

COLLIER COUNTY
Growth Management Division
Planning & Regulation
Planning & Zoning Department

August 18, 2017

GradyMinor - Sharon Umpenhour
3800 Via Del Rey
Bonita Springs, FL 34134

RE: PL20160002306
Pine Ridge Commons PUD (PUDA)
* Web Access Code: 531

The following comments regarding the above referenced project are being provided as requested. Please be aware that this is not a comprehensive list and is only being provided as a courtesy. Not all review departments have completed their reviews. You will receive an entire list of comments after all reviews are completed.

Resubmittals will not be received based on these provisional comments. All reviews must be completed prior to resubmittal.

Additional Comments:

Rejected Review: Addressing - GIS Review

Reviewed By: Annis Moxam

#1 Please add street names Pather Lane and Premier Way to Exhibit A - PUD Master Plan

Additional Comments:

Pending Review: Comprehensive Planning Review

Reviewed By:

#1. GMPA must be approved ahead of PUDA in order to be consistent.

Additional Comments:

Rejected Review: Environmental Review

Reviewed By: Summer Araque

#1. The proposed off-site preserve requires a deviation. This PUD changing from a commercial PUD to a mixed-use PUD. Therefore, this falls under 3.05.07.H.1.f.d.: "Preserves less than one acre in size." Therefore, since the preserve requirement for this PUD is 1.47 acres, a deviation would be required. Staff may not support the deviation or leave it up to the decision of the Planning Commission as the deviation would far exceed the proposed LDC amendment moving forward. Also, this site will now include residential which would have originally required a higher preserve requirement. Therefore, reducing the preserve onsite even further may not be supported.

#2. Evaluation Criteria e. states: "Usable open space will be provided within the PUD as required by the LDC for the commercial development. Native preservation areas have been previously designated and are provided consistent with Section 3.05 of the LDC."

This is not correct. A portion of the previously provided preserve is proposed to go offsite. This request requires a deviation.

#3. Please will look into whether this PUD requires a 25% preserve. This questions has been posed by several staff members reviewing this petition.

Additional Comments:

Rejected Review: Transportation Planning Review

Reviewed By: Michael Sawyer

#1. Additional Items that need to be addressed for Transportation Review:

Rev.2: There still appears to be an inconsistency between the PUD development Language and the TIS. Specifically PUD Section 2.2.C. and TIS Table 1, Table 2A, Table 2B, and Table 2C. The PUD indicates that existing retail and office development of 275,000 s.f. is retained plus 375 multi-family units. The TIS appears to show in Table 1 total retail and office development of 204,342 s.f. plus 375 multi-family apartment units. If the commercial development s.f total remains the same and this amendment adds 375 multi-family units then Tables 2A and 2B appear to be incorrect in that the base daily 2-way and PM Peak hour trips are the some or nearly the same. Please revise TIS and or PUD to be consistent regarding total commercial development amounts.

Rev.1: Reference TIS, understanding that traffic counts are reduced with this request, please provide a standard distribution calc's and map to show where/how remaining trips will be distributed on the network for clarity. Please also note that the development is within the Northwest TCMA again for clarity.

#2 Additional Items that need to be addressed for Transportation Review:

Rev.2: Second request to provide developer commitment to limit PM Peak hour trips consistent with TIS count. Please also note previous comment regarding inconsistent PUD and TIS development scenarios.

Rev.1: Provide developer commitment to limit PM trips consistent with revised TIS counts provided.

Additional Comments:

Rejected Review: Zoning Review

Reviewed By: Eric Johnson

#1. If a deviation is required (and requested), it will have to be included in the PUD Document. Provide justification for the deviation on a separate document.

Additional Comments:

Rejected Review: County Attorney Review

Reviewed By: Heidi Ashton-Cicko

#1. Miscellaneous Corrections Please send the word version of your amendment to me by email for preparation of the Ordinance.

#2. Miscellaneous Corrections: Based on the number of changes to the PUD document and recent comments from the CCPC, please provide the entire PUD document with strike-thru's and underlines for changed text.

#3. Miscellaneous Corrections: Please make changes to the amended PUD text and master plan per comments to be provided by email on 7-21-17

Additional Comments:

Pending Review: School District Review

Reviewed By:

Additional Comments:

Pending Review: Emergency Management Review

Reviewed By:

Eric Johnson

Principal Planner