

DATA AND ANALYSIS
FOR
FUTURE LAND USE ELEMENT
OF
ALACHUA COUNTY
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: 2001 - 2020

**FUTURE LAND USE ELEMENT
DATA AND ANALYSIS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS	PAGE
LIST OF TABLES	ii
LIST OF MAPS	ii
INTRODUCTION	1
<u>I. SCOPE AND PURPOSE</u>	
<u>II. EVALUATION AND APPRAISAL REPORT</u>	
<u>III. UPDATE</u>	
DATA AND ANALYSIS	
<u>POPULATION PROJECTIONS (Table A)</u>	3
<u>LAND USE ANALYSIS REQUIREMENTS</u>	
<u>I. AVAILABILITY OF FACILITIES AND SERVICES</u>	4
A. Transportation Mobility	
B. Potable Water and Sanitary Sewer	
C. Solid Waste	
D. Stormwater Management	
E. Conservation and Open Space	
<u>II. CHARACTER AND MAGNITUDE OF VACANT LAND TO DETERMINE USE SUITABILITY</u> ..	4
A. Gross Vacant Land	
B. Soils	
C. Topography	
D. Natural Resources	
E. Historic Resources	
<u>III. LAND NEEDED TO ACCOMMODATE PROJECTED POPULATION</u>	6
A. Methodology of Demand Analysis/Estimated Gross Acreage	
B. Land Use Categories	
<u>IV. NEED FOR REDEVELOPMENT</u>	15
A. Renewal of Blighted Areas	
B. Elimination or Reduction of Inconsistent Uses	
<u>V. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND REDEVELOPMENT OF FLOODPRONE AREAS</u>	16
<u>VI. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND REDEVELOPMENT BASED ON HAZARD MITIGATION REPORTS</u>	17
<u>VII. DEVELOPMENT CONTROLS</u>	17
(1) Urban Growth Boundary (Urban Cluster Line)	
(2) Urban Services Line	
(3) Traditional Neighborhood Developments/ Mixed Use Village Centers	
(4) Activity Centers	
(5) Rural Clustered Subdivisions	
(6) Transfer of Development Rights	
(7) Community and Neighborhood Planning Program	
<u>VIII. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION</u>	25
<u>APPENDICES</u>	
TABLES 1 - 6	A1-A7
MAPS 1 - 4	

Support Tables Future Land Use Element

Appendix

1. Forecast Dwelling Units to Accommodate Future Population in the Urban Cluster
- II. Calculation of Land Needed in Urban Cluster for Total Additional Units Needed (2020 and 2010)
- III. Estimate of Allocations to Non-Residential Uses
- IV. Comparison of Land Needed to Land Available in the UC (2020)
- 4A. Comparison of Land Needed to Land Available in the UC (2010)
5. Capacity of Urban Service Line (2010) For Residential Development (Including the addition of parcels as approved by BoCC 3-25-02 and 4-8-02)
6. Capacity of Urban Cluster (2020) for Residential Development

Support Maps Future Land Use Element

Map Title

1. Alachua County Urban Cluster Central Water and Sewer Lines
2. Alachua County Existing Land Use

(Note: Alachua County Wetlands and Floodplains (Map 3) and Future Land Use Map (Map 4) referenced in the text are adopted maps. See the GOP Section of the Future Land Use Element)

INTRODUCTION

Scope and Purpose

The Future Land Use Element is a required comprehensive plan element under Florida's Local Government Comprehensive Planning and Land Development Regulation Act (Chapter 163, Florida Statutes). The Future Land Use Element must designate the proposed future general distribution, location, and extent of the uses of land. The Future Land Use Element must also include standards for the densities and intensities of each land use category. To this end, the Future Land Use Element contains both a series of maps to depict the future land use pattern and a complementary section of Goals, Objectives, and Policies.

The Future Land Use Element serves as a guide for the development and use of land within unincorporated Alachua County. It is designed to promote sustainable land development that includes a balance of social equity, economic opportunity, and environmental protection. This includes the determination of an efficient pattern and location of future land uses through the relationship between land use and the transportation system, the provision of public facilities and services, and protection of the natural environment. The Future Land Use Element contains objectives and policies to promote more compact growth, while providing choice of living environments, separation of urban and rural areas, and protection of agriculture and natural resources.

The Alachua County Comprehensive Plan has utilized the concept of sustainability for the overall relationship between social, environmental and economic systems. Smart growth is emphasized for urban development. Specific urban forms include Traditional Neighborhood Developments, with emphasis on connected streets and public spaces, mixed-use Village Center developments and transit oriented developments. Carrying capacity generally forms a basis for conservation. The rural area is envisioned as maintaining agricultural uses and rural character. New residential rural development is required as rural open space subdivisions. A greenway is a possible form of an interconnected open space system, linking the urban and rural areas of the County.

A major feature of the ecological system of Alachua County, Payne's Prairie, was first described by naturalist William Bartram in his *Travels* in the late 1700s:

“...a level green plain, above fifteen miles over, fifty miles in circumference, and scarcely a tree or bush of any kind to be seen upon it. It is encircled with high, sloping hills, covered with waving forests and fragrant wild Orange groves rising from an exuberantly fertile soil...”

Protection of the Payne's Prairie and the entire ecosystem of the county is a focus of this plan within a framework of sustainable development.

Evaluation and Appraisal Report

Pursuant to F.S. 163.3191, an assessment and evaluation of the current Future Land Use Element was performed which included the following components.

- I. A summary of the data and analysis from the element as adopted (October 2, 1991).
- II. The condition of the element at the date of the evaluation and appraisal report (1997).
- III. A summary matrix for evaluating the objectives of the Future Land Use Element.
- IV. An evaluation of the effect on the adopted element of changes to Chapter 163, Part II, F.S.; Rule 9J-5, F.A.C.; the state comprehensive plan; and the strategic regional policy plan.
- V. Recommendations regarding the Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR) of the Future Land Use Element of the Alachua County Comprehensive Plan.
- VI. Unforeseen or unanticipated changes resulting in problems or opportunities (none reported in EAR).
- VII. Successes or shortcomings.
- VIII. Public participation.

This was adopted in 1998 by County Ordinance 98-36.

Update

The Future Land Use Element of the updated Comprehensive Plan 2001 - 2020 includes specific policy language to implement the EAR recommendations. The general approach promotes creating pedestrian friendly, mixed use neighborhoods in the urban area and protecting agriculture and open space in the rural area. The methodology explained in Section III addresses the EAR recommendations.

Table A indicates the population projections used for the planning process. These projections utilize the University of Florida Bureau of Economic and Business Research projections based on the 1999 estimate of population. Although the 2000 Census data reported a slightly different population total for Alachua County than the BEBR estimate, the percentage difference is less than 3% and is acceptable for the purposes of calculations of the land use need for the Urban Cluster. (Nationally the US Census reported approximately 3% margin of error in the population count).

POPULATION PROJECTION - COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Total Population - Projected to 2020 assuming constant percentage of total County

	1999	%County	2000	%County	2005	%County	2010	%County	2015	%County	2020	%County
	BEBR Est.											
Alachua	6,305	2.9%	8,342	3.79%	9,413	3.97%	10,524	4.15%	11,143	4.15%	11,736	4.15%
Archer	1,452	0.7%	1,937	0.88%	2,015	0.85%	2,080	0.82%	2,202	0.82%	2,319	0.82%
G'ville	101,405	46.9%	101,319	46.03%	106,677	44.99%	113,279	44.67%	119,939	44.67%	126,327	44.67%
Hawthorne	1,394	0.6%	1,849	0.84%	1,897	0.80%	1,953	0.77%	2,067	0.77%	2,178	0.77%
High Spr.	3,944	1.8%	4,930	2.24%	5,335	2.25%	5,706	2.25%	6,041	2.25%	6,363	2.25%
LaCrosse	150	0.1%	132	0.06%	119	0.05%	101	0.04%	107	0.04%	113	0.04%
Micanopy	644	0.3%	836	0.38%	806	0.34%	812	0.32%	859	0.32%	905	0.32%
Newberry	2,601	1.2%	3,015	1.37%	3,225	1.36%	3,449	1.36%	3,652	1.36%	3,846	1.36%
Waldo	1,049	0.5%	1,387	0.63%	1,423	0.60%	1,446	0.57%	1,530	0.57%	1,612	0.57%
Uninc.	97,305	45.0%	96,353	43.78%	106,191	44.79%	114,251	45.05%	120,959	45.05%	127,401	45.05%
(Sum)	216,249	100.0%	220,100	100.00%	237,100	100.00%	253,600	100.0%	268,500	100.0%	282,800	100.0%
Total County	216,249	100.0%	220,100	100.0%	237,100	100.0%	253,600	100.0%	268,500	100.0%	282,800	100.0%
BEBR	LOW		217,955		212,800		212,700		211,000		207,300	
PROJ.	MEDIUM		217,955		232,800		248,100		263,900		279,900	
2000 Census	HIGH		217,955		254,900		287,800		323,200		360,700	

Total County source is BEBR Projections based on 1999 Estimate (rounded to nearest 100)
 City of Gainesville 2000-2010 source is City data, projected to 2020 assuming constant percentage
 Municipal totals assume a constant percentage from NCFRPC data (derived from Shimberg AHNA)

I. AVAILABILITY OF FACILITIES AND SERVICES

Detailed analysis of facilities and services to serve existing land uses and land for which development orders have been issued is provided in the other elements of the plan as summarized below.

Transportation Mobility

A review of the existing traffic circulation network is provided in the Transportation Mobility Element of this Plan. The existing level of service provided by these facilities serving existing land uses is reviewed in detail. Gainesville Regional Transit System currently provides transit services along a 48 mile route network.

Potable Water and Sanitary Sewer

Map 1 shows the existing and planned central water and sewer lines in the Urban Cluster. The analysis of existing potable water facilities in the Potable Water and Sanitary Sewer Element, indicates that taking into account existing as well as committed demand for unbuilt units, there is a surplus capacity of 5.2 mgd for the urban cluster. When complete, the planned expansions in 2003 will serve the community beyond 2015.

The analysis of sanitary sewer facilities is based on the Potable Water and Sanitary Element. Analysis of the Gainesville Regional Utilities System level of service indicates a surplus capacity at present of 3.77 mgd. The present wastewater system, with planned expansions, is projected to adequately serve the future needs of customers beyond 2016.

Solid Waste

The analysis of existing solid waste facilities in the Solid Waste Element indicates the Leveda Brown Environmental Park and transfer station should have adequate capacity to serve both Alachua and Gilchrist Counties well beyond 2020 utilizing the regional solid waste disposal facility. Options are also discussed in the plan.

Stormwater Management

The analysis of stormwater management systems in the Stormwater Management Element indicates LOS is adequate. The plan emphasizes utilizing natural topography for stormwater management and hazard mitigation.

Conservation and Open Space

The analysis of existing conservation and open space facilities in the Conservation and Open Space Element indicates the importance of conservation policies to avoid, minimize and mitigate adverse impacts to wetlands, floodplains and all other strategic ecosystems.

II. CHARACTER AND MAGNITUDE OF VACANT LAND TO DETERMINE SUITABILITY FOR USE

Gross Vacant Land

Vacant or undeveloped land in unincorporated Alachua County was identified from data obtained from the Alachua County Property Appraiser's Office, and is shown on the Existing Land Use Map (Map 2). The gross vacant or undeveloped land in the unincorporated county consists of approximately 16,562 acres within the Urban Cluster. The gross residential vacant land in the urban cluster is 15,453 acres which is 47.8 percent of the total urban residential land uses. The gross non-residential vacant land in the

urban cluster is 6,637 acres which is 42.9 percent of the non-residential future land use categories (commercial, industrial, institutional, recreation and utility). The gross vacant or undeveloped land within the Urban Services Line is approximately 12,749 acres. The Urban Services Line is discussed in detail in Section III. LAND NEEDED TO ACCOMMODATE PROJECTED POPULATION and Section VII. DEVELOPMENT CONTROLS.

Soils

General soils are shown on the USDA Soils Map incorporated by reference in the Future Land Use Map Series. The soils of Alachua County have been surveyed and mapped by the Soil Conservation Service (SCS). A copy of the completed survey is on file at the Alachua County Office of Planning and Development. Included in that survey is detailed information on each of the soil series identified in Alachua County, and maps showing the extent of those soils in the County. The acreage and proportionate extent of the soils of Alachua County are discussed in the Conservation and Open Space Element.

Characteristics pertaining to planning decisions are American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials (AASHTO) classification, drainage class, permeability class, depth to seasonal high water table, shrink-swell potential, hydric classification, available water capacity, farm capability class, and woodland suitability class. These characteristics are discussed in detail in the Conservation and Open Space Element.

Topography

Alachua County lies in the North-central portion of the Florida peninsula and is part of the Central Highlands or Central Florida Ridge of the Atlantic Coastal Plain (Spangler, 1985). The County is comprised of approximately 892 square miles and consists of a low, flat karst limestone plain in the West bounded by a West-facing escarpment and a flat upland plateau in the east (Williams, et al., 1977). Elevations in the county range from approximately 25 feet above sea level near the Santa Fe River to over 195 feet northwest of Gainesville. The topographic relief map is a digitized image of the topographic contours on the United States Geological Survey 1:24,000 scale quadrangle maps of Alachua County (Lindquist and Arrington, 1987). Topography is discussed in detail in the Conservation and Open Space Element.

Natural Resources

Natural resources in Alachua County consist of soils, surface and groundwater, strategic ecosystems, wetlands and floodplains as discussed in detail in the Conservation and Open Space Element (COSE). The Wetlands and Floodplains Map is included in this report (Map 3) and other conservation maps are in the COSE. Analysis of the effect of natural resources on the suitability for use of residential land within the Urban Cluster and within the Urban Services Line was performed as part of the Comprehensive Plan update process. The Urban Cluster analysis is shown in Table 6 and 7. The Urban Services Line analysis is shown in Table 5. These tables are discussed in the text in Section III, "Methodology of Demand Analysis/Estimated Gross Acreage."

Historic Resources

Historic resources in Alachua County are discussed in the new Historic Resources Element. Historic structures as classified by architectural style are as follows: Folk Victorian (15); Bungalow (2); Craftsman (45); Frame Vernacular (756); Georgian Revival (9); Gothic Revival (4); Greek Revival (1); Masonry Vernacular (34); Mediterranean Revival (1); Mission (2); Minimal Traditional (17); Neo-Classical (3); Other (9); Queen Anne (8); Ranch (22); Tudor Revival (2); other not specified (2). Archaeological and paleontological resources are also inventoried and protected.

III. AMOUNT OF LAND NEEDED TO ACCOMMODATE PROJECTED POPULATION

A. Methodology of Demand Analysis/Estimated Gross Acreage

This calculation was completed by County planning staff with expert assistance from consultants. The general methodology for analysis of urban growth boundaries was refined for Alachua County by Gail Easley in Spring 2001, based on her American Planning Association report *Staying Inside the Lines: Urban Growth Boundaries* (PAS Report # 440, 1992). This methodology determines future urban land needs for unincorporated Alachua County, and whether the amount of land currently in the urban cluster is sufficient in size to meet those needs through 2020. The commercial/retail sub-analysis was done by Fishkind and Associates, Inc., utilizing DOR and property appraiser data.

The analysis is based on the following information:

- forecast of land needed to meet the need for residential uses within unincorporated Alachua County.
- forecast of land needed to meet the need for commercial (office and retail), industrial, recreation, institutional, and other activities within unincorporated Alachua County.
- existing development patterns, considering density and intensity of development, average household size, and the allocation of land use and development activity to urban and rural portions of Alachua County.
- data included in the Evaluation and Appraisal Report, adopted in 1998.

The planning process included analysis of the Future Land Use Map (Map 4) to accommodate anticipated growth through the updated planning time frame. The projected population increase was compared with vacant land suitable for development for the years 2010 and 2020. The land suitable for urban development within the Urban Cluster exceeded the projected need through the year 2020 and 2010. Therefore, the plan includes an urban service line to phase urban development through 2010. This line was determined in the portion of the Urban Cluster east of I-75 by the location of boundary forming natural areas, consideration of the need to promote economic development in this area and the previously adopted boundary of the Urban Cluster. West of I-75, existing and planned central sewer lines were used as a critical indicator of urban infrastructure and services to determine where urban development should be concentrated in the period through 2010. West of I-75 and south of Archer Road (which is part of the area identified in the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization's Livable Communities Reinvestment Plan as a future transit corridor) the line is drawn generally 1/4 mile south of existing and planned central sewer lines. West of I-75, north of Archer Road, areas were included based on the extent of existing and planned central sewer lines. Other general factors relating to where urban development should be concentrated in the areas west of I-75 include the development of the transportation network, provision of mass transit, recreation facilities, provision of public services, Karst topography and other conservation issues, public school impacts, and fiscal impacts.

The methodology applied to Alachua County is shown in the attached tables. Table 1 shows the number of dwelling units needed in 2010 and 2020, based on the average household size (2.2 persons per household), the vacancy rate (10%), and a market factor providing for twice the units needed to accommodate the population projected through 2010 and 1.5 times the need for the population growth projected through 2020. New units were then distributed among low density, medium and high density

residential land use categories. The trend of 20% of residential development occurring in the rural area is expected to continue through the planning period. The distribution among low, medium through high density and the rural/urban splits are based on the EAR data that was derived from final building permit data. Table 2 of the methodology is the calculation of the number of acres needed in the Urban Cluster to accommodate the dwelling units shown in Table 1. Table 3 is the estimate of non-residential land use activity in the Urban Cluster. Table 4 shows the relationship between land needs in 2020 and the current size of the Urban Cluster. There are 4,378 acres beyond the projected need in the Urban Cluster through the year 2020. (Table 4A indicates the land needs in 2010 and the current size of the Urban Cluster. This calculation shows 7,396 acres available for urban development beyond the projected need in the Urban Cluster through the year 2010). Therefore there is no need in both 2010 and 2020 for modification of the area designated for urban development.

The vacancy rate is simply 1 minus the ratio of households to total housing stock. The number of vacancies is the vacancy rate times the housing stock. These are total vacancies--single family, multifamily, mobile home & other. Housing occupied by seasonal residents is considered vacant. The methodology utilizes a vacancy rate of 10 percent, which is based on historic and projected vacancies (Email communication with Dr. David Lenze, 2/12/01).

A market factor is included in the calculation to allow for a measure of flexibility between supply and demand. A sufficient market factor allows flexibility in the siting of development, thereby helping ensure that developers can find locations favored by the market. Market factor is a multiplier used in developing a forecast of future land use needs, specifically housing, to allow for market choice. The market factor results in additional developable land in the urban cluster and thereby can have a positive effect on housing affordability. The market factor also addresses market uncertainty with respect to the accuracy of market predictions, for example if some landowners withhold their land from development. The market factor ensures that enough land is set aside for residential purposes to accommodate these residential support activities--parks, easements for utilities, churches, to name a few. Across the country the range in factors is as low as 1.15 (Portland, Oregon) to over 2.0 (several Florida locations). Alachua County has used the market factor 2.0 for calculations for the year 2010 and the market factor 1.5 for the year 2020.

It is projected that an additional 5,203 housing units will be needed in the unincorporated area of the County from 2000 to 2010. Applying the market factor for this timeframe (2.0) results in a total capacity needed equal to 10,405 units. Based on recent trends in the County and the plan policies which encourage development in the Urban Cluster, 80% of these new households will occur in the urban area, so 8,324 additional urban residential units will be needed within the Urban Cluster during the planning period. The required acreage for these new units was then calculated based on conservative projections of average urban gross densities shown in Table 2 for the year 2010: This translates into approximately 4,265 additional gross acres of Urban Cluster residential land needed to accommodate projected population growth through the year 2010.

It is projected that an additional 11,844 housing units will be needed in the unincorporated area of the County from 2000 to 2020. The total capacity needed is 17,766 units, using the market factor of 1.5. Factoring for 80% of needed units to locate in the Urban Cluster, 14,213 additional urban residential units will be needed within the Urban Cluster during the planning period. With the average urban gross densities from Table 2 for the year 2020, this would translate into approximately 7,283 additional gross acres of urban cluster residential land needed to accommodate projected population growth through the year 2020.

The next step in the methodology, shown in Tables 5-6, determined the impact of conservation constraints based on the best available scientific data for GIS mapping of primary and secondary conservation areas. Since policies in the plan require protection of 80 percent of strategic ecosystems, a development factor of 0.20 is used in the calculations for primary conservation areas. Since the policies require protection of 25 percent of secondary areas the development factor for the calculation of development potential for these lands is 0.75. This is a general assumption, since site-specific verification of the location of conservation resources will be done during development review and may result in greater development potential (for example, the mapping scale may show an area as all primary conservation whereas site specific verification may indicate the land is partially secondary conservation). This analysis calculates the urban services line residential development potential based on a total of 10,834 vacant acres of land with conservation characteristics.¹ There are 6,768 residential acres, including 2,348 acres of primary conservation and 4,420 acres of secondary conservation. Applying the development potential factors results in an estimated residential developable acreage of 3,785 acres. There is additionally 1,236 undeveloped acres within the USL without conservation constraints, so the total residential land available for development within the USL is calculated to equal 5,021 acres. This exceeds the 4,265 acres needed for residential development for the year 2010. A similar calculation of development potential calculated with vacant land conservation constraints for the year 2020 in the Urban Cluster indicates 7,392 acres vacant residential land available for a need of 7,283 acres. In both calculations the vacant residential land available exceeds the land needed.

Methodology – Determining Future Need for Commercial Land

The methodology to determine the future need for commercial land analyzed land use needs data for the unincorporated rural area, the urban cluster, and municipalities. The current distribution among these sub-areas is 61.2% of commercial square footage in the unincorporated urban area, 8.5% in the unincorporated rural area and 30.3% in the municipalities. A future acreage need was calculated based on the current distribution. This was consistent with the goal of the comprehensive plan to maintain the character of the rural area and concentrate urban development in more highly developed areas, with better overall access, surrounding services, and concentrations of available labor.

Table: Distribution of Commercial Square Footage in Alachua County, Year 2000

	TOTAL	Uninc. Urban	Uninc. Rural	Municipal
Hotel	100%	84.3%	2.8%	13.0%
Industrial	100%	39.2%	18.9%	41.9%
Office	100%	81.1%	1.7%	17.2%
Retail	100%	64.0%	4.5%	31.5%
TOTAL	100%	61.2%	8.5%	30.3%

Source: Fishkind & Associates, Inc. March 2001. Historic Employment Trends and Conditions (utilizing data from Alachua County Property Appraiser)

In 2000, the largest employment sectors in Alachua County are the University of Florida and Shands Medical Center. Of the 27,000 state employees in the County, 23,000 are in educational services, representing 20 percent of Alachua County total employment. The next largest employment category is medical and health services, with nearly 14,000 employees and 12 percent of employment countywide. Local government employs about 10,500 employees or 9 percent of the total. These three largest sectors represent about 41 percent of County employment, a trend since 1980, although there has been

¹ Including three parcels totalling 62 acres, with 52 acres of conservation characteristics, approved by BoCC March 25, 2002.

diversification and change in the local economy (Source: Fishkind and Assoc., Inc, 2001).

Strategic Growth Segments and Land Use Needs

There are emerging employment sectors with rapid growth and these areas represent important trends, opportunities and needs. These high growth industries are concentrated in four major areas: A) high technology products and services (industrial and medical); B) transportation related air and ground; C) Information Services (financial and business service); D) recreation convenience and personal service.

The methodology utilized by Fishkind and Associates for the land use needs analysis is to forecast employment by SIC code, then convert employment to square feet and convert square footage to acreage by assuming a floor area ratio (determined by existing land use patterns). Floor area ratios are based on the property appraiser’s data.

Non-Residential Square Footage Demand Analysis

	<u>2000</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2020</u>
Office Employment	9,405,834	11,557,267	13,241,345
Industrial Employment	9,549,169	11,356,194	12,998,054
Retail Employment	8,034,555	9,355,909	10,541,150

Activity Centers Analysis

Activity Center analysis was done by the consultants to determine the locational distribution of future non-residential uses. At present there are slightly more than 2,500 acres designated in Activity Centers. Based on the Fishkind analysis, there is sufficient vacant activity center acreage to accommodate the future unincorporated urban retail, office, hotel and industrial demand.

B. Categories of Land Use

The future land use categories for the Comprehensive Plan: 2001 - 2020 are:

Residential (Estate, Low, Medium, Medium-High, and High Densities), Roadway Commercial, Commercial, Office, Tourist/Entertainment, Rural Commercial, Industrial, Light Industrial, Institutional, Institutional/Medical, Institutional/Corrections, Rural/Agriculture, Rural Employment Center, Rural Community Employment Center, Rural Cluster, Recreation, Preservation.

Areas mapped for Activity Centers also include areas for Conservation, Open Space, Shopping Center, Tourist/Entertainment/Office, Office/Medical, Office/Business Park, Warehouse/distribution, Office/Residential, and Utility.

General acreage data for County land is as follows:

Total land acreage of Alachua County	620,876 ac	
Total parcel acreage of Alachua County	593,585 ac	
Total parcel acreage of unincorporated area	501,492 ac	.845 of County
Total parcel acreage of Urban Cluster.....	45,437 ac	.091 of unincorporated area
Total parcel acreage of Rural Unincorporated....	456,055 ac	.909 of unincorporated area
Total parcel acreage of municipalities	92,011 ac	.155 of County
Total parcel acreage of private land	524,345 ac	.883 of County
Total parcel acreage of public land	69,240 ac	.117 of County

The following table, Future Land Use Distribution in unincorporated Alachua County, Year 2020, shows acreage and percentage data for specific land uses.

Future Land Use Distribution in Unincorporated Alachua County, Year 2020

Land Use	Acreage	Percentage
Commercial	3,061	0.6%
Industrial	2,539	0.5%
Institutional	8,009	1.6%
Recreation/OS	1,833	0.4%
Utility	4	0.0%
Residential	32,345	6.6%
Estate (1 DU/Ac)	6,020	1.2%
High (14-24 DU/Ac)	1,326	0.3%
Med (4-8 DU/Ac)	2,234	0.5%
MH (8-14 DU/Ac)	844	0.2%
LM (2-4 DU/Ac)*	572	0.1%
L (1-4 DU/Ac)	20,106	4.1%
Very L (0-2 DU/Ac)*	1,241	0.3%
Preservation/Conservation	69,285	14.2%
Rural/Agricultural	372,766	76.1%

TOTAL

489,842

* In Special Area Studies only

Source: Alachua County GIS, January 2002

There are 456,055 acres of rural unincorporated land. The rural/agricultural land use totals 372,766 acres. There are 83,289 acres of other land uses, including institutional, preservation, and uses in the rural clusters, in the rural unincorporated area.

Urban Residential

Low density residential (1-4 units per acre) land use is about 63% of all residential. Medium (4-8 units/acre), medium-high (8-14 units/acre), and high (14-24) density residential together represent about 17 % of all residential.

Mixed- use development has been occurring in Alachua County. Haile Plantation is a planned unit development including 2,686 residential units on 1626 acres. The gross density is 1.65 du/acre. The development includes single family residential at an average density of 3 du/acre, zero lot line/patio homes at an average density of 6 du/acre, and multi-family at 16.7 du/acre. There is also 450 acres of

open space and 280,000 of non-residential uses (Alachua County Growth Management Department records). The Town of Tioga is another example of mixed -use development. Town of Tioga is a 500-acre Traditional Neighborhood Development built on the site of an old abandoned settlement. It will have a mix of essential retail, institutional and recreational uses linked via alley ways, common areas, sidewalks, and bike lanes to facilitate pedestrian activity. Streets are narrow and organized in a grid pattern to permit connectivity of adjacent neighborhoods. Parks, amenities and planned retail districts are within walking distance of all residents, while 19% of the development is preserved as green space.

Rural/Agricultural

The rural agricultural landscape has existed in Alachua County at least since the sixteenth century A.D., when the Spanish made the area the hub of their cattle ranching. Alachua County has since been a main center for agriculture in Florida. Cattle and dairy products, poultry, vegetables, tobacco, corn, and timber produce the greatest revenue. The whole state is served by the University's Institute of Food and Agriculture Sciences through its research and education centers. Several state and federal agricultural agencies also have headquarters in Gainesville. Transportation of agricultural products is essential to the state and local economy. The rural agricultural landscape is increasingly threatened by sprawling, uncontained urban development.

Once topsoil is paved and converted for urban uses, the value as farmland or forest is diminished forever. Sometimes climatic events result in land use changes. For example, Windsor settled in 1846 as a cotton plantation and was named after its English founders; the town prospered as a citrus center in the 1880s. During these years, it also attracted tourists and had a population of more than 400. The freezes of the 1890s destroyed the citrus industry and now only a few homes remain, one a historic site.

The total number of farms in Alachua County in 1997 was 1,086 farms on 198,193 acres. The average farm size was 182 acres, up from 176 in 1992. The market value of farms changed from an average value of \$1566.9/acre in 1992 to \$1983.2/acre in 1997, based on a sample of the total farms. In 1997 there were 8,123 acres of foreign-owned farmland acreage in the County, 1.57 percent of total farmland (BEBR, 2000: Tables 9.35 and 9.45).

The state average for water use for agricultural irrigation is 1,653 gallons per acre (Source: BEBR, 2000 Statistical Abstract, Table 9.50). The water management districts project water demand for agriculture to be 35 percent (SJRWMD) and 40 percent (SRWMD) of total water usage for the year 2020 (Source: FDEP).

As of 1997, there were approximately 296,535 acres of forest in Alachua County. The portions of land within the Rural/Agricultural land use category that are in large scale silviculture/timber use are concentrated in the northeast and eastern parts of the County. The following data indicates about 240,000 acres in timber in 2001, so about 55,000 acres converted from timber to either another agricultural use or a residential use. The resulting loss of tree canopy has far-reaching impact both on local stormwater runoff and global warming.

Acreage and Agricultural use data from the Alachua County Property Appraiser Report is as follows:

	Timber	Orchard	Pasture	Nursery	Crops	Misc.
2000 Parcels	5,204	275	3,315	171	892	43
2000 A c r e s	245,012	3,302	100,540	1,354	29,823	357
2001 Parcels	5,249	270	3,345	163	865	41
2001 Acres	240,947	3 ,229	99,935	1,368	28,426	354

Source: Alachua County Property Appraiser website (The property appraisal notes that some parcels may have more than one use, therefore the total agricultural use parcels will not equal the sum of the individual uses.)

Data from the Census of Agriculture, 1992 and 1987, are directly comparable for acreage and inventories although dollar values have not been adjusted for changes in price levels. This is included as Appendix AGRI.

Residential conversions of the rural area, if not appropriately designed, can worsen land use conflicts. New subdivision lots less than 20 acres in the Rural/Agricultural area since 1995 are shown here:

Calendar YEAR	< 3 acres	3-8 acres	>8 acres	Total/year
1995	32	42	12	86
1996	0	56	33	89
1997	94	60	21	175
1998	30	34	21	85
1999	0	22	7	29
2000	0	35	4	39
2001 (partial)	20	6	5	31 (partial)

Source: Alachua County Department of Growth Management

It should be noted, however, that residential use permits in the Rural/Agriculture land use has shown a six year average of 345 new single family residential units, including mobile homes, on lots up to 20 acres. This indicates a rapid rate of conversion of the rural area to allow low density development. Therefore the rural land character is threatened by the piece-meal development of residential uses. The

data indicates that mobile homes are the predominant building type on new lots in the rural area (slightly more mobile homes than site-built homes for 5 years out of six, 1995-2000). Data for residential use in the Rural/Agriculture land use, including new subdivision lots by size of lot, is included in Appendix Table “New Building Permits Issued.”

The problem of small lot development in the rural area was noted in a 1992 report by the American Farmland Trust, *Florida’s Growth Management Plans: Will Agriculture Survive?* This report noted that the degree to which rural low density residential zones are effective in conserving farmland is directly related to the minimum lot size required for each residence. The larger the minimum lot size, the more effective the zone is in conserving farmland. The current policy allowing residential development on 5 acre lots in the rural area is totally ineffective, according to this report. The minimum lot sizes can be rated as follows according to their effectiveness in conserving farmland:

under 4.9 acres	totally ineffective
5 to 9.9 acres	generally ineffective
10 acres	moderately ineffective
10.1 to 20 acres	moderately effective
20.1 to 40 acres	generally effective
over 40 acres	highly effective

In the six years, 1995-2000, the average numbers for single family and mobile home permits issued by lot size in unincorporated Alachua County were as follows:

Less than 3 acres	162 average yearly
3 to 8 acres	182 average yearly
8 to 12 acres	72 average yearly
12 to 20 acres	35 average yearly
Total 20 acres or less	511 average yearly

While some of these small lots may have continued some type of agricultural use and received the agricultural exemption, the viability of farmland is reduced as the parcels are fragmented. Agricultural lot sizes of five acres or less are identified as rural residential zones, and are not recommended for agricultural areas (*Holding Our Ground: Protecting America’s Farms and Farmland*, by Tom Daniels and Deborah Bowers). In addition, five acre lots are often too large for a homeowner to manage without incurring problems such as exotic invasive vegetation and soil erosion.

The requirement in the current plan for clustering of subdivisions with 25 or more lots has been weakened as a result of phased subdivision applications, each with less than the 25 lot threshold. As reported in the EAR, two requests for cluster development were denied by the County. One application was denied based on the presence of large wetland and floodplain areas in the vicinity of Kanapaha Prairie, and another application was denied based in part on the impact of the anticipated population upon buildout with such a concentration in an area remote from fire and school services (EAR, FLUE Page I-

24). Within Rural Clusters, Rural Employment Centers and Rural Community Employment Centers, very limited development has occurred.

New policies requiring mandatory clustering of all residential subdivision development in the rural area are designed to protect the characteristics and features of the rural area while continuing to allow a gross density of 1 unit per 5 acres. The discussion of rural clustered subdivisions under Development Controls section will expand on this new requirement, which is intended to help Alachua County use the development regulation process to their advantage to protect interconnected networks of greenways and permanent open space for rural areas.

The *Rural Lands Stewardship Program*, created by the 2001 Legislature, or a similar transfer of development right program, may help Alachua maintain the economic value of agricultural and silvicultural lands, while directing growth to locations within areas more-suitable for increased densities, mixed uses and cluster development, using transferrable land use credits. See the Development Controls section for more discussion of these methods.

Conservation

Resource areas of wellfield protection areas, lakes, floodplains, wetlands, and minerals and soils are generally mapped in the Future Land Use map series. Strategic ecosystems and other habitat resources, archaeological resources and sinkholes are also mapped. Identification and protection of these conservation resources are also identified in detail in the policies in the Conservation and Open Space Element.

Commercial/Retail

The 1999 Property Appraiser data indicates existing retail square footage is approximately 10 million square feet. National Research Bureau Shopping Center Directory reports shopping center supply of 3.5 million square feet. The Fishkind retail demand model estimates countywide household based retail demand in year 2000 of 5.7 million square feet. The Fishkind report reconciled this discrepancy among data sources with the assumption that a percentage of “one story stores” are not used for retail but instead are service or office type uses. Fishkind estimates the share of these parcels in office type uses is nearly one third, which leaves a total retail supply of 7.8 million square feet in the County. Fishkind estimates the number of retail acres to be 1,800.

The identification of areas for higher intensity activities in the commercial and institutional land use categories has been based in part on analysis of projected population within defined market areas. Criteria for this identification are in policies in Sections 3 and 5 of the Future Land Use Element. The acreage sum of all Activity Centers is 2,528.6 acres. The methodology for determining commercial land use needs includes acreage for each activity center.

The 2001 Alachua County Property Appraiser Report indicates a total just value of business, commercial and industrial uses of \$1,388,428,700 (http://www.acpafl.org/annual_reports/2001_report/realuse_2001.htm).

Industrial

The 1999 property appraiser data indicates existing industrial square footage Countywide (including municipalities) is approximately 9.3 million square feet. It is not possible to directly determine the number of corresponding acres in use due to the limits of the property appraiser data, which identify parcel size by front foot or lot, rather than acres. However, the number of acres in use was

estimated. Based on Floor Area Ratios (FAR) of 0.10 (as determined from the Appraiser data) there are approximately 6,500 industrial acres in use, including two large uses, the Gainesville Regional Airport and the Gainesville Regional Utilities Deerhaven site, which account for 2,253 acres of the total.

Activity Centers Analysis

At present there are slightly more than 2,500 acres designated in Activity Centers. The Activity Center analysis by Fishkind and Associates determined acreages based on DOR codes. Vacant acreages in the Activity Centers calculated from DOR codes equals 1226 acres. Based on the Fishkind analysis, there is sufficient vacant activity center acreage to accommodate the future unincorporated urban retail, office, hotel and industrial demand. The total acreage by Activity Centers is as follows:

Activity Centers	
Archer/34th Street	257.3 acres
Archer/Tower Road	185.2 acres
Eastgate	4.3 acres
Eastside	344.8 acres
Jonesville	281.6 acres
Millhopper	52.7 acres
North Main	50.7 acres
Oaks Mall	261.9 acres
Santa Fe	117.1 acres
Springhills	723.8 acres
Tower/24th Ave.	47.4 acres
Williston/13th	62.4 acres
Williston/I-75	139.5 acres
Total	2,528.6 acres

IV. NEED FOR REDEVELOPMENT

A. Renewal of Blighted Areas

Gainesville was the fourth (4th) fastest growing city in Florida during the 1990s. The percentage population increase was 19.2 % for the decade. This rate of growth has primarily led to suburban sprawl, however, and existing developed areas have declined, especially in the area known as “East Gainesville.” Plan East Gainesville is a recent project of the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Organization (MTPO) to address the need for redevelopment. The Mission Statement of the MTPO is as follows:

As a result of a significant public participation program, develop a joint City of Gainesville and Alachua County special area plan, land conservation plan and transportation plan to revitalize the eastern Gainesville Urbanized Area, after considering the environmental, economic, neighborhood and transportation impacts of proposed development in this area.

In an effort to promote redevelopment and reduce blight, the County designated the East Side Activity Center, located within the Urban Cluster (east of Gainesville city limits and west of Newnans Lake), as an area for mixed use development. The County is currently considering a program to set up a Community Redevelopment Agency for the activity center to be funded through tax increment financing. In 1998, the General Accounting Office identified Census Tracts 2, 6 and 7 as economically depressed areas based on the criteria of level of unemployment, poverty and percentage of low income households. The area continues to remain blighted and economically distressed and has experienced little economic activity beyond County and City of Gainesville initiated projects. Inadequate infrastructure, public transportation facilities and the deterioration of buildings are significant factors contributing to the current

conditions and blight in the area.

Alachua County continues to provide housing rehabilitation and neighborhood revitalization through its State Housing Initiatives Partnership (SHIP) and Small Cities Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Programs for residential units located within existing neighborhoods in the small cities and communities and scattered rural sites in the unincorporated areas of the County.

B. Elimination or Reduction of Inconsistent Uses

Administrative rezonings in the late 1990s resulted in reduction of inconsistent land uses types. Excessive expanses of parking areas at sprawling developments is one example of development form inconsistent with the goals of the Comprehensive Plan. Policies addressing redevelopment according to pedestrian design standards will reduce this problem.

V. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND REDEVELOPMENT OF FLOOD PRONE AREAS

In Alachua County there are a total of 5,721 parcels, which cover an area of 176,140 acres, that include land within the 100 year flood plain. (This data is based on GIS floodplain maps produced by the Federal Emergency Management Agency in 1996 and subject to change when these maps are updated in the next few years.) Of these 5,721 parcels, 1,215 are vacant non-agricultural parcels, totalling 18,964 acres. This is the total acreage of the parcels and not necessarily just the portion of the parcels that are in the flood plain. The total parcel count and parcel land acreage of all Alachua County (including the municipalities) is 8,294 parcels totalling 593,585 acres (Source: County GIS/Property Appraiser Data, Sept. 2000).

Parcels including Floodplain	# Parcels	Acreage
Total Alachua County	8,294	593,585 acres
Total with Floodplain	5,721	176,140 acres
% of County Total	(69%)	(29.7%)
Total with Vacant Floodplain	1,215	18,964 acres
% of Floodplain Total	(21%)	(10.7%)

Source: Property Appraiser Data, and Growth Management GIS, Sept. 2000 based on 1996 FEMA maps.

The Comprehensive Plan combines locational and design approaches for hazard mitigation of flooding. The plan emphasizes protecting the floodplain and minimizing structural approaches.

Six basic structural alternatives are available to address flooding in floodprone areas. These are capacity improvements, regional detention/retention, purchase of floodprone properties, development restrictions, no action, and the use of operational control structures.

VI. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND REDEVELOPMENT BASED ON HAZARD

MITIGATION REPORTS

Floodplains, sinkholes, fires, tornadoes and hurricanes are natural hazards in Alachua County. Man-made hazards includes chemical and other emergencies.

The Alachua County Local Hazard Mitigation Working Group identified eight (8) situations and recommendations, but acknowledged these strategies are a “work-in-progress.” Each is subject to review and change. The eight (8) identified Strategies are:

(1) Develop and incorporate pre- and post mitigation planning into Comprehensive Plans and Elements; review, revise and create ordinances and procedures that promote community wide mitigation benefits. Coordinate activities with other local agencies to promote cooperation between jurisdictions. This strategy was incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan update.

(2) Alachua County has submitted four (4) county flood control mitigation actions for action following review by the State. These projects are the stormwater pump station at South West 34th Street Industrial Park, the Flood Control Project at Robin Lane subdivision, a drainage project (pump station) for the Heatherwood subdivision at NW 39th Ave. and NW 54th Terrace, and retention basin construction of Shaw’s Pond near NW 143rd Street.

(3) Develop a partnership between the public and private sectors and the general public for Wildland/Urban interface wildfire mitigation. This partnership should address public education, fuel reduction, use of fire resistant building materials and landscaping practices. A “Firewise Community” workshop was held in Alachua County on Oct. 4, 2001.

(4) Identify, retrofit and construct safe disaster shelter space. The County has 40,500 Category 5 disaster shelter spaces using the pre-American Red Cross 4496 criteria.

(5) Complete a total shelter/building analysis to determine retrofit feasibility.

(6) Establish a community wide preparedness and response organization.

(7) Create a local ordinance establishing a cost recovery mechanism to recover expended funds. The ordinance would serve two purposes: a deterrent and a revenue source for unbudgeted expenditures.

(8) Review existing data regarding Flood Mitigation Assistance Program and determine the most feasible course of action.

VII. DEVELOPMENT CONTROLS

As a guide for the development and use of land within unincorporated Alachua County, the Future Land Use Element incorporates principles of sustainable land development that includes a balance of social equity, economic opportunity, and environmental protection. These principles include natural resource and agricultural protection, efficient use of infrastructure and services, distinct urban and rural areas, more compact development patterns, residential neighborhoods as a collective asset, reduced dependency on single occupant vehicles, and more diverse and vital communities. In order to implement these principles, the Future Land Use Element contains a variety of techniques and strategies, including:

- Urban growth boundary, i.e. Urban Cluster line
- Urban services line
- Traditional neighborhood developments
- Mixed use village centers

- Activity center design standards
- Clustered subdivisions
- Transfer of development rights program
- Community and neighborhood planning program

A review of each of these techniques is provided below.

Urban Growth Boundary (Urban Cluster Line)

An Urban Growth Boundary is a line on a map that is used to mark the separation of urbanizable land from rural land and within which urban growth should be contained for a period of time specified by the growth management program. The Alachua County Future Land Use Map terms this line the Urban Cluster. This designation, which has been a part of the County's Plan since 1991, cannot be changed without a Comprehensive Plan Amendment.

Urban Services Line

The Future Land Use Element designates an urban services line on the Future Land Use map to promote efficient use of land and infrastructure, and minimize sprawl, by phasing development of land within the urban cluster.

The urban services line identifies the area within the urban cluster within which phased development is promoted through 2010. The urban services line has been analyzed for capacity and determined adequate through at least 2010, as detailed in Table 5. The Plan calls for a reevaluation of the urban services line prior to 2006 for adequate capacity. This evaluation will include factors such as population growth rates and density rates, build out rates, housing prices and market factors, and effects of environmental constraints on development.

Before additional wastewater lines are extended, urban development is directed into the area currently served by wastewater lines. Before development proposed outside the urban services line can occur, it must provide a full complement of urban services. Flexibility for applications for development in the urban cluster but outside the urban services line allows for special review and approval based on a set of factors including not only provision of central wastewater, but an adequate local road network, mass transit, recreation, public protection facilities, public schools, fiscal impacts to the public, and a management plan for conservation areas. Other factors considered include enhancement of the local jobs-housing mix, inclusion of a mixed use village center and affordable housing, and purchase of development rights through the County's Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program provided for in the Plan.

Traditional Neighborhood Developments

Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND) is a form of development following the principles of New Urbanism. New Urbanism is an architectural and urban design movement based on settlement patterns prevalent in North America prior to the Second World War, and culminating in the American town planning movement of the 1920s. New Urbanism is often held out as an alternative to the single-use, automobile-oriented "conventional" suburban development occurring after WWII. In contrast to conventional development, characterized by separation of uses and housing types within developments accessible only by automobile, New Urbanism holds the traditional neighborhood, with housing and other uses integrated at a fine grain, to be the basic building block of a walkable, interconnected

community (*Suburban Nation*, Duany, et al, 2000, pp. 3-4, 15-20.).

Traditional neighborhood developments with mixed housing types and mixed uses are strongly encouraged through the development review process. These traditional neighborhood developments are required to meet specific criteria to protect the natural environment, create usable interconnected open space, achieve higher net densities and integration with surrounding areas, achieve a sense of community through well-defined centers and edges and an integrated range of housing types and lot sizes, and utilize an interconnecting grid system of pedestrian friendly streets.

Citing sprawl as a conventional Florida development pattern with enormous economic and social costs, Reid Ewing distinguishes exemplary new developments, as well as traditional towns, using several criteria. While sprawl is characterized by poor accessibility – to jobs, schools, etc. – and lack of community open space, the criteria distinguishing good community development are market success, shopping and recreational opportunities, environmental themes, affordable housing with amenities, road connections, and street life (*Best Development Practices*, Ewing, 1996, pp. 1, 5-6.).

Traditional Neighborhood Development is distinguished from conventional master planned development by its use of principles focused on compact walkability. These principles include public space in the form of a distinct center as a generator of neighborhood form, the distance of a five-minute walk as a unit of measure, an interconnected street grid system, and pedestrian-scaled streets designed as multi-use space, including details such as narrow street width, wide sidewalks, shade trees, and buildings oriented close to the street. This basic framework of human scale and orientation also allows for the possibility of mixing a variety of housing types and uses in close proximity, while maintaining livability through an overall discipline and order (*Suburban Nation*, Duany, et al, 2000, pp. 3-4, 15-20).

Guidelines for best development practices for land use, transportation, environmental, and housing have been developed by Ewing as a means to blend desirable aspects of contemporary and traditional development. These practices advocate such strategies as keeping vehicle miles traveled below the area average, mixing land uses and housing (including affordable housing) at the finest grain the market will bear, making subdivisions into neighborhoods with well-defined centers and edges, taming auto-oriented land uses, designing the street network with multiple connections, providing pedestrian and bicycle networks equal to the auto network. Ewing advocates using a systems approach to environmental planning for best development, including developing in already disturbed areas while preserving connected areas and corridors of significant habitat (*Best Development Practices*, Ewing, 1996, pp. 17, 51, 91, 129.).

As an alternative to conventional suburban development patterns, the Alachua County Future Land Use Element encourages Traditional Neighborhood Developments (TNDs) as an urban residential design strategy in policies under Objective 1.4. Specifically, Policy 1.4.2 provides for TNDs within residential zoning districts. Such provision allows for expedited “as of right” approval of TNDs based on clear design and performance criteria, rather than the more costly, time-consuming, and uncertain planned development/ rezoning process.

The performance criteria for TNDs included in the Comprehensive Plan include strategies from the New Urbanism and Best Development Practices. These criteria include protection of the natural environment, creation of usable interconnected open space, higher net densities designed for integration with surrounding areas, a sense of community through well-defined centers and edges and an integrated range of housing types and lot sizes, and an interconnecting grid system of pedestrian friendly streets. In addition, the Future Land Use Element provides an option to include mixed uses within a new TND provided they are designed at a limited scale and consistent with policy standards for village centers, as discussed below.

Mixed Use Village Centers

The Future Land Use Element provides for mixed use village centers as a strategy to encourage reduction of automobile use and greater use of non-automobile forms of transportation, by providing limited daily retail and service needs integrated with residential areas. The village center is an alternative to the existing provision for Neighborhood Convenience Centers, which may be included in existing residential areas when integrated with a planned unit development. Village centers are provided with incentives to encourage their development, and standards to ensure integration with neighborhoods at a pedestrian friendly, human scale.

Village centers are encouraged through several incentives. They are allowed in urban residential areas as part of a new traditional neighborhood development, through development plan approval in standard residential zoning districts. Village centers may include up to 30,000 square feet of commercial area as part of a new residential development. They may include up to 50,000 square feet of commercial area within an identified radius of a new development, provided the additional need is demonstrated through a market study and the development plan provides connectivity and integration with the surrounding area. When located along well-served planned transit system corridors, TNDs with village centers are eligible for consideration as a Transportation Concurrency Exception for Projects that Promote Public Transit, higher densities through designation as a transfer of development rights receiving area, and commercial areas up to 50,000 square feet based on demonstrated need to serve the transit ridership.

Traditional Neighborhood Developments may include mixed use village centers through the development plan approval process provided they meet specific site and design standards in the Comprehensive Plan and land development regulations (LDRs), to ensure integration with new residential developments. These standards specify the village center must be part of a new TND of a minimum of 30 acres, located at least one-half mile apart, and achieve at least 90% of the maximum density allowed by the residential land use. In order to be considered through the development plan approval process, a public involvement process must be used, including a facilitated neighborhood charrette or similar forum to help identify common interests as well as concerns between surrounding neighborhoods and the developer. In addition, design standards are required to ensure compact, multi-purpose, walkable centers, which integrate a mix of uses within an overall pedestrian-friendly environment. These design standards include a balanced mix of uses, however, industrial and highway-oriented uses specified in the LDRs are not allowed. The mix of uses are required to be integrated through an overall design framework of size, scale, proportion, and materials. Public space must be an organizing element around which other development is located.

The village center must also be organized along a density and intensity gradient to ensure integration with the site and surrounding uses. Village centers must be located at the geographic center of the TND, unless site constraints prevent it or the village center is located along a public road. In both cases, the village center must be effectively integrated with surrounding uses with minimized impacts, and oriented primarily toward the TND. Other design standards address the pedestrian circulation system, pedestrian street character, impacts of auto access, parking, and signage, and design of stormwater facilities as amenities.

A primary characteristic of mixed use village centers is the provision of a high quality pedestrian environment. However, the Comprehensive Plan recognizes that certain limited uses that do not contribute to this environment, such as parking lots and service areas, must also be included. In order to maintain a continuous high quality pedestrian streetscape while allowing for these uses, an "A/B" street grid is allowed. The A/B street grid is a technique that allows the pedestrian quality of a limited number of streets to be compromised in order to maintain a primary pedestrian friendly network. The primary grid of A streets maintains continuous streetscape definition through pedestrian oriented uses and frontages. The automobile oriented uses are assigned to the B streets, rather than being dispersed throughout the site where they would interrupt pedestrian continuity. (Suburban Nation, Duany, et al, 2000, p. 161.)

Limited flexibility for village centers that do not meet all requirements in the TND provision within standard zoning districts may also be included in residential developments through the planned

development process. However, the village center must still meet all comprehensive plan policy standards.

Activity Centers

Activity centers are located within the urban cluster designated on the Future Land Use map, to provide for the concentration of mixtures of higher intensity and density land uses in the urban area. Activity centers include design standards to ensure that they are pedestrian-friendly compact centers integrated with surrounding uses and connected to a multi-modal transportation system.

Different levels of activity centers are identified based on their primary and secondary functions, market size and area, and intensity. Activity centers are identified as retail or employment oriented, and as high, medium, or low intensity. A comprehensive plan amendment is required for new, expansion, or redevelopment of activity centers to establish the level, type, and uses on the Future Land Use map and to establish specific activity center plan policies in the Comprehensive Plan. Such comprehensive plan amendments are considered based on the findings of a market or employment study, and urban form location and size requirements.

These design standards include a balanced mix of uses, integrated within a pedestrian-friendly environment through an overall design framework of size, scale, proportion, and materials. Public space must be an organizing element around which other development is located. The activity center must also be organized along a density and intensity gradient to ensure integration with the site and surrounding uses. Other design standards address the pedestrian circulation system, pedestrian street character, connectivity and street grid system, impacts of auto access, parking, and signage, and design of stormwater facilities as amenities.

Research conducted by 1000 Friends of Oregon concludes that building orientation and pedestrian orientation are closely correlated, and that variation in building orientation can account for changes of 10% or more in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per household. In addition, the equations used in this research included a variable for employment density at the zonal level. This measure of "mixed use" at the zonal or neighborhood level was also statistically significant in explaining observed variations in automobile dependence. The report states, "Ordinances and policies which are designed to regulate the built environment need to be drafted in a manner that reflects these lessons learned from Portland's 'traditional' neighborhoods... The research demonstrates that building orientation, as one of several land use variables which can be influenced by public policy, has a statistically significant impact on household vehicle miles of travel, an important measure of travel behavior." – Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc. Building Orientation, a supplement to The Pedestrian Environment, Volume 4B, 1000 Friends of Oregon, 1994. <http://ntl.bts.gov/DOCS/bob.html>

An Alachua County ordinance will regulate the following aspects of shopping center and large retail establishments:

- The aesthetic character of facades and exterior walls;
- The design of site entrances in relationship to the surrounding community;
- Sidewalks for pedestrian circulation;
- Parking lot design and location;
- Landscaping that improves the aesthetic appearance of parking lots and entrances;
- Stormwater management that is aesthetically pleasing and environmentally sound;
- The size, color, and materials of signs so they are functional and aesthetically compatible with the surrounding community; and

The placement, height, and materials for lighting which enhances security without unnecessary “light pollution.”

The Comprehensive Plan also specifies the evaluation and update of all activity center plans to bring them into compliance with these mixed use pedestrian-friendly standards. This evaluation will include a public participation process incorporating neighborhood meetings, charrettes, and notice to property owners.

Rural Clustered Subdivisions

While rural areas contain valuable resources of agriculture, open space, natural resources, and rural character, they are also under increasing development pressures. The Comprehensive Plan provides for the use of clustered subdivisions as a means to protect the characteristics and features of rural areas, while allowing for rural residential lifestyles. Clustered subdivisions are existing in other Florida counties including St. Johns, Leon and Hillsborough.

The Future Land Use Element contains six goals for protecting rural areas through rural clustered subdivisions. These goals are:

- Protect natural and historic resources.
- Support continued agricultural activities by preserving viable soils and effective land masses.
- Minimize land use conflicts.
- Provide recreational and habitat corridors through linked open space networks.
- Achieve flexibility, efficiency, and cost reduction in the provision of services and infrastructure.
- Reduce natural hazard risks to life and property.

At a workshop at the Florida Farm Bureau on January 9, 2002, concerning the requirement for rural clustered subdivisions in the Alachua County Comprehensive Plan Update, national expert Randall Arendt explained the merits of this form of development.

According to Arendt, rural clustered subdivisions are advantageous for reasons which include:

- Open space can remain in production.
- Geometry determines design and results in aesthetic quality and efficiency.
- Reduction in management costs (time and money) for homeowners.

Arendt’s rural cluster subdivisions design concepts are framed by the rural area purpose, and are based on symbiotic relationships. Site design criteria address issues such as avoidance of critical wildlife habitat areas, preservation of significant site features (sinkholes, large trees, hedgerows, etc.), and providing road connections and trail linkages between current and future subdivisions (Arendt, 1994, p. 229). The application of his design concepts in high fire hazard areas will advance hazard mitigation

planning.

Rural cluster subdivisions are advantageous when natural stormwater management is incorporated into the design, allowing for protection of water quality and the natural aquifer recharge function. Often roadway paving is decreased, thereby resulting in less runoff problems. The use of natural pesticide management can also be incorporated where the open space is productive agriculture, thereby improving water quality.

Rural cluster subdivisions can be one component of area-wide planning for conservation and development. The resource area planning approach required by the Alachua County Conservation and Open Space Element may typically map (in addition to wetlands and floodplains) farm fields, pastures, steep slopes, sinkholes, ridgelines and hilltops; high aquifer recharge areas; significant wildlife habitats; waterfront land; and scenic corridors. Rural cluster subdivisions allow new development at higher net densities outside such areas on a development parcel. In essence, rural cluster subdivisions are simply an internal transfer of density involving the same number of dwellings (Arendt, 1994: 253).

Transfer of Development Rights Program

The Comprehensive Plan provides for establishment of a voluntary Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program as one of several tools to help protect agricultural land and uses. The TDR program provides a means to allow owners of rural property the option of protecting land in the rural area while still receiving an economic return. An owner that decides to participate in a TDR program relinquishes his or her right to develop the property at the maximum density allowed, in exchange for monetary compensation. The purchaser of the development rights is then allowed to develop at a density higher than the maximum allowed, based in part on the number of rights purchased.

A TDR program would include designation of sending areas and receiving areas for development rights. The sending areas are the areas to be preserved, and are based on factors such as viability of existing agricultural uses, soils, and general land use patterns. The receiving areas are based on appropriate infrastructure, environmental suitability, and capacity to absorb additional development potential.

The Rural Lands Stewardship Program, created by the 2001 Florida Legislature, may help Alachua County maintain the economic value of agricultural and silvicultural lands, while directing growth to locations within rural areas more-suitable for increased densities, mixed uses and cluster development, using transferrable land use credits. Once funded, landowners will be able to receive financial payments for one of the following arrangements: a protection easement lasting in perpetuity, a 30-year protection easement, or a 5-10-year protection easement. The easements are attached to the landowner's property deed. These easements may restrict the construction of buildings, roads, billboards, other advertising, or utilities; subdividing the property; dumping; or any activities that adversely affect the hydrology of the land, soil conservation, fish or wildlife habitat. The Act also requires that, concurrent with an agricultural protection agreement, the landowner must grant the state an option to purchase the property in fee simple at the conclusion of the agreement or an extension of up to five years with the right to purchase attached (Source: 1000 Friends of Florida). The Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services is given the responsibility for implementing the program. However, until funding is provided, the Department is not prepared to enter into any agreements, although rule development is underway. The program is created through Ss. 570.70 and 201.15, F.S. The requirements of this program for designating 50,000 acres for sending areas and transferring the development within the rural area may not be advisable for Alachua County, however, due to the 1 unit per 5 acre density already allowed for rural residential development and the resulting transportation impacts within the rural area if density bonuses are allowed there.

Under Alachua County's proposal for developing a voluntary TDR program, a rural landowner

could choose to sell development rights equivalent to one dwelling unit per five acres, the maximum density currently allowed in the rural area to a designated area within the Urban Cluster or a municipality where infrastructure is available. The sending area that has successfully sold these rights will then be required to rezone to an Agriculture or Silviculture zoning district. Agricultural zoning can help reduce conflicts between farmers and nonfarmers, protect valuable soils, promote efficient and orderly growth, maintain a “critical mass” of agriculture as a viable industry in the local economy, as well as serving other public values such as retaining open space and protecting water and air quality. The Agriculture district is primarily for agricultural uses such as row crops, grazing land, and orchards, but also allows limited residential development at a maximum density of one unit per twenty acres. The Silviculture district is primarily for forestry or silviculture, but allows limited residential development at a maximum density of one dwelling unit per forty acres.

Some key components of a successful TDR program are:

1. Well defined and defensible sending and receiving areas must be established.

-legitimate public purpose to preserving the area defined as a sending area.

-the sending and receiving areas must be of adequate size to accommodate and create a viable market for the property right exchanges.

2. Program mandates.

-Owners of land in sending areas have no right to use their land other than in conformity with the plan (in Alachua County it has been proposed that land will be changed to appropriate zoning after the TDR sale is completed).

-The receiving areas must be adequately zoned so that added densities are encouraged, available, and feasible. (This concept incorporated from Transfer of Development Rights to Protect Water Resources. Strong, Ann Louise. Land Use Law, September 1998, Page 5).

3. TDRs are Part of a Multi-dimensional approach. Other incentives, such as tax breaks for agriculture, public purchase of land, purchase of development rights, urban growth boundaries, impact fees or concurrency requirements are also necessary to combat sprawl.

The determining factor, however, for the viability of any TDR program maybe that there must be a market demand for development at a density or intensity higher than that available under the current zoning (APA, Growing Smart).

Community and Neighborhood Planning Program

The Comprehensive Plan envisions greater involvement in the planning process through a community and neighborhood planning program. This program will empower communities and neighborhoods to address specific needs and circumstances of their area by incorporating their vision and goals into focused special area plans. These plans will include both urban and rural areas and promote more cohesive communities by utilizing the basic planning components of neighborhood, district, and corridor.

The neighborhood can range from a free standing village to part of a larger collection of neighborhoods and districts making up an urbanized town. Neighborhoods have distinct centers and edges, a balanced mix of uses, are walkable, structured by an interconnected network of streets, and prioritize public space. Corridors, of transportation or open space, can connect neighborhoods and districts, or act as natural boundaries between urban areas.

The neighborhood, district, and corridor are identified in the New Urbanist literature as the fundamental components for creating complete communities that mix uses, and for “integrating natural environments and man-made communities into a sustainable whole.” (*The New Urbanism*. Katz, Peter, 1994, p. xvii-xx.)

VIII. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The update of the Comprehensive Plan since the Evaluation and Appraisal report has included a public meeting process aimed at involving a cross section of community participants.

Phase 1 of this process, several town meetings were held around Alachua County to hear citizens express views on the main issues related to the Comprehensive Plan Update. Next a series of stakeholder meetings were held in 2000 to develop “Issue Papers” and prepare a Consensus Report. On January 8, 19 and 24, Town Meetings were held including the LPA and BoCC that resulted in the completion of the “Neighborhoods, Housing, and Mobility” Issue Paper. The LPA and BoCC held workshops on February 1 and 15, issuing the “Infrastructure, Utilities and Sustainable Construction” Issue Paper. During the February 29 LPA workshop, work was completed on the “Protection of Farmland and Existing Natural Areas, Environmental Education” Issue Paper. The March 21 BoCC Workshop completed the “Protection of Natural and Rural Areas” paper. “Jobs, Sense of Place and Protecting Rural and Natural Areas II” was compiled at public meetings with the LPA and BoCC on March 25, 29 and April 10. “Protecting Rural and Natural Areas III” was the result of a April 2 Town Meeting and May 2 LPA Workshop. A May 22 LPA workshop resulted in “Protecting Natural and Natural Areas.” A stakeholder and BoCC Workshop on June 14 completed the Consensus Report. A Land Use/Spatial Area-Based Analysis was completed on the GIS in August 2000.

Phase 2 of the public participation process began in Fall 2000 with a series of Joint Meetings of the LPA and BoCC. These meetings allowed public comment on draft policies for plan elements. The schedule included Solid Waste, Potable Water and Sanitary Sewer, Stormwater Management, and Housing on October 16. On October 23 the meetings discussed FLUE (Urban Residential), Recreation and Open Space (Recreation Goal), and Economic. FLUE and the Conservation/Aquifer Recharge Element were the topic on November 20. December 13 followed with Conservation/Aquifer Recharge (including Open Space part II), Recreation (resource-based), FLUE (part III), and Historic. This series concluded on January 24, 2001 with Conservation, Transportation, Intergovernmental Coordination, and FLUE.

The Local Planning Agency meetings also allowed formal citizen participation through public comment.

October 30 reviewed Stormwater Management, Potable Water and Sanitary Sewer, and Solid Waste.

November 15 included Housing, Recreation and Open Space (Goal I-Recreation), and Economic. Some elements were repeated, for example January 31 included Housing and Historic. FLUE (Rural Agriculture policies), Conservation and Open Space were discussed on February 19, and Transportation, and FLUE on February 26. March 19 covered FLUE, FLUE Map Series, Transportation, and Capital

Improvement. The LPA meeting on April 16, 2001 finalized the recommendations to the BoCC for all eleven elements.

The next phase of meetings were the BoCC Special Meetings held on April 30, and May 1, 21 and 29. A brochure was mailed out to all Alachua County property owners from the property tax records in early June, giving information about the Comprehensive Plan Update process. Public forums were held on June 13, 18 and 20 to allow discussion of the plan, and specifically the draft primary and secondary conservation resources map.

The Board of County Commissioners held Transmittal Public Hearings in 2001 according to the following schedule:

June 25	Conservation and Open Space
July 2	FLUE amendments - CPA-01-00, CPA-02-00, CPA-04-00, CPA-05-00
July 17	Housing, Recreation
July 23	Stormwater Management, Potable Water and Sanitary Sewer, Historic
August 6	Transportation Mobility, Capital Improvement
August 9	Solid Waste, Intergovernmental Coordination, Economic
August 23	All Elements for transmittal
August 30	Continued from 8/23/01, all elements approved for transmittal

At the time of the vote for transmittal, the BoCC also voted to continue public discussion on specific issues with a series of public forums. These were organized by County staff and included state and national experts speaking on the issue areas. The forums were held as follows:

Agricultural Protection Policies (October 31, 2001), Transportation Concurrency (November 26, 2001), High Aquifer Recharge Area Maps and Wetland Buffers (December 5, 2001), Rural Clustered Subdivisions (January 9, 2002), Urban Design (January 28, 2002) and Urban Services Line (February 18, 2002).

Adoption phase Public Hearings were held in March 2002.

REFERENCES:

Alachua County Comprehensive Planning Team, Jan. 2000. "Integrating Neighborhoods into Communities."

Alachua County Comprehensive Planning Team, February 2000. "Recreation, Open Space and Habitat Fragmentation."

Alachua County Comprehensive Planning Team, February 2000. "Infrastructure, Utilities and Sustainable Construction."

Alachua County Comprehensive Planning Team, February 2000. "Protection of Natural and Rural Areas I."

Alachua County Comprehensive Planning Team, March 2000. "Protection of Natural Systems."

Alachua County Local Mitigation Working Group, 1999/2000, Alachua County Local Mitigation Strategy Final Deliverables.

American Farmland Trust, 1992. *Florida's Growth Management Plans: Will Agriculture Survive?*

American Farmland Trust, 1997. *Saving American Farmland: What Works.*

Arendt, Randall, et.al.. 1994. *Rural by Design. Maintaining Small Town Character*. Chicago, Illinois: Planners Press.

Calthorpe, Peter. 1990. "Suburbia: Ready for Foot and Rail?" *Landscape Architecture Magazine*.

Calthorpe, Peter, 2001. *Regional City*.

Comptroller of the Currency, Administrator of National Banks. 1998. Agricultural Lending, Comptroller's Handbook.(with 3 letters/attachments)

Coughlin, Robert E., 1984. *The Effects of Agricultural Zoning on the Ability of Farmers to Borrow Money*. Philadelphia: Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Dept. of City and Regional Planning Research Report Series: No. 8..

Daniels, Tom, and Deborah Bowers, YEAR. *Holding Our Ground: Protecting America's Farms and Farmland*.

Duany, Andreas with E. Plater-Zyberk and J. Speck. 2000. *Suburban Nation*. NY: North Point Press.

Easley, V. Gail. 1992. "Staying Inside the Lines: Urban Growth Boundaries." *Planning Advisory Service Report* Number 440.

Ewing, Reid, 1996. *Best Development Practices*. Florida Department of Community Affairs.

Fishkind and Associates, 2001. "Alachua County Long-Term Economic Forecast and Analysis of Geographic Distribution of Land Use Needs." Report to Alachua County Department of Growth Management.

Hirschhorn and Souza. 2001. *New Community Design to the Rescue*. National Governors Association.

Katz, Peter, 1994. *The New Urbanism*. McGraw-Hill.

Nelson, Arthur C. 1990. *The Analytic Basis for an Effective Prime Farmland Preservation Scheme in the U.S.A.* *Journal of Rural Studies*, Vol. 6, No. 3, pp. 337-346.

Nelson, Arthur C. 1990. *Economic Critique of U.S. Prime Farmland Preservation Policies*. *Journal of Rural Studies*, Vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 119-142.

Schneider, Devon M., David R. Godschalk and Norman Axler. 1978. "The Carrying Capacity Concept as a Planning Tool." *Planning Advisory Service Report* No. 338. (In Wyman)

Wyman, Charles D. (Compilation) *Carrying Capacity in Urban Development Planning*. Chapel Hill: UNC Sea Grant College Program.

AUTHOR. 2001. *New Urbanism: Comprehensive Report and Best Practices Guide*. New Urban Publications.

Support documents of the Alachua County Comprehensive Plan that specifically relate to TDRs include:

Save Your Rural Landscape by Using TDRS. May 1995, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania.

This report describes the Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) concept of preserving farmland and rural character while protecting property values and answers some commonly asked questions about TDRs.

Transfer of Development Rights: Cases, Statutes, Examples. November 1998. This APA Planning Advisory Service memo examines legal issues associated with TDRs and provides examples of TDR

programs.

Table 1. FORECAST DWELLING UNITS TO ACCOMMODATE FUTURE POPULATION OF THE URBAN CLUSTER						
<u>Dwelling units needed</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>Refere</u>	<u>2010 to</u>	<u>Refer</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Refe</u>
Unincorporated population	114,251	1	13,150	2	127,401	1
<i>divided by</i>						
Average household size	2.20	3	2.20	3	NA	
<i>equals</i>						
Dwelling units	51,932		5,977			
<i>adjusted for vacancy</i>						
Total Dwelling Units Needed	57,703	4	6,641		64,344	
<i>minus</i>						
Existing units	52,500	5	NA	6	52,500	
<i>equals</i>						
New units needed	5,203		6,641		11,844	
<i>times</i>						
Market factor	2.00	7	NA		1.50	7
<i>equals</i>						
Total capacity needed	10,405		7,361		17,766	
<i>times</i>						
% low density	0.63	8	0.63	9		
<i>equals</i>						
units to be accommodated in low density land use category	6,555		4,637		11,193	
<i>and</i>						
Total additional units needed	10,405		7,361		17,766	
<i>times</i>						
% medium, med-high, and high	0.17	8	0.17	9		
<i>equals</i>						
units to be accommodated in med, med-high, & high density use categories	1,769		1,251		3,020	
<i>and</i>						
Total additional units needed	10,405		7,361		17,766	
<i>times</i>						
% "other"	0.20		0.20			
<i>equals</i>						
units to be accommodated in rural	2,081		1,472		3,553	

1. Source: BEBR and Alachua County Department of Growth Management , January 2001
2. Calculated based on 2020 projection minus 2010 projection
3. Shimberg report and Alachua County Department of Planning and Development, January 2001
4. Vacancy rate is assumed to be 10%

5. EAR Future Land Use Element Tables 18 and 23 for existing housing units in 1991, plus Building Permit data, 1992-00, from Alachua County. Department of Growth Management, Jan. 2001
6. No adjustment for existing units since this column is only for new units from 2010 to 2020
7. Established by proposed policy in the Alachua County Comprehensive Plan
8. Ratio of actual use in the EAR
9. Assumed to be constant through the planning period for purposes of calculations

TABLE 2. CALCULATION OF LAND NEEDED IN URBAN CLUSTER			
<u>Land Area Needed 2010</u>	<u>units</u>	<u>average</u>	<u>"new"</u> <u>acres</u>
low density residential land use	6,555	1.60	4,097
med, med-high, & high density residential	1,769	10.50	168
rural area	2,081	NA	NA
Total new acres needed in the urban cluster			4,265
From Table 1 of this worksheet.			

<u>Land Area Needed 2020</u>	<u>units</u>	<u>average</u>	<u>"new"</u> <u>acres</u>
low density residential land use	11,193	1.60	6,995
med, med-high, & high density residential	3,020	10.50	288
rural area	3,553	NA	NA
Total new acres needed in the urban cluster			7,283
From Table 1 of this worksheet.			

TABLE 3. ESTIMATE OF ALLOCATIONS TO NON-RESIDENTIAL USES

Vacant Land needed for new non-residential uses	<u>Acres</u>	<u>Reference</u>
Recreation	1,504	1
Institutional	1,305	2
Commercial, Office and Hotel	817	3
Industrial	314	3
	3,940	

1. This is the current allocation of land for recreation land use in the Urban Cluster, EAR Future Land Use Element Table 7. For purposes of estimating additional land needed for 2020, this current allocation has been used.
2. The existing institutional land use in the Urban Cluster of 4,050 ac, from the Dept. of Revenue land use codes, was divided by the total unincorporated population of 96,353 to derive a ratio of 42 ac of Institutional land per 1,000 population. This ratio was applied to the total 2020 unincorporated population of 127,401 to yield an estimated need for an additional 1,305 ac of Institutional land use in the Urban Cluster: $42 \text{ ac}/1,000 \times 127,401 = 5,355 \text{ ac} - 4,050 \text{ ac} = 1305 \text{ ac}$
3. This is the demand calculated for future acreage non-residential need allocation in the Urban Cluster from the Fishkind report (Fishkind and Associates, Activity Centers by Land Use and Geographic Distribution of Commercial Land Use Needs, March 2001).

Note: Fishkind also calculates capacity of existing Activity Centers to total 2,529 acres for all land uses.

TABLE 4. COMPARISON OF LAND NEEDED TO LAND AVAILABLE IN THE URBAN CLUSTER, YEAR 2020		
	<u>Acres</u>	<u>Refer</u>
Total land area (urban cluster)	45,437	1
<i>minus</i>		
Land in Right of Ways	4,135	1A
<i>minus</i>		
Estate Residential land use	5,137	2
Other existing exclusive residential land	11,755	3
<i>minus</i>		
Residential land use in other categories	1,933	4
<i>minus</i>		
Existing non-residential land use	6,876	5
<i>minus</i>		
Vacant land needed for new	3,940	6
<i>minus</i>		
Vacant land needed for new residential	7,283	7
<i>equals</i>		
Surplus within the urban cluster	4,378	8

1. County GIS, March 2001

- 1A. County GIS, March 2001.

2. EAR, Future Land Use Element, Table 7, total of all land designated for estate residential land use. The forecast of housing needs assumes that lands in estate residential will not be increased and that units accommodated on estate residential land have a de minimus impact on the future housing supply.

3. EAR, Future Land Use Element, Table 7, total of land actually used for low, medium, medium-high, and high density residential land use. This does not include vacant land in those land use categories.

4. EAR, Future Land Use Element, Table 7, total of land that is actually used for residential purposes, but is located on land designated in a non-residential (for example, commercial) land use category.

5. EAR, Future Land Use Element, Table 7, total of land that is actually used for the following purposes: commercial, industrial, institutional, activity centers, and recreation.

6. From Table 3 of this worksheet. This is an estimate of land to be allocated to the specified non-residential uses (based on forecasts of additional need), without regard to the current land use designations.

7. From Table 2 of this worksheet.

8. Distribution of future residential and non-residential uses would need to be consistent with Activity Center plans and mixed use policies

TABLE 4A. COMPARISON OF LAND NEEDED TO LAND AVAILABLE IN THE URBAN CLUSTER YEAR 2010

	<u>Acres</u>	<u>Referen</u>
Total land area (urban cluster)	45,437	1
<i>minus</i>		
Land in Right of Ways	4,135	1A
<i>minus</i>		
Estate Residential land use	5,137	2
<i>minus</i>		
Other existing exclusive residential land	11,755	3
<i>minus</i>		
Residential land use in other categories	1,933	4
<i>minus</i>		
Existing non-residential land use	6,876	5
<i>minus</i>		
Vacant land needed for new non-residential	3,940	6
<i>minus</i>		
Vacant land needed for new residential	4,265	7
<i>equals</i>		
Surplus within the urban cluster	7,396	8

1. County GIS, March 2001

- 1A. County GIS, March 2001.

2. EAR, Future Land Use Element, Table 7, total of all land designated for estate residential land use. The forecast of housing needs assumes that lands in estate residential will not be increased and that units accommodated on estate residential land have a de minimus impact on the future housing supply.

3. EAR, Future Land Use Element, Table 7, total of land actually used for low, medium, medium-high, and high density residential land use. This does not include vacant land in those land use categories.

4. EAR, Future Land Use Element, Table 7, total of land that is actually used for residential purposes, but is located on land designated in a non-residential (for example, commercial) land use category.

5. EAR, Future Land Use Element, Table 7, total of land that is actually used for the following purposes: commercial, industrial, institutional, activity centers, and recreation.

6. From Table 3 of this worksheet. This is an estimate of land to be allocated to the specified non-residential uses (based on forecasts of additional need), without regard to the current land use designations.

7. From Table 2 of this worksheet.

8. Distribution of future residential and non-residential uses would need to be consistent with Activity Center plans and mixed use policies

Table 5

Capacity of Urban Service Line (2010) For Residential Development

**Including the addition of parcels as approved by the BoCC
March 25, 2002 and April 8, 2002**

	<u>Urban Service Line Acreage</u>	<u>FLUM Designation Residential L,M,MH,H</u>	Development X Factor=		<u>Estimated Residential Developable Acreage</u>
Total vacant land area	13,173	8,366			
Vacant land in Primary Conservation	5,083	2,552	0.20	(*)	510
+ Vacant land in Secondary Conservation	6,067	4,532	0.75	(*)	3,399
= Total Vacant land in Conservation in U.S.L.	11,150	7,084			3,909
Total Vacant w/o Conservation Constraints	2,023	1,282	NA		1,282

Total Vacant Residential land available- Year 2010 5,191

Source: County GIS, August 2001 and updated March 2002

Notes: (*) Factor representing the estimated minimum of land identified as Primary and Secondary Conservation area on which development would be possible. The factors are based on the requirement for Primary Conservation areas with Strategic Ecosystems to protect 80% of the land per Conservation & Open Space Element Policy 4.10.5., and policies applicable to Secondary Conservation resources. Designated conservation land could yield additional development potential due to site-specific verification of location of conservation resources during development review, allowing for developing allowable gross density through clustering, and other approaches in the amended policies.

Residential land available for development	1,282	Vacant land available w/o Conservation Constraints
+	3,909	Vacant land constrained based on Dev. Factor (*)
equals	5,191	Vacant Residential land available- Year 2010

This exceeds the 4,265 acres needed for new urban residential use for Year 2010

See Map "Unincorporated Alachua County Future Land Use Map: 2020 for Urban Cluster and Surrounding Area with Urban Services Line."

TABLE 6

Capacity of Urban Cluster (2020) for Residential Development

	Urban Cluster Acreage	FLUM Designation Residential L,M,MH,H	Development X Factor		Estimated Residential Developable Acreage
Total vacant land area		16,562	11,618		
Vacant land in Primary Conservation	6,017	3,483	0.2	(*)	697
+ Vacant land in Secondary Conservation	7,394	5,759	0.75	(*)	4,319
=Total Vacant land in Conservation	13,411	9,242			5,016
Total Vacant w/o Conservation Constraints	3,151	2,376	NA		2,376
Total Vacant Residential land available- Year 2020					7,392

Source: County GIS, June 2001

Notes: (*) Factor representing the estimated minimum of land identified as Primary and Secondary Conservation area on which development would be possible. The factors are based on the requirement for Primary Conservation areas with Strategic Ecosystems to protect 80% of the land per

Conservation & Open Space Element Policy 4.10.5., and policies applicable to Secondary Conservation resources. Designated conservation land could yield additional development potential due to site-specific verification of location of conservation resources during development review, allowing for developing allowable gross density through clustering, and other approaches in the amended policies.

Residential land available for development	2,376	Vacant land available w/o Conservation Constraints
+	5,016	Vacant land constrained based on Dev. Factor (*)
equals	7,392	Vacant Residential land available- Year 2020

This exceeds the 7,283 acres needed for new urban residential use for Year 2020

See Map "Unincorporated Alachua County Future Land Use Map: 2020 for Urban Cluster and Surrounding Area with Urban Service Line."