

July 29, 2016

Lourdes O'Farrill/Lisette Egipciano
Orange County Development Review
201 S. Rosalind Ave, 2nd Floor
Orlando, FL 32801

Re: Sunbridge Planned Development - Regulating Plan
LUP-16-06-216- DISTRICT 4

Lourdes and Lisette,
Please find below our comments to the DRC comments on the Sunbridge
Regulating Plan for Plan Dated: June 16, 2016.

DEVELOPMENT ENGINEERING REVIEW

1) The master POA shall be responsible for maintenance of trails and any other specialty items, such as hardscaping, landscaping and street lighting.

Response: The document has been revised to read, "The master POA, or other similar entity, shall be responsible . . .". in section 3.3.1 (pg 24) and 3.3.2 (pg 25).

2) On Figure 3.3.2(b): Neighborhood Connector 2 Typical Section, revise the drive lanes to 11 foot width.

Response: The document has been revised with the note added to all cross-sections stating that final roadway dimensions to be determined during final engineering.

3) On Figure 3.3.2(e): One-Way Alley Typical Section, revise the drive width to 17 feet which may include ribbon curbs.

Response: Consistent with other approved developments in Orange County, Sunbridge proposed one-way alleys are 12' drive with 1' ribbon curb each side.

EPD REVIEW

1) Minimize wetland impacts - Conservation areas determined to be Class I wetlands may only incur impacts where there is no other feasible or practical alternative or where development may be shown to represent an overriding public benefit as determined before the Orange County Board of County Commissioners (this also applies to Class II wetlands in the Econlockhatchee River Protection Ordinance area as determined during the EPD permitting process). Do not locate stormwater, roads, ponds, buildings or residential lots in Class I wetlands without proper conservation area impact permits.

Some minimization guidelines:

- a. The road locations may need some adjustments to minimize wetlands impacts.
- b. Barrier walls versus side slopes will likely be required in some areas to minimize impacts.

c. Some transit stops may need to be moved if indicated in wetlands. Provide comments that these locations need to be justified if the location is to impact wetlands versus placement in upland areas.

Response: So noted.

2) Projected Wetland Encroachments - Provide a map or show cross-hatching on a map with any expected wetland impacts. Define the cross-hatching in a legend. Provide initial estimates of the impact acreages by wetland classification if known.

Response: Discussions concerning wetland impacts are on-going and will be addressed through the ELSAD and Conservation Area Impact Permit process once determined.

3) Transportation Connection - The transportation element of the Regulating Plan needs to depict the proposed location of the connector road to the Osceola Parkway expansion project.

Response: Sunbridge Parkway is the connector roadway to Osceola County. It is shown on the map. The alignment of Sunbridge Parkway south of the PD boundary is not subject to approval in this PD-RP. The alignment to the south is shown on the ELSAD application, which is on file with the County.

4) Preservation Land Use - Explain and indicate the locations of the Preservation land use. The request for the FLUM change is to change from Industrial (IND)/Rural(R) to Innovation Way (IW) and Urban Service Area (USA) Expansion. The Regulating Plan should also include Preservation. EPD requests Developer change the FLUM for all significant preservation areas (including but not limited to Robert's Island Slough, Econ River and its tributaries and associated upland buffers) placed under Conservation to Preservation.

Response: The T1-Natural Zone, as indicated on the PD-RP Map (Figure 2.1) includes the areas designated as Environmental Land Stewardship Program lands that are subject to this application. Roberts Island Slough is not part of the legally described property within this application.

5) Adjacent Protected Properties - Add a note that the project should not impact the ingress/egress easement granted to Orange County by Holland Properties for access to Phase IV of TM-Econ Mitigation Bank.

Response: The document has been updated accordingly (section 4.9, pg 34)

6) Public Land Proximity - Residential (may be adjusted for non-residential situations). Add a note: The covenants, conditions, and restrictions (CC&Rs) shall contain notification to potential purchasers, builders or tenants of this development that the adjacent land use includes publicly managed property. The notice shall indicate that the adjacent property will require the use of resource management practices that may result in periodic temporary conditions that may limit outdoor activities. These practices will include, but not be limited to, ecological burning, pesticide and herbicide usage, exotic plant and animal

removal, usage of heavy equipment and machinery, and other practices as may be deemed necessary for proper resource management.

Response: The document has been updated accordingly (section 4.8, pg 34)

7) Fire Wise Standards - Add a note that Sunbridge should be designed utilizing Firewise community standards.

Response: The document has been updated accordingly (section 4.5, pg 33)

8) Indicate Coordination Efforts - Address that the developer needs to coordinate with the OC Green PLACE program avoiding or minimizing impacts to adjacent Green PLACE properties and mitigation bank.

Response: So noted.

9) Trails - Indicate how the developer plans to work with Planning Department and Green PLACE program to incorporate the Florida National Scenic Trail.

Response: The applicant has been in discussions with representatives of the Florida National Scenic Trail, and those negotiations are ongoing.

10) Notice of Proximity - Project is in close proximity to major conservation areas/easements /mitigation banks (TM-Econ Mitigation Bank Phase 1-4, Crosby Island Marsh Mitigation Bank). Developer needs to incorporate a notice of proximity within the deeds, covenants and restrictions.

Response: So noted.

11) Erosion Control - Use caution to prevent erosion during construction along the boundary of the property, into wetlands and buffers, and into all drainage facilities and ditches. Construction will require Best Management Practices (BMPs) for erosion control. Minimize the extent of area exposed at one time, apply perimeter controls where necessary, and perform maintenance checks every seven (7) days and after every 1/2 inch rain. The construction entry area shall be designed to prevent trucks from tracking soil onto local roads and the affected storm drainage system shall be protected as indicated in 34-250(g). This may require periodic street sweeping.

Response: So noted.

12) Environmental Land Stewardship Program (ELSP) Ordinance - Add a note of commitment. The developer shall enter into an Environmental Stewardship Plan with Orange County following Orange County Code Chapter 15 Environmental Control, Article XVIII Environmental Land Stewardship known as the Environmental Land Stewardship Program (ELSP).

Response: The document has been updated accordingly (section 4.10, pg 34). A draft ELSP agreement was submitted as part of the associated Future Land Use Amendment # 2016-2-A-4-2

13) Outstanding FL Waters - Add a note to recognize that areas of this project that are found to be within FDEP 62-302.700 Special Protection, Outstanding Florida Waters, Outstanding Natural Resource Waters shall comply with the state

regulation. No degradation of water quality, other than that allowed in Rule 62-4.242(2) and (3), F.A.C., is to be permitted in Outstanding Florida Waters and Outstanding national Resource Waters, respectively, notwithstanding any other Department rules that allow water quality lowering.

Response: The document has been updated accordingly (section 4.3, pg 33)

14) Special Protection Area - Note that portions of this site are located within the Orange County Econlockhatchee River Protection ordinance area. In those areas, as a minimum, basin-wide regulations apply and will need to reference the Econlockhatchee River Protection ordinance Chapter 15 Article XI. All future plans submitted must acknowledge this with a note on the plan and shall comply with all protection ordinance codes.

Response: So noted.

15) TMDL - Acknowledge that any portions of this site that discharge into an impaired water body may require additional treatment or design considerations. The Impaired Waters Rule, Chapter 62-303 of the Florida Administrative Code may increase the requirements for pollution abatement treatment of stormwater as part of future approvals of related Basin Management Action Plans currently in development by the state Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP). The applicant is advised to follow related legislation in order to assure compliance with future regulations.

Response: So noted.

16) Developable Acreage - Acknowledge that the net developable acreage will be the gross acreage less any surface water and wetlands. All acreages regarding wetlands and buffers are considered approximate until finalized by a Conservation Area Determination and/or Conservation Area Impact permits. Approval of this plan does not permit any proposed conservation area impacts.

Response: So noted.

17) Conservation Areas - Acknowledge that all acreages regarding conservation areas and wetland buffers are considered approximate until finalized by a Conservation Area Determination (CAD) and a Conservation Area Impact (CAI) Permit. Approval of this plan does not authorize any direct or indirect conservation area impacts. Until wetland permitting is complete, the developable acreage is the gross acreage less the wetlands and surface waters. The applicant is advised not to make financial decisions based upon development within a wetland or surface water areas. Any plan showing development in a wetland area without Orange County and other jurisdictional governmental agency wetland permits is speculative and may not be approved.

Response: So noted.

18) Access Points and Roads, wetlands & rare uplands. Add a note to the plan: Access locations and roads that impact wetlands and rare uplands are only approximations and are not approved with this plan. The exact location will have to consider minimization and avoidance of wetland impacts and rare habitat and

will be determined during the Orange County conservation area determination and impact permit process.

Response: The PD-RP Map (Figure 2.1) has been updated accordingly

19) No Clearing - Add a note, "No construction, clearing, filling, alteration or grading is allowed within or immediately adjacent to a conservation area or easement (includes the conservation area and the wetland setback/buffer) without first obtaining a wetland impact permit approved by the county and obtaining other applicable jurisdictional agency permits." Reference Orange County code 15-376.

Response: The document has been updated accordingly (section 4.6, pg 34)

20) CAD Required - Add a note that the applicant understands that Orange County Conservation Area Determinations (CAD) must be complete before PSP or DP submittal, as outlined in Chapter 15, Article X Wetland Conservation Areas. If these permits have been obtained, or if permits have been completed for portions of the property, or if historical documents are located, then submit supporting copies with the PSP/DP submittals. The EPD recognizes that some areas have completed CADs, verification with EPD Permitting staff will be needed to determine the status of these documents and any change of ownership will need to be processed.

Response: So noted.

21) State and Federal Regulatory Habitat Compliance - Add a note that development of the subject property shall comply with all state and federal regulations pertaining to wildlife or plants regarding endangered, threatened, or species of special concern of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and/or the Florida Fish & Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC).

Response: The document has been updated accordingly (section 4.11, pg 34)

22) Connectivity - Add a note: "The design shall include provisions for wildlife connectivity across or under roadways that traverse wetland systems and associated buffers. Road and pedestrian crossings of the wetland, floodplains and environmentally sensitive corridors shall be minimized and designed to allow for unimpeded passage of wildlife and to maintain local hydrology."

Response: The document has been updated accordingly (section 3.1 d), pg 23)

23) Storm Drain Inlet Labels - All storm drain inlets constructed as part of new development projects in

Orange County shall have metal medallion inlet markers installed. Text on the marker shall be evenly spaced and read "No Dumping, Drains to Waterway". Markers must be commercial grade stainless steel, aluminum, brass or bronze and either stamped from sheet metal or cast. Metal marker color must be non-reflective blue or green. Aquatic creature or symbol shown on marker shall be consistent throughout the subdivision. Markers must be affixed to a clean,

prepared surface with adhesives, fasteners, or heat as recommended by the manufacturer. Markers shall be aligned with the center of drainage inlets at the top of the curb. Lettering must be between 0.4 - 0.5 inches and the total diameter of the marker between 3.75 and 4.25 inches.

Response: So noted.

24) Econ Landscape - The project will be subject to the Orange County Landscape Code (Chapter 24) and also Chapter 15, Articles X, XI and XVIII. Add a note to the landscaping sheets that: "Native plant species shall be utilized in landscaping, and removal of understory vegetation shall be minimized to the greatest extent practical as required in the Econlockhatchee River Basin Ordinance 15-442(b)." State that all plants in the landscape plan meet this code or clearly indicate which plants are native and which ones are not native. If an exception is desired, then submit a request and provide the justification in writing to the Environmental Protection Division or address this aspect of the habitat protection in the ELSP.

Response: The document has been updated accordingly (section 4.5, pg 33)

FIRE REVIEW

1) This LUP is 5.9 miles from Fire Station 85 resulting in a 9 minute travel time. This LUP is within the travel time objective set by Fire Rescue for rural population emergency travel times.

Response: So noted.

2) The Fire Rescue portion of this plan was reviewed by Jeffrey Coiro. Please call (407) 836-8309 if you have any questions.

Response: So noted.

3) During construction, when combustibles are brought on to the site, access roads and a suitable temporary or permanent supply of water acceptable to the fire department shall be provided and maintained Chapter 16, NFPA 1 2012 Edition (FFPC 5th Edition).

Response: So noted.

4) All two-way fire department access roads shall have a minimum clear width of twenty (20) feet as measured from face of curb to face of curb. All one-way fire department access roads shall have a minimum clear width of seventeen (17) feet as measured from face of curb to face of curb. 18.2.3.4.1.1 NFPA 1, 2012 Edition (FFPC 5th Edition) and (Subdivision Rules and Regulations Section 34-171(2)). If alleys shown are to be required for fire department access or hose-lay requirements per NFPA 1, Chapter 18 (2012 Edition), ensure compliance with above code section.

Response: So noted.

PARKS REVIEW

1) The Regulating Plan and Code mention a series of regional trails that run alongside the main roadways. Unlike the APF Park where who maintains and owns is spelled out, there is no such language regarding the trails. Are these trails within the ROW and if so are they to be owned and maintained by the County? Parks and Recreation is only accepting ownership and maintenance responsibility new trails that are specified in the adopted Orange County Trails Master Plan. In addition, Parks and Recreation requests more discussion on the actual configuration of the APF Park.

Response: The document has been revised to read, "The master POA, or other similar entity, shall be responsible . . .". in section 3.3.1 (pg 24) and 3.3.2 (pg 25). The applicant is open to more discussion on the park configuration of the APF Park prior to the actual development of this park.

PLANNING REVIEW

Regulating Plan Map Revisions:

1) Identify the 3 communities (phases)

Response: As discussed with Planning Division staff, project conceptualization at this point is not sufficient to make a meaningful description of separate communities within Sunbridge. In lieu of this, a series of transect vignettes have been provided to aide in the conceptualization of the character of development.

2) Identify (label) Specific Transect Neighborhoods

Response: The Regulating Plan has been revised accordingly.

3) Depict Conceptual Neighborhood Nodes (T3)

Response: The Regulating Plan has been revised accordingly.

4) Depict a greater amount of streets (to define neighborhoods) (*Note: Not required to depict all local streets*)

Response: The Regulating Plan has been revised accordingly.

5) External and internal access is important; therefore, depict potential access points to areas beyond the Sunbridge RP boundary.

Response: Access to areas outside Sunbridge through First and Second Order streets are indicated on the plan. Access and connectivity of Lower Order Streets outside Sunbridge should be deferred to future road agreements with adjoining property owners.

General Regulating Plan Document Revisions:

1) Vignettes should be provided for each Transect Type (including a Neighborhood Node).

Response: Vignettes have been added for T5 and T4 transects. Neighborhood nodes are indicated on each of the T3 vignettes.

2) Vignettes should be based on actual Phase I areas, but should reflect the design criteria to be applied in all other Phases.

Response: As discussed with Planning Division staff, T3 vignettes are based on anticipated Phase 1 areas.

3) Replace "PDRP" with PD-RP" throughout document.

Response: The document has been revised accordingly.

4) Ensure an appropriate First and Second Order Street enclosure within T5 and T4 transects by establishing a minimum 1:3 building height to street width ratio (include illustration).

Response: The document has been revised accordingly; buildings added to cross-sections and requirements added to T4 and T5 development standards tables.

5) Establish front porch and front-loaded garage design standards (min. porch depth and width; minimum façade (non-garage) porch coverage; min. percentage of homes with porches within residential blocks; garage door recession from front plane; min. garage door widths; etc.)

Response: The document has been revised accordingly.

Section 1 RP Revisions:

1) In the first paragraph of Section 1.1, there is an acronym for "ICAMR". Either delete, or initially use the full spelling.

Response: The document has been revised accordingly.

2) Eliminate Expedited Review Section 1.5.

Response: As discussed with Planning Division staff, this is a Comprehensive Plan requirement. As such, it remains in the document.

3) Provide transect-based block perimeter standards.

Response: With the additions of T5 and T4 vignettes, along with intersection density requirements, block sizes will be consistent with the principles and intent of the district.

4) The last four sentences of Section 1.2 should be reworked. Per conversations with Planning staff, the Regulating Plan Map must reflect greater detail than the current submittal, including full depiction of "Phase 1" block and street patterns, with a broader design descriptions and vignettes provided in the overall RP document. Vignettes should be based on actual Phase 1 areas, with specific callouts of various features. Although the Phase 1 block and street patterns and vignettes are conceptual, they will be used as a basis for reviewing subsequent PSP and DP in other phases.

Response: The document has been revised accordingly.

5) Revise Section 1.3 by adding reference to Preliminary Subdivision Plan (PSP) (as opposed to only DP). Eliminate reference to "site plan" and "Conceptual Area

Plan". The last sentence should be revised to state that any blocks and streets as depicted on the PD-RP or illustrative vignettes are conceptual and subject to change, provided that the design intent of any transect, organization of land uses, streets, blocks, and interconnectivity is maintained.

Response: The document has been revised accordingly.

6) Expand Section 1.6 to include substantial change criteria (e.g. any 15% or greater increase to any land use development program, and/or increase in projected trips without correlating decrease).

Response: The document has been revised accordingly.

Section 2 RP Revisions:

1) Provide definition for "small-scale apartments" [2.1.2(a)] and revise table 2.2 to reflect multi-family as permitted (P).

Response: The document has been revised accordingly.

2) Ancillary dwelling units should not count towards density. Revise reference in Section 2.1.2(a)(1).

Response: The document has been revised accordingly.

3) Subparagraphs with titles should have a period after the title. For example: 2.1.1 (a) Uses. Stewardship lands may be used as...

Response: The document has been revised accordingly.

4) In Section 2.1.2(a) subparagraph 1, remove "increase density" language since these types of units will not count towards density.

Response: The document has been revised accordingly.

5) In Section 2.1.2(a) subparagraph 2, the bulleted list should coincide with Table 2.2(a) Permitted Uses by Transect. Provide definition for "small-scale apartments" [2.1.2(a)] and revise table 2.2 to reflect multi-family as permitted (P).

Response: The document has been revised accordingly.

6) Refer to granny flats as accessory dwelling units.

Response: The document has been revised accordingly.

7) In Section 2.1.2(a) subparagraph 5, Neighborhoods, the term central focal point is used, but is not defined or used anywhere.

Response: The document has been revised to refer to a "discernable center."

8) Eliminate the 100-140 intersection density per square mile within the T3 Transect. The 100-140 intersection density is primarily for T4 and T5.

Response: This comment conflicts with Transportation Planning comment 3. Our response to that comment is as follows: "The intersection density requirement has been added to all Transects. The definition of connectivity has been expanded beyond vehicular connectivity to include pedestrian and bicycle connections, as well."

9) In Section 2.1.2(b) subparagraph 1, remove the phrase “The County recognizes”.

Response: The document has been revised accordingly.

10) In Figure 2.1.2(d(3) subparagraph 1 Typo (“creating”).

Response: The document has been revised accordingly.

11) In Section 2.1.3(a) subparagraph 2, rework the last sentence to state that the Activity Center will be “laid out as generally reflected on the Regulating Plan Map.”

Response: The document has been revised accordingly.

12) Figure 2.1.7: SD-R, should reflect “Research Park District” as opposed to “Beachline Special District”.

Response: The document has been revised accordingly.

Development Standards Table:

1) Standards should require rear-loaded (alley) access for all lots 50-feet or less.

Response: The document has been revised to reflect alley access for all lots less than 40’ in width.

2) Setbacks for front loaded garages on lots greater than 50 feet and less than 85 feet should be increased.

Response: Setbacks for front-loaded garages have been added to T3 and T4 development standard table.

3) Provide separate criteria for rear loaded and front loaded setbacks.

Response: The document has been revised accordingly.

4) In no instance should garages be closer than 20 feet to the property line.

Response: The document has been revised accordingly.

5) Provide separate standards for single-family detached and single family attached (townhomes) (lot width, setbacks, etc.).

Response: The document has been revised accordingly.

6) Remove Maximum Building Height, but keep Maximum Building Stories.

Response: The document has been revised accordingly.

7) Minimum Height: Add a note regarding height / width ratio a minimum of 1:3, for building height / ROW width along First and Second Order Streets within T4 and T5 (minimum of 3 stories).

Response: The document has been revised accordingly.

8) Remove Maximum Impervious Surface Ratio (and note 6 regarding FAR).

Response: Maximum ISR has been removed from each table. Note 6 regarding FAR has been revised per discussion with staff to reflect the

responsibility of the Developer to maintain a cumulative record of FAR approvals.

9) Provide build-to-zone requirements for T4 and T5.

Response: The document has been revised accordingly.

10) Provide minimum living area standards.

Response: The document has been revised accordingly.

11) Require 1st floor retail / commercial / office use under T5, in lieu of mixed used percentages.

Response: After discussions with Planning Division staff, applicant believes that required land-use percentages are more realistic way of attaining goal of creating a mixed-use environment. Therefore, the language remains.

Section 4 RP Revisions

1) In Section 4.1.4, the reference to Required Park Area (Section 4.1.3) should be to Section 4.1.2.

Response: The document has been revised accordingly.

2) In Section 4.1.4(b) there is a reference to Required Park Area credit in Section 4.1.2, but there is no such language in Section 4.1.2.

Response: The document has been revised accordingly.

Cross-Sections:

1) Three (3) separate cross-sections should be provided for First and Second Order Streets (1 each for T5, T4, and other).

Response: The document has been revised accordingly. Note that a combined T4/T5 cross-section has been created.

2) Cross-sections should reflect on-street parking.

Response: The document has been revised accordingly; T4/T5 First and Second Order Streets reflect on-street parking.

3) Add build-to-lines / zones along all T5 and T4 First and Second Order Street cross-sections.

Response: The illustration has been revised to show buildings consistent with build-to-zone requirements from development standards tables.

4) T4 and T5 cross-sections should reflect adjacent building massing (land uses), based on the minimum 1:3 building height / ROW width ratio.

Response: The illustration has been revised to show buildings consistent with build-to-zone requirements from development standards tables.

UTILITIES REVIEW

1) If you have any questions related to Utilities, please contact Laura Woodbury at 407-254-9928, or by e-mail at Laura.Woodbury@ocfl.net.

Response: So noted.

2) Please remove water, reclaimed water, and sewer mains from the four roadway Typical Sections provided on pages 20 and 21. (Main placement requirements are described in OCU's Standards and Construction Specifications Manual. To maintain flexibility, Utilities prefers not to specify exact locations in the Regulating Plan.)

Response: The document has been revised accordingly.

ZONING REVIEW

1) Change 1.6 "Conflicts & Omissions to the following:

1.6 Deviations from Regulations:

1) If a development standard within the Regulating Plan or a Regulation Not Addressed is requested to be altered, such alternate standards shall be reviewed by appropriate staff relative to the nature of the regulation or standard in question, with final decision by the Planning and Zoning Managers (and the County Engineer if applicable). If the proposed alteration is considered consistent with the intent of the Regulating Plan with minimal impact to neighboring properties, it may be accepted as non-substantial and appropriate to proceed without the need of further approvals. If the proposed alteration is considered inconsistent or substantial, it may be appealed to the DRC for further evaluation.

2) Deviations from the following Sustainability Principals are prohibited from being designated consistent or non-substantial: (a) Placing parking in front of the principal building in any T-4, T-5 or T-6 Transect. (b) Exceeding the allowable ratios of Spatial Enclosure. (c) Exceeding the allowable variations in block design and interconnectivity. (d) Developing residential lots of 40-feet or less without alley-access.

3) All development regulations and standards in this Regulating Plan shall be reviewed and approved for permitting by the appropriate department or division in accordance with the relevant subject matter.

4) Regulations Not Addressed: In the review of preliminary site plans, if it is determined by the Regulating Plan review staff a development standard has not been included in the Regulating Plan or there is ambiguity to a Regulating Plan standard, the applicant shall request an interpretation of the development standard from the Planning and/or Zoning Manager. The interpretation may take two forms: An agreed upon standard by the Planning and/or Zoning Manager or a referral to the most applicable section of the current Orange County code. The interpretation shall be binding on the applicant. If the applicant does not agree with the interpretation, the applicant may appeal the decision

to the Development Review Committee (DRC) as a Change Determination. The DRC's decision may be appealed to the BCC.

Response: The document has been revised to address this comment. See section 1.6, pg. 7 of revised PD-RP document.

2) Page 10: 2) What are the sizes of the large-lot, standard-lot & small-lots?

Response: Per discussions with Planning Division staff, the document has been revised to delete references to large, standard, and small lots. It was not the applicant's intent to have differing development standards for subsets of single-family detached lots.

3) Add note: "Small-scale apartments shall have no more than 8 units in a building and no more than 25 units in the apartment development without a minimum of 1000-foot distance from any other apartment building."

Response: The document has been revised accordingly (see sidenote on pg 10). The applicant proposes no minimum separation requirement.

4) Page 15 2.1.6 SD-I Add that the use types shall be consistent with the I-2 zoning district.

Response: The intent of the language and table is to reflect the uses currently allowed in the ICP PD.

5) The table has no apartments in T3. Page 10 allows small scale in T3. Note 2 (top right of page/above table) says granny flats/garage apts. do not count towards density. This conflicts with the top of Page 10.

Response: The document has been revised accordingly.

6) Page 17: Note 2 density does or does not count appears again. Note 5, eliminate height in feet and keep height in stories.

Response: The document has been revised accordingly.

6, cont.) Note 7 Change the end, as vertical mixed-use will require non-residential on the first floor for those buildings within the T5 transect. (T5 can have residential on the second and above floors) T4 may allow (with county approval) residential all the way to the first floor.

Response: After discussions with Planning Division staff, applicant believes that required land-use percentages are more realistic way of attaining goal of creating a mixed-use environment. Therefore, the language remains.

7) Page 17: Lot development standards shall include townhomes. Front yards shall have 20-foot minimum for garages to allow driveways to accommodate vehicles. Add alleys to the table as alternative standards.

Add that porches (and home fronts) may go to 10-feet in the front (garages/driveways, if front-loaded, must still be 20-feet). Min lot width must have listed the townhomes, small, standard & large lots mentioned on Page 10. Change height from feet to stories. Townhomes and small lots must be alley-

only-access. Eliminate max impervious coverage. SD-R needs max amount of residential/commercial uses.

Response: The document has been revised accordingly. Note that references to small, standard, and large lots have been deleted.

8) Contact Bob Windom of the Orange County Zoning Division at (407) 836-9620 or email bob.windom@ocfl.net with any questions pertaining to the Zoning comments.

Response: So noted.

9) Page 19: Make separate cross sections for T4 & T5 areas for First/Second order Streets. These will be more compact, front zones in front of the buildings, trees in cut outs, not full strips, median closed in, and add on-street parking.

Response: The document has been revised accordingly.

TRAFFIC REVIEW

1) Figures 3.3.2 (a)(c)(d) The callout for the sidewalk says 4 feet, but the dimensions show 5 feet. A 5 foot sidewalk is required.

Response: The document has been revised accordingly.

2) Figure 3.3.2 (c)(d) What will be the accommodation for bicycles? Will sharrows be marked in the travel lanes (<=35 mph)?

Response: These are intended to be local, slow speed streets. Sharrows can be added if appropriate.

Figure 3.3.2 (b) 1)Please install a buffered bike lane adjacent to the on-street parking per FL Greenbook Figure 9-18. 2)An asphalt pathway would need to be approved by Parks.

Response: The document has been revised accordingly.

Figure 3.3.2 (a) FL Greenbook states that all new or reconstructed arterial and collector roadways , in and within one mile of an urban area, should include bike lanes.

Response: While the functional class of this roadway is still to be determined, the neighborhood will be served with a robust off-road multi-use trail system.

TRANSPORTATION REVIEW

1) Policy FLU5.2.2(f)(2) requires a financially-feasible capital improvements plan with the adoption of a PD-Regulating Plan, with the Innovation Way-Transportation Agreement also required by Policy T2.5.1 and Policy T2.6.4. The transportation analysis is to serve as data and analysis for the IW-TA per Policy FLU5.2.1(b), which would require an analysis accepted by Orange County.

Response: The financially-feasible capital improvements plan is an obligation of the County. The applicant would appreciate seeing a draft prior to adoption. The required transportation analysis has been provided

and reviewed by Orange County. A Innovation Way Transportation/Roadway Agreement is forthcoming.

2) The PD-Regulating Plan should make reference to new development's contributions to the multimodal network that may be required, consistent with Policy T2.5.7.

Response: The PD-RP refers to the multimodal network throughout Section 3.

3) The connectivity in terms of intersections per square mile that is required by Policy FLU5.2.2(d) doesn't specify that only bike/ped connections can be considered an eligible connection or that environmental exemptions are possible these are both proposed by the PD-Regulating Plan on page 10. How will connectivity requirements of this policy be reviewed? Also, the PD-Regulating Plan cites this policy only in reference to Neighborhood Zones and doesn't address it for other areas, but it is applicable within the entire Innovation Way Overlay.

Response: The document has been revised with updated connectivity language. The intersection density requirement has been added to all Transects. The definition of connectivity has been expanded beyond vehicular connectivity to include pedestrian and bicycle connections, as well.

4) There are several Transportation Element Policies requiring connectivity that are not addressed in the PD-Regulating Plan. Policy T2.5.9.1 requires that all development plans shall meet certain connectivity standards between adjacent developments. Policy T2.5.11.1 requires connectivity between development and adjacent schools, and Policy T2.6.3 requires public access to parks, lakes, and open space.

Response: The document has been revised to include a section addressing these policies; see section 3.4, pg. 29.

5) Page 11 of the PD-Regulating Plan makes reference to connecting to the "arterial" please replace with reference to functionally-classified roadway.

Response: The document has been revised accordingly.

6) Page 18 of the PD-Regulating Plan states local streets shall have street trees, but doesn't specify maintenance responsibilities.

Response: The document has been revised to address maintenance responsibilities; see section 3.3.1 and 3.3.2.

7) Page 20 of the PD-Regulating Plan notes that the Neighborhood Connector 1 and 2 typical section may be used in commercial/mixed use contexts, but the sidewalk is only five feet in width. (TP)

Response: The document has been revised to include notation that final dimensions will be determined with final engineering. In the case of more adjacent land use intensity, a wider sidewalk would be appropriate.

8) This development is vested from transportation concurrency for 82,000 average annual daily trips. There is a vested rights certificate # 92-007 on file for this development. Since additional parcels are being added to the development, the applicant should update the vested rights certificate to include all parcels within the development. A copy of the certificate is required with each building permit application. (TP)

Response: The document has been revised accordingly; refer to section 5.4.

9) Prior to Adoption of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment, a Multi-Modal Transportation Network Agreement must be in place. (TP)

Response: So noted. This agreement is in process.

Sincerely,



Blake Drury, AICP
Director, Planning and Urban Design
b.drury@gaiconsultants.com

cc: Sunbridge Team