



The City Commission and City Plan Board held a joint meeting on June 10, 2019, to discuss a list of proposed amendments to the City of Gainesville's Land Development Code. The discussion included 31 potential amendments and the commission and board were provided with ballots to make a determination as to what items should be High – Medium – Low Priority. Based on the ballots provided the following provides an analysis of those ballots. There were also seven (7) additional amendments provided by the Commission and Board at the conclusion of the discussion. Those items are marked with an asterisk (*).

The Commission and Board ballots were grouped and calculated as follows:

- 0-25 - High (Begin Immediately)
- 26-30 - Medium (Begin after high priority items)
- 31-39 - Low (Work on during Comprehensive Plan update)

Any item with a score between 0-25 were classified as High due to receiving the most 1s. Therefore, a lower number indicated that a higher priority should be given for the amendment.

Based on the scoring the following items were ranked as **High with a score between 0-25:**

1. **ADU – 15** (Completed 9/30/20)
2. **Neighborhood workshop/notification process – 17** (CPB recommended approval 1/28/21, pending CCOM review)
3. **Single Room Occupancy (SRO) – 21** (Completed 9/17/20)
4. **Row/Street vacations – 21** (CPB approved 1/28/21, pending CCOM review)
5. **Excess parking in parking structures – 23** (Completed 11/21/19)
6. **Building orientation – 22** (Pending CPB recommendation, discussed 1/28/21)
7. **Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) Context Sensitive Areas – 23** (Comprehensive Plan Item)
8. **Building Frontage in Transects – 23** (Pending CPB recommendation, discussed 1/28/21)
9. ***Community Benefit for increased density – 23** (Inclusionary Zoning Item)

Based on the scoring the following items were ranked as **Medium with a score between 26-30:**

10. ***Vacant storefronts – 26**
11. ***Define infill development - 26**
12. ***Transect 10 ac. Limit - 26** (Pending privately initiated amendment)
13. **Demolition by neglect – 27**
14. **Parking – 27** (Comprehensive Plan Item)
15. **Septic Tanks – 28**
16. ***Height restriction next to hist. dist. – 28**
17. **Single family tree mitigation – 29** (Completed 9/17/20)
18. **Pleasant Street – Downtown (DT) zoning – 29** (Comprehensive Plan Item)
19. **Density within Midtown – 29** (Comprehensive Plan Item)
20. ***Encourage cultural spaces – 29** (Comprehensive Plan Item)

- 21. ***Design standards – 29** (Comprehensive Plan Item)
- 22. **Alcoholic Beverage establishments in U8 – 30**
- 23. **Emergency radio – 30**
- 24. **Building materials – 30** (Pending CPB recommendation, discussed 1/28/21)
- 25. **Fencing – 30**
- 26. **Food Trucks – 30** (Completed 7/4/20)

Based on the scoring the following items were ranked as **Low with a score between 31-39:**

- 27. **Density within DT and U9 Transects – 31** (Comprehensive Plan Item)
- 28. **Sidewalk Requirements – 31** (Pending CPB recommendation, discussed 1/28/21)
- 29. **Corridor Plan for University Ave. – 32** (Comprehensive Plan Item)
- 30. **Residential Conservation (RC) zoning – 33**
- 31. **Greenspace – 33**
- ~~32. **Countywide wetlands – 34** (Removed do to Urban Growth Boundary implementation)~~
- ~~33. **Strategic Ecosystems – 34**~~
- 34. **Transect zoning along Waldo Rd. – 34** (Potential Comprehensive Plan Item)
- 35. **Historic Designation Process – 34**
- 36. **Heritage Overlay – 35** (Pending CPB recommendation, discussed 1/28/21)
- 37. **Digital Access for new development – 36** (Comprehensive Plan Item)
- 38. **Urban Agriculture – 36** (CPB recommended approval 1/28/21, pending CCOM review)

The scoring provided by the Commission and Board is not indicative of the importance of the items, but, in some cases based on the amount of time that the proposed amendments may take to execute by staff along with any potential funding and staffing requirements.