PDMU-06-30(G)(R6) – LAKEWOOD CENTRE GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN
(PLN1907-0086)

An Ordinance of the Board of County Commissioners of Manatee County, Florida, regarding land development, amending Ordinance PDMU-06-30(G)(R5) to approve changes to the General Development Plan and Ordinance as follows: 1) Addition of 69.55 acres and allocate existing entitlements to the land; 2) True up parcel entitlements based upon internal transfers; 3) Revise parcel boundaries for certain residential and retail parcels; 4) Update phasing and build-out dates to reflect previously granted legislative extensions; 5) Amend stipulations to facilitate these changes; 6) Modify certain conditions consistent with current department practices and other amendments for internal consistency; and 7) Modify acreage of previously approved wetland impacts, identify new proposed impacts and identify the preservation of wetland acreage within the approximately 69.55 acre parcel; providing for severability; and providing for an effective date.

The Lakewood Centre DRI southern portion is generally located north of State Road 70 East, south of Malachite Drive, east of Lakewood Ranch Boulevard, and west of the White Eagle Boulevard and the northern portion is generally located north of 44th Avenue East, south of State Road 64 East, east of Lakewood Ranch Boulevard and west of White Eagle Boulevard (approximately 1,593.23 acres).

Planning Commission: 05/14/2020
Board of County Commissioners: 06/04/2020

RECOMMENDED MOTION:

Based upon the staff report, evidence presented, comments made at the Public Hearing, the action of the Planning Commission, and finding the request to be CONSISTENT with the Manatee County Comprehensive Plan and the Manatee County Land Development Code, as conditioned herein, I move to ADOPT Manatee County Zoning Ordinance No. PDMU-06-30(G)(R6); and APPROVE the revised General Development Plan with Stipulations, as recommended by the Planning Commission.

(Commissioner Baugh)

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:
On May 14, 2020, by a vote of 6 – 0, the Planning Commission recommended approval. Mr. Rutledge was absent.
PUBLIC COMMENT AND CORRESPONDENCE:
May 14, 2020 Planning Commission

Public Comments:

Melissa Huggins, a new resident to Mallory Park this coming fall stated:
- She was told apartments going in next to Mallory Park. She doesn’t want to live next to apartments.
- Moving to Mallory Park because current home has been rezoned away from Lakewood Ranch High School and her kids want to go there.
- Traffic is a big deal there and buses can’t get to the area schools on time.

Diana Vaniel, resident of Lakewood Ranch:
- Display a petition signed by more than 1,000 people who are concerned with development and how people weren’t aware how things are changing.
- Concerned subject area was a park now being developed as apartments and this hasn’t been made clear to community.
- Letter sent to homes doesn’t represent what is being discussed today.
- There are issues with children walking past apartments from their development to get to school.
- Following are issues with apartments near their community:
  - Safety of kids next to multi-family rental property/commercial property complexes,
  - Safety of kids walking to and from school,
  - Safety of kids and residents with increase of transients and traffic,
  - Change of community character,
  - Overcrowding of schools and number of students per teacher,
  - Schools need more infrastructure with increase in population,
  - Access to school for fire and police,
  - Traffic congestion,
  - Parking congestion,
  - Number of rental units popping up within vicinity of a K-8 school and safety concerns,
  - Rental and commercial properties driving down real estate values in adjacent housing and neighborhoods,
  - Increase of crime due to lower housing costs,
  - Increase noise,
  - Appearance of neighborhood and surrounding scapes,
  - Tremendous volume of rental properties continues to increase in area will drive prices down and will affect grounds upkeep,
  - Asked who did the traffic study – the developer or our transportation staff. Asked if we allow the person getting revenue from project to create study,
  - Destruction of Wetlands,
• Destruction of visible wildlife,
• Potential destruction of endangered species – what studies have been done on gophers
• Added burden to public safety resources,

• Don’t need more apartments – short term people aren’t in apartments they are looking for homes to stay in.

William Vaniel,
• Discussed the petition with 1,100 + signatures.
• Clarity of what was sent out to citizens was none existent.
• Letter was dated 5/1 received 5/4 to come to a hearing for 5/14 they didn’t have much time to prepare.
• When they moved into home they were told subject parcel would be a park.
• In August/September 2019 meeting to change from park never received a letter, is the process broke, was 2019 done without noticing.
• The placement of apartments on both side of school along 44th avenue questions good judgement in land use by all involved especially decision makers.
• Will create a revolving door of residents that are unfamiliar with school access patterns and numerous other concerns. Safety of children is most important. Last year school year children had to walk all the way around Mallory Park and come up White Eagle Boulevard because school didn’t want them crossing one driveway with traffic coming through. Is that a concern gone with this application – putting driveways where kids cross and apartments there with people coming and going same time kids going to school. County needs to pay for a crossing guard.
• Who is benefiting from transaction development/building not the students or parents?
• Take 84 apartments and move to other apartments and stay clear of school.
• Recognize the will of the people – petition signatures, 100’s of letters and people here by revising the plan and eliminating apartments on both sides of their schools.

David Morgan, resident of Mallory Park, stated:
• Concerned lot 2001 right next to elementary and middle school bordered by 3 roads, next to fully developed field, county should retain that property and deem it a park.
• South is Bob Garner Park with one multi use field that is always in use. Park originally had larger portion sold and now being development with high density modular homes that look like dorms for Lecom.
• Parks and nature trails named after people because they are a gift to the community. Urged Planning Commission members be part of a gift and don’t approve as multi density housing.

Kristin Pomeroy, resident of Mallory Park, stated:
• Project is a big concern.
• Proposes changes to an already well-established area.
• When building their home were promised subject property would be a park.
• Loved knowing Lakewood Ranch is known as one of the top largest green communities in the Country. The amount of green space they have is being jeopardized by the building taking place not to mention the disruption of wildlife.
• Purchased home knowing a part of a Master Plan area and would not be building on tops of each other’s neighborhoods.
• She isn’t aware of any other area in Lakewood Ranch has a lot of concentrated multi-family development. She understands the need for affordable housing in Lakewood Ranch but feels there is already an adequate amount.
• Excessive number of apartments already built within a 2-mile radius of elementary/middle schools.
• Do any other schools in Manatee County have apartments built around them?
• The 1st rental community in Lakewood Ranch (Estia) being built on top of Mallory Park with a bike trail connecting to Bob Garner Park; there are safety concerns with this.
• They were told this parcel would be light commercial not residential.
• Area has changed a lot in last 2 years, overabundance of building changing the entire dynamic of area that made it special in first place. North of SR 70 and east of Lakewood Ranch Boulevard is an extreme area of building.
• They pay the same taxes and CDD fees but what they are being told versus what getting are two different things.
• Children current attend Gullett and is a member of PTO and there is a concerning amount of building that is overcrowding the school which is a concern.
• Traffic in area is congested and adding more apartments / homes making it worse.
• This is a small footprint with a lot of people in area.
• Please reconsider this plan.

Ricardo Sabros, resident of Mallory Park, stated:
• Concerned about apartment complexes – schools are overcrowded now.
• Northeast section of Lakewood Ranch has many kids.
• There needs to be a study of the conditions of the building and the families.
• There are more kids in schools than expected after the rezoning still having this problem.
• Overcrowding is getting worse and concerned safety of kids because of the overcrowding.
• Please study this again.

Elan Feder, resident of Mallory Park since 2017, stated:
• His understanding was the parcel would be a park.
• Never heard about the change in 2019 and not given opportunity to voice opinions at that time.
• Gullett Elementary is overcrowded, his kids are in 3rd grade and school started year with 11 3rd grade classes and had to split to make more 3rd grade classes.
• There is an unexpected ratio of kids moving into Lakewood Ranch.
• Mallory Park had to increase playground area due to all children moving in.
• Building temporary housing / apartments with high density adjacent to school is not good for anyone living here.
• Adding additional 200 and shifting 300 very unclear what applicant is doing.
• About 500 additional people going to work in morning and putting children at risk. There is already a backup on Lakewood Ranch Boulevard to 64 with people avoiding I-75 and Estia isn’t even occupied yet.
• There are a number of major problems no one is addressing.

Additional public comments were entered into the record.
# PROJECT SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>PDMU-06-30(G)(R6) (PLN1907-0086)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT NAME</td>
<td>Lakewood Centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| LAND OWNER(S) | SMR North 70, LLC  
SMR Northwest Land, LLC |
| APPLICANT /AGENT | Caleb J. Grimes, Esquire  
Grimes, Galvano, Grimes, Hawkins, & Gladfelter, P.L. |
| EXISTING ZONING | PDMU (Planned Development Mixed Use)  
PDMU/WP-E/ST (Planned Development Mixed Use / Watershed Protection Evers / Special Treatment Overlay Districts) |
| APPROVED USE (S) | • 4,544 residential dwelling units:  
- 1,669 single-family detached units  
- 2,875 multi-family units  
• 1,574,000 sq. ft. of commercial space  
• 1,463,000 sq. ft. of office space  
• 250,000 sq. ft. of light industrial space  
• 300 Hotel Rooms |
| PROPOSED USE (S) | As previously approved with PDMU-06-30(G)(R5):  
• 4,544 residential dwelling units:  
- 1,669 single-family detached units  
- 2,875 multi-family units  
• 1,574,000 sq. ft. of commercial space  
• 1,463,000 sq. ft. of office space  
• 250,000 sq. ft. of light industrial space  
• 300 Hotel Rooms |
| PROPOSED CHANGE (s) | 1) Addition of 69.55 acres and allocate existing entitlements to the land;  
2) True up parcel entitlements based upon internal transfers;  
3) Revise parcel boundaries for certain residential and retail parcels;  
4) Update phasing and build-out dates to reflect previously granted legislative extensions;  
5) Amend stipulations to facilitate these changes; and  
6) Modify certain conditions consistent with current department practices and other amendments for internal consistency. |
| SPECIFIC APPROVAL REQUESTS | Previously approved alternatives for:  
• LDC Section 1005.4.D. Reduction in parking requirements for multi-family projects on Parcels FF, KK, and LL from 2.1 spaces/unit to 1.8 spaces/unit |
| CASE PLANNER | Rossina Leider, Planning Section Manager |
| STAFF RECOMMENDATION: | APPROVAL with stipulations |
DETAILED DISCUSSION

History & Background
The Lakewood Centre Development of Regional Impact (DRI #27) and General Development Plan (GDP) were approved on August 5, 2008, and its current entitlements are the following: 4,544 residential units, 1,574,000 square feet of commercial space, 1,463,000 square feet of office space, 250,000 square feet of light industrial space, and 300 hotel rooms.

The Lakewood Centre project includes a total of approximately 1,523.7 acres and is generally located north of 44th Avenue East and south of SR 64 East (northern portion), north of SR 70 East and south of Malachite Drive (southern portion), as well as east of Lakewood Ranch Boulevard and west of White Eagle Boulevard. The northern portion of the DRI is zoned PDMU (Planned Development Mixed Use) and is within the MU-C (Mixed Use – Community) Future Land Use Category. The southern portion is zoned PDMU/WP-E/ST (Planned Development Mixed Use/Watershed Protection Evers/Special Treatment Overlay Districts) and is within the R/O/R (Retail/Office/Residential) and MU (Mixed Use) FLUCs.
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN AMENDMENTS

The following amendments to the Lakewood Centre GDP were approved by the BOCC:

December 6, 2012: Received approval to update the phasing, build-out, expiration and CLOS dates to reflect legislatively approved extensions, update Transportation Conditions to reflect compliance with conditions contained therein, modify Affordable Housing Conditions, modify Design Conditions, clarification of allowable uses, and allow for the transfer of residential units to Parcel K, as well as other minor changes for internal consistency including update departmental references.

October 3, 2013: Received approval to update the phasing and build-out dates to reflect legislatively approved extensions, update conditions to reflect compliance with requirements contained therein, exchange 100,000 square feet of commercial and 100,000 square feet of office for 1,008 single-family units in Phase 1 and other amendments for internal consistency.

December 4, 2014: Received approval to provide for the rezoning of an additional 796.22 acres to the General Development Plan and to reallocate development totals contained within the original DRI to the additional lands, provide for specific approval of Phases 2 and 3, and reflect satisfaction of transportation mitigation of impacts of the project through build-out.

May 9, 2017: Received approval to modify the list of allowable uses for the project consistent with current practice, provide for the introduction of light industrial, reduce retail entitlements and provide an initial 250,000 square feet of light industrial entitlements, and update parcel totals for land uses based upon prior internal transfers among parcels.

August 1, 2019: Received approval to add approximately 30.07 acres of land to the project boundaries, modify use of land previously designated as park, revise boundaries of certain residential and commercial parcels, reallocate existing parcel entitlements based upon internal transfers, update entitlements made via administrative exchange, update phasing and built-out dates according to approved legislative extensions, and other amendments for internal consistency.

EXISTING DEVELOPMENT TOTALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Phase 1 2008 – 2030*</th>
<th>Phase 2 2009 –2029*</th>
<th>Phase 3 2012-2033*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential (dwelling units)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>2,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>1,233</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>1,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,133</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>4,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Office (sq. ft.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>360,000</td>
<td>442,000</td>
<td>772,000</td>
<td>1,574,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>358,000</td>
<td>458,000</td>
<td>647,000</td>
<td>1,463,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>718,000</td>
<td>1,150,000</td>
<td>1,419,000</td>
<td>3,287,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel (rooms)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: WilsonMiller

* The phasing build-out dates shall be July 20th of the years indicated, which includes legislatively approved
Request

The request is for an amendment to the General Development Plan (GDP) and Zoning Ordinance for the Lakewood Centre. A companion application to amend the Development Order (Ordinance 20-01 – Lakewood Centre - DRI #27) and the Master Development Plan (Map H) is reviewed under a separate application.

In general, the current request is to add land to the project boundaries and allocate existing entitlements, reallocate existing parcel entitlements based upon internal transfers, revise boundaries of certain residential and commercial parcels, update phasing and built-out dates according to approved legislative extensions, and other amendments for internal consistency.

An analysis of each request is detailed below and shown in strike thru/underline format in the attached Zoning Ordinance, as well in the General Development Plan when applicable.

1. Addition of 69.55 acres and allocate existing entitlements to the land.

Under the GDP, the applicant proposes to add approximately 69.55 acres to the boundaries of Lakewood Centre Development for a total area of 1,593.23 acres. Simultaneously, the applicant proposes to incorporate the land addition to the mixed-use acreage of the project, and to allocate previously approved entitlements to this parcel.

This additional land is a vacant parcel zoned PDMU WP-E/ST (Planned Development Mixed Use/Watershed Protection Evers/Special Treatment), within the R/O/R (Retail/Office/Residential) Future Land Use Category (FLUC) and located on the southern portion of the development bounded by White Eagle Boulevard, New Haven Boulevard, and Rangeland Parkway to the east, west, and south respectively. The new parcel will be designated as “Parcel M”, which comprises the 69.55 acres addition (excluding wetland areas) plus previous parcels “L”, “M”, “N”, “O”, “P” and “Q”. The total allocated entitlements to Parcel “M” include 200,000 square feet of office space, 236,000 square feet of retail space, and 200 multi-family dwelling units.

The referenced 69.55 acres parcel was approved in 2004 for a 230,000 square foot high intensity recreational area (7,400 seat multi-purpose arena with 2,467 parking spaces) known as Bradenton-Sarasota Arena [PDMU-04-03(Z)(G)]. All prior approvals related to the multi-purpose recreational facility project have expired and no development has occurred within the last 15 years.

Staff has no objection to the above requested modification since the addition of land to the boundaries of the GDP and the reallocation of entitlements will not create additional transportation impacts. Also, it will allow the development of a vacant mixed-use parcel adjacent to existing thoroughfares and nearby of a variety of recently developed residential and mixed-uses areas (see GDP on pages 11 and 12).

2. True up parcel entitlements based upon internal transfers.

3. Revise parcel boundaries for certain residential and retail parcels.

The applicant proposes to update the General Development Plan to redistribute approved entitlement based upon internal transfers between parcels of northern and southern portions of the site, as well as modify the layout of certain parcels specifically located on the southern portion of the development.
In general, the proposal includes the following changes:

- Reflect existing lake on Parcel Y, and transfer 341 multi-family units to Parcel U.
- Create new Parcel M from the combination of current Parcels M, N, O, P, and Q with the land to be added to the development (previous Bradenton-Sarasota Arena). Then, assign entitlements to the new Parcel M including: 236,000 square feet of retail space from commercial entitlements of current Parcels M, N, O, P and Q, 200,00 square feet of office space from Parcel U, and 200 multi-family units from existing Parcel J.
- Create new Parcels I-1 and I-2, as well as new Parcels J-1 and J-2 from current Parcels I and J, respectively, due to the realignment of New Haven Boulevard. Existing entitlements of Parcels I and J will be reallocated as follows:
  - **Parcel I:**
    - Office space: 200,000 square feet to Parcel I-1, 238,000 square feet to Parcel I-2, and 20,000 square feet to Parcel G.
    - Retail space: 125,000 square feet to Parcel I-1, 100,000 square feet to parcel I-2, 200,000 square feet to Parcel U, and 20,000 square feet to Parcel G.
    - Residential Units: 300 multi-family units to Parcel I-1 and 185 multi-family units to Parcel U.
  - **Parcel J:**
    - Office space: 196,500 square feet to Parcel J-1 and 196,500 square feet to Parcel J-2.
    - Retail space: 95,000 square feet to Parcel J-1, 95,000 square feet to parcel J-2, and 180,000 square feet to Parcel U.
    - Residential Units: 200 multi-family units to Parcel M and 15 multi-family units to Parcel U.
    - Industrial space: 250,000 square feet to Parcel J-1.
    - Hotel rooms: 300 hotel units to Parcel J-1.

Entitlements and acreage of Parcels I-1, I-1, J-1, and J-2 are:

- I-1: 200,000 sq. ft. office, 125,000 sq. ft. retail, and 300 multi-family units (51.2 acres).
- I-2: 238,000 sq. ft. office, and 100,000 sq. ft. retail (47.6 acres).
- J-1: 196,500 sq. ft. office, 95,000 sq. ft. retail, 250,000 sq. ft. Industrial, and 300 hotel rooms (100.2 acres).
- J-2: 196,500 sq. ft. office, and 95,000 sq. ft. retail (57.7 acres).

In addition, the proposal identifies the preservation of 5.06 acres of jurisdictional wetlands within the 69.55 acres of land to be added to the project boundaries (new Parcel M), as well as the required 30 feet wide wetland buffer. Also, the current application includes the modification of previously approved wetland impacts, providing suitable documentation to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of LDC Section 706.4 (Application for Wetland Impacts) and the reduction of wetland impacts from 12.7 acres to 4.67 acres.

Proposed changes in parcels acreage and reallocation of entitlement between parcels is summarized in the following chart:
### Lakewood Centre
#### Parcels subject to change acreage and/or entitlements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel #</th>
<th>PDMU-06-30(G)(R5) Current entitlements and area</th>
<th>PDMU-06-30(G)(R6) Proposed entitlements and area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern Portion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U</strong></td>
<td>501,000 sq. ft. Office 63.5 acres</td>
<td>301,000 sq. ft. Office / 380,000 sq. ft. Retail 541 MF 63.5 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W</strong></td>
<td>181 MF/SF 45 acres</td>
<td>181 SF 45 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Y</strong></td>
<td>425 MF 23.7 acres</td>
<td>84 MF 23.7 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southern Portion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G</strong></td>
<td>100,000 sq. ft. Office 200,000 sq. ft. Retail 29.0 acres</td>
<td>120,000 sq. ft. Office / 220,000 sq. ft. Retail 29.0 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong></td>
<td>458,000 sq. ft. Office 445,000 sq. ft. Retail 485 MF &amp; SF 90.4 acres</td>
<td>[I-1(*)] 200,000 sq. ft. Office / 125,000 sq. ft. Retail 300 MF 51.2 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J</strong></td>
<td>393,000 sq. ft. Office 370,000 sq. ft. Retail 250,000 sq. ft. Industrial 300 Hotel rooms 215 MF &amp; SF 148.9 acres</td>
<td>[J-1(*)] 196,500 sq. ft. Office / 95,000 sq. ft. Retail 250,000 sq. ft. Industrial 300 Hotel rooms 100.2 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L (</strong>)**</td>
<td>13,000 sq. ft. Retail 2.7 acres</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
<td>7,000 sq. ft. Retail 1.7 acres</td>
<td>200,000 sq. ft. Office / 236,000 sq. ft. Retail 200 MF 57.7 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N (</strong>)**</td>
<td>7,000 sq. ft. Retail 1.8 acres</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O (</strong>)**</td>
<td>12,000 sq. ft. Retail 2.7 acres</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P (</strong>)**</td>
<td>78,000 sq. ft. Retail 10.3 acres</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q (</strong>)**</td>
<td>132,000 sq. ft. Retail 17.3 acres</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) Reconfiguration of existing Parcel I and J to create Parcel I-1, I-2, J-1, and J-2.
(**) Acreage and Entitlements of current Parcels L, M, N, O, P, and Q are transferred to new Parcel M.
No changes to the total approved entitlements of the Lakewood Centre development are taken into consideration as part of the current revisions of the General Development Plan (see Table 1 – Development Totals on page 9). However, the proposal includes the following changes related “Acreage by Land Use”:

- Increment of retail (only), and mixed use, & retail & office acreage.
- Decrease of residential (only) and recreational acreage.
- Increment of wetland and wetland buffers acreage.
- Increment of the total acreage of project.

### Acreage by Land Use (North & South)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>PDMU-06-30(G)(R5)</th>
<th>PDMU-06-30(G)(R6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential (only)</td>
<td>581.4</td>
<td>569.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use, &amp; Retail, &amp; Office</td>
<td>355.7</td>
<td>456.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail (only)</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>79.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands</td>
<td>185.3</td>
<td>198.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland Buffers</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upland Preservation</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Lake</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Ponds</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>99.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Space</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Site Area</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,523.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,593.2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff has no objections to the requested changes since they do not increase the approved density or intensity of the overall project, and in many instances only represents the modification of certain parcels’ layout, and the reallocation of acreage or entitlements within the project’s parcels which is not expected to create additional peak hours trip.

4. **Update phasing and build-out dates to reflect previously granted legislative extensions.**

The applicant requests to update Table 1 – Development Totals under Section 4, Condition A(1) of the Zoning Ordinance to reflect modification of phasing and build-out dates according to previously approved legislative extensions taking place since the last amendment of the General Development Plan in August 1, 2019.

The changes on the phasing and built-out dates are the following: (See Attachment 6 – Opioid Epidemic Granted Legislative Extension Letter dated 07/31/2019)
Phase 1: from 2008-2030 to 2008-2031
Phase 2: from 2009-2029 to 2009-2030
Phase 3: from 2012-2033 to 2012-2034
Build-out dates: from November 4th to September 10th.

Table 1 – Development Totals of the Zoning Ordinance [Section 4 – General Development Plan, Condition A(1)] will be updated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Phase 1 2008 – 2031*</th>
<th>Phase 2 2009 – 2030*</th>
<th>Phase 3 2012 – 2033*</th>
<th>Total**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential (dwelling units)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>2,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family</td>
<td>1,233</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>1,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,133</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>4,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Office (sq. ft.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>360,000</td>
<td>442,000</td>
<td>772,000</td>
<td>1,574,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>358,000</td>
<td>458,000</td>
<td>647,000</td>
<td>1,463,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>718,000</td>
<td>1,150,000</td>
<td>1,419,000</td>
<td>3,287,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel (rooms)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The phasing buildout dates shall be November 4th to September 10th of the years indicated, which includes legislatively approved extensions through Opioid Epidemic (Executive Orders 17-146, 17-177, 17-178, 17-230, 17-285, 17-329, 18-47, 18-110, 18-177, 18-235, 18-279, 18-362, and 19-36) (SB 360, SB 1762, HB 7207 and F.S. 252.363).

** Residential entitlements have been updated to reflect administrative exchange (AD-17-16 issued 07/18/2017).

Conversion and/or increase of approved entitlements is not taking in consideration at this time. Staff has no objection to the proposed revisions since they are related to reflect extensions previously granted by the Governor of Florida.
5. Amend stipulations to facilitate these changes.

6. Modify certain conditions consistent with current department practices and other amendments for internal consistency.

The applicant proposes to amend some stipulations to add notation about completion of the requirements, as well as modify certain conditions related to current department practices for internal consistency. No changes to “design standards” or any other specific condition have been changed within the current revision of the General Development Plan.

Revised language is shown in strike-thru/underline language in the attached ordinance.

Staff has no objection to the request.

7. Modify acreage of previously approved wetland impacts, identify new proposed impacts and identify the preservation of wetland acreage within the approximately 69.55 acre parcel

The proposed amendment of the General Development Plan reflects the addition of a 69.5-acre parcel to the overall project area that includes 5.06 acres of wetlands. These additional wetlands and the required 30 feet buffer will not be impacted with this revision.

Additional environmental considerations are taking place currently, including changes to previously approved project-wide wetlands impacts and wetland preservation area. The applicant proposes a reduction of wetland impacts from 12.7 acres to 4.67 acres equivalent to a net reduction of 8.03 acres of wetland impacts.

Staff has no objection to the request since appropriate documentation related to impact avoidance and minimization analysis has been provided.

Conclusion

Staff recommends approval of the proposed changes to the General Development Plan, as well as the revised Zoning Ordinance (in strike-thru/underline format) attached to this report.
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN – NORTHERN PORTION

Parcel W
Change from Single-Family/Multi-family to Multi-Family Units only (units previously constructed)

Parcel Y
Reduction of 341 Multi-Family Units

Parcel U
Reduction of 200,000 sq. ft. of office
Addition of 380,000 sq. ft. of retail
Addition of 541 Multi-Family Units
Parcel G
Addition of 20,000 sq. ft. of retail and 20,000 sq. ft. of office.
- Mixed Use Parcel including only non-residential entitlements (office & retail)

Parcel M (new parcel)
Create from previous Parcels L, M, N, O, P, and Q, and land added to the GDP.
Mixed Use Parcel including office, retail, and multi-family units

Parcel I-1 (new parcel)
Create from partition of previous Parcel I and realignment of New Haven Boulevard.
Mixed Use Parcel including office, retail, and multi-family units

Parcel I-2 (new parcel)
Create from partition of previous Parcel I and realignment of New Haven Boulevard.
Mixed Use Parcel including only non-residential entitlements (office & retail)

Parcel J-1 (new parcel)
Create from partition of previous Parcel J and realignment of New Haven Boulevard.
Mixed Use Parcel including only non-residential entitlements (office, retail, industrial, and hotel rooms)

Parcel J-2 (new parcel)
Create from partition of previous Parcel J and realignment of New Haven Boulevard.
Mixed Use Parcel including only non-residential entitlements (office & retail)
# SITE CHARACTERISTICS AND SURROUNDING AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERAL LOCATION</th>
<th>Southern Portion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North of SR 70 East, south of Malachite Drive, east of Lakewood Ranch Boulevard, and west of White Eagle Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northern Portion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North of 44th Avenue East, south of SR 64 East, east of Lakewood Ranch Boulevard, and west of White Eagle Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIZE</td>
<td>1,593.23 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXISTING USE(S)</td>
<td>Commercial, office, light industrial, and residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED USE(S)</td>
<td>No changes related to approved types of uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUTURE LAND USE CATEGORY</td>
<td>ROR – Retail/Office/Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MU – Mixed Use (330.67 acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MU-C – Mixed-Use Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENSITY (Dwelling Units/Acre)</td>
<td>Max. Density Allowed within FLUCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R/O/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gross: 9 du/acre to 32 du/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Net: 20 du/acre to 36 du/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gross: 9 du/acre to 30 du/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Net: 20 du/acre to 36 du/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MU-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gross: 3 du/acre to 9 du/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Net: 9 du/acre to 20 du/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTENSITY (Floor Area Ratio)</td>
<td>Max. Floor Area Ratio (FAR) allowed within FLUCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R/O/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5 to 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MU: 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MU-C: 0.23 to 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERLAY DISTRICT(S)</td>
<td>WP-E (Watershed Protection Evers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST (Special Treatment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIFIC APPROVAL(S)</td>
<td>Previously Granted Specific Approval:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LDC Section 1005.4.D: Reduction in parking requirements for multi-family projects on Parcels FF, KK, and LL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SURROUNDING USES & ZONING

<p>| NORTH                                 | Northern Portion |
|                                       | Commercial / PDMU |
|                                       | Residential / PDR, and RSF-1 |
|                                       | Vacant/Ornamental Nursery / A-1 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOUTH</th>
<th>Residential / PDMU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NORTHERN PORTION</td>
<td>Residential and vacant commercial / PDMU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN PORTION</td>
<td>Commercial/Office/Residential / PDMU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST</td>
<td>Residential / PDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHERN PORTION</td>
<td>Residential / PDMU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN PORTION</td>
<td>Commercial/Office/Industrial / PDMU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST</td>
<td>Institutional (fire station) / A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHERN PORTION</td>
<td>Commercial/Office/Industrial / PDMU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHERN PORTION</td>
<td>Educational and Recreational / PDPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial / PDC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SITE DESIGN DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>BUFFERS</strong></th>
<th>30’ wetland buffers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20’ roadway buffers along all streets shown on the GDP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OPEN SPACE**
- Minimum required for portions of the project outside of WP-E Overlay District: 25% for residential & office, 20% for commercial
- Minimum required for portions of the project within WP-E Overlay District: 35% for residential & 30% for non-residential

- 537.0 acres (33.7% of the entire overall site)

| **RECREATIONAL ACREAGE** | 44.3 acres |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ACCESS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood Ranch Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Eagle Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malachite Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 70 East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 64 East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44th Avenue East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangeland Parkway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatewood Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117th Street East</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| WETLAND ACREAGE & IMPACTS | Total Wetland Acreage: 198.5 acres  
Wetland Impacts: Minimal for road crossings and to facilitate the town center development |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| FLOOD ZONE(S)            | X, A and AE per FEMA FIRM Panels 12081C0331E & 12081C0333E effective 3/17/2014.  
The northeastern most portion identified on the Amended General Development Plan is partially located within the FEMA 100-year floodway associated with Mill Creek. Portions of the project area are located within the FEMA 2014 FIRM 100-year floodplain (Zones “AE” and “A”). The Base Flood Elevation shall be determined for areas designated as Zone “A”. The northern most portions identified on the Amended General Development Plan are partially located within the Manatee County 25-year associated with Gates Creek and Mill Creek.  
The southern portion is partially located within the FEMA 2014 FIRM 100-year floodplain (Zone “A”). The Base Flood Elevation shall be determined for areas designated as Zone “A”. In addition, the southern portion is partially located within 100-year floodplain delineation pursuant to the Braden River Watershed Management Plan (MWP). The Braden River WMP and other available drainage modeling shall be utilized for floodplain mitigation.  
Public Flowage Easements will be required for existing drainage conveyance systems which convey runoff from public right-of-way. |
| AREA OF KNOWN FLOODING   | Yes, rainfall. A 50% reduction in allowable runoff for Mill Creek Watershed.  
Watersheds: 25% reduction in allowable runoff for Braden Watershed. |
| UTILITY CONNECTIONS       | According to the Manatee County GIS, the following water and wastewater facilities are in the vicinity of this development:  
Northern Project Boundary  
POTABLE WATER  
12” PVC potable water main along Malachite Drive  
Western Project Boundary  
POTABLE WATER  
42” potable water main along Lakewood Ranch Boulevard  
WASTEWATER  
16” PVC sanitary force mains run parallel to a 12” PVC sanitary force main along Lakewood Ranch Boulevard  
Eastern Project Boundary  
POTABLE WATER  
16” PVC potable water main along White Eagle Blvd; 12” PVC potable water main along New Haven Boulevard |

(See attachment XX)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WASTEWATER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24” &amp; 20” PVC sanitary force main along White Eagle Boulevard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Southern Project Boundary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POTABLE WATER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36” potable water main along SR 70 E; 16” PVC potable water main along Rangeland Parkway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WASTEWATER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8” PVC sanitary force main along Rangeland Parkway; approximately 625 Linear Feet of 3” private PVC sanitary force main along SR 70 E between the private pump station and White Eagle Boulevard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION**

With this request, no changes are proposed related to Environmental Planning issues previously discussed/analyzed for areas that are already part of the project, with exception of the reduction of previously approved wetland impacts. The below information is related to the 69.55 acres parcel that has been added to the project boundaries with the current application.

**Wetlands:**
The 5.06 acres of jurisdictional wetlands within the 69.55-acre parcel M being added will not be impacted and will have a 30 foot wetland buffer. The applicant is proposing a modification to the previously approved wetland impacts that if approved would reduce the impacts from 12.7 acres to 4.67 acres.

**Uplands:**
The majority of the site has been mass graded and consists of disturbed lands, retention ponds, woodland pastures and Brazilian pepper dominated areas.

**Endangered Species:**
According to the July 2019 Environmental Narrative report submitted by E Co Consultants, Inc., no listed species, habitats or nesting areas will be affected within the added project area.

**Trees:**
No information at this time, but most of the property has already been cleared of trees.

**Landscaping/Buffers:**
Landscaping will be addressed during site plan approval.

**TRANSPORTATION**

**Major Transportation Facilities**
The southern portion of the Lakewood Centre General Development Plan (GDP) is generally located north of SR 70 East, east of Lakewood Ranch Boulevard, west of White Eagle Boulevard, and south of Malachite Drive. The northern portion of the Lakewood Centre GDP is generally located north of 44th Avenue East, east of Lakewood Ranch Boulevard, west of White Eagle Boulevard, and south of SR 64 East.
The following thoroughfares are within or adjacent to the GDP:

- **SR 64 East** is an existing four-lane road with 50 mph posted speed and is designated as a six-lane arterial roadway in the Comprehensive Plan’s Future Traffic Circulation Plan and has a planned right of way width of 200 feet, or as determined by FDOT.

- **SR 70 East** is an existing six-lane road with 50 mph posted speed and is designated as a six-lane arterial roadway in the Comprehensive Plan’s Future Traffic Circulation Plan and has a planned right of way width of 200 feet, or as determined by FDOT.

- **Lakewood Ranch Boulevard** is an existing four-lane road with 45 mph posted speed and is designated as a six-lane arterial roadway in the Comprehensive Plan’s Future Traffic Circulation Plan and has a planned right of way width of 150 feet.

- **44th Avenue East** is an existing four-lane road with 45 mph posted speed and is designated as a four-lane arterial roadway in the Comprehensive Plan’s Future Traffic Circulation Plan and has a planned right of way width of 120 feet.

- **White Eagle Boulevard** is an existing four-lane road with 40 mph posted speed and is designated as a four-lane collector roadway in the Comprehensive Plan’s Future Traffic Circulation Plan and has a planned right of way width of 120 feet.

- **Malachite Drive** is an existing four-lane road with 35 mph posted speed and is designated as a four-lane collector roadway in the Comprehensive Plan’s Future Traffic Circulation Plan and has a planned right of way width of 120 feet.

- **Rangeland Parkway** is an existing four-lane road with 35 mph posted speed and is designated as a four-lane collector roadway in the Comprehensive Plan’s Future Traffic Circulation Plan and has a planned right of way width of 120 feet.

- **New Haven Boulevard (GG Road)** is an existing four-lane road between Rangeland Parkway and Malachite Drive, with 35 mph posted speed. The overall designation for existing New Haven Boulevard and the planned section between SR 70 and Rangeland Parkway is four-lane collector roadway with a planned right of way width of 120 feet.

- **Gatewood Drive** is an existing two-lane road with 30 mph posted speed and is designated as a two-lane collector roadway in the Comprehensive Plan’s Future Traffic Circulation Plan and has a planned right of way width of 84 feet.

- **117th Street East** is an existing two-lane divided road with 30 mph posted speed. It is designated as a two-lane collector roadway in the Comprehensive Plan’s Future Traffic Circulation Plan and has a planned right of way width of 84 feet.

**Transportation Concurrency**

The Lakewood Centre GDP has a Local Development Agreement (LDA) that addresses mitigation of external transportation impacts and has an approved Certificate of Level of Service (CLOS). The developers have been providing mitigation consistent with the conditions and requirements of the LDA and CLOS. This application includes a request for an
amendment to the General Development Plan (GDP) to add a 69.5-acre parcel to the project boundary. No changes to entitlements were requested; and therefore, the application is consistent with the external traffic impacts associated with the approved LDA and CLOS. If future development proposals exceed the currently approved entitlements, then a new traffic analysis will be required to determine if any additional transportation mitigation is required.

**Access**

At the time of future site plan submittal and accompanying traffic analysis review, all proposed access points will be evaluated to determine if any further site-related improvements will be required for the site.

| CERTIFICATE OF LEVEL OF SERVICE (CLOS) COMPLIANCE |
| TRANSPORTATION CONCURRENCY |
| CLOS APLIED FOR: No. Project has an existing LDA and CLOS |
| TRAFFIC STUDY REQ’D: No |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEAREST THOROUGHFARE</th>
<th>LINK</th>
<th>ADOPTED LOS</th>
<th>FUTURE LOS (W/PROJECT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood Centre DRI has an existing Certificate of Level of Service for transit, drainage, and solid waste. Potable water, sanitary sewer, and school facilities are reviewed at the time of Final Site Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POSITIVE ASPECTS**

- The overall density and intensity of the project are not changed with this request.
- Modification of parcels layout, reallocation of acreage and entitlements between parcels will not require additional traffic related improvements.

**NEGATIVE ASPECTS**

It is staff’s opinion that there are no apparent or notable negative impacts.

**STAFF RECOMMENDED STIPULATIONS**

Refer to Attachment 7 (strike-through/underline Ordinance).

**REMAINING ISSUES OF CONCERN – NOT RESOLVED OR STIPULATED**

No remaining issues.

**SPECIFIC APPROVALS**

None at this time
COMPLIANCE WITH COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The site is in the R/O/R (Retail/Office/Residential), MU (Mixed-Use) and MU-C (Mixed-Use Community) Future Land Use Categories. This project was specifically reviewed for compliance with the following policies:

Policy 2.1.2.7 Appropriate Timing. The property is located within an area of the County that was approved as a mixed-use development, providing a variety of housing opportunities, employment-based non-residential development, and educational and recreational opportunities for all of its residents. This concept is consistent with the intent of the PDMU zoning district. Buffering, site design, and density limitations are ensured, with conditions in both the Zoning Ordinance and the Development Order for the DRI.

Policies 2.2.1.17.1 (R/O/R), 2.2.1.21.1 (MU), and 2.2.1.28.1 (MU-C) Intent. In general, the intent of the R/O/R, MU, and MU-C future land use categories is to provide areas to be developed with a mix of residential and non-residential uses, with horizontal or vertical integration of uses, achieving internal trip capture and providing for high quality environment for living, working, or visiting. The Lakewood Centre project is a multi-use development.

Policies 2.2.1.17.2 (R/O/R), 2.2.1.21.2 (MU), and 2.2.1.28 (MU-C) Range of Potential Uses. Neighborhood, community, and regional serving commercial uses, urban and sub-urban residential uses, lodging, offices, public or semi-public uses, school, and recreational uses are included in the range of potential uses in R/O/R, MU, and MU-C FLUCs. Light industrial use is allowed within MU and MU-C FLUCs and is prohibited within the R/O/R FLUC.

Policies 2.2.1.17.3 (R/O/R), 2.2.1.21.3 (MU), and 2.2.1.28 (MU-C). Density/Intensity. The range of allowed density varies from a maximum of 3 du/acre within the MU-C/R FLUC to 32 du/acre for R/O/R FLUC. The proposed gross density of the overall development is 2.77 du/acre. The range of allowed intensity varies from 0.23 FAR within the MU-C/R FLUC to 1.00 FAR for MU and R/O/R FLUCs. The proposed intensity of the overall development is 0.35 FAR.

Policy 2.6.1.1 Compatibility. PDMU development are intended to draw up the single use PD district requirements for individual uses to ensure consistency with development patterns and surrounding properties. The General Development Plan provides design standards to achieve compatibility, and compatibility issues will be reviewed at time of future preliminary and final site plan review for each specific project.

Policy 2.6.2.7 Require Clustering to Limit Impacts and Policy 2.6.5.5 Preserve/Protect Open Space. The site plan shows a total of 33.7% open space to be provided for the overall Lakewood Centre project. For areas outside of the WP-E Overlay District, open space required is 25% for residential and office uses, as well as 20% for commercial uses. For areas within the WP-E Overlay District, 30% open space is required for non-residential projects and 35% for residential developments.
ATTACHMENTS
1. Applicable Comprehensive Plan Policies
2. Maps/Aerials
3. Site Plan (General Development Plan)
4. School Report email dated 01/25/2019
5. Potable Water and Wastewater Facilities
6. Environmental Narrative
7. Granted Legislative Extensions
8. Ordinance PDMU-06-30(G)(R6) strike-through/underline
9. Newspaper Advertising
10. Public Comment
### APPLICABLE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN POLICIES

**Policy: 2.1.2.4**  
Limit urban sprawl through the consideration of new development, when deemed compatible with existing and future development, in areas which are internal to, or are contiguous expansions of the built environment.

**Policy: 2.1.2.7**  
Review all proposed development for compatibility and appropriate timing. This analysis shall include:

- consideration of existing development patterns,
- types of land uses,
- transition between land uses,
- density and intensity of land uses,
- natural features,
- approved development in the area,
- availability of adequate roadways,
- adequate centralized water and sewer facilities,
- other necessary infrastructure and services.

Limiting urban sprawl applicable specific area plans  
(See also policies under Objs. 2.6.1 - 2.6.3)

**Policy 2.2.1.17.** ROR: Establish the Retail/Office/Residential future land use category as follows:

**Policy 2.2.1.17.1.** Intent: To identify, textually in the Comprehensive Plan's goals, objectives, and policies, or graphically on the Future Land Use Map, areas exhibiting a broad range of commercial, office, and residential uses and to prohibit the intrusion of new industrial uses into these ROR areas. ROR areas are especially found at major community or region-serving nodes and are encouraged to develop with horizontal or vertical integration of uses, internal trip capture, and an overall high quality environment for living, working, or visiting.

**Policy 2.2.1.17.2.** Range of Potential Uses (see Policy 2.2.1.5): Neighborhood, community and regional serving commercial uses, mixed with medium and high density residential, lodging, office, public/semi-public, schools, and recreational uses (see also Objective 4.2.1).

**Policy 2.2.1.17.3.** Range of Potential Density/Intensity:

Maximum gross residential density:

- Nine (9) dwelling units per acre for properties within the CHHA or CEA.
- Sixteen (16) dwelling units per acre.
- Thirty-two (32) dwelling units per acre along designated Urban Corridors (forty (40) dwelling units per acre if a density bonus is approved).

Thirty-two (32) dwelling units per acre for residential projects that designate a minimum of twenty-five (25) percent of the dwelling units as "Affordable Housing."

Thirty-two (32) dwelling units per acre for mixed-use development that includes a
commercial or office component.

Properties within the CEA and CHHA are not eligible for the additional density offered for urban corridors, mixed-use development, and/or affordable housing.

Minimum gross residential density: 7.0 only in UIRA for residential projects that designate a minimum of twenty-five (25) percent of the dwelling units as "Affordable Housing".

Maximum net residential density:

Twenty (20) dwelling units per acre.

Thirty-six (36) dwelling units per acre for residential projects that designate a minimum of twenty-five (25) percent of the dwelling units as "Affordable Housing."

Thirty-six (36) dwelling units per acre for mixed-use developments that include a commercial or office component.

Maximum "net" densities shall not apply to projects within designated Urban Corridors, and may not apply to clustered development in the WO or CHHA Overlay Districts, pursuant to Policies 2.3.1.5 and 4.3.1.5.

Maximum floor area ratio:

0.5.

1.0 in the UIRA.

1.0 for Hotels.

1.0 for mixed-use.

1.0 along designated Urban Corridors; 2.0 along Urban Corridors if an FAR bonus is approved.

Policy 2.2.1.17.4. Other Information:

(a) Generally, limit the use of the ROR future land use category on vacant land to locations adjacent to arterial or higher classification roadways (as shown on the Future Traffic Circulation: Functional Classification Map (Map 5B)), or adjacent to ROR designated lands that meet the criteria.

(b) Development or redevelopment within the ROR area shall not be required to achieve compliance with the Commercial Locational Criteria described in Sections 2.10.4.1 and 2.10.4.2 of this element. However, any such development or redevelopment shall still be required to achieve compliance with other commercial development standards contained in this element, and be consistent with other goals, objectives, and policies in this Comprehensive Plan (see also Policy 2.10.4.2).

(c) No industrial uses, or uses which have a primary purpose of wholesale distribution of goods from that site shall be permitted in the Retail/Office/Residential designation.

(d) Expansion of legally established light industrial uses may be approved within the same parcel if there are no additional impacts to adjoining properties. The Land Development Code shall provide for a process to approve the expansion.
Policy 2.2.1.21. MU: Establish the Mixed-Use future land use category as follows:

Policy 2.2.1.21.1. Intent: To identify, textually in the Comprehensive Plan's goals, objectives, and policies, or graphically on the Future Land Map, major centers of suburban or urban activity in areas with a high level of public facility availability, and intended (but not required) to develop with a horizontal or vertical mix of residential and nonresidential uses, achieving internal trip capture, and the development of a high quality environment for living, working, or visiting.

Policy 2.2.1.21.2. Range of Potential Uses (see Policies 2.1.2.3—2.1.2.7, 2.2.1.5):
Commercial, office, and light industrial uses mixed with suburban or urban residential uses and support uses such as recreational uses, public or semi-public uses, and schools. Hospitals are also appropriate in this future land use category.

Policy 2.2.1.21.3. Range of Potential Density/Intensity:

Maximum gross residential density:
Nine (9) dwelling units per acre for properties located within the CHHA or CEA.
Twelve (12) dwelling units per acre.
Thirty (30) dwelling units per acre along Urban Corridors (forty (40) dwelling units per acre if a density bonus is approved).
Thirty (30) dwelling units per acre for residential projects that designate a minimum of twenty-five (25) percent of the dwelling units as "Affordable Housing."
Thirty (30) dwelling units per acre for mixed-use development that includes a commercial or office component.
Properties within the CEA and CHHA are not eligible for the additional density offered for urban corridors, affordable housing, and/or mixed-use.
Minimum gross residential density:
7.0 only in UIRA for residential projects that designate a minimum of twenty-five (25) percent of the dwelling units as "Affordable Housing."
Maximum net residential density:
Twenty dwelling units per acre.
Thirty-six dwelling units per acre for residential projects that designate a minimum of twenty-five (25) percent of the dwelling units as "Affordable Housing."
Thirty-six dwelling units per acre for mixed-use developments that include a commercial or office component.
Net densities shall not apply along Urban Corridors and may not apply to clustered development in the WO or CHHA Overlay Districts, pursuant to Policies 2.3.1.5 and 4.3.1.5.
Maximum floor area ratio:
1.0 (2.0 along designated Urban Corridors if a FAR bonus is approved).
2.0 inside the UIRA.
Policy 2.2.1.21.4. Other Information:
(a) Generally, limit the use of the MU future land use category on vacant land to locations adjacent to arterial or higher classification roadways (as shown on the Future Traffic Circulation: Functional Classification Map (Map 5B)), or adjacent to MU designated lands that meet the criteria.
(b) All projects are subject to the following criteria, except for individual single family dwellings located on a lot of record and developed without generating a requirement for either subdivision review, or final site or development plan review, or equivalent development order review.

(1) Non-residential uses exceeding one hundred fifty thousand (150,000) square feet of gross building area (region-serving uses) may be considered only if consistent with the requirements for large commercial uses, as described in this element (see Table 2-2, and Policies 2.10.2.1 and 2.10.3.3).

(2) Development in areas designated with the Mixed Use category shall contain the minimum percentage of at least three (3) of the following general categories of land uses (measured in acres district-wide, not per development site);

- Ten (10) percent Residential.
- Ten (10) percent Commercial/Professional.
- Ten (10) percent Light Industrial/Distribution.
- Five (5) percent Recreation/Open Space.
- Three (3) percent Public/Semi-Public.

(3) Access between these uses shall be provided by roads other than those shown on the Major Thoroughfare Map Series of this Comprehensive Plan or alternative vehicular and pedestrian access methods acceptable to the County.

(d) Development or redevelopment within the area designated under this category shall not be required to achieve compliance with the commercial locational criteria described in Objectives 2.10.4.1 and 2.10.4.2 of this element.

Policy 2.2.1.28. Mixed Use - Community (MU-C): Establish the Mixed Use—Community future land use category as follows:

Policy 2.2.1.28.1. Intent: To identify, textually in the Comprehensive Plan's goals, objectives, and policies, or graphically on the Future Land Map, areas which are established as major centers of suburban/urban activity through the identification of potential Activity Centers.

A graphic depiction of the potential Activity Center shall be adopted as a part of any FLUM amendment establishing a MU-C category and shall become a part of the Future Land Use Map Series. Also, to provide incentives for, encourage, or require the horizontal or vertical integration of various residential and nonresidential uses within these areas, achieving internal trip capture, and the development of a high quality environment for living, working, or visiting. Subareas specifying the range of potential uses, range of potential density/intensity, and other information follow below:

Development or redevelopment within the MU-C designated area shall achieve compliance with the Community Design and Compatibility guiding principles outlined in Chapter 9 of the Land Development Code.

For properties illustrated with a potential Activity Center, the requirements of Policy 2.2.1.28.5 (Mixed Use-Community/Residential) shall apply if an Activity Center is not planned.

Policy 2.2.1.28.2. Mixed Use—Community Center Level 1 (MU-C/AC-1): Establish the Activity Center Level 1 subareas as follows:
Purpose: The MU-C/AC-1 category is intended to accommodate regional-serving commercial uses, but may also include neighborhood and community-serving uses.

Range of Potential Uses: Commercial and office uses which function in the market place as neighborhood, community, or region-serving. Also light industrial uses suburban or urban density residential, uses recreational uses, public or semi-public uses, and schools.

Range of potential density/intensity:
Maximum gross residential density:
Nine (9) dwelling units per acre.
Maximum net residential density:
Twenty (20) dwelling units per acre, except for clustered development in the WO or CHHA Overlay Districts which may exceed the net density pursuant to Policies 2.3.1.5 and 4.3.1.5.

Maximum floor area ratio:
1.0.

Other Information:
(a) All projects are subject to the following criteria, except for individual single family dwellings located on a lot of record and developed without generating a requirement for either subdivision review, or final site or development plan review, or equivalent development order review.

(1) Non-Residential uses exceeding one hundred fifty thousand (150,000) square feet of gross building area (region-serving uses) may be considered only if consistent with the requirements for large commercial uses (see Table 2-2 and Policy 2.10.2.1); however, such uses shall not be subject to Policy 2.10.3.3.

(2) Development within this Mixed Use AC-1 subarea shall contain the minimum percentage of at least three (3) of the following general categories of land uses (measured in acres district-wide, not per development site). If two (2) of the land uses include Recreation/Open Space and Public/Semi-Public the required mix of uses increases to four (4) land use types, one (1) of which must be residential.

Ten (10) percent Residential.
Twenty (20) percent Commercial/Professional.
Fifteen (15) percent Light Industrial/Distribution.
Five (5) percent Recreation/Open Space.
Three (3) percent Public/Semi-Public.

(3) For new development projects presented in a unified development plan containing multiple future land use designations including MU-C, all land uses may be considered towards the minimum mix of required uses.

(b) Access between uses within this subarea shall be provided by roads other than those shown on the Major thoroughfare Map Series of this Comprehensive Plan or alternative vehicular and pedestrian access methods acceptable to the County.

(c) Development or redevelopment within the area designated under this category shall not be required to achieve compliance with the commercial locational criteria described in Objectives 2.10.4.1 and 2.10.4.2 of this element.
Policy 2.2.1.28.3. Mixed Use—Community/Activity Center Level 2 (MU-C/AC-2): Establish the Activity Center Level 2 subarea as follows:

Purpose: The AC-2 activity center is intended to accommodate community-serving commercial uses, but may also include neighborhood-serving commercial uses.

Range of Potential Uses: Commercial and office uses which function in the market place as neighborhood or community serving. Also light industrial uses and suburban or urban density residential uses.

Range of potential density/intensity:
- Maximum gross residential density:
  - Nine (9) dwelling units per acre.
- Maximum net residential density:
  - Twenty (20) dwelling units per acre, except for clustered development in the WO or CHHA Overlay Districts which may exceed the net density, pursuant to Policies 2.3.1.5 and 4.3.1.5.
- Maximum floor area ratio:
  - 0.35.

Maximum Square Footage for Neighborhood, Community, or Region-Serving Commercial Uses:
- Large (thirty thousand (300,000) s.f.).

Other Information:
(a) Non-residential projects exceeding one hundred fifty thousand (150,000) square feet gross building area may be considered only if consistent with the requirements for large commercial uses (see Table 2-2 and Policy 2.10.2.1); however, such uses shall not be subject to Policy 2.10.3.3.

(b) Development within this Mixed Use AC-2 subarea shall contain the minimum percentage of at least three (3) of the following general categories of land uses (measured in acres district-wide, not per development site). If two (2) of the land uses include Recreation/Open Space and Public/Semi-Public the required mix of uses increases to four (4) land use types, one (1) of which must be residential.

  - Ten (10) percent Residential.
  - Twenty (20) percent Commercial/Professional.
  - Fifteen (15) percent Light Industrial/Distribution.
  - Five (5) percent Recreation/Open Space.
  - Three (3) percent Public/Semi-Public.

Policy 2.2.1.28.4. Mixed Use—Community/Activity Center Level 3 (MU-C/AC-3): Establish the Activity Center Level 3 subareas as follows:

Purpose: The AC-3 activity center is intended to accommodate neighborhood-serving commercial uses.
Range of Potential Uses: Commercial and office uses that serve the immediate neighborhoods. Also limited light industrial uses and suburban or urban density residential development.

Range of potential density/intensity:
Maximum gross residential density:
Three (3) dwelling units per acre.
Maximum net residential density:
Nine (9) dwelling units per acre, except for clustered development in the WO or CHHA Overlay Districts which may exceed the net density, pursuant to Policies 2.3.1.5 and 4.3.1.5.

Maximum floor area ratio: 0.23.

Maximum square footage for Neighborhood Commercial uses: Medium (one hundred fifty thousand (150,000) s.f.)

Other Information:
(a) Development sites in the AC-3 category shall contain a minimum of fifty (50) percent nonresidential development.

Policy 2.2.1.28.5. Mixed Use - Community/Residential (MU-C/R): Establish the Residential subareas as follows:

Purpose: The MU-C/R category is intended to accommodate low and medium density residential and support uses.

Range of Potential Uses: Residential uses with integrated support uses serving the neighborhood.

Range of potential density/intensity:
Maximum gross residential density:
Three (3) dwelling units per acre.
Maximum net residential density:
Nine (9) dwelling units per acre, except for clustered development in the WO or CHHA Overlay Districts which may exceed the net density, pursuant to Policies 2.3.1.5 and 4.3.1.5.

Maximum floor area ratio: 0.23.

Maximum square footage for Neighborhood Commercial uses: Medium (one hundred fifty thousand (150,000) s.f. as permitted in the Manatee County Comprehensive Plan Policy 2.10.4.2. for DRI’s and Large Projects).

Objective 2.6.1 Compatibility Through Screening, Buffering, Setbacks, and Other Mitigative Measures. Require suitable separation between adjacent land uses to reduce the possibility of adverse impacts to residents and visitors, to protect the public health, and to provide for strong communities.

Objective 2.6.5 Quality in Project Design: Promote appropriate diversity within and between existing and future development projects to achieve high quality, efficient functioning design.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy: 2.6.5.4</th>
<th>Maximize the conservation and/or protection of public or private open space, including common open space, through the land development process by requiring that minimum percentages of the upland area on any project be maintained as undisturbed or landscaped areas.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land uses within the Watershed Overlay District shall meet additional requirements required by the Comprehensive Plan (See also Policy 2.2.2.2.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 2.9.1.3</td>
<td>Provide vehicular access between neighborhoods, particularly (but not exclusively) when part of a planned unit development containing more than one neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 2.9.1.5</td>
<td>Promote the development of pedestrian friendly designs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>