

On February 8, 2021 a resident raised concern about several issues pertaining to the proposed Veranda Volaris Multifamily Development (P20-173). Staff is offering the following memo as clarification to the concerns raised.

Parking

The Developer has provided for 601 parking spaces for the overall development. This equates to 563 standard spaces, 13 accessible spaces, and 25 garage spaces. The code provisions for the parking calculations of multifamily developments include duplexes, townhouses, garden style flats, apartments or condominiums. Not all of these multifamily uses would be similar in nature as some would have attached garages and driveways to accommodate parking, yet the code stipulates a space count without the consideration of detached and designated multifamily parking.

When scenarios such as this occur, the Zoning Code (Section 158.221(c)(26) permits further review: "Where there is any question regarding the number of off-street parking spaces to be provided, the number shall be determined and fixed by the Site Plan Review Committee." Generally, to accomplish this accounting for adequate parking, a parking justification statement is submitted by a certified engineer on behalf of the Applicant. The Applicant has provided for such a statement to depict the parking and justified the development has adequate parking before the Site Plan Review Committee. To that point, the justification indicates the development would operate acceptably at peak operation with 441 spaces: equating to the proposed development exceeding this justification by 160 spaces, or 135 spaces not including the garages. In short, Volaris is exceeding the peak operational parking requirements even with the exclusion of the garages as designated parking.

As background, the practice of assessing appropriate multifamily parking through a justification statement within Port St. Lucie is not uncommon. Other Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) containing multifamily uses within the City are actively seeking or already approved to have parking requirements that deviate from the requirements specified in the City's Zoning Code.

As it pertains to the garage area, it should be noted that the interior dimensions of the parking garages are approximately 12 feet wide by 21 ½ feet long. These dimensions exceed the area requirement specified within code (Section 158.221) stipulating a minimum area requirement of 9.5 feet by 18 feet. Any perceived limitation may be the entry of the garages, which is 8' wide, but done so to accommodate the building's structural supports. Lastly, these garages only account for 4% of the overall 601 spaces provided in Volaris.

As it pertains to the dog park and clubhouse, the dog park is not required to provide for parking, which will be detailed further below. The clubhouse is required to provide for parking at a ratio of 1:300 sf per the adopted development agreement, Section X, Parking and Vehicle Storage Areas(e). The applicant has provided for the parking for the clubhouse based upon this ratio within the overall parking calculations.

Pedestrian Connectivity and Amenities

The proposed site plan includes a comprehensive network of sidewalks which exceed development requirements. This provision was intentional to provide the residents the ability to walk to their private recreational amenity areas and encourage an active pedestrian network internally and to nearby commercial uses. The dog park is one such walkable amenity proposed by the developer. The Veranda PUD stipulates that active recreation areas and similar uses (dog parks) shall not have a parking

requirement, Section X, Parking and Vehicle Storage Areas (e). Therefore, while parking is adjacent to the dog park, it is not required for the use.

This memo should also serve as an opportunity to highlight the accommodations the developer is proposing, yet not required to provide. In addition to basic sidewalks provisions, the applicant is proposing completely walkable connections to the clubhouse and amenities. The intention here is to provide a sense of character and community for residents. For example, the centrally located lakes not only serve to provide stormwater retention, but also add aesthetic value. Further, these spaces include benches, trash receptacles, community grills, landscaping, and a looping walking paths around each of the wetponds for residents to enjoy.

Landscape Buffering Requirements

Section 154.03 Landscape Design Standards (C)(3)(D)(2) of the City's Landscape Code indicates the necessity of providing a masonry wall between higher intensity uses, such as multifamily, to single-family residential uses. However, the Veranda PUD Section XII Landscape and Urban Design Guidelines(H), allows, "Landscaping and buffering may be used in lieu of an architectural walls and may be shared or located on only one of the two abutting properties provided it can be demonstrated that such will meet or exceed the minimum code requirements and intent for such..."

As seen in the conceptual landscaping and buffering graphic, the shared buffering between the single family and multifamily properties equates to approximately 50 feet of proposed or existing vegetation, which is more than two-times the code required vegetative width. Additionally, the applicant is proposing an open space abutting their landscape strip with a width of 20 feet. The overall buffering separation is approximately 70 feet and exceeds the code provisions for buffering by 3.5 times.

Proposed setbacks for the multifamily buildings should also be a point of consideration in this matter. Per the Veranda PUD, Lot Typical Type O, the multifamily building shall have a side setback of 25 feet when adjoining single family areas. You will notice the actual setbacks to any single-family area are closer to 100 feet from the property line, this is approximately 4 times the required amount. Additionally, this required 25-foot building setback to single family uses should clarify the confusion pertaining to the slides.

Based upon the provisions identified above, Planning staff believes the applicant has demonstrated they are buffering in excess of the code provisions and therefore shall not be required to provide for the architectural wall.

Lighting Nuisance

Associated with the landscape buffering, concern was also raised about lighting nuisances. It is anticipated that the landscaped buffer will screen any vehicle lights from shining into residences. As it relates to the site lighting, Section 158.221(b) of the Zoning Code contains provisions to prohibit nuisance lighting to nearby residential districts. The applicant has provided for a "Shielding of Lighting Statement" on the submitted site plan for compliance.

Building Height

There was some confusion pertaining to the overall building height. The resident felt it was misleading to state the building height at 37' 6" whereas the actual height to the peak of the roof is around 45 feet. The rationale for indicating 37' 6" is per a code requirement.

City code defines Building Height as: *The vertical distance measured from the mean finished ground level adjoining the front of a building to the level of the highest point of the roof or top surface on a flat or shed roof, the deck level on a mansard roof, and the average distance between the eaves and the ridge level for gable, hip, and gambrel roofs.*

The applicant is adhering to the code definition of building height by depicting the vertical distance from mean finished ground level to the average distance of the ridge levels.

Thank you,

Laura H. Dodd, Planner II