

Civil Engineers • Land Surveyors • Planners • Landscape Architects

March 16, 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 5 Response

Dear Mr. Finn:

This correspondence is our formal response to the sufficiency review letter provided to us on March 13, 2018. Responses to staff comments have been provided in **bold**.

Attorney Review; Reviewed By: Heidi Ashton-Cicko

1. Please make the changes per my 3-8-18 comments, to be provided by the planner.

Response:

Changes have been made as requested.

Stipulations from Environmental Services Review:

Approved with stipulation. Language needs to be added to PUD. See stipulation. Agreed to disagree. The following language shall be added as an 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 GMPA Ord. ##-## allows the 15% preservation (1.47 acres) to continue to be the minimum requirement.

Mr. Timothy Finn RE: PL20160002306 - Pine Ridge Commons PUD (PUDA), Review 5 Response March 16, 2018 Page 2 of 2

Response:

The applicant does not agree to include the above language in the PUD. The applicant preserves the language in the current draft PUD document.

Stipulations from Comprehensive Planning:

1. Statement of Compliance, Paragraph 2: Revise the FLUE policy reference from Policy 5.4 to Policy 5.6. (Due to policy changes in the FLUE since this PUD was originally adopted in 1999, the existing policy reference is non-sensical.)

2. Statement of Compliance, Paragraph 4: Revise the policy references from 3.1.E and F to 3.2.e. and f. (Due to policy changes in the FLUE since this PUD was originally adopted in 1999, the existing policy reference is non-sensical.)

3. Statement of Compliance, Paragraph 5: Revise the policy reference from Policy 7.5 to 7.4. (This existing policy reference appears to have been in error at time of existing PUD adoption in 1999.)

4. Statement of Compliance, Paragraph 6: Revise the policy reference from Policies 3.1 H and L to Objective 3. (Due to policy changes in the FLUE since this PUD was originally adopted in 1999, the existing policy reference is non-sensical.)

5. This PUDA is consistent with the GMP only if the companion GMP amendment petition is adopted and becomes effective.

Response:

Changes have been made as requested.

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

Sincerely,

D. Wayne Arnold, AICP

c: David Genson Richard D. Yovanovich GradyMinor File