

# **MANATEE COUNTY REVIEW COMMENTS REGARDING USF SARASOTA/MANATEE 2010 CAMPUS MASTER PLAN**

## **Vision Statement**

- Manatee County Government applauds the commitment by the USF System to increase their level of community engagement and facilitate increased collaborations among institutions, strengthening economic and community engagement.

## **Future Land Use Element**

- The site is in an area designated Public/Semi-Public-2 (P/SP-2) on the Manatee County Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map.
- The PSP-2 category is designed for facilities such as colleges, universities and hospitals.
- The Future Land Use Element of the Master Plan identifies the development totals for the site and describes how development will take place.
- As noted earlier, 427,000 square feet of building are proposed. The overall floor area ratio on the site will be 0.20.
- Footnotes for Table 4.1 indicate that, "average height assumed for proposed housing is three to four floors". Footnotes for Table 4.2 indicate that the average height for parking structures is four levels. Maximum building height is typically 35 feet in Manatee County. Staff recommends more detailed review of site plans, particularly for buildings with a height in excess of 35 feet, to appropriately consider compatibility, setbacks, screening, buffering, and lighting.
- Manatee County Comprehensive Plan Policy 7.1.4.1 requires preservation and protection of significant historical and archaeological resources. Staff recommends USF consider adding a Policy to Objective 4.3 to recognize the historical significance of the Crosley Estate, adjacent to the campus. Staff recommends USF consider including policy language to recognize the historical significance of the Crosley Estate located adjacent to the campus to the west, and sharing an access easement with the University. As development of the campus progresses, staff would like for the University to employ design elements to preserve and protect the historic character of the adjacent property.

- Manatee County Comprehensive Plan Policy 2.6.1.1 identifies techniques for mitigating compatibility concerns between uses. Two techniques noted are innovative site design and appropriate building design. Staff recommends policy language to protect views along Seagate Drive to the Crosley Estate through the innovative use of site design, ensuring the mass and scale of buildings adjacent to Seagate Drive are consistent with the historic integrity of the Crosley Estate, and do not detract from its historical significance. Staff also recommends that the University, through the Office of Facilities Planning and Management, include Manatee County Government in the review of architectural renderings for buildings adjacent to Seagate Drive.
- Staff recommends Policy 4.5.1 be revised to reference Figure 4-7, as there is no Figure 4-8.
- Regarding Policy 4.9.3, staff recommends the last sentence be revised to add, “or sublease of other lands to the University”.
- It is recommended that the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map be amended to PSP-2 for those parcels that are proposed for acquisition after they are acquired by USFSM.

### **Zoning**

- The current zoning categories on the four parcels that are located within unincorporated Manatee County are General Commercial (GC), Planned Development Residential (PDR), and Residential Single-Family 4.5 dwelling units per acre (RSF 4.5).
- These classifications do not permit colleges and universities.
- It is recommended that the property be rezoned to MP-I (Master Planned - Institution). Agreement by the university to obtain this zoning classification would also provide a forum to address development concerns and provide unified campus zoning.

### **Transportation Element**

- The Manatee County Transportation Planning Division has been working with USFSM and their consultants to address transportation related concerns. Staff has reviewed the Applicant's responses to the two (2) remaining transportation-related comments, as documented in an April 22, 2013 memorandum.

- The results of this review have indicated that the responses have adequately addressed concerns regarding the procedures/methodology used to derive future (2020) turning movements into/out of the existing/proposed driveways with U.S. 41, including the associated *Synchro* analysis. However, one minor issue was uncovered as a result of this review and provided below.
  - o In conjunction with the Applicant's responses, it was determined that the methodology used to develop future (2020) through traffic along U.S. 41 assumed no growth along this corridor through 2020. Although this methodology is not consistent with typical and acceptable county procedures regarding traffic studies, a review of current and future traffic volumes from other county sources indicate that any analysis results will likely be similar to those already provided in the Applicant's *Synchro* analysis. Thus, **no** further analysis or response is required by the Applicant.

*Traffic Design General Comments:*

- Along a state road such as U.S. 41, the applicant will need to coordinate with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) for any proposed accesses. Similarly, any proposed changes along U.S. 41 such as installation of a median, lane width reduction, traffic signal installation, etc., must be coordinated through FDOT. In addition, the applicant must provide a Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis to the Traffic Design Division for approval prior to the design of any proposed traffic signal location on U.S. 41. The Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis must be signed and sealed by a licensed professional engineer registered in the State of Florida.
- The County has no objection to a traffic signal or landscaped medians on U.S. 41 that are appropriately designed and meet criteria for installation. However, the County requests that any changes to traffic control, medians, and access management modifications to U.S. 41 shall not impact access to the Powel Crosley Estate by prohibiting any turning movement to or from Seagate Drive.
- Reduced lane width may increase certain types of crashes (such as sideswipe crashes). Therefore, the County does not recommend the use of lane width reduction as a tool to reduce vehicle speeds.

*General Comment:*

The Campus Master Plan identifies a range of options to address pedestrian mobility and safety. One of the options includes a landscaped buffer. Please note that Manatee County has no funding for maintenance of landscaping. If this option is utilized, funding should be provided by an entity other than Manatee County.

## **Housing Element**

- On-campus housing for students is proposed for the first time with this Campus Master Plan.
- This Campus Master Plan calls for the construction of 200 to 330 new student beds in approximately 115,500 gsf of building area, based on a goal of housing 25% of undergraduates, as calculated by projected full time enrollment.
- Within the element, it is recommended that a Housing Study be conducted by USFSM to include on- and off-campus housing options and an analysis of the local residential market. Manatee County staff supports this recommendation.

## **General Infrastructure**

### **Stormwater**

- The Stormwater Management Division of the Public Works Department reviewed the Stormwater subelement.
- The master plan reflects acquisition of numerous properties. Some of these properties consist of existing impervious coverage. Any existing impervious areas that are utilized in conjunction with the master plan will not require additional stormwater management facilities. Any existing impervious area to be removed can be utilized as credit within the USFSM campus.
- Proposed impervious areas associated with the campus master plan will require stormwater facilities. Stormwater runoff which discharges directly to Sarasota Bay will not require attenuation of runoff, however 150% water quality treatment will be required. Stormwater runoff which discharges to public right-of-way or existing drainage systems shall provide attenuation of runoff for the 25-year/24-hour storm event and water quality treatment. Ultimately, existing stormwater runoff drainage patterns shall remain the same in post-development condition.
- The Master Plan shall not utilize the 72" outfall culvert which serves the Sarasota-Bradenton International Airport as a means of conveyance or outfall of drainage runoff for campus facilities. The 72" outfall culvert serves solely as an outfall for the airport and serves as a diversion outfall for runoff in lieu of discharge to a flood prone area.
- Based upon Preliminary DFIRM floodplain delineation, no portion of the existing or proposed campus property is located within the 100-year

floodplain (Zone AE or VE). However, any improvements to the Crosley Estates property may be located within the 100-year floodplain (Zone AE or VE).

- Proposed development, Stormwater Management facilities, and floodplain impacts and mitigation shall be in compliance with the Manatee County Comprehensive Plan, the Land Development Code, Public Works Department Highway, Traffic, and Stormwater Standards, and the Stormwater Management Design Manual.
- Construction drawings for all stormwater facilities are to be reviewed and approved by Manatee County Government.

### **General Infrastructure**

#### **Potable Water**

- The Master Plan recommends that the University continue to receive potable water supply and fire protection from Manatee County.
- The Data Collection and Analysis document indicates that the current consumption rate for existing gross floor area is nearly 0.24 GPD/square foot, which is the Level of Service that is approved in the Campus Development Agreement (CDA) for the full 250,000 square feet of building. Staff recommends that consumption needs for existing and future development be analyzed and incorporated in the CDA that will follow this Campus Master Plan.
- It is recommended that fire flow test results be provided to the Cedar Hammock Fire District personnel (Policy 7.2.2.3).
- It is recommended that potable water be prohibited for irrigation purposes.
- Construction drawings for all potable water facilities are to be reviewed and approved by Manatee County Government. Please revise policies to make this clear.

### **General Infrastructure**

#### **Sanitary Sewer**

- The Master Plan recommends that the University continue to maintain its current connection to the Manatee County Southwest Sewage Treatment Plant.

- The Data Collection and Analysis document and Policy 7.3.2.1 indicate that the current 28 gallons per minute at Average Daily Flow (ADF) will not be adequate when full-time students begin living on campus. Staff recommends that a thorough sanitary sewer needs analysis be conducted by USFSM prior to review of a revised Campus Development Agreement.
- Construction drawings for all sewer facilities are to be reviewed and approved by Manatee County Government. Please revise policies to make this clear.

### **General Infrastructure**

#### **Solid Waste**

- In the Data Collection and Analysis (DCA) document, page 7-9, the first paragraph indicates that USF spends \$2,800 annually. County records indicate USF was billed \$2,300 in 2012. If the information in the DCA is based on 2012 billing, please revise accordingly.
- In the DCA, paragraph A.1, on page 7-9, staff is unaware of the Finkelstein and Associates assessment of the service life of the Lena Road Landfill. The state mandates an annual assessment of landfill life. Our current estimate was calculated by Atkins Global, Manatee County's Solid Waste consultant. The landfill is estimated to reach closure in 2045, based on the most recent calculation. This estimate is based on 0.64 tons per cubic yard. Manatee County averages an annual consumption of 463,500 cubic yards per year. The most recent analysis indicates that the landfill has 14,626,480 cubic yards remaining of available space.
- Staff is unaware of a mandate from FDEP regarding recyclable waste being removed from the waste stream prior to disposal. Staff understands that the state has set a 75% recycling goal within two milestones – by the year 2020, the state hopes counties and municipalities with a population of 50,000 or more are recycling 75% of their waste stream. Manatee County is taking the goal very seriously and is taking steps to reach this goal.

### **General Infrastructure**

#### **Hot Water**

- Manatee County applauds USFSM in their efforts to become carbon neutral by 2070. Exploring options for green technologies to provide heat to buildings will help move the university toward this goal.

## **General Infrastructure**

### **Chilled Water**

- Although not a required element of the Campus Master Plan, Manatee County applauds USFSM in their efforts to become carbon neutral by 2070. Expansion of the chilled water production and distribution system to support the additional floor area identified in this master plan will help reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

## **General Infrastructure**

### **Electrical Power and Other Fuels**

- Manatee County applauds the commitment of USFSM to improve energy conservation measures and explore opportunities to diversify the fuel mix for electricity production with renewable energy to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

## **General Infrastructure**

### **Telecommunications**

- Manatee County applauds the efforts of USFSM to provide existing and planned buildings with communications connectivity for telephone, data, and video/media networks.

## **Conservation**

- The 2010 Campus Master Plan Update indicates that two of the three conservation easement areas would be impacted by parking implementation. Please clarify where they are and identify who these conservation easements are dedicated to and whether there has been any discussion concerning vacating/releasing these easements. The previous Master Plan identified a 4 acre conservation area for the existing on site population of Gopher Tortoise. Comprehensive Plan Policy 3.3.2.1 requires protection of threatened, endangered, or species of special concern from incompatible development.
- It is staff's understanding that the most recent evaluations have indicated the presence of a single gopher tortoise within the preserve areas and that the proposed plan is not likely to adversely impact the gopher tortoise.

### **Recreation and Open Space**

- The Recreation and Open Space Element outlines the plans for the expansion of recreation facilities needed to serve a residential student body, and maintaining the preservation of existing conservation and naturalized areas.
- Page 9-3, item “B.” of the Data Collection and Analysis document should be revised to reflect Manatee County’s Level of Service Standards for parks that are established in the Comprehensive Plan. These standards are as follows:
  - o One local park per 10,000 residents.
  - o One district park per 100,000 residents.
  - o One regional park per 500,000 residents.
- Staff recommends USFSM consider safety measures to be implemented along informal walking/jogging trails on and near campus to ensure student safety.
- Regarding Policy 9.5.1, Manatee County is committed to coordinating with USFSM regarding recreation and open space needs. Staff recommends this policy be revised to clarify that the provision of recreation facilities needed for the student body of the university is primarily the responsibility of USFSM.
- Manatee County Comprehensive Plan Policy 4.1.14 requires identification of all areas of significant seagrass habitat and to direct marine traffic to avoid these areas. The proposed boat house, identified on Exhibit 9-1, is located in an area where Sarasota Bay is relatively shallow (0-3’ depth MLW) for approximately 1000’ from the shoreline. While this depth may be suitable for rowing vessels, kayaks and canoes it is not suitable for sailboats or power boats.

### **Intergovernmental Coordination**

- This element discusses mechanisms for coordination between USFSM and local agencies and governmental entities.
- Manatee County staff appreciates the opportunity to review proposed amendments to the Campus Master Plan, based on Policies 10.1.2, and 10.1.3.
- Manatee County staff will endeavor to continue to include USFSM as a review agency for site development cases that are located within the context area of the university, consistent with Objective 10.2.

### **Capital Improvements**

- This element provides for an evaluation of the facilities needs and site improvements associated with the Campus Master Plan Goals, Objectives, and Policies Report, and Data Collection and Analysis Report.
- It is also important to note that this Element includes a graphic showing proposed property acquisition, based on priority, and a graphic showing proposed buildings for the 10-year planning horizon.
- The element is also intended to estimate the cost of the improvements that the University has fiscal responsibility and to lay out a policy framework for such improvements.
- Policy 11.3.2 prohibits construction of academic and research buildings less than the minimum heights established in Element 4, Future Land Use, except by special approval from the President. As noted previously, staff recommends more detailed review of site plans, particularly for buildings with a height in excess of 35 feet, to appropriately consider compatibility, setbacks, screening, buffering, and lighting.