



WALDROP ENGINEERING

CIVIL ENGINEERING & LAND DEVELOPMENT CONSULTANTS

28100 BONITA GRANDE DR. #305
BONITA SPRINGS, FL 34135
P: 239-405-7777
F: 239-405-7899

February 26, 2015

Mr. Tony Palermo, AICP
Lee County Department of Community Development
1500 Monroe Street
Fort Myers, FL 33901

**RE: Miromar Lakes MPD/DRI—University Village Phase 1
Final Plan Approval (ADD2014-00213)**

Dear Mr. Palermo:

Enclosed please find responses to Staff's insufficiency comments sent via email on December 12, 2014. The following information has been provided to assist in the review and approval:

1. One (1) copy of the comment response letter;
2. One (1) copy of the revised FPA Plan Set, Sheets 1-3 (24"X36"); and
3. One (1) copy of the revised Schedule of Deviations and Justifications, including Exhibit "A".

The following is a list of Lee County comments with our responses in bold:

LC Development Services Review PD Application Sufficiency Checklist

1. (Deviation #1) DS Staff supports the requested 4:1 excavation slope with the condition that enhanced herbaceous plantings in combination with reinforcing mats are used to stabilize the surface of the slope.

RESPONSE: So noted. Please refer to the revised Schedule of Deviations and Justifications. The Applicant is proposing Turf Reinforcement Mat (TRM) along all 4:1 lake bank slopes in combination with 6,500 +/- herbaceous plants. These enhanced plantings are proposed in addition to the code minimum littoral planting requirements, and the increased littorals to offset the bulkhead shoreline. Sheet 2 of the FPA plan set demonstrates the locations of turf reinforcement mats and the enhanced plantings along all lake bank slopes proposed at the 4:1 slope.

2. (Deviation #2) DS Staff defers this Chapter 34 request to Zoning, however the proposed development is situated on a portion of the site that is undisturbed or encumbered by any existing development and can therefore be safely, successfully and completely developed without benefit of a deviation from the Land Development Code. Furthermore, the applicants justification does not demonstrate an enhancement to the site in accord with 34-377(a)(4).

RESPONSE: So noted. Zoning Staff has expressed support for the proposed reduction to vehicle stacking for the service lanes/drive-thru due to the pedestrian-oriented nature of the development.

3. The DO drawings for University Village identify the multi-family development be provided with roadside trash pickup, which is contrary to Section 10-261 of the LDC (which requires dumpsters). I don't see an approved deviation in Z-13-020 for this. Can this be made a part of the FPA?

Response: Trash/solid waste disposal facilities will be provided for the multi-family residential development via centralized garbage containers/receptacles, labeled on Sheet 2 of the FPA plan set as "Dumpster". Curb-side pickup is not proposed and the project will comply with the requirements set forth in LDC Section 10-261.

Please note employees of the proposed student housing facility will facilitate the delivery of refuse/solid waste from the multi-family residential development to the dumpster enclosure area as part of the operational format dictated by the student housing developer. However, the solid waste service provider will only be responsible for trash pick-up from the dumpster locations as shown.

LC Environmental Sciences PD Application Checklist – Sufficiency Checklist

1. Please note the northernmost finger portion of the lake indicates 115 LF of bulkhead near pavilion but depicts turf reinforcement mat as per legend. Please revise for consistency.

Response: The 115 LF of bulkhead label has been removed per the above comment. This portion of the lake bank will have a 4:1 slope in accordance with proposed Deviation No. 1.

2. Please revise to label all proposed bulkhead (TYP) with proposed linear footage.

RESPONSE: Please refer to Sheet 2 of the revised FPA plan set. All bulkhead has been labeled with the proposed linear footage per section.

3. Please revise Deviation request #1 and associated lake cross sections with turf reinforcement mat to provide details on the proposed # and spacing of enhanced littorals.

RESPONSE: Please refer to the revised Schedule of Deviations and Justifications, which provides a calculation of proposed herbaceous planting enhancements. Additionally, Sheet 3 of the FPA plan set demonstrates the revised 4:1 lake cross section with locations of TRM and enhanced plantings.

4. Please revise deviation request #4 to provide linear footage of entire lake and linear footage of all bulkhead. Please note the justification states that bulkhead is needed for pedestrian bridge crossing, please also address why needed in amenity and pedestrian plaza area.

Response: Deviation #4 regarding hardened shoreline has been removed, and the proposed deviations have been renumbered accordingly. Proposed bulkhead shoreline will not exceed 20% of total shoreline in accordance with the LDC. The bulkhead is proposed to enhance the amenity area, including the resort-style pool, as shown on Sheet 2 of the revised plan set.

5. Please revise deviation request #4 and associated cross section to indicate and provide details of proposed compensatory littoral zone as per LDC 10-418(3). What littorals are proposed for the 5-foot shelf at 6-feet below control elevation?

Response: Please see above response. Deviation #4 regarding hardened shoreline has been removed and the proposed deviations have been renumbered accordingly.

6. Is the Future FGCU South Blvd going to be a public road? If so then ES staff recommends that the shrub requirement is not eliminated but clustered in a manner to allow for pedestrian movement. If not, then a deviation is not needed from LDC Section 10-416(d)(3).

Response: Please refer to the revised Schedule of Deviations and Justifications. As discussed during the meeting with Staff on January 21, 2015, the Applicant has withdrawn the request for omission of the double hedgerow. The deviation has been revised to request the clustering of required shrub material, with 18 shrubs per 100 lineal feet of buffer.

7. Please revise plan to label the entire required Type D buffer along Ben Hill Griffin Pkwy.

Response: Please refer to Sheet 2 of the revised FPA plan set. The Type "D" buffer along Ben Hill Griffin Parkway is labeled.

8. Please note any improvements proposed in the FPA boundary require perimeter buffer to be provided. Please revise site plan to indicate.

Response: Please refer to proposed Deviation No. 4. The Applicant is seeking alternative timing for the installation of the Estero Parkway right-of-way buffer until FPA and local Development Order are approved for the "C-S" parcel at the northeast corner of Ben Hill Griffin Parkway and Estero Parkway. Condition 32 of Resolution Z-13-020 sets forth different buffer requirements depending upon the use of the property and site configuration. The areas proposed for vertical construction will be buffered from the future Estero Parkway right-of-way via the internal roadway buffers, as outlined in the enclosed justification.

9. Are any landscape strips proposed along the internal roads or medians?

Response: No.

10. Please explain why the legal description and boundary of 118.09 acres differs from the FPA Phase 1 site plan boundary of 60.39 acres.

Response: Please refer to the revised Phase I Land Use Summary Table on Sheet 3 of the FPA plan set. The table has been revised to provide the following breakdown of acreage:

- Total FPA area is 118.09 acres to align with the Development Order boundary per DOS2014-00094.
- 61.61 acres are within the FPA development area labeled on sheet 2 of the FPA plan set.
- 4.0 acres consists of the FGCU South Blvd. right-of-way easement.
- 52.48 acres are labeled as “Future Development” areas. The FPA and DO are proposed for the entire 118.09 acres to allow for clearing, filling and other temporary permitted uses within the Future Development areas prior to vertical construction.

The Applicant is amenable to a condition that addresses the requirement for subsequent Final Plan Approval(s) prior to vertical construction within those areas labeled as “Future Development” to ensure that the development is in compliance with all conditions of Z-13-020 and the Land Development Code, where applicable.

11. Please explain the difference in the “Future Development” area labeled within the FPA boundary and the “Future Development Area 53.70 acres” indicated in the Land Use Summary Table.

Response: Please refer to the revised FPA plan set. The areas labeled “Future Development” on Sheet 2 total 52.48 acres of the overall 118.09-acre FPA boundary.

12. Why is “Future Development” labeled on a Final Plan Approval? This area does not meet Z-13-020 Condition 1.c. & d. requirements. Why is this area included in the FPA boundary when no vertical development is proposed in phase 1? What is proposed in the “Future Development” area during Phase 1?

Response: Please refer to the above responses. No vertical construction is proposed within the “Future Development” area. These areas have been included to allow for clearing, filling, and temporary uses and infrastructure.

13. Please revise Land Summary to indicate the open space requirement per Z-13-020.

Response: Please refer to Sheet 3 of the revised FPA plan set. The Open Space Table demonstrates the minimum required and provided open space for the FPA

development area. An updated tabulation will be provided at the time of FPA for those areas labeled "Future Development Area".

14. Please revise Land Summary Note (1) to reference Deviation #16.

Response: Please refer to Sheet 3 of the revised FPA plan set. Note (1) has been revised to include reference to Deviation #16.

Please note the Applicant has added proposed Deviation 5 to the revised Schedule of Deviations and Justifications and Sheets 2 and 3 of the FPA plan set to address alternative building perimeter plantings, as discussed during the Applicant's meeting with Staff on January 21, 2015.

If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me directly at (239) 405-7777 ext. 207, or alexisc@waldropengineering.com.

Sincerely,

WALDROP ENGINEERING, P.A.



Alexis V. Crespo, AICP, LEED AP
Principal Planner

Enclosures

cc: Michael Elgin, Miromar Development