

**PASCO COUNTY
BIANNUAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT NO. BCPA05-2(11)
2005 - SECOND CYCLE
COUNTY COMMISSION DISTRICT 1
CITIZENS' ADVISORY COMMITTEE PLANNING DISTRICT 5**

SUMMARY

Case Number: BCPA05-2(11)

Applicant: Evans Properties, Inc. (Prospect Nursery Property)

Owner: Evans Properties, Inc.

Agent: WilsonMiller, Inc.

Location: The subject area is located in East Central Pasco County, south of Prospect Road, one mile west of Handcart Road; Section 13, Township 25 South, Range 20 East.

Parcel ID No.: 13-25-20-0000-00600-0000

Acreage: 220 Acres, m.o.l.

Adopted Future Land Use (FLU) Classification: AG (Agricultural)

Proposed FLU Classification: RES-3 (Residential - 3 du/ga)

I. Summary

Section 163.3187, Florida Statutes (F.S.), allows a local government to process Comprehensive Plan Amendments not more than two times during any calendar year. This is the second of two cycles for the Year 2005.

Prospect Nursery is a proposed 653-dwelling-unit residential development. The applicant is requesting a change to the FLU Map from AG (Agricultural) to RES-3 (Residential - 3 du/ga). The AG (Agricultural) land use has a density of one unit per ten gross acres or 0.1 dwelling unit per gross acre. The RES-3 (Residential - 3 du/ga) land use has a density of three dwelling units per gross acre.

The FLU classifications for the surrounding area are AG (Agricultural) to the south, east, and west and RES-1 (Residential - 1 du/ga) to the north. The subject parcel is zoned A-C Agricultural. Zoning of the surrounding area to the north, south, east, and west is A-C Agricultural. Two 10-acre parcels to the northwest are zoned A-R Agricultural-Residential. To the southeast is Lange Farm Equestrian Village MPUD Master Planned Unit Development. The project contains 152 acres and is approved for 37 dwelling units. Sixty-one percent of the site is set aside as an agricultural preserve. The FLU classification of the MPUD Master Planned Unit Development is AG (Agricultural). The character of this area of the County is rural-residential and agricultural. The surrounding uses are pasture land, orange groves, single-family residences on large lots, and timber land. Residential development of the areas within two miles of the subject property has been developed at densities of 0.24, 0.26, 0.27, and 0.95 unit per acre. Class II wetlands exist on 20 acres of the northern and southeastern portions of the subject property. Water and sewer are currently not available nor planned at this time for this section of the County. There are no transportation improvements planned, programmed, or funded for Prospect Road.

Developing the site at a density of RES-3 (Residential - 3 du/ga) will create urban sprawl within the area and is incompatible with the existing pattern of development. The development will increase daily vehicle trips from 257 to 5,834. The roads in this area are rural roads and are not designed for this increased density.

This proposed amendment is located in Pasco County Citizens' Advisory Committee (CAC) Planning District 5. During the evaluation and appraisal of the current Comprehensive Plan, one of the issues identified by the CAC was to protect and retain the rural character of the land while allowing for the protection and development of agricultural property rights. It is also important to note that CAC Planning District 2 also raised a similar issue of protection of the rural lifestyle at a low development density for which there is a rural study underway to address the elements of rural character and

protection of the unique characteristics of Northeast Pasco County, which is occurring approximately two miles north of this property.

The increase in density from one unit per ten acres to three units per acre could potentially impact the rural character of this area when development patterns and trends are not supportive of a higher density for the planning horizon. To protect the agricultural character of the land while preserving property rights will require clustering options and the preservation of open space.

The Growth Management Department staff cannot support the FLU Map change to RES-3 (Residential - 3 du/ga) due to the following: 1) there are no current or proposed public facilities in the area; 2) for this type of development, the current road network of two lanes does not have the capacity, and there are no future plans for expansion; 3) the development is not consistent with the surrounding pattern of development and land uses of AG (Agricultural) and AG/R (Agricultural/Rural); and 4) staff expressed to the applicant that as proposed, a development of this magnitude would create urban sprawl because the infrastructure and public services are not present in this area. It was suggested by Growth Management Department staff that the applicant develop the property as an agricultural MPUD Master Planned Unit Development (AG [Agricultural] and MPUD Master Planned Unit Development) similar to Lange Equestrian Village MPUD which would require setting aside significant acreage as open space while clustering dwelling units. However, the applicant was not supportive of staff's recommendation. Developing the site at a density of RES-3 (Residential - 3 du/ga) will create urban sprawl within the area. The development will increase daily vehicle trips from 257 to 5,834 additional trips, causing traffic congestion within the area.

II. Benefits/Costs Generated by the Proposed Amendment

Anticipated monetary benefits generated from the proposed amendment include temporary construction-related jobs, impact fees, and sales and gas-tax revenues. The applicant has not determined the price level of housing that would be built on the property; therefore, it cannot be determined at this time if the impact fees and property taxes generated would be enough to off set the infrastructure improvements necessary for building and maintaining the infrastructure. Under most circumstances, residential development consumes more in services than it contributes to the County tax base. Any calculation made would be speculative at best and any infrastructure improvements would not be a prudent investment to be undertaken by the County. Direct monetary costs would include, but not be limited to, construction of infrastructure to accommodate the increased demand for roads, water, sewer, stormwater, solid waste, schools, parks, libraries, sheriff, and fire and rescue services systems. Impact fees would defray the costs, but would not be enough to completely pay for the entire costs. The Utilities Department has indicated that it is not providing water and sewer service to this area of the County. Any infrastructure investment to this area would not be a cost-effective operation for the County. In fact, as evidenced by the Utilities Department's response, it would be cost prohibitive.

III. Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends denial of the applicant's request.

**PASCO COUNTY
BIANNUAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT NO. BCPA05-2(11)
2005 - SECOND CYCLE
COUNTY COMMISSION DISTRICT 1
CITIZENS' ADVISORY COMMITTEE PLANNING DISTRICT 5**

REPORT

Case Number: BCPA05-2(11)

Applicant: Evans Properties, Inc. (Prospect Nursery Property)

Owner: Evans Properties, Inc.

Agent: WilsonMiller, Inc.

Location: The subject area is located in East Central Pasco County, south of Prospect Road, one mile west of Handcart Road; Section 13, Township 25 South, Range 20 East.

Parcel ID No.: 13-25-20-0000-00600-0000

Acreage: 220 Acres, m.o.l.

Adopted FLU Classification: AG (Agricultural)

Proposed FLU Classification: RES-3 (Residential - 3 du/ga)

I. Site Characteristics

A. Soil

Development potential of the site is based upon the soil classifications found on the subject property. Data from the Soil Survey of Pasco County states that development limitations are classified as slight, moderate, or severe. Development limitations are considered slight, if soil properties and site features are generally favorable for the indicated use and limitations are minor and easily overcome; moderate, if soil properties or site features are not favorable for the indicated use; and severe, if soil properties or site features are so unfavorable or so difficult to overcome that special design, significant increases in construction cost, and possibly increased maintenance are required. Special feasibility studies may be required where the soil limitations are severe.

Slight soils on the property include Tavares, Lochloosa, and Millhopper and represent approximately one-third of the subject property. Moderate soils on the property include Sparr, Narcoossee, Adamsville, and Newman; and these soils represent approximately one-third of the subject property. Severe soils include Pomona, Myakka, Sellers, Placid, Basinger, and Immokalee and represent approximately one-third of the subject property.

B. Flood Plain

The subject property is located in Flood Zone "X," which is an area that is determined to be outside the 100- and 500-year floodplains. However, due to the presence of wetlands on the property, the Pasco County Design/Stormwater Division has raised some concerns about the discharge of stormwater from the property. Pasco County is currently drafting a stormwater ordinance which will create and regulate drainage basins of special concern. This property would fall under the more stringent stormwater rules of that ordinance.

C. Wetlands

There are 20.48 acres of wetlands located in the northern and southeastern portions of the 220-acre parcel. There is also 0.19 acre of lake acreage on the parcel. This consists of a reservoir in the northeast portion of the parcel. The wetlands on the property are Class II wetlands. Class II wetlands consist of isolated wetland or formerly isolated wetlands, which by way of man's activities, have been directly connected to other surface-water drainage and are greater or equal to five acres.

D. Historic/Archaeological Sites

Data from the Pasco County Geodetic Mapping Section indicates there are no known historical or archaeological sites on the subject property.

II. Background

Prospect Nursery is a proposed 653-dwelling-unit residential development. The applicant is requesting a change to the FLU Map from AG (Agricultural) to RES-3 (Residential - 3 du/ga). The AG (Agricultural) land use has a density of one unit per ten gross acres or 0.1 dwelling unit per gross acre. The RES-3 (Residential - 3 du/ga) land use has a density of three dwelling units per gross acre.

The FLU classifications for the surrounding area are AG (Agricultural) to the south, east, and west and RES-1 (Residential - 1 du/ga) to the north. The subject parcel is zoned A-C Agricultural. Zoning of the surrounding area to the north, south, east, and west is A-C Agricultural. Two 10-acre parcels to the northwest are zoned A-R Agricultural-Residential. To the southeast is Lange Farm Equestrian Village MPUD Master Planned Unit Development. The project contains 152 acres and is approved for 37 dwelling units. Sixty-one percent of the site is set aside as an agricultural preserve. The FLU classification of the MPUD Master Planned Unit Development is AG (Agricultural). The character of this area of the County is rural-residential and agricultural. The current land use is primarily agricultural and includes citrus groves. The surrounding uses are pasture land, orange groves, single-family residences on large lots, and timber land. Residential development of the areas within two miles of the subject property has been developed at densities of 0.24, 0.26, 0.27, and 0.95 units per acre. Class II wetlands exist on 20 acres of the northern and southeastern portions of the subject property. Water and sewer is currently not available nor planned at this time for this section of the County. There are no transportation improvements planned, programmed, or funded for Prospect Road.

Developing the site at a density of RES-3 (Residential - 3 du/ga) will create urban sprawl within the area and is incompatible with the existing pattern of development. The development will increase daily vehicle trips from 257 to 5,834. The roads in this area are rural roads and are not designed for this increased density.

This proposed amendment is located in CAC Planning District 5. During the evaluation and appraisal of the current Comprehensive Plan, one of the issues identified by the CAC was to protect and retain the rural character of the land while allowing for the protection and development of agricultural property rights. It is also important to note that CAC Planning District 2 also raised a similar issue of protection of the rural lifestyle at a low development density for which there is a rural study underway to address the elements of rural character and protection of the unique characteristics of Northeast Pasco County, which is occurring approximately two miles north of this property.

The increase in density from one unit per ten acres to three units per acre could potentially impact the rural character of this area when development patterns and trends are not supportive of a higher density for the planning horizon. To protect the agricultural character of the land while preserving property rights, will require clustering options and the preservations of open space.

III. Comprehensive Plan Review

The following is an assessment of the proposed amendment's consistency with the Goals, Objectives, and Policies of the Comprehensive Plan and an analysis for whatever further amendment, if applicable, that would be advisable in conjunction with the proposed amendment.

Chapter 2, Future Land Use Element

Goal 1: Achieve a high-quality living environment for the citizens of Pasco County through improved management of the County's land, natural, and economic resources.

Objective 1.1: Establish land use densities and intensities at locations which reduce the potential for urban sprawl and which reflect a concern for the cost effectiveness of public services, infrastructure capabilities, and environmental constraints.

Comment: Section 9J-5.006(5), Florida Administrative Code (FAC), gives guidance to local governments about how to ensure that plan amendments are consistent with relevant provisions of the State Comprehensive Plan; regional policy plans; and Chapter 163, Part II, F.S., regarding discouragement of urban sprawl. This includes provisions concerning the efficiency of land use, the efficient provision of public facilities and services, the separation of urban and rural land uses, and the protection of agriculture and natural resources. Paragraph (5)(g) of the section

describes those aspects or attributes of a plan amendment which, when present, indicate that the plan amendment may fail to discourage urban sprawl. The primary indicators, with comments, regarding this specific land use amendment are listed below.

The evaluation of the presence of these indicators shall consist of an analysis of the plan amendment within the context of features and characteristics unique to each locality in order to determine whether the plan or plan amendment:

1. Promotes, allows, or designates for development substantial areas of the jurisdiction to develop as low-intensity, low-density, or single-use development or uses in excess of demonstrated need.

The request is for RES-3 (Residential - 3 du/ga), which would develop as a suburban density, single-use, residential development.

2. Promotes, allows, or designates significant amounts of urban development to occur in rural areas at substantial distances from existing urban areas while leaping over undeveloped lands which are available and suitable for development.

The request would allow 219 acres of rural and agricultural land to be changed to suburban development. Development pressure is occurring to the south and west, resulting in a speculative request to change the FLU classification for this property.

3. Promotes, allows, or designates urban development in radial, strip, isolated, or ribbon patterns generally emanating from existing urban developments.

The request would designate urban development in an isolated area in which the FLU classification is agricultural, existing use is agricultural, and the pattern of development for the area is agricultural.

4. As a result of premature or poorly planned conversion of rural land to other uses, fails to adequately protect and conserve natural resources, such as wetlands; floodplains; native vegetation; environmentally sensitive areas; natural groundwater, aquifer-recharge areas; lakes; rivers; shorelines; beaches; bays; estuarine systems; and other significant natural systems.

A change of land use would be an inappropriate conversion of rural-agricultural land to suburban land. Wetland areas in the north and southeast portions of the subject property would need to be adequately protected.

5. Fails to adequately protect adjacent agricultural areas and activities, including silviculture, and including active agricultural and silvicultural activities as well as passive agricultural activities and dormant, unique, and prime farmlands and soils.

Residential development of this property would impact adjacent agriculture activity in the area both directly and indirectly. Proposed development would be a typical subdivision, which would not adequately protect adjacent areas and activities.

6. Fails to maximize use of existing public facilities and services.

Maximization of existing public facilities would not be applicable due to the fact that there are no public facilities and services in the area.

7. Fails to maximize use of future public facilities and services.

Future public facilities and services would not be maximized by increasing density in this area as this would leap over existing undeveloped land.

8. Allows for land-use patterns or timing which disproportionately increase the cost in time, money, and energy of providing and maintaining facilities and services, including roads, potable water, sanitary sewer, stormwater management, law enforcement, education, health care, fire and emergency response, and general government.

No provision of services are planned, programmed, or funded for this area of the County. Providing and eventually maintaining services in this area of the County would grossly and disproportionately increase the cost to the County in time, money, and energy. The County has no plans to provide urban services to this area.

9. Fails to provide a clear separation between rural and urban uses.

The request would blur the line between rural and urban uses. It would be akin to spot zoning. Areas to the north, south, east, and west are still under rural/agricultural use.

10. Discourages or inhibits infill development or the redevelopment of existing neighborhoods and communities.

This indicator does not apply as there is limited development on the surrounding parcels.

11. Fails to encourage an attractive and functional mix of uses.

The request is for a single use of 653 dwelling units, which would not encourage an attractive and functional mix of uses. The request does not include any commercial or office uses.

12. Results in poor accessibility among linked or related land uses.

There would be no related uses since the surrounding property is agricultural and rural, and the proposed use would be a 653-dwelling-unit subdivision. Accessibility would be on to one road, Prospect Road, a two-lane undivided, rural road.

13. Results in the loss of significant amounts of functional open space.

The request results in the loss of significant amounts of functional open space since the open space will now be converted to single-family housing units.

Chapter 2, Future Land Use Element

Goal 1: Achieve a high-quality living environment for the citizens of Pasco County through improved management of the County's land, natural, and economic resources.

Objective 1.2: Achieve an arrangement of land uses which is efficient with respect to land utilization, reduces average travel distances, and reduces the average cost of delivering public services.

Comment: The proposed amendment would be inefficient with respect to land utilization. It would increase the average cost of delivering public services. The current land use and surrounding land use is agricultural. By introducing residential development in this area, at this time, the County would not be efficiently allocating its resources in providing cost-effective delivery of services and adding additional rooftops in a rural area where there has not been a demonstration of need for the increased density. Average travel distances would be increased, resulting in increased commuting time. Census statistics show Pasco's work force spends 28.5 minutes each way, or 57 minutes daily, driving to and from their jobs. In Florida, only Miami-Dade County residents drive longer.

Policy 1.2.13: Approve development applications only if such applications are consistent with this Comprehensive Plan. Moreover, only those developments for which satisfactory public facilities are either available or will be available concurrent with the project's impacts shall be approved (see Objective 1.4).

Objective 1.4: Ensure the adequacy and availability of public facilities and services concurrent with the impacts of future development.

Comment: Public water and wastewater is currently not available at this location. Future water and wastewater are not proposed for the subject property. No improvements are scheduled for Handcart Road in the 2004-15 Pasco County Transportation Capital Improvement Projects. Based upon the lack of infrastructure proposed today and the planning horizon, this Comprehensive Plan application should not be approved.

Chapter 6, Housing Element

Goal 1: Ensure an adequate supply of all housing types in appropriate locations.

Objective 1.1: Maintain an adequate supply of residentially designated and zoned land.

Policy 1.1.1: Approve rezoning of nonresidentially zoned lands (consistent with the policies of the Land Use Element) in order to maintain a reasonably priced supply of buildable residential land.

Comment: The County has classified RES-3 (Residential - 3 du/ga) areas of the County to develop for single-family residential development. Based on approved and proposed MPUD Master Planned Unit Developments and Developments of Regional Impact (DRIs), there are currently over 15,000 single-family homes approved for this area of the County. Another 10,000 are currently proposed for this same area. The County has another 70,000 single-family homes either proposed and/or approved. This amendment request is a speculative Comprehensive Plan Amendment which could result in an overallocation of single-family residential homes. During the evaluation and appraisal of amendments to the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Maps, there will be a thorough and comprehensive review of residential land classifications. This review will determine if the County has overallocated residential land uses. Once this evaluation is completed and if additional residential units are required, appropriate locations will be chosen for proper areas to meet future housing demands.

Chapter 7, Transportation Element

Goal 3: Coordination of the traffic-circulation system with Future Land Uses and natural resource constraints.

Objective 3.1: Provide a safe, efficient, and effective transportation system that is coordinated with and supports the Future Land Use Element and the associated map series, ensuring that existing and proposed population densities, housing, employment patterns, and land uses are consistent with the transportation modes and services proposed to serve the County.

Comment: At this time, the road system in its current state is safe, efficient, and effective for the rural-agricultural land uses which exist currently. Introducing the traffic of a RES-3 (Residential - 3 du/ga) land use would place 5,577 additional daily trips on Prospect Road, which is not designed for RES-3 (Residential - 3 du/ga) traffic. At this time, the most efficient and effective use of transportation funding is not for transportation improvements on the roads that access the subject parcel. The current 2004-15 Pasco County Transportation Capital Improvement Projects evidences this.

Chapter 10, Public Facilities Element

Goal 2: Provide an adequate, potable-water-distribution system throughout urbanized areas of Pasco County.

Objective 2.1: Inhibit urban sprawl through the maximum use of existing, potable-water facilities.

Comment: Providing potable water to this area, at this time, would promote urban sprawl and would not maximize the use of existing potable-water facilities.

Chapter 11, Capital Improvements Element

Goal 1: Timely and efficient provision of adequate public facilities through the use of sound growth management and fiscal policies.

Objective 1.1: Management of the land development and capital improvements planning processes so that public facility needs do not exceed Pasco County's ability to fund and provide needed capital improvements to correct deficiencies, accommodate future growth, and replace obsolete facilities.

Policy 1.1.3: Direct the land-development process in a way that maximizes the use of existing public facilities, particularly those facilities that have the capacity to maintain adopted Level of Service (LOS) standards.

Comment: This area of the County is a rural area and has no existing or planned public facilities. Providing public facilities to this area, at this time or in the near future, would be neither timely nor efficient. Supplying public facilities to this area would be cost prohibitive to the County and would in no way maximize the use of existing public facilities.

Objective 1.2: Maintain adopted LOS standards as defined in the individual Comprehensive Plan Elements and meet existing and future facility needs by coordinating land use decisions with a schedule of capital improvements.

Comment: The Capital Improvements Element does not list any projects in the vicinity of the subject property. Any capital improvements in this area of unincorporated Pasco County would not only be inconsistent with the Capital Improvements Element, but would not promote sound growth management and fiscal policies.

Objective 1.2: Prioritization of capital improvement projects in a manner that achieves and maintains adopted LOS standards while protecting the County's investment in existing public facilities.

Policy 1.5.1: Generally assign highest priority to the renewal and replacement of obsolete or worn-out facilities, second priority to correcting existing deficiencies in public facilities, and third priority to facilities necessary to accommodate future growth. Pasco County may increase the priority of a particular capital improvement to accomplish cost savings due to factors such as matching grant funds and private contributions. Individual County departments may also consider other internal-departmental, prioritization criteria in scheduling capital projects.

Comment: Considering the needs of the County and the areas where rapid growth is occurring, this application does not exhibit a need at this time or in the near future. Provision of services to this amendment would be neither timely nor efficient and would show an inefficient usage of County funds.

IV. Impact Analysis

A. Transportation

As part of the application process for submission of Biannual Comprehensive Plan Amendments, the applicant is required to provide a detailed transportation analysis. The analysis is necessary to meet the requirements of Rule 9J-5, FAC, and Section 163, F.S., through the provision of relevant and appropriate data and analysis. The analysis shall demonstrate that 1) LOS standards are met or will be met concurrent with the impacts of development, both for short-range and long-range planning timeframes; and 2) fiscal implications of the existing deficiencies and future needs. The analysis was developed by the Growth Management Department in coordination with Florida Department of Community Affairs (FDCA). Previous comprehensive plan amendments have received objections from the FDCA due to a lack of a transportation analysis.

A transportation analysis was not included in this Comprehensive Plan application. Growth Management Department staff contacted the applicant by mail to request a transportation analysis. The applicant has stated that a transportation analysis was provided in the original submittal. The transportation information provided in the original submittal does not meet the requirements of Rule 9J-5, FAC, and Section 163, F.S.

Based on the currently adopted (2004-15) Pasco County Transportation Capital Improvement Projects, no road improvements are scheduled for Prospect Road. If approved, this proposed development would place an additional 5,577 or more daily trips of traffic on this two-lane rural road.

B. Sanitary Sewer

Wastewater is currently not available at this location. Future wastewater is not proposed for the subject property. Correspondence from the Pasco County Utilities Department has indicated that public utility services are not planned for this section of the County. Planned pipeline facilities, located within one mile of the subject property, are not sized to provide capacity for any development other than the current RES-3 (Residential - 3 du/ga) or higher land use areas as set out in the Comprehensive Plan. The fact that future transmission facilities may pass through or near RES-1 (Residential - 1 du/ga) or lower density land use areas should not be construed to indicate that sewer capacity is either planned or available for the development of additional properties beyond what the current Comprehensive Plan provides.

C. Potable Water

Correspondence from the Pasco County Utilities Department has indicated that public utility services are not planned for this section of the County. Planned pipeline facilities located within one mile of the subject property are not sized to provide capacity for any development other than the current RES-3 (Residential - 3 du/ga) or higher land use areas as set out in the Comprehensive Plan. These future facilities are transmission facilities required to transmit water supply from the source/point of connection with Tampa Bay Water to areas of future development along S.R. 52. The fact that future transmission facilities may pass through or near RES-1 (Residential - 1 du/ga) or lower density land use areas should not be construed to indicate that water capacity is either planned or available for development of additional properties beyond what the current Comprehensive Plan provides.

D. Drainage

Upon review by the Pasco County Design/Stormwater Division, it has been determined that the department has some concerns about the discharge of stormwater from the property. Pasco County is currently drafting a stormwater ordinance, and this property could fall under the more stringent stormwater rules in that ordinance.

E. Recreation and Open Space

John S. Burks Memorial Park is a community park located approximately four miles to the northeast of the subject property. This park contains baseball, softball, football, and soccer fields; a nature trail; a picnic area; a playground; and restrooms. The San Antonio Athletic Complex is approximately six miles to the northwest. Hercules Aquatic Center is approximately seven miles to the southeast. A regional park is currently planned approximately seven miles to the east, at the southeastern intersection of I-75 and Overpass Road.

F. Solid Waste

The impact of this development on solid waste would be 5.2 additional tons per day.

G. Mass Transit

Mass Transit is not available in this area. Paratransit (advance reservation, door to door) service is available.

H. Capital Expenditure

Pasco County Capital Improvements Element, Table 11-1, Schedule of Capital Projects, does not list any water or wastewater improvements for this area. Planned pipeline facilities, located in Curley Road and Tyndall Road, are not sized to provide capacity for any development other than the current RES-3 (Residential - 3 du/ga) or higher land use areas as set out in the Comprehensive Plan. These facilities are transmission facilities required to transmit the water supply from a source/point of connection with Tampa Bay Water to areas of future development, such as the Cannon Ranch properties and other planned development along S.R. 52. Wastewater transmission capacity is also required to send flow from this area to the treatment plant located in Wesley Chapel. The fact that these transmission facilities may pass through or near RES-1 (Residential - 1 du/ga) or lower density land use areas should not be construed to indicate that public water and sewer capacity is either planned or available for development of additional properties beyond what the current Comprehensive Plan provides.

I. Additional Service Requirements

1. Utilities: The subject properties lie in the Tampa Electric service area.
2. Fire, Police, and Emergency Services: Services will be provided by the Pasco County Sheriff's Office and the Pasco County Emergency Services Department. The applicant, through impact fees, in accordance with the Fire Combat and Rescue Services Ordinance, will pay the cost of additional services. In addition, fire protection shall be required with the installation of fire hydrants, and additional land may be requested for a future fire/rescue station.
3. Health Care: The nearest hospital in this area is the Pasco Community Hospital, approximately seven miles from the subject property, located on Fort King Road, in Dade City.

4. Schools: The approximate impact of this development on the school system would be an additional 222 students of which 108 would be elementary school age, 52 would be middle school age, and 62 would be high school students. These numbers are based on historical students per housing units. Current trends do not reflect past trends and reliance on this data may fail to account for the true impact upon the school system. Information from the Planning Department of the District School Board of Pasco County (School Board) has indicated that schools in this and all areas of the County are currently over capacity. School impact fees collected for new homes will not make up the entire costs to build new schools. Pursuant to the Interlocal Agreement adopted in May 2003, the County and School Board will coordinate on all approved land use amendments.

V. Population Projections and Land Use Allocations

Population projections completed for the Pasco County Evaluation and Appraisal Report estimate that between 2000-25, Pasco County will grow by 160,565 residents. Based on proposed and approved DRIs and MPUD Master Planned Unit Developments, the majority of this growth is occurring in CAC Districts 2, 4, and 5. The general population growth areas in District 2 are occurring outside of the cities of Dade City and Zephyrhills as they annex land. In this area, there are at least 10,160 dwelling units approved or proposed. South of District 2 is CAC District 5. The high growth area in this district is the Wesley Chapel area where over 52,918 dwelling units are either approved or proposed. At 2.3 persons per household, this will produce 169,388 people. The total does not include the growth areas along the Suncoast Parkway corridor where another 22,211 homes are approved or proposed. Growth pressure may eventually occur in this area; however, a land use amendment at this time from agricultural to suburban residential would be a speculative and irresponsible growth-management decision.

VI. Intergovernmental Coordination

The Town of St. Leo lies within one mile of the subject property. The City of San Antonio lies within 1½ miles of the subject property. Pursuant to interlocal agreements and to ensure compatible developments between the County and these municipalities, these municipalities were notified. Upon notification, government officials from both municipalities expressed their disapproval of the proposed FLU Amendment.

Pursuant to the Interlocal Agreement adopted in May 2003, the County and the District School Board of Pasco County will coordinate on all approved land use amendments.

Attachments:

1. Location Map
2. Existing FLU Map
3. Proposed FLU Map
4. County Correspondence
5. Municipality Correspondence
6. Ex Parte Sign-In/Disclosure Form

Attachment 1

LOCATION MAP

Attachment 2

EXISTING FLU MAPS

Attachment 3

PROPOSED FLU MAPS

Attachment 4

COUNTY CORRESPONDENCE

Attachment 5

SERVICE PROVIDER CORRESPONDENCE