



9101 Bonita Beach Road  
Bonita Springs, FL 34135  
Tel: (239) 949-6262  
Fax: (239) 949-6239  
www.cityofbonitasprings.org

**Peter Simmons**  
Mayor

**Amy Quaremba**  
Council Member  
District One

**Greg DeWitt**  
Council Member  
District Two

**Steven Slachta**  
Council Member  
District Three

**Peter R. O'Flinn**  
Council Member  
District Four

**Michael Gibson**  
Council Member  
District Five

**Fred Forbes**  
Council Member  
District Six

**Carl L. Schwing**  
City Manager  
(239) 949-6267

**Audrey E. Vance**  
City Attorney  
(239) 949-6254

**City Clerk**  
(239) 949-6247

**Public Works**  
(239) 949-6246

**Code Enforcement**  
(239) 949-6257

**Parks & Recreation**  
(239) 992-2556

**Community  
Development**  
(239) 444-6150

January 10, 2017

Mr. Wayne Arnold  
3800 Via Del Rey  
Bonita Springs, FL 34134

Re: Pelican Landing Commercial Planned Development (CPD)/Residential  
Planned Development (RPD) Amendment, PD15-23946-BOS

Dear Mr. Arnold:

The Zoning Division has reviewed the information provided and supplemented for the planned development amendment request referenced above. Additional support documentation is required for the application to be deemed complete. Please provide comments for each requirement not satisfied on the attached checklist.

If the requested items are not provided within 60 calendar days of this letter, this application will be considered withdrawn.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
Zoning Division

Jacqueline Toemmes Genson, AICP  
Planning and Zoning Manager

Copy:  
Audrey Vance, City Attorney  
Leah Fontanez, Assistant to the City Attorney's Office  
Arleen Hunter, Assistant City Manager  
John Dulmer, AICP, Community Development Director  
Sarah Miller, Community Development  
Tom Ross, Transportation Review  
Mary Gibbs, Village of Estero  
Angela Dietrich, Lee County  
David Theriaque, Theriaque & Spain  
PD Files

## **BONITA SPRINGS Planning and Zoning**

**Items in italicize indicate that either further information may be needed to address insufficiency comments from the July 11, 2016 and November 23, 2016 letters or areas of disagreement between the applicant and staff.**

1. Application.
  - a. *Part 5A. Please complete.*

*Staff acknowledges the applicant does not want to complete this portion of the application since there is no request to increase the amount of residential dwelling units within the Pelican Landing CPD/RPD. Based on previous staff reports, staff has opined that the increase in land area without an increase in dwelling units has not increased the gross density for the Pelican Landing CPD/RPD as defined in LDC 34-1492.*

- d. Request Statement and Demonstration of Compatibility.
  - i. FDC Analysis.
    3. *Page 5.*

- a. *Policy 105.1.5. A portion of this statement is inaccurate. The portion of the parcel located in the Kersey Smoot RPD has been designated as a golf course since 1998. The portion of the parcel located within the Pelican Landing CPD/RPD RPD Area E only allowed for multi-family at a maximum height of 75' above minimum flood elevation with no more than 6 habitable floors, but was rezoned in 2000 for incorporation into the golf course development.*

*Lee Plan Policy 105.1.5*

***POLICY 105.1.5:*** *Zoning requests located in the coastal high hazard area will be considered for reduced or minimum density assignments, in accordance with their future land use category density range. This evaluation should be done in concert with an evaluation of other individual characteristics such as compatibility with existing uses, desired urban form, and availability of urban services. (Added by Ordinance No. 05-19)*

*While the applicant is not requesting to increase the number of units of the Pelican Landing CPD/RPD or the DRI, the request is*

*to reallocate units to an area of the MCP and DRI that as originally approved and as subsequently amended, is not approved for such uses nor at the requested density. Only the Pelican Landing CPD/RPD RPD land development Area E was designated for a variety of residential uses at a maximum height of 75' with no more than 6 habitable floors.*

*The 1994 PD/DRI Hearing Examiner (HEX) report indicated that the applicant originally requested 12 buildings and one hotel in the original deviation request for RPD Areas E, F and CPD Area B. The report indicated that these areas were more appropriate for lower density residential uses and building heights based on consistency with the Lee Plan and the LDC criteria to review deviations. The HEX recommendation was for no more than 240 residential units north of Coconut Road; however, staff understands that the Lee County Board of County Commissioners (BoCC) did not retain that language. Instead they only allowed the deviation to apply to 8 buildings in RPD Areas F and for one hotel CPD Area B, not this area (RPD Area E).*

*This amendment request is a zoning request, which is located within the CHHA with its primary means of evacuation on Coconut Road. The amendment request reallocates previously approved units to areas that have no current residential density assignment according to the adopted MCPs and Map H's; therefore, the request is an increase in density for those areas. Staff acknowledges that planned development density is applied by gross acreage; however, this request is moving from a net density of 0 dwelling units (du)/acre to over 7 du/acre.*

*The City of Bonita Springs Comprehensive Plan does not have a similar policy as Lee Plan Policy 105.1.5. This amendment request was analyzed by staff during the review of the City's Comprehensive Plan,*

*Resolution 03-83, and the Bonita Springs LDC; this remand order was requested to review the request under the Lee Plan and Lee County LDC. Based on the review of the Lee Plan Policy, staff believes this amendment request is inconsistent with this policy.*

*The Annexation Agreement between the City of Bonita Springs and the applicant contemplated a zoning change concurrent with the city's comprehensive plan amendment. Subsequently, the applicant changed the request for review under the Lee Plan and Lee County LDC pursuant to Florida Statutes §171.062 (2). The Annexation Agreement does not address review under the Lee Plan and Lee County LDC regulations.*

*Additionally, a complaint was filed in the Circuit Court of the Twentieth Judicial Circuit in and for Lee County, Florida related to the Pelican Landing Golf Resort Ventures Limited Partnership Annexation Agreement. A legitimate argument exists that the Annexation Agreement constitutes an improper contracting away of the City's police powers, and, therefore, may be void ab initio. The applicant references the Annexation Agreement as justification and/or a response to staff's July 11, 2016 insufficiency letter. The applicant may care to provide a supplemental justification and/or a response to staff's comments above and separate from the Annexation Agreement.*

*On page 6 of your letter dated November 29, 2016, you state that the "property was annexed into the City in reliance on the representations of the City Council expressed in the annexation agreements. . . ." Please identify: (a) the entity that allegedly relied upon such representations; (b) the actions and expenditures that such entity made in reliance upon such representations; and (c) whether such entity has any legal*

*interest in the pending applications. If such entity does not have any legal interest in the pending applications, please identify all entities that have a legal interest in the pending applications.*

*Also on page 6 of your letter dated November 29, 2016, you state that the City has violated the "annexation agreements" and that "the City does not want the property owner to have a reasonable use of the land." The decision to proceed pursuant to Lee County's land use regulations was made by the applicant, not by the City Council or the City Staff. Moreover, the fact that the City Council denied a particular Future Land Use Map designation and zoning category for the subject property in February 2016 does not preclude the applicant from proposing a different Future Land Use Map designation and zoning category for the subject property.*

*Staff acknowledges that the applicant and staff disagree on the application of this policy as it relates to this request. The Kersey Smoot RPD HEX report stated that the net effect of the amendment will be to shift the density and the residential uses away from Estero Bay and away from Eco-Park.*

4. Page 1. 163.3178(9)FS does not appear to be a proper citation.

2. Lee Plan Consistency

- a. *Future Land Use Element (FLUE) Policy 5.1.2. Public comment at the February 3, 2016 meeting indicated that the Kersey Smoot RPD and Pelican Landing CPD/RPD RPD Area E was historically entitled with lower density and private recreational development. Staff acknowledges that the DRI development order lists conditions relative to Hurricane Preparedness as outlined in the 1994 DRI development order. However, this request would expose far more residents to hurricane hazards north of Coconut Road than what was originally contemplated when the companion DRI and rezonings were first approved (Pelican Landing CPD/RPD in 1994; Kersey Smoot RPD in 1998).*

*Staff acknowledges that the applicant and staff disagree on the application of this policy as it relates to this request.*

- c. *FLUE Policy 5.1.10(c). Density across more than one future land use classification. This policy was adopted by Lee County in 1990 and amended in 1992, which specified language regarding that the land be under single ownership at the time this policy was adopted and is contiguous. The Kersey Smoot property was acquired in 1998, which is after this policy was adopted. Please explain how this request to shift density from the Pelican Landing CPD/RPD is consistent with this policy.*

*City staff acknowledges that the county staff did not review the Kersey Smoot rezoning for consistency with this policy. Staff acknowledges that the county relied on the DRI as a basis for consistency with the future land use element of the Lee Plan.*

*The sufficiency response did not address this comment. Density is defined in Subdivision II. - Residential Development of LDC 34. Page 16 of the August 17, 1998 Kersey Smoot RPD staff report provided a Lee Plan analysis for gross density for the RPD in addition to citing the gross density for the DRI.*

*The Annexation Agreement between the City of Bonita Springs and the applicant contemplated a zoning change concurrent with the city's comprehensive plan amendment. Subsequently, the applicant changed the request for review under the Lee Plan and Lee County LDC pursuant to Florida Statutes§171.062 (2). The Annexation Agreement does not address review under the Lee Plan and Lee County LDC regulations.*

*Additionally, a complaint was filed in the Circuit Court of the Twentieth Judicial Circuit in and for Lee County, Florida related to the Pelican Landing Golf Resort Ventures Limited Partnership Annexation Agreement. A legitimate argument exists that the Annexation Agreement constitutes an improper contracting away of the City's police powers, and, therefore, may be void ab initio. The applicant references the Annexation Agreement as justification and/or a response to staff's July 11, 2016 insufficiency letter. The applicant may care to provide a supplemental justification and/or a response to staff's comments above and separate from the Annexation Agreement.*

3. Lee County LDC

- a. *LDC 34-935(f)(1)e. Staff understands the applicant is proposing to amend deviation 12, which is for this LDC section. Please*

*demonstrate how the request to redevelop an existing golf course increases common open space for the purpose of preserving environmentally sensitive land, securing areas of native vegetation and wildlife habitat, or preserving historical, archaeological or scenic views.*

*The applicant did not address this comment as provided in the November 23, 2016 insufficiency letter.*

*Staff acknowledges that the applicant and staff disagree on the justification as it relates to this deviation request.*

*Staff acknowledges that portions of the golf course were originally a part of the Kersey Smoot RPD and that the golf course was not considered part of common open space as it relates to the DRI. Staff's point is that the redevelopment of this property, which is currently a golf course, does not increase common open space for the purpose of preserving environmentally sensitive land, securing areas of native vegetation and wildlife habitat, or preserving historical, archaeological or scenic views*

- b. The applicant is requesting to amend Z-94-14, deviation 12 to add area F1 and the ability for up to 4 more towers north of Coconut Road. Please provide a separate deviation request and justification.*

*Please provide a separate deviation request document with the written justification per LDC 34-373(a)(9). The justification shall include how deviation requests meets both tests pursuant to LDC 34-145(d)(4)a2c) in Exhibit IV-H. The Exhibit IV-H submitted August 30, 2016 in Tab 12 does not satisfy this LDC requirement.*

*Based on the insufficiency responses, staff acknowledges that the applicant and staff disagree on the justification as it relates to this deviation request. It is staff's opinion that the area proposed for a conservation easement is afforded protections based on the Wetlands Future Land Use Category Classification on the Lee County Future Land Use Map and Objective 1.5 and Goal 114 of the Future Land Use Element. What additional benefits are gained by placing this already recognized Environmentally Critical Area into a conservation easement?*

*According to the HEX Recommendation Report for the 1994 Pelican Landing DRI and Pelican Landing CPD/RPD, the applicant originally requested high rise development in the Parcel E area of the Pelican Landing CPD/RPD. The HEX opined that this concentration of development abutting wetlands of the Estero Bay*

*was inconsistent with Lee Plan. It should be noted that the Lee County Board of County Commissioners (BoCC) did not approve the applicant's request for 12 buildings and one hotel in the original deviation request for RPD Areas E, F and CPD Area B and that they only approved 8 buildings in RPD Areas F and for one hotel CPD Area B, not this area (RPD Area E). The BoCC agreed that deviation north of Coconut Road was not appropriate based on the final condition in Z-94-14. While some of those Goals, Objectives, and Policies have been amended, the general intent of Policy 107.2.10 has not changed.*

- d. *LDC 34-378(b). Staff acknowledges that the applicant is requesting to use existing dwelling units that were approved in Z-94-14; however, this request entails new residential dwellings units on property that was developed and has current zoning entitlements as a golf course. Therefore, these residential units from Z-94-14 are not vested as to density or intensity.*

*Staff acknowledges that the applicant and staff disagree on this comment.*

*Staff acknowledges the language that exists in both the County and City DRIs relative to item 14 in Part III LEGAL EFFECT AND LIMITATIONS OF THE DEVELOPMENT ORDER, AND ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS. While the applicant is not requesting to increase the number of units of the Pelican Landing CPD/RPD or the DRI, the request is to reallocate density to an area of the MCP and DRI that is not approved for such uses nor at the requested density. Only the Pelican Landing CPD/RPD RPD land development Area E was designated for a variety of residential uses at a maximum height of 75' with no more than 6 habitable floors.*

*On page 11 of your letter dated November 29, 2016, you state that the "applicant annexed into the City in reliance on the City's representations." Please identify: (a) the entity that you allege was the "applicant" which allegedly relied upon such representations; (b) the actions and expenditures that such entity made in reliance upon such representations; and (c) whether such entity has any legal interest in the pending applications. If such entity does not have any legal interest in the pending applications, please identify all entities that have a legal interest in the pending applications.*

**Kersey Smoot RPD**

- e. *Z-07-031. Staff acknowledges that the Kersey Smoot RPD was approved with 362 units. Please provide the number of units built in Kersey Smoot to date. Please explain if the applicant is proposing to retain all 362 units within this planned development. If*

*so, please demonstrate consistency with the Lee Plan for this reduced area.*

*Staff acknowledges the applicant does not want to provide the gross density for the Kersey Smoot RPD and that the balance of the project is located within unincorporated Lee County; however, it is important to ensure that this zoning request does not create an inconsistency with the Lee Plan for another RPD regardless if its located in the City's jurisdiction and within the same DRI boundary. Based on the reduced land area, staff has determined that the density for the Kersey Smoot RPD equates to approximately 2 dwelling units an acre, which is consistent with the Lee Plan for that planned development.*

*On page 12 of your letter dated November 29, 2016, you refer to the "applicant." Please identify the entity which is the "applicant" for the pending applications.*

4. Pelican Landing CPD/RPD

- a. *Z-94-14, Condition 19. Please provide the unit breakdown by development and Lee County Future Land Use Classification to demonstrate consistency. Staff acknowledges in 2002, the City of Bonita Springs portions of the Pelican Landing CPD/RPD (prior to the 2014 annexations) were assigned the Moderate Density Mixed Use Planned Development classification; however, each final plan approval and/or local development order should have provided the unit breakdown consistent with this condition.*

*On page 13 of your letter dated November 29, 2016, you state that "WCI Communities has prepared a spreadsheet. . . ." We were unable to find a corporate entity named "WCI Communities" on the Division of Corporations' website. Accordingly, please identify the specific entity that prepared the spreadsheet.*

5. Miscellaneous.

- a. *Please find attached comments from the Village of Estero Please provide responses to those agency comments.*
- b. *The City of Bonita Springs has retained David Theriaque for outside counsel for this project. Staff intends to ask Mr. Theriaque questions pertaining to this application, which may trigger additional comments relative to this zoning case and the companion DRI case, outside of this sufficiency review.*
- c. *Miscellaneous. Please provide staff's questions with the response to sufficiency document. Please provide one hard copy original and then one PDF copy of the sufficiency response submittal (disc or flash drive).*

- d. According to the Division of Corporations, Pelican Landing Golf Resort Ventures Limited Partnership is inactive. The Division of Corporations has received an LP Notice of Cancellation. Please update the application, authorized agent forms, affidavit of authorization, disclosure of interest forms, etc. to reflect the current ownership of the subject property.
- e. Please provide an updated property owner list and mailing labels for the city to distribute courtesy mailed notices.

Please contact Jacqueline Genson, AICP, Planning and Zoning Manager  
Phone: 239.444.6163  
E-mail: [Jacqueline.genson@cityofbonitaspringscd.org](mailto:Jacqueline.genson@cityofbonitaspringscd.org)

### **BONITA SPRINGS Transportation Review**

1. The trip generation for all other developments in the vicinity of Pelican Landing along Coconut Road are low. For example, in the buildout scenario, the three subdivisions along the north side of Coconut Road west of US 41 only contribute a total of 427 trips in the PM peak. However, there are over 650 units in these three subdivisions combined. There is potential for these developments to generate much higher volumes based on ITE trip generation rates for these existing uses. Please explain why these volumes are so low.
2. The table titled "Area-Specific Developments" on page 15 of the TIS lists several developments that are assumed to be contributing to the background traffic for 2024. Please provide a map showing the location of each of these developments, the number and direction of PM peak hour trips assigned for each development to the network and the location that each development has access to the network where these trips are assigned. Include the development parameters and a summary of the PM peak hour trip generation for each development. This information will be used to verify the background traffic volumes.
3. The approved pelican Landing DRI includes a total of 3,072 PM peak hour external trips. The exhibits for Total Traffic (Current Zoning) show 344 trips at the Coconut Point Resort Drive entrance, 264 trips at The Colony entrance on Coconut Road and 337 trips on Pelican Colony Blvd. just west of North Commons Drive. Please provide a map showing the location(s) of where the remaining 2,127 trips access the external network.
4. The existing traffic counts indicate a total of 74 trips entering Walden Center Drive from both Coconut Road and Pelican Colony Blvd. and 235 trips exiting Walden Center Drive. It appears that most of these trips originate or terminate at sites along Walden Center. The future Total Traffic (Current Zoning) indicates a total of 128 trips entering Walden Center Drive and 459 trips exiting. This is an increase of approximately 90%. There are only a few undeveloped parcels left at the north end

of Walden Center Drive. Please identify the approved uses for the remaining undeveloped parcels and the associated PM peak hour trip generation.

5. Please confirm that the signal timing, including phase length and splits, used for the analysis of the Coconut Road/US 41 signal is consistent with the timing plan currently in operation. The Existing conditions analysis used a cycle length of 180 seconds. The Buildout conditions analysis used a cycle length of 165 seconds. Has FDOT or Lee County DOT indicated that they intend to reduce the cycle length as traffic volumes increase along US 41?
6. The report notes that the US 41/Coconut Road intersection is projected to operate at LOS C overall. However, the intersection summary of the analysis indicates that the overall intersection is projected to operate at LOS E and the eastbound approach is projected to operate at LOS E. This needs to be added to the conclusions of the report. This will also impact the overall operations of the Coconut Road corridor west of US 41. This information needs to be added to the conclusions of the report.
7. Please provide origin and destination information for the trips that are diverted due to the proposed signal at US 41 and Pelican Colony Boulevard. The Future Total Traffic (Rezoning) exhibits indicate that 520 trips will divert from Coconut Road to Pelican Colony Boulevard. This is a substantial diversion of traffic. Almost half of this volume is diverting south to head north on US 41. The result of this diversion is that the eastbound approach of Coconut Blvd at US 41 is projected to operate at LOS E with an approach delay of 72 seconds per vehicle while the eastbound approach of Pelican Colony Blvd at US 41 is projected to operate at LOS F with an approach delay of 120 seconds per vehicle. Why would so many vehicles divert south to Pelican Colony Boulevard to travel north on US 41 when delay at the intersection is almost twice as long? This needs to be justified.

Please contact Tom Ross, Transportation Reviewer  
Phone: (407) 650-2178  
E-mail: [tom.ross@ch2m.com](mailto:tom.ross@ch2m.com)

## ZTIS PD Application Sufficiency Checklist

### Raptor Bay TIS—Submitted by DPA, Dated November 22, 2016

- 1) Description of Development & ITE Land Use Code. The TIS must contain a general description of each type of use proposed, the units of development (i.e. number of dwelling units, square feet of building floor area, etc.) and the Land Use Code for each type of use utilized in the trip generation (e.g. Single family detached housing (200 lots), Land Use Code 210). [AC-13-17]

1a) The Land Use Codes must be complete and appropriate for each proposed use. [AC-13-17]

**Item 1) and 1a) provided as required.**

- 2) Trip End Rates or Equations. The TIS must contain the equations or the average trip end generation rates for each type of use proposed and the name of the document from which this information was obtained (i.e. ITE TRIP

**GENERATION, current edition). [AC-13-17]**

2a) Trip generation must be based on the combination of uses shown in the Schedule of Uses on the Master Concept

Plan which generates the highest total number of trips during the A.M. and P.M. peak hour of the adjacent street(s).

**[AC-13-17]**

- 2a1) Trip generation must be based on regression equations, where available. [AC-13-17]
- 2a2) Trip generation may be based on average generation rates where regression equations are not available or were approved in advance by the Director. [AC-13-17]
- 2a3) Trip generation rates may be based on a study of one or more similar developments when the study is approved in advance by the Director. [AC-13-17]

2b) Trip generation equations or average trip rates must be complete and correct. [AC-13-17]

**Item 2)2a)2a1 thru 2a3) provided as required.**

- 3) Site Plan. The TIS must contain a drawing showing the proposed project access point(s) & location of all other access points on both sides of all streets being accessed within 660 feet for project entrances on arterial streets, within 330 feet for project entrances on collector streets & within 125 feet for project entrances on local streets. [AC-13-17]

3a) Road Classifications. The roads accessed by the development must be identified including their LCDOT functional classification and their classification on the Official Trafficways Map. [AC-13-17]

**Item 3) and 3a) site plan not provided, but conceptual location provided. Item 3a) provided as required.**

## ZTIS PD Application Sufficiency Checklist

### Raptor Bay TIS—Submitted by DPA, Dated November 22, 2016

4) Background Traffic. The TIS must contain 100th highest hour traffic for the current year and for the year following the year in which the project is expected to be completed. [AC-13-17]

4a) For projects which are to be constructed in phases, peak season peak hour traffic must be shown for the year(s) in which each phase of the project is to be completed. [AC-13-17]

**Item 4) and 4a) information provided as required.**

5) Directional Splits. The TIS must contain a drawing showing the percentage, number of trips, and the direction of travel for trips entering and exiting the project at each proposed access point. [AC-13-17]

5a) The distribution of traffic must be reasonably distributed to the project entrances. A graphical depiction of all turning movements at each of the project entrances/access points must be provided. [AC-13-17]

**Item 5) and 5a) Percentage trip information was provided graphically. Number of trips and direction of trips information provided as required.**

6) Area of Influence. The TIS for projects generating more than 100 trips during the A.M. or P.M. peak hour of the adjacent street must contain a drawing showing the area of influence of the project. [AC-13-17]

6a) Area of influence is defined as the area in which project traffic is 10% or more of the maximum service volume at

LOS "C" on roadway links and 10% or more of the total approach volumes at intersections at project buildout.

**[AC-13-17]**

6b) The traffic throughout the area of influence must be reasonably distributed and the distribution must show a reasonable reduction in the number of trips as they move away from the project.

[AC-13-17]

**Item 6) 6a) and 6b) information provided as required.**

## ZTIS PD Application Sufficiency Checklist

### Raptor Bay TIS—Submitted by DPA, Dated November 22, 2016

7) Level of Service Analysis. The TIS for projects generating more than 100 net new trips during the A.M. or P.M. peak hour of the adjacent street must contain an analysis of the Level of Service for all links within the area of influence. [AC-13-17]

7a) The TIS must contain an analysis of the Level of Service for each of the projects access points and all intersections within one-quarter mile of the project. The analysis must follow the methods established in the most current edition of the HIGHWAY CAPACITY MANUAL for either signalized or unsignalized intersections. [AC-13-17]

**Item 7) information provided as required. Link analysis data should be based on county accepted values for evaluation purposes and not consultant derived values.**

**Item 7a) information provided as required.**

8) Arterial Analysis. The TIS for projects generating more than 300 trips during the AM or PM peak hour of the adjacent street must contain analysis of the arterial road accessed or impacted in the area of influence of the project using the methods established in the most current edition of the HIGHWAY CAPACITY MANUAL for an urban or suburban road. [AC-13-17]

**Item 8) N/A.**

9) Necessary Improvements. When the Level of Service analysis for any project shows that the LOS on links or at any intersection fall below the minimums adopted in THE LEE PLAN (e.g. Village of Estero Interim Comprehensive Plan), the TIS must contain recommendation & analysis of the improvements necessary to offset the added traffic impacts to restore/meet/exceed the prescribed LOS standards. [AC-13-17]

**Item 9) information provided as required. Assumption that PCB signal at US 41 would reduce PM EB traffic on Coconut Rd by 45% (Exhibits 14c and 16c) seems high. Improvement recommendations (pg. 33-34) make sense (signal at US 41/Pelican Colony Blvd when warranted; intersection improvements at US 41/Coconut Rd; and roundabout feasibility study). Existing count data presented in study would aid recommended roundabout study effort. Coordinated effort between City of Bonita Springs, Village of Estero, Lee County and FDOT is needed to insure project mitigation measures are used to make needed improvements identified in the study.**

10) Miscellaneous items. **Item 10) N/A**

11) Contact. The Staff reviewer may be contacted with any questions relative to this ZTIS PD Application Sufficiency Checklist. **Item 11) Reviewer: Norman J. Trebilcock, AICP, PE; Trebilcock Consulting Solutions, PA; email: [ntrebilcock@trebilcock.biz](mailto:ntrebilcock@trebilcock.biz), Telephone: 239-566-9551. Review submittal date: December 12, 2016.**

## ZTIS PD Application Sufficiency Checklist

### Raptor Bay TIS—Submitted by DPA, Dated November 22, 2016

- 1) Description of Development & ITE Land Use Code. The TIS must contain a general description of each type of use proposed, the units of development (i.e. number of dwelling units, square feet of building floor area, etc.) and the Land Use Code for each type of use utilized in the trip generation (e.g. Single family detached housing (200 lots), Land Use Code 210). [AC-13-17]

1a) The Land Use Codes must be complete and appropriate for each proposed use. [AC-13-17]

**Item 1) and 1a) provided as required.**

- 2) Trip End Rates or Equations. The TIS must contain the equations or the average trip end generation rates for each type of use proposed and the name of the document from which this information was obtained (i.e. ITE TRIP

**GENERATION, current edition). [AC-13-17]**

2a) Trip generation must be based on the combination of uses shown in the Schedule of Uses on the Master Concept

Plan which generates the highest total number of trips during the A.M. and P.M. peak hour of the adjacent street(s).

**[AC-13-17]**

- 2a1) Trip generation must be based on regression equations, where available. [AC-13-17]
- 2a2) Trip generation may be based on average generation rates where regression equations are not available or were approved in advance by the Director. [AC-13-17]
- 2a3) Trip generation rates may be based on a study of one or more similar developments when the study is approved in advance by the Director. [AC-13-17]

2b) Trip generation equations or average trip rates must be complete and correct. [AC-13-17]

**Item 2)2a)2a1 thru 2a3) provided as required.**

- 3) Site Plan. The TIS must contain a drawing showing the proposed project access point(s) & location of all other access points on both sides of all streets being accessed within 660 feet for project entrances on arterial streets, within 330 feet for project entrances on collector streets & within 125 feet for project entrances on local streets. [AC-13-17]

3a) Road Classifications. The roads accessed by the development must be identified including their LCDOT functional classification and their classification on the Official Trafficways Map. [AC-13-17]

**Item 3) and 3a) site plan not provided, but conceptual location provided. Item 3a) provided as required.**

## ZTIS PD Application Sufficiency Checklist

### Raptor Bay TIS—Submitted by DPA, Dated November 22, 2016

4) Background Traffic. The TIS must contain 100th highest hour traffic for the current year and for the year following the year in which the project is expected to be completed. [AC-13-17]

4a) For projects which are to be constructed in phases, peak season peak hour traffic must be shown for the year(s) in which each phase of the project is to be completed. [AC-13-17]

**Item 4) and 4a) information provided as required.**

5) Directional Splits. The TIS must contain a drawing showing the percentage, number of trips, and the direction of travel for trips entering and exiting the project at each proposed access point. [AC-13-17]

5a) The distribution of traffic must be reasonably distributed to the project entrances. A graphical depiction of all turning movements at each of the project entrances/access points must be provided. [AC-13-17]

**Item 5) and 5a) Percentage trip information was provided graphically. Number of trips and direction of trips information provided as required.**

6) Area of Influence. The TIS for projects generating more than 100 trips during the A.M. or P.M. peak hour of the adjacent street must contain a drawing showing the area of influence of the project. [AC-13-17]

6a) Area of influence is defined as the area in which project traffic is 10% or more of the maximum service volume at

LOS "C" on roadway links and 10% or more of the total approach volumes at intersections at project buildout.

**[AC-13-17]**

6b) The traffic throughout the area of influence must be reasonably distributed and the distribution must show a reasonable reduction in the number of trips as they move away from the project.

[AC-13-17]

**Item 6) 6a) and 6b) information provided as required.**

## ZTIS PD Application Sufficiency Checklist

### Raptor Bay TIS—Submitted by DPA, Dated November 22, 2016

7) Level of Service Analysis. The TIS for projects generating more than 100 net new trips during the A.M. or P.M. peak hour of the adjacent street must contain an analysis of the Level of Service for all links within the area of influence. [AC-13-17]

7a) The TIS must contain an analysis of the Level of Service for each of the projects access points and all intersections within one-quarter mile of the project. The analysis must follow the methods established in the most current edition of the HIGHWAY CAPACITY MANUAL for either signalized or unsignalized intersections. [AC-13-17]

**Item 7) information provided as required. Link analysis data should be based on county accepted values for evaluation purposes and not consultant derived values.**

**Item 7a) information provided as required.**

8) Arterial Analysis. The TIS for projects generating more than 300 trips during the AM or PM peak hour of the adjacent street must contain analysis of the arterial road accessed or impacted in the area of influence of the project using the methods established in the most current edition of the HIGHWAY CAPACITY MANUAL for an urban or suburban road. [AC-13-17]

**Item 8) N/A.**

9) Necessary Improvements. When the Level of Service analysis for any project shows that the LOS on links or at any intersection fall below the minimums adopted in THE LEE PLAN (e.g. Village of Estero Interim Comprehensive Plan), the TIS must contain recommendation & analysis of the improvements necessary to offset the added traffic impacts to restore/meet/exceed the prescribed LOS standards. [AC-13-17]

**Item 9) information provided as required. Assumption that PCB signal at US 41 would reduce PM EB traffic on Coconut Rd by 45% (Exhibits 14c and 16c) seems high. Improvement recommendations (pg. 33-34) make sense (signal at US 41/Pelican Colony Blvd when warranted; intersection improvements at US 41/Coconut Rd; and roundabout feasibility study). Existing count data presented in study would aid recommended roundabout study effort. Coordinated effort between City of Bonita Springs, Village of Estero, Lee County and FDOT is needed to insure project mitigation measures are used to make needed improvements identified in the study.**

10) Miscellaneous items. **Item 10) N/A**

11) Contact. The Staff reviewer may be contacted with any questions relative to this ZTIS PD Application Sufficiency Checklist. **Item 11) Reviewer: Norman J. Trebilcock, AICP, PE; Trebilcock Consulting Solutions, PA; email: [ntrebilcock@trebilcock.biz](mailto:ntrebilcock@trebilcock.biz), Telephone: 239-566-9551. Review submittal date: December 12, 2016.**