

PASADENA HILLS AREA PLAN AMENDMENT JUSTIFICATION STATEMENT

When the adopted Pasadena Hills Area Plan was submitted to DCA in 2008, it mistakenly included parcels owned by Iafrate Properties LLC. At the final adoption hearing on January 8, 2008, a representative for the Iafrate properties asked that they be removed from the Area Plan. The Board voted to approve the Area Plan excluding parcels 07-25-21-0000-00100-0000 and 07-25-21-0000-00300-0000 owned by Iafrate Properties LLC. The text and figures of the Area Plan were never corrected to reflect the Boards decision.

The Figures that are referenced throughout the document have been modified in this amendment to reflect the deletion of these two parcels. The larger of the two Iafrate parcels consumed the majority of the developable land in Village A west of Prospect Road. With the deletion of 40% of the Village it is unlikely that Village A would ever be able to develop at the maximum Village Center intensity of 390,000 square feet of non-residential uses. The market analysis concluded that Pasadena Hills would support 2,260,000 square feet of non-residential uses to meet the daily and weekly needs of the future residents that are proposed to move to this area of Pasco County, and the traffic study confirmed that the proposed infrastructure would support these trips. Instead of losing the non-residential square feet, the County is suggesting a portion of the entitlements in Village A be spread throughout the Villages. There will be no increase in total non-residential square feet, so the County feels that a new market analysis is unnecessary. By spreading the square footage among multiple Villages, the roadway network will not suffer a negative impact at any one location.

The two Iafrate parcels also had the Village future land use overlay potential for 1200 residential units. The entirety of Village A is already considered a Village Center with a maximum of 10 units per acre, so rather than not allowing the Plan to develop at its full potential, the County is recommending converting the residential units from the Iafrate parcels to an additional 200,000 square feet of office entitlements. These entitlements are proposed to be used in 50,000 square foot increments in Type 2 Villages along Primary Infrastructure. One of Pasco County's primary goals is to increase job growth and to keep its residents from driving out of the County for work. The additional 200,000 square feet of office uses will enable more residents to enjoy the live/work/play experience of this mixed-use community.

The use of a Land Use Equivalency Matrix, approved by the County as part of its Land Development Code is being requested in this amendment as a mechanism to facilitate the exchange residential entitlements for non-residential entitlements within a Village. This is another mechanism to potentially increase the jobs and revenue in Pasco County. The County would need to approve the use of the equivalency matrix each time it is contemplated to ensure that the traffic impacts of the revised land use mix do not exceed the traffic impacts of the existing land use mix, that the proposed exchange includes appropriate assurances that any additional utility demands associated with the proposed exchange can be accommodated, that the impact upon the Financial Plan as a result of the reduction in transportation revenues can be accommodated and that the functional integrity of the village plan is maintained.

Upon closer examination of the Plan, the County realized that the Commercial Separation language is unachievable. The intent of the separation is to avoid strip commercial or competing commercial, but the one-mile spacing policy from any type of non-residential use would not allow for any neighborhood centers to be built, as depicted in Map R. Each of the Villages has

roughly a one-mile circumference, allowing for only one non-residential center in each Village. The County is recommending that the policy be amended to include only Village Scale Centers in the one-mile separation policy, with the appropriate separation for Community and Neighborhood Scale Centers to be established during the MPUD zoning approval process.

With the revision of the Commercial Separation language, Neighborhood Scale Centers can be developed if the Village desires to have them. The County would like to give the option to the applicant to combine all of the Neighborhood Scale Centers into the Village Center. The Plan currently allows Type 1 Villages and Type 3 Villages to combine all of their non-residential into a single non-residential center. The amendment is proposing to extend this option to Type 2 Villages as well. An added benefit of combining these centers is the decrease in overall PM peak hour trips.

The reduction in acreage in Village A and a closer look at the approved non-residential development adjacent to the Plan compelled the County to re-evaluate the Village Types and their locations within the Plan. It no longer makes sense for Village A to be a Type 1 Village. Village J has multiple owners in the proposed village center location that own five and ten acre tracts. The County feels that it is unlikely for these owners to develop a cohesive village center, and therefore do not believe that it should be a Type 1 Village. The County feels that Village G is a superior alternative for a Type 1 Village. It is located north of Village J on Handcart Road, a four-lane primary infrastructure road, and 50% of the proposed village center location is owned by a single landowner. The County is recommending Village D and Village G become two Type 1 Villages in Pasadena Hills. It is also recommending that the total maximum gross leasable square feet of non-residential development permitted within all Type 1 Villages combined not exceed the existing cap of 1,020,000 square feet, with no one Village exceeding 540,000 square feet.

Adjacent to the southern boundary of the Plan are three large commercial centers. Two town centers and one lifestyle center are approved for this area. With the close proximity of these uses, the County feels that the residents in this area may not be able to support additional high intensity non-residential development. Therefore, the County is recommending that Village L and M be modified to Type 3 Villages. Village E and K will remain Type 3 Villages. These four Type 3 Villages will continue to have the potential for neighborhood scale non-residential development, but will not be competing with nearby town centers. All Type 3 Villages combined will be subject to the existing maximum non-residential development of 120,000 square feet, with no one Village exceeding 60,000 square feet.

With the above, recommended changes, that leave Villages A, B, C, F, H, I and J as Type 2 Villages. Since there are so many Type 2 Villages, the amendment proposes to divide these into two subcategories. Villages that are located on primary infrastructure (Clinton Avenue Extension, Overpass Road and Handcart Road) are proposed to be denoted as Type 2A Villages. These villages will be allowed to develop up to 190,000 square feet of non-residential uses with an additional 50,000 of office uses that were exchanged with the Iafrate residential units. Villages A, C, I and J are recommended to become Type 2A Villages. The remaining Type 2 Villages (Village B, F and H) will be Type 2B Villages. These villages will retain the current non-residential development potential of a maximum of 140,000 square feet. All Type 2 Villages combined will be subject to the existing maximum non-residential development of 1,120,000 square feet.

The shuffling of Village Types creates a better location for non-residential uses in the Pasadena Hills Area Plan, as shown in Map S, and by changing the Village Types this amendment is actually proposing a reduction of 3,150 residential units in addition to the 1,200 residential units

that are being converted to office use. In total these proposed actions reduce the residential entitlements in the Villages of Pasadena Hills by 4,350 residential units.

The village reallocations also require a shift in the location of elementary schools. Seven elementary schools are required by the Area Plan, two in Type 1 Villages and five in Type 2 Villages. The County is not suggesting that the number of schools required in each Village type change, simply the specific villages that are required to have schools. Map H shows the proposed locations of the elementary schools within the Villages.

The adopted future land use element requires that the entire Village Center of a Type 1 Village be rezoned at one time to take advantage of the Village Overlay densities and intensities. The County believes this is an unfair burden on the applicant. Since this Plan extends to 2050 to could be many years, if ever, before enough adjacent owners come to the decision to rezone their parcels, or collectively sell them to a developer, to create a Village Center. The County is proposing to amend the policy to allow Type 1 Villages to be treated the same as Type 2 and 3 Villages, with the 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 the village center for that Village to receive its MPUD designation.

The County is also proposing to include university campuses as a use in all Village Types. The County envisions this mixed-use land use category as an ideal setting for a college campus and does not want to preclude the opportunity to entertain the potential development of such a significant use in this area of Pasco County.

Pasadena Hills Area Plan Figure PH-1 through PH-8, PH-12, PH-13 and PH-15 have been amended to provide more accurate data than was available at the time of the original submittal. Many of these figures simply have the corrected boundary shown, reflecting the exclusion of the two Iafrate Properties LLC parcels. Aerial interpretation and field visits were used to more accurately depict the Category I wetlands and Core Reserve boundaries shown in Figure PH-3 and PH-7. The revised Core Reserve lines and studying the built and planned development already established in Pasadena Hills allowed the County to create a more realistic transportation system, shown in Figure PH-4 and PH-8 and Table PH-1.

Finally, with the creation of a completely new land use category, there are bound to be scrivener's errors that need to be addressed. This amendment has also modified the Pasadena Hills Future Land Use Element to correct inconsistent policies and references.