



PD Modification Application: MM 22-1501

Zoning Hearing Master Date: April 17, 2023

BOCC Land Use Meeting Date: June 13, 2023

1.0 APPLICATION SUMMARY

Applicant: Isabelle Albert, AICP, Half Associates, Inc.

FLU Category: CMU-12


Service Area: Urban

Site Acreage: 6.91 AC +/-

Community Plan Area: University

Overlay: None

Request: Major Modification to PD 20-0308



Request Summary:

Allow the entitlement increase for mini warehouse uses in POD B.

The approved access serving non-commercial uses is also proposed to be shifted to the east; and to add a cross access bounding box.

Existing Approvals:

PD 20-0308 allows for 331 dwelling units in POD A and 33,000 square feet of BPO and CG uses, and/or community residential home in POD B.

Proposed Modification(s):

The applicant requests modifications to the POD B only. The request is limited to a maximum of 83,308 square feet if developed with mini warehouse uses while retaining the 33,000 square feet for existing BPO/CG and/or community residential home uses.

The proposed PD site plan also adds a cross access bounding box between the subject parcel and POD A to allow for flexibility with the final location of the connection point to be determined at the time of site construction plan review.

Additional Information:

PD Variations	None
Waiver(s) to the Land Development Code	None

APPLICATION NUMBER: MM 22-1501

ZHM HEARING DATE: April 17, 2023


BOCC LUM MEETING DATE: June 13, 2023

Case Reviewer: Tania C. Chapela

Planning Commission Recommendation	Consistent
Development Services Department Recommendation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Approvable, subject to conditions of approval, for the second development option and signage requests.

2.0 LAND USE MAP SET AND SUMMARY DATA

2.1 Vicinity Map




Context of Surrounding Area:

The subject site is located on the south side of E Telecom Parkway, approximately 2000 feet west of the intersection with I-75. The subject property is vacant; with single family uses in the surrounding area to the north and west, a vacant TECO owned property to the east, and conservation lands to the south.

2.0 LAND USE MAP SET AND SUMMARY DATA


2.2 Future Land Use Map



Subject Site Future Land Use Category:	CMU-12
Maximum Density/F.A.R.:	0.5 FAR
Typical Uses:	Residential, Urban commercial, offices, multi-purpose, mixed-use development.

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	City of Temple Terrace	n/a (FLU of N)	Single Family	Single Family
South	City of Temple Terrace	-	-	Multi Family
East	AS-1	1 unit per acre	Agricultural, Single-Family	Vacant (TECO)
West	PD	NA	Water Pond	Vacant (City of Temple Terrace Water Pond)

*subject to utilities


2.0 LAND USE MAP SET AND SUMMARY DATA

2.4 Approved Site Plan (partial provided below for size and orientation purposes. See Section 8.1 for full site plan)



2.0 LAND USE MAP SET AND SUMMARY DATA

2.5 Proposed Site Plan (partial provided below for size and orientation purposes. See Section 8.2 for full site plan)



APPLICATION NUMBER: MM 22-1501

ZHM HEARING DATE: April 17, 2023

BOCC LUM MEETING DATE: June 13, 2023

Case Reviewer: Tania C. Chapela

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
E. Telecom Parkway	Temple Terrace Local - Urban	2 Lanes <input type="checkbox"/> Substandard Road <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient ROW Width	<input type="checkbox"/> Corridor Preservation Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Site Access Improvements <input type="checkbox"/> Substandard Road Improvements <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other

Project Trip Generation Not applicable for this request

	Average Annual Daily Trips	A.M. Peak Hour Trips	P.M. Peak Hour Trips
Existing	3,524	126	305
Proposed	166	11	19
Difference (+/-)	-3,358	-115	-286

*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	X	None	None	Meets LDC
South		None	None	Meets LDC
East		None	None	Meets LDC
West		None	None	Meets LDC
Notes:				

Design Exception/Administrative Variance Not applicable for this request

Road Name/Nature of Request	Type	Finding
N/A	Choose an item.	Choose an item.
	Choose an item.	Choose an item.
Notes:		

4.0 ADDITIONAL SITE INFORMATION & AGENCY COMMENTS SUMMARY

INFORMATION/REVIEWING AGENCY				
Environmental:	Comments Received	Objections	Conditions Requested	Additional Information/Comments
Environmental Protection Commission	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Natural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
Conservation & Environ. Lands Mgmt.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
Check if Applicable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wetlands/Other Surface Waters <input type="checkbox"/> Use of Environmentally Sensitive Land Credit <input type="checkbox"/> Wellhead Protection Area <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Surface Water Resource Protection Area <input type="checkbox"/> Potable Water Wellfield Protection Area <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Significant Wildlife Habitat <input type="checkbox"/> Coastal High Hazard Area <input type="checkbox"/> Urban/Suburban/Rural Scenic Corridor <input type="checkbox"/> Adjacent to ELAPP property <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ 				
Public Facilities:	Comments Received	Objections	Conditions Requested	Additional Information/Comments
Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Design Exc./Adm. Variance Requested <input type="checkbox"/> Off-site Improvements Provided	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Service Area/ Water & Wastewater <input type="checkbox"/> Urban <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> City of Tampa <input type="checkbox"/> Rural <input type="checkbox"/> City of Temple Terrace	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Hillsborough County School Board Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> K-5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6-8 <input type="checkbox"/> 9-12 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A Inadequate <input type="checkbox"/> K-5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6-8 <input type="checkbox"/> 9-12 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
Impact/Mobility Fees Self-Storage/Mini-Warehouse (Per 1,000 s.f.) Mobility: \$725*110 = \$79,750 Fire: \$32*110 = \$3,520				
Comprehensive Plan:	Comments Received	Findings	Conditions Requested	Additional Information/Comments
Planning Commission <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Locational Criteria <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Locational Criteria Waiver Requested <input type="checkbox"/> Minimum Density Met <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Inconsistent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

5.0 IMPLEMENTATION RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Compatibility

The proposed uses are comparable to the current CG (Commercial General) allowed uses. The proposed Maximum 0.5 FAR is allowable in the CMU-12 Comprehensive Plan category. Furthermore, the proposed building area will not intrude into the required setbacks, nor will decrease the required buffers or screening. Additionally, the increased FAR will have minimal impact on the transportation network. Per the Transportation Staff, the proposed modification would result in a decrease in maximum potential trips generated by the subject site by -3,403 daily trips.

Given the above, staff finds the proposed modification to be compatible with the surrounding properties and in keeping the general development pattern of the area.

5.2 Recommendation

Staff recommends approval of the applicant’s request, subject to conditions.

6.0 PROPOSED CONDITIONS

Approval of the request, subject to the conditions listed, is based on the revised general site plan submitted November 22, 2023.

1. The project shall be permitted a maximum of 320 multi-family units, a maximum of 11 townhome units, and a maximum of 33,000 square feet of commercial (CN) and office (BPO) uses, and / or Community Residential Home , or a maximum 83,308 square foot mini-warehouse use where shown on the general site plan.

1.1 To ensure the project will provide two land uses, construction plans for phase 1 shall be for 320 multifamily unit and 11 townhomes to be constructed in POD A. Construction plans shall also include POD B with utilities connection on site, stormwater, driveway access, and drive-aisle between POD A and POD B, as well as the construction of the multi-use trail along Telecom Parkway as depicted on the general site plan.

2. Development standards shall be as follows:

2.1 Multi-family and townhomes:

Front yard setback:	50 feet
Accessory garage front setback:	20 feet
Rear yard setback:	20 feet
Side yard setback:	50 feet
Accessory garage side setback:	10 feet
Minimum building separation:	25 feet
Maximum building height:	60 feet/four stories (No additional setback of 2 feet for every 1 foot over 20 feet in height shall be required along PD boundaries)
Maximum building coverage:	40 percent

Maximum impervious surface ratio: 80 percent
Wetland setback: 30 feet

2.2 Business Professional Office / Commercial General, except for mini warehouse uses:

Front yard setback: 30 feet
Rear yard setback: 20 feet
Side yard setback: 30 feet
Maximum building height: 35 feet
Maximum building coverage: 20 percent
Maximum impervious surface ratio: 60 percent
Wetland setback: 30 feet

2.3 Mini Warehouse:

Front yard setback: 30 feet
Rear yard setback: 20 feet
Side yard setback: 10 feet
Maximum building height: 4-Stories, 60 feet
Maximum building coverage: 40 percent
Maximum impervious surface ratio: 75 percent
Wetland setback: 30 feet

~~2.3~~ 2.4. Community Residential Home


Front yard setback: 25 feet
Rear yard setback: 20 feet
Side yard setback: 10 feet
Maximum building height: 35 feet (No additional setback of 2 feet for every 1 foot over 20 feet in height shall be required along PD boundaries)
Maximum building coverage: 40 percent
Maximum impervious surface ratio: 70 percent
Wetland setback: 30 feet

- 3. An internal pedestrian and vehicular connection shall be constructed within the easement area between POD A and POD B, and the Developer shall install a 6-foot chain link fence around the perimeter of the existing City of Temple Terrace stormwater pond and provide a 12-foot wide gated access in a location approved by the City of Temple Terrace Public Works Department. Prior to any work in the existing easement area, the Developer shall provide the City of Temple Terrace with an indemnification agreement and certificate of insurance on terms and conditions to be mutually agreed by the parties.
- 4. The Developer shall construct an 8-foot wide asphalt trail along the southern right-of-way line of East Telecom Drive. The trail shall begin at the eastern easement line of Hollow Stump Road and be constructed continuously to connect with the existing trail at Arbor Island Blvd provided the trail width may be reduced with approval from City of Temple Terrace staff in areas where existing conditions will not permit the construction of an 8-foot wide trail.

5. Notwithstanding anything herein these conditions or on the PD site plan to the contrary, bicycle and pedestrian access may be permitted anywhere along the PD boundaries.
6. If RZ 20-0308 is approved, the County Engineer will approve a Design Exception (dated December 26, 2019) for Hollow Stump Rd. which was found approvable by the County Engineer (on May 4, 2020). As Hollow Stump Rd. is a substandard local roadway, the developer will be required to make certain improvements to Hollow Stump Rd. consistent with the Design Exception. Specifically:
 - 6.1 Between Telecom Pkwy. and the access serving Pod A, the developer shall:
 - 6.1.1 Widen the road such that there are two (2) 10-foot wide travel lanes;
 - 6.1.2 Install Type D curb along both sides of the roadway; and,
 - 6.1.3 Construct a 6-foot wide sidewalk adjacent to the back of curb on the east side of the roadway.
 - 6.2 Between the access serving Pod A and the southern property boundary, the developer shall:
 - 6.2.1 Widen the road such that there is a minimum pavement width of 15 feet; and,
 - 6.2.2 Install ribbon curb along both sides of the roadway.
7. Subject to review and approval of the City of Temple Terrace (during the site access permit review process), the developer shall:
 - 7.1 Obtain a roadway connection permit prior to construction plan approval;
 - 7.2 Construct the following site access improvements:
 - 7.2.1 Construct a westbound to southbound left turn lane on E. Telecom Pkwy. into the project access driveway to Pod A;
 - 7.2.2 If warranted, construct a westbound to southbound left turn lane on E. Telecom Pkwy. into the project access driveway to Pod B.; and,
 - 7.2.3 If warranted, construct an eastbound to southbound right turn lane into on E. Telecom Pkwy. into the project access driveway to Pod B.
8. The developer shall construct an 8-foot wide asphalt trail along the southern side of E. Telecom Pkwy. between the existing terminus of the trail (just east of the intersection of Arbor Island Blvd. and E. Telecom Pkwy.) and Hollow Stump Rd. Notwithstanding the above, City of Temple Terrace staff may reduce the required trail width in areas where existing conditions will not permit construction of the 8-foot wide trail.
9. The developer shall construct an internal pedestrian and vehicular connection between Pod A and Pod B. Such connection may be gated but shall be available for the daily use of Pod A residents. Additionally, the developer shall:
 - 9.1 Install a 6-foot chain link fence around the perimeter of the existing City of Temple Terrace stormwater pond;

- 9.2 Install a 12-foot wide gated access to the existing City of Temple Terrace stormwater pond (in a location to be reviewed and approved by the City of Temple Terrace Public Works Department); and,
- 9.3 Prior to any work within the existing easement area, provide the City of Temple Terrace with an indemnification agreement and certificate of insurance on terms and conditions to be mutually agreed by the parties.
10. Vehicular and pedestrian cross access between folio#37376.0003 and the remaining portion of the PD may be permitted anywhere within the bounding box shown on the PD site plan.
- ~~10.~~ 11. Approval of this zoning petition by Hillsborough County does not constitute a guarantee that the Environmental Protection Commission of Hillsborough County (EPC) approvals/permits necessary for the development as proposed will be issued, does not itself serve to justify any impact to wetlands, and does not grant any implied or vested right to environmental approvals.
- ~~11.~~ 12. Prior to the issuance of any building or land alteration permits or other development, the approved wetland/other surface water (OSW) line must be incorporated into the site plan. The wetland/OSW line must appear on all site plans, labeled as "EPC Wetland Line", and the wetland must be labeled as "Wetland Conservation Area " pursuant to the Hillsborough County Land Development Code (LDC).
- ~~12.~~ 13. Final design of buildings, stormwater retention areas, and ingress/egresses are subject to change pending formal agency jurisdictional determinations of wetland and other surface water boundaries and approval by the appropriate regulatory agencies.
- ~~13.~~ 14. The construction and location of any proposed wetland impacts are not approved by this correspondence, but shall be reviewed by EPC staff under separate application pursuant to the EPC Wetlands rule detailed in Chapter 1-11, Rules of the EPC, (Chapter 1-11) to determine whether such impacts are necessary to accomplish reasonable use of the subject property.
- ~~14.~~ 15. 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 any stated conditions shall be interpreted as the regulations in effect at the time of preliminary site plan/plat approval.
- ~~15.~~ 16. 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 Apr 10 2023 14:52:11

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.

7.0 ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND/OR GRAPHICS

None.


8.0 SITE PLANS (FULL)

8.1 Approved Site Plan (Full)



8.0 SITE PLANS (FULL)

8.2 Proposed Site Plan (Full) – Sheet 1 of 2



9.0 FULL TRANSPORTATION REPORT (see following pages)

AGENCY REVIEW COMMENT SHEET

TO: Zoning Technician, Development Services Department

DATE: 4/05/2023

REVIEWER: Richard Perez, AICP

AGENCY/DEPT: Transportation

PLANNING AREA/SECTOR: USF/ Northwest

PETITION NO: MM 22-1501

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

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

- Vehicular and pedestrian cross access between folio#37376.0003 and the remaining portion of the PD may be permitted anywhere within the bounding box shown on the PD site plan.

PROJECT SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS

The applicant is requesting a major modification to a portion of PD 20-0308 to allow for up to 83,308 sf of self-storage/mini warehouse as an alternative development option. The subject site currently allows for up to 33,000 sf of Commercial General (CG) and Business Professional Office (BPO) uses.

As required by the Development Review Procedures Manual (DRPM), the applicant submitted a trip generation analysis for the proposed project. Staff has prepared a comparison of trips generated under the existing and proposed zoning designations, utilizing a generalized worst-case scenario. Calculations are based on data from the 11th Edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineer's Trip Generation Manual.

Existing PD Zoning:

Land Use/Size	24 Hour Two-Way Volume	Total Peak Hour Trips	
		AM	PM
PD, 33,000 Supermarket (ITE LUC 850)	3,524	126	305

Proposed Modification (Alternative Development Option):

Land Use/Size	24 Hour Two-Way Volume	Total Peak Hour Trips	
		AM	PM
PD, 83,308 sf Self-Storage (ITE LUC 151)	121	7	12

Trip Generation Difference:

	24 Hour Two-Way Volume	Total Peak Hour Trips	
		AM	PM
Difference (+/-)	-3,403	-119	-293

The proposed modification will result in a decrease in maximum potential trips generated by the subject site by -3,403 daily trips, -119 AM trips and -293 PM trips.

TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE SERVING THE SITE

E. Telecom Pkwy. is a 2-lane, local roadway owned and maintained by the City of Temple Terrace. The roadway is characterized by 12-foot wide travel lanes in good condition. The roadway lies within a +/- 55-foot wide right-of-way. There are +/- 5-foot wide sidewalks along portions of the north and south side of Telecom Pkwy. in the vicinity of the proposed project. There are +/- 4-foot wide bicycle lanes on Telecom Pkwy. east of the proposed project. There is a +/- 8-foot wide multi-purpose trail along the south side of Telecom Pkwy. east of the proposed project.

Staff notes that per condition of approval #4 the developer is required to construct an 8-foot multi use pathway on the south side of E. Telecom Parkway, along the project frontage.

SITE ACCESS AND CONNECTIVITY

The project will be access via Telecom Pkwy as previously approved.

The proposed PD site plan adds a cross access bounding box between the subject parcel and the larger PD to allow for flexibility with the final location of the connection point to be determined at the time of site construction plan review.

ROADWAY LEVEL OF SERVICE

Telecom Parkway is owned by the City of Temple Terrace. As such, Level of Service (LOS) information for adjacent roadway sections is unavailable.

Transportation Comment Sheet

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
E. Telecom Parkway	Temple Terrace Local - Urban	2 Lanes <input type="checkbox"/> Substandard Road <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient ROW Width	<input type="checkbox"/> Corridor Preservation Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Site Access Improvements <input type="checkbox"/> Substandard Road Improvements <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other

Project Trip Generation <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable for this request			
	Average Annual Daily Trips	A.M. Peak Hour Trips	P.M. Peak Hour Trips
Existing	3,524	126	305
Proposed	166	11	19
Difference (+/-)	-3,358	-115	-286

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

Connectivity and Cross Access <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable for this request				
Project Boundary	Primary Access	Additional Connectivity/Access	Cross Access	Finding
North	X	None	None	Meets LDC
South		None	None	Meets LDC
East		None	None	Meets LDC
West		None	None	Meets LDC
Notes:				

Design Exception/Administrative Variance <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable for this request		
Road Name/Nature of Request	Type	Finding
N/A	Choose an item.	Choose an item.
Notes:		

4.0 Additional Site Information & Agency Comments Summary			
Transportation	Objections	Conditions Requested	Additional Information/Comments
<input type="checkbox"/> Design Exception/Adm. Variance Requested <input type="checkbox"/> Off-Site Improvements Provided	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	See report.

COUNTY OF HILLSBOROUGH

**RECOMMENDATION OF THE
LAND USE HEARING OFFICER**

APPLICATION NUMBER: MM 22-1501

DATE OF HEARING: April 17, 2023

APPLICANT: BL Holdings Tampa, LLC

PETITION REQUEST: The Major Modification request is to modify PD 20-0308 to Parcel B regarding a proposed 83,308 square feet of mini-warehouse or retain the 33,000 square feet of already approved BPO, CG or Community Residential Home land uses

LOCATION: South side of the intersection of E. Telecom Pkwy. And Arbor Island Blvd.

SIZE OF PROPERTY: 6.91 acres, m.o.l.

EXISTING ZONING DISTRICT: PD 20-0308

FUTURE LAND USE CATEGORY: CMU-12

SERVICE AREA: Urban


COMMUNITY PLAN: N/A

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW STAFF REPORT

***Note:** Formatting issues prevented the entire Development Services Department staff report from being copied into the Hearing Master's Recommendation. Therefore, please refer to the Development Services Department web site for the complete staff report.

1.0 APPLICATION SUMMARY

Development Services Department



Applicant: Isabelle Albert, AICP, Halff Associates, Inc.

FLU Category: CMU-12

Service Area: Urban

Site Acreage: 6.91 AC +/-

Community Plan Area: N/A

Overlay: None

Request: Major Modification to PD 20-0308

Request Summary:

Allow the entitlement increase for mini warehouse uses in POD B.

The approved access serving non-commercial uses is also proposed to be shifted to the east; and to add a cross access bounding box.

Existing Approvals:

PD 20-0308 allows for 331 dwelling units in POD A and 33,000 square feet of BPO and CG uses, and/or community residential home in POD B.

Proposed Modification(s):

The applicant requests modifications to the POD B only. The request is limited to a maximum of 83,308 square feet if developed with mini warehouse uses while retaining the 33,000 square feet for existing BPO/CG and/or community residential home uses.

The proposed PD site plan also adds a cross access bounding box between the subject parcel and POD A to allow for flexibility with the final location of the connection point to be determined at the time of site construction plan review.

Additional Information:


PD Variations: None

Waiver(s) to the Land Development Code	None
--	------

Planning Commission: Consistent

Development Services Department Recommendation	• Approvable, subject to conditions of approval
--	---


2.0 LAND USE MAP SET AND SUMMARY DATA 2.2 Future Land Use Map



Subject Site Future Land Use Category:	CMU-12
Maximum Density/F.A.R.:	0.5 FAR
Typical Uses:	Residential, Urban commercial, offices, multi-purpose, mixed-use development.


2.0 LAND USE MAP SET AND SUMMARY DATA

2.4 Approved Site Plan (partial provided below for size and orientation purposes. See Section 8.1 for full site plan)



2.0 LAND USE MAP SET AND SUMMARY DATA

2.5 Proposed Site Plan (partial provided below for size and orientation purposes. See Section 8.2 for full site plan)



Classification Current Conditions Select Future Improvements

3.0 TRANSPORTATION SUMMARY (FULL TRANSPORTATION REPORT IN SECTION 9 OF STAFF REPORT)			
Adjoining Roadways (check if applicable)			
E. Telecom Parkway	Temple Terrace Local - Urban	2 Lanes <input type="checkbox"/> Substandard Road <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient ROW Width	<input type="checkbox"/> Corridor Preservation Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Site Access Improvements <input type="checkbox"/> Substandard Road Improvements <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other

Project Trip Generation Not applicable for this request

Design Exception/Administrative Variance Not applicable for this request
N/A

4.0 ADDITIONAL SITE INFORMATION & AGENCY COMMENTS SUMMARY

Check if Applicable: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wetlands/Other Surface Waters <input type="checkbox"/> Use of Environmentally Sensitive Land Credit <input type="checkbox"/> Wellhead Protection Area <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Surface Water Resource Protection Area <input type="checkbox"/> Potable Water Wellfield Protection Area <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Significant Wildlife Habitat <input type="checkbox"/> Coastal High Hazard Area <input type="checkbox"/> Urban/Suburban/Rural Scenic Corridor <input type="checkbox"/> Adjacent to ELAPP property <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____				
Public Facilities:	Comments Received	Objections	Conditions Requested	Additional Information/Comments
Transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Design Exc./Adm. Variance Requested <input type="checkbox"/> Off-site Improvements Provided	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	

Service Area/ Water & Wastewater <input type="checkbox"/> Urban <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> City of Tampa <input type="checkbox"/> Rural <input type="checkbox"/> City of Temple Terrace	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
Hillsborough County School Board Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> K-5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6-8 <input type="checkbox"/> 9-12 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A Inadequate <input type="checkbox"/> K-5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6-8 <input type="checkbox"/> 9-12 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
Impact/Mobility Fees Self-Storage/Mini-Warehouse (Per 1,000 s.f.) Mobility: \$725*110 = \$79,750 Fire: \$32*110 = \$3,520				
Comprehensive Plan:	Comments Received	Findings	Conditions Requested	Additional Information/Comments
Planning Commission <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Locational Criteria <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Locational Criteria Waiver Requested <input type="checkbox"/> Minimum Density Met <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Inconsistent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consistent	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

5.0 IMPLEMENTATION RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Compatibility

The proposed uses are comparable to the current CG (Commercial General) allowed uses. The proposed Maximum 0.5 FAR is allowable in the CMU-12 Comprehensive Plan category. Furthermore, the proposed building area will not intrude into the required setbacks, nor will decrease the required buffers or

screening. Additionally, the increased FAR will have minimal impact on the transportation network. Per the Transportation Staff, the proposed modification would result in a decrease in maximum potential trips generated by the subject site by -3,403 daily trips.

Given the above, staff finds the proposed modification to be compatible with the surrounding properties and in keeping the general development pattern of the area.

5.2 Recommendation

Staff recommends approval of the applicant's request, subject to conditions.

Zoning conditions were presented to the Zoning Hearing Master at the hearing and are hereby incorporated into the Zoning Hearing Master's recommendation.

SUMMARY OF HEARING

THIS CAUSE came on for hearing before the Hillsborough County Land Use Hearing Officer on April 17, 2023. Ms. Michelle Heinrich of the Hillsborough County Development Services Department introduced the petition.

Ms. Brice Pinson 1000 North Ashley Drive testified on behalf of the applicant. Ms. Pinson stated that the request for a Major Modification to the PD is for 83,309 square feet of mini-warehouse uses and to retain the existing entitlements if developed with BPO, CG or a Community Residential Home.

Hearing Master Finch asked Ms. Pinson to confirm that the request is for either the 33,000 square feet of CG and BPO and/or a Community Residential Home or the 83,301 square feet of mini-warehouse but not both uses. Ms. Pinson replied that was correct. She added that the 83,308 square feet would only be if the property is developed with a mini-warehouse otherwise the site would stay with the 33,000 square feet.

Ms. Pinson continued her presentation by stating that the Planning Commission found the request compatible with the surrounding area as did the Development Services Department. The request also results in a reduction of the overall daily trips.

Ms. Tania Chapela of the Development Services Department, testified regarding the County staff report and stated that a correction to her staff report was needed regarding the statement that Development Services found the request approvable but included mention of a development option and signage that should not be a part of the staff report. Ms. Chapela testified that the modification only applies to Parcel B and adds 83,308 square feet of mini-warehouse uses while retaining the 33,000 square feet of BPO, CG and the Community Residential Home land use. Ms. Chapela described the surrounding

land uses and stated that staff found the request compatible with the area and supportable.

Hearing Master Finch asked Ms. Chapela about proposed condition 10 regarding the vehicular and pedestrian cross access which could be located anywhere within the box on the site plan at the time of site development review. Mr. Perez of the County's Transportation Review section replied that staff confirmed the bounding box that is shown on the site which provides flexibility for the cross access and the exact location will be determined at site development review.

Ms. Melissa Lienhard of the Planning Commission testified regarding the Planning Commission staff report. Ms. Lienhard stated that the property is designated Community Mixed Use-12 by the Future Land Use Map and is located within the Urban Service Area. She described the request and stated that it meets Objective 1 and Policy 1.2 regarding compatibility with the surrounding area. She stated that the request meets Policy 1.4 regarding growth in the Urban Service Area and also Policy 22.2 as the site is not subject to commercial locational criteria. Ms. Lienhard testified that the modification meets Objective 19 and Policy 19.1 regarding mixed use projects. She concluded her presentation by stating that the project is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Hearing Master Finch asked audience members if there were any proponents of the application. None replied.

Hearing Master Finch asked audience members if there were any opponents of the application. None replied.

Ms. Heinrich of the Development Services Department testified staff would update their staff report to reflect the Planning Commission's comments that the site is not located in a Community Planning Area.

Ms. Pinson did not have additional comments.

Hearing Master Finch then concluded the hearing.

EVIDENCE SUBMITTED

No documents were submitted into the record.

PREFACE

All matters that precede the Summary of Hearing section of this Decision are hereby incorporated into and shall constitute a part of the ensuing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The subject site is 6.91 acres and is zoned Planned Development (20-0308). The property is designated CMU-12 by the Comprehensive Plan and located in the Urban Service Area.
2. The Planned Development (PD) is currently approved for 320 multi-family units, 11 townhomes, and a maximum of 33,000 square feet of Business Professional Office (BPO), Commercial Neighborhood (CN) and/or a Community Residential Home.
3. The Major Modification request pertains to POD B on-site to permit an 83,308 square foot mini-warehouse or the already permitted 33,000 square feet of Business Professional Office (BPO), Commercial Neighborhood (CN) and/or a Community Residential Home.
4. The Planning Commission found the request meets Objective 1 and Policy 1.2 regarding compatibility with the surrounding area as well as Policy 1.4 regarding growth in the Urban Service Area. Staff testified that the site is not subject to commercial locational criteria and does meet Objective 19 and Policy 19.1 regarding mixed use projects. Staff found the modification consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.
5. The subject property is bordered by parcels located in the City of Temple Terrace to the north and south as well as property zoned AS-1 owned by TECO to the east and a PD to the west which has a City of Temple Terrace pond on-site.
6. The applicant's representative testified that the proposed 83,308 square feet of mini-warehouse would represent a decrease in the overall vehicular trips when compared to the currently approved land uses.
7. County transportation staff testified that the pedestrian and vehicular cross access point located on the eastern portion of the project interior to the site and shown within a bounding box would be determined at the time of site development approval.

8. The proposed modification to POD B reduces the transportation impacts of the Planned Development if the parcel is developed with the proposed mini-warehouse land use and is compatible with the area. The request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and Land Development Code.

FINDINGS OF COMPLIANCE/NON-COMPLIANCE WITH THE HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The Major Modification request is in compliance with and does further the intent of the Goals, Objectives and the Policies of the Future of Hillsborough Comprehensive Plan.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Based on the Findings of Fact cited above, there is substantial competent evidence to demonstrate that the requested Major Modification to the Planned Development zoning is in conformance with the applicable requirements of the Land Development Code and with applicable zoning and established principles of zoning law.

SUMMARY

Planned Development 20-0308 is currently approved for 320 multi-family units, 11 townhomes, and a maximum of 33,000 square feet of Business Professional Office (BPO), Commercial Neighborhood (CN) and/or a Community Residential Home.


The Major Modification request pertains to POD B on-site to permit an 83,308 square foot mini-warehouse or the already permitted 33,000 square feet of Business Professional Office (BPO), Commercial Neighborhood (CN) and/or a Community Residential Home.

The Planning Commission staff found the modification consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

The proposed modification reduces the overall vehicular trips when compared to the currently approved land uses and is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and Land Development Code.

RECOMMENDATION


Based on the foregoing, this recommendation is for **APPROVAL** of the Major Modification to Planned Development 20-0308 as indicated by the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law stated above subject to the zoning conditions prepared by the Development Services Department.



May 8, 2023


Susan M. Finch, AICP
Land Use Hearing Officer

Date



**Hillsborough County
City-County
Planning Commission**

Unincorporated Hillsborough County Rezoning	
Hearing Date: April 17, 2023 Report Prepared: April 5, 2023	MM 22-1501 12301 Hollow Stump Road <i>South of East Telecom Parkway, west of Old Morris Bridge Road and north of East Fowler Avenue.</i>
Summary Data:	
Comprehensive Plan Finding:	CONSISTENT
Adopted Future Land Use:	Community Mixed-Use-12 (CMU-12)
Service Area	Urban
Community Plan:	N/A
Requested Zoning:	Request for a major modification to a planned development (PD 20-0308) to permit the development of 331 multi-family units, 33,000 square feet of Business Professional Office (BPO) uses, Commercial General (CG) uses and/or a Community Residential Home or 83,308 square feet for mini warehouse
Parcel Size (Approx.):	55.2+/- acres
Street Functional Classification:	Arbor Island Boulevard– Local East Telecom Parkway – Local Old Morris Bridge Road – Collector East Fowler Ave – Principal Arterial
Locational Criteria	N/A
Evacuation Zone	C, D & E



Context

- The approximately 55.2 +/--acre site is located on the south side of East Telecom Parkway, west of Old Morris Bridge Road, north of East Fowler Avenue and east of Hollow Stump Road. The subject site is in the Urban Service Area. There are a significant amount of wetlands on the site.
- The subject site's Future Land Use designation is Community Mixed Use-12 (CMU-12). Typical allowable uses in the CMU-12 category include residential, community scale retail commercial, office uses, research corporate park uses, light industrial, multi-purpose and clustered residential and/or mixed-use projects at appropriate locations. Non-residential land uses must be compatible with residential uses through established techniques of transition or by restricting the location of incompatible uses. Agricultural uses may be permitted pursuant to policies in the agricultural objective areas of the Future Land Use Element. Projects that are 10 acres in size or greater must demonstrate a mix of land uses in accordance with Policy 19.1. CMU-12 is located to the east of the site. To the southwest is Residential-6 (RES-6). Further east is Natural Preservation (N).
- The subject site is surrounded by Temple Terrace on the north, west and south sides. The Temple Terrace Future Land Use Classifications to the north are Urban Mixed Use-20 (UMU-20). To the south is Residential-18 (R-18). To the southwest is Residential-4 (R-4) and to the west is Research Corporate Park (R/CP).
- The site is currently approved for a mixed use planned development. Across East Telecom Parkway is single family and multi-family residential housing, and to the west is a large Verizon data center. There are multi-family and single-family dwellings located to the southeast of the property.
- The applicant is requesting a major modification to a planned development (PD 20-0308) to permit the development of 331 multi-family units, 33,000 square feet of Business Professional Office (BPO) uses, Commercial General (CG) uses and/or a Community Residential Home or 83,308 square feet for mini warehouse.
- The property has significant wildlife habitat and wetlands.

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 1.2: Minimum Density

All new residential or mixed-use land use categories within the USA shall have a density of 4 du/ga or greater unless environmental features or existing development patterns do not support those densities.

Within the USA and in categories allowing 4 units per acre or greater, new development or redevelopment shall occur at a density of at least 75% of the allowable density of the land use category, unless the development meets the criteria of Policy 1.3.

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.

Land Use Categories

Objective 8: The Future Land Use Map will include Land Use Categories which outline the maximum level of intensity or density and range of permitted land uses allowed and planned for an area. A table of the land use categories and description of each category can be found in Appendix A.

Policy 8.1: The character of each land use category is defined by building type, residential density, functional use, and the physical composition of the land. The integration of these factors sets the general atmosphere and character of each land use category. Each category has a range of potentially permissible uses which are not exhaustive, but are intended to be illustrative of the character of uses permitted within the land use designation. Not all of those potential uses are routinely acceptable anywhere within that land use category.

Policy 8.2: Each potential use must be evaluated for compliance with the goals, objectives, and policies of the Future Land Use Element and with applicable development regulations.

Policy 8.7: Calculation of density/intensity of conservation and preservation land must follow the provisions of the Environmentally Sensitive Land Credit outlined in Policy 13.3.

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.

Environmental Considerations

Objective 13: New development and redevelopment shall not adversely impact environmentally sensitive areas and other significant natural systems as described and required within the Conservation and Aquifer Recharge Element and the Coastal Management Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

Policy 13.3: Environmentally Sensitive Land Credit

Density and FAR calculations for properties that include wetlands will comply with the following calculations and requirements for determining density/intensity credits.

- Wetlands are considered to be the following:
 - Conservation and preservation areas as defined in the Conservation and Aquifer Recharge Element
 - Man-made water bodies as defined (including borrow pits).
- If wetlands are less than 25% of the acreage of the site, density and intensity is calculated based on:
 - Entire project acreage multiplied by Maximum intensity/density for the Future Land Use Category
- If wetlands are 25% or greater of the acreage of the site, density and intensity is calculated based on:
 - Upland acreage of the site multiplied by 1.25 = Acreage available to calculate density/intensity based on
 - That acreage is then multiplied by the Maximum Intensity/Density of the Future Land Use Category

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 16.8: The overall density and lot sizes of new residential projects shall reflect the character of the surrounding area, recognizing the choice of lifestyles described in this Plan.

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.

Mixed Use Land Use Categories

Objective 19: All development in the mixed-use categories shall be integrated and interconnected to each other.

Policy 19.1: Larger new projects proposed in all mixed-use plan categories shall be required to develop with a minimum of 2 land uses in accordance with the following:

- Requirements for 2 land uses will apply to properties 10 acres or greater in the RMU-35, UMU-20, and CMU-12 land use categories, and to properties 20 acres or greater in the SMU-6 and NMU-4 land use categories.
- At least 10% of the total building square footage in the project shall be used for uses other than the primary use.
- The mix of uses may be horizontally integrated (located in separate building). Horizontal integration may also be achieved by utilizing off-site uses of a different type located within ¼ mile of the project, on the same side of the street of a collector or arterial roadway connected by a continuous pedestrian sidewalk.
- The land uses that may be included in a mixed-use project include: retail commercial, office, light industrial, residential, residential support uses, and civic uses provided that the use is permitted in the land use category.
- These requirements do not apply within ½ of a mile of an identified Community Activity Centers (if other mixed-use standards have been adopted for that area or when the project is exclusively industrial).

Policy 19.2: In the mixed use land use categories, when two or more uses are required on the same project, then the development shall be implemented through a zoning district that demonstrates street connectivity, description of land uses, and site placement, access locations and internal connections at a minimum.

Community Design Component

GOAL 1: Plan a pattern of compact, livable and walkable neighborhoods and communities within the urban service area which are supported by locally-oriented employment, goods and services.

OBJECTIVE 1-2: Promote a variety of uses in order to create vitality and bring many activities of daily life within walking distances of homes.

Policy 1-2.2: *Require a mix of housing types and lot sizes within mixed use neighborhoods, emphasizing harmonious design and building type.*

5.2 URBAN/SUBURBAN

GOAL 13: *Within urban and/or suburban areas of the County, encourage new developments or infill developments to incorporate a mix of uses.*

OBJECTIVE 13-1: *Flexible urban design standards should be considered to guide new development and redevelopment in urban/suburban areas.*

Environmental and Sustainability Section (E&S)

Objective 3.5: *Apply adopted criteria, standards, methodologies and procedures to manage and maintain wetlands and/or other surface waters for optimum fisheries and other environmental values in consultation with EPC.*

Policy 3.5.1: *Collaborate with the EPC to conserve and protect wetlands and/or other surface waters from detrimental physical and hydrological alteration. Apply a comprehensive planning-based approach to the protection of wetland ecosystems assuring no net loss of ecological values provided by the functions performed by wetlands and/or other surface waters authorized for projects in Hillsborough County.*

Policy 3.5.2: *Collaborate with the EPC through the land planning and development review processes to prohibit unmitigated encroachment into wetlands and/or other surface waters and maintain equivalent functions.*

Policy 3.5.4: *Regulate and conserve wetlands and/or other surface waters through the application of local rules and regulations including mitigation during the development review process.*

Staff Analysis of Goals, Objectives and Policies:

The 55.2 +/--acre subject site is located on the south side of East Telecom Parkway, west of Old Morris Bridge Road, north of East Fowler Avenue and east of Hollow Stump Road. The subject site is currently approved for a mixed use planned development (PD). Across East Telecom Parkway is single-family and multi-family residential housing, and to the west is a large Verizon data center and to the east is a large TECO easement. There are multi-family and single-family dwellings located to the southeast of the property. The property has Community Mixed Use-12 (CMU-12) FLU designation and to the east is CMU-12 FLU category. The overall PD is surrounded by Temple Terrace on the north, west and south sides. To the north is Urban Mixed Use-20 (UMU-20) FLU, to the south is Residential-18 (R-18), to the southwest is Residential-4 (R-4) and to the west is Research Corporate Park (R/CP) all within the Temple Terrace jurisdiction.

The applicant is requesting a major modification to a planned development (PD 20-0308) to permit the development of 331 multi-family units, 33,000 square feet of Business Professional Office (BPO) uses, Commercial General (CG) uses and/or a Community Residential Home or 83,308 square feet for mini warehouse. The area subject to the modification is in the northeast portion of the property and identified as POD B. To the north of this area is East Telecom Parkway and to the east is a large TECO easement. To

the south is a very large wetland tract and to the west is public/quasi-public institutional use.

The proposed development is compatible with the area and meets the intent of FLUE Objective 1 and FLUE Policies 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4 as it provides growth in the Urban Service Area. The proposed multi-family housing and non-residential uses are also compatible with the development pattern in the area as required in Policy 1.4 as the area is primarily residential in character and there are multi-family housing developments directly to the south and the north of the subject site. The proposed development meets the minimum density which is 250 units as required in the Urban Service Area per FLUE Policy 1.2.

Objective 8 enables the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) and Policy 8.1 mandates the range of acceptable land uses in each classification in the FLUM. Policy 8.2 requires all development to be compliant with the Future Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan and the proposed rezoning does meet the intent of the FLU category. The subject site was approved as a mixed use planned development. Objective 9 and Policy 9.1 requires that all development meet or exceed the land development regulations in Hillsborough County. PC Staff finds the proposal consistent with Objective 9 and Policy 9.1 since the proposed development is for an additional commercial option and the increase in intensity does not exceed the FLU.

The Environmental Protection Commission (EPC) has identified wetlands present on the subject site. The EPC Wetlands Division has reviewed the proposed site plan and has provided agency comments dated November 1, 2022, indicating that a resubmittal is not necessary for the site plan's current configuration. Planning Commission staff finds this request consistent with Objective 13 and Policy 13.3 as the proposal is subject to the Environmentally Sensitive Land Credit, and the maximum permitted density is 334 units. The project is not increasing the residential density and is remaining with the previously approved 331 units. There is an increase of commercial intensity. However this increase is only for a secondary option which is to provide a mini warehouse within POD B. The proposed commercial intensity increase does not exceed the maximum allowed per the CMU-12 FLU category and does not exceed beyond what is allowed pursuant to Policy 13.3.

The proposal meets the intent of Objective 16 and its associated policies regarding neighborhood protection and compatibility (Objective 16, Policies 16.1, 16.2, 16.3, 16.8 and 16.10). The proposed development meets Objective 19 and Policy 19.1 which outlines the intent of all Mixed-Use categories in the Comprehensive Plan. The development is proposing multi-family residential, BPO uses, CG uses and/or a Community Residential Home, and mini warehouse as an alternative commercial development option. The request not revise the existing acreages proposed for residential or commercial.

The Community Design Component (CDC) Goal 1, Objective 1-2, Policy 1-2.1, Goal 12, and Objective 13-1 contains policy direction that encourages mixed use development in urban and suburban areas. The surrounding area has two jurisdictions Temple Terrace and Unincorporated Hillsborough County. Both jurisdictions have a mixed-use development pattern, particularly there is the Urban Mixed Use- 20 FLU category across East Telecom Parkway, therefore the proposed development is consistent with the surrounding development pattern. The applicant is proposing a 2:1 building height setback variation along the northeastern portion of the property. PC staff did not find a compatibility issue as the modified area abuts a 200-foot wide TECO easement to the west followed by

conservation lands. To the south are wetlands and to the west is public/quasi-public institutional use.

Overall, the rezoning would allow for development that is consistent with the Goals, Objectives and Policies of the Future Land Use Element of the Unincorporated Hillsborough County Comprehensive Plan and is compatible with the existing development pattern found within the surrounding area.

Recommendation

Based upon the above considerations, the Planning Commission staff finds the proposed Major Modification **CONSISTENT** with the *Hillsborough County Comprehensive Plan*, subject to conditions proposed by the Development Services Department.

HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY FUTURE LAND USE RZ MM 22-1501

<all other values>

Rezoning


STATUS

- APPROVED
- CONTINUED
- DENIED
- WITHDRAWN
- PENDING


- Tampa Service
- Urban Service
- Shoreline
- County Boundary
- Jurisdiction Boundary
- Roads
- Parcels
- WATER NATURAL LULC, Wet Poly
- AGRICULTURAL/MINING-120 (.25 FAR)
- PEC PLANNED ENVIRONMENTAL COMMUNITY-1/2 (.25 FAR)
- AGRICULTURAL-1/10 (.25 FAR)
- AGRICULTURAL RURAL-1/5 (.25 FAR)
- AGRICULTURAL ESTATE-1/2.5 (.25 FAR)
- RESIDENTIAL-1 (.25 FAR)
- RESIDENTIAL-2 (.25 FAR)
- RESIDENTIAL PLANNED-2 (.35 FAR)
- RESIDENTIAL-4 (.25 FAR)
- RESIDENTIAL-6 (.25 FAR)
- RESIDENTIAL-9 (.35 FAR)
- RESIDENTIAL-12 (.35 FAR)
- RESIDENTIAL-16 (.35 FAR)
- RESIDENTIAL-20 (.35 FAR)
- RESIDENTIAL-35 (1.0 FAR)
- NEIGHBORHOOD MIXED USE-4 (3) (.35 FAR)
- SUBURBAN MIXED USE-6 (.35 FAR)
- COMMUNITY MIXED USE-12 (.50 FAR)
- URBAN MIXED USE-20 (1.0 FAR)
- REGIONAL MIXED USE-35 (2.0 FAR)
- OC-20
- 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/QUASIPUBLIC
- NATURAL PRESERVATION
- WIMAUMA VILLAGE RESIDENTIAL-2 (.25 FAR)
- CITRUS PARK VILLAGE



DATA SOURCES: Rezoning boundaries from The Planning Commission and are not official. Parcel lines and data from Hillsborough County Property Appraiser. The rezoning data is for informational purposes only. It is intended that the City/County Planning Commission. ACCURACY: It is intended that the Hillsborough County City/County Planning Commission. This map is for informational purposes only. For the most current data and information, visit the appropriate website.



Map Printed from Rezoning System: 10/12/2022
 Author: Beverly F. Daniels
 File: G:\Rezoning\System\MapProjects\HC\06\Rezoning_Copy.mxd





**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
Michael Owen
Donna Cameron Cepeda
Joshua Wostal

COUNTY

ADMINISTRATOR Bonnie
M. Wise **COUNTY**

ATTORNEY Christine M.
Beck **INTERNAL AUDITOR**
Peggy Caskey

DEPUTY COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

Gregory S. Horwedel

Project Name: Ripple Subdivision

Zoning File: None Modification: MM (22-1501)

Atlas Page: None Submitted: 05/15/23

To Planner for Review: 05/15/23 Date Due: ASAP

Contact Person: Isabelle Albert, Halff Phone: 813-331-0976/ialbert@halff.com

Right-Of-Way or Land Required for Dedication: Yes No

The Development Services Department HAS NO OBJECTION to this General Site Plan.

The Development Services Department RECOMMENDS DISAPPROVAL of this General Site Plan for the following reasons:

Reviewed by: Tania C. Chapela Date: 05/17/2023

Date Agent/Owner notified of Disapproval: _____

RIPPLE SUBDIVISION MAJOR MODIFICATION TO PLANNED DEVELOPMENT TAMPA, FL 33637 SECTION 12, TOWNSHIP 26, RANGE 19

SITE DATA TABLE

NO.	DESCRIPTION	DATE	REVISIONS
1.	PLAN SET	05/11/2023	ISSUE FOR REVIEW
2.	FIELD CORRECT	05/11/2023	PLAN SET
3.	REVISION	05/11/2023	PLAN SET
4.	REVISED	05/11/2023	PLAN SET
5.	REVISED	05/11/2023	PLAN SET
6.	REVISED	05/11/2023	PLAN SET
7.	REVISED	05/11/2023	PLAN SET
8.	REVISED	05/11/2023	PLAN SET
9.	REVISED	05/11/2023	PLAN SET
10.	REVISED	05/11/2023	PLAN SET

USES TABLE

NO.	DESCRIPTION	DATE	REVISIONS
1.	PLANNED USE	05/11/2023	ISSUE FOR REVIEW
2.	PLANNED USE	05/11/2023	ISSUE FOR REVIEW
3.	PLANNED USE	05/11/2023	ISSUE FOR REVIEW
4.	PLANNED USE	05/11/2023	ISSUE FOR REVIEW
5.	PLANNED USE	05/11/2023	ISSUE FOR REVIEW
6.	PLANNED USE	05/11/2023	ISSUE FOR REVIEW
7.	PLANNED USE	05/11/2023	ISSUE FOR REVIEW
8.	PLANNED USE	05/11/2023	ISSUE FOR REVIEW
9.	PLANNED USE	05/11/2023	ISSUE FOR REVIEW
10.	PLANNED USE	05/11/2023	ISSUE FOR REVIEW

SITE NOTES

- THE PROJECT IS LOCATED WITHIN THE URBAN SERVICES AREA.
- THE SITE IS LOCATED WITHIN THE URBAN SERVICES AREA.
- FOR ALL INFORMATION REGARDING THE CITY OF TAMPA, VISIT TAMPAFLORIDA.GOV.
- FOR ALL INFORMATION REGARDING THE COUNTY OF HILLSBOROUGH, VISIT HILLSBOROUGHFLORIDA.GOV.
- FOR ALL INFORMATION REGARDING THE STATE OF FLORIDA, VISIT FLORIDA.GOV.
- ALL UTILITIES ARE SHOWN ON THE PLAN AND WILL BE PROTECTED BY THE PROJECT DEVELOPER. THE PROJECT DEVELOPER SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS FROM THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES.
- THE PROJECT DEVELOPER SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS FROM THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES.
- THE PROJECT DEVELOPER SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS FROM THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES.
- THE PROJECT DEVELOPER SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS FROM THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES.
- THE PROJECT DEVELOPER SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS FROM THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES.
- THE PROJECT DEVELOPER SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS FROM THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES.
- THE PROJECT DEVELOPER SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS FROM THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES.
- THE PROJECT DEVELOPER SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS FROM THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES.
- THE PROJECT DEVELOPER SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS FROM THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES.
- THE PROJECT DEVELOPER SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS FROM THE APPROPRIATE AGENCIES.

LEGAL DESCRIPTION

A PORTION OF AND A PORTION OF THE SOUTHWEST 1/4 OF SECTION 12, TOWNSHIP 26 SOUTH, RANGE 19 EAST, HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA, S&P PARCELS BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEING PART OF THE SOUTHWEST 1/4 OF SECTION 12, TOWNSHIP 26 SOUTH, RANGE 19 EAST, HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA, THERE AS ALSO THE WEST 1/2 OF THE NORTH 1/2 OF SAID SECTION 12, TOWNSHIP 26 SOUTH, RANGE 19 EAST, HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA, S&P PARCELS BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEING PART OF THE SOUTHWEST 1/4 OF SECTION 12, TOWNSHIP 26 SOUTH, RANGE 19 EAST, HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA, THERE AS ALSO THE WEST 1/2 OF THE NORTH 1/2 OF SAID SECTION 12, TOWNSHIP 26 SOUTH, RANGE 19 EAST, HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA, S&P PARCELS BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEING PART OF THE SOUTHWEST 1/4 OF SECTION 12, TOWNSHIP 26 SOUTH, RANGE 19 EAST, HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA, THERE AS ALSO THE WEST 1/2 OF THE NORTH 1/2 OF SAID SECTION 12, TOWNSHIP 26 SOUTH, RANGE 19 EAST, HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA, S&P PARCELS BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

DEVELOPMENT STIMULUS

PROPOSED USE	MINIMUM BUILDING FOOTPRINT	MINIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT	MINIMUM BUILDING SETBACK	MINIMUM BUILDING SIDE SETBACK	MINIMUM BUILDING FRONT SETBACK	MINIMUM BUILDING REAR SETBACK	MINIMUM BUILDING CORNER SETBACK
MULTI-FAMILY	50' (MIN) / 50' (MAX)	20'	25'	N/A	N/A	40'	0.0
TOWNHOME	20' (ACCESSORY 10' ACCESSORY GARAGE)	10'	20'	N/A	N/A	20'	0.75
SPRINGS	30'	30'	20'	N/A	N/A	40'	0.60
COMMUNITY RESIDENTIAL HOME (CRH)	25'	10'	20'	N/A	N/A	40'	0.70
MIN WAREHOUSE (MW)	30'	10'	20'	N/A	N/A	40'	0.75

PLANNER:
HALFF ASSOCIATES, INC.
1000 NASHLEY DRIVE, SUITE 800
TAMPA, FL 33606-4000
PHONE: (813) 962-4500

PREPARED BY:



CIVIL ON DEMAND, LLC
3892 EHRLICH RD, SUITE 912
TAMPA, FL 33624
PHONE: (813) 948-9194

CLIENT:
BL HOLDINGS TAMPA, LLC
4620 N HALE AVE.
TAMPA, FL 33614
ATTN: BEN LARSEN & DANIEL BERGIN

OWNERS:
BL HOLDINGS TAMPA, LLC
4620 N HALE AVE.
TAMPA, FL 33614
ATTN: BEN LARSEN & DANIEL BERGIN


APPLICANT:
BL HOLDINGS TAMPA, LLC
4620 N HALE AVE.
TAMPA, FL 33614
ATTN: BEN LARSEN & DANIEL BERGIN

COVER

REVISIONS

NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION
1	05/11/2023	ISSUE FOR REVIEW
2	05/11/2023	ISSUE FOR REVIEW
3	05/11/2023	ISSUE FOR REVIEW
4	05/11/2023	ISSUE FOR REVIEW
5	05/11/2023	ISSUE FOR REVIEW
6	05/11/2023	ISSUE FOR REVIEW
7	05/11/2023	ISSUE FOR REVIEW
8	05/11/2023	ISSUE FOR REVIEW
9	05/11/2023	ISSUE FOR REVIEW
10	05/11/2023	ISSUE FOR REVIEW

DESIGNED BY:
DRAWN BY:
CHECKED BY:
SCALE:
CAD FILE:
RIPPLE SUBDIVISION - MAJOR MODIFICATION TO PLANNED DEVELOPMENT - TAMPA, FLORIDA
JOB NUMBER:
C0079-0001
SHEET



INDEX OF DRAWINGS

SHEET NO.	TITLE
1	COVER SHEET
2	GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

CIVIL ENGINEER:
CIVIL ON DEMAND
3802 EHRLICH RD, STE 312
TAMPA, FL 33624
(813)434-5744




REVISIONS

NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION
01	05/15/23	ISSUED FOR PERMIT
02	05/15/23	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
03	05/15/23	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS
04	05/15/23	REVISED PER CITY COMMENTS

GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN
RIPPLE SUBDIVISION
TAMPA, FLORIDA
MAJOR MODIFICATION TO PLANNED DEVELOPMENT

DESIGNED BY:
DRAWN BY:
CHECKED BY:
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"
CADD FILE:
MAJOR MODIFICATION:
JOB NO.:
CADD FILE: 2023-0001





AGENCY COMMENTS

AGENCY REVIEW COMMENT SHEET

TO: Zoning Technician, Development Services Department

DATE: 4/05/2023

REVIEWER: Richard Perez, AICP

AGENCY/DEPT: Transportation

PLANNING AREA/SECTOR: USF/ Northwest

PETITION NO: MM 22-1501

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

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

- Vehicular and pedestrian cross access between folio#37376.0003 and the remaining portion of the PD may be permitted anywhere within the bounding box shown on the PD site plan.

PROJECT SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS

The applicant is requesting a major modification to a portion of PD 20-0308 to allow for up to 83,308 sf of self-storage/mini warehouse as an alternative development option. The subject site currently allows for up to 33,000 sf of Commercial General (CG) and Business Professional Office (BPO) uses.

As required by the Development Review Procedures Manual (DRPM), the applicant submitted a trip generation analysis for the proposed project. Staff has prepared a comparison of trips generated under the existing and proposed zoning designations, utilizing a generalized worst-case scenario. Calculations are based on data from the 11th Edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineer's Trip Generation Manual.

Existing PD Zoning:

Land Use/Size	24 Hour Two-Way Volume	Total Peak Hour Trips	
		AM	PM
PD, 33,000 Supermarket (ITE LUC 850)	3,524	126	305

Proposed Modification (Alternative Development Option):

Land Use/Size	24 Hour Two-Way Volume	Total Peak Hour Trips	
		AM	PM
PD, 83,308 sf Self-Storage (ITE LUC 151)	121	7	12

Trip Generation Difference:

	24 Hour Two-Way Volume	Total Peak Hour Trips	
		AM	PM
Difference (+/-)	-3,403	-119	-293

The proposed modification will result in a decrease in maximum potential trips generated by the subject site by -3,403 daily trips, -119 AM trips and -293 PM trips.

TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE SERVING THE SITE

E. Telecom Pkwy. is a 2-lane, local roadway owned and maintained by the City of Temple Terrace. The roadway is characterized by 12-foot wide travel lanes in good condition. The roadway lies within a +/- 55-foot wide right-of-way. There are +/- 5-foot wide sidewalks along portions of the north and south side of Telecom Pkwy. in the vicinity of the proposed project. There are +/- 4-foot wide bicycle lanes on Telecom Pkwy. east of the proposed project. There is a +/- 8-foot wide multi-purpose trail along the south side of Telecom Pkwy. east of the proposed project.

Staff notes that per condition of approval #4 the developer is required to construct an 8-foot multi use pathway on the south side of E. Telecom Parkway, along the project frontage.

SITE ACCESS AND CONNECTIVITY

The project will be access via Telecom Pkwy as previously approved.

The proposed PD site plan adds a cross access bounding box between the subject parcel and the larger PD to allow for flexibility with the final location of the connection point to be determined at the time of site construction plan review.

ROADWAY LEVEL OF SERVICE

Telecom Parkway is owned by the City of Temple Terrace. As such, Level of Service (LOS) information for adjacent roadway sections is unavailable.

Transportation Comment Sheet

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
E. Telecom Parkway	Temple Terrace Local - Urban	2 Lanes <input type="checkbox"/> Substandard Road <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient ROW Width	<input type="checkbox"/> Corridor Preservation Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Site Access Improvements <input type="checkbox"/> Substandard Road Improvements <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other

Project Trip Generation <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable for this request			
	Average Annual Daily Trips	A.M. Peak Hour Trips	P.M. Peak Hour Trips
Existing	3,524	126	305
Proposed	166	11	19
Difference (+/-)	-3,358	-115	-286

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

Connectivity and Cross Access <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable for this request				
Project Boundary	Primary Access	Additional Connectivity/Access	Cross Access	Finding
North	X	None	None	Meets LDC
South		None	None	Meets LDC
East		None	None	Meets LDC
West		None	None	Meets LDC
Notes:				

Design Exception/Administrative Variance <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable for this request		
Road Name/Nature of Request	Type	Finding
N/A	Choose an item.	Choose an item.
Notes:		

4.0 Additional Site Information & Agency Comments Summary			
Transportation	Objections	Conditions Requested	Additional Information/Comments
<input type="checkbox"/> Design Exception/Adm. Variance Requested <input type="checkbox"/> Off-Site Improvements Provided	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	See report.

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
 Diana M. Lee, P.E. AIR DIVISION
 Rick Muratti, Esq. LEGAL DEPT
 Steffanie L. Wickham WASTE DIVISION
 Sterlin Woodard, P.E. WETLANDS DIVISION

AGENCY COMMENT SHEET

REZONING	
<p>HEARING DATE: January 17, 2023</p> <p>PETITION NO.: 22-1501</p> <p>EPC REVIEWER: Kelly M. Holland</p> <p>CONTACT INFORMATION: (813) 627-2600 X 1222</p> <p>EMAIL: hollandk@epchc.org</p>	<p>COMMENT DATE: November 1, 2022</p> <p>PROPERTY ADDRESSES: 7211 Rapa Horn Dr and 12301 Hollow Stump Rd</p> <p>FOLIO #s: 0373760000, 0373760003 and (part of) 0373763000</p> <p>STR: 12-28S-19E</p>
<p>REQUESTED ZONING: Major Modification to an existing Planned Development</p>	
FINDINGS	
WETLANDS PRESENT	YES
SITE INSPECTION DATE	NA
WETLAND LINE VALIDITY	SWFWMD wetland line valid through 3-18-2024
WETLANDS VERIFICATION (AERIAL PHOTO, SOILS SURVEY, EPC FILES)	Generally, in the southern 2/3 of the property
<p>The EPC Wetlands Division has reviewed the proposed rezoning. In the site plan's current configuration, a resubmittal is not necessary. If the zoning proposal changes and/or the site plans are altered, EPC staff will need to review the zoning again. This project as submitted is conceptually justified to move forward through the zoning review process as long as the following conditions are included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approval of this zoning petition by Hillsborough County does not constitute a guarantee that the Environmental Protection Commission of Hillsborough County (EPC) approvals/permits necessary for the development as proposed will be issued, does not itself serve to justify any impact to wetlands, and does not grant any implied or vested right to environmental approvals. The construction and location of any proposed wetland impacts are not approved by this correspondence but shall be reviewed by EPC staff under separate application pursuant to the EPC Wetlands rule detailed in Chapter 1-11, Rules of the EPC, (Chapter 1-11) to determine whether such impacts are necessary to accomplish reasonable use of the subject property. Prior to the issuance of any building or land alteration permits or other development, the approved wetland / other surface water (OSW) line must be incorporated into the site plan. The wetland / OSW line must appear on all site plans, labeled as "EPC Wetland Line", and the wetland must be 	

Environmental Excellence in a Changing World

Environmental Protection Commission - Roger P. Stewart Center
 3629 Queen Palm Drive, Tampa, FL 33619 - (813) 627-2600 - www.epchc.org

labeled as "Wetland Conservation Area" pursuant to the Hillsborough County Land Development Code (LDC).

- Final design of buildings, stormwater retention areas, and ingress/egresses are subject to change pending formal agency jurisdictional determinations of wetland and other surface water boundaries and approval by the appropriate regulatory agencies.

INFORMATIONAL COMMENTS:

The following specific comments are made for informational purposes only and to provide guidance as to the EPC review process. However, future EPC staff review is not limited to the following, regardless of the obviousness of the concern as raised by the general site plan and EPC staff may identify other legitimate concerns at any time prior to final project approval.

- The subject property contains wetland/OSW areas, which have been delineated. Knowledge of the actual extent of the wetland and OSW are necessary in order to verify the avoidance of wetland impacts pursuant to Chapter 1-11. Prior to the issuance of any building or land alteration permits or other development, the wetland survey must be submitted for review and formal approval by EPC staff.
- Chapter 1-11 prohibits wetland impacts unless they are necessary for reasonable use of the property. Staff of the EPC recommends that this requirement be taken into account during the earliest stages of site design so that wetland impacts are avoided or minimized to the greatest extent possible. The size, location, and configuration of the wetlands may result in requirements to reduce or reconfigure the improvements depicted on the plan.
- The Hillsborough County Land Development Code (LDC) defines wetlands and other surface waters as Environmentally Sensitive Areas. Pursuant to the LDC, wetlands and other surface waters are further defined as Conservation Areas or Preservation Areas and these areas must be designated as such on all development plans and plats. A minimum setback must be maintained around the Conservation/Preservation Area and the setback line must also be shown on all future plan submittals.
- Any activity interfering with the integrity of wetland(s) or other surface water(s), such as clearing, excavating, draining or filling, without written authorization from the Executive Director of the EPC or authorized agent, pursuant to Section 1-11.07, would be a violation of Section 17 of the Environmental Protection Act of Hillsborough County, Chapter 84-446, and of Chapter 1-11.

kmh / app

ec: Isabelle Albert, Applicant - ialbert@halff.com

School Board

Nadia T. Combs, Chair
Henry "Shake" Washington, Vice Chair
Lynn L. Gray
Stacy A. Hahn, Ph.D.
Karen Perez
Melissa Snively
Jessica Vaughn



Superintendent of Schools
Addison G. Davis

DATE: October 31, 2022
TO: Hillsborough County Development Review Staff
FROM: Hillsborough County School District
SUBJECT: 11.14.2022 ZHM Hearing Date

District staff have reviewed the above-referenced Hillsborough County Zoning Hearing Master PD & MM Log. The following rezoning request have been determined to be subject to an "Adequate Facilities Analysis (Rezoning, Initial Submittal) - RZ-PD 22-1499; RZ-MM-22-1501 and RZ-PD-22-1503. Prior to review and comments from the School Board please have the applicant submit the following information:

- 1) Pay the corresponding fee at <https://hillsborough-county-school-district--growth-management-planni.square.site/product/adequate-facilities-analysis-rezoning-initial-submittal-1st-revision-included-/3?cp=true&sa=true&sbp=false&q=false>; and
- 2) Submit and upload an application, along with payment receipt to the County. The application is found on the District's website at <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1xolPecJtku5W7dr-xFGIFFZQ8LLaQZRT/view>

More information related to the School Concurrency review fees and process is found on the District's website at <https://www.hillsboroughschools.org/Page/4570>. Should questions arise, please contact staff below.

Thank you,

Andrea A. Stingone M.Ed., Department Manager, Planning & Siting
Growth Management Department
e: andrea.stingone@hcps.net
p: 813-272-4429

Attachment

ZHM (PD & MM) Log

ZHM Date: 01/17/2023 6:00 PM

Cut Off Date: 10/07/2022

Comm. Sign Posting Deadline Date: 12/09/2022

Type	App #	Folio(s)
RZ-PD	22-1401	88025.6082,,,"
RZ-PD	22-1497	51578.0200,51578.3000,51578.2000,,
RZ-PD	22-1499	29195.0000,29194.0000,,,"
MM	22-1501	portion of 37376.0003,,,"
RZ-PD	22-1503	64819.0000,,,"

**WATER RESOURCE SERVICES
REZONING REVIEW COMMENT SHEET: WATER & WASTEWATER**

PETITION NO.: MM22-1501 REVIEWED BY: Randy Rochelle DATE: 4/27/2023

FOLIO NO.: 37376.0003

WATER

- The property lies within the City of Tampa Water Service Area. The applicant should contact the provider to determine the availability of water service.

- A ___ inch water main exists (adjacent to the site), (approximately ___ feet from the site) _____. 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 City of Tampa Wastewater Service Area. The applicant should contact the provider to determine the availability of wastewater service.

- A ___ inch wastewater force main exists (adjacent to the site), (approximately ___ feet from the site) _____. 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: _____.



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.

TO: Zoning Review, Development Services

DATE: 03/31/2023

REVIEWER: Ron Barnes, Impact & Mobility Fee Coordinator

APPLICANT: BL Holdings Tampa, LLC

PETITION NO: 22-1501

LOCATION: E Telecom Pkwy

FOLIO NO: 37476.7014

Estimated Fees:

Self-Storage/Mini-Warehouse

(Per 1,000 s.f.)

Mobility: $\$725 * 83.308 = \$60,398.30$

Fire: $\$32 * 83.308 = \$2,665.86$

Project Summary/Description:

Urban Mobility, Northeast Fire - 83,308 sf mini warehouse, prior approved 33,000 sf
BP/PO/CG/Community Residential Home uses to be retained



VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT

1 MS. HEINRICH: The next case is Item D.6, Major Mod
2 22-1501. The applicant is requesting a major modification from
3 PD, 20-0308. Tania Chapela with Hillsborough County Development
4 Services will provide Staff findings after presentation by the
5 applicant.

6 HEARING MASTER: Good evening. We have someone that
7 can help you if you need it.

8 MS. PINSON: My name is Brice Pinson with Halff
9 Associates. I'm here representing the applicant and this is for
10 a major modification to an existing PD. Address is 1000 North
11 Ashley Drive.

12 HEARING MASTER: Thank you.

13 MS. PINSON: So the location of this is just south of
14 East Telecom Parkway and west of Old Morris Bridge Road. It's
15 about 6.91 acres and located (indiscernible) community plan
16 area.

17 The Future Land Use is CMU-12 and zoning is
18 PD 20-0308. The surrounding uses, to the north is bordered by
19 Telecom Parkway and across Telecom Parkway there's single-family
20 residential. To the east there's about 205-foot wide TECO
21 easement. To the west, there is a City of Temple Terrace parcel
22 with a stormwater pond. And then also a Verizon data services
23 services office. And to the south is wetlands.

24 The current PD right now has POD A and POD B. POD A's
25 approved for 331 dwelling units. POD B is currently approved

1 for BPO, CG and community residential home uses up to 33,000
2 square feet.

3 The request is for POD B and it's to request 83,308
4 square feet if developed with mini warehouse uses, which is 0.5
5 FAR what is currently allowed within CMU-12 Future Land Use.
6 And then also just to retain the existing entitlements if
7 developed with BPO, GC or community residential.

8 HEARING MASTER: Can I stop you. I apologize for
9 interrupting you presentation, but this is exactly my question
10 in that slide. So I just wanted to clarify because the -- the
11 conditions say the townhomes, the 33,000 square feet of CM and
12 BPO, the community residential home or the 83,308 mini
13 warehouse. So it's -- I just want to be clear for the record.
14 So it -- it is not both, correct?

15 MS. PINSON: Correct.

16 HEARING MASTER: Okay.

17 Ms. PINSON: It's -- it's only if it's developed with
18 mini warehouse use that we would get that square footage.
19 Otherwise, if it's developed with the other uses, it would stay
20 at 33,000.

21 HEARING MASTER: Right. Right. So 83,308 of mini
22 warehouse would be the only use on that parcel --

23 MS. PINSON: Correct.

24 HEARING MASTER: -- if that's the chosen use?

25 MS. PINSON: Correct.

1 HEARING MASTER: Understood. Okay. I apologize. Go
2 ahead.

3 MS. PINSON: That's okay.

4 So Planning Commission found us consistent and
5 compatible with the surrounding area and with the Future Land
6 Use Category. Development Services also found it comparable to
7 the current uses. It results in a reduction of overall daily
8 trips. And we have no objection from the agencies. And that's
9 all. But I'm here if you have any questions.

10 HEARING MASTER: That was my only question. Thank you
11 so much. If you could please sign-in with the Clerk's Office.

12 Development Services.

13 MS. CHAPELA: Good evening. Tania Chapela,
14 Development Services. Before I start, I just found a title in
15 my report that's page number two. It is under the
16 recommendation statement. It says approvable subject to
17 conditions of approval. And then it says for the sake of
18 development option and requests. So that part for the sake of
19 development option and signage request should not be there.

20 HEARING MASTER: Okay. Thank you for that.

21 MS. CHAPELA: The applicant is requesting to allow the
22 entitlement increase for mini warehouse uses in POD B only. The
23 approved access serving non-commercial uses is also supposed to
24 be shifted to the east and to have a cross access bound in box.
25 The request is limited to allow a maximum of 83,308 square feet

1 if develop with mini warehouse uses while retaining the 33,000
2 square feet for the existing BPO, CG and for community
3 residential home uses. Currently approve the lot is vacant.

4 No variations and no waivers were requested. The
5 subject property is vacant is -- it has some single-family uses
6 in the surrounding area to the north and west. There is a
7 vacant TECO home property to the east and conservation land to
8 the south. If proposed uses are comparable to the current
9 commercial general allowed uses. We propose maximum 0.5 FAR is
10 allowable in the CMU-12 Comprehensive Plan Category.

11 Furthermore, the proposed building area will not
12 intrude into the required setbacks nor will decrease the
13 required buffers or screening. And additionally, the increased
14 FAR will have minimal impact on the transportation. Given the
15 above, Staff finds the proposed modification to be compatible
16 with the surrounding properties and in keeping the general
17 development part of the area. Staff recommends approval of the
18 applicant's request, subject to conditions of approval. And
19 this concludes my presentation.

20 HEARING MASTER: Just a quick question. And I -- it
21 may go to Mr. Ratliff if that's the appropriate person to ask.

22 Condition -- proposed condition number ten regarding
23 the -- the vehicular and pedestrian cross access from the
24 property, I believe that would be west through the Temple
25 Terrace property. The condition doesn't state it, but I believe

1 Mr. Ratliff, or in this case, Mr. Perez' comments talked talk
2 about that that -- that's an open area yet to be determine
3 exactly where the access point will be. But that it will be
4 determined at the time of site development review.

5 I just want to confirm that for the record. The --
6 the question -- the condition says it can be anywhere within
7 that box, but I just want to -- for the record, document that
8 that will be established at that point. Is that accurate?

9 MS. CHAPELA: It is my understanding after an email
10 that was sent today was a double confirmation. But I will
11 prepare the transportation staff to get that.

12 HEARING MASTER: All right. Fair enough. If we could
13 ask Mr. Ratliff or if Mr. Perez is on the line, either one?

14 MR. PEREZ: Good evening, Madam Hearing Master.
15 Richard Perez. For the record, yes, we confirmed the bounding
16 box that is shown on the site plan allows flexibility for that
17 required vehicular and pedestrian cross access to be located
18 within bound box. And that would be determined at site
19 construction, the exact location alignment within bounding box.

20 HEARING MASTER: All right. Thank you for that
21 clarification. I appreciate it. All right.

22 We'll go to the Planning Commission.

23 MS. LIENHARD: Thank you. The subject property is
24 located in the Community Mixed Use 12, Future Land Use Category.
25 It is in the urban service area and the subject property is not

1 located within the limits of the community plan.

2 Typical allowable uses in the CMU-12 Future Land Use
3 Category residential, commercial, office uses, research,
4 corporate park uses and mixed use projects (indiscernible).

5 CMU-12 is located to the east of the subject site and
6 to the southwest is Residential-6. And further east is natural
7 preservation. The area subject to the modification is in the
8 northeast portion of the property and identified as POD B. To
9 the north of this area is east Telecom Parkway. And to the east
10 is a large -- I'm sorry, to the north is East Telecom Parkway
11 and to the east is a large TECO easement. To the south is a
12 very large wetland tractor. To the west is a public plaza held
13 by institutional use.

14 The most development is compatible with the area and
15 meets the intent of Future Land Use Element Objective 1 and
16 Future Land Use Element Policy 1.2 as it provides for growth in
17 the urban service area. The proposed multi-family housing and
18 non-residential uses are also compatible with the development
19 pattern in the area as required by Policy 1.4, as the area is
20 primarily residential in character and there are multi-family
21 housing developments directly to the south and north of the
22 subject site.

23 For Future Land Use Element Policy 22.2, commercial
24 locational criteria does not apply to the site due to its
25 designation of CMU-12. The proposal meets the intent of

1 Objective 16 and its associated policies regarding neighborhood
2 protection and compatibility.

3 The proposed development meets Objective 19 and Policy
4 19.1, which outlines the intent of all mixed use categories in
5 the comprehensive plan. The development is proposing a
6 multi-family residential BPO uses, CG uses and/or community
7 residential home. And a mini warehouse as an alternative to
8 have second development options.

9 Based upon those considerations, the Planning
10 Commission Staff finds the proposed modification consistent with
11 the Unincorporated Hillsborough County Comprehensive Plan and
12 that's subject to the conditions proposed by Development
13 Services. Thank you.

14 HEARING MASTER: Thank you. I appreciate it.

15 Is there anyone in the room or online that would like
16 to speak in support? Anyone in favor? I see no one. Anyone in
17 opposition? No one. Ms. Heinrich, anything else?

18 MS. HEINRICH: Yes. Michelle Heinrich, Development
19 Services. If I heard Planning Commission Staff correctly, the
20 site is not within a community plan, correct?

21 MS. LIENHARD: It is not.

22 MS. HEINRICH: Okay. Then, certainly we'll make an
23 update to the report to remove the reference on the front page
24 to it being in university community plan area.

25 HEARING MASTER: Okay. Thank you for that. I

1 appreciate it.

2 And then we go back to the applicant, if you have any
3 other comments.

4 MS. PINSON: I don't have any other comments.

5 HEARING MASTER: All right. Thank you. Appreciate
6 it. Then we'll close Major Modification 22-1501 and go to the
7 next case.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

-----X
)
IN RE:)
)
ZONE HEARING MASTER)
HEARINGS)
)
-----X

ZONING HEARING MASTER HEARING
TRANSCRIPT OF TESTIMONY AND PROCEEDINGS

BEFORE: PAMELA JO HATLEY
Land Use Hearing Master

DATE: Monday, March 20, 2023

TIME: Commencing at 6:00 p.m.
Concluding at 8:08 p.m.

PLACE: Hillsborough County Board of
County Commissioners
601 East Kennedy Boulevard
2nd Floor Boardroom
Tampa, Florida 33601

Reported in person by:

Brittany Bridges, CER No. 1607
U.S. Legal Support
4200 West Cypress Street, Suite 750
Tampa, Florida 33607
(813)223-7321

1 Hearing.

2 Item A7, Rezoning PD 22-1257. This application is out
3 of order to be heard and is being continued to the April
4 17, 2023 Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

5 Item A8, Rezoning PD 22-1330. This application is out
6 of order to be heard and is being continued to the April
7 17, 2023 Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

8 Item A9, Rezoning PD 22-1390. This application is
9 being continued by the applicant to the April 17, 2023
10 Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

11 Item A10, Major Mod Application 22-1392. This
12 application is being continued by the applicant to the
13 April 17, 2023 Zoning Hearing -- Hearing Master Hearing --
14 excuse me.

15 Item A11, Major Mod Application 22-1501. This
16 application is out of order to be heard and is being
17 continued to the April 17, 2023 Zoning Hearing Master
18 Hearing.

19 Item A12, Rezoning PD 22-1503. This application is
20 out of order to be heard and is being continued to the
21 April 17, 2023 Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

22 Item A13, Major Mod Application 22-1510. This
23 application is being continued -- is being continued by
24 Staff to the April 17, 2023 Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

25 Item A14, Major Mod Application 22-1543. This

HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

-----X
IN RE:)
)
ZONE HEARING MASTER)
HEARINGS)
)
-----X

ZONING HEARING MASTER HEARING
TRANSCRIPT OF TESTIMONY AND PROCEEDINGS

BEFORE: PAMELA JO HATLEY
Land Use Hearing Master

DATE: Monday, February 20, 2023

TIME: Commencing at 6:00 p.m.
Concluding at 8:11 p.m.

LOCATION: Hillsborough County Planning
Commission Board Room-2nd Floor
601 East Kennedy Boulevard
Tampa, Florida 36602

Reported via Cisco Webex Videoconference by:
Samantha Kozlowski, CER

1 March 20, 2023 Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

2 Item A.15, rezoning PD 22-1401. This application is
3 out of order to be heard and is being continued to the
4 April 17, 2023 Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

5 Item A.16, rezoning standard 22-1431. This
6 application is being continued by the applicant to the
7 April 17, 2023 Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

8 Item A.17, rezoning PD 22-1497. This application is
9 out of order to be heard and is being continued to the
10 April 17, 2023 Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

11 Item A.18, major mod application 22-1501. This
12 application is being continued by the applicant to the
13 March 20, 2023 Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

14 Item A.19, rezoning PD 22-1503. This application is
15 out of order to be heard and is being continued to the
16 March 20, 2023 Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

17 Item A.20, major mod application 22-1510. This
18 application is out of order to be heard and is being continued
19 to the March 20, 2023 Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

20 Item A.21, major mod application 22-1543. This
21 application is out of order to be heard and is being continued
22 to the March 20, 2023 Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

23 Item A.22, rezoning PD 22-1577. This application is
24 out of order to be heard and is being continued to the
25 March 20, 2023 Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

Zoning Hearing Master Hearing
January 17, 2023

HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

-----X
)
IN RE:)
)
ZONE HEARING MASTER)
HEARINGS)
)
-----X

ZONING HEARING MASTER HEARING
TRANSCRIPT OF TESTIMONY AND PROCEEDINGS

BEFORE: SUSAN FINCH
 Land Use Hearing Master

DATE: Tuesday, January 17, 2023

TIME: Commencing at 6:04 p.m.
 Concluding at 11:35 p.m.

Reported via Cisco Webex Videoconference by:
 Diane DeMarsh, CER No. 1654

Zoning Hearing Master Hearing
January 17, 2023

1 February 20, 2023 Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

2 Item A.27, major mod application 22-1501. This
3 application is being continued by staff to the February 20, 2023
4 Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

5 Item A.28, Rezoning PD 22-1503. This application is
6 out of order to be heard and is being continued to the
7 February 20, 2023 Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

8 Item A.29, Rezoning Standard 22-1636. This
9 application is being continued by the applicant to the February
10 20, 2023 Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

11 And Item A.30, Rezoning Standard 22-1654. This is
12 being continued by staff to the February 20, 2023 Zoning Hearing
13 Master Hearing.

14 That concludes all withdrawals and continuances.

15 HEARING MASTER: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Grady. I
16 appreciate it. Let me start by going over our hearing
17 procedures today. Our hearing today consists of agenda items
18 that require a public hearing by a zoning hearing master. I'll
19 conduct the hearing on each agenda item and will file a
20 recommendation within 15 business following tonight's hearing.
21 Those recommendations are then sent to the Board of County
22 Commissioners who will make the final decision.

23 Our hearing tonight is informal. I'll ask questions
24 related to the scope of direct testimony. I may call and
25 question witnesses as I deem inappropriate and I will decide all



**EXHIBITS SUBMITTED
DURING THE ZHM HEARING**

NONE



**PARTY OF
RECORD**

NONE