

**MEMORANDUM
FROM
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES**

Date: December 4, 2009
To: Brandon Dunn, Planner

From: Brad Browning, Senior Environmental Planner
Phone: (239)533-8157
e-mail: bbrowning@leegov.com

Project: North Olga
Case: CPA2009-00002

PROJECT:

The North Olga Community Planning Panel is requesting approval of the proposed North Olga Community Plan and the corresponding text amendments in efforts to preserve and promote the unique character, historic heritage and quality of life in North Olga, as well as proactively prescribed a specific set of Goals, Objectives and Policies to direct any future growth within the area..

PROJECT SITE:

ES Staff has reviewed the application submittal and has the following comments and questions:

Policy 36.1.2- ES staff agrees with the intent of this policy but it could require impacts to high quality uplands to keep low quality wetlands. ES staff suggest creating a standard that would give more guidelines to preserving high quality uplands/wetlands versus impacting low quality uplands/wetlands.

Policy 36.1.5- What is the timeframe for the submittal? Does this include landscaping?

Policy 36.1.4- ES staff has no objections to this policy.

Objective 36.2 - ES staff has no objections to this policy but Land Development Code will need to be created if the community desires stronger open space and enhanced buffer requirements.

Policy 36.2.3- Clarify if the 50% open space is for all new developments or just new residential developments. Land development code must be created for the 50% open space requirement. What will the open space requirements be for projects 20 acres or less? Can the 50% open space include pools, recreation facilities or lakes?

Policy 36.2.4- This policy could affect open space requirements. What will the open space requirements be for a mixed use projects? Also how can the density be increased greater than one

unit per acre if not changing the land use (Rural 1dwelling unit/1acre, DRGR 1dwelling unit/10 acre).

Policy 36.2.5- Land development code must be created for the 50 foot rural buffer. Clarify the number of trees and shrubs required per 100 feet for the 50 foot rural buffer.

Policy 36.3- ES staff has no objections to this policy.

Policy 36.3.5- Land development code must be created for the 40% open space requirement. What will the open space requirements be for projects 20 acres or less?

Policy 36.3.6 Should this policy include landscaping?

Policy 36.4.2 - Has Conservation 20/20 commented on this policy. ES staff has no objections to this policy.

Policy 36.6.1- How can the density be increased greater than one unit per acre if not changing the land use (Rural 1/1acre, DRGR 1/10 acre)?

Objective 36.7 and Policy36.7.1- Has Conservation 20/20 commented on this policy. These uses would need to be consistent with the management plans for 20/20 properties. Also not all 20/20 properties allow public access.

Policy 36.7.2- When and how will the open space master plan be created? This could become problematic at this stage. Will the connectivity be created when parcels are developed?

Policy 36.7.3-Has Conservation 20/20 commented on this policy. ES staff has no objections to this policy.

Policy 36.7.4- Will this policy include single family developments? What is meant by public access? Does this mean boat ramps, piers or board walks? Who will maintain this public accesses?

Policy 36.7.6- ES staff does not understand the intent of this policy. ES staff suggest revising this policy because if the county does not own the land then there is no way for the county to provide the intent of this policy.

Objective 36.8- ES staff has no objections to this policy.

Policy 36.8.1- ES staff suggest revising the policy. Instead of using “ and appropriate riverine buffer” revise the policy to state “and to require the appropriate natural waterway buffers during development”.

Policy 36.8.2- ES staff has no objections to this policy.

Policy 36.8.4- ES staff has no objections to this policy but Land development code will need to be created if the community desires stronger indigenous preserve requirements. Need to provide standards for this policy.

Policy 36.8.5- ES staff suggest revising the policy to require that the heritage tree be replaced on site and not allow off site replacement. What about the size/number of the replacement trees for the removal of heritage trees? Need to provide standards for this policy.

Policy 36.8.6- ES staff has no objections to this policy.

Policy 36.8.7- Land development code must be created to require the 50 foot setback. Also the 50 foot setback should be required from on site and off site fire dependent vegetation/ preserve lands. How can a project have greater density?

Policy 36.8.8-ES staff has no objections to this policy.