



Civil Engineers • Land Surveyors • Planners • Landscape Architects

July 1, 2019

Corby Schmidt, AICP
Principal Planner
Collier County Growth Management Division
Comprehensive Planning Section
2800 N. Horseshoe Drive
Naples, FL 34104

RE: PL20180003659; Courthouse Shadows GMP Amendment (GMPA)
Review 2 Response, Submittal #3

Dear Mr. Schmidt:

This correspondence is our formal response to the sufficiency review letter provided to us on June 6, 2019. Responses to staff comments have been provided in **bold**.

Rejected Review: County Attorney Review

Reviewed By: Heidi Ashton-Cicko

Email: heidi.ashton@colliercountyfl.gov Phone #: (239) 252-8773

Correction Comment 6:

Your narrative indicates you are proposing 300 multi family apartments on approximately 17.5 acres of the 20.35-acre PUD. Please confirm that this GMP Amendment applies only to the 10-acre portion described and depicted in your application and the proposed AC 16 map change.

Response:

Yes, the GMP amendment only applies to the 10-acre portion described in the application and proposed AC 16 map change.

Correction Comment 8:

Miscellaneous Corrections: The proposed text is confusing and lack's clarity. Please revise it to make it concise.

Response:

The proposed language has been revised as suggested by staff.

Rejected Review: Public Utilities - PUED Review

Reviewed By: Eric Fey

Corby Schmidt, AICP

RE: PUDA-PL20180003659; Courthouse Shadows GMP Amendment (GMPA), Review 2 Response

July 1, 2019

Page 2 of 4

Email: Eric.Fey@colliercountyfl.gov Phone #: (239) 252-1037

Correction Comment 3:

3/19/2019: Non-residential development does not directly facilitate population growth and should not be included in the Level of Service (LOS) calculations for sanitary sewer service. Please revise Exhibit V.E "Public Facilities Level of Service Analysis" accordingly.

6/6/2019: The LOS analysis for sanitary sewer compares existing retail to proposed multi-family and identifies 0.15 gpd/sf as a Collier County LOS standard. Please revise Exhibit V.E to pursuant to my previous comment by eliminating all references to retail.

Response:

Exhibit V.E. has been revised and is included with Submittal #3.

Correction Comment 4:

3/19/2019: At the top of page 2 of Exhibit V.E, please type the words represented by the acronym "EP," and please correct the spelling of "Estimates."

6/6/2019: Please delete the footnote regarding ERC estimates; it is irrelevant.

Response:

Exhibit V.E. has been revised as requested.

Correction Comment 5:

6/6/2019: Please submit a letter of no objection to this petition from the City of Naples Utilities Department.

Response:

A letter of no objection to this petition from the City of Naples Utilities Department is included with Submittal #3.

Rejected Review: Transportation Planning Review

Reviewed By: Michael Sawyer

Email: michael.sawyer@colliercountyfl.gov Phone #: (239) 252-2926

Correction Comment 1:

Rev.2: See rev.1 comment.

Rev.1: The same TIS is used for both this GMPA and the companion PUDA requests; therefore, to avoid potential consistency issues the same comments are provided for this petition as those for the PUDA.

Response:

Acknowledged.

Correction Comment 2:

Rev.2: The Mixed-Use Option will substantially change the trip generation character of the site. The residential portion will effectively eliminate the “shopping center” portion of the site leaving several small commercial out-parcels with higher trip generating uses (per square area) than traditional a “shopping center”. A detailed analysis including specific commercial uses for all parcels (existing and proposed) within the PUD will be required at SDP to confirm the trip cap will not be exceeded.

Response:

The reviewer's suggested methodology is acceptable based upon the understanding that the county established pass-by rates for the individual uses will be used to determine net new trips and a reasonable expectation of shared trips and internal capture can be considered as part of verifying the PUD's net new trips is at or below the adopted trip cap of 662 PM peak hour two-way trips. This methodology will only be used if the residential is developed. Also, the Applicant restates that the new trips generated by the residential units will be substantially less than the displaced 100 KSf of commercial uses.

Rev.1: The TIS and PUD are not consistent. Revise one or the other or both documents for consistent uses-square footage limits-and units. Demonstrate that the total requested development in the PUD is accounted for in the TIS. The TIS is based on a comparison of the Commercial Option Master Plan and the Mixed-use Option Master Plan. The Mixed-use Option scenario includes 300 MFUs and 65 KSF of commercial uses. However, the Mixed-use Option maximum uses are not clearly defined in either the PUDA language. Neither document identifies the maximum area within the PUD that can be converted to mixed-use. The maximum number of multifamily units is identified in Paragraph 1 of Exhibit A; however, it does not restrict which option may include the residential uses.

Response:

The TIS and the PUD document accurately refer to the existing approved PUD land uses (i.e., 165,000 s.f. of commercial) and both documents accurately refer to the proposed amendment to include 300 residential units. If the residential is approved and if developed, then 100,000 s.f. of the total 165,000 s.f. of commercial will be physically displaced, but the land entitlements will remain intact. Furthermore, the adopted PM peak hour trip cap of 662 new two-way PM peak hour trips will ensure that the residential units and 100,000 s.f. of commercial uses cannot co-exist.

Correction Comment 6:

Rev.2: This is a new review comment due to revisions as well as discussions at the NIM. There

is a Road Safety Audit that FDOT completed for the US 41 corridor a few years ago and provided to Kristina Johnson with a contact at FDOT in a series of recent emails. Please make sure that if there are any improvements identified in that plan that you are incorporating them into your PUD-Master Plan.

Response:

The Applicant confirms receipt of FDOT's Road Safety Audit Report and notes that it is public record. As per your request, we coordinated with FDOT on the Safety Audit dated June 2015. Per the enclosed email correspondence with Mark Clark there are two (2) upcoming improvement projects along US-41 however they do not require any improvements or changes that need to be incorporated into the Courthouse Shadows property. Therefore, the proposed PUD amendment and potential to develop residential within the PUD will not affect FDOT's implementation of any or all of the proposed safety improvements.

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

Sincerely,

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

D. Wayne Arnold, AICP

c: Doug Kirby
Rob Sucher
Richard D. Yovanovich
GradyMinor File