



July 25, 2017

Todd M. Mathes
Benderson Development
7978 Cooper Creek Blvd.
Suite 100
University Park, FL 34201

Re: Siesta Promenade Critical Area Plan (CAP) Application Sufficiency Review

Dear Mr. Mathes:

On June 28, 2017, Planning Services received a new (revised and updated) CAP Application for review. After review of these materials, Sarasota County finds this application **INSUFFICIENT**. Comments are listed below.

PLANNING SERVICES (Todd Dary) 861-5260, tdary@scgov.net

Executive Summary

An executive summary outlining key findings must be submitted.

Future Land Use Plan

A “Future Land Use Plan” consisting of a plan(s) and conditions of development approval that will be adopted as the Critical Area Plan must be submitted. The plan and conditions will address development requirements that will apply to any project that might occur on the property, and not only that proposed in the rezone development concept plan. The details of development indicated on the development concept plan are not required. The locational aspect of certain elements may be addressed through conditions of development approval and not in plan. Other review agencies may recommend elements or conditions to be included. The following elements must be included:

- The location of vehicular connections to adjacent roadways.
- Location and size of pedestrian connections (walks ways) to adjacent roadways.
- Location and size of internal pedestrian connections.
- Location, size, function and interconnectivity of public squares and open spaces.
- Location and size of landscape and buffering treatment of all adjacent properties and streets.
- Location and nature of improvements in public rights-of way including sidewalks and street trees.
- Locations, heights and proximity to property lines of any proposed buildings exceeding the height limitation of 35 feet.
- Standards for architectural treatment of commercial buildings along public rights-of-way.

Future Land Use Policy 1.2.15 – Proposed Development Concept Plan, including Mix of Uses
Sheet 3, “Site Plan” – See Rezone Petition comments for “Development Concept Plan.”

Future Land Use Policy 1.2.15 - Buffering Illustrations, Illustrations of Building Height and Separation, and Architectural Renderings.

Sheet 4 – Multifamily Residential Site Plan

This plan should include the label “illustration of building height and separation”

Maximum building height as defined in the zoning regulations (measured to the mean height between eaves and ridge of roof) should be shown on the sections.

In sections clearly indicate and label the right-of-way and edge of pavement of Glencoe Ave.

Section R-1 shows graphically and indicates a dimension of 29 feet between edge of pavement and the property line, where the actual dimension appears to be 18 or 19 feet. The graphic depictions and dimensions of “single family house to 3 story building” and “single family house to edge of pavement” are also inaccurate. These dimensions are similarly inaccurate for Section R-2.

Sheets 5-8 – Street Views

These renderings of proposed residential structures show a raised curb along Glencoe Avenue where none exists. These renderings should accurately illustrate improvements proposed in the right-of-way of Glencoe Ave.

Sheet LA-01

Sheet LA-01 includes two plans for a 200’ length of street buffer/plantings along Glencoe Ave.

The first plan more closely matches the section in the lower part of the sheet and indicates 9 palms and understory plantings in the 20’ buffer/setback between the proposed building and street right-of-way, along with street trees and understory plantings within the right-of-way of Glencoe Ave.

The second plan shows only the 20’ buffer section and shows 8 canopy trees and understory plantings.

Is the second plan shown intended to be an option? How do the two plans relate? Please clarify.

Plan and section should indicate the required sidewalk located at or near the edge of right-of-way. (width?)

The plan graphically shows approximately 29 feet between the edge of pavement of Glencoe Ave. and the property line, where the actual dimension appears to vary between 15 and 18 feet.

The plan shows street trees on the east and west sides of Glencoe Ave. planted approximately 28 feet on center. On the east side, this area is mostly the front yards of single family residences with driveways and existing trees that would preclude the planting of trees in the illustrated configuration. In addition, the consent and participation of property owners adjacent to the street would be advised. A condition of development approval that provides for the development of a street tree plan including selection of appropriate species and the execution of an agreement for maintenance by the developer should be provided.

The dimensions of the section should be graphically correct and match the plan. The trees indicated on the single family lot should be removed.

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING (Shanon Rodden) 861-0899, srodden@scgov.net

Critical Area Plan Comments

- Per the CAP scope, the following items are required for review:
 - Updated traffic impact analysis which addresses all FDOT and Sarasota County comments as discussed in the June 26, 2017 meeting.
- Based on the development concept plan, a right-of-way/street vacation will be required.

Multi-modal Plan Comments

- Rename “Existing Bike Routes” to “Existing Bicycle Facility”
- Please include a table with expected number of bicycle, pedestrian, and transit users due to the development.
- Include the following details and analysis for each sheet:
 - Dimensions of the bicycle and pedestrian facility (sidewalk width, bicycle lane vs. paved shoulder, etc.);
 - A narrative that describes the experience that a typical user would encounter to each destination. For example, does the sidewalk change width, how long did it take to cross the intersection, how safe did it feel to ride on the road/bicycle lane;
 - Recommended mitigation measures for all gap areas or improvements to existing conditions in accordance with current best practices, but also provide justification if it is not feasible to accommodate those standards;
 - An analysis of private shuttle service to the defined destination areas; and
 - An analysis of all identified crosswalks and crossings and include any deficiencies or gaps.

Sheet 2 – Phillippi Estate Park

- If Hollywood Boulevard is being identified as the primary bicycle and pedestrian route, it should be noted as a gap since there are no sidewalks or bicycle lanes. Possible mitigation measures to consider include sharrows and sidewalks along Hollywood Boulevard. It is noted that Beechwood Avenue has existing sidewalks.
- A bicycle route along Route B should be identified and any gap analysis included.

Sheet 5 – Point of Rocks

- There does not appear to be any bicycle or pedestrian facilities along Point of Rocks Road. This should be identified as a gap with possible mitigation measures.

Sheet 7 – Legacy Trail/Culverhouse Nature Park

- Considering that The Legacy Trail does not extend to Clark Road, Route A should be classified as Route B.
- While there are no on-road bicycle facilities along Clark Road, we recognize that there is a sidewalk for cyclists to legally ride on. This could be considered a gap for bicyclist since the sidewalk does not meet the minimum requirements of 8 feet for a shared used path.
- Please analyze the biking route conditions along Route B as shown on the map.

Sheet 9 – U.S. 41 Businesses

- There are no bicycle and pedestrian facilities along Brentwood Avenue. This should be identified as a gap with possible mitigation measures.
- It is unclear why an alternative Route B was not identified.

Sheet 11 – Gulfgate/Sarasota Pavillion

- There are not existing bicycle facilities along Gulf Gate Drive. The proposed bicycle route should be labeled as a gap.

Sheet 12 – Southpointe/Southbridge

- There are no existing on-road bicycle facilities along the bicycle route. This should be changed to a gap, with a note related to the US 41 Improvements.

PARKS RECREATIONS AND NATURAL RESOURCES (Mike Sosadeeter) 350-3205, msosadee@scgov.net

Sheet 2 – Phillippi Estate Park

- The applicant should consider a separate route through the existing residential neighborhoods to a pedestrian/bicycle access into the southern boundary of Phillippi Estate Park at the dead end of Wildwood Avenue. Wildwood Avenue intersects with Southwood Street which parallels the southern boundary of the park. Wayfinding signage or other route indicators should be installed along the route.
- The proposed walking routes ‘A’ and ‘B’ should also avoid US 41 and consider using the southern entrance into Phillippi Estate Park rather than the front entrance off of US 41 for the same reasons mentioned in 7.(a) above. The pedestrian route should be separate from the bicycle route for safety reasons unless a 10-12 foot wide multi-purpose paved route is available. If continuous sidewalks are not currently available, the applicant should construct missing sections of sidewalk.

Sheet 3, 4 & 5 – Siesta Beach, Turtle Beach, Crescent Beach, Point of Rocks Beach

- In addition to bus, bicycle, and walking options proposed, the applicant should provide a private shuttle service to the beach parks and/or work with SCAT to increase the frequency of trips to the beaches and/or look into expanding the Siesta Key Breeze Trolley service to the project site
- Applicant needs to construct an adequate bicycle lane or widened sidewalk from the project site to the Siesta Key bridge; otherwise it will be too dangerous for most bicyclists.

Sheet 7 – Legacy Trail/Culverhouse Nature Park

- The proposed bus route stops short of the current Legacy Trail and should only be considered after Legacy Trail Extension is built.
- Unless significant upgrades are made to provide a safe bicycle route, the proposed bicycle route ‘A’ along Clark Road seems like a highly unlikely route given the high volume of vehicular traffic, road intersections, and commercial driveway entrances to traverse along the route. This route also does not lead to Legacy Trail.
- Bicycle route ‘B’ seems like to only reasonable option since it follows secondary streets and actually leads to Legacy Trail. Safe crossings at Stickney Point Road and US 41 would need to be constructed to make this a safe alternative.
- The US 41 Bike & Pedestrian Project appears to be a safe future option if designed as a separate paved route from US 41 and with safe crossings on Stickney Point Road and US 41.

Sheet 11 – Access to Gulf Gate and Sarasota Pavilion

- Provide an analysis of the current pedestrian/bicycle crossing conditions on U.S. 41 and Stickney Point Road, including but not limited to, crossing timing, wait times, vehicular turning in relation to pedestrian crossing, etc..

If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact this office at (941) 861-5244.

Sincerely,



Todd Dary

cc: Allen Parsons, Planning Manager
Tate Taylor, Planning Manager