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PROJECT SUMMARY AND BACKGROUND

The historic neighborhood of Tampa Heights has been the focus over the past five years of historic preservation and urban revitalization efforts by The Historic Tampa Hillsborough County Preservation Board; Tampa Preservation, Incorporated; The City of Tampa; Florida Department of State, Division of Historical Resources; Florida Department of Environmental Regulation; H.U.D.; and many private individuals. The area is currently undergoing evaluation as to its eligibility for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places.

The tangible results of these efforts have begun to reveal themselves through the increase of private investment in the neighborhood, the steady rise in rehabilitated housing stock and the new construction of compatible infill structures. Additionally, the neighborhood is becoming socially and economically stable, while providing opportunities for existing residents to remain in their homes. Demonstrable results in this stabilization process can be seen through the establishment and active participation in the Tampa Heights Civic Association and the Tampa Heights Neighborhood Revitalization Alliance. Through their efforts along with those of the City of Tampa and TECO, there have been substantial improvements in street lighting including the pruning of street trees to allow for improved illumination as well as additional lighting. Other City efforts have resulted in neighborhood wide clean-ups, and improved police surveillance. There are efforts underway by the Tampa Heights Neighborhood Revitalization Alliance to develop economic development strategies to improve job opportunities for neighborhood residents as well as social service supports.

Starting in the Spring of 1989, the Preservation Board participated in the Tampa Heights Planning Committee on neighborhood revitalization. When Greiner, Inc. presented plans for the I-275 widening to the Tampa Heights Planning Committee in August 1989, concerns were expressed that this project would have a negative impact on the revitalization efforts under way as well as a detrimental effect on the historic structures of the area. Issues of particular concern by the area residents were:

Construction disruption and noise impact of the expansion work.

Highway noise and visual impact on the area after construction.

Lack of buffer between existing residences and the highway right of way.

Streets dead end into the highway. This reflects the existing condition of the relationship between streets and highway in the area. The result has been an un-monitored dump site and location for drug and illegal activities. The neighborhood was most adamant about wanting no dead end street situations and no barricaded street ends.

The numbers of buildings which would be lost within this particular neighborhood. Many of these buildings contribute to the historic ambiance and charm of the area, which has been the primary factor in its revitalization.

Following that first meeting, Preservation Board design staff examined the issues raised at the meeting and proposed a solution to address the problems. The concept suggested the creation of a buffer park along the edge of the expanded highway, which would keep existing mature trees to act as an auditory and visual barrier. The nearest existing street to the west of the interstate is Grove Avenue. It was observed that if this street were extended, running parallel to the new highway alignment, it could act as a small collector street for those streets cut off by the highway. Furthermore, the park could incorporate bicycle and pedestrian paths to enhance alternative modes of urban transportation and recreational opportunities. If the park concept were to be extended to the Hillsborough River, it could provide for connections to existing and proposed park, recreational and alternate transportation modes. More importantly, such a buffer would help to minimize the impact of the highway on nearby residential historic structures allowing them a continued useful life.

1. The Tampa Heights Planning Committee was the precursor to the Tampa Heights Civic Association.
desirability of the proposed solution. The responses were positive and supportive of the idea. Throughout the rest of 1989 and 1990, the opportunities for further development of the linear park concept were explored. In May of 1990, FDOT agreed to provide funding for a design study for the project. This report accompanies the design drawings resulting from that funding.

In 1992 The Preservation Board conducted a search for a design team to work on the park project. Following state procedures for the designer selection, the Board awarded the contract to HOH Associates of Winter Park, Florida.
TAMPA HEIGHTS LINEAR PARK
LOCATOR MAP
PROJECT SURVEY

A survey of the project area was provided to the Preservation Board by FDOT and was used as the basis for laying out the project. Additionally existing mature trees were located from aerial photographs of the area. Storm sewer locations were identified from maps provided by the City of Tampa Sewer Department. These limited plans and maps were determined to be sufficient for the design development phase of the project, since they reflected the latest level of Tampa Interstate Design work.

SITE INVENTORY/ DATA COLLECTION

Site Inventory

HOH Associates began their work by conducting a site analysis to visually identify opportunities and constraints which the project site embodied. Photographic documentation and field notes recorded some of the more outstanding features:

1. A vast difference in park character was perceived between the residential and commercial areas. If a goal was to allow people to feel comfortable to traverse the park to the river, the commercial area seemed like a large obstacle. The park areas seemed to lie between the rear of the businesses and the immense interstate which is to be built.

2. The width of the area beneath the interstate was perceived as immense. As judged in the field, envisioned as two football fields long. The safety, human scale, comfort and aesthetics of the interstate overpasses were determined by the client and consultant as an area of great concern, needing special design, though beyond the scope of this park project.

3. The river and natural spring were seen as a terrific neighborhood amenity, but its accessibility is restricted because of the existing police maintenance yard and the closed, fenced park at the spring site.

4. Residential streets running in an east-west direction have dead-end views at the interstate. This was seen as an opportunity to visually connect the neighborhood to the park.

5. The historic neighborhood character was perceived as a positive image that could be developed further. The vision of a standard interstate edge, positioned along this historic, residential setting felt out of scale and overwhelming.

6. Streets which were to be demolished contain brick paving and granite curbing which could be used again.

7. The old Henderson School building is positioned at the center of the park and was seen as an opportunity to become a community focal point.

8. The proposed interstate edge moved dramatically inward toward the neighborhood, from the existing edge. Many existing trees are to be lost, reducing the limited buffer that already exists.

9. Noise levels were judged, in a non-scientific approach, by listening and recording varying sound levels from the interstate edges that were above and level with the perceiver. Noise was substantially reduced when the interstate was 10 to 12 feet above and seemed especially dimmed if a jersey barrier wall existed. Most noise seemed to come from tires meeting pavement.
EXISTING VIEW LOOKING NORTH ON GROVE
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COMMUNITY INPUT

Following the early discussions of the desirability of a buffer park with neighborhood residents, the City of Tampa, FDOT and the Greiner Team, additional interested parties were contacted, given a presentation of the park concept and asked for their input. The Parks Department was most helpful in their insights and advice.

Two new Tampa Heights community organizations have come into being since Greiner’s presentation to the Tampa Heights Planning Committee. The Planning Committee has disbanded to be replaced by the Tampa Heights Civic Association. The Tampa Heights Neighborhood Revitalization Alliance (THNRA) was established in 1991 to act as a vehicle to facilitate and coordinate the twenty-three organizations and agencies active in the revitalization efforts. Among them are the City of Tampa, Habitat for Humanity, the Hillsborough County City-County Planning Commission, the Junior League of Tampa, Inc., Leadership Tampa of the Greater Tampa Chamber of Commerce, the Tampa Heights Civic Association, Tampa Coalition Housing Committee, Tampa United Methodist Centers and Tampa Preservation, Inc. These organizations have been informed and involved with the development of the park project through their participation in the THNRA and with individual presentations and discussions with those groups most interested in the project. Not surprisingly, the group most interested and active was the Tampa Heights Civic Association.

Additionally, the concept of a linear buffer park was presented to the Regional Planning Council and State Representatives Jim Hargrett, Jim Davis and Mary Figg, for the districts involved.

DESIGN WORKSHOP AND COMMUNITY MEETINGS

The design team, working with the Preservation Board, devised a methodology for community input in the design process. It was decided that a large group meeting would not be the most effective first design input, but rather that representatives from the interested parties should meet for a day long workshop, set forth goals and objectives, which could then be presented to their respective constituencies. Through the work shop and subsequent feedback from the participants, the design team could focus on and respond to the community’s concerns. Design proposals could then be presented to a large forum.

The workshop was held on Saturday, October 31, 1992 from 10:00 am to 4:00 pm. Representatives from the following organizations were invited: City of Tampa Parks Department, City of Tampa Planning Department, Tampa Heights Neighborhood Revitalization Alliance, Tampa Heights Civic Association, Tampa Preservation, Inc., Tampa United Methodist Centers, Junior League and the Preservation Board. From the invited organizations, nine participants were able to attend along with four design team members from HOH Associates. (See Appendix A)
TAMPA HEIGHTS LINEAR PARK
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO WORKSHOP QUESTIONS

Question No. 1
Q.  Imagine a revitalized Tampa Heights. Describe its character to someone from out of town.
A.  A diverse, quiet, historic residential district, revitalized in the future beyond today’s appearance. A clean, uncluttered, and friendly place to live. A neighborhood of choice with diverse people and income levels. A lower density than current zoning. A sense of neighborhood connection to the river.

Question No. 2
Q.  You live within a block or two of the new park. Describe it to a family you would like to move into the neighborhood.
A.  Clean, nice, pretty, shady, protected, well lighted, sense of pride, a place with things to see and do. A green park with everyday use.

Question No. 3
Q.  You’ve just opened an advertising agency in the Henderson and Florida area. A lot of your potential clients are downtown and will come to your office through the big area under the new highway. How would you like it to look?
A.  Abatement from interstate, interstate as sculpture, waterfalls, beautiful plants, and interstate structure with attractive characteristics. Well lighted or more natural daylight, local art-walls, safe, secure, pleasant transition between downtown and quiet Tampa Heights.

Question No. 4
Q.  What are the recreational facilities, lacking in the neighborhood, that might be located in the park and adjacent buildings? Give us at least three ideas.
A.  Biking, jogging, play lots, boating, bike and skate rentals. Don’t duplicate YMCA activities. Neighborhood parties, community center, weddings, young adult center, bicycles separated from sidewalks.

Question No. 5
Q.  You are riding your bike from Roblee Park to the waterfront. What would be your route through Tampa Heights?
A.  Follow the linear park, follow side streets such as Highland and Henderson. An elevated experience.

Question No. 6
Q.  What areas would you avoid if you were out walking your dog at night?
A.  Avoid hidden ambushes, Palm Avenue and Columbus Drive under the interstate. Safe would be where neighbors front on the park. Bayshore Blvd. is a good example of a safe place.

Question No. 7
Q.  What kinds of lighting would you like in the park?
A.  Well lighted but not glaring into homes. Low level, friendly appearance, non-obtrusive interstate lighting.

Question No. 8
Q.  How do you imagine the new Grove Avenue might be used?
TAMPA HEIGHTS LINEAR PARK
SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP SETTING OF GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

GOALS

A. HELP PRESERVE AND REVITALIZE THIS HISTORIC COMMUNITY

Objectives

1. Preserve visual character of forms, shapes, etc.
2. Preserve old trees
3. Preserve residential patterns
4. Revitalize: give new and improved feeling

B. MITIGATE THE IMPACT OF THE INTERSTATE EXPANSION ON HISTORIC RESOURCES OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD

Objectives

1. Preserve trees for buffer
2. Provide visual buffers, both hard and soft scape
3. Provide noise buffers
4. Address pedestrian circulation routes which potential may be shut off by the interstate, "Neighborhood connections between east and west Tampa Heights"

C. PROVIDE FOR RECREATIONAL USES WITHIN THE PARK

Objectives

1. Provide pedestrian/jogging paths
2. Provide bicycle paths
   (Playgrounds and sports are not priorities)

D. DEVELOP GROVE AVENUE INTO A CONNECTOR FOR DEAD-ENDING STREETS

Objectives

1. Align Grove Avenue to protect existing trees.

E. PLAN THE PARK TO STRENGTHEN THE NEIGHBORHOOD IDENTITY

Objectives

1. Develop graphic identity, forms, shapes, etc. to help strengthen the neighborhood identity.
2. Explore opportunities for public art.

F. PROVIDE SOLUTIONS THAT RESPECT SAFETY THROUGHOUT THE PARK

1. Provide visual access throughout the park for safety.
2. Plan for lighting to strengthen safety.
3. Provide solutions that follow codes and standards including handicap accessibility
G. PROVIDE SOLUTIONS THAT RESPECT LOW MAINTENANCE

1. Recognize the realistic maintenance levels for upkeep of structures, art, benches, landscape, water features, etc.
2. Recognize the potential for vandalism and misuse of park improvements.

This exercise was helpful in establishing priorities for the park development and helped participants to understand that not every idea could be incorporated into the program. It also became a tool for conflict resolution, where conflicting ideas, visions and interests were expressed.

ISSUES AND IDEAS RAISED BY WORKSHOP AND COMMUNITY MEETING PARTICIPANTS:

The following issues were raised and discussed. Where not incorporated into the program an explanation is provided in the Program Development Section of this report.

1. Preserve existing quality of trees for character, shade and buffer
2. Provide a noise wall for the residential section of the roadway
3. Use landscape to help screen undesirable views of the highway
4. Identify wall materials that reflect the image of the neighborhood and that will help the structure visually relate to the overall environment
5. Provide input for highway structure, form and materials that will help blend the bridges, columns, walls etc. into the neighborhood
6. Provide input for highway structure design for the overpasses above Columbus Drive, Palm Avenue and the HOV Transit area
7. Provide a separate bicycle path of 8' width with a complete connection from Columbus Drive to the river
8. Provide pedestrian walks of 5' minimum width along the residential section of the park with a connection from Columbus drive to the river
9. Provide seating that discourages sleeping, unwanted loitering or vandalism
10. All walks, bike paths, should be handicap accessible
11. Provide approximately one place to sit for every linear block of park length
12. Provide a fitness course
13. Provide roller blading use and the possibility for skate rental
14. Provide boat dock facilities at the river or show how they can be incorporated into the overall design
15. Provide opportunities for children's creative play
16. Provide a community center for community functions such as neighborhood parties, teen socials, weddings, etc. and as a headquarters for children's play (Henderson Ave. School?)
17. Provide parking for visitors near the commercial sections of the park rather than at the residential end
18. Provide suggestions to DOT engineers for noise wall design along the interstate
19. Design Grove Avenue to be shady, narrow, scenic, secure and a parkway signed for slow traffic and not a short cut
20. Restrict plant growth in the 2' to 7' height range to allow open views
21. Do not place structures in the park that will provide hidden walls
22. Orient homes to face the park to encourage "neighborhood watch"
23. Provide sufficient lighting so that all areas of the park can be seen at night
24. Avoid Lighting that will glare into homes
25. Provide two levels of lighting, low level, friendly character toward the street and homes and a medium level for efficient park lighting
26. Restrict interstate lighting from glaring into homes
27. Encourage police presence - possibly a police sub-station which could be in the old Henderson School or similar existing building
28. Identify a committed level of maintenance with the Parks Department (Bayshore Blvd vs. Robles Park)
29. Select landscape materials that are native or indigenous for low maintenance
30. Select hardscape materials that have minimum vandalism potential
31. Identify maintenance requirements for special features such as artwork or water features
Following the workshop, additional meetings were held with the Preservation Board staff, who acted as a conduit for additional thoughts and input from workshop participants as well as responses to the development of project design ideas.

The results of this work and a schematic design were presented to the Tampa Heights Civic Association on January 27, 1993. A question and answer period was held at the end of the presentation for additional neighborhood input.

The design Development phase was begun after incorporating the additional feedback from the schematic design phase.
DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROJECT PROGRAM

The programmatic requirements for the Tampa Heights Linear Park were developed over several months based on the input from interested parties. Much of this input was received during the design workshop and community meetings described above.

The starting point for program development was provided by the Preservation Board staff based on their understanding of the needs and goals of the historic neighborhood through their participation in neighborhood groups active in the revitalization effort. Other considerations were to keep the program development in conformance with the previously stated goals for the project as presented to FDOT and local governmental agencies as well as good urban design and historic preservation practices. The initial program presented to the design team was:

PURPOSE:
1. to buffer the residential areas from direct contact with the roadway.
2. to provide an orderly resolution for streets interrupted by the highway by the extension of Grove Avenue as a collector and street edge to the park.
3. to provide separate pedestrian and bicycle paths.
4. to reinforce a sense of neighborhood identity.
5. to link the neighborhood to the river and other riverfront parkways in the city.
6. to provide open space in this inner city neighborhood.
7. to provide a strong artistic statement that can expand our understanding of the city, highways, rivers or elements of the physical reality of this place.
8. to provide recreational facilities for the neighborhood.
9. to create a safe, inviting environment.

DESIRED AMENITIES:
1. retain existing trees.
2. create a water feature(s). Explore means of using storm water to provide a solution.
3. create level changes stepping up to the roadway to provide a vegetated "hill".
4. provide shaded areas with spots of sun.
5. use paving materials to suggest the differences between the bicycle and pedestrian paths and to allude to the park's link to the river.
6. establish a vegetation vocabulary which sets the aesthetic tone of the park.
7. establish a design vocabulary for all park elements, i.e. benches, trash containers, signs.
8. design a barrier free park.

This program was examined, questioned and refined during the initial stages to the project, based on the experience of the design team as well as with additional community input through the design workshop process.

Input from the design workshop and community meetings as well as comments from other parties were examined as to their practicality, differences of opinions, and whether or not they fell within the project scope.

ISSUES RELATING TO PRACTICALITY AND/OR DIFFERENCES OF OPINION:

1. Skate/roller blade and bicycle rentals: The ideas for skate and bicycle rentals were controversial in that some participants felt that this would be a positive expansion of recreational activities, while to other participants, these activities caused concern about neighborhood safety and autonomy in a transitional environment. They felt that in the residential section of the park, such facilities would become an attractive nuisance. Others felt that this may be true in the short term, but they would be an asset in the long run. In such cases, the program needed to require that the design solutions try to accommodate the long range as well as the short range needs of the community.

2. Fitness course/playground: These ideas were suggested by some of the non-resident participants and were not well received by the neighborhood residents for many of the same reasons described above. Additionally, residents felt that fitness equipment as well as playground equipment should be located
in larger parks, such as Waterfront Park. Play and recreational activities should be passive in nature, thereby eliminating the social and turf issues often accompanying playgrounds and recreational equipment. Boat docks, on the other hand, were not seen as controversial since boating activity would be located at the more public end of the park and would not negatively affect the residential area, however provision of this facility was seen as beyond the project scope and dealt with as a recommendation.

3. Orientation of homes to face the park: This idea was raised to support eyes on the street (park) concepts of urban design and planning and to awkward relationships of buildings with the new street and park. In most cases the adjacent properties already contain houses or other structures oriented parallel to the park alignment. While this is not the ideal orientation for these buildings, side yards along the street was seen as an acceptable condition and that the benefits gained from realignment were not sufficient to justify the costs.

4. Separate bicycle path: Several concerns were raised as how best to provide a continuous bike path throughout the park. South of Henderson Avenue, the right of way becomes very narrow and is interrupted by highway off-ramps and existing streets. Design options for the resolution of these problems were to be explored.

5. Parking: None of the project participants wanted separate parking lots for the park. They felt that this park due to its small size should be pedestrian in nature and did not want to encourage numerous outside vehicular traffic. Neighbors agreed that some on street parking along Grove Avenue would be acceptable, if it proved feasible during the design phase.

ISSUES BEYOND THE PROJECT SCOPE AND/OR JURISDICTION:

Issues raised that were beyond the scope or jurisdiction of the project could only be given as recommendations. Issues raised in this category were:

1. The inclusion of noise walls/barriers in the residential area.
2. Restrict interstate lighting from glaring into homes.
3. Identify maintenance requirements for all special features. This can only occur where those special features have been identified. Public art which might be selected in the future is outside the current project scope.
4. Encourage police presence - possibly a police sub-station in the Henderson school or other existing building.
5. Provide boat dock facilities at the river.
6. Provide input for highway structure, form and materials that will help blend the bridges, columns, walls etc. into the neighborhood.
7. Provide input for highway structure design for the overpasses above Columbus Drive, Palm Avenue and the HOV area.
8. Provide a community center for community functions such as neighborhood parties, teen socials and as a headquarters for children's play. *(This function may be redundant with the construction of the new YMCA in the neighborhood.)*
9. Identify a committed level of maintenance with the Parks Department.

ISSUES INCORPORATED INTO THE FINAL PROGRAM:

Many of the workshop ideas were embraced by all participants and incorporated into the final program. For the design professionals most of these items were given, but were happy to see that they were widely accepted by participants. Issues raised in this category are:

1. Use of native plant materials with non-native specimens used only as special events or accent plantings.
2. Low maintenance soft and hard scape materials. Participants did not want this to mean that low maintenance is no-maintenance.
3. Compliance with handicapped access and other codes.

FINALIZED PROGRAM:

1. Buffer the residential areas from direct contact with the roadway.
2. Provide an orderly resolution for streets interrupted by the highway by the extension of Grove Avenue as a collector and street edge to the park.
3. Provide separate pedestrian and bicycle paths if possible, given the physical constraints of the site. Explore alternative design solutions. Minimum pedestrian walk widths are 5 feet.
4. Reinforce a sense of neighborhood identity. Provide wall and hard scape materials that reflect the image of the neighborhood and will help the highway structure relate visually to the overall environment.
5. Link the neighborhood to the river and other riverfront parkways in the city.
6. Provide open space.
7. Provide a strong artistic statement that can expand our understanding of the city, highways, rivers or elements of the physical reality of this place.
8. Provide passive recreational opportunities for the neighborhood.
9. Create a safe, inviting environment, restricting plant growth in the 2' to 7' height range to allow open views. Do not place structures in the park which will provide hidden walls.
10. Retain existing trees and add to them to maintain neighborhood character, shade and buffer. Provide shaded areas with spots of sun.
11. Create a water feature(s). Explore means of using storm water to provide a solution.
12. Use landscape elements to help screen undesirable views of the highway.
13. Provide seating that discourages sleeping, unwanted loitering and vandalism. Provide approximately one seat for every linear block of park length.
14. Use paving materials to suggest the differences between the bicycle and pedestrian paths and to allude to the park's link to the river.
15. Establish a vegetation vocabulary which sets the aesthetic tone of the park. Select landscape materials that are native or indigenous for low maintenance. Use non-native species only as accents or special events.
16. Establish a design vocabulary for all park elements, i.e. benches, trash containers, signs.
17. Design a barrier free park, with all pedestrian paths to be handicapped accessible.
18. Provide sufficient lighting so that all areas of the park can be seen at night. Avoid lighting that will glare into homes. Provide two levels of lighting; low level, friendly character toward the street and residences and a medium level for efficient park lighting.
19. Select soft and hard scape materials that have minimum vandalism potential and are low maintenance.
20. Provide on street parking only if accomplished without sacrificing other project requirements.

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS OUTSIDE THE PROJECT SCOPE:

1. Include noise walls/barriers in the residential area.
2. Restrict interstate lighting from glaring into homes.
3. Identify maintenance requirements for all special features. This can only occur where those special features have been identified. Public art which might be selected in the future is outside the current project scope.
4. Encourage police presence - possibly a police sub-station in the Henderson school or other existing building.
5. Provide boat dock facilities at the river.
6. Provide input for highway structure, form and materials that will help blend the bridges, columns, walls etc. into the neighborhood.
7. Provide input for highway structure design for the overpasses above Columbus Drive, Palm Avenue and the HOV area.
8. Provide a community center for community functions such as neighborhood parties, teen socials and as a headquarters for children's play. *(This function may be redundant with the construction of the new YMCA in the neighborhood.)*
9. Identify a committed level of maintenance with the Parks Department.
CONCEPT IDEAS

Initial Conceptual Ideas

Following the workshop the Consultant prepared "image" boards illustrating scenes, pictures, and styles that began to fit within the projects' design vocabulary. The image boards represented ideas for the residential and urban areas of the park. Some of the most notable images that received favorable comments during a client presentation were:

1. A balustrade above a retaining wall with trailing, flowering vines.
2. Historic markers set along a path.
4. Terraced green walls.
5. Tree groves with clear understory.
6. Homes fronting on a curved brick street.
7. Perches, or places to sit.
8. "Controlled" nature vs. the City.
9. Interstate structure as sculpture or structure that fits within its environs.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Martha Sherman
FROM: Jeff Dix
DATE: November 25, 1992
RE: Concept Development Meeting - Tampa Heights Linear Park

A concept development meeting was held on Friday, November 20 at the Preservation Board offices to discuss initial design ideas and review image boards prepared by HOH. Present at the meeting were Stephanie Ferrell and Martha Sherman of the Preservation Board; Joel Jackson and Andrew Baker; two representatives from Tampa Preservation Inc.; and Rich Holaday, Chris Nance, and Jeff Dix of HOH. Image boards were presented showing various ideas or "pearls" that may be adaptable to the park design. The ideas included on the residential board were: gateways, water wall, wall sculpture, various wall treatments, including a balustrade, simplistic space, perches, and natural landscape in the urban environment. Images represented on the urban board were: structures as sculpture, architectural treatments of structure, wall as house front facades, elevated park at the urban area, various water treatments, and riverfront development.

Comments made during the workshop discussion are noted below.

1. Natural landscape image looked difficult to maintain. In addition, tall hidden plants may be places for homeless sleeping. The image of rocks, boulders, and natural area didn’t seem to fit with the Tampa area.

2. Balustrades looked very appropriate with the image of the overall Tampa area. The image is one of long lasting "timeless structure". The balustrades can be combined with other wall treatments.

3. The idea of gateways seemed appropriate at park entrance points such as Palm and Columbus Avenues.

4. Streams and fountains can involve high maintenance and any water solution should not only look good but also be realistically maintainable. The design should realize that in twenty years the water features will still be working and not be shut off like many project’s fountains are. Water features have to be safe to prevent drowning. A stream may be ideal at the retention pond hooked into the artesian well that exists. The water feature may be visual or may also be for play. Water quality from interstate runoff would be poor whereas the water coming from the artesian well should be fine. The idea of creative water play equipment was discussed.
Memorandum
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5. The interstate structure designed in a classical architectural style could be an appropriate solution to the blending of the interstate and the neighborhood.

6. False building facades represented on walls may be appropriate in underpasses but not in the park. Something could possibly be done on the ceilings of the interstate.

7. Sidewalks could be designed in a unique way with pattern, texture, or a story represented in plaques that are read along the way. This may represent an intriguing feature for discovery along the route. Its a feature that would draw people through the park. The idea of games for children patterned into sidewalks for four square, hop scotch, or other games may be appropriate. This could be done with a pattern and correct sizes of game squares are important. Stephanie suggested inviting someone from a local art group to be included on the committee. Maps could be represented in concrete such as the area of Tampa or something relating to Fort Brook. The park could become a field trip destination for children to learn about the history of Tampa.

8. Andrew Baker indicated that bricks should also be evaluated as material besides concrete or limestone.

9. Joel Jackson indicated his dislike of plants located next to walls where garbage would collect and people would hide. Grass slopes may be ideal for kids play.

10. Another idea discussed involved representing pieces of historic homes that had been buried underneath the interstate. Cornerstones or front porches of homes could be shown protruding out of the earth slopes.

Other items that were discussed were street crossings for bicycles and pedestrians and the possibility that two levels could be designed at the urban section. Pavement material changes could occur in the street to indicate pedestrian or bike flow. An upper level park pathway should be wide and well done. The availability of the school for other uses is going to be considered. The question arose whether the police station will move some parking and Martha is going to inquire as to the long term plans for the police department moving.

Some research needs to be done with HART and the question of downtown parking was raised regarding the use underneath the interstate. A question was raised whether Henderson could be closed and whether or not if businesses would be effected. A suggestion was made that a representative of DOT be part of our design committee.
In the afternoon, members of our committee met with Michael Coleman of DOT and two representatives of Greiner. We generally discussed the status of the project and image boards were presented. Some of the comments noted in the meeting are described as follows:

1. Greiner indicated the Tampa Heights area cannot be treated differently from another and DOT will treat the entire interstate for uniformity in design. They said the driver shouldn't get a discontinuous effect. The question will arise as to whether elements selected for our design may be able to be used for other neighborhoods or can elements in our design be reflected back towards the neighborhood and not necessarily be seen from the driver's point of view. Greiner did indicate that the opportunity is wide open for something different than the standard approach and they mentioned wall colors, textures, patterns etc. He stressed that the budgeted money must be used for mitigation and not construction of parks. The flexibility in design comes from the section of interstate as being DOT level three treatment which allows more flexibility with the structure. They thought buildings could go underneath the interstate however nothing flammable. Greiner will begin preparing a computer image model of the interstate area in January and should be completed somewhere around April. It is their opinion the noise wall should be 12' to 15' high minimum to be effective and that walls may or may not be planned for Tampa Heights. At this time, walls are not in the plans because they don't meet economic feasibility.

Richard Holaday asked that someone with DOT or Greiner be included on our committee and stated that open communication and coordination could occur especially since the schedule of our design sits so well into the DOT plans schedule.

JD/nes

cc: Chris Nance
    Rich Holaday

11tmhts2.mem
SCHEMATIC DESIGN

Plans were developed at a scale of 1" = 40' to illustrate alternatives schemes for the various park areas. The schemes which were agreed upon for further direction included the following features:

1. A park which is a simple, green linear belt.
2. A interstate retaining wall with a balustrade and vines.
3. Historic story plaques set in the path.
4. Places for art.
5. A waterfall.
6. An elevated bikeway in the urban area that is open for views, safe an attractive.
7. A riverfront development with a pavilion and other attracting elements.
TAMPA HEIGHTS CIVIC ASSOCIATION
JANUARY 27, 1993
SCHEMATIC DESIGN PRESENTATION OF TAMPA HEIGHTS LINEAR PARK
BY RICHARD HOLADAY, HOH ASSOCIATES

Martha Sherman’s notes:

Project background and history given by Stephanie Ferrell(SEF), describing the original FDOT presentation to the Civic Association in 1989 and the concerns expressed by the Tampa Heights residents about how the treatment of the edge of the highway would effect them. The initial concept of a buffer park grew out of that meeting and we have been working toward the goal of making it reality since.

Rich Holaday (RH) presentation:

Project Objectives:

1. To screen off the expressway
2. To provide a pedestrian and bicycle route from Columbus Dr. to the River
3. The strip should be green
4. The ability to see through the park with no hidden areas
5. To provide a well lighted park
6. To provide some active areas

Explanation of the drawing orientation

"Walk or Bicycle ride" through the park in the residential section from Columbus to Henderson and then through the urban section to the river.

Section A-A
Top of park 100' wide
A gateway is shown at Grove and Columbus to address entrance

Plan
Landscaped areas for activities
12' path for pedestrians and bikes textured warning of intersection, leaning rail
Landscape - green keep existing trees, new trees oaks and palms, trees block view of roadway, reduce sound
I-275 expansion design does not currently call for sound barriers at this location. If the community wants them, they need to give input.

Drawing of wall of interstate at Columbus
material other than typical concrete - stone like looking wall - effect of something softer + vines growing on it. On top is more landscape and a balustrade like structure

RECEIVED
FEB 04 1993
HOH Associates, Inc.
Winter Park
Section B-B

the expressway is lower, width of park narrower side walk on west side of Grove, bike path on East side. Shows trees, lighting extra buffer planting.

Plan

Bosque of sabal palms
Grove Street brick
sitting at nodes
Palm Avenue entrance identification
vehicular traffic to Henderson, only.

Drawing of Blue Walkway symbol of river intense blue concrete path to the river

Drawing of wall pattern alternative
continuity of design elements throughout project (Interstate)

Drawing of serpentine wall
retaining wall entire length - powerful visual system to provide continuity

ALTERNATIVELY

gatehouse structure
pedestrian walkway
pattern for game activity
structure - symbol of removed houses
275 wall with landscape

Plan

Grove at Henderson
can't drive beside - portable out - tight - reuse of school

exit ramp

problem location
expressway traffic

3 alternate routes presented and discussed
2 sections shown

at grade - palms and shade tolerant plants
bike path - up option
opportunities under the system
scale of the roadway - lots of opportunities

Terminus at Hillsborough River

Sabal palms
crossing Doyle Carlton Dr.
retention, overlook, aquatic plantings, fountain (visual focus)

Drawings

grass panels, sculpture, activities, 1 hard surfaced area at water potential dock, gazebo, other potentials - sails, sculptural symbol
Plan/Sections

Henderson Ave. system splits
friendly, pedestrian activity
street tree plantings
residential near Grove sidewalk, grass strip trees
54’ R.O.W. 2 travel lanes, 1 parking lane, grass, trees, sidewalk

urban further west
2 travel lanes, 2 parking lanes, curb, sidewalk to building edge, trees, tree grates

Brick intersections or other special treatment at pedestrian crossings

Great opportunity at River, with city owned land.
March 26, 1993

Mr. Jeffrey Dix
HOH Associates Inc.
1560 Orange Avenue Suite 300
Winter Park, Florida 32789

Re: Tampa Heights Linear Park

Dear Jeff,

Stephanie Ferrell and I have reviewed your schematic design drawings for the Tampa Heights Linear Park. We are very pleased with the ideas presented and congratulate you on a job well done. There were a number of options presented and choices to be made. The comments listed below reflect our observations as well as comments received from the Tampa Heights Civic Association members and Joel Jackson of the City of Tampa Parks Department.

1. Columbus Drive entrance: A tower like structure reflecting the tower of the church on the west side of Grove Street would be a better marker than the arch shown over Grove Street. We have concerns regarding the encroachment on the public right of way.

2. "Walk through history": A number of people had a negative response to the "wire frame house that used to be there", however liked the concept of historical reference. After considerable discussion, the idea of a historical time-line or series of plaques placed in the walkway or along the retaining wall appealed to people.

3. Palm Bosques: This idea has been enthusiastically received by everyone we have spoken with. They have the benefit of providing shade and greenery without impeding visual contact.

4. Retaining wall and berms: The retaining wall with the Stone like texture, balustrade and bougainvillea is the preferred treatment for the highway edge. It would be desirable to provide some small berms to create some terrain.

5. Water: The idea of using water runoff from the roadway continues to be of interest. One idea has been a trickling wet wall, similar to Paley Park in New York. This would have the advantage of masking highway noise, and if not allowed to be in an accessible pond, would not become a bath tub. The naturalistic pond shown near the river is a positive feature and should be retained, perhaps in a more free form shape.
6. Blue walk: Several people, including myself, don’t like the blue walk. We would prefer to see something with some texture or pattern. If a smooth texture is needed for bicycle safety, perhaps a patterned surface would be the answer.

7. Intersection of Palm Avenue and Central Avenue: This needs to be looked at again. Central Avenue is the busiest north south street in the neighborhood, and dead ending it into an alley does not work from a traffic flow perspective or for the needs of the residents abutting the alley. It might be better to bring Central over to Grove, or to let the streets converge at a point and install a traffic light at this location.

8. Elevated bike path at south portion of park: From a bike users perspective this is a desirable solution. Both at grade and elevated routes would be the most desirable solution.

9. Pavilion Structure at river: The structure shown in your drawings is more rustic in appearance than fits with the rest of the design vocabulary. If a pavilion is to be incorporated a more sophisticated design in keeping with the rest of the park would be desirable.

10. Trees: The approach to tree types and locations throughout the park has been positively received. The keeping of existing mature trees, intermixed with new oaks and palms is very appealing, and has received much positive comment.

If any of these comments are unclear, please give me a call. Again thank you for a great job.

Sincerely,

Martha Sherman

cc: Stephanie Ferrell
ORDER OF MAGNITUDE ESTIMATE
TAMPA HEIGHTS LINEAR PARK
ORDER OF MAGNITUDE COST SUMMARY
AUGUST 23, 1993

The cost estimate illustrated on the following pages includes work above and beyond work that would be completed by standard D.O.T. practices along this interstate edge. Costs such as noise wall, retaining wall, Grove Street sub-base, etc. were considered work that would have been done without the park. Park costs have been outlined, however, at this preliminary stage of planning, all costs cannot be anticipated. A 20% contingency has been included for this reason.

### Summary

#### Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>$649,025.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge &amp; Wall Improvements</td>
<td>795,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation</td>
<td>220,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fountains</td>
<td>104,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardscape</td>
<td>427,720.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>386,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>17,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnishings</td>
<td>75,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grove Street</td>
<td>395,370.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevated Bike Ramp</td>
<td>1,000,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency - 20%</td>
<td>818,083.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** $4,908,498.00

### Henderson Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>$19,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation</td>
<td>8,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardscape Furnishings</td>
<td>152,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Fixtures</td>
<td>98,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency - 20%</td>
<td>55,720.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** $334,320.00*

* Does not include basic infrastructure improvements
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>TOTAL PRICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td><strong>Landscape</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Canopy Trees</td>
<td>$375.00</td>
<td>$114,375.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Live Oak - 65 Gal.; 12'-14'x5'-6'; 24&quot;-34&quot; Cal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Palms</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>195,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sabal Palm 25' C.T.; B&amp;B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td><strong>Trailing Plants</strong></td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>9,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bougainvillia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Gal.; 36&quot; O.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>or Lantana 1 Gal.; Full 24&quot; O.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Oleander Highway - Shrubs</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>4,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Gal.; 30&quot; O.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Upper Terrance Buffer - Wax Myrtle</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>70,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 Gal.; Full 5' O.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td><strong>Seat Wall Shrubs</strong></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lantana Camara 'Gold Mound'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lantana 1 Gal.; Full 24&quot; O.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>950</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td><strong>Ilex Species</strong></td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>8,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Gal.; Full 30&quot; O.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>950</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Zamia Floridana - Coontie</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>23,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Gal.; Full 30&quot; O.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td><strong>Vines</strong></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ficus - Fig Vine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Gal.; 4 PPF; 3' O.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Bike Ramp Vine</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>8,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Confederate Jasmine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Gal.; 2' O.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td><strong>Lawn</strong></td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>190,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>St. Augustine 'Floratam'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Allowance</td>
<td>Tree Protection</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Landscape Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$649,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>I-275 Bridge Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>Integral Color Upgrade</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>$105,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,680</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>Concrete Balustrade Detail</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>$280,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Brick, Concrete and Sign Facing Treatment for Bridge Under Pass (Palm &amp; Columbus)</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>False Bridge/Art Wall</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
<td>$360,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>I-275 Bridge Improvements Total</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$795,800.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Irrigation</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>Irrigation System</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Pump &amp; Well</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Irrigation Total</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$220,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Park Fountains</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Allowance</td>
<td>Floating Fountain</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Allowance</td>
<td>Decorative Plaza Fountain</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Allowance</td>
<td>Decorative Wall Fountain</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Potable Drinking Fountain</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Park Fountains Total</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$104,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Grading</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Allowance</td>
<td>Fine Site Grading</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Grading Total</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Park Hardscape</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,720</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>12' Bike Path with Brick Edge</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>$133,920.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>4' Brick Art Walk</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>$46,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,680</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>24&quot; Decorative Concrete Seat Wall</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>$92,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Allowance</td>
<td>Concrete Steps to River</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Allowance</td>
<td>Park Gate House</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Allowance</td>
<td>Park River House/Plaza</td>
<td>80,000.00</td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>10' River Boat Dock Boardwalk</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Allowance</td>
<td>Misc. Riverfront Furniture, Flagpoles, Etc.</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Park Hardscape Total</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$427,720.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Park Lighting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>20' Park/Street Luminaire</td>
<td>3,700.00</td>
<td>$255,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>8' Bikeway Luminaire</td>
<td>3,500.00</td>
<td>87,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Allowance</td>
<td>Bridge &amp; Art Wall Lighting</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>22,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Allowance</td>
<td>Gate House Lighting</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Allowance</td>
<td>River House Lighting</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Allowance</td>
<td>Misc. Landscape Lighting</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Allowance</td>
<td>Misc. Sign Lighting</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Park Lighting Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$386,300.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Park Signage</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2'-6&quot;x7&quot; Sign Column</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td><strong>$2,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>6'x6' Cast Bronze History Plaques</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>13,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>8'x8' Cast Bronze Historical City Map</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td><strong>1,500.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Park Signage Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$17,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Park Furnishings</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>8' Aluminum Park Bench</td>
<td>1,300.00</td>
<td><strong>$57,200.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Trash Receptacle</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>River House Swings</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Granite Park Bench</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
<td><strong>4,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Park Furnishings Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$75,200.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Grove Street Improvements</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1*</td>
<td>83,750</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>24' Brick Pavement (cost beyond asphalt)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td><strong>$251,250.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2*</td>
<td>5,560</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>6&quot; Vertical Granite Curb (cost beyond concrete curb)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>11,120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Allowance</td>
<td>Decorative Sign Posts</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Allowance</td>
<td>Tree Protection</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>4' Paverblock Sidewalk</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td><strong>108,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Grove Street Improvements Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$395,370.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Elevated Bike Ramp</strong></th>
<th>Allowance 500.00</th>
<th><strong>$1,000,000</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Subtotal</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>$4,090,415</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>20% Contingency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$818,083</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$4,908,498.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35.
Note:

1. Tampa River Walk Treatment is not included in Estimate
2. Granite Curb and Street Brick may be Obtained from Demolished Streets
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>TOTAL PRICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>$375.00</td>
<td>$19,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Canopy Trees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elm 12'-13'x8'-10'; 2½'-3'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cal. 65 Gal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Irrigation</td>
<td>Allowance</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Irrigation Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Hardscape Furnishings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5' x5' Decorative Tree Grates</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>$15,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Tree Guard</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>10,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>8' Aluminum Bench</td>
<td>1,300.00</td>
<td>7,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Trash Receptacle</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>4' Decorative Paver Sidewalk</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>12' Average Decorative Paver Sidewalk</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>84,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Handicap/Brick Corner Pavement</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>11,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hardscape Furnishings Elements Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$152,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Street Fixtures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20' Street Luminaire</td>
<td>3,700.00</td>
<td>$88,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Allowance</td>
<td>Misc. Signage</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Street Fixtures Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$98,800.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal $278,600.00

20% Contingency $55,720.00

TOTAL $334,320.00

Note:
Misc. Improvements such as Utilities, Curbing, Paving, Striping, Traffic Signalization, etc. are not included in this Estimate.
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SECTION 01000 - PROJECT SUMMARY

A. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1. Tampa Heights Linear park consists of approximately 1.2 miles of bikeway and greenbelt park along proposed expansion of Interstate 275. The park adjoins 3,000 Ln. Ft. of the proposed Grove Street alignment. Grove street involves residential street paving and streetscape improvements. In addition, 2,000 Ln. Ft. of Henderson Street involves urban streetscape improvement.

2. SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS
   a. Land parcel acquisition.
   b. Coordination with F.D.O.T.
   c. Existing site conditions.
   d. Neighborhood concerns.
   e. Tampa River walk design guidelines.
   f. ADA requirements.
   g. Bicycle path standards.
   h. Tampa Parks Department.

SECTION 02150 - TREE PROTECTION

A. PROJECT INCLUDES

1. Protect all trees which are to remain including those on the Drawings, those marked in the field, and those not within the area of construction.

SECTION 02210 - SITE PREPARATION AND EARTHWORK

A. PROJECT INCLUDES

1. Clearing and grubbing.
2. Topsoil stripping and stockpiling.
3. Temporary erosion and sediment control and dust control.
4. Temporary protection of adjacent property, structures, benchmarks, and monuments.

5. Excavation and backfilling for bringing the site, including stormwater basins, roads, drives, building sites, paved areas, and open areas to restoration.


B. QUALITY ASSURANCE

1. Field Engineering.

2. Fill materials.

3. Compaction.

C. PRODUCTS

1. Materials for fill.

SECTION 02510 - WALKWAYS

A. PROJECT INCLUDES

1. Furnish all labor, materials and equipment necessary to complete all walkways, bike ramps and related items shown on the Drawings and specified herein.

B. REFERENCED SPECIFICATIONS

1. All materials and methods of construction shall conform to the requirements of the "Florida Department of Transportation, Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction."

C. SUBMITTALS

1. Prepare sample walkway panel in field for approval.

SECTION 02515 - CONCRETE PAVERS

A. PROJECT INCLUDES

1. Solid units of design, size, color and shapes indicated. All units shall comply with manufacturer’s specifications.
2. Area of work is generally for parkway sidewalks and urban streetscape. Units are intended to be set on a compacted subgrade with sand setting bed. Edges shall be stabilized by being set in a cement mortar mud bed or equivalent.

SECTION 02520 - BRICK PAVING

A. PROJECT INCLUDES

1. Brick pavers as indicated including areas such as:

   Groves street paving, bike path edging and park entrance walks. Street paving shall involve standard stabilization of vehicular road beds. Bricks for Grove Street may come from streets demolished by interstate expansion. Brick for walks shall be the same if adequate amounts exist. If not, a brick of full paver width such as Bickerstaff Woodmold Common (seconds), Red Flash Range, 4"x8"x2 3/8" nominal size shall be used. Walkway bricks are intended to be set over compacted subgrade and sand setting bed. Edge bricks shall be stabilized by setting in a cement mortar mud bed or equivalent. Positive drainage shall occur in all areas.

SECTION 02528 - CURBS

A. PROJECT INCLUDES

1. Use of granite curbs consistent with the neighborhood. If limits are placed on quantities due to costs, concrete curbs could be substituted along Henderson Street. Granite curbing should be re-used from streets demolished by Interstate expansion.

SECTION 02720 - STORM DRAINAGE SYSTEMS

A. PROJECT INCLUDES

1. All storm system requirements as designed in construction documents. Piping shall avoid tree roots. Retention areas, if needed, shall occur under the Interstate and not disrupt the park design.

SECTION 02800 - SITE FURNISHING

A. PROJECT INCLUDES

1. Site furnishings: furnishings selected for design aesthetics required consistency in shapes, textures and colors, as indicated on Drawings.
B. PRODUCTS

1. Benches: Designed for vandal and sleeping resistance and aesthetics.
2. Trash receptacles: Selected for vandal resistance and aesthetics.
3. Tree grates.
4. Tree gavros.
5. Signage.
7. Historic storm map and history plaques to be set in pavement.
8. Wrought iron fencing: Designed for park image along Columbus Drive.
9. Elevated bikeway fencing: Designed for open views, safety and design aesthetics.

SECTION 02847 - TRAFFIC SIGNS

A. PROJECT INCLUDES

1. On Groves Street and Henderson Avenue, traffic signs shall be mounted on posts consistent with the image of the park and streetscape. Select posts similar to dark green iron light standards.

SECTION 02850 - DECORATIVE WATER FEATURES

A. PROJECT INCLUDES

1. Water features at the Riverfront Park and at the Interstate retaining wall where Henderson Avenue ends at Grove Street. Also included may be the improvement of the natural spring existing where Henderson Avenue ends at the Hillsborough River.

Final design of the man-made features shall take into account optimum aesthetics, vandalism, economic operation, safety, and ease of maintenance. Work included will be water service, drainage, pumping, piping electrical, lighting and other items involved in fountain operations.

B. REQUIRED SUBMITTALS

1. Complete shop drawings.
SECTION 02934 - SOLID SODDING

A. PROJECT INCLUDES

1. Solid sodding in areas indicated on Drawings.

B. QUALITY ASSURANCE

1. Comply with restrictions in regard to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and Florida Department of Agriculture.

C. PRODUCTS

1. Grass Sod: St. Augustine 2-inch thickness, live, fresh, uninjured, with soil mat adhering to roots.

2. Fertilizer:
   a. To comply with State laws.
   b. Numerical designations indicate minimum percentages of (1) total nitrogen, (2) available phosphoric acid, and (3) water soluble potash.
   c. Water for Grassing: From approved source.

SECTION 02950 - LANDSCAPE PLANTING

A. PROJECT INCLUDES

1. Furnishing, planting, watering, fertilizing and mulching all plants of the species, size and quality indicated on the Drawings.

B. PRODUCTS

1. General
   a. Definition of nomenclature.
   b. Grade standards and quality as per Florida Department of Agriculture "Grades and Standards for Nursery Plants", Parts 1 and 2.
   c. Size of plants specified are minimum standards.
   d. Plant protection.
2. Plant material designations and definitions:
   a. Balled and burlapped. Natural, biodegradable burlap only.
   b. Container grown plants.

3. Planting Materials
   a. Topsoil:
      (1) Friable loam with 5 percent humus, reasonably free of weeds, subsoil, stones, clods, sticks, roots, pH 6.0 to 7.0.
      (2) Soil testing by laboratory registered by the State.
      (3) Soil preparation: Rototill areas previously compacted over 90 percent.
   b. Fertilizer: Complete balanced blend formula.
   c. Mulch: Shredded cypress, clean, bright, free of weeds, moss, sticks and other debris.
   d. Water: Contractor shall furnish suitable water for irrigation of new plantings during construction.
   e. Stakes and Ties: Contractors responsibility to maintain all plants in a plumb, upright position.

C. GUARANTEE
   1. Plants shall be guaranteed for a minimum of 60 days.

SECTION 02960 - IRRIGATION SYSTEM

A. PROJECT INCLUDES
   1. Installation of complete underground irrigation system.

B. PRODUCTS
   1. Pipe: In 20-foot lengths, clearly marked with manufacturer's name and classification.
      a. Mainline Pipe: PVC Type I, SDR 26, Class 160
b. Lateral Pipe: PVC Type I, SDR 26, Class 160

2. Fittings:
   a. As per specified pipe, with solvent weld or IPS threaded connections, as required.
   b. Fittings and solvent cement and cleaner shall be guaranteed by Contractor and manufacturer as compatible to pipe.

3. Threaded Pipe Connections: Galvanized Schedule 40 or PVC Schedule 80.


5. Gate Valves: 2½ inch and small shall be bronze, double disc wedge type with integral taper seats.

6. Sprinkler Heads:
   a. Rotary Pop Up: Gear driven, 35-40 foot radius at 35-40 psi, with discharge rate of 2.5-5 GPM, in full and part circle.
   b. Rotary Shrub Riser Mounted: Gear driven, 35-40 foot radius at 35-40 psi, with discharge rate of 2.5-5 gpm. Full and part circle with ¾-inch male thread at base.
   c. Spray Sprinklers: Fixed spray for in ground installation.

7. Automatic Control Valves: Electric solenoid operated valves, glob or angle configuration, 24-volt, 60-cycle operation.

8. Valve Box: 9 inch diameter, 10 inch depth.

9. Wire: Type UF, 600 volts, single strand, solid copper with PVC insulation 4/64-inch tick, 14 gauge, red for hot, common wire 24 gauge, white.

10. Sprinkler Control System:
   a. Electromechanical type, capable of automatic or manual operation.
   b. 17 volts minimum AC power input, capable of operating 24-volt AC electric remote control valves.
   c. Each controller station shall have time setting knob.
d. 14-day calendar dial, 24-hour clock dial, with 12 captive hour pins and master on-off switch.

e. All interior parts to be accessible through controller door.

C. GUARANTEE

1. Irrigation System, including parts and labor shall be guaranteed for at least one year.

SECTION 03000 - CONCRETE (SITE WORK)

A. PROJECT INCLUDES

1. All the plain and reinforced concrete work.

B. QUALITY ASSURANCE

1. General: Arrangements for field testing shall be made by the Contractor with the laboratory as selected by the Owner.

2. Compressive tests.

3. Slump tests.

4. Reports.

C. PRODUCTS

1. Cement.

2. Fine aggregate.

3. Coarse aggregate.


5. Admixtures.

6. Membrane curing compound.

7. Expansion joint filler.

8. Separation board.
9. Membrane.

10. Reinforcing steel.

SECTION 03300A - CAST-IN-PLACE CONCRETE

A. PROJECT INCLUDES

1. Plant-Mixed Cast-In-Place Concrete:
   a. Footings, foundations.
   b. Slabs, columns.
   c. Seat wall structure, steps, ramps, bike path.

B. QUALITY ASSURANCE


3. Floor Flatness and Levelness Tolerances.

C. PRODUCTS

1. Concrete design mixes.

2. Formwork.

3. Reinforcing materials.

4. Concrete materials.

5. Concrete admixtures.

6. Auxiliary materials.

SECTION 03410 - ARCHITECTURAL PRECAST CONCRETE

A. PROJECT INCLUDES

1. Architectural Precast Concrete: Plain smooth-faced units.
   a. Plain smooth-faced units.
2. Architectural Precast Concrete Applications:
   a. Balustrades and columns.
   b. Trim units on bridges, seat wall cap, and architectural structures.

B. QUALITY ASSURANCE

1. Standards.
2. Testing.
3. Fabrication and erection tolerance limits.

C. PRODUCTS

1. Design mix.
2. Formwork.
3. Reinforcing materials.
4. Concrete materials.
5. Connection materials.
7. Surface finish.

SECTION 04200 - UNIT MASONRY

A. PROJECT INCLUDES

1. Unit Masonry Construction:
   a. Concrete block bearing walls and columns.
   b. Brick facing on walls, columns and structures.

B. QUALITY ASSURANCE
C. PRODUCTS

1. Concrete masonry units.
2. Brick units.
3. Mortar and grout.

SECTION 05500 - METAL FABRICATIONS

A. PROJECT INCLUDES

1. Metal fabrications for roofs of gatehouse and riverhouse and iron fencing.

B. QUALITY ASSURANCE

1. Design Engineering.

C. PRODUCTS

SECTION 16010 - GENERAL ELECTRICAL

A. PROJECT INCLUDES

1. Furnish and install electrical systems and equipment as defined by the Drawings and architectural outline specifications.
2. Establish and maintain non-essential and essential electrical power and lighting systems as required for this project and in keeping with applicable codes.

SECTION 16525 - EXTERIOR LIGHTING

A. PROJECT INCLUDES

1. Light fixtures, poles and other equipment necessary to furnish lighting as indicated on the Drawings. Lighting shall primarily by H.I.D., metal halide with photocell operation.
2. Light levels should meet the minimum safety standards for street and park activity as recommended by the I.E.S. Lighting Handbook, current edition.
3. Poles shall be cast iron or cast aluminum.
APPENDIX A

List of workshop participants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Invited</th>
<th>Attended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russell Bomar</td>
<td>Russell Bomar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pres.: Tampa Heights Civic Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trisha Willsley</td>
<td>Trisha Willsley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa Heights Civic Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Williams</td>
<td>Bertha Glover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa Height Civic Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertha Glover</td>
<td>Rebecca Clarke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa Height Civic Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Rasmussen</td>
<td>Rebecca Clarke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa Heights Neighborhood Revitalization Alliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Clarke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pres.: Tampa Preservation, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Nelson</td>
<td>Harriet Plyler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Dir.: Tampa Preservation, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harriet Plyler</td>
<td>Joel Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior League</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Jackson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Tampa Parks Dept.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Steir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Tampa Planning Dept.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Baker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation Board of Directors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Ferrell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exec. Dir.: Preservation Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha Sherman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation Board staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOH Design Team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Holaday, Ian Tyndall, Jeff Dix, Chris Nance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TAMPA HEIGHTS LINEAR PARK
WORKSHOP AGENDA

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 31, 1992

10:00 - 10:15  INTRODUCTION/PROJECT BACKGROUND  Jeff Dix
10:15 - 10:30  SITE BRIEFING
               • Site Characteristics/Analysis  Chris Nance
10:30 - 12:30 PROJECT ISSUES
               • Questions and discussion  Ian Tyndall
12:30 - 1:00  LUNCH
1:00 - 2:30  PROJECT BRAINSTORM / SPECULATION SESSION
              • Break into groups with assigned tasks/topics
2:30 - 3:00  WRAP UP
APPENDIX B

Back-up documentation
Historic Tampa/Hillsborough County Preservation Board

May 16, 1990

Mr. James G. Kennedy, P.E.
District Secretary
District 7, FDOT
4950 W. Kennedy Blvd. Suite 500
Tampa, Florida 33609

Re: Tampa Heights Linear Park

Dear Jim,

I am writing to follow up on our discussion of the linear park concept as part of the mitigation for the expansion of the interstate through the historic neighborhood of Tampa Heights. As you know, we have applied for a DER grant (attached) to fund the design development phase of the park design. This grant requires matching funding from other parties with interests in the project. Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) certainly is such an interested party to this project.

In our discussions, of several months ago you agreed that FDOT would provide a $30,000 cash match to the DER grant, should we be awarded it. You had previously committed to provide for reprographic costs and surveyors fees required for the design development phase. It is my understanding the cash grant would come directly through FDOT and that the reprographics and survey costs would be provided through Greiner Engineering's ongoing contract with FDOT. Please acknowledge this agreement, by signing and returning this letter.

We appreciate your support of this project and look forward to working with your office.

Sincerely,

Stephanie E. Ferrell, AIA
Director, Historic Tampa/Hillsborough County Preservation

cc: Dick Combs, Greiner Engineering

James G. Kennedy
April 30, 1992

Ms. Stephanie Ferrell  
President  
Florida Trust for Historic Preservation  
2009 North 18th Street  
Tampa, Florida 33605

Dear Stephanie:

Thank you for the words of support at the 1000 Friends of Florida Transportation and Environment Roundtable in Orlando.

We are trying to make a difference in the transportation development process. Your example of the linear park concept in Tampa is a great result of working to use the planning process to achieve a realistic result instead of simply saying the system is not responsive. The old axiom is true, "the harder I work, the luckier I seem to be."

Again, thanks for the comments.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Ben G. Watts, P.E.  
Secretary

BGW:mbw
April 16, 1993

Stephanie Ferrell
Historic Tampa/Hillsborough
County Preservation Board
2009 North 18th St.
Tampa, FL 33605

Dear Ms. Ferrell:

Subject: Tampa Heights Linear Park

This is a response to a review of preliminary plans for the above project. My comments are based on the drawings received by the city, as well as my attendance of Rich Holiday's (with HOH Associates) presentation at the Tampa Heights Civic Association meeting on January 28, 1993. The following comments have been discussed with Ross Ferlita and the other Parks Department managers.

* We like the concept of landscaping using mostly native trees and ground covers. This will ensure clear unobstructed views through the park.

* We like the concept of Historical Markers. We especially like the idea of embedding such information into the sidewalk. This will ease maintenance and ensure an uncluttered view.

* Good lighting is important. The Parks Department has found that taller more powerful lights are better than shorter pole mounted or bollard fixtures.

* We are concerned that HOH plans show little details on the treatment of the underside of the interstate. In most cases, even so called "shade tolerant" plants will not do well under overpasses. Therefore, we recommend hardscapes or other architectural treatments be considered.