

Project Name: 23-00400045

Project Description: The Forest Apartments Subdivision

Review Comments List Date: 6/18/2024

Ref. # 39, Building, Richard Nixon, 6/18/24 10:08 AM, Cycle 2, Info Only

Comment: Does not pertain to the FBC.

Ref. # 26, CRA, Andrew Pinney, 2/15/24 5:43 PM, Cycle 1, Resolved

Markup: Changemark note #01, Subdivision Resurvey Plan-2.pdf

Why does the ingress/egress easement stop here? How is the rear parcel/parking lot accessed? Is the entire rear parcel under cross access? If so, add the appropriate note.

Reviewer Response: Andrew Pinney - 6/12/24 3:49 PM

File "ADOC-Easement Agreement" in application 23-00400044

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/10/24 10:37 AM

The access easement is only per Plat Book 124, Page 41. The adjacent plat to the West does not have an access easement, per the plat. Further, see REA which provides for cross access between the properties.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/7/24 9:46 AM

The access easement is only per Plat Book 124, Page 41. The adjacent plat to the West does not have an access easement, per the plat. Further, see REA which provides for cross access between the properties.

Ref. # 36, CRA, Andrew Pinney, 2/26/24 9:42 AM, Cycle 1, Info Only

Markup: Changemark note #04, Subdivision Resurvey Plan-2.pdf

Keep the first two curves of the existing driveway entry drive.

"Curvilinear streets are recommended for residential minor and collector streets in order to discourage excessive vehicular speeds and to provide attractive vistas." Sec. 31-19 of the Code of the City of Margate.

Ref. # 1, Coordinator, Paul Ojeda, 8/7/23 3:46 PM, Resolved

Comment: under Public Hearing Sign Agreement the last Folio ID number is missing a number the correct Folio should be 494101310020

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 8/30/23 11:33 AM

Response: The folio ID number on the public hearing sign agreement has been revised to reflect the correct folio number.

Ref. # 2, Coordinator, Paul Ojeda, 8/7/23 3:49 PM, Resolved

Comment: Under the subdivision Resurvey Application, please revise the last Folio Id number is missing a digit. I should be 494101310020

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 8/30/23 11:33 AM

Response: The application form has been revised to reflect the correct folio number.

Ref. # 3, Coordinator, Paul Ojeda, 8/7/23 3:50 PM, Resolved

Comment: All documents should reflect the new address for the project as 787 S state Road 7 Margate Fl

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 8/30/23 11:34 AM

Response: All application documents have been revised to reflect the new assigned address.

Ref. # 12, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 10/25/23 4:18 PM, Cycle 1, Resolved

Comment: Provide referenced email from Bob Hely indicating landfill capacity and letter from Republic Services confirming capacity to service the project.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 1/26/24 10:48 AM

Response: The email from Bob Hely and the correspondences from Republic Trash Services have been provided with this submittal.

Ref. # 14, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 10/25/23 4:23 PM, Cycle 1, Info Only

Comment: Submit preliminary drainage calculations.

Reviewer Response: Paula Fonseca - 2/2/24 11:39 AM

Information provided satisfies the requirements for completeness check request; however, comments may be provided during DRC review.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 1/26/24 10:48 AM

Response: The preliminary drainage calculations have been provided with this submittal.

Ref. # 16, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 10/26/23 11:08 AM, Cycle 1, Resolved

Comment: Provide clear drawings and explanation of easement to be vacated and/or relocated.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 1/26/24 10:48 AM

Response: It is necessary to vacate portions of existing water & sewer easements to accommodate the proposed residential buildings. The platted Ingress, Egress, Utility & Drainage easement (spine road) is being realigned, as such this recorded easement must be vacated to accommodate the new design. We will be recording a new Ingress, Egress, Utility & Drainage easement that conforms to the geometry of the proposed realigned spine road. Exhibits for the easement vacations and the new Ingress, Egress, Utility & Drainage easements are included with this submittal. Sketch & legal descriptions of the easements to be vacated have been provided with this submittal.

Ref. # 18, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 10/26/23 11:59 AM, Cycle 1, Info Only

Comment: Traffic Report - Signalized Intersection Level of Service: 1) Include SW 7th Street/SR7 left turn, right turn, and through lane movements. 2) Include Southgate Blvd/SR7 left turn, right turn, and through lane movements.

Reviewer Response: Paula Fonseca - 2/2/24 2:32 PM

Information provided satisfies the requirements for completeness check request; however, comments may be provided during DRC review.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 1/26/24 10:48 AM

Response: The requested level of service information is presented in the updated report as requested. Please see Tables 3 and 4.

Ref. # 19, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 10/26/23 11:59 AM, Cycle 1, Resolved

Comment: Traffic Report - address office traffic assuming office is at full capacity.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 1/26/24 10:49 AM

Response: The traffic impact study has been updated to reflect the adjacent office space operating at full capacity.

Ref. # 28, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 2/23/24 1:03 PM, Cycle 1, Resolved

Markup: Changemark note #01, ADOC-Drainage Calculations.pdf

Clarify if SF for impervious and pervious areas includes existing and proposed areas.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/10/24 10:39 AM

Yes, the proposed calculations include the entire site which include the existing to remain impervious and pervious areas.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/7/24 9:46 AM

Yes, the proposed calculations include the entire site which include the existing to remain impervious

and pervious areas.

Ref. # 29, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 2/23/24 1:03 PM, Cycle 1, Resolved

Markup: Changemark note #02, ADOC-Drainage Calculations.pdf

Reference how the K value was obtained.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/10/24 10:39 AM

The K values used in the drainage report were based off the geotechnical report by Ardaman & Associates, Inc. dated February 28, 2024. They reported 3 k values on sheets 8, 9 and 10. An average of all three readings was used for the drainage calculations. (See ADOC-Geotech Report).

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/7/24 9:47 AM

The K values used in the drainage report were based off the geotechnical report by Ardaman & Associates, Inc. dated February 28, 2024. They reported 3 k values on sheets 8, 9 and 10. An average of all three readings was used for the drainage calculations. (See ADOC-Geotech Report).

Ref. # 30, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 2/23/24 1:03 PM, Cycle 1, Resolved

Markup: Changemark note #03, ADOC-Drainage Calculations.pdf

Where are these existing retention areas

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/10/24 10:40 AM

Refer to residential plans, sheets PGD-4 and PGD-4.1 for location of retention areas.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/7/24 9:47 AM

Refer to sheets C-310 and C-311 for location of retention areas.

Ref. # 31, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 2/23/24 1:09 PM, Cycle 1, Resolved

Comment: Drainage: Provide or identify pre-treatment methods for surface water prior to discharging into the Conservation area.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/10/24 10:40 AM

Refer to the Commercial plans, sheets PGD-4 and PGD-4.1 as well as residential plans, sheet PGD-4 and PGD-4.1. The storm system has proposed exfiltration trench as well as three detention areas that will provide pre-treatment. Updated calculations showing pre-treatment is provided.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/7/24 9:47 AM

Refer to the PGD sheets C-500 and C-501 as well as residential plans sheet C-600 and C-601. The storm system has proposed exfiltration trench as well as three detention areas that will provide pre-treatment. Updated calculations showing pre-treatment is provided.

Ref. # 32, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 2/23/24 1:15 PM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

Comment: Transportation: Evaluate U-turn alternatives at SW8th Court and Santa Catalina Ln going southbound on SR 7.

Reviewer Response: Paula Fonseca - 6/14/24 3:50 PM

Under review by City consultant.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/10/24 10:40 AM

As noted in the project traffic assignment figures (Figures 5 through 7), it is estimated that approximately 14% of the exiting traffic will travel south on State Road 7 and perform a U-Turn at the first median opening in order to travel north on State Road 7. The first median opening south of the site is located at SW 8th Court – approximately 500 feet south of the project driveway. (During heavily congested time periods, it may be difficult to weave across three travel lanes within 500 feet. As such, the next opportunity to perform the referenced U-Turn will be at Santa Catalina Circle which is approximately 600 feet south of SW 8th Court). The number of vehicles expected to perform this U-Turn maneuver is relatively low (15 vehicles in the AM peak hour and 7 vehicles in the PM peak hour). Not only are these U-Turn volumes relatively low, the available storage capacities of the southbound turn lanes are substantial (approximately 375 feet at SW 8th Court and approximately 275 at Santa Catalina Circle). As such, these movements are expected to function adequately. This

discussion is included in the updated traffic study on page 26.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/7/24 9:47 AM

As noted in the project traffic assignment figures (Figures 5 through 7), it is estimated that approximately 14% of the exiting traffic will travel south on State Road 7 and perform a U-Turn at the first median opening in order to travel north on State Road 7. The first median opening south of the site is located at SW 8th Court – approximately 500 feet south of the project driveway. (During heavily congested time periods, it may be difficult to weave across three travel lanes within 500 feet. As such, the next opportunity to perform the referenced U-Turn will be at Santa Catalina Circle which is approximately 600 feet south of SW 8th Court). The number of vehicles expected to perform this U-Turn maneuver is relatively low (15 vehicles in the AM peak hour and 7 vehicles in the PM peak hour). Not only are these U-Turn volumes relatively low, the available storage capacities of the southbound turn lanes are substantial (approximately 375 feet at SW 8th Court and approximately 275 at Santa Catalina Circle). As such, these movements are expected to function adequately. This discussion is included in the updated traffic study on page 26.

Ref. # 33, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 2/23/24 1:16 PM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

Comment: Transportation: as per FDOT Pre-approval letter indicates, include evaluation of any needs for improvements at the intersection of SW 7th Street and SR 7 due to project traffic.

Reviewer Response: Paula Fonseca - 6/14/24 11:03 AM

Provide FDOT statement that TIA will suffice. If signal timing is unlikely to be altered, provide potential traffic or road improvements to optimize the eastbound approach as the SW 7th Street eastbound lanes are directly impacted by the Forest development and currently at LOS E.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/10/24 10:40 AM

The traffic impact study prepared for the City of Margate will suffice for the FDOT's request for a traffic study and evaluation of SR 7 and SW 7th St. In regard to the intersection of SR 7 and SW 7th St., the overall Level of Service (LOS) is projected to be "B" in the AM and PM peak hours. It is noted that the side-street delays at this intersection are currently in excess of 60.0 seconds / vehicle (i.e. LOS "E") for both approaches (EB and WB). This is a typical condition on major arterial roadways and minor signalized sidestreets. This condition is attributed to the maintaining agencies (in this case, Broward County Traffic Engineering) and their priority for the traffic volumes on the major street. By giving the traffic volumes on the major street preferential treatment, the overall roadway network is optimized, more users are served more efficiently, and traffic progression is maintained from one signalized intersection to the next. Since this intersection is functioning well (LOS "A/B") it is unlikely that Broward County will significantly alter the signal timings. However, once The Forest Apartments project is complete and occupied, a signal timing review and optimization analysis can be requested on behalf of the project and the City of Margate. This discussion is included in the updated traffic study on page 24.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/7/24 9:48 AM

The traffic impact study prepared for the City of Margate will suffice for the FDOT's request for a traffic study and evaluation of SR 7 and SW 7th St. In regard to the intersection of SR 7 and SW 7th St., the overall Level of Service (LOS) is projected to be "B" in the AM and PM peak hours. It is noted that the side-street delays at this intersection are currently in excess of 60.0 seconds / vehicle (i.e. LOS "E") for both approaches (EB and WB). This is a typical condition on major arterial roadways and minor signalized sidestreets. This condition is attributed to the maintaining agencies (in this case, Broward County Traffic Engineering) and their priority for the traffic volumes on the major street. By giving the traffic volumes on the major street preferential treatment, the overall roadway network is optimized, more users are served more efficiently, and traffic progression is maintained from one signalized intersection to the next. Since this intersection is functioning well (LOS "A/B") it is unlikely that Broward County will significantly alter the signal timings. However, once The Forest Apartments project is complete and occupied, a signal timing review and optimization analysis can be requested on behalf of the project and the City of Margate. This discussion is included in the updated traffic

study on page 24.

Ref. # 34, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 2/23/24 1:23 PM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

Comment: Transportation: Traffic study only references signal timing optimization at the Atlantic/SR 7 & Southgate/Rock Island Road intersections; however, it fails to provide further details to optimize it.

Reviewer Response: Paula Fonseca - 6/14/24 3:50 PM

Under review by City consultant.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/10/24 10:41 AM

The intersection at S. State Road 7 and W. Atlantic Boulevard and the intersection at Rock Island Road and Southgate Boulevard were both optimized for the purposes of reducing the anticipated vehicular delay. This is achieved by holding the overall traffic signal cycle length constant (this is required in order to maintain signal progression within the overall roadway corridor) and adjusting the green times allocated to the individual approaches and movements. In other words, the amount of green time provided to these approaches and movements is reassigned to correspond with the vehicular demand thereby reducing the overall intersection delay. In both cases, the overall intersection delay can be reduced through this technique. This discussion is included on page 26 of the updated report and the output for these analyses is presented in Appendix I.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/7/24 9:48 AM

The intersection at S. State Road 7 and W. Atlantic Boulevard and the intersection at Rock Island Road and Southgate Boulevard were both optimized for the purposes of reducing the anticipated vehicular delay. This is achieved by holding the overall traffic signal cycle length constant (this is required in order to maintain signal progression within the overall roadway corridor) and adjusting the green times allocated to the individual approaches and movements. In other words, the amount of green time provided to these approaches and movements is reassigned to correspond with the vehicular demand thereby reducing the overall intersection delay. In both cases, the overall intersection delay can be reduced through this technique. This discussion is included on page 26 of the updated report and the output for these analyses is presented in Appendix I.

Ref. # 35, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 2/23/24 2:07 PM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

Comment: Drainage: Ensure agreement to discharge surface water to neighboring parcel incorporates language ensuring its validity in perpetuity, irrespective of changes in ownership.

Reviewer Response: Paula Fonseca - 6/14/24 3:49 PM

Finalized and executed agreement is a requisite prior to obtaining the engineering permit. As part of this review, provide updated status of agreement with Broward County and draft document incorporating requested language to ensure that surface water from Forest development and existing building offices can discharge to neighboring property (currently under Broward County ownership) in perpetuity and irrespective of changes in land ownership.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/10/24 10:41 AM

We are currently under review with Broward County Surface Water and are working with them to obtain these agreements. An update will be provided once an agreement has been drafted. Applicant requests that the Agreement be a condition of final building permit.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/7/24 9:48 AM

We are currently under review with Broward County Surface Water and are working with them to obtain these agreements. An update will be provided once an agreement has been drafted. Applicant requests that the Agreement be a condition of final building permit.

Ref. # 37, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 2/27/24 1:20 PM, Cycle 1, Resolved

Comment: Per Section 31-18, provide opinion of title from a licensed Florida Attorney.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/10/24 10:41 AM

Response: An opinion of title has been provided with this submittal. Please refer to ADOC-Opinion of

Title.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/7/24 9:48 AM

Response: An opinion of title has been provided with this submittal. Please refer to ADOC-Opinion of Title.

Ref. # 38, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 6/14/24 3:49 PM, Cycle 2, Unresolved

Comment: Provide 30' drainage/access easement through the parking lot area west of the development (Parcel Id: 494101330010). This easement will be a continuation of the existing/realigned 30' ingress/egress, utility & drainage easement.

Ref. # 5, Planning, Christopher Gratz, 10/25/23 12:03 PM, Cycle 1, Resolved

Comment: The plat does not have a note restricting the level of development. So apparently there has been an amendment. A letter explaining the proposed changes, complete history of any prior amendments, and any plans necessary to explain the request is required.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 1/26/24 10:49 AM

Response: The plat has a restriction placed under the Notes Section. It states that the following, "This plat is restricted to 146,000 sq. Ft. Of office." There have been no amendments to this note, therefore, this is the current restrictive note on the plat.

Ref. # 6, Planning, Christopher Gratz, 10/25/23 12:03 PM, Cycle 1, Resolved

Comment: Narrative is to address Park LOS.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 1/26/24 10:49 AM

Response: The narrative has been revised to include the level of service analysis for community parks.

Ref. # 8, Planning, Christopher Gratz, 10/25/23 12:06 PM, Cycle 1, Info Only

Comment:

Comment that must be met to go past DRC.

SCAD to be revised to reflect the correct number of units.

Ref. # 11, Planning, Christopher Gratz, 10/25/23 12:14 PM, Cycle 1, Info Only

Comment: Subdivision survey was not provided. All that is in the folders are surveys. What is labeled as a subdivision is just the survey with some numbers superimposed over a survey which has far more information unacceptable information than required and is missing the information that is required. This is essentially a plat without the various Broward County signature blocks. See Sec. 31-18.

Reviewer Response: Christopher Gratz - 1/30/24 12:19 PM

I've never read a parcel legal with the subdivided parcels being called "site", should be parcels with legal for each.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 1/26/24 10:49 AM

Response: The Subdivision Resurvey has been provided with this submittal. Please refer to Survey.

Ref. # 17, Planning, Christopher Gratz, 10/26/23 11:25 AM, Cycle 1, Resolved

Comment: Narrative and exhibits clearly and simply explaining and showing the abandonment and relocation of the is easements needed.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 1/26/24 10:49 AM

Response: It is necessary to vacate portions of existing water & sewer easements to accommodate the proposed residential buildings. The platted Ingress, Egress, Utility & Drainage easement (spine road) is being realigned, as such this recorded easement must be vacated to accommodate the new design. We will be recording a new Ingress, Egress, Utility & Drainage easement that conforms to the geometry of the proposed realigned spine road. Exhibits for the easement vacations and the new

Ingress, Egress, Utility & Drainage easements are included with this submittal.

Ref. # 20, Planning, Christopher Gratz, 10/26/23 4:10 PM, Cycle 1, Info Only

Comment: The easement that will be required for the expanded sidewalk along the ROW will need to be shown on this subdivision resurvey. The details of this sidewalk are not resolved at this time.

Ref. # 21, Planning, Christopher Gratz, 10/26/23 4:15 PM, Cycle 1, Resolved

Comment: Narrative references a document titled Republic Trash Service Confirmation. Could not find this file in the attachments

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 1/26/24 10:50 AM

Response: The letter from Republic Trash Services has been uploaded with this submittal as ADOC-Republic Trash Services Confirmation.

Ref. # 22, Planning, Christopher Gratz, 1/29/24 11:29 AM, Cycle 2, Info Only

Comment: For DRC approval change all references in all documents and plans to reflect the recent Code update; i.e. TOC was removed from the Code, Appendix A was deleted and all the Code sections have changed.

Ref. # 23, Zoning, Christopher Gratz, 2/6/24 11:33 AM, Cycle 1, Resolved

Comment: Revise legal descriptions, from "Site" to "Parcel"

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/10/24 10:41 AM

The term "site" has been changed to "parcel" in the legal description.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/7/24 9:49 AM

The term "site" has been changed to "parcel" in the legal description.

Ref. # 24, Zoning, Christopher Gratz, 2/6/24 11:47 AM, Cycle 1, Resolved

Markup: Sidewalk Easement, Subdivision Resurvey Plan-2.pdf

Code asks for "public access easement" as opposed to sidewalk easement shown on the subdivision resurvey plan. The landscaping and benches proposed on the site plan pose an issue being in an easement that is named sidewalk easement. The dimension of this easement needs to be closely coordinated with the site plan.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/10/24 10:42 AM

The easement has been labeled as a "public access easement."

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/7/24 9:49 AM

The easement has been labeled as a "public access easement."

Ref. # 25, Zoning, Christopher Gratz, 2/6/24 12:11 PM, Cycle 1, Resolved

Comment: Revise all documents by removing "TOC" from them, the Code was changed and that was eliminated from it. The development is still entitled to use the Code requirements from before the change became effective in December.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/10/24 10:42 AM

Response: All documents have been revised to reflect a zoning designation of Gateway (G) rather than TOC-G.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/7/24 1:48 PM

Response: All documents have been revised to reflect a zoning designation of Gateway (G) rather than TOC-G.