



**RECEIVED**

By Planning and Zoning at 5:08 pm, Jul 06, 2016

Landscape Architects | Land Planners | Environmental Consultants

1934 Commerce Lane · Suite 1 · Jupiter, Florida · 33458 · Ph 561.747.6336 · Fax 561.747.1377 · www.cotleurhearing.com · Lic # LC-C000239

July 6, 2016

Ms. Kelly Ferraiolo  
Village of Wellington  
12300 Forest Hills Boulevard  
Wellington, FL

RE: DRC Comments for Winding Trails (FKA Wanderer's Club Executive Golf Course Course)  
Comprehensive Plan Amendment 16-58 (2016-021 CPA3)  
Zoning Text Amendment 16-53 (ZTA 2016-002)  
Rezoning 16-59 (2016-022 REZ)  
Master Plan Amendment 16-60 (2016-023 MPA3)  
Site Plan 16-61 (2016-16 SP6)

Dear Kelly,

On behalf of W&W Real Estate and the project team, we are in receipt of staff comments in response to our June 9, 2016 resubmittal. Our team has reviewed each of the respective departmental comments. Please find below our response to each of the outstanding questions or comments, together with the action or actions to remedy the identified concern. To assist you in the review, our responses are listed in the same order and format as outlined in your June 21, 2016 comments.

### **General Application:**

#### Planning and Zoning:

1. PCN's on application are wrong. The following PCN's encompass the land and the lakes: (CERTIFICATION)
  - a. 73-41-44-18-03-006-0000
  - b. 73-41-44-07-07-010-0020
  - c. 73-41-44-07-07-005-0010 (Acme Improvement District Lakes)
  - d. 73-41-44-18-03-004-0010 (Acme Improvement District Lakes)
  - e. 73-41-44-18-03-004-0020 (Lake Maintenance Tracts)

**Response: This has been corrected.**

~~2. The Wanderer's Club Partners LLC owns the Lake Maintenance Tracts around the Lakes 1, 3 and 4. The Wanderer's Club Partners LLC shall be party to all applications or W & W Equestrian~~

Club LLC shall take ownership of the Lake Maintenance Tracts prior to Public Hearing.  
(CERTIFICATION)

**Response: Per discussions at the DRC meeting, it was agreed that the first part of the subject comment is no longer necessary. The Applicant will maintain ownership of all of the Lake Maintenance Tracts prior to the applications going to a public hearing.**

3. The Lakefield South Homeowners owns the area where the bridle trail crossing is proposed across Country Golf Drive. The Lakefield South Homeowners shall be party to all applications prior to Public Hearings or provide consent to cross over their private road. An access easement may be required. (Certification)

**Response: The previously proposed bridle trail crossing has been removed.**

## **Petition 16-58 (2016-021 CPA3) – Comprehensive Plan Amendment**

### Planning and Zoning:

~~1. Update ownership and application information in Section I with Wanderer's Club Partners LLC.~~  
(CERTIFICATION)

**Response: Per discussions at the DRC meeting, it was agreed that the subject comment is no longer necessary. The Applicant will maintain ownership of all of the Lake Maintenance Tracts prior to the applications going to a public hearing.**

2. Correct and remove references to Lakefield PUD throughout the Comprehensive Plan Application Attachment. As stated at the numerous meeting we have had and in the preliminary comments, this is The Landings at Wellington PUD. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The appropriate documents have been updated to remove references to Lakefield PUD.**

3. Provide the page and official record book number of the plat and the master plan information as requested in Section IV., Question 3. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The Comprehensive Plan attachment has been revised to include the appropriate plat recordation information.**

4. Correct reference to "26.91 du" and replace with "26.91 persons" in Section XIII, Question 2. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The Comprehensive Plan attachment has been revised to correct this typo.**

5. Correct reference to the “C-51” Canal and replace with “C-15” Canal in Section VIII, Question No. 2. This correction was requested in the preliminary comments. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The Comprehensive Plan attachment has been revised to correct this typo.**

Traffic:

1. No response to this previous comment was received. It is proposed to extend the Equestrian Preserve Area to this property. Therefore, the bridle paths should also be extended to provide continuous access for these new proposed equestrian uses. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: Per discussions with staff at the DRC meeting, the Applicant has decided to consolidate the two trails into a single 12-foot wide public bridle trail.**

2. Peak hour trips for the golf course are incorrect. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The peak hour trips for the golf course have been revised.**

3. An historic growth rate of 1% was utilized. Area roadways, Wellington Trace and Greenview Shores Boulevard, have higher historic growth rates. Consider using a higher growth rate. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: An historic growth rate of 2% has been applied to all area roadways.**

4. Daily capacities on Table 5 should come from the Wellington Traffic Performance Standards. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: Table 5 has been revised to include Wellington Traffic Performance Standards.**

PBC Fire Rescue:

1. None

## **Petition 16-53 (ZTA 2016-002) – Zoning Text Amendment**

Planning and Zoning:

1. Remove water body setback for manure bin from table as Section 30-153 of Wellington’s Code of Ordinances provides regulations for Best Management Practices and setbacks for manure bins. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The Property Development Table has been revised to remove the water body setback for the manure bins.**

2. Accessory structure front setback should be equal to or greater than the principal structure setback. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The Property Development Table has been revised to include revised accessory structure setbacks.**

Traffic:

1. None

Building:

1. None

PBC Fire Rescue:

1. None

## **Petition 16-59 (2016-022 REZ) - Rezoning**

Planning and Zoning:

1. Correct and remove references to Lakefield PUD throughout the Justification Statement, this is The Landings at Wellington PUD. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The narrative has been revised to correct the Lakefield references.**

Traffic:

1. The Site Plan shows 12 stalls per barn which equates to 108 stalls. The traffic statement shows 72 stalls. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: Based on the acreages of the nine parcels, the maximum number of horse stalls is 103. The traffic statement has been revised to reflect this. In addition, the Site Plan sheets have been revised to note the maximum number of barns on each parcel.**

2. The driveways along Aero Club Drive and Greenbriar Boulevard should align with driveways across the street whenever possible. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The driveway entrances between Parcels 3 and 4 along Greenbriar and between Parcels 5 and 6 along Aero Club have been adjusted to align with the existing driveways across the street. Please see revised site plans.**

3. Provide driveway volumes for each driveway on Site Plan. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The driveway volumes for each driveway have been added to the revised site plans.**

4. How are residences and grooms quarters incorporated into each site? The site plan only shows a barn. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: A floor plan of the barns has been submitted to staff, which demonstrates that the grooms quarters will be located on the first floor and the owner's dwelling unit will be located on the second floor.**

Building:

1. None

PBC Fire Rescue:

1. None

## **Petition 16-60 (2016-023 MPA3) – Master Plan Amendment**

Planning and Zoning:

1. Within the Planned Development Chart, update the acreage for POD D. The acreage shall include Lakefield South (29 acres) and the residential portion of Winding Trails (28.41 acres). (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The Master Plan PDR Chart has been updated to include a separate row for the Winding Trails development, reflected as D-1. The acreage for Pod D has been updated as requested by staff.**

2. Update the Golf Course, Residential, Lakes and Right-of-Way acreage and percentage in the Site Area Breakdown. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The associated acreages for the Winding Trails property, the lakes, residential areas, and right-of-way acreages have been updated in the Site Area Breakdown table.**

3. Update the Total Density, Total Units, and lot breakdown for the Site Data table. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The Master Plan has been revised to provide updated density, units, and lot breakdown within the Site Data Table.**

4. The Master Plan was recreated by the agent and removed important labels that were on the approved document. Only update POD D and super-impose on the approved Master Plan. Also, "The Wanderer's Club" label should be changed back to "Lakefield" like on the approved document. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: All documents have been revised to reflect the Lakefield name rather than Wanderer's Club. .**

5. An access arrow for the proposed Right-of-Way to Lot 1 and 2 should be on Greenbriar Boulevard. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: An access arrow has been added to the Master Plan to show the proposed private right-of-way.**

6. Add an access arrow to Lot 1 as shown for Lot 2. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The Master Plan has been adjusted so that both access arrows are now visible.**

7. The existing configuration of Lake 3 shall be removed from the Master Plan. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The existing configuration of Lake 3 has been removed from the Master Plan.**

8. A 20' Right-of-Way Landscape Buffer shall be required for all properties adjacent to a right-of-way. A detail of the Right-of-Way buffer shall be provided and comply with Table 7.3-7 of the LDRs. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: A 20-foot right-of-way landscape buffer has been provided along Greenbriar and Aero Club Drive. Required along Aero Club and Greenbriar Boulevard. As discussed with staff at the DRC meeting a right-of-way buffer is not required along the canal.**

9. A 10' Incompatibility Landscape Buffer shall be provided for all properties adjacent to Residential E (Lakefield South) where they do not abut a lake. A detail of the incompatibility landscape buffer shall be provided and comply with Table 7.3-8 of Wellington's LDRs. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: An incompatibility buffer has been provided on the Master Plan as requested by staff.**

10. All buffer easements shall be included on the Master Plan. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The Master Plan has been revised to include all buffer easements.**

11. Update the Cross Sections with the above landscape buffer requirements. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The landscape cross-sections have been updated to depict the prescribed buffer requirements.**

12. Per Section 6.8.2.F.1.b of the LDRs, the developer shall be required to provide five (5) acres of property for each 1,000 population for park and recreational facilities and one (1) acre of property for each 1,000 population for other civic facilities. The 2010 US Census estimates there

are approximately three (3) persons per household which equals 27 people in population for Winding Trails which equates to the following:

- a. Parks and Recreational Facilities: 5,880 square feet
- b. Civic Facilities: 1,176 square feet

In lieu of dedication, the developer may pay a fee equal to \$50,000 per acre which equates to the following:

- a. Parks and recreational facilities: \$6,749.31
- b. Civic facilities: \$1,349.86

A 10% credit is available for passive recreational areas (i.e. bridle trails) if the conditions in Section 6.8.2.F.1.b.vii.(a) of the LDRs are met.

**Response: Noted.**

13. In compliance with the Comprehensive Plan, the internal bridle trail system shall be connected to the public bridle trail. The connection of the Red Trail from Winding Trails to the show grounds, as proposed in your application, will require that the applicant construct the public trail from the south east corner of the property south along Ousley Farms Road to Pierson Road. This will include the horse crossing on Greenbriar Boulevard. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The equestrian trail map has been revised to include the proposed bridle trails.**

14. "Paddox", "Manuer" and "Structuer" are misspelled throughout most of the documents. Please correct. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The various documents/plans have been revised to correct the spelling of these items.**

Traffic:

1. Master Plan shows increase of nine (9) single family units in Pod D; however traffic study addressed units as apartments. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The traffic study has been revised to reflect single family units.**

2. No stables were shown for Parcel D on the Master Plan. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The Master Plan has been revised to reference the total number of stables proposed.**

3. The access arrows shown on Master Plan should align with driveways across the street whenever possible. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The driveway entrances between Parcels 3 and 4 along Greenbriar and between Parcels 5 and 6 along Aero Club have been adjusted to align with the existing driveways across the street. Please see revised site plans.**

4. The access arrow shown on eastern property line should be shown as second arrow to Greenbriar Blvd. Demonstrate how that access will work with the alignment of the roadway across the street. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: A close up exhibit of this intersection has been provided to staff to demonstrate how the access and roadway alignment will work.**

Building:

1. None

PBC Fire Rescue:

1. Dead-end fire department access roads in excess of 150 feet in length shall be provided with approved provisions for the turning around of fire apparatus. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The parking courts have been revised to provide the necessary turn arounds for fire truck access.**

## **Petition 16-61 (2016-16 SP6) – Site Plan**

Planning and Zoning:

1. Correct the Petition Number listed in Site Data. The petition number should read: **16-61 (2016-16 SP6)** (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The site data has been revised to reflect the correct petition number.**

2. All other applications need to be approved prior to the certification of the Site Plan. Therefore, only include the requested Future Land Use Designation and Zoning District in the Site Data. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The site data table has been revised as requested to remove the references to “existing and approved.”**



~~3. If other owners are party to the applications, the "Owner/Client" information needs to be updated on all Site Plans. (CERTIFICATION)~~

**Response: Per discussions at the DRC meeting, it was agreed that the subject comment is no longer necessary. The Applicant will maintain ownership of all of the Lake Maintenance Tracts prior to the applications going to a public hearing.**

4. All PCNs need to match those listed in the General Application. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The General Application has been revised to include the update PCN numbers.**

5. The Future Land Use and Zoning designation for the surrounding properties on the Conceptual Site Plan are incorrect. Please revise. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The site plan has been revised to reference the corrected future land use and zoning designations for the surrounding properties.**

6. Define Green Space and indicate what is included in the Green Space calculations. What is the difference between "Open Space" and "Green Space." (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: Greenspace has been broken into subcategories of open space and LME/Lake Bank areas. These two areas have been identified on the various site plan sheets.**

7. Typical Barn shall be changed to "4 stalls per acre for a maximum of 12 stalls per lot". (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The site plan has been revised to reflect the maximum number of horse stalls permitted per lot.**

8. Remove the size of the paddocks, dressage practice fields and riding rings. If the size is listed on the plan, it will limit the owner from building larger or small rings/fields. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The site data information has been revised to remove the references to sizes of paddocks, dressage fields, and riding rings.**

9. Per Section 6.4.4.55 of the LDR, a maximum of one (1) groom's quarters not to exceed 500 square feet in area shall be permitted for each four stalls. The Site Plan and all of the Justification Statements indicate there are only nine (9) grooms quarters units throughout the entire project. Understand that if you only allow one (1) groom's quarter per property, it is limited to 500 square feet no matter how many stalls are within the barn. Additional grooms quarters may be permitted, but it will change the traffic statement and site data so please be aware any future change may require a site plan amendment. (COMMENT)

**Response: Noted.**

10. The site plan shall only include what is being proposed. Remove all outlines of existing lakes that are to be reconfigured. Only the scope of work shall be bold and prominent. Lakefield South is not part of the site plan and shall be faded out and indicated on the Site Plan that it is not part of the application. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The site plans has been revised to remove all outlines of existing lakes. In addition, the Lakefield South area has been greyed out on the plans.**

11. Determine the frontage of each lot for setback purposes. Each lot must meet minimum width and depth requirements. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The frontages off each lot has been provided on the site plan. In addition, the various setbacks have been labeled as “front, side, and rear” for clarity purposes.**

12. Review the proposed setbacks in the ZTA. Some structures do not meet the proposed setbacks. Also, setbacks are to be measured from the outside of the Right-of-Way and shall not include the Right-of-Way. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The setback measurement has been revised to be measured from the outside of the right-of-way.**

13. Property lines need to be separate from the lake and be shown on the plan. As shown for Lot 1, there is not a definitive south property line. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The site plan has been revised to clearly show a south property line for Lot 1.**

14. The proposed “20’ Private Driveway” needs to be labeled “20’ Private Right-of-Way”. Please see Fire’s comment above regarding requirement of a turn around for a fire apparatus. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The private driveway has been revised to show a 20-foot private right-of-way from its connection to Greenbriar Boulevard to the first driveway intersection at Lot 2. After this point, the driveway will become a private driveway.**

15. Indicate the acreage of the land designated as Open Space west of Lot 2. Make sure this open space and all open space is properly labeled and listed in the site data. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: This area has been added to Lot 2 and is no longer shown as open space.**

16. The proposed 20' Lake Maintenance Easements around most of the reconfigured lakes encumbers private property that is not owned by the applicant. Please revise. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The lake maintenance easements have been revised**

17. How will you access the Lake Maintenance Easements? (COMMENT)

**Response: The lake maintenance easements will be accessed via the surrounding rights-of-ways of Aero Club Drive, Greenbriar Boulevard, and the private driveway.**

18. How will the shared driveways be addressed? Who will be responsible for maintaining? A limited access easement and/or cross access agreement between the properties may be required. Please review with Engineering. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: Shared access easements have been added to each of the driveways. The Winding Trails HOA will be responsible for maintaining the shared driveways.**

19. The Master Plan and Site Plan shall include all easements. Will there be drainage easements? (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: Yes, there will be drainage easements in various locations throughout the project. These have been shown on the Master and Site Plan.**

20. What is the bridge connection for? Is it a bridle trail? Indicate on Site Plan. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The bridge connection has been removed from the proposed site plan.**

21. Will the lots and private right-of-way be gated? (COMMENT)

**Response: Yes, the private lots will be gated. A detail of a typical gate has been added to the site details sheet. Please note that the typical gate exhibit is for illustrative purposes only, as each individual property owner will provide a gate of equal or greater quality.**

22. The proposed right-of-way providing access to Lot 1 and 2 is abutting the edge of the proposed lake bank, is within a Lake Maintenance Easement, Canal Maintenance Easement and a Landscape Buffer. Please check with Engineering to confirm which easements can overlap. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The right-of-way and LME has been revised to remove the easement overlap.**

23. Correct the north arrow on the Location Map on all pages. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The north arrow has been correction on all Location Maps.**

24. Add landscape buffer easements as mentioned in Master Plan Amendment comments above. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The appropriate landscape buffer easements have been provided on the site plan.**

25. A Landscape Plan including the buffers is required and must meet the LDRs. The Landscape Plans submitted show access to Lots 1 and 2 through Country Golf Drive. The landscape plan submitted does not meet code and needs to be updated accordingly. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The landscape plans have been updated to remove connections to the internal Lakefield South community.**

26. Is a perimeter fence being proposed along the perimeter where Lakefield South properties abut Lot 1 and 2? It seems that the fence is provided in some areas and not others. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: Yes, a perimeter fence is proposed along the perimeter of the Winding Trails community. This has been more clearly depicts on the site plans.**

27. Per the LDRs, a maximum of five (5) feet of passive open space (i.e. bridle trails) can overlap into a landscape buffer. Revise site plan reducing the encroachment. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The bridle trails along Greenbriar Boulevard and Aero Club Drive no longer overlap with the 20-foot right-of-way landscape buffers. The Applicant has revised the plans to provide one larger public bridle trail in place of the two smaller trails previously proposed. The public trail will connect to the overall Village equestrian trail system.**

28. Are you proposing two (2) bridle paths and two (2) fences parallel to each other along Aero Club and Greenbriar? Indicate "proposed" or "existing" for each. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The development plans have been revised to combine the two bridle paths into a single 12-foot wide public bridle path.**

29. In the Justification Statement it stated that the project will provide connectivity to PBIEC. On the Conceptual Site Plan, it does not show connectivity to Ousley Farms Road. The proposed bridle trail and the horse crossing shall be shown on the Site Plan. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The proposed public equestrian trail will connect to the existing Red Trail on the north side of Greenbriar Boulevard. The Red Trail is currently utilized as a connection to PBIEC. To reach PBIEC, Equestrians would travel east on the proposed public bridle trail along Greenbriar Boulevard and then cross over Greenbriar Boulevard to reach the existing trail that runs along the east side of Ousley Farms Road. Equestrians utilize this area for crossing in its**

**existing condition. Should staff have a desire to facilitate a more formal horse crossing on Greenbriar Boulevard, the Applicant is will to participate in such discussions.**

30. Per Section 30-153 of Wellington's Code of Ordinances, manure bins shall be constructed with a concrete pad and a lip. Provide a manure bin detail showing how the manure bin will be constructed per the Code. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The site details sheet has been revised to note that the Applicant will provide either a pitched floor or a lip at the end of the manure bin.**

31. All driveway widths shall be shown on the site plan. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: Each driveway entrance will be 24 feet wide. This has been notated on the site plans.**

32. Once the lakes are reconfigured, who will maintain the lakes? (COMMENT)

**Response: The lakes will continue to be maintained by ACME IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT. The littoral zones will be maintained by the Winding Trails HOA.**

33. Is there signage being proposed for Winding Trails? If so, it must be shown on the Site Plan and a detail shall be provided. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: No signage is propose at this time.**

34. A replat will be required. (CONDITION)

**Response: Noted.**

35. Architectural Review Board approval of elevations will be required prior to Building Permit approval. (CONDITION)

**Response: Noted.**

36. Provide a detail of all proposed street lights. Please provide a photometric plan. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The private driveways are not proposed to be lit.**

37. Per Section 7.3.11 of the LDRs, littoral planting and upland buffers shall be required. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: A littoral planting plan has been included in the revised development plans.**

Traffic:

1. The Site Plan shows 12 stalls per barn which equates to 108 stalls. The traffic statement shows 72 stalls. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: Based on the acreages of the nine parcels, the maximum number of horse stalls is 103. The traffic statement has been revised to reflect this. In addition, the Site Plan sheets have been revised to note the maximum number of barns on each parcel.**

2. The driveways along Aero Club Drive and Greenbriar Boulevard should align with driveways across the street whenever possible. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The driveway entrances between Parcels 3 and 4 along Greenbriar and between Parcels 5 and 6 along Aero Club have been adjusted to align with the existing driveways across the street. Please see revised site plans.**

3. Provide driveway volumes for each driveway on Site Plan(CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The driveway volumes for each driveway have been added to the revised site plans.**

4. How are residences and grooms quarters incorporated into each site? The site plan only shows a barn. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: A floor plan of the barns has been submitted to staff, which demonstrates that the groom's quarters will be located on the first floor and the owner's dwelling unit will be located on the second floor.**

Building:

1. None

PBC Fire Rescue:

1. Dead-end fire department access roads in excess of 150 feet in length shall be provided with approved provisions for the turning around of fire apparatus. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The parking courts have been revised to provide the necessary turn arounds for fire truck access.**

Engineering Comments:

Engineering provided one set of comments for all applications:

Preliminary Engineering Responses in General:

1. Document states a minimum 50-ft separation distance from roads with flush shoulders to a water hazard. What is the minimum separation distance from a roadway with curbing to a water hazard without requiring guardrail? (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The Applicant has provided a 50-foot road travel lane. There are no roads adjacent to the subject site that have raised curbs; therefore, this should not be an issue.**

2. Document states that “associated parking and driveways will add another 1.5 ac. of potential impervious surface”. Is the stated 1.5 ac. of impervious surface for the entire subdivision or for each lot? If 1.5 ac of impervious surface is for the entire subdivision, this limits each lot to 0.166 acres (7,260 SF) of impervious surface. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The document now references an assumed 2.0 acres of potential impervious surface from the associated parking and driveways. This is a total acreage for all nine (9) parcels.**

3. Pervious concrete will not be considered pervious area for the purposes of meeting Wellington’s compensating storage requirement. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: Previous references to pervious concrete have been removed from the drainage statement.**

4. Existing versus proposed lake areas are almost equal (0.05 acres difference). So, compensating storage for proposed building coverage and proposed impervious surfaces, is not going to be provided in lake areas. Exfiltration trench is mentioned as a possible method to providing the necessary compensating storage. Approximately how much exfiltration trench would be required per lot, assuming a maximum of 8,400 SF of building coverage and proposed amount of impervious surface per lot? (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The revised development plans demonstrate a total of 21.31 acres of proposed lake area. This is approximately two acres larger than the existing 19.29 acres of lake area. Please see revised lake plan.**

5. Two lakes are shown on “Proposed Lake Area” exhibit that do not meet the minimum required lake area of 0.5 acres. Please revise plans accordingly to resize or remove these lakes. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The development plans have been revised to ensure that all lake area exceed 0.50 acres. Please see revised lake plan.**

Drainage Statement:

5. Lots must meet minimum “Basin A” storage requirements of 0.40 acre-feet/acre and 0.89 acre-feet/acre at Elevation 16.0 and 17.5 (NGVD), respectively. Reference to this requirement and compliance with Wellington’s Stormwater Ordinance, “Exhibit 3” must be mentioned in Drainage Statement. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The basis for design will be in accordance with the Ordinance No. 2010-14 and will comply with the General Criteria as outlined in the Ordinance on Pages 6 through 10 and Exhibit 3 on Page 15.**

6. What are proposed grading limits for development of lots? What is proposed finish floor elevation of structures? What are grading minimum and maximum elevations for impervious surfaces? What are grading minimum and maximum elevations for open space/pervious surfaces? (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The grading design will be such that no stormwater will flow directly of the site. Typically, stormwater runoff will be collected in a system of catch basins and conveyed by underground culverts to the existing lake system that includes a portion of the C-15 Canal, which discharges through a controlled outfall to Acme Improvement District C-2 Canal, adjacent to the site. Most specifics of the grading will be determined during the design phase.**

7. What is proposed maximum impervious coverage per lot? Applicant may also provide maximum impervious coverage per acre (if preferred), since the lots vary in size. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The maximum impervious area per lot will be approximately 0.2 acres (see attached engineering response memo). The total building coverage will be about 2.0 acres (9 lots \* 0.2 ac = 1.8 ac). This equates to 0.03 per acre (1.8 ac / 65.45 ac).**

8. Who will be responsible for Lake Maintenance and littoral plantings after the lakes are reconfigured? (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: After the lakes are reconfigured, the Winding Trails HOA will maintain the littoral plantings. The lake bodies will continue to be maintained by the Acme Improvement District.**

#### Conceptual Landscape Plan

1. No landscaping permitted in Lake Maintenance or Utility Easements. Please revise Landscape Plan accordingly. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The Applicant has revised the landscape plans to remove any landscape material within the Lake Maintenance or Utility Easements. The only proposed material will be within the littoral areas.**

2. Are any littoral plantings proposed? If not, why not? Please see page 10 of Wellington's Stormwater Ordinance regarding reconfigured lakes. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: Yes, the Applicant is proposing to provide littoral plantings within the lake areas. These areas have been depicted on the revised landscape plans.**



3. Proposed landscaping on lake banks may not be permitted, depending on who will be responsible for lake maintenance and the types of lake bank plantings proposed. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The Applicant has revised the landscape plans to remove any landscape material within the Lake Maintenance or Utility Easements. The only proposed material will be within the littoral areas.**

Conceptual Site Plan:

1. Sheet 1 of 10: Does "Lake Subtotal" area listed in Site Data Table represent proposed water surface area? Please clarify. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: Yes, the "lake subtotal" area consists of water surface area.**

2. Sheet 1 of 10: Does "Greenspace" area listed in Site Data table represent lake maintenance areas and lake banks? Are any other areas included in "Greenspace" category? (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: Greenspace in the site data consists of the LME and lake bank areas. This has been clarified on the revised plans.**

3. Sheet 1 of 10: Is 40-ft dimension listed in Site Data Table under "Riding Ring" category a radius or a diameter? Please clarify. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The 40-foot dimension has been removed from the development plans, per prior comments from Zoning.**

4. Sheet 1 of 10: General Notes – Safe sight triangle must meet FDOT requirements for proposed driveway connections to Aero Club Drive and Greenbriar Blvd. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The note on Sheet 1 regarding the safe sight triangle has been revised to reflect compliance with FDOT standards.**

5. Sheet 1 of 10: It appears that the applicant is proposing to reconfigure "Lake 3" which does not appear to be owned by the applicant. Please explain. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The Applicant currently owns the majority of Lake 3. The remaining property will be obtained by the Applicant prior to public hearing.**

6. All Sheets: The north arrow on the Location Map should be facing up not to the right. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The north arrows on the Location Maps have been revised.**

7. All Sheets: The spelling of paddocks and manure are incorrect. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: This has been corrected on the revised plans.**

8. All Sheets: The existing and proposed edge of water, lake bank, and top of bank are difficult to interpret. Please revise plans so these lines are easy to decipher and label accordingly. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The site and landscape plans have been revised to more clearly show the various lake boundary lines.**

9. All Sheets: All driveway curves shall be designed to accommodate a large horse trailer. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: An autoturn exhibit has been included herein to demonstrate that the driveway curves can adequately accommodate horse trailers.**

10. All Sheets: All proposed driveways shall be exclusive from Lake and Canal Maintenance Easements. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The development plans have been revised to remove any overlaps between the driveways and LME's.**

11. All Sheets: Lake Maintenance Easements and Utility Easements shall be exclusive. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The development plans have been revised to remove any overlaps between the utility easements and LME's.**

12. All Sheets: Proposed Horse Wash Drainfield location must be shown and meet minimum BMP setbacks. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The horse wash drainfield has been located in a manner to sufficiently meet all minimum setbacks.**

13. All Sheets: Please provide an abbreviation list. (20' ROW LB?) (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The legend on the site plan sheets has been updated to identify Landscape Buffer.**

14. Sheet 2 of 10: What is purpose of fence shown? Fence appears to end abruptly at Lake 3 to the south and at property line to the north. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The fence line has been revised to provide continuous enclosure of the proposed parcels.**

15. Sheet 2 of 10: Is minimum setback from proposed Lake 3 reconfiguration to adjacent roadway met? (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: A minimum separation distance of 28 feet (20-ft LME + 8-foot slope) is proposed between Lake 3 and the adjacent roadway.**

16. Sheet 2 of 10: Is there an existing sidewalk located along County Golf Drive? Is the sidewalk proposed? A sidewalk is shown on cross-section B-B on Sheet 8 of 10. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: Yes, there is an existing sidewalk along Country Golf Drive.**

17. All Sheets: All proposed lake reconfigurations must be shown on the Conceptual Site Plan. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The site plan has been revised to reflect all proposed lake configurations.**

18. Sheet 3 of 10: Proposed bridle path may not be located within Lake Maintenance Easement. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The Applicant has revised the proposed development plans to combine the two previously proposed bridle trails into one larger bridle trail. The single trail will be 12 feet wide and will be open entirely to the public. The trail will also connect to the larger equestrian system throughout the Village. The Applicant has proposed a 12-foot wide trail in an effort to provide the highest quality amenity to the existing and future Village residents. The LME on the east side of Lake 2 has been designed to incorporate a small portion of the 12-foot bridle trail. Walkways/sidewalks are often incorporated into LME areas to provide interest and diversity to the pedestrian experience as they travel along the path. Many of the existing bridle trails throughout the Village are located along canals without harm to the equestrian rider or the water body. Staff has been very clear that it is not their desire to maintain vegetation within the LME or lake bank areas of the Acme lakes. Therefore, the proposed bridle trail is not imposing a loss of landscape material that would otherwise be installed. The bridle trail will be made of a natural material consistent with the existing bridle trails throughout the Village. The proposed design has been extremely effective with many projects in other areas that have incorporated walking paths or mulch trails along LME's and it will serve to increase the riding enjoyment of the trail.**

19. Sheet 3 of 10: Is fencing proposed along proposed bridle path? If so, please show on plan and clarify the fence type. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: Yes, a perimeter fence is proposed along the perimeter of the Winding Trails community. This has been more clearly depicts on the site plans.**

20. Sheet 3 of 10: What is the proposed surface material type of proposed bridle path? (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The bridle trail surface will match that of the existing bridle trail system. A note to this effect has been added to the site plans.**

21. Sheet 3 of 10: Is bridle path and crossing shown at northwest corner of plan sheet existing or proposed? Has Lakefield agreed to proposed bridle path crossing County Golf Drive? If so, please provide approval. If not, how and when is approval anticipated? (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The bridge crossing has been removed from the proposed development plan.**

22. Sheet 4 of 10: Is "2.5-ft horse fence" proposed? If proposed, does this fence height meet applicable Wellington codes? (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: All proposed fencing will be consistent with the Village's existing horse fence along the existing bridle trail system.**

23. Sheet 4 of 10: Why are you proposing two bridle trails that are adjacent and parallel with a fence and hedge separating the two? Why not proposed one, larger bridle trail? (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The previous plans depicted two separate bridle trails. This has been revised to reflect one 12-foot wide bridle trail that will be accessible to the public. All references to golf carts has been removed.**

24. Sheet 4 of 10: Manure Bin on Lot 3 does not appear to meet minimum BMP setbacks. How does applicant plan to address this issue? (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The manure bin on Lot 3, has been adjusted to meet the minimum BMP setbacks.**

25. All Sheets: Please label all match lines per industry standards. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The match lines have been revised as requested.**

26. All Sheets: Only two structures on shown on lots, one barn and one manure bin. Are any additional structures proposed? If not, does the applicant intend on allowing additional buildings to be constructed on lots in the future? (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: At this time, the Applicant does not anticipate any additional buildings or structures on site. However, to allow for future flexibility, accessory structure setbacks have been proposed with the subject applications.**

27. Sheet 4 of 10: As shown, barns appear to be located very close to proposed lake bank (within 50-ft). Does this distance meet applicable minimum setbacks? Are there any constructability concerns due to the close proximity of the proposed lakes? (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The barns have been appropriately setback from the lake areas.**

28. All Sheets: Legend lists "500 SF Septic Field". Is this the minimum required septic field size for the maximum size structure proposed for the lots? (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The 500-square-foot area is proposed as a maximum area for the septic drainfield. The plans have been revised to include "maximum" for clarity purposes.**

29. Sheet 4 of 10: Is 12-ft shared (public?) bridle path existing or proposed? If proposed, will an easement be provided for the 12-ft shared (public?) bridle path? What is the proposed surface material type of the proposed bridle path? Please remove reference to "golf cart path". (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The previous plans depicted two separate bridle trails. This has been revised to reflect one 12-foot wide bridle trail that will be accessible to the public. All references to golf carts has been removed.**

30. Sheet 5 of 10: Is "20' Access Easement" existing or proposed? If existing, will this easement be abandoned? If proposed, why is this easement being proposed? (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The 20-foot access easement show on Sheet 5 is proposed to be abandoned. This has been noted on the revised plans.**

31. Sheet 5 of 10: Does barn shown on Lot 5 meet minimum side setback requirement? (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The barn on Lot 5 has been adjusted to meet all proposed dimensional requirements.**

32. Sheet 5 of 10: Please label proposed shared access drive on Conceptual Site Plan. Who will be responsible for maintenance of proposed shared access drive? Will shared access drive be located in an easement? (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The Winding Trails HOA will maintain the shared access driveways. Shared access easements have been added to the revised plans.**

33. Sheet 6 of 10: At south end of this sheet, lot corner appears to be too close to edge of Lake 4. Please revise to provide a 20-ft lake maintenance easement. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The Lake Maintenance easement in this area has been revised to show the correct location of the easement.**

34. Sheet 6 of 10: As shown, barns appear to be located very close to proposed lake bank (within 50-ft). Does this distance meet applicable minimum setbacks? Are there any constructability concerns due to the close proximity of the proposed lakes? (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The barns have been appropriately setback from the lake areas.**

35. Sheet 6 of 10: On this sheet there is a 5-ft utility easement and a 12-ft utility easement shown in the same location. Are these easements existing or proposed? Who does 5-ft utility easement belong to or who is 5-ft utility easement going to be dedicated to? (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: This was an error and has been corrected to reflect a 5-foot LAE.**

36. Sheet 6 of 10: At northeast corner of this sheet, there is an inconsistent width of what appears to be a lake maintenance easement? Please correct. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The Lake Maintenance Easement shown on Sheet 6 has been revised to show a consistent width.**

37. Sheet 6 of 10: At northeast corner of this sheet, the easement following the cul-de-sac stops at what appears to be a proposed lake maintenance easement. What type of easement (utility?) is this? Why is easement being shown to dead end at lake maintenance easement? (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: This is an existing drainage easement. The affected site plan sheet has been revised to identify this as a drainage easement for clarity purposes.**

38. Sheet 7 of 10: At south end of this sheet, why is the lake maintenance easement shown with an inconsistent width. Please correct with 20-ft consistent width. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: The Lake Maintenance Easement shown on Sheet 7 has been revised to show a consistent width.**

39. Sheet 7 of 10: What is separation from corner of Lakefield lots to the proposed edge of water? Lots appear too close to edge of water. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: A minimum separation distance of 28 feet (20-ft LME + 8-foot slope) is proposed between the edge of water for Lake 1 and the adjacent roadway.**

40. Sheet 8 of 10: On Parking Court Detail, what is the material type “crushed rock” referring to? (Crushed concrete? Shellrock? Asphalt Millings?) Please clarify. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: By “crushed rock” the Applicant would propose 1) asphalt millings or (2) crushed rock aggregate product per FL DOT 89. This has been clarified in the engineering response memo and on the revised site plan.**

41. Sheet 8 of 10: Please correct spelling of structure in “Manure Structure Detail”. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: Sheet 8 has been revised to correct the spelling errors.**

42. Sheet 8 of 10: Please add Horse Wash Drainfield and Horse Hair Interceptor Detail to this sheet. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: All affected sheets have been revised to include a horse wash drainfield and horse hair interceptor detail.**

43. Sheet 8 of 10: Cross Section B-B shows an “Existing 4’ Concrete Sidewalk”. This sidewalk does not appear on Sheet 2 of 10. Please correct. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: Cross-section B-B has been revised to show the existing 4-foot concrete sidewalk.**

44. Sheet 8 of 10: Utility easement is not shown in Cross Section A-A. Please correct. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: Cross-section A-A has been revised to show the proposed utility easements.**

45. Sheet 9 of 10: Please label lot numbers on this sheet. (CERTIFICATION)

**Response: Sheet 9 has been revised to label the lot numbers.**



STAFF USE ONLY  
**RECEIVED**  
 Intake Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
 By: \_\_\_\_\_  
 By Planning and Zoning at 5:07 pm, Jul 06, 2016

**Planning & Zoning**

12300 Forest Hill Blvd., Wellington, FL 33414 (561) 791-4000 [PZApplications@wellingtonfl.gov](mailto:PZApplications@wellingtonfl.gov)

**PART 1: PLANNING AND ZONING GENERAL APPLICATION**  
 (Completed Part 1 and 2 of the Application is required)

**INSTRUCTIONS:**

1. Date of required pre-application meeting: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Please complete all questions on the application. If not applicable, indicate with N/A.
3. Provide required attachments as shown on the checklist (Part 2)
4. Check the appropriate type of request (Must complete Part 2 of the application specific to your request):

- |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Administrative Appeal                          | <input type="checkbox"/> Development Order/<br>Amendment/Other         | <input type="checkbox"/> Site Plan/Amendment/<br>Subdivision        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Administrative Variance                        | <input type="checkbox"/> Easement/Right-Of-Way<br>Vacation Abandonment | <input type="checkbox"/> Special Permit Use                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Annexation                                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Master Plan/Amendment                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Unity of Title/Unity of<br>Control/Release |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Architectural Review Board                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor Site Plan Amendment                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Variance                                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Comprehensive Plan<br>Amendment                | <input type="checkbox"/> Rezoning                                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Zoning Text Amendment                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Conditional Use/Compatibility<br>Determination |  |   |

Multiple requests may be selected. A completed Part 2 Application for each request shall be submitted with a completed Part 1: Planning and Zoning General Application.

Application Fee: \$ \_\_\_\_\_ (Total fee for all requests)  
 (Note: the application fee is an initial deposit and could be as all above applications are cost recovery.)

**I. PROPERTY OWNER AND AGENT INFORMATION**

Property Owner(s) of Record: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_ City: \_\_\_\_\_ ST: \_\_\_\_\_ Zip: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_ Cell: \_\_\_\_\_

Email Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Applicant (if other than owner): \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_ City: \_\_\_\_\_ ST: \_\_\_\_\_ Zip: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_ Cell: \_\_\_\_\_

Email Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Agent & Company Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_ City: \_\_\_\_\_ ST: \_\_\_\_\_ Zip: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_ Cell: \_\_\_\_\_

Email Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Consultants: If applicable to the request, please attach a separate list of all consultants that will provide information on this request. Include the name, address, telephone number, and fax number as well as the type of professional service provided.

Authorization or Power of Attorney must be attached if applicant is other than owner.



**II. REQUEST**

A. Describe type of request:

---

---

**III. PROPERTY LOCATION**

A. Is the subject property located within one mile of another municipality? [ ] yes [ ] no

If 'yes' please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

B. Property Control Number (PCN): If additional PCNs, list on a separate sheet and attach to the application.

PCN: \_\_\_\_\_

C. Total Acreage of Subject Property \_\_\_\_\_

D. Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_

E. Project Address: \_\_\_\_\_

F. General Location Description (proximity to closest major intersection in miles or fractions thereof):

---

---

**IV. LAND USE AND ZONING INFORMATION**

A. Zoning Designation: \_\_\_\_\_ Future Land Use Designation: \_\_\_\_\_

B. Existing Use(s) on Property: \_\_\_\_\_

C. Proposed Use(s): \_\_\_\_\_

D. Do you have a Zoning Confirmation for this project? If so, please attach \_\_\_\_\_

**V. COMPLIANCE**  
(Attach additional sheets if necessary)

A. Is property in compliance with all previous conditions of approval and/or applicable LDR requirements?

[ ] yes [ ] no. If no, please explain: \_\_\_\_\_

---

B. Code Enforcement Case Number(s) \_\_\_\_\_

C. Report on the status of all previous conditions of approval: \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

---

---

**VI. PROJECT HISTORY**

List in sequence the last five approvals starting with the most recent.

Petition Number	Request	Action	Date	Resolution/ Ordinance Number

**VII. ADJACENT PROPERTIES**

Adjacent Property to the:	Land Use Designation	Zoning Designation	Existing Use(s) of Property	Approved Use(s) of Property*
SUBJECT SITE				
NORTH				
SOUTH				
EAST				
WEST				



**RECEIVED**

By Planning and Zoning at 5:08 pm, Jul 06, 2016

Landscape Architects | Land Planners | Environmental Consultants

1934 Commerce Lane · Suite 1 · Jupiter, Florida · 33458 · Ph 561.747.6336 · Fax 561.747.1377 · www.cotleurhearing.com · Lic # LC-C000239

*Winding Trails*  
**Zoning Text Amendment**  
**Justification Statement**  
July 6, 2016

**Introduction**

On behalf of W&W Equestrian Club, LLC, the Applicant, we are requesting approval of a Zoning Text Amendment to establish property development regulations for the subject property.

**Project Contact:**

**Agent/Planner - Cotleur & Hearing, Inc.**

Donaldson Hearing / Kathryn DeWitt

1934 Commerce Lane, Suite 1

Jupiter, FL 33458

Phone: (561) 747-6336 x 110

Fax: (561) 747-1377

E-mail: [kdewitt@cotleur-hearing.com](mailto:kdewitt@cotleur-hearing.com)

**Background**

The site is located at the northeast corner of Aero Club Drive and Greenbriar Boulevard within the Lakefield PUD. The Lakefield PUD encompasses approximately 148.31 acres. Only the portion of the golf course and lake areas, 65.45 acres, are owned by the Applicant, W&W Equestrian Club, LLC, and subject to this application. The remaining areas of the PUD will remain in their current state.

**Land Use and Zoning**

The project has a Future Land Use Map designation of Commercial Recreation (CR). The Applicant has submitted a companion application to change the Comprehensive Plan designations of the property from Commercial Recreation to Residential B Future Land Use and bring the subject property into the Equestrian Preserve Area (EPA). The current Zoning designation is Agricultural Residential/Planned Unit Development (AR/PUD). In correspondence to the Future Land Use change to EPA, the property will also become part of the Equestrian Overlay Zoning District (EOZD).

**Project Description**

The Wanderer's Club Par 3 Executive Course is an existing golf course surrounded by a residential community. Over the last several years, the golf course has become defunct and is no longer viable. The golf course property was sold to the Applicant for future development. The property will be broken up into nine (9) different parcels and is proposed to be developed

as luxury equestrian residential estates. The community will provide a luxury equestrian environment to horse aficionados by providing an owners' apartment and abundant amenities for each owner. Additionally, the Par 3 Executive Course is closely located to the Palm Beach International Equestrian Center (PBIEC) and International Polo Club (ICP). The course is adjacent to the five (5)-mile equestrian trail along the C-15 canal and the equestrian trail that runs parallel to Greenbriar Boulevard.

The new community will include nine (9) estate lots. Each estate ranges from 1.90-4.30 acres in size. It is envisioned that each lot will include equestrian facilities, such as a barn, a groom's quarters, an owner's apartment, paddocks, and a dressage/hunter jumper practice ring. The Applicant is proposing to extend the EOZD designation over the subject property. Inclusion within the EOZD will allow the use of these types of equestrian amenities to exist on the various parcels. Concurrent Comprehensive Plan Amendment, Rezoning, and Zoning Text Amendment applications have been submitted to staff for review.

The concurrent site plan amendment application includes one (1) dwelling unit and one (1) groom's quarters per parcel for a total of nine (9) dwelling units and nine (9) groom's quarters. This equates to a density of 0.14 dwelling units per acre. The parcels will have an immense amount of open space with the presence of a riding/dressage ring and paddocks. The only impervious area will be one (1) principal structure and a small parking area. The remainder of the parcel will be pervious material. The groom's quarters will be located within the same structure as the owner's dwelling unit and the horse stalls.

### **Zoning Text Amendment**

The Applicant has submitted concurrent applications for a Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment to extend the boundaries of the EPA and Rezoning application to change the zoning designation from AR/PUD to AR/PUD/EOZD – Subarea F. The purpose of the zoning text amendment is to provide property development regulations to accommodate for the unique development pattern proposed. The EOZD overlay for the property includes a new subarea, F. The proposed language is shown below in strike-through and underline format. Where possible, unedited text has been omitted for brevity.

#### **Sec. 6.10.4. - Subareas Established.**

*For the purposes of this Article, the following subareas are established and shall be so indicated on the Official Zoning Map of the Village of Wellington:*

*(previous text omitted for brevity)*

*F. Subarea F. Subarea F consists of the portion of the Wanderer's Club).....;commonly known as "Wanderer's Club Equestrian Estates"*

*(previous text omitted for brevity)*

**Sec. 6.10.6. - Development Standards.**

Minimum setbacks and other development standards for principal and accessory uses within the Equestrian Preservation Areas are established in Table A.

**A. Minimum Setbacks.**

1. *Measurement.* All setbacks shall be measured from property lines or from right-of-way easement lines in those subdivisions without dedicated or platted rights-of-way.
2. *Exemptions.* Excluding dressage walls, there are no required setbacks for equestrian amenities.

Table A.  
 Minimum Setbacks for Principal and Accessory Uses

(Table A omitted for brevity)

Table A.1.  
 Minimum Setbacks for Principal and Accessory Uses for Subarea F

PRINCIPAL STRUCTURE SETBACKS				
SETBACK	MIN. SETBACK FOR PRINCIPAL STRUCTURE	MIN. SETBACK FOR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE	MIN. SETBACK FOR MANURE BINS	RIDING RING / PADDOCKS / PRACTICE FIELD
FRONT	50'	55'	30'	20'
SIDE, INTERIOR	50'	10'	30'	20'
SIDE, CORNER	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
REAR	10'	10'	30'	20'
OTHER	50' from residential lot	-	50' from residential lot	50' from residential lot

Table B.  
 Development Standards for Principal and Accessory Uses

(Table B omitted for brevity)

Table B.1.  
 Development Standards for Principal and Accessory Uses for Subarea F

DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR PRINCIPAL AND ACCESSORY USES	
MIN. LOT WIDTH	300'
MIN. LOT DEPTH	100'
MAX. FAR	20%
MAX. BUILDING HEIGHT	2 STORIES AND 35 FEET
MAX. LOT COVERAGE	20%
MAX. HORSE STALL DENSITY	4 STALLS PER ACRE MAX 12 STALLS PER LOT

(previous text omitted for brevity)

**Sec. 6.10.8. - Maximum Density and Minimum Lot Size.**

Maximum density and minimum lot size requirements for property within the Equestrian Preservation Areas are established in Table D.

**Table D.**  
**Maximum Density and Minimum Lot Size Requirements**

<b>Subarea</b>	<b>Maximum Density</b>	<b>Minimum Lot Size</b>	<b>Cluster Development</b>
A	0.2 Dwelling Units per Acre	5 Acres	Prohibited
B	0.5 Dwelling Units per Acre	1 Acre	Prohibited
C	0.1 Dwelling Units per Acre	10 Acres	Prohibited
D	0.5 Dwelling Units per Acre	2 <sup>1</sup> Acres	Permitted
E	0.2 Dwelling Units Per Acre	5 Acres	Prohibited
<u>F</u>	<u>0.5 Dwelling Units Per Acre</u>	<u>2 Acres</u>	<u>Prohibited</u>

**Note**

1. In a cluster development minimum lot size is 0.33 acres provided that overall density of the cluster development shall be not more than one unit per two acres.

**Sec. 6.10.9. - Supplemental District Regulations.**

The requirements listed below shall apply to all uses within the Equestrian Preservation Areas.

**D. Use of Tents as Temporary Stalls.** The use of tents as temporary stalls shall comply with the standards listed below:

1. Tents Prohibited. After June 1, 2003, tents shall not be permitted in Subarea A, Subarea F, and the residential-developed areas of Subareas B and D, except in conjunction with the construction of a barn or stable. Any such temporary tent shall be removed within ten (10) working days of the issuance of a certificate of occupancy for the barn or stable.

**I. Equestrian Arenas, Covered.**

1. Setbacks. Setbacks for roofed equestrian arenas shall comply with the requirements of Table A.
2. Measurement of Setbacks. Setbacks shall be measured from property line or edge of roadway easement, as applicable.
3. Design. A roofed equestrian arena shall be constructed in a manner consistent with the architectural style, color, and materials of the principal structure.
4. Covered Arenas shall not be permitted in Subarea F.

-End of Text Amendment Language-

### **Zoning Text Amendment Criteria**

#### **A. Reason and need for the requested text change.**

*The proposed Zoning Map amendment is based on a change in assumptions. The Par 3 Executive Golf Course is an existing golf course surrounded by a residential community. Over the last several years, the golf course has become defunct and is no longer viable. The change in viability of the golf course is the impetus of the proposed redevelopment. The golf course property was sold to the Applicant for future development. The property will be broken up into nine (9) different parcels and is proposed to be developed as luxury equestrian residential estates. The community will provide a luxury equestrian environment to horse aficionados by providing an owners' apartment and abundant amenities for each owner. The type of luxury equestrian estates that are proposed on the property are not addressed in the Village's current Land Development Regulations. Therefore, the Applicant has proposed language to create a new subarea within the EOZD, Subarea F, which contains property development regulations and standards to be applied within the new subarea.*

#### **B. Reason for the present text being invalid or inappropriate.**

*As described above, the subject property was previously a Par 3 golf course that is no longer in use. The Applicant is proposing to redesign the golf course and associated lake areas to create nine (9) large estate lots. Due to the unique configuration of a typical golf course, the estate lots have varying forms. The present text of the Village's Land Development Regulations (LDRs) does not address the varying nature of the equestrian estate development being proposed. The LDRs are better suited for large plotted lots with standard lot sizes. Therefore, the Applicant has provided language that will establish standards for this specific type of development. The regulations address setbacks, size, and height regulations for principal structure, accessory structure, paddocks, dressage fields, barns, manure bins, etc.*

#### **C. Explain how the proposed amendment complies with the objectives and purposes of Wellington's Comprehensive Plan.**

*The proposed text amendment has been modeled after the existing code language. The proposed text includes all of the standards currently regulated in other subareas of the EOZD (i.e. setbacks, accessory structures, height limitations, lot coverage, density, etc). The proposed amendment is consistent with the Village's Comprehensive Plan. The purpose of the Equestrian Preservation Area, as described in the Comprehensive Plan, is to limit density and intensity, provide preservation of green space, provide equestrian circulation system, provide safe crossing of roadways, and generally provide for the preservation of the rural lifestyles (Policy 1.2.13 of the Land Use Element). We feel that the proposed text amendment will produce a development pattern consistent with the*

Winding Trails  
CH# 150201  
2016-002 ZTA  
Zoning Text Amendment  
July 6, 2016

*intent of the EOZD and further the purpose of the overlay. The text amendment limits density to 0.14 dwelling units per acre or one (1) dwelling unit per parcel. The parcels will also have an immense amount of open space with the presence of riding rings and dressage fields.*

**Conclusion**

The Applicant is requesting approval of a Zoning Text Amendment to create Subarea F with associated property development regulations that will be applied to the subject property. The proposed amendment is consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan and zoning regulations. The Applicant looks forward to working with Staff to respond to any questions or issues that might arise as a result of your review.