

**ATTACHMENT 8**  
**SUMMARY OF PUBLIC MEETINGS**  
**DATED DECEMBER 4, 10, AND 12, 2013**

Sarasota 2050 RMA Policy Revisited  
2<sup>nd</sup> Phase  
Public Meeting  
December 4, 2013

Sarasota County held a public meeting on Wednesday, December 4, 2013, at 6:00 p.m., in the South County Commission Chamber, R.L. Anderson Administration Center, 4000 South Tamiami Trail, Venice, FL., on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Phase of the Sarasota 2050 Resource Management Area (RMA) Policy Revisited.

2 Individuals signed the attendance sheet.

There were no written comments collected from the meeting.

**Hand-outs provided:**

All hand-outs are available online at [www.scgov.net](http://www.scgov.net) Keyword ‘Sarasota 2050 Evaluation’

- ‘December 4<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup>, 2013 Public Meetings Sarasota 2050 Resource Management Area (RMA) Policy Revisited Phase 2 – Proposed Policy and Zoning Regulations Amendments Summary’
- ‘Sarasota 2050 Overview’

A PowerPoint presentation is available online at [www.scgov.net](http://www.scgov.net) Keyword ‘Sarasota 2050 Evaluation.’

**Staff Present:**

**Planning and Development Services Department:**

Allen Parsons, Long Range Planning Division Manager

Bill Spaeth, Planner

Elma Felix, Planner

Steve Kirk, Planner

Amy Lavender, Administrative Specialist

Vivian Roe, Planner

Ann Sheller, Planner

**Natural Resources Department:**

Jim Dierolf, Environmental Supervisor

Rachel Herman, Project Scientist

Matt Osterhoudt, Manager

## Sarasota 2050 RMA Policy Revisited

### 2<sup>nd</sup> Phase

### Public Meeting

December 4, 2013

The meeting opened at 6:00 p.m. by Allen Parsons, Long Range Planning Division Manager. Mr. Parsons and several other staff provided information about the Sarasota 2050 Phase 2 topics, via a PowerPoint presentation. Sign-in sheets, comment-cards and informational hand-outs were made available to all attendees, near the entrance of the Commission Chamber. All attendees were encouraged to sign-in and give feedback. All information and supporting documents are available during normal business hours in the Planning and Development Services Department, 1660 Ringling Blvd., 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Sarasota FL, or visit [www.scgov.net](http://www.scgov.net) Keyword: 'Sarasota 2050 Evaluation', to view or download the documents.

All feedback and comments can also be submitted via:

- Web Site Comment Form <http://www.scgov.net>
- Email [planner@scgov.net](mailto:planner@scgov.net)
- Mail to: Planning and Development Services Department 1660 Ringling Blvd., Sarasota, FL 34236
- Telephone Planner of the day at 941-861-5000

There are two additional Sarasota 2050 2<sup>nd</sup> Phase public meetings scheduled on December 10, 2013 at 6:00 p.m. in the Green Building at Twin Lakes Park, 6700 Clark Road, Sarasota FL and December 12, 2013, at 6:00 p.m. in the Commission Chamber, County Administration Center, 1660 Ringling Blvd., Sarasota FL.

The 2<sup>nd</sup> Phase topics are tentatively scheduled for the Planning Commission (PC) on January 16, 2014 at 6:30 p.m., in the Commission Chamber, County Administration Center, 1660 Ringling Blvd., Sarasota FL. Visit [www.scgov.net](http://www.scgov.net) Keyword: Planning Commission, the Friday prior to view or download the documents.

The 2<sup>nd</sup> Phase topics are tentatively scheduled for the Board of County Commission (BCC) on March 18, 2014 at 1:30 p.m. in the Commission Chamber, County Administration Center, and 1660 Ringling Blvd., Sarasota FL. Visit [www.scgov.net](http://www.scgov.net) , Meetings and Agendas (Meetings on Demand), the Thursday prior to view or download the documents.

A question and answer period followed the presentation.

Sarasota 2050 RMA Policy Revisited  
2<sup>nd</sup> Phase  
Public Meeting  
December 4, 2013

**Meeting Summary:**

*Please note that this meeting summary provided here is not a transcript of the dialog, rather it is a detailed summary provided to convey the nature of the questions and responses.*

The 2<sup>nd</sup> Phase series of public meetings involve policy changes to the Comprehensive Plan that primarily apply to development in the eastern part of Sarasota County. The 2050 Evaluation Process relates to continued growth and economic development based on 3 main topics:

- Open Space (OS)
- New Urbanism (NU)
- Fiscal Neutrality (FN)

Sarasota County has commissioned a consultant firm, Laffer Associates, to evaluate the Fiscal Neutrality Phase associated with the proposed changes to the Sarasota 2050 Policy. A draft report will be made available on December 20, 2013.

**Staff Presentations:**

**Bill Spaeth**

Topics of Discussion:

- FN-3 Affordable Housing Requirements  
Proposed Change:
  - Clarified administration of Affordable Housing Plan
  - Clarified monitoring and reporting.
- SP-1 Modification of the 4000 Dwelling Unit (DU) Settlement Area Limitation  
Proposed Change:
  - Eliminate the 4000 DU information on Settlement Areas.
  - Evaluate impacts of additional Settlement Area designed through Comprehensive Plan amendment.
- SP-2 2050 Zoning Language Updates  
Proposed Change:
  - 3 basic changes to use table within Article 11.
  - Delete all zoning provisions for 'Optional Town Center'
- SP-3 Policy Language Updates  
Proposed Change:
  - Delete date specific language.

Sarasota 2050 RMA Policy Revisited  
2<sup>nd</sup> Phase  
Public Meeting  
December 4, 2013

**Elma Felix**

Topics of Discussion:

- NU-3 Land Use Mix Requirements  
Proposed Change:
  - Requirements for residential, public/civic, commercial/retail, and office as a percentage of land use.
  - No changes proposed for Public Space land use.
- NU-7 Flexibility in Walk-ability Application  
Proposed Change:
  - No change. The walk-ability requirement is not a constraint on development for Villages or Settlement Areas
- NU-15 Modification Process Evaluation  
Proposed Change:
  - Clarify that there are currently 3 levels of modification:
    1. Minor (Administration grantable)
    2. Substantial (Full zoning process required)
    3. Neighborhood Plan (Board grantable if not Minor of Substantial)
  - Eliminate conflicting language to table 11.3.3

**Steve Kirk**

Topics of Discussion:

- NU- 16 Urbanism/Form Based Standards  
Proposed Change:
  - Modify parts of New Urbanism/Form-Based zoning regulations that do not affect the traditional town center design.
  - Provide for more flexibility in planning and design.
- NU-18 Village Size Requirements  
Proposed Change:
  - Provide criteria that will allow smaller properties under the Village land use designation to develop as part of, and to integrate with the larger Village.

**Vivian Roe**

Topics of Discussion:

- OS-9a Greenbelts around Village Centers  
Proposed Change:

## Sarasota 2050 RMA Policy Revisited

### 2<sup>nd</sup> Phase

### Public Meeting

December 4, 2013

- Allow a reduction of the Greenbelt between a Village Center and adjacent roadway if criteria are met.
- OS-9c: Protection of Roadway Character  
Proposed Change:
  - Modify Policy VOS5.2 to specify that the Countryside Line is the geographical boundary that delineates urban from rural characteristics.

#### **Matt Osterhoudt**

##### Topics of Discussion:

- OS-10 Greenway Alternatives  
Proposed Change:
  - Where currently pasture, Zoning Regulations could allow reduction of the 550-width to a minimum of 300 feet.
  - Buffer must be enhanced with riparian forest and may include other environmental features.
- OS-14 State Parks and Other Public Lands  
Proposed Change:
  - Create new policy in Chapter 2, the Environment, of the Comprehensive Plan that addresses avoiding, minimizing, and mitigating impacts.

#### **Rachel Herman**

##### Topics of Discussion:

- OS-15 Conservation of Pine Flatwoods  
Proposed Change:
  - No changes to Sarasota 2050 policy are recommended given limited amount of Pine Flatwoods within village areas.
- OS-4 Lakes as Open Space  
Proposed Change:
  - Lakes of  $\geq 50$  acres and lake banks may count if environmental objectives are met first. 25% of shoreline is a public edge. Public access is allowed to the lake.

#### **Public Comments, Questions and Concerns:**

**Public:** Concern was expressed regarding public access to a community lake relating to recreational usage of motor boats. Interest was shown to propose a restriction to the operation of paddle and electric boats only.

Sarasota 2050 RMA Policy Revisited

2<sup>nd</sup> Phase

Public Meeting

December 4, 2013

**Staff:** Open Space would relate to recreational opportunities. A developer could propose to utilize borrow-pits for recreational activities but the proposal would have to be further researched in terms of environmental and public impact. This would only be an option after all the environmental policies were met.

**Public:** Concern was stated with regard to the different phases of the Sarasota 2050 Evaluation Process and why it is being presented separately.

**Staff:** Based on the complexity of the topic, the three Phases allow the less complex topics to track faster than the more complex topics.

**Public:** Concerns were stated regarding Fiscal Neutrality.

**Staff:** This item will be discussed during Phase 3 of the Sarasota 2050 Evaluation. A consultant firm, Laffer Associates, has been hired by Sarasota County to evaluate Fiscal Neutrality.

**Public:** Concerns were stated regarding NU and the State Road (SR) 776 Corridor Plan.

**Public:** A suggestion was stated to reduce the buffer along the road-ways for Village Centers and make-up for the reduction by increasing it between the residences and the Village Centers.

**Public:** Related to the SR 776 Corridor Plan, a suggestion was given, to implement some changes that allow for more flexible minimums to maximums for buffers instead of a fixed distance.

**Staff:** All feedback and comments are welcomed and will be considered by the BCC and also will be included in the BCC Board Packet.

**Meeting concluded at 7:50 p.m.**

# NEIGHBORHOOD WORKSHOP

**PLEASE SIGN IN!**

Project Name:  
SARASOTA 2050 2ND PHASE

Location: Commission Chamber

Project Number: \_\_\_\_\_  
Date/Time: DECEMBER 4, 2013  
Staff Member: Bill Spaeth

To receive a written summary of the meeting, please provide an email address.

	Name	Email	ADDRESS & ZIP CODE	Phone
1	DAWN MOORE	dawn@quiltmoore.com		941-4089572
2	GARY NIESKES	nieskes@comcast.net		941-474-3931
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

To receive a written summary of the meeting, please provide an email address.



Sarasota 2050 RMA Policy Revisited  
2<sup>nd</sup> Phase  
Public Meeting  
December 10, 2013

Sarasota County held a public meeting on Wednesday, December 10, 2013, at 6:00 p.m., in the Green Building at Twin Lakes Park, located at 6700 Clark Road, Sarasota, FL, on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Phase of the Sarasota 2050 Resource Management Area (RMA) Policy Revisited.

21 Individuals signed the attendance sheet.

There were 6 written comments collected from the meeting.

**Hand-outs Provided:**

Also available online at [www.scgov.net](http://www.scgov.net) Keyword ‘Sarasota 2050 Evaluation’

- ‘December 10<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup>, 2013 Public Meetings Sarasota 2050 Resource Management Area (RMA) Policy Revisited Phase 2 – Proposed Policy and Zoning Regulations Amendments Summary’
- ‘Sarasota 2050 Overview Handout’

A PowerPoint presentation is available online at [www.scgov.net](http://www.scgov.net) Keyword: ‘Sarasota 2050 Evaluation’.

**Staff Present:**

**Planning and Development Services Department:**

Allen Parsons, Long Range Planning Division Manager  
Bill Spaeth, Planner  
Elma Felix, Planner  
Steve Kirk, Planner  
Amy Lavender, Administrative Specialist  
Vivian Roe, Planner

**Natural Resources Department:**

Jim Dierolf, Environmental Supervisor  
Rachel Herman, Project Scientist  
Matt Osterhoudt, Manager

Sarasota 2050 RMA Policy Revisited  
2<sup>nd</sup> Phase  
Public Meeting  
December 10, 2013

The meeting opened at 6:00 p.m. by Allen Parsons, Long Range Planning Division Manager. Mr. Parsons and several other staff provided information about the Sarasota 2050 Phase 2 topics, via a PowerPoint presentation. Sign-in sheets, comment-cards and informational hand-outs were made available to all attendees, near the front entrance. All attendees were encouraged to sign-in and give feedback. All information and supporting documents are available during normal business hours in the Planning and Development Services Department at: 1660 Ringling Blvd., 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Sarasota FL, or visit [www.scgov.net](http://www.scgov.net) Keyword: 'Sarasota 2050 Evaluation', to view or download the documents.

All feedback and comments can also be submitted via:

- Web Site Comment Form <http://www.scgov.net>
- Email [planner@scgov.net](mailto:planner@scgov.net)
- Mail to Planning and Development Services Department 1660 Ringling Blvd., Sarasota, FL 34236
- Telephone Planner of the day at 941-861-5000

There is a final Sarasota 2050 2<sup>nd</sup> Phase public meeting scheduled December 12, 2013 at 6:00 p.m. in the Commission Chamber, County Administration Center, located at 1660 Ringling Blvd., Sarasota FL.

The 2<sup>nd</sup> Phase topics are tentatively scheduled for the Planning Commission (PC) January 16, 2014 at 6:30 p.m. in the Commission Chamber, County Administration Center, 1660 Ringling Blvd., Sarasota FL. Visit [www.scgov.net](http://www.scgov.net) Keyword: Planning Commission, the Friday prior to view or download the documents.

The 2<sup>nd</sup> Phase topics are tentatively scheduled for the Board of County Commission (BCC) on March 18, 2014 at 1:30 p.m. in the Commission Chamber, County Administration Center, 1660 Ringling Blvd., Sarasota FL. Visit [www.scgov.net](http://www.scgov.net), Meetings and Agendas, (Meetings on Demand) the Thursday prior to view or download the documents.

A question and answer period followed the presentation.

Sarasota 2050 RMA Policy Revisited  
2<sup>nd</sup> Phase  
Public Meeting  
December 10, 2013

**Meeting Summary:**

*Please note that this meeting summary provided here is not a transcript of the dialog, rather it is a detailed summary provided to convey the nature of the questions and responses.*

The 2<sup>nd</sup> Phase series of public meetings involve policy changes to the Comprehensive Plan that primarily apply to development in the eastern part of Sarasota County. The 2050 Evaluation Process relates to continued growth and economic development based on 3 main topics:

- Open Space (OS)
- New Urbanism (NU)
- Fiscal Neutrality (FN)

Sarasota County has commissioned a consultant firm, Laffer Associates, to evaluate the Fiscal Neutrality Phase associated with the proposed changes to the Sarasota 2050 Policy. A draft report will be made available on December 20, 2013.

**Staff Presentations:**

**Bill Spaeth**

Topics of Discussion:

- FN-3 Affordable Housing Requirements  
Proposed Change:
  - Clarified administration of Affordable Housing Plan
  - Clarified monitoring and reporting.
- SP-1 Modification of the 4000 Dwelling Unit (DU) Settlement Area Limitation  
Proposed Change:
  - Eliminate the 4000 DU information on Settlement Areas.
  - Evaluate impacts of additional Settlement Area designed through Comprehensive Plan amendment.
- SP-2 2050 Zoning Language Updates  
Proposed Change:
  - 3 basic changes to use table within Article 11.
  - Delete all zoning provisions for 'Optional Town Center'
- SP-3 Policy Language Updates  
Proposed Change:
  - Delete date specific language.

Sarasota 2050 RMA Policy Revisited  
2<sup>nd</sup> Phase  
Public Meeting  
December 10, 2013

**Elma Felix**

Topics of Discussion:

- NU-3 Land Use Mix Requirements  
Proposed Change:
  - Requirements for residential, public/civic, commercial/retail, and office as a percentage of land use.
  - No changes proposed for Public Space land use.
- NU-7 Flexibility in Walk-ability Application  
Proposed Change:
  - No change. The walk-ability requirement is not a constraint on development for Villages or Settlement Areas
  
- NU-15 Modification Process Evaluation  
Proposed Change:
  - Clarify that there are currently 3 levels of modification:
    1. Minor (Administration grantable)
    2. Substantial (Full zoning process required)
    3. Neighborhood Plan (Board grantable if not Minor or Substantial)
  - Eliminate conflicting language to table 11.3.3.

**Steve Kirk**

Topics of Discussion:

- NU- 16 Urbanism/Form Based Standards  
Proposed Change:
  - Modify parts of New Urbanism/Form-Based zoning regulations that do not affect the traditional town center design.
  - Provide for more flexibility in planning and design.
- NU-18 Village Size Requirements  
Proposed Change:
  - Provide criteria that will allow smaller properties under the Village land use designation to develop as part of, and to integrate with the larger Village.

**Vivian Roe**

Topics of Discussion:

- OS-9a Greenbelts around Village Centers  
Proposed Change:

Sarasota 2050 RMA Policy Revisited

2<sup>nd</sup> Phase

Public Meeting

December 10, 2013

- Allow a reduction of the Greenbelt between a Village Center and adjacent roadway if criteria are met.

**Matt Osterhoudt**

Topics of Discussion:

- OS-10 Greenway Alternatives

Proposed Change:

- Where currently pasture, Zoning Regulations could allow reduction of the 550-width to a minimum of 300 ft.
- Buffer must be enhanced with riparian forest and may include other environmental features.

- OS-14 State Parks and Other Public Lands

Proposed Change:

- Create new policy in Chapter 2, the Environment, of the Comprehensive Plan that addresses avoiding, minimizing, and mitigating impacts.

**Rachel Herman**

Topics of Discussion:

- OS-15 Conservation of Pine Flatwoods

Proposed Change:

- No changes to Sarasota 2050 policy are recommended given limited amount of pine flatwoods within village areas.

- OS-4 Lakes as Open Space

Proposed Change:

- Lakes of  $\geq 50$  acres and lake banks may count if environmental objectives are met first. 25% of shoreline is a public edge. Public access is allowed to the lake.

**Public Comments, Questions and Concerns:**

**Public:** A question was asked with regard to the difference between Greenways and Greenbelts.

**Staff:** The Greenways are environmentally sensitive lands that are mapped on Resource Management Area (RMA) 1 and RMA 3. The term Greenbelt relates to the 500 ft. buffer area of land around the development site.

**Public:** A question was asked with regard to the difference between a Village and a Hamlet and what type of development was allowed.

Sarasota 2050 RMA Policy Revisited

2<sup>nd</sup> Phase

Public Meeting

December 10, 2013

**Staff:** Villages are larger scale developments that allow for more intensive development. Hamlets are smaller scale developments that allow for 400 residential units (1 unit per acre) with a small allowance for commercial. More information on Hamlets will be presented in Phase 3.

**Public:** A question was asked with regard to the Villages and Hamlets and how the each area is determined.

**Staff:** The determination of what is designated for a Village and a Hamlet is taken from an adopted Comprehensive Plan land use map. In terms of what type of development that could be proposed is up to the property ownership and associated development interests.

**Public:** A question was asked with regard to infrastructure (schools) and who would be responsible for the fees associated.

**Staff:** 2050 has a requirement for Fiscal Neutrality. There is a list of 15 items regarding infrastructure that are required to be paid for by the development. The developer is required to designate a site for a school but is not responsible for the construction of that school. Fiscal Neutrality will be presented in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Phase. Sarasota County has commissioned a consultant firm, Laffer Associates, to evaluate Fiscal Neutrality. A draft report will be available on December 20, 2013.

**Public:** A question was asked with regard to county lands and which of these will be for sale for development.

**Staff:** This question is related to the Transfer of Development Rights (TDRs) from publicly owned lands and was discussed previously in Phase 1. There is a provision in 2050 that relates to TDRs that would allow Sarasota County to sell the development rights off of publicly owned lands and transfer those rights to the applicable Villages.

**Public:** A question was asked with regard to TDRs and if it related towards selling the property easement.

**Staff:** Property has a number of rights associated with it. One of those rights is the number of dwelling units that is allowable on the property. For example, if there was a 10 acre piece of property that allowed 1 unit per acre, those rights could be sold and transferred to another piece of property. The underlining ownership of the property stays the same but the right to develop that property has been transferred to different property.

Sarasota 2050 RMA Policy Revisited

2<sup>nd</sup> Phase

Public Meeting

December 10, 2013

**Public:** A question was asked with regard to the Village Center slide on the PowerPoint presentation and why it was located on the periphery and not in the center.

**Staff:** Visibility is a key part for the success of commercial retail in Village Centers. It is also in Sarasota County's best interest for commercial centers to be successful.

**Public:** A question was asked with regard to the allowable height of the buildings in the Villages.

**Staff:** The proposed plan allows for 5 story buildings, an estimate of 12 feet per story. This is consistent with other existing plans in Sarasota County. The current Village regulation for a building is 51 ft.

**Public:** A question was asked with regard to Greenways and the proposed decrease from 500 ft. to 300 ft. of and if this was the exclusive determination to comply with the most ecological benefit.

**Staff:** This is not exclusive and there are other ways that this can be configured. This determination presented was based on the current policy.

**Public:** A question was asked with regard to eliminating the proposed requirement of the 300 ft. buffer and if the existing wetlands could make up for the elimination of that buffer.

**Staff:** Research shows that it is essential for there to be up-land areas to support Riparian Systems, in addition to the existing wetlands, as stated in chapter 2 of the Comprehensive Plan.

**Public:** Concern was stated with regard to the proposed NU development and that there wouldn't be enough development to sustain it.

**Public:** Concern was stated with regard to the proposed 50 foot buffer around the Villages and if this amount was flexible.

**Staff:** 50 ft. is the minimum amount of buffer that a developer could propose in a Planned Commercial Development (PCD). This number could be increased depending on the type of development. All details would have to be approved by the BCC if and when a development project was proposed. The policy doesn't require a 50 ft. of a landscape buffer; it is currently 500 ft. of open land.

Sarasota 2050 RMA Policy Revisited

2<sup>nd</sup> Phase

Public Meeting

December 10, 2013

**Public:** Concern was stated regarding the decision by the BCC that approved the development of multiple Village Centers and that these could be located along the entire road-way.

**Staff:** The strip form of development is currently not allowed in the NU form of development.

**Public:** A question was asked about the 500 ft. of land buffer reduction and if it could be made up in a different location.

**Staff:** According to the policy a certain amount of open space is required and would be maintained as improved pasture.

**Public:** A question was asked with regard to the Village Concept Plan and what the walking distance would be for the residents going to the Village Center.

**Staff:** The neighborhoods are located within ¼ mile walking distance to the Village Centers.

**Public:** A question was asked with regard to the height and type of the buildings allowable in the Village Centers.

**Staff:** There is a range of housing types that are allowed and consistent with the Zoning Ordinance. The maximum residential single-family building height is 35 ft., with the exception of the Village Center which would allow other buildings types with higher densities, such as, apartment and attached buildings. Any additional proposed building heights to exceed the 35 ft. maximum would have to be approved by the BCC.

**Public:** A question was asked with regard to the development and if there were 2 smaller residential neighborhoods on either side of a road-way within a Village, could the 500 ft. buffer be shared by both neighborhoods.

**Staff:** The 500 ft. buffer is only required around the perimeter of the Village. The current code allows a 500 ft. buffer around a combined Village.

**Public:** A concern was stated that the concept of large Villages would create sprawl and not be consistent with the 2050 plan.

**Staff:** Any part of land that has a Village Designation assigned to it is eligible for Village development. There will be a concentration of development in the eastern part of Sarasota County to accommodate future growth.



Sarasota 2050 RMA Policy Revisited  
2<sup>nd</sup> Phase  
Public Meeting  
December 10, 2013

**Public:** A question was asked with regard to the Villages and why they would be combined.

**Staff:** The combination of Villages is a provision that allows for smaller existing neighborhoods to be integrated to the new proposed development to ensure that the road-ways, environmental systems and parks are connected.

**Public:** A question was asked with regard to the proposed elimination of the 4000 dwelling unit cap within the settlement areas.

**Staff:** The settlement area is going to be designated to accommodate the new Future Urban development design and 2 dwelling units per acre is the maximum allowed on the property. A developer could also propose a Comprehensive Plan Amendment to increase that amount.

**Public:** A question was asked with regard to the density of the development in the Villages and if it was going to be similar to typical Suburban development.

**Staff:** Each Village is going to be designed to include its own Village Center. The Villages and neighborhoods will be connected throughout. There will be a focal point within each Village. The design of the Village centers will not be typical Strip Commercial Development but will look similar to the Grand Palm neighborhood. The regulations proposed are for a traditional Town Center design with 50% open-space.

**Public:** A question was asked with regard to the design of Lakewood Ranch and if the Village Centers would be similar.

**Staff:** The residential density would be similar to Lakewood Ranch. The difference between Lakewood Ranch and 2050 is that there are provisions to include connectivity. These are consistent with the NU design requirements for the Village Centers.

**Public:** A question was asked with regard to affordable housing and what is defined as affordable.

**Staff:** Affordable housing is specifically defined in the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code. It is based on household median income and what a family can afford in terms of mortgage or rental payments. 15% of the residential units in 2050 are designated to fulfill the affordable housing provision.

**Public:** A question was asked with regard to capacity of development related to the current policy and that Sarasota County cannot approve any new development if there is no demand.

Sarasota 2050 RMA Policy Revisited  
2<sup>nd</sup> Phase  
Public Meeting  
December 10, 2013

**Staff:** The current policy states that if there is more than 150% of capacity for the next 20 years, no new Village Development can be approved. The capacity relates to the land inside the Urban Service Boundary. Sarasota County maintains capacity levels annually based on the future population projections. This will be discussed further in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Phase. Phase 3 workshops will tentatively be scheduled in March 2014. Phase 3 public hearings will tentatively be scheduled in May 2014.

**Public:** A question was asked with regard to population growth and how this was determined.

**Staff:** The population is determined by multiplying the number of housing units by an estimate of 2 persons per household.

**Public:** A question was asked with regard to the utilities (water) and if there would be enough to sustain the demand.

**Staff:** There are Impact Fees associated with any new Development in Sarasota County and these are analyzed on a case by case basis. If for some reason that there wasn't enough water to sustain the development in the Villages, the development wouldn't be approved.

**Meeting concluded at 7:55 p.m.**

# NEIGHBORHOOD WORKSHOP

**PLEASE SIGN IN!**

Project Name: SARASOTA 2050 2ND PHASE	Project Number: _____ Date/Time: <u>DECEMBER 10, 2013</u> Staff Member: <u>Bill Spaeth</u>
Location: _____	

#	Name	Email	ADDRESS & ZIP CODE	Phone
1	GEORGIA BLOTZER	georgiablotz@yahoo.com	Venice 34292	
2	Norma Dayton	ohpiffle@yahoo.com	Venice 34293	493-5087
3	Bob Medrab	Robertbomoe@aol.com	-	374-5844
4	Mike Silofa	GBC1952@comcast.net	SRC 34284	
5	Ray HACKETT	rayhackett12@hotmail.com	SRC 34234	
6	Trent Cullen	Trenttcl@comcast.net	7150 CLARK RD	650-0236
7	Marion Bob Mendelson	marionm8@juno.com	708 Palmetto Dr Venice 34293	492-5091
8	Debbie Ash	debbiea@verizon.net	2127 Calusa Lakes Nokomis	
9	MADEIRA HALLIDAY	mghallid@verizon.net	2406 SONOMA DR. #101	NO KOMIS, FL
10	CHAMER VERDE	CHAMER.VLD@amsil.com	SARASOTA 34236	536-6967
11	MIKE MORAN	mike@moran.com	1888 SEBOIS BLVD	580-1848
12	JOEY ANDERSON	reetri@comcast.net	1001 Racine Dr 34240	371-0652
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

# NEIGHBORHOOD WORKSHOP

**PLEASE SIGN IN!**

Project Name:  
SARASOTA 2050 2ND PHASE

Project Number: \_\_\_\_\_  
Date/Time: DECEMBER 10, 2013  
Staff Member: Bill Spaeth

Location:

	Name	Email	ADDRESS & ZIP CODE	Phone
1	Tony Romanus	TROMANUS@VERIZON.NET	5551 CONTENTO DR SIESTA KEY 34242	941 993 3432
2	Bruce Dayton	bruceclayton1@verizon.net	1612 E <del>CLAYTON</del> DR Venice, FL 34293	941-193 5087
3	Steve Scott	If You Want It Done Right @ Yahoo!.com	272F BRUCE LN SARASOTA 34237	90617 257-6255
4	Christian Cotter	christian.cotter@gmail.com	4345 Oak View Drive Sarasota, FL 34232	404-583- 5987
5	Jack Bispham		SPE	
6	GARY HEFFNER	CHAIRMAN@FRUITVILLE2100A	1135 STAEGER AVE 34232	941 312 -1703
7	CARY FROSCHAUER	cefrosche@verizon.net	KWLNR	356-6735
8	CHARLES PALMER	C PALM 1926@GMAIL.COM		
9	Lourdes Ramirez	LPTASK@hormad.com	CONVA	
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

## We Welcome Your Comments:

Please Print

I ~~cannot~~ support Staff's position that no further restrictions should be placed upon Pine Flatwoods. I believe the purpose of revisiting the 2050 plan was to make the plan more workable. My concern is that if we further restrict Pine Flatwoods we will make it more difficult to implement the 2050 plan.

Description of Amendment: 05-15 No further regulations of Pine Flatwoods

Name: BO MEDRED

Address:

Phone:

E-Mail: Robertbomo@aol.com

## We Welcome Your Comments:

Please Print

If I have a problem with the greenspace around Village Center being reduced from 500' to 50', why can't it be 150' to give additional greenspace to the community.

I would suggest that speakers try to define the terms in their presentation so that those in the audience ~~can~~ who are not urban planners can understand.

Description of Amendment:

Name: Georgia Blotzer

Address: 13079 Tigers Eye Dr Venice 34292

Phone:

E-Mail:

**We Welcome Your Comments:**  
**Please Print**

I have a concern over the language being proposed in OS-4 Section 11.2.5.n.1.xii(C) (page 58 of 130). I do not know/understand the relationship of the proposed language to Para(D) of that section which speaks to Settlement Areas. I would rather that Lakes be permitted as Open Space in Villages, Hamlets and Settlement Areas with further instruction. A suggested change could be to insert "Villages + Hamlets" to Para (A) to not conflict with (D) which pertains to Settlements.

Description of Amendment: OS-4 LAKES AS OPEN SPACE

Name: BO MEDRED

Address:

Phone:

E-Mail:

**We Welcome Your Comments:**  
**Please Print**

SUPPORT Removing the Town Center due to the policy deleted in Ordinance 2012-041

Description of Amendment: SP-2 - Zoning Language Update

Name: BO MEDRED

Address:

Phone:

E-Mail: Robertbomoe@aol.com



Sarasota County

### We Welcome Your Comments:

Please Print

Agree with staff's recommendation to eliminate the 4000 DU cap for the reasons stated by staff. It appears that FLU Policy 3.1.10 also needs to be amended to eliminate the 4000 unit cap.

Zoning Ordinance Section 11.2.4.C.4.i appears it also needs to be amended to take out the 4000 unit cap

Description of Amendment: SP-1 Modification of Settlement Area DU Limit

Name: Bob MEDVED

Address: 5

Phone:

E-Mail: Robertbomo@aol.com



Sarasota County

### We Welcome Your Comments:

Please Print

- why aren't these meetings being publicized more and why are they being held so close to the holidays?

- would you speak before organizations to explain the proposed policies

Description of Amendment:

Name: Georgia Blotzer

Address: 13079 Tigers Eye Dr, Venice 34292

Phone:

E-Mail: georgiablots@yahoo.com

Sarasota 2050 RMA Policy Revisited  
2<sup>nd</sup> Phase  
Public Meeting  
December 12, 2013

Sarasota County held a public meeting on Wednesday, December 10, 2013, at 6:00 p.m., in the Commission Chamber, Sarasota County Administration Center, located at 1660 Ringling Blvd., Sarasota, FL, on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Phase of the Sarasota 2050 Resource Management Area (RMA) Policy Revisited.

16 Individuals signed the attendance sheet.

There were 2 written comments collected from the meeting.

**Hand-outs Provided:**

Also available online at [www.scgov.net](http://www.scgov.net) Keyword 'Sarasota 2050 Evaluation'

- 'December 10<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup>, 2013 Public Meetings Sarasota 2050 Resource Management Area (RMA) Policy Revisited Phase 2 – Proposed Policy and Zoning Regulations Amendments Summary'
- 'Sarasota 2050 Overview Handout'

A PowerPoint presentation is available online at [www.scgov.net](http://www.scgov.net) Keyword 'Sarasota 2050 Evaluation'.

A question and answer period followed the presentation.

**Staff Present:**

**Planning and Development Services Department:**

Allen Parsons, Long Range Planning Division Manager  
Bill Spaeth, Planner  
Steve Kirk, Planner  
Amy Lavender, Administrative Specialist  
Vivian Roe, Planner

**Natural Resources Department:**

Jim Dierolf - Environmental Supervisor  
Rachel Herman - Project Scientist  
Matt Osterhoudt - Manager



## Sarasota 2050 RMA Policy Revisited

### 2<sup>nd</sup> Phase

### Public Meeting

December 12, 2013

The meeting opened at 6:06 p.m. by Allen Parsons, Long Range Planning Division Manager. The parking lot was being resurfaced at the time of this meeting and Mr. Parsons apologized for any inconvenience that this may have caused. Mr. Parsons and several other staff provided information about the Sarasota 2050 Phase 2 topics, via a PowerPoint presentation. Sign-in sheets, comment-cards and informational hand-outs were made available to all attendees, near the entrance of the Commission Chamber. All attendees were encouraged to sign-in and give feedback. All information and supporting documents are available during normal business hours in the Planning and Development Services Department at: 1660 Ringling Blvd., 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Sarasota FL, or visit [www.scgov.net](http://www.scgov.net) Keyword: 'Sarasota 2050 Evaluation', to view or download the documents.

All feedback and comments can also be submitted via:

- Web Site Comment Form <http://www.scgov.net>
- Email [planner@scgov.net](mailto:planner@scgov.net)
- Mail to Planning and Development Services Department 1660 Ringling Blvd., Sarasota, FL 34236
- Telephone Planner of the day at 941-861-5000

The 2<sup>nd</sup> Phase topics are tentatively scheduled for the Planning Commission (PC) on January 16, 2014 at 6:30 p.m. in the Commission Chamber, County Administration Center, located at 1660 Ringling Blvd., Sarasota FL. Visit [www.scgov.net](http://www.scgov.net) Keyword: Planning Commission, the Friday prior to view or download the documents.

The 2<sup>nd</sup> Phase topics are tentatively scheduled for the Board of County Commission (BCC) on March 18, 2014 at 1:30 p.m. in the Commission Chamber, County Administration Center, located at 1660 Ringling Blvd., Sarasota FL. Visit [www.scgov.net](http://www.scgov.net) , Meetings and Agendas (Meetings on Demand), the Thursday prior to view or download the documents.

A question and answer period followed the presentation.

Sarasota 2050 RMA Policy Revisited  
2<sup>nd</sup> Phase  
Public Meeting  
December 12, 2013

**Meeting Summary:**

*Please note that this meeting summary provided here is not a transcript of the dialog, rather it is a detailed summary provided to convey the nature of the questions and responses.*

The 2<sup>nd</sup> Phase series of public meetings involve policy changes to the Comprehensive Plan that primarily apply to development in the eastern part of Sarasota County. The 2050 Evaluation Process relates to continued growth and economic development based on 3 main topics:

- Open Space (OS)
- New Urbanism (NU)
- Fiscal Neutrality (FN)

Sarasota County has commissioned a consultant firm, Laffer Associates, to evaluate the Fiscal Neutrality Phase associated with the proposed changes to the Sarasota 2050 Policy. A draft report will be made available on December 20, 2013.

**Staff Presentations:**

**Bill Spaeth**

Topics of Discussion:

- FN-3 Affordable Housing Requirements  
Proposed Change:
  - Clarified administration of Affordable Housing Plan
  - Clarified monitoring and reporting.
- SP-1 Modification of the 4000 Dwelling Unit (DU) Settlement Area Limitation  
Proposed Change:
  - Eliminate the 4000 DU information on Settlement Areas.
  - Evaluate impacts of additional Settlement Area designed through Comprehensive Plan amendment.
- SP-2 2050 Zoning Language Updates  
Proposed Change:
  - 3 basic changes to use table within Article 11.
  - Delete all zoning provisions for 'Optional Town Center'
- SP-3 Policy Language Updates  
Proposed Change:
  - Delete date specific language.

**Steve Kirk**

Topics of Discussion:

## Sarasota 2050 RMA Policy Revisited

### 2<sup>nd</sup> Phase

### Public Meeting

December 12, 2013

- NU-3 Land Use Mix Requirements  
Proposed Change:
  - Requirements for residential, public/civic, commercial/retail, and office as a percentage of land use.
  - No changes proposed for Public Space land use.
- NU-7 Flexibility in Walk-ability Application  
Proposed Change:
  - No change. The walk-ability requirement is not a constraint on development for Villages or Settlement Areas
  
- NU-15 Modification Process Evaluation  
Proposed Change:
  - Clarify that there are currently 3 levels of modification:
    1. Minor (Administration grantable)
    2. Substantial (Full zoning process required)
    3. Neighborhood Plan (Board grantable if not Minor or Substantial)
  - Eliminate conflicting language to table 11.3.3.

#### **Steve Kirk**

Topics of Discussion:

- NU- 16 Urbanism/Form Based Standards  
Proposed Change:
  - Modify parts of New Urbanism/Form-Based zoning regulations that do not affect the traditional town center design.
  - Provide for more flexibility in planning and design.
- NU-18 Village Size Requirements  
Proposed Change:
  - Provide criteria that will allow smaller properties under the Village land use designation to develop as part of, and to integrate with the larger Village.

#### **Vivian Roe**

Topics of Discussion:

- OS-9a Greenbelts around Village Centers  
Proposed Change:
  - Allow a reduction of the Greenbelt between a Village Center and adjacent roadway if criteria are met.

## Sarasota 2050 RMA Policy Revisited

### 2<sup>nd</sup> Phase

#### Public Meeting

December 12, 2013

#### **Matt Osterhoudt**

##### Topics of Discussion:

- OS-10 Greenway Alternatives

##### Proposed Change:

- Where currently pasture, Zoning Regulations could allow reduction of the 550-width to a minimum of 300 feet.
- Buffer must be enhanced with riparian forest and may include other environmental features.

- OS-14 State Parks and Other Public Lands

##### Proposed Change:

- Create new policy in Chapter 2, the Environment, of the Comprehensive Plan that addresses avoiding, minimizing, and mitigating impacts.

#### **Rachel Herman**

##### Topics of Discussion:

- OS-15 Conservation of Pine Flatwoods

##### Proposed Change:

- No changes to Sarasota 2050 policy are recommended given limited amount of pine flatwoods within village areas.

- OS-4 Lakes as Open Space

##### Proposed Change:

- Lakes of  $\geq 50$  acres and lake banks may count if environmental objectives are met first. 25% of shoreline is a public edge. Public access is allowed to the lake.

#### **Public Comments, Questions and Concerns:**

**Public:** Concerns were stated with regard to the phases/style of the public meetings and that a neighborhood public workshop/sharette was preferred with more communication from staff.

**Staff:** The 2050 Evaluation process has been divided into 3 phases. These relate to the Scope of Work that was approved by the BCC in July 2013. Phase 1 includes the issues involving modifications to the Zoning Regulations that don't require any Comprehensive Plan Policy Changes. The 2<sup>nd</sup> Phase involves policy changes (Comprehensive Plan) that don't deviate significantly from the original fundamental values of the 2050 policy. The 3<sup>rd</sup> Phase involves policy changes that may deviate from those values. Fiscal Neutrality will also be evaluated in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Phase. All information is available on the Sarasota County website. Contact and web site

Sarasota 2050 RMA Policy Revisited

2<sup>nd</sup> Phase

Public Meeting

December 12, 2013

information is all located on the hand-out. All comments, questions and concerns will be submitted to the Board of County Commissioners.

**Public:** Concern was stated with regard to the amount of staff time involved in 2050 and if the effort will bring a result or just be a wasted effort.

**Staff:** Sarasota County Staff from the Planning and Development Services Department and the Natural Resources Department are involved in the 2050 scoping process. (7-8 primary staff members are involved in the scoping process.)

**Public:** A comment was stated with regard to the trees and that more should be preserved.

**Staff:** Long Range Plans are examined after a period of time to see how well they have worked or what could be changed or improved. The intent is to gain public feedback and allow for changes to 2050 that will result in the best outcome for all.

**Public:** A question was asked with regard to the public meeting process and if there have been any open houses.

**Staff:** A public workshop was held for the 1<sup>st</sup> Phase in September 2013. There are 3 public workshops scheduled for the 2<sup>nd</sup> Phase. There are also 3 public workshops scheduled for the 3<sup>rd</sup> phase.

**Public:** A comment was stated with regard to the timing that these public meetings have taken place and that they are not convenient to allow for the optimum amount of people to participate.

**Public:** Concern was stated with regard to walk-ability (slide number 26 of the presentation – A and B Streets) and if the development would be similar to Lakewood Ranch.

**Staff:** This model was built by staff and is based on the requirements for 2050. The B Street isn't intended to be walk-able. It is meant to be a service street. Based on our analysis with the assistance from Bill Spikowski, New Urbanism Planner, this was one of the suggestions that he made because it will make the code more flexible.

**Public:** A question was asked with regard to walk-ability (slide number 26 of the presentation) and if there was an actual community similar to this development that has thrived.

**Staff:** With regard to Lakewood Ranch, part of their Town Center does front along an A Street. The intent of the A Streets is to have intense activity such as retail. If this graphic is compared to

Sarasota 2050 RMA Policy Revisited

2<sup>nd</sup> Phase

Public Meeting

December 12, 2013

Downtown Sarasota, there are more B Streets than A Streets. The A Streets are limited to Palm Avenue, Main Street and a few other streets.

**Staff:** These developments are going to be focused on housing at first. It will not support larger types of development like Downtown Sarasota. Most streets located within a newly constructed development

**Public:** Concern was stated with regard to the 70% Opacity level and the environment (slide number 37 of the presentation) and if that 50 ft. setback was added to make up for the trees lost in another area.

**Public:** Concern was stated with regard to the A streets (slide number 37 of the presentation) and that they were not sufficient for walk-ability.

**Public:** Concern was stated with regard to A and B Streets (Slide number 37 of the presentation) and if that 70% opacity wasn't sufficient for successful retail business.

**Public:** A question was asked with regard to Riparian Habitats (slide number 41 of the presentation) and the amount of time and money involved for the creation of them.

**Staff:** The Riparian Habitats will require 20 or more years to be successful. There are large scale planting projects/concepts that will have to be evaluated. This is going to be very costly and it has not yet been determined if the developer will be responsible for the cost.

**Public:** Concerns were stated with regard to today's economy and that it still hasn't improved for this type development.

**Public:** A question was asked with regard to NU-3 (slide number 18 of the presentation) and what the percentages relate to.

**Staff:** NU-3 table percentages relate to land area.

**Public:** A question was asked with regard to NU-18 and new Senate Bill number 372 that has been recently been introduced that would remove Sarasota County from the DRI process and how this would relate to 2050.

**Public:** A question was asked with regard to Oscar Scherer State Park (slide number 48 of the presentation – OS-14) and if these items would be implemented at the same time.

Sarasota 2050 RMA Policy Revisited

2<sup>nd</sup> Phase

Public Meeting

December 12, 2013

**Staff:** These items would be implemented at the same time.

**Public:** Concern was stated with regard to NU-7 (slide number 21 of the presentation) and if a ¼ mile radius correlates to the 5 minute walking time. The sidewalks don't follow a straight line and this may be misleading because the route could possibly be longer than 5 minutes.

**Public:** Concern was stated with regard to the 500 ft. distance from roadways to Village Center development and that this should remain as open-space so that the retail would be visible from the roadway.

**Public:** Concern was stated with regard to the existing creeks and flow ways on the property (slide number 39 of the presentation) and if there could be additional buffering added.

**Staff:** If there is a water course on the property there is an additional 50 ft. planted buffer that is required.

**Public:** Concern was stated with regard to the type of plants that are planted in the 50 ft. buffer along a water course.

**Staff:** All environmental aspects are important regarding how they are combined with the development.

**Public:** Concern was stated with regard to Pine Flatwoods (slide number 56 of the presentation) in Myakka Park and if there are more that were not listed on the map.

**Staff:** This information was taken from the most recent data layer from the GIS map.

**Public:** Concern was stated with regard to the 2050 process and that phases are not sufficient because some of the bigger issues could be overlooked as separate items are adopted.

**Public:** Concern was stated with regard to the Village Center and that it was going to be a strip/commercial form of development.

**Staff:** There are many examples of NU types of development. Retail isn't successful if it isn't visible. 2050 provisions don't allow the typical strip form of development. This is intended to look more like the Main Street development integrated with residential neighborhoods.

**Public:** Concerns were stated with regard to roadways and how they affect Wildlife Corridors and that there should be an underpass for the wildlife to access.

Sarasota 2050 RMA Policy Revisited  
2<sup>nd</sup> Phase  
Public Meeting  
December 12, 2013

**Public:** A suggestion was stated with regard to Wildlife Corridors being built over the roadways.

**Public:** A question was asked with regard to the type of plants being planted and if they were indigenous to Florida.

**Staff:** Native habitat types are required within a Greenway. Native species of plants are not required within the 70% Opacity. Some exotic plants are allowed according to the zoning code. The list of plants is available and the species are not invasive. Most of the trees listed are all native with regard to a few exotic palm species.

**Public:** A question was asked with regard to Fiscal Neutrality and if this would be part of the January 16, 2014 PC hearing.

**Staff:** FN-3 Affordable Housing is not part of the Phase 2 topics. This topic relates to the clarification of administration of the Affordable Housing Plan.

**Public:** Concern was stated with regard to the Arterial Roadway and that it wasn't going to be a traditional Main Street with slower speeds but a 45 MPH to 50 MPH roadway similar to Lakewood Ranch.

**Public:** A suggestion was stated with regard to the Villages and that the future roadways should be visible on the map.

**Meeting concluded at 7:55 p.m.**



# NEIGHBORHOOD WORKSHOP

**PLEASE SIGN IN!**

Project Name:  
SARASOTA 2050 2ND PHASE

Project Number: \_\_\_\_\_  
Date/Time: DECEMBER 12<sup>th</sup>, 2013  
Staff Member: Bill Spaeth

Location: \_\_\_\_\_

	Name	Email	ADDRESS & ZIP CODE	Phone
1	KAFI BENZ	12AFCON@gmail.com		
2	Ivan Len	ternquay@me.com		
3	KEUCY KLEPPER	KEUCY.KLEPPER@KIMLEY-HORN.COM		
4	SEAN MAHER	seanmaher1@gmail.com		586-740
5	Bob Easteruk	EASTERLELBIK@AOL.COM		34239
6	ZELDA WALKER	ZDI Realty@gmail.com	838 HONORE AVE	
7	Gabe Midwood	britishisle@hotmail.com		401 741-1824
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

# NEIGHBORHOOD WORKSHOP

**PLEASE SIGN IN!**

Project Name: SARASOTA 2050 2ND PHASE	Project Number: _____ Date/Time: <u>DECEMBER 12, 2013</u> Staff Member: <u>Bill Spaeth</u>
Location: _____	

	Name	Email	ADDRESS & ZIP CODE	Phone
1	SUSAN CHAPMAN	susan.chapman@sarasotagov.com		313 11607
2	John Krotec	now.volunteer@gmail.com		(941) 371-6208
3	JANE PAQUETTE	janoel@convent.net		
4	Wade Matthews	wademathews@gmail.com		
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

# NEIGHBORHOOD WORKSHOP

**PLEASE SIGN IN!**

Project Name: SARASOTA 2050 2ND PHASE	Project Number: _____ Date/Time: <u>DECEMBER 12, 2013</u> Staff Member: <u>Bill Spaeth</u>
Location: _____	

	Name	Email	ADDRESS & ZIP CODE	Phone
1	Debi Osborne	debi.ecosara@k12.fl.us		941-2100
2	Ken Marsh	ken.marsh@sarasotacountyschools.net		941-9000
3	David Langhast	dlanghast@k12.fl.us		
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

# NEIGHBORHOOD WORKSHOP

**PLEASE SIGN IN!**

Project Name:  
SARASOTA 2050 2ND PHASE

Project Number: \_\_\_\_\_  
Date/Time: DECEMBER 12, 2013  
Staff Member: Bill Spaeth

Location:

	Name	Email	ADDRESS & ZIP CODE	Phone
1	KEVIN COOPER	KCOOPER@SARASOTACHAMBER.COM		
2	JON MILLER	JONOSARASOTA@GMAIL.COM		
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

## We Welcome Your Comments

\*~~It~~ perceptions are sometimes (and most times) the truth for people. I believe it is important to be clear & concise about the reasons changes are being initiated. It would be nice to give those reasons in terms that **PLEASE PRINT** residents can understand and who are not well-schooled or educated about land-use issues.

Name: John Krotec

Address: 1515 Vereda Verde

City, State, Zip Sarasota, FL 34232

Email: and Phone Number ops@engineers.com (941) 371-6208

### COMMENT(S):

- ① The major question we hear is, "Why change a plan before anything has even been implemented under 2050?" - Educate why the changes are needed.
- ② Consider carefully "A" streets / "B" streets %'s. Find examples of where they work.
- ③ Use of "A" streets along main arterials to facilitate retail-uses. Also, investigate opacities from current retail developments. (over)

## SARASOTA COUNTY CIVILITY CODE

Pursuant to Resolution No. 2001-145 adopted on June 12, 2001, the following Civility Code shall govern all proceedings before the Sarasota County Planning Commission:

1. All electronic devices, including cell phones and pagers, shall be either turned off or otherwise silenced.
2. Prolonged conversations shall be conducted outside meeting areas.
3. Clapping, whistling, heckling, gesturing, loud conversations, or other disruptive behavior is prohibited.
4. Individuals who have submitted comment cards may make comments at the Public Meeting.
5. Comments at Public Meetings shall be limited to the subject being considered.
6. All public comments shall avoid personal attacks, abusive language and redundancy.
7. No person attending a Public Meeting is to harass, annoy or otherwise disturb any other person in the room.

Any member of the public whose behavior is disruptive and violates the Sarasota County Civility Code is subject to removal from the Public Meeting and such other action as may be appropriate.

④ Actual feasibility of reconstructing greenways with environmental features (ie. riparian forests) need to accurately determined (if might make any, an improvement, as possible)

# We Welcome Your Comments

**PLEASE PRINT**

**Name:** Ann Lenk

**Address:** 835 S. Osprey Ave Unit 314 Sarasota 342

**City, State, Zip**

**Email: and Phone Number**

**COMMENT(S):** Could you make these meetings any more difficult to attend?

Xmas parking lot etc?!

The city should not have to shoulder the burden  
of complaints