

PD Modification Application: MM 26-0062**Zoning Hearing Master Date:**

July 20, 2026

BOCC Land Use Meeting Date:

September 22, 2026

**Hillsborough
County Florida****Development Services Department****1.0 APPLICATION SUMMARY**

Applicant: Chris Doherty

FLU Category: OC-20

Service Area: Urban

Site Acreage: 9.48

Community Plan Area: Apollo Beach

Overlay: None

**Introduction Summary**

The applicant is seeking to modify a 9.48 acre portion of an existing Planned Development, PD 77-0123 as most recently modified by PRS 25-1203. The applicant is requesting a modification to PD Pocket 62B to allow for the development of 237 multi-family dwellings through an exchange of commercial or office use entitlements. This application is being heard concurrently with a modification to the Apollo Beach DRI (#49) under application DRI DO 26-0245.

Existing Approvals	Proposed Modifications
Pocket 62B: permitted up to 440,207 SF of Commercial or Office use.	Reduce permitted Commercial or Office use to 405,696 SF
	Allow for up to 237 Multi-Family Dwellings
	Establish vehicular and pedestrian access points along Apollo Beach Boulevard and pedestrian cross-access for the properties located to the north and south


Additional Information

PD Variations	LDC 6.06.06 – Buffering & Screening Requirements
	Reduce 30' buffer with Type "C" screening to 10' buffer with enhanced Type "B" screening.
Waivers to the Land Development Code	None

Planning Commission Recommendation Consistent	Development Services Recommendation Not Supportable
---	---

2.0 LAND USE MAP SET AND SUMMARY DATA

2.1 Vicinity Map




Context of Surrounding Area:

The subject property is located within the Apollo Beach Community planning area approximately 0.25 miles west of the Apollo Beach Boulevard and N US Highway 41 intersection. The development site adjoins properties within the same PD on all sides, which are approved and developed for a mix of office or commercial uses that include retail, light manufacturing, and mini warehousing. Additional uses in the immediate vicinity include a religious institution, multi-family and conventional single-family dwellings, multi-user office complex, and a mobile home park.

2.0 LAND USE MAP SET AND SUMMARY DATA

2.3 Immediate Area Map



Adjacent Zonings and Uses

Location	Zoning (Pockets)	Maximum Density/ FAR Permitted by Zoning District	Allowable Use	Existing Use
North	PD 77-0123 (62B)	0 DU/GA FAR: 0.75	Commercial or Office	Light Manufacturing
South	PD 77-0123 (62B)	0 DU/GA FAR: 0.75	Commercial or Office	Retail
East	PD 77-0123 (62B)	0 DU/GA FAR: 0.75	Commercial or Office	Retail
West	PD 77-0123 (77 & 62B)	0 DU/GA Pocket 77 FAR: 0.25 Pocket 62B FAR: 0.75	Commercial or Office	Retail & Mini Warehousing

2.0 LAND USE MAP SET AND SUMMARY DATA


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



62A	MF	72	
62B	Commercial or Office		440,207
63A	Commercial or Office		30,610
	Office		24,000

2.0 LAND USE MAP SET AND SUMMARY DATA

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



62A	MF	72	
62B	Commercial or Office / MF	237	440,207 ← 405,696
63A	Commercial or Office		30,610

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
Apollo Beach Blvd.	County Collector - Rural	4 Lanes ☒ Substandard Road ☐ Sufficient ROW Width	☐ Corridor Preservation Plan ☐ Site Access Improvements ☐ Substandard Road Improvements ☒ Other - TBD
	Choose an item.	Choose an item. Lanes ☐ Substandard Road ☐ Sufficient ROW Width	☐ Corridor Preservation Plan ☐ Site Access Improvements ☐ Substandard Road Improvements ☐ Other
	Choose an item.	Choose an item. Lanes ☐ Substandard Road ☐ Sufficient ROW Width	☐ Corridor Preservation Plan ☐ Site Access Improvements ☐ Substandard Road Improvements ☐ Other

Project Trip Generation (Modification Area Only) ☐ Not applicable for this request

	Average Daily Trips	A.M. Peak Hour Trips	P.M. Peak Hour Trips
Existing	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Proposed	1,061	92	89
Difference (+/-)	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown

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

Connectivity and Cross Access ☐ Not applicable for this request

Project Boundary	Primary Access	Additional Connectivity/Access	Cross Access	Finding
North		None	Pedestrian	Meets LDC
South		None	Pedestrian	Meets LDC
East		None	None	Meets LDC
West	X	Pedestrian & Vehicular	None	Does Not Meet LDC

Notes: Access and median spacing issues have not been resolved, as such the access does not comply with LDC requirements.

Design Exception/Administrative Variance ☐ Not applicable for this request

Road Name/Nature of Request	Type	Finding
Apollo Beach Blvd./ Access Spacing	Administrative Variance Requested	Not Supported
Apollo Beach Blvd./ Median Spacing	Administrative Variance Requested	Not Supported
Apollo Beach Blvd./ Substandard Road	Design Exception Requested	Not Supported
	Choose an item.	Choose an item.

Notes:

4.0 ADDITIONAL SITE INFORMATION & AGENCY COMMENTS SUMMARY

INFORMATION/REVIEWING AGENCY	Comments Received	Objections	Conditions Requested	Additional Information/Comments
Environmental				
Environmental Protection Commission	☒ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☒ No	☒ Yes ☐ No	Chapter 1-11 Wetland Impact Noticed Exemption Approved by EPC on 12-15-25
Environmental Services	☒ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☒ No	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Natural Resources	☒ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☒ No	☒ Yes ☐ No	
Conservation & Environmental Lands Management	☒ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☒ No	☐ Yes ☒ No	
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 Area ☐ Significant Wildlife Habitat ☒ Coastal High Hazard Area ☐ Urban/Suburban/Rural Scenic Corridor ☐ Adjacent to ELAPP property ☐ Other _____				
Public Facilities				
Transportation ☒ Design Exc./Adm. Variance Requested ☐ Off-site Improvements Provided	☒ Yes ☐ No	☒ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☒ No	Conditions are not provided unless a minimally compliant, supportable application is submitted.
Service Area/ Water & Wastewater ☒ Urban ☐ City of Tampa ☐ Rural ☐ City of Temple Terrace	☒ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☒ No	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Hillsborough County School Board Adequate ☒ K-5 ☒ 6-8 ☒ 9-12 ☐ N/A Inadequate ☐ K-5 ☐ 6-8 ☐ 9-12 ☐ N/A	☒ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☒ No	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Impact/Mobility Fees: Urban Mobility, South Park/Fire – 237 multi-family units				
Fee estimate is based on a 1,200 square foot, Multi-Family Units 1-2 story Mobility: \$6,661 * 237 units = \$1,578,657 Parks: \$1,555 * 237 units = \$ 368,535 School: \$3,891 * 237 units = \$ 922,167 Fire: \$ 249 * 237 units = \$ 59,013 Total Multi-Family (1-2 story) = \$2,928,372				

APPLICATION NUMBER: MM 26-0062

ZHM HEARING DATE: July 20, 2026

BOCC LUM MEETING DATE: September 22, 2026

Case Reviewer: Sam Ball

Comprehensive Plan	Comments Received	Findings	Conditions Requested	Additional Information/Comments
Planning Commission ☐ Meets Locational Criteria ☒ N/A ☐ Locational Criteria Waiver Requested ☐ Minimum Density Met ☒ N/A	☒ Yes ☐ No	☐ Inconsistent ☒ Consistent	☒ Yes ☐ No	

5.0 IMPLEMENTATION RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Compatibility

The activities associated with light manufacturing use to the north are contained within a structure positioned approximately 120 feet north of the subject property's boundary. The manufacturing facility to the north is also screened from the subject property with dense vegetation and protected wetlands. The loading docks of the manufacturing facility are located more than 275 feet from the proposed multi-family development site and are oriented towards the opposite direction. In lieu of the 30-foot buffer with Type "C" screening the applicant is proposing a 10-foot buffer with Type "B" screening to mitigate the impacts of the incompatible uses. Based on these findings, staff finds that approval of the requested waiver to the 30-foot buffer with Type "C" screening will have minimal impact. Based on the zoning and development pattern of the area, and the above considerations, staff finds the proposed development compatible with the area.

5.2 Recommendation

The proposed number of residential units is being provided through a conversion of commercial entitlements to residential entitlements. The conversion rate is as provided in the related Apollo Beach DRI (#49) development order. As outlined in the Additional Information (Section 7.0) and the Transportation Report (Section 9) sections of this report the amount of commercial entitlements proposed to be converted (34,511 square feet) is insufficient to achieve the requested number of residential units (237).

Based on the above considerations, staff finds the request not supportable.

6.0 PROPOSED CONDITIONS

NA

Zoning Administrator Sign Off:	
SITE, SUBDIVISION AND BUILDING CONSTRUCTION IN ACCORDANCE WITH HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN & BUILDING REVIEW AND APPROVAL. Approval of this re-zoning petition by Hillsborough County does not constitute a guarantee that the project will receive approvals/permits necessary for site development as proposed will be issued, nor does it imply that other required permits needed for site development or building construction are being waived or otherwise approved. The project will be required to comply with the Site Development Plan Review approval process in addition to obtain all necessary	

7.0 ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND/OR GRAPHICS

Notwithstanding the use and intensity compatibility findings, site development is required to comply with the terms and conditions contained within the Apollo Beach DRI (#49). The application does not satisfy the requirements of Section IV.A(2) of the Apollo Beach DRI (#49) as stated below, which is required for the conversion of development rights.

Increments of individual approved land uses, or any subphase, portion or combination thereof, may be converted to other increments of individual approved land uses having the equivalent trip generation based on the Institute of Transportation Engineer's ("ITE") Trip Generation, latest edition. In addition, the cumulative project totals for each approved land use shall not be exceeded as a result of such conversion. Prior to such conversion, the Developers shall provide the County for review and approval, traffic trip generation data sufficient to verify that such conversion will not result in directional trip generation which exceeds that projected.

The summary table below shows the number of entitlements allowed in the PD and corresponding DRI, the required entitlements to qualify for the exchange and the shortage of entitlements based on the transportation related exchange ratio.

Pocket 62B Folio	Use	Current GFA
51578.5000	Mini WH	76,280
51583.1000	Light MFG	29,920
51583.0240	CG	21,561
51583.0210	CG	109,524
51587.0200	Bank	3,459
51587.5000	Pharmacy	11,116
51583.0220	Bank	4,077
51583.0000	Office	29,536
51583.0545	Carwash	3,835
51583.0525	GC	9,246
51583.0510	GC	7,056
51583.0500	Surface Parking	0
51583.0505	Surface Parking	0
Total Entitlements Used (GFA)		305,610
Current Entitlements Balance Without Exchange (GFA)	440,207	134,597
Exchange Entitlements Balance for 237 DUs Proposed by Applicant	34,511	100,086
Transportation Exchange GFA Requirements/Balance for 237 DUs	310,363	(175,766)

Agency	Number	Violation	Status
Code Enforcement*			
☒ None current or pending			
☐ Violation(s)			
Building Code Compliance*			
☒ None current or pending			
☐ Violation(s)			

APPLICATION NUMBER: MM 26-0062

ZHM HEARING DATE: July 20, 2026


BOCC LUM MEETING DATE: September 22, 2026

Case Reviewer: Sam Ball


Natural Resources*			
☒ None current or pending			
☐ Violation(s)			
EPC*			
☒ None current or pending			
☐ Violation(s)			

8.0 SITE PLANS (FULL)

8.1 Approved Site Plan (Full)

A large, empty rectangular box with a thin black border, intended for the submission of the Approved Site Plan. It occupies the majority of the page below the section header.

APOLLO BEACH DRI



PHASES IA & IB		
POCKET	POCKET INCLUDED WITH DEVELOPMENT ORDER	ALLOWABLE A/C U.S.
10	10	100
11	11	100
12	12	100
13	13	100
14	14	100
15	15	100
16	16	100
17	17	100
18	18	100
19	19	100
20	20	100
21	21	100
22	22	100
23	23	100
24	24	100
25	25	100
26	26	100
27	27	100
28	28	100
29	29	100
30	30	100
31	31	100
32	32	100
33	33	100
34	34	100
35	35	100
36	36	100
37	37	100
38	38	100
39	39	100
40	40	100
41	41	100
42	42	100
43	43	100
44	44	100
45	45	100
46	46	100
47	47	100
48	48	100
49	49	100
50	50	100
51	51	100
52	52	100
53	53	100
54	54	100
55	55	100
56	56	100
57	57	100
58	58	100
59	59	100
60	60	100
61	61	100
62	62	100
63	63	100
64	64	100
65	65	100
66	66	100
67	67	100
68	68	100
69	69	100
70	70	100
71	71	100
72	72	100
73	73	100
74	74	100
75	75	100
76	76	100
77	77	100
78	78	100
79	79	100
80	80	100
81	81	100
82	82	100
83	83	100
84	84	100
85	85	100
86	86	100
87	87	100
88	88	100
89	89	100
90	90	100
91	91	100
92	92	100
93	93	100
94	94	100
95	95	100
96	96	100
97	97	100
98	98	100
99	99	100
100	100	100

Map H (Revised) May 2026
Apollo Beach, FL 33570 | Hillsborough County
Map H (Revised) May 2026
Apollo Beach, FL 33570 | Hillsborough County

- LEGEND:**
- POCKET DESIGNATION
 - COLLECTOR ROADWAYS
- DRI STATUS**
- PARCELS NOT IN THE DRI NOR ZONING
 - PARCELS IN THE ZONING BUT NOT DRI
 - VACANT PARCELS REMAINING TO BE BUILT AND/OR REVIEWED
 - PARCELS THAT ARE CONSIDERED BUILT OR APPROVED



MAP H (REVISED) MAY 2026
APOLLO BEACH, FL 33570 | HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY

8.0 SITE PLANS (FULL)

8.2 Proposed Site Plan (Full)

APPLICATION NUMBER: MM 26-0062

ZHM HEARING DATE: July 20, 2026

BOCC LUM MEETING DATE: September 22, 2026

Case Reviewer: Sam Ball

9.0 FULL TRANSPORTATION REPORT (see following pages)

AGENCY REVIEW COMMENT SHEET

TO: Zoning Technician, Development Services Department

DATE: 07/13/2026

REVIEWER: James Ratliff, AICP, PTP, Principal Planner AGENCY/DEPT: Transportation

PLANNING AREA/SECTOR: APB/ South

PETITION NO: MM 26-0062

☐

This agency has no comments.

☐

This agency has no objection.

☐

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

☒

This agency objects for the reasons set forth below.

RATIONALE FOR OBJECTION

1. The area of modification lies within tract 62B. The applicant notes 310,909 s.f. of uses have been constructed within that tract to date. Transportation Review Section (TRS) staff notes that zoning section staff is responsible for determining whether entitlements exist to support the proposed project. Regardless, the applicant submitted a request to exchange land uses as permitted under the Development of Regional Impact (DRI) Development Order (DO). Specifically, they requested to exchange 34,511 s.f. of 62B commercial entitlements to 237 multi-family dwelling units (staff notes that the units would require a minimum height of 4-stories or higher based on rate of exchange used, i.e. taller apartments generally generate fewer trips on a per unit basis). TRS staff determined that the applicant did not correctly calculate the exchange.
2. Staff advised the applicant on January 14, 2026, that “The only metric that works for the exchange is outbound PM peak hour trips, the exchange comes up short in each other area, i.e. directional daily inbound and outbound, directional AM inbound and outbound, and directional PM inbound trips.” Staff noted that the exchange must examine each separately. On January 29, 2026, after meetings with the applicant and further discussion internally, staff advised the applicant that it confirmed the “need to execute the conversion based on 12th Edition rate equivalency for directional trips and all three time periods (AADT, AM peak and PM peak). Then we apply re-calculate the baseline (using 12th Edition) for the residential trips for the residential pm peak trip cap “bucket” you are exchanging into and PM trip cap (2,029 total /1,319 inbound /710 outbound trips) referenced in the DO table (specific condition IV.A.1.) and add in the trips from the new residential entitlements (89 total/ 57 in/ 32 out), to check if it exceeds the bucket maximum.”

TRS staff went on to state that (as shown in the summary tables below) it had calculated the need to exchange 310,364 s.f. of commercial entitlements (i.e. to get enough outbound trips in the a.m. peak hour, which is the controlling factor); however, such exchange would cause the development to exceed the allowable cap (i.e. “bucket”) of residential trips by 10 exiting trips. Also, staff understands that such entitlements are not available for exchange within tract 62B.

Exchange Calculation:

		LUC	Use	Units	Daily	In	Out	AM	In	Out	PM	In	Out
Needed/ "To"	Equations	221	Apartments 4+ stories	237 DUs	1061	530	531	92	21	71	89	57	32
Needed/ "From"													
Original	Avg/EQ/EQ	820	Shopping Center	870,464 s.f.	31,676	15,838	15,838	664	412	252	2,203	1,079	1,124
Proposed	Avg/EQ/EQ	820	Shopping Center	560,100	20,382	10,191	10,191	475	294	181	1,647	807	840
Exchange	Difference			310,364	11,294	5,647	5,647	189	118	71	556	272	284
				Difference From - To	10,233	5,117	5,116	97	97	0	467	215	252
				OK/SHORT?	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK	OK

Residential "Bucket" Calculation:

Excerpt from A.1. Table (DRI DO)						
	EXISTING DEVELOPMENT	As of 12/31/1996	Units/ Sq. Ft	Total PM Peak Trips	PM Peak Entering	PM Peak Exiting
	From DO					
A	RESIDENTIAL UNITS	UNITS	2,429	2,029	1,319	710
	Calibrated to 12th Edition (Using Equations, LUC 210)					
B	RESIDENTIAL UNITS	UNITS	2,429	1,811	1,123	688
	New Bucket (LUC 221, 12th Edition)					
C	RESIDENTIAL UNITS 4+ stories	UNITS	237	89	57	32
	Subtotals (B+C)		2,666	1,900	1,180	720
	Over/Under A - (B+C)		-237	129	139	-10
			OK	OK	Short	

It should be noted that the above calculations do not factor in the land use exchange being processed via file 26-1132, which may further reduce the number of trips available within the residential trip "bucket".

- Since there are insufficient entitlements under their control necessary to execute the exchange, and such exchange would violate the DRI DO, staff does not support the request. Although not a part of this request, staff may not support an amendment to the DRI DO to add additional entitlements or an exchange in excess of that envisioned in the original DO has the potential to reduced planned internal capture and/or shift peaking characteristics of the development from commercial uses (which has anticipated traffic patterns that are entering from US 41 in the a.m.) to residential development (which has anticipated traffic patterns which are existing in the a.m.) thereby putting additional pressure on the US 41 and Apollo Beach Blvd. intersection (which is the primary entrance and exit for the DRI).
- The applicant submitted a Sec. 6.04.02.B. Administrative Variance (AV) request for the County Engineer's consideration, seeking relief from the Sec. 6.04.07 median spacing standards (as it relates to the full median opening at which the project access is proposed). Over the course of multiple calls/emails, the applicant was informed that staff has significant safety and operational concerns regarding the proposed access configuration, does not support the median variance, and believes the applicant did not meet its burden to address criteria a., b. and c.
- The applicant was provided the below photo (taken at approximately 11:30 am on a Saturday) of conditions at the next median opening to the south/east of the proposed project median opening (and which is also a median opening that is the subject of the median spacing AV) to further illustrate these concerns. This photo shows the operational and safety issues that can occur when inadequate site distance is present (i.e. neutral or negative offsets), and when there is a lack of dedicated left turn lanes at median openings. In the photo below the subject vehicle cannot complete a left turn, given inadequate site distance /blocked visibility of the outermost northbound through lane. The blue SUV and while SUV behind it are both attempting to turn left, but similarly cannot make such turn, given the subject vehicle and another vehicle behind it also attempting such turn (not pictured) are blocking their view of the southbound outermost

through lane. The impasse was only resolved when the white SUV reversed enough to go around the stopped vehicle, providing site visibility for the subject vehicle to complete its turn (which subsequently enabled the blue SUV adequate visibility to complete its turn).

This situation increases the likelihood of side-impact crashes when people pull forward into the traffic without having a clear sight lines of the outermost free-flowing turn lane (and in some cases are waved on by other drivers attempting to be “Good Samaritans” but who didn’t see the other traffic or were attempting to communicate only that it was clear from one of the possible directions of conflict). Safety concerns are also present given turning vehicles must stop within a through lane to wait for refuge in the median, and reverse within a through lane, increasing the potential for rear end collisions.

Given the issues, the applicant was informed that it would need to either restrict the access to a right-in/right-out access (thereby redirecting traffic to the next closest median openings to the north/west and east/south), which would also require turn lanes to provide for a safe configuration and/or as would otherwise be required pursuant to Sec. 6.04.04.D. of the LDC). Alternatively, the County Engineer was willing to support the AV if the applicant constructed left turn lanes at each approach to the median opening serving this site (i.e. to help mitigate the site distance issues illustrated in the photo below, and minimizing the potential for that type of “Good Samaritan” side angle crash).



6. With respect to the median opening spacing variance which was submitted, the applicant’s Engineer of Record (EOR) met with staff and the County Engineer to review the request. The applicant failed to address how this median opening variance would not create operational or safety issues. The concern stems from the fact that traffic entering and exiting the project would be turning left in and left out of the site, on a 4-lane roadway with substandard median spacing, proximate to a curve, and at a median opening that doesn’t have southbound or northbound left turn lanes. Currently, traffic turning into the shopping center on the west side of Apollo Beach Blvd. at this opening must queue into the western through lane if there is more than one vehicle waiting to make that turn (which appears likely based on the data). Development of the subject site as proposed will add opposing southbound traffic as well as exiting traffic from the proposed development which would need to make a 2-stage turn (seeking shelter in the median until a gap occurs), and which is in the same space that traffic exiting the shopping center (to go northbound) would also be seeking to make a similar 2-stage turn. This configuration would increase the potential for rear end and side-impact collisions (as noted in the example provided above) as well as reduce the level of service of the roadway.

The County Engineer examined the project and offered that one potential solution might be for the applicant to construct northbound and southbound left turn lanes at the median opening (to allow northbound and southbound turning traffic to safely wait at the intersection without queuing into the through lanes). The County Engineer indicated that was one possible solution, and that other solutions could be proposed by the applicant (and would be given due

consideration by the County Engineer). A revised request was submitted by the applicant on July 9, 2026, well past the deadline for submitting revised TRARs for this application cycle.

7. The County Engineer found that the median spacing variance request does not prove that there is an unreasonable burden on the applicant as required by Sec. 6.04.02.B of the LDC. The applicant states in the AV request, “Relocating the existing median opening in either direction will result in the median opening not meeting the minimum spacing standards. Closing the existing full median opening would impact traffic operations at the retail shopping plaza driveway (located on the west side of Apollo Beach Boulevard) and the adjacent median openings.” The applicant failed to address how closure or directionalization impacts the shopping center on the west/south side of the roadway given it is served by multiple median openings. Furthermore, staff notes such discussion is not relevant to criteria at hand, which is the burden faced by this applicant.

The AV request states, “Based on the existing traffic counts collected for the traffic study dated October 10, 2025 and the distribution presented in the traffic study, approximately 90 percent of the proposed development traffic will be routed to the south. Relocating the median opening will require 90 percent of exiting traffic to utilize the relocated median opening to make a U-turn movement to go south. The 10 percent of inbound traffic coming from the north will be rerouted to an adjacent median opening to make a U-turn movement to access the development. This relocated median opening will cause operational challenges while still not meeting the minimum spacing requirements.” The applicant’s request failed to state that the next median opening to the north does not have the same type or intensity of development utilizing that median as would be the case at the proposed median. The applicant states, “Although not required based on the traffic study, if the full access median is permitted to remain at its current location, a northbound left turn lane and southbound right turn lane will be constructed.” It is not clear where these are proposed, as they are not shown on the PD site plan. Presumably the northbound left turn lane is at the median, but staff does not understand how a southbound right turn lane would address the issue. Staff also notes the applicant failed to update the PD narrative to list these as “Developer Commitments”, nor did they address why the dual left turn lanes suggested by the County Engineer at the median opening as a possible solution was not unreasonable.

8. The County Engineer found that the median spacing variance request does not prove that the variance would not be detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare as required by Sec. 6.04.02.B of the LDC. The applicant states in the AV request, “There have been seven crashes on the Apollo Beach Boulevard segment between the northern and southern median openings during the five-year period from January 1, 2020 to December 31, 2024.” and, “During the five-year period, there were no bicycle, pedestrian, or golf cart related crashes along Apollo Beach Boulevard. The study roadway segment between the northern and southern median openings experienced an average crash rate of 1.205 crashes per million vehicle miles traveled (MVMT), approximately 31 percent lower than the statewide average crash rate of 1.747 for similar urban roadway facilities in the State of Florida. Therefore, it is expected that maintaining the location of the existing full median opening on Apollo Beach Boulevard will not reduce the safety for users of the roadway facility.”

The applicant failed to consider that the existing configuration of the median is such that there is only one access utilizing the median (i.e. the proposed access does not yet exist). As such, reports showing existing crash history has little to no bearing on the potential for crashes at the reconfigured median (whereby a 4th leg will be added to the intersection).

The applicant also failed to consider the safety implications of the lack of left turn lanes/ offset visibility as noted in the photo/example above.

9. The County Engineer found that the median spacing variance request does not prove that without the variance reasonable access cannot be provided. The applicant states in the AV request, “The

existing full median opening on Apollo Beach Boulevard is needed to provide reasonable access to the proposed site. If the existing full median opening is closed, and the driveway is constructed as a right in right out (RIRO) driveway, traffic generated by both the proposed development and the existing retail plaza will be rerouted to the adjacent median openings where they will need to make U-turn movements. Per the traffic study dated October 10, 2025, the existing full median opening to the north of the proposed project driveway may accommodate passenger car U-turns, but larger vehicles (such as delivery trucks, fire trucks, waste management trucks, and semi-trailers) will need to be rerouted further. Therefore, the existing full median opening is necessary for the proposed development and, without a variance, reasonable access cannot be provided to the site.”

Staff notes the applicant failed to address that turn lanes could be provided at the adjacent medians to address any similar visibility issue or as otherwise required per Sec. 6.04.04.D. of the LDC, and why providing southbound/northbound left turn lanes at both legs of the proposed median opening is not reasonable.

10. The applicant submitted a Sec. 6.04.02.B. Administrative Variance (AV) request for the County Engineer’s consideration, seeking relief from the Sec. 6.04.07 access spacing standards (as it relates to the next closest access to the north on the same side of the street). Current policy requires certain Transportation Related Administrative reviews (TRARs), such as this AV request, to be reviewed concurrently with the PD zoning action, since its denial at a later stage would conflict with any PD zoning plan that may be approved by the BOCC. Staff understands that while the County Engineer may agree to the AV in concept, the applicant was informed that there were additional changes that were needed in order for the AV request to be presented to the County Engineer. The applicant submitted a revised request on July 9, 2026, well past the June 18, 2026, deadline for the AV to resubmitted such that it can be properly reviewed by staff and found approvable by the County Engineer. A cursory review indicated additional issues exist, but since a full review could not take place they could not be documented for the purposes of the zoning. As such, the County Engineer was not able to review or find these variances approvable.
11. The applicant submitted a Transportation Technical Manual (TTM) Design Exception (DE) request for the County Engineer’s consideration, as it relates to the project’s substandard road requirements (reference LDC Sec. 6.04.03.L). Current policy allows certain Transportation Related Administrative reviews (TRARs), such as this DE request, to be deferred to the site/construction plan review stage or processed concurrently with the PD zoning action. The applicant elected to process the request concurrently with the zoning. Staff understands that while the County Engineer may agree to the DE in concept, the applicant was informed that there were additional changes that were needed in order for the DE request to be presented to the County Engineer. The applicant submitted a revised request on July 9, 2026, well past the June 18, 2026, deadline for the DE to resubmitted such that it can be properly reviewed by staff and found approvable by the County Engineer. A cursory review indicated additional issues exist, but since a full review could not take place they could not be documented for the purposes of the zoning. As such, the County Engineer was not able to review or find these variances approvable.
12. While a continuance may provide extra time to resolve issues with the TRARs, it is unknown whether it would assist with resolving the above issues with DRI entitlements/requirements.
13. On January 6, 2016, The Hillsborough BOCC Unanimously Adopted Resolution R16-007 Pertaining To “Vision Zero” (i.e. seeking to eliminate serious injuries and further the County’s goal that no loss of life is acceptable on our roadways).
14. Given the land use exchange/trip cap issue, that the above safety, operational and other concerns have not yet been addressed, and that the median spacing AV (in its current state) is not approvable by the County Engineer, and other AVs were submitted too late for a proper review and have not yet been found approvable, staff recommends denial of the proposed zoning modification request.

SUMMARY OF REQUEST AND TRIP GENERATION

The applicant is requesting a Major Modification (MM) to previously approved Planned Development (PD) 77-0123, as most recently amended via 25-1203. The PD is also located within the Apollo Beach Development of Regional Impact (DRI) #59. During a previous amendment (via Resolution R20-070) the DRI was amended to include a statement that “all remaining development will be mitigated through payment of mobility fees pursuant to the terms of the Hillsborough County Mobility Fee Ordinance, Ord. No. 16-8, as it may be amended.” No other transportation conditions directly address required improvements exist within the DRI; however, staff notes that the applicant is entitled to seek land use exchanges, which are not permitted to “result in directional trip generation which exceeds that projected.” (Reference Specific Condition IV.A.2.) Determinations as to whether land use exchanges are needed to support a project are made by the zoning review section. The zoning section has determined that an exchange is necessary; however, there are insufficient entitlements to execute the exchange.

The applicant is proposing to exchange 34,511 s.f. of commercial or office entitlements that remain available in Pocket 62B to 237 multi-family dwelling units (4 stories or more). As such, the applicant is proposing to modify Pocket 62B entitlements to reduce from 440,207 s.f. to 405,696 s.f. and add the 237 multi-family dwelling units. (4 stories or more). TRS staff determined the exchange was not being correctly calculated and would cause the development to exceed certain maximum trip cap specified in the DO, as further detailed in the rationale for objection section above.

As required by the Development Review Procedures Manual (DRPM), the applicant submitted a trip generation and site access analysis which examined development within only the modification area. Consistent with Section 6.2.1.C. of the DRPM, staff waived the requirement to examine impacts from the entirety of the PD/DRI, which encompasses over +/- 1,200 acres.

Staff was unable to prepare a comparison of the potential number of peak hour trips generated under the existing and proposed zoning designations, given a lack of clarity as to how the applicant is intending to address the lack of DRI entitlements. The data below shows trips from the proposed residential development, utilizing a generalized worst-case scenario. Data for the proposed project is based upon the 12th Edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineer’s Trip Generation Manual.

Proposed Zoning (Modification Area Only):

Zoning, Land Use/Size	24 Hour Two-Way Volume	Total Peak Hour Trips	
		AM	PM
237 Multi-Family Apartments 4+ Stories (ITE LUC 221)	1,061	92	89

INFRASTRUCURE SERVING THE SITE

Apollo Beach Blvd. is a substandard, publicly maintained collector roadway. The roadway is characterized by +/- 21-22 feet of pavement on each side of the divided median, with pavement being in average condition. The roadway lies within a +/- 100-foot-wide right-of-way in the vicinity of the proposed project. There are +/- 5-foot-wide sidewalks along portions of the roadway (on both sides) in the vicinity of the proposed project. There are no bicycle facilities present along the roadway in the vicinity of the project.

SITE ACCESS AND SITE ACCESS IMPROVEMENTS

The applicant is proposing one (1) vehicular access connection to Apollo Beach Blvd., one (1) gated emergency access connection to Apollo Beach Blvd., and one (1) pedestrian cross access each along the northern and southern project boundaries as required by Sec. 6.04.03.Q. of the LDC.

Although turn lanes are not required per Sec. 6.04.04.D. of the LDC, the applicant was informed that northbound and southbound turn lanes at both median approaches were necessary to achieve a safe design. This is discussed hereinabove in the “Rationale for Objection” section.

ADMINISTRATIVE VARIANCE – APOLLO BEACH BLVD. – ACCESS SPACING

The applicant’s Engineer of Record (EOR) submitted a Sec. 6.04.02.B. Administrative Variance (dated July 9, 2026) from the Sec. 6.04.07 LDC requirement, governing the project’s Apollo Beach Blvd. access spacing. The Hillsborough County LDC requires a minimum connection spacing of 245 feet for a Class 5 roadway with a posted speed of 45 miles per hour or less. Apollo Beach Blvd. has a posted speed of 40 mph in the vicinity of the proposed project. The applicant is seeking a variance of +/- 70 feet from the closest driveway to the north (on the same side of the roadway), such that the developer will be permitted to construct the project access in a location +/- 175 feet from that driveway.

As noted in the “Rationale for Objection” section hereinabove, the request was submitted too late to be properly reviewed and as such is not approvable by the County Engineer.

ADMINISTRATIVE VARIANCE – APOLLO BEACH BLVD. – MEDIAN SPACING

The applicant’s Engineer of Record (EOR) submitted a Sec. 6.04.02.B. Administrative Variance (dated July 9, 2026) from the Sec. 6.04.07 LDC requirement, governing the project’s Apollo Beach Blvd. median spacing. The Hillsborough County LDC requires a minimum median spacing of 660 feet for a Class 5 roadway with a posted speed of 45 miles per hour or less. Apollo Beach Blvd. has a posted speed of 40 mph in the vicinity of the proposed project. The applicant is requesting a variance of +/- 240 feet between the existing (project access) median opening and the next closest median to the south, such that the medians will be permitted to remain with a spacing of +/- 420 feet.

For reasons described above in the “Rationale for Objection” section hereinabove, the request is not approvable by the County Engineer.

DESIGN EXCEPTION REQUEST – APOLLO BEACH BLVD. – SUBSTANDARD ROAD

As Apollo Beach Blvd. is a substandard collector roadway, the applicant’s Engineer of Record (EOR) submitted a Design Exception request (dated June 9, 2026) to determine the specific improvements that would be required by the County Engineer. As noted in the “Rationale for Objection” section hereinabove, the request was submitted too late to be properly reviewed and as such is not approvable by the County Engineer.


ROADWAY LEVELS OF SERVICE (LOS) INFORMATION

Roadway	From	To	LOS Standard	Peak Hour LOS
Apollo Beach Blvd.	Surfside Blvd.	US 41	D	C

Source: 2024 Hillsborough County Level of Service (LOS) Report.

< THIS PAGE WAS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK >

< THIS PAGE WAS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK >



**Hillsborough County
City-County
Planning Commission**

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

Unincorporated Hillsborough County Rezoning Consistency Review	
Hearing Date: July 20, 2026 Report Prepared: July 9, 2026	Case Number: MM 26-0062 Folio(s): 51578.6000, 51583.0550 General Location: Apollo Beach Boulevard, west of North US Highway 41
Comprehensive Plan Finding	CONSISTENT
Adopted Future Land Use	Office Commercial-20 (20 du/ga; 0.75 FAR)
Service Area	Urban
Community Plan(s)	Apollo Beach + SouthShore Areawide Systems
Rezoning Request	Major Modification (MM) to Planned Development (PD) 77-0123 to develop 237 dwelling units
Parcel Size	9.48 ± acres
Street Functional Classification	Apollo Beach Boulevard – County Collector North US Highway 41 – State Principal Arterial
Commercial Locational Criteria	N/A
Evacuation Area	A

Table 1: COMPARISON OF SURROUNDING PROPERTIES			
Vicinity	Future Land Use Designation	Zoning	Existing Land Use
Subject Property	Office Commercial-20	PD 77-0123	Vacant Land
North	Office Commercial-20	PD	Light Industrial + Multi-Family + HOA/Common Property
South	Residential-6 + Office Commercial-20	PD	Light Commercial + Single Family + HOA/Common Property
East	Office Commercial-20 + Suburban Mixed-Use-6	PD + CG	Light Commercial
West	Office Commercial-20 + Residential-6	PD + CN	Light Commercial + Public/Quasi-Public/Institutions

Staff Analysis of Goals, Objectives and Policies:

The 9.48 ± acre subject site is located north of Apollo Beach Boulevard and west of North US Highway 41. The subject site is within the Urban Service Area (USA) and is within the limits of the Apollo Beach Community Plan and the Southshore Areawide Systems Plan. The applicant is requesting a Major Modification to Planned Development (PD) 77-0123 to develop 237 dwelling units. The site is a part of a Development of Regional Impact (DRI) Development Order which identifies 964 remaining residential units authorized for development as of December 2019.

The subject site is currently vacant. Surrounding land uses include light industrial uses to the north. To the east there are light commercial uses, including dining establishments, a Publix shopping center, a dental office, and a veterinary clinic. Additional light commercial uses are located to the west, with single-family residential units located farther west across Apollo Beach Boulevard. Light commercial uses are also located to the south of the site. The subject property is located within the Urban Service Area, where Objective 1.1 of the Future Land Use Section (FLUS) directs 80 percent of the county's growth. FLUS Policy 3.1.3 requires new development to be compatible with surrounding uses, emphasizing that compatibility does not require identical development, but rather sensitivity to maintaining the character of existing development. The applicant proposes the development of 237 dwelling units with a building height exceeding 60 feet. While the Apollo Beach Community Plan seeks to discourage residential development exceeding 50 feet in height, the proposed height is considered compatible despite nearby buildings being at least 2-stories in height due to the commercial intensity of the surrounding area. The proposed

residential development is consistent with FLUS Objective 1.1 and Policy 3.1.3, as it aligns with the surrounding development pattern and maintains compatibility in scale and character with nearby uses, including existing light commercial development.

Pursuant to Objective 2.2, Future Land Use categories establish the maximum density and intensity and the range of permitted land uses within each designation. The subject site is designated Office Commercial-20 (OC-20) on the Future Land Use Map (FLUM). The OC-20 category is intended to accommodate commercial and office development and is among the most intensive designations on the FLUM. It allows for a maximum residential density of 20 dwelling units per gross acre or a maximum non-residential intensity of 0.75 floor area ratio (FAR), and permits consideration of community commercial, office, mixed-use, and compatible residential uses. While the 9.48-acre subject site could be considered for up to 189 dwelling units based on the base OC-20 density standard, the applicant proposes approximately 237 multi-family dwelling units. This exceeds the base OC-20 density, however the proposal remains consistent with Objective 2.2 and the intent of the OC-20 designation due to the site's location within an area of high commercial intensity and access to urban services. Furthermore, Exhibit C of the Development of Regional Impact (DRI) Development Order identifies 964 remaining residential units authorized for development as of December 2019. The proposed development would utilize a portion of these remaining entitlements and would remain well below the total number of residential units authorized within the DRI. Based on the site context, residential uses permitted within the OC-20 designation, and the availability of DRI entitlements, the proposed development is consistent with the aforementioned policies, provided the proposal complies with all applicable provisions of the DRI Development Order.

The subject site is located within the Coastal High Hazard Area (CHHA). Pursuant to FLUS Policy 2.3.5, density bonuses are not applicable to properties located within the CHHA. The applicant is not requesting a density bonus and is therefore consistent with this policy direction. The subject site consists of approximately 9.48 acres and could be considered for up to 189 dwelling units based on the maximum residential density of 20 dwelling units per gross acre permitted under the OC-20 Future Land Use category, however under the DRI entitlements, the site can still be considered for 964 residential units. While the proposed development exceeds the base OC-20 density, it does not rely on a density bonus and remains consistent with adopted Future Land Use policies. Additionally, the proposal is consistent with FLUS Objective 6.2, which requires that new development and redevelopment not adversely impact environmentally sensitive areas or significant natural systems, as outlined in the Environmental and Sustainability Section and the Coastal Management Section of the Comprehensive Plan.

The Comprehensive Plan requires that all development meet or exceed the land development regulations in Hillsborough County (FLUS Objective 4.1, FLUS Policy 4.1.1 and FLUS Policy 4.1.2). However, at the time of uploading this report, County Transportation comments were not yet available in Optix and thus were not taken into consideration for analysis of this request.

The proposed development meets the intent of FLUS Objective 4.4 and FLUS Policy 4.4.1, which require new development to be compatible with surrounding neighborhoods. The surrounding land use pattern includes vacant land, single-family residential uses, and light commercial development. FLUS Policy 4.4.1 requires that increases in density or intensity be compatible with existing, proposed, or planned development and integrated with adjacent uses through appropriate transitions of intensity and mitigation of potential impacts. The applicant proposes a maximum building height of approximately 60 feet. While the Apollo Beach Community Plan generally seeks to discourage residential development exceeding 50 feet in height, the Plan also recognizes that building height should be evaluated in relation

to surrounding land use intensity. Given the subject site's Office Commercial-20 Future Land Use designation, its location within an area characterized by higher commercial intensity, and the presence of surrounding non-residential development, the proposed building height is compatible with the surrounding area and therefore meets the intent of FLUS Objective 4.4 and FLUS Policy 4.4.1.

The subject site is within the boundaries of the Apollo Beach Community Plan and the SouthShore Areawide Systems Plan. Strategy 2 of the Apollo Beach Community Plan emphasizes promoting quality land use and design. The Plan identifies a special district at the commercial node along Apollo Beach Boulevard west of U.S. Highway 41, requiring new construction to meet design guidelines that support the town center concept. While the site is designated Office Commercial-20, which is one of the most intensive Future Land Use categories, the Plan generally discourages residential development exceeding 50 feet in height. The applicant is proposing a maximum building height that exceeds 60 feet. Although this exceeds the recommended 50-foot height, the proposed height is consistent with the site's intensive commercial context and surrounding development pattern. Goal 1 of the Cultural/Historic Objective promotes sustainable, well-planned growth that preserves the area's environment, cultural identity, and livability. Goal 1.a of the Economic Objective in the SouthShore Areawide Systems Plan encourages identification and marketing of lands for economic development, including residential, commercial, office, and industrial uses. Goal 1.b emphasizes implementing preferred development patterns from individual community plans, including activity centers, compatibility, design, and pedestrian and bicycle connectivity. The proposed development of 240 dwelling units would support economic activity in the area. While the proposed building height of 60 feet exceeds the preferred 50-foot recommendation in the Apollo Beach Community Plan, the Plan discourages rather than prohibits taller buildings, and the site's location within the intensive OC-20 Future Land Use category makes the proposal consistent with the Livable Communities Element of both the Apollo Beach Community Plan and the SouthShore Areawide Systems Plan.

Overall, staff finds that the proposed Major Modification is compatible with the existing development pattern found within the surrounding area and does support the vision of the Apollo Beach Community Plan and the SouthShore Areawide Systems Plan. The proposed Major Modification would allow for development that is consistent with the Goals, Objectives, and Policies of the *Unincorporated Hillsborough County Comprehensive Plan*.

Recommendation

Based upon the above considerations and the following Goals, Objectives and Policies, Planning Commission staff finds the proposed Major Modification **CONSISTENT** with the *Unincorporated Hillsborough County Comprehensive Plan*, subject to the conditions proposed by the Development Services Department and the requirements of the Development of Regional Impact (DRI).

FUTURE LAND USE SECTION

Urban Service Area

Objective 1.1: 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.

Land Use Categories

Objective 2.2: *The Future Land Use Map (FLUM) shall identify Land Use Categories summarized in the table below, that establish permitted land uses and maximum densities and intensities.*

Policy 2.2.1: *The character of each land use category is defined by building type, residential density, functional use, and the physical composition of the land. The integration of these factors sets the general atmosphere and character of each land use category. Each category has a range of potentially permissible uses which are not exhaustive, but are intended to be illustrative of the character of uses permitted within the land use designation. Not all of those potential uses are routinely acceptable anywhere within that land use category.*

Density and Intensity Bonuses

Objective 2.3: *Utilize density and intensity requirements to encourage growth in efficient and predictable patterns throughout Hillsborough County*

Policy 2.3.5: *Density bonuses outlined in the Comprehensive Plan shall not be applicable to properties within the Coastal High Hazard Area.*

Note: Development that has significant environmental conditions on-site must also be in conformance with the objectives and policies of the Environmental & Sustainability Section. Development proposed within the Coastal High Hazard Area must also be in conformance with the Goals, Objectives and Policies found in the Coastal Management Section.

Compatibility

Objective 3.1: *New developments should recognize the existing community and be designed in a way that is compatible (as defined in FLUE Policy 3.1.3) with the established character of the surrounding neighborhood.*

Policy 3.1.3: *Compatibility is defined as the characteristics of different uses or activities or design which allow them to be located near or adjacent to each other in harmony. Some elements affecting compatibility include the following: height, scale, mass and bulk of structures, pedestrian or vehicular traffic, circulation, access and parking impacts, landscaping, lighting, noise, odor and architecture. Compatibility does not mean “the same as.” Rather, it refers to the sensitivity of development proposals in maintaining the character of existing development.*

Relationship to Land Development Regulations

Objective 4.1: *All existing and future land development regulations shall be made consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, and all development approvals shall be consistent with those development regulations as per the timeframe provided for within Chapter 163, Florida Statutes. Whenever feasible and*

consistent with Comprehensive Plan policies, land development regulations shall be designed to provide flexible, alternative solutions to problems.

Policy 4.1.1: *Each land use plan category shall have a set of zoning districts that may be permitted within that land use plan category, and development shall not be approved for zoning that is inconsistent with the plan.*

Policy 4.1.2: *Developments must meet or exceed the requirements of all land development regulations as established and adopted by Hillsborough County, the state of Florida and the federal government unless such requirements have been previously waived by those governmental bodies.*

Neighborhood/Community Development

Objective 4.4: Neighborhood Protection – *The neighborhood is the 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 4.4.1: *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*

Environmental Considerations

Objective 6.2: *New development and redevelopment shall not adversely impact environmentally sensitive areas and other significant natural systems as described and required within the Environmental and Sustainability Section and the Coastal Management Section of the Comprehensive Plan.*

LIVABLE COMMUNITIES ELEMENT: APOLLO BEACH COMMUNITY PLAN

V. Strategies:

2. Ensure Quality Land Use and Design

- *Create a special district for the commercial node at Apollo Beach Boulevard west of U.S. Highway 41 that requires new construction to meet design guidelines that further the town center concept.*
- *Create a special district containing design guidelines for the Apollo Beach Boulevard corridor west of the commercial node at U.S. Highway 41.*
- *Discourage development of over 50 feet in height in residentially zoned areas.*

LIVABLE COMMUNITIES ELEMENT: SOUTHSORE AREAWIDE SYSTEMS PLAN

Cultural/Historic Objective

The SouthShore region of Hillsborough County supports a diverse population with people living in unique communities, interspersed with farms, natural areas, open spaces and greenways that preserve and enhance the natural and cultural heritage

The community desires to:

1. *Promote sustainable growth and development that is clustered and well planned to preserve the area's environment, cultural identity and livability.*

Economic Development Objective

The SouthShore community encourages activities that benefit residents, employers, employees, entrepreneurs, and businesses that will enhance economic prosperity and improve quality of life.

The community desires to pursue economic development activities in the following areas:


1. *Land Use/Transportation*
 - a. *Analyze, identify and market lands that are available for economic development, including: residential commercial, office, industrial, agricultural (i.e., lands that already have development orders or lands that are not developable.)*
 - b. *Recognize preferred development patterns as described in individual community plans, and implement the communities' desires to the greatest extent possible (including codification into the land development code). I.e., activity center, compatibility, design and form, pedestrian and bicycle/trail connectivity.*

HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY
FUTURE LAND USE
MM 26-0062

Rezoning
STATUS



PENDING




Tampa Service Area




Urban Service Area



Shoreline



County Boundary




Jurisdiction Boundary



Roads




Parcels




AGRICULTURAL/MINING-1/20 (.25 FAR)



PEC PLANNED ENVIRONMENTAL COMMUNITY-1/2 (.25 FAR)




AGRICULTURAL-1/10 (.25 FAR)



AGRICULTURAL/RURAL-1/5 (.25 FAR)




AGRICULTURAL ESTATE-1/2.5 (.25 FAR)




RESIDENTIAL-1 (.25 FAR)




RESIDENTIAL-2 (.25 FAR)



RESIDENTIAL PLANNED-2 (.35 FAR)




RESIDENTIAL-4 (.25 FAR)




RESIDENTIAL-6 (.25 FAR)



RESIDENTIAL-9 (.35 FAR)




RESIDENTIAL-12 (.35 FAR)




RESIDENTIAL-16 (.35 FAR)



RESIDENTIAL-20 (.35 FAR)




RESIDENTIAL-35 (1.0 FAR)




NEIGHBORHOOD MIXED USE-4 (9) (.35 FAR)



SUBURBAN MIXED USE-6 (.35 FAR)



COMMUNITY MIXED USE-12 (.50 FAR)



URBAN MIXED USE-20 (1.0 FAR)



REGIONAL MIXED USE-35 (2.0 FAR)




INNOVATION CORRIDOR MIXED USE-35 (2.0 FAR)



OFFICE COMMERCIAL-20 (.75 FAR)



RESEARCH CORPORATE PARK (1.0 FAR)



ENERGY INDUSTRIAL PARK (.50 FAR USES OTHER THAN RETAIL, 25 FAR RETAIL/COMMERCE)




LIGHT INDUSTRIAL PLANNED (.75 FAR)




LIGHT INDUSTRIAL (.75 FAR)



HEAVY INDUSTRIAL (.75 FAR)



PUBLIC/QUASH-PUBLIC



NATURAL PRESERVATION



WIMAUMA VILLAGE RESIDENTIAL-2 (.25 FAR)



CITRUS PARK VILLAGE



Map Printed from Rezoning System: 10/23/2025
Author: Samantha Lirides
File: G:\Rezoning\System\MapProject\HCS\SanLirides_HCSRezoning.mxd

