



Agenda Item #1
CRC - 07/25/05

TAMPA BAY REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL
CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council
Pinellas Park, FL 33782

April 25, 2005
9:30 a.m.

REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT:

Mr. Robert Kersteen, Pinellas County, Chair
Mr. Michael Guju, Pinellas County
Deputy Mayor Bob Langford, City of New Port Richey
Councilwoman Virginia Littrell, City of St. Petersburg
Mr. Kathleen Wolf, Pasco County

REPRESENTATIVES ABSENT:

Mr. Richard Albrecht, Pasco County
Commissioner Bill Dodson, City of Plant City
Mayor Ward Friszolowski, City of St. Pete Beach
Reverend James T. Golden, City of Bradenton
Mr. Kenneth Hoyt, Hillsborough County

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mr. Chuck Courtney, King Engineering
Mr. Ken Crews, COO, Two Rivers
Ms. Rhea F. Law, Attorney, Fowler White/Two Rivers
Ms. Gina Miller, Director, HRGTF
Mr. Bill Oliver, Sr. V.P., Tindale-Oliver
Ms. Chris Papandreas, Sr. Planner, King Engineering
Ms. Jennifer Seney, Executive Director, Pasco Wildlife, Inc.
Mr. Sebring Sierra, Vice President, Two Rivers
Mr. Robert A. Williams, Attorney, Fowler White/Two Rivers
Ms. Brenda Winningham, DCA (via speakerphone)
Mr. Manny L. Pumariega, Executive Director, TBRPC
Mr. John Meyer, Principal Planner, TBRPC
Mr. Gerald Smelt, Principal Planner, TBRPC
Mr. Randy Deshazo, Senior Planer, TBRPC
Ms. Rebeca Searcey, Planner, TBRPC
Ms. Sue Young, Secretary, TBRPC

Mr. Robert Kersteen called the meeting of the Clearinghouse Review Committee of the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council to order on April 25, 2005, at 9:30 a.m.

Agenda Item #1 - Minutes

Deputy Mayor Langford moved that the minutes from the March 28, 2005 meeting be approved. Ms. Kathleen Wolf seconded the motion; the motion passed.

Agenda Item #2 - Consent Agenda

Deputy Mayor Langford moved that the consent agenda be approved. Ms. Wolf seconded the motion, and the motion passed.

Agenda Item #3 - Items Removed From the Consent Agenda

None.

Agenda Item #4 - Developments of Regional Impact

A. DRI #262 - Two Rivers, Pasco County

Mr. Meyer made the following presentation:

The purpose of the pre-application conference is an agreement between the applicant and the review agencies as to what the regional issues will be and the methodologies that will be incorporated for the duration of the DRI review. He noted that in the committee members folders are supplemental pages representing comments received from TBRPC's transportation consultant, the Water Management District, Tampa Bay Water and the Department of Environmental Protection.

The applicant is proposing a 3,500-acre multi-use development located in southeast Pasco County. The proposal straddles the Hillsborough County line and is located east of Morris Bridge Road and west of US 301. It is generally south of the anticipated SR 56 extension. As indicated in the report, the buildout of the two-phase project is expected by 2027 and will include 7,000 residential units, 690,000 square feet of commercial and 1.362 million square feet of office space. The developer also has elected to pursue a preliminary development agreement with the Department of Community Affairs. A preliminary development agreement allows the developer to go forward with a limited amount of development while the remainder of the development is undergoing DRI review. In this particular instance, the PDA is for a 530-acre parcel in the southwest corner of the project and will include approximately 500 residential units. Council staff will be participating in the review of this preliminary development agreement proposal. One of the conditions in the preliminary development agreement is a requirement for the ADA to be submitted within a 3-month period following execution of the PDA.

Some of the Council's primary concerns will be the protection of natural resources of regional significance, impact to the transportation system, school impacts and availability of water. A 10-mile radius will be utilized to define the boundaries of the affordable housing analysis. A concern expressed by Council staff regarding the pre-application document is identified on page 15 of the Council's report. It pertains to numerous modifications requested in the housing analysis. Council staff has agreed to the appropriateness of 10 of the 14 modifications requested. The exceptions are stated on this page along with the rationale for our position. As evidenced on page 19 of the Council report, the Council is also opposed to three provisions of the

transportation methodology. These issues pertain to the requirement for all volume over capacity ratios to be 1.0 or less. The second pertains to a minimum background growth rate to be utilized in the transportation analysis. The third issue pertains to the process for calculating the pass-by and internal capture rates.

Upon approval of the pre-application conference report, the applicant will be encouraged to commence preparation of the application for development approval if they have not already done so. In accordance with Rule 9J-2, the review agencies will be provided a period of approximately 50 days following this meeting to provide any final comments regarding the pre-application conference. Any subsequent comments will be appended to the report and sent out in final form.

Ms. Rhea Law, Attorney, Fowler White/Two Rivers, made the following presentation:

She noted that she was surprised by the number of comments that were delivered to them this morning. The developer has had a lot of conversations with the County and various reviewing agencies. They have modified the plan a lot, and it looks like they are going to continue to modify it as they go forward.

This project is really very unique. There are a lot of opportunities, one of which has been focused on by Pasco County. It is right on the Hillsborough/Pasco line. Morris Bridge Road is on the west and US 301 is on the east. The dotted line across the top is proposed for SR 56 connection. That roadway is very important; it is an east/west connector between I-75 and Zephyrhills. It has also been identified by Pasco County Economic Development as an area they would like to see as an employment corridor. It is more than just an additional roadway. There are a lot of projects in this area; there is an opportunity to work together, not only in the alignment and the construction of the road, but also to focus on how this employment corridor might come to fruition.

Indian Creek runs north and south through this project, giving a rich opportunity for environment protection and focus for the community. The property's primary use has been cattle ranching for many years. It is improved pasture.

The project is about 3500 acres. The job creation areas include office and commercial. There is approximately 1.4 million square feet of office in the corridor. The Town Center is 387,000 square feet. There is one other commercial area located along Morris Bridge Road. The designation of these areas has been set in conjunction with Pasco County. She was surprised in looking at Pasco's County's comments that they wanted to move some from Phase 1 to Phase 2. More conversations will take place. Phase 1 is through 2017; Phase 2 is through 2027.

Ms. Law made one last comment relating to the PD&E study that will need to be done on SR56. The current PD&E study is along the northern section of this property, but it is running right through the Pasco County jail site. That probably is not going to work, so we will need to revise the study.

The developer will be working with the various agencies on each of the issues. They will follow up with the Regional Planning Council on the transportation issue, and they will address the affordable housing issues.

Questions and comments followed.

Ms. Wolf asked why schools are exempted. Mr. Meyer answered that this pertains to school construction; impacts to the school system are analyzed under the education issue.

Mr. Guju noted that the St. Petersburg Times had a long article on concurrency in yesterday's paper. The two major areas the article discussed were education and roads. Infrastructure for education and roads, in his opinion, should be in and well developed by the time this project is up and running. What are the things that are being done to ensure that the roads and education systems are intact so we avoid portables in education, as well as burdening our current road structure?

Ms. Law stated that the legislature is now suggesting some significant funding to address some of the needs that have occurred over time. Concurrency speaks to having the services in effect at the time of the impact. The development order will address that.

Ms. Cooper noted that the western school site may have regionally significant resources on it.

Ms. Law described the County's goal of creating an employment corridor. They want to have more than just employment on these particular parcels, all the way along SR56 in the appropriate locations.

Mr. Kersteen said he had read a St. Petersburg Times article this morning about growth. It stated that growth does not pay for itself. He noted that in the years St. Petersburg had growth, the 60's through the end of the 70's, the budgets were not as much a problem as they have been lately because growth was fueling the tax intake. When a developer comes in, the developer provides the roads at no cost, also water, sewer, piping, drainage. What really troubles him is what the tax payment is for the land predevelopment versus what it is after development. It's sometimes a huge windfall, which in this case becomes income to Pasco County government. Is there any way to study this to assist the growth management committees, which will be meeting shortly?

Ms. Law stated there are two responses to that. DCA has been attempting to have a statewide way to calculate the real impact and the costs associated with growth. The methodology has not received total acceptance yet. What we are also seeing, though, is that, in general, the valuation across the state has been going up. So, in addition to the roads you are seeing, you are seeing a valuation on land in place going up much more. Her final comment is that office and commercial are contributors.

Ms. Jennifer Seney, Executive Director of Pasco Wildlife, Inc., had some comments to make. She stated she lives and works in Pasco County. Her sole reason to be here today is to see the direction in which this DRI may go in conjunction with the project in Hillsborough. This is actually a project that is 3,500 acres in Pasco County. In the future it may also be a separate project, but attached by virtue of being next to it, are approximately 1,700 to 1,800 acres in Hillsborough. Her concern is that we not forget that this project is contiguous to the project to the south and that we should take that into account. Her fear is that planning is done in small squares. She stated that the regional planning council is the body from which regionality can come. It is very difficult to get both county jurisdictions to work together. They have different comprehensive

plans, different LDR's, different processes for getting the job done. She is here to encourage this body to lead the counties into a cooperative effort on this.

What disturbs her is that to the south there is an environmental community for land use designation and 12 inches away there is a traditional DRI. That is the difference in jurisdictions. To the south of the border we are talking about perhaps a total of 1,200 on 1,700 acres, probably far less, and to the north we are talking commercial, residential. There is very little difference other than a geopolitical boundary between the two pieces of land. They both contain Indian Creek, which feeds into the Hillsborough River; why would the two jurisdictions treat them differently? She would like to encourage agencies to keep in mind that we do live next to each other and what we do on the north of this boundary affects the south of the boundary, and ultimately the Hillsborough River. She is concerned about 10 to 25 years away, after the windfall. She noted Mr. Kersteen had mentioned that St. Petersburg has had a little trouble with their budget now, because they have no growth. That is exactly what she is talking about. The key is balance.

Ms. Littrell stated she wanted to clarify a statement. Mr. Kersteen did not say that St. Petersburg has no growth. St. Petersburg has actually issued more growth permits this year than ever in the history of the city.

Ms. Cooper noted that what Mr. Kersteen said about dealing with the infrastructure and the DRI paying for its roads, etc. is correct. The whole idea behind the regional review is to look at those impacts outside of the jurisdiction. How to deal with the impact on roadways is analyzed as part of the DRI process.

Ms. Law stated that the property to the south is very different from the property to the north. What is being proposed in Hillsborough County is not a development at this time, but rather a comprehensive plan designation that focuses on adding to the regional environmental resources of a large regional resource, the Hillsborough River State Park. There are areas in here that are being set aside in order to add to the resources; that is what the comprehensive plan designation is all about. Also, the list of agencies on the handout indicates that this is very much a regional review.

Mr. Meyer reiterated that Hillsborough County has participated in the review of this Two Rivers DRI proposal and will continue to review the proposal as it goes forward in the DRI review process. Regarding the parcel to the south, Council staff is aware of that, and the developer will be required to address adjacent land holdings as part of the Application for Development Approval (ADA). The appropriateness of aggregation will need to be determined by DCA.

Ms. Wolf made a motion to approve the pre-application conference report. Deputy Mayor Langford seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Agenda Item #5 - Other Business - Chairman

None.

Agenda Item #6 - Announcement of Next Meeting Date

The next meeting will be announced as needed.

Agenda Item #7 - Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 10:06 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Young, Recording Secretary

Mr. Robert Kersteen, Chair