

Residential Planned-2 (RP-2) Land Use Study

Thursday, Jun 18, 2020 05:09 PM EDT - 07:16 PM EDT

Note: The below Questions are a direct transcription from the written questions submitted during the presentation. The Answers have been slightly edited for brevity.

- **Q: In the past Developer Credits were used in the area, but that's not how it is anymore. If you increase the developer fees to address the infrastructure issues, how can you guarantee it will be used here, and not used elsewhere in the county?**

Question asked by: Brittany Stohr

A: Jared Schneider: That's been a discussion in the County recently, with mobility and impact fees being increased so our hope obviously is that's directed here within the community as developments are being built so I think that's something we need to continue to talk about with the County and make sure that's what's going on. I will say on top of mobility fees and impact fees we've also been looking at what are some other revenue sources like a Tax Increment Financing or Municipal Service tax for the area that gets spent in the community as well so yeah that's a really good question.

Yassert Gonzalez: Usually the ways those fees are structured, they have a lot of strings attached and that was one thing that was impressed upon in the last meeting we had with the County Attorney, you just cannot willy-nilly spend it anywhere. They have a specific purpose and they will be attached to those and again like you said we've been meeting with them and they have made it clear that if we collect in certain neighborhoods in certain places they will have to be spent there. There are very enforceable ways of preventing the money from being misspent.

- **Q: Please explain why a parcel of 100 acres shouldn't be treated same as 160 acres; particularly with smaller parcels scattered near/amongst "downtown Balm" area where any transit might serve? Wouldn't this same central area also be the commercial focus instead of scattered commercial with each project (similar to Wimauma concept)?**

Question asked by: Michael Peterson

A: Jared Schneider: That's something we have had a lot of discussion on. The 160 acres was kind of an arbitrary set up based on what a neighborhood size would look like in the past when the policies were developed. So that's really what we are having a lot of discussion on now – do we have some kind of minimum, especially

in that south village area that we showed. Right now we kept it at 160 acres or if you are adjacent, so we felt like we are really trying to make sure you didn't have the sprawled out area, two dwelling units throughout the smaller lots but I do think from some of our discussions we are having we are probably going to have something that's your example of 100 acres, that's a pretty large set up and you have them spread out in downtown Balm so I think we'll be revisiting that when we have more discussion.

Kelley I want to go back to...we can talk more about the commercial. I think that would be good in the open commentary too. That was an interesting point about the downtown Balm as well. You and I talked a little bit about that trying to encourage if somebody wants to do commercial in that area so that was something we put in the Community Benefits as well – as a part of the Community Benefit could you start to put infrastructure into the downtown Balm area.

- **Q: How many people are online**

Question asked by: Buddy Harwell

A: Lionel Fuentes: At the time the question was asked we had 30 online.

- **Q: Small parcels also required to give up a 250' buffer around their perimeter same as large projects of hundreds of acres?**

Question asked by: Michael Peterson

A: Jared Schneider: That's the issue, right, if you have an acre and then you take 250 feet on all the sides so that's where we are trying to provide some flexibility because we felt like I've heard the community, I understand the 250 foot but if it's a flat surface and it's not providing that buffer away from the development that's where we want to provide the flexibility but still listen to the community and with different buffering requirements is it a berm – that's some of what we wanted to look at.

Kelley Klepper: It's one of those things a lot of communities start looking at a sliding scale of sorts. As the distance decreases, the amount of trees and landscape berms and things like that increases and that can also be applied to projects or parcel sizes as well. The one thing we always talk about is that one size does not fit all and there is not one piece of property out there that is exactly square or would fit that so I think we definitely need to look at some variations in that while still achieving the ultimate desire there.

- **Q: How do you reconcile need to accommodate new population without wasteful sprawl of low density with calls for public water/sewer service that doesn't work without densities higher than you're discussing; particularly with clustering reluctance?**

Question asked by: Michael Peterson

A: Jared Schneider: That's the issue we talk about with suburban sprawl. We're concerned if you have larger lots spread out through the area it's not going to be efficient from a water /sewer area so we are really trying to balance and blend that. So that's the portion of the clustering that we do like is you get not only is it the water/sewer but it's the street concentrated in certain areas, it's much more efficient, I know the County and Planning Commission are looking at an overall One Water system. So we are really trying to concentrate services in certain areas.

Kelley Klepper: It does start to become a numbers game, I shouldn't say game but what's the return on investment. Part of it is a tradeoff, you start looking at some of the environmental impacts without sanitary sewer versus the needs and property rights of those property owners. It's a very fine line to balance them off between.

- **Q: the area around hawkstone development...what is going on with Hobson Simmons Rd area**

Question asked by: Shirley Ahedo

A: Kami Corbett: I represent the developer of Hawkstone so I can provide a little bit of background. I don't know specific information and I am happy if you all want to share my information with Shirley and she can get in touch with me. Right now, they are not planning on using Hobson Simmons as an access road. There are only requirements to improve Hobson Simmons if they use it as an access point and there are no plans to do that at this time. There also is a requirement to put up a fence and plant fairly mature trees and to retain the mature trees along Hobson Simmons. That was themed to be a rural road and we were actually required to screen.

- **Q: Will there be consideration and flexibility for smaller parcel buffers? a 250' buffer takes a disproportionate share of land on a 50 acre vs 160+ acre parcel. Buffers along the primary roads ie Balm Boyette important - but large buffers not necessarily needed when adjacent to another RP-2 development with cross connections.**

Question asked by: Kelly Love

A: Jared Schneider: We're trying to be as flexible as possible so it's not a stringent standard but yet it meets the intent of what we've talked about and that's really buffering when you don't have an RP-2 development with a cross connection but I agree with the RP-2 development with a cross-connection. You're absolutely right so that's partially

why we talked about the 250 foot and then having a scale-back or step-down approach that Kelley mentioned.

Kelley Klepper: A lot of places where they do similar types of these transitions, we'll actually put in place the standard but then allow for a reduction if there is an existing development or if there's an agreement between the property owners of those two property owners at that time to allow for a reduction.

- **Q: can the development area take anyone's property as eminent domain**
Question asked by: Shirley Ahedo

A: Jay Collins: In this planning project there is no eminent domain that is a part of this. The government is not looking to buy anyone's properties or anything else with this so we can hopefully ease your mind in that respect. All private property owners have a right to sell their properties to each other or anyone else they may have the desire to sell it to.

- **Q: Comment with regards to the clustering. The issue we have is that the cluster leads to more houses and more people in the long term. If you have the third option is that eventually someone goes in and develops in 10 years down the way anyways. This is happening right now in the North section, and we don't like it.**
Question asked by: Brittany Stohr

A: Jared Schneider: I'd like to hear more about that. When we are talking about the clustering, we are really trying to talk about the open space that does stay open space for perpetuity for recreational or whether its something else farm related. I could understand that where you have infill that comes in and that has happened in some areas.

Kelley Klepper: Generally, that's not the intent behind a true cluster. I know that in some areas if it's in a transitional area, which of course this is not at this point, there are provisions set up for that but in the majority of cases I've seen have been those areas are set aside with a conservation easement or preservation easement or something along those lines.

- **Q: Are you feeling free to suggest your best planning suggestions for future needs in this growing area, or are you forced to honor resident desires even if they are contrary to good planning practices? Everyone knows what some would dictate on property of others, but weren't you brought in for an independent look of what's best for this area's future in context of south Hillsborough's undeniable growth pressures mirroring county and state population increases? Sensing a danger of**

watered-down suggestions trying to appease all that become unworkable/ineffective as repeat of the RP-2 you're supposed to fix.

Question asked by: Michael Peterson

A: Jared Schneider: Yes we were brought in as an independent party and yes we do feel that way. I don't think we've had anyone tell us 'you have to say this', no one has told us that. I think it's not an easy balance. We're trying to listen to the community that's been out there, that's out there today while also planning for good growth. I think what we have right now are some of the policies you are seeing is some of the general framework so definitely getting into more of the details we are talking a little bit about that. The last thing we want to do is have some watered down policies and I think somebody said it, we want it to be pretty clear and that was the danger in the past where I think it wasn't clear. Also I'll say that again I don't want it to be watered down practices at this point I want it to be very clear.

Kelley Klepper: The one thing that I will say is in working with Jay and Mariann and the staff it's been very clear early on of 'what do you think? how do you see this area growing/developing? what are some tools that we can think about?'. So staff has been very open and welcoming to the analysis and the information that we've been looking at for a couple of different months. At the end of the day, we're going to make a recommendation through staff and there's going to be a public process on this and it's going to be up to the elected officials to support those recommendations. And everyone gets a chance to make their comments and their thoughts known especially in the public forum. We're going to be making recommendations based on sound planning principals and understanding of individual property rights and an overall general sense of what's going on in this portion of the County.

Jared Schneider: We've talked a lot about this Kelley. RP-2 did not work, it didn't really work for anyone so at the end of the day we may not all agree on everything, but we want an RP-2 that works.

- **Q: At what point in time during this study are we going to be talking about the counties responsibility in timely provide their required part? Schools, roads,..**

Question asked by: Michael Fabbro

A: Jared Schneider: Definitely internal to the site we are talking about providing school sites, that's got to be key – I know we've talked about the access to schools, to streets. I think a lot of the infrastructure we've talked about in the past has been the substandard roadways adjacent to sites or even folks trying to get from Balm to Tampa so there's some of those regional issues too. So my hope is the mobility fees – that was one of our initial recommendations we were hitting on was the mobility fee increases so I'm happy to hear that's a good first step. I think

somebody talked about the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan so while I think it was not identified and we haven't talked about it or shown it in specifics, it was a recommendation that I think there needs to be a really clear plan in south Hillsborough County that lays out what does the street network look like, which streets are we enhancing. There's that line in RP-2 in the past that says we will not plan for the area. What we are saying here is that you should plan for the area, that is the responsible planning aspect. It's something you alluded to, it's mentioned in the policies and needs to get a little bit more specific in the Land Development Code.

Additional Oral Comment

Kami Corbett: I want to make a distinction between screening and buffering. The current RP-2 only references buffering so it's just purely a distance separation it's no visual screening and I would strongly encourage you to look at screening options to help provide that more flexibility because I think in many instances screening provides better transition between compatible uses in the rural area and you can really enhance landscaping and maybe really enhance the way the corridor looks or roadway looks that much better with screening than you can with just a 250 foot buffer.

The other comment I wanted to make was we should be looking to be sure that we are asking for looking to develop policies that provide incentives for redevelopment in the form that's desired rather than punitive policies to prevent something we don't want because I think that's how a lot of planned policies were directed and that's why you don't get the result you want because they're not truly market incentives to produce the result you want, they're really just punitive policies to prevent something.

And the last thing I will say to the community, no matter what conversation you're having with the County about roadway improvements and the expenditure of mobility fees in the RP-2 area, there are no improvements in the RP-2 area on the Long Range Transportation Plan, that's through 2045. If your improvements are not on the Long Range Transportation Plan, they will not be funded. There was one improvement in the RP-2 area that was put on by County staff in 2019. The MPO removed that at the request of people that reside in this area that did not want any roadway improvements in the rural area. So please be mindful of that when you're talking to the County, if you want infrastructure to occur in the RP-2, they've got to get it in their Long Range Transportation Plan.