



FLORIDA DESIGN
CONSULTANTS, INC.
— THINK IT. ACHIEVE IT. —

3030 Starkey Boulevard
New Port Richey, Florida 34655

707 N. Franklin Street, 6th Floor
Tampa, Florida 33602

800.532.1047
www.fldesign.com

October 22, 2014

Dorothy E. Masumian
West Pasco Government Center
Planning And Development Department
8731 Citizens Drive, Suite 230
New Port Richey, FL 34654

**RE: Asturia Preliminary Plan Phases 1-4 &
Construction Plan/Stormwater Plan Phase 1 – RSD14-014
Resubmittal**

Dear Ms. Masumian:

This letter is in response to the comments received from your office dated October 6, 2014 regarding the above-referenced project. To facilitate your review, the comments are restated below (in bold) followed by our responses.

Planning and Development - Dot Masumian

Comment No. 1: ALL SHEETS ARE TO BE PART OF ONE COMPLETE SET SECURLY FASTENED. Not only were the plans not securely fastened together, they were in different rolls.

Response No. 1: Acknowledged. All sheets are bound in this submittal.

Comment No. 2: You submitted an incorrect type of request for wetland encroachment. This cannot be processed as an alternative standard, but must be a variance request. Please check with our Intake section for the fees due. ELAM received additional information on October 1, 2014. Additional comments may be issued by that department upon full review of the submittal.

Response No. 2: Pursuant to a recent meeting with County staff, the Alternative Standard Request is the appropriate request for this project. This Alternative Standard Request was resubmitted on October 6, 2014.

Comment No. 3: Neighborhood Notice General Requirements:

- A. Neighborhood notice shall be provided by the applicant by mail with proper postage in accordance with the mailing requirements of this section 305.2.A.**
- B. Content shall contain: General description of the project to include size and or number of units; date application was accepted for review; availability to view at the County offices; ability to provide comments to County administrator or designee.**
- C. Proof of Notice: The applicant shall submit a copy of the mailed notices sent to the property owners (sample attached can be copied to letterhead), along with the original mailing list certified by the post office as proof of mailing, and original completed, signed, and notarized affidavit to the Planning and Development Department a minimum of 30 days prior to approval.**
- D. Most projects will require letters to abutting property owners within 500 feet. Definition of abutting is: directly abutting and across from an easement or R-O-W. Contact our office if you have questions on the requirement.**

Approval cannot be completed until 30 days after this notice has been mailed.

Response No. 3A.-D.: Neighborhood notices were mailed on October 2, 2014. The affidavit was submitted to Pasco County on October 3, 2014 and a copy is attached for your information.

Comment No. 12: COA: Any plant materials of whatsoever type and kind required by these regulations shall be replaced within thirty (30) days of their demise and/or removal.

Correct the word king to kind.

Response No. 12: The word "king" has been corrected to "kind".

Comment No. 1: Attached is a copy of 6668, which was approved by the Zoning Administrator on 10/8/13. The following conditions need to be resolved to the satisfaction of the Planning and Development Department.

~~3.a, 3.b, 3.c, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49.a, 49.b, 49.c, 57, 58, 59~~
3.a, .b, .c; 5, 9, 10 -- being processed with Real Estate

Response No. 1: Below is a summary of the compliance for each of the conditions listed above.

Condition No. 6: This item is in progress. The developer is in the process of obtaining the Performance Bond.

- Condition No. 8: This item is not applicable at this time as it refers to a time in the future when the Performance Guarantee is ready for release.
- Condition No. 9: This item is not applicable at this time, as it refers to a time in the future when the Linkage Uplands construction plan is submitted.
- Condition No. 10: This item has been completed and approved by ELM.
- Condition No. 16: A CDD has been formed. This condition is not applicable at this time as it refers to items that must be complete prior to platting.
- Condition No. 19: This condition is currently outstanding. An LOI is anticipated within two (2) weeks.
- Condition No. 21: There are no gates in this development, so this condition does not apply.
- Condition No. 22: The MRP has been approved, so this condition is satisfied.
- Condition No. 23: All roadways are public, so this condition is satisfied.
- Condition No. 24: There are no private streets, so this condition is not applicable.
- Condition No. 26: This condition has been met. The 142 R/W was deeded to Pasco County. See attached deed.
- Condition No. 28: This condition has been met. See the attached letter from Lane Gardner, dated May 28, 2014.
- Comment No. 2: The proposed use is consistent with the above-referenced zoning district permitted uses.**
- Response No. 2: Acknowledged.
- Comment No. 3: COA? Add the following statement to the plan: "If during construction activities any evidence of the presence of State and Federally protected plant and/or animal species is discovered, work shall come to an immediate stop and Pasco County shall be notified within two working days of the plant and/or animal species found on the site".**
- Response No. 3: The note has been added. See note 34, sheet 3.

Comment No. 4: The comp. plan states: “Pasco County shall require a minimum 25 ft. buffer, not inclusive of any lots, around all post development Category I wetlands. Wetland buffers around Category II and III wetlands shall be as required by SWFWMD or regulatory agencies and shall not be inclusive of any lots”. Remove structures from wetland buffer area. Show and identify the appropriate wetland buffer on the preliminary plan.

Response No. 4: An Alternative Standards Request regarding encroachments into the Upland Buffers adjacent to Category I wetlands has been submitted and is currently being reviewed.

Alternate Standards Request

Comment No. 1: Reduce the minimum building height from 18 feet to 14 feet (one story)
Why can you not meet this requirement?
What percentage of structures would not meet minimum height?

Comment No. 2: Reduce the minimum building height from 24 feet to 14 feet (2 story)
Why can you not meet this requirement?
What percentage of structures would not meet minimum height?

Comment No. 3: Reduce the minimum lot width from 40 feet to 36 feet within the TND area.
Staff will support this request. It appears that only 52 lots will be affected.

Comment No. 4: Reduce the minimum finished floor elevation of all TND products from three feet to ten inches.
Staff will support reduction to 12 inches minimum.

Comment No. 5: Allow Asturia’s extensive linked park and multi-use path system which are adjacent to and cross the central lake in the TND area to satisfy the “public-edge condition” requirement.
Per Justyna Buszewski – this is already approved with the Master Park Plan

Comment No. 6: Eliminate the requirement to serve 85% of detached units with a lane and allow on-street parking.
Per Justyna Buszewski this has been approved with the Master Roadway Plan

Comment No. 7: Confirm on-street parking is allowed on a lane
Per Justyna Buszewski this has been approved with the Master Roadway Plan

Comment No. 8: Eliminate requirement limiting street curb cuts to a maximum of 2 where front loaded TND is proposed.
Need clarification on this request. How many curb cuts and location of them are proposed?

Comment No. 9: Increase the street tree spacing in the TND area to a minimum of 60 feet on center.

Code calls for 30-40 feet on "A" streets. Need clarification on this request. Staff does not support this request at this time.

**Comment No. 10: Reduce the minimum street light height from 15 feet to 12 feet
Staff will support the reduction to 12 ½ feet matching Duke Energy's poles.**

Comment No. 11: Increase the maximum perimeter block length criteria from 2,100 feet to 3,000 feet within Asturia, or allow mid-block pedestrian passages\parks allow for increased block perimeter.

Need clarification on this request. Must be consistent with MUTRM language. Plan appears to comply with code. Where do you feel it is inconsistent?

**Comment No. 12: Increase the upper range of block length from 600 feet to 900 feet within Asturia.
Need clarification on this request. Must be consistent with MUTRM language. Plan appears to comply with code. Where do you feel it is inconsistent?**

Comment No. 13: Increase the upper range of half block width from 350 feet to 500 feet within Asturia.

Need clarification on this request. Must be consistent with MUTRM language. Plan appears to comply with code. Where do you feel it is inconsistent?

Comment No. 14: Appears to be a request for a change in the code, not an alternative standard request. This will be provided to staff for future re-write of this section of the code.

Comment No. 15: If the garage is facing a street, the setback from the primary structure is a minimum of 5 feet.

Comment No. 16: The wording of the code states "Porches may extend six (6) feet into the setback". Six feet is the correct dimension to be used.

Response: See attached "TND Alternate Standard Request and Justification - Response to Comments" for responses to Items 1-16 above.

Traffic Operations - Robert Reck

Comment No. 1: Sheets 49 thru 56: these sheets contain numerous errors and omissions, the following comments will not cover all of them. It is the responsibility of the Engineer of Record for all errors or omissions on the plans. All signs and markings are required to conform to Florida Department of Transportation Standards and the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices.

Response No. 1: All traffic signage and markings have been revised to match the MUTCD.

Comment No. 2: **Previous Comment - Sheets 49 thru 56: identify all pavement markings by size and color; some pavement markings still missing.**

Response No. 2: The plans have been revised accordingly.

Comment No. 3: **Sheets 49 thru 56: many of the sidewalks and ramps at the intersections are located so the stop bar is too far back from the intersections and sight distance requirement will not be met.**

Response No. 3: The sidewalks and ramps have been relocated so that the stop bars are correctly located. Note, many unnecessary crosswalks have been eliminated from the plans.

Florida Department of Transportation - John Kilkenny

Comment No. 1: **Access and drainage permits will be required from FDOT for connections to SR 54. Permit category and fee is based on the total vehicle trips per day at total build-out.**

The location of the access connection along SR 54 should be better aligned with the median opening at Black Lake Road (SR 54A). The developer will be responsible for all cost associated with traffic analysis, traffic warrants, design and construction of turn lanes, traffic controls, intersection lighting, or traffic signals.

Response No. 1: The access alignment has been slightly shifted to meet Green Book allowances.

If you have any comments or questions, please contact me at srogers@fldesign.com or 813-414-5661.

Sincerely,

Stuart M. Rogers, P.E., LEED AP
Senior Vice President

c: Lane Gardner, SR 54 Land Associates, LLC, w/o Encl.
Sean Manson, SR 54 Land Associates, LLC, w/o Encl.
File 506-100C-30.04