Pete

STATE OF FLORIDA

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS

"Dedicated to making Florida a better place to call home"

JEB BUSH
Governor

THADDEUS L. COHEN, AIA
Secretary

March 11, 2005

The Honorable Joe Martinez
Chairman, Miami-Dade County
Board of County Commissioners
111 N.W. 1st Street, Ste. 220
Miami, Florida 33128

Dear Chairman Martinez:

The Department of Community Affairs has completed its review of the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment for Miami-Dade County (DCA No. 05-1), which was received on January 7, 2005. Copies of the proposed amendment have been distributed to appropriate state, regional and local agencies for their review, and their comments are enclosed.

The Department has reviewed the comprehensive plan amendment for consistency with Rule 9J-5, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C) and Chapter 163, Part II, Florida Statutes (F.S.) and has prepared the attached Objections, Recommendations, and Comments (ORC) Report which outlines our findings concerning the comprehensive plan amendment. The Department is supportive of Miami-Dade County's efforts to encourage multi-use and higher density residential development within the Urban Development Boundary. The Department has concerns relating to transportation, land use compatibility, provision of public facilities, and environmental protection. We are also encouraged by proposals, which if executed, would alleviate many of those concerns. The Department staff is available to work with you to resolve any remaining 9J-5 consistency issues, prior to the adoption of the amendment.

If you have any questions, please call Roger A. Wilburn, Principal Planner, at (850) 922-1822.

Sincerely yours,

Mike McDaniel

for Charles Gauthier, AICP
Chief of Comprehensive Planning

CG/rws

Enclosures: Objections, Recommendations and Comments Report
Review Agency Comments

cc: Mr. George M. Burgess, County Manager, Miami-Dade County
Ms. Carolyn A. Dekle, Executive Director, South Florida Regional Planning Council

2555 SHUMARD OAK BOULEVARD • TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32399-2100
Phone: 850.488.8466/Suncom 278.8466 FAX: 850.921.0781/Suncom 291.0781
Internet address: http://www.dca.state.fl.us

CRITICAL STATE CONCERN FIELD OFFICE
2796 Overseas Highway, Suite 212
Marathon, FL 33050-2227
(305) 289-2402

COMMUNITY PLANNING
2555 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2100
(850) 488-2356

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT
2555 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2100
(850) 413-9969

HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
2555 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2100
(850) 488-7956

INTRODUCTION

The following objections, recommendations and comments are based upon the Department's review of Miami-Dade County 05-1 proposed amendment to their comprehensive plan pursuant to s.163.3184, Florida Statutes (F.S.).

The objections relate to specific requirements of relevant portions of Chapter 9J-5, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), and Chapter 163, Part II, F.S. Each objection includes a recommendation of one approach that might be taken to address the cited objection. Other approaches may be more suitable in specific situations. Some of these objections may have initially been raised by one of the other external review agencies. If there is a difference between the Department's objection and the external agency advisory objection or comment, the Department's objection would take precedence.

Each of these objections must be addressed by the County and corrected when the amendment is resubmitted for our compliance review. Objections that are not addressed may result in a determination that the amendment is not in compliance. The Department may have raised an objection regarding missing data and analysis items which the local government considers not applicable to its amendment. If that is the case, a statement justifying its non-applicability pursuant to Rule 9J-5.002(2), F.A.C., must be submitted. The Department will make a determination on the non-applicability of the requirement, and if the justification is sufficient, the objection will be considered addressed.

The comments that follow the objections and recommendations section are advisory in nature. Comments will not form bases of a determination of non-compliance. They are included to call attention to items raised by our reviewers. The comments can be substantive, concerning planning principles, methodology or logic, as well as editorial in nature dealing with grammar, organization, mapping, and reader comprehension.

Appended to the back of the Department's report are the comment letters from the other state review agencies and other agencies, organizations and individuals. These comments are advisory to the Department and may not form bases of Departmental objections unless they appear under the "Objections" heading in this report.

TRANSMITTAL PROCEDURES

Upon receipt of this report, Miami-Dade County has 60 days in which to adopt, adopt with changes, or determine that the County will not adopt the proposed amendment. The process for adoption of local comprehensive plan amendments is outlined in s. 163.3184, Florida Statutes, and Rule 9J-11.011, Florida Administrative Code.

Within ten working days of the date of adoption, the County must submit the following to the Department:

Three copies of the adopted comprehensive plan amendment;

A copy of the adoption ordinance;

A listing of additional changes not previously reviewed;

A listing of findings by the local governing body, if any, which were not included in the ordinance; and

A statement indicating the relationship of the additional changes to the Department's Objections, Recommendations and Comments Report.

The above amendment and documentation are required for the Department to conduct a compliance review, make a compliance determination and issue the appropriate notice of intent.

In order to expedite the regional planning council's review of the amendment, and pursuant to Rule 9J-11.011(5), F.A.C., please provide a copy of the adopted amendment directly to Executive Director of the South Florida Regional Planning Council.

Please be advised that Section 163.3184(8)(c), Florida Statutes, requires the Department to provide a courtesy information statement regarding the Department's Notice of Intent to citizens who furnish their names and addresses at the local government's plan amendment transmittal (proposed) or adoption hearings. In order to provide this courtesy information statement, local governments are required by law to furnish the names and addresses of the citizens requesting this information to the Department. **Please provide these required names and addresses to the Department when you transmit your adopted amendment package for compliance review. In the event no names, addresses are provided, please provide this information as well.** For efficiency, we encourage that the information sheet be provided in electronic format.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS

OBJECTIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND COMMENTS

FOR

MIAMI-DADE COUNTY

AMENDMENT 05-1

March 11, 2005
Division of Community Planning
Office of Comprehensive Planning

This report is prepared pursuant to Rule 9J-11.010, F.A.C.

OJECTIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND COMMENTS REPORT
PROPOSED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT
MIAMI-DADE COUNTY (DCA No. 05-1)

I. CONSISTENCY WITH CHAPTER 163, F.S., and RULE 9J-5, F.A.C.

The amendment package contains 17 proposed changes to Miami-Dade County Comprehensive Development Master Plan. Fifteen of the proposed changes are to the Future Land Use Map (FLUM). The amendment involves two text changes to the Coastal Zone and Capital Improvements Elements. The Department has identified concerns relating to transportation, land use compatibility, and provision of public facilities.

OBJECTIONS

ISSUES

Objection 1-Transportation

For applications 3, 10, and Doral-1 and 2, the County has not demonstrated that it will maintain Level of Service Standards (LOS) for roadways with the proposed map changes. The county has not provided a traffic analysis to evaluate the impact of the land use change on the roadway network at the maximum densities and intensities allowed by the land use category. The amendment is not supported by adequate data and analysis, which demonstrates that adequate roadway capacity will be available to meet the adopted LOS standards through the five-year planning period. The supporting analysis is instead based on the impacts of the planned projects. The analysis does not adequately address whether capital improvements will be required to maintain LOS and whether funding will be available to ensure financial feasibility. The analysis does not adequately demonstrate coordination between the land use element and other elements of the plan in regard to long-term transportation and infrastructure needs.

Recommendation:

The County should demonstrate through appropriate traffic information what impact the amendment will have on the roadway network based on the maximum density and intensity allowed by the land use category. The analysis should demonstrate the ability of the County to maintain the adopted LOS for roadways through the five-year planning period.

Citation:

Florida Statutes: Subsections 163.3177(2), 163.3177(6)(a), (c), & (j)5., and 163.3177(8)
Florida Administrative Code: Rules 9J-5.005(2) and (5), F.A.C.; 9J-5.016(2) and (3)(b)1., 3., and 5., Rule 9J-5.016(3)(c)(1)f; Rule 9J-5.019(4)(b)2. &(c)1., F.A.C.; Rule 9J-5.006(3)(b)1. &(c)3., F.A.C.;

Objection 2-Land Use Compatibility

The proposed future land uses on application sites 8 and 9 are not compatible with adjacent land uses on these amendment sites.

Recommendation:

Leave the existing future land use on Site 8 unchanged, or change the proposed use to some other non-residential non-school orientated land use. For Site 9, the County should leave the existing future land use in place, or restrict the residential density on the portion of the site within the Outer Airport Protection Zone, so that the density is consistent with airport zoning requirements.

Citation:

Florida Statutes: Subsection 163.3177(6)(a) and (j)
Florida Administrative Code: Rule 9J-5.006(3)(c)2., Rule 9J-5.019(4)(c)

Objection 3-Protection of Environmental Resources

The land use change as submitted does not provide for adequate protection of Natural Forest Communities (NFC) and endangered species on Application Site 10.

Recommendation:

The County should address how the NFC, on Application Site 10, will be protected though such measures as the redelineation of the NFC boundary, adequate buffering and compatibility of adjacent land uses, and the development of a management plan for preservation of the NFC prior to the adoption of the amendment.

Citation:

Florida Statutes: Subsection 163.3177(6)(d)
Florida Administrative Code: Rules 9J-5.013(1)(a)5., 9J-5.013(2)(b)3., and 9J-5.013(c)3. and 9.

Objection 4-Provision of Public Facilities and Services

The amendment fails to identify that adequate sewer and water capacity are available at the adopted LOS to service the Doral-1 and 2 sites through the five-year planning timeframe.

Recommendation:

Demonstrate that sewer and water resources are available to serve the proposed, for the Doral-1 and 2 sites, at the adopted LOS through the five-year planning timeframe.

Citation:

Florida Statutes: Subsection 163.3177(6)(c)
Florida Administrative Code: Rules 9J-5.006(2)(a), (3)(c)3., 9J-5.011(1)(f)1., 9J-5.011(2)(b)2., 9J-5.011(2)(c)1.

COMMENTS

Intergovernmental Coordination

The Doral-1 and 2 parcels are located within the City of Doral. The City is newly incorporated and has not yet developed its own comprehensive plan. As the result of a City charter provision, the County maintains land use control over the Doral-1 and 2 parcels. The City has identified in a December 22, 2004 letter, that the County processed and transmitted the amendments to the Department without any input from the City. The City is responsible for providing public services to both of the parcels, including police and public safety, parks and recreation, code enforcement, permitting and other general government activities. It is important that the City be provided the opportunity for input to the land use decisions affecting these parcels. The City and County should review the amendment jointly and work together to resolve their differences. The City should be notified, and be involved in all future decisions pertaining to land uses for Doral-1 and 2.

School Overcrowding

The Doral-and 2 parcels would create a population of 27,000 new residents for Doral, more than double the 2000 City population. This growth would generate as many as 5,277 new students in the Miami-Dade school system. The school facilities currently serving the area are in excess of their design capacity. The John Smith Elementary School is currently operating 147% of FISH capacity; and Doral Middle School operates at 119 % of FISH capacity; and Miami Springs Senior High, is operating at 137 % of FISH capacity. The City, County, and land owners should continue to work together to reach agreement on how the school system impacts of the proposed change will be mitigated, prior to adoption of the amendment.

II. CONSISTENCY WITH THE STATE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The amendment is not consistent with following provision of the State Comprehensive Chapter 187, F.S.:

Natural Systems and Recreational Lands (9)(a)(b)
Land Use (15)(a)(b)
Public Facilities (17)(a)(b)

Department of Environmental Protection

Jeb Bush
Governor

Marjory Stoneman Douglas Building
3900 Commonwealth Boulevard
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-3000

Colleen M. Castille
Secretary

February 4, 2005

11
2/7/05

Mr. D. Ray Eubanks
Bureau of Local Planning
Department of Community Affairs
2555 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2100

Re: Miami-Dade County Comprehensive Plan Amendment 05-1
ORC Review

The Office of Intergovernmental Programs of the Department of Environmental Protection has reviewed the proposed amendment under the procedures of Chapter 163, Part II, *Florida Statutes*, and Chapters 9J-5 and 9J-11, *Florida Administrative Code*, and we offer the following comments.

Application Number 2:

The proposed amendment would change the current land use designation on a 260± acre parcel from Estate Density Residential (1-2.5 DU/acre) to Industrial and Office. The density range of Estate Density designation is typically characterized by detached estates which utilize only a small portion of the total parcel. The land use change to Industrial and Office would allow a mix of industries, manufacturing operations, warehouses, office buildings, distribution centers, merchandise centers and similar uses, resulting in a significant increase in intensity of use. The amendment package indicates that potable water and wastewater treatment from Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Department may be unavailable, and that alternative means of sewage disposal will be required until adequate collection/transmission and treatment capacity is made available.

According to the best data available to the Department, approximately 99% of the subject parcel contains wetlands. The soils within the parcel consist of a Lauderhill-Dania-Pahokee association. According to the *Soil Survey of Dade County Area, Florida*, these soils are nearly level and very poorly drained. As indicated in the amendment package, these soils have severe limitations for building because of ponding and excess humus, low strength and depth to rock.

Best data available using the DRASTIC index (a measure that assesses vulnerability of groundwater resources) indicates a score of 200-226, representing the highest potential for impacting the surficial aquifer. The entire parcel is located within a FEMA Flood zone according to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA, Map 12025C0075J).

The parcel is immediately adjacent to the North Lakebelt Storage Area, which is part of the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan. It is recommended that the County coordinate its wetland protection and conservation policy with the South Florida Water Management District in order to avoid unanticipated impacts.

Application Doral 1:

The proposed amendment would change the current land use designation on a 453± acre parcel from Industrial and Office to Office/Residential (233.1 acres), Business and Office (20 acres), and Low-Medium Residential (5 to 13 DU/Acre on 199.99 acres). The amendment package indicates that potable water and wastewater treatment from Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Department may be unavailable, and that alternative means of sewage disposal will be required until adequate collection/transmission and treatment capacity is made available.

According to the best data available to the Department, 100% of the subject parcel contains wetlands. Best data available using the DRASTIC index (a measure that assesses vulnerability of groundwater resources) indicates a score of 200-226, representing the highest potential for impacting the surficial aquifer. The entire parcel is located within a FEMA Flood zone according to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA, Maps 12025C0075J and 12025C0160J).

Application Doral 2:

The proposed amendment would change the current land use designation on a 170± acre parcel from Industrial and Office (72.1 acres) and Water (97.9 acres) to Office Residential (170 acres). The amendment package indicates that potable water and wastewater treatment from Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Department may be unavailable, and that alternative means of sewage disposal will be required until adequate collection/transmission and treatment capacity is made available.

According to the best data available to the Department, 100% of the subject parcel contains wetlands. Best data available using the DRASTIC index (a measure that assesses vulnerability of groundwater resources) indicates a score of 200-226, representing the highest potential for impacting the surficial aquifer. The entire parcel is located within a FEMA Flood zone according to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA, Maps 12025C0160J).

Recommendations for Application 2, Doral 1, and Doral 2:

The Biscayne aquifer, a surficial aquifer, runs underneath the subject area. It's vulnerable to surface land uses and activities due to its close proximity to the surface. Direct impacts to groundwater are possible from non-point and point source pollution. Natural resource impacts due to non-point source runoff will likely include:

- Alteration of the existing surface water hydrology and natural drainage patterns on adjacent properties, as a result of increased impervious surface development.

- Alteration of water quality of increased nutrient and pollutant loads typically associated with urban and suburban development (road surface runoff, lawn fertilizers, etc.).

The Department recommends that the applicant consider a full range of planning strategies to minimize impacts to the Biscayne aquifer by limiting impervious surfaces and designing stormwater treatment systems to protect groundwater and surface water resources. Due to the high aquifer vulnerability, the County should consider the potential for surface and ground water pollution and the location of potable water well fields when approving industrial uses in the amendment area.

It should be noted that the State's policy regarding wetland protection, pursuant to *Chapter 373*, *Florida Statutes*, requires that wetland impacts first be avoided, then minimized, and lastly, mitigated. The County needs to protect functioning wetlands from development pressures so that wetlands may help reduce the level of pollutants that enter surface waters and the Biscayne Aquifer. Protection of wetlands will also help reduce drainage problems by reducing the number of impervious surfaces, and serving as important detention and retention areas. Vegetated buffers need to be established for protection of wetlands both adjacent to surface water bodies, and where needed to protect them from encroaching development.

Please call me at 850/245-2174 if you have any questions regarding our response.

Sincerely,

DTL

Daniel T. Lawson
Office of Intergovernmental Programs

11 KM
1/28/05

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF STATE
Glenda E. Hood
Secretary of State
DIVISION OF HISTORICAL RESOURCES

RECEIVED
JAN 28 2005
RPM BSP
PLAN PROCESSING TEAM

January 26, 2005

Mr. Ray Eubanks
Department of Community Affairs
Bureau of State Planning
2555 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2100

Re: Historic Preservation Review of the Miami-Dade County (05-1) Comprehensive Plan Amendment Request

Dear Mr. Eubanks:

According to this agency's responsibilities under sections 163.3177 and 163.3178, *Florida Statutes*, and Chapter 9J-5, *Florida Administrative Code*, we reviewed the above document to determine if data regarding historic resources have been given sufficient consideration in the request to amend the Miami-Dade County Comprehensive Plan.

We reviewed multiple proposed amendments to the Future Land Use Map, in addition to two text amendments, to consider the potential effects of these actions on historic resources. While our cursory review suggests that the majority of the proposed changes may have no adverse effects on historic resources, it is the county's responsibility to ensure that the proposed revisions will not have an adverse effect on significant archaeological or historic resources in Miami-Dade County.

We do have concerns about several of the land use changes:

- For Amendment #2 (260.15 acres), there are two recorded archaeological sites, 8DA1075 and 8DA1080. Human remains have been reported at site 8DA1075.

- For Amendment #3 (152.28 acres), we have no concerns if the East Fontainbleau Golf Course is not an historic course (less than 50 years old).

- For Amendment #11 (4.93 acres), it appears that an historic structure located at 16400 SW 137 Ave. (8DA5623) may be within the amendment parcel.

500 S. Bronough Street • Tallahassee, FL 32399-0250 • http://www.flheritage.com

☐ Director's Office (850) 245-6300 • FAX: 245-6436
☐ Archaeological Research (850) 245-6444 • FAX: 245-6436
✓ Historic Preservation (850) 245-6333 • FAX: 245-6437
☐ Historical Museums (850) 245-6400 • FAX: 245-6433

☐ Northeast Regional Office
☐ Central Florida Regional Office

- Finally, for the Doral-1 site, our records indicate that archaeological site 8DA1078 is within this parcel. We note that the application information indicates that site 8DA3221 is also within this parcel. A review of our files indicates that we have no record that a Florida Master Site File form has been submitted for this site, and request that Miami-Dade County submit this information.

For these amendment parcels which have recorded resources on them, the county must ensure that these historic sites are considered with land use changes. For human remains issues, the stipulations of Chapter 872, *Florida Statutes*, must be followed. If these concerns are addressed and appropriate actions are taken by the county to protect these resources, then any resulting changes should be acceptable.

If you have any questions regarding our comments, please feel free to contact Susan M. Harp of the Division's Compliance Review staff at (850) 245-6333.

Sincerely,

Laura A. Kammerer

for Frederick Gaske, Director

Teri Alberto-Nagel

Community Development Director

December 22, 2004

RECEIVED
JAN 3 2005
RPM BSP
PLAN PROCESSING TEAM

Mr. Dan Evans, Community Planner
Division of Community Planning
Florida Department of Community Affairs
2555 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

Re: Miami-Dade County's Comprehensive Development Master Plan (CDMP) Land Use Amendments, Doral - 1 and Doral - 2

Dear Mr. Evans:

Miami-Dade County recently transmitted the above-referenced CDMP land use amendments to your agency. These two (2) land use amendments involve a land area known as "Section 8" (T54S, R 34E) which is wholly located within the corporate boundaries of the City of Doral. Unfortunately, due to a City Charter provision whose interpretation is currently a point of disagreement between the County and Doral, Miami-Dade County chose to process and transmit to the Florida Department of Community Affairs (FDCA) the aforementioned Section 8 amendments without any formal review or requested input from the City of Doral.

The purpose of this letter is to formally object to the proposed Doral-1 and Doral-2 land use amendments, and provide summary data and analysis to support our position. The conclusion of this letter is that the myriad of measurable impacts of these amendments to Doral's road system, schools, other community facilities/services and community vision will be extremely negative to Doral for many years to come if they are approved as proposed. The densities requested are excessive and out of character with adjacent and nearby neighborhoods in Doral. It is important to note that Miami-Dade County's Director of Planning and Zoning came to essentially the same conclusions and recommended DENIAL of both the Doral-1 and Doral-2 plan amendment applications.

The City was incorporated last year and is currently preparing its first Comprehensive Plan, which is expected to be completed by the fall of next year. The City is utilizing the County's CDMP, as it applies to Doral, as its interim adopted Comprehensive Plan. It should be pointed out that Section 8 represents approximately 1/3 of the vacant land left in the City of Doral, thus these amendments are very important to the City's future.

The Section 8 land use amendments comprise 623 acres in size and are located on the northern boundary of Doral, one (1) mile east of the Homestead Extension of the Florida Turnpike and north of (theoretical) NW 74th Street. The entirety of this Section is currently shown as Industrial and Office (I/O) land use, except for two (2) small Business and Office parcels located in the northwest and southwest corners of the section. Section 8 has no completed paved roads on its border or in its interior. It is completely vacant and has no public facilities nearby. Current land use designations around the section include I/O to the east, I/O and Institutional / Public Facility on the south and north, Low Density Residential land use on the west, and I/O and Medium Density Residential to the north.

The Doral-1 application involves 453 acres within Section 8. Part of the land use request involves changing 200 acres to Low-medium Density with a one-level density increase due to use of good urban design principles which would produce a potential medium density of 13 to 25 units per acre (upa). Three other parcel requests would change 233 acres to the Office/Residential land use which would allow densities of 13-25 upa and higher. Finally, 20 acres of Doral-1 is being proposed for Business and Office land use.

The Doral-2 land use amendment request involves 170 acres also in Section 8. The land use change request seeks to change the entire site to Office/Residential which also would allow densities of 13-25 upa and higher. Approximately 98 acres or 58% of this site is covered by an artificial lake.

Inconsistency with the CDMP

These proposed land use amendments are clearly contrary to a number of objectives and policies of the County's and City's CDMP, and Future Land Use Element (FLUE). Here are some examples:

FLUE Policy 2A: "All development orders authorizing new or significant expansion of existing, urban land uses shall be consistent upon the provision of services at or above the Level of Service (LOS) standards specified in the Capital Improvements Element."
City's Response: Doral 1 and 2 are inconsistent with this policy since there is no way to know whether any LOS standards will be met. The applicants have provided no development plan or density justification. A traffic study was submitted on November 4, 2004, shortly before the transmittal hearing and could not be evaluated in the short timeframe before the hearing.

FLUE Policy 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."
City's Response: None of the above factors have been evaluated for these amendments, thus the applications are inconsistent with this policy.

FLUE Policy 4C: "Residential neighborhoods shall be protected from intrusion by uses that would disrupt or degrade the health, safety, tranquility, character, and overall welfare of the neighborhoods by creating such impacts as excessive density, noise, light, glare, odor, vibration, dust or traffic."
City's Response: Doral has already raised issue of excessive density and traffic in this case. No credible impact assessments have been performed to date to help in analyzing neighborhood impacts. The applications are inconsistent with this policy.

FLUE Policy 8A: "Miami-Dade County shall strive to accommodate residential development in suitable locations and densities which reflect such factors as recent trends in location and design of residential units; projected availability of service and infrastructure capacity; proximity and accessibility to employment, commercial and cultural centers; character of existing adjacent or surrounding neighborhoods; avoidance of natural resource degradation; maintenance of quality of life and creation of amenities. Density patterns should reflect the Guidelines for Urban Form contained in this Element."

City's Response: Availability of service and infrastructure capacity has not been established. There are no current public facilities including roads serving this entire land section. These amendments will have substantial adverse impacts of the quality of life in the remainder of Doral.

Transportation Policy 1B: "....The minimum acceptable peak-period LOS for all State and County roads between the UIA and UDB: 2. (a) Roadways shall operate at no worse than LOS D...."
City's Response: The LOS of surrounding roads (many of which do not exist) at project build-out has not been credibly established since a traffic study has only recently been submitted. The amendments are inconsistent with this policy at this time.

Furthermore, the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) is in the PD & E phase to construct and/or improve sections of NW 74 Street and NE 107 Avenue. FDOT representatives have stated that upon completion of these improvements, the resulting LOS along these section roads will be an alarming level "F".

It is clear from the above citations that the proposed amendments are inconsistent with a number of key CDMP future land use and transportation policies.

Traffic Level-of-Service Deficiencies

As stated in the County's staff analysis for these two (2) applications, "the site does not have or is expected to have the roadway network needed to support the proposed land use designations." The centerpiece of any future road network which might have the potential to handle significant traffic from Section 8 is a new road and Turnpike interchange at NW 74th Street. County staff indicates that this interchange is planned "sometime after 2009." Without very substantial road and transit improvements in this area, future traffic from Section 8 will "grid-lock" Doral's already overloaded roads to the south such as NW 107th Avenue, NW 97th Avenue, NW 58th Street and NW 41st Street. Most sections of these roads are also currently operating at a LOS "F". These applications in their present forms should be denied on the basis of traffic concerns alone.

Over-crowded Schools

County staff calculations indicate that at maximum proposed density of 25 units per acre (upa), the applications will produce a population of 27,000 new residents of Doral, more than double (+130%) the 2000 City population. This will produce over 4,000 students, pushing school utilization to between 180-340%, according to County planning staff report.

For example, the current situation is that John I. Smith Elementary, is currently operating at 147% FISH capacity; Doral Middle, operates at 119% FISH capacity; and Miami Springs Senior High, is operating at 137% FISH capacity. These percentages depict actual capacity and do not include the projected growth.

School construction in Doral is severely limited due to restrictions under Miami International Airport (MIA) flight paths, which prohibit and/or limit the construction of schools in many parts of the City. Better than adequate school capacity is a quality-of-life issue in Doral and these applications have not provided any feasible scenarios to provide schools for 4,000+ new students as well as alleviating the overcrowding at other schools servicing Doral.

Impact to other Public Services

The City of Doral will be providing many of the public facilities and services to the future residents of Section 8, including police and public safety, parks and recreation, code enforcement, permitting and general government. The City has had no involvement in the process of developing or analyzing these plan amendment applications, with the only exception being, our involvement during the public hearing during which we expressed our strong opposition. The City is a supporter of "smart growth" principles and plans to implement these concepts in our new Comprehensive Plan. It is not possible to assess these plan amendments with regard to smart growth without even the most rudimentary impact analyses.

Excessive Density and Neighborhood Incompatibility

The land use amendments, if granted, would allow between 13-25 units per gross acre throughout Section 8. The CDMP allows developers to count all parts of the land section, including water bodies, commercial and industrial areas, thus the density is applied to all 453 acres requested in the two (2) applications. Thus, between 5,889 and 11,325 dwelling units plus commercial, industrial and civic uses would be developed in this section under these amendments. The medium density request is not compatible with existing neighborhoods of Doral in and near this area, and will severely hinder Doral's future planning options. Section 7 to the west of the subject amendments is master planned for an average of 7 units per acre and is under-construction. No other development exists adjacent to this site. Established neighborhoods one (1) mile to the south have average densities of 4-6 upa. The elevated densities requested in these applications should be rejected by the agency on the basis of incompatibility.

Based on the above-stated concerns and serious negative impacts on the City of Doral, we ask the Agency to reject the proposed amendments and re-establish planning at the local community level in Doral.

Thank you for your attention to these concerns. I cannot stress enough how important this issue of over-development in Section 8 is to the City of Doral. If you or other officials in the Florida Department of Community Affairs have any questions and comments regarding these issues, please don't hesitate to contact me directly. We would also be glad to meet with you and other DCA officials in person if you deemed it useful and appropriate.

Sincerely,

Teri Alberto-Nagel
Planning and Community Development Director

cc. Mayor and Councilpersons
Yocelyn Galiano-Gomez, City Manager
Sergio Purrinos, Assistant City Manager
John Hearn, City Attorney
Henry Iler, Consulting City Planner
Dianne O'Quinn, Miami-Dade County Director of Planning and Zoning
Juan Mayol, Esq.

SOUTH FLORIDA WATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

3301 Gun Club Road, West Palm Beach, Florida 33406 • (561) 686-8800 • FL WATS 1-800-432-2045 • TDD (561) 697-2574
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 24680, West Palm Beach, FL 33416-4680 • www.sfwmd.gov

GOV 08-06

RECEIVED
JAN 19 2005

January 14, 2005

Ray Eubanks, Administrator
Plan Review and Processing
Department of Community Affairs
2555 Shumard Oak Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-2100

Dear Mr. Eubanks:

Subject: Proposed Amendment Comments
Miami-Dade County, DCA# 05-1

South Florida Water Management District staff has reviewed the above subject document and we have no adverse comments. If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact Jim Golden at (561) 682-6862 or me at (561) 682-6779.

Sincerely,

P.K. Sharma, AICP
Lead Planner
Planning and Resource Evaluation Division
Water Supply Department

PKS/nk

c: Roger Wilburn, DCA
Carolyn Dekle, SFRPC
George M. Burgess, Miami-Dade County

GOVERNING BOARD

Nicolás J. Gutierrez, Jr., Esq., *Chair*
Pamela Brooks-Thomas, *Vice-Chair*
Jack M. Bass
Michael Collins
Hugh M. English
Lennart E. Lindahl, P.E.
Kevin McCarty
Harkley R. Thornton
Trudi K. Williams, P.E.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE

Henry Dean, *Executive Director*

South
Florida
Regional
Planning
Council

11

2/15/05

MEMORANDUM

AGENDA ITEM #6d

DATE: FEBRUARY 7, 2005

TO: COUNCIL MEMBERS

FROM: STAFF

SUBJECT: MIAMI-DADE COUNTY PROPOSED COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT

Introduction

On January 6, 2005 Council staff received proposed amendment package #05-1P to the Miami-Dade County Comprehensive Development Master Plan for review of consistency with the *Strategic Regional Policy Plan for South Florida (SRPP)*. Staff review is undertaken pursuant to the Local Government Comprehensive Planning and Land Development Regulation Act, Chapter 163, Part II, Florida Statutes (F.S.), and Rules 9J-5 and 9J-11, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.).

Community Profile

Miami-Dade County was established in 1836 though settlement did not ensue until after the Civil War. In 1896, Henry Flagler extended the Florida East Coast Railroad from West Palm Beach to Miami. In the early part of the last century, developers sought a means to obtain additional land for development. Before this time, the swamps of the Everglades extended to within three miles of Biscayne Bay. Canals were dredged and land drained to make way for subsequent building.

With its current estimated population of slightly over 2.3 million, Miami-Dade County is the most populous county in Florida. The County now has 34 municipalities. The County's population is expected to increase by more than half a million over the next 15 years. Immigrants from Central and South America continue to choose Miami-Dade County and the rest of South Florida as their new home. Approximately 57% of the County's population is of Hispanic origin. The percentage of the population that is working age or younger is larger in Miami-Dade County than the state average. For nearly two decades, the County has had higher unemployment rates as well as a higher percent of families with incomes below the poverty level than the state average.

The structure of the County's economy is heavily service and trade oriented. Approximately 57% of total employment is in either the service or trade sectors. The County has established itself as a wholesaling and financial center and major tourist destination. Miami-Dade County ranks ninth in

3440 Hollywood Boulevard, Suite 140, Hollywood, Florida 33021
Broward (954) 985-4416, Area Codes 305, 407 and 561 (800) 985-4416
SunCom 473-4416, FAX (954) 985-4417, SunCom FAX 473-4417
e-mail sfadmin@sfrpc.com

export sales among all metropolitan areas in the country. Almost a quarter of the state's total employment in transportation is located in the County. The Port of Miami is the largest cruise ship port in the world and one of the largest container ports in the southeast. The environmental sensitivity of Miami-Dade County is underscored by the fact that the urbanized portion of the County lies between two national parks, Everglades and Biscayne National Parks. The close relationship of tourism to the preservation of Miami-Dade County's unique native plants and wildlife has been recognized as an economic as well as an environmental issue. In order to manage growth, the County's Comprehensive Plan established an Urban Development Boundary (UDB) which distinguishes the area where urban development may occur from areas where it should not occur. For more information about the County or the Region, visit the Council's website at www.sfrpc.com.

Summary of Staff Analysis

Amendment package #05-1 contains eleven (11) proposed amendments to the Miami-Dade County Comprehensive Development Master Plan (CDMP) for which review is requested. These proposed amendments have been included in this analysis using the numbers assigned to them in the application. Changes would affect the Future Land Use Element (FLUE), the Future Land Use Map (FLUM), Coastal Management Element and the Capital Improvements Element.

The general location of Miami-Dade County is shown on Attachment 1. Attachments 2 to 11 relate to the Future Land Use amendments and are referenced below. A summary of proposed amendment package #05-1 is included below. A detailed analysis of the amendments is included in the attached staff report.

Miami-Dade County Comprehensive Master Development Plan Proposed Amendment #05-1				
Amendment	Request to:	Acres	Attachment	Staff Recommendation
2	Redesignate a single property on the FLUM FROM: Estate Density Residential (1 to 2.5 DU/ac) & One Density Increase with Urban Design TO: Industrial & Office	260.15 acres	2	Generally Consistent with the *SRPP* with Conditions
3	Redesignate a single property on the FLUM FROM: Parks and Recreation & Medium Density Residential TO: Medium Density Residential Communities (13 to 25 DU/ac)	152.28 acres	3	Generally Inconsistent with the *SRPP*
7	Redesignate a single property on the FLUM FROM: Low-Medium Density Residential (5 to 13 DU/ac) TO: Business and Office	9.50 acres	4	Generally Consistent with the *SRPP*

Miami-Dade County Comprehensive Master Development Plan Proposed Amendment #05-1				
Amendment	Request to:	Acres	Attachment	Staff Recommendation
8	Redesignate a single property on the FLUM FROM: Industrial and Office TO: Business and Office	67.80 acres	5	Generally Inconsistent with the *SRPP*
9	Redesignate a single property on the FLUM FROM: Industrial and Office TO: Low-Density Residential (2.5 to 6.0 DU/ac)	27.50 acres	6	Generally Inconsistent with the *SRPP*
10 a	Redesignate two parcels of land on the FLUM and FLUE <u>Amendment 10 a</u> FROM: Institutional and Public Facility TO: Office/Residential	Total acres: 143.5 <u>Parcel 1</u> 62.81 acres	7	Generally Inconsistent with the *SRPP*
10 b	<u>Amendment 10 b</u> FROM: Institutional and Public Facility TO: Low-Medium Density Residential (5 to 13 DU/ac)	<u>Parcel 2</u> 80.71 acres	7	Generally Inconsistent with the *SRPP*
11	Redesignate a single property on the FLUM FROM: Industrial and Office TO: Business and Office	4.93 acres	8	Generally Consistent with the *SRPP*
14	Revise Policies 4E, 4F, and 4G for Manatee Protection in the Coastal Management Element	N/A	N/A	Generally Consistent with the *SRPP*
15	Modify adopted tables of Proposed Projects in the Capital Improvements Element	N/A	N/A	Generally Consistent with the *SRPP*
Doral 1	Redesignate a single property on the FLUM <u>Tract A</u> FROM: Industrial & Office TO: Office/Residential <u>Tract B</u> FROM: Business & Office (5 ac) and Industrial & Office (194.99 ac). TO: Low-Medium Density Residential (5 to 13 DU/ac) including Density Increase 1 eligibility for one density category higher than the underlying designation	Total acres 453.15 73 acres 199.99 acres	10	Generally Inconsistent with the *SRPP*

	with incorporation of sound urban design principles. Tract C FROM: Industrial and Office TO: Office/Residential Tract D-1 FROM: Industrial and Office TO: Business and Office Tract E FROM: Industrial and Office TO: Office Residential	87.1 acres 20 acres 73.1 acres		
Doral 2	Redesignate a single property on the FLUM FROM: Industrial and Office (72.1 ac) and Water (97.9 ac) TO: Office/Residential	170 acres	11	Generally Inconsistent with the *SRPP*

The Miami-Dade County Board of County Commissioners approved the proposed amendments by Resolution # R-1316-04 on November 5, 2004 by a unanimous vote of all members present (11 members).

Comment

Council staff received an additional information package from Miami-Dade County, which was provided to the County by the applicants of the Doral 1 and Doral 2 proposed amendments. The applicants' information package was enclosed with the County's submittal of the April 2004 Cycle of Proposed Amendments received on January 6, 2004.

An analysis by Council staff of the applicants' information regarding proposed amendment Doral 1 confirms that the applicant has submitted a Declaration of Restrictions which states that the proposed development would not exceed 5,929 dwelling units, including all land parcels within the amendment site. Likewise, the applicant on behalf of proposed amendment Doral 2 has also submitted a Declaration of Restrictions, which states that the maximum residential density of the proposed development would not exceed ten (10) dwelling units per gross acre for a total of 1,700 dwelling units.

In addition to the Declarations of Restrictions, the applicants' information package includes a transportation/roadway analysis and a brief summary of public schools impacts.

The information submitted by the applicants of the Doral 1 and Doral 2 proposed amendments leads Council staff to believe that the findings of the school analysis provided by the Miami-Dade Public Schools, as well as the transportation/roadway impacts, and parks and open space analysis outlined on the staff report, may change.

Moreover, Council staff contact with Miami-Dade County, the Florida Department of Transportation-District 6, and the Miami-Dade Public Schools confirms that these agencies have not completed their review of additional information provided by the applicants.

Mar. 11, 2005 DCA's Recom ORC

Recommendation

Find proposed amendment packet #05-1 generally consistent with the *Strategic Regional Policy Plan for South Florida* for proposed amendments No. 7, No. 11, No. 14 and No. 15.

Find proposed amendment No. 2 generally consistent with the *SRPP* with the condition that the applicant confirms coordination with the appropriate local agencies, Florida Department of Transportation District 6 and the Florida Turnpike Authority to ensure that transportation impacts are mitigated.

Find proposed amendments No. 3, No. 8, and No. 9 generally inconsistent with the *Strategic Regional Policy Plan for South Florida*, particularly with the goals and policies relating to Goal 5 and Policies 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3, and Goal 8 and Policies 8.1 and 8.2.

GOAL 5	Overcome school overcrowding in the Region.
Policy 5.1	Implement planning and financial mechanisms to ensure the ability to meet school needs for existing and future development.
Policy 5.2	Support the implementation of school concurrency requirements in the Region as a means to ensure the timely availability of adequate educational facilities.
Policy 5.3	Discourage development proposals that would exacerbate school overcrowding, except where mitigation measures that would alleviate overcrowded conditions at impacted schools are agreed upon by the affected local government and school board.
GOAL 8	Enhance the Region's mobility, efficiency, safety, quality of life, and economic health through improvements to road, port, and public transportation infrastructure.
Policy 8.1	Maintain the Florida Intrastate Highway System, other state roads, local roadways, and public transportation systems to preserve the Region's investment in infrastructure, support daily use and needs, enhance the Region's global competitiveness and economic health, increase safety, ensure emergency access and response, and provide for evacuation purposes.
Policy 8.2	Reduce the utilization of the Florida Interstate Highway System and other components of the regional road system for short, local trips.

Find proposed amendment No. 10 generally inconsistent with the *Strategic Regional Policy Plan for South Florida*, particularly with the goals and policies relating to Goal 8 and Policies 8.1 and 8.2, and Goal 14 and Policies 14.2 and 14.4.

GOAL 8	Enhance the Region's mobility, efficiency, safety, quality of life, and economic health through improvements to road, port, and public transportation infrastructure.
Policy 8.1	Maintain the Florida Intrastate Highway System, other state roads, local roadways, and public transportation systems to preserve the Region's investment in infrastructure, support daily use and needs, enhance the Region's global competitiveness and economic health, increase safety, ensure emergency access and response, and provide for evacuation purposes.
Policy 8.2	Reduce the utilization of the Florida Interstate Highway System and other components of the regional road system for short, local trips.

GOAL 14	Preserve, protect, and restore Natural Resources of Regional Significance.
Policy 14.2	Improve the quality and connectedness of Natural Resources of Regional Significance and other natural areas by eliminating inappropriate uses of land, improving land use designations, and utilizing land acquisition where necessary.
Policy 14.4	Direct land uses that are not consistent with the protection and maintenance of natural resource values away from Natural Resources of Regional Significance, adjacent buffer areas, and other natural resource areas.

Find proposed amendments Doral 1 and Doral 2 generally inconsistent with the *Strategic Regional Policy Plan for South Florida,* particularly with the goals and policies relating to Goal 5 and Policies 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3, Goal 8 and Policies 8.1 and 8.2, and Goal 10, and Policies 10.1, 10.3, and 10.4. Approve the attached staff report for transmittal to the Florida Department of Community Affairs.

GOAL 5	Overcome school overcrowding in the Region.
Policy 5.1	Implement planning and financial mechanisms to ensure the ability to meet school needs for existing and future development.
Policy 5.2	Support the implementation of school concurrency requirements in the Region as a means to ensure the timely availability of adequate educational facilities.
Policy 5.3	Discourage development proposals that would exacerbate school overcrowding, except where mitigation measures that would alleviate overcrowded conditions at impacted schools are agreed upon by the affected local government and school board.
GOAL 8	Enhance the Region's mobility, efficiency, safety, quality of life, and economic health through improvements to road, port, and public transportation infrastructure.
Policy 8.1	Maintain the Florida Intrastate Highway System, other state roads, local roadways, and public transportation systems to preserve the Region's investment in infrastructure, support daily use and needs, enhance the Region's global competitiveness and economic health, increase safety, ensure emergency access and response, and provide for evacuation purposes.
Policy 8.2	Reduce the utilization of the Florida Interstate Highway System and other components of the regional road system for short, local trips.
GOAL 10	Increase awareness of the Region's green infrastructure, its significance to the Region's economy, and the public's role in access and use that is compatible with long-term sustainability.
Policy 10.1	Preserve lands designated as open space, parks and recreation, and conservation; these areas shall contain uses that are directly related to active or passive recreation or habitat preservation.
Policy 10.3	Encourage interagency cooperation and co-location of parks and other public facilities where appropriate for use and access.
Policy 10.4	Establish minimum green infrastructure level of service standards such as acres per population or households for publicly accessible recreation and open space within Regional Activity Centers, Community Redevelopment Areas, and urban corridors.

Council Action

The Council at it February 7, 2005 meeting made the following findings:

a. Amendments 7,11,14 and 15 of proposed amendment package #05-1 generally consistent with the *Strategic Regional Policy Plan for South Florida (SRPP).*

b. Amendment 2 of proposed amendment package #05-1 generally consistent with the *SRPP* with the condition that the applicant confirm coordination with the appropriate local agencies, Florida Department of Transportation District 6 and the Florida Turnpike Authority to ensure that transportation impacts are mitigated.

c. Amendments 3, 8, and 9 of proposed amendment package #05-1 generally inconsistent with the *SRPP* citing Goals 5, and 8, and Policies 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 8.1, and 8.2.

d. Amendment 10 of proposed amendment package #05-1 generally inconsistent with the *SRPP* citing Goals 8, and 14, and Policies 8.1, 8.2, 14.2 and 14.4.

e. Amendments Doral 1 and Doral 2 of proposed amendment package #05-1 generally inconsistent with the *SRPP* citing Goals 5, 8, and 10 and Policies 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 8.1, 8.2, 10.1, 103, and 10.4.