

SARASOTA COUNTY
SARASOTA 2050 RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AREA (RMA) POLICY REVISITED
APPROVED SCOPE OF WORK

I. Sarasota 2050 RMA Policy Revisited: Scope of Work.

Prepared pursuant to County Code 94-85(c):

A. Scope of Work document Part 1 – “Definition and issue identification”.

This Scope of Work document has been prepared recognizing that the extent of any proposed Comprehensive Plan, Zoning and/or Land Development Regulation amendment will ultimately be determined by the results of the analysis on each issue. All issues presented, by both the private development interests and members of the public, were considered and assessed by staff. The issues identified and described within this section were determined to warrant evaluation and analysis.

1. Open Space/Environment.

- a) Conservation Easement (CE) Timing.
OS-1 Issue Statement: Allow CEs to be recorded incrementally consistent with a master plan. Create consistent standard regarding the timing of recording Conservation Easements for Villages, Hamlets, Settlement Areas and other development proposals.
- b) Open Space (What is allowed and what constitutes open space?).
OS-4 Issue Statement: Allow lakes and lake banks to count as open space if they have a minimum of 25% public access along the edge and public access is allowed after native habitat and environment objectives have been accomplished.
- c) OS-5 Issue Statement: Allow Greenway RMA to count towards the Open Space requirement.
- d) Greenbelts and View-sheds.
OS-9 Issue Statement: Review the conditions for establishing greenbelt and viewshed distances based on existing site environmental factors and location criteria. Establish an evaluation matrix for making the determinations.
- e) Greenways.
OS-10 Issue Statement: Better define the evaluation parameters for determining alternative greenway configurations and whether storm-water facilities or other uses may be incorporated into the design.
- f) Oscar Scherer State Park (OSSP).
OS-14 Issue Statement: Ensure the integrity of Oscar Scherer State Park, and ensure ecological connections with other public lands and greenways.
- g) Pine Flatwood.
OS-15 Issue Statement: Better define criteria for when pine flatwoods habitat should be conserved with a focus on corridors, buffering and connectivity.

**SARASOTA 2050 RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AREA (RMA) POLICY REVISITED
APPROVED SCOPE OF WORK**

2. New Urbanism/Smart Growth.

a) Housing Types.

NU-1 Issue Statement: Evaluate housing types including definitions, number of types, and percentage of types required/allowed. Recommended options for providing flexibility in provisions for housing types including the number of types, and percentage of types, allowing additional housing types not defined, and options for administrative modification to requirements.

b) Commercial Location.

NU-2 Issue Statement: Evaluate requirement that a Village or Neighborhood Center must be centrally located in a Village development. Recommend Village Center location options including the perimeter of Village development and along existing adjacent arterials.

NU-3 Issue Statement: Evaluate Land Use Mix Requirements as detailed in table indicating minimum requirements as a percentage of land use. Recommend elimination of, or changes to, specified requirements for residential, public/civic, commercial/retail, and office as a percentage of land use. No changes proposed for Public Space land use.

NU-4 Issue Statement: Evaluate requirement that there be only one Village Center per Village. Recommend options for providing for multiple Village Centers. This evaluation would be made at the same time and in the context of evaluating alternative Village Center location options.

NU-5 Issue Statement: Evaluate requirement that there be at least one Village Center. Recommend options for providing no Village Centers.

c) Walk-ability.

NU-7 Issue Statement: Allow greater flexibility in the application of the walk-ability provisions. Evaluate requirements for 1/4 mile proximity of neighborhood center and focal point to a certain amount of housing. Recommend alternatives to 1/4 mile radius requirement. This evaluation would be made at the same time and in the context of evaluating the definition and requirement for focal points.

NU-8 Issue Statement: Evaluate definition and requirement for focal points. Recommend alternative definition and requirements and address the 4,000 foot separation provision within Hamlets.

NU-9 Issue Statement: Evaluate the required 400 unit maximum for Hamlet. Recommend alternative limitations.

Rationale: Evaluate a Comprehensive Plan amendment. Evaluation of the maximum 400 units is recommended. It is unclear the purpose for this restriction.

d) Density.

NU-11 Issue Statement: Evaluate and clarify language specifying density allowed.

**SARASOTA 2050 RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AREA (RMA) POLICY REVISITED
APPROVED SCOPE OF WORK**

NU-13 Issue Statement: Evaluate standards and requirements for calculating transfer of development rights for dwelling units. Recommend changes to how transfer rights are calculated.

e) **Specific Provisions.**

NU-15 Issue Statement: Evaluate how all modification provisions provided in the Comprehensive Plan and zoning regulations are processed. Recommend alternatives to board approval of modifications, including flexible standards or administrative approval of modifications.

NU-16 Issue Statement: Evaluate "new urbanism" form-based development standards. Recommend alternatives to adopted design and development standards. Development standards are currently reviewed / approved administratively at the neighborhood and village center plan stage after master land use approvals by the board.

NU-18 Issue Statement: Re-examine the minimum size requirements for a Village as related to the county's goals for inclusive mixed use neighborhoods.

3. Fiscal Neutrality.

a) **Compliance.**

FN-1 Issue Statement: Evaluate how compliance with policy and regulatory requirements governing fiscal neutrality can be demonstrated subsequent to initial project approval.

b) **Timing Provisions.**

FN-2 Issue Statement: Evaluate the basis for timing/limiting mechanisms for Village development within the Village / Open Space RMA.

c) **Specific Provisions.**

FN-3 Issue Statement: Review affordable housing requirements specifically in the context of fiscal neutrality.

4. Specific Provisions.

a) **Limitations.**

SP-1 Issue Statement: Re-examine the intensity of development contemplated in the designated settlement area as related to the county's infrastructure capabilities.

b) **Corrections.**

SP-2 Issue Statement: Align the language used in the Zoning Reg. 2050 Use Table (Sec. 11.2.5.d.) with the main Zoning Code Use Table (Sec. 5.1.) and/or vice versa.

SP-3 Issue Statement: Corrections and updates to policy language that is no longer needed due to regulations having been written and adopted.

**SARASOTA 2050 RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AREA (RMA) POLICY REVISITED
APPROVED SCOPE OF WORK**

B. Scope of Work Document Part 2 - ‘Further research issues and estimate workload’.

1. The proposed schedule for the analysis and review of each issue is as follows:

- a) 4 to 6 months: Issues to be addressed within a short term timeframe that generally involve modifications to the Zoning or Land Development Regulations only without policy changes.
 - i. OS-1: Conservation Easement timing.
 - ii. NU-1: Housing Types
 - iii. NU-2: Commercial Location
 - iv. NU-4: Village Center Requirement
 - v. NU-11: Clarity of Density Granted
 - vi. NU-13: Clarity in Dwelling Unit Derivation
- b) 7 to 10 months: Issues to be addressed within a minimal timeframe involving policy changes (Comprehensive Plan) that do not deviate significantly from the original fundamental values represented by 2050 policy.
 - i. OS-4: What Constitutes as Open Space
 - ii. OS-5: Greenway RMA as Open Space
 - iii. OS-9: Greenbelts and View-sheds
 - iv. OS-10: Greenways
 - v. OS-14: Oscar Scherer State Park
 - vi. OS-15: Pine Flatwoods
 - vii. NU-3: Land Use Mix Requirements
 - viii. NU-7: Flexibility in Walk-ability application
 - ix. NU-15: Modification Process
 - x. NU-16: Block Structure and Size
 - xi. NU-18: Village Size Requirements
 - xii. FN-1: Compliance
 - xiii. FN-2: Timing Provisions
 - xiv. FN-3: Affordable Housing
 - xv. SP-1: 4000 Dwelling Unit Settlement Area Limitation
 - xvi. SP-2: 2050 Use Table Alignment of Language
 - xvii. SP-3: Removal of accomplished Policy language directing regulation development
- c) 10 to 14 months: Issues to be addressed within a moderate timeframe involving policy changes (Comprehensive Plan) that appear to deviate to some extent from the original fundamental values represented by 2050 policy.
 - i. NU-5: Minimum One Village Center Requirement
 - ii. NU-8: Definition of Focal Points
 - iii. NU-9: 400 Unit Limit on Hamlets

2. The county resources required to research and analyze each issue may intensify as information and facts are brought forward:

- a) Estimated staffing workload:

	Staff Hours
i. Research and Analysis Phase	4400
ii. Community Engagement Phase	2000
iii. Processing Phase	1400
iv. Adoption Phase	1200

- b) Consultant services to address Fiscal Neutrality.
The Board, authorized the County Administrator to negotiate with at least two economists (Donna Arduin, David Denslow (UofF) and possibly Sean Snaith (UCF)) with the authority to make the selection and to authorize the work to proceed.

**SARASOTA 2050 RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AREA (RMA) POLICY REVISITED
APPROVED SCOPE OF WORK**

Directed to comprise a volunteer “Review Team” consisting of three individuals (two retired bankers/one public finance person or two public finance persons/a retired banker).

Directed completion of the Economists/Review Team work in 60 days and report to the Board no later than December 2013.

II. Community Engagement

The level of community engagement will be directly related to the three proposed scheduled timeframes of 4 to 6 months, 7 to 10 months, and over 10 months.

A. 4 to 6 months timeframe.

This timeframe is available for modifications to the Zoning / Land Development Regulations that do not involve policy changes (Comprehensive Plan).

1. Informational and educational material on proposed modifications will be made available at the county’s 2050 web page on the county’s web site.
2. One public workshop will be conducted.
3. Local Planning Authority (LPA) review of proposed modifications at a public hearing.
4. Sarasota Board of County Commissioner’s hearing on proposed modifications.

B. 7 to 10 months timeframe.

This timeframe is available for modifications to the Comprehensive Plan and/or Zoning / Land Development Regulations involving policy changes (Comprehensive Plan) that do not deviate significantly from the original fundamental values represented by 2050 policy.

1. Informational and educational material on proposed modifications will be made available at the county’s 2050 web page on the county’s web site.
2. Three public workshops will be conducted.
3. LPA review of proposed modifications at a public hearing.
4. Sarasota Board of County Commissioner’s hearing on proposed modifications.
5. State review of all proposed Comprehensive Plan modifications.
6. Sarasota Board of County Commissioner’s adoption hearing.

C. 10 to 14 months timeframe.

This timeframe is available for modifications to the Comprehensive Plan and/or Zoning / Land Development Regulations involving policy changes (Comprehensive Plan) that appear to deviate to some extent from the original fundamental values represented by 2050 policy.

1. Informational and educational material on proposed modifications will be made available at the county’s 2050 web page on the county’s web site.
2. Five public workshops will be conducted.
3. LPA review of proposed modifications at a public hearing.
4. Sarasota Board of County Commissioner’s hearing on proposed modifications.
5. State review of all proposed Comprehensive Plan modifications.
6. Sarasota Board of County Commissioner’s adoption hearing.