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On motion of Bruce P. Curry, Seconded by Theodore Trent Green, R.A.

The following resolution was adopted:

WHEREAS, the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission, in accordance with Laws of Florida, has developed a long-range comprehensive plan for unincorporated Hillsborough County entitled the Future of Hillsborough: a Comprehensive Plan for Unincorporated Hillsborough County, pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 163, Part II, Florida Statutes and Chapter 97-351, Laws of Florida, as amended; and

WHEREAS, the Board of County Commissioners of Hillsborough County has adopted the Future of Hillsborough: a Comprehensive Plan for Unincorporated Hillsborough County by Ordinance 89-28, as amended; and

WHEREAS, the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission staff has submitted a plan amendment on behalf of the citizens within the University Area Community Plan boundary area to amend the Livable Communities Element to update the University Community Area Community Plan as currently adopted; and

WHEREAS, the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission has reviewed the proposal, has considered existing and expected future development patterns and community facilities in the respective area, as well as the adopted goals, objectives and policies of the Future of Hillsborough Comprehensive Plan as follows, As described in the attached staff report dated January 14, 2013:
**Future Land Use Element**

**Goal:** Ensure that the character and location of land uses optimizes the combined potentials for economic benefit and the enjoyment and the protection of natural resources while minimizing the threat to health, safety and welfare posed by hazards, nuisances, incompatible land uses, and environmental degradation.

**Urban Service Area**

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

**Policy 1.2: Minimum Density**

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

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

**Policy 1.3:**

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

- Development at a density of 75% of the category or greater would not be compatible (as defined in Policy 1.4) and would adversely impact with the existing development pattern within a 1,000 foot radius of the proposed development;
- Infrastructure (Including but not limited to water, sewer, stormwater and transportation) is not planned or programmed to support development.
• Development would have an adverse impact on environmental features on the site or adjacent to the property.
• The site is located in the Coastal High Hazard Area.
• The rezoning is restricted to agricultural uses and would not permit the further subdivision for residential lots.

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

**Neighborhood/Community Development**

**Policy 16.3:**
Development and redevelopment shall be integrated with the adjacent land uses through:

a.) the creation of like uses; or
b.) creation of complementary uses; or
c.) mitigation of adverse impacts; and
d.) transportation/pedestrian connections

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

1.0 Community and Special Area Studies

Purpose of Community and Special Area Studies
Community and Special Area Studies are intended to be extensions and refinements of the County’s Comprehensive Plan. The studies should discuss the special and unique characteristics of the areas under study and examine the issues and problems facing the areas and provide strategies for solutions. They are meant to portray a vision for the future and may have an impact on zoning. Community and Special Area Studies are to be developed through an extensive citizen participation program.

The Comprehensive Plan is general in nature and provides guidance on an issue countywide. A community or special area study is more detailed in nature and is intended to provide specific recommendations on issues in a particular area of the county.

The County’s Comprehensive Plan, for example, would permit consideration of commercial use at all major intersections. A Community or Special Area Study may specify certain locations for commercial development. Further, community or special area studies may define the form (or character) of commercial development, such as a Main Street, town center, strip or shopping center.

Another example is that, while the County’s Comprehensive Plan does not identify all public facilities, a Community or Special Area Study could identify major public facilities such as schools, parks, libraries and the infrastructure needed to support the community or area under study.

The general steps for the community and special area study preparation would be defining community or area boundaries, preparing a plan for citizen participation, collecting data (including input from the citizens), analyzing data, extracting and prioritizing issues and recommending solutions and bringing them forward in a public setting. The citizen participation component is expected throughout the planning process.

There are three components of a community or special area study:

1. Comprehensive plan amendments to incorporate the appropriate sections of the study(s) into the adopted comprehensive plan and to make any necessary adjustments;
2. Land development regulations (LDR’s) to address the special and unique
development issues identified; and
3. A capital improvements program to identify the future infrastructure issues.

Community or Special Area Studies will be adopted as part of the County’s Comprehensive
Plan. The study will include strategies that will be included in the existing comprehensive
plan, land development regulations and a capital improvement program as mentioned above.
These changes will be the tools for implementation.

It is recognized that from time to time, compliance with regulations implementing
community plans may create unforeseen hardships for particular properties. Therefore, the
Comprehensive Plan contemplates allowing a procedure for requesting variances from the
regulations implementing provisions of community plans. The procedure for requesting a
variance from the regulations implementing provisions of community plans and the criteria
for granting such a variance shall be those procedures and criteria set out in Hillsborough
County’s Land Development Code for variances.

UNIVERSITY AREA COMMUNITY PLAN

Section B
Eliminate Economically Obsolete Land Uses by:

- advocating local business and home ownership to promote community
  stability and reinvestment.

- discouraging criminal activity and providing a sense of security for area
  residents through implementation of CPTED (Crime Prevention through
  Environmental Design) principles;

- maintaining a variety of land-use options and promoting mixed-use
  development in the area;

- developing a zoning district that creates stable, pedestrian friendly
  neighborhoods with compatible mixed uses, a variety of housing types,
  and tree lined main streets and boulevards;

- providing greater flexibility in land-use and density for future
  development while ensuring that neighborhood buffers and urban
  amenities are enhanced;
• creating unified pedestrian links between land uses by means of community Main Streets and side walks;

• encouraging the redevelopment of sub-standard and deteriorated housing focused along main streets through mixed land uses and higher densities; and

**Section D**

Ensure Community Input by:

• implementing the strategies and principles contained in the Master Plan in a collaborative and holistic manner to encourage participation by the stakeholders of the University Area Community; and

• coordinating future development in the area with input from residents, property owners, and other representatives from the community.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission finds CPA 12-25 University Area Community Plan Update CONSISTENT with the Future of Hillsborough Comprehensive Plan and recommends the plan amendment be approved.
I. PROPOSED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT

A. Description of Request

Request: This is a publicly initiated text amendment intended to update the vision statement, goals and strategies of the adopted University Area Community Plan using the standards outlined in the Staff Community Planning Guide. The adopted community plan establishes a revised boundary for the area being affected by the amendment due to annexations by the City of Temple Terrace.

The University Area Community Plan area is in north-central unincorporated Hillsborough County and is bordered by the City of Tampa on the west and south, and the Cities of Tampa and Temple Terrace on the east. The northern boundary is Skipper Road/Bearss Avenue/Bruce B. Downs Boulevard up to North 30th Street/Bruce B. Down Boulevard, and East Fletcher Avenue from North 50th Street to the Hillsborough River.

BACKGROUND
In 1998, the Hillsborough County Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) unanimously approved a community-based planning program in response to citizen concerns. An audit of countywide planning programs was presented to the BOCC in spring 2011.

In response to the audit, the Staff Community Plan Guide for unincorporated Hillsborough County was developed by staff in collaboration with the Development Services Department and members of the public. The Planning Commission and Hillsborough County have worked together to develop this Community Plan Guide for staff to utilize in the preparation of new community plans and updates of existing ones. The purpose of the Staff Guide is to provide consistency with regard to format and content in the Community Plans; ensure Community Plans are not regulatory in nature and are not duplicative or conflict with established regulations. The proposed text amendment is the first Community Plan update developed using the Staff Community Planning Guide (October 2012).
The Hillsborough County Board of County Commissioners directed the Planning Commission to update the adopted community plans every ten years. The University Area Community Plan became effective February 28, 2001 and therefore, the process to update it began in 2011, to be completed in 2012.

**Public and Stakeholder Engagement**

Planning Commission staff:

- conducted 27 Stakeholder interviews with key businesses, organizations, and agencies,
- held three Open Houses and four Advisory Committee meetings working with residents, civic leaders, business owners, and organizational representatives in the development of the plan update, and
- conducted both a website survey and a one-on-one citizen issue and major corridor business survey

The plan update incorporates changes to the adopted plan vision, goals, and strategies based on a review of the existing plan, what has been completed since adoption, what has and has not been completed and on changes in existing conditions.

- Changes to the adopted University Area Community Plan are generally limited to text changes reflecting strategies that have been completed through implementation in the County’s Land Development Code since the Plan’s adoption, text changes supporting recommendations of recent transportation and housing and redevelopment studies completed for this area, and the addition of two new recommendations.

- The first new recommendation is to revise the Land Development Code in the University Community Area-Main Street and Neighborhood Office (NHO) zoning districts related to stormwater design along with common architectural themes; and in both the Special-University Community (SPI-UC) 1, 2, 3 and 4; and the Main Street and NHO zoning districts related to fencing and Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) features for new development.

- The second new recommendation recognizes 131st Avenue as an economically important east-west corridor. Other minor changes will be to clarify language have also been made.

- Changes to the boundary of the University Area Community are being made to reflect annexations of 3 small areas east of 56th Street by the City of Temple Terrace since the adoption of the plan.
• Changes are provided in strikethrough and underline format in Attachment A, along with a copy of the revised boundary map for the area being affected by the amendment.

**Impact:** The text amendment consists of the vision, goals and strategies of the University Area Community Plan as it seeks to maintain, preserve and encourage the redevelopment of the suburban characteristics, atmosphere, and quality of life; continuing to improve the viability of residential types, pedestrian and public transit, and economic development within the area to provide a stable live and work environment for residents in order to provide a strong, diversified economic base for the community. It also encourages new and existing infrastructure in order to keep the University Area Community an attractive, functional, and safe place for visitors and local residents.

**B. Review Agency/Department Responses**

Copies of agency responses are included as an attachment to this report. No objections were received.

*See Section IV. Review Agency Comments*

**C. Conformance with the Future of Hillsborough 2025 Comprehensive Plan**

Staff has determined that the following Comprehensive Plan Policies are relevant to the proposed plan amendment.

**Future Land Use Element**

**Goal:** Ensure that the character and location of land uses optimizes the combined potentials for economic benefit and the enjoyment and the protection of natural resources while minimizing the threat to health, safety and welfare posed by hazards, nuisances, incompatible land uses, and environmental degradation.

**Urban Service Area**

**Objective 1:** Hillsborough County shall pro-actively direct new growth into the urban service area with the goal that at least 80% of all population growth will occur within the USA during the planning horizon of this Plan. Within the Urban Service Area, Hillsborough County will not impede agriculture. Building permit activity and other similar measures will be used to evaluate this objective.
Policy 1.2: Minimum Density
All new residential or mixed use land use categories within the USA shall have a density of 4 du/ga or greater unless environmental features or existing development patterns do not support those densities.

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

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

- Development at a density of 75% of the category or greater would not be compatible (as defined in Policy 1.4) and would adversely impact with the existing development pattern within a 1,000 foot radius of the proposed development;
- Infrastructure (Including but not limited to water, sewer, stormwater and transportation) is not planned or programmed to support development.
- Development would have an adverse impact on environmental features on the site or adjacent to the property.
- The site is located in the Coastal High Hazard Area.
- The rezoning is restricted to agricultural uses and would not permit the further subdivision for residential lots.

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

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

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

Livable Communities Element

1.0 Community and Special Area Studies

Purpose of Community and Special Area Studies
Community and Special Area Studies are intended to be extensions and refinements of the County’s Comprehensive Plan. The studies should discuss the special and unique characteristics of the areas under study and examine the issues and problems facing the areas and provide strategies for solutions. They are meant to portray a vision for the future and may have an impact on zoning. Community and Special Area Studies are to be developed through an extensive citizen participation program.

The Comprehensive Plan is general in nature and provides guidance on an issue county-wide. A community or special area study is more detailed in nature and is intended to provide specific recommendations on issues in a particular area of the county.

The County’s Comprehensive Plan, for example, would permit consideration of commercial use at all major intersections. A Community or Special Area Study may specify certain locations for commercial development. Further, community or special area studies may define the form (or character) of commercial development, such as a Main Street, town center, strip or shopping center.

Another example is that, while the County’s Comprehensive Plan does not identify all public facilities, a Community or Special Area Study could identify major public facilities such as schools, parks, libraries and the infrastructure needed to support the community or area under study.
The general steps for the community and special area study preparation would be defining community or area boundaries, preparing a plan for citizen participation, collecting data (including input from the citizens), analyzing data, extracting and prioritizing issues and recommending solutions and bringing them forward in a public setting. The citizen participation component is expected throughout the planning process.

There are three components of a community or special area study:

1. Comprehensive plan amendments to incorporate the appropriate sections of the study(s) into the adopted comprehensive plan and to make any necessary adjustments;
2. Land development regulations (LDR’s) to address the special and unique development issues identified; and
3. A capital improvements program to identify the future infrastructure issues.

Community or Special Area Studies will be adopted as part of the County’s Comprehensive Plan. The study will include strategies that will be included in the existing comprehensive plan, land development regulations and a capital improvement program as mentioned above. These changes will be the tools for implementation.

It is recognized that from time to time, compliance with regulations implementing community plans may create unforeseen hardships for particular properties. Therefore, the Comprehensive Plan contemplates allowing a procedure for requesting variances from the regulations implementing provisions of community plans. The procedure for requesting a variance from the regulations implementing provisions of community plans and the criteria for granting such a variance shall be those procedures and criteria set out in Hillsborough County’s Land Development Code for variances.

UNIVERSITY AREA COMMUNITY PLAN

Section B
Eliminate Economically Obsolete Land Uses by:

- advocating local business and home ownership to promote community stability and reinvestment.
- discouraging criminal activity and providing a sense of security for area residents through implementation of CPTED (Crime Prevention through Environmental Design) principles;
- maintaining a variety of land-use options and promoting mixed-use development in the area;
• developing a zoning district that creates stable, pedestrian friendly neighborhoods with compatible mixed uses, a variety of housing types, and tree lined main streets and boulevards;

• providing greater flexibility in land-use and density for future development while ensuring that neighborhood buffers and urban amenities are enhanced;

• creating unified pedestrian links between land uses by means of community Main Streets and sidewalks;

• encouraging the redevelopment of sub-standard and deteriorated housing focused along main streets through mixed land uses and higher densities; and

Section D
Ensure Community Input by:
• implementing the strategies and principles contained in the Master Plan in a collaborative and holistic manner to encourage participation by the stakeholders of the University Area Community; and

• coordinating future development in the area with input from residents, property owners, and other representatives from the community.

Staff Analysis
The University Community Area Master Plan prepared in 1997 recognized the area as having “significant potential for revitalization and redevelopment if certain impediments are improved and the advantages of its natural location and people are seized upon and successfully marketed.” These assets included proximity to regional assets (which in addition to University of South Florida, University Mall), and both the Veterans and University Community Hospitals (now Florida Hospitals).

The Master Plan called for a reinvestment in public infrastructure in the form of sidewalks and streetscaping to create a new neighborhood identity “the creation of an identifiable character, and a new, affordable owner-occupied housing neighborhood that includes traffic calming features, a pedestrian lifestyle, and a variety of housing types.” Staff reviewed the implementation success of the adopted Master Plan and has included changes to the adopted University Area Community Plan that are generally limited to text changes reflecting strategies that have been completed through implementation in the County’s Land Development Code since the Plan’s adoption, text changes supporting recommendations of recent transportation and housing and redevelopment
studies completed for this area, and the addition of two new recommendations to revise the Land Development Code noted above.

Other minor changes will be to clarify language have also been made. Other proposed additions and changes to the community plan, as currently adopted reflect a continuation of the Plan’s original findings. Specifically, as these changes apply to areas beyond the major streets networks of North 22nd Street, North 30th Street/Bruce B. Downs Boulevard, East Fletcher Avenue, North Nebraska Avenue, and East Fowler Avenue. They are related to continuing to improve the viability of residential types, pedestrian and public transit, and economic development within the area to provide a stable live and work environment for residents.

Hillsborough County, through the then Planning and Growth Management Department (now Development Services Department) received an Urban Infill and Redevelopment Assistance Planning Grant from the Florida Department of Community Areas in March 2001. The program encourages the redevelopment of Florida’s urban cores and provides economic assistance for the preparation and implementation of community redevelopment plans. The grant allowed Hillsborough County to update the 1997 Master Plan and designate Sub-Areas 1 and 2 as an Urban Infill and Redevelopment Area (UIRA). Once the community plan is adopted a next step should be to submit an application to renew the UIRA designation based on redevelopment which has occurred since its original adoption.

Insights and opinions were gathered via an online survey, one-to-one business survey, individual interviews and a series of topical roundtables which included Housing, Transportation and Economic Development.

Baseline data for the University Area Community planning area was completed at beginning of the process and included in the Background Report included as an attachment. An Overview, geography, demographics, socioeconomic and income, building activity and land use information was provided as a set of tables, charts, graphs and maps. (See Attachment A, University Area Community Plan Data report dated September 2011.)

Existing Neighborhood Character
1. North of Fletcher Avenue, west of Bruce B. Downs Boulevard
   UAC Zoning district along 22nd Avenue, potential for redevelopment
2. South of Fletcher Avenue, west of Bruce B. Downs Boulevard
   Housing Initiatives, VA Hospital, Bruce B. Downs traffic, sidewalks
3. North of Fletcher, east of Bruce B. Downs Boulevard
Medical services support uses, Hospitals. USF housing
4. Adjacent to the City of Temple Terrace
   Code enforcement, crime, long range annexation by City of Temple Terrace, sidewalks

- There have also been a number of plans/studies that are specific to the areas within the boundary of the University Area Community Plan or contain sections that are directed to areas within the community plan boundary which provide(d) information related to identified issues within the community, and for Hillsborough County generally. Some included recommendations that were developed out valid public participation processes, vetted by community Citizens. Several of he identified strategies of the Plan make reference to recommendations of these plans/studies as a guide for implementation. These documents are:

1. Community Plan Background document,
2. Recommendations of University of South Florida Area Multimodal Transportation District,
3. Evaluation & Transportation Needs for the University Area,
4. Tampa Walk Bike Plan,
5. Pedestrian & Bicycle High Crash Areas Strategic Plan the Unincorporated Hillsborough,
6. Recommendations identified by the District I, of the Hillsborough County Sheriff’s Office,
7. 2012 University Area Rental/Redevelopment Plan,
8. Livable Roadways Guidelines,
9. Hillsborough County Post-Disaster Redevelopment Plan, and

References to these documents are included in the University Area Community Plan Background attached as backup to this report.

Staff Conclusions and Recommendation

Staff finds the CPA 12-25 CONSISTENT with the Future of Hillsborough Comprehensive Plan and recommends the Planning Commission APPROVE the attached resolution (with Attachment A) recommending adoption to the Board of County Commissioners.

Staff Report by: Pedro Parra, Principal Planner  
Date: January 14, 2013
This page left intentionally blank.
Attachment A

Proposed Text In Strikethrough and Underline
This page left intentionally blank.
Disclaimer:

- This community plan demonstrates Hillsborough County’s commitment to use the community plan vision, goals, strategies, and action plan when evaluating and deciding on matters pertaining to the community plan area. The Community Plan does not legally obligate the County to implement or commit public funds for any of the goals or strategies presented.
- The goals and strategies are listed in the community’s priority order.
- Documents listed herein, unless previously adopted by the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC), constitute a reference to planning and design practices. No BOCC adoption by reference of these documents is intended.

Vision

The University Area Community Plan Master Plan (Master Plan) will strive to create a stable, safe, and livable community through physical revitalization which establishes positive neighborhood identity and provides community design guidelines to achieve a pedestrian friendly, mixed use area that will serve the needs of the citizens of the University Area Community.

The Master Plan, Community Plan was originally published as "The University Community Area: A Master Plan for Physical Revitalization. The Community Plan will promote the redevelopment and revitalization of the University Area Community while addressing the interdependent relationship between the area’s regional assets and the surrounding local businesses and neighborhoods. These assets include, the University of South Florida, University Mall, the University Area Community Development Center, and surrounding medical facilities including the Veterans and University Community hospitals, and residential neighborhoods.

Goals and Strategies

The University Area Community Master Plan Area, as shown on the boundary map on the previous page, delineates the boundaries that were established during the community planning process to develop the Master Plan and within which the following strategies are to be considered. A specific area within the study area will be defined to which these strategies will apply.
Goal 1: Build Community Infrastructure

Section A

Build New Community Infrastructure by:
The community supports:
• within the context of overall county priorities, implementing infrastructure projects as recommended within the context of overall county priorities, and as feasible in the Master Plan Community Plan Background document through a combination of public and private funding;
• creating and continuing the stormwater management planning efforts utilizing the recommended projects and environmental design principles contained in the Master Plan within the community plan area;
• creating a network of boulevards, main streets, and pedestrian links (sidewalks/trails) to facilitate mobility and non-motorized travel within the University Area Community; and
• where appropriate, implementing traffic calming techniques including traffic islands and roundabouts, where appropriate;
• the design and planning recommendations of:
  – the University of South Florida Area Multimodal Transportation District, Study Area Evaluation & Transportation Needs for the University Area,
  – Tampa Walk Bike Plan, and
  – Pedestrian & Bicycle High Crash Areas Strategic Plan the Unincorporated Hillsborough

Goal 2: Eliminate Obsolete Land Uses

Section B

Eliminate Economically Obsolete Land Uses by:
The community supports:
• advocating local business and home ownership to promote community stability and reinvestment;
• discouraging criminal activity and providing a sense of security for area residents through implementation of CPTED (Crime Prevention through Environmental Design) principles;
• working with the Hillsborough County Sheriff’s Office and other stakeholders to develop strategies for crime prevention and public safety with the UAC boundary;
• maintaining a variety of land-use options and promotion mixed-use developments in the area
developing and implementing the University Area Community Main Street and Neighborhood Office zoning districts to create stable, pedestrian friendly neighborhoods with compatible mixed uses, a variety of housing types, and tree lined main streets and boulevards;

improvement to East 131st Avenue should support it as a neighborhood east-west corridor, looking at appropriate design features and roadway layouts that support pedestrian and local circulator connectors;

providing greater flexibility in land-use and density for future development while ensuring that neighborhood buffers and urban amenities are enhanced;

creating unified pedestrian links between land uses by means of community Main Streets and sidewalks;

encouraging the redevelopment of sub-standard and deteriorated housing focused along main streets through mixed land uses and higher densities;

encouraging public and private collaboration to implement strategies 1, 2 and 3 of the 2012 University Area Rental/Redevelopment Study.

The County will, where feasible:

revise the Land Development Code in the University Community Area zoning districts (UCA-MS and NHO) to:

1. achieve a common architectural theme similar to public structures and roadway landscaping built since the district was established;

2. allow alternate design techniques, in accordance with the Stormwater Technical Manual, such as natural sloping and limited fencing that improve the aesthetic and amenity value of stormwater management facilities; and

3. encourage a common architectural theme to public structures and roadway landscaping built since the district was established

to ensure safety and quality of life, the County will in collaboration with the Hillsborough County Sheriff’s Office maintain a strategic program for crime prevention and public safety within the UCA boundary. The strategic program will identify and implement actions appropriate both for the UAC as a whole and for specific areas within the UAC boundary. Tools, techniques and programs expected to reduce crime and promote public safety may include but not be limited to:

• Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) applied to building and site design;

• Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) applied to public spaces;
• revisions to the Special Public Interest University Community and University Community zoning districts (SPI-UC-1,2,3 and 4 and UCA-MS and NHO to support CPTED principles;
• enhanced police presence/community policing;
• street lighting;
• surveillance cameras with monitoring;
• emergency call boxes;
• improved bike/pedestrian crossings; and
• traffic control improvements

Tools, techniques and programs for crime prevention and public safety will be evaluated in terms of:
• effectiveness;
• cost of initial implementation (public and private);
• operational and maintenance cost (public and private); and
• community and public resources required for effective implementation.

• In recognition of 131st Avenue (North 30th Street/Bruce B. Downs to North Nebraska Avenue) as an economically important east-west corridor, the County will prepare a Strategic Redevelopment Plan for revitalization of the corridor in keeping with the Comprehensive Plan’s Design Component. The strategic redevelopment plan will consider both the public and private implications of various design options, and identify a combination of regulations, investments and incentives required to achieve the desired result over a period of time.

Goal 3: Create Community Identity

Section C
Create Community Identity by:

The community supports:
• developing physical improvements such as landscaping, gateways, sidewalks, signage, and street trees to define community identity; and
• using landscape buffers and urban design guidelines/features/techniques to reduce conflicts between land uses, to promote high quality development, and to create an identifiable community character;
• the use of Hillsborough County code enforcement to assist in regulating land-use and improving community identity and safety.
Goal 4: Ensure Community Input

Section D
Ensure Community Input by:

The community supports:

• implementing the strategies and principles contained in the Master University Area Community Plan in a collaborative and holistic manner to encourage participation by the stakeholders of the University Area Community; and
• coordinating future development in the area with input from residents, property owners, and other representatives from the community;
• creating a citizen-based umbrella organization that will ensure that the Vision, Goals and Strategies of this community plan are implemented:
  • provide a joint forum for public, private and non-profit community and neighborhood groups/associations to meet and discuss community issues
  • work in partnership with the public, private and non-profit sectors
  • monitor and comment on:
    – capital improvement plans,
    – Comprehensive Plan changes,
    – new development proposals and negotiations (e.g., rezonings, public facilities, public works projects)
  • pursue and/or encourage public and private sector grant sources
  • encourage conservation projects
  • encourage other civic programs
  • create awareness of opportunities for participation

Goal 5: Economic Development

Section E

Delineation of Urban Infill and Redevelopment Area

The community supports:

• For the purpose of implementing the principles and strategies of the University Area Community Master Plan, Hillsborough County has designated an Urban Infill and Redevelopment Area for the area delineated on the Urban and Infill Redevelopment Area Map (Figure 17A) and as defined by s. 163.2514 (2), F.S. The geographic limits of this area encompass those areas designated in the Master Plan as sub-area 1 and sub-area 2 and more clearly defined as the area is bounded by I-275 to the west, Skipper Road to the north, Bruce B. Downs to the
east, and Fowler Avenue to the south. Within this area, the following components will be promoted: economic development; job creation; housing; transportation; crime prevention; neighborhood revitalization and preservation; and land use incentives to encourage urban infill and redevelopment within the University Area Community.:

- implementing the recommendations of the Hillsborough County Post-Disaster Redevelopment Plan;
- implementing the recommendations of the Economic Development Areas and Economic Potential Evaluation studies for the Future of Hillsborough Comprehensive Plan; and
- evaluating the application of an area-wide brownfield designation for the University Area Community.
Map Series

University Area Community Plan Boundary Map
2010 Aerial Photography
2025 Adopted Future Land Use
Existing Land Use
Hillsborough County Zoning
This page left intentionally blank.
This page left intentionally blank.
Agency Comments

As of January 3, 2013

City of Temple Terrace – December 10, 2012
The City of Temple Terrace has no formal comments regarding the above referenced projects. One small error I will note is the spelling of ‘Multimodal’ on Page 2 of the Goals and Strategies. The Community Development staff requests that once formally adopted, a presentation is made to the City Council regarding the new goals and strategies specifically for the areas that border our jurisdiction.

Development Services Department (DSD) – November 27, 2012

- DSD staff agrees with the overall intent of the plan recognizing the University area as prime for redevelopment.

- The Plan notes that: “This community plan demonstrates Hillsborough County’s commitment to use the community plan vision, goals, strategies, and action plan when evaluating and deciding on matters pertaining to the community plan area. The Community Plan does not legally obligate the County to implement or commit public funds for any of the goals or strategies represented.” However, some strategies in the plan are in contradiction with the statement above when they specifically that “the County will” implement a specific strategy (see Goal 2)[,]

- DSD staff identified several strategies of the Plan make reference to other plans, documents and recommendations as guide for implementation. These documents are:
  1. Community Plan Background document,
  2. Recommendations of University of South Florida Area Multimodal Transportation District,
  3. Evaluation & Transportation Needs for the University Area,
  4. Tampa Walk Bike Plan,
  5. Pedestrian & Bicycle High Crash Areas Strategic Plan the Unincorporated Hillsborough[,]
  6. Recommendations identified by the District 1, of the Hillsborough County Sheriff’s Office[,]
  7. 2012 University Area Rental/Redevelopment Plan[,]
  8. Livable Roadways Guidelines[,]
  9. Hillsborough County Post-Disaster Redevelopment Plan[, and]

- These plans, documents and recommendations are not included in the text amendment package submitted to Development Services and do not show a formal reference of adoption or previous review by the Hillsborough County Board of County Commissioners. Please keep in mind that Florida Statutes 163.3177(b) states:

  "(b) A local government may include, as part of its adopted plan, documents adopted by reference but not incorporated verbatim into the plan. The adoption by reference must identify the title and author of the document and indicate clearly what provisions and edition of the document is being adopted."

- DSD staff finds that the planning intent of most of the referenced documents is proper for the implementation of the goals, objectives and policies of the Comprehensive Plan (in general) and the Long Range Transportation Plan.

- The Plan text amendment made specific references to amend the County's Land Development Code. DSD staff finds that the amendments to the LDC listed below are feasible to implement:
  - Revise the University Community Area zoning districts (UCA-MS and NHO) to achieve a common architectural theme similar structures and roadway landscaping.
  - Revise the Special Public Interest University Community and University Community Area zoning districts (SPI-UC-1, 2, 3 and 4 and UCA-MS and NHO) to support crime reduction and safety:
    - In new non-residential and multi-family development use aesthetic durable opaque fencing; and
    - Implement Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) features for new development based on input from the Hillsborough County Sheriff’s Office, Code Enforcement and Development Services Departments during development review.

- DSD staff agrees on the potential of 131st [Avenue] within the University area. The Community Plan calls the County to recognize 131st Avenue (from North 30th Street/Bruce B. Downs Boulevard to North Nebraska) as an economically important east-west corridor and a future premium transportation corridor (e.g., dedicated lane/fixed rail). The Planning Commission staff report does not offer an evaluation of the impacts and feasibility of this proposed change under the suggested use of the
Livable Roadways Guidelines and Comprehensive Plan Community Design Component policies.

- The community plan calls to create a citizen-based umbrella organization for implementation defining specific roles. DSD staff feels that the plan needs to clarify or suggest the nature of the proposed organization; advisory board (subject to sunshine), non-profit, etc.

- DSD staff recommends the Planning Commission prepare a financial impact statement as requested by the Board before the adoption of any community plan.

Environmental Protection Commission (EPC) – November 5, 2012
Staff from the Environmental Protection Commission of Hillsborough (EPC) has conducted a review of the subject October 2012 Comprehensive Plan Amendments and does not object to the language proposed.

Hillsborough Area Regional Transit Authority (HART) – October 26, 2012
HART has reviewed the comprehensive plan text amendment for University Community Plan Update. HART’s comments are on the following draft goals and strategies.

Goal 1
Strategy to implement recommendations of the USF Area Multimodal Transportation District, Study Area Evaluation & Transportation Need for the University Area, Tampa Walk Bike Plan, and Pedestrian & Bicycle High Crash Areas Strategic Plan of Unincorporated Hillsborough County.

HART concurs. All the plans encourage safe connection to transit.

Goal 2
Strategies identifying East 131st Avenue for as a future premium transportation corridor and recognizing East 131st Avenue as an economically important east-west corridor and as such will emphasize the use of Livable Roadways Guidelines and Comprehensive Plan Community Design component policies for design of all modes of travel for this roadway from North 30th Street/ Bruce B. Downs Boulevard to North Nebraska Avenue.
The designation of 131st Street as a priority corridor for transit modes is beneficial to future transit service planning. 131st Street is a vital transit link for the University Area due to the location of the University Area Transit Center on 131st Street between Livingston Avenue and North 27th Street. Nine HART routes and the USF Bull Runner travel on portions of 131st Street to connect to the University Area Transit Center. Six of the routes will connect to the future MetroRapid north-south planned for Nebraska Avenue and Fletcher Avenue. The northeast corner of 131st Street and Nebraska Avenue is designated for a MetroRapid station.

Goal 4- Ensure Community Input
HART concurs. The strategies added to this goal will encourage collaboration with all partners includin

Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) - October 30, 2-12
Staff has reviewed the proposed text amendments to the Livable Communities Element and the University Area Community Plan.

Major Transportation investments are currently planned in other corridors throughout the University Community Area. Please consider revising the 131st Avenue description (on page 3, bullet 2) as a critical community connection to those corridors, by describing it as a Complete Street corridor with circulator transit services.

If approved and applied to specific parcels of land in the future, the specific transportation impacts of those proposals to the surrounding transportation system will be evaluated.

Public Utilities Department, Potable Water and Wastewater – October 23, 2012
Public Utilities Staff responsible for potable water and wastewater planning have reviewed CPA 12-25 Livable Communities Text Change - University Area Community Plant Update and have no comments.

Public Utilities Department, Solid Waste (PUD/SW) – November 2, 2012
Comments:
1. The adopted level of service for solid waste in Hillsborough County if 2 years of permitted landfill space, with 10 years of raw land under the control of the County available.
2. The County currently has 15-20 years of permitted landfill space and additional area available to permit.
3. There is no initial capital investment required to maintain an adequate Level of Service with the projected impacts for the changes in the Land Use classifications.
4. Any annual operation costs resulting from the projected impacts will be recovered through the rates established for the Solid Waste Management System.
5. The Public Utilities Department has a CIP program, which includes maintaining and expanding its Solid Waste Management System.

Public Works – November 2, 2012
Public Works has reviewed the plan amendments and has no comments.

Sheriff’s Office – November 30, 2012
...All other materials submitted for review has been give "no comment" to provide.

Tampa Bay Water – November 2, 2012
*Tampa Bay Water offers no comments.*

Transportation Systems – Multimodal Review (No date on document.)
The multi-modal transportation team has been closely involved with Planning Commission staff in the development of the University Area Community Plan. The plan and ensuing text changes to the draft Goals and Strategies reflect a concerted effort to achieve the University Area’s vision of becoming a thriving and safe community, a vision supported by the Long Range Transportation Plan.

As future development occurs, the multi-modal/complete streets planning group would like an opportunity to comment at that time.

No additional comments at this time.
Hassan Halabi

From: Samaniego, Mary <MSamaniego@TempleTerrace.com>
Sent: Monday, December 10, 2012 11:28 AM
To: Hassan Halabi
Cc: Stephenson, Charles; Tony LaColla; Parrish, Brad
Subject: October 2012 Submittal of Comprehensive Plan Amendments CPA 12-25 and CPA 12-26

Hassan,

The City of Temple Terrace has no formal comments regarding the above referenced projects. One small error I will note is the spelling of ‘Multimodal’ on Page 2 of the Goals and Strategies. The Community Development staff requests that once formally adopted, a presentation is made to the City Council regarding the new goals and strategies specifically for the areas that border our jurisdiction.

Thank you for your time and attention,

Mary Samaniego

Mary Samaniego
Planner
City of Temple Terrace
813.506.6462
DATE: November 27, 2012

TO: Melissa Zomita, AICP, Assistant Executive Director
Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission

FROM: Gene Boles, FAICP, Director
Development Services Department (DSD)

SUBJECT: CPA 12-25 University Community Plan

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on CPA 12-25 which amends the Livable Communities Element to include the University Area Community Plan (Plan). The DSD staff has the following comments.

- DSD staff agrees with the overall intent of the plan recognizing the University area as prime for redevelopment.
- The Plan notes that: “This community plan demonstrates Hillsborough County’s commitment to use the community plan vision, goals, strategies, and action plan when evaluating and deciding on matters pertaining to the community plan area. The Community Plan does not legally obligate the County to implement or commit public funds for any of the goals or strategies represented that the revised community plan does not legally obligate the County to implement or commit public funds for any of the goals or strategies represented.” However, some strategies in the plan are in contradiction with the statement above when they specify that “The County will” implement a specific strategy (see Goal 2)
- DSD staff identified several strategies of the Plan make reference to other plans, documents and recommendations as guide for implementation. These documents are:
  1. Community Plan Background document
  2. Recommendations of University of South Florida Area Multimodal Transportation District,
  3. Evaluation & Transportation Needs for the University Area,
  4. Tampa Walk Bike Plan
CPA 12-25 University Community Plan
November 27, 2012
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5. Pedestrian & Bicycle High Crash Areas Strategic Plan the Unincorporated Hillsborough
6. Recommendations identified by the District I, of the Hillsborough County Sheriff’s Office;
7. 2012 University Area Rental/Redevelopment Study
8. Livable Roadways Guidelines
9. Hillsborough County Post-Disaster Redevelopment Plan;

- These plans, documents and recommendations are not included in the text amendment package submitted to Development Services and do not show a formal reference of adoption or previous review by the Hillsborough County Board of County Commissioners. Please keep in mind that Florida Statutes 163.3177(b) states:
  “(b) A local government may include, as part of its adopted plan, documents adopted by reference but not incorporated verbatim into the plan. The adoption by reference must identify the title and author of the document and indicate clearly what provisions and edition of the document is being adopted.”

- DSD staff finds that the planning intent of most of the referenced documents is proper for the implementation of the goals, objectives and policies of the Comprehensive Plan (in general) and the Long Range Transportation Plan.

- The Plan text amendment made specific references to amend the County’s Land Development Code. DSD staff finds that the amendments to the LDC listed below are feasible to implement:
  
  o Revise the University Community Area zoning districts (UCA-MS and NHO) to achieve a common architectural theme similar to public structures and roadway landscaping.

  o Revise the Special Public Interest University Community and University Community Area zoning districts (SPI-UC - 1, 2, 3 and 4 and UCA-MS and NHO) to support crime reduction and safety:
    • In new non-residential and multi-family development use aesthetic durable opaque fencing; and
    • Implement Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) features for new development based on input from the Hillsborough County Sheriff’s Office, Code Enforcement and Development Services Departments during development review.
• DSD staff agrees on the potential of 131st within the University area. The Community Plan calls the County to recognize 131st Avenue (from North 30th Street/Bruce B. Downs Boulevard to North Nebraska) as an *economically important east-west corridor and a future premium transportation corridor* (*e.g.*, dedicated lane/fixed rail). The Planning Commission staff report does not offer an evaluation of the impacts and feasibility of this proposed change under the suggested use of the Livable Roadways Guidelines and Comprehensive Plan Community Design Component policies.

• The community plan calls to create a citizen-based umbrella organization for implementation defining specific roles. DSD staff feels that the plan needs to clarify or suggest the nature of the proposed organization: advisory board (subject to sunshine), non-profit, etc.

• DSD staff recommends the Planning Commission to prepare a financial impact statement as requested by the Board before the adoption of any community plan.

Cc: Lucia Garsys, Deputy County Administrator, Planning and Infrastructure Services Mike Williams, Manager, Engineering and Environmental Services, Public Works Dept. Joe Moreda, Manager, Community Development Section
VIA EMAIL

November 5, 2012

The Planning Commission
Mr. Hassan Halabi
Halabih@plancom.org
601 E. Kennedy Blvd.
18th Floor
Tampa, FL 33602

Subject: EPC Comments – October 2012 Comprehensive Plan Amendments

Staff from the Environmental Protection Commission of Hillsborough County (EPC) has conducted a review of the subject October 2012 Comprehensive Plan Amendments and does not object to the language proposed.

If you have any further questions, please contact me at 813-627-2600, extension 1257 or email me at berkulis@epchc.org.

Sincerely,

Teresa Berkulis
Environmental Specialist I
Air Management Division

An agency with values of environmental stewardship, integrity, honesty, and a culture of fairness and cooperation.

www.epchc.org
E-Mail: epchinfo@epchc.org
AN AFFIRMATIVE ACTION – EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER
Memorandum

TO: Mr. Hassan Halabi  
Senior Planner/Countywide Planning  
Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission

FROM: Linda Walker, Planner II  
Hillsborough Area Regional Transit Authority (HART)

DATE: October 26, 2012

RE: CPA12-25  
University Area Community Plan Update  
Livable Communities Text Change

HART has reviewed the comprehensive plan text amendment for University Community Plan Update. HART’s comments are on the following draft goals and strategies.

Goal 1  
Strategy to implement recommendations of the USF Area Multimodal Transportation District, Study Area Evaluation & Transportation Need for the University Area, Tampa Walk Bike Plan, and Pedestrian & Bicycle High Crash Areas Strategic Plan of Unincorporated Hillsborough County.

HART concurs. All the plans encourage safe connection to transit.

Goal 2  
Strategies identifying East 131st Avenue for as a future premium transportation corridor and recognizing East 131st Avenue as an economically important east-west corridor and as such will emphasize the use of Livable Roadways Guidelines and Comprehensive Plan Community Design component policies for design of all modes of travel for this roadway from North 30th Street/ Bruce B. Downs Boulevard to North Nebraska Avenue.

The designation of 131st Street as a priority corridor for transit modes is beneficial to future transit service planning. 131st Street is a vital transit link for the University Area due to the location of the University Area Transit Center on 131st Street between Livingston Avenue and North 27th Street. Nine HART routes and the USF Bull Runner travel on portions of 131st Street to connect to the University Area Transit Center. Six of the routes will connect to the future MetroRapid north-south planned for Nebraska Avenue and Fletcher Avenue. The northeast corner of 131st Street and Nebraska Avenue is designated for a MetroRapid station.

Goal 4- Ensure Community Input  
HART concurs. The strategies added to this goal will encourage collaboration with all partners including HART. This will encourage future coordination with HART and the Community to prioritized transit needs for the University Area.
MEMORANDUM

DATE: October 30th, 2012

TO: Hassan Halabi, Senior Planner

FROM: Bud Whitehead, MPO/Transportation Section

RE: CPA 12-25 - Livable Communities Text Change - University Area Community Plan Update

Staff has reviewed the proposed text amendments to the Livable Communities Element and the University Area Community Plan.

Major Transportation investments are currently planned in other corridors throughout the University Community Area. Please consider revising the 131st Avenue description (on page 3, bullet 2) as a critical community connection to those corridors, by describing it as a Complete Street corridor with circulator transit services.

If approved and applied to specific parcels of land in the future, the specific transportation impacts of those proposals to the surrounding transportation system will be evaluated.
Hassan Halabi

From: Moran, Kevin <MoranK@HillsboroughCounty.ORG>
Sent: Tuesday, October 23, 2012 11:14 AM
To: Hassan Halabi
Cc: Weiss, T. Barton; Hammett, Chuck; Rogers, Kimberly; McCary, John
Subject: CPA 12-25 Livable Communities Text Change

Mr. Halabi,
Public Utilities Staff responsible for potable water and wastewater planning have reviewed CPA 12-25 Livable Communities Text Change - University Area Community Plant Update and have no comments.

Kevin Moran, P.E.
Section Manager - Planning, GIS and Records
Public Utilities Department
Hillsborough County BOCC
p: 813.272.5977 x:43356 | f: 813.272.6224
e: morank@hillsboroughcounty.org
w: http://www.hillsboroughcounty.org

Please note: All correspondence to or from this office is subject to Florida’s Public Records laws.
DATE:   November 2, 2012

TO:   Hassan Halabi, Senior Planner
       The Planning Commission

FROM:   Eli Alvarado, Project Manager II
         Public Utilities Department

SUBJECT:  Review of Plan Amendments CPA 12-23 through 12-28

The Public Utilities Department Solid Waste (PUD/SW) staff has reviewed the Comprehensive
Plan Amendments cited above, and has the following comments:

1. The adopted level of service for solid waste in Hillsborough County is 2 years of
   permitted landfill space, with 10 years of raw land under the control of the County
   available.

2. The County currently has 15 - 20 years of permitted landfill space and additional area
   available to permit.

3. There is no initial capital investment required to maintain an adequate Level of Service
   with the projected impacts from the changes in the Land Use classifications.

4. Any annual operating costs resulting from the projected impacts will be recovered
   through the rates established for the Solid Waste Management System.

5. The Public Utilities Department has a CIP program, which includes maintaining and
   expanding its Solid Waste Management System.

Please contact me at 663-3217 should you have any questions.
Hassan Halabi

From: Bridges, Chris <BridgesC@HillsboroughCounty.ORG>
Sent: Friday, November 02, 2012 10:56 AM
To: Hassan Halabi
Subject: October 2012 Submittal of Comprehensive Plan Amendments

Hassan,

Public Works has reviewed the plan amendments and has no comments.

Regards,

Chris Bridges, P.E.
Hillsborough County Public Works Department
Engineering and Environmental Section
601 E. Kennedy Blvd., 22nd Floor
Tampa, Fl. 33602
813 307 1848
813 272 6458 (fax)
Hi Mr. Halabi,
Tampa Bay Water offers no comments.
Please direct any further request to me directly at this email.
Thank you!
Ivana Blankenship
From: Hassan Halabi [mailto:halabih@plancom.org]
Sent: Friday, November 02, 2012 8:51 AM
To: Beth Alden; Bob Campbell (campbellr@hillsboroughcounty.org<mailto:campbellr@hillsboroughcounty.org>); Bud Whitehead; Carolyn Kamermayer (kamermayerc@hillsboroughcounty.org<mailto:kamermayerc@hillsboroughcounty.org>); Debra McInturff (dmcinturff@hcso.tampa.fl.us<mailto:dmcinturff@hcso.tampa.fl.us>); El Alvarado (Alvaradoe@hillsboroughCounty.org<mailto:Alvaradoe@hillsboroughCounty.org>); Joe Moreda; Linda Walker (walkerl@hartline.org<mailto:walkerl@hartline.org>); Lorraine Duffy-Suarez (lorraine.duffy-suarez@sdhc.k12.fl.us<mailto:lorraine.duffy-suarez@sdhc.k12.fl.us>); Mark Thornton (thorntonm@hillsboroughcounty.org<mailto:thorntonm@hillsboroughcounty.org>); williamsm@hillsboroughcounty.org<mailto:williamsm@hillsboroughcounty.org>); Paul Vanderploog (vanderploogp@hillsboroughcounty.org<mailto:vanderploogp@hillsboroughcounty.org>); Paula Dye; Richard Garrity (epcinfo@epchc.org<mailto:epcinfo@epchc.org>); Richard Garrity (Business Fax); Ronald Rogers (rogersr@hillsboroughcounty.org<mailto:rogersr@hillsboroughcounty.org>); Sean P. McGinnis (mcginnis@epchc.org<mailto:mcginnis@epchc.org>); Sean P. McGinnis (mcginnis@epchc.org<mailto:mcginnis@epchc.org>); Sean P. McGinnis (Business Fax); Sharon A. Gonzalez (sgonzale@hcso.tampa.fl.us<mailto:sgonzale@hcso.tampa.fl.us>); Sharon A. Gonzalez (Business Fax); T. Barton Weiss (weissb@hillsboroughcounty.org<mailto:weissb@hillsboroughcounty.org>); Tom Hiznay (hiznay@hillsboroughcounty.org<mailto:hiznay@hillsboroughcounty.org>)
Cc: Steve Griffin; Krista Kelly
Subject: October 2012 Submittal of Comprehensive Plan Amendment

Good morning
This is a friendly reminder that your review and comments for the above listed Plan Amendments Cycle are due to us today. Your comments are very important to us in preparing the staff report to the Planning Commission and to the Board of County Commissioners. If you already have sent your comments to us, please disregard this notice, and if you have not sent them out, please do so as soon as possible.
Your quick response to this request is greatly appreciated.
Thank you
Have a nice day
Hassan Halabi

Hassan Halabi | Senior Planner | Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission
(813) 273-3774 ext. 324 | halabih@plancom.org<mailto:halabih@plancom.org> | www.theplanningcommission.org<http://www.theplanningcommission.org/> We are committed to maintaining the highest level of service and we value your feedback. Please complete our Customer Service Survey by visiting http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/tpcCustomerServiceSurvey
Transportation Systems - Multimodal Review

Hillsborough County

Comprehensive Plan Amendment Request CPA 12-25

The multi-modal transportation team has been closely involved with Planning Commission staff in the development of the University Area Community Plan. The plan and ensuing text changes to the draft Goals and Strategies reflect a concerted effort to achieve the University Area's vision of becoming a thriving and safe community, a vision supported by the Long Range Transportation Plan.

As future development occurs, the multi-modal/complete streets planning group would like an opportunity to comment at that time.

No additional comments at this time.

Gena

Gena Torres Project Manager II
E torresa@plancorn.org • T 813.273.3774 x357 • F 813.301.7172
All incoming and outgoing messages are subject to public records inspection.
Land use & transportation planning to improve quality of life

THE PLANNING COMMISSION

a consolidated professional planning agency
serving Tampa, Temple Terrace, Plant City & Unincorporated Hillsborough County
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Hassan Halabi

From: SHARON GONZALEZ <sgonzale@hcso.tampa.fl.us>
Sent: Friday, November 30, 2012 9:34 AM
To: Hassan Halabi
Cc: RONALD HARTLEY; TONY PELUSO (ERNEST); ferdonj@hillsboroughcounty.org; MICHELE HAMILTON; ALBERT G MURILLO
Subject: Planning Commission

Hassan,

I am sorry for the tardiness of this response however, one of the documents has aroused discussion with senior staff of the agency.

The document of concern is CPA 12-24: Balm Community Plan, specifically Goal 7.

Presently reads as follows for CPA 12-24:

**Goal 7**: local law and code enforcement shall provide appropriate methods, and effective services to prevent the continued occurrence of crime or violations throughout Balm and establish a safe, secure and attractive community.

The community desires...
- To maintain at least minimum adopted levels of service for emergency response times to calls.
- Increased or expanded implementation of the Crime Prevention through Environmental Design standards in the land Development Code.

The HCSO staff who reviewed this request have asked that the **entire Goal 7 be removed from CPA 12-24**. This decision is based on collaboration between a Command Staff Member, Chief Legal Counsel and Senior Code Enforcement Personnel; these individuals agree that it would be bias if this statement were included within this document. Services provided by both agencies are committed to providing the highest level of services throughout Hillsborough County.

Please modify this document, CPA 12-24, per this request. All other materials submitted for review has been give "no comment" to provide.

Thank you for keeping us informed of agency notifications.
Citizen Comment

Jerry Mastrogiavanni
Per our conversation I would like to add this for the record.

Jerry
813-971-1725

- Owner of an established area business continuously since 1972. I not only care passionately about the future of this area, I invest there. I am currently exploring opportunities to move there in the near future. In any event, I will always remain involved.
- Appreciate the efforts of planning and public investment in the area in recent years, even though I may not always agree with it. Too, the current Plan update seems more a matter of bureaucratic exercise than a spirited discussion to comprehensively address the area’s challenges: such as business disinvestment, means to stimulate growth, deteriorating housing stock and poor infrastructure.
- Like many, due to the area’s unique geographical location relative to major employers, I think the potential for quality, wholesale redevelopment is virtually boundless.
- In the Goals and Strategies section of the Plan, the following statement appears: “advocating local business and home ownership to promote community stability and reinvestment.” In my view, this part of the Plan is contradicted by the UC zoning district approved a few years ago for a portion of the area. In the UC district, single family residential is a prohibited use. This makes no sense to me. Stable single family is a cornerstone of any neighborhood, and it should only be encouraged in the University Community area. Perhaps there is some merit for the district’s zoning treatment of properties fronting 22nd St., but we’ve seen nothing so far that would indicate such. But for the balance of the district and the area as a whole, single family should only be encouraged.
- I’m also concerned that the design standards for the UC district represent regulatory overkill and may serve to inhibit innovative development.
I've heard talk of designating portions of the area as "brownfields," in an effort to loosen regulatory impediments. That should be further explored.

I'm also curious about the possibility of a zoning-free zone, where developers would be freed to allow market forces to dictate.

Appreciate the opportunity to speak to the Board and for their attention to the concerns of this neighborhood.
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Online Constant Contacts Survey Results
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The University Area Community Plan area is in north-central unincorporated Hillsborough County and is bordered by the City of Tampa on the west and south, and the Cities of Tampa and Temple Terrace on the east. The northern boundary is Skipper Road/Bearss Avenue/Bruce B. Downs Boulevard up to North 30th Street/Bruce B. Down Boulevard, and East Fletcher Avenue from North 50'h Street to the Hillsborough River.

The University Community Area Master Plan prepared in 1997 recognized the area as having “significant potential for revitalization and redevelopment if certain impediments are improved and the advantages of its natural location and people are seized upon and successfully marketed.” The community planning area is in close proximity to regional assets (which in addition to University of South Florida, University Mall, and both the Veterans and University Community Hospitals [now Florida Hospitals]). The community continues to support and recognize the findings of the Master Plan for Physical Revitalization and Master Plan, Addendum A as guiding documents for the community planning area.

The University Community Area: A Master Plan for Physical Revitalization was prepared by the Florida Center for Community Design and Research, June 1997 with the intention of the:

Creation (through redevelopment and renovation with minimal long-term displacement of area residents) of an identifiable character, and a new, affordable owner-occupied housing neighborhood that includes traffic calming features, a pedestrian lifestyle, and a variety of housing types.

University Community Area Master Plan, Addendum A, was prepared by the Florida Center for Community Design and Research, December 2001 after:

Receipt of an Urban Infill and Redevelopment Assistance Planning Grant from the Florida Department of Community Affairs in March 2001 which encourages the redevelopment of Florida’s urban cores and provides economic assistance for the preparation and implementation of community redevelopment plan allowed for the update of the then existing Master Plan and the designation of two sub-areas of the plan as an Urban Infill and Redevelopment Area. The area is comprised of Sub-Areas 1 and 2 as delineated in the original University Community Area Master Plan. The addendum addresses 18 elements required by State law for the Master Plan to qualify as an Urban Infill and Redevelopment Plan. Some of those elements include community input and public participation, activities and programs to accomplish goals, economic/redevelopment incentives,
The Master Plan called for a reinvestment in public infrastructure in the form of sidewalks and streetscaping to create a new neighborhood identity “the creation of an identifiable character, and a new, affordable owner-occupied housing neighborhood that includes traffic calming features, a pedestrian lifestyle, and a variety of housing types.”

Hillsborough County, through the then Planning and Growth Management Department received an Urban Infill and Redevelopment Assistance Planning Grant from the Florida Department of Community Areas in March 2001. The program encourages the redevelopment of Florida’s urban cores and provides economic assistance for the preparation and implementation of community redevelopment plans. The grant allowed Hillsborough County to update the 1997 Master Plan and designate Sub-Areas 1 and 2 as an Urban Infill and Redevelopment Area.

University Area Community Plan Update adoption process incorporates changes to the adopted community plan within the Hillsborough County Comprehensive Plan, Livable Community Element, in the following way:

- The Planning Commission presents the entire University Area Community Plan Update document and makes a recommendation that the Plan be forwarded to the Board of County Commissioners for its acceptance.

- The Board of County Commissioners receives and accepts the entire University Area Community Plan update document including background information at a public meeting. The Board receives the community plan as a report to acknowledge the work that the community has done to create a vision and plan for their community. The Board then adopts only the Vision and Goals and Strategies of the community plan into the County’s Comprehensive Plan, Livable Communities Element, and the community plan boundary map.

Baseline data for the University Area Community planning area was completed at beginning of the process and is included in the Background Report included as an attachment. An Overview, geography, demographics, socioeconomic and income, building activity and land use information was provided as a set of tables, charts, graphs and maps. (See Background Attachment, University Area Community Plan Data report dated September 2011.) The background data provides a picture of the community based on a 2010 information baseline and is intended to support citizens as
they work with both the public and private sectors to implement the adopted Vision, Goals and Strategies as adopted into the Comprehensive Plan’s Livable Communities Element.

The plan update incorporates changes to the adopted plan vision, goals, and strategies based on a review of the existing plan, what has been completed since adoption, what has been completed and what has not been completed as identified in the University Area Master Plan in 2001, and on changes in existing conditions since. These changes generally include:

- changes to the adopted University Area Community Plan are generally limited to text changes reflecting strategies that have been completed through implementation in the County’s Land Development Code since the Plan’s adoption;

- support of recommendations of recent transportation, housing, redevelopment disaster planning, and economic development studies completed/underway for this area (these are intended to constitute a reference to planning and design practices);

- revising the Land Development Code in the University Community Area zoning districts Main Street and Neighborhood Office (UCA-MS and NHO) to:

  - achieve a common architectural theme similar to public structures and roadway landscaping built since the districts were established,
  - allow alternate design techniques, in accordance with the Stormwater Technical Manual, such as natural sloping and limited fencing that improve the aesthetic and amenity value of stormwater management facilities, and
  - encourage a common architectural theme too public structures and roadway landscaping built since the district was established;

- to ensure safety and quality of life, the County will in collaboration with the Hillsborough County Sheriff’s Office maintain a strategic program for crime prevention and public safety within the UCA boundary. The strategic program will identify and implement actions appropriate both for the UAC as a whole and for specific areas within the UAC boundary. Tools and techniques and programs expected to reduce crime and promote public safety may include but not be limited to:
• Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) applied to building and site design;
• Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) applied to public spaces;
• revisions to the Special Public Interest University Community and University Community zoning districts (SPI-UC-1,2,3 and 4 and UCA-MS and NHO to support CPTED principles.
• enhanced police presence/community policing;
• street lighting;
• surveillance cameras with monitoring
• emergency call boxes;
• improved bike/pedestrian crossing; and
• traffic control improvement

Tools, techniques and programs for crime prevention and public safety will be evaluated in terms of:
• effectiveness;
• cost of initial implementation (public and private); and
• operational and maintenance cost (public and private); and
• community and public resources required for effective implementation.

• in recognition of 131st Avenue (North 30th Street/Bruce B. Downs to North Nebraska Avenue) as an economically important east-west corridor, the County will prepare a Strategic Redevelopment Plan for revitalization of the corridor in keeping with the Comprehensive Plan's Design Component. The strategic redevelopment plan will consider both the public and private implications of various design options, and identify a combination of regulations, investments and incentives required to achieve the desired result over a period of time.

• changes to the boundary of the University Area Community are being made to reflect annexations of 3 small areas east of 56th Street by the City of Temple Terrace since the adoption of the plan.

The text amendment consists of the vision, goals and strategies of the University Area Community Plan as it seeks to maintain, preserve and encourage the redevelopment of the suburban characteristics, atmosphere, and quality of life; continuing to improve the viability of residential types, pedestrian and public transit, and economic development within the area to provide a stable live and work environment for residents in order to provide a strong, diversified economic base for the community. It also encourages new
and existing infrastructure in order to keep the University Area Community an attractive, functional, and safe place for visitors and local residents.

The University Community Area Master Plan prepared in 1997 recognized the area as having "significant potential for revitalization and redevelopment if certain impediments are improved and the advantages of its natural location and people are seized upon and successfully marketed." These assets included proximity to regional assets (which in addition to University of South Florida, University Mall), and both the Veterans and University Community Hospitals (now Florida Hospitals).

The Master Plan called for a reinvestment in public infrastructure in the form of sidewalks and streetscaping to create a new neighborhood identity "the creation of an identifiable character, and a new, affordable owner-occupied housing neighborhood that includes traffic calming features, a pedestrian lifestyle, and a variety of housing types." Staff reviewed the implementation success of the adopted Master Plan and proposed changes to the adopted University Area Community Plan that are summarized above.

Florida Statutes 163.3177(b) states:

"(b) A local government may include, as part of its adopted plan, documents adopted by reference but not incorporated verbatim into the plan. The adoption by reference must identify the title and author of the document and indicate clearly what provisions and edition of the document is being adopted."

The following documents are included by reference has having been vetted through community engagement with the University Area Community and therefore reflecting the desires of the community, specifically recommendations within the boundary of the University Area Community Plan boundary (it is not intended or inferred that any project(s) referenced here commit the Board of County Commissioners for funding through the Capital Improvements Program budgeting process):

- University of South Florida Area Multimodal (Study Area Evaluation and Transportation Needs, Prepared for Hillsborough County by Jacobs Engineering Group, May 25, 2010) Transportation District;
- City of Tampa Walk-Bike Plan Phase I (April 2011) and Phase II, Metropolitan Planning Organization for Transportation (June 2012);
- Pedestrian & Bicycle High Crash Areas Strategic Plan the Unincorporated Hillsborough, Metropolitan Planning Organization for Transportation (April 2012);
• Recommendations identified by the District I, of the Hillsborough County Sheriff's Office, Needs and Suggestions for Areas 1 & 2, 3 and 4, J.R. Burton Major, District I Commander, January 2012 2012;
• University Area Rental/Redevelopment Study, A joint study to analyze the rental housing market and redevelopment potential of properties in the University Community Plan area, prepared by WadeTrim for Hillsborough County Florida, Affordable Housing Department and The Planning Commission, April 2012;
• Hillsborough County Post-Disaster Redevelopment Plan; prepared the Hillsborough County and the Cities of Tampa, Temple Terrace, and Plant City, approved July 2010;
• Economic Development Areas Analysis and Mapping, prepared by HDR for the Planning Commission, August 2011; and,

Specific recommendations are identified below.*

University of South Florida Area Multimodal Transportation District (Study Area Evaluation and Transportation Needs, Prepared for Hillsborough County by Jacobs Engineering Group, May 25, 2010)
Goal: to facilitate the use of multiple modes of transportation that will lead to a reduction in automobile use and vehicle miles traveled, to create opportunities for long-term funding of multimodal improvements, and to help the community objectives for encouraging infill and redevelopment. The designation of such districts recognizes the inherent integral relationship between transportation, land use, and urban design, and the degree to which these elements affect each other.

USF Area selected: 1) because it is a growing regional activity center with a diverse and dense mix of residents, students and employees, with access to a variety of places including the university campus, other schools, hospitals, parks, public services, and commercial center; 2) some multimodal improvements are already in the works. These include the Fletcher Avenue Pedestrian Safety Study and related improvements, 22nd Street enhancement project recently completed that provides a model for other corridors in the area, and the new “MetroRapid” Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) service scheduled to begin soon along Fletcher and Nebraska Avenues; 3) roads are congested with vehicles, and redevelopment is hindered by costly mitigation requirements for roadway Level of Service (LOS); and, 4) there are transit riders, bicyclists, and
pedestrians in this area, indicating that improvements of these modes will be used if provided.

3.2 Needed Projects for Multimodal Transportation
Types of improvements for the USF Area MMTD include the following, in various locations through the USF Area.

Pedestrian Improvements
- Sidewalks
- Intersection enhancement such as ADA curb-cuts, crosswalks and pedestrian signals
- Pedestrian enhancements such as landscaping and lights
- Drainage improvements
- New multi-use trails

Bicycle Improvements
- Bicycle lanes
- Wider and more clearly defined bicycle lanes
- Bicycle signals
- Motorist and bicycle safety and education
- Bicyclist amenities such as secure bike storage boxes
- New multi-use trails

Transit Improvements
- Improved frequency and expanded hours on existing local bus routes
- New local bus service
- New premium bus service such as “MetroRapid” BRT
- New circulator bus route serving major destinations in USF Area
- New Light Rail limited-Stop service
- Better taxi service

Complete improvements lists are provided in tables in this report. The costs of the projects were identified using cost estimates from the LRTP and CIP. Priorities were established based on the project’s potential to improve the Pedestrian Bicycle, Transit or Roadway LOS, and if it would connect to an existing facility (sidewalk, bicycle lane, or transit route), an arterial, primary neighborhood collector, or primary USF thoroughfare. The Prioritization scoring is explained on the tables. The summary list of improvements with cost and maps are shown in Appendix E; the summary with
prioritization scores shown as Appendix F; and detailed list by segment is shown in Appendix G.

City of Tampa Walk-Bike Plan Phase I (April 2011) and Phase II, Metropolitan Planning Organization for Transportation (June 2012)
Builds on the MPO’s Comprehensive Plan. The study identified specific and feasible improvements in high priority areas, for immediate and near term implementation. Plan results are the identification of pedestrian needs, with the objective of leveraging additional funding for pedestrian improvements as part of an integrated system throughout the city.

USF Strategy
- Temple Terrace to Campus
- Bull Runner Loop/40th Street Access
- Neighborhood Streets
- Major Roadway Intersections

Phase I that concentrated on the USF Area including major routes into these areas.

The Metropolitan Planning Organization partnered with the City of Tampa to support Tampa’s vision of making walking and bicycling easily accessible. The partnership is currently in the process of developing a City Walk-Bike Plan Phase II.

Both Phase I and Phase II consider the following methods to provide bicycle and pedestrian facilities:

- Sidewalk construction
- Provision of a side-path trail
- Shifting travel lanes to provide a marked bike lane
- Road diets
- Shared lane arrows
- Crosswalk and intersection safety enhancements
- Enhancements to/prioritization of greenways and trails projects to address bicycle and pedestrian mobility needs

“[G]enerally providing for a grid system of bicycle and pedestrian facilities” and provide the specific mobility goals that will be addressed as part of this project within the University Area Community Plan boundary:
- Cross-City north-south and east-west connections that include a connection from USF area to Downtown
- Connections to Tampa’s Greenways and Trails off-road facilities.
- Connections to significant Hillsborough County and Temple Terrace bike facilities.
- Connections to HART transfer centers and top 20 bus stops.

Appendix A: Project Shortlist Tables includes those within the University Community Area Plan boundary, under the North Tampa subsection.

Pedestrian & Bicycle High Crash Areas Strategic Plan the Unincorporated Hillsborough, Metropolitan Planning Organization for Transportation (April 2012)
The four corridors mentioned in the study that relate to the University Area Community plan are: 56th Street from Fowler Avenue to Fletcher Avenue, 42nd Street from Fletcher Avenue to Bruce B. Downs Boulevard, 46th Street/Skipper Road From Fletcher Avenue to Bruce B. Downs Boulevard, and Bruce B. Downs Boulevard from Fletcher Avenue to Tampa City Limit.

Make crosswalk angle and path to follow as much as possible the desired pedestrian route. Install pedestrian crossings at all four approaches unless proven not needed to facilitate safe crossing. Consistent striping of crosswalks to ensure visibility. Bike lanes at intersections should be skip-dashed in keeping with MUTCD standards. Bike lane markings should be, at the very least, painted 50 feet from the intersection in keeping with MUTCD standards and to communicate the purpose to both motorists and bicyclists.

Install bike parking at transit stops since bicycles were frequently observed to be locked to sign posts or fencings nearby transit stops. Enhance pedestrian lighting to maximize pedestrian visibility at night. Regulate debris removal maintenance from bike lanes making them dangerous to use. Bike lanes should be fully paved and be free of rutting.

Vegetation should be trimmed back so as not to obstruct visibility access. 56th street from Fowler Ave. to Fletcher Ave. and 42nd street from Fletcher Ave. to Bruce B. Downs Blvd. needs mid-block crossings between controlled intersections. Enhanced street lighting at transit stops where pedestrians cross to get to transit stops on east side. Pavement marking washed out along most of the corridor. At Fletcher, signalized, the bike lane should be transitioned in between the left and right turn lanes. Fill in sidewalk gaps. Upgrade lighting along the corridor to enhance better lighting uniform.
Table 3 Top 10 Ranked Corridors Preliminary Cost Estimates includes those corridors with recommends improvements within the University Area Community Plan boundary.

Recommendations identified by the District I, of the Hillsborough County Sheriff’s Office, Needs and Suggestions for Areas 1 & 2, 3 and 4, J.R. Burton Major, District I Commander, January 2012 2012 University Area Rental/Redevelopment Plan, prepared by WadeTrim for Hillsborough County Florida, Affordable Housing Department and The Planning Commission, April 2012

Included as an attachment to this amendment.

University Area Rental/Redevelopment Study, A joint study to analyze the rental housing market and redevelopment potential of properties in the University Community Plan area, prepared by WadeTrim for Hillsborough County Florida, Affordable Housing Department and The Planning Commission, April 2012

Section 3.6 Preliminary Redevelopment Strategies

The following preliminary redevelopment strategies are recommended based on property characteristics, initial priority site recommendations and potential funding sources:

Strategy 1: Assemble small (< 0.5 acre) properties in strategic locations, particularly those identified as “priority sites” due to their characteristics, to support redevelopment under UCA-MS and UCA-NHO zoning.

Sites with a Property Criteria (PC) score of 9- or 10-points should be pursued in the short-term with strategic investment by cooperative relationships with nonprofits and other private sector entities or through special districts. These sites, as well as sites scoring 4- or 5-points, should be reserved for strategic projects that will act as catalysts for future redevelopment. This should not deter the redevelopment of lower scoring sites (fewer than 4-points) if such sites are in a high priority location (i.e., Siting Criteria (SC), ranked “High”) and there is market-based demand for infill; however, these lower scoring sites should not be pursued for strategic investment in the short-term due to the present challenges associated with their property characteristics.
Strategy 2: Through public-private partnership, seek support of two “pilot” redevelopment projects, one within each of the UCA-specific zoning districts to exemplify how the private sector can capitalize on the locational value of the University Area.

Given the uncertainty of state and federal funding sources in the future, one of the most effective and viable opportunities is cooperation with non-profits and private sector entities. In order to foster existing and new private sector relationships, it will be critical to demonstrate the viability of redevelopment within the UCA specific zoning districts. Getting one, successful, keystone project “on the ground” will create enough momentum for other private sector entities to follow suit. Such a project must take into consideration current market conditions while allowing for the flexibility to respond to long-term economic change.

Strategy 3: Continue to utilize the funding sources described previously as catalysts for more intensive mixed-use development on assembled properties to better establish the envelope for redevelopment and to provide much-needed pedestrian connectivity to bus/transit stations and activity centers, particularly along east-west roadways.

Public funding sources such as, but not limited to, the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program, are critical for infrastructure improvements and the construction of community facilities that have the potential to attract private investment. These funding sources support a framework for land assembly and establish the envelope for redevelopment by improving conditions surrounding a potential site, thus making the site more marketable to both developers and, in turn, future tenants.

As an example, there is some evidence of recent private “re-investment” in multifamily properties south of East 131st Avenue (e.g. Spanish Trace and University Club). This momentum cannot be maintained without comparable investment from the public sector along east-west roadways. Again, public funding sources have the ability to promote private investment by improving
conditions surrounding a property, making the investment more viable and ultimately improving property values.

Strategy 4: **Was not supported by the Affordable Housing Services department and is therefore not included as a recommended strategy:**

Utilize HUD funding (through NSP and other funds) to further stabilize single-family and less-intensive multi-family homes ancillary to the UCA zoning districts, particularly west of North 22nd Street and north of Fletcher Avenue, between North 12th Street and North 21st Street.

Hillsborough County Post-Disaster Redevelopment Plan, prepared the Hillsborough County and the Cities of Tampa, Temple Terrace, and Plant City, approved July 2010

University Community Area sub-area

Disaster mitigation and/or post-disaster components to be used within the planning process, as a subset of countywide PDRP: community plan updates are an opportunity to both educate the public about their threat exposures, possible mitigation solutions, and perhaps plan changes reflecting movement toward the land use desires of the countywide Post Disaster Redevelopment Plan. The Mitigation Strategy Working Group proposed the following Local Mitigation Strategy:

Because of recent flooding events and the Presidential Declaration issued for T.S. Debby within the State, post-disaster funding via the Stafford Act will become available. You are the coordinating entity with respect to project approval. Prior to receiving the notice of funding from the State, your assistance is needed in review of the attached list of projects to illustrate whether, or not, modifications are needed.

Once the notice of funding availability is issued, a meeting will be set to discuss potential applications. Additionally, and at this time, jurisdictions may complete grant applications for projects listed on the approved LMS project list. Unless a project has been ranked and is on the approved LMS project list or a request (and ranking) form has been submitted and approved by the LMS Working Group (annually approved updated and approved by the Board of County Commissioners), the respective project
may not be submitted for funding under the Stafford Act Hazard Mitigation Grant Program.

No recommendations were made at the time this report.

Economic Development Areas Analysis and Mapping, prepared by HDR for the Planning Commission, August 2011
Recommendations related to University Area Community Plan:
University of South Florida EDA
USF Campus, James A Haley Medical Center & South of Fowler
- Potential to support biotechnology & medical-related targeted industries
- Proximity to hospital staff & USF-based researchers offers key competitive advantage
- Potential for intensification on campus & on sites south of Fowler Ave
- Long-term potential for redevelopment of University Mall & industrial sites
- Opportunity to support newly-formed Innovation Alliance

Recommendations related to University Area Community Plan:
- FLUE (general)
  - Need to recognize that siting requirements will constantly change over time.
  - Need to recognize parameters of availability and affordability of land or facilities of sufficient size.
  - Industrial/manufacturing are different today;
  - Provide flexible regulations and other tools:
    - Overlay Zones
    - Floating Zones
    - Performance Zoning
    - Flexible Zoning
    - Form-Based Zoning

Other proposed additions and changes to the community plan, as currently adopted reflect a continuation of the Plan’s original findings. Specifically, as these changes apply to areas beyond the major streets networks of North 22nd Street, North 30th Street/Bruce B. Downs Boulevard, East Fletcher Avenue, North Nebraska Avenue, and East Fowler Avenue. They are related to continuing to improve the viability of residential types, pedestrian and public transit, and economic development within the area to provide a stable live and work environment for residents.
BUSINESS SURVEY
The survey was done during the update in partnership with The Planning Commission (Countywide Team and Tampa Team), University Area Community Development Corporation, Hillsborough County Economic Development Department, and University of South Florida Office of Community Engagement (possibility being explored).

The survey for the University Area was conducted in July 2012 as part of the continuing partnership between the University Area Community Development Corporation, Hillsborough County Economic Development Services, and the Planning Commission.

The business survey was developed to provide a summary of businesses and current issues within the University Area Community Plan boundary: including a snapshot of existing businesses with information on the type of businesses that exist, length of existence, number of employees and needs, vitality of businesses, and issues of businesses affecting the sustainability of doing business in the area. The Hillsborough County Board of County Commissioners has directed the Planning Commission to update the University Area Community Plan (which became effective February 28, 2001). The Planning Commission staff is working with stakeholders and citizens in the development of the plan update. The involvement of those who live or own a business in the community is vital in charting the future course for the community plan area. The findings from the survey will be used only for Hillsborough County Economic Development Department research and for the update of the University Area Community Plan. Finally, contact information for businesses interested in participating in the University Area Business Association was also collected on behalf of the UACDC.

COMMUNITY IMPLEMENTATION AND PARTICIPATION
To ensure that the communities desires identified in the Community Plan are recognized and to help in the implementation to the Mission, Goals and Strategies a citizen-based umbrella organization is proposed to be developed composed of both citizens and representatives of business, civic and residents of the area that after registering with the County have the same standing as other Registered Neighborhood groups. This group is proposed as following:

Community Plan Implementation Through Community Participation
To ensure that the Vision, Goals and Strategies of this community plan are implemented, the community supports creating a citizen-based umbrella organization to:
• Provide a joint forum for public, private and non-profit community and neighborhood groups/associations to meet and discuss community issues.
• Work in partnership with the public, private and non-profit sectors.
• Monitor and comment on:
  - Capital improvement plans,
  - Comprehensive Plan changes,
  - New development proposals and negotiations (e.g., zonings, public facilities, public works projects).
• Pursue and/or encourage public and private sector grant applications.
• Encourage conservation projects and other civic programs.
• Create awareness of opportunities for participation, both needs and successes.
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University Area Community Plan

Overview
The University Area Community (UAC) is located in the north central portion of Hillsborough County. The UAC comprises two distinct land areas. The larger area borders the City of Tampa to its east and south and unincorporated Hillsborough County to its west and north. The smaller area resides east and south of the City of Tampa and north of the City of Temple Terrace. The University of South Florida occupies a large land mass between these two locations. The Lutz Community and the Lake Magdalene Community are two of the communities in the unincorporated area nearest to the UAC.

Due to its close proximity to the University of South Florida, the overall demographic profile is consistent with a university or college setting. The UAC reflects a younger and more racially diverse population (20-24 years represent 21.4% of the population). Non-family households contain a larger percentage of nonrelatives living together when compared to Hillsborough County (12.1% and 4.5% respectively). Residents in the UAC primarily rent their housing units compared to the Unincorporated County (91% and 35% respectively).

Geography
Staff used three separate geographies and several data sources to produce this document. Data presented in the first section of this document came from the 2010 Census using the smallest geographic level available, the Census Block, to match the UAC boundary. Building permit data was compiled, and population and housing data were estimated for activity that falls within the UAC. The remaining data came from the United States Census, American Community Survey (ACS).

The ACS has a predefined geography identified with the University Area. The ACS defines this area as the University Census Designated Place (CDP). This profile approximates the UAC but IS NOT an exact match for the boundary of the community planning area. However, this data includes the most current and detailed information available at the time of this publication.

Demographics
From the 2000 to the 2010 Census, the UAC experienced far less growth than the unincorporated county as a whole. Population increased 6% (2,196 persons) and housing units increased 16% (2,858 units) compared with 29% and 32% in the unincorporated county. The majority of the increase has been in apartment units.

Based on the 2010 Census, the population’s racial profile is dissimilar to the rest of unincorporated county. Although both the UAC and unincorporated county consist primarily of persons defining themselves as White Only, the UAC’s percentage is much lower (47.1% compared to the county’s 74.8%). The percentage of persons identifying themselves as Black Only (34.4%) was higher when compared to 12.8% percent in the unincorporated county. Also persons of
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Other/Multiple Races was (13.2%) compared to 8.4% in the unincorporated county.

Persons of Hispanic ethnicity account for 29.7% of the population. An analysis shows the largest specific Hispanic origin population from Puerto Rico (11.7%) when compared to Hillsborough County (6.6%). The Mexican population in this area is also larger when compared to Hillsborough County (7% vs. 4.6%).

Age distribution in this area diverges from the overall trends in the unincorporated county and the surrounding CDPs. Thirty-four percent of the population is aged between 20-29 (20-24 years, 21.4%; 25-29 years, 12.4%) compared to only 14% for the unincorporated area. This is fitting due to its proximity to the University of South Florida.

**Socioeconomic & Income**
Residents in this area have a lower income when compared to the overall county and/or the other Census Designated Places surrounding it. Household, family and per-capita income is lower than surrounding areas (per capita income is $13,933 in the University area compared to Temple Terrace’s $28,460). Given the lower income levels, the area has a high percentage of families and households below the poverty level. Over half of all female households with no husband present are below poverty status and nearly two-thirds (62.3%) of the population under 18 years is below the poverty level. Female workers in the UAC earn approximately half of what female workers earn in the entire county ($12,801 compared to $25,758).

**Building Activity**
Like the unincorporated county, building permit activity in the UAC has slowed dramatically since 2006. Unlike the unincorporated county, this area has shown negative growth for single-family detached units since 2000 (consisting of more demolitions than new structures) and did not reach a peak in 2005 as did the rest of the unincorporated county. Instead, much of the residential activity was concentrated in apartment units.

**Land Use**
The major existing land use category in the UAC is multi-family (36 percent of land area). The next largest land use category is light commercial (13.5% of land area). The future land uses in this area are consistent with the existing land use. The largest category is Residential-20 (64 percent of land area) and Office-Commercial 20 (17 percent of land area). This seems consistent since the area is primarily an urban enclave attached to a large university with growing research activities.

Open House September 20, 2011
This map depicts the Adopted University Community Area Plan boundary.

This map depicts the Adopted University Community Plan Boundary over the 2010 Census Blocks.
This map depicts the Adopted Northwest Hillsborough CPA boundary over the CDPs used for Tables 11-19.

Open House September 20, 2011
Table 1: Population and Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>University Community Area</th>
<th>Unincorporated HC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000 Population</td>
<td>35,537</td>
<td>644,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Census</td>
<td>37,733</td>
<td>834,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 Housing Units</td>
<td>17,777</td>
<td>269,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Housing Units</td>
<td>20,635</td>
<td>353,934</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau, STF1, 2000; US Census Bureau STF1, 2010

Table 2: Race & Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>University Community Area</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Unincorporated HC</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>37,733</td>
<td></td>
<td>834,255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White only</td>
<td>17,755</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>624,083</td>
<td>74.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American only</td>
<td>12,976</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>107,161</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian &amp; Alaska native only</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>3,205</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian only</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>28,682</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian &amp; other Pacific Islander only</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other and/or multiple races</td>
<td>4,967</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>70,481</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>11,209</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>215,582</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau, STF1, 2010

Table 3: Hispanic Origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>University CDP</th>
<th>MOE</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Unincorporated HC</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>MOE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population (estimate)</td>
<td>31,937</td>
<td>+/- 1,639</td>
<td>1,167,116</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino of Any Race</td>
<td>9,358</td>
<td>+/- 1,137</td>
<td>260,297</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>2,237</td>
<td>+/- 575</td>
<td>54,163</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>+/- 2,735</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>3,745</td>
<td>+/- 873</td>
<td>77,158</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>+/- 3,228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuban</td>
<td>1,086</td>
<td>+/- 423</td>
<td>55,114</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>+/- 2,409</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Hispanic</td>
<td>2,290</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>73,862</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic</td>
<td>22,579</td>
<td>+/- 1205</td>
<td>906,819</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau, 2005-2009 American Community Survey, Margin of Error at 90 percent confidence
### Table 4: Age & Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Structure</th>
<th>University Area</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Unincorporated HC</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>37,733</td>
<td></td>
<td>834,255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18,403</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>406,498</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19,330</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>427,757</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>3,029</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>54,692</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 years</td>
<td>2,125</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>55,348</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14 years</td>
<td>1,610</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>57,910</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19 years</td>
<td>2,435</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>57,386</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24 years</td>
<td>8,080</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>57,522</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 29 years</td>
<td>4,674</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>57,950</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 34 years</td>
<td>3,041</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>55,622</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 39 years</td>
<td>2,051</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>58,882</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 44 years</td>
<td>1,816</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>61,100</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 49 years</td>
<td>1,901</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>64,495</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 54 years</td>
<td>1,697</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>58,397</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 59 years</td>
<td>1,337</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>49,698</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 64 years</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>43,728</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 69 years</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>32,510</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 to 74 years</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>23,837</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 to 79 years</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>18,346</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 to 84 years</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>13,967</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 years and over</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>12,865</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau, STF1, 2010

### Table 5: Occupied Housing Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Units</th>
<th>University Area</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Unincorporated HC</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Units</td>
<td>20,635</td>
<td></td>
<td>353,934</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Housing Units</td>
<td>4,248</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>38,191</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Housing Units/Households</td>
<td>16,387</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td>315,743</td>
<td>89.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied</td>
<td>1,467</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>205,455</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter Occupied</td>
<td>14,920</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
<td>110,288</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons per Household</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau, STF1, 2010
### Table 6: Permitted Residential Units

#### University Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Single Family Detached</th>
<th>Single Family Attached</th>
<th>Apartment</th>
<th>Mobile Home</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>1078</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Unincorporated Hillsborough County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Single Family Detached</th>
<th>Single Family Attached</th>
<th>Apartment</th>
<th>Mobile Home</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>4,569</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>2,888</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>8,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>5,270</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>7,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>6,169</td>
<td>1,154</td>
<td>1,846</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>9,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>6,831</td>
<td>1,442</td>
<td>3,089</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>11,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>6,936</td>
<td>2,152</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>10,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>6,855</td>
<td>2,964</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>10,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>4,204</td>
<td>2,960</td>
<td>1,549</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>8,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2,151</td>
<td>1,122</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>3,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1,660</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>1,853</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>4,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1,554</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,888</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48,087</td>
<td>15,037</td>
<td>15,184</td>
<td>2,822</td>
<td>81,130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission.

Based upon Permits issued. These projects may not have been completed.
### University Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Retail / Wholesale</th>
<th>Industrial / Manufacturing</th>
<th>Warehouse</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,493,535</td>
<td>4,198,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,756,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>3,807,284</td>
<td>398,380</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,469,161</td>
<td>40,200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,715,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>167,346</td>
<td>622,588</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>315,657</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,105,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1,363,378</td>
<td>2,709,671</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>391,608</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,464,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>5,254,708</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500,115</td>
<td>909,446</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,684,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,065,889</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>111,888</td>
<td>966,089</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,143,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>851,268</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,615,107</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,466,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2,674,947</td>
<td>640,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>242,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,557,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>190,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,266,790</td>
<td>395,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,991,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,234,785</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,234,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,124,112</td>
<td>16,726,133</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,347,954</td>
<td>8,423,231</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41,621,430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Unincorporated Hillsborough County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Retail / Wholesale</th>
<th>Industrial / Manufacturing</th>
<th>Warehouse</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>25,383,364</td>
<td>135,516,014</td>
<td>1,716,414</td>
<td>12,455,565</td>
<td>41,133,984</td>
<td>6,865,891</td>
<td>223,071,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>15,610,020</td>
<td>78,637,642</td>
<td>6,087,612</td>
<td>17,041,684</td>
<td>56,813,522</td>
<td>8,294,377</td>
<td>182,490,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>26,954,829</td>
<td>74,685,824</td>
<td>6,848,635</td>
<td>7,603,523</td>
<td>54,654,163</td>
<td>652,845</td>
<td>171,399,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>42,639,644</td>
<td>63,553,891</td>
<td>330,113</td>
<td>15,032,814</td>
<td>33,982,671</td>
<td>3,937,277</td>
<td>159,476,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>35,624,151</td>
<td>76,895,212</td>
<td>944,654</td>
<td>8,616,264</td>
<td>58,425,478</td>
<td>5,102,786</td>
<td>185,608,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>23,266,907</td>
<td>159,224,153</td>
<td>5,021,919</td>
<td>22,885,409</td>
<td>58,761,034</td>
<td>9,947,120</td>
<td>279,106,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>39,348,679</td>
<td>157,358,294</td>
<td>11,902,921</td>
<td>13,998,197</td>
<td>111,186,427</td>
<td>19,756,605</td>
<td>353,551,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>26,949,434</td>
<td>64,775,352</td>
<td>8,073,365</td>
<td>11,826,881</td>
<td>138,859,908</td>
<td>5,443,543</td>
<td>255,928,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>20,475,118</td>
<td>48,149,090</td>
<td>16,312,998</td>
<td>44,679,193</td>
<td>146,808,156</td>
<td>22,900,723</td>
<td>299,325,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>28,382,624</td>
<td>30,403,026</td>
<td>8,508,589</td>
<td>16,656,512</td>
<td>55,635,014</td>
<td>520,000</td>
<td>140,105,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>11,092,000</td>
<td>31,878,000</td>
<td>1,691,000</td>
<td>2,349,000</td>
<td>52,137,000</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>99,203,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295,726,770</td>
<td>921,076,498</td>
<td>67,438,217</td>
<td>173,145,042</td>
<td>808,403,357</td>
<td>83,477,167</td>
<td>2,349,267,051</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission.  
Based upon Permits issued. These projects may not have been completed.
### Table 8: Housing Unit Change

#### University Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Single Family Detached</th>
<th>Single Family Attached</th>
<th>Apartment</th>
<th>Mobile Home</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>-96</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>-20</strong></td>
<td><strong>180</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,798</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1959</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission.
Based upon certificate of occupancies issued.

#### Unincorporated Hillsborough County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Single Family Detached</th>
<th>Single Family Attached</th>
<th>Apartment</th>
<th>Mobile Home</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>4,465</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>3,141</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>8,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>5,233</td>
<td>1,114</td>
<td>3,579</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>10,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>5,407</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>1,867</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>8,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>6,928</td>
<td>1,056</td>
<td>1,967</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>10,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>5,915</td>
<td>1,872</td>
<td>1,259</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>9,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>7,072</td>
<td>2,748</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>11,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>4,883</td>
<td>3,341</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>9,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2,639</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>1,508</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>5,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1,887</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>2,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,632</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>1,344</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>3,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>46,061</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,823</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,748</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,506</strong></td>
<td><strong>79,138</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission.
Based upon certificate of occupancies issued.
## Table 9: Existing Land Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Land Use*</th>
<th>University Area</th>
<th></th>
<th>Unincorporated HC</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acreage</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Acreage</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>159,114.8</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Commercial</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1,545.4</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Industrial</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>11,534.4</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Commercial</td>
<td>366.7</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>8,559.1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>5,530.5</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>981.2</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>24,639.7</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home Park</td>
<td>105.8</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>5,026.0</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6,483.8</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Institutional</td>
<td>311.6</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>118,621.6</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Utility</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>3,219.4</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational / Open Space</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6,238.5</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>4,129.6</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>149.0</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>103,432.7</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Family</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>1364.9</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown/ROW/Not Classified</td>
<td>334.4</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>35,858.9</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>44,921.7</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>105.6</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>30,348.0</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,710.33</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>570,569.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Excludes Mining

Source: Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission, September 2011

Hillsborough County Property Appraiser parcel data, August 2011

Open House September 20, 2011
## Table 10: Future Land Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future Land Use</th>
<th>University Area</th>
<th>Unincorporated HC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acreage</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural/Mining</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural/Rural</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural/Estate</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrus Park Village</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Mixed Use-12</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Industrial Park</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Industrial</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial-Planned</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Preservation</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Mixed Use-4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Commercial-20</td>
<td>464.2</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Environmental Community</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Quasi-Public</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Corporate Park</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential-1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential-12</td>
<td>231.0</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential-2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential-20</td>
<td>1,745.9</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential-4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential-6</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential-9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Mixed Use-35</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Planned-2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban Mixed Use-6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Mixed Use-20</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>19,812</td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission, September 2011
Hillsborough County Property Appraiser parcel data, 2011
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 11: Household Type (Including Living Alone) by Relationships</th>
<th>University CDP, Florida</th>
<th>Hillsborough County, Florida</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>Margin of Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>32,375</td>
<td>+/-2,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In households:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In family households:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householder:</td>
<td>5,536</td>
<td>+/-685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2,103</td>
<td>+/-499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3,433</td>
<td>+/-452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>2,492</td>
<td>+/-525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>7,464</td>
<td>+/-1,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandchild</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>+/-313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brother or sister</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>+/-290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>+/-190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other relatives</td>
<td>1,329</td>
<td>+/-814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonrelatives:</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>+/-346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housemate or roommate</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>+/-247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried partner</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>+/-212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other nonrelatives</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>+/-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In nonfamily households:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householder:</td>
<td>8,186</td>
<td>+/-752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3,910</td>
<td>+/-575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living alone</td>
<td>2,977</td>
<td>+/-490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not living alone</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>+/-379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4,276</td>
<td>+/-566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living alone</td>
<td>3,309</td>
<td>+/-481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not living alone</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>+/-285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonrelatives:</td>
<td>3,906</td>
<td>+/-1,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housemate or roommate</td>
<td>2,637</td>
<td>+/-968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried partner</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>+/-206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other nonrelatives</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>+/-430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In group quarters</td>
<td>1,376</td>
<td>+/-581</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2007-2009 American Community Survey, Margin of Error based on 90 percent confidence
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Hillsborough County</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>University CDP</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>Margin of Error</td>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>Margin of Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>777,178</td>
<td>+/-260</td>
<td>18,249</td>
<td>+/-1,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school graduate:</td>
<td>109,829</td>
<td>+/-3,579</td>
<td>4,417</td>
<td>+/-810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In labor force:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak only English</td>
<td>26,910</td>
<td>+/-1,717</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>+/-301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak Spanish</td>
<td>23,199</td>
<td>+/-1,731</td>
<td>1,133</td>
<td>+/-448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak all other languages</td>
<td>3,157</td>
<td>+/-631</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>+/-210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in labor force:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak only English</td>
<td>35,694</td>
<td>+/-2,092</td>
<td>1,531</td>
<td>+/-487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak Spanish</td>
<td>17,593</td>
<td>+/-1,350</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>+/-305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak all other languages</td>
<td>3,276</td>
<td>+/-592</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>+/-111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate (includes equivalency):</td>
<td>220,301</td>
<td>+/-5,253</td>
<td>5,416</td>
<td>+/-1,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In labor force:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak only English</td>
<td>142,562</td>
<td>+/-4,165</td>
<td>3,203</td>
<td>+/-840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak Spanish</td>
<td>105,115</td>
<td>+/-3,445</td>
<td>2,228</td>
<td>+/-615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak all other languages</td>
<td>6,188</td>
<td>+/-1,026</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>+/-204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in labor force:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak only English</td>
<td>77,739</td>
<td>+/-2,768</td>
<td>2,213</td>
<td>+/-586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak Spanish</td>
<td>61,636</td>
<td>+/-2,349</td>
<td>1,555</td>
<td>+/-377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak all other languages</td>
<td>13,070</td>
<td>+/-1,142</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>+/-447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college or associate’s degree:</td>
<td>222,286</td>
<td>+/-4,581</td>
<td>4,156</td>
<td>+/-750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In labor force:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak only English</td>
<td>166,078</td>
<td>+/-3,577</td>
<td>2,618</td>
<td>+/-612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak Spanish</td>
<td>133,131</td>
<td>+/-3,253</td>
<td>1,915</td>
<td>+/-524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak all other languages</td>
<td>6,233</td>
<td>+/-860</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>+/-117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in labor force:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak only English</td>
<td>56,208</td>
<td>+/-2,143</td>
<td>1,538</td>
<td>+/-447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak Spanish</td>
<td>45,478</td>
<td>+/-2,043</td>
<td>1,184</td>
<td>+/-388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak all other languages</td>
<td>7,480</td>
<td>+/-869</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>+/-156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree or higher:</td>
<td>224,762</td>
<td>+/-4,949</td>
<td>4,260</td>
<td>+/-873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In labor force:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak only English</td>
<td>176,460</td>
<td>+/-3,942</td>
<td>2,790</td>
<td>+/-652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak Spanish</td>
<td>138,065</td>
<td>+/-3,401</td>
<td>1,395</td>
<td>+/-484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak all other languages</td>
<td>20,634</td>
<td>+/-1,255</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>+/-178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in labor force:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak only English</td>
<td>48,302</td>
<td>+/-1,997</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td>+/-490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak Spanish</td>
<td>37,606</td>
<td>+/-1,897</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>+/-334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak all other languages</td>
<td>5,085</td>
<td>+/-573</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>+/-177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2007-2009 American Community Survey, Margin of Error based on 90% confidence
### Table 13: Year Structure Built

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>University CDP</th>
<th>MOE</th>
<th>Hillsborough County</th>
<th>MOE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17,112 +/-907</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>521,939 +/-1,660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built 2005 or later</td>
<td>579 +/-223</td>
<td></td>
<td>31,836 +/-1,594</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built 2000 to 2004</td>
<td>1,508 +/-401</td>
<td></td>
<td>70,565 +/-2,182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built 1990 to 1999</td>
<td>2,306 +/-495</td>
<td></td>
<td>89,462 +/-2,628</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built 1980 to 1989</td>
<td>5,553 +/-596</td>
<td></td>
<td>118,350 +/-2,887</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built 1970 to 1979</td>
<td>4,318 +/-594</td>
<td></td>
<td>85,826 +/-2,109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built 1960 to 1969</td>
<td>2,107 +/-418</td>
<td></td>
<td>52,901 +/-1,801</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built 1950 to 1959</td>
<td>289 +/-172</td>
<td></td>
<td>41,634 +/-1,575</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built 1940 to 1949</td>
<td>219 +/-159</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,824 +/-1,187</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built 1939 or earlier</td>
<td>233 +/-161</td>
<td></td>
<td>16,541 +/-1,023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau, 2007-2009 American Community Survey, Margin of Error based on 90 percent confidence

### Table 14: Median Earnings in the Past 12 Months (in 2009 Inflation-Adjusted Dollars) by Sex by Work Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>University CDP</th>
<th>MOE</th>
<th>Hillsborough County</th>
<th>MOE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persons 16 years and over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (dollars):</td>
<td>16,828 +/-1,078</td>
<td></td>
<td>29,594 +/-438</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male --</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (dollars)</td>
<td>19,786 +/-3,226</td>
<td></td>
<td>33,191 +/-699</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked full time, year round in the past 12 months (dollars)</td>
<td>25,067 +/-1,844</td>
<td>41,741 +/-488</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (dollars)</td>
<td>12,056 +/-3,740</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,704 +/-815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female --</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (dollars)</td>
<td>12,801 +/-3,246</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,758 +/-434</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked full time, year round in the past 12 months (dollars)</td>
<td>27,067 +/-3,249</td>
<td>35,118 +/-573</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (dollars)</td>
<td>7,229 +/-1,433</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,912 +/-393</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau, 2007-2009 American Community Survey, Margin of Error based on 90 percent confidence
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>University CDP</th>
<th>MOE</th>
<th>Hillsborough County</th>
<th>MOE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupied Housing Units</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No vehicle available</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>+/808</td>
<td>8,079</td>
<td>+/2,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One vehicle available</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>+/251</td>
<td>90,981</td>
<td>+/2,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two vehicles available</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>+/251</td>
<td>131,227</td>
<td>+/2,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three vehicles available</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>+/93</td>
<td>40,380</td>
<td>+/1,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four vehicles available</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>+/54</td>
<td>10,714</td>
<td>+/952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five or more vehicles available</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>+/37</td>
<td>2,471</td>
<td>+/480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Renter Occupied Units</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No vehicle available</td>
<td>3,492</td>
<td>+/572</td>
<td>22,424</td>
<td>+/1,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One vehicle available</td>
<td>6,136</td>
<td>+/765</td>
<td>89,047</td>
<td>+/2,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two vehicles available</td>
<td>2,097</td>
<td>+/486</td>
<td>49,974</td>
<td>+/2,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three vehicles available</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>+/206</td>
<td>7,934</td>
<td>+/988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four vehicles available</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>+/85</td>
<td>1,318</td>
<td>+/405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five or more vehicles available</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>+/49</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>+/175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau, 2007-2009 American Community Survey, Margin of Error based on 90 percent confidence
Table 16: Poverty Status of Individuals in the Past 12 Months by Living Arrangement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>University CDP, Florida</th>
<th>Hillsborough County, Florida</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>Margin of Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>32,375 +/-2,797</td>
<td>1,181,782 +/ -4,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In households:</td>
<td>30,999 +/-2,849</td>
<td>942,596 +/-5,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In family households:</td>
<td>18,907 +/-2,724</td>
<td>942,596 +/-5,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householder:</td>
<td>5,536 +/-685</td>
<td>288,073 +/-2,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2,103 +/-499</td>
<td>161,499 +/-2,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3,433 +/-452</td>
<td>126,574 +/-2,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>2,492 +/-525</td>
<td>203,771 +/-3,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>7,464 +/-1,533</td>
<td>347,821 +/-4,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandchild</td>
<td>483 +/-313</td>
<td>22,714 +/-1,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brother or sister</td>
<td>586 +/-290</td>
<td>14,108 +/-1,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>311 +/-190</td>
<td>15,587 +/-1,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other relatives</td>
<td>1,329 +/-814</td>
<td>25,627 +/-2,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housemate or roommate</td>
<td>706 +/-346</td>
<td>24,895 +/-1,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried partner</td>
<td>322 +/-247</td>
<td>4,349 +/-863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other nonrelatives</td>
<td>351 +/-212</td>
<td>11,748 +/-1,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>311 +/-190</td>
<td>15,587 +/-1,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other relatives</td>
<td>1,329 +/-814</td>
<td>25,627 +/-2,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonrelatives</td>
<td>706 +/-346</td>
<td>24,895 +/-1,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housemate or roommate</td>
<td>322 +/-247</td>
<td>4,349 +/-863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried partner</td>
<td>351 +/-212</td>
<td>11,748 +/-1,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other nonrelatives</td>
<td>33 +/-52</td>
<td>8,798 +/-1,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>311 +/-190</td>
<td>15,587 +/-1,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other relatives</td>
<td>1,329 +/-814</td>
<td>25,627 +/-2,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonrelatives</td>
<td>706 +/-346</td>
<td>24,895 +/-1,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housemate or roommate</td>
<td>322 +/-247</td>
<td>4,349 +/-863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried partner</td>
<td>351 +/-212</td>
<td>11,748 +/-1,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other nonrelatives</td>
<td>33 +/-52</td>
<td>8,798 +/-1,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In nonfamily households:</td>
<td>12,092 +/-1,694</td>
<td>219,842 +/-4,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householder:</td>
<td>8,186 +/-752</td>
<td>166,786 +/-2,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3,910 +/-575</td>
<td>81,576 +/-2,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living alone</td>
<td>2,977 +/-490</td>
<td>59,941 +/-2,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not living alone</td>
<td>933 +/-379</td>
<td>21,635 +/-1,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4,276 +/-566</td>
<td>85,210 +/-2,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living alone</td>
<td>3,309 +/-481</td>
<td>70,884 +/-1,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not living alone</td>
<td>967 +/-285</td>
<td>14,326 +/-1,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonrelatives</td>
<td>3,906 +/-1,181</td>
<td>53,056 +/-2,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housemate or roommate</td>
<td>2,637 +/-968</td>
<td>22,340 +/-2,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried partner</td>
<td>595 +/-206</td>
<td>18,956 +/-1,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other nonrelatives</td>
<td>674 +/-430</td>
<td>11,760 +/-1,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In group quarters</td>
<td>1,376 +/-581</td>
<td>19,344 +/-4,190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2007-2009 American Community Survey, Margin of Error based on 90 percent confidence
Table 17: Household and Family Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Median Household income</th>
<th>Mean Household income</th>
<th>Median Family income</th>
<th>Mean Family income</th>
<th>Per Capita income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University CDP</td>
<td>$21,238</td>
<td>$28,944</td>
<td>$27,475</td>
<td>$34,655</td>
<td>$13,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE +/-</td>
<td>$2,043</td>
<td>$2,302</td>
<td>$5,187</td>
<td>$4,282</td>
<td>$1,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutz CDP</td>
<td>$72,627</td>
<td>$95,189</td>
<td>$88,838</td>
<td>$111,774</td>
<td>$35,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE +/-</td>
<td>$4,764</td>
<td>$7,466</td>
<td>$7,400</td>
<td>$9,979</td>
<td>$3,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Magdalene CDP</td>
<td>$49,712</td>
<td>$75,983</td>
<td>$70,262</td>
<td>$97,238</td>
<td>$32,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE +/-</td>
<td>$7,071</td>
<td>$6,541</td>
<td>$7,595</td>
<td>$9,844</td>
<td>$2,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt Lake-Leto CDP</td>
<td>$38,978</td>
<td>$49,460</td>
<td>$44,873</td>
<td>$58,825</td>
<td>$20,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE +/-</td>
<td>$2,357</td>
<td>$3,959</td>
<td>$3,068</td>
<td>$6,787</td>
<td>$1,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Carrollwood CDP</td>
<td>$55,439</td>
<td>$81,191</td>
<td>$75,372</td>
<td>$100,008</td>
<td>$35,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE +/-</td>
<td>$9,093</td>
<td>$9,767</td>
<td>$8,712</td>
<td>$14,801</td>
<td>$3,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td>$43,652</td>
<td>$67,459</td>
<td>$51,207</td>
<td>$81,108</td>
<td>$27,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE +/-</td>
<td>$1,012</td>
<td>$2,213</td>
<td>$1,815</td>
<td>$3,718</td>
<td>$917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple Terrace</td>
<td>$48,977</td>
<td>$67,126</td>
<td>$63,724</td>
<td>$85,650</td>
<td>$28,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE +/-</td>
<td>$4,468</td>
<td>$5,326</td>
<td>$5,220</td>
<td>$8,239</td>
<td>$2,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide</td>
<td>$50,384</td>
<td>$69,623</td>
<td>$61,450</td>
<td>$81,191</td>
<td>$27,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE +/-</td>
<td>$571</td>
<td>$893</td>
<td>$723</td>
<td>$1,293</td>
<td>$393</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau, 2007-2009 American Community Survey
Margin of Error based on 90 percent confidence
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Families below poverty</th>
<th>Married-couple family</th>
<th>Female householder, no husband present</th>
<th>All persons below poverty status</th>
<th>Under 18 years</th>
<th>18-64 years</th>
<th>65 years and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University CDP</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE +/-</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutz CDP</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE +/-</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Magdalene CDP</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE +/-</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt Lake-Leto CDP</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE +/-</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Carrollwood CDP</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE +/-</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE +/-</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple Terrace</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE +/-</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE +/-</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau, 2007-2009 American Community Survey
Margin of Error based on 90 percent confidence
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Birth By Citizenship Status</th>
<th>University CDP, Florida</th>
<th>Hillsborough County, Florida</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>Margin of Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>32,375</td>
<td>+/-2,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native:</td>
<td>25,222</td>
<td>+/-2,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in state of residence:</td>
<td>13,261</td>
<td>+/-1,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in other state in the United States:</td>
<td>10,163</td>
<td>+/-1,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>3,189</td>
<td>+/-616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>2,877</td>
<td>+/-781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>3,351</td>
<td>+/-668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>+/-331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born outside the United States:</td>
<td>1,798</td>
<td>+/-833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>1,636</td>
<td>+/-832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Island Areas</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>+/-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born abroad of American parent(s)</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>+/-113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign born:</td>
<td>7,153</td>
<td>+/-1,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalized U.S. citizen</td>
<td>1,912</td>
<td>+/-454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a U.S. citizen</td>
<td>5,241</td>
<td>+/-1,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other nonrelatives</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>+/-52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2007-2009 American Community Survey,
Margin of Error based on 90 percent confidence
Online Constant Contacts

Survey Results
## Constant Contact Survey Results

**Survey Name:** University Area Community Plan Update  
**Response Status:** Partial & Completed  
**Filter:** None  
**Feb 09, 2012 4:20:24 PM**

### 1. How long have you lived, worked, owned a business, rented commercial space, or otherwise been connected to this community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Number of Response(s)</th>
<th>Response Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 1 year</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5 years</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10 years</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 20 years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20 years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not connected to this neighborhood</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Responses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>250</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Which of the following describes your connection to the University Area Community? Please check all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connection</th>
<th>Number of Response(s)</th>
<th>Response Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I live in the University Area Community.</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I work in the University Area Community.</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I own property in the University Area Community.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I own a business in the University Area Community.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I go to school here.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use community services or belong to a social organization here.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Why do you choose to live, work, shop, play, or own a business, etc., in the University Area Community?

180 Response(s)

4. Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Weakness</th>
<th>Neutral or No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location of community</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character of community</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment in community</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mix of land uses (homes, businesses, education, recreation, etc.)</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of property for development</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational resources</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural resources</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious institutions</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local businesses</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; recreation</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other

Total 236

14.8%

100%
5. Of the characteristics, services, programs and facilities above (question 4), which should be the highest priority?

156 Response(s)

6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.</th>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Weakness</th>
<th>Neutral or No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public safety</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkability</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transportation (HART)</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road network/ street system</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian safety</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle safety</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic congestion</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway maintenance</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street lighting</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle and pedestrian routes</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34 Comment(s)
7. Of the characteristics, services, programs and facilities above (question 6), which should be the highest priority?

171 Response(s)

8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.</th>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Weakness</th>
<th>Neutral or No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Center</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social service agencies</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly support and assistance</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government commitment and involvement</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job opportunities</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shops and restaurants</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing options - conditions and choices</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property values and affordability</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater/ drainage</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24 Comment(s)
9. Of the characteristics, services, programs and facilities above (question 8), which should be the highest priority?

163 Response(s)

10. As defined in the adopted 2001 University Area Community Plan, the following are Goals of the Plan in the process of being implemented in the community. Please rank the Goals from one (1) through five (5) with five (5) being the most important Goal of the Plan. Use the comment box to recommend other goals that should be included in the Plan Update. Remember: 5 = MOST Important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.</th>
<th>LEAST Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build new community infrastructure (ex: road improvements)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate uses of land that are obsolete or no longer viable</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create community identity</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure community input</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify areas for redevelopment</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23 Comment(s)

11. Thinking about major projects and programs that have been built or launched in the University Area over the past decade, please select the three (3) that have been the most beneficial to the community. If you have comments regarding major projects in the community, please use the comment box provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Response(s)</th>
<th>Response Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Activities &amp; Adult and Early Childhood Education Programs</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muller Magnet Elementary School (2003)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Area Community Development Center's +SPIN &amp; Parent Services</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. What other improvements would you like to see in the University Area Community?

148 Response(s)

13. What other comments or observations about the University Area Community do you have?

104 Response(s)

14. What is your zip code?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>Number of Response(s)</th>
<th>Response Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33612</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33613</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. If you would like to receive updates on the University Area Community Plan and other important updates about planning in your community, please provide your email address. Thank you!

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33617</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33620</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Responses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>250</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First Name 67
Last Name 65
Email Address 62
Postal Code 55
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Business Survey
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UNIVERSITY AREA COMMUNITY PLAN BUSINESS SURVEY

The involvement of those who live or own a business in the community is vital in chartering the future course for the community plan area. Planning Commission staff worked with the Hillsborough County Economic Development Department and the University Community Area Development Corporation to develop the business survey. The survey was intended to include indicators of the health and community development markers of local businesses along the major roadways. It was designed to provide a sample of business types and their current issues: in other words a snapshot of existing businesses, length in existence, number of employees and needs, vitality of businesses, and issues affecting their long term sustainability.

The University Area Community Plan is composed of 4 subareas as shown below in Figure 1. Based on the neighborhood character of each of the sub-areas, the designated Urban Infill and Redevelopment Area, composed of Subareas 1 and 2 were chosen as the focus of the application for the business survey. (Hillsborough County, through the then Planning and Growth Management Department received an Urban Infill and Redevelopment Assistance Planning Grant from the Florida Department of Community Areas in March 2001. The program encourages the redevelopment of Florida’s urban cores and provides economic assistance for the preparation and implementation of community redevelopment plans. The grant allowed Hillsborough County to update the 1997 Master Plan and designate Sub-Areas 1 and 2 as an Urban Infill and Redevelopment Area.)

1. North of Fletcher Avenue, west of Bruce B. Downs Boulevard, and east of I-275
2. South of Fletcher Avenue, west of Bruce B. Downs Boulevard, and east of I-275
3. North of Fletcher, east of Bruce B. Downs Boulevard, and west of E. 46th Street
4. Adjacent to the City of Temple Terrace, and south of E. Fletcher Avenue
The nature of the type of roadways differs from sub-areas 3 and 4 which are composed of more local roadway connective verse the pass through of the major roadway transecting sub-areas 1 and 2. The Urban Infill and Redevelopment program encourages the redevelopment of Florida’s urban cores and provides economic assistance for the preparation and implementation of community redevelopment plans. The major roadways in sub –areas 1 and 2 covered by the survey included sections of:

- E. Fletcher Avenue
- E. 131st Avenue
- E. Bearss Avenue
- Bruce B. Downs Boulevard/N. 30th Street
- N. Nebraska Avenue

Figure 2 illustrates staff’s assessment of market capture of the major roadways within the University Area Community Plan boundary.
Figure 3, below delineates the breakdown of survey subareas that the survey was administered

University Area Community Plan Business Survey Zones a-d

COMPLETED SURVEYS BY MAP AREAS

E. Fletcher Ave.
A1: E. Fletcher Ave., from N. Nebraska Ave. to N. 12th Str.
1134 E. Fletcher Avenue

A2: E. Fletcher Ave., from N. 12th Str. to N. 15th Str.
1220 E. Fletcher Avenue
1323 E. Fletcher Avenue
1345 E. Fletcher Avenue
1402 E. Fletcher Avenue
1410 E. Fletcher Avenue
1412 E. Fletcher Avenue
1414 E. Fletcher Avenue
1432 E. Fletcher Avenue
1441 E. Fletcher Ave Suite 141
1441 E Fletcher Ave
1444 E. Fletcher Ave

A3: E. Fletcher Ave., from N. 15th Str. to N. 19th Str.
No surveys reported

A4: E. Fletcher Ave., from N. 19th Str. to N. 22nd Str.
1935 E. Fletcher Avenue
1935 E. Fletcher Avenue
1937 E. Fletcher Avenue
2111 Fletcher Avenue
2002 E. Fletcher Ave Suite C
2002 E. Fletcher Avenue
2030 E. Fletcher Avenue

A5: E. Fletcher Ave., from N. 22nd Str. to Livingston Ave.
13301 N. 22nd Street
2001 E Fletcher Avenue
2107 E Fletcher Avenue
2216 Fletcher Avenue
2317 E Fletcher Avenue
2230 E Fletcher Avenue
2330 E Fletcher Avenue
2602 E Fletcher Avenue

A6: E. Fletcher Ave., from N. 23rd Str. to Bruce B. Downs Blvd./N. 30th Str.
13510 University Plaza Street
13514 Plaza Court
13520 University Plaza Street
13524 University Plaza Street
13528 University Plaza Street
13564 University Plaza Street
13574 University Plaza Street
13578 University Plaza Street
13602 University Plaza Street
13604 University Plaza Street
13606 University Plaza Street
13616 University Plaza Street

E. 131st Ave.
B1: E. 131st Ave., from N. Nebraska Ave. to Coastal Key Rd./N. 12th Str.
No surveys reported

B2: E. 131st Ave., from N. 12th Str. to N. 17th Str.
No surveys reported

B3: E. 131st Ave., from N. 17th Str. to N. 20th Str.
1902 E 131st Avenue

B4: E. 131st Ave., from N. 22nd Str. to Livingston Ave.
2202 E 131st

B5: E. 131st Ave., from N. 23rd Str. to Bruce B. Downs Blvd./N. 30th Str.
No surveys reported

E. Bearss Ave. and Bruce B. Downs/N. 30th Str.

C1: E. Bearss Ave., from N. 22nd Str. to west of Livingston Ave.
2255 E. Bearss Avenue
2267 E. Bearss Avenue
2271 E Bearss Avenue
2289 E Bearss Avenue
2291 E. Bearss Avenue

C2: E. Bearss Ave., from N. 19th Str. to N. 22nd Str.
1907 E. Bearss Avenue
1909 E Bears Avenue
1913 E Bears Avenue
1913 E Bears Avenue
1913 E Bears Avenue
1913 E Bears Avenue
1913 east Bears Avenue

C3: Bruce B. Downs/N. 30th Str. to Grand Pavilion Dr.
1448 Bruce B Down Blvd
14422 Bruce B Down
14434 Bruce B down
14440 E Bears Avenue
12206 Bruce B. Downs Blvd

C4: Bruce B. Downs/N. 30th Str., from north of Children’s Hospital to E. 138th Ave.
Mental Health facility

N. Nebraska Ave.
D1: N. Nebraska Ave., from E. Fletcher Ave., to E. 121st Ave.
No surveys reported
D2: N. Nebraska Ave., from E. 122 Ave. to E. 126th Ave.
12309 N. Nebraska Avenue
12317 N. Nebraska Avenue
12319 N. Nebraska Avenue

D3: N. Nebraska Ave., from E. 126th Ave. to Lexington Blvd.
12811 N. Nebraska Avenue

D4: N. Nebraska Ave., from E. 131st Ave. to E. Fletcher Ave.
13101 North Nebraska Avenue
13719 N Nebraska Ave

D5: N. Nebraska Ave., from E. Fletcher Ave. to E. 138th Ave.
13211-D N. Nebraska Ave
13719 N. Nebraska Avenue

D6: N. Nebraska Ave., from E. 138th Ave. to Skipper Road

**U. University Mall**
2139 University Square Mall
12207 University Square Mall
2264 University Square Mall
12335 University Square Mall

*No surveys reported*

Figure 4 below shows the location spread of completed surveys.
Total Survey completed 70

1. **In what category does your business fit?** [Based on survey or observation – categories are based on the NAICS – North American Industry Classification System]

   - Retail 47
   - Service 25
   - Wholesale 0
   - Manufacturing 0
   - Construction 3
   - Transportation and Warehousing 0
   - Information 0
   - Finance and Insurance 1
   - Real Estate and Rental and Leasing 1
   - Professional, Scientific, and Technical 0
   - Management of Companies and Enterprises 0
   - Educational Services 1
   - Health Care and Social Assistance 5
   - Public Administration 0
   - Other: Food, auto repair, food-diner, day labor
2. **How long has this business been operating?**
   - 0-2 years: 12
   - 3-10 years: 16
   - 10+ years: 35
   - Don’t Know: 6

3. **How long have you been in this location?**
   - 0-2 years: 20
   - 3-10 years: 24
   - 10+ years: 25
   - Don’t Know: 2

4. **Is this business locally owned?**
   - Yes: 49
   - No: 19

5. **How many Employees does the business currently employ?**
   - Owner
   - Full-Time
   - Part-Time

6. **How many employees did this business employ last year?**
   - Owner
   - Full-Time
   - Part-Time

7. **Do you expect to hire additional employees anytime within the next year?**
   - Yes: 33
   - No: 29
   - If so, around how many?: 1-11

8. **What type of skills do you look for when you are hiring new employees?**
   - Air conditioning installation
   - Sheet metal
   - ASE certified mechanics
   - Automotive knowledge people skills
   - Barbers
   - Basic Skills
   - Bilingual
   - Cashier experience
   - Certified car technician
   - Child care, 40 hours of outside training
   - Cleaning and knowledge of fish
   - Clerical, computer
   - Computer skills
   - Cooks and drivers
   - Customer Service
degree in construction management
degrees in medicine and mental health, clinical
fast worker
good morals, versatile
good work ethic
hairdresser, skin and nail
high school, some college
in depth knowledge of martial arts
insurance license
knowledge of cosmetics
knowledge of guns
medical assistance and nursing
medical coding, billing
multi tasking
non specific
people skills
retail experience
sales, service, internet
speak mandarin or chinese

9. Are you able to find qualified employees that meet this skill-set to hire?
   Yes  44
   No   19

10. From where do most of your customers come? (check all that apply)
   Neighborhood (University Area) 49
   Community (Tampa, Temple Terrace, Others in HC) 37
   Regional (All of Tampa Bay) 19
   Web/Internet 12
   Other:
       Hospitals
       VA, State, USF, Moffitt
       Ft. Meyers, Florida

11. Does the University Area have the customer base you need?
   Yes  46
   No   20

![Customer base needed](image)
12. Is safety an issue for you or your customers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, what needs improvement?

- more security
- accidents
- turning light
- non handicap cars in handicap parking
- rough neighborhood
- better crosswalks
- street lighting
- more police patrols
- center to help out kids and teens who steal
- 19th and Fletcher traffic
- people getting hit by cars
- Robberies
- drug dealing
- Stealing
- homeless
- increase patrols
- traffic
- panhandling
- vandalism
- j-walking
- "bullet proof vests, guns, muscles"
- sidewalks
- police are always in the area
13. If Crime is an issue for you, what types?
- assaults
- Shoplifting
- Robbery
- Break-ins
- Other:
  - petty theft
  - murder
  - verbal threats
  - homeless
  - theft
  - homeless
  - stealing
  - muggings,
  - vandalism
  - prostitution
  - drug dealing
  - alcoholics

14. Are you familiar with the University Area Enterprise Zone?
- Yes 14
- No 44

Familiarity with the Enterprise Zone
- Yes 24%
- No 76%
15. Have you heard of or been involved in the University Area Community Plan?
   Yes  5
   No  56

Familiarity with the Community Plan

16. Does anyone who works at this business live within the Enterprise Zone (green) area?
   Yes (how many)  31
   No  25
   Don’t Know  5
   1-7

17. Does anyone who works at this business live within the University Area Community Plan boundary (red)?
   Yes (how many)  26
   No  35
   Don’t Know  4
   Range of Responses  1-10

18. Are there any improvements (ex. renovation, expansion, etc.) being planned to this property or business in the next year?
   Yes  18
   No  36
   Don’t Know  12

19. What type of physical changes to the University Area community would increase your business?
   Neighborhood Beautification  24
   Better sidewalk connection  12
   Better bus service – hours & routes  11
   Flood control and streets  5
   Other:
   safety
   code enforcements
   wide bike lanes
   cleaner area
   paving streets
   more traffic lights
remove median 22nd street
homeless
security
aesthetics
cleaner streets
reduce traffic
bus stops (such covers)
living spaces
crime
bring back population
more crossings
better pedestrian
renovation
better more visible signs
signs too small
pedestrian crosswalks
better access to building
stop light entrance
networking
entrance is bad
Roads
construction delays
more security
traffic

20. What else can the government do that would help you grow your business?
   Job Training 9
   Building/redevelopment/permitting assistance 11
   Special business assistance programs 10
   Crime prevention 34
   Transportation improvements 21
   Community projects 13
   Community resources 8
   Actively promote civic groups (Ex. Apt. Associations, HOA, etc.) 7
   Develop/engage business groups (Ex. chamber of commerce) 9
   Other:
      grant money
      workforce center improvement
      no stereotypes
      more single family home
      economy
      security
      tax incentives
      water problems
      youth program
      police patrol
no adequate drainage
no cross walk
sponsorship - back to school bash softball teams
traffic lights

Aspects that need improvements

21. How familiar are you with the housing types (mobile homes, apartments, townhomes, and single family homes) in this area? [Circle One]

1 (very familiar) 30
2 8
3 11
4 10
5 (not familiar at all) 12

22. What do you think are some of the best things about the University Area?

Location to surrounding areas (USF, Hospitals, University Mall, New Tampa, etc.) 44
Established community partnerships with local businesses 4
University Area Community Development Center Programs 2
Fletcher Avenue improvement 11
University and major hospitals 19
Diverse population 23
K-12 Schools 4
Other:
  Park-n-ride
  good flow of traffic
  more culture based store business
security
busing
loyalty and support
strong community
22nd street improving
Busch Gardens
restaurants
frequent visits from police

Positive aspects of the area

23. What do you consider to be the biggest problems or challenges in the University Area?

- Disorganized business associations: 3
- Housing choices (apartments, townhomes, houses): 13
- Unique retail for area residents: 1
- Opportunities to live and work in the neighborhood: 6
- “Pass through” nature of traffic: 19
- “Suitcase City”/ transient reputation: 23
- Educational opportunities for residents: 12
- No affordable insurance for employers to offer workers: 6
- Need community character or identity for the neighborhood: 15
- The area is fragmented - residents, business owners, civic associations do not feel that they are part of a unique community: 10
Other:
  loud music
  panhandling
  racism against Hispanics
  lack of security
  the median on 22nd
  housing
  crime
  more police patrols
  better security at night
  homeless
  potholes
  pedestrian safety
  no economic stimulant
  drug dealing
  security
  fighting and violence
  lack of work
  more and bigger signs
  activities for teens
  drugs
  traffic
  more restaurants along Nebraska

![Graph showing major problems in the area]
What other ideas do you have that will help you sustain and grow your business? Please share any suggestions you have to make this area better for businesses in the University Area.

safer intersections
empty businesses
need of new businesses
renovating business
traffic lights
better security
better traffic lights
tax breaks
better traffic lights
bus stops more crosswalks
improve Fletcher Avenue
more police patrol
better traffic
better sidewalks
attractions for children
median on 22nd
more community development
improve reputation of area
homeless issues
lack of publicity
homeless shelter
security and safety
improve transportation system, beautification
improve roads
bigger business
homeless, crime
more police
policing cameras
not enough business
remodel
zoning networking
15th street drainage
Hillsborough County Sheriff

District 1, Report
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January 23, 2012

Mr. Pedro Parra
601 E. Kennedy, 18th Floor
P.O. Box 1110
Tampa, FL 33601

Dear Mr. Parra:

On behalf of all the personnel at District 1 of the Hillsborough County Sheriff's Office, thank you and your team for the work you are undertaking to make our community a more attractive and safe place to live and work.

As a result of our meeting with you and your staff on December 8th, I have provided statistical information and provided a list of needs and suggestions which should be useful as you work on the University Area Community Plan Update. Also, the surveys you provided to us were disseminated to our employees and returned to Ms. Yeneka Hemingway last week. Since the University Area Community Plan was published in 1997, significant improvements have been made in this area including the establishment of the Sheriff's Office District 1 headquarters.

The Hillsborough County Sheriff's Office is dedicated to ensure the safety and quality of life of the citizens of our community and this cannot be accomplished without partnership with agencies such as yours. We support and encourage the continued efforts to improve and enhance the infrastructure of the University Area. The implementation of needed improvements to this area will determine the direction of this community over the next ten to twenty years.

Again, thank you and your staff for meeting with us and for your interest in our perspective of the University Area Community Plan. Do not hesitate to contact me or my staff if additional information is needed.

Sincerely,

J.R. Burton, Major
District I Commander
University Area Community Development Plan
Information from the Hillsborough County Sheriff’s Office
District I Investigations Section

Areas 1 & 2:

- Increased street lighting to deter criminal activity, allow for safer pedestrian movement and improved use of existing video surveillance cameras.
- Additional surveillance cameras added to the existing 20 camera system.
  - Federate video feeds from existing sources such as Department of Transportation cameras, WalMart, Target and other government and quasi-public sources.
  - Allow apartment complexes and businesses to provide monitor only video feeds.
- Addition of gunshot location technology to reduce violent crimes and improve response to events involving firearms.
- Convert nuisance type apartments and duplexes into privately owned residences instead of leased or rented properties.
- Place emergency call boxes along high pedestrian areas of:
  - 15th Street between 142nd Avenue and Fowler Avenue.
  - 19th Street between 143rd Avenue and 127th Avenue
  - 22nd Street between Bearss Avenue and Club Drive (Universty Square Mall).
  - Nebraska Avenue between Bearss and Fowler Avenue.

Area 3:

- Due to this area being geographically isolated from other Hillsborough County resources including law enforcement and fire rescue, it might be better served by being annexed by either the city of Temple Terrace or the city of Tampa.
- More bicycle lanes and pedestrian friendly crossing areas. There are numerous residents with connections to the University of South Florida that travel between school/work and their residents via foot or bicycle.
- Addition of surveillance cameras could assist with safety and the monitoring of activity in this area.

Area 4:

- This area suffers from many poorly lit sections and winding roadways. Additional street lights would assist with personal safety issues for pedestrians, Pedi cyclists and vehicles.
- Widening the main thoroughfares of North 42nd Street and North 46th Street would alleviate some traffic congestion and allow for the installation of better lighting.
- Adding federated video feeds from the hospital and local businesses to the Eye on Crime camera system would assist with the monitoring of criminal activity in this area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>CRIME TYPE</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BURGLARY - ARMED</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BURGLARY - ASSAULT/BATTERY</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BURGLARY - BUSINESS</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BURGLARY - CURTILAGE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BURGLARY - POSSESS TOOLS/IMPEDE SERVICES</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BURGLARY - RESIDENCE</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BURGLARY - VEHICLE</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROBBERY</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROBBERY - BUSINESS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROBBERY - CARJACKING</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROBBERY - HOME INVASION</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROBBERY - PERSON</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THEFT - VEHICLE/OTHER MOBILE</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>500</strong></td>
<td><strong>368</strong></td>
<td><strong>330</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>BURGLARY - ARMED</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BURGLARY - ASSAULT/BATTERY</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BURGLARY - BUSINESS</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BURGLARY - CURTILAGE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BURGLARY - POSSESS TOOLS/IMPEDE SERVICES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BURGLARY - RESIDENCE</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BURGLARY - VEHICLE</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROBBERY</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROBBERY - BUSINESS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROBBERY - CARJACKING</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROBBERY - HOME INVASION</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROBBERY - PERSON</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THEFT - VEHICLE/OTHER MOBILE</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>615</strong></td>
<td><strong>447</strong></td>
<td><strong>369</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURGLARY - ARMED</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURGLARY - ASSAULT/BATTERY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURGLARY - BUSINESS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURGLARY - CURTILAGE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURGLARY - POSSESS TOOLS/IMPEDE SERVICES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURGLARY - RESIDENCE</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURGLARY - VEHICLE</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBBERY</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBBERY - HOME INVASION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBBERY - PERSON</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEFT - VEHICLE/OTHER MOBILE</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>147</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BURGLARY - ARMED</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURGLARY - ASSAULT/BATTERY</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURGLARY - BUSINESS</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURGLARY - CURTILAGE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURGLARY - POSSESS TOOLS/IMPEDE SERVICES</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURGLARY - RESIDENCE</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURGLARY - VEHICLE</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBBERY</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBBERY - BUSINESS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBBERY - CARJACKING</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBBERY - HOME INVASION</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBBERY - PERSON</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEFT - VEHICLE/OTHER MOBILE</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>254</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total Part 1 Crimes by Area / Year

AREA:
- 1.00
- 2.00
- 3.00
- 4.00
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role and Organization</th>
<th>Interview Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victor Crist</td>
<td>Hillsborough County, Board of County Commissioners, District 2</td>
<td>July 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wednesday, August 03, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thursday, September 29, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wit Ostrenko</td>
<td>Museum of Science and Industry (MOSI), President/CEO</td>
<td>Wednesday, August 03, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Bosek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Genshaft</td>
<td>University of South Florida, University President</td>
<td>Friday, August 05, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vickie Chachere</td>
<td>News Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Flick</td>
<td>Hillsborough County - Public Works, Traffic Services Division</td>
<td>Friday, August 05, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Montelione</td>
<td>Tampa City Council, District 7 New North Transportation Alliance, Co-Director, Transportation, Research Associate, Center for Urban Transportation (CUTR)</td>
<td>Monday, August 08, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Hendricks</td>
<td>City of Temple Terrace, Director of Community Development</td>
<td>Tuesday, August 09, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Stevenson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Parrish</td>
<td>Senior Planner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Samaniego</td>
<td>Planner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Small</td>
<td>City Clerk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy Tack</td>
<td>City Manager Administrative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesley &quot;Les&quot; Miller</td>
<td>Hillsborough County, Board of County Commissioners, District 3</td>
<td>Tuesday, August 16, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University Mall, University Mall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Locke</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Wednesday, August 17, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Severino</td>
<td>University of South Florida,</td>
<td>Wednesday, August 17, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fletcher Avenue Project Development and Environmental Study (PD&amp;E), Hillsborough County, Public Works</td>
<td>Friday, August 19, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Kniesly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Bentancourt</td>
<td>RS&amp;H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Langlass</td>
<td>RS&amp;H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Coleman</td>
<td>RS&amp;H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Feigenbaum</td>
<td>HART, University Community Hospital, Planning Director</td>
<td>Tuesday, August 23, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td>Monday, August 29, 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
University Area Community Plan  
Primary Stakeholder Interviews

LeRoy Moore  
Tampa Housing Authority  
University Area Community Development Corporation;  
Interim Director  
Wednesday, August 31, 2011

Sara Combs  
Director of Community Outreach  
Monday, November 7, 2001

Martine Dorvil  
Director of Affordable Housing  
Monday, November 7, 2001

Michael Morina  
Pastor, University Baptist Church and Senior Vice President of USF Area Community Civic Association, Inc.  
H. Lee Moffitt Cancer Center & Research Institute, Director of Planning  
Friday, September 9, 2011

Don Grantham  
Community Service Coordinator, Hillsborough County Economic Development Department  
Monday, September 12, 2011

Diane Hammom  
New North Transportation Alliance Presentation  
Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Open House #1  
Director, Parking & Transportation Services, University of South Florida, Bull Runner  
Tuesday, September 20, 2011

Manuel Lopez  
Rick Fallin  
Transportation Manager  
Director, Hillsborough County, Affordable Housing Services  
Friday, September 30, 2011

Paula Harvey  
Karen Collins  
Senior Planner  
Manager of Contracts and Compliance  
Lanette Glass  
Neighborhood Stabilization Manager  
Wednesday, October 5, 2011

Temple Terrace Chamber of Commerce  
University Area Enterprise Zone Board  
Lawrence Hall  
USF Area Community Civic Association  
David Cantello  
Board Presentation  
Vice Chair Robbins Lumber Co  
Board Presentation  
Pastor, Tampa Para Christo  
Wednesday, October 11, 2011  
Wednesday, October 19, 2011  
Wednesday, October 26, 2011
University Area Community Plan
Primary Stakeholder Interviews

Ondina Hernandez  Mission Director, Mision Santa  Wednesday, October 26, 2001
Bob Morris  Maria  Monsignor, Catholic Diocese

Father Jude Vera  Pastor, St. Mary Catholic Church  Monday, October 31, 2011

Angela Severino  James A Haley Veteran’s Hospital  Wednesday, November 9, 2011
Verana Richardson  Acting Deputy Director  Suzanne Tate  Acting Associate Director
Edward Cutolo  MD, Chief of Staff  Laureen Doloresco  Care/Nursing Services
Shella Miller  Acting Assistant Director  Hillsborough County Sheriff's Office

J. R. Burton, Major District I  Deputy District Commander  Thursday, December 8, 2011
Captain Rick Hernandez  Investigations Commander
Lelutenant David Fleet  Crime Analyst
Amber Warnock

Eleyes (Evie) Larmond  President of Carribean Community Association  Monday December 19, 2011
Josette TouLme  President of Haitian Association Foundation  Tuesday December 20, 2011
Josette TouLme  Mental Health Forum Haitian Community  Thursday January 19, 2012
Josette TouLme  Carribean Community Association  Friday January 20, 2012
Eleyes (Evie) Larmond

David Cantello  Pastor, Tampa Para Christo  Sunday January 22, 2012
Dan Jurman  UACDC Executive Director  Tuesday, February 07, 2012
Monday February 13, 2012
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Agenda and Speakers
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open House #1/Kickoff</strong></td>
<td>The open house is an informal meeting held jointly with the Hillsborough County Public Works Department. It gave citizens an opportunity to ask questions of staff therefore there was no agenda or speakers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stakeholder Interviews</strong></td>
<td>Rather than hold monthly meeting to capture feedback from citizens in the community staff thought it would be more productive and efficient to interview key stakeholders within the community. (Please see attached the list on stakeholders that were interviewed.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open House #2</strong></td>
<td>This open house was an informal meeting held to give citizens an opportunity to give feedback about what the stakeholders said about future changes in the community. It gave citizens an opportunity to ask questions of staff therefore there was no agenda or speakers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advisory Committee Meeting #1 (Housing)</strong></td>
<td>Presentations:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Strategies from 2001 Master Plan and University Area Community Plan and Comments from the University Area Community Plan Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- University Area Rental/Redevelopment Study Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Affordable Housing Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Community Policing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Critical Intervention Services, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- University Area Community Development Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Recommendations from Hillsborough County Sheriff’s Office/ Critical Intervention Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Advisory Committee Meeting #2 (Transportation) | University Area Community Plan Findings- Pedro Parra, Planning Commission  and Randy Kranjec, Metropolitan Planning Organization  
| May 8, 2012 (6:00-8:00pm)  
| University Community Development Center  
| Tampa, FL 33613  
| - Master Plan for Physical Revitalization  
| - Addendum D (Urban Infill and Redevelopment Plan)  
| - Comprehensive Plan Adoption  
| - North 22nd Street Master Plan  
| - University of South Florida Area Multimodal Transportation District, Study Area Evaluation & Transportation Needs  
| - County Walk/Bike Plan  
| - Pedestrian Safety Action Plan  
| - Bicycle Safety Action Plan  
| - Fletcher Avenue Complete Streets Project  
| - Fletcher Avenue Development and Environmental Study  
| - Stakeholder Interviews  
| - Pending University Transit Study, Randy Kranjec, Metropolitan Planning Organization  
| - TBARTA/FDOT Regional Transit Corridor Evaluation, USF to Wesley Chapel study involves Bruce B. Downs Boulevard, Cindy Sharpe, Public Relations |
| Advisory Committee Mtg. #3 (Economic Development) | Strategies from the 2001 Master Plan, Urban Infill and Redevelopment Plan and University Area Community Plan  
| June 19, 2012  
| University Community Development Center  
| Tampa, FL 33613  
| - Hillsborough County Land Development Code  
|  - University Community Area  
|  - Main Street District (UCA-MS)  
|  - Neighborhood Office District (UCA-NHO)  
|  - Special University Community Districts (1, 2, 3 and 4)  
|  - Demographic Data  
|  - Comments from the University Area Community Plan Survey  
|  - Studies |
### Business Survey

**Week of**

This business survey was undertaken as a partnership between the University Area Community Development Corporation, Hillsborough County Economic Development Services, and the Planning Commission. The Business Survey was administered over a three day period July 10, 11, and 12 to determine how local businesses were performing and what services they may need to be more successful now and in the future.

### Advisory Committee Mtg. #4 (Business Survey)

**July 24, 2012**

University Community Development Center
Tampa, FL 33613

### Open House #3

**September 27, 2012 (5:30-7:30pm)**

University Community Development Center
Tampa, FL 33613

This Open House was an opportunity for citizens to view and comment on the work that the advisory committee and stakeholders developed. Also to review the proposed changes to the adopted community plan.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Communication Method</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kickoff Open House #1</td>
<td>September 20, 2011</td>
<td>University Community Development Center, 14013 North 22nd Street</td>
<td>A hard copy flyer was sent to approximately 7,200 people and stakeholders meetings</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House</td>
<td>March 5, 2012</td>
<td>University Community Development Center, 14013 North 22nd Street</td>
<td>An electronic notification was sent out to approximately 173 people. A hard copy flyer was sent to approximately 8.</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Issues</td>
<td>April 17, 2012</td>
<td>University Community Development Center, 14013 North 22nd Street</td>
<td>An electronic notification was sent out to approximately 328 people. A hard copy flyer was sent to approximately 8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Meeting</td>
<td>May 8, 2012</td>
<td>University Community Development Center, 14013 North 22nd Street</td>
<td>An electronic notification was sent out to approximately 337 people. A hard copy flyer was sent to approximately 12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development Opportunities</td>
<td>June 19, 2012</td>
<td>University Community Development Center, 14013 North 22nd Street</td>
<td>An electronic notification was sent out to approximately 341 people. A hard copy flyer was sent to approximately 12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development Opportunities</td>
<td>July 24, 2012</td>
<td>University Community Development Center, 14013 North 22nd Street</td>
<td>An electronic notification was sent out to approximately 381 people. A hard copy flyer was sent to approximately 13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House</td>
<td>September 27, 2012</td>
<td>University Community Development Center, 14013 North 22nd Street</td>
<td>An electronic notification was sent out to approximately 371 people. A hard copy flyer was sent to approximately 3,154</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss Responses from Open House</td>
<td>October 9, 2012</td>
<td>University Community Development Center, 14013 North 22nd Street</td>
<td>An electronic notification was sent out to approximately 373 people. A hard copy flyer was sent to approximately 20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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