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

August 24, 2018

Tina M. Ekblad, MPA, AICP, LEED AP
Morris-Depew and Associates, Inc.
2914 Cleveland Avenue
Fort Myers, FL 33901

RE: Application for Major Planned Development Amendment
DCI2018-00018
Portico RPD

Dear Ms. Ekblad:

The Zoning Section has reviewed the submission package for the above-referenced zoning application in accordance with the submittal requirements contained in Sections 34-201 through 34-203 and 34-373 of the Land Development Code (LDC). Please be advised that the application remains insufficient at this time. The following items must be addressed prior to the application being deemed sufficient for public hearing:

1. **Master Concept Plan (MCP)**

   a. Sheet X-106 of the MCP (Open Space Plan) is in need of further revisions to demonstrate compliance with certain conditions of Resolution Z-04-080 and the required open space associated with the proposed Planned Development amendment. Please revise the open space plan as follows:

      i. The table depicted on the Open Space Plan remains unclear. It appears the table is organized to include the amenity area, lakes, and wetland N under "Other Open Space"; however, the calculations suggest that each of these areas contributes to the overall calculation of open space. Please revise the table for clarity accordingly.

      ii. Condition 12 of Resolution Z-04-080 requires 8.67 acres of overall open space and 6.62 acres of indigenous preservation within the Townhouse tract. Please revise the open space plan to label the open space in the Townhouse tract to demonstrate compliance with this condition.

      iii. Please label the upland tract acreages on the open space plan to demonstrate compliance with the 8.56 acres of uplands calculated in the open space table.

      iv. Please clarify whether the proposed amendment complies with Condition 12 of Z-04-080 given the lot size changes proposed by this amendment.

Staff recommends scheduling a meeting to further discuss the open space plan for the development.

b. Please revise Sheets X-101 and X-102 of the MCP to show the general location and extent of the COP area depicted on Sheet X-108 to provide additional context relative to the COP area.

c. Cross Section E (Typical Section for Deviation 2) may no longer be required since Typical Section O (Lake Bank Slope Typical) on Sheet X-108 of the MCP depicts the required lake maintenance easements. Please review and revise accordingly.

d. Please revise the Flow Splitter Configuration Plan View details on Sheet X-108 of the MCP to provide road dimensions inside the traffic circle as consistent with the detail approved by Resolution Z-04-080. The revised details provide dimensions outside of the splitter area, but not inside the splitter area.

e. Please revise the Flow Splitter Configuration Plan View detail for the Two-Family Attached road configuration to depict the common lot line between the two-family attached dwelling units. The revised detail depicts only driveway locations and not the common lot line.

f. Please revise Cross Section O (Lake Bank Slope Typical) on Sheet X-108 of the MCP to note that the 10-foot drainage easement depicted on the cross section is a minimum easement width.

2. <u>Schedule of Uses and Property Development Regulations</u>

a. Please revise the property development regulations to note accessory structure side, rear, and waterbody setbacks, as well as building separation regulations as approved by Resolution Z-04-080.

b. Please revise the property development regulations to include a footnote regarding the 25-foot setback to fire dependent indigenous plant communities requested by Deviation 15.

c. Please revise the property development regulations to add a footnote requiring a minimum 10-foot rear setback for lots impacted by Deviation 17 to be consistent with note 2 of Cross Section O (Lake Bank Slope Typical) on Sheet X-108 of the MCP.

3. <u>Schedule of Deviations</u>

a. Deviation 15 is being requested to allow the setback dimensions approved through the platting process to remain. It is unclear as to what setback is being provided. LDC Section 10-415(b)(1)(c) requires a 20-foot setback from a non-fire dependent preserve (wetland) and a 30-foot setback from a fire dependent preserve (uplands). The request transposes the setback requirements and references Tract G, which is not labeled on the MCP documents. Please revise the MCP to indicate the areas that will not meet the setback requirements, annotate the dimensions that will be provided, and label Tract G. Please also provide verification from the Fire Marshal in support of the deviation.

b. Deviation 18 must provide more specificity. Enhancements must be provided for lakes that will not meet the 20-foot planted littoral shelf (PLS) requirement of Section 10-418(2) of the LDC. Currently, the request states a 12-foot-wide PLS will be provided and will contain littoral plantings in accordance with LDC requirements. LDC 10-418(d)(2) bases the calculation of the required quantity of the littoral plantings on a 20-foot-wide littoral shelf along 25 percent of the lake. The deviation request indicates that more than 25 percent of the lake will be covered, but does not provide an exact percentage of coverage. Please revise the request to provide a calculation quantifying the amount of littorals to be provided. The quantity of proposed littoral plantings should exceed Code requirements to meet the deviation criteria in LDC Section 34-373(a)(9) and should be based upon based on the 20-foot-wide PLS.

4. Survey and Legal Description

a. The legal description within the title certification contains less and except language that is not consistent with the sketch and legal description and boundary survey that has been submitted. The legal description must match within all three documents. Additionally, the boundary survey must be updated to reflect that it is based upon the title certification document.

5. Traffic Impact Statement (TIS)

a. The TIS must contain a general description of each type of use proposed, the units of development (i.e. the number of dwelling units, square feet of building floor area, etc.) and the Land Use Code for each type of use utilized in the trip generation (i.e. single-family detached housing (200 lots), Land Use Code 210).

b. 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 non-TIS submittals for this case appear to indicate that a maximum of 1,600 single family dwelling units may be permitted. Please provide a condition for this case that clearly states the permitted maximum number of single-family, multifamily, and total dwelling units for the site that agrees with the values considered in the TIS.

c. The TIS must contain an analysis of the Level of Service for each of the project's access points and all intersections within one-quarter mile of the project. The analysis must follow the methods established in the most current edition of the Highway Capacity Manual for either signalized or unsignalized intersections.

d. The number trips for each southbound movement as considered in Exhibit 10A and the corresponding AM peak hour LOS analysis for the intersection of Buckingham Road and Orange River Boulevard under 2027 build-out conditions appears incorrect. Please review and revise the TIS accordingly.

e. The TIS does not appear to contain a LOS analysis for each of the project's access points during the AM/PM peak hours under background traffic

conditions in the year following estimated project build-out. Please review and revise the TIS accordingly.

6. **Other**

   a. The subject property is located in the Caloosahatchee Shores and Buckingham Planning Communities as established by the Lee Plan. The Lee Plan requires owners or agents requesting zoning actions in these planning communities to hold an advertised public information session to provide an overview of the request and to provide an opportunity for public comment. The Lee Plan also requires the submission of a meeting summary document describing the date, time, and location of the meeting and summarizing the comments received over the course of the meeting prior to a finding of sufficiency. Please provide the required meeting summary documents for each public information session.

Please respond to the enclosed sufficiency review comments within sixty (60) calendar days of the date of this letter. This application will be considered withdrawn if no response is received within this timeframe.

Please feel free to contact me at (239) 533-8786 or ARodriguez4@leegov.com if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
Zoning Section

Anthony R. Rodriguez, AICP
Principal Planner

ARR