

Planning Committee Report

Orange County/City of Orlando Consolidation of Services Study Commission

Table of Contents

Members	2
Meeting Schedule	2
Side-By-Side Comparisons	2
Findings of Fact.....	2
Conclusions.....	7
Recommendations	9
Chart Depicting the Committee Schedule and Presenters	Appendix A
Planning Departments Side-By-Side Comparison.....	Appendix B
Glossary of Planning Terms Used in This Report	Appendix C
Orange County and City of Orlando Levels of Standards for Seven Service Areas.....	Appendix D
Total Planning Staff Employed in Orange County As Compared to the Totals for Hillsborough and Pinellas Counties	Appendix E
Local Government Comprehensive Certification Agreement (LGCCA)	Appendix F

Planning Committee Report

Orange County/City of Orlando Consolidation of Services Study Commission

Members

The Planning Committee consisted of the following individuals:

- Jimmy Goff, Chair
- Don Ammerman
- Scott Gabrielson
- Monty Knox
- Frances Pignone
- Kathy Putnam

Meeting Schedule and Presenters

The Planning Committee (the “Committee”) held its first meeting on December 30, 2005 and met on five separate occasions, concluding its deliberations on March 16, 2006. A chart compiling the Committee’s schedule of meetings and the presenters is attached as Appendix A.

Side-By-Side Comparisons

A detailed Side-By-Side Comparison of the data presented and considered by the Committee is attached as Appendix B. The data cited in the Side-by-Side Comparison is information provided by either Orange County or the City of Orlando and is not based on any independent calculations or studies prepared by the Committee. To help the readers better understand the terminology in this Planning Report, a glossary of planning terms used is attached as Appendix C.

Findings of Fact

The following findings of fact were determined by the Committee to be of significance and are the basis for their conclusions and recommendations:

Planning Fact #1 The Committee participated in a teleconference call with a representative from the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission (HCCCPC) at the Committee meeting held on December 30, 2005. (Source: Ray Chiaramonte, HCCCPC) The following are the significant findings from that call:

- The HCCCPC was established in 1950. Because there was no long-range planning, Sam Gibbons spearheaded an effort to remove planning one step from politics and to have a planning commission that would make recommendations to the elected representatives of Hillsborough County.

Planning Committee Report

Orange County/City of Orlando Consolidation of Services Study Commission

- The HCCCPC prepares the Comprehensive Land Use Plan for the four jurisdictions of Hillsborough County.
- The HCCCPC has a staff of 60 County civil service workers (12 of the 60 are MPO members who specialize in transportation planning).
- Their Urban Service Area, adopted in the 1990s, restricted two-thirds of Hillsborough County to the Rural Service Area. The two-thirds restriction is still in place, and the Urban Service Area is actually smaller now than it was then. The Urban Service Area helps promote redevelopment. By somewhat limiting the opportunities for development in the County, the policy promotes redevelopment in the city.
- The HCCCPC is funded by ad valorem taxes according to a formula, but it goes through the County budget process.
- The HCCCPC, in its deliberations, considers the impact of planning decisions on all jurisdictions.
- As regards to annexations, the HCCCPC only gets involved if a land use change is requested in connection with the annexation.
- The HCCCPC makes recommendations to a Board. The HCCCPC has a 90% Board agreement rate with their recommendations. Both the media and citizens are supportive of the HCCCPC. The HCCCPC has a full time media person.
- Hillsborough County and all of its cities but one, Tampa, have planning departments. Tampa has relied on the HCCCPC for planning. Now Tampa desires to have its own planning staff. The HCCCPC works at a more comprehensive, long-range, broader level than the municipal planning staffs.
- The HCCCPC prepares and recommends the comprehensive plans for all jurisdictions.
- State law governs the HCCCPC duties and responsibilities.
- The HCCCPC reviews capital improvements (Capital Improvements Programs) of each jurisdiction for consistency with the Comprehensive Plan.
- The HCCCPC has not been able to standardize land use codes for the entire county.
- The HCCCPC would like to get a dedicated funding source tied to population growth.

Planning Committee Report

Orange County/City of Orlando Consolidation of Services Study Commission

- The HCCCPC does proactive planning and when it recognizes a problem it recommends a fix. For example, the HCCCPC developed a “livable roadways” program for the County in response to the HCCCPC observation that roadways did not have an attractive appearance.
- The HCCCPC reviews every zoning action for consistency with the Comprehensive Plan.

Planning Fact #2 The Committee participated in a teleconference call with representatives from the Tallahassee and Leon County Planning Department at the Committee meeting held on January 19, 2006. *(Source, unless otherwise noted, was: Fred Goodrow, Tallahassee and Leon County Planning Department)*. The following are the significant findings from that call:

- The Tallahassee and Leon County Planning Department, established in the 1960s, is based on an agreement between Tallahassee and Leon County that is reviewed every six years, and that applies only to Comprehensive Planning and rezoning. Tallahassee (size: 102.7 sq. miles) is the only municipality in Leon County (size: 670 sq miles), although there are some “Census Designated Places” (CDP), such as Woodville. These CDPs are not municipalities. *(Source: Ed Young, Tallahassee and Leon County Planning Department)*.
- Both Tallahassee and Leon County have to agree for changes to be made to the urban district (size: 161.3 sq miles). *(Source: Ed Young, Tallahassee and Leon County Planning Department)*. It is one of the most compact developed area in the state.
- The Tallahassee and Leon County Planning Department is funded out of the general fund.
- The Tallahassee and Leon County Planning Department is looked on as a planning resource and they are involved with infrastructure planning (i.e. water, sewer, roads).
- The Tallahassee and Leon County Planning Department is preparing the Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR) for the entire Plan.

Planning Fact #3 The Committee participated in a teleconference call with representatives from the Pinellas County Planning Council at the Committee meeting held on January 19, 2006. *(Source: David Healey, Pinellas County Planning Council)*. The following are the significant findings from that call:

- The Pinellas County Planning Council was created by a special act of the State Legislature in 1973 and a Charter Amendment in 1988.

Planning Committee Report

Orange County/City of Orlando Consolidation of Services Study Commission

- The Pinellas County Planning Council has 13 members representing 25 entities (1 county, 24 cities).
- The Pinellas County Planning Council prepares and administers the countywide Comprehensive Land Use Plan.
- Local plans can be more restrictive than a county plan, but cannot exceed the parameters of the countywide plan. There is consistency in density, definitions, etc.
- The Pinellas County Planning Council is holding workshops to educate communities on the EAR so that each community can prepare its EAR.
- Ten (10) of the 24 cities have their own planning departments. The other cities depend on the Pinellas County Planning Council. Small cities are served by other utilities that provide utility planning by contract. Many of the small cities only have one main street.
- The Pinellas County Planning Council is funded by a separate ad valorem millage rate (0.020) under their charter.
- The Pinellas County Planning Council doesn't reach far beyond comprehensive planning. For example, the Council does not plan down to the utility level. Redevelopment is now a major concern. The Pinellas County Planning Council has a countywide Redevelopment Plan.

Planning Fact #4 Both Orange County and the City of Orlando are currently meeting State concurrency requirements. Both governments have adopted Comprehensive Land Use Plans that have been approved by the State of Florida Department of Community Affairs. Any amendments to those Plans have been approved through a similar process that requires comment from the Regional Planning Council, from the public and from adjoining governments.

Planning Fact #5 The County and City meet quarterly with each other. The meetings could be formalized. Planning for certain infrastructure needs (e.g. fire stations, roads, police stations, parks) could be better coordinated.

Planning Fact #6 The State of Florida requires that all cities and counties establish level of service standards for purposes of concurrency. Concurrency requires that adequate facilities be in place at time of development. Levels of service standards are required for parks, roads, water, sewer, solid waste, stormwater and transit. The City of Orlando and Orange County's adopted level of service standards are different in each area. See Appendix D for the Orange County and City of Orlando levels of standards for the seven service areas.

Planning Committee Report

Orange County/City of Orlando Consolidation of Services Study Commission

Planning Fact #7 Appendix E compares the planning staff totals for Orange County and Orange County municipalities with the staff totals for Pinellas County.

Planning Fact #8 The City of Orlando is one of two municipalities statewide, with Lakeland being the other, to enter into a Local Comprehensive Planning Agreement (LGCPA) with the Florida Department of Community Affairs. Under the LGCPA, most of the City's Growth Management Plan (GMP) amendments are exempt from state and regional review. However, the City is still subject to a maximum of two amendments to the Regular GMP per year. In exchange for this benefit, the City is required to monitor a series of baseline conditions, pursue several community development goals and submit an annual report indicating changes to the baseline conditions and progress in achieving the stated community development goals. (*Source: Dean Grandin, City of Orlando City Planner*). Note: More information is available in Appendix F - Local Government Comprehensive Certification Agreement (LGCPA).

Planning Fact #9 Since 1980, Orange County has used an Urban Service Area (USA) concept in its Comprehensive Policy Plan (CPP) to indicate areas of the County appropriate for urban and suburban growth and the provision of urban services, such as central water and wastewater service that make such growth possible.

- In 1991, in response to changes in Florida's growth management legislation, Orange County adopted a new USA boundary at the parcel level. This new USA boundary was less conceptual and more regulatory in nature, with a defined threshold of 14,801 acres available for USA boundary expansion to accommodate projected growth over the planning period.
- In response to unanticipated population and economic growth, which has added an estimated 127,000 new residents to Orange County since 2000 (U.S. Census), the 14,801 acre allocation already has been added to the USA, and additional expansions are considered on a case-by-case basis through amendments to Orange County's CPP. This approach has led to challenges, in that cities' lack of coordination with the USA in their annexations and growth and the County's incremental USA expansions make public service planning more fragmented. To address some of these challenges and to meet the needs of growth in a sustainable fashion, Orange County conducted the Horizon West planning process with landowners and citizens in southwest Orange County to address the future uses of former citrus groves no longer suitable for agriculture use and located near the County's internationally-renowned International Drive theme parks and tourist areas. The Horizon West sector planning process included a series of community meetings and design workshops for the overall planning area and its individual Villages. The workshops helped create detailed specific area plans for the area's land uses, environmental protection and provision of adequate infrastructure to meet the needs of new development.

Planning Committee Report

Orange County/City of Orlando Consolidation of Services Study Commission

- This sector planning process became a model for revisions to Florida's growth management laws in 1998 to offer an incentive-based alternative to the Development of Regional Impact (DRI) process. Recognizing the considerable time and resources needed for the DRI process, an optional area-wide master planning process, pursuant to Section 163.3245, Florida Statutes, was enabled for the sector planning of large-scale developments planned in a comprehensive and detailed manner with extensive public participation. Horizon West is a sector plan under this statutory criteria, which helps to ensure that Horizon West's development is compatible, sustainable, and has public facilities and services that add to the community's quality of life.

Planning Fact #10 The Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission, the Tallahassee and Leon County Planning Department, and the Pinellas County Planning Council each prepare a countywide comprehensive land use plan. Other jurisdictions within the county may or may not have their own planning department. There are differences in how the three consolidated planning departments are funded. Two are funded by ad valorem taxes, with one according to a formula and the funding going through the county budget process and one by a set millage rate. The other is funded by the general fund.

Planning Fact #11 Florida law requires the coordination of planning between the School Board and the respective local governing bodies to ensure that plans for construction and opening of public educational facilities are facilitated and coordinated in time and place with plans for residential development, concurrently with other necessary services. Such planning requires, in part and without limitation, that the location of public educational facilities must be consistent with the comprehensive plan and implementing land development regulations of appropriate local governing bodies. To fulfill this statutory requirement, and in recognition of the benefits to their citizens and students, the Orange County Public Schools, Orange County and the City of Orlando have entered into an interlocal agreement regarding school capacity. The agreement establishes the process for determining the availability of school capacity and the roles and responsibilities of the respective parties in determining and resolving school capacity issues. (Source: Linda Rhinesmith, Economic Development Manager, City of Orlando).

Planning Fact #12 Both the Orange County and the City of Orlando have professional planning staffs that are effectively dealing with this area's substantial growth. The Committee saw plenty of evidence of cooperation and communication between the two staffs.

Planning Committee Report

Orange County/City of Orlando Consolidation of Services Study Commission

Conclusions

Based upon testimony received by the Committee members during its various meetings, the Committee unanimously adopted the five conclusions that follow at their meeting held on March 16, 2006:

Planning Conclusion #1 Planning done in a comprehensive way would result in better intergovernmental cooperation, would probably save money through avoidance of duplication of service provision and could better serve citizens.

Planning Conclusion #2 Both Orange County and the City of Orlando have good Comprehensive Plans.

Planning Conclusion #3 Orange County and the City of Orlando Planning Divisions have agreed informally to meet on a quarterly basis to discuss plans for new development and ongoing projects.

Planning Conclusion #4 Concurrency is a complex issue that needs further refinement throughout the state and cannot simply be resolved through the efforts of Orange County and the City of Orlando. It is anticipated that the new 2005 Growth Management Act will result in refinements and rules necessary to help further manage growth and its impact on service delivery and facilities.

Planning Conclusion #5 The efforts of the planning staffs of Orange County and the City of Orlando are very professional and commendable.

Planning Committee Report

Orange County/City of Orlando Consolidation of Services Study Commission

Recommendations

Consolidation of the Orange County City of Orlando planning departments was studied for efficiencies in service delivery, economies of scale, opportunities for enhanced intergovernmental cooperation and other related issues. The Committee recommends that the Study Commission adopt the following recommendations for further consideration by both the County and the City:

Planning Recommendation # 1

That because the Committee found that neither efficiencies in service delivery nor economies of scale would result from consolidation of services, and because bigger is not necessarily better, neither the Orange County and City of Orlando Planning Departments nor their services be consolidated.

Planning Recommendation # 2

That Orange County and the City of Orlando explore creating common elements and terminology in respect to the Land Development Codes, including such areas as landscape standards, sign regulations, etc.

Planning Recommendation # 3

That Orange County and the City of Orlando should jointly plan for parks, fire, schools, roads and other critical infrastructure needs, such as was demonstrated by the Southeast Sector plan between the City and the County.

Planning Recommendation # 4

That Orange County and the City of Orlando formalize their quarterly meetings between planning staff to evaluate common issues and opportunities and jointly study areas with shared boundaries (e.g. International Drive corridor).

Planning Recommendation # 5

That Orange County and the City of Orlando should coordinate the development and methodology for impact fees.

Planning Committee Report

Orange County/City of Orlando Consolidation of Services Study Commission

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A, MEETING SCHEDULE AND PRESENTERS to the Planning Committee Report

APPENDIX B, PLANNING DEPARTMENTS SIDE-BY-SIDE COMPARISON, to the Planning Committee Report

APPENDIX C, GLOSSARY OF PLANNING TERMS USED IN THIS REPORT, to the Planning Committee Report

APPENDIX D, ORANGE COUNTY AND CITY OF ORLANDO STANDARDS FOR SEVEN SERVICE AREAS, to the Planning Committee

APPENDIX E, TOTAL PLANNING STAFF EMPLOYED IN ORANGE COUNTY AS COMPARED TO THE TOTALS FOR HILLSBOROUGH AND PINELLAS COUNTIES, to the Planning Committee Report

APPENDIX F LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMPREHENSIVE CERTIFICATION AGREEMENT (LGCPA), to the Planning Committee Report

APPENDIX B, PLANNING DIVISION SIDE-BY-SIDE COMPARISON, to the Planning Committee Report

ORANGE COUNTY	CITY OF ORLANDO
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>ORGANIZATION</u></p> <p>DEPARTMENT: Growth Management</p> <p>DIVISION: Planning</p> <p>MANAGER: Chris Testerman</p> <p>SERVICES PROVIDED:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intergovernmental Coordination/Annexations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Annexation Review Group ○ CST/PST review ○ Fiscal analysis ○ Joint planning agreements ○ Interlocal service agreements ○ School planning ○ Enclave/Periphery Study • Development review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Project review ○ Subdivision plans ○ Development plans ○ Development Review Committee • Planning and Zoning Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Rezoning requests ○ Community meetings ○ Parking standards ○ Special exceptions ○ Development Advisory Board ○ Impact Fees • Comprehensive Planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CRP amendment ○ DRI project review ○ Special Overlay Districts ○ Visioning/Public participation ○ Evaluation and Appraisal Report • Research and Strategic Planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Demographic and population studies ○ Enterprise Zone ○ Economic development ○ Land Market monitoring ○ Fiscal impact analysis ○ Website Maintenance • Urban design <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Site plan review ○ Architectural and Lighting Ordinance ○ Urban Design Commission 	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>ORGANIZATION</u></p> <p>DEPARTMENT: Economic Development</p> <p>DIVISION: City Planning</p> <p>MANAGER: Dean Grandin</p> <p>SERVICES PROVIDED:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current Planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Project review ○ Municipal Planning Board/ Board of Zoning Adjustment ○ Land Development Code and map amendments ○ Subdivisions ○ Planning/Zoning official determinations ○ Southeast Town Design Review Committee • Long Range Planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Growth Management Plan Amendments ○ Evaluation and appraisal reports ○ Neighborhood Plans/Special Area Studies ○ Municipal Planning Board ○ Developments of Regional Impact ○ Demographic analysis and projections ○ DCA Certified Community oversight • Strategic Planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Annexations ○ Fiscal impact analyses ○ Special studies ○ Research ○ Website maintenance ○ Active Living by Design • Design and Historic Preservation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Project appearance review ○ Historic Preservation Board/DDB DRC ○ Historic District/Landmark Nominations ○ Baldwin Park Town Design Review Committee ○ Small Project Design ○ Virtual Orlando (3D Model of Clay)

Note: These data are not exactly comparable because of variability of accounting, organizational structure, and services provided.

APPENDIX B, PLANNING DIVISION SIDE-BY-SIDE COMPARISON, to the Planning Committee Report

ORANGE COUNTY	CITY OF ORLANDO																																																																																										
<p>DIVISION: Zoning MANAGER: Mitch Gordon</p> <p>SERVICES PROVIDED:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arbor review • Commercial plans review • Permitting • Project review and research • Street addressing <p style="text-align: center;"><u>2005 STAFF</u></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">PROFESSIONALS</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">DIVISION</th> <th style="text-align: center;">NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Planning</td> <td style="text-align: right;">25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zoning</td> <td style="text-align: right;">13</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL Professionals</td> <td style="text-align: right;">38</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">SUPPORT STAFF</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">DIVISION</th> <th style="text-align: center;">NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Planning</td> <td style="text-align: right;">4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zoning</td> <td style="text-align: right;">20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL Support Employees</td> <td style="text-align: right;">24</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">COVERED BY COLLECTIVE BARGAINING</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">DIVISION</th> <th style="text-align: center;">NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Planning</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zoning</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL Employees covered</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">TOTAL</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">DIVISION</th> <th style="text-align: center;">NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Planning</td> <td style="text-align: right;">29</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zoning</td> <td style="text-align: right;">33</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL Planning Employees</td> <td style="text-align: right;">62</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>FINANCIAL INFORMATION</u></p> <p>PAY PLAN: Orange County Pay Plan</p> <p>BENEFITS PLAN: Orange County Benefits Plan</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">FY 2003-2004 BUDGET</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">DIVISION</th> <th style="text-align: center;">BUDGET</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Planning</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$2,167,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zoning</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$2,080,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$4,247,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	PROFESSIONALS		DIVISION	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES	Planning	25	Zoning	13	TOTAL Professionals	38	SUPPORT STAFF		DIVISION	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES	Planning	4	Zoning	20	TOTAL Support Employees	24	COVERED BY COLLECTIVE BARGAINING		DIVISION	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES	Planning	0	Zoning	0	TOTAL Employees covered	0	TOTAL		DIVISION	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES	Planning	29	Zoning	33	TOTAL Planning Employees	62	FY 2003-2004 BUDGET		DIVISION	BUDGET	Planning	\$2,167,000	Zoning	\$2,080,000	TOTAL	\$4,247,000	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>2005 STAFF</u></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">PROFESSIONALS</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">SECTION/ DIVISION</th> <th style="text-align: center;">NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>City Planning</td> <td style="text-align: right;">18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL Professionals</td> <td style="text-align: right;">18</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">SUPPORT STAFF</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">DIVISION</th> <th style="text-align: center;">NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>City Planning</td> <td style="text-align: right;">6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL Support Employees</td> <td style="text-align: right;">6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">COVERED BY COLLECTIVE BARGAINING</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">DIVISION</th> <th style="text-align: center;">NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>City Planning</td> <td style="text-align: right;">17</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL Employees covered</td> <td style="text-align: right;">17</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">TOTAL</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">DIVISION</th> <th style="text-align: center;">NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>City Planning</td> <td style="text-align: right;">24</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL Planning Employees</td> <td style="text-align: right;">24</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>FINANCIAL INFORMATION</u></p> <p>PAY PLAN: City of Orlando Pay Plan</p> <p>BENEFITS PLAN: City of Orlando Benefits Plan</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">FY 2003-2004 BUDGET</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">DIVISION</th> <th style="text-align: center;">BUDGET</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>City Planning</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$2,111,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$2,111,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	PROFESSIONALS		SECTION/ DIVISION	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES	City Planning	18	TOTAL Professionals	18	SUPPORT STAFF		DIVISION	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES	City Planning	6	TOTAL Support Employees	6	COVERED BY COLLECTIVE BARGAINING		DIVISION	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES	City Planning	17	TOTAL Employees covered	17	TOTAL		DIVISION	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES	City Planning	24	TOTAL Planning Employees	24	FY 2003-2004 BUDGET		DIVISION	BUDGET	City Planning	\$2,111,000	TOTAL	\$2,111,000
PROFESSIONALS																																																																																											
DIVISION	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES																																																																																										
Planning	25																																																																																										
Zoning	13																																																																																										
TOTAL Professionals	38																																																																																										
SUPPORT STAFF																																																																																											
DIVISION	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES																																																																																										
Planning	4																																																																																										
Zoning	20																																																																																										
TOTAL Support Employees	24																																																																																										
COVERED BY COLLECTIVE BARGAINING																																																																																											
DIVISION	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES																																																																																										
Planning	0																																																																																										
Zoning	0																																																																																										
TOTAL Employees covered	0																																																																																										
TOTAL																																																																																											
DIVISION	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES																																																																																										
Planning	29																																																																																										
Zoning	33																																																																																										
TOTAL Planning Employees	62																																																																																										
FY 2003-2004 BUDGET																																																																																											
DIVISION	BUDGET																																																																																										
Planning	\$2,167,000																																																																																										
Zoning	\$2,080,000																																																																																										
TOTAL	\$4,247,000																																																																																										
PROFESSIONALS																																																																																											
SECTION/ DIVISION	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES																																																																																										
City Planning	18																																																																																										
TOTAL Professionals	18																																																																																										
SUPPORT STAFF																																																																																											
DIVISION	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES																																																																																										
City Planning	6																																																																																										
TOTAL Support Employees	6																																																																																										
COVERED BY COLLECTIVE BARGAINING																																																																																											
DIVISION	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES																																																																																										
City Planning	17																																																																																										
TOTAL Employees covered	17																																																																																										
TOTAL																																																																																											
DIVISION	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES																																																																																										
City Planning	24																																																																																										
TOTAL Planning Employees	24																																																																																										
FY 2003-2004 BUDGET																																																																																											
DIVISION	BUDGET																																																																																										
City Planning	\$2,111,000																																																																																										
TOTAL	\$2,111,000																																																																																										

Note: These data are not exactly comparable because of variability of accounting, organizational structure, and services provided.

APPENDIX B, PLANNING DIVISION SIDE-BY-SIDE COMPARISON, to the Planning Committee Report

ORANGE COUNTY		CITY OF ORLANDO																			
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">FY 2004-2005 BUDGET</th> </tr> <tr> <th>DIVISION</th> <th>BUDGET</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Planning</td> <td>\$3,743,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zoning</td> <td>\$2,700,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>\$6,243,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		FY 2004-2005 BUDGET		DIVISION	BUDGET	Planning	\$3,743,000	Zoning	\$2,700,000	TOTAL	\$6,243,000	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">FY 2004-2005 BUDGET</th> </tr> <tr> <th>DIVISION</th> <th>BUDGET</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>City Planning</td> <td>\$2,136,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>\$2,136,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		FY 2004-2005 BUDGET		DIVISION	BUDGET	City Planning	\$2,136,000	TOTAL	\$2,136,000
FY 2004-2005 BUDGET																					
DIVISION	BUDGET																				
Planning	\$3,743,000																				
Zoning	\$2,700,000																				
TOTAL	\$6,243,000																				
FY 2004-2005 BUDGET																					
DIVISION	BUDGET																				
City Planning	\$2,136,000																				
TOTAL	\$2,136,000																				
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">FY 2005-2006 BUDGET</th> </tr> <tr> <th>DIVISION</th> <th>BUDGET</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Planning</td> <td>\$3,800,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zoning</td> <td>\$2,700,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>\$6,508,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		FY 2005-2006 BUDGET		DIVISION	BUDGET	Planning	\$3,800,000	Zoning	\$2,700,000	TOTAL	\$6,508,000										
FY 2005-2006 BUDGET																					
DIVISION	BUDGET																				
Planning	\$3,800,000																				
Zoning	\$2,700,000																				
TOTAL	\$6,508,000																				
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">FY 2006-2007 BUDGET (PROPOSED)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>DIVISION</th> <th>BUDGET</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Planning</td> <td>\$3,990,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zoning</td> <td>\$2,979,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>\$6,969,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		FY 2006-2007 BUDGET (PROPOSED)		DIVISION	BUDGET	Planning	\$3,990,000	Zoning	\$2,979,000	TOTAL	\$6,969,000										
FY 2006-2007 BUDGET (PROPOSED)																					
DIVISION	BUDGET																				
Planning	\$3,990,000																				
Zoning	\$2,979,000																				
TOTAL	\$6,969,000																				
<p>TOTAL OPERATING EXPENDITURES FOR ALL OF THE ABOVE (FY 2004-2005)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employee salary: \$3,600,000 Overtime: \$6,000 Training: \$7,500 Equipment and maintenance (including systems and software support): \$40,000 Other: \$0 TOTAL: \$3,654,000 		<p>TOTAL OPERATING EXPENDITURES FOR ALL OF THE ABOVE (FY 2004-2005)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employee salary: \$1,533,000 Overtime: \$1,000 Training: \$14,000 Equipment and maintenance (including systems and software support): n/a Other: \$112,000 TOTAL: \$2,136,000 																			
<p>FUNDING SOURCE:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">FUNDING OBTAINED FROM</th> </tr> <tr> <th>DIVISION</th> <th>SOURCE</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Planning</td> <td rowspan="2">General Fund; Building/planning/zoning Fund</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zoning</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		FUNDING OBTAINED FROM		DIVISION	SOURCE	Planning	General Fund; Building/planning/zoning Fund	Zoning	<p>FUNDING SOURCE:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">FUNDING OBTAINED FROM</th> </tr> <tr> <th>DIVISION</th> <th>SOURCE</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>City Planning</td> <td>General Fund</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		FUNDING OBTAINED FROM		DIVISION	SOURCE	City Planning	General Fund					
FUNDING OBTAINED FROM																					
DIVISION	SOURCE																				
Planning	General Fund; Building/planning/zoning Fund																				
Zoning																					
FUNDING OBTAINED FROM																					
DIVISION	SOURCE																				
City Planning	General Fund																				
<p align="center"><u>OPERATIONAL DATA</u></p> <p>NUMBER OF SQUARE MILES COVERED: 800</p> <p>PAID PLANNING SERVICES STAFFING PER 1,000 RESIDENTIAL POPULATION: 0.09 (planning staff [62] divided by 2005 estimated unincorporated Orange County population [677,185] multiplied by 1,000)</p> <p>PAID PLANNING SERVICES STAFF COST PER CAPITA FOR RESIDENTIAL POPULATION: \$5.40 (2004-2005 expenditures [\$3,654,000] divided by estimated 2005 population [677,185] within unincorporated Orange County)</p>		<p align="center"><u>OPERATIONAL DATA</u></p> <p>NUMBER OF SQUARE MILES COVERED: 109.6</p> <p>PAID PLANNING SERVICES STAFFING PER 1,000 RESIDENTIAL POPULATION: 0.11 (planning staff [24] divided by 2005 estimated city resident population [217,327] multiplied by 1,000)</p> <p>PAID PLANNING SERVICES STAFF COST PER CAPITA FOR RESIDENTIAL POPULATION: \$9.80 (2004-2005 expenditures [\$2,136,000] divided by estimated city resident population [217,327])</p>																			

Note: These data are not exactly comparable because of variability of accounting, organizational structure, and services provided.

**APPENDIX B, PLANNING DIVISION SIDE-BY-SIDE COMPARISON, to the
Planning Committee Report**

ORANGE COUNTY	CITY OF ORLANDO
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>PARTNERSHIPS/AGREEMENTS</u></p> <p>PARTNERSHIPS:</p> <p>AGREEMENTS/SUPPORT AGREEMENTS: Interlocal agreement for Public School Facility Planning</p> <p>COOPERATIVE EFFORTS WITH CITY OF ORLANDO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly meetings to provide updates on plans and ongoing developments 	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>PARTNERSHIPS/AGREEMENTS</u></p> <p>PARTNERSHIPS:</p> <p>AGREEMENTS/SUPPORT AGREEMENTS: Interlocal agreement for Public School Facility Planning</p> <p>COOPERATIVE EFFORTS WITH ORANGE COUNTY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly meetings to provide updates on plans and ongoing developments

Note: These data are not exactly comparable because of variability of accounting, organizational structure, and services provided.

APPENDIX B, PLANNING DIVISION SIDE-BY-SIDE COMPARISON, to the Planning Committee Report

ORANGE COUNTY				CITY OF ORLANDO			
ORANGE COUNTY IMPACT FEES				CITY OF ORLANDO IMPACT FEES			
Road Impact Fee				TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE			
Land Use Type	Unit	Fee (\$) 7/1/06	Fee (\$) 7/1/06	Impact Fee Use	Fee Basis	**	Fee range (\$)
Single-Family Detached	Dwelling	3,500	3,605	Amusement (Theme) Park	Acre	.9	6,513-9,694
Multi-Family	Dwelling	2,453	2,527	Auto Service and Gas Station	Pump	1	2,493-2,597
Mobile Home Park	Site	1,826	1,881	Bank	1,000 sf	1	7,208-10,792
Retirement Housing	Dwelling	788	812	Bus Terminal	1,000 sf	.9	2,149-3,199
Hotel/Motel	Room	2,596	2,674	Church	1,000 sf	.9	801-1,193
Tourist Hotel	Room	1,015	1,045	Day Care	1,000 sf	.9	2,332-3,651
Time Share	Dwelling	1,240	1,277	Eating and Drinking Establishments	1,000 sf	.9	3,573-11,259
Retail, 50,000 sf or less*	1,000sq.ft.	12,649	13,028	Funeral Home	1,000 sf	.9	801-1,193
Retail, 50,001-100,000 sf*	1,000sq.ft.	12,916	13,303	General Office <100,000 gsf	1,000 sf	.9	1,540-2,126
Retail, 100,001-200,000 sf*	1,000sq.ft.	11,617	11,966	General Office >200,000 gsf	1,000 sf	.9	846-1,378
Retail, 200,001-300,000 sf*	1,000sq.ft.	10,597	10,915	General Office 100,000-199,999 gsf	1,000 sf	.9	998-1,626
Retail, 300,001-400,000 sf*	1,000sq.ft.	9,888	10,185	Hospital	1,000 sf	.9	1,443-2,147
Retail, 400,001-500,000 sf*	1,000sq.ft.	9,344	9,624	Hotel/Motel	Room	1	605-1,243
Retail, 500,001-1,000,000 sq. ft.*	1,000sq.ft.	8,178	8,423	Industrial	1,000 sf	.9	599-892
Retail, 1,000,001-1,200,000 sq. ft.*	1,000sq.ft.	7,465	7,689	Manufacturing	1,000 sf	.9	331-493
Retail, more than 1,200,000 sq. ft.*	1,000sq.ft.	7,142	7,356	Mini Storage	1,000 sf	.9	224-334
Retail, Tourist	1,000sq.ft.	4,439	4,572	Movie Theater	1,000 sf	.9	5,354-8,806
Auto, New Car Sales	1,000sq.ft.	5,855	6,031	Residential – Group Housing (2.5 beds = 1 MFE)	Unit	1	541-807
Auto Service	1,000sq.ft.	4,627	4,766	Residential – Mobile Home	Unit	1	402-600
Bank	1,000sq.ft.	23,848	24,563	Residential – Multi-Family	Unit	1	541-807
Day Care Center	1,000sq.ft.	6,763	6,966	Residential - Nursing Home (2 beds = 1 MFE)	Unit	1	541-807
Drug Store	1,000sq.ft.	7,616	7,844	Residential – RSSF	Unit	1	541-807
Racquet Club	1,000sq.ft.	3,003	3,093	Residential – Single Family	Unit	1	799-1,192
Restaurant, Quality	1,000sq.ft.	12,223	12,590	Residential Tandem	Unit	1	541-807
Restaurant, high-Turnover	1,000sq.ft.	16,820	17,325	Retail >1,250,000 gsf	1,000 sf	.9	1,091-2,773
Restaurant, Fast Food	1,000sq.ft.	25,907	26,684	Retail 0 – 24,999 gsf	1,000 sf	.9	4,771-7,144
Supermarket	1,000sq.ft.	12,455	12,829	Retail 1,000,000 – 1,249,999 gsf	1,000 sf	.9	1,091-2,925
Office, 100,000 sq. ft. or less	1,000sq.ft.	6,396	6,588	Retail 100,000-199,999 gsf	1,000 sf	.9	1,091-4,414
Office, 100,001-200,000 sq. ft.	1,000sq.ft.	4,967	5,116	Retail 200,000-299,999 gsf	1,000 sf	.9	1,091-3,353
Office, more than 200,000 sq. ft.	1,000sq.ft.	4,420	4,553	Retail 25,000-49,999 gsf	1,000 sf	.9	1,091-7,144
Office, Medical/Dental	1,000sq.ft.	14,762	15,205	Retail 300,000-399,999 gsf	1,000 sf	.9	1,091-3,818
Light Industrial	1,000sq.ft.	3,130	3,224	Retail 400,000-499,999	1,000 sf	.9	1,091-3,475
Manufacturing	1,000sq.ft.	1,712	1,763	Retail 50,000-99,999 gsf	1,000 sf	.9	1,091-4,647
Warehousing	1,000sq.ft.	2,223	2,290	Retail 500,000-999,999 gsf	1,000 sf	.9	1,091-3,231
Mini-Warehouse	1,000sq.ft.	895	922	School – elementary school (grades k-8)	1,000 sf	.9	652-1,029
Hospital	1,000sq.ft.	6,249	6,436	School – high School	1,000 sf	.9	703-1,046
Nursing Home	1,000sq.ft.	2,169	2,234	School – Junior community College	1,000 sf	.9	830-1,235
Library	1,000sq.ft.	9,001	9,271	School – University	1,000 sf	.9	2,589-3,853
Post Office	1,000sq.ft.	18,998	19,568	Warehousing	1,000 sf	.9	420-624
Public Assembly	1,000sq.ft.	3,101	3,194				
School	1,000sq.ft.	4,687	4,828				

Note: all residential, hotel, and time share fees are per unit. All non-residential fees are per 1,000 square feet
 * Gross leasable area is total square footage under roof less than ten (10) percent; all others are gross floor area

MFE – Multi-Family Equivalent

** .9 = Formula ((Gross Square Footage X 90%)/1,000) X appropriate fee rate.

1= For these categories, the fee used directly corresponds to the quantity developed.

Note: These data are not exactly comparable because of variability of accounting, organizational structure, and services provided.

APPENDIX B, PLANNING DIVISION SIDE-BY-SIDE COMPARISON, to the Planning Committee Report

ORANGE COUNTY				CITY OF ORLANDO			
WASTEWATER IMPACT FEE				WASTEWATER IMPACT FEE			
Land Use Type/Establishment	Fee Based On Unit (Equivalent Residential Unit (ERU) 300 gallons per day (GPD))		Fee (\$)	Land Use Type	Fee Based On	Fee (\$)	
	Unit	Factor		Single Family	Equivalent Residential Unit (ERU) 250 gallons per day (GPD)	2,537.50	
RESIDENTIAL				Multi-Family	Equivalent Residential Unit (ERU) 190 gallons per day (GPD)	1,928.50	
*Single-family home	Per unit	1.000	3,668	Tandem/Garage apartment/duplex	Equivalent Residential Unit (ERU) 190 gallons per day (GPD)	1,928.50	
*Duplex (1 or 2 bedrooms)	Per unit	0.833	3,055	Commercial	\$10.15 * 15.0 gallons per day per fixture unit Restaurants: Indoors, per seat	243.60	
*Duplex (3 or more bedrooms)	Per unit	1.000	3,668				Outdoor Covered, per seat
*Multi-family (2 bedrooms)	Per unit	0.833	3,055			Outdoor Uncovered per seat	91.35
*Multi-family (1 bedroom)	Per unit	0.583	2,138				
*Multi-family (efficiency <500 sq ft)	Per unit	0.500	1,834				
*Multi-family (3 or more bedrooms)	Per unit	1.000	3,668				
*Mobile home (1or 2 bedrooms)	Per unit	0.667	2,447				
*Mobile home (3 or more bedrooms)	Per unit	0.833	3,055				
COMMERCIAL							
*Auditorium	Seat	0.017	62				
*Barber/beauty shop	Operator Station	0.300	1,100				
*Bowling alley	Lane	0.333	1,221				
*Convenience store (no gas pumps)	Use fixture units	N/A					
FOOD SERVICE							
*Restaurant/cafeteria	Seat	0.100	367				
*Restaurant (twenty-four hour)	Seat	0.167	613				
*Restaurant (fast food)	Seat	0.050	183				
*Bar/cocktail lounge	Seat	0.067	246				
HOTEL/MOTEL (not including food service, banquet and meeting rooms, and laundries)	Room	0.500	1,834				
INDUSTRIAL BUILDING (not including food service or industrial wastewater flows; industrial wastewater flows to be determined on fixture basis unless director or his designee agrees to alternative flow calculation)							
*Without showers	Employee	0.050	183				
*With showers (emergency showers not included)	Employee	0.177	429				
LAUNDRY	Per machine	1.333	4,889				
OFFICE BUILDING (add food service and retail space)	1,000 sq ft gross	0.334	1,225				
SERVICE STATION	Per bay	1.000	3,668				
*Add:	Per wash bay	3.200	11,738				
*Add:	Per toilet room	1,000	3,668				

Note: These data are not exactly comparable because of variability of accounting, organizational structure, and services provided.

APPENDIX B, PLANNING DIVISION SIDE-BY-SIDE COMPARISON, to the Planning Committee Report

ORANGE COUNTY		CITY OF ORLANDO	
WASTEWATER IMPACT FEE (continued)			
Land Use Type/Establishment	Fee Based On Unit (Equivalent Residential Unit (ERU) 300 gallons per day [GPD])		Fee (\$)
	Unit	Factor	
THEATER	Per seat	0.010	37
*Theater (Dinner)	Per seat	0.067	246
TRAILER PARK (overnight)	Space	0.333	1,221
DENTIST OFFICE	Per dentist	0.833	3,055
MEDICAL OFFICE	Per doctor	0.833	3,055
CHURCH	Per seat	0.017	62
HOSPITAL	Per bed	0.833	3,055
NURSING HOME	Per bed	0.417	1,530
WAREHOUSE OFFICE			
*Use fixture units for warehouse area an see "Office" category for calculating ERUs in that area. (Add for food service and add for retail space if applicable)			
WAREHOUSE SPACE	Use fixture units	N/A	
MEETING AND/OR BANQUET ROOMS	Per seat	0.017	62
*(Total sq ft/15 sq ft/person X 0.017 X number of seats)			
AUTOMOTIVE REPAIR AND MAINTENANCE STORE	Per bay	0.250	917
RETAIL SPACE	Use fixture units	N/A	
RETAIL STORE/SELF-SERVICE GAS PUMPS	Per restroom	1.000	3,668
*(Add remaining fixture units)			
EXTENDED CARE FACILITIES	Per efficiency	0.500	1,834
CONVENIENCE STORE WITHOUT GAS PUMP	Use fixture units		
SCHOOLS, MIDDLE AND HIGH	Per student	0.067	246
SCHOOLS, ELEMENTARY AND NURSERY	Per student	0.025	92
Footnote (c) For all establishments not listed above, the total equivalent residential unit (ERU) value shall be determined by multiplying the number of fixture units, as published in the Standard Plumbing Code, by twenty-five (25), and then dividing that numerator by three hundred (300) GPD.			

Note: These data are not exactly comparable because of variability of accounting, organizational structure, and services provided.

APPENDIX B, PLANNING DIVISION SIDE-BY-SIDE COMPARISON, to the Planning Committee Report

ORANGE COUNTY				CITY OF ORLANDO		
				ORLANDO UTILITES COMMISSION (OUC)		
WATER IMPACT FEE				WATER IMPACT FEE		
Land Use Type/Establishment	Fee Based On Unit (Equivalent Residential Unit (ERU) 350 gallons per day [GPD])		Fee (\$)	Land Use Type	Fee Based On Percentage or Multiple of Equivalent Residential Connection [ERC] (325 gallons per day [GPD])*	Fee (\$) (System Development Charge [SDC])
	Unit	Factor				
RESIDENTIAL				Residential- Single Family – ¾ inch meter	1.000	1,920
*Single-family home	per unit	1.000	1,950	Residential- Single Family – 1 inch and above meter	3.310	6,355
*Duplex (1 or 2 bedrooms)	per unit	0.833	1,624	Duplex, 1-2 bedrooms	0.833	1,599
*Duplex (3 or more bedrooms)	per unit	1.000	1,950	Duplex, 3 or more bedrooms	1.000	1,920
*Multi-family (2 bedrooms)	per unit	0.833	1,624	Multifamily, efficiency (<500 sq. ft.)	0.500	960
*Multi-family (1 bedroom)	per unit	0.583	1,137	Multifamily, 1 bedroom	0.583	1,119
*Multi-family (efficiency <500 sq ft)	Per unit	0.500	975	Multifamily, 2 bedroom	0.833	1,599
*Multi-family (3 or more bedrooms)	Per unit	1.000	1,950	Multifamily, 3 or more bedrooms	1.000	1,920
*Mobile home (1 or 2 bedrooms)	Per unit	0.667	1,301	Hotel (per room)	0.500	960
*Mobile home (3 or more bedrooms)	Per unit	0.833	1,624	Commercial ¾ inch meter	1.310	2,515
COMMERCIAL				Commercial 1 inch meter	3.680	7,066
*Auditorium	Seat	0.017	33	Commercial 1 ½ inch meter	7.450	14,304
*Barber/beauty shop	Operator Station	0.300	585	Commercial 2 inch meter	11.580	22,234
*Bowling alley	Lane	0.333	649	Commercial 3 inch meter or greater	Determined by a site-specific fixture analysis.	
Convenience store (no gas pumps)	Use fixture units	N/A		<p> The system development charge is designed to recover a portion of the amount of investment required for water system facilities caused by growth. This charge is assessed on all new metered connections that create additional demands on the system and existing meter connections that have a significant increase in flow as determined by OUC. This charge is applied based on the associated customer capacity requirements that are measured in Equivalent Residential Connections (ERC). The ERC concept defines all other uses as either a percentage or multiple of the estimated single-family water use. The system development charge does not apply to special irrigation meters.</p>		
FOOD SERVICE						
*Restaurant/cafe/teria	Seat	0.100	195			
*Restaurant (twenty-four hour)	Seat	0.167	326			
*Restaurant (fast food)	Seat	0.050	98			
*Bar/cocktail lounge	Seat	0.067	131			
HOTEL/MOTEL (not including food service, banquet and meeting rooms, and laundries)	Room	0.500	975			
INDUSTRIAL BUILDING (not including food service or industrial wastewater flows; industrial wastewater flows to be determined on fixture basis unless director or his designee agrees to alternative flow calculation)						
*Without showers	Employee	0.050	98			
*With showers (emergency showers not included)	Employee	0.177	228			
LAUNDRY						
OFFICE BUILDING (add food service and retail space)	1,000 sq ft gross	0.334	651			
Service station	Per bay	1.000	1,950			
*Add:	Per wash bay	3.200	6,240			
*Add:	Per toilet room	1,000	1,950			
THEATER						
*Theater (Dinner)	Per seat	0.067	131			
TRAILER PARK (overnight)	Space	0.333	649			
DENTIST OFFICE	Per dentist	0.833	1,624			
MEDICAL OFFICE	Per doctor	0.833	1,624			

Note: These data are not exactly comparable because of variability of accounting, organizational structure, and services provided.

APPENDIX B, PLANNING DIVISION SIDE-BY-SIDE COMPARISON, to the Planning Committee Report

ORANGE COUNTY			CITY OF ORLANDO		
WATER IMPACT FEE (continued)					
Land Use Type/Establishment	Fee Based On Unit (Equivalent Residential Unit (ERU) 350 gallons per day [GPD])		Fee (\$)		
	Unit	Factor			
CHURCH	Per seat	0.017			33
HOSPITAL	Per bed	0.833			1,624
NURSING HOME	Per bed	0.417			813
WAREHOUSE OFFICE					
*Use fixture units for warehouse area an see "Office" category for calculating ERUs in that area. (Add for food service and add for retail space if applicable)					
MEETING AND/OR BANQUET ROOMS	Per seat	0.017			33
*(Total sq ft/15 sq ft/person X 0.017 X number of seats)					
AUTOMOTIVE REPAIR AND MAINTENANCE STORE	Per bay	0.250			486
RETAIL STORE/SELF-SERVICE GAS PUMPS	Per restroom	1.000			1,950
EXTENDED CARE FACILITIES	Per efficiency	0.500			975
CONVENIENCE STORE WITHOUT GAS PUMP	Use fixture units	N/A			
SCHOOLS, MIDDLE AND HIGH	Per student	0.067			131
SCHOOLS, ELEMENTARY AND NURSERY	Per student	0.025			49
FIRE IMPACT FEE					
Land Use Type	Fee Based On	Fee 3/10/06	Fee 03/10/07		
Single Family Detached	Per Unit	200.85	207.88		
Multi-Family	Per Unit	176.03	182.19		
Mobile Home	Per Unit	200.85	207.88		
Hotel/Motel	Per 1,000 sq. ft.	162.75	168.45		
Offices/Institutional	Per 1,000 sq. ft.	182.87	189.27		
Industrial	Per 1,000 sq. ft.	39.36	40.74		
Storage	Per 1,000 sq. ft.	47.34	49.00		
Retail	Per 1,000 sq.ft.	223.34	231.16		
PARKS AND RECREATION IMPACT FEE					
Land Use Type	Fee Based On	Fee 3/10/06	Fee 3/10/07		
Single Family	Per unit	1,122.89	1,205.98		
Multi-Family	Per unit	809.43	869.33		
Accessory Family	Per unit	809.43	869.33		
Mobile Home	Per unit	841.17	903.42		

Note: These data are not exactly comparable because of variability of accounting, organizational structure, and services provided.

APPENDIX B, PLANNING DIVISION SIDE-BY-SIDE COMPARISON, to the Planning Committee Report

ORANGE COUNTY				CITY OF ORLANDO			
LAW ENFORCEMENT IMPACT FEE							
Land Use Type	Fee Based On	Fee 3/10/06	Fee 3/10/07				
Single Family	Per Unit	193.00	197.83				
Multi-Family	Per Unit	61.00	62.53				
Mobile home	Per Unit	61.00	62.53				
Hotel/Motel	Per Room	98.00	100.45				
Manufacturing	Per 1,000 sq. ft.	47.00	48.18				
Warehousing		47.00	48.18				
Commercial/Retail		308.00	315.70				
Office/Institutional		77.00	23.58				
Schools		23.00	23.58				
SCHOOLS IMPACT FEE							
Land Use Type	Fee Based On	Fee					
Single Family	Per Unit	7,000					
Multi-Family	Per Unit	3,807					
Mobile Home	Per Unit	4,104					

Note: These data are not exactly comparable because of variability of accounting, organizational structure, and services provided.

Planning Committee Report

Orange County/City of Orlando Consolidation of Services Study Commission

APPENDIX A, MEETING SCHEDULE AND PRESENTERS, to the Planning Committee Report

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING DATE	PRESENTER(S)	FORMAL PRESENTATION(S)
December 30, 2005	Teleconference with Raymond Chiaramonte - Assistant Executive Director, Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission; Dean Grandin – City of Orlando Planning Director; Chris Testerman – Orange County Planning Director	
January 19, 2006	Teleconference with Fred Goodrow – Division Manager for Comprehensive Planning, Tallahassee and Leon County Planning Department, and David Healey , Executive Director, Pinellas County Planning Council	
February 9, 2006	Commission Discussion	
March 1, 2006	Commission Discussion	
March 16, 2006	Commission Discussion	

APPENDIX B, PLANNING DIVISION SIDE-BY-SIDE COMPARISON, to the Planning Committee Report

ORANGE COUNTY	CITY OF ORLANDO
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>ORGANIZATION</u></p> <p>DEPARTMENT: Growth Management</p> <p>DIVISION: Planning</p> <p>MANAGER: Chris Testerman</p> <p>SERVICES PROVIDED:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intergovernmental Coordination/Annexations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Annexation Review Group ○ CST/PST review ○ Fiscal analysis ○ Joint planning agreements ○ Interlocal service agreements ○ School planning ○ Enclave/Periphery Study • Development review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Project review ○ Subdivision plans ○ Development plans ○ Development Review Committee • Planning and Zoning Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Rezoning requests ○ Community meetings ○ Parking standards ○ Special exceptions ○ Development Advisory Board ○ Impact Fees • Comprehensive Planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CRP amendment ○ DRI project review ○ Special Overlay Districts ○ Visioning/Public participation ○ Evaluation and Appraisal Report • Research and Strategic Planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Demographic and population studies ○ Enterprise Zone ○ Economic development ○ Land Market monitoring ○ Fiscal impact analysis ○ Website Maintenance • Urban design <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Site plan review ○ Architectural and Lighting Ordinance ○ Urban Design Commission 	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>ORGANIZATION</u></p> <p>DEPARTMENT: Economic Development</p> <p>DIVISION: City Planning</p> <p>MANAGER: Dean Grandin</p> <p>SERVICES PROVIDED:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current Planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Project review ○ Municipal Planning Board/ Board of Zoning Adjustment ○ Land Development Code and map amendments ○ Subdivisions ○ Planning/Zoning official determinations ○ Southeast Town Design Review Committee • Long Range Planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Growth Management Plan Amendments ○ Evaluation and appraisal reports ○ Neighborhood Plans/Special Area Studies ○ Municipal Planning Board ○ Developments of Regional Impact ○ Demographic analysis and projections ○ DCA Certified Community oversight • Strategic Planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Annexations ○ Fiscal impact analyses ○ Special studies ○ Research ○ Website maintenance ○ Active Living by Design • Design and Historic Preservation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Project appearance review ○ Historic Preservation Board/DDB DRC ○ Historic District/Landmark Nominations ○ Baldwin Park Town Design Review Committee ○ Small Project Design ○ Virtual Orlando (3D Model of Clay)

Note: These data are not exactly comparable because of variability of accounting, organizational structure, and services provided.

APPENDIX B, PLANNING DIVISION SIDE-BY-SIDE COMPARISON, to the Planning Committee Report

ORANGE COUNTY	CITY OF ORLANDO																																																																																										
<p>DIVISION: Zoning MANAGER: Mitch Gordon</p> <p>SERVICES PROVIDED:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arbor review • Commercial plans review • Permitting • Project review and research • Street addressing <p style="text-align: center;"><u>2005 STAFF</u></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">PROFESSIONALS</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">DIVISION</th> <th style="text-align: center;">NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Planning</td> <td style="text-align: right;">25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zoning</td> <td style="text-align: right;">13</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL Professionals</td> <td style="text-align: right;">38</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">SUPPORT STAFF</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">DIVISION</th> <th style="text-align: center;">NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Planning</td> <td style="text-align: right;">4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zoning</td> <td style="text-align: right;">20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL Support Employees</td> <td style="text-align: right;">24</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">COVERED BY COLLECTIVE BARGAINING</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">DIVISION</th> <th style="text-align: center;">NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Planning</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zoning</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL Employees covered</td> <td style="text-align: right;">0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">TOTAL</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">DIVISION</th> <th style="text-align: center;">NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Planning</td> <td style="text-align: right;">29</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zoning</td> <td style="text-align: right;">33</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL Planning Employees</td> <td style="text-align: right;">62</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>FINANCIAL INFORMATION</u></p> <p>PAY PLAN: Orange County Pay Plan</p> <p>BENEFITS PLAN: Orange County Benefits Plan</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">FY 2003-2004 BUDGET</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">DIVISION</th> <th style="text-align: center;">BUDGET</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Planning</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$2,167,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zoning</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$2,080,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$4,247,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	PROFESSIONALS		DIVISION	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES	Planning	25	Zoning	13	TOTAL Professionals	38	SUPPORT STAFF		DIVISION	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES	Planning	4	Zoning	20	TOTAL Support Employees	24	COVERED BY COLLECTIVE BARGAINING		DIVISION	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES	Planning	0	Zoning	0	TOTAL Employees covered	0	TOTAL		DIVISION	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES	Planning	29	Zoning	33	TOTAL Planning Employees	62	FY 2003-2004 BUDGET		DIVISION	BUDGET	Planning	\$2,167,000	Zoning	\$2,080,000	TOTAL	\$4,247,000	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>2005 STAFF</u></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">PROFESSIONALS</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">SECTION/ DIVISION</th> <th style="text-align: center;">NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>City Planning</td> <td style="text-align: right;">18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL Professionals</td> <td style="text-align: right;">18</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">SUPPORT STAFF</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">DIVISION</th> <th style="text-align: center;">NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>City Planning</td> <td style="text-align: right;">6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL Support Employees</td> <td style="text-align: right;">6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">COVERED BY COLLECTIVE BARGAINING</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">DIVISION</th> <th style="text-align: center;">NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>City Planning</td> <td style="text-align: right;">17</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL Employees covered</td> <td style="text-align: right;">17</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">TOTAL</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">DIVISION</th> <th style="text-align: center;">NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>City Planning</td> <td style="text-align: right;">24</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL Planning Employees</td> <td style="text-align: right;">24</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>FINANCIAL INFORMATION</u></p> <p>PAY PLAN: City of Orlando Pay Plan</p> <p>BENEFITS PLAN: City of Orlando Benefits Plan</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">FY 2003-2004 BUDGET</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">DIVISION</th> <th style="text-align: center;">BUDGET</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>City Planning</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$2,111,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$2,111,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	PROFESSIONALS		SECTION/ DIVISION	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES	City Planning	18	TOTAL Professionals	18	SUPPORT STAFF		DIVISION	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES	City Planning	6	TOTAL Support Employees	6	COVERED BY COLLECTIVE BARGAINING		DIVISION	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES	City Planning	17	TOTAL Employees covered	17	TOTAL		DIVISION	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES	City Planning	24	TOTAL Planning Employees	24	FY 2003-2004 BUDGET		DIVISION	BUDGET	City Planning	\$2,111,000	TOTAL	\$2,111,000
PROFESSIONALS																																																																																											
DIVISION	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES																																																																																										
Planning	25																																																																																										
Zoning	13																																																																																										
TOTAL Professionals	38																																																																																										
SUPPORT STAFF																																																																																											
DIVISION	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES																																																																																										
Planning	4																																																																																										
Zoning	20																																																																																										
TOTAL Support Employees	24																																																																																										
COVERED BY COLLECTIVE BARGAINING																																																																																											
DIVISION	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES																																																																																										
Planning	0																																																																																										
Zoning	0																																																																																										
TOTAL Employees covered	0																																																																																										
TOTAL																																																																																											
DIVISION	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES																																																																																										
Planning	29																																																																																										
Zoning	33																																																																																										
TOTAL Planning Employees	62																																																																																										
FY 2003-2004 BUDGET																																																																																											
DIVISION	BUDGET																																																																																										
Planning	\$2,167,000																																																																																										
Zoning	\$2,080,000																																																																																										
TOTAL	\$4,247,000																																																																																										
PROFESSIONALS																																																																																											
SECTION/ DIVISION	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES																																																																																										
City Planning	18																																																																																										
TOTAL Professionals	18																																																																																										
SUPPORT STAFF																																																																																											
DIVISION	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES																																																																																										
City Planning	6																																																																																										
TOTAL Support Employees	6																																																																																										
COVERED BY COLLECTIVE BARGAINING																																																																																											
DIVISION	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES																																																																																										
City Planning	17																																																																																										
TOTAL Employees covered	17																																																																																										
TOTAL																																																																																											
DIVISION	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES																																																																																										
City Planning	24																																																																																										
TOTAL Planning Employees	24																																																																																										
FY 2003-2004 BUDGET																																																																																											
DIVISION	BUDGET																																																																																										
City Planning	\$2,111,000																																																																																										
TOTAL	\$2,111,000																																																																																										

Note: These data are not exactly comparable because of variability of accounting, organizational structure, and services provided.

APPENDIX B, PLANNING DIVISION SIDE-BY-SIDE COMPARISON, to the Planning Committee Report

ORANGE COUNTY		CITY OF ORLANDO																			
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">FY 2004-2005 BUDGET</th> </tr> <tr> <th>DIVISION</th> <th>BUDGET</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Planning</td> <td>\$3,743,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zoning</td> <td>\$2,700,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>\$6,243,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		FY 2004-2005 BUDGET		DIVISION	BUDGET	Planning	\$3,743,000	Zoning	\$2,700,000	TOTAL	\$6,243,000	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">FY 2004-2005 BUDGET</th> </tr> <tr> <th>DIVISION</th> <th>BUDGET</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>City Planning</td> <td>\$2,136,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>\$2,136,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		FY 2004-2005 BUDGET		DIVISION	BUDGET	City Planning	\$2,136,000	TOTAL	\$2,136,000
FY 2004-2005 BUDGET																					
DIVISION	BUDGET																				
Planning	\$3,743,000																				
Zoning	\$2,700,000																				
TOTAL	\$6,243,000																				
FY 2004-2005 BUDGET																					
DIVISION	BUDGET																				
City Planning	\$2,136,000																				
TOTAL	\$2,136,000																				
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">FY 2005-2006 BUDGET</th> </tr> <tr> <th>DIVISION</th> <th>BUDGET</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Planning</td> <td>\$3,800,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zoning</td> <td>\$2,700,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>\$6,508,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		FY 2005-2006 BUDGET		DIVISION	BUDGET	Planning	\$3,800,000	Zoning	\$2,700,000	TOTAL	\$6,508,000										
FY 2005-2006 BUDGET																					
DIVISION	BUDGET																				
Planning	\$3,800,000																				
Zoning	\$2,700,000																				
TOTAL	\$6,508,000																				
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">FY 2006-2007 BUDGET (PROPOSED)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>DIVISION</th> <th>BUDGET</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Planning</td> <td>\$3,990,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zoning</td> <td>\$2,979,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>\$6,969,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		FY 2006-2007 BUDGET (PROPOSED)		DIVISION	BUDGET	Planning	\$3,990,000	Zoning	\$2,979,000	TOTAL	\$6,969,000										
FY 2006-2007 BUDGET (PROPOSED)																					
DIVISION	BUDGET																				
Planning	\$3,990,000																				
Zoning	\$2,979,000																				
TOTAL	\$6,969,000																				
<p>TOTAL OPERATING EXPENDITURES FOR ALL OF THE ABOVE (FY 2004-2005)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employee salary: \$3,600,000 Overtime: \$6,000 Training: \$7,500 Equipment and maintenance (including systems and software support): \$40,000 Other: \$0 TOTAL: \$3,654,000 		<p>TOTAL OPERATING EXPENDITURES FOR ALL OF THE ABOVE (FY 2004-2005)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employee salary: \$1,533,000 Overtime: \$1,000 Training: \$14,000 Equipment and maintenance (including systems and software support): n/a Other: \$112,000 TOTAL: \$2,136,000 																			
<p>FUNDING SOURCE:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">FUNDING OBTAINED FROM</th> </tr> <tr> <th>DIVISION</th> <th>SOURCE</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Planning</td> <td rowspan="2">General Fund; Building/planning/zoning Fund</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zoning</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		FUNDING OBTAINED FROM		DIVISION	SOURCE	Planning	General Fund; Building/planning/zoning Fund	Zoning	<p>FUNDING SOURCE:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">FUNDING OBTAINED FROM</th> </tr> <tr> <th>DIVISION</th> <th>SOURCE</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>City Planning</td> <td>General Fund</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		FUNDING OBTAINED FROM		DIVISION	SOURCE	City Planning	General Fund					
FUNDING OBTAINED FROM																					
DIVISION	SOURCE																				
Planning	General Fund; Building/planning/zoning Fund																				
Zoning																					
FUNDING OBTAINED FROM																					
DIVISION	SOURCE																				
City Planning	General Fund																				
<p align="center"><u>OPERATIONAL DATA</u></p> <p>NUMBER OF SQUARE MILES COVERED: 800</p> <p>PAID PLANNING SERVICES STAFFING PER 1,000 RESIDENTIAL POPULATION: 0.09 (planning staff [62] divided by 2005 estimated unincorporated Orange County population [677,185] multiplied by 1,000)</p> <p>PAID PLANNING SERVICES STAFF COST PER CAPITA FOR RESIDENTIAL POPULATION: \$5.40 (2004-2005 expenditures [\$3,654,000] divided by estimated 2005 population [677,185] within unincorporated Orange County)</p>		<p align="center"><u>OPERATIONAL DATA</u></p> <p>NUMBER OF SQUARE MILES COVERED: 109.6</p> <p>PAID PLANNING SERVICES STAFFING PER 1,000 RESIDENTIAL POPULATION: 0.11 (planning staff [24] divided by 2005 estimated city resident population [217,327] multiplied by 1,000)</p> <p>PAID PLANNING SERVICES STAFF COST PER CAPITA FOR RESIDENTIAL POPULATION: \$9.80 (2004-2005 expenditures [\$2,136,000] divided by estimated city resident population [217,327])</p>																			

Note: These data are not exactly comparable because of variability of accounting, organizational structure, and services provided.

**APPENDIX B, PLANNING DIVISION SIDE-BY-SIDE COMPARISON, to the
Planning Committee Report**

ORANGE COUNTY	CITY OF ORLANDO
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>PARTNERSHIPS/AGREEMENTS</u></p> <p>PARTNERSHIPS:</p> <p>AGREEMENTS/SUPPORT AGREEMENTS: Interlocal agreement for Public School Facility Planning</p> <p>COOPERATIVE EFFORTS WITH CITY OF ORLANDO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly meetings to provide updates on plans and ongoing developments 	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>PARTNERSHIPS/AGREEMENTS</u></p> <p>PARTNERSHIPS:</p> <p>AGREEMENTS/SUPPORT AGREEMENTS: Interlocal agreement for Public School Facility Planning</p> <p>COOPERATIVE EFFORTS WITH ORANGE COUNTY:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly meetings to provide updates on plans and ongoing developments

Note: These data are not exactly comparable because of variability of accounting, organizational structure, and services provided.

APPENDIX B, PLANNING DIVISION SIDE-BY-SIDE COMPARISON, to the Planning Committee Report

ORANGE COUNTY				CITY OF ORLANDO			
ORANGE COUNTY IMPACT FEES				CITY OF ORLANDO IMPACT FEES			
Road Impact Fee				TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE			
Land Use Type	Unit	Fee (\$) 7/1/06	Fee (\$) 7/1/06	Impact Fee Use	Fee Basis	**	Fee range (\$)
Single-Family Detached	Dwelling	3,500	3,605	Amusement (Theme) Park	Acre	.9	6,513-9,694
Multi-Family	Dwelling	2,453	2,527	Auto Service and Gas Station	Pump	1	2,493-2,597
Mobile Home Park	Site	1,826	1,881	Bank	1,000 sf	1	7,208-10,792
Retirement Housing	Dwelling	788	812	Bus Terminal	1,000 sf	.9	2,149-3,199
Hotel/Motel	Room	2,596	2,674	Church	1,000 sf	.9	801-1,193
Tourist Hotel	Room	1,015	1,045	Day Care	1,000 sf	.9	2,332-3,651
Time Share	Dwelling	1,240	1,277	Eating and Drinking Establishments	1,000 sf	.9	3,573-11,259
Retail, 50,000 sf or less*	1,000sq.ft.	12,649	13,028	Funeral Home	1,000 sf	.9	801-1,193
Retail, 50,001-100,000 sf*	1,000sq.ft.	12,916	13,303	General Office <100,000 gsf	1,000 sf	.9	1,540-2,126
Retail, 100,001-200,000 sf*	1,000sq.ft.	11,617	11,966	General Office >200,000 gsf	1,000 sf	.9	846-1,378
Retail, 200,001-300,000 sf*	1,000sq.ft.	10,597	10,915	General Office 100,000-199,999 gsf	1,000 sf	.9	998-1,626
Retail, 300,001-400,000 sf*	1,000sq.ft.	9,888	10,185	Hospital	1,000 sf	.9	1,443-2,147
Retail, 400,001-500,000 sf*	1,000sq.ft.	9,344	9,624	Hotel/Motel	Room	1	605-1,243
Retail, 500,001-1,000,000 sq. ft.*	1,000sq.ft.	8,178	8,423	Industrial	1,000 sf	.9	599-892
Retail, 1,000,001-1,200,000 sq. ft.*	1,000sq.ft.	7,465	7,689	Manufacturing	1,000 sf	.9	331-493
Retail, more than 1,200,000 sq. ft.*	1,000sq.ft.	7,142	7,356	Mini Storage	1,000 sf	.9	224-334
Retail, Tourist	1,000sq.ft.	4,439	4,572	Movie Theater	1,000 sf	.9	5,354-8,806
Auto, New Car Sales	1,000sq.ft.	5,855	6,031	Residential – Group Housing (2.5 beds = 1 MFE)	Unit	1	541-807
Auto Service	1,000sq.ft.	4,627	4,766	Residential – Mobile Home	Unit	1	402-600
Bank	1,000sq.ft.	23,848	24,563	Residential – Multi-Family	Unit	1	541-807
Day Care Center	1,000sq.ft.	6,763	6,966	Residential - Nursing Home (2 beds = 1 MFE)	Unit	1	541-807
Drug Store	1,000sq.ft.	7,616	7,844	Residential – RSSF	Unit	1	541-807
Racquet Club	1,000sq.ft.	3,003	3,093	Residential – Single Family	Unit	1	799-1,192
Restaurant, Quality	1,000sq.ft.	12,223	12,590	Residential Tandem	Unit	1	541-807
Restaurant, high-Turnover	1,000sq.ft.	16,820	17,325	Retail >1,250,000 gsf	1,000 sf	.9	1,091-2,773
Restaurant, Fast Food	1,000sq.ft.	25,907	26,684	Retail 0 – 24,999 gsf	1,000 sf	.9	4,771-7,144
Supermarket	1,000sq.ft.	12,455	12,829	Retail 1,000,000 – 1,249,999 gsf	1,000 sf	.9	1,091-2,925
Office, 100,000 sq. ft. or less	1,000sq.ft.	6,396	6,588	Retail 100,000-199,999 gsf	1,000 sf	.9	1,091-4,414
Office, 100,001-200,000 sq. ft.	1,000sq.ft.	4,967	5,116	Retail 200,000-299,999 gsf	1,000 sf	.9	1,091-3,353
Office, more than 200,000 sq. ft.	1,000sq.ft.	4,420	4,553	Retail 25,000-49,999 gsf	1,000 sf	.9	1,091-7,144
Office, Medical/Dental	1,000sq.ft.	14,762	15,205	Retail 300,000-399,999 gsf	1,000 sf	.9	1,091-3,818
Light Industrial	1,000sq.ft.	3,130	3,224	Retail 400,000-499,999	1,000 sf	.9	1,091-3,475
Manufacturing	1,000sq.ft.	1,712	1,763	Retail 50,000-99,999 gsf	1,000 sf	.9	1,091-4,647
Warehousing	1,000sq.ft.	2,223	2,290	Retail 500,000-999,999 gsf	1,000 sf	.9	1,091-3,231
Mini-Warehouse	1,000sq.ft.	895	922	School – elementary school (grades k-8)	1,000 sf	.9	652-1,029
Hospital	1,000sq.ft.	6,249	6,436	School – high School	1,000 sf	.9	703-1,046
Nursing Home	1,000sq.ft.	2,169	2,234	School – Junior community College	1,000 sf	.9	830-1,235
Library	1,000sq.ft.	9,001	9,271	School – University	1,000 sf	.9	2,589-3,853
Post Office	1,000sq.ft.	18,998	19,568	Warehousing	1,000 sf	.9	420-624
Public Assembly	1,000sq.ft.	3,101	3,194				
School	1,000sq.ft.	4,687	4,828				

Note: all residential, hotel, and time share fees are per unit. All non-residential fees are per 1,000 square feet
 * Gross leasable area is total square footage under roof less than ten (10) percent; all others are gross floor area

MFE – Multi-Family Equivalent

** .9 = Formula ((Gross Square Footage X 90%)/1,000) X appropriate fee rate.

1= For these categories, the fee used directly corresponds to the quantity developed.

Note: These data are not exactly comparable because of variability of accounting, organizational structure, and services provided.

APPENDIX B, PLANNING DIVISION SIDE-BY-SIDE COMPARISON, to the Planning Committee Report

ORANGE COUNTY				CITY OF ORLANDO			
WASTEWATER IMPACT FEE				WASTEWATER IMPACT FEE			
Land Use Type/Establishment	Fee Based On Unit (Equivalent Residential Unit (ERU) 300 gallons per day (GPD))		Fee (\$)	Land Use Type	Fee Based On	Fee (\$)	
	Unit	Factor		Single Family	Equivalent Residential Unit (ERU) 250 gallons per day (GPD)	2,537.50	
RESIDENTIAL				Multi-Family	Equivalent Residential Unit (ERU) 190 gallons per day (GPD)	1,928.50	
*Single-family home	Per unit	1.000	3,668	Tandem/Garage apartment/duplex	Equivalent Residential Unit (ERU) 190 gallons per day (GPD)	1,928.50	
*Duplex (1 or 2 bedrooms)	Per unit	0.833	3,055	Commercial	\$10.15 * 15.0 gallons per day per fixture unit Restaurants: Indoors, per seat	243.60	
*Duplex (3 or more bedrooms)	Per unit	1.000	3,668				Outdoor Covered, per seat
*Multi-family (2 bedrooms)	Per unit	0.833	3,055			Outdoor Uncovered per seat	91.35
*Multi-family (1 bedroom)	Per unit	0.583	2,138				
*Multi-family (efficiency <500 sq ft)	Per unit	0.500	1,834				
*Multi-family (3 or more bedrooms)	Per unit	1.000	3,668				
*Mobile home (1or 2 bedrooms)	Per unit	0.667	2,447				
*Mobile home (3 or more bedrooms)	Per unit	0.833	3,055				
COMMERCIAL							
*Auditorium	Seat	0.017	62				
*Barber/beauty shop	Operator Station	0.300	1,100				
*Bowling alley	Lane	0.333	1,221				
*Convenience store (no gas pumps)	Use fixture units	N/A					
FOOD SERVICE							
*Restaurant/cafeteria	Seat	0.100	367				
*Restaurant (twenty-four hour)	Seat	0.167	613				
*Restaurant (fast food)	Seat	0.050	183				
*Bar/cocktail lounge	Seat	0.067	246				
HOTEL/MOTEL (not including food service, banquet and meeting rooms, and laundries)	Room	0.500	1,834				
INDUSTRIAL BUILDING (not including food service or industrial wastewater flows; industrial wastewater flows to be determined on fixture basis unless director or his designee agrees to alternative flow calculation)							
*Without showers	Employee	0.050	183				
*With showers (emergency showers not included)	Employee	0.177	429				
LAUNDRY	Per machine	1.333	4,889				
OFFICE BUILDING (add food service and retail space)	1,000 sq ft gross	0.334	1,225				
SERVICE STATION	Per bay	1.000	3,668				
*Add:	Per wash bay	3.200	11,738				
*Add:	Per toilet room	1,000	3,668				

Note: These data are not exactly comparable because of variability of accounting, organizational structure, and services provided.

APPENDIX B, PLANNING DIVISION SIDE-BY-SIDE COMPARISON, to the Planning Committee Report

ORANGE COUNTY		CITY OF ORLANDO	
WASTEWATER IMPACT FEE (continued)			
Land Use Type/Establishment	Fee Based On Unit (Equivalent Residential Unit (ERU) 300 gallons per day [GPD])		Fee (\$)
	Unit	Factor	
THEATER	Per seat	0.010	37
*Theater (Dinner)	Per seat	0.067	246
TRAILER PARK (overnight)	Space	0.333	1,221
DENTIST OFFICE	Per dentist	0.833	3,055
MEDICAL OFFICE	Per doctor	0.833	3,055
CHURCH	Per seat	0.017	62
HOSPITAL	Per bed	0.833	3,055
NURSING HOME	Per bed	0.417	1,530
WAREHOUSE OFFICE			
*Use fixture units for warehouse area an see "Office" category for calculating ERUs in that area. (Add for food service and add for retail space if applicable)			
WAREHOUSE SPACE	Use fixture units	N/A	
MEETING AND/OR BANQUET ROOMS	Per seat	0.017	62
*(Total sq ft/15 sq ft/person X 0.017 X number of seats)			
AUTOMOTIVE REPAIR AND MAINTENANCE STORE	Per bay	0.250	917
RETAIL SPACE	Use fixture units	N/A	
RETAIL STORE/SELF-SERVICE GAS PUMPS	Per restroom	1.000	3,668
*(Add remaining fixture units)			
EXTENDED CARE FACILITIES	Per efficiency	0.500	1,834
CONVENIENCE STORE WITHOUT GAS PUMP	Use fixture units		
SCHOOLS, MIDDLE AND HIGH	Per student	0.067	246
SCHOOLS, ELEMENTARY AND NURSERY	Per student	0.025	92
Footnote (c) For all establishments not listed above, the total equivalent residential unit (ERU) value shall be determined by multiplying the number of fixture units, as published in the Standard Plumbing Code, by twenty-five (25), and then dividing that numerator by three hundred (300) GPD.			

Note: These data are not exactly comparable because of variability of accounting, organizational structure, and services provided.

APPENDIX B, PLANNING DIVISION SIDE-BY-SIDE COMPARISON, to the Planning Committee Report

ORANGE COUNTY				CITY OF ORLANDO		
				ORLANDO UTILITES COMMISSION (OUC)		
WATER IMPACT FEE				WATER IMPACT FEE		
Land Use Type/Establishment	Fee Based On Unit (Equivalent Residential Unit (ERU) 350 gallons per day [GPD])		Fee (\$)	Land Use Type	Fee Based On Percentage or Multiple of Equivalent Residential Connection [ERC] (325 gallons per day [GPD])*	Fee (\$) (System Development Charge [SDC])
	Unit	Factor				
RESIDENTIAL				Residential- Single Family – ¾ inch meter	1.000	1,920
*Single-family home	per unit	1.000	1,950	Residential- Single Family – 1 inch and above meter	3.310	6,355
*Duplex (1 or 2 bedrooms)	per unit	0.833	1,624	Duplex, 1-2 bedrooms	0.833	1,599
*Duplex (3 or more bedrooms)	per unit	1.000	1,950	Duplex, 3 or more bedrooms	1.000	1,920
*Multi-family (2 bedrooms)	per unit	0.833	1,624	Multifamily, efficiency (<500 sq. ft.)	0.500	960
*Multi-family (1 bedroom)	per unit	0.583	1,137	Multifamily, 1 bedroom	0.583	1,119
*Multi-family (efficiency <500 sq ft)	Per unit	0.500	975	Multifamily, 2 bedroom	0.833	1,599
*Multi-family (3 or more bedrooms)	Per unit	1.000	1,950	Multifamily, 3 or more bedrooms	1.000	1,920
*Mobile home (1or 2 bedrooms)	Per unit	0.667	1,301	Hotel (per room)	0.500	960
*Mobile home (3 or more bedrooms)	Per unit	0.833	1,624	Commercial ¾ inch meter	1.310	2,515
COMMERCIAL				Commercial 1 inch meter	3.680	7,066
*Auditorium	Seat	0.017	33	Commercial 1 ½ inch meter	7.450	14,304
*Barber/beauty shop	Operator Station	0.300	585	Commercial 2 inch meter	11.580	22,234
*Bowling alley	Lane	0.333	649	Commercial 3 inch meter or greater	Determined by a site-specific fixture analysis.	
Convenience store (no gas pumps)	Use fixture units	N/A		<p> The system development charge is designed to recover a portion of the amount of investment required for water system facilities caused by growth. This charge is assessed on all new metered connections that create additional demands on the system and existing meter connections that have a significant increase in flow as determined by OUC. This charge is applied based on the associated customer capacity requirements that are measured in Equivalent Residential Connections (ERC). The ERC concept defines all other uses as either a percentage or multiple of the estimated single-family water use. The system development charge does not apply to special irrigation meters.</p>		
FOOD SERVICE						
*Restaurant/cafe/teria	Seat	0.100	195			
*Restaurant (twenty-four hour)	Seat	0.167	326			
*Restaurant (fast food)	Seat	0.050	98			
*Bar/cocktail lounge	Seat	0.067	131			
HOTEL/MOTEL (not including food service, banquet and meeting rooms, and laundries)	Room	0.500	975			
INDUSTRIAL BUILDING (not including food service or industrial wastewater flows; industrial wastewater flows to be determined on fixture basis unless director or his designee agrees to alternative flow calculation)						
*Without showers	Employee	0.050	98			
*With showers (emergency showers not included)	Employee	0.177	228			
LAUNDRY	Per machine	1.333	2,599			
OFFICE BUILDING (add food service and retail space)	1,000 sq ft gross	0.334	651			
Service station	Per bay	1.000	1,950			
*Add:	Per wash bay	3.200	6,240			
*Add:	Per toilet room	1,000	1,950			
THEATER	Per seat	0.010	20			
*Theater (Dinner)	Per seat	0.067	131			
TRAILER PARK (overnight)	Space	0.333	649			
DENTIST OFFICE	Per dentist	0.833	1,624			
MEDICAL OFFICE	Per doctor	0.833	1,624			

Note: These data are not exactly comparable because of variability of accounting, organizational structure, and services provided.

APPENDIX B, PLANNING DIVISION SIDE-BY-SIDE COMPARISON, to the Planning Committee Report

ORANGE COUNTY				CITY OF ORLANDO			
WATER IMPACT FEE (continued)							
Land Use Type/Establishment	Fee Based On Unit (Equivalent Residential Unit (ERU) 350 gallons per day [GPD])		Fee (\$)				
	Unit	Factor					
CHURCH	Per seat	0.017		33			
HOSPITAL	Per bed	0.833		1,624			
NURSING HOME	Per bed	0.417		813			
WAREHOUSE OFFICE							
*Use fixture units for warehouse area an see "Office" category for calculating ERUs in that area. (Add for food service and add for retail space if applicable)							
MEETING AND/OR BANQUET ROOMS	Per seat	0.017		33			
*(Total sq ft/15 sq ft/person X 0.017 X number of seats)							
AUTOMOTIVE REPAIR AND MAINTENANCE STORE	Per bay	0.250		486			
RETAIL STORE/SELF-SERVICE GAS PUMPS	Per restroom	1.000		1,950			
EXTENDED CARE FACILITIES	Per efficiency	0.500		975			
CONVENIENCE STORE WITHOUT GAS PUMP	Use fixture units	N/A					
SCHOOLS, MIDDLE AND HIGH	Per student	0.067		131			
SCHOOLS, ELEMENTARY AND NURSERY	Per student	0.025		49			
FIRE IMPACT FEE							
Land Use Type	Fee Based On	Fee 3/10/06	Fee 03/10/07				
Single Family Detached	Per Unit	200.85	207.88				
Multi-Family	Per Unit	176.03	182.19				
Mobile Home	Per Unit	200.85	207.88				
Hotel/Motel	Per 1,000 sq. ft.	162.75	168.45				
Offices/Institutional	Per 1,000 sq. ft.	182.87	189.27				
Industrial	Per 1,000 sq. ft.	39.36	40.74				
Storage	Per 1,000 sq. ft.	47.34	49.00				
Retail	Per 1,000 sq.ft.	223.34	231.16				
PARKS AND RECREATION IMPACT FEE							
Land Use Type	Fee Based On	Fee 3/10/06	Fee 3/10/07				
Single Family	Per unit	1,122.89	1,205.98				
Multi-Family	Per unit	809.43	869.33				
Accessory Family	Per unit	809.43	869.33				
Mobile Home	Per unit	841.17	903.42				

Note: These data are not exactly comparable because of variability of accounting, organizational structure, and services provided.

APPENDIX B, PLANNING DIVISION SIDE-BY-SIDE COMPARISON, to the Planning Committee Report

ORANGE COUNTY				CITY OF ORLANDO			
LAW ENFORCEMENT IMPACT FEE							
Land Use Type	Fee Based On	Fee 3/10/06	Fee 3/10/07				
Single Family	Per Unit	193.00	197.83				
Multi-Family	Per Unit	61.00	62.53				
Mobile home	Per Unit	61.00	62.53				
Hotel/Motel	Per Room	98.00	100.45				
Manufacturing	Per 1,000 sq. ft.	47.00	48.18				
Warehousing		47.00	48.18				
Commercial/Retail		308.00	315.70				
Office/Institutional		77.00	23.58				
Schools		23.00	23.58				
SCHOOLS IMPACT FEE							
Land Use Type	Fee Based On	Fee					
Single Family	Per Unit	7,000					
Multi-Family	Per Unit	3,807					
Mobile Home	Per Unit	4,104					

Note: These data are not exactly comparable because of variability of accounting, organizational structure, and services provided.

Planning Committee Report

Orange County/City of Orlando Consolidation of Services Study Commission

APPENDIX C, GLOSSARY OF PLANNING TERMS USED IN THIS REPORT, to the Planning Committee Report

Glossary of Planning Terms

Ad Valorem tax: A tax levied on the assessed value of real property (also known as “property tax”).

Comprehensive Plan: A plan for development of an area that recognizes the physical, economic, social, political, aesthetic, and related factors of the community involved.

Concurrency: Statutory requirement that certain public facilities be available concurrent with the impacts of development. The facilities include sanitary sewer, potable water, solid waste, Stormwater drainage, recreation, schools and transportation. (S.163.3180 F.S.) (*Source: Chris Testerman, Manager, Orange County Planning Division*)

Density: The number of dwelling units permitted per net acre of land.

Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR): A summary audit of a local government’s Comprehensive Plan to assess progress and identify changes that need to be made. The EAR is required by Florida Statutes Chapter 163.3191 and is conducted approximately every seven years.

Impact Fee: A fee charged by local governments to developers as a total or partial reimbursement for the cost of providing additional facilities or services needed as a result of new development (e.g., wider roads, new sewers, etc.)

Infrastructure: Facilities and services needed to sustain industry, residential, commercial, and all other land-use activities, including water, sewer lines, and other utilities, streets and roads, communications, and public facilities such as fire stations, parks, schools, etc.

Land Use Code (also known as Land Development Codes or Zoning Codes): A set of detailed regulations that indicate how land is occupied or utilized; regulations that indicate the kinds, location and intensity of land uses, the applicable resource protection and development policies, and, where necessary, a listing of implementing actions.

Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO): A local governmental unit that has legal jurisdiction over a geographic area for government service planning such as transportation and land-use planning. (In Central Florida, MetroPlan is our MPO and deals only with transportation planning issues.)

Planning Committee Report

Orange County/City of Orlando Consolidation of Services Study Commission

Millage Rate: The rate established each year by local government that is used in the calculation of property taxes.

Redevelopment: Any proposed expansion, addition, or major façade change to an existing building, structure, or parking facility.

Rural: A sparsely developed area where the land is primarily used for farming, forestry, resource extraction, very low-density residential uses (one unit per 10 acres or less) or open space uses.

Urban Service Area: A defined area, not always coincidental with a municipality's corporate boundaries, that defines the geographical limits of government-supplied public utilities (such as water, gas, electricity, and sewer) and services (such as police, fire, schools, parks, and recreation).

Source: A Glossary of Zoning, Development, and Planning Terms, American Planning Association, edited by Michael Davidson and Fay Dolnick

Planning Committee Report

Orange County/City of Orlando Consolidation of Services Study Commission

APPENDIX D, ORANGE COUNTY AND CITY OF ORLANDO STANDARDS FOR SEVEN SERVICE AREAS, to the Planning Committee

Table of Contents

D.1 Orange County Adopted Level of Service Standards

D.2 City of Orlando Adopted Level of Service Standards

Planning Committee Report

Orange County/City of Orlando Consolidation of Services Study Commission

Appendix D.1 Orange County Adopted Level of Service Standards

(Received from Michael Rigby, AICP, Senior Planner, Research and Strategic Planning Section, Orange County Planning Division, 2:39 p.m., March 6, 2006, in an e-mail, Subject: Adopted Levels of Service)

Transportation Element

OBJECTIVE 1.1 The County will continue to enforce minimum level-of-service standards on County roads and State roads within unincorporated Orange County.

POLICIES

1.1.1 The generalized peak hour level-of-service for roadways identified within the Florida Intrastate Highway System shall be as follows:

Service	Urban Expansion Areas, FIHS	Urban Urbanized <u>Area *</u> D**	Rural <u>Area*</u> B**
---------	--------------------------------	--	----------------------------------

* As defined by MetroPlan Orlando

1.1.2 The generalized peak hour level-of-service for Orange County shall be as follows:

County and State Maintained Roads

Service	Urban Expansion Areas, Freeways Principal Arterials Minor Arterial Collectors	Urban Urbanized <u>Area *</u> D** E** E** E**	Rural Service Area <u>Rural Settlements</u> B** D** D** D**
---------	---	---	--

* Includes Approved Specific Area Plans in Horizon West

** Level of Service A – free flow – individual users are unaffected by the presence of others in the traffic stream

Level of Service B – stable flow – presence of other users in the traffic stream begins to be noticeable

Planning Committee Report

Orange County/City of Orlando Consolidation of Services Study Commission

Level of Service C – stable flow – marks the beginning of the range in which the operation of individual users becomes significantly affected by the presence of others

Level of Service D – high density but stable flow – speed and freedom to maneuver are severely restricted

Level of Service E – represents operating conditions at or near capacity level. All speeds are reduced to a low, but relatively uniform value

Level of Service F – is used to define forced or breakdown flow. This condition exists whenever the amount of traffic approaching a point exceeds the amount which can traverse the point

(Source for Level of Service Definitions: Susan McCune, AICP, Project Manager, Transportation Planning Division, Orange County Public Works Department, 3:13 p.m., March 7th, 2006, in an e-mail, Subject: Level of Service Standards)

Capital Improvement Element

OBJECTIVE 1.3 Orange County shall regulate growth by requiring the adopted level of service standards for traffic circulation, mass transit, recreation, potable water, sanitary sewer, solid waste, and storm water management to be maintained through public or private investment.

POLICIES

- 1.3.1 Public facilities and services consistent with the adopted level of service standards must be available concurrent with the impacts of new development or expansion of service areas, consistent with 9J-5.0055(2), F.A.C.
- 1.3.2 (Please see Transportation Element, Policy 1.1.1.)
(Amend. 12/00, Ord.#00-25)
- 1.3.3 The level of service standard for transit is 73,500 person trips per day transit capacity, consistent with Transportation Policy 1.6.1.
(Amend. 12/00, Ord.#00-25)
- 1.3.4 When central water service from Orange County Public Utilities is required for development, the level of service standard shall be 350 gallons per day per equivalent residential unit.
- 1.3.5 When central sewer from Orange County Public Utilities is required for development, the level of service standard shall be 300 gallons per day per equivalent residential unit.

Planning Committee Report

Orange County/City of Orlando Consolidation of Services Study Commission

- 1.3.6 The level of service standard for solid waste is to maintain a landfill capacity to accommodate solid waste generated at a rate of 6.0 lbs/ person/day.
- 1.3.7 The level of service standards for recreation are 1.5 acres/1,000 population for publicly owned activity-based parks, and 6.0 acres/1,000 population for publicly owned resource-based parks.
- 1.3.8 Orange County shall maintain a level of service standard, for new and existing development, based on the following storm water quantity and quality criteria:

- A. Design storm based on 24 hour minimum.

<u>FACILITY</u>	<u>DESIGN STORM</u>
Bridges	50 Year
Canals, ditches, or culverts for drainage external to the development	25 Year
Cross drains, storm sewers	10 Year
Roadside swales for drainage internal to the development	10 Year
Detention basins	25 Year
Retention basins (no positive outfall)	100 Year

- B. Pollution abatement shall be accomplished by requiring storm water management systems to retain or detain with filtration, the first one-half inch of run-off from developed sites, or the run-off generated from the first inch of rainfall on developed sites, whichever is greater.
- C. Orange County shall require a retention/detention system that limits peak discharge of a developed site to the discharge from the site in an undeveloped condition during a 24-hour/25-year frequency storm event.

Planning Committee Report

Orange County/City of Orlando Consolidation of Services Study Commission

- D. Orange County shall require, prior to development approval, that projects receive appropriate permits from State agencies to comply with the rules and regulations for storm water facility design, performance and discharge.
- E. Discharged storm water run-off shall not degrade receiving surface water bodies below the minimum conditions as established by State water quality standards (17-302 and 17-40.420, Florida Administrative Code).

Planning Committee Report

Orange County/City of Orlando Consolidation of Services Study Commission

Appendix D.2 City of Orlando Adopted Level of Service Standards

(Received from Linda Rhinesmith, Economic Development Manager, City of Orlando, 4:14 p.m., March 20th, 2006, in an e-mail, Subject: LOS standards)

WASTEWATER

The following wastewater LOS standards apply to new and existing development:

Land Use	Gallons Per Day	Unit
Single Family	250	Dwelling Unit
Multi Family	190	Dwelling Unit
Office	0.08	Square Feet
Commercial	0.09	Square Feet
Industrial	0.12	Square Feet
Lodging	119	Room
Hospital	0.08	Square Feet
Government	0.08	Square Feet

PARKS AND RECREATION

The following parks and recreation LOS standards apply to new and existing residential development:

Combined Community/Neighborhood Parks	3.25 acres/1,000 population
Individual Community Park Sectors	1.3 acres/1,000 population
Individual Neighborhood Park Service Areas	0.75 acres/1,000 population

SOLID WASTE

The following solid waste LOS standards apply to new and existing development:

Land Use	Pounds Per Day	Unit	Minimum Pick Up
Residential	4.54	Unit	Twice a Week
Non-Residential	0.009	Square Feet	Twice a Week
Hotel	5.70	Room	Twice a Week

POTABLE WATER

The following potable water LOS standards apply to new and existing development:

Land Use	LOS Without Reclaimed Water	LOS With Reclaimed Water
Single-Family	325 g/du/d	160 g/du/d
Multi-Family	200 g/du/d	200 g/du/d
Hotel	187 g/rm/d	187 g/rm/d
Commercial	0.13 g/sqft/d	0.13 g/sqft/d
Office	0.15 g/sqft/d	0.15 g/sqft/d
Industrial	0.22 g/sqft/d	0.22 g/sqft/d
Government	0.15 g/sqft/d	0.15 g/sqft/d
Hospital	0.22 g/sqft/d	0.22 g/sqft/d

Minimum Line Pressure

50 psi
40 psi
25 psi

Demand condition

Average Day
Peak Day
Peak Day + Fire Flow

Planning Committee Report

Orange County/City of Orlando Consolidation of Services Study Commission

STORMWATER The following Stormwater LOS standards apply to new development:

Facility	LOS Standard
City Primary	Design Storm: 25 year/24 hour Max Flood Stage: 100 yr/3 day below floor elevations Max. Hydraulic Grade Line (HGL): at gutter elevation for 25 year/6 hour storm
City Secondary	Design Storm: 10 year/6 hour Max. HGL: 1' below gutter elevation Check Storm: 25 year/6 hour Max HGL: at gutter elevation
City Tertiary	Design Storm: 10 year/6 hour Max. HGL: 1' below gutter elevation Check Storm: 25 year/6 hour Max. HGL: at gutter elevation
Arterial Road	Roadway Section and Inlet Design: 10 year/6 hour storm Minimum 2' between seasonal high water table and bottom of base course.
Collector Road	Roadway Section and Inlet Design: 5 year/6 hour storm Minimum 1' between seasonal high water table and bottom of base course
Minor Road	Roadway Section and Inlet Design: 3 year/6 hour storm Minimum 1" between seasonal high water table and bottom of base course.
Travel Lane Spread	12 feet for all roads; roads with parking lane, width measured from face to curb to centerline outermost travel lane; clearance between design water surface and top of curb – 1"
Max. Run Distance	400 feet to first inlet
Retention Ponds	Retain the greater of: -first ½ inch of runoff, or -runoff from the first 1 inch of rain; separate from detention system
Detention Ponds	Design Storm: 25 year/24 hour Detain the volume necessary to restrict post development peak runoff to predevelopment peak runoff.
Detention Ponds	Same as above plus storage (landlocked basins) on-site for the 100 year/ 24 hour storm.
Floodprone Areas	Development allowed in 100 year floodplain with compensatory storage loss and floodstage increases less than one foot from the base elevation.

Planning Committee Report

Orange County/City of Orlando Consolidation of Services Study Commission

TRANSPORTATION

Major thoroughfares outside the Transportation Concurrency Exception Area with an adopted LOS standard of "F" shall not be significantly degraded. Significant degradation means traffic increases exceeding the following percentages over the adopted vehicles per hour per land (vphpl) standards:

Limited Access Facilities

- 4 lanes 29%
- 6 lanes 18

Arterials and Collectors

- 2 Lanes Undivided 56%
- 4 Lanes Undivided 34%
- 4 Lanes Divided 25%
- 6 Lanes Divided 17%

One-Way Roads

- 2 Lanes 25%
- 3 Lanes 17%
- 4 Lanes 15%

Constrained Facilities

- 4 or 6 Lanes 10%

All other thoroughfares have a LOS standard E.

Planning Committee Report

Orange County/City of Orlando Consolidation of Services Study Commission

APPENDIX E, TOTAL PLANNING STAFF EMPLOYED IN ORANGE COUNTY AS COMPARED TO THE TOTALS FOR HILLSBOROUGH AND PINELLAS COUNTIES, to the Planning Committee Report

INCORPORATED ORANGE COUNTY CITY/TOWN	Total Number of Planning Employees
• Apopka	Total staff: 4 3 Planners/1 Non-Planner
• Belle Isle	Total staff: 1 1 Planner
• Eatonville	Total staff: 3 2 Planners/1 Non-Planner
• Edgewood	Total staff: 1 City Clerk
• Maitland	Total staff: 17 5 Planners/12 Non-Planners
• Oakland	Total staff: 1
• Ocoee	Total staff: 7 4 Planners/3 Non-Planners
• Windermere	Total staff: 1 1 Planner
• Winter Garden <i>(Information taken off Winter Gardens official website)</i>	Total staff: 5 3 Planners/2 Non-Planners
• Winter Park	Total staff: 11 5 Planners/6 Non-Planners
• SUB TOTAL	Total staff: 51 24 Planners
• Orange County	Total Staff: 63
• City of Orlando	Total staff: 25
TOTAL ORANGE COUNTY	Planners: 112
INCORPORATED HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY CITY/TOWN	Total Number of Planning Employees
• Tampa	Total planning staff: 0
• Plant City	Total: 2 Planners
• Temple Terrace	Total: 1 Planner
• SUB TOTAL	Total; 3 Planners
• Hillsborough County	Planning and Growth Management: 88 Planners/19 Non-Planners
• Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission	Total staff: 60 (12 of the 60 are MPO who do transportation planning)
TOTAL HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY	Total: 170 Planners: 151

Planning Committee Report

Orange County/City of Orlando Consolidation of Services Study Commission

INCORPORATED PINELLAS COUNTY CITY/TOWN	Total Number of Planning Employees
Belleair	1
Belleair Beach	1
Belleair Bluff	1
Belleair Shore	0
Clearwater	12
Dunedin	2
Gulf Port	2
Indian Rocks Beach	2
Indian Shores	1
Kenneth City	0
Largo	7
City of Madeira Beach	1
North Redington Beach	0
City of Oldsmar	2
City of Pinellas Park	3
Town of Redington Beach	3
Town of Redington Shores	0
City of Safe Harbor	2
City of St. Pete Beach	2
City of St. Petersburg	21
City of Seminole	1
City of South Pasadena	1
City of tarpon Springs	3
City of Treasure Island	2
SUB TOTAL	70
Pinellas County	20
Pinellas County Planning Council	7
TOTAL PINELLAS COUNTY	97
RECAP	
TOTAL PLANNERS - ORANGE COUNTY	112
TOTAL PLANNERS - HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY	151
TOTAL PLANNERS - PINELLAS COUNTY	97

Planning Committee Report

Orange County/City of Orlando Consolidation of Services Study Commission

APPENDIX F, LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMPREHENSIVE CERTIFICATION AGREEMENT (LGCPA), to the Planning Committee Report

(Received from Kevin R. Tyjeski, AICP, Chief Planner – Long Range Planning, City of Orlando, 4:57 p.m., February 20, 2006, in an e-mail, Subject: Planning Committee Report Input)

Mr. O'Neil:

The City of Orlando's Local Government Comprehensive Planning Certification Agreement (LGCPA) and Annual Reports are posted on the following web site:

http://www.cityoforlando.net/planning/cityplanning/Certification/Cert_Agreement.htm

Under the LGCPA, most of the City's Growth Management Plan (GMP) amendments are exempt from state and regional review. However, the City is still subject to the twice per year limitation on Regular GMP amendments. In addition, the following GMP amendments are not exempt from state and regional review:

1. Plan amendments that change the boundary of the Certification Area;
2. Plan amendments that propose a rural land stewardship area, pursuant to Section 163.3177(11)(d), Florida Statutes;
3. Plan amendments that propose an optional sector plan, pursuant to Section 163.3245, Florida Statutes;
4. Plan amendments that propose a school facilities element;
5. Plan amendments that update a comprehensive plan based on an evaluation and appraisal report;
6. Plan amendments that impact lands outside the Certification Area (i.e., amendments needed to assign City future land use designations to annexed property);
7. Plan amendments that implement new statutory requirements that require specific comprehensive plan amendments;
8. Plan amendments that increase hurricane evacuation times or increase the need for shelter capacity on lands within the coastal high hazard area;

Planning Committee Report

Orange County/City of Orlando Consolidation of Services Study Commission

9. Plan amendments that implement the water supply planning requirements pursuant to Section 163.3177(6)(c), Florida Statutes; and

10. Plan amendments for proposed DRIs and plan amendments to existing DRIs undergoing substantial deviation review pursuant to s. 380.06(19), Florida Statutes.

In exchange for this benefit, the City is required to monitor a series of baseline conditions, pursue several community development goals, and submit an annual report indicating any changes to the baseline conditions and progress in achieving the community development goals. Progress to date is summarized in the Annual Report available on the City's web site. If you have specific questions, please feel free to call me.

Kevin R. Tyjeski, AICP
Chief Planner - Long Range Planning
City of Orlando
P.O. Box 4990
400 South Orange Avenue
Orlando, FL 32802-4990
Phone: (407) 246-3387
Fax: (407) 246-2895