Collier County
Growth Management Department

October 9, 2017

Mr. D. Wayne Arnold
Q. Grady Minor & Associates
3800 Via Del Rey
Bonita Springs, FL 34134

Mr. R. Bruce Anderson, Esquire
Cheffy Passidomo, P.A.
821 5th Avenue South,
Naples, FL 34102

RE: Review Letter 1: Planned Unit Development Amendment
PL20160002496
Fiddler's Creek – Marco Shores PUD

Dear Mr. Arnold and Mr. Anderson,

The first review is complete and the following comments are provided to you regarding the above referenced project. If you have questions, please contact the appropriate staff member who conducted the review. The project will retain a "HOLD" status until all comments are satisfied.

The following comments shall be addressed as noted:

Rejected Review: Addressing - GIS Review
Reviewed By: Annis Moxam
Email: annismoxam@colliergov.net Phone #: (239) 252-5519

Correction Comment 1:
On Master Plan – Exhibit FC – A1, please add street names Fiddlers Creek Parkway, Club Center Blvd, Marsh DR, Sandpiper DR and Championship DR.

Rejected Review: Comprehensive Planning Review
Reviewed By: Sue Faulkner
Email: SueFaulkner@colliergov.net Phone #: (239) 252-5715

Correction Comment 1:
Based upon the above analysis, staff concludes the proposed Planned Unit Development Amendment may NOT be deemed consistent with the Future Land Use Element (FLUE). However, the petition may be deemed consistent, if the companion Growth Management Plan Amendment (GMPA) is adopted and becomes effective. The PUDA Ordinance needs to contain an effective date linked to the effective date of the companion GMPA.

Rejected Review: Emergency Management Review
Reviewed By: Nancy Gundlach
Email: nancygundlach@colliergov.net Phone #: (239) 252-2484

Correction Comment 1:
Miscellaneous Corrections

Comments will be provided as soon as they are available. (Emergency Management is currently occupied with post Irma duties.)

Rejected Review: Environmental Review
Reviewed By: Summer Araque
Email: summerbrownaraque@colliergov.net Phone #: (239) 252-6290

Correction Comment 1:
Why are some areas labeled Preserve and some Reserve? (LDC 3.05.07 H.1.).

Why is preserve not in Land Use Summary, only in subnotes?

Correction Comment 2:
If other Commitment sections are being required to be mainstreamed, please remove any commitments that

Correction Comment 3:
Put "Preserve" in parentheses behind "Reserve" as requested in preapplication meeting notes.

Rejected Review: Public Utilities - PUED Review
Reviewed By: Eric Fey
Email: EricFey@colliergov.net Phone #: (239) 252-2434

Correction Comment 1:
9/11/2017: Both commercial tracts are within the potential well field area for the future Southeast Regional Water Treatment Plant (SERWTP). Please consider adding a commitment to provide well site easements and call me to discuss specifics.

Rejected Review: Transportation Pathways Review
Reviewed By: Michael Sawyer
Email: michaelsawyer@colliergov.net Phone #: (239) 252-2926

Correction Comment 1:
Additional Comments- Transportation Pathways Review:

Rev.1: Provide deviation for any sidewalks if any are proposed that do not meet minimum standards.

Rejected Review: Transportation Planning Review

Reviewed By: Michael Sawyer
Email: michaelsawyer@colliergov.net Phone #: (239) 252-2926

Correction Comment 1:
Additional Items that need to be addressed for Transportation Review:

Rev.1: Comments provided may not be complete due to Irma shut down. Additional new comments may be expected. Please also see comments provided with GMPA and DRI petition requests.

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

Rev.1: Please address the following:

1. Exhibit 5, page 4.1 of the TIS, shows the New Trip Generation Calculations. The comments regarding this exhibit are:
a. The trip generation calculations where computed using the ITE, Trip Generation, Sixth Edition but the latest 9th edition shall be used. Calculations change reflect a tangible difference.
b. LUC are not listed on this exhibit, but Business/Commercial cannot be summed up in one LUC. Please show calculation as attributed to each LUC under the "Commercial" umbrella. The TIS refers to an Appendix J but the Appendix was not included.
2. Figure 1, page 5.1 of the TIS, depict the traffic distribution for the development. The following are the comments regarding this figure:
a. The traffic distribution, depicted in Figure 1, does not add up to the total number of "commercial" generated traffic shown on Exhibit 5.
b. Where, in Figure 1, is the Golf course traffic included?
3. The PUD Amendment-PL20160002496 states that the DRI/PUD is requesting to add new project access points on US 41. These access points are to be analyzed to view the expected traffic operations and LOS.

Please also note regarding the DRI and GMPA petition requests for consistency changes needed if any.
Development of Regional Impact (DRI)
4.The DRI Exhibit 4; dated April 25, 2017 mentions a 150-rooms hotel as part of the Fiddler's Creek DRI. This hotel is not considered in the TIS (see Table A – Approved/Vested Land Uses of the TIS).
5.Location of such hotel is not marked in the Master Plan.

Correction Comment 3:
Additional Items that need to be addressed for Transportation Review:

Rev.1: Comments received from FDOT.
•This portion of the US 41 has an Access Management Classification of 3 with a posted speed of 60 mph. The established spacing standard is 660 feet between driveway connections, 1320 feet for directional median openings, and 2640 feet for full median openings and signals.

•The development team explained the Fiddler Creek Development of Regional Impact (DRI) has expanded the property under common ownership and is proposing to add residential housing in this area. The team is proposing a new access to US 41 for the expansion area, but the expansion

would not be adding additional density or traffic to the roadway. The development team does not feel the additional access or expansion would require a notice of proposed change (NOPC) through the DRI process.

•FDOT staff stated adding an additional access to the existing DRI would seem to fall under the NOPC process, but would defer to the appropriate authoritative agencies to determine the proper statutory procedures to have the Development Order (DO) amended.

•Once the DO is amended, the driveway should be placed at a location that can meet the minimum driveway spacing standards of 660 feet (from edge of pavement to edge of pavement) from the north and south of the existing access points on US 41.

•If approved the driveway should be design to meet current District One Standards, to include a 16' inbound lane, 12' outbound lane with a minimum ingress and egress radii of 50 feet.

•This is a high speed area on US 41. The developer should be aware if the site generates enough traffic in the peak hour there may be a need for additional offsite improvements.

•If deceleration lanes are required, they will be designed per Standard Index 301, using a design speed of 60 mph, and have a total deceleration length of 405 feet. State law requires that all right turn lanes on state facilities will be designed to include bicycle keyhole lanes. All left turn lane will be design with adequate queue storage, that will be determined based a Traffic Impact Study (TIS), which will be required at the time of permitting.

•FDOT staff explained the Duda driveway is not part of the Fiddler Creek DRI. The driveway will have to be removed in the future, but FDOT is agreeable to allowing the access to be permitted for construction purposes only with specific conditions to restrict access for those specific uses.

Please note:

A site specific development plan with traffic impact analysis and review of existing roadway conditions must be reviewed before the Department can commit to a specific location or geometry of access that can be permitted to the State Roadway.

For future reference, please note the Department measures driveway spacing from edge of pavement to edge of pavement, and median opening spacing from centerline to centerline.

Per F.A.C. 14-96.003(4): "Traffic control features and devices in the right of way such as traffic signals, channelizing islands, medians, median openings, and turn lanes are operational and safety characteristics of the State Highway System and are not means of access. The Department may install, remove, or modify any present or future traffic control feature or device in the right of way to promote traffic safety in the right of way or promote efficient traffic operations on the highway. A connection permit is only issued for connections and not for any present or future traffic control devices at or near the permitted connections. The permit may describe these features and/or devices, but such description does not create any type of interest in such features."

<u>Correction Comment 4:</u>
Additional Items that need to be addressed for Transportation Review:

Rev.1: Reference TIS page 2, traffic signal. Update PUD commitment (PUD section 12.5)regarding signal to clarify timing etc. Also 12.5.B. revise tum to turn. And add section E. for the last sentence.

Correction Comment 5:
Additional Items that need to be addressed for Transportation Review:

Rev.1: See also FDOT comments. Regarding proposed access on 41. On master plan(s) show existing conditions on 41 including development and roadways along the north side of 41 (please include street names). Please outline the roadway improvements/changes needed on 41 to accommodate the proposed access points. It appears the existing full opening may be relocated however this is not clear.

Correction Comment 6:
Additional Items that need to be addressed for Transportation Review:

Rev.1: Regarding the northwest/first access point on 41. The access appears to be relocated to FDOT preferred location (please confirm including requested master plan detail comment above), however the interconnection/main roadway link into Fiddlers Creek has been removed. Put back-do not remove this link/interconnection on the master plan. Staff does not support the removal of this roadway link/interconnection. Please also show all internal interconnections especially at all proposed commercial development areas.

Rejected Review: Zoning Review
Reviewed By: Nancy Gundlach
Email: nancygundlach@colliergov.net Phone #: (239) 252-2484

Correction Comment 1:
Miscellaneous Corrections

PUD Document Section #.3.: Please update the Residential acreage from 1227 to 1280.

Correction Comment 2:
Miscellaneous Corrections

The Master Plan states "CF," and PUD Document states "Group Care Facilities. Please reconcile.

Correction Comment 3:
Miscellaneous Corrections

PUD Document Section 6.2 A.(17) Self Storage (indoor). Please clarify, is it air conditioned?

Correction Comment 4:
Miscellaneous Corrections

Question/clarification: The old Master Plan depicts a "fuzzy" area near the south west corner of Fiddler's Creek by the Collier Boulevard entrance. Is that area a Commercial area or is it something else?

Correction Comment 5:
Miscellaneous Corrections

Please provide an Exhibit depicting the existing, relocated and proposed access points off of Collier Boulevard and US 41. Also, please label the street names of the access points.

Rejected Review: County Attorney Review
Reviewed By: Heidi Ashton-Cicko
Email: heidiashton@colliergov.net Phone #: (239) 252-8773

Correction Comment 1:
Miscellaneous Corrections: Regarding July 25, 2017 PUD document: P.4: Why did area of development increase from 2133.22 to 4439.31 acres?

Correction Comment 2:
Miscellaneous Corrections: Regarding July 25, 2017 PUD document: p.8: Why is there a need to move Unit 30 from the Marco Shores PUD land summary?

Correction Comment 3:
Miscellaneous Corrections: Regarding July 25, 2017 PUD document: p.17 Please provide documentation to show the location of parcels 21, 22, 60, 61, 62, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69 and 70?

Correction Comment 4:
Miscellaneous Corrections: Regarding July 25, 2017 PUD document: See changes to pages 28 and 29 and PUD master plan?

Correction Comment 5:
Miscellaneous Corrections: Whole doc: What is the difference between a preserve and a reserve?

Correction Comment 6:
Miscellaneous Corrections: Please provide consent of owners that are affected by the master plan and text changes.

The following comments are informational and/or may include stipulations:

- **Applicants who are converting a paper submittal to E-Permitting must resubmit complete sets of all plans, signed and sealed, even if they were previously approved on an earlier review. As a reminder, all documents that are required to be signed and sealed must be digitally signed and sealed when submitting through our E-Permitting process. On the cover letter please identify that previous submittals were done through paper and that this submittal is by E-Permitting. Also, identification of the changes in cover letter (ex. See note #23 Civil Plan Sheet 4) improves the efficiency of the resubmittal review.**

- **When addressing review comments, please provide a cover letter outlining your response to each comment. Include a response to completed reviews with stipulations.**

- **Please be advised that Sections 10.02.03.H.1, and 10.02.04.B.3.c require that a re-submittal must be made within 270 days of this letter.**

If you have any questions, please contact me at (239) 252-2484.

Sincerely,

Nancy Gundlach

Nancy Gundlach
Principal Planner
Growth Management Department

Attachments: RLS (County Attorney red-lines)
Comp Planning Consistency Review, dated September 21, 2017

Copy to: FCC Commercial LLC
Annis Moxam
Sue Faulkner
Summer Araque
Eric Fey
Mike Sawyer
Heidi Ashton
Sharon Umpenhour