



Civil Engineers • Land Surveyors • Planners • Landscape Architects

July 22, 2022

Mr. Eric Ortman  
Collier County Growth Management Department  
2800 North Horseshoe Drive  
Naples, FL 34104

RE: Roost Road MPUD (PL20220000890), Submittal 2

Dear Mr. Ortman:

This correspondence is our formal response to the sufficiency review letter provided to us on June 2, 2022. Responses to staff comments have been provided in **bold**. The request has been revised to reflect the prior intensity of use approved for the business park portion of the property.

*Rejected Review: Comprehensive Planning Review*

*Reviewed By: Parker Klopf*

*Email: Parker.Klopf@colliercountyfl.gov Phone #: (239) 252-2471*

Correction Comment 1:

Please clarify the reasoning for the fluid density provision between tracts in the second paragraph of exhibit A and how that will work if the commercial plan is implemented.

**RESPONSE:**

**The PUD and evaluation criteria have been revised to clarify.**

Correction Comment 2:

Provide two separate tract maps, one for the full residential development plan and one for the residential/commercial development plan. On the residential/commercial plan separate the commercial and residential components into a three-tract plan.

**RESPONSE:**

**After discussing with staff, the separate tract maps are unnecessary. Tracts A and B have been more clearly labeled.**

Correction Comment 3:

Show the applicable buffers between the different tracts on the tract maps.

**RESPONSE:**

**A notation has been added to the Master Plan indicating that should the business park be developed the required 25 foot wide buffer per LDC 4.02.13.G would apply.**

Correction Comment 4:

According to Policy 5.3d/e the accumulated density between these properties may be distributed throughout a project but the overall intensity of development shall be determined based upon a comparison of public facility impacts as allowed by the existing zoning district and the proposed zoning district. Please provide public facility impact study that shows that the impacts of the proposed zoning are equal to or less than the existing zoning.

**RESPONSE:**

**The GMP discussion in the evaluation criteria did an analysis per Policy 5.3 d/e. No further analysis is required.**

*Rejected Review: Emergency Management Review  
Reviewed By: Eric Ortman for Dan Summers  
Email: Daniel.Summers@colliercountyfl.gov Phone #: (239) 252-3601*

Correction Comment 1:

Mr. Summer's comments are still pending and will be made available to applicant as soon as possible. The "rejection" is being made so that the insufficiency letter may be produced in CityView and sent to the applicant.

**RESPONSE:**

**We are in receipt of Mr. Summer's spreadsheet indicating the request for an emergency generator and cots. We have added a commitment in the PUD.**

*Rejected Review: Engineering Stormwater Review  
Reviewed By: Eric Ortman for Richard Orth  
Email: Richard.Orth@colliercountyfl.gov Phone #: (239) 252-5092*

Correction Comment 1:

Mr. Orth's comments are still pending and will be made available to applicant as soon as possible. The "rejection" is being made so that the insufficiency letter may be produced in CityView and sent to the applicant.

**RESPONSE:**

**The project is under review by SFWMD and the surface water management system will be consistent with the approved ERP.**

*Rejected Review: Engineering Surveyor Review  
Reviewed By: Marcus Berman  
Email: marcus.berman@colliercountyfl.gov Phone #: (239) 252-6885*

Correction Comment 1:

Exhibit D and Boundary Survey: Legal Description, 1) The Parcel 4 description should be located between the end of Parcel 3 and the Less and Except parcel. 2) 3rd paragraph under the Less and Except, remove the "11" in the bearing.

**RESPONSE:**

The legals were provided in 2 separate title commitments as the overall survey is for 2 properties combined into one and that is the reason for them being separated the way they are. Each is labeled per title commitment... The typo in the legal of "11" has been replaced with " " " .

Correction Comment 2:

Boundary Survey: I entered the boundary courses to get a closed figure and found that the west line of parcel 2 B/D is for the overall line for Parcels 1 & 2 so using the B/D of the west line of parcel 1 and intersecting it with the north line parcel 2, I come up with a distance 1368.98, 0.47' short of what the survey says. This is just what I found, is it right or wrong, I do not know, it would be wise to reverify the boundary dimensions and recheck the acreage. One more item, L20 on the survey and the less and except B/D do not match.

**RESPONSE:**

The distance label has been revised. L20 references a deed and calced bearing in the table. The deed is per the provided less and except legal. The calced corresponds to the fractional breakdown as determined from the field survey.

Correction Comment 3:

Boundary Survey Location Map: Change CR 951 to SR 951.

**RESPONSE:**

**The Boundary Survey Location Map has been revised and an updated copy is included with submittal 2.**

*Rejected Review: Environmental Review*

*Reviewed By: Craig Brown*

Email: [Craig.Brown@colliercountyfl.gov](mailto:Craig.Brown@colliercountyfl.gov) Phone #: (239) 252-2548

Correction Comment 1:

Please address CCME Objective 7.1 in the Evaluation Criteria document.

**RESPONSE:**

**The Evaluation Criteria has been revised as requested and Some clarification has been added to the environmental data.**

Correction Comment 2:

The master concept plan notes and the developer commitment in Exhibit A indicates Tract A does not contain any native vegetation and should the Tract A be developed separately no preservation is required. The previous ordinance indicates 15% or 7.93 acres are to be preserved (Ordinance 02-47). Please clarify and update the preservation requirements/calculations for all of the provided exhibits and environmental data.

**RESPONSE:**

**After a site visit with the project biologist and staff, it was determined that no native vegetation exists on the Business Park site; therefore, no native vegetation is shown on this portion of the project. The**

**preserve calculation and commitment have been revised accordingly.**

Correction Comment 3:

Provide the following Environmental Data (LDC 3.08.00): The document described as Habitat Breakdown in the Environmental Data packet does not include FLUCCS codes Hydric Pine Flatwood (625) and Exotic Forested Wetland (630). Staff believe they both should be considered native vegetation. Please address and update the necessary preservation calculations.

**RESPONSE:**

**These areas do have some native vegetation however, the dominance consists of exotic vegetation. Historical aerals show that these areas were a fallow farm field. This is secondary growth that is dominated with exotics and the occasional native vegetation. Excessive water in these areas are actually killing some of the native vegetation such as pine trees. Dead pine trees are scattered throughout. During the site visit this was discussed and examined.**

Correction Comment 4:

Provide the following Environmental Data (LDC 3.08.00): Please provide the sources for the data provided to address both black bear and bald eagle illustrations provided.

**RESPONSE:**

**Acknowledged, exhibits have been modified to show sources.**

Correction Comment 5:

Provide the following Environmental Data (LDC 3.08.00): Please indicate with an exhibit showing the transects walked for the listed species survey.

**RESPONSE:**

**Report revised and included with submittal 2.**

Correction Comment 6:

Please address and provide the following Environmental Data (LDC 3.08.00): The Environmental Data indicates Tillandsia species were observed onsite no exhibit was provided to indicate the locations. Will any plants need to be relocated per LDC 3.04.03.

**RESPONSE:**

**The applicant will follow LDC 3.04,03 Requirement for Protected Plants.**

*Rejected Review: Public Utilities - PUED Review*

*Reviewed By: Jennifer Rainey*

*Email: JenniferA.Rainey@colliercountyfl.gov Phone #: (239) 252-8836*

Correction Comment 1:

Statement of Utility Provisions: Retail Use should reflect 50,000 sf not 15,000 sf

**RESPONSE:**

**The Statement of Utility Provisions has been revised and is included with submittal 2.**

Correction Comment 2:

Statement of Utility Provisions: Add units to all calculations. Water Peak, Water Average Daily and Sewer Average Daily should be in GPD. Sewer Peak should be in GPM per WW flow calculator (example sewer peak = 324.3 GPM for the 500 DUs). Please include the WW flow calculator in your resubmittal.

**RESPONSE:**

**The Statement of Utility Provisions has been revised and is included with submittal 2.**

Correction Comment 3:

Statement of Utility Provisions: Confirm intent of residential or business park plus retail. Options conflict with other application materials. Update and define uses per WW calculator to obtain Sewer Average Daily (GPM) and Sewer Peak (GPM). Define the variety of uses. Provide WW calculator to backup scenario. Update calcs including units. Note: Water Average Daily should be Sewer Average Daily x 1.4 in GPD. Water Peak should be Water Average Daily x 1.3 in GPD.

**RESPONSE:**

**The Statement of Utility Provisions has been revised and is included with submittal 2.**

Correction Comment 4:

Front Setback and \*2 conflict. Please review and update.

**RESPONSE:**

**Footnote #2 has been modified to eliminate the potential conflict.**

*Rejected Review: Transportation Pathways Review  
Reviewed By: Michael Sawyer  
Email: michael.sawyer@colliercountyfl.gov Phone #: (239) 252-2926*

Correction Comment 1:

Rev.1: Reference Exhibit E, Deviations. Remove deviation 4. Sidewalks. Staff will not support this deviation. Follow current LDC minimum standards.

**RESPONSE:**

**This is an existing approved deviation applicable only to the business park use on Tract A. The applicant is not authorized to modify existing deviations.**

*Rejected Review: Transportation Planning Review  
Reviewed By: Michael Sawyer  
Email: michael.sawyer@colliercountyfl.gov Phone #: (239) 252-2926*

Correction Comment 1:

Rev.1: Reference Exhibit E, Deviations. Remove Deviation 3. Staff will not support the deviation. Street intersections follow FDOT Greenbook Standards.

**RESPONSE:**

**This is an existing approved deviation applicable only to the business park use on Tract A. The applicant is not authorized to modify existing deviations.**

Correction Comment 2:

Rev.1: Reference Exhibit F, Commitments, Transportation A. Revise this section to provide all three potential development scenarios as A.1, A.2. and A.3. Currently appears all are equally applicable.

**RESPONSE:**

**The TIS has evaluated the existing and potential intensity. There are only two development scenarios proposed.**

Correction Comment 3:

Rev.1: TIS document. Revise the TIS to show all three scenario's all applicable tables separate and together, including separate distribution, and separate impacts. TIS must cover all three development scenarios, trip counts, and impacts.

**RESPONSE:**

**As noted, there are three (3) development scenarios, but Scenarios 1 and 3 (as defined by the TIS) are basically the same therefore negating the need for a third analysis, as described below.**

**Scenario No. 1. The existing land uses are developed as currently entitled. This is the most intense development scenario. The commercial land uses will have access via only Collier Boulevard and the residential uses will have access via only Roost Road. The TIS does evaluate the impacts for this condition.**

**Scenario No. 2. As proposed, the properties are combined and developed under unified control and the maximum development will be 500 dwelling units that will have access to both Collier Boulevard and Roost Road. This is the least intense development which is expected to occur if the PUD amendment is approved by the BCC but the trips cap will not be reduced from the existing entitlements (i.e., Scenario 1).**

**Scenario No. 3. If the PUD amendment is approved but the properties are not developed under unified control and the commercial tract is developed as currently entitled and the residential tract is developed as proposed. This scenario will generate 24 less PM peak hour trips than Scenario 1 and the access is the same as described for Scenario 1. Therefore, the impacts identified for Scenario 1 are applicable to Scenario 3 which negates the need for a separate impact analysis.**

Correction Comment 4:

Rev.1. Please include a project trip distribution figure showing the project volumes for each of the three scenarios.

**RESPONSE:**

**The TIS has been revised and the trip distributions have been established for Scenario 1 and Scenario 2. Because Scenario 3 access and traffic distributions and off-site impacts are the same as Scenario 1 (less**

**24 trips), there was no need create another distribution map or table.**

Correction Comment 5:

Rev.1: Several locations in the TIS, including Tables A, B, 1A and 1B refer to existing land uses. However, it appears the property is presently undeveloped. Is the intent to refer to existing land use entitlements? Please clarify. Also, please explain how the existing entitlements were arrived at. None of the documents included in this submittal specifically support these uses. For example, Ordinance 02-47 does not include Tract B and does not specifically list retail uses, other than eating places, nor does it limit the GFA of any uses as suggested in the TIS. Shopping Center does not appear to be a permitted use as currently approved.

**RESPONSE:**

**The properties remain undeveloped and the TIS was revised for clarification purposes.**

Correction Comment 6:

Rev.1: The only retail uses allowed per the proposed MPUD are eating places (group 5812). Please replace shopping center rates with restaurant rates in the trip generation calculations in this scenario.

**RESPONSE:**

**The commercial tract is entitled to 200,000 s.f. of business park, 50,000 s.f. of retail and a 200-room hotel. The TIS has been revised to reflect the maximum development intensity of the existing land use entitlements.**

Correction Comment 7:

Rev.1: The proposed MPUD would allow up to 500 single family units as well as 150,000 SF of business park uses, and 50,000 SF of retail uses. This is allowed by the proposed MPUD language provided no dwelling units are developed in Tract A and the PUD is under unified control. Please provide three scenarios in the TIS which includes 150,000 SF of business park uses and 50,000 SF of retail uses in Tract A and 500 single family dwelling units in Tract B, along with the various other scenario proposed along with all applicable impacts.

**RESPONSE:**

**The TIS was revised for the most-intense development scenario (i.e., existing land use entitlements) and the least-intense development scenario (as proposed 500 dwelling units under constructed unified control). As defined by Table A of the TIS, if Tracts A and B become combined and under unified control, then the proposed number and type of dwelling units (i.e., 500 multi-family and single-family units) can be located where desired throughout the PUD and Tract A and Tract B will have access to Collier Boulevard and Roost Road. If not under unified control, then the number and type of dwelling units are an alternate land use that can only be constructed on the corresponding referenced Tract A and Tract B. Also, if not developed under unified control, any existing or proposed land use entitlements that remain intact can be developed as entitled.**

Correction Comment 8:

Rev.1: Revise the trip cap as outlined above including language for Commitment A to reflect the trip cap if the PUD is developed under unified control. Revise the language for Commitment B to reflect the

separate trip caps for each Tract to apply when they are not developed under unified control all within the same commitment not as separate commitments.

**RESPONSE:**

**The trips cap is based upon the properties' existing land use entitlements' trips cap and is not proposed to be reduced. The request for the PUD amendment is to allow the Developer(s) to construct less-intense uses which will generate substantially fewer trips, but the existing trips cap will not be reduced.**

Correction Comment 9:

Rev.1: Tables 2A and 2B include Collier Blvd (CR 951) Links 32.2 (Golder Gate Pkwy to GG Canal) and 36.2 (Wal-Mart to Manatee) as 6D (6 lanes divided) with capacities of 3000 VPHPD and 2500 VPHPD each respectively. However, the 2021 AUIR lists these links as 4D (4 lanes divided) with capacities of 2300 VPHPD and 2000 VPHPD respectively. Please revise consistent with the AUIR and revise Tables 4A and 4B accordingly for each of the scenarios. Also remove the portion of the TIS that proposes to increase capacity over those listed.

**RESPONSE:**

**The TIS is based upon the 5-year CIP as defined by the 2021 AUIR and then applies the applicable capacity thresholds, which has been accepted in the past for other projects. However, for informational purposes, the revised TIS also includes the existing capacities and LOS results as requested by the reviewer.**

Correction Comment 10:

Rev.1: Please revise the 2026 Peak Hour PK Direction Background volume for Segment 38 to 1910 in Table 4B, consistent with Table 4A.

**RESPONSE:**

**The TIS was revised as noted.**

*Rejected Review: Zoning Review*

*Reviewed By: Eric Ortman*

*Email: Eric.Ortman@colliercountyfl.gov Phone #: (239) 252-1032*

Correction Comment 1:

The survey and property owner list do not agree with respect to the number of parcels. This may require adjusting acreage on all documents.

**RESPONSE:**

**The parcels shown on the boundary survey are per the title commitment. The parcels listed on the property owner list are from the property appraiser. The information provided is correct on both documents and the acreage shown on all documents is correct.**

Correction Comment 2: Application

1. Pg. 2. Please correct zoning. It is PUD, E, and MH

2. Pg. 3. Please correct adjacent zoning so that it matches master plan. C-4 should be added to N.



**RESPONSE:**

**The application has been revised as requested and is included in submittal 2.**

Correction Comment 3: Property Ownership Disclosure

1. Move entities from Corp (b) to Gen (d) as they are LLCs
2. Provide list of all individuals who stand to benefit from approval of this petition.
3. Clarify the percent of ownership for each owner.

**RESPONSE:**

**The Property Ownership Disclosure has been revised as requested and is provided in submittal 2.**

Correction Comment 4: Exhibits A-F

Exhibit A

1. It appears that there are three scenarios for Tract A: all business (B), business and residential (B&R) or all residential (R) Permitted Uses. If Tract A is developed both B&R (Principal Use #2, #3) there is a contradiction between this and the second to last sentence of paragraph two on page one.

**RESPONSE:**

**There are only two scenarios. Overall PUD will be residential only or Tract A will be business park/retail uses and Tract B will be residential uses.**

2. The landscape around Roost Road has dramatically changed since 2002. Many of the industrial uses permitted by Ord. 02-47 may no longer be appropriate including industrial and commercial machinery, industrial inorganic chemicals, leather and leather products, plastic materials and synthetics, and rubber and miscellaneous plastic parts.

**RESPONSE:**

**The Business Park portion of the PUD is under contract for sale, if the sale is not finalized the business park uses will remain and be consistent with the GMP.**

3. To provide maximum development flexibility and maximum clarity, it would be helpful if Exhibit A were broken down into each of the scenarios.

**RESPONSE:**

**There are only two scenarios. Overall PUD will be residential only or Tract A will be business park/retail uses and Tract B will be residential uses.**

4. Under Tract B and Amenity Area please indicate that "construction offices" are limited to the time-period of active development.

**RESPONSE:**

**A notation has been added indicating that construction offices are limited to that during active construction.**

Exhibit B

1. Table 1 - change average lot width to minimum lot width
2. Table 1 - add footnote for double asterisk for max gross comm
3. Table 2 – accessory structure side setback should not be zero
4. Table 2 – Footnote 6 does not agree with minimum distances between building for zero-lot line homes.

**RESPONSE:**

**Exhibit B has been revised and is included with submittal 2.**

5. Provide justification for the requested height of accessory structures for townhouses.

**RESPONSE:**

**The height is necessary to permit both pool screen enclosures and screens on second story balconies.**

Exhibit C

1. Please add C-4 zone to master plan A and B so that they match C

**RESPONSE:**

**Exhibit C has been revised and is included with submittal 2.**

Correction Comment 5: Evaluation Criteria LDC 10.02.13.B.5

1. Paragraph 2 Page 1: The sentence which includes, “allow a maximum of 500 residential units and/or 150,000 square feet of business park uses, and 50,000 square feet of retail uses” contradicts the first sentence of paragraph two in Exhibit A.
2. Criterion A: Response does not address suitability with respect to traffic, drainage/stormwater capacities and management (project is in CHHA), adequacy of water and sewer capacity.
3. Criterion C: Please provide the calculations for FLUE Policy 5.3.e.
4. Criterion G: Please correct response. There are two public use (P) districts abutting the subject property and extensive undeveloped land immediately west of Collier Blvd.
5. Criterion H: Response does not include deviations sought.

**RESPONSE:**

**The Evaluation Criteria has been revised as requested.**

Correction Comment 6: Evaluation Criteria LDC 10.02.08.F

1. For questions 1-4 please list how the proposed development will be consistent with each of the items.
2. Question 5 – Rephrase response as the Urban Coastal Fringe Subdistrict does not prohibit mobile homes where land is already zoned MH but does prohibit rezones to permit mobile home development.
3. Question 13 – Rephrase response; residential land uses are already permitted on some of the subject parcels.
4. Question 16 – The response does not address the degree of site alteration required.

**RESPONSE:**

**The Evaluation Criteria has been revised as requested. Redundant statements have been referenced rather than repeated.**

*Rejected Review: County Attorney Review*

*Reviewed By: Derek Perry*

*Email: Derek.Perry@colliercountyfl.gov Phone #: (239) 252-8066*

Correction Comment 1:

Please confirm that the Property Ownership Disclosure Form lists all human persons with an equitable interest in the application. Please ensure all human persons that will financially benefit from the approval of this application are listed. This may be resolved by responding “confirmed” in the response letter to the County upon resubmittal.

**RESPONSE:**

**A revised Property Ownership Disclosure Form has been revised and lists all human persons that will financially benefit from the approval of this application.**

Correction Comment 2:

The Permittable Uses of Page 1 of 18 are unclear and ambiguous. Please resolve accordingly.

**RESPONSE:**

**The permitted uses description has been modified for clarity.**

Correction Comment 3:

On pages 1 – 3 of 18, Tract A, the Principal Uses in subsection 1 (100%) and subsection 2 (30%) do not distinguish between the Business Park uses and/or the Retail uses. Please remove percentages and otherwise resolve accordingly.

**RESPONSE:**

**This language exists in the approved ordinance for the business park and are required to be retained by the seller.**

Correction Comment 4:

For the Deviations Exhibit, pages 15-16 of 18, please relist the Deviations from Ordinance 2002-47 as new, numbered deviations. Should these deviations apply only to Tract A, please label as such accordingly.

**RESPONSE:**

**Deviations are numbered accordingly and those applicable to Tract A only are so noted.**

Correction Comment 5:

This application uses base MH-zoning’s square footage requirement of 6,000 sq. feet and the existing property’s 43.1 acres to calculate 7.26 density units per acre (with references that this is permissible because the subject property is consistent by policy in the GMP). However, this property is located in the Urban Coastal Fringe Subdistrict and the Coastal High Hazard Area. The Urban Coastal Fringe Subdistrict restricts density in the GMP: “residential densities within the Subdistrict shall not exceed a maximum of four (4) dwelling units per acre, except as allowed in the Density Rating System to exceed four (4) units per acre through provision of Affordable Housing and Transfers of Development Rights, and except as

allowed by certain FLUE Policies under Objective 5.” Please explain how 7.26 density units per acre is lawful under the GMP (see, e.g., Policy 5.3.c-d, and Policy 5.4).

**RESPONSE:**

**It is our understanding that this comment has been answered internally by County staff and no longer requires an applicant response.**

Correction Comment 6:

Miscellaneous Corrections: Doesn't the FLUE's Density Reduction subtract density from this application (1 unit per acre) as property within the Coastal High Hazard Area (see B. DENSITY RATING SYSTEM, 3. Density Reduction, page 59 of the FLUE in the GMP)? Please explain.

**RESPONSE:**

**It is our understanding that this comment has been answered internally by County staff and no longer requires an applicant response.**

Correction Comment 7:

The pre-app notes mention that this petition will contain affordable housing. Please confirm that this application proposes to rezone all 377 density units of affordable housing via MH-zoning to residential-zoning without any affordable housing commitments or requirements.

**RESPONSE:**

**This was discussed at the preapplication meeting in the event the applicant would seek density above the 500 units authorized without an affordable housing bonus. The applicant is not proposing affordable housing or bonus density.**

Correction Comment 8:

Please remove the errant quotation mark at the end of Exhibit F, General, paragraph B.

**RESPONSE:**

**Revised as requested.**

Correction Comment 9:

Please confirm whether there will be a square footage cap to the Hotels, Page 3 of 18, Tract A A.2.e.

**RESPONSE:**

**The minutes reflect a maximum of 200 units with no floor area. The PUD has been revised to state 200 units.**

Correction Comment 10:

Please specify “single family” with “Zero Lot Line” on page 3 of 18, Tract A A.3.b, and elsewhere the term “Zero Lot Line” appears.

**RESPONSE:**

**Revised as requested.**

Correction Comment 11:

Please specify principal “residential” uses on page 3 of 18, Tract A B.1.

**RESPONSE:**

**Revised as requested.**

Correction Comment 12:

Please confirm with staff whether CUD language is permissible for accessory uses; and if not, please remove the clauses, where applicable (in light of pending changes and recent policy discussions with the Board regarding CUDs)

**RESPONSE:**

**After consulting with staff it was determined that the CUD language is not necessary for accessory uses.**

Correction Comment 13:

For Table II Residential, on page 7 of 18, please update the minimum distance between buildings to minimum distance between "structures". Please remove Front Parcel setbacks from footnote \*2. Please remove "building" from Maximum Height in accessory structures table.

**RESPONSE:**

**Revised as requested.**

Correction Comment 14:

Please explain how the 0/5 feet works for Zero Lot Line Minimum Distance Between Buildings.

**RESPONSE:**

**It permits zero feet where attached and where there are building off-sets or separation 10 feet is required.**

Correction Comment 15:

For the Master Plan, please provide a more clearly labeled and hatched Tract Map that better distinguishes between A and B.

**RESPONSE:**

**Revised as requested.**

Correction Comment 16:

For the Master Plan, please label the Enlargement of Tract A and the Enlargement of Tract B as such and soften (make more opaque) the property outside of the boundaries (for example, soften any Tract B that is shown on the Tract A map).

**RESPONSE:**

**The Master Plan has been revised to distinguish the Tracts.**

Correction Comment 17:

For the Tract B map of the Master Plan, please better label, carve out, and identify Lucy Lane.

**RESPONSE:**

**Lucy Lane is identified on the Master Plan.**

Correction Comment 18:

For the Master Plan, please label the OR Book and Pages of the Roost Road ROW. Please note that the Boundary Survey only provided one half of the road. Please confirm the appropriate legal access exists for the other (eastern) half of the road and include this information on the Master Plan.

**RESPONSE:**

**The Master Plan has been revised.**

Correction Comment 19:

Depending on how the hypothetical unification of the PUD and subsequent shifting of units is stated, explained, and/or presented in the zoning document, please change Note 3 of the Master plan accordingly.

**RESPONSE:**

**Based on our post review call with staff the notation will remain as written.**

Correction Comment 20:

Please clarify, combine, and/or eliminate Retail Uses and Business Park uses as one use classification.

**RESPONSE:**

**The ASGM Business Park was approved with business park and non-business park uses, which includes limited retail uses.**

Correction Comment 21:

Please provide Consents from Rookery Bay Business Park, LLC and Managing Entity of Tract A and Carleton MHC LLC as Managing Entity of Tract B, because they are not the applicant.

**RESPONSE:**

**The managing entity information has been revised and a consent form has been provided from both managing entities.**

*Rejected Review: Landscape Review*

*Reviewed By: Mark Templeton*

*Email: Mark.Templeton@colliercountyfl.gov Phone #: (239) 252-2475*

Correction Comment 1:

Deviation 2 indicates it is for the South and North buffer of the BP/R tracts. But the Master Plan buffer notes indicate that the only boundary that would not have a buffer is the Southern boundary of the BP/R Tract. The Staff will make a site visit to evaluate the condition of the preserves to the North and South

**RESPONSE:**

**The preserves have been adjusted based on a site visit from Craig Brown.**

Correction Comment 2:

If \*4 is added to the master plan along the North side of the BP/R tract to be consistent with deviation 4 language, this will need to be limited to only the portion of that boundary that abuts the preserve in Enbrook which shows residential abutting a portion of the BP/R tract.

**RESPONSE:**

**The limited area of the deviation is identified on the Master Plan.**

Correction Comment 3:

LDC 4.06.02 C.5 states that a business park is required to provide a 25' buffer around the entire boundary. So the buffer along Collier Blvd should be a 20' Type D if residential, 25' buffer per LDC 4.06.05 C.5 if business park.

**RESPONSE:**

**The master plan has been revised to reflect the potential for the business park buffer.**

Correction Comment 4:

Is deviation 2 only applicable in the event that it is developed as residential and not BP? If not, please revise the language for deviation 2 to indicate that the deviation is from the BP buffer requirements of LDC 4.06.02 C.5 in addition to 4.06.02 Table 2.4

**RESPONSE:**

**The deviation language has been revised as requested.**

Please feel free to contact me or Richard Yovanovich (239-435-3535) should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "D. Wayne Arnold".

D. Wayne Arnold, AICP

c: Mattamy Homes  
Richard D. Yovanovich, Esq.  
GradyMinor File (MHRRZPPL)