

APPENDIX C

CONSISTENCY OF AMENDMENT APPLICATIONS WITH ADOPTED CDMP POLICIES

All CDMP amendment applications are evaluated for consistency with the Adopted Components of the CDMP. Each element of the CDMP is recommended for changes in the “*Staff Applications - October 2012 Cycle EAR-Based Applications to Amend the Comprehensive Development Master Plan*” (Applications Report). These applications were initiated to reflect changes in state law, to address the major issues as identified in the “*Adopted 2010 Evaluation and Appraisal Report*” (EAR), and to improve the effectiveness of the CDMP to manage growth. Numerous changes to policies are recommended, with reasons noted by staff in the Applications Report. Some of the existing CDMP policies are now obsolete, or the work described in the policy has been completed. Many more policies are recommended to improve implementation of preexisting CDMP objectives. Additionally, changes to the CDMP Adopted 2015 and 2025 Land Use Plan (LUP) map to redesignate parcels, as identified in Part C of Application No. 1, were also evaluated for consistency with the provisions of the CDMP.

To facilitate the reviews of the requested CDMP LUP) map amendments, the parcels were arranged in three groups according to the reasons for the proposed change, as discussed in detail in Chapter 1 of this report and in Application No. 1 of the Applications Report. The three groupings of reasons for proposed changes are summarized below:

- Group 1 Changes to redesignate parcels located within municipalities to a corresponding designation on the LUP map.

- Group 2 Changes to move the Urban Expansion Area (UEA) to exclude properties that have constraints to urban development.

- Group 3 Changes to increase expand the Urban Development Boundary to include property and redesignate the property on the LUP map for urban development.

Following the discussion of reasons, each group was evaluated for consistency of changes with selected objectives and policies of the Comprehensive Development Master Plan. As these changes have been fully discussed and recommended in the “*Adopted 2010 Evaluation and Appraisal Report*”, only the most significant supporting CDMP objectives and policies related to each grouping are presented herein. The applicable objectives and policies are listed in abbreviated form at the end of each group. The full texts of these objectives and policies are presented in Appendix A under the heading “Text of CDMP Objectives and Policies Cited in Reasons for Amendments”, following the policy consistency review of the three groupings.

Group 1

Parcel Nos. 1-19, 21-121, 123-156, 158-164, 167-236, 238-252, and 255-291 are located in municipal areas. Redesignation of these parcels are based on the 2010 EAR recommended Revision No. 4 to the Land Use Plan Map (See Page 4-10 of the Adopted 2010 EAR), which is to incorporate changes in the CDMP Land Use Plan (LUP) map that are based on the land use designations in adopted municipal comprehensive plans that are either new or been revised since 2003. The proposed redesignations for the parcels reflect the plans of the adopted comprehensive plan land use designations for the municipalities identified in the table below:

**Summary of Municipal Parcels
Subject to Proposed CDMP LUP Map Changes**

	Municipality	Total No. of Parcels	Parcel Nos.
1	City of Aventura	5	1,2,3,4,7
3	City of Coral Gables	19	130,192,193,196,199,201,203-208,210-216
4	Town of Cutler Bay	7	229, 230, 232-236
5	City of Doral	29	136-157,158-164,167
6	City of Florida City	14	272,274-286
7	City of Hialeah	12	58-61,66-69,110-113
8	City of Hialeah Gardens	6	62-64, 70-72
9	City of Homestead	38	238-252,255-271,273, 287-291
10	City of Miami	67	74-86,96-109,114-116,118-121,123-129 131,132,133,135,173-191,197,198,200
11	City of Miami Beach	10	39,88-95
12	City of Miami Gardens	11	36-38,41-48
13	Town of Miami Lakes	2	57,65
14	Village of Miami Shores	2	40,73
15	City of Miami Springs	1	117
15	City of North Miami	14	9,16-19,21-23,26-31
17	City of North Miami Beach	12	10-15,24,25,32-35
18	City of Opa-locka	8	49-56
19	Village of Palmetto Bay	13	217-228,231
20	Village of Pinecrest	1	209
21	City of South Miami	1	202
22	City of Sunny Isles Beach	3	5,6,8
23	City of Sweetwater	5	168-172
24	City of West Miami	3	134,194,195
	Total	283	

Consistency Review: These proposed redesignations are supported by the following excerpt from the CDMP Statement of Legislative Intent (CDMP Page 4):

The right of all municipalities in Miami-Dade County to enact and administer comprehensive planning and land development regulations to govern development-related activities solely within their respective incorporated jurisdictional boundaries as provided by Chapter 163, Part 2, Florida Statutes, is generally reserved and preserved to the municipalities. The CDMP shall not supersede authority of incorporated municipalities to exercise all powers relating solely to their local affairs as provided by the Metropolitan-Dade County Charter, provided that the following fundamental growth management components of the CDMP that are necessary to carry on a central metropolitan government in Miami-Dade County shall serve as minimum standards for zoning, service, and regulation to be implemented through all municipal comprehensive plans and land development regulations:

1. The Urban Development Boundary (UDB), Urban Expansion Area (UEA) Boundaries, and the CDMP provisions which prescribe allowable land uses and public services and facilities outside the UDB;
2. The Policies for Development of Urban Centers contained in the text of the Land Use Element;
3. The Population Estimates and Distributions as mapped in the Land Use Element;
4. Policies which provide that the County shall maintain and utilize its authority provided by the Metro-Dade County Charter to maintain, site, construct and operate public facilities in incorporated and unincorporated areas of the County.

Group 2

Parcel Nos. 292, 293, 294 and 295 are recommended to be removed from within the Urban Expansion Area (UEA) based on Recommendation No. 4 of the 'UDB Capacity and Urban Expansion' major issue in the Adopted 2010 EAR (page 4-2).

Consistency Review: This proposed redesignation is supported by the following CDMP objectives and policies.

- LU-3 Upon the adoption of the CDMP, the location, design and management practices of development and redevelopment in Miami-Dade County shall ensure the protection of natural resources and systems by recognizing, and sensitively responding to constraints posed by soil conditions, topography, water table level, vegetation type, wildlife habitat, and hurricane and other flood hazards, and by reflecting the management policies contained in resource planning and management plans prepared pursuant to Chapter 380, Florida Statutes, and approved by the Governor and Cabinet, or included in the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan approved by Congress through the Water Resources Development Act of 2000.
- LU-3B. All significant natural resources and systems shall be protected from incompatible land use including Biscayne Bay, future coastal and inland wetlands, future potable water-supply wellfield areas identified in the Land Use Element or in adopted wellfield protection plans, and forested portions of Environmentally Sensitive Natural Forest Communities as identified in the Natural Forest Inventory, as may be amended from time to time.
- LU-8G. When considering land areas to add to the UDB, after demonstrating that a need exists, in accordance with foregoing Policy LU-8F:
- i) The following areas shall not be considered:
 - a) The Northwest Wellfield Protection Area located west of the Turnpike Extension between Okeechobee Road and NW 25 Street and the West Wellfield Protection Area west of SW 157 Avenue between SW 8 Street and SW 42 Street;
 - b) Water Conservation Areas, Biscayne Aquifer Recharge Areas, and Everglades Buffer Areas designated by the South Florida Water Management District;
 - c) The Redland area south of Eureka Drive; and

- ii) The following areas shall be avoided:
 - a) Future Wetlands delineated in the Conservation and Land Use Element;
 - b) Land designated Agriculture on the Land Use Plan map;
 - c) Category 1 hurricane evacuation areas east of the Atlantic Coastal Ridge;
 - d) Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan project footprints delineated in Tentatively Selected Plans and/or Project Implementation Reports; and

Group 3

The proposed expansion of the Urban Development Boundary to include Parcel 296 and to change the Land Use Plan map designation of the site from "Open Land" to Restricted "Industrial and Office" is supported by the following CDMP objectives and policies

Consistency Review: This proposed UDB expansion and redesignation of the site is supported by the following CDMP objectives and policies.

- LU-1G. Business developments shall preferably be placed in clusters or nodes in the vicinity of major roadway intersections, and not in continuous strips or as isolated spots, with the exception of small neighborhood nodes. Business developments shall be designed to relate to adjacent development, and large uses should be planned and designed to serve as an anchor for adjoining smaller businesses or the adjacent business district. Granting of commercial or other non-residential zoning by the County is not necessarily warranted on a given property by virtue of nearby or adjacent roadway construction or expansion, or by its location at the intersection of two roadways.
- LU-1O. Miami-Dade County shall seek to prevent discontinuous, scattered development at the urban fringe particularly in the Agriculture Areas, through its CDMP amendment process, regulatory and capital improvements programs and intergovernmental coordination activities.
- LU-4A. When evaluating compatibility among proximate land uses, the County shall consider such factors as noise, lighting, shadows, glare, vibration, odor, runoff, access, traffic, parking, height, bulk, scale of architectural elements, landscaping, hours of operation, buffering, and safety, as applicable.
- LU-4B. Uses designated on the LUP map and interpretive text, which generate or cause to generate significant noise, dust, odor, vibration, or truck or rail traffic shall be protected from damaging encroachment by future approval of new incompatible uses such as residential uses.