lucido&associates

October 4, 2019 Hand Delivery

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

RE: Trillium RPUD
Our reference number: 18-1110

Dear Tom:

Please accept this correspondence as our formal resubmittal in response to the staff comments received on October 1, 2019. Please find enclosed the original resubmittal packet containing the revised documents and plans referenced below, a CD with PDF copies of the resubmitted materials, and an additional copy of the 24 x 36 plans. The enclosed revised materials are listed as follows:

1. Highlighted engineering plans;
2. Revised landscape plan.

Itemized responses:

Zoning and Development

Fire Rescue- Cawley

1. All work shall conform with the most current edition of the Florida Fire Prevention Code.
   Response: Agree.

Utilities- Rogolino

1. In reviewing the above reference project, this Department does approved the proposed RPUD. Please address the following comments:

   A. Individual carts are approved with the understanding a single/ one bill will be required for all proposed units/ clubhouse.
   Response:
   Agree. The property owner's association will be responsible for paying for all individual carts within the community, so the City will provide a single bill to the POA.

   B. Further review will be required. This review is not for construction.
   Noted. The further review will occur with the site permit plan application.
   Agree.

Engineering Review- Landscape

Overall

1. Plans sheets are difficult to read. Suggest increasing scale or editing line weights to help clarity.
   Response: Noted. The plans have been updated for better legibility.

2. Confirm all fencing, light poles, utilities, etc. are shown on the plans to avoid conflicts with the landscape.
   Response: Noted. All fencing, utilities, etc. have been confirmed. Light poles will be coordinated with the FPL at the time of construction.

3. Per plans LA-5 and LA-6, trees are called to be preserved. Please show approximate canopy spread for all existing trees to remain.
   Response: Trees shown as preserved are offsite. The trees shall remain undisturbed during construction.

4. Confirm proposed trees/palms meet FPL required setbacks from overhead utilities using FPL's Right Tree Right Place.
   Response: Proposed trees have been confirmed in compliance with the FPL Right Tree in the Right Place.

5. *Label and provide clearances for all fire hydrants*
   Response: No hydrants will be obstructed by the landscape.

6. *Please adjust match line labels so that they are legible.*
   Response: Match labels have been adjusted.

CV Landscape Plan

7. Provide table/calculations as to how the site is meeting required buffer, interior, native, and overall site Landscape Requirements.
   Response:
   This project is a townhome residential community and therefore does not fit within the commercial landscape requirements for interior landscaping.

   Buffer: From the back of the unit to the sidewalk is 25' and is heavily landscaped. The City of Stuart landscape code requires 25' when adjacent to commercial properties.

   Native Requirement: The City requires at least 50% of the landscape to be native landscape. The trees provided are 92% native, the palms are 52% native, the shrubs are 72% native and the accent grasses are 90% native and the groundcovers excluding turf are 60% native.

   Overall Site Requirements: The City requires not less than 20% of the site to be landscaped, and the site exceeds the requirement by providing 31% of the site as landscaped area.

8. The xeriscape chart is not the current version per code 6.04.05.C; you cannot have 2 lines referring to mulch and gain 15 points. Please update and provide how you are meeting the required 50 points.
   Response:
   The xeriscape chart has been updated.

LA-1 Landscape Plan

9. Along northwest property (behind units 55-62), tree locations are shown in conflict with the fence, please revise.
   Response:
   Acknowledged, the trees have been revised.

10. Along northeast property (behind units 45-54), an unidentified proposed line runs through the property. This line conflicts with Foxtail palms proposed behind these units. Please identify what this line is and if necessary, revise proposed landscape to avoid conflict.
    Response:
    Acknowledged, the line has been removed.

11. Repeat Comment: Proposed Green Buttonwood trees along northwest property looks in conflict with overhead utility lines. Please confirm that the trees are in accordance with FPL's Right Tree Right Place 30' setback clearance.
    Response:
    The landscape in this area has been revised.

12. Provide additional shrubs or sod along units, 4, 9, and 55.
    Response:
    Sod has been provided.

13. Label littoral and upland plantings.
    Response:
    The littoral plantings have been removed from the plan.

14. What are unidentified black arched lines adjacent to southwest street trees? Please identify.
    Response:
    The arched lines have been removed from the plan.

15. Revised plans to remove all conflicts between plant callouts and labels.
    Response:
    Noted.

16. Include root barrier where proposed trees are located within 5' of utility lines.
    Response:
    No root barrier is proposed. Root barrier is not required by Martin County Utilities, the utility provider.

17. What are unidentified black arched lines adjacent to southwest street trees? Please identify. Please revise plans to eliminate all conflicts between plant callouts and labels.
Response:
The line has been removed from the landscape plan.

LA-2 Landscape Plan:

18. Along northeast property (behind units 29-40), an unidentified proposed line runs through the property. This line conflicts with Foxtail palms proposed behind these units. Please identify what this line is and if necessary, revise proposed landscape to avoid conflict.
Response:
The line has been removed.

19. In the eastern corner of the property, Green Buttonwood's are proposed within a few feet of an existing concrete wall. Consider revising the location of the proposed trees to allow for the Green Buttonwood to have ample root and canopy growing conditions.
Response:
Noted.

20. Include root barrier locations where proposed trees are located within 5' of utility lines.
Response:
No root barrier is proposed. Root barrier is not required by Martin County Utilities, the utility provider.

LA-3 Landscape Plan:

21. Please remove existing tree identification number and location markers for trees to be removed. Eastern corner of detention area has a Bald Cypress located within a foot of a proposed storm line and inlet. Please revise plans to eliminate the conflict.
Response:
Acknowledged.

22. An unidentified proposed line encircles the detention area, provide label or delete.
Response:
Acknowledged.

23. Please provide exhibit to the arrangement of littoral and upland planting design. Many of the proposed species have different optimal growing elevations in relation to the typical water elevation and the species placement is not clear per the landscape plan hatch. For example, Iris virginica has an optimal growing condition of 0.5 feet above and 0.5 feet below the typical water elevation while Nymphaea odorata has an optimal growing condition of 3.0 to 5.0 feet below the typical water elevation.
Response:
Littoral plantings have been removed.

LA-4 Master Plant Schedule:

24. Per section 6.04.02.A.6, shrubs shall be a minimum 24" height with 12" spread or in a 3-gallon pot. Some plant specifications still do not meet the code requirement, please revise. Please include within the master schedule a littoral and upland buffer plant schedule. The schedule needs to include botanical and common name, container size, plant size, and spacing.
Response:
The plant schedule has been revised to have all shrubs at 3-gallon size except for saw palmetto.

25. Please clarify the callout for trees that do not require mitigation, species identified on LA-6 are listed as 'Pine'.
Response:
Noted.

26. Trees 665-678 are called to be preserved, please provide tree protection around those trees on the plans.
Response:
Trees 665-678 are offsite.

27. Please revise plans to eliminate conflicts with tree identification number labels. Pine mitigation calculations are incorrect, please revise and ensure tree mitigation credits is met.
Response:
Pine mitigation table has been updated.

28. Bursera simaruba is not proposed in the landscape schedule, therefore, it cannot be used for mitigation. Revise calculations to meet minimum tree credit calculation
Response:
Noted. Bursera simaruba has been removed.

LA-6 Landscape Details:

29. Please provide common and botanical names in the tree table.
Response:
Botanical name is not necessary for the tree mitigation calculations- the notation of pine tree is sufficient.

30. What does the box around some trees indicate? Please provide a key to clarify
Response:
The box signifies trees that meet the threshold of a specimen tree in the City and therefore require mitigaton.

Environmental Review- Comply

Section 5.01.00 – Complete. Avoidance and Minimization and Other Environmental Impacts – An Environmental Assessment Report (EA) prepared by EW Consultants, Inc. dated September 2019, was provided with the September 11, 2019 response letter. The EA includes a map indicating wetland limits, and provides information regarding compliance with avoidance, minimization and mitigation requirements.
Section 5.02.00 – Complete. Environmental Assessment Report - The EA describes FLUCFCS codes of cover types occurring on site, provides a breakdown of their acreage, and provide a figure delineating the land use types.

The EA includes a wetland delineation map as approved by the South Florida Water Management District and documents completion of wetland mitigation.
The EA explains that the upland preserve requirements are being met off-site, per City of Stuart Ordinance Number 2361-2018.

The EA states that coordination with the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC) and the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) will occur as part of the in-process or upcoming state and federal permit application processes.

Section 5.03.00 – Complete. Wetlands – The EA includes a map indicating wetland limits, and provides information regarding compliance with avoidance, minimization and mitigation requirements

Traffic Review- Comply

Kimley-Horn has reviewed the Traffic Impact Analysis (revised August 2019) prepared by The MilCor Group Inc. related to the above-mentioned project. The subject project is located generally on the south side of SE Miami Avenue, west of SE Commerce Boulevard, and east of SE Federal Highway in the City of Stuart, Florida. The proposed development consists of 76 single family dwelling units and access to the project will be provided via an existing 50-foot unnamed access road located between the proposed development and commercial properties fronting US 1.

Based on the analysis provided, the project has the potential to generate 534 net new daily trips, 37 net new AM peak hour trips (8 in / 28 out), and 46 net new PM peak hour trips (29 in / 17 out). The analysis demonstrates that adjacent impacted roadways have sufficient capacity available to support the proposed project trips and no ingress turn lanes are warranted. We have no further comments for the applicant at this time.

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.

Engineering Review

Master Drainage Plan

1. The construction of drainage out fall from the commercial development to the west appears to cross the property line near the connection to the existing manhole. Construction of the pipe as currently shown will require a grading easement from that property owner.
   Response:
   Acknowledged.

2. Show how the swales on the north and south sides of the site will be connected to the pond and drainage system.
   Response: Acknowledged, a connection from the north and south swales to the lake has been shown. Please note that the final drainage system will be designed and submitted with the site construction application, and the current swale connections may be revised to tie into the final drainage system. Please see the revised plan.

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

Sincerely,

Doug Fitzwater
Copy to team