

Assessment of Land Use and Economic Development Effects FY 2019

Central Avenue Bus Rapid Transit Project	
Project Location:	Cities of St. Petersburg, South Pasadena, and St. Pete Beach, Florida
Lead Agency:	Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority (PSTA)
Project Status:	Small Starts Project Development
<i>Date of entry into PD:</i>	May 2016

A. RATINGS

RECOMMENDED RATINGS

LAND USE – Medium

- **Existing Land Use** – Medium

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT EFFECTS – Medium-Low

- **Plans and Policies** – Medium-Low
- **Performance and Impacts** – Medium-Low
- **Affordable Housing** – Medium-Low

RECOMMENDED SUBFACTOR RATINGS

	LAND USE	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT EFFECTS						
	Existing Land Use	Plans and Policies				Performance and Impacts		Afford. Housing
		Growth Mgmt.	Corr. Policies	Zoning Regs.	Tools to Implement	Perf. of Policies	Potential Impact	Afford. Housing
FY 2019	3	N/A	2	3	2	2	2	2

BI. SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS: LAND USE

I. EXISTING LAND USE

a. Existing Land Use

- The proposed station areas include 37,944 residents at a population density of 4,341 per square mile. Based on FTA scoring guidelines, the figure for average population density earns a “Medium-Low” rating. Employees served by the proposed route total 49,355 corresponding to a “Medium-Low” rating.
- In Downtown St. Petersburg, developments have short setbacks, sidewalks, and landscaping. Newer and high-rise buildings appear to have internal or garage parking facilities, while older, shorter buildings have large surface parking lots. Downtown has a mix of uses, including restaurants, hotels, green space, office buildings, supermarkets, and residences. Moving westward, surface parking lots, single-family residences, and big box retail becomes more prevalent, though sidewalk infrastructure is maintained.
- Pasadena Avenue, 75th Avenue, and the northern portion of Gulf Boulevard, in the Cities of South Pasadena and St. Pete Beach, are lined by parks, strip malls, drug stores, drive-through and fast casual restaurants, and surface parking lots. Buildings are setback from the street, with surface parking between the street and the building.
- The southern portion of Gulf Boulevard is surrounded by mid-rise beach resorts, beach clubs, and public beach access parking, as well a few strip malls and single-family residences. Resorts are setback behind surface parking lots.
- Along Central Avenue, sidewalks are consistently present on both sides of the road and intersections include contrasting marked crossings, ADA ramps, and bumpouts. Longer blocks include mid-block bumpouts and marked crossings. Crossings are unsignalized in residential areas and signalized in Downtown and higher density areas. First Avenues North and South, along which the BRT will run parallel to Central Avenue, have consistent set-back sidewalks and ADA ramps, but show less evidence of marked crossings and bumpouts.
- Along Pasadena Avenue and in St. Pete Beach, sidewalks are consistently present on both sides of the road and signalized intersections include marked crossings with ADA ramps. However, blocks are extremely long with few marked mid-block crossings.
- The CBD has 5,608 parking spaces in public surface lots and parking garages, in addition to spaces in private lots. The cost to park in the public lots is \$1.50 per hour. There are also approximately 2,621 on-street parking spaces, 231 of which will be removed for stations. Typical CBD daily parking cost is \$12.00-\$13.50, corresponding to a “Medium-High” rating. There is approximately 0.51 parking space per employee in the CBD, corresponding to a “Low” rating.
- There are 1,610 legally binding affordability restricted (LBAR) housing units within a one-half mile radius of all station areas and 30,124 total existing housing units within a one-half mile radius of all station areas. The proportion of existing LBAR housing in the transit corridor compared to the proportion of LBAR housing in the county is 3.19, which corresponds with a “High” rating by FTA guidelines.

<i>B2. SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT EFFECTS</i>
I. TRANSIT-SUPPORTIVE PLANS AND POLICIES
<p>a. Growth Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A
<i>B2. SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT EFFECTS</i>
<p>b. Transit-Supportive Corridor Policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Tampa Bay Regional Transportation Authority’s (TBARTA) <i>Transit Oriented Development Resource Guide</i> (2012) encourages jurisdictions in Tampa Bay to increase density with one-half mile of transit stations. • Pinellas County’s Future Land Use Map anticipates denser development along the Central Avenue corridor. • The City of St. Petersburg’s <i>Comprehensive Plan</i> (2016) includes the goal to “create well-designed, transit oriented development ...and to incorporate the land use and economic development criteria outlined in the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) New Starts Planning and Development Process.” • The <i>Central Avenue Revitalization Plan</i> (2012) outlines guiding principles for the corridor, such as mixed-use, dense, and transit-oriented development. The <i>South St. Petersburg Community Redevelopment Plan</i> (2015) supports these principles. • The <i>Innovation District Visioning Summary</i> (2015) high-lights the need for “supportive uses and places,” including filling in parking lots, vacant land, and underutilized land with more dense uses and encouraging a variety of active and mixed uses. • The Cities of St. Pete Beach and South Pasadena do not include similar transit-oriented development policies in their comprehensive plans. • The City of St. Petersburg has addressed pedestrian infrastructure needs in multiple plans, created a Committee to Advocate for Persons with Impairments, and an ADA Task Force. These demonstrate plans to improve pedestrian facilities, including facilities for persons with disabilities. • The Cities of St. Pete Beach and South Pasadena include only limited information on their goals to improve pedestrian infrastructure in their comprehensive plans and make no mention of ADA improvements. However, the two cities possess the areas along the corridor most in need of pedestrian and ADA improvements. • Beginning in June 2017, the City increased its parking rates from \$1.00 to \$1.50 per hour and extended paid parking times. • South Pasadena does not currently have any programs established to limit the amount of space used for parking, and its comprehensive plan is not supportive of such programs. • St. Pete Beach does not currently have any programs established to limit the amount of space used for parking, but its comprehensive plan is supportive of such programs.

c. Supportive Zoning Regulations Near Transit Stations

- Most of the route falls within the City of St. Petersburg.
 - The eastern end of the route – the CBD – is zoned as DC-1, DC-2, DC-P, and DC-C, where DC stands for Downtown Center. Commercial FAR within the CBD is 4.0 with the potential for bonus approvals as high as “greater than 8.0.” This corresponds to a “Medium-Low” rating for the base zoning and up to a “Medium-High” rating with bonus approvals. The Downtown Center zoning designations permit bonus density for the provision of mixed land uses and pedestrian and transit-supportive design. Minimum setbacks are between zero and 20 feet.
 - Most of the corridor is covered by the Central Avenue Activity Center, which allows higher maximum densities and intensities than permitted in the underlying zoning district.
 - Adjacent to the CBD, the Central Avenue corridor is zoned CCT-2, or Corridor Commercial Traditional, which, under the activity center designation, permits up to 2.5 FAR, corresponding to a “Medium-High” rating. Minimum setbacks are zero to ten feet.
 - The western two-thirds of the Central Avenue corridor between First Avenues North and South is mostly zoned CRT-1, or Corridor Residential Traditional. This permits up to 2.5 FAR under the activity center designation, corresponding to a “Medium-High” rating. Minimum setbacks are between zero and 30 feet.
 - NT-1, NT-2, or NT-3, or Neighborhood Traditional Single-Family, are common zones north and south of the corridor outside of the CBD. These permit between 0.4 and 0.5 FAR, corresponding to a “Low” rating. Minimum setbacks of 25 to 40 feet are permitted.
 - The City of St. Petersburg has provisions for reduced parking in the Downtown, shared parking, and adjusting parking rates based on demand.
- The route traverses South Pasadena and stops twice within the jurisdiction.
 - Permitted residential densities range from 10 to 13.5 dwelling units per acre, corresponding to a “Medium” rating. Residential setbacks range between 15 and 35 feet. Commercial development is permitted at 0.65 FAR, corresponding to a “Medium-Low” rating. The minimum setback is 25 feet.
 - The Planned Redevelopment overlay zoning along Pasadena Avenue permits commercial densities up to 1.25 FAR, corresponding to a “Medium” rating and residential uses up to 25 dwelling units per acre, corresponding to a “High” rating. Minimum setbacks range between zero and 75 feet, depending on building height.
 - The City of South Pasadena does not currently have any codes established to limit space used for parking.
- The western end of the route falls within the City of St. Pete Beach.
 - Along 75th Avenue, the majority of the zoning is TC-1, or Town Center Core District. This allows for a maximum FAR of 1.45 and a maximum residential dwelling unit density of 15 units per acre. This corresponds to a “Medium” rating. Setbacks between five and 15 feet are permitted.
 - Along the northern part of Gulf Boulevard, CC-2, or Commercial Corridor Gulf Blvd District, prevails. This allow for a maximum of 0.7 FAR (“Medium-Low”) or 12 dwelling units per acre (“Medium”). This corresponds to a “Medium-Low” or “Medium” rating, respectively. Non-residential uses are permitted a 20 foot maximum setback.
 - Two residential designations are prevalent to the east of Gulf Boulevard. These are RU-2 and RM. These allow for FARs of 0.4 and 0.5, respectively, and a minimum setback of 20 feet. FAR permitted corresponds to “Low” rating.
 - Other designations along the central and southern portions of Gulf Boulevard include AC (Activity Center District), which allows a residential density of up to 15 dwelling units per acre or a maximum FAR of 1.0 (“Medium”), and BHC (Boutique Hotel/Condo District), which allows for up to 18 dwelling units per acre (“Medium-High”). The AC designation permits minimum setbacks of 20 feet. The BHC designation permits minimum setbacks 20 to 100 feet depending on building height.
 - The City of St. Pete Beach does not currently have any codes to limit the space used for parking.

- d. Tools to Implement Land Use Policies**
- The *Central Avenue Revitalization Plan* (2012) describes a series of four “Conversation on Central” meetings held along Central Avenue beginning in August 2010. These quarterly meetings help established corridorwide communication and helped the City of St. Petersburg identify priorities.
 - As part of the *TBARTA Master Plan* (2009), the TBARTA Land Use Working Group met bi-monthly to discuss existing land use, growth, and goals. The group emphasized the need for a “TOD toolbox” to help the region better compete for FTA funds. TBARTA created the *TOD Resource Guide* (2012) to address this need. The *TOD Resource Guide* informed station area planning for the project.
 - Through Pinellas County’s Multimodal Impact Fee Ordinance, bus stop shelters and pads are eligible for a credit against the impact fee assessment.
 - The City of St. Petersburg offers Multimodal Impact Fee credits when developers construct transit-support infrastructure beyond that required by code.
 - In St. Petersburg, FAR bonuses are available in Downtown Center districts for developers that provide support to the City’s Downtown mass transit program.
 - On August 3, 2017, the local chapter of the Urban Land Institute held a monthly “StimULI” session on “Designing & Developing a District,” attracting experts from design and branding, development, business, and the City of St. Petersburg.
 - The City of St. Pete Beach provides minimal mention of engaging stakeholders in the formation of its comprehensive plan, while South Pasadena provides no mention.

B2. SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT EFFECTS

II. PERFORMANCE AND IMPACTS OF POLICIES

- a. Performance of Land Use Policies**
- Renderings of Johns Hopkins Children’s Hospital, Brownstones, James Museum, Galaxy Hotel, ONE, and The Salvador show transit supportive densities and sidewalk infrastructure. Additional renderings of Police Headquarters and Crafts Museum do not show transit-supportive densities, but do include landscaped pedestrian areas. No renderings show visible parking facilities and all renderings, with the exception of the Police Headquarters, show minimal setbacks.
 - In April 2017, there were 23 development projects within downtown, including museums, hotels, residences, mixed-use projects, a medical research and education facility, and a new police headquarters.
 - A new pier, Pier Park, is expected be completed by the end of 2018 with pedestrian infrastructure to tie the waterfront with Downtown.

- b. Potential Impact of Transit Investment on Regional Land Use**
- Vacant land is scattered throughout the corridor, with greater concentrations on the eastern half (Downtown St. Petersburg and Grand Central District). Zoning in Downtown St. Petersburg allows transit-supportive densities and encourages transit-friendly characteristics.
 - The Tampa Bay region’s population is expected to grow 21 percent by 2040 and its employment is expected to grow 27 percent. Station areas are expected to grow 15 percent in population by 2040 and eight percent in employment. These represent slower growth rates than the region.

III. TOOLS TO MAINTAIN OR INCREASE SHARE OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING**a. Tools to Maintain or Increase Share of Affordable Housing**

- The City of St. Petersburg's *Comprehensive Plan* (2016) includes the following target: "The City shall ensure that affordable housing for extremely low, very low, low, and moderate-income households, including households with special needs, is available to 35 percent of the new households forecasted by 2010." It also includes Objective H1: "The City shall provide technical and financial assistance to the private sector to provide dwelling units of various types, sizes, and costs to meet the affordable housing needs of existing and future populations of the city..." The City of St. Petersburg has committed general revenue funds to establish a Housing Capital Improvement Program to fund specific housing initiatives, and provides a Workforce Housing Density Bonus for developers who build affordable housing
- The *South St. Petersburg Community Redevelopment Plan* assesses affordable housing needs within the South St. Petersburg Community Redevelopment Area (CRA), which covers most the corridor and the area south of the corridor within St. Petersburg. The South St. Petersburg CRA directs 40 percent of tax increment financing (TIF) revenues to the development of affordable and market-rate housing in the CRA. Additionally, a TIF rebate for up to 15 years is provided for developers of affordable housing. Habitat for Humanity of Pinellas County has invested more than \$2.9 million in the South St. Petersburg CRA.
- The *Intown Redevelopment Plan* (2015) includes the goal that "The development of both affordable and market rate housing should be encouraged through incentives." The plan states that bonus and exemption provisions include increase of FAR for developers who provide affordable housing. Intown encompasses the very eastern end of the route.
- An amendment to the City of St. Pete Beach's *Comprehensive Plan* (1998) states that "Pinellas County... is experiencing an affordable housing crisis." The City of St. Pete Beach established a density bonus of up to five units per acre for the provision of affordable housing units.
- The City of South Pasadena's *Comprehensive Plan* (2008) makes no mention of affordable housing.

C. PROJECT OVERVIEW

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Central Avenue Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project consists of an 11-mile service between downtown St. Petersburg and St. Pete Beach, serving the Cities of St. Petersburg, South Pasadena, and St. Pete Beach in the Tampa Bay region of Florida. Six of these 11 miles will be on bus-only lanes. The route consists of 17 stations and is the first exclusive guideway project in the region. It will be served by hybrid articulated buses and run 7 days per week from 6:00am to midnight, with 15-minute frequencies during the daytime and 30-minute frequencies during the nighttime. Transit signal priority will be implemented at 53 intersections and up to six new or reconstructed signals will be installed. Ten other bus routes will connect to the service.

CORRIDOR DESCRIPTION

The Central Avenue BRT project runs east-west along First and Second Avenues North and South, parallel to Central Avenue, throughout most of its journey through St. Petersburg and South Pasadena. The BRT will utilize South Pasadena and 75th Avenues to travel to St. Pete Beach, where it will run north-south along Gulf Boulevard.

The project connects downtown St. Petersburg – including two professional sports fields, museums, government offices, institutes of higher education, hospitals, and hotels – to South Pasadena, a mostly residential area, and to St. Pete Beach – including hotels, resorts, beaches, and a hospital.

DESCRIPTION OF LOCAL AGENCIES

The Central Avenue BRT would be owned and operated by Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority (PSTA), which provides public transportation services to Pinellas County, Florida. The PSTA oversees 38 bus routes, including two express routes to Hillsborough County, and its DART service for persons with disabilities.

The project runs through the cities of St. Petersburg, South Pasadena, and St. Pete Beach, all located within Pinellas County. St. Petersburg and St. Pete Beach host the main activity centers and endpoints, while South Pasadena is a small municipality with only two sets of stops between the two.

D. QUANTITATIVE DATA SUMMARY			
Data	Current Year (2016)	Horizon Year (N/A)	Growth (%) (N/A)
Metropolitan Area			
Total Population	2,185,606		
Total Employment	1,304,208		
Central Business District			
Total Employment	19,937		
Employment Density (employees/sq. mi.)	13,491.9		
Corridor			
Total Population	39,665		
Total Employment	49,434		
Total Land Area (Square Miles)	9.0		
Population Density (Persons per Square Mile)	4,394.4		
Employment Density (Jobs per Square Mile)	5,476.7		
All Station Areas			
Total Population	37,944		
Total Employment	49,355		
Total Land Area (Square Miles)	8.7		
Population Density (Persons per Square Mile)	4,341.4		
Employment Density (Jobs per Square Mile)	5,647.0		
Affordable Housing			
Proportion in All Station Areas	5%		
Proportion in All Counties in Which Stations are Located	2%		
Ratio, Proportion in All Station Areas to Proportion in All Counties in Which Stations are Located	3.19		

<i>E1. DETAILED ASSESSMENT OF LAND USE</i>	
I. EXISTING LAND USE	
a. EXISTING LAND USE	Rating: Medium
Existing corridor and station area development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed 8.7 square mile station area, incorporating all areas within one-half mile of the 17 stops, includes 30,124 housing units and 37,944 residents at a population density of 4,341 per square mile. Based on FTA scoring guidelines, the figure for average population density earns a “Medium-Low” rating. Population density is highest on the eastern end of the route near the CBD and waterfront. • Employees served by the proposed route total 49,355, corresponding to a “Medium-Low” rating. Employment density within one-half mile of stations is 5,647 employees per square mile. The 1.5 mile square CBD employs 19,937 people, or 1.5 percent of metropolitan area employees. Employment density is highest in the CBD, along Central Avenue, Pasadena Avenue, and central Gulf Boulevard.
Existing corridor and station area development character	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Downtown St. Petersburg, developments have short setbacks, sidewalks, and landscaping. Newer and high-rise buildings appear to have internal or garage parking facilities, while older, shorter buildings have large surface parking lots. There appears to be a mix of uses, including restaurants, hotels, green space, office buildings, supermarkets, and residences. • West of Downtown, surface parking lots increase in size and frequency, but buildings continue to have short setbacks with sidewalk infrastructure. A mix of uses, including arts centers, breweries, restaurants, residences, educational institutions, and businesses, is present. • Towards the central and western parts of the Central Avenue corridor, a mix of businesses and surface parking uses remains prevalent. Small single-family detached homes and townhouses become prevalent to the north and south of Central Avenue. These are intermixed with occasional parks and big box uses, such as a Walmart Supercenter and a United States Postal Service building, with accompanying large parking and loading spaces. • Pasadena Avenue, in the City of South Pasadena, is lined by parks, strip malls, drive-through and fast casual restaurants, and surface parking lots. Buildings are set back from the street, with surface parking between the street and the buildings. • 75th Avenue in St. Pete Beach is lined with sidewalks, surface parking lots, and a mix of retail uses. Stores are set back behind surface parking lots. • The northern portion of Gulf Boulevard contains surface parking lots, a few vacant lots, restaurants, strip malls, ice cream stores, drive-through and fast casual restaurants, and other similar uses. Stores are set back behind surface parking lots. • The southern portion of Gulf Boulevard is surrounded by mid-rise beach resorts, beach clubs, and public beach access parking, as well a few strip malls and single-family residences. Resorts are setback behind large surface parking lots.
Existing station area pedestrian facilities, including access for persons with disabilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Along Central Avenue, sidewalks are consistently present on both sides of the road and intersections include contrasting marked crossings, ADA ramps, and bumpouts. Longer blocks include mid-block bumpouts and marked crossings. Crossings are unsignalized in residential areas and signalized in Downtown and higher density areas. First Avenues North and South, along which the BRT will run, have consistent setback sidewalks and ADA ramps, but show less evidence of marked crossings and bumpouts. • Along Pasadena Avenue and on St. Pete Beach, sidewalks are consistently present on both sides of the road and signalized intersections include marked crossings with ADA ramps. However, blocks are extremely long with few marked mid-block

<i>E1. DETAILED ASSESSMENT OF LAND USE</i>	
	crossings.
Existing corridor and station area parking supply	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The CBD has 5,608 parking spaces in public surface lots and parking garages, in addition to spaces in private lots. The cost to park in the public lots is \$1.50 per hour. There are also approximately 2,621 on-street parking spaces, 231 of which will be removed for stations. Typical CBD daily parking cost is \$12.00-\$13.50, corresponding to a “Medium-High” rating. There is approximately 0.51 parking space per employee in the CBD, corresponding to a “Low” rating.
Proportion of existing legally binding affordability restricted housing in the corridor compared to the proportion of legally binding affordability restricted housing in the counties in which the project travels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are 1,610 legally binding affordability restricted (LBAR) housing units within a one-half mile radius of all station areas and 30,124 total existing housing units within a one-half mile radius of all station areas. The proportion of existing LBAR housing in the transit corridor compared to the proportion of LBAR housing in the county is 3.19, which corresponds with a “High” rating by FTA guidelines.
<i>E2. DETAILED ASSESSMENT OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT EFFECTS</i>	
I. TRANSIT-SUPPORTIVE PLANS AND POLICIES	
a. GROWTH MANAGEMENT	Rating: N/A
Concentration of development around established activity centers and regional transit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
Land conservation and management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
b. TRANSIT-SUPPORTIVE CORRIDOR POLICIES	Rating: Medium-Low
Plans and policies to increase corridor and station area development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TBARTA’s <i>Transit Oriented Development Resource Guide</i> (2012) includes “Land Use” as a guiding principle. Under this principle, it includes a guideline to “create compact development areas with one-half mile walk of public transit with sufficient density and/or intensity to support ridership.” Throughout the document, which is designed to serve as a reference and resource for jurisdictions within the Tampa Bay Region, increasing density around transit stations is emphasized. Pinellas County’s Future Land Use Map, shown in its <i>Long Range Transportation Plan</i> (2014), anticipates denser development along the Central Avenue corridor. The <i>Central Avenue Revitalization Plan</i> (2012) recommends increasing residential density maximums to about 60 units per acre, corresponding to a “High” rating, directly along Central Avenue. The plan also outlines guiding principles for the corridor, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dense development, related to later recommendations to increase density and intensity along the corridor; and Transit-Oriented Development, with a focus on increased densities around stations. The <i>South St. Petersburg Community Redevelopment Plan</i> (2015) supports the

E1. DETAILED ASSESSMENT OF LAND USE	
	<p>implementation of the <i>Central Avenue Revitalization Plan</i> (2012), including the “continued evolution of the Central Avenue Corridor as a dense, mixed-use transit-oriented development corridor.” The plan also encourages “targeted rezoning of land to increase densities in residential neighborhoods and promote...improved transit access.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City of St. Petersburg’s <i>Comprehensive Plan</i> (2016) includes the following objective: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Creating walkable, moderate to high density, mixed-use developments located within approximately one-half mile of public transit stops or stations. • The cities of South Pasadena and St. Pete Beach do not have any plans or policies to increase corridor and station area development included in their comprehensive plans.
Plans and policies to enhance transit-friendly character of corridor and station area development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City of St. Petersburg’s <i>Comprehensive Plan</i> (2016) includes the goal to “create well-designed, transit oriented development to allow residents, visitors, and tourists to travel to a variety of places without using a personal vehicle, to provide direction for developing and redeveloping properties around transit stations in a way that makes it convenient for people to use transit, and to incorporate the land use and economic development criteria outlined in the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) New Starts Planning and Development Process.” The plan includes the following objectives and policies underneath this goal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Introducing creative parking strategies; ○ Providing a variety of housing types; ○ Providing active uses such as retail and office on the ground floor of buildings; and ○ Creating continuous, direct, safe, and convenient transit and pedestrian linkages. • The <i>Central Avenue Revitalization Plan</i> (2012) outlines guiding principles for the corridor, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mixed-Use development, encouraging a variety of land use types and vertical and horizontal mix of uses. • The <i>Innovation District Visioning Summary</i> (2015) highlights the need for “supportive uses and places,” including filling in parking lots, vacant land, and underutilized land with more dense uses and encouraging a variety of active and mixed uses. • The Cities of St. Pete Beach and South Pasadena do not include similar transit-oriented development policies in their comprehensive plans.
Plans to improve pedestrian facilities, including facilities for persons with disabilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City of St. Petersburg has addressed pedestrian infrastructure needs in multiple plans, created a Committee to Advocate for Persons with Impairments, and an ADA Task Force. These demonstrate plans to improve pedestrian facilities, including facilities for persons with disabilities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The City of St. Petersburg’s <i>CityTrails Bicycle Pedestrian Master Plan 2009 Status Update</i> states that the City, as part of the Tampa Bay Region, was the worst in the nation in per capita deaths or injuries to pedestrians in the year 2000. By 2008, the city was named the best walking city in Florida by <i>Prevention</i> magazine. Pedestrian crashes were reduced by 50 percent from 2000 to 2008. The status report indicates that between 2003 and 2008, the City: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Enhanced numerous crosswalks and intersections with yield

<i>E1. DETAILED ASSESSMENT OF LAND USE</i>	
	<p>signs, ITS warning beacons, countdown pedestrian signals, and refreshed pavement markings;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Added 13 miles of sidewalks; and ▪ Reduced response time for sidewalk repairs from 30 months to less than one month. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The City of St. Petersburg’s <i>Comprehensive Plan</i> (2016) states that “Pedestrian and bicycle facilities shall be designed, encouraged and celebrated as indicators of a healthy city.” It advocates for “pedestrian first” design. Along commercial and residential corridors, the plan recommends pedestrian connections and landscaping. In TOD areas, the plan advocates to “Make safety, with the emphasis on pedestrian, bicycle and Americans with Disabilities (ADA) access, a key focus of the TOD development strategy.” The plan outlines steps to take towards meeting these goals. For instance, it states that “The City seeks to work with the Pinellas County MPO and FDOT to obtain funding for bikeway and sidewalk improvements, encourage the inclusion of bicycle and pedestrian facilities in roadway construction and reconstruction projects, and develop design standards and programs.” It also states that “The City shall require sidewalk construction in the rights-of-way of roadways adjacent to properties proposed for development through the application of the site plan review process.” ○ The City of St. Petersburg’s <i>ADA Self-Evaluation and Transition Plan Update</i> (2016) describes the City’s Committee to Advocate for Persons with Impairments and the ADA Evaluation Task Force’s findings as well as the City’s ADA transition plan and priorities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pinellas County MPO’s <i>2040 Long Range Transportation Plan</i> (2014) includes an objective to “Increase bicycle and pedestrian travel by providing sidewalks, bike lanes and multi-use trails throughout the county.” The plan states the MPO’s aim to incorporate FDOT’s complete streets policy into its own complete street policy. • The Cities of St. Pete Beach and South Pasadena include only limited information on their goals to improve pedestrian infrastructure in their comprehensive plans and make no mention of ADA improvements. However, the two cities possess the areas along the corridor most in need of pedestrian and ADA improvements. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The City of St. Pete Beach <i>Comprehensive Plan</i> (1998) notes that residents have expressed “a need and desire to improve the safety, traffic flow and appearance of Gulf Boulevard that is the primary and most visible corridor through our community by: improving pedestrian and bicycle safety...” The plan includes Policy 1.3.3 to “encourage alternative mobility options through safe, comfortable and continuous pedestrian and bicycle pathways linked to the downtown area, recreational facilities, activity and entertainment centers and public beach access points to reduce reliance on the auto.” ○ The City of South Pasadena’s <i>Comprehensive Plan</i> (2008) includes transportation goal 202 to “Achieve an adequate pedestrian and bicycle circulation system throughout the City by providing and adequate number of safe places to cross major roads, providing sidewalk and bikeways where feasible, and developing signalized and well-marked pedestrian crossings.” Objectives also include coordinating with other entities and providing well-marked pedestrian crossings with adequate crossing times.

E1. DETAILED ASSESSMENT OF LAND USE	
Parking policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A parking study completed for the St. Petersburg Downtown Partnership recommended that the City implement demand-based pricing, rather than a flat rate of \$1.00 per hour. Beginning in June 2017, the following was implemented: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Meters on Central Avenue extended from 6:00pm to 8:00pm, seven days per week; and ○ Rates increased from \$1.00 to \$1.50 per hour. • South Pasadena’s <i>Comprehensive Plan</i> (1998) includes the objective to “reduce the need for parking by participating in shared parking plans, employer ride-share and shuttle service programs.” The plan also states that “a variety of parking solutions for motorized and non-motorized vehicles shall be pursued to support redevelopment...”
c. SUPPORTIVE ZONING NEAR TRANSIT STATIONS	
Rating: Medium	
Zoning ordinances that support increased development density in transit station areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the route falls within the City of St. Petersburg. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The eastern end of the route – the CBD – is zoned as DC-1, DC-2, DC-P, and DC-C, where DC stands for Downtown Center. Commercial FAR within the CBD is 4.0 with the potential for bonus approvals as high as “greater than 8.0.” These densities correspond to a “Medium-Low” rating for the base zoning and up to a “Medium-High” rating with the bonuses. ○ The City of St. Petersburg’s <i>Comprehensive Plan</i> (2016) includes the goal to apply a TOD Future Land Use Map Overlay to premium transit station locations which allows for greater densities and intensities. This has been enacted in the form of the Central Avenue Activity Center. Most of the corridor is covered by the Central Avenue Activity Center, which allows for higher maximum densities and intensities than permitted in the underlying zoning district. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Adjacent to the CBD, the Central Avenue corridor is zoned CCT-2, or Corridor Commercial Traditional, which permits 1.5 FAR. Under the activity center designation, up to 2.5 FAR is permitted within the entirety of the CCT-2 designation, corresponding to a “Medium-High” rating. ▪ The western two-thirds of the Central Avenue corridor between First Avenues North and South is mostly zoned CRT-1, or Corridor Residential Traditional. This corresponds to up to 1.0 FAR. Under the activity center designation, up to 2.5 FAR is permitted, corresponding to a “Medium-High” rating. ○ NT-1, NT-2, or NT-3, or Neighborhood Traditional Single-Family, are common zones north and south of the corridor outside of the CBD. These permit between 0.4 and 0.5 FAR, corresponding to a “Low” rating. • The City of South Pasadena falls between St. Petersburg and St. Pete Beach. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Residential single family zoning designations allow densities between ten and 12.5 dwelling units per acre, corresponding to a “Medium” rating. ○ Mobile homes are permitted at a density of 13.5 dwelling units per acre, corresponding to a “Medium.” ○ Multi-family residential is permitted at up to 12.5 dwelling units per acre and three stories, corresponding to a “Medium.” ○ The General Commercial District permits heights up to three stories and densities up to 0.65 FAR, corresponding to a “Medium-Low” rating. ○ The Planned Redevelopment overlay zoning designation lies along

E1. DETAILED ASSESSMENT OF LAND USE	
	<p>Pasadena Avenue. Depending on the underlying zoning, up to 1.25 FAR is permitted for commercial uses, corresponding to a “Medium” rating, and up to 25 dwelling units per acre is permitted for residential uses, corresponding to a “High” rating.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The western end of the route falls within the City of St. Pete Beach. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Along 75th Avenue, the majority of the zoning is TC-1, or Town Center Core District. This allows for a maximum FAR of 1.45 (Medium rating) and a maximum residential dwelling unit density of 15 units per acre (Medium-High rating). ○ Along the northern part of Gulf Boulevard, CC-2, or Commercial Corridor Gulf Blvd District, prevails. This allow for a maximum of 0.7 FAR or 12 dwelling units per acre. This corresponds to “Medium-Low” and “Medium” ratings, respectively. ○ Two residential designations are prevalent to the east of Gulf Boulevard. These are RU-2 and RM. These allow for FARs of 0.4 and 0.5, respectively. This corresponds to a “Low” rating. ○ Other designations along the central and southern portions of Gulf Boulevard include AC (Activity Center District), which allows a residential density of up to 15 dwelling units per acre or a maximum FAR of 1.0 (“Medium”), and BHC (Boutique Hotel/Condo District), which allows for up to 18 dwelling units per acre (“Medium-High”).
<p>Zoning ordinances that enhance transit-oriented character of station area development and pedestrian access</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the route falls within the City of St. Petersburg. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Downtown Core zoning designations (DC-1, DC-2, DC-P, and DC-C) permit bonus density for the provision of active street uses, such as retail, public amenities, historic preservation, workforce housing, and exterior office uses which make parking not visible from the street. Minimum setbacks are between zero and 20 feet depending on the height of the building. DC zoning designations require building facades and entrances to be oriented towards the street, with parking, loading docks, etc. located at the rear of the building. The first floor of big box buildings are required to have “use liners,” such as retail, restaurant, or residential uses, and ground facades along primary streets must have at least 50 percent transparency at the ground level. ○ The CCT-2 zoning designation permits minimum setbacks of zero feet from the property line or 10 feet from the curb, whichever is greater, when buildings are shorter than 42 feet. When buildings are between 42 and 72 feet, a setback of 10 feet from the property line or 20 feet from the curb, whichever is greater, is permitted. CCT-2 also requires that building facades and entrances be oriented towards the street, with parking, loading docks, garages, and mechanical equipment placed to the rear of the building. Within the Central Avenue Corridor Activity Center, CCT-2 zoned parcels must have at least 60 percent of their linear building frontage along Central Avenue and First Avenues North and South devoted to non-vehicular, pedestrian-oriented uses. ○ The CRT-1 zoning designation within the Central Avenue Activity Corridor permits minimum setbacks of zero feet from the property line or 10 feet from the curb, whichever is greater, when buildings are shorter than 42 feet. When buildings are between 42 and 72 feet, a setback of 20 feet from the property line or 30 feet from the curb, whichever is greater, is permitted. Buildings must be oriented towards the street with all service areas, loading docks, mechanical equipment, parking, etc. located

<i>E1. DETAILED ASSESSMENT OF LAND USE</i>	
	<p>to the rear of the building. Within the Central Avenue Corridor Activity Center, CRT-1 zoned parcels must have at least 60 percent of their linear building frontage along Central Avenue and First Avenues North and South devoted to non-vehicular, pedestrian-oriented uses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Neighborhood Traditional Single-Family zoning designations (NT-1, NT-2, and NT-3) permit minimum setbacks of 25 to 40 feet depending on the height of the building. For nonresidential uses, all service areas and loading docks must be located behind the facade of the principal structure. Driveways and garage doors must face the alley or side street. Entries must connect to the sidewalk. ● The route traverses through the City of South Pasadena. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Residential single family and mobile home setbacks range between 15 and 25 feet. ○ Multi-family residential developments require a setback of 35 feet. ○ The General Commercial District requires a setback of 25 feet. ○ Minimum building setbacks for development with the Planned Redevelopment zoning designation ranges between zero and 75 feet, depending on building height. ● The western end of the route falls within the City of St. Pete Beach. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Along 75th Avenue, the majority of the zoning is TC-1, or Town Center Core District. Along 75th Avenue, setbacks between five and 15 feet are permitted. ○ Along the northern part of Gulf Boulevard, CC-2, or Commercial Corridor Gulf Blvd District, prevails. Non-residential uses are permitted a 20 foot maximum setback. ○ Two residential designations are prevalent to the east of Gulf Boulevard. These are RU-2 and RM. Both require a minimum setback of 20 feet. ○ Other designations along the central and southern portions of Gulf Boulevard include AC (Activity Center District) and BHC (Boutique Hotel/Condo District). The AC designation permits minimum setbacks of 20 feet. The BHC designation permits minimum setbacks 20 to 100 feet depending on building height. ○ For all zoning designations, buildings open to the public shall have an entrance for pedestrians from the street to the building interior. Commercial and mixed-use buildings are required to show a “storefront character,” including display windows. Trees are required along pedestrian walkways.
Zoning allowances for reduced parking and traffic mitigation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● In St. Petersburg, parking minimum reductions are available for developers who construct workforce and affordable housing projects. ● The City of St. Petersburg has provisions for reduced parking in Downtown, shared parking, and adjusted parking rates based on demand. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The City of St. Petersburg has lower requirements for parking in the Downtown Center zoning designations as well as along Central Avenue. For example, it requires one parking space per residential unit up to two bedrooms in a multi-family unit and no parking for cafes less than 1,200 square feet. ○ Section 16.040.090.3.2 of the City of St. Petersburg’s municipal code allows for joint use or shared parking. The code states that “Joint use of required nonresidential parking spaces may occur where two or more

E1. DETAILED ASSESSMENT OF LAND USE	
	<p>uses on the same or separate sites are able to share the same parking spaces because their parking demands occur at different times.” The code sets forth a method for calculating the number of shared parking spaces needed based on use by time of day.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Pasadena does not currently have any codes established to limit the amount of space used for parking, and its comprehensive plan is not supportive of such programs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The code only enforces minimums, such as two parking spaces for residential single-family dwellings and 1.5 spaces for multi-family residential dwelling units. • St. Pete Beach does not currently have any codes established to limit the amount of space used for parking, but its comprehensive plan is supportive of such programs. <p>The code only enforces minimums, such as two spaces per every residential unit or one space per every 100 square feet of restaurant area.</p>
d. TOOLS TO IMPLEMENT LAND USE POLICIES	
Rating: Medium-Low	
Outreach to government agencies and the community in support of land use planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <i>Central Avenue Revitalization Plan</i> (2012) describes a series of four “Conversation on Central” meetings held along Central Avenue beginning in August 2010. These quarterly meetings helped establish corridorwide communication and helped the City of St. Petersburg identify priorities and issues, such as improving the corridor’s image and identity, transit conditions, lighting, safety, maintenance, and mix of land uses. • As part of the TBARTA <i>Master Plan</i> (2009), the TBARTA Land Use Working Group, consisting of representatives from various land use planning agencies, environmental groups, the development community, and transportation agencies, as well as community members, met bi-monthly to discuss existing land use patterns, long-range land use plans, growth projections, community goals, and transit-oriented development. After the plan was finalized, the group continued its discussions and emphasized the need for a “TOD toolbox” to help the region better compete for FTA funds. TBARTA created the <i>TOD Resource Guide</i> (2012) to address this need. The <i>TOD Resource Guide</i> informed station area planning for the project. • The City of St. Pete Beach <i>Comprehensive Plan</i> (1998, last amended 2012) states that the City received resident suggestions and input during a six year process beginning December 2001. The plan consolidates these suggestions into 10 factors, including the desire to revitalize Downtown, the desire to reduce traffic congestion by making the city more walkable, and improve pedestrian and bicycle safety along Gulf Boulevard. • The City of South Pasadena did not mention any public outreach efforts conducted in the formation of its <i>Comprehensive Plan</i> (2008).
Regulatory and financial incentives to promote transit-supportive development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Pinellas County Transportation Impact Fee Ordinance (TIFO), in place since 1986, provides a countywide uniform approach to the assessment, collection and expenditure of transportation impact fees. Through TIFO, developers get credit for pre-existing uses, encouraging the redevelopment and re-use of existing structures. Lower fees are applied to Downtown districts where more density is desired. • Through Pinellas County’s Multimodal Impact Fee Ordinance, bus stop shelters and pads are eligible for a credit against the impact fee assessment in an amount equal to the cost of the improvement or one percent of the fee, whichever is greater. • The City of St. Petersburg offers Multimodal Impact Fee credits when developers

E1. DETAILED ASSESSMENT OF LAND USE	
	<p>construct transit-supportive infrastructure beyond that required by code.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In St. Petersburg, FAR bonuses are available in Downtown Center districts for developers that provide support to the City’s Downtown mass transit program. Developers must contribute 0.25 percent or more of the total construction cost for each 0.5 FAR bonus. • As mentioned in “Zoning allowances for reduced parking and traffic mitigation,” in St. Petersburg, parking minimum reductions are available for developers who construct workforce and affordable housing projects. • In DC-1 and DC-2 zoning designations that apply to portions of Downtown St. Petersburg, FAR bonuses for fully internal parking, green building construction, streetscape improvements, public art, historic structure preservation, affordable housing system funding, and transit system funding are awarded. • No mention of similar regulatory or financial incentives to promote transit-supportive development is included in the comprehensive plans of South Pasadena or St. Pete Beach.
Efforts to engage the development community in station area planning and transit-supportive development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On August 3, 2017, the local chapter of the Urban Land Institute held a monthly “StimULI” session on “Designing & Developing a District.” The event included over 140 attendees, including experts from design and branding, development, business, and the City of St. Petersburg. Speakers included people from the City of St. Petersburg, Eastman Equity, Clear Ph, and Mesh Architecture. The event was moderated by the President and CEO of the St. Petersburg Area Chamber of Commerce. • The EDGE Business District Association, TBARTA Land Use Working Group, and WIPA Partnership, described under “Outreach to government agencies and the community in support of land use planning,” include members of the development community.
II. PERFORMANCE AND IMPACTS OF POLICIES	
a. PERFORMANCE OF LAND USE POLICIES	
Rating: Medium-Low	
Demonstrated cases of developments affected by transit-oriented policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renderings of Johns Hopkins Children’s Hospital, Brownstones, James Museum, Galaxy Hotel, ONE, and The Salvador show transit supportive densities and sidewalk infrastructure, including landscaping. These are all located in or near Downtown St. Petersburg. • Additional renderings of Police Headquarters and Crafts Museum do not show transit-supportive densities, but do include landscaped pedestrian areas. • No renderings show visible parking facilities and all renderings, with the exception of the Police Headquarters, show minimal setbacks.
Station area development proposals and status	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In April 2017, there were 23 development projects within Downtown St. Petersburg, including museums, hotels, residences, mixed-use projects, a medical research and education facility, and a new police headquarters. Nineteen of these are new construction projects, two are redevelopment projects, and one is an addition project. These include 2,355 residential units, 470 hotel rooms, and 9,646,115 square of other development, 9,000,000 of which will be the Tropicana ballpark for the Tampa Bay Rays. Residential developments range in size from three units to 377 units, and hotels range in size from 100 to 200 rooms. • A new pier, Pier Park, is expected be completed by the end of 2018 with pedestrian infrastructure to tie the waterfront with Downtown.

E1. DETAILED ASSESSMENT OF LAND USE	
<p>b. POTENTIAL IMPACT OF TRANSIT INVESTMENT ON REGIONAL LAND USE Rating: Medium-Low</p>	
<p>Adaptability of station area land for development</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vacant land is scattered throughout the corridor, with greater concentrations on the eastern half (Downtown St. Petersburg and Grand Central District). • Zoning in Downtown St. Petersburg, where vacant land is more concentrated, allows transit-supportive densities and encourages transit-friendly characteristics.
<p>Corridor economic environment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Tampa Bay region’s population is expected to grow 21 percent by 2040 and its employment is expected to grow 27 percent. • Station areas are expected to grow 15 percent in population by 2040 and eight percent in employment. These represent slower growth rates than the region. • Since 2014, 10 corporations have relocated their businesses from outside St. Petersburg to Downtown offices. • Over the past five years, the number of dwelling units in Downtown St. Petersburg has increased by almost 20 percent.
III. TOOLS TO MAINTAIN OR INCREASE SHARE OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING	
<p>a. TOOLS TO MAINTAIN OR INCREASE SHARE OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING Rating: Medium-Low</p>	
<p>Documented evaluation of corridor-specific affordable housing needs and supply</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City of St. Petersburg’s <i>Comprehensive Plan</i> (2016) includes the following target: “The City shall ensure that affordable housing for extremely low, very low, low, and moderate-income households, including households with special needs, is available to 35 percent of the new households forecasted by 2010.” • The <i>South St. Petersburg Community Redevelopment Plan</i> (2015) assesses affordable housing needs within the South St. Petersburg Community Redevelopment Area (CRA), which covers most of the corridor and the area south of the corridor within St. Petersburg. The plan states that 55 percent of all households and 73 percent of renters pay more than 30 percent of their income for housing costs. The plan notes the comparative lack of multi-family housing units within the CRA. • An amendment to the City of St. Pete Beach’s <i>Comprehensive Plan</i> (1998) states that “Pinellas County, as in many areas of the State of Florida, is experiencing an affordable housing crisis. A scarcity of land, increasing land values and rising insurance and property taxes are creating a substantial impediment to providing affordable housing options for City and County residents who provide needed services to our community.” • The City of South Pasadena’s <i>Comprehensive Plan</i> (2008) makes no mention of affordable housing.
<p>Plans and policies to preserve or increase affordable housing in region and corridor</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City of St. Petersburg’s <i>Comprehensive Plan</i> (2016) includes Objective H1: “The City shall provide technical and financial assistance to the private sector to provide dwelling units of various types, sizes, and costs to meet the affordable housing needs of existing and future populations of the city...” Policies under this objective include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Providing information, technical assistance, and incentives to the private sector; ○ Developing working relationships with the private sector; ○ Reviewing ordinances;

E1. DETAILED ASSESSMENT OF LAND USE	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Monitoring the Workforce Housing Density/Intensity Bonus Ordinance to ensure that units are being produced; ○ Pursuing an amendment to the Pinellas County Transportation Impact Fee Ordinance to reduce the impact fee for affordable housing projects; ○ Triennially reviewing the development regulations to develop incentives; ○ Encouraging rehabilitation of older housing stock into affordable housing; ○ Making city-owned vacant and underutilized land available for affordable housing projects; and ○ Marketing affordable housing options. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The <i>Intown Redevelopment Plan</i> (2015) includes the goal that “The development of both affordable and market rate housing should be encouraged through incentives.” Intown is located just south of Downtown, along the Tampa Bay waterfront. It encompasses the very eastern end of the route. ● The City of St. Pete Beach established a density bonus of up to five units per acre for the provision of affordable housing units.
Adopted financing tools and strategies targeted to preserving or increasing affordable housing in the region and/or corridor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The City of St. Petersburg has committed general revenue funds to establish a Housing Capital Improvement Program to fund specific housing initiatives. ● The City of St. Petersburg primarily uses HUD programs, such as the Community Development Block Grant, HOME Investment Partnership, and Emergency Solutions Grant, as well as state funds from the State Housing Initiatives Partnership Program (SHIP) to fund affordable housing. ● The South St. Petersburg CRA directs 40 percent of TIF revenues to the development of affordable and market-rate housing in the CRA. Additionally, a TIF rebate for up to 15 years is provided for developers of affordable housing. The City of St. Petersburg’s Workforce Housing Density Bonus Program requires a developer to maintain an agreed-upon number of affordable housing units for 30 years in exchange for density bonuses between six and 15 units per acre, depending on the underlying zoning designation and agreement between the City of St. Petersburg and the developer.
Evidence of developer activity to preserve or increase affordable housing in the corridor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Habitat for Humanity of Pinellas County has invested more than \$2.9 million in the South St. Petersburg CRA, building 43 new single-family homes and rehabilitating six other homes for low-income applicants. Habitat Pinellas also offers home repair using donated labor.
The extent to which the applicant’s activities account for long-term affordability and the needs of very- and extremely-low income households in the corridor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The City of St. Petersburg’s <i>Comprehensive Plan</i> (2016) makes repeated references to providing for the needs of very- and extremely-low income households. For instance, the plan states that “The City shall provide affordable housing incentives (such as revised Land Development Regulations and expedited permitting processing) to developers of affordable housing for the extremely low, very low and low income groups.”

F. SUBMISSION INFORMATION

TIMELINESS OF SUBMISSION

FY	Description
2019	The submission was provided on time.

QUALITY OF SUBMISSION

FY	Description
2019	The submission adequately documents and contextualizes existing conditions, plans, policies, tools, and zoning ordinances in the City of St. Petersburg. Information for the cities of South Pasadena and St. Pete Beach was lacking. Supplemental resources were well organized.

LIST OF SUBMISSION MATERIALS

FY	Materials Submitted
2019	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Virginia St. FY18 SS Template (SS Template Part 1) 2. Supplemental Land Use and Economic Template (SS Template Part 2) <p><i>The following were submitted as links, rather than attachments:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Forward Pinellas Countywide Plan for Pinellas County 4. Forward Pinellas Long Range Transportation Plan 5. Forward Pinellas Microbrewery Study 6. City of St. Petersburg Comprehensive Plan 7. City of St. Petersburg Economic Development Webpage 8. City of St. Petersburg Community Redevelopment Agency Annual Report 9. Bayboro Redevelopment Plan 10. Intown Redevelopment Plan 11. Intown West Redevelopment Plan 12. South St. Petersburg Community Redevelopment Plan 13. City of St. Petersburg City Trails Bicycle Pedestrian Master Plan, 2009 Status Report 14. Central Avenue Revitalization Plan 15. Innovation District Visioning Summary 16. Edge District Improvement Plan 17. WIPA District Website 18. City of St. Petersburg Parking Demand Study 19. City of St. Petersburg Committee to Advocate for Persons with Impairments, ADA Self-Evaluation and Transition Plan Update 20. St. Pete Beach Comprehensive Plan 21. South Pasadena Comprehensive Plan 22. University of South Florida St. Petersburg Master Plan 23. Tampa Bay Area Regional Transit Authority Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Resource Guide 24. St. Pete Rising, Urban Development Blog

<i>G1. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT: LAND USE</i>	
<i>Note: Failure to respond to recommendations may cause ratings to be decreased in future evaluations. The project sponsor should pay particular attention to providing sufficient information and supporting documentation to permit reviewers to fully assess progress on planning activities, development projects, etc.</i>	
Subfactor	Potential Strategies to Improve Land Use Rating
Existing Land Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide updates on population density, employment, and existing affordable housing.

<i>G2. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT EFFECTS</i>	
Subfactor	Potential Strategies to Improve Economic Development Effects Rating
Growth Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
Transit-Supportive Corridor Policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> St. Petersburg plans and policies seem significantly more well-developed and transit-supportive than South Pasadena’s and St. Pete Beach’s plans and policies. Include more documentation of transit-supportive plans and policies in South Pasadena and St. Pete Beach or, alternatively, encourage those jurisdictions to adopt more transit-supportive plans and policies.
Zoning Regulations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> St. Petersburg ordinances seem significantly more transit-supportive than St. Pete Beach’s ordinances. Include more documentation of transit-supportive ordinances in St. Pete Beach or, alternatively, encourage the jurisdiction to adopt more transit-supportive ordinances. South Pasadena’s zoning map was inaccessible. Provide zoning map or state which zoning designations are along the corridor.
Tools to Implement Land Use Plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide more information on how South Pasadena and St. Pete Beach have engaged stakeholders. Provide more information on coordination between St. Pete Beach, St. Petersburg, and South Pasadena. Provide more information on what financial and regulatory tools exist in St. Pete Beach and South Pasadena. If stakeholder engagement, coordination, or tools are lacking, encourage those jurisdictions to pursue and document these.
Performance of Land Use Policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Show development projects throughout the corridor, not just in Downtown St. Petersburg.
Potential Impact of Transit Project on Regional Land Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition to a vacant land map, provide figures, statistics, or tables describing vacant and underutilized land. Tie the vacant or underutilized land to zoning designations or current proposals.
Tools to Maintain or Increase Share	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide more detail assessment of supply and needs outside of the South St. Petersburg CRA, including within other parts of St. Petersburg and in the

<p>of Affordable Housing</p>	<p>cities of St. Pete’s Beach and South Pasadena.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide documentation of affordable housing units generated by private for-profit developers, not just Habitat for Humanity. • South Pasadena does not mention affordable housing within its <i>Comprehensive Plan</i> and no other plan or information has been provided on the city’s provision of affordable housing. Provide information on how South Pasadena plans to address affordable housing. • The needs of very- and extremely-low income households should be addressed within the context of St. Pete Beach and South Pasadena. • The narrative states that the City of St. Petersburg primarily uses HUD and state funds for its affordable housing programs. Also include any local funding or programs that support affordable housing initiatives.
------------------------------	---