



DRAFT REPORT

CITY OF GULFPORT

EVALUATION & APPRAISAL REPORT OF THE ADOPTED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

October 2006





TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	3
Public Participation & Local Issues.....	6
Change in Population & Land Area.....	17
Analysis of Vacant Land.....	22
Demands of Growth.....	23
Development Location.....	38
School Facilities Planning.....	40
Water Planning.....	43
Coastal High Hazard Evaluation.....	44
State and Regional Policy Plans	46
General Assessment of Elements.....	58
Community Redevelopment Area Evaluations.....	60
Maps.....	61



INTRODUCTION

The City of Gulfport Comprehensive Plan serves as a guide for local decision-making and forms the foundation of the City's planning process. All subsequent planning documents and land development regulations must be consistent with the City's adopted comprehensive plan. The comprehensive plan was originally developed through a planning process that included significant public participation. This participation provides assurance to the citizens that the community's vision of the future guides comprehensive planning efforts.

Updating the comprehensive plan also involves public participation. As the community evolves the comprehensive plan evolves. This document, the evaluation and appraisal report (EAR) of the adopted comprehensive plan, is the result of staff, elected officials, and the community at-large working together to identify current community issues and evaluate the current plan's



ability to address those issues. If any area of the plan is inadequate to address community concerns than recommendations are included in this report to update those areas of the plan. The updates will occur through a second phase of the process known as the EAR based amendments.

The state of Florida also recognizes the need for periodic review of comprehensive plans. Currently, Florida Statutes (FS) Chapter 163.3191 includes a requirement for the preparation of an EAR every seven years. As stated by the Florida Department of Community Affairs (DCA), the EAR is the first step in updating the City's comprehensive plan and is intended to accomplish the following goals:

1. Identify major issues for the community;
2. Review past actions of the local government in implementing the comprehensive plan;
3. Assess the degree to which comprehensive plan objectives have been achieved;
4. Assess both successes and shortcomings of the comprehensive plan, which shall include the assessment of the general health of each element of the comprehensive plan. The elements reviewed in this EAR include:



- Future Land Use;
 - Transportation;
 - Housing;
 - Sewer, Solid Waste, Drainage, Potable Water, and Natural Groundwater Aquifer Recharge;
 - Coastal Management and Conservation;
 - Recreation and Open Space;
 - Intergovernmental Coordination;
 - Economic Development and Redevelopment;
 - Capital Improvements.
5. Identify ways that the comprehensive plan should be changed to:
- Respond to changing conditions and trends affecting the local community;
 - Respond to the need for new data;
 - Respond to changes in State requirements regarding growth management; and
 - Respond to changes in regional plans; and
6. Ensure effective intergovernmental coordination.

Furthermore, FS Chapter 163.3191 requires assessment of eight (8) issues within the EAR:

- Discuss changes in population since the plan was adopted or last amended: compare actual changes with the changes projected by the plan;
- Discuss changes in land area, including annexation, since the plan was adopted or last amended;
- Identify the amount and location of vacant land and its suitability and availability for development;
- Discuss the extent to which the community meets the demands of growth on infrastructure, maintains level of service standards, provides public services and facilities, guarantees concurrency management, and maintains financial feasibility of the plan;
- Discuss whether development located where originally anticipated in the plan as adopted or last amended;
- Assess success of coordinating land use and school facilities planning, including use of joint population projections;
- Evaluate plan with respect to the water management district's plan; evaluate need to revise potable water element to include long-range water supply facilities work plan; and
- In coastal high-hazard areas, evaluate whether past reduction in land use density impairs the property rights of current residents when redevelopment occurs.



Once the EAR process is complete and the document is adopted by City Council and found sufficient by DCA, the second phase, the EAR based Amendments, will begin and must be completed within one year of the EAR adoption.





PUBLIC PARTICIPATION & LOCAL ISSUES

A summary of the public participation program and activities undertaken by the local government in preparing this report. And a description and evaluation of local issues identified by the community.

City staff identified a short initial list of local issues for the City of Gulfport, and through a workshop, hosted by the Pinellas Planning Council, elected and appointed officials helped to refine the initial list.

On February 1, 2006 a presentation was made to the Local Planning Agency regarding the EAR following public notice. The presentation discussed the Comprehensive Plan, its purpose and parts, what the EAR is and why communities perform one every seven years and what the contents of an EAR are. The general process of performing an EAR was reviewed as well as a review of the EAR schedule. A brief discussion was also included regarding what constitutes an issue, and the public workshop to identify EAR issues was set.

The second public meeting, the issues workshop, was held on February 15, 2006. This consisted of a comprehensive public workshop during which issues were gathered from citizens and elected officials. Nearly 100 people attended the workshop. The City was divided into six neighborhoods and attendees sat at the table in which their neighborhood was located. Either a member of the Consultant's team or one of the City's Planning Department Staff guided each table. Approximately 45 minutes were spent with each group brainstorming and listing their



issues. Dozens of issues were generated. All the lists were then placed on the walls of the meeting room and each attendee was given five stickers and instructed to place them next to the five issues which they felt were the most important regardless of the group of origin. Not all of the issues generated even one vote. Many issues only received one or two votes. The issues were then subsequently organized and consolidated into 31 issues.

A third public meeting was held on July 5, 2006 at which a presentation to the Local Planning Agency was made regarding the status of the EAR. The presentation included discussions regarding amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and general findings as related to each of the EAR items.



The list is provided with the affected plan elements and general suggestions, which help address each issue. The issues generally address concerns regarding nonconformities caused by inadequate land use, mixed-use development, aesthetics, safety, waterfront access and activities, protecting/enhancing the environment, and intergovernmental coordination.

Issue #1

Improve existing regulations and facilities to allow boater access to the beach area. This includes designating an area where canoes and kayak operators can store and launch their vessels.

Both Coastal Management Objectives 2 and 10 provide protection of water dependent uses and public access to the water. Specific policies relating to boater access could be added under these objectives to better address this issue. However the issue could be better addressed through the addition of specific policies, relating to boater access, under each of the objectives. Also objectives and policies could be added to the Economic Development and Area Redevelopment Element that address this issue. This also may be considered as part of and relating to the concept of designating a Recreation and Working Waterfront Area and may require additional objectives. Grants may be available for such areas.

Issue #2

Create City operated mooring field, which will provide needed storage space and allow better control over derelict boats.

The following objectives address this issue, but specific policies could be added under each objective to better address mooring fields:

- Future Land Use Element (Objectives 2 and 3),
- Transportation (Objective 2),
- Coastal Management and Conservation (Objective 10),
- Recreation and Open Space (Objective 3) and
- Economic Development and Area Redevelopment (Objective 5).

Issue #3

Create an alternative to proportionate share in the WRD-MU district (and any subsequent mixed-use districts) to encourage more mixed-use development.

The Future Land Use Element Objective 1 and 2 could be altered and have additional policies added that deal with mixed-use development city-wide and within CRAs respectively. Another



alternative could be to add a new objective that more comprehensively addresses mixed-use development and potential impacts. Objective 5 of the Economic Development and Area Redevelopment Element is affected and could be rewritten along with additional policies that address the expansion of certain employment opportunities within mixed-use development and live-work developments. Besides these added objectives and/or policies the density/intensity standards will need to be updated, for applicable land uses, to allow mixed-use development to utilize F.A.R. standards instead of requiring proportionate share which does not allow for economically feasible mixed-use developments. The F.A.R. standards would allow a height and bulk that would be allowed if the site were developed as non-residential or commercial.

Issue #4

Provide affordable commercial space to encourage artist activity in Gulfport, e.g., city owned/operated space, encourage artist's cooperative or guild, give bonus densities to mixed-use developments that provide affordable commercial rental space, etc.

None of the Future Land Use Element and Economic Development and Area Redevelopment Element objectives fully address this issue, therefore either existing objectives will need to be rewritten and policies added to better address the issue or new objectives and related policies that focus on how artists fit into the City's future both from the land use and economic development standpoints will need to be added.

Issue #5

Evaluate possibility of mixed-use in all commercial areas and some residential transition areas, e.g., Tangerine Ave, and adjacent to WRD-MU district (commercial uses in transition areas would be lighter and more restrictive, e.g., live/work, specialty services/shops, and B&Bs).

This is somewhat related to Issue 3 in that none of the Future Land Use Element or Economic Development and Area Redevelopment Element objectives fully address mixed-use, neither the impacts nor the intensity/density standards. Therefore new objectives and related policies will need to be added to guide future land development regulations that will encourage quality mixed-use developments that are compatible with the community.

Issue #6

Promote tourism and provide economic development and business recruitment in the 49th Street Corridor.



The Future Land Use (Objective 2) and Economic Development and Area Redevelopment (Objective 5) are affected at the policy level with some policies (Policies 2.1, 2.3; Future Land Use Element) and Policies 5.4, 5.5, 5.6, 5.7 and 5.8; Economic Development and Area Redevelopment Element) currently addressing this issue. It is recommended that a new Objective with supporting Policies be added to the Capital Improvement Element which focuses on improving/enhancing the physical environment through the implementation of Design Guidelines, streetscaping, etc.

Issue #7

Explore upgrading technology within city including; “wifi” services, improved internet site that better promotes city, and co-location of towers and other IT facilities; with this make sure LDRs are sufficient to protect character of city and restrict large towers or antennas.

A new subelement for the Utilities Element should be created to specifically address Telecommunications. The Economic Development and Area Redevelopment (Objective 6) and Capital Improvement (Objective 3) Elements could be affected at the policy level and new policies could be added to support this issue as it relates to business development and City support/installation of telecommunication facilities.

Issue #8

Do not allow height variances in the WRD area and along the rest of waterfront in order to maintain existing low rise development pattern. (Keep taller buildings in the R-4 district).

This issue would be best addressed via Code amendments; therefore, **no changes** are suggested to the Comprehensive Plan.

Issue #9

Create commercial design guidelines w/ illustrated supplement for all commercial areas, and expand application of residential guidelines to discourage large-scale and/or tract development throughout City. The City of Gulfport is developed with an eclectic array of homes and commercial buildings, which all share one common theme. They are primarily built to human scale, and any design guidelines should protect the human scale and not inhibit the eclectic design pattern. (The PYCC is exempt from residential design guidelines).

Design Guidelines are typically used to either enhance/ reinforce the character of a specific area or to create a character. Design Guidelines often include or complement regulations which address historic/archaeologic resources. Objective 6 of the Future Land Use Element, which



currently addresses historic and archaeological resources, could be updated to more broadly address not only those resources but basic character of the City as a whole. Several of its supporting policies should be updated as well to address this issue. In addition several new policies are also recommended for Objective 6. This Objective could also be split up into two Objectives with one focusing specifically on historic and archaeological resources and the other on the general character of the City. The Economic Development and Area Redevelopment Element (Objective 3) are affected at the policy level specifically where the Plan addresses the desired reduction of deteriorating/dilapidated structures. Suggested Plan amendments with regard to this issue would be intended to reinforce the concept that changes to such structures would be required to meet City standards.

Issue #10

Expand streetscaping projects beyond the 49th Street Corridor and invest more beautification money throughout city. This should include improved street lighting, landscaping and landscaped medians, better signage and entry signs for city and waterfront (downtown), improved sidewalks, and pedestrian amenities.

A Policy supporting Objective 1 of the Future Land Use Element could be modified to address this issue. In addition, a new Objective with supporting policies could be included in the Economic Development and Area Redevelopment which would focus on improving the physical environment in support of attracting new businesses and retaining existing ones. The new objective with supporting policies proposed as included in the response for Issue 6, above, with regard to the Capital Element would also work to address this issue.

Issue #11

Adjust land use designations to reflect actual densities and eliminate high percentage of nonconformities, i.e., 12 dwelling units/acre instead of 10 or 10 dwelling units/acre instead of 7.5.

Future Land Use (Objective 3) and Economic Development and Area Redevelopment (Objective 3) Elements are affected at the policy level. New policies would mandate a time frame to identify all non-conforming properties with regard to density. To increase the range of allowable dwelling units in each affected residential category would address the issue. However, compatible density issues should be considered and density cannot be increased in the Coastal High Hazard Area.



Issue #12

Provide workforce (affordable) housing through techniques, e.g., allowing garage apartments and granny flats in single-family districts, and providing reasonable bonus densities for developers who provide at least 10% affordable units (perhaps a sliding scale; the more affordable units provided the greater the bonus, e.g., range from 10% to 25%).

Objective Four of the Housing Element should be updated and several new supporting policies should be added to address this issue. These changes would encourage greater flexibility for the provision of garage apartments/granny flats. The Economic Development and Area Redevelopment Element (Objective 3) is affected at the policy level and further reinforces the commitment of the City to encourage homeownership at as many income levels as possible.

Issue #13

Encourage artist community to create public art for display in parks and around public buildings.

The Future Land Use Element (Objective 2) is affected at the policy level. In addition, policies within Objective 5 of the Recreation Open Space Element should be added. A new objective, Objective 7, along with supporting policies are suggested to be added to the Economic Development and Area Redevelopment Elements. Proposed changes address topics such as increasing the City's commitment to provide outlets for public art, encourage live/work artist spaces, requiring new development to include elements of public art, the creation of an art gallery, etc.

Issue #14

Strengthen tree ordinance to ensure preservation of tree canopy and increase the replacement requirement when trees are removed.

The Conservation Subelement of the Coastal Management and Conservation Element are affected at the policy level as several new policies are suggested to be added to Objective 1. These changes would provide additional guidance for the protection of existing trees, encouragement of cluster development and other like site design techniques to preserve trees and the designation of historic/specimen trees.



Issue #15

Explore possibility of creating an invasive plant removal program and encourage/require use of xeriscaping to reduce water consumption for irrigation.

The Conservation Subelement of the Coastal Management and Conservation Element are affected at the policy level with the suggested addition of several new policies to Objective 1. These changes would provide additional guidance for the removal of invasive plant species.

Issue #16

Evaluate beach renourishment program for improvements and increase clam bayou clean-ups to improve water quality of Boca Ciega Bay.

The Conservation Subelement of the Coastal Management and Conservation Element (Objective 1) and the Recreation Open Space (Objective 3) Element are affected at the policy level and changes generally call for greater intergovernmental coordination.

Issue #17

Encourage/create programs that aid in reduction of air pollution, e.g., city telecommuting program and encourage private businesses to telecommute, ride sharing, improved ped/bike system to encourage walking and riding bikes, and improved transit schedule and bus shelters (Improving the transit and ped/bike system is a transportation issue as well).

The Goal of the Transportation Element should be updated to address this issue. In addition, a new objective for the Transportation Element, Objective 5, with several new supporting policies is suggested to address this issue. These changes could provide such details as encouraging telecommuting, the enhancement of existing pedestrian/bicycle connections, better-designed bus stops, etc. The City could also consider the creation of a Multimodal Transportation District.

Issue #18

Evaluate improving speed limit signage and enforcement for streets and alleys.

New policies within the Transportation Element under Objective 3 which deal with traffic calming could be added to address this issue.



Issue #19

Enhance code enforcement within city to discourage illegal dumping, overgrowth in alleys, illegal parking, to clean up excessive litter and junk on problem properties, and to deal with deteriorating buildings (residential and commercial).

Policies under Objective 3 of the Housing Element currently address this issue. Additionally, the City can address this issue without modification to the Comprehensive Plan. The City could create a data base which tracks Code violations to better allocate resources. A Plan amendment though a new policy could be included in the Economic Development and Redevelopment Element could be implemented which mandates this.

Issue #20

Improve sidewalk ordinance so that exceptions are only provided when there is an obstruction in the way of proposed sidewalk location; if variance is granted require an in-lieu fee so sidewalks can be provided somewhere else in the City.

The Transportation (Objective 5) and Capital Improvement (Objective 4) Elements are affected at the policy level and will provide greater detail and direction with regard to payment in-lieu of instances, when sidewalks are required to be installed and sets a timeframe by which a contiguous sidewalk system should be in place.

Issue #21

Work with county to determine if Pinellas Trail can be extended to downtown.

The Transportation and Recreation Open Space Elements are affected at the policy level (Objectives 5 and 3, respectively) with regard to this issue specifically as relating to the creation of a Pinellas Trail spur to downtown. A new objective, Objective 6 with supporting policies, is recommended to be added to the Intergovernmental Coordination Element to address this issue.

Issue #22

Provide transportation between Marina & Downtown and improve car/truck access to the marina.

The Transportation and Economic Development and Area Redevelopment Elements (Objectives 1 and 5, respectively) are affected at the policy level. Although the City can do this without a Plan amendment, it should be noted that language in the Plan which encourages this type of



improvement can enhance the City's potential score in grant applications which could help finance such a project.

Issue #23

Maintain existing alley system including alleys behind commercial corridors.

The Transportation Element (Objective 4) is affected at the policy level however; current objectives adequately address this issue.

Issue #24

Improve intersection design along Gulfport Boulevard within commercial area.

The Transportation and Intergovernmental Coordination Elements (Objectives 1 and 3, respectively) are affected at the policy level. However; current objectives adequately address this issue.

Issue #25

Correct damaged storm drains throughout City and add needed storm sewers to streets that currently do not have storm sewers.

Current Goals, Objectives and Policies within the Comprehensive Plan within the Utilities (Policy 1.4), Intergovernmental Coordination (Objective 3) and Capital Improvements (Policy 1.2) Elements currently address this issue. No changes are suggested.

Issue #26

Upgrade old infrastructure facilities within City for: storm water, sanitary sewer, potable water (includes improving existing lift station), and explore underground utilities where feasible and work with other utility agencies to upgrade services and facilities where needed.

Current portions of the Utilities Element (Sanitary Sewer Subelement Objectives 2 and 3 and Policies 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3; Drainage Subelement Objective 1, 2 and 3 and Policies 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 3.1 and 3.2 and Potable Water Subelement Objective 2 and Policies 1.6, 2.1, 2.4 and 2.5) address this issue. Policy changes within the Intergovernmental Coordination (Objective 3), Economic Development and Area Redevelopment (Objective 6) and Capital Improvements (Objective 4) Elements are suggested.



Issue #27

Explore alternative funding sources for all infrastructure improvements and deficiencies.

Objective 4 and supporting Policies 4.1 and 4.2 of the Economic Development Redevelopment Element address this issue. The Capital Improvements Element is affected at the policy level (Objective 5).

Issue #28

Coordinate with City of St. Petersburg and County to expand reclaimed water throughout the City of Gulfport.

No changes are suggested because the contents of the Utilities Element address this issue (Sanitary Sewer Subelement Policy 4.2).

Issue #29

Better coordination with the City of St. Petersburg for planning, economic development, public services, and public safety.

Policy changes under Objective 3 within the Intergovernmental Coordination Element and Objective 5 within the Economic Development and Area Redevelopment Element are the only suggested changes. Existing policies within the Intergovernmental Coordination Element address Planning (Policies 2.4 and 2.6) and Public Services (Objective 1 and Policies 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3) Issues.

Issue #30

Improve solid waste services for commercial sites and look at possibility of automated trucks; maintain trash collection as a City run service.

Policy changes under Objective 3 within the Solid Waste Subelement of the Utilities Element are the only suggested changes.

Issue #31

Evaluate possibility of expanding the recycling program, and work with County to provide hazardous materials collection.

Policy changes under Objective 3 within the Solid Waste Subelement of the Utilities Element are the only suggested changes. Objective 2 and supporting Policies 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 within the same



subelement currently address this issue. Existing Objectives and Policies within the Capital Improvements Element also address this issue.

The City of Gulfport transmitted a Letter of Understanding to the Department of Community Affairs (DCA) requesting review of these issues, and a response with either suggested changes or acceptance of the issues as provided. A letter from the DCA was received accepting the listed issues.





CHANGE IN POPULATION AND LAND AREA

Population growth and changes in land area, including annexations since the adoption of the original plan or the most recent update amendments.

More than doubling in population from 1950 (4,750) to 2005 (12,899), the City of Gulfport increased by 8,149 people since the middle of the last century. Beginning with the 1970 population of 9,730, the rate of population growth in Gulfport began to slow due to the consumption of developable vacant land.

- Between the last comprehensive plan update for the City of Gulfport (1995 base year data) and 2005, the City's population increased by 1,172 people or 117 people per year (0.96% annual growth rate). (Table A-1, below)
- Seasonal and tourism-related temporary residents also add to the total demand placed upon Gulfport's utilities, parks and transportation systems. Given differing methodologies and data availability, it is not possible to compare the sum of seasonal and tourist residents between 1995 and 2005.
- Pinellas County estimates that Gulfport had approximately 1,600 seasonal residents in 1995 compared to 1,450 in 2005, an apparent modest decline. The total number of tourists in 2005, expressed as full time equivalent residents, was estimated by Pinellas County to be 855.
- There are currently 7,534 dwelling units within the City constituting a 4.7 % increase over the 7,196 dwelling units listed in 1995.

Table A-1
City of Gulfport
Population Growth – Permanent Population 1995 and 2005

Jurisdiction	Year/Population		Total	Average
	1995	2005	Change	Growth Rate
City of Gulfport	11,727	12,899	1,172	0.96%

Date: August 14, 2006

Source: Bureau of Economic and Business Research, University of Florida

When the last Comprehensive Plan update was made with the use of 1995 base year data, it was projected that the City of Gulfport would have 12,962 people in the year 2005. This projection was very accurate. (Table A-2, below)



- The City's 1995 base year population projection of 12,962 residents for 2005 is only 63 people less (0.5%) than the estimate of 12,899 that was made in 2005. (Table A-2)
- The City's small area coupled with its small amount of vacant developable land tends to make for comparatively straight forward population projections.

Table A-2
City of Gulfport
Comparison of Population Estimates to Population Projections 1995 and 2005

Jurisdiction	1995 Proj. of 2005	2005 Estimate	Absolute Difference	Percent Difference
City of Gulfport	12,962	12,899	-63	-0.5%

Date: August 14, 2006

Source: City of Gulfport Comprehensive Plan (1996), and Bureau of Economic and Business Research, University of Florida





The City of Gulfport has 40 acres of vacant land that can accommodate residential development according to the FLUM (Source: Table A-6) and roughly half of this land is in Hurricane Evacuation Zone A. Gulfport's 40 vacant acres that are suitable for residential development (Table B-1) can be expected to allow for the addition of no more than 450 people (given the maximum build out of the vacant parcels according to the FLUP and the prevailing persons per household (source: Claritas, 2006)). It should be noted, however, that the City's current FLUP designations are inadequate in many areas of the City and do not reflect actual existing densities. Through the EAR based amendments the City will calculate all net densities throughout the City and make recommendations to apply FLUP designations more compatible with existing development and future growth potential.

- Calculating maximum population projections will be difficult until the City is able to determine actual net densities and alter FLUP designations accordingly.
- The City could of course continue to grow in both population and geographic size with additional annexations.
- Seasonal residents are projected to add approximately 1,500 residents and tourists (expressed in terms of full time equivalent population) another 900 (Source: Pinellas County and TBE Group, Inc. 2006). The annual number of seasonal residents and tourists is assumed to remain constant throughout the projection period to 2030.

Table A-3
City of Gulfport
Population Projections – Permanent Population Annual 2006 - 2011,
2015 and 2030

Year	Population	Absolute Change	Average Growth Rate
2005	12,899		
2006	12,999	100	0.78%
2007	13,079	80	0.62%
2008	13,154	75	0.57%
2009	13,224	70	0.53%
2010	13,289	65	0.49%
2011	13,349	60	0.45%
2015	13,350*	--	0.00%
2030	13,350*	0	0.00%

Date: August 15, 2006

Source: Bureau of Economic and Business Research & TBE Group, Inc. * -- rounded to nearest 10



Population growth is expected to take place on the remaining vacant land shown in Table B-1 and Map 3. The great majority of the vacant land and future population growth is going to take place in the vicinity of the Pasadena Yacht and County Club and some adjoining properties. It is worth noting that there are vacant infill lots throughout the City of Gulfport, with the largest concentration in the eastern portion of the City. The City sees these lots as opportunities for development in that many of them are outside of the CHHA.

It is also important that Gulfport provide the working environment within which residents and businesses can increase their wealth. Due to its established character, Gulfport is not likely to experience any significant new business growth outside of existing areas. There will be the opportunity for neighborhood and tourism related retail development in the form that has occurred over the past several decades. There may also be some conversion of existing residential development on main roads to small office uses that are compatible with the surrounding neighborhoods. The City recognizes that the health of its small businesses is important to all of Gulfport.

To the extent possible, Gulfport can provide support to wealth creation by ensuring that the mobile-self-employed and other businesses have access to the most advanced business systems. It is best not to label or name what is meant by “advanced business systems” in a planning document designed to remain relevant to the year 2030. Technological advances that lead to improvements in productivity are occurring at a very rapid pace. For example, the City of Gulfport could have an interest in encouraging the development of access to “Wi-Fi” services throughout the City. In 2006, “Wi-Fi” is an example of an advanced business system, in 2015 any replacement communications technology may be known by a different name and have different requirements.

Since the last comprehensive plan update, the City of Gulfport has annexed approximately 17 acres (17.17) to grow in geographic size from 2,112 acres or 2,129 acres. (Table A-4, below)

Table A-4
City of Gulfport
Land Area – Acres
1996 and 2005

Jurisdiction	1996	2005	Absolute Change
City of Gulfport	2,112	2,129	17 (17.17)

Date: August 16, 2006

Source: TBE Group, Inc. and Pinellas County Property Appraiser



The location of the annexations is shown on Map 4. The majority of the annexations took place within Evacuation Level C – 13 of the 17 acres or 76%. (Table A-5, below) The majority (11 out of 17 acres or 65%) of the annexations also were into the Residential Urban FLUM category which allows for a gross density of 7.5 units per acre. Most (approximately 70 %) of these annexations occurred in the southwest quadrant of the City specifically adjacent to the east side of the Pasadena Yacht and Country Club.

**Table A-5
Land Annexed Since 1995 by Future Land Use Plan
Hurricane Evacuation Zone and Future Land Use Plan and Density**

Evacuation Level	Future Land Use Category	Permitted Density (units per acre)*	Permitted Density (units)	Actual Density	Acreage	Total Acreage
B	Residential Urban	7.5	17	10	2.27	3.82
	Vacant (FLUP unknown)	0.0	0	10	0.00	
	R/OS	1.0	2	10	1.55	
C	Residential Urban	7.5	60	10	7.98	12.99
	Residential Low	5.0	7	0	1.35	
	R/OS	1.0	4	0	3.66	
D	Residential Urban	7.5	3	10	0.36	0.36

Source: Pinellas County Property Appraiser records; 2006 and TBE Group, Inc.





VACANT LAND FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENT

The extent of vacant and developable land

As seen in Map 3 and Table B-1, the City of Gulfport has 51 acres of vacant land in 2006.

- Almost 39% of the vacant land is within Hurricane Evacuation Zone A, which places significant limitations on its development unless the property has vested entitlements.
- The densities allowed on the remaining vacant residential and are moderate for the categories allowed in City's FLUM, with the majority (60.7%) of vacant residential land allowing five units or more per acre. The comparatively small amount of vacant residential developable land is reflected in the City's population projections, which was discussed previously.
- Gulfport also has nonresidential vacant developable land -- 6.28 acres are in commercial-related FLUM categories. The City of Gulfport's 3.91 acres of vacant Recreation and Open Space land is not considered developable and was not included in the vacant developable land used to calculate the City's population projections.

Table B-1

Vacant Land by Hurricane Evacuation Zone						Acreage
Future Land Use Category – Acres						
A	B	C	D	E	None	
Residential Low (5 upa*)						18.67
14.83	1.09	0.00	1.18	1.39	0.18	
Residential Low Medium (10 upa)						2.54
1.28	0.29	0.37	0.60	0.00	0.00	
Residential Suburban (2.5 upa)						6.49
1.48	2.65	2.36	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Residential Urban (7.5 upa)						12.20
1.68	1.18	0.79	1.13	3.77	3.64	
CRD						0.76
0.30	0.28	0.00	0.00	0.18	0.00	
Commercial General (0.5 FAR**)						3.23
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.32	
Commercial Limited (0.45 FAR)						3.05
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.59	0.62	1.83	
Recreation/Open Space (0.25 FAR)						3.91
0.00	3.91	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
19.57	5.49	3.52	3.50	5.96	8.97	50.83
Total Acres						

*upa = Units per acres ** FAR is Floor Area Ratio. Source: PCPD and TBEGroup, Inc.



DEMANDS OF GROWTH

The financial feasibility of implementing the comprehensive plan and of providing needed infrastructure to achieve and maintain adopted level of service standards and sustain concurrency management systems through the capital improvements element, as well as the ability to address infrastructure backlogs and meet the demands of growth on public services and facilities.

It must be noted at the outset that some of the data contained in the current Comprehensive Plan does not appear to exist at this time including:

1. Potable water demands. Average Daily and Maximum Daily Demands for Gulfport projections for 2020, 2025 and 2030 (Table 5-8 of the Comprehensive Plan);
2. Gulfport Roadway Mileage by Surface, Ownership (Table 3-1 of the Comprehensive Plan); and
3. Projected Maximum Day Demand (2020, 2025 and 2030) for sanitary sewer (Table 5-4 of the Comprehensive Plan).

The population data collected in combination with the analysis of vacant land indicates that the City of Gulfport will continue to grow at a slow pace with the greatest construction potential being seen in redevelopment. This will be true even assuming the application of suggested changes to the Future Land Use Plan map by increasing the permitted density of significant areas of the City. These changes will simply bring existing densities into conformance not necessarily leading to actual greater densities. The infrastructure data when analyzed in the context of the population data suggests that the existing level of infrastructure is adequate to serve the existing and future built-out population for the City. The one exception, given current data, indicates that the LOS for solid waste will be exceeded by the year 2020.

Some of the records from which data has been collected are incomplete. For example, there is a great deal of sanitary sewer line (approximately 21,000 linear feet) for which a diameter is not provided. The

City of Gulfport's Public Service Department, listed as the source of the





data contained within the current Comprehensive Plan, does not currently have any updated data. The level of service standards (LOS) for potable water, sanitary sewer and solid waste have not changed significantly since 1999. It appears that existing infrastructure will be adequate to serve the City in the foreseeable future.

The City will conduct a financial feasibility study consistent with and in accordance with the Fiscal Impact Analysis Model created by Fishkind & Associates, Inc. for the Florida Department of Community Affairs as part of its Comprehensive Plan update process.

Facility	Adopted LOS Standards	Able to Meet Adopted LOS in 2030
Parks and Recreation		
Equipped Play Area/Tot Lot	0.5 acres/1,000 persons	No (4.9 acres exist; demand will be 6.5 acres by 2030)
Neighborhood Park	2.0 acres/1,000 persons	Yes
Community Park	2.0 acres/1,000 persons	Yes
Urban Open Space	1.0 acres/1,000 persons	Yes
Potable Water		
Cit of St. Petersburg (source); City of Gulfport (delivery system)	125 gallons per capita per day	Yes
Sanitary Sewer		
Southwest Wastewater Treatment Plant	166 gallons per person per day	Yes
Northwest Wastewater Treatment Plant	173 gallons per person per day	Yes
Solid Waste		
Refuse-to-Energy, Land Fill and Yard Waste Conversion Facilities	1.3 tons/yr/person	No (demand is projected to be 1.38 tons/yr/person by 2020)
Stormwater		



Facility	Adopted LOS Standards	Able to Meet Adopted LOS in 2030
Water Quantity	<p>Level A - No significant street flooding. During periods of heavy rain there is some street flooding throughout the city. However, outside the 100 year flood plain streets are generally passable with a motor vehicle.</p> <p>Level B - No major residential yard flooding and street remains passable by a passenger vehicle. This is the prevailing existing level of service except in specific areas within the 100 year flood plain. Large emergency vehicles can still reach residents.</p> <p>Level C - No significant structure flooding. Structure flooding has occurred within the 100 year flood plain during extended periods of heavy rain in conjunction with high tides. Street is passable by emergency equipment such as fire trucks.</p> <p>Level D - No limitations on flooding. No experience factor is determined at this level.</p>	Yes
Water Quality	<p>Level A - Meets Southwest Florida Water Management District standards set forth in Chapters 17-25 and 62-25 of the Florida Administrative Code (FAC), and Chapters 40D-4, 40D-40 and 40D-400 of the Environmental Resource Permitting Rules.</p> <p>Level B - Provide no treatment.</p>	Yes
Transportation		



Facility	Adopted LOS Standards	Able to Meet Adopted LOS in 2030
Collector and Arterial Roads	Daily LOS: C Peak Hour LOS: D	Yes

Parks and Recreation

Introduction:

The City of Gulfport Parks and Recreation Program include various types of recreational facilities such as: Beaches, Picnic Areas, Gymnasiums, Fishing Piers, Parks, Ball Fields, Community and Recreational Centers, and Tennis Complexes. Both passive and active parks are encompassed in the City of Gulfport’s Capital Improvements Program.

Level of service Standard:

- Equipped Play Area/Tot Lot: 0.5 acres/1,000 persons
- Neighborhood Park: 2.0 acres/1,000 persons
- Community Park: 2.0 acres/1,000 persons
- Urban Open Space: 1.0 acres/1,000 persons

Looking Back:

The City of Gulfport currently reports a total acreage of Public/Semi Public and Private Recreation Resources of 275 acres. The total demand for the four listed types of Recreation Facilities is 69.7 acres where a total of 275 acres are provided. The greatest surplus is in the amount of Urban Open Space land with 212 acres provided where 12.7 acres are required. The only deficit is in regard to the amount of Equipped Play Area/Tot Lot where 6.3 acres are required where 4.9 acres are provided.

Looking Forward:

By 2030, projections show the municipality’s permanent population will increase to 13,350 residents. Park acreage needed to meet the adopted level of service standard will increase to 73.4 acres. Overall, the municipality will continue to maintain a surplus of park acreage totaling 201.8 acres by the year 2030. The only deficit continues to be with regard to Equipped Play Area/Tot Lot where 6.7 acres are expected to be required where 4.9 acres are provided.

Conclusion:

The City of Gulfport has adequate parkland to service both the existing and projected future population of the City. It will be necessary to add 1.6 acres of Equipped Play Area/Tot Lot.



This could easily be accomplished through the conversion of existing Neighborhood Park, Community Park and/or Urban Open Space areas.

Potable Water

Introduction:

The City of St. Petersburg's Water District Service Area (WDSA) is comprised of the cities of St. Petersburg, Gulfport and South Pasadena. The WDSA also includes the unincorporated areas of Bear Creek, Lealman, Gandy and Bay Pines. Although Gulfport receives its water from St. Petersburg, Gulfport uses its own water distribution system. The existing water distribution system provides water to residential, commercial, and other customers within and outside the city limits of Gulfport. Water, which is purchased from the City of St. Petersburg is distributed through a system over 360,000 linear feet of various sized water mains and contains 150 hydrants.

Currently, the system has five points of connection with the St. Petersburg water system. They are located on 64th Street South and Gulfport Boulevard, 58th Street South and 7th Avenue South, 49th Street South and 7th Avenue South, 49th Street South and 26th Avenue South, and Royal Palm Drive, 500 feet south of Gulfport Boulevard South. As the following table indicates, total capacity of the connections is 27.4 mgd. Generally, the water distribution system network supplies adequate pressure for single story structures through the large distribution mains. Static pressures are generally well above 60 P.S.I. Fire fighting residual pressures seldom fall below 20 P.S.I. Multi-story structures are required to construct booster pumps for higher pressure requirements.

For concurrency, it must be demonstrated that potable water capacity is available when new development is permitted that is either at or in excess of the adopted level of service standard of City of Gulfport. This is done by comparing the current level of service demand value to the adopted level of service standard, and comparing future demand projections to overall capacity. These measures provide an assurance the current level of service standard is reasonable and able to be met, and that suitable capacity is still available for the projected future growth of City of Gulfport.

Level of service Standard:

The current level of service standard is 125 gallons per capita daily (GPCD).

Looking Back:

Current average daily demand is calculated to be 96 GPCD. This is 23 % lower than the adopted level of service standard of 125 GPCD. The municipality believes this value is reasonable, and will be maintained in the future as the reclaimed water system grows, and offsets other potable



water uses. The City of St. Petersburg currently maintains an average potable water capacity of approximately 44 million gallons daily (MGD) of which the City's use is approximately 3.5 %.

This information is based on the most complete data available from the City of St. Petersburg Public Works Department.

Looking Forward:

For utility planning purposes, the municipality forecasts that by 2030 the permanent population will reach approximately 13,350. The water plant capacity will be maintained as a maximum day supply of 77 MGD. Overall potable water capacity will maintain a surplus of approximately 16.5 MGD. If growth rates continue as projected, the potable water system will still maintain its level of service capacity of 125 GPCD well through the year 2030.

Conclusion: The City of Gulfport will continue to be able to meet its adopted level of service for potable water through the planning horizon year of 2030.



Sanitary Sewer

Introduction:

The existing sanitary sewer system provides sewage disposal service to residential, commercial, and other customers in Gulfport. The system was constructed in 1958 and completed in 1959. Overall, the city's sanitary sewer system contains over 213,000 feet of various diameter gravity collection mains, more than 700 manholes, two wastewater pumping stations, 4,230 feet of 12-inch diameter force main, and 2,450 feet of 10 inch-diameter force main. The gravity collection system was constructed to take advantage of an approximately 30-foot difference in elevation between the northern and southern sections of Gulfport.



For concurrency, it must be demonstrated that sanitary sewer capacity is available when new development is permitted that is either at or in excess of the adopted level of service standard of City of Gulfport. This is done by comparing the current level of service demand value to the adopted level of service standard, and comparing future demand projections to overall capacity. These measures provide an assurance the current level of service standard is reasonable and able to be met, and that suitable capacity is still available for the projected future growth of City of Gulfport.

Level of service Standard:

Gulfport’s sewerage is treated by two wastewater facilities, the Northwest and Southwest Wastewater Treatment Plants. The Northwest Wastewater Treatment Plant serves an extensive geographic area that includes the cities of Treasure Island, St. Petersburg Beach, South Pasadena, northwest St. Petersburg, and portions of unincorporated Pinellas County and Gulfport (through the Bear Creek Sanitary Sewer District). The geographic service area of the Southwest Wastewater Treatment Plant includes southwest St. Petersburg, Tierra Verde and most of Gulfport. Capacity for both plants is 20 million gallons per day each. Further, the City of St. Petersburg has established the following levels of service for average day demand:

- Northwest Wastewater Treatment Plant - 166 gallons per capita per day (gpcd)
- Southwest Wastewater Treatment Plant - 173 gallons per capita per day (gpcd)

The level of service is used to project and compare facility capacity with future demand.

Wastewater treatment is provided through an interlocal agreement with the City of St. Petersburg. The agreement does not specify which portions of the treatment facilities are allocated to the City of Gulfport. Capacity assessment is analyzed based on the entire service area. Thereafter, Gulfport’s allocation is determined by the proportion of the city’s population to the service area population.

Looking Back:

Current average daily demand is calculated to be 169.5 and 160.7 gpcd, respectively for the Northwest and Southwest Treatment Plants. While the current overall demand is less than the capacities for either treatment plant, the average daily demand is currently 169.5 gpcd and exceeds the adopted level of service of 166 gpcd of the Northwest Treatment Plant. The average daily demand for the Southwest Treatment Plant is currently estimated to be 160.7 gpcd and is within the adopted level of service of 173 gpcd for this plant. This information is based on the most complete data available, as provided by the City of St. Petersburg Public Works Department and population estimates/projections. It is recommended that the City of St. Petersburg municipality revise its level of service standard to more accurately reflect current and projected generation of wastewater.



Looking Forward:

Sanitary sewer output is projected to increase to 182.5 gpcd by 2025 (the City of St. Petersburg only had data to the year 2025) continuing to exceed the adopted level of service of 166 gpcd of the Northwest Treatment Plant although the overall demand of 16.3 MGD will not exceed the 20 MGD capacity of the plant.

The demand of the Southwest Treatment Plant is projected to increase to 168.0 gpcd by 2025 and is within the adopted level of service of 173 gpcd for this plant.

Conclusion: The City of St. Petersburg will continue to be able to meet future demands for sanitary sewer service although it is recommended that the City revise its level of service standard to more accurately reflect projected generation of wastewater through the planning horizon year of 2025.

Solid Waste

Introduction:

The City of Gulfport operates its own solid waste collection and recycling collection system. The sanitation division provides twice-weekly solid waste pick-ups to residential customers. Commercial pick-ups are scheduled on an as needed basis. One day per week is designated a yard waste pick-up day and as a special pick-up day for items that are too bulky and ungainly for regular pick-up. Currently, the Sanitation Division collects about 11,700 tons of solid waste per year or approximately 0.92 tons per capita per year.

Disposal of solid waste within the county is provided through the Pinellas County Solid Waste and Disposal and Recovery Act (Chapter 75-487, Laws of Florida) as passed by the Florida Legislature in 1975. The Board of County Commissioners has the sole responsibility for disposal within the county. The act also included flow control legislation which resulted in the Board directing all solid waste to one location, the county land fill and eventually the Pinellas County Solid Waste and Resource Recovery Plant. In addition to flow legislation, Pinellas County entered into interlocal agreements with all local municipalities, including Gulfport, directing all solid waste to the Pinellas County land fill and Solid Waste and Resource Recovery Plant.

The Pinellas County Solid Waste and Resource Recovery Plant is a multipurpose facility that the City of Gulfport uses for disposal of solid waste and yard waste. The plant site contains a refuse-to-energy facility, land fill and facility that converts yard waste to mulch. The refuse-to-energy facility uses technology that involves mass burning and electrical generation. Solid waste is burned to generate steam for use as an energy source. The steam is used to drive turbines and generate electricity. The combustible residue is processed to recover ferrous metals, aluminum,



heavy non-ferrous metals which are sold and recycled, and aggregate which is used onsite. According to the Pinellas County Planning Department, approximately 92% of the solid waste stream is completely incinerated or recovered and only 8% goes to the county landfill.

Level of service Standard:

The current level of service standard for residential customers is 1.3 tons of solid waste per year per capita.

Looking Back:

Collection of the solid waste, recycling and yard waste materials is being accomplished with the following equipment:

1. Three, three-person crew served rear loader trucks,
2. Two automated side loader trucks,
3. Two trash loader trucks with outrigger and claw, and
4. One recycling truck.

The City of Gulfport has remained under the adopted level of service of 1.3 tons per capita per year.

Looking Forward:

The permitted allowable tonnage at the Pinellas County Solid Waste and Resource Recovery Plant is 1,149,750 tons per day. At the end of the planning horizon (2030), it is projected that the City will reach a demand of 1.77 tons per capita per year exceeding its adopted level of service of 1.3 tons per capita per year

Conclusion:

Over the planning horizon (2030), the City of Gulfport will not be able to continue to meet the level of service standard for solid waste.

Stormwater

Introduction:

The drainage system within the jurisdiction of Gulfport is generally underground and provides drainage for most portions of the City. Although documentation of initial construction is not available, an assumption is made based upon the size and type of piping and catch basins used that the bulk of the system was built during the mid-twenties at approximately the same time the water system was constructed. Through the years, a number of modifications and additions have been made. A 1978 project consisted of constructing a 54-inch-diameter trunk to a 42-inch-diameter trunk on Gulfport Boulevard South and 7th Avenue. The last major stormwater project to be completed was an Area Improvement Program partially funded by Community



Development Block Grant Funds. The project was completed in 1989 and addressed drainage problems in the northeast area of Gulfport. Since this time, several small stormwater drainage projects have occurred. These include new pipe and catch basins and the creation of a three-acre drainage/filtration pond located in Wood-Ibis Park. Additional catch basins and piping will divert surface water runoff and direct it to Wood-Ibis Park.

The storm drainage network within the city boundaries consists of a total of approximately 135,900 linear feet of various diameter drainage line, 380 inlets, 25 retention ponds or lakes, three creeks and numerous outlets along Boca Ciega Bay. Of these totals, approximately 120,000 linear feet of various diameter drainage pipe, 211 inlets, and two retention ponds or lakes are City-owned and maintained. All remaining storm sewer pipe, inlets, creeks, and retention ponds or lakes are privately owned and maintained. These are mainly found within the Pasadena Yacht and Country Club.



Level of Service Standard:

The Level of Service adopted by the city includes:

Water Quantity -

- Level A - No significant street flooding. During periods of heavy rain there is some street flooding throughout the city. However, outside the 100 year flood plain streets are generally passable with a motor vehicle.
- Level B - No major residential yard flooding and street remains passable by a passenger vehicle. This is the prevailing existing level of service except in specific areas within the 100 year flood plain. Large emergency vehicles can still reach residents.
- Level C - No significant structure flooding. Structure flooding has occurred within the 100 year flood plain during extended periods of heavy rain in conjunction with high tides. Street is passable by emergency equipment such as fire trucks.
- Level D - No limitations on flooding. No experience factor is determined at this level.



Water Quality -

- Level A - Meets Southwest Florida Water Management District standards set forth in Chapters 17-25 and 62-25 of the Florida Administrative Code (FAC), and Chapters 40D-4, 40D-40 and 40D-400 of the Environmental Resource Permitting Rules.
- Level B - Provide no treatment.

Looking Back:

In part, the Level of Service standards determination is dependent upon current regulations from stormwater runoff and surface water management. Regulation of stormwater runoff and the management and storage of surface water is handled by the Southwest Florida Water Management District (SWFWMD). Regulation of stormwater discharge is found in Chapters 17-25 and 62-25 of the Florida Administrative Code (FAC), while the State of Florida Department of Environmental Protection delegates permitting for stormwater discharge to the SWFWMD. Chapters 40D-4, 40D-40 and 40D-400 of the Environmental Resource Permitting Rules of the SWFWMD regulates the management, retention and treatment of surface waters. The City of Gulfport will continue to comply with these stormwater regulations for new and replacement drainage systems.

The level of service concerning stormwater quality shall involve using data and recommendations from the master drainage plan effort and from SWFWMD level of service standards for stormwater drainage that address water quality and quantity for both existing and new development. City of Gulfport shall comply with all applicable National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits and use the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) requirements for the NPDES stormwater discharge permit, as a minimum water quality standard for stormwater drainage.

Looking Forward:

Since the adoption of the Stormwater Management Master Plan, the city has evaluated the plan's recommended implementation sequence. The Public Services Department prioritizes and schedules drainage projects based on need, perceived drainage problems, projected costs, and revenue sources. Stormwater improvement projects are included within the six-year Capital Improvement Program which is annually adopted by city council. Funding for the implementation of the master plan is a key factor in analyzing, prioritizing and selecting storm drainage projects for the Capital Improvement Program. Funding sources include the general revenues, the countywide Local Option Sales Tax, grant funding, and stormwater utility fees.

Federal and state regulations have mandated that the City of Gulfport must maintain, improve and extend its surface water drainage system to improve stormwater runoff. To meet these



objectives, the city has adopted a stormwater management utility fee. Section 403.0893(2), Florida Statutes, encourages the proper management of stormwater runoff and authorizes the city to establish a utility fee to do so. The stormwater management utility fee funds a portion of the construction, operation, maintenance and administration of the city's stormwater management program. This fee aids in the achievement of protecting property, improving public safety, improving water quality, reducing pollutants entering Boca Ciega Bay, extending roadway pavement life, implementing the Stormwater Management Master Plan, meeting the Federal requirements of the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System Permit, and fulfilling the goals, objectives and policies found within the Comprehensive Plan.

In addition to the city's stormwater projects adopted into the Capital Improvement Program, the Streets Division of the Public Services Department performs activities to maintain and improve the existing drainage system. The current level of effort in maintenance of the existing drainage system implemented on a continual basis by the city includes:

- Reducing the pollutant load in stormwater by regular sweeping of roadways.
- Keeping inlets and outlets of the drainage system free of debris.
- Enforcing all applicable federal, state and local regulations relating to flood control.

- Coordinating with the Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Southwest Florida Water Management District and Pinellas County on public projects affecting water quality and flood control.

Conclusion:

The City of Gulfport is requiring all new development to maintain the stormwater level of service standards, while implementing capital improvements designed to correct deficiencies in areas that have historically flooded.



Transportation

Introduction:

The existing right-of-way system has been in place without any significant changes since the 1920s. The system is basically a north-south, east-west grid pattern out of which the roadway system was developed. Due to the residential character of the city, the system is dominated by neighborhood streets. The existing paved roadway system has been in existence without significant changes since the early 1950s.

Presently, a total of 67.64 roadway miles exist within the city's jurisdiction. Within this total roadway mileage, 55.3 miles are maintained by the City of Gulfport, 0.34 miles are shared maintenance with Pinellas County, 1.9 miles are maintained by Pinellas County, 2.54 miles are shared maintenance with St. Petersburg and 7.6 miles of roadway are privately owned and maintained. Virtually all roadways are paved in asphalt or brick. Since 1989, nearly all of the unpaved roadway segments have been eliminated.



Since 1989, the city's traffic circulation system was in accordance with the Florida Department of Transportation (F.D.O.T.) Roadway Functional Classification system. Gulfport was served by two four-lane Collectors and two two-lane Collectors. The Federal Functional Classification System has been implemented since the last Evaluation and Appraisal Report. The City, along with the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), F.D.O.T and other local governments evaluates the function of a road and assigns a functional class by the character of service of the road in relation to the total public road system.

Level of Service Standard:

The City of Gulfport has adopted a daily LOS C and peak hour LOS D on all collector and arterial roadways. Based upon the annual traffic counts collected by the City and transmitted to the MPO, as provided within the policies of this element, average daily traffic and LOS conditions have been determined. In 2005, most roadway segments were operating at a peak hour LOS D or better with the exception of 58th Street South from 11th Avenue South to 15th Avenue South and Gulfport Boulevard from 15th Avenue South to 64th Street South. These roadways are operating at LOS E and do not meet the adopted peak hour level of service standards.



Looking Back and Forward:

While the MPO has not yet performed projected level of service studies through 2030, based on the existing and projected population and employment growth in the area, the level of service on the Roadway Network is expected to degrade further with additional segments exceeding the adopted level of service D.

It is important to note that, of the two deficient road segments, the 58th Street segment is under the jurisdiction of the City while the Gulfport Boulevard segment is under the jurisdiction of Pinellas County.

Although deficient road segments are projected in future years, additional improvements may be identified and funded to meet these needs in future Capital (CIP) and/or Transportation Improvement Programs (TIP). Furthermore, deficient roads may be improved by developers based on conditions specified during approval of developments. These improvements may not yet be identified, but would appear in subsequent versions of the Capital Improvements Program.



Scheduled improvements proposed by the Pinellas County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) from 2005/2006 to 2009/2010 include resurfacing of City-wide local streets, upgrading of City sidewalks, resurfacing of alleys and restoration of brick streetscaping.

In general, deficient roads by definition, are in need of increased capacity, or reduced demand thereby improving the existing level of service and rendering them non-deficient. Increasing capacity of deficient roads can be accomplished in many ways. Funding of physical capacity improvements is the primary means of addressing the issue.

Deficient roadways also can be improved by constructing a parallel facility. In many cases, when a major thoroughfare is widened, the effect is felt on the surrounding road network. Improvements to a roadway parallel to a deficient road serve to relieve traffic from the deficient road by diverting traffic to the improved parallel roadway. Therefore, the deficient road may improve without actual construction occurring on that facility. Alternatively, transportation options such as public transit may be implemented to help relieve the deficiency.



Conclusion:

It is projected, if additional improvements are not planned and programmed, at least two roadway segments will exceed their level of service standard by 2030. The City will need to work closely with both Pinellas County and the MPO to ensure that these roadway needs are addressed in future Transportation (TIP) and Capital (CIP) Improvements Programs.



LOCATION OF DEVELOPMENT

The location of existing development in relation to the location of development as anticipated in the original plan, or in the plan as amended by the most recent evaluation and appraisal report update amendments, such as within areas designated for urban growth.

Development which occurred throughout 2005 was tracked via the issuance of building permits. Most (approximately 60 %) of the permits issued by the City were for “minor” non-structural improvements to buildings and properties such as new roofs, HVAC systems, electrical, doors, windows, siding, stucco exteriors, etc. Less than one percent (17 total) of the permits was for completely new construction. This is further corroborated through an examination of the value of the issued permits. Most of the permits (almost 80 %) were for improvements equal to or less than \$5,000. In fact, almost all permits issued (approximately 90 %) were for improvements equal to or less than \$10,000.

New development was also tracked between 2002 and 2006 (the City began keeping computer records in their current system in 2002) through the issuance of permits for new buildings. In this time period approximately 100 permits for new buildings were issued. All but three were for residential construction. Almost half (46) of those permits were issued in 2003 with about a third of those as part of a single townhome development. In fact, between 2002 and 2006 almost 25 % of all permits issued for new building construction were for townhomes.

The location of new development is generally scattered throughout the City although a significant number of permits were issued in the western portion of the City specifically within and around the Pasadena Yacht and Country Club area. This is not surprising since this area contains most of the vacant parcels of land.

As shown above, in Vacant Land for Future Development, approximately 50 acres of land is currently vacant within the City. Of that, most (40 acres) is within a residential land classification. Of that, significant portions appear to be part of homeowner association common areas and should be seen as generally undevelopable in the near future. Therefore, it can be inferred that most of the City’s development potential, as is typical for the rest of the County, will likely be through redevelopment of currently occupied parcels. This is supported through the preponderance of “improvement”-type building permits issued in 2005.

Significant portions of land within residential FLUP classifications are over dense as compared with the permitted level of density per the Comprehensive Plan and the Countywide Land Use Rules. For example, within the three largest FLUP classifications (RU, RL and RLM) with regard to not only numbers of properties but sheer acreage, almost half of those properties (approximately 2,200) are technically over dense. In fact, given that there are approximately 5,000 properties in the City that means that almost half (44 %) of the properties in the City of Gulfport are nonconforming with regard to density. Should these structures on these properties be damaged or destroyed they would not be permitted to rebuild at their current density.



City Staff has indicated that past Codes permitted “granny flats” and above-garage apartments. The current Code no longer contains those permissive provisions. Essentially, the Code and the Plan have changed over the years while properties and their uses, apparently, have not. Many of these properties have been transformed from conforming to nonconforming simply because of these changes. A reasonable course of action may be to evaluate the possibility of amending the Future Land Use Map by changing the FLUP classification of these areas to one that is more in keeping with current development and evaluate the Code to ascertain whether provisions permitting “granny flats” and above-garage apartments should be added.

A simple study shows that if all of properties within the four most over dense categories, RS, RL, RU and RLM, were changed to the next most intense residential land use. The number of over dense properties will drop from 44 % (2,200 properties) to just over 10 % (500 properties). The study excluded those properties existing within the Hurricane Evacuation Zone

A (Coastal High Hazard Area – CHHA) which would preclude increase the density of those properties through a Land Use amendment. As a point of reference, there are 702 properties which have a FLUP classification of RS, RL, RU or RLM which also are within the CHHA. Of those properties, 143 are over dense with seven RS, 11 RL, 76 RU and 49 RLM. Discounting those properties from any proposed FLUP change, the number still drops from 2,200 (44 %) over dense properties to 645 (13 %). It appears to be a worthwhile pursuit to delineate those properties which are over dense and are outside the CHHA for potential Land Use amendments.

The majority of permits (80 %) issued by the City are for general maintenance and generally minor improvements (equal to or less than \$5,000) to existing buildings and properties. Wholesale redevelopment of properties is not occurring. It is further evident that over half of the acreage and actual properties in the City are currently nonconforming with regard to, at least, density. It is recommended that, in order to encourage the appropriate redevelopment of existing properties that the Future Land Use Plan classifications throughout the City be closely examined with particular emphasis placed on those properties currently within the RS, RL, RU and RLM classifications. Furthermore, it is recommended that the Zoning Code be re-evaluated to insure that the desired type of development and redevelopment is encouraged with regard to the setbacks, height, aesthetics, etc.





SCHOOL FACILITIES PLANNING

The coordination of the comprehensive plan with existing public schools and those identified in the applicable educational facilities plan adopted pursuant to s.1013.35. The assessment shall address, where relevant, the success or failure of the coordination of the future land use map and associated planned residential development with public schools and their capacities, as well as the joint decision making processes engaged in by the local government and the school board in regard to establishing appropriate population projections and the planning and siting of public school facilities. For those counties or municipalities that do not have a public schools interlocal agreement or public school facility element, the assessment shall determine that it no longer meets the criteria, it must adopt appropriate school concurrency goals, objectives, and policies in its plan amendments pursuant to the requirements of the public school facility element, and enter into the existing interlocal agreement required by ss.163.3177(6)(h)2. and 163.31777 in order to fully participate in the school concurrency system.

There are two interlocal agreements between the School Board and several municipalities in Pinellas County including the City of Gulfport. The first one is referred to as the 1993 agreement. The second agreement was originally drafted and adopted in 1996 and recently resigned in 2003. This agreement is currently being rewritten and reviewed by all affected municipalities including the City of Gulfport and is expected to be approved in August 2006. The 1996/2003 agreement includes provisions for concurrency, general coordination and sharing of information of such things as changes the School Board may make to existing schools, and zoning and land use changes made by the individual municipalities. The updated document will include but is not limited to provisions relating to concurrency per section Statue 163.3180(13)(g), acknowledgement of the School Choice and school capacity. No significant changes are suggested for existing portions of the Comprehensive Plan (listed below). The City will **not** be exempted from the requirement of adding a Public Schools Facility Element to their Comprehensive Plan because there are three public schools within the City; Boca Ciega High School, Hamilton-Disston Exceptional, and Gulfport Montessori Elementary School. This is also noted below in the discussion regarding State and Regional Policy Plan changes.

Element	Objective / Policy	Details	Critique
FLUE	Objective 9	The City of Gulfport shall support efforts that facilitate coordination of planning between the City of Gulfport and the School Board for the location and development of public educational facilities.	N/C



Element	Objective / Policy	Details	Critique
FLUE	Policy 9.1	Permits public educational facilities within the RS, RL, RU, RLM, RM and RH classifications	The Institutional classification per the Countywide Rules and the description of the Institutional classification (page 2-51) and the Code (Institutional District) all permit schools. The list of appropriate classification is limited to residential ones. It is not clear why this is so and a reassessment may be prudent.
FLUE	Policy 9.2	New or expanding public educational facilities are required to meet the requirements of the Comprehensive Plan	N/C
FLUE	Policy 9.3	New or expanding public educational facilities are required to meet the following requirements: Compatibility with adjacent properties; Site is adequate for the use with regard to State requirements, area, utilities, buffering, etc.; Public services and facilities are adequate to serve the site based on the 5-year CIP of the School Board and the City's Comprehensive Plan; There are no environmental constraints; There will be no adverse impacts to archeological/historical sites; the site is well-drained and suitable for development with or without adaptations; the site is consistent with the County's Stormwater Management Plan and the City's adopted watershed management plan; the site is not is a CHHA, V-zone or floodway; Parking/vehicle queuing can be accommodated; and the site is outside the area regulated by section 333.03(3), F.S. regarding proximity to airports.	N/C
FLUE	Policy 9.4	Additional requirements specific to Elementary Schools (access to minor collector roads); Middle Schools (access to minor collector roads and buffering of outdoor recreational facilities); High School (access to major collector roads and stadiums/outdoor recreational facilities are buffered); Vocational-Technical Schools (access to a major collector road and buffering of industrial educational facilities.	N/C
FLUE	Policy 9.5	Addresses use of substandard sites	N/C
FLUE	Policy 9.6	Consistency can be specific to types of public educational facilities.	N/C
FLUE	Policy 9.7	The City may impose reasonable conditions of approval.	N/C



Element	Objective / Policy	Details	Critique
FLUE	Policy 9.8	On- and off-site impact determination required. Mitigation of impacts shall be worked out by the Board and the City	N/C
FLUE	Policy 9.9	The City and Board shall annually coordinate in the development of their respective CIPs	The City will need to determine if this has been done as required.
ROSE	Policy 3.1	The City shall continue existing joint use agreements with the Public School system to maximize utilization of recreational facilities	N/C
ICE	Objective 1	By 2000, the City of Gulfport shall attempt to enter into interlocal agreements, or other suitable documents with ... the Pinellas County School Board ... providing services but not having regulatory authority of the use of land, for the purpose of providing close coordination, evaluation and implementation of local comprehensive plans.	This agreement is in place and is in the process of being written.
ICE	Objective 5	The City shall support efforts that facilitate coordination of planning between the City and the Board for the location and development of schools	N/C
ICE	Policy 5.1	Development and expansion of school are to be consistent with the Plan.	N/C
ICE	Policy 5.2	Addresses the interlocal agreement to facilitate coordination of planning for the locating and development of schools	N/C
ICE	Policy 5.3	Proposed new or expanded schools are to be reviewed against the general criteria established through the interlocal agreement	N/C
ICE	Policy 5.4	The City will review plans for any significant changes at a school and mitigation may be required - to be addressed through the agreement	N/C
ICE	Policy 5.5	The City and Board shall annually coordinate in the development of their respective CIPs	The City will need to determine if this has been done as required.



WATER PLANNING

The extent to which the local government has been successful in identifying alternative water supply projects and traditional water supply projects, including conservation and reuse, necessary to meet the water needs identified in s.373.0361(2)(a) within the local government's jurisdiction. The report must evaluate the degree to which the local government has implemented the work plan for building public, private, and regional water supply facilities, including development of alternative water supplies, identified in the element as necessary to serve existing and new development.

The October 6, 1988 Interlocal Agreement regarding potable water and sanitary sewer was reviewed and the agreement appears to be adequate in best serving the City's needs. Three changes, albeit at a Policy level, are suggested to the Plan as follows:

Sanitary Sewer, Solid Waste, Drainage, Potable Water, and Natural Groundwater Recharge Element; Sanitary Sewer Sub Element:

Change 1:

POLICY 1: The city shall continue the inter-local agreement with the City of St. Petersburg and the City of St. Petersburg's Comprehensive Plan's Potable Water Sub-Element for provision of potable water. The following levels of service set forth by St. Petersburg:

1. Average Day - ~~130~~ 125 gallons per capita per day.
2. Max/Avg. Day Ratio - ~~1.30~~ 1.25.
3. Minimum Pressure - 30 pounds per square inch (psig) during peak hour of the maximum day and 20 psig during peak demand at curbside.

Intergovernmental Coordination Element

Change 2:

POLICY 1.6: The City shall, on an annual basis, review and evaluate the current Interlocal Agreement regarding Potable Water and Sanitary Sewer with the City of St. Petersburg to ensure conformance and agreement with the provisions contained within.

Change 3:

POLICY 1.7: The City shall, on or before March 1 of each year, give written notice to the City of St. Petersburg of its projected treated water requirements for that current and five following years in terms of maximum and average usage in gallons per day.



The changes above are minor and will better reflect and reference the existing Potable Water and Sanitary Sewer Interlocal Agreement and the City of St. Petersburg's Comprehensive Plan with regard to its Potable Water Sub-Element.

The City currently does not have a reclaimed water system and does not plan on installing one at any time in the future.





COASTAL HIGH HAZARD EVALUATION

An evaluation of whether any past reduction in land use density impairs the property rights of current residents located within the coastal high hazard area (CHHA) when redevelopment occurs, including, but not limited to, redevelopment following a natural disaster.

Data provided by the Pinellas County Planning Department was utilized to analyze the amount and type of land usage within the CHHA. Approximately 17 % (354.22 acres) of the City's land area is within the CHHA.

Several new tables should be added to the Comprehensive Plan, which further examine the types and numbers of properties within the CHHA. **In addition, permitted densities are also studied.** Finally, the number of permitted and existing dwelling units will be examined.

The amount of land within the CHHA is approximately half that as recorded in 1999. A new methodology based upon storm surge accounts for the change in the CHHA, Zone A delineation. There are 832 individual properties within the CHHA, most, 727, of which are within a residential FLUP classification.

There are 7,534 dwelling units within the City. The Hurricane Evacuation Zone A contains 1,012 dwelling units or approximately 13% of the total number of dwelling units. **Most, 28% (2,110) of the dwelling units in the City are not within a Hurricane Evacuation zone at all and an additional 15.84% (1,194) of the dwelling units are within Hurricane Evacuation zone E.**

As mentioned above, there are 832 properties within the CHHA. Of those, 779 properties include a residential **or overnight accommodation use.** Most of those properties, 706, are not within the CRD. Only 144 (20.40%) of the properties exceed the otherwise permitted density. Most of these properties 562 (79.60%) are under their otherwise permitted density. As such, the redevelopment of most properties within the CHHA at or greater than current intensities of development would be possible. In addition, since most properties within the City are outside the CHHA the effect of land use changes will have little if any effect on property rights City-wide.

Properties within the adopted Waterfront Redevelopment Plan area are governed by development potential, density and intensity, specifically listed in Appendix E of that Plan.

Additionally, the **City is considering increasing the development potential again to further redevelopment in the waterfront area.** This is possible as it will further the public interest of the City as a whole, one of the criteria which allows an increase in the development potential within the CHHA.

Finally, the City will examine the need to adjust densities slightly on a City-wide basis to reflect what has been legally developed over time as a result of the requirements and allowances of past



zoning districts in the City Code. This will result in Code and Plan will consistency with each other and may mean some slight increase in the densities for residential plan categories to accommodate what exists on the ground

Furthermore, the existing Comprehensive Plan currently addresses legally-permitted, nonconforming properties within the CHHA through the provision of Policy 6.8 of the Coastal Management Sub Element within the Coastal Management and Conservation Element. Policy 6.8, provided below, which appears to adequately protect existing, nonconforming, legally permitted properties and uses.

Policy 6.8: Legally non-conforming uses shall be subject to the following:

- Following damage resulting from a hurricane or other natural or man-made disaster, the City shall consider appropriate and/or innovative provisions for those legally non-conforming uses to allow compensating variations to dimensional requirements (e.g., height, setback, open space) and gives consideration to density transfers in order to permit the opportunity to redevelop at existing legally non-conforming densities.
- The reconstruction of any legally non-conforming residential dwelling shall adhere to those development regulations (local, state, or federal) in effect at the time the development order is issued.
- No development order for any single-family residential unit shall be withheld due to inconsistency with the density provisions of this Plan if such residential unit will be constructed upon a legal lot of recording existing as of the adoption date of this Comprehensive Plan and such construction otherwise conforms to the requirements set forth in the land development regulations.
- Nothing contained in this policy shall be considered to grant to any legally recognized non-conforming use privileges beyond those set forth in this Comprehensive Plan.

A policy will be added to the FLUE to acknowledge the Waterfront Redevelopment Area and its development potentials.





STATE AND REGIONAL POLICY PLANS

Relevant changes to the state comprehensive plan, the requirements of this part, the minimum criteria contained in chapter 9J-5, Florida Administrative Code, and the appropriate strategic regional policy plan since the adoption of the original plan or the most recent evaluation and appraisal report update and appraisal report update amendments.

State and Regional Policy Plans were examined and applicable changes are presented below with general suggested changes, as necessary. Many changes will be minor in nature addressing details such as environmental policy changes, definition updates timing changes and the like. One change will most likely require that the City include a Public Schools Facility Element in the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan currently addresses changes to Sections 163.3177 and 163.3178 which requires comprehensive plans to include waterways in the comprehensive system of public and private sites for recreation and to include in the Coastal Management Element shoreline component management strategies that will be used to preserve recreational and commercial working waterfronts defined in Section 3421.07, F.S. through Objective 10 and its supporting Policies of the Coastal Management Subelement. In addition, suggested Plan changes in support of several issues will further meet this requirement.

CHANGES TO FLORIDA STATUE CHAPTER 163: INTERGOVERNMENTAL PROGRAMS			
Changes to Chapter 163, F.S. 1986-2005		163, F.S. Citations	Amendment Needed By Element
1	Required that ports and local governments in the coastal area, which has spoil disposal responsibilities , identify dredge disposal sites in the comp plan.	163.3178(7)	Section G should be added to Section III of the CCE of the Comp. Plan to address the spoil disposal responsibilities of Gulfport.
2	Added the Growth Policy Act to Ch. 163, Part II to promote urban infill and redevelopment. [elaborated in 2005]	163.2511,163.2514, 163.2517, 163.2520, 163.2523, 163.2526	The Future Land Use Element may include references to theses sections of Chapter 163.
3	Required that all comp plans comply with the school siting requirements by October 1, 1999.	163.3177(6)(a) - [this sentence stricken in 2005]	There are several schools within Gulfport however, the ICE may be examined for compliance



CHANGES TO FLORIDA STATUTE CHAPTER 163: INTERGOVERNMENTAL PROGRAMS			
Changes to Chapter 163, F.S. 1986-2005		163, F.S. Citations	Amendment Needed By Element
4	Made transportation facilities subject to concurrency.	163.3180(1) (a)	Need to find out if there are any transportation facilities within Gulfport Ch. 163. PART V REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITIES (11) "Transportation facility" or "transportation facilities" means the property or property rights, both real and personal, of a type used for the establishment of public transportation systems which have heretofore been, or may hereafter be, established by public bodies for the transportation of people and property from place to place.
5	Required use of professionally accepted techniques for measuring level of service for cars, trucks, transit, bikes and pedestrians.	163.3180(1) (b)	An objective should be added to the Transportation Element adopting this requirement.
6	Allowed multi-modal transportation districts in areas where priorities for the pedestrian environment are assigned by the plan. [elaborated in 2005]	163.3180 (15)	An objective may be added to the Transportation Element, as desired.
7	Exempted amendments for urban infill and redevelopment areas, public school concurrency from the twice-per-year limitation .	163.31879(1) (h) and (i) - [Now: (i) and (j)]	Acknowledged
8	Defined brownfield designation and added the assurance that a developer may proceed with development upon receipt of a brownfield designation. [Also see 163.3221(1) for "brownfield" definition.]	163.3220(2)	A section may be added to the FLUE. This is not a requirement
2000: Ch. 2000-158, ss. 15-17, Ch. 2000-284, s. 1, Ch. 2000-317, s. 18, Laws of Florida]			
9	Added exemption of sales from local option surtax imposed under Section 212.054, F.S., as examples of incentives for new development within urban infill and redevelopment areas .	163.2517(3)(j)2	A change is not necessary to the Comp Plan.
2002: (Ch. 2002-296, SS. 1 - 11, Laws of Florida)			
10	Required that all agencies that review comprehensive plan amendments and rezoning include a nonvoting representative of the district school board .	163.3174	This is for "meetings at which the agency considers comprehensive plan amendments and rezonings that would, if approved, increase residential density on the property that is the subject of the application".
11	Required coordination of local comprehensive plan with the regional water supply plan.	163.3177(4) (a)	Infrastructure, Interlocal Governmental Coordination Elements will need to be updated, as necessary.



CHANGES TO FLORIDA STATUE CHAPTER 163: INTERGOVERNMENTAL PROGRAMS			
Changes to Chapter 163, F.S. 1986-2005		163, F.S. Citations	Amendment Needed By Element
12	Plan amendments for school-siting maps are exempt from s. 163.3187(1)'s limitation on frequency.	163.3177(6)(a)	Acknowledged.
13	Required that by adoption of the EAR, the sanitary sewer, solid waste, drainage, potable water and natural groundwater aquifer recharge element consider the regional water supply plan and include a 10-year work plan to build the identified water supply facilities.	163.3177(6)(c)	The City of St. Petersburg provides potable water. The delivery system is owned and operated by the City of Gulfport. Update IE as necessary
14	Required consideration of the regional water supply plan in the preparation of the conservation element.	163.3177(6)(d)	Infrastructure and CC Elements simply need to be updated with current data but they do not need significant changes.
15	Required that the intergovernmental coordination element (ICE) include relationships, principles and guidelines to be used in coordinating comp plan with regional water supply plans.	163.3177(6)(h)	This is already addressed in Policy 3.3 of the Intergovernmental Coordination Element however, this element should be thoroughly examined and updated as necessary.
16	Required the local governments adopting a public educational facilities element execute an inter-local agreement with the district school board, the county, and non-exempting municipalities.	163.3177(6)(h)4	Gulfport will need to adopt a public educational facilities element unless waiver requirements are met. Objective 5 of the ICE and Objective 9 of the FLUE broadly address this but these sections may need to be moved to a new EFE. – <i>Details on the waiver requirements are provided below</i>
17	Required that counties larger than 100,000 population and their municipalities submit an inter-local service delivery agreements (existing and proposed, deficits or duplication in the provisions of service) report to DCA by January 1, 2004. Each local government is required to update its ICE based on the findings of the report. DCA will meet with affected parties to discuss and id strategies to remedy any deficiencies or duplications.	163.3177(6)(h)6,7 & 8	Gulfport is within a county that has a population greater than 100,000. Interlocal agreement submission was to have been submitted on or before January 1, 2004. The ICE currently addresses interlocal agreements provided by Objectives 1, 3.
18	Required local governments and special districts to provide recommendations for statutory changes for annexation, including any changes that address the delivery of local government services in areas planned for annexation to the Legislature by February 1, 2003.	163.3177(6)(h)9	Gulfport has the opportunity to annex additional land. There do not appear to be any references to providing local government services to areas planned for annexation. The FLUE, Sanitary Sewer, Solid Waste, etc. Element and ROSE may need to be updated to address this.



CHANGES TO FLORIDA STATUTE CHAPTER 163: INTERGOVERNMENTAL PROGRAMS				
Changes to Chapter 163, F.S. 1986-2005		163, F.S. Citations	Amendment Needed By Element	
19		Added a new section 163.31777 that requires local governments and school boards to enter into an inter-local agreement that addresses school siting, enrollment forecasting, school capacity, infrastructure and safety needs of schools, schools as emergency shelters, and sharing of facilities.	163.31777	FLUE Obj. 9 addresses some of this as does ICE Obj. 5. It is not clear if this requirement has been met at this time – due date was 12-01-04.
20		Added a provision that the concurrency requirement for transportation facilities may be waived by plan amendment for urban infill and redevelopment areas.	163.3180(4)(c)	Need to confirm that there are no transportation facilities in Gulfport.
21		Expanded the definition of “affected persons” to include property owners who own land abutting a change to a future land use map.	163.3184(1)(a)	Clarification within the policy. An amendment can be made to the definitions within the Comp. Plan.
22		Required EAR’s to include (1) consideration of the appropriate regional water supply plan, and (2) an evaluation of whether past reductions in land use densities in coastal high hazard areas have impaired property rights of current residents where redevelopment occurs.	163.3191(2)(1)	Gulfport receives potable water from the City of St. Petersburg via a delivery system owned and operated by Gulfport - updates to the IC and Infrastructure Elements as needed. Need to study is reduction in land use density has occurred within the CHHA since the last EAR.
2004: [Ch. 04-5, s. 11; ch. 04-37, s. 1; ch. 04-230, ss. 1-4; ch. 04-372, ss. 2-5; ch. 04-381, ss. 1-2; ch. 04-384, s. 2, Laws of Florida.]				
23		(13): Created to require local governments to identify adequate water supply sources to meet future demand.	163.3167	Gulfport receives potable water from the City of St. Petersburg via a City-owned and operated delivery system - updates to the IC and Infrastructure Elements as needed.
24	A	(1): Provided legislative findings with respect to the shortage of affordable rentals in the state.	Creates 163.31771.	This is not a requirement but permits municipalities to allow accessory dwellings in single-family districts – this is something that can be addressed in the Comp. Plan in FLUE or Housing Element if desired/needed.
	B	(2): Provided definitions. (3): Authorized local governments to permit accessory dwelling units in areas zoned for single family residential use based upon certain findings.		
	C	(4): Provided for certain accessory dwelling units to apply towards satisfying the affordable housing component of the housing element in a local government’s comprehensive plan.		
	D	(5): Required the DCA to report to the Legislature.		
2005 [Ch. 2005-290 and Ch. 2005-291, ss. 10-12, Laws of Florida]				



CHANGES TO FLORIDA STATUTE CHAPTER 163: INTERGOVERNMENTAL PROGRAMS				
Changes to Chapter 163, F.S. 1986-2005		163, F.S. Citations	Amendment Needed By Element	
25	A	(2) Required comprehensive plans to be “financially” rather than “economically” feasible. (3)(a)5. Required the comprehensive plan to include a 5-year schedule of capital improvements. Outside funding (i.e., from developer, other government or funding pursuant to referendum) of these capital improvements must be guaranteed in the form of a development agreement or interlocal agreement.	163.3177	The "financially" feasible verbiage is used on page 10-3. Section 3. Other Revenue Sources on page 10-7 of the CIP Element should be amended to include this requirement. The CIP includes a six-year CIP which exceeds the five years required by this provision. In addition, Objective 1 requires a minimum of a five-year planning horizon. An objective addressing outside funding may be included in the ICE.
	B	(3)(a)6.b.1. Required plan amendment for the annual update of the schedule of capital improvements. Deleted provision allowing updates and change in the date of construction to be accomplished by ordinance.		The City of St. Petersburg provides potable water. The delivery system is owned and operated by the City of Gulfport. Update IE as necessary
	C	(6)(c) Required the potable water element to be updated within 18 months of an updated regional water supply plan to incorporate the alternative water supply projects selected by the local government to meet its water supply needs.		Gulfport gets water from the City of St. Petersburg - Address in IE (utilities)
	D	(12) Must adopt public school facilities element . (12)(a) and (b) A waiver from providing this element will be allowed under certain circumstances.		A Public School Facilities Element (PSFE) will be required to be added to the City Comprehensive Plan unless the City is found to be exempt. There is at least one school within the City of Gulfport so it is likely that the City will NOT be exempt from this requirement.
	E	(12)(g) Expanded list of items to be to include colocation, location of schools proximate to residential areas , and use of schools as emergency shelters .		
	F	(12)(h) Required local governments to provide maps depicting the general location of new schools and school improvements within future conditions maps.		
	G	(12)(i) Required DCA to establish a schedule for adoption of the public school facilities element.	yes	
	H	(12)(j) Established penalty for failure to adopt a public school facility element.		
	I	(13)(new section) Encouraged local governments to develop a “ community vision ,” which provides for sustainable growth, recognizes its fiscal constraints, and protects its natural resources.	This is optional.	



CHANGES TO FLORIDA STATUE CHAPTER 163: INTERGOVERNMENTAL PROGRAMS				
Changes to Chapter 163, F.S. 1986-2005			163, F.S. Citations	Amendment Needed By Element
	J	(14)(new section) Encouraged local governments to develop a “ urban service boundary ,” which ensures the area is served (or will be served) with adequate public facilities and services over the next 10 years. See 163.3184(17).		
26		(2) Required the public schools interlocal agreement (if applicable) to address requirements for school concurrency . The opt-out provision at the end of subsection (2) is deleted.	163.31777	This will be required unless Gulfport is found to be exempt. The 2006 IA is currently under review and should be finalized by August 2006. This draft includes a section regarding concurrency.
27	A	(1)(a) Added “ schools ” as a required concurrency item.	163.3180	acknowledged
	B	(2)(a) Required consultation with water supplier prior to issuing building permit to ensure “ adequate water supplies ” to serve new development is available by the date of issuance of a certificate of occupancy.		The ICE may need to be modified to more clearly outline this requirement.
	C	(4)(c) Allowed concurrency requirement for public schools to be waived within urban infill and redevelopment areas (163.2517).		This will affect the City if a school is to be located within Gulfport's CRD.
	D	(5)(d) Required guidelines for granting concurrency exceptions to be included in the comprehensive plan.		This may be N/A as Gulfport does not have any transportation facilities. The portion addressing concurrency will need to be examined.
	E	(5)(e) – (g) If local government has established transportation exceptions , the guidelines for implementing the exceptions must be “ consistent with and support a comprehensive strategy, and promote the purpose of the exceptions. ” Exception areas must include mobility strategies, such as alternate modes of transportation, supported by data and analysis. FDOT must be consulted prior to designating a transportation concurrency exception area. Transportation concurrency exception areas existing prior to July 1, 2005 must meet these requirements by July 1, 2006, or when EAR update.	163.3180	Done only if exception areas are established.



CHANGES TO FLORIDA STATUTE CHAPTER 163: INTERGOVERNMENTAL PROGRAMS			
Changes to Chapter 163, F.S. 1986-2005		163, F.S. Citations	Amendment Needed By Element
F	(6) Required local government to maintain records to determine whether 110% de minimis transportation impact threshold is reached. A summary of these records must be submitted with the annual capital improvements element update. Exceeding the 110% threshold dissolves the de minimis exceptions.		An additional objective with supporting policies may be added to the Transportation Element. It is important to note that statutory requirements allowing de minimis impacts for concurrency have been changed to require local governments to maintain records to ensure that the 110% criteria is not exceeded. This documentation must be submitted annually with the updates to the local CIE schedule. If DCA determines that a local government has exceeded the 110% criterion on a particular roadway, then it will prohibit further de minimis development approvals on that roadway until the local government provides proof to DCA that the volume has been reduced below 110%.
G	(7) Required consultation with the Department of Transportation prior to designating a transportation concurrency management area (to promote infill development) to ensure adequate level of service standards are in place. The local government and the DOT should work together to mitigate any impacts to the Strategic Intermodal System.		This is required only in the event a TCMA is desired.
H	(13) Required school concurrency (not optional).		This will be required unless Gulfport is found to be exempt.
I	(13)(c)1. Requires school concurrency after five years to be applied on a " less than districtwide basis " (i.e., by using school attendance zones, etc).	163.3180	
J	(13)(c)3. No application for development approval may be denied if a less-than-districtwide measurement of school concurrency is used; however the development impacts must be shifted to contiguous service areas with school capacity.		This will be required unless Gulfport is found to be exempt.
K	(13)(g)2. Section deleted – it is no longer required that a local government and school board base their plans on consistent population projection and share information regarding planned public school facilities, development and redevelopment and infrastructure needs of public school facilities. However, see (13)(g)6.a. for similar requirement.		N/A - 13.g.6.a will require a note in EAR.



CHANGES TO FLORIDA STATUE CHAPTER 163: INTERGOVERNMENTAL PROGRAMS			
Changes to Chapter 163, F.S. 1986-2005		163, F.S. Citations	Amendment Needed By Element
	L	(13)(g)6.a. (formerly (13)(g)7.a.) Local governments must establish a uniform procedure for determining if development applications are in compliance with school concurrency.	
	M	(13)(g)7. (formerly (13)(g)8.) Deleted language that allowed local government to terminate or suspend an interlocal agreement with the school board.	
	N	(13)(h) (new 2005 provision) The fact that school concurrency has not yet been implemented by a local government should not be the basis for either an approval or denial of a development permit.	
	O	(16) (new 2005 Section) Required local governments to adopt by December 1, 2006 a method for assessing proportionate fair-share mitigation options. FDOT will develop a model ordinance by December 1, 2005.	Has the City done this?
28	A	(2)(k) Required local governments that do not have either a school interlocal agreement or a public school facilities element, to determine in the EAR whether the local government continues to meet the exemption criteria in s.163.3177 (12).	This will be required.
	B	(2)(l) The EAR must determine whether the local government has met its various water supply requirements, including development of alternative water supply projects.	This City does not provide its own water supply.
	C	(2)(p) (New 2005 Provision) The EAR must assess methodology for impacts on transportation facilities.	This impacts updates to the Comp. Plan.
	D	(10) The EAR-based amendment must be adopted within a single amendment cycle. Failure to adopt within this cycle results in penalties. Once updated, the comprehensive plan must be submitted to the DCA.	Acknowledged.

CHANGES TO SECTION 9J-5 MINIMUM CRITERIA FOR REVIEW OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMPREHENSIVE PLANS AND PLAN AMENDMENTS, EVALUATION AND APPRAISAL REPORTS, LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS AND DETERMINATIONS OF COMPLIANCE		
Changes to Rule 9J-5, F.A.C. 1989-2003	9J-5, F.A.C. Citations	Amendment Needed By Element
21-Mar-99		



CHANGES TO SECTION 9J-5 MINIMUM CRITERIA FOR REVIEW OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMPREHENSIVE PLANS AND PLAN AMENDMENTS, EVALUATION AND APPRAISAL REPORTS, LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS AND DETERMINATIONS OF COMPLIANCE				
Changes to Rule 9J-5, F.A.C. 1989-2003			9J-5, F.A.C. Citations	Amendment Needed By Element
1	A	Required policies of the Transportation Element to: • Provide for safe and convenient on-site traffic flow ;	9J-5.019(4)(c)	Additional Objectives/Polices need to be added to the TE.
	B	• Establish measures for the acquisition and preservation of public transit rights-of-way and corridors;		
25-Feb-01				
2		Revised the definition of “ marine wetlands. ”	9J-5.003	Revise definition as follows: “Marine wetlands” means areas with a water regime determined primarily by tides and the dominant vegetation is salt tolerant plant species including those species listed in subsection 62-301.200(3), F.A.C., “Submerged Marine Species.”
21-Mar-99				
3		Revised concurrency management system requirements to include provisions for establishment of public school concurrency.	9J-5.005(1) and (2)	A Public School Facility Element will be required per F.S. 163.3177(12) unless a waiver can be obtained. A concurrency management system could be incorporated into that element.
4		Required data for the Housing Element include a description of substandard dwelling units and repealed the requirement that the housing inventory include a locally determined definition of standard and substandard housing conditions.	9J-5.010(1)(c)	Section II.B. Condition of the Housing Stock (page 4-12) of the Housing Element should be updated to include the description provided in 9J-5.10(2)(b): Substandard units are those that fail to meet the applicable building code, the minimum housing code, or that lack complete plumbing; lack complete kitchen facilities; lack central heating; or are overcrowded.
5		Required the Intergovernmental Coordination Element to include objectives that ensure adoption of interlocal agreements within one year of adoption of the amended Intergovernmental Coordination Element and ensure intergovernmental coordination between all affected local governments and the school board for the purpose of establishing requirements for public school concurrency.	9J-5.015(3)(b)	ICE Section III. should be updated to reflect the requirement of adopting interlocal agreements within one year of adoption of an amended ICE. Objective 5 could be updated to include public school concurrency.
6		Adoption of an interlocal agreement for school concurrency.	9J-5.015(3)(c)	Objective 5 could be updated to include public school concurrency. ICE Section III.B should be updated to reflect this requirement.



Changes to Statewide Regional Planning Policies			
Policy			Amendment Needed By Element
1		2.68 – 2.71 - Sustainable Development	The Comp. Plan generally addresses the items listed through these sections with the exceptions of the provision of green infrastructure/buildings and mixed-use development.
2	A	Natural Resources Goal Area Added the following goals: 4.N- Related to new/expansion existing boat ramps	While an amendment is not necessarily required, this topic could be addressed in the CCME.
	B	4.39 - Low Impact Development Technology	This does not affect the Comp. Plan however the CCME could be modified to incorporate this concept.
	C	4.156 - Marinas and Boat Ramps	This does not affect the Comp. Plan however the CCME could be modified to incorporate this concept.
3		Added the following policies: 5.2 - Cross-access easements	An objective could be added to the TE which tie into the changes to 9J-5.019(4)(c) addressing inter- and intra site access.

Exemption Criteria to the School Element Adoption Requirement	
Florida Statute Chapter 163.3177. Required and optional elements of comprehensive plan; studies and surveys	
Subsection	Text
12	A public school facilities element adopted to implement a school concurrency program shall meet the requirements of this subsection. Each county and each municipality within the county, unless exempt or subject to a waiver, must adopt a public school facilities element that is consistent with those adopted by the other local governments within the county and enter the interlocal agreement pursuant to s. 163.31777 .
12.a	The state land planning agency may provide a waiver to a county and to the municipalities within the county if the capacity rate for all schools within the school district is no greater than 100 % and the projected 5-year capital outlay full-time equivalent student growth rate is less than 10 %. The state land planning agency may allow for a single school to exceed the 100-% limitation if it can be demonstrated that the capacity rate for that single school is not greater than 105 %. In making this determination, the state land planning agency shall consider the following criteria:
12.a.1	Whether the exceedance is due to temporary circumstances;
12.a.2	Whether the projected 5-year capital outlay full time equivalent student growth rate for the school district is approaching the 10-% threshold;
12.a.3	Whether one or more additional schools within the school district are at or approaching the 100-% threshold; and
12.a.4	The adequacy of the data and analysis submitted to support the waiver request.
12.b.	A municipality in a nonexempt county is exempt if the municipality meets all of the following criteria for having no significant impact on school attendance:
12.b.1	The municipality has issued development orders for fewer than 50 residential dwelling units during the preceding 5 years, or the municipality has generated fewer than 25 additional public school students during the preceding 5 years.
12.b.2	The municipality has not annexed new land during the preceding 5 years in land use categories that permit residential uses that will affect school attendance rates.
12.b.3	The municipality has no public schools located within its boundaries.



Exemption Criteria to the School Element Adoption Requirement

Florida Statue Chapter 163.3177. Required and optional elements of comprehensive plan; studies and surveys

12.c.	A public school facilities element shall be based upon data and analyses that address, among other items, how level of service standards will be achieved and maintained. Such data and analyses must include, at a minimum, such items as: the interlocal agreement adopted pursuant to s. 163.31777 and the 5-year school district facilities work program adopted pursuant to s. 1013.35 ; the educational plant survey prepared pursuant to s. 1013.31 and an existing educational and ancillary plant map or map series; information on existing development and development anticipated for the next 5 years and the long-term planning period; an analysis of problems and opportunities for existing schools and schools anticipated in the future; an analysis of opportunities to collocate future schools with other public facilities such as parks, libraries, and community centers; an analysis of the need for supporting public facilities for existing and future schools; an analysis of opportunities to locate schools to serve as community focal points; projected future population and associated demographics, including development patterns year by year for the upcoming 5-year and long-term planning periods; and anticipated educational and ancillary plants with land area requirements.
-------	--





GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF ELEMENTS

A brief assessment of success and shortcomings related to each element of the plan.

The condition of the Future Land Use Element is **FAIR** and requires several amendments that will address the issues generated by citizens, staff and elected officials; including, but not limited to, preservation of community character, non-conforming land use densities, and annexation. Other updates will simply include changes with regard to dates and timing. Another significant addition includes the provision of language addressing the inclusion of regulatory incentives and criteria that encourage the preservation of recreational and commercial working waterfronts as defined in F.S. 342.07. This could be accomplished through the addition of a new objective and supporting policies. Overall this element needs significant changes to better reflect concerns and desires of the community.

The Transportation Element is in **FAIR** condition. A variety of amendments to address the issues generated by citizens, staff and elected officials are needed regarding improvements to the transportation system (pedestrian, bicycle and vehicular), with regard to access, continuity and safety. Other updates will simply include changes with regard to dates and timing. The City will also consider the addition of policies to address the possible creation of a Multimodal Transportation Area and researching grant sources which may aid in creating, marketing and/or developing such an area.

The Housing Element is in **GOOD** condition. Several amendments to this element will adequately address the issues generated by citizens, staff and elected officials. For example amendments to address improving the affordable housing stock through the use of bonus densities and other incentive programs, and allowing garage apartments and granny flats in certain areas of the City (the old zoning code actually permitted them up until 1985). Other updates will simply include changes with regard to dates and timing.

The Sanitary Sewer, Solid Waste, Drainage, Potable Water and Natural Groundwater Recharge Element is in **FAIR** condition. A variety of amendments are needed to address the issues generated by citizens, staff and elected officials as well as annexation concerns. The most significant change is the addition of a new sub element, the Telecommunications Sub Element. This new sub element is suggested to address several issues generated during the identification of local issues.

The Coastal Management and Conservation Element is in **FAIR** condition requiring a variety of amendments to address the issues generated by citizens, staff and elected officials regarding concerns about existing tree canopy, pollution of surrounding water bodies and providing adequate facilities for recreational boating. Specifically, the Conservation Sub Element needs significant updates to better reflect the issues and concerns of the community.



The Recreation and Open Space Element is in **GOOD** condition. Changes are suggested that will address local issues regarding the provision/encouragement of public art.

The Intergovernmental Coordination Element is in **FAIR** condition and requires a variety of changes to address issues generated by citizens, staff and elected officials. Most suggested changes address issues regarding better coordination with St. Petersburg regarding planning along the City's boundaries with St. Petersburg; including public safety, aesthetics and enhancement of the Pinellas Trail. Other suggestions deal with timing issues and references to Interlocal Agreements.

The Economic Development and Redevelopment Element is in **FAIR** condition. A variety of amendments are necessary to address a range of concerns from public safety, aesthetics, encouraging mixed-use development, etc. Other suggestions deal with timing issues. This element needs significant changes to better reflect concerns and desires of the community.

The Capital Improvements Element is in **GOOD** condition with few changes necessary.

A Public School Facilities Element **will be required** in the City Comprehensive Plan, because there are three public schools within the City of Gulfport; Boca Ciega High School, Hamilton-Disston Exceptional School, and Gulfport Montessori Elementary School. The 2005 Florida Legislative Session resulted in a new requirement for the development of a Public School Facilities Element and concurrency standards for public school facilities to be coordinated on a countywide basis and implemented by 2008. The City shall adopt the Public Schools Facilities Element consistent with the requirements of Chapter 163 and 235, Florida Statutes and Pinellas County.





COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AREA EVALUATIONS

The City of Gulfport has two Community Redevelopment Areas (CRAs), The Waterfront Redevelopment Area (WRD), and the 49th Street Redevelopment Corridor Redevelopment Area (49th CRA), comprising 207.86 acres or 9.84% of the City's area.

The WRD is the smaller of the two CRAs consisting of 83.87 acres. The 49th CRA is almost three times the size with 186.38 acres. The two CRAs include 931 properties with 227 in the WRD and 704 in the 49th CRA.

The WRD consists of a single FLUP classification, community redevelopment district (CRD), which allows densities and intensities consistent with the land use standards outlined in the adopted WRD Plan. The 49th CRA consists of six FLUP classifications: Commercial General, Commercial Limited, Institutional, Recreation/Open Space, Residential Low Medium, and Residential Urban, because the adopted 49th CRA does not outline specific use areas with specified densities and intensities. It is recommended that the 49th CRA Plan be updated to include land use areas, and density and intensity standards so that the land use could be changed to CRD allowing development more consistent with the adopted plan in the future.

Approximately 26% of the 49th St. CRA has a commercial land use designation and zoning. The WRD allows for mixed-use development. The mixed-use limited (MUL) area, encourages live-work development, and the mixed-use (MU) area allows retail, office, and restaurants mixed with residential uses.

A variety of Plan amendments are necessary to bring the Comprehensive Plan in line with existing and desired conditions. Specifically, the Plan tends to refer to CRD areas in the future tense. Changes should be made to reflect the fact the City enjoys several CRD areas and should focus on maintaining and enhancing them. Enhancements could include more encouragement of live/work artist space, better water access/mooring facilities and exploring methods to encourage development and redevelopment in these areas through Code amendments.



MAPPING:

The following maps have been created:

1. Map 1: Aerial of City of Gulfport;
2. Map 2: Annexations between 1996 and 2005;
3. Map 3: Vacant Land;
4. Map 4: Existing Land Use;
5. Map 5: Future Land Use Plan Classifications;
6. Map 6: Hurricane Evacuation Zones;
7. Map 7: Land Eligible for Annexation; and
8. Map 8: Zoning Districts.