

PASCO COUNTY, FLORIDA
INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

TO: Development Review Committee DATE: 1/05/10 FILE: PGM10-81

SUBJECT: CPAL10-1(09) Pasadena Hills Area
Plan Amendment
DRC: Jan 14, 2010, 1:30 p.m., DC
Recommendation: Approval

FROM: Richard E. Gehring REFERENCES: Comm. Dist. 1
Growth Management Administrator Project Planner: Quanlin Hu

DESCRIPTION AND CONDITIONS

Summary

Proposed are amendments to the Pasadena Hills Area Plan. This plan was adopted by the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) January 8, 2008 and was incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan as GOAL FLU 6: PASADENA HILLS. As required by the Area Plan, the Villages of Pasadena Hills Financial Plan was approved by the BCC on February 10, 2009 to provide an overall financial strategy to fund infrastructure improvements identified in the Area Plan.

The initial purpose of this amendment is to correct a scrivener's error. At the January 8, 2008 adoption hearing, the BCC approved the request by the lafrate properties' representative to remove their parcels (07-25-21-0000-00100-0000 and 07-25-21-0000-00300-0000) from the Area Plan. However, the package transmitted to the Florida Department of Community Affairs (FDCA) did not reflect the change. Upon closer evaluation of the Area Plan, additional revisions are proposed to more effectively allocate potential development entitlements and reduce foreseeable hardships on development.

The proposed amendments are identified in the attached redline version of the Area Plan. A summary of these changes is listed below:

- Remove 143.8 acres of land owned by lafrate Properties LLC from the Area Plan map series, and reallocate the potential development entitlements of the lafrate properties within the plan;
- Amend Village Type maximum non-residential and office entitlements;
- Allow the use of an Equivalency Matrix as part of the Land Development Code (LDC);
- Amend FLU 6.5.5 Commercial Separation;
- Amend the potential to combine all non-residential centers into the Village Center (or Neighborhood Center in a Type 3 Village);
- Amend Village Type locations to better reflect non-residential intensities adjacent to the Area Plan boundary;
- Amend the locations of the seven elementary schools, based on the reallocation of Village Types;
- Amend Policy FLU 6.5.8.a Effective Date of the land use designation for an entire Type 1 Village to be determined by the date of the rezoning of the first parcel of land in the village center;
- Add University Campuses as an allowable use in all Village Types;
- Amend required LDC amendment deadline;
- Amend affordable housing language in Policy FLU 6.5.3.e and the guiding principles of each village type;
- Update the overall financial strategy requirement based on the approved Villages of Pasadena

Hills Financial Plan;

- Amend the effective timing and requirement of the core reserve area;
- Add public notice requirement to the submittal requirements of each village type;
- Amend Table PH-1 to reflect more accurate information and to be consistent with the approved financial plan;
- Amend Figures to display more accurate data;
- Correct Scrivener's Errors.

Discussion

The representatives of the Pasadena Hills Property Owner Group (POG) initiated the amendment process and have coordinated with County staff. Detailed amendment justification is provided by POG representatives in the application and attached hereto. The justification for amending the Village Type maximum non-residential and office entitlements and reallocating the village types and locations are summarized below:

The lafrate properties consumed the majority of the developable land in Village A. After the removal of lafrate properties, it is proposed to reallocate 200,000 square feet of the maximum potential Village Center intensity of 390,000 square feet of non-residential uses in Village A throughout the Area Plan area. Also proposed is conversion of the potential 1,200 residential units from lafrate properties to an additional 200,000 square feet of potential office entitlements. These entitlements are proposed to be used in 50,000 square feet increments in Type 2 Villages.

The classifications of individual villages are proposed to be revised as follows:

Village	Existing Village Type	Revised Village Type	Justification
A	1	2A	major reduction in development potentials due to the removal of lafrate properties
C	2	2A	along Primary Infrastructure, additional 50,000 square feet potential office entitlements
G	2	1	50% of the proposed village center location is owned by a single landowner. easier than Village J to develop a cohesive village center because that
I	2	2A	along Primary Infrastructure, additional 50,000 square feet potential office entitlements
J	1	2A	hard to develop a cohesive village center with multiple property owners
L	2	3	should lower non-residential development intensity due to the close proximity to town centers and other large commercial centers to the south
M	2	3	should lower non-residential development intensity due to the close proximity to town centers and other large commercial centers to the south

The proposed amendment reduces the total residential development potential by 4,367 units, with an increase of 843 single family units and a reduction of 5,210 multi-family units. The total retail square feet remains 2,260,000, consistent with the Financial Plan. As mentioned in the previous paragraph, there is an additional 200,000 square feet of potential office entitlements. Detailed changes in development potential in each village can be found in Table U attached hereto.

The existing and proposed Future Land Use overlay maximum development potential are shown below:

Existing FLU Overlay	Acreage	Residential Units	Non-Residential Square Footage	Office
VMU-1	1,534	9,956	1,020,000	300,000
VMU-2	7,098	32,578	1,120,000	
VMU-3	1,818	3,820	120,000	
TOTAL	10,450	46,354	2,260,000	300,000

Proposed FLU Overlay	Acreage	Residential Units	Non-Residential Square Footage	Office
VMU-1	1,584	9,516	1,020,000	300,000
VMU-2	5,277	24,216	1,120,000	200,000
VMU-3	3,589	8,255	120,000	
TOTAL	10,450	41,987	2,260,000	500,000

Difference		(4,367)		200,000
-------------------	--	----------------	--	----------------

ALTERNATIVES AND ANALYSIS

1. Recommend approval of the amendments proposed by staff to the Local Planning Agency.
2. Recommend denial of the amendments proposed by staff to the Local Planning Agency.
3. Direct staff to pursue another course of action.

RECOMMENDATION

The Planning and Growth Management staff recommends Alternative 1.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Proposed redline version of the Pasadena Hills Area Plan
2. Amendment Justification
3. Table U – Village of Pasadena Hills Comprehensive Plan Amendment Entitlement Tradeoff Table Summary

REG/CBC/QH/CPAL10-1(09)/DRC/pgm10-81