Lee County
Southwest Florida

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

John E. Manning
District One

Cecil L. Pendergrass
District Two

Larry Kiker
District Three

Brian Hamman
District Four

Frank Mann
District Five

Roger Desjarlais
County Manager

Richard Wm. Wesch
County Attorney

Donna Marie Collins
Hearing Examiner

Writer's Direct Dial Number: 239-533-8317

August 3, 2018

ALEXIS CRESPO, AICP
WALDROP ENGINEERING, P.A.
28100 BONITA GRANDE DR
SUITE 305
BONITA SPRINGS, FL 34135

Re: TREELINE 115 MPD
DCI2018-00007 - Major PD

Dear ALEXIS CRESPO, AICP:

The Zoning Section has reviewed the information provided for the above zoning application. The Land Development Code requires additional information for the application to be sufficient. Please respond to each requirement not satisfied on the attached checklists. For your assistance, we have enclosed any additional memoranda from the various Lee County reviewing agencies.

A public hearing date will not be scheduled until a complete application is submitted.

If you do not provide the requested supplements or corrections within 60 calendar days of this letter, the Code requires that this application be considered withdrawn. Please feel free to contact me or the staff reviewers if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
Zoning Section

Electronically signed on 8/3/2018 by
Dirk A Danley Jr, Senior Planner

ALEXIS CRESPO, AICP
WALDROP ENGINEERING, P.A.
Re: TREELINE 115 MPD
DCI2018-00007
August 3, 2018

Zoning Review:

1. Please describe the method of calculating density off of the commercial tracts for residential development.

Planning Review:

1. Staff has reviewed the density calculations and finds the requested number (for multiple family) is right at the maximum allowable density. Based on final design (which could include additional wetland impacts) and an inconsistency found on the MCP the requested density could be over the maximum allowable density.

2. There appears to be an inconsistency on the Master Concept Plan. The Land Use Summary identifies 9.2 acres of commercial area which is in substantial agreement with the density calculations in the application, while the Open Space Summary shows a total of 23.2 acres of commercial area which is not consistent in the density calculations and would result in the project being over the maximum allowable density.

3. Please update the analysis of the Wetlands Future Land Use category to include allowable uses. The current analysis addresses only residential density.

4. Please note, the applicant may be able to request density be calculated from the entire project area based on the concurrent CPA and Lee Plan Policy 11.1.2.

Legal Description Review:

1. The closure ratio of the legal description is 1:868. Must obtain a 1:5,000 ratio to be sufficient. Boundary survey not certified to Lee County.

Environmental Review:

1. Protected Species Survey: Provide a map showing the location of the species that were observed on the site.

2. FLUCCS: Please revise the FLUCCS map to provide the percentage of exotic vegetation found in each FLUCCS on the site. Currently, the FLUCCS indicates "D" and does not indicate a exotic coverage percent. This is important because anything under 75% exotic is considered indigenous and may be used to meet indigenous open space requirements (LDC 10-1).

3. FLUCCS: The FLUCCS map indicates some areas within the preserve to be Pine Flatwood (FLUCCS 411) but the aerial shows open pasture. Please double check the accuracy of the FLUCCS map and remove all areas that do not meet the definition of indigenous (LDC 10-1) from the proposed preserve areas.

4. FLUCCS: The Lee Plan analysis for Policy 1.5 indicates that the isolated wetlands are disturbed by agricultural uses. However, the FLUCCS does not indicate pasture or disturbed FLUCCS codes. Please make sure the the Lee Plan analysis and the supporting documents are consistent.

5. Property Regulations: The property regulations do not indicate what the preserve setbacks will be. LDC 10-415 (b)(1)(c) and the State Fire Code require a 20 foot setback from wetlands and a 30 foot setback from fire dependent communities (i.e. pine flatwood, palmetto prairie, and xeric scrub). Please provide the appropriate setbacks in the property regulations.

6. Open Space: Please provide an open space diagram illustrating the areas used for open space. Please label the individual preserve acreages on the open space diagram. Please label the open space being used to meet the Commercial open space requirements (30%) and the Residential open space requirements (40%).

7. Buffer: A Type D buffer must be provided north of the preserve adjacent to Treeline Avenue. The MCP does not illustrate a dashed 15 foot Type D buffer line in this area.

8. Phasing: If project is planned to be phased, please provide a written statement breaking down the phasing schedule (LDC 34-373). Include the open space, landscaping, indigenous preserves, and surface water management. If not, the indigenous preserves and perimeter buffering will be required to be completed as part of the first development order.

9. Stormwater Management: Typically a perimeter berm is constructed around the perimeter of the development to contain onsite stormwater so that it can be pre-treated before entering into the County's system. This helps with water quality. Please describe and illustrate as part of the stormwater management plan where the perimeter berm will be constructed, show the areas for pre-treatment, and provide this as part of the water quality section within the Lee Plan analysis. Please keep in mind that if the perimeter berm is to be constructed on the property line the indigenous preserve areas may be impacted and could affect the density calculations. Please make appropriate changes to the preserve acreages, density and provide cross sections to illustrate the impacts. If proposed on the inside of the preserve (internal to the project), please provide a cross section to ensure that no impacts to the preserve occur as a result of the construction of the berm.

TIS Review:

1. Trip generation must be based on the combination of the uses shown in the Schedule of Uses on the Master Concept Plan which generates the highest total number of trips during the A.M. and P.M. peak hour of the adjacent street(s). [AC-13-17]

   - The site design parameters that are stated in the TIS do not appear to correspond to the parameters that are stated and/or depicted in the non-TIS submittals. The TIS appears to describe limitations on the number of single family dwelling units and medical office gross floor area, whereas other submittals (including the application and narrative) do not. Please review and revise the TIS (or other submittals) accordingly.

2. Background Traffic. The TIS must contain 100th highest hour traffic for the current year and for the year following the year in which the project is expected to be completed. [AC-13-17]

- The TIS does not appear to identify and use the correct existing traffic volume on at least one link in the analysis. See Treeline Avenue. Please review and revise the TIS accordingly.

- The TIS does not appear to provide the raw unadjusted turning movement counts at the site access to Treeline Avenue, including westbound Dartington Drive trips. Please review and revise the TIS accordingly.

10.) Miscellaneous Items.

- The TIS review is not complete. Review comments are based upon information presented in the TIS in its present form. The TIS reviewer reserves the right to comment on and/or require revisions to any portion of the TIS, whether or not it was part of the original submittal or subsequent revisions, until the TIS has been deemed sufficient for substantive review.