

June 20, 2022

**Katie LaBarr, AICP
Stantec
6920 Professional Parkway
Sarasota, FL 34240**

RE: Lakewood Ranch Southeast Development of Critical Concern (DOCC)

Dear Mrs. LaBarr:

On **May 31, 2022**, Planning Services received the submittal for the above referenced Development of Critical Concern (DOCC). After review of this Application, Sarasota County finds this application **INCOMPLETE** as submitted.

Comments are listed below along with contact names and numbers:

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION (Bryan Beard) 951-7717, Bbeard@scgov.net
Please see memo below.

STORMWATER (Scott Woodman) 861-0914 Swoodman@scgov.net
Please see memo below.

In order to continue processing your application, please provide your written response to all the comments within 45 days. If additional time is needed to generate and submit the requested information, please submit a written request to our office requesting extension of the 45-calendar day completeness response period. The letter must include the reason(s) for the extension and specify the requested extension amount of time. If a one-time extension is granted and the requested information is not submitted by the end of the extension period, the petition shall be deemed withdrawn.

Please note that all responses to completeness questions, including supplemental materials, must be submitted to Planning Services for distribution.

If you have any questions regarding the attached comments, please contact the appropriate reviewer directly. If you have general questions regarding the future processing of your application, please contact me at 861-5207.

Sincerely,

Hannah Sowinski, AICP
Planner II
Planning Services

Application: 22-134868-GR**Project Name: Lakewood Ranch Southeast DOCC**

Parcel ID No.: 0225001000

Review Discipline: Environmental Protection Division

Reviewer Name: Bryan Beard

Reviewer Phone Number: 941-915-7717

Email Address: Bbeard@scgov.net

Summary

- ☒ 1st Request for Additional Information
- ☐ 2nd Request for Additional Information
- ☐ Request for Resubmittal Checkpoint Meeting
- ☐ Review Approved (with Stipulations)

Comments

1. The proposed zoning designation has a 43% - 50% open space requirement that needs to be satisfied first with Native habitats consistent with ENV Policy 1.3.1 and UDC Article 9, Section 124-173. However, the current proposal (as identified on the proposed F1 and F2 Maps) does not accomplish this requirement. Policy 1.3.1 does permit alternatives to be considered that clearly demonstrate greater native habitat function and value and connectivity. Please fulfill all open space first with habitats or provide an alternative for review that clearly demonstrates a greater habitat function and value and connectivity for review.

2. Staff Pre-application comment #5 requested the need for the verification of Watercourses (UDC Article 13, Section 124-251) existing on-site. On site meetings with Ardurra staff resulted in watercourses being identified within the project boundaries. The response for this Pre-application information request in the application for the DOCC states the following:

Response: Please see Section 4: Environmental of this application package regarding watercourses.

During the review of Section 4 of the application staff was unable to find any information with regards to Watercourses and associated buffers. Please identify the approximate Watercourses and associated buffers on the Master Plan (C-3 Map) or provided information that was suggested was included Section 4 in the DOCC application for review.

3. Please provide analysis of the on-site Greenway RMA as prescribed in Policy GS Policy 1.1 and provide the proposed Alternative Greenway consistent with UDC, Article 14, Section 124-271(i)(2)(g) as prescribed in VTZ Policy 3.3.

4. Please provide the draft/template Restrictive Covenant as required by UDC, Article 14, Section 124-272(f)(2).

5. Current proposed wildlife corridors do not provide adequate wildlife mobility opportunities within the center of the proposed project and pushes all corridors to the boundaries of the property into spaces

that appear to be as small as 50 feet. Please provide a corridor option that connects to the north to the publicly own preservation lands through the proposed project.

6. Please remove draft Development Order Section 4 Land and Soil, A. 1. Condition. This is not a condition for a development approval and is not necessary. A condition for a development order should not supersede a County Ordinance.

Stipulations

1. None at this time.

Application: 22-134868-GR**Project Name: Lakewood Ranch Southeast (DOCC)**

Parcel Nos.: 0179010020, 0515010010, 0515010001, 0514020001, 0514010001, 0512030001, 0517120001, 0517010002, 0519020001, 0519010001, 0521030001, A Portion of 0535030006, 0537010001, 0536020001, 0225001000, 0541010001, 0543010010, 0545002010

Review Discipline: Stormwater

Reviewer Name: Scott Woodman

Reviewer Phone Number: (941) 861-0914

Email Address: swoodman@scgov.net

Summary

- ☒ 1st Request for Additional Information
- ☐ 2nd Request for Additional Information
- ☐ Request for Resubmittal Checkpoint Meeting
- ☐ Review Approved

Comments

1. In the DOCC submittal, Section 2: Development of Critical Concern for Part II.A.11, the listed items to be summarized in tabular form on the Map G-1 are missing. Please revise the Map G-1 to include the missing summarized (in tabular form) information. Please also make sure that all of the items listed in Part II.A.11 that need to be indicated on the existing drainage map (Map G-1) are provided. It appears that not all of the items listed to be shown on Map G-1 are provided.
2. In the DOCC submittal, Section 2: Development of Critical Concern for the Response to Part II.D.3.a., please revise the referenced methodology meeting with County Staff to be March 24, 2022. Additionally, in the last paragraph of the response, please add that the technical inputs to the models will be consistent with "County Requirements" in addition to the FEMA requirements.
3. In the DOCC submittal, Section 2: Development of Critical Concern for the Response to Part II.D.3.c., it states "As noted above, this information will be provided with the initial drainage study prior to or concurrent with the main roadway project application through the site (aka RECM-LWRSE)." Please provide more clarification of the timing of the main roadway project application. Will this be at time of MDO or Rezone PUD? Please provide additional clarification as to the timing of the items discussed in this response.
4. Please revise the submitted Draft Development Order Ordinance Section 8.A.3 to correctly reflect that the overall Assessment of Pre-Development Conditions (Map G-1) has not been approved or provide a blank field that can be filled in once the map has been approved by County Staff. This statement is also inconsistent with the DOCC submittal, Section 6: Development Review Committee Responses to Stormwater in the submittal. Please revise to be consistent.

Stipulations

1. None.