



April 19, 2018

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

RE: PUDA-PL20180000049; I-75/Alligator Alley

Dear Mr. Arnold:

The following comments regarding the above referenced project that was submitted on 3-20-18, 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: Environmental Review; Reviewed By: Summer Araque

1. Section 2.4 – Does not make sense as it states that 29.4 acres of the 40.8 acres is proposed for Commercial uses. How many acres will be purchased for the apartment complex?
2. Master Plans – revegetated is spelled incorrectly on the hatching legend for both exhibits.
3. Environmental Development Commitments:
 - a. It is the agent's option to remove Commitments C-E
 - b. Refer to Deviation number in Commitment G
4. Deviation Justifications number 4 and 5 need to be more specific. Let's discuss at post-Review 1 meeting. For Deviation #5 you may refer to the redevelopment.
5. a. Preserves are labeled; however, it is difficult to decipher where the preserve boundary ends for Exhibit B.
 - b. Breakout the Preserve in the Land Use Summary for both Exhibits and Section 4.3.
6. Provide calculations on site plan showing the appropriate acreage of native vegetation to be retained, the maximum amount and ratios permitted to be created on-site or mitigated off-site. Exclude vegetation located within existing utility and access easements from the preserve calculations (LDC3.05.07 B. - D.).
7. It is not necessary to list specific uses in the preserve as you will need to follow the LDC. If you would like to include language related to uses in the preserve, please incorporate the following language into Section 3.2:
Passive uses are allowed within preserves to provide for access to the preserve, as long as any clearing required to facilitate these uses does not impact the minimum required native vegetation or cause loss of function to the preserve. Passive uses are subject to LDC section Allowable uses

within County required preserves.

8. Section 3.2 needs to be revised as follows

- a. Revise 11.4 acres
- b. Remove the word Water Management in the first sentence
- c. Remove the second sentence and revise the third to remove "However"

9. Is any of the preserve acting as the Landscape buffer? If yes, provide the following note:

Where preserves occur adjacent to development off site and will be used in lieu of landscape buffers, include the following condition in the environmental commitments section of the PUD document or master plan:

Preserves may be used to satisfy the landscape buffer requirements after exotic vegetation removal in accordance with LDC sections 4.06.02 and 4.06.05.E.1. Supplemental plantings with native plant materials shall be in accordance with LDC section 3.05.07.

10. Provide the following Environmental Data (LDC 3.08.00):

- a. Provide aerial exhibits showing Preserves as part of the environmental data report. Include acreage and provide for both preserve proposals.
- b. On page 4, please use present tense for new calculation which excludes the ROW & easements.
- c. Provide a map showing connection to adjacent preserves.
- d. Provide proposed replanting plan for created preserve.

Rejected Review: Public Utilities - PUED Review; Reviewed By: Eric Fey

1. 4/19/2018: Accurately show and label all existing and proposed CUEs on the master plan, particularly the 20' CUEs for the future raw water transmission mains emanating from the well sites.

2. 4/19/2018: The preserve may not encroach into the raw water well site or transmission main easements, and CUEs shall not be utilized for restoration of native vegetation or for required buffer plantings. Revise the master plan accordingly.

3. 4/19/2018: Please provide a typical cross section of the berm along the northeastern PUD boundary, showing adequate vehicular access along the 20' CUE for the future raw water transmission main. The cross section should show required buffer plantings in relation to the main; a 7.5' min. setback is required.

4. 4/19/2018: Please add a commitment to provide a 20' CUE along the western, northern, and eastern PUD boundaries, north of Bedzel Circle, and connecting to the raw water well site easements, to serve as a corridor for future raw water mains and/or potential relocation of water and wastewater transmission mains now in the Collier Blvd right-of-way.

5. 4/19/2018: Delete paragraph 5.3 A as this is an unnecessary statement.

6. 4/19/2018: Revise paragraph 5.3 B as follows: 1) change four instances of the word "field" to "site"; 2) adjust the location descriptions for the raw water well site easements as needed; and 3) in the last sentence, change the words "wastewater transmission" to "domestic wastewater collection/transmission" to be consistent with the FDEP's rule language.

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

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

Rev.1: Reference PUD Doc., Section IV, 4.2, Revise the development intensity to be consistent with your TIS report or revise your TIS to reflect 265,000 sf commercial, plus 107 room hotel, plus 425 residential units.

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

Rev.1: Reference PUD Doc., K. Please revise trip limit to most current CAO language.

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

Rev.1: Reference Evaluation Criteria Narrative page one, third paragraph. It is stated that no commercial uses or square footage is eliminated by this proposed change but the proposed residential use would obviously displace acreage for commercial uses...please explain how specifically? Also note review 1 and 2 comments above

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

Rev.1: TIS comments:

1. The TIS states that the proposed Amendment does not result in additional “net new” trips. This is true for the PM peak hour traffic, as shown on Table C (pg. 4) of the TIS. This is not true for the daily trips or for the AM peak hour trips: Please include AM peak hour trip calc's for clarity of proposed impacts. Such as the following...

Land Use	AM Pk. Hr.	PM Pk. Hr.	ADT
Current PUD/uses	XXX	XXX	XXXXX
Proposed PUD/Uses	XXX	XXX	XXXXX

The planning commission has shown interest in AM peak trips at recent hearings. This information will not change staff's review based on the GMP however it is requested to provide a clearer idea of impacts.

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

Rev.1: Please provide confirmation of coordination of proposed master plan with FDOT staff as discussed at pre app meeting regarding the interchange improvements now under design and budgeted.

Rejected Review: Zoning Review; Reviewed By: Timothy Finn

1. In the Application under Associations section: This section was left blank which addresses the name and mailing address of all registered Home Owners Associations that could be affected by the application. Please confirm if there is indeed no Home Owners Associations that would be affected by the application.

2. In the Application under the Applicant Contact Information: Revise this section to cross out agent and then provide a separate sheet providing agents information i.e (Wayne Arnold and Rich Yovanovich) and more importantly Josh Purvis needs to provide authorization from the owners to appoint himself as the applicant.

3. In the proposed PUD Amendment, page 8 of 20 under Section 4.3: The following footnote "***Residential uses may only be developed within the area platted as Lot 1 on the Alligator Alley Commerce Center Phase Two Plat" needs to be reflected on the revised "Conceptual Commercial/Residential Master Plan Exhibit B" dated 3-16-2018
4. In the proposed PUD Amendment, page 8 of 20 under Section 4.2: The 265,000 square feet needs to be revised to what is stated in the TIS which is 183,000 square feet in Table B. Per the TIS on page 3 the development of 425 multi family dwelling units will require 82,000 s.f. of commercial/retail land uses be displaced by the residential use.
5. In the proposed PUD Amendment, page 12 of 20 under Section C.2: Change the "R" reference to "C/R" as reflected in the "Conceptual Commercial/Residential Master Plan Exhibit B" dated 3-16-2018.
6. In the proposed PUD Amendment, Table 3 - Residential Development Standards: Identify the Amenity Area on the "Conceptual Commercial/Residential Master Plan Exhibit B" dated 3-16-2018.
7. In the proposed PUD Amendment, Table 3 - Residential Development Standards: Consider increasing the separation distance in the amenity area from anything outside the amenity area.
8. In the proposed PUD Amendment, page 15 of 20 under Section 5.1: Add a commitment similar to Commitment A with "developed solely with residential uses"
9. With regard to both the Conceptual C.P.U.D. Masterplan Exhibit A dated 01/05 and the "Conceptual Commercial/Residential Master Plan Exhibit B" dated 3-16-2018; Is the Exhibit A version going to be superseded by the Exhibit B version? Please clarify. Only one Masterplan will be accepted. Moreover, the depiction of the 6.12 acreage needs to be illustrated in Exhibit B.
10. In the proposed PUD Amendment, page 18 of 20 under Section 5.6.B: Please delete this section as all commitments need to be included in the PUD document itself.
11. On the "Conceptual Commercial/Residential Master Plan Exhibit B" dated 3-16-2018, please include the location of all proposed major internal thoroughfares and pedestrian accessways, including interconnecting roadways within the PUD as well as with abutting uses.

Rejected Review: County Attorney Review; Reviewed By: Scott Stone

1. Your application front page indicates that Josh Purvis is the "Applicant/Agent." However, your Affidavit of Authorization lists Q Grady Minor and Coleman, Yovanovich and Koester as "Agent." Please revise the application cover page to list those two as Agents (you can add another section to the page if necessary).
2. Please provide written evidence from each owner indicating their consent for Thompson Thrift Development, Inc. to submit this application.
3. Please provide evidence that Thompson Thrift Development, Inc. is a legal and active entity in Florida, and that John Purvis is authorized to sign the Affidavit of Authorization on their behalf.

4. WR-1 Associates, Ltd. is not showing up on sunbiz.org. Please provide evidence that they are a legal and active entity in Florida, and evidence of authority for anyone signing an affidavit or covenant of unified control on their behalf.

5. Your preserve calculation for the mixed use plan appears to be based on only 37.6 acres, instead of the entire 40.8 acre site. Please explain how you came to that number, and provide an exhibit/plan that clearly shows the areas within the PUD that you are excluding from the acreage calculation.

6. When was the affordable housing commitment (5.6) removed from the PUD?

7. Please provide a legible version of the existing Master Plan (Exhibit A) that was adopted within Ordinance 07-26.

8. See handwritten markups to PUD document, to be provided in separate e-mail from the planner.

9. More comments to follow after next resubmittal.

Rejected Review: Landscape Review; Reviewed By: Mark Templeton

1. The language included in Deviation Justification #1 "The shape of a man made body of water...." is in section 4.06.05.N.1.a, not 4.06.02.D.5.a. Please revise. There is no 4.06.02.D.5.a.

2. The section of code that deviation #2 is referencing (4.06.05.H) includes requirements for landscape installation, root barrier, lighting separation, and guying and bracing requirements, not setback for toes of slope from property lines. Please revise to reference the correct section of code that the deviation is seeking relief from.

GENERAL COMMENTS: [Timothy Finn]

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(CCPC) or Hearing Examiner(Hex).
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 Hex/CCPC and the Board of County Commissioners (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 the Neighborhood Information criteria has been met. In some petition types a Neighborhood Information Meeting (NIM) must be held while other petition types only require the agent to send a letter. All letters and ads must be pre-approved by the county planner. For additional information about the process please contact me. Please note that the NIM must be held at least 15 days prior to the first hearing. As you prepare for that meeting, 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.
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: Wayne Arnold, Grady Minor and Associates, P.A., Richard D. Yovanovich, Coleman, Yovanovich & Koester, P.A., Josh Purvis, Thompson Thrift Development, Inc. Summer Araque, Eric Fey, Michael Sawyer, Scott Stone, Mark Templeton