

PD Modification Application: MM 26-0346

Zoning Hearing Master Date:

March 23, 2026

BOCC Land Use Meeting Date:

May 12, 2025



**Hillsborough
County Florida**

Development Services Department

1.0 APPLICATION SUMMARY

Applicant: ACG BBQ, LLC


FLU
Category: SMU-6 (Suburban Mixed Use – 6)

Service Area: Urban

Site Acreage: 1.73

Community
Plan Area: Riverview

Overlay: None



Introduction Summary

PD 15-0079, last modified under MM 18-0173 in 2018, was approved in 2015 to allow the property, Parcel B, located at the northeast corner of Gibsonton Drive and Alafia Trace Boulevard to be used for BPO, bank or credit union use. The applicant is requesting a modification to include an option that would allow Parcel B to be developed for a sit-down restaurant with one drive-through facility.

Existing Approvals	Proposed Modifications
Parcel B: Site development to allow up to 12,000 square feet (SF) of BPO, bank, or credit union. No drive-throughs, other than for a bank/credit union, are permitted.	Parcel B: Site development to include an option for up to 4,000 SF of sit-down restaurant with drive-through facilities use with an enhanced buffer and limited hours of operation.


Additional Information

PD Variations	6.07.00 – Fences and Wall Allow an 8-foot-tall masonry wall in lieu of a 6-foot-tall fence.
---------------	--

Planning Commission Recommendation Consistent	Development Services Recommendation Approvable, subject to proposed conditions
---	--

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. The 2015 PD approval included an Office Commercial – 20 (OC-20) flex for Parcel A, and the flex was reapproved to Parcel A under major modification MM 18-0173. A flex from OC-20 to the west is being requested as a part of this application for 4.38 acres of the PD that would cover Parcel A and portions of Parcel B and C.
Maximum Density/FAR	SMU-6: 6 dwelling units per gross acre / FAR: 0.25 OC-20: 20 dwelling units per gross acre / FAR: 0.75
Typical Uses	SMU-6: Agricultural, residential, neighborhood commercial, office, research corporate park, light industrial multi-purpose, clustered residential, and mixed use. OC-20: Agricultural, community commercial type uses, office, mixed use, and compatible residential uses.


2.0 LAND USE MAP SET AND SUMMARY DATA

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



1.0
2.1
3.1
4.1
5.1
6.1
7.1
8.1
9.1
10.1

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



APPLICATION NUMBER: MM 26-0346
ZHM HEARING DATE: March 23, 2026

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
Gibson Drive	County Arterial - Urban	4 Lanes ☒ Substandard Road ☒ Sufficient ROW Width	☒ Corridor Preservation Plan ☐ Site Access Improvements ☐ Substandard Road Improvements ☐ Other
Alafia Trace Boulevard	Private Local Roadway	2 Lanes ☐ Substandard Road ☒ Sufficient ROW Width	☐ Corridor Preservation Plan ☐ Site Access Improvements ☐ Substandard Road Improvements ☐ Other

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

	Average Daily Trips	A.M. Peak Hour Trips	P.M. Peak Hour Trips
Existing Option	1,390	129	186
Proposed Option	1,792	133	126
Difference (+/-)	+ 402	+ 4	No Change

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

Connectivity and Cross Access (for PD Modification Area) ☐ Not applicable for this request

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

Design Exception/Administrative Variance ☒ Not applicable for this request

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

4.0 ADDITIONAL SITE INFORMATION & AGENCY COMMENTS SUMMARY

INFORMATION/REVIEWING AGENCY				
Environmental	Comments Received	Objections	Conditions Requested	Additional Information/Comments
Environmental Protection Commission	☒ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☒ No	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Environmental Services	☒ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☒ No	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Natural Resources	☒ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☒ No	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Conservation & Environmental Lands Management	☒ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☒ No	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Check if Applicable: ☐ Wetlands/Other Surface Waters ☐ Use of Environmentally Sensitive Land Credit ☐ Wellhead Protection Area ☐ Surface Water Resource Protection Area ☐ Potable Water Wellfield Protection Area ☐ Significant Wildlife Habitat ☐ Coastal High Hazard Area ☒ Urban/Suburban/Rural Scenic Corridor ☐ Adjacent to ELAPP property ☐ Other _____				
Public Facilities	Comments Received	Objections	Conditions Requested	Additional Information/Comments
Transportation ☐ Design Exc./Adm. Variance Requested ☐ Off-site Improvements Provided	☒ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☒ No	☒ Yes ☐ No	See report
Service Area/ Water & Wastewater ☒ Urban ☐ City of Tampa ☐ Rural ☐ City of Temple Terrace	☒ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☒ No	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Hillsborough County School Board Adequate ☐ K-5 ☐ 6-8 ☐ 9-12 ☒ N/A Inadequate ☐ K-5 ☐ 6-8 ☐ 9-12 ☒ N/A	☒ Yes ☐ No	☐ Yes ☒ No	☐ Yes ☒ No	
Impact/Mobility Fees				
Comprehensive Plan	Comments Received	Findings	Conditions Requested	Additional Information/Comments
Planning Commission ☐ Meets Locational Criteria ☐ N/A ☐ Locational Criteria Waiver Requested ☐ Minimum Density Met ☐ N/A	☐ Yes ☐ No	☐ Inconsistent ☐ Consistent	☐ Yes ☐ No	

5.0 IMPLEMENTATION RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Compatibility

If Parcel B is developed as a restaurant with drive-up facilities, measures to mitigate the impacts on the adjoining residential development to the north will include buffering and screening enhancements along the northern development to consist of an eight-foot-tall masonry wall, a row of 10-foot-tall evergreen shade trees with a 2-inch minimum caliper spaced of no more than 15 feet apart at the time of planting, a 50-foot minimum building setback, and the hours of operation will be limited to 10:30 AM to 9:30 PM. Upon review of the proposed waiver to eating establishment requirements, Development Review Staff finds based on the eating establishment mitigation measures, that the approval of the requested waiver to the 200-foot separation of drive-through order boxes from residentially zoned property would have limited impact to the residentially developed properties to the north. The residential subdivision to the north is developed with 35 feet of open space between the nearest platted residential lot, which would result in a separation of 185 between the order box and the nearest platted residential lot. Additionally, staff finds that the limited hours of operation and the additional buffering and screening requirements will reduce the noise and light impacts associated with the drive-through. Based on these findings, staff finds the proposed modification compatible with the zoning and development pattern in the area.

5.2 Recommendation

Staff finds the proposed modification approvable, subject to conditions.

6.0 PROPOSED CONDITIONS

Prior to site plan certification, applicant shall revise

Approval - Approval of the request, subject to the conditions listed below, is based on the general site plan submitted ~~May 24, 2022~~ March 3, 2026.

1. Development of the project shall be limited to the following:

1.1 Parcel A:

A total of 7,500 square feet for BPO uses, a bank/credit union, personal services, food product stores with no on-site consumption, a restaurant and restricted retail uses. The maximum square footage permitted for a restaurant is 2,000 square feet. Restricted retail uses are limited to a maximum of 2,000 square feet and are restricted to the following: a bookstore, newsstand, hobby shop, gift shop, pharmacy, consignment store, antique store, jewelry store, home furnishings store, paint store and florist. No drive-throughs, other than for a bank/credit union, are permitted. Additionally, a minor motor vehicle repair use may be permitted in lieu of the permitted uses listed above.

1.2 Parcel B:

12,000 square feet of BPO uses and/or a bank/credit union, or a 4,000 square foot restaurant (eating establishment) with one drive-through lane. The order box for the said restaurant may be located 150' from the northern boundary of parcel B. The bank/credit union cannot exceed 5,000 square feet and shall be limited to three drive/through lanes. ~~No drive-throughs, other than for a bank/credit union, are permitted.~~

1.3 Parcel C:

98 townhome units.

2. Development within Parcels A and B shall meet the following development standards:

Parcel A:

Front Yard Setback:	30 feet
Side Yard Setback:	20 feet
Rear Yard Setback:	20 feet
Maximum Building Height:	35 feet/2-stories*

Parcel B:

Front Yard Setback (South/Gibsonston Dr.): 150 feet (no building is permitted within the TECO easement)

Front Yard Setback (West/Alpha Trace Blvd.): 20 feet

Side Yard Setback (North): 20 feet for non-sit down restaurant uses and 50 feet for a sit-down restaurant with one drive through lane

Side Yard Setback (East): 20 feet

Maximum Building Height: 35-feet/2-stories*

*Buildings over 20 feet in height shall provide an additional side and rear setback of 2 feet for every 1 foot over 20 feet in height.

2.1 All building entrances shall be oriented towards the internal access road from Gibsonston Drive. All minor auto repair service bays shall be oriented to the east (no bays are permitted to face west).

2.2 Parcels A and B to provide buffering and screening in compliance with Land Development-Code Section 6.06.06, exclusive of the TECO easement. If Parcel A is developed for a minor motor vehicle repair use, a 6 foot buffer

with an 8-foot high precast masonry wall and ornamental trees which are not less than 10 feet high at the time of planting, a minimum of two-inch caliper and spaced not more than 15 feet apart, shall be provided along the western PD boundary, exclusive of the TECO easement. If Parcel B is developed with a restaurant (eating establishment) with one drive-through lane, a 20-foot-wide buffer with an 8-foot-high precast masonry wall and a row of evergreen shade trees which are not less than 10 feet high at the time of planting, a minimum of two-inch caliper and spaced not more than 15 feet apart, shall be provided along the northern boundary of Parcel B.

2.3 Hours of operation for a restaurant (eating establishment) with one drive-through shall be from 10:30 a.m. to 9:30 p.m.

2.3.2.4 Hours of operation for minor motor vehicle repair use shall be: Monday through Saturday 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. and Sunday 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

2.42.5 All compressors shall be enclosed within the building.

2.52.6 All work on motor vehicles shall be within the enclosed building.

2.62.7 A temporary chain link security fence between Parcel A and folio number 76453.0000 shall be installed upon zoning approval and shall remain until such time Parcel A is developed.

3. Development within Parcel C shall meet the following development standards:

Individual platted lot setbacks:

Front yard setback: 20 feet

Side yard setback for end units: 10 feet

Rear yard setback: 15 feet*

Maximum Building Height: 35 feet/2-stories**

*Buildings adjacent to the single-family residential located on Rivercrest Drive and Oakridge Avenue shall maintain a 20 foot setback from those lots.

**No additional setback for buildings over 20 feet in height shall apply.

3.1 A 5-foot buffer with Type A screening shall be required along the north, west and east property lines of Parcel C, exclusive of the TECO easement. This buffer is permitted to be part of the individual platted lot's side or rear yard, or a separately platted tract.

4. Parking for the townhomes shall meet Land Development Code Section 6.05.02.E. Should the townhome units provide a one-car garage and one tandem driveway space to meet the Land Development Code, additional guest parking shall be required at a ratio, of 0.25 spaces per each one-car garage unit. These additional parking spaces may be provided as surface parking or in a separate guest parking lot. The guest parking lot shall be centrally located to the units they serve.
5. There shall be a 20-foot wide buffer along Gibsonton Drive, exclusive of the TECO easement. Within this buffer area, screening shall be achieved through the use of a berm and/or hedge, which, at the time of planting, shall be a minimum of three feet high and 75% opaque. Additionally, trees at least ten feet tall shall be planted at an average of 50 feet on center. Trees can be grouped to meet design considerations.
6. Approval of this zoning petition by Hillsborough County does not constitute a guarantee that the Environmental Protection Commission approvals/permits necessary for the development as proposed will be issued, does not itself serve to justify any impacts to wetlands, and does not grant any implied or vested right to environmental approvals.

7. This site contains trees that qualify as Grand Oaks as defined by the Land Development Code (LDC). All trees confirmed as Grand Oak must be accurately located and labeled as such on the submitted preliminary plan/plat through the Site Development/Subdivision Review Process. Design efforts are to be displayed on the submitted preliminary plan to avoid adverse impacts to these trees.
8. An evaluation of the property identified a number of mature trees. The stature of these trees warrants every effort to minimize their removal. The applicant is encouraged to consult with staff of the Natural Resources Unit for design input addressing these trees prior to submittal of preliminary plans through the Land Development Code's Site Development or Subdivision process.
9. The planting of required trees shall be sensitive to overhead electric utility lines. Trees that exceed a mature, overall height of 20 feet shall not be planted within 30 feet of an existing or proposed overhead electric utility line.
10. Prior to or concurrent with plat/construction/site plan review, a detailed transportation analysis shall be submitted to determine any mitigation and site access improvements that may be required.
11. Roadways within Parcel C shall be privately owned and maintained and may be gated. Parcel C shall be permitted one (1) full access to along the south boundary of Parcel C, and one (1) emergency access along the eastern boundary of Parcel C.
 - A. The developer shall construct a minimum 15-foot wide emergency access from the internal project roadways within Parcel C to Rivercrest Drive (which shall be gated with a Knox box or similar device acceptable to the Hillsborough County Fire Marshall). The connection does not need to be paved but shall be sufficiently stabilized to support a 32-ton vehicle.
12. Cross access to the property shown as folio 076453.0000 to the west of Tract A may be available, subject to the agreement of both property owners, unless otherwise required by the Hillsborough County Land Development Code. If access is provided to folio 076453.0000, no buffering or screening shall be required on the western boundary of Tract A, except for a minor motor vehicle repair use. The plan submitted for certification shall show the potential access point to 076453.0000, however, through submittal of a minor change, the location of the access point may be shifted to any point south of the TECO easement, subject to agreement of both property owners and in accordance with the Hillsborough County Land Development Code.
13. 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. (This condition shall only apply to the area being modified under MM 26-0346.)
14. 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. (This condition shall only apply to the area being modified under MM 26-0346.)
- ~~13.~~15. If the notes and/or graphics 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 regulations in effect at the time of preliminary plan/plat approval.
- ~~14.~~16. 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.

APPLICATION NUMBER: MM 26-0346

ZHM HEARING DATE: March 23, 2026

BOCC LUM MEETING DATE: May 12, 2025

Case Reviewer: Sam Ball

Zoning Administrator Sign Off:

J. Brian Grady


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

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

7.0 ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND/OR GRAPHICS

The applicant is requesting a variation to 6.06.00 of the LDC to allow an 8-foot wall in lieu of a 6-foot fence along the northern property boundary to mitigate the impacts of a restaurant with drive-up facilities to the residential properties to the north.

The applicant is requesting a waiver to Section 6.11.35 of the LDC to reduce the minimum order box separation from the residentially zoned property to the north from 200 to 150 feet. The illustration (right) shows that the nearest platted lot would be at least 185 feet from the ordering call box.




Property Violation History

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


8.0 SITE PLANS (FULL)


8.1 Approved Site Plan (Full)

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

8.0 SITE PLANS (FULL)

8.2 Proposed Site Plan (Full)

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



ADJACENT PARCEL INFORMATION

PARCEL #	OWNER	FOLIO	USE	TU	ZONING
1	JERRY ANN CAINES	766272522	TOWNHOUSE	SMU-1	P 15-0-079
2	DEVIANI AND NAWAL	766272524	TOWNHOUSE	SMU-1	P 15-0-079
3	IRVING RIVKIN	766272526	TOWNHOUSE	SMU-1	P 15-0-079
4	ROBERTA L. REATZ T.A.L.	766272528	TOWNHOUSE	SMU-1	P 15-0-079
5	A SAMANTHA CONDY	766272530	TOWNHOUSE	SMU-1	P 15-0-079
6	JOHN THORNGREN	766272532	TOWNHOUSE	SMU-1	P 15-0-079
7	ANNE L. PEREZ AND JOAQUIN PEREZ	766272535	TOWNHOUSE	SMU-1	P 15-0-079
8	FRANK S. KELLER	766272770	TOWNHOUSE	SMU-1	P 15-0-079
9	ARACELIS M. JIMENEZ	766272771	TOWNHOUSE	SMU-1	P 15-0-079

MM 26-0346 SITE
DATA TABLE

1. TOTAL PROJECT SIZE: ±1.73 AC.
 2. PLOT/766212716
 3. EXISTING ZONING: PD
 4. PROPOSED ZONING: PD
 5. FLEX WITHIN PD: 06-20 (4.38 AC. OF TOTAL FLEX WITHIN PD)
 6. USE: OFFICE & COMMERCIAL
 7. INTENSITY: 12,000 SF OFFICE (BPO USES AND/OR BANK / CREDIT UNION) AND RESTAURANT WITH DRIVE-THRU (SEE CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL)
 8. RETENTION/RETENTION: ±3.0 ACRES TOTAL
 9. OTHER WATER BODIES: NONE
 10. NATURAL WATER BODIES: NONE
 11. CONSERVATION AREAS: ±0.1 ACRES WITHIN PD
 12. RESERVATION AREAS: ±0.1 ACRES WITHIN PD
 13. OPEN SPACE/RETENTION: YES**
 14. ASSESS SPACE TO WETLAND DELINEATION
- ** DETERMINATION OF OPEN SPACE ASSESSMENT TO BE RETAINED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CURRENT

SITE NOTES

1. THE PROJECT IS WITHIN THE RIVERVIEW COMMUNITY PLAN; THE PROJECT AREA IS NOT LOCATED IN AN OVERLAY DISTRICT.
2. THE SITE IS LOCATED WITHIN THE URBAN SERVICE AREA.
3. POTABLE WATER BY HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY
SEWAGE DISPOSAL BY HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY

LEGEND

- MAJOR MODIFICATION BOUNDARY (MM 26-0346)
150' STUDY AREA
PARCEL DELINEATION
EXISTING STRUCTURE
EXISTING VEHICULAR & PEDESTRIAN ACCESS
EXISTING VEHICULAR & PEDESTRIAN CROSS ACCESS
00-20 FLEX AREA

PROJECT TEAM

APPLICANT:
HESBONSON LAND PARTNERS, LLC
16020 S. FLORIDA AVENUE
TAMPA, FLORIDA 33603

PLANNER:
JANETTE ALF ASSOCIATES, INC.
SABELLE ALBERT, AICP
N. 11TH AVENUE, SUITE 900
TAMPA, FLORIDA 33602

REPRESENTATIVE:
WOLLOY & J. MOLLOY
WILLIAM (BILLY) J. MOLLOY
325 SOUTH BOULEVARD
TAMPA, FLORIDA 33606

TRAFFIC:
PALM TRAFFIC
MICHAEL MITES
10000 N. 11TH AVENUE
TAMPA, FLORIDA 33611

LEGAL DESCRIPTION FOR MM AREA

Figure 8 of LANGAGES AT ALANTA, according to the map of that terrain, recorded in Part Book 129, pages 27 thru 32, Public Records of Mississippi County, Idaho.


ROADWAYS

ROAD	TYPE	CONDITION	LANES	ROW WIDTH	ASPHALT WIDTH
GREENTON DRIVE	MAJOR ARTERIAL (URBAN SEDIC CORRECTOR)	GOOD CONDITION	4-LANES DIVIDED	134'-154'	72'-100'
ALJATA TRACE (B.V.D.)	LOCAL ROAD	GOOD CONDITION	2-LANES UNDIVIDED	50'-85'	24'-65'
TOCORAHA PL.	LOCAL ROAD	GOOD CONDITION	UNDIVIDED	40'	22'

AND USE & DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

PANEL	AGE-WEIGHT	DENSITY / INTENSITY CALCULATIONS	USE	MAX. HEIGHT (2 STORY)	MIN. STORY HEIGHT (2 STORY)	MIN. STORY WIDTH (2 STORY)	MAX. SEISMIC WEIGHT (2 STORY)	PERF.
A*	0.9	0.9 AC + 0.1SD0 + 0.35 SD1 AC = 0.5271 SD	MINOR MOTOR VEHICLE SEPARATE FROM TRUCKS TRUCKS WITH DRIVER-TRUCKS	35 FEET	30 FEET	30 FEET	20 FEET	0.35
B	0.9	0.9 AC + 0.1SD0 + 0.35 SD1 AC = 0.5271 SD	MINOR MOTOR VEHICLE SEPARATE FROM TRUCKS TRUCKS WITH DRIVER-TRUCKS (SEE CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL)	35 FEET	30 FEET	30 FEET	20 FEET	0.35
C	14.5	13.5 AC + 0.5 BU/A + 0.5 SD1 (SEE CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL)	900 TONNAGES (SEE CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL)	35 FEET	30 FEET	30 FEET	15 FEET	N/A

PROPOSED BUILDINGS SHALL FACE EAST TOWARDS THE ACCESS ROAD
* OTHER PERMITTED USES ARE FOOD PRODUCTION, DELICATESSEN, UP TO 2000 SF RESTAURANT, UP TO 2000 SF RETAIL (LIMITED TO BOOK STORE, NEWSSTAND, HOBBY SHOP, GIFT SHOP, PHARMACY, CONSIGNMENT STORE, ANTIQUE STORE, JEWELRY STORE, HOME FURNISHING STORE, PAINT STORE, AND FLOREST)



Project No.	63282.001
Issued	01/2026
Drawn By	BP
Checked By	JA
Scale	1" = 40'
Sheet Title	PD SITE PLAN
Sheet Number	2 OF 2

[illegible]

LOCATION MAP

LEGEND

- MAJOR MODIFICATION BOUNDARY (MM 26-0346)
150' STUDY AREA
PARCEL DELINEATION
EXISTING STRUCTURE
EXISTING VEHICULAR & PEDESTRIAN ACCESS
EXISTING VEHICULAR & PEDESTRIAN CROSS ACCESS
00-20 FLEX AREA

PROJECT TEAM

APPLICANT:
HESBONSON LAND PARTNERS, LLC
16020 S. FLORIDA AVENUE
TAMPA, FLORIDA 33603

PLANNER:
JANETTE ALF ASSOCIATES, INC.
SABELLE ALBERT, AICP
N. 11TH AVENUE, SUITE 900
TAMPA, FLORIDA 33602

REPRESENTATIVE:
WOLLOY & J. MOLLOY
WILLIAM (BILLY) J. MOLLOY
325 SOUTH BOULEVARD
TAMPA, FLORIDA 33606

TRAFFIC:
PALM TRAFFIC
MICHAEL MITES
10000 N. 11TH AVENUE
TAMPA, FLORIDA 33611

LEGAL DESCRIPTION FOR MM AREA

Figure 8 of LANGAGES AT ALANTA, according to the map of that terrain, recorded in Part Book 129, pages 27 thru 32, Public Records of Mississippi County, Idaho.

Project No.	63282.001
Issued	01/2026
Drawn By	BP
Checked By	JA
Scale	1" = 40'
Sheet Title	PD SITE PLAN
Sheet Number	2 OF 2

[illegible]

APPLICATION NUMBER: MM 26-0346

ZHM HEARING DATE: March 23, 2026

BOCC LUM MEETING DATE: May 12, 2025

Case Reviewer: Sam Ball

9.0 FULL TRANSPORTATION REPORT (see following pages)

AGENCY REVIEW COMMENT SHEET

TO: Zoning Technician, Development Services Department

DATE: 03/16/2026

REVIEWER: Jessica Kowal, MPA, Principal Planner

AGENCY/DEPT: Transportation

PLANNING AREA: Riverview

PETITION NO: MM 26-0346

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

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. Development of the project shall be limited to the following:

- 1.1. Parcel A: A total of 7,500 square feet for BPO uses, a bank/credit union, personal services, food product stores with no on-site consumption, a restaurant and restricted retail uses. The maximum square footage permitted for a restaurant is 2,000 square feet. Restricted retail uses are limited to a maximum of 2,000 square feet and are restricted to the following: a bookstore, newsstand, hobby shop, gift shop, pharmacy, consignment store, antique store, jewelry store, home furnishings store, paint store and florist. No drive-throughs, other than for a bank/credit union, are permitted. Additionally, a minor motor vehicle repair use may be permitted in lieu of the permitted uses listed above.
- 1.2. Parcel B: 12,000 square feet of BPO uses and/or a bank/credit union, or a 4,000 square foot restaurant (eating establishment) with one drive-through lane. The order box for the said restaurant may be located 150' from the northern boundary of parcel B. The bank/credit union cannot exceed 5,000 square feet and shall be limited to three drive/through lanes. ~~No drive-throughs, other than for a bank/credit union, are permitted.~~

PROJECT SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS

The applicant is requesting a Major Modification to Planned Development (PD) 15-0079, which was most recently modified by MM 18-0173. The applicant is proposing to add the option for a 4,000 square foot eating establishment with a drive through window on Parcel B of the PD. The site's Future Land Use is SMU-6

Although Transportation Review Staff does not object to the request in general, the applicant proposed a condition regarding the maximum queuing lane length for the drive through lane that Transportation Review Staff does object to. The condition proposed stated, *"If developed with a restaurant (eating establishment) with one drive-through lane, the maximum queuing lane length shall not exceed 150 linear feet."*

LDC Sec. 6.11.35.B provides design criteria for eating establishments with drive-through service, specifically, "3. Adequate automobile stacking space will be provided from the order box to ensure that any public right-of-way or common vehicular use area will not be blocked by or utilized for vehicular stacking." There is not enough site-specific information at this zoning stage to ensure this code provision will be met. Transportation Review Staff will review the proposed drive through queuing length when the site/construction plans are submitted for review.

Trip Generation Analysis

As required pursuant to the Development Review Procedures Manual (DRPM), the applicant submitted a transportation analysis for the proposed project option. Staff prepared a comparison of the trips potentially generated under the existing and proposed zoning designations, utilizing a generalized worst-case scenario. The data presented below is based on the Institute of Transportation Engineer's *Trip Generation Manual, 12th Edition*.

Approved Zoning (for PD Modification Area):

Zoning, Size/Land Use	24 Hour Two-Way Volume	Total Peak Hour Trips	
		AM	PM
PD, 7,000 High-Turnover (Sit-Down) Restaurant (ITE LUC 932)	726	63	64
PD, 5,000 SF Medical-Dental Office (ITE LUC 720)	170	16	17
PD, 5,000 SF Drive-In Bank (ITE LUC 912)	494	50	105
Total	1,390	129	186

Proposed Option (for PD Modification Area):

Zoning, Size/Land Use	24 Hour Two-Way Volume	Total Peak Hour Trips	
		AM	PM
PD, 4,000 SF Fast-Food with Drive Through (ITE LUC 934)	1,792	133	126

Trip Generation Difference (for PD Modification Area):

	24 Hour Two-Way Volume	Total Peak Hour Trips	
		AM	PM
Difference of Current vs. Proposed Option	+ 402	+ 4	No Change

TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE SERVING THE SITE

The subject site has frontage on Gibsonton Dr and Alafia Trace Blvd.

Gibsonton Dr is a 4-lane, divided, substandard, urban arterial roadway. The roadway is characterized by +/- 11-foot-wide travel lanes in average condition, no bike lanes, and +/- 5-foot-wide sidewalks along both sides of the roadway within the vicinity of the proposed project. The roadway lies within a +/- 138-foot-wide right of way.

Gibsonton Dr is shown on the Hillsborough County Corridor Preservation Plan as a future 6-lane roadway. The Hillsborough County Transportation Technical Manual requires 110 feet of right of way for a 4-lane urban, divided roadway (TS-6), of which we add 22 feet for the additional two lanes to identify the minimum of 132 feet of right of way needed for a 6-lane urban, divided roadway. Along the project's frontage, the existing right of way for Gibsonton Dr exceeds the necessary right of way for the future widening, therefore no additional right of way preservation is required by this project site.

The Capital Improvement Program (CIP) has planned and funded improvements for Gibsonton Dr from I-75 to Balm Riverview Rd consisting of improvements to the roadway corridor (Project No. 69682025) and improvements to bicycle and pedestrian facilities (Project No. 69691019).

Alafia Trace Blvd is a 2-lane, divided, private local roadway. The roadway is characterized by +/- 12-foot-wide travel lanes in average condition and +/- 5-foot-wide sidewalks along both sides of the roadway. The roadway lies within a varying +/- 50 to +/- 85-foot-wide right of way.

SITE ACCESS

The PD has an existing full access connection to Gibsonton Dr. The modification area has an approved access connection to Alafia Trace Blvd which the applicant is not proposing to change with this request.

The submitted transportation analysis identified the project warrants a 285-foot eastbound left turn lane on Gibsonton Dr at the intersection with Alafia Trace Blvd. There is a sufficient 285-foot eastbound left turn lane existing on Gibsonton Dr at Alafia Trace Blvd.

ROADWAY LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS) INFORMATION

The roadway level of service provided below for Gibsonton Dr is for informational purposes only.

Generalized Level of Service				
Roadway	From	To	LOS Standard	Peak Hr. Directional LOS
Gibsonton Drive	I-75 N Ramp	US Highway 301	D	F

Source: [2024 Hillsborough County Level of Service \(LOS\) Report](#)

HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY

RECOMMENDATION OF THE LAND USE HEARING OFFICER

APPLICATION NUMBER:	MM 26-0346
DATE OF HEARING:	March 23, 2026
APPLICANT:	ACG BBQ, LLC
PETITION REQUEST:	MM
LOCATION:	9603 Alafia Trace Blvd.
SIZE OF PROPERTY:	1.73 acres
EXISTING ZONING:	PD (15-0079)
FUTURE LAND USE CATEGORY:	SMU-6
SERVICE AREA:	Urban
COMMUNITY PLANNING AREA:	None

SUMMARY OF APPLICATION

The application is a request to modify a 1.73 acre parcel identified as Parcel B within a larger approximate 16.34 acre mixed use Planned Development. The larger PD was approved in 2015 (modified in 2018) for a maximum of 98 townhomes and two outparcels for office and retail uses (Parcels A and B).

The residential tract is developed with townhomes. Parcel A is approved for 7,500 sq. ft. of office and retail uses. Parcel A is developed with an approximate 7,000 sq. ft. Tire Kingdom – auto repair shop. Parcel B is approved for 12,000 sq. ft. of office/bank uses. Parcel B is vacant.

The subject site is located on the north side of Gibsonton Drive, approximately 1,400 ft. west of the US 301/Gibsonton Drive intersection.

Access to the mixed use project is from Gibsonton Drive via Alafia Trace Blvd, an approximate 420 ft long 2 lane street, which is a private roadway owned by the Alafia Trace POA. The POA grants access easement rights to Parcels A and B.

The Major Modification request is to allow for an alternative land use on Parcel B. The alternative land use would be for a maximum 4,000 sq. ft. restaurant with one-drive thru lane.

The LDC requires restaurant drive thru call boxes to be located a minimum of 200 ft. from residential zoning. The applicant is proposing the call box be a minimum of 150 ft. from residential zoning.

The existing conditions are proposed to be modified to address the introduction of a restaurant use with one-drive thru lane/call box as follow:

- 1) limit the hours of operation of the restaurant from 10:30 a.m. to 9:30 p.m.;

- 2) require an 8 ft. masonry wall along the northern property line adjacent to the townhome development along with 10 ft. tall evergreen shade trees at the time of planting, spaced 15 ft. apart;

The parcel has a FLUE Map designation of SMU-6.

SUMMARY OF HEARING

The applicant representatives, William Molloy, Isabelle Albert and Michael Yates, provided power point slides and testimony in support of the request.

It was stated that the Major Modification is to allow for a maximum 4,000 sq. ft. restaurant with one-drive thru lane as an alternative land use on Parcel B.

Parcel B is a 1.73 acre component of a larger 16.43 acre mixed use PD.

The overall PD is comprised of a maximum 98 unit townhome project and two outparcel (Parcels A and B). The townhome project and Parcel A have been developed. Parcel B is vacant.

Parcel B is currently approved for 12,000 sq. ft. of office/bank uses.

Access to the project is to Gibsonton Drive via Alafia Trace Blvd. The Gibsonton Drive/Alafia Trace intersection is signalized.

There is an approximate 160 ft wide TECO powerline corridor easement that crosses the 1.73 acre parcel in a northwest to southeast direction. This TECO easement/powerline corridor substantially impacts the subject site. The remaining area outside the easement totals approximately 0.9 acres. The applicant stated that they have met with TECO and are working with TECO to allow for traffic circulation and parking within the easement.

The applicant stated that the LDC has a 200 ft. setback requirement for restaurant drive-thru call boxes from residential zoning. The applicant stated that the call box is proposed to be located at a point that is 150 ft from the adjacent townhome development to the north. To address this separation

issue, the applicant is proposing the construction of an 8 ft. masonry wall and the planting of 10 ft tall evergreen shade trees 15 ft. on center along the northern property line to mitigate the noise associated with the call box.

The applicant is also proposing a limit on the hours of operation. The hours proposed: 10:30 a.m. to 9:30 p.m.

Development Services finds the major modification approvable subject to conditions.

The Planning Commission staff finds the proposed major modification consistent with the Comprehensive Plan under the SMU-6 designation.

No one spoke in support at the hearing.

The following people spoke in opposition at the hearing:

David Lopez, attorney representing the Alafia Trace townhome POA members
Shameya Francis, President of the Alafia Trace POA

Edwin Garcia, resident of the Alafia Trace townhome community

Dr. Laura Hauser, resident of the Alafia Trace townhome community

It was stated that Alafia Trace Blvd is a private road owned by the Landings at Alafia Trace POA (Alafia Trace POA). The POA is responsible for the maintenance and repairs to the roadway and associated landscaping within the r-o-w. There is a POA r-o-w maintenance cost sharing agreement in place between the Townhome community owners and Parcels A and B. It was stated that introducing a restaurant as a use allowed on Parcel B will create more traffic and will unfairly burden the townhome owners with a greater share of the cost of maintaining the r-o-w. It was stated that this was the greatest concern of the Alafia Trace residents.

It was stated that the proposed restaurant use would be a more intensive use. That the use would have longer hours during the week and on weekends than the uses currently approved on the parcel. The proposed drive-thru call box

would be too close to the townhome community. The restaurant food odors would be a concern.

It was stated that traffic congestion is a major issue on Alafia Trace Blvd and Gibsonton Drive.

The Landings at Alafia Trace POA and its members are strongly opposed to the proposed restaurant use.

EVIDENCE SUBMITTED

The applicant representatives provided a power point presentation and oral testimony supplementing the file on record. The residents and representative for the Alafia Trace POA provided oral testimony at the hearing.

FINDINGS OF FACT

The subject site is approximately 1.73 acres in size. The parcel is identified as Parcel B and is a part of a larger 16.43 acre mixed use Planned Development approved for a maximum of 98 townhomes, 7,500 sq. ft. of retail and office uses within Parcel A and 12,000 sq. ft. of office/bank uses in Parcel B. Parcels A and B are outparcels and front on Gibsonton Drive. The townhomes are located to the rear of the site, setback approximately 420 ft. from Gibsonton Drive.

This PD project is located on the north side of Gibsonton Drive approximately 1,400 ft west of the US 301/Gibsonton Drive intersection.

Access to the townhomes and Parcels A and B are to Gibsonton Drive via Alafia Trace Boulevard. The townhome community has an emergency access at the northeast corner of the community to be utilized by emergency vehicles only. The Alafia Trace Boulevard/Gibsonton Drive intersection is signalized. A

large retail center is located on the opposite/south side of Gibsonton Drive and one of their main entrances is at this location.

Alafia Trace Boulevard is approximately 420 feet long, from Gibsonton Drive to the gated entrance to the Landings at Alafia Trace townhome community. Alafia Trace Blvd is a private road owned by the Alafia Trace Property Owners Association. The POA is responsible for the repairs/maintenance of the roadway and landscaping. There is a maintenance/repair cost sharing agreement in place between the townhome community and Parcels A and B.

To date the townhome community has been developed. Parcel A has been developed with an approximate 7,000 sq. ft. Tire Kingdom auto repair store. Parcel B remains vacant.

Parcel B is bifurcated by an approximate 160 ft wide TECO powerline corridor/easement. The easement crosses the site on an angle in a northwest to the southeast direction. The result is that approximately 0.9 acres of Parcel B are located outside of the TECO easement.

The TECO easement represents a substantial site limitation. The applicant has met with TECO and is comfortable that they will be able to come to an agreement with TECO to allow for site circulation and parking within the easement.

It is found that if the applicant can not come to an agreement with TECO the site will not likely be developed with the subject proposed restaurant use.

Substantial testimony was heard that the private cost sharing agreement for the cost of maintenance of the Alafia Trace Blvd. r-o-w was based on an office/bank use on Parcel B. The POA believes that a restaurant will result in an increase in traffic above the approved office/bank use traffic and this shifts more of the burden for repairs on to the POA.

It is noted that the Development Services traffic report picked a worst case scenario, a fast food restaurant to estimate traffic generated by the proposed use. A fast food restaurant is not proposed nor allowed by the proposed conditions of zoning. Furthermore, the hours of operation are proposed to be

limited from 10:30 a.m. to 9:30 p.m. This eliminates traffic during the a.m. peak hours. The proposed use will not be open during the breakfast hours.

The proposed use will not have as much daily traffic as identified in the staff report. It is not clear that the proposed use, if developed will generate more daily traffic than the 12,000 sq. ft. of office/bank uses that are currently approved on the subject parcel.

The best way to determine the daily traffic impacts associated with the proposed use would be to conduct traffic counts at such time the use is open for business.

From an operational perspective the proposed restaurant use will have less a.m. peak hour impacts than the currently approved 12,000 sq. ft. of office/bank uses. The proposed use will have no a.m. peak hour impacts and will have similar if not lower p.m. peak hour impacts. It is likely that the proposed restaurant use will similar if not less p.m. peak hour traffic as the currently approved land uses on Parcel B.

Based on the testimony at the hearing and a review of the case file, the rezoning was originally approved in 2015. In 2018 the rezoning was amended to allow the property located further to the west to cross-access through Parcel A and utilize Alafia Trace Boulevard. This adjacent site to the west is approved for 25,000 sq. ft. of CG uses. To date an approximate 3,300 sq. ft. Starbucks was developed on the adjacent parcel and it does now have access to and does utilize Alafia Trace Boulevard to gain access to Gibsonton Drive where there is a traffic signal. It is noted that the parcel to the west is not yet built out. Additional development is anticipated and this additional development also has zoning approval for cross-access to Alafia Trace Blvd.

It is not clear, as it is a private matter, whether the retail owner to the west is contributing to the cost sharing agreement for the maintenance of Alafia Trace Boulevard.

Whether the traffic associated with the proposed restaurant generates more traffic than the approved uses on Parcel B and what this looks like in terms of

a modified cost sharing structure are understandable concerns of the Alafia Trace POA but these are private matters.

It is found, from an access management perspective, that directing local traffic to the traffic signal at Alafia Trace Blvd. represents sound transportation planning. This local street cross-access situation helps to eliminate additional driveway connections on to Gibsonton Drive, reduces turning moving conflicts and improves traffic flow along Gibsonton Drive.

It is also noted that the adjacent segment of Gibsonton Drive operates at LOS F. Traffic conditions on Gibsonton Drive are congested during peak hours. The proposed restaurant land use will not contribute to a.m. peak hour congestion and is not likely to contribute to p.m. peak hour congestion on Gibsonton Drive in any substantively greater degree than the currently approved land uses on Parcel B.

The applicant proposes a restaurant with one drive-thru window and call box. There is an LDC standard that restaurant call boxes be located a minimum of 200 feet from residential zoning. The intent of this standard is to mitigate the noise from the call box on adjacent residential uses. The applicant has proposed that the call box be located a minimum of 150 feet away from the townhome community property line.

There is one townhome within the adjacent approximate 98 unit townhome community located within 200 ft. of the proposed call box. The distance to this closest townhome is approximately 185 feet.

To mitigate the noise impacts associated with the call box the applicant has proposed the construction of an 8 ft. masonry wall and the planting of 10 ft. tall evergreen shade trees along the property line between the proposed use and the townhome community.

Solid walls have been found to be effective in mitigating noise impacts. The proposed 8 ft tall masonry wall will also mitigate overall site noise, mitigate car headlights, and provide additional security and privacy for the adjacent townhome community.

It is found that a retail use, more specifically a maximum 4,000 sq. ft. restaurant with one call box and limited hours of operation would be a compatible land use at this location.

It is found that the proposed MM is consistent with the FLUE Map designation of SMU-6.

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

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

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

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

DECISION

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


Steven K. Luce

4/10/2026

Steven K. Luce

Date

Land Use Hearing Officer



**Hillsborough County
City-County
Planning Commission**

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

Unincorporated Hillsborough County Rezoning Consistency Review	
Hearing Date: March 23, 2026 Report Prepared: March 12, 2026	Case Number: MM 26-0346 Folio(s): 76621.2716 General Location: North of Gibsonton Drive, west of Alafia Trace Boulevard and east of US Highway 301 South
Comprehensive Plan Finding	CONSISTENT
Adopted Future Land Use	Suburban Mixed Use-6 (6 du/ga; 0.25, 0.35, 0.50 FAR)
Service Area	Urban
Community Plan(s)	Riverview & SouthShore Areawide Systems
Rezoning Request	Major Modification (MM) to Planned Development (15-0079) to develop a 4,000 square foot sit down restaurant with a drive-thru lane
Parcel Size	+/- 1.73 acres
Street Functional Classification	Gibsonton Drive – County Arterial Alafia Trace Boulevard – Local Road US Highway 301 South– State Principle Arterial
Commercial Locational Criteria	Meets

Table 1: COMPARISON OF SURROUNDING PROPERTIES			
Vicinity	Future Land Use Designation	Zoning	Existing Land Use
Subject Property	Suburban Mixed Use-6	PD 15-0079	Vacant
North	Suburban Mixed Use-6	PD	Multi-Family
South	Suburban Mixed Use-6 + Office Commercial-20	PD + CG	Light Commercial
East	Suburban Mixed Use-6	RSC-6 + PD	Light Commercial
West	Suburban Mixed Use-6	PD	Multi-Family + Heavy Commercial + Light Commercial

Staff Analysis of Goals, Objectives, and Policies:

The 1.73± acre subject site is located north of Gibsonton Drive, west of Alafia Trace Boulevard and east of US Highway 301 South. It is located within the limits of the Riverview Community Plan and SouthShore Areawide Systems Plan and within the Urban Service Area (USA). The site is designated Suburban Mixed Use (SMU-6) on the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) and is zoned Planned Development (PD 15-0079) with the most recent Major Modification (MM 18-0173). The applicant is requesting a Major Modification to the Planned Development to allow a 4,000 square-foot sit-down restaurant with one drive-through lane on Parcel B. The request also includes a waiver to Land Development Code Section 6.11.35.B.1 to allow the drive-through order box to be located 150 feet from residentially zoned property rather than the required 200 feet.

Future Land Use Section (FLUS) Goal 2 and FLUS Objective 2.1, and each of their respective policies, establish the Future Land Use Map as well as the allowable range of uses for each Future Land Use category. 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. The Suburban Mixed Use (SMU-6) Future Land Use category allows for agricultural, residential, neighborhood commercial, office uses, research corporate park uses, light industrial multi- purpose and clustered residential and/or mixed-use. Office uses are not subject to locational criteria. The category supports neighborhood-serving commercial uses that are compatible with

nearby residential development and encourages mixed-use development patterns that provide services in close proximity to residential communities.

The subject site is currently approved for up to 12,000 square feet of Business Professional Office (BPO) uses and/or a bank or credit union, with any bank or credit union use limited to 5,000 square feet and up to three drive-through lanes. The applicant is requesting approval for a 4,000 square-foot restaurant with a single drive-through lane, which represents a lower intensity drive-through configuration than the currently approved bank use. The proposed restaurant use remains within the commercial character anticipated under the SMU-6 Future Land Use designation and does not exceed the overall intensity envisioned for the site (1.78 acres x 43,560 square feet per acre = 75,358.80 x 0.25 FAR = 18,839 square feet). Therefore, the proposed Major Modification is consistent with the uses and development character allowed within the Suburban Mixed Use-6 category and is consistent with FLUS Goal 2 and Objective 2.1.

The proposal meets the Commercial Locational Criteria (CLC) as established by FLUS Objective 4.7 and its associated policies, as the subject site fronts Gibsonton Drive, which has a context road classification of Suburban Commercial. This roadway classification supports the location of neighborhood-serving commercial uses along the corridor. The proposed restaurant use complements the existing commercial development pattern along Gibsonton Drive, where nearby uses include Tire Kingdom and Starbucks, along with additional commercial development in the surrounding area. While a waiver is not required for this request, it should be noted that Planning Commission staff supported CLC waivers for this property during the 2015 Planned Development rezoning and the 2018 Major Modification, both of which were subsequently approved by the Board of County Commissioners. These prior approvals reflect the established commercial character of the corridor and further support the appropriateness of neighborhood-serving commercial uses at this location. Therefore, the proposed commercial use is consistent with FLUS Objective 4.7 and its associated policies.

The subject site is located within the Urban Service Area, where Objective 1.1 of the Future Land Use Section directs approximately 80 percent of the county's growth. The surrounding area consists of a mix of residential, office, and commercial uses. To the west of the subject site are existing commercial uses including Tire Kingdom and Starbucks, along with additional commercial development currently under construction. Office uses are located to the east, while a townhome community approved as part of the Planned Development is located to the north. Additional commercial development exists south of Gibsonton Drive. This pattern reflects a developing mixed-use corridor characterized by neighborhood-serving commercial uses integrated with residential development.

FLUS Policy 3.1.3 requires that new development be compatible with surrounding development, noting that compatibility does not require identical uses but rather sensitivity to the character of existing development. Additionally, the Neighborhood Protection policies under FLUS Objective 4.4 and Policy 4.4.1 require development to be compatible with nearby residential areas. The applicant has incorporated several design and operational commitments to ensure compatibility with the residential development located north of the site. These include construction of an 8-foot solid wall along the northern property line (exceeding the minimum 6-foot requirement), enhanced landscaping consisting of evergreen shade trees planted at a minimum of 10 feet in height with two-inch caliper and spaced no more than 15 feet apart, and an increased northern setback of 50 feet where only 20 feet is required. Additionally, the drive-through order box will be located 150 feet from the residentially zoned property line, though the actual separation from the nearest residential lot line is approximately 185 feet due to a 35-foot-wide dry pond owned by the Homeowners Association (HOA) located between the properties.

Furthermore, the applicant has voluntarily committed to limited hours of operation from 10:30 a.m. to 9:30 p.m., which reflect the operational characteristics of a sit-down restaurant rather than a fast-food establishment with extended hours. These operational limitations help minimize potential impacts related to noise, traffic, and late-evening activity. Taken together, the enhanced buffering, increased setbacks, and operational restrictions ensure that the proposed restaurant use remains compatible with the adjacent residential development and surrounding mixed-use area.

The Comprehensive Plan requires that all development meet or exceed the land development regulations in Hillsborough County (FLUS Policies 4.1.1, 4.1.2, and 4.1.6). At the time of this analysis, comments from Hillsborough County Development Services and Transportation Review may still be forthcoming; however, the proposal will be required to comply with all applicable land development regulations prior to final approval and development.

The subject site is located within the boundaries of the Riverview Community Plan. Goal 2 of the Community Plan establishes the Riverview District Concept Map, which identifies distinct geographic districts intended to guide the character and pattern of development within the community. The proposed modification is consistent with the vision of the Community Plan by supporting the Mixed-Use District, which encourages development patterns that integrate commercial and residential uses while respecting existing land use patterns. The proposed sit-down restaurant with a single drive-through lane introduces a neighborhood-serving commercial use that supports nearby residential development and contributes to the mix of services envisioned within mixed-use areas. Additionally, the subject property is located along Gibsonton Drive, an emerging commercial corridor characterized by a mix of office and retail uses, including nearby establishments such as Tire Kingdom and Starbucks. The proposal incorporates buffering, enhanced landscaping, and limited hours of operation to ensure compatibility with the residential development located north of the site. Therefore, the request supports the Community Plan's vision of directing mixed-use and neighborhood-serving commercial development to appropriate locations while maintaining compatibility with surrounding residential areas. The subject site is also located within the boundaries of the SouthShore Areawide Systems Plan. The Plan promotes sustainable and well-planned growth while preserving the agricultural, cultural, and historic resources that contribute to the character of the SouthShore area. The proposed development supports this intent by directing growth to a site within the Urban Service Area along the established commercial corridor of Gibsonton Drive, where infrastructure and services are available. The proposal introduces a neighborhood-serving restaurant use within existing Planned Development and is compatible with surrounding commercial uses, including Tire Kingdom and Starbucks, as well as nearby residential development. Additionally, the subject site is not identified on the SouthShore Historical Resources Inventory. Therefore, the proposed Major Modification supports the Community Plan's objective of encouraging well-planned growth while preserving rural and historic resources elsewhere in the SouthShore area.

Overall, staff finds that the proposed Major Modification to PD 15-0079 is compatible with the surrounding development pattern, meets the intent of its associated community plans and is consistent with the Goals, Objectives, and Policies of the Unincorporated Hillsborough County Comprehensive Plan.

Recommendation

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

Staff Identified Goals, Objectives and Policies of the *Unincorporated Hillsborough County Comprehensive Plan* Related to the Request:

FUTURE LAND USE SECTION

Urban Service Area

Objective 1.1: *Direct at least 80% of new population growth into the USA and adopted Urban expansion areas through 2045. Building permit activity and other similar measures will be used to evaluate this objective.*

Land Use Categories

Goal 2: *Ensure that the character, compatibility and location of land uses optimize the combined potential for economic benefit, fiscal sustainability, protection of natural resources and maintaining viable agriculture. Ensure density and intensities are maintained through the Future Land Use Map.*

Objective 2.1: *The Future Land Use Map is a regulatory tool governing the pattern of development in unincorporated Hillsborough County through the year 2045.*

Policy 2.1.1: *The Future Land Use Map shall identify Future Land Use categories, summarized in Table 2.2 and further described in Appendix A, that establish permitted land uses and maximum densities and intensities.*

Objective 2.2: *The Future Land Use Map (FLUM) Shall identify Land Use Categories, summarized in table 2.2 of the Future Land Use Element.*

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

Community Context and Compatibility

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

Objective 3.2: *Hillsborough County is comprised of many diverse communities and neighborhoods. The comprehensive plan is effective in providing an overall growth management strategy for development within the entire County. Strategies shall be developed that ensure the long-range viability of its communities through a community and special area studies planning effort.*

Relationship to Land Development Regulations

Policy 3.2.4: *The County shall assist the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission in developing community plans for each planning area that are consistent with and further the Goals, Objectives and Policies of the Comprehensive Plan. The community plans will be adopted as part of the Comprehensive Plan in the Livable Communities Element. These community specific policies will apply in guiding the development of the community. Additional policies regarding community planning and the adopted community plans can be found in the Livable Communities Element*

Development

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

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

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

Policy 4.1.6: *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 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.*

Neighborhood and Community Development

Objective 4.4: Neighborhood Protection – *Enhance and preserve existing neighborhoods and communities. Design neighborhoods which are related to the predominant character of their surroundings.*

Policy 4.4.1: *Any density or intensity increases shall be compatible with existing, proposed or planned surrounding development. Development and redevelopment shall be integrated with the adjacent land uses through:*

- a) the creation of like uses; and*
- b) creation of complementary uses; and*
- c) mitigation of adverse impacts; and*
- d) transportation/pedestrian connections; and*
- e) Gradual transitions of intensity*

Neighborhood and Community Serving Uses

Objective 4.7: *To meet the daily shopping and service needs of residents, only neighborhood-serving commercial uses will be permitted within land use categories that are primarily residential or agricultural in nature. Intensive commercial uses (uses allowed within the Commercial Intensive zoning district) shall not be considered neighborhood-serving commercial. Such developments do not require a Future Land Use Map Amendment to a non-residential category provided they meet the criteria established by the following policies and all other Goals, Objectives and Policies in the Comprehensive Plan. The frequency and allowance of neighborhood-serving commercial uses will be different in the Urban Service Area than in the Rural Area due to the population density, scale and character of the areas.*

Policy 4.7.1: *In the Urban Service Area, locational criteria must be met to allow neighborhood- serving commercial uses in the following primarily residential land use categories:*

- *Residential Planned -2 (RP-2)*
- *Residential - 2 (RES-2)*
- *Residential - 4 (RES-4)*
- *Neighborhood Mixed Use- 4(3) (NMU-4(3))*
- *Neighborhood Mixed Use-6 (NMU-6)*
- *Residential - 6 (RES-6)*
- *Suburban Mixed Use-6 (SMU-6)*
- *Residential - 9 (RES-9)*

Any rural Future Land Use categories in the Urban Service Area

- *Residential - 12 (RES-12)*
- *Residential - 16 (RES-16)*
- *Residential - 20 (RES-20)*
- *Residential - 35 (RES-35)*

LIVABLE COMMUNITIES ELEMENT: RIVERVIEW COMMUNITY PLAN

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

1. *Hwy 301 Corridor – Provide a safe, attractive and efficient corridor system that contributes to the character and economic well-being of the community and provides a sense of arrival.*
2. *Downtown – Focus and direct mixed-use development to create an aesthetically pleasing and pedestrian-friendly downtown.*
3. *Riverfront – Recognize the historical, environmental, scenic, and recreational value of the Alafia River.*
4. *Mixed Use – Focus and direct development toward walkable mixed-use town center locations throughout the community while respecting existing land use.*
5. *Residential – Encourage attractive residential development that complements the surrounding character and promotes housing diversity.*
6. *Industrial–Attract employment centers and desirable industry with appropriate infrastructure in areas without conflicting with surrounding land use.*
7. *Open Space – Build upon the county owned Boyette Scrub lands by acquiring lands from willing sellers.*

LIVABLE COMMUNITIES ELEMENT: SOUTHSORE AREAWIDE SYSTEMS PLAN

The community desires to:

1. *Promote sustainable growth and development that is clustered and well planned to preserve the area's environment, cultural identity and livability.*
 - a. *Employ an integrated, inclusive approach to sustainable growth and development that is well planned to maintain the cultural and historic heritage and unique agricultural and archaeological resources of SouthShore.*
 - b. *Encourage and support the preservation of areas of archaeological, cultural and/or historical significance as shown on the SouthShore Historical Resources Inventory map*
 - c. *Encourage and support the identification and preservation of significant older structures such as houses, outbuildings, bridges, and fences to retain a sense of identity, visual beauty, and history.*
 - d. *Support communities and neighborhoods in preserving and revitalizing downtown centers using economic development and historic resource incentives whenever possible.*
 - e. *Assist the Historic Resources Review Board, Southern Hillsborough County Historic Connections, historical societies, museums, and other preservation organizations in SouthShore in their public education and preservation efforts.*
 - f. *Continue to support and preserve agricultural activities that have historically been an important part of SouthShore heritage and maintain agriculture as an integral part of the SouthShore economy, landscape, and natural resource base.*
 - g. *Support aquaculture and agri-businesses services and facilities, such as equipment sales and service, research, facilities, nurseries and greenhouses, packinghouses, and fertilizer services.*
 - h. *Recognize that the State of Florida has adopted the "Florida Right to Farm Act" (F.S. 823.14) limiting the circumstances under which agricultural operations may be deemed a nuisance when new development is proposed adjacent to or near active agricultural operations.*

HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY
FUTURE LAND USE
MM 26-0346

Rezoning
STATUS



PENDING


- Tampa Service Area
- Urban Service Area
- Shoreline
- County Boundary
- Jurisdiction Boundary
- Roads
- Parcels
- Water

- AGRICULTURAL/MINING-1/20 (.25 FAR)
- PEC PLANNED ENVIRONMENTAL COMMUNITY-1/2 (.25 FAR)
- AGRICULTURAL-1/10 (.25 FAR)
- AGRICULTURAL/RURAL-1/5 (.25 FAR)
- AGRICULTURAL ESTATE-1/2.5 (.25 FAR)
- RESIDENTIAL-1 (.25 FAR)
- RESIDENTIAL-2 (.25 FAR)
- RESIDENTIAL PLANNED-2 (.35 FAR)
- RESIDENTIAL-4 (.25 FAR)
- RESIDENTIAL-6 (.25 FAR)
- RESIDENTIAL-9 (.35 FAR)
- RESIDENTIAL-12 (.35 FAR)
- RESIDENTIAL-16 (.35 FAR)
- RESIDENTIAL-20 (.35 FAR)
- RESIDENTIAL-35 (1.0 FAR)
- NEIGHBORHOOD MIXED USE-4 (3) (.35 FAR)
- SUBURBAN MIXED USE-6 (.35 FAR)
- COMMUNITY MIXED USE-12 (.50 FAR)
- URBAN MIXED USE-20 (1.0 FAR)
- REGIONAL MIXED USE-35 (2.0 FAR)
- INNOVATION CORRIDOR MIXED USE-35 (2.0 FAR)
- OFFICE COMMERCIAL-20 (.75 FAR)
- RESEARCH CORPORATE PARK (1.0 FAR)
- ENERGY INDUSTRIAL PARK (.50 FAR USES OTHER THAN RETAIL, .25 FAR RETAIL/COMMERCE)
- LIGHT INDUSTRIAL PLANNED (.75 FAR)
- LIGHT INDUSTRIAL (.75 FAR)
- HEAVY INDUSTRIAL (.75 FAR)
- PUBLIC/QUASI-PUBLIC
- NATURAL PRESERVATION
- WIMAUMA VILLAGE RESIDENTIAL-2 (.25 FAR)
- CITRUS PARK VILLAGE

DATA SOURCES: Rezoning boundaries from The Planning Commission and are not official. Parcel lines and data from Hillsborough County Property Appraiser. This map is for informational purposes only and is not intended to be used as a legal document. It is intended that the user of this map verify the accuracy of the information shown on this map with the appropriate authorities. Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission. ACCURACY: It is intended that the user of this map verify the accuracy of the information shown on this map with the appropriate authorities. Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission. This map is for informational purposes only. It is the most current data and information, and the appropriate authorities.



Map Printed from Rezoning System: 2/23/2026
Author: R. Mathie
File: G:\Rezoning\System\MapProjects\HCBogor_JdeRezoning_2.mxd



**GENERAL
SITE PLAN
FOR
CERTIFICATION**



**Hillsborough
County** Florida

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

PO Box 1110, Tampa, FL 33601-1110
(813) 272-5600

**HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT**

GENERAL SITE PLAN REVIEW/CERTIFICATION

**BOARD OF COUNTY
COMMISSIONERS**

Chris Boles
Donna Cameron Cepeda
Harry Cohen
Ken Hagan
Christine Miller
Gwendolyn "Gwen" Myers
Joshua Wostal

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

Bonnie M. Wise

COUNTY ATTORNEY

Julia Mandell

COUNTY INTERNAL AUDITOR

Melinda Jenzarli

DEPUTY COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

Gregory S. Horwedel

Project Name: Gibson Drive

Zoning File: PD 15-0079 Modification: MM 26-0346

Atlas Page: None Submitted: 04/20/26

To Planner for Review: 04/20/26 Date Due: ASAP

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


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

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

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

Reviewed by: Sam Ball Date: 4-20-26

Date Agent/Owner notified of Disapproval: _____





AGENCY COMMENTS

AGENCY REVIEW COMMENT SHEET

TO: Zoning Technician, Development Services Department

DATE: 03/16/2026

REVIEWER: Jessica Kowal, MPA, Principal Planner

AGENCY/DEPT: Transportation

PLANNING AREA: Riverview

PETITION NO: MM 26-0346

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

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. Development of the project shall be limited to the following:

- 1.1. Parcel A: A total of 7,500 square feet for BPO uses, a bank/credit union, personal services, food product stores with no on-site consumption, a restaurant and restricted retail uses. The maximum square footage permitted for a restaurant is 2,000 square feet. Restricted retail uses are limited to a maximum of 2,000 square feet and are restricted to the following: a bookstore, newsstand, hobby shop, gift shop, pharmacy, consignment store, antique store, jewelry store, home furnishings store, paint store and florist. No drive-throughs, other than for a bank/credit union, are permitted. Additionally, a minor motor vehicle repair use may be permitted in lieu of the permitted uses listed above.
- 1.2. Parcel B: 12,000 square feet of BPO uses and/or a bank/credit union, or a 4,000 square foot restaurant (eating establishment) with one drive-through lane. The order box for the said restaurant may be located 150' from the northern boundary of parcel B. The bank/credit union cannot exceed 5,000 square feet and shall be limited to three drive/through lanes. ~~No drive-throughs, other than for a bank/credit union, are permitted.~~

PROJECT SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS

The applicant is requesting a Major Modification to Planned Development (PD) 15-0079, which was most recently modified by MM 18-0173. The applicant is proposing to add the option for a 4,000 square foot eating establishment with a drive through window on Parcel B of the PD. The site's Future Land Use is SMU-6

Although Transportation Review Staff does not object to the request in general, the applicant proposed a condition regarding the maximum queuing lane length for the drive through lane that Transportation Review Staff does object to. The condition proposed stated, *"If developed with a restaurant (eating establishment) with one drive-through lane, the maximum queuing lane length shall not exceed 150 linear feet."*

LDC Sec. 6.11.35.B provides design criteria for eating establishments with drive-through service, specifically, "3. Adequate automobile stacking space will be provided from the order box to ensure that any public right-of-way or common vehicular use area will not be blocked by or utilized for vehicular stacking." There is not enough site-specific information at this zoning stage to ensure this code provision will be met. Transportation Review Staff will review the proposed drive through queuing length when the site/construction plans are submitted for review.

Trip Generation Analysis

As required pursuant to the Development Review Procedures Manual (DRPM), the applicant submitted a transportation analysis for the proposed project option. Staff prepared a comparison of the trips potentially generated under the existing and proposed zoning designations, utilizing a generalized worst-case scenario. The data presented below is based on the Institute of Transportation Engineer's *Trip Generation Manual, 12th Edition*.

Approved Zoning (for PD Modification Area):

Zoning, Size/Land Use	24 Hour Two-Way Volume	Total Peak Hour Trips	
		AM	PM
PD, 7,000 High-Turnover (Sit-Down) Restaurant (ITE LUC 932)	726	63	64
PD, 5,000 SF Medical-Dental Office (ITE LUC 720)	170	16	17
PD, 5,000 SF Drive-In Bank (ITE LUC 912)	494	50	105
Total	1,390	129	186

Proposed Option (for PD Modification Area):

Zoning, Size/Land Use	24 Hour Two-Way Volume	Total Peak Hour Trips	
		AM	PM
PD, 4,000 SF Fast-Food with Drive Through (ITE LUC 934)	1,792	133	126

Trip Generation Difference (for PD Modification Area):

	24 Hour Two-Way Volume	Total Peak Hour Trips	
		AM	PM
Difference of Current vs. Proposed Option	+ 402	+ 4	No Change

TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE SERVING THE SITE

The subject site has frontage on Gibsonton Dr and Alafia Trace Blvd.

Gibsonton Dr is a 4-lane, divided, substandard, urban arterial roadway. The roadway is characterized by +/- 11-foot-wide travel lanes in average condition, no bike lanes, and +/- 5-foot-wide sidewalks along both sides of the roadway within the vicinity of the proposed project. The roadway lies within a +/- 138-foot-wide right of way.

Gibsonton Dr is shown on the Hillsborough County Corridor Preservation Plan as a future 6-lane roadway. The Hillsborough County Transportation Technical Manual requires 110 feet of right of way for a 4-lane urban, divided roadway (TS-6), of which we add 22 feet for the additional two lanes to identify the minimum of 132 feet of right of way needed for a 6-lane urban, divided roadway. Along the project's frontage, the existing right of way for Gibsonton Dr exceeds the necessary right of way for the future widening, therefore no additional right of way preservation is required by this project site.

The Capital Improvement Program (CIP) has planned and funded improvements for Gibsonton Dr from I-75 to Balm Riverview Rd consisting of improvements to the roadway corridor (Project No. 69682025) and improvements to bicycle and pedestrian facilities (Project No. 69691019).

Alafia Trace Blvd is a 2-lane, divided, private local roadway. The roadway is characterized by +/- 12-foot-wide travel lanes in average condition and +/- 5-foot-wide sidewalks along both sides of the roadway. The roadway lies within a varying +/- 50 to +/- 85-foot-wide right of way.

SITE ACCESS

The PD has an existing full access connection to Gibsonton Dr. The modification area has an approved access connection to Alafia Trace Blvd which the applicant is not proposing to change with this request.

The submitted transportation analysis identified the project warrants a 285-foot eastbound left turn lane on Gibsonton Dr at the intersection with Alafia Trace Blvd. There is a sufficient 285-foot eastbound left turn lane existing on Gibsonton Dr at Alafia Trace Blvd.

ROADWAY LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS) INFORMATION

The roadway level of service provided below for Gibsonton Dr is for informational purposes only.

Generalized Level of Service				
Roadway	From	To	LOS Standard	Peak Hr. Directional LOS
Gibsonton Drive	I-75 N Ramp	US Highway 301	D	F

Source: [2024 Hillsborough County Level of Service \(LOS\) Report](#)

COMMISSION

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



DIRECTORS

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

AGENCY COMMENT SHEET

REZONING	
HEARING DATE: 3/23/2026	COMMENT DATE: 1/7/2026
PETITION NO.: 26-0346	PROPERTY ADDRESS: 9603 Alafia Trace Blvd, Riverview, FL 33578
EPC REVIEWER: Melissa Yañez	FOLIO #: 0766212716
CONTACT INFORMATION: (813) 627-2600 x 1360	STR: 20-30S-20E
EMAIL: yanezm@epchc.org	
REQUESTED ZONING: Modification to PD	
FINDINGS	
WETLANDS PRESENT	NO
SITE INSPECTION DATE	NA
WETLAND LINE VALIDITY	NA
WETLANDS VERIFICATION (AERIAL PHOTO, SOILS SURVEY, EPC FILES)	Desktop Review - Aerials, soil survey and EPC files
The EPC Wetlands Division has reviewed the proposed rezoning. In the site plan's current configuration, a resubmittal is not necessary. If the zoning proposal changes and/or the site plans are altered, EPC staff will need to review the zoning again. 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. EPC staff reviewed the above referenced parcel in order to determine the extent of any wetlands and other surface waters pursuant to Chapter 1-11, Rules of the EPC. This determination was performed using aerial photography, soil surveys, and reviewing EPC files. Through this review, it appears that no wetlands or other surface waters exist onsite/ within the proposed construction boundaries. Please be advised this wetland determination is informal and non-binding. A formal wetland delineation may be applied for by submitting a "WDR30 - Delineation Request Application". Once approved, the formal wetland delineation would be binding for five years.	

My/cb

Ec: ialbert@half.com

Environmental Excellence in a Changing World

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



School Impact Review – No Comment or Objection

Date Issued: 12/18/2026

Acreage: ±1.73 acres

Jurisdiction: Hillsborough

Proposed Zoning: PD

Case Number: PD-26-0346

Future Land Use: SMU-6

Address: 9603 Alafia Trace Blvd, Riverview

Maximum Residential Units: N/A

Parcel Folio Number(s): 076621.2716

Residential Type: N/A

_____ **The District has no comment. The proposed development would not meet the threshold for School Concurrence.**

 X **The District has no objection, subject to listed or attached conditions.**

NOTE:

The applicant indicates that the proposed use is retail. As proposed, this project is not anticipated to generate students and therefore, is exempt from adequate public facility analysis from from the School Board.

The information provided above is valid for sixth months from the date issued. Please contact the School District for an updated review as necessary.

Renée M. Kamen, AICP
Manager, Planning & Siting
Growth Management Department
Hillsborough County Public Schools
E: renee.kamen@hcps.net
P: 813.272.4083 C: 813.394.0313



AGENCY REVIEW COMMENT SHEET

NOTE: THIS IS ONLY FOR ESTIMATE PURPOSES, BASED ON THE FEES AT THE TIME THE REVIEW WAS MADE. ACTUAL FEES WILL BE ASSESSED BASED ON PERMIT APPLICATIONS RECEIVED AND BASED ON THE FEE SCHEDULE AT THE TIME OF BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION.

TO: Zoning Review, Development Services

DATE: 03/11/2026

REVIEWER: Ron Barnes, Impact & Mobility Fee Coordinator

APPLICANT: ACG BBQ, LLC

PETITION NO: 26-0346

LOCATION: 9603 Alafia Trace Blvd

FOLIO NO: 76621.2716

Estimated Fees:

Retail - Fast Food w/Drive Thru

(Per 1,000 s.f.)

Mobility: \$104,494 * 4 = \$417,976

Fire: \$313 * 4 = \$1,252

Retail - Coffee/Donut Shop w/Drive Thru

(Per 1,000 s.f.)

Mobility: \$115,638 * 4 = \$462,552

Fire: \$313 * 4 = \$1,252

Project Summary/Description:

Urban Mobility, South Fire - restaurant w/DT 4,000 sf

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

PETITION NO.: MM 26-0346

REVIEWED BY: Clay Walker, E.I. DATE: 3/9/2026

FOLIO NO.: 76621.2716

WATER

- ☐ The property lies within the _____ Water Service Area. The applicant should contact the provider to determine the availability of water service.
- ☒ A 8 inch water main exists ☐ (approximately ___ feet from the site), ☒ (adjacent to the site), and is located south of the subject property within the south Right-of-Way of Gibsonton Drive. This will be the likely point-of-connection, however there could be additional and/or different points-of-connection determined at the time of the application for service. This is not a reservation of capacity.
- ☐ Water distribution system improvements will need to be completed prior to connection to the County's water system. The improvements include _____ and will need to be completed by the _____ prior to issuance of any building permits that will create additional demand on the system.

WASTEWATER

- ☐ The property lies within the _____ Wastewater Service Area. The applicant should contact the provider to determine the availability of wastewater service.
- ☒ A 6 inch wastewater forcemain exists ☐ (approximately _____ feet from the project site), ☒ (adjacent to the site) and is located south of the subject property within the north Right-of-Way of Gibsonton Drive. This will be the likely point-of-connection, however there could be additional and/or different points-of-connection determined at the time of the application for service. This is not a reservation of capacity.
- ☐ Wastewater collection system improvements will need to be completed prior to connection to the County's wastewater system. The improvements include _____ and will need to be completed by the _____ prior to issuance of any building permits that will create additional demand on the system.

COMMENTS: The subject rezoning includes parcels that are within the Urban Service Area and would require connection to the County's potable water and wastewater systems. The subject area is located within the Hillsborough County Wastewater Service Area and will be served by the Falkenburg Wastewater Treatment Plant. If all of the development commitments for the referenced facility are added together, they would exceed the existing reserve capacity of the facility. However, there is a plan in place to address the capacity prior to all of the existing commitments connecting and sending flow to the referenced facility. As such, an individual permit will be required based on the following language noted on the permits: The referenced facility currently does not have, but will have prior to placing the proposed project into operation, adequate reserve capacity to accept the flow from this project.

AGENCY COMMENT SHEET

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

FROM: **Reviewer:** Andria McMaugh **Date:** 01/07/2026

Agency: Natural Resources **Petition #:** 26-0346

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

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.



Agency Review Comment Sheet

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

TO: Zoning Review, Development Services **REQUEST DATE:** 12/17/2025

REVIEWER: Kim Cruz, Environmental Supervisor **REVIEW DATE:** 12/31/2025

PROPERTY OWNER: Highland Investors, Inc. **PID:** 26-0346

APPLICANT: ACG BBQ, LLC

LOCATION: 9603 Alafia Trace Blvd. Riverview, FL 33578

FOLIO NO.: 76621.2716

AGENCY REVIEW COMMENTS:

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

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

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

AGENCY REVIEW COMMENT SHEET

TO: ZONING TECHNICIAN, Planning Growth Management

DATE: 19 Dec. 2025

REVIEWER: Bernard W. Kaiser, Conservation and Environmental Lands Management

APPLICANT: Isabelle Albert

PETITION NO: MM 26-0346


LOCATION: 9603 Alafia Trace Blvd., Riverview, FL 33578

FOLIO NO: 76621.2716

SEC: 20 **TWN:** 30 **RNG:** 20

- ☒ This agency has no comments.
- ☐ This agency has no objection.
- ☐ This agency has no objection, subject to listed or attached conditions.
- ☐ This agency objects, based on the listed or attached conditions.

COMMENTS: _____.



VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT

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

HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY, FLORIDA
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

IN RE:
ZONING HEARING MASTER MEETING

ZONING HEARING MASTER MEETING
TRANSCRIPT OF TESTIMONY AND PROCEEDINGS

BEFORE: Steve Luce
Zoning Hearing Master
DATE: 03/23/2026
TIME: Commencing at 6:00 p.m.
TIME: Concluded at 10:05 p.m.
LOCATION: Hillsborough County BOCC
Development Services Department
601 East Kennedy Boulevard
Second Floor
Tampa, Florida 33602

Reported by:
Kate Khvostova

1 MS. HEINRICH: Our next application is Item D.11.
2 Major Mod 26-0346. The applicant is requesting a major
3 modification in PD 15-0079. Sam Ball, with Development
4 Services has reviewed this application and will provide the
5 staff findings after the applicant's presentation.

6 HEARING OFFICER: The applicant, please.

7 MS. ALBERT: Good evening. Isabelle Albert, of
8 Halff, 1000 North Ashley Drive. I'm here with Mr. Molloy and
9 Mr. Yates.

10 So here's the site. It's about 1.73 acres. It's
11 in the Riverview Community Plan. It's also located in the
12 urban service area. It is part of a larger planned
13 development, which I will go and explain with the next slide.
14 And it is located in SMU-6. And it is off of Gibsonton Drive
15 and US 301 to the east.

16 So it's currently approved for 98 townhomes towards
17 the rear, and in the front there are two parcels, which are
18 separated by a 125 foot wide TECO easement. Parcel A is
19 approved for restricted BPO uses, including a 2,000 square
20 foot restaurant and a minor motor vehicle repair. Right now
21 it's developed with Tire Kingdom. And the Parcel B is
22 approved for 12,000 square feet of BPO uses, including a bank
23 that are limited for three drive-through lanes.

24 So we're here tonight to discuss the Parcel B,
25 which is we're requesting to add a 4,000 square foot

1 restaurant and eating establishment, with one drive-through
2 lane. And we're also looking at the hours of operation. The
3 reason why we went this way, is just to address the
4 compatibility concerns that we -- was raised by some of the
5 staff that we address the restaurant with the drive-through.

6 And what we're doing is that this restaurant
7 drive-through is very different than what you would typically
8 find at a McDonald's, a Burger King, or anything like that.
9 And the best way to do that is to address the hours of
10 operation.

11 We are also requesting, as part of this request, a
12 waiver to the 150-foot to the 200-foot minimum requirement
13 distance from the residential zone property for a call box.
14 We are providing 150 foot from our property line, 100
15 in -- but if you account for the potential plot to the north,
16 and the closest residential, it's more like 185 feet.

17 But we've also increased our wall. There's a
18 six-foot wall, and we're increasing it to eight-foot wall, as
19 well as adding vegetation there. But we also, for the
20 restaurant, increased the setback from 20 to 50 feet. And
21 again, we have those hours of operation.

22 This is currently the intersection. Very rarely
23 have I said that we did not have to require or request any DE
24 or anything like that, and it's a -- it's a lighted
25 intersection.

1 And Development Services, as well as the Planning
2 Commission staff, found it consistent and approvable with the
3 proposed conditions of approval within the staff report, and
4 there's no objections from the reviewing agencies. And I'm
5 here if you have any questions.

6 HEARING OFFICER: Is the intent to utilize the area
7 below the TECO easement for any part of the development?

8 MS. ALBERT: Yes. So -- yes. So the building
9 obviously is not located in the TECO easement, and this is
10 part of the third deed. But we were allowed to have some
11 parking within that area, drive aisles. And prior to filing
12 this application, obviously there was a lot of discussions
13 with staff of TECO, and they were in support, so this is why
14 we're coming here today to request this.

15 HEARING OFFICER: And does the easement spell out
16 the ability to use that area below the power lines for
17 parking?

18 MS. ALBERT: It spells out that no structures are
19 permitted in the easement.

20 HEARING OFFICER: Okay.

21 MS. ALBERT: And Mr. Molloy can answer any
22 questions regarding that.

23 HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Molloy, if you don't mind
24 coming forward for just a moment.

25 MS. ALBERT: I'm sorry. What was that?

1 HEARING OFFICER: I'd like to ask Mr. Molloy a
2 question.

3 MS. ALBERT: Okay.

4 MR. MOLLOY: William Molloy, sir.

5 HEARING OFFICER: Yeah.

6 MR. MOLLOY: Did you have a question?

7 HEARING OFFICER: I don't know if you've met with
8 TECO or read the easement? Are there any issues with --

9 MR. MOLLOY: We actually started this exercise,
10 sir, with TECO, going to their land use committee, I believe
11 it's called.

12 HEARING OFFICER: Okay.

13 MR. MOLLOY: Just to make sure that they have an
14 appetite for the project. We've been before that board twice
15 now.

16 HEARING OFFICER: Okay.

17 MR. MOLLOY: They do have an appetite for it.
18 We're working towards -- I think it's going to be actually
19 more like a public partner agreement than an easement. But
20 they are going to, if everything goes correctly, let us use
21 everything under the power lines for parking and pavement.
22 No activity, just parking and pavement.

23 HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Thank you.

24 MR. MOLLOY: Okay.

25 HEARING OFFICER: All right. Does that conclude

1 your team's presentation?

2 MR. MOLLOY: Presentation. Yes, sir.

3 HEARING OFFICER: Okay. All right. Development
4 Services staff.

5 MR. BALL: Good evening. Sam Ball, with
6 Hillsborough County Development Services.

7 The applicant is requesting a major modification to
8 PD 15-0079, to include an option that will allow Parcel B to
9 be developed for a sit-down restaurant. The property is
10 currently approved for site development to allow up to 12,000
11 square feet of BPO, bank, or credit union, but drive-throughs
12 are only allowed for the bank or credit union.

13 The property covers 1.73 acres. It's located on
14 the northeast corner of Gibsonton Drive and Alafia Trace
15 Boulevard. The surrounding zoning development pattern
16 consists of residential, office, and commercial PD zonings,
17 which are developed for retail, single-family, residential,
18 medical office, office, and minor vehicle repair uses.

19 If approved, site development would include the
20 option for a 4,000 square foot sit-down restaurant with
21 drive-through facility use. To mitigate the impacts of the
22 proposed restaurant use on the residential properties to the
23 north, the applicant is proposing limited hours of operation
24 from 10:30 a.m. to 10:30 p.m. The drive-through facilities
25 would be limited to one lane, a 50-foot setback from the

1 north property line, with a 20-foot enhanced buffer.

2 The enhancements would include an 8-foot high
3 pre-cast masonry wall with a row of evergreen shade trees,
4 which are at least 10 feet tall at the time of planting, and
5 spaced no more than 15 feet apart. To allow for the 8-foot
6 tall masonry wall, the applicant requested a PD variation to
7 exceed the six-foot height limit. The applicant is also
8 requesting a waiver to LDC Section 6.11.35.B1 to reduce the
9 order box separation from the residentially zoned property to
10 the north from 200 feet to 150 feet.

11 Based on the surrounding zoning development pattern
12 and proposed development standards, staff finds the request
13 approvable, subject to the conditions. That concludes my
14 presentation.

15 HEARING OFFICER: All right. Thank you.

16 All right. Planning Commission staff?

17 MR. ROYAL: Thank you. Tyrek Royal, Planning
18 Commission staff.

19 The site is s designated suburban mixed-use 6,
20 which includes a range of residential, office, and
21 neighborhood-serving commercial uses, including restaurants
22 as suburban intensities.

23 The proposed restaurant use is consistent with
24 allowable use, and does not exceed the development intensity
25 permitted under the SMU-6 category. The proposed

1 4,000-square-foot building is well below the maximum
2 allowable floor area, based on the site acreage and current
3 floor area ratio. Therefore, the request is consistent with
4 FLU Goal 2 and Objective 2.1, regarding use, density, and
5 intensity.

6 FLU Objective 3.1 and Policy 3.1.3 require new
7 development to be sensitive to surrounding conditions, rather
8 than identical in use. The surrounding area reflects an
9 established mixed-use corridor along Gibsonton Drive for
10 commercial uses such as a Starbucks and Tire Kingdom nearby,
11 as well as multi-family and town home developments to the
12 north and west.

13 This pattern demonstrates a transition from
14 residential uses to increasingly commercial uses along the
15 corridor, making the neighborhood-serving restaurant an
16 appropriate continuation of the existing development trend.

17 FLU Objective 4.4 and Policy 4.4.1 require
18 development to be compatible with the adjacent residential
19 areas, with appropriate buffering and design. In this case,
20 the applicant has incorporated multiple enhancing
21 compatibility measures, including an 8-foot tall wall along
22 the northern property line, enhanced evergreen landscaping,
23 increased setbacks to 50 feet, and the separation of the
24 drive-through order point of approximately 185 feet from the
25 nearest residential lot line, due to an intervening HOA-owned

1 drainage feature.

2 Additionally, the proposed operation hours of 10:30
3 to 9:30 p.m. will help reduce potential late night noise and
4 activity impacts. Collectively, these design and operation
5 commitments provide adequate mitigation measures to ensure
6 compatibility with the nearby residential uses.

7 Overall, staff finds that the request is consistent
8 with the goals, objectives, and policies of the comprehensive
9 plan. Thank you.

10 HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. At this point in
11 time, is there anyone in the audience who wishes to speak in
12 support of the application? I see no one responding.

13 Anyone in the audience wish to speak in opposition
14 to the application?

15 THE CLERK: Mr. Chair, we have four virtual online.

16 HEARING OFFICER: Okay.

17 THE CLERK: Mr. Lopez, you can go first.

18 MR. LOPEZ: Thank you very much. My name is David
19 Lopez. I'm the attorney for the Landings at Alafia Trace
20 Homeowner Association, which is located directly to the north
21 of this Parcel B, where the proposed -- the application is
22 directed. We also have present other members of the
23 homeowner association here today, who I'm sure are going to
24 want to speak and share their opinions.

25 On behalf of the association, the one thing I

1 wanted to really highlight here, and it wasn't mentioned in
2 anybody's presentation thus far, is that the only access
3 point to this parcel is off of Alafia Trace Boulevard, which
4 is perpendicular to Gibsonton Drive. The only access --

5 THE CLERK: I'm sorry. Can I have your address
6 first?

7 MR. LOPEZ: Yes. I'm sorry. 201 East Kennedy
8 Boulevard, Tampa, Florida 33602.

9 HEARING OFFICER: Okay. You can proceed.

10 MR. LOPEZ: Okay. Thank you. And I would add
11 there are no access points off of Gibsonton into this parcel,
12 only off Alafia Trace Boulevard. And that property is, in
13 fact, owned by the homeowners' association, and is privately
14 owned property. And while there's an easement there, what
15 we're talking about here is adding a use to this property
16 which would permit much more heavy utility vehicular traffic
17 across it than what is purposely -- I mean, currently
18 calculated or currently predicted.

19 So what the result would be is, this is a stretch
20 of road that the association is mandated by its governing
21 documents, its declaration, and covenants to maintain.
22 Approximately 100 units or 100 parcels are located in that
23 HOA just north of this parcel, which means that all those
24 people there will bear the brunt of added road maintenance
25 expenses that will necessarily come about with increased

1 traffic, increased vehicular traffic.

2 So what this does, if this is eventually approved,
3 is it guarantees that those 100 parcels will, because of the
4 increased traffic, wind up paying more in homeowners'
5 association assessments, in order to maintain this road,
6 which they are bound to do so by the covenants. They don't
7 have an option to not pay the assessments. They have to do
8 that according to law, which as I'm sure everybody knows, if
9 it's not paid by the homeowners it's subject to lien and
10 foreclosure.

11 So what we're doing here is, if it's approved, is
12 guaranteeing increase in assessment rates for those owners
13 because of the increased traffic, which will trigger
14 increased road maintenance, which will cost more money.

15 So the homeowners' association is opposing this
16 application, which will result in a use that yields a much
17 higher vehicular traffic than is currently contemplated. So
18 that's one the main basis for the HOA's objection, as
19 mentioned, the --

20 HEARING OFFICER: Sure. Sir, if I could ask you?

21 MR. LOPEZ: Sorry?

22 HEARING OFFICER: Is there anything in the HOA docs
23 that talks about cost sharing for maintenance of the road?

24 MR. LOPEZ: There is -- there is a use and easement
25 and fee-sharing agreement between the association that was

1 entered into, on behalf of the association by the developer
2 many years ago, and it covers the relationship between the
3 HOA and the owners of Parcel B. And there is another parcel,
4 which was mentioned earlier in the presentation, that is
5 across Alafia, Parcel A, which currently has a Tire Kingdom
6 sitting on it right now.

7 So there is a fee-sharing agreement present that
8 requires the owners of those two parcels to pay a certain
9 percentage of the road maintenance for the association. But
10 again, even with that, the increase in vehicular traffic will
11 undoubtedly and unavoidably, still cause an increase in the
12 homeowners' association assessments to those nearly-100 lot
13 owners that make their homes just to the north of that. So
14 even though there is a percentage, which those parcel owners
15 are required to contribute to the road maintenance,
16 ultimately the cost of it -- the lions' share of the cost
17 will be borne by this 100-or-so unit owners in the HOA.

18 HEARING OFFICER: Is there any avenue, process that
19 can be pursued to meet with this member of the HOA, this
20 applicant, to restructure the language in the HOA docs?

21 MR. LOPEZ: Well, sir, the owner of this property
22 is not a member of the HOA. These two parcels, and Parcel B,
23 sit outside the legal description of the HOA. It is an
24 easement and a fee-sharing agreement that exists. It's on
25 record, in the public record, between whoever owns the

1 property, Parcel B, and the HOA. So that exists independent
2 of the covenant.

3 HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Got you. So is there any
4 avenue in that separate access easement agreement to go back
5 and restructure the cost sharing?

6 MR. LOPEZ: Well, I can't speculate as to that,
7 sir. That would have to involve the two parties speaking
8 together to see if there was a way to do it.

9 As of right now, that has not been done, it has not
10 been approached by the owner to make, what I would call, a
11 more equitable agreement. I can't speculate as to what the
12 future might hold there.

13 HEARING OFFICER: Okay. All right. Thank you for
14 your comments, sir.

15 MR. LOPEZ: All right. And again, I guess one of
16 the members of the association, board members, are present.

17 HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Very good.
18 Next speaker, please.

19 THE CLERK: The next one I have, Shameyah?

20 MS. FRANCIS: Hello. My name is Shameyah Francis,
21 and my address is 9501 Tocobaga Place, Riverview, Florida
22 33578.

23 I am here as a homeowner and the president of The
24 Landings at Alafia Trace. Just represented as Parcel C,
25 which is between 96 to 100 units.

1 And we strongly oppose this major modification.

2 And before I go there, the question that you asked our
3 attorney in reference to the cost-sharing, this application
4 presented by Parcel B was, or is, also the same owner, which
5 is the developer of our community, who gave us a cost-sharing
6 agreement, which is essentially low, which has burdened us at
7 the 96 to 98 owners in the community.

8 But to get back to just, making sure that we have
9 the time, we strongly do oppose the major modification
10 because it fundamentally changes what was originally the
11 crew, and places a more intense commercial use directly next
12 to our established community. This is not just a minor
13 adjustment. The planned development limit is partial,
14 basically to office use and/or bank or a credit union, and it
15 specifically prohibits other drive-through lanes, it's
16 specifically only for the bank drive-through.

17 What is being proposed now is a sit-down restaurant
18 with a drive-through. This is a material difference, and
19 more intrusive use, one that brings continuous traffic, idle
20 vehicle, speaker noise, longer dwelling or idle time, and
21 extended hours, including evenings and the weekend. The
22 change alone undermines the basis of the PD.

23 HEARING OFFICER: Okay.

24 MS. FRANCIS: What makes this more concerning is
25 that the requests relies on multiple waivers to make the high

1 intrusive use fit. This application acknowledged that the
2 site does not meet the commercial locational criteria, yet it
3 is asking the board to override that requirement,
4 specifically, the setbacks of 150, and then trying to use the
5 boundaries within our borders for an additional -- for the
6 additional to 185. And then also with the setback being at
7 50, which is closer to our walls. This clearly indicates
8 that the site was not intended for this level of commercial
9 intensity.

10 In addition, they are requesting to reduce,
11 basically kind of separate -- you know, they want one
12 drive-through, but it's still too close to our fence, as we
13 stated, and will have loud noises, a speaker system, going to
14 have the cars. You know, here the application is asking to
15 reduce the protection while simultaneously increasing the
16 intense use. That is the opposite of what the plan requires.

17 HEARING OFFICER: Okay.

18 MS. FRANCIS: When we all started talking about
19 justification offer to these, with the TECO easement and
20 making possible changes. But this is our hardship, it's
21 simply a characteristic of the property.

22 If the site cannot accommodate this use, while
23 complying with established standards, then the appropriate
24 conclusion is that this use does not belong in this site.

25 The comparison of the bank with the drive-through

1 lane is also misleading. A bank has a fundamental
2 difference. It is shorter visits, lower traffic turnover,
3 lower outside speaker system, and does not generate smoke,
4 food odors, or additional trash and excess foot traffic or
5 car traffic.

6 The restaurant, a drive-through operates
7 continuously, especially during peak hours, peak meal times,
8 even in the evening, while stopping vehicles, and noise
9 emission are the concerns. The impacts are not comparable.
10 We have already seen real-life effects of this development
11 that is immediate to our area, because we also nearby we have
12 the Tire Kingdom, which is on this Parcel A, and then we have
13 Parcel B, which is what we are referring to.

14 At the opposite of the Starbucks there was a -- at
15 the opposite of the Tire Kingdom a Starbucks was built. And
16 they use our privately-owned roads and are not paying
17 cost-sharing, at this point in time. We have excess traffic,
18 it's congested, circulation issue, our quality of life. It's
19 hard to enter into our community. In the morning, most of
20 the time it's so backed up that it could take us 5 to 10
21 minutes to get out of the community, because it's our only
22 way in and out of our community, since the back gate is only
23 for emergency purposes.

24 This proposal will intensify the same impacts, and
25 bring them closer to our homes. And critically, this

1 development will rely on our private roads, once again, that
2 are already experiencing congestion from the existing
3 commercial use by Starbucks and Tire Kingdom.

4 The road is the only point of ingress and egress by
5 our residents. Today, it's already caused delays and
6 frustration for our residents trying to enter and exit our
7 community. Adding a high-turnover restaurant or even a low
8 sitdown restaurant will further burden the same access point,
9 increasing congestion, increasing accidents, and raising
10 legitimate safety concerns.

11 Additionally, by approving any changes as our
12 attorney stated, we will have more wear and tear on our roads
13 and, in turn, we will have more costs for the 100 homeowners
14 versus all the business attached right in front of us that
15 are utilizing our roads more than us.

16 HEARING OFFICER: Okay.

17 MS. FRANCIS: At its core, basically, this request
18 asks the Board to allow a more intense use of the originally
19 approved area, to relax multiple standards designed to
20 protect our residents, and shift the resulting impacts onto
21 an existing residential community, The Landings at Alafia
22 Trace, which creates an undue burden.

23 For these reasons, this major modification is
24 inconsistent with the intent of the planned development, and
25 it should be denied.

1 HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Thank you, ma'am.

2 Okay. Anyone else wish to speak?

3 THE CLERK: The next one is Mr. Edwin.

4 MR. GAINES: Yes. Good evening. My name is Edwin

5 Gaines Jr., 9517 Tocobaga Place, Riverview, Florida.

6 I'd just like to make a statement. Our community
7 is strongly opposed to the proposed application, because of
8 the significant gridlock it anticipates create. The
9 increased traffic congestion would negatively impact daily
10 life of residents and strain the existing infrastructure.
11 Currently, our community is surrounded by businesses that do
12 not contribute to their fair share toward the maintenance of
13 our roadways.

14 This lack of equitable financial support places an
15 undue burden on the residents who must cover the expenses
16 associated with the roadway upkeep and landscaping.

17 Safety is also a concern -- safety is also a major
18 concern for our community. The presence of unfamiliar
19 vehicles, access to multiple business through our roads,
20 increase risk for residents, particularly because of the
21 unpredictable nature of this traffic.

22 Basically, we're hoping that our private road does
23 not turn into a full-time drive-through, and this is why we
24 are so opposed to it.

25 HEARING OFFICER: Okay.

1 MR. GAINES: That's all.

2 HEARING OFFICER: All right. Thank you, sir.

3 All right. Anyone else wish to speak?

4 THE CLERK: I believe the last one is Dr. Laura.

5 DR. HAUSER: Yes. Good evening.

6 HEARING OFFICER: Good evening.

7 DR. HAUSER: My name is Dr. Laura Hauser. I live
8 at 9515 Tocobaga Place in Riverview. And I am one of the
9 original owners in The Landings at Alafia Trace.

10 And we've already -- you've heard that this is, you
11 know, a much more intense use. We only have that one usable
12 exit, and I think the delay is closer to 10 to 20 minutes
13 during peak traffic hours. It can take 30 minutes to go, the
14 less than a mile, from our light to the freeway in the
15 morning.

16 But I'm especially concerned about the potential
17 for vehicles to queue and block access to the road in the
18 surrounding area. The county's own transportation review
19 states there is not enough site-specific information to
20 ensure compliance for code requirements that public
21 rights-of-way in common vehicular use areas will not be
22 blocked by vehicle stacking. And we only have one access
23 point, but that's blocking our only way in and out.

24 The county report also shows that the traffic would
25 increase almost 30 percent, an additional 402 trips per day.

1 And again, that is a private two-lane road that was not
2 designed to absorb additional drive-through traffic and
3 queueing.

4 They've also -- others have mentioned the fact that
5 we bear the cost of maintaining that road, but we also bear
6 the cost of maintaining and repairing the damage. Tire
7 Kingdom uses our community to test-drive cars after they fix
8 them, even though we asked them not to. Starbucks, coming
9 out, they try to cut through our property to bypass all the
10 traffic at the light, only to find that they can't get out,
11 and then they have to drive over our landscaping and damage
12 that, to turn around and get back out.

13 Trees have been knocked down from car accidents,
14 and because it's on a private road, it's left to us to take
15 care of that.

16 But I'm also really concerned about this
17 drive-through being closer to the residential property. The
18 developer made it sound like we have a huge retention pond
19 right there, and we don't. The retention pond is in the back
20 of our property, not in the front. There is a very small
21 area up front, and this drive-through would be very close to
22 several homes there on the edge.

23 So if you reduce that, these standards exist to
24 protect the residents from the noise, speaker activity,
25 headlights, idling vehicles, pan handlers, and other

1 circumstances. And again, we talked about the burden that
2 that places directly on our homes.

3 And I'm also concerned that they call this a
4 sit-down restaurant with a drive-through, but all of the
5 traffic and transportation analysis evaluates it as a 4,000
6 square foot fast-food, with drive-through.

7 So approval of this opens the door for them to come
8 back later and turn this into more of a real fast-food,
9 potentially 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. And for your
10 office to argue, well, that's not a big leap from what it is.

11 So this request is not about one business, it's
12 about the long-term effect on neighborhood access, safety,
13 noise, traffic, and fairness to the residents who already
14 bear the consequences of this development pattern.

15 Our neighborhood should not be required to absorb
16 additional congestion, costs, and a risk, simply because the
17 applicant now wishes to intensify the use that is different
18 than what we were originally told to expect.

19 For these reasons, I respectfully ask this request
20 be denied.

21 HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Thank you, ma'am.

22 All right. I believe that concludes all those that
23 are online that wanted to speak to this item tonight.

24 Is there anyone else in opposition? Okay. I see
25 no one responding.

1 With that, Development Services, comments?

2 MS. HEINRICH: I do not have any comments. I don't
3 know if Transportation does, because I know some access
4 issues came up and possibly some easement issues.

5 HEARING OFFICER: Okay.

6 MS. KOWAL: Good evening. Jessica Kowal, with
7 Transportation Review.

8 HEARING OFFICER: I'm sorry. Can you repeat your
9 name again?

10 MS. KOWAL: Jessica Kowal, with Transportation
11 Review.

12 HEARING OFFICER: Okay.

13 MS. KOWAL: As the one lady stated, the
14 transportation staff report does mention a concern with the
15 queueing, but it was not queueing in general. The applicant
16 had initially proposed a maximum queueing length of 150 feet,
17 which staff had concerns about because of the lack of detail
18 on the PD zoning plan. Had we had more information or there
19 was a strict controlled site plan, we would have been able to
20 assess these impacts and been able to make a clear decision.

21 That statement in the transportation staff report
22 was put there to acknowledge the fact that the applicant did
23 propose something that staff did not agree to at this time,
24 with the amount of detail.

25 Regarding the other transportation issues, the

1 proposal for the 4,000 square foot restaurant, our ITE does
2 not have a land use code that is applicable for a sit-down
3 restaurant with a drive-through. Therefore, we did assess it
4 as the maximum impact, as a 4,000 square foot restaurant
5 which is fast-food, in ITE's view, with a drive-through.

6 The applicant also did propose a restaurant with
7 drive-through. They did not restrict it to sit-down only,
8 therefore, that's why we ran the numbers the way we did.

9 Just to clarify, the applicant is retaining the
10 option on this parcel, with this as an additional option, and
11 it does show little increase in the daily trips in the a.m.
12 peak hour, but no change, actually a reduction in trips in
13 the p.m. peak hour.

14 So there will be a comparable application of the
15 fast-food restaurant. Although we do understand that the
16 queueing is a concern, not only for staff, but for the
17 citizens and the people located there, I did check the plat,
18 and it does appear as though that that road is a property
19 owner's association, no specifically homeowners' association.
20 However, that is our -- yes -- however, that is something
21 that I would assume was thought off when this property was
22 subdivided for the commercial uses up front, and then the
23 residential in the rear.

24 Any other questions?

25 HEARING OFFICER: No.

1 MS. KOWAL: Thank you.

2 HEARING OFFICER: Okay. All right. Applicant has
3 an opportunity for rebuttal.

4 MR. MOLLOY: Good evening, again. William Molloy,
5 325 South Boulevard. I'm going to be quick, so Mr. Yates can
6 speak to our transportation stuff.

7 I just want to be very clear on this. One, we were
8 not aware of the opposition. That was a new discovery this
9 evening. We would have addressed it a little more
10 appropriately if we had time.

11 This project did come in as one PD. The town homes
12 and two commercial outparcels, with the TECA easement
13 crossing it. The drive-through is not a new use. It's
14 approved right now for a bank with three drive-throughs, so
15 that squawk box is going to exist in some form or another,
16 anyway about it. That was approved use.

17 When I spoke earlier, Mr. Luce, I mentioned that we
18 started with TECO. The very second point we started with was
19 that squawk box, where do we put it, how to articulate it,
20 how do we protect that neighborhood the best we can from
21 that. And I think the program that we came up with is
22 pretty -- is careful and considerate, the eight-foot wall
23 we've added, the water barrier, and as much trees as we can
24 put in between the restaurant and the community.

25 All that being said, I think Mr. Yates needs to

1 speak to the traffic, and Isabelle wants to clarify what we
2 are doing with the queueing, because there's some
3 misinformation right now.

4 HEARING OFFICER: Okay.

5 MR. YATES: Good evening. Michael Yates of Palm
6 Traffic, and I have been sworn.

7 I want to share something on the overhead. I think
8 this may help in giving a little clarity. This was contained
9 in the appendix of the traffic study, but it is a conceptual
10 layout for the site. And as you can see, this is the general
11 plan that we're working with.

12 And you can see the TECO easement goes right along
13 here, so you can see the building is outside the TECO
14 easement. The lower section is for parking. And so the
15 conversations we have had with Transportation Services and
16 the county engineer is to -- when we come in to fully
17 evaluate the site, we can run the queueing through the
18 parking lot, as an alternative back-up scenario if the queues
19 do tend to get longer. So we are working with staff in
20 developing a queue evaluation procedure. And that is one of
21 the discussion we have had to insure that the queue does not
22 leave the site. And so that there is a plan in place to
23 address the queue and to insure that it does not leave the
24 site.

25 HEARING OFFICER: When you go through site

1 development and you work with the transportation staff.

2 MR. YATES: Yes.

3 HEARING OFFICER: All right. Do they weigh-in on
4 the queue?

5 MR. YATES: 100 percent, and very specific.

6 HEARING OFFICER: Okay.

7 MR. YATES: It is a very detailed review and very
8 careful to insure that that queue does not leave the site.

9 HEARING OFFICER: And if you come in with a layout
10 that doesn't work?

11 MR. YATES: We will be told about it.

12 HEARING OFFICER: You will be told it won't work,
13 and they could deny your application?

14 MR. YATES: Correct.

15 HEARING OFFICER: Your commercial site plan.

16 MR. YATES: Correct. We will absolutely have to
17 make sure that staff is comfortable with the queue layout,
18 and we will have to commit to that during site review that
19 ensures that that site does not block any of the access or
20 the operations of the adjacent facility, Alafia Trace.

21 HEARING OFFICER: Okay.

22 MR. YATES: So that was it. I know Jessica covered
23 the transportation where the a.m. and p.m. trips, as they're
24 shown in the staff report, is a wash on trips from the
25 current approved uses. And so from a transportation

1 perspective, it should be a very similar use from what is
2 approved today. I will let Isabelle finish up. Thank you.

3 MS. ALBERT: Thank you. For the record, Isabelle
4 Albert. So just to clarify a little bit, I was just talking
5 with Ms. Jessica, they did not object to the use. Their only
6 concern was the queuing. And the reason why we have that
7 queuing in there is because as you can see a sit-down
8 restaurant like Sonny's, they're a sit-down restaurant. They
9 have that fast -- they have the drive-through lane, just
10 limited to one, but it's also not a highly used -- it's not
11 part of their main business. Their main business is a
12 sit-down restaurant, and then you'll have that one lane.

13 HEARING OFFICER: I mean, you use Sonny's as an
14 example, but could it be McDonald's? Could it be Burger
15 King?

16 MS. ALBERT: No.

17 HEARING OFFICER: Could it be Taco Bell?

18 MS. ALBERT: If you look at McDonald's and Burger
19 King, their queuing lanes usually accommodate more than 8 to
20 10 cars. This is, like, five, six cars. It really is half.

21 And the hours of operation, which are part of the
22 condition, so it's not going to be a 24-hour, but it's part
23 of the condition that it starts at 10:30 until 9:00 at night.
24 This is not a business model for typical fast-food
25 restaurants that you've seen.

1 And so again, you know, we were thinking about the
2 residents and, you know, we were trying to accommodate by
3 increasing the buffers and increasing the wall height. But
4 again, we're not waiving anything from the plan, except that
5 150-foot call box, but it's mitigated with the additional
6 screening and buffering that we've done.

7 HEARING OFFICER: Okay. And if I could ask that
8 real quick, Michelle Heinrich.

9 MS. ALBERT: Yes, absolutely. Thank you.

10 HEARING OFFICER: The question I asked is about,
11 their example showed Sonny's, but would the conditions that
12 you recommend for approval, would it allow for a McDonald's,
13 or a Burger King, or a Taco Bell?

14 MS. ALBERT: No. It would not.

15 HEARING OFFICER: Okay. All right. Anything else?

16 MS. ALBERT: No.

17 HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Molloy?

18 MR. MOLLOY: Mr. Luce, we're done, sir, if you are.

19 HEARING OFFICER: You're good?

20 MR. MOLLOY: Yes, sir.

21 HEARING OFFICER: All right. With that, thank you
22 everyone who participated in this application.

23 That concludes this case, and that concludes
24 tonight's Zoning Hearing Master Hearing. We are adjourned.

25 (Hearing adjourned at 10:05 p.m.)

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

STATE OF FLORIDA

COUNTY OF HILLSBOROUGH

I, Kate Khvostova, Digital Reporter and Notary Public do
hereby certify:

That the foregoing proceeding hereinbefore set forth was
accurately captured with annotations by me during the
proceeding.

I further certify that I am not related to any of the
parties to this action by blood or marriage, and that I am in
no way interested in the outcome of this matter.

In witness thereof, I have hereunto set my hand this 30
March, 2026.

Kate Khvostova

KATE KHVOSTOVA

Notary Commission No. HH 310964

Commission Expires: 9/12/2026

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

TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Patricia J. Dunham, do hereby certify:

That the foregoing is a complete and accurate transcript of the original digital audio recording of the proceedings captured in the above-entitled matter. As the transcriptionist, I have reviewed and transcribed the entirety of the proceeding to ensure a verbatim record to the best of my ability.

I further certify that I am neither attorney for, nor a relative or employee of any of the parties to the action; further, that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this matter.

In witness thereof, I have hereunto set my hand this 30 March, 2026.

Patty Dunham

Patricia J. Dunham

**EXHIBITS SUBMITTED
DURING THE ZHM HEARING**

SIGN-IN SHEET: RFR, ZHM, PHM, LUHOPAGE 1 OF 7DATE/TIME: 3-23-26 6pmHEARING MASTER: Steve LucePLEASE **PRINT CLEARLY**, THIS INFORMATION WILL BE USED FOR MAILING

APPLICATION # <u>MM</u> <u>26-0215</u>	PLEASE PRINT NAME <u>Isabelle Albert</u> MAILING ADDRESS <u>1000 W. Ashley Dr #900</u> CITY <u>Tampa</u> STATE <u>FL</u> ZIP <u>33602</u> PHONE <u>813 331-0976</u>
APPLICATION # <u>RZ</u> <u>25-0270</u> <u>R26-0283</u>	PLEASE PRINT NAME <u>Todd Freeman</u> MAILING ADDRESS <u>200 1st Ave S #101</u> CITY <u>Tampa</u> STATE <u>FL</u> ZIP <u>33602</u> PHONE <u>813 207-1700</u>
APPLICATION # <u>RZ</u> <u>25-1338</u>	PLEASE PRINT NAME <u>SYED ALI</u> MAILING ADDRESS <u>602 OCONOR AVE</u> CITY <u>TAMPA</u> STATE <u>FL</u> ZIP <u>33606</u> PHONE <u>813 260-8502</u>
APPLICATION # <u>RZ</u> <u>26-0359</u>	PLEASE PRINT NAME <u>Matthew Spio</u> MAILING ADDRESS <u>311 W palm ave Apt 425 Tampa FL 33602</u> CITY <u>Tampa</u> STATE <u>FL</u> ZIP <u>33602</u> PHONE <u>813 321-754-7550</u>
APPLICATION # <u>RZ</u> <u>26-0359</u>	PLEASE PRINT NAME <u>ROBBY SHIVER</u> MAILING ADDRESS <u>2101 FAIRFIELD AVE</u> CITY <u>BRANDON</u> STATE <u>FL</u> ZIP <u>33511</u> PHONE <u>813 594-8248</u>
APPLICATION # <u>RZ</u> <u>26-0457</u>	PLEASE PRINT NAME <u>DON THOMPSON</u> MAILING ADDRESS <u>10829 ALORION RD.</u> CITY <u>LITHIA</u> STATE <u>FL</u> ZIP <u>33547</u> PHONE <u>813 220-046</u>

SIGN-IN SHEET: RFR, ZHM PHM, LUHOPAGE 2 OF 7DATE/TIME: 3-23-26 6pm HEARING MASTER: Steve LucePLEASE **PRINT CLEARLY**, THIS INFORMATION WILL BE USED FOR MAILING

APPLICATION # RZ 26-0468	PLEASE PRINT NAME <u>ART GILLETTE</u> MAILING ADDRESS <u>10910 BALM RIVERVIEW RD.</u> CITY <u>RIVERVIEW</u> STATE <u>FL.</u> ZIP <u>33569</u> PHONE <u>413 441-9591</u>
APPLICATION # RZ 25-0882	PLEASE PRINT NAME <u>DAVID WRIGHT</u> MAILING ADDRESS <u>8956 WESTERLAND DR.</u> CITY <u>LAND OLAKE</u> STATE <u>FL</u> ZIP <u>34637</u> PHONE <u>813-238-7473</u>
APPLICATION # RZ 25-0939	PLEASE PRINT NAME <u>Todd Tressman</u> MAILING ADDRESS <u>200 2nd Ave S #45</u> CITY <u>TPC</u> STATE <u>FL</u> ZIP <u>33601</u> PHONE <u>727-841-7600</u>
APPLICATION # RZ 25-1386	PLEASE PRINT NAME <u>Isabelle Albert</u> MAILING ADDRESS <u>1000 N. Ashley Dr #900</u> CITY <u>Tampa</u> STATE <u>FL</u> ZIP <u>33602</u> PHONE <u>813 331-0976</u>
APPLICATION # RZ 25-1386	PLEASE PRINT NAME <u>William J. Mollay</u> MAILING ADDRESS <u>315 5th</u> CITY <u>Tampa</u> STATE <u>FL</u> ZIP <u>33604</u> PHONE <u>336-0</u>
APPLICATION # RZ 25-1386	PLEASE PRINT NAME <u>MICHAEL YATES</u> MAILING ADDRESS <u>PAINT BRICK 4006 S MacDill Ave</u> CITY <u>TAMPA</u> STATE <u>FL</u> ZIP <u>33611</u> PHONE <u>813 205 8057</u>

SIGN-IN SHEET: RFR, ZHM PHM, LUHOPAGE 3 OF 7DATE/TIME: 3-23-26 6pm HEARING MASTER: Steve LucePLEASE **PRINT CLEARLY**, THIS INFORMATION WILL BE USED FOR MAILING

APPLICATION # <u>RZ</u> <u>25-1387</u>	PLEASE PRINT NAME <u>GERRY DEDENBACH</u> MAILING ADDRESS <u>11601 ResBarch Drive</u> CITY <u>Alachua</u> STATE <u>FL</u> ZIP <u>32015</u> PHONE <u>352 331-1976</u>
APPLICATION # <u>RZ</u> <u>26-0070</u>	PLEASE PRINT NAME <u>Jake Cremer</u> MAILING ADDRESS <u>2602 W Cleveland St #203</u> CITY <u>Tampa</u> STATE <u>FL</u> ZIP <u>33606</u> PHONE <u>813-419-3914</u>
APPLICATION # <u>RZ</u> <u>26-0070</u>	PLEASE PRINT NAME <u>MICHAEL YATES</u> MAILING ADDRESS <u>PALM TRAFFIC 4006 S MacDILL Ave</u> CITY <u>TAMPA</u> STATE <u>FL</u> ZIP <u>33611</u> PHONE <u>813 205 8057</u>
APPLICATION # <u>RZ</u> <u>26-0070</u>	PLEASE PRINT NAME <u>Cynthia Spde H</u> MAILING ADDRESS <u>2002 W. Cleveland St.</u> CITY <u>Tampa</u> STATE <u>FL</u> ZIP <u>33606</u> PHONE <u>813 419 3914</u>
APPLICATION # <u>RZ</u> <u>26-0070</u>	PLEASE PRINT NAME <u>Rodney Smith</u> MAILING ADDRESS <u>10016 Ohio Ave</u> CITY <u>Thonotosassa</u> STATE <u>FL</u> ZIP <u>33582</u> PHONE <u>813 494-5048</u> <u>5048</u>
APPLICATION # <u>RZ</u> <u>26-0070</u>	PLEASE PRINT NAME <u>Ray Foster</u> MAILING ADDRESS <u>10724 Williams Rd</u> CITY <u>Thonotosassa</u> STATE <u>FL</u> ZIP <u>33592</u> PHONE <u>813-763-3990</u>

SIGN-IN SHEET: RFR, ZHM, PHM, LUHOPAGE 4 OF 7DATE/TIME: 3-23-26 6pmHEARING MASTER: Steve LucePLEASE **PRINT CLEARLY**, THIS INFORMATION WILL BE USED FOR MAILING

APPLICATION # RZ 26-0213	PLEASE PRINT NAME <u>Michael Brooks</u> MAILING ADDRESS <u>400 H Tampa FL Stz 1710</u> CITY <u>Tampa</u> STATE <u>FL</u> ZIP <u>33602</u> PHONE _____
APPLICATION # RZ 26-0213	PLEASE PRINT NAME <u>Esabelle Albert</u> MAILING ADDRESS <u>1000 W. Ashley Dr # 900</u> CITY <u>Tampa</u> STATE <u>FL</u> ZIP <u>33602</u> PHONE <u>813 0926</u>
APPLICATION # RZ 26-0213	PLEASE PRINT NAME <u>MICHAEL YATES</u> MAILING ADDRESS <u>Palme Traffic 4006 S MacDill Ave</u> CITY <u>TAMPA</u> STATE <u>FL</u> ZIP <u>33611</u> PHONE <u>813 205 8057</u>
APPLICATION # RZ 26-0213	PLEASE PRINT NAME <u>JUAN MANUJ</u> MAILING ADDRESS <u>17403 Chelsea Downs Cir</u> CITY <u>Lithia</u> STATE <u>FL</u> ZIP <u>33541</u> PHONE <u>760 409 5170</u>
APPLICATION # RZ 26-0213	PLEASE PRINT NAME <u>Travis Brumgardner</u> MAILING ADDRESS <u>10139 Bryant Rd</u> CITY <u>Lithia</u> STATE <u>FL</u> ZIP <u>33547</u> PHONE <u>813-766 0619</u>
APPLICATION # RZ 26-0213	PLEASE PRINT NAME <u>Brendan McCafferty</u> MAILING ADDRESS <u>6620 Fishhawk Crossing Blvd</u> CITY <u>Lithia</u> STATE <u>FL</u> ZIP <u>33547</u> PHONE <u>813-785-7040</u>

DATE/TIME: 3-23-26 6pm HEARING MASTER: Steve LucePLEASE **PRINT CLEARLY**, THIS INFORMATION WILL BE USED FOR MAILING

APPLICATION # <u>RZ</u> <u>26-0213</u>	PLEASE PRINT NAME <u>Ashani Fairclough</u> MAILING ADDRESS <u>731 Kensington Lake Rd</u> CITY <u>Bahawh</u> STATE <u>FL</u> ZIP <u>33511</u> PHONE <u>813 466 294</u>
APPLICATION # <u>RZ</u> <u>26-0213</u>	PLEASE PRINT NAME <u>Rasnah Davis</u> MAILING ADDRESS <u>5402 Garry Ridge Dr</u> CITY <u>Lithia</u> STATE <u>FL</u> ZIP <u>33547</u> PHONE <u>352-213-114</u>
APPLICATION # <u>RZ</u> <u>26-0213</u>	PLEASE PRINT NAME <u>William Kent King</u> MAILING ADDRESS <u>18232 Lidhia Ranch Road</u> CITY <u>Tamara</u> STATE <u>FL</u> ZIP <u>33547</u> PHONE <u>813-503-280</u>
APPLICATION # <u>RZ</u> <u>26-0213</u>	PLEASE PRINT NAME <u>Eric W. Smith</u> MAILING ADDRESS <u>617 W. Lumberton Rd</u> CITY <u>Bronck</u> STATE <u>FL</u> ZIP <u>33511</u> PHONE <u>813 662 7429</u>
APPLICATION # <u>RZ</u> <u>26-0213</u>	PLEASE PRINT NAME <u>Katherine Wiggins</u> MAILING ADDRESS <u>18808 Boyette Rd</u> CITY <u>Lithia</u> STATE <u>FL</u> ZIP <u>33547</u> PHONE <u>813-546-7137</u>
APPLICATION # <u>RZ</u> <u>26-0213</u>	PLEASE PRINT NAME <u>David Seibert</u> MAILING ADDRESS <u>18920 Boyette Rd</u> CITY <u>Lithia</u> STATE <u>FL</u> ZIP <u>33547</u> PHONE <u>813 685-8448</u>

DATE/TIME: 3-23-26 6pmHEARING MASTER: Steve LucePLEASE **PRINT CLEARLY**, THIS INFORMATION WILL BE USED FOR MAILING

APPLICATION # <u>RZ</u> <u>26-0213</u>	PLEASE PRINT NAME <u>Laverne Kendrick</u> MAILING ADDRESS <u>18833 Bouette Rd</u> CITY <u>Lithia</u> STATE <u>OH</u> ZIP <u>33547</u> PHONE <u>813-298-3421</u>
APPLICATION # <u>RZ</u> <u>26-0213</u>	PLEASE PRINT NAME <u>GARY TAYLOR</u> MAILING ADDRESS <u>10005 Bryant Rd</u> CITY <u>Lithia</u> STATE <u>FL</u> ZIP <u>33547</u> PHONE <u>813-604-726</u>
APPLICATION # <u>RZ</u> <u>26-0214</u>	PLEASE PRINT NAME <u>Kami Corbett</u> MAILING ADDRESS <u>101 E Kennedy Blvd Ste 3700</u> CITY <u>TAMPA</u> STATE <u>FL</u> ZIP <u>33602</u> PHONE <u>813-227-8421</u>
APPLICATION # <u>MM</u> <u>26-0335</u>	PLEASE PRINT NAME <u>RYAN MANASSE</u> MAILING ADDRESS <u>400 N. ASHLEY DR. STE. 3100</u> CITY <u>TAMPA</u> STATE <u>FL</u> ZIP <u>33602</u> PHONE <u>813-225-2500</u>
APPLICATION # <u>MM</u> <u>26-0346</u>	PLEASE PRINT NAME <u>Isabelle Albert</u> MAILING ADDRESS <u>10000 Ashley Dr #900</u> CITY <u>Tampa</u> STATE <u>FL</u> ZIP <u>33602</u> PHONE <u>813-331-0976</u>
APPLICATION # <u>MM</u> <u>26-0346</u>	PLEASE PRINT NAME <u>William Moller</u> MAILING ADDRESS <u>325 S 36th</u> CITY <u>Tampa</u> STATE <u>FL</u> ZIP <u>33602</u> PHONE <u>813-629-8752</u>

SIGN-IN SHEET: RFR, ZHM PHM, LUHOPAGE 7 OF 7DATE/TIME: 3-23-26 6pmHEARING MASTER: Steve LucePLEASE **PRINT CLEARLY**, THIS INFORMATION WILL BE USED FOR MAILING

VS APPLICATION # MM 26-0346	PLEASE PRINT NAME <u>David Lopez</u> MAILING ADDRESS <u>201 E. Kennedy Blvd</u> CITY <u>Tampa</u> STATE <u>FL</u> ZIP <u>33602</u> PHONE _____
VS APPLICATION # MM 26-0346	PLEASE PRINT NAME <u>Shameyah Francis</u> MAILING ADDRESS <u>9501 Tocobaga Place</u> CITY <u>Riverview</u> STATE <u>FL</u> ZIP <u>33578</u> PHONE _____
VS APPLICATION # MM 26-0346	PLEASE PRINT NAME <u>Edwin Gaines JR</u> MAILING ADDRESS <u>9517 Tocobaga Place</u> CITY <u>Riverview</u> STATE <u>FL</u> ZIP <u>33578</u> PHONE _____
VS APPLICATION # MM 26-0346	PLEASE PRINT NAME <u>Dr Laura Hawser</u> MAILING ADDRESS <u>9515 Tocobaga Place</u> CITY <u>Riverview</u> STATE <u>FL</u> ZIP <u>33578</u> PHONE _____
APPLICATION # MM 26-0346	PLEASE PRINT NAME <u>MICHAEL YATES</u> MAILING ADDRESS <u>PAVE TRAFFIC 4006 S. MacDILL Ave</u> CITY <u>TAMPA</u> STATE <u>FL</u> ZIP <u>33611</u> PHONE <u>813 205 8057</u>
APPLICATION #	PLEASE PRINT NAME _____ MAILING ADDRESS _____ CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP _____ PHONE _____

ZHM, PHM, VRH, LUHO

PAGE: 1 of 1

Steve Luce

[illegible]

MARCH 23, 2026 - ZONING HEARING MASTER

The Zoning Hearing Master (ZHM), Hillsborough County, Florida, met in Regular Meeting, scheduled for Monday, March 23, 2026, at 6:00 p.m., in the Boardroom, Frederick B. Karl County Center, Tampa, Florida, and held virtually.

▶ Steve Luce, ZHM, called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and led in the pledge of allegiance to the flag.

A. WITHDRAWALS AND CONTINUANCES

▶ Michelle Heinrich, Development Services (DS), introduced staff and reviewed the changes/withdrawals/continuances.

▶ Steve Luce, ZHM, overview of ZHM process.

▶ Senior Assistant County Attorney Mary Dorman, overview of evidence/ZHM/BOCC Land Use agenda process.

▶ Steve Luce, ZHM, Oath.

B. REMANDS

B.1. RZ 25-1338

▶ Michelle Heinrich, DS, called RZ 25-1338.

▶ Testimony provided.

▶ Steve Luce, ZHM, closed RZ 25-1338.

C. REZONING STANDARD (RZ-STD):

C.1. RZ 26-0359

▶ Michelle Heinrich, DS, called RZ 26-0359.

▶ Testimony provided.

▶ Steve Luce, ZHM, closed RZ 26-0359.

C.2. RZ 26-0457

▶ Michelle Heinrich, DS, called RZ 26-0457.

▶ Testimony provided.

▶ Steve Luce, ZHM, closed RZ 26-0457.

MONDAY, MARCH 23, 2026

C.3. RZ 26-0468

- ▶ Michelle Heinrich, DS, called RZ 26-0468.
- ▶ Testimony provided.
- ▶ Steve Luce, ZHM, closed RZ 26-0468.

D. REZONING-PLANNED DEVELOPMENT (RZ-PD) & MAJOR MODIFICATION (MM) :

D.1. RZ 25-0882

- ▶ Michelle Heinrich, DS, called RZ 25-0882.
- ▶ Testimony provided.
- ▶ Steve Luce, ZHM, closed RZ 25-0882.

D.2. RZ 25-0939

- ▶ Michelle Heinrich, DS, called RZ 25-0939.
- ▶ Testimony provided.
- ▶ Steve Luce, ZHM, closed RZ 25-0939.

D.3. MM 25-1239

- ▶ Michelle Heinrich, DS, announced application MM 25-1239 was withdrawn.

D.4. RZ 25-1386

- ▶ Michelle Heinrich, DS, called RZ 25-1386.
- ▶ Testimony provided.
- ▶ Steve Luce, ZHM, closed RZ 25-1386.

D.5. RZ 25-1387

- ▶ Michelle Heinrich, DS, called RZ 25-1387.
- ▶ Testimony provided.
- ▶ Steve Luce, ZHM, closed RZ 25-1387.

MONDAY, MARCH 23, 2026

D.6. RZ 26-0070

- ▶ Michelle Heinrich, DS, called RZ 26-0070.
- ▶ Testimony provided.
- ▶ Steve Luce, ZHM, closed RZ 26-0070.

D.7. RZ 26-0213

- ▶ Michelle Heinrich, DS, called RZ 26-0213.
- ▶ Testimony provided.
- ▶ Steve Luce, ZHM, closed RZ 26-0213.

D.8. RZ 26-0214

- ▶ Michelle Heinrich, DS, called RZ 26-0214.
- ▶ Testimony provided.
- ▶ Steve Luce, ZHM, closed RZ 26-0214.

D.9. MM 26-0215

- ▶ Michelle Heinrich, DS, called MM 26-0215.
- ▶ Testimony provided.
- ▶ Steve Luce, ZHM, continued MM 26-0215 to April 27, 2026, ZHM hearing.

D.10. MM 26-0335

- ▶ Michelle Heinrich, DS, called MM 26-0335.
- ▶ Testimony provided.
- ▶ Steve Luce, ZHM, closed MM 26-0335.

D.11. MM 26-0346

- ▶ Michelle Heinrich, DS, called MM 26-0346.
- ▶ Testimony provided.

MONDAY, MARCH 23, 2026

▶ Steve Luce, ZHM, closed MM 26-0346.

D.12.RZ 26-0349

▶ Michelle Heinrich, DS, RZ 26-0349 continued to April 27, 2026, ZHM hearing.

E. ZHM SPECIAL USE - **None.**

ADJOURNMENT

▶ Steve Luce, ZHM, adjourned the meeting at 10:05 p.m.



Zoning Hearing Master Hearing

MM 26-0346

March 23, 2026

Application No. MM 26-0346

Name: Isabelle Albert

Entered at Public Hearing: ZHM

Exhibit # 1

Date: 03/23/2026

     CONNECT WITH US. LIKE US. FOLLOW US.

half.com

SITE INFORMATION



- +/- 1.73 ACRES
- RIVERVIEW COMMUNITY PLAN
- URBAN SERVICE AREA
- PD 15-0079 (MM 18-0173)
- SUBURBAN MIXED USE (SMU-6)



CURRENT APPROVALS



PARCEL B:

12,000 square feet of BPO uses and/or a bank/credit union (Max 5,000 SF) and limited to three drive-through lanes. No other drive-throughs are permitted.

20' Rear Setbacks

PARCEL A:
7,500 sf restricted BPO uses, including 2,000 SF restaurant, and minor vehicle repair (Tire Kingdome)

20' buffer, 6' high fence,
10 evergreen @ 10-ft tall

The site plan for Parcel B (150') shows a triangular building and vehicular use area. Key features include:


- Parcel B (150'):** The central triangular area, colored pink, designated for building and vehicular use.
- Setbacks and Buffers:**
 - 35' wide retention area:** Located along the left boundary.
 - 20' Buffer with 8' Precast Masonry Wall & Landscaping:** Located along the top boundary.
 - 150' Call Box Setbacks:** Indicated along the top boundary.
 - 15' Major Modification Area:** Located along the top boundary.
 - 10' Utility Easement:** Located along the bottom boundary.
 - 20' Buffer Easement (Private):** Located along the right boundary.
- Easements:**
 - 160' TECO Easement (O.R. BK 1764, PC 77):** Located along the right boundary.
 - Water Easement (Public):** Located along the right boundary.
 - Central Florida Pipeline Corporation Right of Way Easement (O.R. BK 7750, PG 577) (O.R. BK 8290, PG 1560):** Located along the right boundary.
- Adjacent Properties:**
 - Jaffa-Godiva LLC:** 0764380200, Medical Off C, SMU-6, PD 01-0960.
 - Highland Investors Inc.:** 0766212716, Vacant Townhome, SMU-6, PD 15-0079.
- Other Labels:**
 - Gate:** Located at the bottom left corner.
 - Alafia Trace Blvd.:** Located at the bottom right corner.
 - Vehicle Use Area Only:** A portion of the triangular area.
 - Building Use Area:** A portion of the triangular area.
 - 50' Dimension:** A horizontal dimension across the top of the triangular area.
 - 15' Dimension:** A vertical dimension along the left side of the triangular area.
 - 20' Dimension:** A horizontal dimension along the top left corner.

- Actual distance to residential lot is 185'
- Increase setback to 50'
- Install 8' masonry wall
- Increase the number of trees to 13

- Drive-Thru is accessory to the restaurant (limited to 1)

- 

ROAD CONDITIONS



Lighted Intersection

Based on the traffic analysis, no improvements are required as the road network is constructed per code and FDOT regulations.

AGENCY REVIEW

No objections from reviewing agencies


DEVELOPMENT
SERVICES
DEPARTMENT
APPROVABLE

PLANNING
COMMISSION
STAFF
CONSISTENT



THANK YOU

MM 26-0346



PARTY OF RECORD

NONE