

~~V.6 DRAFT Planning Committee Report~~

~~(Updated 03/30/06) (V.6.F 03/28/06)~~

~~V.6.0 Contents~~

- ~~—V.6.1 Members~~
- ~~—V.6.2 Meeting Schedule and Presenters~~
- ~~—V.6.3 Executive Summary~~
- ~~—V.6.4 Side-By-Side Comparison~~
- ~~—V.6.5 Findings~~
- ~~—V.6.6 Conclusions~~
- ~~—V.6.7 Recommendations~~

~~—Appendix V.6.A, Meeting Schedule and Presenters~~ PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT

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
Appendix V.6.B, Total Planning Staff Employed in Orange County as Compared to the Total for Pinellas County	
—Appendix V.6.C, Glossary of Planning Terms Used in This Report	Appendix C
—Appendix V.6.D, Local Government Comprehensive Certification Agreement (LGCCA)	
—Appendix V.6.E, Orange County and City of Orlando <u>Levels of Standards for for</u> Seven Service Areas	Appendix D
—Appendix V.6.F, Side-By-Side Comparison	

~~V.6.1 Members~~—The Planning Committee Members were:

- ~~—Jimmy Goff~~—Chairman
- ~~—Don Ammerman~~—Member
- ~~—Monty Knox~~—Member
- ~~—Frances Pignone~~—Member
- ~~—Kathy Putnam~~—Member
- ~~—Scott Gabrielson~~—Member

~~V.6.2 Meeting Schedule and Presenters~~

~~V.6 DRAFT Planning Committee Report~~

~~The Planning Committee held its first meeting on December 30, 2005 and concluded its deliberations on March 16th, 2006. The Committee meeting dates and presenters are shown in Appendix V.6.A.~~

~~V.6.3 Executive Summary~~

~~(To be written after final decision on recommendations)~~

~~V.6.4 Side-By-Side Comparison and Glossary~~

~~The Purchasing Services Side-By-Side Comparison is at Appendix V.6.F. The Side-By-Side presents data the Committee thought relevant to their deliberations~~

~~and conclusions. To help readers of this report to understand the terminology used in this Report, a glossary of planning terms used in this report is at Appendix V.6.C.~~

~~V.6.5 Findings~~

~~The Committee finds that:~~

~~V.6.5.1 The Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission (HCCCPC) (Source: Ray Chiaramonte, HCCCPC):~~

~~The HCCCPC was established in 1950. Because no long-range planning was going on, 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.~~

~~The HCCCPC prepares the Comprehensive Land Use Plan for the four jurisdictions of Hillsborough County.~~

~~The HCCCPC has a staff of 60 who are under the County civil service workers (12 of the 60 are MPO members who do 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 limiting opportunity in the County somewhat, it promotes redevelopment in a city.~~

~~The HCCCPC is funded by ad valorem taxes according to a formula, but it goes through the County budget process.~~

~~V.6 DRAFT Planning Committee Report~~

- ~~—The HCCGPC look at things in comprehensive way, that is, in its deliberations the HCCGPC considers the impact of planning decisions on all jurisdictions.~~
- ~~—As regards to annexations, the HCCGPC only gets involved if a land use change is requested in connection with the annexation.~~
- ~~—The HCCGPC makes recommendations to a Board. The HCCGPC has a 90% Board agreement rate with their recommendations. Both the media and citizens are supportive of the HCCGPC. The HCCGPC has a full time media person.~~
- ~~—Hillsborough County and all of its cities but one, Tampa, have planning departments. Tampa has relied on the HCCGPC for planning; now Tampa desires to have its own planning staff. The HCCGPC works at a higher level than those planning staffs, that is, at a more comprehensive, long-range, broader level.~~
- ~~—The HCCGPC prepares and recommends the comprehensive plans for all jurisdictions.~~
- ~~—State law governs the HCCGPC duties and responsibilities.~~
- ~~—The HCCGPC reviews capital improvements (Capital Improvements Programs) of each jurisdiction for consistency with the Comprehensive Plan.~~
- ~~—The HCCGPC has not been able to standardize land use codes for the entire county.~~
- ~~—The HCCGPC would like to get a dedicated funding source tied to population growth.~~
- ~~—The HCCGPC does proactive planning; that is, when it recognizes a problem, it recommends a fix; for example, it developed a “livable roadways” program for the County in response to the HCCGPC observation that roadways did not have an attractive appearance.~~
- ~~—The HCCGPC reviews every zoning action for consistency with the Comprehensive Plan.~~

~~V.6.5.2 Tallahassee and Leon County Planning Department (unless otherwise noted, the source was: Fred Goodrow, Tallahassee and Leon County Planning Department):~~

- ~~—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~~

~~V.6 DRAFT Planning Committee Report~~

~~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 CDP 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.~~
- ~~They are looked on as a planning resource, and do get involved with infrastructure planning (i.e. water, sewer, roads).~~
- ~~They are preparing the Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR) for the entire Plan.~~

~~V.6.5.3 Pinellas County Planning Council:~~

- ~~Created by a special act of State Legislature in 1973 and a Charter Amendment in 1988.~~
- ~~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 county plan, but cannot exceed the parameters of the countywide plan. There is consistency in density, definitions, etc.~~
- ~~They are holding workshop to educate communities on the EAR so that each communities can prepare its EAR.~~
- ~~Ten 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.~~

~~V.6 DRAFT Planning Committee Report~~

~~The Pinellas County Planning Council doesn't reach far beyond comprehensive planning; for example, it doesn't plan down to the utility level. Redevelopment is a major concern now. The Pinellas County Planning Council has a countywide Redevelopment Plan.~~

~~V.6.5.4 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.~~

~~V.6.5.5 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.~~

~~V.6.5.6 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, storm water and transit. The City of Orlando and Orange County's adopted level of service standards are different in each area. See Appendix V.6.E for Orange County and City of Orlando standards for seven service areas.~~

~~V.6.5.7 Figure V.6.2 compares the planning staffs total for Orange County and Orange County municipalities against the total of the staffs for Pinellas County.~~

~~V.6.5.8 The City of Orlando is one of two municipalities statewide (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 the twice per year limitation on Regular GMP amendments. 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 community development goals. (Source: Dean Grandin, City of Orlando City Planner) (Note: More information is at Appendix V.6.D, Local Government Comprehensive Certification Agreement [LGCPA].)~~

~~V.6.5.9 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 that growth possible.~~

~~In 1991, in response to changes in Florida's growth management legislation,~~

~~V.6 DRAFT Planning Committee Report~~

~~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 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 to 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.~~

- ~~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 (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 these 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.~~

~~**V.6.5.10** 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 (one according to a formula with the funding going through the county budget process and one by a set millage) and the other is funded by the general fund.~~

~~**V.6.5.11** Florida Statutes 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~~

~~V.6 DRAFT Planning Committee Report~~

~~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 a 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)~~

~~V.6.5.12 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 lots of evidence of cooperation and communication between the staffs.~~

~~V.6.6 Conclusions~~

~~Upon conclusion of deliberations the Committee unanimously determined:~~

~~V.6.6.1 Planning done in a comprehensive way would result in better intergovernmental cooperation, probably save money through avoidance of duplication of service provision, and better serve citizens.~~

~~V.6.6.2 Both Orange County and the City of Orlando have good Comprehensive Plans.~~

~~V.6.6.3 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.~~

~~V.6.6.4 Concurrence is a complex issue that needs further refinement throughout the state and cannot simply be resolved by Orange County and City of Orlando efforts. 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.~~

~~V.6.6.5 The efforts of the planning staffs of Orange County and the City of Orlando are very professional and commendable.~~

~~V.6 DRAFT Planning Committee Report~~

~~V.6.7 Recommendations~~

~~Consolidation of the Orange County and City of Orlando Planning services was studied for efficiencies in service delivery, economies of scale, opportunities for enhanced intergovernmental cooperation, and other related issues. The Committee recommends:~~

~~**V.6.7.1**— 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.~~

~~**V.6.7.2**— That Orange County and the City of Orlando explore creating common elements and terminology in respective Land Development Codes, including such areas as landscape standards, sign regulations, etc.~~

~~**V.6.7.3**— That Orange County and the City of Orlando should jointly plan for parks, fire, schools, roads and other critical infrastructure needs.~~

~~**V.6.7.4**— That Orange County and 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).~~

~~**V.6.7.5**— That Orange County and the City of Orlando should coordinate the development and methodology for Impact fees.~~

V.6 ~~DRAFT~~ Planning Committee Report

APPENDIX V.6.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	

~~V.6 DRAFT Planning Committee Report~~

APPENDIX V.6.B, TOTAL PLANNING STAFF EMPLOYED IN ORANGE COUNTY AS COMPARED TO THE TOTAL FOR PINELLAS COUNTY to the Planning Committee Report

V.6 ~~DRAFT~~ Planning Committee Report

TOTAL PLANNING STAFF EMPLOYED IN ORANGE COUNTY AS COMPARED TO THE TOTAL FOR PINELLAS COUNTY		
Incorporated Orange County City/Town	Total Number of Planning Employees	How Many Work on Comprehensive Land Use Plan
—Apopka	Total staff: 4 3 Planners/1 Non-Planner	2 Planners
—Belle Isle	Total staff: 1 1 Planner	Contract w/consultant
—Eatonville	Total staff: 3 2 Planners/1 Non-Planner	Contract w/consultant
—Edgewood	Total staff: 1 City Clerk	Contract w/consultant
—Maitland	Total staff: 17 5 Planners/12 Non-Planners	3 Planners
—Oakland	Total staff: 1	1 Planner (Amendments only—getting ready to re-write & will be contracting with consultant for that purpose)
—Ocoee	Total staff: 7 4 Planners/3 Non-Planners	1 Planner
—Windermere	Total staff: 1 1 Planner	1 Planner
—Winter Garden (Information taken off Winter Gardens official website)	Total staff: 5 3 Planners/2 Non-Planners	Did not provide information
—Winter Park	Total staff: 11 5 Planners/6 Non-Planners	3 Planners (Every 10 years seek service of an outside consultant for update)
—SUB TOTAL	Total staff: 51 26 Planners/25 Non-Planners	Planners: 14 Consultant Contracts: 5 contracts
—Orange County	Total Staff: 63	
—City of Orlando	Total staff: 24	
—MPO	?	
TOTAL ORANGE COUNTY	Total staff: 138+	
Incorporated Orange County City/Town		
—Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission	Total staff: 60 (12 of the 60 are MPO who do transportation planning)	
—Tampa	Total planning staff: 0	
—Plant City	Total: 2 Planners	
—Temple Terrace	Total: 1 Planner	
—Hillsborough County (source: Paula Harvey)	Planning and Growth Management: 200+ Planning and Zoning Division Total: 47 29 Planners	0
TOTAL HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY	Total: Planners	
TOTAL PINNELLAS COUNTY	Total: Planners	

~~V.6 DRAFT Planning Committee Report~~

~~APPENDIX V.6.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.)~~

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

~~V.6 DRAFT Planning Committee Report~~

~~**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*~~

~~V.6 DRAFT Planning Committee Report~~

~~APPENDIX V.6.D, 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;~~
- ~~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.~~

~~V.6 DRAFT Planning Committee Report~~

~~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~~

~~APPENDIX V.6.E, ORANGE COUNTY AND CITY OF ORLANDO STANDARDS FOR SEVEN SERVICE AREAS to the Planning Committee~~

~~Table of Contents~~

~~V.6 DRAFT Planning Committee Report~~

~~V.6.E.1 Orange County Adopted Level of Service Standards~~

~~V.6.E.2 City of Orlando Adopted Level of Service Standards~~

~~Appendix V.6.E.1 Orange County Adopted Level of Service Standards~~

V.6 ~~DRAFT Planning Committee Report~~

~~(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,	Urban	Rural
		<u>Area *</u>	<u>Area*</u>
	FIHS	D**	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,	Urban	Rural Service Area
		<u>Area *</u>	<u>Rural Settlements</u>
	Freeways	D**	B**
	Principal Arterials	E**	D**
	Minor Arterial	E**	D**
	Collectors	E**	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

- 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

~~V.6 DRAFT Planning Committee Report~~

~~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.

~~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.

~~V.6 DRAFT Planning Committee Report~~

~~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.~~

FACILITY	DESIGN STORM
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.~~

~~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~~

~~V.6 DRAFT Planning Committee Report~~

~~established by State water quality standards (17-302 and 17-40.420, Florida Administrative Code).~~

V.6 ~~DRAFT~~ Planning Committee Report

Appendix V.6.E.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	400	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

V.6 ~~DRAFT~~ Planning Committee Report

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.

~~V.6 DRAFT Planning Committee Report~~

~~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	20%
—6 lanes	48
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	40%

~~All other thoroughfares have a LOS standard E.~~

~~—Total Planning Staff Employed in Orange County~~
~~As Compared to the Total for Pinellas County Appendix E~~
~~Local Government Comprehensive Certification Agreement (LGCCA) Appendix F~~

V.6 DRAFT Planning Committee Report

PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT

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 August 30, 2005 and met on six 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

~~V.6 DRAFT Planning Committee Report~~

politics and to have a planning commission that would make recommendations to the elected representatives of Hillsborough County.

- The HCCCPC prepares the Comprehensive Land Use Plan for the four jurisdictions of Hillsborough County.
- The HCCCPC has a staff of 60 who are under the 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.

~~V.6 DRAFT Planning Committee Report~~

- o The HCCCPC would like to get a dedicated funding source tied to population growth.
- o 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.
- o 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:

- o 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).
- o 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.
- o The Tallahassee and Leon County Planning Department is funded out of the general fund.
- o 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).
- o 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:

~~V.6 DRAFT Planning Committee Report~~

- o Created by a special act of the State Legislature in 1973 and a Charter Amendment in 1988.
- o The Pinellas County Planning Council has 13 members representing 25 entities (1 county, 24 cities).
- o The Pinellas County Planning Council prepares and administers the countywide Comprehensive Land Use Plan.
- o 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.
- o The Pinellas County Planning Council is holding workshops to educate communities on the EAR so that each community can prepare its EAR.
- o 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.
- o The Pinellas County Planning Council is funded by a separate ad valorem millage rate (0.020) under their charter.
- o 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

~~V.6 DRAFT Planning Committee Report~~

area. See Appendix D for the Orange County and City of Orlando levels of standards for the seven service areas.

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.

- o 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.
- o 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.

V.6 DRAFT Planning Committee Report

- o 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.

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:

~~V.6 DRAFT Planning Committee Report~~

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.

V.6 DRAFT Planning Committee Report

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.