# CITY OF GAINESVILLE PLANNING DIVISION DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

071067

Petition No. 156SUB-06PB

Meeting Date: 2/21/08

Date of Review: 2/11/08

Type of Review: Design Plat Review for Walnut Creek Phase II.

Agent: Causseaux, Hewitt & Walpole, Inc. agent for Legacy Property Development, Inc.

Owner: George E. Fletcher

Zoning: PD Residential

Name of project: Walnut Creek Subdivision

Description of Project: Subdivision for creation of fifty-five lots

Location: 2500 Block of N.W. 39th Avenue

Reviewing Planner: Lawrence

I. Department Comments: This petition is with reference to design plat for Phases II of the Walnut Creek Subdivision. The petition is presented together with a request to re-establish and modify the Planned Development for Walnut Creek. Phases II received design plat but could not proceed to final plat until stormwater concerns related to Phase I was resolved. The applicant is proposing to resolve the stormwater concerns of Phase I by modifying the design of Phases II.

1. Planning:

Approved with conditions

2. Public Works &

Approved with conditions

Traffic Engineering:

3. **G.R.U & Gas:** 

Approved with conditions

4. Police:

No Comments

5. Fire: -

Approved as submitted

6. **Building:** -

Approved as submitted

7. Arborist: -

Approved with conditions

8.

9. Environmental -

Approved with conditions

10. Concurrency Review:

Approved with conditions

II. Overall Recommendation:

Staff recommends Design Plat approval of Petition 156SUB-06PB,

with conditions subject to approval of the PD.

#### SITE PLAN EVALUATION SHEET

DEVELOPMENT PLAN & SUBDIVISION REVIEW EVALUATION CURRENT PLANNING, Thomas Centre Building B

306 NE 6th Avenue, 334-5023

071067

Petition No. 83PDA-06PB & 156SUB-06PB

Review Date:

2/13/2008

Review For: George E. Fletcher, agent for Legacy Property Development Inc. Planned Development Amendment. Walnut

Creek. Located: 2500 block of Northwest 39th Avenue.

Review Type:

Preliminary Final Amend.

Project Planner:

Lawrence Calderon

#### RECOMMENDATIONS/REQUIREMENTS/COMMENT

- This petition is only for Re-establishment of the Planned Development and to address Design Plat.
- The application is deficient in not having a complete set of documents reflecting the PD Layout Plan, Existing Conditions Map, Legal Description, modified application and similar required documents
- 3. Please provide a design plat document to match the plans showing construction drawings.
- 4. Please provide a separate PD Layout Plan and a separate copy of the old PD Layout Plan to complement the map showing the overlay of the old and new PD Layout Plan
- 5. A strikethrough copy of the existing ordinance should be provided to show what portions of the ordinance is intended to be not relevant to the new Phase II
- 6. There is work shown in Phase I, which does not have proper authorization from property owners.
- 7. The piping shown to handle the new stormwater is a modification of the Phase I subdivision. No modification of that portion is included.
- 8. The proposed design plat shows bump-outs along NW 26<sup>th</sup> Street which is not supported by Public Works. Please show how this or a modified design will be consistent with requested PD standards.
- 9. Sidewalks shall be provided along the full width of Lot 101
- 10. A linear park or pervious trail should be incorporated along the east side of NW 26<sup>th</sup> Street between the area south of Lot 101 and Glen Springs Road
- 11. Show sidewalk along Glen Springs Road
- 12. The fence on the east side of the property should be in place in a well kept manner
- 13. Prior to Final Plat approval, the applicant must demonstrate how lot 100 will be developed to preserve the existing Heritage Trees.
- 14. Construction traffic shall not traverse the existing Phase I development. The applicant must show how construction staging will be implemented.

#### CONCURRENCY REVIEW PLANNING DIVISION - (352) 334-5022

071067

Sheet 1 of 1 Petition 83PD & 156SUB-06PB Date Received 12/13/07 Preliminary DRB X PB Other Review Date 1/25/08 Final Project Name Walnut Creek Ph. II & PD amendment Amendment Location 2500 blk. of NW 39th Ave., south side Special Use Agent/Applicant Name DRMP X Planned Dev. Reviewed by Onelia Lazzari AV X Design Plat Concept Approvable Approvable Insufficient X(as submitted) (subject to below) Information PD Concept (Comments only) Concept (Comments only) RECOMMENDATIONS/REQUIREMENTS/COMMENTS The developer should be aware that Walnut Creek subdivision has alreadsigned a TCEA Agreement for the required Concurrency Management Element Policy 1.1.6 standards that must be met for the Phase II portion of the development and that the terms of that agreement still apply. This required the developer to construct two bus shelters along the Glen Springs

Agreement for the required Concurrency Management Element Policy 1.1.6 standards that must be met for the Phase II portion of the development and that the terms of that agreement still apply. This required the developer to construct two bus shelters along the Glen Springs road area in the vicinity of the development. Unless the City hears something else from the developer, it is assumed that the developer does not wish to renegotiate this TCEA Agreement and that the developer will comply with its conditions. However, the City can offer the petitioner the ability to amend that TCEA Agreement to make a payment for construction of the bus shelters in lieu of actual construction. This may make it easier for the developer, and the City would then take on the responsibility of permitting, placement, and construction of those 2 bus shelters along Glen Springs Road.

Please contact Onelia Lazzari if the developer wishes to discuss the payment option in lieu of construction.

This would be the eighth review of the PDA and the sixth review of the design plat.

## SITE PLAN EVALUATION SHEET CITY ARBORIST 334-2171 – Sta. 27

071067

Petition: None assigned Project: Walnut Creek Agent: George E. Fletcher /D!	Review date: 1/25/08	Planner: L. Calderon
APPROVED (as submitted)	APPROVED D	ISAPPROVED
Tree Survey Required Landscape Plan Required Irrigation system required		Comments by:
Attention to conditions (rev		Meg Niederhofer City Arborist

The header indicates this is either the eighth or sixth review of this project, depending on whether one considers the comments to pertain to the old PD or to the design plat. There is no PD ordinance to which to compare this most recent submittal which is labeled a "construction drawing." I realize this may be perceived as nit-picking, but the fact is this project has attracted a lot of attention from the public, so the legality of resurrecting the numbers used for the design plat that applied to an ordinance that has expired should be determined. The next submittal should include text of the new PD proposal. Without a valid PD ordinance that has been approved by Plan Board and City Commission, any kind of approval, even "with conditions," is inappropriate, in my opinion.

The submittal is a great improvement over the fifth review of the design plat. Additional Live Oaks have been identified and added to the plan. These new trees proposed for preservation will help to make up for the loss of the 48" 54", 36", 36"-30"-14", 36", 32", 36"-30", 46", 36" and 46" trees that were to be preserved and now must be removed to solve the drainage problem. There is a net loss, but you may not have to address it if you prepare a new PD ordinance. If you are amending the old ordinance, then you will have to prepare some sort of accounting for trees originally to have been preserved as compared to those now proposed.

I am concerned that the provisions for the preservation of certain Heritage Live Oaks do not meet 30-264 (1) which is the absolute minimum in the Code for tree protection (50% of the root zone completely undisturbed with no grade change or roots cut). Lots 100, 99, 114, 115, 116, 117 do not appear to have sufficient area to meet the 50% minimum and have space to construct homes. Providing details for these lots that show how the homes and work space would be accomplished should be part of a comprehensive tree protection plan that identifies the type of barricade (chainlink would be best), their locations, and dimensions.

This would be the eighth review of the PDA and the sixth review of the design plat.

071067

The inclusion of a landscape plan that meets Code is a big improvement. It shows compliance with the tree requirements relative to the new retention basin and street trees. Two problems exist, however. Public Works might not approve the concept of bulb-outs on a City-maintained street. Also, the existing retention basins in Phase I are not in compliance with Code. I realize that the two phases are separate, but I believe this process would be smoother if that problem was solved.

I will be at the meeting on Tuesday, when we'll have a chance to sit down with the other reviewers and work toward resolution of these problems.

## SITE PLAN EVALUATION SHEET

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW 334-5070 M.S. 58

071067

Petition No. <u>083PDA-06PB</u> , <u>156SUB-06PB</u> Review Date: <u>2/11/08</u>	
Keynesty For (Tooks) - 1 D - 1 C	Review Type:
Review For : Technical Review Committee Plan Reviewed: 2/11/2008	Planned Development
Description, Agent & Location: Walnut Creek Phase II and III	Project Planner:
DRMP 2500 block NW 39 <sup>th</sup> Avenue	Lawrence Calderon
	Dawrence Carderon
APPROVED APPROVED	
	DISAPPROVED
(as submitted) (subject to below)	
Wetlands or wetland buffers must be shown.	
Creeks or creek setbacks must be shown.	Comments By:
Lakes or lake setheral and the shown.	7
Lakes or lake setbacks must be shown.	4 ( 1 0 ( )
Significant ecological communities on site.	Mrk A. Gold
Archaeological/historical sites on site.	Mark Garland
	Environmental Coordinator
	Environmental Coordinator
NOTTO TO	
NOTES/RECOMMENDATIONS:	
1. The applicant has agreed to contact an archaeologist before construction to	o increasing a second
archeological site reported from the area. The new PD ordinance for this are	o investigate the status of the
are state reported from the area. The new PD ordinance for this are	2 Charld regrees the
	a should require this.
2. The applicant proposes to apply for a relocation permit for any conher tor	
2. The applicant proposes to apply for a relocation permit for any conher tor	
2. The applicant proposes to apply for a relocation permit for any conher tor	
2. The applicant proposes to apply for a relocation permit for any conher tor	
2. The applicant proposes to apply for a relocation permit for any conher tor	
2. The applicant proposes to apply for a relocation permit for any conher tor	
2. The applicant proposes to apply for a relocation permit for any conher tor	
2. The applicant proposes to apply for a relocation permit for any conher tor	
2. The applicant proposes to apply for a relocation permit for any conher tor	
2. The applicant proposes to apply for a relocation permit for any conher tor	
2. The applicant proposes to apply for a relocation permit for any gopher tor ordinance for this area should require this at a minimum.	toises found on site. The new PD
2. The applicant proposes to apply for a relocation permit for any gopher tor ordinance for this area should require this at a minimum.	toises found on site. The new PD
2. The applicant proposes to apply for a relocation permit for any gopher tor ordinance for this area should require this at a minimum.	toises found on site. The new PD
2. The applicant proposes to apply for a relocation permit for any gopher tor ordinance for this area should require this at a minimum.	toises found on site. The new PD
2. The applicant proposes to apply for a relocation permit for any gopher tor ordinance for this area should require this at a minimum.	toises found on site. The new PD
2. The applicant proposes to apply for a relocation permit for any gopher tor ordinance for this area should require this at a minimum.	toises found on site. The new PD
2. The applicant proposes to apply for a relocation permit for any gopher tor ordinance for this area should require this at a minimum.	toises found on site. The new PD
2. The applicant proposes to apply for a relocation permit for any gopher tor ordinance for this area should require this at a minimum.	toises found on site. The new PD
2. The applicant proposes to apply for a relocation permit for any gopher tor ordinance for this area should require this at a minimum.	toises found on site. The new PD
2. The applicant proposes to apply for a relocation permit for any gopher tor ordinance for this area should require this at a minimum.	toises found on site. The new PD
2. The applicant proposes to apply for a relocation permit for any gopher tor ordinance for this area should require this at a minimum.	toises found on site. The new PD
2. The applicant proposes to apply for a relocation permit for any gopher tor ordinance for this area should require this at a minimum.	toises found on site. The new PD

### SITE PLAN EVALUATION SHEET

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT 334-5072 M.S. 580 7 10 6 7

Petition No. Review Date: 12/21/07 Review For: Technical Review Committee Plan Reviewed: 12/28/2007	Review Type:
Description, Agent & Location: Walnut Creek Subdivision Phase II	Design Plat
DRMP Inc 3600 block of NW 31st Avenue	Project Planner:
	<u>Lawrence Calderon</u>
☐ APPROVED ☐ APPROVED	DISABBBOVED
(as submitted) (subject to below)	DISAPPROVED
(Subject to Dolow)	
100 Yr. critical duration storm event must be analyzed.	Comments By:
SJRWMD stormwater permit is required.	Comments by.
Treatment volume must be recovered within 72 Hrs. (F.S. of 2)	aushankar
Approved for Concurrency	
	Sundaram (Jai) Jaishankar E.I.
	Development Review Engineer
REVISIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS:	
1 Cover Chart states the sub-it 1	
1. Cover Sheet states the submitted sets are the construction plans for Phase	s II & III. Are there two phases?
2. Sheet 8 of 34 - The new stormwater basin perimeter has been changed sin	
stormwater management report showing that the new basin conforms to a	Il applicable drainers design suitaria
Please note that all other applicable plan sheets that show the basin will n	eed to be revised accordingly to reflect
modified basin shape.	see to be revised accordingly to refrect
2. Sheet 9 of 34 shows square "cut outs" in the pavement of NW 26 <sup>th</sup> street	with that area designated for winged
elm trees. There are maintenance and safety issues associated with this lay	yout. The trees will have to be located
3. Typical sections as shown in sheet 15 of 34 show the parking areas sloping	is away from the outh. We would
prefer that the road slopes towards the curb instead.	ig away nom the curb. We would



#### 071067

### DEVELOPMENT REVIEW EVALUATION GAINESVILLE REGIONAL UTILITIES

Jan 24, 2008

Sewer Electric

Gas Real Estate Ellen Underwood, New Development Coordinator PO Box 147117, Gainesville, FI 32614 Voice (352) 393-1644 - Fax (352) 334-3480

7	Petition	083PD	A-06PR
		~~~	

George E. Fletcher, agent for Legacy Property Development Inc. (Walnut Creek) Planned Development Amendment to re-establish the Second Phase of the Walnut Creek Planned Development and to allow modification of the stormwater management system for Phases I and II. Zoned: PD (Planned Development) Located in the 2500 block of NW 39th Avenue. (Planner, Lawrence Calderon)

	<ul><li>Conceptional Comments</li><li>Approved as submitted</li></ul>	<ul><li>○ Conditions/Comments</li><li>○ Insufficient information to approve</li></ul>
New		
Services		
Water		
Sanitary		



071067

### DEVELOPMENT REVIEW EVALUATION GAINESVILLE REGIONAL UTILITIES

Ellen Underwood, New Development Coordinator PO Box 147117, Gainesville, Fl 32614 Voice (352) 393-1644 - Fax (352) 334-3480

Jan 24, 2008

8 Petition 156SUB-06PB

George E. Fletcher, agent for Legacy Property Development Inc. (**Walnut Creek**) Design Plat Review for Phase II, on 15.8 acres, M.O.L and to allow modification of the stormwater system for Phase I of the Walnut Creek Subdivision. Zoned: PD (Planned Development) Located in the 2500 block of NW 39th Avenue. (Planner, Lawrence Calderon)

	<ul><li>○ Conceptional Comments</li><li>○ Approved as submitted</li></ul>	<ul><li>● Conditions/Comments</li><li>○ Insufficient information to approve</li></ul>
New Services	This project will need to go through with a plan review application.	n plan review. Please submit 4 sets of plans along
Water		
Sanitary Sewer		
Electric		
Gas		
Real Estate		



8

071067

### DEVELOPMENT REVIEW EVALUATION GAINESVILLE REGIONAL UTILITIES

Ellen Underwood, New Development Coordinator PO Box 147117, Gainesville, Fl 32614 Voice (352) 393-1644 - Fax (352) 334-3480

Feb 11, 2008

Petition 156SUB-06PB \$ 83PDA -06PB

George E. Fletcher, agent for Legacy Property Development Inc. (Walnut Creek) Design Plat Review for Phase II, on 15.8 acres, M.O.L and to allow modification of the stormwater system for Phase I of the Walnut Creek Subdivision. Zoned: PD (Planned Development) Located in the 2500 block of NW 39th Avenue. (Planner, Lawrence Calderon)

	<ul><li>○ Conceptional Comments</li><li>○ Approved as submitted</li></ul>	ns/Comments ent information to app	)rovo
New Services	This project will need to go through with a plan review application.	,	
Water Sanitary Sewer Electric Gas Real Estate			

Original document in standard print. Revisions June 2006 February 2008 in bold print with deletions lined thru.

# CAMEO DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION 3600 NW 43rd St., Suite C-1 Gainesville, Florida 32608 8127

071067

DRMP 4110 SW 34<sup>th</sup> St., Suite 8 Gainesville, Florida 32608

PD Amendment—June 2006 February 2008
Walnut Creek Planned Development

#### Purpose and Intent

This proposed Residential Planned Development (PD) is submitted as a neo-traditional neighborhood development of single family detached homes. The development follows the guidelines set forth in the Land Development Code under Sections 30-211, 30-213, and 30-216. The development will be named Walnut Creek and is in conformance with the current comprehensive plan which proposes unique designs t hat are not currently available in the Gainesville area. The majority of the homes will be directly across from each other to offer a more traditional neighborhood theme. This concept will provide moderately price homes with brick and stucco exteriors and modern elevations with approximately 70% of the homes having front porches with a minimum depth of 8 feet that will be oriented to the neighborhood tree lined streets and approximately 60% with rear alley access. Garages, which are accessed from the front, shall be set back a minimum of 20 feet to the rear of the front porch or the front façade of the house, whichever is closer to the street. All other garages shall be accessed from the alley. Trees will also be planted along sidewalks to compliment the existing heritage oaks to further enhance the appearance. There will be residences that have on street parking; however, most of the homes will have to access their garages from the rear to further eliminate congestion of vehicles. Common areas have been carefully positioned to further preserve tree canopies and road layouts.

A. We have addressed the efforts of tree preservation by varying the lot widths and depths by overlaying the trees on the site plan. The lot sizes and setbacks are as follows:

Lot Widths	36 Feet to 40 Feet	Above 40 Feet
Minimum yards setbacl	c:	
Front	10 Feet	10 Feet
Side	3.5 Feet	4 Feet
Rear	10 Feet	10 Feet
Minimum lot dept	100 Feet	100 Feet

- B. The subdivision plat submittal will address the regulated trees and any additional buffers and preservation.
- C. A minimum lot dimension would be 36'x100'

Original document in standard print. Revisions June 2006 February 2008 in bold print with deletions lined thru.

#### Environmental constraints

The heritage trees have been identified and overlain on the site plan. All roadways have been carefully designed in an attempt to save trees and capitalize on their beauty. We have noted on the plans that the lot designs and the right of ways will address the preservation of all tree canopies where necessary. All lots directly adjacent to the Hidden Pines subdivision will have minimum 60' width. The proposed PD has a linear retention pond common areas separating Hidden Pines and any adjoining lots. The proposed PD will have a fence and landscape buffering wherever the alleys about adjoining properties. Also we will maximize all existing foliage to further enhance the development. Walnut Creek is not in a Flood Zone and none exist on the site. The surface water and wetlands district are not affected by the proposed development and development is not located near or within a nature park, greenway, wellfield, or wetland district. The soil composition make up is consistent with millhopper sand, wachula sand and arrendondo fine sands.

Arrendondo sand is found in nearly level to gently sloping upland areas with 0 to 5 percent gradients. It is ell drained soil with rapid permeability rate in the surface and subsurface layers. Moderately rapid in the upper si inches of the subsoil. The water table is at a depth of more than 72 inches.

Millhopper sand is found in gently sloping areas with a 0 to 5 percent gradient. It is moderately well drained soil with a permeability rate in the surface and subsurface layers. Moderately rapid in the upper six inches of subsoil and slow to moderately slow below this depth. The water table is at a depth of 40 to 60 inches for one to four months and at a depth of 60 to 72 inches for 2 two to four months during the year.

Wachula sand is found nearly level. Poorly drained soil in broad areas of flatwoods. Slopes are nearly smooth and range from 0 to 2 percent. This soil has a water table that is at a depth of less than 10 inches for one to four moths and is at a depth of 10 to 40 inches for about six months. During the driest seasons the water table recedes to A DEPTH OF MORE THAN 40 INCHES. Permeability is moderately rapid to rapid in the surface and subsurface layers. Moderate to moderately rapid in the upper part of the subsoil and slow to moderately slow in the upper part. The slope on the site ranges from zero to .66% with an average of .36%.

There are no lakes, creeks, wetlands, or other prominent Topographic features on the site. The stormwater drainage systems are being designed to consist of a system of dry retention a wet basins-designed to meet the requirements and standards of the City of Gainesville and the St. Johns River Water Management District. Additional stormwater storage is provided o attenuate rainfall events. The existing topography of the site consists of very gently sloping land towards the western south and west boundary where the basins will be located and the seasonal high ground water table should not impact the design of the system. The collection of all surface water run off will be contained on the site.

#### External and Internal Transportation access

Walnut Creek has three access points. The main entrances at the north boundary from NW 39<sup>th</sup> Avenue are approximately 420 feet from the northeast corner of the property line. The secondary access point is at the southern most boundary off NW 31<sup>st</sup> Avenue approximately 100 feet from the southeast corner of the property. The third access point is located at the northern boundary of the Hidden Pines Subdivision of NW 27<sup>th</sup> Street. Walnut Creek's layout will have a maximum of approximately 138 single family detached dwelling units that will generate 1388 Average Daily Trips (ADT).