Project Name: 24-00400057

Project Description: Carolina Club LUPA
Review Comments List Date: 5/7/2025

Ref. # 43, Building, Richard Nixon, 4/15/25 11:08 AM, Cycle 1, Info Only Comment: Documents were not reviewed for Florida Building Code compliance. Permits and plans will be required.

Ref. # 30, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 2/13/25 4:38 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. # 31, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 2/13/25 4:41 PM, Cycle 1, Info Only Markup: Changemark note #01-ENG, 3_LUPA 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 4:13 PM *This task to be completed during site plan approval.*

Responded by: LINDSAY MURPHY - 3/13/25 9:15 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. # 32, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 2/13/25 4:43 PM, Cycle 1, Info Only Markup: Changemark note #02-eng, 3_LUPA 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 4:13 PM

This task to be completed during site plan approval.

Responded by: LINDSAY MURPHY - 3/13/25 9:15 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. # 33, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 2/13/25 4:44 PM, Cycle 1, Info Only

Markup: Changemark note #03, 3_LUPA 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 4:13 PM

This task to be completed during site plan approval.

Responded by: LINDSAY MURPHY - 3/13/25 9:15 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. # 34, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 2/13/25 4:47 PM, Cycle 1, Info Only

Markup: Changemark note #04, 3_LUPA Application Text_October 2024.pdf

Comments may be provided during the review of the Traffic Impact Assessment report;

therefore, additional comments may be provided in the traffic section

Responded by: LINDSAY MURPHY - 3/13/25 9:15 PM

Comment is noted and understood.

Ref. # 47, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 5/1/25 10:36 AM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

Comment:

TRAFFIC

Section F. Traffic Circulation

Table 1: Current Roadway Data PM Peak Hour

Wiles Rd: Rock Island Road to SR 7, V/C should be 0.57.

Ref. # 48, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 5/1/25 10:36 AM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

Comment:

TRAFFIC

Section F. Traffic Circulation

Table 2: Current Roadway Data â€" Daily

Atlantic Blvd: Rock Island Road to SR 7, Capacity is 50,000, V/C = 1.0 and LOS is D in the MPO

Table. Table 2 does not match.

Ref. # 49, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 5/1/25 10:37 AM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

Comment:

TRAFFIC

Section F. Traffic Circulation

Table 5: 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). Please provide the SF of the retail and grocery store separately.
- c. The residential units are not included in the trip generation.

Ref. # 50, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 5/1/25 10:37 AM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

Comment:

TRAFFIC

Section F. Traffic Circulation

Please provide trip distribution documentation.

Ref. #51, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 5/1/25 10:38 AM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

Comment:

TRAFFIC

Section G. Mass Transit Analysis

- 1. BCT Route is not within a $\hat{A}\frac{1}{4}$ mile of the site via roadways. There is no East-West connection to Riverside Drive.
- 2. Margate Routes C and D are not included in the letter from Broward County Transit.
- 3. Broward County Transit correspondence is included in Exhibit S, not T.

Ref. # 52, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 5/1/25 10:39 AM, Cycle 1, Unresolved Comment:

TRAFFIC

Exhibit B.1 Pedestrian Connectivity Plan

The existing sidewalk network on Holiday Springs Blvd, Pine Walk Drive N & S, and Rock Island Road does have sidewalks on both sides of the road. There are no midblock crossings anywhere along these roadways for access to both sides of the streets.

Ref. # 53, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 5/1/25 10:39 AM, Cycle 1, Unresolved Comment:

TRAFFIC

Exhibit B.1 Pedestrian Connectivity Plan

Pod B has no sidewalk connectivity shown.

Ref. # 54, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 5/1/25 10:39 AM, Cycle 1, Unresolved Comment:

TRAFFIC

Exhibit B.1 Pedestrian Connectivity Plan

Pod A, the commercial site, has no sidewalk connectivity.

Ref. # 55, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 5/1/25 10:40 AM, Cycle 1, Unresolved Comment:

ENVIRONMENTAL

Provide update on the status of the Site Assessment Report, Soil Management Plan/Remedial Action Plan, remediation, verification testing, and modification to the DRC as recommended in the Phase II ESA.

Ref. # 56, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 5/1/25 10:41 AM, Cycle 1, Unresolved Comment:

ENVIRONMENTAL

Provide status of the ongoing State-funded remediation of PAHs at the southwest corner of the maintenance building.

Ref. # 57, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 5/1/25 10:41 AM, Cycle 1, Unresolved Comment:

ENVIRONMENTAL

Provide update regarding comment on Phase I and Phase II ESA - Declaration of Restrictive Covenant (DRC) imposing several restrictions including land use restrictions limiting land use to a golf course facility.

Ref. # 58, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 5/1/25 10:42 AM, Cycle 1, Unresolved Comment:

ENVIRONMENTAL

Will the maintenance area be reevaluated under another Phase II ESA to determine successful remediation due to presence of arsenic in soil and groundwater?

Ref. # 59, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 5/1/25 10:43 AM, Cycle 1, Unresolved Comment:

ENVIRONMENTAL

Provide information regarding existence of any Environmental Liens and Activity and Use Limitations that are filed or recorded against the property.

Ref. # 60, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 5/1/25 10:44 AM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

Comment:

ENVIRONMENTAL

Has another preliminary survey been completed in the spring (nesting season) to determine presence of burrowing owls? As recommended in the environmental assessment.

Ref. # 61, Engineering, Paula Fonseca, 5/1/25 10:45 AM, Cycle 1, Unresolved Comment:

WATER/SEWER

Provide expected ERCs required to serve this development. Include a description of existing ERCs, proposed ERCs due to development and ERC balance.

Ref. # 10, Fire, David Scholl, 1/15/25 2:39 PM, Cycle 1, Unresolved Comment:

- 1. Fire Department service delivery concurrency evaluation required for proposed development . (FL Fire Prevention Code 15.1)
- 2. Land required set aside for potential future fire station.

Responded by: LINDSAY MURPHY - 3/26/25 1:01 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 9:15 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. #39, Fire, David Scholl, 3/20/25 2:09 PM, Cycle 2, Unresolved

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

Responded by: LINDSAY MURPHY - 3/26/25 1:01 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. # 40, Fire, David Scholl, 4/1/25 2:23 PM, Cycle 3, Unresolved Comment: 1. Land required set aside for potential future fire station.

Ref. # 42, Fire, David Scholl, 4/7/25 5:00 PM, Cycle 1, Unresolved Comment:

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

Ref. # 18, Planning, Andrew Pinney, 2/5/25 4:56 PM, Cycle 1, Unresolved

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

Reviewer Response: Andrew Pinney - 3/19/25 2:18 PM

Comment deferred per email.

Responded by: LINDSAY MURPHY - 3/13/25 9:15 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. # 44, Planning, Andrew Pinney, 4/29/25 9:13 AM, Cycle 1, Info Only Comment:

'Protect environment/open space' was a key issue identified by the public during the Margate 2.0 comprehensive plan update. As applicable to this golf course LUPA, one of the strategies for this key issue is:

"To the extent possible, repurpose golf courses to offer tracts of green space that will attract native wildlife, restore ecological functions and provide opportunities for members of the surrounding community to interact with nature."

Recommend creating pockets of hardwood hammocks along proposed pedestrian trail and new drainage lakes.

Ref. # 45, Planning, Andrew Pinney, 4/29/25 4:51 PM, Cycle 1, Unresolved Comment:

The proposed R(14) land use designation for Pod C raises compatibility concerns. This proposal contemplates six-story mid-rise multifamily development. Adjacent residential properties were developed at a much lower intensity. Property abutting the south of Pod C is mostly single family detached dwellings, with some townhouse. Property abutting the north of Pod C is low-rise two and three story garden condominium and single family family detached dwellings.

COMPATIBILTY - means a condition in which land uses or conditions can coexist in relative proximity to each other in a stable fashion over time such that no use or condition is unduly negatively impacted directly or indirectly by another use or condition.

Policy 1.2.2 The compatibility of existing and future land uses and the established character or predominantly developed areas shall be a primary consideration in the review and approval of amendments to the Future Land Use Plan in order to prevent incompatible uses. It is recognized that approved redevelopment plans aimed at eliminating or reducing blighted and deteriorating areas may appropriately promote the introduction of land use patterns in variance with existing land use patterns [BLUP 2.10.2, 2.10.3].

Policy 3.2.2 All proposed development, shall be compatible with adjacent land uses. Compatibility determination shall include consideration of factors such as, but not limited to, operational characteristics and intensity of use (ex: hours of business, indoor vs outdoor activities, traffic generation, etc.), noise, glare, odor and other externalities, and adequacy of buffering.

Resolve issues through the Development Agreement.

Ref. # 46, Planning, Andrew Pinney, 4/29/25 5:53 PM, Cycle 1, Unresolved Comment: This land use plan amendment is located within Dashed Line Area "A" on Margate's Future Land Use Map. The maximum permitted development and approximate acreage of each Dashed Line Area are provided in Policy 1.2.6, Element I - Future Land Use, Volume 1. A policy amendment is required to approve this map amendment.

Ref. # 62, Planning, Andrew Pinney, 5/6/25 5:50 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. # 41, 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.