



ENGINEERING PLAN REVIEW COMMENTS

Project Name:	Margate Care for Heroes, LLC
Address:	603 Melaleuca Drive, Margate, FL
Permit Type:	DRC – Traffic Statement Review for Rezoning Application
Utility:	N\A
Project Number:	DRC 2020-338
Contractor:	T.B.D.
Review Date:	March 16, 2021
Revision Number:	2 nd Review
Reviewer:	Randy L. Daniel, P.E., PMP, CFM
Review Result:	Rejected
Contact:	Margate Care for Heroes, LLC Miryam Jimenez 954-608-4067

D.E.E.S.\ Engineering Review

The Director of the Department of Environmental and Engineering Services, or his qualified designee, has conducted a review of the submitted documentation in accordance with Article IV, Chapter 31 of the City of Margate's Code of Ordinances and finds the following:

A. TRAFFICWAYS

As a preamble to the following discourse and review, the Department of Environmental and Engineering Services (DEES) hereby indicates dissatisfaction with the accuracy of the Traffic Statement (TS) that was submitted for review. As a consequence, there may be additional inaccuracies in the Statement that were not discovered and therefore not discussed below. Furthermore, based on the discrepancies found in the report, DEES is not confident that the Traffic Statement was diligently prepared, despite the required oversight provided by Professional Engineer Partington.

1. Paragraph 3 of the TS states that “an analysis of trips expected to be generated by both the prior and the proposed developments was conducted”. Please provide the details of the analysis and the results that compared the prior development with the proposed; clearly illustrate the increase/decrease in trip counts in accordance with the selected parameters.
2. Section 31-37 in the City's code clearly requires that “a proposed development shall be presumed to have the maximum impact permitted under applicable land development regulations...”. Replace average value with the value that has the greatest impact for use in Table 1.



ENGINEERING PLAN REVIEW COMMENTS

3. Please explain how the data in Table 1 was derived from Tables 2-13.
4. Tables 2 -13 indicate that the greatest impact to the trip generation characteristic, of the four (4) characteristics analyzed, is the **number of employees**, with an associated number of 144 new daily trips generated. Accordingly, please reconcile the number of new trips generated by employees (144) and the number recorded in table 1 (31).
5. Paragraph 5 speaks to “common practice of traffic engineering around the nation” in regards to the decision to use “dwelling units as the independent variable” in the analysis. Please provide supporting documentation for this claim.
6. Both Policy 2.1.2 in Element II - Transportation of the City’s Comprehensive plan (pp II-80 /II-81) and Section 31-48 (C) of the City’s Code of Ordinances require the Level of Service (LOS) for Local Roads to be “C”. Melaleuca Drive is a local road but the Traffic Statement inaccurately states that LOS “D” shall be the Level of Service required for local roads. Please redo the analysis using LOS “C”.
7. Melaleuca Drive is not a signalized roadway, yet Table 4 of the TS references “State Signalized Arterials”. Please redo analysis and omit references to signalized intersections. Melaleuca Drive is not an arterial road.
8. Parking is not required for the Traffic Statement and should be removed. Parking requirements are stipulated in Section 33.3 of the City Code of Ordinances.

B. POTABLE WATER AND WASTEWATER

Previously addressed in Review # 1.

C. DRAINAGE

Previously addressed in Review # 1.

D. SOLID WASTE

Previously addressed in Review # 1.

E. RECREATION

Not applicable to this development.