lucido & associates

Land Planning / Landscape Architecture

September 4, 2018

Stephen Mayer Senior Planner
City of Stuart Development Department
121 SW Flagler Avenue
Stuart, Florida 34994

RE: Watermark RPUD – Major PUD Amendment - Response to Comments (LA 17-1140)

Dear Mr. Mayer:

Please find below our response to the review comments provided by the City of Stuart consultant, Kimley Horn, dated August 24, 2018.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT:

Section 5.01.00 Avoidance or Minimization of Wetland and other Environmental Impacts.

The Environmental Assessment references one wet prairie wetland on-site that was previously placed under a conservation easement. The EA also provides an email from South Florida Water Management District indicating that the wetland limits are grandfathered. Section 5.03.00, Land Development Code specifies that the wetland determination for a site is based on those wetlands verified by the State of Florida pursuant to F.S. 373.421 and Chapter 62-340 Florida Administrative Code. The proposed site plan avoids impacts to this wetland.

The site plan does, however, depict a separate US Army Corps of Engineers wetland delineation which consists of two wetlands: one that includes the wet prairie approved by SFWMD, but with a larger footprint and a small wetland in the northeast corner of the site. The wetland impacts shown on the site plan include total 0.49 acres. The EA does not speak to this USACE wetland limit at all and shows these areas as Florida Land Use, Cover and Forms Classification System (FLUCFCS) 310- Herbaceous which is an upland land cover. Kimley-Horn completed a Natural Resource Assessment on this property for another client in January 2018 and confirmed that the areas shown on the site plan as USACE wetlands are indeed wetlands.

Section 5.03.02 Wetland Protection Standards, B. 3. Indicates "the requirement for avoidance and minimization of direct impacts to wetlands in accordance with the Federal Clean Water Act… shall be met". Per the code this would be demonstrated by a letter of intent to issue a permit or a permit from the USACE. The impacts should qualify for a Nationwide Permit. And a copy of the permit should be submitted to the City prior to any wetland impacts. In an email dated August 21, 2018, the applicant's environmental consultant indicated that a permit is pending from the USACE.

All the SFWMD wetlands are avoided by the site plan and a majority of the USACE jurisdictional wetlands are avoided. Thus, it appears that the avoidance and minimization of wetland impacts to state wetlands has been met.

Section 5.02.00 Environmental Assessment Report for Sites with Wetlands Greater Than One Acre

An Environmental Assessment was provided.

1. Site Description: Complete. There is a location map, but it is a Quadrangle Map and not a location map showing streets/roads and the site in relation to the City municipal boundary.

An additional location map has been added to the report

2. Vegetative Descriptions – Provided. The City may want to request a clarification in the EA, because the USACE wetland areas are not provided or described in the EA. Vegetative descriptions are provided, but they correspond to the state wetland areas only; thus, USACE wetland areas are described as upland habitat.

The report has been revised to include discussion on the USACOE wetland area

3. Wetland Delineation – State wetland limits are provided as required.

Acknowledged

4. Wildlife Evaluation – Wildlife methodology and survey results were provided. There are numerous gopher tortoise burrows located on-site. Based on the site plan, the gopher tortoises will require relocation and a permit from the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission will be required prior to development.

A revised burrow survey, relocation permit and relocation of affected tortoises will be conducted prior to construction. The City will be provided the FWC permit at the time that this occurs.

5. Preserve area and upland buffer evaluation - Complete. All the state wetlands and a majority of the USACE wetlands are being preserved. A 50-60-foot buffer is proposed from the state wetlands and an additional 25-foot buffer is provided from the edge of proposed USACE wetland impact to the development.

Acknowledged

6. Native Vegetation preserve area onsite/offsite relocation assessment: Not applicable. According to the EA, there is no native upland onsite.

Acknowledged

Section 5.03.00 Wetlands

An Environmental Assessment was provided.

1. The state wetlands are being preserved.

2. There are minor impacts to USACE jurisdictional wetlands. A permit is required from USACE.

3. Upland Buffers: The buffer requirements of 50 feet and at no point less than 25 feet has been met and the construction setback from the buffer appears to have been provided though not labeled on the site plan. Because there is no native vegetation in the upland buffers, native plantings are required. Landscape plans or details regarding the planting plan were not provided. This can be provided with Site Plan Application.

4. Greenways: Not applicable. The wetlands occur on the edge of the property and in some cases, connect to other offsite wetlands and uplands.

5.03.03 Wetland Mitigation

Because the application materials address only the state wetland limits, there is no information provided for USACE wetland impacts. Mitigation details can be provided with the final site plan approval.

Section 5.04.00 Environmentally Sensitive Lands

Not applicable.

Section 5.05.00 Trees

No information provided.
A survey including tree locations and DBH is provided with this response

Section 5.06.00 Mangrove and Shoreline
Not applicable

Section 5.07.00 Floodplain and Flood Damage Prevention
The survey provided was not legible. Provide a legible copy of the survey and a FEMA firmette.
A survey and FEMA Firmette are provided with this response

Section 5.08.00 Resource Protection Regulations Adopted by Reference

Section 5.08.01 Martin County Wellfield Protection Ordinance.

No detail was provided regarding any wellfields in the area.
The subject property is located within a public water supply wellfield protection zone. A source map illustrating wellfield locations is provided with this response.

Section 5.09.01 Historic Preservation
Not applicable.

5.10.00 Clustering of Development
Not applicable.

Summary

Per our review and subsequent discussions with the City, the EA provided with the application should be updated to reflect correct wetland limits including USACE jurisdiction and update the FLUCFCS map. A copy of the permits should be provided to the City when issued. Gopher tortoise were documented in the EA. A relocation permit will be required before construction.

The Environmental Assessment has been revised to include discussion the USACOE wetland and is provided. The USACOE Nationwide Permit is currently under review and will be provided to the City upon approval. It is acknowledged that a gopher tortoise relocation permit will be required prior to construction, with relocation of affected tortoises.

TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY:

Kimley-Horn has performed a review of the Traffic Impact Study (dated June 4, 2018) prepared by Bowman Consulting related to the above-mentioned project. The subject project is generally located on the east side of US 1, north of NW Windemere Drive. The proposed development will contain 284 multi-family residential dwelling units. Please find below our review comments pertaining to the impacts to transportation facilities:

1. City of Stuart Land Development Code states, "An analysis of all driveways into the project shall be performed which includes, at a minimum, projected turning movements in and out of the project during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours." Please provide an evaluation of the project driveway along with a figure that shows the projected AM and PM peak hour turning movements at the project driveway along US 1.

The traffic impact study has been updated accordingly

2. The project trip distribution for the development shown on page 2 in the middle table does not add up to the entering and exiting traffic calculated within the trip generation table. Please revise accordingly as well as subsequent data (i.e. intersection traffic volume worksheets and Synchro 10 analysis).

The traffic impact study has been updated accordingly

3. Volumes input for existing conditions at both study area intersections were not seasonally adjusted by the applicable peak season factor (1.08). Please revise the volume inputs to reflect this factor.

The traffic impact study has been updated accordingly

4. The northbound left-turn lane at the directional median at Family Furniture is approximately 330 feet long, including its taper. Based on Synchro 10 analysis, the 95th percentile queue length is approximately 5.8 vehicles (145 feet) during the AM peak hour. Based on the 2018 FDOT Design Manual Exhibit 212-1, the required deceleration length for a roadway posted at 45 mph is 185 feet. Therefore, the turn lane will operate acceptably (and be able to accommodate its 95th percentile queue and its deceleration length) upon buildout of the subject development.

5. The southbound left-turn lane at the intersection of US 1 & NW Windemere Drive is approximately 380 feet long, including its taper. Based on the Synchro 10 analysis, the 95th percentile queue length is approximately 324 feet long during the PM peak hour. The required deceleration length for this turn lane is 185 feet. Due to the northbound left-turn lane at NW 21st Street, extending the

southbound left-turn lane (to accommodate its 324-foot 95th percentile queue and its 185-foot deceleration length) is not feasible without significantly impacting the directional median opening at NW 21st Street. The existing southbound turn lane length can however accommodate its 95th percentile queue length without blocking the southbound through lanes. Therefore, it is recommended no modifications to turn lane lengths be performed at this time.

ENGINEERING REVIEW:

Kimley-Horn has reviewed the submittal documents associated with the Major PUD Amendment Application, Site Plan and associated documents, prepared by Lucido and Associates and Bowman Consulting for the proposed Watermark Residential development in Stuart, Florida. Please find below our review comments pertaining to the following items listed within the application:

Watermark PUD document

1. Exhibit 4 – Survey – the survey is not legible in the document. Please provide a legible copy for review.

A full sized 24x36 print of the survey is provided with this response

2. Exhibit 13 – 1 – Access- Sidewalks need to be minimum of 6'.

The text has been amended to indicate minimum sidewalk width of 6'

3. Exhibit 13 – 2 – Density – Density proposed is 30 DU/ac. This needs to be reviewed by the City as it exceeds the code limit of 15 as stated section 2.03.05 and 2.07.00.

Acknowledged

4. Exhibit 13 – 10 – Parking – The City needs to review and comment on the proposed parking rate. Based on the parking table on the site plan and using the code required rate of spaces for 1 bedroom and 2 spaces for 2 and 3 bedrooms, the required parking would be 508. Parking provided is 490 which is 18 spaces less than code.

Acknowledged

5. Exhibit 13 – 11 – Potable Water – change the references to Martin County

References have been changed to Martin County

6. Exhibit 13 – 16 – Wastewater – change the references to Martin County

References have been changed to Martin County

Site Plan

1. Provide maintenance access to both of the dry ponds and the wet pond

A maintenance access easement has been added along the south side of the wet pond that connects to the dry retention area

2. Only one dumpster is provided for the entire development. Demonstrate that the single dumpster and recycle area can support the proposed development

The development shall be provided with a 30-yard compactor with pick-up twice each week.

3. Provide City standard dumpster details
See response to previous comment

4. Extend the sewer main to provide multiple sewer connections to the north building
A second lateral from the north building has been added. The sanitary main line location has been adjusted to run along the south side of the building to connect to both lateral lines.

5. There appears to be a power pole and guy wire that will need to be relocated near the project entrance
The entrance driveway has been modified to avoid the existing power pole. We will coordinate with FPL to address the guy wire location.

6. Per SFWMD requirements Volume II section 5.4.2, demonstrate that the wet pond meets the minimum area of 0.5 acres and 100 feet in width at the control elevation.
A wall has been added to the north side to meet the minimum requirements at the control elevation

7. The sliding gate and fence protrude into the slope of the wet pond. The fence should be relocated to the top of bank.
The gate issues have been addressed with the addition of the wall and the fence location has been relocated to the top of bank.

8. The total site area shown in the site data table does not match the area from the legal description. This also impacts the floor area ratio. It appears that the open space and building coverage were calculated using correct total site area.
Site data has been updated

9. Open Space should not be less than 30% per section 2.07.00.D.4.b.
Open space calculations have been updated on the site plan to demonstrate a minimum of 30% provided

10. The building height and number of stories exceeds the code requirements for residential districts.
Maximum building height is 45' measured from the lowest finish floor elevation to the eave of a pitched roof. The peak of the roof may not exceed 15' above the maximum building height. The proposed building shall meet the criteria. The application is requesting a PUD zoning that provides an opportunity to establish a multi-family development with structures that exceed straight zoning regulations.

11. The parking proposed is 18 stalls than the required parking calculation
The RPUD includes language proposing a parking rate suitable to the development

12. 490 stalls are listed in the parking table, however using the parking counts provided on the plan, only 486 are counted.
The parking calculations have been updated

13. ADA stalls are not graphically depicted on the site plan
ADA stall have been graphically depicted on the site plan

14. Provide details for the proposed perimeter fence
Details for the fence have been added to the site plan

15. Provide auto turn analysis for fire truck access and garbage truck movements.
An auto turn exhibit is provided with this response

Respectfully,

Matthew R. Yates, RLA
Lucido & Associates