

Review of Key Points in the Proposed Envision Alachua Sector Plan, Stated Intent and Policy Comparison

Produced at the request of the Alachua County Commission Board of County Commissioners

February 12, 2016

The Board requested a review of the vision that would potentially be realized by the Envision Alachua Sector Plan and how the proposed policies compare to that vision. This is not meant to be an inclusive review of every policy but is a review of key policies related to the vision and is a supplement to the staff report. The staff report contains a detailed review and analysis of all policies.

Policy Question: Should the County allow urban development outside of the Urban Cluster?

Envision Alachua Stated Intent (from Planning Commission) Public Hearing	Staff Identified Proposed Policies	Policy Comparison
<p style="text-align: center;">Create major employment centers to diversify regional economy.</p>	<p>Policy 10.2.1: Proposed Land Use Map;</p> <p>Policy 10.2.6: Employment Oriented Mixed-Use</p> <p>Policies 10.3.1, 10.3.3.1, 10.3.4.1: land uses and development program for both SR 20 Job Center and US 301 Job Center;</p> <p>Policy 102.6.3: Jobs to Housing balance</p>	<p>1,500 homes would be allowed prior to any non-residential being constructed. Once 1,000,000 square feet of non-residential is built or under construction, more homes may be built. The first 1,000,000 sq. ft. could all be retail. Jobs-to-housing ratio is only evaluated by full build-out of each Detailed Specific Area Plan (DSAP), not actual construction. 75% of development could be housing.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Support UF's Preeminence Initiative</p>	<p>Policy 10.1.1.2: utilizing local assets – UF, etc.</p> <p>Policy 10.3.1: square footage included in Campus Master Plan not included in maximum development program</p>	<p>Descriptive not regulatory and not limited to UF but a list of various assets to utilize including UF, Santa Fe, existing rail, highways, Shands, existing agriculture and silviculture. This policy lists assets that may or may not be utilized in this project, nothing requires collaboration.</p> <p>UF could use the property today by including it in their Campus Master Plan but it would not include private land uses.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Reduce poverty</p>	<p>No policies address poverty</p>	<p>No requirements in policies for type of jobs to be created or affordability of housing and no requirement for what gets built first.</p>

<p>Address unemployment – need large land area for manufacturing</p>	<p>Policy 10.1.1.1: EASP shall provide sites for economic opportunity</p> <p>Policy 10.3.3.1: Describes land uses</p> <p>Policy 10.2.6.3: Jobs to Housing Balance states EOMU shall create regional scale economic development opportunities.</p> <p>Policy 10.3.3.3 and Policy 10.3.4.3: Gives potential land use mix with percentages of each type of use for SR 20 Job Center and US 301 Job Center</p>	<p>Applicant requesting land uses that allow mixed-use development. No guaranteed economic development or jobs – a square footage ratio is used.</p> <p>No requirement for types of job to be developed;</p> <p>US 301 Job Center has more manufacturing and is located on the rail, but cannot be developed until after 2030 according to the proposed policy.</p> <p>The SR 20 Job center is more research and development oriented – could be up to 75% residential with no manufacturing. The US 301 Job Center could be up to 60% residential.</p>
---	--	---

Policy Question: Should the County allow avoidable impacts to wetlands? Should any wetland impacts be allowed without further County review or approval?

Envision Alachua Stated Intent (from Planning Commission)	Staff Identified Proposed Policies	Policy Allowance
<p align="center">Allow an urban form of compact, walkable, mixed use development</p>	<p>Policies 10.3.2: General design standards to create walkable, mixed use center</p> <p>Policy 10.3.2.1: Utilities and transportation system shall be designed to avoid, minimize and/or mitigate impacts to natural resources that are protected consistent with these policies.</p> <p>Policy 10.4.2.1: Allows up to 400 acres of wetlands to be filled without further County approval.</p>	<p>SR 20 Job Center has too many wetlands and natural resources to effectively create a gridded street network and walkable pattern of development throughout the development while avoiding, minimizing, etc. impacts to the natural resources.</p> <p>Exhibits 10.1 – 10.5 showing potential block layouts are not regulatory, only descriptive.</p> <p>To create the urban form of walkable development, especially within the SR 20 Job Center, the applicant is requesting the addition of Policy 10.4.2.1 that allows filling of at least 400 acres of wetlands.</p>

Policy Question: Should protection of conservation resource be a determining factor in development location and design?

Envision Alachua Stated Intent (from Planning Commission)	Staff Identified Proposed Policies	Policy Allowance
<p align="center">Promotes environmental protection through placing the environmental considerations first, and developing accordingly.</p>	<p>Proposed Policy 10.0: Sector Plan shall consist of ...a minimum of 80% set aside in perpetuity of Open space, conservation or non-development uses.</p> <p>Policy 10.4.2.1: Allows up to 400 acres of wetlands to be filled without further County approval.</p>	<p>Property being set aside in conservation will continue to be timbered including clear cutting. Development rights will be removed.</p> <p>EA properties are almost entirely within designated Strategic Ecosystems and contain protected natural resources. The amount of property being placed into EA-CON is roughly equivalent to what the Comprehensive Plan would require. Minimization and avoidance requires pre-development planning to consider qualitative value of the impacts before a development proposal. The current Comp Plan requires looking at natural resources as one factor in determining the most appropriate place to develop.</p> <p>The process for Sector Plan approval is first the general long-term master plan on at least 15,000 acres then detailed specific area plans on 1,000(or more) acres. There is no detailed plan submittal phase for the whole property to determine environmental impact, interconnection of DSAP areas, and infrastructure corridors.</p> <p>These policies also treat wetland impacts for the compact-mixed use areas, large-scale manufacturing and residential the same. There is no discussion of where the 400 acre impact would occur, or policy consideration of avoidance or minimization for some land use types (such as residential).</p>

	<p>Policy 10.1.1.1: Strategies supporting FLUE Principle 1 provision of significant areas for conservation – regional linkages</p> <p>Policy 10.2.4.2: Deed restrictions and EA-CON (Conservation) land use designation are placed on conservation lands up front– actual conservation easements come later.</p> <p>Policies 10.3.3.3(2) and 10.3.4.3 (2) active recreation in floodplain</p> <p>Policy 10.3.3.4 and 10.3.4.4: Development allowed within 100 year flood plain as long as no increase in peak stage or discharge outside of the EASP boundary</p> <p>Policy 10.3.3.4 iii. and Policy 10.3.4.4.iii: The County determines that development within the SR 20 Job Center to accommodate a large-scale employment center and within the US 301 Job Center to accommodate rail-based advanced manufacturing is of overriding public interest so to allow impacts to natural resources consistent with state and federal permitting.</p>	<p>There is only one regional linkage proposed – Lochloosa Creek. However, it does not meet criteria for full functionality because it truncates, significantly narrows and the proposed policies allow multiple road crossings.</p> <p>Conservation easements are placed on the property as development is proposed proportional with each DSAP. The final conservation easements come with the final Detailed Specific Area Plan (DSAP)</p> <p>Active recreation is not defined</p> <p>Allows flood compensation anywhere within the EOMU or adjacent to it which means compensation could occur in a different floodplain than where the impacts occurred.</p> <p>The County looks at avoidance of impacts to natural resources first. If it is determined that there is no alternative to the impacts, then mitigation is determined. In State permitting allows mitigation without first reviewing avoidance in this situation.</p>
--	---	--

Policy Question: Should the County allow urban development of rural land instead of directing development to the Urban Cluster and municipalities?

Envision Alachua Stated Intent (from Planning Commission)	Staff Identified Proposed Policies	Policy Allowance
<p align="center">Allows major employment centers that are not feasible within the Urban Cluster and cities.</p>		<p>No policies in the proposal Plan address feasibility of major employment centers within the Urban Clusters and Cities.</p>
<p align="center">Protection of 22,362 acres of regional significant resources from development and intense agriculture.</p>	<p>Policy 10.0: A sector plan shall consist of a minimum of 15,000 acres with a minimum of 80% set aside in perpetuity of open space, conservation, or non-development uses.</p>	<p>Development consistent with the current Comprehensive Plan except that the development would produce a roughly equivalent amount of protected acreage (100% of wetlands and 50% of uplands) while not allowing the intensive development or wetland impacts proposed by the applicant. There are no policies that address that development consistent with the proposed policies is less of an impact on environmental resources than development allowed by the current Comp Plan.</p>
<p align="center">Physical Infrastructure Schools Public Safety Capital Improvements</p>	<p>Objective 10.5 (Transportation), Policies 10.5.2.1(Water and Sewer) Policy 10.5.8.b (funding policy) - will pay portion of capital cost attributable to development Policy 10.6.3 - DSAP will be consistent with County ability to fund infrastructure (and/or private developer)</p>	<p>Infrastructure policies indicate that the developer will pay for the portion of capital cost attributable to the development, which leaves the source of the balance of the funding questionable. “But for” the development, there may be no need to add the infrastructure.</p> <p>There are no proposed policies that ensure public funding will not be needed. There are also no policies proposed to address long-term maintenance of infrastructure.</p>