

make  
copies

Com + Mayor

Honorable Mayor and City Commission

Thursday, December 20, 2001

**Re: Review of documents per SW 13<sup>th</sup> Street and RTS / Greyhound Project (Development Plan Review 3/30/01 Petition # 61SPC-01-DB for the old GRU Building at 700 SE 3<sup>rd</sup> Street)**

From a review of documents, it would appear that Greyhound and City Planning Staff – including RTS as developer and Public Works – spent staff time, money from the City budget and much effort to thoroughly review the proposed project at 700 SE 3<sup>rd</sup> Street including neighborhood meetings, department review and proposed site changes, detailed site plans, a lease, cost estimates and a negotiated agreement as to shared costs with Greyhound, etc. Documentation states that the project was estimated to cost \$479K and \$1.2M in federal funds was available for completion. Eventually, \$800K of these funds was expended for buses. The project did not incur neighborhood opposition, went through DRB review and the site was determined to be feasible for a bus depot. I understand that Greyhound would still be interested in this location.

Therefore, it is obvious that Greyhound is well aware of site plan requirements and hence understands that the site of SW 13<sup>th</sup> Street is not feasible unless City Staff hold them to lower standards than required in the past for the 700 SE 3<sup>rd</sup> Street project.

Should Greyhound decide to pursue the China Palace location on SW 25<sup>th</sup> and SW 13<sup>th</sup>, on behalf of the residents and businesses on SW 13<sup>th</sup> Street, I request that the City require at a minimum the same standards that were required of the site at 700 SW 3<sup>rd</sup> Street.

Highlights, from the DRB documentation for the old GRU Depot site based on input from all city departments:

SITE PLAN EVALUATION SHEET (copy of pertinent section attached)

Revisions necessary to meet ordinance requirements:

Item 2: “The Petitioner needs to very clearly separate the bus traffic from car traffic. Cars and buses should not use the same curb cut.”

SITE PLAN EVALUATION SHEET (copy attached)

Item 5: “The car parking located in the general vicinity of the bus parking must have landscape islands protecting the ends of the cars for the bus turning maneuvers. Staff questions the interaction between the buses and the automobiles. The petitioner should redesign the bus and car access so that they are not interconnected.”

CONCURRENCY REVIEW (copy of pertinent section attached):

Item 1: “.....located in Zone A of the TCEA – must meet requirements of the Concurrency Management Elements. All relevant Policy 1.1.4 standards must be met.”

Note: The current bus station has 30 parking spaces including 2 handicapped, the proposed site on the old GRU Depot had 28+ and the China Palace site has 15 or 16 currently existing marked spaces without any adjustments for site plan modifications as noted above.

In addition:

1. The draft plans provided by Greyhound to City Staff did not truthfully present the egress and ingress onto State Highway 441 / SW 13<sup>th</sup> Street. The current curb cut does not allow buses to exit and cross the median to go south. To do so, would require modification of the SW 13<sup>th</sup> Street median -- removal of existing trees and some of the existing median -- and FDOT input.
2. SW 25<sup>th</sup> Place was not constructed for major traffic and large vehicles and is not wide enough to allow safe passage for buses and cars to pass each other. Greyhound states that 25 buses a day will enter and exit the depot from 5:00 AM and 11:00 PM.

I have not even touched upon the issue the issue of stormwater runoff – there are no current facilities on the site for this purpose.

In conclusion, the China Palace site would not seem to be feasible for a Greyhound bus depot in accordance to City/County requirements and ordinances. I would appreciate a written response to from City Staff.

Cordially,



Jane Burman-Holtom

cc. Tom Saunders, Director, Community Development

# SITE PLAN EVALUATION SHEET

## DEVELOPMENT PLAN & SUBDIVISION REVIEW EVALUATION

### CURRENT PLANNING ROOM 158, THOMAS CENTER "B"

**306 Northeast 6th Avenue 334-5023**

Petition No. <u>061SPC-01DB</u>	Date Plan Rec'd: <u>06/05/01</u>	Review Type: <u>Concept Review</u>
Review For: <u>Development Review Board</u>	Review Date: <u>06/14/01</u>	Project Agent:
Description, Agent & Location: <u>Greyhound Bus Term./RTS Admin. Off.</u>		<u>Melissa Reno</u>

**APPROVABLE**  
(as submitted)

**APPROVABLE**  
(subject to below)

**DISAPPROVED**

<input type="checkbox"/> Plan meets ordinance requirements as submitted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revisions necessary for plan to meet ordinance requirements	Comments By:  <hr style="width: 80%; margin: 0 auto;"/> <p style="text-align: center;">Gene G. Francis Planner</p>
--	--

#### RECOMMENDATIONS/REQUIREMENTS/COMMENTS

The petitioner, Greyhound Bus Lines and the Regional Transit System (RTS) are proposing a development partnership that unites the public and private sector at a common location. The Greyhound Bus Lines are required to move out of their present terminal facilities, on Southwest 4th Avenue, within the next several months. They have been meeting with RTS recently to discuss the feasibility of sharing the same facilities located at 700 Southeast 3rd Street. The facility in question is the old GRU building located across the street from the newly renovated Kelly Power Plant. Several years ago, the Board approved a site plan for a new RTS Terminal at this location. That project was never finalized and the money intended for that facility was spent on new buses for increased student ridership. RTS and Greyhound are now proposing to demolish the southern, single-story portion of the existing building and utilizing the northern, two-story portion of the building. The Greyhound Bus Lines will utilize the ground floor of the facility for their terminal and RTS will use the second story for administrative offices. The existing paved area of the site will have to be reconfigured for both bus and automobile access. The plan before the Board is for concept review only. The Board will neither approve nor deny this plan, however, the Board should provide the petitioner with constructive comments that may help the petitioner development a better site plan.

**The planning division staff has the following comments and recommendations:**

1. The petitioner needs to include all of their property in their site plan application.
- ② The petitioner needs to very clearly separate the bus traffic from the car traffic. Cars and buses should not use the same curb cut.
3. There is some talk about reopening Southeast 6th Avenue. If that comes to pass, the petitioner should utilize that street as the access for the buses to the site. If it is too difficult for the buses to return out the same way they entered, perhaps they can create a one-way out adjacent to SE 6th Avenue. That will allow for better separation between the buses and cars.

# SITE PLAN EVALUATION SHEET

## DEVELOPMENT PLAN & SUBDIVISION REVIEW EVALUATION

### CURRENT PLANNING ROOM 158, THOMAS CENTER "B"

### 306 Northeast 6th Avenue 334-5023

Petition No. <u>061SPC-01DB</u>	Date Plan Rec'd: <u>05/14/01</u>	Review Type: <u>Concept Review</u>
Review For: <u>Technical Review Committee</u>	Review Date: <u>05/29/01</u>	Project Agent:
Description, Agent & Location: <u>Grayhound Bus Term./RTS Admin. Off.</u>		

**APPROVABLE** (as submitted)
                         
  **APPROVABLE** (subject to below)
                         
  **DISAPPROVED**


<input type="checkbox"/> Plan meets ordinance requirements as submitted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Revisions necessary for plan to meet ordinance requirements	Comments By:  <hr style="width: 80%; margin: auto;"/> Gene G. Francis Planner
--	--

#### RECOMMENDATIONS/REQUIREMENTS/COMMENTS

1. Planning staff needs for the petitioner to provide City staff with 24"x 36" site plans of the entire site, which includes the vacated street and the land to the north.
2. On the enlarged plans, the petitioner must provide staff with a list of site data that indicates to staff building area, before and after demolition, gross floor area, total and by floor, information about numbers of employees, parking required and provided, etc..
3. There should be no access onto S.E. 2nd Street from the paved area associated with the bus parking. The curb cuts and driveways leading to S.E. 2nd Street should be removed. The two vehicles shown along the west property line must be relocated with the understanding that vehicles can not back into the right-of-way.
4. The petitioner should provide some form of garden wall with metal railing along the west property line, especially in the area of the bus parking, as discussed at the First Step meeting. In addition, buffering material should be added in the same general area.
5. The car parking located in the general vicinity of the bus parking must have landscape islands protecting the ends of cars from the bus turning maneuvers. Staff questions the interaction between the buses and the automobiles. The petitioner should redesign the bus and car access points so that they are not interconnected.
6. The petitioner needs to better define the internal parking located in the southwest part of site. Additional could be added to the opposite (east) side of the drive. The drive leading out to Depot Avenue should be taken out.
7. What, if anything, is proposed for the area where the building is to be demolished?
8. Does the site plan drawing, provided to staff, indicate that the buses can make all of the turns necessary to park in their lot?

**CONCURRENCY REVIEW  
PLANNING DIVISION - (352) 334-5022**

Sheet 1 of 1

<b>Petition</b>	<u>61SPC-01DB</u>	<b>Date Received</b>	<u>5/14/01</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DRB	<input type="checkbox"/> PB	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<b>Review Date</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Final
<b>Project Name</b>	<u>RTS-Greyhound facility</u>			<input type="checkbox"/> Amendment
<b>Location</b>	<u>700 SE 3rd Street</u>			<input type="checkbox"/> Special Use
<b>Agent/Applicant Name</b>	<u>RTS</u>			<input type="checkbox"/> Planned Dev.
<b>Reviewed by</b>	<u>Onelia Lazzari</u>			<input type="checkbox"/> Design Plat
				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concept

Approvable (as submitted)     
  Approvable (subject to below)     
  Insufficient Information  
 PD Concept (Comments only)     
  Concept (Comments only)

RECOMMENDATIONS/REQUIREMENTS/COMMENTS

1. This development is located in Zone A of the Transportation Concurrency Exception Area. In order to have a development plan approved for the site, the development must meet the requirements in the Concurrency Management Element. All relevant Policy 1.1.4 standards must be met. Policy 1.1.4.a. requires sidewalk connections from the building to existing and planned public sidewalk along development frontage. A sidewalk connection from SE 2nd Street to the building must be provided. Also, a sidewalk connection from SE 3rd Street to the front of the Greyhound main entrance must be provided. Marked crosswalks (to meet Policy 1.1.4.e.) must be also be provided where the pedestrian path crosses the parking lot area to the front of the Greyhound building area.