



Civil Engineers • Land Surveyors • Planners • Landscape Architects

March 12, 2019

Ms. Nancy Gundlach
Principal Planner
Collier County Growth Management Division
2800 N. Horseshoe Drive
Naples, FL 34104

**RE: Review Letter 4 Response: Planned Unit Development Rezone
PL20170000768, Baumgarten PUD (PUDR)**

Dear Ms. Gundlach:

This correspondence is our formal response to the sufficiency review letter provided to us on March 7, 2019. Responses to staff comments have been provided in **bold**.

Rejected Review: Public Utilities - PUED Review
Reviewed By: Eric Fey
Email: EricFey@colliergov.net Phone #: (239) 252-1037

Correction Comment 1:

9/13/2017: Estimate the total population to be served based on an occupancy of 2.5 people per dwelling unit and an equivalency of one person per 100 gpd of average daily wastewater flow for non-residential. Estimate average daily wastewater flow per Part 2 of the Design Criteria, assuming 250 gpd per dwelling unit and per Table I of F.A.C. 64E-6.008 for non-residential. Estimate average daily water demand as 1.4 (ERC ratio of 350:250) times the average daily wastewater flow. Estimate the peak daily water demand using a peaking factor of 1.35 per our 2014 Master Plan. Estimate peak daily wastewater flow likewise. Revise the Statement of Utility Provisions accordingly.

10/5/2018: The demand/flow estimates are mostly correct for the scenarios evaluated, but this comment remains outstanding, pending Transportation Planning approval of the scenarios presented in the TIS. Note however that the calculation for fast food restaurants could be reduced from 40 GPD to 20 or 35 GPD per seat (single service articles only), depending on the anticipated hours of operation.

1/23/2019: The average daily flow of 14,000 GPD you calculated for the hotel use is for

wastewater; the average daily demand for potable water is 1.4 times this number (i.e. 19,600 GPD). Also, the proposed medical office use is missing from your summary tabulation. Revise your Statement of Utility Provisions form and the attached calculations accordingly. This comment will remain outstanding, pending Transportation Planning approval of the development scenario presented in the TIS.

3/6/2019: This comment will remain outstanding, pending Transportation Planning approval of the development scenario presented in the TIS. (See correction 1 from Transportation Planning.)

Response:

Acknowledged.

Correction Comment 2:

9/13/2017: At numerous places within the evaluation criteria (Exhibit 3), you assert that the existing wastewater transmission system has capacity for the project. This is not accurate. The existing force main along Immokalee Road is presently stressed, but completion of new force main extensions to serve proposed developments in the northeast wastewater service area will create additional transmission capacity. Capacity will be confirmed at the time of development permit review. Please revise Exhibit 3 accordingly, and contact Craig Pajer (CraigPajer@colliergov.net) for more specific information on wastewater system capacity.

10/5/2018: The text revisions did not address the comment.

1/23/2019: The previously reported flows were incorrect, and you did not provide a copy of the email referenced in your response. Submit the correct flow to Craig Pajer and get confirmation from him that the wastewater transmission system can handle the design peak hour flow. Include a copy of his response in your resubmittal.

3/6/2019: The wastewater transmission system must be able to handle pumped flow equal to or greater than the design peak hour flow, which was not reported in the 1/31/2019 email from Dan Waters to Craig Pajer. Per the wastewater flow calculation workbook attached to my email on 3/1/2019, the peak hour flow is 452 gpm. Please confirm with Mike Stevens, our new principal project manager for wastewater, that our wastewater transmission system can handle the design peak hour flow.

Response:

Please see 3/7/2019 email from Craig Pajer included with this submittal.

Correction Comment 3:

9/20/2017: There is not an existing dead-end water main on Cortona Way. CCPU intends to complete the loop connection within the existing ROW/CUE in Tuscany Cove but is not required

to do so. A 15' CUE is required for the stub-out to the property line. Please revise the proposed language for commitment 3.a as follows: "As part of the subdivision plat approval for the PUD, the owner shall provide a water main stub-out to the southern property line of the PUD, near the north end of the unnamed roadway spur west of 15485 Cortona Way, in a location determined by the Owner and approved by the County. A County Utility Easement shall be conveyed to the County at no cost to the County for the water main stub-out and shall be shown on the recorded plat or recorded by separate instrument prior to preliminary acceptance of utilities. The stub-out shall be sized to supply fire flow to the PUD under maximum day conditions, as required by Collier County Design Criteria in the Collier County Water-Sewer District Utilities Standards Manual, as adopted by Ord. 2004-31, as amended, and as further amended by Resolution No. 2014-258, or its successor resolution. This stub-out will not be required if the residential tract is master metered."

10/5/2018: Your response is a false statement. The requested language was modified in three places: 1) The words, "the residential portion of," were added to the first sentence. This change is acceptable.

2) The words, "near the north end of the unnamed roadway spur west of 15485 Cortona Way," were changed to, "at the interconnect location shown on the PUD Master Plan." This change would be acceptable if the above-described location were shown on the PUD. Potential egress is shown at this location, but no water main loop connection is identified.

3) The words "conveyed to the County at no cost to," were changed to, "made available for purchase by." This change is unacceptable. The loop connection is required for the proposed development pursuant to the CCWSD Utilities Standards Manual, Section 1 - Design Criteria, subsection 2.2.1.

1/23/2019: Change the words "made available" to "granted" in both commitments (3.a and 3.b).

3/6/2019: Commitment 3a ends with the statement, "This stub-out will not be required if the residential tract is master metered." This statement is missing from commitment 3b.

Understand that if you exclude this statement, the stub-out will be required regardless of whether the residential tract is master metered. I have no objection to adding this statement to commitment 3b.

Response:

Commitment 3b has been revised as requested.

Correction Comment 4:

3/6/2019: The potential full interconnect with Bent Creek does not align with the internal roadway through the activity center and does not correspond with the actual location of Glenforest Dr, which is approximately 720 feet south of the northeast property corner. Either get confirmation from Transportation Planning that the master plan is acceptable with this

discrepancy or realign the internal roadway, which could affect the location and geometry of the residential tract, which in turn could affect correction 3 above.

Correction Comment 5:

3/6/2019: Preliminary site plan and subdivision plat exhibits reviewed at the pre-application meetings for the plans-and-plat permit (PPL-PL20190000344), and the site development plan permit for the proposed apartment complex (SDP-PL20190000132) show a single residential tract occupying more area than you depict on your PUD master plan, which shows two residential tracts separated by a lake. Revise the acreages in the site summary on page 2 of Exhibit C or provide confirmation from Nancy Gundlach that the discrepancy does not require correction.

Response:

The Master Plan is conceptual and requires no revisions.

Rejected Review: Transportation Planning Review

Reviewed By: Michael Sawyer

Email: Michael.Sawyer@colliercountyfl.gov Phone #: (239) 252-2926

Correction Comment 1:

Additional Items that need to be addressed for Transportation Review:

Rev.4: Inconsistency remains. Provide consistent uses and square footage calculations-limitations.

Rev.3: There remain inconsistencies between the PUD and TIS. The TIS states that there are now two scenarios; however these appear to be the same "scenario" except the second includes internal capture? Please explain why-how this is a separate scenario. Additionally, the square footage calculations are not consistent: TIS is at 201,000 sf commercial, and PUD is at 370,000 on page one and/or at 228,000 on page 9. Select a sf amount and provide consistently.

Rev.2: This comment has not been addressed. PUD and TIS are not consistent with the TIS now proposing three separate scenarios, development totals, and master plan instead of the previous two and all three are not consistent with the PUD. Revise the entire TIS to be consistent with the now new proposed development containing 400 residential dwelling units, 370,000 sf commercial uses, and 140 hotel-motel rooms. Revise the PUD as needed as well for consistency.

Rev.1: Revise the application (PUD doc and TIS) to provide a consistent submittal. The TIS contains two separate proposed scenarios both inconsistent with the PUD doc (also appears the school impact analysis is not consistent). Various commercial square footages are provided as well as dwelling unit counts. Without a consistent submittal, a full review is not possible. If two

scenarios remain part of the TIS please make sure both accounts for the total development requested in the PUD doc or have a consistent scenario requested and clearly outlined in the PUD doc.

Response:

Language has been added to the TIS to explain how the scenario was chosen to establish the Trip Cap.

Correction Comment 2:

Additional Items that need to be addressed for Transportation Review:

Rev.4: Master Plans remain inconsistent. There are three now provided none of which match any of the others. In an effort to gain consistency each is outlined below. For the most part, the PUD master plan and the second TIS master plan are similar except as noted below.

A). Master Plan provided in with the PUD, Exhibit C dated 2-1-19'. There is no notation provided for the northern most/potential inconnection to Bent Tree Preserve (similar to the first TIS master plan Exhibit C dated 11-26-18). There is also a note and arrow on this master plan that is not on the second TIS master plan dated 2-1-19, the note indicates "Access points do not line up with each other or with the existing roadway in the neighboring development." Please explain this note. Regarding the west ingress now proposed on Immokalee, please revise to show a radius instead of straight line access point to avoid confusion-questions moving forward. Please also note that a turn lane will also be required with compensating ROW.

B). First Master Plan provided with the TIS, Exhibit C dated 11-26-18. It's likely this was included in error however it is intended please explain why and revise to be consistent.

C). Second Master Plan provided with the TIS, Exhibit C dated 2-1-19. Please note the consistency comments above specifically the "Access points do not line up..." and the northern most interconnection note to Bent Tree.

Rev.3: Master plans are now much more consistent however the TIS does not show the additional second potential interconnection to Bent Creek south of your internal roadway that ends at the eastern property line (which is labeled interconnection on the TIS but not on the PUD master plan). Please revise both master plans to include both Ingress as well as Egress at all interconnections. Also, revise both master plan to be consistent with other review comments (including not limited to removing the west access on Immokalee).

Rev.2: Comment not addressed, see also review 2 comments above regarding consistent PUD and TIS documents. Master Plans now have four completely different versions.

Rev.1: Revise the TIS and PUD master plans to provide a consistent request. The TIS master plan is not readable; please revise. On the TIS master plan, the second access is not clearly shown and the PUD master plan does not show both access locations...is not consistent. There are numerous other inconsistent elements on the master plan; please decide which version is

proposed and consistently incorporate into the full submittal package.

Response:

The Master Plan in the TIS now matches the PUD Master Plan.

Correction Comment 3:

Additional Items that need to be addressed for Transportation Operations Review:

Rev.4: DCA still remains outstanding. Staff understands it is nearly complete; however comment remains.

Rev.3: This item-issue will be part of the companion DCA for this petition. Comment remains until completion of the DCA including CAO review. Because the DCA will address this access, please remove the current intersection-signal information and data-justification from the TIS to avoid confusion. However, instead please provide a full traffic simulation (using VISSIM) of the two intersections at Immokalee Road and the proposed new access signal, to ensure that the closely space intersections can be operated without significant impacts to traffic flow and safety. The traffic operations analysis submitted for the proposed signal on Collier Blvd. has the following issues that need to be addressed in the simulation:

A.The 95th percentile queues for the SB through during the AM peak are reported as 801 feet and 520 feet for the AM and PM peaks respectively. The 50th percentile queues are reported as 583 feet and 405 feet for the AM and PM peaks respectively. The distance between the proposed intersection and the existing intersection at Immokalee Road (measured center to center) is only 1100 feet. It is likely that the proposed intersection design will result in less than 950 feet between the SB stop and the crosswalk on the south side of the intersection at Immokalee Road.

B. The 95th percentile queues for the NB left turn lane are reported as 221 feet and 402 feet during the AM and PM peaks respectively. The 50th percentile queues are reported as 114 feet and 203 feet during the AM and PM peaks respectively. The length of the existing NB left turn lane is 335 feet including taper. Assuming a deceleration length of 240 feet, there is only 95 feet available for storage. There is no room to extend the length due to SB left turn lane at Tuscany Cove Drive.

C.The 95th percentile queues for the SB left turn lane are reported as 76 feet and 116 feet during the AM and PM peaks respectively. The 50th percentile queues are reported as 38 feet and 52 feet during the AM and PM peaks respectively. The maximum length available for a SB left turn lane is 340 feet. Assuming a deceleration length of 240 feet, there is only 100 feet available for storage. The maximum length is constrained by the existing NB triple left turn at Immokalee Road.

Rev.2: Reference TIS, page 17, 18, 19, 20...Staff will accept a right-in/right-out/left-in configuration. The full median opening and proposed traffic signal do not meet access

management standards (see specifics below), will negatively impact traffic operations and increase congestion along Collier Boulevard. Revise the Master Plan and all traffic distribution volumes/analyses accordingly. The Synchro analyses provided for the proposed access do not indicate how the two closely spaced intersections would be coordinated. The geometry used in the Synchro analyses shows combined right-through and exclusive left-turn lanes for the eastbound and westbound approaches. However the text on Page 19 of the TIS indicates that the east/west geometry would consist of combined left-through and exclusive right-turn lanes. Access management: The requested full opening is approximately 0.19 miles from the crosswalk at Immokalee and Collier which is below the smallest allowable distance in the access management policy of 0.25 for lower classification of roadway which would normally be 0.5 miles. Given the extra conflict present with the three approach turn lanes as proposed staff does not agree with the TIS findings.

Rev.1: Reference TIS, page 14, Site Access Turn Lane Analysis. Connections to the subject site, Collier Boulevard (CR951). Staff does not support the proposed full opening. Staff will support a right in/out and left in condition. The proposed full opening is not reasonable and will increase (NOT decrease) the existing traffic congestion at this location. Revise this portion of the TIS and applicable calculations/analysis. Also revise PUD Exhibit 3 Evaluation Criteria, page 7 of 13 and all other PUD references to this same access location-issue.

Response:

Comment acknowledged.

Correction Comment 4:

Additional Items that need to be addressed for Transportation Operations Review:

Rev.4: Staff now agrees that an ingress access at this location can be approved however note requested change on the master plan to show a radius access point to better show intended ingress only limitation, as well as turn lane, also noted above.

Rev.3: Comment not addressed for the reasons outlined below and in follow-up meeting discussions, please remove this access.

Rev.2: Comment not addressed due to multiple different master plans in the PUD and TIS. Staff remains opposed to the west access located on Immokalee in the dual right turn lanes for east bound Immokalee from north bound Collier. The existing turn lanes at this location already have a high accident rate, further conflicts on Immokalee remains problematic and a safety concern...please remove this access.

Rev.1: Reference TIS, page 14 and 15, Site Access Analysis, Immokalee Road, "West access." Staff does not agree with this additional proposed access which is not clearly shown on any master plan (shown on TIS master plan but is not clear/readable/easily missed and not shown

on the PUD master plan). The existing dual right turn lanes on 951 for east bound Immokalee is currently problematic plus likely right out lane jumping to use U-turn movement at Goodland Bay Drive cause too many potential conflicts-safety concerns.

Response:

It would be more appropriate for staff to write a condition of approval regarding the appropriate radius for the right-in only access point than to show a radius on the conceptual PUD Master Plan.

Correction Comment 5:

Additional Items that need to be addressed for Transportation Review:

Rev.4: Comment remains because of remaining work efforts on the DCA.

Rev.3: It is now staff's understanding based on new commitments that this item-issue WILL be part of the companion DCA for this petition. Comment remains only until completion of the DCA including CAO review.

Rev.2: Comment remains. Additionally, staff does not see a clear reason for a DCA for this development and believe developer comments will address requirements. Please provide a previously requested.

Rev.1: Provide a developer commitment to accept ROW stormwater for the future overpass interchange at the intersection of Immokalee and Collier Boulevard as discussed at the pre-application meeting. Please discuss specific language with staff including CAO.

Response:

This is an item that is in the business points provided to the County Attorney for inclusion in the Developer Agreement.

Correction Comment 6:

Additional Items that need to be addressed for Transportation Review:

Rev.4: Comment remains because of remaining work efforts on the DCA.

Rev.3: It is now staffs understanding based on new commitments that this item-issue WILL be part of the companion DCA for this petition. Comment remains only until completion of the DCA including CAO review.

Rev.2: Comment remains. Additionally, staff does not see a clear reason for a DCA for this development and believe developer comments will address requirements. Please provide a previously requested.

Rev.1: Provide a developer commitment that acknowledges the potential future overpass interchange at the intersection of Immokalee and Collier Boulevard including no harm/future business damages for Collier County. Please discuss specific language with staff including CAO.

Response:

Acknowledged.

Rejected Review: Zoning Review

Reviewed By: Nancy Gundlach

Email: Nancy.Gundlach@colliercountyfl.gov Phone #: (239) 252-2484

Note: Theses review comments are based upon PUD Document dated March 1, 2019.

Correction Comment 12:

Exhibit A- Amenities not located within a residential building: Please provide the following principal setbacks:

- o Minimum lot area
- o Minimum lot width
- o Minimum lot depth
- o Minimum distance between buildings
- o Minimum floor area
- o Waterbody setback

Please rename "Amenities not located within a residential building" to "Stand-alone Amenity Sites."

Response:

This section has been reformatted based on our March 8, 2019 teleconference with Nancy Gundlach and Heidi Ashton-Cicko.

Correction Comment 14:

Exhibit C, Master Plan: Show the location of the (stand alone) Amenity Center(s) on the Master Plan.

Response:

As discussed, we do not know the exact location of amenities that is why we have development standards. It is possible that amenities may be located within residential buildings.

Correction Comment 15:

Exhibit F - Commitment 5. Planning 1.: Remove it as it is not a commitment, but a deviation from parking requirements and there is not enough information to evaluate the deviation.

Response:

The PUD has been revised to remove this commitment.

Correction Comment 17:

Please add a Legend to the Master Plan. Define "R," "MU" (Mixed-use) and "A" (Amenity Center).

Response:

Please see "Site Summary" on Exhibit C, Master Plan Notes.

Correction Comment 18:

Exhibit E, Deviations:

Deviation 3: Change the word "limits" to "allows."

Response:

Exhibit E has been revised as requested.

Correction Comment 19:

Please include only the Master Plan that is in the PUD Document in the TIS.

Response:

The TIS has been revised to include on the Master Plan in the PUD document.

Correction Comment 22:

PUD Exhibit B, Development Standards and PUD Exhibit C, Master Plan. Provide a 25-foot residential setback limited to one-story from Bent Creek and Tuscany Cove property boundaries. The setback for taller buildings shall be at a 1:1 ratio. (For example, a 60-foot tall building shall be located 60 feet from the property line.)

Another option is to include the Master Plan that depicts the lakes along the southern property boundary.

Response:

We agree to disagree and believe the 50' PUD boundary setback is appropriate for the residential dwellings.

Correction Comment 24:

Exhibit B, Permitted Uses: Relocate the Amenity Area Land Uses to Exhibit A: Permitted Land Uses.

Response:

The PUD document has been revised as requested.

Correction Comment 25:

Please see attached Zoning red-lines.

Response:

Revisions have been made per County Attorney and staff markups.

Rejected Review: County Attorney Review

Reviewed By: Heidi Ashton-Cicko

Email: Heidi.Ashton@colliercountyfl.gov Phone #: (239) 252-8773

Correction Comment 1:

Miscellaneous Corrections: Please see changes to PUD document from my 3-4-19 review, to be provided by the planner.

Response:

Revisions have been made per County Attorney markups.

Correction Comment:

Please provide an affidavit of representation and affidavit of unified control from Tree Plateau Co, Inc.

Response:

The Covenant of Unified Control was previously included with submittal 1 and was emailed to Heidi Ashton-Cicko on March 8, 2019.

Please contact either Richard Yovanovich at 435-3535 or me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

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

D. Wayne Arnold, AICP

Enclosures

Cc: David Genson
Eric Mallory
Richard D. Yovanovich
GradyMinor File