

FUTURE LAND USE DATA AND ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTION

The Smart Charlotte 2050 Future Land Use element is designed to incorporate smart and sustainable planning principles into the County's Comprehensive Plan and will help ensure that all future planning activities accommodate the needs of the County's residents and protect the County's diverse natural resources up to the planning horizon of the year 2030. The planning vision for the County is to the year 2050

The Future Land Use element provides specific guidance and direction to address those issues and challenges most important to the Charlotte County citizenry including:

- 1. Urban Service Area.** The establishment of a functional urban services area through the identification of an Urban Service boundary that is based upon a thoughtful evaluation about where future urban development and urban services should be located rather than a simple illustration that mirrors the location and structure of the historic platted lands. The 2030 Service Area Delineation, establishing the Urban Service Area and the Rural Service Area, can be seen on FLUM Series Map #3.
- 2. Community Identity.** Establishing a clear identity and livable alternative for the County's neighborhoods and commercial areas. The current pattern of development separated into commercial, institutional, and low density uses results in an overall community form that is not sustainable for a changing population or attractive in an increasingly competitive economic development market.
- 3. Platted Lots/Density.** The issues associated with the extensive amount, location, and form of the historic platted lands in the County has continued to be an issue and concern for the community. Prior to Smart Charlotte 2050, the strategy for addressing platted lands did not recognize differences between the types of platted subdivisions except for the extent (percentage of total platted lots) to which they had built residential dwellings. A more substantive evaluation of the desirability of urbanizing these various neighborhoods, and more proactive measures to create both incentives and disincentives as applicable to enforce the ultimate vision for future development, was determined to be necessary to support and reinforce sustainable growth practices.
- 4. Aging in Place.** Current demographic trends compel us to plan for the significant size and changing needs of our aging population. The County has created new policies to help direct the planning, design and location of new housing, transportation systems, and community services to support this important demographic.

5. **East County Rural Character.** New objectives and policies were created to address the protection of rural character, natural resources and agricultural uses in the eastern half of the County, while providing reasonable flexibility for change in a challenging agricultural economy.
6. **Density.** The plan includes new policies that promote and encourage more dense and mixed-use development in targeted areas as one of the key components of the County's long-term approach to sustainability and economic development. Clear standards reward and support higher density, mixed-use re-development while managing their impact on surrounding areas.
7. **Industrial vs. Commercial Use.** The County's long-term desire to protect areas for industrial and employment-based use is directly addressed through Smart Charlotte 2050, which specifically identify strategic areas of the County that should be protected and supported for industrial and employment uses.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE 2050 PLAN

The Future Land Use element functionally addresses key provisions of growth management in a focused and targeted manner in an effort to create a more sustainable development pattern within the County. Major initiatives include a Planning Framework, FLU Data and Analysis Appendix A, that provides a structure for identifying and addressing the complex issues facing the County, based upon development conditions and activities rather than the simple geography of the four planning districts (West, East, South and Mid-County) that were used in the 1997-2010 Comprehensive Plan; and an enhanced strategy to address the platted lands issues of the County.

LEGISLATION

FEDERAL

- [Clean Water Act.](#)
- [National Environmental Policy Act \(NEPA\)](#)
- [Endangered Species Act \(ESA\).](#)
- [Energy Policy Act.](#)
- [Resource Conservation and Recovery Act.](#)
- [Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act.](#)

STATE

- [Environmental Land and Water Management Act \(Chapter 380, Florida Statutes\):](#)
In 1972, the Florida Legislature adopted four statutes affecting planning and environmental policy. Chapter 380, F.S., also authorized the creation of "Areas of Critical State Concern" wherein the State of Florida could effectively pre-empt land use regulations in places where local government efforts were found wanting.
- **Local Government Comprehensive Planning Act (LGCPA):** This Act, adopted in 1975, requires all of Florida's counties and municipalities to adopt comprehensive plans to guide future development. The LGCPA did not require the adoption of a Future Land Use Map, and it did not mandate a capital improvements program. The LGCPA provided for State and regional review of local government comprehensive plans, though it did not provide authority to challenge plans adopted by local governing bodies.
- **State Comprehensive Plan (Chapter 187) and Local Government Comprehensive Planning and Land Development Regulation Act:** In 1985, the Legislature of Florida adopted the State Comprehensive Plan (Chapter 187) and the Local Government Comprehensive Planning and Land Development Regulation Act (Chapter 163, Part II, F. S.), better known as the "Growth Management Act", which amended the 1975 LGCPA by requiring a Future Land Use Map, and by tying capital spending to a five-year capital improvement element. The rules governing the minimum contents of a local government comprehensive plan (Rule 9J-5, Florida Administrative Code) were promulgated by the Department of Community Affairs in 1986. Although Charlotte County had adopted comprehensive plans in the past (beginning with a "701" plan in 1966). The 1988 comprehensive plan was the County's first plan that attempted to meet the standards of the Growth Management Act and of Rule 9J-5.
- **Chapters 28-24 and 73C-40, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.)** pertain to Developments of Regional Impact.
- **Bert J. Harris, Jr., Private Property Rights Protection Act:** Enacted by the Florida Legislature in 1995. This Act creates a new circuit court cause of action for private real property owners whose existing uses or vested rights relative to real property have been

"inordinately burdened" by an action of government. The Harris Act may severely limit local, regional, and State government actions regarding land uses of private property owners or may require compensation for such actions.

- **During 2005 there were 11 bills enacted by the Florida Legislature that affected Growth Management** – six Senate Bills (SB 332, 360, 444, 620 724 and 908) and five House Bills (HB 517, 955, 989, 1029 and 1045). The County’s Comprehensive Plan reflects the changes required by SB 360 (Infrastructure Planning and Funding), 444 (Development of Water Supplies), HB 955 (Waterfront Property) and HB 989 (Public Marinas and Boat Ramps).
- **House Bill (HB) 697:** In 2008, this HB was enacted by the Florida Legislature. HB 697 established new local planning requirements relating to energy-efficient land use patterns, transportation strategies to address greenhouse gas (GHG) reductions, energy conservation, and energy efficient housing. These new requirements became effective on July 1, 2008. While the requirements were repealed by legislation, HB 7207, adopted in 2011, these concepts continue to form the basis of the Smart Charlotte 2050 vision.

Smart Charlotte 2050 has been specifically designed to discourage urban sprawl; promote energy-efficient land use patterns and initiate greenhouse gas reduction strategies. The Future Land Use element update includes goals, objectives and policies that recognize and address energy efficient land use decisions that are made at three scales of planning: the regional scale; the site planning scale and the building scale.

Specific geographic areas have been established to support, reinforce and create incentives for redevelopment within the County’s “Revitalizing Neighborhoods”, which require the development of a Revitalization Plan for each area. Other geographic areas have been established which are identified as “Emerging” areas; future development will be required to adhere to an Emerging Area Plan as each is developed and adopted. Each Plan requires a collaborative community visioning process to insure a context-sensitive, sustainable mixture of land uses and to address densities, intensities and height limitations that support the reduction in GHG emissions and result in efficient infrastructure and development patterns. The Plans will be formed around the following smart growth practices:

1. The form is compact mixed use and energy-efficient land use patterns of development that:
 - Provide a mix of residential, commercial and recreational uses in close proximity;
 - Include a transportation network and land use pattern that encourages walking and bicycling to achieve the reduction of GHG emissions;
 - Support transit; and
 - Reduce the number and length of automobile trips.

2. Higher densities are located within each "Neighborhood" in appropriate places in an effort to:
 - Attempt to reduce the carbon footprint;
 - Encourage a blended average density of seven dwelling units per acre within the higher density areas; and
 - Provide future opportunities for mass transit by clustering density around potential future transit stops.

LOCAL

- **Zoning Code:** This code provides the standards and regulations that apply to land and structures in the County. These standards and regulations help implement the County's Comprehensive Plan which contain goals, objectives, and policies and recommendations of how development in the County is to be achieved. The County has numerous zoning districts. Each district has a list of permitted uses and standards for building setbacks, densities, and heights; some have specific design guidelines.
- **Excavation and Earthmoving code:** This code continues to regulate excavation activities in order to minimize the detrimental effects of such activities on groundwater, surface water, wildlife, and surrounding land use and property values.
- **Watershed Overlay District** (previously known as the Special Surface Water Protection Overlay District): This special designation is applied to the watersheds of Shell Creek and Prairie Creek. The creeks have been deemed as having special significance because these waters are utilized as a potable drinking water source when they enter the Hendrickson Dam Reservoir. The intent is to establish a level of development control within a specified distance of the creeks in order to minimize the disruption of natural hydroperiods, flows and water quality.
- **Surface Water and Wetland Protection code:** This code provides guidelines and standards for development within or adjacent to wetlands and surface water areas within unincorporated Charlotte County. The ordinance requires the creation of an upland buffer with a minimum average width of fifteen feet which must be maintained in natural vegetation.
- **Open Space/Habitat Preservation code:** This code requires that all development undergoing site plan review, and which contain habitat suitable for use by endangered or potentially-endangered species, shall set aside a minimum of five percent of the development area to be preserved in a natural state in perpetuity. In lieu of setting aside five percent of the development site, developers may fulfill the requirements of the ordinance by contributing \$300 per acre (or fraction thereof) of the subject property to the County's Open Space/Habitat Reservation Trust Fund. This fund continues to accrue monies that are then used to acquire environmentally-sensitive lands.
- **Environmentally Sensitive Lands Protection code:** The purpose of this code is to establish an efficient, fair, scientifically valid, voluntary and economically-sound

procedure for the protection of environmentally-sensitive lands not currently in public ownership, and to limit protection to those lands which satisfy the ecological criteria set forth herein. This ordinance is non-regulatory and in no way encumbers the development rights of the landowners or presumes to affect the fair market value of any property identified as environmentally sensitive.

- **Transfer of Density Units code:** This code allows for the application, review and approval of transfers of density units while providing a procedure for measuring and granting density units. It establishes criteria for appropriate Sending and Receiving Zones and the process, rules, and procedures to sever density from a Sending Zone and transfer density to a Receiving Zone.
- **Conservation Easement Program:** This program encourages property owners who meet specific criteria set forth in the ordinance to grant the County an easement over a portion or all of their land, thereby qualifying for a reduction in the Equivalent Residential Unit count assigned to the subject property for street and drainage, stormwater utilities, waterways, and fire municipal service benefit unit assessment purposes. This promotes green space within the urban areas.

KEY INITIATIVES

PLANNING FRAMEWORK

The Planning Framework was designed to organize the Guiding Principles and implementation techniques that would be necessary to achieve the 2050 vision for Charlotte County in a manner reflecting the complexities of the land characteristics and development context within the County. The Smart Charlotte 2050 Framework, FLUM Series Map #2, establishes a long-term vision for the future of Charlotte County that illustrates the land use relationships which will support a “Smart Growth” approach to resource protection and future development in a sustainable form through four Framework Types. See Future Land Use Data and Analysis Appendix A: Smart Charlotte 2050 Planning Framework, December 2008, for more in depth review of the following Framework Types.

The four Framework Types were further broken down into specific components of design that reflected different types of communities or places within each area and served to distinguish one place from another. These components are listed in each table following the description.

Natural Resources

Charlotte County shall promote land use practices that protect natural resources within conservation lands, and target additional acquisition to close gaps in regional and State-wide wildlife corridors. The County will strive to improve the quality of water that discharges into surface waters, and educate residents about controlling the sources of pollutants. The County will seek to minimize environmental impacts within the built environment by reducing carbon emissions, minimizing water use and controlling pollution.

Table FLU-1: Natural Resources Planning Framework	
Planning Policy & Components	Approach
a. Conservation Lands – Existing protected areas and wildlife management areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Acquire key tracts of conservation land ● Oppose incompatible land use changes ● Improve access to wildlife management areas
b. Water – The waterways, canals, estuaries and harbor, and the wetlands, floodplain and buffers that protect them.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Implement water quality protection measures ● Protect natural lands that buffer surface waters ● Promote measures to reduce non-point source pollution
c. Future Wildlife Corridors – Natural areas that can provide a future linkage with regionally-significant conservation lands.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Identify gaps in conservation networks ● Implement other measures to protect important natural lands ● Minimize road encroachments into wildlife corridors

<p>d. “Green” Design for the Built Environment – Sustainable design practices that protect habitat, air and water quality.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage LEED, or other comparable certifications for buildings • Encourage FGBC green community, or other comparable certifications for communities • Consider climate change in County decisions particularly along the coast • Identify ways to reduce vehicle miles traveled
--	--

Agricultural & Rural

Charlotte County shall define a future agricultural and rural landscape that recognizes agricultural uses as both an important component of our visual character and our economy. Agricultural and rural areas should be planned to protect habitat and natural resources, allow appropriately designed settlement, and support continued agricultural business activity by allowing it to adapt and change over time.

Table FLU-2: Agricultural & Rural Planning Framework	
Planning Policy & Components	Approach
<p>a. Rural Estates – Low density residential development in rural areas.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect rural character
<p>b. Settlement Areas – Sustainable development form that protects significant open space while serving as a transition and edge to existing urban development.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define new standards of development
<p>c. Agriculture – Areas of agricultural activity and use.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain & promote
<p>d. Mining & Resource Extraction – Mining in agriculture areas.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a set of development guidelines for location, environmental protection and mitigation

In 2009, the County hired RWA Consulting, Inc., to provide an in depth review of the County’s eastern agricultural lands. The study supplied by the consultants is included as FLU Data and Analysis Appendix B: East County Planning Guide.

Neighborhoods

Charlotte County shall support a diverse range of neighborhoods by protecting and enhancing our existing neighborhoods while targeting others for intensified, mixed-use redevelopment. Neighborhood development policy should promote community identity and character by creating walkable places that integrate commercial uses, have a mix of housing types, and distinguish between urban, suburban and rural areas. Old platted neighborhoods that are ill suited for such development should be discouraged from developing any further and from intensifying any uses.

Table FLU-3: Neighborhoods Planning Framework	
Planning Policy & Components	Approach
a. Revitalizing – Developed neighborhoods with a range of affordable housing in need of reinvestment and revitalization.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote & intensify
b. Emerging – Areas of undeveloped platted lots and other undeveloped lands where neighborhood development is desired.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Redefine
c. Maturing – Areas of platted lots that are not fully developed but where growth is occurring.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain
d. Managed – Areas of platted lots that are only sparsely developed and where for environmental and urban service reasons, further development is discouraged.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limit and constrain

Economic Development

Charlotte County shall focus economic development in targeted areas that foster business creation and expansion and protect future opportunities. Economic development initiatives should align public investments, incentives, and land use policy to encourage and protect growth around our existing assets, such as the I-75 corridor and County Airport, and in redeveloping corridors, centers and districts.

Table FLU-4: Economic Development Planning Framework	
Planning Policy & Components	Approach
a. Corridors – The arterial transportation links that support and promote commercial development, including newly developing and redeveloping areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limit expansion Encourage residential Strengthen Character
b. Centers – The focused destinations of regional commercial and/or employment, including new and redeveloping areas. (e.g., Murdock Village, Charlotte Harbor CRA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish location Limit size & intensity Walkable design
c. Districts – Employment areas dominated by a single use with regional transportation access (e.g., Enterprise Charlotte Airport Park)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect use Enhance infrastructure

URBAN SERVICE AREA (FLUM Series Map #3: 2030 Service Area Delineation)

The Urban Service Area boundary has been revised from that depicted in the 1997-2010 Comprehensive Plan to clearly distinguish urban from rural places, based upon the planned future land uses for the area and development limitations such as environmentally sensitive habitat. The key provisions of this revision are:

1. The Smart Charlotte 2050 Plan redefined the “infill” and “suburban” areas to more accurately reflect an appropriate planning focus for these areas. This change was made to specifically address the issues associated with the vast areas of undeveloped platted residential lots in the County. Although these areas have been identified as a part of the Urban Service Area, many of these lands do not have access to urban infrastructure, including water and sewer. Even for those neighborhoods that do have access to central water or sewer, Charlotte County Utilities is often building and providing infrastructure to subdivisions that are substantially vacant. Most neighborhoods lack a range of housing options beyond single-family dwelling units and lack amenities such as neighborhood parks, sidewalks, and near-by support retail services.

In lieu of the former “infill” and “suburban” designations, Smart Charlotte 2050 establishes a Neighborhood Framework, which organizes the County’s neighborhoods within the Urban Service Area into four types of neighborhoods: Revitalizing, Maturing, Emerging, and Managed. The Neighborhood Framework types can be seen on FLUM Series Map #2: 2050 Framework. This new categorization provides a methodology to differentiate the County’s planning approach for neighborhood development as well as the prioritization of urban facilities and services, recognizing that we cannot treat every neighborhood in the County the same way.

Revitalizing. These neighborhoods include those areas where housing and commercial stock is aging and in general need of reinvestment and revitalization. Generally there is 50 percent or greater build-out. Some of these areas are possible candidates to receive a Community Redevelopment Area, or similar program, designation after completion of a Revitalization Plan. Strengthening the residential and commercial base of these neighborhoods is critical for maintaining long-term stability and economic value. Revitalizing Neighborhoods are considered infill locations within the County. Revitalizing Neighborhoods will be encouraged to create Revitalization Plans to outline the redevelopment goals for those neighborhoods.

Maturing. These neighborhoods mostly contain lots within which development continues to occur based on neighborhood and home builder marketing. Generally there is 30 percent or greater build-out. Even though the functionality of the neighborhood is limited by its mainly singular use, stable growth is occurring and the majority of that growth is residential development. These neighborhoods are generally served with central water

and sewer services. The continued protection of the neighborhood is important and necessary. Formal plans for Maturing Neighborhoods are not considered necessary as the growth and development of these areas is fairly recent and continues without much need for changes of land use.

Emerging. These neighborhoods include large areas of undeveloped lots or other undeveloped lands in locations that are appropriate for residential and mixed use development. Emerging Neighborhoods are generally near regional transportation corridors, typically have central water and sewer infrastructure, and are in the path of future urban development. These neighborhoods have the opportunity to create a sense of identity for the community and to introduce smart growth principles supporting more sustainable neighborhoods prior to further development. Emerging Neighborhoods will be encouraged to create Emerging Area Plans to help guide anticipated development.

Managed. These neighborhoods include areas of undeveloped, sparsely developed, or underdeveloped platted lands. These lands contain or are adjacent to sensitive environmental resources and usually lack urban services and utilities, although future provision for infrastructure may already have been made for some areas based on State mandates or consent orders. While some development has occurred within these areas, the County wishes to discourage further development and intensification of these neighborhoods in order to limit the extent that the development of these lands could impact sensitive lands, waterways, and wetlands. The lands within Managed Neighborhoods qualify as sending zones for density transfers.

2. The Smart Charlotte 2050 Plan includes additional policies that clarify the distinction between the urban and rural service areas and address more explicitly the County's intent to restrict the extension of urban services into the Rural Service Area. In addition, the proposed Plan prohibits the extension of the urban service boundary unless the next EAR evaluation provides an indication that expansion is necessary.
3. Those areas deemed to be particularly sensitive areas where increased density should be restricted and density should be encouraged to be removed, such as the coastal areas and other lands that have substantial environmentally sensitive lands, have been removed from the Urban Service Area and placed into the Rural Service Area. These lands were originally placed within the Managed Neighborhoods designation of the Neighborhood Framework prior to being removed from the Urban Service Area; SPAM Series Map #11 shows the Neighborhood Framework as it was prior to these properties being removed from the Urban Service Area. Having been placed within the Rural Service Area, these properties are no longer assigned a Neighborhood designation and the adopted Neighborhood Framework, seen on FLUM Series Map #2: 2050 Framework, shows these areas designated as Agricultural/Rural. SPAM Series Map # 12: Areas Removed from the (1997-2010) Urban Service Area identifies these lands and

further differentiates them in lots and parcels. This removal of land from the Urban Service Area into the Rural Service Area also included County- and State-owned environmental and park land. Approximately 6,237 acres were removed from the Urban Service Area.

The total amount of land that has been removed from the 1997-2010 Urban Service Area through the adoption of the 2030 Service Area Delineation is shown in Table FLU-5. The table also depicts the acreage of land based on Future Land Use categories and Zoning designations and shows both the base density and the potential maximum density that could have been built on those lands under the 1997-2010 Comprehensive Plan. Because intensification of density or intensity in the Rural Service Area is prohibited unless being done through a Conservation Subdivision development or a Rural Community Mixed Use or Mineral Resource Extraction plan amendment, these lands must now be developed at the existing base density, if they are developed at all. The last column of the table shows the amount of potential density that has been removed by placing these lands within the Rural Service Area.

Table FLU-5: Land Removed from the Urban Service Area and Calculated Removal of Potential Density					
Future Land Use Map (FLUM) category (Based on 1997-2010 Comprehensive Plan density allocations)	Zoning	Acreage	Base Density (units)	Maximum Density by FLUM (units)	Potential Density Removed (units)
Agriculture (Max density is 1 unit per acre inside Urban Service Area)	AE	582.58	58	58	0
	*MHS	0.27	1	1	0
Low Density Residential (Max density is 5 units per acre)	AE	174.77	174	873	699
	ES	244.35	24	1,221	1,197
	MHP	0.93	4	4	0
	MHS	1.28	6	6	0
	MP	0.52	0	2	2
	RE-1	10.90	10	54	44
	RMF-5	1.93	35	35	0
	*RMF-10	36.42	36	182	146
	RSF-3.5	2,844.78	9,956	14,223	4,267
RSF-5	108.15	540	540	0	
Medium Density Residential (Max density is 10 units per acre)	ES	11.18	1	111	110
	RMF-10	39.44	394	394	0

Table FLU-5: Land Removed from the Urban Service Area and Calculated Removal of Potential Density					
Future Land Use Map (FLUM) category (Based on 1997-2010 Comprehensive Plan density allocations)	Zoning	Acreage	Base Density (units)	Maximum Density by FLUM (units)	Potential Density Removed (units)
High Density Residential (Max density is 15 units per acre)	RMF-10	1.32	13	19	6
	RMF-12	0.14	1	2	1
	RMF-15	0.09	1	1	0
	*RMF-5	172.60	1,726	2,589	863
Resource Conservation (Max density is 1 unit per 40 acres)	ES	1.75	1	1	0
Preservation (Max density is 1 unit per 10 acres)	AE	142.91	14	14	0
	ES	1,111.64	111	111	0
	MP	6.84	0	0	0
	*RMF-5	49.98	4	4	0
	*RMF-12	0.93	1	1	0
	*RSF-5	0.01	0	0	0
Commercial – Center and Corridor (Max density is up to 15 per acre)	MP	0.13	0	0	0
	PD	68.26	0	0	0
	CG	32.69	0	0	0
Public Lands & Facilities (No density allocated)	RSF-3.5	80.81	0	0	0
	RSF-5	36.69	0	0	0
Parks & Recreation (No density allocated)	AE	169.53	0	0	0
	MP	0.39	0	0	0
	RMF-5	5.04	0	0	0
	RMF-10	99.31	0	0	0
	RMF-15	0.33	0	0	0
	RSF-3.5	67.91	0	0	0
	RSF5	130.86	0	0	0
Total		6,236.91	13,111	20,446	7,335

Source: Growth Management Department, assembled on April 26, 2010 by the Land Information Division. Calculations were done by Principal Planner, Inga Williams.

*These are inconsistencies between the Future Land Use Map category and Zoning designation

- The Urban Service Area has been expanded in two locations; these are shown on SPAM Series Map #13. One area is located along Burnt Store Road and the other area is located along U.S. 17 (Duncan Road). The area along Burnt Store Road contains properties that were part of a former flower farm, which was severely damaged by Hurricane Charley and chose not to rebuild. The properties contain over 1,200 linear

feet of frontage along Burnt Store Road and there are water and sewer lines within the Burnt Store right-of-way. In an effort to make efficient use of existing urban services and through evaluation of a plan amendment to change this property from Limited Development to Village Residential, the County found these lands to be better suited to urban development. The amount of acreage placed into the Urban Service Area by this change is 158.5 acres.

The other property is located along U.S. 17 and consists of the properties placed under the Rural Settlement Overlay District. The allocated densities and intensities of the overlay district make this area more suited for placement inside the Urban Service Area rather than the Rural Service Area. The amount of acreage placed within the Urban Service Area through this change is 4,950. Density for this area must come from those lots removed from the Urban Service Area, shown on SPAM Series Map #12.

Since density for these locations must be transferred from other locations within the County, there was no increase of the County's overall density by placing these lands within the Urban Service Area.

POPULATION PROJECTIONS

Under Florida’s Growth Management legislation, one of the obligations of the Future Land Use element of the Comprehensive Plan is to include a future land use plan based upon surveys, studies, and data. One of the most important pieces of data to include is population projections. Based on the projected population growth, and the projected needs to accommodate this growth, land uses must be assigned or proven to exist that will allow for the projected growth to occur.

As part of the formation of this comprehensive plan, the County developed population projections through the year 2050. These were updated in 2012. As required by new legislation adopted in 2011, the new projections are based upon the 2010 U.S. Census counts and medium population projections prepared by the Bureau of Economic and Business Research at the University of Florida.

Historic Population Data

Table FLU-6 shows the County’s permanent population at each decennial Census since 1930, the first that included Charlotte County. While the County’s population grew explosively during the middle decades of the 20th Century, this growth rate has leveled off in more recent years. The growth rate is expected to continue to decline in the future, reflecting greater national demographic trends.

Table FLU-6: Permanent Population Counts, 1930-2010	
Year	Population
1930	4,013
1940	3,663
1950	4,286
1960	12,594
1970	27,559
1980	58,460
1990	110,975
2000	141,627
2010	159,978

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2012

2050 Population Projections

Population projections through 2050, including permanent and seasonal populations, are shown in Table FLU-7.

Table FLU-7: Population Projections, 2010-2050				
Year	Permanent	Seasonal	Hotel/Motel	Total Population

	Population	Population	Population	
2010	159,978	15,615	3,224	178,817
2015	168,000	16,081	3,338	187,419
2020	176,500	16,538	3,444	196,482
2025	184,701	16,943	3,558	205,202
2030	192,601	17,292	3,665	213,558
2040	206,701	17,776	3,885	228,362
2050	217,901	17,944	4,106	239,951

Source: Charlotte County Community Development Department, 2012

Based on these projections, the permanent population of Charlotte County at the long-range planning horizon of the year 2030 is projected to be 192,601 and at the vision horizon of the year 2050 it is projected to be 217,901. This 2050 build-out is about 46 percent of the capacity of the County’s build-out potential shown in Table FLU-8, below. Given the growth rate and the adopted Future Land Use Map, the County is not projected to achieve total build out until after the year 2200. It is evident that the County meets, and extensively exceeds, the State requirement to provide future land uses for at least ten years of potential growth.

Seasonal Projections

Florida counties also have substantial seasonal residency rates. While these residents are only in the County for part of the year they do place demands upon public infrastructure and other facilities, and must be taken into account for planning purposes in order to ensure that services and facilities are not overwhelmed. As shown in Table FLU-7, seasonal populations in the County are estimated to be between 12 percent of the permanent population in 2010 and ten percent at the vision horizon of the year 2050. These rates, along with projections for hotel and motel residents, were used to project total seasonal populations.

Conclusion

The previous adopted comprehensive plans and the single family lots created by General Development Corporation (GDC) have combined to allow an estimated ultimate build-out population of 470,923. Trending at the rate established by the population projections, the potential absorption of all the developable land in the County will occur just after the year 2200. Using the assumption that employment will develop at a consistent rate, the absorption of non-residential lands is projected to occur slightly sooner than that. With both the population and employment forecasts projected to occur well after the vision horizon of the year 2050, the Charlotte County Comprehensive Plan has identified more than enough land sufficient to accommodate the growth trend by the planning horizon of the year 2030.

PLATTED LANDS STRATEGY ENHANCEMENT

Background: The Platted Lands Challenge in Charlotte County

The early history of Charlotte County is filled with the platting of land far in excess of what was needed to accommodate the existing population or the demonstrable future population growth. The recent history of planning in the County has often been dominated by efforts to deal with this over-supply of developable land, particularly with regard to land platted for residential development.

When Charlotte County was organized out of DeSoto County in 1921, there were probably fewer than 4,000 residents spread throughout the County's 694 square miles. Most of these people likely lived in the Punta Gorda or Charlotte Harbor areas, across the Peace River from each other, or in the Englewood area near Lemon Bay along the Gulf of Mexico. But even by then there had been some large platted subdivisions created, including Solana and Cleveland northwest of Punta Gorda along what is now U.S. 17, McCall Town and Myakka City south of the Myakka River along what is now S.R. 776, and Grove City between Placida Road and Lemon Bay south of Oyster Creek. Charlotte Harbor itself was platted in 1888.

While the population of Charlotte County grew slowly in the following decades from 4,013 people recorded in 1930, the first Census in which Charlotte County appeared, to 4,286 people in 1950, several more areas were platted during this same period far exceeding population growth. Most of this platting occurred during the late 1920s when Florida experienced a land boom that ended with the onset of the Great Depression in 1929. El Jobean on the east bank of the Myakka River, Del Verde and Dixie Estates in the eastern portion of the County at the intersection of S.R. 31 and C.R. 74, and Bermont Villa and Verde Park even further east are all large subdivisions platted in the 1920s, producing lots that considerably outstripped the growth in the number of local residents. Table FLU-8 shows a comparison between population growth and the number of lots in the County through 2009. Platting and population growth were both reduced during the decades following the Great Depression as economic hardship and war constrained or siphoned off resources. Between 1930 and 1950 the population of Charlotte County grew by only 273 persons, and only 602 lots were platted, but the end of World War II and the prosperity it unleashed, coupled with a growing mobility among Americans, set the stage for an explosion in both population and lots.

Table FLU-8: Population and Lots, pre-1900 to 2010			
Decade	Population ⁽¹⁾	Lots Platted ⁽²⁾	Total Number of Lots
Through 1900	-----	4,473	4,473
1910	-----	36	4,509
1920	-----	357	4,866
1930	4,013	23,163	28,029
1940	3,663	9	28,038
1950	4,286	593	28,631
1960	12,594	140,520	169,151
1970	27,559	26,520	195,701
1980	58,460	25,600	221,301
1990	110,975	4,081	225,382
2000	141,627	2,647	228,029
2010	159,488	5,169	233,198

Source: US Bureau of the Census & Charlotte County Growth Management Department, 2010

(1) Charlotte County first appeared in the 1930 Census. 2010 population estimate from County population projections.

(2) Lots platted in the decade preceding the Census year. 2010 totals are through December 31, 2009.

There were already nearly seven times more lots than people in 1950 (4,286 people compared with 28,512 lots), but the increase in disposable income, the expansion of the American economy, and the growing affordability of reliable air conditioning and pest control precipitated the platting of the County in earnest. The General Development Corporation purchased the Frizzell ranch in 1955 and began the platting and sale of the Port Charlotte subdivision, a 185-square mile development in Charlotte and Sarasota Counties. The largest portion of this subdivision lies in central Charlotte County, with additional sections west of the Myakka River in Charlotte County and north into Sarasota County. The Sarasota County portion incorporated as the City of North Port Charlotte in 1959, later changing its name to North Port. In Charlotte County, the Port Charlotte subdivision ultimately resulted in 114,446 lots being platted in 101 sections through 1971, by far the largest number of lots platted within any single subdivision in Charlotte County. In total, over 140,000 lots were platted in Charlotte County between 1951 and 1960, nearly seventeen times the number of actual people who came to call the County home during the same time period. By 1960, the County contained 169,151 lots but only 12,594 people.

The 1960s and 1970s saw further significant platting, including further expansion of the Port Charlotte subdivision westward across the Myakka River and along SR 776 towards the Englewood area, and the development of the Rotonda subdivision in the West County region,

including Rotonda West, Rotonda Meadows, Rotonda Villas, Rotonda Sands, Rotonda Heights, and Rotonda Lakes. Other subdivisions platted during the 1970s include two different subdivisions named Punta Gorda Isles, the first west of the Peace River in the Mid-County region and the second along Burnt Store Road just north of the Lee County line. During this period the population of Charlotte County rose from 12,594 in 1960 to 58,460 in 1980, an increase of 45,866 (364 percent) while the County's lots inventory increased by 52,100 lots (31 percent). While the population grew at a far greater rate during this period than the number of lots, there were still over 4,000 more lots platted than people added.

The pace of platting lessened after 1980, but it might be argued that this was primarily due to a lack of available plattable land, rather than any decline in the demand to plat. In 1962 the County adopted its first zoning ordinance, but this did little to prevent or inhibit the widespread platting of land. This ordinance had a minimum lot size in its Agricultural Crop and Agricultural Livestock districts, rural districts in the eastern part of the County, of 7,500 square feet, or 75 feet by 100 feet, urban-scale lots with no chance of being farmed once sold to individual owners. In 1981, the current Charlotte County Zoning Ordinance was adopted, establishing the Agriculture (AG), Agriculture Estates – 10 (AE-10), and Agriculture Conservation (AC) districts, all of which require a minimum lot size of ten acres or more. This change from the 1961 ordinance prevented the creation of small, urban-scale lots in the areas zoned AG, AE-10, and AC. These zoning districts were established in the mostly-unplatted eastern portion of Charlotte County – in general, the area east of U.S. 17, Charlotte County Airport, and I-75 – and effectively eliminated the opportunity to create any more massive subdivisions on the scale of Port Charlotte on the remaining unplatted land, much of which is far from any public infrastructure and still in some form of agricultural use. When an Urban Service Area boundary was adopted as part of the 1988 Comprehensive Plan, these eastern areas were excluded from the Urban Service Area, designating them as rural and inappropriate for platting at the densities that had occurred in earlier decades.

In addition, a shift in philosophy occurred among developers. No longer were expansive subdivisions being marketed at middle-class retirees from the Northeast, or to investors who might be looking to hold onto the lot only long enough to see the value of the land rise further, at which point they would sell to a new buyer. Instead, new subdivisions tended to be higher-end developments with golf courses, recreation centers, and other similar amenities. Many were constructed as gated communities. Some of these include Riverwood, which replatted a large portion of the original undeveloped El Jobean subdivision, and Cape Haze Windward along Placida Road on the Cape Haze Peninsula. The population of Charlotte County rose from 58,460 in 1980 to an estimated 159,488 in 2010, representing an increase of 101,028 persons (273 percent). At the same time, the lots inventory increased by only 11,897 lots. By then, however, the damage had been done. With an estimated 2010 population of 159,488, Charlotte County had platted 233,198 lots, or 1.46 lots for every man, woman, and child residing within the County.

There can be no real debate about whether there is a surplus of lots in Charlotte County; there is. This is mostly a legacy of the platting activity between 1950 and 1980, which occurred in an environment of limited regulation and little regard for providing a mixture of land uses or consideration of the costs of providing public services to so many potential residences. While the advertisements of the Del Verde subdivision from the 1920s promoted the sale of “Town Center Business Lots” and touted the development as “Building a city where a city belongs”, advertisements for the Port Charlotte subdivision mention only homesites. Even if the Del Verde advertisements were mostly marketing hype, since the site is miles from any other development, transportation hubs, or public facilities, it did at least pay lip service to the development of a complete community and, had it been completed, it might even have achieved some portion of its promises. The post-War plats, on the other hand, are biased overwhelmingly in favor of urban-scale residential lots, approximately 80 feet wide by 125 feet deep, on which deed restrictions often limit construction to single-family residences. The lands designated for commercial development were strung out along U.S. 41, and rarely extended more than one lot deep from the highway, preventing the development of real commercial centers and forcing the development of strip plazas and similar low-density commercial uses. The existence of canal systems and deed restrictions make it difficult to change this pattern, and to this day Port Charlotte has no real, identifiable center.

The legacy of this platting activity is large areas of lots, served by public roads with full signage, and not a single home in sight. The U.S. Census estimated in 2006 that out of 7,554 Census blocks in Charlotte County, 2,949 had a population of 0, and another 1,473 had a population of between 1 and 10 persons. That means 58 percent of all of Charlotte County’s Census blocks were estimated to have a population of ten persons or less. This has produced areas that generate little tax revenue but can consume public funds for road maintenance and provide opportunities for illegal activities such as the improper dumping of waste and debris.

During the preparation of the 1997-2010 Comprehensive Plan a review of the total number of lots within the County and a potential build-out based on the development of all of those lots was performed. The information derived from the evaluation was alarming. In 1997, the ultimate build-out population was estimated to exceed 500,000, which would require massive public infrastructure and facility improvements that would seriously strain the County’s ability to provide and maintain them, to say nothing of the indirect costs of additional County staff for the expansion of these services and facilities. This situation was termed the County’s Platted Lands Challenge and the 1997-2010 Comprehensive Plan identified strategies to mitigate this potential build-out scenario. A number of strategies to deal with the Platted Lands Challenge were proposed in that plan and these are restated below.

1. The direct purchase of lots. In this scenario, the County would set a goal of reducing its overall number of lots by some annual quantity or factor such as 1,000 lots or one percent of all lots. The County would then acquire all lots for which taxes have not been

paid, and would set aside an annual appropriation for the direct purchase of lots, either at Sheriff's sales or on the open market.

Comment: This policy was formally adopted into the 1997-2010 Comprehensive Plan and the County has purchased lots.

2. The direct acquisition of targeted lands. In this scenario, the County would establish an annual acquisition goal, expressed either in terms of lots purchased or in a percentage reduction of total lots. The County would also establish an annual appropriation for the direct, negotiated, voluntary purchase of land, but the lands purchased must lie within areas designated for acquisition on the Future Land Use Map.

Comment: This option was not formally adopted as a policy in the plan, but was implemented on certain occasions in certain circumstances. Conservation Charlotte, more fully discussed on Page 35 of the Natural Resources Data and Analysis, was a program approved in November 2006 to implement this measure.

3. The direct purchase of lots with assistance from the State of Florida. In this scenario, the County would identify portions of the platted areas which are environmentally sensitive or contain critical habitat for listed species and work to acquire those lands.

Comment: This option was not formally adopted in the plan, but was implemented on certain occasions in certain circumstances, one such occasion was the purchase of lots in the Tippecanoe II Scrub area.

4. The establishment of new zoning categories. The County would amend its land development regulations to require or encourage deplanning, consolidation, and replanning of land, particularly for plats in the reserve and rural service areas.

Comment: This option was not formally adopted into the plan, and was never implemented.

5. The creation of an organization to handle consolidation and deplanning. The County could create an organization, possibly a private non-profit entity, which would consolidate lands, replat them, and then resell the land in larger sized, more manageable parcels.

Comment: This option was not formally adopted into the plan, but the creation of the Murdock Village Community Redevelopment Area and the acquisition of a majority of the lots within the Murdock CRA, coupled with the County's attempts to partner with a private developer to redevelop the property were an attempt to implement policies similar to this option. This project successfully eliminated 3,017 lots by the County.

6. The use of administrative deplanning. The County would create an administrative deplanning process in which no fees are charged to persons wishing to consolidate lots in targeted areas.

Comment: This policy was formally adopted into the 1997-2010 Comprehensive Plan.

7. The adoption of graduated impact fees. The County would adopt graduated impact fees in order to create an economic disincentive to developing within remote platted areas. A higher fee would be charged for development in rural service areas as opposed to lower fees in urban service areas.

Comment: Graduated impact fees were eventually adopted in 2009 by the Board of County Commissioners through Ordinance No. 2009-026 and will need to be updated to correspond with the Neighborhood Framework and the new Urban Service Area delineation.

8. The acquisition of tax deeds. The County would take over ownership of lots for which property owners have not paid their taxes, thereby removing them from the inventory of buildable lots.

Comment: This option was not formally adopted into the plan, but has been used by the County in certain situations. Most of the lots were used to swap with owners of property that the County wanted to acquire for some reason, such as for right-of-way, parks, Murdock Village, or environmental land.

9. The adoption of an Urban Service Area strategy. The County would use the Urban Service Area strategy to direct 90% of urbanized development to Infill areas.

Comment: This strategy was adopted into the 1997-2010 Comprehensive Plan and has been revised and refined within this 2050 Plan.

In the 1997-2010 Comprehensive Plan, the County set a goal to reduce the overall number of vacant lots within the Urban Service Area by a minimum of one percent per year by January 1, 2005. In 1996, the inventory amounted to 167,981 lots and parcels. An annual reduction of one percent of the total number of lots should have resulted in the removal of 12,977 vacant lots by the beginning of 2005. This goal was reached as 13,643 lots were eliminated, and the goal was renewed with the adoption of the Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR) -based amendments in 2007 to reduce lots by one percent per year through 2020. The net number of lots platted annually since 1997 is show in Table FLU-9. While wording regarding the one percent reduction included in the data and analysis of the original pre-EAR 1997-2010 Comprehensive Plan was clearly stated, the policy that was adopted supporting this was not; explicit language was adopted with the 2007 EAR-based amendments stating the reduction was one percent per year.

Table FLU-9: Net Platted Lots, 1997-2009			
Year	Lots Platted	Lots Deplatted	Net Lots Platted
1997	299	335	-36
1998	610	167	443
1999	133	12,628	-12,495

Table FLU-9: Net Platted Lots, 1997-2009			
Year	Lots Platted	Lots Deplatted	Net Lots Platted
2000	23	460	-437
2001	462	1,666	-1,204
2002	424	8	416
2003	330	912	-582
2004	419	167	252
2005	537	4,420	-3,883
2006	1,911	2,046	-135
2007	990	1,595	-605
2008	20	4,608	-4,588
2009	76	5	71
TOTAL	6,234	29,017	-22,783

Source: Charlotte County Growth Management Department, 2010

The data used in the pre-EAR 1997-2010 Comprehensive Plan was flawed as it did not distinguish between residential lots and non-residential lots and included parcels within the total. In 1997, planning staff estimated a total of 226,418 lots and parcels within the Urban Service Area. Of that total, 167,981, or 74 percent, were vacant. There were estimated to be 23,389 lots and parcels within the Rural Service Area.

With better technology, more accurate data was made available as part of the 2007 revision of 1997-2010 Comprehensive Plan based on the 2003 Evaluation and Appraisal Report. Table 1.8 of that Plan indicated that the total lots and parcels within the County in 2006 amounted to 256,933 or 7,126 more than indicated in the pre-EAR 1997-2010 Comprehensive Plan. Table 1.8 of that plan separated out the platted lands and parcels by general land use but did not separate them based upon their inclusion in the Urban Service Area or Rural Service Area. 147,842 of these lots and parcels, or 57 percent of the total, were coded as vacant, including residential, commercial, industrial, and “non-agricultural” lots. Under that plan, potential build-out of vacant, urbanized land, calculated to be 134,070 lots, was estimated to be 292,273 people.

It is the County’s intention to begin again with information compiled for Smart Charlotte 2050 Comprehensive Plan. The intent is not to discount the entirety of the data and analysis or the validity of the conclusions drawn by use of that data within previous comprehensive plans. It is and has always been acknowledged that Charlotte County contains an excess of lots and parcels with assigned densities and intensities and that development of these lots and parcels will create a serious strain on County resources, fiscal and environmental, should they all be built upon as presently designed. This 2050 Plan reiterates that acknowledgement and attempts to provide new guidance to develop what is currently available in a more efficient and cost-effective manner.

Current Platted Lands

In February 2009, the Growth Management Department prepared an analysis of vacant lots to determine the reduction in vacant lots over time. Using data from the Charlotte County Property Appraiser, the Department determined that there were of 129,088 vacant, platted lots within the Urban Service Area in 2001 and only 108,539 vacant lots in 2009. When the lots were cross-referenced by legal description, it was determined that 15,142 lots were eliminated between 2001 and 2009 due to plat vacations. This reflects a reduction of 11.7 percent over eight years, an annual reduction of 1.46 percent, more than meeting the County’s stated goal of reducing the inventory of vacant lots by one percent annually. Table FLU-9 shows the annual net creation of lots since 1997, when data began to be regularly tracked.

In March 2010, the Department reassessed the platted lands within the Urban Service Area and the Rural Service Area established in the 1997-2010 plan. These lots, differentiated by location within the Urban Service Area or Rural Service Area, and by general Future Land Use, are shown in Table FLU-10 and on SPAM Series Map #14: Vacant Lots by General Future Land Use and SPAM Series Map #15: Developed Lots by General Future Land Use. Table FLU-10 shows that an additional 284 platted lots were eliminated between February 2009 and March 2010.

Table FLU-10: Platted Lots as of April 1, 2010					
General Future Land Use	Within Urban Service Area		Within Rural Service Area		Total
	Vacant	Developed	Vacant	Developed	
Residential ⁽¹⁾	102,124	65,104	1,046	1,308	169,582
Commercial ⁽²⁾	3,094	1,178	72	0	4,344
Industrial ⁽³⁾	1,479	335	0	0	1,814
Mixed Use ⁽⁴⁾	1,079	2,620	0	0	3,699
Agricultural ⁽⁵⁾	166	201	17,173	333	17,873
Conservation and Parks ⁽⁶⁾	265	250	5,171	12	5,698
Other ⁽⁷⁾	48	26	1	0	75
Total	108,255	69,714	23,463	1,653	203,085

Source: Charlotte County Growth Management Department, 2010

- (1) Includes Low Density, Medium Density, and High Density Residential, Coastal Residential, and RV Park
- (2) Includes Commercial Center, Commercial Corridor, Commercial (Charlotte Harbor)
- (3) Includes Low and Heavy Industrial, Industrial (Charlotte Harbor), and Enterprise Charlotte Airport Park
- (4) Includes Compact Growth Mixed Use, DRI Mixed Use, US 41 Mixed Use, Neighborhood Business/Residential (Charlotte Harbor), Mixed Use (CH), Tourist (CH), Murdock Village Mixed Use, Babcock Mixed Use, and Village Residential
- (5) Includes Agriculture, Limited Development, Mineral Resource Extraction, Rural Estate Residential
- (6) Includes Preservation, Resource Conservation, and Parks & Recreation
- (7) Includes Public Lands and Facilities

Given the 167,228 platted lots within the Urban Service Area and the 2000 U.S. Census average household size of 2.18 persons, those lots could support a population of at least 364,557. This is more than twice the County's 2010 population estimate of 159,488 and roughly 40,000 more than the vision horizon population of 323,244 in the year 2050. This analysis assumes that every platted lot would be developed with a single-family unit, but many of these lots are designated for multi-family development, so the population would in that case be higher. It also does not take into account any of the platted lots designated for mixed-use, nor any of the 23,390 platted lots located in the Rural Service Area with designations that would allow residential units to be built upon them.

Assessment of Current Strategy

As planning initiatives have become more advanced and sophisticated in Florida, the subtleties associated with establishing policies that will achieve community planning visions and goals have become more and more important. Over the past 24 years as many communities have created and implemented comprehensive plans consistent with Florida's Growth Management Legislation, they have witnessed the unintended consequences of broad-brush policies that were designed to address one issue but inadvertently created another issue. For Charlotte County, while the current platted-lands strategy of the County has succeeded in reducing the total platted lands, it has not addressed the fundamental form of development in the County which still favors lower-density suburban development patterns that are in direct contrast to the State's current initiatives to establish energy-efficient land use patterns which reduce greenhouse gas emissions and adhere to the principles of Smart Growth.

The Smart Charlotte 2050 Plan updates the Platted Lands Challenge to establish more focused techniques to address the various components of land use development and redevelopment in the County.

- 1. Urban Service Boundary.** The Smart Charlotte 2050 Plan includes additional policies that will clarify the distinction between the urban and rural service area and address more explicitly the County's intent to restrict the extension of urban services into the rural service area. In addition, the proposed plan includes additional standards for amending the urban service boundary to establish more specific criteria for how rural areas can convert to urban areas.
- 2. Platted Lots.** The Smart Charlotte 2050 Plan distinguishes the types of vacant platted lands through a more refined planning process that recognizes that all platted lands are not the same. Through the Neighborhood Framework, the 2050 Plan recognizes four different neighborhood types and establishes different policies and standards for directing future development within these areas.

- 3. Transfer of Density Units.** The Smart Charlotte 2050 Plan revised the policies of the Future Land Use element to specifically include the TDU policy of the County within the Comprehensive Plan policy structure and has made revisions to that policy. The 2050 Plan requires that the current TDU Ordinance be revised to include the new directives for redevelopment activities that will transform the core of the County from its current suburban form into a more energy efficient land use pattern, and to include further limits to increased development in inappropriate areas.

TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS AND DENSITY UNITS

On December 16, 1988, the County adopted a Comprehensive Plan that called for the preservation of natural, historical, archeological and cultural resources. To accomplish that goal, the County created land use restrictions that it acknowledged could be burdensome to landowners. To help alleviate this burden and provide an incentive for property owners to protect these resources, the County adopted a Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) ordinance in 1994 which allowed residential development rights to be severed from properties containing these special resources and transferred to properties more suitable for development. The use of the TDR ordinance was also a result of a pre-TDR transaction that proved that transfers of density could work as long as the density had a value in the market place. In this pre-TDR transaction, density was stripped from the Cape Haze Peninsula and moved to the Development of Regional Impact (DRI) on Burnt Store Road known as Caliente Springs, and later renamed Tern Bay. This was done in reaction to objections by the Department of Community Affairs (DCA) to the creation of a new, large residential development across the harbor from a platted residential subdivision that was entirely vacant, contained no infrastructure, was platted over wetlands, and was clearly unnecessary. The transfer of density was a positive step to help the developer overcome the DCA's objections to the DRI.

However, it wasn't until 2001, when the County made revisions to the TDR ordinance, that a market value for density was created and the TDR ordinance was used. The revisions were made necessary due to the adoption of a new comprehensive plan in 1997, which was not made official until June of 2000 because of challenges, and because there was increased interest from developers to build on the County's remaining large tracts of vacant and agricultural lands. Most of the interest was focused along Burnt Store Road, which precipitated the Burnt Store Area Plan, in the eastern rural lands, and on those few remaining large properties in Port Charlotte. Given the County's many lots, this was seen as a mixed blessing; positive because it would create better, planned neighborhoods that would contain up-to-date infrastructure and services but negative because it would not help diminish the existing supply of pre-platted lots that burdened the County.

Like the majority of land within the County, these large tracts of land contained low to very low density designations and in order to be useful for new development would require increased development rights. In a pro-active response to the speculative proposals of developers, the County quickly acted to revise the TDR ordinance. The one major item that the revised ordinance did was to create a closed system, thereby creating a market for density, by requiring anyone increasing density on property to transfer any added density from some other, less-suitable-for-development site within the County.

Another feature of the 2001 ordinance was to make the Board of County Commissioners the approving body rather than the Board of Zoning Appeals. Also, the criteria for sending zone designations was broadened to allow density to be removed from substandard, lots within the

Rural Service Area as one method of implementing the Platted Lots Strategy of the 1997-2010 Comprehensive Plan and from the Coastal High Hazard Area in an attempt to remove populations from harm's way. It also prohibited density from being sent into the Coastal High Hazard area. One option to purchasing and transferring density was created and that was to allow a payment-in-lieu-of-transfer into a County Land Acquisition Trust Fund, which funds the County would then use to purchase lots. This ordinance was used to good effect. The transfers that occurred under this ordinance are detailed in Table FLU-11, below, and the TDR sending and receiving zones are shown on SPAM Series Map #16.

Table FLU-11 :Transfers of Density Completed under 2001 TDR Ordinance						
Applicant Name & Year	Units Severed from SZ & sent to RZ	*Region of SZ	Sending Zone Criteria	Acreage placed into Conservation Easement	*Region of RZ	Fee Paid by Applicant
Biscayne Trust 2003	528	East	Wetlands and endangered species habitat for scrub jays	197	Mid	Not utilized
Lago del Sol 2003	102	Mid	Endangered species habitat for scrub jays	25	Mid	Not utilized
Fitzsimmons 2003	Utilized Land Acquisition Trust Fund	N/A	N/A	N/A	West	\$7,400 for 2 units
LeMain 2003	Utilized Land Acquisition Trust Fund	N/A	N/A	N/A	West	\$3,700 for 1 unit
Pawlikowski 2003	Utilized Land Acquisition Trust Fund	N/A	N/A	N/A	West	\$3,700 for 1 unit
KB Homes Creekside 2004	193	Mid	Endangered species habitat for scrub jays &	30.8	South	Not utilized
Southwest Florida Land 6 LLC 2005	45	East	Endangered species habitat for scrub jays	2.3	Mid	Not utilized
RealMark Tucker's Grade 2005	650	East	Substandard, platted lots located outside the Urban Service Area	38	South	Not utilized

Table FLU-11 :Transfers of Density Completed under 2001 TDR Ordinance						
Applicant Name & Year	Units Severed from SZ & sent to RZ	*Region of SZ	Sending Zone Criteria	Acreage placed into Conservation Easement	*Region of RZ	Fee Paid by Applicant
KB Homes Tuscany Isles 2005	55	Mid	Endangered species habitat for scrub jays	12.6	South	Not utilized
Totals	1,577			326.4		\$14,800

Source: Charlotte County Growth Management Department

*Note:

Mid = Area of the County between the Peace River and the Myakka River

West = Area of the County west of the Myakka River

South = Area of the County generally between US 17 and the Peace River and I-75 and Charlotte Harbor

East = Area of the County generally east of US 17 and I-75

In 2004, the County made further revisions to its TDR ordinance. The name of the ordinance was changed to Transfers of Density Units (TDU). More substantive changes were included in the criteria for the density transfers as well as an annual review requirement.

The stated intent of the County’s 2004 TDU ordinance was to protect ecologically valuable, historic and archeological resources, direct growth from areas less suited for development to areas better suited for development, promote creative and compact development, and reduce substandard lots. The criteria of a sending zone changed to allow any substandard lot to qualify, not just those in the Rural Service Area, and three new criteria were added to qualify a property as a sending zone:

1. Located outside the Urban Service Area and containing a bona-fide agricultural use.
2. Located in the Suburban area of the Urban Service Area, platted and not currently served or proposed to be served by water and sewer within the next five years.
3. Vacant with an approved residential development plan that does not use all the density available for development on the site (excess density).

The new ordinance also allowed a property owner to retain some units on the sending zone unless there were environmental, ecological or archeological resources present; in those cases all density had to be removed. This ordinance also allowed property in the Tropical and Category 1 Hurricane Storm Surge Zone, also known as the Coastal High Hazard Area, to become receiving zones under very specific circumstances. For these lands, the density had to be transferred from property with an equivalent storm surge zone and the flood zone had to be of equivalent or greater hazard intensity. Even with this provision, property on a barrier island could not become a receiving zone for density.

The TDU ordinance was revised in 2007, adopted December 3rd, after requests from users to modify some of the processes and criteria. The County's Growth Management Department took the opportunity to explore its interest in focusing the ordinance to provide incentives for infill development and incentives for protection of environmentally sensitive property. Six stakeholders were asked to sit on a formal panel as advisors to planning staff and all meetings between staff and the panel were open for public comment. The process was very involved and, in the end, did not result in any major changes to the ordinance. Some of the processes and criteria for sending and receiving zones were modified; two minor modifications to sending zone criteria focused excess density into the Infill Area of the Urban Service Area. One restriction to receiving density in the Coastal High Hazard Area (Tropical and Category 1 Storm Surge Zones) was modified to remove the flood hazard restriction except in the area of the County west of Charlotte Harbor and Myakka River. In the end, it was decided to use the rewrite of the comprehensive plan to create new policies regarding the larger question of identifying true infill locations and incentivizing population concentrations in those locations, as well as how to refocus attention on environmental protections.

Future Land Use Data and Analysis Appendix D: Transfer of Density Units and Certification of Sending Zones Summary Tables summarize information related to sending zone and receiving zone sites that have been approved under the 2004 and 2007 TDU ordinances. SPAM Series Map #17 shows the sending and receiving zones approved since the adoption of the 2004 TDU ordinance.

With the adoption of Smart Charlotte 2050, the rules governing transfers of density within the Code of Laws and Ordinances will need to be updated to implement the new policies; however, even prior to the update of the Code of Laws and Ordinances, upon the effective date of the 2050 Plan those rules outlined in FLU Policy 1.2.5 to 1.2.14 are in immediate effect.

NEIGHBORHOOD FRAMEWORK TYPES

The Neighborhood Frameworks, shown on FLUM Series Map #2: 2050 Framework, are described in the Urban Service Area section of this Data and Analysis, within FLU Goal 4 and associated Objectives and Policies, and further discussed below. The intent of creating this neighborhood categorization was to identify and group areas of the County that exhibit similar development characteristics. The ultimate goal is to use this framework to guide redevelopment and provision of infrastructure to appropriate areas.

- Revitalizing Neighborhoods are the new “infill” areas of the County where higher density and intensity is purposely to be directed. This focus will engender the means to create nodes of thriving, age-in-place, walkable, livable, communities that become transit destinations. SPAM Series Map #18 shows the 2030 Future Land Use Map categories within these neighborhoods. SPAM Series Map #19 shows the Zoning designations within these neighborhoods. SPAM Series Map #20 shows the Existing Land Use of these neighborhoods.
- Maturing Neighborhoods are to remain the quieter, suburban locations with which most of the County’s population is familiar with. There may be some changes to allow neighborhood commercial uses in appropriate locations but these areas will by and large continue to slowly develop as platted and zoned. At some point in the future, some of these locations may become Revitalizing Neighborhoods. SPAM Series Map #21 shows the 2030 Future Land Use Map categories within these neighborhoods. SPAM Series Map #22 shows the Zoning designations within these neighborhoods. SPAM Series Map #23 shows the Existing Land Use of these neighborhoods.
- Emerging Neighborhoods are areas that are mostly vacant at this point in time but where the County recognizes new growth will occur. They may either develop with suburban uses, such as the Burnt Store Overlay District, or become equal in development potential to a Revitalizing Neighborhood, such as is envisioned for the area between Toledo Blade Boulevard and Collingswood Boulevard. SPAM Series Map #24 shows the 2030 Future Land Use Map categories within these neighborhoods. SPAM Series Map #25 shows the Zoning designations within these neighborhoods. SPAM Series Map #26 shows the Existing Land Use of these neighborhoods.
- Managed Neighborhoods are areas where the County does not support future development or intensification of existing zoning entitlements. These areas are sparsely developed pre-platted areas and contain environmentally sensitive lands, are indicated as being a high priority Critical Lands and Waters Identification Project area, or are adjacent to waterways or wetlands. The County would prefer those properties that are undeveloped to remain undeveloped and the base density of those lands transferred to other locations in the Urban Service Area. Properties in these areas are not eligible to

receive increases in density or intensity. SPAM Series Map #27 shows the 2030 Future Land Use Map categories within these neighborhoods. SPAM Series Map #28 shows the Zoning designations within these neighborhoods. SPAM Series Map #29 shows the Existing Land Use of these neighborhoods.

Managed Neighborhoods

The table below, Table FLU-12, compiles the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) and Zoning designation pairings for combined Managed Neighborhoods. The table shows base density and the maximum density that could be achieved under the 1997-2010 FLUM designation. As these areas are no longer allowed to rezone upward to achieve a higher density, the last column shows the potential density that is being separated from these Neighborhoods by adoption of the Smart Charlotte 2050 plan. This potential density, 13,092 units, will be tracked and used as incentives for redevelopment within Revitalizing Neighborhoods.

Table FLU-12: Managed Neighborhoods and Calculated Removal of Potential Density					
FLUM category (Based on 1997-2010 Comprehensive Plan density allocations)	Zoning	Acreage	Base Density (units)	Maximum Density by FLUM (units)	Potential Density Removed (units)
Low Density Residential (Max density is 5 units per acre)	AE	397.68	397	1,988	1,591
	ES	1.15	1	5	4
	MHS	162.94	814	814	0
	MP	8.55	0	0	0
	RE1	64.38	64	321	257
	*RMF-10	0.60	1	3	2
	RMF-5	121.07	605	605	0
	RMF-3.5	125.61	439	628	189
	RSF-3.5	7,345.92	25,710	36,726	11,016
	RSF-5	2,108.76	10,543	10,543	0
	*CG	3.43	3	17	14
PD	96.70	483	483	0	
Medium Density Residential (Max density is 10 units per acre)	RMF-10	295.56	2,955	2,955	0
High Density Residential (Max density is 15 units per acre)	RMF-15	5.71	85	85	0
	RMF-10	2.51	25	37	12
Preservation (Max density is 1 unit per 10 acres)	ES	119.40	11	11	0
	RMF-10	7.51	1	1	0
Commercial Center (Vested, max density is up to 15 per acre)	*RSF-5	0.65	2	9	7
	CI	1.44	0	0	0
	CG	91.34	0	0	0
Public Lands & Facilities (No density allocated)	MHS	1.00	0	0	0
	RSF-3.5	44.80	0	0	0

Table FLU-12: Managed Neighborhoods and Calculated Removal of Potential Density					
FLUM category (Based on 1997-2010 Comprehensive Plan density allocations)	Zoning	Acreage	Base Density (units)	Maximum Density by FLUM (units)	Potential Density Removed (units)
Parks & Recreation (No density allocated)	RSF-3.5	89.31	0	0	0
Babcock Mixed Use	BZD	3,025.03	0	0	0
Total		14,121.05			13,092

Source: Growth Management Department, assembled on May 10, 2010 by the Land Information Division. Calculations were done by Principal Planner, Inga Williams.

*These are inconsistencies between the Future Land Use Map category and Zoning designation

Tables FLU-13 and -14 compile more specific existing land use data on combined Managed Neighborhoods. Table FLU-13 lists the number of lots and parcels within the Managed Neighborhoods and shows that the majority of land within these neighborhoods is platted and the majority of those lots are vacant. Table FLU-14 shows the acreage of the lots and parcels by existing land use. There is a large amount of agricultural listed within the Parcel column since the north portion of the Babcock Charlotte development is designated a Managed Neighborhood. If this number were removed it would reflect Table FLU-14 and show that the majority of the Managed Neighborhoods are vacant.

Table- FLU 13: Managed Neighborhoods Parcel and Lot Count Summary by Existing Land Use			
Existing Land Use	Parcels	Lots	Totals
Agricultural	14	0	14
Burial Grounds	0	1	1
Conservation	1	0	1
Institutional	0	5	5
Mining Sites	1	2	3
Miscellaneous	1	1	2
Public Buildings & Grounds	0	4	4
Residential	16	3,961	3,977
Vacant	48	30,790	30,838
Water	0	5	5
Total Lots and Parcels	81	34,769	34,850

Source: Growth Management Department, assembled on May 10, 2010 by the Land Information Division.

Table FLU-14: Managed Neighborhoods Parcel and Lot Acreage Summary by Existing Land Use			
Existing Land Use	Parcels	Lots	Totals
Agricultural	3,025.03	0	3,025.03
Burial Grounds	0	0.56	0.56
Conservation	0.38	0	0.38
Institutional	0	16.78	16.78
Mining Sites	94.84	395.38	490.22
Miscellaneous	3.20	0.51	3.70
Public Buildings & Grounds	0	8.26	8.26
Residential	71.21	1,139.01	1,210.22
Vacant	369.62	8,994.88	9,364.50
Water	0	2.23	2.23
Total Acres	3,564.28	10,557.61	14,121.88

Source: Growth Management Department, assembled on May 10, 2010 by the Land Information Division.

All Neighborhoods

While SPAM Series Map #23, #26 and #29 give a general snapshot of the development within each Neighborhood Framework type, a more detailed analysis was completed based on broadly delineated communities. These communities were created for this analysis and so only show lands within the Urban Service Area and only cover lands designated with a Neighborhood Framework; it does not include lands within the Economic Development Framework. SPAM Series Map #30 shows these communities. Within these communities, existing land uses for each Neighborhood Framework type was compiled and is listed in Table FLU-15.

Table FLU-15: Neighborhood Framework Information by Existing Land Use (ELU) Acreage Corresponds with the Communities shown in SPAM Series Map #18			
Community Name	Neighborhood	General ELU	Acreage
South/East County			
Babcock	Managed		
		<i>Agricultural</i>	3,025.03
		Total Developed	3,025.03
	Emerging		
		<i>Agricultural</i>	8,341.17
		<i>Mining Sites</i>	1,836.22

Table FLU-15: Neighborhood Framework Information by Existing Land Use (ELU) Acreage Corresponds with the Communities shown in SPAM Series Map #18			
Community Name	Neighborhood	General ELU	Acreage
		Total Developed	10,177.39
	Maturing		
		None	0
	Revitalizing		
		None	0
North of Shell Creek			
	Managed		
		None	0
	Emerging		
		None	0
	Maturing		
		<i>Agricultural</i>	131.64
		<i>Commercial</i>	1.32
		<i>Institutional</i>	1.59
		<i>Mining Sites</i>	5.65
		<i>Miscellaneous</i>	0.76
		<i>Public Buildings and Grounds</i>	2.01
		<i>Residential</i>	714.94
		Total Developed	857.91
		Vacant	756.68
	Water	1.59	
Revitalizing			
	None	0	
South of Shell Creek			
	Managed		
		None	0
	Emerging		
		<i>Agricultural</i>	269.93
		<i>Commercial</i>	8.54
		<i>Conservation</i>	7.64
		<i>Industrial</i>	4.24
		<i>Institutional</i>	2.29
		<i>Miscellaneous</i>	0.31
		<i>Residential</i>	228.65
		Total Developed	521.60
		Vacant	178.38
	Maturing		
		<i>Agricultural</i>	105.73
	<i>Commercial</i>	14.71	
	<i>Conservation</i>	26.06	

Table FLU-15: Neighborhood Framework Information by Existing Land Use (ELU) Acreage Corresponds with the Communities shown in SPAM Series Map #18			
Community Name	Neighborhood	General ELU	Acreage
		<i>Institutional</i>	10.30
		<i>Miscellaneous</i>	21.17
		<i>Public Buildings & Grounds</i>	1.96
		<i>Residential</i>	772.92
		Total Developed	952.85
		Vacant	484.81
	Revitalizing		
		<i>Burial Grounds</i>	14.03
		<i>Commercial</i>	40.47
		<i>Conservation</i>	3.00
		<i>Industrial</i>	24.44
		<i>Institutional</i>	5.90
		<i>Miscellaneous</i>	0.03
		<i>Public Buildings & Grounds</i>	2.33
		<i>Residential</i>	270.98
		Total Developed	361.18
		Vacant	223.55
	Burnt Store Area		
	Managed		
		None	0
	Emerging		
		<i>Agricultural</i>	2,948.45
		<i>Commercial</i>	2.57
		<i>Institutional</i>	6.86
		<i>Miscellaneous</i>	0.88
		<i>Public Buildings & Grounds</i>	36.15
		<i>Residential</i>	473.46
		Total Developed	3,468.37
		Vacant	3,635.36
	Maturing		
		<i>Conservation</i>	14.11
		<i>Public Buildings & Grounds</i>	0.71
		<i>Residential</i>	339.28
		Total Developed	354.10
		Vacant	816.71
	Revitalizing		
		None	0
	Central Punta Gorda		
	Managed		
		None	0

**Table FLU-15: Neighborhood Framework Information
by Existing Land Use (ELU) Acreage
Corresponds with the Communities shown in SPAM Series Map #18**

Community Name	Neighborhood	General ELU	Acreage	
	Emerging			
		<i>Agricultural</i>	105.63	
		<i>Commercial</i>	41.87	
		<i>Educational</i>	186.69	
		<i>Industrial</i>	7.58	
		<i>Institutional</i>	14.66	
		<i>Public Buildings & Grounds</i>	155.96	
		<i>Recreational</i>	84.34	
		<i>Residential</i>	240.62	
			Total Developed	837.35
			Vacant	788.77
		Maturing		
			<i>Agricultural</i>	298.47
			<i>Burial Grounds</i>	29.74
			<i>Commercial</i>	7.73
			<i>Industrial</i>	0.44
			<i>Institutional</i>	12.45
			<i>Marina</i>	1.06
			<i>Miscellaneous</i>	9.47
			<i>Public Buildings & Grounds</i>	2.31
			<i>Recreational</i>	18.10
			<i>Residential</i>	1,196.36
			Total Developed	1,576.13
			Vacant	625.27
		Revitalizing		
			None	0
	Mid County			
	East of 41			
		Managed		
			None	0
Emerging				
		None	0	
Maturing				
		<i>Educational</i>	40.23	
		<i>Institutional</i>	21.46	
		<i>Public Buildings & Grounds</i>	57.16	
		<i>Residential</i>	1,093.83	
		Total Developed	1,212.68	
		Vacant	969.75	
		Revitalizing		

Table FLU-15: Neighborhood Framework Information by Existing Land Use (ELU) Acreage Corresponds with the Communities shown in SPAM Series Map #18				
Community Name	Neighborhood	General ELU	Acreage	
		<i>Burial Grounds</i>	31.22	
		<i>Commercial</i>	100.98	
		<i>Educational</i>	56.06	
		<i>Industrial</i>	1.35	
		<i>Institutional</i>	200.94	
		<i>Medical</i>	26.14	
		<i>Miscellaneous</i>	16.98	
		<i>Public Buildings & Grounds</i>	73.74	
		<i>Recreational</i>	162.20	
		<i>Residential</i>	2,745.74	
			Total Developed	3,415.35
			Vacant	925.25
West of 41				
	Managed			
		<i>Residential</i>	87.10	
			Total Developed	87.10
			Vacant	369.11
	Emerging			
		None		0
	Maturing			
		<i>Educational</i>		20.14
		<i>Institutional</i>		37.26
		<i>Miscellaneous</i>		2.64
		<i>Public Buildings & Grounds</i>		30.93
		<i>Residential</i>		550.53
			Total Developed	641.50
			Vacant	877.49
	Revitalizing			
		<i>Commercial</i>		0.86
		<i>Conservation</i>		1.63
		<i>Educational</i>		12.90
		<i>Institutional</i>		22.77
		<i>Miscellaneous</i>		5.11
	<i>Public Buildings & Grounds</i>		67.49	
	<i>Recreational</i>		4.92	
	<i>Residential</i>		2,530.09	
		Total Developed	2,645.77	
		Vacant	1,182.97	
Harbour Heights Area				
	Managed			

Table FLU-15: Neighborhood Framework Information by Existing Land Use (ELU) Acreage Corresponds with the Communities shown in SPAM Series Map #18			
Community Name	Neighborhood	General ELU	Acreage
		None	0
	Emerging		
		None	0
	Maturing		
		<i>Commercial</i>	5.81
		<i>Industrial</i>	8.35
		<i>Institutional</i>	5.47
		<i>Miscellaneous</i>	9.01
		<i>Public Buildings & Grounds</i>	0.52
		<i>Residential</i>	187.25
		Total Developed	216.41
		Vacant	172.70
	Revitalizing		
		None	0
East of I-75			
	Managed		
		None	0
	Emerging		
		None	0
	Maturing		
		<i>Commercial</i>	6.83
		<i>Educational</i>	27.18
		<i>Institutional</i>	16.62
		<i>Miscellaneous</i>	4.00
		<i>Public Buildings & Grounds</i>	9.15
		<i>Recreational</i>	86.81
		<i>Residential</i>	1,353.52
		Total Developed	1,504.11
		Vacant	943.49
Revitalizing			
	None	0	
North Charlotte Harbor			
	Managed		
		None	0
	Emerging		
		<i>Agricultural</i>	263.89
		<i>Burial Grounds</i>	0.10
		<i>Commercial</i>	22.42
		<i>Institutional</i>	89.99
		<i>Miscellaneous</i>	648.15

Table FLU-15: Neighborhood Framework Information by Existing Land Use (ELU) Acreage Corresponds with the Communities shown in SPAM Series Map #18			
Community Name	Neighborhood	General ELU	Acreage
		<i>Public Buildings & Grounds</i>	5.06
		<i>Residential</i>	536.86
		Total Developed	1,566.47
		Vacant	622.82
	Maturing		
		<i>Commercial</i>	5.30
		<i>Institutional</i>	0.36
		<i>Miscellaneous</i>	0.68
		<i>Public Buildings & Grounds</i>	2.15
		<i>Residential</i>	348.99
		Total Developed	357.48
		Vacant	249.48
	Revitalizing		
		None	0
	North Port Charlotte		
	Managed		
		None	0
	Emerging		
		<i>Commercial</i>	4.46
		<i>Educational</i>	17.52
		<i>Industrial</i>	5.62
		<i>Residential</i>	25.90
		Total Developed	53.5
		Vacant	158.95
	Maturing		
		<i>Institutional</i>	26.60
		<i>Miscellaneous</i>	0.23
		<i>Public Buildings & Grounds</i>	3.19
		<i>Residential</i>	274.34
		Total Developed	304.36
		Vacant	1,614.59
	Revitalizing		
		None	0
Northwest Port Charlotte			
	Managed		
		<i>Burial Grounds</i>	0.56
		<i>Institutional</i>	16.78
		<i>Mining Sites</i>	94.84
		<i>Miscellaneous</i>	3.04

**Table FLU-15: Neighborhood Framework Information
by Existing Land Use (ELU) Acreage
Corresponds with the Communities shown in SPAM Series Map #18**

Community Name	Neighborhood	General ELU	Acreage
		<i>Public Buildings & Grounds</i>	6.84
		<i>Residential</i>	398.40
		Total Developed	520.46
		Vacant	2,666.91
		Water	0.87
	Emerging		
		None	0
	Maturing		
		None	0
	Revitalizing		
	None	0	
Riverwood			
	Managed		
		None	0
	Emerging		
		None	0
	Maturing		
		<i>Commercial</i>	17.99
		<i>Conservation</i>	16.00
		<i>Industrial</i>	10.44
		<i>Institutional</i>	1.05
		<i>Mining Sites</i>	3.79
		<i>Miscellaneous</i>	32.77
		<i>Public Buildings & Grounds</i>	10.72
		<i>Recreational</i>	122.61
		<i>Residential</i>	489.60
		Total Developed	704.97
		Vacant	833.56
		Water	82.86
Revitalizing			
	None	0	
West County			
East of 771			
	Managed		
		<i>Mining Sites</i>	395.38
		<i>Public Buildings & Grounds</i>	1.22
		<i>Residential</i>	529.83
		Total Developed	926.43
		Vacant	5,480.09
Emerging			

Table FLU-15: Neighborhood Framework Information by Existing Land Use (ELU) Acreage Corresponds with the Communities shown in SPAM Series Map #18			
Community Name	Neighborhood	General ELU	Acreage
		<i>Agricultural</i>	5.15
		<i>Institutional</i>	8.47
		<i>Miscellaneous</i>	102.45
		<i>Residential</i>	22.55
		Total Developed	138.62
		Vacant	1,020.64
	Maturing		
		None	0
	Revitalizing		
		None	0
Barrier Islands			
	Managed		
		None	0
	Emerging		
		None	0
	Maturing		
		<i>Agricultural</i>	11.89
		<i>Commercial</i>	23.13
		<i>Institutional</i>	1.89
		<i>Marina</i>	1.34
		<i>Miscellaneous</i>	9.71
		<i>Public Buildings & Grounds</i>	17.92
		<i>Residential</i>	402.86
		Total Developed	468.74
		Vacant	56.98
	Revitalizing		
	None	0	
Englewood			
	Managed		
		<i>Residential</i>	160.93
		Total Developed	160.93
		Vacant	280.57
		<i>Water</i>	1.36
	Emerging		
		None	0
	Maturing		
		<i>Agricultural</i>	30.89
		<i>Commercial</i>	3.54
		<i>Conservation</i>	10.56
		<i>Educational</i>	129.30

**Table FLU-15: Neighborhood Framework Information
by Existing Land Use (ELU) Acreage
Corresponds with the Communities shown in SPAM Series Map #18**

Community Name	Neighborhood	General ELU	Acreage
		<i>Institutional</i>	52.17
		<i>Miscellaneous</i>	50.87
		<i>Public Buildings & Grounds</i>	48.89
		<i>Recreational</i>	124.58
		<i>Residential</i>	2,599.45
		Total Developed	3,050.25
		Vacant	4,360.29
		Water	45.25
	Revitalizing		
		<i>Commercial</i>	98.23
		<i>Industrial</i>	0.52
		<i>Marina</i>	5.19
		<i>Miscellaneous</i>	0.62
		<i>Public Buildings & Grounds</i>	2.12
		<i>Residential</i>	306.01
		Total Developed	412.69
		Vacant	114.06
		Water	0.92
Placida			
	Managed		
		None	0
	Emerging		
		None	0
	Maturing		
		<i>Agricultural</i>	4.63
		<i>Commercial</i>	173.10
		<i>Conservation</i>	1.26
		<i>Institutional</i>	19.58
		<i>Marina</i>	36.60
		<i>Miscellaneous</i>	25.41
		<i>Public Buildings & Grounds</i>	6.83
		<i>Recreational</i>	409.15
		<i>Residential</i>	697.13
		Total Developed	1,373.69
		Vacant	836.56
		Water	49.43
	Revitalizing		
		<i>Commercial</i>	50.51
		<i>Marina</i>	11.20
	<i>Miscellaneous</i>	7.69	

Table FLU-15: Neighborhood Framework Information by Existing Land Use (ELU) Acreage Corresponds with the Communities shown in SPAM Series Map #18			
Community Name	Neighborhood	General ELU	Acreage
		<i>Public Buildings & Grounds</i>	8.10
		<i>Residential</i>	5.92
		Total Developed	83.42
		Vacant	22.59
Rotonda			
	Managed		
		<i>Conservation</i>	0.38
		<i>Miscellaneous</i>	0.51
		<i>Public Buildings & Grounds</i>	0.20
		<i>Residential</i>	33.97
		Total Developed	35.06
		Vacant	567.82
	Emerging		
		None	0
	Maturing		
		<i>Marina</i>	1.49
		<i>Miscellaneous</i>	11.52
		<i>Public Buildings & Grounds</i>	0.45
		<i>Recreational</i>	1,177.01
		<i>Residential</i>	1,099.32
		Total Developed	2,289.79
		Vacant	964.68
	Revitalizing		
		None	0
Grove City			
	Managed		
		Vacant	29.94
	Emerging		
		None	0
	Maturing		
		None	0
	Revitalizing		
		<i>Commercial</i>	37.07
		<i>Industrial</i>	34.79
		<i>Institutional</i>	23.66
		<i>Marina</i>	8.32
		<i>Mining Sites</i>	168.85
		<i>Miscellaneous</i>	160.51
		<i>Public Buildings & Grounds</i>	10.67

Table FLU-15: Neighborhood Framework Information by Existing Land Use (ELU) Acreage Corresponds with the Communities shown in SPAM Series Map #18			
Community Name	Neighborhood	General ELU	Acreage
		<i>Residential</i>	541.59
		Total Developed	985.46
		Vacant	478.39
		Water	1.95

Source: Growth Management Department, assembled on May 10, 2010, by the Land Information Division.

Water is not counted in total.

Mid = Area of the County between the Peace River and the Myakka River

West = Area of the County west of the Myakka River

South/East = Area of the County generally south and east of the Peace River and east of Charlotte Harbor

CRITICAL WILDLIFE CORRIDORS

As part of this comprehensive plan, the County has adopted a wildlife corridor map for the Rural Service Area east of Burnt Store Road and U.S. 17. This map, FLUM Series Map #22: Critical Wildlife Corridors, shows lands that are designated with a Preservation or Resource Conservation FLUM category (public and private) and lands that are designated Wildlife Corridor Critical Linkages (WCC Linkages). Lands designated WCC Linkages contain riparian corridors, wetlands, expanses of wooded landscape, and land that is under active agriculture.

The amount of land in Preservation and Resource Conservation is 166,636 acres and the amount of land designated as WCC Linkages is 54,208 acres. There is a total of 283,426 acres in the Rural Service Area east of Burnt Store Road and U.S. 17. The total land constituting the WCC Linkages amounts to 19 percent of all land in this rural, east County area. The total amount of land designated Agriculture in this area amounts to 113,747 acres; the total amount of WCC Linkages designated Agriculture amounts to 44 percent of all lands designated Agriculture in this area.

Table FLU-16: Wildlife Corridor Critical Linkages Information		
Critical Linkage Future Land Uses	Acres	Base Density
Agriculture	50,081.15	5,008
Burnt Store Limited Development	1,887.59	188
Public Lands & Facilities	1,256.06	0
Rural Estate Residential	312.93	62
Mineral Resource Extraction	103.06	10
Commercial	35.39	0
Low Density Residential	52.26	52
Parks & Recreation	28.33	0
Roads & Right of Ways	451.00	0
Total	54,207.77	5,320

Source: Growth Management Department, assembled in April, 2010, by the Land Information Division. Calculations were done by Principal Planner, Inga Williams.

The WCC Linkages are allowed to develop as Conservation Subdivisions, FLU Policy 3.1.2, if they are designated Agriculture on the Future Land Use Map (FLUM). Conservation Subdivisions are required to set aside 70 percent of their land as open space, and a portion of that can remain in agricultural use. Since Conservation Subdivisions can only be developed on

property designated as Agriculture on the FLUM, development of all WCC Linkages as Conservation Subdivisions could result in an increase of 5,008 units.

WCC Linkages are also encouraged to sever density and send it to more appropriate locations. The County will give properties designated Agriculture or Burnt Store Limited Development a base density of one unit per five acres and Rural Estate Residential a base density of one unit per 2.5 acres for the purpose of severing density. In such a case, one unit of density can be retained on the property if there is an active agricultural use that will be continued. The retention of a unit of density gives the property owner an incentive to continue to manage the land. This density bonus to sever density from within the Critical Wildlife Corridors could create an extra 5,258 units of density if all Wildlife Corridor Critical Linkages utilized the TDU program.

With the adoption of this comprehensive plan, the County amended the FLUM categories of Shell Creek Preserve and Prairie Creek Preserve from Agriculture to Preservation and Babcock Ranch from Agriculture to Resource Conservation. The County removed 5,732 units of density with these amendments.

The County has also committed to expanding the designation of corridors throughout the County by establishing a County-wide Wildlife Corridor Linkage Strategy by December 2012. This strategy will look at opportunities to provide greenways linking existing parks and preserves within the Urban Service Area and linking these greenways with corridors in the Rural Service Area.

INVENTORY

Size and Location of the County

Charlotte County is located next to the Gulf of Mexico along the southwest Florida coast. The County is composed of 693.7 square miles of land area and approximately 129 square miles of water area, most of which is Charlotte Harbor and its tributaries. Bordering jurisdictions include: the City of North Port, and Sarasota and DeSoto Counties to the north; Highlands County to the northeast; Glades County to the east; Hendry County to the southeast; and the City of Cape Coral and Lee County to the south. SPAM Series Map #31: General Location and Adjacent Communities, displays Charlotte County's location relative to the State of Florida and the adjacent counties and municipalities.

Adjacent Future Land Uses

Charlotte County is bordered by two municipal and five county governments. The land use pattern along these borders is generally consistent between each jurisdiction and Charlotte County. A description of adjacent land uses is located in the next several paragraphs and general future land uses are depicted on SPAM Series Map #32: Southwest Florida Regional Future Land Use Map 2030, and SPAM Series Map #33: DeSoto County 2030 Future Land Use Map.

Sarasota County borders Charlotte to the north in the Englewood community, which is split between the two counties. The Sarasota County side is primarily comprised of residential and commercial uses. Major roadways connecting the two counties are State Road 776, Pine Street, and River Road. The barrier island of Manasota Key is also divided between the two counties. The Sarasota County portion is characterized by low-density residential lands - mostly single-family home sites of approximately one acre in size.

The *City of North Port* comprises most of the remainder of the Sarasota - Charlotte County border. It is a platted lands community that was originally developed by the General Development Corporation as a part of the Port Charlotte subdivision. The major connectors between both communities are U.S. 41 and Toledo Blade Boulevard. The more developed areas of North Port are located north of the Port Charlotte area. Most development has occurred near the U.S. 41 corridor. It consists of single-family residential units and commercial malls. The remainder of North Port (just north of Murdock) is primarily vacant platted residential lands.

DeSoto County also borders Charlotte County to the north. Land uses are primarily rural and agricultural along the border. The exception is in the vicinity of Kings Highway and Interstate 75 where there is primarily urban residential development, and U.S. 17 where Wal-Mart has developed a distribution center on the County line. Also allowed to develop within proximity to the distribution center is approximately 1,023 acres of industrial, along with urban residential uses. Highway 31 links the agricultural lands of south DeSoto and east Charlotte County.

Glades County lies to the east of Charlotte County. Glades' existing land uses along the border are primarily agriculture related and include citrus, rangeland, agricultural fields, and commercial timber forests. Additionally, some lands are used for conservation purposes and a limited number of residential homes are located in the southwestern corner of the County. County Road 74 links the two counties.

Hendry County meets Charlotte County at the southeast township corners. Existing uses are similar to those of Glades County and include agriculture and residential. No major roadways connect the two counties.

Lee County borders Charlotte County to the south and existing land uses along the border include citrus, conservation, agriculture, residential, and vacant (usually rangeland) lands. The barrier island of Boca Grande is split between Lee and Charlotte Counties, and the existing land uses are similar. Both are comprised mainly of residential dwellings in the border area. Four major roads link the mainland - Interstate 75, U.S. 41, State Road 31, and CR 765 (Burnt Store Road). Boca Grande is linked by Gasparilla Road.

The *City of Cape Coral* comprises most of the Lee - Charlotte County border west of U.S. 41. It is a platted lands community. The major connectors between both communities are U.S. 41 and Burnt Store Road. Most development consists of single-family residential units and strip commercial and commercial malls.

Internal Municipality Existing Land Uses

The *City of Punta Gorda* is the only municipality within the County and is located entirely within Charlotte County. SPAM Series Map #34 shows the location of the City within the County and the existing land uses within its approximate 14 square mile boundary include primarily residential and commercial uses.

Charlotte County Existing Land Uses

Table FLU-17 below identifies the fifteen primary existing land use categories and the acreages of each County-wide.

Table FLU-17: Existing Land Uses	
Existing Land Use Category	Acreage
Residential use	30,036
Commercial use	2,650
Industrial use	818
Agricultural use	130,082
Recreational use	2,875
Conservation use	177,927
Educational use	558
Medical use	26

Table FLU-17: Existing Land Uses	
Existing Land Use Category	Acreage
Institutional	821
Public buildings and grounds	7,854
Mining sites	6,842
Burial grounds	100
Marinas	66
Miscellaneous	2,814
Vacant lands	60,451

Source: Growth Management Department, Land Information Division, May 13, 2010

The Existing Land Use Map is meant to be a descriptive tool, unlike the Future Land Use Map, it has no regulatory purpose. SPAM Series Map #35 depicts the existing land uses in Charlotte County as of May 13, 2010.

When considering the extent of vacant and developed lands in Charlotte County, the terms must be defined.

Vacant lands are primarily those classified by the County’s Property Appraiser as such. In general, vacant lands do not contain any structures or use, although they may contain roads, other infrastructure, and stormwater ponds in anticipation of development.

Developed lands contain a structure or a use. This includes buildings, parking lots, docks, storage, or agriculture which, while not rising to the level of “development” as provided by the Florida Statutes, is recognized by the State, Regional, and Charlotte County Comprehensive Plan as a legitimate category of land use. With this understanding, it is possible to assess the suitability of Charlotte County’s vacant land.

Vacant land within the Urban Service Area consists primarily of undeveloped, roughly quarter acre lots intended for residential use. The majority of the vacant lots are directly accessible by roads, though the condition of the roads range from well maintained to roads with grass growing through cracks in the pavement. Road condition, however, does not appear to be a factor in whether a property owner decides to build as there are numerous examples of new homes being constructed on roads badly in need of maintenance. Large, unplatted residential lands do still exist within the Urban Service Area but these are slowly and consistently being platted into residential or mixed use developments. The vacant lands within the Urban Service Area also include properties bearing commercial, industrial, and other non-residential designations intended to serve the residential lands when needed. These primarily occur along all major roads in the County, such as U.S. 41, S.R. 776, U.S. 17, Veterans Blvd., etc. A depiction of the vacant land within the Urban Service Area as of May 10, 2010 by generalized Future Land Use Map category can be seen on SPAM Series Map #36.

Community/Neighborhood Plans

Charlotte County has only one municipality, the City of Punta Gorda, but has a host of geographic entities, which may be called "subdivisions", "settlements", "villages", "neighborhoods", or "communities". They are not cities or towns in any official sense, but they have evolved their own identities. Residents of places such as Deep Creek, South Gulf Cove, and Rotonda may identify with their neighborhoods (communities) more than they do with Charlotte County.

In support of the various communities, Charlotte County instituted a community-neighborhood planning program. The County has completed Community Plans for Placida, South Gulf Cove, Boca Grande, Little Gasparilla Island, Grove City and Manasota and Sandpiper Keys and each Plan is in different stages of goal implementation. The locations of these areas are depicted on FLUM Series Map #10. Some of these plans require changes to the Code of Laws and Ordinances to implement planning goals and objectives. The most extensive code changes were done in support of the Manasota and Sandpiper Keys' community plan, which resulted in new zoning designations and design guidelines.

This planning program has been expanded and formalized by the adoption of the Neighborhoods Framework. The focus now is to create and adopt Revitalizing and Emerging Plans that are meant to provide regulatory controls for developing areas; however, a simpler community component still exists called Neighborhood Planning. Neighborhood Plans are encouraged for areas of the County focused on the establishment of community goals, the identification of neighborhood issues of concern, and development of specific strategies to resolve the issues and achieve the goals. Neighborhood Plans are not meant to be regulatory or require regulatory revisions.

Community/neighborhood planning often begins because of interested parties (stakeholders) getting together to discuss their community. Frequently the discussions are motivated by issues and concerns, but may sometimes include pro-active thoughts such as maintaining or enhancing the existing situation for the benefit of current and future residents. Civic Associations and Homeowner groups are often the stakeholders that bring the initial request for a community planning effort to the County. The direction and scope of a Neighborhood Plan will be dependent upon the unique community for which it is being developed.

The Growth Management Department places information on each of the community plans on its website at the following link:

<http://www.charlottecountyfl.com/GrowthManagement/PlanningZoning/>

Area Plans

Area Plans are similar in scope to Optional Sector Plans, Section 163.3245, State Statutes, but do not require the regulatory oversight of the Department of Community Affairs.

Burnt Store Area Plan. In 2004, the County collaborated with a number of property owners and prepared the 22,370± acre Burnt Store Area Plan, The boundary of the Burnt Store Area is centered along Burnt Store Road from Green Gulf Boulevard to the Lee County line, and east to west from U.S. 41 to Charlotte Harbor. The Burnt Store Area Plan was accepted by the Board of County Commissioners and policies adopted into the comprehensive on November 15, 2005 and is incorporated as FLU Data and Analysis Appendix E. These policies include guidance on improvements to transportation, utilities, environmental linkages, preservation and protection of the natural resources and wildlife, improvement to and enhancement of waterways and stormwater management, as well as a coordinated approach to land development within the Burnt Store Area. The Land Development Regulations to implement the Burnt Store Area Plan have been drafted by County staff and are planned to be adopted into County's Land Development Regulations by early 2011. Until that time, all development has and will continue to proceed through the Planned Development rezoning process. In 2009, a Watershed Flood Study for the Burnt Store Area Planning Overlay District was completed. This document is included as FLU Data and Analysis Appendix F.

Babcock Ranch Community. In 2005, the County adopted the Babcock Ranch Overlay District (an overlay and a new Future Land Use Map category) into the comprehensive plan, which included many pages of objectives and policies. The vision of the development is a mixed-use, environmentally-oriented, energy efficient, planned community. Subsequent to the comprehensive plan amendment, in 2006, the County adopted the Babcock Ranch Overlay Zone (the new name will be Babcock Charlotte Zoning District) which covers a 13,630± acre area. Revisions to update this code within the Land Development Regulations are underway and will reflect changes made since 2006; for instance, the Master Development Order was approved in 2007 and the first increment of the development was approved by the Board in 2009. The County has already revised the original Objections and Policies adopted in 2005 as part of the adoption of this Smart Charlotte 2050 plan to remove items added to the development order(s) and update other items in accordance with multi-party settlement agreements. The next step is to reflect these changes within the zoning district.

U.S. 17 Area. In 2008, the County initiated the U.S. 17 Corridor Planning Study. The study area extends from the Charlotte/DeSoto County line to the City of Punta Gorda, west to the Peace River and east to encompass all areas with a direct impact on, or nexus with, the U.S. 17 corridor. The intent of the study is to establish a set of strategies to maintain and enhance the appearance and environmental quality along the corridor and to provide land use guidance through objectives and policies in order to manage growth, development and redevelopment along the corridor. Based on the public input received, County staff worked with a group of consultants to create a plan that will represent the voices of many stakeholders. The goal of the study was to learn and build upon the extensive knowledge and diversity of the community in order to create a plan that represents a combined vision for the future.

The U.S. 17 Corridor Planning Study report, incorporated as FLU Data and Analysis Appendix G, was completed in December 2009. As noted in the study's recommendations, the area located east of U.S. 17, south of the DeSoto County Line and north of Washington Loop Road N is unique because the DeSoto County Enterprise Zone, which includes the Wal-Mart Distribution Center, is located directly north of the planning area and there is a lack of any physical delimiter to separate those urban uses from Charlotte County's rural uses. Charlotte County's dividing line between the Urban Service Area and Rural Service Area in this location is U.S. 17. The Rural Settlement Overlay District was created as a way to transition urban uses into the agricultural and preservation uses further to the east. It establishes meaningful planning guidelines and standards for non-agricultural development of this specific area of the U.S. 17 corridor. The County will create Land Development Regulations to pursue the vision of the U.S. 17 area, which will include sustainable development strategies.

Community Facilities and Services

Community facilities and services can be grouped into Utility Facilities, Emergency Facilities, Cultural Facilities, Human Service Facilities, Health Facilities, Justice Facilities, and General Administration Facilities.

County government, in siting future County facilities and services, can encourage development within given locations. Also, the design of future facilities could set the tone for surrounding buildings. If the County chooses to locate its major institutions and office-type facilities in the Revitalizing or Emerging Neighborhoods, it could help support growth and make these locations true urban centers. The County would be adding to the vibrancy of these places, setting the stage for further compact development and thereby promoting growth management as it was intended. The siting and design of future County facilities could embrace the 2050 vision of the future for a County that has compact, diverse, and interesting places.

Utility Facilities consist of water and sewer facilities and solid waste. SPAM Series Map #37 shows the location of solid waste facilities. SPAM Series Map #84 shows the locations of water facilities and SPAM Series Map #87 shows the location of sewer facilities. Charlotte County is served by numerous public and private utilities. One utility, Charlotte County Utilities (CCU), is owned and operated under the direction of the Board of County Commissioners. CCU does not own a potable water treatment facility; it purchases water from the Peace River - Manasota Regional Water Supply Authority. Additional information regarding utility facilities is provided in the Infrastructure Data and Analysis. The only Class I landfill in Charlotte County is known as the Zemel Road Landfill. This facility is located on Zemel Road, approximately 2 miles north of the Charlotte/Lee County line. Additional information regarding utility facilities is provided in the Infrastructure Data and Analysis. The County has added a mini-transfer & recycling station in Englewood and Port Charlotte.

Emergency Facilities includes fire and EMS facilities, the Office of Emergency Management and hurricane shelter locations. Fire and EMS facilities include 16 stations and two marine units.

Areas within a 2.5 mile radius of a fire station have a response time of 4-6 minutes. SPAM Series Map #38 shows the location of these facilities and SPAM Series Map #39 shows the fire and EMS response times. The Englewood Area Fire Control District, the City of Punta Gorda Fire Department, and the City of North Port Fire Departments share mutual aid with the Charlotte County Fire/EMS Department. The Department has developed a Five Year Plan to replace equipment as needed. The Office of Emergency Management coordinates the activities of all government, private and volunteer agencies in preparing and responding to any natural disaster or emergency. The office is also responsible for developing, maintaining, and coordinating emergency preparedness, response, recovery and mitigation programs. All public schools in Charlotte County can be used as hurricane shelters.

Cultural Facilities include libraries, museums, and the arts. Information regarding the library and museum facilities is provided in the Recreation and Open Space Data and Analysis. SPAM Series Map #91 shows the location of the libraries. The official arts agency of Charlotte County is the Arts & Humanities Council. The Council is funded through local, state and grant dollars. The Council offers a variety of programs including educational activities, and the Art in Public Places program.

Human Services incorporates several programs which include the 2-1-1 Information Line, the Family Services Center and Financial Services Programs, Housing Services, Senior Services Programs, Transportation Programs, Veterans Services. SPAM Series Map #40 shows the location of these facilities. The Family, Financial, Senior and Veterans Services divisions include a variety of programs that provide support to children, families, veterans and the elderly. The Housing Services division administers the neighborhood stabilization program and the Community Development Block Grant Program. Transportation programs include Dial-A-Ride and Sunshine Ride Services.

Health Facilities includes private hospitals and Charlotte County Health Department facilities. There are three hospitals in Charlotte County providing medical services. Peace River Regional Medical Center and Fawcett Memorial Hospital both serve the Port Charlotte area, while Charlotte Regional Medical Center serves Punta Gorda and the surrounding communities. An additional hospital, Englewood Community Hospital, located in Sarasota County, provides medical service primarily for the residents living west of the Myakka River. The Charlotte County Health Department is an agency of the Florida Department of Health and provides three clinics, an environmental health division, communicable disease control, and vital statistics. SPAM Series Map #41 shows the location of the hospitals and the health department facilities.

Justice Facilities include the Charlotte County Sheriff's Office, the County and Judicial court systems, and the Department of Corrections. SPAM Series Map #42 shows the location of these facilities. The Charlotte County Sheriff's Office uses the community policing philosophy to identify community problems and resolve them. Charlotte County has two levels of courts: the County Court and the 20th Judicial Circuit Court. The County Court has a limited jurisdiction

and handles county and city ordinance violations, minor offenses and civil cases. The Circuit Court has general jurisdiction and handles domestic relations cases, major criminal offenses, probate matters, civil cases and appeals from County court judgments. All of the courts are located in the Charlotte County Justice Center at 350 East Marion Ave in Punta Gorda. The Justice Center houses all functions related to the judicial system, including the States Attorney and the Public Defender, Sheriff's Civil Service Office and Clerk of the Courts. The Charlotte County Sheriff's Office operates a County jail facility at 26601 Airport Road in Punta Gorda. A jail expansion is currently underway.

General Administration Facilities include all buildings and facilities owned by Charlotte County. SPAM Series Map #43 shows the location of these facilities. The County owns approximately 2 million gross square feet of building space with associated facilities and equipment. The County Administration Building at 18500 Murdock Circle houses the main government facilities. A satellite office on San Casa Boulevard was closed due to the economic downturn of 2008-09 but has recently reopened one day a week to accommodate residents located west of the Myakka River. The Public Works Department is located in a facility on Florida Street. Charlotte County Utilities and various other departments are located at the Eastport Environmental Campus on Harborview Road.

Historic Resources

A comprehensive, County-wide historical resources survey was conducted in two phases. Phase one examined all properties within one mile from the shoreline and was completed in May of 2008. Phase two discovered additional resources and was completed in September of 2008.

According to both surveys, archaeologists believe that Native Americans inhabited Charlotte County beginning in the Early Archaic Period (10,000-8000 B.P.) Over 100 prehistoric and historic archaeological sites in Charlotte County have been recorded in the Florida Master Site File database. In addition, three railroad lines, fifteen roadways, seven bridges, five cemeteries and approximately 1,800 structures have been identified as historic in Charlotte County. Many of these historical resources are depicted on SPAM Series Map #44: Historic Resource Map.

The Charlotte Harbor area was designated as a historic district by Ordinance 93-57 in November 1993. The El Jobean area was designated a historic district by Resolution 2000-079 in July 2000. Several historic resources are located within both districts.

There are sixteen structures and sites in Charlotte County that are included on the National Register of Historic Places. There are a total of 1,894 historical structures and sites listed on the Florida Master Site File. In addition to maintaining the Florida Master Site File, the Department of State's Division of Historic Resources reviews local government plans and local development projects for impacts to historic properties and archaeological sites. More locally, Charlotte County's Historical Advisory Committee reviews development and construction

proposals and advises the Board of County Commissioners and County staff regarding the potential effects of development activities on historical resources.

A local register can aid in protecting known historical and archaeological sites when the sites are threatened by proposed development. The County has committed to creating a Local Historic Register through FLU Policy 1.3.1, which shall list buildings, structures, objects, sites, and districts that have been designated as historically significant in the County.

Natural Resources

Charlotte County is endowed with a wealth of natural resources. The west portion of the County is bounded by the Gulf of Mexico, a chain of barrier islands, and aquatic preserves. The middle portion of the County is situated between two rivers, the Peace and Myakka, which form into Charlotte Harbor. The south and east portion of the County is bordered to the west by the harbor and is the home to a diverse range of wildlife.

Beaches, estuarine systems and shorelines

Beaches located on the barrier islands are an important attraction for tourism, one of the County's primary economic bases. Gasparilla Island, Manasota Key, and the bridgeless barrier islands Little Gasparilla, Don Pedro, Knight, and Bocilla Islands have beaches for public use. Together, these islands provide approximately 12 miles of beaches. In addition, the County has many areas of estuarine systems and over 100 miles of shoreline. SPAM Map Series #45: Beaches, Estuarine Systems and Shorelines identifies the County's public beaches, its estuarine systems, and its shorelines.

Dredge Disposal Sites

Rule 9J-5, Florida Administrative Code, requires local governments that have dredge disposal responsibilities to identify existing and future spoil sites. Charlotte County uses dredged material as cover for the Zemel Road Landfill cells. There are no other identified dredge disposal sites for County use.

Flood plains

The 100- and 500-year floodplains are identified on FLUM Series Map #17. The majority of land located within the floodplains is near water bodies and has been developed or subdivided. While it is in the best interest to minimize development within floodplains, past practices limit the County's ability to limit development since most of the land within them have been subdivided. Development within floodplains must meet strict building requirements consistent with the regulations of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

Habitat areas

The County is home to many lands that have been acquired by the Federal, State and Charlotte County governments. A discussion and identification of these areas can be found in the Natural

Resources Data and Analysis and the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Resources Data and Analysis.

Potable water wellheads and protection areas

Many of the County's public potable water suppliers pump water from underground aquifers. These suppliers generally use reverse osmosis treatment facilities. Public potable water wellheads are located throughout the County, as identified on FLUM Series Map #7. Commercial and industrial development applications that are located within 1,500 feet of a wellhead are reviewed in order to ensure that contamination of wellfields does not occur. The applicant must submit a pollution prevention plan to the utility operator, which must approve it. The last step in the process is staff review and a decision by the Board of County Commissioners prior to building permit issuance. The Infrastructure element provides a more thorough review of potable water providers in the County.

GROWTH SCENARIO

As part of Smart Charlotte 2050, a growth scenario was developed incorporating many of the elements of the plan, in order to demonstrate how these elements might interact and affect future development patterns. The scenario was prepared using CorPlan, an ArcMap plug-in developed by the Renaissance Planning Group, a planning consultant based in Tampa and Orlando. CorPlan allows new land use patterns to be substituted for the existing land use patterns, and demonstrates the change in buildout capacity of the area changed. When combined with population projections, the scenario is able to show changes in population density and land use intensity between the initial state and the scenario.

The land use patterns used in the CorPlan scenarios are termed “Community Elements” and are themselves assembled from “Building Elements.” A Building Element is essentially a single development site, establishing the use, density, and intensity of development upon a site, including non-developable elements such as parking, stormwater retention, and open space. Community Elements are then assembled using various Building Elements as well as ratios for roads, civic uses, public parking, open space, and public stormwater retention. In the growth scenario developed as part of Smart Charlotte 2050, four different Community Elements were used, involving 16 different Building Elements. Table FLU-18 shows the Community Elements used and the areas of each.

Table FLU-18: Community Elements Used in the Growth Scenario		
Community Element	Area in Acres	Growth Weight
Medical District Core	180.64	High
US 17 Employment District	547.52	Medium
US 17 Village Center	185.60	Medium
US 17 Village Residential	621.28	Medium
Managed Residential	14,298.24	Very Low

Source: Charlotte County Growth Management Department, 2010

Medical District Core: The Medical District Core Community Element is located in central Port Charlotte, and is intended to be a focus of redevelopment and revitalization based upon the two existing hospitals and the secondary services and business located in the area. It is designated as a Revitalizing Neighborhood on FLUM Series Map #2, and the Community Element includes very high density residential and mixed use buildings at densities between 20 and 60 units per acre and Floor Area Ratios of between 1.0 and 3.0. The proposed combination of very high density residential uses and high-intensity office uses represents a significant departure from the County traditional development pattern.

US 17 Employment Center: The U.S. 17 Employment Center Community Element is located in the eastern portion of the County, on the east side of U.S. 17 and immediately south of the DeSoto County line. It is located within the Rural Settlement Overlay District as shown on

FLUM Series Map #8. It is intended to be developed as a significant employment center that is able to take advantage of the transportation nexus of U.S. 17, I-75, and the Charlotte County Airport, and to offer employment opportunities to residents of the Rural Settlement Overlay District and other residents of eastern Charlotte County. The Community Element includes predominantly light industrial, office, and retail uses with Floor Area Ratios of between 0.3 and 1.0 and residential densities at seven units per acre.

US 17 Village Center: The U.S. 17 Village Center Community Element is also located within the Rural Settlement Overlay District, in two locations. These are intended to be local low-intensity centers that offer commercial and service opportunities to the local residents of the RSOD and also include residential uses in single family, multi-family, and mixed use buildings. Densities range from 3.5 to seven units per acre, and Floor Area Ratios of between 0.3 and 1.0.

US 17 Village Residential: The U.S. 17 Village Residential Community Element is the third Community Element located within the Rural Settlement Overlay District. It is intended to surround and connect the U.S. 17 Village Centers, and to consist of low density single family dwellings at a density of 3.5 units per acre.

Managed Residential: The Managed Residential Community Element is located in various locations across the County, and is designated as Managed Neighborhood on FLUM Series Map #2. Because of the nature of the Managed Neighborhoods, this Community Element consists entirely of low density single family residential dwellings at a density of 3.5 units per acre.

RESULTS

As shown in Table FLU-18, 15,833.28 acres were designated with new Community Elements. While these changes did not result in a reduction of the final build-out population, they do affect the ultimate population distribution, as they change where new residents might settle in the coming years.

Population distribution was completed at the U.S. Census block level, and was accomplished by assigning a growth weight to each block, ranging from “High” for those blocks expected to have a high priority or attraction for future development to “Very Low” for those blocks where development is not encouraged or expected. The growth weights for the five Community Elements used in the growth scenario are included in Table FLU-18. In general, only those Census blocks completely contained within the bounds of the Community Elements had their growth weights changed, although all of the Community Elements related to the Rural Settlement Overlay District are located within a single large Census block, the majority of which is intended to remain rural and agricultural.

As mentioned above, the growth scenario does not anticipate any changes to the final build-out population, so the populations at 2030 and 2050 have not changed. The distribution of that

population has, however. SPAM Series Map #46A shows projected population density by U.S. Census block in 2030 and SPAM Series Map #46B shows the same data for 2050. SPAM Map #47A and SPAM Map #47B show the projected population density for the same years using the growth scenario. Comparing the two sets of maps shows that the Medical District Core has absorbed more of the projected population by 2030 in the growth scenario than in the current-trend scenario, with several more Census blocks exceeding ten persons per acre in the growth scenario while those areas range between five and ten persons per acre in the current-trend scenario. This continues through 2050.

It is more difficult to graphically show the changes in population density for the other Community Elements using the data ranges established in the maps. The Rural Settlement Overlay District shows no change between the two scenarios; in both, it has a population density of between zero and 2.5 persons per acre. Many of the Managed Residential areas were already assigned a growth weight of Low, which was changed to Very Low in the growth scenario. There are almost no differences in these areas when the current-trend 2030 and growth scenario 2030 maps are compared, with the Managed Residential areas showing a density of between zero and 2.5 persons per acre.

While this growth scenario has not reduced the ultimate build-out population of the County, it does allow for significant densification in certain new development and redevelopment areas. Furthermore, this scenario did not take into account the transfer of density units required to fully implement certain of these densifications, such as the Rural Settlement Overlay District. A more finely-tuned scenario, taking careful consideration of the construction of both Building Elements and Community Elements, and of other development policies, may result in a reduction in the ultimate build-out population. Such reductions, however, would not affect the development potential to the extent that ultimate build-out would arrive within the horizons of this plan.