

**Project Name: 24-00400056**

**Project Description: Carolina Club\_Rezoning**

Review Comments List Date: 5/7/2025

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.

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.

Ref. # 26, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 5/1/25 1:06 PM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

Comment:

TRAFFIC

The methodology states that count data will not be more than 12 months old. The data was collected in December of 2023 and February of 2024.

Ref. # 27, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 5/1/25 1:06 PM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

Comment:

TRAFFIC

Inventory and Planning Data

The dates for the data collection are December 13, 2024, and February 29, 2024. The December date should be 2023.

Ref. # 28, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 5/1/25 1:06 PM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

Comment:

TRAFFIC

Inventory and Planning Data

The Peak Season Category Factors (PSCF) provided are for 2022. The 2023 and 2024 PSCF reports were available at the time this report was prepared. Please include the updated reports.

Ref. # 29, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 5/1/25 1:07 PM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

Comment:

TRAFFIC

Existing (2024) Traffic

Please include the correct PSCF reports for the existing volumes. The 2022 data is outdated.

Ref. # 30, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 5/1/25 1:08 PM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

Comment:

TRAFFIC

Existing (2024) Traffic

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

Ref. # 31, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 5/1/25 1:08 PM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

Comment:

TRAFFIC

Existing (2024) Traffic

Figure 3 will be reviewed when the PSCF reports are included.

Ref. # 32, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 5/1/25 1:09 PM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

Comment:

TRAFFIC

Background Traffic

The growth rate calculations were for only three (3) years of which 2020 and 2021 are included and did not include 2023 (34,000) or 2024 (35000).

Ref. # 33, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 5/1/25 1:09 PM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

Comment:

TRAFFIC

Background Traffic

In lieu of further calculations, please include a minimum growth rate of one percent (1%).

Ref. # 34, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 5/1/25 1:09 PM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

Comment:

TRAFFIC

Background Traffic

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

Ref. # 35, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 5/1/25 1:09 PM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

Comment:

TRAFFIC

Background Traffic

Figure 4 will be reviewed when the PSCF reports are included, and the growth rate is revised.

Ref. # 36, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 5/1/25 1:10 PM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

Comment:

Project Traffic

Trip Generation

- a. The existing golf course has been closed since 2019. It is not applicable as an existing use.
- b. The Land Use Code for the commercial portion assumes a Shopping Plaza with a Grocery Store with a total of 57,500 Square Feet (SF). Land Use Code 821 Shopping Plaza states that no Shopping Plaza is less than 40,000 SF with a supermarket as its anchor. The retail portion of the plaza is no less than 40,000 SF as supermarkets are usually larger than that. Please provide the SF of the retail and grocery store separately.
- c. Please include a statement explaining why the Average Rate was used versus the Fitted Curve equations.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

Ref. # 6, Fire, David Scholl, 1/15/25 2:36 PM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

Comment: Fire Department service delivery concurrency evaluation required for proposed development . (FL Fire Prevention Code 15.1)

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

*Per email correspondence with the Fire Marshall, a copy of a proposal from Fitch & Associates to provide a fire concurrency evaluation, which has been executed by the applicant, has been provided under separate cover to the City's Fire Department. The study is underway. A copy of the signed proposal has also been uploaded with this resubmittal.*

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

*Per email corespondence with the Fire Marshall, a copy of a proposal from Fitch & Associates to provide a fire concurrency evaluation, which has been executed by the applicant, has been*

*provided under separate cover to the City's Fire Department.*

Ref. # 16, Fire, David Scholl, 3/20/25 2:12 PM, Cycle 2, Unresolved

Comment: 1. Land required set aside for potential future fire station.

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

*Land dedication is not identified in Code or Comprehensive Plan as a requirement for completeness of an application. Any requirements relative to Fire Service Delivery will be determined after the completion of the Fire Concurrency Evaluation.*

Ref. # 19, Fire, David Scholl, 4/1/25 2:23 PM, Cycle 3, Unresolved

Comment: 1. Land required set aside for potential future fire station.

Ref. # 21, Fire, David Scholl, 4/7/25 5:00 PM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

Comment:

1. Land required set aside for potential future fire station.

Ref. # 7, Planning, Andrew Pinney, 2/5/25 9:51 AM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

Comment: Provide sketch and legal exhibits for each of the requested zoning designations gross acreage.

Reviewer Response: Andrew Pinney - 3/20/25 3:28 PM

*Comment deferred.*

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

*The submitted application includes a Survey, including legal descriptions, of each Pod in both net and gross acres. Separate sketch and legals were prepared in response to staff's request and are provided with the revised application.*

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.

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. # 20, Zoning, Christopher Gratz, 4/4/25 4:36 PM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

Comment:

The previous letter we received regarding the waiver of F.S. 166.033(1) only specified the application number for the pre-application meeting. Please provide a letter specifically citing application numbers 24-00400057: Carolina Club LUPA, 24-00400056: Carolina Club Rezoning, 24-00400067: Carolina Club Development Agreement, waving the 180-day requirement of F.S. 166.033(1).

On 4/2/2025 the applications were deemed complete, and 180 days from this date will be 9/29/25. All three (3) applications are being processed concurrently. All applications are predicated on the Land Use Plan Amendment (LUPA) being approved.

This amendment requires following the State Coordinated Review Process which may take 90 days for the Objections, Recommendation and Comments Report to be issued. Broward County is a Charter County requiring approvals from both the Planning Council and County Commission before transmittal to the Department of Commerce.

For just the first part of the process, it is impossible for these applications to be processed within the 180-day timeframe with two (2) hearings required here at the City, and two (2) hearings with the Broward County Planning Council and County Commission.

Therefore, if we do not receive a letter waiving the 180-day requirement of F.S. 166.033(1), we are compelled to take these applications to a Public Hearing at the City Commission before 9/29/25 with a recommendation of denial regardless of where they are in the review process.