Hillsborough
County Florida
Development Services Department

### 1.0 APPLICATION SUMMARY

| Applicant: | Jacob T. Cremer; Stearns Weaver <br> Miller |
| :--- | :--- |
| FLU Category: | SMU-6 |
| Service Area: | Urban |
| Site Acreage: | Approximately 33.58 acres |
| Community <br> Plan Area: | Ruskin/Southshore |
| Overlay: | None |



## Introduction Summary:

The applicant seeks to develop an approximately 33.58-acre unified development consisting of one folio. The request is for a rezoning from Agricultural Rural (AR) to Planned Development (PD) to allow for the development of 146 dwelling units consisting of 96 townhomes and 50 single-family detached homes.

| Zoning: | Existing | Proposed |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| District(s) | AR | PD |
| Typical General Use(s) | Single-Family Residential/Agricultural | Single-family |
| Acreage | 33.58 acres | 33.58 acres |
| Density/Intensity | Minimum 5 acre per SF home | Single-family Min. Lot Size: $4,400 \mathrm{sf}$ <br> Townhome Min. Lot Size: $1,530 \mathrm{sf}$ |


| Development Standards: |  | Existing | Proposed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District(s) |  | AR | PD |
| Setbacks/Buffering and Screening | Front: 50 ft . <br> Side: 25 ft . <br> Rear: 50 ft . |  | Single-family detached: <br> Front: 20 ft .; Side: 5 ft .; Rear: 20 ft . <br> Townhome: <br> Front: 20 ft .; Side: 7.5 ft .; Rear: 20 ft . |
| Height |  | 50 ft . Max. Ht. | 35 ft . Max. Ht. |
| Additional Information: |  |  |  |
| PD Variation(s) |  | None requested as part of this application |  |
| Waiver(s) to the Land Development Code |  | None requested as part of this application. |  |


| Planning Commission Recommendation: | Development Services Recommendation: |
| :--- | :--- |
| CONSISTENT | APPROVABLE, Subject to Conditions. |

### 2.0 LAND USE MAP SET AND SUMMARY DATA

### 2.1 Vicinity Map



## Context of Surrounding Area:

The site is located on the north side of East College Avenue, approximately 3,500 feet east of South U.S. Highway 41 and is located in the Urban Service Area within the limits of the Ruskin / Southshore Community Plan. The immediate area surrounding the property is predominantly developed with residential with a Place of Worship to the immediate east of the subject site. To the west is vacant property and the CSX railroad right-of way. The surrounding general vicinity area includes AR zoning, Planned Development (PD) zoning including multi-family residential, and single-family residential development.

### 2.0 LAND USE MAP SET AND SUMMARY DATA

### 2.2 Future Land Use Map



| Subject Site Future Land Use Category: | Suburban Mixed Use-6 (SMU-6) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Maximum Density: | 6 dwelling per acre |
| Typical Uses: | Typical uses of SMU-6 include residential, suburban scale neighborhood <br> commercial, office uses, research corporate park uses, light industrial <br> multi-purpose and clustered residential and/or mixed-use projects at <br> appropriate locations. |

### 2.0 LAND USE MAP SET AND SUMMARY DATA

### 2.3 Immediate Area Map



### 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 ifapplicable) |  |  | Select Future Improvements |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Road Name | Classification | Current Conditions | $\square$ Corridor Preservation Plan |
|  | County Local - | 2 Lanes | Substandard Road <br> SE $12^{\text {th }}$ Street |
|  | Urban | $\square$ Suffice Access Improvements <br>  | $\boxtimes$ Substandard Road Improvements <br> $\square$ 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 | 57 | 4 | 6 |
| Proposed | 1,175 | 81 | 104 |
| Difference (+/-) | $+1,118$ | +77 | +98 |

*Trips reported are based on net new external trips unless otherwise noted.
Connectivity and Cross Access $\square$ Not applicable for this request

| Project Boundary | Primary Access | Additional <br> Connectivity/Access | Cross Access | Finding |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| North |  | None | None | Meets LDC |
| South | N | None | None | None |
| East | None | None | Meets LDC |  |
| West | Notes: |  |  |  |


| Design Exception/Administrative Variance $\square$ Not applicable for this request |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Road Name/Nature of Request | Type | Finding |  |
| SE $12^{\text {th }}$ St./Substandard Roadway | Design Exception Requested | Approvable |  |
| Notes: Proposing to construct 10-ft wide sidewalk on west side of street. Sidewalk may narrow at certain sections <br> where constrained by Row. |  |  |  |


| 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 $\square \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\boxtimes$ Yes <br> $\square$ No | See report. |
| No | $\square$ No |  |  |

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

INFORMATION/REVIEWING AGENCY

| Environmental: | Comments Received | Objections | Conditions Requested | Additional Information/Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Environmental Protection Commission | ® Yes <br> $\square$ No | $\begin{aligned} & \square \text { Yes } \\ & \boxtimes \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | ® Yes No | See Agency Comment Sheet. |
| Natural Resources | $\begin{aligned} & \square \text { Yes } \\ & \boxtimes \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \square \text { Yes } \\ & \boxtimes \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \square \text { Yes } \\ & \boxtimes \text { No } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Conservation \& Environ. Lands Mgmt. | $\begin{aligned} & \boxtimes \text { Yes } \\ & \square \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \square \text { Yes } \\ & \boxtimes \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \square \text { Yes } \\ & \boxtimes \text { No } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Check if Applicable: <br> Wetlands/Other Surface Waters <br> 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 |  |  |  |
| Public Facilities: | Comments Received | Objections | Conditions Requested | Additional Information/Comments |
| Transportation <br> Design Exc./Adm. Variance Requested <br> Off-site Improvements Provided | $\boxtimes$ Yes <br> $\square$ No | $\begin{aligned} & \square \text { Yes } \\ & \boxtimes \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | $\boxtimes$ Yes <br> $\square$ No | See Transportation Report. |
| Service Area/ Water \& Wastewater 凹Urban $\quad \square$ City of Tampa $\square$ Rural $\quad \square$ City of Temple Terrace | $\boxtimes$ Yes <br> $\square$ No | $\square$ Yes <br> ® No | $\boxtimes$ Yes <br> $\square$ No | See Water Resources Report and Statement of Record |
| Hillsborough County School Board | $\begin{aligned} & \square \text { Yes } \\ & \boxtimes \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \square \mathrm{Yes} \\ & \boxtimes \mathrm{No} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \square \text { Yes } \\ & \boxtimes \text { No } \end{aligned}$ | See Hillsborough County Public Schools "Adequate Facilities Analysis: Rezoning". 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. |

## Impact/Mobility Fees

(Fee estimate is based on a 2,000 square foot, Single Family Detached Unit)
Mobility: \$9,183 *50 = \$459,150
Parks: \$2,145 * 50 = \$107,250
School: \$8,227 * 50 = \$411,350
Fire: \$335 * 50 = \$16,750
Single Family Detached per unit = \$19,890 * $50=\$ 994,500$
(Fee estimate is based on a 1,500 square foot, 3 Bedroom 1-2 story Single Family Attached Units)

BOCC LUM MEETING DATE: January 10, 2023
Mobility: \$6,661 * 96 = \$639,456
Parks: \$2,145 * 96 = \$205,920
School: \$7,027 * $96=\$ 674,592$
Fire: \$249 * 96 = \$23,904
Multi-Family (1-2 story) per unit $=\$ 13,873$ * $96=\$ 1,543,872$
Urban Mobility, South Park/Fire - 96 Single family attached, 50 Single family detached

| Comprehensive Plan: | Comments Received | Findings | Conditions Requested | Additional Information/Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Planning Commission Meets Locational Criteria $\boxtimes N / A$ Locational Criteria Waiver Requested Minimum Density Met N/A | $\boxtimes$ Yes No | Inconsistent <br> $\boxtimes$ Consistent | $\begin{aligned} & \square \mathrm{Yes} \\ & \text { 邓 No } \end{aligned}$ | See Planning Commission Report |

### 5.0 IMPLEMENTATION RECOMMENDATIONS

### 5.1 Compatibility

The applicant seeks to develop an approximately 33.58 -acre unified development consisting of one folio. The request is for a rezoning from Agricultural Rural (AR) to Planned Development (PD) to allow for the development of 146 dwelling units consisting of 96 townhomes and 50 single-family detached homes.

The site is located on the north side of East College Avenue at the intersection of E. College Avenue and $12^{\text {th }}$ St SE. The subject property is located in the Urban Service Area within the limits of the Ruskin Community Plan. The immediate area surrounding the property is predominantly developed with residential and Place of Worship to the immediate east of the subject site. To the west is vacant property and the CSX railroad right-of way. Immediately north of the subject site is approved for multifamily development, however it is currently developed with single-family homes.

The applicant does not request any variations to Land Development Code Parts 6.06.00 (Landscaping/Buffering). The applicant is required to have a 5 ft . buffer with Type " A " screening adjacent to the single-family properties located to the south and west of the subject property. The applicant proposes a condition to allow the use of existing vegetation in lieu of required screening pursuant to Land Development Code Section 6.06.06.C.12, which permits an applicant to submit an alternative screening plan at the time of site and development review. The alternative plan shall afford screening, in terms of height, opacity and separation, equivalent to or exceeding that provided by the above requirements. East College Avenue is also an Urban Scenic Roadway. Land Development Code §6.06.03.I.2.C pertaining to Scenic Roadways requires the planting of one street tree per 40 feet of frontage and the planting of one canopy tree for every 50 feet of yard frontage along East College Avenue.

There are wetlands present on the subject property. The Environmental Protection Commission (EPC) Wetlands Division has reviewed the proposed rezoning and has determined a resubmittal is not necessary for the site plan's current configuration. If the zoning proposal changes and/or the site plans are altered, EPC staff will need to re-review the plan.

A 16-inch water main exist adjacent to the site and is located within the north right of way of E college Ave. There is a four-inch wastewater force main approximately 60 feet from the site and is located within the east right of way of 12th St SE. Water distribution system improvements will need to be completed prior to connection to the counties water system. The improvements include two funded CIP projects that are currently under construction and will need to be completed by the county prior to issuance of any building permits that will create additional demand on the system.

The site will comply with and conform to all other applicable policies and regulations, including but not limited to, the Hillsborough County Land Development Code.

The Planning Commission found that the proposed rezoning would be consistent with the Unincorporated Hillsborough County Comprehensive Plan.

## Transportation Design Exception Overview:

12th St SE is a substandard local roadway, and the applicant's engineer of record submitted a design exception request for 12th St SE to determine the specific improvements that would be required by the county engineer. Based on factors presented in the design exception request, the county engineer found the design exception request approvable. The developer will be required to construct a 10 -foot wide sidewalk on the West side of the roadway from 3rd Ave SE from State Road 674 consistent with the approved design exception. A full review may be found in the Transportation Agency Review Comment Sheet.

### 5.2 Recommendation

Based on the above consideration, including the existing development pattern, staff finds the request APPROVABLE.

### 6.0 PROPOSED CONDITIONS

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

1. The development shall be limited to 146 dwelling units consisting of 96 townhomes and 50 single-family detached homes.
2. The buildings shall be developed to the standards described in this section. Buffer and screening shall be in accordance with the LDC, Part 6.06.00, unless otherwise specified herein.
a) Single-family attached dwelling units shall be developed to the following standards:

| Minimum Lot Area | 1,530 square feet |
| :--- | :--- |
| Minimum Front Yard Setback | 20 feet |
| Minimum Side Yard Setback | $71 / 2$ feet |
| Minimum Rear Yard Setback | 20 feet |
| Maximum Height | 35 feet |

b) Single-family detached dwelling units shall be developed to the following standards:

| Minimum Lot Area: | 4,400 square feet |
| :--- | :--- |
| Minimum Front Yard Setback | 20 feet |
| Minimum Side Yard Setback | 5 feet |
| Minimum Corner Side Yard Setback | 10 feet |
| Minimum Rear Yard Setback | 20 feet |
| Maximum Height | 35 feet |

3. The subject property shall be subject to the following landscaping and screening standards:
a. A landscaped area along East College Avenue will require landscaping in compliance with Land Development Code Section 6.06.03.I.2.C for Urban Scenic Roadways.
b. A five-foot ( $5^{\prime}$ ) landscape buffer with type "A" screening shall be provided along the property boundary abutting single-family development as shown on the site plan. Existing vegetation may be retained in lieu of construction of the 6 ft high screening where said vegetation is at least 6 feet in height and provides an overall opacity of seventy-five percent.
4. The project shall have one (1) full access connection on SE 12th St., as shown on the PD Site Plan.
5. The internal project roadways shall be constructed consistent with the Transportation Technical Manual, TS3 typical Section.
6. The developer shall record a 20 -foot drainage easement along the northern project boundary to allow the County access for maintenance purposes, as shown on the PD site plan.
7. Notwithstanding anything herein or shown on the PD site plan to the contrary, bicycle and pedestrian access may be permitted anywhere along PD boundaries.
8. If PD 22-1224 is approved, the County Engineer will approve a Design Exception (dated November 1, 2022) which was found approvable by the County Engineer (on November 4, 2022) for SE 12th St. substandard road improvements. As SE 12th St. is a substandard local roadway, the developer will be required to construct a 10 -ft wide sidewalk on the west side of the roadway from SE 3rd Ave. and to SR 674 consistent with the approved design exception. Where the proposed new sidewalk runs along the frontages the last 100 feet approaching SR 674, the width of the sidewalk may narrow, if constrained by limited right-of-way. This segment shall be constructed as close to 10 feet wide as feasible, but in no case shall not be narrower than 5 feet wide.
9. Natural Resources staff identified a number of significant trees on the site including potential Grand Oaks. Every effort must be made to avoid the removal of and design the site around these trees. The site plan may be modified from the Certified Site Plan to avoid tree removal.
10. An evaluation of the property supports the presumption that listed animal species may occur or have restricted activity zones throughout the property. Pursuant to the Land Development Code (LDC), a wildlife survey of any endangered, threatened or species of special concern in accordance with the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission Wildlife Methodology Guidelines shall be required. This survey information must be provided upon submittal of the preliminary plans through the Land Development Code's Site Development or Subdivision process. Essential Wildlife Habitat as defined by the LDC must be addressed, if applicable, in consideration with the overall boundaries of this rezoning request.
11. This site contains trees that may qualify as Grand Oaks as defined by the Land Development Code (LDC). All trees confirmed as a Grand Oak must be accurately located and labeled as such on the submitted preliminary plat through the Subdivision Review process. Design efforts are to be displayed on the submitted preliminary plat to avoid adverse impacts to these trees.
12. Wetlands or other surface waters are considered Environmentally Sensitive Areas and are subject to Conservation Area and Preservation Area setbacks. A minimum setback must be maintained around these areas which shall be designated on all future plan submittals. Proposed land alterations are restricted within the wetland setback areas.
13. 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.
14. The construction and location of any proposed wetland impacts are not approved by this correspondence, but shall be reviewed by EPC staff under separate application pursuant to the EPC Wetlands rule detailed in Chapter 1-11, Rules of the EPC, (Chapter 1-11) to determine whether such impacts are necessary to accomplish reasonable use of the subject property.
15. 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).
16. 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.
17. 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.
18. If the notes and/or graphic on the site plan are in conflict with specific zoning conditions and/or the Land Development Code (LDC) regulations, the more restrictive regulation shall apply, unless specifically conditioned otherwise. References to development standards of the LDC in the above stated conditions shall be interpreted as the regulations in effect at the time of preliminary site plan/plat approval, unless otherwise stated herein.
19. The development of the project shall proceed in strict accordance with the terms and conditions contained in the Development Order, the General Site Plan, the land use conditions contained herein, and all applicable rules, regulations, and ordinances of Hillsborough County.
20. In accordance with LDC Section 5.03.07.C, the certified PD general site plan shall expire for the internal transportation network and external access points, as well as for any conditions related to the internal transportation network and external access points, if site construction plans, or equivalent thereof, have not been approved for all or part of the subject Planned Development within 5 years of the effective date of the PD unless an extension is granted as provided in the LDC. Upon expiration, re-certification of the PD General Site Plan shall be required in accordance with provisions set forth in LDC Section 5.03.07.C

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

## SITE, SUBDIVISION AND BUILDING CONSTRUCTION IN ACCORDNACE WITH HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN \& BUILDING REVIEW AND APPROVAL.

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

### 7.0 ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND/OR GRAPHICS

### 8.0 PROPOSED SITE PLAN (FULL)



### 9.0 FULL TRANSPORTATION REPORT (see following pages)

TO: Zoning Technician, Development Services Department
REVIEWER: Richard Perez, AICP
PLANNING AREA: Ruskin / South

DATE: 11/04/2022
AGENCY/DEPT: Transportation
PETITION NO: PD 22-1224
$\square$ 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

- If PD 22-1224 is approved, the County Engineer will approve a Design Exception (dated November 1,2022 ) which was found approvable by the County Engineer (on November 4, 2022) for SE $12^{\text {th }}$ St. substandard road improvements. As SE 12th St. is a substandard local roadway, the developer will be required to construct a $10-\mathrm{ft}$ wide sidewalk on the west side of the roadway from SE 3 rd Ave. and to SR 674 consistent with the approved design exception.

Where the proposed new sidewalk runs along the frontages the last 100 feet approaching SR 674, the width of the sidewalk may narrow, if constrained by limited right-of-way. This segment shall be constructed as close to 10 feet wide as feasible, but in no case shall not be narrower than 5 feet wide.

- The project shall have one (1) full access connection on SE $12^{\text {th }} \mathrm{St}$., as shown on the PD Site Plan.
- The internal project roadways shall be constructed consistent with the Transportation Technical Manual, TS-3 typical Section.
- The developer shall record a 20 -foot drainage easement along the northern project boundary to allow the County access for maintenance purposes, as shown on the PD site plan.
- Notwithstanding anything shown in the PD site plan or in the PD conditions to the contrary, pedestrian access shall be allowed anywhere along the project boundary.


## PROJECT SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS

The applicant is requesting to rezone the subject property from Agricultural (AR) to Planned Development (PD) to construct 50 single family detached residential lots and 96 town home units on $+/-33.58$ acres. The site is located on the east SE $12^{\text {th }}$ St. and north side of SR 674 (College Ave.). The Future Land Use designation of the site is Suburban Mixed Use 6 (SMU-6).

## Trip Generation Analysis

The applicant submitted a trip generation and site access analysis as required by the Development Review Procedures Manual (DRPM). Staff has prepared a comparison of the trips potentially generated under the existing and proposed zoning designations, utilizing a generalized worst-case scenario. Data presented below is based on the Institute of Transportation Engineer's Trip Generation Manual, $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition.

## Approved Zoning:

| Zoning, Lane Use/Size | 24 Hour <br> Two-Way Volume | Total Peak Hour Trips |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | AM | PM |
| AR: 6 Units, Single Family Detached (ITE 210) | 57 | 4 | 6 |

## Proposed Zoning:

| Zoning, Lane Use/Size | 24 Hour | Total Peak Hour Trips |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | AM | PM |
| PD: 96 Units, Town Homes (ITE 220) | $\mathbf{7 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{4 4}$ | $\mathbf{5 4}$ |
| PD: 50 Units, Single Family Detached (ITE 210) | $\mathbf{4 7 2}$ | $\mathbf{3 7}$ | $\mathbf{5 0}$ |
| Total Trips | $\mathbf{1 , 1 7 5}$ | $\mathbf{8 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 4}$ |

## Trip Generation Difference:

| Zoning, Lane Use/Size | 24 Hour | Total Peak Hour Trips |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | AM | PM |
| Difference (+/-) | $\mathbf{+ 1 , 1 1 8}$ | $+\mathbf{7 7}$ | $\mathbf{+ 9 8}$ |

The proposed rezoning will result in an increase in potential trip generation by 1,118 daily trips, 77 AM peak hour trips, and 98 PM peak hour trips.

## TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE SERVING THE SITE

SE $12^{\text {th }} \mathrm{St}$. is a publicly maintained 2-lane, undivided, substandard local roadway characterized by $+/-10-$ foot wide travel lanes in average condition. The roadway lies within a $+/-51$ to $+/-55$-foot wide right-ofway. There is a sidewalk on the east side of the roadway. There are no curb and gutter and no bicycle facilities in the vicinity of the proposed project.

Pursuant to the Hillsborough County Transportation Technical Manual, a local roadway shall meet the typical section TS-3 standard. TS-3 standard includes 10 -foot-wide lanes, 5 foot paved, and 5 -foot wide sidewalks on both sides and curb and gutter within a minimum of 50 feet of right-of-way.

SE $12^{\text {th }}$ St. is not included in the Hillsborough County Corridor Preservation Plan.
In lieu of improving the roadway to standard, the applicant is requesting a design exception to construct a continuous 10 -foot sidewalk along the project frontage and 2 single family lots that are not included in the PD on the west side of SE $12^{\text {th }}$ St. Where existing single family lots intervene between the project frontage on $12^{\text {th }} \mathrm{St}$. the developer may construct a sidewalk narrower than 10 ft to stay within the right-of-way, if necessary, but in no case this segment of sidewalk shall not be less than the standards 5 ft sidewalk. See the Design Exception request section below for additional detail.

## SITE ACCESS \& CONNECTIVITY

The proposed PD site plan provides for a full access connection to SE $12^{\text {th }} \mathrm{St}$. The connection will align with the local road, Casa Bonita Ave., serving the residential subdivision on the east side of SE $12^{\text {th }} \mathrm{St}$.

Based on the applicant's traffic study, turn lanes are not warranted. The traffic study analyzed the current traffic volumes plus project traffic and found that the SE 12th St. will continue to function as a local roadway, i.e. daily traffic volumes will not exceed 5,000 daily trips. As such, local roadways do not warrant auxiliary/turn lanes for site access.

The PD site plan proposes the subdivision roads consistent with the County Transportation Technical Manual TS-3 local roadway typical section. However, the PD site plan indicates that the internal roads may be public private.

SE 3rd Ave. abuts the subject property to the north, which is currently an unimproved right-of-way that includes a significant County drainage conveyance on the south side along the project's northern boundary. The applicant is required to establish a 20 -foot drainage easement along the northern project boundary to allow the County to access the SE $3^{\text {rd }}$ Ave. drainage ditch for maintenance purposes consistent with the County's Stormwater Management Technical Manual Section 4.1.15.2(A). As a result of the adjacent drainage feature a connection form the project is not practical.

No access connections or stubouts to the south and west are proposed due to extensive floodplain, and wetlands.

## REQUESTED DESIGN EXCEPTION: SE $12{ }^{\text {TH }}$ STREET

As SE $12^{\text {th }}$ St. is a substandard local roadway, the applicant's Engineer of Record (EOR) submitted a Design Exception request for SE $12^{\text {th }}$ St. (November 1, 2022) to determine the specific improvements that would be required by the County Engineer. Based on factors presented in the Design Exception request, the County Engineer found the Design Exception request approvable (on November 4, 2022). The developer will be required to construct a 10 - ft wide sidewalk on the west side of the roadway from SE 3rd Ave. and to SR 674 consistent with the approved design exception.

Where the proposed new sidewalk runs along the frontages the last 100 feet approaching SR 674, the width of the sidewalk may narrow, if constrained by limited right-of-way. This segment shall be constructed as close to 10 feet wide as feasible, but in no case shall not be narrower than 5 feet wide.

If this zoning is approved, the County Engineer will approve the Design Exception request.

## LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS)

$\mathrm{SE} 12^{\text {th }} \mathrm{St}$. is not a regulated roadway.

| Roadway | From | To | LOS <br> Standard | Peak Hour <br> Directional LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SR 674 (College Ave.) | US HWY 41 | I-75 | D | C |

SOURCE: 2020 Hillsborough County Level of Service (LOS) Report

From: Williams, Michael [WilliamsM@HillsboroughCounty.ORG]
Sent: Friday, November 4, 2022 11:23 AM
To: Steven Henry [shenry@lincks.com]
CC: Carol Walden [cwalden@stearnsweaver.com]; Lampkin, Timothy
[LampkinT@hillsboroughcounty.org]; Perez, Richard [PerezRL@hillsboroughcounty.org]; PWCEIntake [PW-CEIntake@hillsboroughcounty.org]; Morales, Cintia
[MoralesCS@hillsboroughcounty.org]
Subject: FW: RZ PD 22-1224 Design Exception Review
Attachments: 22-1224 DEReq 11-02-22.pdf
Importance: High

Steve,
I have found the attached Design Exception (DE) for PD 22-1224 APPROVABLE.

Please note that it is you (or your client's) responsibility to follow-up with my administrative assistant, Cintia Morales (moralescs@ hillsboroughcounty.org or 813-307-1709) 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. Ifthe 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 <br> 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

Facebook \| Twitter \| YouTube \| LinkedIn \| HCFL Stay Safe

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

From: Tirado, Sheida [TiradoS@hillsboroughcounty.org](mailto:TiradoS@hillsboroughcounty.org)
Sent: Wednesday, November 2, 2022 10:11 PM
To: Williams, Michael < WilliamsM@ HillsboroughCounty.ORG>
Cc: Morales, Cintia [MoralesCS@hillsboroughcounty.org](mailto:MoralesCS@hillsboroughcounty.org);Perez, Richard
[PerezRL@hillsboroughcounty.org](mailto:PerezRL@hillsboroughcounty.org)
Subject: RZ PD 22-1224 Design Exception Review
Importance: High
Hello Mike,

The attached Design Exception is approvable to me. Please include the following people in your response email:
shenry@lincks.com
cwalden@stearnsweaver.com
lampkint@hillsboroughcounty.org
perezrl@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 \| LinkedIn \| HCFL Stay Safe
Please note: All correspondence to or from this office is subject to Florida's Public Records law.

## LINCKS \& ASSOCIATES, INC.

November 1, 2022
Mr. Mike Williams
County Engineer Development Review Director
Hillsborough County
601 East Kennedy Blvd., $20^{\text {th }}$ Floor
Tampa, FL 33602
Re: Ruskin Reserve South
Folio Number 056731.0000
RZ PD 22-1224
Lincks Project No. 21126

The purpose of this letter is to request a Design Exception to the Hillsborough County Transportation Technical Manual to meet Land Development Code Section 6.04.03L for $12^{\text {hh }}$ Street from the project access to College Avenue. The developer proposes to rezone the subject property to allow the following land uses:

- Single Family - 50 Dwelling Units
- Townhomes - 96 Dwelling Units

According to the Hillsborough County Functional Classification Map, $12^{\text {th }}$ Street is classified as a local roadway and the subject site is within the Hillsborough County Urban Service Area. As shown in Table 1, the anticipated daily traffic on $12^{\text {th }}$ Street is projected to be less than 5,000 vehicles per day with the development of the project.

Table 2 provides the trip generation for the project.
The access to serve the project is proposed to be one (1) full access to $12^{\text {th }}$ Street to align with Casa Bonita Avenue.

The request is for a Design Exception to TS-7 of the Hillsborough County Transportation Technical Manual for $12^{\text {th }}$ Street from the project access to College Avenue. This segment of $12^{\text {th }}$ Street is currently a two (2) lane roadway. The following exceptions are requested to accommodate the proposed project.

1) Right of Way - TS-7 has 96 feet of right of way. The right of way along the property frontage is approximately 50 feet.
2) Lane Width - TS-7 has 12 foot travel lanes. The existing roadway has approximately 11 foot travel lanes.
3) Shoulders - TS-7 has 8 foot shoulders with 5 foot paved. The existing roadway has unpaved shoulders along the subject section.
4) Sidewalk - TS-7 has sidewalk on both sides of the roadway. There is currently sidewalk along the east side of the roadway.

The justification for the Design Exception is as follows:

1. As indicated, $12^{\text {th }}$ Street is a local road. In addition, there are speed bumps along the roadway. Improving the roadway to 12 foot lanes and paved shoulders would potentially increase the speed along the roadway which is contrary to the purpose of the speed bumps.
2. The developer proposes to construct a 10 foot sidewalk on the west side of $12^{\text {th }}$ Street along the proposed frontage as shown in Figure 1. In addition, the intention is to connect the sidewalk to the sidewalk within SR 674. The southern-most 100 feet of the sidewalk may have a reduced width due to right of way and utility constraints as the developer does not control the right of way along the segment of $12^{\text {th }}$ Street adjacent to folio 56729.0000. If the 10 foot sidewalk cannot be accommodated along folio 56729.0000, the developer shall construct the maximum width possible for up to 10 feet but no less than 5 feet with the appropriate transition.

Figure 1 illustrates the limits of the proposed improvements.
Based on the above, it is our opinion, the proposed improvements to $12^{\text {th }}$ Street will mitigate the impact of the project and meet the intent of the Transportation Technical Manual to the extent feasible.

Mr. Mike Williams
November 1, 2022
Page 3

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


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

Mr. Mike Williams
November 1, 2022
Page 4

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \begin{array}{l}
\left.\begin{array}{l}
W d \\
W \forall \\
\overline{p o p a d}
\end{array}\right]
\end{array} \\
& \begin{array}{c}
\text { Location } \\
\text { North of SR } 674
\end{array} \\
& \text { (1) Counts dated 7/6/22. } \\
& \text { (2) Peak Season Traffic converted to daily volume based on FDOT K }=0.09 \text {. }
\end{aligned}
$$

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

Mr. Mike Williams
November 1, 2022
Page 6


FIGURE 1
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### 3.0 TRANSPORTATION SUMMARY (FULLTRANSPORTATION REPORT IN SECTION 9 OF STAFF REPORT)

## Adjoining Roadways (check if applicable)

| Road Name | Classification | Current Conditions | Select Future Improvements |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| SE 12th Street | County Local - | 2 Lanes | $\square$ Corridor Preservation Plan |
|  | $\boxtimes$ Substandard Road <br>  <br>  Urban | $\square$ Site Access Improvements |  |
|  |  | Substandard Road Improvements <br>  |  |

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

|  | Average Annual Daily Trips | A.M. Peak Hour Trips | P.M. Peak Hour Trips |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Existing | 57 | 4 | 6 |
| Proposed | 1,175 | 81 | 104 |
| Difference $(+/-)$ | $+1,118$ | +77 | +98 |

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

| Connectivity and Cross Access $\square$ Not applicable for this request |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Project Boundary | Primary Access | Additional <br> Connectivity/Access | Cross Access | Finding |
| North |  | None | None | Meets LDC |
| South |  | None | None | Meets LDC |
| East | None | None | Meets LDC |  |
| West | None | None | Meets LDC |  |
| Notes: |  |  |  |  |


| Design Exception/Administrative Variance $\square$ Not applicable for this request |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Road Name/Nature of Request | Type | Finding |  |  |
| SE 12th St./Substandard Roadway | Design Exception Requested | Approvable |  |  |
| Notes: Proposing to construct 10-ft wide sidewalk on west side of street. Sidewalk may narrow at certain sections <br> where constrained by ROW. |  |  |  | Choose an item. |


| 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 $\square \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\boxtimes$ Yes <br> $\square$ No | See report. |

## COUNTY OF HILLSBOROUGH

## RECOMMENDATION OF THE <br> LAND USE HEARING OFFICER

| APPLICATION NUMBER: | RZ PD 22-1224 |
| :---: | :---: |
| DATE OF HEARING: | November 14, 2022 |
| APPLICANT: | Property Reserve, Inc. |
| PETITION REQUEST: | A request to rezone property from $A R$ to PD to permit 96 townhomes and 50 single-family detached dwelling units |
| LOCATION: | 603 SE 12 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street |
| SIZE OF PROPERTY: | 33.58 acres, m.o.l. |
| EXISTING ZONING DISTRICT: | AR |
| FUTURE LAND USE CATEGORY: | SMU-6 |
| SERVICE AREA: | Urban |
| COMMUNITY PLAN: | Ruskin |

## 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: Jacob T. Cremer; Stearns Weaver Miller
FLU Category: SMU-6
Service Area: Urban
Site Acreage: Approximately 33.58 acres
Community Plan Area: Ruskin/Southshore
Overlay: None

Introduction Summary:

The applicant seeks to develop an approximately 33.58-acre unified development consisting of one folio. The request is for a rezoning from Agricultural Rural (AR) to Planned Development (PD) to allow for the development of 146 dwelling units consisting of 96 townhomes and 50 singlefamily detached homes.

| Zoning: Exist | Existing Proposed |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| District(s) AR | AR |  |
| Typical General Sing <br> Resi  <br> Use(s)  | Single-Family Residential/Agricultural | Single-family |
| Acreage 33.58 | 33.58 acres | 33.58 acres |
| Density/IntensityMinim <br> home | Minimum 5 acre per SF home | Single-family Min. Lot Size: 4,400 sf Townhome Min. Lot Size: 1,530 sf |
| Development Standards: Existing Proposed |  |  |
| District(s) | AR PD |  |
| Setbacks/Buffering and Screening | Front: 50 ft . Side: 25 ft . Rear: 50 ft . | Single-family detached: <br> Front: 20 ft.; Side: 5 ft.; Rear: 20 ft . <br> Townhome: <br> Front: 20 ft.; Side: 7.5 ft.; Rear: 20 ft . |
| Height | 50 ft . Max. Ht. | 35 ft . Max. Ht. |
| Additional Information: |  |  |


| PD Variation(s) | None requested as part of <br> this application |
| :--- | :--- |
| - | None requested as part of <br> this application. |
| Waiver(s) to the Land Development Code | Development Services Recommendation: <br> Planning Commission <br> Recommendation: CONSISTENT |

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



## Context of Surrounding Area:

The site is located on the north side of East College Avenue, approximately 3,500 feet east of South U.S. Highway 41 and is located in the Urban Service Area within the limits of the Ruskin / Southshore Community Plan. The immediate area surrounding the property is predominantly developed with residential with a Place of Worship to the immediate east of the subject site. To the west is vacant property and the CSX railroad right-of way. The surrounding general vicinity area includes AR zoning, Planned Development (PD) zoning including multi-family residential, and single-family residential development.

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



|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Subject Site <br> Future Land <br> Use Category: | Suburban Mixed Use-6 (SMU-6) |
| Maximum <br> Density: | 6 dwelling per acre |
|  | Typical uses of SMU-6 include residential, suburban scale <br> neighborhood commercial, office uses, research corporate park <br> uses, light industrial multi-purpose and clustered residential <br> and/or mixed-use projects at appropriate locations. |
| Typical Uses |  |

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



[^0]| Location: | Zoning: | Maximum <br> Density/F.A.R. <br> Permitted by Zoning District: | Allowable Use: | Existing Use: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North | PD 06-0638 and AR | 5.5 dwellings per ac. AR: 1 du per 5 ac. | 37 multifamily units | SF / Vacant |
| South | AR / E. <br> College Ave. <br> ROW | AR: 1 du per 5 ac. | Single-family / Agricultural | SF and E. College Ave. ROW |
| East | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PD 99-1383 } \\ & \text { PD 88- } \\ & 0009 / \mathrm{MM} 04- \\ & 1479 \end{aligned}$ | PD 99-1383: <br> Min. lot size: 7,462 <br> sf MM 04-1479: <br> 6 du per ac. | PD 99-1383: SF residential MM 041479: Place of Worship, Elementary School, 72 MF units | Place of Worship \& Ancillary (including parking) |
| West | AR | 1 du per 5 ac. | Single-family detached \& CSX Transportation Inc. | SF / Vacant and CSX Railroad |

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 |
| SE $12^{\text {th }}$ Street | County Local Urban | 2 Lanes <br> - Substandard Road <br> - 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 | 57 | 4 | 6 |
| Proposed | 1,175 | 81 | 104 |
| Difference $(+/-)$ | $+1,118$ | +77 | +98 |

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

| Connectivity and Cross Access $\square$ Not applicable for this request |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Project Boundary | Primary Access | Additional <br> Connectivity/Access | Cross Access | Finding |
| North |  | None | None | Meets LDC |
| South |  | None | None | Meets LDC |
| East | X | None | None | Meets LDC |
| West | None | None | Meets LDC |  |
| Notes: |  |  |  |  |


| Design Exception/Administrative Variance $\square$ Not applicable for this request |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Road Name/Nature of Request | Type | Finding |  |  |
| SE $12^{\text {th }}$ St./Substandard Roadway | Design Exception Requested | Approvable |  |  |
| Notes: <br> whoposing to construct 10-ft wide sidewalk on west side of street. Sidewalk may narrow at certain sections <br> when. |  |  |  | Choose an item |


| 4.0 Additional Site Information \& AgencyComments Summary |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Transportation | Objections | Conditions <br> Requested | Additional <br> Information/Comments |
| $\boxtimes$ Design Exception/Adm. Variance Requested <br> $\boxtimes$ Off-Site Improvements Provided | $\square$ Yes $\square \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\boxtimes$ Yes <br> $\square \mathrm{No}$ | See report. |

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

## Environmental:

$\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No

Environmental Protection Commission
$\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No

See Agency Comment Sheet．
区 Wetlands／Other Surface Waters
$\square$ Use of Environmentally Sensitive Land Credit
$\square$ Wellhead Protection Area
$\square$ Surface Water Resource Protection Area

# Potable Water Wellfield Protection Area $\square$ Significant Wildlife Habitat 

区 Coastal High Hazard Area$\square$ Urban／Suburban／Rural Scenic Corridor $\square$ Adjacent to ELAPP property

## Transportation

® Design Exc．／Adm．Variance Requested $\square$ Off－site Improvements Provided

## Service Area／Water \＆Wastewater

凹Urban $\square$ City of Tampa<br>$\square$ Rural $\square$ City of Temple Terrace

See Transportation Report．
$\boxtimes$ Yes $\square$ No
See Water Resources Report and Statement of Record

## Hillsborough County School Board

Adequate $\boxtimes \mathrm{K}-5 \square 6-8 \square 9-12 \square \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ Inadequate $\square \mathrm{K}-5$ 区6－8 $\boxtimes 9-12 \square \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$
See Hillsborough County Public Schools＂Adequate Facilities Analysis： Rezoning＂．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．

## Impact／Mobility Fees

（Fee estimate is based on a 2,000 square foot，Single Family Detached Unit）
Mobility：\＄9，183＊50＝\＄459，150
Parks：$\$ 2,145$＊ $50=\$ 107,250$
School：\＄8，227＊50＝\＄411，350
Fire：$\$ 335$＊ 50 ＝\＄16，750
Single Family Detached per unit $=\$ 19,890$＊ $50=\$ 994,500$
（Fee estimate is based on a 1，500 square foot， 3 Bedroom 1－2 story Single Family Attached Units）

Mobility：\＄6，661＊ 96 ＝\＄639，456
Parks：$\$ 2,145$＊ $96=\$ 205,920$
School：\＄7，027＊ $96=\$ 674,592$
Fire：$\$ 249$＊ $96=\$ 23,904$
Multi－Family（1－2 story）per unit $=\$ 13,873$＊ $96=\$ 1,543,872$
Urban Mobility，South Park／Fire－ 96 Single family attached， 50 Single family detached

| Comprehensive Plan： | Comments Received | Findings | Conditions Requested | Additional <br> Information／Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Planning Commission |  |  |  |  |
| Meets <br> Locational Criteria <br> 区N／A $\qquad$ <br> Locational Criteria <br> Waiver Requested <br> 区 Minimum <br> Density Met $\square$ N／A | 区 Yes $\square$ No | Inconsistent区 Consistent | $\square$ Yes 区No | See Planning Commission Report |

## 5．0 IMPLEMENTATION RECOMMENDATIONS

## 5．1 Compatibility

The applicant seeks to develop an approximately 33．58－acre unified development consisting of one folio．The request is for a rezoning from Agricultural Rural（AR）
to Planned Development (PD) to allow for the development of 146 dwelling units consisting of 96 townhomes and 50 single-family detached homes.

The site is located on the north side of East College Avenue at the intersection of E. College Avenue and $12^{\text {th }}$ St SE. The subject property is located in the Urban Service Area within the limits of the Ruskin Community Plan. The immediate area surrounding the property is predominantly developed with residential and Place of Worship to the immediate east of the subject site. To the west is vacant property and the CSX railroad right-of way. Immediately north of the subject site is approved for multifamily development, however it is currently developed with single-family homes.

The applicant does not request any variations to Land Development Code Parts 6.06.00 (Landscaping/Buffering). The applicant is required to have a 5 ft . buffer with Type "A" screening adjacent to the single-family properties located to the south and west of the subject property. The applicant proposes a condition to allow the use of existing vegetation in lieu of required screening pursuant to Land Development Code Section 6.06.06.C.12, which permits an applicant to submit an alternative screening plan at the time of site and development review. The alternative plan shall afford screening, in terms of height, opacity and separation, equivalent to or exceeding that provided by the above requirements. East College Avenue is also an Urban Scenic Roadway. Land Development Code $\S 6.06 .03 .1 .2 . C$ pertaining to Scenic Roadways requires the planting of one street tree per 40 feet of frontage and the planting of one canopy tree for every 50 feet of yard frontage along East College Avenue.

There are wetlands present on the subject property. The Environmental Protection Commission (EPC) Wetlands Division has reviewed the proposed rezoning and has determined a resubmittal is not necessary for the site plan's current configuration. If the zoning proposal changes and/or the site plans are altered, EPC staff will need to re-review the plan.

A 16-inch water main exist adjacent to the site and is located within the north right of way of $E$ college Ave. There is a four-inch wastewater force main approximately 60 feet from the site and is located within the east right of way of 12th St SE. Water distribution system improvements will need to be completed prior to connection to the counties water system. The improvements include two funded CIP projects that are currently under construction and will need to be completed by the county prior to issuance of any building permits that will create additional demand on the system.

The site will comply with and conform to all other applicable policies and regulations, including but not limited to, the Hillsborough County Land Development Code.

The Planning Commission found that the proposed rezoning would be consistent with the Unincorporated Hillsborough County Comprehensive Plan.

## Transportation Design Exception Overview:

12th St SE is a substandard local roadway, and the applicant's engineer of record submitted a design exception request for 12th St SE to determine the specific improvements that would be required by the county engineer. Based on factors presented in the design exception request, the county engineer found the design exception request approvable. The developer will be required to construct a 10 -foot wide sidewalk on the West side of the roadway from 3rd Ave SE from State Road 674 consistent with the approved design exception. A full review may be found in the Transportation Agency Review Comment Sheet.

### 5.2 Recommendation

Based on the above consideration, including the existing development pattern, staff finds the request APPROVABLE.

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. Jake Cremer 401 East Jackson Street Suite 2100 Tampa testified on behalf of the applicant and introduced the development team's land planner.

Mr. David Smith 401 East Jackson Street Tampa testified on behalf of the applicant and showed a PowerPoint presentation. Mr. Smith stated that the property is located at the corner of College and 12ths Street. There is one intervening parcel at the corner that is separated by a floodway between the subject property and the parcel to the north. The property is 33.58 acres. Mr. Smith detailed the zoning and land use categories in the area and stated that the property is irregularly shaped because there is an intervening residential property that is located on the south side of the floodway. He added that the property is traversed by a floodway and wetland area. The southern portion of the site will be used for pond compensation storage in the area. He described the surrounding land uses and showed a copy of the proposed site plan. The property will be developed with single-family and also townhomes. One access point will be off of $12^{\text {th }}$ Street. Specifically, 50 single-family homes and 96 townhomes are proposed to be developed which is consistent with the Plan's minimum density standards. The maximum height will be 35 feet. Mr. Smith described the proposed buffering and screening and stated that the SMU-6 land
use category requires two land uses which is accomplished by having the two different housing types. No housing type will be less than 25 percent and a minimum 10 percent of the land area will be utilized for the second use. Both Planning staffs support the request. The Planning Commission also found that the rezoning is consistent with the Ruskin Community Plan.

Mr. Tim Lampkin, Development Services Department testified regarding the County's staff report. Mr. Lampkin stated that the request is to rezone 33.5 acres from Agricultural Rural to Planned Development to permit the development of 146 dwelling units consisting of 50 single-family detached homes and 96 townhome dwelling units. He described the location of the property and stated that the surrounding area is predominately residential with a religious institution to the east. A 10 -foot wide sidewalk will be constructed on the west side from $3^{\text {rd }}$ Avenue Southeast to SR 674 in accordance with the approved design exception. Mr. Lampkin described the proposed buffering and screening and stated that staff find the request approvable.

Ms. Andrea Papandrew of the Planning Commission staff stated that the property is designated Suburban Mixed Use-6 Future Land Use category and located in the Urban Service Area and the Ruskin Community Planning Area. The project meets Policy 1.4 regarding compatibility. She 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 Ruskin Community Plan and 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 and Mr. Cremer did not have additional comments.
The hearing was then concluded.

## EVIDENCE SUBMITTED

Mr. Smith submitted a copy of his PowerPoint presentation 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 33.58 acres in size and is zoned Agricultural Rural (AR) and designated Suburban Mixed Use-6 (SMU-6) by the Comprehensive Plan. The property is located in the Urban Service Area and the Ruskin Community Plan.
2. The PD rezoning is requested to develop 50 single-family detached dwelling units and 96 townhomes.
3. No Planned Development Variations or waivers are requested.
4. The Planning Commission staff testified that the request meets Policy 1.4 regarding compatibility. The SMU-6 land use category requires two land uses. The application meets the requirement with the two different housing types. The Planning Commission staff found the request consistent with the Ruskin Community Plan and the Comprehensive Plan.
5. The surrounding area is predominately developed with residential land uses.
6. No testimony in opposition was provided at the Zoning Hearing Master hearing.
7. County transportation staff has no objection to the request and stated that the developer will be required to construct a 10-foot wide sidewalk on the west side of the roadway from $3^{\text {rd }}$ Avenue SE to State Road 674 in accordance with the approved design exception. The sidewalk may narrow due to limited right-of-way but in no case shall be less than 5 feet in width.
8. The rezoning to Planned Development for the development of 50 singlefamily and 96 townhomes is consistent with the parcel's location within the Urban Service Area. The project is consistent with the existing zoning and land use pattern as well as the Land Development Code and Comprehensive Plan.

## 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 33.58 acres from Agricultural Rural to Planned Development is to develop 50 single-family detached homes and 96 townhomes.

The Planning Commission testified that the request meets Policy 1.4 regarding compatibility with the surrounding area. The applicant proposes two housing types to meet the SMU-6 requirement for providing two land uses. The Planning Commission staff found the request consistent with the Ruskin Community Plan and the Comprehensive Plan.

No testimony in opposition was provided at the Zoning Hearing Master hearing.
The rezoning to Planned Development for the development of 50 single-family detached homes and 96 townhomes is consistent with the parcel's location within the Urban Service Area. The project is consistent with the existing zoning and land use pattern as well as the Land Development Code and 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 <br> Date <br> Land Use Hearing Officer



## 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 22-1224 <br> 603 Southeast 12th Street <br> West side of $12^{\text {th }}$ Street and north of College Avenue |
| Summary Data: |  |
| Comprehensive Plan Finding: | CONSISTENT |
| Adopted Future Land Use: | Suburban Mixed Use-6 ( $6 \mathrm{du} / \mathrm{ga}$; 0.25/0.35/0.50 FAR) |
| Service Area: | Urban |
| Community Plan: | Ruskin, Southshore |
| Rezoning Request: | Rezone from Agricultural Rural (AR) to Planned Development (PD) to develop 146 dwelling units. |
| Parcel Size (Approx.): | 33.58 +/- acres (1,462,744 square feet) |
| Street Functional Classification: | $12^{\text {th }}$ Street - Local College Avenue -Arterial |
| Locational Criteria: | N/A |
| Evacuation Area: | A |

Plan Hillsborough planhillsborough.org planner@plancom.org 813-272-5940 601 E Kennedy Blvd $18^{\text {th }}$ floor
Tampa, FL, 33602

## Context

- The subject site is located on approximately 33.58 acres on the west side of 12 th Street and north of College Avenue. The site is in the Urban Service Area and within the limits of the Ruskin and Southshore Community Plans.
- The subject site's Future Land Use designation is Suburban Mixed Use-6 (SMU-6). Typical uses of 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. Neighborhood Commercial uses shall meet locational criteria or be part of larger mixed use planned development. Office uses are not subject to locational criteria.
- The subject site is surrounded by SMU-6 to the east, south and west, and Residential-6 (RES-6) to the north. Further west is designated as Residential-12 (RES-12). The site is mainly surrounded by single family residential and public institutional uses, and vacant agricultural land.
- There are 2.66 acres of wetlands on the site and approximately 25.73 acres of the site is located within the Coastal High Hazard Area.
- The subject site is zoned Agricultural Rural (AR). In the general vicinity, the site is mainly surrounded by AR zoning, Planned Development (PD) zoning and Residential, Duplex Conventional (RDC-12) zoning.
- The applicant requests to rezone the site from Agricultural Rural (AR) to Planned Development (PD) to develop 146 dwelling units. 96 units are proposed to be single family attached townhomes and 50 units are proposed as single family detached.


## 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

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 1.3:
Within the USA and within land use categories permitting 4 du/ga or greater, new rezoning approvals for residential development of less than $75 \%$ of the allowable density of the land use category will be permitted only in cases where one or more of the following criteria are found to be meet:

Development at a density of $75 \%$ of the category or greater would not be compatible (as defined in Policy 1.4) and would adversely impact with the existing development pattern within a 1,000 foot radius of the proposed development;

Infrastructure (Including but not limited to water, sewer, stormwater and transportation) is not planned or programmed to support development.

Development would have an adverse impact on environmental features on the site or adjacent to the property.

The site is located in the Coastal High Hazard Area.
The rezoning is restricted to agricultural uses and would not permit the further subdivision for residential lots.

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

## Land Use Categories

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

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

## Relationship to Land Development Regulations

Objective 9: All existing and future land development regulations shall be made consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, and all development approvals shall be consistent with those development regulations as per the timeframe provided for within Chapter 163, Florida Statutes.

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

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

## Environmental Considerations

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

## Policy 13.3: Environmentally Sensitive Land Credit

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

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


## Neighborhood/Community Development

Objective 16: Neighborhood Protection - The neighborhood is 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 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 16.7: 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.

Policy 16.11: Within residential projects, site planning techniques shall be encouraged to ensure a variety and variation of lot sizes, block faces, setbacks and housing types.

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

## 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.

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

## Community Design Component (CDC)

### 5.0 NEIGHBORHOOD LEVEL DESIGN

### 5.1 COMPATIBILITY

OBJECTIVE 12-1: New developments should recognize the existing community and be designed in a way that is compatible with the established character of the surrounding neighborhood.

Policy 12-1.4: Compatibility may be achieved through the utilization of site design techniques including but not limited to transitions in uses, buffering, setbacks, open space and graduated height restrictions, to affect elements such as height, scale, mass and bulk of structures, pedestrian or vehicular traffic, circulation, access and parking impacts, landscaping, lighting, noise, odor and architecture.

## Livable Communities Element: Ruskin and Southshore Community Plans

## Ruskin Community Plan

Goal 5: Community and Neighborhood Character - Provide for a diversity of home styles and types while protecting Ruskin's small town character.

## Strategies:

- Limit the height of new residential development to 50 feet, unless a more restrictive limitation exists.
- Encourage development that is connected with, and integrated into, the Ruskin community. Design features (e.g. walls, gates) that isolate or segregate development from the community is inconsistent with the community's character and should be discouraged.
- Developments should continue and/or replicate the traditional "grid" street pattern found in Ruskin to the greatest extent practicable.
- Support housing to accommodate a diverse population and income levels.

Goal 7: College Avenue - Ensure that development along College Avenue enhances the appearance of Ruskin, avoids strip commercial patterns, and is compatible with the revitalization of downtown Ruskin.

Strategies:

- Residential uses, including higher density housing will be encouraged between 12th Street and 3rd Street. Commercial and office uses should not be permitted.


## Southshore Areawide Systems Community Plan

4. Maintain housing opportunities for all income groups.
a. Explore and implement development incentives throughout SouthShore that will increase the housing opportunities for all income groups, consistent with and furthering the goals, objectives and policies within the Comprehensive Plan Housing Element

## Staff Analysis of Goals Objectives and Policies:

The subject site is located on approximately 33.58 acres on the west side of 12th Street and north of College Avenue. The site is in the Urban Service Area and within the limits of the Ruskin and Southshore Community Plans. The applicant requests to rezone the site from Agricultural Rural (AR) to Planned Development (PD) to develop 146 dwelling units. 96 units are proposed to be single family attached townhomes and 50 units are proposed as single family detached.

The subject site is in the Urban Service Area where according to Objective 1 of the Future Land Use Element (FLUE), 80 percent of the county's growth is to be directed. Policy 1.4
requires all new developments to be compatible with the surrounding area, noting that "Compatibility does not mean "the same as." Rather, it refers to the sensitivity of development proposals in maintaining the character of existing development." The proposed residential density in the SMU-6 designation and in Urban Service Area is compatible with the existing character of development in the area. The site is surrounded by the SMU-6, RES-6 and RES-12 designation with single family residential, public institutional uses and vacant land.

The proposal is consistent with Policy 1.2, 1.3 and 13.3 as it relates to minimum density and environmental considerations. The majority of the site is located within the Coastal High Hazard Area and has 2.66 acres of wetlands. The site meets the exception under Policy 1.3 to have an allowable density of less than $75 \%$ of the maximum permitted. The allowable density has been calculated as follows: 33.58 acres $\times 6$ du/ac $=201$ dwelling units maximum. 146 dwellings are being proposed; therefore it is consistent with Policy 13.3. The Environmental Protection Commission Wetlands Division has reviewed the proposed site and has determined that a resubmittal is not necessary. Given that there is a separate approval process for wetland impacts with the Environmental Protection Commission and they currently do not object, Planning Commission staff finds this request consistent with Objective 13 and associated policies in the FLUE.

The proposed rezoning meets the intent of Objective 16 and policies 16.1, 16.2, 16.3, 16.7, 16.8, 16.10, 16.11 and 17.7. The proposal includes appropriate setbacks and landscape buffers. In addition, the stormwater retention areas proposed on the west, southwest and south side of the property serves as a buffer and protects the environmentally sensitive land on site. The proposed density and lots sizes are reflective of the surrounding neighborhoods. The site plan appears to show an efficient system of internal circulation with main access off $12^{\text {th }}$ Street and a proposed sidewalk on $12^{\text {th }}$ Street extending down to College Avenue. At the time of drafting this report, Planning Commission staff had not received transportation comments based on the October $25^{\text {th }}$ site plan submittal, therefore Planning Commission staff finding did not take transportation comments into consideration for the analysis of the request.

Objective 19 and associated Policies 19.1 and 19.2 require two land uses for projects in the SMU-6 that are 20 acres or greater. The secondary use must be $10 \%$ of the site. The proposal includes two housing types. The proposal consists of single family attached townhomes with single family detached residential use on at least $25 \%$ of the site, ensuring the minimum 10\% second use requirement in SMU-6 is achieved.

Objective 12-1 and Policy 12-1.4 of the Community Design Component (CDC) discuss how new development shall be compatible with the established character of the surrounding area. The development pattern and character of this portion of College Avenue contains residential and public institutional uses and therefore the proposed residential use is compatible with the surrounding development pattern.

The subject site meets the intent of the Ruskin and Southshore Community Plans. Goal 5 of the Ruskin Community Plan provides for diverse home styles and types and includes a strategy to support housing to accommodate a diverse population and income levels. The proposal provides for two different home styles and types in an area dominated by single family detached homes. In addition, Goal 7 of the Ruskin Community Plan encourages higher density residential uses between 12th Street and 3rd Street along College Avenue. The site is just north of College Avenue and is between 12th Street and 3rd Street. The

Southshore Plan seeks to create housing opportunities for a diverse population and income level. The proposed development meets the intent of the housing goals in the plan.

Overall, staff finds that the proposed residential development with two housing types within the Urban Service Area supports the vision of the Ruskin and Southshore Community Plans. The proposed Planned Development would allow for development that is consistent with the Goals, Objectives, and Policies of the Future Land Use Element of the Unincorporated Hillsborough County Comprehensive Plan. The request is compatible with the existing development pattern found within the surrounding area.

## Recommendation

Based upon the above considerations, Planning Commission staff finds the proposed Planned Development CONSISTENT with the Unincorporated Hillsborough County Comprehensive Plan, subject to the conditions proposed by the Development Services Department.
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# GENERAL <br> SITE PLAN FOR CERTIFICATION 

## HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT

GENERAL SITE PLAN REVIEW/CERTIFICATION

## Project Name:Ruskin reserve south <br> Zoning File: RZ-PD (22-1224) Modification: None

Atlas Page: None Submitted:12/15/22
To Planner for Review: $12 / 15 / 22$ Date Due: ASAP
Contact Person: Jacob T. Cremer Phone: $\xrightarrow{\text { jcemene@steansweaver.con; cwaddem@steamsweaver.com }}$
Right-Of-Way or Land Required for Dedication: Yes $\square$ No $\square$
$\checkmark$
The Development Services Department HAS NO OBJECTION to this General Site Plan.

$\square$
The Development Services Department RECOMMENDS DISAPPROVAL of this General Site Plan for the following reasons: Date: $12-20-22$

Date Agent/Owner notified of Disapproval: $\qquad$



TO: Zoning Technician, Development Services Department
REVIEWER: Richard Perez, AICP
PLANNING AREA: Ruskin / South

DATE: 11/04/2022
AGENCY/DEPT: Transportation
PETITION NO: PD 22-1224
$\square$ 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

- If PD 22-1224 is approved, the County Engineer will approve a Design Exception (dated November 1,2022 ) which was found approvable by the County Engineer (on November 4, 2022) for SE $12^{\text {th }}$ St. substandard road improvements. As SE 12th St. is a substandard local roadway, the developer will be required to construct a $10-\mathrm{ft}$ wide sidewalk on the west side of the roadway from SE 3 rd Ave. and to SR 674 consistent with the approved design exception.

Where the proposed new sidewalk runs along the frontages the last 100 feet approaching SR 674, the width of the sidewalk may narrow, if constrained by limited right-of-way. This segment shall be constructed as close to 10 feet wide as feasible, but in no case shall not be narrower than 5 feet wide.

- The project shall have one (1) full access connection on SE $12^{\text {th }} \mathrm{St}$., as shown on the PD Site Plan.
- The internal project roadways shall be constructed consistent with the Transportation Technical Manual, TS-3 typical Section.
- The developer shall record a 20 -foot drainage easement along the northern project boundary to allow the County access for maintenance purposes, as shown on the PD site plan.
- Notwithstanding anything shown in the PD site plan or in the PD conditions to the contrary, pedestrian access shall be allowed anywhere along the project boundary.


## PROJECT SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS

The applicant is requesting to rezone the subject property from Agricultural (AR) to Planned Development (PD) to construct 50 single family detached residential lots and 96 town home units on $+/-33.58$ acres. The site is located on the east SE $12^{\text {th }}$ St. and north side of SR 674 (College Ave.). The Future Land Use designation of the site is Suburban Mixed Use 6 (SMU-6).

## Trip Generation Analysis

The applicant submitted a trip generation and site access analysis as required by the Development Review Procedures Manual (DRPM). Staff has prepared a comparison of the trips potentially generated under the existing and proposed zoning designations, utilizing a generalized worst-case scenario. Data presented below is based on the Institute of Transportation Engineer's Trip Generation Manual, $10^{\text {th }}$ Edition.

## Approved Zoning:

| Zoning, Lane Use/Size | 24 Hour <br> Two-Way Volume | Total Peak Hour Trips |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | AM | PM |
| AR: 6 Units, Single Family Detached (ITE 210) | 57 | 4 | 6 |

## Proposed Zoning:

| Zoning, Lane Use/Size | 24 Hour | Total Peak Hour Trips |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | AM | PM |
| PD: 96 Units, Town Homes (ITE 220) | $\mathbf{7 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{4 4}$ | $\mathbf{5 4}$ |
| PD: 50 Units, Single Family Detached (ITE 210) | $\mathbf{4 7 2}$ | $\mathbf{3 7}$ | $\mathbf{5 0}$ |
| Total Trips | $\mathbf{1 , 1 7 5}$ | $\mathbf{8 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 4}$ |

## Trip Generation Difference:

| Zoning, Lane Use/Size | 24 Hour | Total Peak Hour Trips |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | AM | PM |
| Difference (+/-) | $\mathbf{+ 1 , 1 1 8}$ | $+\mathbf{7 7}$ | $\mathbf{+ 9 8}$ |

The proposed rezoning will result in an increase in potential trip generation by 1,118 daily trips, 77 AM peak hour trips, and 98 PM peak hour trips.

## TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE SERVING THE SITE

SE $12^{\text {th }} \mathrm{St}$. is a publicly maintained 2-lane, undivided, substandard local roadway characterized by $+/-10-$ foot wide travel lanes in average condition. The roadway lies within a $+/-51$ to $+/-55$-foot wide right-ofway. There is a sidewalk on the east side of the roadway. There are no curb and gutter and no bicycle facilities in the vicinity of the proposed project.

Pursuant to the Hillsborough County Transportation Technical Manual, a local roadway shall meet the typical section TS-3 standard. TS-3 standard includes 10 -foot-wide lanes, 5 foot paved, and 5 -foot wide sidewalks on both sides and curb and gutter within a minimum of 50 feet of right-of-way.

SE $12^{\text {th }}$ St. is not included in the Hillsborough County Corridor Preservation Plan.
In lieu of improving the roadway to standard, the applicant is requesting a design exception to construct a continuous 10 -foot sidewalk along the project frontage and 2 single family lots that are not included in the PD on the west side of SE $12^{\text {th }}$ St. Where existing single family lots intervene between the project frontage on $12^{\text {th }} \mathrm{St}$. the developer may construct a sidewalk narrower than 10 ft to stay within the right-of-way, if necessary, but in no case this segment of sidewalk shall not be less than the standards 5 ft sidewalk. See the Design Exception request section below for additional detail.

## SITE ACCESS \& CONNECTIVITY

The proposed PD site plan provides for a full access connection to SE $12^{\text {th }} \mathrm{St}$. The connection will align with the local road, Casa Bonita Ave., serving the residential subdivision on the east side of SE $12^{\text {th }} \mathrm{St}$.

Based on the applicant's traffic study, turn lanes are not warranted. The traffic study analyzed the current traffic volumes plus project traffic and found that the SE 12th St. will continue to function as a local roadway, i.e. daily traffic volumes will not exceed 5,000 daily trips. As such, local roadways do not warrant auxiliary/turn lanes for site access.

The PD site plan proposes the subdivision roads consistent with the County Transportation Technical Manual TS-3 local roadway typical section. However, the PD site plan indicates that the internal roads may be public private.

SE 3rd Ave. abuts the subject property to the north, which is currently an unimproved right-of-way that includes a significant County drainage conveyance on the south side along the project's northern boundary. The applicant is required to establish a 20 -foot drainage easement along the northern project boundary to allow the County to access the SE $3^{\text {rd }}$ Ave. drainage ditch for maintenance purposes consistent with the County's Stormwater Management Technical Manual Section 4.1.15.2(A). As a result of the adjacent drainage feature a connection form the project is not practical.

No access connections or stubouts to the south and west are proposed due to extensive floodplain, and wetlands.

## REQUESTED DESIGN EXCEPTION: SE $12{ }^{\text {TH }}$ STREET

As SE $12^{\text {th }}$ St. is a substandard local roadway, the applicant's Engineer of Record (EOR) submitted a Design Exception request for SE $12^{\text {th }}$ St. (November 1, 2022) to determine the specific improvements that would be required by the County Engineer. Based on factors presented in the Design Exception request, the County Engineer found the Design Exception request approvable (on November 4, 2022). The developer will be required to construct a 10 - ft wide sidewalk on the west side of the roadway from SE 3rd Ave. and to SR 674 consistent with the approved design exception.

Where the proposed new sidewalk runs along the frontages the last 100 feet approaching SR 674, the width of the sidewalk may narrow, if constrained by limited right-of-way. This segment shall be constructed as close to 10 feet wide as feasible, but in no case shall not be narrower than 5 feet wide.

If this zoning is approved, the County Engineer will approve the Design Exception request.

## LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS)

$\mathrm{SE} 12^{\text {th }} \mathrm{St}$. is not a regulated roadway.

| Roadway | From | To | LOS <br> Standard | Peak Hour <br> Directional LOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SR 674 (College Ave.) | US HWY 41 | I-75 | D | C |

SOURCE: 2020 Hillsborough County Level of Service (LOS) Report

From: Williams, Michael [WilliamsM@HillsboroughCounty.ORG]
Sent: Friday, November 4, 2022 11:23 AM
To: Steven Henry [shenry@lincks.com]
CC: Carol Walden [cwalden@stearnsweaver.com]; Lampkin, Timothy
[LampkinT@hillsboroughcounty.org]; Perez, Richard [PerezRL@hillsboroughcounty.org]; PWCEIntake [PW-CEIntake@hillsboroughcounty.org]; Morales, Cintia
[MoralesCS@hillsboroughcounty.org]
Subject: FW: RZ PD 22-1224 Design Exception Review
Attachments: 22-1224 DEReq 11-02-22.pdf
Importance: High

Steve,
I have found the attached Design Exception (DE) for PD 22-1224 APPROVABLE.

Please note that it is you (or your client's) responsibility to follow-up with my administrative assistant, Cintia Morales (moralescs@ hillsboroughcounty.org or 813-307-1709) 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. Ifthe 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

Facebook \| Twitter \| YouTube \| LinkedIn \| HCFL Stay Safe

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

From: Tirado, Sheida [TiradoS@hillsboroughcounty.org](mailto:TiradoS@hillsboroughcounty.org)
Sent: Wednesday, November 2, 2022 10:11 PM
To: Williams, Michael < WilliamsM@ HillsboroughCounty.ORG>
Cc: Morales, Cintia [MoralesCS@hillsboroughcounty.org](mailto:MoralesCS@hillsboroughcounty.org);Perez, Richard
[PerezRL@hillsboroughcounty.org](mailto:PerezRL@hillsboroughcounty.org)
Subject: RZ PD 22-1224 Design Exception Review
Importance: High
Hello Mike,

The attached Design Exception is approvable to me. Please include the following people in your response email:
shenry@lincks.com
cwalden@stearnsweaver.com
lampkint@hillsboroughcounty.org
perezrl@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 \| LinkedIn \| HCFL Stay Safe
Please note: All correspondence to or from this office is subject to Florida's Public Records law.

## LINCKS \& ASSOCIATES, INC.

November 1, 2022
Mr. Mike Williams
County Engineer Development Review Director
Hillsborough County
601 East Kennedy Blvd., $20^{\text {th }}$ Floor
Tampa, FL 33602
Re: Ruskin Reserve South
Folio Number 056731.0000
RZ PD 22-1224
Lincks Project No. 21126

The purpose of this letter is to request a Design Exception to the Hillsborough County Transportation Technical Manual to meet Land Development Code Section 6.04.03L for $12^{\text {hh }}$ Street from the project access to College Avenue. The developer proposes to rezone the subject property to allow the following land uses:

- Single Family - 50 Dwelling Units
- Townhomes - 96 Dwelling Units

According to the Hillsborough County Functional Classification Map, $12^{\text {th }}$ Street is classified as a local roadway and the subject site is within the Hillsborough County Urban Service Area. As shown in Table 1, the anticipated daily traffic on $12^{\text {th }}$ Street is projected to be less than 5,000 vehicles per day with the development of the project.

Table 2 provides the trip generation for the project.
The access to serve the project is proposed to be one (1) full access to $12^{\text {th }}$ Street to align with Casa Bonita Avenue.

The request is for a Design Exception to TS-7 of the Hillsborough County Transportation Technical Manual for $12^{\text {th }}$ Street from the project access to College Avenue. This segment of $12^{\text {th }}$ Street is currently a two (2) lane roadway. The following exceptions are requested to accommodate the proposed project.

1) Right of Way - TS-7 has 96 feet of right of way. The right of way along the property frontage is approximately 50 feet.
2) Lane Width - TS-7 has 12 foot travel lanes. The existing roadway has approximately 11 foot travel lanes.
3) Shoulders - TS-7 has 8 foot shoulders with 5 foot paved. The existing roadway has unpaved shoulders along the subject section.
4) Sidewalk - TS-7 has sidewalk on both sides of the roadway. There is currently sidewalk along the east side of the roadway.

The justification for the Design Exception is as follows:

1. As indicated, $12^{\text {th }}$ Street is a local road. In addition, there are speed bumps along the roadway. Improving the roadway to 12 foot lanes and paved shoulders would potentially increase the speed along the roadway which is contrary to the purpose of the speed bumps.
2. The developer proposes to construct a 10 foot sidewalk on the west side of $12^{\text {th }}$ Street along the proposed frontage as shown in Figure 1. In addition, the intention is to connect the sidewalk to the sidewalk within SR 674. The southern-most 100 feet of the sidewalk may have a reduced width due to right of way and utility constraints as the developer does not control the right of way along the segment of $12^{\text {th }}$ Street adjacent to folio 56729.0000. If the 10 foot sidewalk cannot be accommodated along folio 56729.0000, the developer shall construct the maximum width possible for up to 10 feet but no less than 5 feet with the appropriate transition.

Figure 1 illustrates the limits of the proposed improvements.
Based on the above, it is our opinion, the proposed improvements to $12^{\text {th }}$ Street will mitigate the impact of the project and meet the intent of the Transportation Technical Manual to the extent feasible.

Mr. Mike Williams
November 1, 2022
Page 3

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


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

Mr. Mike Williams
November 1, 2022
Page 4
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\text { North of SR } 674
\end{array} \\
& \text { (1) Counts dated 7/6/22. } \\
& \text { (2) Peak Season Traffic converted to daily volume based on FDOT K }=0.09 \text {. }
\end{aligned}
$$

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

Mr. Mike Williams
November 1, 2022
Page 6
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### 3.0 TRANSPORTATION SUMMARY (FULLTRANSPORTATION REPORT IN SECTION 9 OF STAFF REPORT)

## Adjoining Roadways (check if applicable)

| Road Name | Classification | Current Conditions | Select Future Improvements |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| SE 12th Street | County Local - | 2 Lanes | $\square$ Corridor Preservation Plan |
|  | $\boxtimes$ Substandard Road <br>  <br>  Urban | $\square$ Site Access Improvements |  |
|  |  | Substandard Road Improvements <br>  |  |

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

|  | Average Annual Daily Trips | A.M. Peak Hour Trips | P.M. Peak Hour Trips |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Existing | 57 | 4 | 6 |
| Proposed | 1,175 | 81 | 104 |
| Difference $(+/-)$ | $+1,118$ | +77 | +98 |

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

| Connectivity and Cross Access $\square$ Not applicable for this request |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Project Boundary | Primary Access | Additional <br> Connectivity/Access | Cross Access | Finding |
| North |  | None | None | Meets LDC |
| South |  | None | None | Meets LDC |
| East | None | None | Meets LDC |  |
| West | None | None | Meets LDC |  |
| Notes: |  |  |  |  |


| Design Exception/Administrative Variance $\square$ Not applicable for this request |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Road Name/Nature of Request | Type | Finding |  |  |
| SE 12th St./Substandard Roadway | Design Exception Requested | Approvable |  |  |
| Notes: Proposing to construct 10-ft wide sidewalk on west side of street. Sidewalk may narrow at certain sections <br> where constrained by ROW. |  |  |  | Choose an item. |


| 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 $\square \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\boxtimes$ Yes <br> $\square$ No | See report. |

## COMMISSION

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


## AGENCY COMMENT SHEET

- 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).
- 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.
- 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 considered during the earliest stages of site design so that wetland impacts are avoided or minimized to the greatest extent possible. The size, location, and configuration of the wetlands may result in requirements to reduce or reconfigure the improvements depicted on the plan.
- The Hillsborough County Land Development Code (LDC) defines wetlands and other surface waters as Environmentally Sensitive Areas. Pursuant to the LDC, wetlands and other surface waters are further defined as Conservation Areas or Preservation Areas and these areas must be designated as such on all development plans and plats. A minimum setback must be maintained around the Conservation/Preservation Area and the setback line must also be shown on all future plan submittals.
- Any activity interfering with the integrity of wetland(s) or other surface water(s), such as clearing, excavating, draining or filling, without written authorization from the Executive Director of the EPC or authorized agent, pursuant to Section 1-11.07, would be a violation of Section 17 of the Environmental Protection Act of Hillsborough County, Chapter 84-446, and of Chapter 1-11.
kmh / app
ec: Jacob T. Cremer, Agent - jcremer@stearnsweaver.com \& cwalden@stearnsweaver.com

Hillsborough County
P U B LIC S C H O OL S
Preparing Students for Life

Adequate Facilities Analysis: Rezoning

Date: 9/26/2022

Jurisdiction: Hillsborough County

Case Number: RZ 22-1224

HCPS \#: RZ-474

Address: 603 12 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ St SE, Ruskin

Parcel Folio Number(s): 056731.0000

Acreage: $\pm 33.6$ acres

Proposed Zoning: Planned Development

Future Land Use: SMU-6

Maximum Residential Units: 146 Units

Residential Type: (96) Single-Family, Attached \& (50) Single-Family, Detached

| School Data | Thompson Elementary | Shields <br> Middle | Lennard <br> High |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FISH Capacity <br> Total school capacity as reported to the Florida Inventory of School Houses (FISH) | 950 | 1,557 | 2,249 |
| 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 | 710 | 1,782 | 2,249 |
| Current Utilization <br> Percentage of school capacity utilized based on $40^{\text {th }}$ day enrollment and FISH capacity | 75\% | 114\% | 100\% |
| Concurrency Reservations <br> Existing concurrency reservations due to previously approved development. Source: CSA Tracking Sheet as of September 25, 2022 | 198 | 10 | 251 |
| 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 | 21 | 9 | 14 |
| Proposed Utilization <br> School capacity utilization based on $40^{\text {th }}$ day enrollment, existing concurrency reservations, and estimated student generation for application | 98\% | 116\% | 112\% |

Notes: Thompson Elementary School currently has adequate capacity for the residential impact of the proposed development. Shields Middle and Lennard High Schools do not have adequate capacity for the residential impact of the proposed development. In these cases, the school district is required by state law to consider whether additional capacity exists in adjacent concurrency service areas (i.e., school attendance boundaries). At this time additional capacity does not exist in adjacent service areas at the high school level. A proportionate share agreement is an available mitigation option until the county approves a new school location.

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

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

PETITION NO.: PD22-1224 REVIEWED BY: Randy Rochelle DATE: 8/22/2022
FOLIO NO.: 56731.0000

## 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 16 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 E. College Avenue. This will be the likely point-of-connection, however there could be additional and/or different points-of-connection determined at the time of the application for service. This is not a reservation of capacity.
$\boxtimes \quad$ 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 4 inch wastewater force main exists $\square$ (adjacent to the site), $\boxtimes$ (approximately 60 feet from the site) and is located within the east Right-of-Way of $12^{\text {th }}$ Street SE. 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: 16 August 2022
REVIEWER: Bernard W. Kaiser, Conservation and Environmental Lands Management
APPLICANT: Jacob Cremer PETITION NO: RZ-PD 22-1224
LOCATION: Not listed
FOLIO NO: $\underline{56731.0000}$ SEC: ___ TWN: ___ RNG: ___
$\boxtimes \quad$ 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: $\qquad$ .

TO: Zoning/Code Administration, Development Services Department
FROM: Reviewer: Carla Shelton Knight Date: November 2, 2022
Agency: Natural Resources
Petition \#: 22-1224
( ) This agency has no comment
( ) This agency has no objections
(X) This agency has no objections, subject to listed or attached conditions
( ) This agency objects, based on the listed or attached issues.

1. Natural Resources staff identified a number of significant trees on the site including potential Grand Oaks. Every effort must be made to avoid the removal of and design the site around these trees. The site plan may be modified from the Certified Site Plan to avoid tree removal. This statement should be identified as a condition of the rezoning.
2. An evaluation of the property supports the presumption that listed animal species may occur or have restricted activity zones throughout the property. Pursuant to the Land Development Code (LDC), a wildlife survey of any endangered, threatened or species of special concern in accordance with the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission Wildlife Methodology Guidelines shall be required. This survey information must be provided upon submittal of the preliminary plans through the Land Development Code's Site Development or Subdivision process. Essential Wildlife Habitat as defined by the LDC must be addressed, if applicable, in consideration with the overall boundaries of this rezoning request. This statement should be identified as a condition of the rezoning.
3. This site contains trees that may qualify as Grand Oaks as defined by the Land Development Code (LDC). All trees confirmed as a Grand Oak must be accurately located and labeled as such on the submitted preliminary plat through the Subdivision Review process. Design efforts are to be displayed on the submitted preliminary plat to avoid adverse impacts to these trees. This statement should be identified as a condition of the rezoning.

Page 1 of 2

22-1224
Natural Resources
Page Two:
4. Wetlands or other surface waters are considered Environmentally Sensitive Areas and are subject to Conservation Area and Preservation Area setbacks. A minimum setback must be maintained around these areas which shall be designated on all future plan submittals. Proposed land alterations are restricted within the wetland setback areas. This statement should be identified as a condition of the rezoning.
5. Approval of this petition by Hillsborough County does not constitute a guarantee that Natural Resources approvals/permits necessary for the development as proposed will be issued, does not itself serve to justify any impacts to trees, natural plant communities or wildlife habitat, and does not grant any implied or vested right to environmental approvals.
6. The construction and location of any proposed environmental impacts are not approved by this correspondence, but shall be reviewed by Natural Resources staff through the site and subdivision development plan process pursuant to the Land Development Code.
7. If the notes and/or graphic on the site plan are in conflict with specific zoning conditions and/or the Land Development Code (LDC) regulations, the more restrictive regulation shall apply, unless specifically conditioned otherwise. References to development standards of the LDC in the above stated conditions shall be interpreted as the regulations in effect at the time of preliminary site plan/plat approval.

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
REVIEWER: Ron Barnes, Impact \& Mobility Fee Coordinator
APPLICANT: Property Reserve Inc

DATE: 11/04/2022

PETITION NO: 22-1224

LOCATION: 603 SE 12th St
FOLIO NO: 56731.0000

## Estimated Fees:

(Fee estimate is based on a 2,000 square foot, Single Family Detached Unit)
Mobility: \$9,183 *50 = \$459,150
Parks: \$2,145 * 50 = \$107,250
School: \$8,227 * 50 = \$411,350
Fire: $\$ 335$ * 50 = \$16,750
Single Family Detached per unit = \$19,890 * 50 = \$994,500
(Fee estimate is based on a 1,500 square foot, 3 Bedroom 1-2 story Single Family Attached Units)
Mobility: \$6,661 * 96 = \$639,456
Parks: $\$ 2,145$ * 96 = \$205,920
School: \$7,027 * 96 = \$674,592
Fire: \$249 * 96 = \$23,904
Multi-Family (1-2 story) per unit $=\$ 13,873$ * $96=\$ 1,543,872$

## Project Summary/Description:

Urban Mobility, South Park/Fire - 96 Single family attached, 50 Single family detached


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

HEARING MASTER: Thank you. I appreciate it. Is there anyone in the room or online that would like to speak in support? Anyone in favor? I'm seeing no one. Anyone in opposition to this request? I see no one. All right. Mr. Grady, anything else?

MR. GRADY: Nothing further.
HEARING MASTER: All right. Go back to the applicant. You have five minutes if you'd like.

MR. CREMER: Jay Cremer. Nothing further. We ask for your support tonight. Thank you.

HEARING MASTER: Thank you so much. With that we'll close rezoning 22-1223 and go to the next case.

MR. GRADY: The next item is Agenda Item D. 8 Rezoning PD 22-1224, the applicant's Property Reserve Incorporated. The request is a rezone from $A R$ to a plan development. Tim Lampkin will provide staff recommendation after presentation by the applicant.

HEARING MASTER: Good evening.
MR. CREMER: Good evening. Jay Cremer again. 401
East Jackson Street, number one -- Number 2100 in Tampa.
David Smith our planner will give our -- a brief presentation. Thank you.

HEARING MASTER: Thank you.
MR. SMITH: Thank you. Again, for the record, David Smith, Director of Development Zoning. Sterns, Weaver,

Miller, 401 East Jackson Street, Suite 2100, Tampa 33601.
This property, as I alluded to, is immediately south of the prior application. As you can see in the location map or vicinity map, this is almost exactly at the corner of Shell Point -- excuse me, College and 12th. There's only one intervening property at the corner that is separated by a floodway between this property and the one to the north. It's 33.58 acres in size. And next size -- slide, please.

So the future land use and zoning of the properties right now, we have agricultural AR zoning, future land use, it's suburban mixed use six located in SouthShore Areawide Plan located within the Ruskin Community Plan in the urban service area. Next slide.

So you see this property has an irregular shape because there's an intervening residential property that is located kind of wrapped by the property, but on the south side of the floodway. The property is traversed by a floodway and wetland areas. The portion of the site that's immediately south of the floodway is basically going to be used for pond compensation storage in the area. So when you look at our surrounding area, we have developed church across 12th. We have an existing subdivision and then a little bit to the north and east, there's an additional small subdivision that it's probably older than the one to the south. To our north is 3rd Avenue that we just discussed. It is the unimproved right-of-way and
also the large storm water conveyance system. On the east -excuse me, on the west side, we have residential and government on property. Surprisingly, I found out that the Port Authority actually owns some of the land that is around CSX immediately to our west. Next slide.

So here's the site plan of the property. This is a development that is proposed for residential uses, townhome and single-family. You can see that most of the property is developed with or will be utilized for ponds and flood plane compensation. One access point will be off of 12th. Next slide, please.

This particular zoning has 50 single-family detached and 96 townhomes for a total of 146 dwelling units, density of 4.7 dwelling units per acre, which is consistent with the SMU-6 that meets the $75 \%$ minimum density requirement. The staff report indicates the -- that what we've shown in the slide, the setbacks and lot sizes for the very -- or excuse me, the setbacks for each one of the lot types, maximum height, 35 feet, one full access. Drainage, we're proposing are providing a drainage easement to the county along 3rd Avenue southeast. The site plan upper record notes that on the site plan, the county requested that in order to maintain the storm water conveyance system. We're looking at ten-foot buffer A with screening along the north, south and west of the project. As is typically permitted when there's existing vegetation that can provide the
opacity required for those Type A screens. They can be substituted for other vegetation or also in lieu of any type of fencing. When you look at the surrounding area, there's significant separation between the actual development -development area and anything that is on the west side of the property or to the south because of the flood way and intervening wetlands. Next slide.

Due to its location in the $S M U-6$, the property is required to have two uses. This has been accomplished by the provision of two different housing types. We've assured that no no one use type will be less than $25 \%$. So therefore that makes sure that 10\% -- minimum 10\% of the land area will be utilized for the second use. Planning Commission has found this acceptable and consistent. The Ruskin Community Plan also classifies this area as area two, which allows a variety of housing types, including townhomes. So we have a mix of townhomes and single-family, consistent with that provision. Goal five of the community plan provides, you know, provide diverse home styles and types to accommodate diverse population and income. Again, this is accomplished through the mix of the housing types that are proposed. And it also asks, you know, recommends higher density within this portion of the community plan. This does accomplish that even though the site is not developing too intensively because we'll only be compatible with the single-family development that is across 12th and also the
fact that we have significant limitation, even though we have 33 acres, a large portion of it is in flood plane and -- and wetland area. Next slide.

Again, the -- the applicant's requesting no vary -variations to land development code. Staff finds it approvable. We are asking for a design exception to the -- for the substandard roads. Again, this only deals with the ten-foot pedestrian path that will traverse the west side of 12 th. That's been found approvable and acceptable by the County Engineer. Next slide.

This -- in reviewing the planning commission staff report, they looked at the Ruskin Community Plan, and, again, they found that this property is a residential density SMU-6. It's compatible with the existing character of the development. The retention ponds to the west, southwest and south of the site, serve as buffers to protect environmental sense of land on site and adjacent. Proposed density and lot sizes are reflective of the surrounding neighborhoods. And the development pattern and character of the portion of College Avenue contains residential and public institutional and therefore is also compatible with this development or what we proposed with them. Next slide, please.

Again, transportation and connectivity, as indicated on the aerial that $I$ showed earlier, there's really no viable way to cross the floodway, the wetlands to connect anything to
the east -- excuse me to the west. Also CSX then ends up traversing even further to the west and causes the same disconnect in those grids. When you go to the north, again, we have the large storm water conveyance and there are no existing street connections all the way up to Shell Point and the small block faces do not warrant cross connectivity at -- at this location. Also are one access point to 12th lines up with the adjacent subdivision that's across on the west side and that actual subdivision does not continue and connect any further west, but we do provide for that opportunity if -- if it had connected or would connect in the future. (Inaudible) engineer found the DE the acceptable and approvable. Next slide.

So looking at the conclusions, Hillsborough County Development Services Staff recommended approval with conditions. Planning Commission Staff found it consistent with Hillsborough Comprehensive Plan. And we respectfully request a recommendation for approval. I'm here to answer any questions. We also have the same development team that was here for the prior application available if there are any questions.

HEARING MASTER: I do see that same condition regarding the sidewalk and the narrowing of that area.

MR. SMITH: Yes.
HEARING MASTER: Okay.
MR. SMITH: Thank you.
HEARING MASTER: No, no, nothing further. Thank you.

All right. Mr. Cremer, does that conclude the presentation? All right. Thank you so much. Development Services.

MR. LAMPKIN: Good evening. Tim Lampkin, Development Services for case 22-1224. The applicant is seeking to develop an approximately 33.5 acre unified development consisting of one folio. The request is for rezoning from agricultural rural to plan development to allow for the development of 146 dwelling units consisting of 96 townhomes and 50 single family detached homes. The site is located on the north side of East College Avenue at the intersection of East College Avenue and 12th Street southeast. The subject property is located in the urban service area within the limits of the Ruskin Community Plan. The immediate area surrounding the property is predominantly developed residential with a place of worships to the immediate east of the subject site. To the west it's vacant property and the CSX railroad right-of-way. Immediately north of the subject site is approved for a multi-family development, however is currently developed with single-family homes. The applicant does not request any variations to Land Development Code Part 6.06.00, landscaping and offering. The -- the applicant is required to have a five foot buffer with Type A screening adjacent to the single-family properties located to the south and west of the subject property that the applicant discussed. The applicant proposes a condition to allow the use of existing visitation in lieu of required screening pursuant to Land

Development Code Section 6.06.06.C.12. This permits an applicant to submit an alternative screening plan at the time of site and development review. The alternative plan shall afford screening in terms of height, opacity and separation equivalent to or exceeding that provided by the requirements of a five-foot buffer with Type A screening. East College Avenue is also an urban scenic roadway. Land Development Code Section 6.06.03.I.2.C pertaining to scenic roadways requires the planting of one street -- tree per 40 feet of frontage and the planning of one canopy tree for every 50 feet of yard frontage along East College Avenue.

It's noted that the water distribution system improvements will need to be completed prior to connection to the County's water system. These improvements include two funded CIP projects that are currently under construction and will need to be completed by the County prior to issuance of any building permits that will create additional demand on the system. This is conditioned and it's a standard condition due to the CIP project in this location of the County.

The site will comply with and conform to all other applicable policies and regulations, including but not limited to the Hillsborough Land Development Code. The Planning Commission has found the proposed rezoning would be consistent with the Unincorporated Hillsborough County comp plan. There is a 12 th Street southeast, as the applicant went over, is the
substandard local roadway and the applicant's engineer of record submitted a design exception request for 12th Street southeast to determine the specific improvements that would be required. Based upon factors presented in the design exception request, the County engineer found the design exception request
approvable. The developer will be required to construct a ten-foot wide sidewalk on the west side of the roadway from 3rd Avenue southeast from State Road 674 consistent with the approved design exception.

Based upon the aforementioned, staff finds the request approvable and that concludes my presentation unless there any questions.

HEARING MASTER: Not at this time, but thank you. Planning Commission.

MS. PAPANDREW: Andrea Papandrew, Planning Commission Staff. The subject property is within the suburban mixed use six future land use category. The site is within the limits of the Ruskin and the SouthShore Areawide Systems Community Plans. The site is in the urban service area or according to Objective one, the future land use element, $80 \%$ of the County's growth is to be directed. Policy 1.4 requires all new to be compatible with the surrounding area. The proposed residential density in the suburban mixed use six designation and the urban service area is compatible with the existing character of development in the area. The site surrounded by the suburban mixed use six,

Residential-6 and Residential-12 designations with single-family residential, public institutional uses and vacant land. The proposal is consistent with Policy 1.2, 1.3 and 13.3 as it relates to minimum density and environmental considerations. The majority of the site is located within the coastal high hazard area and therefore the site meets the exemption under Policy 1.3 to have an allowable density of less than $75 \%$ of the maximum permitted. The allowable density allows up to 201 dwelling units, 146 dwelling units are being proposed and this is consistent with Policy 13.3.

The EPC has reviewed the proposed site and has determined that a resubmitted is not necessary given if the EPC does not object. Planning Commission Staff finds the request consistent with Objective 13 and associated policies. The proposed rezoning meets the intent of Objective 16, Policy 161, 16,2, 16.3, 16.7, 16.8, 16.10, 16.11 and 17.7. The proposal includes appropriate setbacks and landscape buffers in addition to storm water retention areas proposed on the west, southwest and south side of the property serve as a buffer and protects the environment to sensitive lands on site.

The proposed density and lot sizes are a reflector of the surrounding neighborhoods and the site plan appears to show an effective system internal circulation with main access off 12th Street and the proposed sidewalk on 12th extending down to College Avenue. At the time of drafting this report, Planning

Commission Staff had not received transportation comments based on the October 25th site plan submittal. Therefore, Planning Commission Staff did not take transportation comments into consideration for the analysis of this request.

Objective 19 and associated Policies 19.1 and 19.2 required two land uses for projects in the suburban mixed use six that are 20 acres or greater. The proposal includes two housing types, single-family attached townhomes and single-family detach residential uses on at least $25 \%$ of the site and have met the minimum $10 \%$ second use requirement.

Objective 12-1 and Policy 12-1.4, the community design component discusses how new development shall be compatible with the established character of the surrounding area, development pattern and character of this portion of College Avenue contains residential and public institutional uses and therefore the proposed residential use is compatible with the surrounding development pattern.

The site also meets the intent of the Ruskin and the SouthShore Community Plans. Goal five of the Ruskin Community Plan provides for diverse home styles and supports diverse population income levels. And the proposal provides for two different home styles and types in an area dominated by single-family attached homes.

In addition, Goal seven, the rest of the community plan encourage high density residential usage, between 12th

Street and 3rd Street along College Avenue and this site is just north of College Avenue between 12th and 3rd Street.

And lastly, the SouthShore Plan seeks to create housing opportunities for a diverse population, income level and the proposed development meets the intent of the housing goals. Based upon the above considerations, Planning Commission Staff finds the proposed plan development consistent with the Unincorporated Hillsborough County Comprehensive Plan subject to the conditions proposed by the Development Services Department. Thank you.

HEARING MASTER: Thank you. Is there anyone in the room or online that would like to speak in support? No one. Anyone in opposition to this request? No one. All right. Mr. Grady.

MR. GRADY: Nothing further.
HEARING MASTER: Mr. Cremer.
MR. CREMER: Nothing further. Appreciate your time.
HEARING MASTER: Thank you so much. We'll close rezoning 22-1224 and go to the next case.

MR. GRADY: The next item is Agenda Item D.9, major mod application 22-1301. The applicant's CC Saffold Farms, LLC. The request is for a major modification of existing plan development. Michelle Heinrich will provide staff recommendation after presentation by the applicant.

HEARING MASTER: Good evening.
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IN RE:
LAND USE HEARING OFFICER ) HEARINGS


LAND USE HEARING OFFICER HEARING TRANSCRIPT OF TESTIMONY AND PROCEEDINGS

BEFORE:
PAMELA JO HATLEY Land Use Hearing Master

DATE:
Monday, October 17, 2022
TIME :
Commencing at 6:00 p.m.
Concluding at 9:10 p.m.
PLACE:
Robert W. Saunders, Sr. Public Library
Ada T. Payne Community Room
1505 N. Nebraska Avenue
Tampa, Florida 33602
Reported via Zoom Videoconference by:
Julie Desmond, Court Reporter
U.S. Legal Support
the November 14, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

Item A.28, Specialist General 22-1222. This application is not awarded. The hearing is being continued to the November 14, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

Item A. 29, Rezoning PD 22-1223. This application is being continued by the applicant to the November 14, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

Item A. 30, Rezoning PD 22-1224. This application is being continued by the applicant to the November 14, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

Item A.31, Rezoning PD 22-1225. This application not awarded. The hearing is being continued to the November 14, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

Item A.32, Rezoning PD 22-1226. This application is being continued by the applicant to the November 14, 2022, Zoning Hearing Master Hearing.

Item A.33, Major Mod Application 22-1228. This application is being continued by the applicant to the November 14, 2022, Zoning Hearing

## EXHIBITS SUBMITTED

## DURING THE ZHM HEARING

SIGN-IN SHEET: RFR, ZHM, PM, LUGO
$5 \quad$ Page $\perp$ of 6 date/time: H/y/z2 bpm hearing master: Susan Finch

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY, THIS INFORMATION WILL BE USED FOR MAILING


SIGN-IN SHEET: RFR, ZHM, PHI, LUHO DATE/TIME: $1 / 14 / 22$ Gem HEARING MASTER: $\qquad$
PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY, THIS INFORMATION WILL BE USED FOR MAILING


SIGN-IN SHEET: RFR, ZHM, PM, LUGO date/time: lly/2z bpm HEARING MASTER: Susan Finch

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY, THIS INFORMATION WILL BE USED FOR MAILING


SIGN-IN SHEET: RFR, ZHM, PHI, LUHO
DATE/TIME: $\mu / 4 / 22$ 6 pm HEARING MASTER: $\qquad$ Susan Finch

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY, THIS INFORMATION WILL BE USED FOR MAILING


SIGN-IN SHEET: RFR, ZHM. PHI, LUHO
PAGE 5 OF 6 DATE/TIME: $1 / 14 \mid 22$, 6 pm HEARING MASTER: SuSan Finch

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY, THIS INFORMATION WILL BE USED FOR MAILING


SIGN-IN SHEET: RFR, ZHM, PHM, LUHO
DATE/TIME: $1 / 14 / 22,6 \mathrm{~m}$ HEARING MASTER: Susun Finch
PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY, THIS INFORMATION WILL BE USED FOR MAILING

| APPLICATION \# $R 2 \quad 22-1301$ | $\underbrace{\text { NAME Sere Venry }}_{\text {piege privt }}$ <br> MAILING ADDRESS $\qquad$ 5023 <br> w. Lavel CITY $\qquad$ Tampa <br> STATE $\qquad$ FL <br> ZIP $\qquad$ PHONE $\qquad$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| APPLICATION \# | $\qquad$ <br> MAILING ADDRESS $\qquad$ <br> CITY $\qquad$ STATE $\qquad$ ZIP $\qquad$ PHONE $\qquad$ |
| APPLICATION \# $5022-1222$ | PLEASE PRINT <br> NAME $\qquad$ DOUC DENBOEROL <br> MAILING ADDRESS $\qquad$ 5453 mohr Loop CITY $\qquad$ STATE FL $\qquad$ ZIP 33615 PHONE 760.250 |
| APPLICATION \# | NAME $\qquad$ <br> MAILING ADDRESS $\qquad$ <br> CITY $\qquad$ STATE $\qquad$ ZIP $\qquad$ PHONE $\qquad$ |
| APPLICATION \# | PLEASE PRINT <br> NAME $\qquad$ <br> MAILING ADDRESS $\qquad$ <br> CITY $\qquad$ STATE $\qquad$ ZIP $\qquad$ PHONE $\qquad$ |
| APPLICATION \# | PLEASE PRINT <br> NAME $\qquad$ <br> MAILING ADDRESS $\qquad$ <br> CITY $\qquad$ STATE $\qquad$ ZIP $\qquad$ PHONE $\qquad$ |


| HEARING TYPE: | ZHM, PHM, VRH, LUHO | DATE: November 14, 2022 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | HEARING MASTER: | Susan Finch |


| APPLICATION \# | SUBMITTED BY | EXHIBITS SUBMITTED | HRG. MASTER <br> YES OR NO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MM 22-1301 | Rosa Timoteo | 1. Revised staff report | Yes (Copy) |
| MM 22-1301 | Kami Corbett | 2. Applicant presentation packet | No |
| MM 22-1301 | Isabelle Albert | 3. Applicant presentation packet | No |
| MM 22-0860 | Rosa Timoteo | 1. Revised staff report | Yes (Copy) |
| RZ 22-0943 | Isabelle Albert | 1. Applicant presentation packet | No |
| RZ 22-0949 | Colin Rice | 1. Applicant presentation packet | No |
| RZ 22-0949 | Christopher Jordan | 2. Applicant presentation packet | Yes (Copy) |
| RZ 22-1103 | Stephen Sposato | 1. Applicant presentation packet | No |
| RZ 22-1103 | Steve Henry | 2. Applicant presentation packet | No |
| RZ 22-1223 | David M. Smith | 1. Applicant presentation packet | No |
| RZ 22-1224 | David M. Smith | 1. Opponent presentation packet | No |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

NOVEMBER 14， 2022 －ZONING HEARING MASTER

The Zoning Hearing Master（ZHM），Hillsborough County，Florida，met in Regular Meeting，scheduled for Monday，November 14，2022，at 6：00 p．m．，in the Ada T．Payne Community Room，Robert W．Saunders Sr．Public Library，Tampa， Florida，and held virtually．

目Susan Finch，ZHM，calls the meeting to order and leads in the pledge of allegiance to the flag．

A．WITHDRAWALS AND CONTINUANCES
具Brian Grady，Development Services，introduces staff and reviews withdrawals／continuances．

绿Susan Finch，ZHM，overview of ZHM process．
金Senior Assistant County Attorney Mary Dorman，overview of oral argument／ZHM process．

园Susan Finch，ZHM，oath．
B．REMANDS
None．
C．REZONING STANDARD（RZ－STD）：
C．1．RZ 22－0698
组Brian Grady，Development Services，calls RZ 22－0698．
國David Wright，applicant rep，presents testimony．
哣Susan Finch，ZHM，questions to applicant rep．
國David Wright，applicant rep，answers ZHM questions．
目Isis Brown，Development Services，staff report．
圏Andrea Papandrew，Planning Commission，staff report．
绿Susan Finch，ZHM，calls proponents／opponents／Development Services／applicant rep／closes RZ 22－0698．

C．2．RZ 22－1303
国Brian Grady，Development Services，calls RZ 22－1303．
國David Mullen，applicant rep，presents testimony．
国Isis Brown，Development Services，staff report．
园Susan Finch，ZHM，questions to Development Services．
国Isis Brown，Development Services，answers ZHM questions．
目Alex Steady，Development Services Transportation，answers ZHM questions．
且Brian Grady，Development Services，answers ZHM questions．
园Andrea Papandrew，Planning Commission，staff report．
国Susan Finch， ZHM，calls proponents／opponents／Development
Services／applicant rep．
RTaner Tavlan，applicant rep，gives rebuttal．
国Susan Finch，ZHM，closes RZ 22－1303．
C．3．RZ 22－1449
目Brian Grady，Development Services，calls RZ 22－1449．
隝Kelli Conte，applicant rep，presents testimony．
国Brian Grady，Development Services，staff report．
國Andrea Papandrew，Planning Commission，staff report．
国Susan Finch， ZHM ，calls proponents／opponents／Development Services／applicant rep／closes RZ 22－1449

C．4．RZ 22－1452
且Brian Grady，Development Services，calls RZ 22－1452．
国Richard Kosan，applicant rep，presents testimony．
园Isis Brown，Development Services，staff report

MONDAY，NOVEMBER 14， 2022

直Andrea Papandrew，Planning Commission，staff report．屋Susan Finch，ZHM，calls proponents／opponents／Development Services／applicant rep／closes RZ 22－1452．

D．REZONING－PLANNED DEVELOPMENT（RZ－PD）\＆MAJOR MODIFICATION（MM）：
D．1．RZ 22－0461
园Brian Grady，Development Services，calls RZ 22－0461．
Truett Gardner，applicant rep，presents testimony．
且Susan Finch，ZHM，questions to applicant rep．
國Truett Gardner，applicant rep，answers ZHM questions．
国Susan Finch，ZHM，questions to applicant rep．
隝Truett Gardner，applicant rep，answers ZHM questions．
隝Addie Clark，applicant rep，continues testimony．
隝Steve Henry，applicant rep，continues testimony．
［国Susan Finch，ZHM，questions to applicant rep．
园Steve Henry，applicant rep，answers ZHM questions．
国Truett Gardner，applicant rep，continues testimony．
国Michelle Heinrich，Development Services，staff report．
园Susan Finch，ZHM，questions to development Services．
Michelle Heinrich，Development Services，answers ZHM questions／continues staff report．

组James Ratliff，Development Services Transportation，staff report．
国Andrea Papandrew，Planning Commission，staff report．
直Susan Finch，ZHM，calls proponents／opponents／Development Services／applicant rep．

园Truett Gardner，applicant rep，answers ZHM questions．

MONDAY，NOVEMBER 14， 2022

國Susan Finch，ZHM，closes RZ 22－0461．
D．2．MM 22－0860
国Brian Grady，Development Services，calls MM 22－0860．
國William Molloy，applicant rep，presents testimony．
园Susan Finch，ZHM，questions to applicant rep．
William Molloy，applicant rep，answers ZHM questions．
Steve Henry，applicant rep，continues testimony．
且Susan Finch，ZHM，questions to applicant rep．
國Steve Henry，applicant rep，answers ZHM questions．
國William Molly，applicant rep，continues testimony．
國Susan Finch，ZHM，questions to applicant rep．
哣William Molloy，applicant rep，answers ZHM questions．
园Sam Ball，Development Services，staff report．
园Susan Finch，ZHM，questions to Development Services．
隝Sam Ball，Development Services，answers ZHM questions．
园Andrea Papandrew，Planning Commission，staff report．
国Susan Finch， ZHM，palls proponents／opponents／Development Services／applicant rep．

国William Molloy，applicant rep，corrects record．
1国Susan Finch，ZHM，closes MM 22－0860．
D．3．RZ 22－0943
國Brian Grady，Development Services，calls RZ 22－0943．
［国Isabelle Albert，applicant rep，presents testimony／submits exhibits．
国Susan Finch，ZHM，questions to applicant rep．

且Isabelle Albert，applicant rep，answers ZHM questions．
国Tania Chapela，Development Services，staff report．
且Andrea Papandrew，Planning Commission，staff report．
四Susan Finch，ZHM，calls proponents／opponents／Development Services／applicant rep／closes RZ 22－0943．

D．4．RZ 22－0949
Brian Grady，Development Services，calls RZ 22－0949．
国Colin Rice，applicant rep，presents testimony／submits exhibits．
国Tim Lampkin，Development Services，staff report．
Andrea Papandrew，Planning Commission，staff report．
［国Susan Finch，ZHM，questions to Planning Commission．
国Andrea Papandrew，Planning Commission，answers ZHM questions．
際Susan Finch，ZHM，calls proponents／opponents．
国Christopher Jordan，opponent，presents testimony／submits exhibits．
四David Shern，opponent，presents testimony．
国Joan Alagood，opponent，presents testimony．
国Vincent Roberson，opponent，presents testimony．
䲩Attila Nagy，opponent，presents testimony．
［國Susan Finch，ZHM，questions to Development Services Transportation．
圈Alex Steady，Development Services Transportation，answers ZHM questions．
國Susan Finch，ZHM，questions to Development Services Transportation．
组Alex Steady，Development Services Transportation，answers ZHM questions．国Colin Rice，applicant rep，gives rebuttal．

国Susan Finch，ZHM，questions to applicant rep．

国Colin Rice，applicant rep，answers ZHM questions．
国Susan Finch，ZHM，closes MM 22－0949．
隝Susan Finch，ZHM，breaks．
国Susan Finch，ZHM，resumes meeting．
D．5．RZ 22－1103
国Brian Grady，Development Services，calls RZ 22－1103．
原Kami Corbett，applicant rep，presents testimony．
䧕Steven Sposato，applicant rep，presents testimony／submits exhibits．
国Steve Henry，applicant rep，continues testimony．
国Kami Corbett，applicant rep，concludes testimony．
國Sam Ball，Development Services，staff report．
䧊Andrea Papandrew，Planning Commission，staff report．
直Susan Finch，ZHM，calls proponents／opponents／Development Services／applicant rep closes RZ 22－1103．

D．6．MM 22－1112
国Brian Grady，Development Services，calls MM 22－1112．
William Molloy，applicant rep，presents testimony．
园Susan Finch，ZHM，questions to applicant rep．
William Molloy，applicant rep，answers ZHM questions．
隝Jason Kendal，applicant rep，continues testimony．
绿Susan Finch，ZHM，questions to applicant rep
［国Jason Kendall，applicant rep，answers ZHM questions．
目William Molloy，applicant rep，presents testimony．
国John Sullivan，applicant rep，presents testimony．

䀠Michelle Heinrich，Development Services，staff report．
目Andrea Papandrew，Planning Commission，staff report．
國Susan Finch，ZHM，calls proponents．
园Steven Griffin，opponent，presents testimony．
［身Susan Finch，ZHM，calls proponents／opponents／Development Services／applicant rep．

William Molloy，applicant rep，gives closing remarks．
国Susan Finch，ZHM，closes MM 22－1112．
D．7．RZ 22－1223
且Brian Grady，Development Services，calls RZ 22－1223．
园Jacob Cremer，applicant rep，presents testimony．
圆David Smith，applicant rep，presents testimony／submits exhibits．
园Sam Ball，Development Services，staff report．
国Andrea Papandrew，Planning Commission，staff report．
国Susan Finch，ZHM，calls proponents／opponents／Development Services／applicant rep／closes RZ 22－1223．

D．8．RZ 22－1224
园Brian Grady，Development Services，calls RZ 22－1224．
國Jacob Cremer，applicant rep，presents testimony．
国David Smith，applicant rep，presents testimony／submits exhibit．
国Tim Lampkin，Development Services，staff report．
陵Andrea Papandrew，Planning Commission，staff report．
国Susan Finch，ZHM，calls proponents／opponents／Development Services／applicant rep／closes RZ 22－1224．

D．9．MM 22－1301
国Brian Grady，Development Services，calls MM 22－1301．
国Kami Corbett，applicant rep，presents testimony／submits exhibits．
目Isabelle Albert，applicant rep，presents testimony．
且Susan Finch，ZHM，questions to applicant rep．
隝Isabelle Albert，applicant rep，answers ZHM questions．
隝Kami Corbett，applicant rep，continues testimony．
园Susan Finch，ZHM，questions to applicant rep．
园Isabelle Albert，applicant rep，answers ZHM questions．
Kami Corbett，applicant rep，answers ZHM questions．
国Michelle Heinrich，Development Services，staff report．
组Susan Finch，ZHM，questions to Development Services．
［䲩Michelle Heinrich，Development Services，answers ZHM questions．
园James Ratliff，Development Services Transportation，staff report．
烈Susan Finch，ZHM，questions to Development Services Transportation．
國James Ratliff，Development Services Transportation，answers ZHM questions．
Brian Grady，Development Services，answers ZHM questions．
园Andrea Papandrew，Planning Commission，staff report．
直Susan Finch，ZHM，calls proponents／opponents／Development Services／applicant rep．

园Kami Corbett，applicant rep，questions to ZHM．
目Susan Finch，ZHM，answers to applicant rep．
园James Ratliff，Development Services Transportation，answers ZHM questions．

园Susan Finch，ZHM，questions to Development Services Transportation．
目James Ratliff，Development Services Transportation，answers ZHM questions．国Kami Corbett，applicant rep，answers ZHM questions．
Steve Henry，applicant rep，closing remarks．
国Susan Finch，ZHM，closes MM 22－1301．
E．ZHM SPECIAL USE
E．1．SU 22－1222
国Brian Grady，Development Services，calls SU 22－1222．
國Doug Denboer，applicant rep，presents testimony．
隫Michelle Heinrich，Development Services，staff report．
国Andrea Papandrew，Planning Commission，staff report．
苌Susan Finch，ZHM，calls proponents／opponents／Development Services／applicant rep／closes SU 22－1222．

ADJOURNMENT
Susan Finch，ZHM，adjourns the meeting．
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Property
Location
Size: $\pm 33.58$ acres
Property is located in
unincorporated
Hillsborough County,
north of College Ave E
and east of US Highway
41 South
Folios: 56731.0000


FLU: Suburban Mixed Use-
6 (SMU-6)
әıоцsyłnos aчł U! рәұеכот
Areawide Systems Plan
Within the Ruskin
Community Plan and
Urban Service Area



Proposed Site Plan
PD Rezoning Request

Consistency with Goals and Strategies in the
Comprehensive Plan and Ruskin Community Plan -The typical uses in the SMU-6 FLU category are residential, suburban scale
 industrial multi-purpose and clustered residential and/or mixed use projects.
>Policy 19.1 is fulfilled as the Project proposes two different types of residential uses and the unit mix insures no one type is less than $25 \%$ of the site.
-The Ruskin Community Plan classifies this property as Area " 2 " which allows
for a variety of land uses and housing types, including townhomes.
-The Project meets Goal 5 of the Ruskin Community Plan by providing diverse
home styles and types to accommodate a diverse population and income levels.
-Goal 7 of the Ruskin Community Plan encourages higher density residential uses between $12^{\text {th }}$ Street and $3^{\text {rd }}$ Street along College Avenue, which is where this project is located.
Hillsborough County Staff Report

- The Applicant requested no variations to the Land Development Code.
""[S]taff finds the request APPROVABLE."
Planning Commission Staff Report
Staff evaluated the Ruskin Community Plan requirements and the explanations
provided by the applicant and determined that:
""The proposed residential density in the SMU-6 designation and in the Urban Service Area is compatible with the existing character of development in the area."
" $[T]$ stormwater retention areas proposed on the west, southwest and south
side of the property serves as a buffer and protects the environmentally
"The proposed density and lots sizes are reflective of the surrounding neighborhoods."
""The development pattern and character of this portion of College Avenue
contains residential and public institutional uses and therefore the proposed residential use is compatible with the surrounding development pattern."
Transportation \& Connectivity $\rightarrow$ The Applicant is proposing one access point to the east onto $12^{\text {th }}$ Street SE that aligns with the only right-of-way in an adjacent subdivision.
The County Engineer found the Design Exception request to allow for only one
sidewalk to be constructed on the west side of $12^{\text {th }}$ Street SE approvable.
CONCLUSION
Hillsborough County staff has recommended approval with conditions.
- Planning Commission staff found the project consistent with the
Hillsborough County Comprehensive Plan.
- We respectfully request approval of RZ-PD 22-1224.


Hearing on November 14, 2022
Concerning my property located at 1102 College Ave. E. and 1024 College Ave. E., Ruskin, FL
I am submitting my requests by mail as I will be out of town due to a prior commitment that could not be changed .I would like to express concerns that I have regarding the development requested for the above application. I am enclosing a map showing that my property will be directly affected by this development.

My first and most important request is that this development be denied. South Hillsborough County is already suffering from overgrowth with no thought to the future or the improvements required at the expense of the county to support the infrastructure. The outlet from this development will flow out on $12^{\text {th }}$ St. which is a narrow ill-maintained narrow two lane road that flows to SR674 or Shell Point Road. The road is very narrow and needs a lot of work. There are no sidewalks and no lights at night. There have been several accidents at $12^{\text {th }} \mathrm{St}$. and SR 674. Shell Point Road is also a narrow two lane road and has two schools and developments crowded onto the road. If this development is approved there is going to be immediate needs for road widening, sidewalks and traffic lights. This will put extremely high costs on the county.

Should this development be approved here are some items that would directly affect my property. What are the plans to build a bridge over the creek, known as Marsh Branch that allows water to flow from Ruskin Inlet to Marsh Branch Pond? This is a natural flow of water and any obstruction would cause flooding to any property on the borders of this water flow.. As there will be heavy equipment and construction on the property I request that the developer clean out the creek and prove that the water is properly flowing and be held responsible for flood damage due to their neglect.

As this property is already in Zone A due to overdevelopment in the area I am sure that the developer will be required to raise the height of the land. This will cause all water runoff to flood my property. I would like to request a solid wall be built on all sides so that water runoff from rain will not flood my property. I would also like to have a privacy fence built around the property to protect my property from intrusion.

Please consider the damage that is being done to South Hillsborough County and deny this request for adding more home building in this area.

Thank you for your consideration.


Lolita M. Collis
1024 College Ave E. and 1102 College Ave E.
Ruskin, FL 33570
Email: leecollis1@aol.com

Received October 25， 2022 Development Services

（c） 2022 Microsoft Corporation，（c） 2022 ToinTom
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