Rezoning Application:
PD 22-0461
Zoning Hearing Master Date:
BOCC Land Use Meeting Date:

November 14, 2022
January 10, 2023

Hillsborough
County Florida

### 1.0 APPLICATION SUMMARY

| Applicant: | HCA Health Services and South <br> Riverview LLC |
| :--- | :--- |
| FLU Category: | RES-6, SMU-6 and UMU-20 |
| Service Area: | Urban |
| Site Acreage: | 80.54 +/- |
| Community | Riverview \& Southshore Areawide <br> Plan Area: |
| Systems |  |
| Overlay: | None |



Introduction Summary:
The applicant seeks to rezone property currently zoned PD (Planned Development) \#04-1820, AR (Agricultural Rural) and RSC-9 (Residential Single-Family Conventional) to PD to allow for a mixed use project consisting of multi-family uses, medically related warehousing and recovery/sterilization uses, a free-standing ER and limited retail uses. This request includes a flex request of the UMU-20 Future Land Use category.

| Zoning: | Existing |  |  | Proposed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District(s) | PD \#04-1820 | AR | RSC-9 | PD \#22-0461 |
| Typical General Use(s) | Hospital (250 beds) and Medical Office uses | Single-Family <br> Residential/Agricultural | Single-Family Residential | 900 Multi-Family Units 285,000 sf Warehouse/ Recovery-Sterilization/ER Facility/ Limited Retail |
| Acreage | 39.0 +/- | 40.96 +/- | 0.58 +/- | 80.54 +/- |
| Density/Intensity | 0.38 FAR | 1 unit per 5 acres | 9 units per acre | $\begin{gathered} 14.6 \text { units per acre } \\ (900 / 61.39 \mathrm{ac}) \\ 0.43 \text { FAR }(285,000 / \\ 14.99 \mathrm{ac}) \end{gathered}$ |
| Mathematical Maximum* | 660,000 sf | 8 units | 5 units | 900 Multi-Family Units 285,000 sf of Warehouse/ Recovery-Sterilization/ER Facility/Limited Retail |

*number represents a pre-development approximation

| Development Standards: | Existing |  |  | Proposed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District(s) | PD \#04-1820 | AR | RSC-9 | PD \#22-0461 |
| Lot Size / Lot Width | N/A | 5 acres / 150' | 5,000 sf / 50' | N/A |
| Setbacks/Buffering and Screening | $30^{\prime}$ Front Yard <br> 20' Side Yards <br> 20' Rear Yard 20' buffer/ <br> Type B screening | 50' Front Yard <br> 25' Side Yards <br> 50' Rear Yards <br> No buffer/screening | 20' Front Yard <br> 5' Side Yards <br> 20' Rear Yards <br> No buffer/screening | 25-30' Front Yard/PD <br> 20' Side Yard/PD 20' Rear/PD <br> 10-20' buffer/A \& B Screening |
| Height | 30-85 feet | 50 feet | 35 feet | 50-65 feet |

Additional Information:

| PD Variation(s) | LDC Part 6.06.00 (Landscaping/Buffering) <br> Request for no buffering and screening internal to the project |
| :--- | :--- |
| Waiver(s) to the Land <br> Development Code | None requested as part of this application |

Planning Commission Recommendation:
Consistent

Development Services Recommendation:
Approvable, subject to proposed conditions

### 2.0 LAND USE MAP SET AND SUMMARY DATA

### 2.1 Vicinity Map



Folio: 77557.0000, 77558.0000, 77569.0000


STR: 7-31-20

 \%


 Produced Ey : Developmert Services Deparment

## Context of Surrounding Area:

The site is located on the northern side of Big Bend Road, east of Interstate 75 and west of Highway 301 in the Riverview community. The area is developed with residential and non-residential uses. Non-residential development includes a hospital, shopping centers and retail outparcels fronting Big Bend Road and US Highway 301. Residential development consists of single-family detached neighborhoods at both low and mid density levels. Recreational facilities are present west of the project, which include the Spurlino Family YMCA and Vance Vogel Park and Sports Complex.

### 2.0 LAND USE MAP SET AND SUMMARY DATA

### 2.2 Future Land Use Map
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Subject Site Future Land Use Category:

Maximum Density/F.A.R.:

RES-6 (Residential-6), SMU-6 (Suburban Mixed-Use-6), and UMU-20 (Urban Mixed-Use-20)

RES-6: 6 units per acre / 0.25 FAR
SMU-6: 6 units per acre / 0.25 FAR
UMU-20: 20 units per acre / 1.0 FAR
RES-6: Residential, suburban scale neighborhood commercial, office uses, multi-purpose projects and mixed use development.
SMU-6: Residential, suburban scale neighborhood commercial, office uses, research corporate park uses, light industrial multi-purpose and clustered residential and/or mixed use projects.
UMU-20: Residential, regional scale commercial uses such as mall, office and business park uses, research corporate park uses, light industrial, multipurpose and clustered residential and/or mixed use projects.

### 2.0 LAND USE MAP SET AND SUMMARY DATA

### 2.3 Immediate Area Map



Folio: 77557.0000, 77558.0000, 77569.0000
$\square$ APPLICATION SITE
$\square$ ZONING BOUNDARY
$\square$ PARCELS
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STR: 7-31-20





| Location: | Zoning: | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Maximum } \\ \text { Density/F.A.R. } \\ \text { Permitted by Zoning } \\ \text { District: }\end{array}$ | Allowable Use: | Existing Use: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North | PD | 3.9 u/a | Single-Family Residential | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Single-Family Residential and HOA } \\ \text { Stormwater/Open Space }\end{array}$ |
| South | PD | 0.29 FAR | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Medical Office and } \\ \text { Hospital }\end{array}$ | Medical Office and Hospital |
| East | $\begin{array}{c}\text { AR, RSC-6, } \\ \text { ASC-1 \& RSC-2 }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { AR: } 1 \text { unit/5 ac } \\ \text { RSC-6: } 6 \text { u/a } \\ \text { ASC-1: } 1 \mathrm{u} / \mathrm{a} \\ \text { RSC-2: } 2 / a\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { AR \& ASC-1: Single-Family } \\ \text { and Agriculture } \\ \text { RSC-2 \& RSC-6: Single- } \\ \text { Family Residential }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { AR: Single-Family Residential } \\ \text { RSC-6: Single-Family Residential } \\ \text { and Vacant }\end{array}$ |
| WSC-1: Single-Family Residential |  |  |  |  |
| RSC-2: Church/School |  |  |  |  |$]$

### 2.0 LAND USE MAP SET AND SUMMARY DATA

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


### 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 |
| Big Bend Rd. | County Arterial Rural | 4 Lanes <br> $\square$ Substandard Road ©Sufficient ROW Width | Corridor Preservation Plan Site Access Improvements Substandard Road Improvements Other |
| Old Big Bend Rd. | County Collector <br> - Rural | 2 Lanes <br> © Substandard Road <br> $\square$ Sufficient ROW Width | Corridor Preservation Plan <br> © Site Access Improvements <br> 区 Substandard Road Improvements <br> Q Other |
| Simmons Rd. | County Local Rural | 2 Lanes <br> © Substandard Road $\square$ Sufficient ROW Width | $\square$ Corridor Preservation Plan <br> © Site Access Improvements <br> ® Substandard Road Improvements <br> 区 Other |
|  | Choose an item | Choose an item Lanes $\square$ Substandard Road $\square$ Sufficient ROW Width | Corridor Preservation Plan Site Access Improvements Substandard Road Improvements Other |

Project Trip Generation $\square$ Not applicable for this request

|  | Average Annual Daily Trips | A.M. Peak Hour Trips | P.M. Peak Hour Trips |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Existing | 13,511 | 1,105 | 1,170 |
| Proposed | 7,123 | 532 | 655 |
| Difference $(+/-)$ | $(-) 6,388$ | $(-) 573$ | $(-) 515$ |

Connectivity and Cross Access $\square$ Not applicable for this request

| Project Boundary | Primary Access | Additional <br> Connectivity/Access | Cross Access | Finding |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| North |  | Vehicular \& Pedestrian <br> (Potential) | None | Meets LDC |
| South | X | Vehicular \& Pedestrian | None | Meets LDC |
| East | X | Vehicular \& Pedestrian | None | Meets LDC |
| West | X | Vehicular \& Pedestrian | None | Meets LDC |
| Notes: |  |  |  |  |


| Design Exception/Administrative Variance $\square$ Not applicable for this request |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Road Name/Nature of Request | Type | Finding |
| Old Big Bend Rd./ Substandard Rd. | Administrative Variance Requested | Approvable |
| Simmons Rd./ Number of Access Connections | Administrative Variance Requested | Approvable |
| Old Big Bend Rd. | Design Exception Requested | Approvable |
| Simmons Rd. | Design Exception Requested | Approvable |
| Notes: |  |  |

### 4.0 ADDITIONAL SITE INFORMATION \& AGENCY COMMENTS SUMMARY

INFORMATION/REVIEWING AGENCY

| Environmental: | Comments Received | Objections | Conditions Requested | Additional Information/Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Environmental Protection Commission | $\boxtimes$ Yes <br> $\square$ No | $\begin{aligned} & \square \mathrm{Yes} \\ & \boxtimes \mathrm{No} \end{aligned}$ | $\boxtimes$ Yes <br> $\square$ No |  |
| Natural Resources | $\begin{aligned} & \square \mathrm{Yes} \\ & \boxtimes \mathrm{No} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \square \mathrm{Yes} \\ & \square \mathrm{No} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \square \mathrm{Yes} \\ & \square \mathrm{No} \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Conservation \& Environ. Lands Mgmt. | $\boxtimes$ Yes No | $\begin{aligned} & \square \mathrm{Yes} \\ & \boxtimes \mathrm{No} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \square \mathrm{Yes} \\ & \boxtimes \text { No } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Check if Applicable: Wetlands/Other Surface Waters Use of Environmentally Sensitive Land Credit Wellhead Protection Area Surface Water Resource Protection Area | Potable Water Wellfield Protection AreaSignificant Wildlife HabitatCoastal High Hazard AreaUrban/Suburban/Rural Scenic CorridorAdjacent to ELAPP propertyOther $\qquad$ |  |  |  |
| Public Facilities: | Comments Received | Objections | Conditions Requested | Additional Information/Comments |
| Transportation <br> - Design Exc./Adm. Variance Requested <br> $\boxtimes$ Off-site Improvements Provided | 『 Yes <br> $\square$ No | $\begin{aligned} & \square \mathrm{Yes} \\ & \boxtimes \mathrm{No} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \boxtimes \mathrm{Yes} \\ & \square \mathrm{No} \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Service Area/ Water \& Wastewater | 区 Yes <br> $\square$ No | $\begin{aligned} & \square \mathrm{Yes} \\ & \boxtimes \mathrm{No} \end{aligned}$ | $\boxtimes \mathrm{Yes}$ $\square \mathrm{No}$ | Water distribution system improvements required |
| Hillsborough County School Board <br> Adequate $\square K-5 \square 6-8 \quad \square 9-12 \quad \square \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ <br> Inadequate $\boxtimes K$-5 $\boxtimes 6$-8 $\boxtimes 9-12 \quad \square N / A$ | $\begin{aligned} & \boxtimes \text { Yes } \\ & \square \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \square \mathrm{Yes} \\ & \boxtimes \mathrm{No} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \square \mathrm{Yes} \\ & \boxtimes \mathrm{No} \end{aligned}$ |  |

Impact/Mobility Fees (Various use types allowed. Estimates are a sample of potential development)
Office , General Retail - Shopping Center (50k s.f. or less) Warehouse
(Per 1,000 s.f.) (Per 1,000 s.f.) (Per 1,000 s.f.)
Mobility: \$7,502.00
Mobility: \$12,206.00 Mobility: \$1,239.00
Fire: $\$ 158.00$
Fire: \$313.00
Fire: $\$ 34.00$

Retail - Conv Mkt. w/Gas
(Per fueling position)
Mobility: \$12,361-16,580
Retail - Fast Food w/Drive Thru Multi-Family
(Per 1,000 s.f.)
Mobility: \$94,045.00 Mobility: \$3,521-5,995
Fire: $\$ 313.00$
(per unit)

Parks: \$777-2,742
School: \$1,645-10,976
Fire: \$249.00

Urban Mobility, South Fire, Central Parks - Mixed Use - 285,000 sf mixed used with 900 multi-family units. No breakdown of uses or unit sizes.

| APPLICATION NUMBER: |
| :--- |
| ZHM HEARING DATE: <br> BOCC LUM MEETING DATE: |
| November 14, 2022 <br> January 10, 2023 |
| Comprehensive Plan: |

### 5.0 IMPLEMENTATION RECOMMENDATIONS

### 5.1 Compatibility

The project is planned to be a mixed use project consisting of residential and non-residential uses. Non-residential uses (at proposed maximum heights of 50 feet) will be situated along Old Big Bend Road/Big Bend Road and will serve the area's medical facilities and residents. Multi-Family uses (at proposed maximum heights of 65 feet) are planned to occur with the retail tract along Big Bend Road and within the northern area of the Planned Development.

This segment of Old Big Bend Road/Big Bend Road is a commercial corridor located in proximity to I-75 to the west and is envisioned for an urban development pattern (UMU-20 FLU Category). The area consisting of Tracts 2, 3 and 4, proposed for non-residential uses, is presently zoned PD to allow for office and hospital uses with building heights of 3060 feet ( 85 feet for the hospital tower). This project will provide front yard setbacks of at least 30 feet for non-residential buildings, which is comparable to standard commercial zoning districts. In keeping with an urban development form, the proposed maximum building height is 50 feet. This building height is equal to those found to the CG (Commercial General) and Cl (Commercial Intensive) standard zoning districts. Internally, buildings at heights over 20 feet will not be required to provide an additional setback to allow for layout flexibility and accommodation of the intensity envisioned for this area. The non-residential tracts of this PD are not directly adjacent to residential development due to existing or planned roadways.

Similar commercial project at similar heights are found within the area, such as PD 10-0619 (St. Joseph's Hospital) located directly south of the site on the south side of Big Bend Road with approved building heights of 68-110 feet; PD 86-0154 to the southwest of the site on the west side of I-75 which permits office building heights of 75 feet; PD 17-1397 located to the southeast of the site on the west side of US Hwy 301 which permits commercial building heights of 60-75 feet; and, PD 03-0316 located southeast of the site located at the corner of Big Bend Road/US Hwy 301 permitting portions of the site to have building heights of 50 feet (see Figure 1).

The project proposes a multi-family component thereby providing proximity between residences and area employers. The site contains portions within the UMU-20 FLU category, was well as a flex of that category northward into the site. This future land use category plans for high density development within access to employment centers and highways. Comparable to standard multi-family zoning districts, a 25 foot front yard setback is proposed. Minimum setbacks of 20 feet are required along the PD's northern and eastern boundaries. These setbacks serve as buffers to contain screening between the project and adjacent properties. These setbacks are required to be increased when buildings over 20 feet are proposed, with the required buffering and screening along the property line remaining in place. A maximum building height of 65 feet is proposed with a $2: 1$ setback for buildings over 20 feet in height required along the eastern and portions of the northern boundaries. A 65 foot high building will require a 110 foot setback. The majority of the properties to the north are separated from the project by an open space/retention pond area in the neighboring project providing approximately 260 feet of separation. Therefore, along this portion of the northern boundary, the $2: 1$ setback for buildings over 20 feet in height will not be required. Along other portions of the northern boundary and the entire eastern boundary, the $2: 1$ setback is required. Property to the west of the multi-family area is developed with a County park (with the eastern portion of the park remaining undeveloped and vegetated). Provision of a 10 foot wide buffer and Type A screening will be dependent upon a ROW preservation area that may or may not occur at the time of site development. The $2: 1$ building setback is not proposed along this boundary due to the intervening land between the project and active park areas.

Urban style multi-family developments are found within the area, such as PD 11-0415 located southwest of the site on the south side of Old Big Bend/Big Bend Road approved for apartment building heights of 4-story/60 feet; PD 16-0209 located southwest of the site on the south side of Old Big Bend/Big Bend Road and approved for apartment building
heights of 58 feet; I-PD 89-0160 located southeast of the site on the south side of Old Big Bend Road/Big Bend Road and approved for apartment building heights of 45 feet; PD 18-0109 located southeast of the site along the west of US Hwy 301 and approved for apartment building heights of 60 feet; PD 21-0969 located south of the project, west of US Hwy 301 approved for a portion to contain apartment building height of 45 feet (see Figure 1).

Figure 1: Surrounding Non-Residential and Multi-Family Projects


Non-Residential

Multi-Family

ZHM HEARING DATE:

### 5.2 Recommendation

Approvable, subject to proposed conditions.

### 6.0 PROPOSED CONDITIONS

Requirements for Certification:

1. Site Data Table to correct the Multi-Family side and rear setbacks from $10^{\prime}$ to $10^{\prime}$-West, $20^{\prime}$-North, and $20^{\prime}$-East.
2. Site Data Table to add "unless otherwise stated in the conditions of approval" to the 5 ' side yard setback and $5^{\prime}$ rear yard setback.
3. Site Data Table to add "unless otherwise stated in the conditions of approval" to the statement of "structures shall be setback an additional two feet for every one foot over structure over $20^{\prime \prime \prime}$ in the Maximum Building Height section.
4. Note \#12 to be remove or revise the following sentence: "All parcel lines are conceptual and may change with final outparcel layout and plat." The following sentences to be removed due to PD waiver of internal buffering and screening: "In the event internal driveways are less than 50 ' in width, minimum internal use to use landscape buffer will be 10 feet. When no driveway is present, internal use to use buffer will be a minimum of 0 '."
5. Site plan notation of "landscape buffer shall meet LDC Section 6.06 .06 at the time of site development" to be revised to state: "landscape buffer shall meet LDC Section 6.06 .06 at the time of site development, unless otherwise required by conditions of approval." .
6. Site Plan to delineate and label the Hillsborough County parcel located along the eastern boundary of the PD.
7. On all sheets, remove the word "Extension" from Simmons Rd.
8. Modify the "Driveway B" Typical Section on Sheet 3 of 3 to add minimum 5-foot wide sidewalks on both sides of the roadway, separated from the back of curb by 5 -foot wide green strips. Add a footnote applying to the sidewalk on the east side of the roadway. Footnote shall state "The sidewalk along east side of road is optional; however, such sidewalk shall be constructed together with any vehicular access constructed within the "Potential Access Area" as shown on Sheet 1 of PD site plan (i.e. the optional access to/across folio 77550.0000)."
9. On Sheet 2 of 3, replace the three (3) references stating "By the 22-0461 Developer" to instead state "By the Developer of the Subject PD".
10. For all Typical Sections on Sheet 3 of 3, ensure all individual components are labeled. For example, label the 5foot wide and 1 -foot wide areas as "Grass Strip". On the "Driveway A" and "Driveway B" Typical Sections, ensure that it is labeled as "Type F curb and gutter".
11. On Sheet 3 of 3, please ensure label stating "Simmons Rd. Ultimate Configuration (Includes Phase 2 Group 2 Improvements)" is prominently shown. It should appear either at the top or bottom of the graphic. Consider placing it above the note near the top left corner of the graphic, with a bold font that is at least as large as the other text in the graphic.
12. On Sheet 2 of 3, add to the "Phase 2 Improvements (Group 2)" list a new item stating "Developer or others to construct eastbound to northbound left turn lane on realigned Old Big Bend Rd. onto Lincoln Rd."
13. On Sheet 2 of 3 , modify note 4 and 5 within the "Phase 1 Improvements" list. These incorrectly state these will be constructed to the Type TS-3 non-residential standard. Replace instances stating "Roadway" with "Driveway" within the first two sentences. Replace the last sentence with a sentence stating "Developer to construct to the Typical Section standard shown on Sheet 3 of 3."
14. On Sheet 2 of 3, add to the "Phase 2 Improvements (Group 1)" list a new item stating, "Developer to construct a transit bus bay, shelter and amenities - see zoning conditions."
15. On Sheet 1 of 3, modify the graphic depiction of the potential access area bounding box such that its southernmost extent runs to the limits of the southern PD boundary.

Approval - Approval of the request, subject to the conditions listed below, is based on the general site plan submitted October 25, 2022.

1. The site shall permit a maximum of 900 multi-family units 285,000 square feet of the following uses:
1.1 Medical Equipment Warehouse ( 150,000 sf maximum). This use shall be limited to the storage of medical equipment (such as, but not limited to, hospital beds, ventilators, IV pumps, diagnostic equipment, and general items used by medical facilities) only. No showrooms, retail sales to the general public, manufacturing, assembly, processing, repairs or open storage shall be permitted.
1.2 Medical Equipment Recovery/Sterilization Facility ( 80,000 sf maximum). This use shall be limited to the sterilization of medical equipment (such as, but not limited to, surgical instruments, surgical carts, surgical supplies and general items used by medical facilities) only. No biomedical waste treatment, which requires a permit by the Florida Department of Health, or use of a biohazardous waste incinerator shall be permitted. No use, or component of the overall sterilization use, meeting the definition of Heavy Industrial per the Land Development Code shall be permitted.
1.3 Free-Standing ER Facility ( 25,000 sf maximum). In accordance with LDC Section 6.11.26, helistops and heliports are prohibited.
1.4 Limited Retail uses permitted in the CN (Commercial Neighborhood) zoning district ( $30,00 \mathrm{sf}$ maximum) which includes the listing provided below. See conditions 22.c. and 22.c.i - 22.c.iii for additional requirements.
Apparel and Shoe Store
Appliance Stores
Art Supply Store
Automated Teller (ATM)
Automotive Supply Store
Bicycle Sales
Book/Stationary Store, New and Used
Brew Pub
Camera/Photography Store
Eating Establishments (2,000 s.f. Max., Coffee/Donut Shops Not Permitted)
Florist Shop
Food Product Stores: Bakery, Candies \& Nuts, Dairy, Delicatessens, Meat Seafood and Produce
Furniture/Home Furnishings
General Business, Such as Retail Goods and Stores
Gun Sales
Hardware Store
Jewelry Store
News Stand
Novelty and Souvenir Shop
Optician/ Optical Supplies
Pet Shop
Specialty Food Store (7,000 s.f. Max.)
Sporting Goods Store
Tobacco Shop
Vehicle Part Sales
2. Multi-Family uses shall be permitted within Tracts 1 and 4 only, as depicted on the General Site Plan.
3. Medical Equipment Warehouse, Medical Equipment Recovery/Sterilization Facility and Free-Standing ER uses shall be permitted in Tracts 2 and 3 only, as depicted on the General Site Plan.
4. Limited Retail uses (as specified in condition 1.4) shall be permitted in Tract 4 only, as depicted on the General Site Plan.
5. Building setbacks within Tract 1 shall be as follows:
5.1 All buildings within Tract 1 shall maintain a minimum 25 foot setback from Tract 1's southern (abutting the Old Big Bend Road realignment road) tract boundary. No 2:1 additional setback for buildings over 20 feet in height shall apply.
5.2 Should at the time of site development a Right-of-Way preservation area, in accordance with the Hillsborough County Corridor Preservation Plan, be required along the western boundary of Tract 1, all buildings within Tract 1 shall maintain a minimum 25 foot setback from the Right-of-Way preservation area. No 2:1 additional setback for buildings over 20 feet in height shall apply.
5.3 Should at the time of site development or subsequent to the approval of this rezoning, no Right-of-Way preservation area, in accordance with the Hillsborough County Corridor Preservation Plan, be required, buildings shall maintain a minimum setback of 10 feet from Tract 1's western boundary. No 2:1 additional setback for buildings over 20 feet in height shall apply.
5.3 All buildings within Tract 1 shall maintain a minimum 20 foot setback from Tract 1's northern tract boundary, unless otherwise required. Any buildings greater than 20 feet in height, which abut the delineated portion of the northern boundary on the general site plan shall be setback an additional 2 feet for every 1 foot of height over 20 feet. No 2:1 additional setback for buildings over 20 feet in height shall apply for buildings which do not abut the delineated portion of the northern boundary on the general site plan.
5.4 All buildings within Tract 1 shall maintain a minimum 20 foot setback from Tract 1's eastern tract boundary, unless otherwise required. Any buildings greater than 20 feet in height abutting the eastern boundary shall be setback an additional 2 feet for every 1 foot of height over 20 feet.
5.5 All buildings within Tract 1 shall maintain a minimum 10 foot setback where abutting Tract 2. No 2:1 additional setback for buildings over 20 feet in height shall apply.
6. All buildings within Tract 2 shall maintain a minimum 30 foot setback from Tract 2's western (abutting Simmons Road) and southern (abutting the Old Big Bend Road realignment road) tract boundaries. All setbacks shall be measured from any required right-of-way preservation or dedication line. All buildings within Tract 2 shall maintain a minimum setback of 5 feet from the northern tract boundary, eastern tract boundary, and any internal boundaries within Tract 2, unless otherwise stated. No 2:1 additional setback for buildings over 20 feet in height shall apply.
7. All buildings within Tract 3 shall maintain a minimum 30 foot setback from Tract 3's western (abutting Simmons Road), northern (abutting the Old Big Bend Road realignment Road), eastern (abutting Driveway A) and southern (abutting Old Big Bend Road/Big Bend Road) tract boundaries. All setbacks shall be measured from any required right-of-way preservation or dedication line. All buildings within Tract 3 shall maintain a minimum setback of 5 feet from internal boundaries within Tract 3. No 2:1 additional setback for buildings over 20 feet in height shall apply.
8. All limited retail buildings within Tract 4 shall maintain a minimum 30 foot setback from Tract 4's western (abutting Driveway A), northern (abutting the Old Big Bend Road realignment Road), eastern (abutting Driveway B) and southern (abutting Old Big Bend Road/Big Bend Road) tract boundaries. All multi-family buildings within Tract 4 shall maintain a minimum 25 foot setback from Tract 4's western (abutting Driveway A), northern (abutting the Old Big Bend Road realignment Road), eastern (abutting Driveway B) and southern (abutting Old

Big Bend Road/Big Bend Road) tract boundaries. All setbacks shall be measured from any required right-of-way preservation or dedication line. All limited retail buildings within Tract 4 shall maintain a minimum setback of 5 feet from internal boundaries within Tract 4. All multi-family buildings within Tract 4 shall maintain a minimum setback of 10 feet from internal boundaries within Tract 4. No 2:1 additional setback for buildings over 20 feet in height shall apply.
9. Medical Equipment Warehouse, Medical Equipment Recovery/Sterilization, Free-Standing ER, and Limited Retail buildings shall be limited to a maximum height of 50 feet.
10. Multi-Family buildings shall be limited to a maximum height of 65 feet. See condition 5 for setback requirements due to building heights over 20 feet.
11. Within Tract 1, a 20 foot wide buffer with Type $B$ screening shall be provided along the northern and eastern PD boundaries, as depicted on the General Site Plan. Screening shall not be required within wetlands should the existing vegetation within wetlands be deemed by Natural Resources staff to meet the Type B screening requirements. Should the existing vegetation within the wetlands be found to not meet all or part of the Type B screening requirements, all or part of the Type B screening shall be provided at a location in accordance with any wetland setback, which may be outside of the 20 foot wide buffer. Should streams or natural water bodies exist within these buffers, the Type B screening shall be provided at a location in accordance with any required Natural Resources or EPC required setback, which may be outside of the 20 foot wide buffer.
12. Within Tract 1, buffering and screening along the western PD boundary shall be governed as follows:
12.1 Should at the time of site development a Right-of-Way preservation area, in accordance with the Hillsborough County Corridor Preservation Plan, be required along the western boundary of Tract 1 and no temporary uses/improvements permitted by LDC Section 5.11.09 (Interim Use of Reserved Land) occur within that area, then no buffering and screening shall be required.
12.2 Should at the time of site development a Right-of-Way preservation area, in accordance with the Hillsborough County Corridor Preservation Plan, be required along the western boundary of Tract 1 and temporary uses/improvements permitted by LDC Section 5.11.09 (Interim Use of Reserved Land) occur within that area, a minimum 10 foot wide buffer with Type A screening shall be required. When such temporary uses/improvements be removed or relocated, the buffering and screening shall no longer be required.
12.3 Should at the time of site development or subsequent to the approval of this rezoning, no Right-of-Way preservation area, in accordance with the Hillsborough County Corridor Preservation Plan, be required, a minimum 10 foot wide buffer with Type A screening shall be provided, as depicted on the general site plan.
12.4 For required buffering and screening along the western boundary, the following shall shall apply. Screening shall not be required within wetlands should the existing vegetation within the wetlands be deemed by Natural Resources staff to meet the Type A screening requirements. Should the existing vegetation within the wetlands be found to not meet Type A screening requirements, screening shall be provided at a location in accordance with any wetland setback, which may be outside of the 10 foot wide buffer.
13. No internal buffering and screening between residential and non-residential uses shall be required in Tract 4.
14. No buffering and screening between Tracts 1 and 2 and 1 and 4 shall be required. No buffering and screening between Tracts 2 and 3 shall be required. No buffering and screening between Tracts 3 and 4 shall be required.
15. If at the time of site development for Tract 4, should property to the east be zoned for a Group 5 or 6 use and is either vacant or developed with a Group 5 or 6 use, no buffering and screening shall be required. If at the time of site development for Tract 4 should property to the east be zoned for a Group 4, 3, 2 or 1 use and is either vacant or developed with a Group 4, 3, 2 or 1 use, required buffering and screening shall be provided (excluding any cross access point). Such required buffering and screening shall be located east of Driveway B.
14. Individual tract acreage sizes provided on the general site plan are general approximations. Acreages may be modified at the site development/subdivision/platting stage to be slightly smaller or larger as depicted on the general site plan. However, significant acreage changes that result in a change in the overall form and circulation as depicted on the general site plan are prohibited.
15. If at the time of site development, the Right-of-Way preservation area, in accordance with the Hillsborough County Corridor Preservation Plan, be required along the western boundary of Tract 1, this preservation area shall be permitted to shift eastward into Tract 1 to avoid any wetland impacts, if deemed necessary by the Environmental Protection Commission (EPC).
16. The vehicular and pedestrian crossing of the stream within Tract 1 shall be permitted to shift northward or southward if deemed necessary by the Environmental Protection Commission (EPC).
17. 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.
18. 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.
19. 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).
20. 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.
21. Water distribution system improvements will need to be completed prior to connection to the County's water system. The improvements include two funded CIP projects that are currently under construction, C32001South County Potable Water Repump Station Expansion and C32011-Potable Water In-Line Booster Pump Station, and will need to be completed by the County prior to issuance of any building permits that will create additional demand on the system.
22. Project entitlements shall be split into two phases, for the purposes of enforcement of these zoning conditions. Additional subphases shall be allowed; however, the required transportation improvements must be completed with the initial phase/subphase, and all access restrictions and other requirements shall apply to the entire phase/subphase (i.e. no deferral of requirements will be permitted to a later subphase unless expressly allowed pursuant to these conditions). Additionally, phasing must occur in sequential order (i.e. Phase 2 entitlements
cannot be constructed before Phase 1 entitlements), although nothing in this condition shall prohibit the simultaneous construction of Phase 1 and Phase 2 entitlements if all required improvements are in place prior to issuance of any Certificates of Occupancy (temporary or otherwise) for the initial increment of development. Entitlements shall be as follows:
a. Phase 1 Entitlements:
i. 300 multi-family dwelling units; and,
ii. 80,000 s.f. Medical Equipment Recovery/Sterilization Facility, which shall be defined in condition 1.2.
b. Phase 2 Entitlements:
i. 600 multi-family dwelling units;
ii. 150,000 s.f. Medical Equipment Warehouse Facility, which shall be defined in Condition 1.1;
iii. 25,000 s.f. Free Standing Emergency Facility; and,
iv. 30,000 s.f. of certain Limited Retail uses, as further restricted/defined below.
c. Limited Retail Use and Form Restrictions. For the purposes of creating a retail strip plaza, and in accordance with the transportation analysis, the following use and form restrictions shall apply to the retail development.
i. The Limited Retail uses shall be limited to:

| Apparel and Shoe Store | General Business, Such as Retail <br> Goods and Stores |
| :--- | :--- |
| Appliance Stores | Gun Sales |
| Art Supply Store | Hardware Store |
| Automated Teller (ATM) | Jewelry Store |
| Automotive Supply Store | News Stand |
| Bicycle Sales | Novelty and Souvenir Shop |
| Book/Stationary Store, New and Used | Optician/ Optical Supplies |
| Brew Pub | Pet Shop |
| Camera/Photography Store | Specialty Food Store (7,000 g.s.f. <br> Max.) |
| Eating Establishments (2,000 g.s.f. <br> Max., Coffee/Donut Shops Not <br> Permitted) | Sporting Goods Store |
| Florist Shop | Tobacco Shop |
|  <br> Nuts, Dairy, Delicatessens, Meat <br> Seafood and Produce | Vehicle Part Sales |
| Furniture/Home Furnishings |  |

ii. No freestanding retail uses/ outparcels shall be permitted. Each retail building shall contain multiple tenancies, with no less than three tenants occupying each building.
iii. Drive-through uses shall be prohibited.
23. As generally shown on the PD site plan, the project shall be served by a variety of vehicular and pedestrian access connections. Additional internal connections, whether or not shown on the PD site plan as Conceptual Access connections and whether or not they are to Simmons Rd., the realigned Old Big Bend Rd., or another internal facility, may be approved th the discretion of the Administrator if consistent with these zoning conditions and requested at the time of plat/site/construction plan review and consistent with the access management standards and procedures contained within Section 6.04 of the Hillsborough County Land Development Code (LDC). Additionally:
a. Notwithstanding anything on the PD site plan or herein these conditions to the contrary, bicycle and pedestrian access may be permitted anywhere along the PD boundaries.
b. Project access connections shall be subject to strict phasing requirements as shown on Sheet 2 of 3 or contained herein these conditions. Specifically, access shall be as follows:
i. Phase 1 access shall consist of:

1. One (1) right-in/right-out connection to Big Bend Rd.;
2. Two (2) right/in right-out connections to Simmons Rd. (i.e. stubouts to support future Phase 2 development); and,
3. One (1) connection to the existing Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road east of the project, at the southeast corner of the project.
ii. Phase 2 access shall consist of:
4. Two (2) right-in/right-out connections to Big Bend Rd.;
5. Two (2) right-in/right-out connections to Simmons Rd.; and,
6. One (1) connection to the relocated Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road east of the project, near the project's boundary with the northern portion of folio 77552.0000.
iii. An additional vehicular access along the northern project boundary with folio 77652.3124 shall be permitted within either Phase 1 or Phase 2 . Such access shall only be permitted in the event a public road is constructed within the area designated on the PD site plan along the western project boundary for potential right-of-way preservation.
iv. An optional vehicular and pedestrian access shall be permitted along the project's eastern boundary within folio 77550.0000 , as generally shown on the PD site plan. Such vehicular and pedestrian access may be permitted during either Phase 1 or Phase 2; however, such access shall not be permitted during Phase 1 until the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road has been constructed through the northern portion of folio 77552.0000, and the existing portions of the Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road east of the project have been removed. Additionally, such access:
7. May occur anywhere within the bounding box shown on the PD site plan, subject to Hillsborough County approval with respect to access spacing and design; and,
8. Shall be subject to the developer obtaining all Hillsborough County, review agency and/or other regulatory and permitting approvals necessary to permit a crossing of the County drainage facility within folio 77550.0000.
9. As described above, project entitlements are tied to specific access arrangements and required infrastructure improvements within and surrounding the project.
a. Phase 1 Improvements. Prior to the issuance of Certificates of Occupancy (temporary or otherwise) for any Phase 1 Entitlements, the developer of the subject PD shall do the following as a part of its Phase 1 Improvements, as generally shown on Sheet 2 of 3:
i. On Simmons Rd., between existing Old Big Bend Rd. and the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road, construct two (2) 11-foot wide travel lanes and curb, as well all improvements east of the of the northbound travel lane as shown within the "Simmons Rd. (Big Bend Rd. to Old Big Bend Rd. Realigned)" Typical Section depicted on Sheet 3 of 3 of the PD site plan. This may necessitate the developer design the roadway improvements depicted on the rightmost portion of Sheet 3 of 3 of the PD site plan, i.e. the "Simmons Rd. Ultimate Configuration", in order to ensure proper placement when considering the full intersection design and signal modifications.
ii. Between the intersection of Simmons Rd. and the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road and a point $+/-475$ feet north of the intersection, construct an extension of Simmons Rd. to the "Simmons Rd. (North of Old Big Bend Rd. Realigned)" Typical Section depicted on Sheet 3 of 3 of the PD site plan.
iii. Construct the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road between Simmons Rd. and the eastern project boundary in the vicinity of folio 77552.0000 as shown on the PD site plan. The majority of the roadway shall be constructed to the "Old Big Bend Rd. Realigned" Typical Section depicted on Sheet 3 of 3 of the PD site plan; however, to the minimum extent necessary to accommodate transitions to the constrained Typical Section planned for that portion of the relocated roadway within folio 77552.0000, the developer may utilize the "Old Big Bend Rd. Realigned" Alternate Typical Section depicted on Sheet 3 of 3 of the PD site plan.
iv. Construct "Driveway B" between the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road and the existing portions of the Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road east of the project to the "Driveway B" Typical Section depicted on Sheet 3 of 3 of the PD site plan. The developer shall record in the Official Records of Hillsborough County an easement for public access purposes over the "Driveway B" travel lanes and sidewalks. Such easement may be vacated by the County through the delegated authority process upon completion and acceptance of all Phase 2 (Group 1) and Phase 2 (Group 2) improvements.
v. Remove Old Big Bend Rd. between Simmons Rd. and the eastern project boundary and restore the sod.
vi. Construct "Driveway A" between Big Bend Rd. and the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road to the "Driveway A" Typical Section depicted on Sheet 3 of 3 of the PD site plan. The developer shall record in the Official Records of Hillsborough County an easement for public
access purposes over the "Driveway B" travel lanes and sidewalks. Such easement may be vacated by the County through the delegated authority process upon completion and acceptance of all Phase 2 (Group 1) and Phase 2 (Group 2) improvements.
vii. Construct a northbound to eastbound right turn lane on Simmons Rd. onto the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road.
viii. Construct a westbound to southbound left turn lane on the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. onto Simmons Rd.
ix. Construct one (1) right-in/right-out connection to Big Bend Rd. (i.e. the "Driveway A" connection).
b. Phase 2 Improvements. The developer shall construct certain improvements as a part of its Phase 2 Improvements obligation, hereafter referred to as "Phase 2 (Group 1) Improvements", as generally shown on Sheet 2 of 3 of the PD site plan. Additional improvements, defined hereinbelow as "Phase 2 (Group 2) Improvements," shall also be completed and accepted by the County for maintenance in order to support Phase 2 Entitlements. These improvements are generally shown on Sheets 2 of 3 and 3 of 3 of the PD site plan. Phase 2 (Group 2) Improvements may be constructed by the developer of this project, or another developer; however, prior to the issuance of Certificates of Occupancy (temporary or otherwise) for any Phase 2 Entitlements, all Phase 1, Phase 2 (Group 1) and Phase 2 (Group 2) Improvements must be completed and accepted by the County for maintenance.
i. With Regards to the Phase 2 (Group 1) Improvements, the developer of the subject PD shall:
10. Design and construct modifications to the existing traffic signal at Big Bend Rd. and Simmons Rd. as necessary to accommodate the opening of the northern leg of the intersection and accommodate all new turning movements, as well as any other geometric improvements at the intersection necessary to facilitate such changes (if any).
11. Convert the eastbound U-turn lane on Big Bend Rd. at its intersection with Simmons Rd. to an eastbound to northbound left turn lane and lengthen the turn lane as defined within the traffic analysis (to be updated at the time of plat/site/construction plan approval).
12. Construct a westbound to northbound right turn lane on Big Bend Rd. onto Simmons Rd.
13. Install/adjust pedestrian crosswalks and signal infrastructure along all four (4) legs of the Big Bend Rd. and Simmons Rd. intersection, as applicable.
14. Construct a second right-in/right-out connection to Big Bend Rd. (i.e. the "Driveway B" connection).
15. Construct a bus bay, transit accessory pad, and bus shelter with trash receptacles, seating and at least one (1) bicycle rack. The location and design
of of the bus bay shall be subject to HART (Hillsborough Area Regional Transit) and Hillsborough County approval and may require the developer to dedicate additional right-of-way.
ii. With Regards to the Phase 2 (Group 2) Improvements, the developer of the subject PD or another developer shall:
16. Construct the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road west of Simmons Rd. to a Typical Section standard to be determined.
17. Remove $+/-700$ feet of Old Big Bend Rd. west of Simmons Rd. and resod.
18. Between Big Bend Rd. and the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road, construct all roadway improvements as shown within the "Simmons Rd. Ultimate Configuration" detail on the rightmost portion of Sheet 3 of 3 of the PD site plan. Notwithstanding anything shown in the "Ultimate Configuration" detail to the contrary, the lengths of turn lanes shall be determined by a transportation analysis, which shall be updated at the time of plat/site/construction plan review.
19. Construct a northbound to westbound left turn lane on Simmons Rd. onto the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road.
20. Construct an eastbound to southbound right turn lane on the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road onto Simmons Rd.
21. Construct a southbound to westbound right turn lane on Simmons Rd. onto Big Bend Rd.
22. Construct dual southbound to eastbound left turn lane on Simmons Rd. onto Big Bend Rd.
23. Between the eastern project boundary and Lincoln Rd. (i.e. through folios 77550.0000 and 77552.0000 ), construct the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road to the "Old Big Bend Rd. Realigned" Alternate Typical Section depicted on Sheet 3 of 3 of the PD site plan.
24. Construct an eastbound to northbound left turn lane on the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road onto Lincoln Rd.
25. Construct a northbound to westbound left turn lane on Lincoln Rd. onto the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road.
26. Remove those portions of the existing Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road between "Driveway B" and Lincoln Rd. and resod.
c. Notwithstanding anything herein these conditions or on the PD site plan to the contrary, in the event the developer of the subject PD or others completes construction of the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road through folio 77552.0000 to Lincoln Rd. and removes the existing portions of the Old Big
bend Rd. frontage road east of the project, the developer shall be permitted to construct the second right-in/right-out access from Driveway B to Big Bend Rd. during Phase 1; however, no additional entitlements shall be granted until all of the Phase 1, Phase 2 (Group 1) and Phase 2 (Group 2) improvements have been constructed and accepted for maintenance, as applicable.
27. In accordance with the Hillsborough County Corridor Preservation Plan, the developer shall preserve a minimum of 64 feet of right-of-way along the project's western boundary as generally shown on PD site plan. Additionally:
a. Until such time as the County may acquire the property to construct transportation improvements envisioned by the Hillsborough County Corridor Preservation Plan, the developer may be permitted to construct access driveways, roadways, parking lots, buffering and screening and other temporary uses consistent with the "Multifamily Building \& Parking Field" designation on the PD site plan, subject to approval by Hillsborough County and compliance with all requirements of Hillsborough County Land Development Code (LDC) Section 5.11.09, governing the Interim Use of Reserved Land.
b. Notwithstanding the above or anything on the PD site plan to the contrary, such preservation shall no longer be required in the event the Hillsborough County Comprehensive Plan is updated to remove the specific corridor triggering the preservation requirement, and in such case the uses and standards applying to the "Proposed Multifamily Building \& Parking Field" area shall govern this portion of the project.
28. The developer of the subject PD shall dedicate and convey to Hillsborough County sufficient right-of-way within the PD boundary necessary to accommodate all Phase 1, Phase 2 (Group 1) and Phase 2 (Group 2) improvements. The developer of the subject PD or other developers shall, if necessary to complete a required improvement, be required to dedicate and convey or otherwise acquire additional right-of-way as necessary to effectuate required Phase 2 (Group 1) and Phase 2 (Group 2) improvements.
29. No parking spaces shall be permitted along "Driveway A" or "Driveway B".
30. All public roadways and certain internal driveways (identified as "Driveway A" and "Driveway B" on the PD site plan), shall be constructed to the Typical Section standards identified on Sheet 3 of 3 and as consistent with any applicable Design Exceptions or other conditions herein these zoning conditions. All other public or private roadways within the project, if any, shall be constructed to Hillsborough County Transportation Technical Manual (TTM) Typical Section standards.
31. If PD 22-0461 is approved, the County Engineer will approve a Design Exception (dated July 26, 2022) for the Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road, which was found approvable by the County Engineer (on September 12, 2022). The Design Exception provides for two (2) Typical Section standards for the portion of the facility within the project, in lieu of the Type TS-4 Typical Section standards required pursuant to the TTM. Conditions governing the use of each Typical Section are contained hereinabove.
32. If PD 22-0461 is approved, the County Engineer will approve a Design Exception (dated July 26, 2022) for Simmons Road which was found approvable by the County Engineer (on September 12, 2022). The Design Exception provides an alternate Typical Section standards within the project in lieu of the TS-4 Section standard required pursuant to the TTM. Conditions governing the use of each Typical Section are contained hereinabove.
33. If PD 22-0461 is approved, the County Engineer will approve a Section 6.04.02.B Administrative Variance (dated July 25,2022 ) which was found approvable by the County Engineer (on September 12, 2022) for a portion of the Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road substandard road improvements. Approval of this Administrative Variance will
waive certain substandard road improvements required by Section 6.04.03.L. for those portions of the existing Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road west and east of the project boundaries. This approval waives only those improvements required to support Phase 1 of the project. Required improvements to these facilities necessary to support Phase 2 are addressed as a part of the Phase 2 (Group 2) improvement conditions hereinabove.
34. If PD 22-0461 is approved, the County Engineer will approve a Section 6.04.02.B Administrative Variance (dated July 26,2022 ) which was found approvable by the County Engineer (on September 12, 2022) from the Section 6.04.03.I. LDC requirements governing Tract 3. Approval of this variance will permit two (2) vehicular access connections to Simmons Rd. from Tract 3, whereas only one (1) is permitted by the LDC. Conditions governing these and other project access connections are included hereinabove.
35. The developer shall be permitted to request additional Section 6.04.02.B. Administrative Variances from the Section 6.04.03.I. LDC requirements governing number of required access connections, as well as the Section 6.04.07 LDC requirements governing spacing of required access connections, at the time of plat/site/construction plan review for those "additional internal connections" referenced in Condition 23, hereinabove. Such reviews and approval may occur outside of the zoning modification process but shall be processed concurrently with the site/construction plan permit for the phase or subphase being developed.
36. All PD zoning conditions herein shall be considered Critical Design Features. As such, modification of any condition shall be subject to the rules and regulations outlined within Section 5.03.07.A. of the LDC.
37. 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 the provisions set forth in LDC Section 5.03.07.C.
38. If the notes and/or graphics on the site plan are in conflict with specific zoning conditions and/or the LDC regulations, the more restrictive regulation shall apply, unless specifically conditioned otherwise. Reference 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.


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

## Project Density/Intensity:

This application requests a flex of the UMU-20 FLU (Future Land Use) Category northward into the site. Without the flex request, the overall site contains 38.89 acres within the UMU-20 FLU Category, 40.82 acres within the SMU-6 FLU Category and 0.83 acres within the RES-6 FLU Category. Natural water bodies comprise 4.16 acres of the site, which is within the SMU-6 FLU Category and removed from density/intensity calculations (overall PD acreage decreased to 76.38 acres).

When accounting for the flex area and removal of the natural water body acreage, the overall site contains 54.32 acres within the UMU-20 FLU Category, 21.23 acres within the SMU-6 FLU Category and 0.83 within the RES-6 FLU Category.

The below table (Table 1.1) demonstrates the maximums permitted as the FLU categories are blended within the site, which includes the flex and does not include natural water bodies. The proposal does not exceed the maximum intensity/density permitted under the Comprehensive Plan and meets the minimum density requirement for residential development within a FLU Category at or above 4 units per acre in the Urban Service Area.

Table 1.1 Maximums Permitted:

| FLU Category | Acreage | FAR/Density | Non-Res | Res |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| RES-6 | 0.83 | $0.25 / 6$ u/a | 0 | 4 units |
| SMU-6 | 21.23 | $0.25 / 6$ u/a | 0 | 127 units |
| UMU-20 | 39.33 | $1.0 / 20$ u/a | 0 | 786 units |
| UMU-20 | 14.99 | $1.0 / 20$ u/a | $652,964 \mathrm{sf}$ | 0 |
| Total: | 76.38 |  | $652,964 \mathrm{sf}$ | 917 units |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Proposed: |  |  | $285,000 \mathrm{sf}$ | 900 units |

## Project Uses:

The non-residential portion of this project is primarily focused to serve area medical facilities. This includes medical equipment warehousing uses and medical equipment recovery/sterilization facility uses, as well limited retail uses.

The developer proposes to warehouse medical equipment (such as beds, ventilators, IV pumps, etc) which will remain warehoused on site until needed by a medical facility. Like other types of warehouses, the building is secured and owned and operated by one or more entities. This use is not proposed to be open to the public for retail sales, used for showrooms, or to include open storage.

The project also proposes a "sterilization facility," which is described as facility which receives medical instruments which are then cleaned and sterilized for use by medical facilities. This process does not use an incinerator, specifically a biohazardous waste incinerator, which is classified as a potentially heavy industrial use and not permitted in these FLU categories. Also, per the applicant, this use is not involved in the handling of biomedical waste. Both staff and the applicant view this use as akin to a municipal solid waste recovery facility, which is defined in the Land Development Code as a facility where solid waste is processed to remove one or more of the various components in solid waste for further processing and shipment to recyclable material markets. The Land Development Code refers to Florida State Statutes for the definition. Under Chapter 403, Florida Statutes, F.S. Section 403.703, solid waste is further refined to define solid waste, biological waste and biomedical waste. Surgical instruments are mentioned as a type of biomedical waste.

## PD Variation Request:

The applicant requests to remove any required buffer or screening internal to the site (between Tracts) and between residential and non-residential uses within the same Tract. The multi-family residential is classified as a Group 3 use and the non-residential uses would be classified as Group 5 uses, per the Land Development Code. This would require a 20 foot wide buffer with Type B screening. Per the applicant's responses, compliance with this requirement will limit the overall design of the site, restrict connectivity and integration and is not conducive of a mixed use project. Potential impacts between the uses will be able to be mitigated through building setbacks and separations (due to parking areas, stormwater ponds, drive aisles, and so for) within the project. No required buffering and screening along the perimeter of the project is proposed to be waived. Staff does not object to the PD variation request.

### 8.0 PROPOSED SITE PLAN (FULL)
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### 9.0 FULL TRANSPORTATION REPORT (see following pages)

REVIEWER: James Ratliff, AICP, Principal Planner AGENCY/DEPT: Transportation
PLANNING AREA/SECTOR: RV/ South

This agency has no comments.

This agency has no objection.

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

This agency objects for the reasons set forth below.

## CONDITIONS OF ZONING APPROVAL

## New Conditions

1. Project entitlements shall be split into two phases, for the purposes of enforcement of these zoning conditions. Additional subphases shall be allowed; however, the required transportation improvements must be completed with the initial phase/subphase, and all access restrictions and other requirements shall apply to the entire phase/subphase (i.e. no deferral of requirements will be permitted to a later subphase unless expressly allowed pursuant to these conditions). Additionally, phasing must occur in sequential order (i.e. Phase 2 entitlements cannot be constructed before Phase 1 entitlements), although nothing in this condition shall prohibit the simultaneous construction of Phase 1 and Phase 2 entitlements if all required improvements are in place prior to issuance of any Certificates of Occupancy (temporary or otherwise) for the initial increment of development. Entitlements shall be as follows:
a. Phase 1 Entitlements:
i. 300 multi-family dwelling units; and,
ii. 80,000 s.f. Medical Equipment Recovery/Sterilization Facility, which shall be defined as ___(Zoning staff to insert here) $\qquad$
b. Phase 2 Entitlements:
i. 600 multi-family dwelling units;
ii. $\quad 150,000$ s.f. Medical Equipment Warehouse/Distribution Facility, which shall be defined as __(Zoning staff to insert here) $\qquad$ ;
iii. 25,000 s.f. Free Standing Emergency Facility; and,
iv. 30,000 s.f. of certain Limited Retail uses, as further restricted/defined below.
c. Limited Retail Use and Form Restrictions. For the purposes of creating a retail strip plaza, and in accordance with the transportation analysis, the following use and form restrictions shall apply to the retail development.
i. The Limited Retail uses shall be limited to:

| Apparel and Shoe Store | General Business, Such as Retail Goods <br> and Stores |
| :--- | :--- |
| Appliance Stores | Gun Sales |
| Art Supply Store | Hardware Store |
| Automated Teller (ATM) | Jewelry Store |
| Automotive Supply Store | News Stand |
| Bicycle Sales | Novelty and Souvenir Shop |


| Book/Stationary Store, New and Used | Optician/ Optical Supplies |
| :--- | :--- |
| Brew Pub | Pet Shop |
| Camera/Photography Store | Specialty Food Store (7,000 g.s.f. Max.) |
| Eating Establishments (2,000 g.s.f. Max., <br> Coffee/Donut Shops Not Permitted) | Sporting Goods Store |
| Florist Shop | Tobacco Shop |
|  <br> Nuts, Dairy, Delicatessens, Meat Seafood <br> and Produce | Vehicle Part Sales |
| Furniture/Home Furnishings |  |

ii. No freestanding retail uses/ outparcels shall be permitted. Each retail building shall contain multiple tenancies, with no less than three tenants occupying each building.
iii. Drive-through uses shall be prohibited.
2. As generally shown on the PD site plan, the project shall be served by a variety of vehicular and pedestrian access connections. Additional internal connections, whether or not shown on the PD site plan as Conceptual Access connections and whether or not they are to Simmons Rd., the realigned Old Big Bend Rd., or another internal facility, may be approved at the discretion of the Administrator if consistent with these zoning conditions and requested at the time of plat/site/construction plan review and consistent with the access management standards and procedures contained within Section 6.04 of the Hillsborough County Land Development Code (LDC). Additionally:
a. Notwithstanding anything on the PD site plan or herein these conditions to the contrary, bicycle and pedestrian access may be permitted anywhere along the PD boundaries.
b. Project access connections shall be subject to strict phasing requirements as shown on Sheet 2 of 3 or contained herein these conditions. Specifically, access shall be as follows:
i. Phase 1 access shall consist of:

1. One (1) right-in/right-out connection to Big Bend Rd.;
2. Two (2) right/in right-out connections to Simmons Rd. (i.e. stubouts to support future Phase 2 development); and,
3. One (1) connection to the existing Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road east of the project, at the southeast corner of the project.
ii. Phase 2 access shall consist of:
4. Two (2) right-in/right-out connections to Big Bend Rd.;
5. Two (2) right-in/right-out connections to Simmons Rd.; and,
6. One (1) connection to the relocated Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road east of the project, near the project's boundary with the northern portion of folio 77552.0000 .
iii. An additional vehicular access along the northern project boundary with folio 77652.3124 shall be permitted within either Phase 1 or Phase 2. Such access shall only be permitted in the event a public road is constructed within the area designated on the PD site plan along the western project boundary for potential right-of-way preservation.
iv. An optional vehicular and pedestrian access shall be permitted along the project's eastern boundary within folio 77550.0000 , as generally shown on the PD site plan. Such vehicular and pedestrian access may be permitted during either Phase 1 or Phase 2; however, such access shall not be permitted during Phase 1 until the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road has been constructed through the northern portion of folio 77552.0000 , and the existing portions of the Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road east of the project have been removed. Additionally, such access:
7. May occur anywhere within the bounding box shown on the PD site plan, subject to Hillsborough County approval with respect to access spacing and design; and,
8. Shall be subject to the developer obtaining all Hillsborough County, review agency and/or other regulatory and permitting approvals necessary to permit a crossing of the County drainage facility within folio 77550.0000 .
9. As described above, project entitlements are tied to specific access arrangements and required infrastructure improvements within and surrounding the project.
a. Phase 1 Improvements. Prior to the issuance of Certificates of Occupancy (temporary or otherwise) for any Phase 1 Entitlements, the developer of the subject PD shall do the following as a part of its Phase 1 Improvements, as generally shown on Sheet 2 of 3:
i. On Simmons Rd., between existing Old Big Bend Rd. and the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road, construct two (2) 11-foot wide travel lanes and curb, as well all improvements east of the of the northbound travel lane as shown within the "Simmons Rd. (Big Bend Rd. to Old Big Bend Rd. Realigned)" Typical Section depicted on Sheet 3 of 3 of the PD site plan. This may necessitate the developer design the roadway improvements depicted on the rightmost portion of Sheet 3 of 3 of the PD site plan, i.e. the "Simmons Rd. Ultimate Configuration", in order to ensure proper placement when considering the full intersection design and signal modifications.
ii. Between the intersection of Simmons Rd. and the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road and a point $+/-475$ feet north of the intersection, construct an extension of Simmons Rd. to the "Simmons Rd. (North of Old Big Bend Rd. Realigned)" Typical Section depicted on Sheet 3 of 3 of the PD site plan.
iii. Construct the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road between Simmons Rd. and the eastern project boundary in the vicinity of folio 77552.0000 as shown on the PD site plan. The majority of the roadway shall be constructed to the "Old Big Bend Rd. Realigned" Typical Section depicted on Sheet 3 of 3 of the PD site plan; however, to the minimum extent necessary to accommodate transitions to the constrained Typical Section planned for that portion of the relocated roadway within folio 77552.0000, the developer may utilize the "Old Big Bend Rd. Realigned" Alternate Typical Section depicted on Sheet 3 of 3 of the PD site plan.
iv. Construct "Driveway B" between the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road and the existing portions of the Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road east of the project to the "Driveway B" Typical Section depicted on Sheet 3 of 3 of the PD site plan. The developer shall record in the Official Records of Hillsborough County an easement for public access purposes over the "Driveway B" travel lanes and sidewalks. Such easement may be vacated by the County through the delegated authority process upon completion and acceptance of all Phase 2 (Group 1) and Phase 2 (Group 2) improvements.
v. Remove Old Big Bend Rd. between Simmons Rd. and the eastern project boundary and restore the sod.
vi. Construct "Driveway A" between Big Bend Rd. and the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road to the "Driveway A" Typical Section depicted on Sheet 3 of 3 of the PD site plan. The developer shall record in the Official Records of Hillsborough County an easement for public access purposes over the "Driveway B" travel lanes and sidewalks. Such easement may be vacated by the County through the delegated authority process upon completion and acceptance of all Phase 2 (Group 1) and Phase 2 (Group 2) improvements.
vii. Construct a northbound to eastbound right turn lane on Simmons Rd. onto the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road.
viii. Construct a westbound to southbound left turn lane on the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. onto Simmons Rd.
ix. Construct one (1) right-in/right-out connection to Big Bend Rd. (i.e. the "Driveway A" connection).
b. Phase 2 Improvements. The developer shall construct certain improvements as a part of its Phase 2 Improvements obligation, hereafter referred to as "Phase 2 (Group 1) Improvements", as generally shown on Sheet 2 of 3 of the PD site plan. Additional improvements, defined hereinbelow as "Phase 2 (Group 2) Improvements," shall also be completed and accepted by the County for maintenance in order to support Phase 2 Entitlements. These improvements are generally shown on Sheets 2 of 3 and 3 of 3 of the PD site plan. Phase 2 (Group 2) Improvements may be constructed by the developer of this project, or another developer; however, prior to the issuance of Certificates of Occupancy (temporary or otherwise) for any Phase 2 Entitlements, all Phase 1, Phase 2 (Group 1) and Phase 2 (Group 2) Improvements must be completed and accepted by the County for maintenance.
i. With Regards to the Phase 2 (Group 1) Improvements, the developer of the subject PD shall:
10. Design and construct modifications to the existing traffic signal at Big Bend Rd. and Simmons Rd. as necessary to accommodate the opening of the northern leg of the intersection and accommodate all new turning movements, as well as any other geometric improvements at the intersection necessary to facilitate such changes (if any).
11. Convert the eastbound U-turn lane on Big Bend Rd. at its intersection with Simmons Rd. to an eastbound to northbound left turn lane and lengthen the turn lane as defined within the traffic analysis (to be updated at the time of plat/site/construction plan approval).
12. Construct a westbound to northbound right turn lane on Big Bend Rd. onto Simmons Rd.
13. Install/adjust pedestrian crosswalks and signal infrastructure along all four (4) legs of the Big Bend Rd. and Simmons Rd. intersection, as applicable.
14. Construct a second right-in/right-out connection to Big Bend Rd. (i.e. the "Driveway B" connection).
15. Construct a bus bay, transit accessory pad, and bus shelter with trash receptacles, seating and at least one (1) bicycle rack. The location and design of of the bus bay shall be subject to HART (Hillsborough Area Regional Transit) and Hillsborough County approval and may require the developer to dedicate additional right-of-way.
ii. With Regards to the Phase 2 (Group 2) Improvements, the developer of the subject PD or another developer shall:
16. Construct the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road west of Simmons Rd. to a Typical Section standard to be determined.
17. Remove $+/-700$ feet of Old Big Bend Rd. west of Simmons Rd. and resod.
18. Between Big Bend Rd. and the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road, construct all roadway improvements as shown within the "Simmons Rd. Ultimate Configuration" detail on the rightmost portion of Sheet 3 of 3 of the

PD site plan. Notwithstanding anything shown in the "Ultimate Configuration" detail to the contrary, the lengths of turn lanes shall be determined by a transportation analysis, which shall be updated at the time of plat/site/construction plan review.
4. Construct a northbound to westbound left turn lane on Simmons Rd. onto the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road.
5. Construct an eastbound to southbound right turn lane on the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road onto Simmons Rd.
6. Construct a southbound to westbound right turn lane on Simmons Rd. onto Big Bend Rd.
7. Construct dual southbound to eastbound left turn lane on Simmons Rd. onto Big Bend Rd.
8. Between the eastern project boundary and Lincoln Rd. (i.e. through folios 77550.0000 and 77552.0000), construct the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road to the "Old Big Bend Rd. Realigned" Alternate Typical Section depicted on Sheet 3 of 3 of the PD site plan.
9. Construct an eastbound to northbound left turn lane on the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road onto Lincoln Rd.
10. Construct a northbound to westbound left turn lane on Lincoln Rd. onto the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road.
11. Remove those portions of the existing Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road between "Driveway B" and Lincoln Rd. and resod.
c. Notwithstanding anything herein these conditions or on the PD site plan to the contrary, in the event the developer of the subject PD or others completes construction of the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road through folio 77552.0000 to Lincoln Rd. and removes the existing portions of the Old Big bend Rd. frontage road east of the project, the developer shall be permitted to construct the second right-in/right-out access from Driveway B to Big Bend Rd. during Phase 1; however, no additional entitlements shall be granted until all of the Phase 1, Phase 2 (Group 1) and Phase 2 (Group 2) improvements have been constructed and accepted for maintenance, as applicable.
4. In accordance with the Hillsborough County Corridor Preservation Plan, the developer shall preserve a minimum of 64 feet of right-of-way along the project's western boundary as generally shown on PD site plan. Additionally:
a. Until such time as the County may acquire the property to construct transportation improvements envisioned by the Hillsborough County Corridor Preservation Plan, the developer may be permitted to construct access driveways, roadways, parking lots, buffering and screening and other temporary uses consistent with the "Multifamily Building \& Parking Field" designation on the PD site plan, subject to approval by Hillsborough County and compliance with all requirements of Hillsborough County Land Development Code (LDC) Section 5.11.09, governing the Interim Use of Reserved Land.
b. Notwithstanding the above or anything on the PD site plan to the contrary, such preservation shall no longer be required in the event the Hillsborough County Comprehensive Plan is updated to remove the specific corridor triggering the preservation requirement, and in such case the uses and standards applying to the "Proposed Multifamily Building \& Parking Field" area shall govern this portion of the project.
5. The developer of the subject PD shall dedicate and convey to Hillsborough County sufficient right-of-way within the PD boundary necessary to accommodate all Phase 1, Phase 2 (Group 1) and Phase 2 (Group 2) improvements. The developer of the subject PD or other developers shall, if necessary to complete a required improvement, be required to dedicate and convey or otherwise acquire additional right-of-way as necessary to effectuate required Phase 2 (Group 1) and Phase 2 (Group 2) improvements.
6. No parking spaces shall be permitted along "Driveway A" or "Driveway B".
7. All public roadways and certain internal driveways (identified as "Driveway A" and "Driveway B" on the PD site plan), shall be constructed to the Typical Section standards identified on Sheet 3 of 3 and as consistent with any applicable Design Exceptions or other conditions herein these zoning conditions. All other public or private roadways within the project, if any, shall be constructed to Hillsborough County Transportation Technical Manual (TTM) Typical Section standards.
8. If PD 22-0461 is approved, the County Engineer will approve a Design Exception (dated July 26, 2022) for the Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road, which was found approvable by the County Engineer (on September 12, 2022). The Design Exception provides for two (2) Typical Section standards for the portion of the facility within the project, in lieu of the Type TS-4 Typical Section standards required pursuant to the TTM. Conditions governing the use of each Typical Section are contained hereinabove.
9. If PD 22-0461 is approved, the County Engineer will approve a Design Exception (dated July 26, 2022) for Simmons Road which was found approvable by the County Engineer (on September 12, 2022). The Design Exception provides an alternate Typical Section standards within the project in lieu of the TS-4 Section standard required pursuant to the TTM. Conditions governing the use of each Typical Section are contained hereinabove.
10. If PD 22-0461 is approved, the County Engineer will approve a Section 6.04.02.B Administrative Variance (dated July 25, 2022) which was found approvable by the County Engineer (on September 12, 2022) for a portion of the Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road substandard road improvements. Approval of this Administrative Variance will waive certain substandard road improvements required by Section 6.04.03.L. for those portions of the existing Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road west and east of the project boundaries. This approval waives only those improvements required to support Phase 1 of the project. Required improvements to these facilities necessary to support Phase 2 are addressed as a part of the Phase 2 (Group $2)$ improvement conditions hereinabove.
11. If PD 22-0461 is approved, the County Engineer will approve a Section 6.04.02.B Administrative Variance (dated July 26, 2022) which was found approvable by the County Engineer (on September 12, 2022) from the Section 6.04.03.I. LDC requirements governing Tract 3. Approval of this variance will permit two (2) vehicular access connections to Simmons Rd. from Tract 3, whereas only one (1) is permitted by the LDC. Conditions governing these and other project access connections are included hereinabove.
12. The developer shall be permitted to request additional Section 6.04.02.B. Administrative Variances from the Section 6.04.03.I. LDC requirements governing number of required access connections, as well as the Section 6.04.07 LDC requirements governing spacing of required access connections, at the time of plat/site/construction plan review for those "additional internal connections" referenced in Condition 2, hereinabove. Such reviews and approval may occur outside of the zoning modification process but shall be processed concurrently with the site/construction plan permit for the phase or subphase being developed.
13. All PD zoning conditions herein shall be considered Critical Design Features. As such, modification of any condition shall be subject to the rules and regulations outlined within Section 5.03.07.A. of the LDC.

## Other Conditions

- Prior to PD Site Plan Certification, the developer shall revise the PD site plan to:
- On all sheets, remove the word "Extension" from Simmons Rd.
- Modify the "Driveway B" Typical Section on Sheet 3 of 3 to add minimum 5-foot wide sidewalks on both sides of the roadway, separated from the back of curb by 5 -foot wide green strips. Add a footnote applying to the sidewalk on the east side of the roadway. Footnote shall state "The
sidewalk along east side of road is optional; however, such sidewalk shall be constructed together with any vehicular access constructed within the "Potential Access Area" as shown on Sheet 1 of PD site plan (i.e. the optional access to/across folio 77550.0000)."
- On Sheet 2 of 3, replace the three (3) references stating "By the 22-0461 Developer" to instead state "By the Developer of the Subject PD".
- For all Typical Sections on Sheet 3 of 3, ensure all individual components are labeled. For example, label the 5 -foot wide and 1 -foot wide areas as "Grass Strip". On the "Driveway A" and "Driveway B" Typical Sections, ensure that it is labeled as "Type F curb and gutter".
- On Sheet 3 of 3, please ensure label stating "Simmons Rd. Ultimate Configuration (Includes Phase 2 Group 2 Improvements)" is prominently shown. It should appear either at the top or bottom of the graphic. Consider placing it above the note near the top left corner of the graphic, with a bold font that is at least as large as the other text in the graphic.
- On Sheet 2 of 3, add to the "Phase 2 Improvements (Group 2)" list a new item stating "Developer or others to construct eastbound to northbound left turn lane on realigned Old Big Bend Rd. onto Lincoln Rd."
- On Sheet 2 of 3 , modify note 4 and 5 within the "Phase 1 Improvements" list. These incorrectly state these will be constructed to the Type TS-3 non-residential standard. Replace instances stating "Roadway" with "Driveway" within the first two sentences. Replace the last sentence with a sentence stating "Developer to construct to the Typical Section standard shown on Sheet 3 of 3."
- On Sheet 2 of 3, add to the "Phase 2 Improvements (Group 1)" list a new item stating, "Developer to construct a transit bus bay, shelter and amenities - see zoning conditions."
- On Sheet 1 of 3, modify the graphic depiction of the potential access area bounding box such that its southernmost extent runs to the limits of the southern PD boundary.


## PROJECT SUMMARY AND TRANSPORTATION ANALYSIS

The applicant is requesting to three multiple parcels, totaling +/- 80.54 acres, from Agricultural Rural (AR), and Planned Development (PD) \#04-1820 to PD. The existing PD current has approval for a 360,000 s.f. hospital with a maximum of 250 beds, 240,000 s.f. of attached (to the hospital) medical office space, and 60,000 s.f. of detached medical office uses. The applicant is proposing entitlements for the new PD consisting of the following uses at buildout:

- 900 multi-family dwelling units;
- 150,000 s.f. of Medical Equipment Warehouse/Distribution Facility uses;
- 80,000 s.f. Medical Equipment Recovery/Sterilization Facility uses;
- 25,000 s.f. Free Standing Emergency Facility uses; and,
- 30,000 s.f. of certain Limited Retail uses, as further described below.

The applicant did not provide a list of the retail uses being requested, and utilized a very specific Land Use Code (LUC) from the Institute of Transportation Engineer's Trip Generation Manual data within its traffic study which analyzed project impacts. Given that the applicant utilized LUC 822, which is for a "Strip Retail Plaza Less Than 40,000 s.f.", transportation staff undertook a two-step process to ensure the uses being sought matched those studied in their analysis. First, transportation and zoning section staff undertook an analysis to pare down the list of Commercial Neighborhood uses within the LDC to identify only those deemed to be retail (consistent with the applicant's request). Transportation staff then examined the trip generation rates for each of these specific uses and compared it to the rates for LUC 822 to determine whether or not those could reasonably occur within a strip center.

As a hypothetical example, while it is natural to assume based on the colloquial use of the term "strip retail plaza" a supermarket may occur within such plaza, if a smaller Publix store of 35,000 s.f. were to be located within such plaza, that would leave only 5,000 s.f. for other uses within ITE's " 40,000 s.f. strip plaza". Supermarkets generate 8.95 trips per 1,000 s.f. in the p.m. peak hour, office generates 1.15 trips per 1,000 s.f. in the p.m. peak hour, and "strip retail plazas" generate 6.59 trips per 1,000 s.f. in the p.m. peak hour. These two uses individually analyzed would generate 319 p.m. peak hour trips, while utilizing LUC 822 would indicate only 264 p.m. peak hour trips should be generated. It is therefore mathematically improbable, if not impossible, for a traditional supermarket of smaller to average size to exist in this configuration with other low intensity uses (office in the above example) and generate equal to or less than the trip rates for ITE LUC 822. This conflict exists across many use examples and within all three periods analyzed (i.e. average daily trip rates, a.m. peak hour rates and p.m. peak hour rates). Other uses are far more problematic. For example, fast-food restaurants without drive-through facilities generate 25.1 a.m. peak hour trips per 1,000 s.f. and 48.7 p.m. peak hour trips per 1,000 s.f. When incorporating such uses into a strip shopping center it becomes easy to see the mathematical challenges involved.

In order to address the above issue, transportation staff disallowed certain uses which would likely cause the project to generate more traffic than was otherwise studied. Staff also imposed certain size restrictions on certain uses, as well as form restrictions. For example, there is no enforceable way to restrict certain high trip intensive restaurant chains by name. Anecdotally, many small "mom and pop" restaurants generate far fewer trips than chain establishments. While not always the case, these smaller, less intense establishments often occupy smaller areas than other restaurant types. Instead of disallowing all restaurants, staff instituted a cap of 2,000 s.f. of restaurant uses to attempt to provide some level of restaurant use within a strip retail plaza while staying within the average rates provided by ITE. Staff notes that coffee/donut shops tend have much smaller average sizes compared to other eating establishments (as well as much higher trip rates, particularly in the a.m. peak hour), and so those uses were disallowed.

Staff does not object to the inclusion of such uses for this project; however, given the importance and sensitivity of trip impacts to the infrastructure network in this area as further discussed below in various sections, it is critical that the uses be carefully analyzed to ensure a worst-case scenario was examined. Based on the above analysis, staff determined specific uses and thresholds which were incorporated into the proposed zoning conditions, provided hereinabove.

Since the project will generate more than 50 peak hour trips at buildout, a detailed transportation analysis is required per the Development Review Procedures Manual (DRPM). Due to the unique configuration of area infrastructure and their sensitivity to transportation impacts, as required by staff the applicant submitted a transportation analysis that was more comprehensive and detailed than is typically received for projects in the rezoning stage of the development process. Multiple meetings were held with the applicant's consultant to develop an appropriate methodology for the analysis. Given safety issues that could be created by failing to relocate (as discussed in more detail below) the Old Big Bend Rd. and Simmons Rd. intersection far enough to the north, as well as the County's desire to ensure that operations of both the relocated intersection and the newly opened northern leg of the existing Big Bend Rd. and Simmons Loop intersection (also described further below) does not unduly impact the functioning of Big Bend Rd., the transportation analysis examined impacts of and capacity available for traffic to/from this and other projects.

The applicant is proposing a two (2) phase project, with 300 dwelling units and 80,000 s.f. Medical Equipment Recovery/Sterilization Facility to occur within the first phase, and all remaining entitlements to occur within the second phase. A detailed description of project phasing has been included below.

## Status of Adjacent PD to the West (PD 18-0996)

Staff notes that there is a pending PD to the west of this project which will directly impact the Simmons and Big Bend Rd. intersection, and from which land is needed to construct all improvements necessary to support Phase 2 of this project. That project, PD 18-0996, was the subject of a potential Mobility Fee

Alternative Satisfaction Agreement (MFASA) but was delayed due to previously pending litigation. That project is seeking approval for up to 160,000 s.f. of Commercial General (CG) uses; however, the amount of uses that could ultimately be developed for that project was limited based upon a proposed condition, developed based upon the traffic analysis performed at the time. That condition would limit their traffic to a cumulative total of 818 a.m. peak hour trips and 762 p.m. peak hour trips. As mentioned previously, the adjacent project is currently in a holding pattern (i.e. it has been heard by the Zoning Hearing Master but is not being permitted to move forward to the Board of County Commissioners) due to the fact that negotiations surrounding several key agreements which included various land exchanges, right-of-way vacations, and other details were never finalized. Perhaps more importantly, in the $4+$ years since this project was last reviewed, design of the Big Bend Rd. I-75 interchange project has advanced and there have been substantial changes which no longer make it possible for the County to support the right-in/right-out access from that project to Big Bend Rd. Given the age of that project and uncertain nature of its moving forward, the applicant of the subject PD did not include these assumptions as background traffic in the proposed analysis. Given the above, if that adjacent project ever chooses to resume the planning process, it will be necessary for the project to make substantial modifications to its proposal and provide revised data and analysis.

That adjacent project was also reliant upon a land exchange agreement with the Parks Department in order to facilitate the proposed configuration of the Old Big Bend Rd. realignment west of Simmons Rd. shown on that PD. The Parks Department has indicated that there have been changes to Comprehensive Plan policies which will necessitate a reevaluation of the previous proposals to determine if they are still supportable, and/or if the roadway alignment needs to shift. Given this, staff did not assume that the previous alignment of Old Big Bend Rd. west of Simmons as a fixed point, and notes that future planning efforts within that adjacent PD will need to realign to match the proposed alignment within the subject PD.

## Trip Generation Comparison

Staff has prepared a comparison (generally consistent with the applicant's analysis) of the potential number of peak hour trips generated under the existing and proposed zoning designations, utilizing a generalized worst-case scenario. Data shown below is based on the $11^{\text {th }}$ Edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineer's Trip Generation Manual.

Existing Zoning:

| Land Use/Size | 24 Hour Two- <br> Way Volume | Total Peak <br> Hour Trips |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | PM |  |  |  |  |  |
| PD, 250 Bed Hospital <br> (ITE Code 610) | 3,877 | 295 | 310 |  |  |  |  |
| PD, 300,000 s.f. Medical Office Uses <br> (ITE Code 720) | 9,558 | 804 | 852 |  |  |  |  |
| AR, 8 Single-Family Detached Dwelling Units <br> (ITE Code 210) | 76 | 6 | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Total: |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{1 3 , 5 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 1 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 1 7 0}$ |

Proposed Zoning:

| Land Use/Size | 24 Hour Two- <br> Way Volume | Total Peak <br> Hour Trips |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | PM |  |
| PD, 900 Multi-Family Dwelling Units <br> (ITE Code 221) | 4,086 | 333 | 351 |
| PD, 150,000 s.f. Medical Equipment Warehouse <br> Uses (ITE Code 150) | 275 | 42 | 44 |
| PD, 80,000 s.f. Medical Equipment Recovery/ <br> Sterilization Facility (ITE Code 140) | 504 | 58 | 52 |
| PD, 25,000 s.f. Free Standing Emergency Room <br> (ITE Code 650) | 624 | 28 | 38 |


| PD, 30,000 s.f. Strip Retail Plaza <40k s.f. <br> (ITE Code 822) | 1,634 | 71 | 170 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total: | $\mathbf{7 , 1 2 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 3 2}$ |

Difference:

| Land Use/Size | 24 Hour TwoWay Volume | Total Peak Hour Trips |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | AM | PM |
| Total: | (-) 6,388 | (-) 573 | (-) 515 |

## TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE SERVING THE SITE

Big Bend Rd. is a publicly maintained 4-lane, divided, arterial roadway characterized by $+/-12$-foot wide travel lanes in average condition. There are bicycle facilities (on paved shoulders) present on Big Bend Rd. in the vicinity of the proposed project. There are $+/-5$-foot wide sidewalks along the south side of Big Bend Rd. in the vicinity of the proposed project.

Old Big Bend Rd. is a publicly maintained 2-lane, undivided, substandard, local roadway characterized by +/- 11-foot wide travel lanes in below average condition. There are no sidewalks or bicycle facilities on Old Big Bend Rd. in the vicinity of the proposed project. Although the frontage road is presently classified as a local roadway, staff considers it to be a collector roadway due to the way it currently functions and, more importantly, the fact that existing + future volumes exceed the local roadway capacity.

Big Bend Rd. and Old Big Bend Rd. (which acts as a frontage roadway to Big Bend Rd.) lies within a shared $+/-260$-foot wide right-of-way along the project's frontage. Along the project's frontage, Big Bend Rd. is shown on Hillsborough County Corridor Preservation Plan as a future 6-lane roadway. Although there is no typical section for 6-lane roadways, the minimum right-of-way necessary is calculated by taking the typical section for a 4-lane divided roadway (TS-6 within the Hillsborough County Transportation Technical Manual), which requires a minimum of 110 feet of right-of-way, and to which an additional 24 feet is added for the additional two lanes (for a total of 134 feet of right-of-way required).

Based upon the transportation analysis submitted by the applicant as well as the existing and proposed corridor configuration, staff believes that a worst-case planning-level scenario for right-of-way needs (along the project frontage) related to the 6-laning of Big Bend Rd. and any needed turn lanes includes:

- 134 feet for 6-lane facility (per above);
- 12 feet for any existing or required westbound to northbound right turn lane; and,
- 12 feet for any existing eastbound to southbound right turn lane.

It appears that sufficient right-of-way exists to accommodate the 158 feet of right-of-way needed to accommodate future widening, as further described above. Additionally, the applicant is proposing to relocate a portion of the frontage road (Old Big Bend Rd.) north of its present location. Lastly, staff notes that the Big Bend Rd. widening project (CIP Project Number 69647000) has not identified the need for any additional right-of-way from the subject property.

Simmons Rd. is a publicly maintained 2-lane, undivided, substandard, local roadway characterized by +/10 to 12 feet of pavement in average condition. The roadway lies within a variable width right-of-way (between approximately 25 and 45 feet in width). There are no sidewalks or bicycle facilities along Simons Rd. While the portion of the roadway north of Big Bend Rd. is known as Simmons Rd., the roadway is named Simmons Loop south of Big Bend Rd. (where it exists as a 2-lane collector roadway that connects to US 301). Simmons Rd./Simmons Loop is shown on the Hillsborough County Corridor Preservation Plan as a future 2-lane roadway that extends north to Gibsonton Dr. and south to Paseo Al

Mar Blvd. As such, the developer will be required to preserve a minimum of 64 feet of right-of-way (from its southern property boundary to its northern property boundary) to accommodate a 2-lane, urban, collector roadway. Staff notes that the improvements required/shown on the PD site plan will result in a greater preservation than this minimum requirement. In the event the Corridor Preservation Plan is updated to remove the facility, at the applicant's request staff has conditioned the project to allow for this requirement to be removed from the PD without requiring a zoning modification.

Lincoln Rd. is a publicly maintained 2-lane, undivided, substandard (for non-residential purposes), local roadway characterized by $+/-10$-foot wide travel lanes in average to below average condition. Lincoln Rd., similar to Cowley Rd. at its northern terminus, is functioning as a collector roadway. The roadway lies within a $+/-95$-foot wide right-of-way. There are no bicycle facilities or sidewalks present on Lincoln Rd. in the vicinity of the proposed project. Although the road is presently classified as a local roadway, staff considers it to be a collector roadway due to the fact that existing + future volumes exceed the local roadway capacity.

## SITE ACCESS

The site is presently accessed via Old Big Bend Rd. and Lincoln Rd. The only access to/from Big Bend Rd. is via Old Big Bend Rd. to Lincoln Rd. (to the east) or via Old Big Bend Rd. to the access road separating East Bay High School and Eisenhower Middle School (approximately 1 mile west of the subject site). Traffic traveling to/from the north would currently utilize Bullfrog Creek Rd.
(approximately 2,500 feet west of the subject site). The County previously closed the northern leg of the Simmons Loop and Big Bend Rd. intersection due to safety issues created by its proximity to the Simmons Rd. and Old Big Bend Rd. intersection.

The applicant is proposing two (2) right-in/right-out access connections to Big Bend Rd. at project buildout. The applicant is also proposing to reopen the northern leg of the intersection, which will require relocation of Old Big Bend Rd. such that the new Old Big Bend Rd. and Simmons Loop intersection is located $+/-800$ feet from the existing Simmons Loop and Big Bend Rd. intersection. Realignment of the portion of this roadway west of Simmons Rd. to a safe location that can accommodate future anticipated traffic (both sub-regional and local) will require impact to the adjacent properties (to the west), currently in the zoning process via pending PD 18-0996, and the preferred alignment for which would necessitate use of certain parcels owned by Hillsborough County and partially in use as the Vance Vogel Sports Complex (those portions west of Bullfrog Creek).

Although this roadway relocation is being proposed by the Developer in order to enhance access to their proposed project, this project is necessary in order to facilitate construction of a portion of a new north/south 2-lane roadway (which is planned between Gibsonton Dr. and Paseo al Mar Blvd.). This new roadway is identified on Hillsborough County Corridor Preservation Plan (found within the adopted Hillsborough County Comprehensive Plan, and adopted as Map 25).

Issues related to various elements of the site access plan are discussed below. It should be noted that that specific proposed roadway configuration/geometries have not gone through engineering level design/ review. As such, small deviations may be necessary at the time of plat/site/construction plan approval.

## Right-in/Right-Out Access Spacing on Big Bend Rd.

Along this section of Big Bend Rd., Section 6.04.07 of the LDC provides that the minimum spacing for a right-in/right-out connection along this segment is 245 feet. Additionally, while these connections will be located within $1 / 4$-mile of the nearest Interstate 75 on/off ramp (which triggers special spacing standards within the LDC), they are located east of the first access connection (i.e. the Simmons Rd. intersection). In consultation with the County Engineer, staff has determined that a minimum spacing standard of 400 feet is appropriate for access connections along this portion of the corridor. The proposed project has been designed such that all access connections meet or exceed this standard.

## Other Access Locations/Spacing

Given the large project acreage, complex design issues, lack of identified end users, and the bubble plan nature of the proposed zoning, staff was unable to determine at this stage in the development process. how many access connections might be needed, where they might be located, and/or whether they could be supported; however, in addition to the Big Bend Rd. project access, certain other project access connections were deemed to be critical to the safe and efficient functioning of the project (i.e. those connections on Simmons Rd. between Big Bend Rd. and the relocated Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road). Additionally, the external connection along the eastern project boundary in the vicinity of folio 77552.0000 is a critical access connection whose location has been predetermined. These connections are shown as black arrows on the PD site plan. Other conceptual connections have been shown with different symbology. Staff has included a condition allowing the applicant to propose certain other additional access connections where or not conceptually shown (and request Section 6.04.02.B. Administrative Variances) from the Section 6.04.03.I. and 6.04.07 LDC standards, if necessary, at the time of plat/site/construction plan review.

## Northern Leg of Simmons Loop/Simmons Rd. and Big Bend Rd. Intersection

The applicant is proposing to open the northern leg of the Simmons Rd. and Big Bend Rd. intersection. This will require reconfiguration of the existing traffic signal as well as a number of physical improvements to ensure the intersection operates safely and efficiently given the substantial amount of future development which is anticipated on both the northwest and northeast corners of the Simmons Rd. and Big Bend Rd. intersection.

The applicant's transportation analysis and staff review indicate a need for the following improvements on Simmons Rd. at its intersection with Big Bend Rd.:

1. Dual, dedicated, southbound to eastbound dedicated left turn lanes;
2. A single, dedicated, southbound to westbound right turn lane; and,
3. A single, dedicated, southbound through lane.

The applicant's transportation analysis and staff review indicate a need for the following improvements on Simmons Rd. at its relocated intersection with Old Big Bend Rd.:

1. A single, dedicated, northbound to eastbound right turn lane;
2. A single, dedicated, northbound to westbound left turn lane; and,
3. A single, dedicated, northbound through lane.

The location of the relocated Old Big Bend Rd. and Simmons Rd. intersection has been pushed as far north as possible to maximize the available queuing and stacking distances (for both northbound and southbound traffic). This will maximize the likelihood that other area development can obtain additional density and intensity, as well as accommodate general background traffic growth, without negatively impacting either of the adjacent intersections.

## Old Big Bend Rd. Realignment and Simmons Rd.

As discussed above, relocation of the Simmons Rd. and Old Big Rd. intersection is necessary in order to reopen the northern leg of the Simmons Loop/ Simmons Rd. and Big Bend Rd. intersection. Given the location of Simmons Loop south of Big Bend Rd., any extension of the roadway will require additional right-of-way from the owners of folios within the adjacent pending PD to the west.

Given that engineering level design of the improvements has not occurred, staff was unable to provide an exact amount of right-of-way that will be required to accommodate the reconstruction of Simmons Rd. and opening of the northern leg of the intersection. Staff has proposed conditions of approval that require the applicant to dedicate and convey or otherwise acquire whatever right-of-way is necessary to construct the required improvements necessary to achieve full project buildout. Staff notes that a specific breakdown of obligations and requirements by project phase is included hereinbelow.

As the above developer-proposed improvements will cure the substandard condition of Simmons Rd. and Old Big Bend Rd., the typical substandard road condition language was substituted for the more specific conditions proposed hereinabove.

## Old Big Bend Rd. East to Lincoln Rd., and Adjacent PD 22-0567

The applicant is proposing to construct the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road such that it terminates along the eastern project boundary in the vicinity of the location of its ultimate planned extension eastward to Lincoln Rd. (across folio 77550.0000 and through the northern portion of folio 77552.0000 ). Folio 77552.0000 is included within pending PD 22-0567, whose developers have been in discussions with both the developer of the subject PD and County staff. In the future, should this adjacent PD not move forward or should provisions for extension of the roadway through this portion of the northern folio not be made, Phase 2 of the project would not be constructible (since the development traffic could not be safely accommodated and zoning obligations unable to be met).

In the interim (i.e. during Phase 1) the developer will construct Driveway B to provide an interim connection between the existing portions of Old Big Bend Rd. east of the project and the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage Rd. In order to ensure the public has a right to travel on the facility, the developer will be required to provide a public access easement over the vehicular and pedestrian facilities comprising Driveway B. The facility has been designed (and the PD conditioned) to safely accommodate through traffic (i.e. no parking can occur along the driveway, and the design provides for a greater driveway separation than might otherwise be permitted).

These existing portions of Old Big Bend Rd. east of the project will be removed during Phase 2.

## PROJECT PHASING

Phase 1/ Lincoln Rd. Issues
As mentioned above, due to the unique configuration of existing roadway geometry, and the nature of the proposed development, it was necessary for the applicant to propose a multi-phase project. The first phase will accommodate up to 300 multi-family dwelling units and 80,000 s.f. Medical Equipment Recovery/Sterilization Facility uses.

The applicant's transportation study analyzed the impacts related to this first phase. Given the safety and operational issues at the existing Lincoln Rd. and Old Big Bend Rd. intersection, staff informed the applicant that it could not support any increment of development which intensified traffic for any turning movement at this intersection. The applicant's analysis indicated that construction of Driveway A in Phase 1 will result in a rerouting of a portion of traffic from the existing Lincoln Rd. and Old Big Bend Rd. intersection to the newly created Big Bend Rd. and Driveway A intersection. These displaced trips will allow the additional trips generated by the Phase 1 increment of development to occur without impacting the intersection. In order to ensure the public has a right to travel on the facility, the developer will be required to provide a public access easement over the vehicular and pedestrian facilities comprising Driveway A. The facility has been designed (and the PD conditioned) to safely accommodate through traffic (i.e. no parking can occur along the driveway, and the design provides for a greater driveway separation than might otherwise be permitted).

## Phase 2

All remaining entitlements have been relegated to Phase 2. Staff has proposed conditions governing the sequential nature of the phasing and ensuring other details and expectations are clear. A variety of transportation improvements have been identified as necessary to support Phase 2 entitlements. These have been split into two groups, the Phase 2 (Group 1) Improvements, and the Phase 2 (Group 2) Improvements. Group 1 improvements are those which are required to be constructed by the developer of the subject PD. Group 2 improvements are required to be constructed by this developer or another developer prior to issuance of any Certificates of Occupancy for Phase 2 entitlements. Group 2 improvements require dedication of land by this and other developers, or the acquisition of land currently owned by other developers by the developer of the subject PD. Should that not occur, the developer of
the subject PD will be unable to construct the required improvements. Should another developer decline to construct the required Group 2 improvements, then Phase 2 of this project is unconstructible. A detailed list of required Phase 1, Phase 2 (Group 1) and Phase 2 (Group 2) improvements can be found within the PD conditions and on the PD site plan.

## ADMINISTRATIVE VARIANCE \#1 - OLD BIG BEND RD. - SUBSTANDARD ROAD

As Old Big Bend Rd. is a substandard roadway, the applicant's Engineer of Record (EOR) submitted a Section 6.04.02.B Administrative Variance (dated July 25, 2022) which was found approvable by the County Engineer (on September 12, 2022) for a portion of the Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road substandard road improvements. Approval of this Administrative Variance will waive certain substandard road improvements required by Section 6.04.03.L. for those portions of the existing Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road west and east of the project boundaries. This approval waives only those improvements required to support Phase 1 of the project. Required improvements to these facilities necessary to support Phase 2 are addressed as a part of the Phase 2 (Group 2) improvement conditions hereinabove.

If PD 22-0461 is approved, the County Engineer will approve the Administrative Variance.

## ADMINISTRATIVE VARIANCE \#2 - NUMBER OF ACCESS CONNECTIONS

The applicant's Engineer of Record (EOR) submitted a Section 6.04.02.B Administrative Variance (dated July 26, 2022) which was found approvable by the County Engineer (on September 12, 2022) from the Section 6.04.03.I. LDC requirements governing Tract 3. Approval of this variance will permit two (2) vehicular access connections to Simmons Rd. from Tract 3, whereas only one (1) is permitted by the LDC. Conditions governing these and other project access connections are included hereinabove.

If PD 22-0461 is approved, the County Engineer will approve the Administrative Variance.

## DESIGN EXCEPTION \#1 - OLD BIG BEND RD. FRONTAGE RD. TYPICAL SECTIONS

The applicant's Engineer of Record (EOR) submitted a Design Exception (dated July 26, 2022) which was found approvable by the County Engineer (on September 12, 2022) from the Typical Section - 4 (TS-4) standards governing urban collector roadways. The Design Exception provides for two (2) Typical Section standards for the portion of the facility within the project, in lieu of the Type TS-4 Typical Section standards required pursuant to the Transportation Technical Manual (TTM). The requested changes include utilization of 10 -foot wide multi-purpose pathways in lieu of the 5 -foot wide sidewalks and 7 -foot wide buffered bicycle facilities required pursuant to TS-4. Conditions governing the use of each Typical Section are contained hereinabove.

If PD 22-0461 is approved, the County Engineer will approve the Design Exception.

## DESIGN EXCEPTION \#2 - SIMMONS RD. TYPICAL SECTION

The applicant's Engineer of Record (EOR) submitted a Design Exception (dated July 26, 2022) which was found approvable by the County Engineer (on September 12, 2022) from the Typical Section - 4 (TS-4) standards governing urban collector roadways. The Design Exception provides for an alternate Typical Section standard for the facility, in lieu of the Type TS-4 Typical Section standards required pursuant to the Transportation Technical Manual (TTM). The requested changes include utilization of 10 -foot wide multi-purpose pathways in lieu of the 5 -foot wide sidewalks and 7 -foot wide buffered bicycle facilities required pursuant to TS-4. Conditions governing the use of each Typical Section are contained hereinabove.

If PD 22-0461 is approved, the County Engineer will approve the Design Exception.

## ROADWAY LEVEL OF SERVICE

Level of Service (LOS) information for adjacent roadway sections is reported below. Lincoln Rd. and Old Big Bend Rd. are not included in the LOS report. As such, no data for these facilities could be provided.

| Roadway | From | To | LOS <br> Standard | Peak Hour <br> Directional <br> LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Big Bend Rd. | I-75 N Ramp | US 301 | D | C |

Source: Hillsborough County 2020 Level of Service Report.

## Project Number: 69657000

## Quick Facts

- Community Area: Gibsonton
- Project Type: Roadway Corridor Improvements

Current Phase


- Current Project Phase: Construction
- Commissioner District: District 4


## Estimated Project Schedule

- Project Development (Planning) Completion - Early 2020
- Design/Land Acquisition Completion - N/A
- Procurement Completion - N/A
- Construction Duration - Mid 2021 to Mid 2025
- Closeout - Early 2026

Project Cost Estimate

- Total: \$81,970,530
- Planning: \$0
- Design and Land: \$270,530
- Construction: \$81,700,000

Joint design-build project with FDOT. FDOT to contribute $\$ 20$ million to the County. Estimate includes $\$ 12$ million for wastewater facilities. May: Bonds, FDOT Grant, Financing, Utilities, and Impact Fees

## Project Description

- Big Bend Rd from Covington Gardens Dr to Simmons Loop will be widened from a 4-lane to a 6-lane divided road with enhanced bike, pedestrian and bus facilities, with reconfiguration and improvements to the ramps. Improvements to be designed and constructed by Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT). - Other improvements include reconstruction of the bridges on Old Big Bend Rd and Big Bend Rd, signal improvements at Covington Gardens Dr and Simmons Loop, and increasing stormwater drainage.


## Project Objectives

- Increase the overall mobility along Big Bend Rd and I-75, while maximizing safety along the corridor.
- Better accommodate growth and traffic volume.


## Questions?

Santos, Manuel
Project Manager
(813) 635-5400


Hillsborough County Florida

Big Bend Road Widening - US 41 to Covington Gardens Drive and Simmons Loop to US Hwy 301
Capital Improvement Program Project Fact Sheet Project Number: 69647000

## Quick Facts

- Community Area: Multiple
- Project Type: Roadway Corridor Improvements

Current Phase


- Current Project Phase: Design
- Commissioner District: Multiple


## Estimated Project Schedule

- Project Development (Planning) Completion - Mid 2021
- Design/Land Acquisition Completion - Late 2023
- Procurement Completion - Early 2024
- Construction Duration - Early 2024 to Late 2025

Project Cost Estimate

- Total: \$60,051,118
- Planning: \$1,816,186
- Design and Land: \$5,028,901
- Construction: \$53,206,031

May include: Impact Fees, Grants, Mobility Fees, Financing, Bond and Undetermined

## Project Description

- Corridor improvement for Big Bend Rd from US 41 to Covington Gardens Dr and from Simmons Loop to US 301 from a 4-lane divided road to a 6-lane divided road with enhanced bike, pedestrian and bus facilities.
- Enhance pedestrian safety features, including wide sidewalks and enhanced crosswalks and signals.

Stormwater drainage will also be improved.

## Project Objectives

- Better accommodate growth and traffic volume.
- Increase the overall mobility along Big Bend Road, while maximizing safety along the corridor.


## Questions?

Santos, Manuel
Project Manager
(813) 635-5400


## Ratliff, James

| From: | Williams, Michael |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Monday, September 12, 2022 3:12 PM |
| To: | Steven Henry |
| Cc: | Truett Gardner; Ryan Hileman; Heinrich, Michelle; Ratliff, James; PW-CEIntake |
| Subject: | FW: RZ PD 22-0461- DE and AV Review |
| Attachments: | 22-0461 AVReq 07-26-22_1_Substandard Road Old Big Bend Phase 1.pdf; 22-0461 AVReq 07-26-22_ |
|  | 2_Number of Accesses Big Bend.pdf; 22-0461 DEReq 07-26-22_1_Substandard Road Old Big |
|  | Bend.pdf; 22-0461 DEReq 07-26-22_2_Substandard Road Simmoons Loop Extension.pdf |

Steve,
I have found the attached Section 6.04.02.B. Administrative Variances (AV) and Design Exceptions (DE) for PD 22-0461 APPROVABLE with Conditions. The Condition being that Retail uses will be restricted to those allowed in the PD.

Please note that it is you (or your client's) responsibility to follow-up with Transportation staff 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 PWCEIntake@hillsboroughcounty.org

Mike

Michael J. Williams, P.E.

## Director, Development Review

## County Engineer

Development Services Department

P: (813) 307-1851
M: (813) 614-2190
E: Williamsm@HillsboroughCounty.org
W: HCFLGov.net

Hillsborough County
601 E. Kennedy Blvd., Tampa, FL 33602

From: Tirado, Sheida [TiradoS@hillsboroughcounty.org](mailto:TiradoS@hillsboroughcounty.org)
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2022 2:57 PM
To: Williams, Michael [WilliamsM@HillsboroughCounty.ORG](mailto:WilliamsM@HillsboroughCounty.ORG)
Subject: RZ PD 22-0461- DE and AV Review
Importance: High

Hello Mike,

The attached DEs and AVs can be considered AWC. If you agree the Condition will be: Retail uses will be restricted to the allowed by PD 22-061 restrictions. In your email please include:
shenry@lincks.com
tgardner@gardnerbrewer.com
rhileman@bohlereng.com
heinrichm@hillsboroughcounty.org
ratliffja@hillsboroughcounty.org

Best Regards,

Sheida L. Tirado, PE (she/her/hers)
Transportation Review Manager
Development Services Department

P: (813) 276-8364
E: tirados@HCFLGov.net
W: HCFLGov.net

Hillsborough County
601 E. Kennedy Blvd., Tampa, FL 33602
Facebook \| Twitter \| YouTube \| Linkedln \| HCFL Stay Safe
Please note: All correspondence to or from this office is subject to Florida's Public Records law.

## LINCKS \& ASSOCIATES, INC.

July 25, 2022
Mr. Michael Williams, PE
County Engineer Development Review Director
Hillsborough County
601 East Kennedy Blvd., $20^{\text {th }}$ Floor
Tampa, FL 33602
Re: Big Bend - Camden
RZ-PD 22-0461
Folio 077569-0000
077558-0000
077557-0000
Lincks Project No. 21224
The purpose of this letter is to request a Section 6.04.02.B Administrative Variance to Section 6.04.03L Existing Facilities of the Hillsborough County Land Development Code, which requires projects taking access to a substandard road to improve the roadway to current County standards between the project driveway and the nearest standard road.

The subject property is currently zoned Planned Development (PD) to allow the following land uses:

- Hospital - 360,000 Square Feet and 250 Beds
- Medical Office - 300,000 Square Feet

The developer proposes a rezone the property to PD to allow the following land uses:

- Multi-Family - 900 Dwelling Units
- Warehouse - 150,000 Square Feet
- Sterilization Facility - 80,000 Square Feet
- Ambulatory Care/Emergency Facility - 25,000 Square Feet
- Retail - 30,000 Square Feet

The proposed PD plan is included in the appendix of this letter.
Phase 1 of the project is proposed to include 450 Multi-Family Dwelling Units.
Table 1 provides the trip generation comparison of the approved land uses versus the proposed land uses. As shown, the proposed modification would result in a net decrease in the project traffic.

Mr. Mike Williams
July 25, 2022
Page 2

According to the Hillsborough County Functional Classification Map, Old Big Bend Road is classified as a local roadway. However, the roadway is anticipated to serve more than 5,000 vehicles per day, therefore it is considered a collector roadway.

The developer of the subject property is working with the developer/land owners to the east and west of the subject property to extend Old Big Bend Road to the east to Lincoln Road and realigned Old Big Bend Road to the north to Simmons Loop Road Extension.

This Administrative Variance is for the two segments of Old Big Bend for Phase 1 of the project, which are as follows:

- Eastern Project Boundary to Lincoln Road
- Simmons Loop Extension (Phase 1) to the west

These are graphically shown in Figure 1.
The request is to waive the requirement to improve the two segments of Old Big Bend Road to current County roadway standards, which are found within the Hillsborough County Transportation Technical Manual.

The variance to the TS-7 standards are as follows:

1. Lane Width - TS-7 has 12 foot lanes. The existing road has 11 foot lanes.
2. Shoulders - TS-7 has 8 foot shoulders with 5 foot paved. There are unpaved shoulders along the roadway.
3. Sidewalks - TS-7 has 5 foot sidewalk on both sides of the road. There are no sidewalks along the roadway.

## (a) there is an unreasonable burden on the applicant,

It would be unreasonable to require the applicant to improve the roadway for the following reasons:

1. Old Big Bend Road is proposed to be realigned along both segments with the Phase 2 development, as shown in Figure 2.
2. Sidewalk is proposed to be provided with the budgeted 6-laning of Big Bend Road
3. The proposed PD modification would result in a net decrease in project traffic.
(b) the variance would not be detrimental to the public health, safety and welfare,

The variance is to allow Phase 1 to develop until such time, as Old Big Bend Road is realigned east and west. Since this is an interim condition and the proposed PD would result in a significant reduction in project traffic, the proposed variance would not be detrimental to the public health, safety and welfare.
(c) without the variance, reasonable access cannot be provided. In the evaluation of the variance request, the issuing authority shall give valid consideration to the land use plans, policies, and local traffic circulation/operation of the site and adjacent areas.

The developer does not control the property east and west to realign the roadway. Therefore, the variance is required to allow Phase 1 of the project.

Mr. Mike Williams
July 25, 2022
Page 4

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

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

## ___Disapproved



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

Date $\qquad$
Sincerely,

Michael J. Williams
Hillsborough County Engineer

Mr. Mike Williams
July 25, 2022
Page 5
(1) Source: ITE Trip Generation Manual, $11^{\text {th }}$ Edition, 2021.

Mr. Mike Williams
July 25, 2022
Page 6


Mr. Mike Williams
July 25, 2022
Page 7
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## LINCKS \& ASSOCIATES, INC.

July 26, 2022
Mr. Michael Williams, PE
County Engineer Development Review Director
Hillsborough County
601 East Kennedy Blvd., $20^{\text {th }}$ Floor
Tampa, FL 33602
Re: Big Bend - Camden
RZ-PD 22-0461
Folio 077569-0000
077558-0000
077557-0000
Lincks Project Number 21224
The purpose of this letter is to request an Administrative Variance to Section 6.04.03 I of the Hillsborough County Land Development for the access to serve the proposed development parcels along Simmons Loop Extension.

The subject property is currently zoned Planned Development (PD) to allow the following land uses:

- Hospital - 360,000 Square Feet and 250 Beds
- Medical Office - 300,000 Square Feet

The developer proposes a rezone the property to PD to allow the following land uses:

- Multi-Family - 900 Dwelling Units
- Warehouse - 150,000 Square Feet
- Sterilization Facility - 80,000 Square Feet
- Ambulatory Care/Emergency Facility - 25,000 Square Feet
- Retail - 30,000 Square Feet

The proposed PD plan is included in the appendix of this letter.
As shown in Table 1, the proposed modification would result in a net decrease in project traffic.

In conjunction with the development of the project, the developer proposes to extend Simmons Loop north to the realignment of Old Big Bend Road. There are proposed to be

Mr. Mike Williams
July 26, 2022
Page 2
proposed to be three non-residential land uses along the frontage of Simmons Loop Extension which are as follows:

- Warehouse
- Sterilization Facílity
- Ambulatory Care/Emergency Facility

It is anticipated the subject segment of Simmons Loop Extension would have more than 5,000 vehicles per day, therefore it would be classified as a collector roadway. As per the LDC, the number of accesses required for the parcels along Simmons Loop Extension are shown in Table 2.

The request is to allow two right-in/right-out accesses to Simmons Loop Extension from Big Bend Road to Old Big Bend Road Realigned to serve the non-residential parcels along the roadway.

The justification for the variance to allow the turn access are as follows:
a) there is an unreasonable burden on the applicant,

1. The accesses along Simmons Loop Extension are to serve a number of distinct non-residential uses.
2. The accesses would be limited to right-in/right-out.

Given the roadway frontage, the mixture of uses and configuration of the parcels it is unreasonable to require the number of accesses per the LDC.
b) the variance would not be detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare,

The accesses meet the spacing criteria contained in an LDC for the right-in/rightout accesses along the east side of Simmons Loop Extension and where warranted, turn lanes per the LDC are to be provided.
c) without the variance, reasonable access cannot be provided. In the evaluation of the variance request, the issuing authority shall give valid consideration to the land use plans, policies, and local traffic circulation/operation of the site and adjacent areas.

As stated, the project is proposed to be a mixed-use development. The accesses are necessary to provide adequate circulation for the proposed uses. Given the configuration of the site it is not reasonable to restrict the access per the LDC.

Mr. Mike Williams
July 26, 2022
Page 3

Please do ngt hesitate to contact us if you have any questions or require any additional information.

Best Regerds,

Based on the information provided by the applicant, this request is:
$\qquad$ Disapproved

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

## Date

$\qquad$
Sincerely,

Michael J. Williams
Hillsborough County Engineer

Mr. Mike Williams
July 26, 2022
Page 4
(1) Source: TE Trip Generation Manual, $11^{\text {th }}$ Edition, 2021.

Mr. Mike Williams
July 26, 2022
Page 5
TABLE 2
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## HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY LDC

with the movement of vehicles into or out of the access. The applicant may submit an analysis showing that for his particular site, a throat of less than $100^{\prime}$ is appropriate and will result in no adverse impact to the public roadway system.
H. Access Along Acceleration/Deceleration Lanes

A driveway shall not be constructed along acceleration or deceleration tapers connecting to interchange ramp terminals, intersecting roadways, bus bays or other driveways unless access would be unreasonably denied and the driveway can be made to function properly, i.e., safe and efficient traffic operation.

1. Number of Access Points
2. The minimum number of driveways should be allowed that will adequately serve the need for the abutting property, and yet not seriously impact the function and capacity of the highway to which access is desired.
3. The number of entrances shall be determined based on the maximum desirable vehicle flow rate at entrances for residential and non-residential land uses based on the street characterlstics.
4. All access drives shall be required to comply with access spacing criteria and cross access connections are considered as a driveway connection for the purpose of complying with this section of the LDC. Cross access connections shall be consistent with Section 6.04.03 (Q) of the Land Development Code.
5. Properties that are bordered by physical impediments such as railroad tracks, limited access highways, existing navigable river or government owned property with restrictions may request an Administrative Variance pursuant to Section 6.04.02(B) of the Land Development Code.
6. The applicant may be permitted fewer driveway connections than required by the threshold matrix if through an approved traffic engineering study it is demonstrated that the proposed driveway connections will provide adequate capacity for the project to operate in a safe and efficient manner without causing delays or backups on the impacted roadways.
7. Where Non-Residential development abuts Collector/Arterial and Local roads primary driveway connections shall be at Collector/Arterial roads and Local roads shall be use for secondary access.

Table 1: Function and Driveway Guidelines

Residential Uses

| Street Character <br> Function | Maximum Vehicle Flow |
| :--- | :--- |
| Local | 90 |
| Collector/Arterial | 180 |


| Street Character <br> Function | Maximum Vehicle Flow |
| :--- | :--- |
| Local | 180 |
| Collector/Arterial | 300 |

## Calculation Formula

Number of Driveways = Peak Hour Total Project Traffic/Maximum Vehicle Flow. Fractional results shall be rounded up to the next highest whole number.

## Sample Calculation:

Example: A developer plans to construct a shopping center at a site near the intersection of two arterial roadways, which will house 250,000 square feet leasable area. The developer proposes three arterial connections.

Are three arterlal connectlons adequate for this site? As with the above sample, we start by calculating the number of peak hour trips generated by the site. In this case the ITE trip generation indicates a total of 1,146 peak hour vehicle trips. We reference Table 2 and find the non-residential collector maximum vehicle flow figure. Dividing the peak hour total by 300 results in the need for 3.82 or four driveways. Therefore, the number of collector connections should be four.
J. Spacing of Accesses and Median Openings

The minimum spacing between adjacent access points and between adjacent median openings are a function of the Access Class assigned to the main roadway. The distances shown in 6.04.07 are minimums and may not be sufficient if extensive right or left turn storage is required. Greater distances may be required to provide sufficient site-specific storage. Right turn in/right turn out movement and accesses which do not meet the minimum spacing may be permitted where, due to size, configuration, or location of the parcel, there is no feasible alternative access meeting the desired standard.
K. Drainage Considerations

Access shall be constructed in accordance with the requirements of Hillsborough County Stormwater Management Technical Manual.
L. Existing Facilities

1. Improvements and upgrading of existing roadways are to conform with standards for new roadways of the same access class. Exception to these standards shall be allowed only where physically impossible for the permittee to comply or otherwise upgrade existing site conditions. All such
exceptions shall be approved by the Director of Public Works.
2. Where driveways are constructed within the limits of existing curb and gutter construction, the existing curb and gutter shall be removed either to the nearest joints or to the extent that no remaining section is less than five feet long. If the curb is not removed to the nearest joint, the curb will be cleanly cut with a concrete saw. Driveways materials type should conform to the original construction on a section unless otherwise specifically provided on the permit.
M. Intersections

At an intersection, no driveway shall be allowed within the radius return of the intersecting roadways. An exception for existing developments may be considered when driveways are reconstructed as part of a roadway reconstruction project.
N. Emergency Access

In addition to minimum yard and building spacing requirements specified in this Code, all buildings and other structures, land preparation, and landscaping shall be so located and arranged on lots as to provide safe and convenient access for emergency purposes, fire protection, servicing, and off-street parking and loading located on the premises.
O. Prohibition of Use of Residentially Zoned Private Property for Access to Uses Not Permitted in Residential Districts; Exceptions

No private land which is agriculturally or residentially zoned shall be used for vehicular or pedestrian access to land or structures in other districts used for any purpose not permitted in agricultural or residential districts, except as provided below or otherwise authorized by this Code or other lawful regulations:

1. Where provision does not exist for safe access for emergency and public service vehicles and such access is not reasonably feasible except through privately owned residential or agricultural land, access reserved for and limited to such vehicles may be authorized by the Land Use Hearing Officer, subject to conditions and safeguards designed to protect the tranquility and character of the residential land so traversed.
2. Where convenience and safety would be promoted, walkways and bicycle paths to non-residentially zoned land may be authorized by the Land Use Hearing Officer across privately owned residentially zoned land, subject to conditions and safeguards to protect the tranquility and character of the residential land so traversed.
P. Right-of-Way Protection and Acquisition
3. No development activity (buildings, parking areas, water retention, etc.) shall be permitted within existing right-of-way corridors, as established and recorded through the Hillsborough County Thoroughfare Plan Regulations.
4. Prior to the development of land contiguous to public transportation corridors, right-of-way shall be reserved or dedicated to the appropriate governmental jurisdiction in accordance with an adopted Hillsborough County Transportation Corridor Map. In the absence of an adopted Corridor Map, right of way shall be reserved or dedicated to the appropriate governmental jurisdiction in accordance with the current MPO Long Range Transportation Needs Assessment Map in effect at the time of the request for reservation or conveyance. No development activity shall be permitted within the designated transportation corridors.
Q. Cross-Access Criteria and Requirements
5. The purpose of requiring cross-access in certain situations is to reduce the necessity to use the public street system in order to move between adjacent and complementary land uses where such interchange of vehicular or pedestrian trips are likely to occur.
6. When each of the following conditions exist, provisions for vehicular and pedestrian cross-access must be provided:
a. The site is on at least one roadway with an Access Management Classification of 1 through 5 .
b. The site has a commercial or office land use or zoning designation, and is adjacent to a parcel which also has a commercial or office land use designation or zoning and which has access on the same roadway.
7. When each of the following conditions exists, provisions for pedestrian cross-access must be provided.
a. The site has frontage on at least one roadway with an Access Management Classiflcation of 1 through 5.
b. The site has a commercial or office land use or zoning designation and is adjacent to a parcel having frontage on the same roadway which has a land use or zoning designation allowing 12 dwelling units per acre or more, or
c. The site has a residential land use or zoning designation allowing 12 dwelling units or more per acre and is adjacent to a parcel having a land use or zoning designation of 12 dwelling units or more per acre or a commercial or office land use or zoning designation and which has access on the same roadway.
8. As used herein, "provisions for cross-access" shall mean that the developer of the property shall design his site in such a manner as to make cross-access possible as provided in this division.
9. When the criteria in 2 or 3 above are met, provisions for cross-access must be provided as established below:
a. If the adjacent site is developed and, in the opinion of Hillsborough County, cross-access is feasible, the developer shall design and build the appropriate cross-access to the property line of the adjacent parcel.
b. If the adjacent site is developed but, in the opinion of Hillsborough County, cross-access is not feasible at this time, the developer shall design and designate on the site plan the location of future cross access, but will not be required to construct the cross-access at the time of initial site development. The owner shall commit, in writing, to construct and allow cross-access at such time as Hillsborough County determines that cross-access is feasible and desirable.
c. If the adjacent site is undeveloped, the developer shall design and build the cross-access to the property line of the adjacent parcel in anticipation of future connection when that site is developed.
d. The minimum width of a vehicular cross-access shall be 24 feet. The minimum width of a pedestrian cross-access shall be five feet.

## R. Corner Clearance

Corner clearances for all connections shall meet or exceed the minimum connection spacing requirements of 6.04 .07 of this division except as provided below:

1. Type I. The minimum corner clearance for a Type I connection shall be ten feet.
2. All Other Types, Isolated Corner Property—A single connection (on each frontage) may be placed
closer to the intersection if, due to property size, the applicable minimum spacing standards in Table I cannot be met, and where joint access which meets or exceeds the applicable connection spacing cannot be obtained with a neighboring property or, it is determined by the County that joint access is not feasible based on conflicting land uses or conflicting traffic volumes/characteristics, then the minimum corner clearance given in 6.04 .08 can be used. Such properties, for the purpose of this document will be called "isolated corner properties".
3. In cases where connections are permitted under this criteria, the permit will contain the following conditions:
a. There will be no more than one connection per frontage.
b. When joint or alternative access which meets or exceeds the applicable minimum connection spacing becomes available, the permittee will close the permitted connection, unless the permittee shows that such closure is not feasible because of conflicting land use or conflicting traffic volumes/characteristics or existing structures which preclude a change in the existing connection.
(Ord. No. 00-21, § 2, 5-18-00; Ord. No. 01-30, § 2, 11-15-01; Ord. No. 02-13, § 2, 8-1-02; Ord. No. 09-62, Item B, 10-26-09, eff. 2-1-2010)

LINCKS \& ASSOCIATES, INC.

July 26, 2022
Mr. Michael Williams, PE
County Engineer Development Review Director
Hillsborough County
601 East Kennedy Blvd., $20^{\text {th }}$ Floor
Tampa, FL 33602
Re: Big Bend - Camden
RZ-PD 22-0461
Folio 077569-0000
077558-0000
077557-0000
Lincks Project No. 21224

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 Land Development Code Section 6.04.03L for Old Big Bend Road from Simmons Loop Extension to the eastern property line. The subject property is currently zoned (PD) to allow the following land uses:

- Hospital - 360,000 Square Feet and 250 Beds
- Medical Office - 300,000 Square Feet

The developer proposes a rezone the property to PD to allow the following land uses:

- Multi-Family - 900 Dwelling Units
- Warehouse - 150,000 Square Feet
- Sterilization Facility - 80,000 Square Feet
- Ambulatory Care/Emergency Facility - 25,000 Square Feet
- Retail - 30,000 Square Feet

The proposed PD plan is included in the appendix of this letter.
As shown in Table 1, the proposed modification would result in a significant reduction in project traffic.

According to the Hillsborough County Functional Classification Map, Old Big Bend Road is classified as a local roadway, however, it is anticipated the roadway may serve more than 5,000 vehicles per day therefore it is considered a collector roadway. The subject site is within the Hillsborough County Urban Service Area.

Mr. Mike Williams
July 26, 2022
Page 2

The request is for a Design Exception to TS-4 of the Hillsborough County Transportation Technical Manual for Old Big Bend Road. The segment of Old Big Bend Road is currently a two (2) lane roadway and the developer proposes to realign the roadway, as shown in Figure 1. The following exceptions are requested to accommodate the proposed project.

1) Bike Lanes - TS-4 has 7 foot buffered bike lanes. The existing roadway is a rural roadway with no bike lanes.
2) Sidewalk - TS-4 has sidewalk on both sides of the roadway. There is currently no sidewalk along the subject segment of the roadway.

The justification for the Design Exception is as follows:
The developer proposes two alternative sections. The first is from Simmons Loop Extension east through the project to the transitions to the drainage canal. This section is shown in Figure 2. Figure 3 illustrates the proposed section where the roadway crosses the drainage canal on the eastern portion of the property.

1. Bike Lanes - No bike lanes are proposed. In lieu of the bike lanes, wider sidewalk on each side of the road is proposed.
2. Sidewalk - 10 ' sidewalk on both sides of the roadway are proposed instead of the bike lanes. Given the roadway is within a mixed use development and will connect to mixed uses east and west, the wider sidewalk provides a better option for pedestrians and bikes.

Based on the above, it is our opinion, the proposed improvements to Old Big Bend Road Realigned will mitigate the impact of the project and meet the intent of the Transportation Technical Manual to the extent feasible.

Mr. Mike Williams
July 26, 2022
Page 3

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


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

| $\ldots$ | 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.

Sincerely,

Michael J. Williams
Hillsborough County Engineer
(1) Source: TE Trip Generation Manual, $11^{\text {th }}$ Edition, 2021.

Mr. Mike Williams
July 26, 2022
Page 5


Mr. Mike Williams
July 26, 2022
Page 6


FIGURE 2

Mr. Mike Williams
July 26, 2022
Page 7


FGGURE 3

## APPENDIX

## PD PLAN
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LINCKS \& ASSOCIATES, INC.

July 26, 2022
Mr. Michael Williams, PE
County Engineer Development Review Director
Hillsborough County
601 East Kennedy Blvd., 20 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Floor
Tampa, FL 33602
Re: Big Bend - Camden
RZ-PD 22-0461
Folio 077569-0000
077558-0000
077557-0000
Lincks Project No. 21224

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 Land Development Code Section 6.04.03L for Simmons Loop Extension from Big Bend Road to north of the Old Big Bend Road Realigned. The subject property is currently zoned (PD) to allow the following land uses:

- Hospital - 360,000 Square Feet and 250 Beds
- Medical Office - 300,000 Square Feet

The developer proposes a rezone the property to PD to allow the following land uses:

- Multi-Family - 900 Dwelling Units
- Warehouse - 150,000 Square Feet
- Sterilization Facility - 80,000 Square Feet
- Ambulatory Care/Emergency Facility - 25,000 Square Feet
- Retail - 30,000 Square Feet

A copy of the PD plan is included in the appendix of this letter.
As shown in Table 1, the proposed modification would result in a significant reduction in project traffic.

Simmons Loop Extension is not shown on the Hillsborough County Functional Classification Map, however, it is anticipated the roadway may serve more than 5,000 vehicles per day that is considered a collector roadway. The subject site is within the Hillsborough County Urban Service Area.

Mr. Mike Williams
July 26, 2022
Page 2

The request is for a Design Exception to TS-4 and TS-5 of the Hillsborough County Transportation Technical Manual for Simmons Loop Extension.

The Simmons Loop Extension is proposed to be constructed from Big Bend Road to north of Old Big Bend Realigned by the developer in conjunction with the development of the project. Figure 1 illustrated the general layout of the proposed roadway. The roadway is proposed to be constructed as a divided roadway (TS-5) from Big Bend Road to Old Big Bend Road Realigned and an undivided roadway, north of Old Big Bend Road Realigned (TS-4).

The justification for the Design Exception is as follows:

The developer proposed alternative sections which are shown in Figures 2 and 3. The sections include the following:

1. Bike Lanes - No bike lanes are proposed. In lieu of the bike lanes, wider sidewalk on each side of the road is proposed.
2. Sidewalk - 10' sidewalk on both sides of the roadway are proposed instead of the bike lanes. Given the roadway is within a mixed use development and will connect to mixed uses east and west, the wider sidewalk provides a better option for pedestrians and bikes.

Based on the above, it is our opinion, the proposed improvements to Simmons Loop Extension will mitigate the impact of the project and meet the intent of the Transportation Technical Manual to the extent feasible.

Mr. Mike Williams
July 26, 2022
Page 3

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

Licks \& Associates, Inc.
\#51555


Based on the information provided by the applicant, this request is:
$\qquad$ Disapproved
 Approved
$\qquad$ 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.

Sincerely,

Michael J. Williams
Hillsborough County Engineer

Mr. Mike Williams
July 26, 2022
Page 4
(1) Source: $\pi E$ Trip Generation Manual, $11^{\text {th }}$ Edition, 2021.

Mr. Mike Williams
July 26, 2022
Page 5



* turn lanes are to be 11 feet

TYPICAL SECTION
SIMMONS LOOP EXTENSION
(Big Bend Rd to Old Big Bend Rd Realigned)
NTS
(1) MIN. TOTAL WIDTH TO BE 15' FROM F.C. TO F.C. WHERE NO TURN LANES ARE ADJACENT TO THE THROUGH LANE.
(2) MAY VARY AS MEDIAN TRANSITIONS TO THE NORTH

Mr. Mike Williams
July 26, 2022
Page 7


FIGURE 3

## APPENDIX









TS-4 and TS-5


1. ALL DIMENSIONS SHOWN ARE MINIMUM.

* 3. PROVIDE 2' MINIMUM CLEARANCE FROM FENCES, WALLS, HEDGES, ABOVEGROUND UTILTIES OR
IMPROVEMENTS, DROP OFFS, OR FROM THE TOPS OF BANKS WITH SLOPES STEEPER THAN
TO 4, THAT INTERFERE WITH THE SAFE, FUNCTIONAL USE OF THE SIDEWALK. INTERMITTEN
THIS 2' STRIP AS FAR FROM THE SIDEWALK AS POSSIBLE, IF NOT IN THE CLEAR ZONE.
$\dagger$ 4. SEE SIDEWALK PROTECTION OPTIONS, DRAWING NO. TD-16 SHEET 7 OF 7 FOR USE WHEN
SOD SHALL BE PLACED IN TWO ROWS STAGGERED. (BOTH TEMPORARY AND PERMANENT)
TYPICAL SECTION
LO甘 000'OL OL 000's
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| - |
| :---: |
| $\stackrel{-}{0}$ |
| - |
| $\vdots$ |
| $\dot{2}$ |
| $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{u}$ |
| $\frac{1}{\omega}$ |


| URBAN COLLECTORS |
| :--- |
| (2 LANE DIVIDED) |
| TYPICAL SECTION |


| REVIIIN DATE: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $10 / 17$ | TRANSPORTATION <br> TECCHNICAL <br> MANUAL | Hillsborough <br> County Florida |

### 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 |
| Big Bend Rd. | County Arterial Rural | 4 Lanes <br> $\square$ Substandard Road『Sufficient ROW Width | Corridor Preservation Plan Site Access Improvements Substandard Road Improvements Other |
| Old Big Bend Rd. | County Collector <br> - Rural | 2 Lanes <br> $\boxtimes$ Substandard Road <br> $\square$ Sufficient ROW Width | Corridor Preservation Plan <br> Site Access Improvements <br> Substandard Road Improvements <br> Other |
| Simmons Rd. | County Local Rural | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \text { Lanes } \\ & \boxtimes \text { Substandard Road } \\ & \square \text { Sufficient ROW Width } \end{aligned}$ | Corridor Preservation Plan <br> Site Access Improvements <br> Substandard Road Improvements <br> Other |
|  | Choose an item. | Choose an item. Lanes <br> $\square$ Substandard Road <br> $\square$ Sufficient ROW Width | Corridor Preservation Plan Site Access Improvements Substandard Road Improvements Other |

## Project Trip Generation $\square$ Not applicable for this request

|  | Average Annual Daily Trips | A.M. Peak Hour Trips | P.M. Peak Hour Trips |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Existing | 13,511 | 1,105 | 1,170 |
| Proposed | 7,123 | 532 | 655 |
| Difference (+/-) | $\mathbf{( - ) \mathbf { 6 , 3 8 8 }}$ | $\mathbf{( - ) \mathbf { 5 7 3 }}$ | $\mathbf{( - ) \mathbf { 5 1 5 }}$ |

Connectivity and Cross Access $\square$ Not applicable for this request

| Project Boundary | Primary Access | Additional <br> Connectivity/Access | Cross Access | Finding |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| North |  | Vehicular \& Pedestrian <br> (Potential) | None | Meets LDC |
| South | $X$ | Vehicular \& Pedestrian | None | Meets LDC |
| East | $X$ | Vehicular \& Pedestrian | None | Meets LDC |
| West | Vehicular \& Pedestrian | None | Meets LDC |  |
| Notes: |  |  |  |  |


| Design Exception/Administrative Variance $\quad \square$ Not applicable for this request |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Road Name/Nature of Request | Type | Finding |
| Old Big Bend Rd./ Substandard Rd. | Administrative Variance Requested | Approvable |
| Simmons Rd./ Number of Access Connections | Administrative Variance Requested | Approvable |
| Old Big Bend Rd. | Design Exception Requested | Approvable |
| Simmons Rd. | Design Exception Requested | Approvable |
| Notes: |  |  |

4.0 Additional Site Information \& Agency Comments Summary

| Transportation | Objections | Conditions <br> Requested | Additional <br> Information/Comments |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\boxtimes$ Design Exception/Adm. Variance Requested | $\square$ Yes $\square \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ |  |  |
| $\boxtimes$ Off-Site Improvements Provided | $\boxtimes$ Yes <br> $\square$ No |  |  |

# RECOMMENDATION OF THE <br> LAND USE HEARING OFFICER 

| APPLICATION NUMBER: | RZ PD 22-0461 |
| :---: | :---: |
| DATE OF HEARING: | November 14, 2022 |
| APPLICANT: | T. Truett Gardner/Gardner Brewer Hudson |
| PETITION REQUEST: | A request to rezone property from AR, RSC-9 \& PD 04-1820 to PD to permit a mixed use project consisting of multifamily residential, medically related warehousing \& recovery/sterilization uses, a free-standing ER and limited retail land uses |
| LOCATION: | Northeast corner of Old Big Bend Rd. and Simmons Rd. |
| SIZE OF PROPERTY: | 80.54 acres, m.o.l. |
| EXISTING ZONING DISTRICT: | AR, RSC-9, PD 04-180 |
| FUTURE LAND USE CATEGORY: | RES-6, UMU-20, SMU-6 |
| SERVICE AREA: | Urban |
| COMMUNITY PLAN: | Riverview and SouthShore Area Wide Systems |

## DEVELOPMENT REVIEW STAFF REPORT

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

### 1.0 APPLICATION SUMMARY



Applicant: HCA Health Services and South Riverview LLC

## FLU Category: RES-6, SMU-6 and UMU-20

Service Area: Urban
Site Acreage: 80.54 +/-
Community Plan Area: Riverview \& Southshore Areawide Systems
Overlay: None

Introduction Summary:

The applicant seeks to rezone property currently zoned PD (Planned Development) \#04-1820, AR (Agricultural Rural) and RSC-9 (Residential SingleFamily Conventional) to PD to allow for a mixed use project consisting of multifamily uses, medically related warehousing and recovery/sterilization uses, a free-standing ER and limited retail uses. This request includes a flex request of the UMU-20 Future Land Use category.
Zoning: Existing Proposed

| District(s) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PD } \\ & \# 04- \\ & 1820 \end{aligned}$ | AR | RSC-9 | PD \#22-0461 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Typical General Use(s) | Hospita <br> I (250 <br> beds) <br> and <br> Medical <br> Office <br> uses | Single-Family Residential/Agricultura I | Single-Family Residential | 900 Multi- <br> Family Units 285,000 sf <br> Warehouse/ <br> Recovery- <br> Sterilization/E <br> R Facility/ <br> Limited Retail |
| Acreage | 39.0 +/- | 40.96 +/- | 0.58 +/- | 80.54 +/- |
| Density/Intensit y | $\begin{aligned} & 0.38 \\ & \text { FAR } \end{aligned}$ | 1 unit per 5 acres | 9 units per acre | 14.6 units per acre <br> (900/61.39 ac) <br> 0.43 FAR <br> (285,000/ <br> $14.99 \mathrm{ac})$ |
| Mathematical Maximum* | $\begin{aligned} & 660,00 \\ & 0 \mathrm{sf} \end{aligned}$ | 8 units | 5 units | 900 Multi- <br> Family Units 285,000 sf of Warehouse/ RecoverySterilization/E R Facility/Limited Retail |

*number represents a pre-development approximation

## Development Services Department

| Development Standards: |
| :--- |
| Existing Proposed |
|   <br> District(s) PD \#04- <br> 1820  |
| Lot Size / Lot <br> Width |
| N/A | | AR |
| :--- |


| Additional Information: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| PD Variation(s) | LDC Part 6.06.00 (Landscaping/Buffering) <br> Request for no buffering and screening internal <br> to the project |
| Waiver(s) to the Land <br> Development Code | None requested as part of this application |
| Planning Commission <br> Recommendation: <br> Consistent | Development Services Recommendation: <br> Approvable, subject to proposed conditions |

### 2.0 LAND USE MAP SET AND SUMMARY DATA 2.1 Vicinity Map



VICINITY MAP
RZ-PD 22-0461
Folio: 77557.0000, 77558.0000,
77569.0000
77569.0000


STR: 7-31-20

 y =2



## Context of Surrounding Area:

The site is located on the northern side of Big Bend Road, east of Interstate 75 and west of Highway 301 in the Riverview community. The area is developed with residential and non-residential uses. Non-residential development includes a hospital, shopping centers and retail outparcels fronting Big Bend Road and US Highway 301. Residential development consists of single-family detached neighborhoods at both low and mid density levels. Recreational facilities are present west of the project, which include the Spurlino Family YMCA and Vance Vogel Park and Sports Complex.

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



| Subject Site Future Land Use <br> Category: | RES-6 (Residential-6), SMU-6 (Suburban <br> Mixed-Use-6), and UMU-20 (Urban Mixed- <br> Use-20) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Maximum Density/F.A.R.: | RES-6: 6 units per acre / 0.25 FAR SMU-6: <br> 6 units per acre / 0.25 FAR UMU-20: 20 <br> units per acre / 1.0 FAR |
|  | RES-6: Residential, suburban scale <br> neighborhood commercial, office uses, <br> multi-purpose projects and mixed use <br> development. <br> SMU-6: Residential, suburban scale <br> neighborhood commercial, office uses, <br> research corporate park uses, light industrial <br> multi-purpose and clustered residential <br> and/or mixed use projects. |


| Typical Uses: | UMU-20: Residential, regional scale <br> commercial uses such as mall, office and <br> business park uses, research, corporate <br> park uses, light industrial, multi- purpose <br> and clustered residential and/or mixed use <br> projects. |
| :--- | :--- |

### 2.0 LAND USE MAP SET AND SUMMARY DATA 2.3 Immediate Area Map



| South | PD | 0.29 FAR | Medical Office and Hospital | Medical Office and Hospital |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| East | AR, RSC- <br> 6, ASC-1 <br> \& RSC-2 | AR: 1 unit/5 ac RSC-6: 6 u/a ASC-1: 1 u/a RSC-2: 2/a | AR \& ASC-1 : <br> Single-Family and Agriculture RSC-2 \& RSC- <br> 6: SingleFamily Residential | AR: Single-Family Residential RSC-6: <br> Single-Family <br> Residential and Vacant <br> ASC-1: SingleFamily Residential RSC-2: <br> Church/School |
| West | AR, RSC- <br> 2, RSC-3 <br> \& AS-1 | AR: 1 unit/5 ac RSC-2: 2 u/a RSC-3: 3 u/a AS1: 1 u/a | AR \& AS-1: <br> Single-Family and Agriculture RSC-2 \& RSC- <br> 3 : Single- <br> Family <br> Residential | AR: County Park/Wetlands RSC2, RSC-3 \& AS-1: Single-Family Residential |

### 2.0 LAND USE MAP SET AND SUMMARY DATA

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



## 4．0 ADDITIONAL SITE INFORMATION \＆AGENCY COMMENTS SUMMARY Information／Comments

Environmental Protection CommissionYes $\boxtimes$ No
Natural Resources
区 Yes $\square$ No
$\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No
$\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No
Conservation \＆Environ．Lands Mgmt．
Check if Applicable：
区 Wetlands／Other Surface WatersUse of Environmentally Sensitive Land Credit
$\square$ Wellhead Protection Area
$\square$ Surface Water Resource Protection AreaPotable Water Wellfield Protection Area
Significant Wildlife HabitatCoastal High Hazard AreaUrban／Suburban／Rural Scenic CorridorAdjacent to ELAPP propertyOther $\qquad$

## Transportation

区 Design Exc．／Adm．Variance Requested $\begin{aligned} & \text { Off－site Improvements Provided }\end{aligned}$

## Objections

## Service Area／Water \＆Wastewater

凹Urban $\square$ City of Tampa
$\square$ Rural $\square$ City of Temple Terrace
Water distribution system improvements required

## Hillsborough County School Board

Adequate $\square \mathrm{K}-5 \square 6-8 \square 9-12 \square \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ Inadequate $\boxtimes \mathrm{K}-5$ 区6-8 $\boxtimes 9-12 \square \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$
凹 Yes $\square$ No

Impact/Mobility Fees (Various use types allowed. Estimates are a sample of potential development)
$\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No
$\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No

Office , General (Per 1,000 s.f.) Mobility: \$7,502.00 Fire: \$158.00
Retail - Conv Mkt. w/Gas (Per fueling position) Mobility: \$12,361-16,580 Fire: $\$ 313.00$ (per 1,000 sf)

Retail - Shopping Center (50k s.f. or less) (Per 1,000 s.f.) Mobility: \$12,206.00

Fire: \$313.00
Retail - Fast Food w/Drive Thru (Per 1,000 s.f.) Mobility: \$94,045.00
Fire: \$313.00
Warehouse
(Per 1,000 s.f.) Mobility: \$1,239.00 Fire: \$34.00
Multi-Family
(per unit)
Mobility: \$3,521-5,995 Parks: \$777-2,742 School: \$1,645-10,976 Fire: \$249.00

Urban Mobility, South Fire, Central Parks - Mixed Use - 285,000 sf mixed used with 900 multi-family units. No breakdown of uses or unit sizes.

| Comprehensive | Comments <br> Received |  | Conditions <br> Rlan: | Findings |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | Requested | Additional |
| :--- |
| Information/Comments |

### 5.0 IMPLEMENTATION RECOMMENDATIONS

### 5.1 Compatibility

The project is planned to be a mixed use project consisting of residential and non-residential uses. Non-residential uses (at proposed maximum heights of 50 feet) will be situated along Old Big Bend Road/Big Bend Road and will serve the area's medical facilities and residents. Multi-Family uses (at proposed maximum heights of 65 feet) are planned to occur with the retail tract along Big Bend Road and within the northern area of the Planned Development.

This segment of Old Big Bend Road/Big Bend Road is a commercial corridor located in proximity to l-75 to the west and is envisioned for an urban development pattern (UMU-20 FLU Category). The area consisting of Tracts 2, 3 and 4, proposed for non-residential uses, is presently zoned PD to allow for office and hospital uses with building heights of 30-60 feet ( 85 feet for the hospital tower). This project will provide front yard setbacks of at least 30 feet for nonresidential buildings, which is comparable to standard commercial zoning districts. In keeping with an urban development form, the proposed maximum building height is 50 feet. This building height is equal to those found to the CG (Commercial General) and Cl (Commercial Intensive) standard zoning districts. Internally, buildings at heights over 20 feet will not be required to provide an additional setback to allow for layout flexibility and accommodation of the intensity envisioned for this area. The non-residential tracts of this PD are not directly adjacent to residential development due to existing or planned roadways.

Similar commercial project at similar heights are found within the area, such as PD 10-0619 (St. Joseph's Hospital) located directly south of the site on the south side of Big Bend Road with approved building heights of 68-110 feet; PD 86-

0154 to the southwest of the site on the west side of I-75 which permits office building heights of 75 feet; PD 17-1397 located to the southeast of the site on the west side of US Hwy 301 which permits commercial building heights of 60-75 feet; and, PD 03-0316 located southeast of the site located at the corner of Big Bend Road/US Hwy 301 permitting portions of the site to have building heights of 50 feet (see Figure 1).

The project proposes a multi-family component thereby providing proximity between residences and area employers. The site contains portions within the UMU-20 FLU category, was well as a flex of that category northward into the site. This future land use category plans for high density development within access to employment centers and highways. Comparable to standard multi-family zoning districts, a 25 foot front yard setback is proposed. Minimum setbacks of 20 feet are required along the PD's northern and eastern boundaries. These setbacks serve as buffers to contain screening between the project and adjacent properties. These setbacks are required to be increased when buildings over 20 feet are proposed, with the required buffering and screening along the property line remaining in place. A maximum building height of 65 feet is proposed with a 2:1 setback for buildings over 20 feet in height required along the eastern and portions of the northern boundaries. A 65 foot high building will require a 110 foot setback. The majority of the properties to the north are separated from the project by an open space/retention pond area in the neighboring project providing approximately 260 feet of separation. Therefore, along this portion of the northern boundary, the $2: 1$ setback for buildings over 20 feet in height will not be required. Along other portions of the northern boundary and the entire eastern boundary, the $2: 1$ setback is required. Property to the west of the multi-family area is developed with a County park (with the eastern portion of the park remaining undeveloped and vegetated). Provision of a 10 foot wide buffer and Type A screening will be dependent upon a ROW preservation area that may or may not occur at the time of site development. The 2:1 building setback is not proposed along this boundary due to the intervening land between the project and active park areas.

Urban style multi-family developments are found within the area, such as PD 110415 located southwest of the site on the south side of Old Big Bend/Big Bend Road approved for apartment building heights of 4-story/60 feet; PD 16-0209 located southwest of the site on the south side of Old Big Bend/Big Bend Road and approved for apartment building heights of 58 feet; I-PD 89-0160 located southeast of the site on the south side of Old Big Bend Road/Big Bend Road and approved for apartment building heights of 45 feet; PD 18-0109 located southeast of the site along the west of US Hwy 301 and approved for apartment building heights of 60 feet; PD 21-0969 located south of the project, west of US Hwy 301 approved for a portion to contain apartment building height of 45 feet (see Figure 1).

Figure 1: Surrounding Non-Residential and Multi-Family Projects


Approvable, subject to proposed conditions.
Zoning conditions, which were presented Zoning Hearing Master hearing, were reviewed and are incorporated by reference as a part of the Zoning Hearing Master recommendation.

## SUMMARY OF HEARING

THIS CAUSE came on for hearing before the Hillsborough County Land Use Hearing Officer on November 14, 2022. Mr. Brian Grady of the Hillsborough County Development Services Department introduced the petition.

Mr. Truett Gardner 400 North Ashley Drive testified on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Gardner showed a PowerPoint presentation and stated introduced the
development team. He stated that the rezoning application is complicated and that adjacent property owner notice has been sent out six times. He added that all of the responses to the notice have been positive. Mr. Gardner showed graphics regarding the conceptual design of the project and identified the location of the property which is 80.54 acres. The southern portion of the site is zoned Planned Development and is owned by HCA which will continue to the own the parcel. The PD is currently approved for 660,000 square feet of medical uses of which 360,000 square feet is for a hospital, 240,000 square feet for medical office and 60,000 square feet is for detached medical offices. The hospital is approved for a maximum height of 85 feet. The proposed rezoning will add 39 acres to the approved PD and include uses such as a hospital, medical offices and multi-family residential. The overall square footage is proposed to be reduced to 285,000 square feet of commercial and medical uses and 900 multifamily dwelling units which represents a decrease of 375,000 square feet or 43 percent. He added that the maximum height will be reduced from 85 feet to 65 feet. Mr. Gardner showed the proposed site plan and stated that the overall daily trips will be reduced by 47 percent. He detailed the land uses proposed on the site plan and identified the 300 unit multi-family residential area that is proposed in Phase One. 80,000 square feet of medical equipment and sterilization facility will likely be located in the southwest corner. Phase Two requires numerous transportation improvements and realignments to occur. With the improvements, an additional 600 multi-family units would be allowed with 150,000 square feet of medical equipment warehouse, 25,000 square feet for an ER facility and 30,000 square feet of limited retail uses located in the southwest corner of the site. The total development would be 285,000 square feet and 900 dwelling units which is substantially less than could be potentially requested under the Comprehensive Plan density standards. Mr. Gardner identified the three wetlands that run laterally beginning the northwest corner of the site to the eastern corner. He concluded his presentation by stating that the wetlands will remain undisturbed including the 30 -foot wetland setback area.

Hearing Master Finch asked Mr. Gardner to confirm that the southern portion of the property is already approved for a hospital. Mr. Gardner replied that was correct. Hearing Master Finch asked if the impacts of the approved PD are substantially more than what is being proposed under the subject rezoning. Mr. Gardner replied that was correct. Mr. Gardner added that the comparison of the project impacts to the already approved development was based on only the 40 acres that is zoned PD and not the approximate 40 acres located to the north of the existing PD.

Hearing Master Finch asked Mr. Gardner about his PowerPoint slide that stated that there are no waivers or variations being requested because the County's staff report states that there is a variation request regarding buffering and screening internal to the project. Mr. Gardner replied that there are two requests. One regarding the required setback for buildings over 20 feet in height and second, regarding the required buffering and screening internal to the project.

Ms. Addie Clark 400 North Ashley Drive Suite 1100 Tampa testified on behalf of the applicant regarding the project traffic. She showed a graphic to discuss the reduction in trips generated by the currently approved development and the proposed development. The results of the comparison showed a 40 percent decrease in the number of trips. Ms. Clark stated that the high density development is proposed to be located internal to the project with connections to employment centers thereby reducing the need for people to travel long distances for their everyday needs.

Mr. Steve Henry 5023 West Laurel Tampa testified on behalf of the applicant regarding the project roadway network and improvements that will be made. Mr. Henry showed a graphic to identify the project location and the roadway improvements that will be constructed. An extension of Simmons Loop from south of Big Bend north. An issue identified is that Old Big Bend Road is very close to Big Bend Road therefore Old Big Bend Road will be moved to the north such that there is enough separation at the intersection of Big Bend Road and Old Big Bend Road. Mr. Henry testified that the road will be extended to the east through the site to connect with Lincoln Road. He added that the graphic shows the property to the east and the west which the applicant does not control. He stated that he is working with those properties to ultimately get the roadways over to Lincoln Road and then to the west to tie into the existing Old Big Bend Road.

Hearing Master Finch asked Mr. Henry if there was a rezoning on the adjacent parcel. Mr. Henry replied yes and stated that the property to the east is in the zoning process. The property to the west has been in the zoning process for several years and a lawsuit had been filed. He added that a new developer is involved which will hopefully result in a modification to accommodate the improvement that is proposed under the subject rezoning.

Mr. Henry continued his presentation by stating that there are two north/south access ways that the applicant will build to provide a grid system. The result will be the extension of Simmons Loop on the west and a north/south access road to the east along with another north/south access road on the eastern boundary in addition to the connection to Lincoln Road. He stated that there are four design exceptions and administrative variances that have been applied for and deemed approvable by the County. Mr. Henry discussed the timing of the improvements and the associated phasing of the project.

Hearing Master Finch asked Mr. Henry about proposed zoning condition 22 regarding the construction of the improvements in Phase One and if Phase Two would not be permitted until the completion of the improvements to the east and west. Mr. Henry replied yes that was correct.

Mr. Gardner completed the applicant's presentation by stating that he has worked closely with St. Joe's and Camden has extended an invitation for them to be in their preferred employer program. This will provide workforce housing
directly targeted to the hospital facility.
Ms. Michelle Heinrich, Development Services Department testified regarding the County's staff report. Ms. Heinrich stated that the request is to rezone approximately 80 acres which is currently zoned PD, AR and RSC-9 to allow for 900 multi-family units and 285,006 square feet for a medical warehouse use, a medical recovery/sterilization facility. A free-standing ER and limited retail uses. Regarding the variation mentioned by the applicant, Ms. Heinrich stated that staff does not classify that as a variation but rather it is addressed in the PD zoning conditions.

Hearing Master Finch asked Ms. Heinrich if there is a zoning condition to address the height/setback issue. Ms. Heinrich replied yes and added that the condition addresses where the setback is not required.

Ms. Heinrich continued her presentation by stating that the property is located in the RES-6, SMU-6 and UMU-20 land use categories. A flex of the UMU-20 category is requested. The non-residential buildings will have a maximum height of 50 feet and the multi-family buildings will be a maximum of 65 feet. Ms.
Heinrich described the existing PD entitlements and described the location of the proposed land uses. She detailed two unique uses. The first is a medical equipment warehouse for the storage of IV's, beds and other medical uses. The warehouse is not open to the public. The second unique use is the medical equipment recovery/sterilization facility which is a building used to receive and sterilize medical equipment such as surgical instruments. Ms. Heinrich testified that a phasing plan is proposed to tie the amount of development to occur with each phase of site access developments. She completed her presentation by stating that staff found the rezoning approvable with conditions.

Mr. James Ratliff of the County's Transportation Review Section testified that the road improvements will be an important facility that will provide a parallel relief for a north/south road between 1-75 and 301. The road will connect to Gibsonton Drive in the future. He added that the intersection had to be closed due to the proximity of Old Big Bend Road to Big Bend Road which created safety issues. Mr. Ratliff discussed the required collaboration between the subject property and the parcels to the east and west. He detailed the proposed phasing of the project and the overall improvement to the area.

Ms. Andrea Papandrew of the Planning Commission staff stated that the property is designated Residential-6, Suburban Mixed Use-6 and Urban Mixed Use-20 Future Land Use category and located in the Urban Service Area and the Riverview Community Planning Area. She stated that the request met the County's minimum density requirements and discussed the proposed flex of the UMU-20 land use category. She added that the UMU-20 does not require compliance with commercial locational criteria. Ms. Papandrew concluded her remarks by listing Comprehensive Plan policies that are met by the proposed development and stated that the Planning Commission staff finds the request
consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.
Hearing Master Finch asked audience members if there were any proponents of the application. None replied.

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

County staff did not have additional comments.
Mr. Gardner testified during the rebuttal period that the zoning condition which addresses the additional setback for buildings over 20 feet issue and where it is not required.

The hearing was then concluded.

## EVIDENCE SUBMITTED

No documents were submitted into the record.
PREFACE
All matters that precede the Summary of Hearing section of this Decision are hereby incorporated into and shall constitute a part of the ensuing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.

## FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The subject site is 80.54 acres in size and is zoned Agricultural Rural (AR), Residential Single-Family Conventional-9 and Planned Development (PD 041820) and designated Residential-6 (RES-6), Suburban Mixed Use-6 (SMU6) and Urban Mixed Use-20 (UMU-20) by the Comprehensive Plan. The property is located in the Urban Service Area and the Riverview and SouthShore Areawide Community Planning Areas.
2. The southern 40.96 acres of the 80.54 acre subject property is zoned PD 041820 and is currently approved for a 360,000 square foot hospital with a maximum of 250 beds, 240,000 square feet of attached medical office land uses and 60,000 square feet of detached medical office land uses. The permitted maximum building height is 85 feet.
3. The PD rezoning is requested to develop a maximum of 900 multi-family dwelling units and 285,000 square feet of medical office warehouse (maximum: 150,000 sq. ft.), medical equipment recovery/sterilization facility (maximum: 80,000 sq. ft.), a free-standing emergency room (maximum: 25,000 sq. ft.) and limited Commercial Neighborhood (maximum: 30,000 sq.
ft.). The proposed maximum height for the multi-family buildings is 65 feet. The proposed maximum height for the non-residential buildings is 50 feet.
4. A Planned Development Variation is being requested regarding the required buffering and screening internal to the project between the proposed residential and non-residential development.

The request meets the criteria of Land Development Code Section 5.03.06.C.6(b) as the request is necessary to achieve a mixed-use development and is mitigated by the live-work design that provides employment opportunities to both on-site uses and also the medical land uses in the community. Further, the variation will not substantially interfere with the rights of adjacent property owners as the variation applies to parcels internal to the project.
5. A flex of the UMU-20 Future Land Use category is proposed northward into the subject property.
6. The Planning Commission staff testified that the request meets the County's minimum density requirements and supports the proposed flex of the UMU-20 land use category. Staff stated that the UMU-20 does not require compliance with commercial locational criteria. The Planning Commission staff found the request consistent with the Riverview Community Plan and the Comprehensive Plan.
7. The surrounding area is zoned PD to the north and the south and developed with single-family residential (north) and a hospital (south). Properties to the east and west are zoned agricultural and residential and developed with agricultural and residential land uses.
8. The applicant's representative and transportation expert testified that the daily vehicular trips for the proposed development is significantly reduced as compared to the currently approved PD by 47 percent.
9. Transportation improvements are required by the proposed zoning conditions. These improvements include but are not limited to the extension of Simmons Road, the realignment of Old Big Bend Road to the north to provide sufficient separation from Big Bend Road, and connection to Lincoln Road on the east resulting in a grid pattern. County transportation staff testified that the road improvements will provide a parallel relief for a north/south road between 1-75 and US 301.
10. Transportation improvements are conditioned to be completed with the identified phase of the project in sequential order thereby ensuring there is transportation infrastructure in place necessary to serve the phased development.
11. The project is conditioned to eliminate the required additional setback for buildings over 20 -feet in height internal to the project. It is noted that the multi-family residential portion of the project is not directly adjacent to the non-residential development.
12. No opposition testimony was presented at the Zoning Hearing Master hearing.
13. The impacts of the project in terms of traffic impacts and maximum building height are substantially reduced as compared to the already approved Planned Development.
14. The rezoning to Planned Development for the mixed-use project provides much needed housing and employment opportunities in the community. The multi-family dwelling units will accommodate residents that potentially work in the medical facilities both on-site and in the immediate area. The proposed transportation improvements will provide needed relief between 1-75 and US 301. The rezoning results in a development that is compatible with the area.

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

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

## CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

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

## SUMMARY

The request is to rezone 80.54 acres from AR, RSC-9 and Planned Development 04-1820 to Planned Development is to develop a maximum of 900 multi-family dwelling units and 285,000 square feet of medical office warehouse (maximum: 150,000 sq. ft.), medical equipment recovery/sterilization facility (maximum: 80,000 sq. ft.), a free-standing emergency room (maximum: 25,000 sq. ft.) and limited Commercial Neighborhood (maximum: 30,000 sq. ft.). The proposed maximum height for the multi-family buildings is 65 feet. The proposed maximum height for the non-residential buildings is 50 feet.

The southern 40.96 acres of the 80.54 acre subject property is zoned PD 041820 and is currently approved for a 360,000 square foot hospital with a maximum of 250 beds, 240,000 square feet of attached medical office land uses and 60,000 square feet of detached medical office land uses. The permitted maximum building height is 85 feet.

The Planning Commission testified that staff supports the requested flex of the UMU-20 Future Land Use category and that the rezoning is compatible with the surrounding development pattern, the Riverview Community Plan and the Comprehensive Plan.

Transportation improvements are required by the proposed zoning conditions. These improvements include but are not limited to the extension of Simmons Road, the realignment of Old Big Bend Road to the north to provide sufficient separation from Big Bend Road, and connection to Lincoln Road on the east resulting in a grid pattern. County transportation staff testified that the road improvements will provide a parallel relief for a north/south road between 1-75 and US 301. Transportation improvements are conditioned to be completed with the identified phase of the project in sequential order thereby ensuring there is transportation infrastructure in place necessary to serve the phased development.

The impacts of the project in terms of traffic impacts and maximum building height are substantially reduced as compared to the already approved Planned Development.

The rezoning is consistent with the Land Development Code and the Comprehensive Plan.

## RECOMMENDATION

Based on the foregoing, this recommendation is for APPROVAL of the Planned Development rezoning request as indicated by the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law stated above subject to the zoning conditions prepared by the Development Services Department.


December 7, 2022
Susan M. Finch, AICP
Date
Land Use Hearing Office


## Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission

| Unincorporated Hillsborough County Rezoning |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Hearing Date: <br> November 14, 2022 <br> Report Prepared: <br> November 2, 2022 | Petition: PD 22-0461 <br> 13097 Lincoln Road <br> North side of Big Bend Road, west of Lincoln Road, east of Interstate 75 |
| Summary Data: |  |
| Comprehensive Plan Finding: | CONSISTENT |
| Adopted Future Land Use: | Urban Mixed Use-20 (20 du/ga; 1.0 FAR) <br> Residential-6 (6 du/ga; 0.25 FAR) <br> Suburban Mixed Use-6 (6 du/ga; 0.25/0.35/0.50 FAR) |
| Service Area: | Urban |
| Community Plan: | Riverview and Southshore Areawide Systems |
| Request: | Approval of 900 multi-family dwelling units and 285,000 square feet of non-residential uses |
| Parcel Size (Approx.): | 80.54 +/- acres |
| Street Functional Classification: | Big Bend Road - Arterial Lincoln Road - Local |
| Locational Criteria: | N/A |
| Evacuation Zone: | Partially in Evacuation Zones D and E |

## Context

- The approximately 80.54 acre site is located on the north side of Big Bend Road, east of Interstate 75 and west of Lincoln Road. The site is in the Urban Service Area and within the limits of the Riverview Community Plan and the Southshore Areawide Systems Plan.
- The subject site includes three Future Land Use designations: Urban Mixed Use-20 (UMU20, Residential-6 (RES-6) and Suburban Mixed Use-6 (SMU-6). Typical allowable uses in the UMU-20 category include residential, regional scale commercial uses such as a mall, office and business park use, research corporate park uses, light industrial, multi-purpose and clustered residential and/or mixed-use projects at appropriate locations. Projects that are 10 acres or greater within the Urban Mixed Use-20 future land use classification must demonstrate a mix of land uses in accordance with Policy 19.1.
- Typical allowable uses in the RES-6 Future Land Use category include residential, suburban scale neighborhood commercial, office uses, multi-purpose projects and mixed use development. In RES-6, non-residential uses are required to meet established locational criteria for the specific land use requested.
- Typical allowable uses in SMU-6 include residential, suburban scale neighborhood commercial, office uses, research corporate park uses, light industrial multi-purpose and clustered residential and/or mixed use projects at appropriate locations. In SMU-6, Neighborhood Commercial uses must meet locational criteria or be part of larger mixed use planned development. In SMU-6, office uses are not subject to locational criteria. In all three Future Land Use categories, agricultural uses may be permitted pursuant to policies in the agricultural objective areas of the Future Land Use Element.
- The UMU-20 Future Land Use category is located to the southwest and southeast of the subject site as well as to the south along Big Bend Road. RES-6 is located to the east of the subject site and the Residential-4 (RES-4) Future Land Use category is located to the north of the subject site. To the west is Public/Quasi-Public (P/QP), which contains a Hillsborough County park.
- Much of the area contains Planned Development zoning developed with various uses such as multi-family residential housing, light commercial and St. Joe's South hospital. The overall area is one of relative intensity given the proximity of the site to the I-75 and Big Bend Road interchange.
- The applicant is requesting approval of a Planned Development to permit a maximum of 900 multi-family residential units and 285,000 square feet of non-residential development.


## Compliance with Comprehensive Plan:

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

## FUTURE LAND USE ELEMENT

## Urban Service Area (USA)

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

Policy 1.2: Minimum Density All new residential or mixed-use land use categories within the USA shall have a density of 4 du/ga or greater unless environmental features or existing development patterns do not support those densities.

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

Policy 1.4: Compatibility is defined as the characteristics of different uses or activities or design which allow them to be located near or adjacent to each other in harmony. Some elements affecting compatibility include the following: height, scale, mass and bulk of structures, pedestrian or vehicular traffic, circulation, access and parking impacts, landscaping, lighting, noise, odor and architecture. Compatibility does not mean "the same as." Rather, it refers to the sensitivity of development proposals in maintaining the character of existing development.

Objective 7: The Future Land Use Map is a graphic illustration of the county's policies governing the determination of its pattern of development in the unincorporated areas of Hillsborough County through the year 2025.

Policy 7.3: The land use category boundaries may be considered for interpretation as flexible boundaries in accordance with the Flex Provision as follows:

- Through application of the flex provision, the land use category boundaries shall be deemed to extend beyond the precise line to include property adjoining or separated by a man made or natural feature from the existing boundary line.
- The line may be relocated a maximum of 500 feet from the existing land use boundary of the adopted Land Use Plan Map. Right-of-Way is not included in the measurement of the 500 foot flex.
- No new flexes can be extended from an existing flexed area.
- All flexes must be parallel to the land use category line.
- Flexes are not permitted in the Rural Area or in areas specified in Community Plans. Flexes are also not permitted from the Urban Service Area into the Rural Area. All flexes in the Rural Area approved prior to July 2007 are recognized and are not to be considered non-conforming.
- Flexes to increase residential density are not permitted in the Coastal High Hazard Area.
- Flexes are not permitted from a municipality into the unincorporated county.
- A flex must be requested as part of planned development or site plan oriented rezoning application. Major Modification to approved zoning that changes the intensity, density or the range of uses will require that the previous flex request be re-evaluated for consistency and a new flex request may be required.
- Applicants requesting a flex must provide written justification that they meet the criteria for a flex as outlined below.
- The Board of County Commissioners may flex the plan category boundary to recognize or grant a zoning district which is not permitted in the land use category but lies within the distance of a conforming land use category, as described above. Prior to the determination by the Board of County Commissioner, the staff of the Planning Commission
shall make a recommendation on the consistency of the request with the Comprehensive Plan.

Policy 7.4: The criteria for consideration of a flex request are as follows:

- The availability and adequacy of public facilities to serve the proposed development accommodated by the flex;
- The compatibility with surrounding land uses and their density and intensity;
- The utilization of the flex furthers other goals, objectives and policies of the Future Land Use Element.

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

Policy 8.8: For projects whose boundaries encompass more than one land use category, density and intensity calculations will allow for the blending of those categories across the entire project. All portions of the project must be contiguous to qualify for blending. Blending of densities and intensities is not permitted across improved public roadways or between the Urban Service Area (USA) and Rural Service Area (RSA) boundary. The combined total number of dwelling units and/or FAR possible under all the land use categories within the project will be used as a ceiling for review purposes. This provides maximum design flexibility for those projects, because the location or clustering of those units on the project site need not conform to the land use category boundary on the site as long as the maximum number of dwelling units permitted for the entire project are not exceeded.

## Neighborhood/Community Development

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

Policy 16.1: Established and planned neighborhoods and communities shall be protected by restricting incompatible land uses through mechanisms such as:
a) locational criteria for the placement of non-residential uses as identified in this Plan,
b) limiting commercial development in residential land use categories to neighborhood scale;
c) requiring buffer areas and screening devices between unlike land uses;

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

Policy 16.3: Development and redevelopment shall be integrated with the adjacent land uses through:
a) the creation of like uses; or
b) creation of complementary uses; or
c) mitigation of adverse impacts; and
d) transportation/pedestrian connections

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

Policy 16.7: Residential neighborhoods shall be designed to include an efficient system of internal circulation and street stub-outs to connect adjacent neighborhoods together.

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

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

## Mixed Use Land Use Categories

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

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

- Requirements for 2 land uses will apply to properties 10 acres or greater in the RMU-35, UMU-20, and CMU-12 land use categories, and to properties 20 acres or greater in the SMU-6 and NMU-4 land use categories.
- At least $10 \%$ of the total building square footage in the project shall be used for uses other than the primary use.
- The mix of uses may be horizontally integrated (located in separate building). Horizontal integration may also be achieved by utilizing off-site uses of a different type located within $1 / 4$ mile of the project, on the same side of the street of a collector or arterial roadway connected by a continuous pedestrian sidewalk.
- The land uses that may be included in a mixed-use project include: retail commercial, office, light industrial, residential, residential support uses, and civic uses provided that the use is permitted in the land use category.
- These requirements do not apply within $1 / 2$ of a mile of an identified Community Activity Centers (if other mixed-use standards have been adopted for that area or when the project is exclusively industrial).

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

Policy 22.10: The Locational Criteria outlined in Policy 22.2 will not apply in the following instances:

- where proposed neighborhood commercial uses are proposed as part of a Traditional Neighborhood Development meeting the requirements of this plan and the adopted land development regulations for Traditional Neighborhood Development; or
- in large mixed use developments within the mixed use future land use categories (typically over 40 acres in size).


## Interstate 75 Corridor Development

Objective 34: Plan categories for the Interstate 75 corridor shall permit urban level intensities that will encourage mixed use patterns of development.

Policy 34.3: Access to high density/intensity development shall be encouraged to be located onto the county arterial and collector system rather than the state highway system in the I-75 Corridor. This will be accomplished through the promotion of clustering of highest intensity uses with access to the county arterial system, through the review of access points by Florida Department Of Transportation (FDOT) and the requirement that new developments provide sufficient right-of-way for a future county parallel arterial system to serve l-75 Corridor development.

Objective 35: Incentive programs and design sensitive regulations shall be developed and implemented that will promote high quality private and public development, and to assure creative and responsive approaches to the review of development within the l-75 mixed use categories.

Policy 35.4: Encourage high quality site designs through incentives or specific development standards for on-site lighting, perimeter landscaping, and signage.

Policy 35.7: Assure that the integrity of existing residential development is protected through established techniques and the principles of land use transition expressed in this plan.

Policy 35.9: Planned development districts or mixed use standard zoning districts are required for all new rezonings, except as provided for in applicable development regulations.

Objective 36: Employment centers shall be planned throughout the Interstate 75 corridor that will preserve employment opportunities (office and industrial), and residential opportunities shall be limited in each of the plan categories within one mile (east and west) from the Interstate 75 corridor in order to promote opportunities for all segments of the population to live and work within the corridor, regardless of age, sex, race and income.

Policy 36.1: Encourage the inclusion of housing within mixed use projects.
Policy 36.5: Quality employment opportunities (office/industrial) shall be provided within mixed use categories.

Policy 37.4: Encourage pedestrian, bicycle and public transit use amenities in site designs.

## Community Design Component

### 2.1 Mixed Use Development

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

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

## LIVABLE COMMUNITIES ELEMENT

## Riverview Community Plan

Goal 2 Reflect the vision of Riverview using the Riverview District Concept Map. The Riverview District Concept Map will illustrate the unique qualities and land uses related to distinct geographic areas identified as "districts". (See Figure 10)

The following specific districts are incorporated into the Riverview District Concept Map. Require future development and redevelopment to comply with the adopted Riverview District Concept Map.
4. Mixed Use - Focus and direct development toward walkable mixed-use town center locations throughout the community while respecting existing land use.
5. Residential - Encourage attractive residential development that complements the surrounding character and promotes housing diversity.

Goal 4 Provide safe, attractive, efficient multi-modal transportation, including vehicular, bicycle/pedestrian and transit.

Goal 7 Encourage economic development by supporting local business while attracting a variety of new uses and services, particularly high technology businesses.

Goal 9 Attract, locate and support appropriate industry and employment with state-of-the-art infrastructure.

Goal 11 Interconnect districts and public places with concepts for walkability, particularly schools and parks.

- Collaborate with private sector developers, government agencies and non-profit organizations to provide safe roadway, sidewalk and pathway connections, biking and equestrian linkages and other pedestrian amenities.


## Staff Analysis of Goals, Objectives, and Policies:

The applicant is requesting approval of a Planned Development for the purposes of developing the subject site with 900 multi-family residential uses and $\mathbf{2 8 5 , 0 0 0}$ square feet of non-residential uses. Specifically, the proposed non-residential uses are as follows:

- Medical equipment warehouse facility - 150,000 square feet
- Municipal solid waste material recovery facility - 80,000 square feet
- Free standing emergency facility - 25,000 square feet
- Limited retail uses - 30,000 square feet

The site is located within the Urban Service Area (USA). Per Policy 1.2 of the Future Land Use Element (FLUE), sites located in the USA are to be developed at a minimum of 75\% of the allowable density per the land use classification. This request is meeting the intent of

Policy 1.2 by providing a mixed use development with 900 dwelling units and 285,000 square feet of non-residential uses.

The applicant is requesting a flex of the UMU-20 Future Land Use category located within the site to the northern 500 feet of the SMU-6 Future Land Use category, per FLUE Policy 7.3. The size of the flex area is 15.43 acres. For the purpose of density and intensity calculations, the total acreage utilized for UMU-20 is 54.32 , which includes the 38.89 acres designated as UMU-20 on the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) and the 15.43 acres of the flex area. Subtracting the 15.43 acre flex area leaves 25.39 acres of SMU-6. The RES-6 Future Land Use category consists of 0.83 acres.

For the purpose of demonstrating the allowable density and intensity of the subject site, the applicant has provided a table on the site plan dated 08-30-2022 (shown below). The table demonstrates how the requested development is consistent with the density and intensity that is able to be considered in the UMU-20, SMU-6 and RES-6 Future Land Use categories. Per FLUE Policy 8.8, for projects whose boundaries encompass more than one land use category, density and intensity calculations will allow for the blending of those categories across the entire project. When blending the intensity and density of multiple Future Land Use categories within a project, the combined total number of dwelling units and/or FAR possible under all the land use categories within the project will be used as a ceiling for review purposes. This provides maximum design flexibility for those projects, because the location or clustering of those units on the project site need not conform to the land use category boundary on the site as long as the maximum number of dwelling units permitted for the entire project are not exceeded.

Per the table below, 0.83 acres of RES-6 yields up to 4 dwelling units ( 0.83 acres * $6 \mathrm{du} / \mathrm{ga}$ ). The SMU-6 portion of the property that does not contain open water is 21.23 acres, which would yield 127 dwelling units ( 21.23 acres * 6 du/ga). The UMU-20 flex area, 15.43 acres, would yield 308 dwelling units ( 15.43 acres * 20 du/ga). The portion of the UMU-20 area allocated to multi-family residential is 23.9 acres, which would yield 478 dwelling units ( 23.9 acres * $20 \mathrm{du} / \mathrm{ga}$ ). Based upon these calculations, up to 917 dwelling units could be considered for the subject property. With 900 dwelling units proposed, the proposed density is consistent with density expected in the UMU-20, SMU-6 and RES-6 Future Land Use categories.

The remaining acreage of UMU-20 is utilized to calculate the allowable intensity of the proposed non-residential. With 14.99 acres remaining at a 1.0 FAR, up to 652,964 square feet of non-residential uses can be considered for the subject site. With 285,000 square feet proposed, the proposed intensity is consistent with the intensity expected in the UMU20 Future Land Use category.

| Acreage | FLU | FAR | Commercial Available (SF) | DU/AC | DU/AC Available (Units) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.83 | R-6 |  |  | 6 | 4.98 | 4 |
| 4.16 | SMU-6 WATER |  |  | 0 | - | 0 |
| 21.23 | SMU-6 |  |  | 6 | 127.38 | 127 |
| 15.43 | UMU-20 (FLEX) |  |  | 20 | 308.60 | 308 |
| 23.9 | UMU-20 (MF RES PORTION) |  |  | 20 | 478.00 | 478 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 918.96 | 917 |
| 14.99 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { UMU-20 (RETAIL } \\ & \text { PORTION) } \end{aligned}$ | 1.0 | 652,964.4 |  | - |  |
| 80.54 | Proposed Dev | TOTAL | 285,000.0 |  | 900.0 |  |

Per FLUE Policy 7.4, the criteria for consideration of a flex request are: (1) the availability and adequacy of public facilities to serve the proposed development accommodated by the flex; (2) the compatibility with surrounding land uses and their density and intensity; and (3) the utilization of the flex furthers other goals, objectives and policies of the Future Land Use Element. The subject site is located within the Urban Service Area with public facilities nearby to service the development and the proposed development is also compatible with the existing development area in the surrounding area, consistent with FLUE Policy 7.4. The subject site is in an area that contains a wide range of uses including light commercial, multi-family, single family residential and a large hospital complex. The proposed multi-family residential units would provide for a housing option in a mixed use development, consistent with Goal 1 and Objective 1-2 of the Community Design Component, which calls for compact, walkable communities within the Urban Service Area that are supported by employment, goods and services. The project is also consistent with several Goals, Objectives and Policies of the Future Land Use Element and the Riverview Community Plan as described later in this report, fulfilling the third bullet under the Flex Provision.

The proposed Planned Development is consistent with the Neighborhood Protection policies under FLUE Objective 16. Specifically, FLUE Policy 16.1 focuses on the protection of neighborhoods through locational criteria for non-residential uses. Due to the expected intensity of the UMU-20 Future Land Use category, locational criteria is not required for non-residential uses. In addition, per FLUE Policy 22.10, locational criteria does not apply to large mixed use developments within mixed use Future Land Use categories (typically over 40 acres in size). FLUE Policy 16.2 calls for gradual transitions of intensities between land uses. The proposed Planned Development is consistent with this policy direction, as the non-residential land uses are proposed on the southern portion of the site closest to Big Bend Road. This arrangement of uses is also consistent with FLUE Policy 16.5, which seeks to focus more intensive development along arterials and collector roadways, and to areas outside of existing and developing neighborhoods.

FLUE Objective 19 outlines the intent of all mixed-use Future Land Use categories in the Comprehensive Plan. FLUE Policy 19.1 specifically states: "Requirements for 2 land uses will apply to properties 10 acres or greater in the RMU-35, UMU-20, and CMU-12 land use categories, and to properties 20 acres or greater in the SMU-6 and NMU-4 land use categories." Furthermore, according to FLUE Policy 19.1 at least $10 \%$ of the total square
footage of the building must be designated for a second use. The request is consistent with this policy direction by providing for a mix of uses (medical office, retail and multifamily residential). Per Policy 19.2, mixed use projects must demonstrate street connectivity and internal connections between uses. The project will connect to the sidewalk along Big Bend Road and will also be providing internal connections per the Conditions of Approval, consistent with policy direction in FLUE Policy 19.2 as well as FLUE Objective 19.

The proposed Planned Development is also consistent with Objectives and Policies in the Future Land Use Element regarding development in the Interstate 75 corridor. Objective 34 states that plan categories in the l-75 corridor should permit urban level intensities that will encourage a mixed use pattern of development. The proposed mixed use project that will provide for multi-family residential development, medical uses and retail uses meets the intent of the I-75 corridor vision. The provision of housing within the proposed mixed use development is consistent with FLUE Policy 36.1, which encourages the inclusion of housing within mixed use projects. Per FLUE Policy 36.5, employment opportunities such as office and industrial should be provided within mixed use categories. The proposed Planned Development is consistent with this policy direction by providing for $\mathbf{2 5 5 , 0 0 0}$ square feet of medical uses.

The site is located within the limits of the Riverview Community Plan, specifically within the Residential District and the Mixed Use District. The proposed development would support the vision of the Riverview Community Plan by developing residential uses on the northern portion of the site adjacent to existing residential development. The proposed development would also create a mixed use development, consistent with the vision for the Mixed Use District on the Riverview District Concept Map. Providing internal and external pedestrian and vehicular connections is also consistent with the Riverview Community Plan, which calls for providing a safe and efficient multi-modal system within Riverview (Goal 4). The Community Plan also envisions connecting pedestrians with public places such as parks (Goal 11). As this project is adjacent to the Vance V. Vogel park and providing pedestrian access from the subject site to the sidewalks along Big Bend Road, which connects to the park to the west, the proposed project is consistent with the vision of the Riverview Community Plan. The proposed project is also consistent with the Community Plan vision as it relates to economic development. The proposed $\mathbf{2 8 5 , 0 0 0}$ square feet of non-residential development, which includes 255,000 square feet of medical uses and 30,000 square feet of neighborhood serving commercial uses, is in line with the Community Plan's vision to encourage the support of local businesses by attracting a variety of new uses and services.

Overall, the proposed Planned Development would provide for a development pattern that is comparable to the mixed-use development pattern within the surrounding area and meets the intent of the mixed-use policies as well as the vision of the Riverview Community Plan.

## Recommendation

Based upon the above considerations, the Planning Commission staff finds the proposed Planned Development CONSISTENT with the Future of Hillsborough Comprehensive Plan for Unincorporated Hillsborough County, subject to conditions proposed by the Development Services Department.
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This agency has no comments.

This agency has no objection.

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

This agency objects for the reasons set forth below.

## CONDITIONS OF ZONING APPROVAL

## New Conditions

1. Project entitlements shall be split into two phases, for the purposes of enforcement of these zoning conditions. Additional subphases shall be allowed; however, the required transportation improvements must be completed with the initial phase/subphase, and all access restrictions and other requirements shall apply to the entire phase/subphase (i.e. no deferral of requirements will be permitted to a later subphase unless expressly allowed pursuant to these conditions). Additionally, phasing must occur in sequential order (i.e. Phase 2 entitlements cannot be constructed before Phase 1 entitlements), although nothing in this condition shall prohibit the simultaneous construction of Phase 1 and Phase 2 entitlements if all required improvements are in place prior to issuance of any Certificates of Occupancy (temporary or otherwise) for the initial increment of development. Entitlements shall be as follows:
a. Phase 1 Entitlements:
i. 300 multi-family dwelling units; and,
ii. 80,000 s.f. Medical Equipment Recovery/Sterilization Facility, which shall be defined as ___(Zoning staff to insert here) $\qquad$ .
b. Phase 2 Entitlements:
i. 600 multi-family dwelling units;
ii. $\quad 150,000$ s.f. Medical Equipment Warehouse/Distribution Facility, which shall be defined as __(Zoning staff to insert here) $\qquad$ ;
iii. 25,000 s.f. Free Standing Emergency Facility; and,
iv. 30,000 s.f. of certain Limited Retail uses, as further restricted/defined below.
c. Limited Retail Use and Form Restrictions. For the purposes of creating a retail strip plaza, and in accordance with the transportation analysis, the following use and form restrictions shall apply to the retail development.
i. The Limited Retail uses shall be limited to:

| Apparel and Shoe Store | General Business, Such as Retail Goods <br> and Stores |
| :--- | :--- |
| Appliance Stores | Gun Sales |
| Art Supply Store | Hardware Store |
| Automated Teller (ATM) | Jewelry Store |
| Automotive Supply Store | News Stand |
| Bicycle Sales | Novelty and Souvenir Shop |


| Book/Stationary Store, New and Used | Optician/ Optical Supplies |
| :--- | :--- |
| Brew Pub | Pet Shop |
| Camera/Photography Store | Specialty Food Store (7,000 g.s.f. Max.) |
| Eating Establishments (2,000 g.s.f. Max., <br> Coffee/Donut Shops Not Permitted) | Sporting Goods Store |
| Florist Shop | Tobacco Shop |
|  <br> Nuts, Dairy, Delicatessens, Meat Seafood <br> and Produce | Vehicle Part Sales |
| Furniture/Home Furnishings |  |

ii. No freestanding retail uses/ outparcels shall be permitted. Each retail building shall contain multiple tenancies, with no less than three tenants occupying each building.
iii. Drive-through uses shall be prohibited.
2. As generally shown on the PD site plan, the project shall be served by a variety of vehicular and pedestrian access connections. Additional internal connections, whether or not shown on the PD site plan as Conceptual Access connections and whether or not they are to Simmons Rd., the realigned Old Big Bend Rd., or another internal facility, may be approved at the discretion of the Administrator if consistent with these zoning conditions and requested at the time of plat/site/construction plan review and consistent with the access management standards and procedures contained within Section 6.04 of the Hillsborough County Land Development Code (LDC). Additionally:
a. Notwithstanding anything on the PD site plan or herein these conditions to the contrary, bicycle and pedestrian access may be permitted anywhere along the PD boundaries.
b. Project access connections shall be subject to strict phasing requirements as shown on Sheet 2 of 3 or contained herein these conditions. Specifically, access shall be as follows:
i. Phase 1 access shall consist of:

1. One (1) right-in/right-out connection to Big Bend Rd.;
2. Two (2) right/in right-out connections to Simmons Rd. (i.e. stubouts to support future Phase 2 development); and,
3. One (1) connection to the existing Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road east of the project, at the southeast corner of the project.
ii. Phase 2 access shall consist of:
4. Two (2) right-in/right-out connections to Big Bend Rd.;
5. Two (2) right-in/right-out connections to Simmons Rd.; and,
6. One (1) connection to the relocated Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road east of the project, near the project's boundary with the northern portion of folio 77552.0000 .
iii. An additional vehicular access along the northern project boundary with folio 77652.3124 shall be permitted within either Phase 1 or Phase 2. Such access shall only be permitted in the event a public road is constructed within the area designated on the PD site plan along the western project boundary for potential right-of-way preservation.
iv. An optional vehicular and pedestrian access shall be permitted along the project's eastern boundary within folio 77550.0000 , as generally shown on the PD site plan. Such vehicular and pedestrian access may be permitted during either Phase 1 or Phase 2; however, such access shall not be permitted during Phase 1 until the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road has been constructed through the northern portion of folio 77552.0000 , and the existing portions of the Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road east of the project have been removed. Additionally, such access:
7. May occur anywhere within the bounding box shown on the PD site plan, subject to Hillsborough County approval with respect to access spacing and design; and,
8. Shall be subject to the developer obtaining all Hillsborough County, review agency and/or other regulatory and permitting approvals necessary to permit a crossing of the County drainage facility within folio 77550.0000 .
9. As described above, project entitlements are tied to specific access arrangements and required infrastructure improvements within and surrounding the project.
a. Phase 1 Improvements. Prior to the issuance of Certificates of Occupancy (temporary or otherwise) for any Phase 1 Entitlements, the developer of the subject PD shall do the following as a part of its Phase 1 Improvements, as generally shown on Sheet 2 of 3:
i. On Simmons Rd., between existing Old Big Bend Rd. and the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road, construct two (2) 11-foot wide travel lanes and curb, as well all improvements east of the of the northbound travel lane as shown within the "Simmons Rd. (Big Bend Rd. to Old Big Bend Rd. Realigned)" Typical Section depicted on Sheet 3 of 3 of the PD site plan. This may necessitate the developer design the roadway improvements depicted on the rightmost portion of Sheet 3 of 3 of the PD site plan, i.e. the "Simmons Rd. Ultimate Configuration", in order to ensure proper placement when considering the full intersection design and signal modifications.
ii. Between the intersection of Simmons Rd. and the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road and a point $+/-475$ feet north of the intersection, construct an extension of Simmons Rd. to the "Simmons Rd. (North of Old Big Bend Rd. Realigned)" Typical Section depicted on Sheet 3 of 3 of the PD site plan.
iii. Construct the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road between Simmons Rd. and the eastern project boundary in the vicinity of folio 77552.0000 as shown on the PD site plan. The majority of the roadway shall be constructed to the "Old Big Bend Rd. Realigned" Typical Section depicted on Sheet 3 of 3 of the PD site plan; however, to the minimum extent necessary to accommodate transitions to the constrained Typical Section planned for that portion of the relocated roadway within folio 77552.0000, the developer may utilize the "Old Big Bend Rd. Realigned" Alternate Typical Section depicted on Sheet 3 of 3 of the PD site plan.
iv. Construct "Driveway B" between the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road and the existing portions of the Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road east of the project to the "Driveway B" Typical Section depicted on Sheet 3 of 3 of the PD site plan. The developer shall record in the Official Records of Hillsborough County an easement for public access purposes over the "Driveway B" travel lanes and sidewalks. Such easement may be vacated by the County through the delegated authority process upon completion and acceptance of all Phase 2 (Group 1) and Phase 2 (Group 2) improvements.
v. Remove Old Big Bend Rd. between Simmons Rd. and the eastern project boundary and restore the sod.
vi. Construct "Driveway A" between Big Bend Rd. and the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road to the "Driveway A" Typical Section depicted on Sheet 3 of 3 of the PD site plan. The developer shall record in the Official Records of Hillsborough County an easement for public access purposes over the "Driveway B" travel lanes and sidewalks. Such easement may be vacated by the County through the delegated authority process upon completion and acceptance of all Phase 2 (Group 1) and Phase 2 (Group 2) improvements.
vii. Construct a northbound to eastbound right turn lane on Simmons Rd. onto the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road.
viii. Construct a westbound to southbound left turn lane on the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. onto Simmons Rd.
ix. Construct one (1) right-in/right-out connection to Big Bend Rd. (i.e. the "Driveway A" connection).
b. Phase 2 Improvements. The developer shall construct certain improvements as a part of its Phase 2 Improvements obligation, hereafter referred to as "Phase 2 (Group 1) Improvements", as generally shown on Sheet 2 of 3 of the PD site plan. Additional improvements, defined hereinbelow as "Phase 2 (Group 2) Improvements," shall also be completed and accepted by the County for maintenance in order to support Phase 2 Entitlements. These improvements are generally shown on Sheets 2 of 3 and 3 of 3 of the PD site plan. Phase 2 (Group 2) Improvements may be constructed by the developer of this project, or another developer; however, prior to the issuance of Certificates of Occupancy (temporary or otherwise) for any Phase 2 Entitlements, all Phase 1, Phase 2 (Group 1) and Phase 2 (Group 2) Improvements must be completed and accepted by the County for maintenance.
i. With Regards to the Phase 2 (Group 1) Improvements, the developer of the subject PD shall:
10. Design and construct modifications to the existing traffic signal at Big Bend Rd. and Simmons Rd. as necessary to accommodate the opening of the northern leg of the intersection and accommodate all new turning movements, as well as any other geometric improvements at the intersection necessary to facilitate such changes (if any).
11. Convert the eastbound U-turn lane on Big Bend Rd. at its intersection with Simmons Rd. to an eastbound to northbound left turn lane and lengthen the turn lane as defined within the traffic analysis (to be updated at the time of plat/site/construction plan approval).
12. Construct a westbound to northbound right turn lane on Big Bend Rd. onto Simmons Rd.
13. Install/adjust pedestrian crosswalks and signal infrastructure along all four (4) legs of the Big Bend Rd. and Simmons Rd. intersection, as applicable.
14. Construct a second right-in/right-out connection to Big Bend Rd. (i.e. the "Driveway B" connection).
15. Construct a bus bay, transit accessory pad, and bus shelter with trash receptacles, seating and at least one (1) bicycle rack. The location and design of of the bus bay shall be subject to HART (Hillsborough Area Regional Transit) and Hillsborough County approval and may require the developer to dedicate additional right-of-way.
ii. With Regards to the Phase 2 (Group 2) Improvements, the developer of the subject PD or another developer shall:
16. Construct the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road west of Simmons Rd. to a Typical Section standard to be determined.
17. Remove $+/-700$ feet of Old Big Bend Rd. west of Simmons Rd. and resod.
18. Between Big Bend Rd. and the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road, construct all roadway improvements as shown within the "Simmons Rd. Ultimate Configuration" detail on the rightmost portion of Sheet 3 of 3 of the

PD site plan. Notwithstanding anything shown in the "Ultimate Configuration" detail to the contrary, the lengths of turn lanes shall be determined by a transportation analysis, which shall be updated at the time of plat/site/construction plan review.
4. Construct a northbound to westbound left turn lane on Simmons Rd. onto the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road.
5. Construct an eastbound to southbound right turn lane on the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road onto Simmons Rd.
6. Construct a southbound to westbound right turn lane on Simmons Rd. onto Big Bend Rd.
7. Construct dual southbound to eastbound left turn lane on Simmons Rd. onto Big Bend Rd.
8. Between the eastern project boundary and Lincoln Rd. (i.e. through folios 77550.0000 and 77552.0000), construct the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road to the "Old Big Bend Rd. Realigned" Alternate Typical Section depicted on Sheet 3 of 3 of the PD site plan.
9. Construct an eastbound to northbound left turn lane on the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road onto Lincoln Rd.
10. Construct a northbound to westbound left turn lane on Lincoln Rd. onto the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road.
11. Remove those portions of the existing Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road between "Driveway B" and Lincoln Rd. and resod.
c. Notwithstanding anything herein these conditions or on the PD site plan to the contrary, in the event the developer of the subject PD or others completes construction of the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road through folio 77552.0000 to Lincoln Rd. and removes the existing portions of the Old Big bend Rd. frontage road east of the project, the developer shall be permitted to construct the second right-in/right-out access from Driveway B to Big Bend Rd. during Phase 1; however, no additional entitlements shall be granted until all of the Phase 1, Phase 2 (Group 1) and Phase 2 (Group 2) improvements have been constructed and accepted for maintenance, as applicable.
4. In accordance with the Hillsborough County Corridor Preservation Plan, the developer shall preserve a minimum of 64 feet of right-of-way along the project's western boundary as generally shown on PD site plan. Additionally:
a. Until such time as the County may acquire the property to construct transportation improvements envisioned by the Hillsborough County Corridor Preservation Plan, the developer may be permitted to construct access driveways, roadways, parking lots, buffering and screening and other temporary uses consistent with the "Multifamily Building \& Parking Field" designation on the PD site plan, subject to approval by Hillsborough County and compliance with all requirements of Hillsborough County Land Development Code (LDC) Section 5.11.09, governing the Interim Use of Reserved Land.
b. Notwithstanding the above or anything on the PD site plan to the contrary, such preservation shall no longer be required in the event the Hillsborough County Comprehensive Plan is updated to remove the specific corridor triggering the preservation requirement, and in such case the uses and standards applying to the "Proposed Multifamily Building \& Parking Field" area shall govern this portion of the project.
5. The developer of the subject PD shall dedicate and convey to Hillsborough County sufficient right-of-way within the PD boundary necessary to accommodate all Phase 1, Phase 2 (Group 1) and Phase 2 (Group 2) improvements. The developer of the subject PD or other developers shall, if necessary to complete a required improvement, be required to dedicate and convey or otherwise acquire additional right-of-way as necessary to effectuate required Phase 2 (Group 1) and Phase 2 (Group 2) improvements.
6. No parking spaces shall be permitted along "Driveway A" or "Driveway B".
7. All public roadways and certain internal driveways (identified as "Driveway A" and "Driveway B" on the PD site plan), shall be constructed to the Typical Section standards identified on Sheet 3 of 3 and as consistent with any applicable Design Exceptions or other conditions herein these zoning conditions. All other public or private roadways within the project, if any, shall be constructed to Hillsborough County Transportation Technical Manual (TTM) Typical Section standards.
8. If PD 22-0461 is approved, the County Engineer will approve a Design Exception (dated July 26, 2022) for the Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road, which was found approvable by the County Engineer (on September 12, 2022). The Design Exception provides for two (2) Typical Section standards for the portion of the facility within the project, in lieu of the Type TS-4 Typical Section standards required pursuant to the TTM. Conditions governing the use of each Typical Section are contained hereinabove.
9. If PD 22-0461 is approved, the County Engineer will approve a Design Exception (dated July 26, 2022) for Simmons Road which was found approvable by the County Engineer (on September 12, 2022). The Design Exception provides an alternate Typical Section standards within the project in lieu of the TS-4 Section standard required pursuant to the TTM. Conditions governing the use of each Typical Section are contained hereinabove.
10. If PD 22-0461 is approved, the County Engineer will approve a Section 6.04.02.B Administrative Variance (dated July 25, 2022) which was found approvable by the County Engineer (on September 12, 2022) for a portion of the Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road substandard road improvements. Approval of this Administrative Variance will waive certain substandard road improvements required by Section 6.04.03.L. for those portions of the existing Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road west and east of the project boundaries. This approval waives only those improvements required to support Phase 1 of the project. Required improvements to these facilities necessary to support Phase 2 are addressed as a part of the Phase 2 (Group $2)$ improvement conditions hereinabove.
11. If PD 22-0461 is approved, the County Engineer will approve a Section 6.04.02.B Administrative Variance (dated July 26, 2022) which was found approvable by the County Engineer (on September 12, 2022) from the Section 6.04.03.I. LDC requirements governing Tract 3. Approval of this variance will permit two (2) vehicular access connections to Simmons Rd. from Tract 3, whereas only one (1) is permitted by the LDC. Conditions governing these and other project access connections are included hereinabove.
12. The developer shall be permitted to request additional Section 6.04.02.B. Administrative Variances from the Section 6.04.03.I. LDC requirements governing number of required access connections, as well as the Section 6.04.07 LDC requirements governing spacing of required access connections, at the time of plat/site/construction plan review for those "additional internal connections" referenced in Condition 2, hereinabove. Such reviews and approval may occur outside of the zoning modification process but shall be processed concurrently with the site/construction plan permit for the phase or subphase being developed.
13. All PD zoning conditions herein shall be considered Critical Design Features. As such, modification of any condition shall be subject to the rules and regulations outlined within Section 5.03.07.A. of the LDC.

## Other Conditions

- Prior to PD Site Plan Certification, the developer shall revise the PD site plan to:
- On all sheets, remove the word "Extension" from Simmons Rd.
- Modify the "Driveway B" Typical Section on Sheet 3 of 3 to add minimum 5-foot wide sidewalks on both sides of the roadway, separated from the back of curb by 5 -foot wide green strips. Add a footnote applying to the sidewalk on the east side of the roadway. Footnote shall state "The
sidewalk along east side of road is optional; however, such sidewalk shall be constructed together with any vehicular access constructed within the "Potential Access Area" as shown on Sheet 1 of PD site plan (i.e. the optional access to/across folio 77550.0000)."
- On Sheet 2 of 3, replace the three (3) references stating "By the 22-0461 Developer" to instead state "By the Developer of the Subject PD".
- For all Typical Sections on Sheet 3 of 3, ensure all individual components are labeled. For example, label the 5 -foot wide and 1 -foot wide areas as "Grass Strip". On the "Driveway A" and "Driveway B" Typical Sections, ensure that it is labeled as "Type F curb and gutter".
- On Sheet 3 of 3, please ensure label stating "Simmons Rd. Ultimate Configuration (Includes Phase 2 Group 2 Improvements)" is prominently shown. It should appear either at the top or bottom of the graphic. Consider placing it above the note near the top left corner of the graphic, with a bold font that is at least as large as the other text in the graphic.
- On Sheet 2 of 3, add to the "Phase 2 Improvements (Group 2)" list a new item stating "Developer or others to construct eastbound to northbound left turn lane on realigned Old Big Bend Rd. onto Lincoln Rd."
- On Sheet 2 of 3 , modify note 4 and 5 within the "Phase 1 Improvements" list. These incorrectly state these will be constructed to the Type TS-3 non-residential standard. Replace instances stating "Roadway" with "Driveway" within the first two sentences. Replace the last sentence with a sentence stating "Developer to construct to the Typical Section standard shown on Sheet 3 of 3."
- On Sheet 2 of 3, add to the "Phase 2 Improvements (Group 1)" list a new item stating, "Developer to construct a transit bus bay, shelter and amenities - see zoning conditions."
- On Sheet 1 of 3, modify the graphic depiction of the potential access area bounding box such that its southernmost extent runs to the limits of the southern PD boundary.


## PROJECT SUMMARY AND TRANSPORTATION ANALYSIS

The applicant is requesting to three multiple parcels, totaling +/- 80.54 acres, from Agricultural Rural (AR), and Planned Development (PD) \#04-1820 to PD. The existing PD current has approval for a 360,000 s.f. hospital with a maximum of 250 beds, 240,000 s.f. of attached (to the hospital) medical office space, and 60,000 s.f. of detached medical office uses. The applicant is proposing entitlements for the new PD consisting of the following uses at buildout:

- 900 multi-family dwelling units;
- 150,000 s.f. of Medical Equipment Warehouse/Distribution Facility uses;
- 80,000 s.f. Medical Equipment Recovery/Sterilization Facility uses;
- 25,000 s.f. Free Standing Emergency Facility uses; and,
- 30,000 s.f. of certain Limited Retail uses, as further described below.

The applicant did not provide a list of the retail uses being requested, and utilized a very specific Land Use Code (LUC) from the Institute of Transportation Engineer's Trip Generation Manual data within its traffic study which analyzed project impacts. Given that the applicant utilized LUC 822, which is for a "Strip Retail Plaza Less Than 40,000 s.f.", transportation staff undertook a two-step process to ensure the uses being sought matched those studied in their analysis. First, transportation and zoning section staff undertook an analysis to pare down the list of Commercial Neighborhood uses within the LDC to identify only those deemed to be retail (consistent with the applicant's request). Transportation staff then examined the trip generation rates for each of these specific uses and compared it to the rates for LUC 822 to determine whether or not those could reasonably occur within a strip center.

As a hypothetical example, while it is natural to assume based on the colloquial use of the term "strip retail plaza" a supermarket may occur within such plaza, if a smaller Publix store of 35,000 s.f. were to be located within such plaza, that would leave only 5,000 s.f. for other uses within ITE's " 40,000 s.f. strip plaza". Supermarkets generate 8.95 trips per 1,000 s.f. in the p.m. peak hour, office generates 1.15 trips per 1,000 s.f. in the p.m. peak hour, and "strip retail plazas" generate 6.59 trips per 1,000 s.f. in the p.m. peak hour. These two uses individually analyzed would generate 319 p.m. peak hour trips, while utilizing LUC 822 would indicate only 264 p.m. peak hour trips should be generated. It is therefore mathematically improbable, if not impossible, for a traditional supermarket of smaller to average size to exist in this configuration with other low intensity uses (office in the above example) and generate equal to or less than the trip rates for ITE LUC 822. This conflict exists across many use examples and within all three periods analyzed (i.e. average daily trip rates, a.m. peak hour rates and p.m. peak hour rates). Other uses are far more problematic. For example, fast-food restaurants without drive-through facilities generate 25.1 a.m. peak hour trips per 1,000 s.f. and 48.7 p.m. peak hour trips per 1,000 s.f. When incorporating such uses into a strip shopping center it becomes easy to see the mathematical challenges involved.

In order to address the above issue, transportation staff disallowed certain uses which would likely cause the project to generate more traffic than was otherwise studied. Staff also imposed certain size restrictions on certain uses, as well as form restrictions. For example, there is no enforceable way to restrict certain high trip intensive restaurant chains by name. Anecdotally, many small "mom and pop" restaurants generate far fewer trips than chain establishments. While not always the case, these smaller, less intense establishments often occupy smaller areas than other restaurant types. Instead of disallowing all restaurants, staff instituted a cap of 2,000 s.f. of restaurant uses to attempt to provide some level of restaurant use within a strip retail plaza while staying within the average rates provided by ITE. Staff notes that coffee/donut shops tend have much smaller average sizes compared to other eating establishments (as well as much higher trip rates, particularly in the a.m. peak hour), and so those uses were disallowed.

Staff does not object to the inclusion of such uses for this project; however, given the importance and sensitivity of trip impacts to the infrastructure network in this area as further discussed below in various sections, it is critical that the uses be carefully analyzed to ensure a worst-case scenario was examined. Based on the above analysis, staff determined specific uses and thresholds which were incorporated into the proposed zoning conditions, provided hereinabove.

Since the project will generate more than 50 peak hour trips at buildout, a detailed transportation analysis is required per the Development Review Procedures Manual (DRPM). Due to the unique configuration of area infrastructure and their sensitivity to transportation impacts, as required by staff the applicant submitted a transportation analysis that was more comprehensive and detailed than is typically received for projects in the rezoning stage of the development process. Multiple meetings were held with the applicant's consultant to develop an appropriate methodology for the analysis. Given safety issues that could be created by failing to relocate (as discussed in more detail below) the Old Big Bend Rd. and Simmons Rd. intersection far enough to the north, as well as the County's desire to ensure that operations of both the relocated intersection and the newly opened northern leg of the existing Big Bend Rd. and Simmons Loop intersection (also described further below) does not unduly impact the functioning of Big Bend Rd., the transportation analysis examined impacts of and capacity available for traffic to/from this and other projects.

The applicant is proposing a two (2) phase project, with 300 dwelling units and 80,000 s.f. Medical Equipment Recovery/Sterilization Facility to occur within the first phase, and all remaining entitlements to occur within the second phase. A detailed description of project phasing has been included below.

## Status of Adjacent PD to the West (PD 18-0996)

Staff notes that there is a pending PD to the west of this project which will directly impact the Simmons and Big Bend Rd. intersection, and from which land is needed to construct all improvements necessary to support Phase 2 of this project. That project, PD 18-0996, was the subject of a potential Mobility Fee

Alternative Satisfaction Agreement (MFASA) but was delayed due to previously pending litigation. That project is seeking approval for up to 160,000 s.f. of Commercial General (CG) uses; however, the amount of uses that could ultimately be developed for that project was limited based upon a proposed condition, developed based upon the traffic analysis performed at the time. That condition would limit their traffic to a cumulative total of 818 a.m. peak hour trips and 762 p.m. peak hour trips. As mentioned previously, the adjacent project is currently in a holding pattern (i.e. it has been heard by the Zoning Hearing Master but is not being permitted to move forward to the Board of County Commissioners) due to the fact that negotiations surrounding several key agreements which included various land exchanges, right-of-way vacations, and other details were never finalized. Perhaps more importantly, in the $4+$ years since this project was last reviewed, design of the Big Bend Rd. I-75 interchange project has advanced and there have been substantial changes which no longer make it possible for the County to support the right-in/right-out access from that project to Big Bend Rd. Given the age of that project and uncertain nature of its moving forward, the applicant of the subject PD did not include these assumptions as background traffic in the proposed analysis. Given the above, if that adjacent project ever chooses to resume the planning process, it will be necessary for the project to make substantial modifications to its proposal and provide revised data and analysis.

That adjacent project was also reliant upon a land exchange agreement with the Parks Department in order to facilitate the proposed configuration of the Old Big Bend Rd. realignment west of Simmons Rd. shown on that PD. The Parks Department has indicated that there have been changes to Comprehensive Plan policies which will necessitate a reevaluation of the previous proposals to determine if they are still supportable, and/or if the roadway alignment needs to shift. Given this, staff did not assume that the previous alignment of Old Big Bend Rd. west of Simmons as a fixed point, and notes that future planning efforts within that adjacent PD will need to realign to match the proposed alignment within the subject PD.

## Trip Generation Comparison

Staff has prepared a comparison (generally consistent with the applicant's analysis) of the potential number of peak hour trips generated under the existing and proposed zoning designations, utilizing a generalized worst-case scenario. Data shown below is based on the $11^{\text {th }}$ Edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineer's Trip Generation Manual.

Existing Zoning:

| Land Use/Size | 24 Hour Two- <br> Way Volume | Total Peak <br> Hour Trips |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | PM |  |
| PD, 250 Bed Hospital <br> (ITE Code 610) | 3,877 | 295 | 310 |
| PD, 300,000 s.f. Medical Office Uses <br> (ITE Code 720) | 9,558 | 804 | 852 |
| AR, 8 Single-Family Detached Dwelling Units <br> (ITE Code 210) | 76 | 6 | 8 |
|  | Total: | $\mathbf{1 3 , 5 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 1 0 5}$ |

Proposed Zoning:

| Land Use/Size | 24 Hour Two- <br> Way Volume | Total Peak <br> Hour Trips |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | PM |  |
| PD, 900 Multi-Family Dwelling Units <br> (ITE Code 221) | 4,086 | 333 | 351 |
| PD, 150,000 s.f. Medical Equipment Warehouse <br> Uses (ITE Code 150) | 275 | 42 | 44 |
| PD, 80,000 s.f. Medical Equipment Recovery/ <br> Sterilization Facility (ITE Code 140) | 504 | 58 | 52 |
| PD, 25,000 s.f. Free Standing Emergency Room <br> (ITE Code 650) | 624 | 28 | 38 |


| PD, 30,000 s.f. Strip Retail Plaza <40k s.f. <br> (ITE Code 822) | 1,634 | 71 | 170 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total: | $\mathbf{7 , 1 2 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 3 2}$ |

Difference:

| Land Use/Size | 24 Hour TwoWay Volume | Total Peak Hour Trips |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | AM | PM |
| Total: | (-) 6,388 | (-) 573 | (-) 515 |

## TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE SERVING THE SITE

Big Bend Rd. is a publicly maintained 4-lane, divided, arterial roadway characterized by $+/-12$-foot wide travel lanes in average condition. There are bicycle facilities (on paved shoulders) present on Big Bend Rd. in the vicinity of the proposed project. There are $+/-5$-foot wide sidewalks along the south side of Big Bend Rd. in the vicinity of the proposed project.

Old Big Bend Rd. is a publicly maintained 2-lane, undivided, substandard, local roadway characterized by +/- 11-foot wide travel lanes in below average condition. There are no sidewalks or bicycle facilities on Old Big Bend Rd. in the vicinity of the proposed project. Although the frontage road is presently classified as a local roadway, staff considers it to be a collector roadway due to the way it currently functions and, more importantly, the fact that existing + future volumes exceed the local roadway capacity.

Big Bend Rd. and Old Big Bend Rd. (which acts as a frontage roadway to Big Bend Rd.) lies within a shared $+/-260$-foot wide right-of-way along the project's frontage. Along the project's frontage, Big Bend Rd. is shown on Hillsborough County Corridor Preservation Plan as a future 6-lane roadway. Although there is no typical section for 6-lane roadways, the minimum right-of-way necessary is calculated by taking the typical section for a 4-lane divided roadway (TS-6 within the Hillsborough County Transportation Technical Manual), which requires a minimum of 110 feet of right-of-way, and to which an additional 24 feet is added for the additional two lanes (for a total of 134 feet of right-of-way required).

Based upon the transportation analysis submitted by the applicant as well as the existing and proposed corridor configuration, staff believes that a worst-case planning-level scenario for right-of-way needs (along the project frontage) related to the 6-laning of Big Bend Rd. and any needed turn lanes includes:

- 134 feet for 6-lane facility (per above);
- 12 feet for any existing or required westbound to northbound right turn lane; and,
- 12 feet for any existing eastbound to southbound right turn lane.

It appears that sufficient right-of-way exists to accommodate the 158 feet of right-of-way needed to accommodate future widening, as further described above. Additionally, the applicant is proposing to relocate a portion of the frontage road (Old Big Bend Rd.) north of its present location. Lastly, staff notes that the Big Bend Rd. widening project (CIP Project Number 69647000) has not identified the need for any additional right-of-way from the subject property.

Simmons Rd. is a publicly maintained 2-lane, undivided, substandard, local roadway characterized by +/10 to 12 feet of pavement in average condition. The roadway lies within a variable width right-of-way (between approximately 25 and 45 feet in width). There are no sidewalks or bicycle facilities along Simons Rd. While the portion of the roadway north of Big Bend Rd. is known as Simmons Rd., the roadway is named Simmons Loop south of Big Bend Rd. (where it exists as a 2-lane collector roadway that connects to US 301). Simmons Rd./Simmons Loop is shown on the Hillsborough County Corridor Preservation Plan as a future 2-lane roadway that extends north to Gibsonton Dr. and south to Paseo Al

Mar Blvd. As such, the developer will be required to preserve a minimum of 64 feet of right-of-way (from its southern property boundary to its northern property boundary) to accommodate a 2-lane, urban, collector roadway. Staff notes that the improvements required/shown on the PD site plan will result in a greater preservation than this minimum requirement. In the event the Corridor Preservation Plan is updated to remove the facility, at the applicant's request staff has conditioned the project to allow for this requirement to be removed from the PD without requiring a zoning modification.

Lincoln Rd. is a publicly maintained 2-lane, undivided, substandard (for non-residential purposes), local roadway characterized by $+/-10$-foot wide travel lanes in average to below average condition. Lincoln Rd., similar to Cowley Rd. at its northern terminus, is functioning as a collector roadway. The roadway lies within a $+/-95$-foot wide right-of-way. There are no bicycle facilities or sidewalks present on Lincoln Rd. in the vicinity of the proposed project. Although the road is presently classified as a local roadway, staff considers it to be a collector roadway due to the fact that existing + future volumes exceed the local roadway capacity.

## SITE ACCESS

The site is presently accessed via Old Big Bend Rd. and Lincoln Rd. The only access to/from Big Bend Rd. is via Old Big Bend Rd. to Lincoln Rd. (to the east) or via Old Big Bend Rd. to the access road separating East Bay High School and Eisenhower Middle School (approximately 1 mile west of the subject site). Traffic traveling to/from the north would currently utilize Bullfrog Creek Rd.
(approximately 2,500 feet west of the subject site). The County previously closed the northern leg of the Simmons Loop and Big Bend Rd. intersection due to safety issues created by its proximity to the Simmons Rd. and Old Big Bend Rd. intersection.

The applicant is proposing two (2) right-in/right-out access connections to Big Bend Rd. at project buildout. The applicant is also proposing to reopen the northern leg of the intersection, which will require relocation of Old Big Bend Rd. such that the new Old Big Bend Rd. and Simmons Loop intersection is located $+/-800$ feet from the existing Simmons Loop and Big Bend Rd. intersection. Realignment of the portion of this roadway west of Simmons Rd. to a safe location that can accommodate future anticipated traffic (both sub-regional and local) will require impact to the adjacent properties (to the west), currently in the zoning process via pending PD 18-0996, and the preferred alignment for which would necessitate use of certain parcels owned by Hillsborough County and partially in use as the Vance Vogel Sports Complex (those portions west of Bullfrog Creek).

Although this roadway relocation is being proposed by the Developer in order to enhance access to their proposed project, this project is necessary in order to facilitate construction of a portion of a new north/south 2-lane roadway (which is planned between Gibsonton Dr. and Paseo al Mar Blvd.). This new roadway is identified on Hillsborough County Corridor Preservation Plan (found within the adopted Hillsborough County Comprehensive Plan, and adopted as Map 25).

Issues related to various elements of the site access plan are discussed below. It should be noted that that specific proposed roadway configuration/geometries have not gone through engineering level design/ review. As such, small deviations may be necessary at the time of plat/site/construction plan approval.

## Right-in/Right-Out Access Spacing on Big Bend Rd.

Along this section of Big Bend Rd., Section 6.04.07 of the LDC provides that the minimum spacing for a right-in/right-out connection along this segment is 245 feet. Additionally, while these connections will be located within $1 / 4$-mile of the nearest Interstate 75 on/off ramp (which triggers special spacing standards within the LDC), they are located east of the first access connection (i.e. the Simmons Rd. intersection). In consultation with the County Engineer, staff has determined that a minimum spacing standard of 400 feet is appropriate for access connections along this portion of the corridor. The proposed project has been designed such that all access connections meet or exceed this standard.

## Other Access Locations/Spacing

Given the large project acreage, complex design issues, lack of identified end users, and the bubble plan nature of the proposed zoning, staff was unable to determine at this stage in the development process. how many access connections might be needed, where they might be located, and/or whether they could be supported; however, in addition to the Big Bend Rd. project access, certain other project access connections were deemed to be critical to the safe and efficient functioning of the project (i.e. those connections on Simmons Rd. between Big Bend Rd. and the relocated Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road). Additionally, the external connection along the eastern project boundary in the vicinity of folio 77552.0000 is a critical access connection whose location has been predetermined. These connections are shown as black arrows on the PD site plan. Other conceptual connections have been shown with different symbology. Staff has included a condition allowing the applicant to propose certain other additional access connections where or not conceptually shown (and request Section 6.04.02.B. Administrative Variances) from the Section 6.04.03.I. and 6.04.07 LDC standards, if necessary, at the time of plat/site/construction plan review.

## Northern Leg of Simmons Loop/Simmons Rd. and Big Bend Rd. Intersection

The applicant is proposing to open the northern leg of the Simmons Rd. and Big Bend Rd. intersection. This will require reconfiguration of the existing traffic signal as well as a number of physical improvements to ensure the intersection operates safely and efficiently given the substantial amount of future development which is anticipated on both the northwest and northeast corners of the Simmons Rd. and Big Bend Rd. intersection.

The applicant's transportation analysis and staff review indicate a need for the following improvements on Simmons Rd. at its intersection with Big Bend Rd.:

1. Dual, dedicated, southbound to eastbound dedicated left turn lanes;
2. A single, dedicated, southbound to westbound right turn lane; and,
3. A single, dedicated, southbound through lane.

The applicant's transportation analysis and staff review indicate a need for the following improvements on Simmons Rd. at its relocated intersection with Old Big Bend Rd.:

1. A single, dedicated, northbound to eastbound right turn lane;
2. A single, dedicated, northbound to westbound left turn lane; and,
3. A single, dedicated, northbound through lane.

The location of the relocated Old Big Bend Rd. and Simmons Rd. intersection has been pushed as far north as possible to maximize the available queuing and stacking distances (for both northbound and southbound traffic). This will maximize the likelihood that other area development can obtain additional density and intensity, as well as accommodate general background traffic growth, without negatively impacting either of the adjacent intersections.

## Old Big Bend Rd. Realignment and Simmons Rd.

As discussed above, relocation of the Simmons Rd. and Old Big Rd. intersection is necessary in order to reopen the northern leg of the Simmons Loop/ Simmons Rd. and Big Bend Rd. intersection. Given the location of Simmons Loop south of Big Bend Rd., any extension of the roadway will require additional right-of-way from the owners of folios within the adjacent pending PD to the west.

Given that engineering level design of the improvements has not occurred, staff was unable to provide an exact amount of right-of-way that will be required to accommodate the reconstruction of Simmons Rd. and opening of the northern leg of the intersection. Staff has proposed conditions of approval that require the applicant to dedicate and convey or otherwise acquire whatever right-of-way is necessary to construct the required improvements necessary to achieve full project buildout. Staff notes that a specific breakdown of obligations and requirements by project phase is included hereinbelow.

As the above developer-proposed improvements will cure the substandard condition of Simmons Rd. and Old Big Bend Rd., the typical substandard road condition language was substituted for the more specific conditions proposed hereinabove.

## Old Big Bend Rd. East to Lincoln Rd., and Adjacent PD 22-0567

The applicant is proposing to construct the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road such that it terminates along the eastern project boundary in the vicinity of the location of its ultimate planned extension eastward to Lincoln Rd. (across folio 77550.0000 and through the northern portion of folio 77552.0000 ). Folio 77552.0000 is included within pending PD 22-0567, whose developers have been in discussions with both the developer of the subject PD and County staff. In the future, should this adjacent PD not move forward or should provisions for extension of the roadway through this portion of the northern folio not be made, Phase 2 of the project would not be constructible (since the development traffic could not be safely accommodated and zoning obligations unable to be met).

In the interim (i.e. during Phase 1) the developer will construct Driveway B to provide an interim connection between the existing portions of Old Big Bend Rd. east of the project and the realigned Old Big Bend Rd. frontage Rd. In order to ensure the public has a right to travel on the facility, the developer will be required to provide a public access easement over the vehicular and pedestrian facilities comprising Driveway B. The facility has been designed (and the PD conditioned) to safely accommodate through traffic (i.e. no parking can occur along the driveway, and the design provides for a greater driveway separation than might otherwise be permitted).

These existing portions of Old Big Bend Rd. east of the project will be removed during Phase 2.

## PROJECT PHASING

Phase 1/ Lincoln Rd. Issues
As mentioned above, due to the unique configuration of existing roadway geometry, and the nature of the proposed development, it was necessary for the applicant to propose a multi-phase project. The first phase will accommodate up to 300 multi-family dwelling units and 80,000 s.f. Medical Equipment Recovery/Sterilization Facility uses.

The applicant's transportation study analyzed the impacts related to this first phase. Given the safety and operational issues at the existing Lincoln Rd. and Old Big Bend Rd. intersection, staff informed the applicant that it could not support any increment of development which intensified traffic for any turning movement at this intersection. The applicant's analysis indicated that construction of Driveway A in Phase 1 will result in a rerouting of a portion of traffic from the existing Lincoln Rd. and Old Big Bend Rd. intersection to the newly created Big Bend Rd. and Driveway A intersection. These displaced trips will allow the additional trips generated by the Phase 1 increment of development to occur without impacting the intersection. In order to ensure the public has a right to travel on the facility, the developer will be required to provide a public access easement over the vehicular and pedestrian facilities comprising Driveway A. The facility has been designed (and the PD conditioned) to safely accommodate through traffic (i.e. no parking can occur along the driveway, and the design provides for a greater driveway separation than might otherwise be permitted).

## Phase 2

All remaining entitlements have been relegated to Phase 2. Staff has proposed conditions governing the sequential nature of the phasing and ensuring other details and expectations are clear. A variety of transportation improvements have been identified as necessary to support Phase 2 entitlements. These have been split into two groups, the Phase 2 (Group 1) Improvements, and the Phase 2 (Group 2) Improvements. Group 1 improvements are those which are required to be constructed by the developer of the subject PD. Group 2 improvements are required to be constructed by this developer or another developer prior to issuance of any Certificates of Occupancy for Phase 2 entitlements. Group 2 improvements require dedication of land by this and other developers, or the acquisition of land currently owned by other developers by the developer of the subject PD. Should that not occur, the developer of
the subject PD will be unable to construct the required improvements. Should another developer decline to construct the required Group 2 improvements, then Phase 2 of this project is unconstructible. A detailed list of required Phase 1, Phase 2 (Group 1) and Phase 2 (Group 2) improvements can be found within the PD conditions and on the PD site plan.

## ADMINISTRATIVE VARIANCE \#1 - OLD BIG BEND RD. - SUBSTANDARD ROAD

As Old Big Bend Rd. is a substandard roadway, the applicant's Engineer of Record (EOR) submitted a Section 6.04.02.B Administrative Variance (dated July 25, 2022) which was found approvable by the County Engineer (on September 12, 2022) for a portion of the Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road substandard road improvements. Approval of this Administrative Variance will waive certain substandard road improvements required by Section 6.04.03.L. for those portions of the existing Old Big Bend Rd. frontage road west and east of the project boundaries. This approval waives only those improvements required to support Phase 1 of the project. Required improvements to these facilities necessary to support Phase 2 are addressed as a part of the Phase 2 (Group 2) improvement conditions hereinabove.

If PD 22-0461 is approved, the County Engineer will approve the Administrative Variance.

## ADMINISTRATIVE VARIANCE \#2 - NUMBER OF ACCESS CONNECTIONS

The applicant's Engineer of Record (EOR) submitted a Section 6.04.02.B Administrative Variance (dated July 26, 2022) which was found approvable by the County Engineer (on September 12, 2022) from the Section 6.04.03.I. LDC requirements governing Tract 3. Approval of this variance will permit two (2) vehicular access connections to Simmons Rd. from Tract 3, whereas only one (1) is permitted by the LDC. Conditions governing these and other project access connections are included hereinabove.

If PD 22-0461 is approved, the County Engineer will approve the Administrative Variance.

## DESIGN EXCEPTION \#1 - OLD BIG BEND RD. FRONTAGE RD. TYPICAL SECTIONS

The applicant's Engineer of Record (EOR) submitted a Design Exception (dated July 26, 2022) which was found approvable by the County Engineer (on September 12, 2022) from the Typical Section - 4 (TS-4) standards governing urban collector roadways. The Design Exception provides for two (2) Typical Section standards for the portion of the facility within the project, in lieu of the Type TS-4 Typical Section standards required pursuant to the Transportation Technical Manual (TTM). The requested changes include utilization of 10 -foot wide multi-purpose pathways in lieu of the 5 -foot wide sidewalks and 7 -foot wide buffered bicycle facilities required pursuant to TS-4. Conditions governing the use of each Typical Section are contained hereinabove.

If PD 22-0461 is approved, the County Engineer will approve the Design Exception.

## DESIGN EXCEPTION \#2 - SIMMONS RD. TYPICAL SECTION

The applicant's Engineer of Record (EOR) submitted a Design Exception (dated July 26, 2022) which was found approvable by the County Engineer (on September 12, 2022) from the Typical Section - 4 (TS-4) standards governing urban collector roadways. The Design Exception provides for an alternate Typical Section standard for the facility, in lieu of the Type TS-4 Typical Section standards required pursuant to the Transportation Technical Manual (TTM). The requested changes include utilization of 10 -foot wide multi-purpose pathways in lieu of the 5 -foot wide sidewalks and 7 -foot wide buffered bicycle facilities required pursuant to TS-4. Conditions governing the use of each Typical Section are contained hereinabove.

If PD 22-0461 is approved, the County Engineer will approve the Design Exception.

## ROADWAY LEVEL OF SERVICE

Level of Service (LOS) information for adjacent roadway sections is reported below. Lincoln Rd. and Old Big Bend Rd. are not included in the LOS report. As such, no data for these facilities could be provided.

| Roadway | From | To | LOS <br> Standard | Peak Hour <br> Directional <br> LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Big Bend Rd. | I-75 N Ramp | US 301 | D | C |

Source: Hillsborough County 2020 Level of Service Report.

## Project Number: 69657000

## Quick Facts

- Community Area: Gibsonton
- Project Type: Roadway Corridor Improvements

Current Phase


- Current Project Phase: Construction
- Commissioner District: District 4


## Estimated Project Schedule

- Project Development (Planning) Completion - Early 2020
- Design/Land Acquisition Completion - N/A
- Procurement Completion - N/A
- Construction Duration - Mid 2021 to Mid 2025
- Closeout - Early 2026

Project Cost Estimate

- Total: \$81,970,530
- Planning: \$0
- Design and Land: \$270,530
- Construction: \$81,700,000

Joint design-build project with FDOT. FDOT to contribute $\$ 20$ million to the County. Estimate includes $\$ 12$ million for wastewater facilities. May: Bonds, FDOT Grant, Financing, Utilities, and Impact Fees

## Project Description

- Big Bend Rd from Covington Gardens Dr to Simmons Loop will be widened from a 4-lane to a 6-lane divided road with enhanced bike, pedestrian and bus facilities, with reconfiguration and improvements to the ramps. Improvements to be designed and constructed by Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT). - Other improvements include reconstruction of the bridges on Old Big Bend Rd and Big Bend Rd, signal improvements at Covington Gardens Dr and Simmons Loop, and increasing stormwater drainage.


## Project Objectives

- Increase the overall mobility along Big Bend Rd and I-75, while maximizing safety along the corridor.
- Better accommodate growth and traffic volume.


## Questions?

Santos, Manuel
Project Manager
(813) 635-5400


Hillsborough County Florida

Big Bend Road Widening - US 41 to Covington Gardens Drive and Simmons Loop to US Hwy 301
Capital Improvement Program Project Fact Sheet Project Number: 69647000

## Quick Facts

- Community Area: Multiple
- Project Type: Roadway Corridor Improvements

Current Phase


- Current Project Phase: Design
- Commissioner District: Multiple


## Estimated Project Schedule

- Project Development (Planning) Completion - Mid 2021
- Design/Land Acquisition Completion - Late 2023
- Procurement Completion - Early 2024
- Construction Duration - Early 2024 to Late 2025

Project Cost Estimate

- Total: \$60,051,118
- Planning: \$1,816,186
- Design and Land: \$5,028,901
- Construction: \$53,206,031

May include: Impact Fees, Grants, Mobility Fees, Financing, Bond and Undetermined

## Project Description

- Corridor improvement for Big Bend Rd from US 41 to Covington Gardens Dr and from Simmons Loop to US 301 from a 4-lane divided road to a 6-lane divided road with enhanced bike, pedestrian and bus facilities.
- Enhance pedestrian safety features, including wide sidewalks and enhanced crosswalks and signals.

Stormwater drainage will also be improved.

## Project Objectives

- Better accommodate growth and traffic volume.
- Increase the overall mobility along Big Bend Road, while maximizing safety along the corridor.


## Questions?

Santos, Manuel
Project Manager
(813) 635-5400


## Ratliff, James

| From: | Williams, Michael |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Monday, September 12, 2022 3:12 PM |
| To: | Steven Henry |
| Cc: | Truett Gardner; Ryan Hileman; Heinrich, Michelle; Ratliff, James; PW-CEIntake |
| Subject: | FW: RZ PD 22-0461- DE and AV Review |
| Attachments: | 22-0461 AVReq 07-26-22_1_Substandard Road Old Big Bend Phase 1.pdf; 22-0461 AVReq 07-26-22_ |
|  | 2_Number of Accesses Big Bend.pdf; 22-0461 DEReq 07-26-22_1_Substandard Road Old Big |
|  | Bend.pdf; 22-0461 DEReq 07-26-22_2_Substandard Road Simmoons Loop Extension.pdf |

Steve,
I have found the attached Section 6.04.02.B. Administrative Variances (AV) and Design Exceptions (DE) for PD 22-0461 APPROVABLE with Conditions. The Condition being that Retail uses will be restricted to those allowed in the PD.

Please note that it is you (or your client's) responsibility to follow-up with Transportation staff 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 PWCEIntake@hillsboroughcounty.org

Mike

Michael J. Williams, P.E.

## Director, Development Review

## County Engineer

Development Services Department

P: (813) 307-1851
M: (813) 614-2190
E: Williamsm@HillsboroughCounty.org
W: HCFLGov.net

Hillsborough County
601 E. Kennedy Blvd., Tampa, FL 33602

From: Tirado, Sheida [TiradoS@hillsboroughcounty.org](mailto:TiradoS@hillsboroughcounty.org)
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2022 2:57 PM
To: Williams, Michael [WilliamsM@HillsboroughCounty.ORG](mailto:WilliamsM@HillsboroughCounty.ORG)
Subject: RZ PD 22-0461- DE and AV Review
Importance: High

Hello Mike,

The attached DEs and AVs can be considered AWC. If you agree the Condition will be: Retail uses will be restricted to the allowed by PD 22-061 restrictions. In your email please include:
shenry@lincks.com
tgardner@gardnerbrewer.com
rhileman@bohlereng.com
heinrichm@hillsboroughcounty.org
ratliffja@hillsboroughcounty.org

Best Regards,

Sheida L. Tirado, PE (she/her/hers)
Transportation Review Manager
Development Services Department

P: (813) 276-8364
E: tirados@HCFLGov.net
W: HCFLGov.net

Hillsborough County
601 E. Kennedy Blvd., Tampa, FL 33602
Facebook \| Twitter \| YouTube \| Linkedln \| HCFL Stay Safe
Please note: All correspondence to or from this office is subject to Florida's Public Records law.

## LINCKS \& ASSOCIATES, INC.

July 25, 2022
Mr. Michael Williams, PE
County Engineer Development Review Director
Hillsborough County
601 East Kennedy Blvd., $20^{\text {th }}$ Floor
Tampa, FL 33602
Re: Big Bend - Camden
RZ-PD 22-0461
Folio 077569-0000
077558-0000
077557-0000
Lincks Project No. 21224
The purpose of this letter is to request a Section 6.04.02.B Administrative Variance to Section 6.04.03L Existing Facilities of the Hillsborough County Land Development Code, which requires projects taking access to a substandard road to improve the roadway to current County standards between the project driveway and the nearest standard road.

The subject property is currently zoned Planned Development (PD) to allow the following land uses:

- Hospital - 360,000 Square Feet and 250 Beds
- Medical Office - 300,000 Square Feet

The developer proposes a rezone the property to PD to allow the following land uses:

- Multi-Family - 900 Dwelling Units
- Warehouse - 150,000 Square Feet
- Sterilization Facility - 80,000 Square Feet
- Ambulatory Care/Emergency Facility - 25,000 Square Feet
- Retail - 30,000 Square Feet

The proposed PD plan is included in the appendix of this letter.
Phase 1 of the project is proposed to include 450 Multi-Family Dwelling Units.
Table 1 provides the trip generation comparison of the approved land uses versus the proposed land uses. As shown, the proposed modification would result in a net decrease in the project traffic.

Mr. Mike Williams
July 25, 2022
Page 2

According to the Hillsborough County Functional Classification Map, Old Big Bend Road is classified as a local roadway. However, the roadway is anticipated to serve more than 5,000 vehicles per day, therefore it is considered a collector roadway.

The developer of the subject property is working with the developer/land owners to the east and west of the subject property to extend Old Big Bend Road to the east to Lincoln Road and realigned Old Big Bend Road to the north to Simmons Loop Road Extension.

This Administrative Variance is for the two segments of Old Big Bend for Phase 1 of the project, which are as follows:

- Eastern Project Boundary to Lincoln Road
- Simmons Loop Extension (Phase 1) to the west

These are graphically shown in Figure 1.
The request is to waive the requirement to improve the two segments of Old Big Bend Road to current County roadway standards, which are found within the Hillsborough County Transportation Technical Manual.

The variance to the TS-7 standards are as follows:

1. Lane Width - TS-7 has 12 foot lanes. The existing road has 11 foot lanes.
2. Shoulders - TS-7 has 8 foot shoulders with 5 foot paved. There are unpaved shoulders along the roadway.
3. Sidewalks - TS-7 has 5 foot sidewalk on both sides of the road. There are no sidewalks along the roadway.

## (a) there is an unreasonable burden on the applicant,

It would be unreasonable to require the applicant to improve the roadway for the following reasons:

1. Old Big Bend Road is proposed to be realigned along both segments with the Phase 2 development, as shown in Figure 2.
2. Sidewalk is proposed to be provided with the budgeted 6-laning of Big Bend Road
3. The proposed PD modification would result in a net decrease in project traffic.
(b) the variance would not be detrimental to the public health, safety and welfare,

The variance is to allow Phase 1 to develop until such time, as Old Big Bend Road is realigned east and west. Since this is an interim condition and the proposed PD would result in a significant reduction in project traffic, the proposed variance would not be detrimental to the public health, safety and welfare.
(c) without the variance, reasonable access cannot be provided. In the evaluation of the variance request, the issuing authority shall give valid consideration to the land use plans, policies, and local traffic circulation/operation of the site and adjacent areas.

The developer does not control the property east and west to realign the roadway. Therefore, the variance is required to allow Phase 1 of the project.

Mr. Mike Williams
July 25, 2022
Page 4

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

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

## ___Disapproved



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

Date $\qquad$
Sincerely,

Michael J. Williams
Hillsborough County Engineer

Mr. Mike Williams
July 25, 2022
Page 5
(1) Source: ITE Trip Generation Manual, $11^{\text {th }}$ Edition, 2021.

Mr. Mike Williams
July 25, 2022
Page 6


Mr. Mike Williams
July 25, 2022
Page 7
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## LINCKS \& ASSOCIATES, INC.

July 26, 2022
Mr. Michael Williams, PE
County Engineer Development Review Director
Hillsborough County
601 East Kennedy Blvd., $20^{\text {th }}$ Floor
Tampa, FL 33602
Re: Big Bend - Camden
RZ-PD 22-0461
Folio 077569-0000
077558-0000
077557-0000
Lincks Project Number 21224
The purpose of this letter is to request an Administrative Variance to Section 6.04.03 I of the Hillsborough County Land Development for the access to serve the proposed development parcels along Simmons Loop Extension.

The subject property is currently zoned Planned Development (PD) to allow the following land uses:

- Hospital - 360,000 Square Feet and 250 Beds
- Medical Office - 300,000 Square Feet

The developer proposes a rezone the property to PD to allow the following land uses:

- Multi-Family - 900 Dwelling Units
- Warehouse - 150,000 Square Feet
- Sterilization Facility - 80,000 Square Feet
- Ambulatory Care/Emergency Facility - 25,000 Square Feet
- Retail - 30,000 Square Feet

The proposed PD plan is included in the appendix of this letter.
As shown in Table 1, the proposed modification would result in a net decrease in project traffic.

In conjunction with the development of the project, the developer proposes to extend Simmons Loop north to the realignment of Old Big Bend Road. There are proposed to be

Mr. Mike Williams
July 26, 2022
Page 2
proposed to be three non-residential land uses along the frontage of Simmons Loop Extension which are as follows:

- Warehouse
- Sterilization Facílity
- Ambulatory Care/Emergency Facility

It is anticipated the subject segment of Simmons Loop Extension would have more than 5,000 vehicles per day, therefore it would be classified as a collector roadway. As per the LDC, the number of accesses required for the parcels along Simmons Loop Extension are shown in Table 2.

The request is to allow two right-in/right-out accesses to Simmons Loop Extension from Big Bend Road to Old Big Bend Road Realigned to serve the non-residential parcels along the roadway.

The justification for the variance to allow the turn access are as follows:
a) there is an unreasonable burden on the applicant,

1. The accesses along Simmons Loop Extension are to serve a number of distinct non-residential uses.
2. The accesses would be limited to right-in/right-out.

Given the roadway frontage, the mixture of uses and configuration of the parcels it is unreasonable to require the number of accesses per the LDC.
b) the variance would not be detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare,

The accesses meet the spacing criteria contained in an LDC for the right-in/rightout accesses along the east side of Simmons Loop Extension and where warranted, turn lanes per the LDC are to be provided.
c) without the variance, reasonable access cannot be provided. In the evaluation of the variance request, the issuing authority shall give valid consideration to the land use plans, policies, and local traffic circulation/operation of the site and adjacent areas.

As stated, the project is proposed to be a mixed-use development. The accesses are necessary to provide adequate circulation for the proposed uses. Given the configuration of the site it is not reasonable to restrict the access per the LDC.

Mr. Mike Williams
July 26, 2022
Page 3

Please do ngt hesitate to contact us if you have any questions or require any additional information.

Best Regerds,

Based on the information provided by the applicant, this request is:
$\qquad$ Disapproved

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

## Date

$\qquad$
Sincerely,

Michael J. Williams
Hillsborough County Engineer

Mr. Mike Williams
July 26, 2022
Page 4
(1) Source: TE Trip Generation Manual, $11^{\text {th }}$ Edition, 2021.

Mr. Mike Williams
July 26, 2022
Page 5
TABLE 2
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## HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY LDC

with the movement of vehicles into or out of the access. The applicant may submit an analysis showing that for his particular site, a throat of less than $100^{\prime}$ is appropriate and will result in no adverse impact to the public roadway system.
H. Access Along Acceleration/Deceleration Lanes

A driveway shall not be constructed along acceleration or deceleration tapers connecting to interchange ramp terminals, intersecting roadways, bus bays or other driveways unless access would be unreasonably denied and the driveway can be made to function properly, i.e., safe and efficient traffic operation.

1. Number of Access Points
2. The minimum number of driveways should be allowed that will adequately serve the need for the abutting property, and yet not seriously impact the function and capacity of the highway to which access is desired.
3. The number of entrances shall be determined based on the maximum desirable vehicle flow rate at entrances for residential and non-residential land uses based on the street characterlstics.
4. All access drives shall be required to comply with access spacing criteria and cross access connections are considered as a driveway connection for the purpose of complying with this section of the LDC. Cross access connections shall be consistent with Section 6.04.03 (Q) of the Land Development Code.
5. Properties that are bordered by physical impediments such as railroad tracks, limited access highways, existing navigable river or government owned property with restrictions may request an Administrative Variance pursuant to Section 6.04.02(B) of the Land Development Code.
6. The applicant may be permitted fewer driveway connections than required by the threshold matrix if through an approved traffic engineering study it is demonstrated that the proposed driveway connections will provide adequate capacity for the project to operate in a safe and efficient manner without causing delays or backups on the impacted roadways.
7. Where Non-Residential development abuts Collector/Arterial and Local roads primary driveway connections shall be at Collector/Arterial roads and Local roads shall be use for secondary access.

Table 1: Function and Driveway Guidelines

Residential Uses

| Street Character <br> Function | Maximum Vehicle Flow |
| :--- | :--- |
| Local | 90 |
| Collector/Arterial | 180 |


| Street Character <br> Function | Maximum Vehicle Flow |
| :--- | :--- |
| Local | 180 |
| Collector/Arterial | 300 |

## Calculation Formula

Number of Driveways = Peak Hour Total Project Traffic/Maximum Vehicle Flow. Fractional results shall be rounded up to the next highest whole number.

## Sample Calculation:

Example: A developer plans to construct a shopping center at a site near the intersection of two arterial roadways, which will house 250,000 square feet leasable area. The developer proposes three arterial connections.

Are three arterlal connectlons adequate for this site? As with the above sample, we start by calculating the number of peak hour trips generated by the site. In this case the ITE trip generation indicates a total of 1,146 peak hour vehicle trips. We reference Table 2 and find the non-residential collector maximum vehicle flow figure. Dividing the peak hour total by 300 results in the need for 3.82 or four driveways. Therefore, the number of collector connections should be four.
J. Spacing of Accesses and Median Openings

The minimum spacing between adjacent access points and between adjacent median openings are a function of the Access Class assigned to the main roadway. The distances shown in 6.04.07 are minimums and may not be sufficient if extensive right or left turn storage is required. Greater distances may be required to provide sufficient site-specific storage. Right turn in/right turn out movement and accesses which do not meet the minimum spacing may be permitted where, due to size, configuration, or location of the parcel, there is no feasible alternative access meeting the desired standard.
K. Drainage Considerations

Access shall be constructed in accordance with the requirements of Hillsborough County Stormwater Management Technical Manual.
L. Existing Facilities

1. Improvements and upgrading of existing roadways are to conform with standards for new roadways of the same access class. Exception to these standards shall be allowed only where physically impossible for the permittee to comply or otherwise upgrade existing site conditions. All such
exceptions shall be approved by the Director of Public Works.
2. Where driveways are constructed within the limits of existing curb and gutter construction, the existing curb and gutter shall be removed either to the nearest joints or to the extent that no remaining section is less than five feet long. If the curb is not removed to the nearest joint, the curb will be cleanly cut with a concrete saw. Driveways materials type should conform to the original construction on a section unless otherwise specifically provided on the permit.
M. Intersections

At an intersection, no driveway shall be allowed within the radius return of the intersecting roadways. An exception for existing developments may be considered when driveways are reconstructed as part of a roadway reconstruction project.
N. Emergency Access

In addition to minimum yard and building spacing requirements specified in this Code, all buildings and other structures, land preparation, and landscaping shall be so located and arranged on lots as to provide safe and convenient access for emergency purposes, fire protection, servicing, and off-street parking and loading located on the premises.
O. Prohibition of Use of Residentially Zoned Private Property for Access to Uses Not Permitted in Residential Districts; Exceptions

No private land which is agriculturally or residentially zoned shall be used for vehicular or pedestrian access to land or structures in other districts used for any purpose not permitted in agricultural or residential districts, except as provided below or otherwise authorized by this Code or other lawful regulations:

1. Where provision does not exist for safe access for emergency and public service vehicles and such access is not reasonably feasible except through privately owned residential or agricultural land, access reserved for and limited to such vehicles may be authorized by the Land Use Hearing Officer, subject to conditions and safeguards designed to protect the tranquility and character of the residential land so traversed.
2. Where convenience and safety would be promoted, walkways and bicycle paths to non-residentially zoned land may be authorized by the Land Use Hearing Officer across privately owned residentially zoned land, subject to conditions and safeguards to protect the tranquility and character of the residential land so traversed.
P. Right-of-Way Protection and Acquisition
3. No development activity (buildings, parking areas, water retention, etc.) shall be permitted within existing right-of-way corridors, as established and recorded through the Hillsborough County Thoroughfare Plan Regulations.
4. Prior to the development of land contiguous to public transportation corridors, right-of-way shall be reserved or dedicated to the appropriate governmental jurisdiction in accordance with an adopted Hillsborough County Transportation Corridor Map. In the absence of an adopted Corridor Map, right of way shall be reserved or dedicated to the appropriate governmental jurisdiction in accordance with the current MPO Long Range Transportation Needs Assessment Map in effect at the time of the request for reservation or conveyance. No development activity shall be permitted within the designated transportation corridors.
Q. Cross-Access Criteria and Requirements
5. The purpose of requiring cross-access in certain situations is to reduce the necessity to use the public street system in order to move between adjacent and complementary land uses where such interchange of vehicular or pedestrian trips are likely to occur.
6. When each of the following conditions exist, provisions for vehicular and pedestrian cross-access must be provided:
a. The site is on at least one roadway with an Access Management Classification of 1 through 5 .
b. The site has a commercial or office land use or zoning designation, and is adjacent to a parcel which also has a commercial or office land use designation or zoning and which has access on the same roadway.
7. When each of the following conditions exists, provisions for pedestrian cross-access must be provided.
a. The site has frontage on at least one roadway with an Access Management Classiflcation of 1 through 5.
b. The site has a commercial or office land use or zoning designation and is adjacent to a parcel having frontage on the same roadway which has a land use or zoning designation allowing 12 dwelling units per acre or more, or
c. The site has a residential land use or zoning designation allowing 12 dwelling units or more per acre and is adjacent to a parcel having a land use or zoning designation of 12 dwelling units or more per acre or a commercial or office land use or zoning designation and which has access on the same roadway.
8. As used herein, "provisions for cross-access" shall mean that the developer of the property shall design his site in such a manner as to make cross-access possible as provided in this division.
9. When the criteria in 2 or 3 above are met, provisions for cross-access must be provided as established below:
a. If the adjacent site is developed and, in the opinion of Hillsborough County, cross-access is feasible, the developer shall design and build the appropriate cross-access to the property line of the adjacent parcel.
b. If the adjacent site is developed but, in the opinion of Hillsborough County, cross-access is not feasible at this time, the developer shall design and designate on the site plan the location of future cross access, but will not be required to construct the cross-access at the time of initial site development. The owner shall commit, in writing, to construct and allow cross-access at such time as Hillsborough County determines that cross-access is feasible and desirable.
c. If the adjacent site is undeveloped, the developer shall design and build the cross-access to the property line of the adjacent parcel in anticipation of future connection when that site is developed.
d. The minimum width of a vehicular cross-access shall be 24 feet. The minimum width of a pedestrian cross-access shall be five feet.

## R. Corner Clearance

Corner clearances for all connections shall meet or exceed the minimum connection spacing requirements of 6.04 .07 of this division except as provided below:

1. Type I. The minimum corner clearance for a Type I connection shall be ten feet.
2. All Other Types, Isolated Corner Property—A single connection (on each frontage) may be placed
closer to the intersection if, due to property size, the applicable minimum spacing standards in Table I cannot be met, and where joint access which meets or exceeds the applicable connection spacing cannot be obtained with a neighboring property or, it is determined by the County that joint access is not feasible based on conflicting land uses or conflicting traffic volumes/characteristics, then the minimum corner clearance given in 6.04 .08 can be used. Such properties, for the purpose of this document will be called "isolated corner properties".
3. In cases where connections are permitted under this criteria, the permit will contain the following conditions:
a. There will be no more than one connection per frontage.
b. When joint or alternative access which meets or exceeds the applicable minimum connection spacing becomes available, the permittee will close the permitted connection, unless the permittee shows that such closure is not feasible because of conflicting land use or conflicting traffic volumes/characteristics or existing structures which preclude a change in the existing connection.
(Ord. No. 00-21, § 2, 5-18-00; Ord. No. 01-30, § 2, 11-15-01; Ord. No. 02-13, § 2, 8-1-02; Ord. No. 09-62, Item B, 10-26-09, eff. 2-1-2010)

LINCKS \& ASSOCIATES, INC.

July 26, 2022
Mr. Michael Williams, PE
County Engineer Development Review Director
Hillsborough County
601 East Kennedy Blvd., $20^{\text {th }}$ Floor
Tampa, FL 33602
Re: Big Bend - Camden
RZ-PD 22-0461
Folio 077569-0000
077558-0000
077557-0000
Lincks Project No. 21224

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 Land Development Code Section 6.04.03L for Old Big Bend Road from Simmons Loop Extension to the eastern property line. The subject property is currently zoned (PD) to allow the following land uses:

- Hospital - 360,000 Square Feet and 250 Beds
- Medical Office - 300,000 Square Feet

The developer proposes a rezone the property to PD to allow the following land uses:

- Multi-Family - 900 Dwelling Units
- Warehouse - 150,000 Square Feet
- Sterilization Facility - 80,000 Square Feet
- Ambulatory Care/Emergency Facility - 25,000 Square Feet
- Retail - 30,000 Square Feet

The proposed PD plan is included in the appendix of this letter.
As shown in Table 1, the proposed modification would result in a significant reduction in project traffic.

According to the Hillsborough County Functional Classification Map, Old Big Bend Road is classified as a local roadway, however, it is anticipated the roadway may serve more than 5,000 vehicles per day therefore it is considered a collector roadway. The subject site is within the Hillsborough County Urban Service Area.

Mr. Mike Williams
July 26, 2022
Page 2

The request is for a Design Exception to TS-4 of the Hillsborough County Transportation Technical Manual for Old Big Bend Road. The segment of Old Big Bend Road is currently a two (2) lane roadway and the developer proposes to realign the roadway, as shown in Figure 1. The following exceptions are requested to accommodate the proposed project.

1) Bike Lanes - TS-4 has 7 foot buffered bike lanes. The existing roadway is a rural roadway with no bike lanes.
2) Sidewalk - TS-4 has sidewalk on both sides of the roadway. There is currently no sidewalk along the subject segment of the roadway.

The justification for the Design Exception is as follows:
The developer proposes two alternative sections. The first is from Simmons Loop Extension east through the project to the transitions to the drainage canal. This section is shown in Figure 2. Figure 3 illustrates the proposed section where the roadway crosses the drainage canal on the eastern portion of the property.

1. Bike Lanes - No bike lanes are proposed. In lieu of the bike lanes, wider sidewalk on each side of the road is proposed.
2. Sidewalk - 10 ' sidewalk on both sides of the roadway are proposed instead of the bike lanes. Given the roadway is within a mixed use development and will connect to mixed uses east and west, the wider sidewalk provides a better option for pedestrians and bikes.

Based on the above, it is our opinion, the proposed improvements to Old Big Bend Road Realigned will mitigate the impact of the project and meet the intent of the Transportation Technical Manual to the extent feasible.

Mr. Mike Williams
July 26, 2022
Page 3

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


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

| $\ldots$ | 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.

Sincerely,

Michael J. Williams
Hillsborough County Engineer
(1) Source: TE Trip Generation Manual, $11^{\text {th }}$ Edition, 2021.

Mr. Mike Williams
July 26, 2022
Page 5


Mr. Mike Williams
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FIGURE 2

Mr. Mike Williams
July 26, 2022
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LINCKS \& ASSOCIATES, INC.

July 26, 2022
Mr. Michael Williams, PE
County Engineer Development Review Director
Hillsborough County
601 East Kennedy Blvd., 20 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Floor
Tampa, FL 33602
Re: Big Bend - Camden
RZ-PD 22-0461
Folio 077569-0000
077558-0000
077557-0000
Lincks Project No. 21224

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 Land Development Code Section 6.04.03L for Simmons Loop Extension from Big Bend Road to north of the Old Big Bend Road Realigned. The subject property is currently zoned (PD) to allow the following land uses:

- Hospital - 360,000 Square Feet and 250 Beds
- Medical Office - 300,000 Square Feet

The developer proposes a rezone the property to PD to allow the following land uses:

- Multi-Family - 900 Dwelling Units
- Warehouse - 150,000 Square Feet
- Sterilization Facility - 80,000 Square Feet
- Ambulatory Care/Emergency Facility - 25,000 Square Feet
- Retail - 30,000 Square Feet

A copy of the PD plan is included in the appendix of this letter.
As shown in Table 1, the proposed modification would result in a significant reduction in project traffic.

Simmons Loop Extension is not shown on the Hillsborough County Functional Classification Map, however, it is anticipated the roadway may serve more than 5,000 vehicles per day that is considered a collector roadway. The subject site is within the Hillsborough County Urban Service Area.

Mr. Mike Williams
July 26, 2022
Page 2

The request is for a Design Exception to TS-4 and TS-5 of the Hillsborough County Transportation Technical Manual for Simmons Loop Extension.

The Simmons Loop Extension is proposed to be constructed from Big Bend Road to north of Old Big Bend Realigned by the developer in conjunction with the development of the project. Figure 1 illustrated the general layout of the proposed roadway. The roadway is proposed to be constructed as a divided roadway (TS-5) from Big Bend Road to Old Big Bend Road Realigned and an undivided roadway, north of Old Big Bend Road Realigned (TS-4).

The justification for the Design Exception is as follows:

The developer proposed alternative sections which are shown in Figures 2 and 3. The sections include the following:

1. Bike Lanes - No bike lanes are proposed. In lieu of the bike lanes, wider sidewalk on each side of the road is proposed.
2. Sidewalk - 10' sidewalk on both sides of the roadway are proposed instead of the bike lanes. Given the roadway is within a mixed use development and will connect to mixed uses east and west, the wider sidewalk provides a better option for pedestrians and bikes.

Based on the above, it is our opinion, the proposed improvements to Simmons Loop Extension will mitigate the impact of the project and meet the intent of the Transportation Technical Manual to the extent feasible.

Mr. Mike Williams
July 26, 2022
Page 3

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

Licks \& Associates, Inc.
\#51555


Based on the information provided by the applicant, this request is:
$\qquad$ Disapproved
 Approved
$\qquad$ 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.

Sincerely,

Michael J. Williams
Hillsborough County Engineer

Mr. Mike Williams
July 26, 2022
Page 4
(1) Source: $\pi E$ Trip Generation Manual, $11^{\text {th }}$ Edition, 2021.

Mr. Mike Williams
July 26, 2022
Page 5



* turn lanes are to be 11 feet

TYPICAL SECTION
SIMMONS LOOP EXTENSION
(Big Bend Rd to Old Big Bend Rd Realigned)
NTS
(1) MIN. TOTAL WIDTH TO BE 15' FROM F.C. TO F.C. WHERE NO TURN LANES ARE ADJACENT TO THE THROUGH LANE.
(2) MAY VARY AS MEDIAN TRANSITIONS TO THE NORTH

Mr. Mike Williams
July 26, 2022
Page 7


FIGURE 3
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TS-4 and TS-5


1. ALL DIMENSIONS SHOWN ARE MINIMUM.

* 3. PROVIDE 2' MINIMUM CLEARANCE FROM FENCES, WALLS, HEDGES, ABOVEGROUND UTILTIES OR
IMPROVEMENTS, DROP OFFS, OR FROM THE TOPS OF BANKS WITH SLOPES STEEPER THAN
TO 4, THAT INTERFERE WITH THE SAFE, FUNCTIONAL USE OF THE SIDEWALK. INTERMITTEN
THIS 2' STRIP AS FAR FROM THE SIDEWALK AS POSSIBLE, IF NOT IN THE CLEAR ZONE.
$\dagger$ 4. SEE SIDEWALK PROTECTION OPTIONS, DRAWING NO. TD-16 SHEET 7 OF 7 FOR USE WHEN
SOD SHALL BE PLACED IN TWO ROWS STAGGERED. (BOTH TEMPORARY AND PERMANENT)
TYPICAL SECTION
LO甘 000'OL OL 000's
MAX. ALLOWABLE DESIGN SPEED
4
0
0
1
0
0
2
0
2
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0
0

| - |
| :---: |
| $\stackrel{-}{0}$ |
| - |
| $\vdots$ |
| $\dot{2}$ |
| $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{u}$ |
| $\frac{1}{\omega}$ |


| URBAN COLLECTORS |
| :--- |
| (2 LANE DIVIDED) |
| TYPICAL SECTION |


| REVIIIN DATE: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $10 / 17$ | TRANSPORTATION <br> TECCHNICAL <br> MANUAL | Hillsborough <br> County Florida |

### 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 |
| Big Bend Rd. | County Arterial Rural | 4 Lanes <br> $\square$ Substandard Road $\boxtimes$ Sufficient ROW Width | Corridor Preservation Plan Site Access Improvements Substandard Road Improvements Other |
| Old Big Bend Rd. | County Collector <br> - Rural | 2 Lanes <br> $\boxtimes$ Substandard Road <br> $\square$ Sufficient ROW Width | Corridor Preservation Plan <br> Site Access Improvements <br> Substandard Road Improvements <br> Other |
| Simmons Rd. | County Local Rural | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \text { Lanes } \\ & \boxtimes \text { Substandard Road } \\ & \square \text { Sufficient ROW Width } \end{aligned}$ | Corridor Preservation Plan <br> Site Access Improvements <br> Substandard Road Improvements <br> Other |
|  | Choose an item. | Choose an item. Lanes <br> $\square$ Substandard Road <br> $\square$ Sufficient ROW Width | Corridor Preservation Plan Site Access Improvements Substandard Road Improvements Other |

## Project Trip Generation $\square$ Not applicable for this request

|  | Average Annual Daily Trips | A.M. Peak Hour Trips | P.M. Peak Hour Trips |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Existing | 13,511 | 1,105 | 1,170 |
| Proposed | 7,123 | 532 | 655 |
| Difference (+/-) | $\mathbf{( - ) \mathbf { 6 , 3 8 8 }}$ | $\mathbf{( - ) \mathbf { 5 7 3 }}$ | $\mathbf{( - ) \mathbf { 5 1 5 }}$ |

Connectivity and Cross Access $\square$ Not applicable for this request

| Project Boundary | Primary Access | Additional <br> Connectivity/Access | Cross Access | Finding |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| North |  | Vehicular \& Pedestrian <br> (Potential) | None | Meets LDC |
| South | $X$ | Vehicular \& Pedestrian | None | Meets LDC |
| East | $X$ | Vehicular \& Pedestrian | None | Meets LDC |
| West | Vehicular \& Pedestrian | None | Meets LDC |  |
| Notes: |  |  |  |  |


| Design Exception/Administrative Variance $\quad \square$ Not applicable for this request |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Road Name/Nature of Request | Type | Finding |
| Old Big Bend Rd./ Substandard Rd. | Administrative Variance Requested | Approvable |
| Simmons Rd./ Number of Access Connections | Administrative Variance Requested | Approvable |
| Old Big Bend Rd. | Design Exception Requested | Approvable |
| Simmons Rd. | Design Exception Requested | Approvable |
| Notes: |  |  |

4.0 Additional Site Information \& Agency Comments Summary

| Transportation | Objections | Conditions <br> Requested | Additional <br> Information/Comments |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\boxtimes$ Design Exception/Adm. Variance Requested <br> $\boxtimes$ Off-Site Improvements Provided | $\square$ Yes $\square \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ <br> $\boxtimes$ No | $\boxtimes$ Yes <br> $\square$ No |  |

## COMMISSION

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


## DIRECTORS

Janet D. Lorton executive director Elaine S. DeLeeuw admin division Sam Elrabi, P.E. water division Rick Muratti, Esq. legal dept Reginald Sanford, MPH aIr division Steffanie L. Wickham waste division Sterlin Woodard, P.E. wetlands division

## AGENCY COMMENT SHEET


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

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


## INFORMATIONAL COMMENTS:

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

- The subject property contains wetland/OSW areas, which have not been delineated. Knowledge of the actual extent of the wetland and OSW are necessary in order to verify the avoidance of wetland impacts pursuant to Chapter 1-11. Prior to the issuance of any building or land alteration permits or other development, the wetlands/OSWs must be field delineated in their entirety by EPC staff or Southwest Florida Water Management District staff (SWFWMD) and the wetland line surveyed. Once delineated, surveys must be submitted for review and formal approval by EPC staff.
- The site plan depicts wetland impacts that have not been authorized by the Executive Director of the EPC. The wetland impacts are indicated for a potential right-of way preservation area and internal access road. If at the time of site development, the 64 -foot wide right-of-way preservation area adjacent to the western property boundary has not been removed from the Hillsborough County Corridor Preservation Plan, the County will require its construction to the northern PD boundary. Should this roadway be required to be constructed, the roadway can move internal to the project to avoid or minimize wetland impacts. 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. If 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 this agency 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.
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Jpc/aow
cc: landuse@gardnerbrewer.com
groth@bohlereng.com

Adequate Facilities Analysis: Rezoning

Date: 9/26/2022

Jurisdiction: Hillsborough County

Case Number: RZ 22-0461

HCPS \#: RZ-470

Address: 13097 Lincoln Rd, Riverview

Acreage: 28.6 (+/- acres)

Proposed Zoning: Planned Development

Future Land Use: R-6/UMU-20/SMU-6

Maximum Residential Units: 900 Units

Residential Type: Multifamily

Parcel Folio Number(s): 077558.0000, 077569.0000, 077570.0000

| School Data | Summerfield Crossing Elementary | Eisenhower Middle | East Bay High |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FISH Capacity <br> Total school capacity as reported to the Florida Inventory of School Houses (FISH) | 943 | 1,488 | 2,480 |
| 2021-22 Enrollment <br> K-12 enrollment on 2021-22 40 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ day of school. This count is used to evaluate school concurrency per Interlocal Agreements with area jurisdictions | 880 | 1,415 | 1,910 |
| Current Utilization <br> Percentage of school capacity utilized based on $40^{\text {th }}$ day enrollment and FISH capacity | 93\% | 95\% | 77\% |
| Concurrency Reservations <br> Existing concurrency reservations due to previously approved development. Source: CSA Tracking Sheet as of September 25, 2022 | 36 | 73 | 570 |
| Students Generated <br> Estimated number of new students expected in development based on adopted generation rates. Source: Duncan Associates, School Impact Fee Study for Hillsborough County, Florida, Dec. 2019 | 103 | 37 | 46 |
| Proposed Utilization <br> School capacity utilization based on $40^{\text {th }}$ day enrollment, existing concurrency reservations, and estimated student generation for application | 108\% | 102\% | 102\% |

Notes: Summerfield Crossing Elementary, Eisenhower Middle and East Bay High schools are projected to be over capacity. State law requires the school district to consider whether additional capacity exists in adjacent concurrency service areas (i.e., attendance boundaries). At this time, additional capacity is available at the elementary, middle and high school level.

This is an analysis for adequate facilities only and is NOT a determination of school concurrency. A school concurrency review will be issued PRIOR TO preliminary plat or site plan approval.

Renée M. Kamen, AICP
Manager, Planning \& Siting
Growth Management Department
Hillsborough County Public Schools
E: renee.kamen@hcps.net
P: 813.272.4083

## AGENCY REVIEW COMMENT SHEET

NOTE: THIS IS ONLY FOR ESTIMATE PURPOSES, BASED ON THE FEES AT THE TIME THE REVIEW WAS MADE. ACTUAL FEES WILL BE ASSESSED BASED ON PERMIT APPLICATIONS RECEIVED AND BASED ON THE FEE SCHEDULE AT THE TIME OF BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION.
TO: Zoning Review, Development Services DATE: 11/03/2022

REVIEWER: Ron Barnes, Impact \& Mobility Fee Coordinator
APPLICANT: HCA Health Services and South Riverview LLC
PETITION NO: 22-0461
LOCATION: 13097 Lincoln Rd, Old Big Bend
FOLIO NO: 77557.0000; 77558.0000; 77569.0000

## Estimated Fees:

(Various use types allowed. Estimates are a sample of potential development)

| Office, General | Retail - Shopping Center (50k s.f. or less) | Warehouse |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (Per 1,000 s.f.) | (Per 1,000 s.f.) | (Per 1,000 s.f.) |
| Mobility: $\$ 8,336.00$ | Mobility: $\$ 13,562.00$ | Mobility: $\$ 1,377.00$ |
| Fire: $\$ 158.00$ | Fire: $\$ 313.00$ | Fire: $\$ 34.00$ |

Retail - Conv Mkt. w/Gas (Per fueling position) Mobility: $\$ 13,734-\$ 18,422$ Mobility: $\$ 104,494.00$ Fire: $\$ 313.00$ (per 1,000 sf) Fire: $\$ 313.00$

Multi-Family
(per unit)
Mobility: \$1,555-6,661
Parks: \$777-2,742
School: \$1,645-10,976
Fire: \$249.00

## Project Summary/Description:

Urban Mobility, South Fire, Central Parks - Mixed Use - 285,000 sf mixed used with 900 multi-family units. No breakdown of uses or unit sizes.

## WATER RESOURCE SERVICES <br> REZONING REVIEW COMMENT SHEET: WATER \& WASTEWATER

PETITION NO.: PD22-0461 REVIEWED BY: Randy Rochelle DATE: 3/2/2022
FOLIO NO.: $\quad 77557.0000$ \& Multiple More

## WATER

The property lies within the $\qquad$ Water Service Area. The applicant should contact the provider to determine the availability of water service.
$\boxtimes \quad$ A 12 inch water main exists $\boxtimes$ (adjacent to the site), $\square$ (approximately _ feet from the site) and is located within the north Right-of-Way of Old Big Bend 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.
$\boxtimes \quad$ Water distribution system improvements will need to be completed prior to connection to the County's water system. The improvements include two funded CIP projects that are currently under construction, C32001 - South County Potable Water Repump Station Expansion and C32011 - Potable Water In-Line Booster Pump Station, and will need to be completed by the County prior to issuance of any building permits that will create additional demand on the system.

## WASTEWATER

The property lies within the $\qquad$ Wastewater Service Area. The applicant should contact the provider to determine the availability of wastewater service.
$\boxtimes \quad$ A 16 inch wastewater force main exists $\square$ (adjacent to the site), $\boxtimes$ (approximately 115 feet from the site) and is located south of the subject property within the south Right-of-Way of Old Big Bend 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 $\qquad$ 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

## Statement of Record

The South County service area (generally south of the Alafia River) has seen significant customer growth over the recent past. As new customers are added to the system there is an increased demand for potable water that is causing delivery issues during certain periods of the year. The greatest demand for water occurs during the spring dry season, generally the months of March through May. During the dry season of 2021 the Water Resources Department was challenged to deliver water to the southern portions of the service area to meet customer expectations for pressure and flow. While Levels of Service per the Comprehensive Plan were met, customers complained of very low pressure during early morning hours. Efforts to increase flow and pressure to the south resulted in unacceptably high pressures in the north portions of the service area. The Florida Plumbing Code limits household pressure to 80 psi to prevent damage to plumbing and possible injury due to system failure. The Department had to balance the operational challenges of customer demand in the south with over pressurization in the north, and as a result, water pressure and flow in the South County service area remained unsatisfactory during the dry period of 2021.

As a result of demand challenges, the Department initiated several projects to improve pressure and flow to the south area. Two projects currently under construction CIP C32001 - South County Potable Water Repump Station Expansion and CIP C32011 - Potable Water In-Line Booster Pump will increase the delivery pressure to customers.

These projects are scheduled to be completed and operational prior to the 2022 dry season, and must demonstrate improved water delivery through the highest demand periods before additional connections to the system can be recommended.

TO: ZONING TECHNICIAN, Planning Growth Management
DATE: 1 Mar. 2022
REVIEWER: Bernard W. Kaiser, Conservation and Environmental Lands Management
APPLICANT: Truett Gardner PETITION NO: RZ-PD 22-0461
LOCATION: Not listed
FOLIO NO: 77557.0000,77558.0000, 77569.0000
SEC: $\underline{07}$ TWN: $\underline{31}$ RNG: $\underline{20}$
$\boxtimes \quad$ This agency has no comments.
$\square \quad$ This agency has no objection.
$\square \quad$ This agency has no objection, subject to listed or attached conditions.
$\square \quad$ This agency objects, based on the listed or attached conditions.

COMMENTS: $\qquad$ .


HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS


ZONING HEARING MASTER HEARING
TRANSCRIPT OF TESTIMONY AND PROCEEDINGS

BEFORE: Susan Finch, Zoning Hearing Master Land Use Hearing Master

DATE: Monday, November 14, 2022
TIME: Commencing at 6:00 p.m. Concluding at 10:13 p.m.

Reported via Cisco Webex Videoconference by: LaJon Irving, CER No. 1256
we'll close Rezoning 22-1452 and go to the next case.
MR. GRADY: The next item is -- is Agenda Item D.1 Rezoning PD 22-0461. The applicant is Truett Gardner with Gardener Brewer and Hudson. The request is a rezone from AR, RSC-9 in plan development to a plan development. Michelle Heinrich with County Staff will provide Staff recommendation after presentation by the applicant.

HEARING MASTER: All right. Good evening.
MR. GARDNER: How are you?
HEARING MASTER: I'm good.
MR. GARDNER: Good. Truett Gardner, 400 North Ashley
Drive. And we do have a Powerpoint, but just preliminarily wanted to introduce our team. We've got Chad Weaver sitting in the middle of the back with Camden Properties. And then Brett Roth with Bollar (phonetically). And then presenting tonight are Addie Clark and Steve Henry. And we filed this application in January of 2022. And and so we've been working closely with staff for the last 11 months. It is a complex and complicated one, but we've worked it all the way through. And given the complexity, I'm happy to answer any questions you may have that I can assure you the staff report would put you to sleep and also anything that we've submitted as well.

HEARING MASTER: Thank you. Appreciate it.
MR. GARDNER: And we're proud of the final product.
And we have sent notice out a total of six times and all the
responses we've gotten have been nothing but positive. And with that, I'll present this Powerpoint. Next slide. There we go. Okay. It's a separate -- so team -- here we go. Conceptual designs. This is some of the work that Camden, is a large national (inaudible). And some of the work that they've done and some of the conceptual designs for this project should it be approved. Next slide. Okay. No problem.

So on the site itself, you can see 75 to the west, Big Bend to the south and then Simmons Road is the western boundary of the property outlined in red. And then Lincoln is on the east side, a total of three parcels, totaling 80.54 aces. And immediately south of our property is the, just point of reference, the Saint Jo's South Hospital. The side, as you can see, is currently vacant. Next slide.

So this is the PD or the southern portion of the property. This portion totals just under 40 acres. And HCA is the owner of this currently. HCA would stay in this deal. The next slide will kind of show how Camden will work alongside HCA. But the current PD approval, again, this is just the south side, approves a total of 660,000 square feet of medical uses, 360 for hospital, 240 for medical office, 60 for detached medical office. And then those are the standards below. The one I'd point out is the hospital is approved for eight -- a max height of 85 feet. Next slide.

This is really showing kind of the benefits of this
project going from what's currently approved to what's proposed and then the change reflected. So the site currently 39 acres. Proposed is 80. So we're adding just over 41 acres to the site. The current uses, as I just explained, are medical related, hospital, medical office uses and then proposed multi-family residential along with medical uses and limited retail. So really this creates a mixed use development for this overall property. From a density standpoint, as mentioned, currently approved, 660,000 square feet. And what we're proposing is 285,000 square feet of commercial and medical uses and 900 multi-family uses. That's a decrease of 375,000 square feet, which represents $43 \%$. Max height currently 85 feet, that's being reduced to a max height of 65 feet. So a 20 foot reduction. And then proposed daily trips, which we'll get into later, is being reduced by 47\%. Next slide.

This is the proposed plan. So south of the hatch line that runs laterally, basically in the center is where the current $P D$ ends. So now you can see the totality of the site. It's broken into two separate phases. Phase one would be no more than 300 multi-family units and then also 80,000 square feet of medical equipment recovery, in particular, sterilization facility, that would be likely located in the southwest corner. I believe that's tract three is how that's designated. And then phase two, which Steve Henry will get into, requires a bunch of transportation improvements and realignments to occur. Once
those occur, then that's triggered. And an additional 600 multi-family units would be allowed along with a 150,000 square feet of medical equipment warehouse, 25,000 square feet of -for an ER facility and 30,000 square feet of limited retail uses. That would be in the southeast corner is where that's limited to. So total development, 285,000 square feet and 900 dwelling units. When you look at that in totality of what could potentially be requested, it's 653,000 and 917 dwelling units. So we're asking for substantially less than the potential density for the overall property. Next slide.

As I mentioned, staff report all findings of consistency. We've worked closely with them and thank them for all of their efforts. Next slide.

There are -- this is the -- represents the northeast corner of the property. There is a wetland that you can see running laterally beginning in the northwest corner and then running diagonally across the eastern corner. Three wetlands have been designated there. Wetland one, which is the large one you see on the middle right or lower right, is 1.85 acres. Wetland two, which is on the far west, is just under a half an acre and wetland three, which is on the eastern side, is . 5 five acres. And we've committed that those will remain undisturbed and a 30-foot wetland set back will be maintained. There is the possibility of having a bridge going across, but that's to be designated later and -- but wanted to mention that.

Next slide.
That's it for me. Addie, you'll be next and then Steve and then I'm happy to answer any questions either now or later.

HEARING MASTER: Before you move on, let me just make sure I understand. So the -- the lower half, the southern half of the property is already approved for a hospital, right?

MR. GARDNER: Correct.
HEARING MASTER: And so those are the impacts that are substantially more than what you're proposing here today, right?

MR. GARDNER: Correct.
HEARING MASTER: Okay.
MR. GARDNER: So maybe to clarify, we did not count any potential impacts outside of the 40 acres that's currently approved.

HEARING MASTER: The northern 40 is not in that -MR. GARDNER: Not in that setoff.

HEARING MASTER: Okay. And then before you leave, your slide said no waivers or variations, the staff report notes there's a variation for buffering and screening internal to the project.

MR. GARDNER: Correct. Which is actually in our -- in our Powerpoint, I'll explain it first and am happy to go to it later. So two really, I think one is only mentioned in the staff report, but I'll -- I'll go through both of them just to
capture them both. So one is height related. Actually, if we could go back to the site plan, which I think is slide four. There we go.

So if you'll notice the, and you might have wondered what this was, on the eastern side starting less than -- than midway, running all the way north and then going to the west, designates an area. Everything that's to the east and to the north of that area is single family. And so what we're requesting there is a waiver of the two to one ratio for the height. So if height exceeds 20 feet --

HEARING MASTER: Oh.
MR. GARDNER: -- then for each foot you have to
increase. So we've requested a waiver of that except for the yellow portions. And if that was to go to the full 65 feet, I believe it's 110-foot setback would be required.

HEARING MASTER: So not in the area of where it's shaded yellow?

MR. GARDNER: Correct. And then secondly, the -- the waiver, which I think is the one that's referenced in the site plan, deals with buffering. And we're requesting that that be waived internally and just so the site can be more cohesive and work together.

HEARING MASTER: Okay.
MR. GARDNER: So those are the two.
HEARING MASTER: All right. That was my question --

MR. GARDNER: Sure.
HEARING MASTER: -- at the moment. Thank you. Good evening.

MS. CLARK: Good evening. For the record, Addie Clark, 400 North Ashley Drive, Suite 1100 in Tampa. So as Truett previously mentioned, the site is currently approved for a total of 660,000 of -- square feet of medical and hospital uses. So this graph here compares the trips generated by the currently approved development in blue and the proposed development in Orange in the a.m. and the p.m. peak hours.

As demonstrated by this graph and the traffic study that was approved by County Staff, compared to the development that is currently allowed onsite today, the proposed development will generate $40 \%$ fewer trips. Next slide, please.

This substantial reduction in trips is due to the proposed developments focused on providing areas of onsite interaction where people can experience a true live, work and play environment. As you can see in this table, the intentional mix of land uses results in people not always having to leave the site or go on the external roadway network, causing a reduction of about 500 fewer peak hour trips, compared to what can be built onsite today right now.

So by designing a site to have high density development with internal connections to employment centers, you reduce the need for people to travel long distances to meet
their everyday needs.
Now, I'll pass it on over to our engineer Steve Henry from Lincks \& Associates to discuss some of the improvements in connectivity that the project is proposing.

HEARING MASTER: Thank you so much. If you could please sign in.

MS. CLARK: Yes. Thank you.
HEARING MASTER: Thank you. Good evening.
MR. HENRY: If you could go the next slide, please. Good evening. Steve Henry, Lincks \& Associates, 5023 West Laurel, Tampa 33607. And what I'm going to talk to you is about the roadway network that is serving the project and also what the improvements are that we're doing. The next slide, please.

So this this graphic illustrates the project site, which is in red and then also the yellow identifies the roadway system that we're proposing that will be built as a part of this project and also the adjacent projects. So the first one is the extension of Simmons Loop. So what we're proposing is to extend Simmons Loop from south of Big Bend north. Now, that's -- this extension has always been planned. In fact, we worked on the traffic analysis and planning for Saint Jo's to the south. And when you look at that roadway, it was actually designed and built to accommodate the additional through lane for that intersection.

Now, one of the issues that we have when you go out
and look, you'll see that Old Big Bend Road is very close to Big Bend Road. And so what we've got to do is move Old Big Bend Road north so that there's enough separation between Big Bend Road intersection and the Old Big Bend Road intersection.

And so what you see is in yellow, if you start from the west, we're taking Old Big Bend Road and swinging it north so that we get enough separation between Big Bend Road and Old Big Bend Road. And then we -- what we're going to do is then extend it east through the site over to the east and then connect it over to Lincoln Road and it'll actually connect where it is. There's currently an Aldi shopping center that is built on the east side of Lincoln Road. We will connect at their driveway or -- or lying with their driveway on the east side. If you go to the next slide.

So one of the things that we're working with is what we've done here in blue is show the projects to the east and to the west. So we don't control those properties, but we are working closely with them. They are both in the zoning process and we're working with them to be able to build the portion of the project that we're building and then work with them to ultimately get those roadways over to Lincoln Road and then on the west, get it to tie back into the existing Old Big Bend Road.

HEARING MASTER: And they're rezoning right now? MR. HENRY: The east side is in the zoning process.

The west side's a little more complicated. It's actually been in the zoning process for a number of years now. They actually went through ZHM and now it just been continuing it. But there -- there was a lawsuit and other things going on with that piece of property, but there's a new developer that's looking at it. And hopefully we'll bring it back in with a modification to that zoning to accommodate what we're proposing here.

HEARING MASTER: Okay.
MR. HENRY: So -- but we're working with both of those. In addition to that, if you'll notice, there's also two north/south roadways that we're proposing to build or they're actually access ways, I'll call them, that will also provide a grid system. So we'll end up having on the west side the extension of Simmons Loop. And then as you move east, we'll have a north/south access road. And then further east, another north/south access road on our eastern boundary. And then further east of that is then Lincoln Road. So we'll end up with a -- a grid system that we've got there. So if you go to the next graphic.

So in conjunction with the project, we've got four design exceptions, administrative variances. I'm happy to walk you through them if you'd like. They're -- they're all in the staff report. They're all deemed approvable, but I'm happy to walk you through, but $I$ know it's a long agenda tonight. I don't know if you want to walk through those.

HEARING MASTER: I've read them.
MR. HENRY: Okay.
HEARING MASTER: I read them.
MR. HENRY: Okay. If you'll go to the next slide.
So as indicated, what we're doing is, we're phasing the project, as we talked earlier, we don't control the property to the east. We don't control to the west. So we got to be able to build at least that portion of the roadway network to conserved phase one, which is the 80,000 square feet of medical plus the 300 multi-family. And so what we're going to build is the extension of Simmons Loop Road, but that will only be from Old Big Bend Road north to the realignment of Big Bend Road. So if you look at that graphic, I don't have a pointer unfortunately, but you can see where Old Big Bend Road is going east and then you see the black line where it's Simmons Road. So we'll tie into Old Big Bend Road there, bring it north and then do the realignment of Old Big Bend Road through our project. And then bring it south again and tie back into Old Big Bend Road on our eastern boundary. The intent obviously is so that's phase one. And then if you'll go the next slide. Let's go one more slide.

So then ultimately what we'll do is, what we'll build is the ultimate, which is working with the guys to the east, property owners to the west, to be able to make that full connection in the future. But right now with phase one, we can
only build what we have control over the property to build. And that's outlined in the staff report as to what's getting built in phase one and then how phase two we're able to move forward once were able to connect to the east and to the west.

HEARING MASTER: Let me ask you a question.
MR. HENRY: Sure.
HEARING MASTER: The Zoning Condition 22 that talks about the timing of the --

MR. HENRY: Yes.
HEARING MASTER: -- construction of the improvements, and it says the required improvements must be completed with the initial phase/subphase and shall imp -- and those access restrictions and other requirements shall apply to the entire face. So does that mean that that all of what you've described in phase one, the -- the real location and so forth, will all be done during phase one --

MR. HENRY: Yes.
HEARING MASTER: -- of the project?
MR. HENRY: Correct.
HEARING MASTER: All right. And then phase two doesn't come into play until the other pieces to the east or west?

MR. HENRY: Yes, that's correct.
HEARING MASTER: Okay.
MR. HENRY: That's correct.

HEARING MASTER: All right. I understand. All right.
That's all I had. Thank you.
MR. HENRY: Thank you.
HEARING MASTER: I appreciate it. Please sign in.
Mr. Gardner, does that complete your presentation?
MR. GARDNER: That does. I would say one thing. We have worked closely with Saint Jo's and Camden has extended an invitation for them to be in their preferred employer program. They've had some issues there with nurses and other people that work for the hospital and their ability to get there. And so we wanted to work closely with them. This is providing workforce housing directly targeted to them and so I just wanted to state that.

HEARING MASTER: Okay. Thank you so much. I appreciate it. We'll go to Development Service.

MS. HEINRICH: Hi. Good evening. Michelle Heinrich, Development Services. Are you able to hear me?

HEARING MASTER: I can.
MS. HEINRICH: Great. So just to go over some of the points to dovetail some of the applicant team's presentation. The applicants are requesting to rezone approximately 80 acres, which is currently zoned PD, AR and RSC-9 to PD to allow for 900 multi-family units and 285,006 square feet for a medical warehouse use, a medical recovery/sterilization facility, a freestanding ER and limited retail uses. This results in a
density of 14.6 units per acre and an FAR of 0.43 . One PD variation is requested, which is to remove the internal buffering and screening between and within the development tracks.

I know the applicant mentioned in his presentation a -- a waiver to the two to one set back. We don't categorize that as a PD variation, but that is one of the district standards that we can address in the PD and it's addressed in the conditions. And in -- the same requirements that Mr. Gardner mentioned. The site is --

HEARING MASTER: I'm sorry to interrupt --
MS. HEINRICH: -- is located -- oh.
(Simultaneous conversation.)
HEARING MASTER: Sorry. So that is a zoning condition to address --

MS. HEINRICH: Yes.
HEARING MASTER: -- the setback? Okay.
MS. HEINRICH: Yes. We have specified where it is not required and where it is required.

HEARING MASTER: Okay. Perfect.
MS. HEINRICH: And as Mr. Truett mentioned, the perimeter buffering and screening, no variation is requested to that, only internal to the site.

HEARING MASTER: All right. Thank you. Go ahead.
MS. HEINRICH: The site is located in the RES-4 -- I'm
sorry, RES-6, SMU-6 and UMU-20 future land use categories with a flex of the UMU-20 category further into the site. The site is also located in the Riverview Community Plan Area in the urban service area. The area contains institutional, residential and nonresidential uses, as well as recreational uses, such as the Spurlino YMCA and the Vance Vogel Park and Sports Complex. An urban development style is proposed with nonresidential buildings proposed at a maximum height of 50 feet and multi-family buildings proposed at a maximum height of 65 feet.

It should be noted that the existing $P D$, which covers tracks two, three, four and part of one, is approved for hospital use with heights of 60 to 85 feet. Tracks two, three and four are located along Big Bend Road and the proposed height is 50 feet, which is comparable to the standards CG and CI zoning districts. Staff's review of the area found multiple nonresidential projects with building heights at or greater than 50 feet and those are identified in the staff report.

The multi-family portion of the PD will occur in tracks one and four. The majority of this area is within the UMU-20 and the UMU-20 flex area. To mitigate for the height relative to immediately adjacent single-family uses, the two to one set back will be provided in addition to the boundary set backs of 20 feet. Code required buffering and screening will be provided. Similar multi-family project heights were found within the area and again is located in our staff report for
more specifics.
The project proposes two unique uses which are defined in the PD conditions. Firstly, is the medical equipment warehouse, which is defined as a use that provides storage only for medical equipment such as IVs, beds and the like for surrounding medical uses. The warehouses will not be open to the public, will not offer retail, sales or show rooms and no open storage is permitted.

Secondly, the medical equipment recovery/sterilization facility is defined as a building used to receive and sterilize medical equipment, such as surgical instruments. No biomedical waste treatment will be conducted and no biohazardous waste incinerator will be used. The retail component is limited to the specific uses found within the $C N$ zoning district and are outlined in the conditions of approval.

Also, as just discussed by the applicant's team, you'll see that a phasing plan is proposed that ties the amount of development to occur with each phase of site access developments. The received finding of consistency from the planning commissions and no objections from reviewing agencies, along with our review, found this to be approvable subject to proposed conditions. And I will let you know that James Ratliff, who reviewed this for Transportation, is available and would like to make some comments in regards to the Transportation related items.

HEARING MASTER: All right.
MS. HEINRICH: Thank you.
HEARING MASTER: Thank you so much. I appreciate it.
Mr. Ratliff. Mr. Ratliff, are you there?
MR. GRADY: Mr. Ratliff, it looks like you're muted.
MR. RATLIFF: Okay. There we go. Sorry about that.
Are you able to hear me now?
HEARING MASTER: I can. Thank you.
MR. RATLIFF: Okay. Great. And are you able to see my screen?

HEARING MASTER: Yes. If it says project overview, I see it.

MR. RATLIFF: Yes. So for the record, James Ratliff, Transportation Review Section. I did want to go through the project briefly because it is very complicated, a lot of different pieces. This project is building a portion of the road that is -- is it important -- going to be an important facility that provides parallel relief for a north/south road between I-75 and 301. And that road in the future is going to connect Gibsonton Drive and it will provide -- and there's already segments of this road system that are existing. But this is a part of a -- ultimately providing a parallel north/south relief facility between those two roadways, all the way from Gibsonton on the north, all the way down to Paseo Al Mar on the south.

And the area that we're focusing in is right here today. So in the past, this intersection had to be closed for safety reasons. This was previously open, but due to the proximity of this intersection or of the -- of the Old Big Bend Road to Big Bend Road, it created safety issues and so we did have to close that.

This project is going to be providing some improvements that are going to be necessary in order to reopen that in the future. And as Steve mentioned, it -- it's all about finely tuning that in order to get that intersection or that -- that frontage road pushed back far enough so that that can be accommodated safely in the -- in the future and reopen safely. It has created some issues at some adjacent alternate intersections. And so, again, we really do want to get this fixed in order to be able to reopen that intersection and help relieve traffic at those adjacent side intersections.

It is going to be a collaboration, though, between multiple property owners. Of course, the subject application, 22-0461 that you can see here in red. Also as Mr. Henry mentioned, 180996, which is a pending PD to the west and then also there's a pending $P D$ to the east, which is also ultimately required in order for phase two of this project's entitlements to be realized. Essentially, what we're trying to do is, again, realign the Old Big Bend frontage road here so that we can construct essentially a -- you know, reconstruct a parallel road
far enough to the north and again, connect that all the way over through the project to the east over to Lincoln Road and get these intersections again pulled back far enough away that we can, you know, safely accommodate project traffic and -- and area regional traffic, as well.

As far as the phase one connections, this project, like we mentioned, is going to be constructing that facility that you see here in red. There -- there's only going to be a single connection to Big Bend Road in the interim as a part of phase one. And that's what you see here in yellow. That's labeled on the plan as Driveway A. The phase one will also include removal of this existing segment of Old Big Bend Road that you see right here with the red arrow over it. And so project traffic on the existing Old Big Bend Road will be routed up and around. What we're also going to be doing is removing that additional segment to the east of Driveway $A$ here and rerouting traffic again through to that existing in phase one, a connection to Lincoln, which is in that suboptimal location that I mentioned.

Phase two connection is going to remove that existing remaining portion of Old Big Bend Road and also on -- on the east to Lincoln, but also here on the west side as well, west of Simmons. And this is just a conceptual draft alignment. But again, in -- in order for phase two of this project to be realized, it's going to be requiring relocating that Old Big

Bend Road, something like you might see here to the north, constructing Driveway $B$ on the site plan, which would be the second connection to Big Bend Road. And then continuing that connection on the north side of that adjacent $P D$ over to Lincoln. And all of that together is necessary in order to reopen that intersection here and the -- the northern leg of that existing intersection and realize the phase two entitlements for that project.

And so hopefully this provided a little bit -- maybe better overview of exactly what improvements are going to be required in which. And I'm happy to answer any questions you may have.

HEARING MASTER: No. I -- I appreciate it. That's a very nice use of the graphics to explain that whole process, so I appreciate it.

MR. RATLIFF: Sure.
HEARING MASTER: All right. Does that conclude your comments?

MR. RATLIFF: It does.
HEARING MASTER: All right. Thank you so much. I -we will go to the Planning Commission.

MS. PAPANDREW: Andrea Papandrew, Planning Commission Staff. The subject property is within the Residential-6, suburban mixed use six and urban mixed use 20 future land use categories. And the Riverview and SouthShore Areawide Systems

Community Plans. The site is located within the urban service area and per Policy 1.2 of the Future Land Use Element, sites located in the urban service area are to be developed at a minimum of $75 \%$ of the allowable density per the land use classification. The request is meaning the intent of this policy, by providing a mixed use development with 900 dwelling units and 285,000 square feet of nonresidential uses.

The applicant is requesting a flex of the urban mix use 20 future land use category located within the site to the northern 500 feet of the suburban mix use six future land use category, per Policy 7.3. So taking out the flex area of 15 acres leaves 25.39 acres of suburban mixed use six and the Residential-6 future land use category consists of point 0 -0.83 acres per FLUE Policy 8.8 for projects whose boundaries encompass more than one land use category, density intensity calculations will allow for the blending of those categories across the entire project. When blending the intensity and intensity of multiple future land use categories, the combined total number of dwelling units and floor area ratio possible under all the land use categories within the project will be used as a ceiling for review purposes.

So the staff report does include a table provided by the applicant on how the requested development is consistent with the density intensity that can be considered under all the future land use categories. The Residential 6.83 acres allows
up to four dwelling units. The SMU-6 portion of the property that does not contain open water is 21.23 aces, which would yield 127 dwelling units. The urban mix use 20 flex area would yield 308 dwelling units. The portion of the urban mix 20 area allocated a multi-family residential is 23.9 acres, yielding 478 dwelling units.

Based upon all these calculations, up to 917 dwelling units could be considered for the property with 900 dwelling units proposed by the applicant. The density is consistent with the density expected in all of the three future land use categories. The remaining acreage of UMU-20 is utilized to calculate the allowable intensity of the post non-residential use with 14. 99 acres remaining at a 1.0 floor area ratio. Up to 652,964 square feet of non-residential uses can be considered for the site with 285,000 square feet proposed. The proposed intensity is consisted with the intensity expected in the urban mix use 20 future land use category.

The site does meet the criteria for a flex, per Policy 7.4. The site is located within the urban service area with public facilities nearby to service the development and it's also compatible with existing development in the surrounding area. The site contains a wide range of uses within the surrounding area, including light commercial, multi-family, single-family residential and a large hospital complex. The proposed multi-family residential units would provide for
housing option in a mixed use development consistent with goal one and objective one-two of the community design component, which calls for compact, walkable communities within the urban service area that are supported by employment, goods and services. And the project is also consistent with several goals, objectives and policies of the future land use element and the Riverview community plan.

The proposed plan development is consistent with the neighborhood protection policies under Objectives 16. Specifically, 16.1, which focuses on the protection of neighborhoods through locational criteria for non-residential uses. Due to the expected intensity of the urban mixed use 20 future land use category, locational criteria is not required for the non-residential uses.

In addition, per Policy 22.10, locational criteria does not apply to large mixed use developments within mixed use future land use categories. Policy 16.2 calls for gradual transition of intensities between land uses. The proposed plan development is consistent with this policy direction as the non-residential land uses are proposed on the southern portion of the site closest to Big Bend Road. The arrangement of use is also consistent with Policy 16.5, which seeks to focus more intensive development along arterial and collector roadways and to areas outside of existing developing neighborhoods.

Objective 19 outlines -- outlines the intent of all
mixed use future land use categories in the comprehensive plan. Policy 19.1 specifically states that requirements for two land uses will apply to properties ten acres are greater in the RMU-35, UMU-20 and CMU-12 land use categories and the property is 20 acres or greater -- SM -- SMU-6 and NMU-4 land use categories.

The request is consistent with this Policy of direction by providing a mix of uses. Per Policy 19.2, mixed use projects must demonstrate street connectivity, internal connections between uses and the project will connect to the sidewalk along Big Bend Road and per the conditions of approval, will be providing internal connections. Objective 34 states that plan categories in the Interstate-75 corridor should permit urban level intensities that will encourage a mixed use pattern of development. The proposed project will provide for multi-family residential development, medical uses and retail and meets the intent of the I-75 corridor vision.

The provision of housing within the proposed development is consistent with Policy 36.1 , which encourages the inclusion of housing within mixed use projects and per FLUE Policy 36.5, employment opportunities, such as office and industrial should be provided within mixed use categories. And the proposed is consistent with this Policy direction as well, providing 255,000 square feet of medical uses.

The site is located within the limits of the Riverview

Community Plan, specifically the residential district in the mixed use district. The proposed development will support the vision of the community plan by developing residential uses in the northern portion of the site adjacent to existing residential development. The proposed will also create a mixed use development consistent with the vision for the mix use district. Providing internal and external pedestrian vehicular connections is also consistent with the review community plan, which calls for providing the safe and efficient multi-model system. The community plan also envisions connecting pedestrians with public places, such as parks. And as this project is -- is adjacent to the Vance V. Vogel Park, it'll provide pedestrian access from the subject site to the sidewalks along Big Bend Road, which connects the park to the west. The proposed 285,000 square feet of non-residential development is the line with the community plans vision to encourage the support of local business by tracking a variety of new uses and services.

Based upon the above considerations, Planning Commission Staff finds the proposed plan development consistent with the Unincorporated Hillsborough County Comprehensive Plan, subject to conditions proposed by the Development Services Department. Thank you.

HEARING MASTER: Thank you very much. Is there anyone in the room or online that would like to speak in support? I'm
seeing no one. Anyone in opposition to this request? No one.
All right. Mr. Grady. Anything else?
MR. GRADY: Nothing further.
HEARING MASTER: Mr. Gardner, you have the last word. MR. GARDNER: Nothing further. Although I did want to point out, you were asking about the conditions for the height. Just so you can find those, it's 5.3.

HEARING MASTER: Yeah.
MR. GARDNER: It pertains to the northern boundary.
And then 5.4 pertains to the eastern boundary. Both of those are within you'll -- you'll see. And then those relate to track one.

HEARING MASTER: Yes.
MR. GARDNER: So all of that area you saw with the yellow highlight on the sides are -- are in in tack one.

HEARING MASTER: Yeah. Thank you for that. I did find that. Yeah.

MR. GARDNER: And that's all we have. Thank you.
HEARING MASTER: Thank you.
MR. GARDNER: I know we've thrown a lot of information at you, so --

HEARING MASTER: No, it's -- it's -- you've done a good job of explaining. I appreciate it.

MR. GARDNER: Thank you.
HEARING MASTER: All right. Thank you. And then with
that, we'll close Rezoning 22-0461 and go to the next case.
MR. GRADY: The next item is Agenda Item D.2, major mod application 22-0860. The applicant is Sunfield Homes. The request is rezone -- is for major modification of existing plan development. Sam Ball with County Staff will provide staff recommendation after presentation by the applicant.

HEARING MASTER: Good evening.
MR. MOLLOY: Good evening. William Molly, 325 South Boulevard, Tampa, Florida. This is a project on about 4.6 acres in South County at Simmons Loop in 301. And it's actually just south of the project we just looked at. The original request here was to allow for all CN uses in this rapidly growing area down in Riverview. However, we ran into a bit of a buzz saw when the Board change their policy to say that you can't just have CN. They want to know what uses specifically you're contemplating. So what we wound up with is a highly detailed set of conditions, which are the product of probably half a dozen meetings with the planning condition -- Planning Commission and Development Services. These are reflected here. HEARING MASTER: Can I ask HTB staff -- oh, there you go. So I could see it. Perfect. Thank you. All right. I see it.

MR. MOLLOY: Okay. So again, what -- what we've done here and I'm not going to say these were all proffered by us, there was obviously some collaboration with staff, but this is
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Monsanto, Michelle Heinrich, Chris Grandlienard, Isis Brown, Tim Lampkin, and Sam Ball. From the County Attorney's Office, Cameron Clark. From the Planning Commission, Jillian Massey, and from our Transportation Review Staff, Richard Perez, James Ratliff, and Sheida Tirado.

We do have a number of changes to the published agenda, and I'll go through those changes first, and then I'll go through the public withdrawals and continuances beginning on page 4 of the agenda.

The first change is on page 9 of the agenda, item D-3, Rezoning-PD 22-0461. The applicant is requesting a continuance to the November 14th, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

I believe the applicant is either here or online to explain the reasons for the requested continuance.

HEARING MASTER HATLEY: All right. Thank you. We'll hear from the applicant. This is PD 22-0461.

MS. CLARK: Yes. Hi. Good evening. My name is Addie Clark with Gardner, Brewer, Hudson at 400 North Ashley Drive. On behalf of our client, we're requesting a continuance to the hearing date
of November 14 th to allow us additional time to resolve some entitlement phasing questions with the co-applicant. And we appreciate staff's time and consideration. Thank you.

HEARING MASTER HATLEY: All right. Thank you.

Is there anyone here or online -- members of the public who wish to speak to the continuance of this item in support or opposition?

I don't hear anyone. Okay. Then Rezoning-PD 22-0461 is continued to November 14, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master meeting.

MS. CLARK: Thank you.
MR. GRADY: The next item on the changes on page 7, item C-1, Rezoning-Standard 22-0698. The applicant is David Wright. The applicant's requesting a continuance to the November 14 th, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

I believe the applicant's online to explain the reasons for the requested continuance.

MR. WRIGHT: Good evening. My name is David Wright with the applicant. My address is P.O. Box 273417, Tampa, Florida.

Yes, I'm requesting a continuance to the November 14 th hearing. We need some additional

Monsanto, Michelle Heinrich, Chris Grandlienard, Isis Brown, Tim Lampkin, and Sam Ball. From the County Attorney's Office, Cameron Clark. From the Planning Commission, Jillian Massey, and from our Transportation Review Staff, Richard Perez, James Ratliff, and Sheida Tirado.

We do have a number of changes to the published agenda, and I'll go through those changes first, and then I'll go through the public withdrawals and continuances beginning on page 4 of the agenda.

The first change is on page 9 of the agenda, item D-3, Rezoning-PD 22-0461. The applicant is requesting a continuance to the November 14th, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

I believe the applicant is either here or online to explain the reasons for the requested continuance.

HEARING MASTER HATLEY: All right. Thank you. We'll hear from the applicant. This is PD 22-0461.

MS. CLARK: Yes. Hi. Good evening. My name is Addie Clark with Gardner, Brewer, Hudson at 400 North Ashley Drive. On behalf of our client, we're requesting a continuance to the hearing date
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application is out of order to be heard and is being continued to the September 19, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

Item A-6, Rezoning-Standard 22-0453. This application is being withdrawn from the Zoning Hearing Master process.

Item A-7, Rezoning-PD 22-0461. This application is being continued by the applicant to the September 19, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

Item A-8, Rezoning-PD 22-0567. This application is being continued by the applicant to the September 19, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

Item A-9, Rezoning-PD 22-0648. This
application is out of order to be heard and is being continued to the September 19, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

Item A-10, Major Mod Application 22-0671. This application is out of order to be heard and is being continued to the September 19, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

Item A-11, Rezoning-PD 22-0684. This application is being continued by the applicant to the September 19, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master
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August 15th, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.
Item A-5, Rezoning-PD 22-0207. This application is out of order to be heard and is being continued to the August 15th, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

Item A-6, Major Mod Application 22-0221. This application is being continued by the applicant to the August 15th, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

Item A-7, Major Mod Application 22-0313. This application is being continued by staff to the August 15, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

Item A-8, Rezoning-PD 22-0369. This
application is being continued by staff to the August 15, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

Item A-9, Rezoning-PD 22-0433. The application is out of order to be heard and is being continued to the August 15th, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

Item A-10, Rezoning-PD 22-0461. This application is being continued by the applicant to the August 15, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

Item A-11, Rezoning-PD 22-0559. This application is being continued by the applicant to the August 15, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.
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This application is out of order to be heard and is being continued to the July 25th, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

Item A-9, Rezoning-PD 22-0181. This application is out of order to be heard and is being continued to the July 25th, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

Item A-10, Major Mod Application 22-0221. This application is continued by the applicant to the July 25th, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

Item A-11, Rezoning-PD 22-0369. This application is being continued by staff to the July 25th, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

Item A-12, Rezoning-PD 22-0420. This application is being continued by the applicant to the July 25th, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

Item A-13, Rezoning-PD 22-0433. This application is being continued by the applicant to the July 25th, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

Item A-14, Rezoning-PD 22-0461. This application is being continued by the applicant to the July 25th, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

Item A-15, Major Mod Application 22-0477. This application is being continued by the applicant to the July 25th, 2022, Zoning Hearing
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applicant to the June 13, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

Item A-18, Rezoning-PD 22-0420. This application is being continued by the applicant to the June 13, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

Item A-19, Rezoning-PD 22-0433. This application is being continued by the applicant to the June 13, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

Item A-20, Rezoning-PD 22-0442. This application is being continued by the applicant to the June 13, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

Item A-21, Rezoning-PD 22-0443. This
application is being continued by the applicant to the June 13, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

Item A-22, Rezoning-PD 22-0444. This
application is out of order to be heard and is being continued to the June 13, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

Item A-23, Rezoning-Standard 22-0453. This application is being continued by the applicant to the August 15, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

Item A-24, Rezoning-PD 22-0461. This application is being continued by the applicant to the June 13, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

Item A-25, Major Mod Application 22-0477.
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| HEARING TYPE: | ZHM, PHM, VRH, LUHO | DATE: 9/19/2022 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| HEARING MASTER: | Pamela Jo Hatley | PAGE: 1 OF 1 |


| APPLICATION \# | SUBMITTED BY | EXHIBITS SUBMITTED | HRG. MASTER <br> YES OR NO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MM 22-0313 | Brian Grady | 1. Revised Staff Report | No |
| RZ 22-0461 | Brian Grady | 1. Staff Supplemental Document | No |
| RZ 22-1240 | Brian Grady | 1. Revised Staff Report | No |
| RZ 22-0692 | Brian Grady | 1. Revised Staff Report | No |
| RZ 22-0692 | David Smith | 1. Applicant Presentation | Yes (Copy) |
| RZ 22-1070 | Todd Pressman | 1. Applicant Presentation | No |
| RZ 22-0684 | Jacob Cremer | 1. Applicant Presentation | No |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
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The Zoning Hearing Master (ZHM), Hillsborough County, Florida, met in Regular Meeting, scheduled for Monday, September 19, 2022, at 6:00 p.m., in the Ada T. Payne Community Room, Robert W. Saunders Sr. Public Library, Tampa, Florida, and held virtually.

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

Brian Grady, Development Services, introduces staff and reviews changes/withdrawals/continuances.
D.3. RZ 22-0461

Brian Grady, Development Services, calls RZ 22-0461.
Addie Clark, applicant rep, requests continuance.
Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls proponents/opponents/continues RZ 22-0461. C.1. RZ 22-0698

Brian Grady, calls RZ 22-0698.
David Wright, applicant rep, requests continuance.
Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls for proponents/opponents/continues RZ 220698.
C.2. RZ 22-0927

Brian Grady, Development Services, calls RZ 22-0927.
Todd Pressman, applicant rep, requests continuance.
Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls proponents/opponents/continues RZ 22-0927. C.4. RZ 22-1096

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

Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to Development Services.
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Brian Grady, Development Services, answers ZHM questions.
Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls for proponents/opponents/continues RZ 221096.
D.7. MM 22-1112

Brian Grady, Development Services, calls MM 22-1112 staff continuance
Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls proponents/opponents/continues MM 22-1112.
Brian Grady, Development Services, continues changes/withdrawals/continuances.

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

Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, Oath.
B. REMANDS
C. REZONING STANDARD (RZ-STD):
C.3. RZ 22-1070

Brian Grady, Development Services, calls RZ 22-1070.
Todd Pressman, applicant rep, presents testimony.
Chris Grandlienard, Development Services, staff report.
$>$ Jillian Massey, Planning Commission, staff report.
Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls proponents/opponents/Development Services/applicant rep/closes RZ 22-1070.
C.5. RZ 22-1105

Brian Grady, Development Services, calls RZ 22-1105.
John LaRocca, applicant rep, presents testimony.
Chris Granlienard, Development Services, staff report.
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Jillian Massey, Planning Commission, staff report.
Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls proponents/opponents/Development Services/applicant rep/closes RZ 22-1105.
C.6. RZ 22-1240

Brian Grady, Development Services, calls RZ 22-1240.
Rhea Lopes, applicant rep, presents testimony.
Isis Brown, Development Services, staff report.
Jillian Massey, Planning Commission, staff report.
Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls proponents/opponents/Development Services/applicant rep/closes RZ 22-1240.
D. REZONING-PLANNED DEVELOPMENT (RZ-PD) \& MAJOR MODIFICATION (MM):
D.1. MM 22-0313

Brian Grady, Development Services, calls MM 22-0313.
Patricia Ortiz, applicant rep, presents testimony.
Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions applicant rep.
Patricia Ortiz, applicant rep, answers ZHM questions and continues testimony.

Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to applicant rep.
Patricia Ortiz, applicant rep, answers ZHM questions and continues testimony.

Tim Lampkin, Development Services, staff report.
Pamela Ho Hatley, ZHM, questions to Development Services.
Tim Lampkin, Development Services, answers ZHM questions.
Jillian Massey, Planning Commission, staff report.

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 2022

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

Patricia Ortiz, applicant rep, provides rebuttal.
Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, closes RZ 22-0313.
D.2. RZ 22-0433

Brian Grady, Development Services, calls RZ 22-0433.
David Wright, applicant rep, presents testimony.
Tim Lampkin, Development Services, staff report.
Jillian Massey, Planning Commission, staff report.
Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls proponents/opponents/Development Services/ applicant rep/closes RZ 22-0433.
D.4. RZ 22-0684

Brian Grady, Development Services, calls RZ 22-0684.
Jacob Cremer, applicant rep, presents testimony.
Justin Wright, applicant rep, presents testimony.
Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to applicant rep.
Justin Wright, applicant rep, answers ZHM questions and continues testimony.

Amanda Wright, applicant rep, presents testimony
Jacob Cremer, applicant rep, continues testimony.
Israel Monsanto, Development Services, staff report.
Jillian Massey, Planning Commission, staff report.
Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls proponents.
Janet Lorton, proponent, presents testimony.

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 2022

Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls opponents/Development Services.
Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to Development Services
Israel Monsanto, Development Services, answers ZHM questions.
Jacob Cremer, applicant rep, answers ZHM questions.
Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, statement for record.
Jacob Cremer, applicant rep, answers ZHM statement for record.
Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, closes RZ 22-0684.
D.5. RZ 22-0692

Brian Grady, Development Services, calls RZ 22-0692.
David Smith, applicant rep, presents testimony.
Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to applicant rep.
David Smith, applicant rep, answers ZHM questions and continues testimony.
Sam Ball, Development Services, staff report.
Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to Development Services.
Sam Ball, Development Services, answers ZHM questions.
Brian Grady, Development Services, answers ZHM questions.
Jillian Massey, Planning Commission, staff report.
Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls proponents
Diana Keene, proponent, presents testimony.
Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls opponents/Development Services.
Brian Grady, Development Services, statement for record.
Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to applicant rep.
David Smith, applicant rep, answers $Z H M$ questions and provides rebuttal.
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Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, closes RZ 22-0692.
D.6. RZ 22-0864

Brian Grady, Development Services, calls RZ 22-0864.
William Molloy, applicant rep, presents testimony.
Isabelle Albert, applicant rep, presents testimony.
Michelle Heinrich, Development Services, staff report.
Jillian Massey, Planning Commission, staff report.
Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls proponents.
Marilynn Bearss, proponent, presents testimony.
Suzette Murphree, proponent, presents testimony.
Jarrod Bragg, proponent, presents testimony.
Savannah Grooms, proponent, presents testimony.
Hope Hamilton, proponent, presents testimony.
Barry Lawrence, proponent, presents testimony.
Andrea Albert, proponent, presents testimony.
Samuel Amos, proponent, presents testimony.
Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls opponents/Development Services/applicant rep.
Isabelle Albert, Development Services, provides rebuttal.
Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to applicant rep
Isabelle Albert, applicant rep, answers $Z H M$ questions and continues rebuttal.

Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, questions to Development Services.
Brian Grady, Development Services, questions to applicant rep.
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Isabelle Albert, applicant rep, answers Development Services questions and continues rebuttal.

Brian Grady, Development Services, statement for record.
James Ratliff, Development Services Transportation, questions to applicant rep.

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

James Ratliff, Development Services Transportation, statement for record.
Isabelle Albert, applicant rep, continues rebuttal.
James Ratliff, Development Services Transportation, statement for record.
Isabelle Albert, applicant rep, continues rebuttal.
Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, calls closes RZ 22-0864.
ADJOURNMENT
Pamela Jo Hatley, ZHM, adjourns meeting.

Hillsborough County
PUBLIC SCHOOIS
Preparing Students for Life

Adequate Facilities Analysis: Rezoning

Date: 4/20/2022

Jurisdiction: Hillsborough County
Case Number: RZ 22-0461

HCPS \#: RZ-440

Address: 13097 Lincoln Rd, Riverview

Acreage: 28.6 (+/- acres)
Proposed Zoning: Planned Development

Future Land Use: R-6/UMU-20/SMU-6

Maximum Residential Units: 900 Units

Residential Type: Multifamily

Parcel Folio Number(s): 077558.0000, 077569.0000, 077570.0000

| School Data | Corr Elomentary | Elsenhower Middie | $\begin{gathered} \text { Enst Bry } \\ \text { Hish } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FISH Capacity <br> Total school capacity as reported to the Florida Inventory of School Houses (FISH) | 929 | 1488 | 2480 |
| 2021-22 Enrollment <br> $\mathrm{K}-12$ enrollment on 2021-22 40 th day of school. This count is used to evaluate school concurrency per Interlocal Agreements with area jurisdictions | 637 | 1415 | 1910 |
| Current Utilization <br> Percentage of school capacity utilized based on $40^{\text {th }}$ day enrollment and FISH capacity | 69\% | 95\% | 77\% |
| Concurrency Reservations <br> Existing concurrency reservations due to previously approved development. Source: CSA Tracking Sheet as of September 13, 2022 | 49 | 73 | 570 |
| Students Generated <br> Estimated number of new students expected in development based on adopted generation rates. Source: Duncan Associates, School Impact Fee Study for Hillsborough County, Florida, Dec. 2019 | 103 | 37 | 46 |
| Proposed Utilization <br> School capacity utilization based on $40^{\text {th }}$ day enrollment, existing concurrency reservations, and estimated student generation for application | 85\% | 102\% | 102\% |

Notes: Corr Elementary, Eisenhower Middle and East Bay High schools are projected to be over capacity. State law requires the school district to consider whether additional capacity exists in adjacent concurrency service areas (i.e., attendance boundaries). At this time, additional capacity is available at the elementary middle and high school level.

This is an analysis for adequate facilities only and is NOT a determination of school concurrency. A school concurrency review will be issued PRIOR TO preliminary plat or site plan approval.

Renée M. Kamen, AICP
Manager, Planning \& Siting
Growth Management Department
Hillsborough County Public Schools
E: renee.kamen@hcps.net
P: 813.272.4083


Hillsborough County
PUBI.IC SCHOOIS Preparing Students for Life
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Date: 4/20/2022

Jurisdiction: Hillsborough County

Case Number: RZ 22-0461

HCPS \#: RZ-440

Address: 13097 Lincoln Rd, Riverview

Acreage: 28.6 (+/- acres)

Proposed Zoning: Planned Development

Future Land Use: R-6/UMU-20/SMU-6

Maximum Residential Units: 900 Units

Residential Type: Multifamily

Parcel Folio Number(s): 077558.0000, 077569.0000, 077570.0000

| School Data | Car Blementary | Eisenhower Midate | $\begin{gathered} \text { East Bay } \\ \text { Hish } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FISH Capacity <br> Total school capacity as reported to the Florida Inventory of School Houses (FISH) | 929 | 1488 | 2480 |
| 2021-22 Enrollment <br> K-12 enrollment on 2021-22 $40^{\text {th }}$ day of school. This count is used to evaluate school concurrency per Interlocal Agreements with area jurisdictions | 637 | 1415 | 1910 |
| Current Utilization <br> Percentage of school capacity utilized based on $40^{\text {th }}$ day enrollment and FISH capacity | 69\% | 95\% | 77\% |
| Concurrency Reservations <br> Existing concurrency reservations due to previously approved development. Source: CSA <br> Tracking Sheet as of September 13,2022 | 49 | 73 | 570 |
| Students Generated <br> Estimated number of new students expected in development based on adopted generation rates. Source: Duncan Associates, School Impact Fee Study for Hillsborough County, Florida, Dec. 2019 | 103 | 37 | 46 |
| Proposed Utilization <br> School capacity utilization based on $40^{\text {th }}$ day enrollment, existing concurrency reservations, and estimated student generation for application | 85\% | 102\% | 102\% |

Notes: Corr Elementary, Eisenhower Middle and East Bay High schools are projected to be over capacity. State law requires the school district to consider whether additional capacity exists in adjacent concurrency service areas (i.e., attendance boundaries). At this time, additional capacity is available at the elementary middle and high school level.

This is an analysis for adequate facilities only and is NOT a determination of school concurrency. A school concurrency review will be issued PRIOR TO preliminary plat or site plan approval.
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## Adequate Facilities Analysis: Rezoning

Date: 4/20/2022
Jurisdiction: Hillsborough County

Case Number: RZ 22-0461

HCPS \#: RZ-440

Address: 13097 Lincoln Rd, Riverview

Acreage: 28.6 (+/- acres)
Proposed Zoning: Planned Development

Future Land Use: R-6/UMU-20/SMU-6

Maximum Residential Units: 900 Units

Residential Type: Multifamily

Parcel Folio Number(s): 077558.0000, 077569.0000, 077570.0000

| School Data | Cor Elementany | Esenhicwer Midde | $\begin{gathered} \text { Enst Byy } \\ \text { High } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FISH Capacity <br> Total school capacity as reported to the Florida Inventory of School Houses (FISH) | 929 | 1488 | 2480 |
| 2021-22 Enrollment <br> K -12 enroliment on 2021-22 40 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ day of school. This count is used to evaluate school concurrency per Interlocal Agreements with area jurisdictions | 637 | 1415 | 1910 |
| Current Utilization <br> Percentage of school capacity utilized based on $40^{\text {th }}$ day enrollment and FISH capacity | 69\% | 95\% | 77\% |
| Concurrency Reservations <br> Existing concurrency reservations due to previously approved development. Source: CSA Tracking Sheet as of September 13, 2022 | 49 | 73 | 570 |
| Students Generated <br> Estimated number of new students expected in development based on adopted generation rates. Source: Duncan Associates, School Impact Fee Study for Hillsborough County, Florida, Dec. 2019 | 103 | 37 | 46 |
| Proposed Utilization <br> School capacity utilization based on $40^{\text {th }}$ day enrolliment, existing concurrency reservations, and estimated student generation for application | 85\% | 102\% | 102\% |

Notes: Corr Elementary, Eisenhower Middle and East Bay High schools are projected to be over capacity. State law requires the school district to consider whether additional capacity exists in adjacent concurrency service areas (i.e., attendance boundaries). At this time, additional capacity is available at the elementary middle and high school level.

This is an analysis for adequate facilities only and is NOT a determination of school concurrency. A school concurrency review will be issued PRIOR TO preliminary plat or site plan approval.

Renée M. Kamen, AICP
Manager, Planning \& Siting
Growth Management Department
Hillsborough County Public Schools
E: renee.kamen@hcps.net
P: 813.272.4083
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