

CHAPTER 8

FUTURE LAND USE ELEMENT

The purpose of this planning element is to designate the future general distribution, location, and extent of the uses of land for housing, business, industry, agriculture, recreation, conservation and other categories of public and private uses of land in Levy County, Florida. This is accomplished by studying the land use plans of adjacent jurisdictions, examining development trends and planned residential development in Levy County, projecting future population growth in non-residential land uses, by performing a land use suitability-capability analysis, and by summarizing the 1985 evaluation and approval of the 1978 land use plan. The plan concludes with land use policies and a future land use map.

Existing Land Use

The following table summarizes the amount of land to be found in the various land use categories for 1978, 1987, and includes projections for the two planning periods: to 1995:, and 2020. The current land use totals are reflected in the Existing Land Use Map: 1987 to be found in the pocket of the back cove of this plan. The Future Land Use Map depicts the location and distribution of land use categories by type and intensity.

TABLE 8-1

ACREAGE OF LAND USES IN LEVY COUNTY BY YEAR

Land Use Acreage	1979 Actual	1987 Actual	1995 Projected	2000 Projected	2010 Projected	2020 Projected
Residential:	18,210	31,168	34,000	36,250	40,250	44,625
Low Density	--	25,869	27,200	29,000	32,200	35,700
Medium Density	--	4,987	5,100	5,438	6,038	6,694
High Density	--	312	1,700	1,812	2,012	2,231
Commercial	500	450	491	524	582	645
Industrial	1,166	1,516	1,656	1,765	1,960	2,174
Agricultural (including silviculture)	176,804	519,007	504,940	502,114	497,008	491,591
Recreation & Open Space	--	665	689	734	815	903
Conservation**	--	118,930	128,930	128,930	128,930	128,930
Public Facilities Public Buildings	31,694	5,394*	5,884	6,273	6,965	7,722
Historic Resources	--	200	200	200	200	200
Vacant	475,794	27,368	27,368	27,368	27,368	27,368
Total	704,158	704,158	704,158	704,158	704,158	704,158

Note: \* Includes Educational, Public buildings and grounds and other public facilities.

\*\* Conservation = +/- 57,000 in public ownership in 1989, including the lower Suwannee and Cedar Key National Wildlife Refuge.

Low Density = No more than 1 dwelling unit per 5 acres.

Medium Density= Between 2 dwelling units per acre and 1 dwelling unit per 5 acres.

High Density = More than 2 dwelling units per acre.

Source: Central Florida Planning and Development Corp., July 1987.

The 1978 data is derived from the 1978 Levy County Comprehensive Plan.

Please note that the existing and projected figures differ from those of the 1978 plan. This is due to the difference in methodologies and the specific land use category definitions used. The following analysis assesses existing land uses, and it is not intended and should not be interpreted as establishing what uses and intensities will be allowed in the future... that is addressed in the action plan.

### Residential Land Use

This category includes land use for residential purposes, including single family, duplex, multi-family structures and group quarters, accessory building [garages, sheds], mobile homes parks and subdivisions. This category does not include RV and recreational campgrounds, hotels, motels, and other transient housing, such as shelters or time-sharing facilities, seasonal units such as hunting or summer cabins, nor farm residences on active farms.

Residences on active farms are shown in the agricultural or conservation land use. Hotels, motels and other transient housing are shown in commercial land use. Campgrounds appear in many other land use categories.

This category has been divided into three sub-classifications: high density residential, medium density residential, and low density residential use. The category of high density residential use includes residences developed at densities over 2 but no more than 4 units per acre and usually features apartments [quadraplex], other multi-family residences and some mobile home parks. Medium density residential uses, include residences developed within the range of less than 2 units per acre and 1 unit per 5 acres. This category features single-family residences built in small-lot subdivisions, mobile home parks and lower density multi-family residences such as duplexes, triplexes, and low-density apartments. Low density residential development includes residences developed at a density of 1 units per 5 acres or less. Most residences in this category are conventional single-family residences, large-lot or estate housing and mobile homes.

### Commercial Land Use

This category includes land used for retail and wholesale trade, offices, hotels, motels, restaurants, service outlets, automobile service stations and repair facilities. Commercial land use in Levy County is described by the following levels of intensity; the central business district with its dense arrangement of professional offices and retail stores; commercial nodes such as shopping centers and highway strip commercial where retail and wholesale trade is clustered and served with access roads providing linkages to nearby arterials and scattered neighborhood businesses such as convenience stores and service stations.

### Industrial Land Use

This category [light industry] includes land used for light manufacturing, wood product processing, warehousing, and storage. Heavy industry consists of the mining operations within the county.

While this land use category is limited in terms of area, 1,116 acres, it is arguably the most intensive land use with the potential of producing significant environmental and economic impacts. To date, the environmental problems have been minimal while the economic value has been substantial.

### Agricultural Land Use

This category includes land used for the production of food and fiber crops and supportive uses; agricultural sales outlets such as farmers markets; silviculture production and harvesting; and land lying fallow which is part of a parcel that is mostly or has previously been agriculturally productive. It also includes single-family residential units which may be developed on agricultural lands which are limited to a density of one unit per ten acres [gross coverage]. Sub-categories of differing densities and intensities have been determined to be impractical and have not been established.

Agricultural land uses account for the greatest amount of acreage in the county— over 500,000 acres. This represents just over 70% of the entire county area. Almost all regions of the county fall within this category. All lands classified as agricultural use are located within unincorporated Levy County. Isolated single-family residences and mobile homes completely surrounded by agricultural uses are also included within this category.

### Recreational Land Use

This category includes land used for neighborhood and community parks, golf courses, spectator sports facilities, and certain pastoral open space areas. The large federal and state parks, inventoried in both the open space and the conservation element are classified as recreation and open space land uses in this element.

Levy County has a total of 665 acres inventoried within the recreational land use category. These areas are scattered throughout the county but are found predominantly around municipalities, with some county facilities located within municipal boundaries.

Typical recreational land uses include outdoor courts and ball diamonds, usually at neighborhood parks, golf courses and playing fields. Such facilities are not included in this category if they are part of an educational institution. In such cases, they will be included in the education, public buildings and grounds and other public facilities land use category.

As discussed in the Recreation and Open Space Element, Levy County enjoys an abundance of natural recreational amenities; therefore, less emphasis has been placed on manmade facilities than typically occur in more urban developed counties.

This location of developed parks and facilities are of immediate importance to the locational patterns of residential development. Golf courses and playing fields serve as buffers between dissimilar land uses are themselves attractors of residential development.

**Conservation Land Use**

Areas designated as conservation land uses include wetlands, some forests, public-managed lands, flood plains, flood prone areas, sinkhole prone areas, and other areas in which valuable natural resources are found. Very little development [limited to low-density single family residences, previously developed when such development was permissible, and silvicultural operations] currently exist in these areas.

This land use classification includes many of the areas designated as pastoral open within the open space inventory in the Recreation and Open Space Element.

**Public Facilities Land Use**

This category has been subdivided into three subcategories; the first is public buildings and grounds which includes city halls, post offices, fire and police stations, libraries, public utilities, the county airport and maintenance yards, educational facilities [elementary , middle and high schools, whether public, parochial or private] and other public facilities [churches, public clubs, health centers, hospitals, and facilities for the care of the aged and infirm].

This category also consists of government buildings, including federal, state, and local offices and storage and maintenance facilities.

**Historic Resources Land Use**

This land use category includes a historic building, archaeological and prehistoric sites which have been designated special protective status by the Board of County Commissions.

This category is comprised of some significant archaeological and historical resources found mostly along the western portion of Levy County. Some famous historical structures are located within Cedar Key. The location and significance of these resources is detailed in Table 8-2 herein. Additional resources of archaeological significance have been discovered throughout Levy County but are not identified to ensure that they would not be disturbed by sight-seers or looters.

TABLE 8-2

**SIGNIFICANT HISTORIC, ARCHEOLOGICAL AND ARCHITECTURAL RESOURCES IN LEVY COUNTY BY LOCATION**

SITE #	SITE NAME	LOCATION
8LV81	Bowlegs Town	T12s, R19E, S4
8LV113	NN [Shipwreck]	T10S, R14E, S29
8LV120	Island Hotel	Cedar Key
8LV121	Sea Horse Key & Lighthouse	T16S, R13E, S12
8LV129	Fort Waccassassa	T11S, R16E, S12
8LV131	Fort Jennings	T13S, R16E, S32
8LV133	Salt Works at Salt Island	T15S, R15E, S18
8LV136	Sea Horse Key Cemetery	T16S, R13E, S12

Source: Florida Department of State, Division of Historic Resources, Bureau of Historic Preservation, June, 1987

Vacant Land

This land use category is utilized only on the existing land use map and in tabular representation of existing land use acreage figures. This category includes vacant and undeveloped acreage. Most of the land in this category consists of lands that are in subdivisions which are platted but not developed; land which formerly contained structures but now have no active use; and some agricultural lands not lying fallow.

Uses Consistent with the County’s Character and Future Land Uses

There are few existing or proposed land uses in Levy County that are inconsistent with the county’s character and future land use plan. Based upon discussions with the Development Department Director, the few non-conformities that do exist are of three types:

- (1) Uses that pre-dated the adoption of the Land Use Plan and the Zoning Ordinance, and which were “grandfathered” and allowed to continue. Examples include salvage yards and bars.
- (2) Residential uses that have been allowed to develop within, or encroach upon, other zoning districts or land uses. An example of the former would be on-going residences permitted within the industrial zoning district

located between Fanning Springs and Chiefland on the west side of U.S. 19. An example of the latter would be residential subdivisions located around a feedlot near Chiefland, where individual wells became polluted with nitrate from landspraying of manure.

(3) Spot commercial zoning along major highways for speculative purposes, or to allow non-highway commercial services to be developed along the arterial system.

The number of these incompatible uses, and the degree of their impact upon the county, is minimal. For this reason, the County Commission at various times has considered and rejected an amortization schedule for non-conforming uses. This policy is expected to remain unchanged; therefore, the action plan for this element and its various goals, objectives and policies will seek to prevent the creation of any additional uses that are inconsistent with the County's character and proposed future land uses.

---

### **Land Use Plans of Adjacent Jurisdictions**

This analysis is intended to supply the information necessary to assure that the land use plan for Levy County is coordinated as much as possible with the plans of cities within Levy County and with adjacent counties.

#### **Chiefland Land Use Plan**

The future land use plan for Chiefland provides for:

- (1) Heavy industry along U.S. 19 south to the city limits and the unincorporated area.
- (2) Commercial development along U.S. 19 north to the city limits and the unincorporated area.
- (3) Residential development along the remainder of the city limits. Most of the residential development is proposed to be low density [less than three dwelling units per acre]. Some high density [over three dwelling units per acre] residential development is proposed along the southeast and northwest boundary with the county.
- (4) A limited amount of public / quasi-public use [for expanded church property] on the eastern boundary near the center of town.

The Chiefland Plan is currently being updated, and no changes are anticipated.

#### **Cedar Key Land Use Plan**

Levy County abuts the Cedar Key city limits along SR 24, around the museum, and around the Cedar Key Airport. Along SR 24, the proposed future land use is high density residential. That portion of the city which is near the museum [south of Hodges Avenue] is proposed for primarily medium density residential development, as is the area of the city near the airport.

Inglis Land Use Plan

The Inglis Land Use Plan provides for commercial strip development along US 19 and SR 40. The balance of the city where it abuts Levy County is proposed for low density.

Fanning Springs Land Use Plan

This plan, which is currently part of the Gilchrist County Plan, was being updated in 1985. Commercial uses are proposed along US 19, limited commercial development is proposed at highway intersections in what currently is unincorporated a Levy County contiguous to the city, and residential uses of relatively low density area proposed for the majority of the remaining urban area. A substantial portion of Suwannee River waterfront is proposed for public use as undeveloped open space.

Williston Land Use Plan

The future land use plan for Williston provides for:

- (1) No industrial development along any boundary with the county.
- (2) High density [over four dwelling units per acre] residential development only along the southeastern boundary with Levy County and extending into a proposed annexation area in East Williston, currently a part of the unincorporated area.
- (3) A water retention area and a five to ten acre neighborhood park east Williston area.
- (4) Low density [below four dwelling units per acre] residential development extending into a “fringe area” of unincorporated Levy County along the west, north, and northeast boundary.

This plan was updated in 1985, and no major changes were made.

Yankeetown Land Use Plan

The future land use plan for Yankeetown generally provides for continued agricultural and forestry uses as a buffer around major portions of the town boundary. Some residential development is proposed along the eastern boundary in the general vicinity of SR 40-A.

Otter Creek Land Use Plan

Levy County prepared the Otter Creek land use plan as Chapter 10 in 1982. Proposed land uses contiguous to unincorporated Levy County are all residential.

Bronson Land Use Plan

Commercial uses are proposed to adjoin the county along US 27-A south and CR-32. The balance of adjacent land uses are agricultural and either low-density or medium-density residential.

Alachua County Land Use Plan

The Alachua County Land Use Plan provides water and agricultural land use along the Levy County boundary. The plan describes the “agricultural” classifications as “agricultural tracts consisting of one or more acres of land.” This definition is important for comparative purposes, as “agricultural” definitions vary widely from county to county.

Marion County Land Use Plan

The Major Development Concept Map indicated “exclusive agriculture” along the Marion-Levy boundary, extending from the Alachua County line south to C-326. From C-326 south and then west, the land use proposed is “transitional agriculture” with a small amount of “exclusive agriculture.” Along the western boundary of Marion County, an “urban development” area includes the Rainbow Lakes Estates residential development, with a transition to agriculture, forestry/recreation, and ultimately an “environmental preservation” area along the Withlacoochee River.

Gilchrist County Land Use Plan

This plan provides an urban plan for the City of Fanning Springs as well as the unincorporated areas. The city plan provides for single-family residential development along the boundary of Levy County, except for US 19 which provides for commercial development.

[The Fanning Springs plan was updated during 1985. See discussion under the heading of Fanning Springs].

Three land uses are proposed along the Gilchrist-Levy boundary. According to the above referenced plan, a “preservation” land use classification has been created specifically to protect the entire region of the county known as Waccasassa Flats.

For the purposed of this study, preservation is defined as no development other than non-intensive agricultural and forestry operations. Since this area is made up of environmentally fragile wetlands and planted and mixed forest, poor and badly drained soils is subject to frequent flooding, it is not rationally suited to any kind of development except certain agricultural and forestry operations which are compatible with the nature of the area. It is also important to note that the Flats contain several species of wildlife and that development in the area would endanger the wildlife and reduce the area’s recreational potential.

Thus no future development is expected in this area and its approximately 10,000 acres are projected to remain in their present state.

A small area of residential development is proposed along the Levy County boundary just south of Trenton. This development would be located in the general area encompassed by routes C-49, C-347, and C-319.

All of the remaining Gilchrist-Levy boundary is proposed for agricultural usage. The previously referenced plan states that:

Currently, the most important and extensive land use in the county is agricultural. This is expected to remain true in the foreseeable future, even though some agricultural acreage will be lost to residential and commercial

development. However, this loss should be small because population growth and resulting development in the county [absolute terms] is projected to be moderate for the next 20 years.

In order to implement the agricultural use policies contained in the county's goals and objectives, agricultural activities, especially intensive feeding operations, should be protected from potentially conflicting land uses through strict enforcement of zoning and subdivision regulations. This protection is necessary because of the importance of productive agricultural activities in the county for the county's economy and to the general welfare of the State.

### **Development Trends and Planned Residential Development**

Major planned developments and the numerous subdivisions located throughout the county can provide an indication of development trends and future population impacts. The major planned developments in Levy County to date consist of one Development of Regional Impact (DRI) and a few other large scale developments with vested rights. The numerous subdivisions included both recorded and unrecorded subdivisions, depending upon the date of plat preparation.

#### **Major Developments**

The Forest Park III DRI was presented to the Board of County Commissioners in 1974. Consisting of 923 lots on 1,460 acres at that time, this development is now being sold in large parcels of five acres or more. This will result in fewer than 300 homes in the site in the future, unless further subdivisions should occur. No other DRIs have been submitted since 1974.

There are several other major developments in the county which are not DRIs, because they predate the DRI legislation and therefore have "vested rights."

#### **Subdivisions**

To assess the development potential contained in existing subdivisions, recorded or unrecorded subdivisions of 40 acres or more have been mapped [see Map 8-1]. This map provides an indication of the intensity and location of proposed developments, and it also provides a useful comparison with other maps which follow and which show limiting factors and provide a suitability analysis.

The existing subdivisions of 40 acres and above contain almost 46,000 residential lots, and cover a total of 35,000 acres.

This represents an increase of 8,000 acres since the 1978 plan was adopted; and, an increase of almost 2,000 lots. Table 8-3 shows all plats, regardless of size, approved between October, 1978 and April, 1985.

Most subdivisions have occurred in the vicinity of Chiefland and Williston. By referring to the map of soil suitability in Chapter 5, the best agricultural lands in Levy County are located in these two area. Thus, there is a developing conflict in north-central Levy County between urban and agricultural land uses.

MAP 8-1

PLATTED AND SUBDIVIDED AREAS

### Historic and Projected Residential Growth

The population growth rate in unincorporated Levy County is low in relation to adjacent counties, and it is somewhat lower than projected in the 1978 Comprehensive Plan. The projected growth rate in that plan was 5% annually.

In the Recreation and Open Space element of the 1978 plan, the unincorporated population was projected to increase from 8,624 persons in 1977, to 11,745 persons in 1990. This would be an annual growth rate of about 3%.

This 1987 plan was projected a total city-plus-county population of 34,000 by 1995. This represents an annual growth rate of 2.5%.

Recent [last one-half of 1984] final inspection data show that on an annual basis, the county-wide rate is 564 homes per year. 1/ This represents an annual demand for approximately 1,800 acres. 2/ With reference back to Table 3-25 in the housing element, the use of more conservative population projections indicated that by the end of the initial planning period in 1995, residential land use in Levy County will increase to 34,000 acres. This represents an annual demand for only 295 acres. Over 75% of the new homes are located in unincorporated areas of the county.

#### Out-migration

No records are available on out-migration from Levy County. For this reason, final inspection data alone will over-estimate increases in population and land use. An indicator of out-migration is the labor force size, which normally increases steadily. A decrease in labor force size, as occurs during a recession, can be an indicator of out-migration.

#### Conclusions

A sustained population growth rate of at least 2% annually is expected in Levy County. Most of this growth will be in the unincorporated area, converting about 300 acres per year to residential use.

### Nonresidential Projections

Commercial, industrial, public/quasi-public, recreational and agricultural uses are expected to change in Levy County at a rate dependent upon population growth, the overall economy, and government decisions. In the following projections, changes are based primarily upon population growth.

-----  
1/ Source: Withlacoochee Regional Planning Council, June 1985. Biannual Completion Data.

2/ 5,240 divided by 1912 homes = 2.7 acres per home, exclusive of Type II subdivisions. If Type II subdivisions are included, the average lot size in Levy County is 3.25 acres, which times 564 units per year equals about 1800 acres annually.

TABLE 8-3

**NEW SUBDIVISIONS IN LEVY COUNTY**  
Levy County Plats Since October, 1978 Through August, 1983

A TYPE II

	<u>Plat Name</u>	<u># LOTS</u>	<u>ACRES +/-</u>
1.	Schwartz	8	72
2.	Markham	8	80
3.	Haven	9	90
4.	6/11/15	7	65
5.	Blackwell	4	40
6.	Harpers Acres	11	110
7.	Wynne	14	163
8.	Bonable Acres	15	170
9.	Gilreath	6	60
10.	Shamrock Unit 1	47	470
11.	Shamrock Unit 2	43	430
12.	Shamrock Unit 3	45	450
13.	Aztec Acres	10	120
14.	Lake Bonable Estate	49	500
15.	Randle	49	500
16.	Inguna Hills	16	160
17.	Bahia Farms	10	100
18.	Le-Mar Ranchettes	42	420
19.	Morgan	10	100
20.	Chris Acres	10	100
21.	Bronson Hill Estate	7	70
22.	S and H Farms	18	180
23.	Victoria Oaks	10	100
24.	Johnson	6	60
25.	Southwood Pines	10	100
26.	Dorset Hills	64	640
		528 (Lots)	5,350 (Acres)
	TYPE II		

TABLE 8-3 [CONTINUED]

## NEW SUBDIVISIONS IN LEVY COUNTY

Levy County Plats Since October, 1978 Through August, 1983

B CONVENTIONAL		OCTOBER '78	THROUGH '83
<u># PM</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>LOTS</u>	<u>ACRES</u>
5-71	Emerald Highlands Unit1	32	200
5-72	Fannin Forest	22	66
5-73	Shady Lane	8	40
5-74	Florian Heights Unit 2	14	100
6-1	Cal-A-Bet Meadows	16	50
6-2	Carson Development	8	8
6-3	Lynn Oaks	16	64
6-4	Florian Heights Unit 3	16	80
6-5	Newsome [Replat] Estates	16	80
6-6	Seminole Forest	24	120
6-7	Chiefland Wood Unit 1	23	120
6-8	Forest Park Unit 3 Phase 1	147	640
6-12	Hideaway Unit 3	80	20
6-13	Mary-Ann Farms	12	45
6-14	Williston Highlands Unit 15	3	2
6-16	Cedar Key Plantation	106	40
6-17	Forest Park Unit 3 Phase II	118	640
6-20	Robin Run	9	45
6-21	Florian Heights Unit 4	5	25
6-22	Rocky Hammocks Oaks	8	40
6-23	Levy Estates	9	45
6-24	Fox Run	24	30
6-25	Ogle Oaks	7	32

---

6-26	Cedar Key Shores Unit 6A	13	12
6-27	Cedar Key Shores Unit 6B	19	20
6-28	Cedar Key Shores Unit 7	18	20
6-29	Lynn Oaks Unit 2	12	60
6-30	High Meadows	12	60
6-31	Eastern Acres	32	30
6-32	Quail Run	20	20
6-33	Bronson Oaks	30	30
6-34	Still Wood Estates	6	6
6-35	Little Fanning	49	50
6-36	Boogie Ridge	13	12
6-37	Nancy Acres	14	3
6-38	University Oaks Manor	56	30
6-39	Westview	7	2
6-40	Southern Oaks	8	40
6-41	Graceland Shores Replat	5	2
6-43	Cedar Mobile Home Paradise	71	80
6-44	Pinewood Estates	16	20
6-45	Fort Fannin	33	60
6-46	Rustling Pines	24	30
6-47	Pinewood Unit 2	17	8
6-48	Old 19 Hammock	6	14
6-49	Fox Run 1st Addition	6	7
6-50	Saxon Meadows	5	19
6-51	Cherokee Hammock	15	10
6-52	Laurelwood	10	10
6-53	Kennedy Estates	8	16
6-54	Dear Run	20	75

**Levy County Comprehensive Plan****Data & Analysis**

---

6-55	Small Ranch Subdivision	5	50
6-56	Small Ranch Subdivision	6	52
		<hr/>	
Total 1978 - 1983		1,279	3,380

TABLE 8-3 (CONTINUED)

## NEW SUBDIVISIONS IN LEVY COUNTY

April, 1978 Through August 12, 1987

<u># PB</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>LOTS</u>	<u>ACRES</u>
7-23	Suwannee Meadows	14	80
7-24	Meadowview Estates	15	36
7-25	Meadowview Estates Unit 1	16	18
7-26	North Star Ranchettes	15	74
7-27	Long Pond Landing	36	36
7-28	Long Pond Landing Add. 2	15	75
7-29	Long Pond Landing Add. 1	54	60
7-30	Country Acres	10	10
7-31,32	Spanish Trace	100	100
7-33,34	Spanish Trace Add. # 1	33	165
7-35	Arrowhead Acres	8	40
7-36	King B Ranchettes Add. # 1	12	60
7-38	Whispering Oaks Unit 2	37	185
7-39	Cedar Pines Unit 2	13	65
7-40	Countryside Estates	24	120
7-42	Country Walk Estates, Unit 1	6	6
7-43	Gin Mar-Farms [Replat]	4	4
7-44	Country Walk Estates, Unit 2	14	70
7-45	Emerald Forest	32	160
7-46	Shady Acres	8	40
7-47	Loumar Estates	8	40
7-48	Starwood Acres Unit 1	10	74
7-49	Country Pines	10	74
7-50	Park Avenue	7	13

<u># PB</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>LOTS</u>	<u>ACRES</u>
7-51	Enchanted Forest	26	32
7-52	King's Hill	16	64
7-53	Sunshine Estates 2nd Add.	23	23
7-54	Waccassassa Oaks	6	19
7-55	Long Pond View	11	33
7-56,57	Deer River Estates	45	45
7-58	Meadowland River Acres	6	37
7-59	Wacasassa River Acres	12	60
7-60	B. J. Simpson Subdivision Add. 1	11	60
7-61	Rolling Ridge	7	7
7-62	Sunshine Estates 3rd Add.	11	55
7-63	Crystal Subdivision	7	35
7-64	Diamond Estates	10	10
Total 1985-1987		697	2,081
Total 1978-1987		2,409	7,321

Commercial

There were approximately .02 commercial acres per person in Levy County in 1978 [500 acres/18,000 persons]. This factor, multiplied by the projected 1995 population of 33,000 persons, yields a 1995 commercial acreage of 660 acres.

Industrial

During the third quarter of 1977, there were about 2,250 industrial employees in Levy County. During this same period, the labor force totaled about 6,800 persons in a total population of 12,756 persons county-wide. The labor force participation rate, therefore, was 53%, or which 33% were employed by industry.

To develop an estimate of future industrial acreage needed, it is assumed that the industrial acreage will remain proportional with state population. Therefore, the population of 11,976,843 times .00013 yields 1,557 industrial acres by 1995.

### Public/Quasi-Public

The major causes for increased public ownerships in Levy County are expected to be new subdivision roads, utility right-of-ways, and the possible expansion of the turnpike. Increases in school site acres are expected, at least within the next five or six years. Also, the county is presently in the process of searching for the future site of the Department of Corrections Forestry Camp.

### Agricultural

Although there has been some reduction in farm acreages during the past few years, the rate of projected loss will be somewhat lower than Table 8-1 indicates because some development will occur within municipalities. Also, other land use categories, such as conservation and vacant, will decrease in acreage.

Approximately 85% of the acreage needed for other land uses will come from this category. However, any development of prime agricultural acres shall be discouraged.

### Recreation

Table 8-1 indicates that there are currently 93,149 acres for recreation use in the county. However, the acreage consists primarily of resource-based type recreation. There continues to be a need for activity-based type recreation which offers activities such as basketball, tennis, baseball, etc.

To develop an estimate of future recreation acreage, the need analysis for recreation facilities set in the Recreation and Open Space Element of this updated comprehensive plan was used.

### Conservation

This category will primarily be converted to historic or natural resource use, where resource protection is warranted. Therefore, this land use might decrease, but at a very slow rate.

### Historic Resources

Historic resources are important features that humans left in Levy County. They mark the progress of humanity, recount history, and provide interesting and educational experiences. Such places and structures must be protected and preserved for future generations. Table 8-4 lists sites now classified as having significant historic value and worthy of protection. Currently, there are no new designated sites to add to existing acreage.

TABLE 8-4

**HISTORIC STRUCTURES IN LEVY COUNTY**

SITE #	SITE NAME	LOCATION
8LV81	Bowlegs Town	T12S, R19E, S4
8LV113	NN [Shipwreck]	T10S, 9
8LV120	Island Hotel	Cedar Key
8LV121	Sea Horse Key & Lighthouse	T16S, R13E, S12
8LV129	Fort Waccassassa	T11S, R16E, S12
8LV131	Fort Jennings	T13S, R16E, S32
8LV133	Salt Works at Salt Island	T15S, R15E, S18
8LV136	Sea Horse Key Cemetery	T16S, R13E, S12

Source: Florida Department of State, Division of Historical Resources, Bureau of Historic Preservation, June, 1987.

**Public Participation**

In preparing this 1987 plan update, two potentially controversial issues were identified by the Development Department. There were agricultural land use and strip commercial development. These issues were discussed and debated at length as follows:

**July 26, 1984**

First Planning Commission workshop on the plan update.

**August 27, 1984**

First public hearing on land use regulation.

**October 1, 1984**

Second public hearing on land use regulation.

**January 14, 1985**

Third public hearing to discuss the Evaluation and Appraisal report, including:

(1) Progress made to date

- (2) Comments and objections from the state and region.
- (3) Public comments.

March 25, 1985

Extension Office public meeting at the Levy County Agricultural Center to discuss:

- (1) 5-acre minimum lot sizes
- (2) Alternatives, such as planned unit developments
- (3) Transfer of development rights.

**Limiting Factors**

The following factors are limitations upon development and should be taken into consideration in the development of a future land use plan: 1) flood-prone areas, 2) suitability of soils for septic tanks, 3) prime agricultural land, 4) conservation and recreation areas, and 5) coastal areas.

Flood-prone Areas

The Federal Flood Insurance [FFI] Program has identified and mapped on a preliminary basis all areas within Levy County which are located within the 100-Year Floodplain. In the future [following detailed engineering studies], all structures constructed within this area must be elevated and flood proofed to comply with FFI regulations. A large portion of Levy County lies within flood prone areas. This represents a severe limitation upon development.

These areas should be limited to low density residential development and all non-conforming existing uses should be amortized over a period of time.

Septic Tanks

Generally, all development within the county will require septic tanks, as central sewage disposal systems are not provided by Levy County. Favorable soil properties are necessary for septic tank absorption fields to function properly. The Soil Conservation Service [SCS] has mapped soils within Levy County and classified the degree of soil limitation for septic tanks into three categories:

\_\_\_\_\_ Slight. Soil properties are generally favorable for development with very few limitations.

\_\_\_\_\_ Moderate: Soil properties are unfavorable for development but limitation can be overcome by special planning and design.

\_\_\_\_\_ Severe: Soil properties are so unfavorable that major soil reclamation would have to be done for development to occur.

### The Conservative Lands Issue

By definition herein, “conservation lands” include all environmentally sensitive lands as designated by Policy 3.1 of the Levy County Comprehensive Plan, Chapter 5, Conservation; they include all areas determined to have limitations for septic tanks, limitations due to flooding, or any other natural constraint; and they include all public lands in the coastal zone. The intent of this section is to assess the density or intensity of development that can occur in conservation areas without adversely affecting natural resources. Agricultural lands used for crops or pasture are addressed as a separate major issue area; therefore, they are excluded from the dissertation which follows.

#### Prime Agricultural Lands

The SCS is updating the maps of the prime agricultural areas within Levy County. These areas represent a theoretical limitation upon development... but only if the conservation of agricultural land uses is viewed as being incompatible with residential development.

#### Conservation and Recreation

There are a number of scenic and/or natural resources within Levy County that represent limitations upon development. Aesthetically pleasing, unique, natural resources must be reserved for conservation and recreation because they enhance the quality of life of residents and visitors to Levy County. These natural resources include rivers, bays, springs, and wildlife management areas.

Rivers. The Levy County River Protection Law prohibits unsightly construction and destruction of vegetation within 50 feet of the Suwannee, Withlacoochee, Waccasassa Rivers, and their tributaries. The intent of the ordinance is to preserve the scenic beauty of the county’s rivers by limiting development along their shores. [In 1989, the Cedar Key Oysterman’s Association requested a 150 foot setback].

Bays. The Waccasassa and Withlacoochee Bays, located off the coast of Levy County, contain some of the most productive oyster beds along the Western Florida coast. Development along these bays should be limited to ensure that these valuable resources are protected.

Springs. Several springs are located within the county. These springs serve as links between the Floridan Aquifer and county’s rivers. There are unusual swimming and recreation areas that should be preserved for the benefit of present and future citizens of Levy County.

Wildlife Management Areas. The Gulf Hammock Wildlife Management Area lies within the boundaries of Levy County. Although privately owned, this area is designated as a conservation and preservation area and is a limitation upon development.

State Preserves. The Waccasassa Bay State Preserve is located between Cedar Key and Yankeetown. Development is restricted from this area.

### Public Lands

Levy County has no authority over non-county public lands. Each federal, state, or regional agency which has regulatory jurisdiction over their public lands develops and adopts a management plan, and that plan is what determines the location, timing and intensity of land use.

Refuges. Development in a refuge area needs to be limited to that which is essential for public access [of a generally passive, non-disruptive nature], research and practices essential to habitat management; i.e. below 1% of the refuge area..

County Lands. In areas contiguous to refuges, the use needs to be restricted to primitive camping and hiking, with zero land coverage. Some other county lands, such as the Yankeetown, Henry Beck and Blue Springs parks, need to be [and they are] developed according to an approved site plan, which provides for resource-based recreational opportunities. Development needs to be limited to access, erosion control, unpaved parking and sanitation facilities.

The Cedar Key airport is a politically sensitive issue, but that airport location is in a coastal high hazard area within which the investment of additional public monies for infrastructure would violate Chapter 163, Florida Statutes. If an alternative site could be developed on the mainland, and if acquisition terms do not preclude uses other than an airport, then a different and less intense use would be appropriate.

### Areas With Flooding Limitations

Levy County experiences three types of flooding... coastal, riverine and localized. Each such area presents differing needs in terms of conserving the environment, conserving human lives and property, and in terms of intensity of development that may occur without damaging natural resources.

Coastal Flooding. There are two types of coastal floodprone areas... a velocity zone subject to both a high storm surge and wave action, and a non-velocity zone with decreasing flood elevations in proportion to distance inland. The State of Florida permitted the subdivision and platting of Atsena Otie Key in 1989, portions of which are within the velocity zone and portions of which are not. There remain a number of small islands along the Levy County coastline that are undeveloped; however, the remainder of the coastline is already in public ownership except for Cedar Key, which is already developed and platted. No development should be permitted in unplatted lands located within the velocity zone, except that one dwelling unit per parcel of record in 1989 should be permitted so as to allow each owner a reasonable use of their property. As defined here, a "parcel of record" is one which is shown on the Levy County Property Appraiser's maps and/or which is recorded in the Official Plat Books of Levy County. Unrecorded plats and unapproved but recorded plats are specifically excluded from the definition above.

Within the non-velocity coastal flooding area, the threat of damage to natural resources by development, and the threat to development by flooding, is relatively lower. In these areas, virtually all of which are commercial forests, development at a density of one dwelling unit per twenty [20] acres would be acceptable provided the following conditions are met:

- (1) All structures must be elevated with the first floor at or above the 100-year flood elevation.

(2) All lands which are both flood prone and designated an “environmentally sensitive” as defined by this plan should be left undisturbed or the disruption should be mitigated to protect their natural functions.

(3) All roads for ingress and egress should be elevated at or above the 100-year flood to allow evacuation in an emergency.

Riverine Flooding. Flash floods do not and cannot occur in Levy County along the Suwannee and Withlacoochee Rivers. Flash floods can occur along the Waccassassa River, and they did occur in 1988 when 16 inches of rainfall occurred in 24 hours. Only one property was damaged, and no homes were destroyed.

#### Areas With Septic Tank Limitations

As noted within Chapter 7 of this plan, there are two conflicting soils maps and interpretations available in 1989, with the conflict resolution to occur in 1990 with the availability of new maps and interpretations as prepared by the Soil Conservation Service. Regardless of which map is used, either one shows very extensive areas which have limitations for septic tanks. The major threat posed by septic tanks is to the coastal estuaries in general, and to shellfish [and indirectly, humans] in particular. A secondary threat from septic tanks exists where percolation rates are too rapid and/or the potable groundwater aquifer is too close to the surface, thereby creating the potential for groundwater contamination.

For these reasons, and to assure that natural resources are not damaged by development that is too intense, the following standards need to apply to areas with septic tank limitations.

(1) In flood prone areas along the Suwannee and Withlacoochee River, which contain no other conservation areas and their associated limitations, rural residential and commercial development can be allowed at septic tank densities equivalent to ten [10] acres per dwelling unit, with first floor elevations at or above the 100 year flood level.

(2) Along the Waccassassa River, as shown on the Future Land Use Map, residential development should be limited to an intensity comparable to that allowed for commercial forest/rural residential areas, with first floor elevations at or above the 100-year flood level.

Localized Flooding. This type of flooding usually results in areas contiguous to, as well as inside of or part of, wetlands. Development in areas of localized flooding will usually not adversely affect natural resources, provided that incompatible land uses are not created [i.e. residences surrounded by commercial forest lands]; provided that access, wastewater treatment and stormwater runoff are properly constructed and maintained; and, provided that only upland sites are developed. Because of these facts, and because there are no fast moving waters or wave action, development within areas of localized flooding can occur with flood protection measures, with relatively low densities. Based upon this analysis, each parcel to be developed should contain a usable upland area equal to the minimum lot area required for non-flood prone lots in the same zoning district.

#### The Agricultural Lands Issue

Map 8-2 shows the location of agricultural land uses in Levy County as they existed in 1972. For comparative purposes, reference back to Map 8-1 indicated the developing conflict between subdivisions and agricultural land use... both are taking place in the same areas.

The 1984-1985 Levy County Evaluation and Appraisal Report states that: “Most of the land designated as having high potential for agriculture use is currently zoned A-2. This district allows subdivision into 5-acre parcels. Since virtually no commercial farming operation can be economically viable at a size of five [or even ten] acres, it is doubtful that the present zoning will serve to preserve a viable agricultural economy in Levy County. In fact, unless revised, the present zoning ordinance virtually assures that eventually all agricultural lands in Levy County will be converted to residential use.

The 1978 Comprehensive Plan recommended some changes in zoning which have not been implemented. Examples include the adoption of a revised zoning map for agricultural areas to the south of Chiefland, and discouraging residential subdivisions in primarily agricultural areas. During the plan evaluation process, the issue of future agricultural land use in Levy County needs to be resolved, with plan policies reflecting those which actually will be implemented by the County Commission.

A “Part 5, the Foundations of Agricultural Conservation Through Land Use Planning and Regulatory Controls in Levy County” was included within the above-referenced evaluation and appraisal report. This report was prepared as a part of the background information and data base for updating the 1978 Levy County Comprehensive Plan. It provided an overview of agricultural land use trends from the National Agricultural Lands Study; an assessment of agricultural lands in Florida; and assessment of Legal Foundations for both planning and zoning; an assessment of the basis for the existing and previous Levy County land use policies, proposals for strengthening the agricultural land use policies of Levy County as part of the comprehensive plan update in 1984, and proposals for strengthening the major plan implementation tool, the zoning ordinance.

The sections which follow are reprinted directly from the report, to document for the record exactly how the agricultural land issue has been considered by Levy County.

#### National Agricultural Lands Study (NALS)1/

This 1981 report consists of several volumes, which together represent the most comprehensive study of agricultural lands in the history of the nation. As described in the sections which follow, this country is faced with an impending crisis in agriculture... from the conversion of prime agricultural lands to non-agricultural use. In most cases, the loss is irreversible.

#### Urban Sprawl

Migration to rural areas is, from the executive summary of the NALS, the primary reason for the loss of agricultural lands. This has been compounded by the spread of suburbs into rural areas.

#### Federal Programs

The NALS identified about 90 programs that contribute to the conversion of agricultural land. Primarily, these include the programs administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development [HUD] and the Farmers Home Administration.

The South

The NALS noted that “states and local governments in the south have done less to protect agricultural land than any other region.”

Florida Trends

From 1967 to 1977, Florida lost [through conversion] about 3,470,000 acres of agricultural lands. The NALS estimates that Florida has 1,471,000 acres of prime farmland, of which 404,000 are devoted to cropland use.

Definitions

The NALS contains the following definitions:

Agricultural Lands. Lands currently used to produce agricultural commodities or lands that have potential for such production.

Prime Farmland. The best land for farming. Prime acres are flat or gently rolling and susceptible to little or no soil erosion. They are our most energy-efficient acres, producing the most food, feed, fiber, forage, and oilseed crops with the least amount of fuel, fertilizer, and labor. Their soil quality, growing season and moisture supply assure continuous, high productivity without degrading the environment. Prime farmland includes cropland, pastureland, range and forest lands. It does not include land converted to urban, industrial, transportation, or water.

**TABLE 8-5**

**CONSERVATION AREA DENSITY STANDARDS FOR LEVY COUNTY, FLORIDA**

Location	Availability of Services*		
	No Central Services	Central Water With Septic Tanks	Central Water and Central Sewer
10 Year Flood	1 Unit/20 acres No septic systems allowed	1 Unit/10 acres No septic systems allowed	1 Unit/acre
100 Year Flood	1 Unit/20 acres Soils analysis required	1 Unit/acre Soils analysis required	2 Units/acre
No Flood**	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable

\* With the exception of Fowlers Bluff, which contains an unincorporated community water system, all other areas under the jurisdiction of the Board of Levy County Commissioners may be provided with central water or central sewer only by and incorporated city or town, a special district or a municipal service district.

\*\* Conservation areas in Levy County extend landward to the landward extent of the 100-year flood zone; therefore, by definition there are no conservation areas that are not floodprone.

-----  
1/ See Map V-1, 1978 Levy County Comprehensive Plan.

1/ January 17, 1981. Superintendent of Documents, US Printing Office, Washington, DC, 20402.

Transfer of Development Rights (TDR)

The NALS provides in the Guidebook 1/ (p.174) a discussion of how TDR has been used in various areas. Because of the high potential for this land use control technique to be utilized in Levy County, TDR will be presented in a separate section [Implementation] this report.

#### Agricultural Lands In Florida

This is a topic addressed in a legislative staff report in 1981.<sup>2/</sup> The sections which follow were taken from that report.

Prime Lands in Florida. In 1958, Florida had 2,056,000 acres of “prime” farmland. This decreased by 31% to 1,417,000 acres in 1977. Florida has the smallest amount of prime land in the southeastern United States yet the largest percentage of loss to non-agricultural use.

Definitions. This report used the preceding definition from the NALS.

Acreage in Levy County. <sup>3/</sup>The 1977 estimate for Levy County was 20,355 acres of prime farmland. No lands in Levy County are currently designated as being “unique”, i.e. used for the production of specific high-value food and fiber crops such as citrus, avocados, vegetables and strawberries. Based upon this report, any acreage in Levy County which is now used for lettuce, cabbage, radish, celery, carrots, eggplant, squash, sweet corn, tomatoes, peas, snap beans, pole beans, lima beans, cucumbers, peppers, escarole, and potatoes has the potential for being designated as unique farmland.

Preservation Techniques. The agricultural lands report contains definitions for the following preservation techniques:

- (1) Comprehensive Planning
- (2) Agricultural Zoning
- (3) Agricultural Redistricting
- (4) Purchase of Development Rights
- (5) Transfer of Development Rights
- (6) Differential Assessment
- (7) Development Permit System
- (8) Right to Farm

These various techniques will be described later in this report. As for the agricultural lands report, it states that what is being done at the [Levy] county level to preserve agricultural land is: “Special Zoning; moratorium on subdivision development has been withdrawn.”

- 
- 1/ The Protection of Farmland; A Reference Guidebook for State and Local Governments. National Agricultural Lands Study. Superintendent of Documents, Washington, DC.
  - 2/ Florida House Representatives, Committee on Agriculture and General Legislation, Agricultural Lands in Florida.
  - 3/ Ibid p.18.

Summary: The following are excerpts from the agricultural lands report:

- (1) “So, the loss of any acreage from Florida’s small prime land base could be considered critical and the loss of some unique land might be.”
- (2) “Any type of preservation technique under consideration would call for very different decisions to be made by diverse elements with conflicting interests.”
- (3) “Federal farm programs— have not served the— function of keeping lands in agriculture when development pressures escalate.”
- (4) “- Florida’s land use assessment law— does not function as an agricultural land retention technique.”
- (5) “- traditional land zoning measures used by most local governments are subject to pressures for zoning variances that sometimes affect existing agricultural operations.”
- (6) “- the most pressing concern should be in nurturing local resolutions to the problems of agricultural land loss in Florida.”

#### Regional Guidelines

The Northeast Florida Regional Planning Council has published a Farmland Retention Guide which serves as an excellent reference service. 1/ Key excerpts from the Guide are presented in the following sections.

Large Minimum Lot Ordinances. Under this approach, the lot size requirement is intended to deter, by cost, the construction of most non-farm dwellings. Generally, the minimum size is related to the typical size of commercial farms in the jurisdiction.

The minimum lot size serves to provide a piece of land which is 1) not too small for profitable farm operation and 2) large enough to deter rural subdivision activity. Too small a minimum acreage would result in more, rather than less, land being taken out of agricultural use because it simply spreads out new development.

Fixed Area-Based Allocation Ordinances. These allow owners to build one house for each unit of land of a specified area that they own. They can be clustered on one part of the farm, having the rest relatively far removed from potentially conflicting residential uses.

While the allocation sets the maximum number of dwellings authorized for each unit of area in the agricultural zone, some counties add further restrictions which reduce this basic allocation. The restrictions Rice County, Minnesota, adds to its basic one dwelling unit per quarter/quarter section are:

-----

1/ Northeast Florida Regional Planning Council. Rural Growth Management and Farmland Retention Guide. 1981.

- (1) No more than 4 non-farm dwellings per mile on one side of a public road;
- (2) No non-farm dwellings permitted on land which has been tilled in the last five years and has Class I, II, or III soils;
- (3) No dwellings permitted in poorly drained areas;
- (4) No dwellings permitted on land with a slope of 12% or greater unless accompanied by proper engineering plans;
- (5) No dwellings permitted which would require a new public street, and
- (6) No dwellings which do not meet the requisite health and sanitary standards.

Standards for Rezoning. If a community fails to develop and apply adequate criteria for rezoning, the protection accorded to agricultural activities may be reduced or lost. Eight categories cover most of the formal criteria which are used to make rezoning determinations:

- (1) Farmability of parcel.
- (2) Proximity to established non-farm population.
- (3) Conformity with Comprehensive Plan.
- (4) Compatibility with surrounding uses.
- (5) Availability of public service.
- (6) Environmental impact.
- (7) Distance to feedlot.
- (8) Industrial expansion.

Draft Ordinance Transfer of Development Rights. Appendix B of the Farmland Retention Guide contains a draft TDR ordinance as developed by Palm Beach County, Florida.

#### Legal Foundation

The foundations for agricultural conservation are established through Florida Law and the previously adopted Levy County Comprehensive Plan(s).

Florida Law. Chapter 163, Florida Statutes, mandates the adoption and implementation of a comprehensive plan by each political jurisdiction. Section 163.3177(6)(a) requires a future land use element designating, among others uses, the : “proposed future general location and extent of the uses of land for agriculture.”

Levy County Comprehensive Plans. The first comprehensive plans was prepared and adopted in 1974. The second and (then) current comprehensive plan was prepared and adopted in 1978.

- (1) The 1974 Plan. A copy of the Preferred Concept Plan from the 1974 Plan is found on the following page. This plan showed three farm areas as follows:

1. Northeast of Chiefland
2. North of Williston
3. South of Williston

Excerpts from the narrative include:

(p.16) General farming and forestry uses are proposed for areas designated for farming. Single-family homes should be permitted as accessory uses on lots of a minimum of five (5) acres (emphasis added).

(p.13 of Background Report) Forestry and farming activities have been summarized previously in this report. These activities are dependent upon the excellent soil resources in the County which are well drained to moderately well drained in the Chiefland and Williston areas according to the US Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service.

(p.25 of Background Report) Farming, especially cattle, peanuts, watermelons will continue to play an important role in the County. The equally important forest industry together with the urban development puts pressure on the farms which now experience difficulties in expanding. A proper balance has to be found between these major expansion demands.

(p. 26 of Background Report) Farming and agricultural activities, in general, are important to the County as both an employment and food source.

(2) The 1978 Plan. Areas proposed for future agricultural land use in the 1978 Plan were arrived at through a detailed suitability analysis. Copies of relevant maps which were utilized to illustrate various land use criteria are found at the end of this chapter. Limiting factors considered included flood prone areas (Map 8-5), soils limitation for septic tanks (Map 8-6), and a suitability analysis which incorporated the flood prone and septic tank maps along with suitability for development and agriculture.

The suitability analysis formed the basis for the future land use map which was adopted as a part of the comprehensive plan. Unlike some other counties, Levy County has clearly defined areas which can be identified as prime agricultural, as well as areas which can be identified as highly suitable for development.

The 1978 Plan adopted (on page 8-34) agricultural alternative 'B' from page 8-32, to: "Discourage residential subdivision". The adopted policy states: "Residential subdivisions will be discouraged in areas proposed for primarily agricultural land uses."

Examples of implementation techniques proposed under alternative 'B' included:

1. Increase the area proposed for agricultural use.
2. Increase minimum lot sizes.
3. Require paved roads in all subdivisions.
4. Adopt TDR ordinance for agricultural areas.

For the record, several other alternatives were considered in the 1978 plan. These included:

- A. Generally prohibit residential subdivisions. Example: allow only PUDs.
- B. Allow, but do not encourage or discourage residential subdivisions.
- C. Encourage residential subdivisions. Example: decrease minimum lot size. Decrease size of area proposed for agricultural use. Relax development standards.

Problems. As noted in Chapter 8 of Part 4 of the 1984 Evaluation and Appraisal Report, the existing policy needs to be revised. This is due to the fact that the existing implementation (zoning) does not assure that commercial agriculture will continue in Levy County.

Conclusion. Levy County has a history (since 1974) of land use planning which predates state-mandated planning (1975) and now covers a ten-year period. During that time, the elected officials have consistently recognized that prime agricultural areas need to be protected. The only changes have been in quantity (how much farmland to protect), location (slight differences between the two plans), and implementation techniques.

If it is generally agreed that our agricultural base should be conserved in the public interest, and that the existing zoning ordinance inadequately implements a poorly defined agricultural conservation policy, then the first step needed is to modify and improve the comprehensive plan agricultural land use policies. This is proposed in the section which follows.

(Author's Note: During 1984 and 1985, the Levy County Planning Commission, meeting first as a separate body, and then in joint workshops with elected officials, reviewed the preceding report, as well as other supplemental data. Those meetings have already been listed under the section entitled "public Participation." The section which follows documents some of the additional land use regulatory matters that were considered during that time).

#### Agricultural Issues and Alternatives Considered During 1985

During March and April of 1985, the Levy County Planning Commission was presented with, and it considered a variety of agricultural issues. The intent was to discuss each issue in depth, and to determine whether or not a consensus could be reached, with Planning Commission findings to be transmitted to the elected officials. The issues discussed included the following, in the form of statements.

1. Levy County has an agricultural portion of our economic base which is important to the county, and which should be sustained in the public interest.
2. Levy County has agricultural soil types which, relative to others, are highly suitable or moderately suitable for one or more agricultural uses. There are important agricultural lands.
3. "Important" agricultural lands should be conserved by discouraging residential subdivisions on them and by encouraging residential development on lands which are not designated as important.
4. The PUD and TDR concepts should be considered as voluntary alternatives to conventional

residential subdivisions in important agricultural areas.

5. A subdivision of 5-acre lots in an important agricultural (A-2) zone should either:
  - (a) require rezoning to a new rural residential category, or,
  - (b) be allowed as a matter of right.
6. Any land which is currently zone for A-2 and which also is identified as lying within an important agricultural area should have a minimum lot size greater than the 5 acres now allowed.
7. All subdivisions in areas zoned A-2 and designated as an important agricultural area should have paved roads.
8. If PUD provisions are adopted, they need to provide a density bonus as an incentive for their use as an alternative to conventional subdivision in prime agricultural areas (example: 1 unit per 2 gross acres).
9. If TDR provision are adopted, they need to provide a density bonus higher than allowed for conventional or PUD development as an incentive for their use in prime agricultural areas (example: 1 unit per 2 gross acres).

It was not possible to develop a consensus on any of the issues presented above; therefore, staff presented a recommendation concerning agricultural land use densities stating:

1. The Board of County Commissioners should adopt a comprehensive plan policy which increases the potential for the conservation of prime agricultural lands. The revised policy should be a statement of intent to adopt one or more of the following alternative conservation measures:
  - (a) Incentives for the transfer of development rights from prime agricultural areas to residential areas.
  - (b) Incentives to provide for clustering of limited residential development in prime agricultural areas through the Planned Unit Development process.
  - (c) Increases per unit in the minimum lot size in prime agricultural areas to an area which more reasonably approaches the size at which a “farm” can be viable commercial operation, and a size which is a disincentive to rural residential development.

Note that the revised agricultural land use policy will allow some residential development to occur in prime agricultural areas; however, the main intent and the expected result will be to protect long-term agricultural investments, to conserve prime agricultural lands for future generations, and to allow the current generation of prime agricultural landowners to realize the financial benefits of residential development without the need to sacrifice valuable lands, and thus their livelihood, in the process.

2. The Board of County Commissioners should adopt a comprehensive plan policy which states that the preferred concept plan is of necessity general in nature, and that the interpretation of boundary lines between land use categories and the application of zoning will be subject to more detailed analysis and interpretation by the Board, including but not limited to Planning Commission recommendations, detailed soils surveys from forms specializing in environmental studies, historic on-site land uses, etc.
3. The Board of County Commissioners should adopt a comprehensive plan policy which more adequately protects forestry areas, by increasing the minimum lot size. This policy should provide that some of the areas as indicated on the preferred concept plan as being used for forestry purposes may upon closer examination be better suited for some other use, and upon an analysis and interpretation by the Board as provided in #2 above, the land use designated may be changed without the necessity for revising the conceptual map.
4. The Board of County Commissioners should adopt as a part of the land use plan a policy statement that the detailed interpretation and implementation of the comprehensive plan policies will be primarily through the zoning ordinance and subdivision regulations.

Locational criteria were also recommended by the county planning staff. These included:

1. The Board of County Commissioners should reaffirm the 1984 preferred Concept Plan and the suitability analysis contained in the 1978 Comprehensive Plan. These plans would continue existing patterns of agricultural land use as shown on the LUDA Map 8-2.
2. Map 8-3, Map 8-5 of the 1978 Plan, which was presented as alternative plan #1, and which replicated the 1974 Preferred Concept Plan, should be adopted as the 1984 Preferred Concept Plan.

This map will designate prime agriculture areas amounting to:

Area	Approximate Acreage
(a) Northeast of Chiefland	41,600
(b) North of Williston	19,840
(c) West of US 41	13,440
(d) East of US 41	8,960
	-----
Total	83,040

Along with the various written alternatives and recommendations, the Planning Commission, the general public and the elected officials were provided with examples and graphic illustrations as to how the Planned Unit Development (PUD) process, if linked to the Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) could be implemented by their zoning department. In the interest of saving space, this information has not been included as a part of this plan.

A Legal Precedent Regarding Levy County Agriculture

During 1985, the Levy County Circuit Court heard the case of Grandoff vs. Board of Levy County Commissioners. The plaintiff alleged that the county policy of allowing 5-acre lot size subdivisions in agricultural zoning districts constituted a violation of the adopted comprehensive plan. Both sides introduced expert testimony, the witnesses were cross-examined, and the court upheld the county position.

MAP 8-2

AGRICULTURAL LAND USE IN LEVY COUNTY, 1972

MAP 8-3

CONCEPTUAL FUTURE LAND USE PLAN  
(Alternative Plan #1)

**MAP 8-3A**

**FUTURE LAND USE PLAN  
(Alternative Plan #2)**

Agricultural Conclusions

The referenced Evaluation and Appraisal Report is on file in the Levy County Development Department. Not a single person in Levy County has expressed any interest in modifying the 1978 plan policy to “discourage residential development in prime agricultural areas”. Minimal support exists at this time to utilize incentive zoning, planned unit developments or the transfer of development rights (TDR) to conserve prime agricultural lands. Each of these topics has been thoroughly discussed, and TDR each has been rejected from consideration as a part of updated plan policies.

The public input during 1987, 1988 and 1989 and the need for an increased tax base, leads the Board and its planning staff to conclude that a fundamental policy change is needed to:

- A. Eliminate exclusive “agricultural” and “forestry” areas, to permit and encourage compatible rural residential growth and development within those areas.
- B. Change the basis of land use designations from one which utilizes minimum parcel sizes which can stand alone as self-sustaining, economically viable units to one which assures that the rural residential growth is compatible with the surrounding forestry, mining or agricultural uses.
- C. Increase property values and taxable valuations on each parcel by increasing minimum lot sizes within the forestry, mining or agricultural areas.
- D. Adopt policies which encourage high quality, environmentally sound planned communities which, by virtue of incentives, accomplish both residential/commercial growth and continued, viable agri-business in surrounding areas.

**The Commercial Zoning Issue**

In addition to the issue of development in prime agricultural areas, the most controversial issue facing the county is commercial land use. Specifically, the issue is whether or not to regulate commercial development, and if so, how and where.

In the 1984 Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR), it was noted that historic rezonings have been inconsistent with the comprehensive plan. This may pose a potential problem by decreasing the economic viability of the unincorporated areas. Additionally, the unlimited commercial zoning of highway frontage in the unincorporated areas could have significant impacts upon through traffic in the county, and significantly alter both the character and quality of life in Levy County. These potential impacts are described in greater detail in the sections which follow, as taken from Part 6, Commercial Land Use of the referenced EAR.

**Traffic Impacts**

Most commercial zonings have been taking place along the major highways. In some cases the changes have been entirely speculative in nature, in others the changes have been for actual commercial use... in either case, however, the changes have not occurred according to county guidelines ... there aren't any.

The 1978 Traffic Circulation Element contains the following adopted policy: "The County Commission will consider ordinances to regulate commercial strip development along major highways". The intent of this section is to re-establish the basis for retaining such a policy, and to propose additional plan policies and future zoning ordinance revisions to implement those policies.

Map I-1 was adopted by the Board of County Commissioners as part of 1978 Plan. These designations were based upon the text of the plan, and they recognized the need to develop and maintain a highway network which continued to perform as efficiently as possible.

MAP I-1

HIGHWAY FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION  
LEVY COUNTY

What is the purpose of arterial roads? Their principal purpose is to connect Levy County to the state and region. This is important to local residents who commute to work, to the transportation of pupils to school, to the movement of goods into and out of the county, to shoppers, and to generally move high speed, high volume traffic between relatively distant locations.

Anyone driving south on US 19 can see what happens when strip commercial development is allowed to continue without control. The result is that our highways become plugged up and congested. In short, the arterial system becomes transformed to a more local system, providing a primary function of access to adjacent land uses. The results are chaos, confusion and increased costs of goods and services.

Closer to home, SR 44 and US 41 in Citrus County provide good examples of how not to adequately regulate land uses along major highways. Both roads are cluttered with marginal commercial establishments and unlimited curb cuts. Traffic speeds have been drastically reduced, there are frequent stops for turning movements, and accidents are common.

All of this is unnecessary. Additionally, it is not too late to do something about the problem, which is not yet acute or irreversible in Levy County. What are needed are minimum standards for zoning changes, including reasonable controls of land use, and regulatory controls to minimize the adverse impacts of development upon the movements of through traffic.

#### Municipal Impacts

Each of the cities and towns in Levy County is, with the exception of Chiefland and possibly Inglis, a commercial center which is both relatively compact and not totally developed. In each, some evidence of declining businesses is already evident.

It is generally accepted that “urban sprawl” has a detrimental impact upon established businesses in cities. Conversely, the less commercial development is scattered all over Levy County, the more likely that the businesses located within the cities, and thus the cities themselves will continue to grow and prosper.

#### Quality of Life

This is an issue not often addressed in comprehensive plans. The out-migration of persons from Tampa, St. Petersburg, Miami and northern urban areas gives testimony to the fact that quality of life is an important factor to consider in planning for our future.

To the person moving to Beverly Hills (Citrus County) from a high density place like Detroit or New York, they are moving to a rural paradise. In contrast, to a native Levy Countian, the congestion of Beverly Hills at a density of 6 to 8 units per acre is something both undesirable and unwelcome. In other words, quality of life is subjective, not easily measured and relative to the experience of the individuals making the judgement.

As Levy County continues to grow and develop it will do so primarily due to immigration from urban areas with high population densities and extensive commercial development. While giving lip service to a desire for an unspoiled rural atmosphere, these new residents can be expected to have a higher tolerance for development patterns similar to what was left behind than, for example, a person born and raised near

Bronson.

How does this relate to commercial land use? Because of unlimited strip commercial development continues unabated along our major highways, the total character of Levy County will be unalterably changed. As has happened in Citrus County, and is now happening in Marion County, rampant, controlled commercial development will generate more of the same, in ever increasing amounts, attracting more and more people who accept congestion as a way of life. Setting standards now and adhering to them in the future, is the only logical way to prevent a degradation of “quality of life” as now perceived by Levy Countians.

### Recommendations

On both the arterial\* and collector systems, no rezoning to commercial use should be permitted unless the following standards can be met:

1. The proposed change should be contiguous to an intersection with either a collector or an arterial road, or, an existing commercial use at such an intersection.
2. The proposed use should be limited strictly to highway services: i.e. service stations, motels, restaurants, etc.
3. Every commercial use applicant should be required to provide:
  - A. Adequate setbacks
  - B. Paved turning lanes
  - C. A dedicated frontage road easement
  - D. Curb cuts in accord with county standards

\* With the exception of US 19/US 27 from Chiefland to the north, where existing development patterns are already irreversible.

On the local street system, commercial land use should be limited to those which are both an internal and an integral part of an approved PUD.

### Alternatives Considered

The Levy County Planning Commission has considered multiple alternatives regarding where and how commercial zoning should take place in Levy County. The discussions have been divided into two categories of roads, one limited to the principal arterials, and the other including both minor arterial and collector roads.

#### Arterial Roads

- A. Locational Criteria Alternatives
  1. The parcel shall be contiguous to existing commercial zoning.
  2. The parcel shall be contiguous to existing city limits.
  3. The parcel shall be located within:

- One (1) mile of city limits
- One-half (1/2) mile of a city limits
- One-fourth (1/4) mile of a city limits

4. The parcel, if not meeting any of the above criteria, shall be located at the intersection of a locally designated collector and arterial, or, the intersection of two arterials.
5. No commercial zoning is permitted unless municipal water and sewer services are available.
6. Annexation is required.

B. Frontage Road Alternatives

1. Is required:
  - (a) Right-of-way width:
 

[1]	50'
[2]	60'
[3]	70'
[4]	80'
  - (b) Surface preparation:
 

[1]	None
[2]	Limerock
[3]	Pavement
2. Is not required.

C. Curb Cut Alternatives

1. Are to be limited to:
  - (a) One per parcel or tract
  - (b) One per 300 feet
  - (c) One per 400 feet
  - (d) One per 600 feet
  - (e) One per 800 feet
  - (f) One per 1000 feet
2. Are not to be limited.

D Permitted Zoning Alternatives

- a. Limit zoning on the arterial network to only C-3, Highway Commercial.
- b. Allow C-1, C-2, and C-4 zoning in addition to the C-3 zoning.

Note: The Planning Commission needs to consider that the arterial roads are intended to carry large volumes of rapidly moving through traffic, with access to adjoining lands not being a principle purpose; in fact, the use of an arterial road for property access interferes with the functional integrity of the highway.

Further, if alternative #2 is selected, then a recommendation needs to be made to do away with the C-3 zoning category, as the elimination of any locational criteria will eliminate the need for any differentiation between the commercial categories.

Minor Arterial and Collector Roads

A. Locational Criteria Alternatives

- a. The parcel shall be contiguous to existing (and developed) commercial zoning.
- b. The parcel shall be located within:
  - (a) One (1) mile of a city limits
  - (b) One half (1/2) mile of a city limits
  - (c) One fourth (1/4) mile of a city limits
- c. The parcel shall be located at the intersection of:
  - (a) A minor arterial and a principal arterial
  - (b) A minor arterial and a collector
  - (c) Two collector roads
  - (d) A collector and a local, paved road
  - (e) A collector and any public or private road, paved or unpaved
  - (f) Two local roads

B. Frontage Road Alternatives

- A. Is required:
  - (a) Right-of-way width
  - (b) Surface preparation
    - A. None
    - B. Limerock
    - C. Pavement

- B. Is not required.

C. Curb Cut Alternatives

- C. Are to be limited to:
  - A. One per parcel or tract
  - B. One per 300 feet
  - C. One per 400 feet
  - D. One per 600 feet
  - E. One per 800 feet
  - F. One per 1000 feet
  
- D. Are not allowed within the following distance from an intersection:
  - A. 200 feet
  - B. 300 feet
  - C. 400 feet
  - D. 600 feet
  
- E. Are not to be limited.

D. Permitted Zoning Alternatives

Assuming that C-3 is regulated as voted upon at our last meeting, C-1 and C-2 are appropriate uses. Should C-4 be limited to:

- A. Locations contiguous to industrial zones?
- B. Large lots?
- C. other?

The Planning Commission Recommendations

Principal Arterials

- A. Zoning should be limited to C-3, Highway Commercial.
  
- B. To be considered for rezoning, the parcel should be:
  - 1. Within one mile of a city limits; or
  - 2. Located at the intersection of a collector and arterial, or, two arterials; or
  - 3. Contiguous to an existing, developed commercial zone.
  
- C. A frontage road (service road) should be provided, having:
  - 1. A minimum right-of-way width of 50 feet
  - 2. A paved surface
  
- D. Driveways (curb cuts) should be limited to the frequency of median cuts on US 19, with that distance applicable to both US 19 and US 27.

Minor Arterials and Collectors

A. Locational Criteria

1. The parcel of land shall be located within one-fourth (1/4) mile of an intersection of:
  - \*(a) A minor arterial and a principal arterial
  - \*(b) A collector and a principal arterial
  - (c) A minor arterial and a collector
  - (d) A collector and collector
2. A parcel of land contiguous to existing developed commercial use, only as an expansion of the existing business.

B. Frontage Road

1. Is not required.

C. Curb Cuts

1. Are to be limited to:
  - (a) One per parcel or tract

D. Permitted Zoning

1. C-1, C-2 and C-3 are appropriate uses. \*\*C-4 is to be limited to only parcel or tracts of 5 acres or more with a 200' set back which may be used for parking area.

\*\* (Junk Yard to be omitted as a Special Exception to a C-4 zone).

Conservation and Recreation

There are a number of scenic and/or natural resources within Levy County that represent limitations upon development. Aesthetically pleasing, unique, natural resources must be reserved for conservation and recreation because they enhance the quality of life of residents and visitors to Levy County. These natural resources include rivers, bays, springs and wildlife management areas.

Rivers. The Levy County River Protection Law prohibits unsightly construction and the destruction of vegetation within 50 feet of the Suwannee, Withlacoochee, Wacasassa Rivers, and their tributaries. The intent of the ordinance is to preserve the scenic beauty of the county's rivers by limiting development along their shores.

Bays. The Waccasassa and Withlacoochee Bays located off the coast of Levy County contain some of the most productive oyster beds along the Western Florida Coast. Development along these bays should be limited to insure that these valuable resources are protected.

Springs. Several springs are located within the county. These springs serve as links between the Floridan Aquifer and county's rivers. They are unusual swimming and recreation areas that should be preserved for the benefit of present and future citizens of Levy County.

Wildlife Management Areas. The Gulf Hammock Wildlife Management Area lies within the boundaries of Levy County. Although privately owned, this area is designated as a conservation and preservation area and is a limitation upon development.

State Preserves. The Waccasassa Bay State Preserve is located between Cedar Key and Yankeetown. Development is restricted from this area.

### **Suitability Analysis**

A suitability analysis has been used to analyze the physical characteristics of the land in Levy County as described in the preceding section. The purpose of a suitability analysis is to: 1) identify areas most suitable for development, 2) identify areas most suitable for agriculture, 3) identify areas unsuitable for either agriculture or development, 4) compare and contrast the results of suitability analysis with the Levy County 1974 Comprehensive Plan.

#### **Methodology**

To conduct the suitability analysis for Levy County, each physical characteristic that acts as a limitation upon development was mapped upon a separate transparency. Transparencies were made for suitability of soils for septic tanks, flood-prone areas, and prime agricultural lands. Darker shades were used to depict severe limitations upon development and lighter shades were used to depict slight limitations upon development. The transparencies were then super imposed upon a base map of Levy County, with results presented on Map 8-4. Maps 8-5 and 8-6 show, at the end of this chapter, flood-prone areas and septic tank limitations.

#### **Development Areas**

The largest area in the county suitable for development is along US Alternate 27 between Williston and Bronson. This area is suitable for septic tanks, is not subject to flooding and is not prime agricultural land. Prime agricultural land is potentially a limitation upon development because agricultural land and development land are generally incompatible and in conflict with each other.

#### **Blighted Areas**

Blighted areas are considered to be areas where sound growth is substantially impaired by unsanitary or unsafe conditions, faulty lot layouts, inadequate street layout, inadequate infrastructure or services, inadequate parking facilities, or any conflicts between incompatible land uses. Blighted areas are economic liabilities to the community. Structures are often left unmaintained and deteriorate as reinvestment does not occur.

The area becomes useless for most land uses and remains a burden to the community. There are no major blighted areas currently existing in Levy County. This is due to the rural nature of the county and its small population. However, there is one area of a substantial substandard housing existing in East Williston. This is addressed in the Substandard Housing section of the Housing Element in this plan.

Also, to ensure that there will be no increase in blighted areas, no development should be permitted to occur in areas without the appropriate services and supporting infrastructure. Land use conflicts should be minimized through the separation and buffering of incompatible uses; and development should be properly timed to occur as services and infrastructure become available. The Goals, Objectives and Policies section of this Element provides specific directives to prevent blighting in Levy County.

#### Agricultural Areas

The largest tracts of agricultural land are located in the northwest section of the county surrounding Chiefland and in the eastern section of the county.

#### Areas Unsuitable for Development

Most of the county is both unsuitable for development and is not good agricultural land. These areas are shown as blank areas on Map 8-4.

MAP 8-4

LEVY COUNTY DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL OVERVIEW

## APPENDIX A

**METHODOLOGY FOR DETERMINING REQUIRED ACREAGE  
FOR FUTURE LAND USES**

In order to determine the appropriate acreage needed for each land use in the year 2000, the acreage of existing land uses is used as a basis or starting point. Empirically, it can be expected that acreage requirements for residential uses will increase as the county grows by more than 10,000 persons. Acreage for commercial uses and public facilities should increase correspondingly. As acreage requirements for some land uses increase, a decrease must occur in others (to maintain the same net balance of total acreage). The decrease will probably occur in acreage required for agricultural use and for vacant/undeveloped/underdeveloped land, a category which will not be utilized for future land use projections.

**Residential Land Use.** This is the major component affecting the acreage for all future land use types. The following steps were taken to project future required acreage:

1. Project the number of new residents in the county from 1995 and 2020.
2. Project the persons per dwelling unit to 1995 and 2020.
3. Calculate the total number of additional dwelling units required for 1995 and 2020.
4. Project the percentage of dwelling units that are single-family, multi-family, and mobile homes to year 1995 and 2020.
5. Assign expected proportion of the above dwelling types that are expected to be components of low-density; medium-density; and high-density residential use and the number likely to occur in other land use categories; i.e. eighty percent (80%) low-density, fifteen percent (15%) medium density and five percent (5%) high density.
6. Determine the number of dwelling units per category from the percentage by category determined in #5 above.
7. Determine the applicable density ranges of each residential category; determine the mean of each density range by unit type for each residential category.
8. Using data from #6 and #7 (the density range for each unit type by residential category and the number of each unit type by residential category) determine the appropriate additional acreage required by multiplying units by acreage per unit (inverse of density).
9. This yields total additional acreage needed for residential land use. However, the following must be taken into account: a) some of the dwelling units will be found in non-residential land use categories - this was taken care of in step #5; b) not all new units will require new residential acreage as some dwelling units will go into land already classified for residential land uses - increasing the density there. In this basically rural county where large lots are typical and affordable to many, fewer than ten percent (10%) of all new dwelling units are expected to be developed on land currently platted for residential land use on small lots ... especially those with unimproved roads.

**Commercial Land Use.** To serve the increased population, more acreage will be required for commercial uses. The following steps were taken to project future required acreage:

1. Assume the number of establishments per person is constant; assume the average size of commercial establishments is constant; and assume commercial vacancy rate is constant.
2. Determine ratio of persons per establishment (existing) and multiply by number of projected new residents to determine projected number of establishments for years 1995 and 2020.
3. Take ratio of acreage required per establishment and multiply by the number of establishments projected for years 1995 and 2020. This is the additional acreage required for commercial use; this figure is added to existing acreage as no loss of acreage is expected in this category.

Industrial Land Use. As the population increases, industrial acreage will increase proportionally. However, this growth will be slow. Projected industrial use was accomplished by:

- a. Assume acreage per person is constant.
- b. Determine ratio of persons per acre and multiply by number of projected new residents to determine projected acreage for the years 1995 and 2020.

Agricultural Land Use. This category along with the “vacant” category are the main contributors of acreage to other land use categories and is therefore, projected to decrease. The projected acreage is the result of subtracting that area projected to increase in other categories. The few acres of prime farmland that exist are preserved.

Recreation and Open Space Uses. Gradual change is projected assuming no increases of existing acreage. This is due to the large amount of land categories as recreation and open space use; therefore, only twenty-four (24) additional acres are projected for the initial planning period.

Conservation Land Use. This category is projected to remain constant because this acreage includes environmentally critical acreage.

Public Facilities. This category is expected to increase in acreage to meet the needs of a growing population.

Projected future required acreage was obtained by:

1. Assuming no conversion of existing public facilities acreage to other land use categories.
2. Allocating additional acreage for new public facilities.
3. Allocating additional acreage for Department of Corrections Forestry Work Camp which will include public works facilities, sewage treatment facilities, and central water facilities and
4. Adding additional acreage for communications and transportation facilities throughout the county.

Historic Resources. This category is projected to remain constant assuming no losses of existing acreage.

Vacant Land. No change in vacant land is projected because most of this area is located in sand hills which are undesirable for development, already platted in lots that are too small or in subdivisions without roads, and which are unsuitable for commercial agriculture or forestry due to low yields.

APPENDIX B

TABLE 8-6

SEASONAL POPULATION ESTIMATES AND THE  
VARIOUS MUNICIPALITIES FOR LEVY COUNTY

Low to Median Range<sup>1</sup>

	1980 Census	Total Change	April 1, 1986 Estimated
Levy	994	167	1,160
Bronson	43	5	48
Cedar Key	35	9	44
Chiefland	9	2	100
Fanning Springs (pt.)	8	3	10
Inglis	59	19	77
Otter Creek	8	-2	7
Williston	112	10	122
Yankeetown	30	2	32
Unincorporated	600	121	721

Note: Detail may not add to total due to rounding

---

<sup>1</sup> Bureau of Economic and Business Research, University of Florida. Estimates of Population by County and Municipality in Florida, April 1, 1986.

TABLE 8-7

**SEASONAL POPULATION PROJECTIONS 2  
LEVY COUNTY MUNICIPALITIES**

Low to Median Range

	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010	2020	Annual Change
Levy <sup>1</sup>	1,250	1,360	1,455	1,530	1,620	1,795	18
Bronson	51	55	60	64	68	77	9
Cedar Key	49	56	63	70	77	91	1.4
Chiefland	101	103	104	105	106	109	3
Fanning Springs (pt.)	12	14	16	18	20	24	4
Inglis	90	105	121	136	152	183	3
Otter Creek	6	4	3	1	0	0	-3
Williston	129	138	147	155	164	181	2
Yankeetown	33	34	36	37	39	41	3

Note: Detail may not add to total due to rounding

---

<sup>1</sup>Bureau of Economic and Business Research, University of Florida. Projections of Florida - Population by County 1985-2020.

TABLE 8-8

HISTORIC AND PROJECTED POPULATION IN LEVY COUNTY

Year	Unincorporated Population <sup>3</sup>	County-wide Population <sup>1/2</sup>
1980 Census	12,001	19,870
1986 UF	14,414	23,205
1990	15,594	25,000
1995 (Initial Planning Period)	17,706	27,200
2000	18,047	29,000
2005	18,973	30,700
2010	19,698	32,200
2020	21,798	35,700

Sources:

---

<sup>1</sup>The 1980 Census

<sup>2</sup>The University of Florida, Bureau of Economic and Business Research, Population Studies, May 1988

<sup>3</sup> Central Florida Planning and Development Corporation

MAP 8-5

FLOOD-PRONE AREAS IN LEVY COUNTY

**MAP 8-6**

**SOILS SUITABILITY FOR SEPTIC TANKS  
AS MAPPED IN 1974**