

Response to Comments Letter
Wilson Grove – Comprehensive Plan Amendment
February 24, 2023

City of Port St. Lucie
121 S.W. Port St. Lucie Blvd.
Port St. Lucie, FL 34984

Re:	Project Name:	Wilson Grove – Comprehensive Plan Amendment
	CH Project Number:	20-0518
	City Project No.:	P21-128
	PSLUSD File No:	11-681-00
	Application Description:	Wilson Grove – Comprehensive Plan Amendment

Dear SPRC Staff:

On behalf of the applicant, please accept these revised plans and response letter regarding the project known as Wilson Grove – DRI Amendment. To assist you in the review, we have provided a detailed response to each of the comments outlined in your staff comment letters.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMENTS

1. You submitted two documents with this resubmittal for the proposed comprehensive plan amendment to amend the conceptual land use plan for the Wilson Groves NCD District. One is labeled comprehensive master plan and the other is labeled Figure 1-6.

COMMENT RESPONSE: The plan labeled Comprehensive Master Plan will be removed. Figure 1-6 is being proposed to replace the current Figure 1-6 adopted in 2020 as shown in the city's Future Land use Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

2. What is the purpose of the document labeled comprehensive master plan? It appears to be a replica of Map H.

COMMENT RESPONSE: At one time, the city requested the Comprehensive master plan as part of the review for the Comprehensive Plan Amendment. However, it seems now the city is suggesting only Figure 1-6 should be proposed to replace the current Figure 1-6 adopted in 2020 as shown in the city's Future Land use Element of the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive master plan will be removed as part of this project.

3. The document that was submitted and labeled Figure 1-6 is the document that should be used for the comprehensive plan amendment with the comments listed below addressed:

- a. Remove the word Paseo from Paar Drive and just identify Paar Drive as E/W 4 with Hegener Drive in parenthesis. The City Council has approved renaming Paar to Hegener Drive.

COMMENT RESPONSE: Only Figure 1-6 will be used for review of the Comprehensive Plan and the Comprehensive master plan will be removed. The nomenclature for Paar Drive will be changed to show E/W 4 with Hegener Drive in parentheses. The proposed Paseo will remain within the 150' right of way. The Paseo proposed on Figure 1-6 has previously received support from staff based on comments from both Planning & Zoning and Public Works on December 1, 2022, and Planning & Zoning on October 14, 2022.

Planning & Zoning 10/14/2022: *"14. ...Staff would support Paar as a two laned roadway with the Paseo as was previously proposed..."*

Planning & Zoning 12/1/2022: *"17. In previous meetings with City staff, there was discussion about constructing Paar Drive as a two-lane roadway with the Paseo incorporated into the right-of-way so that all modes of transportation could be accommodated. Planning staff was in favor of the concept of Paar Drive as a two-lane roadway with a parallel Paseo and expressed support for this option in numerous meetings..."*

Public Works 12/1/2022: *"12. The 2-lane roadway network is required for connectivity, congestion management and health and safety; therefore, Paar Drive cannot be eliminated. We will allow a portion of the Paar Drive right-of-way to contain the requested Paseo."*

- b. The Paseo is not identified in the City's comprehensive plan nor is it included in the currently approved DRI development order for Wilson Groves. If the Wilson Groves DRI Development Order is amended to include a Paseo in City ROW, then the Paseo can be depicted on Figure 1-6 as part of a future comprehensive plan amendment.

COMMENT RESPONSE: In past comment letters from staff, it was not mentioned that the Development Order would need to be amended to propose a Paseo parallel to Paar Drive. The Development Order does not need to be amended for this purpose.

- c. Remove the note at the bottom left of the page that says location and configuration of all development parcels, including access, lakes, open space, residential and non-residential uses will be fully delineated during the zoning or platting process. The is note is unnecessary and somewhat misleading. All development has to be consistent with the land use sub-categories depicted on Figure 1-6. Per Policy 1.2.1.3, Figure 1-6 is intended to illustrate how the land use sub-categories are allocated, where they are located, and how they will function in relation to each other.

COMMENT RESPONSE: This note is necessary to ensure Figure 1-6 and Map H are not reviewed as regulatory documents governing the location of site-specific elements that are to be determined and evaluated during the zoning or subdivision plat process. We agree that both Figure 1-6 and Map H is the document that governs the location of residential and non-residential land use sub districts within the DRI for each parcel. Any changes to any sub-district acreage for any parcel warrants a Map H and Figure

1-6 amendment.

The specifics of access locations, park sites, schools will be allowed to fluctuate within the parcel they are shown on Map H or Figure 1-6 provided the impacts to level of service are not significantly altered by moving the locations of the sites within the same parcel. The details of the design of everything shown on Map H will be provided within each respective MPUD, Site Plan or Subdivision Plat submittal.

4. The traffic study that was submitted with the comprehensive plan does not anticipate any residential development for Parcel D. Per Policy 1.2.2.7 of the comprehensive plan, the mixed-use land use-subdistrict has to include a minimum of three uses and one of the uses has to be residential. The policy requires a minimum of 30% and a maximum 70% of the net acreage within a Mixed-Use Area to be residential. The traffic study should reflect this requirement and identify residential under TAZ 648.

COMMENT RESPONSE: We agree with the comment. TAZ 648 has been revised to show all the multi-family (1,925 units) located in Parcel D. The traffic study and distribution assignment maps have been updated to reflect this change.

3RD PARTY TRAFFIC COMMENTS

1) Approved Land Use Table 1a:

- a. The land use intensity changes from “Age Restricted to “Single Family” is acceptable and complies with WATS 3.0.

COMMENT RESPONSE: Agreed.

- b. Please advise on the 40 additional acres of Regional Park since this is not provided in WATS 3.0.

COMMENT RESPONSE: The original WATS study did not include the 40 acres of Regional Park as required in Resolution 11-R01 in error. It was an oversight and has been corrected in the revised Traffic Study. The traffic analysis provided herein references the 40-acre regional park and references 50 additional acres as part of the approved DO for Wilson Groves.

2) ITE Trip Generation:

- a. The 22.6% internalization rate for the proposed Daily and PM trips is taken from the approved WATS study as noted in Appendix C. Note: this reduction is applicable only for Wilson Grove.

COMMENT RESPONSE: Agreed.

3) Roadway Phasing:

- a. The study needs to identify the phasing plan for the entire Wilson Grove DRI development since it was planned to start in 2010 for Phase 1 and it's now 2023.

COMMENT RESPONSE: The phasing plan is not applicable to this revision. The applicant is changing the location of land use. The ultimate buildout analysis is the appropriate and agreed upon approach for

evaluating this change.

4) Link Analysis:

- a. Discovery Way was included in the previous analyses. Please provide details on the removal of Discovery Way from the current traffic study analysis.

COMMENT RESPONSE: Only the roadways that are the responsibility of the applicant were included in the analysis.

- b. The trip assignment assumptions are not applicable based on the WATS 3.0. The trip assignment to each roadway in the study was taken from the WATS 3.0, which was created using the approved conceptual master plan; however, the proposed master plan has changed the parcel labels/locations. For example, on Range Line Road from Marshall Pkwy to Paar Road, WATS 3.0 recommends to use 8.6% for Parcel A because the location of Parcel A was adjacent to Range Line Road when the WATS 3.0 was developed. Now, Parcel A has been proposed to be relocated in between N/S A and N/S B (closer to Becker Road), but the majority of the trips (12.7%) was assigned to Range Line road in this study. The study should revisit the trip assignments throughout the network.

COMMENT RESPONSE: The assignments were revised based on the individual pod's access and relationship to the roadway. Attachment 4.b provides the assignments for each parcel.

- c. A significant adjustment to the intensity of land uses is being proposed in Traffic Zone 648 (aka, Parcel D): Approved trip generation 15,836 (Table 1b) versus the Proposed trip generation of 36,116 (Table 2b). Table 4 Link Analysis for a 4-lane Becker Road indicates 52,694 trips on Becker Road east of N/S "A" with a peak hour volume of 2,317. Becker Road total trips of 52,694 may require 6 lanes and the peak hour volume of 2,317 is only 4.5% of the daily traffic loading. Additionally, the discounting of pass-by trips may not be appropriate in this regional traffic analysis. Please provide additional information to support the acceptability of Becker Road at 4 lanes and the 4.5% peak hour volume.

COMMENT RESPONSE: The tables are set up in a manner that the AADT (two directions) is entered twice since the formulas are set up to apply the K and D factors to arrive at the peak hour directional values. This approach is consistent with other DRIs. So the two AADTs do not get added together. The Total AADT is half of what the reviewer has indicated. So the peak hour factor is 9%. We apologize of the formatting has led to confusion.

- d. The 4-lane segment of Marshall Parkway between N/S "B" and Community Boulevard has a daily volume of 59,878 and a peak hour volume of 2,695. Table 4 indicates the 4-lane segment meets capacity requirements? Please provide additional information to support the acceptability of Marshall Parkway at 4 lanes and the 4.5% peak hour volume.

COMMENT RESPONSE: The tables are set up in a manner that the AADT (two directions) is entered twice since the formulas are set up to apply the K and D factors to arrive at the peak hour directional values. This approach is consistent with other DRIs. So the two AADTs do not get added together. The Total AADT is half of what the reviewer has indicated. So the peak hour factor is 9%. We apologize of the formatting has led to confusion.

- e. Please provide a map for the trip assignment for each Parcel and also for the entire Wilson Grove DRI.

COMMENT RESPONSE: See response 4b above and attachment 4.b.

5) Conclusion:

- a. The roadway link analysis suggests a worsening of LOS may be occurring at selected locations with the proposed land use revisions, which may require additional roadway widening.

COMMENT RESPONSE: We believe when the reviewer understands the tables formatting, the concerns regarding the LOS will be allayed.

ADDITIONAL TRAFFIC COMMENTS:

- 1. They need to provide supporting documentation if they are not going to revise their trip assignment any further in order to accept the proposed laneage on the roads.

COMMENT RESPONSE: The traffic report and associated tables show the reallocation of land uses does not affect the proposed laneage of roads.

- 2. Pass-by trips are not recommended for a regional study such as this.

COMMENT RESPONSE: The pass by rates are appropriate for this traffic study as they are only used for retail and have been used for all studies by each DRI (Southern Grove, Riverland).

I trust that the answers to the comments included in this resubmittal are complete and will allow this project to be approved at the earliest possible date. Please contact this office with any questions you may have in your review of this information.

Sincerely yours,



Daniel T. Sorrow, AICP, PLA, LEED AP BD+C
Cotleur & Hearing
1934 Commerce Lane, Suite 1
Jupiter, FL 33458