Doug McDowell

From:	Emily Pierce <epierce@rtlaw.com></epierce@rtlaw.com>
Sent:	Thursday, February 20, 2020 5:24 PM
То:	Doug McDowell
Cc:	Jon C. Lasserre; Michael Mullin
Subject:	RE: Concourse Crossing
Attachments:	Northern Parcel - Concourse Crossing.pdf; Property Appraiser's Map - Northern Parcel
	Concourse Crossing.pdf

Doug,

I spoke with Jon Lasserre and reviewed my notes in order to address the question you raised about the buffer and the discussions with the neighbors. I have also spoken briefly with Tony Robbins at Prosser.

Based upon my notes it appears that a number of neighbors spoke during the P&Z meeting about concerns they had with regard to the proposed development. Those concerns generally fell into two categories: (1) drainage/standing water (Mrs. Rowe & Mrs. Horne - neighbors to the west in Harbor Concourse; Mr. McCarthy neighbor to the north); and (2) buffering the homes from the adjacent parcels (Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Audette and Mrs. Heape – neighbors to the north and east). My notes reflect a general discussion after the meeting with these neighbors where we took down their names and contact information , took down information about their concerns, promised to look into drainage in the area and generally discussed buffering and fencing. We told the neighbors we would get back to them to address their concerns.

Neal Brockmeier from Prosser investigated the drainage system constructed within Harbor Concourse and reviewed the wetland systems in the area. Neal met with both Mrs. Rowe and Mrs. Horne "on-site" and he was able to show them the delineation between their property and the adjacent wetlands. He discussed lot elevation and the staging and function of the wetlands. He explained that Concourse Crossing could not disturb or drain the wetlands, and also could not increase the amount of water draining into the wetlands. Both women seemed to be happy with the responses and the fact that Neal came out and met with them. Mrs. Rowe requested that if any trees are cut on the Concourse Crossing site, that they not be disposed of in the wetlands. The developer will comply with this request (this would also violate Water Management District rules). Per my notes, Neal reached out to, but was unable to reach Mr. McCarthy. Neal was able to review wetland maps for Mr. McCarthy's property and could see that the onsite wetlands were holding water, i.e., functioning as they are supposed to.

I reviewed the Property Appraiser's maps and the proposed PUD and saw that the proposed development is not adjacent to Mr. Audette's property and that there is no vertical development adjacent to Mr. McCarthy's property. I spoke to Mrs. Heape and her daughter about what would constitute a sufficient buffer for the Heape property. We agreed on a 20' undisturbed natural buffer and a fence. We agreed to come in 20' off of the shared property line and then put up the fence (vs. having the buffer inside of the fence) to ensure that the lot owners would not incorporate the buffer area into their yards. Prosser revised the PUD application to include a graphic showing the placement of the buffer and the fencing to make sure that the developer and the neighbors understand where the buffer and fence are to be located in relation to the property line and to each other. To the extent that Mr. Audette can see the development, the fencing and buffering will benefit him as well. With regard to Mr. McCarthy's property I did not reach back out to Mr. McCarthy following Neal's attempt to reach him since the entire Concourse Crossing property north of Frank Ward Road is a 2.79 acre buffer adjacent to his property (again, there is no vertical development on this parcel).

I understand from speaking with people at Prosser that Mr. McCarthy wants a fence along his property line between the Concourse Crossing pond and his pond (see the attached aerial). Nassau I Amelia LLC will install a fence along the property boundary (approximately 90' feet) between the parcels following construction of the pond and the installation

of the landscaping. Additionally, although we did not hear from John Luther Peters or Kennard & Company, the two property owners north of the Concourse Crossing pond, Nassau I Amelia LLC will install a fence along the pond's northern property boundary if the County would like the developer to do so.

I believe that we addressed all of the neighbors' concerns that were raised during the P&Z meeting.

Emily

Emily Pierce | Shareholder



ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Rogers Towers, P.A. | 1301 Riverplace Blvd., Suite 1500 | Jacksonville, Florida 32207 Direct 904.346.5787 | Fax 904.396.0663 | Internal 5787 | <u>EPierce@RTLAW.com</u> | <u>View Attorney Bio</u> | www.rtlaw.com

From: Doug McDowell <dmcdowell@nassaucountyfl.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2020 11:06 AM
To: Emily Pierce <EPierce@RTLAW.com>
Subject: Concourse Crossing

[EXTERNAL]

Emily:

Thanks for taking my call today re: Concourse Crossing. Just a reminder, if you could just briefly summarize what we talked about today, i.e how you met with the neighboring property owners and agreed to the 20' buffer with the fence, in an e-mail I would appreciate it.

Thanks again.

Doug McDowell, AICP | Principal Planner

Nassau County | Planning and Economic Opportunity 96161 Nassau Place | Yulee, FL 32097 P: (904) 530-6300 E: <u>dmcdowell@nassaucountyfl.com</u>



NASIAU COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY FLORIDA

Under Florida law, e-mail addresses are public records. If you do not want your e-mail address released in response to a public records request, please do not send electronic mail to this entity. Instead, please contact this office by phone or in writing.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email is from the law firm of Rogers Towers, P.A. ("Rogers Towers") and the information in this email and all attachments to this email (the "Information") are intended solely for the intended recipient(s). The Information may be legally privileged and confidential. If you are not an intended recipient or you believe that you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately, delete the email from your computer, and do not review, use, disseminate, distribute or copy this email or the Information. Please also take the necessary steps to permanently remove any copies of the Information from your system and do not retain any copies, whether in electronic or physical form or otherwise. If you are not an existing client of Rogers Towers, do not construe anything in this email to create an attorney-client relationship between you and Rogers Towers unless the email contains a specific statement to that effect and do not disclose anything to Rogers Towers in reply that you consider confidential.



hood Park

EXHIBIT "C" Concourse Crossing ROW Reservation Development Plan



50' 100' 200' April 9, 2018







