

ATTACHMENT 1

SUMMARY OF COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 2013-I

Note: Specific details regarding the Amendment can be found in the attached staff reports.

Summary:

Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 2013-I relates to the Sarasota 2050 Resource Management Area (RMA) Policy component of the County Comprehensive Plan (Chapter 9).

The Planning Commission recommended approval by a 5-0 vote of the proposed Amendments at a public hearing on July 24, 2014 (Minutes provided as Attachment 11) as supported by Attachment 7 titled “Planning Commission Staff Report dated July 24, 2014”. The signed Planning Commission Resolution is Attachment 8.

Additional clarifications on certain Phase 3 issues were provided to the Board within Attachment 6 titled “Supplemental Staff Report dated August 27, 2014”, which was in response to questions raised at or after the Planning Commission public hearing.

Attachment 5 titled “Supplemental Staff Report No. 2 dated October 22, 2014” presents background information on suggested changes to CPA No. 2013-I and ZOA No. 86 that address questions raised on Fiscal Neutrality at the Board’s August 27, 2014 public hearing, and provides additional clarification for Conservation Subdivisions.

Attachment 2 titled “Florida Dept. of Economic Opportunity related Correspondence” presents communications from the FDEO, state and local review agencies on CPA No. 2013-I, which do not identify any concerns relative to the proposed Amendment.

Attachments 3 and 4 are Ordinances 2014-047 and 2014-046 respectively adopting CPA No. 2013-I and ZOA No. 86, each including the following changes to language from that which was presented at the August 27, 2014 Board public hearing. The first change modifies the Fiscal Neutrality requirements by eliminating all follow up monitoring requirements. The second change incorporates clarification of Zoning Regulation Section 11.2.14.c.4.ii. and 11.2.14.c.5.i. regarding the timing for establishment of values on proposed facility requirements. The third change introduces additional qualifications on property eligible to take advantage of the proposed Conservation Subdivision exemption.

Attachments 9 and 10 provide supplemental documentation related to the public meetings held on these Amendments, and correspondence received.

The recommendations for each of the 2050 Phase 3 issues are briefly summarized below:

- 1. Update of Comprehensive Plan Map Figures RMA-1, 3, and 4:** The 2050 map figures need to be updated to reflect scrivener’s changes that have occurred since the maps were initially adopted in 2002 including changes to associated Future Land Use Map designations and municipal boundaries;
- 2. Conservation Subdivisions:** Proposed policy and regulatory changes. Implement a 20-acre or less threshold that will not require the establishment of a Conservation Subdivision when the rezoning of a property involves an increase in residential density within the Rural Heritage/Estate RMA;
- 3. FN-1 Fiscal Neutrality:** Proposed policy and regulatory changes. Require a Fiscal Neutrality Plan with a rezoning action for a Hamlet, Village, or Settlement Area, and emphasize the importance of the initial plan by removing the monitoring requirements. Additionally, balance the provision of affordable housing without negatively impacting fiscal impact analysis results;
- 4. FN-1a Fiscal Neutrality Compliance for Public Transit:** No proposed policy or regulatory changes. Item derived from a recommendation of Fiscal Neutrality consultant, Laffer Associates, to

delete Public Transit as one of the fifteen identified items for which Fiscal Neutrality must be demonstrated as part of a 2050 development. Public transit is a key supportive mechanism associated with the intended form of development. The potential to provide appropriate funding via mechanisms such as a mobility fee, provides future potential revenue to support an alternative development pattern intended by 2050 policy;

5. **FN-2 Timing/Phasing of Development:** Proposed policy changes include: 1) Eliminate the 15-year waiting period required for consecutive Village approval, which is applicable only within the “Central Village Area”; 2) Eliminate policy which prevents the approval of a Village development, if the additional units cause the potential dwelling unit capacity for urban development within the unincorporated County to exceed 150 percent of the forecasted housing demand for the subsequent 20-year period; and 3) Modify the area designated for inclusion in the Residential Capacity Analysis to include the Urban Service Area, the Future Urban Area, and lands west of the Countryside Line;
6. **FN-3 Affordable Housing:** Proposed policy and regulatory changes. Recommendations to address intent and implementation differences between policy and regulations. Affordable Housing is recommended to be incentivized in Policy, while it is prescriptively required in regulations. The recommendation includes a change to allow for alternative mechanisms on how the Affordable Housing requirement may be met;
7. **NU-5 Minimum of One Village Center:** Proposed policy and regulatory changes. Allow a reduction or elimination of the non-residential building square footage required within a subsequent, smaller Village Center, where the market analysis demonstrates such need, or lack of need. In addition, clarify that each of the three areas designated Village Land Use on the RMA-3 Land Use Map (North, Central, and South) have at least one Village Center;
8. **NU-9 400 Dwelling Unit (DU) Limit on Hamlets:** No proposed policy or regulatory changes. Recognizing that each Hamlet is an individual neighborhood, the 400 DU cap is already at the extreme higher end of the neighborhood size spectrum while retaining walk-ability;
9. **NU-7 Hamlet Walk-ability:** No proposed policy or regulatory changes. It has been demonstrated that the largest of Hamlets can be designed to meet the walk-ability standards in accordance with the fundamental principles of the 2050 policy;
10. **NU-8 Hamlet Focal Points:** Proposed policy and regulatory changes. Eliminate the 4,000 foot separation requirement between “focal points” because there is no significant impact on the design of a Hamlet;
11. **OS-9b Greenbelts between Hamlets:** Proposed policy and regulatory changes. Allow multiple Hamlet Development Areas within a single Master Development Plan to potentially be within +/-100 feet of each other so that the required equivalent open space can be consolidated for agricultural or other consolidated/coordinated uses;
12. **OS-5 Greenways as Open Space in Hamlets:** Proposed policy and regulatory changes. Eliminate the currently ambiguous allowance for Greenways that are on-site within a Hamlet Master Development Plan, to be counted toward the percentage of Open Space required. Affirming that on-site Greenways shall count toward the required open space percentages encourages inclusion of the Greenway within the Hamlet Master Development Plan, which will contribute to its protection pursuant to 2050 policy; and

Additional clarifications: Two clarifications that are also being recommended involve Policy VOS2.1(c) recognizing that Hamlet Land Use designated property can serve as on-site Open Space for a Village, and that Zoning Regulation 11.3.15.a. calls for appropriate county staff to review 2050 project proposals.