



GROWTH MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT

MEMORANDUM

TO: Development Review Committee (DRC)

FROM: Lily Savage, Senior Planner

THRU: Keith Burnsed, AICP
Assistant Director of Growth Management

DATE: September 11, 2026

SUBJ: September 14th DRC Meeting –Staff Report
Welaunee Arch Phase 1 PUD (TRZ260004)

I. PROJECT SUMMARY

Item: Welaunee Arch Phase 1 PUD (TRZ260004)

Agent: Moore Bass Consulting, (850) 222-5678

Tax I.D. No.: 1204202220000

Existing Zoning: Critical Planning Area (CPA)

Surrounding Zoning: North: Leon County School PUD and Open Space (OS)
East: Planned Development (PD)
South: Residential Preservation (RP)
West: Residential Preservation-1 (RP-1)

Access: Centerville Road

Summary of Application:

The Planned Unit Development (PUD) application proposes a rezoning to establish mixed use development consisting of a Town Center, Village Center, Neighborhood, and Residential zones consistent with the Welaunee Arch Critical Area Plan (CAP). The total acreage for the PUD is approximately 1,277 acres and is located along Centerville Road in a Critical Planning Area

zoning district. The PUD outlines allowable uses of these districts, maximum densities and intensities, and traffic patterns throughout the development.

II. STANDARD OF REVIEW

In accordance with Chapter 10, *Tallahassee Land Development Code* (TLDC), the Development Review Committee shall review a Planned Unit Development Plan application to determine if the application complies with the Comprehensive Plan and other applicable land development regulations and make a recommendation of approval, approval with conditions, or denial of a Planned Unit Development zoning district to the Planning Commission.

III. FINDINGS AND THE CONDITIONS BASED ON SPECIFIC CODE REQUIREMENTS

In accordance with Chapter 10 of the *Tallahassee Land Development Code* (TLDC), the DRC shall determine the following in deciding whether to recommend to: approve, approve with conditions, or deny the proposed rezoning:

1. Whether the applicable standards and requirements of the TLDC Chapter 4, Concurrency Management, have been met; and
2. Whether the applicable standards and requirements of the TLDC Chapter 5, Environmental Management, have been met; and
3. Whether the applicable standards and requirements of the TLDC Chapter 7, Sign Code, have been met; and
4. Whether the applicable standards and requirements of the TLDC Chapter 9, Subdivisions and Site Plans, have been met; and
5. Whether the applicable standards and requirements of the TLDC Chapter 10, Zoning, have been met; and
6. Whether the requirements of other applicable regulations or ordinances which impose specific requirements on the proposed development have been met.

A. CHAPTER 4, Concurrency Management

An affidavit waiving concurrency for a preliminary development order was submitted as part of the PUD amendment application. A concurrency analysis will be required at the time of the subdivision or site plan application.

The transportation concurrency section of the PUD, page 7, states that concurrency for individual phases will be evaluated through PUD Final Development Plans, however, Final Development Plans are no longer code requirements as part of the PUD process.

Remove “PUD Final Development Plans” from the transportation concurrency section on page 7 and update the language to read “traffic concurrency for individual phases will be

evaluated through subdivisions, site plans, or building permits, as applicable, in accordance with the City Land Development Code and the Development Agreement.”

B. CHAPTER 5, Environmental Management

1. ‘NFI Approval Letter’ is included in the Concept PUD table of contents. As of 9/11/2026, the TNF260018 preliminary Natural Features Inventory (NFI) application being finalized for approval. Finalize the environmental assessment prior to PUD approval and include the preliminary Natural Features Inventory (TNF260018) approval letter within the PUD.
2. Add the missing Preliminary Environmental Features map which should consist of the approved preliminary NFI map from TNF260018.
3. In Figure 5 – Concept Stormwater Plan, two conceptual stormwater management facilities (SWMF) overlap with regulated features. Wetland buffers are required to remain in a natural vegetative state per Sec. 5-81(a)(1)a. Specifically,
 - a. The overlapping SWMF with regulated features may need to be relocated for conservation or preservation purposes at the time of permitting of subdivision or site plan. Revise the location of the conceptual SWMF located west of Northeast Gateway Phase II adjacent to the southern property boundary to avoid overlap with the priority exceptional specimen tree area and Zone A floodplain by shifting the boundary north. Contact LUES for additional information on adjusting the SWMF location to avoid these features.
4. Page 7, near the bottom there are outdated references that need to be eliminated. Delete outdated reference to ... “the COT Environmental Management Ordinance”.
5. Page 9, the development schedule has unclear/incorrect language regarding when development can start. Add language to the development schedule that states “no construction activities may commence prior to approval of environmental permitting.”
6. Page 11, near bottom, additional clarifying language is needed regarding the Alternative Development Program. Amend the reference to Alternative Development Program to include “in accordance with Policy 13.2.45”.
7. Page 12, at top, there is no approving body listed for the trail location approval listed. Clarify trails will be as approved by Growth Management biologist, also clarify proposed SWMFs in open space must meet LDC design criteria to count as landscape credit if the area of open space is used in density calculations.
8. Page 14, Parking location standards third paragraph has language that appears to contradict the requirements of TLDC 5-85(k). Clarify that sidewalks shall not reduce or eliminate internal landscape islands required under TLDC 5-85(k).
9. Page 15, Parking location standards last paragraph conflicts with code for VUA landscaping, TLDC 5-85(k). VUA landscaping is always required between pavement and property line (presuming the pavement stops short of property line). Landscaping should shade VUA pavement.
10. Page 16, the missing discussion about pond ownership and maintenance must include at a minimum information regarding ponds to be city maintained must

- meet applicable city design/maintenance requirements. (Could list both city and private option for flexibility, if clarify design requirements for city ponds.)
11. Page 16, Floodplain Management- add text to end of paragraph: “Development in floodplain area must comply with COT LDC Chapters 5 and 6 as applicable.”
 12. Page 18, Onsite Easements, additional language needs to be added to the easement requirements. Recommend editing last paragraph text to “...any and all necessary onsite easements...”
 13. Page 20, Natural Features: the protection for natural features is insufficient and must be updated. Clarify the protections will be 50’ from wetland line “or the outer-most conservation/preservation feature boundary, whichever is greater.”
 14. Page 20, Landscaping, define the abbreviation for EMP.
 15. Page 20, Landscaping, to meet code the tree wells must be minimum size of 6’x6’ for trees to be minimum 3’ from impervious areas. Clarify text as needed.
 16. FIGURE 5- The SWMF located directly south of the intersection of the Shamrock extension and NE Gateway north overlaps with an old growth live oak forest containing multiple exceptional specimen trees, an area of Zone A floodplain, and a potential karst feature. Please relocate the SWMF located directly south of the intersection of the Shamrock extension and NE Gateway north out of the green space.
 17. FIGURE 5- There is missing information on the stormwater management facilities (SWMF) regarding type. The Applicant shall determine if stormwater management facilities shall be retention (closed basin) or detention and clearly indicate this on Figure 5.
 18. FIGURE 9-1 and 9-2- The planting strips shown in ROW do not meet minimum separation distance between impervious area and plantings required per, TLDC 5-85m. Provide wider planting strips in ROW (8’ min.) if possible but no less than 6.5’ to provide 3’ minimum separation between tree trunk and impervious area.
 19. The SFMP must be approved before final PUD approval.
 20. In Development Standards charts clarifying language must be added regarding ADUs. In Development Standards charts (several in footnotes)- Should clarify that even though ADUs don’t count for density, they still count as impervious area, see pages 26 and 27. As an alternative this footnote can be removed assuming Zoning and Planning reviewers have no issues.
 21. There is missing discussion regarding trail signage. Trail signage must be added as requirement.

C. CHAPTER 6, Flood Damage Protection

This project must meet code requirements for development within a regulated floodplain and all proposed work within floodway.

Provide an SFMP for review. The SFMP must include information on the base flood elevations within floodplains.

D. CHAPTER 7, Sign Code

Development on-site should support pedestrian orientated compact development standards. Provide sign requirements for pedestrian-orientated development. Signage standards outlined in Sec. 7-68 should be used as a template.

E. CHAPTER 9, Subdivision and Site Plans

1. On page 6, it states that “the applicant may elect at Final Development Plan to use one or more of the incentives contemplated...” for housing affordability. Final Development Plans are no longer code requirements as part of the PUD process. This must be determined during the PUD process or defer to evaluation during subdivision, site plan, or building permit review, as applicable. Revise page 6 to read, “To promote a range of housing types and choices, the applicant may elect at subdivision, site plan, or building permit review, as applicable, to use one or more of the incentives contemplated ...”

F. CHAPTER 10, Zoning

1. On page 6, nonresidential uses are limited to specific square footages. These must be outlined during the PUD process if they are to be identified. Revise to read, “Specific non-residential building square footages are identified in this PUD and any modification to these allotments will follow any amendments necessary in accordance with chapter 10-165, TLDC.” Additionally, provide the non-residential building that is to be retained across Welaunee Arch.
2. On page 9, it discusses a development schedule while referring heavily to the Final Development Plan, however Final Development Plans are no longer used as part of the PUD process. Revise page 9 to remove Final Development Plans from the development schedule section. As phasing plans can be determined at subdivision or site plan, incorporate this language into the development schedule.
3. On Page 14, it states “bicycle and pedestrian circulation plan for a conceptual circulation plan, which may be adjusted in final design without requiring an amendment to this PUD.” However, per Sec. 10-165 TLDC, changes in concept plans with the PUD require an amendment. Strikethrough, “... which may be adjusted in final design without requiring an amendment to this PUD” in the bicycle and pedestrian circulation plan section.
4. On page 14, parking standards are discussed within the transportation section. Reduced parking by the TLDC must be established prior to the PUD approval or must be reviewed at time of development as part of the parking standards review process. Currently, there is a range above 100% of the requirements outlined in the TLDC which will exceed the number of spaces that will be permitted throughout the PUD. Revise the parking standards to state that in order to support pedestrian-oriented development patterns, the permitted number of parking spaces shall be based on a range of 65%-90% of the permitted spaces detailed in TLDC Sec. 10-285, Table 8A, General Parking Ratios.
5. On Page 14, parking location standards are discussed with incentives for reduced parking being determined in the final development plan, as well as general location of where parking is allowed. Revise page 14 to remove parking

incentives. The revised language for parking ranges based on TLDC will account for reduced parking requirements. Any proposed parking outside of the stated range of permitted spaces will require a parking standards review. Additionally, revise parking location standards to state that only rear and side parking are allowed, except along arterial roadways. Add that should front bay parking be implemented, it shall be consistently applied across the entire block frontage in the mixed-use zones.

6. On Page 14, parking location standards are discussed but bicycle parking is not mentioned. Provide bicycle parking ratios in accordance with Sec. 10-285, Table 8B, Downtown Overlay ratios within this section of the PUD.
7. Revise to remove parking incentives. The revised language for parking ranges based on the TLDC should account for less parking requirements. Revise page 15 to state that transit coordination will be evaluated at the time of subdivision site plan application. If other standards requiring transit to this area are requested, provide that language within the PUD.
8. On Page 20, landscaping standards are outlined, however, buffering standards are not mentioned and are required. Provide buffering standards particular to this PUD to specify standards between PUD districts or between specific types of land uses. These should be unique to the PUD with the allowable uses in mind and should not refer to code.
9. On page 21 and 22, a permitted use table outlines allowable uses for each of the zoning districts, however, not all these uses are permitted or necessary within the permitted use table. Additionally, the TLDC defines multifamily as being 3 units or more. To allow for triplexes and quadraplexes in this zoning district would be allowing for multifamily based on code's definition. Revise the permitted use table to move Accessory Dwelling Unit light industrial, and utilities from all uses. Additionally, as home occupation uses are allowed in residential uses per Florida Statute, remove home occupation as an allowed use. Finally, revise the multifamily use to state, "multifamily greater than 4 units" for consistency with TLDC.
10. The Town Center development standards discuss density for residential uses; however, it limits this density for development that is not vertical nor mixed use buildings. Provide the density rate for buildings that are vertical and mixed use in the Town Center development standards.
11. The development standards for Town Center outlines that there are no requirements for Open Space, however, community open space is required. Urban forest canopy areas are listed as an option; this is defined in code and would not be feasible as a focal point for development. The applicant shall set a minimum standard for usable green space within the Town Center, either as a whole or per development. Additionally, define "focal point" in the glossary.
12. Parking standards are outlined in the Town Center development standards. Throughout the PUD it states parking must be located in the rear or side of the development. Strikethrough, "where feasible" in number 7 of Town Center development standards. Also, revise parking standards to state that front bay parking is only permitted along arterial roadways.

13. Parking standards are outlined the Village Center development standards. The parking location standards section outlines parking location as the side and rear of development, except along arterial roads. Number 10 of the development standards for Village Center contradicts this standard. Revise Town Center development standards to state that front bay parking is only permitted along arterial roadways.
14. Density standards for Accessory Dwelling Units is included in both Neighborhood Zone and Residential Zone Development Standards, however, the density standard is outlined and defined in TLDC and is not necessary in the PUD. Strikethrough the density calculation statements in Neighborhood Zone and Residential Zone Development Standards.
15. The driveway standard for residential uses is included in both Neighborhood Zone and Residential Zone Development standards, and states that residential uses must have a driveway with a length of 22 feet long. Revise Neighborhood Zone and Residential Zone Development standards to state that driveways for single-family residential use shall be a minimum of 22 feet long, currently there are different driveway lengths given in the table.
16. Frontage elements are outlined within the development standards graphic on page 29. Frontage elements are stated as “optional” while the setbacks are not optional. Provide required frontage elements. If no frontage elements are required, then state this within development standards. Outline the front and side setbacks for each zone in another row outside of frontage elements for clarity.
17. Driveway access is discussed on page 29 for residential development. The driveway width has a maximum of 16’, however, this is contradictory to driveway standards in the City. Revise this driveway width to state 24’ maximum.
18. A minimum height of 18” is outlined in the development standards table for residential foundations. Remove minimum height for foundations from development standards.

G. WELAUNEE CRITICAL AREA PLAN (CAP)

1. Policy 13.2.4: Land Use Districts. Growth Management will be incorporating a minor amendment to the Welaunee CAP to clarify that this will be addressed at the time of permitting in conjunction with the detailed NFI.
2. Policy 13.2.16: Interim Uses. Agricultural and silvicultural uses are noted as allowable interim uses for all land uses, but the specification of “on which development is planned to occur” from Policy 13.2.16 is needed, as is identification of known areas to be preserved and managed according to approved management plan (conservation and preservation areas). “Agricultural and silvicultural uses, whether existing or new, shall be an allowed interim use in any area of the Welaunee Arch on which development is planned to occur, up to and until the start of actual construction on the applicable land.” Include footnotes regarding avoidance of conservation and preservation areas in the zoning category Development Standards tables.

3. Policy 13.2.33: Stormwater Management. A Stormwater Facilities Master Plan (SFMP) is required to be prepared for the entirety of the Welaunee Arch prior to approval of the first PUD Concept Plan. The SFMP was not provided. “Prior to approval of the first PUD Concept Plan, a Stormwater Facilities Master Plan (SFMP) shall be prepared for the entirety of the Welaunee Arch.” Provide SFMP for review. The SFMP is required to be approved prior to approval of the PUD Concept Plan.
4. Policy 13.2.38: Primary Open Space System. The PUD Concept Plan does not address the management plan requirement applicable to the open space systems. “The open space systems shall be governed by one or more management plans approved by the City in order to protect the values for which they were designated. The management plans may be adopted in phases so long as they are consistent with one another.” Add sentence detailing management plan requirement for open space system on pg. 28.
5. Policy 13.2.39: Conservation and Preservation Areas.
 - a. Growth Management will be incorporating a minor amendment to the Welaunee CAP, this amendment will allow the recording of conservation easements and management plans prior to site plan or subdivision approval rather than prior to the effective date of the PUD as currently required by policy 13.2.39. Changing the easement recording prior to site-specific subdivision or site plan provides more appropriate timing when greater detail is known about specific areas and if an Alternative Development Program may be utilized.
6. Policy 13.2.42: Natural Area Resident Notifications. This policy was not addressed in the application: “PUD Concept Plans will include notification requirements for informing residents, once development is completed, with information on how to avoid human-bear conflicts and notices of proximity to areas that are actively managed with prescribed fires.” Include natural area resident requirement in PUD consistent with Policy 13.2.42.

VI. RECOMMENDATION

The Growth Management Department recommends approval of the application with the stated conditions.