



PD Modification Application: PRS 26-0617

Zoning Hearing Master Date: N/A

BOCC Land Use Meeting Date: May 12, 2026

1.0 APPLICATION SUMMARY

Applicant: 301 Wimauma, LLC


FLU Category: RES-4

Service Area: Urban

Site Acreage: 506.69

Community Plan Area: Wimauma & South Shore Areawide Systems

Overlay: None



Introduction Summary:

PD 25-0469 was approved in 2025 to allow the development of 1,600 single-family homes (200 of which may be townhome units) and a K-8 Public School.

The applicant is requesting a minor modification to add an optional stub out point to the southern boundary, which could allow a connection to Bishop Road. No changes to the entitlements are proposed.

Existing Approval(s):

- Two stub out points along the southern boundary

Proposed Modification(s):

- Two stub out points, plus an optional stub out point along the southern boundary.

Additional Information:

PD Variation(s): None Requested as part of this application

Waiver(s) to the Land Development Code: None Requested as part of this application

Planning Commission Recommendation:


N/A

Development Services Recommendation:

Approvable, subject to proposed conditions

2.0 LAND USE MAP SET AND SUMMARY DATA

2.2 Immediate Area Map




Adjacent Zonings and Uses

Location:	Zoning:	Maximum Density/F.A.R. Permitted by Zoning District:	Allowable Use:	Existing Use:
North	AR	1 dwelling unit per 5 acres	Agriculture/Single-Family Conventional	Fire Station /Agriculture
South	PD 18-1048	3.84 dwelling units per acre	Single-Family Conventional	Agriculture
East	AR	1 dwelling unit per 5 acres	Agriculture/Single-Family Conventional	Agriculture and Conservation
West	AR	1 dwelling unit per 5 acres	Agriculture/Single-Family Conventional	Residential



2.0 LAND USE MAP SET AND SUMMARY DATA

2.3 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

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



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
CR 579	County Collector - Rural	2 Lanes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Substandard Road <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient ROW Width	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Corridor Preservation Plan <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Site Access Improvements <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Substandard Road Improvements <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other – Off-Site Signal

Project Trip Generation Not applicable for this request

	Average Daily Trips	A.M. Peak Hour Trips	P.M. Peak Hour Trips
Existing	17,326	2,170	1,661
Proposed	17,326	2,170	1,661
Difference (+/-)	No Change	No Change	No Change

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

Connectivity and Cross Access Not applicable for this request

Project Boundary	Primary Access	Additional Connectivity/Access	Cross Access	Finding
North		None	None	Meets LDC
South		Pedestrian & Vehicular	None	Meets LDC
East	X	Pedestrian & Vehicular	None	Meets LDC
West	X	Pedestrian & Vehicular	None	Meets LDC

Notes:

Design Exception/Administrative Variance Not applicable for this request

Road Name/Nature of Request	Type	Finding
CR 579/ Substandard Road	Deminimis Design Exception Requested	Previously Approved

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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	No wetlands present
Natural Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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 type="checkbox"/> Wetlands/Other Surface Waters <input type="checkbox"/> Use of Environmentally Sensitive Land Credit <input type="checkbox"/> Wellhead Protection Area <input type="checkbox"/> Surface Water Resource Protection Area <input type="checkbox"/> Potable Water Wellfield Protection Area <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Wildlife Habitat <input type="checkbox"/> Coastal High Hazard Area <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Design Exc./Adm. Variance Requested <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Off-site Improvements Provided	<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	
Service Area/ Water & Wastewater <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Urban <input type="checkbox"/> City of Tampa <input type="checkbox"/> Rural <input type="checkbox"/> City of Temple Terrace	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	N/A
Impact/Mobility Fees NA				
Comprehensive Plan:	Comments Received	Findings	Conditions Requested	Additional Information/Comments
Planning Commission <input type="checkbox"/> Meets Locational Criteria <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/> Locational Criteria Waiver Requested <input type="checkbox"/> Minimum Density Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Inconsistent <input type="checkbox"/> Consistent	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	N/A

5.0 IMPLEMENTATION RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Compatibility

Staff does not have any compatibility concerns with the requested modification to add an optional access/stub out to the southern boundary.

5.2 Recommendation

Based on these considerations, staff finds the proposed Personal Appearance, subject to conditions, approvable.

6.0 PROPOSED CONDITIONS

Requirements Prior to Certification:

- 1. Add labels at the proposed (middle) project intersection on CR 579 and label as “Potential Signal/Roundabout/Other Improvement – See Condition of Approval”.

Approval - Approval of the request, subject to the conditions listed below, is based on the general site plan submitted April 24, 2026.

- 1. The Development shall be limited to 1,600 residential single-family detached and single-family attached (townhome) lots, maximum of 200 may be townhome lots, and a K-8 public school with a maximum of 1,620 students. A maximum 630 dwelling units are permitted to the west of CR 579 and a maximum of 970 dwelling units permitted to the east of CR 579.
- 2. Single-family and townhome lots shall be developed in accordance with the following:

Single-Family Detached Lots:

Minimum Lot Size:	4,400 square feet
Minimum Lot Width:	40 feet
Minimum Lot Depth:	110 feet
Minimum front yard setback:	20 feet
Minimum side yard setback:	5 feet*
Minimum rear yard setback:	15 feet
Maximum building coverage:	75%
Maximum building height:	35 feet (1-3 stories)

*Corner lots shall require a front yard functioning as a side yard setback of 10 feet. If the corner side yard is used for access, the required setback shall be 20 feet.

Townhome Lots:

Minimum Lot Size:	1,200 square feet
Minimum Lot Width:	15 feet
Minimum Lot Depth:	80 feet
Minimum front yard setback:	20 feet
Minimum side yard setback:	5 feet (Corner: 15 feet)
Minimum rear yard setback:	10 feet
Maximum building coverage:	75%
Maximum building height:	35 feet

- 2.1 Any single-family detached lot developed at a lot width of less than 50 feet shall require a 2-car garage.
- 2.2 Any single-family detached lot developed at a lot width of less than 50 feet shall have the home’s primary door face the roadway.

3. The Planned Development shall permit a public school facility where depicted on the general site plan. The school site shall be a minimum of 25 upland acres in size. Development of this public school shall require compliance by the School Board with the Hillsborough County Interlocal Agreement for School Facilities Planning, Siting and Concurrency.
 - 3.1 The School District and the Developer will use their best efforts to reach a mutually agreeable dedication agreement within five (5) years of approval of the final plan amendment for RZ 25-0469. Within ninety (90) days of the expiration of the "Agreement Period," the Developer will provide written notice to the School District that at the end of the Agreement Period, the Developer will be moving forward with development of the School Site for residential use at the expiration of the Agreement Period. The Developer may develop the School Site prior to expiration of the Agreement Period should the School District at any time advise the Developer in writing that they do not intend to enter into a dedication agreement to acquire the School Site.
 - 3.2 Any and all roadways within the Planned Development serving and/or providing access to the public school parcel shall be platted to the public school parcel's property line(s) as a public road(s). In no event shall there be any intervening land restricting access to the public school parcel.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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).
7. Final design of buildings, stormwater retention areas, and ingress/egresses are subject to change pending formal agency jurisdictional determination of wetland and other surface water boundaries and approval by the appropriate regulatory agencies.
8. An evaluation of the property identified the potential existence of significant wildlife habitat as delineated on the Hillsborough County Significant Wildlife Habitat Map. The potential for upland significant wildlife habitat within the boundaries of the proposed application shall require the site plan to identify its existence by type (mesic or xeric), location and how the Land Development Code preservation provision for upland significant wildlife habitat will be addressed.
9. Approval of this petition by Hillsborough County does not constitute a guarantee that Natural Resources approvals/permits necessary for the development as proposed will be issued, does not itself

serve to justify any impacts to trees, natural plant communities or wildlife habitat, and does not grant any implied or vested right to environmental.

10. The construction and location of any proposed environmental impacts are not approved by this correspondence, but shall be reviewed by Natural Resources staff through the site and subdivision development plan process pursuant to the Land Development Code.
11. The subject application is adjacent to the ELAPP preserve, Little Manatee River Corridor. Per LDC 4.01.11, compatibility of the development with the preserve will be ensured with a compatibility plan that addresses issues related to the development such as, but not necessarily limited to, access, prescribed fire, and landscaping. The compatibility plan shall be proposed by the developer, reviewed and approved by the Conservation and Environmental Lands Management Department, and shall be required as a condition of granting a Natural Resources Permit.
12. For the purposes of these zoning conditions:
 - a. The portion of the PD lying east of CR 579 is hereafter referred to as the “Eastern Development Area”; and,
 - b. The portion of the PD lying west of CR 579 is hereafter referred to as the “Western Development Area”.
13. Development shall be limited to a maximum of 1,600 single-family detached dwelling units or townhomes (of which a maximum of 200 may be constructed as townhomes), and a 1,620-student maximum non-charter public school with grade levels K-8 as further described in Condition 14. Additionally:
 - i. The above development maximums shall be further restricted within the Eastern Development Area and Western Development Area, as further detailed below.
 - ii. Within the Eastern Development Area, residential development shall be limited to a maximum of 970 dwelling units; and,
 - iii. Within the Western Development Area, residential development shall be limited to a maximum of 630 dwelling units.
14. The school shall be limited to a non-charter public facility serving grade levels K through 8, and with a maximum of 1,620 students. Notwithstanding the exemptions provided in LDC Sec. 6.03.10 which are specifically applicable to public schools, the property owner shall provide adequate on-site vehicular queuing and take other actions to limit off-site impacts as further described herein. Additionally, the school shall provide for onsite vehicular queuing for the number of students who are projected to be ineligible for busing (hereafter referred to as “Non-Bussed Students”). Specifically:
 - a. The queue shall provide for the uninterrupted stacking of vehicles within the subject site;
 - b. The minimum length of queue for the school shall be determined by multiplying the number of Non-Bussed Students by 0.196, then multiplying by 25 feet, and then multiplying by 1.25; and,
 - c. The school shall take all actions necessary to ensure that students are not dropped off or picked up outside of school property (i.e. within adjacent parcels or along roadways along the school frontage or proximate to the school).
15. The project shall be served by and limited to the following access connections:

- a. Within the Eastern Development Area, three (3) full access connections to CR 579; and,
- b. Within the Western Development Area:
 - i. Two (2) full access connection to CR 579;
 - ii. Two (2) vehicular and pedestrian roadway stubouts along the western PD boundary as further described below; and,
 - iii. Two (2) vehicular and pedestrian roadway stubouts along the southern PD boundary.
- c. ~~Notwithstanding anything herein these conditions or shown on the PD site plan to the contrary, bicycle and pedestrian access may be permitted anywhere along the PD boundaries.~~ Notwithstanding the above, the developer may be permitted to construct one (1) additional vehicular and pedestrian roadway stubout along the southern project boundary to facilitate a connection to Bishop Rd. Such connection shall be contingent upon modification of the adjacent PD to permit such connection, review and approval of Hillsborough County with respect to the specific location and design of such connection, and the developer constructing all required site access improvements on Bishop Rd. necessary to serve such connection (all of which shall be evaluated at the time of plat/site/construction plan review).
- d. Notwithstanding anything herein these conditions or shown on the PD site plan to the contrary, bicycle and pedestrian access may be permitted anywhere along the PD boundaries.

16. With respect to project roadways and required site access improvements:

- a. The developer shall construct the two (2) roadway stubouts described in Condition 15.b.ii. concurrent with development of the Western Development Area.
 - i. The southernmost stubout shall be constructed such that it extends the internal roadway network through folio 79456.0010 (i.e. to that folio's western edge). The intent of this stubout is to provide an opportunity for the future connection of adjacent neighborhoods, increase accessibility to schools planned and/or under construction, and further the planned Wimauma grid network via the future extension of the stubout (by others) such that it connects to Lesser Goldfinch Dr., Redpoll Cliff Pl., or another suitable roadway in the same vicinity. As such, the intent of this condition is to require the developer to secure the dedication and conveyance of such right-of-way to Hillsborough County.
 - ii. The northernmost stubout shall be constructed to the eastern edge of folio 79456.0010. The intent of this stubout is to provide an opportunity for the future connection of adjacent neighborhoods, increase accessibility to schools planned and/or under construction, and further the planned Wimauma grid network via the future extension of the stubout (by others) such that it aligns with the existing (unimproved F. St. right-of-way).
- b. The developer shall construct the two (2) vehicular and pedestrian roadway stubouts along the southern PD boundary concurrent with development of the Western Development Area. The location of these stubouts shall be coordinated with the location of planned stubouts within the adjacent PD to the south of the subject PD.

- c. At the time of construction of the northernmost access within the Eastern Development Area, the developer shall disclose whether the area designated as the School Site will or could be constructed for that purpose or if the developer intends to exercise the residential development option described in Note 24 as shown on the PD site plan. If the School Site will be developed for such use (or a determination has not been made) then the developer shall construct an east-west collector road between the northernmost CR 579 access and extending east along the entirety of the school parcel, concurrently with construction of such access. The east-west collector road shall be constructed to the C3-2U (i.e. Suburban 2-lane Undivided) Typical Section standard as found within the Transportation Design Manual (TDM). Notwithstanding anything shown on the PD site plan to the contrary, access to the school site shall be permitted anywhere along this internal collector roadway (subject to LDC Sec. 6.04.07 access spacing standards).
 - d. Concurrent with the initial increment of development within the Eastern Development Area and Western Development Area, or otherwise at the request of the County during the site/construction plan review process, the developer shall submit transportation analyses which examines trip generation at each project access with CR 579. Such analyses shall be subject to the review and approval of Development Services and will be used to examine if single or dual inbound (or outbound) turn lanes are warranted pursuant to the analysis and/or Sec. 6.04.04.D. of the LDC, and whether additional receiving lanes must be constructed (either on CR 579 or internal roadways, as applicable) to accommodate required turning movements. The developer shall also submit a signal warrant analysis for each project access along CR 579, which shall be reviewed by and subject to the approval of Hillsborough County Public Works. If such signal is found to be warranted, the developer shall install the signal. Alternatively, at the developer's option, the developer may construct a single lane or dual lane roundabout (as necessary) at each access.
 - e. Notwithstanding Condition 16.d., the developer shall construct a minimum of one roundabout, one traffic signal, or one controlled pedestrian crossing (e.g. Rapid Rectangular Flashing Beacons, pedestrian actuated signal, etc.) in order to provide bicycle and pedestrian connectivity between the Eastern Development Area and Western Development Area. All such infrastructure shall be subject to the review and approval of Hillsborough County Public Works.
 - f. Other internal project roadways shall be constructed to an appropriate urban typical section as described in the Transportation Technical Manual (TTM) or Florida Design Manual (FDM), as applicable. Designation of the appropriate typical section shall occur at the time of plat/site/construction plan review and be based upon anticipated traffic volumes within each segment as demonstrated by an analysis to be submitted by the developer. Such study shall be reviewed and approved by Hillsborough County Development Services.
17. The developer has proffered to install a traffic signal and associated turn lane/geometric improvements (through the Mobility Fee Alternative Satisfaction Agreement [MFASA] process) at the intersection of CR 579 and SR 674. The developer shall be responsible for the design and construction of the signal, together with any signal warrant studies necessary to support its installation (which shall be subject to the review and approval of Hillsborough County Public Works and FDOT).
 18. In accordance with the Hillsborough County Corridor Preservation Plan, the developer shall preserve the minimum necessary right-of-way along its CR 579 frontages as necessary to accommodate a 2-lane enhanced rural collector roadway (i.e. a minimum width of 108 feet of right-of-way). Notwithstanding anything in the Design Exception to the contrary (in which the developer has proffered to dedicate up to 96 feet of right-of-way along its frontage), the specific alignment of such

preservation areas shall be determined at the time of site/construction plan approval and the alignment shall be adjusted/transitioned as necessary as it approaches the northern and southern boundaries of the project (i.e. to accommodate a western roadway shift) in order to avoid future impacts to adjacent ELAPP properties on the east side of CR 579 north and south of the project. Only those interim uses allowed by the Hillsborough County Corridor Preservation Plan shall be permitted within the preserved right-of-way. The right-of-way preservation areas shall be shown on all future site plans, and building setbacks shall be calculated from the future right-of-way line. Additionally, the developer may be required to dedicate and convey additional lands to Hillsborough County as necessary to accommodate required substandard road or site access improvements.

19. If ~~26-0008~~26-0617 is approved by the BOCC, the County Engineer will approve a de minimis exception for a Design Exception (dated June 12, 2025) and which was approved by the County Engineer (on October 15, 2025) for the CR 579 substandard road improvements. As CR 579 is a substandard collector roadway, the developer will be required to make certain improvements to CR 579 within three segments, consistent with the Design Exception approval. Specifically:
- a. Within Segment A, which is defined as that portion of CR 579 between SR 674 and the southern boundary of the PD:
 - i. The developer shall dedicate and convey a minimum of 96 feet of right-of-way (exclusive of any additional right-of-way needed for required site access or other improvements);
 - ii. The developer shall ensure there 6-foot-wide stabilized shoulders, of which 5 feet is paved, along both sides of the roadway;
 - iii. The developer shall construct a minimum 10-foot-wide sidewalk along the west side of CR 579 (transitioning to a 5-foot-wide sidewalk where the 10-foot-wide sidewalk is not feasible north of the proposed project boundary, due to right-of-way constraints); and,
 - iv. The developer shall construct a minimum 5-foot-wide sidewalk along the eastern side of CR 579, but only along the project frontages.
 - b. Within Segment B, which is defined as that portion of CR 579 between the southern boundary of the subject PD and the southern boundary of the adjacent Cypress Ridge Ranch project (i.e. adjacent PD 24-1033), the developer shall construct 6-foot-wide stabilized shoulders, of which 5 feet are paved, along both sides of the roadway; and,
 - c. Within Segment C, which is defined as that portion of CR 579 between the southern boundary of the adjacent Cypress Ridge Ranch project (i.e. adjacent PD 24-1033) and Saffold Rd.:
 - i. The developer shall construct 5-foot-wide paved shoulders along both sides of the roadway; and,
 - ii. The developer shall construct a minimum 10-foot-wide sidewalk along the west side of CR 579.
20. If the notes and/or graphics on the site plan conflict with specific zoning conditions and/or the Land Development Code (LDC) regulations, the more restrictive regulation shall apply, unless specifically conditioned otherwise. References to development standards of the LDC in the above stated conditions shall be interpreted as the regulations in effect at the time of preliminary site plan/plat approval.

- 21. In accordance with LDC Section 5.03.07.C, the certified PD general site plan shall expire for the internal transportation network and external access points, as well as for any conditions related to the internal transportation network and external access points, if site construction plans, or equivalent thereof, have not been approved for all or part of the subject Planned Development within 5 years of the effective date of the PD unless an extension is granted as provided in the LDC. Upon expiration, re-certification of the PD General Site Plan shall be required in accordance with provisions set forth in LDC Section 5.03.07.C.

Zoning Administrator Sign Off:

J. Brian Grady

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

Agency	Number	Violation	Status
Code Enforcement*			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None current or pending			
<input type="checkbox"/> Violation(s)			
Building Code Compliance*			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None current or pending			
<input type="checkbox"/> Violation(s)			
Natural Resources*			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None current or pending			
<input type="checkbox"/> Violation(s)			
EPC*			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None current or pending			
<input type="checkbox"/> Violation(s)			

APPLICATION NUMBER: PRS 26-0617

ZHM HEARING DATE: N/A

BOCC LUM MEETING DATE: May 12, 2026

Case Reviewer: Jared Follin

9.0 FULL TRANSPORTATION REPORT (see following pages)

AGENCY REVIEW COMMENT SHEET

TO: Zoning Technician, Development Services Department

DATE: 4/24/2026

REVIEWER: James Ratliff, AICP, PTP, Principal Planner

AGENCY/DEPT: Transportation

PLANNING AREA: WM

PETITION NO: PRS 26-0617

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

REVISED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

15. The project shall be served by and limited to the following access connections:
- a. Within the Eastern Development Area, three (3) full access connections to CR 579; and,
 - b. Within the Western Development Area:
 - i. Two (2) full access connections to CR 579;
 - ii. Two (2) vehicular and pedestrian roadway stubouts along the western PD boundary as further described below; and,
 - iii. Two (2) vehicular and pedestrian roadway stubouts along the southern PD boundary.
 - c. [Notwithstanding the above, the developer may be permitted to construct one \(1\) additional vehicular and pedestrian roadway stubout along the southern project boundary to facilitate a connection to Bishop Rd. Such connection shall be contingent upon modification of the adjacent PD to permit such connection, review and approval of Hillsborough County with respect to the specific location and design of such connection, and the developer constructing all required site access improvements on Bishop Rd. necessary to serve such connection \(all of which shall be evaluated at the time of plat/site/construction plan review\).](#)
 - d. Notwithstanding anything herein these conditions or shown on the PD site plan to the contrary, bicycle and pedestrian access may be permitted anywhere along the PD boundaries.

[Transportation Review Section staff is proposing to amend the above condition to reflect access changes proposed by the applicant.]

19. If 26-~~0008~~-0617 is approved by the BOCC, the County Engineer will approve a de minimis exception for a Design Exception (dated June 12, 2025) and which was approved by the County Engineer (on October 15, 2025) for the CR 579 substandard road improvements. As CR 579 is a substandard collector roadway, the developer will be required to make certain improvements to CR 579 within three segments, consistent with the Design Exception approval. Specifically:
- a. Within Segment A, which is defined as that portion of CR 579 between SR 674 and the southern

boundary of the PD:

- i. The developer shall dedicate and convey a minimum of 96 feet of right-of-way (exclusive of any additional right-of-way needed for required site access or other improvements);
 - ii. The developer shall ensure there 6-foot-wide stabilized shoulders, of which 5 feet is paved, along both sides of the roadway;
 - iii. The developer shall construct a minimum 10-foot-wide sidewalk along the west side of CR 579 (transitioning to a 5-foot-wide sidewalk where the 10-foot-wide sidewalk is not feasible north of the proposed project boundary, due to right-of-way constraints); and,
 - iv. The developer shall construct a minimum 5-foot-wide sidewalk along the eastern side of CR 579, but only along the project frontages.
- b. Within Segment B, which is defined as that portion of CR 579 between the southern boundary of the subject PD and the southern boundary of the adjacent Cypress Ridge Ranch project (i.e. adjacent PD 24-1033), the developer shall construct 6-foot-wide stabilized shoulders, of which 5 feet are paved, along both sides of the roadway; and,
- c. Within Segment C, which is defined as that portion of CR 579 between the southern boundary of the adjacent Cypress Ridge Ranch project (i.e. adjacent PD 24-1033) and Saffold Rd.:
- i. The developer shall construct 5-foot-wide paved shoulders along both sides of the roadway; and,
 - ii. The developer shall construct a minimum 10-foot-wide sidewalk along the west side of CR 579.

[Transportation Review Section staff is proposing to amend the above condition to reflect the de minimis pass-through of previously approved Design Exceptions. Given no additional impacts are proposed, the County Engineer found that no modifications to the previously approved Design Exception were necessary.]

Other Conditions:

- o Add labels at the proposed (middle) project intersection on CR 579 and label as “Potential Signal/Roundabout/Other Improvement – See Condition of Approval”.

PROJECT SUMMARY AND TRIP GENERATION

The applicant is requesting a minor modification (PRS) for multiple parcels, totaling +/- 506.69 acres, with existing approval as Planned Development (PD) 25-0469, as most recently modified via PRS 26-0008. The PD is approved a maximum of 1,600 single-family detached dwelling units (of which 200 may be constructed as townhomes) and a 1,620 student non-charter public K-8 school. The applicant is seeking to add an additional optional stubout along the southern PD boundary (between the westernmost existing connection and the western property boundary) which could permit a connection from the subject PD to Bishop Rd. Staff notes there is no reciprocal connection within the adjacent PD (currently approved as PRS 24-1033, with a pending modification via file 25-1386), which would permit such connection. A PRS would be needed to effectuate such connection in the future.

Consistent with the Development Review Procedures Manual (DRPM), the developer submitted a trip generation and site access analysis. Staff prepared the below comparison of the number of trips potentially generated under the existing and proposed zoning designations is presented below, utilizing a generalized worst-case scenario. For the K-8 school, ITE Land Use Code (LUC) 520 (Elementary School) was utilized since there is no LUC for K-8 schools and LUC 522 (Middle School/Junior High School) generated lower values in all three analysis periods. Data presented below is based on the Institute of Transportation Engineer’s (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 12th Edition.

Existing Zoning:

Land Use/Size	24 Hour Two-Way Volume	Total Peak Hour Trips	
		AM	PM
1,600 Single-Family Detached Dwelling Units (ITE Code 210)	13,648	987	1,402
1,620 Student Non-Charter Public K-8 School (ITE LUC 520)	3,678	1,183	259
Subtotal:	17,326	2,170	1,661

Proposed Zoning:

Land Use/Size	24 Hour Two-Way Volume	Total Peak Hour Trips	
		AM	PM
1,600 Single-Family Detached Dwelling Units (ITE Code 210)	13,648	987	1,402
1,620 Student Non-Charter Public K-8 School (ITE LUC 520)	3,678	1,183	259
Subtotal:	17,326	2,170	1,661

Trip Generation Difference:

Land Use/Size	24 Hour Two-Way Volume	Total Net Peak Hour Trips	
		AM	PM
Difference	No Change	No Change	No Change

TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE SERVING THE SITE

CR 579 is a 2-lane, undivided, substandard rural collector roadway characterized by +/- 20 to 22 feet of pavement in average condition. The roadway lies within a +/- 58-foot to +/- 60-foot-wide right-of-way. There are no sidewalks or bicycle facilities within the vicinity of the proposed project.

Along the project's frontage, CR 579 is shown on the Hillsborough County Corridor Preservation Plan as a future 2-lane enhanced roadway. Although there is no typical section for 2-lane enhanced roadways, the minimum right-of-way necessary is calculated by taking the typical section for a 2-lane rural, undivided roadway (TS-7 within the Hillsborough County Transportation Technical Manual), which requires a minimum of 96 right-of-way, and adding an additional 12 feet of right-of-way for enhancements (for a total of 108 feet of right-of-way required). The specific alignment of such preservation areas shall be determined at the time of site/construction plan approval; however, the alignment shall be adjusted/transitioned as necessary as it approaches the northern and southern boundaries of the project (i.e. to accommodate a western roadway shift) in order to avoid future impacts to adjacent ELAPP properties on the east side of CR 579 north and south of the project. Only those interim uses allowed by the Hillsborough County Corridor Preservation Plan shall be permitted within the preserved right-of-way. The right-of-way preservation areas shall be shown on all future site plans, and building setbacks shall be calculated from the future right-of-way line. Additionally, the developer may be required to dedicate and convey additional lands to Hillsborough County as necessary to accommodate required substandard road or site access improvements.

SITE ACCESS AND CONNECTIVITY

Generally

The applicant is proposing to take access to the project via CR 579. One additional access connection is proposed to be added by the applicant for this PRS. A series of roadways will be constructed to accommodate internal project traffic. The applicant's analysis indicated that certain auxiliary (turn) lanes were warranted per Section 6.04.04.D. of the LDC; however, intersections may be required to be signalized. If signalized, auxiliary turn lanes would need to be constructed; however, if the developers choose to pursue installation of roundabouts, auxiliary turn lanes may no longer be needed. As such, staff has deferred the determination of auxiliary turn lanes to the site/construction plan stage. The developer will be required to analyze the need for site access improvements, based on whatever intersection control devices are ultimately warranted, and may be required to install dual lefts into or out of the site depending upon the final type/amount of development and configuration/design of proposed intersections and access control devices. Staff notes that dual receiving lanes or other similar improvements could be needed. Also, if turn lanes on one leg of an intersection are required, the County will require a turn lane on the opposite leg regardless of whether such turn lane is strictly warranted pursuant to Sec. 6.04.04.D. County staff has ensured that access locations as well as the proposed conditions will work together to minimize external impacts from the potential school site to CR 579 to the greatest extent possible.

External Connectivity


--Western Boundary--

Along the project's western boundary (within the Western Development Area), which is approximately 6,290 feet in length, there is an abandoned railroad corridor now owned by the Tampa Electric Co. (TECO). Area planning efforts have been based on Sec. 6.02.01.A. of the LDC and guided by the requirement of 1,320 feet access spacing as provided for within the Wimauma Village Community Plan (WVCP). This would suggest a total of four connections (rounded down from 4.76) would be required. Excluding the northernmost +/- 1,850 feet of the site, which is shown as wetlands/conservation on the PD site plan, a total of three connections (rounded down from 3.36) would be required. The developer is proposing two through road connections. The third connection was presumed to be the Bishop Rd.


Extension, which is a potential extension of that collector roadway to CR 579. This extension was proposed by the applicant of the adjacent PD to the south of the subject PD and is currently under construction. After meetings with County staff and the applicant, it was agreed that the developer would obtain rights to the western boundary of the TECO parcel for one crossing (the southernmost connection) while the northernmost connection would remain stubbed out to the PD boundary.

--Eastern Boundary--

Lands owned by the County, which were acquired through the Jan K. Platt Environmental Lands Acquisition and Protection Program (ELAPP), surround the project along the PDs eastern, northern and



southern PD boundaries (of the Eastern Development Area). As such, there are no opportunities for additional connectivity to these areas.




--Northern Boundary--

The northern property boundary within the Western Development Area is approximately 400 feet in length (between the TECO corridor and CR 579). Given the connection spacing standards, zero connections are required. Although the applicant is proposing no connections, CR 579 provides north-south connectivity and bifurcates the PD. The entirety of the northern portion of the site within the Western Development Area is shown as wetland/conservation areas. These areas have been shown in green.

--Southern Boundary--

The southern property boundary is approximately 3,200 feet in length (between the TECO corridor and CR 579). Given the connection spacing standards, a total of two connections would be required (rounded down from 2.42).



The developer is providing two connections, in addition to the CR 579 north-south corridor, (for a total of three connections provided). Applicant-proposed through road connections are shown circled in red. An additional optional stubout along the southern boundary is being proposed as a part of this PRS (as further described herein above) which, if constructed, would result in a fourth connection.

--Overall Analysis and Connectivity--


Where the term “through road” is used, it should be noted that this term is used loosely to denote any roadway connection or stubout (whether or not there is a roadway currently planned to connect to the stubout). This offset roadway design also has the effect of calming through road traffic, and is consistent with LDC Section 6.02.01.A.10 which states “Local streets should be designed to discourage excessive speeds. Residential streets should be designed to discourage fast movement (more than 30 MPH), through the use of curvilinear alignment and by offsetting local street intersections.” Internal project design will be reviewed for compliance with this and other applicable standards at the time of site/construction plan review. Notwithstanding the above, staff has prepared a graphic showing approved projects, planned and under construction corridors, together with other possible corridors to conceptually demonstrate how connectivity is planned and can potentially be enhanced to meet community goals. Staff notes that such connectivity not only increases bicycle and pedestrian safety and provides alternate routes to schools and for emergency vehicles, but it also provides important redundancy in our roadway systems, which can become critical alternative routes during accidents, other emergencies, and to maintain the safe/functional operations of our roadways and intersections as area roadways exceed planned capacities.

DEMINIMIS DESIGN EXCEPTION – CR 579 SUBSTANDARD ROAD

Given that CR 579 is a substandard collector roadway, the applicant's Engineer of Record (EOR) submitted a Design Exception request for CR 579 (dated June 12, 2025) to determine the specific improvements that would be required by the County Engineer. Based on factors presented in the Design Exception request, the County Engineer found the request approvable (on July 8, 2025) and approved the request after BOCC approval of 25-0469 (on October 15, 2025). Given no additional increase in the maximum number of trips generated by the project, no changes in the substandard road improvements are contemplated as a part of this rezoning effort. The request authorized deviations from the 2021 Transportation Technical Manual (TTM) TS-7 Typical Section (for 2-lane Undivided, Local and Collector Rural Roads) including:

- Improvements were split into three segments. Segment A is defined as that portion of CR 579 between SR 674 and the southern boundary of the PD. Segment B is defined as that portion of CR 579 between the southern boundary of the subject PD and the southern boundary of the adjacent Cypress Ridge Ranch project (i.e. adjacent PD 24-1033). Segment C is defined as that portion of CR 579 between the southern boundary of the adjacent Cypress Ridge Ranch project (i.e. adjacent PD 24-1033) and Saffold Rd. A graphic has been provided below to demonstrate these areas.
- The developer shall be permitted to utilize the existing 10-foot to 11-foot-wide travel lanes in their existing configuration in lieu of the 12-foot-wide travel lanes required by the Hillsborough County Transportation Technical Manual's (TTM) TS-7 Typical Section; and,
- In lieu of the 8-foot-wide shoulders (of which 5 feet is paved) typically required by the TTM's TS-7, the developer will be permitted to construct 6-foot-wide stabilized shoulders (of which 5-foot is paved) within Sections A and B, and 5-foot-wide paved shoulders within a stabilized shoulder of indeterminate width within Segment C.
- In lieu of 7-foot-wide buffered bicycle facilities along both sides of the roadway, the developer will be permitted to install a 10-foot-wide multi-use path within Segment A along the west side of CR 579 (transitioning to a 5-foot-wide sidewalk north of the project where necessary due to right-of-way constraints).

SEGMENTS GRAPHIC




If 26-0617 is approved by the BOCC, the County Engineer will approve the deminimis Design Exception request.

ROADWAY LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS) INFORMATION

Information for pertinent roadways segment(s) are included below.

Roadway	From	To	LOS Standard	Peak Hour Directional LOS
CR 579	Manatee County Line	SR 674	D	B

Source: Hillsborough County 2024 Level of Service Report.



- Legend**
- Private Local Roadway (Existing)
 - Private Collector Roadway (Existing or Proposed)
 - FDOT Arterial or Principal Arterial Roadway (Existing)
 - County Collector Roadway (Existing or Proposed)
 - County Local Roadway (Existing)
 - County Local Roadway (Proposed)
 - County Local Roadway (Potential Opportunity/ Anticipated Requirement)
 - Areas Not Yet Necessarily Zoned to Its Highest and Best Use or Otherwise has Euclidean Zoning Designation (i.e. Not Master Planned through the PD Process)
 - General Area of Known Environmental Sensitivity within 21-0959

Ratliff, James

From: Williams, Michael
Sent: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 11:59 AM
To: Steven Henry
Cc: Kami Corbett; kelly.love@clearviewland.com; Follin, Jared; Ratliff, James; Drapach, Alan; De Leon, Eleonor; Tirado, Sheida; PW-CEIntake
Subject: FW: RZ PD 25-0469 - Design Exception Review
Attachments: 25-0469 DEAd 06-13-25.pdf

Steve,

I have found the attached Design Exception (DE) for PD 25-0469 APPROVABLE.

Please note that it is you (or your client's) responsibility to follow-up with my administrative assistant, Eleonor De Leon (DeLeonE@hcfl.gov or 813-307-1707) after the BOCC approves the PD zoning or PD zoning modification related to below request. This is to obtain a signed copy of the DE/AV.

If the BOCC denies the PD zoning or PD zoning modification request, staff will request that you withdraw the AV/DE. In such instance, notwithstanding the above finding of approvability, if you fail to withdraw the request, I will deny the AV/DE (since the finding was predicated on a specific development program and site configuration which was not approved).

Once I have signed the document, it is your responsibility to submit the signed AV/DE(s) together with your initial plat/site/construction plan submittal. If the project is already in preliminary review, then you must submit the signed document before the review will be allowed to progress. Staff will require resubmittal of all plat/site/construction plan submittals that do not include the appropriate signed AV/DE documentation.

Lastly, please note that it is critical to ensure you copy all related correspondence to PW-CEIntake@hcfl.gov

Mike

Michael J. Williams, P.E.

Director, Development Review

County Engineer

Development Services Department

P: (813) 307-1851

M: (813) 614-2190

E: Williamsm@HCFL.gov

W: HCFLGov.net

Hillsborough County

601 E. Kennedy Blvd., Tampa, FL 33602

[Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [YouTube](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [HCFL Stay Safe](#)

Please note: All correspondence to or from this office is subject to Florida's Public Records law.

From: Tirado, Sheida <TiradoS@hcfl.gov>
Sent: Thursday, July 3, 2025 6:16 PM
To: Williams, Michael <WilliamsM@hcfl.gov>
Cc: Ratliff, James <RatliffJa@hcfl.gov>; Drapach, Alan <DrapachA@hcfl.gov>
Subject: RZ PD 25-0469 - Design Exception Review

Hello Mike,

The attached Design Exception is Approvable to me, please include the following people in your response email:

shenry@lincks.com
kami.corbett@hwhlaw.com
kelly.love@clearviewland.com
follinj@hcfl.gov
ratliffja@hcfl.gov
drapacha@hcfl.gov

Best Regards,

Sheida L. Tirado, PE
Transportation Review & Site Intake Manager
Development Services Department

E: TiradoS@HCFL.gov
P: (813) 276-8364 | M: (813) 564-4676

601 E. Kennedy Blvd., Tampa, FL 33602

HCFL.gov

[Facebook](#) | [X](#) | [YouTube](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [Instagram](#) | [HCFL Stay Safe](#)

Hillsborough County Florida

Please note: All correspondence to or from this office is subject to Florida's Public Records law.



Supplemental Information for Transportation Related Administrative Reviews

Instructions:

- This form must be provided separately for each request submitted (including different requests of the same type).
- This form must accompany all requests for applications types shown below. Staff will not log in or assign cases that are not accompanied by this form, or where the form is partially incomplete.
- A response is required in every field. Blank fields or non-responsive answers will result in your application being returned.
- All responses must be typed.
- Please contact Eleonor de Leon at deleone@HCFL.gov or via telephone at (813) 307-1707 if you have questions about how to complete this form.

Request Type (check one)	<input type="checkbox"/> Section 6.04.02.B. Administrative Variance <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Technical Manual Design Exception Request <input type="checkbox"/> Alternative Parking Plan Request (Reference LDC Sec. 6.05.02.G3.) <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Determination of Required Parking for Unlisted Uses (Reference LDC Sec. 6.05.02.G.1. and G.2.)
Submittal Type (check one)	<input type="checkbox"/> New Request <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised Request <input type="checkbox"/> Additional Information
Submittal Number and Description/Running History (check one and complete text box using instructions provided below)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. CR 579 - Substandard Road <input type="checkbox"/> 4. <input type="checkbox"/> 2. <input type="checkbox"/> 5. <input type="checkbox"/> 3. <input type="checkbox"/> 6.
<p>Important: To help staff differentiate multiple requests (whether of the same or different type), please use the above fields to assign a unique submittal number/name to each separate request. Previous submittals relating to the same project/phase shall be listed using the name and number previously identified. It is critical that the applicant reference this unique name in the request letter and subsequent filings/correspondence. If the applicant is revising or submitting additional information related to a previously submitted request, then the applicant would check the number of the previous submittal.</p>	
Project Name/ Phase	JPL
<p>Important: The name selected must be used on all future communications and submittals of additional/revised information relating to this variance. If request is specific to a discrete phase, please also list that phase.</p>	
Folio Number(s)	079453.0000, 079456.0000, 079455.0100
<input type="checkbox"/> Check This Box If There Are More Than Five Folio Numbers	
<p>Important: List all folios related to the project, up to a maximum of five. If there are additional folios, check the box to indicate such. Folio numbers must be provided in the format provided by the Hillsborough County Property Appraiser's website (i.e. 6 numbers, followed by a hyphen, followed by 4 additional numbers, e.g. "012345-6789"). Multiple records should be separated by a semicolon and a space e.g. "012345-6789; 054321-9876").</p>	
Name of Person Submitting Request	Steven J. Henry, P.E.
<p>Important: All Administrative Variances (AV) and Design Exceptions (DE) must be Signed and Sealed by a Professional Engineer (PE) licensed in the State of Florida.</p>	
Current Property Zoning Designation	
<p>Important: For Example, type "Residential Multi-Family Conventional – 9" or "RMC-9". This is not the same as the property's Future Land Use (FLU) Designation. Typing "N/A" or "Unknown" will result in your application being returned. This information may be obtained via the Official Hillsborough County Zoning Atlas, which is available at https://maps.hillsboroughcountv.org/maphillsborough/maphillsborough.html. For additional assistance, please contact the Zoning Counselors at the Center for Development Services at (813) 272-5600 Option 3.</p>	
Pending Zoning Application Number	MM 25-0469
<p>Important: If a rezoning application is pending, enter the application number proceeded by the case type prefix, otherwise type "N/A" or "Not Applicable". Use PD for PD rezoning applications, MM for major modifications, PRS for minor modifications/personal appearances.</p>	
Related Project Identification Number (Site/Subdivision Application Number)	N/A
<p>Important: This 4-digit code is assigned by the Center for Development Services Intake Team for all Certified Parcel, Site Construction, Subdivision Construction, and Preliminary/Final Plat applications. If no project number exists, please type "N/A" or "Not Applicable".</p>	



June 12, 2025

Mr. Michael Williams, PE
County Engineer Development Review Director
Hillsborough County Government
601 East Kennedy Blvd., 20th Floor
Tampa, FL 33602

Re: JPL
MM 25-0469
Folio 079453.0000, 079456.0000, 079455.0100
Lincks Project # 19071

The purpose of this letter is to request a Design Exception to the Hillsborough County Transportation Technical Manual per Section 1.7.2 to meet the Land Development Code Section 6.04.03L for CR 579 from SR 674 to the southern boundary of the Cypress Ridge Development – see Segment Graphic attached. The project is located east and west of CR 579 and south of SR 674. The developer proposes to modify the existing Planned Development for the property to allow 1,600 Single Family Homes and a 1,620 K-8 School.

Table 1 provides the trip generation.

The access to serve the project is proposed to be as follows:

- Four (4) full accesses to CR 579 from the East Parcel
- Two (2) full accesses to CR 579 from the West Parcel
- Two (2) cross accesses to Cypress Ridge to the south

According to the Hillsborough County Roadways Functional Classification Map, CR 579 is a collector road.

Based on the evaluation of CR 579, there is not sufficient right of way to improve CR 579 to TS-7 standards. Therefore, a Design Exception is required for CR 579. The roadway is broken down into segments based on ownership, right of way, and existing/future development. The JPL Development is to improve Segments A and B and the Council Growers Development is to improve Segment C.

Segment A

This section is from SR 674 to the southern property line of the subject project. See Typical Section A for the section proposed along the segment.

5023 West Laurel Street
Tampa, FL 33607
813 289 0039 Telephone
8133 287 0674 Telefax
www.Lincks.com Website

Mr. Mike Williams
June 12, 2025
Page 2

1. Right of Way – The right of way along the segment of CR 579 varies between approximately 51 feet to 74 feet. The developer has committed to providing the right of way on each side of CR 579 to provide a total of 48 feet of right of way from the existing centerline of CR 579 within the limits of the property they own.
2. Lane Width – TS-7 has 12 foot lanes. The proposed section is to maintain the existing lanes at 10 to 11 feet. Due to limited right of way, 12 foot lanes cannot be provided.
3. Shoulder – TS-7 has 8 foot shoulders with 5 feet paved. The proposed section has 6 foot shoulders with 5 feet paved.
4. Sidewalk – TS-7 has 5 foot sidewalk on both sides of the roadway. A 10 foot sidewalk is proposed along the west side of CR 579 within the property controlled by the developer. North of the property the 10 foot sidewalk is to transition to a 5 foot sidewalk.

Segment B

This segment is from the southern property line of the subject parcel to the northern property line of the Council Growers project along the Cypress Ridge Development, as shown in the attached graphic. See Typical Section B for the section proposed along this segment of the roadway.

1. Right of Way – The right of way along the segment of CR 579 varies between approximately 59 feet to 90 feet. The developer of PD 18-1048 is required to dedicate an additional 21.5 feet of right of way on the west side of CR 579.
2. Lane Width – TS-7 has 12 foot lanes. The proposed section is to maintain the existing lanes at 10 to 11 feet. Due to limited right of way, 12 foot lanes cannot be provided.
3. Shoulder – TS-7 has 8 foot shoulders with 5 feet paved. The proposed section has 6 foot shoulder with 5 feet paved.
4. Sidewalk – TS-7 has 5 feet on both sides of the roadway. The developer of PD 18-1048 is required to provide a 5 foot sidewalk along the property frontage.

This proposed Design Exception for CR 579 protects and furthers the public health, safety and welfare based on the following:

Mr. Mike Williams
June 12, 2025
Page 3

1. Five (5) foot paved shoulders/bike lanes are proposed along the entire length of the roadway. These will provide shoulders/bike lanes that do not currently exist on the roadway.
2. A continuous 10 foot sidewalk along the section of the roadway is to be provided. This increases the pedestrian safety along the roadway and furthers the Vision Zero goals for Hillsborough County.

Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions or require any additional information.

Best Regards,


 Steven J Henry
 President
 Lincks & Associates, LLC
 A TMC Company
 P.E. #51555



Based on the information provided by the applicant, this request is:

- Disapproved
 Approved
 Approved with Conditions

If there are any further questions or you need clarification, please contact Sheida L. Tirado, P.E., (813) 276-8364, TiradoS@hillsboroughcounty.org.

Date _____

**Michael J.
Williams**

Digitally signed by
 Michael J. Williams
 Date: 2025.10.15
 09:44:55 -04'00'

Sincerely,

Michael J. Williams
Hillsborough County Engineer

The County Engineer has reviewed zoning modification application # 26-0617 and determined the changes to be de minimis. As such, the previous approval shall stand.

 Michael J. Williams, P.E.
 Hillsborough County Engineer on _____


TABLE 1
 ESTIMATED PROJECT TRIP ENDS (1)


Location	Land Use	Code	Size	Daily Trip Ends	AM Peak Hour Trip Ends			PM Peak Hour Trip Ends		
					In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
West	Single Family	210	630 DU's	5,487	100	298	398	353	208	561
East	Single Family	210	970 DU's	8,161	147	442	589	530	311	841
	Elementary School	520	1,085 Students	2,463	434	369	803	80	94	174
	Middle School	522	535 Students	1,124	193	165	358	38	42	80
	Sub-Total			11,748	774	976	1,750	648	447	1,095
	Total			17,235	874	1,274	2,148	1,001	655	1,656

(1) Source - ITE Trip Generation Manual, 11th Edition, 2021.

Mr. Mike Williams
June 12, 2025
Page 5


SEGMENTS GRAPHIC





TYPICAL SECTION SEGMENT A C.R. 579

* THE RIGHT-OF-WAY IS TO BE PRESERVED/DEDICATED WITHIN THE LIMITS OF THE PROPERTY OWNED BY THE DEVELOPER.



TYPICAL SECTION SEGMENT B C.R. 579

*TO BE CONSTRUCTED BY THE DEVELOPER OF THE
CYPRESS RIDGE DEVELOPMENT

APPENDIX



PD PLAN



HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY ROADWAYS
FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION MAP



**HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY
ROADWAYS
FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION**
Infrastructure & Development Services




Legend

- Functional Classifications
Authority Classification
- State, Principal Arterial
 - State, Arterial
 - Hillsborough, Arterial
 - Hillsborough, Collector
 - Urban Service Area Boundary
 - City Limits

The Hillsborough County Roadway Functional Map will be used in all matters in the Hillsborough County Land Development Code (LDC) that relate to functional classification of roads. Some, but not all, examples of those matters are as follows:

PART 3.02.00 INTERSTATE-75 PLANNED DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS
 PART 3.03.00 PLANNED DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS
 PART 3.04.00 PLANNED DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS
 PART 6.02.00 SUBDIVISION STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES
 PART 6.07.00 FENCES AND WALLS
 PART 12.01.00 DEFINITIONS - SPECIAL USES
 OTHER PARTS OF THE LDC NOT LISTED ABOVE.



In addition to subject matters in the LDC, Functional Classification of roads plays an important role in administering the Pedestrian Traffic Control Program and the Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program.



NOTE: Every reasonable effort has been made to assure the accuracy of this map. Hillsborough County does not warrant the accuracy of the information shown on this map, and it is not to be used for any purpose other than that for which it was prepared. The map is not to be construed as a guarantee of any kind, and it is not to be used for any purpose other than that for which it was prepared.

SOURCE: This map has been prepared for the inventory of real property located within Hillsborough County and its municipalities. The map is based on GIS/Aerial Data and other information available to the County. The County is not responsible for the accuracy of the information shown on this map. The County is not responsible for the accuracy of the information shown on this map.


881 E. Kennedy Blvd
Tampa, FL 33602
(813) 272-6810
printroom@hillsboroughcounty.org



TS-7



DRAWING NO. TS-7
SHEET NO. 1 OF



TYPICAL SECTION


N.T.S.

FOR LESS THAN 10,000 AADT

MAX. ALLOWABLE DESIGN SPEED - 50 MPH

1. ALL DIMENSIONS SHOWN ARE MINIMUM.
2. SEE APPROPRIATE SECTIONS OF TECHNICAL MANUAL FOR DESIGN PARAMETERS.
- * 3. PROVIDE 2' MINIMUM CLEARANCE FROM FENCES, WALLS, HEDGES, ABOVEGROUND UTILITIES OR IMPROVEMENTS, DROP OFFS, OR FROM THE TOPS OF BANKS WITH SLOPES STEEPER THAN 1 TO 4, THAT INTERFERE WITH THE SAFE, FUNCTIONAL USE OF THE SIDEWALK. INTERMITTENT ABOVEGROUND UTILITIES, OR MATURE TREES, 2' OR LESS IN DIAMETER MAY BE PLACED IN THIS 2' STRIP AS FAR FROM THE SIDEWALK AS POSSIBLE, IF NOT IN THE CLEAR ZONE.
4. SOD SHALL BE PLACED IN TWO ROWS STAGGERED. (BOTH TEMPORARY AND PERMANENT)
5. PAVED SHOULDER TO BE STRIPED AS A DESIGNATED BIKE LANE, AS APPROPRIATE.

**LOCAL & COLLECTOR RURAL ROADS
(2 LANE UNDIVIDED)
TYPICAL SECTION**



**TRANSPORTATION
TECHNICAL
MANUAL**

REVISION DATE:
10/17

CR 579 ASSESSMENT



Lincks & Associates, Inc.
CR 579 Field_Survey

CR 579 Special Field Survey for Substandard Road Assessment

Limits of Survey: Scaffold Road to CR 674

Date of Survey: 11-05-22

By: WLR & DZS

Type of Road: Two lane, crown, asphalt

Pav't cond.: Fair to good to very good

Shoulder cond.: Good to poor, some erosion

Swales: swales both sides, most of the segment

Notes:

1. Left and right slopes are measured away from the pavement line, crown, invert crown, centerline or median that separates opposing traffic. Slopes down to the left and right from any of those dividing features are negative, slopes up are positive.
2. Measured Lane Pavement Width is edge of pavement to edge of pavement, including any paved shoulders. Minimum, Maximum and Average Lane Width values are lane widths without shoulders
3. Nominal dimensions for shoulders are when there is no discrete separation between shoulder and front slope and the minimum required shoulder is used as a nominal shoulder.
4. Most traffic signs are 8' to 10' from EOP and are breakaway.
5. AADT is 800. Requirement for shoulder is 8'. FDOT greenbook allows a max. of 12% slope. See Summary Page for existing shoulder widths and slopes.
6. CR 579 classified as Major on Hillsborough County Map and Minor Collector RURAL on FDOT map.
7. Hillsborough Transportation Manual for Subdivision and Site Development Projects Section 3.1 requires 12' lanes for commercial rural roads without bike lanes or paved shoulders. See Summary Page for existing lane widths
8. There are no Traffic Control Poles or devices. All Light Poles, Utility Poles, and Trees are outside of the Clear Zone. Some mailboxes, guardrails and drainage culvert headwalls are within the Clear Zone. See Field Survey.

Speed Limits and Clear Zone Distances

Road Jurisdiction: FDOT Hillsborough County Pasco County

Left Lanes				Right Lanes					
Type of Lane: Through (T), Through Curbed (TC), Auxiliary (A), or Auxiliary Curbed (AC)	Begin Station	End Station	Speed Limit (mph)	Clear Zone	Type of Lane: Through (T), Through Curbed (TC), Auxiliary (A), or Auxiliary Curbed (AC)	Begin Station	End Station	Speed Limit (mph)	Clear Zone
T	0+00	5+15	45	14'	T	0+00	5+75	45	14'
T	5+15	169+30	55	18'	T	5+75	169+30	55*	18'

* Presumed speed as speed limit sign missing

Summaries of Widths and Slopes for Pavement, Shoulders and Side Slopes

Lane Pavement Width and Slopes			Shoulders Width and Slopes			
Left Slope	Width	Right Slope	Left Width	Left Slope	Right Width	Right Slope
Minimum: -3.8%	20.0'	-4.3%	4.0'	2.0%	4.0'	0.0%
Maximum: 2.2%	22.7'	-1.3%	8.0'	16.0%	8.0'	17.0%
Average: -2.4%	20.5'	-2.6%	6.7'	10.2%	6.5'	9.5%

Average values calculated from trimmed mean values (without outliers)

LEFT Side Slopes			
Front Slope 1 Width	Front Slope 1 Slope	Front Slope 2 Width	Front Slope 2 Slope
4'	2%	7'	5%
11'	37%	7'	25%
7'	16.7%	7'	15.0%

LEFT Side Slopes			
Bottom Width	Back Slope 1 Width	Back Slope 1 Slope	Back Slope 2 Slope
0'	4'	10%	3%
8'	12'	100%	10%
3'	8'	43.6%	6.5%

~ = Slope continues beyond limits of survey

RIGHT Side Slopes			
Front Slope 1 Width	Front Slope 1 Slope	Front Slope 2 Width	Front Slope 2 Slope
4'	9%	0'	
14'	30%	10'	
7'	19.0%	3'	

RIGHT Side Slopes			
Bottom Width	Back Slope 1 Width	Back Slope 1 Slope	Back Slope 2 Slope
0'	1'	2%	10%
10'	15'	160%	13%
3'	10'	40.5%	11.5%

~ = Slope continues beyond limits of survey

LEFT Slope Maximums				RIGHT Slope Maximums			
Front slope		Back slope		Front slope		Back slope	
Inside Clear Zone	Outside Clear Zone	Inside Clear Zone	Outside Clear Zone	Inside Clear Zone	Outside Clear Zone	Inside Clear Zone	Outside Clear Zone
25%	33%	33%	50%	25%	33%	33%	50%
14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14
1	0	3	3	0	0	2	2
7.1%	0.0%	21.4%	21.4%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	14.3%

Maximum Allowed:	25%	33%	33%	50%
Number of Sections:	14	14	14	14
Sections Exceeding:	1	0	3	3
Percent Exceeding:	7.1%	0.0%	21.4%	21.4%



Field Survey

Station	Left Slopes and Swales			Lane Pavement			Right Slopes and Swales			
	Back Slope (width/slope)	Bottom (width)	Front Slope (width/slope)	Left Slope	Width	Right Slope	Total/Paved Slope	Front Slope (width/slope)	Bottom (width)	Back Slope (width/slope)
1+00	11'12.2%, ~/-3%	0'	4'/-6%	-3.2%	22.7'	-3.4%	*8'0'/-14%	4'/-14%	4'	7'22%
LT 4' BWF 39' LT, 5+15 45 mph South										
RT Trees 20' RT, 5+75 55 mph North, RT side shoulder erosion, 3+23 72" CMP culvert, HDW 16' LT, 16' RT										
Notes 0+00 set at centerline intersection with Saffols Road										
8+00	15'18%	0'	5'/-12%	-3.0%	20.0'	-2.7%	*8'0'/-15%	5'/-15%	0'	10'16%
LT 4' BWF 28' LT										
RT Trees 35' RT										
Notes 10+70 (3) 48" CMP Culvert, HDW 18' LT, 20' RT										
20+00	4'40%, ~/-10%	7'	5'/-37%	-3.8%	20.0'	-2.6%	4'0'0%	6'/-25%	6'	1'160%
LT M.B.'s 6'-8' LT, U.P. 20' LT										
RT Trees 17' RT										
Notes										
28+00	8'45%	5'	8'/-10%, 7'/-25%	-2.6%	20.6'	-2.7%	6'0'0'-8%	8'/-25%	4'	5'130%
LT Trees 20' LT										
RT Trees 18' RT										
Notes										
36+00	8'24%	0'	8'/-10%	-3.5%	20.4'	-3.0%	*8'0'0'-17%	6'/-17%	0'	10'222%, 8'/-13%
LT Trees 20' LT, U.P. 24' LT										
RT Trees 30' RT, 4' BWF 32' RT										
Notes 45+27 24" RCP Culvert, HDW LT 15', RT 16'										
52+00	12'16%	0'	8'/-15%	-2.3%	21.0'	-1.3%	8'0'0'-12%	7'/-17%	0'	11'20%, 14'/-10%
LT Trees 25' LT										
RT Trees 26' RT, 56+70 (3) 36" RCP culvert, HDW 20' LT, 19' RT										
Notes										
68+00	6'100%	8'	10'/-25%	-3.7%	21.0'	-1.8%	6'0'0'-9%	14'/-15%	4'	5'100%
LT Trees 26' LT										
RT Trees 20' RT										
Notes Pav't Good, 71+00 24" RCP culvert, HDW 19' LT, 20' RT										
84+00	7'23%	4'	5'/-14%	-3.2%	20.4'	-1.6%	7'0'0'-10%	8'/-14%	4'	15'10%
LT U.P. 20' LT, GR 94+23 to 95+80 8' LT										
RT Trees 25' RT, BWF 34' RT, GR 93+60 to 94+74 8' RT										
Notes 94+50 36" RCP Culvert, HDW 15' LT, 17' RT										

Lincks & Associates, Inc.
CR 579 Field Survey

Station	Left Slopes and Swales			Lane Pavement		Right Shoulder		Right Slopes and Swales		
	Back Slope (width/slope)	Bottom (width)	Front Slope (width/slope)	Left Slope	Width	Right Slope	Total/Paved/ Slope	Front Slope (width/slope)	Bottom (width)	Back Slope (width/slope)
100+00	10'/10%	0'	5'/-16%	-1.6%	20.4'	-1.4%	6'/0'/-12%	7'/-16%	0'	13'/8%
LT Trees 24' LT, GR LT 101+60 to 104+00 8' LT										
RT Trees 25' RT, 6' CLF 66' RT, GR RT 101+30 to 102+55 8' RT										
Notes 102+30 (2) 48" Box Culverts, HDW 16' LT, 12' RT										
120+00	8'/100%	6'	6'/25%	-2.1%	20.0'	-2.9%	6'/0'/-6%	7'/-27%	6'	8'/15%
LT Trees 24' LT										
RT										
Notes										
134+00	5'/100%	2'	9'/-25%	-0.6%	21.0'	-2.1%	6'/0'/-5%	4'/-30%	10'	4'/30%
LT MB's 4' LT, U.P. 18' LT, Trees 20'										
RT										
Notes										
150+00	-/10%	7'	5'/-21%	-2.9%	20.1'	-2.3%	5'/0'/-6%	6'/-28%	6'	15'/25%
LT Trees 16' LT, 163+12 Centerline Hillsborough St										
RT 4' WF 32' RT										
Notes										
166+00			11'/-16%, -/5%	2.2%	22.0'	-4.3%	*8'/0'/-9%	7'/-9%	0'	15'/2%
LT										
RT U.P. 28' RT, 5' WF 30' RT										
Notes										
172+00			-/2%	-2.6%	21.0'	-3.7%	5'/0'/-10%	12'/-14%	0'	12'/7%
LT										
RT 5' WF 25' RT										
Notes										
179+30 End of Segment at EOP S.R. 674										
LT										
RT										
Notes										
LT										
RT										
Notes										
LT										
RT										
Notes										

CR 579 Aerial & Stationing



Stations in 1000 ft increments



**CURRENTLY
APPROVED**

Approval of the request, subject to the conditions listed, is based on the revised general site plan submitted June 30, 2025.

1. The Development shall be limited to 1,600 residential single-family detached and single-family attached (townhome) lots, maximum of 200 may be townhome lots, and a K-8 public school with a maximum of 1,620 students. A maximum 630 dwelling units are permitted to the west of CR 579 and a maximum of 970 dwelling units permitted to the east of CR 579.

2. Single-family and townhome lots shall be developed in accordance with the following:

Single-Family Detached Lots:

Minimum Lot Size:	4,400 square feet
Minimum Lot Width:	40 feet
Minimum Lot Depth:	110 feet
Minimum front yard setback:	20 feet*
Minimum side yard setback:	5 feet**
Minimum rear yard setback:	15 feet
Maximum building coverage:	75%
Maximum building height:	35 feet (1-3 stories)

*Garages shall be setback an additional 5 feet.

**Corner lots shall require a front yard functioning as a side yard setback of 10 feet. If the corner side yard is used for access, the required setback shall be 20 feet.

Townhome Lots:

Minimum Lot Size:	1,200 square feet
Minimum Lot Width:	15 feet
Minimum Lot Depth:	80 feet
Minimum front yard setback:	20 feet
Minimum side yard setback:	5 feet (Corner: 15 feet)
Minimum rear yard setback:	10 feet
Maximum building coverage:	75%
Maximum building height:	35 feet

2.1 Any single-family detached lot developed at a lot width of less than 50 feet shall require a 2-car garage.

2.2 Any single-family detached lot developed at a lot width of less than 50 feet shall have the home's primary door face the roadway.

3. The Planned Development shall permit a public school facility where depicted on the general site plan. The school site shall be a minimum of 25 upland acres in size. Development of this public school shall require compliance by the School Board with the Hillsborough County Interlocal Agreement for School Facilities Planning, Siting and Concurrency.

3.1 The School District and the Developer will use their best efforts to reach a mutually agreeable dedication agreement within five (5) years of approval of the final plan amendment for RZ 25-

0469. Within ninety (90) days of the expiration of the “Agreement Period,” the Developer will provide written notice to the School District that at the end of the Agreement Period, the Developer will be moving forward with development of the School Site for residential use at the expiration of the Agreement Period. The Developer may develop the School Site prior to expiration of the Agreement Period should the School District at any time advise the Developer in writing that they do not intend to enter into a dedication agreement to acquire the School Site.

- 3.2 Any and all roadways within the Planned Development serving and/or providing access to the public school parcel shall be platted to the public school parcel's property line(s) as a public road(s). In no event shall there be any intervening land restricting access to the public school parcel.
4. 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.
 5. 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.
 6. 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).
 7. Final design of buildings, stormwater retention areas, and ingress/egresses are subject to change pending formal agency jurisdictional determination of wetland and other surface water boundaries and approval by the appropriate regulatory agencies.
 8. An evaluation of the property identified the potential existence of significant wildlife habitat as delineated on the Hillsborough County Significant Wildlife Habitat Map. The potential for upland significant wildlife habitat within the boundaries of the proposed application shall require the site plan to identify its existence by type (mesic or xeric), location and how the Land Development Code preservation provision for upland significant wildlife habitat will be addressed.
 9. Approval of this petition by Hillsborough County does not constitute a guarantee that Natural Resources approvals/permits necessary for the development as proposed will be issued, does not itself serve to justify any impacts to trees, natural plant communities or wildlife habitat, and does not grant any implied or vested right to environmental.
 10. The construction and location of any proposed environmental impacts are not approved by this correspondence, but shall be reviewed by Natural Resources staff through the site and subdivision development plan process pursuant to the Land Development Code.
 11. The subject application is adjacent to the ELAPP preserve, Little Manatee River Corridor. Per LDC 4.01.11, compatibility of the development with the preserve will be ensured with a compatibility plan

that addresses issues related to the development such as, but not necessarily limited to, access, prescribed fire, and landscaping. The compatibility plan shall be proposed by the developer, reviewed and approved by the Conservation and Environmental Lands Management Department, and shall be required as a condition of granting a Natural Resources Permit.

12. For the purposes of these zoning conditions:
 - a. The portion of the PD lying east of CR 579 is hereafter referred to as the “Eastern Development Area”; and,
 - b. The portion of the PD lying west of CR 579 is hereafter referred to as the “Western Development Area”.

13. Development shall be limited to a maximum of 1,600 single-family detached dwelling units or townhomes (of which a maximum of 200 may be constructed as townhomes), and a 1,620-student maximum non-charter public school with grade levels K-8 as further described in Condition 14. Additionally:
 - a. The above development maximums shall be further restricted within the Eastern Development Area and Western Development Area, as further detailed below.
 - b. Within the Eastern Development Area, residential development shall be limited to a maximum of 970 dwelling units; and,
 - c. Within the Western Development Area, residential development shall be limited to a maximum of 630 dwelling units.

14. The school shall be limited to a non-charter public facility serving grade levels K through 8, and with a maximum of 1,620 students. Notwithstanding the exemptions provided in LDC Sec. 6.03.10 which are specifically applicable to public schools, the property owner shall provide adequate on-site vehicular queuing and take other actions to limit off-site impacts as further described herein. Additionally, the school shall provide for onsite vehicular queuing for the number of students who are projected to be ineligible for busing (hereafter referred to as “Non-Bussed Students”). Specifically:
 - a. The queue shall provide for the uninterrupted stacking of vehicles within the subject site;
 - b. The minimum length of queue for the school shall be determined by multiplying the number of Non-Bussed Students by 0.196, then multiplying by 25 feet, and then multiplying by 1.25; and,
 - c. The school shall take all actions necessary to ensure that students are not dropped off or picked up outside of school property (i.e. within adjacent parcels or along roadways along the school frontage or proximate to the school).

15. The project shall be served by and limited to the following access connections:
 - a. Within the Eastern Development Area, two (2) full access connections to CR 579; and,
 - b. Within the Western Development Area:
 - i. One (1) full access connection to CR 579;
 - ii. Two (2) vehicular and pedestrian roadway stubouts along the western PD boundary as further described below; and,
 - iii. Two (2) vehicular and pedestrian roadway stubouts along the southern PD boundary.

- c. Notwithstanding anything herein these conditions or shown on the PD site plan to the contrary, bicycle and pedestrian access may be permitted anywhere along the PD boundaries.
16. With respect to project roadways and required site access improvements:
- a. The developer shall construct the two (2) roadway stubouts described in Condition 15.b.ii. concurrent with development of the Western Development Area.
- i. The southernmost stubout shall be constructed such that it extends the internal roadway network through folio 79456.0010 (i.e. to that folio's western edge). The intent of this stubout is to provide an opportunity for the future connection of adjacent neighborhoods, increase accessibility to schools planned and/or under construction, and further the planned Wimauma grid network via the future extension of the stubout (by others) such that it connects to Lesser Goldfinch Dr., Redpoll Cliff Pl., or another suitable roadway in the same vicinity. As such, the intent of this condition is to require the developer to secure the dedication and conveyance of such right-of-way to Hillsborough County.
- ii. The northernmost stubout shall be constructed to the eastern edge of folio 79456.0010. The intent of this stubout is to provide an opportunity for the future connection of adjacent neighborhoods, increase accessibility to schools planned and/or under construction, and further the planned Wimauma grid network via the future extension of the stubout (by others) such that it aligns with the existing (unimproved F. St. right-of-way).
- b. The developer shall construct the two (2) vehicular and pedestrian roadway stubouts along the southern PD boundary concurrent with development of the Western Development Area. The location of these stubouts shall be coordinated with the location of planned stubouts within the adjacent PD to the south of the subject PD.
- c. At the time of construction of the northernmost access within the Eastern Development Area, the developer shall disclose whether the area designated as the School Site will or could be constructed for that purpose or if the developer intends to exercise the residential development option described in Note 24 as shown on the PD site plan. If the School Site will be developed for such use (or a determination has not been made) then the developer shall construct an east-west collector road between the northernmost CR 579 access and extending east along the entirety of the school parcel, concurrently with construction of such access. The east-west collector road shall be constructed to the C3-2U (i.e. Suburban 2-lane Undivided) Typical Section standard as found within the Transportation Design Manual (TDM). Notwithstanding anything shown on the PD site plan to the contrary, access to the school site shall be permitted anywhere along this internal collector roadway (subject to LDC Sec. 6.04.07 access spacing standards).
- d. Concurrent with the initial increment of development within the Eastern Development Area and Western Development Area, or otherwise at the request of the County during the site/construction plan review process, the developer shall submit transportation analyses which examines trip generation at each project access with CR 579. Such analyses shall be subject to the review and approval of Development Services and will be used to examine if single or dual inbound (or outbound) turn lanes are warranted pursuant to the analysis and/or Sec. 6.04.04.D. of the LDC, and whether additional receiving lanes must be constructed (either on CR 579 or internal roadways, as applicable) to accommodate required turning movements. The developer shall also submit a signal warrant analysis for each project access along CR 579, which shall be reviewed by and subject to the approval of Hillsborough County Public Works. If such signal

- is found to be warranted, the developer shall install the signal. Alternatively, at the developer's option, the developer may construct a single lane or dual lane roundabout (as necessary) at each access.
- e. Notwithstanding Condition 16.d., the developer shall construct a minimum of one roundabout, one traffic signal, or one controlled pedestrian crossing (e.g. Rapid Rectangular Flashing Beacons, pedestrian actuated signal, etc.) in order to provide bicycle and pedestrian connectivity between the Eastern Development Area and Western Development Area. All such infrastructure shall be subject to the review and approval of Hillsborough County Public Works.
 - f. Other internal project roadways shall be constructed to an appropriate urban typical section as described in the Transportation Technical Manual (TTM) or Florida Design Manual (FDM), as applicable. Designation of the appropriate typical section shall occur at the time of plat/site/construction plan review and be based upon anticipated traffic volumes within each segment as demonstrated by an analysis to be submitted by the developer. Such study shall be reviewed and approved by Hillsborough County Development Services.
17. The developer has proffered to install a traffic signal and associated turn lane/geometric improvements (through the Mobility Fee Alternative Satisfaction Agreement [MFASA] process) at the intersection of CR 579 and SR 674. The developer shall be responsible for the design and construction of the signal, together with any signal warrant studies necessary to support its installation (which shall be subject to the review and approval of Hillsborough County Public Works and FDOT).
 18. In accordance with the Hillsborough County Corridor Preservation Plan, the developer shall preserve the minimum necessary right-of-way along its CR 579 frontages as necessary to accommodate a 2-lane enhanced rural collector roadway (i.e. a minimum width of 108 feet of right-of-way). Notwithstanding anything in the Design Exception to the contrary (in which the developer has proffered to dedicate up to 96 feet of right-of-way along its frontage), the specific alignment of such preservation areas shall be determined at the time of site/construction plan approval and the alignment shall be adjusted/transitioned as necessary as it approaches the northern and southern boundaries of the project (i.e. to accommodate a western roadway shift) in order to avoid future impacts to adjacent ELAPP properties on the east side of CR 579 north and south of the project. Only those interim uses allowed by the Hillsborough County Corridor Preservation Plan shall be permitted within the preserved right-of-way. The right-of-way preservation areas shall be shown on all future site plans, and building setbacks shall be calculated from the future right-of-way line. Additionally, the developer may be required to dedicate and convey additional lands to Hillsborough County as necessary to accommodate required substandard road or site access improvements.
 19. If 25-0469 is approved by the BOCC, the County Engineer will approve a Design Exception (dated June 12, 2025) and which was found approvable by the County Engineer (on July 8, 2025) for the CR 579 substandard road improvements. As CR 579 is a substandard collector roadway, the developer will be required to make certain improvements to CR 579 within three segments, consistent with the Design Exception approval. Specifically:
 - a. Within Segment A, which is defined as that portion of CR 579 between SR 674 and the southern boundary of the PD:
 - i. The developer shall dedicate and convey a minimum of 96 feet of right-of-way (exclusive of any additional right-of-way needed for required site access or other improvements);

- ii. The developer shall ensure there 6-foot-wide stabilized shoulders, of which 5 feet is paved, along both sides of the roadway;
 - iii. The developer shall construct a minimum 10-foot-wide sidewalk along the west side of CR 579 (transitioning to a 5-foot-wide sidewalk where the 10-foot-wide sidewalk is not feasible north of the proposed project boundary, due to right-of-way constraints); and,
 - iv. The developer shall construct a minimum 5-foot-wide sidewalk along the eastern side of CR 579, but only along the project frontages.
 - b. Within Segment B, which is defined as that portion of CR 579 between the southern boundary of the subject PD and the southern boundary of the adjacent Cypress Ridge Ranch project (i.e. adjacent PD 24-1033), the developer shall construct 6-foot-wide stabilized shoulders, of which 5 feet are paved, along both sides of the roadway; and,
 - c. Within Segment C, which is defined as that portion of CR 579 between the southern boundary of the adjacent Cypress Ridge Ranch project (i.e. adjacent PD 24-1033) and Saffold Rd.:
 - i. The developer shall construct 5-foot-wide paved shoulders along both sides of the roadway; and,
 - ii. The developer shall construct a minimum 10-foot-wide sidewalk along the west side of CR 579.
- 20. If the notes and/or graphics on the site plan conflict with specific zoning conditions and/or the Land Development Code (LDC) regulations, the more restrictive regulation shall apply, unless specifically conditioned otherwise. References to development standards of the LDC in the above stated conditions shall be interpreted as the regulations in effect at the time of preliminary site plan/plat approval.
- 21. In accordance with LDC Section 5.03.07.C, the certified PD general site plan shall expire for the internal transportation network and external access points, as well as for any conditions related to the internal transportation network and external access points, if site construction plans, or equivalent thereof, have not been approved for all or part of the subject Planned Development within 5 years of the effective date of the PD unless an extension is granted as provided in the LDC. Upon expiration, re-certification of the PD General Site Plan shall be required in accordance with provisions set forth in LDC Section 5.03.07.C.



AGENCY COMMENTS

AGENCY REVIEW COMMENT SHEET

TO: Zoning Technician, Development Services Department

DATE: 4/24/2026

REVIEWER: James Ratliff, AICP, PTP, Principal Planner

AGENCY/DEPT: Transportation

PLANNING AREA: WM

PETITION NO: PRS 26-0617

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

REVISED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

15. The project shall be served by and limited to the following access connections:
- a. Within the Eastern Development Area, three (3) full access connections to CR 579; and,
 - b. Within the Western Development Area:
 - i. Two (2) full access connections to CR 579;
 - ii. Two (2) vehicular and pedestrian roadway stubouts along the western PD boundary as further described below; and,
 - iii. Two (2) vehicular and pedestrian roadway stubouts along the southern PD boundary.
 - c. Notwithstanding the above, the developer may be permitted to construct one (1) additional vehicular and pedestrian roadway stubout along the southern project boundary to facilitate a connection to Bishop Rd. Such connection shall be contingent upon modification of the adjacent PD to permit such connection, review and approval of Hillsborough County with respect to the specific location and design of such connection, and the developer constructing all required site access improvements on Bishop Rd. necessary to serve such connection (all of which shall be evaluated at the time of plat/site/construction plan review).
 - d. Notwithstanding anything herein these conditions or shown on the PD site plan to the contrary, bicycle and pedestrian access may be permitted anywhere along the PD boundaries.

[Transportation Review Section staff is proposing to amend the above condition to reflect access changes proposed by the applicant.]

19. If 26-~~0008~~-0617 is approved by the BOCC, the County Engineer will approve a de minimis exception for a Design Exception (dated June 12, 2025) and which was approved by the County Engineer (on October 15, 2025) for the CR 579 substandard road improvements. As CR 579 is a substandard collector roadway, the developer will be required to make certain improvements to CR 579 within three segments, consistent with the Design Exception approval. Specifically:
- a. Within Segment A, which is defined as that portion of CR 579 between SR 674 and the southern

boundary of the PD:

- i. The developer shall dedicate and convey a minimum of 96 feet of right-of-way (exclusive of any additional right-of-way needed for required site access or other improvements);
 - ii. The developer shall ensure there 6-foot-wide stabilized shoulders, of which 5 feet is paved, along both sides of the roadway;
 - iii. The developer shall construct a minimum 10-foot-wide sidewalk along the west side of CR 579 (transitioning to a 5-foot-wide sidewalk where the 10-foot-wide sidewalk is not feasible north of the proposed project boundary, due to right-of-way constraints); and,
 - iv. The developer shall construct a minimum 5-foot-wide sidewalk along the eastern side of CR 579, but only along the project frontages.
- b. Within Segment B, which is defined as that portion of CR 579 between the southern boundary of the subject PD and the southern boundary of the adjacent Cypress Ridge Ranch project (i.e. adjacent PD 24-1033), the developer shall construct 6-foot-wide stabilized shoulders, of which 5 feet are paved, along both sides of the roadway; and,
- c. Within Segment C, which is defined as that portion of CR 579 between the southern boundary of the adjacent Cypress Ridge Ranch project (i.e. adjacent PD 24-1033) and Saffold Rd.:
- i. The developer shall construct 5-foot-wide paved shoulders along both sides of the roadway; and,
 - ii. The developer shall construct a minimum 10-foot-wide sidewalk along the west side of CR 579.

[Transportation Review Section staff is proposing to amend the above condition to reflect the de minimis pass-through of previously approved Design Exceptions. Given no additional impacts are proposed, the County Engineer found that no modifications to the previously approved Design Exception were necessary.]

Other Conditions:

- o Add labels at the proposed (middle) project intersection on CR 579 and label as “Potential Signal/Roundabout/Other Improvement – See Condition of Approval”.

PROJECT SUMMARY AND TRIP GENERATION

The applicant is requesting a minor modification (PRS) for multiple parcels, totaling +/- 506.69 acres, with existing approval as Planned Development (PD) 25-0469, as most recently modified via PRS 26-0008. The PD is approved a maximum of 1,600 single-family detached dwelling units (of which 200 may be constructed as townhomes) and a 1,620 student non-charter public K-8 school. The applicant is seeking to add an additional optional stubout along the southern PD boundary (between the westernmost existing connection and the western property boundary) which could permit a connection from the subject PD to Bishop Rd. Staff notes there is no reciprocal connection within the adjacent PD (currently approved as PRS 24-1033, with a pending modification via file 25-1386), which would permit such connection. A PRS would be needed to effectuate such connection in the future.

Consistent with the Development Review Procedures Manual (DRPM), the developer submitted a trip generation and site access analysis. Staff prepared the below comparison of the number of trips potentially generated under the existing and proposed zoning designations is presented below, utilizing a generalized worst-case scenario. For the K-8 school, ITE Land Use Code (LUC) 520 (Elementary School) was utilized since there is no LUC for K-8 schools and LUC 522 (Middle School/Junior High School) generated lower values in all three analysis periods. Data presented below is based on the Institute of Transportation Engineer’s (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 12th Edition.

Existing Zoning:

Land Use/Size	24 Hour Two-Way Volume	Total Peak Hour Trips	
		AM	PM
1,600 Single-Family Detached Dwelling Units (ITE Code 210)	13,648	987	1,402
1,620 Student Non-Charter Public K-8 School (ITE LUC 520)	3,678	1,183	259
Subtotal:	17,326	2,170	1,661

Proposed Zoning:

Land Use/Size	24 Hour Two-Way Volume	Total Peak Hour Trips	
		AM	PM
1,600 Single-Family Detached Dwelling Units (ITE Code 210)	13,648	987	1,402
1,620 Student Non-Charter Public K-8 School (ITE LUC 520)	3,678	1,183	259
Subtotal:	17,326	2,170	1,661

Trip Generation Difference:

Land Use/Size	24 Hour Two-Way Volume	Total Net Peak Hour Trips	
		AM	PM
Difference	No Change	No Change	No Change

TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE SERVING THE SITE

CR 579 is a 2-lane, undivided, substandard rural collector roadway characterized by +/- 20 to 22 feet of pavement in average condition. The roadway lies within a +/- 58-foot to +/- 60-foot-wide right-of-way. There are no sidewalks or bicycle facilities within the vicinity of the proposed project.

Along the project's frontage, CR 579 is shown on the Hillsborough County Corridor Preservation Plan as a future 2-lane enhanced roadway. Although there is no typical section for 2-lane enhanced roadways, the minimum right-of-way necessary is calculated by taking the typical section for a 2-lane rural, undivided roadway (TS-7 within the Hillsborough County Transportation Technical Manual), which requires a minimum of 96 right-of-way, and adding an additional 12 feet of right-of-way for enhancements (for a total of 108 feet of right-of-way required). The specific alignment of such preservation areas shall be determined at the time of site/construction plan approval; however, the alignment shall be adjusted/transitioned as necessary as it approaches the northern and southern boundaries of the project (i.e. to accommodate a western roadway shift) in order to avoid future impacts to adjacent ELAPP properties on the east side of CR 579 north and south of the project. Only those interim uses allowed by the Hillsborough County Corridor Preservation Plan shall be permitted within the preserved right-of-way. The right-of-way preservation areas shall be shown on all future site plans, and building setbacks shall be calculated from the future right-of-way line. Additionally, the developer may be required to dedicate and convey additional lands to Hillsborough County as necessary to accommodate required substandard road or site access improvements.

SITE ACCESS AND CONNECTIVITY

Generally

The applicant is proposing to take access to the project via CR 579. One additional access connection is proposed to be added by the applicant for this PRS. A series of roadways will be constructed to accommodate internal project traffic. The applicant's analysis indicated that certain auxiliary (turn) lanes were warranted per Section 6.04.04.D. of the LDC; however, intersections may be required to be signalized. If signalized, auxiliary turn lanes would need to be constructed; however, if the developers choose to pursue installation of roundabouts, auxiliary turn lanes may no longer be needed. As such, staff has deferred the determination of auxiliary turn lanes to the site/construction plan stage. The developer will be required to analyze the need for site access improvements, based on whatever intersection control devices are ultimately warranted, and may be required to install dual lefts into or out of the site depending upon the final type/amount of development and configuration/design of proposed intersections and access control devices. Staff notes that dual receiving lanes or other similar improvements could be needed. Also, if turn lanes on one leg of an intersection are required, the County will require a turn lane on the opposite leg regardless of whether such turn lane is strictly warranted pursuant to Sec. 6.04.04.D. County staff has ensured that access locations as well as the proposed conditions will work together to minimize external impacts from the potential school site to CR 579 to the greatest extent possible.

External Connectivity


--Western Boundary--

Along the project's western boundary (within the Western Development Area), which is approximately 6,290 feet in length, there is an abandoned railroad corridor now owned by the Tampa Electric Co. (TECO). Area planning efforts have been based on Sec. 6.02.01.A. of the LDC and guided by the requirement of 1,320 feet access spacing as provided for within the Wimauma Village Community Plan (WVCP). This would suggest a total of four connections (rounded down from 4.76) would be required. Excluding the northernmost +/- 1,850 feet of the site, which is shown as wetlands/conservation on the PD site plan, a total of three connections (rounded down from 3.36) would be required. The developer is proposing two through road connections. The third connection was presumed to be the Bishop Rd.


Extension, which is a potential extension of that collector roadway to CR 579. This extension was proposed by the applicant of the adjacent PD to the south of the subject PD and is currently under construction. After meetings with County staff and the applicant, it was agreed that the developer would obtain rights to the western boundary of the TECO parcel for one crossing (the southernmost connection) while the northernmost connection would remain stubbed out to the PD boundary.

--Eastern Boundary--

Lands owned by the County, which were acquired through the Jan K. Platt Environmental Lands Acquisition and Protection Program (ELAPP), surround the project along the PDs eastern, northern and



southern PD boundaries (of the Eastern Development Area). As such, there are no opportunities for additional connectivity to these areas.




--Northern Boundary--

The northern property boundary within the Western Development Area is approximately 400 feet in length (between the TECO corridor and CR 579). Given the connection spacing standards, zero connections are required. Although the applicant is proposing no connections, CR 579 provides north-south connectivity and bifurcates the PD. The entirety of the northern portion of the site within the Western Development Area is shown as wetland/conservation areas. These areas have been shown in green.

--Southern Boundary--

The southern property boundary is approximately 3,200 feet in length (between the TECO corridor and CR 579). Given the connection spacing standards, a total of two connections would be required (rounded down from 2.42).



The developer is providing two connections, in addition to the CR 579 north-south corridor, (for a total of three connections provided). Applicant-proposed through road connections are shown circled in red. An additional optional stubout along the southern boundary is being proposed as a part of this PRS (as further described herein above) which, if constructed, would result in a fourth connection.

--Overall Analysis and Connectivity--


Where the term “through road” is used, it should be noted that this term is used loosely to denote any roadway connection or stubout (whether or not there is a roadway currently planned to connect to the stubout). This offset roadway design also has the effect of calming through road traffic, and is consistent with LDC Section 6.02.01.A.10 which states “Local streets should be designed to discourage excessive speeds. Residential streets should be designed to discourage fast movement (more than 30 MPH), through the use of curvilinear alignment and by offsetting local street intersections.” Internal project design will be reviewed for compliance with this and other applicable standards at the time of site/construction plan review. Notwithstanding the above, staff has prepared a graphic showing approved projects, planned and under construction corridors, together with other possible corridors to conceptually demonstrate how connectivity is planned and can potentially be enhanced to meet community goals. Staff notes that such connectivity not only increases bicycle and pedestrian safety and provides alternate routes to schools and for emergency vehicles, but it also provides important redundancy in our roadway systems, which can become critical alternative routes during accidents, other emergencies, and to maintain the safe/functional operations of our roadways and intersections as area roadways exceed planned capacities.

DEMINIMIS DESIGN EXCEPTION – CR 579 SUBSTANDARD ROAD

Given that CR 579 is a substandard collector roadway, the applicant's Engineer of Record (EOR) submitted a Design Exception request for CR 579 (dated June 12, 2025) to determine the specific improvements that would be required by the County Engineer. Based on factors presented in the Design Exception request, the County Engineer found the request approvable (on July 8, 2025) and approved the request after BOCC approval of 25-0469 (on October 15, 2025). Given no additional increase in the maximum number of trips generated by the project, no changes in the substandard road improvements are contemplated as a part of this rezoning effort. The request authorized deviations from the 2021 Transportation Technical Manual (TTM) TS-7 Typical Section (for 2-lane Undivided, Local and Collector Rural Roads) including:

- Improvements were split into three segments. Segment A is defined as that portion of CR 579 between SR 674 and the southern boundary of the PD. Segment B is defined as that portion of CR 579 between the southern boundary of the subject PD and the southern boundary of the adjacent Cypress Ridge Ranch project (i.e. adjacent PD 24-1033). Segment C is defined as that portion of CR 579 between the southern boundary of the adjacent Cypress Ridge Ranch project (i.e. adjacent PD 24-1033) and Saffold Rd. A graphic has been provided below to demonstrate these areas.
- The developer shall be permitted to utilize the existing 10-foot to 11-foot-wide travel lanes in their existing configuration in lieu of the 12-foot-wide travel lanes required by the Hillsborough County Transportation Technical Manual's (TTM) TS-7 Typical Section; and,
- In lieu of the 8-foot-wide shoulders (of which 5 feet is paved) typically required by the TTM's TS-7, the developer will be permitted to construct 6-foot-wide stabilized shoulders (of which 5-foot is paved) within Sections A and B, and 5-foot-wide paved shoulders within a stabilized shoulder of indeterminate width within Segment C.
- In lieu of 7-foot-wide buffered bicycle facilities along both sides of the roadway, the developer will be permitted to install a 10-foot-wide multi-use path within Segment A along the west side of CR 579 (transitioning to a 5-foot-wide sidewalk north of the project where necessary due to right-of-way constraints).

SEGMENTS GRAPHIC




If 26-0617 is approved by the BOCC, the County Engineer will approve the deminimis Design Exception request.

ROADWAY LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS) INFORMATION

Information for pertinent roadways segment(s) are included below.

Roadway	From	To	LOS Standard	Peak Hour Directional LOS
CR 579	Manatee County Line	SR 674	D	B

Source: Hillsborough County 2024 Level of Service Report.



Ratliff, James

From: Williams, Michael
Sent: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 11:59 AM
To: Steven Henry
Cc: Kami Corbett; kelly.love@clearviewland.com; Follin, Jared; Ratliff, James; Drapach, Alan; De Leon, Eleonor; Tirado, Sheida; PW-CEIntake
Subject: FW: RZ PD 25-0469 - Design Exception Review
Attachments: 25-0469 DEAd 06-13-25.pdf

Steve,

I have found the attached Design Exception (DE) for PD 25-0469 APPROVABLE.

Please note that it is you (or your client's) responsibility to follow-up with my administrative assistant, Eleonor De Leon (DeLeonE@hcfl.gov or 813-307-1707) after the BOCC approves the PD zoning or PD zoning modification related to below request. This is to obtain a signed copy of the DE/AV.

If the BOCC denies the PD zoning or PD zoning modification request, staff will request that you withdraw the AV/DE. In such instance, notwithstanding the above finding of approvability, if you fail to withdraw the request, I will deny the AV/DE (since the finding was predicated on a specific development program and site configuration which was not approved).

Once I have signed the document, it is your responsibility to submit the signed AV/DE(s) together with your initial plat/site/construction plan submittal. If the project is already in preliminary review, then you must submit the signed document before the review will be allowed to progress. Staff will require resubmittal of all plat/site/construction plan submittals that do not include the appropriate signed AV/DE documentation.

Lastly, please note that it is critical to ensure you copy all related correspondence to PW-CEIntake@hcfl.gov

Mike

Michael J. Williams, P.E.

Director, Development Review

County Engineer

Development Services Department

P: (813) 307-1851

M: (813) 614-2190

E: Williamsm@HCFL.gov

W: HCFLGov.net

Hillsborough County

601 E. Kennedy Blvd., Tampa, FL 33602

[Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [YouTube](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [HCFL Stay Safe](#)

Please note: All correspondence to or from this office is subject to Florida's Public Records law.

From: Tirado, Sheida <TiradoS@hcfl.gov>
Sent: Thursday, July 3, 2025 6:16 PM
To: Williams, Michael <WilliamsM@hcfl.gov>
Cc: Ratliff, James <RatliffJa@hcfl.gov>; Drapach, Alan <DrapachA@hcfl.gov>
Subject: RZ PD 25-0469 - Design Exception Review

Hello Mike,

The attached Design Exception is Approvable to me, please include the following people in your response email:

shenry@lincks.com
kami.corbett@hwhlaw.com
kelly.love@clearviewland.com
follinj@hcfl.gov
ratliffja@hcfl.gov
drapacha@hcfl.gov

Best Regards,

Sheida L. Tirado, PE
Transportation Review & Site Intake Manager
Development Services Department

E: TiradoS@HCFL.gov
P: (813) 276-8364 | M: (813) 564-4676

601 E. Kennedy Blvd., Tampa, FL 33602

HCFL.gov

[Facebook](#) | [X](#) | [YouTube](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [Instagram](#) | [HCFL Stay Safe](#)

Hillsborough County Florida

Please note: All correspondence to or from this office is subject to Florida's Public Records law.



**Hillsborough
County Florida**
Development Services

Supplemental Information for Transportation Related Administrative Reviews

Instructions:

- This form must be provided separately for each request submitted (including different requests of the same type).
- This form must accompany all requests for applications types shown below. Staff will not log in or assign cases that are not accompanied by this form, or where the form is partially incomplete.
- A response is required in every field. Blank fields or non-responsive answers will result in your application being returned.
- All responses must be typed.
- Please contact Eleonor de Leon at deleone@HCFL.gov or via telephone at (813) 307-1707 if you have questions about how to complete this form.

Request Type (check one)	<input type="checkbox"/> Section 6.04.02.B. Administrative Variance <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Technical Manual Design Exception Request <input type="checkbox"/> Alternative Parking Plan Request (Reference LDC Sec. 6.05.02.G3.) <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Determination of Required Parking for Unlisted Uses (Reference LDC Sec. 6.05.02.G.1. and G.2.)
Submittal Type (check one)	<input type="checkbox"/> New Request <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revised Request <input type="checkbox"/> Additional Information
Submittal Number and Description/Running History (check one and complete text box using instructions provided below)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. CR 579 - Substandard Road <input type="checkbox"/> 4. <input type="checkbox"/> 2. <input type="checkbox"/> 5. <input type="checkbox"/> 3. <input type="checkbox"/> 6.
<p>Important: To help staff differentiate multiple requests (whether of the same or different type), please use the above fields to assign a unique submittal number/name to each separate request. Previous submittals relating to the same project/phase shall be listed using the name and number previously identified. It is critical that the applicant reference this unique name in the request letter and subsequent filings/correspondence. If the applicant is revising or submitting additional information related to a previously submitted request, then the applicant would check the number of the previous submittal.</p>	
Project Name/ Phase	JPL
<p>Important: The name selected must be used on all future communications and submittals of additional/revised information relating to this variance. If request is specific to a discrete phase, please also list that phase.</p>	
Folio Number(s)	079453.0000, 079456.0000, 079455.0100
<input type="checkbox"/> Check This Box If There Are More Than Five Folio Numbers	
<p>Important: List all folios related to the project, up to a maximum of five. If there are additional folios, check the box to indicate such. Folio numbers must be provided in the format provided by the Hillsborough County Property Appraiser's website (i.e. 6 numbers, followed by a hyphen, followed by 4 additional numbers, e.g. "012345-6789"). Multiple records should be separated by a semicolon and a space e.g. "012345-6789; 054321-9876").</p>	
Name of Person Submitting Request	Steven J. Henry, P.E.
<p>Important: All Administrative Variances (AV) and Design Exceptions (DE) must be Signed and Sealed by a Professional Engineer (PE) licensed in the State of Florida.</p>	
Current Property Zoning Designation	
<p>Important: For Example, type "Residential Multi-Family Conventional – 9" or "RMC-9". This is not the same as the property's Future Land Use (FLU) Designation. Typing "N/A" or "Unknown" will result in your application being returned. This information may be obtained via the Official Hillsborough County Zoning Atlas, which is available at https://maps.hillsboroughcountv.org/maphillsborough/maphillsborough.html. For additional assistance, please contact the Zoning Counselors at the Center for Development Services at (813) 272-5600 Option 3.</p>	
Pending Zoning Application Number	MM 25-0469
<p>Important: If a rezoning application is pending, enter the application number proceeded by the case type prefix, otherwise type "N/A" or "Not Applicable". Use PD for PD rezoning applications, MM for major modifications, PRS for minor modifications/personal appearances.</p>	
Related Project Identification Number (Site/Subdivision Application Number)	N/A
<p>Important: This 4-digit code is assigned by the Center for Development Services Intake Team for all Certified Parcel, Site Construction, Subdivision Construction, and Preliminary/Final Plat applications. If no project number exists, please type "N/A" or "Not Applicable".</p>	



June 12, 2025

Mr. Michael Williams, PE
County Engineer Development Review Director
Hillsborough County Government
601 East Kennedy Blvd., 20th Floor
Tampa, FL 33602

Re: JPL
MM 25-0469
Folio 079453.0000, 079456.0000, 079455.0100
Lincks Project # 19071

The purpose of this letter is to request a Design Exception to the Hillsborough County Transportation Technical Manual per Section 1.7.2 to meet the Land Development Code Section 6.04.03L for CR 579 from SR 674 to the southern boundary of the Cypress Ridge Development – see Segment Graphic attached. The project is located east and west of CR 579 and south of SR 674. The developer proposes to modify the existing Planned Development for the property to allow 1,600 Single Family Homes and a 1,620 K-8 School.

Table 1 provides the trip generation.

The access to serve the project is proposed to be as follows:

- Four (4) full accesses to CR 579 from the East Parcel
- Two (2) full accesses to CR 579 from the West Parcel
- Two (2) cross accesses to Cypress Ridge to the south

According to the Hillsborough County Roadways Functional Classification Map, CR 579 is a collector road.

Based on the evaluation of CR 579, there is not sufficient right of way to improve CR 579 to TS-7 standards. Therefore, a Design Exception is required for CR 579. The roadway is broken down into segments based on ownership, right of way, and existing/future development. The JPL Development is to improve Segments A and B and the Council Growers Development is to improve Segment C.

Segment A

This section is from SR 674 to the southern property line of the subject project. See Typical Section A for the section proposed along the segment.

5023 West Laurel Street
Tampa, FL 33607
813 289 0039 Telephone
8133 287 0674 Telefax
www.Lincks.com Website

Mr. Mike Williams
June 12, 2025
Page 2

1. Right of Way – The right of way along the segment of CR 579 varies between approximately 51 feet to 74 feet. The developer has committed to providing the right of way on each side of CR 579 to provide a total of 48 feet of right of way from the existing centerline of CR 579 within the limits of the property they own.
2. Lane Width – TS-7 has 12 foot lanes. The proposed section is to maintain the existing lanes at 10 to 11 feet. Due to limited right of way, 12 foot lanes cannot be provided.
3. Shoulder – TS-7 has 8 foot shoulders with 5 feet paved. The proposed section has 6 foot shoulders with 5 feet paved.
4. Sidewalk – TS-7 has 5 foot sidewalk on both sides of the roadway. A 10 foot sidewalk is proposed along the west side of CR 579 within the property controlled by the developer. North of the property the 10 foot sidewalk is to transition to a 5 foot sidewalk.

Segment B

This segment is from the southern property line of the subject parcel to the northern property line of the Council Growers project along the Cypress Ridge Development, as shown in the attached graphic. See Typical Section B for the section proposed along this segment of the roadway.

1. Right of Way – The right of way along the segment of CR 579 varies between approximately 59 feet to 90 feet. The developer of PD 18-1048 is required to dedicate an additional 21.5 feet of right of way on the west side of CR 579.
2. Lane Width – TS-7 has 12 foot lanes. The proposed section is to maintain the existing lanes at 10 to 11 feet. Due to limited right of way, 12 foot lanes cannot be provided.
3. Shoulder – TS-7 has 8 foot shoulders with 5 feet paved. The proposed section has 6 foot shoulder with 5 feet paved.
4. Sidewalk – TS-7 has 5 feet on both sides of the roadway. The developer of PD 18-1048 is required to provide a 5 foot sidewalk along the property frontage.

This proposed Design Exception for CR 579 protects and furthers the public health, safety and welfare based on the following:

Mr. Mike Williams
June 12, 2025
Page 3

1. Five (5) foot paved shoulders/bike lanes are proposed along the entire length of the roadway. These will provide shoulders/bike lanes that do not currently exist on the roadway.
2. A continuous 10 foot sidewalk along the section of the roadway is to be provided. This increases the pedestrian safety along the roadway and furthers the Vision Zero goals for Hillsborough County.

Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions or require any additional information.

Best Regards,


 Steven J Henry
 President
 Lincks & Associates, LLC
 A TMC Company
 P.E. #51555



Based on the information provided by the applicant, this request is:

- Disapproved
 Approved
 Approved with Conditions

If there are any further questions or you need clarification, please contact Sheida L. Tirado, P.E., (813) 276-8364, TiradoS@hillsboroughcounty.org.

Date _____

**Michael J.
Williams**

Digitally signed by
 Michael J. Williams
 Date: 2025.10.15
 09:44:55 -04'00'

Sincerely,

Michael J. Williams
 Hillsborough County Engineer

The County Engineer has reviewed zoning modification application # 26-0617 and determined the changes to be de minimis. As such, the previous approval shall stand.

 Michael J. Williams, P.E.
 Hillsborough County Engineer on _____

TABLE 1


ESTIMATED PROJECT TRIP ENDS (1)


<u>Location</u>	<u>Land Use</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Size</u>	<u>Daily Trip Ends</u>	<u>AM Peak Hour Trip Ends</u>			<u>PM Peak Hour Trip Ends</u>		
					<u>In</u>	<u>Out</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>In</u>	<u>Out</u>	<u>Total</u>
West	Single Family	210	630 DU's	5,487	100	298	398	353	208	561
East	Single Family	210	970 DU's	8,161	147	442	589	530	311	841
	Elementary School	520	1,085 Students	2,463	434	369	803	80	94	174
	Middle School	522	535 Students	1,124	193	165	358	38	42	80
	Sub-Total			11,748	774	976	1,750	648	447	1,095
	Total			17,235	874	1,274	2,148	1,001	655	1,656

(1) Source - ITE Trip Generation Manual, 11th Edition, 2021.

Mr. Mike Williams
June 12, 2025
Page 5


SEGMENTS GRAPHIC





TYPICAL SECTION SEGMENT A C.R. 579

* THE RIGHT-OF-WAY IS TO BE PRESERVED/DEDICATED WITHIN THE LIMITS OF THE PROPERTY OWNED BY THE DEVELOPER.



TYPICAL SECTION SEGMENT B C.R. 579

*TO BE CONSTRUCTED BY THE DEVELOPER OF THE
CYPRESS RIDGE DEVELOPMENT

APPENDIX



PD PLAN



HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY ROADWAYS
FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION MAP



HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY
ROADWAYS
FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION
Infrastructure & Development Services




Legend

- Functional Classifications
Authority Classification
- State, Principal Arterial
 - State, Arterial
 - Hillsborough, Arterial
 - Hillsborough, Collector
 - Urban Service Area Boundary
 - City Limits

The Hillsborough County Roadway Functional Map will be used in all matters in the Hillsborough County Land Development Code (LDC) that relate to functional classification of roads. Some, but not all, examples of those matters are as follows:

PART 3.02.00 INTERSTATE-75 PLANNED DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS
 PART 3.03.00 PLANNED DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS
 PART 3.04.00 PLANNED DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS
 PART 6.02.00 SUBDIVISION STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES
 PART 6.07.00 FENCES AND WALLS
 PART 12.01.00 DEFINITIONS - SPECIAL USES
 OTHER PARTS OF THE LDC NOT LISTED ABOVE.



In addition to subject matters in the LDC, Functional Classification of roads plays an important role in administering the Pedestrian Traffic Control Program and the Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program.



NOTE: Every reasonable effort has been made to assure the accuracy of this map. Hillsborough County does not warrant the accuracy of the information shown on this map. The map is provided for informational purposes only and is not intended to be used for any legal or financial purposes. The map is not intended to be used for any legal or financial purposes. The map is not intended to be used for any legal or financial purposes.

SOURCE: This map has been prepared for the inventory of real property located within Hillsborough County and its unincorporated areas. The map is based on GIS/Aerial Data. The map is not intended to be used for any legal or financial purposes. The map is not intended to be used for any legal or financial purposes.


881 E. Kennedy Blvd
Tampa, FL 33602
(813) 272-6810
printroom@hillsboroughcounty.org



TS-7



DRAWING NO. TS-7
SHEET NO. 1 OF



TYPICAL SECTION


N.T.S.

FOR LESS THAN 10,000 AADT

MAX. ALLOWABLE DESIGN SPEED - 50 MPH

1. ALL DIMENSIONS SHOWN ARE MINIMUM.
2. SEE APPROPRIATE SECTIONS OF TECHNICAL MANUAL FOR DESIGN PARAMETERS.
- * 3. PROVIDE 2' MINIMUM CLEARANCE FROM FENCES, WALLS, HEDGES, ABOVEGROUND UTILITIES OR IMPROVEMENTS, DROP OFFS, OR FROM THE TOPS OF BANKS WITH SLOPES STEEPER THAN 1 TO 4, THAT INTERFERE WITH THE SAFE, FUNCTIONAL USE OF THE SIDEWALK. INTERMITTENT ABOVEGROUND UTILITIES, OR MATURE TREES, 2' OR LESS IN DIAMETER MAY BE PLACED IN THIS 2' STRIP AS FAR FROM THE SIDEWALK AS POSSIBLE, IF NOT IN THE CLEAR ZONE.
4. SOD SHALL BE PLACED IN TWO ROWS STAGGERED. (BOTH TEMPORARY AND PERMANENT)
5. PAVED SHOULDER TO BE STRIPED AS A DESIGNATED BIKE LANE, AS APPROPRIATE.

**LOCAL & COLLECTOR RURAL ROADS
(2 LANE UNDIVIDED)
TYPICAL SECTION**



**TRANSPORTATION
TECHNICAL
MANUAL**

REVISION DATE:
10/17

CR 579 ASSESSMENT



Lincks & Associates, Inc.
CR 579 Field_Survey

CR 579 Special Field Survey for Substandard Road Assessment

Limits of Survey: Scaffold Road to CR 674

Date of Survey: 11-05-22

By: WLR & DZS

Type of Road: Two lane, crown, asphalt

Pav't cond.: Fair to good to very good

Shoulder cond.: Good to poor, some erosion

Swales: swales both sides, most of the segment

Notes:

1. Left and right slopes are measured away from the pavement line, crown, invert crown, centerline or median that separates opposing traffic. Slopes down to the left and right from any of those dividing features are negative, slopes up are positive.
2. Measured Lane Pavement Width is edge of pavement to edge of pavement, including any paved shoulders. Minimum, Maximum and Average Lane Width values are lane widths without shoulders
3. Nominal dimensions for shoulders are when there is no discrete separation between shoulder and front slope and the minimum required shoulder is used as a nominal shoulder.
4. Most traffic signs are 8' to 10' from EOP and are breakaway.
5. AADT is 800. Requirement for shoulder is 8'. FDOT greenbook allows a max. of 12% slope. See Summary Page for existing shoulder widths and slopes.
6. CR 579 classified as Major on Hillsborough County Map and Minor Collector RURAL on FDOT map.
7. Hillsborough Transportation Manual for Subdivision and Site Development Projects Section 3.1 requires 12' lanes for commercial rural roads without bike lanes or paved shoulders. See Summary Page for existing lane widths
8. There are no Traffic Control Poles or devices. All Light Poles, Utility Poles, and Trees are outside of the Clear Zone. Some mailboxes, guardrails and drainage culvert headwalls are within the Clear Zone. See Field Survey.

Speed Limits and Clear Zone Distances

Road Jurisdiction: FDOT Hillsborough County Pasco County

Left Lanes				Right Lanes					
Type of Lane: Through (T), Through Curbed (TC), Auxiliary (A), or Auxiliary Curbed (AC)	Begin Station	End Station	Speed Limit (mph)	Clear Zone	Type of Lane: Through (T), Through Curbed (TC), Auxiliary (A), or Auxiliary Curbed (AC)	Begin Station	End Station	Speed Limit (mph)	Clear Zone
T	0+00	5+15	45	14'	T	0+00	5+75	45	14'
T	5+15	169+30	55	18'	T	5+75	169+30	55*	18'

* Presumed speed as speed limit sign missing

Summaries of Widths and Slopes for Pavement, Shoulders and Side Slopes

Lane Pavement Width and Slopes			Shoulders Width and Slopes			
Left Slope	Width	Right Slope	Left Width	Left Slope	Right Width	Right Slope
Minimum: -3.8%	20.0'	-4.3%	4.0'	2.0%	4.0'	0.0%
Maximum: 2.2%	22.7'	-1.3%	8.0'	16.0%	8.0'	17.0%
Average: -2.4%	20.5'	-2.6%	6.7'	10.2%	6.5'	9.5%

Average values calculated from trimmed mean values (without outliers)

LEFT Side Slopes			
Front Slope 1 Width	Front Slope 1 Slope	Front Slope 2 Width	Front Slope 2 Slope
4'	2%	7'	5%
11'	37%	7'	25%
7'	16.7%	7'	15.0%

LEFT Side Slopes			
Bottom Width	Back Slope 1 Width	Back Slope 1 Slope	Back Slope 2 Slope
0'	4'	10%	3%
8'	12'	100%	10%
3'	8'	43.6%	6.5%

~ = Slope continues beyond limits of survey

RIGHT Side Slopes			
Front Slope 1 Width	Front Slope 1 Slope	Front Slope 2 Width	Front Slope 2 Slope
4'	9%	0'	0'
14'	30%	10'	10'
7'	19.0%	3'	3'

RIGHT Side Slopes			
Bottom Width	Back Slope 1 Width	Back Slope 1 Slope	Back Slope 2 Slope
0'	1'	2%	10%
10'	15'	160%	13%
3'	10'	40.5%	11.5%

~ = Slope continues beyond limits of survey

LEFT Slope Maximums				RIGHT Slope Maximums			
Front slope		Back slope		Front slope		Back slope	
Inside Clear Zone	Outside Clear Zone	Inside Clear Zone	Outside Clear Zone	Inside Clear Zone	Outside Clear Zone	Inside Clear Zone	Outside Clear Zone
25%	33%	33%	50%	25%	33%	33%	50%
14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14
1	0	3	3	0	0	2	2
7.1%	0.0%	21.4%	21.4%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	14.3%

Maximum Allowed:	25%	33%	33%	50%
Number of Sections:	14	14	14	14
Sections Exceeding:	1	0	3	3
Percent Exceeding:	7.1%	0.0%	21.4%	21.4%



Field Survey

Station	Left Slopes and Swales			Lane Pavement			Right Slopes and Swales			
	Back Slope (width/slope)	Bottom (width)	Front Slope (width/slope)	Left Slope	Width	Right Slope	Total/Paved/ Slope	Front Slope (width/slope)	Bottom (width)	Back Slope (width/slope)
1+00	11'12.2%, ~/-3%	0'	4'/-6%	-3.2%	22.7'	-3.4%	*8'0'/-14%	4'/-14%	4'	7'22%
LT 4' BWF 39' LT, 5+15 45 mph South										
RT Trees 20' RT, 5+75 55 mph North, RT side shoulder erosion, 3+23 72" CMP culvert, HDW 16' LT, 16' RT										
Notes 0+00 set at centerline intersection with Saffols Road										
8+00	15'18%	0'	5'/-12%	-3.0%	20.0'	-2.7%	*8'0'/-15%	5'/-15%	0'	10'16%
LT 4' BWF 28' LT										
RT Trees 35' RT										
Notes 10+70 (3) 48" CMP Culvert, HDW 18' LT, 20' RT										
20+00	4'40%, ~/-10%	7'	5'/-37%	-3.8%	20.0'	-2.6%	4'0'0%	6'/-25%	6'	1'160%
LT M.B.'s 6'-8' LT, U.P. 20' LT										
RT Trees 17' RT										
Notes										
28+00	8'45%	5'	8'/-10%, 7'/-25%	-2.6%	20.6'	-2.7%	6'0'0'-8%	8'/-25%	4'	5'130%
LT Trees 20' LT										
RT Trees 18' RT										
Notes										
36+00	8'24%	0'	8'/-10%	-3.5%	20.4'	-3.0%	*8'0'0'-17%	6'/-17%	0'	10'222%, 8'/-13%
LT Trees 20' LT, U.P. 24' LT										
RT Trees 30' RT, 4' BWF 32' RT										
Notes 45+27 24" RCP Culvert, HDW LT 15', RT 16'										
52+00	12'16%	0'	8'/-15%	-2.3%	21.0'	-1.3%	8'0'0'-12%	7'/-17%	0'	11'20%, 14'/-10%
LT Trees 25' LT										
RT Trees 26' RT, 56+70 (3) 36" RCP culvert, HDW 20' LT, 19' RT										
Notes										
68+00	6'100%	8'	10'/-25%	-3.7%	21.0'	-1.8%	6'0'0'-9%	14'/-15%	4'	5'100%
LT Trees 26' LT										
RT Trees 20' RT										
Notes Pav't Good, 71+00 24" RCP culvert, HDW 19' LT, 20' RT										
84+00	7'23%	4'	5'/-14%	-3.2%	20.4'	-1.6%	7'0'0'-10%	8'/-14%	4'	15'10%
LT U.P. 20' LT, GR 94+23 to 95+80 8' LT										
RT Trees 25' RT, BWF 34' RT, GR 93+60 to 94+74 8' RT										
Notes 94+50 36" RCP Culvert, HDW 15' LT, 17' RT										

Lincks & Associates, Inc.
CR 579 Field Survey

Station	Left Slopes and Swales			Lane Pavement		Right Shoulder Total/Paved/ Slope	Right Slopes and Swales		
	Back Slope (width/slope)	Bottom (width)	Front Slope (width/slope)	Left Slope	Width		Right Slope	Front Slope (width/slope)	Bottom (width)
100+00	10'/10%	0'	5'/-16%	-1.6%	20.4'	-1.4%	7'/-16%	0'	13'/8%
LT Trees 24' LT, GR LT 101+60 to 104+00 8' LT									
RT Trees 25' RT, 6' CLF 66' RT, GR RT 101+30 to 102+55 8' RT									
Notes 102+30 (2) 48" Box Culverts, HDW 16' LT, 12' RT									
120+00	8'/100%	6'	6'/25%	-2.1%	20.0'	-2.9%	7'/-27%	6'	8'/15%
LT Trees 24' LT									
RT									
Notes									
134+00	5'/100%	2'	9'/-25%	-0.6%	21.0'	-2.1%	4'/-30%	10'	4'/30%
LT MB's 4' LT, U.P. 18' LT, Trees 20'									
RT									
Notes									
150+00	-/10%	7'	5'/-21%	-2.9%	20.1'	-2.3%	6'/-28%	6'	15'/25%
LT Trees 16' LT, 163+12 Centerline Hillsborough St									
RT 4' WF 32' RT									
Notes									
166+00			11'/-16%, -/5%	2.2%	22.0'	-4.3%	7'/-9%	0'	15'/2%
LT									
RT U.P. 28' RT, 5' WF 30' RT									
Notes									
172+00			-/2%	-2.6%	21.0'	-3.7%	12'/-14%	0'	12'/7%
LT									
RT 5' WF 25' RT									
Notes									
179+30 End of Segment at EOP S.R. 674									
LT									
RT									
Notes									
LT									
RT									
Notes									
LT									
RT									
Notes									

CR 579 Aerial & Stationing



Stations in 1000 ft increments

COMMISSION

Gwendolyn “Gwen” W. Myers CHAIR
 Harry Cohen VICE-CHAIR
 Chris Boles
 Donna Cameron Cepeda
 Ken Hagan
 Christine Miller
 Joshua Wostal



DIRECTORS

Janet D. Lorton EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
 Elaine S. DeLeeuw ADMIN DIVISION
 Sam Elrabi, P.E. WATER DIVISION
 Diana M. Lee, P.E. AIR DIVISION
 Michael Lynch WETLANDS DIVISION
 Rick Muratti, Esq. LEGAL DEPT
 Steffanie L. Wickham WASTE DIVISION

AGENCY COMMENT SHEET

REZONING	
<p>HEARING DATE: May 12, 2026</p> <p>PETITION NO.: 26-0617</p> <p>EPC REVIEWER: Abbie Weeks</p> <p>CONTACT INFORMATION: (813) 627-2600 x1101</p> <p>EMAIL: weeksa@epchc.org</p>	<p>COMMENT DATE: April 9, 2026</p> <p>PROPERTY ADDRESS: 1108, 1404, & 1689 S. 579 Hwy, Wimauma</p> <p>FOLIO #: 0794550100, 0794560000, 0794530000</p> <p>STR: 15/16-32S-20E</p>
<p>REQUESTED ZONING: Modification to PD</p>	
FINDINGS	
WETLANDS PRESENT	YES
SITE INSPECTION DATE	N/A
WETLAND LINE VALIDITY	Valid through April 29, 2030 (SWFWMD)
WETLANDS VERIFICATION (AERIAL PHOTO, SOILS SURVEY, EPC FILES)	Wetlands and OSWs are approximately depicted
<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/ 	

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

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).

- 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 site plan depicts Other Surface Water (OSW) impacts that have not been authorized by the Executive Director of the EPC. The impacts are indicated for roadway crossings. 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. It is recommended that a request for determination of Noticed Exempt Activities ([WEA10 - Exempt Activities in Wetlands \(formsite.com\)](http://formsite.com)) be submitted. If proposed impacts are determined to not meet Noticed Exemption and you choose to proceed with the wetland impacts depicted on the plan, a separate wetland impact/mitigation proposal and appropriate fees must be submitted to the EPC for review.
- 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.

aow /

ec: Kayla.witkowski@clearviewland.com
kami.corbett@hwhlaw.com



Agency Review Comment Sheet

NOTE: Wellhead Resource Protection Areas (WRPA), Potable Water Wellfield Protection Areas (PWWPA), and Surface Water Resource Protection Areas (SWRPA) reviews are based on the most current available data on the Hillsborough County maps, as set forth in Part 3.05.00 of the Land Development Code.

TO: Zoning Review, Development Services **REQUEST DATE:** 3/9/2026

REVIEWER: Kim Cruz, Environmental Supervisor **REVIEW DATE:** 3/23/2026

PROPERTY OWNER: 301 Wimauma, LLC **PID:** 26-0617

APPLICANT: 301 Wimauma, LLC

LOCATION: 1689 579 Hwy. Wimauma, FL 33598
1108 S 579 Hwy. Wimauma, FL 33598
1404 S 579 Hwy. Wimauma, FL 33598

FOLIO NO.: 79456.0000, 79453.0000, 79455.0100

AGENCY REVIEW COMMENTS:

At this time, according to the Hillsborough County BOCC approved maps adopted in the Comprehensive Plan, the property is not located within a Wellhead Resource Protection Area (WRPA) and/or Surface Water Resource Protection Area (SWRPA), as defined in Part 3.05.00 of the Hillsborough County Land Development Code (LDC).

At this time, according to the Florida Department of Environmental Protection well location information, the property is not located within 500 feet of non-transient non-community and/or community water system wells; therefore, the site is not located within a Potable Water Wellfield Protection Area (PWWPA).

Based on the above Wellhead and Surface Water Resource Protection information, Hillsborough County Environmental Services Division has no objection to the applicant's request at this time.

AGENCY COMMENT SHEET

TO: **Zoning/Code Administration, Development Services Department**

FROM: **Reviewer: Andria McMaugh Date: 04/02/2026**

Agency: Natural Resources Petition #: 26-0617

- This agency has **no comment**
- This agency has **no objections**
- This agency has **no objections, subject to listed or attached conditions**
- This agency **objects, based on the listed or attached issues.**

AGENCY REVIEW COMMENT SHEET

TO: ZONING TECHNICIAN, Planning Growth Management

DATE: 03-16-2026

REVIEWER: Jan Kirwan, Conservation and Environmental Lands Management

APPLICANT: Kami Corbett

PETITION NO: 26-0617

LOCATION: Wimauma

FOLIO NO: 79453.0000, 79455.0100, 79456.0000

SEC: _____ **TWN:** _____ **RNG:** _____

- This agency has no comments.

- This agency has no objection.

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

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

COMMENTS: Compatibility Plans; Conditions and Comments

1. The subject application is adjacent to the Little Manatee River Corridor Nature Preserve. Per LDC4.01.11, compatibility of the development with the preserve will be ensured with a compatibility plan that addresses issues related to the development such as, but not necessarily limited to, access, prescribed fire, and landscaping. The compatibility plan shall be proposed by the developer, reviewed and approved by the Conservation and Environmental Lands Management Department, and shall be required as a condition of granting a Natural Resources Permit..

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

PETITION NO.: PRS 26-0617 REVIEWED BY: Clay Walker, E.I. DATE: 3/10/2026

FOLIO NO.: 79456.0000, 79453.0000, 79455.0100

WATER

- The property lies within the _____ Water Service Area. The applicant should contact the provider to determine the availability of water service.
- A 12 inch water main exists (approximately ___ feet from the site), (adjacent to the site), and is located south of the subject property within the south Right-of-Way of Bishop Road. This will be the likely point-of-connection, however there could be additional and/or different points-of-connection determined at the time of the application for service. This is not a reservation of capacity.
- Water distribution system improvements will need to be completed prior to connection to the County's water system. The improvements include _____ and will need to be completed by the _____ prior to issuance of any building permits that will create additional demand on the system.

WASTEWATER

- The property lies within the _____ Wastewater Service Area. The applicant should contact the provider to determine the availability of wastewater service.
- A 12 inch wastewater forcemain exists (approximately ___ feet from the project site), (adjacent to the site) and is located south of the subject property within the north Right-of-Way of Bishop Road. 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: The subject rezoning includes parcels that are within the Urban Service Area and would require connection to the County's potable water and wastewater systems. The subject area is located within the Hillsborough County Wastewater Service Area and will be served by the South County Wastewater Treatment Plant. If all of the development commitments for the referenced facility are added together, they would exceed the existing reserve capacity of the facility. However, there is a plan in place to address the capacity prior to all of the existing commitments connecting and sending flow to the referenced facility. As such, an individual permit will be required based on the following language noted on the permits: The referenced facility currently does not have, but will have prior to placing the proposed project into operation, adequate reserve capacity to accept the flow from this project.