



September 15, 2021

Tampa City Council
315 East Kennedy Boulevard
City Hall, 3rd Floor
Tampa, Florida 33602

Dear Council Members:

The Davis Island Civic Association opposes the Privately initiated text amendment proposed by Mr. Micheleni and Lum. Our opposition is based on the following considerations:

1. No consideration of this amendment should be made until completion of the massing study requested by Councilman Dingfelder.
2. Any delay will not impede existing development as the current construction boom demonstrates and the said development is possible without the proposed changes.
3. The height definition has already been changed since the PITA was submitted. Developments are now measured from finished floor versus finished grade. This probably allows an additional 5 ft. in the lower lying areas.
4. Existing RM-24 and PD developments are resulting in very intense development on very small sites and often out of character with the neighborhoods. If the Footnote #2 is approved, there is the possibility of a 45 ft. wall 7 ft. from the adjoining property plus additional development on the roof up to 60 ft. Note: A. Finished floor – 5 ft. B. Building Height – 35 ft. C. Parapet Wall – 5 ft.
5. The unintended consequences of this more intense development has not been addressed with regard to neighborhood impacts, specifically trash pick-up, inadequate parking, etc.
6. We believe changes which provide additional development rights should be combined with planning initiatives via the use of incentives to achieve broader goals like affordable housing. We recommend staff review the St. Pete code which has some excellent examples to use as a starting point.
7. If approved, this code change will result in development of greater mass in South Tampa versus development that the City indicates as desirable areas to direct development.
8. Lastly, the impact of this increased massing on housing affordability should be addressed. We are seeing RM-24 utilized for development with less units than the zoning allows but with much greater square footage than what is being replaced, or could be built if built to the maximum density. Therefore, these changes are eliminating the workforce rental/ownership housing supply with \$1 million plus townhomes.

We respectfully request you deny this proposed text amendment. Further, we recommend all future amendments be accompanied by staff analysis showing examples of the impacts of the proposed change.

Your consideration is appreciated.

Janice Davis - President D.I.C.A.

Robert Abberger - Zoning Chair