DATE: 03/08/2018 CITY OF STUART MODULE : zdplnrevrpt
TIME: 15:38:34 PLAN REVIEW STOP REPORT

SELECTION CRITERIA: appl_no='Z18020007'

PROJECT NO.: Z18020007 APPLICANT NAME: E CLARK GIBSON (TR)
OWNER NAME: GIBSON, E CLARK (TR) APPLICATION DATE: 02/21/18
PROJECT TYPE: MAJOR RPUD - MAJOR RESIDENTIAL PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPME
PARCEL: 20374100400100131000000 NW JENSEN BEACH BLVD
JENSEN BEACH, FL 34957

---

REVIEW STOP: F - FIRE PROTECTION SYSTEMS
REV NO: 1 STATUS: A DATE: 03/06/18 CONT ID:
REVIEW SENT BY: flasaga DATE: 03/06/18 TIME: 16:02 TIME SPENT: 0.00
REV RECEIVD BY: flasaga DATE: 02/23/18 TIME: 14:38 SENT TO:

REVIEW NOTES: *** NONE ***

---

REVIEW STOP: PD - POLICE DEPARTMENT
REV NO: 1 STATUS: DATE: CONT ID:
REVIEW SENT BY: DATE: TIME: TIME SPENT: 0.00
REV RECEIVD BY: treetz DATE: 02/23/18 TIME: 14:39 SENT TO:

REVIEW NOTES: *** NONE ***

---

REVIEW STOP: PW - PUBLIC WORKS
REV NO: 1 STATUS: A DATE: 03/08/18 CONT ID:
REVIEW SENT BY: mrogolin DATE: 03/08/18 TIME: TIME SPENT: 0.00
REV RECEIVD BY: mrogolin DATE: 02/23/18 TIME: 14:39 SENT TO:

REVIEW NOTES: *** NONE ***

---

REVIEW STOP: T - TRAFFIC
REV NO: 1 STATUS: DATE: CONT ID:
REVIEW SENT BY: DATE: TIME: TIME SPENT: 0.00
REV RECEIVD BY: treetz DATE: 02/23/18 TIME: 14:40 SENT TO:

REVIEW NOTES: *** NONE ***

---

Kimley»Horn

To: Tom Reetz
Senior Planner
City of Stuart Development Department

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

Date: March 9, 2018

Re: **Osprey Preserve RPUD Multi-family– Stuart, Florida**
**RPUD Amendment Application Review - Engineering**

---

Dear Mr. Reetz,

Kimley-Horn has reviewed the submittal of the RPUD Amendment Application and associated documents, dated February 20, 2018 prepared by Lucido and Associates for the proposed Osprey Preserve development in Stuart, Florida. In addition to the current review package, we reviewed the previous application for this project when it was a single family development. The current package is consistent and met the applicable comments of our previous review. Please find below our review comments pertaining to the following items listed within the application:

Master Site Plan

1. The development appears to not be a gated community. Please confirm.
2. Provide an ADA parking stall and accessible aisle detail.
3. Will the standard parking stalls include wheel stops or will the car overhang the sidewalk at the head of the stalls?
4. Under the Building and Lot data table, change single family to Multi-family.
5. Will the project include a monument sign? If so, show the location on site plan.
6. Show the location of the Mailbox kiosk.
7. Clarify the entrance configuration. There appears to be 2 inbound lanes and one outbound lane. Show lane striping and transition for the 2 inbound lanes.

Master Drainage Plan

1. Provide North Arrow on Plan
2. Cross Section 1
    a. The top of wall elevation should be 16.5 to match drainage report

Kimley»Horn

To: Tom Reetz
Planning Division
City of Stuart Development Department

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

Date: March 6, 2018

Re: **Osprey Preserve RPUD**
**Review of Traffic Analysis**

---

Kimley-Horn has performed a review of the Traffic Impact Analysis (dated February 16, 2018) prepared by The Milcor Group Inc. related to the above-mentioned project. The subject project is generally located on the southwest corner of the intersection of Jensen Beach Boulevard (SR 732) & Green River Parkway. The proposed development will have a total of 87 residential condominium/townhouse dwelling units. Please find below our review comments pertaining to the impacts to transportation facilities:

1. The trip generation equations used are not consistent with equations included in the Institute of Transportation Engineers' (ITE) *Trip Generation Manual*, 9th Edition. Please adjust to the following:

    - Daily: Ln(T) = 0.87Ln(X) + 2.46; 50% entering / 50% exiting
    - AM Peak Hour: Ln(T) = 0.80Ln(X) + 0.26; 17% entering / 83% exiting
    - PM Peak Hour: Ln(T) = 0.82Ln(X) + 0.32; 67% entering / 33% exiting

    Please update the subsequent figures and tables based on the modified trip generation calculations.

2. Based on the City of Stuart's Land Development Code, "An analysis of all project driveways shall be performed which includes, at a minimum, projected turning movements in and out of the project during the AM and PM peak hours." Please ensure the proposed ingress turn lanes, as shown in the site plan, will provide adequate deceleration and queue storage components based on FDOT standards and the 95th percentile queue storage.

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

   b. Will there be a fence or rail at the top of wall?
   c. Change FFE to 18.2
3. Cross Section 2 – change FFE to 17.9.
4. Show maintenance access for both the dry detention and lake areas. The dry detention area appears to be land locked with no access.
5. It appears that the retaining wall will wrap around the north and west sides of the development. Please label for confirmation.

Master Utility Plan

1. Provide North Arrow on Plan
2. Move the proposed water service and sanitary service (typ) arrows to point to the services near lots 46 and 47
3. Provide water and sewer services to the Pool / Cabana
4. At the corner lots of 12 and 13, the meters are shown in the driveway.
5. Show an easement around the fire hydrants.
6. Provide a typical ROW section which shows the location of all utilities including electric telephone and cable. Water meters and cleanouts should be in the ROW or an easement.
7. Show the location of transformers and street lights

Landscape Plan

1. The typical lot landscape plan shows a Chinese Fan Palm between the driveways. Note this is the same location as the sewer services for the buildings.
2. Trees at the back of all lots are in conflict with the storm drain inlets and pipe.
3. There is a discrepancy in the quantity of Sabal Palms (Cabbage Palms) between the plant schedule and the mitigation chart. Furthermore, the specified height would need to read 18' CT to count toward 18" of mitigation.
4. Unless previous conversations or decisions have been made through talks with the city development director the Wax Myrtle, Green Buttonwood, and Cocoplum shrub material do not meet the minimum tree requirements and therefore do not count towards tree mitigation. Per code, only Slash Pines and Palms will count towards softwood mitigation.
5. Live Oak and Slash Pine specifications should read 4.5" DBH and 2.5" DBH respectively to meet code required mitigation specifications.

lucido & associates

March 28, 2018 Hand Delivery

Tom Reetz, Senior Planner
City of Stuart Development Department
121 SW Flagler Avenue
Stuart, Florida 34994

**Re: Osprey Preserve RPUD – City of Stuart Resubmittal 1**
**Our Ref. #17-546**

Dear Tom:

Please accept this correspondence as our formal resubmittal in response to the development review comments provided on March 21, 2018. Please find enclosed three sets of the resubmittal packet containing the revised documents and plans referenced below, and a CD with PDF copies of the resubmitted materials. The enclosed revised materials are listed as follows:

- Master Site Plan;
- Signed & sealed Master Drainage Plan;
- Signed & sealed Master Utility Plan;
- Landscape Plan;
- Environmental Assessment and Wetland Maintenance and Monitoring Plan
- Traffic Impact Analysis.

**Itemized responses:**

**Kimley Horn- Environmental Review**

This plan meets the requirements. One minor comment; there are two different Preserve Area Signs shown in this plan. The second sign on page 9 of the plan meets the City's code.
**Response**
**Please see the updated Preserve Area Management Plan.**

**Kimley Horn- RPUD Application Review**

**Master Site Plan Comments**

1. The development appears to not be a gated community. Please confirm.
**Response:**
**The development is not a gated community.**

2. Provide an ADA parking stall and accessible aisle detail.
**Response:**
**An ADA parking stall and aisle detail has been provided on the Master Site Plan.**

3. Will the standard parking stalls include wheel stops or will the car overhang the sidewalk at the head of the stalls?
**Response:**
**Wheel stops will be provided. Design and details will be provided with the final construction plan submittal.**

4. Under the Building and Lot data table, change single family to Multi-family.
**Response:**
**The project will have 86 duplex units and 1 single family residence.**

5. Will the project include a monument sign? If so, show the location on site plan.
**Response:**
**A monument sign has been shown on the Master Site Plan. Final design and location to be determined at site permitting.**

6. Show the location of the Mailbox kiosk.
**Response:**
**The proposed mailbox kiosk is shown on the Master Site Plan.**

7. Clarify the entrance configuration. There appears to be 2 inbound lanes and one outbound lane. Show lane striping and transition for the 2 inbound lanes.
**Response:**
**The plan has been revised to show one inbound lane and two outbound lanes. Striping has been shown, but the final configuration should be reviewed with the site permit plans.**

**Master Drainage Plan Comments**

1. Provide North Arrow on Plan
**Response:**
North arrow has been added to Master Utility Plan

2a. Cross Section 1: The top of wall elevation should be 16.5 to match drainage report
**Response:**
See updated master utility plan for corrected leader locations

2b. Cross Section 1: Will there be a fence or rail at the top of wall?
**Response:**
**Please see updated section which now includes decorative aluminum fence**

2c. Cross Section 1: Change FFE to 18.2
**Response:**
**Cross section 1 has been updated to include corrected FFE of 16.5.**

3. Cross Section 2 – change FFE to 17.9.
**Response:**
**Cross section 1 has been updated to include corrected FFE of 17.9.**

4. Show maintenance access for both the dry detention and lake areas. The dry detention area appears to be land locked with no access.
**Response:**
**See updated Master Drainage plan which reflect dry pond has been provided a 9' access easement and Lake has been provided one parking space with no proposed parking stop for access.**

5. It appears that the retaining wall will wrap around the north and west sides of the development. Please label for confirmation.
**Response:**
**Beginning and ending location of retaining wall have been labeled as well as the linework has been widened to delineate more clearly.**

**Master Utility Plan Comments**

1. Provide North Arrow on Plan
**Response:**
North arrow has been added to Master Utility Plan

2. Move the proposed water service and sanitary service (typ) arrows to point to the services near lots 46 and 47
**Response:**
See updated master utility plan for corrected leader locations

3. Provide water and sewer services to the Pool / Cabana
**Response:**
Please see updated master utility plan which now provides utility services to the pool/cabana.

4. At the corner lots of 12 and 13, the meters are shown in the driveway.
**Response:**
Please see updated master utility plan which now shows the meters located within grass area.

5. Show an easement around the fire hydrants.
**Response:**
Fire hydrants are shown for reference and are not to scale. Please see updated master utility plan cross section which demonstrates the hydrants will fall within the ROW and therefore no easement should be required.

6. Provide a typical ROW section which shows the location of all utilities including electric telephone and cable. Water meters and cleanouts should be in the ROW or an easement.
**Response:**
Please see updated master utility plan which includes requested cross section of ROW and all utilities

7. Show the location of transformers and street lights
**Response:**
**The location of the transformers and street lights will be shown on the site permit application after coordination with Florida Power and Light.**

**Landscape Plan Comments**

1. The typical lot landscape plan shows a Chinese Fan Palm between the driveways. Note this is the same location as the sewer services for the buildings.
**Response:**
**The sewer services have been relocated.**

2. Trees at the back of all lots are in conflict with the storm drain inlets and pipe.
**Response:**
**The trees have been relocated and no longer conflict with the storm drain inlets and pipe.**

3. There is a discrepancy in the quantity of Sabal Palms (Cabbage Palms) between the plant schedule and the mitigation chart. Furthermore, the specified height would need to read 18' CT to count toward 18" of mitigation.
**Response:**
**The plan schedule and mitigation chart has been updated.**

4. Unless previous conversations or decisions have been made through talks with the city development director the Wax Myrtle, Green Buttonwood, and Cocoplum shrub material do not meet the minimum tree requirements and therefore do not count towards tree mitigation. Per code, only Slash Pines and Palms will count towards softwood mitigation.
**Response:**
**The applicant has met with the City of Stuart and developed a mitigation plan specific to this property under the RPUD.**

5. Live Oak and Slash Pine specifications should read 4.5" DBH and 2.5" DBH respectively to meet code required mitigation specifications.
**The applicant has met with the City of Stuart and developed a mitigation plan specific to this property under the RPUD**

**Kimley Horn- Review of Traffic Impact Analysis**

1. The trip generation equations used are not consistent with equations included in the Institute of Transportation Engineers' (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition. Please adjust to the following:
· Daily: Ln(T) = 0.87Ln(X) + 2.46; 50% entering / 50% exiting
· AM Peak Hour: Ln(T) = 0.80Ln(X) + 0.26; 17% entering / 83% exiting
· PM Peak Hour: Ln(T) = 0.82Ln(X) + 0.32; 67% entering / 33% exiting
Please update the subsequent figures and tables based on the modified trip generation calculations.
**Response:**
**Please see the updated traffic analysis.**

2. Based on the City of Stuart's Land Development Code, "An analysis of all project driveways shall be performed which includes, at a minimum, projected turning movements in and out of the project during the AM and PM peak hours." Please ensure the proposed ingress turn lanes, as shown in the site plan, will provide adequate deceleration and queue storage components based on FDOT standards and the 95th percentile queue storage.
**Response:**
**Please see the updated traffic analysis.**

**City of Stuart- Fire Protection**
**No review comments.**

**City of Stuart- Police Department**
**No review comments.**

**City of Stuart- Public Works**
**No review comments.**

**City of Stuart- Traffic**
**No review comments.**

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or need any additional materials.

Sincerely,

Doug Fitzwater

Copy to: Paul Quinn, DR Horton
Clark Gibson, Property Owner

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