

Leon County, Department of Growth & Environmental Management

MEMORANDUM

TO: Adam Antony Biblo, AICP, ULI
Director, Development Services Division

FROM: Nawfal R. Ezzagaghi, P.E. *N.R.E.*
Environmental Review Supervisor

Cc: John P. Kraynak, P.E.
Director, Environmental Compliance Division

DATE: May 19, 2009

RE: Summerfield PUD Phase I
EIA Findings
Parcel ID: 21-04-51-000-012-0

We have completed our review of the Environmental Impact Analysis Application. It is hereby approved with the condition that all recommendations\comments referenced hereon be incorporated into the Environmental Permit Application.

Environmental Review Processes and Required Documents:

A Natural Features Inventory (NFI) is required for this project. An amendment to the previously approved NFI (flood elevations) for this project (reference LEA03-0072) was approved on 01-07-2009 (reference LEA08-0069).

An Environmental Impact Analysis (EIA) is required for this project. The applicant has submitted an EIA application (reference LEA 08-0057), and a review has been completed. The EIA findings are hereby included in this memo.

Comments Regarding The submitted EIA -Ref.: LEA08-0057

1. The engineer has submitted a continuous simulation (similar to the Bradfordville recovery approach) to demonstrate that stormwater runoff collected within the stormwater management facility is fully contained. The highest simulated stage was reported at 89.8, which is well below the finish floor of the proposed multi-residential units. This has been completed to demonstrate compliance with the intent of the retention volume recovery requirements of Sec. 10-4.303(14).
2. A Low Impact Development (LID) approach has been adopted. The interior landscape islands have been, in addition to sediment sumps, designed to provide a volume in excess of 24,000 cubic feet to emulate 92% of the pre-development runoff conditions the closed basin experiences. This storage also provides water quality treatment before discharging to the bottom of the basin.
3. The submitted Special Development A & B impacts appear to be in compliance with the City\County Comprehensive Plan Policy 2.2.12 which states:
*"Lake Jackson -Zone A = below elevation 100 feet NGVD (criteria) 5% or 4,000 sq. ft may be disturbed
Zone B = between 100 feet NGVD and 110 feet NGVD (criteria) 50% of the site must be left natural
Preserve shoreline vegetation in its natural state for minimum of 50 linear feet landward of the ordinary high water line..."*

Staff's findings are further verified when referencing the Land Development Regulations Sec. 10-4.323 which state:

- "(1) Zone A. Wetland and floodplain ecotone, from elevation 89 feet NGVD or the water's edge, whichever provides the greater area of protection, to 100 feet NGVD:
A. Development area limitations.
1. Clearing, soil disturbance, and building area shall not exceed the greater of 4,000 square feet or five percent of that part of the development site located within zone A above 89 feet NGVD..."

No clearing, soil disturbance, and building appears to be proposed below the contour line representing elevation 87.78. Furthermore, Sec. 10-4.323(b)(1)C which addresses the natural vegetation protection zone, relates this region to the water's edge or the normal high water line of which none are located within the area receiving runoff (a current cattle Pasture with no listed species habitat per the approved Natural Features Inventory) from the proposed improvements.

4. Within sheet C-10, it shall be noted that staff is in disaccord with the Patriarch Trees list. Having said that, the engineer has altered the previously presented layout and has provided an alternative which takes into account other patriarch trees (although not listed as such in the plans). Details of required mitigation to further assure their survival is required and shall be made part of the anticipated Environmental Management Permit.