Landscape Architects ■ Planners ■ Environmental Consultants

LC-0000177

GENTILE | GLAS | HOLLOWAY | O'MAHONEY & Associates, Inc.

George G. Gentile FASLA
M. Troy Holloway ASLA
Emily M. O'Mahoney FASLA
Dodi Buckmaster Glas AICP

April 6, 2020

Mr. Stephen Mayer
City of Stuart – Planning
121 SW Flagler Avenue
Stuart, FL

Dear Mr. Mayer:

Pursuant to additional staff (and Riverland) comments received via email on March 19, 2020, please accept this letter as our formal written response. Also, attached hereto with this letter are the revised plans in pdf format, which address the comments where applicable. We have also, on this date, forwarded to your office, via FEDEX, one set of hard copies. For your convenience we have prepared our responses in **bold italics.**

1. A construction timeline that includes commitment to install the wall on the northern boundary first, and how that is facilitated with the neighboring property owners.
   Response: As discussed, Atlantic Realty Partners plan to construct the project in one continuous phase. Once the affected developable area is cleared, the first priority and phase of construction will be to install the 8' screen wall and chainlink fence along the north property boundary.

2. A revised application summary to reflect community meetings and requests made by the community.
   Response: The justification statement has been revised to provide the date of the meeting and detailed responses to their concerns.

3. A profile of the development company, providing not sensitive.
   Response: An 8 page marketing brochure for Atlantic Residential is attached hereto.

4. Is the stormwater easement on the Northeast side of the property to be removed?
   Response: As we discussed, the subject easement will be removed. This has been stated in more detail on the attached revised Drainage Statement.

5. The parking ratio is under the code, and this will also necessitate a waiver request. Staff will want to include justification in the form of industry standard or use in similar development(s).
   Response: In our previous response/submittal, dated March 11, 2020, we provided some detailed information/data from the ITE, (attached hereto), which indicated Parking Generation rates from 48 different studies. These studies looked at the

Peak Period Parking Demands for Occupied Dwelling Units Monday-Friday from 10pm-5am for similar General Urban/Suburban locations with NO nearby rail transit. The results from these ITE studies provided an AVERAGE parking rate of 1.32 parking spaces per unit. We have also attached hereto, a list of specific projects that our client, Atlantic Residential, has entitled, permitted, constructed and successfully operates with parking rates that are actually lower than the 1.75 spaces per unit required by the City of Stuart. As their list of 6 properties indicates, the parking rates vary from 1.29 spaces per unit to 1.61 spaces per unit; for an average of 1.49 spaces per unit. Well below the 1.61 spaces per unit currently being requested.

Atlantic Residential Properties

Existing Project	No. of Units	City of Stuart Requirement	Spaces Provided	Parking Ratios Provided	Building Type	Close Proximity to Public Transit?	Project Status
Bridgeview - Stuart, FL	212	1.75 Spaces/Unit	342	1.61 Spaces/Unit	Garden - walk up parking	No	Proposed
Mayfair Reserve - Wauwatosa, WI	236	1.75 Spaces/Unit	347	1.47 Spaces/Unit	Garden - covered parking	No	Stabilized
Revel at the Ballpark - Atlanta, GA	275	1.75 Spaces/Unit	415	1.51 Spaces/Unit	Midrise - covered parking	No	Delivered - In Lease up
Parkview - Palmetto Bay, FL	235	1.75 Spaces/Unit	371	1.58 Spaces/Unit	Midrise - covered parking	No	Entitled - In Permitting
Evoq Town Flats - John's Creek, GA	142	1.75 Spaces/Unit	211	1.49 Spaces/Unit	Garden - walk up parking	No	Delivered - In Lease up
Lumen at Grant Park - Atlanta, GA	238	1.75 Spaces/Unit	308	1.29 Spaces/Unit	Midrise - covered parking	Yes	Stabilized
Total Units	1338	Total Spaces	1994	Avg. Parking Ratio	1.49 Spaces/Unit		

6. Staff recommends an 8' high screen wall (post and panel would be acceptable). The wall may be positioned within buffer area to allow maintenance access. There boundary wall transitions due to soil/ground quality, then a chain-link 8' fence is recommended. A screen wall of 8' would provide a far greater visual barrier.

   Response: As requested, an 8' black poly-vinyl chainlink fence and screen wall have been provided along the north property boundary. The fence will be placed on the property line, while the wall will be set 1' south of the property line. We reached out to Riverland on 4/2/2020 regarding their acceptance of this and the need for routine maintenance access; we have not received a response to date.

7. Riverland residents requested that the Bridgeview screen wall attach to the existing Riverland wall along Kanner Highway.
   Response: The proposed Bridgeview screen wall will be attached to the existing Riverland wall as requested, and this has been indicated on the attached plans.

8. Riverland residents requested a right-turn decal lane into the Bridgeview project.
   Response: As discussed, per FDOT standards & guidelines a right turn-lane is NOT warranted, justified or required for this project, based on the projected traffic numbers. As the projected traffic for Bridgeview is only 35% of FDOT's threshold for a turn lane requirement, FDOT has determined & stated during the pre-application conference on April 2, 2020, that NO turnlane will be required or requested.

9. Staff recommends to move/remove a portion of bldg. #2 with the purpose of providing a setback from the northern boundary which is similar to that of bldg. #1. Wrap around balconies should also be omitted from this elevation. This is also concerning as the sightline study shows the impact from bldg. #1, which is setback further.
   Riverland residents
   Response: The required MINIMUM building setback for the northern boundary is 55'; the proposed setback is 79.3' to the closest building corner of Bldg. #2; or 24.3' greater than the required setback. The building height also does NOT exceed the code requirement. However, in an effort to reduce 'balcony' visibility, we have completely removed the balconies from the 2 end units on the 4th floor, as the graphic section and section/elevations on sheets SP-3 & SP-4 indicate. We have also provided TWO different sections, due to the fact that where the building is located closest to the north property line, the heavily vegetated native upland buffer is also located, and will essentially screen the views between the parcels. So we also provided a section graphic that parallels bldg. #2 to the north property line, where NO upland preservation exists, other than the 8' screen wall and the 25' heavily planted fully native landscape buffer. Also, as discussed, we have provided a section graphic of bldg. #1 as well. Although setback further, at 154.3' to the north property boundary, this elevation has more balconies that face north and thought this section was more valid and impacted more properties.

   All 3 sections clearly indicate an extremely narrow cone of visibility into the Riverland Mobile Home Park; and when combined with an 8' screen wall and a heavily vegetated fully planted 25' buffer, with all native oversized plantings, the view will be minimal to non-existent.

We appreciate the time and follow up discussion with staff. Should you have any questions or require additional information, please feel free to contact myself or Pat Lentini at 561-575-9557.

Sincerely,

Gentile Glas Holloway O'Mahoney & Associates, Inc.

M. Troy Holloway, PLA, ASLA, LEED®AP, BD&C
Partner

cc: Steve Sealy, Atlantic Residential