

CW 18-19 Forward Pinellas Staff Analysis

Relevant Countywide Considerations:

- 1) **Consistency with the Countywide Rules** – This proposed amendment is submitted by the City of St. Petersburg and seeks to amend a site totaling approximately 1.5 acres from Residential Medium (used to depict areas that are primarily well-suited for medium-density residential uses at a maximum density of 15 dwelling units per acre) to Multimodal Corridor (intended to recognize those corridors of critical importance to the movement of people and goods throughout the county and that are served by multiple modes of transport, including automobile, bus, bicycle, rail, and/or pedestrian). This category is intended to include those transportation corridors connecting Activity Centers, characterized by mixed-use development, and in particular, supported by and designed to facilitate transit.

The subject property includes an existing fitness club with surface parking. The applicant is proposing to replace the existing fitness club with a modernized fitness club and structured parking. Structured parking is not an allowable use on the portion of the subject property that is designated Residential Medium, but this use would be permitted under the Multimodal Corridor category.

The Countywide Rules state that the Multimodal Corridor (MMC) category “...is appropriate for locations that are identified on the Transit-Oriented Land Use Vision Map, and correspond to the Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority’s Core Bus Network.” The Countywide Rules also state that: “...the purpose of this plan category is to recognize those corridors of critical importance to the movement of people and goods throughout the county, and that are served by multiple modes of transport, including automobile, bus, bicycle, rail, and/or pedestrian. This category is intended to include those transportation corridors connecting Activity Centers, characterized by mixed-use development, and in particular, supported by and designed to facilitate transit.”

This site is consistent with the purpose of the MMC category in that this segment of 4th Street is identified as a Primary and Special Corridor on the Transit-Oriented Land Use Vision Map and Route 4 operates along this roadway as part of the Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority’s (PSTA) Core Bus Network. This site is consistent with the locational characteristics of the MMC category given the subject property is adjacent to an arterial roadway which supports transit, has connected pedestrian facilities, and the site is in the vicinity of a variety of residential and non-residential uses that will complement the desired commercial use(s). Furthermore, PSTA’s bus service along the corridor provides a key transit connection between the downtown St. Petersburg and Gateway area activity centers. If approved, this amendment will be consistent with the City of St. Petersburg’s Comprehensive Plan.

This amendment can be deemed consistent with this Relevant Countywide Consideration.

- 2) **Adopted Roadway Level of Service (LOS) Standard** – The amendment area is not located on a roadway operating at an LOS of “F”, therefore those standards are not applicable.
- 3) **Location on a Scenic/Noncommercial Corridor (SNCC)** – The amendment area is not located on a SNCC, therefore those standards are not applicable.

- 4) **Coastal High Hazard Areas (CHHA)** – A portion of the amendment area is located within the CHHA and is therefore subject to the Countywide Rules criteria regarding development in the CHHA. These criteria are used for reviewing proposed amendments that would increase density or intensity, or that would permit certain uses, within the CHHA. The Forward Pinellas Board and the Countywide Planning Authority may, at their discretion, consider approving such amendments based on a balancing of the nine criteria below.

- a. *Access to Emergency Shelter Space and Evacuation Routes – The uses associated with the requested amendment will have access to adequate emergency shelter space as well as evacuation routes with adequate capacities and evacuation clearance times.*

The use associated with the requested amendment does not involve any residential dwelling units.

- b. *Utilization of Existing and Planned Infrastructure – The requested amendment will result in the utilization of existing infrastructure, as opposed to requiring the expenditure of public funds for the construction of new, unplanned infrastructure with the potential to be damaged by coastal storms.*

The amendment area includes a mix of uses all served by existing infrastructure and no significant upgrades are required to serve the subject property.

- c. *Utilization of Existing Disturbed Areas – The requested amendment will result in the utilization of existing disturbed areas as opposed to natural areas that buffer existing development from coastal storms.*

The subject property that lies within the CHHA was developed previously. This proposal entails the redevelopment of an existing disturbed site.

- d. *Maintenance of Scenic Qualities and Improvement of Public Access to Water – The requested amendment will result in the maintenance of scenic qualities, and the improvement of public access, to the Gulf of Mexico, inland waterways (such as Boca Ciega Bay), and Tampa Bay.*

The subject property is located along a highly urbanized section of the 4th Street corridor, is far removed from any public access to the water, and does not exhibit any scenic qualities.

- e. *Water Dependent Use – The requested amendment is for uses which are water dependent.*

The proposed use is not water dependent.

- f. *Part of Community Redevelopment Plan – The requested amendment is included in a Community Redevelopment Plan, as defined by Florida Statutes for a downtown or other designated redevelopment areas.*

The subject property is not located within a designated Community Redevelopment Area.

- g. Overall Reduction of Density or Intensity – The requested amendment would result in an increase in density or intensity on a single parcel, in concert with corollary amendments which result in the overall reduction of development density or intensity in the surrounding CHHA.*

The existing Residential Medium Countywide Plan Map category permits up to 15 units per acre. The proposed Multimodal Corridor Countywide Plan Map category permits up to 40 units per acre or 1.5 floor area ratio (FAR) or a proportionate share of each. However, the applicant is proposing to file a covenant on the land restricting future residential development to the maximum number permitted under existing standards (15 UPA). Therefore, there would be no increase in residential density for this site. Lastly, the applicant's proposal to redevelop the subject property with a modernized fitness club and structured parking lacks any residential units thereby supporting policies that restrict increases in residential density in the CHHA.

- h. Clustering of Uses – The requested amendment within the CHHA provides for the clustering of uses on a portion of the site outside the CHHA.*

This amendment will not result in a clustering of uses on a portion of the site outside of the CHHA.

- i. Integral Part of Comprehensive Planning Process – The requested amendment has been initiated by the local government as an integral part of its comprehensive planning process, consistent with the local government comprehensive plan.*

The requested amendment is consistent with the St. Petersburg Comprehensive Plan Coastal Management Objective CM10.B which states; "The City shall direct population concentrations away from known or predicted coastal high hazard areas consistent with the goals, objectives and policies of the Future Land Use Element". Furthermore, the applicant is proposing to file a covenant on the land restricting future residential development to the maximum number permitted under existing standards.

On balance, this amendment can be deemed consistent with this Relevant Countywide Consideration.

- 5) Designated Development/Redevelopment Areas** – The amendment area is not located within a designated development/redevelopment area, so those policies are not applicable.
- 6) Adjacent to or Impacting an Adjoining Jurisdiction or Public Educational Facility** – The proposed amendment area is not adjacent to another jurisdiction or public educational facility, therefore those standards are not applicable.

Conclusion:

On balance, it can be concluded that the proposed amendment is consistent with the Relevant Countywide Considerations found in the Countywide Rules.