

Core Study Team Meeting Summary April 30, 2009

Mr. Griffin started the meeting with an overview of the agenda. Mr. Incorvia reviewed the presentation made by the project team to the Economic Stimulus Task Force. Mr. Incorvia was left with the impression that the Task Force preferred the permit-ready approach with reference to I-4, and was open to the idea of an overlay for portions of the corridor. Chair Abberger asked if the BOCC approved the study, what is the timeline for implementation of the report. Staff has provided a timeline to report back to the Economic Stimulus Task Force.

Mr. Healey reviewed the timeline that is to be distributed to the Task Force. He highlighted the similarities and differences between the aggressive timeline and the sequential timeline. In Scenario 1, both the Comprehensive Plan and the Land Development Code changes would be adopted in the same month. Scenario 1 may be a challenge where two things must match in the public hearing process. There is a 5-month difference between the two timelines. The BOCC has to accept and direct staff to go forward with either Scenario 1 or Scenario 2. Mr. Incorvia responded that realistically April 2011 would be the conclusion date for the implementation steps.

Ms. Bacca made the observation that it may be more advantageous to have Scenario 2 to allow the public time to attend meetings. She stated that if there are multiple meetings in one month, it is hard to keep the momentum. Mr. Moreda commented that the separation between the Comprehensive Plan changes and the Land Development Code changes can breed conflict, and people forget the overall policy agreements that had been made in the planning process. He stated that there are advantages and disadvantages to both.

Mr. Aluotto asked why it is not possible to the same hearing process for both the land use and zoning, with the exception of the adoption hearing. Mr. Griffin wondered if this would be part of a normal cycle for the Land Development Code amendments, and Mr. Moreda replied that it would be better as a separate process. He commented that it would be its own cycle, a third LDC cycle for the year. Mr. Incorvia commented that there is a tendency for confusion in distinguishing LDC and Comprehensive Plan changes.

Mr. Moran commented that if there are just text changes to establish the district – then would the property owner still have to rezone? Mr. Incorvia stated that in some areas of the corridor that have already been identified the team would proactively begin the rezoning process to the special I-4 zoning district.

Mr. Register stated that he felt that it is up to the Planning and Growth Management (PGM) Department and Planning Commission to make the decision on how to proceed – either with the aggressive or the sequential timeline.

Ms. Bacca stated that there is really not that much difference between the two timelines. Mr. Johnson stated that he feels that each step is in the right direction, and can pitch it as helping the landowner along as the corridor plan is implemented. Ultimately, he commented, the BOCC will dictate what they want. He gave the example of the hometown democracy effort with reference to plan amendments in 2007, and how the plan amendment cycle was modified in anticipation of the election.

Ms. Corbett commented that from an industry perspective that it would be better to have the LDC and Comprehensive Plan amendments run concurrently. Especially when it comes to review of the performance standards, it would be better to understand the big picture.

Mr. Griffin then introduced the draft proposed boundary maps provided on the study team’s desk. He explained the map, stating that the performance criteria would be discussed for those areas that are not already identified for rezoning to the Interstate-4 Zoning District. He commented that the overlay will have different criteria for urban areas versus rural areas. He stated that in a preliminary discussion with DCA the concept was favorably viewed by DCA staff. Mr. Moreda clarified that it would then be an overlay to the existing land use category.

Mr. Johnson solicited Ms. Flott comments. Ms. Flott expressed concern whether the proposed overlay would indeed ‘protect’ the corridor from unwanted development.

Mr. Moran asked about the specificity of the standards. Mr. Griffin responded that they can be very specific. Mr. Johnson clarified that the performance criteria is what qualifies a property for the zoning district.

Mr. Aluotto questioned the 'green' map, and could potential give 35,000 acres of economic development potential. Mr. Register stated that discussion definitely has been stimulated.

Mr. Incorvia explained the map. He stated that the 12 permit-ready sites are illustrated by the stars. Those areas within the Joint Planning Areas are in essence approached like an Urban Service Area. The area identified by the green cross-hatching would be reserving for future development, discouraging uses inconsistent with the I-4 Corridor Plan until infrastructure is available and there is a qualifying employer.

Mr. Griffin described the map with the blue boundaries. He stated this is a draft and can be contracted further. The performance standards would be in place, and the existing future land use category would remain in place and property owners would be afforded the use of property that they enjoy today. However, if a rezoning is requested, then the property will have to move to the I-4 zoning district.

Mr. Johnson stated that the Comprehensive Plan currently has policies that the rural area should be protected, this is not something new. This proposed protection would only validate the Comprehensive Plan rural policies as they exist today. Development would only be permitted if specific performance criteria were met.

Mr. Griffin gave an example that if a property owner has 10 acres of AR-1/5 and wanted to rezone to RES-1, the Board would be reminded by the staff that the area has the vision of long-term economic development through the adopted I-4 policies.

Ms. Bare stated that performance criteria as proposed seem to be written for the end user. However, it is typically the developer that does the land development. Is the developer also eligible?

Mr. Incorvia stated that everyone is eligible to ask, however, the standards are more oriented to the end user. Mr. Healey asked whether the zoning district could provide a certain form of control. Mr. Griffin commented that would be one way to approach it, but the performance standards could also address that as well. Mr. Healey stated that the end user may not have to be defined, and that could be controlled through allowing a specific menu of allowed uses.

Mr. Moreda thought this would be rezoned by the County – will it be rezoned by individual property owners? Mr. Incorvia responded that there may be both, identified sites and then additional sites. Mr. Moreda asked about the issue of compatibility – will that water down with what is being proposed? Mr. Healey responded that BOCC will have to recognize and confront the issue. Mr. Moreda asked why we would want to confront it. Mr. Healey when there is any change in land use, you engender change. Mr. Register suggested that we identify the areas that may be problematic. Otherwise, we may end up spinning our wheels. Mr. Healey called it the tyranny of compatibility.

Mr. Healey asked about the map with the blue boundary. Would zoning changes be permitted in the areas not outlined in blue? Mr. Griffin commented that the reason those areas left out were to recognize the existing community plans of Thonotosassa and Seffner. Ms. Bacca asked about the blue arm, which Mr. Griffin responded as a redevelopment opportunity along the north side of US-92. In addition, that portion is within the USA and is all zoned commercial with the exception of the middle school site.

Ms. Flott clarified that was for Commercial General, not light industrial. She stated that was a difference and felt it may be in conflict with their community planning effort.

Mr. Register asked whether there would be heartburn with light industrial or office uses. Mr. Incorvia commented they want a better quality than what is available today, and maybe it should be addressed entirely through community plan process instead.

Mr. Aluotto reviewed the numbers. So, if in the middle cannot do anything except for agriculture. Do the property owners have to wait? Is it realistic to have an area that large that has only economic development. If it is that large, it may not work. Mr. Aluotto added that Ms. Bare brought forward a good point, the performance criteria should not necessarily be oriented to the end user. Is there no place for a possible good exception? Maybe the incentives should be in the Economic Development Department rather than through the Land Use Category or the LDC. Mr. Register commented may have to find a proxy for the performance standards.

Mr. Griffin stated that if the developer meets the criteria for the target industries, the criteria may not dictate the wage, but dictate the industry that is proposed to

go on a site. Ms. Bare commented we should pursue attracting by industry, rather than attracting by a minimum wage requirement. She stated that we cannot assume the economy that will be humming along and will pay the kind of wages that are desired. If there is a 10-year lease, and a new tenant moves in at the expiration of 10 years – will they have to meet the wage requirement as well? Mr. Register added that if the criteria are so onerous, then Hillsborough County may not be able to attract the industry that it is trying to attract.

Mr. Healey asked whether the base was related to targeted industries, or whether the discussion was expanding to allow a number of other uses. There is nothing wrong identifying the types of uses in the I-4 Corridor Zoning District. Ms. Bare responded that if a building is built, and 60% occupied by targeted industries and 40% other – will that be ok? Mr. Incorvia responded that the rezoned acres will provide for this; the discussion is about the other lands above and beyond that designated already on the corridor.

Mr. Moran commented that the County is taking a risk, giving up rural land for high-paying jobs. The County is seeking certain type of job flow. Mr. Register stated that you can define the industries, but you may not be able to use the \$50,000 minimum annual wage criterion. Mr. Griffin stated that by the nature of the industry, it should pay a living wage. Cannot usurp the market, but we can state the type of industry that is allowed.

Mr. Johnson stated it is about having the tools available, and there may be unforeseen consequences. The idea is to have the toolbox available. Mr. Incorvia stated the performance criteria will be discussed the next meeting.

Ms. Bacca felt that the performance criteria should be discussed together with the LDC standards due to the fact that they relate. Ms. Bacca thinks that the team needs to build into the overlay district a way to reevaluate the definitions on a regular basis-a periodic economic evaluation is necessary and need to understand the change needs relating to target industries as time goes on.

Mr. Incorvia commented that there can be a property surplus that will be created unless we are careful with the performance standards. Mr. Register stated that Ms. Bacca was on point in that industry changes on a regular basis and that the target industries should be reevaluated regularly.

Mr. Register stated that Ms. Bacca is asking for a document that is flexible in determining the target industry to accommodate changes in the way we work. It is possible that an annual review of those targeted industries can be done.

Ms. Bacca responded that would be too often. If there is a vision created, it should not be changed easily. There should be objective criteria based on analysis, and a process should be created for evaluation of which industries should be permitted. Mr. Register asked is it just a component of the plan relating to target industries, or is it the whole plan that should be evaluated? Ms. Bacca stated that there should be an evaluation every 4-5 years to see if the plan is working. Mr. Griffin stated that the EAR process can do that.

Mr. Johnson stated that if the industry determines that action must more rapid, then a plan amendment can be pursued. Ultimately that it should not be the "end all," after all, industry may change away from the goals of the I-4 Corridor. Mr. Register added that he is not sure that much area is needed for potential development.

Ms. Corbett questioned how the maps were developed. She commented that she does not feel that the blue boundary lines represent community plans. Mr. Griffin commented that it was just offered as one of two different approaches to discuss.

Mr. Griffin stated now that there is general understanding of how we are trying to accomplish defining a boundary. What is the opinion of the Core Study Team? It is a given that the USA would be expanded to accommodate the 12 sites that have already been identified in the joint planning areas.

Mr. Moran clarified that on the green map, if performance criteria were met, a property owner could rezone anywhere in that area. Mr. Griffin asked whether should go back to the one mile north and south of the border. Mr. Moran felt if the standards are strong enough, then the green area is fine. Mr. Healey commented that the area was expanded by the advice of the Government and Business Advisors, who stated that more inventory was important. Mr. Incorvia stated the original boundary went through the middle of properties, etc. The new boundary is more clarified by going down the center lines of roadways. Ms. Corbett stated the clear direction from the BOCC was to work on allowing for sites along the entire corridor.

Mr. Jeffers asked whether the performance criteria will handle the phasing of what will happen. Mr. Griffin responded that it will address the phasing in the manner of requiring certain things present, like water and sewer and other infrastructure.

Mr. Register asked whether Ms. Flott liked taking the “finger” on the blue map out of the question. It was clarified by Ms. Flott that all of Seffner should be left alone, and it should implement its own standards. Ms. Lamboy suggested that the performance criteria set up by the Corridor study may possibly benefit Seffner. Ms. Flott responded that it may be confusing to have the Community plan and an overlay as well. Mr. Register stated that certain areas should be highlighted as environmentally sensitive and therefore not open to development.

Ms. Bacca stated that theoretically that the office park may want to build around an environmental feature and make it an asset. We should not close the door completely if there is a good solution that may be offered. Mr. Griffin stated that the green map should have very strict standards, and therefore will build in protection for the communities and the County with reference to financing improvements and environmental sensitivity.

Mr. Register questioned Mr. Moran’s suggestion – is his suggestion that the “green area” has stringent criteria? Mr. Moran answered affirmatively that was his suggestion.

Mr. Aluotto observed that at the end of the day, the existing land use category would remain and could be changed only if it meets the I-4 Corridor standards. Mr. Healey commented that the property owner would still be able to apply for anything allowed by the existing land use category. Ms. Bacca stated that it would be better to only allow what is permitted by the current zoning – the land use category should not be able to change. She stated that it should be that you cannot change the zoning unless it is consistent with the I-4 Overlay.

Ms. Corbett cautioned that there is some SMU-6 in the Rural Area (green zone) and there may be some challenges to what is being proposed.

Mr. Healey suggested that we hear from the Government and Business Advisors and the Citizens before we proceed forward. Mr. Aluotto suggested looking at the map again and determine what may be a better solution than the currently-proposed “green zone.”

It was suggested to bring some aerials in the next discussion on the boundary. Mr. Incorvia commented that for the moment the team is considering the green map, but will not decide until after we hear from the Government and Business Advisors and Community Advisors.

Ms. Bacca suggested linking the meeting minutes to the notices that are sent out to the meetings. She also suggested format improvements for the Hillsborough County web site, like having the presentations in chronological order. She stated that it would be good to tell the Government and Business advisors to look at the discussions by the Core Study Team regarding the boundary areas.

Mr. Hurlburt asked about the stars – are those site-ready locations? Mr. Incorvia responded that they would be about 2011. He asked where are the utilities? What is the performance criteria for the individual sites?

Mr. Incorvia responded that would be discussed in 2 weeks with the consultant. Mr. Hurlburt asked if we aren't interested in looking in a narrower area, why is the overlay going to put criteria on the agricultural? He stated that the area needs the flexibility of Euclidean zoning, no PD zoning which is relatively site-specific and inflexible. In addition, capital improvements need to be discussed and need to determine where those come to play. Temple Terrace and Tampa is likely much more ready than office and research than Plant City.

Mr. Register stated that the team is laying the groundwork for a substantial amount of time in the future. There will be a time when water and sewer services will be extended, and things will change in terms of available land that is cost-efficient to development. He commented that we need to prepare for the future.