

June 4, 2022

Brett Harrington



CPA 2022-B

Good day Mr. Harrington,

The Miakka Community Club (MCC) has reviewed both the preapplication and the Application for Comprehensive Plan Amendment submitted by Katie LaBarr, Project Manager, Planning, Stantec Consulting Services Inc. referred to as CPA 2022-. B.

MCC will begin by renewing our request for an additional Neighborhood Workshop.

FLU Policy 1.3.4. “The purpose of the workshop shall be for the **applicant and community to work collaboratively and discuss the nature of the proposed development, to solicit suggestions and concerns**” ... (emphasis added).

Resolution No. 2021-165, C “Any person who believes that a required Neighborhood Workshop did not meet the county standards must raise the issue in writing...” MCC is once again raising that issue.

**THE WORKSHOP SYNOPSIS** shows one person (#2) says this is not much of a workshop. #13 asks for a more robust process of public input and #21 states several people were unable to join the online workshop. They stated the workshop was inadequate in terms of public access. Following are Responses given by Stantec, which MCC finds to be substantive lacking:

*Compatibility:*

1. This proposal does not match the existing home and land use in this area. Please elaborate on how this proposal supports the existing residents and landowners?

**Response: The intent is to commit to 50% open space for the overall project and to include greenbelts along the edges of the project to ensure compatibility with the adjacent land uses.**

The Response doesn't answer the question. As the Stantec stated in the Pre-Application, the existing zoning district is OUE-1, OUR AND HPD on this land. The first two require an 80% open space requirement and the HPD requires a 60% open space. The land east of this development is Rural on the FLUM and is therefore either OUE-1 or OUR, both of which UDC requirement of 80% open space

How does 50% open space match 60 and 80% open space. This is **NON-RESPONSIVE**.

*Concept Plan:*

4. You state that this new development will have 50% open space, but your map does not appear to show 50% open space.

**Response: That is the text of the proposal and will be part of our commitment and the development review process.**

An answer would state how many acres are open space and how many acres are to be developed. They list in the text amendment what qualifies as open space. The open space acreage should show how many acres are dedicated to each allowable use.

7. The north east corner of your development does not show buffer. Is the green space north of your development (red line) permanent Green space??

**Response: When we have concept plans at such a scale, sometimes it may be difficult to**

really understand or see the separation along the different edges, but we will include details in our application, with our master development plan, that addresses these edge conditions. We assure you that proper buffering will be completed throughout the site.

Rather than assure that there will be proper buffering, just state what the buffering will be. Who determines what is “proper buffering”? What are the criteria?

This is what the Neighborhood Workshop allows for collaboration and the opportunity to solicit suggestions This is **NON-RESPONSIVE**.

#### *Environment:*

1. Will you be providing a wildlife underpasses on the new road?

2. What about wildlife corridor? It seems to be homes from district lines to line

**Response: These are details that would be addressed during the construction plan review, but it's important to note that the concept plan does contemplate ribbons of green space throughout the site, to provide interconnected corridors for wildlife and protected species.**

The response should have stated how many acres of ribbons of green space will be provided and how wide the ribbons will be. How can the public feel confident of the interconnected corridors are of sufficient size to protect wildlife and protected species?

The protected species and the wildlife should be identified. **NON-RESPONSIVE.**

3. Will all development, including roadways, adhere to dark skies principles with shaded lights and downward only lighting.

**Response: Anything that is required by Sarasota County UDC will be complied with at the time of development.**

This is not an answer. The public are not UDC consultants. If the Consultant was truly interested, particularly since this is provided in written responses, in providing the public with information then Stantec would have listed those sections of the UDC with the language of each requirement. **NON-RESPONSIVE.**

#### *Housing:*

4. Is there any affordable housing in Lakewood ranch now?

**Response: Affordable/Community housing will be offered on a voluntary basis with the incentives that are provided for in the UDC. There is an overall cap of 5,000 dwelling units on the property, which includes any community housing.**

**Response times for sheriff, EMS, fire, etc. are evaluated during the review process, and in even greater detail at time of rezone. The cost of these services will be contemplated in the fiscal neutrality study that we will prepare and submit for review.**

The UDC requirements should be listed and the language provided.

There is not information on response times of sheriff, EMS, fire etc. While the response says it will be given in more detail at the rezoning, that implies that some review or analysis has been conducted. Yet, they did not provide that information. **NON-RESPONSIVE.**

#### *Lakepark Estates:*

3. Has LWR purchased Lakepark Estates?

**Response: Lakewood Ranch has not purchased Lakepark Estates. Lakepark Estates will be incorporated into the Village Transition Zone; however, it's not going to cause any changes to Phase One that has already been approved. We are working with staff on how to facilitate this through the proper language**

Phases 2 and 3 have also been approved, it was an approval for all of Lakepark Estates.

How many homes are being built in Phase 1, Phase 2 and Phase 3?

What are the start and finish dates for each Phase?

The total allowed houses were 400. Will the density for the entire project be increased? If so, by how many?

*Policy:*

2. 2050 Plan policies were that Hamlet transitioned between Village and rural development. How does an increase in density achieve this policy goal?

**Response: The goal of these amendments is to allow for a form of development that is very similar to what is observed in Lakewood Ranch. We propose to do this by creating the Village Transition Zone, which will be limited to the subject property and be slightly less dense than the Village designation and slightly more dense than the Hamlet designation. This zone will allow for a maximum base density of 2 dwelling units per gross developable acre, not to exceed a maximum unit count of 5,000 units. The amendments will also include incentive community housing.**

This is not slightly more dense than what would be allowed by the Hamlet Designation.

Hamlets preferred density is from 50 to 150 units. For the proposed 4,000 acres, that would be between 200 and 600 units. 5,000 units for the entire project area is MORE THAN SLIGHTLY MORE DENSE. IT IS A 2,400% (200 units) or a 733.33% increase (600 units).

There is not a guarantee that this land would be Hamlets. That requires a quasi-judicial hearing before the Board of County Commissioners. Currently allowed densities for the 4,000 acres would be a total of 717 units: 60 from the 300 acres zoned OUE-1, 257 from the 2,570 acres zoned OUR 400 from the 1,030 HPD. This is an increase of 597.35%

**UNSUBSTANTIATED STATEMENT.**

4. What does your "commitment" mean? Does that mean you will positively commit and put in writing?

**Response: As we indicated in this presentation, part of this Comprehensive Plan Amendment is to create a Village Transition Zone which will include text on incentives for affordable housing, following the same basis outlined in the UDC. There will not be a mandate for affordable housing as that is no longer allowed in Florida Statute. All application materials are made available to the public and published on the County website, so you'll have the opportunity to review our policy language once it is formally submitted for staff review.**

Again, the specific UDC requirements should be given. **NON-RESPONSIVE.**

*Process:*

4. If this goes ahead, when will initial land clearing begin

**Response: We are at the beginning of the review process, so it is too early to tell when initial clearing may begin.**

This is grossly inaccurate. Lakepark Estates has already begun development. Lakepark Estates is CURRENTLY not in compliance with stipulation 2 which required turn lanes for both entrances/exits before or concurrent with development.

Can we expect continued non-compliance of stipulations in the future? Is this the *modus operandi*?

*Public participation:*

3. How can we stop your request for zoning changes and keep our open-use-estate classification? No one wants to see more development out here. Do any of you live in these areas.

**Response: There are several opportunities for public engagement and input throughout this process. The first is through tonight's workshop where we are looking for feedback from the community. There will also be opportunities for residents to speak to the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners as these applications move through the public hearing review process.**

We all know that the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners are not for public engagement. They merely create a public record. Both of these meetings occur at the end of the process.

The engagement and input should occur through a Neighborhood Workshop that allows for those exchanges rather than the Workshop that occurred already.

4. There is a reason we moved to Bern Creek and not Lakewood Ranch. Have you considered how your project impacts residents like us?

**Response: Yes, the intent would be to provide appropriate buffering adjacent to each of the particular boundary conditions. We will provide the specific details in our application.**

What is appropriate buffering? NON-RESPONSIVE.

#### *Transportation:*

2. Wouldn't an additional road extending east to Verna Road assist in an evacuation event?

**Response: This project may improve hurricane evacuation clearance times, by providing a regional corridor connecting University Parkway to Fruitville Road, via Bourneside Boulevard. Bourneside Boulevard currently extends all the way to State Road 64, so providing that north-south corridor for cross county transportation may be beneficial.**

“may be beneficial” is NON-RESPONSIVE.

Hurricane evacuation is from downtown to the east, not to the north. Are the Consultants aware that Fruitville Road is an evacuation route for heading EAST, not to get people to a parking lot called I-75?

13. What is FDOT's role in approving these plans?

**Response: None of these roadways touch state rights-of-way, so they would have no role in this process.**

Isn't Fruitville Road a State Road, HWY 780?

During the review of Hi Hat's Comprehensive Plan Amendment, didn't FDOT ask to be part of the review of other proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments?

#### *Misc.:*

2. "VOS Policy 5.2 Protected Roadway Character requires open vistas and protect the integrity of the rural character of Fruitville Road/SR 780 east of Dog Kennel Road, now called Lorraine Road. How will you accomplish this? Already, Lake Park Estates has not protected the rural character of Fruitville Road. Will construction continue at Lake Park Estates and go west or will Lakewood Ranch build east or both? What is the build out date? Is Lakewood Ranch currently at build out density? While the western boundary is urban, the proposed area of change, 3,900 acres, is surrounded by rural lands that may currently have livestock. How will you mitigate the construction noises such as continual diesel engines on large equipment and the backup beepers that will most likely startle the livestock? I believe there is already such a problem around the Polo Club, frightening the horses. What water source will be used to irrigate the lawns? Fruitville Road is currently listed as a constrained road. How many more vehicles will be added to Fruitville Road due to this proposed density increase? Fruitville Road is an evacuation route. What analysis was conducted to determine what the additional traffic would do to reduce evacuation times? Thank you,

Becky Ayech

President Miakka Community Club

Did SMR or Lakewood Ranch challenge the 2050 Amendment? Why or why not? What has changed since the adoption of 2050 that necessitates the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment? The waterbodies colored blue is called stormwater on the Development Concept Plan. How many are there? What is the total acreage? What is the average size? Will they dry down since they are stormwater? Or will they be augmented? If augmented, from where will the water come? How will you manage the mosquitoes? Will the HOA or another entity prohibit mowing

to the edge of the stormwater ponds/waterbodies? What will lawn fertilizer applications or restrictions be? Who will enforce? You portray this as a transition. 2050 defines Hamlets as a transition form of development intended to blend toward the more rural eastern area of the County. Why do you need a different type of transition form of development? Two units an acre does not blend with rural. It is urban sprawl. Bill Spaeth, retired Sarasota Planner identified Lake park Estates as urban sprawl. This is urban sprawl times 2. If adopted, this will become a creeping of urban density that will use the same reasoning for extending urban development throughout the Rural area identified on the Future Land Use Map (FLUM). Why can't the 1,000-acre development, Lake Park Estates remain with a density cap of 400 dwelling units on 1 unit per acre? Why don't you build up and not out? What amenities will be provided? Where are they located on the Development Concept Plan? Lake Park Estates is currently under construction. If the proposed Amendment is approved, when will the next phase begin? Will the infrastructure be in phases or done all at once? How many water tanks need to be built so the water pressure is sufficient for fire suppression? Where will they be located? What will they look like? Will you be able to see them or will they be screened? Lake Park Estates was required to have one pressure tank that would be located along Fruitville Road.

3. How exactly is this an example of smart growth? Sincere question.

4. How is this a smart growth effort? Will there be objective environmental impact studies? Who will pay for infrastructure? Please include accident and incident reports within 5 miles for last 5 years. Btw this was difficult to get into.

**NON-RESPONSIVE TO MOST OF THESE QUESTIONS.**

**For the question on 2050 - the 2050 regulations were adopted in 2002, about 20 years ago. Things change and sometimes adjustments are needed, and we believe these adjustments that we are proposing are appropriate for long term compatible development.**

They do not explain why. What data and analysis has been provided to substantiate these claims?

6. How many acres of the 3900 acres are deemed "developable" acres? If 50% is deemed OPEN SPACE and not developable, does that mean the developable acres are 1850 acres, and total units 3900? i.e. 2 X 1850 DEVELOPABLE ACRES

**Response: In round numbers, yes this is correct.** 6. How many acres of the 3900 acres are deemed "developable" acres? If 50% is deemed OPEN

SPACE and not developable, does that mean the developable acres are 1850 acres, and total units 3900? i.e. 2 X 1850 DEVELOPABLE ACRES

**Response: In round numbers, yes this is correct.**

This is not the same answer that has been given in the application, they set the limit at 5,000 units not 3,900. Which is the correct answer?

## **NARRATIVE AND CONSISTENCY**

Neighborhood commercial is not proposed, as the needs for commercial uses are supplied elsewhere in locations more conducive to the success of commercial and retail enterprise. In addition, the proposed project seeks to support the existing commercial development of the area such as Waterside.

The VTZ RMA seeks to provide a more compatible development form and density transition from Village to Hamlet. The maximum base density will be 1 du/gross acre, including such portions of the Greenway RMA located within the VTZ RMA. To achieve the desired development form, the dwelling units to which the on-site Greenway RMA and required Open Space would otherwise be entitled will be transferred into

the Developed Area of the property resulting in a maximum base density of 2 dwelling units per acre of Developed Area. This base density may be increased by way of incentives outlined in the Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment, yet the development cannot exceed 5,000 dwelling units.

The proposed VTZ RMA requires the protection and incorporation of open space and environmental resources by incorporating the Greenway and through the provisions 50% open space, subject to a potential decrease to 43% for reduced Greenbelts.

Phase One of Lakepark Estates is being

developed under the HPD zoning which has more restrictive standards than will be implemented by the VTZ RMA, therefore the Phase One development (density, open space, etc.) will be compliant with the overall VTZ Master Plan and be able to be incorporated seamlessly.

**c. Justification for the proposed amendment including a statement of consistency with the Comprehensive Plan;**

The purpose of the Applicant's requests is to implement an alternative form of development that supports and incorporates elements of existing Lakewood Ranch, encouraging the extension of that form of development on the subject property. Please see **Section 2.4** below for the consistency analysis with the Comprehensive Plan.

## 2.4 Comprehensive Plan Consistency

The proposed Comprehensive Plan Large-Scale Map Amendment and Text Amendment both recognize and address the unique location, characteristics, and features of the Lakewood Ranch Southeast property. With the proposed addition of the new VTZ RMA category and its corresponding policy language, it is acknowledged that certain existing policies within *Chapter 8 – 2050 Resource Management Area* are no longer applicable. **They must identify which existing policies within Chapter 8 that are no longer applicable.** Therefore, an evaluation of certain applicable goals, objectives, and policies in other sections of the Sarasota County Comprehensive Plan are provided below to demonstrate consistency between existing and proposed language, consistent with Chapter 163 F.S.

The proposed development is consistent with the intent, goals, objectives, policies, guiding principles and programs of the Sarasota County Comprehensive Plan including but not limited to the following:

### **Chapter 1 – Environment**

#### **ENV Objective 1.2 Protection of Resources: Protect environmental resources during land use changes and establishment of urban services.**

The proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments propose preservation of 50% open space including the general preservation of lands designated as a 2050 Greenway RMA, which have an existing conservation easement, wetlands, and other native habitats. Open Space may be reduced to 43% for reduced greenbelts. **The proposal does not protect environmental resources. The current land use designation of OUE-1, OUR require 80% Open Space and HPD requires 60% Open Space. Currently, the existing zoning would provide 2,296 acres of Open Space. If all the land would be changed to Hamlet, there would be 2,400 acres of Open space, VTZ 's 50% Open Space would provide 2,000 acres in Open Space and their request for only 43% Open Space would be 1,720 acres.**

**No one person would find it reasonable to lose 576 acres of Open Space as meeting ENV Objective 1.2**

#### **ENV Objective 1.3 Habitat Connectivity: Preserve a network of habitat connectivity across the landscape that ensures adequate representation of native habitats suitable to support the functions and values of all ecological communities.**

The proposed VTZ RMA includes provisions for **significant open space within the subject property.** Residential development will be clustered and designed in a manner to minimize the disruption of habitat connectivity throughout and adjacent to the site. The location of areas designated for habitat preservation and open space will be guided by the Sarasota County 2050 Greenway RMA map including attention to connectivity between Greenway-designated areas across the subject property's landscape.

The reduction of Open Space as well as the reduction on the perimeter of the property on Fruitville Road to 50' from 500' does not provide adequate representation of native habitats nor significant open space.

#### **Chapter 2 – Parks, Preserves, and Recreation**

**PARKS Objective 1.1 Recreation Level of Service (LOS): Acquire, develop, maintain, protect and enhance parks, preserves and recreation facilities, consistent with the needs and interests of Sarasota County's population and based on financial feasibility to operate and maintain the parks.**

The proposed VTZ Master Plan and information included as a part of the DOCC will showcase how the proposed project will incorporate onsite recreational and preservation areas.

By simply saying sometime in the future we will do this is not consistency, more like wishful thinking.

**PARKS Objective 1.2 Compatibility and Sustainability: Ensure that parks, preserves and facilities are compatible with surrounding land uses, the Sarasota 2050 Plan, and the natural environment.**

The proposed amendment will ensure that the subject property will provide 43% to 50% of its gross acreage to Open Space. Uses within the Open Space include, but are not limited to natural habitat, improved pastures, stormwater facilities, water storage facilities, public or private park facilities, and trails. These uses will work to balance the preservation of ecologically sensitive areas, specifically within the Greenway RMA, and recreational/park needs of the community, residents, and surrounding neighbors.

Some of the allowable uses in the 43-50% Open Space are not compatible with parks or preserves. Stormwater facilities certainly are not compatible with the natural environment. If they were, there would already be lakes. The water storage facilities can be above ground, huge tanks, that are not compatible with parks.

#### **Chapter 7 – Future Land Use**

**FLU Goal 4: Promote orderly development through the establishment of innovative regulatory platforms that meet the needs of a growing and changing population.**

The proposed VTZ RMA seeks to provide an appropriate development form and density transition between the existing Village and Hamlet RMA overlay zones. The intent of the VTZ RMA is to establish development parameters that are specific to the subject site only, given the unique characteristics of the site and the needs of the County's growing population. Proposed development is intended to be a balanced and compatible extension of the existing Lakewood Ranch community. The proposed density that is contemplated in the new policy language provides a thoughtful transition from higher density, more urban development of Village, to the more rural density that exists further east. This transition is consistent with limiting urban sprawl and preserving the rural character of the community.

The subject property will also undergo an extensive planning process, known as a DOCC application, in order to ensure orderly and resilient development with an increased focus on collaboration across varied disciplines and the community.

Densities of 2 units per acre in the land does not preserve rural character at 1 homestead per 5 and 10 acres.

This development is auto dependent development with a single use that is not functionally related to adjacent land uses except for the small section adjacent to Lakewood Ranch

#### **Chapter 9 – Housing**

**HOU Objective 1.1 Housing Creation: Encourage the market to provide ample diversity in housing types and affordability levels to accommodate present and future housing need of Sarasota County residents.**

The proposed VTZ RMA will allow for Lakewood Ranch Southeast to be developed as an extension of the Lakewood Ranch community; thus, the subject property will provide housing types that are



complimentary to those that exist in the sounding area **Sounding Area being only on the side of Lakewood Ranch As noted the existing property is OUE-1, OUR and HPD and is identified as “rural” on the FLUM. It is not complementary to those properties.** Additionally, the proposed Comprehensive

Plan Amendments offer an option to allow the inclusion of Community Housing to accommodate individuals and families from diverse income levels and offer a variety of housing types.

**HOU Policy 1.1.4: Establish and maintain residential development standards that support housing production while promoting the vitality of established neighborhoods.**

The proposed amendment will allow the subject property to be developed as a compatible and complementary extension of the highly demanded Lakewood Ranch community. Lakewood Ranch Southeast will increase the County’s housing production, while also promoting the vitality of established neighborhoods through connected street and trail networks, open space, unified signage, wayfinding, and more. **The rest of the property not next to the Lakewood Ranch community is also highly in demand. Antidotally, 5- and 10-acre homesteads are also in high demand and they provide 80% Open Space and produce less traffic and are currently having more wildlife due to the noise and destruction caused by Lakepark Estates.**

**They have not explained how they are providing vitality to the established neighborhoods. The only neighborhood they consider is Lakewood Ranch.**

**This 597.35% increase in density certainly doesn’t forebode well for the rural neighbors. There will be noise and odor complaints. The rural character will not be vitalized by the increased lighting and 39,900 trip increase in traffic.**

#### **Chapter 11 – Economic Development**

**ECON Objective 2.2: Support practices that encourage the attraction and development of a workforce that is younger, inclusive and diverse.**

The proposed VTZ RMA will encourage the Lakewood Ranch Southeast property to develop in a way that positively contributes to the County’s housing stock, supporting the current and future local workforce (Waterside, Lakewood Ranch Corporate Park, etc.).

**All of these are off site. This is not smart growth if your population needs to go off site for employment.**

## **2.6 Summary**

In summary, the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments will allow for the Lakewood Ranch Southeast property to support the County’s growing population in a development form that is a compatible extension of the existing Lakewood Ranch community.

This RMA framework implements the organizing concepts represented by the principles set forth within “Directions for the Future,” adopted by the Board on October 10, 2000 by Resolution 2000-230. “Directions for the Future” contained the following principles to guide long range planning and sustainability initiatives for the county.

Of the 12 principles, the proposed CPA 2022-B does not comport with the following:

: • Preserve and strengthen existing communities. **The only community CPA 2022-B recognizes is Lakewood Ranch and totally ignores the rural communities including the Old Miakka Community**

• Provide for a variety of land uses and lifestyles to support residents of diverse ages, incomes, and family sizes. **They want everybody to look like Lakewood Ranch. They assert CPA 2022-B should be taken as a whole to Lakewood Ranch not a stand -alone. This eliminates the requirements that would apply to a Village Overlay, like schools and commercial and office space.**



- Preserve environmental systems **Reducing the size of required Open Space does not preserve Open Space**
- Avoid urban sprawl **This development is an auto dependent development with a single use that is not functionally related to adjacent land uses except for the small section adjacent to Lakewood Ranch**
- Reduce automobile trips. **All daily needs as well as employment will be off site.**
- Preserve rural character, including opportunities for agriculture **This density request is not preserving rural character. They state it is suburban.**
- Balance jobs with housing. **We don't know the costs of housing versus the average wage.**

## TRANSPORTATION

Section 5, Transportation obfuscates the real impacts of the traffic that will be generated by this proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment.

What should be considered:

**Existing Traffic Counts on Fruitville Road from Verna to I-75.** (They look at new traffic impacts on University Parkway from I 75 to Lake Osprey and then further eastern segments.) Fruitville Road is the only road into Sarasota and access to I -75.

**Total Trips Under existing zoning on CPA 2022-B.** The existing zoning is OUE-1 - 600 acres equals 60 du, OUR – 2,570 acres equals 257 and the Lakepark Estates Hamlet equal 400 du. This is 717 du and using the 7.98 factor that would be  $7.98 \times 717 \text{ du}$  equals (The analysis of Total Trips in the analysis of CPA-2018-C, a factor of 7.98 was used to determine the total trips. 2,727 du would generate 21,765 daily trips). 5,722.

**Total Trips under proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment.** The Report only speaks to Peak P.M. trips. As stated above, Fruitville Road is the ONLY road into Sarasota from not only Old Miakka, but also Manatee and Desoto Counties. The existing traffic counts will verify that the traffic on Fruitville Road is constant. It is not limited to cars and personal trucks, but a large amount of semi-trucks and dump trucks and livestock trailers. The livestock trailer traffic is expected to increase because of the Estuarian Center in Manatee County which is most easily reached using Fruitville Road.

In the analysis of Total Trips in the analysis of CPA-2018-C, a factor of 7.98 was used to determine the total trips. 2,727 du would generate 21,765 daily trips. There could be internal capture of some trips because a Hamlet allows for some commercial.

Using that same factor of 7.98, 5,000 du would generate **39,900 daily trips**. CPA 2022-B does not propose to capture any internal traffic. They have stated they plan for residents to go off site for their daily needs.

## SCHOOLS

5. Property Zoning: Existing OUE-1, OUR & HPD Proposed OUE-1, OUR & HPD  
Why isn't the proposed use RSF-2 PUD or more importantly Village transition Zone?

6. Future Land Use: Existing Rural Proposed Rural

The RURAL AREA preserves agricultural lands, maintains open spaces and protects native habitats. Residential densities in the rural are typically limited to a maximum of 1 dwelling unit per five acres. Another implementing zoning classification is OUR, 1 unit per 10 acres.

Are they implying the Village Transition Zone is consistent with the Legend for the Rural Designation on the FLUM?

MCC, unequivocally, states “they are not remotely close”.

8. Provide the approximate dates of: start of construction, initial occupancy and build out for each phase of the project.

The anticipated build out timing is 10 years.

NON- RESPONSIVE.

### **GENERAL**

Stantec states the buildout will be in 10 years.

The first 5 years will have 300 du built each year, a total of 1,500 du. This will generate 11,970 daily trips. There remains 3,500 du to build in the 6-10 years. This will generate an additional 27,930 daily trips.

Why is there such a diversity in the number of homes built in the two time periods? What data and analysis were used to reach this conclusion?

How will this second flux of traffic effect the LOS on Fruitville Road from Verna to I-75?

Respectfully submitted,  
Becky Ayech  
President  
Miakka Community Club