

CPAL-18-060 • REZ-18-070 • TXT-18-179 • DMP-18-071

Utilities Department Formal Review Comments

CPAL-18-060

- Please change the wording on Page 12 of the application where it states “irrigation lines” to “Reclaimed water lines”. And “irrigation water” to “reclaimed water”.
- I don’t see a soil analytical summary table for Sabal Trace itself, locations SB-1 thru SB-8 like there is for offsite locations BG-1 thru BG-10. Is there a reason for this to not be included?

REZ-18-070/TXT-18-179

- The existing reclaimed storage tank and pumps will be removed by the developer and a new reclaimed water pond/lake will need to be installed by the developer, metered as the water enters the pond not after.

Public Works – Infrastructure Formal Review Comments

Submit a Traffic Impact Analysis including the following:

- Daily trips generated
- Peak Hour Am trips generated
- Peak Hour PM trips generated

Use the latest edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineers, Trip Generation Manual for the trip generation rates for the highest and best uses.

Graphically show the trip distribution from the proposed project’s connections to the City of North Port roadways, with direction of trips onto the City’s roadways.

1. As part of the Traffic Study, please submit an operational and safety analysis for the following intersections;
 - a. Greenwood Avenue at Sumter Blvd.
 - b. Greenwood Avenue at North Port Blvd.
 - c. Appomattox Drive at Sumter Blvd.
 - d. Appomattox Drive at North Port Blvd.
2. As part of the operational analysis, review the existing northbound left turn lane along Sumter Blvd. at Greenwood and Appomattox Dr. We want to make sure that the additional traffic will not result in left turn queues blocking the inside north bound thru lane along Sumter Blvd. at these two locations.

3. Perform a right turn lane warrant analysis per National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) Publication 279 at the following intersections:
 - a. Southbound Sumter to westbound Greenwood
 - b. Southbound Sumter to westbound Appomattox Dr.
 - c. Northbound North Port Blvd. to Eastbound Greenwood Avenue
 - d. Northbound North Port Blvd. to Eastbound Appomattox Dr.
 - e. Eastbound Appomattox Dr. at proposed north driveway entrance
 - f. Westbound Greenwood Avenue at proposed south main driveway
4. Perform a left turn lane warrant analysis per NCHRP 745
 - a. Eastbound Greenwood Avenue at proposed south main driveway
 - b. Westbound Appomattox Dr. at proposed north driveway entrance
 - c. Southbound North Port Blvd. at Appomattox Drive.
5. The traffic use for the turn lane analysis must include the total traffic which will be a combination of the project generated traffic plus existing traffic accessing the developments along Appomattox and Greenwood Avenue.
6. The City will consider a separate alternative of providing a bridge over the Coco Plum waterway that can alleviate the traffic along Sumter and Appomattox. A different scenario of the required scenarios on items 3 and 4 above can be analyzed with the potential bridge in place.

The Traffic Impact Analysis shall be prepared, signed and sealed by a professional engineer, licensed with the state of Florida and qualified to prepare the Traffic Impact Analysis.

Planning Division Formal Review Comments

Planning Division - Nicole Galehouse, 941-429-7098

- There is already an Activity Center called “The Springs.” Please choose a new project name.
- The acreage shown on the application varies from the data in the Property Appraiser records (208.5 acres). The survey and legal description do not identify acreage. Please provide verification of acreage on the survey. If acreage is inaccurate, the additional fees/acre will need to be paid.
- A signed and sealed boundary survey needs to be submitted. {Sec. 53-22.D.(9); Sec. 1-33.E.(2)} Survey provided is a specific purpose survey showing new drainage easement and is not signed/sealed.
- The Articles of Corporation provided were for the proposed property ownership. Please provide Articles of Corporation for the current property owner. This should identify the applicant as an authorized agent for the corporation. If the applicant is not listed as the authorized agent, please provide documentation that the applicant has authority to act on behalf of the property owner.
- A school capacity determination is required for a comprehensive plan amendment and a rezone. Please provide documentation of this.
- Terminology throughout the documents uses “Pattern Book” and “Pattern Plan” interchangeably. Please choose one and use consistently.

- Narrative states that the proposal is for 500 residential units plus a mixed-use component. The traffic impact statement shows 500 residential units (200 single family and 300 villas), plus the mixed-use components as: 30,000 square feet of medical office, 20,000 square feet of commercial, 300 senior living units, and 50,000 square feet of mini-storage. For proper calculation of density/intensity, which is the requested maximum number of residential units – 500 or 800?
- Property Development Regulations Table:
 - Chart shows “minimum lot coverage” – is this supposed to be “maximum lot coverage?” In any case, the maximum lot coverage permitted by code in a PCD zoning district is 50%. Lot coverage is not permitted to exceed this or to be varied to exceed these under any circumstances. {Sec. 53-107.B.(1)}
 - Minimum building sizes are only provided for mini-storage. Staff would like to see a minimum building size for conventional multi-family. Additionally, staff is requesting a maximum building size for mini-storage.
 - Minimum open space requirements are 30% per PCD zoning requirements. Please demonstrate why a waiver for this is being requested.
 - If proposed open space is being calculated for the entire site, please provide a requirement that each individual infrastructure/subdivision/site plan application will show a tracking chart.
 - Setbacks for PCD in the ULDC are 0 ft / 0ft / 20 ft (front/side/rear) for commercial and office uses. {Sec. 53-109} Proposed setbacks exceed these requirements. Staff understands the proposed additional separation when abutting residential, however encourages the remaining setbacks to be reduced to code requirements to encourage true mixed-use development.
- Figure 1. Standards for Activity Centers:
 - See note above about minimum open space requirements.
 - Provide a proposed density/intensity for mixed use development. Include the senior living in this, as opposed to calling it out separately. Clearly identify if the proposed density/intensity is calculated individually or if the proposal requests that the residential density and nonresidential FAR may be added together.
 - Percentages should add up to 100. Open space requirements should not be listed here. Proposed changes to open space should remain in the property development regulations table as part of the pattern plan.
- Remove Policy 2.9.2. Request any desired residential density during this process. Any change that would affect the residential density/intensity should come back before staff/Commission for review.
- Maximum number of proposed residential units should be included as a new policy. See example in 13.1.n of the Future Land Use Element.
- Analysis on FLU, Table 2-1 – This proposal would alter this table and create additional Activity Center classifications. This table will need to be amended in future staff comprehensive plan amendments.

- Analysis on FLU, Table 2-7 – Staff recommends removing this analysis, as the table is out of date. Again, this table will need to be amended in future staff comprehensive plan amendments.
- Analysis on FLU, Policy 3.4 – This should address job creation by the proposed development. The fiscal impact analysis conducted by staff will show projected employment.
- Analysis on p.12 refers to letters of service availability from EMS, fire, and police. These were not provided in the exhibits.
- Proposed ULDC Text Amendment
 - Retail mini-storage as permitted use:
 - Currently, retail mini-storage is only permitted as a use in Activity Centers 4 and 6. The character of these Activity Centers is very different from the proposed character of Activity Center 9. AC 4 is largely industrial in use, and the same is proposed for AC 6, which staff is beginning to undertake a master plan of. Staff does not recommend that retail mini-storage be permitted in AC 9.
 - IF the applicant chooses to move forward with the request for retail mini-storage, staff requests the following conditions:
 - A maximum acreage of the site that may be developed for this use.
 - Limitation to require front of building and/or first floor commercial retail (see images below).
 - Increased design standards for the use to properly blend with the other intended mixed-use development (see images below).



NORTH-WEST PERSPECTIVE



- Design standards from US 41 Corridor regulations are only slightly heightened from what is required in Activity Center 1 and what is being proposed in Activity Center 9. Staff recommends removing this requirement from the proposal.
- For model homes, please add code reference to Sec. 53-240(U).
- Why are dumpster containers listed as a prohibited use/structure? How will the mixed-use areas manage waste disposal?

- Staff has concerns about allowing keeping of hens in these residential neighborhoods due to the small proposed lot sizes. Noise and smells may become a nuisance in those conditions. The regulations in Sec. 53-121 were proposed for minimum 80' x 120' residential lot. Consider revising this item.
 - Staff encourages the developer to work with communications companies to include small-cell deployment within proposed infrastructure. Other communities, such as Lakewood Ranch, have done this with great success.
- Environmental assessment provided does not discuss methodology for selection of boring sites. Staff has concerns that no borings were done in the eastern “arm” of the site. Please provide additional methodology.
- The proposed remediation in the environmental assessment requires approval by FDEP. At what stage will this approval be obtained?
- The City will be retaining an outside consultant to review the arsenic data. This expense will be billed to the applicant pursuant to Sec. 1-33.E.(8) and Appendix A. B. “Applicant shall pay the fees for experts, as determined by the City.”
- The environmental assessment provided was specific to the arsenic concerns. Please provide an overall environmental assessment. Additionally, for record purposes, please provide the wetlands, wildlife, and vegetative surveys with both sets of applications and all digital files.
- Traffic impact statement is very specific for proposed uses. Staff recommends use of a conversion matrix, for traffic purposes only – NOT to be used for land use mix.
- Proposed Pattern Plan
 - See notes above for proposed land use standards.
 - List prohibited uses in land use standards.
 - Dimensional and performance standards:
 - Lot coverage exceeds that which is allowed by code (50%). As referenced above, this may not be varied.
 - Discuss placement of air conditioner, pool, and other potential equipment. Provide considerations for noise and easements.
 - Bullet point 6 refers to townhomes – is this single-family attached? Are more than paired villas being proposed? If so, please provide more information on this in the narratives.
 - Roadway buffer map is difficult to read. Please provide a clearer image.
 - Plan narrative talks about sidewalks, however roadway and buffer plan does not show sidewalks on the typical street sections. Please revise these to include multimodal opportunities. Please make sure these comply with requirements of Sec. 37-41.
 - Refer to fire department comments regarding length of dead end roads and ensure that any proposed dead end roads will meet these standards.
 - Provide for required parks and/or amenity centers within residential phases of development.
- Urban Design Standards Pattern Book amendment
 - Please provide a copy of this document as a Microsoft Word file.

- Please provide in an underline/strikethrough version.
- P. 5 – The only areas that are exempt from site amenities are the neighborhood commercial zoning districts, which are simply required to meet the design standards of the closest Activity Center. No Activity Center will be exempt from site amenities or public art. Add a note that for AC 9, these only apply to the mixed-use areas.
- P. 6 – Same general comment as p. 5. These standards are required for all Activity Centers.
- P. 10 – fire sprinkler systems are required on all commercial buildings in the City of North Port (see comments from fire department). Please revise this section.
- P. 12 – There are pending code revisions related to retail mini-storage. IF this use is approved in AC9, the implications of the code revisions as it relates to outdoor sales and storage will need to be clearly addressed in this section.
- P. 13 – Roof materials. Staff recommends providing a substitute that is more hurricane-friendly.



City of North Port

North Port Fire Rescue District

4980 City Center Boulevard
North Port, Florida 34286



www.cityofnorthport.com

(941) 240-8150

Fax: (941) 240-8182

Nicole Galehouse
Senior Planner
Neighborhood Development Services
08-24-2018

Ms. Galehouse,

Fire -Rescue has reviewed CPAL-18-060, REZ-18-070, and TXT-18-179 for The Springs at North Port (Sabal Trace). The Prevention Division will review and comment requirements during the SDR process and subsequent plan submission processes.

North Port Fire Rescue has recently undergone an independent study that showed unit and time utilization by station and by department. The study revealed that Fire station 82 on North Port Boulevard is very close to triggering an additional ambulance for a 12-hour peak period. We anticipate that the addition of this development to fire Station 82's response area will contribute to the need for that additional unit and staffing and we would like the developer to arrange a meeting to facilitate discussions regarding potential one-time developer contributions to assist in alleviating the potential impact of this growth. We would also like to discuss the consideration of residential fire sprinklers in their community and have the opportunity to present the benefits to their development if they were to proceed with that consideration.

Thank you very much for the opportunity. There are no additional concerns noted by Fire-Rescue at this time.

SCOTT A. TITUS

North Port Fire Rescue District

Fire Chief

ISO Class I Department

Main Phone: 941.240.8151

Work Cell: 941.724.7840

Personal Cell: 941.628.0076

stitus@cityofnorthport.com