Kimley»Horn

To: Tom Reetz
Senior Planner
City of Stuart Development Department

From: Kevin Roberson, P.E.
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

Date: November 4, 2019

Re: **Stuart Springtree – Stuart, Florida**
RPUD Rezoning and Major Land Use Amendment Review - Engineering

---

Dear Mr. Reetz,

Kimley-Horn has reviewed the submittal of the RPUD Rezoning and Major Land Use Amendment Application and associated documents, dated November 27, 2019, provided to Kimley Horn on December 6, 2019, prepared by HJA Design Studio for the proposed Stuart Springtree development in Stuart, Florida. Please find below our review comments pertaining to the following items listed within the application:

Project Narrative

3. The City will need to comment on the parking providing being less than required.
   Applicant Response: this was discussed and approved with City Staff
   New Comment: Per discussion with Tom Reetz, Staff is aware of the request for less parking than code required, however the Applicant needs to provide justification.

Stormwater Report

8. ICPR post development input data. The stage volume input data for the Dry Retention node does not match the back up data provided.
   New Comment: ICPR data still does not match the stage storage table in the report for Dry detention. Spot checking storage at elevation 18 and 19.5, the combined vertical and linear storage from the report table is 1.16 and 2.21 respectively. The storage in ICPR is 0.76 and 3.32 respectively.
9. ICPR post development input data. The stage volume input data for the Site node at elevation 19.5 does not match the back up data provided.
10. **New Comment: ICPR data still does not match the stage storage table in the report for Site node. Spot checking storage at elevation 19 and 19.5, the combined pavement**

Kimley»Horn

Memorandum

To: Tom Reetz, Senior Planner, City of Stuart
From: Tricia Richter, PLA, ASLA
Date: December 31, 2019
Subject: Stuart Springtree

We have reviewed the additional application materials for the referenced site, provided under a cover letter dated November 27, 2019, and compared it to the requirements in Sections 5.05 Trees and 6.04 Landscaping. The following is a summary of our findings.

Overall:

- Provide proposed sod species and callouts.

LP-2 Landscape Plan

- Required tree credit calculation is incorrect. As per section 6.004.02.A.2, “palm trees may be substituted for any number of the remaining trees provided that two palm trees shall be counted as one tree.” Only for mitigation of removed trees can select palm species be used at a 1:1 ratio. Please revise calculations and provide additional trees to meet the requirements.

LP-5 Landscape Specifications

- Per code 5.05.02.A.e, for every one foot of clear trunk of palm tree exceeding minimum palm tree size per section 6.04.02.A.2, credit will be given for 1” of replacement. Per code 5.05.02.A.1.g, credits towards tree replacements shall be provided only if all required trees are planted at a minimum DBH of 4.5” and all required palms are planted at minimum 14’ clear trunk. Palm calculations are incorrect, please revise.
    - For each palm that does not count towards a required site tree, 4.5” plus an additional 1” for every one foot of clear trunk above the 14’ clear trunk minimum may be counted towards mitigation.
        - For example, a Royal Palm specified at 18’ clear trunk shall count as 4.5” each as they are being planted in addition to the minimum site tree requirements, plus an additional 4” each, totaling 8.5” per palm. The total credit shall be revised to 68 inches.

Kimley»Horn

Memorandum

To: Tom Reetz, Senior Planner, City of Stuart
From: Tom Fucigna, Environmental Scientist
Date: December 9, 2019
Subject: Springtree Major Land Use Amendment and RPUD Rezoning
Second Review Comments

We have reviewed the additional application materials for the referenced site, provided under a cover letter dated November 27, 2019, and compared it to the requirements in Chapter V. Resource Protection Related to Development Standards. The following is a summary of our findings.

Section 5.02.00 **Environmental Assessment Report** – Complete.
The Applicant has provided documentation that requests for information were submitted to the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC) and the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Note: It is understood that the agencies may not respond to such request depending upon work load.

Section 5.03.00 **Wetlands** – Completed previously.

Section 5.04.00 **Environmentally Sensitive Lands** – Completed previously.

Section 5.05.00 **Tree location map and tree survey** - Completed previously.

Section 5.06.00 **Mangrove and Shoreline Protection** – Not applicable. Completed previously.

Section 5.07.00 **Floodplains and Flood Damage Prevention** – Completed previously.

Section 5.08.01 **Martin County Wellfield Protection Ordinance** – Complete.
Specific information regarding compliance with Martin County Wellfield Protection was not provided, but the applicant has stated, on Page 11, Item 7 of their November 27, 2019 response letter that wellfield protection compliance “will be analyzed and provided at the time of site permit.”

Section 5.09.00 **Historic Preservation** – Completed previously.

and Open Space storage from the report table is 7.318 and 10.953 respectively. The storage in ICPR is 7.26 and 10.76 respectively.

Thank you for the opportunity to assist the City of Stuart in reviewing the noted project. Please contact us if you have any questions or need additional information.

Sincerely,

Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.



Kevin M. Roberson, P.E.
Vice President

Kimley»Horn

To: Tom Reetz
Senior Planner
City of Stuart Development Department

From: Nicholas J. Mora, P.E.
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

Alexander R. Memering, E.I.T.
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.

Date: December 18, 2019

Re: **Springtree – City of Stuart, Florida**
2nd Review of Traffic Impact Analysis

Kimley-Horn has reviewed the Traffic Impact Analysis (dated September 2019) prepared by MacKenzie Engineering & Planning, Inc. related to the above-mentioned project. Please find below one additional review comment pertaining to the development's impacts to adjacent transportation facilities.

1. Please revise the HCS analysis for the intersection of US 1 & Gran Park Way as the volumes appear to be incorrect.

Thank you for the opportunity to assist the City of Stuart in reviewing the noted project. Please contact us if you have any questions or need additional information.