



March 26, 2019

Mr. Brandon Creagan, MCRP, LEED Green Assoc.
Planner
Planning Department
City of Fort Pierce
City Hall
100 N. US Hwy 1
Fort Pierce, FL 34950

Re: Neill Farms – Comment Response Letter
Our Reference Number: 18-896

Dear Mr. Creagan,

We are in receipt of your comment letter, as received by this office via email on February 25, 2019, wherein you included comments provided by yourself and the rest of Technical Review Committee relative to the review of our initial submittal for the above referenced project. Please find below all comments received, along with our response in **bold italics**.

CITY OF FORT PIERCE PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

1. Designate a minimum lot coverage for the Duplex lots and Single-Family Home Lots.
Response: Minimum lot coverage will be based on a combination of factors including home size, setbacks, and drainage (impervious surface). The anticipated homes will range in footprint from 1,300 SF to 2,200 SF. Minimum driveways are 16' per response item 2 below. The proposed setbacks are acknowledged on the enclosed site plan. Lot coverage may vary but is anticipated to be between 30-50% total with homes generally not exceeding 35% of that coverage. Drainage calculations shall be provided at the time of construction level approvals in order to demonstrate the existing wet detention system is capable of serving the proposed development.
2. Designate a minimum driveway width for the Duplex lots and Single-Family Home Lots.
Response: Minimum driveway width will be 16', as now noted on the plan graphics.
3. Are the Duplex lots 30 x 125 or 35 x 125, both figures are present on the plans?
Response: Duplex lots are 35'x130, and is noted as such on the
4. Provide a Street Lighting Plan
Response: The general location of all proposed street lights is illustrated on the Site Plan, FPUA street lighting program will be utilized; final lighting plans shall be submitted at time of building permit.
5. Revise the rear yard setback for pools, patios, and structures. A 0-foot setback for those uses will cause conflict with neighboring properties especially if two neighbors would put a shed or pool on the same rear property line. Look at revising that setback to 1 or 2 feet to help minimize potential

conflicts.

Response: A 2' rear yard setback for abutting back-to-back lots is now proposed, as now noted on the plan graphics.

6. Change the word structures on the pool, patio, and structure setback line to say accessory structures.

Response: The requested revision has been made.

7. What is the feasibility of adding a walking/jogging path around the lake that is next to the club house? This would be a good amenity to add for residents.

Response: At this time, it does not appear feasible due to site grading, proposed easements, and dimensional requirements; however, this request will be further explored.

8. Define the active play area, what type of equipment will it have?

Response: It is envisioned that the active play area will have a play structure (swings, slide, etc.) with a safe-play surface.

9. Coordinate with the St. Lucie County School District regarding a potential stop for children at the club house and a dedication on the plat to allow school busses protected access to utilize the internal streets of the development to allow for pickup and drop-off of children.

Response: See School District responses below.

10. Are there any other buffers planned around the site besides the landscape buffer noted on the plans. In the areas where there is no landscape buffer what sort of buffer will be provided to separate this development from adjacent properties.

Response: Additional landscape buffers have been provided for to the rear of lots 70 and 72, and 75 through 84, so as to provide buffering between the proposed lots and the existing single-family lot on the west side of McNeil Road; see revised plans, attached.

11. Are there architectural renderings of the models to share and or has a home builder been chosen?

Response: Product types have been determined by the builder and are attached herewith this resubmittal.

12. Develop some design standards for the development. For example, roof materials to be used (shingle or barrel tile) and look into the possibility of restricting the same elevations from being located next to, across the street, or directly diagonal to each other.

Response: At this time, it is envisioned that shingles shall be utilized as a common roofing material. Building elevations will be varied such that adjacent homes shall not have the same building elevation.

CITY OF FORT PIERCE ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT (PD COMMENTS)

1. This department recommends that the Single Family and Duplex rear setbacks for patios, pools, and decks of O' be revised to provide a minimum of 10' where lots abut other residential lots or lakes and 5' where abutting landscape buffers to ensure adequate area for lot grading and lake maintenance.

Response: A 2' rear yard setback for abutting, back-to-back, lots is now proposed, as now noted on the plan graphics.

2. The plans shall note that no structure encroachments are permitted within the limits of the proposed drainage easements. This may affect building and patio setback requirements as several lots have a 30' drainage easement situated along the rear of the properties.

Response: Please see revised setback notes on Sheet SP-1.

3. Remove the note on the Building setbacks that permits air conditioners, irrigation pumps and pool equipment to encroach into the 5' side lot setback as there are lots that proposed drainage easements along the side yards and this area shall remain void of equipment to allow ample room for maintenance.

Response: Please see revised setback notes on Sheet SP-1.

4. Extend the proposed 5' sidewalk across lots 4 thru 11 and lots 19 thru 25.

Response: A crosswalk has been provided for; see revised Site Plan.

5. Revise the two parking lot access aisle width from 24' to 26' for the clubhouse parking lot and the parking lot located on the east side of Lot 157.

Response: Acknowledged; the requested revision has been made.

6. Provide information as to the purpose of the proposed roadway located on the west side of Lot 52 and provide the necessary sidewalks for this street.

Response: The referenced drive way is a turn-around for emergency service vehicles, consistent with the previously approved plan.

7. Relocate the proposed monument signs from within the limits of the McNeil Road and Jenkins Road R/W donation.

Response: Acknowledged; please see revised site plan.

8. **ADVISORY COMMENT:** The applicant shall be made aware that prior to approval and recording of the plat that either all infrastructure shall be constructed and approved or said infrastructure shall be bonded.

Response: Acknowledged.

CITY OF FORT PIERCE ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT (PRELIMINARY PLAT COMMENTS)

1. The Final Plat submittal please incorporate the following addition/revisions:

- a. Update the cover page to include specific mortgage, owner, attorney, and POA information as the current submittal does not include the names of the individuals and/or entities.

Response: This information will be included at time of Final Plat.

- b. Revise the Drainage Easement and Lake Easement dedications from St. Lucie County to the Homeowner's Association or provide documentation that St. Lucie County is agreeable to providing maintenance of said easements.

Response: Easement dedication has been revised to reflect the HOA.

- c. Under the heading of Planning and Development Approval, verify that the noted zoning of R-3 is correct or whether this should be revised due to the recent PD application.

Response: R-3 has been revised to "Planned Development".

- d. The dedication notes reference the Water Management Tract, but this also needs to reference the appropriate tract numbers as identified on the plan sheets 2 thru 7.

Response: Water Management tracts and other tracts have been addressed.

- e. There are three Tract l's referenced on the plat, one for the Recreation Tract, one for the Open Space and one for the Water Management Tract; please revise two of the numbers to avoid any confusion.

Response: The referenced tracts have been renumbered.

- f. Add the subdivision street names to the plat.

Response: Street names have not been determined at this time, but shall be added to the Final Plat.

- g. It is recommended that the final plat includes the dedication of the Jenkins Road and McNeil Road Right-of-Ways to St. Lucie County as opposed to the recordation of a separate deed.

Response: Right-of-Way dedications have been added to the Preliminary Plat.

- h. It is recommended that the noted street right-of-ways be encompassed within the limits of a defined Roadway Tract as opposed to being conveyed by deed to the POA.

Response: Right-of-Way dedications have been added to the Preliminary Plat.

2. Advisory Comment: The applicant shall be made aware that the Final Plat will be reviewed by the City's contract surveyor in order to confirm conformity with State Statutes Chapter 177 and as such a professional review fee payable to Northstar Geomatics will be required prior to any review.

Response: Acknowledged.

CITY OF FORT PIERCE BUILDING DEPARTMENT

1. Building Official or his representative has no comment at the time of this meeting, but reserves submission of comments upon completion of the official plan review.

Response: Acknowledged.

FORT PIERCE UTILITIES AUTHORITY (PD COMMENTS)

1. FPUA W/WW Engineering: Water and Wastewater are available for this site and FPUA has already been in discussions with the applicant and Engineer regarding utility planning and concerns. Certified utility plans must be submitted for review and approval prior to construction. Please continue communications with Richard Mutterback at (772) 466-1600 ext. 3425 with any ongoing questions or to schedule a pre-submittal meeting.

FPUA Electric & Gas Engineering: Approved

Response: Acknowledged.

FORT PIERCE UTILITIES AUTHORITY (PRELIMINARY PLAT COMMENTS)

1. FPUA W/WW Engineering: Water and Wastewater are available for this site and FPUA has already been in discussions with the applicant and Engineer regarding utility planning and concerns. Certified utility plans must be submitted for review and approval prior to construction. Please continue communications with Richard Mutterback at (772) 466-1600 ext. 3425 with any ongoing questions or to schedule a pre-submittal meeting.

FPUA Electric & Gas Engineering: Electric & Gas is available for this parcel. Please contact Jason Mittler (772)466-1600x6306 for details.

Response: Acknowledged.

ST. LUCIE COUNTY – ENGINEERING DIVISION

1. A review of the traffic study by an outside party may be required at the cost of the applicant. The County will work with outside consultants to get pricing. Additional Comments may be forthcoming pending the traffic review.

Response: Acknowledged.

2. Due to the amount of development occurring on Jenkins Road, the County is working on a corridor study for the area. The conclusion of the study may identify the need for proportionate share requirements for the expansion of the roadway. The County advises that proposed developments on the corridor should wait until the study is finalized before moving forward with construction permits.

Response: Per our conversation with the St. Lucie County Engineering Department, it would appear at this time that the referenced corridor study may not impact this project due to the County's consideration of our proposed project timeline and the stage of review of the proposed development plan, as compared to the generation and review of the referenced study.

3. Jenkins Road is identified on the County's Right-of-Way Protection Plan as future 160 FT Right-of-Way. It appears that dedications may have been made in the past. Please update the survey to correctly identify the current Right-of-Way. A Right-of-Way dedication of up to 40 FT for Jenkins Road may be required depending on how much was dedicated in the past.

Response: Please see revised Boundary Survey, attached; all affected plans have been updated accordingly. The as-built plans for Jenkins Road (FDOT FPID: 428984-1-52-01) have been included in this response. The as-builts indicate the maximum "proposed R/W line" for this section of Jenkins is 164' (82' from centerline). Further, there are existing dedications that are greater than the 160' suggested in the comment. As such, the proposed right-of-way dedication line has been identified on the plans as 164' to match the Jenkins Road FDOT as-builts.

4. McNeil Road is identified on the County's Right-of-Way Protection Plan as future 80 FT Right-of-Way. The existing Right-of-Way is 66 FT in this location. A Right-of-Way dedication of 7 FT for McNeil Road will be required.

Response: Acknowledged. Please see response for item 6 below.

5. There is currently a driveway connection and right turn lane located at the McNeil Road proposed entrance. The applicant will be required to recertify the driveway, turn lane, and sidewalks located within the County Right-of-Way.

Response: Acknowledged. Please see the enclosed conceptual turn lane plan for McNeill Road.

6. Please verify the location of the berm and sidewalks. The sidewalks along Jenkins Road and McNeil Road should be within the County Right-of-Way, adjacent to the Right-of-Way line. The berm should be located within the development site. Please provide the previously approved plans for this project.

Response: Relative to the existing sidewalk along the project's Jenkins Road frontage, the existing sidewalk currently lies within the County's ROW, and the existing berms appear to also lie within the County's ROW. Relative to the existing sidewalk, it is envisioned that the existing sidewalk shall remain in place unless and until the County initiates roadway construction for the expansion of Jenkins Road; during the course of such construction it is proposed that the sidewalk be reconstructed by the County, to be situated adjacent to the ultimate east ROW line of Jenkins Road. With regard to the existing berms, final site construction plans shall address the berms; it is envisioned at this time the

berms will be removed. The previously approved right-of-way plans have been included as requested (04-212 Neill Farms KB Homes).

Relative to the existing sidewalk along the southern portion of the project's McNeil Road frontage, the existing sidewalk appears to exist within the project boundary. As a ROW dedication for McNeil Road is being requested by the County, it is proposed that additional ROW be dedicated for McNeil Road such that the existing section of sidewalk, and the proposed section of sidewalk, will lie within the ultimate ROW of McNeil Road.

7. A driveway permit will be required for the proposed driveway entrance at Jenkins Road. Driveway permits should be submitted with the appropriate fee to the County's Engineering Division with attention to Grant Chambers, P.E.

Response: Acknowledged.

ST. LUCIE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

1. It appears that the area of the amenity center would be a great location for a bus stop. It would be central to the community and provide parent parking. The plat dedication language does not provide long term assurance that a future POA could non-resend access. Can the language be modified to provide perpetual use for public access of school buses to service the development.

Response: At this time, it is acknowledged that St. Lucie Public Schools, or other public or private educational institution authorized by the state of Florida to operate in St. Lucie County, may utilize the project's internal round-a-bout as a school bus pick-up and drop-off location for students residing in the Neill Farms development; the allowance of such use shall be addressed in the POA/HOA documents. It should be noted that the Developer, his successors or assigns expressly reserves the right to suspend such use should such use be deemed to be not in the best interest of the community, as determined by the POA/HOA.

2. The school is in proximity to both Samuel Gaines Academy and Fairlawn Elementary. Students walking to Fairlawn would go via McNeil. Are there any provisions to provide a sidewalk on McNeil from the Development to Okeechobee Road?

Response: This item will be discussed further directly with the School District and St. Lucie County Engineering Department.

ST. LUCIE TPO

The Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA), dated January 14, 2019, that was conducted by Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. for the proposed Neill Farms PlannedDevelopment contains unsubstantiated assumptions about the traffic volume growth rate.

Page 12 of the TIA indicates "A one percent growth rate was applied to the 2018 volumes to determine the anticipated 2023 volumes". However, no substantiation was provided for the assumed growth rate. Growth rate assumptions that are consistent with historical trends and/or from industry-accepted sources, such as the

U.S. Census Bureau or Florida Bureau of Economic and Business Research (BEBR), should be used to estimate the 2023 traffic volumes.

The table below shows, despite the recession, the average annual growth rate of population in St. Lucie County from 1995 to 2017 is 2.65%. The traffic volume should change proportionally to the regional population. Therefore, 2.65% growth rate should be used to estimate the traffic volume growth rate.

St. Lucie County Population and Growth Rate

Year	1995	2000	2005	2010	2015	2017	Average Annual Growth
Population	176,229	193,433	237,569	278,277	297,929	313,506	
Annual Growth		1.88%	4.20%	3.21%	1.37%	2.58%	2.65%

Date Source: U.S. Census Bureau

Response: The requested revision shall be incorporated into the TIR at such time comments are received from St. Lucie County's third-party Traffic Review Consultant.

ST. LUCIE COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT:

1. In the current configuration (proposed lot design & ROW dedication on McNeil Road), Lot 79 should be reconsidered as the driveway may conflict the adjacent divided roadway entrance.

Response: The noted conflict has been resolved; please see revised plan graphics.

2. A supplemental buffer (wall and/or landscaping) is encourage between lot 78 and lot 83 to provide separation between the proposes internal street and adjacent residential home.

Response: A landscape buffer has been provided for; please see revised plan graphics.

3. The two proposed cul-de-sacs do not feature sidewalk links. The applicant shall consider options to provide a safe and efficient link for pedestrians, between the two terminuses.

Response: A crosswalk has been provided for at both noted locations.

4. The line work for lots 15 & 16 may need revision/clean-up to ensure any applicable or intended drainage easements are accounted for.

Response: Acknowledged.

5. The provided Traffic Impact Report (TIR) identified warrant for a south board left-turn lane on Jenkins Rd. and a north bound left-turn lane on McNeil Rd, however these off-site improvements were not reflected in the Site Plan(s). Please provide detail of these proposed (or warranted per the TIR) improvements and the associated phase of development for completion.

Response: Acknowledged; please see revised plan graphics.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide you with the above responses and look forward to working with you further in your review of our requests. Please do not hesitate to contact me directly should you need any clarification on the responses provided above, or should you require any further documentation.

Respectfully,



Brian Nolan, AICP, ASLA
Senior Landscape Architect/Planner