or be clustered at the intersections of major roadways. Retail uses should be discouraged outside of these nodes." OC-20 surrounds the subject site on all sides. Residential-4 (RES-4) is located further to the north. Residential-6 (RES-6) is located further to the south. The proposed rezoning meets the intent of the OC-20 category as it is an anticipated use in this corridor and in this Future Land Use category and at an FAR of 0.22.

The subject site is located in the Urban Service Area where according to Objective 1 of the Future Land Use Element (FLUE), 80 percent of the county's growth is to be directed. Policy 1.4 requires all new developments to be compatible with the surrounding area, noting that "Compatibility does not mean "the same as." Rather, it refers to the sensitivity of development proposals in maintaining the character of existing development." The subject site is proposing a rezoning to PD to bring the existing structure that was expanded without permits into alignment with acceptable development standards. The applicant is proposing to remove the multiple access points as well as removal of the existing hair salon use on the north side. Planning Commission staff believes this to be sensitive to the existing character of the area which is already a prominent commercial corridor in the county where similar and complementary uses already exist. The proposal meets the intent of Policy 1.4 of the FLUE.

The proposed rezoning meets the intent of Objective 9 and Policy 9.2 of the FLUE that require development to adhere to all local, state and federal land development regulations. The applicant has redesigned the site to be sensitive to compatibility but is requesting waivers to buffering and screening on the south, north and eastern sides of the property. The applicant is also asking for a waiver regarding the assessed value of the building on site. The applicant has also agreed to provide pedestrian connectivity with surrounding commercial uses and has agreed to remove the multiple access points from Ridgewood Avenue and provide one full access from Ridgewood Avenue and one access from State Road 60. Pedestrian cross access to the north and east will be provided. The applicant is also proposing architectural finishes and will conform with the signage requirements. At

the time of uploading this report final Transportation and Zoning comments were not yet available in Optix and therefore the Planning Commission Staff finding did not take them into consideration for the analysis of this request.

The proposed rezoning meets the intent of the Neighborhood Protection Policies of Objective 16 and policies 16.1, 16.2, 16.3, 16.5, 16.10 and 17.7. The development pattern of the surrounding area has a concentration of the most intense uses along SR 60 and a decrease of intensity farther up along Ridgewood Avenue into residential areas. Similarly, the applicant has designed the site plan so that the internal arrangement of the uses also reflects this pattern. The applicant has proposed to remove the hair salon use on the northside to make way for a stormwater retention pond and provide adequate room for one access off of Ridgewood Avenue.

The Community Design Component provides guidance on commercial developments. Goal 17 encourages developments that improve the ambiance of commercial development in the county. Objective 17-1 and Policy 17.1-4 seek to facilitate patterns of development that are organized and purposeful. The internal arrangement of the site is such that it complements the character of the surrounding area in terms of the scale and intensity of uses. The applicant has removed the hair salon use as well as the multiple access points that ensure the site does not appear to further a pattern of strip commercial development.

The subject site meets the intent of the Urban Center Character District of the Brandon Community Plan. The Urban Center Character District is intended for the most intense land uses in the area and an auto repair use is not out of character for the surrounding area.

Overall, the proposed Planned Development would allow for development that is consistent with the Goals, Objectives and Policies of the *Future of Hillsborough Comprehensive Plan for Unincorporated Hillsborough County* and is compatible with the existing and planned development pattern found in the surrounding area.

Recommendation

Based upon the above considerations, the Planning Commission staff finds the proposed Planned Development **CONSISTENT** with the *Future of Hillsborough Comprehensive Plan for Unincorporated Hillsborough County,* subject to the conditions of the Development Services Department.



HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY **FUTURE LAND USE** RZ PD 22-0684

URBAN MIXED USE-20 (1.0 FAR) REGIONAL MIXED USE-35 (2.0 FAR) RESEARCH CORPORATE PARK (1.0 FAR) ENERGY INDUSTRIAL PARK (.50 FAR USES OTHER THAN RETAIL, .25 FAR RETAIL/COMMERCE) LIGHT INDUSTRIAL PLANNED (.50 FAR) LIGHT INDUSTRIAL (.50 FAR) HEAVY INDUSTRIAL (.50 FAR) PUBLIC/QUASI-PUBLIC NATURAL PRESERVATION WIMAUMA VILLAGE RESIDENTIAL-2 (.25 FAR) CITRUS PARK VILLAGE Hillsborough County Property Appraiser. REPRODUCTION: This sheet may not be reproduced in part or full for sale to anyone without specific approval of the Hillsborough County Safe to allybrit this many appears and appears appears appears appears and appears appears appears appears and appears appears appears appears appears and appears appears and appears appears appears appears and appears appears and appears appears and appears and appears appears appears appears appears and appears and appears and appears appears and appears appears and app



920 1,380 1,840 Fee

File: G:\RezoningSystem\MapProjects\HC\Greg_hcRezoning - Copy.mxd

Hillsborough County

GENERAL SITE PLAN FOR CERTIFICATION



DEVELOPMENT SERVICES PO Box 1110, Tampa, FL 33601-1110 (813) 272-5600

HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT

GENERAL SITE PLAN REVIEW/CERTIFICATION

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Harry Cohen Ken Hagan Pat Kemp Gwendolyn "Gwen" Myers Kimberly Overman Mariella Smith Stacy R. White COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR Bonnie M. Wise COUNTY ATTORNEY Christine M. Beck INTERNAL AUDITOR Peggy Caskey

DEPUTY COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR Gregory S. Horwedel

Project Name: Huff Muffler Of	Bandon, LLC
Zoning File: RZ-PD (22-0684)	Modification: None
Atlas Page: None	Submitted: 10/19/22
To Planner for Review: 10/19/22	Date Due: ASAP
Contact Person: Jacob T Cremer	813-223-4800/ jcremer@stearnsweaver.com/ Cwalden@Stearnsweaver.com Phone:
Right-Of-Way or Land Required for D	Dedication: Yes No
The Development Services Departme	ent HAS NO OBJECTION to this General Site Plan.
The Development Services Departme Site Plan for the following reasons:	ent RECOMMENDS DISAPPROVAL of this General
Reviewed by: Israel Monsanto	D Date: 10/20/22
Date Agent/Owner notified of Disappr	roval:



PROJECT DATA LAND USE INFORMATION		
PARCEL ID	U-23-29-20-222-000002-59820.0	8820.0
FOUID	069067-0000	
ADDRESS	702 E. BRANDON BLVD., BRANDON, FL 2	ON, FL 2
FUTURE LAND USE DESIGNATION	8	
EXISTING ZONING	CG-SR60 OVERLAY	
PROPOSED ZONING	PD (AUTO REPAIR)	
TOTAL PROJECT ACREAGE	24,244 SF/0.56 AC.	
TOTAL ESTIMATE WETLAND ACREAGE	NONE	
PROPOSED CONNERCIAL LOT STANDARDS	PROPOSED	
MINIMUM LOT SIZE	24,244 SF	
MINIMUM LOT WETH	94 FT	
MINIUUN FRONT YARD SETBACK (SR 60)	65 FT	
MINIMUM ZND FRONT YARD SETBACK (RIDGEMOOD AVE.)	9 FT	
MINIMUM SIDE YARD SETBACK (E)	0 FT	
MINIMUM SIDE YARD SETBACK (N)	81 FT	
MAXMUM BUILDING HEIGHT	25 FT	

MAXIMUM BUILDING COVERAGE MAXIMUM IMPERVIOUS SURFACE RATIO

33511

GENERAL NOTES	
OVERLAY DISTRICT(S)	SREO
URBAN SERVICE AREA	YES
SPECIAL ZONE(S)	NONE
DESIGNATED SCENIC ROADWAY CORRIDOR(S)	NONE
DESIGNATED LANDWARKS/HISTORIC/ARCH ONSITE & MTHIN 150	NONE
A GENERAL INTERPRETATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL FEATURES	AS SHOWN FLOOD ZONE "X" PER FIRM MAP 12057V 0385H REVISED AUGUST 28, 2008
EXISTING LAND USE	AUTO REPAIR/PERSONAL SERVICES
EXISTING STRUCTURE	LARGER STRUCTURE TO REMAIN SMALLER STRUCTURE TO BE REMOVED
EXISTING WATER SERVICE	HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY
EXISTING SEMER SERVICE	HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY
ARCHITECTURAL FINISHES	THE BULDMC IS SUBJECT TO ARCHITECTURAL FINISHES (REFER TO CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL)

REQUIRED: PROPOSED: 15 SP 17 SP NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES: AUTO REPAIR(MAJOR): 3SP/BAY*(5 BAYS)

OF COMPACT SPACES OF REQUIRED = 3 SP OF 15 REQ (20%)

PROFESSIONAL TEAM CHART BENERT, AND CHART REPEAT AND CHART AND CHART REPEAT AND CHART AND CHART REPEAT AND CHART AND CHART AND CHART AND CHART REPEAT AND CHART AND CHART AND CHART AND CHART REPEAT AND CHART AND CHART AND CHART AND CHART AND CHART REPEAT AND CHART A
I

N TABLE	
FOR SITE DESIGN	
DE	
SITI	CODE
FOR	
VARIATIONS	Mati 109i Bris Buog
ΡD	010
	6

WAIVER 20 FT 5 FT 3 FT

3.14.06 6.06.04.E.

LANDSCAPE BUFFER & ASSOCATED PLANTINGS (5960) LANDSCAPE BUFFER (EAST) LANDSCAPE BUFFER (DRFH)



LOCATION MAP

of the Bast 1/2 of LEQUID DESCription. Level 2012 Best 2014 Description. South. Best 2014 Description. South. Best 2014 Description. South. Best 2014 Description. South. Best 2014 Description. Description of the south Best 2014 Description of BESIMME. LESS the period and Description. The south Best 2014 Description Description. BESIMMER: Inters contrained and and and BESIMMER: Inters contrained and and BES



Received tober 19, 2022

KĘ

19953

4444 XOB .0.9 57365 FL 3567 6010-135 (518) :H9 9710-135 (518) :XA3 973-97090569 973-9709059 973-9709059 973-9709059 973-9709 973-9709 973-9709 973-9709 973-9709 973-9709 973-970 975-970 975-970 975-970 975-970 975-970 975-970 975-970 975-970



22-0684

3TAQ

AGENCY COMMENTS

AGENCY REVIEW COMMENT SHEET

TO: Zoning Technician, Development Services Department

REVIEWER: Alex Steady, AICP, Senior Planner

PLANNING AREA/SECTOR: Brandon/ Central

DATE: 9/09/2022 AGENCY/DEPT: Transportation PETITION NO: RZ 22-0684

	This agency has no comments.
	This agency has no objection.
Х	This agency has no objection, subject to the listed or attached conditions.
	This agency objects for the reasons set forth below.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

- 1. Notwithstanding anything herein these conditions or on the PD site plan to the contrary, bicycle and pedestrian access may be permitted anywhere along the project boundaries.
- 2. The project shall be served by, and limited to, one (1) access connection to Brandon Blvd. and one (1) access connection to Ridgewood Ave. as shown on the PD site plan. All other existing access connections shall be closed and the applicant shall install curbing, sod and/or extend sidewalks, as appropriate.
- 3. The developer shall construct a vehicular and pedestrian cross-access stub out along as generally shown on the PD site plan.

Other Conditions

- Prior to PD Site Plan Certification, the applicant shall revise the PD Site Plan to:
 - Revise "Vehicle Stub out" Label on the north side of the site to read "Cross Access"

PROJECT SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS

The applicant is requesting to rezone one parcel, totaling ± -0.59 ac., from Commercial General (CG) to Planned Development (PD). The proposed PD is seeking entitlements for a 5,384 sf of auto repair facility. The applicant is proposing to demolish the smaller structure used as a hair salon on the northern side of the property as well as the existing gas canopy on site. The applicant is also proposing a variety of access changes, which are further described in the "Site Access" section of this report hereinbelow.

As required by the Development Review Procedures Manual (DRPM), the applicant submitted a trip generation for the proposed project. The applicants submitted trip generation did not exceed the 50 peak hour trips that would require detailed analysis.

Staff has prepared a comparison of the trips potentially generated under the existing and proposed zoning designations, utilizing a generalized worst-case scenario. The information below is based on data from the Institute of Transportation Engineer's <u>Trip Generation Manual</u>, 11th Edition.

Approved Uses:			
	24 Hour Two	Total Peak	
Zoning, Land Use/Size	24 Hour Two- Way Volume	Hour	Trips
	way volume	AM	PM
CG, 6,900 sf Pharmacy/Drugstore with Drive -			
Through Window	753	26	71
(ITE Code 881)			

Proposed Uses:

Zoning, Land Use/Size	24 Hour Two-	Total Peak Hour Trips	
	Way Volume	AM	PM
PD, 5,384 sf Automobile Care Center (ITE Code 942)	170	12	17

Trip Generation Difference:

Zoning, Land Use/Size	24 Hour Two- Way Volume	Total Peak Hour Trips	
	way volume		PM
Difference	-583	-14	-54

TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE SERVING THE SITE

The site has frontage on Brandon Blvd and Ridgewood Ave. Brandon Blvd is an 8-lane divided FDOT maintained principal Arterial Roadway characterized by +/- 12-foot-wide travel lanes. The roadway lies within a +/- 188-foot-wide right-of-way in the vicinity of the proposed project. There are bicycle facilities, sidewalks and curb and gutter on both sides of the roadway in the vicinity of the project.

Ridgewood Ave. is a 2-lane, undivided, publicly maintained, substandard, local roadway characterized by +/- 12-foot-wide travel lanes. There are no bicycle facilities present along Ridgewood Ave in the vicinity of the proposed project. There are sidewalks and curb on the east side of Ridgewood Ave in the vicinity of the project.

SITE ACCESS AND CONNECTIVITY

<u>Generally</u>

The applicant is proposing two access connections to serve the proposed project. Both proposed access points are existing. One existing full access on to Brandon Blvd is proposed. The second proposed access is on the northwest side of the project to Ridgewood Ave. The Applicant is proposing to remove the existing southernmost access on to Ridgewood Avenue due to LDC corner spacing requirements.

Cross Access

The PD site plan is showing vehicular and pedestrian cross access stub out to the parcel to the east, as required pursuant to Sec. 6.04.03.Q. of the LDC.

ROADWAY LEVEL OF SERVICE

Level of Service (LOS) information for adjacent roadway section(s) is reported below.

Roadway	From	То	LOS Standard	Peak Hour Directional LOS
SR 60/ BRANDON BLVD	KINGSWAY RD	VALRICO RD	D	С

Source: Hillsborough County 2020 Level of Service Report.

3.0 TRANSPORTATION SUMMARY (FULL TRANSPORTATION REPORT IN SECTION 9 OF STAFF REPORT)

Adjoining Roadways (check if applicable)					
Road Name	Classification	Current Conditions	Select Future Improvements		
Brandon Blvd	FDOT Principal Arterial - Urban	8 Lanes □Substandard Road □Sufficient ROW Width	 Corridor Preservation Plan Site Access Improvements Substandard Road Improvements Other 		
Ridgewood Ave	County Local - Urban	2 Lanes ⊠ Substandard Road □ Sufficient ROW Width	 Corridor Preservation Plan Site Access Improvements Substandard Road Improvements Other 		

Project Trip Generation Not applicable for this request			
	Average Annual Daily Trips	A.M. Peak Hour Trips	P.M. Peak Hour Trips
Existing	753	26	71
Proposed	170	12	17
Difference (+/-)	-583	-14	-54

*Trips reported are based on net new external trips unless otherwise noted.

Connectivity and Cross Access ONot applicable for this request				
Project Boundary	Primary Access	Additional Connectivity/Access	Cross Access	Finding
North		None	None	Meets LDC
South	Х	None	None	Meets LDC
East		None	Vehicular & Pedestrian	Meets LDC
West		Vehicular & Pedestrian	Pedestrian	Meets LDC
Notes:	•	·	•	•

Design Exception/Administrative Variance ⊠Not applicable for this request		
Road Name/Nature of Request	Туре	Finding
	Choose an item.	Choose an item.
	Choose an item.	Choose an item.
Notes:	·	

4.0 Additional Site Information & Agency Comments Summary			
Transportation	Objections	Conditions Requested	Additional Information/Comments
 Design Exception/Adm. Variance Requested Off-Site Improvements Provided 	□ Yes □N/A ⊠ No	⊠ Yes □ No	See Staff Report.



RON DESANTIS GOVERNOR

605 Suwannee Street Tallahassee, FL 32399-0450 JARED W. PERDUE, P.E. SECRETARY

MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 8, 2022

TO: Ashley Rome, Hillsborough County

FROM: Lindsey Mineer, FDOT

COPIES: Daniel Santos, FDOT Mecale' Roth, FDOT Richard Perez, Hillsborough County Jacob T. Cremer – Stearns Weaver Miller

SUBJECT: RZ-PD 22-0684, 702 E Brandon Blvd

This project is on a state road, SR 60.

The applicant is advised that permits for access to state highways are required, and approval is not guaranteed. The applicant is reminded that zoning application and site development plan approvals by the local government do not guarantee acceptance of external project driveway location(s) on state roads.

It is recommended that the applicant meet with FDOT before zoning approval. Preapplication meetings may be made through Ms. Mecale' Roth at the District Seven Tampa Operations offices of the Florida Department of Transportation.

Contact info: Mecale' Roth <u>Mecale.Roth@dot.state.fl.us</u> 813-612-3237

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

END OF MEMO

COMMISSION

Mariella Smith CHAIR Pat Kemp VICE-CHAIR Harry Cohen Ken Hagan Gwendolyn "Gwen" W. Myers Kimberly Overman Stacy White



DIRECTORS

Janet D. Lorton EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR Elaine S. DeLeeuw ADMIN DIVISION Sam Elrabi, P.E. WATER DIVISION Rick Muratti, Esq. LEGAL DEPT Reginald Sanford, MPH AIR DIVISION Steffanie L. Wickham WASTE DIVISION Sterlin Woodard, P.E. WETLANDS DIVISION

AGENCY COMMENT SHEET

REZONING			
HEARING DATE: 6/13/2022	COMMENT DATE: 4/8/2022		
PETITION NO.: 22-0684	PROPERTY ADDRESS: 702 E Brandon Blvd, Brandon, FL 33511		
EPC REVIEWER: Melissa Yanez CONTACT INFORMATION: (813) 627-2600	FOLIO #: 0690670000		
X1360	STR: 23-29 S -20E		
EMAIL: yanezm@epchc.org			
REQUESTED ZONING: : From CG to PD			
FINDINGS			
WETLANDS PRESENT	NO		
SITE INSPECTION DATE	NA		
WETLAND LINE VALIDITY	NA		
WETLANDS VERIFICATION (AERIAL PHOTO,	NA - Aerial, Historic Soil Survey and EPC File		
SOILS SURVEY, EPC FILES)	Review conducted. No wetlands apparent within		
	parcel.		
INFORMATIONAL COMMENTS:			

Wetlands Management Division staff of the Environmental Protection Commission of Hillsborough County (EPC) conducted an aerial review of the above referenced site in order to determine the extent of any wetlands and other surface waters pursuant to Chapter 1-11, Rules of the EPC. The review revealed that no wetlands or other surface waters were apparent within the above referenced parcel.

Please be advised this wetland determination is informal and non-binding. A formal wetland delineation may be applied for by submitting a "WDR30 - Delineation Request Application". Once approved, the formal wetland delineation would be binding for five years.

My/mst

Environmental Excellence in a Changing World

AGENCY REVIEW COMMENT SHEET

TO: ZONING TECHNICIAN, Planning Growth Manag	DATE: <u>13 Apr. 2022</u>
REVIEWER: Bernard W. Kaiser, Conservation and Er	wironmental Lands Management
APPLICANT: Jocob Cremer	PETITION NO: <u>RZ-PD 22-0684</u>
LOCATION: 702 E. Brandon Blvd., Brandon, FL 33511	
FOLIO NO: <u>69067.0000</u>	SEC: <u>23</u> TWN: <u>29</u> RNG: <u>20</u>

 \square This agency has no comments.

This agency has no objection.

This agency has no objection, subject to listed or attached conditions.

This agency objects, based on the listed or attached conditions.

COMMENTS: _____.

WATER RESOURCE SERVICES REZONING REVIEW COMMENT SHEET: WATER & WASTEWATER

 PETITION NO.:
 PD22-0684
 REVIEWED BY:
 Randy Rochelle
 DATE:
 4/25/2022

 FOLIO NO.:
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000
 69067.0000</td

WATER

- The property lies within the _____ Water Service Area. The applicant should contact the provider to determine the availability of water service.
- A <u>8</u> inch water main exists (adjacent to the site), (approximately <u>feet from</u> the site) <u>and is located within the north Right-of-Way of E. Brandon Boulevard</u>. This will be the likely point-of-connection, however there could be additional and/or different points-of-connection determined at the time of the application for service. This is not a reservation of capacity.
- Water distribution system improvements will need to be completed prior to connection to the County's water system. The improvements include ______ and will need to be completed by the ______ prior to issuance of any building permits that will create additional demand on the system.

WASTEWATER

The property lies within the _____ Wastewater Service Area. The applicant should contact the provider to determine the availability of wastewater service.

- A <u>4</u> inch wastewater force main exists (adjacent to the site), (approximately feet from the site) and is located within the east Right-of-Way of Ridgewood Avenue. This will be the likely point-of-connection, however there could be additional and/or different points-of-connection determined at the time of the application for service. This is not a reservation of capacity.
- Wastewater collection system improvements will need to be completed prior to connection to the County's wastewater system. The improvements include ______ and will need to be completed by the _____ prior to issuance of any building permits that will create additional demand on the system.

COMMENTS: <u>The subject rezoning includes parcels that are within the Urban Service Area</u> and would require connection to the County's potable water and wastewater systems



NOTE: THIS IS ONLY FOR ESTIMATE PURPOSES, BASED ON THE FEES AT THE TIME THE REVIEW WAS MADE. ACTUAL FEES WILL BE ASSESSED BASED ON PERMIT APPLICATIONS RECEIVED AND BASED ON THE FEE SCHEDULE AT THE TIME OF BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION.

то:	Zoning Review, Development Services	DATE: 05/20/2022
REVIEWER:	Ron Barnes, Impact & Mobility Fee Coordinator	
APPLICANT:	Raymond G Savoie, Trustee	PETITION NO: 22-0684
LOCATION:	702 E Brandon Blvd	
FOLIO NO:	69067.0000	

Estimated Fees:

Auto-Repair Facility (Per 1,000 s.f.) Mobility: \$10,535 Fire: \$313

Project Summary/Description:

Urban Mobility, Central Fire - After the fact expansion of Auto Repair facility that was unpermitted

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT

	Page 1 LSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA RD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
IN RE: ZONE HEARING MAS: HEARINGS	X))) TER)))
	ING HEARING MASTER HEARING PT OF TESTIMONY AND PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE:	PAMELA JO HATLEY Land Use Hearing Master
DATE:	Monday, September 19, 2022
TIME:	Commencing at 6:00 p.m. Concluding at 8:34 p.m.
PLACE:	Robert W. Saunders, Sr. Public Library Ada T. Payne Community Room 1505 N. Nebraska Avenue Tampa, Florida 33602
Reported via	a Cisco Webex Videoconference by:
Exe U	Christina M. Walsh, RPR ecutive Reporting Service lmerton Business Center Automobile Blvd., Suite 130 Clearwater, FL 33762 (800) 337-7740

	Page 76
1	HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
2	ZONING HEARING MASTER HEARINGS
3	September 19, 2022 ZONING HEARING MASTER: PAMELA JO HATLEY
4	ZONING HEARING MASIER: PAMELA JO HAILEY
5	
6	D4: Application Number: RZ-PD 22-0684
7	Applicant:Raymond G. SavoieLocation:702 E. Brandon Blvd.
8	Folio Number:069067.0000Acreage:0.59 acres, more or less
	Comprehensive Plan: OC-20
9	Service Area: Urban Existing Zoning: CG
10	Request: Rezone to Planned Development
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Page 77 MR. GRADY: The next item is agenda item 1 2 Again, application D-3 was continued at the D-4. beginning of the hearing. So begin the next item 3 is application number D-4, Rezoning-PD 22-0684. 4 5 The request is to rezone from Commercial 6 General to Planned Development. Israel Monsanto 7 will provide staff recommendation after 8 presentation by the applicant. 9 MR. CREMER: Thank you. For the record, Jay 10 Cremer with Stearns Weaver Miller, 401 East Jackson Street, No. 2100. We have a brief presentation. 11 12 Madam Hearing Officer, we also have a red 13 line of some conditions we've been working on with 14 staff, as well as some support letters, if I may. 15 HEARING MASTER HATLEY: Thank you. 16 MR. CREMER: Thank you. Again, Jay Cremer 17 for the record. Next slide, please. So the property is really right in the heart 18 of the Brandon Boulevard corridor. Next slide. 19 CG 20 zoning, OC-20 Future Land Use. We are within the 21 Urban Service Area. We are within the Brandon 22 Community Plan, and we are within the Brandon State 23 Road 60 Overlay. Next slide, please. 24 The Brandon Overlay is really what we had to 25 work on the hardest with staff on this application,

Page 78 and we'd like to thank them. Believe it or not, 1 2 it's been a two-and-a-half-year journey to get here. We've worked really, really hard. We were 3 4 dealing with a 1920's structure, a 1960's gas 5 station, and a 1980's gas pump canopy. 6 And so the site was essentially completely 7 paved, and we really had to work hard to figure out 8 how can we come as close as possible so that this family can expand their business and -- and also 9 meet the intent of the overlay. 10 So this list -- I won't belabor the point. 11 12 This goes into the staff presentation, but the big 13 things we're doing is we're removing that ugly gas 14 canopy. We're removing the outdated pole sign on 15 the property. 16 We did -- unfortunately, we are going to 17 have to remove the 1920's home that's now used as a 18 hair salon. Unfortunately, with everything we had 19 going on with the property, we weren't able to 20 retain that. Next slide, please. 21 So here you can see the existing site 22 conditions. You can see the canopy up front. You 23 can see the secondary business in the rear, and you 24 can see a number of access points that we're 25 reconfiguring, and as you can see here, there's

virtually no buffering to any of the streets. Next slide, please.

3 So on the proposed site plan, you can see 4 we've really worked hard to add buffering. We've 5 really worked hard to make the site work internally 6 much better. I think ultimately it's going to be 7 much safer for the owner, for the public visiting, 8 and pedestrians that are walking around the site. 9 Next slide, please.

As far as compatibility, just to point out a few of the neighboring businesses, I mean, this is an auto repair facility. There's a Jiffy Lube right down the road. There's a Nativity Catholic Church across the street. We do have a support letter that I passed out from there.

16 Crafty Crab owns the property to the east 17 and north adjacent on both sides. We have a 18 support letter from them as well. Next slide. So 19 as you can see the staff report, you know, the 20 staff pointed to a number of policies that are 21 focused on revitalizing older commercial areas, and 22 we believe we're taking advantage of those policies 23 to effectuate this project. Next slide. 24 So we're requesting one waiver and two 25 variations. Again, these go to the history of the

Executive Reporting Service

1

2

Page 79

Page 80 historic nature of the property. They go to the 1 2 fact that a small portion of the property was taken 3 when Brandon Boulevard was expanded a number of 4 years ago and trying to rehabilitate them for 5 current use. Next slide. The PD waiver this is for the front of the 6 7 property fronting Brandon Boulevard. We're 8 requesting a reduction essentially from 30 feet down to 10 feet. 9 Now, we have worked with Natural Resources 10 11 staff, and we are going to be able to effectuate 12 all of the plantings except for a small reduction 13 in the number of trees just because we physically can't fit them. Next slide, please. 14 15 Variation -- the first variation request is 16 for the east side of the property. There has not 17 been a landscape buffer on the east side of the 18 property historically. 19 We did review county records and determined 20 that the Crafty Crab property does have the 21 6 feet -- the 6 feet of buffering. However, 22 because it's an older property, they don't have the 23 number of plantings that would be required today. As mitigation, we proposed to add a great 24 25 deal more greenery around the property. And,

Page 81 again, they are supporting this application. 1 Next 2 slide, please. Similar story on the variation request on the north. However, there we were able 3 to squeeze in 3 feet of buffer rather than the 4 5 6 feet. Again, that property owner is in support 6 of the application. Next slide. 7 So as far as transportation and 8 connectivity, I really feel like we -- this is --9 again, this is going to be a much safer site. So we have reduced the number of access points to the 10 west to make them safer and further away from the 11 12 light. 13 We have added cross -- pedestrian cross 14 access to the east, to the restaurant, and 15 vehicular cross access or stub-out will be to the 16 north. So, again, this site, I think, is going to 17 work much, much better in the long run. Next 18 slide, please. Next slide. 19 So, again, in conclusion, we have 20 neighborhood support, including the church, 21 including Crafty Crab. We have staff 22 recommendations of approval. 23 And I think I have a few extra minutes left. 24 So my clients would like to say a couple of words. 25 Thank you.

Page 82

HEARING MASTER HATLEY: Okay. Thank you.
 MR. WRIGHT: Good evening. My name is
 Justin Wright. I reside at 13421 Glen Harwell
 Road.

I'm here asking for approval for rezoning of my automotive business, Huff Automotive. I'm requesting rezoning so that I may continue my family business, which started with my father opening a location in Plant City 49 years ago.

I'm hoping to pass it down to my children one day. I have grown up my whole life around the industry and know nothing different. I opened my location and started my 15 years ago and have outgrown my shop.

15 My shop was an eyesore for the greater part 16 of 20 years in the Brandon area. When I was able 17 to purchase the property, I started fixing it up 18 and doing so, I received many complements from not 19 only customers but neighbors in the area on how 20 well-maintained the building and the property has 21 become.

I'm asking for your support and approval so that I may continue to support my family and my employees as well. Thank you for your time. HEARING MASTER HATLEY: What's your name

Executive Reporting Service

5

6

7

8

9

Page 83 1 again, sir? 2 MR. WRIGHT: Justin Wright. 3 HEARING MASTER HATLEY: Mr. Wright --MR. WRIGHT: Yes, sir -- yes, ma'am. 4 5 HEARING MASTER HATLEY: -- are you in title 6 of the property now or are you purchasing --MR. WRIGHT: Deed for contract. 7 8 HEARING MASTER HATLEY: I understand. Okay. 9 MR. WRIGHT: And that was six years ago, I 10 believe. Six or seven years ago. HEARING MASTER HATLEY: I understand. All 11 12 right. Thank you. Please sign in with the clerk's 13 office. 14 MS. WRIGHT: Hi. Good evening. My name is 15 Amanda Wright and I reside at 13421 Glen Harwell 16 Drive in Dover. 17 I'm here for our business, Huff Automotive, 18 which is located at 702 East Brandon Boulevard in 19 Brandon. I'm here tonight to ask for your approval 20 of our rezoning of the business. To say this has 21 been a very long and tedious process would be an 22 understatement. 23 We have been diligently and willingly 24 working with staff for a little over two years now 25 to meet County regulations and develop a site plan

Page 84 with their recommendations and suggestions so that 1 2 we may get their approval on this plan. 3 The countless hours spent on this project 4 along with the tremendous expense of legal fees, 5 surveys, traffic analysis, engineer drawings, and 6 numerous site plans have caused more stress on our 7 family than I would have ever wanted to endure. 8 This business is our livelihood. This business supports multiple families that rely on us 9 to put roofs over their head and food on their 10 11 table. What that being said, we have even proposed to tear down one business, which is my salon, in 12 13 the rear of the property to make this plan work. 14 Those sacrifices have been a hard pill to 15 swallow, but again, we have been working hard with 16 staff and willing to make these changes. We are 17 just a small family business trying to live the 18 American dream, work hard to instill in our 19 children what good work ethic is. Provide honest, 20 affordable service to the public and continue to support our community in which you'll see we've 21 22 submitted some letters from our neighboring school 23 and church. 24 Our hope is that you will consider and 25 support this rezoning. Thank you.

Page 85 1 HEARING MASTER HATLEY: Thank you, 2 Ms. Wright. MR. CREMER: Thank you. Jay Cremer again. 3 I realize that I didn't explain to you the revised 4 5 condition No. 3. The intent of the condition is exactly the 6 7 same. This was simply some language we worked out 8 with Natural Resources because we wanted to make it 9 clearer for the reviewers exactly how many trees and plantings would occur there. 10 So -- and my understanding is that Natural 11 12 Resources and Development Services are both in 13 agreement with this revised condition. So with 14 that, as you can tell, we worked hard on this 15 application. 16 I really think that the Brandon Overlay --17 hopefully, somebody will take a look at it at some 18 point because it's very, very difficult for these 19 rehabilitation projects. 20 But with that, we would just ask for your 21 approval, and our expert team is here if you have 22 any questions. 23 HEARING MASTER HATLEY: All right. Thank 24 you. 25 MR. CREMER: Thank you.

Page 86 1 HEARING MASTER HATLEY: All right. 2 Development Services. 3 MR. MONSANTO: Good evening. Israel 4 Monsanto, Development Services. 5 As stated by the applicant, the request 6 tonight is to rezone a parcel from Commercial 7 General to a Planned Development district to allow the continuation of a motor vehicle repair use on 8 9 the site with modifications to the site design. 10 The parcel is within the State Road 60 Brandon Boulevard Overlay district. Specifically, 11 in the suburban sector. Currently, the motor 12 13 vehicle repair building is located on the southern portion of the site on Brandon Boulevard and an 14 15 office is located in the northern portion of the 16 parcel. 17 Surrounding areas consists today of 18 Commercial and Office uses. A private school and 19 church are located directly south. 20 The site has experienced several building 21 expansions since its original configuration in 22 1961. In the '60s, it was developed for gas 23 station with a gas pump, canopy in its frontage. 24 The building in the back utilized today as a hair 25 salon was established in the mid-1920s, according

Page 87 to Hillsborough County Property Appraiser records. 1 2 The gas station had two driveway connections to State Road 60 and one to Ridgewood Drive. 3 The 4 building on the back also maintained an access from 5 Ridgewood Drive. Throughout the years, the gas 6 station site was improved. The records show the gas pumps canopy has 7 8 been in existence in its current location/configuration since at least 1988. 9 By the 10 late 1990s, the impervious areas were added on both 11 sides of the gas station building and during the 12 widening of State Road 60 in the 1990s, FDOT took 13 the corner of the property along State Road 60 and 14 Ridgewood Avenue. The westernmost access driveway 15 along State Road 60 was eliminated. 16 According to the property -- to the project 17 narrative, the applicant constructed an expansion 18 of the existing 1960 former gas station building 19 without permits. 20 The property is not currently under Code 21 Enforcement action. However, the applicant intends 22 to rectify the situation and obtain zoning approval 23 and after-the-fact building permits to bring this property into compliance. 24 25 The auto repair shop, Huff Muffler, has been

Page 88 in operation in this location since 2012. 1 The 2 business initially operated with only two service bays. Since 2012, the applicant expanded the 3 business by adding two prefabricated metal 4 5 structures; one on the eastern side of the original 6 building and the other one on the western side. The gas station canopy, which was 7 8 constructed in the '80s, remains on the property today. The suburban sector of the State Road 60 9 10 Overlay District does not require building design 11 standards or parking placement requirements. 12 Instead, it requires the provision of a 13 30-foot-wide landscaped buffer along State Road 60, 14 vehicular use area buffering in accordance with the 15 Code. Building facades architecturally finished 16 and specific monument sign design standards. 17 Some of these requirements are triggered 18 when a site undergoes building expansions or renovations, and the cost of such works exceed 19 20 certain percentage threshold compared to the value 21 of existing buildings on-site. 22 Based on the scale and level of building 23 expansions and renovations since 2012 to date, the 24 site has been subject to the suburban overlay 25 requirements.

Page 89 The applicant consequently as part of this 1 2 PD rezoning proposes significant changes in addition to maintaining the current building 3 4 expansions to bring the property closer to compliance with the overlay standards and is 5 6 requesting waiver to reduce the buffer area along 7 State Road 60. PD variations to eliminate vehicular use 8 9 areas are reviewed and are also being requested. Other standards of the overlay district will be 10 met. As noted in the project narrative and our 11

12 staff report, there are some changes deemed 13 proposed to the site.

14 So staff removal of the gas canopy. Removal 15 of noncompliance pole signs. Addition of 16 architecturally finished -- finishes on all the 17 structures. Removal of two access points along 18 Ridgewood Avenue.

19Additional vehicular and pedestrian20stub-outs to adjacent parcels. Addition of a2110-foot landscape buffer along State Road 60.22Removal of the hair salon building to allow the23relocation of the stormwater facilities.24Since the landscape buffer along State Road2560 will be reduced, the PD petition includes a
waiver request from Section 3.14.06.2. The waiver
requests a variation of 20 feet and associated
plantings to reduce the landscape buffer from
30 feet to 10 feet in the direct frontage of that
parcel.

6 Staff has avoided the applicant 7 justifications to reduce the buffer as reasonable 8 as noted in our staff report. The site has been in 9 operation since the '60s with a canopy area and 10 parking spaces serving the site in front of the 11 building.

12 It has been also subject to FDOT takings, 13 and compared to the current site conditions, no 14 buffer is provided between the parking areas and 15 canopy and the front property line.

Additionally, the applicant has modified the request compared to the original site plan showing 8 feet of front buffer areas and has added two more feet. The applicant has also made modifications to move parking spaces to the back of the building in order to accommodate more buffer area along the frontage.

In addition to the waiver requests to the overlay requirements, the applicant has included two PD variations from Section 6.06.04.E, which

Page 91 requires 6-foot landscape buffers between vehicular 1 2 use areas and properties adjacent. In this case, the buffer areas are being 3 reduced from 3 feet to the north and one -- to 4 5 1-foot to the east. Staff has reviewed the buffer variation 6 justifications submitted by the applicant per LDC 7 Section 5.03.06.C.6 and finds they meet the 8 criteria of approval. The justification provided 9 by the applicant -- by the applicant are 10 reasonable. 11 12 Proposed site design, again, will increase 13 green areas to accommodate more landscaping and 14 opening spaces being added to the north where a 15 building exists today. Additionally, adjacent 16 parcels to the north and east also consists of 17 commercial uses. 18 The affected property owner of the parcel 19 surrounding the site, it does not object to this PD 20 rezoning. And similar to the justification for the 21 30-foot waiver request, the proposed alternative 22 and site design by the applicant mitigate the 23 variations being requested. 24 Your recommendation for this application is 25 required to also include a finding on whether the

Page 92 requested variations meet the criteria of approval 1 2 as part of your final recommendations. To conclude, compared to the current site 3 4 conditions and design, the proposed improvements to 5 the use would provide for an overall site that is 6 significantly closer to the intent of the Brandon Boulevard Overlay District. 7 8 The intent of this district is to improve the appearance of new and existing development 9 10 along State Road 60 between I-75 and Dover Road by enhancing landscaping, building and sign 11 12 requirements. 13 The site does not have a buffer today along 14 State Road 60. However, the proposed project will 15 provide 10 feet in direct frontage. Other 16 compatible nearby sites do not provide this buffer. The 10-foot buffer area will include 17 18 landscaping as proposed by Natural Resources. The 19 applicant is also committed to improve existing 20 building with architecturally finished façades as 21 included in the proposed conditions. Stormwater 22 ponds will be placed behind the buildings in 23 accordance with the overlay. 24 And additionally, the impervious surface of 25 the parcel is being overall reduced provided for

more green space.

1

2 The Planning Commission has found the request consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. 3 No design exception or administrative variances were 4 5 requested for Transportation Staff review, and they 6 do not object to this request. No objections were 7 received by any reviewing agencies. 8 The project will be subject to site development regulations and after-the-fact building 9 10 permits and will be required if the PD is approved 11 under the proposed conditions. 12 As the applicant has stated, we did receive 13 a proposed change to condition No. 3. Natural 14 Resources and Development Services agree with those 15 changes. They will provide for more specificity 16 for the planting along State Road 60. 17 Also, I want to have the applicant clarify 18 that the reduction of the State Road 60 Overlay from 30 feet to 10 feet will be in the direct 19 20 frontage, but due to the FDOT clipping, the 21 diagonal section will be 3 feet. 22 HEARING MASTER HATLEY: Okay. 23 MR. MONSANTO: That concludes my 24 presentation. 25 HEARING MASTER HATLEY: Okay. Thank you

very much, Mr. Monsanto.

1

2

Planning Commission.

MS. MASSEY: Hi. This is Jillian Massey
with Planning Commission staff.

5 The site is designated as Office 6 Commercial-20 or OC-20. It's in the Urban Service 7 Area, and it's within the Urban Center Character 8 District of the Brandon Community Plan.

9 OC-20 surrounds the subject site on all
10 sides. Residential-4 is located further north.
11 Residential-6 is located further to the south.

12 The proposed rezoning meets the intent of 13 the OC-20 category as it is an anticipated use in 14 this corridor and this Future Land Use Category 15 has -- the proposal is -- has an FAR of 0.22.

Planning Commission staff believes that this proposal is sensitive to the existing character of the area, which is already prominent -- a prominent commercial corridor in the county where similar and complementary uses already exist.

The proposal meets the intent of Policy 1.4 of the Future Land Use Element. The proposed rezoning also meets the intent of the neighborhood protection policies of Objective 16 and Policy 16.1, 16.2, 16.3, 16.5, 16.10, and 17.7.

1 The development pattern of the surrounding 2 area has a concentration of the most intense uses 3 along State Road 60 and decrease of intensity 4 further up along Ridgewood Avenue into the 5 residential areas.

6 Similarly, the applicant has designed the 7 site so that the internal arrangement of the uses 8 also reflects this pattern. The Community Design 9 Component provides guidance on commercial 10 developments. Goal 17 encourages developments that 11 improve the ambience of commercial development in 12 the county.

Objective 17-1 and Policy 17.1-4 seeks to facilitate patterns of development that are organized and purposeful. The internal arrangement of the site is such that it complements the character of the surrounding area in terms of the scale and intensity of the uses.

19 The subject site meets the intent of the
20 Urban Center Character District of the Brandon
21 Community Plan. The Urban Center Character
22 District is intended for the most intense land uses
23 in the area and an auto repair use is not out of
24 character for the surrounding area.
25 Based on these considerations, the Planning

Page 96 Commission staff finds that the proposed Planned 1 2 Development is consistent with the Future of 3 Hillsborough Comprehensive Plan for unincorporated Hillsborough County subject to the conditions 4 5 proposed by the Development Services Department. 6 Thank you. HEARING MASTER HATLEY: All right. 7 Thank 8 you. 9 Is there anyone here or online who wishes to speak in support of this application? 10 MS. LORTON: Good evening. For the 11 12 record -- hold on a minute. Good evening, 13 Ms. Hatley and staff. My name is Janet Lorton, and 14 I'm here today as a private citizen. I'm not in my 15 role or official capacity at EPC. 16 I've known Mr. and Mrs. Wright, Amanda and 17 Justin, for a long time. They're just the greatest 18 people. They're a young couple with young 19 children. And as Amanda said, just trying to live 20 the American dream, and they've been at this for 21 several years, and I do commend them for what 22 they've achieved working with staff. 23 But I do have some concerns. I am in 24 support of this rezoning, in support of the staff 25 recommendation. As the Planning Commission just

1 said, it is consistent with what you're trying to 2 achieve in overlay district. But the overlay 3 district is where I think there's -- maybe needs to 4 be revisited.

5 One of the things about revisiting this was 6 there are projects within the overlay district. 7 You saw one of them, Jiffy Lube, that went through 8 a variance and literally is not meeting the same 9 criteria that they are.

And there's other projects within, you know, several blocks, you know, that, again, don't meet what they have to meet in this request. And the one of the things that Mr. Israel was saying is there's two -- actually two overlay districts from for most restrictive of those.

17 One of the things that I think should be 18 revisited was what triggered this process with a 19 threshold. A threshold of what the building was 20 worth to the property value.

21 And the reality was that was that came up 22 from staff. And they proposed a third-party 23 evaluation -- property evaluation and that -- that 24 just wasn't considered. And I think maybe moving 25 forward, those things should be considered to find

solutions.

1

2 As she said, they've gone through many iterations with staff, and I'm glad that we've 3 finally come to some kind of sensible conclusion. 4 5 But, you know, it costs a lot of money with lawyers 6 and engineers that she said. 7 But the target kept moving and I talked to 8 Amanda every month. Sometimes more than once a month. We're friends. And I would ask her how 9 10 things were going, and she would say, This is what 11 we have to do, and then this is what we have to do, 12 and then that's what we have to do. 13 So maybe moving forward, just tell an

14 applicant what they need to do so they can achieve 15 what that is instead of spending a lot of money and 16 time. Let's see if there's anything else I wanted 17 to get on the record.

18 They've been strong supporters of the 19 community. And they have lots of referral letters. 20 But again, employing people -- and I think that's 21 one of the things that I think in this solution was 22 to capitulate and get rid of one business and get 23 rid of those employees.

24That seemed a pretty hard solution to me for25having to get to an acceptable outcome, but again,

Page 99 I am in support of what they want and what they 1 2 want for their business, but I think back to the '92 gravel business that came forward with the 3 4 family. Didn't have any staff approval, and it was 5 approved by the BOCC, because, again, these 6 businesses were there or the structures were there 7 from 1925 and 1960. So maybe that needs to be 8 looked at for grandfathering. 9 Again, I'm in support. I think they have one of the nicest-looking businesses. I think 10 they're some of the hardest working people and 11 12 they're good community partners. And I hope you 13 will approve this application as it comes to you 14 today. Thank you. 15 HEARING MASTER HATLEY: Thank you, 16 Ms. Lorton. Be sure and sign in with the clerk, 17 please. Thank you. 18 Is there anyone else who wishes to speak in 19 support of this application? 20 All right. Is there anyone here or online 21 who wishes to speak in opposition to this 22 application? I do not hear anyone. 23 All right. Development Services? 24 MR. GRADY: Nothing further. 25 HEARING MASTER HATLEY: Mr. Monsanto stated

Page 100 that he wished the applicant to confirm they 1 2 understood something specific, and I didn't catch exactly what that was. 3 4 Maybe we need to restate that and have the 5 applicant's representative confirm that. MR. MONSANTO: Yes. Israel Monsanto, 6 7 Development Services. 8 Yes. We want the applicant to verify that the 30-foot buffer reduction is exactly along the 9 10 frontage of the parcel because there's a click that was taken by the FDOT that's reduced to 3 feet, 11 12 which is not exactly (unintelligible). I just want 13 them to put on the record because that's what's in 14 the proposed site plan. 15 MR. CREMER: Jay Cremer for the record. 16 Could you clarify the question or I'm 17 just -- I'm not understanding what the -- what 18 you're --MR. MONSANTO: Yeah. So the 30-foot buffer 19 20 reduction is 10 feet on the frontage, and there is 21 a 3-foot buffer on the diagonal corner of the 22 parcel, which is the area where the FDOT clipped 23 the parcel, which is 3 feet. 24 So I just wanted to clarify that. The 25 reduction is going to be 10 feet on the south

Page 101 frontage and then 3 feet on that diagonal area. 1 So 2 that's the buffer approval in that clip from that 3 diagonal area. MR. CREMER: Yes, that's correct. 4 5 HEARING MASTER HATLEY: Okay. Thank you. 6 Development Services, thank you. Applicant, in your rebuttal and summation, 7 8 just also clarify or confirm that the applicant understands if they -- if the PD rezoning is 9 10 approved, they still have to obtain after-the-fact 11 permits for those building expansions. 12 MR. CREMER: Yes, ma'am. Again, Jay Cremer 13 for the record. 14 We do understand that, and our intent is if 15 this is approved, that will be our next step. 16 Again, the -- you know, the applicant is -- it's 17 been a long journey, and we think we've come up 18 with a good proposal to meet in the middle with staff. 19 20 You know, as one of the -- as the public 21 comments were mentioned, we didn't always 22 necessarily agree with staff on which -- which 23 provisions of the overlay applied because the 24 Brandon Overlay, it has something I've never seen 25 before, which is the more improvements you do to

Page 102 your property, the more restrictions kick in. 1 2 And so it actually ends up being a pretty 3 big distance in it for property owners on the 4 existing structures to improve them. But be 5 that -- you know, be that as it may, we worked 6 really hard with staff. 7 We're comfortable. We've, you know, come to a good middle ground, and I think the community's 8 9 going to be really proud of this facility. So 10 thank you. 11 HEARING MASTER HATLEY: Thank you, 12 Mr. Cremer. 13 All right. That will close the hearing on 14 Rezoning-PD 22-0684. 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

	Page 1 LSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA RD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
IN RE: ZONE HEARING MAST HEARINGS))
-	ING HEARING MASTER HEARING PT OF TESTIMONY AND PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE:	SUSAN FINCH Land Use Hearing Master
DATE:	Monday, August 15, 2022
TIME:	Commencing at 6:00 p.m. Concluding at 10:09 p.m.
PLACE:	Robert W. Saunders, Sr. Public Library Ada T. Payne Community Room 1505 N. Nebraska Avenue Tampa, Florida 33602
Reported via	a Cisco Webex Videoconference by:
Exe U]	Christina M. Walsh, RPR ecutive Reporting Service Imerton Business Center Automobile Blvd., Suite 130 Clearwater, FL 33762 (800) 337-7740

Page 8 application is out of order to be heard and is 1 2 being continued to the September 19, 2022, Zoning 3 Hearing Master Hearing. Item A-6, Rezoning-Standard 22-0453. 4 This application is being withdrawn from the Zoning 5 6 Hearing Master process. 7 Item A-7, Rezoning-PD 22-0461. This 8 application is being continued by the applicant to the September 19, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master 9 10 Hearing. Item A-8, Rezoning-PD 22-0567. 11 This 12 application is being continued by the applicant to 13 the September 19, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master 14 Hearing. 15 Item A-9, Rezoning-PD 22-0648. This 16 application is out of order to be heard and is 17 being continued to the September 19, 2022, Zoning 18 Hearing Master Hearing. 19 Item A-10, Major Mod Application 22-0671. 20 This application is out of order to be heard and is 21 being continued to the September 19, 2022, Zoning 22 Hearing Master Hearing. 23 Item A-11, Rezoning-PD 22-0684. This 24 application is being continued by the applicant to the September 19, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master 25

	Page S SBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA D OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
IN RE: ZONE HEARING MAST HEARINGS)))
	NG HEARING MASTER HEARING T OF TESTIMONY AND PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE:	SUSAN FINCH Land Use Hearing Master
DATE:	Monday, July 25, 2022
TIME:	Commencing at 6:00 p.m. Concluding at 11:20 p.m.
PLACE:	Robert W. Saunders, Sr. Public Library Ada T. Payne Community Room 1505 N. Nebraska Avenue Tampa, Florida 33602
Reported via	Cisco Webex Videoconference by:
Exe Ul: 13555 .	hristina M. Walsh, RPR cutive Reporting Service merton Business Center Automobile Blvd., Suite 130 Clearwater, FL 33762 (800) 337-7740

Page 14 Item A-12, Rezoning-PD 22-0565. 1 This application is being continued by the applicant to 2 the August 15, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing. 3 Item A-13, Rezoning-PD 22-0567. 4 This 5 application is out of order to be heard and is 6 being continued to the August 15, 2022, Zoning 7 Hearing Master Hearing. 8 Item A-14, Rezoning-PD 22-0648. This application is being continued by the applicant to 9 the August 15, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing. 10 Item A-15, Rezoning-PD 22-0667. 11 This 12 application is being withdrawn from the Zoning 13 Hearing Master Hearing process. Item A-16, Major Mod Application 22-0671. 14 15 This application is out of order to be heard and is 16 being continued to the August 15, 2022, Zoning 17 Hearing Master Hearing. 18 Item A-17, Rezoning-PD 22-0684. This 19 application is being continued by the applicant to 20 the August 15, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing. 21 Item A-18, Rezoning-PD 22-0685. This 22 application is being continued by staff to the 23 August 15, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing. 24 Item A-19, Major Mod Application 22-0686. 25 This application is out of order to be heard and is

	Page 1 LLSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA DARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
IN RE: ZONE HEARING MA HEARINGS)))
	ONING HEARING MASTER HEARING RIPT OF TESTIMONY AND PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE:	PAMELA JO HATLEY Land Use Hearing Master
DATE:	Monday, June 13, 2022
TIME:	Commencing at 6:00 p.m. Concluding at 11:56 p.m.
PLACE:	Robert W. Saunders, Sr. Public Library Ada T. Payne Community Room 1505 N. Nebraska Avenue Tampa, Florida 33602
Reported v	via Cisco Webex Videoconference by:
	Christina M. Walsh, RPR Executive Reporting Service Ulmerton Business Center 55 Automobile Blvd., Suite 130 Clearwater, FL 33762 (800) 337-7740

Page 14 application is out of order to be heard and is 1 2 being continued to the July 25th, 2022, Zoning 3 Hearing Master Hearing. 4 Item A-24, Major Mod Application 22-0670. 5 This application is out of order to be heard and is 6 being continued to the July 25th, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing. 7 8 Item A-25, Major Mod Application 22-061 [22-0671]. This application is being continued by 9 the applicant to the July 25th, 2022, Zoning 10 Hearing Master Hearing. 11 12 Item A-26, Rezoning-PD 22-0683. This 13 application is being continued by the applicant to 14 the July 25th, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing. 15 Item A-27, Rezoning-PD 22-0684. This 16 application is being continued by the applicant to 17 the July 25th, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing. 18 Item A-28, Rezoning-PD 22-0685. This 19 application is being continued by the applicant to 20 the July 25th, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing. 21 Item A-29, Major Mod Application 22-0866 --22 0686 -- sorry. Major Mod Application 22-0686. This application is out of order to be heard and is 23 24 being continued to the July 25th, 2022, Zoning 25 Hearing Master Hearing.

EXHIBITS SUBMITTED DURING THE ZHM HEARING

PAGE OF 4 SIGN-IN SHEET: RFR, ZHM, PHM. LUHO HEARING MASTER: Pamela Jo Harley DATE/TIME: 9/19/2022 PRINT CLEARLY. THIS INFORMATION WILL BE USED FOR MAILING PLEASE PLEASE PRINT **APPLICATION #** Clark Iddie NAME 100 # 1100 Ashley Dr. RZ 22-0461 **MAILING ADDRESS** CITY lampa PLEASE PRINT APPLICATION # NAME RZ 22-01.90 **MAILING ADDRESS** Jax 1 CMIPA STATE / CZIP 3768 PHONE CITY PLEASE PRINT **APPLICATION #** NAME KZ 22- 0927 MAILING ADDRESS ZIP PHON TATE PLEASE PRINT **APPLICATION #** NAME KZ 22-670 MAILING ADDRESS ZIP2270/PHONE $\begin{array}{c} \text{PLEASE PRINT} \\ \textbf{NAME} \end{array} \overrightarrow{\bigvee}$ **APPLICATION #** neca 101 E. enneda MAILING ADDRESS _STATE <u>FL</u> ZIP 33602 PHONE <u>695-0469</u> CITY PLEASE PRINT Rhea Lopes **APPLICATION #** NAME 13/10 22-1240 RZ **MAILING ADDRESS** CITY <u>Sarasota</u> STATE <u>F</u> ZIP 34243 PHONE

PAGE QOF 4 SIGN-IN SHEET: RFR, ZHM, PHM, LUHO HEARING MASTER: Pamela Jo Hayley **DATE/TIME:** 9/19/2022 PLEASE **PRINT CLEARLY**, THIS INFORMATION WILL BE USED FOR MAILING NAME PANUL ONIZ ALL **APPLICATION #** MAILING ADDRESS 2810 N Central Are MM 22-6313 _____PHONE 8136178492 STATE CITY ZIP PLEASE PRINT David **APPLICATION #** right NAME RZ 22-0477 MAILING ADDRESS P.G. Box 27 lampe STATE 1-2 ZIP 376 SPHONE CITY PLEASE PRINT **APPLICATION #** Jake Cremer NAME KL 22-0684 MAILING ADDRESS 401 & Juckson St #2100 CITY Janpa STATE FL ZIP 33602 PHONE 313-222 50 51 PLEASE PRIN **APPLICATION #** NAME Jushin Wright MAILING ADDRESS 13421 Gilen Harwell Rd 1(2 22-0684 CITY Drive STATE 1/1 ZIP 3337 PHONE 813-391-6088 **APPLICATION #** NAME THRADOL INRICIN 22-6684 MAILING ADDRESS 13421 Gun Norvell Re CITY OV STATE TL ZIP 335 PHONE 813-G PLEASE PRINT **APPLICATION #** lane-NAME RL 22-6084 1in+alebring 12 MAILING ADDRESS 15755FATE FL ZIP PHONE 813-2 CITY

PAGE 3 OF 4 SIGN-IN SHEET: RFR, ZHM, PHM, LUHO HEARING MASTER: Pamela Jo Hatley **DATE/TIME:** 9/19/2022 **PRINT CLEARLY.** PLEASE THIS INFORMATION WILL BE USED FOR MAILING PLEASE PRINT **APPLICATION #** Javid M. Smith MAILING ADDRESS_ 4 0/ E. Jackson Strat Ste 2100 22-0692 _ ZIP 3360/ PHONE &13 222-50 N STATE F CITY 1 NAME DIANA LEENE **APPLICATION #** 1 Taniler & 8 X0° 22-0692 MAILING ADDRESS _PHONE \$13 7840723 L ZIP S STATE / CITY PLEASE PRINT **APPLICATION #** RZ 22-0864 MAILING ADDRESS _ ZIP 22406 PHONE CITY STATE PLEASE PRINT 🖌 **APPLICATION #** 0. West Sabello NAME MAILING ADDRESS 1000 N. arhey KZ 22-B864 _____STATE <u>FC_____</u>ZIP<u>33621</u>PHONE<u>331-09</u>76 CIT **APPLICATION #** Varilyon Bears NAME 7 KZ 22-0864 MAILING ADDRESS 14215 Kh Maglaline Red _____STATE T_____ZIP 3 32/ SHONE 80 CITY Tango PLEASE PRIN **APPLICATION #** NAME SUZeHe Murphree KL 22-0864 MAILING ADDRESS 13805 Cherry Creak Drive, _____STATE <u>FL__</u> zip<u>3361</u> PHONE 813-695-3971 CITYLampa

PAGE LOF SIGN-IN SHEET: RFR, ZHM, PHM, LUHO HEARING MASTER: <u>| Camela Jo Ektley</u> **DATE/TIME:** 9/19/2022 PLEASE **PRINT CLEARLY**, THIS INFORMATION WILL BE USED FOR MAILING PLEASE PRINT **APPLICATION #** NAME Jarron Brall MAILING ADDRESS LOI E Chapman Rd. KZ 22-0864 CITY LUT STATE f/ ZIP 3354 PHONE \$3-73(-513 NAME SAVANNAH GROOM **APPLICATION #** MAILING ADDRESS 14225 LAKE Mogdaline Blvd. KZ 22-0864 CITY Tampa STATE F1 ZIP 3361 PHONE 81340.8582 NAME Hope Hamilfor **APPLICATION #** MAILING ADDRESS 2413 CLARL road RZ 22-0864 CITY Tampa STATE FL ZIP 813 PHONE 766-186 PLEASE PRINT BAMA CAWAM **APPLICATION #** MAILING ADDRESS 116 Carther (1h Rl KZ 22-0864 CITY COLO STATE CL ZIP 35 CHONE NAME ANDREA Albert **APPLICATION #** MAILING ADDRESS 4510 3rd St CiR W #312 RZ 22-6864 CITY Brodenter FI ZIBY20 TPHONE 941 4050422 NAME SOMUCI AMOS **APPLICATION #** MAILING ADDRESS 3327 +(iPOII 6101 RZ 22-0864 CITY PUMA STATE <u>F1</u> ZIP 3)950 PHONE 763-360 90520

H:\groups\wpodocs\zoning\signin.frm

HEARING TYPE:

ZHM, PHM, VRH, LUHO

DATE: 9/19/2022

HEARING MASTER:

Pamela Jo Hatley

PAGE: 1 OF 1

APPLICATION #	SUBMITTED BY	EXHIBITS SUBMITTED	HRG. MASTER YES OR NO
MM 22-0313	Brian Grady	1. Revised Staff Report	No
RZ 22-0461	Brian Grady	1. Staff Supplemental Document	No
RZ 22-1240	Brian Grady	1. Revised Staff Report	No
RZ 22-0692	Brian Grady	1. Revised Staff Report	No
RZ 22-0692	David Smith	1. Applicant Presentation	Yes (Copy)
RZ 22-1070	Todd Pressman	1. Applicant Presentation	No
RZ 22-0684	Jacob Cremer	1. Applicant Presentation	No

SEPTEMBER 19, 2022 - ZONING HEARING MASTER

The Zoning Hearing Master (ZHM), Hillsborough County, Florida, met in Regular Meeting, scheduled for Monday, September 19, 2022, at 6:00 p.m., in the Ada T. Payne Community Room, Robert W. Saunders Sr. Public Library, Tampa, Florida, and held virtually.

Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls the meeting to order and leads in the pledge of allegiance to the flag.

A. WITHDRAWALS AND CONTINUANCES

Brian Grady, Development Services, introduces staff and reviews changes/withdrawals/continuances.

D.3. RZ 22-0461

Brian Grady, Development Services, calls RZ 22-0461.

Addie Clark, applicant rep, requests continuance.

Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls proponents/opponents/continues RZ 22-0461.

C.1. RZ 22-0698

Brian Grady, calls RZ 22-0698.

David Wright, applicant rep, requests continuance.

Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls for proponents/opponents/continues RZ 22-0698.

C.2. RZ 22-0927

Brian Grady, Development Services, calls RZ 22-0927.

Todd Pressman, applicant rep, requests continuance.

Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls proponents/opponents/continues RZ 22-0927.

C.4. RZ 22-1096

Brian Grady, Development Services, calls RZ 22-1096 and requests continuance.

Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to Development Services.

Brian Grady, Development Services, answers ZHM questions.

Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls for proponents/opponents/continues RZ 22-1096.

D.7. MM 22-1112

Brian Grady, Development Services, calls MM 22-1112 staff continuance

Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls proponents/opponents/continues MM 22-1112.

Brian Grady, Development Services, continues changes/withdrawals/continuances.

Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, overview of ZHM process.

Cameron Clark, Senior Assistant County Attorney, overview of oral argument/ZHM process.

Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, Oath.

B. REMANDS

C. REZONING STANDARD (RZ-STD):

C.3. RZ 22-1070

Brian Grady, Development Services, calls RZ 22-1070.

Todd Pressman, applicant rep, presents testimony.

Chris Grandlienard, Development Services, staff report.

Jillian Massey, Planning Commission, staff report.

Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls proponents/opponents/Development Services/applicant rep/closes RZ 22-1070.

C.5. RZ 22-1105

Brian Grady, Development Services, calls RZ 22-1105.

John LaRocca, applicant rep, presents testimony.

Chris Granlienard, Development Services, staff report.

Jillian Massey, Planning Commission, staff report.

Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls proponents/opponents/Development Services/applicant rep/closes RZ 22-1105.

C.6. RZ 22-1240

Brian Grady, Development Services, calls RZ 22-1240.

Rhea Lopes, applicant rep, presents testimony.

Isis Brown, Development Services, staff report.

Jillian Massey, Planning Commission, staff report.

Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls proponents/opponents/Development Services/applicant rep/closes RZ 22-1240.

D. REZONING-PLANNED DEVELOPMENT (RZ-PD) & MAJOR MODIFICATION (MM):

D.1. MM 22-0313

Brian Grady, Development Services, calls MM 22-0313.

Patricia Ortiz, applicant rep, presents testimony.

Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions applicant rep.

Patricia Ortiz, applicant rep, answers ZHM questions and continues testimony.

Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to applicant rep.

Patricia Ortiz, applicant rep, answers ZHM questions and continues testimony.

Tim Lampkin, Development Services, staff report.

Pamela Ho Hatley, ZHM, questions to Development Services.

Tim Lampkin, Development Services, answers ZHM questions.

Jillian Massey, Planning Commission, staff report.

Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls proponents/opponents/Development Services/applicant rep.

Patricia Ortiz, applicant rep, provides rebuttal.

Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, closes RZ 22-0313.

D.2. RZ 22-0433

Brian Grady, Development Services, calls RZ 22-0433.

David Wright, applicant rep, presents testimony.

Tim Lampkin, Development Services, staff report.

Jillian Massey, Planning Commission, staff report.

Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls proponents/opponents/Development Services/ applicant rep/closes RZ 22-0433.

D.4. RZ 22-0684

Brian Grady, Development Services, calls RZ 22-0684.

Jacob Cremer, applicant rep, presents testimony.

Justin Wright, applicant rep, presents testimony.

Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to applicant rep.

Justin Wright, applicant rep, answers ZHM questions and continues testimony.

Amanda Wright, applicant rep, presents testimony

Jacob Cremer, applicant rep, continues testimony.

Israel Monsanto, Development Services, staff report.

Jillian Massey, Planning Commission, staff report.

Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls proponents.

Janet Lorton, proponent, presents testimony.

 Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls opponents/Development Services. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to Development Services Israel Monsanto, Development Services, answers ZHM questions. Jacob Cremer, applicant rep, answers ZHM questions. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, statement for record. Jacob Cremer, applicant rep, answers ZHM statement for record. Dacob Cremer, applicant rep, answers ZHM statement for record. Dacob Cremer, applicant rep, answers ZHM statement for record. Damela Jo Hatley, ZHM, closes RZ 22-0684. D.5. RZ 22-0692 Brian Grady, Development Services, calls RZ 22-0692. David Smith, applicant rep, presents testimony. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to applicant rep. David Smith, applicant rep, answers ZHM questions and continues testimony. Sam Ball, Development Services, staff report. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to Development Services. Sam Ball, Development Services, answers ZHM questions. Jillian Massey, Planning Commission, staff report. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls proponents Diana Keene, proponent, presents testimony. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls opponents/Development Services. Brian Grady, Development Services, statement for record. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls opponents/Development Services. Brian Grady, Development Services, statement for record. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to applicant rep. David Smith, applicant reo, answers ZHM questions and provides rebuttal. 				
 Israel Monsanto, Development Services, answers ZHM questions. Jacob Cremer, applicant rep, answers ZHM questions. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, statement for record. Jacob Cremer, applicant rep, answers ZHM statement for record. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, closes RZ 22-0684. D.5. RZ 22-0692 Brian Grady, Development Services, calls RZ 22-0692. David Smith, applicant rep, presents testimony. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to applicant rep. David Smith, applicant rep, answers ZHM questions and continues testimony. Sam Ball, Development Services, staff report. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to Development Services. Sam Ball, Development Services, answers ZHM questions. Brian Grady, Development Services, answers ZHM questions. Jillian Massey, Planning Commission, staff report. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls proponents Diana Keene, proponent, presents testimony. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls opponents/Development Services. Brian Grady, Development Services, statement for record. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls opponents/Development Services. 	Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls opponents/Development Services.			
 Jacob Cremer, applicant rep, answers ZHM questions. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, statement for record. Jacob Cremer, applicant rep, answers ZHM statement for record. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, closes RZ 22-0684. D.5. RZ 22-0692 Brian Grady, Development Services, calls RZ 22-0692. David Smith, applicant rep, presents testimony. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to applicant rep. David Smith, applicant rep, answers ZHM questions and continues testimony. Sam Ball, Development Services, staff report. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to Development Services. Sam Ball, Development Services, answers ZHM questions. Brian Grady, Development Services, answers ZHM questions. Jillian Massey, Planning Commission, staff report. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls proponents Diana Keene, proponent, presents testimony. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls opponents/Development Services. Brian Grady, Development Services, statement for record. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to applicant rep. 	\blacktriangleright Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to Development Services			
 Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, statement for record. Jacob Cremer, applicant rep, answers ZHM statement for record. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, closes RZ 22-0684. D.5. RZ 22-0692 Brian Grady, Development Services, calls RZ 22-0692. David Smith, applicant rep, presents testimony. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to applicant rep. David Smith, applicant rep, answers ZHM questions and continues testimony. Sam Ball, Development Services, staff report. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to Development Services. Sam Ball, Development Services, answers ZHM questions. Brian Grady, Development Services, answers ZHM questions. Jillian Massey, Planning Commission, staff report. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls proponents Diana Keene, proponent, presents testimony. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls opponents/Development Services. Brian Grady, Development Services, statement for record. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to applicant rep. 	Israel Monsanto, Development Services, answers ZHM questions.			
 Jacob Cremer, applicant rep, answers ZHM statement for record. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, closes RZ 22-0684. D.5. RZ 22-0692 Brian Grady, Development Services, calls RZ 22-0692. David Smith, applicant rep, presents testimony. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to applicant rep. David Smith, applicant rep, answers ZHM questions and continues testimony. Sam Ball, Development Services, staff report. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to Development Services. Sam Ball, Development Services, answers ZHM questions. Brian Grady, Development Services, answers ZHM questions. Brian Grady, Development Services, answers ZHM questions. Jillian Massey, Planning Commission, staff report. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls proponents Diana Keene, proponent, presents testimony. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls opponents/Development Services. Brian Grady, Development Services, statement for record. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to applicant rep. 	Jacob Cremer, applicant rep, answers ZHM questions.			
 Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, closes RZ 22-0684. D.5. RZ 22-0692 Brian Grady, Development Services, calls RZ 22-0692. David Smith, applicant rep, presents testimony. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to applicant rep. David Smith, applicant rep, answers ZHM questions and continues testimony. Sam Ball, Development Services, staff report. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to Development Services. Sam Ball, Development Services, answers ZHM questions. Brian Grady, Development Services, answers ZHM questions. Jillian Massey, Planning Commission, staff report. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls proponents Diana Keene, proponent, presents testimony. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls opponents/Development Services. Brian Grady, Development Services, statement for record. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to applicant rep. 	Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, statement for record.			
 D.5. RZ 22-0692 Brian Grady, Development Services, calls RZ 22-0692. David Smith, applicant rep, presents testimony. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to applicant rep. David Smith, applicant rep, answers ZHM questions and continues testimony. Sam Ball, Development Services, staff report. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to Development Services. Sam Ball, Development Services, answers ZHM questions. Brian Grady, Development Services, answers ZHM questions. Jillian Massey, Planning Commission, staff report. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls proponents Diana Keene, proponent, presents testimony. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls opponents/Development Services. Brian Grady, Development Services, statement for record. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to applicant rep. 	Jacob Cremer, applicant rep, answers ZHM statement for record.			
 Brian Grady, Development Services, calls RZ 22-0692. David Smith, applicant rep, presents testimony. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to applicant rep. David Smith, applicant rep, answers ZHM questions and continues testimony. Sam Ball, Development Services, staff report. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to Development Services. Sam Ball, Development Services, answers ZHM questions. Brian Grady, Development Services, answers ZHM questions. Jillian Massey, Planning Commission, staff report. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls proponents Diana Keene, proponent, presents testimony. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls opponents/Development Services. Brian Grady, Development Services, statement for record. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to applicant rep. 	Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, closes RZ 22-0684.			
 David Smith, applicant rep, presents testimony. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to applicant rep. David Smith, applicant rep, answers ZHM questions and continues testimony. Sam Ball, Development Services, staff report. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to Development Services. Sam Ball, Development Services, answers ZHM questions. Brian Grady, Development Services, answers ZHM questions. Jillian Massey, Planning Commission, staff report. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls proponents Diana Keene, proponent, presents testimony. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls opponents/Development Services. Brian Grady, Development Services, statement for record. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to applicant rep. 	<u>D.5. RZ 22-0692</u>			
 Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to applicant rep. David Smith, applicant rep, answers ZHM questions and continues testimony. Sam Ball, Development Services, staff report. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to Development Services. Sam Ball, Development Services, answers ZHM questions. Brian Grady, Development Services, answers ZHM questions. Jillian Massey, Planning Commission, staff report. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls proponents Diana Keene, proponent, presents testimony. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls opponents/Development Services. Brian Grady, Development Services, statement for record. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to applicant rep. 	Brian Grady, Development Services, calls RZ 22-0692.			
 David Smith, applicant rep, answers ZHM questions and continues testimony. Sam Ball, Development Services, staff report. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to Development Services. Sam Ball, Development Services, answers ZHM questions. Brian Grady, Development Services, answers ZHM questions. Jillian Massey, Planning Commission, staff report. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls proponents Diana Keene, proponent, presents testimony. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls opponents/Development Services. Brian Grady, Development Services, statement for record. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to applicant rep. 	David Smith, applicant rep, presents testimony.			
 Sam Ball, Development Services, staff report. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to Development Services. Sam Ball, Development Services, answers ZHM questions. Brian Grady, Development Services, answers ZHM questions. Jillian Massey, Planning Commission, staff report. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls proponents Diana Keene, proponent, presents testimony. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls opponents/Development Services. Brian Grady, Development Services, statement for record. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to applicant rep. 	\blacktriangleright Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to applicant rep.			
 Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to Development Services. Sam Ball, Development Services, answers ZHM questions. Brian Grady, Development Services, answers ZHM questions. Jillian Massey, Planning Commission, staff report. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls proponents Diana Keene, proponent, presents testimony. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls opponents/Development Services. Brian Grady, Development Services, statement for record. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to applicant rep. 	\blacktriangleright David Smith, applicant rep, answers ZHM questions and continues testimony			
 Sam Ball, Development Services, answers ZHM questions. Brian Grady, Development Services, answers ZHM questions. Jillian Massey, Planning Commission, staff report. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls proponents Diana Keene, proponent, presents testimony. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls opponents/Development Services. Brian Grady, Development Services, statement for record. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to applicant rep. 	Sam Ball, Development Services, staff report.			
 Brian Grady, Development Services, answers ZHM questions. Jillian Massey, Planning Commission, staff report. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls proponents Diana Keene, proponent, presents testimony. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls opponents/Development Services. Brian Grady, Development Services, statement for record. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to applicant rep. 	\blacktriangleright Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to Development Services.			
 Jillian Massey, Planning Commission, staff report. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls proponents Diana Keene, proponent, presents testimony. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls opponents/Development Services. Brian Grady, Development Services, statement for record. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to applicant rep. 	Sam Ball, Development Services, answers ZHM questions.			
 Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls proponents Diana Keene, proponent, presents testimony. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls opponents/Development Services. Brian Grady, Development Services, statement for record. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to applicant rep. 	Brian Grady, Development Services, answers ZHM questions.			
 Diana Keene, proponent, presents testimony. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls opponents/Development Services. Brian Grady, Development Services, statement for record. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to applicant rep. 	Jillian Massey, Planning Commission, staff report.			
 Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls opponents/Development Services. Brian Grady, Development Services, statement for record. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to applicant rep. 	Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls proponents			
 Brian Grady, Development Services, statement for record. Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to applicant rep. 	Diana Keene, proponent, presents testimony.			
Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to applicant rep.	Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls opponents/Development Services.			
	Brian Grady, Development Services, statement for record.			
David Smith, applicant rep, answers ZHM questions and provides rebuttal.	\blacktriangleright Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to applicant rep.			
	\blacktriangleright David Smith, applicant rep, answers ZHM questions and provides rebuttal.			

Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, closes RZ 22-0692.D.6. RZ 22-0864

Brian Grady, Development Services, calls RZ 22-0864.

William Molloy, applicant rep, presents testimony.

Isabelle Albert, applicant rep, presents testimony.

Michelle Heinrich, Development Services, staff report.

Jillian Massey, Planning Commission, staff report.

Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls proponents.

Marilynn Bearss, proponent, presents testimony.

Suzette Murphree, proponent, presents testimony.

Jarrod Bragg, proponent, presents testimony.

Savannah Grooms, proponent, presents testimony.

Hope Hamilton, proponent, presents testimony.

Barry Lawrence, proponent, presents testimony.

Andrea Albert, proponent, presents testimony.

Samuel Amos, proponent, presents testimony.

Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls opponents/Development Services/applicant rep.

Isabelle Albert, Development Services, provides rebuttal.

Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to applicant rep

Isabelle Albert, applicant rep, answers ZHM questions and continues rebuttal.

Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to Development Services.

Brian Grady, Development Services, questions to applicant rep.

Isabelle Albert, applicant rep, answers Development Services questions and continues rebuttal.

Brian Grady, Development Services, statement for record.

James Ratliff, Development Services Transportation, questions to applicant rep.

Isabelle Albert, applicant rep, answers Development Services Transportation questions.

James Ratliff, Development Services Transportation, statement for record.

Isabelle Albert, applicant rep, continues rebuttal.

James Ratliff, Development Services Transportation, statement for record.

Isabelle Albert, applicant rep, continues rebuttal.

Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls closes RZ 22-0864.

ADJOURNMENT

Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, adjourns meeting.

Application No.	RŻ	22-0684
Name:	Jacob	
Entered at Public	Hearin	ng: ZHM
Exhibit #	Date	

Original Condition:

3. A minimum of 10 feet of landscaped buffer shall be maintained along SR60, as indicated in the General Site Plan. Plantings within this buffer shall be in accordance with LDC Sec. 3.14.06.2.a. The developer shall be permitted to provide at least 1/3 of the required plantings within the buffer area along SR60, subject to Natural Resources review and approval. All other Vehicular Use Area buffers shall be as shown on the General Site Plan.

Revised Condition:

3. A minimum of 10 feet of landscaped buffer shall be maintained along SR60, as indicated in the General Site Plan. <u>Plant symbols on the General Site Plan are general</u> representations and remain subject to Natural Resources review and approval. Plantings within this buffer shall be in accordance with LDC Sec. 3.14.06.2.a. <u>with the following</u> <u>exception:</u> The developer shall be permitted to provide at least 1/3 of the required plantings-<u>W</u>ithin the buffer area along SR60, subject to Natural Resources review and approval, the developer shall install landscaping at the following rate for every 30 feet of <u>highway frontage: one understory tree, eight evergreen shrubs or perennial grasses, and</u> twenty ground cover plants or perennial flowering shrubs. All other Vehicular Use Area buffers shall be as shown on the General Site Plan.

Original Condition:

3. A minimum of 10 feet of landscaped buffer shall be maintained along SR60, as indicated in the General Site Plan. Plantings within this buffer shall be in accordance with LDC Sec. 3.14.06.2.a. The developer shall be permitted to provide at least 1/3 of the required plantings within the buffer area along SR60, subject to Natural Resources review and approval. All other Vehicular Use Area buffers shall be as shown on the General Site Plan.

Revised Condition:

3. A minimum of 10 feet of landscaped buffer shall be maintained along SR60, as indicated in the General Site Plan. <u>Plant symbols on the General Site Plan are general</u> representations and remain subject to Natural Resources review and approval. Plantings within this buffer shall be in accordance with LDC Sec. 3.14.06.2.a. <u>with the following</u> <u>exception:</u> The developer shall be permitted to provide at least 1/3 of the required plantings-<u>W</u>ithin the buffer area along SR60, subject to Natural Resources review and approval, the developer shall install landscaping at the following rate for every 30 feet of highway frontage: one understory tree, eight evergreen shrubs or perennial grasses, and twenty ground cover plants or perennial flowering shrubs. All other Vehicular Use Area buffers shall be as shown on the General Site Plan.

Original Condition:

3. A minimum of 10 feet of landscaped buffer shall be maintained along SR60, as indicated in the General Site Plan. Plantings within this buffer shall be in accordance with LDC Sec. 3.14.06.2.a. The developer shall be permitted to provide at least 1/3 of the required plantings within the buffer area along SR60, subject to Natural Resources review and approval. All other Vehicular Use Area buffers shall be as shown on the General Site Plan.

Revised Condition:

3. A minimum of 10 feet of landscaped buffer shall be maintained along SR60, as indicated in the General Site Plan. <u>Plant symbols on the General Site Plan are general</u> representations and remain subject to Natural Resources review and approval. Plantings within this buffer shall be in accordance with LDC Sec. 3.14.06.2.a. <u>with the following</u> <u>exception:</u> The developer shall be permitted to provide at least 1/3 of the required <u>plantings-Within the buffer area along SR60</u>, subject to Natural Resources review and approval, the developer shall install landscaping at the following rate for every 30 feet of <u>highway frontage: one understory tree, eight evergreen shrubs or perennial grasses, and</u> <u>twenty ground cover plants or perennial flowering shrubs</u>. All other Vehicular Use Area buffers shall be as shown on the General Site Plan.

Original Condition:

3. A minimum of 10 feet of landscaped buffer shall be maintained along SR60, as indicated in the General Site Plan. Plantings within this buffer shall be in accordance with LDC Sec. 3.14.06.2.a. The developer shall be permitted to provide at least 1/3 of the required plantings within the buffer area along SR60, subject to Natural Resources review and approval. All other Vehicular Use Area buffers shall be as shown on the General Site Plan.

Revised Condition:

3. A minimum of 10 feet of landscaped buffer shall be maintained along SR60, as indicated in the General Site Plan. <u>Plant symbols on the General Site Plan are general</u> <u>representations and remain subject to Natural Resources review and approval.</u> Plantings within this buffer shall be in accordance with LDC Sec. 3.14.06.2.a. <u>with the following</u> <u>exception:</u> The developer shall be permitted to provide at least 1/3 of the required <u>plantings W</u>ithin the buffer area along SR60, subject to Natural Resources review and approval, the developer shall install landscaping at the following rate for every 30 feet of <u>highway frontage: one understory tree, eight evergreen shrubs or perennial grasses, and</u> <u>twenty ground cover plants or perennial flowering shrubs</u>. All other Vehicular Use Area buffers shall be as shown on the General Site Plan.
August 30, 2022

To Whom it May Concern:

We own/operate the businesses directly to the east of Huff Muffler, the Crafty Crab Seafood Restaurant (704 E Brandon Blvd.). We are the most impacted neighbors and are supportive of the rezoning request PD-22-0864, including the three PD variations.

Justin and Amanda Wright have been operating their small business on the property since 2012. They have transformed their property into a pleasing commercial property with wellmaintained landscaping. We believe the additional changes being proposed through the PD will improve the property even more and increase the property values in our area. Justin and Amanda are good neighbors and support the community through their small business.

We ask that you approve the rezoning so the business can expand to serve more local residents and the property can be further improved with the proposed changes in the PD site plan.

(g. Rn' /Ca



September 12, 2022

To Whom it May Concern:

My name is Charlie, and I am the Director of Finance and Operations, at Nativity Catholic Church, located at 705 E Brandon Blvd., which is directly across from Huff Muffler of Brandon. The church has been a customer of Huff's for many years now. We are in support of the rezoning request PD-22-0864. Huff Muffler is a strong local business, and we support them as they take care of all of our automotive needs. We also support the expansion of their business to accommodate more customers, such as us and continue to support the community.

Justin and Amanda Wright have transformed their property from being an eyesore into a pleasing and clean commercial property with well-maintained landscaping. The additional changes being proposed through the PD will improve the property even more and make it one of the best-looking properties along SR 60.

I ask that you support this small local business and approve the rezoning.

Sincerely,

Charlie McCarthy Director of Finance and Operations Nativity Catholic Church and School 705 E. Brandon Blvd, Brandon, FL 33511 charlie@nativitycatholicchurch.org

(813) 681-4608

11

August 29, 2022

To Whom it May Concern:

My name is Steve Anderson and I reside at 623 Highview Circle, S. in Brandon and have been a customer of Huff Muffler of Brandon for 10 years now. We are supportive of the rezoning request PD-22-0864. Huff has been taking care of all of our vehicles and we trust them as they are honest and affordable. We support the expansion of the business so that they may continue to service our vehicles and take care of all of our automotive needs in the future.

Justin has made this property over the years more appealing to look at then the previous owners and in my opinion has increased property values around by having made improvements. The additional changes being proposed through the PD will improve the property even more and make it one of the best-looking properties along SR 60.

I ask that you support this small local business and approve the rezoning.

Steve Anderson

September 9, 2022

To Whom it May Concern:

My name is Paul Pucciarelli and I have been a customer of Huff Muffler of Brandon for a few years now as well as have had the privilege of having their kids attend our Academy here at First Baptist of Brandon. I am in support of the rezoning request PD-22-0864. Huff Muffler is a strong local business. They have helped in many ways with fundraising here at First Baptist over the years as well as host a car show at our Spring-a-Palooza event. We support the expansion of the business to accommodate more customers, employ more skilled employees and continue to support not only First Baptist but the community as well.

Over the years, Justin and Amanda Wright have transformed their property from being an eyesore into a pleasing and clean commercial property with well-maintained landscaping. The additional changes being proposed through the PD will improve the property even more and make it one of the best-looking properties along SR 60.

I ask that you support this small local business and approve the rezoning.

Pirria le:

Rev. Paul Pucciarelli Special Ministries Pastor & Academy Principal

August 30, 2022

To Whom it May Concern:

We own/operate the businesses directly to the east of Huff Muffler, the Crafty Crab Seafood Restaurant (704 E Brandon Blvd.). We are the most impacted neighbors and are supportive of the rezoning request PD-22-0864, including the three PD variations.

Justin and Amanda Wright have been operating their small business on the property since 2012. They have transformed their property into a pleasing commercial property with wellmaintained landscaping. We believe the additional changes being proposed through the PD will improve the property even more and increase the property values in our area. Justin and Amanda are good neighbors and support the community through their small business.

We ask that you approve the rezoning so the business can expand to serve more local residents and the property can be further improved with the proposed changes in the PD site plan.

(g.B.)

i.Bin Jang



September 12, 2022

To Whom it May Concern:

My name is Charlie, and I am the Director of Finance and Operations, at Nativity Catholic Church, located at 705 E Brandon Blvd., which is directly across from Huff Muffler of Brandon. The church has been a customer of Huff's for many years now. We are in support of the rezoning request PD-22-0864. Huff Muffler is a strong local business, and we support them as they take care of all of our automotive needs. We also support the expansion of their business to accommodate more customers, such as us and continue to support the community.

Justin and Amanda Wright have transformed their property from being an eyesore into a pleasing and clean commercial property with well-maintained landscaping. The additional changes being proposed through the PD will improve the property even more and make it one of the best-looking properties along SR 60.

I ask that you support this small local business and approve the rezoning.

Sincerely,

Charlie McCarthy Director of Finance and Operations Nativity Catholic Church and School 705 E. Brandon Blvd, Brandon, FL 33511 charlie@nativitycatholicchurch.org

(813) 681-4608

August 29, 2022

To Whom it May Concern:

My name is Steve Anderson and I reside at 623 Highview Circle, S. in Brandon and have been a customer of Huff Muffler of Brandon for 10 years now. We are supportive of the rezoning request PD-22-0864. Huff has been taking care of all of our vehicles and we trust them as they are honest and affordable. We support the expansion of the business so that they may continue to service our vehicles and take care of all of our automotive needs in the future.

Justin has made this property over the years more appealing to look at then the previous owners and in my opinion has increased property values around by having made improvements. The additional changes being proposed through the PD will improve the property even more and make it one of the best-looking properties along SR 60.

I ask that you support this small local business and approve the rezoning.

Steve Anderson

September 9, 2022

To Whom it May Concern:

My name is Paul Pucciarelli and I have been a customer of Huff Muffler of Brandon for a few years now as well as have had the privilege of having their kids attend our Academy here at First Baptist of Brandon. I am in support of the rezoning request PD-22-0864. Huff Muffler is a strong local business. They have helped in many ways with fundraising here at First Baptist over the years as well as host a car show at our Spring-a-Palooza event. We support the expansion of the business to accommodate more customers, employ more skilled employees and continue to support not only First Baptist but the community as well.

Over the years, Justin and Amanda Wright have transformed their property from being an eyesore into a pleasing and clean commercial property with well-maintained landscaping. The additional changes being proposed through the PD will improve the property even more and make it one of the best-looking properties along SR 60.

I ask that you support this small local business and approve the rezoning.

Sincerely, horialle.

Rev. Paul Pucciarelli Special Ministries Pastor & Academy Principal

August 30, 2022

To Whom it May Concern:

We own/operate the businesses directly to the east of Huff Muffler, the Crafty Crab Seafood Restaurant (704 E Brandon Blvd.). We are the most impacted neighbors and are supportive of the rezoning request PD-22-0864, including the three PD variations.

Justin and Amanda Wright have been operating their small business on the property since 2012. They have transformed their property into a pleasing commercial property with wellmaintained landscaping. We believe the additional changes being proposed through the PD will improve the property even more and increase the property values in our area. Justin and Amanda are good neighbors and support the community through their small business.

We ask that you approve the rezoning so the business can expand to serve more local residents and the property can be further improved with the proposed changes in the PD site plan.

Bin Jan 1



September 12, 2022

To Whom it May Concern:

My name is Charlie, and I am the Director of Finance and Operations, at Nativity Catholic Church, located at 705 E Brandon Blvd., which is directly across from Huff Muffler of Brandon. The church has been a customer of Huff's for many years now. We are in support of the rezoning request PD-22-0864. Huff Muffler is a strong local business, and we support them as they take care of all of our automotive needs. We also support the expansion of their business to accommodate more customers, such as us and continue to support the community.

Justin and Amanda Wright have transformed their property from being an eyesore into a pleasing and clean commercial property with well-maintained landscaping. The additional changes being proposed through the PD will improve the property even more and make it one of the best-looking properties along SR 60.

I ask that you support this small local business and approve the rezoning.

Sincerely,

11

Charlie McCarthy Director of Finance and Operations Nativity Catholic Church and School 705 E. Brandon Blvd, Brandon, FL 33511 <u>charlie@nativitycatholicchurch.org</u> (813) 681-4608

August 29, 2022

To Whom it May Concern:

My name is Steve Anderson and I reside at 623 Highview Circle, S. in Brandon and have been a customer of Huff Muffler of Brandon for 10 years now. We are supportive of the rezoning request PD-22-0864. Huff has been taking care of all of our vehicles and we trust them as they are honest and affordable. We support the expansion of the business so that they may continue to service our vehicles and take care of all of our automotive needs in the future.

Justin has made this property over the years more appealing to look at then the previous owners and in my opinion has increased property values around by having made improvements. The additional changes being proposed through the PD will improve the property even more and make it one of the best-looking properties along SR 60.

I ask that you support this small local business and approve the rezoning.

Steve Anderson

September 9, 2022

To Whom it May Concern:

My name is Paul Pucciarelli and I have been a customer of Huff Muffler of Brandon for a few years now as well as have had the privilege of having their kids attend our Academy here at First Baptist of Brandon. I am in support of the rezoning request PD-22-0864. Huff Muffler is a strong local business. They have helped in many ways with fundraising here at First Baptist over the years as well as host a car show at our Spring-a-Palooza event. We support the expansion of the business to accommodate more customers, employ more skilled employees and continue to support not only First Baptist but the community as well.

Over the years, Justin and Amanda Wright have transformed their property from being an eyesore into a pleasing and clean commercial property with well-maintained landscaping. The additional changes being proposed through the PD will improve the property even more and make it one of the best-looking properties along SR 60.

I ask that you support this small local business and approve the rezoning.

horige le:

Rev. Paul Pucciarelli Special Ministries Pastor & Academy Principal

August 30, 2022

To Whom it May Concern:

We own/operate the businesses directly to the east of Huff Muffler, the Crafty Crab Seafood Restaurant (704 E Brandon Blvd.). We are the most impacted neighbors and are supportive of the rezoning request PD-22-0864, including the three PD variations.

Justin and Amanda Wright have been operating their small business on the property since 2012. They have transformed their property into a pleasing commercial property with wellmaintained landscaping. We believe the additional changes being proposed through the PD will improve the property even more and increase the property values in our area. Justin and Amanda are good neighbors and support the community through their small business.

We ask that you approve the rezoning so the business can expand to serve more local residents and the property can be further improved with the proposed changes in the PD site plan.

y this Bin Jang



September 12, 2022

To Whom it May Concern:

My name is Charlie, and I am the Director of Finance and Operations, at Nativity Catholic Church, located at 705 E Brandon Blvd., which is directly across from Huff Muffler of Brandon. The church has been a customer of Huff's for many years now. We are in support of the rezoning request PD-22-0864. Huff Muffler is a strong local business, and we support them as they take care of all of our automotive needs. We also support the expansion of their business to accommodate more customers, such as us and continue to support the community.

Justin and Amanda Wright have transformed their property from being an eyesore into a pleasing and clean commercial property with well-maintained landscaping. The additional changes being proposed through the PD will improve the property even more and make it one of the best-looking properties along SR 60.

I ask that you support this small local business and approve the rezoning.

Sincerely,

Charlie McCarthy Director of Finance and Operations Nativity Catholic Church and School 705 E. Brandon Blvd, Brandon, FL 33511 charlie@nativitycatholicchurch.org

(813) 681-4608

11

August 29, 2022

To Whom it May Concern:

My name is Steve Anderson and I reside at 623 Highview Circle, S. in Brandon and have been a customer of Huff Muffler of Brandon for 10 years now. We are supportive of the rezoning request PD-22-0864. Huff has been taking care of all of our vehicles and we trust them as they are honest and affordable. We support the expansion of the business so that they may continue to service our vehicles and take care of all of our automotive needs in the future.

Justin has made this property over the years more appealing to look at then the previous owners and in my opinion has increased property values around by having made improvements. The additional changes being proposed through the PD will improve the property even more and make it one of the best-looking properties along SR 60.

I ask that you support this small local business and approve the rezoning.

Steve Anderson

September 9, 2022

To Whom it May Concern:

My name is Paul Pucciarelli and I have been a customer of Huff Muffler of Brandon for a few years now as well as have had the privilege of having their kids attend our Academy here at First Baptist of Brandon. I am in support of the rezoning request PD-22-0864. Huff Muffler is a strong local business. They have helped in many ways with fundraising here at First Baptist over the years as well as host a car show at our Spring-a-Palooza event. We support the expansion of the business to accommodate more customers, employ more skilled employees and continue to support not only First Baptist but the community as well.

Over the years, Justin and Amanda Wright have transformed their property from being an eyesore into a pleasing and clean commercial property with well-maintained landscaping. The additional changes being proposed through the PD will improve the property even more and make it one of the best-looking properties along SR 60.

I ask that you support this small local business and approve the rezoning.

L'orcia le.

Rev. Paul Pucciarelli Special Ministries Pastor & Academy Principal

PARTY OF RECORD

From:	Carol Walden
To:	Zoning Intake-DSD; Zoning Intake-DSD
Cc:	Monsanto, Israel; Timoteo, Rosalina
Subject:	RZ-PD 22-0684 - Crafty Crab Support Letter
Date:	Wednesday, September 7, 2022 6:42:47 PM
Attachments:	Support Letter - Crafty Crab - RZ-PD 22-0684.PDF
	RIS - RZ-PD 22-0684 - Crafty Crab Support Letter.PDF

External email: Use caution when clicking on links, opening attachments or replying to this email.

Attached please find the completed Revised Information Sheet and the Crafty Crab support letter regarding planned development rezoning application RZ-PD 22-0684.

Thank you!

Carol Walden, Land Development Paralegal Stearns Weaver Miller Weissler Alhadeff & Sitterson, P.A. 401 East Jackson Street, Suite 2100 Tampa, FL 33602 Direct Number: (813) 222-5035 Main Number: (813) 223-4800 Email: cwalden@stearnsweaver.com www.stearnsweaver.com STEARNS WEAVER MILLER

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The information contained in this E-mail message is attorney privileged and confidential information intended only for the use of the individual(s) named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copy of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in

error, please contact the sender by reply E-mail and destroy all copies of the original message. Thank you.

To Whom it May Concern:

We own/operate the businesses directly to the east of Huff Muffler, the Crafty Crab Seafood Restaurant (704 E Brandon Blvd.). We are the most impacted neighbors and are supportive of the rezoning request PD-22-0864, including the three PD variations.

Justin and Amanda Wright have been operating their small business on the property since 2012. They have transformed their property into a pleasing commercial property with wellmaintained landscaping. We believe the additional changes being proposed through the PD will improve the property even more and increase the property values in our area. Justin and Amanda are good neighbors and support the community through their small business.

We ask that you approve the rezoning so the business can expand to serve more local residents and the property can be further improved with the proposed changes in the PD site plan.

Additional / Revised Information Sheet

Application	Numbor	RZ	22-0684	
Application	Numper:			

Development Services

Hillsborough County Florida

> Office Use Only Received Date:

Received By:

The following form is required when submitted changes for any application that was previously submitted. A cover letter must be submitted providing a summary of the changes and/or additional information provided. If there is a change in project size the cover letter must list any new folio number(s) added. Additionally, **the second page of this form** <u>must</u> be **included indicating the additional/revised documents being submitted with this form**.

Application Number:	RZ 22-0684	Applicant's Name:	Raymond G. Savoie, as Trustee of the Raymond G. Savoie Living Trust
Reviewing Planner's N	ame: Israel Monsa	anto	09/07/2022
	_		ince (PRS) 🔲 Standard Rezoning (RZ)
Variance (VAR)	Development of	Regional Impact (DRI) Major Modification (MM)
Special Use (SU)	Conditional Use	(CU)	Other
Current Hearing Date	(if applicable): 09/19/2	2022	
	Size Change Information		
Changes to project size	may result in a new hearing d	late as all reviews will	be subject to the established cut-off dates.
Will this revision add land to the project? If Yes INO If "Yes" is checked on the above please ensure you include all items marked with * on the last page.			
Will this revision remove land from the project? If Yes INO If "Yes" is checked on the above please ensure you include all items marked with * on the last page.			
Email this form along with all submittal items indicated on the next page in pdf form to: ZoningIntake-DSD@hcflgov.net			
Files must be in pdf format and minimum resolution of 300 dpi. Each item should be submitted as a separate file titled according to its contents. All items should be submitted in one email with application number (including prefix) included on the subject line. Maximum attachment(s) size is 15 MB.			
For additional help	and submittal questions, ple	ase call (813) 277-16	33 or email ZoningIntake-DSD@hcflgov.net.

I certify that changes described above are the only changes that have been made to the submission. Any further changes will require an additional submission and certification.

andwald

Signature

09/07/2022

Date



Identification of Sensitive/Protected Information and Acknowledgement of Public Records

RZ 22-0684

Pursuant to <u>Chapter 119 Florida Statutes</u>, all information submitted to Development Services is considered public record and open to inspection by the public. Certain information may be considered sensitive or protected information which may be excluded from this provision. Sensitive/protected information may include, but is not limited to, documents such as medical records, income tax returns, death certificates, bank statements, and documents containing social security numbers.

While all efforts will be taken to ensure the security of protected information, certain specified information, such as addresses of exempt parcels, may need to be disclosed as part of the public hearing process for select applications. If your application requires a public hearing and contains sensitive/protected information, please contact <u>Hillsborough County</u> <u>Development Services</u> to determine what information will need to be disclosed as part of the public hearing process.

Additionally, parcels exempt under <u>Florida Statutes §119.071(4)</u> will need to contact <u>Hillsborough County Development</u> <u>Services</u> to obtain a release of exempt parcel information.

Are you seeking an exemption from public disclosure of selected information submitted with your application pursuant to Chapter 119 FS? Yes No

I hereby confirm that the material submitted with application

Includes sensitive and/or protected information.

Type of information included and location_____

Does not include sensitive and/or protected information.

Please note: Sensitive/protected information will not be accepted/requested unless it is required for the processing of the application.

If an exemption is being sought, the request will be reviewed to determine if the applicant can be processed with the data being held from public view. Also, by signing this form I acknowledge that any and all information in the submittal will become public information if not required by law to be protected.

Signature:	Carve wheele
0 _	

(Must be signed by applicant or authorized representative)

Intake Staff Signature:

×

Date: _____



Additional / Revised Information Sheet

Please indicate below which revised/additional items are being submitted with this form.

Pleas	se indicat	e below which revised/additional items are being submitted with this form.
In	cluded	Submittal Item
1		Cover Letter*+ If adding or removing land from the project site, the final list of folios must be included
2		Revised Application Form*+
3		Copy of Current Deed * Must be provided for any new folio(s) being added
4		Affidavit to Authorize Agent* (If Applicable) Must be provided for any new folio(s) being added
5		Sunbiz Form* (If Applicable) Must be provided for any new folio(s) being added
6		Property Information Sheet*+
7		Legal Description of the Subject Site*+
8		Close Proximity Property Owners List*+
9		Site Plan*+ All changes on the site plan must be listed in detail in the Cover Letter.
10		Survey
11		Wet Zone Survey
12		General Development Plan
13		Project Description/Written Statement
14		Design Exception and Administrative Variance requests/approvals
15		Variance Criteria Response
16		Copy of Code Enforcement or Building Violation
17		Transportation Analysis
18		Sign-off form
19	\mathbf{X}	Other Documents (please describe):
		Craft Crab Support Letter

*Revised documents required when adding land to the project site. Other revised documents may be requested by the planner reviewing the application.

+Required documents required when removing land from the project site. Other revised documents may be requested by the planner reviewing the application.