

LONG LAKE RANCH VILLAGE 4 NARRATIVE

Long Lake Ranch Village 4 is proposed for 61 single family detached home sites on 12.58 acres. The Preliminary Development Plans (PDP-R), Construction Plans, and Stormwater Management Plans and Report detail the infrastructure necessary to support the proposed lots.

It must be noted that Long Lake Ranch Village 4 was originally submitted to Pasco County on September 18, 2015 as a 50-lot project with 55-foot wide lots. The developer has determined that market conditions are demanding more 45-foot lots. Accordingly, the project now features 61 45-foot wide lots. The developer has requested withdrawal of the original 50-lot application.

Recently, the applicant has submitted a non-substantial MPUD modification to allow for this change in Village 4, and the MPUD application is currently under review. Accordingly, this new PDP/CP/SW application is hereby submitted for your review and consideration. As part of the original submission, Pasco County issued its first round of review comments on November 12, 2015. With this new application, we are providing responses to the County's original first-round questions.

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT (Sam Beneck):

No comments. No response required.

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT (Chris Wright):

1. LDC 901.6 – Street Design and Dedication Requirements

- a. Please provide confirmation that the roadway curves are consistent with the safety design standards for the design speed and roadway cross-section.*

Response: Please note that 50-foot curve radii are used as the minimum radii on the three tightest curves in the proposed design. While the FDOT Green Book recommends 75 feet as the minimum radius for “Low Speed Urban Streets” with a 20 mph design speed, 50-foot curve radii have customarily been used as the minimum radii for local residential streets in Pasco County and

surrounding counties for a number of decades for several reasons. First, residential local streets in suburban subdivisions are not necessarily the same as FDOT low-speed urban streets. Second, the presence of driveways, and in the case of this revised application with 45-foot lots, driveways every 45 feet on center, creates a significant traffic calming effect, as drivers should be exercising care given the likelihood of someone backing out of one of the many closely spaced driveways into the street. The driveways are arguably a more serious hazard than tight radius curves.

In reviewing the Green Book and the MUTCD, we surmised that one alternative to increasing the radii would be to post a horizontal alignment warning sign (W1-1) indicating with a supplementary plaque (W13-1P) an advisory speed of 15 mph, which would correspond to a horizontal curvature as small as 40 feet. Per the MUTCD, these signs would need to be placed 100 feet ahead of the curves. Accordingly, we have shown them on the revised plans at the approaches to the curves in question, except for the location of the curve closest to Sunlake Boulevard on the “in-bound” side and the curve closet to the eastern project boundary west-bound. In the first case, we believe the proximity to Sunlake Boulevard and the presence of other signs might create confusing sign clutter, and further that motorists would not have had adequate space to build up significant speed. In the latter case, we believe the appropriate time to add this sign is in the future, if and when the property to the east is developed. We believe the MUTCD affords this flexibility, as it indicates that, when the advisory speed is 5 mph less than the posted speed, the warning sign is optional.

Please refer to revised Sheets C-701 through C-703 for the added warning signs and advisory speed plaques.

2. *LDC 902.1 – Stormwater Quality*

- a. *Please provide a copy of the SWFWMD Permit along with a copy of the stamped plans that corresponds to the permit prior to the Site Development Permit -*

Condition of Approval (COA)

Response: We acknowledge this as a Condition of Approval and will provide the SWFWMD Permit at the appropriate time.

- b. *Prior to the issuance of the clearing and grubbing/site development permit, provide a copy of the NPDES permit/application. For disturbances one or over 1 ac, the NPDES permit must be filed with FDEP. – COA*

Response: We acknowledge that this will be a condition of approval and will apply for the appropriate NPDES NOI prior to applying for a Site Development Permit.

3. *LDC 902.2 – Stormwater Management Requirements*

- a. *Please verify that the following note is included in the signed and sealed construction drawings: Prior to the start of the clearing and grubbing, or any soil disturbance contact Pasco County Stormwater Mgmt at (727) 834-3611 for a soil erosion and sediment control, pre-inspection meeting.*

Response: Please refer to Note 31 on Sheet C-900 for this information.

- b. *Please clearly delineate on the appropriate pages of the construction drawings all flood plain impact areas that are resulting from the project development activities.*

Response: Please refer to Sheet C-105. The floodplain impacts are now depicted. This information is shown on Sheet C-105 only, as showing it on other drainage sheets would reduce clarify for the contractor who ultimately will construct the improvements.

- c. *Please quantify the volume of flood plain impacts that are occurring due to the proposed development activities and clearly demonstrate how and where the offset mitigating volumes are provided.*

Response: The floodplain (Sub-basin NL0200) is impacted by a volume of 660 cubic yards as a result of activities associated with Long Lake Ranch Village 4. Please note that compensating volume is

provided by various floodplain compensation ponds excavated in previous phases of Long Lake Ranch. The aggregate amount of compensation exceeds the aggregate amount of encroachment for the project.

- d. *Please explain the purpose and function of the proposed swale/ditch in Tract L-5. Based on the close proximity to the adjacent wetlands with poorly drained soils, County staff are concerned this could be a source of nuisance or standing water and cattails, and ultimately a breeding ground for mosquitos.*

Response: Please refer to the revised plans. Sheet C-302, sections D-D, E-E, and G-G indicate the removal of this previously proposed excavation area.

- e. *Preliminary Development Plan Sheet C-108 – In regards to the TRACT ACREAGES TABLE (1) Tract L-5 is referred to as a Drainage & Mitigation & Access Easement, please explain. (2) Tract L-2 is referred to as a Landscape Buffer but maybe receiving runoff from the adjacent right-of-way due to the grade differential, please comment as to the necessity for needing a Drainage Easement aspect to this tract.*

Response: Tract L-5 has been renamed to “B-1,” and is now indicated as a Drainage Area, Conservation and Access easement, as it is no longer proposed for floodplain mitigation. Access must be allowed in case the area needs to be maintained for nuisance species or for any other reason. “Drainage” has been added to the list of uses in Tract L-2.

- f. *Please confirm there will be no issues related to runoff from Tract L-2 and possibly the right-of-way of Sunlake Blvd draining to or being conveyed through the adjoining lots. Staff is concerned over the issue of avoiding nuisance standing water and the necessity for adequate drainage in this area.*

Response: We don’t anticipate that runoff from Tract L-2 and/or Sunlake Boulevard would be problematic now that we have eliminated the previously proposed excavation. Note that the existing grades from Sunlake Boulevard and the buffer are flowing down in the general direction of Wetland F2d, as are the existing elevations

within Tract B-1. The fill transition slope areas from the backs of lots will also tend to direct water to F2d on the west and F2c on the east. These areas occasionally do have standing water in them, as they are jurisdictional wetlands. This has been the case historically, and we have not proposed any alterations to the situation. The reality for residents of Lots 11 through 22 will not be any different than it is for others within Long Lake Ranch whose lots back up to conservation areas.

- g. *Please review all appropriate drawings and ensure that the labeling is consistent for the proposed drainage and access easement between Lots 9 – 10, and 15 - 16.*

Response: Now that the plans are prepared for 45-foot lots, the lot numbers are different. However, we have checked the labeling for the drainage and access easement between new Lots 10 & 11 and 18 & 19 and believe they are now consistent. On sheets where they are labeled, they are labeled as 30 feet between Lots 10 & 11 and 25 feet between Lots 18 & 19. They all include access in their description now, as well.

- h. *Please demonstrate these proposed development activities are consistent with the prior approvals of Pond No. 50-A and Pond 50-B by extracting the relevant design ground cover and routing summaries from the submitted overall drainage report, entitled Master Drainage Report, dated September 2015.*

Response: Please refer to the Master Drainage Document. The SCS Runoff Curve Number tables for Ponds 50A and 50B are the same as they have been since the last modification of the Sunlake Boulevard Phase 2 plans that were approved in 2013, which is when Pond 50 was modified to contain two cells instead of one. During construction of Pond 50B, it was decided that it would only be excavated to the minimum depth necessary to facilitate attenuation and treatment for the watershed it served so as not to generate excess fill dirt that would have to be stockpiled and handled twice. Now that Village 4 is to be constructed, the time is appropriate to excavate the remainder of the material from Pond 50B. Please note that Pond 50A is not proposed to be altered from its existing state, as it was fully excavated with the

construction of Sunlake Boulevard Phase 2.

The Master Drainage document indicates the appropriate ground cover for both Ponds 50A and 50B. Please refer to PDF pages 925 and 926.

Also, refer to the input data for the routing. Refer to Pages 108 and 109 of 111 of the input data (i.e., pages 862 and 863 of the PDF). Please note that the runoff curve numbers used in the ICPR model for Ponds 50A and 50B are 88.0 and 87.2 respectively, and they were calculated on Pages 925 and 926 to be 87.9 and 87.1, respectively, so we believe the model adequately represents the calculated basin characteristics.

- i. *Please review the Storm Water Calculations (Storm Tabulations) and verify there are no inconsistencies with the pipe crown and inverts as shown by the listed invert elevations in the Pipe Table / Structure Table on Sheet C-303, Storm Structure Data of the construction drawings.*

Response: Please refer to revised Storm Tabulations, which are now consistent with the pipe/structure table on Sheet C-303.

- j. *Please clarify what initial tail water elevation was used in the Storm Water Calculations (Storm Tabulation calculations) as the pond NWL appears above the HGL in the summary for two of the pipe runs. Pursuant to FDOT design criteria the initial tail water condition is consistent with the pipe design storm event.*

Response: Please refer to revised Storm Tabulations, which now use the appropriate tailwater elevations as per the pipe design storm event.

4. *LDC 807.4 – Geotechnical Engineering Report*

- a. *Please show the scope of construction relative to the Pond 50B modifications on the related construction drawings. Also, it would seem appropriate and necessary to include a detailed procedure for dewatering / de-mucking of the existing lake area as part of the lake bottom modification. Please consult with a Geotechnical Engineer for recommendations and comments in this regard given*

the anticipated depth of excavation.

Response: Please note that this pond was previously approved by Pasco County as part of construction of Sunlake Boulevard Phase 2, and geotechnical data submitted at the time indicates that suitable material exists to the full depth of excavation. Also note that, because the pond has only been in existence for about the last year and a half, it is not expected that there will be any muck deposits on the pond bottom. Also, please refer to the Lake/Pond Excavation Note that exists on Sheets C-300 and C-901, which provide direction to the contractor regarding pond excavations.

Finally, with regard to dewatering, once a contract for construction of this project is awarded, the contractor and Heidt Design will collaborate on a dewatering plan that will be subsequently submitted to the Southwest Florida Water Management District for review and approval prior to construction commencement.

- b. *Have the Geotechnical Engineer provide a certification per section 807. See attached sample. (please give certification after comments are adequately addressed)*

Response: The requested certification will be provided at the appropriate time.

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT (Dot Masumian):

1. *The neighborhood notice shall be provided at least thirty (30) days prior to the issuance of the final determination and approval of the site plan.*

The applicant shall submit a copy of the mailed neighborhood notices sent to the property owners along with the mailing list and proof of mailing to the County Administrator or designee.

(Notice is mandatory for the following development applications: Zoning Amendments, Conditional Use application, Special Exception applications, Mass Grading, PSPs, & PDPs)

Response: Now that the original application has been withdrawn and a new one submitted, we will wait until a new project tracking number is assigned by Pasco County, and then we will send the mandatory noticing as required.

2. *All changes to plan are to be “bubbled” or “clouded” for easy identification. A cover letter itemizing all comments along with response must also be submitted.*

Response: As this is a new application, we have not bubbled any changes made in response to these comments, as we felt it would be confusing to have bubbles or clouds on an initial submissions.

3. *Please provide letters of service availability from the Serving Utilities. Duke Energy*

Response: We have pursued a letter of service availability from Duke Energy and are waiting on their letter. We will forward it to Pasco County when received.

4. *A tree plan prepared or certified by a Registered Landscape Architect as authorized by Chapter 481, Florida Statutes, as amended, or other type of professional as approved by the County Administrator or designee, demonstrating compliance with this Code, Sections 802 and 905, and a landscape plan showing locations, widths, and buffer type dedicated to landscaping as required by this Code, Section 905. Total inches removed equals 190 inches. Replacement is 1/3 (not 30%) which equals 63 inches required to be replaced. Please change your charts. You do not have to separate the live oaks from others as no live oaks were removed. Your total of 74 inches to be planted exceeds the required amount.*

Response: Please refer to the revised landscaping plans. The charts have been updated as appropriate.

5. *Proposed model center locations. Are there any model center lots?*

Response: Please refer to the revised PDP sheets. We now are showing Lots 1 through 6 in Block 32 as model and/or parking areas for models. We have designated them as “M/P.”

- 6. *Each corner lot shall be at least ten (10) feet greater in width than the minimum required for interior lots within the subdivision.*

Please label the typical lot layout as such.

Response: Please refer to the typical lot detail on Sheet C-104 of the revised plans.

- 7. *Landscaping plans must designate a person or entity, other than the County, to be responsible for maintenance of the landscaping.*

Response: Please refer to Note 37 on Sheet L502 of the revised landscaping plans which now indicates maintenance responsibility.

- 8. *No one (1) plant species of shrubs or ground cover plants or combination thereof, excluding turfgrass, shall constitute more than twenty-five (25) percent coverage of the overall landscape area. White Fountain Grass exceeds the 25%.*

Response: Please refer to the “Landscaping Specifications” on Sheet L501 for the note indicating this requirement. Also refer to updated planting tables which now has an appropriate amount of White Fountain Grass that does not exceed the 25% threshold.

- 9. *LDC 905.2.d.2*

<i>Size of Lot (Square Feet)</i>	<i>Minimum Number of Trees</i>
<i>3,500 – 6,000</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>6,001 – 7,500</i>	<i>3</i>

Trees required per residential lot

Response: The revised landscaping plans now indicate the appropriate number of lot trees.

- 10. *Type B Buffer*

Fifteen (15) feet wide with single row of trees; maximum sixty (60) feet on center. Visual screen to be 80% opaque within one year. A minimum of six (6) feet in height at the time of the installation and include 1 or more of the following:

Opaque Fence, Wall, Berm, Hedge

** Wooden fences are prohibited.*

Fences and walls shall not exceed eight (8) feet in height and may be placed adjacent to the property line. Shrubs used to provide a visual screen shall be placed a maximum of five (5) feet on center.

This is the type buffer required along Sunlake Blvd - not a Type D. You will have to revise your planting chart to indicate how you will comply with the 6-foot height requirement for the shrubs or wall or fence.

Response: As we discussed recently, the lots along Sunlake Boulevard are not double-frontage lots because of the landscape tract that is proposed. Accordingly, the Type D buffer proposed is appropriate for this project.

11. CLEAR-SIGHT TRIANGLES To prevent traffic hazards from limited visibility at a street intersection or intersection of a street and railroad crossing, no structure, building, earthen bank, or vegetation shall be allowed within the clear-sight triangle on corner lots if it exceeds 3.5 feet in height, measured from grade at the finished, paved area at the center of the roadway.

Clear-sight triangles are to be shown on the landscape plan also.

Response: Please refer to the revised landscaping plans, which now indicate the appropriate sight distance triangles as required.

UTILITIES (Mike Kirkpatrick):

No response required.

STREETS & ADDRESSING (Pamela Walton):

1. Need a street name. There are several already reserved that could be used.

Response: Please refer to the revised plans, which indicate Roseate Drive as the street name for Village 4.

BIOLOGIST (Melissa Charbonneau):

Comments:

1. *The wildlife survey that was provided was from 2011. Wildlife surveys are valid for a period of one year. Please provide an addendum to this survey that includes all wildlife survey information including maps of transects, observations, and general information such as the dates that the survey was conducted to obtain the data.*

Response: Site visits are being conducted to gather information sufficient to update of the wildlife characterization for Long Lake Ranch. The updated report will be submitted under separate cover.

2. *A copy of the SWFWMD ERP shall be sent to the Zoning and Site Development prior to issuance of the Site Development Permit.*

Response: We acknowledge and will comply.

Conditions of the Site Development Permit:

1. *If, during construction activities, any evidence of the presence of State and Federally protected plant and/or animal species is discovered that would result in a take, work shall come to an immediate stop, and Pasco County shall be notified within two working days. Work may resume if construction activities are consistent with state and/or federal rules, guidelines or all pertinent permits have been obtained.*

Response: We acknowledge.

FIRE SERVICES (Donald Campbell):

1. *Fire department access roads in excess of 150' shall have an approved turn around device.*

Response: Please refer to the plans for the location of the turn-around device. We believe that the detail, provided on Sheet C-201, complies with appropriate criteria.

TRAFFIC OPERATIONS (David Skrelunas):

No response required. However, please note that the new plans indicate use of W1-1 signs with advisory plaques to warn motorists of the curves with radii less than 75 feet.

STORMWATER (Donald Carey):

No response required.

TAMPA BAY WATER (Ivana Blankenship):

No response required.