



Civil Engineers • Land Surveyors • Planners • Landscape Architects

June 5, 2019

Gilbert Martinez
Principal Planner
Collier County Growth Management Division
2800 N. Horseshoe Drive
Naples, FL 34104

RE: PUDA- PL20180002194, Tree Farm MPUD
Submittal 2

Dear Mr. Martinez:

This correspondence is our formal response to the sufficiency review letter provided to us on March 22, 2019. Responses to staff comments have been provided in **bold**.

Rejected Review: Comprehensive Planning Review
Reviewed By: Sue Faulkner
Email: SueFaulkner@colliergov.net Phone #: (239) 252-5715

Correction Comment 1:

1) Amend Section III to commit to providing no less than 54 DUs (30% of MUAC-derived density) within the C/MU Tract and a maximum of 179 DUs – and note the MPUD cannot exceed 460 DUs.

Response:
Section III has been revised.

Correction Comment 2:

2) Amend Section III to add hotel density of 26 units/acre.

Response:
Section III has not been amended as requested. Section III has been modified to provide that a maximum of 250 hotel rooms will be permitted, which at 26 du/ac over the entire commercial 18.69 acres the PUD would allow 486 hotel units.

Correction Comment 3:

3) Amend Section IV to: a) require all DUs above 281 (the number of DUs derived from the

Urban Residential Subdistrict) to be located within 1/3 mile of the MUAC/C-MU boundary. b) note the MPUD cannot exceed 460 total DUs; replace "460" with a maximum of "406" DUs (281 + 125 DUs allowed to be shifted from MUAC).

Response:

The PUD document has been revised.

Correction Comment 4:

4) Amend the MPUD Master Plan to depict the area within 1/3 mile of the MUAC/C-MU boundary.

Response:

The Master Plan has been revised as requested.

Correction Comment 5:

5) Amend Section VI to require bicycle and pedestrian interconnection between the C-MU and R tracts (required by the MUAC).

Response:

Section VI has been revised as requested.

Correction Comment 6:

6) Amend Statement of Compliance (SOC) #4 to read "Policy 5.6"

Response:

The PUD document has been revised as requested.

Correction Comment 7:

7) Amend SOC #6 to:

- a) Insert "and Mixed Use Activity Center" following "System";
- b) Change "9.85" to "9.86", "9.6" to "9.58", "7.8" to "7.82" (all for format consistency), and "1.79" to "179" and delete the decimal point and two digits following for all figures in the

'Eligible Gross Density' and 'MPUD Gross Density' columns; change "46" DUs to "54."

Response:

The PUD document has been revised as requested.

Correction Comment 8:

8) Amend Section 2.3B and 3.2 to insert "self" for the storage use – to be consistent with

Section 3.3A.2

Response:

PUD document has been revised as requested.

Correction Comment 9:

9) Amend Section 2.3C to replace "434" with "460."

Response:

PUD document has been revised as requested.

Rejected Review: Fire Review

Reviewed By: Daniel Zunzunegui

Email: DanielZunzunegui@colliergov.net Phone #: (239) 252-2310

Correction Comment 1:

This project is within the North Collier Fire Control and Rescue District. Please identify the location and nature of the existing public facilities (fire station) that will service the PUD.

Response:

There are a number of North Collier facilities located along Immokalee Road and Collier Blvd. We are not certain which facility will provide primary service for the PUD.

Rejected Review: Public Utilities - PUED Review

Reviewed By: Eric Fey

Email: EricFey@colliergov.net Phone #: (239) 252-1037

Correction Comment 1:

3/20/2019: A maximum of 434 residential units are identified for approved density in paragraph 2.3 C of the PUD document, whereas 460 units are identified elsewhere in the submitted documents.

Response:

Section 2.3 C of the PUD document has been revised to state "460".

Correction Comment 2:

3/20/2019: Paragraph 4.5 B of the PUD document should be changed to paragraph A since the original paragraph A is being deleted.

Response:

PUD document has been revised as requested.

Rejected Review: Transportation Planning Review

Reviewed By: Michael Sawyer

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

Correction Comment 1:

Rev.1: The TIS provided with this submittal does not meet TIS requirements and full-complete review is not possible. The proposed PUD language allows for up to 460 residential units of varying types including SFDUs, MFDUs, two family attached DUs and townhomes. The TIS analysis for the proposed residential component only considers MFDUs. Using townhomes and/or SFDUs would generate substantially more trips. Revise TIS to 460 units of single family ITE use 210. The additional comments (below) are provided with this review for-as informational-courtesy.

Response:

The Tree Farm PUDA TIS was based on a development scenario that assumed a variety of commercial uses and a maximum of 460 multi-family units. The TIS determined that under this scenario the maximum PM peak-hour two-way net external trips would not exceed 520. As illustrated in the TIS Table 1 – Proposed Development Program, note *, the residential development shall not exceed 226 single-family detached units (LUC 210).**

The development scenario analyzed in the TIS may change, however, the project's estimated trip generation will not exceed the established trip cap.

Correction Comment 2:

Rev.1: Provide methodology meeting notes with the revised TIS.

Response:

Methodology meeting notes have been included as requested.

Correction Comment 3:

Rev.1: The Cover Letter, TIS, and the PUD (in +/- three location) contain various proposed residential developments...none appear fully consistent. Please provide a single consistent proposed residential development. For reference PUD residential lists inconsistency location include but not limited to; page 6 of 29 "Statement of Compliance", 7; page 12 of 29, 2.3.C; page 19 of 29, 4.2. This may or may not be all of the locations that cont

Response:

The TIS was revised to include the following note: "The maximum total daily trip generation for the proposed development shall not exceed 520 two-way PM peak hour net new trips based on the land use codes in the ITE Trip Generation Manual in effect at the time of application for SDP/SDPA or subdivision plat approval."

Correction Comment 4:

Rev.1: Reference PUD, page 28 of 29, Developer Commitments, 6.3 Transportation, J. The proposed trip limit is not accurate-does not reflect the total number of trips proposed by this PUDA. Revise the TIS as requested above and include the revised trip limit in this commitment or revise proposed residential use mix for consistency in all of your documentation including this trip limit commitment.

Response:

Acknowledged.

Rejected Review: County Attorney Review

Reviewed By: Scott Stone

Email: ScottStone@colliergov.net Phone #: (239) 252-5740

Correction Comment 2:

See handwritten markups on proposed PUD text/map changes, to be provided in a separate email from staff.

Response:

Revisions have been made as requested.

Correction Comment 3:

You have submitted a strikethrough/underline of the entire PUD, rather than just the pages you are amending. Please confirm with staff that this is the appropriate format for your PUD Amendment.

Response:

The codified version of the PUD has been provided in strikethrough/underline format.

Correction Comment 4:

It appears you are proposing to remove several pages from the existing approved Master Plan-- including the Aerial Photograph, Conceptual Water Management Plan and Cross Section exhibits. Please explain why. That is not described in your cover letter/narrative.

Response:

A new, legible MPUD Master Concept Plan has been provided. The pages removed are part of the previous Master Plan set, because the Master Plan has been revised to be consistent with current format for PUDs these pages are no longer necessary. The Aerial Photograph, Conceptual Water Management Plan and Cross Section exhibits are not required to be provided in a PUD document. The cross sections are illegible and serve no purpose. A new legible copy of a cross section for Deviation #1 has been prepared and is included in the PUD document.

Correction Comment 5:

Your narrative says you are decreasing retail and office from 120,000 to 80,000 square feet. However, the existing PUD only currently allows 100,000 square feet, so there's a discrepancy there. Also, your proposed text change says a maximum of 80,000 square feet of commercial uses (not just retail and office). I want to make sure the new language matches your intent, so please clarify whether the proposed text change is correct or if your narrative is correct, or otherwise explain what you

Response:

The PUD document has been codified to include HEX No. 2018-12 and HEX No. 2015-42 changes. The reference to decreasing retail and office from 120,000 to 80,000 square feet has been revised to state “decreasing commercial/office uses.....”. The PUD document has been modified to make it clear that the self-storage use is in addition to the retail/office square footages.

Correction Comment 6:

Your narrative indicates you are amending the Master Plan simply to reflect the relocation of a small preserve, as approved by a PUD Minor Change. First, provide a copy of that PUD Minor Change approval. Second, your proposed Master Plan differs greatly from the current approved Master Plan from 2015 (HEX Decision 2015-42). Please explain why you the format, language and appearance of the Master Plan is being changed, if the only thing that should be changing is the location of a small portion of the preserve.

Response:

Please see response to comment 4 above. The Master Plan has been modified to be consistent with HEX No. 2018-12 as well as to be more legible.

- 1. The PUD minor change approval, HEX No. 2018-12, and HEX No. 2015-42 were all provided with submittal 1, see “Submittal 1 17 Original PUD Ordinance.pdf” document.**
- 2. The number of residential dwelling units is proposed to be increased and the current owner no longer uses the firm who prepared the currently approved Master Plan.**

Correction Comment 7:

Your proposed text change includes deletion of the affordable housing developer commitment. However, your narrative/cover letter did not mention this. Did you received approval to remove it by a previous PUD Minor Change? If so, provide a copy of that approval. If not, revise your cover letter/narrative to clearly indicate that you are requesting the removal of the affordable housing developer commitment.

Response:

The cover letter has been updated and is included with submittal 2.

Rejected Review: Zoning Review

Reviewed By: Gilbert Martinez

Email: Gilbert.Martinez@colliercountyfl.gov Phone #: (239) 252-4211

Correction Comment 1:

Comment #1. Revise the MPUD Master Concept Plan to indicate the location of the proposed 105,000 Sq. Ft. Mini-storage facility.

Response:

The PUD has appropriate development standards to ensure compatibility and the identification of the location of the indoor air-conditioned self-storage use is not necessary.

Correction Comment 2:

Comment #2. Provide a boundary survey.

Response:

The PUD boundary is not changing; therefore, a boundary survey is not required.

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

Sincerely,



D. Wayne Arnold, AICP

c: TBC Tree Farm 1, LLC
TBC Tree Farm 2, LLC
Richard D. Yovanovich, Esq.
GradyMinor File