

From: Ryan Von Weller <RVonWeller@wendovergroup.com>
Sent: Monday, October 24, 2022 10:10 AM
To: Jean Salmonsens <Jean.Salmonsens@floridahousing.org>
Subject: site plan approval form

The site plan approval form that is proposed to be required again in the 2022 Geo RFA's is problematic for several reasons. This form has caused issues in multiple jurisdictions with multiple developers over the years, and we have personally been involved in DOAH hearings where the form was brought into question. While the intent to include it makes sense, we ask that it is at least modified to more clearly define what is being asked of City or County staffs.

The issues at hand include the following:

1. Many municipalities have difficulty interpreting what the intention of the form is. Even though a City/County may not have a process that directly references conceptual or preliminary site plan approval, they may have a more formalized process for the first stage of final site plan approval that they deem "preliminary". They then would require completion of that process in order to sign this form. Many times this requires some level of engineered drawings, topographic surveys, utility sizing and locations, landscape plans, tree surveys, etc. For example, the City of Orlando would require this process to be met at the "preliminary" or "conceptual" phase in order to sign this proposed form: <http://www.cityoforlando.net/wp-content/uploads/sites/27/2014/03/Master-Plan-Application-SAMPLE.pdf> This is simply putting way too much financial burden on applicants to almost fully engineer an unfunded site. Additionally, the site plan will most likely change as the development cycle advances, rendering the some of the work done up front for this exercise essentially useless.
2. Even though the language "Although there is no preliminary or conceptual site plan approval process and the final site plan approval has not yet been issued, the site plan, in the applicable zoning designation, has been reviewed" exists in (ii), applicants may still have to adhere to a much more stringent process as detailed above should a municipality interpret the form and their process differently than what may be intended.

The intent of the form is likely to incentivize projects that are more shovel ready than others. However, if a municipality has provided a development with LGAO funding, we believe that indicates their commitment to seeing that specific development permitted and constructed in a timely manner. The only other suggestion we have garnered from municipal staff over the years is to create separate radio buttons that are very clear, such as:

2.
 - (i) this jurisdiction provides either preliminary site plan approval or conceptual site plan approval which has been issued, or

- (ii) this jurisdiction has done a cursory staff review of a conceptual site plan in the applicable zoning designation, and further approvals may still be necessary prior to the issuance of any form of site plan approval

Thank you.