

APPLICATION NO.:	Case CW 24-06
STAFF:	Emma Wennick, Program Planner
APPLICANT:	City of Safety Harbor
PROPERTY SIZE:	0.82 acres m.o.l.
CURRENT COUNTYWIDE PLAN MAP CATEGORY:	Public/Semi-Public
PROPOSED COUNTYWIDE PLAN MAP CATEGORY:	Residential Low Medium
CURRENT LOCAL FUTURE LAND USE PLAN MAP CATEGORY:	City of Safety Harbor – Institutional
PROPOSED LOCAL FUTURE LAND USE PLAN MAP CATEGORY:	City of Safety Harbor – Residential Urban
LOCATION / PARCEL ID:	675 Elm St. (Parcel ID # 04-29-16-51822-002-0040), and three parcels to the south (including Parcel ID # 04-29-16 51822-002-0070, Parcel ID # 04-29-16- 51822-002-0080 and Parcel ID # 04-29-16-51822-002-0090)

BACKGROUND SUMMARY:

The applicant is requesting an amendment to the Countywide Plan Map from Public/Semi-Public to Residential Low Medium. The northern parcel (675 Elm St.) is owned by the city. In June 2023, the City Commission approved Resolution No. 2023-11, an agreement for purchase of property between the City of Safety Harbor and the Pinellas County School Board, and an Agreement for Purchase and Sale between the City of Safety Harbor and Habitat for Humanity of Pinellas County, Inc. In the future, Habitat for Humanity of Pinellas County, Inc. will own the four parcels. The agreements were modified in December to remove lot 9, due to a structural encroachment.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of an amendment to the Countywide Plan Map from from Public/Semi-Public to Residential Low Medium.

PLANNERS ADVISORY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

At its March 4, 2024 meeting, the Planners Advisory Committee voted 12-0 to recommend approval of this amendment.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT COUNCIL/COMMISSION ACTION:

The Safety Harbor City Commission held a public hearing at their regular meeting on February 5, 2024. The Board unanimously approved Ordinance No. 2024-03. There was no public comment.

CURRENT PROPERTY INFORMATION:

Property Use(s):	Vacant
Site Features:	The City of Safety Harbor owns 675 Elm St., and the Pinellas County School Board owns the three parcels to the south.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS:

When considering this application, the following general site conditions, planning concepts, and other facts should be noted:

- 1. The northern parcel (675 Elm St.) is owned by the city. The three parcels to the south are owned by the Pinellas County School Board. In the future, Habitat for Humanity of Pinellas County, Inc. will own the four parcels.
- 2. The site includes four parcels and six platted lots, totaling 0.82 acres. The subject property is vacant, except Lot 9, which has an encroachment.
- 3. Surrounding uses include a church to the north, single family detached residential uses to the east and the south, and a vacant property to the west.

RELEVANT COUNTYWIDE CONSIDERATIONS:

The proposed amendment to the Countywide Plan Map is a legislative decision. The standards for the current and proposed Countywide Plan Map categories are summarized below:

	Current Countywide Plan Map Category: Public/Semi-Public	Proposed Countywide Plan Map Category: Residential Low Medium
Purpose:	Intended to recognize institutional, and transportation/utility uses that serve the community or region, especially larger facilities having acreage exceeding the thresholds established in other plan categories, which are consistent with the need, character, and scale of such uses relative to the surrounding uses, transportation	Intended to depict areas that are now developed, or appropriate to be developed, in a suburban, low density or moderately dense residential manner; and to recognize such areas as primarily well-suited for residential uses that are consistent with the suburban qualities,

	facilities, and natural resource features, and may	transportation facilities, including transit, and natural resources of
	include residential as part of the mix of uses.	such areas.
Permitted Uses:	Institutional; Transportation/Utility; Residential; Residential Equivalent; Vacation Rental pursuant to the provisions of Section 509.242(1)(c), Florida Statutes; Storage/Warehouse/Distribution- Light; Storage/Warehouse/ Distribution-Heavy; Recreation/Open Space; Community Garden; Agricultural- Light; Ancillary Nonresidential	Residential; Residential Equivalent; Vacation Rental pursuant to the provisions of Section 509.242(1)(c), Florida Statutes; Accessory Dwelling Unit; Public Educational Facility; Recreation/Open Space; Community Garden; Agricultural-Light; Agricultural. Office; Personal Service/Office Support; Retail Commercial are Subject to One Acre Maximum Ancillary Nonresidential; Transportation/Utility are subject to a three-acre maximum. Institutional (except Public Educational Facilities which are not subject to this threshold, pursuant to the provisions of Section 6.5.4.2) are subject to a five-acre maximum.
Max. Density:	12.5 units per acre	10 units per acre
Max. Floor Area Ratio (FAR):	Institutional uses shall not exceed 0.65 (except for hospital uses which shall not exceed an FAR of 1.0 within any single jurisdiction) / Transportation/utility uses shall not exceed an FAR of 0.70	0.50
Max. Impervious Surface Ratio (ISR):	Institutional uses shall not exceed 0.85 / Transportation/utility uses shall not exceed 0.90	0.75

Section 6.5.3. of the Countywide Rules provides the review criteria for amendments to the Countywide Plan Map. An analysis of these criteria are provided below:

1. The manner in, and extent to, which the amendment is consistent with the Countywide Rules and with the Countywide Plan Strategies as implemented through the Countywide Rules.

Staff Analysis: The Countywide Rules state that the Residential Low Medium category is "intended to depict areas that are now developed, or appropriate to be developed, in a suburban, low density or moderately dense residential manner; and to recognize such areas as primarily well-suited for residential uses that are consistent with the suburban qualities, transportation facilities, including transit, and natural resources of such areas."

The locational characteristics of the Residential Low Medium category are "generally appropriate to locations ranging from rural areas distant from urban activity centers, to suburban areas near or in proximity to urban activity centers; in close, walkable, or bikeable proximity to low-intensity neighborhood servicing uses and low to mid-intensity and density mixed-use areas; in areas where use and development characteristics are residential in nature; and in areas serving as a transition between rural or suburban to more urban residential areas. These areas are generally served by and accessed from minor and collector roadways which connect to the arterial and highway network."

The city proposes to amend their future land use map for the subject property as part of an effort to increase the maximum density to allow for Habitat for Humanity homes to be developed. The proposed Future Land Use map application requires a Countywide Plan Map amendment through Forward Pinellas.

2. Forward Pinellas has developed the Multimodal Accessibility (MAX) index. Proposed amendments increasing density and/or intensity must maintain a MAX score equal to or better than the Countywide Average MAX score. The current Countywide Average MAX score is 9.7; if that score is not reached, balancing criteria will be required. An amendment adopting or amending the Activity Center (AC), Multimodal Corridor (MMC) and Planned Redevelopment District (PRD) categories and affecting fewer than 10 acres shall be subject to the Multimodal Accessibility Index (MAX Index).

Staff Analysis: The MAX Index score for the subject property's grid cell is 5.75, which is below the countywide average score of 9.7. However, the Countywide Rules state: "An amendment to the Countywide Plan Map that results in an increase of density or intensity within an underperforming grid cell must be evaluated by the applicable criteria."

The proposed Countywide Plan Map Amendment results in a decrease in both density and intensity, and is therefore exempt from the MAX index criteria for an underperforming grid cell.

3. If located within a Scenic/Noncommercial Corridor, the manner in, and extent to, which the amendment conforms to the criteria and standards contained in Section 6.5.4.1 of these Countywide Rules.

Staff Analysis: The amendment area is not located on a Scenic/Noncommercial Corridor.

4. If located within a Coastal High Hazard Area, the manner in, and extent to, which the amendment conforms to the terms set forth in Section 4.2.7.

Staff Analysis: The amendment area is not located within the Coastal High Hazard Area.

5. If the amendment involves the creation, expansion, contraction of, or substantive change to the Activity Center, Multimodal Corridor, or Planned Redevelopment District category, the manner in, and extent to, which the amendment conforms to the purpose and requirements of the applicable category, and addresses the relevant Planning and Urban Design Principles described in Section 6.2.6 and Land Use Goal 16.0 of the Countywide Plan Strategies.

Staff Analysis: The amendment area does not involve the creation, expansion, contraction of, or substantive change to the Activity Center, Multimodal Corridor, or Planned Redevelopment District category.

6. The manner in, and extent to, which the amendment significantly impacts a public educational facility or an adjoining jurisdiction.

Staff Analysis: The proposed amendment is not adjacent to a public educational facility or adjoining jurisdiction; therefore, those policies are not applicable.

7. If the amendment involves the conversion from the Employment (E), Industrial (I), or Target Employment Center (TEC) category, the extent to which the amendment area can continue to provide for target employment opportunities as evaluated and set forth in Section 6.5.4.4.

Staff Analysis: The amendment area does not involve the conversion of Employment, Industrial, or Target Employment Center designated land.

PUBLIC CORRESPONDENCE

The proposed Countywide Plan Map amendment was publicly advertised as required by Section 7.8.4. of the Countywide Rules. No public correspondence has been received to date.

CONCLUSION

Staff finds the proposed amendment is consistent with the Relevant Countywide Considerations found in Section 6.5.3.1 of the Countywide Rules.