



GROWTH MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT
ZONING DIVISION

CONSISTENCY REVIEW MEMORANDUM

To: Nancy Gundlach, AICP, Principal Planner, Zoning Services Section
From: Corby Schmidt, AICP, Principal Planner, Comprehensive Planning Section
Date: June 2, 2017
Subject: Future Land Use Element (FLUE) Consistency Review of Proposed Cleary Residential Planned Unit Development (2nd memo)

PETITION NUMBER: PUDZ-PL20160001985 [REV: 2]

PETITION NAME: Cleary Residential Planned Unit Development (RPUD)

REQUEST: This petition requests a PUD rezone affecting a ± 9.0 -acre property from the A, Agricultural zoning district to the Cleary Residential Planned Unit Development to allow residential development (up to 65 dwelling units) or a senior housing facility (up to 200 units), with associated amenities (recreational uses) and open spaces.

LOCATION: The property is located approximately one-quarter mile east of Logan Boulevard, on the south side of Immokalee Road, and west of the Saturnia Lakes residential PUD, in Section 28, Township 48 South, Range 26 East.

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING COMMENTS: The subject property is located within the Urban designated area (Urban Mixed Use District, Urban Residential Subdistrict), as identified on the Countywide Future Land Use Map of the Growth Management Plan (GMP).

Relative to this petition, the Urban Residential Subdistrict allows residential uses at a base density of 4 dwelling units per acre (DU/A). Also, as explained below, this site is potentially eligible for a 3 DU/A density bonus if qualifying as "infill" development, thereby potentially yielding a total eligible density of 7 DU/A.

FLUE provisions for the Density Rating System state, "Residential In-fill: To encourage residential in-fill in urban areas of existing development outside of the Coastal High Hazard Area, a maximum of 3 residential dwelling units per gross acre may be added if the following criteria are met [staff analysis follows in bracketed text]: The subject site is not in the Coastal High Hazard Area.

- (a) The project is 20 acres or less in size; [the site comprises ± 9 acres]
- (b) At time of development, the project will be served by central public water and sewer; [County water and wastewater services are available to serve this area]
- (c) The project is compatible with surrounding land uses; [this determination is made by Zoning Services staff in their review of the petition in its entirety]
- (d) The property in question has no common site development plan with adjacent property; [The subject property has no common site development plan with adjacent property]
- (e) There is no common ownership with any adjacent parcels; [The subject property is not in common ownership with adjacent properties]

- (f) The parcel in question was not created to take advantage of the in-fill residential density bonus and was created prior to the adoption of this provision in the Growth Management Plan on January 10, 1989; [The subject property consists of two parcels which have been separate properties from approximately 1976 to present]
- (g) Of the maximum 3 additional units, one (1) dwelling unit per acre shall be transferred from Sending Lands; and, [this commitment is included in Exhibit F, List of Developer Commitments, specifying that the first DU/A (9 units) over the base density of 4 DU/A (36 units) will be derived from TDR credits]
- (h) Projects qualifying under this provision may increase the density administratively by a maximum of one dwelling unit per acre by transferring that additional density from Sending Lands". [the County's regulations provide for this density increase via a rezone of the property]

This PUD proposes residential uses at a density of 7.23 DU/A (65 units/8.99 acres), recreational uses and open space. However, it has not demonstrated how the site qualifies to exceed the maximum eligible density of 7.0 DU/A (63 units).

Exhibit 2, Evaluation Criteria indicates that, "provisions have been added to the PUD document requiring that any density above 4 units per acre developed on the property must utilize the density bonus provisions by transferring 1 unit per acre from Sending Lands in accordance with the requirements of the infill provision of the [FLUE]." This criterion is, in part, satisfied by the Developer Commitment provided in Exhibit F, List of Developer Commitments.

In order to promote smart growth policies, and adhere to the existing development character of Collier County, the following FLUE policies shall be implemented for new development and redevelopment projects, where applicable. Each policy is followed by staff analysis in ***[bold italicized text]***.

Objective 7:

In an effort to support the Dover, Kohl & Partners publication, *Toward Better Places: The Community Character Plan for Collier County, Florida*, promote smart growth policies, and adhere to the existing development character of Collier County, the following policies shall be implemented for new development and redevelopment projects, where applicable.

Policy 7.1:

The County shall encourage developers and property owners to connect their properties to fronting collector and arterial roads, except where no such connection can be made without violating intersection spacing requirements of the Land Development Code. ***[This site fronts Immokalee Road, a major arterial roadway. Exhibit C, RPUD Master Plan, depicts a single, direct access to Immokalee Road.]***

Policy 7.2:

The County shall encourage internal accesses or loop roads in an effort to help reduce vehicle congestion on nearby collector and arterial roads and minimize the need for traffic signals. ***[Exhibit C, RPUD Master Plan, depicts a private hammer-head cul-de-sac street inside the project. All vehicular traffic accesses Immokalee Road directly at a single access point.]***

Policy 7.3:

All new and existing developments shall be encouraged to connect their local streets and/or interconnection points with adjoining neighborhoods or other developments regardless of land use type. The interconnection of local streets between developments is also addressed in Policy 9.3 of the Transportation Element. ***[The site abuts a road on one side – Immokalee Road on the north. Property located to the east and south is fully developed [Saturnia Lakes], with no interconnection points proposed. An interconnection point with the abutting property to the west is proposed, where there is potential for residential development. Further west, on the far side of the large residential lot, an interconnection point is proposed by the adjacent commercial development that is now under consideration.]***

Policy 7.4:

The County shall encourage new developments to provide walkable communities with a blend of densities, common open spaces, civic facilities and a range of housing prices and types. ***[As to walkable communities, the PUD requests two Deviations from the Land Development Code (LDC) – for an increased floor area ratio (FAR) and reduced usable open space, if developed with a senior housing facility – which do not remove or alter the provision of sidewalks. The project will be subject to LDC requirements for provision of sidewalks.]***

One non-vehicular interconnection shares the “potential” vehicular interconnection point with the abutting property to the west. Pedestrian/bike connections are provided to Immokalee Road.

As to a blend of densities and a range of housing prices and types, the PUD provides for single-family detached, attached and zero lot line, two-family & duplex residences, townhouses and multi-family residences.

Common open spaces are provided by more than 3.6 acres of open space including water management lakes, recreational/amenity areas and other open spaces. The PUD requests a Deviation from the Land Development Code (LDC) – for reducing the required usable open space from 60% to 30% of the site – if the project is developed with group housing for seniors only. No civic facilities are provided for.]

Based upon the above analysis, the PUD, as proposed, may not be deemed consistent with the Future Land Use Element of the Growth Management Plan. Staff however, recommends the maximum density be reduced to 7.0 DU/A and dwelling unit count be reduced to 63 units – and PUD documents be revised throughout accordingly – to achieve consistency with the Growth Management Plan.

cc: Ray Bellows, Zoning Manager, Zoning Services Section
David Weeks, AICP, Growth Management Manager, Comprehensive Planning Section
Michael Bosi, AICP, Director, Zoning Division
G: Comp\Consistency Reviews\2017

\\bcc.colliergov.net\data\GMD-LDS\CDES Planning Services\Consistency Reviews\2017\PUZ\PUZ-PL2016-1985 Cleary R2 Con Rev_FNL.docx