

**Project Name: 24-00400056**

**Project Description: Carolina Club\_Rezoning**

Review Comments List Date: 8/19/2025

Ref. # 22, Building, Richard Nixon, 4/15/25 11:13 AM, Cycle 1, Info Only

Comment: Documents were not reviewed for Florida Building Code compliance. Permits and plans will be required.

Ref. # 10, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 2/13/25 4:12 PM, Cycle 1, Info Only

Comment: During the review process, provided information may be requested to be updated or changed. Also, additional documentation may be requested to be included as exhibits if required to complement the submitted documents.

Ref. # 12, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 2/13/25 4:35 PM, Cycle 1, Info Only

Markup: Changemark note #01-ENG, 3\_RZ Application Text\_October 2024.pdf

Where is the engineering analysis demonstrating how the site will be drained and impact on surrounding properties? Provide analysis of proposed drainage and its impact on neighboring properties and roads currently discharging into the existing lakes/properties.

Reviewer Response: Paula Fonseca - 3/24/25 4:10 PM

*This task to be completed during site plan approval.*

Responded by: LINDSAY MURPHY - 3/13/25 9:01 PM

*Per conference with Curt Keyser, David Tolces, Cale Curtis, and DSD staff, the detailed analyses will be provided during the site plan phase of this entitlement process. The submitted LUPA provides a Drainage analysis demonstrating drainage capacity/concurrency for the proposed project.*

Ref. # 13, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 2/13/25 4:35 PM, Cycle 1, Info Only

Markup: Changemark note #02-ENG, 3\_RZ Application Text\_October 2024.pdf

Demonstrate that the existing water distribution system has enough capacity to serve the proposed development including fire flow requirements.

Reviewer Response: Paula Fonseca - 3/24/25 4:10 PM

*This task to be completed during site plan approval.*

Responded by: LINDSAY MURPHY - 3/13/25 9:01 PM

*Per conference with Curt Keyser, David Tolces, Cale Curtis, and DSD staff, the detailed analyses will be provided during the site plan phase of this entitlement process. The submitted LUPA provides a Potable Water analysis demonstrating water capacity/concurrency for the proposed project.*

Ref. # 14, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 2/13/25 4:35 PM, Cycle 1, Info Only

Markup: Changemark note #03-ENG, 3\_RZ Application Text\_October 2024.pdf

Demonstrate the existing lift stations, force main system and/or gravity system serving the proposed improvements have enough capacity to handle the additional flow.

Reviewer Response: Paula Fonseca - 3/24/25 4:10 PM

*This task to be completed during site plan approval.*

Responded by: LINDSAY MURPHY - 3/13/25 9:01 PM

*Per conference with Curt Keyser, David Tolces, Cale Curtis, and DSD staff, the detailed analyses will be provided during the site plan phase of this entitlement process. The submitted LUPA provides a Sanitary Sewer analysis demonstrating capacity/concurrency for wastewater anticipated to be generated by the proposed project.*

Ref. # 24, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 5/1/25 1:04 PM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

Comment:

TRAFFIC

Introduction

The conceptual plan will need to be revised to include an actual site plan for the purposes of the traffic study review. This is required for traffic circulation, intersection analyses, and any proposed improvements.

Full site plan including overall layout, building, structures, entrances/exits driveway locations, access roads, direction of traffic, pavement markings, signage, traffic circulations, parking areas, loading areas, number of parkings, speed bumps, pedestrian traffic, emergency access, access to public transportation, queuing space for vehicles, etc. shall be included to properly evaluate the traffic component for this development.

Reviewer Response: Paula Fonseca - 8/15/25 4:59 PM

*Pod A will have 2 access locations: 1 from Sample Rd (which will require FDOT approval) and 1 from Pine Walk Drive. Pod B, a gated community, has 1 access location from Holiday Springs Blvd and a roadway connection Pine Walk Drive with no connection to Pod B provided. How will the access from Pine Walk Drive to Pod B be configured as it is gated? Pod B is also shown in the figures and tables to have a connection to Sample Road. There is no driveway connection to Pod B provided at this location. How will the access from Pine Walk Drive to Pod B be configured as it is gated? Pod C has 1 access from Pine Walk Drive.*

Responded by: LINDSAY MURPHY - 7/10/25 2:03 PM

*A Vehicular Access Plan has been added to the Rezoning application as Exhibit B.2. The exhibit provides proposed lanes and turning movements at the access points to each Pod. The Applicant is only requesting approval of a Land Use Plan Amendment and Rezoning and has provided the required analysis for those applications. The Applicant intends to prepare and submit a full Site Plan as part of a future application.*

Ref. # 25, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 5/1/25 1:05 PM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

Comment:

TRAFFIC

The methodology provided in Appendix A does not match the study and does not appear to be approved by the City.

Reviewer Response: Paula Fonseca - 8/15/25 4:59 PM

*The methodology trip generation still includes the golf course which was requested to be removed. Please revise.*

Responded by: LINDSAY MURPHY - 7/10/25 2:03 PM

*The methodology was originally prepared and provided to the City in January 2024, prior to the City engaging a review consultant. The methodology has been updated per discussions at the review meeting with the City and the updated version is included in the study appendix.*

Ref. # 37, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 5/1/25 1:10 PM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

Comment:

Project Traffic

The calculations for the internal capture do not match the trip generation.

a. For example, Residential is shown as 93 entering and 93 exiting. Table 1 shows 99 entering and 270 exiting.

b. Please revise after the trip generation land uses and calculations are revised.

c. Please provide the trip generation and internal capture information for discussion and approval prior to completing the study.

Reviewer Response: Paula Fonseca - 8/15/25 5:01 PM

*The trip generation and internal capture were not provided for discussion and approval prior to being included in the study. As the residential pods are gated with no internal connection to the commercial area, the intent of internal capture for a mixed-use development on a single site has not been met. Vehicles must leave the commercial site to access the residential pods. Please remove the internal capture from the trip generation table.*

Responded by: LINDSAY MURPHY - 7/10/25 2:03 PM

a. *Response: The internal capture has been updated, and internal calculations have been included in Appendix D.* b. *Response: The study has been updated accordingly.* c.

*Response: Trip generation rates and internal capture calculations have been included in Appendix D.*

Ref. # 38, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 5/1/25 1:11 PM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

Comment:

Project Traffic

Pass-By Capture

a. Please include the tables from ITE that support all the reductions. There are no Daily Pass-By rate tables in the ITE supporting documentation.

b. Please revise after the trip generation calculations are revised.

Reviewer Response: Paula Fonseca - 8/15/25 5:02 PM

*As there are no ITE pass-by rates for Daily traffic, please remove the Daily pass-by rate from the table.*

Responded by: LINDSAY MURPHY - 7/10/25 2:03 PM

a. *Response: Pass-By rates provided by ITE have been included in Appendix D. Because ITE does not provide daily Pass-By rates, they were estimated by averaging AM and PM peak hour Pass-By rates.* b. *Response: Trip generation calculations have been revised accordingly.*

Ref. # 39, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 5/1/25 1:12 PM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

Comment:

Project Traffic

Distribution

a. A Site Plan with the project access locations needs to be provided to confirm the distribution percentages.

b. Please clarify Figures 5, 6 and 7. These are examples:

i. Figure 5 shows 32% on Rock Island Rd between Royal Palm Blvd and Hidden Springs Blvd. The movements at the intersection of Rock Island Rd and Royal Palm Blvd show 6% NBR entering and 3% NBT, 6% WBL exiting, 6% through exiting, 5% SB exiting. There should not be northbound to eastbound entering traffic, WB to SB exiting, etc. The percentages should add up to the link percentages.

ii. Holiday Springs Blvd has 4% EBT exiting and 8% WB entering though Figure 5 has no percentage on the link east of Rock Island Road.

iii. Pinewalk Dr S has 10% WBR as inbound traffic, this is an existing residential area and should not have inbound project traffic.

iv. The intersection of Pinewalk Dr and Pinewalk Dr N is shown with project traffic. Without a site plan, showing roadway connections to the new development areas, the project traffic is not able to be verified. Pod E would have to connect through the existing residences to have trips at that intersection.

c. Please include global percentages coming from the north, south, east, and west.

d. The distribution will be reviewed further when the movements are clarified, and the project traffic comments are addressed. Please provide distribution information for discussion and approval prior to completing the study.

Reviewer Response: Paula Fonseca - 8/15/25 5:02 PM

*The percentages have been revised to account for the correct direction of project traffic, though they are not assigned to all access locations. There is project traffic assigned to the intersection of Rock Island Road and NW 30 Street as connecting to Pod C, yet there is no new driveway connection to Pod C at this location which includes the Pod C trips. There is project traffic assigned to the intersection of Sample Road and Pod B Road which has a roadway connecting to Pod A, yet there are no new driveway connections to Pod A or Pod B with project trips. As the Pod are all separate with the residential being gated communities, 100% of each pods traffic shall be assigned the each pod's driveway connection. Holiday Springs Blvd and Sample Road has 5% EBR, 5% SBT and 10% WBL, yet only 10% entering Pod B. Where is the other 10%? The distribution shall match how the project trips are accessing their locations and shall be accounted for at all access locations. The distribution was not provided for discussion and approval prior to being included in the study.*

Responded by: LINDSAY MURPHY - 7/10/25 2:03 PM

*a. Response: The Conceptual Master Plan has been included in Appendix A. b. Response: Figures 5, 6, and 7 have been updated to correctly reflect the project distribution. c. Response: Figure 5 shows the trip distribution on surrounding roadway links. d. Response: The trip distribution was updated accordingly with the reviewer's comments and figures in the study have been updated. CHRIS TO ANSWER*

Ref. # 40, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 5/1/25 1:13 PM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

Comment:

Total Future Traffic

The Volume Development Worksheets are in Appendix E, not F.

The future volumes will be reviewed after the other items have been addressed and the values will change.

Reviewer Response: Paula Fonseca - 8/15/25 5:02 PM

*As the project volumes are not complete at all of the intersections, the future voumes do not represent the total future traffic conditions.*

Responded by: LINDSAY MURPHY - 7/10/25 2:03 PM

*Response: The Volume Development Worksheets have been moved into Appendix E and comments from the reviewer have been addressed.*

Ref. # 41, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 5/1/25 1:13 PM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

Comment:

Intersection Analysis

For the intersection analyses, please include the Level of Service, Delay, and Queue for all movements, approaches, and overall intersection for all locations, including driveway connections.

Reviewer Response: Paula Fonseca - 8/15/25 5:02 PM

*Comment not addressed: Intersection turning movements are not included in the tables.*

*Please revise to include each movement for each approach for all locations, including driveway connections. As such any required improvements are not able to be evaluated at this time.*

Responded by: LINDSAY MURPHY - 7/10/25 2:03 PM

*Response: The Level of Service, Delay, and Queue for all movements, approaches, and overall intersection for all locations, have been included in the updated traffic study.*

Ref. # 42, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 5/1/25 1:14 PM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

Comment:

Intersection Analysis

Synchro Analysis

- a. The site plan will be required for this review. Some of the intersections are shown using the driveway volumes (Woodside Dr/Sample Road) and some use the net new volumes. Please clarify in the text.
- b. Proposed Residential access roadways will need to show all the project trips for those areas.
- c. Intersections 6, 7 and 8 will need to be included in the analysis.
- d. Pedestrian and bicycle volumes need to be included in the analysis for all intersections.
- e. The Synchro analyses will be reviewed when the other comments are addressed as the volumes will change.

Reviewer Response: Paula Fonseca - 8/15/25 5:02 PM

*Comment Not Addressed: a. Vehicular access exhibit does not include all the access information. b. All project trips are not shown at the driveway access locations. c. Study intersections and traffic count intersections are different yet share the same intersection numbers. Intersection #8 is both Pod C Road/Pinewalk Drive North and Pinewalk Drive South/Rock Island Road. Please provide consistent numbering for all locations. d. Pedestrian and bicycle volumes have not been included. Sample Road/Rock Island Road has over 500 pedestrians at the intersection that have not been accounted for. e. The Synchro analysis is missing information to identify any potential issues and corrections. As such any required improvements are not able to be evaluated at this time.*

Responded by: LINDSAY MURPHY - 7/10/25 2:03 PM

*a. Response: The Conceptual Masterplan has been included in Appendix A for reference. Intersections in the Total Future Scenario include the future background traffic volumes as the baseline, with net new project traffic assigned at each of the study intersections. b. Response: Project trips have been shown at residential access roadways. c. Response: Intersection 8 has been included in all scenarios and intersections 6 and 7 have been included in the Total Future scenarios. d. Response: Pedestrian and bicycle volumes have been included in the analysis for all intersections.*

Ref. # 43, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 5/1/25 1:14 PM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

Comment:

Local Roadway LOS Analysis

Please provide documentation for the calculations for Table 5.

Reviewer Response: Paula Fonseca - 8/15/25 5:02 PM

*Table 5 is now Table 7 and has changed for Peak Hour data to a calculated AADT data. The two-way 2030 volumes do not match the volumes shown in the Future Traffic figure.*

Responded by: LINDSAY MURPHY - 7/10/25 2:03 PM

*Response: Two-way 2030 volumes were derived using the intersection Volume Development Worksheets.*

Ref. # 44, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 5/1/25 1:14 PM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

Comment:

Local Roadway LOS Analysis

C3R parameters include having a 45-mph speed limit, 4% Heavy Vehicle, 5 signals in 2.57 miles. This is not applicable to the roadways in the neighborhood.

Reviewer Response: Paula Fonseca - 8/15/25 5:02 PM

*Pinewalk Drive North should not be considered a collector road as a collector road connects two (2) arterial roadways. It is also not shown on the Broward County Trafficways map as a collector roadway. Pinewalk Drive South is not an arterial or a collector roadway, it is a local road. In addition, please provide the justification for using the maximum threshold for the Generalized Service Volumes for these roads. Based on these roadways as isolated residential roadways, the minimum volume would be more appropriate.*

Responded by: LINDSAY MURPHY - 7/10/25 2:03 PM

*Response: The analysis has been updated to be based upon local roadway LOS Service volume data published in the Broward County Land Development Code.*

Ref. # 45, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 5/1/25 1:15 PM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

Comment:

TRAFFIC - GENERAL COMMENT

Access management for the proposed new connections will need to be provided and coordinated with Broward County and Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT). Provide documentation of Broward County and FDOT meetings and letters accepting or rejecting the proposed connections.

Reviewer Response: Paula Fonseca - 8/15/25 5:02 PM

*The proposed turn lane on Sample Road also includes a Broward County Transit (BCT) bus stop. This will need to be coordinated and approved by both FDOT and BCT for the design of the proposed turn lane and bus stop. In the event there are changes to the proposed lane configuration which are currently provided in the traffic study, the analysis will need to be revised.*

Responded by: LINDSAY MURPHY - 7/10/25 2:03 PM

*Response: Documentation of FDOT conceptual approval will be provided upon receipt under separate cover. No new connections to Broward County Roadways are being contemplated.*

Ref. # 46, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 5/1/25 2:23 PM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

Comment: The development fails to meet the zone change requirement "The proposed change will create or excessively increase automobile and vehicular traffic congestion, above that which would be anticipated with permitted intensities or densities of the underlying land use plan designation, or otherwise affect public safety" as the traffic report indicates that LOS D is not met.

Reviewer Response: Paula Fonseca - 8/18/25 10:35 AM

*Address comments from Traffic Engineer regarding LOS analysis and reevaluate statement.*

Responded by: LINDSAY MURPHY - 7/10/25 2:03 PM

*The proposed change does not create any new adverse LOS E or LOS F conditions at any of the major signalized intersections. Any of these intersections that operate at LOS E or LOS F will do so with or without this project. The overall changes to average driver delay at these intersections is a few seconds or less; therefore, impacts to congestion are relatively low.*

Ref. # 55, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 8/15/25 4:58 PM, Cycle 2, Unresolved

Comment:

Based on submitted documents under this application, the applicant fails to demonstrate that adequate capacity will be available at the adopted level standards established in the Margate Comprehensive Plan Policy 3.1.2.b. for surface water management, solid waste collection and disposal, potable water supply and distribution; and wastewater collection and disposal; since no Site Plan, Civil Engineering Plans, and/or study reports (e.g., drainage evaluation, potable water hydraulic analysis, sewer hydraulic report, analysis of existing lift stations impacted, evaluation of gravity sewer system, expected solid waste generation and methodology to address it, etc.) were submitted to address each one of the required disciplines. Additionally, there is no adequate mitigation plan to address existing environmental contamination as reported in Phase 1 and phase 2 ESA which poses unacceptable risks to public health.

Ref. # 9, Planning, Andrew Pinney, 2/13/25 8:21 AM, Cycle 1, Info Only

Comment: Many planning comments made on the LUPA (24-00400057) are also applicable on this application. (Narrative and exhibits, such as park inventory, pedestrian network plan, etc.)

Responded by: LINDSAY MURPHY - 3/26/25 1:42 PM

*Comment is noted and understood.*

Responded by: LINDSAY MURPHY - 3/13/25 9:01 PM

*Comment is noted and understood.*

Ref. # 23, Planning, Andrew Pinney, 4/30/25 5:51 PM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

Comment:

The rezoning does not satisfy all of the criteria described in Sec. 40.303(B)1 ULDC

c. Existing zoning district boundaries are illogically drawn in relation to existing conditions on the property proposed for change;

d. The proposed change will adversely affect living conditions in the neighborhood;

e. The proposed change will create or excessively increase automobile and vehicular traffic congestion, above that which would be anticipated with permitted intensities or densities of the underlying land use plan designation, or otherwise affect public safety;

i. There are substantial reasons why the property cannot be used in accord with existing zoning;

Resolve issues through the Development Agreement.

Responded by: LINDSAY MURPHY - 7/10/25 2:03 PM

*The submitted Rezoning application provides the Applicant's response to the rezoning criteria described in Sec. 40.303(B)1, a. through j. The draft Development Agreement has been revised to provide additional commitments regarding the development of the project area.*

Ref. # 47, Planning, Andrew Pinney, 5/6/25 5:49 PM, Cycle 1, Info Only

Comment: If relying on vested rights of this property, please follow the process described in Sec. 40.343 ULDC.

Ref. # 48, Traffic, Lisa Bernstein, 8/15/25 1:42 PM, Cycle 2, Unresolved

Comment:

TRAFFIC

Please provide a figure with the existing and proposed lane geometry at all study intersections, including all project driveways

Ref. # 49, Traffic, Lisa Bernstein, 8/15/25 1:50 PM, Cycle 2, Unresolved

Comment:

TRAFFIC

Please include the appropriate project trip totals in the Volume Development Worksheets and on the project trips figure. All project traffic, 100%, for each use shall be assigned at the Pod Driveway locations for both entering and exiting trips for both the AM and PM Peak Hours.

Ref. # 50, Traffic, Lisa Bernstein, 8/15/25 2:01 PM, Cycle 2, Unresolved

Comment:

TRAFFIC - Synchro

In the existing Synchro intersection sheets, the PHF does not match what is provided in the count data. Please verify all PHF values match the count data sheets.

Ref. # 51, Traffic, Lisa Bernstein, 8/15/25 2:07 PM, Cycle 2, Unresolved

Comment:

#### TRAFFIC - Synchro

In the Synchro analysis sheets, the Minimum Green time and Splits do not match the Broward County Signal Timing Sheets. The Walk/Don't Walk timing values are also not provided in the timing data. In addition, there is no data entered for the number of pedestrians and bicycles or the number of pedestrian calls..

Ref. # 52, Traffic, Lisa Bernstein, 8/15/25 2:14 PM, Cycle 2, Unresolved

Comment:

#### TRAFFIC

Figure 7, does not represent the Pods being proposed or all of the access locations for each pod. Pod A only shows one access driveway from Pinewalk Drive North, with no access from Sample Road. The driveway locations, lanes, volumes, and measures of effectiveness (LOS, Delay, Queues) are needed in order to determine the impact to the existing community and any potential improvements that may need to be provided. This applies to Figure 8 as well, in order to determine the overall impacts to the existing community and any potential improvements that may need to be provided.

Ref. # 53, Traffic, Lisa Bernstein, 8/15/25 2:27 PM, Cycle 2, Unresolved

Comment:

#### TRAFFIC

Per an email from Sergeant Mary Crabtree, Margate Police Department (MPD), there are traffic issues on Rock Island Road from Sample Road past Pinewalk Drive North, all the way to Royal Palm Blvd in the AM and PM Peak Hours that inhibit the east and west side residents from exiting onto Rock Island Road efficiently and safely.

A more detailed site plan of the access locations and the total project trips impacting the intersections are needed in order to determine the changes in Levels of Service, Delay, Queues, that will occur at the intersection lane movements. Solutions to the MPD concerns, that may be required of the developer, cannot be provided with the current information provided in the study.

Ref. # 54, Traffic, Lisa Bernstein, 8/15/25 2:33 PM, Cycle 2, Info Only

Comment: The traffic study may not be fully evaluated at this time as there is missing information required to evaluate the impacts to the surrounding community. A more detailed site plan shall be provided, especially for the project access locations, as well as addressing all of the previous and current comments.