



City of Alachua

Planning & Community Development Department Staff Report

Planning & Zoning Board Hearing Date:
Quasi-Judicial Hearing

April 18, 2017

SUBJECT: A request for a Special Exception Permit for a large-scale retail establishment greater than or equal to 80,000 square feet

APPLICANT/AGENT: Brian Cassidy, P.E., CPH, Inc.

PROPERTY OWNER: Wal-Mart Stores East, LP

LOCATION: Approximately 1,000 feet southeast of the US Highway 441/Interstate-75 interchange

PARCEL ID NUMBERS: 03869-013-000

FLUM DESIGNATION: Commercial

ZONING: Commercial Intensive (CI)

OVERLAY: Gateway Overlay District

ACREAGE: ±30.19 acres

PROJECT PLANNER: Justin Tabor, AICP

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that the Planning & Zoning Board transmit the Special Exception Permit for a large-scale retail establishment greater than or equal to 80,000 square feet to the City Commission with a recommendation to approve, subject to the three (3) conditions provided in Exhibit "A" of this Staff Report.

RECOMMENDED MOTION: *Based upon the competent substantial evidence presented at this hearing, the presentation before this Board, and Staff's recommendation, this Board finds the application to be consistent with the City of Alachua Comprehensive Plan and in compliance with the Land Development Regulations and transmits the Special Exception Permit for a large-scale retail establishment greater than or equal to 80,000 square feet to the City Commission with a recommendation to approve, subject to the three (3) conditions provided in Exhibit "A" and located on page 24 of the April 18, 2017, Staff Report to the Planning & Zoning Board.*

CITY OF ALACHUA
STAFF REPORT: WAL-MART #3873
SPECIAL EXCEPTION PERMIT
(LARGE SCALE RETAIL ESTABLISHMENT ≥ 80,000 SQ. FT.)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section Title	Page
Summary	3
Surrounding Uses	3
Neighborhood Meeting	4
Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan	5
Findings of Fact: Compliance with Land Development Regulations	8
Section 2.4.4(D), Special Exception Permit Standards	8
Section 4.3.4(G)(7): Use-Specific Standards, Large Scale Retail Establishments Greater Than or Equal to 80,000 Square Feet	16
Section 6.8.3: Design Standards for Single Tenant Retail Sales and Service Uses Greater Than or Equal to 20,000 Square Feet	17
Exhibit “A” to Wal-Mart #3873 Special Exception Permit (Large-Scale Retail Establishment Greater Than or Equal to 80,000 sq. ft.) Staff Report: Conditions	24
Exhibit “B” to Wal-Mart #3873 Special Exception Permit (Large-Scale Retail Establishment Greater Than or Equal to 80,000 sq. ft.) Staff Report: Supporting Application Materials Submitted by City Staff to the Planning & Zoning Board	25

SUMMARY

The proposed Special Exception Permit is a request by Brian Cassidy, P.E., of CPH, Inc., applicant for Wal-Mart Stores East, LP, property owner, for the approval of a Special Exception Permit for a large-scale retail establishment greater than or equal to 80,000 square feet of gross floor area. This Special Exception Permit application is a companion to a Site Plan application also submitted by the applicant to construct the proposed ±158,562 square foot building for retail sales and services. The applicant has also submitted a second Special Exception Permit application to permit automobile repair and servicing at the proposed development, and a Variance Permit application, to reduce the number of pedestrian connections required by Section 7.3.2(C) of the City's Land Development Regulations (LDRs) to the adjacent public sidewalk or greenway network. The variance is sought due to the limitations of the site and the ability to provide connections to the public sidewalk system.

Section 2.4.4(A) of the City's LDRs states that uses that require a Special Exception Permit are those which are, "...generally compatible with the other uses permitted in a zone district, but require individual review of their location, design, configuration, density, intensity, and public facility impact to determine the appropriateness of the use on any particular site in the district and their compatibility with adjacent uses." Once a Special Exception is granted, the approval shall run with the land and shall not be affected by a change in ownership, unless specifically conditioned as part of the approval. A Special Exception Permit must be granted prior to the approval of the Site Plan and final development order for the proposed development.

The subject property has a Commercial Future Land Use Map (FLUM) Designation, and a Commercial Intensive (CI) zoning designation. Section 4.1 of the City's Land Development Regulations (LDRs) requires large-scale retail establishments greater than or equal to 80,000 square feet to obtain a Special Exception Permit. Large-scale retail establishments greater than or equal to 80,000 square feet are subject to Use-Specific Standards provided in Section 4.3.4(G)(7) of the City's LDRs. An analysis of this application's compliance with the standards established by Section 4.3.4(G)(7) is provided within this report.


SURROUNDING USES

The existing uses, Future Land Use Map (FLUM) Designations, and zoning districts of the surrounding area are identified in Table 1. Map 1 provides an overview of the vicinity of the subject property. (NOTE: The information below is intended to provide a general overview of the area surrounding the subject property and to generally orient the reader. It is not intended to be all-inclusive, and may not identify all existing uses, FLUM Designations, and/or zoning districts surrounding the subject property.)

Table 1. Surrounding Land Uses

Direction	Existing Use(s)	FLUM Designation(s)	Zoning District(s)
North	Vacant Warehouse Building; McDonald's BP Gas Station; Quality Inn	Commercial	Commercial Intensive (CI)
South	Vacant Commercial Land	Commercial	Commercial Intensive (CI)
East	Vacant Commercial Land	Commercial	Commercial Intensive (CI)
West	Interstate-75	N/A	N/A

Map 1. Vicinity Map



NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING

The purpose of a Neighborhood Meeting is to educate the owners of nearby land and any other interested members of the public about the project and to receive comments regarding the project. As required by Section 2.2.4 of the LDRs, all property owners within 400 feet of the subject property were notified of the meeting and notice of the meeting was published in a newspaper of general circulation.

A Neighborhood Meeting was held at 5:30 PM on March 15, 2016, at the Swick House, located at 15010 NW 142nd Terrace. The applicant's agent was present and available to answer questions. As evidenced by materials submitted by the applicant, one (1) person attended the meeting. A summary of the discussion which occurred at the Neighborhood Meeting has been provided by the applicant and is included within the application materials.

CONSISTENCY WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The Goals, Objectives, and Policies (GOPs) identified below are provided to establish a basis of the application's consistency with the Comprehensive Plan. There may be additional GOPs which the application is consistent with that are not identified within this report. An evaluation and findings of consistency with the identified GOPs is also provided below.

Future Land Use Element

GOAL 1: Future Land Use Map 2025:

The City of Alachua shall maintain a Future Land Use Map in order to effectively guide development in a sustainable manner and to ensure economic prosperity and stability while maintaining a high quality of life for all of its present and future citizens.

Objective 1.3: Commercial

The City of Alachua shall establish three commercial districts: Community Commercial, Commercial and Central Business District. These districts shall provide a broad range of retail sales and services, as well as office uses, in order to provide for the availability of goods and services, both to the citizens of Alachua and to the citizens of the North Central Florida region.

Policy 1.3.b: Commercial: The Commercial land use category is established to provide for general commercial uses, as well as more intense commercial and highway commercial uses. This is the land use category in which large-scale, regional commercial uses may locate. The following uses are allowed within the Commercial land use category:

1. Retail sales and services;
2. Personal services;
3. Financial Institutions;
4. Outdoor recreation and entertainment;
5. Tourist-related uses;
6. Hotels, motels;
7. Commercial shopping centers;
8. Auto-oriented uses;
9. Traditional Mixed-use Neighborhood Planned Developments;
10. Employment Center Planned Developments;
11. Commercial recreation centers;
12. Office/business parks;
13. Limited industrial services;
14. Eating Establishments

Evaluation and Findings of Consistency with Goal 1, Objective 1.3, and Policy 1.3.b: The subject property has a Commercial FLUM Designation, which permits large scale, regional commercial uses. The proposed uses are consistent with the uses identified within Policy 1.3.b as allowed within the Commercial FLUM Designation.

Objective 2.6: Large Scale Retail Design Standards:

The City shall establish large scale retail design standards to protect the City's small-town character and to promote the architectural design features as a theme for commercial development within the City.

Policy 2.6.a: The large scale retail design standards shall contain, at a minimum, architectural character, color and materials, relationship to surrounding community and streets, pedestrian flows and parking.

Evaluation and Findings of Consistency with Objective 2.6 and Policy 2.6.a: The materials submitted to support this application and the companion site plan application have been reviewed for compliance with the applicable design standards for business uses established in Section 6.8 of the City's LDRs. Please reference the section of this report which reviews the application's compliance with the standards established in Section 6.8 for further analysis.

Objective 5.2: Availability of facilities and services: The City shall utilize a concurrency management system to ensure that the adopted level of service standards are maintained.

Policy 5.2.a: All new development shall meet level of service requirements for roadways, potable water and sanitary sewer, stormwater, solid waste, public schools, and improved recreation in accordance with LOS standards adopted in the elements addressing these facilities.

Evaluation and Findings of Consistency with Objective 5.2 and Policy 5.2.a: The applicant has submitted a Concurrency Impact Analysis identifying the potential demands on public facilities. The Concurrency Impact Analysis considers existing and reserved capacities. In addition, the applicant has submitted a Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by Mohammed Abdallah of Traffic & Mobility Consultants, dated November 3, 2016, to address the project's potential impacts to transportation facilities. An analysis of the development's impact to public facilities is also provided within this report. The Concurrency Impact Analysis prepared by the applicant, the Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by Traffic & Mobility Services, and the analysis provided within this report demonstrate that the development would not adversely affect the level of service (LOS) standard of any monitored public facilities.

Policy 9.1: Any new development within a Commercial or Industrial Future Land Use Map Designation within the corporate limits, where potable water and wastewater service are available, as defined in Policy 1.2.a and Policy 4.2.a of the Community Facilities and Natural Groundwater Aquifer Recharge Element of the City of Alachua Comprehensive Plan, shall connect to the City of Alachua's potable water and wastewater system.

Evaluation and Findings of Consistency with Policy 9.1: The proposed development would connect to potable water and wastewater facilities.

Transportation Element

Objective 1.1: Level of Service

The City shall establish a safe, convenient and efficient level of service standard for all motorized and non-motorized transportation systems.

Evaluation and Findings of Consistency with Objective 1.1: The applicant has submitted a Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by Mohammed Abdallah of Traffic & Mobility Consultants, dated November 3, 2016, that demonstrates the proposed development would not adversely affect the level of service of transportation facilities.

Community Facilities & Natural Groundwater Aquifer Recharge Element

Policy 1.1.d:

The City hereby establishes the following level of service standards for sanitary sewer facilities:

Levels of Service

- a. **Quality:** Compliance with all applicable standards of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP).
- b. **Quantity:** System-wide wastewater collection and treatment will be sufficient to provide a minimum of 250 gallons per day per equivalent residential unit (ERU) on an average annual basis. Plant expansion shall be planned in accordance with F.A.C. 62-600.405, or subsequent provision. This level of service standard shall be re-evaluated one year from the adoption date for the amended Plan.
- c. **System capacity:** If the volume of existing use in addition to the volume of the committed use of the City's wastewater facility reaches 85% of the permitted capacity design, no further development orders for projects without reserved capacity will be issued until additional capacity becomes available or funds to increase facility capacity are committed in accordance with a development agreement.

Evaluation and Findings of Consistency with Policy 1.1.d: An analysis of the development's impacts to sanitary sewer facilities is provided within this report. The development would not adversely affect the level of service for sanitary sewer facilities.

Policy 1.2.a: The City shall establish a Community Wastewater Service Area, which includes all areas where wastewater service is available. Wastewater service shall be deemed available if:

3. A gravity wastewater system, wastewater pumping station, or force main exists within ¼ mile of the property line of any residential subdivision with more than 5 units, or any multi-family residential development, or any commercial development, or any industrial development and the gravity wastewater system, wastewater pumping station, or force main can be accessed through public utility easements or right of ways. The distance shall be measured as required for construction of the infrastructure along public utility easements and right of ways.

Evaluation and Findings of Consistency with Policy 1.2.a: The proposed development is located within the City's utility service area and would connect to the City's wastewater system.

Policy 2.1.a: The City hereby establishes the following level of service standards for solid waste disposal facilities:

<u>FACILITY TYPE</u>	<u>LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARD</u>
Solid Waste Landfill	.73 tons per capita per year

Evaluation and Findings of Consistency with Objective 2.1.a: An analysis of the development's impacts to solid waste facilities is provided within this report. The development would not adversely affect the level of service for solid waste facilities.

Policy 4.1.b: The City shall establish a Community Potable Water Service Area, which includes all areas where potable water service is available. Water service shall be deemed available if:

3. A water main exists within $\frac{1}{4}$ mile of any residential subdivision with more than 5 units, or any multi-family residential development, or any commercial development, or any industrial development and water service can be accessed through public utility easements or right of ways. The distance shall be measured as required for construction of the infrastructure along public utility easements and right of ways.

Evaluation and Findings of Consistency with Policy 4.1.b: The proposed development is located within the City's utility service area and would connect to the City's potable water system.

Policy 4.1.c: The City establishes the following level of service standards for potable water:

1. Quality: Compliance with all applicable standards of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection.
2. Quantity: System-wide potable water distribution and treatment will be sufficient to provide a minimum of 275 gallons per day per equivalent residential unit (ERU) on an average annual basis. Plant expansion shall be planned in accordance with Florida Administrative Code.
3. System Capacity: If the volume of existing use in addition to the volume of the committed use of the City's potable water facility reaches 85% of the permitted design capacity, no further development orders or permits for projects without reserved capacity will be issued until additional capacity becomes available or funds to increase facility capacity are committed in accordance with a development agreement.

Evaluation and Findings of Consistency with Objective 4.1.c: An analysis of the development's impacts to potable water facilities is provided within this report. The development would not adversely affect the level of service for potable water facilities.

FINDINGS OF FACT: COMPLIANCE WITH LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS

SECTION 2.4.4(D), SPECIAL EXCEPTION STANDARDS

Section 2.4.4(D) of the City's Land Development Regulations (LDRs) establishes the standards with which all applications for a Special Exception Permit must be found to be compliant. The application has been reviewed for compliance with the standards of Section 2.4.4(D). An evaluation and findings of the application's compliance with the standards of Section 2.4.4(D) is provided below. The applicant has also provided an analysis of the application's compliance with Section 2.4.4(D) in the supporting application materials.

(D) *Special exception standards.* A special exception permit shall be approved only upon a finding the applicant demonstrates all the following standards are met:

- (1) *Complies with use specific regulations.* The proposed special exception complies with all relevant standards in Section 4.3, Use specific standards.

Evaluation & Findings: An analysis of the proposed special exception's compliance with Section 4.3.4(G)(7) is provided in this Staff Report. The applicant has also provided an analysis of the application's compliance with Section 4.3.4(G)(7) within the supporting application materials.

- (2) *Compatibility.* The proposed special exception is appropriate for its location and compatible with the character of surrounding lands and the uses permitted in the zone district.

Evaluation & Findings: Compatibility is defined by the City's Comprehensive Plan as, "a condition in which land uses or conditions can coexist in relative proximity to each other in a stable fashion over time such that no use or condition is unduly negatively impacted directly or indirectly by another use or condition."

The subject property has a Commercial FLUM Designation, and is zoned Commercial Intensive (CI). The subject property is located proximate to the US Highway 441/Interstate 75 interchange. Interstate 75 is located immediately to the west of the subject property, and the lands surrounding the subject property on the north, east, and south have a Commercial FLUM Designation and are zoned CI.

The Commercial FLUM Designation is described as follows in Policy 1.3.b of the Future Land Use Element:

Commercial: The Commercial land use category is established to provide for general commercial uses, as well as more intense commercial and highway commercial uses. This is the land use category in which large-scale, regional commercial uses may locate. The following uses are allowed within the Commercial land use category:

- 1. Retail sales and services;*
- 2. Personal services;*
- 3. Financial Institutions;*
- 4. Outdoor recreation and entertainment;*
- 5. Tourist-related uses;*
- 6. Hotels, motels;*
- 7. Commercial shopping centers;*
- 8. Auto-oriented uses;*
- 9. Traditional Mixed-use Neighborhood Planned Developments;*
- 10. Employment Center Planned Developments;*
- 11. Commercial recreation centers;*
- 12. Office/business parks;*
- 13. Limited industrial services;*
- 14. Eating Establishments*

The CI zoning district is described by Section 3.5.2(E) of the City's LDRs as follows:

"The CI District is established and intended to provide lands and facilitate highway-oriented development opportunities within the City, for uses that require high public visibility and an accessible location. The CI district should be located along major arterials or highways and at the US 441/Interstate-75 interchange."

The existing uses, Future Land Use Map (FLUM) Designations, and zoning districts of the surrounding area are identified in Table 2.

Table 2. Surrounding Land Uses

Direction	Existing Use(s)	FLUM Designation(s)	Zoning District(s)
North	Vacant Warehouse Building; McDonald's BP Gas Station; Quality Inn	Commercial	Commercial Intensive (CI)
South	Vacant Commercial Land	Commercial	Commercial Intensive (CI)
East	Vacant Commercial Land	Commercial	Commercial Intensive (CI)
West	Interstate-75	N/A	N/A

The proposed development will provide buffering in accordance with the requirements of the City's LDRs. In addition, the building will be located centrally on the site, providing a setback from the east property line of ± 265 feet, a setback from the south property line of ± 223 feet, and a setback from the west property line (Interstate 75) of ± 181 feet.

Given the preceding, the proposed development would be compatible with the uses permitted on lands in relative proximity to the subject property. The configuration and overall design of the proposed development is sensitive to surrounding areas to minimize any potential impacts to lands in relative proximity to the site.

- (3) *Design minimizes adverse impact.* The design of the proposed special exception minimizes adverse effects, including visual impacts of the proposed use on adjacent lands; furthermore, the proposed special exception avoids significant adverse impact on surrounding lands regarding service delivery, parking and loading, odors, noise, glare, and vibration, and does not create a nuisance.

Evaluation & Findings: The proposed development will provide buffering in accordance with the requirements of the City's LDRs. In addition to buffering, the applicant has provided earthen berms along the east, south, and west property lines to further buffer the visibility of the building from off-site.

The topography of the site lessens the visibility of the building from the south and west, as the finished floor of the building will be at a lower elevation than the elevation at these property lines. The finished floor elevation of the building is 118 feet. The grade along the south property line varies from approximately 150 feet near the east property line, to approximately 130 feet near the west property line. Along the west property line, the grade varies from approximately 130 feet near the south property line to approximately 120 feet near the front building façade.

In addition to the preceding, the building will be located centrally on the site, providing a setback from the east property line of ± 265 feet, a setback from the south property line of ± 223 feet, and a setback from the west property line (Interstate 75) of ± 181 feet. Further, the minimum perimeter buffer width along the north, east, and south property boundaries is 7.5 feet. The proposed buffer width along the north property boundary is a minimum of 35 feet (between the property line and proposed retention area 1); along the east property boundary, the proposed buffer width is approximately 59 feet; and along the south property boundary, the proposed buffer width is 186 feet.

Service delivery areas are located at the rear of the structure, between the south elevation of the building and the south property line. As further described above, the topography of the site will place service delivery areas at an elevation approximately 10 feet to 30 feet below the elevation at the south property line, thereby lessening visibility and reducing noise.

The proposed development would provide landscape buffering in accordance with the City's LDRs. Additional landscaping has been provided within perimeter buffer areas located between property

lines and the on-site circulation areas to meet required tree mitigation. This additional landscaping further minimizes visual and aural impacts which may be created by the proposed development.

- (4) *Design minimizes environmental impact.* The proposed special exception minimizes environmental impacts and does not cause significant deterioration of light, water and air resources, wildlife habitat, stormwater management, scenic resources, and other natural resources.

Evaluation & Findings: The subject property is presently undeveloped and consists primarily of open lands. The subject property is not located within a special flood hazard area, and the site does not contain any wetlands, lakes, ponds, or other waterways. The subject property is not known to contain any endangered or protected flora or fauna.

The City's LDRs require development to provide a minimum of 10 percent of the site as open space. The proposed development would provide approximately 50 percent of the site as open space.

The applicant has submitted two (2) reports pertaining to geologic features: (1) "Report of Geotechnical Exploration Services", Report No. 1211903, prepared by Universal Engineering Sciences and dated May 20, 2016; and (2) "Initial Geotechnical Exploration Services – Limited Sinkhole Potential Evaluation", Report No. 1367557v3, prepared by Universal Engineering Sciences and dated November 14, 2016. These reports are part of the supporting application materials for the companion Site Plan application (Exhibits B.59. and B.60., Site Plan Exhibit "B"), and are incorporated into Exhibit "B" of this Staff Report by reference.

The City engaged the services of GSE Engineering & Consulting, Inc. (GSE) to review the Report of Geotechnical Exploration Services, as well as the civil construction plans and the Stormwater Design Calculations. Upon review of these materials, a letter was issued by GSE (dated June 29, 2016) concerning the geotechnical explorations presented within the materials. In response to the comments provided in GSE's June 29, 2016 letter, the applicant submitted a letter, dated November 21, 2016, addressing the comments provided by GSE in its June 29, 2016 letter, and also submitted a second report entitled "Initial Geotechnical Exploration Services – Limited Sinkhole Potential Evaluation", Report No. 1367557v3, prepared by Universal Engineering Sciences and dated November 14, 2016.

GSE reviewed the applicant's November 21, 2016 letter and the Initial Geotechnical Exploration Services report. Upon review of these materials, GSE concluded in a letter dated December 15, 2016 that the applicant adequately addressed the comments provided in its June 29, 2016 letter, with the exception of a comment pertaining to underdrains beneath the entrance roadways (See Exhibits B.16. and B.17.) Proposed Condition #1, as provided in Exhibit "A" to this Staff Report, would require the applicant to notify the City of any excavation, grading, or other construction activities related to excavation in the right-of-ways of the access roads labelled as "Entrance Road", "Seller Road 1", and "Seller Road 2" on the Site Plan, and within the right-of-way of the extension of NW 151st Boulevard. The proposed condition would also authorize the Public Services Department to determine if any underdrain(s) must be installed within these areas, based upon the subsurface conditions observed during excavation activities, in accordance with the recommendations provided by GSE.

It should be noted that the applicant has provided two (2) additional geotechnical reports in February 2017 [(1) Report of Geotechnical Consulting Services – Pond Berms – Stability Analysis; Universal Engineering Sciences, dated January 29, 2017; and (2)) Report of Geotechnical Consulting Services – Stormwater Management System – Soil Design Parameters; Universal Engineering Sciences, dated January 29, 2017]. These reports were provided to support the design and recommendations provided within the Stormwater Design Calculations. Since the Stormwater Design Calculations were reviewed by the City's consulting geotechnical engineer, no additional review of the reports provided in February 2017 was necessary.

- (5) *Roads and other public facilities.* There is adequate public facility capacity available to serve the proposed special exception, and the proposed special exception use is designed to ensure safe ingress and egress onto the site and safe road conditions around the site.

Evaluation & Findings: The applicant has submitted a Concurrency Impact Analysis which identifies the demands generated by the proposed development upon public facilities. The Concurrency Impact Analysis considers existing and reserved capacities of each public facility.

In addition, and also submitted as part of the supporting application materials, the applicant has submitted a Traffic Impact Analysis, prepared by Mohammed Abdallah of Traffic & Mobility Consultants, dated November 2016. The Traffic Impact Analysis addresses the proposed development's impacts to affected roadway segments. The City engaged the services of Volkert, Inc. to perform an independent review of the Traffic Impact Analysis. The findings of the independent review performed by Volkert, Inc. are included in the materials attached to this report as Exhibit "B" – Supporting Application Materials Submitted by City Staff to the Planning and Zoning Board (See Exhibits B.18. and B.19.) As evidenced in the review letters received from Volkert, Inc., the applicant satisfactorily addressed all comments pertaining to Volkert Inc.'s review of the Traffic Impact Analysis.

The Concurrency Impact Analysis prepared by the applicant, the Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by Traffic & Mobility Consultants, and the analysis of impacts to public facilities provided below demonstrate that the development would not adversely affect the level of service (LOS) standard of the public facilities monitored for concurrency.

Traffic Impact

Table 3. Affected Comprehensive Plan Roadway Segments¹

Segment Number ^{2, 3}	Segment Description	Lanes	Functional Classification	Area Type	LOS
5 (107/1407)	US 441 (from SR 235 to North City Limits)	4/D	Principle Arterial	Urban Trans	D

1 Source: City of Alachua Comprehensive Plan, Transportation Element.
2 For developments generating 1,000 trips or greater, affected roadway segments are identified as all those wholly or partially located within ½ mile of the development's ingress/egress, or to the nearest intersecting major street, whichever is greater, and all roadway segments for which the proposed development's impacts are 5% or greater on the Maximum Service Volume (MSV) of the roadway [Section 2.4.14(H)(2)(b) of the LDRs].
3 FDOT roadway segment number shown in parenthesis (when applicable.) For the purposes of concurrency management, COA Comprehensive Plan segments that make up a portion of a larger FDOT roadway segment will be evaluated together when determining post development roadway capacity.

Table 4. Trip Generation¹

Land Use	AADT (Enter/Exit) ²	AM Peak Hour (Enter/Exit) ²	PM Peak Hour (Enter/Exit) ²
Discount Superstore (ITE Code 813)	8,191 (4,095/4,096)	299 (167/132)	702 (344/358)
Less Pass-By Trips for Superstore (28%)	2,293 (1,146/1,146)	83 (46/36)	196 (98/98)
Net New Trips ³	5,898 (2,949/2,950)	216 (121/96)	506 (246/260)

1 Source: ITE Trip Generation, 9th Edition.
2 Formulas: AADT – 50.75 trips per 1,000 square feet x 161,400 square feet (50% entering/50% exiting); AM Peak Hour – 1.85 trips per 1,000 square feet x 161,400 square feet (56% entering/44% exiting); PM Peak Hour – 4.35 trips per 1,000 square feet x 161,400 square feet (49% entering/51% exiting).
3 Source: ITE Trip Generation Manual, 2nd Edition.

Table 5a. Projected Impact on Affected Comprehensive Plan Roadway Segments (AADT)

Traffic System Category	US 441 Segment 5 (107/1407) ¹
Average Annual Daily Trips	
Maximum Service Volume ²	35,500
Existing Traffic ³	24,411
Reserved Trips ⁴	2,260
Available Capacity ⁴	8,829
Increase/Decrease in Daily Trips Generated by Development ⁵	5,898
Residual Capacity After Development's Impacts⁶	2,931
¹ FDOT roadway segment number shown in parenthesis (when applicable.) For the purposes of concurrency management, COA Comprehensive Plan segments that make up a portion of a larger FDOT roadway segment will be evaluated together when determining post development roadway capacity. ² Source: FDOT 2013 Quality/Level of Service Handbook, Generalized Annual Average Daily Volumes and Generalized Peak Hour Two-Way Volumes for Areas Transitioning to Urbanized Areas or Areas of 5,000 Not in Urbanized Areas. ³ Florida State Highway System Level of Service Report 2015, Florida Department of Transportation, District II, September 2016. ⁴ Source: City of Alachua February 2017 Development Monitoring Report. ⁵ Trip Distribution: Reference Traffic Impact Analysis, Walmart #3873 – Alachua, dated November 2016, prepared by Traffic & Mobility Consultants. ⁶ The application is for a Final Development Order. Facility capacity and concurrency will be reserved.	

Table 5b. Projected Impact on Affected Comprehensive Plan Roadway Segments (Peak Hour)

Traffic System Category	US 441 Segment 5 (107/1407) ¹
PM Peak Hour Trips	
Maximum Service Volume ²	3,200
Existing Traffic ³	2,319
Reserved Trips ⁴	214
Available Capacity ⁴	667
Increase/Decrease in PM Peak Hour Trips Generated by Development ⁵	506
Residual Capacity After Development's Impacts⁶	161
¹ FDOT roadway segment number shown in parenthesis (when applicable.) For the purposes of concurrency management, COA Comprehensive Plan segments that make up a portion of a larger FDOT roadway segment will be evaluated together when determining post development roadway capacity. ² Source: FDOT 2013 Quality/Level of Service Handbook, Generalized Annual Average Daily Volumes and Generalized Peak Hour Two-Way Volumes for Areas Transitioning to Urbanized Areas or Areas of 5,000 Not in Urbanized Areas. ³ Florida State Highway System Level of Service Report 2015, Florida Department of Transportation, District II, September 2016. ⁴ Source: City of Alachua February 2017 Development Monitoring Report. ⁵ Trip Distribution: Reference Traffic Impact Analysis, Walmart #3873 – Alachua, dated November 2016, prepared by Traffic & Mobility Consultants. ⁶ The application is for a Final Development Order. Facility capacity and concurrency will be reserved.	

Evaluation: The impacts generated by the development would not adversely affect the Level of Service (LOS) of the roadway segments identified above. The impacts that would be generated by the development are acceptable.

Potable Water Impacts

Table 6. Potable Water Impacts

System Category	Gallons Per Day
Current Permitted Capacity ¹	2,300,000
Less Actual Potable Water Flows ¹	1,190,000
Reserved Capacity ²	139,670
Available Capacity	970,330
Projected Potable Water Demand from Application ³	3,347
Residual Capacity	966,983
Percentage of Permitted Design Capacity Utilized	57.96%
Sources: ¹ City of Alachua Public Services Department, April 2016. ² City of Alachua February 2017 Development Monitoring Report. ³ Source: Walmart Prototypical Utility Loads.	

Evaluation: The impacts to the potable water system that would be generated by the development would not adversely affect the Level of Service (LOS) for potable water facilities. The impacts that would be generated by the development are therefore acceptable.

Sanitary Sewer Impacts

Table 7. Sanitary Sewer Impacts

System Category	Gallons Per Day
Treatment Plant Current Permitted Capacity	1,500,000
Less Actual Treatment Plant Flows ¹	615,000
Reserved Capacity ²	100,080
Available Capacity	784,920
Projected Sanitary Sewer Demand from Application ³	3,012
Residual Capacity	781,908
Percentage of Permitted Design Capacity Utilized	47.87%
Sources: ¹ City of Alachua Public Services Department, April 2016. ² City of Alachua February 2017 Development Monitoring Report. ³ Source: Walmart Prototypical Utility Loads.	

Evaluation: The impacts to the sanitary sewer system that would be generated by the development would not adversely affect the Level of Service (LOS) for sanitary sewer facilities. The impacts that would be generated by the development are therefore acceptable.

Solid Waste Impacts

Table 8. Solid Waste Impacts

System Category	Pounds Per Day	Tons Per Year
Demand from Existing Development ¹	39,152	7,145.24
Reserved Capacity ²	4,928.41	899.43
Demand Generated by Application ³	789.04	144
New River Solid Waste Facility Capacity ⁴	50 years	
Sources:		
1 Concurrency Impact Analysis, Walmart #3873-00, Alachua, FL, prepared by CPH Engineers, Inc., dated January 30, 2017.		
2 City of Alachua February 2017 Development Monitoring Report.		
3 Sincero and Sincero; Environmental Engineering: A Design Approach. Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 1996		
4 New River Solid Waste Facility. March 2016.		

Evaluation: The impacts to the solid waste system that would be generated by the development would not adversely affect the Level of Service (LOS) for solid waste facilities. The impacts that would be generated by the development are therefore acceptable.

Recreation Facilities

The proposed development is a nonresidential development. Therefore, there are no impacts to recreation facilities. The development will have no impact to the Level of Service (LOS) of recreation facilities.

Public School Facilities

The proposed development is a nonresidential development. Therefore, there are no impacts to public school facilities. The development will have no impact to the Level of Service (LOS) of public school facilities.

- (6) *Not injure neighboring land or property values.* The proposed special exception will not substantially injure the use of neighboring land for those uses that are permitted in the zone district, or reduce land values.

Evaluation & Findings: The adjacent lands to the subject property are vacant. These lands have a Commercial FLUM Designation and Commercial Intensive (CI) zoning designation, which is also the FLUM Designation and zoning of the subject property.

As further described within this Staff Report, the proposed development would provide greater setbacks and buffering between the building and on-site features (such as parking/circulation and service delivery areas) than required by the City's LDRs. These increased setbacks and buffering provide further protections to adjacent and neighboring lands to reduce any potential impacts the proposed development may create.

- (7) *Site plan.* A site plan (Subsection 2.4.9 of this section) has been prepared that demonstrates how the proposed special exception use complies with the other standards of this subsection.

Evaluation & Findings: A Site Plan has been submitted concurrently with this Special Exception Permit application, and demonstrates how the proposed use would comply with the other standards of Section 2.4.4(D) and other applicable provisions of the City's LDRs, including but not limited to Section 2.4.9, *Site Plan*, Section 4.3.4(G)(7), *Use-Specific Standards*, *Large-scale retail establishments*, Section 6.1, *Off-street parking and loading standards*, Section 6.2, *Tree protection/landscape/xeriscape standards*, Section 6.4, *Exterior lighting standards*, Section 6.7, *Open space standards*, Section 6.8, *Design standards for business uses*, and Section 6.9 *Environmental protection standards*.

- (8) *Complies with all other relevant laws and ordinances.* The proposed special exception use complies with all other relevant City laws and ordinances, State and Federal laws, and regulations.

Evaluation & Findings: The proposed development will be required to comply with all other relevant City laws and ordinances, as well as state and federal laws and regulations. The applicant will be required to obtain all other applicable permits, which may include, but is not limited, permits from the Suwannee River Water Management District (SRWMD), the Florida Department of Transportation, FDOT, and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP).

SECTION 4.3.4(G)(7): USE-SPECIFIC STANDARDS, LARGE SCALE RETAIL ESTABLISHMENTS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 80,000 SQUARE FEET

Section 4.3.4(G)(7) of the City's Land Development Regulations (LDRs) establishes Use-Specific Standards for large scale retail establishments that are greater than or equal to 80,000 square feet. The application has been reviewed for compliance with the standards of Section 4.3.4(G)(7). An evaluation and findings of the application's compliance with the standards of Section 4.3.4(G)(7) is provided below. The applicant has also provided an analysis of the application's compliance with Section 4.3.4(G)(7) in the supporting application materials.

Compliance with certain standards of Section 4.3.4(G)(7) are demonstrated by the companion Site Plan application through site design and/or configuration of the proposed development, as shown on the civil construction plans or on architectural plans.

(7) *Large-scale retail establishments.* Large-scale retail establishments shall comply with the following standards:

- (a) *Design standards.* All large-scale retail establishments shall comply with the design standards in Subsection 6.8.3, Design standards for business uses.

Evaluation & Findings: An evaluation of the application's compliance with the standards of Subsection 6.8.3 is provided in this Staff Report.

- (b) *Large-scale retail establishments of greater than or equal to 80,000 square feet of gross floor area.*

- (i) Large-scale retail establishments of greater than or equal to 80,000 square feet of gross floor area shall be special exceptions in the CC and CI zoning districts.

Evaluation & Findings: The subject property is zoned Commercial Intensive (CI). This application proposes to allow a large-scale retail establishment of greater than or equal to 80,000 square feet of gross floor area on the subject property.

- (ii) As part of the application for special exception, a market and impact study shall be submitted. The study shall be based upon an agreed upon methodology utilizing commonly accepted data sources. Data are to be taken from professionally accepted existing sources, such as the United States Census, State Data Center, State University System of Florida, regional planning councils, water management districts, or existing technical studies. The data used shall be the best available existing data. Where data augmentation, updates, or special studies or surveys are deemed necessary by the City, appropriate methodologies shall be clearly described or referenced and shall meet professionally accepted standards for such methodologies.

Evaluation & Findings: The applicant has submitted a Market and Impact Study in accordance with the requirements of this section. The data sources used within the Market and Impact Study include the United States Census Bureau, the University of Florida, Bureau of Economic & Business Research, the Urban Land Institute, the Florida Department of Transportation, the Alachua County Property Appraisers Office, Nielsen Claritas, and Woods & Poole Economics, Inc.

- (iii) At a minimum the market and impact study shall include:
 - a. Inventory of local retail base.
 - b. Assess market areas and market impacts.
 - c. Services and capital expenditures: Calculate cost of infrastructure and utilities (e.g., streets, sewer connections, water lines, etc.).

- d. Traffic and other service impacts.
- e. Calculate the cost of associated economic development incentives (i.e., tax credits).
- f. Assess the impact of redevelopment zone tax-increment financing.
- g. Inventory locations of competing retailers.
- h. Assess impact on existing local retailers.

Evaluation & Findings: The applicant has submitted a Market and Impact Study, prepared by Florida Economic Advisors, and dated March 2016, as part of this Special Exception Permit application. The City engaged the services of GAI Consultants, Inc. (GAI) to review the Market and Impact Study. GAI reviewed the Market and Impact Study to assess if the Market and Impact Study sufficiently addressed the requirements of subsections a., b., g., and h. above. The findings of the review were summarized in a letter from Owen M. Beitsch, PhD, FAICP, CRE, and David R. Darsey, of GAI, dated June 23, 2016, and is included in Exhibit “B” to this Staff Report – Supporting Application Materials Submitted by City Staff to the Planning & Zoning Board (See Exhibit B.20.)

GAI’s review concluded that the Market and Impact Study satisfies the aforementioned subsections and justifies the development of the project based on general market and economic considerations. Other requirements of subsection iii. were reviewed by City Staff (for subsection c.), through independent review of the Traffic Impact Analysis submitted by the applicant (for subsection d.), or are not applicable to this project (for subsections e. and f.).

SECTION 6.8.3: DESIGN STANDARDS FOR SINGLE TENANT RETAIL SALES AND SERVICE USES GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 20,000 SQUARE FEET

Section 6.8.3 of the City’s Land Development Regulations (LDRs) establishes design standards for single tenant retail sales and services uses greater than or equal to 20,000 square feet. The application has been reviewed for compliance with the standards of Section 6.8.3. An evaluation and findings of the application’s compliance with the standards of Section 6.8.3 is provided below. The applicant has also provided an analysis of the application’s compliance with Section 6.8.3 in the application materials.

Compliance with certain standards of Section 4.3.4(G)(7) are demonstrated by the companion Site Plan application through site design and/or configuration of the proposed development, as shown on the civil construction plans or on architectural plans.

6.8.3 Design standards for single tenant retail sales and service uses greater than or equal to 20,000 square feet.

(A) Facade and material design.

(1) *Generally.* All facades facing a street, lands containing existing residential uses, or vacant land classified as CSV, A, RSF-1, RSF-3, RSF-4, RSF-6, RMH-5, RMH-P, RMF-8, or RMF-15, shall be subject to the standards set forth in Subsection 6.8.3(A)(2).

(2) *Standards.*

(a) *Glazing.*

(i) Glazing of the front façade in the following amounts:

- a. Thirty percent of the ground floor facade area when it faces a street or a publicly-accessible parking area which is a part of the development and

consists of 15 percent or more of the development's minimum off-street parking requirement pursuant to Section 6.1.4(B);

- b. Twenty percent of the ground floor facade area when it faces any vacant land classified as CSV, A, RSF-1, RSF-3, RSF-4, RSF-6, RMH-5, RMH-P, RMF-8 or RMF-15, or lands containing existing residential uses.

Evaluation & Findings: This provision is applicable to the front façade and east façade (as the east façade faces a street.) Interstate-75 does not afford the property its principle means of access, and therefore, is not a “street” as defined in Article 10 of the City’s LDRs. The applicant has elected to use the glazing alternatives provided for in Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(iv). Please reference below for an analysis of the application’s compliance with Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(iv).

- (ii) For the purposes of this section, the ground floor facade area of single-story buildings shall be calculated by measuring the applicable building wall between the finished grade and the underside of the roof, wall, or parapet of the facade. For buildings with more than one story, the ground floor façade area shall be calculated by measuring the applicable building wall between the finished grade and the underside of the floor above the ground level floor.

Evaluation & Findings: The applicant has provided calculations of the ground floor façade area of the front façade in accordance with the calculation method defined within Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(ii). The calculations are provided on the Architectural Plans submitted with the application.

- (iii) Windows shall not use reflective or heavily tinted glass that obstructs views into the building.

Evaluation & Findings: The applicant has proposed transparent windows.

- (iv) *Glazing alternatives.* The amount of glazing required pursuant to Subsection 6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(i)a. may be reduced to a minimum of 20 percent when the façade incorporates all of the following architectural elements:

- a. The use of natural brick, a natural brick product, natural stone, or a natural stone product in at least 20 percent of the façade, and;

Evaluation & Findings: The applicant has elected to use the glazing alternative established in this Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(iv). The applicant has provided a calculation of the total front façade area below the roofline (10,198 square feet), the area of the front façade from the ground to the top of parapet walls (14,624 square feet), of the area of the front façade constituting glazing (2,099 square feet, 20.58% of the front façade area), and of the area for which a natural brick product is provided within the front façade (3,344 square feet, 22.86% of the front façade area). The applicant has also provided a calculation of the total east facade area below the roofline (5,694 square feet), the area of the east façade from the ground to the top of parapet walls (7,551 square feet), of the area of the east façade constituting glazing (1,225 square feet, 21.5% of the east façade area), and of the area for which a natural brick product is provided within the east façade (1,724 square feet, 22.83% of the east façade area). Calculations are provided on the Architectural Plans submitted with the application.

- b. Window shutters/plantation-style shutters or a canopy/portico in accordance with the following:

- i. Window shutters or plantation-style shutters which span a minimum of 10 percent of the length of the façade, or;
- ii. A canopy or portico which provides a covered pedestrian walkway adjacent to the façade which spans a minimum of 50 percent of the length of the facade, and;

Evaluation & Findings: The applicant has elected to provide window shutters along the front and east façades. The total length of window shutters along each façade exceeds the minimum 10% required.

- c. Customer entrances which include no less than six of the design features provided in Subsection 6.8.3(C)(2)d. The amount of glazing required pursuant to this subsection may be further reduced by up to 5 percent when the façade incorporates a corresponding increase in the percentage of natural brick, natural brick product, natural stone, or natural stone product in addition to the minimum amount required pursuant to Subsection 6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(iv)a.

Evaluation & Findings: The applicant has provided six of the design features established in Section 6.8.3(C)(2) at the customer entrances along the front and east façades: (a) canopies/porticos above the entrance; (b) roof overhangs over the entrance; (c) entry recesses/projections; (e) raised corniced parapets above the entrance; (i) architectural details, such as tile work and moldings, that are integrated into the building structure and design and are above and/or directly adjacent to the entrance; and (j) integral planters or wing walls that incorporate landscaped areas or seating areas.

(b) Facade massing.

- (i) *Offset required.* Front facades 60 feet wide or wider shall incorporate wall offsets of at least two feet in depth (projections or recesses) a minimum of every 40 feet. Each required offset shall have a minimum width of 20 feet.
- (ii) *Offset alternatives.* The following alternatives can be used in place of the required front facade offsets:
 - a. Facade color changes following the same dimensional standards as the offset requirements;
 - b. Pilasters having a minimum depth of one foot, a minimum width of one foot, and a minimum height of 80 percent of the facade's height; and/or
 - c. Roofline changes when coupled with correspondingly aligned facade material changes.

Evaluation & Findings: The applicant has provided a combination of the offset alternatives established in Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(b)(ii), including: (a) façade color changes following the same dimensional standards as the offset requirements; (b) pilasters having a minimum depth of one foot, a minimum width greater than one foot, and a minimum height of 80 percent of the façade's height; and (c) roofline changes coupled with correspondingly aligned façade material changes. Please reference the architectural plans for a visual representation of which depicts the offset alternatives provided along the front façade.

(c) Roof line changes.

- (i) Roof line changes shall include changes in roof planes or changes in the top of a parapet wall, such as extending the top of pilasters above the top of the parapet wall.

- (ii) When roofline changes are included on a facade that incorporates wall offsets or material or color changes, roofline changes shall be vertically aligned with the corresponding wall offset or material or color changes.

Evaluation & Findings: Roof line changes on the proposed building include changes in the top of the parapet wall. Roof line changes are vertically aligned with corresponding wall material and color changes.

- (d) *Colors.* Facade colors shall be in accordance with the City's adopted color palate. This palate features colors that are low reflectance, subtle, neutral, and/or earth tone colors, while high-intensity colors, bright colors, metallic colors, or black or fluorescent colors are prohibited except for building trim.

Evaluation & Findings: The façade colors incorporate earth tone colors. No high-intensity, bright, metallic, or black or fluorescent colors are proposed.

- (e) *Prohibited materials.* The following materials shall be prohibited:

- (i) Metal siding and exposed smooth-finished concrete block, when visible from a street, existing single-family attached or detached dwellings, or vacant land classified as CSV, A, RSF-1, RSF-3, and RSF-4; and

Evaluation & Findings: Metal siding and smooth-finished concrete block are not proposed on any facade visible from a street, existing single-family attached or detached dwellings, or vacant land classified as CSV, A, RSF-1, RSF-3, and RSF-4.

- (ii) Synthetic stucco (EIFS) within two feet of the grade level and within two feet of any exterior door jamb.

Evaluation & Findings: EIFS is not proposed within two feet of the grade level of any façade or within two feet of any exterior door jamb.

- (f) *Vinyl siding.* Vinyl siding shall be limited to 60 percent or less of any single facade, and all vinyl siding shall have a smooth surface with no visible grained pattern.

Evaluation & Findings: Vinyl siding has not been proposed on any façade.

(B) *Roofs.*

- (1) *Roof planes.* Except for mansard roofs, cupolas and steeples, sloped roofs shall include two or more sloping roof planes with greater than or equal to one foot of vertical rise for every three feet of horizontal run, and less than or equal to one foot of vertical rise for every one foot of horizontal run.

Evaluation & Findings: The proposed development utilizes a flat roof, and therefore this provision is not applicable.

- (2) *Flat roofs.* When flat roofs are used, parapet walls with three-dimensional cornice treatments shall conceal them. The cornice shall include a perpendicular projection a minimum of eight inches from the parapet facade plane.

Evaluation & Findings: The proposed building provides a parapet wall with a three-dimensional cornice treatment. The cornice treatment includes a perpendicular projection greater than eight (8) inches from the parapet façade plane.

- (3) *Roof penetrations and equipment.* All roof-based mechanical equipment, as well as vents, pipes, antennas, satellite dishes and other roof penetrations (with the exception of chimneys), shall be located on the rear elevations or screened with a parapet wall having a three-dimensional cornice treatment so as to have a minimal visual impact as seen from:

- (a) A public street;
- (b) Vacant land classified as CSV, A, RSF-1, RSF-3, RSF-4, RSF-6, RMH-5, RMH-P, RMF-8 or RMF-15; and
- (c) Lands containing single-family detached, attached, townhouse or two- to four-family dwelling developments.

Evaluation & Findings: All roof-based mechanical equipment and roof penetrations will be screened with a parapet wall having a three-dimensional cornice treatment to minimize visual impact.

(C) *Customer entrances.*

- (1) *Required entrances.* Each side of a building facing a public street shall include at least one customer entrance, except that no large retail establishment shall be required to provide entrances on more than two sides of the structure which face public streets.

Evaluation & Findings: Customer entrances are provided on the elevation which faces a public street (east elevation).

- (2) *Entrance design.* Buildings shall have clearly-defined, highly visible customer entrances that include no less than three of the following design features:

- (a) Canopies/porticos above the entrance;
- (b) Roof overhangs above the entrance;
- (c) Entry recesses/projections;
- (d) Arcades that are physically integrated with the entrance;
- (e) Raised corniced parapets above the entrance;
- (f) Gabled roof forms or arches above the entrance;
- (g) Outdoor plaza adjacent to the entrance having seating and a minimum depth of 20 feet;
- (h) Display windows that are directly adjacent to the entrance;
- (i) Architectural details, such as tile work and moldings, that are integrated into the building structure and design and are above and/or directly adjacent to the entrance; or
- (j) Integral planters or wing walls that incorporate landscaped areas or seating areas. A wing wall is a wall secondary in scale projecting from a primary wall and not having a roof.

Evaluation & Findings: On the front (north) and east façades, the applicant has provided six (6) of the design features into each customer entrance: (a) canopies/porticos above the entrance; (b) roof overhangs over the entrance; (c) entry recesses/projections; (e) raised corniced parapets above the entrance; (i) architectural details, such as tile work and moldings, that are integrated into the building structure and design and are above and/or directly adjacent to the entrance; and (j) integral planters or wing walls that incorporate landscaped areas or seating areas.

On the west façade, the applicant has provided three (3) design features into the customer entrance: (a) canopy/portico above the entrance; (b) roof overhang over the entrance; and (e) raised corniced parapets above the entrance.

(D) *Off-street parking.*

- (1) *Location.* No more than 50 percent of the required off-street parking shall be located between the building's primary facade and the street it fronts.

Evaluation & Findings: The building's primary façade does not directly front a street, however, less than 50 percent of the required off-street parking is located in front of the building, as measured by projecting a line from each corner of the front of the building.

(2) *Screening.* Off-street surface parking areas serving a large retail establishment shall be screened in accordance with Section 6.2, in addition to the following:

- (a) In cases where a wall or fence is provided in lieu of a continuous opaque screen of shrub material, such fence or wall shall have a minimum height of 36 inches, and be constructed of stone, brick, stucco, wood or similar material designed to resemble such materials;
- (b) Any fence or wall shall be located at least four feet from the edge of the lot line; and
- (c) All required canopy and understory/ornamental trees shall be located between the fence or wall and the edge of the street right-of-way.

Evaluation & Findings: The applicant has provided landscaping materials in accordance with Section 6.2, and has not elected to provide a wall or fence in lieu of landscaping screening materials to screen parking areas.

(E) *Pedestrian circulation.*

(1) *Sidewalks required.* New large retail establishments shall provide sidewalks constructed in accordance with Subsection 7.3.2(B), Configuration, on all sides of the lot which abut a public street.

Evaluation & Findings: The subject property has limited frontage along two (2) proposed streets, and the streets do not run along or abut the property line of the development.

(2) *Pedestrian pathways.* The on-site pedestrian circulation system shall comply with the standards in Subsection 6.1.10(A), Required improvements, and Subsection 7.3.2(C), Connection.

Evaluation & Findings: The proposed development complies with Section 6.1.10(A), which requires pedestrian crosswalks within parking lots of 100 spaces or more to be at least ten feet (10') in width, either raised above the adjacent pavement, striped, or otherwise designed through the use of alternative materials. Crosswalks are required to be located between all primary building entrances and the parking areas serving those entrances. In addition, Section 6.1.10(A) requires in parking lots of 300 or more spaces, improved pedestrian pathways be provided. These pathways must have a minimum width of three feet (3') located in continuous landscaped parking islands be provided at least every fourth row of parking spaces. The proposed development provides pedestrian pathways within landscaped islands in accordance with Section 6.1.10(A).

The applicant has submitted a companion variance permit application, requesting a variance from Section 6.8.3(E)(2) and from Section 7.3.2(C). Section 7.3.2(C) would require the development to provide a minimum of seven (7) pedestrian connections to the adjacent public sidewalk or greenway network. The variance is sought due to the limitations of the site and the ability to provide connections to the public sidewalk system.

The applicant proposes sidewalks from US Highway 441 to the subject property, along "Entrance Road", "Seller Road 1", and the extension of NW 151st Boulevard. As part of the Variance Permit application, a condition proposed by Staff would require additional pedestrian connections to be provided between the proposed development and the existing sidewalk system. Specifically, the proposed variance permit condition would require the applicant to provide five foot (5') sidewalks within the right of way of "Seller Road 2" to the north and south the road, as depicted and labeled on Sheet C-6B of the Site

Plan, and to provide a 5 foot (5') sidewalk and any necessary crosswalks from the terminus of the right-of-way of "Seller Road 2" connecting said sidewalks along "Seller Road 2" to the primary customer entrances of the development. The sidewalks shall be designed and constructed to comply with the City of Alachua Land Development Regulations and all applicable Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) standards. The proposed variance permit condition would also require the applicant to provide funding to the City for a five foot (5') sidewalk along the south right-of-way line of the NW 151st Boulevard, from the existing terminus of the sidewalk at the intersection of NW 151st Boulevard and NW 148th Drive to the existing terminus of NW 151st Boulevard, which is contiguous to the location of proposed sidewalk improvements as depicted on Sheet C-6B of the Site Plan. The condition requires a Professional Engineer registered in the State of Florida to prepare the calculation of the funding amount, and for the calculation to include the cost of all materials and labor to construct a sidewalk which complies with the City of Alachua Land Development Regulations and all applicable Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) standards. Funding required by this condition must be provided to the City prior to applying for a building permit for the proposed building.

These connections, as would be required by the proposed variance permit condition, would increase connectivity and enhance pedestrian access to the proposed development.

(3) *Connection to public sidewalk system.* In the case of corner lots, a connection shall be made to the sidewalk of both streets.

Evaluation & Findings: The subject property is not a corner lot.

(4) *Distinguished from driving surfaces.* All internal pedestrian walkways shall be distinguished from driving surfaces through the use of durable, low-maintenance surface materials such as pavers, bricks, or scored/stamped concrete or asphalt to enhance pedestrian safety and comfort, as well as the attractiveness of the walkways.

Evaluation & Findings: Pedestrian pathways are proposed to be distinguished from driving surfaces through the use of stamped concrete.

EXHIBIT “A”
TO
WAL-MART STORES EAST, LP
SPECIAL EXCEPTION PERMIT
FOR A LARGE-SCALE RETAIL ESTABLISHMENT
GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 80,000 SQUARE FEET

STAFF REPORT

CONDITIONS:

1. The applicant agrees it shall not use an outdoor speaker or public address system as part of the automobile repair and servicing use, as part of the outdoor garden center, or any other use occurring at the subject property.
2. The applicant agrees it shall obtain all other applicable local, state, and federal permits before the commencement of the development.
3. The applicant agrees that Conditions 1 – 3 as stated above do not inordinately burden the land and shall be binding upon the property owner, including any subsequent property owners, successors, or assigns, and that the development shall comply with Conditions 1 – 3 as stated herein.

EXHIBIT “B”
TO
WAL-MART STORES EAST, LP
SPECIAL EXCEPTION PERMIT
FOR A LARGE-SCALE RETAIL ESTABLISHMENT
GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 80,000 SQUARE FEET
STAFF REPORT

SUPPORTING APPLICATION MATERIALS
SUBMITTED BY CITY STAFF TO THE
PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD

1. All materials provided in Exhibit “B” to the Wal-Mart #3873-00 Site Plan Staff Report, Supporting Application Materials Submitted by City Staff to the Planning & Zoning Board, are herein incorporated by reference into this Exhibit “B” to the Wal-Mart Stores East, LP, Special Exception Permit for a Large-Scale Retail Establishment Greater Than or Equal to 80,000 Square Feet, Supporting Application Materials Submitted by City Staff to the Planning & Zoning Board.
2. In addition to the preceding, all materials attached subsequently hereto shall comprise Exhibit “B” to the Wal-Mart Stores East, LP, Special Exception Permit for a Large-Scale Retail Establishment Greater Than or Equal to 80,000 Square Feet, Supporting Application Materials Submitted by City Staff to the Planning & Zoning Board.

**EXHIBIT “B”
TO
WAL-MART #3873
SPECIAL EXCEPTION PERMIT
(LARGE SCALE RETAIL ESTABLISHMENT ≥ 80,000 SQ. FT.)
STAFF REPORT**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

STAFF REPORTS FOR COMPANION APPLICATIONS

- B.1.: Staff Report – Site Plan (without Staff Report Exhibit “B”)
- B.2.: Staff Report – Special Exception Permit (Automobile Repair & Servicing) (without Staff Report Exhibit “B”)
- B.3.: Staff Report – Variance Permit [Section 6.8.3(E)(2)] (without Staff Report Exhibit “B”)

CITY REVIEW COMMENTS

- B.4.: DRT Summary Letter dated 7/7/2016
- B.5.: Applicant DRT Meeting Summary/Brief, dated 7/6/2016, and 7/6/16 DRT Meeting Sign-In Sheet
- B.6.: Staff DRT Meeting Summary/Brief, dated 6/29/2016, and 6/29/2016 DRT Meeting Sign-In Sheet
- B.7.: Completeness Resubmittal Review Letter dated 6/2/2016
- B.8.: Completeness Review Letter dated 4/6/2016

APPLICANT RESPONSE/TRANSMITTAL LETTERS

- B.9.: Applicant Response Letter dated 1/29/2017
- B.10.: Applicant Response Letter dated 11/21/2016
- B.11.: Applicant Response Letter dated 6/28/2016
- B.12.: Applicant Response Letter dated 5/26/2016
- B.13.: Applicant Response Letter dated 5/18/2016
- B.14.: Application Submittal Cover Letter dated March 31, 2016

REVIEW COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM OUTSIDE REVIEWING PROFESSIONAL CONSULTANTS

- B.15.: Review Comments (Engineering) – EDA Engineers, Surveyors, Planners, Inc., dated 12/15/2016
- B.16.: Review Comments (Engineering) – EDA Engineers, Surveyors, Planners, Inc., dated 5/19/2016
- B.17.: Review Comments (Geotechnical) – GSE Engineering & Consulting, Inc. dated 12/15/2016
- B.18.: Review Comments (Geotechnical) – GSE Engineering & Consulting, Inc. dated 6/29/2016
- B.19.: Review Comments (Traffic Impact Analysis) – Volkert, Inc., dated 12/14/2016
- B.20.: Review Comments (Traffic Impact Analysis) – Volkert, Inc., dated 5/31/2016
- B.21.: Review Comments (Market) – GAI Consultants, Inc., dated 6/23/2016

RESUMES/CURRICULUM VITAE OF CITY STAFF AND OUTSIDE REVIEWING PROFESSIONAL CONSULTANTS

- B.22.: Resume – Justin Tabor, AICP, City of Alachua
- B.23.: Resume – Sergio Reyes, P.E., EDA Engineers, Surveyors, Planners, Inc.
- B.24.: Curriculum Vitae – Kenneth Hill, P.E., GSE Engineering & Consulting, Inc.
- B.25.: Resume – Brian Kanely, P.E., Volkert, Inc.

- B.26.: Resume – Owen M. Beitsch, PhD, FAICP, CRE, GAI Consultants, Inc.
- B.27.: Resume - David R. Darsey, GAI Consultants, Inc.

RESUMES OF APPLICANT'S PROFESSIONAL CONSULTANTS

- B.28.: Resume – Brian Cassidy, P.E., CPH, Inc.
- B.29.: Resume – Javier E. Omana, CNU-a, CPH, Inc.
- B.30.: Resume – Teresa Murphy, AIA, BRR Architecture, Inc.
- B.31.: Resume – Jeffrey S. Pruett, P.E., Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc.
- B.32.: Resume – Eduardo Suarez, M.S.C.E., P.E., Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc.
- B.33.: Resume – Mohammed Abdallah, P.E., Traffic & Mobility Consultants, Inc.
- B.34.: Resume – Robert Christopher Jones, Florida Economic Advisors, LLC

PUBLIC NOTIFICATION – 4/18/2017 PZB MEETING

- B.35.: (1) Published Notice – Alachua County Today, April 6, 2017; (2) Written Notice – Mailed 4/3/2017;
(3) Posted Notice Affidavit, 4/3/2017

APPLICATION & SUPPORTING MATERIALS

- B.36.: Special Exception Permit Application
- B.37.: Application Fee
- B.38.: Statement of Proposed Special Exception
- B.39.: Compliance with Standards for a Special Exception; Large Scale Retail Establishments \geq 80,000 SF
- B.40.: Attachment “A” to Compliance with Standards for a Special Exception; Large Scale Retail Establishments \geq 80,000 SF: Analysis of Compliance with Section 4.3.4(G)(7) of the City’s LDRs
- B.41.: Attachment “B” to Compliance with Standards for a Special Exception; Large Scale Retail Establishments \geq 80,000 SF: Analysis of Compliance with Section 6.8.3 of the City’s LDRs
- B.42.: Attachment “C” to Compliance with Standards for a Special Exception; Large Scale Retail Establishments \geq 80,000 SF: Analysis of Compliance with Section 6.2 of the City’s LDRs
- B.43.: Application Signatory Authorization
- B.44.: Agent Authorization – Wal-Mart Stores East, LP, to CPH, Inc.
- B.45.: Legal Descriptions
- B.46.: Proof of Ownership
- B.47.: Proof of Payment of Taxes
- B.48.: Zoning Map
- B.49.: Neighborhood Meeting Materials
- B.50.: Public Notice Mailing Labels
- B.51.: Lighting Cut Sheets
- B.52.: Estimated Costs of Infrastructure and Utilities
- B.53.: Compliance with Standards for Gateway Overlay District: Justification/Responses
- B.54.: Concurrency Impact Analysis
- B.55.: Market & Impact Study, Walmart Supercenter, Alachua, Florida, Florida Economic Advisors, March 2016
- B.56.: Traffic Impact Analysis, Walmart #3873 – Alachua, Traffic & Mobility Consultants, November 2016
- B.57.: Sheets C-6, C-6A, and C-6B, of Site Plan
- B.58.: Architectural Plans: Building Elevations, Floor Plan, and Waste Receptacle Screening
- B.59.: Architectural Plans: Material Percentage Presentation
- B.60.: Oldcastle Quik Brik Cut Sheets



City of Alachua

Planning & Community Development Department

Staff Report

Planning & Zoning Board Hearing Date:
Quasi-Judicial Hearing

April 18, 2017

SUBJECT: A request for a Site Plan for a ±158,562 square foot building for retail sales and services, with associated parking, stormwater management facilities, utility infrastructure, and supporting site improvements

APPLICANT/AGENT: Brian Cassidy, P.E., CPH, Inc.

PROPERTY OWNERS: First Street Group, L.C.
Wal-Mart Stores East, LP

LOCATION: Approximately 1,000 feet southeast of the US Highway 441/Interstate-75 interchange

PARCEL ID NUMBERS: 03066-000-000; 03869-000-000; 03869-013-000; 03869-014-000

FLUM DESIGNATION: Commercial

ZONING: Commercial Intensive (CI)

OVERLAY: Gateway Overlay District

ACREAGE: ±37.94 acres (including Wal-Mart Stores East, LP parcel and access roads)

PROJECT PLANNER: Justin Tabor, AICP

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that the Planning & Zoning Board transmit the Site Plan to the City Commission with a recommendation to approve, subject to the ten (10) conditions provided in Exhibit "A" of this Staff Report. This recommendation is contingent upon the Board of Adjustment's approval of the applicant's companion variance permit application and the City Commission's approval of the companion Special Exception Permit applications for automobile repair & servicing and for a large-scale retail establishment greater than or equal to 80,000 square feet in area.

RECOMMENDED MOTION: *Based upon the competent substantial evidence presented at this hearing, the presentation before this Board, and Staff's recommendation, this Board finds the application to be consistent with the City of Alachua Comprehensive Plan and in compliance with the Land Development Regulations and transmits the Site Plan to the City Commission with a recommendation to approve, subject to the ten (10) conditions provided in Exhibit "A" and located on pages 37 and 38 of the April 18, 2017, Staff Report to the Planning & Zoning Board. This recommendation is contingent upon the Board of Adjustment's approval of the applicant's companion variance permit application and the City Commission's approval of the companion Special Exception Permit applications for automobile repair & servicing and for a large-scale retail establishment greater than or equal to 80,000 square feet in area.*

**CITY OF ALACHUA
STAFF REPORT: WAL-MART #3873
SITE PLAN**

TABLE OF CONTENTS


Section Title	Page
Summary	3
Surrounding Uses	5
Neighborhood Meeting	6
Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan	6
Environmental Conditions Analysis	12
Findings of Fact: Compliance with Land Development Regulations	17
Section 2.4.9(E), Site Plan Standards	17
Section 3.7.2(C)(2) – (5): US Highway 441/Interstate 75 Gateway Overlay District	18
Section 4.3.4(G)(7): Use-Specific Standards, Large Scale Retail Establishments Greater Than or Equal to 80,000 Square Feet	24
Section 4.3.4(J)(3): Use-Specific Standards, Automobile Repair & Servicing	25
Section 6.8.3: Design Standards for Single Tenant Retail Sales and Service Uses Greater Than or Equal to 20,000 Square Feet	27
Public Facilities Impact	33
Exhibit “A” to Wal-Mart #3873 Site Plan Staff Report: Conditions	37
Exhibit “B” to Wal-Mart #3873 Site Plan Staff Report: Supporting Application Materials Submitted by City Staff to the Planning & Zoning Board	39

SUMMARY

The proposed site plan is a request by Brian Cassidy, P.E., of CPH, Inc., applicant for Wal-Mart Stores East, LP, and First Street Group, L.C., property owners, for the construction of a ±158,562 square foot building, with associated parking, stormwater management facilities, utility infrastructure, and supporting site improvements.

The subject property is ±37.94 acres in area and is located approximately 1,000 feet southeast of the US Highway 441/Interstate-75 interchange. Access to the Walmart Stores East, LP parcel would be provided by a new access road (labelled on the plans as “Entrance Road”) connecting to US Highway 441. Two additional roads (labelled on the plans as “Seller Road 1” and “Seller Road 2”) would connect to the “Entrance Road” and provide the means of access to the Wal-Mart Stores East, LP parcel. The “Entrance Road” is proposed to connect to US Highway 441 approximately 2,000 feet east of the US Highway 441/Interstate-75 interchange. This development would also extend NW 151st Boulevard from its current terminus (approximately 1,100 feet west of the entrance to the One51 Place Apartments) to the proposed “Entrance Road”. Illustration 1 below depicts the overall layout proposed by the Site Plan.

Illustration 1: Sheet C-6 of the Proposed Site Plan



The proposed development would convey stormwater runoff to a retention area on the Walmart Stores East, LP parcel. Stormwater runoff from the proposed Entrance Road and Seller Roads 1 and 2 would be conveyed to a stormwater retention area northeast of the Walmart Stores East, LP parcel and to an existing master stormwater management facility located contiguous to the subject property, commonly referred to as the “TK Basin”.

The proposed development requires two (2) Special Exception Permits: (1) for a large-scale retail establishment greater than or equal to 80,000 square feet of gross floor area; and (2) for automobile repair and servicing. Applications for each Special Exception Permit were submitted by the applicant and reviewed concurrently with this Site Plan.

The applicant has also submitted an application for a Variance Permit, which would reduce the number of required pedestrian connections between the on-site pedestrian circulation system and the adjacent public sidewalk or greenway network. The variance is sought from Section 6.8.3(E)(2), which requires single-tenant retail sales and service uses greater than or equal to 20,000 square feet in area to comply with Section 7.3.2(C). Section 7.3.2(C) requires all multiple-family and nonresidential developments to provide at least one improved pedestrian connection between the on-site pedestrian circulation system and the adjacent public sidewalk or greenway network, with an additional connection required for each additional five acres of development area. For the proposed development, seven (7) connections would be required.

The Staff Reports for each Special Exception Permit application and the Variance Permit application are included within the Exhibit “B” of this Staff Report – Supporting Application Materials Submitted by City Staff to the Planning and Zoning Board.


SURROUNDING USES

The existing uses, Future Land Use Map (FLUM) Designations, and zoning districts of the surrounding area are identified in Table 1. Map 1 provides an overview of the vicinity of the subject property. (NOTE: The information below is intended to provide a general overview of the area surrounding the subject property and to generally orient the reader. It is not intended to be all-inclusive, and may not identify all existing uses, FLUM Designations, and/or zoning districts surrounding the subject property.)

Table 1. Surrounding Land Uses

Direction	Existing Use(s)	FLUM Designation(s)	Zoning District(s)
North	Vacant Warehouse Building; McDonald's BP Gas Station; Quality Inn; Econo Lodge	Commercial	Commercial Intensive (CI)
South	Vacant Commercial Land	Commercial	Commercial Intensive (CI)
East	Vacant Multi-Family Residential Land; Vacant Commercial Land; Master Stormwater Basin ("TK Basin"); Vacant Agricultural Land	High Density Residential; Community Commercial; Commercial; Agriculture	Residential Multiple Family – 15 (RMF-15); Community Commercial (CC); Governmental Facilities (GF); Agriculture (A)
West	Interstate-75	N/A	N/A

Map 1. Vicinity Map



NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING

The purpose of a Neighborhood Meeting is to educate the owners of nearby land and any other interested members of the public about the project and to receive comments regarding the project. As required by Section 2.2.4 of the LDRs, all property owners within 400 feet of the subject property were notified of the meeting and notice of the meeting was published in a newspaper of general circulation.

A Neighborhood Meeting was held at 5:30 PM on March 1, 2016, at the Swick House, located at 15010 NW 142nd Terrace. The applicant's agent was present and available to answer questions. As evidenced by materials submitted by the applicant, three (3) persons signed in on the meeting's sign in sheet. A summary of the discussion which occurred at the Neighborhood Meeting has been provided by the applicant and is included within the application materials.

CONSISTENCY WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The Goals, Objectives, and Policies (GOPs) identified below are provided to establish a basis of the application's consistency with the Comprehensive Plan. There may be additional GOPs which the application is consistent with that are not identified within this report. An evaluation and findings of consistency with the identified GOPs is also provided below.

Future Land Use Element

GOAL 1: Future Land Use Map 2025:

The City of Alachua shall maintain a Future Land Use Map in order to effectively guide development in a sustainable manner and to ensure economic prosperity and stability while maintaining a high quality of life for all of its present and future citizens.

Objective 1.3: Commercial

The City of Alachua shall establish three commercial districts: Community Commercial, Commercial and Central Business District. These districts shall provide a broad range of retail sales and services, as well as office uses, in order to provide for the availability of goods and services, both to the citizens of Alachua and to the citizens of the North Central Florida region.

Policy 1.3.b: Commercial: The Commercial land use category is established to provide for general commercial uses, as well as more intense commercial and highway commercial uses. This is the land use category in which large-scale, regional commercial uses may locate. The following uses are allowed within the Commercial land use category:

1. Retail sales and services;
2. Personal services;
3. Financial Institutions;

4. Outdoor recreation and entertainment;
5. Tourist-related uses;
6. Hotels, motels;
7. Commercial shopping centers;
8. Auto-oriented uses;
9. Traditional Mixed-use Neighborhood Planned Developments;
10. Employment Center Planned Developments;
11. Commercial recreation centers;
12. Office/business parks;
13. Limited industrial services;
14. Eating Establishments

Evaluation and Findings of Consistency with Goal 1, Objective 1.3, and Policy

1.3.b: The subject property has a Commercial FLUM Designation, which permits large scale, regional commercial uses. The proposed uses are consistent with the uses identified within Policy 1.3.b as allowed within the Commercial FLUM Designation.

Objective 2.4: Landscaping and Tree Protection Standards: The City shall adopt landscaping and tree protection standards in order to achieve the aesthetic design values of the community and preserve tree canopies, as well as specimen protected, heritage and champion trees.

Objective 2.5: Open Space Standards: The City shall utilize open space requirements to preserve the rural character of Alachua, protect natural resources, and provide spaces for people to recreate and gather.

Policy 2.5.a: There shall be a minimum of 10% percent open space required. The City shall establish incentives for the provision of open space beyond minimum requirements.

Evaluation and Findings of Consistency with Objectives 2.4 and 2.5 and Policy

2.5.a: The site plan includes a landscaping plan which demonstrates the proposed development complies with the applicable landscaping, buffering, and tree mitigation standards required by the City's Comprehensive Plan and as further regulated within the City's LDRs. The landscaping plan indicates that 52.7% of the subject property shall be landscaped, exceeding the minimum 30% area required by the City's Comprehensive Plan. Open space is provided within the landscaped areas of the site, and exceeds the minimum 10% open space requirement of the City's Comprehensive Plan.

Objective 2.6: Large Scale Retail Design Standards:

The City shall establish large scale retail design standards to protect the City's small-town character and to promote the architectural design features as a theme for commercial development within the City.

Policy 2.6.a: The large scale retail design standards shall contain, at a minimum, architectural character, color and materials, relationship to surrounding community and streets, pedestrian flows and parking.

Evaluation and Findings of Consistency with Objective 2.6 and Policy 2.6.a: The site plan has been reviewed for compliance with the applicable design standards for business uses established in Section 6.8 of the City's LDRs. Please reference the section of this report which reviews the application's compliance with the City's LDRs for further analysis.

Objective 5.1: Natural features: The City shall coordinate Future Land Use designations with appropriate topography, soils, areas of seasonal flooding, wetlands and habitat during review of proposed amendments to the Future Land Use Map and the development review process. Natural features may be included as amenities within a development project.

Evaluation and Findings of Consistency with Objective 5.1: The applicant has submitted the following documents, included within the materials submitted with its application, addressing natural features: "Initial Geotechnical Exploration Services, Proposed Wal-Mart Store No. 3873-00, SEC I-75 and US Highway 441, Alachua, Alachua County, Florida", prepared by Eduardo Suarez, P.E., of Universal Engineering Sciences, dated May 20, 2016; "Report of Geotechnical Consulting Services, Limited Sinkhole Potential Evaluation, Entrance Road Depression Features – Station 43+00, Wal-Mart Store #3873, SEC I-75 and US Highway 441, Alachua, Alachua County, Florida", prepared by Eduardo Suarez, P.E., of Universal Engineering Sciences, dated November 14, 2016; and "Stormwater Design Calculations, Proposed Wal-Mart Store No. 3873, US 441/I-75, Alachua, Florida", prepared by Brian Cassidy, P.E., of CPH, Inc., dated January 2017. An environmental conditions and site suitability analysis is also provided in this report.

Objective 5.2: Availability of facilities and services: The City shall utilize a concurrency management system to ensure that the adopted level of service standards are maintained.

Policy 5.2.a: All new development shall meet level of service requirements for roadways, potable water and sanitary sewer, stormwater, solid waste, public schools, and improved recreation in accordance with LOS standards adopted in the elements addressing these facilities.

Evaluation and Findings of Consistency with Objective 5.2 and Policy 5.2.a: The applicant has submitted a Concurrency Impact Analysis which identifies the demands generated by the proposed development upon public facilities. The Concurrency Impact Analysis considers existing and reserved capacities of each public facility. In addition, the applicant has submitted a Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by Mohammed Abdallah of Traffic & Mobility Consultants, dated November 2016. The Traffic Impact Analysis addresses the proposed development's impacts to affected roadway segments. The City engaged the services of Volkert, Inc. to perform an

independent review of the Traffic Impact Analysis. The findings of the independent review performed by Volkert, Inc. are included in the materials attached to this report as Exhibit “B” – Supporting Application Materials Submitted by City Staff to the Planning and Zoning Board (See Exhibits B.26. and B.27.) As evidenced in the review letters received from Volkert, Inc., the applicant satisfactorily addressed all comments pertaining to Volkert Inc.’s review of the Traffic Impact Analysis. The Concurrency Impact Analysis prepared by the applicant, the Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by Traffic & Mobility Consultants, and the Public Facilities Impact Analysis provided within this report demonstrate that the development would not adversely affect the level of service (LOS) standard of the public facilities monitored for concurrency.

Policy 9.1: Any new development within a Commercial or Industrial Future Land Use Map Designation within the corporate limits, where potable water and wastewater service are available, as defined in Policy 1.2.a and Policy 4.2.a of the Community Facilities and Natural Groundwater Aquifer Recharge Element of the City of Alachua Comprehensive Plan, shall connect to the City of Alachua’s potable water and wastewater system.

Evaluation and Findings of Consistency with Policy 9.1: The proposed development would connect to potable water and wastewater facilities.

Transportation Element

Objective 1.1: Level of Service

The City shall establish a safe, convenient and efficient level of service standard for all motorized and non-motorized transportation systems.

Evaluation and Findings of Consistency with Objective 1.1: The applicant has submitted a Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by Mohammed Abdallah of Traffic & Mobility Consultants, dated November 2016, that demonstrates the proposed development would not adversely affect the level of service of transportation facilities. The Traffic Impact Analysis has been reviewed by an independent traffic engineer. The findings of the independent review of the Traffic Impact Analysis are included within the materials attached to this report as Exhibit “B” – Supporting Application Materials Submitted by City Staff to the Planning and Zoning Board.

Policy 1.3.a: The City shall establish minimum and maximum parking standards in order to avoid excessive amounts of underutilized parking areas.

Policy 1.3.d: The City shall require landscaping within parking areas, with an emphasis on canopy trees. The City shall consider establishing incentives for landscaping in excess of minimum standards.

Policy 1.3.f: The City shall establish bicycle parking facility standards based on type of use within developments.

Policy 1.3.g: The City shall require spaces to accommodate persons with physical disabilities as required by the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Evaluation and Findings of Consistency with Objective 1.1 and Policies 1.3.a, 1.3.d, 1.3.f, and 1.3.g: The site plan demonstrates the proposed development's compliance with the applicable standards of Section 6.1, Off-street parking and loading standards, of the City's Land Development Regulations. Required landscaping materials and pedestrian crossings and connections would be provided within parking areas. The site plan also provides all required bicycle parking facilities and the minimum number of required accessible parking spaces.

Community Facilities & Natural Groundwater Aquifer Recharge Element

Policy 1.1.d:

The City hereby establishes the following level of service standards for sanitary sewer facilities:

Levels of Service

- a. Quality: Compliance with all applicable standards of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP).
- b. Quantity: System-wide wastewater collection and treatment will be sufficient to provide a minimum of 250 gallons per day per equivalent residential unit (ERU) on an average annual basis. Plant expansion shall be planned in accordance with F.A.C. 62-600.405, or subsequent provision. This level of service standard shall be re-evaluated one year from the adoption date for the amended Plan.
- c. System capacity: If the volume of existing use in addition to the volume of the committed use of the City's wastewater facility reaches 85% of the permitted capacity design, no further development orders for projects without reserved capacity will be issued until additional capacity becomes available or funds to increase facility capacity are committed in accordance with a development agreement.

Evaluation and Findings of Consistency with Policy 1.1.d: An analysis of the proposed development's impacts to sanitary sewer facilities is provided within this report. The proposed development would not adversely affect the level of service for sanitary sewer facilities.

Policy 1.2.a: The City shall establish a Community Wastewater Service Area, which includes all areas where wastewater service is available. Wastewater service shall be deemed available if:

3. A gravity wastewater system, wastewater pumping station, or force main exists within $\frac{1}{4}$ mile of the property line of any residential subdivision with more than 5 units, or any multi-family residential development, or any commercial development, or any industrial development and the gravity wastewater system, wastewater pumping station, or force main can be accessed through public

utility easements or right of ways. The distance shall be measured as required for construction of the infrastructure along public utility easements and right of ways.

Evaluation and Findings of Consistency with Policy 1.2.a: The proposed development is located within the City's utility service area and would connect to the City's wastewater system.

Policy 2.1.a: The City hereby establishes the following level of service standards for solid waste disposal facilities:

<u>FACILITY TYPE</u>	<u>LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARD</u>
Solid Waste Landfill	.73 tons per capita per year

Evaluation and Findings of Consistency with Objective 2.1.a: An analysis of the proposed development's impacts to solid waste facilities is provided within this report. The proposed development would not adversely affect the level of service for solid waste facilities.

Policy 4.1.b: The City shall establish a Community Potable Water Service Area, which includes all areas where potable water service is available. Water service shall be deemed available if:

3. A water main exists within $\frac{1}{4}$ mile of any residential subdivision with more than 5 units, or any multi-family residential development, or any commercial development, or any industrial development and water service can be accessed through public utility easements or right of ways. The distance shall be measured as required for construction of the infrastructure along public utility easements and right of ways.

Evaluation and Findings of Consistency with Policy 4.1.b: The proposed development is located within the City's utility service area and would connect to the City's potable water system.

Policy 4.1.c: The City establishes the following level of service standards for potable water:

1. Quality: Compliance with all applicable standards of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection.
2. Quantity: System-wide potable water distribution and treatment will be sufficient to provide a minimum of 275 gallons per day per equivalent residential unit (ERU) on an average annual basis. Plant expansion shall be planned in accordance with Florida Administrative Code.
3. System Capacity: If the volume of existing use in addition to the volume of the committed use of the City's potable water facility

reaches 85% of the permitted design capacity, no further development orders or permits for projects without reserved capacity will be issued until additional capacity becomes available or funds to increase facility capacity are committed in accordance with a development agreement.

Evaluation and Findings of Consistency with Objective 4.1.c: An analysis of the proposed development's impacts to potable water facilities is provided within this report. The proposed development would not adversely affect the level of service for potable water facilities.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS ANALYSIS

Wetlands

According to best available data, there are no wetlands located in areas of the subject property where development is proposed. If any wetlands are identified in these areas, these areas will be subject to the applicable protection standards of the City of Alachua Comprehensive Plan and the Land Development Regulations (LDRs.)

Evaluation: No wetlands have been identified in areas of the subject property where development is proposed, therefore, there are no issues related to wetland protection.

Strategic Ecosystems

Strategic Ecosystems were identified by an ecological inventory project in a report prepared for Alachua County Department of Growth Management in 1987. The purpose of the inventory was to identify, inventory, map, describe, and evaluate the most significant natural biological communities in private ownership in Alachua County. The subject property is not located within or adjacent to a Strategic Ecosystem.

Evaluation: The subject property is not located within or adjacent to a Strategic Ecosystem, therefore, the development would not adversely impact any Strategic Ecosystem(s) identified within the ecological inventory report.

Regulated Plant & Animal Species

The Florida Natural Areas Inventory (FNAI) has identified areas throughout the State of Florida which may contain good quality natural communities. This data layer is known as the Potential Natural Areas (PNA) data layer, and identifies privately owned lands that are not managed or listed for conservation purposes. These areas were delineated by FNAI scientific staff through interpretation of natural vegetation from 1988-1993 FDOT aerial photographs and from input received during Regional Ecological Workshops held for each regional planning council. These workshops were attended by experts familiar with natural areas in the region. Potential Natural Areas were assigned ranks of Priority 1 through

Priority 5 based on size, perceived quality, and type of natural community present. The areas included in Priority 5 are exceptions to the above criteria. These areas were identified through the same process of aerial photographic interpretation and regional workshops as the PNA 1 through 4 ranked sites, but do not meet the standard criteria.

Evaluation: No species identified as endangered, threatened, or of special concern are known to exist on the subject property. The property does not contain any areas identified within the PNA data layer. If a regulated plant or animal species is identified during development, the applicant must adhere to the applicable standards in the City of Alachua Comprehensive Plan and the Land Development Regulations.

Soil Survey

Each soil type found on the subject property is identified below. The hydrologic soil group is an indicator of potential soil limitations. The hydrologic soil group, as defined for each specific soil, refers to a group of soils which have been categorized according to their runoff-producing characteristics. These hydrologic groups are defined by the Soil Survey of Alachua County, Florida, dated August 1985. The chief consideration with respect to runoff potential is the capacity of each soil to permit infiltration (the slope and kind of plant cover are not considered, but are separate factors in predicting runoff.) There are four hydrologic groups: A, B, C, and D. "Group A" soils have a higher infiltration rate when thoroughly wet and therefore have a lower runoff potential. "Group D" soils have very lower infiltration rates and therefore a higher runoff potential.

There are eleven (11) soil types found on the subject property:

Arredondo Fine Sand (0% – 5% slopes)

Hydrologic Soil Group: A

This soil type is well drained and permeability is rapid at the surface. This soil type poses only slight limitations as sites for homes and small commercial buildings.

Arredondo-Urban Land Complex (0% – 5% slopes)

Hydrologic Soil Group: A

This soil type is well drained and permeability is rapid at the surface. This soil type does not pose any significant limitations for development.

Blichton Sand (2% – 5% slopes)

Hydrologic Soil Group: D

This soil type is poorly drained. Permeability is rapid at the surface. This soil type poses severe limitations for urban uses, including dwellings, and small commercial buildings, due to wetness.

Gainesville Sand (0%- 5% slopes)

Hydrologic Soil Group: A

This soil type is well drained with slow surface runoff and rapid permeability. This soil poses only slight limitations for dwellings and local roads.

Kendrick Sand (5% – 8% slopes)

Hydrologic Soil Group: A

This soil type is well drained and permeability is rapid at the surface. This soil type poses only moderate limitations as sites for homes and small commercial buildings because of the slope.

Lochloosa Fine Sand (2% – 5% slopes)

Hydrologic Soil Group: C

This soil type is somewhat poorly drained. Permeability is rapid at the surface. This soil type poses only slight limitations as sites for homes, local roads, and small commercial buildings.

Lochloosa Fine Sand (5% – 8% slopes)

Hydrologic Soil Group: C

This soil type is somewhat poorly drained. Permeability is rapid at the surface. This soil type poses only slight limitations as sites for homes, local roads, and small commercial buildings.

Millhopper Sand (0% – 5% slopes)

Hydrologic Soil Group: A

This soil type is well drained and permeability is rapid at the surface. This soil type poses only slight limitations as sites for homes, local roads, and small commercial buildings.

Millhopper Sand (5% – 8% slopes)

Hydrologic Soil Group: A

This soil type is well drained and permeability is rapid at the surface. This soil type poses only slight limitations as sites for homes and small commercial buildings.

Norfolk Loamy Fine Sand (2% – 5% slopes)

Hydrologic Soil Group: B

This soil type is well drained and permeability is rapid in the surface layer, moderately slow to moderate in the upper part of the subsoil, and very slow to slow in the lower part. This soil type poses slight limitations as sites for small commercial buildings.

Norfolk Loamy Fine Sand (5% – 8% slopes)

Hydrologic Soil Group: B

This soil type is well drained and permeability is rapid at the surface and subsurface layers. This soil type poses moderate limitations as sites for small commercial buildings because of the slope.

Evaluation: The only limitations presented by the site soils primarily relate to limitations presented because of slope in areas where development is proposed. The limitations, therefore, are moderate, and do not present significant limitations for the proposed development.

Flood Potential

Panel 0120D of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) Series, dated June 16, 2006, indicates that the subject property is in Flood Zone X (areas determined to be outside of the 500-year floodplain.)

Evaluation: The subject property is located in Flood Zone X (areas determined to be outside of the 500-year floodplain), therefore there are no issues related to flood potential.

Karst-Sensitive Features

Karst sensitive areas include geologic features, such as fissures, sinkholes, underground streams, and caverns, and are generally the result of irregular limestone formations.

The applicant has submitted two (2) reports pertaining to geologic features: (1) "Report of Geotechnical Exploration Services", Report No. 1211903, prepared by Universal Engineering Sciences and dated May 20, 2016; and (2) "Initial Geotechnical Exploration Services – Limited Sinkhole Potential Evaluation", Report No. 1367557v3, prepared by Universal Engineering Sciences and dated November 14, 2016.

The City engaged the services of GSE Engineering & Consulting, Inc. (GSE) to review the Report of Geotechnical Exploration Services, as well as the civil construction plans and the Stormwater Design Calculations. Upon review of these materials, a letter was issued by GSE (dated June 29, 2016) concerning the geotechnical explorations presented within the materials. In response to the comments provided in GSE's June 29, 2016 letter, the applicant submitted a letter, dated November 21, 2016, addressing the comments provided by GSE in its June 29, 2016 letter, and also submitted a second report entitled "Initial Geotechnical Exploration Services – Limited Sinkhole Potential Evaluation", Report No. 1367557v3, prepared by Universal Engineering Sciences and dated November 14, 2016.

GSE reviewed the applicant's November 21, 2016 letter and the Initial Geotechnical Exploration Services report. Upon review of these materials, GSE concluded in a letter dated December 15, 2016 that the applicant adequately addressed the comments provided in its June 29, 2016 letter, with the exception of a comment pertaining to underdrains beneath the entrance roadways (See Exhibits B.24. and B.25.) Proposed Condition #1, as provided in Exhibit "A" to this Staff Report, would require the applicant to notify the City of any excavation, grading, or other construction activities related to excavation in the right-of-ways of the access roads labelled as "Entrance Road", "Seller Road 1", and "Seller Road 2" on the Site Plan, and within the right-of-way of the extension of NW 151st Boulevard. The proposed condition would also authorize the Public Services Department to determine if any underdrain(s) must be installed within these areas, based upon the subsurface conditions observed during excavation activities, in accordance with the recommendations provided by GSE.

It should be noted that the applicant has provided two (2) additional geotechnical reports in February 2017 [(1) Report of Geotechnical Consulting Services – Pond Berms – Stability Analysis; Universal Engineering Sciences, dated January 29, 2017; and (2)) Report of Geotechnical Consulting Services – Stormwater Management System – Soil Design

Parameters; Universal Engineering Sciences, dated January 29, 2017]. These reports were provided to support the design and recommendations provided within the Stormwater Design Calculations. Since the Stormwater Design Calculations were reviewed by the City's consulting geotechnical engineer, no additional review of the reports provided in February 2017 was necessary.

Evaluation: The geotechnical reports submitted by the applicant provide site-specific data and information concerning geological features that could be present on the subject property. These reports, as well as the civil construction plans and Stormwater Design Calculations, have been reviewed independently by a third-party engineer practicing in the field of geotechnical engineering. The applicant revised the civil construction plans and provided additional information to address comments received by the independent reviewing engineer. Following a review of the revised plans and additional materials submitted to address the review comments, the independent reviewing engineer confirmed that the revised plans and additional materials sufficiently addressed their comments, with the exception of one comment related to underdrains beneath the entrance roadways. To address this comment, proposed Condition #1, as provided in Exhibit "A" to this Staff Report, would require the applicant to notify the City of any excavation, grading, or other construction activities related to excavation in the right-of-ways of the access roads labelled as "Entrance Road", "Seller Road 1", and "Seller Road 2" on the Site Plan, and within the right-of-way of the extension of NW 151st Boulevard. The proposed condition would also authorize the Public Services Department to determine if any underdrain(s) must be installed within these areas, based upon the subsurface conditions observed during excavation activities, in accordance with the recommendations provided by GSE.

Wellfield Protection Zones

Policy 7.2.1 of the Future Land Use Element of the City's Comprehensive Plan establishes a 500 foot radius area around each city-owned potable water well.

Evaluation: The subject property is not located within a City of Alachua wellhead protection zone as identified on the City of Alachua Wellfield Primary Protection Zones Map of the City's Comprehensive Plan, therefore, there are no issues related to wellfield protection.

Historic Structures/Markers and Historic Features

The subject property does not contain any historic structures as determined by the State of Florida and the Alachua County Historic Resources Inventory. Additionally, the subject property is not located within the City's Historic Overlay District, as established by Section 3.7 of the City's Land Development Regulations.

Evaluation: There are no issues related to historic structures or markers.

FINDINGS OF FACT: COMPLIANCE WITH LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS

SECTION 2.4.9(E), SITE PLAN STANDARDS

Section 2.4.9(E) of the City's Land Development Regulations (LDRs) establishes the standards with which all site plans must be found to be compliant. The application has been reviewed for compliance with the standards of Section 2.4.9(E.) An evaluation and findings of the application's compliance with the standards of Section 2.4.9(E) is provided below. The applicant has also provided an analysis of the application's compliance with Section 2.4.9(E) in the application materials.

(E) Site Plan Standards

A Site Plan shall be approved only upon a finding the applicant demonstrates all of the following standards are met:

(1) Consistency with Comprehensive Plan

The development and uses in the Site Plan comply with the Goals, Objectives and Policies of the Comprehensive Plan.

Evaluation & Findings: An analysis of the application's consistency with the Comprehensive Plan has been provided in this report.

(2) Use Allowed in Zone District

The use is allowed in the zone district in accordance with Article 4: *Use Regulations*.

Evaluation & Findings: The subject property is zoned Commercial Intensive (CI). The site plan proposes a large scale retail establishment greater than or equal to 80,000 square feet in area. The use also includes automobile repair and servicing. A large scale retail establishment greater than or equal to 80,000 square feet in area and automobile repair and servicing uses are permitted within the CI zoning district by Special Exception Permit.

The applicant has concurrently submitted two (2) Special Exception Permit applications for the proposed use of the property. Special Exception Permits for large scale retail establishment greater than or equal to 80,000 square feet in area are granted by the City Commission. Section 2.1.3 of the City's LDRs grants the City's Planning & Zoning Board the authority to grant Special Exception Permits for automobile repair and servicing, however, since the Special Exception Permit for this use relates to two (2) actions requiring City Commission action, the Special Exception Permit for automobile repair and servicing shall also be transmitted to the City Commission for final action.

Should the City Commission grant the applicant's Special Exception Permit requests, the use of the subject property as a large-scale retail establishment greater than or equal to 80,000 square feet in area and for automobile repair and servicing would be permitted on the subject property.

(3) *Zone District Use-Specific Standards*

The development and uses in the Site Plan comply with Section 4.3, *Use-Specific Standards*.

Evaluation & Findings: Use-Specific Standards for large scale retail establishments greater than or equal to 80,000 square feet in area are established in Section 4.3.4(G)(7). Use-Specific Standards for automobile repair and servicing are established in Section 4.3.4(J)(3). An analysis of the application's compliance with Sections 4.3.4(G)(7) and 4.3.4(J)(3) has been provided within this Staff Report.

(4) *Development and Design Standards*

The development proposed in the Site Plan and its general layout and design comply with all appropriate standards in Article 6: *Development Standards*.

Evaluation & Findings: The application has been reviewed for and is found to be in compliance with all relevant provisions of Article 6, *Development Standards*, including but not limited to *Section 6.1, Off Street Parking & Loading Standards, Section 6.2, Tree Protection/Landscape/Xeriscape Standards, Section 6.3, Fencing Standards, Section 6.4, Exterior Lighting Standards, Section 6.7, Open Space Standards, and Section 6.9, Environmental Protection Standards*. Further analysis of this application's compliance with *Section 6.8, Design Standards for Business Uses*, has been provided in this Staff Report.

(5) *Subdivision Standards*

In cases where a subdivision has been approved or is pending, the development proposed in the Site Plan and its general layout and design comply with all appropriate standards in Article 7: *Subdivision Standards*.

Evaluation & Findings: No subdivision of land is proposed, therefore, compliance with this standard is not applicable.

(6) *Complies with All Other Relevant Laws and Ordinances*

The proposed site plan development and use complies with all other relevant City laws and ordinances, state and federal laws, and regulations.

Evaluation & Findings: The application is consistent with all other relevant City ordinances and regulations.

SECTION 3.7.2(C)(2) – (5): US HIGHWAY 441/INTERSTATE 75 GATEWAY OVERLAY DISTRICT

Section 3.7.2(C) of the City's Land Development Regulations (LDRs) establishes the US Highway 441/Interstate 75 Gateway Overlay District. Sections 3.7.2(C)(2) – (5) establish the applicability of the overlay district, exemptions, prohibited uses within the overlay district, and development standards for new development within the overlay district. The application has been reviewed for compliance with the standards of Sections 3.7.2(C)(2) – (5). An evaluation and findings of the application's compliance with the standards of Sections 3.7.2(C)(2) – (5) is provided below. The applicant has also provided an analysis of the application's compliance with Sections 3.7.2(C)(2) – (5) in the application materials.

(C) *U.S. Highway 441/Interstate 75 Gateway Overlay District.*

(2) *Applicability.*

- (a) The standards of this section shall apply to all lands that lie within 2,000 feet of the radius of the center point of the interchange of U.S. 441 and I-75.
- (b) The standards of this section shall apply to the entire parcel when all or a portion of a parcel is located within the Gateway Overlay District.
- (c) All proposed uses on property located within the Gateway Overlay District shall comply with all of the requirements of this section.
- (d) All proposed uses on property located within the Gateway Overlay District shall be subject to the development standards set forth in the underlying zoning district, unless a more restrictive standard is established in this section.
- (e) Existing legally approved development on property located within the Gateway Overlay District shall be considered to be a legal nonconformity subject to the nonconformity requirements set forth in Article 8.

Evaluation & Findings: The subject property lies within 2,000 feet of the radius of the center point of the interchange of US Highway 441 and I-75, and is therefore subject to the standards of Section 3.7.2(C).

(3) *Exemptions.*

- (a) Properties with a zoning designation of Planned Unit Development (PUD) or Planned Development (PD) as of the effective date of these regulations (May 23, 2011) shall be exempt from Section 3.7.2 (C) in its entirety.
- (b) Upon written application, the LDR Administrator may grant exemptions from Section 3.7.2(C)(5), Development Standards, for parcels or portions of a parcel that would otherwise be included in the Gateway Overlay District, based on one or more of the following findings:
 - (i) Due to site topography, the development of the property or portion of the property to be exempted will not be substantially visible from I-75 or U.S. 441.
 - (ii) The property is proposed to be developed with a residential, passive recreation, or agricultural related use located on an individual parcel that is not part of a subdivision permitted after the effective date of these regulations.

Evaluation & Findings: The subject property is zoned Commercial Intensive (CI). The applicant has not requested an exemption from Section 3.7.2(C)(5).

(4) *Prohibited uses.*

- (a) Permitted and special exception uses allowed in the underlying zoning designation shall be allowed in the U.S. 441/1-75 Gateway Overlay District, unless modified by the Overlay District standards of this section. The following uses shall be prohibited within the U.S. 441/1-75 Gateway Overlay District:
 - (i) Automobile body shop.
 - (ii) Commercial parking lot or structure.
 - (iii) Crematory.
 - (iv) Funeral home.
 - (v) Laundromat.
 - (vi) Machine shop.
 - (vii) Outdoor display of any type of motorized vehicles, boats, or equipment for sale or rental, except for automobile rentals associated with hotels or motels.
 - (viii) Outdoor kennel.
 - (ix) Recycling dropoff center.

(x) Sexually oriented businesses.

(xi) Tattoo parlors.

Evaluation & Findings: None of the uses prohibited by Section 3.7.2(C)(4) are proposed by the development.

(5) *Development standards.*

(a) *Building design and orientation.*

(i) Architectural elevation plans, drawn to scale, shall be required for all projects involving exterior renovation or new construction.

Evaluation & Findings: Architectural elevation plans, drawn to scale, have been submitted with the Site Plan application.

(ii) Except for roofs, metal shall not be used as a finish building material.

Evaluation & Findings: Metal is not proposed to be used as a finish building material.

(iii) When two or more buildings are proposed on a single lot of record, the primary building shall be oriented to face the public right-of-way.

Evaluation & Findings: Only one building is proposed by the development.

(iv) All accessory structures shall be of comparable design and building materials to the principal structure.

Evaluation & Findings: Accessory structures include material storage areas at the rear of the building and a pick-up canopy to the east of the building. The material storage areas and pick-up canopy structure will be of comparable design and building materials to those proposed for the principal structure.

(v) Glazing shall constitute a minimum of 35 percent of the ground floor area when a building faces and is substantially visible from U.S. 441 or I-75.

Evaluation & Findings: The front (north) façade does not face US 441 or I-75. The west elevation faces I-75, however, this elevation would not be substantially visible from I-75 due to topography; the finished floor elevation of the proposed building; and the provision of landscaping along the west property line.

(vi) Exterior building walls facing a public right-of-way shall incorporate no fewer than three architectural elements comparable to those listed below. Architectural elements contributing to this requirement shall have sufficient visual impact to be noticeable from the public right-of-way, and may include, but not be limited to:

- a. Accent materials.
- b. Public art.
- c. Architectural details, such as tile work and molding integrated into the building facade.
- d. Recesses and/or projections.
- e. Roof overhang, which shall vary according to building width, as follows: one-foot overhang for buildings less than 50 feet in width, two-foot overhang for buildings 50 to 100 feet in width, and three-foot overhang for buildings greater than 100 feet in width.
- f. Varied roof lines.
- g. Articulated cornice lines.
- h. Canopies, awnings, and/or porticos.
- i. Use of brick in at least 30 percent of the facade.
- j. Window shutters.
- k. Change in building materials.
- l. Prominent public entrances defined by substantive architectural features.

m. Fountain or other water feature.

Evaluation & Findings: The applicant has provided at least three of the defined architectural elements for the façades facing a public right-of-way, as follows: East Elevation: (c.) architectural details, such as tile work and molding integrated into the building; (f.) Varied roof lines; (g.) articulated cornice lines; (h.) canopies, awnings, or porticos; (k.) change in building materials; West Elevation: (d.) recesses and/or projections; (f.) varied roof lines; (g.) articulated cornice lines; (k.) change in building materials.

(b) *Fencing.*

- (i) With the exception of ornamental fencing, fences erected after the effective date of these regulations for property with frontage along U.S. 441 shall be installed in the side or rear yard only. Ornamental fencing may be erected inside the front yard.

Evaluation & Findings: The property does not have any frontage along US Highway 441, therefore this provision is not applicable to the proposed development.

(c) *Outside storage areas.*

- (i) All accessory outdoor storage areas shall be screened in accordance with Section 4.4.4(E). Such screening requirements shall apply to the parking of all vehicles used for commercial purposes.

Evaluation & Findings: The applicant proposes a outdoor storage of tires at the rear of the building. This area complies with the screening requirements provided in Section 4.4.4(E).

- (ii) Areas for outdoor storage, trash collection, and loading shall be incorporated into the primary building design. Construction materials for such areas shall be of comparable quality and appearance as the primary building.

Evaluation & Findings: Such areas are incorporated into the design of the building, and construction materials are of a comparable quality and appearance to the building.

(d) *Street buffer.*

- (i) Buffering for properties with frontage along I-75 and U.S. 441 shall meet the requirements of Section 6.2.3(E).

Evaluation & Findings: The proposed development provides buffering along I-75 in accordance with the requirements of Section 6.2.3(E), which pertains to screening along arterial frontages. The property does not have any frontage along US Highway 441.

- (ii) The minimum landscaped buffer width shall be 15 feet. No existing, dedicated, or reserved public or private right-of-way shall be included in the calculation of the buffer width.

Evaluation & Findings: The proposed development provides a buffer greater than 15 feet in width along road frontages.

- (iii) The planting requirements contained in Appendix 6.2.2(A) shall apply. Live Oak shall be used as the required canopy tree. Applicants shall use the following plant materials, in order to create a consistent and uniform planting program for the Gateway Overlay District:

- a. American Holly.
- b. Crape Myrtle.
- c. Drake Elm.
- d. Ligustrum.
- e. Red Maple.
- f. Southern Magnolia.

- g. Southern Red Cedar.
- h. Oak.
- i. Bradford Pear.

Evaluation & Findings: The landscape plan incorporates the required tree species, including: live oak; crape myrtle; southern magnolia; and species of maple and elm.

(e) *Parking areas.*

- (i) All parking areas shall be designed to avoid the appearance of a large expanse of pavement, and shall be conducive to safe pedestrian access and circulation.

Evaluation & Findings: The parking lot area is designed to provide landscaping throughout the parking areas, and provides pedestrian access throughout in accordance with Sections 6.1.10(A) and 6.1.10(B)(2).

- (ii) No more than 25 percent of required parking shall be located in the front of the principal structure, for properties with frontage along U.S. 441. The percentage may be adjusted by the LDR Administrator if the applicant provides written information demonstrating that the property's characteristics, such as size and/or site topography, prevent the applicant from meeting this requirement. Under no circumstances shall the percentage of required parking located in front of the principal structure exceed 50 percent, and shall be the minimum necessary.

Evaluation & Findings: The proposed development does not front US Highway 441.

- (iii) Parking spaces shall not be located within a public right-of-way.

Evaluation & Findings: No parking spaces are located within a public right-of-way.

(f) *Loading areas.*

- (i) Loading areas shall not face a public right-of-way and shall be located at the rear of the principal structure when feasible.

Evaluation & Findings: Loading areas do not face a public right-of-way and are located to the rear of the building.

(g) *Access.*

- (i) Any parcel or assembly of parcels having frontage along U.S. 441 shall be permitted only one direct access. New development shall be designed for cross access to adjacent parcels.

Evaluation & Findings: The proposed development does not have frontage along US Highway 441. Access to the proposed development will be provided by a signalized connection to US Highway 441.

- (h) *Signage.* Except as stated below, signs within the Gateway Overlay District shall comply and be subject to the standards in Section 6.5.

- (i) *Prohibited signs.*

- a. Billboards.
- b. Signs that display video or images or changeable copy.
- c. Balloons, streamers, and air- or gas-filled figures.
- d. Promotional beacons, searchlights, and/or laser lights/images.
- e. Signs that emit audible sounds, smoke, vapor, particles, or odor.
- f. Signs on utility poles or trees.
- g. Signs or advertising devices attached to any vehicle or trailer so as to be visible from public right-of-way, including vehicles with for sale signs and excluding vehicles used for daily transportation, deliveries, or parked while business is being conducted on-site.

- h. Neon tubing used to line the windows, highlight architectural features on the building, or used as part of a sign, excluding incidental signs as provided for in Section 2.4.11.

Evaluation & Findings: No signage identified in Section 3.7.2(C)(5)(h)(i) has been proposed.

(ii) *Freestanding signs.*

- a. Monument signs shall be permitted within the Gateway Overlay District.
- b. A monument sign, including its structure, shall not exceed 16 feet in height.
- c. A sign and its structure shall be composed of materials identical to or similar in appearance, color, and texture to the materials used for the building to which the sign is accessory.
- d. A sign and its structure shall not exceed 100 square feet per side. Changeable copy signs shall only be allowed to comprise up to 50 percent of the total sign area.
- e. Properties with buildings containing multiple tenants or shopping centers shall be limited to one freestanding sign for any one premises, except that a parcel with more than 400 feet of frontage on one or more roads may have two freestanding signs, which must be separated from each other by at least 150 feet of road frontage. A sign and its structure shall not exceed 150 square feet per side. Changeable copy signs shall only be allowed to comprise up to 30 percent of the total sign area.

Evaluation & Findings: Compliance with the provisions of Section 3.7.2(C)(5)(h)(ii) will be reviewed at the time of review of any sign permit(s).

(iii) *Window signs.*

- a. Window signs shall be incorporated into the overall sign area allowed for wall signage as per Section 6.5.4(C)(2).
- b. Signage on any individual window shall not comprise more than 25 percent of the window area.

Evaluation & Findings: Compliance with the provisions of Section 3.7.2(C)(5)(h)(iii) will be reviewed at the time of review of any sign permit(s).

(iv) *Landscaping and buffering.*

- a. All freestanding signs shall provide a landscaped area around base of the sign meeting the following standards:
 - i. Installation of a three-foot landscaped buffer around the base of the sign.
 - ii. Such buffer must be landscaped with a mixture of shrubs, flowers, and/or other plantings native to the area.
 - iii. Xeriscaping shall be utilized to the fullest extent possible to promote sustainable landscaping.
 - iv. Provisions shall be made for irrigation if xeriscaping is not utilized.

Evaluation & Findings: Compliance with the provisions of Section 3.7.2(C)(5)(h)(iv) will be reviewed at the time of review of any sign permit(s).

(v) *Nonconforming signs.*

- a. Nonconforming signs shall be subject to the nonconforming standards as established in Article 8.

Evaluation & Findings: There are no existing nonconforming signs located on the subject property.

SECTION 4.3.4(G)(7): USE-SPECIFIC STANDARDS, LARGE SCALE RETAIL ESTABLISHMENTS GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 80,000 SQUARE FEET

Section 4.3.4(G)(7) of the City's Land Development Regulations (LDRs) establishes Use-Specific Standards for large scale retail establishments that are greater than or equal to 80,000 square feet. The application has been reviewed for compliance with the standards of Section 4.3.4(G)(7). An evaluation and findings of the application's compliance with the standards of Section 4.3.4(G)(7) is provided below. The applicant has also provided an analysis of the application's compliance with Section 4.3.4(G)(7) in the application materials.

(7) *Large-scale retail establishments.* Large-scale retail establishments shall comply with the following standards:

- (a) *Design standards.* All large-scale retail establishments shall comply with the design standards in Subsection 6.8.3, Design standards for business uses.

Evaluation & Findings: An evaluation of the application's compliance with the standards of Subsection 6.8.3 is provided in this Staff Report.

- (b) *Large-scale retail establishments of greater than or equal to 80,000 square feet of gross floor area.*

- (i) Large-scale retail establishments of greater than or equal to 80,000 square feet of gross floor area shall be special exceptions in the CC and CI zoning districts.

Evaluation & Findings: The subject property is zoned Commercial Intensive (CI). The applicant has concurrently submitted a Special Exception Permit application to allow a large-scale retail establishment of greater than or equal to 80,000 square feet of gross floor area on the subject property.

- (ii) As part of the application for special exception, a market and impact study shall be submitted. The study shall be based upon an agreed upon methodology utilizing commonly accepted data sources. Data are to be taken from professionally accepted existing sources, such as the United States Census, State Data Center, State University System of Florida, regional planning councils, water management districts, or existing technical studies. The data used shall be the best available existing data. Where data augmentation, updates, or special studies or surveys are deemed necessary by the City, appropriate methodologies shall be clearly described or referenced and shall meet professionally accepted standards for such methodologies.

- (iii) At a minimum the market and impact study shall include:

- a. Inventory of local retail base.
 - b. Assess market areas and market impacts.
 - c. Services and capital expenditures: Calculate cost of infrastructure and utilities (e.g., streets, sewer connections, water lines, etc.).
 - d. Traffic and other service impacts.
 - e. Calculate the cost of associated economic development incentives (i.e., tax credits).
 - f. Assess the impact of redevelopment zone tax-increment financing.
 - g. Inventory locations of competing retailers.
 - h. Assess impact on existing local retailers.

Evaluation & Findings: The applicant has submitted a Market and Impact Study, prepared by Florida Economic Advisors, and dated March 2016, as part of the aforementioned Special Exception Permit application. The City engaged the services of GAI Consultants, Inc. (GAI) to review the Market and Impact Study. GAI reviewed the Market and Impact Study to assess if the Market and Impact Study sufficiently addressed the requirements of subsections a., b., g.,

and h. above. The findings of the review were summarized in a letter from Owen M. Beitsch, PhD, FAICP, CRE, and David R. Darsey, of GAI, dated June 23, 2016, and is included in Exhibit “B” to this Staff Report – Supporting Application Materials Submitted by City Staff to the Planning & Zoning Board (See Exhibit B.28.)

GAI’s review concluded that the Market and Impact Study satisfies the aforementioned subsections and justifies the development of the project based on general market and economic considerations. Other requirements of subsection iii. were reviewed by City Staff (for subsection c.), through independent review of the Traffic Impact Analysis submitted by the applicant (for subsection d.), or are not applicable to this project (for subsections e. and f.)

SECTION 4.3.4(J)(3): USE-SPECIFIC STANDARDS, AUTOMOBILE REPAIR & SERVICING

Section 4.3.4(J)(3) of the City’s Land Development Regulations (LDRs) establishes Use-Specific Standards for automobile repair and servicing. The application has been reviewed for compliance with the standards of Section 4.3.4(J)(3). An evaluation and findings of the application’s compliance with the standards of Section 4.3.4(J)(3) is provided below. The applicant has also provided an analysis of the application’s compliance with Section 4.3.4(J)(3) in the application materials.

(3) *Automobile repair and servicing.* Automotive repair and servicing shall comply with the following standards:

(a) *Minimum separation.* Lots shall be located at least 250 feet from schools, day care centers, residential uses, or vacant land in residential zone districts.

Evaluation & Findings: The subject property is not located within 250 feet of any school, day care center, residential use, or vacant land in a residential zone district.

(b) *Lot dimensions and area.*

(i) If located on a corner lot, have a minimum of 150 feet of frontage on each street side, and a minimum area of 20,000 square feet.

(ii) In all other instances, have a minimum width of 150 feet and a minimum area of 15,000 square feet.

Evaluation & Findings: The subject property is not a corner lot. The subject property has a minimum width of greater than 150 feet and a minimum area greater than 15,000 square feet.

(c) *On-site circulation.* Be designed to ensure proper functioning of the site as related to vehicle stacking, circulation and turning movements.

Evaluation & Findings: The on-site traffic circulation patterns have been designed to provide proper functioning of the site as related to vehicle stacking, circulation, and turning movements. The applicant has provided on-site traffic control devices, such as stop signs, where warranted. The applicant has provided parking for patrons proximate to the customer entrance into the auto repair and servicing area. Crosswalks have been provided to allow pedestrians to access the automobile repair and servicing area from parking areas.

(d) *Ingress/egress.*

(i) Have no more than two driveways or other methods of ingress or egress located at least 150 feet apart.

Evaluation & Findings: There are two (2) points of ingress/egress to the subject property, located greater than 150 feet apart.

(ii) Methods of ingress/egress shall:

- a. Not exceed 40 feet in width, exclusive of transitions.
- b. Not be located closer than 15 feet to any right-of-way lines of any intersection.
- c. Not be located closer than 15 feet to any other property line.

Evaluation & Findings: The points of ingress/egress to the subject property are designed as the terminus of two roadways that afford access to the site, and are less than 40 feet in width. The ingress/egress points are not within 15 feet of any right-of-way lines of any intersection, and are greater than 15 feet from any other property lines.

- (e) *Enclosure.* Repair and store all vehicles within an enclosed building. Temporary vehicle storage may be allowed in an outdoor storage area that shall be no larger than 25 percent of the total lot area. Such areas shall be located to the rear of the principal structure and be screened from off-site views. The height of materials and equipment stored shall not exceed the height of the screening fence or wall.

Evaluation & Findings: An area is provided inside the building for all repair and servicing operations. No vehicle storage is proposed. The applicant has provided a tire and battery storage area that is screened from off-site views through the combination of screening along the perimeter of the storage area (as shown on the architectural plans) and the site topography (reference grading plans, Sheet C-7).

- (f) *Public address systems.* Have no outdoor speaker or public address system which is audible from single-family lands.

Evaluation & Findings: The applicant has not proposed the use of an outdoor speaker or public address system. Proposed Condition #3, as provided in Exhibit "A" to this Staff Report, would prohibit the use of any outdoor speaker or public address system.

- (g) *Trash storage.* Provide adequate, enclosed trash storage facilities on the site.

Evaluation & Findings: Trash storage is provided south of the building, and will be enclosed with a masonry wall.

- (h) *Testing.* Not test vehicles on residential streets.

Evaluation & Findings: The applicant has stated that no vehicle testing is proposed as part of this project.

- (i) *Parked vehicles.* Not park or store a vehicle as a source of parts, or park or store a vehicle for the purpose of sale or lease/rent.

Evaluation & Findings: The applicant has stated that no vehicle parking or storage of vehicles as a source of parts, or parking or storage of vehicles for the purpose of sale or lease/rent shall occur as part of this project.

- (j) *Vehicle storage.* Not store or park a vehicle that has been repaired and is awaiting removal for more than 30 consecutive days. In cases where a vehicle has been abandoned by its lawful owner prior to or during the repair process, the vehicle may remain on site as long as is necessary after the 30 day period, provided the owner or operator of the establishment can demonstrate steps have been taken to remove the vehicle from the premises using the appropriate legal means.

Evaluation & Findings: The applicant has stated that no parking or storage of vehicles that have been repaired and are awaiting removal is proposed for more than thirty (30) consecutive days.

SECTION 6.8.3: DESIGN STANDARDS FOR SINGLE TENANT RETAIL SALES AND SERVICE USES GREATER THAN OR EQUAL TO 20,000 SQUARE FEET

Section 6.8.3 of the City's Land Development Regulations (LDRs) establishes design standards for single tenant retail sales and services uses greater than or equal to 20,000 square feet. The application has been reviewed for compliance with the standards of Section 6.8.3. An evaluation and findings of the application's compliance with the standards of Section 6.8.3 is provided below. The applicant has also provided an analysis of the application's compliance with Section 6.8.3 in the application materials.

6.8.3 Design standards for single tenant retail sales and service uses greater than or equal to 20,000 square feet.

(A) Facade and material design.

(1) *Generally.* All facades facing a street, lands containing existing residential uses, or vacant land classified as CSV, A, RSF-1, RSF-3, RSF-4, RSF-6, RMH-5, RMH-P, RMF-8, or RMF-15, shall be subject to the standards set forth in Subsection 6.8.3(A)(2).

(2) Standards.

(a) Glazing.

(i) Glazing of the front façade in the following amounts:

- a. Thirty percent of the ground floor facade area when it faces a street or a publicly-accessible parking area which is a part of the development and consists of 15 percent or more of the development's minimum off-street parking requirement pursuant to Section 6.1.4(B);
- b. Twenty percent of the ground floor facade area when it faces any vacant land classified as CSV, A, RSF-1, RSF-3, RSF-4, RSF-6, RMH-5, RMH-P, RMF-8 or RMF-15, or lands containing existing residential uses.

Evaluation & Findings: This provision is applicable to the front façade and east façade (as the east façade faces a street.) Interstate-75 does not afford the property its principle means of access, and therefore, is not a "street" as defined in Article 10 of the City's LDRs. The applicant has elected to use the glazing alternatives provided for in Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(iv). Please reference below for an analysis of the application's compliance with Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(iv).

(ii) For the purposes of this section, the ground floor facade area of single-story buildings shall be calculated by measuring the applicable building wall between the finished grade and the underside of the roof, wall, or parapet of the facade. For buildings with more than one story, the ground floor façade area shall be calculated by measuring the applicable building wall between the finished grade and the underside of the floor above the ground level floor.

Evaluation & Findings: The applicant has provided calculations of the ground floor façade area of the front façade in accordance with the calculation method defined within Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(ii). The calculations are provided on the Architectural Plans submitted with the application.

(iii) Windows shall not use reflective or heavily tinted glass that obstructs views into the building.

Evaluation & Findings: The applicant has proposed transparent windows.

(iv) *Glazing alternatives.* The amount of glazing required pursuant to Subsection 6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(i)a. may be reduced to a minimum of 20 percent when the façade incorporates all of the following architectural elements:

- a. The use of natural brick, a natural brick product, natural stone, or a natural stone product in at least 20 percent of the façade, and;

Evaluation & Findings: The applicant has elected to use the glazing alternative established in this Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(iv). The applicant has provided a calculation of the total front façade area below the roofline (10,198 square feet), the area of the front façade from the ground to the top of parapet walls (14,624 square feet), of the area of the front façade constituting glazing (2,099 square feet, 20.58% of the front façade area), and of the area for which a natural brick product is provided within the front façade (3,344 square feet, 22.86% of the front façade area). The applicant has also provided a calculation of the total east facade area below the roofline (5,694 square feet), the area of the east façade from the ground to the top of parapet walls (7,551 square feet), of the area of the east façade constituting glazing (1,225 square feet, 21.5% of the east façade area), and of the area for which a natural brick product is provided within the east façade (1,724 square feet, 22.83% of the east façade area). Calculations are provided on the Architectural Plans submitted with the application.

- b. Window shutters/plantation-style shutters or a canopy/portico in accordance with the following:
 - i. Window shutters or plantation-style shutters which span a minimum of 10 percent of the length of the façade, or;
 - ii. A canopy or portico which provides a covered pedestrian walkway adjacent to the façade which spans a minimum of 50 percent of the length of the facade, and;

Evaluation & Findings: The applicant has elected to provide window shutters along the front and east façades. The total length of window shutters along each façade exceeds the minimum 10% required.

- c. Customer entrances which include no less than six of the design features provided in Subsection 6.8.3(C)(2)d. The amount of glazing required pursuant to this subsection may be further reduced by up to 5 percent when the façade incorporates a corresponding increase in the percentage of natural brick, natural brick product, natural stone, or natural stone product in addition to the minimum amount required pursuant to Subsection 6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(iv)a.

Evaluation & Findings: The applicant has provided six of the design features established in Section 6.8.3(C)(2) at the customer entrances along the front and east façades: (a) canopies/porticos above the entrance; (b) roof overhangs over the entrance; (c) entry recesses/projections; (e) raised corniced parapets above the entrance; (i) architectural details, such as tile work and moldings, that are integrated into the building structure and design and are above and/or directly adjacent to the entrance; and (j) integral planters or wing walls that incorporate landscaped areas or seating areas.

(b) Facade massing.

- (i) *Offset required.* Front facades 60 feet wide or wider shall incorporate wall offsets of at least two feet in depth (projections or recesses) a minimum of every 40 feet. Each required offset shall have a minimum width of 20 feet.
- (ii) *Offset alternatives.* The following alternatives can be used in place of the required front facade offsets:
 - a. Facade color changes following the same dimensional standards as the offset requirements;

- b. Pilasters having a minimum depth of one foot, a minimum width of one foot, and a minimum height of 80 percent of the facade's height; and/or
- c. Roofline changes when coupled with correspondingly aligned facade material changes.

Evaluation & Findings: The applicant has provided a combination of the offset alternatives established in Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(b)(ii), including: (a) façade color changes following the same dimensional standards as the offset requirements; (b) pilasters having a minimum depth of one foot, a minimum width greater than one foot, and a minimum height of 80 percent of the façade's height; and (c) roofline changes coupled with correspondingly aligned façade material changes. Please reference the architectural plans for a visual representation of which depicts the offset alternatives provided along the front façade.

(c) Roof line changes.

- (i) Roof line changes shall include changes in roof planes or changes in the top of a parapet wall, such as extending the top of pilasters above the top of the parapet wall.
- (ii) When roofline changes are included on a facade that incorporates wall offsets or material or color changes, roofline changes shall be vertically aligned with the corresponding wall offset or material or color changes.

Evaluation & Findings: Roof line changes on the proposed building include changes in the top of the parapet wall. Roof line changes are vertically aligned with corresponding wall material and color changes.

- (d) *Colors.* Facade colors shall be in accordance with the City's adopted color palate. This palate features colors that are low reflectance, subtle, neutral, and/or earth tone colors, while high-intensity colors, bright colors, metallic colors, or black or fluorescent colors are prohibited except for building trim.

Evaluation & Findings: The façade colors incorporate earth tone colors. No high-intensity, bright, metallic, or black or fluorescent colors are proposed.

(e) Prohibited materials. The following materials shall be prohibited:

- (i) Metal siding and exposed smooth-finished concrete block, when visible from a street, existing single-family attached or detached dwellings, or vacant land classified as CSV, A, RSF-1, RSF-3, and RSF-4; and

Evaluation & Findings: Metal siding and smooth-finished concrete block are not proposed on any facade visible from a street, existing single-family attached or detached dwellings, or vacant land classified as CSV, A, RSF-1, RSF-3, and RSF-4.

- (ii) Synthetic stucco (EIFS) within two feet of the grade level and within two feet of any exterior door jamb.

Evaluation & Findings: EIFS is not proposed within two feet of the grade level of any façade or within two feet of any exterior door jamb.

- (f) *Vinyl siding.* Vinyl siding shall be limited to 60 percent or less of any single facade, and all vinyl siding shall have a smooth surface with no visible grained pattern.

Evaluation & Findings: Vinyl siding has not been proposed on any façade.

(B) Roofs.

- (1) *Roof planes.* Except for mansard roofs, cupolas and steeples, sloped roofs shall include two or more sloping roof planes with greater than or equal to one foot of vertical rise for every three feet of horizontal run, and less than or equal to one foot of vertical rise for every one foot of horizontal run.

Evaluation & Findings: The proposed development utilizes a flat roof, and therefore this provision is not applicable.

- (2) *Flat roofs.* When flat roofs are used, parapet walls with three-dimensional cornice treatments shall conceal them. The cornice shall include a perpendicular projection a minimum of eight inches from the parapet facade plane.

Evaluation & Findings: The proposed building provides a parapet wall with a three-dimensional cornice treatment. The cornice treatment includes a perpendicular projection greater than eight (8) inches from the parapet façade plane.

- (3) *Roof penetrations and equipment.* All roof-based mechanical equipment, as well as vents, pipes, antennas, satellite dishes and other roof penetrations (with the exception of chimneys), shall be located on the rear elevations or screened with a parapet wall having a three-dimensional cornice treatment so as to have a minimal visual impact as seen from:

- (a) A public street;
- (b) Vacant land classified as CSV, A, RSF-1, RSF-3, RSF-4, RSF-6, RMH-5, RMH-P, RMF-8 or RMF-15; and
- (c) Lands containing single-family detached, attached, townhouse or two- to four-family dwelling developments.

Evaluation & Findings: All roof-based mechanical equipment and roof penetrations will be screened with a parapet wall having a three-dimensional cornice treatment to minimize visual impact.

(C) *Customer entrances.*

- (1) *Required entrances.* Each side of a building facing a public street shall include at least one customer entrance, except that no large retail establishment shall be required to provide entrances on more than two sides of the structure which face public streets.

Evaluation & Findings: Customer entrances are provided on the elevation which faces a public street (east elevation).

- (2) *Entrance design.* Buildings shall have clearly-defined, highly visible customer entrances that include no less than three of the following design features:

- (a) Canopies/porticos above the entrance;
- (b) Roof overhangs above the entrance;
- (c) Entry recesses/projections;
- (d) Arcades that are physically integrated with the entrance;
- (e) Raised corniced parapets above the entrance;
- (f) Gabled roof forms or arches above the entrance;
- (g) Outdoor plaza adjacent to the entrance having seating and a minimum depth of 20 feet;
- (h) Display windows that are directly adjacent to the entrance;
- (i) Architectural details, such as tile work and moldings, that are integrated into the building structure and design and are above and/or directly adjacent to the entrance; or
- (j) Integral planters or wing walls that incorporate landscaped areas or seating areas. A wing wall is a wall secondary in scale projecting from a primary wall and not having a roof.

Evaluation & Findings: On the front (north) and east façades, the applicant has provided six (6) of the design features into each customer entrance: (a) canopies/porticos above the entrance; (b) roof overhangs over the entrance; (c) entry recesses/projections; (e) raised corniced parapets above the entrance; (i) architectural details, such as tile work and moldings, that are integrated into the building structure and design and are above and/or directly adjacent to the entrance; and (j) integral planters or wing walls that incorporate landscaped areas or seating areas.

On the west façade, the applicant has provided three (3) design features into the customer entrance: (a) canopy/portico above the entrance; (b) roof overhang over the entrance; and (e) raised corniced parapets above the entrance.

(D) *Off-street parking.*

(1) *Location.* No more than 50 percent of the required off-street parking shall be located between the building's primary facade and the street it fronts.

Evaluation & Findings: The building's primary façade does not directly front a street, however, less than 50 percent of the required off-street parking is located in front of the building, as measured by projecting a line from each corner of the front of the building.

(2) *Screening.* Off-street surface parking areas serving a large retail establishment shall be screened in accordance with Section 6.2, in addition to the following:

(a) In cases where a wall or fence is provided in lieu of a continuous opaque screen of shrub material, such fence or wall shall have a minimum height of 36 inches, and be constructed of stone, brick, stucco, wood or similar material designed to resemble such materials;

(b) Any fence or wall shall be located at least four feet from the edge of the lot line; and

(c) All required canopy and understory/ornamental trees shall be located between the fence or wall and the edge of the street right-of-way.

Evaluation & Findings: The applicant has provided landscaping materials in accordance with Section 6.2, and has not elected to provide a wall or fence in lieu of landscaping screening materials to screen parking areas.

(E) *Pedestrian circulation.*

(1) *Sidewalks required.* New large retail establishments shall provide sidewalks constructed in accordance with Subsection 7.3.2(B), Configuration, on all sides of the lot which abut a public street.

Evaluation & Findings: The subject property has limited frontage along two (2) proposed streets, and the streets do not run along or abut the property line of the development.

(2) *Pedestrian pathways.* The on-site pedestrian circulation system shall comply with the standards in Subsection 6.1.10(A), Required improvements, and Subsection 7.3.2(C), Connection.

Evaluation & Findings: The proposed development complies with Section 6.1.10(A), which requires pedestrian crosswalks within parking lots of 100 spaces or more to be at least ten feet (10') in width, either raised above the adjacent pavement, striped, or otherwise designed through the use of alternative materials. Crosswalks are required to be located between all primary building entrances and the parking areas serving those entrances. In addition, Section 6.1.10(A) requires in parking lots of 300 or more spaces, improved pedestrian pathways be provided. These pathways must have a minimum width of three feet (3') located in continuous landscaped parking islands be provided at least every fourth row of parking spaces. The proposed development provides pedestrian pathways within landscaped islands in accordance with Section 6.1.10(A).

The applicant has submitted a companion variance permit application, requesting a variance from Section 6.8.3(E)(2) and from Section 7.3.2(C). Section 7.3.2(C) would require the development to provide a minimum of seven (7) pedestrian connections to the adjacent public sidewalk or greenway network. The variance is sought due to the limitations of the site and the ability to provide connections to the public sidewalk system.

The applicant proposes sidewalks from US Highway 441 to the subject property, along "Entrance Road", "Seller Road 1", and the extension of NW 151st Boulevard. As part of the Variance Permit application, a condition proposed by Staff would require additional

pedestrian connections to be provided between the proposed development and the existing sidewalk system. Specifically, the proposed variance permit condition would require the applicant to provide five foot (5') sidewalks within the right of way of "Seller Road 2" to the north and south the road, as depicted and labeled on Sheet C-6B of the Site Plan, and to provide a 5 foot (5') sidewalk and any necessary crosswalks from the terminus of the right-of-way of "Seller Road 2" connecting said sidewalks along "Seller Road 2" to the primary customer entrances of the development. The sidewalks shall be designed and constructed to comply with the City of Alachua Land Development Regulations and all applicable Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) standards. The proposed variance permit condition would also require the applicant to provide funding to the City for a five foot (5') sidewalk along the south right-of-way line of the NW 151st Boulevard, from the existing terminus of the sidewalk at the intersection of NW 151st Boulevard and NW 148th Drive to the existing terminus of NW 151st Boulevard, which is contiguous to the location of proposed sidewalk improvements as depicted on Sheet C-6B of the Site Plan. The condition requires a Professional Engineer registered in the State of Florida to prepare the calculation of the funding amount, and for the calculation to include the cost of all materials and labor to construct a sidewalk which complies with the City of Alachua Land Development Regulations and all applicable Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) standards. Funding required by this condition must be provided to the City prior to applying for a building permit for the proposed building.

(3) *Connection to public sidewalk system.* In the case of corner lots, a connection shall be made to the sidewalk of both streets.

Evaluation & Findings: The subject property is not a corner lot.

(4) *Distinguished from driving surfaces.* All internal pedestrian walkways shall be distinguished from driving surfaces through the use of durable, low-maintenance surface materials such as pavers, bricks, or scored/stamped concrete or asphalt to enhance pedestrian safety and comfort, as well as the attractiveness of the walkways.

Evaluation & Findings: Pedestrian pathways are proposed to be distinguished from driving surfaces through the use of stamped concrete.

PUBLIC FACILITIES IMPACT

Traffic Impact

Table 2. Affected Comprehensive Plan Roadway Segments¹

Segment Number ^{2, 3}	Segment Description	Lanes	Functional Classification	Area Type	LOS
5 (107/1407)	US 441 (from SR 235 to North City Limits)	4/D	Principle Arterial	Urban Trans	D

¹ Source: City of Alachua Comprehensive Plan, Transportation Element.
² For developments generating 1,000 trips or greater, affected roadway segments are identified as all those wholly or partially located within ½ mile of the development's ingress/egress, or to the nearest intersecting major street, whichever is greater, and all roadway segments for which the proposed development's impacts are 5% or greater on the Maximum Service Volume (MSV) of the roadway [Section 2.4.14(H)(2)(b) of the LDRs].
³ FDOT roadway segment number shown in parenthesis (when applicable.) For the purposes of concurrency management, COA Comprehensive Plan segments that make up a portion of a larger FDOT roadway segment will be evaluated together when determining post development roadway capacity.

Table 3. Trip Generation¹

Land Use	AADT (Enter/Exit) ²	AM Peak Hour (Enter/Exit) ²	PM Peak Hour (Enter/Exit) ²
Discount Superstore (ITE Code 813)	8,191 (4,095/4,096)	299 (167/132)	702 (344/358)
Less Pass-By Trips for Superstore (28%)	2,293 (1,146/1,146)	83 (46/36)	196 (98/98)
Net New Trips ³	5,898 (2,949/2,950)	216 (121/96)	506 (246/260)

¹ Source: ITE Trip Generation, 9th Edition.
² Formulas: AADT – 50.75 trips per 1,000 square feet x 161,400 square feet (50% entering/50% exiting); AM Peak Hour – 1.85 trips per 1,000 square feet x 161,400 square feet (56% entering/44% exiting); PM Peak Hour – 4.35 trips per 1,000 square feet x 161,400 square feet (49% entering/51% exiting.)
³ Source: ITE Trip Generation Manual, 2nd Edition.

Table 4a. Projected Impact on Affected Comprehensive Plan Roadway Segments (AADT)

Traffic System Category	US 441 Segment 5 (107/1407) ¹
Average Annual Daily Trips	
Maximum Service Volume ²	35,500
Existing Traffic ³	24,411
Reserved Trips ⁴	2,260
Available Capacity ⁴	8,829
Increase/Decrease in Daily Trips Generated by Development ⁵	5,898
Residual Capacity After Development's Impacts⁶	2,931

¹ FDOT roadway segment number shown in parenthesis (when applicable.) For the purposes of concurrency management, COA Comprehensive Plan segments that make up a portion of a larger FDOT roadway segment will be evaluated together when determining post development roadway capacity.
² Source: FDOT 2013 Quality/Level of Service Handbook, Generalized Annual Average Daily Volumes and Generalized Peak Hour Two-Way Volumes for Areas Transitioning to Urbanized Areas or Areas of 5,000 Not in Urbanized Areas.
³ Florida State Highway System Level of Service Report 2015, Florida Department of Transportation, District II, September 2016.
⁴ Source: City of Alachua February 2017 Development Monitoring Report.
⁵ Trip Distribution: Reference Traffic Impact Analysis, Walmart #3873 – Alachua, dated November 2016, prepared by Traffic & Mobility Consultants.
⁶ The application is for a Final Development Order. Facility capacity and concurrency will be reserved.

Table 4b. Projected Impact on Affected Comprehensive Plan Roadway Segments (Peak Hour)

Traffic System Category	US 441 Segment 5 (107/1407) ¹
PM Peak Hour Trips	
Maximum Service Volume ²	3,200
Existing Traffic ³	2,319
Reserved Trips ⁴	214
Available Capacity ⁴	667
Increase/Decrease in PM Peak Hour Trips Generated by Development ⁵	506
Residual Capacity After Development's Impacts⁶	161
¹ FDOT roadway segment number shown in parenthesis (when applicable.) For the purposes of concurrency management, COA Comprehensive Plan segments that make up a portion of a larger FDOT roadway segment will be evaluated together when determining post development roadway capacity. ² Source: FDOT 2013 Quality/Level of Service Handbook, Generalized Annual Average Daily Volumes and Generalized Peak Hour Two-Way Volumes for Areas Transitioning to Urbanized Areas or Areas of 5,000 Not in Urbanized Areas. ³ Florida State Highway System Level of Service Report 2015, Florida Department of Transportation, District II, September 2016. ⁴ Source: City of Alachua February 2017 Development Monitoring Report. ⁵ Trip Distribution: Reference Traffic Impact Analysis, Walmart #3873 – Alachua, dated November 2016, prepared by Traffic & Mobility Consultants. ⁶ The application is for a Final Development Order. Facility capacity and concurrency will be reserved.	

Evaluation: The impacts generated by the development would not adversely affect the Level of Service (LOS) of the roadway segments identified above. The impacts that would be generated by the development are acceptable.

Potable Water Impacts

Table 5. Potable Water Impacts

System Category	Gallons Per Day
Current Permitted Capacity ¹	2,300,000
Less Actual Potable Water Flows ¹	1,190,000
Reserved Capacity ²	139,670
Available Capacity	970,330
Projected Potable Water Demand from Application ³	3,347
Residual Capacity	966,983
Percentage of Permitted Design Capacity Utilized	57.96%
Sources: ¹ City of Alachua Public Services Department, April 2016. ² City of Alachua February 2017 Development Monitoring Report. ³ Source: Walmart Prototypical Utility Loads.	

Evaluation: The impacts to the potable water system that would be generated by the development would not adversely affect the Level of Service (LOS) for potable water facilities. The impacts that would be generated by the development are therefore acceptable.

Sanitary Sewer Impacts

Table 6. Sanitary Sewer Impacts

System Category	Gallons Per Day
Treatment Plant Current Permitted Capacity	1,500,000
Less Actual Treatment Plant Flows ¹	615,000
Reserved Capacity ²	100,080
Available Capacity	784,920
Projected Sanitary Sewer Demand from Application ³	3,012
Residual Capacity	781,908
Percentage of Permitted Design Capacity Utilized	47.87%
Sources: ¹ City of Alachua Public Services Department, April 2016. ² City of Alachua February 2017 Development Monitoring Report. ³ Source: Walmart Prototypical Utility Loads.	

Evaluation: The impacts to the sanitary sewer system that would be generated by the development would not adversely affect the Level of Service (LOS) for sanitary sewer facilities. The impacts that would be generated by the development are therefore acceptable.

Solid Waste Impacts

Table 7. Solid Waste Impacts

System Category	Pounds Per Day	Tons Per Year
Demand from Existing Development ¹	39,152	7,145.24
Reserved Capacity ²	4,928.41	899.43
Demand Generated by Application ³	789.04	144
New River Solid Waste Facility Capacity ⁴	50 years	
Sources:		
1 Concurrency Impact Analysis, Walmart #3873-00, Alachua, FL, prepared by CPH Engineers, Inc., dated January 30, 2017.		
2 City of Alachua February 2017 Development Monitoring Report.		
3 Sincero and Sincero; Environmental Engineering: A Design Approach. Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 1996		
4 New River Solid Waste Facility. March 2016.		

Evaluation: The impacts to the solid waste system that would be generated by the development would not adversely affect the Level of Service (LOS) for solid waste facilities. The impacts that would be generated by the development are therefore acceptable.

Recreation Facilities

The proposed development is a nonresidential development. Therefore, there are no impacts to recreation facilities. The development will have no impact to the Level of Service (LOS) of recreation facilities.

Public School Facilities

The proposed development is a nonresidential development. Therefore, there are no impacts to public school facilities. The development will have no impact to the Level of Service (LOS) of public school facilities.

EXHIBIT “A”
TO
WAL-MART #3873
SITE PLAN
STAFF REPORT

CONDITIONS:

1. The extension of a potable water main, as prepared by Brian P. Cassidy, of CPH, Inc., and depicted on plans entitled “Proposed U.S. Highway 441 Watermain Extension”, dated February 17, 2015, as may be revised, shall be constructed, inspected by the City, completed, and accepted, in accordance with the City’s Requirements for Design and Construction, prior to the final inspection for any building permit associated with this Site Plan.
2. The applicant agrees it shall notify the Public Services Department no less than five (5) business days prior to any excavation, grading, or other construction activities related to excavation in the right-of-ways of the access roads labelled as “Entrance Road”, “Seller Road 1”, “Seller Road 2” on the Site Plan, and within the right-of-way of the extension of NW 151st Boulevard. The Public Services Department shall be authorized to determine if any underdrain(s) shall be installed within the specified areas, in accordance with the recommendations of the independent third-party geotechnical review performed by Kenneth L. Hill, P.E., of GSE Engineers and Consultants, Inc., as further described in a letter dated December 15, 2016, and found in Exhibit “B” – Supporting Application Materials Submitted by City Staff to the Planning & Zoning Board.
3. The applicant agrees it shall revise the Site Plan to comply with any conditions of the companion variance permit and special exception permits, including but not limited to revisions necessary to provide five foot (5’) sidewalks within the right of way of “Seller Road 2” to the north and south the road, as depicted and labeled on Sheet C-6B of the Site Plan, and to provide a 5 foot (5’) sidewalk and any necessary crosswalks from the terminus of the right-of-way of “Seller Road 2” connecting said sidewalks along “Seller Road 2” to the primary customer entrances of the development.
4. The applicant agrees it shall not use an outdoor speaker or public address system as part of the automobile repair and servicing use, as part of the outdoor garden center, or any other use proposed by this Site Plan.
5. The applicant agrees it shall provide Public Utilities Easements as depicted on the Site Plan. Public Utilities Easements shall include a legal description of each easement area and a boundary sketch of each described easement. The applicant shall prepare legal descriptions and sketches of each Public Utilities Easement. Public Utilities Easements as depicted on the Site Plan shall be approved by the City and recorded in the Public Records of Alachua County prior to applying for a building permit. The

applicant shall incur all costs associated with the preparation and recordation of such public utility easements.

6. The applicant agrees it shall comply with all comments issued by the Public Services Department as provided in a memorandum from Rodolfo Valladares, P.E., Public Services Director, dated December 15, 2016 and found in Exhibit "B" – Supporting Application Materials Submitted by City Staff to the Planning and Zoning Board.
7. The applicant agrees it shall comply with all recommendations provided by Sergio Reyes, P.E., of EDA Engineers – Surveyors – Planners, Inc., in a letter dated December 15, 2016 and found in Exhibit "B" – Supporting Application Materials Submitted by City Staff to the Planning and Zoning Board.
8. The applicant agrees it shall comply with all recommendations provided by Kenneth L. Hill, P.E., of GSE Engineering and Consulting, Inc., in a letter dated December 15, 2016 and found in Exhibit "B" – Supporting Application Materials Submitted by City Staff to the Planning and Zoning Board.
9. The applicant agrees it shall obtain all other applicable local, state, and federal permits before the commencement of the development.
10. The applicant agrees that Conditions 1 – 10 as stated above do not inordinately burden the land and shall be binding upon the property owner, including any subsequent property owners, successors, or assigns, and that the development shall comply with Conditions 1 – 10 as stated herein.

**EXHIBIT “B”
TO
WAL-MART #3873
SITE PLAN
STAFF REPORT**

**SUPPORTING APPLICATION MATERIALS
SUBMITTED BY CITY STAFF TO THE
PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD**



City of Alachua

Planning & Community Development Department Staff Report

Planning & Zoning Board Hearing Date: Quasi-Judicial Hearing

April 18, 2017

SUBJECT: A request for a Special Exception Permit for automobile repair and servicing as part of a large-scale retail establishment

APPLICANT/AGENT: Brian Cassidy, P.E., CPH, Inc.

PROPERTY OWNER: Wal-Mart Stores East, LP

LOCATION: Approximately 1,000 feet southeast of the US Highway 441/Interstate-75 interchange

PARCEL ID NUMBERS: 03869-013-000

FLUM DESIGNATION: Commercial

ZONING: Commercial Intensive (CI)

OVERLAY: Gateway Overlay District

ACREAGE: ±30.19 acres

PROJECT PLANNER: Justin Tabor, AICP

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that the Planning & Zoning Board transmit the Special Exception Permit for automobile repair and servicing as part of a large-scale retail establishment to the City Commission with a recommendation to approve, subject to the four (4) conditions provided in Exhibit "A" of this Staff Report.

RECOMMENDED MOTION: *Based upon the competent substantial evidence presented at this hearing, the presentation before this Board, and Staff's recommendation, this Board finds the application to be consistent with the City of Alachua Comprehensive Plan and in compliance with the Land Development Regulations and transmits the Special Exception Permit for automobile repair and servicing as part of a large-scale retail establishment to the City Commission with a recommendation to approve, subject to the four (4) conditions provided in Exhibit "A" and located on page 17 of the April 18, 2017, Staff Report to the Planning & Zoning Board.*

CITY OF ALACHUA
STAFF REPORT: WAL-MART #3873
SPECIAL EXCEPTION PERMIT
(AUTOMOBILE REPAIR & SERVICING)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section Title	Page
Summary	3
Surrounding Uses	3
Neighborhood Meeting	4
Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan	5
Findings of Fact: Compliance with Land Development Regulations	8
Section 2.4.4(D), Special Exception Permit Standards	8
Section 4.3.4(J)(3): Use-Specific Standards, Automobile Repair & Servicing	15
Exhibit “A” to Wal-Mart #3873 Special Exception Permit (Automobile Repair & Servicing) Staff Report: Conditions	17
Exhibit “B” to Wal-Mart #3873 Special Exception Permit (Automobile Repair & Servicing) Staff Report: Supporting Application Materials Submitted by City Staff to the Planning & Zoning Board	18

SUMMARY

The proposed Special Exception Permit is a request by Brian Cassidy, P.E., of CPH, Inc., applicant for Wal-Mart Stores East, LP, property owner, for the approval of a Special Exception Permit to permit automobile repair and servicing as part of a large-scale retail establishment. This Special Exception Permit application is a companion to a Site Plan application also submitted by the applicant to construct the proposed ±158,562 square foot building for the large-scale retail establishment and a second Special Exception Permit application to permit a large-scale retail establishment greater than 80,000 square feet in gross floor area. The applicant has also submitted a Variance Permit application to reduce the number of pedestrian connections required by Section 7.3.2(C) of the City’s Land Development Regulations (LDRs) to the adjacent public sidewalk or greenway network. The variance is sought due to the limitations of the site and the ability to provide connections to the public sidewalk system.

Section 2.4.4(A) of the City’s LDRs states that uses that require a Special Exception Permit are those which are, “...generally compatible with the other uses permitted in a zone district, but require individual review of their location, design, configuration, density, intensity, and public facility impact to determine the appropriateness of the use on any particular site in the district and their compatibility with adjacent uses.” Once a Special Exception is granted, the approval shall run with the land and shall not be affected by a change in ownership, unless specifically conditioned as part of the approval. A Special Exception Permit must be granted prior to the approval of the Site Plan and final development order for the proposed development.

The subject property has a Commercial Future Land Use Map (FLUM) Designation, and a Commercial Intensive (CI) zoning designation. Section 4.1 of the City’s Land Development Regulations (LDRs) requires automobile repair and servicing uses to obtain a Special Exception Permit when located in the CI zoning district.

Automobile repair and servicing uses are subject to Use-Specific Standards provided in Section 4.3.4(J)(3) of the City’s LDRs. An analysis of this application’s compliance with the standards established by Section 4.3.4(J)(3) is provided within this report.


SURROUNDING USES

The existing uses, Future Land Use Map (FLUM) Designations, and zoning districts of the surrounding area are identified in Table 1. Map 1 provides an overview of the vicinity of the subject property. (NOTE: The information below is intended to provide a general overview of the area surrounding the subject property and to generally orient the reader. It is not intended to be all-inclusive, and may not identify all existing uses, FLUM Designations, and/or zoning districts surrounding the subject property.)

Table 1. Surrounding Land Uses

Direction	Existing Use(s)	FLUM Designation(s)	Zoning District(s)
North	Vacant Warehouse Building; McDonald’s BP Gas Station; Quality Inn	Commercial	Commercial Intensive (CI)
South	Vacant Commercial Land	Commercial	Commercial Intensive (CI)
East	Vacant Commercial Land	Commercial	Commercial Intensive (CI)
West	Interstate-75	N/A	N/A

Map 1. Vicinity Map



NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING

The purpose of a Neighborhood Meeting is to educate the owners of nearby land and any other interested members of the public about the project and to receive comments regarding the project. As required by Section 2.2.4 of the LDRs, all property owners within 400 feet of the subject property were notified of the meeting and notice of the meeting was published in a newspaper of general circulation.

A Neighborhood Meeting was held at 5:30 PM on March 15, 2016, at the Swick House, located at 15010 NW 142nd Terrace. The applicant's agent was present and available to answer questions. As evidenced by materials submitted by the applicant, one (1) person attended the meeting. A summary of the discussion which occurred at the Neighborhood Meeting has been provided by the applicant and is included within the application materials.

CONSISTENCY WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The Goals, Objectives, and Policies (GOPs) identified below are provided to establish a basis of the application's consistency with the Comprehensive Plan. There may be additional GOPs which the application is consistent with that are not identified within this report. An evaluation and findings of consistency with the identified GOPs is also provided below.

Future Land Use Element

GOAL 1: Future Land Use Map 2025:

The City of Alachua shall maintain a Future Land Use Map in order to effectively guide development in a sustainable manner and to ensure economic prosperity and stability while maintaining a high quality of life for all of its present and future citizens.

Objective 1.3: Commercial

The City of Alachua shall establish three commercial districts: Community Commercial, Commercial and Central Business District. These districts shall provide a broad range of retail sales and services, as well as office uses, in order to provide for the availability of goods and services, both to the citizens of Alachua and to the citizens of the North Central Florida region.

Policy 1.3.b: Commercial: The Commercial land use category is established to provide for general commercial uses, as well as more intense commercial and highway commercial uses. This is the land use category in which large-scale, regional commercial uses may locate. The following uses are allowed within the Commercial land use category:

1. Retail sales and services;
2. Personal services;
3. Financial Institutions;
4. Outdoor recreation and entertainment;
5. Tourist-related uses;
6. Hotels, motels;
7. Commercial shopping centers;
8. Auto-oriented uses;
9. Traditional Mixed-use Neighborhood Planned Developments;
10. Employment Center Planned Developments;
11. Commercial recreation centers;
12. Office/business parks;
13. Limited industrial services;
14. Eating Establishments

Evaluation and Findings of Consistency with Goal 1, Objective 1.3, and Policy 1.3.b: The subject property has a Commercial FLUM Designation, which permits auto-oriented uses. The proposed uses are consistent with the uses identified within Policy 1.3.b as allowed within the Commercial FLUM Designation.

Objective 5.2: Availability of facilities and services: The City shall utilize a concurrency management system to ensure that the adopted level of service standards are maintained.

Policy 5.2.a: All new development shall meet level of service requirements for roadways, potable water and sanitary sewer, stormwater, solid waste, public schools,

and improved recreation in accordance with LOS standards adopted in the elements addressing these facilities.

Evaluation and Findings of Consistency with Objective 5.2 and Policy 5.2.a: The applicant has submitted a Concurrency Impact Analysis identifying the potential demands on public facilities. The Concurrency Impact Analysis considers existing and reserved capacities. In addition, the applicant has submitted a Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by Mohammed Abdallah of Traffic & Mobility Consultants, dated November 3, 2016, to address the project's potential impacts to transportation facilities. An analysis of the development's impact to public facilities is also provided within this report. The Concurrency Impact Analysis prepared by the applicant, the Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by Traffic & Mobility Services, and the analysis provided within this report demonstrate that the development would not adversely affect the level of service (LOS) standard of any monitored public facilities.

Policy 9.1: Any new development within a Commercial or Industrial Future Land Use Map Designation within the corporate limits, where potable water and wastewater service are available, as defined in Policy 1.2.a and Policy 4.2.a of the Community Facilities and Natural Groundwater Aquifer Recharge Element of the City of Alachua Comprehensive Plan, shall connect to the City of Alachua's potable water and wastewater system.

Evaluation and Findings of Consistency with Policy 9.1: The proposed development would connect to potable water and wastewater facilities.

Transportation Element

Objective 1.1: Level of Service

The City shall establish a safe, convenient and efficient level of service standard for all motorized and non-motorized transportation systems.

Evaluation and Findings of Consistency with Objective 1.1: The applicant has submitted a Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by Mohammed Abdallah of Traffic & Mobility Consultants, dated November 3, 2016, that demonstrates the proposed development would not adversely affect the level of service of transportation facilities.

Community Facilities & Natural Groundwater Aquifer Recharge Element

Policy 1.1.d:

The City hereby establishes the following level of service standards for sanitary sewer facilities:

Levels of Service

- a. **Quality:** Compliance with all applicable standards of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP).
- b. **Quantity:** System-wide wastewater collection and treatment will be sufficient to provide a minimum of 250 gallons per day per equivalent residential unit (ERU) on an average annual basis. Plant expansion shall be planned in accordance with F.A.C. 62-600.405, or subsequent provision. This level of service standard shall be re-evaluated one year from the adoption date for the amended Plan.
- c. **System capacity:** If the volume of existing use in addition to the volume of the committed use of the City's wastewater facility reaches 85% of the permitted capacity design, no further development orders for projects without reserved capacity will be issued until additional capacity becomes available or funds to

increase facility capacity are committed in accordance with a development agreement.

Evaluation and Findings of Consistency with Policy 1.1.d: An analysis of the development's impacts to sanitary sewer facilities is provided within this report. The development would not adversely affect the level of service for sanitary sewer facilities.

Policy 1.2.a: The City shall establish a Community Wastewater Service Area, which includes all areas where wastewater service is available. Wastewater service shall be deemed available if:

3. A gravity wastewater system, wastewater pumping station, or force main exists within ¼ mile of the property line of any residential subdivision with more than 5 units, or any multi-family residential development, or any commercial development, or any industrial development and the gravity wastewater system, wastewater pumping station, or force main can be accessed through public utility easements or right of ways. The distance shall be measured as required for construction of the infrastructure along public utility easements and right of ways.

Evaluation and Findings of Consistency with Policy 1.2.a: The proposed development is located within the City's utility service area and would connect to the City's wastewater system.

Policy 2.1.a: The City hereby establishes the following level of service standards for solid waste disposal facilities:

<u>FACILITY TYPE</u>	<u>LEVEL OF SERVICE STANDARD</u>
Solid Waste Landfill	.73 tons per capita per year

Evaluation and Findings of Consistency with Objective 2.1.a: An analysis of the development's impacts to solid waste facilities is provided within this report. The development would not adversely affect the level of service for solid waste facilities.

Policy 4.1.b: The City shall establish a Community Potable Water Service Area, which includes all areas where potable water service is available. Water service shall be deemed available if:

3. A water main exists within ¼ mile of any residential subdivision with more than 5 units, or any multi-family residential development, or any commercial development, or any industrial development and water service can be accessed through public utility easements or right of ways. The distance shall be measured as required for construction of the infrastructure along public utility easements and right of ways.

Evaluation and Findings of Consistency with Policy 4.1.b: The proposed development is located within the City's utility service area and would connect to the City's potable water system.

Policy 4.1.c: The City establishes the following level of service standards for potable water:

1. Quality: Compliance with all applicable standards of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection.
2. Quantity: System-wide potable water distribution and treatment will be sufficient to provide a minimum of 275 gallons per day per equivalent residential unit (ERU) on an average annual basis. Plant expansion shall be planned in accordance with Florida Administrative Code.
3. System Capacity: If the volume of existing use in addition to the volume of the committed use of the City's potable water facility reaches 85% of

the permitted design capacity, no further development orders or permits for projects without reserved capacity will be issued until additional capacity becomes available or funds to increase facility capacity are committed in accordance with a development agreement.

Evaluation and Findings of Consistency with Objective 4.1.c: An analysis of the development's impacts to potable water facilities is provided within this report. The development would not adversely affect the level of service for potable water facilities.

FINDINGS OF FACT: COMPLIANCE WITH LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS

SECTION 2.4.4(D), SPECIAL EXCEPTION STANDARDS

Section 2.4.4(D) of the City's Land Development Regulations (LDRs) establishes the standards with which all applications for a Special Exception Permit must be found to be compliant. The application has been reviewed for compliance with the standards of Section 2.4.4(D). An evaluation and findings of the application's compliance with the standards of Section 2.4.4(D) is provided below. The applicant has also provided an analysis of the application's compliance with Section 2.4.4(D) in the supporting application materials.

(D) *Special exception standards.* A special exception permit shall be approved only upon a finding the applicant demonstrates all the following standards are met:

(1) *Complies with use specific regulations.* The proposed special exception complies with all relevant standards in Section 4.3, Use specific standards.

Evaluation & Findings: An analysis of the proposed special exception's compliance with Section 4.3.4(J)(3) is provided in this Staff Report. The applicant has also provided an analysis of the application's compliance with Section 4.3.4(J)(3) within the supporting application materials.

(2) *Compatibility.* The proposed special exception is appropriate for its location and compatible with the character of surrounding lands and the uses permitted in the zone district.

Evaluation & Findings: Compatibility is defined by the City's Comprehensive Plan as, "a condition in which land uses or conditions can coexist in relative proximity to each other in a stable fashion over time such that no use or condition is unduly negatively impacted directly or indirectly by another use or condition."

The subject property has a Commercial FLUM Designation, and is zoned Commercial Intensive (CI). The subject property is located proximate to the US Highway 441/Interstate 75 interchange. Interstate 75 is located immediately to the west of the subject property, and the lands surrounding the subject property on the north, east, and south have a Commercial FLUM Designation and are zoned CI.

The Commercial FLUM Designation is described as follows in Policy 1.3.b of the Future Land Use Element:

Commercial: The Commercial land use category is established to provide for general commercial uses, as well as more intense commercial and highway commercial uses. This is the land use category in which large-scale, regional commercial uses may locate. The following uses are allowed within the Commercial land use category:

1. Retail sales and services;
2. Personal services;
3. Financial Institutions;
4. Outdoor recreation and entertainment;
5. Tourist-related uses;
6. Hotels, motels;
7. Commercial shopping centers;
8. Auto-oriented uses;
9. Traditional Mixed-use Neighborhood Planned Developments;
10. Employment Center Planned Developments;
11. Commercial recreation centers;
12. Office/business parks;
13. Limited industrial services;
14. Eating Establishments

The CI zoning district is described by Section 3.5.2(E) of the City's LDRs as follows:

"The CI District is established and intended to provide lands and facilitate highway-oriented development opportunities within the City, for uses that require high public visibility and an accessible location. The CI district should be located along major arterials or highways and at the US 441/Interstate-75 interchange."

The existing uses, Future Land Use Map (FLUM) Designations, and zoning districts of the surrounding area are identified in Table 2.

Table 2. Surrounding Land Uses

Direction	Existing Use(s)	FLUM Designation(s)	Zoning District(s)
North	Vacant Warehouse Building; McDonald's BP Gas Station; Quality Inn	Commercial	Commercial Intensive (CI)
South	Vacant Commercial Land	Commercial	Commercial Intensive (CI)
East	Vacant Commercial Land	Commercial	Commercial Intensive (CI)
West	Interstate-75	N/A	N/A

The proposed development will provide buffering in accordance with the requirements of the City's LDRs. In addition, the building will be located centrally on the site, providing a setback from the east property line of ± 265 feet, a setback from the south property line of ± 223 feet, and a setback from the west property line (Interstate 75) of ± 181 feet.

The proposed automobile repair and servicing component of the proposed development would be located on the west side of the building, which is adjacent Interstate 75, effectively eliminating the visibility of any activity associated with automobile repair and servicing on the subject property from areas to the south, east, and north. In accordance with the Use-Specific Standards for automobile repair and servicing, as established by Section 4.3.4(J)(3) of the City's LDRs, all repair and servicing is proposed to occur inside the building. Proposed Condition #2 would require that all repair and servicing activity occur within the building.

Given the preceding, the proposed development would be compatible with the uses permitted on lands in relative proximity to the subject property. The configuration and overall design of the proposed development is sensitive to surrounding areas to minimize any potential impacts to lands in relative proximity to the site.

- (3) *Design minimizes adverse impact.* The design of the proposed special exception minimizes adverse effects, including visual impacts of the proposed use on adjacent lands; furthermore, the proposed special exception avoids significant adverse impact on surrounding lands regarding service delivery, parking and loading, odors, noise, glare, and vibration, and does not create a nuisance.

Evaluation & Findings: The proposed development will provide buffering in accordance with the requirements of the City's LDRs. In addition to buffering, the applicant has provided earthen berms along the east, south, and west property lines to minimize further buffer the visibility of the building from off-site.

The topography of the site lessens the visibility of the building and the automobile repair and servicing area from the south and west, as the finished floor of the building will be at a lower elevation than the elevation of the grade at these property lines. The finished floor elevation of the building is 118 feet. The grade along the south property line varies from approximately 150 feet near the east property line, to approximately 130 feet near the west property line. Along the west property line, the grade varies from approximately 130 feet near the south property line to approximately 120 feet near the front building façade. The automobile repair and servicing area will be located on the west side and near the southwest corner of the building.

In addition to the preceding, the building will be located centrally on the site, providing a setback from the east property line of ±265 feet, a setback from the south property line of ±223 feet, and a setback from the west property line (Interstate 75) of ±181 feet. Further, the minimum perimeter buffer width along the south property boundary is 7.5 feet. The proposed buffer width along the south property boundary, the proposed buffer width is 186 feet. The City's LDRs require arterial screening in accordance with Section 6.2.3(E) be provided for the frontage of Interstate 75. Landscaping in accordance with the requirements of Section 6.2.3(E) has been provided along the subject property's Interstate 75 frontage.

The proposed development would provide landscape buffering in accordance with the City's LDRs. Additional landscaping has been provided within perimeter buffer areas to meet required tree mitigation. This additional landscaping further minimizes visual and aural impacts which may be created by the automobile repair and servicing use and by the proposed development.

- (4) *Design minimizes environmental impact.* The proposed special exception minimizes environmental impacts and does not cause significant deterioration of light, water and air resources, wildlife habitat, stormwater management, scenic resources, and other natural resources.

Evaluation & Findings: The subject property is presently undeveloped and consists primarily of open lands. The subject property is not located within a special flood hazard area, and the site does not contain any wetlands, lakes, ponds, or other waterways. The subject property is not known to contain any endangered or protected flora or fauna.

The City's LDRs require development to provide a minimum of 10 percent of the site as open space. The proposed development would provide approximately 50 percent of the site as open space.

The storage and use of any regulated materials is subject to State and Federal environmental regulation. The applicant states that used motor oil shall be stored in a waste oil tank that is of double wall construction and located in a containment well to collect oil should a spill occur. All other regulated fluids are stored in areas with containment systems, and floor drains will collect and discharge to an oil and water separator prior to any discharge to the sanitary sewer system.

- (5) *Roads and other public facilities.* There is adequate public facility capacity available to serve the proposed special exception, and the proposed special exception use is designed to ensure safe ingress and egress onto the site and safe road conditions around the site.

Evaluation & Findings: The applicant has submitted a Concurrency Impact Analysis which identifies the demands generated by the proposed development upon public facilities. The Concurrency Impact Analysis considers existing and reserved capacities of each public facility.

In addition, and also submitted as part of the supporting application materials, the applicant has submitted a Traffic Impact Analysis, prepared by Mohammed Abdallah of Traffic & Mobility Consultants, dated November 2016. The City engaged the services of Volkert, Inc. to perform an independent review of the Traffic Impact Analysis. The findings of the independent review performed by Volkert, Inc. are included in the materials attached to this report as Exhibit “B” – Supporting Application Materials Submitted by City Staff to the Planning and Zoning Board (See Exhibit B.13. and B.14.) As evidenced in the review letters received from Volkert, Inc., the applicant satisfactorily addressed all comments pertaining to Volkert Inc.’s review of the Traffic Impact Analysis.

The Concurrency Impact Analysis prepared by the applicant, the Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by Traffic & Mobility Consultants, and the analysis of impacts to public facilities provided below demonstrate that the development would not adversely affect the level of service (LOS) standard of the public facilities monitored for concurrency.

Traffic Impact

Table 3. Affected Comprehensive Plan Roadway Segments¹

Segment Number ^{2,3}	Segment Description	Lanes	Functional Classification	Area Type	LOS
5 (107/1407)	US 441 (from SR 235 to North City Limits)	4/D	Principle Arterial	Urban Trans	D

1 Source: City of Alachua Comprehensive Plan, Transportation Element.
2 For developments generating 1,000 trips or greater, affected roadway segments are identified as all those wholly or partially located within ½ mile of the development's ingress/egress, or to the nearest intersecting major street, whichever is greater, and all roadway segments for which the proposed development's impacts are 5% or greater on the Maximum Service Volume (MSV) of the roadway [Section 2.4.14(H)(2)(b) of the LDRs].
3 FDOT roadway segment number shown in parenthesis (when applicable.) For the purposes of concurrency management, COA Comprehensive Plan segments that make up a portion of a larger FDOT roadway segment will be evaluated together when determining post development roadway capacity.

Table 4. Trip Generation¹

Land Use	AADT (Enter/Exit) ²	AM Peak Hour (Enter/Exit) ²	PM Peak Hour (Enter/Exit) ²
Discount Superstore (ITE Code 813)	8,191 (4,095/4,096)	299 (167/132)	702 (344/358)
Less Pass-By Trips for Superstore (28%)	2,293 (1,146/1,146)	83 (46/36)	196 (98/98)
Net New Trips ³	5,898 (2,949/2,950)	216 (121/96)	506 (246/260)

1 Source: ITE Trip Generation, 9th Edition.
2 Formulas: AADT – 50.75 trips per 1,000 square feet x 161,400 square feet (50% entering/50% exiting); AM Peak Hour – 1.85 trips per 1,000 square feet x 161,400 square feet (56% entering/44% exiting); PM Peak Hour – 4.35 trips per 1,000 square feet x 161,400 square feet (49% entering/51% exiting).
3 Source: ITE Trip Generation Manual, 2nd Edition.

Table 5a. Projected Impact on Affected Comprehensive Plan Roadway Segments (AADT)

Traffic System Category	US 441 Segment 5 (107/1407) ¹
Average Annual Daily Trips	
Maximum Service Volume ²	35,500
Existing Traffic ³	24,411
Reserved Trips ⁴	2,260
Available Capacity ⁴	8,829
Increase/Decrease in Daily Trips Generated by Development ⁵	5,898
Residual Capacity After Development's Impacts⁶	2,931
¹ FDOT roadway segment number shown in parenthesis (when applicable.) For the purposes of concurrency management, COA Comprehensive Plan segments that make up a portion of a larger FDOT roadway segment will be evaluated together when determining post development roadway capacity. ² Source: FDOT 2013 Quality/Level of Service Handbook, Generalized Annual Average Daily Volumes and Generalized Peak Hour Two-Way Volumes for Areas Transitioning to Urbanized Areas or Areas of 5,000 Not in Urbanized Areas. ³ Florida State Highway System Level of Service Report 2015, Florida Department of Transportation, District II, September 2016. ⁴ Source: City of Alachua February 2017 Development Monitoring Report. ⁵ Trip Distribution: Reference Traffic Impact Analysis, Walmart #3873 – Alachua, dated November 2016, prepared by Traffic & Mobility Consultants. ⁶ The application is for a Final Development Order. Facility capacity and concurrency will be reserved.	

Table 5b. Projected Impact on Affected Comprehensive Plan Roadway Segments (Peak Hour)

Traffic System Category	US 441 Segment 5 (107/1407) ¹
PM Peak Hour Trips	
Maximum Service Volume ²	3,200
Existing Traffic ³	2,319
Reserved Trips ⁴	214
Available Capacity ⁴	667
Increase/Decrease in PM Peak Hour Trips Generated by Development ⁵	506
Residual Capacity After Development's Impacts⁶	161
¹ FDOT roadway segment number shown in parenthesis (when applicable.) For the purposes of concurrency management, COA Comprehensive Plan segments that make up a portion of a larger FDOT roadway segment will be evaluated together when determining post development roadway capacity. ² Source: FDOT 2013 Quality/Level of Service Handbook, Generalized Annual Average Daily Volumes and Generalized Peak Hour Two-Way Volumes for Areas Transitioning to Urbanized Areas or Areas of 5,000 Not in Urbanized Areas. ³ Florida State Highway System Level of Service Report 2015, Florida Department of Transportation, District II, September 2016. ⁴ Source: City of Alachua February 2017 Development Monitoring Report. ⁵ Trip Distribution: Reference Traffic Impact Analysis, Walmart #3873 – Alachua, dated November 2016, prepared by Traffic & Mobility Consultants. ⁶ The application is for a Final Development Order. Facility capacity and concurrency will be reserved.	

Evaluation: The impacts generated by the development would not adversely affect the Level of Service (LOS) of the roadway segments identified above. The impacts that would be generated by the development are acceptable.

Potable Water Impacts

Table 6. Potable Water Impacts

System Category	Gallons Per Day
Current Permitted Capacity ¹	2,300,000
Less Actual Potable Water Flows ¹	1,190,000
Reserved Capacity ²	139,670
Available Capacity	970,330
Projected Potable Water Demand from Application ³	3,347
Residual Capacity	966,983
Percentage of Permitted Design Capacity Utilized	57.96%
Sources: ¹ City of Alachua Public Services Department, April 2016. ² City of Alachua February 2017 Development Monitoring Report. ³ Source: Walmart Prototypical Utility Loads.	

Evaluation: The impacts to the potable water system that would be generated by the development would not adversely affect the Level of Service (LOS) for potable water facilities. The impacts that would be generated by the development are therefore acceptable.

Sanitary Sewer Impacts

Table 7. Sanitary Sewer Impacts

System Category	Gallons Per Day
Treatment Plant Current Permitted Capacity	1,500,000
Less Actual Treatment Plant Flows ¹	615,000
Reserved Capacity ²	100,080
Available Capacity	784,920
Projected Sanitary Sewer Demand from Application ³	3,012
Residual Capacity	781,908
Percentage of Permitted Design Capacity Utilized	47.87%
Sources: ¹ City of Alachua Public Services Department, April 2016. ² City of Alachua February 2017 Development Monitoring Report. ³ Source: Walmart Prototypical Utility Loads.	

Evaluation: The impacts to the sanitary sewer system that would be generated by the development would not adversely affect the Level of Service (LOS) for sanitary sewer facilities. The impacts that would be generated by the development are therefore acceptable.

Solid Waste Impacts

Table 8. Solid Waste Impacts

System Category	Pounds Per Day	Tons Per Year
Demand from Existing Development ¹	39,152	7,145.24
Reserved Capacity ²	4,928.41	899.43
Demand Generated by Application ³	789.04	144
New River Solid Waste Facility Capacity ⁴	50 years	
Sources:		
1 Concurrence Impact Analysis, Walmart #3873-00, Alachua, FL, prepared by CPH Engineers, Inc., dated January 30, 2017.		
2 City of Alachua February 2017 Development Monitoring Report.		
3 Sincero and Sincero; Environmental Engineering: A Design Approach. Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 1996		
4 New River Solid Waste Facility. March 2016.		

Evaluation: The impacts to the solid waste system that would be generated by the development would not adversely affect the Level of Service (LOS) for solid waste facilities. The impacts that would be generated by the development are therefore acceptable.

Recreation Facilities

The proposed development is a nonresidential development. Therefore, there are no impacts to recreation facilities. The development will have no impact to the Level of Service (LOS) of recreation facilities.

Public School Facilities

The proposed development is a nonresidential development. Therefore, there are no impacts to public school facilities. The development will have no impact to the Level of Service (LOS) of public school facilities.

- (6) *Not injure neighboring land or property values.* The proposed special exception will not substantially injure the use of neighboring land for those uses that are permitted in the zone district, or reduce land values.

Evaluation & Findings: The adjacent lands to the subject property are vacant. These lands have a Commercial FLUM Designation and Commercial Intensive (CI) zoning designation, which is also the FLUM Designation and zoning of the subject property.

As further described within this Staff Report, the proposed development would provide greater setbacks and buffering between the building and on-site features (such as parking/circulation and service delivery areas) than required by the City's LDRs. These increased setbacks and buffering provide further protections to adjacent and neighboring lands to reduce any potential impacts the proposed development may create. In addition, the location of the automobile repair and servicing use on the west side of the building significantly reduces and/or eliminates its view from adjacent and neighboring lands to the south, east, and north. The topography of the site, proposed grading, and finished floor elevation of the building will also limit its visibility from Interstate 75 to the west.

- (7) *Site plan.* A site plan (Subsection 2.4.9 of this section) has been prepared that demonstrates how the proposed special exception use complies with the other standards of this subsection.

Evaluation & Findings: A Site Plan has been submitted concurrently with this Special Exception Permit application, and demonstrates how the proposed use would comply with the other standards of Section 2.4.4(D) and other applicable provisions of the City's LDRs, including but not limited to Section 2.4.9, *Site Plan*, Section 4.3.4(J)(3), *Use-Specific Standards, Automobile repair and servicing*, Section 6.1, *Off-street parking and loading standards*, Section 6.2, *Tree protection/landscape/xeriscape standards*, Section 6.4, *Exterior lighting standards*, Section 6.7, *Open space standards*, Section 6.8, *Design standards for business uses*, and Section 6.9 *Environmental protection standards*.

- (8) *Complies with all other relevant laws and ordinances.* The proposed special exception use complies with all other relevant City laws and ordinances, State and Federal laws, and regulations.

Evaluation & Findings: The proposed development will be required to comply with all other relevant City laws and ordinances, as well as state and federal laws and regulations. The applicant will be required to obtain all other applicable permits, which may include, but is not limited, permits from the Suwannee River Water Management District (SRWMD), the Florida Department of Transportation, (FDOT), and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP), and other agencies regulating materials used as part of the proposed automobile repair and servicing use.

SECTION 4.3.4(J)(3): USE-SPECIFIC STANDARDS, AUTOMOBILE REPAIR & SERVICING

Section 4.3.4(J)(3) of the City's Land Development Regulations (LDRs) establishes Use-Specific Standards for automobile repair and servicing. The application has been reviewed for compliance with the standards of Section 4.3.4(J)(3). An evaluation and findings of the application's compliance with the standards of Section 4.3.4(J)(3) is provided below. The applicant has also provided an analysis of the application's compliance with Section 4.3.4(J)(3) in the application materials.

Compliance with certain standards of Section 4.3.4(J)(3) are demonstrated by the companion Site Plan application through site design and/or configuration of the proposed development, as shown on the civil construction plans and architectural plans.

(3) *Automobile repair and servicing.* Automotive repair and servicing shall comply with the following standards:

(a) *Minimum separation.* Lots shall be located at least 250 feet from schools, day care centers, residential uses, or vacant land in residential zone districts.

Evaluation & Findings: The subject property is not located within 250 feet of any school, day care center, residential use, or vacant land in a residential zone district.

(b) *Lot dimensions and area.*

(i) If located on a corner lot, have a minimum of 150 feet of frontage on each street side, and a minimum area of 20,000 square feet.

(ii) In all other instances, have a minimum width of 150 feet and a minimum area of 15,000 square feet.

Evaluation & Findings: The subject property is not a corner lot. The subject property has a minimum width of greater than 150 feet and a minimum area greater than 15,000 square feet.

(c) *On-site circulation.* Be designed to ensure proper functioning of the site as related to vehicle stacking, circulation and turning movements.

Evaluation & Findings: The on-site traffic circulation patterns have been designed to provide proper functioning of the site as related to vehicle stacking, circulation, and turning movements. The applicant has provided on-site traffic control devices, such as stop signs, where warranted. The applicant has provided parking for patrons proximate to the customer entrance into the auto repair and servicing area. Crosswalks have been provided to allow pedestrians to access the automobile repair and servicing area from parking areas.

(d) *Ingress/egress.*

(i) Have no more than two driveways or other methods of ingress or egress located at least 150 feet apart.

Evaluation & Findings: There are two (2) points of ingress/egress to the subject property, located greater than 150 feet apart.

(ii) Methods of ingress/egress shall:

a. Not exceed 40 feet in width, exclusive of transitions.

b. Not be located closer than 15 feet to any right-of-way lines of any intersection.

c. Not be located closer than 15 feet to any other property line.

Evaluation & Findings: The points of ingress/egress to the subject property are designed as the terminus of two roadways that afford access to the site, and are less than 40 feet in width. The ingress/egress points are not within 15 feet of any right-of-way lines of any intersection, and are greater than 15 feet from any other property lines.

(e) *Enclosure.* Repair and store all vehicles within an enclosed building. Temporary vehicle storage may be allowed in an outdoor storage area that shall be no larger than 25 percent of the total lot area. Such areas shall be located to the rear of the principal structure and be screened from off-site views. The height of materials and equipment stored shall not exceed the height of the screening fence or wall.

Evaluation & Findings: An area is provided inside the building for all repair and servicing operations. Proposed Condition #2 would require that all repair and servicing activity occur within the building. No vehicle storage is proposed. The applicant has provided a tire and battery storage area that is screened from off-site views through the combination of screening along the perimeter of the storage area (as shown on the architectural plans) and the site topography (reference Site Plan, grading plans, Sheet C-7).

(f) *Public address systems.* Have no outdoor speaker or public address system which is audible from single-family lands.

Evaluation & Findings: The applicant has not proposed the use of an outdoor speaker or public address system. Proposed Condition #1 would prohibit the use of any outdoor speaker or public address system.

(g) *Trash storage.* Provide adequate, enclosed trash storage facilities on the site.

Evaluation & Findings: Trash storage is provided south of the building, and will be enclosed with a masonry wall.

(h) *Testing.* Not test vehicles on residential streets.

Evaluation & Findings: The applicant has stated that no vehicle testing is proposed as part of this project.

(i) *Parked vehicles.* Not park or store a vehicle as a source of parts, or park or store a vehicle for the purpose of sale or lease/rent.

Evaluation & Findings: The applicant has stated that no vehicle parking or storage of vehicles as a source of parts, or parking or storage of vehicles for the purpose of sale or lease/rent shall occur as part of this project.

(j) *Vehicle storage.* Not store or park a vehicle that has been repaired and is awaiting removal for more than 30 consecutive days. In cases where a vehicle has been abandoned by its lawful owner prior to or during the repair process, the vehicle may remain on site as long as is necessary after the 30 day period, provided the owner or operator of the establishment can demonstrate steps have been taken to remove the vehicle from the premises using the appropriate legal means.

Evaluation & Findings: The applicant has stated that no parking or storage of vehicles that have been repaired and are awaiting removal is proposed for more than thirty (30) consecutive days.

EXHIBIT "A"
TO
WAL-MART STORES EAST, LP
SPECIAL EXCEPTION PERMIT
FOR AUTOMOBILE REPAIR & SERVICING

STAFF REPORT

CONDITIONS:

1. The applicant agrees it shall not use an outdoor speaker or public address system as part of the automobile repair and servicing use, as part of the outdoor garden center, or any other use occurring at the subject property.
2. The applicant agrees to perform all automobile repair and servicing activity in the proposed building, and that no repair and servicing shall occur within parking areas, drive aisles, or any other areas outside of the building.
3. The applicant agrees it shall obtain all other applicable local, state, and federal permits before the commencement of the development.
4. The applicant agrees that Conditions 1 – 4 as stated above do not inordinately burden the land and shall be binding upon the property owner, including any subsequent property owners, successors, or assigns, and that the development shall comply with Conditions 1 – 4 as stated herein.

EXHIBIT “B”
TO
WAL-MART STORES EAST, LP
SPECIAL EXCEPTION PERMIT
FOR AUTOMOBILE REPAIR & SERVICING

SUPPORTING APPLICATION MATERIALS
SUBMITTED BY CITY STAFF TO THE
PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD

1. All materials provided in Exhibit “B” to the Wal-Mart #3873-00 Site Plan Staff Report, Supporting Application Materials Submitted by City Staff to the Planning & Zoning Board, are herein incorporated by reference into this Exhibit “B” to the Wal-Mart Stores East, LP, Special Exception Permit for Automobile Repair & Servicing, Supporting Application Materials Submitted by City Staff to the Planning & Zoning Board.
2. In addition to the preceding, all materials attached subsequently hereto shall comprise Exhibit “B” to the Wal-Mart Stores East, LP, Special Exception Permit for Automobile Repair & Servicing, Supporting Application Materials Submitted by City Staff to the Planning & Zoning Board.



City of Alachua

Planning & Community Development Department Staff Report

Board of Adjustment Hearing Date: Quasi-Judicial Hearing

April 18, 2017

SUBJECT:	A request for a Variance Permit from Section 6.8.3(E)(2), to reduce the number of required pedestrian connections between the on-site pedestrian circulation system and the adjacent public sidewalk or greenway network, as required by Section 7.3.2(C)
APPLICANT/AGENT:	Brian Cassidy, P.E., CPH, Inc.
PROPERTY OWNERS:	Wal-Mart Stores East, LP
LOCATION:	Approximately 1,000 feet southeast of the US Highway 441/Interstate-75 interchange
PARCEL ID NUMBERS:	03869-013-000
FLUM DESIGNATION:	Commercial
ZONING:	Commercial Intensive (CI)
OVERLAY:	Gateway Overlay District
ACREAGE:	±30.19 acres
RECOMMENDATION:	Staff recommends that the Board of Adjustment approve the Variance Permit, subject to the one (1) condition provided in Exhibit "A" of this Staff Report.
RECOMMENDED MOTION:	<i>Based upon the competent substantial evidence presented at this hearing, the presentation before this Board, and Staff's recommendation, this Board finds the application to be consistent with the City of Alachua Comprehensive Plan and in compliance with the Land Development Regulations and approves the Variance Permit, subject to the one (1) condition provided in Exhibit "A" and located on page 7 of the April 18, 2017, Staff Report to the Planning & Zoning Board.</i>

SUMMARY

This application is a request by Brian Cassidy, P.E., of CPH, Inc., applicant for Wal-Mart Stores East, LP, property owner, for a Variance Permit from Section 6.8.3(E)(2) of the City's Land Development Regulations (LDRs), to reduce the number of required pedestrian connections between the on-site pedestrian circulation system and the adjacent public sidewalk or greenway network, as required by Section 7.3.2(C).

The applicant has submitted a companion Site Plan application for the construction of a ±158,562 square foot building, with associated parking, stormwater management facilities, utility infrastructure, and supporting site improvements. The applicant has also submitted two (2) companion Special Exception Permit applications: (1) for a large-scale retail establishment greater than or equal to 80,000 square feet of gross floor area; and (2) for automobile repair and servicing. The Site Plan application and Special Exception Permit applications were submitted concurrent with and concurrently reviewed with this Variance Permit application.

Section 6.8.3(E)(2) of the City's LDRs requires single-tenant retail sales and service uses greater than or equal to 20,000 square feet in area to comply with Section 7.3.2(C). Section 7.3.2(C) requires all multiple-family and nonresidential developments to provide at least one improved pedestrian connection between the on-site pedestrian circulation system and the adjacent public sidewalk or greenway network, with an additional connection required for each additional five acres of development area. For the proposed development, seven (7) connections would be required.

Section 6.8.3(E)(2) of the City's LDRs states:

Section 6.8.3 Design standards for single tenant retail sales and service uses greater than or equal to 20,000 square feet.

(E) Pedestrian circulation.

(2) Pedestrian pathways. The on-site pedestrian circulation system shall comply with the standards in Subsection 6.1.10(A), Required improvements, and Subsection 7.3.2(C), Connection.

Section 7.3.2(C) of the City's LDRs states:

7.3.2 Sidewalks.

(C) Connection. All multiple-family and nonresidential development shall provide at least one improved pedestrian connection between the on-site pedestrian circulation system and the adjacent public sidewalk or greenway network, with an additional connection required for each additional five acres of development area.

The applicant contends that the proposed development is incapable of compliance with the preceding due to the limitations of the site and the ability to provide connections to the public sidewalk system.

The proposed development would provide sidewalks from US Highway 441 to the subject property, along "Entrance Road", "Seller Road 1", and the extension of NW 151st Boulevard. Proposed sidewalks are shown on Illustration 1 below in blue. Existing sidewalks are shown on Illustrations 1 and 2 in orange. Proposed Condition #1 would require additional pedestrian connections to be provided between the proposed development and the existing sidewalk system. Proposed Condition #1 would require the applicant to provide sidewalks along "Seller Road 2", and to provide funding to the City for a sidewalk along the south side of NW 151st Boulevard from the existing terminus of the NW 151st Boulevard to the location of an existing sidewalk at the intersection of NW 151st Boulevard and NW

148th Drive. These connections would increase connectivity and enhance pedestrian access to the proposed development, and are shown on Illustrations 1 and 2 in green (NOTE: the location of sidewalks to be required by Proposed Condition #1 as shown on Illustrations 1 and 2 are depicted as an approximation of the location of sidewalks to address the condition. Final design may result in slight adjustments in location to meet site constraints.)

Illustration 1: Sheet C-6 of the Companion Site Plan Application, Showing Location of Existing/Proposed Sidewalks




ILLUSTRATION 1 LEGEND

EXISTING SIDEWALKS



PROPOSED SIDEWALKS



SIDEWALKS TO BE PROVIDED BY APPLICANT PURSUANT TO PROPOSED CONDITION #1



EXISTING SIDEWALKS

**PROPOSED CONDITION #1: AREA WHERE APPLICANT
TO PROVIDE FUNDS TO CITY FOR SIDEWALK**

Section 2.4.7(C)(4) of the City's Land Development Regulations (LDRs) establishes the standards with which all zoning variance permits must be found to be compliant. The application has been reviewed for compliance with the standards of Section 2.4.7(C)(4). Staff's evaluation of the application's compliance with the applicable standards of Section 2.4.7(C)(4) is provided below.

- Evaluation & Findings:** There are no existing sidewalks located adjacent to the subject property. The closest existing public sidewalks are located within the right-of-way of US

Highway 441, and at the intersection of NW 151st Boulevard and NW 148th Drive. The properties immediately adjacent to the south and to the east of the subject property are presently undeveloped. Interstate 75 is located to the west of the subject property. The lands to the north of the subject property are developed, and do not provide any opportunity to provide sidewalk connections from the subject property to US Highway 441.

- b. *Not result of action by applicant.* The special circumstances are not the result of the actions of the applicant.

Evaluation & Findings: The applicant is limited in its ability to provide connections to the public sidewalk system due to the location of the subject property relative to the existing public sidewalk system.

- c. *No special privilege.* The granting of the variance will not confer any special privilege on the applicant that is denied to other lands or structures in the same zone district.

Evaluation & Findings: The granting of this variance would not confer any special privilege on the applicant. The variance is requested to address limitations of the site that exist due to its location relative to the existing public sidewalk system.

- d. *Strict application deprives use.* Because of the conditions in Subsection 2.4.7(C)(4)(a) of this section, the application of these LDRs to the land would effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict the utilization of the land and result in unnecessary and undue hardship.

Evaluation & Findings: The application of Section 6.8.3(E)(2), and the number of pedestrian connections required for the proposed development by Section 7.3.2(C), would unreasonably restrict the utilization of the land. Section 7.3.2(C) would require at least seven (7) connections to be provided between the on-site pedestrian circulation system and the adjacent public sidewalk or greenway network. The subject property has limited road frontage (the two roads proposed to provide access to the subject property effectively terminate at the subject property), and no existing public sidewalks are located immediately adjacent to the subject property that would provide the applicant an opportunity to increase the number of connections.

- e. *Minimum variance.* The granting of the variance is the minimum action that will make possible the reasonable use of the land or structure which is not contrary to the public interest, and which would carry out the spirit of these LDRs.

Evaluation & Findings: The applicant has proposed to provide sidewalks from US Highway 441 to the subject property, along “Entrance Road”, “Seller Road 1”, and the extension of NW 151st Boulevard. The applicant has not proposed to provide sidewalks along “Seller Road 2”, located in the southern portion of the project area.

Proposed Condition #1 would require the applicant to provide additional pedestrian connections between the subject property and the existing public sidewalk system.

Staff finds that providing sidewalks along Seller Road 2, connecting between the Entrance Road and the proposed development’s customer entrances, would further reduce the extent of the variance request, resulting in the minimum action to make possible the reasonable use of the land, and would further carry out the intent of the City’s LDRs by providing pedestrians additional opportunities to access the proposed development.

Should sidewalks be provided along Seller Road 2, as would be required by Proposed Condition #1, the development would provide the maximum number of pedestrian connections to the subject property that could be reasonably be accommodated. Additionally, these additional pedestrian facilities would further fulfill the purpose and intent of the requirements of the City's Comprehensive Plan and LDRs pertaining to interconnectivity and pedestrian facilities.

In addition to providing additional connections to the subject property as described above, Proposed Condition #1 would also require the applicant to provide funding to the City for a sidewalk along the south side of NW 151st Boulevard from the existing terminus of the NW 151st Boulevard to the location of an existing sidewalk at the intersection of NW 151st Boulevard and NW 148th Drive. This connection would increase connectivity and enhance pedestrian access to the proposed development.

- f. *Not detrimental.* The authorization of the variance will not result in substantial detriment to adjacent land, and the character of the zone district in which the land subject to the application is located.

Evaluation & Findings: The authorization of the variance would not result in a substantial detriment to adjacent land and the character of the zone district in which the subject property is located. The subject property is zoned Commercial Intensive (CI). The adjacent lands to the south and east are presently vacant and are also zoned CI.

The CI zoning district is described as follows in Section 3.5.2(E) of the City's LDRs:

"The CI District is established and intended to provide lands and facilitate highway-oriented development opportunities within the City, for uses that require high public visibility and an accessible location. The CI district should be located along major arterials or highways and at the US 441/Interstate-75 interchange."

Staff finds that, based upon the character of the CI zoning district and the uses permitted within this zoning district, as described in Section 3.5.2(E) of the City's LDRs and as established in Table 4.1-1 of the City's LDRs, and based upon the character of the surrounding area and the zoning of land adjacent to the subject property, the proposed variance would not result in a substantial detriment to adjacent land.

- g. *Consistency with these LDRs.* The granting of the variance will be generally consistent with the purposes and intent of these LDRs and the public interest.

Evaluation & Findings: As demonstrated within this Staff Report, the proposed development plan, when revised to address the requirements of Proposed Condition #1, would result in the minimum variance necessary to reasonably provide pedestrian connections to the subject property from the existing public sidewalk system, fulfilling the purpose and intent of applicable requirements of the City's Comprehensive Plan and LDRs pertaining to interconnectivity, pedestrian facilities, and other similar planning principles.

EXHIBIT “A”
TO
WAL-MART STORES EAST, LP
VARIANCE PERMIT
SECTION 6.8.3(E)(2)

STAFF REPORT

CONDITIONS:

1. To further the application’s compliance with the standards of Section 2.4.7(C)(4), to provide the maximum number of pedestrian connections that can be reasonably be accommodated to the proposed development, and to fulfill the purpose and intent of the requirements of the City’s Comprehensive Plan and Land Development Regulations pertaining to interconnectivity and pedestrian facilities, the applicant agrees to:
 - a. Provide five foot (5’) sidewalks within the right of way of “Seller Road 2” to the north and south the road, as depicted and labeled on Sheet C-6B of the Site Plan, and to provide a 5 foot (5’) sidewalk and any necessary crosswalks from the terminus of the right-of-way of “Seller Road 2” connecting said sidewalks along “Seller Road 2” to the primary customer entrances of the development. Sidewalks shall be designed and constructed to comply with the City of Alachua Land Development Regulations and all applicable Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) standards; and,
 - b. Provide funding to the City for a five foot (5’) sidewalk along the south right-of-way line of the NW 151st Boulevard, from the existing terminus of the sidewalk at the intersection of NW 151st Boulevard and NW 148th Drive to the existing terminus of NW 151st Boulevard, which is contiguous to the location of proposed sidewalk improvements as depicted on Sheet C-6B of the companion Site Plan application. A Professional Engineer registered in the State of Florida shall prepare the calculation of the funding amount. The calculation shall include the cost of all materials and labor to construct a sidewalk which complies with the City of Alachua Land Development Regulations and all applicable Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) standards. Funding required by this condition shall be provided to the City prior to applying for a building permit for the building shown on the companion Site Plan application.

EXHIBIT “B”
TO
WAL-MART STORES EAST, LP
VARIANCE PERMIT
SECTION 6.8.3(E)(2)

SUPPORTING APPLICATION MATERIALS
SUBMITTED BY CITY STAFF TO THE
PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD



City of Alachua

TRACI L. GRESHAM
CITY MANAGER

PLANNING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIRECTOR KATHY WINBURN, AICP

July 7, 2016

Also sent by electronic mail to bcassidy@cphcorp.com

Mr. Brian P. Cassidy, P.E. CPH, Inc.
5200 Belfort Road
Suite 200
Jacksonville, FL 32256

RE: Development Review Team (DRT) Summary for:

- Wal-Mart #3873-00 Special Exception Permit Application: Large-Scale Retail Establishment \geq 80,000 Square Feet
- Wal-Mart #3873-00 Special Exception Permit Application: Automobile Repair and Servicing
- Wal-Mart #3873-00 Site Plan Application

Dear Mr. Cassidy:

The applications referenced above were reviewed at our July 6, 2016, Development Review Team (DRT) Meeting. Please address all insufficiencies outlined below in writing and provide an indication as to how they have been addressed. A total of four (4) copies of each application package, plans, and a CD containing a PDF of each application's supporting materials must be provided.

Upon receipt of your revised and complete application materials, such materials shall be reviewed to confirm if the insufficiencies identified herein were adequately addressed. Following review of the revised materials, Staff shall determine if: (1) an additional Development Review Team (DRT) Meeting is required; or (2) there are insufficiencies which need to be further addressed, but such revisions may be made without scheduling an additional DRT Meeting. Upon adequately addressing the applications' insufficiencies, the applications may be scheduled for a hearing before the Planning & Zoning Board (PZB.)

Please note that if Staff determines that the revised submission(s) requires outside technical review by the City, your applications may be delayed in order to allow for adequate review time.

You must provide 13 *double-sided, three-hole punched sets* of each application package and all materials, and a CD containing all application materials in PDF format, *no later than 10 business days prior to the PZB Meeting at which your application is scheduled to be heard.*

As discussed at the DRT Meeting, please address the following insufficiencies:

SITE PLAN APPLICATION

1. Compliance with Land Development Regulations

A. Section 3.7.2(C)(5) – Gateway Overlay District

- i. Provide an analysis of the application's compliance with Section 3.7.2(C)(5.)
 - (a) Ensure response specifically identifies the architectural elements (minimum of 6, as the applicant has elected to use glazing reduction provided in Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(iv)) defined in Section 3.7.2(C)(5)(a)(iv) incorporated into each of the following exterior building walls/elevations: (1) East Elevation; (2) West Elevation.
- ii. Section 3.7.2(C)(5)(c)(ii): Demonstrate that construction materials used within outdoor storage areas, areas used for trash collection, and loading areas (i.e., trash compactor, loading dock screening, and tire center storage) are of a comparable quality and appearance as the primary building.
- iii. Section 3.7.2(C)(5)(d): Requires frontage of I-75 frontage to comply with arterial screening requirements of Section 6.2.3(E.) Continuous hedge not provided between area north of parking lot and stormwater retention area 1.

B. Article 4: Use Regulations

- i. Outdoor Storage: Section 4.4.4(E) requires the outdoor storage area to be incorporated into the design of the primary structure; the area to be screened from view from property lines/right-of-way by an opaque fence with landscaping along fence; and to incorporate one of the predominant colors of the primary structure in the fence/roofing (if roofed.) Reference 4.4.4(E) for all requirements.
 - (a) Tire and Battery Storage Area must comply with outdoor storage standards provided in Section 4.4.4(E.)
 - (b) Identify the use of the area along the exterior of the west elevation (appears to be outdoor storage.) If outdoor storage, demonstrate compliance with Section 4.4.4(E.)

C. Section 6.1. Parking/Traffic/Circulation Standards

- i. Table 6.1-4 requires four (4) stacking spaces for each pharmacy drive-through lane, measured from the pickup window.
 - (a) Only three (3) stacking spaces provided for northernmost pickup window. Revise to provide the minimum four (4) required stacking spaces.
 - (b) Address conflict between vehicular traffic exiting northernmost pickup window and the stacking spaces identified for the southern pickup window (as proposed, vehicular traffic from each must cross paths with no clear delineation of right-of-way/traffic flow.) Access to pickup windows and associated stacking spaces must be revised to eliminate conflicts.
- ii. Please address the purpose/function of the large paved area east of the building and south of pharmacy pickup windows. The area does not serve to provide on-site circulation.
- iii. Address compliance with Section 6.1.8(B)(2)(b), as it relates to pharmacy drive-through lanes. Section 6.1.8(B)(2)(b) requires to the maximum extent practicable, drive-in lanes to not be located between the principal structure and adjacent public streets, or for drive-in lanes and facilities to be set back a minimum of 20 feet from any adjacent public street, with the setback landscaped and bermed.
- iv. Section 6.1.8(B)(1)(c) states, "stacking spaces shall be separated from other internal driveways by raised medians if the LDR Administrator determines the median is

- necessary for traffic movement and safety.” As proposed, stacking spaces would not be separated from other paved areas. To provide a clear separation between on-site traffic circulation areas the vehicle stacking spaces, provide a raised median between stacking lanes and other vehicular traffic areas.
- v. Revise plans to comply with Section 6.1.8(B)(3)(a), (c), (d), and (e): *Primary drive aisles*. Primary drive aisles are required within off-street surface parking lots of 300 or more spaces, and shall be configured to appear as an extension of the public street network through the provision of:
 - (a) Sidewalks, parallel to the building facade *located along both sides of the aisle*;
 - (c) Canopy trees, spaced no less than 40 feet on center, located on both sides of the aisle, within three feet of the curb, and extending the full length of the aisle;
 - (d) Designated parallel parking spaces on both sides of the drive aisle; and
 - (e) A road crown in the center of the aisle.
 - vi. Sheet C-6: City of Alachua Parking Requirements: Identify required/provided accessible parking in accordance with Section 6.1.9.
 - vii. Revise plans to comply with Section 6.1.10(A)(2): “Pedestrian pathways shall be provided in off-street surface parking lots with 100 or more parking spaces, in accordance with the following standards:
 - (a) Pedestrian crosswalks, at least ten feet in width, either raised above the adjacent pavement, striped, or otherwise designated through the use of alternative materials, shall be located between all primary building entrances and the parking areas serving those entrances.” *Crosswalks less than ten feet in width (see Keynote 13, Sheet C-6A.)*
 - (b) Within parking lots of 300 or more spaces, improved pedestrian pathways, with a minimum width of three feet, located in continuous landscaped parking islands, shall be provided at least every fourth row of parking spaces.” (1) *Sidewalk not provided every fourth row of parking space in easternmost portion of parking lot.* (2) *Identify width of pedestrian pathways to demonstrate minimum width of 3 feet is provided.* (3) *Westernmost pedestrian pathway is not within a continuously landscaped parking island.*
 - viii. Identify the location of all on-site traffic control devices, such as stop signs/stop bars, etc., within parking lots/drive aisles.

D. Sections 6.2.1, Tree Replacement, Credit, and 6.2.2, Landscape Standards

- i. Sheet TR-2: Tree mitigation appears to be calculated incorrectly. “Total Tree Accounting” table identifies “required landscape plan trees,” however, this only accounts for site landscaping requirements. No consideration is given to all other landscaping requirements (i.e., perimeter buffer requirements, parking lot perimeter/interior, etc.) Please address.
- ii. Sheet TR-2: “Total Tree Accounting” Table – Tree credits for retained trees may not be used to meet mitigation requirements. Section 6.2.2(D)(4) states: “Canopy or ornamental/understory trees that are in very good to excellent health, that are protected before and during development of the site and maintained thereafter in a healthy growing condition, can be used to comply with the landscaping standards for Subsections 6.2.2(D)(1), Site landscaping; 6.2.2(D)(2), Parking lot landscaping; or 6.2.2(D)(3), Perimeter buffers, of this section.” Please address.
- iii. Tree credits – Tables on L-1 and TR-2 show there are 6 trees between 30” and 36” to be retained. Calculation of credits is incorrect (6 trees x 5 credits/tree = 30 credits.) Revise accordingly.

- iv. Sheet L-1: Required Tree Mitigation Table – does not address mitigation trees provided to mitigate for heritage trees removed. Please address.
- v. Sheet TR-2: Confirm trees used to calculate tree credits are healthy regulated trees, and are not a species on the nuisance tree list. Trees used for credit must be in very good or excellent health (see 6.2.2(D)(4.)) No credit is given for any trees on the nuisance tree list.
- vi. Parking Lot Interior – Trees Required – Calculations show 192 required, but only 171 provided. Provide additional trees within parking lot interior to meet minimum required.
- vii. Sheet L-1: Section 6.2.2(D)(3)(e) requires perimeter buffers to be located along the outer perimeter of the parcel. Please address location of perimeter buffer in the information provided on this sheet for the north perimeter buffer and the portion of the east perimeter buffer (north of seller road 1.)
- viii. Section 6.2.2(D)(8) requires canopy trees to be a minimum of 8 feet in height, and shrubs which are upright in nature to be a minimum of 24 inches in height at the time of planting. The specifications for certain canopy trees calls for trees less than 8 feet in height, and specifications for shrubs that are upright in nature are less than 24 inches in height. Revise accordingly.
- ix. Sheet L-1: Verify footnote under Parking Buffer Landscape table is in the appropriate location. Footnote relates to building façade trees.
- x. Provide detail of screening surrounding trash compactor, organic dumpster, and bale and pallet recycling areas to demonstrate compliance with Section 6.2.3(B.) Note that sides providing service access must be gated.
- xi. Sheet TR-2: There are discrepancies between the tree protection notes and tree protection detail. Please resolve discrepancies and verify notes related to tree protection are consistent with Section 6.2.1(D)(2)(a.)
- xii. Sheet TR-2: Tree protection approval – revise note to state the landscape architect shall approve the tree barricades prior to site clearing.
- xiii. Tree Retention Plan (Sheet TR-1) not legible at scale used (1" = 100'.) Please address.

E. Section 6.3, Fencing Standards

- i. Section 6.3.3(B) prohibits fences and walls within front setback areas. A “proposed decorative retaining wall” is depicted on each side of entrance road within front setback areas of the property. Revise to comply with Section 6.3.3(B.)

F. Section 6.4, Exterior Lighting Standards

- i. Lighting Plan:
 - (a) Notes state “LED statistics shown are at 50,000 hours L90 rating (~12 years @ 12 hrs/day.)” Section 6.4.4(D) requires photometrics to demonstrate that initial lamp lumens do not exceed 24,000 lumens or 400 watts for each fixture. Revise photometrics to provide statistics for the initial lamp lumens of all light fixtures.
 - (b) Notes state “Trees are modeled as approved T1, T2, and T3 objects that block lights as 10 year mature trees.” Photometric Plan must depict site photometrics present at completion of project. Revise photometrics to provide statistics for the site at the completion of construction.
 - (c) Revise notes on photometric plans to address comments above.
- ii. The maximum to minimum ratio of the rear drive exceeds the permitted ratio of 10:1 (Section 6.4.4.(E.)) Revise accordingly.
- iii. Lighting Plan: To demonstrate compliance of each fixture with Section 6.4.4(D)(2), add columns in the matrix located in the lower left of the plan that identify the initial lamp

- lumens and wattage of each light fixture (as opposed to only the arranged luminaire lumens/wattage.)
- iv. Provide mounting detail of all light fixtures used on the subject property.
 - v. Provide cut sheets of all light fixtures used on the subject property. Cut sheets must be provided within the Site Plan/Lighting Plan, and depict the use of full cut-off fixtures (6.4.4(F)(1.))
- G. Section 6.5, Signage
- i. A freestanding sign appears to be depicted west of the intersection of US Highway 441 and the entrance road. Please note freestanding signage for a multi-tenant building or development is subject to the provisions of Section 6.5.4(C)(2) (among other subsections of Section 6.5) and compliance with such provisions must be demonstrated as part of the review of a sign permit application.
- H. Section 6.8, Design Standards for Business Uses
- i. Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(ii) states, “for the purposes of this section, the ground floor facade area of single-story buildings shall be calculated by measuring the applicable building wall between the finished grade and the underside of the roof, wall, or parapet of the façade...” The proposed building includes a parapet on the front façade, therefore, the area of the front façade must be calculated from the finished grade to the top of the parapet. Revise area/calculations on Architectural Plans of north and east façades used to calculate required glazing and architectural masonry.
 - ii. Section 6.8.2(A)(1) states that all facades facing a street shall be subject to the standards set forth in Subsection 6.8.3(A)(2.) The east elevation, which faces a proposed public street must comply with the following:
 - (a) Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(iv): The applicant has utilized the glazing reduction permitted by the referenced section, however, has not provided one of the following to comply with subsections b. and c.:
 - Window shutters or plantation-style shutters which span a minimum of 10 percent of the length of the façade, or;
 - A canopy or portico which provides a covered pedestrian walkway adjacent to the façade which spans a minimum of 50 percent of the length of the façade; **and**
 - Customer entrances which include no less than six of the design features provided in Subsection 6.8.3(C)(2)(d.) (NOTE: identify the design features incorporated into the customer entrance.)
 - iii. Calculation of glazing provided for front elevation includes areas to the sides of vestibules and over cart doors. These areas are not visible when facing the front elevation. Calculation of glazing area must and visible when facing the front elevation.
 - iv. The applicant proposes to utilize the glazing reduction provided in Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(iv), which provides for a reduction in glazing of the front façade from 30% to 20%. In order to demonstrate compliance with the preceding section, the applicant must:
 - (a) Provide within the Architectural Plans:
 - A calculation of the length of the front façade consisting of window shutters/plantation-style shutters, or a canopy/portico; and,
 - A calculation of the length of the total façade.
 - (b) Incorporate no less than six (6) of the design features provided in Section 6.8.3(C)(2)(d) into customer entrances on the front façade. Identify which design features are incorporated into customer entrances on the front façade.
 - v. Provide specifications/cut sheet of the proposed ‘architectural masonry.’ Must be a natural brick or natural brick product (6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(iv)a.)

- vi. Front (north) and east elevations do not appear to meet façade massing/alternative requirements provided in Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(b) in the following locations:
 - (a) East Elevation: Between center-most parapets. Roof line change provided, however, a corresponding material change required by 6.8.3(A)(2)(b)(ii)c.
 - (b) Front Elevation: From second pilaster inset from NE corner, to west of grocery vestibule.
 - (c) Front Elevation: From east of GM vestibule to pilaster west of GM vestibule.
 - (d) Front Elevation: from NW corner of building to first roof line change.
- vii. To demonstrate compliance with Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(b), identify the height of all pilasters.
- viii. Section 6.8.3(B)(2) requires flat roofs to be concealed using a parapet wall with cornice treatment. Cornice must include a perpendicular projection of a minimum of 8 inches from the parapet façade plane. Provide detail within the Architectural Plans demonstrating that the cornice surrounding the entire perimeter of the building includes a perpendicular projection of at least 8 inches.
- ix. Section 6.8.3(C) requires customer entrances on each side of the building facing a public street.
 - (a) An entrance is provided along the east elevation, however, the area to which this entrance accesses as depicted on the submitted floor plan does not appear to be a customer area of the store. Address how this entrance complies with Section 6.8.3(C.)
 - (b) Identify the design features selected (minimum of 6, as the applicant has elected to use glazing reduction provided in Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(iv)) provided in Section 6.8.3(C)(2) for the customer entrance on the east elevation.
- x. Revise plans to demonstrate compliance with Section 6.8.3(E)(1): *“Sidewalks required.* New large retail establishments shall provide sidewalks constructed in accordance with Subsection 7.3.2(B), Configuration...” Section 7.3.2(B) requires sidewalks to be a minimum 5 feet wide, 4 inches thick. Identify width/thickness of all sidewalks.
- xi. Revise plans to demonstrate compliance with Section 6.8.3(E)(2): *“Pedestrian pathways.* The on-site pedestrian circulation system shall comply with the standards in Subsection 6.1.10(A), Required improvements, and Subsection 7.3.2(C), Connection.” Seven (7) connections to adjacent public sidewalk system are required.
- xii. Revise plans to demonstrate compliance with Section 6.8.3(E)(4): *“Distinguished from driving surfaces.* All internal pedestrian walkways shall be distinguished from driving surfaces through the use of durable, low-maintenance surface materials such as pavers, bricks, or scored/stamped concrete or asphalt to enhance pedestrian safety and comfort, as well as the attractiveness of the walkways.”

I. General Comments

i. Traffic Circulation

- (a) See comments provided by Brian Kanely, P.E., of Volkert, Inc., in a letter dated May 31, 2016 pertaining to proposed median cut south of entrance road intersection with US 441. Median must be solid from traffic signal to seller road 1.
- (b) Confirm and demonstrate access points along east side of entrance road are consistent with Policy 1.2.b, Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element.
- (c) Applicant to coordinate with Alachua County E-911 office to assign road names.
- (d) Provide keynote on Sheet C-6B noting diamonds to be located at the terminus of entrance road.
- (e) Provide crosswalks at the following locations:
 - On west and south sides of the intersection of entrance road and seller road 1.
 - On east side of the intersection of entrance road and NW 151st Blvd.

ii. Drainage/Stormwater

(a) Sheet C-7: Insufficient data is provided to indicate positive drainage in the following areas. Provide spot elevations and directional arrows indicated stormwater flow in the following areas:

- Each truck well;
- Drive area in southeast corner of property (around the radius of the landscape island;)
- Parking area, drive aisle west of TLE and garden center;
- At the radii of the landscape islands south of S-35; and,
- At the two landscape islands southeast of S-33

(b) Sheet C-7A:

- Verify size of S-73. S-75 discharges to S-73, but S-75 is larger in diameter.
- Verify inlet elevations for NE inlet, S-107, and SE inlet, S-105. S-107 appears to drain to S-105, however, inlet elevations are inverted for such configuration.

iii. Public Facilities

(a) The provision of water/wastewater facilities from off-site locations to the points of termination depicted on plans should be addressed by providing a reference to off-site infrastructure improvement plans to be prepared separate from these plans.

iv. Land Rights

(a) Throughout Plans: Remove references to “outparcel” and “City dedicated parcel.” Revise to reflect parcel’s use as passive recreation or another descriptive term appropriate for its designated use.

(b) Throughout Plans: Delete references to “outlot,” “out parcel,” “out parcel 1,” etc., if this is not applicable to project.

(c) References to “Seller Retained Property” should be removed. Information is not relevant to this application.

(d) Legal descriptions and sketches depicted on survey do not appear match current proposed ROWs shown on civil drawings. Resolve inconsistency.

(e) Legal descriptions and sketches of overall parcel on survey do not reflect tax parcel records. Resolve inconsistency.

(f) Provide draft legal descriptions and sketches of all proposed public utility easements (PUEs.)

v. Miscellaneous

(a) Throughout Plans: Delete references to “proposed legend.” Refer to as “legend.” Likewise, delete references to “proposed notes” throughout plans. Refer to as “notes.”

(b) Throughout Plans: References to GRU for water, wastewater, and electric service are incorrect. Revise to City of Alachua.

(c) Sheet C-1: Verify name of soil consultant is correct. Appears to be misspelled.

(d) Sheet C-1: Revise reference to contact for electric, water, and sewer utilities.

(e) Sheet C-3: Survey Note 13 indicates front, rear, and side setbacks of 10 feet. Correct setbacks: Front – 20 feet; Side – 0 feet; Rear – 15 feet.

(f) Sheet C-3B: Many spot elevations not legible due to overlap of information on drawing.

(g) Sheet C-6: Add Tax Parcel No. 03066-000-000 under Site Data.

(h) Sheet C-6: Impervious Area for parcel currently labelled “City dedicated parcel” is 0 square feet. Revise accordingly.

(i) Sheet C-6: There is a typographical error under “Special Exceptions Requested.”

- (j) Sheet C-6: There is a typographical error under “Conditions,” first bullet.
- (k) Sheet C-6: There is a typographical error under “Conditions,” third bullet, second line (“location” should be plural.)
- (l) Sheet C-6: “Conditions,” third bullet: verify the information is correct pertaining to rainfall to be treated.
- (m) Sheet C-6A: Keynotes: Identify detail sheet where detail for each keynote is provided.
- (n) Sheet C-6A: Keynote 11: Call out states to coordinate with GRU for electric service. Electric service provider is City of Alachua. Revise accordingly.
- (o) Sheet C-6A: Keynote 26: Include statement that all signage requires separate permit.
- (p) Sheet C-6A: Keynote 39: Calls for bicycle rack model types 2170-7, 2170-13, and 2170-19. Detail on Sheet C-12.1 depicts model type 2170-3, 2170-7, 2170-9, 2170-11, and 2170-13.
 - Sheet C-12.1: Delete detail for model types 2170-3, 2170-9, and 2170-11, since they are not used for this project.
 - Add detail for model type 2170-19.
- (q) Sheet C-6A: Keynote 42: Keynote specifications provided, but not depicted on plans. Revise accordingly.
- (r) Sheet C-6A: Light legend symbols do not match those depicted on plan sheet. Revise accordingly.
- (s) Sheet C-6B: provide keynote legend on sheet.
- (t) Sheet C-7: FEMA flood panel referenced is outdated. Current FIRM series is dated June 16, 2006.
- (u) Sheet C-7: There is a typographical error in the title block for “Flood Plain.”
- (v) Sheet C-8: Define abbreviation “FO” in legend.
- (w) Sheet E-8: Dimensions of fixture details for SLA and SLB are incorrect.
- (x) Sheet TR-2: Note on sheet references details concerning individual trees, size, and tree credits as available on that sheet (circular reference.)
- (y) Architectural Plans: Please provide scale on all Architectural Plan sheets.
- (z) Architectural Plan Sheet 2: Area of front elevation consisting of Optical Center not labelled. Revise accordingly.
- (aa) Lighting Plan: There is a note above the matrix in the upper right corner that applies to the preparation of the matrix, and should be removed from the plans as it is not applicable to the information presented within the plans.

J. Concurrency Impact Analysis

- i. Indicate the source of the project demand for potable water, sanitary sewer, and solid waste facilities.
- ii. Reserved capacities for water, wastewater, and transportation facilities are not considered. Revise Concurrency Impact Analysis to consider reserved capacities and the impact to residual capacities.

SPECIAL EXCEPTION PERMIT (SEP) APPLICATION: BUILDING ≥80,000 SQUARE FEET

2. Compliance with Land Development Regulations

- A. Response to Section 2.4.4(D)(8): Property is located within Gateway Overlay District and subject to development standards provided in Section 3.7.2(C)(5.) Provide an analysis of the application’s compliance with Section 3.7.2(C)(5.) See comment 1.A., above for further information.

- B. Response to Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(ii): Ground floor façade area must be calculated from the finished grade to bottom of parapet wall. Revise response accordingly.
- C. Response to Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(iv)c.: Identify the 6 design features that are incorporated into each customer entrance on the front elevation, or reference response to Section 6.8.3(C)(2) if it addresses the requirements of this section.
- D. Response to Section 6.8.3(C)(2):
 - i. The applicant has chosen to utilize glazing alternatives which permit a reduction in glazing for the front façade, but require the incorporation of no less than 6 of the design features provided in the referenced section. Revise response accordingly.
 - ii. Identify a minimum of 6 of the design features incorporated into front facade customer entrances (grocery, home and pharmacy.)
 - iii. Identify a minimum of 3 of the design features that are incorporated into all other customer entrances (auto center and east entrance.)
 - iv. Response states that display windows that are directly adjacent to each customer entrance are provided. Insufficient information has been provided to support that the windows adjacent to market, home and pharmacy, and auto center entrances shall be display windows. Further, no display windows are provided directly adjacent to east entrance. Provide sufficient information to support that the windows adjacent to each entrance shall be used for displays, if this is a design feature to be incorporated into the design of customer entrances.
- E. Response to Section 6.8.3(E)(2):
 - i. Response states that stamped concrete is used for pedestrian crosswalks, however, striping has been proposed. Pedestrian crosswalks must comply with Section 6.8.3(E)(4), which requires the use of durable, low-maintenance surface materials such as pavers, bricks, or scored/stamped concrete. The Site Plan must be revised to comply with Section 6.8.3(E)(4.) Verify response to Section 6.8.3(E)(2) is consistent with surface materials selected.
 - ii. Section 7.3.2(C), referenced in Section 6.8.3(E)(2), requires a total of 7 pedestrian connections to the adjacent public sidewalk network, however, only 4 appear to be proposed. The Site Plan must be revised to comply with the minimum required number of connections. Verify response to Section 6.8.3(E)(2) is consistent with the number of pedestrian connections to adjacent sidewalk network provided.
- F. Response to Section 6.8.3(E)(4):
 - i. Response states that stamped concrete is used for pedestrian crosswalks, however, striping has been proposed. Pedestrian crosswalks must use durable, low-maintenance surface materials such as pavers, bricks, or scored/stamped concrete. The Site Plan must be revised to comply with Section 6.8.3(E)(4.) Verify response to Section 6.8.3(E)(4) is consistent with surface materials selected.

3. Concurrency Impact Analysis

- A. Provide revised Concurrency Impact Analysis, as further described within Site Plan application comments (Comment 1.I.), within supporting materials for this SEP application.

SPECIAL EXCEPTION PERMIT (SEP) APPLICATION: AUTOMOBILE REPAIR & SERVICING

4. Compliance with Land Development Regulations

- A. Response to Section 2.4.4(D)(8): Property is located within Gateway Overlay District and subject to development standards provided in Section 3.7.2(C)(5.) Provide an analysis of the application's compliance with Section 3.7.2(C)(5.) See comment 1.A., above for further information.
- B. Response to Section 2.4.4(D)(3):
 - i. Visual Impact: References attached architectural elevations. Architectural elevations included within companion SEP and Site Plan applications, but have not been included with this SEP application.
 - ii. Noise: Response should address the location of automobile repair/servicing activity.
- C. Response to Section 2.4.4(D)(4):
 - i. Further discussion of the disposal of regulated materials, including but not limited to, motor oil, fluids, batteries, and tires, should be provided. Discussion may include identification of applicable regulating agencies, disposal methods, etc.
 - ii. Typographical error in first line of second paragraph.
- D. Response to Section 4.3.4(J):
 - i. Correct citation on Page 8 of report is Section 4.3.4(J)(3.)
 - ii. References are made to site design features, such as parking areas, buffers, means of ingress/egress, etc., that are depicted on the Site Plan. Sheets from the Site Plan representative of these features should be included as an exhibit to this SEP application.

5. Concurrency Impact Analysis


- B. Provide revised Concurrency Impact Analysis, as further described within Site Plan application comments (Comment 1.I.), within supporting materials for this SEP application.

6. **PUBLIC SERVICES, OUTSIDE ENGINEERING/CONSULTANT REVIEW COMMENTS**

- A. The applicant must address the comments provided by Adam Boukari, Assistant City Manager, in memoranda dated April 28, 2016, and June 16, 2016.
- B. The applicant must address the comments provided by Sergio Reyes, P.E., of eda engineers – surveyors – planners, inc., in a letter dated May 19, 2016.
- C. The applicant must address the comments provided by Brian Kanely, P.E., of Volkert, Inc., in a letter dated May 31, 2016.
- D. The applicant must address the comments provided by Kenneth L. Hill, P.E., of GSE Engineering and Consulting, Inc.
- E. Please see the comments provided by Owen M. Beitsch, PhD, FAICP, CR, and David R. Darsey, of Community Solutions Group, GAI Consultants, Inc, in a letter dated June 23, 2016.
- F. Please see the comments provided by Brian Green, Fire Inspector, Alachua County Fire Rescue, in a letter dated June 27, 2016.

If you have any questions regarding the information above, please contact me at 386-418-6100 x 107 or via e-mail at jtabor@cityofalachua.com. We look forward to receiving your revised applications.

Sincerely,



Justin Tabor, AICP
Principal Planner

Attachments:

Memoranda from Adam Boukari, Assistant City Manager, dated April 28, 2016 and June 16, 2016
Letter from Sergio Reyes, P.E., of eda engineers – surveyors – planners, inc., dated May 19, 2016
Letter from Brian Kanely, P.E., of Volkert, Inc., dated May 31, 2016
Letter from Kenneth L. Hill, P.E., of GSE Engineering, Inc., dated June 29, 2016
Letter from Owen M. Beitsch, FAICP, CR, and David R. Darsey, of Community Solutions Group, GAI Consulting, Inc, dated June 23, 2016
Letter from Brian Green, Alachua County Fire Rescue, dated June 27, 2016

c: Traci Gresham, City Manager *(letter only)*
Adam Boukari, Assistant City Manager *(letter only)*
Marian B. Rush, Esq., City Attorney *(letter only)*
Kathy Winburn, AICP, Planning & Community Development Director *(letter only)*
Adam Hall, AICP, Planner *(letter only)*
David Theriaque, Esq., Theriaque & Spain
Project Files *(letter only)*

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW TEAM SUMMARY

PROJECT NAME: Wal-Mart

APPLICATION TYPES:

- (1) Special Exception Permit application for a large-scale retail establishment greater than or equal to 80,000 square feet of gross floor area;
- (2) Special Exception Permit application for automobile repair and servicing; and,
- (3) Site Plan

APPLICANTS/PROPERTY OWNERS: Wal-Mart Stores East, LP, and First Street Group, L.C.

AGENT: Brian Cassidy, PE, CPH, Inc.

DRT MEETING DATE: July 6, 2016

DRT MEETING TYPE: Applicant

FLUM DESIGNATION: Commercial

ZONING: Commercial Intensive (CI)

OVERLAY: Gateway Overlay District

ACREAGE: ±30.19 acres (Tax Parcel No. 03869-013-000)

PROJECT AREA: ±87.34 acres

PARCELS: 03066-000-000; 03869-000-000; 03869-013-000

PROJECT SUMMARY:

A request for:

- (1) A Special Exception Permit application for a large-scale retail establishment greater than or equal to 80,000 square feet of gross floor area;
- (2) A Special Exception Permit application for automobile repair and servicing; and,
- (3) a Site Plan for a ±158,562 square foot building, with associated parking, stormwater management facilities, and associated utility infrastructure on a ±30.19 acre parcel, located on Tax Parcel Number 03869-013-000, and access drives on Tax Parcel Numbers 03866-000-000 and 03869-000-000.

Upon the applicant's submittal of revised and complete application materials, such materials shall be reviewed to confirm that the insufficiencies identified below were adequately addressed. Following review of the revised materials, Staff shall determine if: (1) an additional Development Review Team (DRT) Meeting is required; or (2) there are insufficiencies which need to be further addressed, but such revisions may be made without scheduling an additional DRT Meeting. Upon adequately addressing the applications' insufficiencies, the applications may be scheduled for a hearing before the Planning & Zoning Board.

Deficiencies to be Addressed

SITE PLAN APPLICATION

1. Compliance with Land Development Regulations

A. Section 3.7.2(C)(5) – Gateway Overlay District

- i. Provide an analysis of the application's compliance with Section 3.7.2(C)(5.)
 - (a) Ensure response specifically identifies the architectural elements (minimum of 6, as the applicant has elected to use glazing reduction provided in Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(iv)) defined in Section 3.7.2(C)(5)(a)(iv) incorporated into each of the following exterior building walls/elevations: (1) East Elevation; (2) West Elevation.
- ii. Section 3.7.2(C)(5)(c)(ii): Demonstrate that construction materials used within outdoor storage areas, areas used for trash collection, and loading areas (i.e., trash compactor, loading dock screening, and tire center storage) are of a comparable quality and appearance as the primary building.
- iii. Section 3.7.2(C)(5)(d): Requires frontage of I-75 frontage to comply with arterial screening requirements of Section 6.2.3(E.) Continuous hedge not provided between area north of parking lot and stormwater retention area 1.

B. Article 4: Use Regulations

- i. Outdoor Storage: Section 4.4.4(E) requires the outdoor storage area to be incorporated into the design of the primary structure; the area to be screened from view from property lines/right-of-way by an opaque fence with landscaping along fence; and to incorporate one of the predominant colors of the primary structure in the fence/roofing (if roofed.) Reference 4.4.4(E) for all requirements.
 - (a) Tire and Battery Storage Area must comply with outdoor storage standards provided in Section 4.4.4(E.)
 - (b) Identify the use of the area along the exterior of the west elevation (appears to be outdoor storage.) If outdoor storage, demonstrate compliance with Section 4.4.4(E.)

C. Section 6.1, Parking/Traffic/Circulation Standards

- i. Table 6.1-4 requires four (4) stacking spaces for each pharmacy drive-through lane, measured from the pickup window.
 - (a) Only three (3) stacking spaces provided for northernmost pickup window. Revise to provide the minimum four (4) required stacking spaces.
 - (b) Address conflict between vehicular traffic exiting northernmost pickup window and the stacking spaces identified for the southern pickup window (as proposed, vehicular traffic from each must cross paths with no clear delineation of right-of-way/traffic flow.) Access to pickup windows and associated stacking spaces must be revised to eliminate conflicts.
- ii. Please address the purpose/function of the large paved area east of the building and south of pharmacy pickup windows. The area does not serve to provide on-site circulation.
- iii. Address compliance with Section 6.1.8(B)(2)(b), as it relates to pharmacy drive-through lanes. Section 6.1.8(B)(2)(b) requires to the maximum extent practicable, drive-in lanes to not be located between the principal structure and adjacent public streets, or for drive-in lanes and facilities to be set back a minimum of 20 feet from any adjacent public street, with the setback landscaped *and bermed*.
- iv. Section 6.1.8(B)(1)(c) states, "stacking spaces shall be separated from other internal driveways by raised medians if the LDR Administrator determines the median is necessary for traffic movement and safety." As proposed, stacking spaces would not be

- separated from other paved areas. To provide a clear separation between on-site traffic circulation areas the vehicle stacking spaces, provide a raised median between stacking lanes and other vehicular traffic areas.
- v. Revise plans to comply with Section 6.1.8(B)(3)(a), (c), (d), and (e): *Primary drive aisles*. Primary drive aisles are required within off-street surface parking lots of 300 or more spaces, and shall be configured to appear as an extension of the public street network through the provision of:
 - (a) Sidewalks, parallel to the building facade *located along both sides of the aisle*;
 - (c) Canopy trees, spaced no less than 40 feet on center, located on both sides of the aisle, within three feet of the curb, and extending the full length of the aisle;
 - (d) Designated parallel parking spaces on both sides of the drive aisle; and
 - (e) A road crown in the center of the aisle.
 - vi. Sheet C-6: City of Alachua Parking Requirements: Identify required/provided accessible parking in accordance with Section 6.1.9.
 - vii. Revise plans to comply with Section 6.1.10(A)(2): "Pedestrian pathways shall be provided in off-street surface parking lots with 100 or more parking spaces, in accordance with the following standards:
 - (a) Pedestrian crosswalks, at least ten feet in width, either raised above the adjacent pavement, striped, or otherwise designated through the use of alternative materials, shall be located between all primary building entrances and the parking areas serving those entrances." *Crosswalks less than ten feet in width (see Keynote 13, Sheet C-6A.)*
 - (b) Within parking lots of 300 or more spaces, improved pedestrian pathways, with a minimum width of three feet, located in continuous landscaped parking islands, shall be provided at least every fourth row of parking spaces." (1) *Sidewalk not provided every fourth row of parking space in easternmost portion of parking lot.* (2) *Identify width of pedestrian pathways to demonstrate minimum width of 3 feet is provided.* (3) *Westernmost pedestrian pathway is not within a continuously landscaped parking island.*
 - viii. Identify the location of all on-site traffic control devices, such as stop signs/stop bars, etc., within parking lots/drive aisles.

D. Sections 6.2.1, Tree Replacement, Credit, and 6.2.2, Landscape Standards

- i. Sheet TR-2: Tree mitigation appears to be calculated incorrectly. "Total Tree Accounting" table identifies "required landscape plan trees," however, this only accounts for site landscaping requirements. No consideration is given to all other landscaping requirements (i.e., perimeter buffer requirements, parking lot perimeter/interior, etc.) Please address.
- ii. Sheet TR-2: "Total Tree Accounting" Table – Tree credits for retained trees may not be used to meet mitigation requirements. Section 6.2.2(D)(4) states: "Canopy or ornamental/understory trees that are in very good to excellent health, that are protected before and during development of the site and maintained thereafter in a healthy growing condition, can be used to comply with the landscaping standards for Subsections 6.2.2(D)(1), Site landscaping; 6.2.2(D)(2), Parking lot landscaping; or 6.2.2(D)(3), Perimeter buffers, of this section." Please address.
- iii. Tree credits – Tables on L-1 and TR-2 show there are 6 trees between 30" and 36" to be retained. Calculation of credits is incorrect (6 trees x 5 credits/tree = 30 credits.) Revise accordingly.
- iv. Sheet L-1: Required Tree Mitigation Table – does not address mitigation trees provided to mitigate for heritage trees removed. Please address.

- v. Sheet TR-2: Confirm trees used to calculate tree credits are healthy regulated trees, and are not a species on the nuisance tree list. Trees used for credit must be in very good or excellent health (see 6.2.2(D)(4.)) No credit is given for any trees on the nuisance tree list.
- vi. Parking Lot Interior – Trees Required – Calculations show 192 required, but only 171 provided. Provide additional trees within parking lot interior to meet minimum required.
- vii. Sheet L-1: Section 6.2.2(D)(3)(e) requires perimeter buffers to be located along the outer perimeter of the parcel. Please address location of perimeter buffer in the information provided on this sheet for the north perimeter buffer and the portion of the east perimeter buffer (north of seller road 1.)
- viii. Section 6.2.2(D)(8) requires canopy trees to be a minimum of 8 feet in height, and shrubs which are upright in nature to be a minimum of 24 inches in height at the time of planting. The specifications for certain canopy trees calls for trees less than 8 feet in height, and specifications for shrubs that are upright in nature are less than 24 inches in height. Revise accordingly.
- ix. Sheet L-1: Verify footnote under Parking Buffer Landscape table is in the appropriate location. Footnote relates to building façade trees.
- x. Provide detail of screening surrounding trash compactor, organic dumpster, and bale and pallet recycling areas to demonstrate compliance with Section 6.2.3(B.) Note that sides providing service access must be gated.
- xi. Sheet TR-2: There are discrepancies between the tree protection notes and tree protection detail. Please resolve discrepancies and verify notes related to tree protection are consistent with Section 6.2.1(D)(2)(a.)
- xii. Sheet TR-2: Tree protection approval – revise note to state the landscape architect shall approve the tree barricades prior to site clearing.
- xiii. Tree Retention Plan (Sheet TR-1) not legible at scale used (1" = 100'.) Please address.

E. Section 6.3, Fencing Standards

- i. Section 6.3.3(B) prohibits fences and walls within front setback areas. A “proposed decorative retaining wall” is depicted on each side of entrance road within front setback areas of the property. Revise to comply with Section 6.3.3(B.)

F. Section 6.4, Exterior Lighting Standards

- i. Lighting Plan:
 - (a) Notes state “LED statistics shown are at 50,000 hours L90 rating (~12 years @ 12 hrs/day.)” Section 6.4.4(D) requires photometrics to demonstrate that initial lamp lumens do not exceed 24,000 lumens or 400 watts for each fixture. Revise photometrics to provide statistics for the initial lamp lumens of all light fixtures.
 - (b) Notes state “Trees are modeled as approved T1, T2, and T3 objects that block lights as 10 year mature trees.” Photometric Plan must depict site photometrics present at completion of project. Revise photometrics to provide statistics for the site at the completion of construction.
 - (c) Revise notes on photometric plans to address comments above.
- ii. The maximum to minimum ratio of the rear drive exceeds the permitted ratio of 10:1 (Section 6.4.4.(E.)) Revise accordingly.
- iii. Lighting Plan: To demonstrate compliance of each fixture with Section 6.4.4(D)(2), add columns in the matrix located in the lower left of the plan that identify the initial lamp lumens and wattage of each light fixture (as opposed to only the arranged luminaire lumens/wattage.)
- iv. Provide mounting detail of all light fixtures used on the subject property.

- v. Provide cut sheets of all light fixtures used on the subject property. Cut sheets must be provided within the Site Plan/Lighting Plan, and depict the use of full cut-off fixtures (6.4.4(F)(1.))

G. Section 6.5, Signage

- i. A freestanding sign appears to be depicted west of the intersection of US Highway 441 and the entrance road. Please note freestanding signage for a multi-tenant building or development is subject to the provisions of Section 6.5.4(C)(2) (among other subsections of Section 6.5) and compliance with such provisions must be demonstrated as part of the review of a sign permit application.

H. Section 6.8, Design Standards for Business Uses

- i. Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(ii) states, “for the purposes of this section, the ground floor facade area of single-story buildings shall be calculated by measuring the applicable building wall between the finished grade and the underside of the roof, wall, or parapet of the façade...” The proposed building includes a parapet on the front façade, therefore, the area of the front façade must be calculated from the finished grade to the top of the parapet. Revise area/calculations on Architectural Plans of north and east façades used to calculate required glazing and architectural masonry.
- ii. Section 6.8.2(A)(1) states that all facades facing a street shall be subject to the standards set forth in Subsection 6.8.3(A)(2.) The east elevation, which faces a proposed public street must comply with the following:
 - (a) Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(iv): The applicant has utilized the glazing reduction permitted by the referenced section, however, has not provided one of the following to comply with subsections b. and c.:
 - Window shutters or plantation-style shutters which span a minimum of 10 percent of the length of the façade, or;
 - A canopy or portico which provides a covered pedestrian walkway adjacent to the façade which spans a minimum of 50 percent of the length of the façade; ***and***
 - Customer entrances which include no less than six of the design features provided in Subsection 6.8.3(C)(2)(d.) (NOTE: identify the design features incorporated into the customer entrance.)
- iii. Calculation of glazing provided for front elevation includes areas to the sides of vestibules and over cart doors. These areas are not visible when facing the front elevation. Calculation of glazing area must and visible when facing the front elevation.
- iv. The applicant proposes to utilize the glazing reduction provided in Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(iv), which provides for a reduction in glazing of the front façade from 30% to 20%. In order to demonstrate compliance with the preceding section, the applicant must:
 - (a) Provide within the Architectural Plans:
 - A calculation of the length of the front façade consisting of window shutters/plantation-style shutters, or a canopy/portico; and,
 - A calculation of the length of the total façade.
 - (b) Incorporate no less than six (6) of the design features provided in Section 6.8.3(C)(2)(d) into customer entrances on the front façade. Identify which design features are incorporated into customer entrances on the front façade.
- v. Provide specifications/cut sheet of the proposed ‘architectural masonry.’ Must be a natural brick or natural brick product (6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(iv)a.)
- vi. Front (north) and east elevations do not appear to meet façade massing/alternative requirements provided in Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(b) in the following locations:
 - (a) East Elevation: Between center-most parapets. Roof line change provided, however, a corresponding material change required by 6.8.3(A)(2)(b)(ii)c.

- (b) Front Elevation: From second pilaster inset from NE corner, to west of grocery vestibule.
- (c) Front Elevation: From east of GM vestibule to pilaster west of GM vestibule.
- (d) Front Elevation: from NW corner of building to first roof line change.
- vii. To demonstrate compliance with Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(b), identify the height of all pilasters.
- viii. Section 6.8.3(B)(2) requires flat roofs to be concealed using a parapet wall with cornice treatment. Cornice must include a perpendicular projection of a minimum of 8 inches from the parapet façade plane. Provide detail within the Architectural Plans demonstrating that the cornice surrounding the entire perimeter of the building includes a perpendicular projection of at least 8 inches.
- ix. Section 6.8.3(C) requires customer entrances on each side of the building facing a public street.
 - (a) An entrance is provided along the east elevation, however, the area to which this entrance accesses as depicted on the submitted floor plan does not appear to be a customer area of the store. Address how this entrance complies with Section 6.8.3(C.)
 - (b) Identify the design features selected (minimum of 6, as the applicant has elected to use glazing reduction provided in Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(iv)) provided in Section 6.8.3(C)(2) for the customer entrance on the east elevation.
- x. Revise plans to demonstrate compliance with Section 6.8.3(E)(1): "*Sidewalks required*. New large retail establishments shall provide sidewalks constructed in accordance with Subsection 7.3.2(B), Configuration..." Section 7.3.2(B) requires sidewalks to be a minimum 5 feet wide, 4 inches thick. Identify width/thickness of all sidewalks.
- xi. Revise plans to demonstrate compliance with Section 6.8.3(E)(2): "*Pedestrian pathways*. The on-site pedestrian circulation system shall comply with the standards in Subsection 6.1.10(A), Required improvements, and Subsection 7.3.2(C), Connection." Seven (7) connections to adjacent public sidewalk system are required.
- xii. Revise plans to demonstrate compliance with Section 6.8.3(E)(4): "*Distinguished from driving surfaces*. All internal pedestrian walkways shall be distinguished from driving surfaces through the use of durable, low-maintenance surface materials such as pavers, bricks, or scored/stamped concrete or asphalt to enhance pedestrian safety and comfort, as well as the attractiveness of the walkways."

I. General Comments

- i. Traffic Circulation
 - (a) See comments provided by Brian Kanely, P.E., of Volkert, Inc., in a letter dated May 31, 2016 pertaining to proposed median cut south of entrance road intersection with US 441. Median must be solid from traffic signal to seller road 1.
 - (b) Confirm and demonstrate access points along east side of entrance road are consistent with Policy 1.2.b, Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element.
 - (c) Applicant to coordinate with Alachua County E-911 office to assign road names.
 - (d) Provide keynote on Sheet C-6B noting diamonds to be located at the terminus of entrance road.
 - (e) Provide crosswalks at the following locations:
 - On west and south sides of the intersection of entrance road and seller road 1.
 - On east side of the intersection of entrance road and NW 151st Blvd.

ii. Drainage/Stormwater

(a) Sheet C-7: Insufficient data is provided to indicate positive drainage in the following areas. Provide spot elevations and directional arrows indicated stormwater flow in the following areas:

- Each truck well;
- Drive area in southeast corner of property (around the radius of the landscape island;)
- Parking area, drive aisle west of TLE and garden center;
- At the radii of the landscape islands south of S-35; and,
- At the two landscape islands southeast of S-33

(b) Sheet C-7A:

- Verify size of S-73. S-75 discharges to S-73, but S-75 is larger in diameter.
- Verify inlet elevations for NE inlet, S-107, and SE inlet, S-105. S-107 appears to drain to S-105, however, inlet elevations are inverted for such configuration.

iii. Public Facilities

(a) The provision of water/wastewater facilities from off-site locations to the points of termination depicted on plans should be addressed by providing a reference to off-site infrastructure improvement plans to be prepared separate from these plans.

iv. Land Rights

(a) Throughout Plans: Remove references to “outparcel” and “City dedicated parcel.” Revise to reflect parcel’s use as passive recreation or another descriptive term appropriate for its designated use.

(b) Throughout Plans: Delete references to “outlot,” “out parcel,” “out parcel 1,” etc., if this is not applicable to project.

(c) References to “Seller Retained Property” should be removed. Information is not relevant to this application.

(d) Legal descriptions and sketches depicted on survey do not appear match current proposed ROWs shown on civil drawings. Resolve inconsistency.

(e) Legal descriptions and sketches of overall parcel on survey do not reflect tax parcel records. Resolve inconsistency.

(f) Provide draft legal descriptions and sketches of all proposed public utility easements (PUEs.)

v. Miscellaneous

(a) Throughout Plans: Delete references to “proposed legend.” Refer to as “legend.” Likewise, delete references to “proposed notes” throughout plans. Refer to as “notes.”

(b) Throughout Plans: References to GRU for water, wastewater, and electric service are incorrect. Revise to City of Alachua.

(c) Sheet C-1: Verify name of soil consultant is correct. Appears to be misspelled.

(d) Sheet C-1: Revise reference to contact for electric, water, and sewer utilities.

(e) Sheet C-3: Survey Note 13 indicates front, rear, and side setbacks of 10 feet. Correct setbacks: Front – 20 feet; Side – 0 feet; Rear – 15 feet.

(f) Sheet C-3B: Many spot elevations not legible due to overlap of information on drawing.

(g) Sheet C-6: Add Tax Parcel No. 03066-000-000 under Site Data.

(h) Sheet C-6: Impervious Area for parcel currently labelled “City dedicated parcel” is 0 square feet. Revise accordingly.

(i) Sheet C-6: There is a typographical error under “Special Exceptions Requested.”

(j) Sheet C-6: There is a typographical error under “Conditions,” first bullet.

- (k) Sheet C-6: There is a typographical error under “Conditions,” third bullet, second line (“location” should be plural.)
- (l) Sheet C-6: “Conditions,” third bullet: verify the information is correct pertaining to rainfall to be treated.
- (m) Sheet C-6A: Keynotes: Identify detail sheet where detail for each keynote is provided.
- (n) Sheet C-6A: Keynote 11: Call out states to coordinate with GRU for electric service. Electric service provider is City of Alachua. Revise accordingly.
- (o) Sheet C-6A: Keynote 26: Include statement that all signage requires separate permit.
- (p) Sheet C-6A: Keynote 39: Calls for bicycle rack model types 2170-7, 2170-13, and 2170-19. Detail on Sheet C-12.1 depicts model type 2170-3, 2170-7, 2170-9, 2170-11, and 2170-13.
 - Sheet C-12.1: Delete detail for model types 2170-3, 2170-9, and 2170-11, since they are not used for this project.
 - Add detail for model type 2170-19.
- (q) Sheet C-6A: Keynote 42: Keynote specifications provided, but not depicted on plans. Revise accordingly.
- (r) Sheet C-6A: Light legend symbols do not match those depicted on plan sheet. Revise accordingly.
- (s) Sheet C-6B: provide keynote legend on sheet.
- (t) Sheet C-7: FEMA flood panel referenced is outdated. Current FIRM series is dated June 16, 2006.
- (u) Sheet C-7: There is a typographical error in the title block for “Flood Plain.”
- (v) Sheet C-8: Define abbreviation “FO” in legend.
- (w) Sheet E-8: Dimensions of fixture details for SLA and SLB are incorrect.
- (x) Sheet TR-2: Note on sheet references details concerning individual trees, size, and tree credits as available on that sheet (circular reference.)
- (y) Architectural Plans: Please provide scale on all Architectural Plan sheets.
- (z) Architectural Plan Sheet 2: Area of front elevation consisting of Optical Center not labelled. Revise accordingly.
- (aa) Lighting Plan: There is a note above the matrix in the upper right corner that applies to the preparation of the matrix, and should be removed from the plans as it is not applicable to the information presented within the plans.

J. Concurrency Impact Analysis

- i. Indicate the source of the project demand for potable water, sanitary sewer, and solid waste facilities.
- ii. Reserved capacities for water, wastewater, and transportation facilities are not considered. Revise Concurrency Impact Analysis to consider reserved capacities and the impact to residual capacities.

SPECIAL EXCEPTION PERMIT (SEP) APPLICATION: BUILDING ≥80,000 SQUARE FEET

2. Compliance with Land Development Regulations

- A. Response to Section 2.4.4(D)(8): Property is located within Gateway Overlay District and subject to development standards provided in Section 3.7.2(C)(5.) Provide an analysis of the application’s compliance with Section 3.7.2(C)(5.) See comment 1.A., above for further information.
- B. Response to Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(ii): Ground floor façade area must be calculated from the finished grade to bottom of parapet wall. Revise response accordingly.

- C. Response to Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(iv)c.: Identify the 6 design features that are incorporated into each customer entrance on the front elevation, or reference response to Section 6.8.3(C)(2) if it addresses the requirements of this section.
- D. Response to Section 6.8.3(C)(2):
 - i. The applicant has chosen to utilize glazing alternatives which permit a reduction in glazing for the front façade, but require the incorporation of no less than 6 of the design features provided in the referenced section. Revise response accordingly.
 - ii. Identify a minimum of 6 of the design features incorporated into front facade customer entrances (grocery, home and pharmacy.)
 - iii. Identify a minimum of 3 of the design features that are incorporated into all other customer entrances (auto center and east entrance.)
 - iv. Response states that display windows that are directly adjacent to each customer entrance are provided. Insufficient information has been provided to support that the windows adjacent to market, home and pharmacy, and auto center entrances shall be display windows. Further, no display windows are provided directly adjacent to east entrance. Provide sufficient information to support that the windows adjacent to each entrance shall be used for displays, if this is a design feature to be incorporated into the design of customer entrances.
- E. Response to Section 6.8.3(E)(2):
 - i. Response states that stamped concrete is used for pedestrian crosswalks, however, striping has been proposed. Pedestrian crosswalks must comply with Section 6.8.3(E)(4), which requires the use of durable, low-maintenance surface materials such as pavers, bricks, or scored/stamped concrete. The Site Plan must be revised to comply with Section 6.8.3(E)(4.) Verify response to Section 6.8.3(E)(2) is consistent with surface materials selected.
 - ii. Section 7.3.2(C), referenced in Section 6.8.3(E)(2), requires a total of 7 pedestrian connections to the adjacent public sidewalk network, however, only 4 appear to be proposed. The Site Plan must be revised to comply with the minimum required number of connections. Verify response to Section 6.8.3(E)(2) is consistent with the number of pedestrian connections to adjacent sidewalk network provided.
- F. Response to Section 6.8.3(E)(4):
 - i. Response states that stamped concrete is used for pedestrian crosswalks, however, striping has been proposed. Pedestrian crosswalks must use durable, low-maintenance surface materials such as pavers, bricks, or scored/stamped concrete. The Site Plan must be revised to comply with Section 6.8.3(E)(4.) Verify response to Section 6.8.3(E)(4) is consistent with surface materials selected.

3. Concurrency Impact Analysis

- A. Provide revised Concurrency Impact Analysis, as further described within Site Plan application comments (Comment 1.I.), within supporting materials for this SEP application.

SPECIAL EXCEPTION PERMIT (SEP) APPLICATION: AUTOMOBILE REPAIR & SERVICING

4. Compliance with Land Development Regulations

- A. Response to Section 2.4.4(D)(8): Property is located within Gateway Overlay District and subject to development standards provided in Section 3.7.2(C)(5.) Provide an analysis of the application's compliance with Section 3.7.2(C)(5.) See comment 1.A., above for further information.

- B. Response to Section 2.4.4(D)(3):
 - i. Visual Impact: References attached architectural elevations. Architectural elevations included within companion SEP and Site Plan applications, but have not been included with this SEP application.
 - ii. Noise: Response should address the location of automobile repair/servicing activity.
 - C. Response to Section 2.4.4(D)(4):
 - i. Further discussion of the disposal of regulated materials, including but not limited to, motor oil, fluids, batteries, and tires, should be provided. Discussion may include identification of applicable regulating agencies, disposal methods, etc.
 - ii. Typographical error in first line of second paragraph.
 - D. Response to Section 4.3.4(J):
 - i. Correct citation on Page 8 of report is Section 4.3.4(J)(3.)
 - ii. References are made to site design features, such as parking areas, buffers, means of ingress/egress, etc., that are depicted on the Site Plan. Sheets from the Site Plan representative of these features should be included as an exhibit to this SEP application.
5. Concurrency Impact Analysis
- B. Provide revised Concurrency Impact Analysis, as further described within Site Plan application comments (Comment 1.I.), within supporting materials for this SEP application.
6. **PUBLIC SERVICES, OUTSIDE ENGINEERING/CONSULTANT REVIEW COMMENTS**
- A. The applicant must address the comments provided by Adam Boukari, Assistant City Manager, in memoranda dated April 28, 2016, and June 16, 2016.
 - B. The applicant must address the comments provided by Sergio Reyes, P.E., of eda engineers – surveyors – planners, inc., in a letter dated May 19, 2016.
 - C. The applicant must address the comments provided by Brian Kanely, P.E., of Volkert, Inc., in a letter dated May 31, 2016.
 - D. The applicant must address the comments provided by Kenneth L. Hill, P.E., of GSE Engineering and Consulting, Inc.
 - E. Please see the comments provided by Owen M. Beitsch, PhD, FAICP, CR, and David R. Darsey, of Community Solutions Group, GAI Consultants, Inc, in a letter dated June 23, 2016.
 - F. Please see the comments provided by Brian Green, Fire Inspector, Alachua County Fire Rescue, in a letter dated June 27, 2016.

Upon the applicant's submittal of revised and complete application materials, such materials shall be reviewed to confirm if the insufficiencies identified herein were adequately addressed. Following review of the revised materials, Staff shall determine if: (1) an additional Development Review Team (DRT) Meeting is required; or (2) there are insufficiencies which need to be further addressed, but such revisions may be made without scheduling an additional DRT Meeting. Upon adequately addressing the applications' insufficiencies, the applications may be scheduled for a hearing before the Planning & Zoning Board.

City of Alachua
Development Review Team (DRT) Meeting

Project Name: Wal-Mart - Site Plan, Special Exception Permits (2)

Meeting Date: July 6, 2016 (APPLICANT MEETING)

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY

[illegible]

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW TEAM SUMMARY

PROJECT NAME: Wal-Mart

APPLICATION TYPES:

- (1) Special Exception Permit application for a large-scale retail establishment greater than or equal to 80,000 square feet of gross floor area;
- (2) Special Exception Permit application for automobile repair and servicing; and,
- (3) Site Plan

APPLICANTS/PROPERTY OWNERS: Wal-Mart Stores East, LP, and First Street Group, L.C.

AGENT: Brian Cassidy, PE, CPH, Inc.

DRT MEETING DATE: June 29, 2016

DRT MEETING TYPE: Staff

FLUM DESIGNATION: Commercial

ZONING: Commercial Intensive (CI)

OVERLAY: Gateway Overlay District

ACREAGE: ±30.19 acres (Tax Parcel No. 03869-013-000)

PROJECT AREA: ±87.34 acres

PARCELS: 03066-000-000; 03869-000-000; 03869-013-000

PROJECT SUMMARY:

A request for:

- (1) A Special Exception Permit application for a large-scale retail establishment greater than or equal to 80,000 square feet of gross floor area;
- (2) A Special Exception Permit application for automobile repair and servicing; and,
- (3) a Site Plan for a ±158,562 square foot building, with associated parking, stormwater management facilities, and associated utility infrastructure on a ±30.19 acre parcel, located on Tax Parcel Number 03869-013-000, and access drives on Tax Parcel Numbers 03866-000-000 and 03869-000-000.

RESUBMISSION DUE DATE: All data, plans, and documentation addressing the insufficiencies identified below must be received by the Planning Department on or before **4:00 PM on Thursday, July 21, 2016**

Deficiencies to be Addressed

SITE PLAN APPLICATION

1. Compliance with Land Development Regulations

A. Section 3.7.2(C)(5) – Gateway Overlay District

- i. Provide an analysis of the application's compliance with Section 3.7.2(C)(5.)
 - (a) Ensure response specifically identifies the architectural elements (minimum of 3) defined in Section 3.7.2(C)(5)(a)(iv) incorporated into each of the following exterior building walls/elevations: (1) East Elevation; (2) West Elevation.
- ii. Section 3.7.2(C)(5)(c)(ii): Demonstrate that construction materials used within outdoor storage areas, areas used for trash collection, and loading areas (i.e., trash compactor, loading dock screening, and tire center storage) are of a comparable quality and appearance as the primary building.
- iii. Section 3.7.2(C)(5)(d): Requires frontage of I-75 frontage to comply with arterial screening requirements of Section 6.2.3(E.) Continuous hedge not provided between area north of parking lot and stormwater retention area 1.

B. Article 4: Use Regulations

- i. Outdoor Storage: Section 4.4.4(E) requires the outdoor storage area to be incorporated into the design of the primary structure; the area to be screened from view from property lines/right-of-way by an opaque fence with landscaping along fence; and to incorporate one of the predominant colors of the primary structure in the fence/roofing (if roofed.) Reference 4.4.4(E) for all requirements.
 - (a) Tire and Battery Storage Area must comply with outdoor storage standards provided in Section 4.4.4(E.)
 - (b) Identify the use of the area along the exterior of the west elevation (appears to be outdoor storage.) If outdoor storage, demonstrate compliance with Section 4.4.4(E.)

C. Section 6.1, Parking/Traffic/Circulation Standards

- i. Table 6.1-4 requires four (4) stacking spaces for each pharmacy drive-through lane, measured from the pickup window.
 - (a) Only three (3) stacking spaces provided for northernmost pickup window. Revise to provide the minimum four (4) required stacking spaces.
 - (b) Address conflict between vehicular traffic exiting northernmost pickup window and the stacking spaces identified for the southern pickup window (as proposed, vehicular traffic from each must cross paths with no clear delineation of right-of-way/traffic flow.) Access to pickup windows and associated stacking spaces must be revised to eliminate conflicts.
- ii. Please address the purpose/function of the large paved area east of the building and south of pharmacy pickup windows. The area does not serve to provide on-site circulation.
- iii. Address compliance with Section 6.1.8(B)(2)(b), as it relates to pharmacy drive-through lanes. Section 6.1.8(B)(2)(b) requires to the maximum extent practicable, drive-in lanes to not be located between the principal structure and adjacent public streets, or for drive-in lanes and facilities to be set back a minimum of 20 feet from any adjacent public street, with the setback landscaped and bermed.
- iv. Section 6.1.8(B)(1)(c) states, "stacking spaces shall be separated from other internal driveways by raised medians if the LDR Administrator determines the median is necessary for traffic movement and safety." As proposed, stacking spaces would not be separated from other paved areas. To provide a clear separation between on-site traffic

- circulation areas the vehicle stacking spaces, provide a raised median between stacking lanes and other vehicular traffic areas.
- v. Revise plans to comply with Section 6.1.8(B)(3)(a), (c), (d), and (e): *Primary drive aisles*. Primary drive aisles are required within off-street surface parking lots of 300 or more spaces, and shall be configured to appear as an extension of the public street network through the provision of:
 - (a) Sidewalks, parallel to the building facade *located along both sides of the aisle*;
 - (c) Canopy trees, spaced no less than 40 feet on center, located on both sides of the aisle, within three feet of the curb, and extending the full length of the aisle;
 - (d) Designated parallel parking spaces on both sides of the drive aisle; and
 - (e) A road crown in the center of the aisle.
 - vi. Sheet C-6: City of Alachua Parking Requirements: Identify required/provided accessible parking in accordance with Section 6.1.9.
 - vii. Revise plans to comply with Section 6.1.10(A)(2): "Pedestrian pathways shall be provided in off-street surface parking lots with 100 or more parking spaces, in accordance with the following standards:
 - (a) Pedestrian crosswalks, at least ten feet in width, either raised above the adjacent pavement, striped, or otherwise designated through the use of alternative materials, shall be located between all primary building entrances and the parking areas serving those entrances." *Crosswalks less than ten feet in width (see Keynote 13, Sheet C-6A.)*
 - (b) Within parking lots of 300 or more spaces, improved pedestrian pathways, with a minimum width of three feet, located in continuous landscaped parking islands, shall be provided at least every fourth row of parking spaces." (1) *Sidewalk not provided every fourth row of parking space in easternmost portion of parking lot.* (2) *Identify width of pedestrian pathways to demonstrate minimum width of 3 feet is provided.* (3) *Westernmost pedestrian pathway is not within a continuously landscaped parking island.*
 - viii. Identify the location of all on-site traffic control devices, such as stop signs/stop bars, etc., within parking lots/drive aisles.

D. Sections 6.2.1, Tree Replacement, Credit, and 6.2.2, Landscape Standards

- i. Sheet TR-2: Tree mitigation appears to be calculated incorrectly. "Total Tree Accounting" table identifies "required landscape plan trees," however, this only accounts for site landscaping requirements. No consideration is given to all other landscaping requirements (i.e., perimeter buffer requirements, parking lot perimeter/interior, etc.) Please address.
- ii. Sheet TR-2: "Total Tree Accounting" Table – Tree credits for retained trees may not be used to meet mitigation requirements. Section 6.2.2(D)(4) states: "Canopy or ornamental/understory trees that are in very good to excellent health, that are protected before and during development of the site and maintained thereafter in a healthy growing condition, can be used to comply with the landscaping standards for Subsections 6.2.2(D)(1), Site landscaping; 6.2.2(D)(2), Parking lot landscaping; or 6.2.2(D)(3), Perimeter buffers, of this section." Please address.
- iii. Tree credits – Tables on L-1 and TR-2 show there are 6 trees between 30" and 36" to be retained. Calculation of credits is incorrect (6 trees x 5 credits/tree = 30 credits.) Revise accordingly.
- iv. Sheet L-1: Required Tree Mitigation Table – does not address mitigation trees provided to mitigate for heritage trees removed. Please address.

- v. Sheet TR-2: Confirm trees used to calculate tree credits are healthy regulated trees, and are not a species on the nuisance tree list. Trees used for credit must be in very good or excellent health (see 6.2.2(D)(4.)) No credit is given for any trees on the nuisance tree list.
- vi. Parking Lot Interior – Trees Required – Calculations show 192 required, but only 171 provided. Provide additional trees within parking lot interior to meet minimum required.
- vii. Sheet L-1: Section 6.2.2(D)(3)(e) requires perimeter buffers to be located along the outer perimeter of the parcel. Please address location of perimeter buffer in the information provided on this sheet for the north perimeter buffer and the portion of the east perimeter buffer (north of seller road 1.)
- viii. Section 6.2.2(D)(8) requires canopy trees to be a minimum of 8 feet in height, and shrubs which are upright in nature to be a minimum of 24 inches in height at the time of planting. The specifications for certain canopy trees calls for trees less than 8 feet in height, and specifications for shrubs that are upright in nature are less than 24 inches in height. Revise accordingly.
- ix. Sheet L-1: Verify footnote under Parking Buffer Landscape table is in the appropriate location. Footnote relates to building façade trees.
- x. Provide detail of screening surrounding trash compactor, organic dumpster, and bale and pallet recycling areas to demonstrate compliance with Section 6.2.3(B.) Note that sides providing service access must be gated.
- xi. Sheet TR-2: There are discrepancies between the tree protection notes and tree protection detail. Please resolve discrepancies and verify notes related to tree protection are consistent with Section 6.2.1(D)(2)(a.)
- xii. Sheet TR-2: Tree protection approval – revise note to state the landscape architect shall approve the tree barricades prior to site clearing.
- xiii. Tree Retention Plan (Sheet TR-1) not legible at scale used (1" = 100'.) Please address.

E. Section 6.3, Fencing Standards

- i. Section 6.3.3(B) prohibits fences and walls within front setback areas. A “proposed decorative retaining wall” is depicted on each side of entrance road within front setback areas of the property. Revise to comply with Section 6.3.3(B.)

F. Section 6.4, Exterior Lighting Standards

- i. Lighting Plan:
 - (a) Notes state “LED statistics shown are at 50,000 hours L90 rating (~12 years @ 12 hrs/day.)” Section 6.4.4(D) requires photometrics to demonstrate that initial lamp lumens do not exceed 24,000 lumens or 400 watts for each fixture. Revise photometrics to provide statistics for the initial lamp lumens of all light fixtures.
 - (b) Notes state “Trees are modeled as approved T1, T2, and T3 objects that block lights as 10 year mature trees.” Photometric Plan must depict site photometrics present at completion of project. Revise photometrics to provide statistics for the site at the completion of construction.
 - (c) Revise notes on photometric plans to address comments above.
- ii. The maximum to minimum ratio of the rear drive exceeds the permitted ratio of 10:1 (Section 6.4.4.(E.)) Revise accordingly.
- iii. Lighting Plan: To demonstrate compliance of each fixture with Section 6.4.4(D)(2), add columns in the matrix located in the lower left of the plan that identify the initial lamp lumens and wattage of each light fixture (as opposed to only the arranged luminaire lumens/wattage.)
- iv. Provide mounting detail of all light fixtures used on the subject property.

- v. Provide cut sheets of all light fixtures used on the subject property. Cut sheets must be provided within the Site Plan/Lighting Plan, and depict the use of full cut-off fixtures (6.4.4(F)(1.))

G. Section 6.8, Design Standards for Business Uses

- i. Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(ii) states, “for the purposes of this section, the ground floor facade area of single-story buildings shall be calculated by measuring the applicable building wall between the finished grade and the underside of the roof, wall, or parapet of the façade...” The proposed building includes a parapet on the front façade, therefore, the area of the front façade must be calculated from the finished grade to the top of the parapet. Revise area/calculations on Architectural Plans of north and east façades used to calculate required glazing and architectural masonry.
- ii. Section 6.8.2(A)(1) states that all facades facing a street shall be subject to the standards set forth in Subsection 6.8.3(A)(2.) The east elevation, which faces a proposed public street must comply with the following:
 - (a) Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(iv): The applicant has utilized the glazing reduction permitted by the referenced section, however, has not provided one of the following to comply with subsections b. and c.:
 - Window shutters or plantation-style shutters which span a minimum of 10 percent of the length of the façade, or;
 - A canopy or portico which provides a covered pedestrian walkway adjacent to the façade which spans a minimum of 50 percent of the length of the façade; ***and***
 - Customer entrances which include no less than six of the design features provided in Subsection 6.8.3(C)(2)(d.) (NOTE: identify the design features incorporated into the customer entrance.)
- iii. Calculation of glazing provided for front elevation includes areas to the sides of vestibules and over cart doors. These areas are not visible when facing the front elevation. Calculation of glazing area must and visible when facing the front elevation.
- iv. The applicant proposes to utilize the glazing reduction provided in Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(iv), which provides for a reduction in glazing of the front façade from 30% to 20%. In order to demonstrate compliance with the preceding section, the applicant must:
 - (a) Provide within the Architectural Plans:
 - A calculation of the length of the front façade consisting of window shutters/plantation-style shutters, or a canopy/portico; and,
 - A calculation of the length of the total façade.
 - (b) Incorporate no less than six (6) of the design features provided in Section 6.8.3(C)(2)(d) into customer entrances on the front façade. Identify which design features are incorporated into customer entrances on the front façade.
- v. Provide specifications/cut sheet of the proposed ‘architectural masonry.’ Must be a natural brick or natural brick product (6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(iv)a.)
- vi. Front (north) and east elevations do not appear to meet façade massing/alternative requirements provided in Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(b) in the following locations:
 - (a) East Elevation: Between center-most parapets. Roof line change provided, however, a corresponding material change required by 6.8.3(A)(2)(b)(ii)c.
 - (b) Front Elevation: From second pilaster inset from NE corner, to west of grocery vestibule.
 - (c) Front Elevation: From east of GM vestibule to pilaster west of GM vestibule.
 - (d) Front Elevation: from NW corner of building to first roof line change.
- vii. To demonstrate compliance with Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(b), identify the height of all pilasters.

- viii. Section 6.8.3(B)(2) requires flat roofs to be concealed using a parapet wall with cornice treatment. Cornice must include a perpendicular projection of a minimum of 8 inches from the parapet façade plane. Provide detail within the Architectural Plans demonstrating that the cornice surrounding the entire perimeter of the building includes a perpendicular projection of at least 8 inches.
- ix. Section 6.8.3(C) requires customer entrances on each side of the building facing a public street.
 - (a) An entrance is provided along the east elevation, however, the area to which this entrance accesses as depicted on the submitted floor plan does not appear to be a customer area of the store. Address how this entrance complies with Section 6.8.3(C.)
 - (b) Identify the design features selected (minimum three) provided in Section 6.8.3(C)(2) for the customer entrance on the east elevation.
- x. Revise plans to demonstrate compliance with Section 6.8.3(E)(1): *"Sidewalks required.* New large retail establishments shall provide sidewalks constructed in accordance with Subsection 7.3.2(B), Configuration..." Section 7.3.2(B) requires sidewalks to be a minimum 5 feet wide, 4 inches thick. Identify width/thickness of all sidewalks.
- xi. Revise plans to demonstrate compliance with Section 6.8.3(E)(2): *"Pedestrian pathways.* The on-site pedestrian circulation system shall comply with the standards in Subsection 6.1.10(A), Required improvements, and Subsection 7.3.2(C), Connection." Seven (7) connections to adjacent public sidewalk system are required.
- xii. Revise plans to demonstrate compliance with Section 6.8.3(E)(4): *"Distinguished from driving surfaces.* All internal pedestrian walkways shall be distinguished from driving surfaces through the use of durable, low-maintenance surface materials such as pavers, bricks, or scored/stamped concrete or asphalt to enhance pedestrian safety and comfort, as well as the attractiveness of the walkways."

H. General Comments

- i. Traffic Circulation
 - (a) See comments provided by Brian Kanely, P.E., of Volkert, Inc., in a letter dated May 31, 2016 pertaining to proposed median cut south of entrance road intersection with US 441. Median must be solid from traffic signal to seller road 1.
 - (b) Confirm and demonstrate access points along east side of entrance road are consistent with Policy 1.2.b, Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element.
 - (c) Applicant to coordinate with Alachua County E-911 office to assign road names.
 - (d) Provide keynote on Sheet C-6B noting diamonds to be located at the terminus of entrance road.
 - (e) Provide crosswalks at the following locations:
 - On west and south sides of the intersection of entrance road and seller road 1.
 - On east side of the intersection of entrance road and NW 151st Blvd.
- ii. Drainage/Stormwater
 - (a) Sheet C-7: Insufficient data is provided to indicate positive drainage in the following areas. Provide spot elevations and directional arrows indicated stormwater flow in the following areas:
 - Each truck well;
 - Drive area in southeast corner of property (around the radius of the landscape island;)
 - Parking area, drive aisle west of TLE and garden center;
 - At the radii of the landscape islands south of S-35; and,
 - At the two landscape islands southeast of S-33

- (b) Sheet C-7A:
 - Verify size of S-73. S-75 discharges to S-73, but S-75 is larger in diameter.
 - Verify inlet elevations for NE inlet, S-107, and SE inlet, S-105. S-107 appears to drain to S-105, however, inlet elevations are inverted for such configuration.
- iii. Public Facilities
 - (a) The provision of water/wastewater facilities from off-site locations to the points of termination depicted on plans should be addressed by providing a reference to off-site infrastructure improvement plans to be prepared separate from these plans.
- iv. Land Rights
 - (a) Throughout Plans: Remove references to “outparcel” and “City dedicated parcel.” The City has ***NOT*** agreed to accept the property. Revise to reflect parcel’s use as passive recreation or another descriptive term appropriate for its designated use.
 - (b) Throughout Plans: Delete references to “outlot,” “out parcel,” “out parcel 1,” etc., if this is not applicable to project.
 - (c) References to “Seller Retained Property” should be removed. Information is not relevant to this application.
 - (d) Legal descriptions and sketches depicted on survey do not appear match current proposed ROWs shown on civil drawings. Resolve inconsistency.
 - (e) Legal descriptions and sketches of overall parcel on survey do not reflect tax parcel records. Resolve inconsistency.
 - (f) Provide draft legal descriptions and sketches of all proposed public utility easements (PUEs.)
- v. Miscellaneous
 - (a) Throughout Plans: Delete references to “proposed legend.” Refer to as “legend.” Likewise, delete references to “proposed notes” throughout plans. Refer to as “notes.”
 - (b) Throughout Plans: References to GRU for water, wastewater, and electric service are incorrect. Revise to City of Alachua.
 - (c) Sheet C-1: Verify name of soil consultant is correct. Appears to be misspelled.
 - (d) Sheet C-1: Revise reference to contact for electric, water, and sewer utilities.
 - (e) Sheet C-3: Survey Note 13 indicates front, rear, and side setbacks of 10 feet. Correct setbacks: Front – 20 feet; Side – 0 feet; Rear – 15 feet.
 - (f) Sheet C-3B: Many spot elevations not legible due to overlap of information on drawing.
 - (g) Sheet C-6: Add Tax Parcel No. 03066-000-000 under Site Data.
 - (h) Sheet C-6: Impervious Area for parcel currently labelled “City dedicated parcel” is 0 square feet. Revise accordingly.
 - (i) Sheet C-6: There is a typographical error under “Special Exceptions Requested.”
 - (j) Sheet C-6: There is a typographical error under “Conditions,” first bullet.
 - (k) Sheet C-6: There is a typographical error under “Conditions,” third bullet, second line (“location” should be plural.)
 - (l) Sheet C-6: “Conditions,” third bullet: verify the information is correct pertaining to rainfall to be treated.
 - (m) Sheet C-6A: Keynotes: Identify detail sheet where detail for each keynote is provided.
 - (n) Sheet C-6A: Keynote 11: Call out states to coordinate with GRU for electric service. Electric service provider is City of Alachua. Revise accordingly.
 - (o) Sheet C-6A: Keynote 26: Include statement that all signage requires separate permit.

- (p) Sheet C-6A: Keynote 39: Calls for bicycle rack model types 2170-7, 2170-13, and 2170-19. Detail on Sheet C-12.1 depicts model type 2170-3, 2170-7, 2170-9, 2170-11, and 2170-13.
 - Sheet C-12.1: Delete detail for model types 2170-3, 2170-9, and 2170-11, since they are not used for this project.
 - Add detail for model type 2170-19.
- (q) Sheet C-6A: Keynote 42: Keynote specifications provided, but not depicted on plans. Revise accordingly.
- (r) Sheet C-6A: Light legend symbols do not match those depicted on plan sheet. Revise accordingly.
- (s) Sheet C-6B: provide keynote legend on sheet.
- (t) Sheet C-7: FEMA flood panel referenced is outdated. Current FIRM series is dated June 16, 2006.
- (u) Sheet C-7: There is a typographical error in the title block for "Flood Plain."
- (v) Sheet C-8: Define abbreviation "FO" in legend.
- (w) Sheet E-8: Dimensions of fixture details for SLA and SLB are incorrect.
- (x) Sheet TR-2: Note on sheet references details concerning individual trees, size, and tree credits as available on that sheet (circular reference.)
- (y) Architectural Plans: Please provide scale on all Architectural Plan sheets.
- (z) Architectural Plan Sheet 2: Area of front elevation consisting of Optical Center not labelled. Revise accordingly.
- (aa) Lighting Plan: There is a note above the matrix in the upper right corner that applies to the preparation of the matrix, and should be removed from the plans as it is not applicable to the information presented within the plans.

I. Concurrency Impact Analysis

- i. Indicate the source of the project demand for potable water, sanitary sewer, and solid waste facilities.
- ii. Reserved capacities for water, wastewater, and transportation facilities are not considered. Revise Concurrency Impact Analysis to consider reserved capacities and the impact to residual capacities.

SPECIAL EXCEPTION PERMIT (SEP) APPLICATION: BUILDING ≥80,000 SQUARE FEET

2. Compliance with Land Development Regulations

- A. Response to Section 2.4.4(D)(8): Property is located within Gateway Overlay District and subject to development standards provided in Section 3.7.2(C)(5.) Provide an analysis of the application's compliance with Section 3.7.2(C)(5.) See comment 1.A., above for further information.
- B. Response to Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(ii): Ground floor façade area must be calculated from the finished grade to bottom of parapet wall. Revise response accordingly.
- C. Response to Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(iv)c.: Identify the 6 design features that are incorporated into each customer entrance on the front elevation, or reference response to Section 6.8.3(C)(2) if it addresses the requirements of this section.
- D. Response to Section 6.8.3(C)(2):
 - i. The applicant has chosen to utilize glazing alternatives which permit a reduction in glazing for the front façade, but require the incorporation of no less than 6 of the design features provided in the referenced section. Revise response accordingly.

- ii. Identify a minimum of 6 of the design features incorporated into front facade customer entrances (grocery, home and pharmacy.)
- iii. Identify a minimum of 3 of the design features that are incorporated into all other customer entrances (auto center and east entrance.)
- iv. Response states that display windows that are directly adjacent to each customer entrance are provided. Insufficient information has been provided to support that the windows adjacent to market, home and pharmacy, and auto center entrances shall be display windows. Further, no display windows are provided directly adjacent to east entrance. Provide sufficient information to support that the windows adjacent to each entrance shall be used for displays, if this is a design feature to be incorporated into the design of customer entrances.

E. Response to Section 6.8.3(E)(2):

- i. Response states that stamped concrete is used for pedestrian crosswalks, however, striping has been proposed. Pedestrian crosswalks must comply with Section 6.8.3(E)(4), which requires the use of durable, low-maintenance surface materials such as pavers, bricks, or scored/stamped concrete. The Site Plan must be revised to comply with Section 6.8.3(E)(4.) Verify response to Section 6.8.3(E)(2) is consistent with surface materials selected.
- ii. Section 7.3.2(C), referenced in Section 6.8.3(E)(2), requires a total of 7 pedestrian connections to the adjacent public sidewalk network, however, only 4 appear to be proposed. The Site Plan must be revised to comply with the minimum required number of connections. Verify response to Section 6.8.3(E)(2) is consistent with the number of pedestrian connections to adjacent sidewalk network provided.

F. Response to Section 6.8.3(E)(4):

- i. Response states that stamped concrete is used for pedestrian crosswalks, however, striping has been proposed. Pedestrian crosswalks must use durable, low-maintenance surface materials such as pavers, bricks, or scored/stamped concrete. The Site Plan must be revised to comply with Section 6.8.3(E)(4.) Verify response to Section 6.8.3(E)(4) is consistent with surface materials selected.

3. Concurrency Impact Analysis

- A. Provide revised Concurrency Impact Analysis, as further described within Site Plan application comments (Comment 1.I.), within supporting materials for this SEP application.

SPECIAL EXCEPTION PERMIT (SEP) APPLICATION: AUTOMOBILE REPAIR & SERVICING

4. Compliance with Land Development Regulations

- A. Response to Section 2.4.4(D)(8): Property is located within Gateway Overlay District and subject to development standards provided in Section 3.7.2(C)(5.) Provide an analysis of the application's compliance with Section 3.7.2(C)(5.) See comment 1.A., above for further information.
- B. Response to Section 2.4.4(D)(3):
 - i. Visual Impact: References attached architectural elevations. Architectural elevations included within companion SEP and Site Plan applications, but have not been included with this SEP application.
 - ii. Noise: Response should address the location of automobile repair/servicing activity.

- C. Response to Section 2.4.4(D)(4):
 - i. Further discussion of the disposal of regulated materials, including but not limited to, motor oil, fluids, batteries, and tires, should be provided. Discussion may include identification of applicable regulating agencies, disposal methods, etc.
 - ii. Typographical error in first line of second paragraph.
- D. Response to Section 4.3.4(J):
 - i. Correct citation on Page 8 of report is Section 4.3.4(J)(3.)
 - ii. References are made to site design features, such as parking areas, buffers, means of ingress/egress, etc., that are depicted on the Site Plan. Sheets from the Site Plan representative of these features should be included as an exhibit to this SEP application.

5. Concurrency Impact Analysis

- B. Provide revised Concurrency Impact Analysis, as further described within Site Plan application comments (Comment 1.I.), within supporting materials for this SEP application.

6. **PUBLIC SERVICES, OUTSIDE ENGINEERING/CONSULTANT REVIEW COMMENTS**

- A. The applicant must address the comments provided by Adam Boukari, Assistant City Manager, in memoranda dated April 28, 2016, and June 16, 2016.
- B. The applicant must address the comments provided by Sergio Reyes, P.E., of eda engineers – surveyors – planners, inc., in a letter dated May 19, 2016.
- C. The applicant must address the comments provided by Brian Kanely, P.E., of Volkert, Inc., in a letter dated May 31, 2016.
- D. The applicant must address the comments provided by Kenneth L. Hill, P.E., of GSE Engineering and Consulting, Inc.
- E. Please see the comments provided by Owen M. Beitsch, PhD, FAICP, CR, and David R. Darsey, of Community Solutions Group, GAI Consultants, Inc, in a letter dated June 23, 2016.
- F. The applicant must comply with comments provided by Brian Green, Fire Inspector, Alachua County Fire Rescue, in a letter dated June 27, 2016.

**ALL COMMENTS AND REQUIREMENTS LISTED ABOVE MUST BE
COMPLIED WITH AND PROVIDED TO CITY STAFF ON OR BEFORE 4:00 PM
ON THE RESUBMISSION DATE OF THURSDAY, JULY 21, 2016.**

Meeting Date: June 29, 2016 - STAFF MEETING

[illegible]



City of Alachua

TRACI L. GRESHAM
CITY MANAGER

PLANNING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIRECTOR KATHY WINBURN, AICP

June 2, 2016

Also sent by electronic mail to bcassidy@cphcorp.com

Mr. Brian P. Cassidy, P.E. CPH, Inc.
5200 Belfort Road
Suite 200
Jacksonville, FL 32256

RE: Review of Revised Application Materials, Received on 5/19/16 and on 5/31/16 for:

- Wal-Mart #3873-00 Special Exception Permit Application: Large-Scale Retail Establishment $\geq 80,000$ Square Feet
- Wal-Mart #3873-00 Special Exception Permit Application: Automobile Repair and Servicing
- Wal-Mart #3873-00 Site Plan Application

Dear Mr. Cassidy:

On May 19, 2016 and on May 31 2016, the City of Alachua received revised application materials for the following applications: (1) A Special Exception Permit application for a large-scale retail establishment greater than or equal to 80,000 square feet of gross floor area; (2) A Special Exception Permit application for automobile repair and servicing; and, (3) a Site Plan for a $\pm 158,562$ square foot building, with associated parking, stormwater management facilities, and associated utility infrastructure on a ± 30.19 acre parcel, located on Tax Parcel Number 03869-013-000, and access drives on Tax Parcel Numbers 03866-000-000 and 03869-000-000.

The revised application materials were submitted to address completeness review insufficiencies as described in a letter dated April 6, 2016. Upon review of the revised application materials, the following insufficiencies remain.

In order to provide a complete application, you must address the following:

Special Exception Permit Applications:

- (1) Large-Scale Retail Establishment $\geq 80,000$ Square Feet**
- (2) Automobile Repair and Servicing**

Application Signatory

Issue: The applicant has provided with the Site Plan materials a document and accompanying exhibits entitled "Certificate of Assistant Secretary," which documents the delegation of authority for Michael Thomas, Director of Project Design and Management, to act on behalf of Wal-Mart Stores East, LP. This documentation, however, has not been provided as an attachment to either Special Exception Permit application.

Action Needed to Address Deficiency: In future submittals, provide the documentation referenced above with each Special Exception Permit application.

Authorized Agent Affidavit

Issue: The applicant has provided with the Site Plan application materials a document entitled "Agent Authorization" which authorizes CPH, Inc., to act on behalf of Wal-Mart Stores, East, LP. This documentation, however, has not been provided as an attachment to either Special Exception Permit application.

Action Needed to Address Deficiency: In future submittals, provide the documentation referenced above with each Special Exception Permit application.

Site Plan Application

Site Plan Attachment #8

Legal description with tax parcel number, separate from all other documentation on 8.5" x 11" paper.

Issue: The applicant has provided in its revised application materials a general description of each of the three tax parcels which collectively comprise the subject property (Tax Parcels 03066-000-000, 03869-000-000, and 03869-013-000) obtained from the Alachua County Property Appraiser's web site.

Action Needed to Address Deficiency: The applicant must provide a complete legal description of the subject property (such as the description provided of the "Overall Parcel" on the ALTA/ACSM Land Title Survey submitted as part of the Site Plan) on 8.5" x 11" paper.

Site Plan Attachment #13


If access is from a State Road, access management permit from Florida Department of Transportation (or documentation providing evidence that a permit application has been submitted.)

Issue: The applicant states that a copy of the access management permit shall be provided once it has been obtained, however, the applicant has not provided documentation evidencing that a permit application has been submitted.

Action Needed to Address Deficiency: Provide documentation evidencing that an access management permit application has been submitted to the Florida Department of Transportation.

If you have any questions regarding the information above, please contact me at 386-418-6100 x 107 or via e-mail at jtabor@cityofalachua.com. We look forward to receiving your revised applications.

Sincerely,



Justin Tabor, AICP
Principal Planner

c: Traci Gresham, City Manager (by electronic mail)
Adam Boukari, Assistant City Manager (by electronic mail)
Marian B. Rush, Esq., City Attorney (by electronic mail)
Kathy Winburn, AICP, Planning & Community Development Director
Adam Hall, AICP, Planner
David Theriaque, Esq., Theriaque & Spain (by electronic mail)
Project File



City of Alachua

TRACI L. GRESHAM
CITY MANAGER

PLANNING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DIRECTOR KATHY WINBURN, AICP

April 6, 2016

Also sent by electronic mail to bcassidy@cphcorp.com

Mr. Brian P. Cassidy, P.E.
CPH, Inc.
5200 Belfort Road
Suite 200
Jacksonville, FL 32256

RE: Completeness Review of:

- Wal-Mart #3873-00 Special Exception Permit Application: Large-Scale Retail Establishment \geq 80,000 Square Feet
- Wal-Mart #3873-00 Special Exception Permit Application: Automobile Repair and Servicing
- Wal-Mart #3873-00 Site Plan Application

Dear Mr. Cassidy:

On March 31, 2016, the City of Alachua received the following applications: (1) A Special Exception Permit application for a large-scale retail establishment greater than or equal to 80,000 square feet of gross floor area; (2) A Special Exception Permit application for automobile repair and servicing; and, (3) a Site Plan for a \pm 158,562 square foot building, with associated parking, stormwater management facilities, and associated utility infrastructure on a \pm 30.19 acre parcel, located on Tax Parcel Number 03869-013-000, and access drives on Tax Parcel Numbers 03866-000-000 and 03869-000-000.

According to Section 2.2.6 of the Land Development Regulations (LDRs), upon receipt of an application, a completeness review shall be conducted to determine that the application contains all the necessary information and materials, is in proper form and of sufficient detail, and is accompanied by the appropriate fee. The Planning Department has reviewed the aforementioned applications for completeness and finds that the following information is needed.

In accordance with Section 2.2.6(B) of the LDRs, the applicant must correct the deficiencies and resubmit the applications for completeness determination. **The time frame and cycle for review shall be based upon the date the applications are determined to be complete.** If the applicant fails to respond to the identified deficiencies within forty-five (45) calendar days, the applications shall be considered withdrawn.

The comments below are based solely on a preliminary review of your applications for completeness. An in-depth review of the content of the applications will be performed, and the findings of the in-depth review will be discussed at a Development Review Team (DRT) Meeting. A DRT Meeting will be scheduled upon satisfaction of the applications' completeness review deficiencies, as indicated below.

In order to provide a complete application, you must address the following:

Special Exception Permit Applications:

(1) Large-Scale Retail Establishment \geq 80,000 Square Feet

(2) Automobile Repair and Servicing

Application Signatory

Issue: Each Special Exception Permit application has been signed on behalf of Wal-Mart Stores East, LP, by Michael Thomas, Director of Project Design and Management, however, Mr. Thomas is not identified as a registered agent/authorized person of Wal-Mart Stores East, LP, or of WSE Management, LLC (the General Partner of Wal-Mart Stores East, LP.)

Action Needed to Address Deficiency: Provide written authorization from a registered agent/authorized person of the referenced entities, for the application signatory to act on behalf of the property owner for purposes of these applications. This may be accomplished by either (1) providing an executed Authorized Agent Affidavit (may be accessed on the City's web site at http://www.cityofalachua.com/images/stories/documents/pz_documents/Authorized Agent Affidavit 2014 09 30.pdf), or (2) providing a notarized letter from a registered agent/authorized person of the referenced entities authorizing the application signatory to act on their behalf.

Authorized Agent Affidavit

Issue: Authorization has not been provided from the property owner (Wal-Mart Stores East, LP) to CPH Engineers, Inc., to act on its behalf.

Action Needed to Address Deficiency: Provide authorization from the property owner to CPH Engineers, Inc., to act on its behalf. This may be accomplished by either (1) providing an executed Authorized Agent Affidavit from the property owner, or (2) providing a notarized letter from the property owner authorizing CPH Engineers, Inc. to act on its behalf.

Special Exception Permit Attachment #2

Analysis of compliance with the Standards for a Special Exception, as defined in Section 2.4.4 of the Land Development Regulations (LDRs)...

Issue: Limited analysis has been provided in the materials submitted with each Special Exception Permit application as to how the proposed Special Exception Permit/development shall meet the following:

- (1) *Complies with use specific regulations.* The proposed special exception complies with all relevant standards in Section 4.3, Use specific standards.

Action Needed to Address Deficiency:

(a) *For the Special Exception Permit application for a large-scale retail establishment greater than or equal to 80,000 square feet of gross floor area:* Provide an analysis of how the application complies with the Use Specific Standards provided in Section 4.3.4(G)(7) of the LDRs. Architectural Plans should also be included with this Special Exception Permit application to demonstrate compliance with Section 6.8.3.

(b) *For the Special Exception Permit application for automobile repair and servicing:* Provide an analysis of how the application complies with the Use Specific Standards provided in Section 4.3.4(J)(3) of the LDRs.

- (2) *Compatibility.* The proposed special exception is appropriate for its location and compatible with the character of surrounding lands and the uses permitted in the zone district.

Action Needed to Address Deficiency: In each Special Exception Permit application, provide an analysis of how the proposed special exception is appropriate for its location and compatible with the character of surrounding lands and the uses permitted in the zone district.

- (3) *Design minimizes adverse impact.* The design of the proposed special exception minimizes adverse effects, including visual impacts of the proposed use on adjacent lands; furthermore, the proposed special exception **avoids significant adverse impact on surrounding lands regarding service delivery, parking and loading, odors, noise, glare, and vibration**, and does not create a nuisance.

Action Needed to Address Deficiency: In each Special Exception Permit application, provide an analysis of how the design of the proposed special exception minimizes adverse effects on surrounding lands regarding each of the standards in bold above.

- (5) *Roads and other public facilities.* There is adequate public facility capacity available to serve the proposed special exception, and the proposed special exception use is designed to ensure safe ingress and egress onto the site and safe road conditions around the site.

Action Needed to Address Deficiency: In each Special Exception Permit application, provide an analysis public facility capacity (including potable water, sanitary sewer, electric, and other applicable public facilities) available to serve the proposed special exception.

- (6) *Not injure neighboring land or property values.* **The proposed special exception will not substantially injure the use of neighboring land for those uses that are permitted in the zone district, or reduce land values.**

Action Needed to Address Deficiency: In each Special Exception Permit application, provide an analysis of how the proposed special exception will not substantially injure the use of neighboring land for those uses that are permitted in the zone district, or reduce land values.

Special Exception Permit Attachment #3

Materials which demonstrate that the special exception permit would promote the public health, safety, morals, order, comfort, convenience, appearance, prosperity or the general welfare, which shall include (at a minimum):

- e. **Any specific requirements of the zoning district.**

Issue:

(1) *For the Special Exception Permit application for a large-scale retail establishment greater than or equal to 80,000 square feet of gross floor area:* The Use-Specific Standards for this use type are established in Section 4.3.4(G)(7) of the LDRs. This section requires the large-scale retail establishment to comply with the design standards of Section 6.8.3 and to submit a market and impact study. A Market and Impact Study, prepared by Florida Economic Advisors, has been submitted as an exhibit to the Site Plan application. This study must be included as an exhibit to the Special Exception Permit application. The applicant must also provide an analysis of compliance with the standards of Section 6.8.3 of the LDRs. Architectural Plans should also be included with this Special Exception Permit application to demonstrate compliance with Section 6.8.3.

(2) *For the Special Exception Permit application for automobile repair and servicing:* The applicant must provide an analysis of compliance with the standards of Section 4.3.4(J)(3) of the LDRs, which establishes Use-Specific Standards for automobile repair and servicing.

Action Needed to Address Deficiency:

(1) *For the Special Exception Permit application for a large-scale retail establishment greater than or equal to 80,000 square feet of gross floor area:* Provide the Market and Impact Study, prepared by Florida Economic Advisors, as an exhibit to the Special Exception Permit application. Provide an analysis of compliance with the standards of Section 6.8.3 of the LDRs.

(2) *For the Special Exception Permit application for automobile repair and servicing:* Provide an analysis of compliance with the standards of Section 4.3.4(J)(3) of the LDRs, which establishes Use-Specific Standards for automobile repair and servicing.

Special Exception Permit Attachment #4

Two (2) sets of labels for all property owners within 400 feet of the subject property boundaries – even if property within 400 feet falls outside of City limits (obtain from the Alachua County Property Appraiser’s web site) – and **all persons/organizations registered to receive notice of development applications**.

Issue: The mailing labels provided do not include all persons/organizations registered to receive notices of development applications.

Action Needed to Address Deficiency: Review the list of persons/organizations registered to receive notice of development applications, and provide four (4) mailing labels (two (2) mailing labels for each Special Exception Permit application) for those persons/organizations which were not provided with the application submittal.

Special Exception Permit Attachment #5

Neighborhood Meeting Materials, including:

- i. Copy of the required published notice (advertisement) – must be published in a newspaper of general circulation, as defined in Article 10 of the City’s Land Development Regulations

Issue: The applicant has submitted what appears to be a proof of the required published notice, however, evidence of the notice’s publication has not been provided.

Action Needed to Address Deficiency: Provide documentation evidencing that the notice of the Neighborhood Meeting was published.

Site Plan Application

Application Signatory

Issue: The application has been signed on behalf of Wal-Mart Stores East, LP, by Michael Thomas, Director of Project Design and Management, however, Mr. Thomas is not identified as a registered agent/authorized person of Wal-Mart Stores East, LP, or of WSE Management, LLC (the General Partner of Wal-Mart Stores East, LP.)

Action Needed to Address Deficiency: Provide written authorization from a registered agent/authorized person of the referenced entities, for the application signatory to act on behalf of the property owner for purposes of these applications. This may be accomplished by either (1) providing an executed Authorized Agent Affidavit, or (2) providing a notarized letter from a registered agent/authorized person of the referenced entities authorizing the application signatory to act on their behalf.

Authorized Agent Affidavit

Issue: Authorization has not been provided from the property owners (Wal-Mart Stores East, LP, and First Street Group, L.C.) to CPH Engineers, Inc., to act on their behalf.

Action Needed to Address Deficiency: Provide authorization from the property owners to CPH Engineers, Inc., to act on their behalf. This may be accomplished by either (1) providing an executed Authorized Agent Affidavit from each property owner, or (2) providing a notarized letter from each property owner authorizing CPH Engineers, Inc. to act on its behalf.

Site Plan Attachment #3

Fire Department Access and Water Supply: The design criteria shall be Chapter 18 of the Florida Fire Prevention Code. Plans must be on separate sealed sheets and must be prepared by a professional Fire engineer licensed in the State of Florida. Fire flow calculations must be provided for each newly constructed building. When required, fire flow calculations shall be in accordance with the Guide for Determination of Required Fire Flow, latest edition, as published by the Insurance Service Office (ISO) and /or Chapter 18, Section 18.4 of the Florida Fire Prevention Code, whichever is greater. All calculations must be demonstrated and provided. All calculations and specifications must be on the plans and not on separate sheets. All fire protection plans are reviewed and approved by the Alachua County Fire Marshal.

Issue: The applicant has provided fire hydrant flow calculations, but has not submitted documentation to identify the flow required to serve the proposed building.

Action Needed to Address Deficiency: Provide fire flow calculations that calculate the flow required to serve the proposed building (*NOTE: further comments may be provided by the Fire Inspector of Alachua County Fire/Rescue upon review of the application and accompanying materials.*)

Site Plan Attachment #6

For Site Plans for Buildings Greater than or Equal to 80,000 Square Feet in Area: Two (2) sets of labels for all property owners within 400 feet of the subject property boundaries – even if property within 400 feet falls outside of City limits (obtain from the Alachua County Property Appraiser's web site) – and **all persons/organizations registered to receive notice of development applications.**

Issue: The mailing labels provided do not include all persons/organizations registered to receive notices of development applications.

Action Needed to Address Deficiency: Review the list of persons/organizations registered to receive notice of development applications, and provide two (2) mailing labels for those persons/organizations which were not provided with the application submittal.

Site Plan Attachment #8

Legal description with tax parcel number, separate from all other documentation on 8.5" x 11" paper.

Issue: The legal description with tax parcel number has not been provided in the required format. The applicant states the legal description is provided in the survey drawings, however, site improvements, including but not limited to site grading and Proposed Retention Area 2, are located in areas not described by the legal descriptions in the survey drawings.

Action Needed to Address Deficiency: Provide the legal description(s) of the subject property, consisting of Tax Parcels 03066-000-000, 03869-000-000, and 03869-013-000, on 8.5" x 11" paper.

Site Plan Attachment #9

Proof of ownership (i.e., copy of deed.)

Issue: The applicant has not provided proof of ownership for Tax Parcels 03066-000-000 and 03869-000-000.

Action Needed to Address Deficiency: Provide proof of ownership for Tax Parcels 03066-000-000, and 03869-000-000.

Site Plan Attachment #10

Proof of payment of taxes.

Issue: The applicant has not provided proof of payment of taxes for Tax Parcels 03066-000-000 and 03869-000-000.

Action Needed to Address Deficiency: Provide proof of payment of taxes for Tax Parcels 03066-000-000, and 03869-000-000.

Site Plan Attachment #13

If access is from a State Road, access management permit from Florida Department of Transportation (or documentation providing evidence that a permit application has been submitted.)

Issue: The applicant states that a copy of the access management permit shall be provided once it has been obtained, however, the applicant has not provided documentation evidencing that a permit application has been submitted.


Action Needed to Address Deficiency: Provide documentation evidencing that an access management permit application has been submitted to the Florida Department of Transportation.

Miscellaneous Comments

- The Architectural Plans submitted are not legible. Provide Architectural Plans that clearly depict architectural features.

If you have any questions regarding the information above, please contact me at 386-418-6100 x 107 or via e-mail at jtabor@cityofalachua.com. We look forward to receiving your revised applications.

Sincerely,



Justin Tabor, AICP
Principal Planner

c: Traci Gresham, City Manager (by electronic mail)
Adam Boukari, Assistant City Manager (by electronic mail)
Marian B. Rush, Esq., City Attorney (by electronic mail)
Kathy Winburn, AICP, Planning & Community Development Director
Adam Hall, AICP, Planner
David Theriaque, Esq., Theriaque & Spain (by electronic mail)
Project File



5200 Belfort Road
Suite 220
Jacksonville, FL 32256
Phone: 904.332.0999
Fax: 904.332.0997

January 29, 2016

Justin Tabor, AICP
Principal Planner
City of Alachua
15100 NW 142nd Terrace
PO Box 6
Alachua, FL 32616

**RE: Walmart Supercenter #3873-00, Alachua, FL
Response to Site Plan Review Comments
CPH Project No. W13392**

Dear Justin:

CPH, Inc., is in receipt of the Site Plan review comments dated December 15, 2016, and offers the following responses. Please note that our responses are shown in **bold** typeface.

Sergio Reyes Comments:

Sheet C-2

1. Per FDEP 62-604.400(2)(g), "sewers and force mains shall be laid at least 10 feet (outside to outside) horizontally from water mains." Please revise Utility Separation Requirement Notes 1A and 1B to comply with FDEP requirements.
RESPONSE: Per FDEP 62-604.400(3), if there are conflicts in the separation requirements between collection systems and drinking water facilities mandated by FDEP 62-604.400(2) and those mandated by Chapter 62-555, F.A.C., then the requirements of Chapter 62-555, F.A.C., shall apply. Utility Separation Requirement Notes 1A and 1B comply with Chapter 62-555 F.A.C.
2. Per FDEP 62-604.400(2)(i), "sewer pipes and force mains shall cross under water mains... shall be laid to provide a minimum vertical distance of 18" between the invert of the upper pipe and the crown of the lower pipe." Please revise Utility Separation Requirement Note 2A to comply with FDEP requirements.
RESPONSE: Per FDEP 62-604.400(3), if there are conflicts in the separation requirements between collection systems and drinking water facilities mandated by FDEP 62-604.400(2) and those mandated by Chapter 62-555, F.A.C., then the requirements of Chapter 62-555, F.A.C., shall apply. Utility Separation Requirement Note 2A complies with Chapter 62-555 F.A.C.

Sheet SW-7/SW-8/SW-9/SW-10

1. No data was inputted into the tables provided within the details.
RESPONSE: Please see revised sheets SW-7, SW-8, SW-9, and SW-10 addressing this comment.



2. Please explain where Walmart standards apply.

RESPONSE: The Walmart standards apply at all locations unless otherwise noted on the plans. A note was added to sheets SW-7, SW-8, SW-9, and SW-10 to clarify where Walmart standards apply.

Sheet SW-11

1. Please explain where all the details apply.

RESPONSE: The Walmart standards apply at all locations unless otherwise noted on the plans. A note was added to sheet SW-11 to clarify where Walmart standards apply.

2. Please show where the sedimentation pond location will be.

RESPONSE: Two Temporary Sediment Basins are proposed and they are depicted on sheet SW-3, see "SB" symbol under "LEGEND" referring to "TEMPORARY SEDIMENT BASINS."

Sheet C-5

1. Under General Utility Notes, we recommend verifying with specific utilities that 72 hours before connecting to any existing line is sufficient, specifically GRU Gas.

RESPONSE: This comment is acknowledged. The applicant's engineer is coordinating with GRU gas to verify that 72 hours' notice is adequate.

Sheet C-7

1. Please add spot grades in the corners of the ADA parking spaces to demonstrate compliance with ADA criteria (i.e. maximum slope 2%)

RESPONSE: This comment is addressed on the revised sheet C-7 included with this submittal.

2. We recommend adding spot grades to the corners of the loading dock.

RESPONSE: The spot grades at the corners of the loading dock are intentionally omitted on the sheet C-7 because it is Walmart's requirement to have the Architect provide this information which is included along with other detailed grading information on the Architect's SP2 Site Details sheet.

3. Is there an overflow for the cistern? Where does it connect to?

RESPONSE: Please see revised Site Grading Plan addressing this comment and note that the Cistern was relocated to the outer perimeter of the front parking area. A roof drain pipe that collects water from the Grocery Vestibule was routed to the Cistern. The Cistern will have an overflow pipe that will connect to the adjacent stormwater system.

Sheet C-8

1. Will Walmart cook onsite? Please verify if the City of Alachua Public Services will require a grease trap to be installed to serve the deli/bakery.

RESPONSE: See sheet C-8, keynote F2. Grease traps are proposed for Walmart's food service operations.

2. Please be sure to provide calculations sizing the water meters specified.

RESPONSE: Please see the previously submitted “Walmart Water Supply Site Survey” prepared by Henderson Engineers, Inc. A 2-inch potable water meter was included in the calculations and discussed in the “CONCLUSIONS” section of the report. The size of the potable water meter shown on Sheet C-17 was revised to be 2 inches which is consistent with the Walmart Water Supply Site Survey.

Sheets- Profiles

1. For informational purposes, the jack and bore that crosses US 441 will need to be permitted through FDOT.

RESPONSE: This comment is acknowledged. An FDOT Utility permit has been applied for through the FDOT One Stop permitting system.

2. For sewer manholes with 4-ft or greater drop, we recommend drop manholes.

RESPONSE: The profile drawings were revised so that all manholes with drops of 4 feet or greater are proposed to be drop manholes.

3. Be sure bending of water main meets the manufacturer’s recommendations or provide fittings.

RESPONSE: This comment is addressed on sheet C-2 “WATER AND RECLAIMED WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS” note number 26.

Sheet C-12

1. Please clarify the type of bike rack proposed. A U-Rack detail is provided but within the plans ribbon racks are referred to, specifically on Sheet C-6A.

RESPONSE: Sheet C-12 was revised to be consistent with sheets C-6, C-6A, and C-12.1.

Drainage Design Notes

1. Per City of Alachua 6.9.3(7)(a), “Detention and retention systems shall be designed in conformance with the SRWMD’s Surface Water Management Permitting Manual, as amended” and therefore, per SRWMD Applicant’s Handbook Volume II Section 3.4, “Storage volumes designed into retention or detention systems must be available as follows: 1. One-half of the total volume within seven days following the end of the design storm event, and 2. The total volume within 30 days following the end of the design storm event.” Please note the recovery of the water quality treatment volume (WQTV) is different than the recovery of the total volume from the design storms. Provide recovery information for the required storm events that shows that half of the total volume has been recovered by day 7 after the end of the storm event and shows that the entire storm has been recovered by the end of day 30 after the storm event. We recommend showing recovery information in a table listing the design storm events, day at which ½ volume recovery occurs, and day at which full volume recovery occurs.

RESPONSE: An analysis demonstrating that SRWMD Recovery requirements are met is contained in the “Pond Recovery” section of the Stormwater Report on page 18. The AdICPR modeling results supporting the Pond Recovery analysis is contained in Appendix M of the Stormwater Report.

2. Per City of Alachua 6.9.3(7)(a), "Detention and retention systems shall be designed in conformance with the SRWMD's Surface Water Management Permitting Manual, as amended" and therefore, per SRWMD Applicant's Handbook Volume II Section 4.4 "Detention and retention systems must be designed to provide [water quality] treatment volumes specified within 72 hours following the end of the design storm event." We recommend modeling the WQTV as a slug load.

RESPONSE: An analysis demonstrating that SRWMD Recovery requirements are met is contained in the "Pond Recovery" section of the Stormwater Report on page 18. The AdICPR results supporting the Pond Recovery analysis is contained in Appendix M of the Stormwater Report.

3. Per City of Alachua 6.9.3(7)(a), "Detention and retention systems shall be designed in conformance with the SRWMD's Surface Water Management Permitting Manual, as amended" and therefore, per SRWMD Applicant's Handbook Volume II Section 5.3.2, "Ponds with berms greater than 5 feet from the top of the berm to the lowest natural ground elevation shall comply with Section 5.8 of this Volume" and therefore SRWMD Applicant's Handbook Volume II Section 5.8.3, "the applicant's engineer shall analyze the stability of embankment slopes using generally accepted methods based on sound engineering principles and document all analyses or considerations in appropriate design reports and files. The design professional must design and provide documentation that the embankment has adequate factors of safety." Please provide slope stability calculations for the pond berms greater than 5-ft in height.

RESPONSE: Please see attached "Pond Berms – Stability Analysis" addressing this comment.

4. Please explain how the base elevation of the mobilized aquifer, the average unsaturated vertical infiltration rate, average horizontal hydraulic conductivity, estimated fillable porosity, and the elevation of the normal seasonal high water table were arrived at. Include references to datums if the geotechnical engineer's recommendations correspond to a different datum that was utilized within the stormwater model. On page 11 of the geotechnical report, the engineer states "Based on available data, we estimate the permanent water table to be near elevation +60 feet NAVD." On page 13 of the Stormwater Report, the elevation of the mobilized aquifer was listed as not encountered. Also, the geotechnical engineer states that "a reasonable estimate for the temporary perched seasonal high groundwater table is from 0.5 to 1 foot below the land surface (bls). Please explain the values utilized in the model.

RESPONSE: The reference on page 11, Section 8.1 of the Geotechnical Report to the permanent water table being near elevation +60 feet NAVD is an estimate for the overall site and not specifically for the stormwater ponds. There is more than 50 feet of elevation change across this property and groundwater elevations will fluctuate, which is also stated on page 11 Section 8.1 of the Geotechnical Report.

The Soil parameters used in the AdICPR Stormwater Model were obtained from the "Stormwater Management System Soil Design Parameters" prepared by Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc., which is attached with this submittal. The Soil Test results were completed specifically for the Stormwater Pond design and were done only within the pond footprint. These test results were completed in order to obtain a more accurate estimate of the soil properties within the retention pond areas. These estimates are more accurate than the general estimate of the water table elevation for the overall project reported on page 11, Section 8.1 of the Geotechnical Report.



Therefore, the “Stormwater Management System Soil Design Parameters” were utilized for the AdICPR Stormwater model.

Also, the temporary perched condition of the seasonal high groundwater table is expected to be removed due to the proposed earthwork operations necessary to construct the project. Please refer to Site Grading Plan Sheets C-8 and C-8A and Sections Sheets C-11, C-11A, and C-11B.

5. Per City of Alachua 6.9.3(7)(a), “Detention and retention systems shall be designed in conformance with the SRWMD’s Surface Water Management Permitting Manual, as amended” and therefore, per SRWMD Applicant’s Handbook Volume II Section 5.3.2 – The exfiltration trench system shall be designed so that the invert elevation of the trench is at or above the seasonal high ground water table elevation. Per the provided geotechnical report by Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc dated May 20, 2016, the geotechnical engineer lists the “reasonable estimate for the temporary perched seasonal high groundwater table is from 0.5 to 1 foot below land surface (bls). The proposed under drains within the basin are below the seasonal high ground water table.

RESPONSE: The temporary perched groundwater table is expected to be removed due to the proposed earthwork operations necessary to construct the project. Please refer to Site Grading Plan Sheets C-8 and C-8A and Sections Sheets C-11, C-11A, and C-11B.

6. In the Post-Development ICPR model, we recommend removing the percolation links to the groundwater table. The links appear to not add value to the model as the entirety of the stormwater appears to recover via the under drain system.

RESPONSE: The project is located within a closed “stream to sink” basin and pre-vs. post-volumetric requirements apply. It is appropriate to include the percolation links to take advantage of the available infiltration to assist in meeting the pre- vs. post-volumetric requirements. We respectfully request to take no action to address this comment.

7. Per City of Alachua 6.9.3(7)(a), “Detention and retention systems shall be designed in conformance with the SRWMD’s Surface Water Management Permitting Manual, as amended” and therefore, per SRWMD Applicant’s Handbook Volume II Section 3.3, “Where multiple off-site discharges are designed to occur and the combined discharges outfall to the same receiving water body, the District will not allow the total post-development peak discharge to exceed the pre-development peak discharge for the combined discharges.” In the Post-Development condition, do the post-development discharge rates and volumes listed in Tables 7A and B for the BNDY North include the total combined discharge rates and volumes from both Pond 1, Pond 2, and Basins 4 & 9 going to BDNV North?

RESPONSE: The post-development discharge rates and volumes listed in Tables 7A and B for the BNDY North include the total combined discharge rates and volumes from both Pond 1, Pond 2, and Basins 4 and 9 going to BDNV North per the Basin Summary Input Reports and the Nodal Diagrams included within Appendices E, G, I, and K in the Stormwater Report.

Public Services Utilities

1. General Water Utility: Composite Utility Plan; Sheet C-8: Eliminate 90 degree elbows on 16-inch water main; replace with 45’s.

RESPONSE: Please see revised sheet C-8 addressing this comment.



2. Water Main: Sheet IR-1, IR-3, IR-8, C-6 & C-8: Route water main to follow easement path at Interstate.

RESPONSE: Please see revised sheets IR-1, IR-3, IR-8, C-6, & C-8 addressing this comment.

3. Hydrants: Offsite Utility Plans- Sheet C-2&6

Sheet C-2- Proposed 16-inch water main (north of SR 441) reduces to an 8-inch line. Drawing annotates "proposed 8" PVC (C900 DR 18)..." Approximate to the cleanout, provide hydrant.

RESPONSE: Please see revised sheet C-2 from the Offsite Utility Plans addressing this comment.

Sheet C-6. Northeast region of the sheet, the 16-inch water main 45 down (i.e. proposed 45 MJ Bend. STA 216+55.63, 120.0' L) provide a hydrant within this area.

RESPONSE: Please see revised sheet C-6 addressing this comment.

4. Sewer Lines: Offsite Utility Plans; US Highway 441 Profile View, Sheet C-3

Sewer lines with over 14 feet of cover shall be SDR 26.

Reference sheet C-5; Site Specific Notes Sheet; General Utility Note 9.a.

RESPONSE: Please see revised sheet C-3 from the Offsite Utility Plans addressing this comment.

5. Alachua Town Centre- Walmart Electric Utility System; Sheet E-6

Reflect, within Specifications sections 1 through 1.5, contractor/developer shall install all conduit, enclosures, poles, luminaries, transformer pads and switch gear bases. CoA will be responsible for installing all conductors, transformers and switch gear. All make up, connections and testing shall be completed by the CoA.

RESPONSE: Please see revised sheet E-6 addressing this comment.

Reflect, within Specification section 2, CoA will procure at the developer's expense all materials necessary for the complete job. Contractor responsible for procuring and installing: conduit, poles and luminaries.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Specification section 2 addressing this comment.

Specification Section 2.7 Fiberglass 6" elbows per City of Alachua approved underground construction standard shall be used (48" radius) instead of 6" SCH 80 PVC.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Specification section 2.7 addressing this comment.

In addition to the responses provided above it is our understanding that further revisions are necessary to the previously submitted Construction plans and Report of Compliance with Standards for Gateway Overlay District in order to comply with the City requirements. The following comments are re-stated from CPH Inc.'s November 21, 2016 response letter with our revised responses shown in bold.

SITE PLAN APPLICATION

1. Compliance with Land Development Regulations

A. Section 3.7.2(C)(5) – Gateway Overlay District

- i. Provide an analysis of the application's compliance with Section 3.7.2(C)(5.)
 - (a) Ensure response specifically identifies the architectural elements (minimum of 6, as the applicant has elected to use glazing reduction provided in Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(iv)) defined in Section 3.7.2(C)(5)(a)(iv) incorporated into each of the following exterior building walls/elevations: (1) East Elevation; (2) West Elevation.

RESPONSE: Please see attached revised document entitled “Compliance with Standards for Gateway Overlay District” and the revised Architectural Elevations included with this submittal.

B. Article 4: Use Regulations

- i. Outdoor Storage: Section 4.4.4(E) requires the outdoor storage area to be incorporated into the design of the primary structure; the area to be screened from view from property lines/right-of-way by an opaque fence with landscaping along fence; and to incorporate one of the predominant colors of the primary structure in the fence/ roofing (if roofed.) Reference 4.4.4(E) for all requirements.
- (b) Identify the use of the area along the exterior of the west elevation (appears to be outdoor storage.) If outdoor storage, demonstrate compliance with Section 4.4.4(E.)

RESPONSE: The area along the exterior of the West Building Elevation is the sales area for large items from the Garden Center. These items include bags of soil, mulch, paving tiles, etc. This area has been revised to move the outdoor storage racks holding large items. They are now contained inside a screened ornamental fence with a 4'-0" high quick brick wainscot as depicted on the revised renderings on the top of page 3 and on the floor plan sheet A1. No outdoor storage items will be visible from outside this enclosure. Also, pursuant to Section 4.4.4(E)(4) of the City's LDRs, a landscaped earth berm may be used instead of, or in combination with, a fence or wall to address screening requirements. A landscaped earth berm is proposed along the westerly property line between the garden center and the property line.

C. Section 6.8, Design Standards for Business Uses

- i. Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(ii) states, “for the purposes of this section, the ground floor facade area of single-story buildings shall be calculated by measuring the applicable building wall between the finished grade and the underside of the roof, wall, or parapet of the façade...” The proposed building includes a parapet on the front façade, therefore, the area of the front façade must be calculated from the finished grade to the top of the parapet. Revise area/calculations on Architectural Plans of north and east façades used to calculate required glazing and architectural masonry.

RESPONSE: During the Development Review Team meeting, it was determined that the building facades would be calculated from the finished grade to the roof line of the appropriate façade for the glazing because it is not feasible to put windows into the parapet wall. All area calculations on the North and East facades will follow this guideline to calculate the required

square footage for glazing. Architectural masonry percentages have been calculated from the finished grade to the top of the parapet wall. This has been shown graphically on the material percentage presentation.

- ii. Section 6.8.2(A)(1) states that all facades facing a street shall be subject to the standards set forth in Subsection 6.8.3(A)(2.) The east elevation, which faces a proposed public street must comply with the following:

(a) Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(iv): The applicant has utilized the glazing reduction permitted by the referenced section, however, has not provided one of the following to comply with subsections b. and c.:

- Window shutters or plantation-style shutters which span a minimum of 10 percent of the length of the façade, or;

RESPONSE: The overall length of the East side of the building is 374'-0". Total shutter length as proposed on the revised elevation is 54'-0" total or 14% percent of the total length.

- vii. To demonstrate compliance with Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(b), identify the height of all pilasters.

RESPONSE: The height of the pilasters located on the elevations is as follows to bring pilasters to 80% of the height of the main wall:

- **Front Elevation: Two short pilasters at 18'-0" in height, and two tall pilasters at 24'-10" in height.**
- **Left Elevation: Four short pilasters at 18'-0" in height.**
- **Right Elevation: One short pilaster at 18'-0" in height, and one tall pilaster at 24'-10" in height.**
- **Rear Elevation: One short pilaster at 18'-0" in height.**

- viii. Section 6.8.3(B)(2) requires flat roofs to be concealed using a parapet wall with cornice treatment. Cornice must include a perpendicular projection of a minimum of 8 inches from the parapet façade plane. Provide detail within the Architectural Plans demonstrating that the cornice surrounding the entire perimeter of the building includes a perpendicular projection of at least 8 inches.

RESPONSE: Architectural detail demonstrating the cornice surrounding the entire perimeter of the building is located on detail 9 on sheet SP2 – Building Details and is included with this resubmittal package.

D. Section 6.1, Parking/Traffic/Circulation Standards

- i. Table 6.1-4 requires four (4) stacking spaces for each pharmacy drive-through lane, measured from the pickup window.

(a) Only three (3) stacking spaces provided for northernmost pickup window. Revise to provide the minimum four (4) required stacking spaces.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-6A which addresses this comment.

- (b) Address conflict between vehicular traffic exiting northernmost pickup window and the stacking spaces identified for the southern pickup window (as proposed, vehicular traffic from each must cross paths with no clear delineation of right-of-way/traffic flow.) Access to pick up windows and associated stacking spaces must be revised to eliminate conflicts.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-6A which addresses this comment.

- ii. Please address the purpose/function of the large paved area east of the building and south of pharmacy pickup windows. The area does not serve to provide on-site circulation.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-6A which addresses this comment. The area east of the building and south of the pharmacy pick-up windows has been revised to allow for better circulation and stacking of vehicles utilizing the Pharmacy Drive-Thru, and to eliminate vehicle conflicts associated with stacking of vehicles at the Pharmacy Drive-Thru.

- iii. Address compliance with Section 6.1.8(B)(2)(b), as it relates to pharmacy drive-through lanes. Section 6.1.8(B)(2)(b) requires to the maximum extent practicable, drive-in lanes to not be located between the principal structure and adjacent public streets, or for drive-in lanes and facilities to be set back a minimum of 20 feet from any adjacent public street, with the setback landscaped and bermed.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-7 and revised Landscape Plan Sheet L-1 which address this comment. A berm was added to the plans.

- iv. Section 6.1.8(B)(1)(c) states, “stacking spaces shall be separated from other internal driveways by raised medians if the LDR Administrator determines the median is necessary for traffic movement and safety.” As proposed, stacking spaces would not be separated from other paved areas. To provide a clear separation between on-site traffic circulation areas the vehicle stacking spaces, provide a raised median between stacking lanes and other vehicular traffic areas.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-6A which addresses this comment.

E. Sections 6.2.1, Tree Replacement, Credit, and 6.2.2, Landscape Standards

- i. Sheet TR-2: “Total Tree Accounting” Table – Tree credits for retained trees may not be used to meet mitigation requirements. Section 6.2.2(D)(4) states: “Canopy or ornamental/understory trees that are in very good to excellent health, that are protected before and during development of the site and maintained thereafter in a healthy growing condition, can be used to comply with the landscaping standards for Subsections 6.2.2(D)(1), Site landscaping; 6.2.2(D)(2), Parking lot landscaping; or 6.2.2(D)(3), Perimeter buffers, of this section.” Please address.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet TR-2 which addresses this comment.

- ii. Tree credits – Tables on L-1 and TR-2 show there are 6 trees between 30” and 36” to be retained. Calculation of credits is incorrect (6 trees x 5 credits/tree = 30 credits.) Revise accordingly.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheets L-1 and TR-2 which address this comment.

- iii. Sheet TR-2: Confirm trees used to calculate tree credits are healthy regulated trees, and are not a species on the nuisance tree list. Trees used for credit must be in very good or excellent health (see 6.2.2(D)(4.)) No credit is given for any trees on the nuisance tree list.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet TR-2 which addresses this comment.

- iv. Sheet L-1: Section 6.2.2(D)(3)(e) requires perimeter buffers to be located along the outer perimeter of the parcel. Please address location of perimeter buffer in the



information provided on this sheet for the north perimeter buffer and the portion of the east perimeter buffer (north of seller road 1.)

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet L-1 which addresses this comment.

SPECIAL EXCEPTION PERMIT (SEP) APPLICATION: BUILDING ≥80,000 SQUARE FEET

1. Compliance with Land Development Regulations

- A. Response to Section 2.4.4(D)(8): Property is located within Gateway Overlay District and subject to development standards provided in Section 3.7.2(C)(5.) Provide an analysis of the application's compliance with Section 3.7.2(C)(5.) See comment 1.A., above for further information

RESPONSE: Please see the attached document entitled "Compliance with Standards for Gateway Overlay District."

- B. Response to Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(iv)c.: Identify the 6 design features that are incorporated into each customer entrance on the front elevation, or reference response to Section 6.8.3(C)(2) if it addresses the requirements of this section.

RESPONSE: The customer entrances on the Front Building Elevation and East Building Elevation comply with the requirement of six (6) design features per Section 6.8.3(C)(2) of the City's LDRs. The six (6) design features incorporated into the customer entrances are as follows:

- (a) Canopies above the entrance
- (b) Roof overhangs above the entrance
- (c) Entry Recesses
- (e) Raised Cornice Parapets
- (i) Architectural details/tile work
- (j) Integral planters

- C. Response to Section 6.8.3(C)(2):

- i. The applicant has chosen to utilize glazing alternatives which permit a reduction in glazing for the front façade, but require the incorporation of no less than 6 of the design features provided in the referenced section. Revise response accordingly.

RESPONSE: The customer entrances on the Front Building Elevation and East Building Elevation comply with the requirement of six (6) design features per Section 6.8.3(C)(2) of the City's LDRs. The six (6) design features incorporated into the customer entrances are as follows:

- (a) Canopies above the entrance
- (b) Roof overhangs above the entrance
- (c) Entry Recesses
- (e) Raised Cornice Parapets
- (i) Architectural details/tile work
- (j) Integral planters

- ii. Response states that display windows that are directly adjacent to each customer entrance are provided. Insufficient information has been provided to support that the

windows adjacent to market, home and pharmacy, and auto center entrances shall be display windows. Further, no display windows are provided directly adjacent to east entrance. Provide sufficient information to support that the windows adjacent to each entrance shall be used for displays, if this is a design feature to be incorporated into the design of customer entrances.

RESPONSE: The current design does not have display windows directly adjacent to either of the customer entrances.

- D. Response to Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(ii): Ground floor façade area must be calculated from the finished grade to bottom of parapet wall. Revise response accordingly.

RESPONSE: During the Development Review Team meeting, it was determined that the building facades would be calculated from the finished grade to the roof line of the appropriate façade. All area calculations on the North and East facades will follow this guideline to calculate the required glazing. Architectural masonry has been calculated from finished grade to the top of the parapet. These standards have been shown graphically on the materials percentage presentation.

- E. Response to Section 6.8.3(C)(2):

- i. Identify a minimum of 3 of the design features that are incorporated into all other customer entrances (auto center and east entrance.)

RESPONSE: The customer entrance at the Auto Center incorporates the three (3) features below:

- (a) Canopies above the entrance
- (e) Raised Cornice Parapets
- (i) Display windows that are directly adjacent to the entrance

However, pursuant to Section 6.8.3(C)(1) of the City's LDRs, the auto center does not need to meet this requirement because it is a third customer entrance and does not face a public street.

- ii. Response states that display windows that are directly adjacent to each customer entrance are provided. Insufficient information has been provided to support that the windows adjacent to market, home and pharmacy, and auto center entrances shall be display windows. Further, no display windows are provided directly adjacent to east entrance. Provide sufficient information to support that the windows adjacent to each entrance shall be used for displays, if this is a design feature to be incorporated into the design of customer entrances.

RESPONSE: The current design does not have display windows directly adjacent to either of the customer entrances. We have chosen other features to comply with this requirement as outlined in previous comments.



Please find the following attachments in support of this submittal:

SITE PLAN

1. Four (4) copies of this Response to Comments Letter.
2. Four (4) copies of Analysis of Compliance with the Gateway Overlay District.
3. Four (4) copies of Revised Concurrency Impact Analysis.
4. Four (4) copies of Revised Stormwater Report.
5. Four (4) sets of Revised Signed and Sealed Civil Construction Plans including site, grading, utility, lighting and landscape plans (24x36 rolled).
6. Four (4) sets of Revised Signed and Sealed Traffic Signal Plans (11x17 folded).
7. Four (4) sets of Revised Architectural Building Elevations (24x36 color, rolled), Floor Plans and Recycling Enclosure (30x42 folded).
8. Four (4) copies of Material Percentage Presentation (11x17 folded).
9. Four (4) copies of Pond Berms – Stability Analysis.
10. Four (4) copies of the Stormwater Management System – Soil Design Parameters.
11. Four (4) copies of Traffic Impact Analysis.
12. One (1) CD containing PDF's of all submitted documents and plans for each submittal.

SPECIAL EXCEPTION - BUILDINGS ≥80,000 SQUARE FEET

1. Four (4) copies of this Response to Comments Letter.
2. Four (4) copies of Signed and Sealed Site Dimension Plan Sheets C-6, C-6A & C-6B (24x36 folded).
3. Four (4) sets of Revised Architectural Building Elevations (24x36 color, rolled), Floor Plans and Recycling Enclosure (30x42 folded).
4. Four (4) copies of Material Percentage Presentation (11x17).
5. Four (4) copies of Analysis of Compliance with the Gateway Overlay District.
6. Four (4) copies of Revised Concurrency Impact Analysis.
7. Four (4) copies of Traffic Impact Analysis.

SPECIAL EXCEPTION – AUTOMOBILE REPAIR & SERVICING

1. Four (4) copies of this Response to Comments Letter.
2. Four (4) copies of Signed and Sealed Site Dimension Plan Sheets C-6, C-6A & C-6B.
3. Four (4) sets of Revised Architectural Building Elevations (24x36 folded), Floor Plans and Recycling Enclosure (30x42 folded).
4. Four (4) copies of Material Percentage Presentation (11x17).
5. Four (4) copies of Analysis of Compliance with the Gateway Overlay District.
6. Four (4) copies of Revised Concurrency Impact Analysis.
7. Four (4) copies of Traffic Impact Analysis.

Please contact me at bcassidy@cphcorp.com or at 904.332.0999 if you have any questions or require additional information. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

CPH, Inc.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'B. Cassidy', is positioned below the company name.

Brian Cassidy, P.E.



5200 Belfort Road
Suite 220
Jacksonville, FL 32256
Phone: 904.332.0999
Fax: 904.332.0997

November 21, 2016

Mr. Justin Tabor, AICP
Principal Planner
City of Alachua
15100 NW 142nd Terrace
P.O. Box 6
Alachua, FL 32616

**Re: Walmart Alachua NWC 441 & 75
CPH Project Number: W13392**

Dear Justin:

CPH, Inc. is in receipt of the City's comments and offers the following responses. Please note that our responses are shown in **bold** typeface. This response letter will provide responses for the Site Plan Application, the Special Exception for buildings ≥80,000 square feet, and the Special Exception for the Tire and Lube Express. The Variance Application will be provided under separate cover.

Also, please note that the offsite water and sewer main extension plans are included in the civil construction plans for City review. The FDEP water and sewer permit applications are also included with the application package for City signature as the water and sewer provider. At this time, we are requesting your review of the offsite water and sewer main extension plans and your signatures on the FDEP Permit applications as the water and sewer provider.

SITE PLAN APPLICATION

1. *Compliance with Land Development Regulations*

A. *Section 3.7.2(C)(5) – Gateway Overlay District*

- i. Provide an analysis of the application's compliance with Section 3.7.2(C)(5.)
- (a) Ensure response specifically identifies the architectural elements (minimum of 6, as the applicant has elected to use glazing reduction provided in Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(iv)) defined in Section 3.7.2(C)(5)(a)(iv) incorporated into each of the following exterior building walls/elevations: (1) East Elevation; (2) West Elevation.

RESPONSE: Please see attached document entitled "Compliance with Standards for Gateway Overlay District" and the revised Architectural Elevations included with this submittal.

- ii. Section 3.7.2(C)(5)(c)(ii): Demonstrate that construction materials used within outdoor storage areas, areas used for trash collection, and loading areas (i.e., trash compactor, loading dock screening, and tire center storage) are of a comparable quality and appearance as the primary building.

RESPONSE: As shown on the attached renderings and architectural drawing Sheet SP-2, the construction materials used for the outdoor storage areas, areas used for trash collection, and loading areas (*i.e.*, trash compactor, loading dock screening, and tire center storage) are the same materials and colors used on the main body of the primary building.

- iii. Section 3.7.2(C)(5)(d): Requires frontage of I-75 frontage to comply with arterial screening requirements of Section 6.2.3(E.) Continuous hedge not provided between area north of parking lot and stormwater retention area 1.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised Landscape Plans which address this comment.

B. Article 4: Use Regulations

- i. Outdoor Storage: Section 4.4.4(E) requires the outdoor storage area to be incorporated into the design of the primary structure; the area to be screened from view from property lines/right-of-way by an opaque fence with landscaping along fence; and to incorporate one of the predominant colors of the primary structure in the fence/ roofing (if roofed.) Reference 4.4.4(E) for all requirements.
- (a) Tire and Battery Storage Area must comply with outdoor storage standards provided in Section 4.4.4(E.)

RESPONSE: The Tire and Battery Storage area will comply with the outdoor storage standards provided in Section 4.4.4(E) of the City's LDRs.

- (b) Identify the use of the area along the exterior of the west elevation (appears to be outdoor storage.) If outdoor storage, demonstrate compliance with Section 4.4.4(E.)

RESPONSE: The area along the exterior of the west elevation is the sales area for large items from the Garden Center. These items include bags of soil, mulch, paving tiles, etc. It requires access of a forklift to help load the upper shelves as well as helping customers retrieve items they have purchased. Pursuant to Section 4.4.4(E)(4) of the City's LDRs, a landscaped earth berm may be used instead of or in combination with a fence or wall. A landscaped earth berm is proposed along the westerly property line between the garden center and the property line.

C. Section 6.1, Parking/Traffic/Circulation Standards

- i. Table 6.1-4 requires four (4) stacking spaces for each pharmacy drive-through lane, measured from the pickup window.
- (a) Only three (3) stacking spaces provided for northernmost pickup window. Revise to provide the minimum four (4) required stacking spaces.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-6A which addresses this comment.

- (b) Address conflict between vehicular traffic exiting northernmost pickup window and the stacking spaces identified for the southern pickup window (as proposed, vehicular traffic from each must cross paths with no clear delineation of right-of-

way/traffic flow.) Access to pick up windows and associated stacking spaces must be revised to eliminate conflicts.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-6A which addresses this comment.

- ii. Please address the purpose/function of the large paved area east of the building and south of pharmacy pickup windows. The area does not serve to provide on-site circulation.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-6A which addresses this comment. The area east of the building and south of the pharmacy pickup windows has been revised to allow for better circulation and stacking of vehicles utilizing the Pharmacy Drive-Thru and to eliminate vehicle conflicts associated with stacking of vehicles at the Drive-Thru windows.

- iii. Address compliance with Section 6.1.8(B)(2)(b), as it relates to pharmacy drive-through lanes. Section 6.1.8(B)(2)(b) requires to the maximum extent practicable, drive-in lanes to not be located between the principal structure and adjacent public streets, or for drive-in lanes and facilities to be set back a minimum of 20 feet from any adjacent public street, with the setback landscaped and bermed.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-7 and revised Landscape Plan Sheet L-1 which address this comment. A berm was added to the plans.

- iv. Section 6.1.8(B)(1)(c) states, “stacking spaces shall be separated from other internal driveways by raised medians if the LDR Administrator determines the median is necessary for traffic movement and safety.” As proposed, stacking spaces would not be separated from other paved areas. To provide a clear separation between on-site traffic circulation areas the vehicle stacking spaces, provide a raised median between stacking lanes and other vehicular traffic areas.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-6A which addresses this comment.

- v. Revise plans to comply with Section 6.1.8(B)(3)(a), (c), (d), and (e): *Primary drive aisles*. Primary drive aisles are required within off-street surface parking lots of 300 or more spaces, and shall be configured to appear as an extension of the public street network through the provision of:

- (a) Sidewalks, parallel to the building facade *located along both sides of the aisle*;

RESPONSE: It is our understanding that this requirement is not applicable to the proposed project.

- (b) Canopy trees, spaced no less than 40 feet on center, located on both sides of the aisle, within three feet of the curb, and extending the full length of the aisle;

RESPONSE: It is our understanding that this requirement is not applicable to the proposed project.

- (c) Designated parallel parking spaces on both sides of the drive aisle; and

RESPONSE: It is our understanding that this requirement is not applicable to the proposed project.

- (d) A road crown in the center of the aisle.

RESPONSE: It is our understanding that this requirement is not applicable to the proposed project.

- vi. Sheet C-6: City of Alachua Parking Requirements: Identify required/provided accessible parking in accordance with Section 6.1.9.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-6 which addresses this comment.

- vii. Revise plans to comply with Section 6.1.10(A)(2): "Pedestrian pathways shall be provided in off-street surface parking lots with 100 or more parking spaces, in accordance with the following standards:

- (a) Pedestrian crosswalks, at least ten feet in width, either raised above the adjacent pavement, striped, or otherwise designated through the use of alternative materials, shall be located between all primary building entrances and the parking areas serving those entrances." *Crosswalks less than ten feet in width (see Keynote 13, Sheet C-6A.)*

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-6A which addresses this comment.

- (b) Within parking lots of 300 or more spaces, improved pedestrian pathways, with a minimum width of three feet, located in continuous landscaped parking islands, shall be provided at least every fourth row of parking spaces." (1) *Sidewalk not provided every fourth row of parking space in easternmost portion of parking lot.* (2) *Identify width of pedestrian pathways to demonstrate minimum width of 3 feet is provided.* (3) *Westernmost pedestrian pathway is not within a continuously landscaped parking island.*

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-6A which addresses this comment.

- viii. Identify the location of all on-site traffic control devices, such as stop signs/stop bars, etc., within parking lots/drive aisles.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-6A which addresses this comment.

D. Sections 6.2.1, Tree Replacement, Credit, and 6.2.2, Landscape Standards

- i. Sheet TR-2: Tree mitigation appears to be calculated incorrectly. "Total Tree Accounting" table identifies "required landscape plan trees," however, this only accounts for site landscaping requirements. No consideration is given to all other landscaping requirements (i.e., perimeter buffer requirements, parking lot perimeter/interior, etc.) Please address.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet TR-2 which addresses this comment.

- ii. Sheet TR-2: "Total Tree Accounting" Table – Tree credits for retained trees may not be used to meet mitigation requirements. Section 6.2.2(D)(4) states: "Canopy or ornamental/understory trees that are in very good to excellent health, that are protected before and during development of the site and maintained thereafter in a healthy growing condition, can be used to comply with the landscaping standards for Subsections 6.2.2(D)(1), Site landscaping; 6.2.2(D)(2), Parking lot landscaping; or 6.2.2(D)(3), Perimeter buffers, of this section." Please address.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet TR-2 which addresses this comment.

- iii. Tree credits – Tables on L-1 and TR-2 show there are 6 trees between 30" and 36" to be retained. Calculation of credits is incorrect (6 trees x 5 credits/tree = 30 credits.) Revise accordingly.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheets L-1 and TR-2 which address this comment.

- iv. Sheet L-1: Required Tree Mitigation Table – does not address mitigation trees provided to mitigate for heritage trees removed. Please address.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet L-1 which addresses this comment.

- v. Sheet TR-2: Confirm trees used to calculate tree credits are healthy regulated trees, and are not a species on the nuisance tree list. Trees used for credit must be in very good or excellent health (see 6.2.2(D)(4.)) No credit is given for any trees on the nuisance tree list.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet TR-2 which addresses this comment.

- vi. Parking Lot Interior – Trees Required – Calculations show 192 required, but only 171 provided. Provide additional trees within parking lot interior to meet minimum required.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised Landscape Plans which address this comment.

- vii. Sheet L-1: Section 6.2.2(D)(3)(e) requires perimeter buffers to be located along the outer perimeter of the parcel. Please address location of perimeter buffer in the information provided on this sheet for the north perimeter buffer and the portion of the east perimeter buffer (north of seller road 1.)

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet L-1 which addresses this comment.

- viii. Section 6.2.2(D)(8) requires canopy trees to be a minimum of 8 feet in height, and shrubs which are upright in nature to be a minimum of 24 inches in height at the time of planting. The specifications for certain canopy trees calls for trees less than 8 feet in height, and specifications for shrubs that are upright in nature are less than 24 inches in height. Revise accordingly.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised Landscape Plans which address this comment.

- ix. Sheet L-1: Verify footnote under Parking Buffer Landscape table is in the appropriate location. Footnote relates to building façade trees.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised Landscape Plans which address this comment.

- x. Provide detail of screening surrounding trash compactor, organic dumpster, and bale and pallet recycling areas to demonstrate compliance with Section 6.2.3(B.) Note that sides providing service access must be gated.

RESPONSE: Please see detail on Sheet SP-2 of screening surrounding trash compactor, organic dumpster, and bale and pallet recycling areas.

- xi. Sheet TR-2: There are discrepancies between the tree protection notes and tree protection detail. Please resolve discrepancies and verify notes related to tree protection are consistent with Section 6.2.1(D)(2)(a.)

RESPONSE: Please see the revised Landscape Plans which address this comment.

- xii. Sheet TR-2: Tree protection approval – revise note to state the landscape architect shall approve the tree barricades prior to site clearing.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised Landscape Plans which address this comment.

- xiii. Tree Retention Plan (Sheet TR-1) not legible at scale used (1" = 100'.) Please address.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet TR-1 which addresses this comment.

E. Section 6.3, Fencing Standards

- i. Section 6.3.3(B) prohibits fences and walls within front setback areas. A “proposed decorative retaining wall” is depicted on each side of entrance road within front setback areas of the property. Revise to comply with Section 6.3.3(B.)

RESPONSE: Please see the revised civil construction plans which address this comment. The decorative retaining wall has been removed.

F. Section 6.4, Exterior Lighting Standards

- i. Lighting Plan:
 - (a) Notes state “LED statistics shown are at 50,000 hours L90 rating (~12 years @ 12 hrs/day.)” Section 6.4.4(D) requires photometrics to demonstrate that initial lamp lumens do not exceed 24,000 lumens or 400 watts for each fixture. Revise photometrics to provide statistics for the initial lamp lumens of all light fixtures.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised Photometric Plan which addresses this comment.

- (b) Notes state “Trees are modeled as approved T1, T2, and T3 objects that block lights as 10 year mature trees.” Photometric Plan must depict site photometrics present at completion of project. Revise photometrics to provide statistics for the site at the completion of construction.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised Photometric Plan which addresses this comment.

- (c) Revise notes on photometric plans to address comments above.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised Photometric Plan which addresses this comment.

- ii. The maximum to minimum ratio of the rear drive exceeds the permitted ratio of 10:1 (Section 6.4.4.(E.)) Revise accordingly.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised Photometric Plan which addresses this comment.

- iii. Lighting Plan: To demonstrate compliance of each fixture with Section 6.4.4(D)(2), add columns in the matrix located in the lower left of the plan that identify the initial lamp lumens and wattage of each light fixture (as opposed to only the arranged luminaire lumens/wattage.)

RESPONSE: Please see the revised Photometric Plan included which address this comment.

- iv. Provide mounting detail of all light fixtures used on the subject property.

RESPONSE: Please see the requested mounting detail on the attached Lighting Cut Sheets.

- v. Provide cut sheets of all light fixtures used on the subject property. Cut sheets must be provided within the Site Plan/Lighting Plan, and depict the use of full cut-off fixtures (6.4.4(F)(1.))

RESPONSE: Please see the attached Lighting Cut Sheets which address this comment.

G. Section 6.5, Signage

- i. A freestanding sign appears to be depicted west of the intersection of US Highway 441 and the entrance road. Please note freestanding signage for a multi-tenant building or development is subject to the provisions of Section 6.5.4(C)(2) (among other subsections of Section 6.5) and compliance with such provisions must be demonstrated as part of the review of a sign permit application.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

H. Section 6.8, Design Standards for Business Uses

- i. Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(ii) states, “for the purposes of this section, the ground floor facade area of single-story buildings shall be calculated by measuring the applicable building wall between the finished grade and the underside of the roof, wall, or parapet of the façade...” The proposed building includes a parapet on the front façade, therefore, the area of the front façade must be calculated from the finished grade to the top of the parapet. Revise area/calculations on Architectural Plans of north and east façades used to calculate required glazing and architectural masonry.

RESPONSE: During the Development Review Team meeting, it was determined that the building facades would be calculated from the finished grade to the roof line of the appropriate façade. All area calculations on the North and East facades will follow this guideline to calculate the required glazing and architectural masonry provided in the building design.

- ii. Section 6.8.2(A)(1) states that all facades facing a street shall be subject to the standards set forth in Subsection 6.8.3(A)(2.) The east elevation, which faces a proposed public street must comply with the following:
 - (a) Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(iv): The applicant has utilized the glazing reduction permitted by the referenced section, however, has not provided one of the following to comply with subsections b. and c.:

- Window shutters or plantation-style shutters which span a minimum of 10 percent of the length of the façade, or;

RESPONSE: The total front façade length is 504'-0". Ten percent of that length equals 50'-4". Total shutter length as proposed on the elevation is 120'-6" or 23.9 percent of the total length. Thus, the building design provides plantation-style shutters which span more than 10 percent of the length of the façade.

- A canopy or portico which provides a covered pedestrian walkway adjacent to the façade which spans a minimum of 50 percent of the length of the façade; and

RESPONSE: This item not required based on addition of plantation-style shutters.

- Customer entrances which include no less than six of the design features provided in Subsection 6.8.3(C)(2)(d.) (NOTE: identify the design features incorporated into the customer entrance.)

RESPONSE: The customer entrances on the Front Elevation and East Elevation comply with the requirement of six (6) design features per Section 6.8.3(C)(2) of the City's LDRs. The six (6) design features incorporated into the customer entrances are as follows:

- (a) Canopies above the entrance
- (b) Roof overhangs above the entrance
- (c) Entry Recesses

- (e) Raised Cornice Parapets
 - (i) Architectural details/tile work
 - (j) Integral planters
- iii. Calculation of glazing provided for front elevation includes areas to the sides of vestibules and over cart doors. These areas are not visible when facing the front elevation. Calculation of glazing area must and visible when facing the front elevation.

RESPONSE: New glazing calculations are provided on the building elevations, which are included as an attachment to this document. The area not visible when facing the Front Elevation is not included in these calculations.

- iv. The applicant proposes to utilize the glazing reduction provided in Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(iv), which provides for a reduction in glazing of the front façade from 30% to 20%. In order to demonstrate compliance with the preceding section, the applicant must:

(a) Provide within the Architectural Plans:

- A calculation of the length of the front façade consisting of window shutters/plantation-style shutters, or a canopy/portico; and,

RESPONSE: The total front façade length is 504'-0" as shown on the provided sheet; A1 – Floor Plan. The building design provides plantation-style shutters which span a minimum of 10 percent of the length of the façade. Ten (10) percent of that length would be 50'-4". Total shutter length as proposed on the elevation is 120'-6" or 23.9 percent of the total length.

- A calculation of the length of the total façade.

RESPONSE: Sheet A1 – Floor Plan shows the length of each façade for this building design. The total length of the front façade is 504'-0".

- (b) Incorporate no less than six (6) of the design features provided in Section 6.8.3(C)(2)(d) into customer entrances on the front façade. Identify which design features are incorporated into customer entrances on the front façade.

RESPONSE: The customer entrances on the Front Elevation and East Elevation comply with the requirement of six (6) design features per Section 6.8.3(C)(2) of the City's LDRs. The six (6) design features incorporated into the customer entrances are as follows:

- (a) Canopies above the entrance
- (b) Roof overhangs above the entrance
- (c) Entry Recesses
- (e) Raised Cornice Parapets
- (i) Architectural details/tile work
- (j) Integral planters

- v. Provide specifications/cut sheet of the proposed 'architectural masonry.' Must be a natural brick or natural brick product (6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(iv)a.)

RESPONSE: Information concerning specifications/cut sheet/color pallet is included with this resubmittal package.

- vi. Front (north) and east elevations do not appear to meet façade massing/alternative requirements provided in Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(b) in the following locations:

(a) East Elevation: Between center-most parapets. Roof line change provided, however, a corresponding material change required by 6.8.3(A)(2)(b)(ii)c.

RESPONSE: Based on a conference call with the City Staff, it is our understanding that this item is no longer a concern.

(b) Front Elevation: From second pilaster inset from NE corner, to west of grocery vestibule.

RESPONSE: Based on a conference call with the City Staff, it is our understanding that this item is no longer a concern.

(c) Front Elevation: From east of GM vestibule to pilaster west of GM vestibule.

RESPONSE: Based on a conference call with the City Staff, it is our understanding that this item is no longer a concern.

(d) Front Elevation: from NW corner of building to first roof line change.

RESPONSE: The front elevation from the northwest corner of the building to the first roof line change has been revised to add an additional change at the center point of the length of run and the addition of a pilaster on the main wall to help break up the mass of that wall. See Front Elevation rendering as part of the resubmittal package.

- vii. To demonstrate compliance with Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(b), identify the height of all pilasters.

RESPONSE: The height of the pilasters located on the elevations is as follows:

- **Front Elevation: Two short pilasters at 17'-4" in height, and two tall pilasters at 24'-10" in height.**
- **Left Elevation: Four short pilasters at 17'-4" in height.**
- **Right Elevation: One short pilaster at 17'-4" in height, and one tall pilaster at 24'-10" in height.**
- **Rear Elevation: One short pilaster at 17'-4" in height.**

- viii. Section 6.8.3(B)(2) requires flat roofs to be concealed using a parapet wall with cornice treatment. Cornice must include a perpendicular projection of a minimum of 8 inches from the parapet façade plane. Provide detail within the Architectural Plans demonstrating that the cornice surrounding the entire perimeter of the building includes a perpendicular projection of at least 8 inches.

RESPONSE: Architectural detail demonstrating the cornice surrounding the entire perimeter of the building is located on Sheet A2 – Building Details and is included with this resubmittal package.

- ix. Section 6.8.3(C) requires customer entrances on each side of the building facing a public street.
- (a) An entrance is provided along the east elevation, however, the area to which this entrance accesses as depicted on the submitted floor plan does not appear to be a customer area of the store. Address how this entrance complies with Section 6.8.3(C.)

RESPONSE: The entrance provided along the East Elevation has been moved and is now located as part of the cart storage area on the right-hand side of the East Elevation. This location services the customer area of the store and also connects to a main entrance on the Front Elevation. This allows Walmart to maintain the retail layout of the store.

- (b) Identify the design features selected (minimum of 6, as the applicant has elected to use glazing reduction provided in Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(iv)) provided in Section 6.8.3(C)(2) for the customer entrance on the east elevation.

RESPONSE: The customer entrances on the East Elevation comply with the requirement of six (6) design features per Section 6.8.3(C)(2) of the City's LDRs. The six (6) design features incorporated into the customer entrances are as follows:

- (a) Canopies above the entrance
 - (b) Roof overhangs above the entrance
 - (c) Entry Recesses
 - (e) Raised Cornice Parapets
 - (i) Architectural details/tile work
 - (j) Integral planters
- x. Revise plans to demonstrate compliance with Section 6.8.3(E)(1): "*Sidewalks required*. New large retail establishments shall provide sidewalks constructed in accordance with Subsection 7.3.2(B), Configuration..." Section 7.3.2(B) requires sidewalks to be a minimum 5 feet wide, 4 inches thick. Identify width/thickness of all sidewalks.
- RESPONSE:** All sidewalks are shown to be 5'-0" wide (min.) (see Site Plans) and will be four (4) inches thick (see Detail Sheet) as shown on the Civil Engineering drawings.
- xi. Revise plans to demonstrate compliance with Section 6.8.3(E)(2): "*Pedestrian pathways*. The on-site pedestrian circulation system shall comply with the standards in Subsection 6.1.10(A), Required improvements, and Subsection 7.3.2(C), Connection." Seven (7) connections to adjacent public sidewalk system are required.

RESPONSE: Pedestrian pathways are proposed to be stamped concrete (see Pavement Legend C-6A and Keynote 13 on Sheet C-6A). The Applicant is requesting a variance from the required number of pedestrian connections. The Variance Application is included with this resubmittal package.

- xii. Revise plans to demonstrate compliance with Section 6.8.3(E)(4): “*Distinguished from driving surfaces*. All internal pedestrian walkways shall be distinguished from driving surfaces through the use of durable, low-maintenance surface materials such as pavers, bricks, or scored/stamped concrete or asphalt to enhance pedestrian safety and comfort, as well as the attractiveness of the walkways.”

RESPONSE: Pedestrian pathways are proposed to be stamped concrete (see Pavement Legend C-6A and Keynote 13 on Sheet C-6A).

I. General Comments

i. Traffic Circulation

- (a) See comments provided by Brian Kanely, P.E., of Volkert, Inc., in a letter dated May 31, 2016 pertaining to proposed median cut south of entrance road intersection with US 441. Median must be solid from traffic signal to seller road 1.

RESPONSE: Please see revised plan Sheet C-6B. The revised plans propose a south-bound left-turn lane for the parcel to the east of the main entrance. Also, the center median and median opening near the entrance were modified to provide better access for users of the median opening. Additionally, to provide adequate storage for north-bound left-turning vehicles and north-bound right-turning vehicles, dual right-turn and dual left-turn lanes have been added. As future developments are proposed that would connect to the access roadway, the roadway design (median openings, turn lane storage, alignments, etc.) should be evaluated to ensure continued safe and efficient functioning of the roadway.

- (b) Confirm and demonstrate access points along east side of entrance road are consistent with Policy 1.2.b, Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element.

RESPONSE: The proposed access points along the east side of the entrance road are consistent with Policy 1.2.b, Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element, which allows for one (1) driveway per parcel.

- (c) Applicant to coordinate with Alachua County E-911 office to assign road names.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

- (d) Provide keynote on Sheet C-6B noting diamonds to be located at the terminus of entrance road.

RESPONSE: Please see Sheet C-9R which addresses this comment.

- (e) Provide crosswalks at the following locations:

- On west and south sides of the intersection of entrance road and seller road 1.

RESPONSE: Please see Sheet C-6B which addresses this comment.

- On east side of the intersection of entrance road and NW 151st Blvd.

RESPONSE: Please see Sheet C-6B which addresses this comment.

ii. Drainage/Stormwater

(a) Sheet C-7: Insufficient data is provided to indicate positive drainage in the following areas. Provide spot elevations and directional arrows indicated stormwater flow in the following areas:

- Each truck well;
- Drive area in southeast corner of property (around the radius of the landscape island;)
- Parking area, drive aisle west of TLE and garden center;
- At the radii of the landscape islands south of S-35; and,
- At the two landscape islands southeast of S-33

RESPONSE: Please see Sheet C-7 which addresses this comment.

(b) Sheet C-7A:

- Verify size of S-73. S-75 discharges to S-73, but S-75 is larger in diameter.

RESPONSE: Please see Sheet C-7B which addresses this comment.

- Verify inlet elevations for NE inlet, S-107, and SE inlet, S-105. S-107 appears to drain to S-105, however, inlet elevations are inverted for such configuration.

RESPONSE: Please see Sheet C-7B which addresses this comment.

iii. Public Facilities

(a) The provision of water/wastewater facilities from off-site locations to the points of termination depicted on plans should be addressed by providing a reference to off-site infrastructure improvement plans to be prepared separate from these plans.

RESPONSE: Please see the Offsite Water and Sewer Extension Plans included with this resubmittal package.

iv. Land Rights

(a) Throughout Plans: Remove references to “outparcel” and “City dedicated parcel.” Revise to reflect parcel’s use as passive recreation or another descriptive term appropriate for its designated use.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised plans which address this comment.

(b) Throughout Plans: Delete references to “outlot,” “out parcel,” “out parcel 1,” etc., if this is not applicable to project.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised plans which address this comment.

- (c) References to “Seller Retained Property” should be removed. Information is not relevant to this application.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised plans which address this comment.

- (d) Legal descriptions and sketches depicted on survey do not appear match current proposed ROWs shown on civil drawings. Resolve inconsistency.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised plans and survey which address this comment.

- (e) Legal descriptions and sketches of overall parcel on survey do not reflect tax parcel records. Resolve inconsistency.

RESPONSE: Tax parcel identification numbers for the parcels owned by Walmart have been added to the legal descriptions on the survey cover sheet as well as labeled directly on the sketches of the parcels on the survey.

- (f) Provide draft legal descriptions and sketches of all proposed public utility easements (PUEs.)

RESPONSE: The Applicant will provide draft legal descriptions as soon as they are available.

v. Miscellaneous

- (a) Throughout Plans: Delete references to “proposed legend.” Refer to as “legend.” Likewise, delete references to “proposed notes” throughout plans. Refer to as “notes.”

RESPONSE: Please see the revised plans which address this comment.

- (b) Throughout Plans: References to GRU for water, wastewater, and electric service are incorrect. Revise to City of Alachua.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised plans which address this comment.

- (c) Sheet C-1: Verify name of soil consultant is correct. Appears to be misspelled.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-1 which addresses this comment.

- (d) Sheet C-1: Revise reference to contact for electric, water, and sewer utilities.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-1 which addresses this comment.

- (e) Sheet C-3: Survey Note 13 indicates front, rear, and side setbacks of 10 feet. Correct setbacks: Front – 20 feet; Side – 0 feet; Rear – 15 feet.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-3 which addresses this comment.

- (f) Sheet C-3B: Many spot elevations not legible due to overlap of information on drawing.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-3B which addresses this comment.

- (g) Sheet C-6: Add Tax Parcel No. 03066-000-000 under Site Data.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-6 which addresses this comment.

- (h) Sheet C-6: Impervious Area for parcel currently labelled “City dedicated parcel” is 0 square feet. Revise accordingly.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-6 which addresses this comment.

- (i) Sheet C-6: There is a typographical error under “Special Exceptions Requested.”

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-6 which addresses this comment.

- (j) Sheet C-6: There is a typographical error under “Conditions,” first bullet.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-6 which addresses this comment.

- (k) Sheet C-6: There is a typographical error under “Conditions,” third bullet, second line (“location” should be plural.)

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-6 which addresses this comment.

- (l) Sheet C-6: “Conditions,” third bullet: verify the information is correct pertaining to rainfall to be treated.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-6 which addresses this comment. The information pertaining to rainfall to be treated is correct.

- (m) Sheet C-6A: Keynotes: Identify detail sheet where detail for each keynote is provided.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-6A which addresses this comment.

- (n) Sheet C-6A: Keynote 11: Call out states to coordinate with GRU for electric service. Electric service provider is City of Alachua. Revise accordingly.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-6A which addresses this comment.

- (o) Sheet C-6A: Keynote 26: Include statement that all signage requires separate permit.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-6A which addresses this comment.

- (p) Sheet C-6A: Keynote 39: Calls for bicycle rack model types 2170-7, 2170-13, and 2170-19. Detail on Sheet C-12.1 depicts model type 2170-3, 2170-7, 2170-9, 2170-11, and 2170-13.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-6A which addresses this comment.

- Sheet C-12.1: Delete detail for model types 2170-3, 2170-9, and 2170-11, since they are not used for this project.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-6A which addresses this comment.

- Add detail for model type 2170-19.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-6A which addresses this comment.

- (q) Sheet C-6A: Keynote 42: Keynote specifications provided, but not depicted on plans. Revise accordingly.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-6A which addresses this comment.

- (r) Sheet C-6A: Light legend symbols do not match those depicted on plan sheet. Revise accordingly.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-6 which addresses this comment.

- (s) Sheet C-6B: provide keynote legend on sheet.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-6B which addresses this comment.

- (t) Sheet C-7: FEMA flood panel referenced is outdated. Current FIRM series is dated June 16, 2006.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-7 which addresses this comment.

- (u) Sheet C-7: There is a typographical error in the title block for "Flood Plain."

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-7 which addresses this comment.

- (v) Sheet C-8: Define abbreviation "FO" in legend.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-8 which addresses this comment.

- (w) Sheet E-8: Dimensions of fixture details for SLA and SLB are incorrect.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet E-8 which addresses this comment.

- (x) Sheet TR-2: Note on sheet references details concerning individual trees, size, and tree credits as available on that sheet (circular reference.)

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet TR-2 which addresses this comment.

- (y) Architectural Plans: Please provide scale on all Architectural Plan sheets.

RESPONSE: Scales have been provided on all Architectural Plans included with the resubmittal package.

- (z) Architectural Plan Sheet 2: Area of front elevation consisting of Optical Center not labelled. Revise accordingly.

RESPONSE: The Optical Center has been labeled on Architectural Plan Sheet 2 and is included with the resubmittal package.

- (aa) Lighting Plan: There is a note above the matrix in the upper right corner that applies to the preparation of the matrix, and should be removed from the plans as it is not applicable to the information presented within the plans.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised Photometric Plan which addresses this comment.

J. Concurrency Impact Analysis

- i. Indicate the source of the project demand for potable water, sanitary sewer, and solid waste facilities.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised Concurrency Impact Analysis which addresses this comment.

- ii. Reserved capacities for water, wastewater, and transportation facilities are not considered. Revise Concurrency Impact Analysis to consider reserved capacities and the impact to residual capacities.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised Concurrency Impact Analysis which addresses this comment.

SPECIAL EXCEPTION PERMIT (SEP) APPLICATION: BUILDING ≥80,000 SQUARE FEET

2. Compliance with Land Development Regulations

- A. Response to Section 2.4.4(D)(8): Property is located within Gateway Overlay District and subject to development standards provided in Section 3.7.2(C)(5.) Provide an analysis of the application's compliance with Section 3.7.2(C)(5.) See comment 1.A., above for further information.

RESPONSE: Please see the attached document entitled “Compliance with Standards for Gateway Overlay District.”

- B. Response to Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(ii): Ground floor façade area must be calculated from the finished grade to bottom of parapet wall. Revise response accordingly.

RESPONSE: During the Development Review Team meeting, it was determined that the building facades would be calculated from the finished grade to the roof line of the appropriate façade. All area calculations on the North and East facades will follow this guideline to calculate the required glazing and architectural masonry provided in the building design.

- C. Response to Section 6.8.3(A)(2)(a)(iv)c.: Identify the 6 design features that are incorporated into each customer entrance on the front elevation, or reference response to Section 6.8.3(C)(2) if it addresses the requirements of this section.

RESPONSE: The customer entrances on the Front Elevation and East Elevation comply with the requirement of six (6) design features per Section 6.8.3(C)(2) of the City’s LDRs. The six (6) design features incorporated into the customer entrances are as follows:

- (a) Canopies above the entrance
- (b) Roof overhangs above the entrance
- (c) Entry Recesses
- (e) Raised Cornice Parapets
- (i) Architectural details/tile work
- (j) Integral planters

- D. Response to Section 6.8.3(C)(2):

- i. The applicant has chosen to utilize glazing alternatives which permit a reduction in glazing for the front façade, but require the incorporation of no less than 6 of the design features provided in the referenced section. Revise response accordingly.

RESPONSE: The customer entrances on the Front Elevation and East Elevation comply with the requirement of six (6) design features per Section 6.8.3(C)(2) of the City’s LDRs. The six (6) design features incorporated into the customer entrances are as follows:

- (a) Canopies above the entrance
- (b) Roof overhangs above the entrance
- (c) Entry Recesses
- (e) Raised Cornice Parapets
- (i) Architectural details/tile work
- (j) Integral planters

- ii. Identify a minimum of 6 of the design features incorporated into front facade customer entrances (grocery, home and pharmacy.)

RESPONSE: The customer entrances on the Front Elevation and East Elevation comply with the requirement of six (6) design features per Section 6.8.3(C)(2) of the City's LDRs. The six (6) design features incorporated into the customer entrances are as follows:

- (a) Canopies above the entrance
- (b) Roof overhangs above the entrance
- (c) Entry Recesses
- (e) Raised Cornice Parapets
- (i) Architectural details/tile work
- (j) Integral planters

- iii. Identify a minimum of 3 of the design features that are incorporated into all other customer entrances (auto center and east entrance.)

RESPONSE: The customer entrances on the Front Elevation and East Elevation comply with the requirement of six (6) design features per Section 6.8.3(C)(2) of the City's LDRs. The six (6) design features incorporated into the customer entrances are as follows:

- (a) Canopies above the entrance
- (b) Roof overhangs above the entrance
- (c) Entry Recesses
- (e) Raised Cornice Parapets
- (i) Architectural details/tile work
- (j) Integral planters

Accordingly, pursuant to Section 6.8.3(C)(1) of the City's LDRs, the auto center does not need to meet this requirement because it is a third customer entrance and does not face a public street.

- iv. Response states that display windows that are directly adjacent to each customer entrance are provided. Insufficient information has been provided to support that the windows adjacent to market, home and pharmacy, and auto center entrances shall be display windows. Further, no display windows are provided directly adjacent to east entrance. Provide sufficient information to support that the windows adjacent to each entrance shall be used for displays, if this is a design feature to be incorporated into the design of customer entrances.

RESPONSE: The current design does not have display windows directly adjacent to either of the customer entrances.

E. Response to Section 6.8.3(E)(2):

- i. Response states that stamped concrete is used for pedestrian crosswalks, however, striping has been proposed. Pedestrian crosswalks must comply with Section 6.8.3(E)(4), which requires the use of durable, low-maintenance surface materials such as pavers, bricks, or scored/stamped concrete. The Site Plan must be revised to comply with Section 6.8.3(E)(4.) Verify response to Section 6.8.3(E)(2) is consistent with surface materials selected.

RESPONSE: Please see the Pavement Legend on Sheet C-6A which indicates stamped concrete is proposed at pedestrian crosswalk areas.

- ii. Section 7.3.2(C), referenced in Section 6.8.3(E)(2), requires a total of 7 pedestrian connections to the adjacent public sidewalk network, however, only 4 appear to be proposed. The Site Plan must be revised to comply with the minimum required number of connections. Verify response to Section 6.8.3(E)(2) is consistent with the number of pedestrian connections to adjacent sidewalk network provided.

RESPONSE: The Applicant is requesting a variance from this requirement. The Variance Application is included with this resubmittal package.

F. Response to Section 6.8.3(E)(4):

- i. Response states that stamped concrete is used for pedestrian crosswalks, however, striping has been proposed. Pedestrian crosswalks must use durable, low-maintenance surface materials such as pavers, bricks, or scored/stamped concrete. The Site Plan must be revised to comply with Section 6.8.3(E)(4.) Verify response to Section 6.8.3(E)(4) is consistent with surface materials selected.

RESPONSE: Please see the Pavement Legend on Sheet C-6A which indicates stamped concrete is proposed at the pedestrian crosswalk areas.

3. Concurrency Impact Analysis

- A. Provide revised Concurrency Impact Analysis, as further described within Site Plan application comments (Comment 1.I.), within supporting materials for this SEP application.

RESPONSE: A revised Concurrency Impact Analysis is included with the Applicant's Special Exception Permit Application.

SPECIAL EXCEPTION PERMIT (SEP) APPLICATION: AUTOMOBILE REPAIR & SERVICING

4. Compliance with Land Development Regulations

- A. Response to Section 2.4.4(D)(8): Property is located within Gateway Overlay District and subject to development standards provided in Section 3.7.2(C)(5.) Provide an analysis of the application's compliance with Section 3.7.2(C)(5.) See comment 1.A., above for further information.

RESPONSE: Please see the attached document entitled "Compliance with Standards for Gateway Overlay District."

- B. Response to Section 2.4.4(D)(3):

- i. Visual Impact: References attached architectural elevations. Architectural elevations included within companion SEP and Site Plan applications, but have not been included with this SEP application.

RESPONSE: Please see the attached Architectural Elevations included with the Applicant's Special Exception Permit Application for Automobile Repair and Servicing.

- ii. Noise: Response should address the location of automobile repair/servicing activity.

RESPONSE: Please refer to the revised analysis of Compliance with Standards for a Special Exception for Automobile Repair and Servicing which addresses this comment.

C. Response to Section 2.4.4(D)(4):

- i. Further discussion of the disposal of regulated materials, including but not limited to, motor oil, fluids, batteries, and tires, should be provided. Discussion may include identification of applicable regulating agencies, disposal methods, etc.

RESPONSE: Please refer to the revised analysis of Compliance with Standards for a Special Exception for Automobile Repair and Servicing which addresses this comment.

- ii. Typographical error in first line of second paragraph.

RESPONSE: Please refer to the revised analysis of Compliance with Standards for a Special Exception for Automobile Repair and Servicing which addresses this comment.

D. Response to Section 4.3.4(J):

- i. Correct citation on Page 8 of report is Section 4.3.4(J)(3.)

RESPONSE: Please refer to the revised analysis of Compliance with Standards for a Special Exception for Automobile Repair and Servicing which addresses this comment.

- ii. References are made to site design features, such as parking areas, buffers, means of ingress/egress, etc., that are depicted on the Site Plan. Sheets from the Site Plan representative of these features should be included as an exhibit to this SEP application.

RESPONSE: Please see attached Site Plan Sheets C-6, C-6A, and C-6B which are included with this Special Exception Permit Application.

5. Concurrency Impact Analysis

- B. Provide revised Concurrency Impact Analysis, as further described within Site Plan application comments (Comment 1.I.), within supporting materials for this SEP application.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised Concurrency Impact Analysis which is included with this Special Exception Permit Application.

**PUBLIC SERVICES, OUTSIDE ENGINEERING/CONSULTANT REVIEW
COMMENTS**

- A. The applicant must address the comments provided by Adam Boukari, Assistant City Manager, in memoranda dated April 28, 2016, and June 16, 2016.
- B. The applicant must address the comments provided by Sergio Reyes, P.E., of EDA engineers – surveyors – planners, Inc., in a letter dated May 19, 2016.
- C. The applicant must address the comments provided by Brian Kanely, P.E., of Volkert, Inc., in a letter dated May 31, 2016.

RESPONSE: A revised Traffic Study addressing the Traffic Study related comments (from Brian Kanely, P.E., of Volkert, Inc., in a letter dated May 31, 2016) is included with this submittal.

Regarding the comments from Volkert, Inc., related to the access configuration and full median opening near the driveway connection to US 441, the proposed design considers the Walmart only and does not consider future development parcels adjacent to the proposed access road. As future development is proposed, the configuration of the access road will need to be re-evaluated at that time.

- D. The applicant must address the comments provided by Kenneth L. Hill, P.E., of GSE Engineering and Consulting, Inc.
- E. Please see the comments provided by Owen M. Beitsch, PhD, FAICP, CR, and David R. Darsey, of Community Solutions Group, GAI Consultants, Inc., in a letter dated June 23, 2016.

RESPONSE: This comment is acknowledged.

- F. Please see the comments provided by Brian Green, Fire Inspector, Alachua County Fire Rescue, in a letter dated June 27, 2016.

RESPONSE: For items A, B, D, and F above, the comments are restated below, followed by our responses in bold.

Public Services

Electric

- 1. No pulls are to be more than 400 linear feet.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised Electric Plans which address this comment.

- 2. Do not use more than three 90 degree bends in a run.



RESPONSE: Please see the revised Electric Plans which address this comment.

3. E1 & E3- The bore under US Hwy 441 will be at the customer's cost.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

4. C8- Utility Legend #B does not specify size of transformer and secondary voltage.

RESPONSE: The size of the transformer and secondary voltage are typically specified by the Walmart Architect in the ARCH/MEP Plans. If it is acceptable to the City, this information will be provided during building plans review.

5. C8- Primary electric line locations within easements are being proposed and line runs developed. Additional discussions will be required.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

Water

1. C5- General Utility Note 11D calls for PE Pipe. PE pipe is not permitted.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-5 which addresses this comment.

2. C8A- SDR-PR-PE... PE Pipe is not permitted. See COA Detail for 2" service for further details.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-8A which addresses this comment.

3. C8A- Corporation stops are not permitted. See COA Detail for 2" service for further details.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-8A which addresses this comment.

4. C8A- See COA Detail for 2" service. Schedule 40 PVC is permitted for 2" and smaller service lines however, all threaded PVC fittings shall be schedule 80 and shall be solvent welded using Oatey No. 30757 Purple Primer and Oatey No. 30893 Medium PVC Cement.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-8A which addresses this comment.

5. C8- Coordinate with COA for water model data to confirm flows and possible fire system/line modifications. COA has an ordinance requiring FM APPROVED Meters on fire systems that utilize pumps. A detector check is not an acceptable metering device for certain fire systems. Detailed review of the final fire system will determine the actual requirements.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

6. C8- Note #8 calls out 90 degree Bend but drawings show a Tee; please clarify.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-8 which addresses this comment.

7. C17 – 3” Water meters shall be installed above grade with bypass piping to allow for testing and service work. Pipe shall be of ductile iron using flange fittings with wheel operated resilient seat gate valves to include the bypass as well. These must also be freeze protected by the use of an approved box.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-17 which addresses this comment.

8. C17.1- Ref 2” BLOW OFF DETAIL, Line seven (7) Schedule 80 Male Adapters shall be used to make connection from PVC to other threaded components. Compression fittings not permitted in construction of new infrastructure.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-17.1 which addresses this comment.

9. C17.1 – Ref 3” BLOW OFF DETAIL, NO valves designed to shut off a service or blow off shall be more or less than 4” from the connection to the main using galvanized steel pipe ONLY. 4” LENGTH Galvanized nipples ONLY for these connection types.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-17.1 which addresses this comment.

10. Calculations provided for the diesel fire pump indicate a 26.1 psi residual. Therefore, a pump control valve needs to be installed to ensure no part of the incoming system can be pulled below 20 psi. This is to be shown in the fire system drawings of the building construction plans.

RESPONSE: A suction control valve will be provided in the ARCH / MEP plans for the building.

11. Diesel fire pump is to be designed and configured to ensure the discharge of water during testing or falsely triggered scenarios is at the minimum necessary for pump cooling and is to be metered on the fire main located at the ROW PUE. In the utility plans, provide meter detail to include meter, backflow support, oversized concrete pad, pipe, freeze protection box and related assemblies.

RESPONSE: The Applicant’s Building Plans will address these requirements.

Public Services

1. C-90 – Pavement Material Legend states Asphalt Type SIII and Type SI. COA would rather use FDOT Super Pave.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C9-O which addresses this comment. The revised plan calls for an FDOT Super Pave asphalt mix as requested.

2. C-10 – Proposed Legend refers to sheets C14 & C9B for Heavy Duty & Full Asphalt Pavement specifications. There are no specifications on these sheets. Provide specifications.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-10 which addresses this comment.



3. Install 10 gauge solid core copper tracer wire on all nonferrous pipe 2: diameter and larger.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised Utility Plans and detail sheets which address this comment.

4. Any meter boxes and/or valve body boxes shall have 10 gauge solid core tracer wire.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised Utility Plans and detail sheets which address this comment.

5. C-8 – Proposed 16” Water Line at NW corner of property; a new easement is being proposed so water line is able to access existing sleeves to run under Interstate 75.

RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

EDA Comments

Sheet C-1

1. Label the parcel numbers on the location map.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-1 which addresses this comment.

2. Mike New no longer works for the City of Alachua.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-1 which addresses this comment.

Sheet C-2

1. Mike New no longer works for the City of Alachua.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-2 which addresses this comment.

Sheet C-6

1. Show and label buffers.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-6 which addresses this comment.

2. Show and label the right-of-way.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-6 which addresses this comment.

3. The subtotal acreage (37.64 ac) does not match the acreage listed in the application.

RESPONSE: A revised application addressing this comment is included with this resubmittal package. The application was revised to match the Site Plans which state the correct acreage.

Please clarify which tax parcels the project is on. The application and the “Tax Parcel ID No.” under Site Data do not match.



RESPONSE: The application and the Site Plans included with this resubmittal package have been revised to address this comment.

Sheet C-6A

1. Dimension property lines.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-6A which addresses this comment.

Sheet C-7

1. Provide additional information to ensure compliance with ADA parking space grading criteria.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-7 which addresses this comment.

Sheet C-8

1. Clarify where the sewer line on the south side of the proposed building connects.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-8 which addresses this comment. No sewer line is proposed in this area.

Sheet C-9

1. Ensure that the sanitary sewer main and the water main have the required separations, specifically at MH-G.

RESPONSE: The Applicant's Engineer checked the required clearances between storm and sanitary sewer pipes and confirmed that the water main will have the required clearances at MH-G and all other locations.

Sheet C-9B

1. Ensure clearances between the storm pipes.

RESPONSE: The Applicant's Engineer checked the required clearances between storm and sanitary sewer pipes and confirmed that the water main will have the required clearances between the storm pipes.

Sheet C-11

1. Geotechnical engineer to provide recommendations on how to install berm fill.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-11 which addresses this comment. The Geotechnical Engineer has reviewed and provided recommendations regarding the proposed berm fill and such recommendations were implemented in the revised plans.

Sheet C-11A

1. Geotechnical engineer to provide recommendations on how to install berm fill.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-11 which addresses this comment. The Geotechnical Engineer has reviewed and provided recommendations regarding the proposed berm fill and such recommendations were implemented in the revised plans.

Sheet C-13

1. Add a length dimension to the ADA spaces within the Standard Pedestrian Island detail.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-13 which addresses this comment.

Sheet C-14

1. The striping around the ADA parking spaces in the Vestibule Crosswalk Striping detail is incorrect. There should be three (3) stripes at 60 degrees next to each space.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-14 which addresses this comment.

Sheet C-16

1. Is the Sinkhole Repair detail provided a recommendation of the geotechnical engineer?

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-16 which addresses this comment. Sheet C-16 was revised per the Geotechnical Engineer's recommendations.

Sheet C-17.1

1. Remove all references to GRU.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-17.1 which addresses this comment. GRU is the Natural Gas provider; all other references to GRU were removed.

Drainage Design Notes

1. Provide recover information for the required storm events. Per City of Alachua 6.9.3(7)(a), "Detention and retention systems shall be designed in conformance with the SRWMD's Surface Water Management Permitting Manual, as amended" and therefore, per SRWMD's Applicant's Handbook Volume II Section 3.4, "Storage volumes designed into retention or detention systems must be available as follows: 1. One-half of the total volume within seven days following the end of the design storm event, and 2. The total volume within 30 days following the end of the design storm event."

RESPONSE: Please see the section entitled "Pond Recovery" on page 18 of the revised Stormwater Report which addresses this comment.

2. Clarify why there are no percolation links included in the model and clarify why the geotechnical engineer did not provide stormwater management system soil design parameters to be used for this model.

RESPONSE: The soils in the two (2) retention areas were determined to have low permeability. The revised design proposes to dispose of the required recovery volumes through the use of a filter drain. Please see revised Sheets C-11A and C-11B. Also, see attached supplement to the Geotechnical Report "Stormwater Management System Soil Design Parameters" included in Appendix O showing results of the permeability testing in the retention ponds.

3. Verify the Mass Balance for the ICPR Model. Results should be zero difference.

RESPONSE: Please see the section entitled "Hydrologic Calculations Post Development" in the revised Stormwater Report which addresses this comment.

4. For the BNDY North node and the BNDY West node, please clarify why at different times, different stages have been given. Provide justification of the assumed tailwater conditions.

RESPONSE: In the Pre-Development ICPR model, Basin 2 is the only Basin directed to the BNDY West node. Basin 2 is modeled as overland flow in the Pre-Development ICPR Model. The initial stage is approximate natural ground. Similarly, in the Post-Development ICPR Model, Basins 1 and 3 are directed towards the BNDY North node and they are also modeled as overland flow.

The BNDY North Node is intended to simulate the roadside ditch adjacent to US 441 which is the discharge location from the retention areas. The stages selected for BNDY North are the approximate bottom and top of the existing ditch along US 441.

5. Provide calculations or a table showing the freeboard for Pond 1 and Pond 2 for each of the required storm events.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised Stormwater Report which addresses this comment. A table was added showing the requested information.

6. Every sheet of the time series is not needed. Please submit the time series sheet of each storm event showing the Maximum Discharge Rate or Maximum Discharge Volume per storm event with the specific criteria highlighted or boxed for both Pre-Development and Post-Development.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised Stormwater Report which addresses this comment.

7. For node Drop1, verify the length of the pipe run. The plans show approximately 781-ft of 24" pipe, 235-ft of 24"x38" pipe, and 116-ft of 30" pipe assuming Drop1 begins at S-168 and ends at S-184. Account for the changes in pipe sizes in your model. Also, account for Drop2 connecting to S-178.

RESPONSE: Due to concerns with stability issues in the ICPR model, we are proposing to use the simplified model included within the report. Please see the revised Stormwater Report which was updated to be consistent with the pipe lengths shown in the plans.

8. For node Drop2, verify the length and size of the pipe run. The plans show approximately 40-ft of 18" pipe, 235-ft of 24"x38", and 116-ft of 30" pipe.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised Stormwater Report which addresses this comment.

9. Clarify why the 2-year storm events have been included.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised Drainage Report which addresses this comment. The 2-year storm events are not included.

10. Clarify the difference between the 100-YR 001-HR storm event and the 100YR-YR 001-HR W storm event.

RESPONSE: The “W” designation is to identify the SRWMD storm events. The storm events without “W” are the FDOT storm events and were not included in the revised report.

11. Provide model data for the water quality treatment volume (WQTV) simulation including the recovery time for each pond.

RESPONSE: Please see the section entitled “Recovery Analysis” in the revised Stormwater Report. The Recovery Analysis was done utilizing AdICPR and the results demonstrating that recovery requirements are met. The results are included in the revised Stormwater Report.

12. Provide Pre-Development and Post-Development Drainage Basin Maps at a larger more readable paper size. The existing spot elevations and contour labels are illegible at the current printed size.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised Pre- and Post-Development Drainage Basin Maps at a larger scale included with this resubmittal package as an attachment to the revised Stormwater Report.

13. Clarify pre-development drainage areas. Where is Depression 1? How do the drainage areas defined by ERP-001-209884-2 relate to the three (3) pre-development drainage areas discussed?

RESPONSE: Please see the revised Pre- and Post-Development Drainage Basin Maps which address this comment.

Regarding Depression 1, this is the existing depression area located on the east side of the driveway connection to US 441 near the entrance. This depression receives runoff from Pre-Developed Drainage Basin 3 in the existing condition. This depression is proposed to be filled and runoff that previously drained to this area will be redirected to retention Pond 2. Please see the revised Pre- and Post-Development Drainage Basin Maps and the revised Stormwater Report. The depression area is identified as Basin 8 in revised Drainage Maps and the revised Stormwater Report.

14. Clarify in the post-development drainage map where the TK basin is located.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised Post Development Drainage Map which addresses this comment.

15. Clarify where Basin 1A is piped.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised Site Grading Plan and the revised Pre- and Post- Development Drainage Basin Maps which address this comment. The basins were revised to be consistent between the Drainage Exhibits and the report. Basin 1A was renamed.



16. Clarify the modification to the existing basin to the east. Has this basin been analyzed to accept this proposed drainage area? If no justification is available, provide calculations showing this basin can handle the additional drainage area.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised Pre- and Post-Development Drainage Basin Maps included with this submittal. The TK Basin has an existing SRWMD permit associated with it as identified on the revised Pre- and Post-Development Drainage Basin Maps. The proposed modifications are less than the previously permitted pervious and impervious areas designed to go to this basin. A letter modification for the existing permit is being sought from SRWMD.

17. Provide a sub-drainage area map showing the areas going to each inlet in relation to the Hydraflow model.

RESPONSE: Please see the attached Sub-Drainage Area Map PB-1 which is included with this resubmittal package as an exhibit to the revised Stormwater Report.

Alachua County Fire Rescue Review Comments

No Comments at this time.

GSE Comments

It is our opinion the geotechnical engineering explorations and report prepared by UES for the project generally meet the standard of care for geotechnical explorations for a project of this size and location with a few exceptions as discussed below. Additionally, it is our opinion some of the recommendations presented in the geotechnical engineering report have not been addressed in the civil design plans prepared by CPH. Our comments/concerns are noted below.

Building

1. Fifty-two (52) soil borings were performed within or near the proposed building limits. It is standard of care for a building of this type to perform soil borings to depths of 15 to 20 feet below the floor elevation to explore the subsurface conditions within the stress influence of the foundations. Eighteen (18) of these borings (approximately 35 percent) have termination depths that are less than 15 feet below the foundation elevation - soil borings A-18, A-33, B-100, B-101, B-108, B-109, B-110, B-112, B-115, B-116, B-117, B-118, B-119, B-120, B-121, B-122, B-123 and B-124). There is a concern that some of the building area has not been adequately explored to confirm the shallow foundation recommendations are appropriate. The geotechnical engineer of record should address this concern.

RESPONSE: There were approximately 34 soil borings to termination depths of more than 15 feet below finish floor. More than 26 borings were performed to depths of 50 feet. There are no concerns about the adequacy of the geotechnical exploration; the geotechnical exploration program provided necessary information for the foundation recommendations. There may be confusion with the depths of some of the soil borings (as enumerated in comment); some of the borings were initially intended as preliminary exploration or as part of parking areas soil exploration that may have been relocated. In any case, the geotechnical exploration generally complies with the

standard of care and more specifically with Walmart's geotechnical requirements (minimum of 12 borings to a depth of 20 feet below proposed final grades).

2. The sinkhole screening of the site performed by UES concluded the subsurface conditions do not indicate the potential for imminent ground collapse associated with sinkhole activity and that the site is at no greater risk for sinkhole activity than the general vicinity. We generally agree with these statements, but four of the soil borings (B-1, GB-1, GB-2 and GB-4) within the building area have a declining strength with depth profile that some engineers associate with potential sinkhole activity. The geotechnical engineer of record should address these four soil borings.

RESPONSE: The four borings mentioned did indicate loose conditions at the soil to limestone interface, however, this type of condition is not uncommon in many parts of Florida including areas that are not prone to sinkhole development. While some engineers associate this condition with potential sinkhole activity, it is only one of multiple indicators utilized to evaluate sinkhole potential. Therefore, it must be reviewed in context to the planned development as well as the overall post development subsurface condition. The migration of subsurface water through the soil matrix causing soil erosion/raveling into subsurface voids is the primary cause for sinkhole formation in this area. Understanding that the area in question will be covered with an impervious surface such as buildings and pavement, and an underdrain system will be installed upstream of building and pavement area to collect any subsurface groundwater which might migrate beneath these structures, it is our assessment that the potential for sinkhole formation from the raveling of soils into subsurface voids from water migration is a lower potential than with an undeveloped and undrained site.

3. Soil boring B-111 located near the southwest building corner has a water table at a depth of 19 feet. This area of the site will be cut approximately 17 to 18 feet to establish the floor elevation. This sets the finished floor of the building within 1 to 2 feet of the groundwater table. The civil engineer should address a remediation plan should groundwater be present in this area.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Site Grading Plan Sheets C-7 and C-7A which address this comment.

4. The geotechnical engineering report recommended an underdrain be constructed around the perimeter of the building. An underdrain is not shown on sheet C-7 Grading and Storm Drainage Plan. The absence of this underdrain should be addressed.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-7C which addresses this comment.

5. The geotechnical engineering report recommended the building area be undercut to a depth of 5 feet below the foundation bottom elevation to remove expansive soils, and to backfill with a low permeable fill material that has between 10% and 25% soil fines passing the No. 200 sieve. This type of material is typically not available from local borrow pits. Additionally, the geotechnical engineering report states that an estimated 80 to 90 percent of the materials that will be excavated from the site will not be suitable for use as structural fill. The source of low permeable fill material should be provided.

RESPONSE: We have preliminarily discussed suitability of the on-site material with potential contractor(s). The intent is to use as much as possible material excavated from the pond areas, mixing some of the on-site material with more suitable soils, and using some local borrow pits. As a general rule, UES does not recommend any specific source of material. Potential contractor(s) should investigate some of the options (as discussed above). Thus, such options will be part of the means and methods of construction.

Roadways and Parking Lots

6. Several areas of the roadways and parking lot will be cut into grade. Most of the cut areas will also require undercutting to remove expansive soils. Many of these cut or undercut areas will be prone to collecting perched groundwater. This perched groundwater can cause premature pavement failure due to saturation of the base course. This perched groundwater is typically evacuated with underdrains constructed beneath or behind the pavement curbing. The site grading plans do not show the locations of underdrains. The need for underdrains should be addressed, and confirm whether the underdrain detail shown on Sheet C-16 is intended for roadway underdrains.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Site Grading Plans Sheets C-7, C-7A, C-7C, and C-16 which address this comment.

7. The geotechnical engineering report recommends that underdrains be constructed in all parking lot islands to evacuate storm and irrigation water so that it does not perch and leach laterally into the pavement, which can cause premature pavement failure. The site grading plan does not show underdrains within parking lot islands. The absence of underdrains within the parking lot islands should be addressed.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Site Grading Plan Sheet C-7C. The Civil and Geotechnical Engineers have coordinated the location of underdrains as shown on the revised plans.

8. The geotechnical engineering report recommends constructing an underdrain along the south edges of the pavement/driveway behind the Walmart building to intercept and evacuate perched groundwater flowing from offsite prior to it reaching the pavement subgrade. No underdrain is shown on the site grading plans. The absence of this underdrain should be addressed.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Site Grading Plan Sheet C-7C which addresses this comment.

9. The Entrance Road travels next to two depressions. The geological review of these two features concluded they were likely relic (ancient) sinkhole features and that there was no visual evidence of instability of these features. We agree the data supports this opinion. However, the instability of a sinkhole feature begins at the limestone surface and progresses upward to the ground surface, resulting in ground subsidence. The stability of a feature cannot be confirmed visually and can only be confirmed with soil borings. A sinkhole screening/geotechnical evaluation of the subsurface in the vicinity of the two depression features is recommended for the Entrance Road near Station 43+00.

RESPONSE: Please see the attached report entitled “Sinkhole Potential Evaluation- Entrance Road Depression Features - Station 43+00 Wal-Mart Store # 3873 SEC of I-75 and US 441- Alachua, Alachua County, Florida.”

Cut Slope Stability/Erosion

10. The hillside behind the building will be cut into grade up to 20 feet to lower the site to the floor elevation of 118 feet and the pavement to approximately elevation 117 feet. Similar cuts will occur to construct the stormwater basins. These excavations will penetrate the surficial sandy soils that contain a perched water table, and seepage out of the slopes is likely. The UES slope stability calculations incorporate the perched groundwater conditions and the calculations indicate the slopes will have an adequate safety factor. However, UES states “infiltrated rain water may perch on top of the shallow deposits of clayey soils; this groundwater may seep... and daylight through the face of the slope. These seepage phenomena towards the face of the slope could cause erosion to the slope face and lead to a reduced stability of the slope. Therefore, measures should be taken to prevent erosion of the slope face such as using geosynthetics and vegetation”. We agree with this statement, and have the same concern that groundwater seepage from cut slopes can eventually affect slope stability. The soil borings suggest slope seepage may occur at boring locations A-32, A-44, A-50, A-56, A-61, A-62, C-7, C-8, C-26, C-27, C-28, C-29 and W-1 through W-19. The site grading plans do not include provisions for preventing erosion of slope faces. The civil design engineer should address the potential for seepage out of cut slopes and slope protection, otherwise the slope stability calculations do not accurately reflect site conditions.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Plan Sheets C-11 and C-11A which address this comment. Underdrain and erosion control mat are proposed in this area to address this concern.

11. The geotechnical engineering report states “Site preparation includes backfilling some drainage areas/gullies. ... A layer of bi-axial geotextile should be placed over the excavated subgrade for constructability purposes to allow a platform to start placing the backfill”. The topographic survey indicates two drainage areas/gullies are present near the southeast corner of the Walmart building. These two features converge into one drainage feature near the truck well. The topographic survey suggests these two drainage features are hillside seepage features. Sheet C-7 Grading and Storm Drainage Plan does not address these drainage features/gullies. The civil engineer should provide a remediation plan for these drainage areas/gullies.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-7 which addresses this comment. A note directing the contractor on how to treat this area was added to address this concern.

Stormwater Basins

12. Fifty-two (52) soil borings were performed within the limits of Retention Area 1. Soil boring C-22A encountered limestone at a depth of 10.5 feet, which corresponds to elevation 83 feet +/- . The basin bottom is set at elevation 80 feet, and therefore, will penetrate limestone in this area. Stormwater infiltration directly into limestone is not allowed by the Water Management District. Sheet 16 includes a detail for remediating sinkholes should they occur within the stormwater basins, but it does not include details/procedures for remediating exposed limestone within the basins. How exposed limestone will be remediated should be

addressed. Additionally, confirm that the sinkhole remediation detail follows the geotechnical engineer of record recommendations.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Sheet C-16 which addresses this comment. The revised sinkhole repair and limestone outcropping details provided on Sheet C-16 were reviewed based on the Geotechnical Engineer.

13. The Stormwater Design Calculations for Retention Area 1 includes only calculations to size the basin and determine the high water elevation. The calculations do not include any infiltration calculations to estimate the basin recovery. The Stormwater Design Calculations should include a recovery analysis. The recovery analysis should include the geotechnical parameters that were used in the analysis. No geotechnical parameters for stormwater design were provided in the geotechnical engineering report. It is customary for the geotechnical engineer of record to provide the geotechnical parameters to be used for the recovery analysis.

RESPONSE: Please see the revised Stormwater Report which addresses this comment. The retention areas are proposed to recover through the use of a filter drain per FDOT index no. 286. See section entitled "Recovery Analysis" in the revised Stormwater Report. Due to very low permeability rates encountered during the geotechnical testing of the retention areas, the permeability of the soils below the retention area have been intentionally omitted. Also, please see the attached supplement to the Geotechnical Report entitled "Stormwater Management System Soil Design Parameters" which shows the results of the permeability testing in the retention ponds, included in Appendix O of the revised Stormwater Report.

14. Fifty-two (52) soil borings were performed in Retention Area 1. Seven (7) permeability tests were performed from soil samples recovered from these soil borings. Seven permeability tests is not an adequate representation of the subsurface materials for a basin of this size. Additional permeability tests should be performed to support the geotechnical parameters discussed in Item 13 above.

RESPONSE: Please see the attached supplement to the Geotechnical Report entitled "Stormwater Management System Soil Design Parameters" which shows the results of the permeability testing in the retention ponds.

15. Retention Area 2 is located east of Retention Area 1. No soil borings were performed in this basin. An adequate number of soil borings should be performed in this basin to provide parameters for basin design and recovery modeling and to address the karst geology considerations. The geotechnical engineer of record should provide the geotechnical soil and groundwater parameters for the basin modeling.

RESPONSE: Please see the attached supplement to the Geotechnical Report entitled "Stormwater Management System Soil Design Parameters" which shows the results of the permeability testing in the retention ponds.

16. As discussed earlier in Item 10, there will be cut slopes on the south sides of the stormwater basins that will likely seep water and create stability/erosion issues. This water seepage is also base flow of groundwater into the retention basins and must be accounted for in the basin design. We have not observed any provisions in the Stormwater Design Calculations



that account for base flow. The civil design engineer should account for base flow into the basins.

RESPONSE: Due to the proposed construction, it is anticipated that the perched groundwater table will be removed. Therefore, the groundwater base flow is anticipated to be minimal and has not been considered in the stormwater design. Revised Sheets C-11 and C-11A include provisions for erosion protection where recommended by the Geotechnical Engineer.

Per your request, we have assembled each resubmittal package to be inclusive of all documents provided and/or requested since the first submittal package. The following is a list of attachments:

SITE PLAN

1. Four (4) copies of this Response to Comments Letter.
2. Four (4) copies of Revised Site Plan Application.
3. Four (4) copies of Michael Thomas Signatory Rights.
4. Four (4) copies of Agent Authorization (CPH to act on behalf of Walmart).
5. Four (4) copies of Agent Authorization (CPH to act on behalf of First Street Group, LLC).
6. Four (4) copies of Site Plan Review Fee Check \$2300 (already paid).
7. Four (4) copies of Legal Descriptions with Tax Parcel ID Numbers, Warranty Deeds as Proof of Ownership and Proof of Payment of Taxes for Parcels 03869-013-000, 03869-014-000, 03066-000-000 and 03869-000-000.
8. Four (4) copies of Neighborhood Meeting Materials (includes: published notice, written notice (letter) sent to property owners within 400-ft, written summary of meeting).
9. Four (4) copies of Mailing Labels for all property owners within 400-ft of the subject property boundaries (copies of labels only, recipients already notified).
10. Four (4) copies of Analysis of Compliance with the Gateway Overlay District.
11. Four (4) copies of Analysis of Compliance with the City's Comprehensive Plan.
12. Four (4) copies of Suwannee River Water Management District (SRWMD) Submitted Permit Application.
13. Four (4) copies of the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) Submitted Transmittal Letter.
14. Four (4) copies of Lighting Cut Sheets.
15. Four (4) copies of Revised Concurrency Impact Analysis.
16. Four (4) copies of Market Study.
17. Four (4) copies of the Water Supply Site Survey.
18. Four (4) copies of Revised Traffic Impact Analysis Report.
19. Four (4) copies of Geotechnical Report.
20. Four (4) copies of the Sinkhole Potential Evaluation – Entrance Road Depression Features – Station 43+00.
21. Four (4) copies of Revised Stormwater Report.
22. Four (4) copies of Fire Department Water Supply Plan.
23. Four (4) sets of Revised Signed and Sealed Civil Construction Plans including site, grading, utility, lighting and landscape plans (24x36 rolled).
24. Four (4) sets of Revised Signed and Sealed Traffic Signal Plans (11x17).
25. Four (4) sets of Revised Architectural Building Elevations (24x36 color, rolled), Floor Plans and Recycling Enclosure (30x42 folded).
26. Four (4) copies of Material Percentage Presentation (11x17).
27. Four (4) copies of Oldcastle Quik Brik Cutsheets.
28. Four (4) copies of the FDEP Water Permit for City signature.



29. Four (4) copies of the FDEP Sewer Permit for City signature.
30. One (1) CD containing PDF's of all submitted documents and plans for each submittal.

SPECIAL EXCEPTION - BUILDINGS ≥80,000 SQUARE FEET

1. Four (4) copies of this Response to Comments Letter.
2. Four (4) copies of the Special Exception Permit Application, including Statement of Proposed Special Exception.
3. Four (4) copies of Special Exception Review Fee Check \$2225 (already paid).
4. Four (4) copies of the Revised Special Exception Justification Report.
5. Four (4) copies of Michael Thomas Signatory Rights.
6. Four (4) copies of Agent Authorization (CPH to act on behalf of Walmart).
7. Four (4) copies of Legal Descriptions with Tax Parcel ID Numbers.
8. Four (4) copies of Warranty Deeds as Proof of Ownership.
9. Four (4) copies of Proof of Payment of Taxes.
10. Four (4) copies of the Zoning Map.
11. Four (4) copies of Neighborhood Meeting Materials (includes: published notice, written notice (letter) sent to property owners within 400-ft, written summary of meeting).
12. Four (4) copies of Mailing Labels for all property owners within 400-ft of the subject property boundaries (copies of labels only, recipients already notified).
13. Four (4) copies of Lighting Cut Sheets.
14. Four (4) copies of Cost Estimate for Infrastructure & Utilities.
15. Four (4) copies of Revised Concurrency Impact Analysis.
16. Four (4) copies of Market Study.
17. Four (4) copies of Revised Traffic Impact Analysis Report.
18. Four (4) copies of Signed and Sealed Site Dimension Plan Sheets C-6, C-6A & C-6B (24x36 folded).
19. Four (4) sets of Revised Architectural Building Elevations (24x36 color, rolled), Floor Plans and Recycling Enclosure (30x42 folded).
20. Four (4) copies of Material Percentage Presentation (11x17).
21. Four (4) copies of Oldcastle Quik Brik Cutsheets.

SPECIAL EXCEPTION – AUTOMOBILE REPAIR & SERVICING

1. Four (4) copies of this Response to Comments Letter.
2. Four (4) copies of the Special Exception Permit Application, including Statement of Proposed Special Exception.
3. Four (4) copies of Special Exception Review Fee Check \$2225 (already paid).
4. Four (4) copies of the Revised Special Exception Justification Report.
5. Four (4) copies of Michael Thomas Signatory Rights.
6. Four (4) copies of Agent Authorization (CPH to act on behalf of Walmart).
7. Four (4) copies of Legal Descriptions with Tax Parcel ID Numbers.
8. Four (4) copies of Warranty Deeds as Proof of Ownership.
9. Four (4) copies of Proof of Payment of Taxes.
10. Four (4) copies of the Zoning Map.
11. Four (4) copies of Neighborhood Meeting Materials (includes: published notice, written notice (letter) sent to property owners within 400-ft, written summary of meeting).
12. Four (4) copies of Mailing Labels for all property owners within 400-ft of the subject property boundaries (copies of labels only, recipients already notified).
13. Four (4) copies of Lighting Cut Sheets.
14. Four (4) copies of Cost Estimate for Infrastructure & Utilities.



15. Four (4) copies of Revised Concurrency Impact Analysis.
16. Four (4) copies of Market Study.
17. Four (4) copies of Revised Traffic Impact Analysis Report.
18. Four (4) copies of Signed and Sealed Site Dimension Plan Sheets C-6, C-6A & C-6B.
19. Four (4) sets of Revised Architectural Building Elevations (24x36 folded), Floor Plans and Recycling Enclosure (30x42 folded).
20. Four (4) copies of Material Percentage Presentation (11x17).
21. Four (4) copies of Oldcastle Quik Brik Cutsheets.

Should you have any questions or require any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me at 904-332-0999 or by email at bcassidy@cphcorp.com.

Sincerely,
CPH, INC.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "B. Cassidy", is positioned above the printed name.

Brian Cassidy, P.E.
Project Manager



June 28, 2016

Justin Tabor, AICP
Principal Planner
City of Alachua
15100 NW 142nd Terrace
Alachua, FL 32615
(386) 418-6121

5200 Belfort Road
Suite 220
Jacksonville, Florida 32256
Phone: 904.332.0999
Fax: 904.332.0997
www.cphcorp.com

Re: Review of Revised Application Materials, Received on 5/19/16 and on 5/31/16 for
- Wal-Mart #3873-00 Special Exception Permit Application: Large-Scale Retail
Establishment \geq 80,000 Square Feet
- Wal-Mart #3873-00 Special Exception Permit Application: Automobile Repair and
Servicing
-Wal-Mart #3873-00 Site Plan Application
CPH Project No. W13392

Dear Justin:

We are providing the following response to your request for additional information for Walmart Alachua. Please note that our responses are shown in **bold** typeface.

Special Exception Permit Applications:

1. Issue: The applicant has provided with the Site Plan materials a document and accompanying exhibits entitled "Certificate of Assistant Secretary," which documents the delegation of authority for Michael Thomas, Director of Project Design and Management, to act on behalf of Wal-Mart Stores East, LP. This documentation, however, has not been provided as an attachment to either Special Exception Permit application.

Action Needed to Address Deficiency: In future submittals, provide the documentation referenced above with each Special Exception Permit application.

CPH RESPONSE: This comment is acknowledged and the requested documentation will be provided in future submittals.

2. Issue: The applicant has provided with the Site Plan application materials a document entitled "Agent Authorization" which authorizes CPH, Inc., to act on behalf of Wal-Mart Stores, East, LP. This documentation, however, has not been provided as an attachment to either Special Exception Permit application.

Action Needed to Address Deficiency: In future submittals, provide the documentation referenced above with each Special Exception Permit application.

CPH RESPONSE: This comment is acknowledged and the requested documentation will be provided in future submittals.

Site Plan Application

1. Site Plan Attachment #8

Issue: The applicant has provided in its revised application materials a general description of each of the three tax parcels which collectively comprise the subject property (Tax Parcels 03066-000- 000, 03869-000-000, and 03869-013-000) obtained from the Alachua County Property Appraiser's web site.

Action Needed to Address Deficiency: The applicant must provide a complete legal description of the subject property (such as the description provided of the "Overall Parcel" on the ALTA/ACSM Land Title Survey submitted as part of the Site Plan) on 8.5" x 11" paper.

CPH RESPONSE: Please see attached nine (9) copies of the requested legal description on 8.5" x 11" paper.

2. Site Plan Attachment #13

Issue: The applicant states that a copy of the access management permit shall be provided once it has been obtained, however, the applicant has not provided documentation evidencing that a permit application has been submitted.

Action Needed to Address Deficiency: Provide documentation evidencing that an access management permit application has been submitted to the Florida Department of Transportation.

CPH RESPONSE: Please see attached Transmittal Letter dated June 10, 2016, to FDOT for Driveway Connection Permit for Walmart Supercenter #3873-00, Alachua FL (US 441) to document that Walmart has applied for the FDOT Access permit.

Please find the following attachments in support of this submittal:

1. Nine (9) 8.5"x11" copies of the legal description for Tax Parcels 03066-000-000, 03869-000-000, and 03869-013-000
2. Nine (9) copies of the Transmittal Letter to FDOT for the Access Permit.

Please contact me at bcassidy@cphcorp.com or at 904.332.0999 if you have any questions or require additional information. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,
CPH, Inc.

Brian Cassidy

Brian Cassidy, P.E.



Letter of Transmittal

Date: June 10, 2016

To: Adam E. Doyle, P.E.
Florida Department of Transportation – Gainesville Operations
5301 NE 39th Avenue
Gainesville, FL 32609
(352) 381-4308

Re: Walmart Supercenter #3873-00, Alachua, FL (US 441)
Driveway Connection Permit Application
CPH Project No. W13392

5200 Belfort Road
Suite 220
Jacksonville, Florida 32256
Phone: 904.332.0999
Fax: 904.332.0997
www.cphengineers.com

WE ARE SENDING YOU THE ATTACHED ITEMS VIA:

FEDEX Priority X Standard 2nd Day
Hand Delivery Courier USPS Other

NO. OF COPIES	DESCRIPTION
4	Driveway Connection Permit Application
4	Signed & sealed sets of Plans
4	Traffic Study
4	Certificate's Documenting Applicant's Signature Authority
4	Agent Authorization's for CPH, Inc. by Walmart Stores East, LP
4	Agent Authorization's for CPH, Inc. by First Street Group, LC
1	CD containing the Submittal Documents & Plans
1	Check #9510285 for \$3,000.00

THESE ITEMS ARE TRANSMITTED AS INDICATED BELOW:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	For Your Use	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	For Review and Approval
<input type="checkbox"/>	As Requested	<input type="checkbox"/>	For Signature and Return

REMARKS:

Please do not hesitate to contact me at 904.332.0999 or at bcassidy@cphcorp.com if you have any questions or need any additional information.

SIGNED: Brian Cassidy
Brian Cassidy, P.E.

If enclosures are not as noted, kindly notify us at once.



May 26, 2016

Justin Tabor, AICP
Principal Planner
City of Alachua
15100 NW 142nd Terrace
Alachua, FL 32615
(386) 418-6121

5200 Belfort Road
Suite 220
Jacksonville, Florida 32256
Phone: 904.332.0999
Fax: 904.332.0997
www.cphcorp.com

Re: Request for Additional Information

- Wal-Mart #3873-00 Special Exception Permit Application: Large-Scale Retail Establishment \geq 80,000 Square Feet
 - Wal-Mart #3873-00 Special Exception Permit Application: Automobile Repair and Servicing
 - Wal-Mart #3873-00 Site Plan Application
- CPH Project No. W13392

Dear Justin:

In responses to your Request for Additional Information please find the following information attached:

1. Seventeen (17) copies of the Architectural Building Elevations
2. Nine (9) copies of the Revised Landscape Plans
3. Nine (9) copies of the Water Study prepared by Henderson Engineers, Inc.
4. One (1) Digital Copy of the revised Geotechnical Report
5. One (1) CD of the Entire Submittal

Regarding the Geotechnical information used for the Pond Design:

1. For the estimated Kh (Horizontal Hydraulic Conductivity) please refer to the Boring logs located in the Geotechnical Report (Borings PB-4, PB-6, PB-2, P-32, P-31, P-22, P-18)
2. Vertical Infiltration was disabled / not used.
3. For the estimated Porosity see section C Laboratory Test data
4. The estimated Base of Aquifer Elevation was taken from the boring logs
5. The estimated Water Table Elevation is discussed in Section 8 of the Geotechnical Report

Please contact me at bcassidy@cphcorp.com or at 904.332.0999 if you have any questions or require additional information. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,
CPH, Inc.

Brian Cassidy

Brian Cassidy, P.E.



May 18, 2016

Justin Tabor, AICP
Principal Planner
City of Alachua
15100 NW 142nd Terrace
Alachua, FL 32615
(386) 418-6121

5200 Belfort Road
Suite 220
Jacksonville, Florida 32256
Phone: 904.332.0999
Fax: 904.332.0997
www.cphcorp.com

Re: Completeness Review of:

- Wal-Mart #3873-00 Special Exception Permit Application: Large-Scale Retail Establishment \geq 80,000 Square Feet
 - Wal-Mart #3873-00 Special Exception Permit Application: Automobile Repair and Servicing
 - Wal-Mart #3873-00 Site Plan Application
- CPH Project No. W13392

Dear Justin:

We are providing the following response to your request for additional information for the Wal-Mart located in Alachua, Florida. We have included the issue and action needed comment prior to our respective response shown in bold lettering.

Issue: Each Special Exception Permit application has been signed on behalf of Wal-Mart Stores East, LP, by Michael Thomas, Director of Project Design and Management, however, Mr. Thomas is not identified as a registered agent/authorized person of Wal-Mart Stores East, LP, or of WSE Management, LLC (the General Partner of Wal-Mart Stores East, LP.)

Action Needed to Address Deficiency: Provide written authorization from a registered agent/authorized person of the referenced entities, for the application signatory to act on behalf of the property owner for purposes of these applications. This may be accomplished by either (1) providing an executed Authorized Agent Affidavit (may be accessed on the City's web site at http://www.cityofalachua.com/images/stories/documents/pz_documents/Authorized_Agent_Affidavit_2014_09_30.pdf), or (2) providing a notarized letter from a registered agent/authorized person of the referenced entities authorizing the application signatory to act on their behalf.

RESPONSE: Please see attached documentation for Michael Thomas signatory authority.

Issue: Authorization has not been provided from the property owner (Wal-Mart Stores East, LP) to CPH Engineers, Inc., to act on its behalf.

Action Needed to Address Deficiency: Provide authorization from the property owner to CPH Engineers, Inc., to act on its behalf. This may be accomplished by either (1) providing an executed Authorized Agent Affidavit from the property owner, or (2) providing a

notarized letter from the property owner authorizing CPH Engineers, Inc. to act on its behalf.

RESPONSE: Please see attached documentation Authorizing CPH, Inc. to act as agent.

Special Exception Permit Attachment #2

Analysis of compliance with the Standards for a Special Exception, as defined in Section 2.4.4 of the Land Development Regulations (LDRs)...

Issue: Limited analysis has been provided in the materials submitted with each Special Exception Permit application as to how the proposed Special Exception Permit/development shall meet the following:

1. Complies with use specific regulations. The proposed special exception complies with all relevant standards in Section 4.3, Use specific standards.

Action Needed to Address Deficiency:

- a. For the Special Exception Permit application for a large-scale retail establishment greater than or equal to 80,000 square feet of gross floor area: Provide an analysis of how the application complies with the Use Specific Standards provided in Section 4.3.4(G)(7) of the LDRs. Architectural Plans should also be included with this Special Exception Permit application to demonstrate compliance with Section 6.8.3.

RESPONSE: Please see attached Special Exception Justification Report

- b. For the Special Exception Permit application for automobile repair and servicing: Provide an analysis of how the application complies with the Use Specific Standards provided in Section 4.3.4(J)(3) of the LDRs.

RESPONSE: Please see attached Special Exception Justification Report

2. Compatibility. The proposed special exception is appropriate for its location and compatible with the character of surrounding lands and the uses permitted in the zone district.

Action Needed to Address Deficiency: In each Special Exception Permit application, provide an analysis of how the proposed special exception is appropriate for its location and compatible with the character of surrounding lands and the uses permitted in the zone district.

RESPONSE: Please see attached Special Exception Justification Report

3. Design minimizes adverse impact. The design of the proposed special exception minimizes adverse effects, including visual impacts of the proposed use on adjacent lands; furthermore, the proposed special exception avoids significant adverse impact on surrounding lands regarding service delivery, parking and loading, odors, noise, glare, and vibration, and does not create a nuisance.

Action Needed to Address Deficiency: In each Special Exception Permit application, provide an analysis of how the design of the proposed special exception minimizes adverse effects on surrounding lands regarding each of the standards in bold above.

RESPONSE: Please see attached Special Exception Justification Report

4. Roads and other public facilities. There is adequate public facility capacity available to serve the proposed special exception, and the proposed special exception use is designed to ensure safe ingress and egress onto the site and safe road conditions around the site.

Action Needed to Address Deficiency: In each Special Exception Permit application, provide an analysis public facility capacity (including potable water, sanitary sewer, electric, and other applicable public facilities) available to serve the proposed special exception.

RESPONSE: Please see attached **Concurrency Impact Analysis**

5. Not injure neighboring land or property values. The proposed special exception will not substantially injure the use of neighboring land for those uses that are permitted in the zone district, or reduce land values.

Action Needed to Address Deficiency: In each Special Exception Permit application, provide an analysis of how the proposed special exception will not substantially injure the use of neighboring land for those uses that are permitted in the zone district, or reduce land values.

RESPONSE: Please see attached **Special Exception Justification Report**

Special Exception Permit Attachment #3

Materials which demonstrate that the special exception permit would promote the public health, safety, morals, order, comfort, convenience, appearance, prosperity or the general welfare, which shall include (at a minimum):

Any specific requirements of the zoning district.

Issue:

1. For the Special Exception Permit application for a large-scale retail establishment greater than or equal to 80,000 square feet of gross floor area: The Use-Specific Standards for this use type are established in Section 4.3.4(G)(7) of the LDRs. This section requires the large-scale retail establishment to comply with the design standards of Section 6.8.3 and to submit a market and impact study. A Market and Impact Study, prepared by Florida Economic Advisors, has been submitted as an exhibit to the Site Plan application. This study must be included as an exhibit to the Special Exception Permit application. The applicant must also provide an analysis of compliance with the standards of Section 6.8.3 of the LDRs. Architectural Plans should also be included with this Special Exception Permit application to demonstrate compliance with Section 6.8.3.
2. For the Special Exception Permit application for automobile repair and servicing: The applicant must provide an analysis of compliance with the standards of Section 4.3.4(J)(3) of the LDRs, which establishes Use-Specific Standards for automobile repair and servicing.

Action Needed to Address Deficiency:

1. For the Special Exception Permit application for a large-scale retail establishment greater than or equal to 80,000 square feet of gross floor area: Provide the Market

and Impact Study, prepared by Florida Economic Advisors, as an exhibit to the Special Exception Permit application. Provide an analysis of compliance with the standards of Section 6.8.3 of the LDRs.

RESPONSE: Please see attached Special Exception Justification report and Market Study.

2. For the Special Exception Permit application for automobile repair and servicing: Provide an analysis of compliance with the standards of Section 4.3.4(J)(3) of the LDRs, which establishes Use-Specific Standards for automobile repair and servicing.

RESPONSE: Please see attached Special Exception Justification Report including analysis of Section 4.3.4(J)(3).

Special Exception Permit Attachment #4

Two (2) sets of labels for all property owners within 400 feet of the subject property boundaries- even if property within 400 feet falls outside of City limits (obtain from the Alachua County Property Appraiser's web site)- and all persons/organizations registered to receive notice of development applications.

Issue: The mailing labels provided do not include all persons/organizations registered to receive notices of development applications.

Action Needed to Address Deficiency: Review the list of persons/organizations registered to receive notice of development applications, and provide four (4) mailing labels (two (2) mailing labels for each Special Exception Permit application) for those persons/organizations which were not provided with the application submittal.

RESPONSE: Please see attached mailing labels

Special Exception Permit Attachment #5

Neighborhood Meeting Materials, including:

Copy of the required published notice (advertisement)- must be published in a newspaper of general circulation, as defined in Article 10 of the City's Land Development Regulations

Issue: The applicant has submitted what appears to be a proof of the required published notice, however, evidence of the notice's publication has not been provided.

Action Needed to Address Deficiency: Provide documentation evidencing that the notice of the Neighborhood Meeting was published.

RESPONSE: Please see attached Notice of Neighborhood Meeting as requested.

Site Plan Application

Issue: The application has been signed on behalf of Wal-Mart Stores East, LP, by Michael Thomas, Director of Project Design and Management, however, Mr. Thomas is not identified as a registered agent/authorized person of Wal-Mart Stores East, LP, or of WSE Management, LLC (the General Partner of Wal-Mart Stores East, LP.)

Action Needed to Address Deficiency: Provide written authorization from a registered agent/authorized person of the referenced entities, for the application signatory to act on behalf of the property owner for purposes of these applications. This may be accomplished by either (1) providing an executed Authorized Agent Affidavit, or (2) providing a notarized letter from a registered agent/authorized person of the referenced entities authorizing the application signatory to act on their behalf.

RESPONSE: Please see attached documentation of Michael Thomas' signatory authority.

Issue: Authorization has not been provided from the property owners (Wal-Mart Stores East, LP, and First Street Group, L.C.) to CPH Engineers, Inc., to act on their behalf.

Action Needed to Address Deficiency: Provide authorization from the property owners to CPH Engineers, Inc., to act on their behalf. This may be accomplished by either (1) providing an executed Authorized Agent Affidavit from each property owner, or (2) providing a notarized letter from each property owner authorizing CPH Engineers, Inc. to act on its behalf.

RESPONSE: Please see attached documentation authorizing CPH, Inc. to act as agent from Walmart Stores East, LP & First Street Group L.C.

Site Plan Attachment #3

Fire Department Access and Water Supply: The design criteria shall be Chapter 18 of the Florida Fire Prevention Code. Plans must be on separate sealed sheets and must be prepared by a professional Fire engineer licensed in the State of Florida. Fire flow calculations must be provided for each newly constructed building. When required, fire flow calculations shall be in accordance with the Guide for Determination of Required Fire Flow, latest edition, as published by the Insurance Service Office (ISO) and /or Chapter 18, Section 18.4 of the Florida Fire Prevention Code, whichever is greater. All calculations must be demonstrated and provided. All calculations and specifications must be on the plans and not on separate sheets. All fire protection plans are reviewed and approved by the Alachua County Fire Marshal.

Issue: The applicant has provided fire hydrant flow calculations, but has not submitted documentation to identify the flow required to serve the proposed building.

Action Needed to Address Deficiency: Provide fire flow calculations that calculate the flow required to serve the proposed building (NOTE: further comments may be provided by the Fire Inspector of Alachua County Fire/Rescue upon review of the application and accompanying materials.)

RESPONSE: Please see attached Water Supply Site Survey prepared by Henderson Engineers.

Site Plan Attachment #6

For Site Plans for Buildings Greater than or Equal to 80,000 Square Feet in Area: Two (2) sets of labels for all property owners within 400 feet of the subject property boundaries- even if property within 400 feet falls outside of City limits (obtain from the Alachua County Property Appraiser's web site)- and all persons/organizations registered to receive notice of development applications.

Issue: The mailing labels provided do not include all persons/organizations registered to receive notices of development applications.

Action Needed to Address Deficiency: Review the list of persons/organizations registered to receive notice of development applications, and provide two (2) mailing labels for those persons/organizations which were not provided with the application submittal.

RESPONSE: Please see attached mailing labels as requested.

Site Plan Attachment #8

Legal description with tax parcel number, separate from all other documentation on 8.5" x 11" paper.

Issue: The legal description with tax parcel number has not been provided in the required format. The applicant states the legal description is provided in the survey drawings, however, site improvements, including but not limited to site grading and Proposed Retention Area 2, are located in areas not described by the legal descriptions in the survey drawings.

Action Needed to Address Deficiency: Provide the legal description(s) of the subject property, consisting of Tax Parcels 03066-000-000, 03869-000-000, and 03869-013-000, on 8.5"x 11" paper.

RESPONSE: Please see attached Legal Descriptions on 8.5"x11" paper as requested.

Site Plan Attachment #9

Proof of ownership (i.e., copy of deed)

Issue: The applicant has not provided proof of ownership for Tax Parcels 03066-000-000 and 03869-000-000.

Action Needed to Address Deficiency: Provide proof of ownership for Tax Parcels 03066-000-000, and 03869-000-000.

RESPONSE: Please see attached proof of ownership for the requested Tax Parcels.

Site Plan Attachment #10

Proof of payment of taxes.

Issue: The applicant has not provided proof of payment of taxes for Tax Parcels 03066-000-000 and 03869-000-000.

Action Needed to Address Deficiency: Provide proof of payment of taxes for Tax Parcels 03066- 000-000, and 03869-000-000.

RESPONSE: Please see attached proof of payment of taxes for the requested Tax Parcels.

Site Plan Attachment #13

If access is from a State Road, access management permit from Florida Department of Transportation (or documentation providing evidence that a permit application has been submitted)

Issue: The applicant states that a copy of the access management permit shall be provided once it has been obtained, however, the applicant has not provided documentation evidencing that a permit application has been submitted.

Action Needed to Address Deficiency: Provide documentation evidencing that an access management permit application has been submitted to the Florida Department of Transportation.

RESPONSE: The requested documentation will be provided once it is available.

Miscellaneous Comments

The Architectural Plans submitted are not legible. Provide Architectural Plans that clearly depict architectural features.

RESPONSE: Please see revised Architectural elevations included with this submittal.

In support of this submittal please find the following attachments:

Site Plan Application

- Nine (9) copies of documentation of Michael Thomas Signature Authority
- Nine (9) copies of Walmart Agent Authorization
- Nine (9) copies First Street Groups Agent Authorization
- Nine (9) copies of the Water Supply Site Survey
- Nine (9) copies Legal Descriptions
- Nine (9) copies proof of ownership
- Nine (9) copies of proof of payment of taxes
- Nine (9) copies of the Building Elevations
- One (1) CD of the Entire Submittal

Special Exception Application for Buildings Greater than 80,000s.f.

- Nine (9) copies Special Exception Justification Report
- Nine (9) copies of the Market Study
- Two (2) sets of Mailing Labels
- Nine (9) copies of the Concurrency Assessment
- Nine (9) copies of the Newspaper Advertisement
- Nine (9) copies of Cost Estimate For Infrastructure & Utilities
- Nine (9) copies of the Traffic Impact Assessment
- Nine (9) copies of the Architectural Building Elevations

Special Exception Application for Automotive Repair and Servicing Use

- Nine (9) copies Special Exception Justification Report
- Two (2) sets of Mailing Labels
- Nine (9) copies of the Concurrency Assessment
- Nine (9) copies of the Newspaper Advertisement
- Nine (9) copies of the Traffic Impact Assessment

Please contact me at bcassidy@cphcorp.com or at 904.332.0999 if you have any questions or require additional information. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,
CPH, Inc.

Brian Cassidy

Brian Cassidy, P.E.



5200 Belfort Road
Suite 220
Jacksonville, FL 32256
Phone: 904.332.0999
Fax: 904.332.0997

March 31, 2016

City of Alachua
Planning and Community Development Department
15100 NW 142nd Terrace, Alachua FL 32615
(386) 418-6121

RE: Special Exception Permit Application Package
Walmart #3873-00
Large scale retail establishments \geq 80,000sf

Dear Ms. Kathy Winburn,

Attached is our Special Exception Permit Application package for the approval of a large scale retail establishment greater than 80,000sf. Included in this submittal are eight (8) sets of the following:

- Attachment 1 – Statement of proposed special exception
- Attachment 2 – Analysis of compliance with the Standards for a Special Exception
- Site, Utility, and Landscape plans showing the proposed placement of structures, ingress and egress, parking and loading areas, refuse and service areas, required open space, utility connections and screening and buffering
- Two (2) sets of labels for all property owners within 400ft of the subject property boundaries
- Neighborhood Meeting materials including:
 - Copy of the required publish notice (advertisement)
 - Copy of written notice (letter) sent to all property owners
 - Written summary of meeting
- Map of the subject property and surrounding area with zoning
- Legal description with tax parcel number (general warranty deed)
- Proof of ownership (general warranty deed)
- Proof of payment of taxes

Along with one (1)

- Fee – check #9510283 for \$2,225.00
- CD with PDFs of submitted materials

Sincerely,
CPH, Inc.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'B. Cassidy', is placed below the typed name.

Brian P. Cassidy, P.E.
Project Manager

December 15, 2016

Mr. Justin Tabor, AICP
Principal Planner
City of Alachua
PO Box 9
Alachua, FL 32616

Re: Review of Wal-Mart #3873-00- Site Plan

Dear Mr. Tabor,

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Wal-Mart #3873-00 – Site Plan. A complete review has been performed due to the changes in design. Please find my comments on Wal-Mart #3873-00 below.

Comments:

Sheet C-2

1. Per FDEP 62-604.400(2)(g), "sewers and force mains shall be laid at least 10 feet (outside to outside) horizontally from water mains." Please revise Utility Separation Requirement Notes 1A and 1B to comply with FDEP requirements.
2. Per FDEP 62-604.400(2)(i), "sewer pipes and force mains shall cross under water mains...shall be laid to provide a minimum vertical distance of 18" between the invert of the upper pipe and the crown of the lower pipe." Please revise Utility Separation Requirement Note 2A to comply with FDEP requirements.

Sheet SW-7/SW-8/SW-9/SW-10

1. No data was inputted into the tables provided within the details.
2. Please explain where Walmart standards apply.

Sheet SW-11

1. Please explain where all the details apply.
2. Please show where the sedimentation pond location will be.

Sheet C-5

1. Under General Utility Notes, we recommend verifying with specific utilities that 72 hours before connecting to any existing line is sufficient, specifically GRU Gas.

Sheet C-7

1. Please add spot grades in the corners of the ADA parking spaces to demonstrate compliance with ADA criteria (i.e. Maximum slope 2%)
2. We recommend adding spot grades to the corners of the loading dock.
3. Is there an overflow for the cistern? Where does it connect to?

Sheet C-8

1. Will Walmart cook onsite? Please verify if the City of Alachua Public Services will require a grease trap to be installed to serve the deli/bakery.
2. Please be sure to provide calculations sizing the water meters specified.

Sheets - Profiles

1. For informational purposes, the jack and bore that crosses US 441 will need to be permitted through FDOT.
2. For sewer manholes with 4-ft or greater drop, we recommend drop manholes.
3. Be sure bending of water main meets the manufacturer's recommendations or provide fittings.

Sheet C-12

1. Please clarify the type of bike rack proposed. A U-Rack detail is provided but within the plans ribbon racks are referred to, specifically on Sheet C-6A.

Drainage Design Notes

1. Per City of Alachua 6.9.3(7)(a), "Detention and retention systems shall be designed in conformance with the SRWMD's Surface Water Management Permitting Manual, as amended" and therefore, per SRWMD Applicant's Handbook Volume II Section 3.4, "Storage volumes designed into retention or detention systems must be available as follows: 1. One-half of the total volume within seven days following the end of the design storm event, and 2. The total volume within 30 days following the end of the design storm event." Please note the recovery of the water quality treatment volume (WQTV) is different than the recovery of the total volume from the design storms. Provide recovery information for the required storm events that shows that half of the total volume has been recovered by day 7 after the end of the storm event and shows that the entire storm has been recovered by the end of day 30 after the storm event. We recommend showing recovery information in a table listing the design storm events, day at which ½ volume recovery occurs, and day at which full volume recovery occurs.
2. Per City of Alachua 6.9.3(7)(a), "Detention and retention systems shall be designed in conformance with the SRWMD's Surface Water Management Permitting Manual, as amended" and therefore, per SRWMD Applicant's Handbook Volume II Section 4.4 "Detention and retention systems must be designed to provide [water quality]

treatment volumes specified within 72 hours following the end of the design storm event.” We recommend modeling the WQTV as a slug load.

3. Per City of Alachua 6.9.3(7)(a), “Detention and retention systems shall be designed in conformance with the SRWMD’s Surface Water Management Permitting Manual, as amended” and therefore, per SRWMD Applicant’s Handbook Volume II Section 5.3.2, “Ponds with berms greater than 5 feet from the top of the berm to the lowest natural ground elevation shall comply with Section 5.8 of this Volume” and therefore SRWMD Applicant’s Handbook Volume II Section 5.8.3, “the applicant’s engineer shall analyze the stability of embankment slopes using generally accepted methods based on sound engineering principles and document all analyses or considerations in appropriate design reports and files. The design professional must design and provide documentation that the embankment has adequate factors of safety...” Please provide slope stability calculations for the pond berms greater than 5-ft in height.
4. Please explain how the base elevation of the mobilized aquifer, the average unsaturated vertical infiltration rate, average horizontal hydraulic conductivity, estimated fillable porosity, and the elevation of the normal seasonal high water table were arrived at. Include references to datums if the geotechnical engineer’s recommendations correspond to a different datum than what was utilized within the stormwater model. On page 11 of the geotechnical report, the engineer states “Based on available data, we estimate the permanent water table to be near elevation +60 feet NAVD.” On page 13 of the Stormwater Report, the elevation of the mobilized aquifer was listed as not encountered. Also, the geotechnical engineer states that “a reasonable estimate for the temporary perched seasonal high groundwater table is from 0.5 to 1 foot below the land surface (bls).” Please explain the values utilized in the model.
5. Per City of Alachua 6.9.3(7)(a), “Detention and retention systems shall be designed in conformance with the SRWMD’s Surface Water Management Permitting Manual, as amended” and therefore, per SRWMD Applicant’s Handbook Volume II Section 5.3.2 - The exfiltration trench system shall be designed so that the invert elevation of the trench is at or above the seasonal high ground water table elevation. Per the provided geotechnical report by Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc dated May 20, 2016, the geotechnical engineer lists the “reasonable estimate for the temporary perched seasonal high groundwater table is from 0.5 to 1 foot below land surface (bls). The proposed under drains within the basin are below the seasonal high ground water table.
6. In the Post-Development ICPR model, we recommend removing the percolation links to the groundwater table. The links appear to not add value to the model as the entirety of the stormwater appears to recover via the under drain system.
7. Per City of Alachua 6.9.3(7)(a), “Detention and retention systems shall be designed in conformance with the SRWMD’s Surface Water Management Permitting Manual, as amended” and therefore, per SRWMD Applicant’s Handbook Volume II Section 3.3, “Where multiple off-site discharges are designed to occur and the combined discharges outfall to the same receiving water body, the District will not allow the

total post-development peak discharge to exceed the pre-development peak discharge for the combined discharges." In the Post-Development condition, do the post-development discharge rates and volumes listed in Tables 7A and &B for the BNDY North include the total combined discharge rates and volumes from both Pond 1, Pond 2, and Basins 4 & 9 going to BDNY North?

If you have any questions, please contact my office at 352-373-3541.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Sergio Reyes", with a horizontal line underneath.

Sergio Reyes, P.E.
President / Principal

May 19, 2016

Mr. Justin Tabor, AICP
Principal Planner
City of Alachua
PO Box 9
Alachua, FL 32616

Re: Review of Wal-Mart #3873-00- Site Plan

Dear Mr. Tabor,

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Wal-Mart #3873-00 – Site Plan. Please find my comments on Wal-Mart #3873-00 below.

Comments:

Sheet C-1

1. Label the parcel numbers on the location map.
2. Mike New no longer works for the City of Alachua.

Sheet C-2

1. Mike New no longer works for the City of Alachua.

Sheet C-6

1. Show and label buffers.
2. Show and label the right-of-way.
3. The subtotal acreage (37.64 ac) does not match the acreage listed in the application.
4. Please clarify which tax parcels the project is on. The application and the "Tax Parcel ID No." under Site Data do not match.

Sheet C-6A

1. Dimension property lines.

Sheet C-7

1. Provide additional information to ensure compliance with ADA parking space grading criteria.

Sheet C-8

1. Clarify where the sewer line on the south side of the proposed building connects.

Sheet C-9

1. Ensure that the sanitary sewer main and the water main have the required separations, specifically at MH-G.

Sheet C-9B

1. Ensure clearances between the storm pipes.

Sheet C-11

1. Geotechnical engineer to provide recommendations on how to install berm fill.

Sheet C-11A

1. Geotechnical engineer to provide recommendations on how to install berm fill.

Sheet C-13

1. Add a length dimension to the ADA spaces within the Standard Pedestrian Island detail.

Sheet C-14

1. The striping around the ADA parking spaces in the Vestibule Crosswalk Striping detail is incorrect. There should be three (3) stripes at 60 degrees next to each space.

Sheet C-16

1. Is the Sinkhole Repair detail provided a recommendation of the geotechnical engineer?

Sheet C-17.1

1. Remove all references to GRU.

Drainage Design Notes


1. Provide recover information for the required storm events. Per City of Alachua 6.9.3(7)(a), "Detention and retention systems shall be designed in conformance with the SRWMD's Surface Water Management Permitting Manual, as amended" and therefore, per SRWMD Applicant's Handbook Volume II Section 3.4, "Storage volumes designed into retention or detention systems must be available as follows: 1. One-half of the total volume within seven days following the end of the design storm event, and 2. The total volume within 30 days following the end of the design storm event."
2. Clarify why there are no percolation links included in the model and clarify why the geotechnical engineer did not provide stormwater management system soil design parameters to be used for this model.
3. Verify the Mass Balance for the ICPR Model. Results should be zero difference.
4. For the BNDY North node and the BNDY West node, please clarify why at different times, different stages have been given. Provide justification of the assumed tailwater conditions.
5. Provide calculations or a table showing the freeboard for Pond 1 and Pond 2 for each of the required storm events.
6. Every sheet of the time series is not needed. Please submit the time series sheet of each storm event showing the Maximum Discharge Rate or Maximum Discharge Volume per storm event with the specific criteria highlighted or boxed for both Pre-Development and Post-Development.
7. For node Drop1, verify the length of the pipe run. The plans show approximately 781-ft of 24" pipe, 235-ft of 24"x38" pipe, and 116-ft of 30" pipe assuming Drop1 begins at S-

168 and ends at S-184. Account for the changes in pipe sizes in your model. Also, account for Drop2 connecting to S-178.

8. For node Drop2, verify the length and size of the pipe run. The plans show approximately 40-ft of 18" pipe, 235-ft of 24"x38", and 116-ft of 30" pipe.
9. Clarify why the 2-year storm events have been included.
10. Clarify the difference between the 100-YR 001-HR storm event and the 100YR-YR 001-HR W storm event.
11. Provide model data for the water quality treatment volume (WQTV) simulation including the recovery time for each pond.
12. Provide Pre-Development and Post-Development Drainage Basin Maps at a larger more readable paper size. The existing spot elevations and contour labels are illegible at the current printed size.
13. Clarify pre-development drainage areas. Where is Depression 1? How do the drainage areas defined by ERP-001-209884-2 relate to the three (3) pre-development drainage areas discussed?
14. Clarify in the post-development drainage map where the TK Basin is located.
15. Clarify where Basin 1A is piped.
16. Clarify the modification to the existing basin to the east. Has this basin been analyzed to accept this proposed drainage area? If no justification is available, provide calculations showing this basin can handle the additional drainage area.
17. Provide a sub-drainage area map showing the areas going to each inlet in relation to the Hydraflow model.

If you have any questions, please contact my office at 352-373-3541.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Sergio Reyes", with a horizontal line underneath.

Sergio Reyes, P.E.
President / Principal



Engineering & Consulting, Inc.

December 15, 2016

Mr. Justin Tabor, AICP
Principal Planner
City of Alachua
P.O. Box 9
Alachua, Florida 32616

Subject: Review of CPH Responses to Geotechnical Concerns
Proposed Walmart
Alachua, Alachua County, Florida
GSE Project No. 12792

Dear Mr. Tabor:

GSE Engineering & Consulting, Inc. (GSE) has reviewed the responses from CPH, Inc. in their letter dated November 21, 2016. Specifically, we reviewed pages 30 through 35 of their response letter that are applicable to the geotechnical concerns raised in our letter dated June 29, 2016.

GSE has reviewed the written responses to the geotechnical concerns in the CPH letter and the applicable sheets of the design drawings referenced in the responses. Based upon our review of the CPH letter and drawings, CPH has adequately addressed the concerns raised in our June 29, 2016 report, with the exception of response No. 6. Response No. 6 addresses the undercutting and need for underdrains beneath the Walmart parking lot, but does not address the need for underdrains beneath the entrance roadways. However, we understand the need for underdrains beneath entrance roadways will be evaluated by City of Alachua personnel during construction of the roadways. As long as City of Alachua personnel determine the need for underdrains beneath roadways, it is our opinion CPH has adequately addressed the geotechnical concerns raised in our June 29, 2016 report.

GSE appreciates the opportunity to have assisted you with this matter. If you have any questions or comments concerning this document or if we may be of further assistance, please contact us.

Sincerely,

GSE Engineering & Consulting, Inc.

Kenneth L. Hill, P.E.
Principal Engineer - Geotechnical
Florida Registration Number 40146

KLH/ldj
Z:\General\Projects\12792 Walmart\12792 CPH Response Review.doc

Distribution: Addressee (1)
File (1)

GSE Engineering & Consulting, Inc.
5590 SW 64th Street, Suite B
Gainesville, Florida 32608
352-377-3233 Phone • 352-377-0335 Fax
www.gseengineering.com
Certificate of Authorization No. 27430



Engineering & Consulting, Inc.

June 29, 2016

Mr. Justin Tabor, AICP
Principal Planner
City of Alachua
P.O. Box 9
Alachua, Florida 32616

Subject: Report of a Geotechnical Review
Proposed Walmart
Alachua, Alachua County, Florida
GSE Project No. 12792

Dear Mr. Tabor:

GSE Engineering & Consulting, Inc. (GSE) has completed a geotechnical review of the submittals for the proposed Wal-Mart store to be located in Alachua, Florida. This review was performed in general accordance with our proposal No. 2016-162 dated May 31, 2016 and Purchase Order No. 6008159.

Background Information

Wal-Mart proposes to construct a store at the southeast corner of the Interstate Highway 75 (I-75) and U.S. Highway 441 interchange in Alachua, Alachua County, Florida. The project will include the Wal-Mart store, service roadways and stormwater management facilities. The project is approximately 44.38 acres in size.

CPH, Inc. (CPH) is the civil design engineer of record for the project, and submitted most of the information pertaining to the project design. Universal Engineering Sciences, Inc. (UES) is the geotechnical engineer of record and completed numerous geotechnical explorations and reports for the project that were used by CPH in the design.

Purpose

You requested we perform this independent review of the civil design plans and geotechnical engineering report to determine if they meet the geotechnical related requirements of the City of Alachua Comprehensive Plan. The City of Alachua Comprehensive Plan does not include many specific geotechnical requirements for site development submittals; most are related to roadway design/construction and storm water basin design. Therefore, we have also reviewed the geotechnical engineering report to determine whether it meets the general standard of care for geotechnical engineering services/explorations for this region of Florida and whether the recommendations in the geotechnical report protect the health, safety and welfare of the general public, in accordance with Florida Statutes.

GSE Engineering & Consulting, Inc.
5590 SW 64th Street, Suite B
Gainesville, Florida 32608
352-377-3233 Phone • 352-377-0335 Fax
www.gseengineering.com
Certificate of Authorization No. 27430

Provided Documents/Submittals

You provided the following documents that were submitted by CPH:

1. Proposed Walmart Supercenter #3873-00 civil design plans prepared by CPH, Sheets C-1 through IR-11.
2. Stormwater Design Calculations, Proposed Walmart Store No. 3873-00, prepared by CPH.
3. Initial Geotechnical Exploration Services, Proposed Walmart Store No. 3873-00, prepared by UES, Project No. 0795.1400110.0000, Report No. 1211903, dated May 20, 2016.
4. Response to Request for Additional Information prepared by CPH dated May 26, 2016.
5. Investigation of a Potential Karst Feature near Alachua, Florida prepared by Mr. Bryan B. McDonald, P.G. with Water & Air Research, Inc. dated April 27, 2015.

Discussion of Provided Documents and Site Conditions

The CPH civil design plans include a site topographic survey, site grading plans, pavement, roadway and stormwater basin grading plans and cross-sections and details. We primarily reviewed the topographic survey and site, pavement, roadway and stormwater basin grading plans as to how they incorporated the geotechnical information into the civil site design.

The stormwater design calculations present supporting data as to how the peak water stages within the basins were determined.

The geotechnical engineering report prepared by UES is a summary of several different geotechnical explorations that were performed at the site from 2004 through 2015. These explorations included soil borings at the building location, parking lot, stormwater basins, access roadways and in areas of deep cuts or fill and a sinkhole screening at the building and main stormwater basin using geophysical methods and soil borings.

Additional information was requested from CPH based upon our cursory review of the provided data.

The Investigation of a Potential Karst Feature near Alachua, Florida is a power point presentation discussing two depressions on the property. The discussion concludes the two depressions are likely paleo sink features.

The site is mostly undeveloped pasture land that has a moderate slope down from the south to north/northeast. Site elevations range from about 149 feet at the southeast property corner to about 77 feet along the north property line. The peak of the hill south of the site (off site) is at elevation 155 feet.

The proposed building will have the finished floor set at elevation 118 feet. This will require cuts of 20 feet +/- along the south side and at the southwest corner of the building and in the driveway/parking area behind the building and fills of up to 10 feet at the northeast corner of the building. The majority of the parking lot in front (north) of the building will be filled 3 to 8 feet.

Stormwater generated from the project will be collected mostly by a large basin located north of the parking lot. The basin has a bottom elevation of 80 feet and a top elevation of 86 feet. The design high water level in the basin is at elevation 83.88 feet. There is a short berm at elevation 82 feet that separates the main portion of the basin from an area where water can be discharged by a structure. The structure has a weir at elevation 83 feet.

A second stormwater basin will be located directly east of the main basin. This basin has a bottom elevation at 71 feet and a top elevation at 79 feet. A short berm at elevation 73 feet separates the majority of the basin from the discharge area. A structure at the west side of the basin has a weir at elevation 77.5 feet.

Water that is discharged by the structures in the basins are piped and discharged into the U.S. Highway 441 right-of-way.

There will be a slope cut into grade behind the building that will range from 6:1 (horizontal to vertical) to 9:1. There will be cut and filled slopes at the two stormwater basins that will be constructed at 3:1 to 4:1.

Access roadways will be located off the Walmart property to the east. These roadways will have both cut and filled sections. Two depressions are located near the intersection of the Entrance Road and Seller Road #2.

Items of Concern

It is our opinion the geotechnical engineering explorations and report prepared by UES for the project generally meet the standard of care for geotechnical explorations for a project of this size and location with a few exceptions as discussed below. Additionally, it is our opinion some of the recommendations presented in the geotechnical engineering report have not been addressed in the civil design plans prepared by CPH. Our comments/concerns are noted below.

Building

1. Fifty-two (52) soil borings were performed within or near the proposed building limits. It is standard of care for a building of this type to perform soil borings to depths of 15 to 20 feet below the floor elevation to explore the subsurface conditions within the stress influence of the foundations. Eighteen (18) of these borings (approximately 35 percent) have termination depths that are less than 15 feet below the foundation elevation - soil borings A-18, A-33, B-100, B-101, B-108, B-109, B-110, B-112, B-115, B-116, B-117, B-118, B-119, B-120, B-121, B-122, B-123 and B-124). There is a concern that some of the building area has not been adequately explored to confirm the shallow foundation recommendations are appropriate. The geotechnical engineer of record should address this concern.

2. The sinkhole screening of the site performed by UES concluded the subsurface conditions do not indicate the potential for imminent ground collapse associated with sinkhole activity and that the site is at no greater risk for sinkhole activity than the general vicinity. We generally agree with these statements, but four of the soil borings (B-1, GB-1, GB-2 and GB-4) within the building area have a declining strength with depth profile that some engineers associate with potential sinkhole activity. The geotechnical engineer of record should address these four soil borings.
3. Soil boring B-111 located near the southwest building corner has a water table at a depth of 19 feet. This area of the site will be cut approximately 17 to 18 feet to establish the floor elevation. This sets the finished floor of the building within 1 to 2 feet of the groundwater table. The civil engineer should address a remediation plan should groundwater be present in this area.
4. The geotechnical engineering report recommended an underdrain be constructed around the perimeter of the building. An underdrain is not shown on sheet C-7 Grading and Storm Drainage Plan. The absence of this underdrain should be addressed.
5. The geotechnical engineering report recommended the building area be undercut to a depth of 5 feet below the foundation bottom elevation to remove expansive soils, and to backfill with a low permeable fill material that has between 10% and 25% soil fines passing the No. 200 sieve. This type of material is typically not available from local borrow pits. Additionally, the geotechnical engineering report states that an estimated 80 to 90 percent of the materials that will be excavated from the site will not be suitable for use as structural fill. The source of low permeable fill material should be provided.

Roadways and Parking Lots

6. Several areas of the roadways and parking lot will be cut into grade. Most of the cut areas will also require undercutting to remove expansive soils. Many of these cut or undercut areas will be prone to collecting perched groundwater. This perched groundwater can cause premature pavement failure due to saturation of the base course. This perched groundwater is typically evacuated with underdrains constructed beneath or behind the pavement curbing. The site grading plans do not show the locations of underdrains. The need for underdrains should be addressed, and confirm whether the underdrain detail shown on Sheet C-16 is intended for roadway underdrains.
7. The geotechnical engineering report recommends that underdrains be constructed in all parking lot islands to evacuate storm and irrigation water so that it does not perch and leach laterally into the pavement, which can cause premature pavement failure. The site grading plan does not show underdrains within parking lot islands. The absence of underdrains within the parking lot islands should be addressed.
8. The geotechnical engineering report recommends constructing an underdrain along the south edges of the pavement/driveway behind the Walmart building to intercept and evacuate perched groundwater flowing from offsite prior to it reaching the pavement subgrade. No underdrain is shown on the site grading plans. The absence of this underdrain should be addressed.

9. The Entrance Road travels next to two depressions. The geological review of these two features concluded they were likely relic (ancient) sinkhole features and that there was no visual evidence of instability of these features. We agree the data supports this opinion. However, the instability of a sinkhole feature begins at the limestone surface and progresses upward to the ground surface, resulting in ground subsidence. The stability of a feature cannot be confirmed visually and can only be confirmed with soil borings. A sinkhole screening/geotechnical evaluation of the subsurface in the vicinity of the two depression features is recommended for the Entrance Road near Station 43+00.

Cut Slope Stability/Erosion

10. The hillside behind the building will be cut into grade up to 20 feet to lower the site to the floor elevation of 118 feet and the pavement to approximately elevation 117 feet. Similar cuts will occur to construct the stormwater basins. These excavations will penetrate the surficial sandy soils that contain a perched water table, and seepage out of the slopes is likely. The UES slope stability calculations incorporate the perched groundwater conditions and the calculations indicate the slopes will have an adequate safety factor. However, UES states *"infiltrated rain water may perch on top of the shallow deposits of clayey soils; this groundwater may seep... and daylight through the face of the slope. These seepage phenomena towards the face of the slope could cause erosion to the slope face and lead to a reduced stability of the slope. Therefore, measures should be taken to prevent erosion of the slope face such as using geosynthetics and vegetation"*. We agree with this statement, and have the same concern that groundwater seepage from cut slopes can eventually affect slope stability. The soil borings suggest slope seepage may occur at boring locations A-32, A-44, A-50, A-56, A-61, A-62, C-7, C-8, C-26, C-27, C-28, C-29 and W-1 through W-19. The site grading plans do not include provisions for preventing erosion of slope faces. The civil design engineer should address the potential for seepage out of cut slopes and slope protection, otherwise the slope stability calculations do not accurately reflect site conditions.
11. The geotechnical engineering report states *"Site preparation includes backfilling some drainage areas/gullies. ... A layer of bi-axial geotextile should be placed over the excavated subgrade for constructability purposes to allow a platform to start placing the backfill"*. The topographic survey indicates two drainage areas/gullies are present near the southeast corner of the Walmart building. These two features converge into one drainage feature near the truck well. The topographic survey suggests these two drainage features are hillside seepage features. Sheet C-7 Grading and Storm Drainage Plan does not address these drainage features/gullies. The civil engineer should provide a remediation plan for these drainage areas/gullies.

Stormwater Basins

12. Fifty-two (52) soil borings were performed within the limits of Retention Area 1. Soil boring C-22A encountered limestone at a depth of 10.5 feet, which corresponds to elevation 83 feet +/- . The basin bottom is set at elevation 80 feet, and therefore, will penetrate limestone in this area. Stormwater infiltration directly into limestone is not allowed by the Water Management District. Sheet 16 includes a detail for remediating sinkholes should they occur within the stormwater basins, but it does not include details/procedures for remediating exposed limestone within the basins. How exposed

June 29, 2016

limestone will be remediated should be addressed. Additionally, confirm that the sinkhole remediation detail follows the geotechnical engineer of record recommendations.


13. The Stormwater Design Calculations for Retention Area 1 includes only calculations to size the basin and determine the high water elevation. The calculations do not include any infiltration calculations to estimate the basin recovery. The Stormwater Design Calculations should include a recovery analysis. The recovery analysis should include the geotechnical parameters that were used in the analysis. No geotechnical parameters for stormwater design were provided in the geotechnical engineering report. It is customary for the geotechnical engineer of record to provide the geotechnical parameters to be used for the recovery analysis.
14. Fifty-two (52) soil borings were performed in Retention Area 1. Seven (7) permeability tests were performed from soil samples recovered from these soil borings. Seven permeability tests is not an adequate representation of the subsurface materials for a basin of this size. Additional permeability tests should be performed to support the geotechnical parameters discussed in Item 13 above.
15. Retention Area 2 is located east of Retention Area 1. No soil borings were performed in this basin. An adequate number of soil borings should be performed in this basin to provide parameters for basin design and recovery modeling and to address the karst geology considerations. The geotechnical engineer of record should provide the geotechnical soil and groundwater parameters for the basin modeling.
16. As discussed earlier in Item 10, there will be cut slopes on the south sides of the stormwater basins that will likely seep water and create stability/erosion issues. This water seepage is also base flow of groundwater into the retention basins and must be accounted for in the basin design. We have not observed any provisions in the Stormwater Design Calculations that account for base flow. The civil design engineer should account for base flow into the basins.

Closing

GSE appreciates the opportunity to have assisted you with this matter. If you have any questions or comments concerning this document or if we may be of further assistance, please contact us.

Sincerely,

GSE Engineering & Consulting, Inc.


Kenneth L. Hill, P.E. 6/29/16
Principal Engineer - Geotechnical
Florida Registration Number 40146

KLH/jbn/ldj
Z:\General Projects\12792 Walmart\12792.doc

Distribution: Addressee (1)
File (1)



Volkert, Inc.

3501 South Main Street
Suite 2
Gainesville, FL 32601

Office 352.372.9594
Fax 352.371.3988
gainesville@volkert.com

www.volkert.com

December 14, 2016

Mr. Justin Tabor, AICP
Principal Planner
City of Alachua
15100 NW 142nd Terrace
P.O. Box 6
Alachua, FL 32616

Subject: Independent Review of the Revised Traffic Impact Analysis for the new Walmart located at US 441 & I-75, Alachua, FL, Prepared by Traffic & Mobility Consultants, November, 2016.

Dear Mr. Tabor:

As per your request, I have reviewed the revised Traffic Impact Analysis for the new Walmart located at US 441 & I-75 in the City of Alachua, FL, prepared by Traffic & Mobility Consultants, November, 2016.

The revised Traffic Impact Analysis satisfactorily addressed the issues I raised when I reviewed the original Traffic Impact Analysis earlier this year. The revised access roadway configuration approaching US 441 that was jointly agreed upon by myself and CHW, Inc. was also accurately represented in the revised Traffic Impact Analysis. Based on my review, the revised Traffic Impact Analysis is ready for approval by the City of Alachua.

The revised Traffic Impact Analysis did not address the impact of traffic from future development on the site (out parcels) and from future through (external) traffic if the access road is ever connected to existing roads south of the site. The City of Alachua Land Development Regulations did not require the revised Traffic Impact Analysis to address these issues. In addition, future development on the site will be required to perform their own traffic impact analysis to determine what, if any, their traffic impacts are on the affected transportation infrastructure.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide transportation engineering services for the City of Alachua, FL. If you have any questions or comments or require additional information, please contact me at 352-240-7459 (direct line) or 352-262-3580 (cell phone).

Sincerely,

Volkert, Inc.

Brian D. Kanely, P.E.
Senior Traffic Engineer
Volkert, Inc.

Office Locations:

Birmingham, Foley, Huntsville, Mobile, Alabama • Gainesville, Orlando, Pensacola, Tampa, Florida • Atlanta, Georgia
Collinsville, Illinois • Baton Rouge, Slidell, Louisiana • Biloxi, Mississippi • Jefferson City, Missouri • Raleigh, North Carolina
Chattanooga, Tennessee • Alexandria, Virginia • Washington, D.C.





Volkert, Inc.

3501 South Main Street
Suite 2
Gainesville, FL 32601

Office 352.372.9594
Fax 352.371.3988
gainesville@volkert.com

www.volkert.com

May 31, 2016

Mr. Justin Tabor, AICP
Principal Planner
City of Alachua
15100 NW 142nd Terrace
P.O. Box 6
Alachua, FL 32616

Subject: Independent Review of the Traffic Impact Analysis for the new Walmart located at US 441 & I-75, Alachua, FL, Prepared by Traffic & Mobility Consultants, March 2016.

Dear Mr. Tabor:

Please find attached the final report for the Independent Review of the Traffic Impact Analysis for the proposed Walmart development located in the southeast quadrant of the intersection of US 441 & I-75 in the City of Alachua, FL.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide transportation engineering services for the City of Alachua, FL. If you have any questions or comments or require additional information, please contact me at 352-240-7459 (direct line) or 352-262-3580 (cell phone).

Sincerely,

Volkert, Inc.

Brian D. Kanely, P.E.
Senior Traffic Engineer

CC: Bo Sanchez
Brian Kirwan
Gene Quinn
Kathy Winburn
Jeannette Williams

Attachment

Office Locations:

Birmingham, Foley, Huntsville, Mobile, Alabama • Gainesville, Orlando, Pensacola, Tampa, Florida • Atlanta, Georgia
Collinsville, Illinois • Baton Rouge, Slidell, Louisiana • Biloxi, Mississippi • Jefferson City, Missouri • Raleigh, North Carolina
Chattanooga, Tennessee • Alexandria, Virginia • Washington, D.C.



**Independent Review of the Traffic Impact Analysis
For the Walmart #3873 Project, Alachua, Florida,
Located in the Southeast Quadrant of I-75 & US 441
Prepared by Volkert, Inc. May 2016**

At the request of the City of Alachua, FL, Planning and Community Development Department, Volkert, Inc., conducted an independent review of the Traffic Impact Analysis for the Walmart #3873 Project (Report) located in the southeast quadrant of the intersection of US 441 & I-75. The traffic impact analysis was prepared by Traffic & Mobility Consultants (Consultant) in March 2016.

The Walmart #3873 Project (Project) is located on the south side of US 441, immediately east of I-75 (southeast quadrant). The proposed Walmart contains 158,562 square feet with a 2,835 square foot seasonal garden center. The total gross floor area of the Walmart Supercenter is 161,397 square feet. The buildout year for the project is 2018. The project will generate a total of 8,191 gross daily trips (702 PM peak hour trips). After the reduction for pass-by trips, the project will generate a total of 5,898 new net daily trips (506 new PM peak hour trips).

Important components with respect to the traffic circulation for the Project include:

- Construction of a site access road which will serve the Walmart site and adjacent property. This site access road would ideally ultimately be connected to County Road 2054 south of the project.
- The Walmart site will have two driveways off the new site access road:
 1. Primary driveway that will access the parking lot in front of the Walmart and will be the primary customer access.
 2. A secondary driveway that will access the rear of the Walmart and will be the primary access for deliveries and truck traffic.
- Construction of a new signalized intersection on US 441 at the new site access road with the appropriate number of right and left turn lanes for traffic entering and exiting the Project.

The independent review of the Traffic Impact Analysis produced the following findings:

Section 1.1 – Study Area/Significance Test

This section of the report describes the study area for the traffic impact analysis. The study area for the project is based on the City's Land Development Code and includes:

- Primary roadway segments within 0.5 miles of the site.
- Any roadway segment where the percent of the project traffic exceeds 5% of the roadway segment's capacity based on the approved level of service standard (LOS D for US 441).

The calculation of the number of trips assigned (distributed) to each roadway segment is based on the trip distribution plot, which is derived from the Alachua County Transportation Demand

Model and the Florida Standard Urban Transportation Model Structure (FSUTMS). A review of the trip generation data and the trip distribution plot demonstrated that the project trips were correctly distributed and assigned to the roadway network. The three roadway segments that require analysis were correctly identified (significance test). Once the limits of the roadway segments for analysis were identified, any existing and proposed traffic signals in those roadway segments must also be analyzed.

The report identifies seven traffic signals that are within the project limits (significant roadway segments) that need to be reviewed/analyzed. However the report did not include the new traffic signal at the Publix just west of I-75 (US 441 & NW 167th Blvd). This signal was operational on the day the intersection turning movement counts were obtained (March 8, 2016) and should have been included in the intersections to be analyzed.

The analysis of the roadway segments and intersections (traffic signals) is based on the PM peak hour volumes. The reference to the PM peak hour was omitted from this section of the report (this information is provided in Section 2.2) and should be included in this section for informational purposes.

Report Deficiencies & Recommended Action:

1. Omitted traffic signal for analysis:
 - a. The existing traffic signal at US 441 & NW 167th Blvd (Publix) was omitted from the list of intersections to be analyzed.
 - b. Add the intersection of US 441 & NW 167th Blvd to the list of intersections to be analyzed.
2. PM peak hour analysis period not stated:
 - a. This section does not state that the analysis period is the PM peak hour.
 - b. Include in this section that the analysis period is the PM peak hour and state the time period (5:00 – 6:00 PM, for example).

Section 2.1 – Existing Traffic Volumes

This section of the report describes and documents the existing traffic volumes that are used in the traffic impact analysis and whether or not a seasonal adjustment factor needs to be applied to the traffic volumes. This information is correctly stated.

This section should also state that the analysis period is the PM peak hour and state what that hour is. The PM peak hour information should also be documented on Figure 2 which shows the existing intersection volumes. Also, the traffic signal at US 441 & NW 167th Blvd needs to be included in the analysis.

Report Deficiencies & Recommended Action:

1. PM peak hour analysis period not stated:
 - a. This section does not state that the analysis period is the PM peak hour.

- b. Include in this section that the analysis period is the PM peak hour and state the time period (5:00 – 6:00 PM, for example).
- 2. Include the peak hour information in Figure 2.
- 3. Omitted traffic signal for analysis:
 - a. The existing traffic signal at US 441 & NW 167th Blvd (Publix) was omitted from the list of intersections to be analyzed.
 - b. Add the intersection of US 441 & NW 167th Blvd to the list of intersections to be analyzed and add the traffic volume information for this intersection to Figure 2.

Section 2.2 – Roadway Segment Analysis

This section of the report describes and documents whether or not the roadway segments meet the level of service (LOS) criteria for US 441. This information is correctly stated on Table 2. The actual time period for the PM peak hour should be stated.

Report Deficiencies & Recommended Action:

- 1. PM peak hour analysis period:
 - a. This section does not state the actual PM peak hour analysis period.
 - b. Include in this section the actual PM peak hour time period (5:00 – 6:00 PM, for example).

Section 2.3 – Intersection Analysis

This section of the report describes and documents whether or not the intersections (traffic signals) meet the LOS criteria for US 441. This information is correctly stated in Table 3. However, the traffic signal at US 441 & NW 167th Blvd (Publix) was not included in the analysis and needs to be added to Table 3.

Table 3 shows the existing intersection conditions. For informational purposes, a column should be added to Table 3 that shows the level of service standard for the intersections is LOS D.

Report Deficiencies & Recommended Action:

- 1. Omitted traffic signal for analysis:
 - a. The existing traffic signal at US 441 & NW 167th Blvd (Publix) was omitted from the list of intersections to be analyzed.
 - b. Add the intersection of US 441 & NW 167th Blvd to the list of intersections to be analyzed.
- 2. LOS standard not shown:
 - a. The intersection LOS standard is not shown on Table 3.
 - b. Add the LOS standard (LOS D) to Table 3 for informational purposes.

Section 3.1 – Trip Generation

This section of the report describes and documents the trip generation for the Project. The total and PM peak hour trips are correctly calculated per the ITE *Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition*. The report correctly states that the pass-by trip percentage is 28% per the *Trip Generation Manual* and correctly calculates the trip reductions for the pass-by trips that are shown on Table 4. (Pass-by trips are trips that are already on the roadway and passing by the project, and enter/exit the project for convenience rather than make a separate trip to the project at another time.) The only issue with the pass-by trip percentage is whether or not the approving agency arbitrarily places a limit on the pass-by trip percentage. The City of Alachua staff advised they utilize the ITE pass-by trip percentage. After the reduction for pass-by trips, the project will generate a total of 5,898 new net daily trips (506 new PM peak hour trips).

Section 3.2 – Trip Distribution/Assignment

This section of the report describes and documents the Project trip distribution and assignment. This information is derived from the Alachua County Transportation Demand Model (long range transportation planning model) and the FSUTMS. The trip distribution is correctly obtained from the trip distribution plot and shown on Figure 3.

The trip distribution shows that 52% of the trips have an origin/destination (O/D) from west of the new site access road (toward High Springs and I-75) and 48% of the trips have an O/D from east of the new site access road (toward Alachua). Also, of the 52% of the trips that have an O/D west of the Project, one-third (33%) of those trips have an O/D on/off I-75.

Section 4.1 – Background Traffic Growth

This section of the report describes and documents the background traffic growth on US 441. Background traffic growth is the increase in traffic volumes that occur on a roadway due to population increases and travel patterns in the area that are not related to the Project. The report uses FDOT traffic counts on US 441 to determine the annual increase in background traffic. A growth rate of 3% was calculated and correctly applied to the future traffic projections.

Section 4.2 – Roadway Segment Analysis

This section of the report describes and documents the future traffic volumes for the buildout year and calculates the LOS for the roadway segments. The 2018 traffic volumes on the roadway segments (US441) for the buildout year have been correctly calculated (existing traffic volume plus background traffic growth). The total traffic (2018 traffic plus project trips) have been correctly calculated and the 2018 LOS has been correctly determined for 2018.

Other Issues/Comments on the Roadway Segment Analysis

The methodology in the report that is used to calculate the future traffic at project buildout (future traffic on US 441 plus project traffic) does not address the following issues:

1. **Reserved Trips:** The City of Alachua maintains a list of reserved trips on the roadway network. A reserved trip is a trip from a future project that has not yet been built but the trips for that project are already assigned to the roadway network. If the project has not been built by its stated buildout year, the project trips are then removed from the roadway network. The City periodically updates the approved reserved trips on the roadway network in the City. The Report does not include any reserved trips on the impacted roadway segments (US 441). The approved reserved trips should be added to the roadway segments listed in Table 1 (Significance Test) to determine the following:
 - a. If any additional roadway segments meet the 5% test.
 - b. Update the LOS for the three roadway segments in Table 1.
 - c. Update the LOS for the eight signalized intersections being reviewed.

Applying the reserved trips to the future 2018 traffic could also impact the turn lane length analysis (Section 4.4). The turn lane length analysis should be reworked to determine if any turn lane lengths change.

2. **Internal Capture Trips:** The Report has no discussion of internal capture trips. When a large site has multiple land uses within its boundary (shopping, eating establishments, motor vehicle services, etc.), customers do not have to leave the site boundaries to conduct business at multiple sites; they drive from one establishment to another without using the external public road system. These internal trips are called internal capture trips. The number of internal capture trips may or may not impact the total number of project trips at the build out year. The Report should have a short discussion on whether or not internal capture trips were required to be calculated for the Walmart site and the adjacent parcels to the Walmart site.
3. **Traffic from Adjacent Lane Uses:** On the project site plan there are parcels adjacent to the Walmart site that are called "Proposed Seller Retained Property". These parcels are locations for future businesses (retail/professional business offices/etc.) that will generate future trips that will primarily impact US 441 and the signalized intersection at US 441 & the new site access road. Per the City, the seller retained parcels adjacent to the Walmart site will be required to produce their own traffic impact statement as they are developed. The issue with a parcel by parcel approach is the geometry of the site access road approaches and the left/right turn lane approaches on US 441 at the new traffic signal are being determined based on only the traffic from the proposed Walmart, not all the traffic from the Walmart and adjacent future development. Once the new site access road, the roadway modifications on US 441 and the new traffic signal is constructed, it would be very difficult to make future roadway and traffic signal modifications at this location due to physical and/or right of way constraints. Although the traffic from the adjacent land uses is not technically an issue for the Walmart project, it is discussed in this independent review because requiring the future adjacent developments to make roadway and/or traffic signal modifications to the site access road and/or the new traffic signal at US 441 may not be practical. Therefore, the design of the site access road and the associated traffic signalization should be designed to provide as much future capacity as possible, even though the design may initially exceed the design requirements for just the Walmart project. The design of the traffic signal

and roadway modifications on US 441 should be closely coordinated with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT).

Report Deficiencies & Recommended Action:

1. Reserved trips not included in the Report:
 - a. The City approved reserved trips were not included in the Report
 - b. Include the reserved trips in the calculation of future (2018) traffic.
2. Internal capture trips not included in the Report:
 - a. Internal capture trips were not discussed in the Report.
 - b. Add a short discussion stating internal capture trips were not required to be a component of the Report.
3. Traffic from adjacent land uses:
 - a. There is no discussion in the Report about the traffic impact from the adjacent land uses.
 - b. Add a discussion in the report about the traffic impact from the development of the adjacent land uses and the need to maximize the turn lane approaches at the new traffic signal at US 441 & the site access road.

Section 4.3 – Intersection Analysis

This section of the report describes and documents the future traffic volumes for the buildout year and calculates the LOS for the intersections (traffic signals). The methodology utilized to calculate the future intersection LOS was correctly applied. The traffic signal at the new Publix (US 441 & NW 167th Blvd) and a column stating the intersection LOS standard should be added to Table 6. The approved reserved trips need to be added to the intersection analysis.

Report Deficiencies & Recommended Action:

1. Omitted traffic signal for analysis:
 - a. The existing traffic signal at US 441 & NW 167th Blvd (Publix) was omitted from the list of intersections to be analyzed.
 - b. Add the intersection of US 441 & NW 167th Blvd to the list of intersections to be analyzed and to Figure 4.
2. LOS standard not shown:
 - a. The intersection LOS standard is not shown on Table 6.
 - b. Add the LOS standard (LOS D) to Table 6 for informational purposes.
3. Reserved trips omitted from the intersection analysis:
 - a. The reserved trips were omitted from the intersection analysis.
 - b. Add the approved reserved trips to the intersection analysis for the 2018 buildout year traffic.

Section 4.4 – Turn Lane Length Analysis

This section of the Report describes and documents the calculation of the turn lanes for the new traffic signal at US 441 & the site access road. The methodology utilized to calculate the turn lane lengths was correctly applied.

The issue with the turn lane lengths is the future traffic volumes at project build out are calculated for only the Walmart development (see discussion in Section 4.2). A discussion on the appropriate lengths for the turn lanes at this location needs to occur with the City and the FDOT that will anticipate future traffic from the parcels adjacent to the Walmart project that will be developed in future years.

Section 5.0 – Study Conclusions and Executive Summary

The Study Conclusions and the Executive Summary need to be modified to reflect the recommended changes discussed in this independent review.

Site Plan/Project Layout Issues

The Report included a conceptual site plan for the Walmart site, the site access road, internal driveways and the proposed seller retained properties. As previously discussed, the calculation of the turn lane lengths for the site access road were based on only the Walmart traffic and did not include future traffic from any of the seller retained property. On the included site plan, the length of the site access road right turn lane approaching US 441 measures approximately 150 feet, not the recommended length of 225 feet. To maximize traffic efficiency and safety for the Walmart and future traffic, the following design criteria should be applied to the site access road:

1. The site access road should contain a solid median from the stop line at the traffic signal at US 441 south to the main driveway to the Walmart site (approximately 600 feet). Within this 600 feet, there should be no left turn access into or out of adjacent properties from the site access road (no openings in the median). The only access to adjacent properties within this 600 feet should be via right turn in/right turn out only driveways.
2. The site plan shows a short southbound left turn lane from the site access road into Parcel D that terminates at the intersection of the site access road and the main driveway to the Walmart site (adjacent to the 1.07 acre out parcel). This left turn lane should be retained.
3. The taper for the northbound right turn lane on the site access road approaching the traffic signal at US 441 should begin where the words “entrance road” are shown on the site access road. This design would provide a length of approximately 400 feet for the right and left turn lanes approaching the traffic signal. This increased turn lane length will significantly improve the efficiency and capacity of the new traffic signal at US 441 & the site access road as the seller retained properties are developed.

4. There was no discussion in the Report as to whether or not the site access road was to be a public road (City of Alachua maintained) or a private road. If a public road, the site access road should be constructed to City of Alachua design and construction standards.
5. The site plan shows a pedestrian crosswalk at the intersection of the site access road and the main driveway to the Walmart site. This will be a busy intersection with significant volumes of turning traffic. To improve pedestrian safety and visibility, the crosswalk should be moved to a location with fewer traffic conflicts. Moving the crosswalk approximately 300 feet south would result in a mid-block location. This will make the crosswalk and pedestrians more visible for traffic and allow the use of the new push button activated rectangular rapid flashing beacon assembly which is being used state wide at pedestrian crossings.

Coordination with Other Agencies

The City of Alachua needs to closely coordinate this project with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT). This coordination is essential for the design of the new intersection and traffic signal on US 441 (a FDOT maintained highway) at the site access road. If the calculation of new LOS standards due to the addition of the reserved trips results in modifications to other signals on US 441, this work will also need to be coordinated with FDOT. If it has not already occurred, a meeting with FDOT Traffic Operations staff should be held to brief FDOT on the scope of the project and its potential impacts on US 441 and in particular, the traffic signals at the on/off ramps at the US 441/I-75 interchange.

Traffic Signalization along US 441

The City of Alachua has been working with the City of Gainesville Public Works Department – Traffic Operations Division to provide coordination for the traffic signals along US 441 between C-235 and Santa Fe High School. These efforts should continue and should ultimately result in the inclusion of the eight traffic signals along US 441 in Alachua being added to the City of Gainesville/Alachua County Traffic Management Center. US 441 serves as an alternate route to I-75 when a traffic incident on the interstate results in traffic being diverted off I-75 and onto US 441. The inclusion on the traffic signals on US 441 in Alachua into the Gainesville/Alachua County TMC will provide the capability to monitor roadway conditions along US 441 and make traffic signal timing changes as needed for traffic incidents or emergency situations.

Other Comments

Methodology Letter

The City of Alachua did not require a methodology letter for the traffic impact analysis for the Walmart project. Although not required, a methodology letter is beneficial for large development projects because it address up front the components the traffic impact analysis must address. This includes trip generation, reserved trips, internal capture trips, acceptable software for data computations, other agencies involved in the project, etc. By knowing the study requirements and components before the study is started, it makes the job easier for all involved parties. The

City should be encouraged to address the methodology letter issue for large development projects like the Walmart project.

Site Plan Issues

This independent review was aimed at addressing issues with the Walmart project. However, issues involving the overall site (Walmart and the adjacent seller retained properties) are equally important. Although the land uses for seller retained properties are not designated, the net sum of their impacts could be significant. The appropriate access management and site plan design issues discussed in this independent review need to be incorporated into the overall site design as this land develops in future years.

Volkert, Inc. appreciates the opportunity to assist the City of Alachua with this independent review of the traffic impact analysis for the new Walmart on US 441 at I-75. Please contact me if you have any questions or need additional information.

Prepared by:
Brian D. Kanely, P.E. *BK*
Senior Traffic Engineer
Volkert, Inc.
May 31, 2016



Planning | Urban Design
Landscape Architecture
Economics | Real Estate

June 23, 2016

GAI Project No. A160439.00

Mr. Justin Tabor, AICP
Principal Planner
Planning & Community Development
City of Alachua
15100 NW 142nd Terrace
Alachua, FL 32615

**Report for Analytical and Review Services
Alachua, Florida**

Dear Mr. Tabor:

In accordance with the proposal submitted to you and the City of Alachua, we have read certain planning documents submitted to the City as part of its normal development review and approvals process. Specifically, your City's *Land Development Regulations* require a market and economic analysis be submitted as part of the permitting process. Section 4.3.4 (G)(7) (b) reads [in part] as follows.

As part of the application for special exception, a market and impact study shall be submitted. The study shall be based upon an agreed upon methodology utilizing commonly accepted data sources. Data are to be taken from professionally accepted existing sources, such as the United States Census, State Data Center, State University System of Florida, regional planning councils, water management districts, or existing technical studies. The data used shall be the best available existing data. Where data augmentation, updates, or special studies or surveys are deemed necessary by the City, appropriate methodologies shall be clearly described or referenced and shall meet professionally accepted standards for such methodologies.

(iii) At a minimum the market and impact study shall include:

- a. Inventory of local retail base.
- b. Assess market areas and market impacts.
- c. Services and capital expenditures: Calculate cost of infrastructure and utilities (e.g., streets, sewer connections, water lines, etc.).
- d. Traffic and other service impacts.
- e. Calculate the cost of associated economic development incentives (i.e., tax credits).
- f. Assess the impact of redevelopment zone tax-increment financing.
- g. Inventory locations of competing retailers.
- h. Assess impact on existing local retailers

The developer and/or related parties of a proposed major retail center anchored by a Walmart Supercenter have provided a study completed by Florida Economic Advisors (FEA) to satisfy items a, b, g, and h. We understand other planning or development team members have submitted additional studies or analyses to address remaining obligations which may apply.

You have asked that we review the FEA document, acting as an independent third party adviser. You have asked we confirm the material's basic sufficiency to satisfy the City's code but in particular you wish us to comment on the reasonableness of the study's estimated share of the market, potential impacts – if any – on other

GAI Consultants, Inc.
618 East South Street
Suite 700
Orlando, Florida 32801
T 407.423.8398
gaiconsultants.com

area retailers, and its likely economic impacts if opened and operated as represented.

Generally our comments consider the basic content of typical studies prepared for such purposes, customary practices therein, the market situation in the region as judged by the report or other secondary data, and the implications of alternative approaches or conclusions. Among other things, we have considered:

- ▶ The basic structure and content of the study in terms of usual expectations within the real estate or retail industries when studies of this kind are prepared.
- ▶ Findings about general market performance, possible growth in sales or performance potential, market capture, relationships or economic links with other area retailers, and overall implications for the area's economic growth or change.
- ▶ Potential limitations in the study's findings relative to the existing submissions and to broader policy goals.
- ▶ Relevance of the findings to the City's code as its purpose is generally understood.
- ▶ Need or justification for other approaches or additional information.

Summary Conclusions

The study for the proposed project prepared by FEA addresses virtually all of the issues we would normally expect to see in an analysis of this kind. To the degree there might be further amplification of certain data, we find no deficiencies or limitations which would affect the material conclusions of the study. We substantively agree with all findings.

Among other data reflected in the study were current and future population within the County and the probable trade areas, household formations in those areas, an assessment of the spending potential now and over the next several years in several key areas, and an evaluation of the existing retailers already serving the marketplace. The latter includes an inventory of the smaller retailers which largely dominate the composition of current retailing options.

The study builds its analysis on the premise that there are primary, secondary, and tertiary populations with spending power to support the project in question. The analysis concludes - we believe quite conservatively - that the proposed project will fulfill demand which otherwise might be captured *outside* of the City or the region based on the composition of these market populations. In our opinion, the analysis appears likely to understate that share of the demand which is new or presently underserved. That would lead to one direct and one implied conclusion. The former is that the market is capable of supporting even more square footage without forcing a redistribution of existing retail activity. The second conclusion is that the presence of the proposed Walmart Supercenter, in

the context of demand potentially in excess of that projected, could be the precursor of yet additional commercial development.

Area Population and Growth

Alachua County is a rapidly growing county, primarily from increased enrollment at the University of Florida and a number of major employment initiatives. This growth has reinforced existing trends toward settlement of communities and areas just outside of Gainesville, including the City of Alachua. The report prepared by FEA elaborates on the County's growth, establishing an important context for the specific growth expectations in the community.

Trade Area Determination

Inside of this larger area, and just beyond, there are primary, secondary, and tertiary areas of population which together and separately comprise the many layers of demand for virtually any kinds of retailing and dining activity.

Retail items fall broadly into two categories with the key attributes suggested by their name: *convenience* goods or *comparison* goods. Convenience items benefit from location specifically, traffic exposure, traffic counts, ingress/egress, and the immediate proximity of supporting neighborhoods. Travel distances for these goods are extremely limited, and rarely are pricing or variety a major factor in choice of outlet. On the other hand, comparison goods - called that because shoppers purposefully weigh their options - normally involve fewer outlets and are capable of drawing demand from a wider and more substantial distance. Variety and selection are important. If these goods are also "price positioned" they may need the income diversity or household stratification which comes from a larger market area.

The report draws the distinction between and among retailers and their geographic base of support quite well. The document cites the Urban Land Institute as its reference for typical trade area dimensions for different kinds of retail environments, defined in part by the size of a project, general market orientation, and type of retail outlets. For purposes of the analysis, the proposed Walmart Supercenter is treated as a super community center with a trade area of about 5.0 miles.

While we could adjust those dimensions to reflect time and access considerations created or constrained by surface transportation networks and other physical features, this added refinement would be necessary were there a variety and mix of retailers proposed or if questions remained about the relative scale of demand. We don't believe there are such issues or questions.

Ultimately the analysis concludes the defined primary trade area will be the source of approximately 80% of total demand. The normal range would be about 70%-80%. The report goes on to estimate the population, household spending, and relevant share of spending directed toward retail goods and dining options in this area.

Figures are provided for both 2015 and 2020. Based on the pace of growth experienced historically, the projections seem reasonable for the purposes described. The report observes gains in population, as correlated to housing starts, are sometimes examined in terms of an average rather than just a high or a low.

Overall Inventory Supported by Analysis

In reality, aggregate spending generated by an area's population and households is widely distributed among a variety of stores, restaurants, and other activities. In the present case, the analysis estimates a total annual spending of about \$234,000,000 with about \$192,000,000 of that total stemming from actual retail and dining spending. This is an appropriate downward adjustment.

The analysis addresses these retail spending patterns by assuming all the existing retailers, accounted for in the inventory, are achieving a share of the market sufficient to sustain them. This analysis uses a figure of \$300 per SF which we would consider high given the variety, efficiency, age, and size of the many stores identified as part of the inventory containing about 514,000 SF. Some of these spaces will, in fact, never be used for retailing activities and may actually be vacant today.

The effect of a number which overstates the performance of any existing store is to understate the actual net demand available for new market entrants, in this case the proposed Walmart Supercenter. If the number were lowered to about \$250 per SF, which we believe is much more plausible for the nature of the spaces identified, the unmet need would increase from the report's estimated 127,000 SF to about 255,000 SF instead. Neither figure recognizes non-local sales, even only at a nominal level. Clearly then the original estimate would be judged conservative by comparison to this much larger number.

Sales Attributable to Walmart

The analysis also attributes sales of \$300 per SF to Walmart to estimate what part of the unmet local need would be absorbed by the planned store. This figure is much lower than we would normally expect Walmart to generate or support. We would be more inclined to assume sales of at least \$350 per SF. This increased number, when applied to the potentially supportable inventory of space, causes that number to decline. Where a lower number used previously [Overall Inventory Supported by Analysis] has the effect of understating potential sales, this higher number has the effect of underestimating how a new store could alter the existing retail marketplace.

The present analysis concludes about 80% of the planned store's retail volume and related square footage will be drawn from the estimated unmet need, supporting effectively about 127,000 SF. However, using a larger number of \$350 per SF, it would appear our modestly revised estimate of the area's unmet demand (255,000 SF) remains sufficient to accommodate the higher than average sales typically experienced at Walmart without adversely affecting the local retail environment.

Inventory over the Planning Horizon

We don't know what else is being proposed within the trade area but there are a handful of new or larger stores that probably should be addressed because of their size or general locations. These retail outlets include a large Lowe's, an older but established Hitchcock's food store, and a Publix grocery. The latter opened after the date(s) recognized in the FEA inventory. All are fairly close to the proposed project.

To the degree the Walmart Supercenter represents the major commercial development activity in the general area, it would absorb most of the unmet need or new demand as the report and this review both suggest. The principal facility of concern appears to be the Lowe's. We agree with FEA's conclusion that Lowe's, because of its emphasis on homebuilding supplies is not really relevant to the remainder of the analysis and, if excluded, unmet demand for most retailing options would be much larger.

If unmet need is indeed understated - as we believe it is - than there would be additional opportunities for other retailers to enter the market. Further, existing retailers, whatever their type, have the opportunity to serve or capture at least some of this unmet need.

Specific to Hitchcock's, it is an open and operating store supported primarily through the market area's existing expenditures and should be relatively insulated from Walmart. It may be capable of increasing its sales activity by capturing some part of the estimated unmet demand in excess of its current sales.

The market share of Publix is a little less clear because the FEA report *does not* address its operation directly. However extending the logic and methods used in the FEA analysis, its share of market would be netted primarily, if not entirely, from the unmet need which is calculated. Assuming this is the case, our estimate of unmet need would be sufficient to accommodate *both* Walmart and Publix.

Impact on Other Retailers

Because unmet need is so large, the report concludes that Walmart will draw its customers primarily from the underserved demand segments. Again, we believe this to be the case but there could be some fallout among marginal businesses. From an analytical point of view, overall sales will be higher with resulting benefits flowing through on sales and property tax generated but the most inefficient local retailers could be challenged.

Economic Impact

We agree with output provided by FEA based on the key assumptions described and the analysis which precedes this part of the study.

Final Comments

We cannot opine precisely how the study submitted and reviewed reconciles to the other supporting and required materials but we believe the document justifies development of the larger project based on the general market and economic considerations described. Had we completed the study, as we understand the City's requirements, it would have taken a similar form and contained similar information. Respecting the views of different analysts, we believe several key numbers may have been conservative and others less so but the materiality of the final conclusion remains unchanged.

From a policy standpoint, the analysis signals opportunities to support not just the proposed Walmart development but other retail options as well.

Sincerely,

**Community Solutions Group,
a GAI Consultants, Inc.
Service Group**




Owen M. Beitsch, PhD, FAICP, CRE
Senior Director



David R. Darsey
Senior Director

OMB/DRD/shw



15100 NW 142nd Terrace
Alachua, FL 32615
Phone: 386-418-6100
Fax: 386-418-6130
www.cityofalachua.com

Justin Tabor, AICP
Planner
jtabor@cityofalachua.com

Work Experience

City of Alachua, Alachua, FL

November 2012 - Present

Principal Planner

June 2007 – November 2012

Planner

- ❖ Responsible for the review of development applications, including comprehensive plan amendments, rezonings, planned developments, text amendments (Comprehensive Plan and Land Development Regulations), certificates of appropriateness, site plans, subdivisions (preliminary/final plats), special exception permits, and variances to determine compliance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations
- ❖ Maintains Concurrency Management System according to the procedures required by City's Land Development Regulations and Florida Statutes
- ❖ Serves as project manager of staff-initiated amendments (comprehensive plan amendments, rezonings, text amendments) and authors amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and Land Development Regulations, including amendments to signage regulations, site/architectural design standards, permitted uses/use types, and development review procedures
- ❖ Prepares and presents Staff Reports to appointed and elected officials at public hearings
- ❖ Completed a comprehensive review of land use/zoning Geographic Information Systems (GIS) data to update data and to verify data accuracy
- ❖ Responsible for continued maintenance and accuracy of GIS land use/zoning data
- ❖ Reviews building permits and local business tax receipt applications to determine compliance with City regulations
- ❖ Assists the public with questions, comments, and concerns related to city regulations, processes, and procedures and development applications

Orange County Board of County Commissioners, Orlando, FL

January 2007 – May 2007

Planning Intern

- ❖ Prepared study of conservation subdivision design to analyze applicability and benefit to County
- ❖ Authored amendments to incorporate conservation subdivision design standards into the Comprehensive Plan and assisted with the creation of implementing zoning regulations
- ❖ Served as project manager for comprehensive plan amendments

Other Employment History/Work Experience

Walt Disney World Resort, Lake Buena Vista, FL

August 2004 – May 2007

- ❖ Attractions Host: Continuous interaction with park guests, providing exceptional customer service to ensure a memorable vacation experience

Education & Certification

Bachelor of Arts, University of Central Florida, 2007

Major: Public Administration

Minor: Urban & Regional Planning

American Institute of Certified Planners – 025477, 2011

Boards, Volunteer Experience, Professional Associations

American Planning Association, San Felasco Chapter (2007 – Present)

Member

Northridge Property Owner's Association (2010 – 2015)

Vice President

SERGIO REYES, PE

President, Director of Engineering



YEARS OF PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Total | 35

eda | 24

EDUCATION

- B.S., Civil Engineering, St. Thomas University, Bogotá, Colombia
- Post-graduate Courses, University of Florida

PROFESSIONAL REGISTRATIONS

- Professional Engineer, Florida, No. 47311

AFFILIATIONS

- American Water Works Association
- American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE)

Mr. Reyes has been a crucial member of eda's team of engineers for the past 24 years. Having 35 years of combined experience, he has worked with public and private sector clients to provide solutions to their varied development needs, from small office buildings and restaurants to large subdivisions and shopping centers.

Mr. Reyes provides design of stormwater drainage facilities and water distribution for several agencies, including Gainesville Regional Airport and Alachua County Public Works. He is the Project Manager for annual contracts with the University of Florida, Gainesville Regional Utilities, Alachua County, City of Alachua, City of Gainesville, City of Newberry, and the Cedar Key Water and Sewer District.

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

- Celebration Pointe Transit Oriented Development (TOD)
- Park Avenue at Santa Fe Apartments and Shopping Center
- Lake City Surgical Center at Cypress Lake Business Park
- Clay Electric Cooperative Lake City District Office, Columbia County
- Alachua County Library District - Tower Road Branch Expansion
- Alachua County Supervisor of Elections Offices, Gainesville
- City of Gainesville Public Works Addition
- Gainesville Regional Utilities (GRU) - Eastside Operations Center
- Gainesville-Alachua County Regional Airport - Master Plan Update
- Gainesville-Alachua County Regional Airport - Access Road
- Reconstruction of NW 154th Avenue

AREAS OF SPECIALIZATION

- Land Development Design and Permitting
- Stormwater Facilities
- Water Distribution Systems
- Waste Water Facilities (including reclaimed water systems)
- Stormwater Systems
- Road Design



Engineering & Consulting, Inc.

CIRRICULUM VITAE

Kenneth L. Hill, P.E.
Principal Engineer

Areas of Specialization:

- ◆ Geotechnical Engineering
- ◆ Slope Stability Analyses
- ◆ Surcharge Design and Analyses
- ◆ Sinkhole Evaluations
- ◆ Geotechnical Explorations
- ◆ Embankment Design
- ◆ Dam & Levee Foundation Design
- ◆ Settlement Analyses
- ◆ Roadway Soil Surveys
- ◆ Mechanically Stabilized Earth
- ◆ Shallow Foundation Analyses
- ◆ Bridge Foundation Analyses
- ◆ Drilled Pier Foundations
- ◆ Pavement Design
- ◆ Groundwater Monitoring Systems
- ◆ Driven Pile Foundations
- ◆ Driven Pile and Drilled Shaft Load Testing

Education:

1983 B.S., Civil Engineering
 University of Missouri - Rolla

Registration:

Professional Engineer (Civil):
Florida - 40146
Georgia - 18552

Professional Summary:

Mr. Hill is involved in project management and technical design and analyses for a wide variety of geotechnical studies for both public and private clients throughout north central Florida, including the Florida Department of Transportation and the University of Florida. He has over 30 years of experience involving planning, management, and performance of geotechnical projects, analyzing and evaluating data and providing recommendations for over 7,000 geotechnical design projects. Mr. Hill is a registered engineer in Florida and Georgia. His extensive technical and design capabilities include the following:



Representative Project Experience:

- ◆ I-75 Widening through Paynes Prairie, Alachua County, Florida – Mr. Hill performed the geotechnical evaluation of lane additions over soft clay fill. During construction, soft clays were found beneath the proposed lane additions. The design recommendations included placing geogrids on the subgrade and in the center of the base course. The recommendations reduced the undercutting and construction costs, and kept the project on schedule.
- ◆ Various forensic and subsidence investigations, North Central Florida Area – Mr. Hill has managed 1000+ forensic and sinkhole investigations for homeowners and insurance companies to determine the cause(s) of damage to structures. The investigation methods included visual observations, soil borings, and laboratory testing of soils, compaction tests and geophysical investigation methods.
- ◆ University of Florida Ben Hill Griffin Stadium, Press Box Tower Expansion, Gainesville, Florida – Mr. Hill managed the geotechnical exploration for an approximate 7-story addition to the Press Box Tower at Florida Field. Cast-in-place concrete piles were used to support the addition, due to the very heavy structural loads.
- ◆ I-75 Widening, S.R. 222 to Santa Fe River, Alachua County, Florida – Mr. Hill managed the geotechnical evaluation of 18 miles of lane and bridge widening for FDOT.
- ◆ Health Professions, Nursing and Pharmacy Complex, Shands Hospital, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida – Mr. Hill performed the geotechnical evaluation of the four story, steel frame hospital. The recommendations included using stone columns to improve soft zones of the subgrade to reduce settlements of the shallow foundations.
- ◆ Suwannee American Cement Company, Branford, Florida Cement Plant, Suwannee County, Florida – Mr. Hill performed the geotechnical and karst investigations of the \$140 million dollar cement plant. The recommendations included deep, drilled shafts for the very heavy structures, shallow foundations in conjunction with stone column improvement for moderately loaded structures, and shallow foundations for light structures.



- ◆ New Engineering Building, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida – Mr. Hill performed the geotechnical evaluation and supervised the construction testing of the three-story classroom building. The foundation recommendations were strip footings designed for a high bearing pressure.
- ◆ Ocala Regional Medical Center, New Satellite Hospital, Ocala, Florida – Mr. Hill performed the geotechnical and karst evaluations of the four- and seven-story hospital structure. The recommendations included shallow foundations and subgrade improvement with stone columns to improve soil support and reduce sinkhole potential.
- ◆ Heathbrook, Ocala, Florida – Mr. Hill managed the geotechnical evaluations of a 1200-acre residential golf course community.
- ◆ North End-Zone Stadium Seating Expansion, Ben Hill Griffin Stadium, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida – Mr. Hill performed the geotechnical evaluation and supervised the construction testing and pile load test of the 10,000-seat expansion. The structure was supported on cast-in-place concrete piles due to soft soil conditions.
- ◆ Florida Clinical Practice Associates, Gainesville, Florida – Mr. Hill managed the geotechnical evaluations and construction testing of the five-story medical office building and parking garage. The foundation recommendations consisted of strip footings at a high bearing pressure to resist potential swell movements of expansive clay soils.
- ◆ First Baptist Church, Ocala, Florida – Mr. Hill supervised the geotechnical evaluation and construction testing of the multi-story sanctuary and education buildings.

Resume

Brian D. Kanely, P.E.

Senior Traffic Engineer

Volkert, Inc.

3501 South Main Street

Suite 2

Gainesville, FL 32601

brian.kanely@volkert.com

Office: 352-240-7459

Cell: 352-262-3580

Work Experience

- Volkert, Inc., 9.5 years, Senior Traffic Engineer, (2007 – present)
- City of Gainesville, FL, 34.5 years, Traffic Engineering Director/Transportation Services Manager, (1973 – 2007)
- Washington DC, Council of Governments – Transportation Planning Section, Engineering Intern, (1972)

Professional License

- Professional Engineer, FL, No. 22592, 1977

Education

- MCE, North Carolina State University, 1972
- BSCE, North Carolina State University, 1969

Certifications

- FDOT Advanced Maintenance of Traffic Certificate
- City of Gainesville, FL, Emergency Management Training

Affiliations

- Institute of Transportation Engineers, Fellow
- American Society of Civil Engineers, Member

Recent Major Project Experience with Volkert, Inc.

- *Traffic Signal Design, NW 143rd Street & 32nd Avenue, Gainesville, Alachua County, FL.* Mr. Kanely was the Engineer of Record and Project Engineer for this traffic signal design project. His responsibilities included all the basic components associated with the traffic signal design, coordination of traffic signal pole designs with the Volkert Structural Section, assisting with utility relocation activities, design of traffic signs and pavement markings for the project and computation of project quantities.
- *Traffic Signal Clearance Retiming Project, Sumter County, FL.* Mr. Kanely was responsible for computing the new traffic signal clearance timings (Yellow, All Red, Walk & Don't Walk) for the fifty traffic signals in Sumter County maintained by Sumter County Public Works. The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) issued new requirements for traffic signal clearance timings for traffic signals on state roads with a required date for installation. Mr. Kanely obtained the necessary field information, the existing signal timings and computed the

new traffic signal clearance timings for the signals on state and county roads that satisfied the new FDOT requirements. The new clearance timings were approved by the FDOT and were forwarded to the County's signal contractor for installation.

- *Traffic Safety Feasibility Study for 3 Schools, Seminole, Pinellas County, FL.* Mr. Kanely was responsible for developing the Design Traffic Memorandum for this school safety related project. The objective of this project is to explore roadway widening options, traffic signal modifications and traffic sign/pavement markings/school zone enhancements for improving school safety at three public schools in Pinellas County near the intersection of 131st St North/86th Avenue North. The project included obtaining manual traffic/pedestrian/bicycle counts at numerous locations, assisting with traffic software modeling activities at three project intersections, interviews with the school principals, analysis of traffic crash data and evaluation of the existing school traffic safety infrastructure. The Design Traffic Memorandum included preparation of all traffic count data, working with the Pinellas County MPO to develop a methodology to compute future traffic volumes, the existing and future level of service at the three critical intersections, recommendations for traffic signal and roadway modifications at the 131st St/86th Avenue intersection and enhancements to the school safety infrastructure at all three schools. The recommendations in the Design Traffic Memorandum were critical to developing roadway widening options, traffic signal modifications and enhancements to school zones to improve school safety at all three schools.
- *County Road 48 Safety Project, Sumter County, FL.* Mr. Kanely was the Traffic Engineer for the C-48 highway safety project in Sumter County, FL. The C-48 safety project was a FDOT funded roadway safety project designed to reduce traffic crashes at several high crash locations along C-48 and improve overall highway safety along the length of C-48. Mr. Kanely was responsible for the no passing zone study for C-48, obtained spot speed studies along C-48 for a review of the existing speed limits and the review/modifications to the traffic signage and pavement markings on C-48. The C-48 project added paved shoulders to the roadway, corrected super elevation at several sharp curves, added guardrail as required and made numerous drainage improvements to the C-48 corridor.
- *Highway Safety Program, Sumter County, FL.* Volkert serves as the traffic safety engineer for the Sumter County Public Works Division and is responsible for the development of a county wide traffic safety program. Mr. Kanely is responsible for the development of studies, reports, data collection and coordination of meetings for the highway safety program. The goal of the highway safety program is to identify locations that are candidates for roadway related safety improvements using Federal Highway Safety funds, with the emphasis being on acquiring as much outside funding as possible. The project includes a countywide screening of traffic accident data, development of candidate projects, establishment of a Traffic Safety Work Group, coordination with the FDOT and assisting the County with developing scope of services for grant projects.
- *ITS Architecture, Sumter County, FL.* In conjunction with its engineering contract with Sumter County, FL, Volkert prepared the ITS Architecture for Sumter County. The County is in the initial phase of planning for a countywide Advanced Traffic Management System and the FDOT required that the ITS Architecture be development and approved before funding would be programmed for the ITS Planning Study. Mr. Kanely worked with a sub-consultant to

develop and obtain approval for the Sumter County ITS Architecture that meet FDOT and FHWA requirements.

- *The Villages Traffic Crash Report, Sumter County, FL.* As a component of the Sumter County Highway Safety Program, Mr. Kanely prepared a comprehensive traffic crash report for the traffic signals in The Villages and at median openings on major county roads in The Villages. The Villages is a large retirement community and is one of the fastest growing communities in the country. A comprehensive review of traffic crashes in The Villages had never been performed prior to this study. The report examined traffic crashes for the five year period 2010 – 2014. The results of the report will be utilized for identifying locations eligible for federal and state traffic safety funding and for traffic enforcement and education activities.
- *Florida Turnpike Detour for the C-468 Roadway Widening Project, Sumter County, FL.* Mr. Kanely was responsible for developing a detour design for Florida Turnpike traffic associated with a roadway widening project, C-468, in Sumter County, FL. The C-468 project included building a new bridge over the Florida Turnpike in Sumter County. The bridge construction required that all traffic be detoured off the turnpike and onto the adjacent state/county roads during nighttime hours for several days while the bridge beams were lifted into place. The detour plan required exploring several detour routes, driving the possible detour routes at night to determine existing conditions, coordination of detour activities with FDOT and County personnel and assisting with the detour plans in the roadway design packet.
- *No Passing Zone Study, Nassau County, FL.* Mr. Kanely was the Project Engineer and Engineer of Record for a no passing zone project in Nassau County. The FDOT had identified five County roads in Nassau County (total of 29 miles) that were experiencing high traffic crash rates and authorized a no passing zone study. Mr. Kanely was responsible for all inventory/field work, establishing the new no passing zones, sign and pavement marking designs, roadway plans, writing the No Passing Zone Study and coordinating construction issues with the FDOT construction manager.
- *SR 16 Detour Analysis at Wards Creek, St. Johns County, FL.* The FDOT was planning a major culvert replacement project on SR 16 at Wards Creek in western St. Johns County. An important component of the project was to examine and prepare a recommendation on whether to detour traffic around the construction site or build a temporary roadway adjacent to the construction site. The detour/temporary roadway would be in place for six months. Mr. Kanely was responsible for preparing and analyzing the detour route option. Mr. Kanely reviewed roadway conditions, travel times, impact on emergency services/school bus routes and interviewed management personnel at St. Johns County Public Works Department. Due to the substandard roadway conditions on the detour route and adverse impact on travel times for emergency services/school bus schedules Volkert recommended the temporary roadway option adjacent to the construction site be selected.
- *West 6th Street Rail Trail, Section 3, City of Gainesville, FL.* Mr. Kanely was the Project Engineer and Engineer of Record for the West 6th Street Rail Trail, Section 3, in the City of Gainesville, FL. Section 3 was 0.7 miles in length, presented numerous ADA challenges and required coordination with the FDOT due to trail crossings at two state roads. The rail trail links with other pedestrian/bicycle facilities near the University of Florida campus and is used by hundreds of students/residents each day as an important commuter and recreational facility.

- *Independent Review of Traffic Impact Analysis for the Cellon Creek Preserve Development Project, City of Alachua, Alachua County, FL.* The City of Alachua retained Volkert to conduct an independent review of the traffic impact analysis for the Cellon Creek Preserve mixed use project adjacent to US 441 in the City of Alachua. Mr. Kanely was responsible for preparing the independent review. The review included the project impact/study area, existing and future roadway capacities, project trip generation and distribution, roadway link/intersection analysis, background traffic and site access. The independent review discovered numerous inconsistencies with the original traffic impact analysis and recommended a follow up study to address the problems with the original traffic impact analysis. The independent review also recommended that the City of Alachua take steps to improve its traffic study requirements and methodology in its land development regulations.

Experience with the City of Gainesville, FL.

- Mr. Kanely worked for the City of Gainesville, FL, for thirty four years as Traffic Engineering Director/Transportation Services Manager. Mr. Kanely was responsible for the planning, design, construction, operations and maintenance of traffic engineering activities for the City. In addition to the traditional traffic engineering activities, Mr. Kanely was responsible for the City's parking programs, traffic calming activities which included the introduction of speed tables, mini traffic circles and roundabouts into the city and coordination of traffic and transportation activities with the FDOT and Alachua County.

Experience with the Washington DC, Council of Governments – Transportation Planning Section

- Following his discharge from the US Army and prior to his return to graduate school at North Carolina State University, Mr. Kanely worked for the Washington DC, Council of Governments – Transportation Planning Section during the spring and summer of 1972 as an engineering intern. Mr. Kanely was responsible for coding and analyzing roadway networks for computer analysis of various transportation facility alternatives for the Washington DC/suburban Maryland/Northern Virginia metropolitan area. The Council of Governments eventually became the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Washington DC metropolitan area when MPO's came into existence via Federal Highway legislation in the 1990's.

Planning | Urban Design
Landscape Architecture
Economics | Real Estate

Owen M. Beitsch, PhD, FAICP, CRE Senior Director, Economic and Real Estate Advisory Services

Education

Masters of Urban and Regional Planning, Florida State University
PhD Public Affairs, University of Central Florida

Registrations/Certifications

Fellow, American Institute of Certified Planners (AICP)
Counselor of Real Estate
Florida Real Estate License

Skills

Redevelopment Planning
Public Finance
Economic Analysis
Market Analysis
Developer Negotiations
Public – Private Partnerships

Affiliations

American Institute of Certified Planners
American Society of Real Estate Counselors
Orlando Neighborhood Improvement Corporation, Chairman
Associate Editor, Real Estate Issues
Xentury City Community Development District, Assistant Chairman
Orlando Housing Authority, Commissioner
Affordable Housing Work Group, Florida Chapter of the American Planning Association
Palm Beach Economic Council Housing Task Force
Mayor's Housing Advisory Panel, City of Orlando
Winter Park Economic Advisory Board
Winter Park Health Foundation

Academic Associations

University of Central Florida

- Adjunct Faculty
- Professor in Residence

Awards

University of Central Florida, Outstanding Alumni Award (2011)
Ballard Award, Recognition by Real Estate Issues for quality of research and writing (2011)
University of Central Florida, Recognition of Academic Excellence (2008)

Dr. Beitsch is active in the management and execution of complex studies for public and private clients with a particular interest in special issues confronting downtown and other urban areas, demonstrated by his civic as well as his business activities. He has held an active leadership role in the Tampa Downtown Partnership and is a founding member of the Orlando Neighborhood Improvement Corporation where he served as Chairman for four years.

Dr. Beitsch recently concluded eight years of service as a member of the Orlando Housing Authority Board of Commissioners. In 2010, he was named a Fellow in the American Institute of Certified Planners, the highest honor bestowed in the urban planning profession and awarded to only about three percent of those achieving certification (AICP).

Professional Experience

Highlights

- Selected by FDOT to identify and codify best practices for engaging the private sector in major transportation initiatives.
- Provided economic analysis supporting Florida East Coast Railroad's privately funded high speed rail proposal.
- Prepared documentation and cost allocation studies for the first schools in Florida to be funded through the state's statutes enabling Educational Benefit Districts.
- Helped develop the station prototype for FOX, Florida's first high speed rail consortium.

- Helped the city of Orlando develop a housing incentive program, focusing on offsets to parking costs and resulting in the first rental housing to be built in the city center in almost twenty years.
- Supported the strategy, closure, and ultimate redevelopment of Orlando's Naval Training Center, now Baldwin Park, one of the nation's most recognized NTD communities and the prototype offered by the Navy as the benchmark by which redeployed installations are evaluated.
- In conjunction with the Orlando Neighborhood Improvement Corporation (ONIC), helped secure the sale and conversion of several hundred units of military housing for private use. At the time, this project represented the state's largest redevelopment initiative focused exclusively on housing.
- Supported planning and disposition of Florida's Bay County Airport, allowing capital freed through the transaction to be applied to a substantially larger airport, enhancing the county's goals of economic development.
- Helped the City of Orlando to secure private capital for an interchange constructed near Universal Studios, applying a tandem special assessment district and community redevelopment area.
- Helped provide the financial underpinnings supporting rail or circulator systems in Tampa, Atlanta, Miami, and Orlando by aligning city goals with appropriate land use and entitlement strategies.

Policy or Redevelopment Planning

Naval Training Center, Orlando, FL; closure and negotiations

Inclusionary Housing, Miami, FL; ordinance and program reviews

State of Florida Office Protocol; policy document establishing procedures and provides for the acquiring of office space

High Speed Rail, Orlando, FL; strategic real estate analysis

Orlando Sports District, Orlando, FL; strategy for developing a master plan focused on Orlando's Citrus Bowl

West Palm Beach Airport, West Palm Beach, FL; development strategy for airport authority acquisition area

Universal Studios, Orlando, FL; tax increment analysis for proposed improvement district

Orange County Housing Authority, Orlando, FL; housing relocation and redevelopment plan

Japanese National Railroad, Orlando, FL; high-speed rail corridor study

Healthcare Facilities

Orlando Regional Healthcare System, Orlando, FL; strategic plan associated with downtown campus expansion

Florida Hospital, Orlando, FL; strategic plan associated with downtown campus expansion

SantaFe HealthCare/AvMed, Gainesville, FL; reuse analysis for existing campus master plan

University of Central Florida Medical School, Orlando, FL; economic impact analysis

Meeting and Other Public Assembly Facilities

Orange County Convention and Civic Center, Orlando, FL; market and financial analysis

Rhode Island Convention Center, Providence, RI; market, financial and economic analysis; developer negotiations

Broward County Convention Center, Ft. Lauderdale, FL; market, financial and economic analysis; developer negotiations

Washington State Convention Center, Seattle, WA; delegate expenditure survey

Savannah Convention Center, Savannah, GA; market and financial analysis

Commercial

Village West, Kansas City, KS; financing plan
Orlando Central Park, Orlando, FL; strategic plan
Lockheed-Martin, Orlando, FL; strategic plan
Daytona Rising, Daytona, FL; feasibility analysis for speedway retail complex
Universal Studios, Orlando, FL; valuation for interchange financing
Orlando International Airport, Orlando, FL; feasibility analysis for industrial facility, ongoing advising services

Recreational or Special Use

New England Aquarium, Boston, MA; market and financial analysis for proposed expansion
Tampa Port Authority, Tampa, FL; leasehold negotiations with proposed Florida Aquarium
Disney Development, Orlando, FL; concept plan for evening recreational facilities
Audubon Society, Yeehaw Junction, FL; market analysis for proposed wildlife sanctuary

Housing

Orlando Utilities Commission, Orlando, FL; financial analysis for proposed apartments
Celebration, Kissimmee, FL; market and financial analysis for Disney planned resort housing
Magnolia Ranch, Kissimmee, FL; market and financial analysis for Disney planned primary community
Perdido Bay, Pensacola, FL; market analysis for existing resort community

Major Publications

- Beitsch, O. (2015). *Private P-3's and economic development: The role of plans*, appearing in Financing of Public Transportation Infrastructure: Utilizing Public-Private Partnerships, L. Martin and W. Lawther (editors). Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Seidel, V. & Beitsch, O. (March, 2014) Evaluating coastal real estate value vs. risk in the wake of sea level rise. *Real Estate Issues*.
- Beitsch, O. (November, 2013). The consequences of tax exempt debt for private real estate development: The case of the Villages. *Real Estate Issues*.
- Beitsch, O. & Kohler, T. (2010). Creating and using redevelopment incentives. Tallahassee: Florida Redevelopment Association.
- Beitsch, O. (2009). Not in our backyard. Plans, planners, regulators, and the new redlining. *Real Estate Issues*.
- Beitsch, O. & Lawther, W. (2008). Accountability in privatization of infrastructure [Monograph]. Distributed at SECOPA: Orlando.
- Beitsch, O. (2005). Democratic voices speaking loudly: Does public participation yield accountability in special purpose governments? Orlando, Florida: University of Central Florida.
- Solin, L., Withers, B., Beitsch, O. Fish, F. et al (1997). Professional practice manual. Chicago: American Planning Association.
- Owen, W. and Beitsch, O. (1997). An introduction to the concept of sports facilities as tools for economic activity. *Real Estate Issues*. April.
- Beitsch, O. (1994). *Market analysis*, appearing in McGraw-Hill Real Estate Development Handbook, R. Irwin (editor). Los Angeles: McGraw-Hill.
- Beitsch, O. (1992). Funding infrastructure, An overview. *Real Estate Finance*. Winter.
- Beitsch, O. (1991). Aquarium revenue support new development. *Urban Land*, February.

Other articles

- Beitsch, O. (2015). Road to Recovery IV: America is Grounded, appearing in GAI blog at http://gaiconsultants.com/resources/featured_stories/
- Beitsch, O. (2014). The Metropolitan Revolution: How Cities and Metros are Fixing our Broken Politics and Fragile Economy, (Book Review). *Real Estate Issues*.
- Delong, T. & Beitsch, O. (2013). The current state of Florida's economy: When will it recover? *Florida Planning*. Summer.
- Beitsch, O. (2012). Florida's ad valorem tax stifles growth. *Orlando Sentinel*. July 24.
- Beitsch, O. (2011). Tax policy and the current state budget. *Orlando Business Journal*. May 6.
- Beitsch, O. (2011). One dimensional analysis. [Commentary]. *Planning Magazine*. February.
- Beitsch, O. (2009). Barriers to privatization. [Commentary]. *Planning Magazine*. January.
- Beitsch, O. (2008). Property taxation, rhetoric and reality in Florida: The unchanged burden. *Florida Planning*. January.
- Beitsch, O. (1988). Market Profiles. Washington, D.C.: Urban Land Institute.
- Beitsch, O. (1987). Market Profiles Washington, D.C.: Urban Land Institute.
- Beitsch, O. (1986). A warm welcome for meetings. *Orbus*, September.

Principal Citations and References

- Chaffin, L.Y. (2013). The War Against Joblessness: US Intervention in State Labor Markets in Response to Economic Recessions.
- Chen, C. A., Berman, E. M., West, J. P., & Eger III, R. J. (2013). *Community Commitment in Special Districts*. *International Public Management Journal*.
- Berman, E & West, J. (2012). *Public values in special districts: A survey of managerial commitment*. *Public Administration Review*. January /February.
- Richardson, S. A., & Richardson, S. A. (2010). Assessing the economic justification for government involvement in sports facilities and events in New Zealand: *a thesis presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Economics*. Massey University, Manawatu campus: New Zealand.
- Kiliç, G. et al. (2009). Planning ethics at local level. Yüce-tepe Ankara Turkey: Council of Ethics for the Public Service of the Republic of Turkey.
- Cordery, C. (2008). Dimensions of accountability: Voices from New Zealand primary health organizations. Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University.
- Berman, E. (2006). Performance and productivity in public and nonprofit organizations. Armonk, New York: ME Sharpe Inc.
- Velt, T. (2005). A prescription for work. *Texture Magazine* January.
- Keshock, C. (2004). The effects of economic impact information on the attitudes of potential sports sponsors operating in mid-size and small college communities. Tallahassee: Florida State University.
- Markus, P. (2002). Forms of co-financing of the stadium in German professional soccer: An institutional economics based, model-theoretic study. Tuebingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck
- Allen, M. (2000). Smoothing wrinkles in the spread: Special assessment issues. *Appraisal Journal*. April.
- Steele, C. (2000). The effect of baseball's arrival on an African American community: A study of contested terrain. Santa Barbara, CA: Fielding Institute.

Major Presentations

- *The emerging models for public-private partnerships in Florida*, Florida Chapter of American Planning Association, State Conference Association (2013).
- *Value Changes in Corridors*, Florida Chapter of American Planning Association, State Conference Association (2013).

- *The community development district in Florida; What is its future role in financing?* Florida Chapter of American Planning Association, State Conference Association (2013).
- *Public-private partnerships in transition*, American Planning Association, National Conference (2013).
- When public-private partnerships may not be beneficial, Florida Chapter of American Planning Association, State Conference Association (2011).
- *Trends: Economics, demographic, and infrastructure*, Urban Land Institute, Orlando Conference (2010). Incubators and their role in economic development, Florida Chapter of American Planning Association, State Conference Association (2010).
- *Private capital for infrastructure*, International Downtown Association, National Conference (2009).
- *Privatization of infrastructure and services*, Florida Chapter of American Planning Association, State Conference (2009).
- *Accountability in privatization of infrastructure*, Southeast Conference of Public Administrators, (2008).
- *Platted lands, economic and planning issues*, Florida Chapter of American Planning Association, State Conference (2008).
- *Linking planning, financing and policy for affordable housing*, Florida Chapter of American Planning Association, State Conference (2008).
- *And how to achieve affordable housing?* Urban Land Institute, Orlando Conference (2008).
- *Capital and infrastructure in the era of Strand*, Urban Land Institute, Tampa Conference (2008).
- *Florida's changing demographics*, Florida Association of Building Officials, State Conference (2006).
- Land valuation strategies, NASA Real Estate and Administrative Managers, National Conference (2004).
- *Impacts of transit oriented design in real estate development*, Florida Chapter of American Planning Association, State Conference (1998).
- *Techniques of population estimates and projections*, Florida Chapter of American Planning Association, State Conference Association (1997).
- *Tax increment: trends and applications*, American Planning Association, National Conference (1996).
- *Sports facilities in public planning*, American Society of Landscape Architects, National Conference (1995).
- *Sports facilities in planning*, Florida Chapter of American Planning Association, State Conference (1995).

David R. Darsey
Senior Director, Economic and Real Estate Advisory Services

Education

B.S. Accounting, University of Florida
M.B.A. University of Florida

Registrations/Certifications

Real Estate License, Florida

Skills

Market Analysis
Financial and Feasibility Studies
Economic Development Studies
Private Public Partnerships

Professional Employment

Real Estate Research Consultants, Inc. (RERC)
Disney Development Company
Laventhol & Horwath

Mr. Darsey has over 25 years of real estate consulting and development experience with a wide variety of real estate projects. His involvement with consulting and development has included assignments in the fields of real estate market and financial analysis for a diverse group of clients.

Mr. Darsey's area of specialization includes project concept development and site analysis; market analysis and competitive project evaluation; sales and property tax analysis to support publicly issued revenue bonds; evaluation of prospective financial operation analysis of economic and fiscal benefits; and identification of funding alternatives.

Professional Experience

Public-Private Partnerships – Revenue Bonds

Unified Government of Wyandotte County, Kansas City, KS – The Village West Redevelopment Area retail and entertainment complex involving Cabela's, Nebraska Furniture Mart, Legends Outlets Kansas City retail area, four hotels and numerous restaurants. A \$174,025,000 bond issue sold in July 2005. GAI principals updated the analysis in 2010 for \$150,289,489 bond issue sold that year. An additional update was completed in 2014 that will be used for a planned future bond sale.

Raymore Galleria, the City of Raymore, MO – The Raymore Galleria project involved estimating sales and property taxes for a new retail center. Approximately \$16,000,000 in bonds were sold in 2014, secured by the revenue streams estimated by GAI principals.

City of Dodge City, KS – Retained to estimate the Sales Tax Anticipation Revenue (STAR) bond revenue that would be generated within the downtown's Heritage Area. New operators within the area include a lodging property, water park, RV campground, and retail and restaurant space. That analysis was completed in September 2014.

City of Liberty, MO – The proposed 345,000 square foot Liberty Commons retail project required estimating future sales tax and property tax revenues generated by development within the Tax Increment Financing district (TIF) and available to support public financing. The City anticipates issuing bonds that would be backed by these revenue streams in 2015.

City of Manhattan, KS – Downtown redevelopment project totaling 300,000 square feet of retail and restaurants, two hotels, conference center, assisted living facility and rental apartments. Bonds totaling \$71,220,000 issued in 2009.

Ohio County Development Authority, Wheeling, WV – The Highlands 2,500,000 square foot retail complex, involving a \$99,000,000 bond issue. The bonds were issued and sold in May 2006. Updated analysis resulted in additional bond issue of \$51,580,000 in April 2007. Projected property tax increment for \$14,000,000 bond issue in 2007.

Schlitterbahn Vacation Village in Kansas City, Kansas – Proposed indoor-outdoor water park, 500,000 square feet of retail/entertainment area and 500 hotel rooms. A \$200,000,000 bond issue has been proposed.

City of Louisville, KY – Museum Plaza, a proposed mixed use project with 300,000 square feet of office, 188 condos, 262 hotel rooms, 35,000 square feet of retail. Analyzed pending bond issue financed by sales tax, property tax, and corporate and individual income tax from on-site employees and companies.

Land Development

HealthPark Florida, Ft. Myers, FL – Market implications for master plan revisions

Baldwin Park, Orlando, FL – Financial analysis for redevelopment options at the former Orlando Naval Training Center

Celebration, FL – Financial development pro-forma; Analysis of comparable "town center" projects

Rotonda Communities, Charlotte County, FL – Five year business plan

MetroWest, Orlando, FL – Market analysis of potential development options

Numerous condominium market analyses in downtown Orlando:

- The Vue, 374 units, completed
- Paramount at Lake Eola, 312 units, completed
- The Waverly, 230 units, successful apartment conversion
- The Grande, 364 units, successful apartment conversion
- The Cristal, 60 units on top of luxury hotel, proposed
- Presidential Towers, 462 units, proposed

Grand Bohemian, St. Petersburg, FL – 50 units on top of luxury hotel

Marriott Hotel, Sarasota, FL – 45 units on top of hotel, in planning

Tarragon Development – Conducted 12 market studies for apartment to condominium conversions in Orlando, Jacksonville, Tampa, Melbourne and Sarasota.

ZOM Florida – 483 unit Baldwin Harbor Apartments, Orlando, Florida

Echelon at Cheney Place Apartments – Downtown Orlando, Florida

Downtown Orlando Housing Study – City of Orlando, Florida

Downtown Bradenton Apartment Study – City of Bradenton, Florida
Broadstreet Partners – Proposed apartments in southwest Orlando and Winter Springs
Ryland Homes – Analysis of market demand and pricing for proposed single family home sites in Central Florida
The Meadows – Proposed short-term rental project in Polk County, Florida

Commercial Real Estate

Fashion Square Mall, Orlando, FL – Market analysis for redevelopment options
Progress Pointe, Winter Park, FL – Market analysis for office and retail project
Winter Springs Town Center, Winter Springs, FL – Office market analysis
Carrier Business Park, Orlando, FL – Office market analysis
Center Place, Orlando, FL – Downtown office market analysis
Celebration Hotel, Orlando, FL – Market analysis and product positioning for a proposed meeting oriented hotel
Four Corners, Windermere, FL – Market and financial analysis for proposed retail and office development options
Lake Park Marina, Lake Park, FL – Market analysis for proposed marina expansion
Retail Center, Gary, IN – Market analysis for proposed retail center adjacent to gaming casinos in Buffington Harbor

Community Planning and Development

City of Orlando, FL – Downtown area-wide DRI; Tax increment projections for downtown community redevelopment area; Office demand analysis for downtown area; Downtown housing demand study
City of Mount Dora, FL – Projected future retail and industrial development in proposed new employment center adjacent to Wekiva Parkway
Ben White Raceway, Orlando, FL – Potential redevelopment options for former racetrack
City of Raleigh, NC – Residential and commercial downtown redevelopment potential
City of Naples, FL – Tax increment projections for community redevelopment area
City of Cape Coral, FL – Tax increment projections for community development area

Recreational and Resort Facilities

NASA Visitor's Center Complex at Kennedy Space Center Florida – Market analysis for new attractions, lodging and meeting facilities
Sunken Gardens, St. Petersburg, FL – Market and financial analysis for attraction purchased by City of St. Petersburg
USS Forrestal Sea, Air and Space Museum, Tampa, FL – Market and financial analysis for conversion of an aircraft carrier to a public museum/attraction
Royal Gorge Tourism Plan, Canon City, CO – Market demand and financial performance of tourist-oriented development options at Royal Gorge Park
Grand Cypress Resort and Walt Disney World, Orlando, FL – Golf course market demand analysis
Lodging Analysis – Numerous studies for proposed hotels in Orlando, Cocoa Beach, Destin, Pensacola, St. Petersburg Beach and Melbourne, Florida

Public Assembly Facilities

Orange County Convention Center, Orlando, FL
Expo Centre, Orlando, FL
Seminole County Meeting Center, Seminole County, FL
Osceola County Convention Center, Osceola County, FL
Southwest Volusia County Meeting Center, Deltona, FL

Brevard County Meeting Center, Melbourne, FL
University of Central Florida Convocation Center, Orlando, FL
Marion County Convention Center, Ocala, FL
Alachua County Meeting Center, Gainesville, FL
Savannah International Trade and Convention Center, Savannah, GA
New Yankee Stadium Site Analysis, New York, NY
Georgia Dome Stadium, Atlanta, GA
Camden Yards Stadium, Baltimore, MD
Milwaukee Brewers Stadium, Milwaukee, WI
Outdoor Concert Amphitheaters, Atlanta, Boston, West Palm Beach and Ocean City, Maryland



Brian Cassidy, P.E.

Project Engineer / Inspector

15 Total Years of Experience • 15 Years with CPH

Experience

Mr. Cassidy serves CPH as Project Engineer. He is responsible for the design and permitting of utility systems and stormwater systems associated with commercial and residential development. Mr. Cassidy has served public and private clientele by providing various utility and land development designs and permitting throughout Northeast Florida.

Education

B.S. in Civil Engineering, University of North Florida, 2002

Professional Registrations, Certifications, Memberships


Professional Engineer – FL (No. 67373)

Key Strengths

- Expert in design of site civil improvements for pipe and vertical construction projects
- Permitted in excess of a hundred civil site projects through North Florida regulatory agencies including the City of Jacksonville
- Design and construction experience in wastewater facilities
- Highly experienced in construction administration services for general site and treatment facility projects
- Stormwater Management Facility Design
- Stormwater Master Planning



Jacksonville Beach Sewer



Atlantic Beach Master Plan



Wal-Mart SuperCenter



Lake City WWTP

Representative Projects

- Lake City WWTP
- Brannan Field Walk - Middleburg, FL
- Wal-Mart Watermain Extension for Kimco Developers - Middleburg, FL
- Wal-Mart SuperCenter - Orange Park, FL
- Jacksonville Beach Sewer
- City of Quincy Forcemain Extension
- Car Spa, Car Wash - Orange Park, FL
- Wal-Mart SuperCenter, Blanding Blvd & Brannan Field Road - Middleburg, FL
- Atlantic Beach Intracoastal Waterway Park Master Plan
- Lancaster Correctional Institute, Trenton, FL

Detailed Project Descriptions

Atlantic Beach Intracoastal Waterway Park Master Plan

- Developed a Master Plan for three City parks (Tideviews, Dutton Island & River Branch Preserves) which encompass approximately 385 acres contiguous with the ICW in Duval County, Florida
- The plan promoted passive recreation and environmental education opportunities including identification of citizen stakeholder groups
- Also recommended a long range Capital Improvement Plan

City of Quincy Forcemain Extension

- Design, permitting and construction observation of approximately 5 miles of 8-inch forcemain for the City of Quincy under a CDBG grant
- Approximately 800 LF directional drill under an existing creek and connection to the existing headworks of the wastewater treatment plant

City of Jacksonville Beach Arden Way Gravity Sewer and Forcemain Relocation

- Design, permitting and construction observation of approximately 1 mile of gravity sewer and forcemain.
- Project involved work within an established residential neighborhood.

Car Spa, Car Wash - Orange Park, FL

- Design and Permitting for a car wash with drive thru on one (1) acre
- Permits obtained through FDOT, SJRWMD, and Clay County
- Cost approximately \$11 million

Wal-Mart SuperCenter, Blanding Blvd & Branam Field Road - Middleburg, FL

- Design and Permitting of new Wal-Mart SuperCenter on 30 acres
- Permitting through SJRWMD, COE, and Clay County
- Cost approximately \$15 million

Brannan Field Walk - Middleburg, FL

- Design and permitting of nine (9) commercial outparcels on 15 acres
- Permitting through SJRWMD and Clay County

Wal-Mart Extension for Kimco Developers - Middleburg, FL

- Design and permitting of approximately 2,000 LF of 12" watermain in public right-of-way
- Involved jack and bore under six (6) lane state highway
- Cost approximately \$750,000

Wal-Mart SuperCenter - Orange Park, FL

- Design and permitting of commercial Wal-Mart SuperCenter
- Approximately 30 acres
- Permitting through SJRWMD, COE, Clay County, and FDOT
- Cost approximately \$30 million

Lancaster Correctional Institute - Trenton, FL

- Design and permitting of two new Correctional Institute Buildings
- Stormwater Management Facility and Utility Infrastructure design to serve new facilities
- Permitting through SRWMD



Javier E. Omana, CNU-a Senior Planner

32 Total Years of Experience • 15 Years with CPH

Experience

Mr. Omana serves CPH as Vice President of Land Planning Services and Senior Planner. His professional experience encompasses a wide range of land development planning activities that include: land use feasibility studies, master planning, site planning, Developments of Regional Impact (DRI), rezonings, entitlement acquisitions, permitting, and governmental approvals. Mr. Omana has master planned/designed, and obtained development approvals for a host of projects ranging from small sites to large scale DRI's.

Education

M.A. in Urban and Regional Planning, Concentration: Land Planning & Urban Design, University of Florida

B.S. in Business Administration, Concentration: Economics, University of Florida


Professional Registrations, Certifications, Memberships

CNU-a Accredited Member

Key Strengths

- Property Entitlements Acquisition
- Land Use Feasibility Reports
- Land Planning/Master Planning
- Site Planning
- Project Management
- Developments of Regional Impact
- Comprehensive Planning
- Land Use Amendments/Rezoning
- Expert Testimony

Sarasota Interstate Park of Commerce



CRA area US 17-92 / Triplet Lake



Miracle City Mall



Lake Mary Small Area Study




Sanford 1st Street Streetscape



San Pedro Center



Atlantic Beach Master Plan



58th Street Master Plan



Representative Projects

- Sarasota Interstate Park of Commerce (SIPOC) DRI
- Seminole Commons
- Delaney Nursing Home
- San Pedro Center, Adult Retirement / Mixed-Use Community
- Ocean Hammock Resort / Harborside Inn and Marina
- Sabal Point Golf Club
- Sanford 1st Street Streetscape Improvements
- Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) area US 17-92 / Triplet Lake
- 58th Street Master Plan
- Miracle City Mall
- John Young Parkway / Magic Way Facilities Campus
- Ravaudage Mixed-Use, Infill-Redevelopment Project
- Canovanas Plaza Retail Center
- Santa Monica Recreational and Residential Resort
- Dubai Student Village
- Lake Mary Small Area Study
- Winter Springs Market Square

Detailed Project Descriptions

Sarasota Interstate Park of Commerce (SIPOC) DRI – University Town Center

- The project consisted of approximately 2.54 miles of multi-lane urban roadway including six roads, three traffic circles and six signalized intersections.
- CPH provided general traffic engineering services including access management studies, traffic volume projections and traffic signal warrant analysis.

Delaney Nursing Home

- CPH conducted a parking study to determine peak hour usage to establish appropriate number of parking spaces.
- Evaluated medical personnel, visitor, vendor and administrative personnel work shifts to ascertain parking loads.
- This study was part of a Master Plan and Rezoning effort.

Seminole Commons

- CPH conducted a parking study to determine proper parking requirements for 1,2, and 3 bedroom project.
- CPH evaluated similar projects within study area for proper blend and peak usage. Used findings to arrive at reduced parking requirement.
- This study was part of a Master Plan and Re-zoning effort.

58th Street Master Plan

- Miami Dade County requested to have a master plan conceptual design for a 42+ acres portion of the existing Public Works and Waste Management site located on 8795 NW 58th Street in Miami-Dade County, Florida.
- Took the lead role as the project planner for the County, handling the master planning and coordination of regulatory agency meetings to assure the timely completion of the project in a cost effective manner.
- Provided space programming, concept design, and master planning of public works/waste services complex.
- The project included reconfiguration of site, moving existing buildings, and has components such as administration offices, fuel and hazard waste storage, materials storage, vehicle storage, and vehicle maintenance facilities.

Atlantic Beach Intracoastal Waterway Park Master Plan

- Developed a plan which promotes passive recreation and environmental education opportunities including identification of citizen stakeholder groups
- In order to solicit public participation, facilitated and conducted workshops for the public participation process to identify and evaluate desired and feasible improvements by the public and City staff
- Addressed the permitability of proposed improvements, cost to construct, parking availability, special security needs, and other required elements.

San Pedro Center, Adult Retirement/Mixed-Use Community

- Land Planning, Entitlements, Survey, Engineering
- Future Land Use Amendment, Planned Development Rezone
- Master Plan Design
- Needs Assessment Report
- Public Participation Program
- Project Management

Orange County Public Schools- John Young Parkway/Magic Way Facilities Campus

- Land Use Feasibility Reports
- Campus Master Planning Access Management Plan
- School Site Layout Analysis
- Entitlement Strategic Implementation Plan

Ocean Hammock Resort/Harborside Inn and Marina

- 150 Acres
- Land Planning, Entitlements, Engineering
- Planned Development Rezone
- Master Planning Design
- Design Charrette

Teresa Murphy AIA

Senior Associate



PROFESSIONAL REGISTRATIONS & CERTIFICATIONS

- + Registered Professional Architect, 1992
- + Licensed in IL & KS

EDUCATION

- + University of Oklahoma, Bachelor of Architecture, 1987

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

- + American Institute of Architects (AIA)

Teresa has nearly 30 years experience in the architectural design of retail, commercial, theater and medical projects. She has been instrumental in site adapting large-scale prototypical retail projects across the country ranging from 15,000 sq. ft. to 195,000+ sq. ft. to fit unique sites in a variety of jurisdictions. Since joining BRR 19 years ago, Teresa has managed numerous projects through entitlement, permitting, production, code review, and construction in Florida. She has produced construction documents, reviewed shop drawings, coordinated RFI's and resolved construction challenges with multiple contractors, and conducted extensive site visits. Teresa became an Associate at BRR in 2007 and was promoted to Senior Associate in 2009. She leads a team of architects and designers that work on retail projects nationwide. Her duties include responsibilities for Walmart Supercenter New Stores Program as well as expansions, takeovers, Neighborhood Markets in national markets.

RELEVANT PROJECTS

Walmart

New Store Program
Northeast & Central U.S.

Walmart

New Commercial Development
Central U.S. & FL

Jane Phillips Hospital*

New Construction & Remodel
Bartlesville, OK

Phillips Petroleum Refinery Control Buildings*

New Buildings in Existing Refineries
Houston, TX

Wilson Elementary*

Classroom Addition
Bartlesville, OK

Cinemark Tinseltown*

20-screen Theater
TX & UT

**Indicates projects completed at a previous firm.*



UNIVERSAL ENGINEERING SCIENCES, INC.

*Construction Materials Testing • Geophysical Services
Environmental Sciences • Geotechnical Engineering*

Biographical Data

JEFFREY S. PRUETT, P.E.

Title Vice President

Expertise Geotechnical Engineering, Foundation Testing, Construction Materials Testing

Academic Background Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering - University of Florida - 1990

Registrations Professional Engineer - Florida No. 50775
Professional Engineer in Georgia, South Carolina, Alabama, Texas and Mississippi

Experience Mr. Pruett has 27 years of post graduate geotechnical engineering and materials testing. He serves as one of Universal's Vice Presidents, Regional Managers, Senior Geotechnical engineers, and Design/Build Project Managers. As geotechnical Engineer of Record he is responsible for geotechnical scope development, oversight of field exploration, and oversight of plans development. He also serves as Foundation Geotechnical Engineer of Record for PDA, PIT, and CSL deep foundation testing.

Mr. Pruett's has performed as geotechnical Engineer of Record for over a dozen FDOT projects including roadways and bridges. His expertise includes deep foundation design of driven piling and drilled shafts, MSE wall and high-fill settlement, and various shallow and deep ground improvement techniques. He has managed several FDOT districtwide and GEC contracts for geotechnical, pavement evaluation, and materials testing.

Related Projects

Jacksonville Arena - Gilbane Scheer Renaissance (COJ)
Jacksonville Arena - Gilbane Scheer Renaissance (COJ)
University of Florida Indoor Practice Facility – Brassfield & Gorrie
Ben Hill Griffin Stadium 3-story Addition – University of Florida Athletic Association
TWMP Segment 1 - JEA
TWMP Segment 2 - JEA
South Shores Second Subaqueous Crossing - JEA
Alltel Stadium Pavilion - JEA
Panama City International Airport Expansion, Panama City, FL.
Thyssen-Krupp Steel Mill, Mt. Vernon, AL.
Progress Energy Nuclear Power Plant, Ingles, FL
The Big I – I-95/I-10 Interchange, Jacksonville, FL
American Cement Plant, Sumter Co., FL
Wal-Mart Puerto Rico Program, Various Locations, Puerto Rico
Lowes Stores Southeastern US, MS, GA, FL, AL
Florida Rock Cement Plant Expansion, Newberry, FL
I-10 Pensacola Bay Bridge Replacement, Pensacola, FL
SR 9A Roadway and Bridges Design/Build, Jacksonville, FL
I-95 Design/Build, St. Johns County, FL
GREC 100 MW Biomass Facility, Alachua County, FL



Biographical Data

EDUARDO SUAREZ, M.S.C.E., P.E.

Senior Geotechnical Engineer

Expertise	Geotechnical Engineering, Construction Inspection and Project Management
Experience	Mr. Suarez has over 30 years experience in geotechnical engineering and project management. His geotechnical experience includes roadway and bridges, commercial and residential development, and large-scale water treatment facility projects. His experience involves work during the phases of design and construction. Project administration experience includes scheduling, cost estimation and review of completed work.
Academic Background	Postgraduate Geotechnical Engineering, U.Politecnica of Catalunya, Barcelona, Spain Master of Science, Civil Engineering, North Carolina State University, Raleigh NC, USA Bachelor of Science, Civil Engineering, University of Santo Tomas, Bogota, Colombia
Registrations	Professional Engineer, Florida No. 60272, 2003
Professional Affiliations	GEO-Institute of ASCE ISSMGE (International Society for Soil Mechanics and Geotechnical Engineer)
Project Experience	<p><i>Retail/Medical/College Facilities</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Provided geotechnical and foundation recommendations for the construction of various College Facilities in Florida (UF Harn Museum-Lepidoptera Bld, Sculpture Garden, Asian Art Wing, UF Law Library, UF West Library, SFC Performing Art Facility, SFC Alachua Training Center).▪ Provided geotechnical and foundation recommendations for the construction of various retail stores and medical facilities in Florida (Wal-Mart, Home Depot, Publix, Lowes, Eckerd's, Walgreen, Family Dollar, and Hitchcock's) (Orthopedic Surgery Center, Laser and Outpatient Surgery Center, UF Chemistry Building). <p><i>Power Plant /Generation Facilities/Water Treatment Facilities</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Biomass Fired Electric Generation Facility, Gainesville Renewable Energy Center, Florida. Geotechnical Project Engineer (EOR) for a proposed 100 MW Electric Generation Facilities and associated structures. Performed geotechnical engineering recommendations, estimated bearing capacity, settlement, shallow, deep foundations recommendations. <p>Deerhaven Generating Station Unit 2, Gainesville Regional Utilities, Florida Geotechnical Project Engineer (EOR) for a proposed Air Quality Control Retrofit Unit and associated structures. Performed geotechnical engineering recommendations, estimated bearing capacity, settlement, shallow, deep foundations recommendations.</p> <p>Provided geotechnical and foundation recommendations for the construction of various Water/Wastewater facilities in Florida (Green Cove Wastewater Treatment Plant Expansion, Town of Lee Wastewater Collection System and Transmission Facilities, Kanapaha Reclaimed Water Facility Infiltrating Wetlands, Oakmont Reclaimed Water Facility)</p>



Biographical Data

Roadway/ Bridges

- **S.R. 26 over U.S. 301 Interchange, Alachua County, Florida.** Geotechnical Project Engineer (EOR) for the proposed realignment to S.R. 26 over US 301. Performed geotechnical engineering recommendation for 1.8 miles of new roadway and a 300-foot long bridge.
- **C.R. 229 Bridge Replacement over New River, Union County, Florida.** Geotechnical Project Engineer (EOR) for the proposed bridge replacement. Performed geotechnical engineering recommendations for half mile of an approach roadway and a 525-foot long bridge.
- **Depression Within Travel Lanes. Emergency Sinkhole Remediation (I 75, SR 45, SR 26, SR 24, SR 121, SR 226, Alachua County) (I10 Madison County) (US-19, Perry County) (US 301, Bradford County) (I10/SR27 (Florida.** Geotechnical Project Engineer for a sinkhole investigation. Performed geotechnical engineering recommendations for sinkhole risk mitigation/repair.
- **Tower Road, Alachua County, S.R. 100 Widening, Union County Florida.** Geotechnical Project Engineer for the proposed roadway reconstruction. Performed geotechnical engineering recommendations for box culvert and travel lanes.
- **Pavement Evaluation CR 236/CR 142/CR225/CR 1474 Alachua County, CR30/CR361/ Taylor County, Florida.** Project Geotechnical Engineer for the proposed pavement rehabilitations. Prepared recommendations for existing roadway.

Landfill

- **Citrus County Central Landfill, Citrus County, Florida.** Geotechnical Project Engineer for a proposed new Disposal Cell. Performed geotechnical engineering recommendations, and side slope stability analysis for excavations of native soil and waste material; estimated bearing capacity, settlement, and groundwater elevation.

Residential Developments

- **Oak Hammock Retirement Community, Alachua County, Florida.** Geotechnical Project engineer for the proposed Pond, stormwater retention areas and roadways. Work scope includes geophysical investigation, water budget, slope stability analysis, recommendations for earthen lined and geomembrane liner system, and geotechnical recommendations for drainage and pavement design.
- **Jefferson Commons, The Sanctuary, Bartram Parking Garage, Alachua County, Florida.** Geotechnical Project engineer for multiple apartment and retail buildings, parking garage. Design considerations include foundation recommendations, groundwater control, pavement design, and site preparation.

Universal Office Gainesville, FL

Years with Universal 16 (2001)

Years with Other Firms 14



MOHAMMED ABDALLAH, PE, PTOE
Principal

Education

B.S.C.E.
University of Central Florida,
1995

M.S.C.E., Transportation
University of Central Florida,
1997

Certifications

Registered Professional
Engineer: Florida PE #56169

Professional Traffic
Operations Engineer #2415

Advanced AMOT #5345

Highway Capacity Analysis
Workshop, McTrans

ITS Evaluation Tools
Modeling Workshop, FDOT

Key Expertise

- Transportation Planning
- Traffic Operations
- Signal Coordination
- Impact Fees
- Concurrency Management
- Mitigation Strategies
- Modeling & Simulation

Activities / Memberships

Institute of Transportation
Engineers (ITE)

American Society of Civil
Engineers (ASCE)

Florida Engineering Society

Home Builders Association
Developer's Council

Mr. Abdallah has 21 years of experience in the fields of traffic engineering and transportation planning. He has served in the public and private sectors with increasing levels of responsibility. Mr. Abdallah has been involved in the production and management of a wide range of transportation studies, varying in scope, size and purpose. In his tenure at Orange County he oversaw the concurrency management system and he managed the County's transportation impact fee program. As chairman of the Alternative Road Impact Fee Committee, he was involved in updating and administering the County's Impact Fee Ordinance. Since joining the private sector, Mr. Abdallah has proven himself an innovator in the field of traffic operations and transportation management strategies. He has administered several transportation management and mitigation plans that balance the demand for growth with the integrity and efficiency of the transportation network. Mr. Abdallah has managed the implementation of transportation planning and engineering projects internationally and is currently focused on the practical application of Transportation Systems and Mobility Strategies to deliver a robust, balanced, user centric, transportation network for the future.

Publications

A Methodology for Route Selection & Guidance Using GIS & Computer Network Models. Abdel-Aty M., Abdallah M. and As-Saidi A. (1997), 76th Annual Meeting.

Traffic Simulation along the I-4 Central Corridor, Volumes I and II. Al-Deek H., Radwan A. E., Abdallah M., and Ishak S., Prepared for FDOT, August 1997.

Professional Experience

Traffic & Mobility Consultants, LLC <i>Principal / Manager</i>	Sep 2012 – Present
Traffic Planning and Design, Inc. <i>Vice President</i>	Aug 2005 – Aug 2012
Levant Consultants, Ltd. (UK) <i>Development Manager</i>	Jul 2002 – Jul 2005
Traffic Planning and Design, Inc. <i>Senior Engineer</i>	Feb 2001 – Jun 2002
Orange County Traffic Engineering <i>Senior Transportation Engineer</i>	Jun 1997 – Feb 2001
Leftwich Consulting Engineers, Inc. <i>Traffic Engineer</i>	Aug 1995 – Jun 1997

Robert Christopher Jones
2011 Samantha Lane, Valrico FL 33594
Tel: (813) 833-9891
e-mail: rcjones3@usf.edu or cj@floridaeconomicadvisors.com

Education

Doctor of Philosophy: Business Economics, University of South Florida. Tampa, FL (2008)

Master of Arts: Business Economics, University of South Florida. Tampa, FL (2005)

Master of Business Administration: Rollins College, Crummer School. Winter Park, FL (1992)

Bachelor of Science: Agricultural Economics, University of Florida. Gainesville, FL (1990)

Professional Positions

President/Chief Economist

Florida Economic Advisors, LLC - Valrico, Florida

2003 - Present

Visiting Instructor/Adjunct Instructor

Economics

University of South Florida - Tampa/Lakeland, Florida

2007 - Present

Visiting Assistant Professor and Adjunct Instructor

Economics/Marketing

Florida Southern College - Lakeland, Florida

2011 – Present

Adjunct Instructor

Hillsborough Community College - Tampa/Plant City, Florida

2013 - 2015

Graduate Teaching Assistant

University of South Florida - Tampa, Florida

2003 - 2006

Chief Economist

City of Orlando, Florida

2003

Senior Economist

Miller Sellen Conner & Walsh, Inc. - Orlando, Florida

1994 - 2003

Associate Economist

Fishkind & Associates, Inc. - Orlando, Florida

1992 - 1994

Career Summary

- 24 years experience as a professional economic and market analyst
- Directed and/or participated in over 400 studies
- Conducted economic feasibility assessments for over 500,000 acres of land in Florida
- Served for 18 months as an advisor to Florida Governor's Office on fiscal impact policy
- Served as the City of Orlando's first chief economist
- Participated in the financial structuring and negotiation of over \$250 million in community redevelopment projects in downtown Orlando
- Consulting advisor to the cities of Tampa, Orlando, Lake Mary, Wauchula, Tavares, DeBary, Leesburg, and New Smyrna Beach on community redevelopment strategy and feasibility
- Consulted for privately-sponsored community redevelopment projects in Orlando, Tampa, Clearwater, Lakeland, and Sanford
- Advisor to special assessment districts in Broward, Lake, Lee, Orange, and Walton Counties
- Consultant to state government and 25 local governments in Florida
- Litigation support and/or expert witness testimony in over 45 cases involving business damages and eminent domain
- Consulted for private development projects with aggregate market values exceeding \$5 billion
- Economic commentaries have appeared on television, radio, and over two dozen newspapers/magazines across Florida
- Collegiate economics and business courses taught include the following:
 - Principles of Microeconomics
(University of South Florida, Hillsborough Community College)
 - Principles of Macroeconomics
(University of South Florida, Florida Southern College, Hillsborough Comm. College)
 - Intermediate Price Theory (University of South Florida)
 - Managerial Economics (University of South Florida)
 - Environmental Economics (University of South Florida)
 - Global Economic Environment of Business (University of South Florida)
 - Urban Economics (University of South Florida)
 - Economic Concepts (University of South Florida)
 - Economics and Regulation (Florida Southern College)
 - Principles of Marketing (Florida Southern College)
 - International Marketing (Florida Southern College)
 - International Business (Florida Southern College)

Selected Publications, Presentations, Cited Quotes (2000 - 2015)

"U.S. Highway 17-92 Corridor CRA Economic Feasibility Assessment": City of DeBary, Florida, December 2003

"County Road 470 Study Area Economic and Market Analysis": City of Leesburg, Florida, January 2004

"Channel District CRA Economic Assessment": City of Tampa, Florida, December 2005

"Orange County Industrial Capacity Analysis": Orange County, Florida, May 2007

"Downtown Tampa CRA Long Range Growth Forecasts and Economic Model": City of Tampa, Florida, June 2007

"Orange County Commercial Capacity Analysis": Orange County, Florida, October 2007

"Orange County Office Capacity Analysis": Orange County, Florida, October 2007

"City of North Port Fiscal Impact Analysis Model": City of North Port, Florida, February 2008

"The Economic Return of New Urbanism": Orange County, Florida, March 2008

"Tampa Downtown Special Services District: Value and Revenue Projections": Tampa Downtown Partnership, Tampa, Florida, March 2008

"Central Florida Commuter Rail System: Orange County Transit Station Market Analysis ": Orange County, Florida, May 2008

"Marion County Economic and Fiscal Impact Analysis: Sustainable Land Use Model": Marion County, Florida, June 2008

"The Effects of Depressed Mood on Academic Outcomes in Adolescents and Young Adults": University of South Florida, Tampa, July 2008

"Market Minute - February 2009": Florida Economic Advisors, February 2009

"Lake County Florida Fiscal Impact Analysis": Lake County, Florida, May 2009

"Tavares, Florida Community Economic Profile": City of Tavares, Florida, April 2010

"Downtown Wauchula Market Assessment": City of Wauchula, Florida, May 2010

"Market Minute - July 2010": Florida Economic Advisors, July 2010

"Polk City Nonresidential De-annexation Impacts": City of Polk City, Florida, August 2010

"Growth and the Florida Economy: Is Anyone in Their Right Mind Still Considering a Vote for Amendment 4?": American Planning Association (Florida Chapter-Orlando Section), Fall 2010

"Polk City Residential De-annexation Impacts": City of Polk City, Florida, December 2010

"Parkway East Economic Opportunity Analysis": City of Palm Coast, Florida, August 2011

"City of North Port Fiscal Impact Analysis Update": City of North Port, Florida, July 2012

"One Daytona Fiscal Impact Analysis": Volusia County, Florida, and the City of Daytona Beach, Florida, July 2014

"Tomoka Town Center *Fiscal Impact Analysis*": City of Daytona Beach, Florida, June 2015

"Daytona Beach Ocean Center *Economic Impact Analysis*": Volusia County, Florida, November 2014 - December 2015

"Town of Longboat Key *Economic and Market Analysis*": Longboat Key, Florida, March 2014

"U.S. and Florida 2002 *Economic Forecast*": Florida Institute of Certified Public Accountants, Central Florida Chapter, Orlando, January 2002

"U.S. and Florida 2003 *Economic Forecast*": Florida Institute of Certified Public Accountants, Central Florida Chapter, Orlando, January 2003

"U.S. and Florida 2004 *Economic Forecast*": Florida Institute of Certified Public Accountants, Central Florida Chapter, Orlando, January 2004

"U.S. and Florida 2005 *Economic Forecast*": Florida Institute of Certified Public Accountants, Central Florida Chapter, Orlando, January 2005

"U.S. and Florida 2006 *Economic Forecast*": Florida Institute of Certified Public Accountants, Central Florida Chapter, Orlando, January 2006

"U.S. and Florida 2007 *Economic Forecast*": Florida Institute of Certified Public Accountants, Central Florida Chapter, Orlando, January 2007

"U.S. and Florida 2008 *Economic Forecast*": Florida Redevelopment Association, Statewide Conference, Daytona Beach, October 2007

"U.S. and Florida 2008 *Economic Forecast*": Florida Institute of Certified Public Accountants, Central Florida Chapter, Orlando, January 2008

"U.S. and Florida 2009 *Economic Forecast*": Orange County Redevelopment Workshop, Orlando, March 2009

"U.S. and Florida 2010 *Economic Forecast*": Florida Institute of Certified Public Accountants, Statewide Conference, Ft. Lauderdale, January 2010

"*The Economics of Commuter Rail Transit*": Florida Redevelopment Association, Statewide Conference, Orlando, October 2010

"U.S. and Florida 2011 *Economic Forecast*": Community Foundation of Greater Lakeland, December 2010

"U.S. and Florida 2011 *Economic Forecast*": Pasco Economic Development Council, January 2011

"U.S. and Florida 2012 *Economic Forecast*": Florida Institute of Certified Public Accountants, Statewide Conference, Ft. Lauderdale, January 2012

"*Florida 2013 Economic Forecast*": Florida Institute of Certified Public Accountants, University of Florida Accounting Conference, Gainesville, November 2012

"*U.S. and Florida 2015 Economic Forecast*": Florida Institute of Certified Public Accountants, Statewide Conference, Ft. Lauderdale, January 2015

"*U.S. and Florida 2015 Economic Forecast*": Florida Institute of Certified Public Accountants, University of South Florida Accounting Conference, Tampa, November 2014

"*U.S. and Florida 2015 Economic Forecast*": Florida Institute of Certified Public Accountants, Healthcare Industry Conference, Orlando, April 2015

"*U.S. and Florida 2016 Economic Forecast*": Florida Institute of Certified Public Accountants, University of South Florida Accounting Conference, Tampa, October 2015

"*Demographics Tell The Story*": Tampa Bay Business Journal, Oct. 2000, author K. Salgat

"*Heritage Swings for Home Run*": Orlando Business Journal, Jan. 2001, author N. Haner-Door

"*District Plans May Misjudge Sales Tax*": Orlando Sentinel, Mar. 2002, author M. Shanklin

"*Businesses in the Dark on Wage Vote*": Orlando Business Journal, Aug. 2003, author N. Haner-Door

"*Winds of Economic Change: The Losers*": Orlando Business Journal, Dec. 2004, author C. Baumann

"*Channel Homes are Wave of the Future*": St. Petersburg Times, Apr. 2006, author J. Thorner

"*County to Figure Cost of Growth*": Ocala Star-Banner, May 2008, author C. Curry

"*Economic Model Aids County*": Riverland News, Dec. 2008, author A. Riffel-Kragh

"*New Polk Layoffs Reflect Jobless Rate*": WTVT FOX-13, August 2010, author K. Suarez

"*Economist Sees Slow Growing in Pasco*": Tampa Tribune, January 2011, author L. Kinsler

"*Putting the State Back to Work*": WUSF Florida Matters, August 2011, author R. Sussingham

"*Florida Lottery Sales on Rise on Back of Most Popular Game*": WFTS ABC Action News, October 2014, author A. Winer

"*Budget Fact Check: Gas Prices Dropping, Other Expenses Rising*": WFTS ABC Action News, October 2014, author S. Fazan

"*Low Diesel Prices Could Save All of Us Money*": WTSP CBS-10 News, August 2015, author E. Glasser

"Real Reasons and Real Numbers Behind Rays' Empty Seats": WTSP CBS-10 News, October 2015, author G. Kamm

Selected Litigation Support Work

1. *Seminole County v. Red Willow Plaza*
Eminent Domain - Widening of Red Bug Lake Road - Represented Shopping Center Owners - Performed Demographic & Retail Market Analysis
2. *Orange County v. Turkey Lake Village Shopping Center*
Eminent Domain - Widening of Conroy Road - Represented Orange County - Performed Demographic & Retail Market Analysis
3. *Orange County v. Scharlin-Robiana*
Eminent Domain - Represented Orange County - Performed Demographic and Retail Market Demand Analysis
4. *FDOT v. Simon (Seminole Towne Centre) - Seminole County*
Eminent Domain - Represented FDOT - Performed Retail Market Analysis, Outparcel Study
5. *FDOT v. Schrimsher (Winter Spgs) - Seminole County*
Eminent Domain - Represented Schrimsher Properties - Performed Demographic & Retail Market Analysis
6. *FDOT v. Digerlando - Hillsborough County*
Eminent Domain - Represented Property Owner (Digerlando) - Performed Demographic & Retail Market Analysis
7. *FDOT v. Tandoi - Hillsborough County*
Eminent Domain - Represented Property Owner (Tandoi) - Performed Demographic Analysis, Residential Market Analysis, Retail Market Analysis
8. *Orange County v. Muszynski/Plate*
Eminent Domain - Represented Orange County - Performed Market Analysis of Day Care Centers, Conducted Demographic Analysis
9. *City of Orlando v. First United Methodist Church*
Eminent Domain - Represented City of Orlando - Performed Office Market Analysis
10. *OOCEA v. Latham*
Eminent Domain - Represented OOCEA - Performed Demographic, Residential, Retail, office, and Industrial Market Analyses
11. *Orange Co. v. Ireland*
Eminent Domain - Represented Orange County - Performed Demographic, Hotel, and Timeshare Market Analyses

12. *City of Cocoa v. Holland Properties (Orange County, FL)*
Eminent Domain - Represented City of Cocoa - Performed Demographic, Residential, Retail, Office, and Industrial Market Analyses
13. *Port St. Lucie v. General Development Utilities - St. Lucie County*
Utility Acquisition - Represented City of Port St. Lucie - Performed Demographic Analysis, Population Projection, Reviewed Population Studies of Cross-Complainant
14. *Osceola County v. Kelley*
Eminent Domain - Represented Osceola County - Performed Demographic and Retail Market Analyses
15. *FDOT v. Behn - Seminole County*
Eminent Domain - Represented J. Behn, Property Owner - Performed Demographic, Retail, and Office Market Analysis
16. *ZOM Properties (Oviedo) vs. Seminole County*
Eminent Domain - Represented ZOM - Performed Demographic & Retail Market Analysis
17. *Orange Co. v. Summit Properties - 4900 Block, Pine Hills Road*
Eminent Domain - Represented Orange County - Performed Demographic & Retail Market Analysis
18. *Apperson v. Buena Vista Television - Orange County*
Business Damages - Represented Apperson (FOX Ch. 35) - Performed Historical Analysis of Nielsen Ratings for the "Duck Tales" Syndicated Television Show
19. *Colonial Properties v. Johnson Engineering - Lee County*
Business Damages - Represented Johnson Engineering - Analyzed Financial Transactions and Pro Forma Projections of Defaulted Development
20. *Nations Bank v. Parkway Center - Hillsborough County*
Represented Trustees of Parkway Center in CDD Default Case - Analyzed Historical Office Market Trends in Local Area
21. *Gateway Commons/Dart Boulevard - Osceola County*
Eminent Domain - Represented Owners of Gateway Commons Property - Performed Demographic & Retail Market Analysis
22. *Kizmay v. Hutchinson - Orange County*
Business Damages - Represented Hutchinson - Projected Commercial Lease Rents Over 35 Year Time Frame
23. *City of Palm Bay v. Ladow - Brevard County*
User Fee Validity - Represented City of Palm Bay - Developed User Fee Methodology for City

24. *Tyler Todd - Orange County*
Personal Injury/Damages -Represented Tyler Todd - Estimated Future Income Loss As A Result of Permanent Injury Suffered In Work Accident
25. *Orange County v. Lipton (Parcel 111)*
Eminent Domain - Represented Orange County - Performed Demographic and Retail Market Analyses
26. *Orange County v. Tri-Regency (Parcel 114)*
Eminent Domain - Represented Orange County - Performed Demographic and Retail Market Analyses
27. *FDOT v. Holland Spring Development Corporation*
Eminent Domain - Represented Holland Spring Development Corporation - Performed Demographic and Retail Market Analyses
28. *Orange County v. Grand Cypress Resort*
Eminent Domain - Represented Orange County - Performed Demographic and Retail Market Analyses
29. *Orange County v. Strates*
Eminent Domain - Represented Orange County - Performed Retail and Industrial Market Analyses
30. *FDOT v. Castle & Cooke*
Eminent Domain - Represented FDOT - Performed Retail and Residential Market Analyses
31. *OOCEA v. Tuscan Ridge, LLC (Doerr)*
Eminent Domain - Represented Tuscan Ridge - Performed Retail and Industrial Market Analyses
32. *Kissimmee Ridge v. SFLWMD*
Eminent Domain - Represented Kissimmee Ridge - Performed Commercial and Residential Market Analyses
33. *Black v. DiCarlo*
Business Damages - Represented Black – Conducted Macroeconomic Analysis
34. *LCG/RRL Airpark v. City of Lakeland*
Preparation for Inverse Condemnation - Represented LCG/RRL Airpark – Performed Office, Retail and Industrial Market Analyses
35. *City of Destin v. Crystal Dunes, et. al.*
Real Estate Damages from Land Use Change - Represented City of Destin - Conducted Econometric Assessments of Value
36. *City of Ponce Inlet v. Pacetta, LLC, et. al.*
Bert Harris Property Rights Claim - Represented City of Ponce Inlet - Conducted Market and Property Valuation Analysis

37. *Maryland Transit Authority v. Langley Park Shopping Center et. al.*

Eminent Domain - Represented Langley Park Shopping Center - Performed Retail and Residential Market Analyses

R. CHRISTOPHER JONES, PH.D.

President & Chief Economist, Florida Economic Advisors, LLC

Professional Profile

Dr. Chris Jones serves as the President and Chief Economist of Florida Economic Advisors, LLC. Dr. Jones is one of Central Florida's most experienced regional economists. In addition to his advanced degrees in business and economics, he has over 24 years of experience as an economic and financial consultant in Central Florida. His private sector background includes tenure as an associate economist with *Fishkind & Associates* and as the founder and Senior Economist of *MSCW Economics* in Orlando. Dr. Jones' public sector service includes a term as the Senior Economic Advisor to the City of Orlando, Florida. With more than 400 studies in his consulting portfolio, Dr. Jones has provided services for various branches of Federal, State, and Local Government, including the Executive Office of the Governor and over 30 units of local government in Florida.

Dr. Jones is widely recognized as one of Florida's leading experts in fiscal policy, serving for two years on Governor Jeb Bush's Fiscal Impact Advisory Committee. He is also considered to be one of the state's premier advisors on affordable housing policy. Dr. Jones served for several years as a founding member of East Central Florida Regional Planning Council's Affordable Housing Resource Group, and assisted in the development of the state-approved methodology for assessing affordable housing demands generated by Developments of Regional Impact.

Dr. Jones is currently a full-time faculty member of the University of South Florida economics department. In addition, he has previously served as professor and instructor at Florida Southern College and Hillsborough Community College. In his work as a university lecturer, Dr. Jones has taught the following courses:

- Principles of Microeconomics
- Intermediate Price Theory
- Managerial Economics
- Principles of Marketing
- Business and Society
- Environmental Economics
- Microeconomic Theory
- Principles of Macroeconomics
- Urban Economics
- Global Environment of Business
- International Marketing
- Economics and Regulation
- Economic Concepts
- Personal Finance

Areas of Expertise & Consulting Practice

Dr. Jones is actively involved in the following areas of economic consulting:

- Residential & Nonresidential Market Demand Analysis
- Economic Impact Studies
- Regional Economic Forecasting and Long-Range Projections
- Fiscal Impact Analysis and Governmental Budgeting

Areas of Expertise & Consulting Practice (con't)

- Land Use Analysis and Optimization Studies
- Consumer Research and Surveying
- Property Value Analysis and Development Cash Flow Modeling

Relevant Experience & Selected Major Clients

Dr. Jones' public sector client list has included numerous branches of Federal, state, and local government. In addition, his private sector experience includes consulting for such major clients as the Walmart Corporation, Westinghouse, Lockheed, ITT, the Pulte Home Corporation, Blockbuster Entertainment and the Trammell Crow Company. Dr. Jones has performed economic research and/or expert witness testimony in over 50 civil litigation cases, involving eminent domain and business damages. A list of selected major clients is provided below:

- | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| ◆ Executive Office of the Governor (FL) | ◆ FL Department of Transportation |
| ◆ Marion County, Florida | ◆ Lake County, Florida |
| ◆ Orange County, Florida | ◆ St. Johns County, Florida |
| ◆ Brevard County, Florida | ◆ Walton County, Florida |
| ◆ City Of Orlando, Florida | ◆ City of Jacksonville, Florida |
| ◆ City of Lakeland, Florida | ◆ City of Lake Mary, Florida |
| ◆ City of DeBary, Florida | ◆ City of Tampa, Florida |
| ◆ City of North Port, Florida | ◆ City of Leesburg, Florida |
| ◆ City of Tavares, Florida | ◆ JR Anderson Real Estate |
| ◆ Walmart Corporation | ◆ Mercury Advisors |
| ◆ Sembler Development | ◆ Williams Companies |
| ◆ Carolina Florida, Inc. | ◆ Downtown Tampa Partnership |
| ◆ WTC Tampa | ◆ St. Joe Company |

Education

Doctor of Philosophy, Business Economics, University of South Florida (2008); Master of Arts in Economics, University of South Florida (2005); Master of Business Administration, Roy E. Crummer Graduate School of Business, Rollins College (1992); Bachelor of Science in Food & Resource Economics, University of Florida (1990)

Past & Present Professional Associations & Advisory Committees

- Governor's Fiscal Impact Advisory Committee
- The Urban Land Institute
- The National Association for Business Economics
- The American Planning Association
- East Central Florida Regional Planning Council Affordable Housing Resource Group

Publications & Media

Dr. Jones' economic commentary has appeared in the following publications:

- ◆ Washington Post
- ◆ Daytona Beach News-Journal
- ◆ Lakeland Ledger
- ◆ Orlando Business Journal
- ◆ Daily Commercial
- ◆ Ft. Myers News-Press
- ◆ Mid-Florida HBA Magazine
- ◆ Riverland News
- ◆ East Orlando Sun
- ◆ Orlando Sentinel
- ◆ Naples Daily News
- ◆ Florida Real Estate Journal
- ◆ Florida APA News
- ◆ Longboat Key Observer
- ◆ Palatka Daily News
- ◆ Charlotte Sun-Herald
- ◆ Ocala Star-Banner
- ◆ Orlando Magazine

Presentations

Dr. Jones has been seen on WTSP CBS-10, WFTS ABC Action News, WOFL FOX-35, and WTVT FOX-13 providing televised economic commentary. He has also been a guest on WUSF's *Florida Matters* program, discussing economic policy. Dr. Jones has been a guest speaker commenting on economic issues before the following civic and professional organizations: The Urban Land Institute; The Florida Institute of Certified Public Accountants; Leadership Winter Park; The American Planning Association; Leadership Orlando; Downtown Tampa Partnership; West Volusia Community Outreach Forum; West Orange County Community Outreach Forum; The Oviedo Chamber of Commerce; The Oviedo Rotary Club; The Community Foundation of Greater Lakeland; The Florida Redevelopment Association; The Pasco County Economic Development Council; and the Orange County Redevelopment Workshop.

Representative Project Experience

Consulting Economist – Pinellas County Metropolitan Planning Organization / Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority / Tampa Bay Regional Transportation Authority / Florida Dept. of Transportation

Served as consulting economist to the aforementioned transit agencies, Pinellas County government, and multiple municipal governments in the economic feasibility analysis of a proposed 25 +/- mile light-rail transit system in Pinellas County, Florida. Major project efforts include transit system case study evaluations, long range growth forecasts, market demand assessments, system economic impact analysis, and system/station threshold determinations.

Consulting Economist – Orange County, Florida

Served as Orange County's consulting economist for long range planning during the 2007-2011 period. Major work efforts have included economic forecasts to support development capacity and land use policies for residential, commercial, office, and industrial development. Co-authored studies on market demand for light-rail transit development and the economic returns from New Urbanism communities.

Consulting Economist – Marion County, Florida

Developed an interactive model for Marion County that allows users the ability to model growth and development scenarios on a project or area-wide level of geography, and assess the economic and fiscal impacts to the County from these scenarios. The model's purpose is to allow the County's professional planners and economic development experts to model growth patterns that sustain or improve the economic base of one of Florida's fastest growing areas.

Consulting Economist – Lake County, Florida

Prepared a comprehensive fiscal impact analysis of the County's long-range growth management plan for local government officials. The analysis considered future growth, development, and annexation impacts on local revenues and service provision costs to the County's unincorporated area.

Consulting Economist – City of North Port, Florida

Developed an interactive model for North Port that allows planners to model growth and development scenarios on a project or area-wide level of geography, and assess the fiscal impacts to the City from these scenarios. The model's purpose is to measure the sustainability of growth patterns for this rapidly expanding Southwest Florida municipality. City planners have been using the model to evaluate development plans since early 2008.

Consulting Economist - City of Tampa, Florida

Economic consultant for the Channel District Strategic Action Plan and Central Business District long range plan. Major work efforts included market research, economic forecasts, fiscal impact analysis, and tax increment revenue projections for these key business centers of Metro Tampa. The results of this research and analysis are the centerpiece of an area-wide public facilities plan, including financial mechanisms and development regulations that promote sustainable economic development within the Channel District and Downtown Tampa.

Green Island Ventures – Osceola County, Florida (Green Island)

Economic consultant to the principal developer of a 6,000 acre mixed-use development adjacent to the Florida Turnpike. Project development plans include 11,000 residential units and 3.2 million square feet of regional retail, office, and research industrial uses. Performed economic and market research, absorption projections, and development phasing programs.

Walmart Corporation – Alachua County, Florida (Walmart Supercenter)

Economic consultant to the Walmart Corporation, for a proposed Walmart retail Supercenter at the Interstate 75/U.S. Highway 441 interchange. Performed economic and market research, identifying trade area need for the proposed center.

Collonade Golf Villas – Lee County, Florida (Lehigh Acres Commercial Center)

Economic consultant to the developer of a 20 acre commercial/retail center along Joel Boulevard, in the Lehigh Acres community. Performed economic and market research, identifying trade area need for the proposed center.

Mercury Advisors – Tampa, Florida (Grand Central at Kennedy)

Economic consultant to the developer of a 1 million square foot mixed-use project in Tampa's Channel District CRA. Performed economic and market research, fiscal evaluations, and ad valorem revenue forecasts. Project features of Grand Central include upscale residential, commercial, and office uses. Grand Central is positioned as the centerpiece of a revitalized Channel District.

JR Anderson Real Estate – North Port, Florida (North Port Gardens)

Economic consultant to the developer of a proposed 2 million square foot mixed-use development along the Interstate 75 corridor, anchored by a 1.4 million square foot lifestyle shopping and entertainment center. Performed economic and market research, fiscal evaluations, and affordable housing analyses.

Skye Development – 101 Meridian (Tampa's Channel District)

Economic consultant to the developer of a 208,000 square foot mixed-use project in Tampa's Channel District CRA. Performed economic and market research, fiscal evaluations, and tax increment revenue forecasts. The project is proposed to include residential, commercial, and office uses, and represents one of the first projects within the Channel District to offer value priced housing to local residents.

Sembler Investments – Seaboard Square (Tampa's Channel District)

Advisor to Sembler in the economic positioning of Seaboard Square, a proposed 1.1 million square foot mixed-use project in Tampa's Channel District CRA. Performed economic research, fiscal evaluations, and tax increment revenue forecasts. The project includes residential, commercial, and office uses.

Senior Economic Advisor - City of Orlando, Florida

A principal role as the City of Orlando's senior economic advisor involved the review and analysis of development proposals targeted at the Downtown Orlando CRA. Activities included analysis of developer pro-formas, development of counter-proposals, and negotiation with private sector developers regarding City participation in CRA development projects. Participated in the formulation of CRA development programs totaling almost 2 million square feet of space with an estimated value exceeding \$250 million.

City of Leesburg, Florida

Economic consultant for a feasibility study that evaluated 2,000+ acres of previously undeveloped property in close proximity to the Florida Turnpike. Performed market research, economic forecasts, and land use allocations for the project study area. The results of this research and analysis have led to further master planning and infrastructure programming efforts by the City.


City of Lake Mary, Florida

Principal consultant and project manager for a multi-phase downtown development feasibility study. Performed market research, land use selection, infrastructure costing,

and bond financing models for the City's 80-acre downtown district. The results of this research and analysis led to the award of a \$200,000 Community Development Block Grant from the State of Florida for financing downtown infrastructure.

y of **ALACHUA** **PUBLIC** **FORE THE** **D ZONING** **E CITY OF** **FLORIDA**

Planning and Zoning Board
a public hearing on April
will be held in the James
in City Hall, located at
a, Florida, to consider the
sity, P.E., of CPH, Inc.,
Stores East, LP, property
ial Exception Permit for
part of a large-scale retail
ely 1,000 feet southeast
-75 interchange, west of
rd, and south of NW US
03869-013-000; FLUM:
Intensive (CI); Overlay



ated parties may appear
application. Copies of the
nspection at the Planning
partment, 15100 NW
any regular business day
0 p.m. Written comments
e following address: City
y Development, P.O. Box
iven pursuant to Section
in order to appeal any
, you will need a record
h purpose, you may need
the proceedings is made,
vidence upon which the
nce with the Americans
ith a disability requiring
er to participate in this
(386) 418-6100 x 101 at
ring.
lay - April 06, 2017)

Alachua County Today
best source for local news - 386.462.3355

I want to provide compassionate service to all of the residents of our community.

* * *

Scott D. Mongeon – Running for the city commission has been on my mind recently due to the direction and speed Newberry is running. I would like to think I can bring in a new set of ears that could transform what the residents are saying into actual progress. Newberry has continued to add residences, but has missed the ball with adding more businesses that could offer many benefits to Newberry. Also, as a coach for Newberry High School, I see the potential for educating our youth with real world issues, helping them to prepare for adulthood.



Scott D. Mongeon

Group V

Joy Glanzer – Newberry has been a well-managed city with a history of good fiscal health and minimal debt. Our elected officials have followed a tradition of conservative spending with a focus on innovative growth. Now, with opportunities to expand eastward, Newberry is on the cusp of great things to come. I will work hard to make sure we take advantage of opportunities to add businesses and industries, which will provide good-paying jobs and economic stability. We will do this in a way which gives our city more balance and helps it to continue to be a desirable place to live and grow your family.



Joy Glanzer

I have lived in Newberry for 40 years with my husband, John, and we raised our four children here. During those years we've owned six businesses in the downtown Newberry area, employing dozens of people. Currently, I own Glanzer Realty and am the broker there. We are grateful for the citizens of Newberry who have supported our businesses so we could make a living here. Newberry is an easy commute to Gainesville with its wide employment opportunities, and is a target for commercial growth and development. I will be vigilant to help keep our regulations strict enough to protect sprawl, yet inviting enough to attract the growth we want. Providing infrastructure will be a pressing issue in the near future as we prepare for the growth. I will work diligently with the rest of the commission with this in mind.

Throughout the years I have been active in our community. I've always stood up when a need arose and volunteered when asked.

I hope you will consider voting for me on April 11.

* * *


The tire roll off will be in a container at the Fire Station 8 am - noon



City of ALACHUA

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD OF THE CITY OF ALACHUA, FLORIDA

Notice is hereby given that the Planning and Zoning Board of the City of Alachua will hold a public hearing on April 18, 2017, at 6:00 p.m. The hearing will be held in the James A. Lewis Commission Chambers in City Hall, located at 15100 NW 142nd Terrace, Alachua, Florida, to consider the following: A request by Brian Cassidy, P.E., of CPH, Inc., applicant and agent for Wal-Mart Stores East, LP, property owner, for consideration of a Special Exception Permit for a large-scale retail establishment greater than or equal to 80,000 square feet, located approximately 1,000 feet southeast of the US Highway 441/Interstate-75 interchange, west of the terminus of NW 151st Boulevard, and south of NW US Highway 441; Tax Parcel Number 03869-013-000; FLUM: Commercial; Zoning: Commercial Intensive (CI); Overlay District: Gateway Overlay District.



At the public hearing, all interested parties may appear and be heard with respect to the application. Copies of the application are available for public inspection at the Planning and Community Development Department, 15100 NW 142nd Terrace, Alachua, Florida, on any regular business day between the hours of 7:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Written comments on the application may be sent to the following address: City of Alachua, Planning and Community Development, P.O. Box 9, Alachua, FL 32616. Notice is given pursuant to Section 286.0105, Florida Statutes, that, in order to appeal any decision made at the public hearing, you will need a record of the proceedings, and that, for such purpose, you may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based. In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, any persons with a disability requiring reasonable accommodation in order to participate in this meeting should call the City Clerk at (386) 418-6100 x 101 at least 48 hours prior to the public hearing.


(Published: Alachua County Today - April 06, 2017)



City of ALACHUA

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD OF THE CITY OF ALACHUA, FLORIDA

Notice is hereby given that the Planning and Zoning Board of the City of Alachua will hold a public hearing on April 18, 2017, at 6:00 p.m. The hearing will be held in the James A. Lewis Commission Chambers in City Hall, located at 15100 NW 142nd Terrace, Alachua, Florida, to consider the following: A request by Brian Cassidy, P.E., of CPH, Inc., applicant and agent for Wal-Mart Stores East, LP, property owner, for consideration of a Special Exception Permit for automobile repair and servicing as part of a large-scale retail establishment, located approximately 1,000 feet southeast of the US Highway 441/Interstate-75 interchange, west of the terminus of NW 151st Boulevard, and south of NW US Highway 441; Tax Parcel Number 03869-013-000; FLUM: Commercial; Zoning: Commercial Intensive (CI); Overlay District: Gateway Overlay District.



At the public hearing, all interested parties may appear and be heard with respect to the application. Copies of the application are available for public inspection at the Planning and Community Development Department, 15100 NW 142nd Terrace, Alachua, Florida, on any regular business day between the hours of 7:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Written comments on the application may be sent to the following address: City of Alachua, Planning and Community Development, P.O. Box 9, Alachua, FL 32616. Notice is given pursuant to Section 286.0105, Florida Statutes, that, in order to appeal any decision made at the public hearing, you will need a record of the proceedings, and that, for such purpose, you may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based. In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, any persons with a disability requiring reasonable accommodation in order to participate in this meeting should call the City Clerk at (386) 418-6100 x 101 at least 48 hours prior to the public hearing.

(Published: Alachua County Today - April 06, 2017)

years that are progressive, yet we need more.

I want to provide compassionate service to all of the residents of our community.

* * *

Scott D. Mongeon – Running for the city commission has been on my mind recently due to the direction and speed Newberry is running. I would like to think I can bring in a new set of ears that could transform what the residents are saying into actual progress. Newberry has continued to add residences, but has missed the ball with adding more businesses that could offer many benefits to Newberry. Also, as a coach for Newberry High School, I see the potential for educating our youth with real world issues, helping them to prepare for adulthood.



Scott D. Mongeon

Group V

Joy Glanzer – Newberry has been a well-managed city with a history of good fiscal health and minimal debt. Our elected officials have followed a tradition of conservative spending with a focus on innovative growth. Now, with opportunities to expand eastward, Newberry is on the cusp of great things to come. I will work hard to make sure we take advantage of opportunities to add businesses and industries, which will provide good-paying jobs and economic stability. We will do this in a way which gives our city more balance and helps it to continue to be a desirable place to live and grow your family.



Joy Glanzer

I have lived in Newberry for 40 years with my husband, John, and we raised our four children here. During those years we've owned six businesses in the downtown Newberry area, employing dozens of people. Currently, I own Glanzer Realty and am the broker there. We are grateful for the citizens of Newberry who have supported our businesses so we could make a living here. Newberry is an easy commute to Gainesville with its wide employment opportunities, and is a target for commercial growth and development. I will be vigilant to help keep our regulations strict enough to protect sprawl, yet inviting enough to attract the growth we want. Providing infrastructure will be a pressing issue in the near future as we prepare for the growth. I will work diligently with the rest of the commission with this in mind.

Throughout the years I have been active in our community. I've always stood up when a need arose and volunteered when asked.

I hope you will consider voting for me on April 11.


* * *

The tire r
the Fire S



NO
HEAR
PLAN
BOAR
ALA

Notice is heret
of the City of
18, 2017, at 6:
A. Lewis Com
15100 NW 142
following: A re
applicant and
owner, for cons
large-scale retai
square feet, lo
the US Highw
the terminus of
Highway 441;
Commercial; Z
District: Gatew



At the public
and be heard w
application are a
and Communit
142nd Terrace, A
between the hou
on the applicatio
of Alachua, Plan
9, Alachua, FL :
286.0105, Florid
decision made a
of the proceeding
to ensure that a
which includes t
appeal is to be
with Disabilities
reasonable acco
meeting should c
least 48 hours pri
(Published: 2

Alachua County Today
is your best source for local news - 386.462.3355



C.M. WALKER/Alachua County Today

job well done. L-R: Mary Lynch, Sallie Milner, Vickie ng.

pinwheels to support this effort at the Woman's Club. The cost is \$20 for a baker's dozen (13), \$5 for three pinwheels and \$2 for one.

Proceeds from the sale of the pinwheels will be donated to child abuse prevention programs.

#


Email cwalker@alachuatoday.com



City of ALACHUA

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD OF THE CITY OF ALACHUA, FLORIDA


Notice is hereby given that the Planning and Zoning Board of the City of Alachua will hold a public hearing on April 18, 2017, at 6:00 p.m. The hearing will be held in the James A. Lewis Commission Chambers in City Hall, located at 15100 NW 142nd Terrace, Alachua, Florida, to consider the following: A request by Brian Cassidy, P.E., of CPH, Inc., applicant and agent for First Street Group, L.C., and Wal-Mart Stores East, LP, property owners, for consideration of a Site Plan for the construction of a ±158,562 square foot building for retail sales and services, with associated parking, stormwater management facilities, utility infrastructure, and supporting site improvements on a ±86.91 acre subject property, consisting of a ±37.94 acre project area, located approximately 1,000 feet southeast of the US Highway 441/Interstate-75 interchange, west of the terminus of NW 151st Boulevard, and south of NW US Highway 441; Tax Parcel Numbers 03066-000-000, 03869-000-000, 03869-013-000, and 03869-014-000; FLUM: Commercial; Zoning: Commercial Intensive (CI); Overlay District: Gateway Overlay District.



At the public hearing, all interested parties may appear and be heard with respect to the application. Copies of the application are available for public inspection at the Planning and Community Development Department, 15100 NW 142nd Terrace, Alachua, Florida, on any regular business day between the hours of 7:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Written comments on the application may be sent to the following address: City of Alachua, Planning and Community Development, P.O. Box 9, Alachua, FL 32616. Notice is given pursuant to Section 286.0105, Florida Statutes, that, in order to appeal any decision made at the public hearing, you will need a record of the proceedings, and that, for such purpose, you may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based. In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, any persons with a disability requiring reasonable accommodation in order to participate in this meeting should call the City Clerk at (386) 418-6100 x 101 at least 48 hours prior to the public hearing.

(Published: Alachua County Today - April 06, 2017)

What does your home equity look like?



Unlocking the equity in your home is easier than you think. With a Home Equity Line of Credit from Capital City Bank, you'll see how the return on your investment can fund home improvements, a dream vacation or college expenses.

Apply for it just like a loan, and once you're approved you can access this cash – up to your full available credit limit – whenever you'd like, for whatever you'd like. Go online or stop by today to apply.*

Apply today at: ccbg.com/equity **Capital City Bank**

*Introductory rate will be in effect for the first six (6) months after your account is opened. Upon expiration of the introductory rate, all balances will be at the Prime Rate, which can range from Prime + 1% to Prime + 5% using the JP Morgan Chase Prime (JPMCP) rate (currently an APR of 4.00%) not to exceed 12.99%. After the promotional period, the variable standard APR will be based on your line amount, combined loan to value ratio, and credit rating. This equity line clients and is subject to change without notice. Hazard insurance required and flood insurance, if applicable. Exclusions and limitations assessed on lines up to \$250,000, subject to the following conditions: (1) if applicable, Borrower will pay for the second and any subsequent survey to have a property survey conducted, Borrower will be responsible for the associated costs. Borrower will participate in closing costs for the loan. If you close your Credit Line and we release our lien within three (3) years from the date of closing, you will owe a prepayment penalty of 2% of the outstanding balance. Offer may be withdrawn at any time.

AFFIDAVIT FOR POSTED LAND USE SIGN

I Justin Teber, POSTED THE LAND USE
(name)
SIGN ON April 3, 2017 FOR THE Wal-Mart #3873 Site Plan
(date) (state type of action and project name)
LAND USE ACTION.

AS PER ARTICLE 2.2.9 D OF THE LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS.

THIS WILL BE INCLUDED IN THE STAFF REPORT.


(signature)

6
(number of signs)

AFFIDAVIT FOR POSTED LAND USE SIGN

I Justin Tebor, POSTED THE LAND USE
(name)
SIGN ON April 3, 2017 FOR THE Wal-Mart Special Exception Permit (LS Retail ≥ 80K sq.ft.)
(date) (state type of action and project name)
LAND USE ACTION.

AS PER ARTICLE 2.2.9 D OF THE LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS.

THIS WILL BE INCLUDED IN THE STAFF REPORT.


(signature)

6
(number of signs)

AFFIDAVIT FOR POSTED LAND USE SIGN

I Justin Tabor, POSTED THE LAND USE
(name)
SIGN ON April 3, 2017 FOR THE Wal-Mart Special Exception Permit (Auto Repair/Service)
(date) (state type of action and project name)
LAND USE ACTION.

AS PER ARTICLE 2.2.9 D OF THE LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS.

THIS WILL BE INCLUDED IN THE STAFF REPORT.


(signature)

6
(number of signs)




City of
ALACHUA

THE GOOD LIFE COMMUNITY

Mailed 4-3-2017
AE

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD OF THE CITY OF ALACHUA, FLORIDA

Notice is hereby given that the Planning and Zoning Board of the City of Alachua will hold a public hearing on April 18, 2017, at 6:00 p.m. The hearing will be held in the James A. Lewis Commission Chambers in City Hall, located at 15100 NW 142nd Terrace, Alachua, Florida, to consider the following: A request by Brian Cassidy, P.E., of CPH, Inc., applicant and agent for Wal-Mart Stores East, LP, property owner, for consideration of a Special Exception Permit for a large-scale retail establishment greater than or equal to 80,000 square feet, located approximately 1,000 feet southeast of the US Highway 441/Interstate-75 interchange, west of the terminus of NW 151st Boulevard, and south of NW US Highway 441; Tax Parcel Number 03869-013-000; FLUM: Commercial; Zoning: Commercial Intensive (CI); Overlay District: Gateway Overlay District.



At the public hearing, all interested parties may appear and be heard with respect to the application. Copies of the application are available for public inspection at the Planning and Community Development Department, 15100 NW 142nd Terrace, Alachua, Florida, on any regular business day between the hours of 7:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Written comments on the application may be sent to the following address: City of Alachua, Planning and Community Development, P.O. Box 9, Alachua, FL 32616. Notice is given pursuant to Section 286.0105, Florida Statutes, that, in order to appeal any decision made at the public hearing, you will need a record of the proceedings, and that, for such purpose, you may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based. In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, any persons with a disability requiring reasonable accommodation in order to participate in this meeting should call the City Clerk at (386) 418-6100 x 101 at least 48 hours prior to the public hearing.


P.O. Box 9 ♦ Alachua, Florida 32616-0009
Phone: (386) 418-6121 ♦ Fax: (386) 418-6130



THE GOOD LIFE COMMUNITY

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD OF THE CITY OF ALACHUA, FLORIDA

Notice is hereby given that the Planning and Zoning Board of the City of Alachua will hold a public hearing on April 18, 2017, at 6:00 p.m. The hearing will be held in the James A. Lewis Commission Chambers in City Hall, located at 15100 NW 142nd Terrace, Alachua, Florida, to consider the following: A request by Brian Cassidy, P.E., of CPH, Inc., applicant and agent for Wal-Mart Stores East, LP, property owner, for consideration of a Special Exception Permit for automobile repair and servicing as part of a large-scale retail establishment, located on a ± 30.19 acre subject property, approximately 1,000 feet southeast of the US Highway 441/Interstate-75 interchange, west of the terminus of NW 151st Boulevard, and south of NW US Highway 441; Tax Parcel Number 03869-013-000; FLUM: Commercial; Zoning: Commercial Intensive (CI); Overlay District: Gateway Overlay District.



At the public hearing, all interested parties may appear and be heard with respect to the application. Copies of the application are available for public inspection at the Planning and Community Development Department, 15100 NW 142nd Terrace, Alachua, Florida, on any regular business day between the hours of 7:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Written comments on the application may be sent to the following address: City of Alachua, Planning and Community Development, P.O. Box 9, Alachua, FL 32616. Notice is given pursuant to Section 286.0105, Florida Statutes, that, in order to appeal any decision made at the public hearing, you will need a record of the proceedings, and that, for such purpose, you may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based. In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, any persons with a disability requiring reasonable accommodation in order to participate in this meeting should call the City Clerk at (386) 418-6100 x 101 at least 48 hours prior to the public hearing.


P.O. Box 9 ♦ Alachua, Florida 32616-0009
Phone: (386) 418-6121 ♦ Fax: (386) 418-6130



THE GOOD LIFE COMMUNITY

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD OF THE CITY OF ALACHUA, FLORIDA

Notice is hereby given that the Planning and Zoning Board of the City of Alachua will hold a public hearing on April 18, 2017, at 6:00 p.m. The hearing will be held in the James A. Lewis Commission Chambers in City Hall, located at 15100 NW 142nd Terrace, Alachua, Florida, to consider the following: A request by Brian Cassidy, P.E., of CPH, Inc., applicant and agent for First Street Group, L.C., and Wal-Mart Stores East, LP, property owners, for consideration of a Site Plan for the construction of a $\pm 158,562$ square foot building for retail sales and services, with associated parking, stormwater management facilities, utility infrastructure, and supporting site improvements on a ± 86.91 acre subject property, consisting of a ± 37.94 acre project area, located approximately 1,000 feet southeast of the US Highway 441/Interstate-75 interchange, west of the terminus of NW 151st Boulevard, and south of NW US Highway 441; Tax Parcel Numbers 03066-000-000, 03869-000-000, 03869-013-000, and 03869-014-000; FLUM: Commercial; Zoning: Commercial Intensive (CI); Overlay District: Gateway Overlay District.



At the public hearing, all interested parties may appear and be heard with respect to the application. Copies of the application are available for public inspection at the Planning and Community Development Department, 15100 NW 142nd Terrace, Alachua, Florida, on any regular business day between the hours of 7:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Written comments on the application may be sent to the following address: City of Alachua, Planning and Community Development, P.O. Box 9, Alachua, FL 32616. Notice is given pursuant to Section 286.0105, Florida Statutes, that, in order to appeal any decision made at the public hearing, you will need a record of the proceedings, and that, for such purpose, you may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based. In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, any persons with a disability requiring reasonable accommodation in order to participate in this meeting should call the City Clerk at (386) 418-6100 x 101 at least 48 hours prior to the public hearing.

P.O. Box 9 ♦ Alachua, Florida 32616-0009
Phone: (386) 418-6121 ♦ Fax: (386) 418-6130

Received 8-17-16 *AK*

TOMOKA HILLS FARMS INC
1301 DIXIANA DOMINO RD
LEXINGTON, KY 40511
PARCELS 03873-000-000 & 03873-001-000

A S SHEILA PATEL
15920 NW US HIGHWAY 441
ALACHUA, FL 32615
PARCEL 03066-008-001

REBECCA H AND KENNETH J FICKETT
3001 NE 20TH WAY
GAINESVILLE, FL 32606
PARCEL 03054-001-000

FIRST STREET GROUP L C
PO BOX 1990
ALACHUA, FL 32616-1990
PARCELS 03066-000-000 & 03869-000-000

MCDONALD'S CORP (009/0551)
16018 NW US HIGHWAY 441
ALACHUA, FL 32615
PARCELS 03059-001-000 & 03059-005-000

CHRISTOPHER ALLAN KOROSIC
15710 NW US HIGHWAY 441
ALACHUA, FL 32615
PARCEL 03868-000-000

AMERICAN PETROLEUM INVESTMENTS
380 COMMERCE PARKWAY
ROCKLEDGE, FL 32955
PARCEL 03066-007-000

10.47 LLC
14110 NW 21ST LANE
GAINESVILLE, FL 32606
PARCEL 03868-002-000

MOHAN-LERRA FAMILY PARTNERSHIP
16715 NW 129TH TERRACE
ALACHUA, FL 32615
PARCEL 03066-006-000

CITY OF ALACHUA
PO BOX 9
ALACHUA, FL 32616
PARCEL 03868-002-001

TEMPLE HILL INC
11149 CONISTON WAY
WINDERMERE, FL 34786-5410
PARCELS 03066-008-002 & 03066-008-000

TLC PROPERTIES INC
2065 NW 57TH STREET
OCALA, FL 34475
PARCEL 03869-001-000

JP & KP LLC
11149 CONISTON WAY
WINDERMERE, FL 34786
PARCELS 03054-000-000 & 03054-002-000

JAMES E JR & RENEE HARKINS
PO BOX 6307
MARIANNA, FL 32447-6307
PARCEL 03869-002-000

ALACHUA HOLDINGS LTD
PO BOX 1990
ALACHUA, FL 32616
PARCEL 03863-000-000

MEGAHEE ENTERPRISES LTD.,LLLP
2632 NW 43RD ST # 2138
GAINESVILLE, FL 32606
PARCELS 03067-001-000, 03066-006-002, 03066-004-000

ALACHUA BBQ LAND LLC
PO BOX 2495
OCALA, FL 34478
PARCEL 03066-004-002

ANTOINETTE ENDELICATO
5562 NW 93RD AVENUE
GAINESVILLE, FL 32653

R & J MCCAULEY LLC
15260 NW 147TH DRIVE
ALACHUA, FL 32615
PARCEL 03863-002-000

DAN RHINE
288 TURKEY CREEK
ALACHUA, FL 32615

THOMAS STALBAUM
4526 SW 63RD BLVD
GAINESVILLE, FL 32608-3879
PARCEL 03066-001-000

TOM GORMAN
9210 NW 59TH STREET
ALACHUA, FL 32653

PINE ACRES LLC
2632 NW 43RD ST #2138
GAINESVILLE, FL 32606
PARCEL 03066-004-001

RICHARD GORMAN
5716 NW 93RD AVENUE
ALACHUA, FL 32653

NATIONAL SPELEOLOGICAL
SOCIETY INC
6001 TULASKI PIKE NW
HUNTSVILLE, AL 35810-1122
PARCEL 03066-002-001

PEGGY ARNOLD
410 TURKEY CREEK
ALACHUA, FL 32615

LUTHER ACQUISITIONS LLC
2632 NW 43RD ST UNIT# 2138
GAINESVILLE, FL 32606
PARCEL 03066-002-000

DAVID FOREST
23 TURKEY CREEK
ALACHUA, FL 32615

JOHN TINGUE
333 TURKEY CREEK
ALACHUA, FL 32615

TAMARA ROBBINS
PO BOX 2317
ALACHUA, FL 32616

TCMOA
1000 TURKEY CREEK
ALACHUA, FL 32615

DR. LEE A. NIBLOCK, COUNTY MGR
ALACHUA COUNTY
12 SE 1ST STREET
GAINESVILLE, FL 32601

LINDA DIXON
AICP
PO BOX 115050
GAINESVILLE, FL 32611

JOHN AMERSON
ALL COUNTY MARION PROPERTY MANAGEMENT
2916 NE JACKSONVILLE RD
OCALA, FLORIDA 34479

CRAIG PARENTEAU
FDEP
4801 CAMP RANCH ROAD
GAINESVILLE, FL 32641

JEANNETTE HINSDALE
PO BOX 1156
ALACHUA, FL 32616

LYNN COULLIAS
7406 NW 126TH AVENUE
ALACHUA, FL 32615

LYNDA COON
7216 NW 126 AVENUE
ALACHUA, FL 32615