

Civil Engineers • Land Surveyors • Planners • Landscape Architects

July 18, 2018

Mr. C. James Sabo, 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: PL20170004414, Russell Square RPUD (PUDZ) Review 2 Response

Dear Mr. Sabo:

This correspondence is our formal response to the sufficiency review letter provided to us on June 29, 2018. Responses to staff comments have been provided in **bold**.

Rejected Review: Environmental Review Reviewed By: Craig Brown Email: CraigBrown@colliergov.net Phone #: (239) 252-2548

Correction Comment 4:

Please provide a tree survey of the area labeled as FLUCCS 212. This area is labeled as #1 on the Environmental Data Exhibit Habitat. If the trees present meet the LDC requirement (Density and size) (3.05.07.A.2) they should be included as part of the existing native vegetation calculations.

Response:

Based on the coordination with County Environmental staff, the native vegetation calculations have been amended to include trees within the pasture area that are greater than 8 trees/acre density and greater than 8 inches dbh. The native habitat exhibit has been amended. In addition to the native habitat requirement of 3.47 acres, 20 additional trees will also be planted to account for the native trees that have grown up in the pasture area.

Correction Comment 5:

Please revise the Habitat Exhibit (Environmental Data). Please clarify if the existing vegetation (shown as Area 2) present is native and should be included as discussed with ES Staff during the meeting for this project.

Q. Grady Minor & Associates, P.A. 3800 Via Del Rey Bonita Springs, FL 34134 Ph. 239-947-1144 Fax. 239-947-0375 EB 0005151 LB 0005151 LC 26000266 www.gradyminor.com Mr. C. James Sabo, AICP RE: PL20170004414, Russell Square RPUD (PUDZ), Review 2 Response July 18, 2018 Page 2 of 7

Response:

The vegetation visible from the aerial located within Area 2 does not meet the size and density standards of the LDC to be counted as native habitat. This area was cleared when the house was constructed and has been maintained through mowing. The majority of the vegetation present is smaller trees. There are 5 pine trees that are greater than 8 inches dbh and a single oak trees that is close to the 18 inch dbh standard. The 6 trees total are less than the 8 trees/acre standard to be included in the native vegetation calculations.

Correction Comment 6:

The Master Concept Plan note 3; this note will need to be revised. Staff is currently in discussions regarding what the revised wording will be.

Please contact Staff for the updated revised wording for this note.

Response:

Note 3, now Note 2, on the Master Plan has been revised to reflect recently approved language.

<u>Correction Comment 7:</u> Revise Exhibit A. (page 2 Of 12) Please add the following wording as a clarifying statement just under the words "Allowable Uses:"

"Uses subject to LDC section Allowable uses within County required preserves." Or wording that refers to the LDC for allowable uses.

Response:

Exhibit A has been revised as requested.

Correction Comment 8:

The MCP indicates with shading that a portion of the northward preserve is going to be replanted. It's not clear what the size of this restoration area will be. Please clarify.

Response:

The required native preservation is 3.47 acres. The project also has a requirement to preserve at least 20 additional trees as outlined in the environmental documents. These trees will be planted in the additional preserve area over and above the required 3.47 acres. At least 0.52 acres (not included in the 3.47 acres) will be associated with the native tree plantings.

Rejected Review: Transportation Planning Review Reviewed By: Michael Sawyer Mr. C. James Sabo, AICP RE: PL20170004414, Russell Square RPUD (PUDZ), Review 2 Response July 18, 2018 Page 3 of 7

Email: michaelsawyer@colliergov.net Phone #: (239) 252-2926

Correction Comment 1:

Additional Items that need to be addressed for Transportation Review:

Rev.2: Please see review 1 comment below. Interconnection has not been provided.

Rev.1: Please revise master plan to accommodate the interconnection with Taormina Reserve PUD to the north as briefly discussed at the pre- app meeting. This includes 60-foot total ROW for Sunset Boulevard Extension with sidewalks on both sides of the public access road. Please show this extension on the master plan and provide a developer commitment.

Response:

The applicant does not agree that a vehicular interconnection to the north is warranted. Sunset Boulevard is a private easement and is to be vacated. The potential interconnection commitment time-frame within the Taormina Reserve PUD has expired and there is no longer an interconnection potential to the PUD. Furthermore, there are no existing or anticipated future capacity issues for Santa Barbara. We met with the former Transportation Director in his office to discuss this and he agreed that the County had not done their part to obtain the required easement or R/W for this to happen. Pedestrian interconnection already exists in the Santa Barbara Boulevard right-of-way, which will provide pedestrian access to the Taormina Reserve project.

Correction Comment 2:

Additional Items that need to be addressed for Transportation Review:

Rev.2: Commitment provided for Cope Lane, thank you. Please revise commitment to indicate construction will simply be to county standards.

Rev.1: Please show the construction of Cope Lane to intersection with Sunset Boulevard noted in review one comment above. This should also be noted as a developer commitment.

Response:

Commitment 4.b. has been revised as requested.

Correction Comment 4:

Additional Items that need to be addressed for Transportation Review:

Rev.2: Commitment provided, thank you; however, it does not contain current required language. Please add...."based on the use codes in the ITE Manual on trip generation rates in effect at the time of application for SDP/SDPA or subdivision plat approval."

Mr. C. James Sabo, AICP RE: PL20170004414, Russell Square RPUD (PUDZ), Review 2 Response July 18, 2018 Page 4 of 7

Rev.1: Provide developer commitment for standard trip limit consistent with TIS. **Response:**

Commitment 4.a. has been revised as requested.

Rejected Review: Zoning Review Reviewed By: C. James Sabo, AICP Email: JamesSabo@colliergov.net Phone #: (239) 252-2708

Correction Comment 5:

There have been sign deviations requested. They will be reviewed. Should you have any additional sign deviation requests. Please include them in the response letter.

Not Resolved: Diana Compagnone comments here:

Deviation 1, Please provide a timeframe that can be measured versus a percentage of sales. For example, through December 2020.

Response:

Deviation 1 has been revised to provide an end date.

Deviation 2, Resolved.

Deviation 3, The incorrect code was provided. Please correct the code to 5.06.02 B.14, the deviation requested is nearly 400% greater than is allowed by code. The deviation appears too large for a boundary marker.

Response:

The code section for deviation #3 is correct. Deviation #4 has been corrected to reference the correct code and language.

Rejected Review: County Attorney Review Reviewed By: Heidi Ashton-Cicko Email: heidiashton@colliergov.net Phone #: (239) 252-8773 Correction Comment 3:

Miscellaneous Corrections: According to the survey, Sunset Boulevard bisects this proposed PUD. Please explain why this roadway is removed from the PUD master plan? And please demonstrate that no one has a right of access through this roadway? [6-22-18 no title information was provided]

Response:

A copy of the title commitment and quit claim deed (OR 2275 PG 0285) are provided with this submittal, which shows the ownership and rights to Sunset Boulevard.

Mr. C. James Sabo, AICP RE: PL20170004414, Russell Square RPUD (PUDZ), Review 2 Response July 18, 2018 Page 5 of 7

Correction Comment 4:

Miscellaneous Corrections: See comments and changes dated 6-26-18 on the proposed PUD document, to be provided by the County planner.

Response:

Revisions to the PUD document have been made as requested. The applicant would like to retain note #1 on the Master Plan note sheet as this is our standard language that has been previously approved on other projects.

Rejected Review: Landscape Review Reviewed By: Mark Templeton Email: MarkTempleton@colliergov.net Phone #: (239) 252-2475

Correction Comment 1:

4.06.02. Provide perimeter landscape buffers. See also LDC section 4.06.02 C, Table 2.4.

Buffers are required per code even where they abut preserves on the adjacent parcel. Please remove the phrase "no buffer required" and label these as Type 'B' buffers. Alternatively, deviations may be requested to reduce or remove these buffers. If deviations from the code required buffers are requested, please provide supporting documentation and photos as part of the justification.

Response:

The Master Plan has been revised to show all buffers except where the Taormina Reserve PUD preserve area is adjacent to the Russell Square RPUD. A deviation, #9, has been requested to allow no buffer in this area.

Correction Comment 2:

4.06.02. Provide perimeter landscape buffers. See also LDC section 4.06.02 C, Table 2.4.

For the preserve adjacent to Santa Barbara Blvd, please add the note that the preserve meets buffer requirements after removal of exotics or supplemental planting will be provided to meet buffer requirements. Please provide a 6' wide easement behind the portion of the preserve abutting the amenity center tract to allow for the double row of shrubs that will be required as part of the 'D' buffer if and where parking areas for the amenity center face Santa Barbara Blvd. If multi-family residential is developed north of the amenity center tract and parking is proposed for the multi-family units between the preserve and the building, the double row of shrubs will be required there as well. Otherwise, please request a deviation and provide supporting documentation and photos to verify that the double row hedge is not necessary.

Mr. C. James Sabo, AICP RE: PL20170004414, Russell Square RPUD (PUDZ), Review 2 Response July 18, 2018 Page 6 of 7

Response:

The PUD will comply with the LDC requirements for landscape buffers except where the Taormina Reserve PUD preserve area is adjacent to the Russell Square RPUD. A deviation, #9, has been requested to allow no buffer in this area. Standard language is provided on the Master Plan Note Sheet.

Correction Comment 3:

If a deviation is not requested to remove the buffer where the preserve is shown along the North, please add the note that the preserve meets the buffer requirements after removal of exotics or supplemental planting will be provided to meet buffer requirements and provide the 6' wide easement behind the preserve to accommodate the hedge that is required as part of the 'B' buffer.

Response:

The PUD will comply with the LDC requirements for landscape buffers except where the Taormina Reserve PUD preserve area is adjacent to the Russell Square RPUD. A deviation, #9, has been requested to allow no buffer in this area. Standard language is provided on the Master Plan Note Sheet.

Sue Faulkner, Principal Planner Comprehensive Planning Section, Zoning Division Review of PUD Documents Evaluation Criteria

Several Growth Management Plan references are incorrect and should be modified:

- Page 2, FLUE Policy 5.3 is Policy 5.5
- Page 2, FLUE Policy 5.4 is Policy 5.6
- Page 2, FLUE Policy 5.5 is Policy 5.7
- Page 3 and 6, Transportation Element Policy 5.1 wording in response differs from Element, it is not an impact on the County's AUIR, but "affecting the overall countywide density or intensity of permissible development, with consideration of their impact on the overall County transportation system, and shall not approve any petition or application that would directly access a deficient roadway segment as identified in the current AUIR or if it impacts an adjacent roadway segment that is deficient as identified in the current AUIR..."
- Page 5, FLUE Policy 5.3 is Policy 5.5
- Page 5, FLUE Policy 5.5 is Policy 5.7

Response:

The evaluation criteria has been revised as requested and is included with this submittal.

Mr. C. James Sabo, AICP RE: PL20170004414, Russell Square RPUD (PUDZ), Review 2 Response July 18, 2018 Page 7 of 7

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

Sincerely,

 $\boldsymbol{<}$

D. Wayne Arnold, AICP

c: Neal Communities of Southwest Florida, LLC GradyMinor File