

**Project Name: 23-00400044**

**Project Description: The Forest Office Park SITE PLAN**

Review Comments List Date: 6/18/2024

Ref. # 26, Building, Richard Nixon, 2/20/24 11:45 AM, Cycle 1, Resolved

Comment: 1. Minimum number of parking spaces shall comply with Florida Accessibility, 8th ed.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/10/24 10:43 AM

*Min required accessible parking spaces (2%) comply with FBC.*

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/7/24 9:52 AM

*Min required accessible parking spaces (2%) comply with FBC.*

Ref. # 27, Building, Richard Nixon, 2/20/24 11:47 AM, Cycle 1, Resolved

Comment: 2. For information purpose only. It appears the club house is a 2-story building that will require an elevator.

Ref. # 28, Building, Richard Nixon, 2/20/24 11:48 AM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

Comment: 3. All common areas, mailboxes, trash compactor.... will require an ADA compliant parking space.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/10/24 10:43 AM

*Acknowledged. All Building have an ADA compliant parking space. Sheet SP-1.1*

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/7/24 9:52 AM

*Acknowledged. All Building have an ADA compliant parking space. Sheet SP-1.1*

Ref. # 61, Building, Richard Nixon, 6/18/24 10:06 AM, Cycle 2, Unresolved

Comment: The trash compactor plan TC-1.1 still does not show an accessible parking spot.

Ref. # 21, CRA, Andrew Pinney, 2/15/24 10:28 AM, Cycle 1, Resolved

Comment: The recycle bins behind the trash compactor are inaccessible from a truck.

Redesign/relocate recycling facilities.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/10/24 10:43 AM

*Trash compactor has been replaced by a maintenance room/ bulk storage. Refer to sheet SP-1 & MA-2.1C. Area is now accessible by truck see AT-2.*

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/7/24 9:53 AM

*Trash compactor has been replaced by a maintenance room/ bulk storage. Refer to sheet SP-1 & MA-2.1C. Area is now accessible by truck see AT-2.*

Ref. # 23, CRA, Andrew Pinney, 2/15/24 2:17 PM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

Markup: Changemark note #02, SP-1.1-Site Plan.pdf

Where is the callbox or card reader for this gate? If a vehicle is denied access, how and where do they turn around?

Reviewer Response: Andrew Pinney - 6/12/24 10:56 AM

*The gate was changed from a swing gate to slide gate, but nothing was provided or modified to allow denied vehicles an area to turn around.*

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/10/24 10:43 AM

*Site plan has been reworked to have a turn around area. Sheet SP-1 & AT-7*

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/7/24 9:53 AM

*Site plan has been reworked to have a turn around area. Sheet SP-1 & AT-7*

Ref. # 55, CRA, Andrew Pinney, 2/26/24 9:37 AM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

Markup: Changemark note #03, SP-1.1-Site Plan.pdf

Why does the sidewalk width drop from 7ft to 5ft? Maintain width throughout sidewalk network.

Reviewer Response: Andrew Pinney - 6/12/24 10:57 AM

*Staff prefers the 7ft width (minimum) throughout.*

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/10/24 10:44 AM

*Sidewalks fronting parking are 7' to accommodate potential car overhang. Everywhere else sidewalk is proposed at 5' min.*

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/7/24 9:53 AM

*Sidewalks fronting parking are 7' to accommodate potential car overhang. Everywhere else sidewalk is proposed at 5' min.*

Ref. # 1, Coordinator, Paul Ojeda, 8/7/23 4:09 PM, Resolved

Markup: Changemark note #01, ADOC-Parking Statement.pdf

Please correct the assigned new address for the project as 787 S State Road 7, MargateFL

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 8/30/23 11:41 AM

*Response: The parking statement has been revised to reflect the new assigned address.*

Ref. # 2, Coordinator, Paul Ojeda, 8/10/23 4:39 PM, Resolved

Markup: Changemark note #01, SURV.pdf

Tree survey is missing information See definition below

Tree survey means a document signed and sealed by a Florida registered land surveyor meeting the requirements of F.S. Â§ 472.025, as amended, which must provide, at a minimum, the following information:

(a)The location, plotted by accurate techniques, of all existing non-nuisance trees;

(b)The common and scientific name of each tree;

(c)The DBH of each tree, or if a multiple-trunk tree, the sum DBH for all trunks; and

(d)Canopy coverage, if required by DEES.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 8/30/23 11:42 AM

*The survey has been revised to include the information requested for the tree survey requirements.*

*Refer to Sheets SURV-01 - SURV-04.*

Ref. # 7, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 10/25/23 3:58 PM, Cycle 1, Resolved

Comment: Clarify reference to traffic study referencing 882 daily trips and peak hour trips of 128.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 1/26/24 10:43 AM

*Response: This was a typo, the reference has been removed.*

Ref. # 8, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 10/25/23 3:58 PM, Cycle 1, Info Only

Comment: Submit preliminary drainage calculations.

Reviewer Response: Paula Fonseca - 2/2/24 10:33 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 10:43 AM

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

Ref. # 10, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 10/25/23 4:00 PM, Cycle 1, Info Only

Comment: Provide agreements affecting property(ies) including but not limited to agreement to discharge surface water to neighboring parcel.

Reviewer Response: Paula Fonseca - 2/2/24 11:35 AM

*Partial information provided satisfies the requirements for completeness check request; however, comments may be provided during DRC review. Drainage Agreement is required prior to obtaining*

*Engineering Permit.*

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 1/26/24 10:44 AM

*Response: We have submitted a surface water management permit to Broward County (Application No. L2023-276). Staff issued comments and we attended a meeting the Broward County Real Property Division and the Surface Water Management Department to discuss the comments and the Applicant's entitlement to drain into the preserve per the previously approved Drainage Permit. A copy of the approved drainage permit with Broward County is provided with this submittal. See ADOC-Drainage Permit.*

Ref. # 31, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 2/23/24 9:54 AM, Cycle 1, Info Only

Comment: Drainage Permit from SFWMD 06-00688-S dated 1985, needs to be modified to address the water surface not leaving site and not entering the C-14 canal via City of Margate canal system.

Reviewer Response: Paula Fonseca - 6/14/24 3:46 PM

*Provide update status of the permit modification request. Modified permit must be completed prior to final site plan approval. Modification of Drainage Permit from SFWMD 06-00688-S dated 1985 is a pre-requisite for Engineering Permit application.*

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/10/24 10:44 AM

*Per discussion with Johana Narvaez on January 31, 2024 the county confirmed that we are allowed to discharge 11 cfs into the neighboring wetland area. The master permit SFWMD 06-00688-S allows a total discharge of 23 cfs however the county has prorated this discharge based on the size of the commercial and residential site. The meeting minutes to this meeting has been included in this submittal (See ADOC-BC Surface Water Meeting Minutes). The drainage calculations showing this discharge was submitted to Broward County Surface water. The first RAI was received and no comments were made in reference to the discharge. The additional comments provided have been address. See ADOC-SWM License Letter.*

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/7/24 9:53 AM

*Per discussion with Johana Narvaez on January 31, 2024 the county confirmed that we are allowed to discharge 11 cfs into the neighboring wetland area. The master permit SFWMD 06-00688-S allows a total discharge of 23 cfs however the county has prorated this discharge based on the size of the commercial and residential site. The meeting minutes to this meeting has been included in this submittal (See ADOC-BC Surface Water Meeting Minutes). The drainage calculations showing this discharge was submitted to Broward County Surface water. The first RAI was received and no comments were made in reference to the discharge. The additional comments provided have been address. See ADOC-SWM License Letter.*

Ref. # 32, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 2/23/24 9:57 AM, Cycle 1, Resolved

Comment: Drainage Calculations: Address minimum elevation for roads and parking lots.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/10/24 10:44 AM

*Calculations have been run to address the minimum elevations for roads and parking lot. Per the SFWMD 06-00688-S permit, we are to have inlets no lower than elevation 9.30 NAVD. The lowest inlet on the proposed site is at 9.50 NAVD.*

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/7/24 9:53 AM

*Calculations have been run to address the minimum elevations for roads and parking lot. Per the SFWMD 06-00688-S permit, we are to have inlets no lower than elevation 9.30 NAVD. The lowest inlet on the proposed site is at 9.50 NAVD.*

Ref. # 33, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 2/23/24 9:59 AM, Cycle 1, Resolved

Comment: Drainage: Provide Status of existing Surface Water License 5-1-49-41

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/10/24 10:44 AM

*With change of engineer of record a separate permit had to be submitted which is application number L2024-086. The first RAI for this application was received on 4/4/2024 (See ADOC-SWM*

License Letter). A follow up meeting to these comments was had on 4/9/2024 and a resubmittal will be done.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/7/24 9:54 AM

*With change of engineer of record a separate permit had to be submitted which is application number L2024-086. The first RAI for this application was received on 4/4/2024 (See ADOC-SWM License Letter). A follow up meeting to these comments was had on 4/9/2024 and a resubmittal will be done.*

Ref. # 34, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 2/23/24 10:17 AM, 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 11:02 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 10:44 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 9:54 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. # 35, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 2/23/24 11:44 AM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

Comment: Transportation: Evaluate U-turn alternatives at SW 8th Court and Santa Catalina Ln going southbound on SR 7.

Reviewer Response: Paula Fonseca - 6/14/24 3:46 PM

*Under review by City consultant.*

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/10/24 10:45 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 9:54 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. # 36, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 2/23/24 11:51 AM, Cycle 1, Info Only

Comment: Transportation: FDOT conducted a Road Safety Audit along SR-7/US-441 from Kimberly Boulevard/SW 11th Street to NW 31st Street. The report provided recommendations for improvement of SW 7th Street/SR 7 intersection. The developer shall review these recommendations and coordinate implementation with FDOT.

Ref. # 37, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 2/23/24 12:02 PM, Cycle 1, Info Only

Markup: Changemark note #01, PW-1.1-Privacy Wall.pdf

Provide footing detail.

Ref. # 38, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 2/23/24 12:09 PM, Cycle 1, Info Only

Markup: Changemark note #01, WS-3-WATER & SEWER.pdf

Address conflict between proposed wall and existing sewer line. Ensure construction equipment can access sewer line and existing easement.

Ref. # 39, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 2/23/24 12:09 PM, Cycle 1, Resolved

Markup: Changemark note #02, WS-3-WATER & SEWER.pdf

Avoid 90 degree bends (typ.)

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/10/24 10:46 AM

*Refer to sheet WS-3.1, 90 degree bends have been avoided.*

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/7/24 9:55 AM

*Refer to sheet C-501, 90 degree bends have been avoided.*

Ref. # 40, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 2/23/24 12:09 PM, Cycle 1, Resolved

Markup: Changemark note #04, WS-3-WATER & SEWER.pdf

Fire Hydrant prone to hit by trucks due to location next to garbage disposal area. Either relocate fire hydrant or include bollards to protect fire hydrant.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/10/24 10:46 AM

*Refer to sheet WS-3.1, the hydrant next to the garbage disposal has been removed.*

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/7/24 9:55 AM

*Refer to sheet C-501, the hydrant next to the garbage disposal has been removed.*

Ref. # 41, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 2/23/24 12:10 PM, Cycle 1, Resolved

Markup: Changemark note #05, WS-3-WATER & SEWER.pdf

Call out this fire hydrant.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/10/24 10:46 AM

*Refer to sheet WS-3, this hydrant is no longer being proposed.*

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/7/24 9:56 AM

*Refer to sheet C-500, this hydrant is no longer being proposed.*

Ref. # 42, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 2/23/24 12:12 PM, Cycle 1, Resolved

Markup: Changemark note #06, WS-3-WATER & SEWER.pdf

what is this red line? Not in legend.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/10/24 10:46 AM

*Refer to updated water and sewer plans sheet WS-3 and WS-3.1, the line is no longer part of set.*

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/7/24 9:56 AM

*Refer to updated water and sewer plans sheet C-500 and C-501, the line is no longer part of set.*

Ref. # 43, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 2/23/24 12:13 PM, Cycle 1, Resolved

Markup: Changemark note #01, WS-1-WATER & SEWER.pdf

Add symbols for proposed water main and proposed sewer.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/10/24 10:46 AM

*See sheets WS-3 and WS-3.1 for updated legend.*

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/7/24 9:56 AM

*See sheets C-500 and C-501 for updated legend.*

Ref. # 44, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 2/23/24 12:15 PM, Cycle 1, Resolved

Markup: Changemark note #01, PGD-3-PAVING, GRADING & DRAINAGE.pdf

Review SE Inv. El.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/10/24 10:46 AM

*Refer to sheet PGD-3, an updated structure table has been provided.*

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/7/24 9:56 AM

*Refer to sheet C-404, an updated structure table has been provided.*

Ref. # 45, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 2/23/24 12:21 PM, Cycle 1, Resolved

Markup: Changemark note #01, PGD-4-PAVING, GRADING & DRAINAGE.pdf

Consider that heavy traffic is proposed through this road for the road design, location of catch basins, and drainage cover.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/10/24 10:46 AM

*Refer to sheet PGD-5.1, a thicker pavement cross section has been proposed.*

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/7/24 9:56 AM

*Refer to sheet C-620, a thicker pavement cross section has been proposed.*

Ref. # 46, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 2/23/24 12:26 PM, Cycle 1, Resolved

Markup: Changemark note #01, SP-1.1-Site Plan.pdf

Provide aisle distance call out

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/10/24 10:47 AM

*Sheet SP-1.1 has been updated to show all drive aisles dimensions. 24'*

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/7/24 9:57 AM

*Sheet SP-1.1 has been updated to show all drive aisles dimensions. 24'*

Ref. # 47, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 2/23/24 12:28 PM, Cycle 1, Resolved

Markup: Changemark note #02, SP-1.1-Site Plan.pdf

Provide proposed road width.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/10/24 10:47 AM

*Sheet SP-1.1 has been updated to show all drive aisles dimensions. 24'*

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/7/24 9:57 AM

*Sheet SP-1.1 has been updated to show all drive aisles dimensions. 24'*

Ref. # 48, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 2/23/24 12:34 PM, Cycle 1, Resolved

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

Clarify if SF for other impervious and pervious areas include existing and proposed.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/10/24 10:47 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 9:57 AM

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

Ref. # 49, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 2/23/24 12:34 PM, Cycle 1, Resolved

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

Reference in this text how the K value was obtained.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/10/24 10:47 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).*

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/7/24 9:58 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. # 50, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 2/23/24 12:34 PM, Cycle 1, Resolved

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

where are these retention areas?

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/10/24 10:47 AM

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

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/7/24 9:58 AM

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

Ref. # 51, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 2/23/24 12:53 PM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

Comment:

Agreement to discharge surface water to neighboring property:

Provide status of Application L2023-276.

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 3:46 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 10:48 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.*

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/7/24 9:58 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. # 52, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 2/23/24 1:10 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 10:48 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 9:58 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. # 53, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 2/23/24 1:24 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 3:46 PM

*Under review by City consultant.*

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/10/24 10:48 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.*

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/7/24 9:58 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. # 56, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 2/29/24 8:58 AM, Cycle 1, Info Only

Comment: The objective of DEES is to eliminate publicly owned utility infrastructure within private property. Utility plans will be reviewed during permitting process to achieve the aforementioned objective.

Ref. # 58, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 6/14/24 11:50 AM, Cycle 2, Unresolved

Comment: Address the stormwater system of the existing office buildings as it seems to be disconnected from the proposed improvements on the master parking area as well as the retention areas to be removed due to development.

Ref. # 59, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 6/14/24 3:47 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. # 60, Fire, David Scholl, 6/18/24 8:30 AM, Cycle 2, Unresolved

Comment:

Maximum centerline right-of-way measurement between fire hydrant shall be three hundred (300) feet in this zoning district. (Margate Ordinance 14-4)

Any building, other than a single-family residential building, that has a standpipe or other sprinkler system must have a fire hydrant within fifty (50) feet of that fire department connection. (Margate Ordinance 14-5)

Ref. # 29, Landscaping, Todd Belback, 2/22/24 4:39 PM, Cycle 1, Resolved

Comment: Misspelled the word - "Pedestrian"

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/10/24 10:48 AM

*Word "Pedestrian" has been revised.*

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/7/24 9:58 AM

*Word "Pedestrian" has been revised.*

Ref. # 30, Landscaping, Todd Belback, 2/22/24 4:52 PM, Cycle 1, Resolved

Comment: Botanical names should be listed as an Example (Gumbo Limbo) *Bursera simaruba* or *Bursera simaruba* Italicized

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/10/24 10:48 AM

*Botanical names have been adjusted as requested. Please see revised schedule.*

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/7/24 9:59 AM

*Botanical names have been adjusted as requested. Please see revised schedule.*

Ref. # 4, Planning, Christopher Gratz, 10/25/23 10:43 AM, Cycle 1, Info Only

Comment:

The parking statement satisfies the completeness check, the following comment will be made with the DRC comments and is being given now to help expedite the project. It does not have to be addressed with the resubmittal.

General office is not the appropriate parking generation rate for this site. Part of the development houses a call center which has a far higher demand than general office and as visible from aerial photos that the site is under-parked with vehicles parked on dirt.

Ref. # 5, Planning, Christopher Gratz, 10/25/23 11:51 AM, Cycle 1, Resolved

Comment:

Missing: Copies of any and all agreements that run with or affect the property, such as cross access agreements, shared parking agreements, restrictive covenants, plat note amendments, or FDOT agreements.

Note: The cross-parking agreement shall also include unfettered pedestrian access from the apartments to the county park during all hours of operation of the park.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 1/26/24 10:44 AM

*Response: Copies of the recorded agreements regarding the water & sewer capacity, the drainage permit with Broward County, the parking agreement, reciprocal easement agreement, and FDOT pre-approval letter have been provided with this submittal. 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. # 11, Planning, Christopher Gratz, 10/26/23 3:10 PM, Cycle 1, Resolved

Comment: Provide details for all walls and fences.

Reviewer Response: Christopher Gratz - 1/29/24 9:15 AM

*PW-1.1-Privacy wall uploaded*

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 1/26/24 10:44 AM

*Response: Refer to architectural and landscape sheets for wall details and to sheet LP-10 for fence details.*

Ref. # 12, Planning, Christopher Gratz, 10/26/23 4:12 PM, Cycle 1, Resolved

Comment: Site Plan narrative references a file named Republic Trash Service Confirmation. No such file was uploaded. There is a file named Trash Service Letter, but it does not include an email from Bob Hely, as described in the narrative.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 1/26/24 10:44 AM

*Response: The email from Bob Hely has been provided with the submittal. The letter from Republic Services was uploaded with the initial submittal in July, as ADOC-Republic Trash Service Confirmation.*

Ref. # 13, Planning, Christopher Gratz, 10/26/23 4:13 PM, Cycle 1, Resolved

Comment: During the pre-application meeting, we stated that the proposed recycling facilities are insufficient. Sec. 19-10 requires one 95-gallon cart for each 8 dwelling units, or equivalent capacity using mechanical containers. Site plan is currently showing 6 squares and does not provide a direct path for the waste hauler to access the carts.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 1/26/24 10:45 AM

*Response: The plans have been revised to address this comment. Please refer to sheet TR-1.1*

Ref. # 14, Planning, Christopher Gratz, 10/26/23 4:13 PM, Cycle 1, Resolved

Comment: Photometric plans shall delineate footcandle measurements in a grid pattern using ten-foot squares throughout the vehicular use area and measured at grade. Several areas have no delineated measurements.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 1/26/24 10:45 AM

*Response: Please refer to revised EPH-1 (parking lot set) with updated base, vehicular use areas and updated measurements at gap locations. Please note that grid patterns for modified areas are sometimes closer than the 10ft due to added measurements or area.*

Ref. # 15, Planning, Christopher Gratz, 10/26/23 4:14 PM, Cycle 1, Info Only

Comment: The lighting plan satisfies the completeness check. This will be a DRC comment if not addressed. Do not place light poles within sidewalks. Two parking lot light poles are shown in sidewalks on sheet E-1PH.

Ref. # 16, Planning, Christopher Gratz, 10/26/23 4:15 PM, Cycle 1, Resolved

Comment: Site plan does not depict bike racks shown on landscape plan. Site plan depicts mirror image of trash compactor detail. Ensure coordination between all plans. Site plan must depict all features required Master Parking Plan. See Sec. 33.2(F) Margate Zoning Code for more information.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 1/26/24 10:45 AM

*Response: The site plan has been revised and fully coordinated between all drawings. Please refer to sheet SP-1.*

Ref. # 17, Planning, Christopher Gratz, 1/29/24 11:28 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. # 18, 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 10:49 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 9:59 AM

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

Ref. # 19, Zoning, Christopher Gratz, 2/9/24 2:18 PM, Cycle 1, Info Only

Comment: The portion of the parking lot being purchased to serve the development must be joined either by the subdivision resurvey or with a Unity of Title to receive final site plan approval, the parcel line is crooked, and the landscape buffer requirement between the properties is not being met on these plans.

Ref. # 20, Zoning, Christopher Gratz, 2/9/24 2:21 PM, Cycle 1, Resolved

Comment: Provide a clean site plan without truck turning movements, with the property lines clearly defined, all access ways dimensioned, and access easements shown. This includes the pedestrian access. Provide truck turning movements on a separate plan.

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/10/24 10:49 AM

*Sheet SP-1.1 has been updated to show clear property line, dimension and easements. Truck turning has been removed and will be found on sheets AT-1, AT-2, AT-3, AT-4 & AT-7*

Responded by: Amanda Martinez - 5/7/24 9:59 AM

*Sheet SP-1.1 has been updated to show clear property line, dimension and easements. Truck turning has been removed and will be found on sheets AT-1, AT-2, AT-3, AT-4 & AT-7*

Ref. # 57, Zoning, Christopher Gratz, 6/13/24 10:22 AM, Cycle 2, Unresolved

Markup: Changemark note #01, SP-1.1-Site Plan.pdf

38' side setback required from residentially zoned properties, the code makes no exception for the property being in another city. The preserve to the west is zoned B-2 which is the rear property line and a 20' rear setback is required from a non-residentially zoned property.