



Civil Engineers • Land Surveyors • Planners • Landscape Architects

January 11, 2018

Mr. Timothy Finn, AICP
Principal Planner
Collier County Growth Management Division/ Planning and Regulation
Land Development Services Department
Comprehensive Planning Section
2800 North Horseshoe Drive
Naples, FL 34104

RE: PL20160002306
Pine Ridge Commons PUD (PUDA)
Review 3 Response

Dear Mr. Finn:

This correspondence is our formal response to the sufficiency review letter provided to us on October 27, 2017. Responses to staff comments have been provided in **bold**.

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

Response:

Street names were added to the Master Plan and a copy was provided in the last submittal. This comment has been resolved.

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.

Response:

Acknowledged.

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.

Response:

The PUD has been revised as follows:

2,13 F. The owner shall provide 1.47 acres of native vegetation preservation on site in accordance with the Goodlette/Pine Ridge Mixed Use Subdistrict of the Urban Designation Urban Mixed Use District of the Growth Management 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.

Response:

Revised as requested.

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.

Response:

The PUD document has been revised as requested.

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.

Response:

The entire PUD document is provided in Strike-thru and underline format as requested.

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.

Response:

Changes have been made as requested.

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

Response:

Changes have been made as requested.

Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "D. Wayne Arnold". The signature is stylized with a large initial "D" and a long, sweeping horizontal stroke.

D. Wayne Arnold, AICP

c: David Genson
Richard D. Yovanovich
GradyMinor File