



Denham

Engineering, LLC

March 4, 2016

Mr. Ken Comia
Planner
City of Groveland
156 S. Lake Ave.
Groveland, FL 34736

**PLAN NAME: Rockers Lockers – Green Valley Lots 3-5
Site Plan Review**
PLAN NUMBER: Application No. 2015-86

Dear Mr. Comia,

The following is our response to the city comments dated 2-16-16.

City Attorney

1. Please advise whether or not Building 7 encroaches on 10' Distribution Easement recorded in O.R. Book 3722, Page 1900, Public Records of Lake County, Florida.
Response: Buildings have been revised accordingly. This was information that came up on the new January 9 survey and it was not known to be an issue. We appreciate you pointing this out. See revised plans.
2. If not already on file, please have Owner/Agent affidavits submitted and signed on behalf of Vacation Finance, LLC and B&J Finance, LLC, as the title opinion reflects them as owners.
Response: There's no place for a company name on the city affidavit, so we are submitting the sunbiz prints showing Billy Rocker owns the companies.
3. THIS COMMENT WAS NOT ADDRESSED: The setbacks set forth in the approved PUD are: Front: 35 feet, Rear: 10 feet, Side 25 feet. The site plan does not meet these setback requirements. Any adjustment requires an amendment to the PUD ordinance, and/or the applicant can aggregate lots into one parcel which removes the setback requirements between applicant's lots, but not between adjacent lots. In either circumstance, utility easements cannot be disregarded. It appears Bldg. 7 encroaches within a drainage/ingress egress easement.
Response: see revised plans. Building 7 has been revised to avoid the easement. We request the lots be aggregated so we may accomplish the layout shown on the plans.
4. The following are visible from SR 50, other public right of way, and may be visible from adjoining properties' public space: Building 2 - West Elevation, Building 8 – East Elevation, Building 11 -North Elevation, Building 13- South Elevation. Therefore, each must meet the

architectural details provided in Sec. 153-106 and Sec. 153-35(c)(20). Not all architectural details and requirements provided for in Sec. 135-35(c)(19) are met.

Response: owner would like to request approval from the city council for this item.

Building 2 West will be blocked by our landscaping and the development on lot 6.

Building 8 East will be blocked by our landscaping and the development on lot 2.

Building 11 is internal to the site and has the retention area and landscaping to block view. Building 13 South will be blocked by our landscaping and the development on lot 1.

5. Trash receptacles should be required. Sec. 153-35(c)(40). Sec. 137-114. "Sec. 153-35(c)(40). Site furnishings including, but not limited to, benches, bicycle racks, trash receptacles and shopping cart corrals shall be compatible with the architectural design of the principal structure and, if located within a planned development, consistent with a uniform program established for all properties within said development." Sec. 137-114: "Site furnishings including, but not limited to, benches, bicycle racks, trash receptacles and shopping cart corrals shall be compatible with the architectural design of the principal structure and, if located within a planned development, consistent with a uniform program established for all properties within said development."

Response: Owner's experience indicates benches, bicycle racks, trash receptacles and shopping cart corrals are not necessary.

6. Compliance with landscaping buffers and landscaping requirements are not met. Any adjustments to buffers and requirements require a waiver approved by City Council. See Sec. 133-99 and 133-67. Although Council approved adjusted setbacks in the preliminary site plan (which should be amended in the PUD as well), the City Landscape Code requires Council to specifically grant variances. No mention was made of landscaping variances. This requires formal action by Council in the form of a resolution.

Response: We request variances necessary to accomplish that shown on the plans. The landscape architect has provided a detailed explanation of our position. We request to proceed simultaneously where staff should make the order on the agenda to be (1) variance from landscape code followed by (2) site plan approval.

The following is the response by the Landscape Architect:

133-67 (b)

The western property line requires a Buffer type 'B' that can either be 15' wide or 20' wide. We have approved a 10' width buffer and a drainage pipe is centered on the 10' width. So in our opinion nothing but shrubs can be planned for this buffer.

133-67 (b)

The northern property line requires a Buffer type 'B' that can either be 15' wide or 20' wide. We have an approved 10' width and have been requested to improve the facade of the buildings above and beyond for appearance reasons. We believe then a fence should not be required, covering up the improvements. Canopy trees were shown at 32' o.c. and ornamental trees at 32' on center. And, a 2' hgt. hedge was provided that covers 20% of the area/width.

133-67 (b)

Along the southern boundary lines requires a Buffer type 'B' that already exists and is between the frontage road and the SR50 ROW line. We have noted such on the plans and felt that the existing buffer satisfies the intent of the buffer requirement. This was understood from previous meetings with Brian Denham, you and the City.

Along the eastern boundary lines requires a Buffer type 'B' that can either be 15' wide or 20' wide. For the first 147' going north to south the same buffer as the norther property line was provided, having Canopy tree's at 32' o.c. This as well as the northern buffer is identical to that approved earlier on plans provided on 2007. Ornamental trees at 32' on center, a 2' hgt. hedge that covers 20% of the area/width. The actual buffer width was 29' and building walls and fence gates provide enclosure.

133-99(1)f. Parking lot perimeter trees and spacing

Trees are requires at avg. 50 LF around perimeter of parking lot with a maximum spacing of 150' and must be from 8' to 30' from the edge of pavement. South of the parking lot the trees cannot be provided. There is no land available that is not in an easement.

133-99 (2) Building Perimeter Landscaping

Since the function of the buildings are to provide storage and require continuous vehicular access, nearly all building perimeters are paved and cannot be landscaped. Those facing the right-of-way were provided buffers according to the above descriptions.

133-99(8) Retention Pond Landscaping

Retention ponds are required to be provided with on tree every 150 LF of bank (top of bank) and within 40' of the top pf bank. We did not see any land available that was not a part of the northern property line buffer that was outside the maintenance berm to plant trees, and the underground piping within the pond indicated planting them in the pond would not be feasible.

We have been though the code and had discussions with our team on previous approvals and feel this satisfies the intent of the landscape code.

We appreciate the city's diligent assistance on our project and will be happy to answer any questions or provide any additional information as required.

Sincerely,



J. Brian Denham, P.E., President
Denham Engineering, LLC