



October 27, 2017

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

RE: PUDA-PL20160002306; Pine Ridge Commons

Dear Mr. Arnold,

The following comments regarding the above referenced project that was submitted on 9-28-17, are being provided as requested. Please be aware that this is not a comprehensive list and is only being provided as a courtesy. All reviews must be completed prior to resubmittal.

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

Rejected Review: Comprehensive Planning Review; Reviewed By: Sue Faulkner

1. GMPA must be approved ahead of PUDA in order to be consistent. The PUDA Ordinance needs to contain an effective date limited to the effective date of the companion GMPA. Also, some revisions to the PUD document are requested as noted above.

Rejected Review: Environmental Review; Reviewed By: Summer Araque

1. Revise PUD document to address the preserve requirement. The following is the suggested language Environmental Commitment:
The PUD Preserve requirement of 1.47 acres was calculated with the Pine Ridge Commons Site Development Plan, that included the preserve calculation for the entire PUD. The 1.47 acres of required preservation was based off the commercial development preservation standard of fifteen (15) percent of the existing native vegetation. With the proposed addition of residential use to the PUD, a preservation standard of twenty-five (25) percent would be required. The PUD will continue to provide 15% preservation as identified on the master concept plan.

Rejected Review: Transportation Planning Review; Reviewed By: Michael Sawyer

1. Additional Items that need to be addressed for Transportation Review:
 - a. Rev.3: Please include the residential vs. commercial square footage reduction with confirmation trip calculations in the TIS. Also revise the language in PUD Section 3.2 to include a requirement to document tracking of the residential unit count and remaining commercial square footage with each SDP or Plat submittal and approval for this development. Also revise this language to remove allowed commercial square footage at time of SDP approval instead of residential unit CO. The tracking documentation must also be submitted to PUD monitoring at

time of SDP submittal.

b. 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 same or nearly the same. Please revise TIS and or PUD to be consistent regarding total commercial development amounts.

c. 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:

a. Rev.3: Please add "unadjusted" to the trip limit commitment.

b. 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.

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

Rejected Review: County Attorney Review; Reviewed By: Heidi Ashton-Cicko

1. 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. As of 10-26-17, this was not done.

2. Please make changes to the amended PUD text and master plan per comments to be provided by email on 7-21-17. Some of the changes were done.

3. Please make changes per my comments dated October 26, 2017, to be provided by the planner

GENERAL COMMENTS:

1. Additional comments or stipulations may be forthcoming once a sufficient application has been submitted for review. This correspondence should not be construed as a position of support or non-support for any issues within the petition. Staff will analyze the petition and the recommendation will be contained in the staff report prepared for the Collier County Planning Commission.

2. Please be advised that pursuant to the LDC, an application can be considered closed if there has been no activity on the application for a period of six (6) months. That six months period will be calculated from the date of this letter.

3. Please ensure that all members of your review team that may testify before the CCPC and the BCC are registered as lobbyists with the county pursuant to the regulations regarding that issue.

4. When addressing review comments, please provide a cover letter outlining your response to each comment. Include a response to all comments.

5. Please put revised dates on all exhibits and in the title block of the Site Plan. The PUD document should include a footer that reflects the project name, petition number, date and page X of Y for the entire document. ***Documents without this information will be rejected.***
6. A partial resubmittal cannot be accepted; please do not resubmit until you can respond to ALL review comments.
7. Public hearings cannot be held until a Neighborhood Information Meeting (NIM) has been held. Please note that the NIM must be held at least 15 days prior to the first hearing. Please be aware of the following items:
 - a) Please provide the required affidavit and its attachments prior to the meeting (in compliance with the LDC); and
 - b) Please post signs to direct attendees to the exact meeting location; and
 - c) Please ensure that there is sound amplification equipment available and working for this meeting. If there is no permanent equipment, please bring a tested/working portable microphone; and
 - d) You must **provide a written synopsis of the meeting that includes a list of all questions and answers** as well as providing the audio/video tape; and
 - e) Please prepare documents for hand out to all NIM attendees and the public hearing file, that show the differences in the uses that would be allowed in the existing and proposed zoning districts. This request is based upon recent CCPC direction.
 - f) **NOTE:** It appears that you conducted a NIM on April 24, 2017. Please be aware that If the **applicant's** petition activity extends beyond 1 year from the date of the first **NIM**, a second **NIM** will be required and shall be noticed in accordance with the Admin Code.
8. Note the adopted fee schedule requires payment of additional fees for petitions that require more than four resubmittals; please contact the appropriate staff and resolve issues to avoid this fee.

Timothy Finn, AICP
Principal Planner

Cc: D. Wayne Arnold, Grady Minor and Associates, P.A., Richard D. Yovanovich, Coleman, Yovanovich & Koester, P.A., Annis Moxam, Sue Faulkner, Summer Araque, Michael Sawyer, Heidi Ashton-Cicko