Concurrency Management Element Data and Analysis Report
Major themes of the 1991-2001 Comprehensive Plan were redevelopment and infill. When the City of Gainesville’s Comprehensive Plan was adopted in 1991, the Future Land Use Element Data and Analysis Report indicated that the city was characterized by existing low density and intensity development and few large parcels of vacant, developable land. The Data and Analysis Report (see page 38) indicated that, at the time, the city was 83% built out (leaving 17% unimproved, developable land). Despite the large annexations that occurred in 1992 which added 9.53 square miles, the overall pattern remains. Much of the 1992 annexed area was already developed at the time of annexation. Some portions of that land had a future land use designation of Agriculture due to silviculture operations that currently remain and are expected to remain past the ten-year horizon of the new 2000-2010 Plan.

The City’s Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR) (adopted by the City Commission September 28, 1998, Resolution No. 980580 and found sufficient by the Department of Community Affairs on December 14, 1998) indicated that infill and redevelopment continue to be a major issue for the City of Gainesville. Another major issue raised in the report was that the City’s share of Alachua County population has declined every year since the 1992 annexations. The EAR (see pages 6-7) indicated the following:

“The emerging pattern of declining share of population has consequences for the preeminence of the City as a central place in Alachua County. The sprawl pattern of development further away from the center also has quality of life implications for city residents, especially as concerns traffic congestion. New activity center/commercial areas built to support the unincorporated area population can lead to abandonment of existing retail centers. This in turn could leave the City with vacant commercial buildings to fill and loss of property tax dollars as the sites decline in value....As part of the population projection update, the City Plan Board and City Commission agreed to a scenario which would involve turning around the declining share of population by the year 2005 to hold constant to a fixed 46.59 percent of future Alachua County population through the year 2010. This will have to be reflected in the Future Land Use Element and other elements and means that significant efforts at residential infill, redevelopment, and increasing density must be made....Amendments to the Transportation Mobility Element concerning transportation concurrency must be made to accommodate redevelopment and higher residential densities.”

The EAR (page 8) recommended “transportation concurrency amendments to allow infill and redevelopment” and further states:

“Redevelopment areas should be mapped and new policies must be added under Objective 2.4 (FLUE) which concerns redevelopment and infill. The new policies
should stress the City’s keen interest in redevelopment and infill to reduce urban sprawl.”

Key redevelopment areas existed at the time of EAR adoption and were noted in the report. These included: the University Avenue corridor from the downtown area to the University of Florida; the East side of Gainesville; all of the City’s adopted Community Redevelopment Areas (College Park/University Heights, 5th Avenue/Pleasant Street, and Downtown Redevelopment Area); Enterprise Zone area; existing activity centers; and selected low density residential areas which can be designated for higher densities. The Pic N Save shopping center site on NW 13th Street and NW 23rd Avenue remains largely vacant and increasingly blighted looking. Since adoption of the EAR, another site has been abandoned--the Scotty’s in the 3800 block of Newberry Road.

The strict adherence to transportation concurrency requirements has played an increasing role in hampering redevelopment/infill efforts. Transportation concurrency requirements within city limits, combined with an abundant source of vacant, developable land in the unincorporated area where roadway level of service standards are A, B, or C, have contributed to a sprawl pattern of development. This sprawl pattern exacerbates traffic congestion on many key roadways within the community. Many of the city’s roadway level of service problems are not caused by developments approved within city limits.

Employment trips from surrounding counties also contribute to traffic congestion in the city. The Florida Department of Labor and Employment Security provided 1990 data concerning the number of employees working in Alachua County who lived in surrounding counties. From that data, the Planning staff developed a conservative estimate of trips generated by those out-of-county employees. The estimate was based on assuming that, at a minimum, each employee generated two average daily trips (one entering and one exiting). In addition, it was conservatively assumed that 50 percent of the employees might make a trip for lunch, errands, medical visit or other type of activity. The resulting number of average daily trips is shown on the map on the next page. Totaling these trips, it can be noted that there were an estimated 35,169 average daily trips entering Alachua County for employment in 1990. It is anticipated that the number will be higher when the 2000 Census is completed. Later in this document, it is pointed out that the City of Gainesville contains most of the major employers in the area and serves as a regional employment center. Thus, the trips from the out-of-county employment disproportionately impact city roadways. There are also impacts associated with non-work trips associated with the University of Florida (students attending from surrounding counties).

In accordance with recommended actions in the Evaluation and Appraisal Report, the City proposes the adoption of a Transportation Concurrency Exception Area. State law recognizes the unintended consequences of transportation concurrency. Concerning Transportation Concurrency Exception Areas, Rule 9J-5 (FAC) states:
“The purpose of this flexible transportation concurrency option approach is to reduce the adverse impact transportation concurrency may have on urban infill development and redevelopment and the achievement of other goals and policies of the state comprehensive plan, such as promoting the development of public transportation.”

Chapter 163.3180(5)(a) (F.S) echoes this sentiment:

“The Legislature finds that under limited circumstances dealing with transportation facilities, countervailing planning and public policy goals may come into conflict with the requirement that adequate public facilities and services be available concurrent with the impacts of development. The Legislature further finds that often the unintended result of the concurrency requirement for transportation facilities is the discouragement of urban infill development and redevelopment. Such unintended results directly conflict with the goals and policies of the state comprehensive plan and the intent of this part.”

**Background Information**

The City of Gainesville consists of 49.31 square miles. The area within the city limits encompasses only 5.1 percent of the entire Alachua County area (969.2 square miles, according to data in the Florida Statistical Abstract). The latest estimate of the City’s population (April 1, 1999) shows 101,405 people. Unincorporated Alachua County’s population (which includes the urban fringe area surrounding Gainesville) was 97,305.

It is useful to examine recent growth patterns using the Bureau of Economic and Business Research official figures. From 1996 to 1997, the City’s population grew by 2.23 percent. The unincorporated area grew 4.07 percent (nearly two times the City’s growth rate). From 1997 to 1998, the City’s population increased only .45 percent, while the unincorporated area grew 2.7 percent (six times the rate of growth when compared to the City’s). From 1998 to 1999, the City’s population increase was 1.08 percent and the unincorporated area grew by 3.3 percent.

The Alachua County Boundary Adjustment Act adopted in 1990 (Chapter 90-496, F.S.), established an urban reserve area boundary for Gainesville/Alachua County and prescribed annexation policies. Map 1 shows the Urban Reserve Area for Gainesville. It should be noted that the entire city falls within the Urban Reserve Boundary Area limits. The Urban Reserve Area around Gainesville was designated as an area that was urban in character or likely to become urban in character within the next 10 years. The area within Gainesville’s city limits forms only 33.3 percent of the entire Urban Reserve Area (148.1 square miles). Urban services are available within the entire city limits of Gainesville.
In order to more fully understand the current development pattern within the city, an examination was made of development approvals since 1996. The developments were placed in three categories: 1) Redevelopment meeting the Chapter 163 definition; 2) Expansion of existing developments at already developed sites; and 3) Development on vacant land. The following table shows the percentage of each type of development pattern.

### Proportion of Development Approvals by Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Development on vacant land</th>
<th>Redevelopment</th>
<th>Expansion of existing development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table illustrates that the great majority of development in Gainesville is not on vacant parcels. This reflects the development pattern of infill and redevelopment.

**The Transportation Concurrency Exception Area**

The City proposes adoption of a Transportation Concurrency Exception Area (TCEA) as part of Petition 51CPA-99PB. Map 2 (to be adopted as Map 1 in Petition 51CPA-99PB) illustrates the area to be included within the TCEA and proposed sub-zones A and B. The legal description for the overall area and associated sub-zones must be adopted and are shown as Exhibits A, B, and C. The goals, objectives and policies to regulate development inside and outside of the TCEA must also be adopted and are part of Attachment 1 of Ordinance No. 981310.

**Existing Urban Service Area**

The TCEA must be within an “existing urban service area” as defined in Chapter 163.3164(29) and must be established in the Plan as a specific geographic area. According to the definition, an “existing urban service area” means built up areas where public facilities and services such as sewage treatment systems, roads, schools, and recreation areas are already in place.”

The City designates the entire area within city limits as an “existing urban service area” and establishes this in the Plan with an amendment to the Future Land Use Element. New Future Land Use Element Policy 2.1.4 is shown in Ordinance 981311 (associated with Petition 52CPA-99PB).
The designation of the area within city limits as an “existing urban service area” is supported by the following data and analysis. Each of the public facilities mentioned in the definition of “existing urban service area” will be discussed below. It should be noted that the area within city limits represents only a portion of the urbanized area within Alachua County (roughly 33.3 percent as indicated earlier). Significant areas of unincorporated Alachua County to the west and south of city limits are highly urbanized with all public facilities available. Some areas east of city limits are also urbanized. The area to the northwest of city limits is the City of Alachua which provides its own urban services.

According to Gainesville Regional Utilities staff, a broad definition of sewage treatment systems includes: wastewater treatment plants, the wastewater collection system (gravity sewers and force mains), and lift stations. Map 5 in the Concurrency Management Element Data and Analysis Report illustrates the locations of the two city-owned wastewater treatment plants serving areas within the city (and significant areas beyond city limits) and also shows lift stations in the urbanized area. The Main Street Plant generally serves the area east of US 441. The Kanapaha Plant generally serves the area west of US 441. However, a shunt operates between the two plants so that flows can be shifted. It should also be noted that the University of Florida (UF) operates its own wastewater treatment plant and collection system on the UF campus. Maps 5 and 6 illustrate the existing wastewater mains (collection system). Again, it should be noted that services extend well beyond city limits, especially to the west.

Map 4 in the Concurrency Management Data and Analysis Report shows the existing potable water system mains and storage tank facilities. The city also serves the University of Florida. However, they own and operate their own potable water distribution mains. Note that existing potable water service extends beyond city limits.

There is an extensive, existing road network within all of city limits. The Future Land Use Map and Transportation Mobility Map Series illustrate the roadway network, including collectors and arterials.

Existing schools serve the population within city limits. Schools were illustrated in the Capital Improvements Element Data and Analysis Report in the 1991 Comprehensive Plan. Since adoption of the Plan, an additional school, Norton Elementary, has been constructed in city limits in northwest Gainesville at 2200 NW 45th Avenue.

Existing recreation facilities in city limits were shown in the Recreation Element Data and Analysis Report submitted with the 1991 Comprehensive Plan. There are facilities in all quadrants of the city which serve not only city residents, but also those in the unincorporated area.

There is also a requirement, as relates to Transportation Concurrency Exception Areas, that the existing urban services area not contain more than 40 percent developable vacant land. City
staff used its Geographic Information System in concert with the Master Property System database and determined the following. The area within city limits is 49.31 square miles (or 31,558.4 acres). Within the entire city limits, there are 6,998 vacant, developable acres (meeting the definition of developable vacant land in Rule 9J-5.0055(6)(a)1.a.). Using those numbers, it can be noted that within the city limits, 22 percent of the land is vacant. This is well below the allowable 40 percent. Using the same technique, the vacant, developable land was calculated for the proposed Transportation Concurrency Exception Area (TCEA). The total acreage (including right-of-way) within the TCEA is 24,957.62 acres (or 38.99 square miles). The vacant, developable land within the TCEA is 3,981.67 acres. This calculates to a vacant acreage percentage of 15.95 percent. In a 12/1/99 phone conversation with DCA staff Jim Crews and Walker Banning, it was determined that the City had previously overestimated the percentage of vacant land because the denominator (total acreage or total land area) had excluded roads and ROW. This has been corrected and results in the new figures shown above.

**Characteristics of the Transportation Concurrency Exception Area**

The proposed Transportation Concurrency Exception Area consists of 24,957.62 total acres of land (includes right-of-way) all within city limits and totally within the Urban Reserve Area boundary. Of the total acreage, 15.95 percent (3,981.67 acres) is vacant, developable land. An examination of the vacant parcels revealed that 74 percent of them were one-half acre or smaller. Many of those parcels are existing lots in already approved residential subdivisions (including lots in subdivisions approved up to 30 years ago). The vacant acreage also includes several undeveloped parcels that have active development orders and are in the process of obtaining building permits. Thus, the results of a study of these vacant lots further supports the City’s findings that redevelopment will be the primary focus in the proposed TCEA.

The vacant land calculations excluded water bodies, lands designated for conservation use or passive recreation, road rights-of-way, and common areas which cannot be developed. It should be noted that the northern boundary of Zone B along NW 53rd Avenue excludes a large tract of land (parcel number 07877-000-000) because it is currently in silviculture use and has no water or sewer lines run to it. The northern boundary also excludes the proposed Greenways of Gainesville DRI (930 vacant acres) and other large tracts of land shown for Agriculture land use on the Future Land Use Map. Also excluded, in the northeast quadrant, are the Gumroot Swamp parcels with a Conservation land use designation.

The proposed TCEA falls within an area proposed for designation as an urban redevelopment area. The Urban Redevelopment Area (see Map 3) is proposed for
adoption as part of the Future Land Use Map Series (see Petition 50LUC-99PB). A further discussion of the Designated Urban Redevelopment Area is below under the section labeled “Size and location of the Designated Urban Redevelopment Area.”

The proposed TCEA also falls within an existing urban service area as defined by Chapter 163.3164(29). Urban service areas are “built-up areas where public facilities and services such as sewage treatment systems, roads, schools, and recreation areas are already in place.” The TCEA, as proposed, includes all these services. Map 4 shows the existing potable water facilities (note: they extend beyond city limits). Maps 5 and 6 show the existing public wastewater facilities and a detail of the sanitary sewer mains. There are major collector and arterial roads servicing the area (see Map 2). Public schools are located throughout the city which serve the residents within the area. Recreation areas, both passive and active, are also located citywide (see the Recreation Element Data and Analysis Report). The City is currently meeting its adopted LOS standards for Potable Water, Wastewater, Recreation, Solid Waste and Stormwater Management (through the development review process). Public transit routes, while not fully serving the entire TCEA, do operate at the major activity centers except for the Hunter’s Crossing Planned Development. It is hoped that as infill and redevelopment occur along the NW 43rd Street area, that a transit route can be extended north from NW 39th Avenue to NW 53rd Avenue to service the Hunter’s Crossing area.

Map 2 illustrated the boundaries of two zones (Zone A and Zone B) for the TCEA. Separate guidelines and policies for development are set for the two sub-zones (see associated goals, objectives and policies, Petition 51CPA-99PB). Zone A encompasses the eastern portion of the city and the area surrounding the University of Florida. Eastern Gainesville has lagged behind western Gainesville in development and redevelopment. It is anticipated that the policies for Zone A may help to incentivize development potential of this area since most of the modifications related to transportation concurrency will not be required to be funded by the developer. The portion of Zone A proximate to the University of Florida campus is well served by transit. Route 13 along SW 13th Street runs at 15 minute frequencies during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours and at 30 minute frequencies in the off-peak hours. Routes 9 and 12 along Archer Road to campus also run at 15 minute frequencies in the peak hours and at 20 minute frequencies off-peak. Route 8 along NW 13th Street to campus/Shands Hospital runs at 30 minute frequencies both on- and off-peak.

Zone A of the proposed TCEA contains all of the existing and proposed Community Redevelopment Areas (see Map 7) and includes downtown Gainesville. Zone A also largely contains the University of Florida Master Plan Area (see Map 8). All of the City’s Enterprise Zone areas are included within the TCEA (see Map 9). Two of the Enterprise Zone areas are located in Zone A and one is in Zone B. The Enterprise Zone area placed in Zone B is there primarily because it is largely undeveloped land which makes development easier in that location.
The University of Florida is wholly located within the TCEA and is a major traffic generator. The latest information available from the University indicates that as of the Fall, 1998 semester, there were 43,327 registered students (37,508 full-time students).

Most of the community’s major employers are located within city limits and are included within the TCEA. These include the following, as obtained from the Gainesville Area Chamber of Commerce (January 1998 data). The table does not include employment for schools located within the TCEA because the data from the School Board is for Alachua County as a whole. Thus, the table underestimates the impact of public school employment. An analysis of the 1990 Transportation Analysis Zone (TAZ) data revealed that 76.45 percent of the 1990 employment in Alachua County fell in TAZs within current city limits. Thus, the city bears the burden of most work-related trips.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>Number of employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shands HealthCare</td>
<td>9,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oaks Mall Merchants Assoc.</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Gainesville &amp; Gainesville Regional Utilities</td>
<td>2,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(based on 1999 data from the City)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran’s Administration Medical Center</td>
<td>1,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia N. Florida Regional Medical Center</td>
<td>1,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shands at AGH</td>
<td>928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alachua County Board of County Commissioners</td>
<td>708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell South</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Athletic Association</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sears Roebuck &amp; Co.</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Gainesville Sun</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCR, Inc.</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gainesville Health &amp; Fitness Center</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigatelli’s Italian Grill</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dillard’s</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burdines</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radisson Hotel—Gainesville</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday Inn--University Center</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wade Raulerson Pontiac GMC Truck, Inc.</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam’s Club</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul West Ford</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belk</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry’s Seafood, Bar &amp; Grill</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Independent Florida Alligator</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Size and location of the Designated Urban Redevelopment Area

It is important to note that there are no statutory or rule limitations on the maximum or minimum size of either a Designated Urban Redevelopment Area or Transportation Concurrency Exception Area (TCEA). In fact, based on material received from Broward County, they have an adopted TCEA in unincorporated Broward County that is 112 square miles in size. The City’s proposed TCEA and Designated Urban Redevelopment Area are 38.99 square miles in size. Thus, Broward County’s TCEA exceeds the size of Gainesville’s by almost three times.

Further, there are no statutory or rule limitations on the location of a Designated Urban Redevelopment Area. The only limitation on the location of a TCEA associated with an urban redevelopment area is that it must be located in an existing urban service area which does not contain more than 40 percent developable vacant land. The earlier discussion concerning the existing urban service area provides supporting data and analysis which proves that the entire city limits of the City of Gainesville meet the criteria for an “existing urban service area” and that the City well meets the less than 40 percent vacant developable land criteria (Gainesville’s percentage in the existing urban service area is 22 percent vacant developable land; see the earlier section labeled “Existing Urban Service Area” for a complete discussion of that figure’s calculation).

A final point is important here. There are also no statutes or rules which prohibit an urban redevelopment area from containing large or complete portions of the “existing urban service area.” Since the TCEA is allowed to be in an existing urban services area which does not contain more than 40 percent vacant developable land, the clear deduction is that some of the land in the urban redevelopment area and TCEA will be vacant. That is, not every development within the proposed TCEA must meet the definition of urban
redevelopment as shown in Chapter 163.3164(26). There is a presumption of some vacant land. One of the TCEA areas designated for urban redevelopment in the City of Tampa (East Industrial Area) contains 20 percent vacant, developable land according to information in their TCEA report. In the case of the City of Gainesville’ s proposed TCEA and Designated Urban Redevelopment Area, the percentage of vacant developable land is only 15.95 percent. Thus, it is quite clear that an overwhelming majority of the development which will take place in the proposed area will have to be redevelopment.

Interestingly, Rule 9J-5 allows a designated urban redevelopment area to include (note the word “include”, but not require) a Community Redevelopment Area established pursuant to the Community Redevelopment Act of 1969 when these areas exist within an Existing Urban Services Area. The City’ s proposed TCEA and Designated Urban Redevelopment Area includes the three existing (and fourth proposed) Community Redevelopment Areas established pursuant to the Community Redevelopment Act of 1969. When looking at that legislation, there are no percentage requirements on vacant developable land.

The City’s proposed Designated Urban Redevelopment Area has been slightly amended (since the first submittal) after discussions with the DCA staff. City staff agreed it was reasonable to change the area considered for designation as an urban redevelopment area to eliminate the Gumroot Swamp lands with Conservation land use and zoning designations (this area is on the northeastern corner of the maps). All of the maps to be adopted under Petition 50LUC-99PB (Attachments 1-5) now reflect that change. This reduces the size of the urban redevelopment area and TCEA by about 752.5 acres. It was always understood that those conservation parcels would not be subject to development.

Additional data and analysis supporting the designated urban redevelopment area

The Department of Community Affairs has asked for further data and analysis supporting the Designated Urban Redevelopment Area. As noted on pages 1-2 of this report, redevelopment was a major theme for the City of Gainesville 1991-2001 Comprehensive Plan and this was echoed in the Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR) submitted to the Department of Community Affairs (found sufficient by DCA in December 1998). This is because of the nearly built-out status of the community, the age status of many structures in the city, and the economic market for more intense or changed uses at some locations (especially in relation to activity centers).

The City’s emphasis on redevelopment can be noted from Objective 2.4 in the existing Future Land Use Element which states, “Redevelopment shall be encouraged to promote
urban infill, improve the condition of blighted areas, to reduce urban sprawl and foster compact development patterns.”

The Major Issues section of the Evaluation and Appraisal Report identified redevelopment and infill as one of the 13 major issues for Gainesville for the new 2000-2010 comprehensive planning period. Also listed was “revisions to the activity center concept.” DCA staff requested that the City include those sections of the EAR as additional supporting material concerning designation of the urban redevelopment area. The material is included in Appendix 1 of the “City of Gainesville Response to Florida Department of Community Affairs regarding Objections, Recommendations and Comments” document (pages 7-8 and 12-13 of the City’s Evaluation and Appraisal Report, Major Issues Section).

The EAR recommended that redevelopment areas be mapped and new policies be added to the Plan concerning redevelopment. As pointed out in the “Transportation concurrency” section of the EAR (see Appendix 1, pages 19-20 of the EAR Major Issues Section), progress with redevelopment has been hindered due to concurrency problems. Thus, the TCEA policies form a key part of the strategy to encourage redevelopment.

The Designated Urban Redevelopment Area Map (as originally shown and as revised) contains the areas listed for redevelopment in the EAR (see Appendix 1, page 7). The redevelopment areas listed in Petition 50LUC-99PB (see page 2 of the petition letter) are repeated below (NOTE: these are also listed in this report, page 2):

1. Downtown area including the Downtown Redevelopment Area
2. College Park/University Heights Redevelopment Area
3. 5th Avenue/Pleasant Street Redevelopment Area
4. Proposed fourth East-side Redevelopment Area in East Gainesville
5. All existing activity centers in the four quadrants of the city (including the University of Florida) except the Gainesville North Activity Center which is currently unbuilt and proposed as the Greenways of Gainesville DRI
6. The University Avenue corridor from the downtown area to the University of Florida
7. The east side of Gainesville which has lagged behind in development (includes the Airport and Airport Industrial Park)
8. All of the City’s Enterprise Zone areas
9. Low density residential areas which will be examined for higher densities as part of the Future Land Use Element analysis

DCA has requested further identification of these redevelopment areas. Each will be discussed below.
In the above list, numbers 1-4 represent areas which meet (or, in the case of number 4, will be required to meet) the requirements for a Community Redevelopment Area as defined in Chapter 163.340(10). Each of these areas are (or will be) tax increment finance districts. The Downtown Redevelopment Area, College Park/University Heights Redevelopment Area, 5th Avenue Pleasant Street Redevelopment Area and proposed fourth East-side Redevelopment Area were all illustrated in Map 7 of this report.

As shown above, number 5 on the list was “all existing activity centers in the four quadrants of the city.” The activity centers included the University of Florida. However, the Gainesville North Activity Center (also known as Greenways of Gainesville DRI) was specifically excluded from the TCEA and designated urban redevelopment area because it is unbuilt (therefore, not subject to redevelopment). Also excluded was the Northwood Shopping Center on US 441 because there are minimal transportation concurrency problems on US 441 in the segment where the shopping center is located. Map 10 shows Activity Centers and their related service/market areas (this map was presented at public hearings before the City Commission and provided to the County Commissioners in their role as Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization members; but it was not previously submitted as part of the Data and Analysis Report to DCA).

A few points are worth noting concerning Map 10. First, a service/market radius was not drawn around the University of Florida because it draws from a broad regional market (from several surrounding counties). UF serves as an existing transit hub (as shown in Attachment 5 to Petition 50LUC-99PB). Second, a service/market radius was not drawn around the downtown area because it also serves a regional market for goods and services. Downtown is a transit hub and a new transit facility is proposed as shown on Attachment 5 (to Petition 50LUC-99PB). Third, a service/market radius of two miles was drawn around the Oaks Mall. The Oaks Mall is designated in Policy 2.3.6 of the Future Land Use Element as a regional activity center, meaning it is intended to serve an area greater than five miles in radius as defined in the Land Development Code. Thus, the two-mile radius underestimates its market area. The Oaks Mall functions as an existing transit hub with a Park and Ride facility.

As indicated in the EAR (see page 12 in the Appendix), the Activity Center concept has been part of Gainesville’s comprehensive planning focus since 1970. Activity Centers are located in all quadrants of the city. The focus has been on a multi-centered city where services/goods are available around the community to meet the needs of residents. This is clearly stated in Goal 2 of the Future Land Use Element which says, “The Land Use Element shall foster the unique character of the city by directing growth and redevelopment in a manner that uses activity centers to provide goods and services to city residents; protects viable, stable neighborhoods; distributes growth and economic activity.
Objective 2.3 also echoes the citywide activity center concept which states, “By June 1992, the City shall adopt Land Development Regulations that require concentrated development patterns through the use of the activity center concept. Activity Centers shall be designed to integrate housing with commercial, employment and recreational opportunities, and shall be located and designed to create vibrant urban areas, promote convenience for city residents and reduce vehicular travel and energy consumption.”

The EAR pointed out that the 1991-2001 Plan utilized the mixed use districts as the implementing mechanism for the activity center concept. “The mixed use districts were intended to encourage a more intense development pattern and introduce an urban village or traditional neighborhood design component…. This has not occurred but remains a goal for the upcoming planning period…” Thus, redevelopment of the activity centers and areas surrounding them is desirable and will be a key focus of the updated Future Land Use Element and new Urban Design Element.

The proposed Urban Design Element Data and Analysis Report (not yet submitted to DCA or adopted) discusses the desirability of converting conventional shopping centers into Town Centers. Quoting from the Data and Analysis Report, “Today, in many communities, plans are underway to retrofit these conventional, car-oriented centers to be more like walkable villages or traditional downtowns. Typically, this involves allowing additional developments in these shopping areas—of a particular nature…. Some of the plans include construction of residences within this new village. The effort often includes surrounding these new village-type retail areas with higher density housing, which helps to enhance the vibrancy of the “village.”

Additions of liner buildings (or any other new development which takes place) to the Activity Centers will trigger the updated Stormwater Management requirements of the Comprehensive Plan. This qualifies as redevelopment of infrastructure (based on the definition of infrastructure shown in Rule 9J-5).

Other redevelopment projects meeting the “infrastructure” definition are occurring in all four quadrants of the City. In the northwest, the intersection of NW 43rd Street and NW 39th Avenue is being re-designed to add additional turn lanes on NW 39th Avenue. In southwest Gainesville, there is a project to upgrade and pave the roads in the Morningstar Neighborhood (close to the Oaks Mall). In the southeast, the Brownfields Project is ongoing to develop a master stormwater park for the entire downtown area with passive recreational amenities. In the northeast, the City recently received block grant funding to make stormwater improvements in the Duval neighborhood.
Number 6 on the list of redevelopment areas is the University Avenue corridor from the downtown area to the University of Florida. Looking at any of the maps provided, this corridor, as defined, runs along University Avenue from US 441 or NW 13th Street to Main Street.

The East side of Gainesville, number 7 on the above list, is the entire area east (both northeast and southeast) of Main Street. This should be clearly discernible on all of the maps provided. This area has lagged behind the western portion of the community, especially in terms of redevelopment. A fourth redevelopment district (discussed above) is proposed to be within this area. The existing airport and airport industrial park lie in this area.

The Enterprise Zone areas (three of them), number 8 on the above list, were shown on Map 9 in the Concurrency Management Data and Analysis Report. These are state-designated areas targeted for economic revitalization, where financial incentives to businesses are offered to encourage private investment and increase employment opportunity for the area residents.

Finally, number 9 on the above list was “Low density residential areas which will be examined for higher densities as part of the Future Land Use Element analysis.” Exactly which specific, limited areas will be chosen cannot be currently mapped because the Future Land Use Element analysis is still ongoing. Two existing policies in the Future Land Use Element may give some guidance however. Policy 2.3.2 indicates that, “The land use map shall designate appropriate areas for high density residential development in close proximity to Activity Centers.” Also, Policy 2.4.4 states, “The City Future Land Use Plan shall accommodate increases in student enrollment at the University of Florida and the relocation of students from the urban fringe by designating appropriate areas for high density residential development and/or appropriate mixed use development within 1/2 mile of the University of Florida campus and J. Hillis Miller Medical Center.

**Compatibility with Comprehensive Plan**

The Transportation Concurrency Exception Area is one of several strategies to increase redevelopment and infill within the city. The TCEA is compatible with the Future Land Use Element’s Goals, Objectives, and Policies. Specifically, Objective 2.4 states, “Redevelopment shall be encouraged to promote urban infill, improve the condition of blighted areas, to reduce urban sprawl and foster compact development patterns.” The TCEA is a major and necessary component of the policies which must be adopted to reduce the negative impacts of transportation concurrency on redevelopment efforts. As indicated in the introductory material, the TCEA is also compatible with the recommendations adopted in the Evaluation and Appraisal Report for amendments needed to update the Comprehensive Plan. An associated petition (52CPA-99PB) repeals the Transportation Concurrency Management Area (TCMA) because that it is being replaced by the TCEA and because the TCMA no longer meets statutory requirements.
Coordination efforts and inter-jurisdictional issues

The City has held ongoing meetings with Florida Department of Transportation, Alachua County Planning, Alachua County Public Works, and the North Central Florida Regional Planning Council (staff to the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization) concerning the TCEA. These meetings started in January 1999 and regular meetings and phone conversations have been held with all parties. City staff made presentations to the Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Board on April 27, 1999 and to the Citizens Advisory Committee and Technical Advisory Committee to the MTPO on April 28, 1999. A presentation was made to the MTPO on June 10, 1999.

As part of the coordination efforts, several objectives and policies have been proposed. Objective 1.8 states that “City shall coordinate on an ongoing basis with Alachua County concerning the TCEA.” An associated policy under this objective provides Alachua County with the opportunity to review development plans impacting Alachua County-maintained roads. Another policy provides support for a joint-TCEA with Alachua County for certain roadways on jurisdictional boundaries.

Objectives 1.7 and 1.9 and associated policies provide for coordination with the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization and Florida Department of Transportation. An associated amendment to the Intergovernmental Coordination Element (see Policy 1.3.5 in Petition 52CPA-99PB) provides for coordination with Alachua County in the implementation of the TCEA through the Technical Advisory Committee to the MTPO.

Policies and guidelines specifying programs to address transportation needs

The goals, objectives and policies associated with this Comprehensive Plan amendment (see Attachment 1 to Petition 51CPA-99PB) provide a number of strategies to address transportation needs within the TCEA. An important component is the separation of Zones A and B to incentivize development within Zone A. Redistribution of development to eastern Gainesville is one means of resolving transportation congestion. Currently, there is excess capacity available in this area. Also, new residential development and/or more dense residential development in this zone could ease traffic congestion by placing the population closer to major employers such as the University of Florida, Shands Hospital, the City and County, Gainesville Regional Utilities, and the Veteran’s Administration Hospital. In addition, student housing near the campus and on major transit routes in Zone A can also relieve problems.

The University of Florida students pay, as part of their activity fees, for a bus pass card. The City’s Regional Transit Service attracted an additional one million plus riders in 1998 over
1997. Transit is an critical strategy for relieving congestion and providing an alternative to single-occupant vehicle travel. Currently, all buses are equipped with bicycle carriers to facilitate multi-modal transportation choices.

As part of the Campus Master Plan Agreement, the University of Florida pledged over ten million dollars for funding transportation-related issues. Funds are to be used for additional provision of transit services, construction of bicycle/pedestrian corridors, roadway construction and right-of-way purchase (funds to Alachua County). The moneys allocated will help to alleviate traffic problems associated with the University.

Within Zone B, developers will be required to meet certain development standards (see Policy 1.1.6) based on the trip generation characteristics of the project. These standards are also an important strategy for resolving traffic problems.

Parking policies play an important role in transportation planning and management. Policy 1.6.1 sets a maximum for on-site parking as the minimum required by the Land Development Code. In the past, many developers have asked for, and received, excess parking at development sites. This is counter-productive for reducing automobile-dependency. Policy 1.6.2 allows developments to request a reduction in the required parking at the site in accordance with criteria set in the Land Development Code. Both surface parking as a principal use and parking garages are specially regulated by the TCEA policies (see Policies 1.4.3 and 1.4.11). These uses can interfere with the safety and comfort of pedestrians and bicyclists. The policies set standards to protect those using alternative modes of transportation.

Objective 1.5 and its associated policies recognize the important role of streetscaping and landscaping in reducing perceived roadway congestion and increasing pedestrian/transit user comfort. In the article “Will the Traffic Work?” by Walter Kulash, Joe Anglin and David Marks, the authors state:

“A small body of existing research suggests that the “other” street characteristics (i.e., other than capacity/speed and safety) may weigh heavily in the individual motorist’s interpretation of traffic service. Driver/passenger surveys show that automobile occupants under-estimate their travel time and distance when driving through an appealing environment, and that, conversely, they overstate their time and distance when driving through a hostile environment. The extent of under- or over-reporting can overshadow large differences in the capacity/speed and safety performance of a given street.”

Roadway widening is not a feasible or desirable strategy for most roadways within the TCEA. Right-of-way acquisition would be prohibitively expensive for most of the area’s streets. Wide roads are not conducive to pedestrian or bicycle safety and comfort and lead to higher speeds. Further, there is mounting evidence that roadway widenings to gain motorized vehicle capacity
increases are actually counterproductive. A November 12, 1998 press release about the Texas Transportation Institute’s annual report on metropolitan congestion in major urban areas revealed the following.

“The analysis by the Surface Transportation Policy Project compared metropolitan areas that have added extensive new road capacity with those that have not, and found no significant difference in the rise in traffic congestion...” the urban areas that added more new lanes spent roughly $22 billion more on construction, but their drivers are still paying high costs due to congestion delays...The STTP report says the problem may be partially explained by the phenomenon of “induced traffic.” Several recent studies have documented that new roads actually encourage more driving and more automobile trips. A University of California study...found that every 1% increase in lane miles generate a .9% increase in traffic within five years, negating the congestion-easing effect of new roads.”

The Victoria Transport Policy Institute produced a March 12, 1999 report called “Generated Traffic--Implications for Transport Planning.” The report mirrors the conclusions of the Texas Transportation Institute. The following comment is instructive.

“Roadway improvements that reduce traffic congestion tend to increase total vehicle travel, due to latent demand. This is called “generated” or “induced” traffic. Generated traffic consists of trips that are shifted in time, route and mode, and new or longer vehicle trips. Recent research indicates that typical roadway improvements can generate significant amounts of traffic.”

“Under some circumstances, increasing roadway capacity can increase total congestion delay by concentrating traffic on a few links in the network and by reducing alternative travel options, such as public transit service.” (from Richard Amott and Kenneth Small, “The Economics of Traffic Congestion,” Sept./Oct. 1994).

Another strategy for addressing transportation needs is the adoption of policies supporting multi-modal transportation choice. Objective 1.2 (and associated policies) contains language encouraging greater street connectivity and the adoption of a map showing Existing and Potential Transit Hubs (see Petition 50LUC-99PB for the map). Policy 1.2.4 states that the City will amend the Future Land Use and Transportation Mobility Elements to support and promote future transit hubs.

Urban design issues are also important in relation to transportation needs. Objective 1.3 and associated policies set a requirement for the City to adopt design standards for development/redevelopment within the proposed TCEA. In the interim period before specific standards are adopted, the City will use its already adopted Central Corridors Overlay District
(see enclosed copy of the Central Corridors portion of the Land Development Code) design standards to regulate developments. Policy 1.7.1 states that the City shall encourage roadway designs that improve multi-modal transportation.

Consideration of the impacts on the Florida Intrastate Highway System

The TCEA impacts the following Florida Intrastate Highway System (FIHS) roadway segments. The table illustrates the existing level of service on these road segments and provides information about the maximum service volume. The city limits touch only a fractional portion of Williston Road between I-75 and SW 13th Street. Alachua County has jurisdictional authority over development orders on the great majority of this segment. Therefore, minimal TCEA impacts should occur on that segment. The entire section of I-75 north from Newberry Road is outside of city limits and development approvals will not be impacted by the TCEA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Segment</th>
<th>Existing LOS</th>
<th>Maximum service volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorne Road from Waldo Road to SE 43rd Street</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>33,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williston Road from I-75 to SW 13th Street</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>33,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williston Road from SW 13th Street to University Ave.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>33,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-75 from Archer Road to Newberry Road</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>73,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-75 from Newberry Road to NW 39th Avenue</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>73,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The following table shows the projected service volume and volume to capacity ratio in 2020 for the FIHS segments. This data is based on the 2020 Gainesville Urban Area Transportation Model. None of the FIHS roads are projected to fail or exceed the maximum service volume for the adopted level of service standard. Since there are no major land use amendments which would change development density or intensity being considered or proposed for these road segments, the TCEA will have a minimal impact on the FIHS. Policy 1.9.2 requires an annual review and monitoring of these FIHS segments. Thus, an early warning system has been instituted to evaluate potential LOS problems on the FIHS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Segment</th>
<th>Projected V/C ratio</th>
<th>Projected service volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorne Road from Waldo Road to SE 43rd Street</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>19,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williston Road from I-75 to SW 13th Street</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>25,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williston Road from SW 13th Street to University Ave.</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>11,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route Description</td>
<td>Flow</td>
<td>Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-75 from Archer Road to Newberry Road</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>45,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-75 from Newberry Road to NW 39th Avenue</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>58,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Central Corridors Minimum Development Standards  
(from the City of Gainesville Land Development Code)
Exhibit E. Special Area Plan for the Central Corridors
Minimum Development Standards

(a) Purpose. The Central Corridors are established to improve the sense of place and community; improve the environment for businesses, including smaller, locally-owned businesses; support a healthy economy by providing a vibrant mix of commercial, office, retail and residential uses in close proximity; reduce crime by encouraging a 24-hour mix of uses and a significant number of pedestrians; strike a balance between the needs of the car and pedestrian by creating a pleasant ambiance and interesting people-scaled features, and make the pedestrian feel safe and convenient; increase transit viability; and improve independence of people without access to a car. The standards are designed to make Gainesville a more vibrant, livable place, and increase citizen pride in its development. The standards are designed to establish an important engine in job creation, a strengthened tax base, and an incubator for new, entrepreneurial, locally-owned businesses and entry-level job opportunities. The standards are also intended to protect the property values of nearby residential areas.

(b) Effect of classification. The Central Corridors standards are an overlay zoning district. They shall operate in conjunction with any underlying zoning district in the subject area. The regulations of the underlying zoning district, and all other applicable regulations, remain in effect and are further regulated by the Central Corridors standards. If provisions of the Central Corridors standards conflict with the underlying zoning, the provisions of the Central Corridors standards shall prevail.

(c) Annual evaluation. The City Plan Board shall conduct an evaluation of these standards on an annual basis.

(d) Exceptions. Exceptions to these standards can be granted by the appropriate reviewing board, city manager or designee, upon a finding that either of the following criteria are met:

1. The proposed construction is consistent with the overall intent of the Central Corridors standards; or

2. The applicant proves an undue hardship, owing to conditions peculiar to the land or structure and not the result of the action of the applicant, would result from strict adherence to these standards.

In addition to the exceptions that may be granted above, exceptions to the build-to line may be granted if the proposed construction includes an existing structure which has been designated as a historic property or has historic significance because it is potentially eligible for listing on the national or local register, and maintaining a viewshed of the existing historic structure is in the public interest.

(e) Right to appeal.

1. Any person aggrieved by a decision rendered by the appropriate reviewing board, city manager or designee may appeal the decision to the City Commission within 14 days from the date that the decision by the appropriate reviewing board, city manager or designee is reduced to writing and served by certified or registered mail, return receipt requested, to such person. The appeal shall be made by filing a written notice of appeal within the above-proscribed time period with the clerk of the City Commission. The notice shall set forth concisely the decision under appeal and the reasons or grounds for the appeal.

2. The Community Development Department shall prepare the appeal for the City Commission. The appeal shall be de novo and shall be heard by the City Commission at its next regular meeting, provided at least 14 days have intervened between the time of the filing of the notice of appeal and the date of such meeting. The City Commission shall hear and consider all evidence and testimony placed before it, and shall render its decision promptly, based on competent, substantial evidence. The City Commission may affirm, amend or reverse the decision of the appropriate reviewing board, city manager or designee. The decision by the City Commission shall be reduced to writing and shall constitute final administrative review.
peals from decisions of the City Commission may be made to the courts as provided by law.

(f) Definitions. Defined terms are as defined in the Traditional City standards, section 4 of this Appendix, and are italicized in the text. Drawings are illustrative only. They do not represent required designs.

(g) Delineation of Central Corridors Overlay District. The Central Corridors overlay district shall apply to all lands adjacent to the streets shown on the map of the Central Corridors. Distances from the Central Corridors overlay district to structures outside the Central Corridors overlay district shall be measured from the nearest curb or edge of pavement.

(h) Required compliance. All now commercial, office, civic and multi-family buildings and developments shall be required to comply with the sections of the text labeled “standards.”

(i) Presumptive vested rights. Developments shall be presumptively vested for the purposes of consistency with this overlay if they have filed a valid application for a preliminary development order issued by the city, as specified by Article VII, Division 3, prior to the effective date.

(j) Non-conforming uses and buildings.

(1) Continuation of use. Nonconforming use may be continued as provided in section 30-23, Non-Conforming Use, and section 30-346, Non-conforming Lots, Uses or Structures.

(2) Expanding existing non-conforming uses.

a. A special use permit may be issued for expansion of uses made non-conforming by the Central Corridors standards when the City Plan Board makes findings that the proposed expansion is in compliance with Article VII, Division 4, Special Use Permit.

b. In addition, no permit for expansion of a non-conforming use shall be issued unless the City Plan Board makes the following findings concerning the proposed expansion:

1. The expansion complies with the Central Corridors standards, as applicable;
2. Auto Dealers, Auto Service and Limited Auto Services, and Gas Service Stations shall comply with sections 30-93 and 30-94;
3. Carwashes shall comply with section 30-95;
4. Outdoor Storage shall comply with section 30-97;
5. Parking Lots, as the principal use other than structured parking or the use of existing parking lots shall comply with section 30-114;
6. The expansion shall not reduce pedestrian safety by increasing driveway widths, adding a new driveway crossing to a sidewalk or crosswalk, or increasing the number of driveway lanes;
7. The expansion shall not increase the size of signs on the site;
8. The non-conforming use shall not be changed (except to a conforming use) as a result of the expansion;
9. The expansion shall not result in a conversion of the non-conforming use from a seasonal to a year-round operation, nor shall it result in the use expanding its hours of operation;
10. Outdoor storage areas shall not be expanded or located any closer to residential development as a result of the expansion; and
11. The proposed expansion shall not add more than 25 percent of new floor area to existing buildings on the site.
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(3) Change of use. A non-conforming use may only be changed to a conforming use.

(4) Development, enlargement, or modification of a non-conforming building. A non-conforming building may be developed, enlarged, or modified without requiring conformance with this overlay if the change would not increase the degree of non-conformity with the standards in this overlay.

(6) Build-to-line.

(1) Intent. The intent of the build-to-line is to pull the building facade close to the street and streetside sidewalk. Because of the transitional nature of these corridors, the build-to-line to move flexible than in the Traditional City. The build-to-line allows new buildings to be aligned with existing buildings; in the future, allows a building to be built in front of the building and allows this future building to abut the streetside sidewalk. Over time, building facades along a block face should be aligned to form a street edge that frames the public realm, while retaining sufficient width for people to walk, and sufficient space to provide a formal landscape created by street trees. Over time, the intent is to pull building facades close to the street and streetside sidewalk, frame a comfortable public realm, and prevent overly large setbacks.

Overly large setbacks are inconvenient and unpleasant for pedestrians. They can significantly increase walking distances from the public sidewalk. They prevent the pedestrian on the public sidewalk from enjoying building details and activity within the building. Similarly, overly large setbacks contribute to sign proliferation and visual blight because a building set back a large distance often needs to "shout," with signs, at passing motorists, transit users, bicyclists and pedestrians in order to be noticed. Buildings pulled up to the street sidewalk have more of a human scale and allow for the construction of canopies which shield the pedestrian from wet weather.

(2) Standard. The build-to-line shall be that which achieves the above-stated intent, as determined by the appropriate reviewing board, city manager or designee, and shall apply even if the facade faces a street outside of the overlay affected area. Building walls along a street that is not within the overlay affected area that were entirely more than 250 feet from the regulated corridor shall be exempt from the Build-to-Line standard. If a portion of the wall along a street is within 250 feet, all of the wall is affected by the standard. In most instances, the build-to-line shall be 20 feet from the curb or edge of pavement for at least 70 percent of the building facade. Factors to be considered for variations to this build-to-line shall be as follows:

• When considering a closer build-to-line, the building facade shall, in most instances, be no closer than 14 feet from the curb or edge of pavement along an arterial, 12 feet along a collector, and 10 feet along a local street, in order to leave space for adequate sidewalks and tree strips (see Map A).

• When the proposed building is adjacent to existing buildings on an abutting property the facade shall, in most instances, be built at the facade of the adjacent building closest to the street, or the 80-foot build-to-line, whichever is closer to the street.

• The appropriate reviewing board, city manager or designee can approve a facade closer to the curb or edge of pavement than the previously listed distances so that a consistent street edge of adjacent buildings can be maintained.

• Buildings on corner lots or buildings on more than one street frontage shall, in most instances, have the 80-foot build-to-line requirement on the more primary street frontage area.

• The appropriate reviewing board, city manager or designee may approve a greater build-to-line (farther from the street) than
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the required build-to line when site constraints such as significant tree features or significant design features warrant it. If such approval by the appropriate reviewing board, city manager or designer is granted, the front yard area must be landscaped to provide shade for pedestrians with tree plantings and to establish the street edge articulation.

- The standards described in this subsection shall supersede any landscape buffer width requirements found in Article VIII of the Land Development Code for frontage areas, except in front of surface parking lots.

Stoops, egress, chimneys, and bay windows are allowed to extend beyond the build-to line as long as they do not exceed more than 25 percent of the front facade. Open porches, projecting signs, balconies, arcades, awnings and outdoor cafes may also extend beyond the build-to line. However, at least 6 feet of unobstructed sidewalk width and room for any required tree strip must be retained.

(1) Parking.

(1) Intent. Parking is one component of the successful commercial area, but should not dominate the street(scape) or degrade the public realm. Parking areas located in front of buildings are inconvenient and unpleasant for pedestrians. They significantly increase walking distances from the public sidewalk. They create hot expanses of asphalt, and prevent the pedestrian on the public sidewalk from enjoying building details and activity within the building. In addition, they prevent the building from contributing to an intimate, comfortable street edge. Buildings pulled up to the street without intervening motor vehicle parking have more of a human scale. A larger curb turning radius at a parking area ingress and egress point allows vehicles to negotiate a turn rapidly, whereas a smaller radius forces a vehicle to slow down.

(2) Standard.

a. No motor vehicle parking is required. All motor vehicle parking except a double-loaded row of parking is to be located in the rear or interior side, or both, of the building, unless topography, stormwater retention, or significant trees, as determined by the appropriate reviewing board, city manager or designer, prevent such a location. In no case shall more than 50 percent of the parking be located between the front facade and the primary abutting street. However, driveway entrances and exits to parking areas shall be allowed on the front side of the building. The minimum number of motor vehicle parking spaces required by section 30-332 is the maximum allowed. However, there shall be no limit on the number of parking spaces in parking structures.

b. Bicycle parking spaces shall be installed as called for by section 30-332. Such parking may encroach into the public right-of-way or beyond the build-to line provided that at least 5 feet of unobstructed sidewalk width and any required tree strip is retained. Bicycle parking requirements may be waived if public bicycle parking exists to serve the use.

(m) Sidewalks.

(1) Intent. Sidewalks, when properly dimensioned and maintained, provide the pedestrian with a pleasant, safe, and convenient place to walk, and mitigate traffic impacts by making the area more walkable. Sidewalks that are too narrow are inconvenient, especially in areas with large volumes of pedestrians.

(2) Standard.

a. All developments must provide sidewalks along all street fronts. All developments must provide pedestrian connections from the public
LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE

b. Minimum sidewalk widths:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Classifications</th>
<th>Multi-Family Residential</th>
<th>Commercial/Institutional/Office Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>feet</td>
<td>feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C or U</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The minimum unobstructed width shall be 6 feet less than the required sidewalk width, as long as at least 5 feet of unobstructed width is retained. At transit stops, the minimum width is 8 feet of unobstructed width. Minimum width for a tree strip shall be 4 feet, or such other width as may be adequate for tree replacement, unless the tree strip requirement is waived by the appropriate reviewing board, city manager or designee.

c. In order to maintain a consistent street edge of adjacent buildings, the appropriate reviewing board, city manager or designee may modify the required sidewalk width and the tree strip width in order to achieve the above-stated intent. In areas where a sidewalk pattern as to materials and width has been adopted, the appropriate reviewing board, city manager or designee may allow the pattern to be continued by each new development. If the sidewalks installed are less than the minimums provided above, sufficient space shall be provided in order for those minimum sidewalk widths to be added in the future.

(n) Building orientation.

(1) Intent. A successful commercial district must have vital streetfronts. Neighborhoods with lively streetfronts become the healthier for business. Streetfront en-
trances provide convenience for customers and residents by minimizing walking distances from public sidewalks and nearby buildings. Rear or side entrances, or entrances oriented toward a parking lot, when no streetfront entrance is available, make travel highly inconvenient for pedestrians and transit users, cuts the building off from street life, "turns the building's back" to the public realm, and hides architectural character from public view.

When a building is located at an intersection, the most convenient entrance is usually abutting the public sidewalks at the corner of the intersection.

(2) Standard. The main entrance of buildings or units must be located on the first floor on the more primary street, even if the more primary street is outside of the overlay affected area. The Building Orientation standard applies if a portion of the wall along the more primary street outside of the overlay affected area is within 250 feet of the overlay affected area.

(o) Building wall articulation.

(1) Intent. All buildings shall be designed to provide streetfront vitality. Long expanses of blank walls tend to be monotonous. Windows attract pedestrians, who act as a security system for the business. Buildings without such relief and interest tend to create a "massive scale," and make the public realm impersonal.

(2) Standard. Building walls facing the more primary street shall have non-reflective, transparent windows or glazed area covering at least 25 percent of their surface at pedestrian level (between 3 feet above grade and 8 feet above grade) on the first floor, even if the wall faces a street outside of the overlay affected area. Operable entrance doors shall be excluded from the calculation of total facade surface area. Building walls along a street that is not within the overlay affected area that are entirely more than 260 feet from the regulated corridor shall be exempt from the
Building Wall Articulation standard. If a portion of the wall along a street is within 250 feet, all of the wall is affected by the standard.

(p) Mechanical equipment.

(1) Intent. Mechanical equipment, when improperly located on a site or improperly screened, can contribute to noise problems and create visual blight.

(2) Standard. All mechanical equipment must be placed on the roof, in the rear, or side of the building, or otherwise visually screened from the street. In no case shall mechanical equipment be allowed along street frontage(s). Mechanical equipment on the roof shall be screened from abutting streets with parapets or other types of visual screening.

(q) Auto-oriented uses.

(1) Intent. Auto-oriented uses tend to create visual blight, and noise and light pollution that detracts from community character and nearby neighborhoods.

(2) Standard. Gas Stations, Car Washes, Auto Dealers, and Limited Automotive Services shall be designed to minimize interruption of pedestrian traffic. The number of gas pumps and service bays shall not exceed 4 fueling positions and 3 service bays. (see figures 1 and 2)