



CITY OF MARGATE

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE (DRC) REVIEW #2

June 8, 2021

PROJECT NAME:	Marquesa		
PROJECT NUMBER:	2021-222		
LOCATION:	5203 Coconut Creek Parkway		
APPLICANT/AGENT:	Antonio Quevedo, P.E, HSQ Group, Inc, agent for TC MC Margate Apartments, LLC.		
REVIEW/APPLICATION	Site Plan		
DISCIPLINE	REVIEWER	EMAIL	TELEPHONE
DRC Chairman	Elizabeth Taschereau – Director	etaschereau@margatefl.com	(954) 884-3686
Planning	Andrew Pinney – Senior Planner	apinney@margatefl.com	(954) 884-3684
Planning	Alexia Howald – Associate Planner	ahowald@margatefl.com	(954) 884-3685
Building	Richard Nixon – Building Official	rnixon@margatefl.com	(954) 970-3004
Engineering	Curt Keyser – Director	ckeyser@margatefl.com	(954) 884-3631
Engineering	Randy L. Daniel – Assistant Director	rdaniel@margatefl.com	(954) 884-3633
Fire	David Scholl – Fire Department	dscholl@margatefl.com	(954) 971-7010
Public Works	Mark Collins – Director	mcollins@margatefl.com	(954) 972-8126
Public Works	Gio Batista – Assistant Director	gbatista@margatefl.com	(954) 972-8123
CRA	Vacant		
Police	Lt. Ashley McCarthy – Police Department	amccarthy@margatefl.com	(954) 972-1232

**Any questions regarding the DRC comments, please contact the appropriate department.
DRC comments follow:**

DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS

BUILDING

1. Missing ADA accessible parking to common amenities. This changed because of the redesign of the site plan.

Note: When making changes to submittal plans the old sheets shall be left in the package and marked "void". New sheet shall be inserted and proposed changes clearly identified on the new sheets. A commentary should also be provided outlining the changes and accompanied with an explanation describing how the changes addressed prior comments.

Note: Building floorplans are for reference only and have not been reviewed for compliance with the Florida Building Code.

FIRE

1. No comments

PUBLIC WORKS

1. No comments

POLICE

1. No comments

ENGINEERING

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 31-35(2), 31-37, and other relevant sections of the City's Code of Ordinances and finds the following:

A. AVAILABILITY OF POTABLE WATER

Potable water service is available to serve the needs of the proposed development. The water treatment plant has sufficient available capacity to satisfy the potable water needs of the proposed development as well as those of other developments in the service area which are occupied; available for occupancy; hold active, valid building permits; or have already reserved capacity.

Please note that this determination shall not be construed as a reservation of capacity for the development unless a developer's agreement has been executed with the City specifically reserving water treatment capacity.

5/31/21 – No Change. Approved.

B. AVAILABILITY OF WASTEWATER TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL SERVICES

Wastewater treatment and disposal service is available to serve the needs of the proposed development. The wastewater treatment plant has sufficient available capacity to satisfy the wastewater treatment and disposal needs of the proposed development as well as those of other developments in the service area which are occupied; available for occupancy; hold active, valid building permits; or have already reserved capacity.

Please note that this determination shall not be construed as a reservation of capacity for the development unless a developer's agreement has been executed with the City specifically reserving wastewater treatment and disposal capacity.

5/31/21 – No Change. Approved.

C. TRAFFIC IMPACTS

The application is for a plat and site plan approval for an apartment development to consist of 220 apartment units. This proposed development will be separate and distinct from the existing development that includes the charter school and other occupancies. Those occupancies are existing and shall remain, so the traffic attributable to them will remain unchanged.

Accordingly, we believe it is appropriate for the analysis to include a comparison of existing trips attributable to the portion of the development being demolished to the proposed trips attributable to the proposed Marquesa project.

5/31/21 – Code Section 31-35(2)c. states that “An applicant for a development permit which will generate in excess of five hundred (500) trips per day.....shall be required to submit to the city a traffic impact statement. Any such statement shall be prepared by a professional engineer registered by the state and shall assess the impact of the proposed development on all public streets and intersections within a one-mile radius of the perimeter of that development.” This code section does not contemplate existing trips or new trips, but only trips generated by the development in question. Your trip statement indicates that this development will generate 6,539 trips per day, which exceeds the 500 trip threshold established by code. Accordingly, please prepare and submit a traffic impact statement prepared by a licensed professional engineer and which satisfies the requirements of 31-35(2)c of the City of Margate’s Code of Ordinances. This matter remains unresolved.

D. SURFACE WATER MANAGEMENT

Analysis and assessment of the surface water impacts could not be performed, as the application appears to be missing the calculations and/or modeling as well as the approvals from Broward County for the proposed modifications to the existing system.

Please provide appropriate calculations, geotechnical data, and other supporting documentation so that we can evaluate the system and determine whether or not it has adequate capacity to serve the proposed development.

5/31/21 – The data, calculations, and Broward County SWM License provided are for the western portion of the property and do not appear to include the proposed development. Accordingly, we still have not received sufficient information from the applicant to evaluate the drainage system and determine whether or not it has adequate capacity to serve the proposed development. This matter remains unresolved.

E. STREETS, SIDEWALKS, PUBLIC PLACES

The public sidewalk abutting the property are proposed, and shall be constructed by the developer in accordance with the City’s current standards.

The plans are unclear with respect to the intended improvements on Banks Road. They appear to indicate new asphalt but do not include any pavement markings or a section. Please clarify the disposition of the vacated right turning lane. The city’s preference is for the existing right turning lane abutting the north half of the east property line to be converted to landscaped swale area.

The remaining existing roadways abutting the property, as well as the pertinent public places, are labeled as “existing to remain” without modifications. They appear to be

in good condition and do not appear to be in distress. To the best of our knowledge and understanding, these public improvements were previously constructed under permits from the City. Accordingly, they are deemed to meet the minimum standards set forth in Chapters 31 and 35 of this Code.

5/31/21 – The pavement markings, striping, and paving shown on revised plan sheet CE-1 appear to indicate a continuous right turn lane that commences north of the northern driveway on Banks Road and continues to the intersection of Coconut Creek Parkway, with no physical barriers to prevent vehicles from continuing straight through the driveway without turning. This is undesirable and may lead to vehicle collisions. Please make this turn lane a “drop-right” lane by extending the right out curb return out to the through lane and creating a separate taper and stacking area for vehicles intending to turn right on Coconut Creek Parkway from Southbound Banks Road.

Similarly, there is no physical barrier at the main entrance from Coconut Creek Parkway to prohibit vehicles in the right turn lane from proceeding straight through the driveway connection. Please make this a “drop-right” turn lane by extending the right out curb to the edge of the bike lane and creating a separate taper and stacking area for the next driveway west of this development.

This matter remains unresolved.

F. WATER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM

To the best of our knowledge and understanding, the existing water distribution system meets or exceeds the minimum standards and requirements of the following:

1. Chapter 39 of the City’s Code of Ordinances
2. AWWA Standards
3. Broward County Environmental Protection and Growth Management Division

Connection charges and/or impact fees will be determined during the engineering permit review.

Please note that we do not plan to allow any portion of the existing water distribution system to be removed, unless it is replaced by an equivalent system constructed in the public right-of-way.

All components of the proposed water distribution system, including any on-site fire hydrants, constructed within the limits of private property shall serve only this development, shall remain privately owned, and shall be operated and maintained by the development. This matter will need to be addressed by a developer’s agreement or some equivalent agreement to be made between the City’s Development Services Department and the applicant.

5/31/21 – While it is still not evident to me why the water distribution system could not be designed as a looped system around the perimeter of this development with hydrants and service laterals extending into the property as needed, thereby keeping the public utility system in the public right-of-way or at the extreme perimeter of the property, the previous engineering reviewer apparently accepted the design concept with public infrastructure on private property, so I will accept the current design concept at this time. However, to obtain an Engineering Permit, the designer will need to show profiles of every utility crossing. Based on the current design, this includes no less than 11 water/sewer crossings and no less than 16 drainage crossings. The utility sub-contractor will be required to be present at the pre-construction meeting and will need to outline his means and methods for installing and testing all utilities and making the final connections without affecting/interrupting water or sewer service for any other customer.

Accepted.

G. WASTEWATER COLLECTION AND TRANSMISSION SYSTEM

To the best of our knowledge and understanding, the existing wastewater collection and transmission system meets or exceeds the minimum standards and requirements of the following:

1. Chapter 39 of the City's Code of Ordinances
 2. AWWA Standards
 3. Broward County Environmental Protection and Growth Management Division
- Impacts to lift station #36 have been analyzed and have been determined to be negligible, and LS #36 has been found to have sufficient capacity to accept and pump the additional flows attributable to the project. The City accepts this analysis.

All components of the proposed wastewater collection and transmission system constructed within the limits of private property shall serve only this development, shall remain privately owned, and shall be operated and maintained by the development. This matter will need to be addressed by a developer's agreement or some equivalent agreement to be made between the City's Development Services Department and the applicant.

5/31/21 – The sewer collection system is generally acceptable. However, to obtain an Engineering Permit, the plans must identify all of the on-site sewer components (laterals, services, pipes, manholes, etc.) as "private". The City will not own or maintain any new sewer components on private property. Additionally, the designer will need to show profiles of every utility crossing. Based on the current design, this includes no less than 11 water/sewer crossings and no less than 16 drainage crossings. The utility sub-contractor will be required to be present at the pre-construction meeting and will need to outline his means and methods for installing and testing all

utilities and making the final connections without affecting/interrupting water or sewer service for any other customer.
Accepted.

H. SOLID WASTE AND RECYCLING

- a. Consider adding 1 or more trash dumpsters or compactors that are situated more conveniently buildings #1, 2, and 3.
- b. Indicate on the site plan the locations for storage and for pick-up (2 locations open cart) of no less than 28 95-gallon recycle carts or 1 14-yard recycling dumpster, as mandated by Sec. 19-10(b)(1).

5/31/21 – Please contact Waste Management, Inc. to obtain approval for your dumpster enclosure and recycling cart storage system, including the quantities, sizes, and method of collection/pick-up. The contact at WM is: Conrod Thorpe, Route Manager, (954) 279-8569, Cthorpe@wm.com. Please note that the City is in the process of changing vendors, so we will seek approval from the incoming vendor and will forward any additional comments or concerns as appropriate.

I. GENERAL

a. D.E.E.S.\ MOT Review

- i. Not applicable for a D.E.E.S.\ MOT Review.

b. D.E.E.S.\ E.R.C. Review

- i. Preliminary impact fees calculation:

1. Water and Sewer = \$526,798.10
2. Fire and Police = \$173,320.40

Calculation may be revised during the construction permitting process. If the applicant has credits based on the previous use, the information shall be submitted as part of the permit package.

c. D.E.E.S.\ Engineering Review

- i. Water and Sewer

- ~~1. Water main line at Coconut Creek Parkway and Banks Road shall remain as existing.~~
- ~~2. Please relocate the water meters to the site perimeter and contain them within an easement to allow the City to read, maintain, and repair them as needed.~~
- ~~3. The water meters shall be served by service lines and water mains contained within the public right of way.~~
4. In case the applicant is considering charging the occupants of each apartment for their share of the water and sewer charges, please note that the City has very strict regulations with respect to sub-metering or billing end-users for their water consumption. Please refer the owner/developer to Code Sections 39-70 (7) and 39-72 (A)(1).

- ii. Drainage

1. Provide Drainage and Maintenance agreement. The agreement shall include language for the renewal of the surface water operation license.

5/31/21 This matter is still pending and remains unaddressed.

- iii. Provide the approved Aquatic and Wetland Resources License.

5/31/21 This matter is still pending and remains unaddressed.

- iv. All plan sheets should have the same orientation.

5/31/21 This matter is still pending and remains unaddressed.

- v. *5/31/21 - New comment based on current submittal. On several of the plan sheets (SP-1, CE-1, CE-3) the work, particularly at the SW corner of the property, appears to continue beyond the property and off the page, and there is no continuation sheet or match line to indicate where the limits of work are and what is occurring beyond the edge of the page. Please resolve/clarify this issue.*

- vi. *5/31/21 - New comment based on current submittal. The Demolition Plan, Sheet DM-1) does not appear to match the other site plans, as DM-1 appears to indicate demolition along the EOP on Coconut Creek Parkway for a distance of 625' west of the property corner, while the other sheets only show work at a distance of 510' west of that same property corner. Please resolve/clarify this issue. All work must be shown and detailed so we can tell what is expected to occur.*
- vii. At time of Engineering Permit application, provide the following items, among others:
 - 1. Details and location of the PRB's.
 - 2. Detail of Erosion Control for the truck entrance.
 - 3. Detail of Solid Lid.
 - 4. *Legend of line types, symbols, shading, hatches, etc.*
 - 5. *A survey that shows all existing easements.*
- d. **Flood Plain Manager Review**
 - i. New Flood Zone: X - Below 500 Year Flood Plain
 - 1. New NAVD 88 Elevation: N/A
 - 2. New Flood Panel: 12011C0355H
- e. **Conditions**
 - i. An engineering permit is required after DRC approval.
 - ii. Landscaping will be reviewed as part of the engineering permit process.
 - iii. Relocation of trees and removal of Specimen trees requires a separate engineering permit and a bond must be posted in accordance with Code Section 23-20(G).
 - iv. *All trees being removed, relocated, or replaced will be governed by the requirements outlined in Section 23-20 of Margate's Code of Ordinances.*
 - v. *Specimen trees being removed must be mitigated as specified in 23-20(I)(2), (3), (4), (5), (6), and (7).*
- f. **Re-submittal**
 - i. Please provide a response letter for our latest comments.
 - 1. Provide an overview; the response letter should begin with a summary of changes.
 - 2. Respond to every point raised by the City.

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

COMMENT 1: This application is for a site plan and is therefore subject to the requirements of Chapter 31 of the Code of the City of Margate.

Sec. 31-35. - Determinations required prior to approval of a development permit.

A determination that adequate services will be available to serve the needs of the proposed development shall be made when the following conditions are met:

(1) *Director of development services.* The director of development services determines:

- a. That the proposed development is consistent with the Margate Comprehensive Plan.
- b. That the proposed development is in conformity with the Margate Zoning Code.
- c. In the case of site plans, that the proposed development is in conformity with the provisions of chapter 23 of this Code.

Subject Property:

The subject property is a ~ 8.113-acre site located within an existing 29.491-acre plat. The site of the subject property was previously developed as a shopping center. The subject property is bounded to the north by a canal, bounded to the east by Banks Road, and bounded to the south by Coconut Creek Parkway. The property abutting to the west is the parent parcel for this site. Remaining improvements on the parent parcel consist of a shopping center that is hosting two charter schools. The subject property is located at 5203 Coconut Creek Parkway. The subject property is located within the TOC-C Corridor zoning district, and has an underlying land use designation of Transit Oriented Corridor (TOC).

History:

This site plan application was submitted in conjunction with a plat application, plat amendment application (for Central Park of Commerce), and an underground wiring waiver application. The first application received for this project was a site plan application, submitted to the City on May 11, 2017. Legal counsel has advised staff to continue to apply the Code in effect at the time of the first submittal for this project. All of the Code citations included in these comments depict the Code as it existed on May 11, 2017, with the exception of the Master Parking Plan for the parent parcel (adjacent property).

Nature of TOC-C District

Section 9.11 of the Margate Zoning Code provides that “Parcels designated as Corridor typically front a primary road. Street-fronting uses are encouraged and will be supported by a redesign of the streetscape to create a highly walkable zone. Buildings are permitted up to four (4) stories, to a maximum of sixty-six (66) feet in height. A wide range of uses, buildings, and frontage types oriented to public streets is encouraged.” Section 7.2 of the Margate Zoning Code provides a detailed statement of purpose and description of the TOC zoning districts.

Section 7.2. - Purpose and general description.

The Transit Oriented Corridor districts are specifically created to implement and encourage the redevelopment of lands designated as Transit Oriented Corridor on the future land use plan map of the City of Margate Comprehensive Plan. The TOC districts generally include right-of-way and private properties abutting or proximate to the State Road 7/U.S. 441 corridor and comprising approximately one thousand one hundred eighty-four (1,184) acres. This area is designated on the City of Margate Future Land Use Map (FLUM) and the Broward County Land Use Plan Map (BCLUPM) as Transit Oriented Corridor (TOC).

This article provides general guidance and specific standards necessary to promote the goals, objectives and policies contained within the future land use element and is designed to maximize the development potential of the State Road 7/U.S. 441 corridor, foster a mix of vertical and horizontal land uses, promote shopfronts and commercial uses at street level, accommodate wide pedestrian-friendly and multimodal sidewalks, encourage upper story residential and office uses, and provide on-site parking facilities in the rear yard and accesses when possible through rear alleys or side streets.

The city will approve individual development projects only if they contribute to the following objectives:

1. Promoting the community vision for an appropriate urban form for future development and redevelopment;
2. Reducing impacts on adjacent neighborhoods through building placement and sensitivity of building design and green building standards;
3. Encouraging infill and redevelopment with an emphasis on pedestrian orientation, increased mobility and integration of transit and bicycle systems that provide alternatives to the automobile and promote a sustainable environment;
4. Increasing the relationship between primary building entrances, the public sidewalk, and pedestrians with entrances to building shopfronts, workplace and housing oriented directly to the public street;

5. Providing opportunities for a range of housing types and price levels to accommodate diverse ages and incomes;
6. Planning transportation corridors in coordination with land use and coordinating the intensity of development proximate to mass transit and encouraging a sustainable environment;
7. Providing that TOC development be compact, pedestrian-oriented and mixed-use;
8. Providing that ordinary activities of daily living may occur within walking distance of most dwellings, allowing independence to those who do not drive;
9. Providing for interconnected networks of tree-lined or shaded roads to be designed and created incrementally to improve pedestrian access to transit and to disperse and reduce the length of automobile trips;
10. Creating an interconnected rear alleyway system;
11. Promoting the small scale of newly formed blocks with public open spaces to serve corridor residents, workers and visitors for increasing social gathering, active and passive recreation, and visual amenities;
12. Promoting appropriate building densities and land uses be provided within walking distance of transit stops;
13. Creating a range of open space including parks, squares, and playgrounds and positioning buildings to front streets and open spaces;
14. Requiring buildings, streetscapes and landscaping to contribute to creating community living spaces;
15. Designing the street environment and building orientation that emphasize comfort, safety, and distinctive identity, with the provision of urban greenways along major corridor roadways containing a variety of shopfronts that provide a high level of transparency at the sidewalk level;
16. Maximizing the development potential for the TOC district;
17. Providing a form-based code as a guide for change to promote a harmonious and orderly evolution of the TOC district redevelopment area; and
18. Encouraging energy efficiency through building design and site development.

[COMMENT: 6/8/2021] THIS IS AN ADVISORY NOTE

I. CONFORMITY WITH CODE

GENERAL

COMMENT 2: Appropriate residential entitlements have not been acquired for the subject property. Staff acknowledges the pending re-plat application seeking assignment of 92 TOC units and 128 Flex units. This site plan cannot be approved until the appropriate entitlements have been secured, and all other code requirements have been satisfied.

[COMMENT ONGOING: 6/8/2021] COMMENT ACKNOWLEDGED BY APPLICANT, BUT REMAINS ONGOING

COMMENT 3: Address inconsistencies among plan sheets. The site plan uses a single symbol for perimeter fence with the same note "PERIMETER FENCE (TYP.)" throughout, and provides a fence detail as a 4ft tall aluminum fence with masonry columns. The landscape plan calls out an 8ft tall vinyl fence along the north property line. Although Section 3.14 of the Margate Zoning Code generally limits fence heights to a maximum of 6ft on plots for multiple dwellings, staff is recommending to the Planning & Zoning Board in their review of the plat filed concurrently with this site plan application to require an 8ft tall vinyl fence along the north property line. The Planning and Zoning Board is authorized by Section 3.14(20) of the Margate Zoning Code to require fences and walls for screening purposes of a height location and type as may be necessary on new subdivisions and resubdivisions of existing ones.

(15) For all plots of multiple dwellings, fences, walls and hedges in front and corner yards shall not exceed a height of four (4) feet above the established grade. Any such structure or planting shall provide at least ninety (90) per cent see-through visibility. In side and rear yards, fences, walls and hedges may be erected and maintained to a height not exceeding six (6) feet above the established grade. In yards abutting nonresidential property or abutting a right-of-way greater than one hundred (100) feet in width, hedges may be maintained to a height not exceeding nine (9) feet above the established grade.

(20) Notwithstanding the above requirements, pursuant to [section 31-19](#), the planning and zoning board may require fences and walls for screening purposes of a height, location and type as may be necessary on new subdivisions and resubdivisions of existing ones.

[COMMENT ONGOING: 6/8/2021] Fence labeling added, fence height adjusted. Inconsistencies remain.

Site plan and civils label buildings by number and type. Landscape plan labels buildings alphabetically. Photometric plan does not label buildings, but instead labels sidewalks.

Architectural plan re-use sheet names in same plan set.

Sheet A1.01, building Type 1 floor plan proposes the stairs, storage room and elevator to be on the right side of the building however on sheet SP-1 proposes the stairs, storage room and elevator proposed on the left of the interior of the building. Minor inconsistency.

Review plans carefully for consistency in labeling, symbols, and data.

COMMENT 4: Provide a fence detail for the recreation areas. Regulations for fence design are described in Section 3.14 of the Margate Zoning Code.

[COMMENT ADDRESSED: 6/8/2021] Detailed provided on Sheet CE-2

COMMENT 5: A performance bond and engineering permit are required for the construction of improvements on public property, per Section 32.3 of the Margate Zoning Code.

[COMMENT: 6/8/2021] THIS IS AN ADVISORY NOTE

Section 32.3. - Street paving [standards; improvements performance bonds; permits required.]

(A) [*Street paving standards generally.*] The below enumerated items shall conform to the requirements of the latest edition of the Florida Department of Transportation's Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction and supplements.

- (1) Earthwork.
- (2) Clearing and grubbing.
- (3) Preparation of roadbed.
- (4) Rock base.
- (5) Finishing rock base.
- (6) Priming.
- (7) Base course materials.
- (8) Surface treatment—Asphaltic concrete.
- (9) Concrete curb and gutters.
- (10) Underground storm drains.
- (11) Pavement markings and traffic signs.

(B) *Minimum [pavement] widths.* All street pavements shall be not less than twenty-four (24) feet and, in addition, shall have a two-foot curb and gutter integral and paralleling each side of pavement, if required.

(C) *Performance bonds.* It shall be necessary for any person, developer, owner or owners to furnish to the City of Margate a good and sufficient performance bond for all of the required street pavement, sidewalks and drainage facilities to be constructed within dedicated or proposed rights-of-way. Said bond shall also secure proper installation of water and sewer lines in accordance with approved specifications and plans. The required performance bond shall be calculated at one hundred twenty-five (125) per cent of the construction costs of the above-required facilities.

Said bond shall be furnished by a surety company of recognized standing, authorized to do business in the State of Florida and having a resident agent in Broward County. Provided, however, that the subdivider, owner or owners may, at his or their option, furnish cash or government bond security in the same amount. The subdivider may also submit an irrevocable letter of credit to the city in place of the preceding forms of security.

All irrevocable letters of credit shall be such as are acceptable at a reasonable prudent lending institution and shall be acceptable only with the approval of either the city manager or his designee.

All improvements shall be completed within a period not to exceed eighteen (18) months. However, the city may extend the time of completion based upon a showing of good cause.

The subdivider, owner or owners shall be responsible for the paving and other improvements mentioned above until said work is accepted by the city and the bond released.

Minimum standards and permits for the excavation and construction of all canals, ditches and swales as provided for herein shall be adopted by separate ordinance, which separate ordinance shall be construed in conjunction with this section.

The performance bond required hereby shall not be released until, in addition to compliance with all of the requirements of the subdivision and platting regulations and ordinances of the city, all street lights and street markers are in place within the subdivision.

(D) *Permits required.* A permit is required for all construction in the public rights-of-way, or proposed rights-of-way under City of Margate jurisdiction. Such permits shall only be issued by the engineering department.

The rights-of-way under City of Margate jurisdiction are those lands dedicated, deeded, used or to be used for a street, alley, walkway, boulevard, drainage facility, access for ingress or egress or other purpose by the public.

The proposed rights-of-way are those lands to be developed prior to dedications and platting and upon completion to be dedicated to the public.

No permit will be issued for work in any right-of-way or proposed right-of-way until the required fees have been paid, and all required performance and maintenance bonds have been posted.

The inspection fee shall be equal to the sum of five and one-half (5.5) per cent of the construction costs as required by subparagraph (A) above, or when the actual contractual cost or engineer's estimate for a project is in excess of one million dollars (\$1,000,000.00), the fees shall be the actual cost of engineering services as determined by the city engineer. The five and one-half (5.5) per cent fee shall cover the administrative and engineering costs for the inspection of streets, paving, drainage facilities and all other improvements required to be constructed by the developer, subdivider or owner. As an alternative to the payment of five and one-half (5.5) per cent of the performance bond at the time of filing a plat, a separate performance bond as provided in subparagraph (C) above may be submitted to the city to guarantee inspection fees. Said bond shall be submitted at the time of plat approval. Twenty-five (25) per cent of the fee shall be paid thirty (30) days prior to construction, twenty-five (25) per cent of the inspection fees shall be paid within sixty (60) days of the initial payment, and the balance (or final fifty (50) per cent) of all inspection fees shall be paid at such time as the city engineer determines that fifty (50) per cent of the total project is completed.

COMMENT 6: Sheet CE-1 has labeling errors. In the southwest corner of the site, a label is pointing to the symbol for perimeter fence and identifying it monument sign. A label is pointing to the symbol for property line and identifying it as perimeter fence. Labeling errors continue between SP, CE, and A sheets in reference to building types (residential buildings) and square footage (clubhouse).

[ONGOING COMMENT: 6/8/2021] Comment not addressed.

COMMENT 7: Provide setbacks consistent with Section 39.5 of the Margate Zoning Code for proposed monument sign.

[ONGOING COMMENT: 6/8/2021] Comment not addressed. Please delineate distances on plans.

(B) Subdivision identification sign:

(1) Number maximum: One (1) monument or two (2) entrance wall signs (if symmetrical to one another) per entrance.

(2) Location: Must be located on common property near said entrances.

(3) Setback minimum: Five (5) feet from right-of-way or placed on subdivision perimeter wall.

(4) Sign copy area maximum: Thirty-two (32) square feet per sign face and an aggregate area of sixty-four (64) square feet.

(5) Height maximum: Seven and one-half (7½) feet above established grade.

PARKING

COMMENT 8: Provide detail of parking spaces located along curve of drive aisle. Ensure that the minimum width of 9ft is provided at the narrowest point of the parking stall, per Section 33.2(B) of the Margate Zoning Code. Provide striping detail for this spaces.

[ONGOING COMMENT: 6/8/2021] Comment not addressed. Typical detail has been provided on CE-2. This comment was addressing those parking spaces located on the curve of a drive aisle. See parking spaces near trash compactor enclosure and near Building #1.

(4) No parking stall shall be less than nine (9) feet in width and eighteen (18) feet in length, except that parallel parking stalls shall be no less than nine (9) feet in width and twenty-two (22) feet in length. Any parking stall abutting a curbed landscape area no less than seven (7) feet in width may reduce stall length by two (2) feet.

COMMENT 9: This site is required to provide 2 loading spaces, as described in Section 33.9 of the Margate Zoning Code.

[ONGOING COMMENT: 6/8/2021] Staff acknowledges the two loading spaces to be located on the parent parcel, however, these loading spaces should be incorporated into the Master Parking Plan for same. Loading zones are required to be “designed for the convenient and safe ingress and egress by motor truck and/or trailer combination.” Provide a paved walkway that connects the loading spaces into the Marquesa sidewalk network. Include ramps/depressed curbs for access/loading. Include all safety provisions necessary to safely utilize the loading spaces.

Section 33.9. - Off-street loading.

(A) On the same plot with every structure or use hereafter erected or created, there shall be provided and maintained adequate space for loading and unloading of materials, goods or things and for delivery and shipping, so that vehicles for these services may use this space without encroaching on or interfering with the public use of streets and alleys by pedestrians and vehicles.

(B) Where any structure is enlarged or any use is extended so that the size of the resulting occupancy comes within the scope of this section, the full amount of off-street loading space shall be supplied and maintained for the structure or use in its enlarged or extended size. Where the use of a structure or land or any part thereof is changed to a use requiring off-street loading space under this section, the full amount of off-street loading space shall be supplied and maintained to comply with this section.

(C) For the purposes of this section, an off-street loading space shall be an area at grade level at least twelve (12) feet wide by forty-five (45) feet long with fourteen and a half (14½) foot vertical clearance. Each off-street loading space shall be directly accessible from a street or alley without crossing or entering any other required off-street loading space, and arranged for convenient and safe ingress and egress by motor truck and/or trailer combination. Such loading space shall also be accessible from the interior of any building it is intended to serve.

(D) Off-street loading spaces shall be provided and maintained in accordance with the following schedule:

(2) For each multiple dwelling or apartment hotel having at least fifty (50) dwelling units but not over a hundred (100) dwelling units: One (1) space. For each multiple dwelling having over a hundred (100) dwelling units: One (1) space plus one (1) space for each additional one hundred (100) dwelling units or major fraction thereof.

COMMENT 10: Master Parking Plan:

Parking Calculation:

[ONGOING COMMENT: 6/8/2021] The parking calculation for the MPP was provided on “Consilium design build” letterhead without the author of the letter indicated on the document. Comment response sheet provided by applicant indicates that the calculation was provided by

Scott Mire. Section 33.2 of the Margate Zoning Code requires that the parking justification is to be performed by a qualified traffic engineer or certified planner (AICP). Please identify author and qualifications on the parking calculation documents.

If noting shifts in the student population of Ascend Career Academy, it is important to note the times of those school shifts. Please reconcile student shift population vs max capacity.

The parking calculation continues to rely on guest parking at a rate of 1 parking space per 100 students. The calculation now cites Section 453 of the Florida Building Code in order to satisfy the zoning requirement of minimum required parking. Please see Section 102.1.1, FBC.

The parking calculation notes time specific usage of parking, such as, “evening non-concurrent event parking,” but then closes by writing, “If the parking calculation had included shared utilization factors as is accepted by current practice, the surplus parking would be even greater.” Utilizing the same parking spaces at different times of the day by different uses is considered shared parking.

The parking calculation provided with the Master Parking Plan (MPP) accounts for retail space, two charter schools (West Broward Academy and Ascend Career Academy), and a surplus of parking to be shared with the proposed Marquesa development to the east. The School Board of Broward County (SBBC) “Planning Tool for School Enrollment and Capacity” indicates that West Broward Academy has a permanent capacity of 910 students, and Ascend Career Academy has a permanent capacity of 1,000 students. The parking calculation provided accounts for the two schools as having capacities of 1,346 students in the elementary/middle school, and 400 students in the high school. **Correct the school capacity figures or provide appropriate documentation to support the capacity figures used in the MPP.** The parking requirement for the high school provided on the MPP indicates 1 parking space is required per employee, shows a staff of 46, and then indicates 44 parking spaces are required. **Correct this typo.** The MPP incorrectly cites Chapter 6 of the State Requirements for Educational Facilities (SREF), this information is provided in Chapter 5. **Correct this typo.** MPP accounts for one visitor parking space for each 100 students, and cites this as a requirement of the SREF. The actual text of the SREF is, “visitor parking = appropriate spaces for the facility.” With visitor parking at 1 space per 100 students, this leaves the schools unable to host school typical functions with visitors such as student performances, award ceremonies, orientation, athletic events, etc. **1 parking space per 100 students for visitor parking is not appropriate.** The SREF also requires one parking space for each 10 students above the 10th grade. The MPP incorrectly identifies the max capacity of Ascend Career Academy as 400, when the SBBC indicates max capacity is 1,000 students. High schools are comprised of four grade levels, (9-12). Assuming half of those students are above grade 10, then the student parking for this school alone would be 50 spaces. **Correct this figure.**

When describing experience from other sites in the City, the response makes reference to “Tuscan Isles.” No such development exists in Margate.

Staff recommends MPP explore shared parking in further detail as part of the justification for the number of parking spaces.

Master Parking Plan (sketch):

[ONGOING COMMENT: 6/8/2021] Reconcile the Site Plan and Master Parking Plan sketch. Site plan shows two loading zones on the NE corner of the parent parcel for Marquesa use, but the MPP sketch does not show these loading zones. The two loading zones are shown in two-way drive aisle with no striping or signage for identification, and no physical improvements to guide vehicle movements. Master Parking Plan depicts this drive aisle in both one-way and two-way condition with nearly no traffic signage and striping to alert driver's changing of traffic pattern. New one-way traffic pattern is not channelized. Garbage truck path on parent parcel runs through Marquesa Loading Zones. Loading zone is depicted in the same space as pedestrian drop-off. Staff is concerned all of these factors lead to an unsafe condition, consider alternate layout.

Will the 71 spaces reserved for use by Marquesa be identified by signage/striping or other indication? Please specify.

The Master Parking Plan (MPP) prepared by Antonio Quevedo does not clearly depict existing conditions, nor proposed improvements. There are a number of parking spaces drawn onto the plan that do not exist, and would interfere with improvements made for the charter schools. Examples include parking spaces shown in the athletic field and parking spaces shown in the drop-off queue. The MPP depicts a dumpster enclosure along the west property line that would interfere with the drop-off queue. There is a parking area on the north side of the building labeled as "EXISTING PARKING SPACES," but recent aerial photos show this area as a basketball court. **Clarify and correct inconsistencies.** The MPP utilizes a number of symbols that are not defined in the legend. **Identify all symbols used on the MPP.** There are a number of notes, such as, "MODIFY EXISTING LANDSCAPE ISLAND," and "MODIFY EXISTING PARKING SPACES," but the details of those modifications are not provided. **Provide details of proposed modifications.** MPP does not depict a single wheel stop. **Include wheel stops in MPP where required by Section 33.2 of the Margate Zoning Code.** There are three loading zones depicted in the MPP, but these spaces appear to conflict with student pick-up and drop-off queues. Section 33.9 of the Margate Zoning Code describes loading zones as, "adequate space for loading and unloading of materials, goods or things and for delivery and shipping." **Revisit Section 33.9 and add loading spaces where appropriate.** The MPP does not depict pedestrian drop-off areas. It appears as though these pedestrian drop-off areas were mistakenly labeled as "loading zones." **Show pedestrian drop-off areas on the MPP.**

(F) Before any building permit for any new parking area, new or change of use, or substantial modification to an existing parking area such as an alteration to vehicle circulation and/or an expansion of the parking area can be issued, a property owner shall submit a master parking plan to the City for review and approval, as follows:

(1) For single-family or duplex housing, a parking plan shall be submitted with the building permit application for said single-family or duplex unit. The plan shall clearly and accurately designate the required off-street parking spaces.

(2) For all other uses or improvements described in Paragraph (F), above, a master parking plan shall be submitted by the property owner to the Development Services Department for review and approval by the Development Review Committee (DRC). The plan shall clearly and accurately designate off-street parking spaces, landscape areas, pedestrian access, bicycle parking facilities, parking for disabled people, pedestrian drop off and pick-up areas, dumpster locations, loading zones, all truck turning movements, drainage, lighting, access aisles, driveways, and the relation to the uses or structures these off-street parking facilities are intended to serve as appropriate. If applicable to the subject property or properties, the following parking area features shall be included in the master parking plan: electric vehicle charging stations, fuel pumps, valet parking, vehicle gates, vehicle reservoir areas (queueing), short-term parking such as order online and pick-up at store parking, designated spaces for restaurants with curbside or automobile service where customers consume food in vehicles, reserved parking spaces, hydrants, freestanding signs, and all other accessory structures within the parking area. Such facilities shall be arranged for the convenient access and safety of pedestrians and vehicles.

(a) The master parking plan shall be prepared by a professional engineer licensed in the State of Florida.

(b) The master parking plan shall provide a detailed parking calculation. If this Code does not prescribe a minimum number of parking spaces for the proposed use(s), then a justification for the number of parking spaces provided shall be prepared by a qualified traffic engineer or certified planner (AICP) and submitted with the master parking plan.

(c) Where shared parking is proposed, the master parking plan shall identify the uses that share the parking and demonstrate the hours of peak demand by each use.

(d) When an application for a change of use is submitted a previously approved master parking plan may be submitted to the Development Services Director for review with an updated parking calculation and justification for the number of spaces provided. The director may approve the plan or forward it to the DRC for review and approval.

(e) Approval of a proposed master parking plan shall be based on the design standards of the City Code for the various components of the plan. All of the following factors shall be considered in the justification of the number of parking spaces:

(i) The physical constraints of the parking field.

- (ii) The intensity of the uses on the property.
- (iii) The use of shared parking.
- (iv) The availability of and convenient access to transit to the site.
- (v) Information from peer-reviewed literature regarding parking generation rates and the reduction of parking demand.
- (vi) Experience from other sites in the City.
- (vii) The proposed master parking plan will not create a parking problem due to customers or employees using on-street parking in the neighborhood, and that traffic problems in the neighborhood will not be materially increased.

(f) The property owner is responsible for making all improvements described in the approved master parking plan prior to the issuance of any temporary certificate of occupancy, certificate of occupancy, or certificate of completion for any application required to comply with this section.

(g) A master parking plan shall be null and void if a building permit and/or engineering permit has not been issued for the improvements described therein within one year from the date of approval. The date of approval shall be the date an official DRC meeting approved the plan, or in the case of a previously approved master plan, the date of the Development Services director approval.

COMMENT 11: In some parts of the vehicular use area, the light levels falls below the minimum required 1.0 footcandle required for light level 1, as described in Section 33.2(E) of the Margate Zoning Code.

[ONGOING COMMENT: 6/8/2021] Light levels adjusted. Please clarify whether the double light pole symbols (grey next to black) are duplicate. If so, please remove duplicate symbols. See light pole symbols between Building #1 and clubhouse, between Building #4 and clubhouse, between Building #3 and clubhouse. Once quantity of poles and locations are determined by designer, correct all affected sheets, such as landscaping.

Table 1.
Levels of Nighttime Traffic and Pedestrian Activity

Level of Activity	Nighttime use
Level 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilities with businesses not operating after 7:00 p.m.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multifamily residential
Level 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilities with businesses operating after 7:00 p.m. These facilities can fall back to level 1 criteria only after the closing hours of all businesses within the center

Table 2.
Required Maintained Illuminance Levels

Feature	Level 1	Level 2
Minimum horizontal illuminance	1.0 (fc)	2.0 (fc)
Maximum Uniformity ratio (max/min) ¹	10:1	10:1
¹ Uniformity ratios shall be measured at grade level.		

COMMENT 12: Some areas of the vehicular use area exceed the maximum allowable uniformity ratio of 10:1 for site lighting, as described in Section 33.2(E) of the Margate Zoning Code. Many areas outside of the vehicular use area have been included in the photometric analysis. There should be one uniformity ratio provided for the entire vehicular use area, rather than calculating this ratio separately for several areas.

[COMMENT ADDRESSED: 6/8/2021] Light levels adjusted in vehicular use area.

COMMENT 13: Provide a detail of disabled parking signs. Section 33.10 of the Margate Zoning Code requires fine amount to be displayed with 2" series print.

[ONGOING COMMENT: 6/8/2021] Detail provided, however, this detail specifies 1" series for all letters.

(E) Each parking space shall be prominently outlined with paint (as required by state statute, rule or regulation) and posted at the middle of the head of each space with an

individual nonmovable sign of a color and design bearing the internationally accepted wheelchair symbol and the caption, "Parking by Disabled Permit Only." Below the sign and caption as previously stated, an additional caption shall state the amount of the fine for unlawful parking in a space for the disabled. The language shall state "Fine-Amount." (The amount shall be that amount of fine which is approved by ordinance of the City of Margate.) Sign must be a minimum size of twelve (12) inches wide and eighteen (18) inches high with lettering at a minimum of one (1) inch in height. *The lettering designating the amount of fine shall be a minimum size of two (2) inches in height.* Said sign shall be no less than five (5) feet and no more than seven (7) feet from the ground.

LANDSCAPING

COMMENT 14: The landscape calculation chart on sheet L-2 incorrectly transcribes landscaping requirements, and applies certain landscaping requirements incorrectly and/or incompletely. The Urban Greenway tree spacing is incorrect, and does not account for 'pervious area' and ground covers required. Section 23-7 of the Code of the City of Margate does not apply to Coconut Creek Parkway and Banks Road perimeters. The chart does not indicate the amount of interior landscape area provided within the vehicular use area. Additional comments may follow. **[COMMENT ONGOING: 6/8/2021]** Formulas incorrectly transcribed/applied.

23-6(B)(1) - applies to first 10ft into property along Banks Rd and Coconut Creek Pkwy. After trees and hedges, plant ground covers to cover at least 50% of remaining area.

23-6(B)(2) - applies to swale plantings in ROW. Include "pervious area" plantings.

23-7 Other Perimeter - applies to north and west property lines

Where 23-8(A) requires one tree for every 200 sqft of interior area, this is based on the amount of area provided. $13,231/200 = 67$ trees and 335 shrubs required.

Table references four benches and one bike rack installed in the urban greenway. Four benches are depicted in the open space area at the intersection of Coconut Creek Pkwy and Banks Rd. Bike rack is not depicted in urban greenway area. Please clarify.

Sec. 23-6. - Driveway limitations, landscaping abutting right-of-way, visual clearance.

(B) *Required landscaping abutting rights-of-way.* On the site of a building or vehicular use area directly fronting on a public right-of-way, with the exception of single-family detached dwellings and duplex detached dwellings, there shall be landscaping provided between the site and the right-of-way as follows:

(1) In non-residential districts and multi-family residential districts, a strip of land at least ten (10) feet in width, adjacent to and parallel with the right-of-way, shall be landscaped. Within said strip there shall be planted at least one (1) shade tree

for every forty (40) lineal feet of frontage or portion thereof. In addition, a hedge shall be planted within the landscape strip and parallel with the street. All hedges must be planted a minimum of two (2) feet back from any public sidewalk. The remaining area of this strip shall be covered with ground covers and turf. Ground covers shall cover at least fifty (50) per cent of the landscaping strip not occupied by trees and shrubs.

(2) In mixed use districts, where developments are required to provide an urban greenway of varying widths based on the size of the abutting roadway. The following provisions shall apply:

- a. An eight-foot-wide planting strip measured from the curb or edge of pavement inward toward the private development, running parallel with the right-of-way shall be provided.
- b. Within said planting strip, one (1) shade tree shall be planted within a minimum eighty (80) square foot pervious area every thirty (30) lineal feet of frontage. Ground covers shall fill areas of the pervious area not occupied by the required shade tree.
- c. Where a substitution for a smaller tree is necessary because of existing overhead utility lines, each category 2 tree shall be planted within a minimum sixty-four (64) square foot pervious area, and each category tree shall be planted within a minimum forty (40) square foot pervious area.
- d. Palm trees are permitted within the urban greenway, but shall not be credited toward the urban greenway tree requirement.
- e. Public amenities requested by the development review committee shall be provided within the planting strip at the time of development, including but not limited to, paved connections to the right-of-way, benches and other public seating, waste receptacles, bicycle racks or lockers, etc.

(3) Where overhead utilities are pre-existing and in conflict with the installation of required trees, a smaller category of tree may be planted at an increased frequency in lieu of the category 1 shade tree requirement, in accordance with subsection [23-6\(C\)](#) and as follows:

- a. One (1) category 2 tree, as provided in appendix 1 of [chapter 23](#) of this Code, shall be planted for every eighteen (18) lineal feet of frontage; or
- b. One (1) category 3 tree, as provided in appendix 1 of [chapter 23](#) of this Code, shall be planted for every twelve (12) lineal feet of frontage.

Sec. 23-7. - Required landscaping adjacent to other perimeters.

(A) *Abutting properties.* All sites of buildings or vehicular use areas, except single-family detached dwellings and duplex detached dwellings, shall provide a perimeter landscape strip not less than five (5) feet in width *along parcel lines that do not directly abut a public right-of-way* or residential property. At the time both abutting properties are developed according to these standards, there will be a landscape strip of no less than ten (10) feet in width, both properties considered.

COMMENT 15: The PLANTLIST Table on sheet L-2 shows a number of shrubs shorter than the minimum required height of 24 inches at the time of planting. Minimum planting heights are described in Section 23-5 of the Code of the City of Margate.

[COMMENT ONGOING: 6/8/2021] Orange Croton shown as 18".

(3) Shrubs and hedges shall be a minimum of two (2) feet in height after planting. Where hedges are required, shrubs must be planted every three (3) feet on center. Shrubs used for hedges shall be woody, evergreen species.

COMMENT 16: Include light fixture locations and all equipment installed on grade on the landscape plan. Adjust tree and palm locations so that the tree/palm canopies are at least 10 feet away from parking lot light poles, per Section 33.2(E)(7) of the Margate Zoning Code. All existing and proposed structures are required to be depicted on the landscape plan, per Section 23-4 of the Code of the City of Margate. Section 23-9 of the Code of the City of Margate requires all equipment installed outside and on the ground to be screen from the right-of-way.

[COMMENT ONGOING: 6/8/2021] Detail sheets of landscaping plan still depict light poles in close proximity to landscaping. For example, see NE corner of Sheet TU-1-B, east side of TU-1-C, etc. Correct all conflicts.

Sec. 23-4. - Plan required

(B) Landscaping plan specifications. Landscaping plans shall be required to be submitted as follows:

1. The landscaping plan must be drawn to scale and *show the location and dimensions of all existing and proposed structures and infrastructure*, including, but not limited to, vehicular use areas, driveways, surface water areas, utilities, and fire lanes, zones and hydrants.
2. The landscaping plan shall indicate the location, size, grade and specifications of all landscaping materials, including common and botanical names, planting instructions, soil and fertilizer requirements, mulch specifications, berm elevations, protective curbs or other devices, existing trees, and the description of any adjacent conditions which affect the landscaping of the subject site.

3. Plant species and materials shall be selected and located on the plan so that plant groupings are organized by water, light, and soil condition requirements.

4. An irrigation plan for all landscaped areas within the site shall be submitted simultaneously with the landscaping plan. Said irrigation plan shall show the source of water, pumps, valves, pipe sizes, rain sensors, head types, locations and spray patterns.

Sec. 23-9. - Dumpster and other screening requirements.

(B) All mechanical, utility, or any other equipment installed outside and on the ground shall be screened from all public rights-of-way by a hedge maintained to a height not less than six (6) inches above the height of the installed equipment. The screening hedge shall be planted within ten (10) feet of the equipment that it was planted to screen. The hedge shall not be required if the equipment is screened by a building or other permanent structure.

Section 33.2. - Parking design standards.

(7) *Tree canopies*: Location of light poles in new facilities and substantial rehabilitation of existing facilities shall be such that poles are placed a minimum of ten (10) feet from the edge of the tree canopy. Tree canopies at existing facilities shall be trimmed in accordance with the City of Margate's Property Maintenance and Landscaping codes, in order to allow lighting to reach the parking surface.

COMMENT 17: Ensure that trees or other landscape materials do not block visibility or otherwise interfere with traffic control signage (stop signs, etc). Adjust tree locations and/or planting heights as necessary.

[COMMENT ADDRESSED: 6/8/2021]

COMMENT 18: Landscape improvements in County right-of-way (Coconut Creek Parkway) typically require a revocable license agreement. Please verify with Broward County.

[COMMENT ONGOING: 6/8/2021] Comment acknowledged by applicant, but remains ongoing.

COMMENT 19: The urban greenway landscape buffer on Banks Road tapers off and ends about halfway down the run where it is required. The full length of the Banks Road right-of-way adjacent to the east property is required to provide an urban greenway, per Section 9.7 of the Margate Zoning Code. The landscape buffer requirement for the urban greenway is described in Section 23-6(B)(2) of the Code of the City of Margate. Banks Road presently has turning lanes for two entrances into the site. The southern entrance from Banks Road is being eliminated and no longer needs a turn lane. Recover this area for the required urban greenway landscape buffer.

[COMMENT ONGOING: 6/8/2021] The TOC form-based code provisions of Section 9.7 are indeed applicable to this project. Article IX uses the plural form when speaking to TOC "districts," and references the Regulating Plan, which again, references all TOC districts. The form-based code

provisions of Section 9.7 are universally applicable to the TOC-C, TOC-G, and TOC-CC districts, unless specifically called out individually.

To clarify, the 15ft sidewalk required along Banks Road consists of a 7ft wide paved path with an 8ft wide landscape buffer. The site nearly complies with this requirement, and only appears to conflict with the regulations near the Banks Road driveway opening.

3. Sidewalks along all secondary roads are required to maintain a fifteen-foot sidewalk. Up to eight (8) feet of this area may be utilized for parallel on-street parking (See Illustration 15, Sidewalks).

COMMENT 20: Sheet L-5 provides a tree planting detail which uses galvanized wire. This material is prohibited by Section 23-5 of the Code of the City of Margate. Please revise.

[COMMENT ADDRESSED: 6/8/2021]

(4) All trees shall be stabilized in a workmanlike manner at the time of planting. The use of nails, wire, rope, or any other method which damages the tree is prohibited. Trees shall remain stabilized until establishment, but in no instance shall a tree remain stabilized for more than twelve (12) months. Trees shall be restaked in the event of blow over or other failures of the stabilization.

COMMENT 21: Sheet NP-L-1 includes a note under the 8'ht., PVC Perimeter Fence label which reads, "Black Anodized Aluminum or similar." Please address inconsistency.

[COMMENT ADDRESSED: 6/8/2021]

COMMENT 22: Sheets TU-1 through TU-3 for typical building unit landscape plan are missing several landscape details that are provided on sheets L-3 and L-4. Please include all landscaping adjacent to the buildings for this review.

[COMMENT ONGOING: 6/8/2021] Ensure labels are provided for plant material.

COMMENT 23: Sheet IRR-1 has overlapping text and lining that makes the labels and notes illegible. Please correct.

[COMMENT ADDRESSED: 6/8/2021]

COMMENT 24: Sheet IRR-2 has a detail for "MARGATE CHARTER SCHOOL CENTRIFUGAL PUMP SYSTEM DETAIL." Sheet IRR-1 shows a suction line running into the canal, and a pump station, within the Marquesa site. Please clarify why the charter school pump detail was provided, or correct the inconsistency.

[COMMENT ADDRESSED: 6/8/2021]

II. CONSISTENCY WITH COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, ELEMENT I

COMMENT 25: Staff finds the application *is nearly consistent* with Policy 4.3 of the Margate Comprehensive Plan, Element I. The subject property has a TOC land use designation and is

within the TOC-C Corridor zoning district. The site plan provided represents a residential density of roughly 27 units per acre. The site plan provides a number of paved sidewalks throughout. A paved walkway and gate through the perimeter fence to conveniently connect Building #4 with the transit stop on Banks Road is necessary to be consistent with this policy.

[COMMENT ONGOING: 6/8/2021] Paved path and gate noted. Please tie in paved path to decorative pedestrian crossing at trash enclosure/maintenance building.

Policy 4.3 Increased residential density shall be promoted within the TOC land use category, and such development shall provide pedestrian access and connectivity to transit facilities.

COMMENT 26: Staff finds the application generally consistent with Policy 1.8 and Policy 5.2 of the Margate Comprehensive Plan, Element I, provided that if any concurrency deficiencies which may be found are addressed in a manner consistent with the adopted land development regulations.

[COMMENT: 6/8/2021] THIS IS AN ADVISORY NOTE

Policy 1.8 Facilities and services shall be available concurrent with the impacts of development, while traffic circulation shall meet the level of service standards as specified within the adopted Traffic Circulation Element.

Policy 5.2 Issuance of any development permit shall only be permitted upon finding that:

- a. The proposed development is consistent with the Future Land Use Map and the permitted uses of Policy 1.2 of this Element.
- b. That potable water is available to serve the needs of the proposed development.
- c. That wastewater treatment and disposal service is available to serve the needs of the proposed development.
- d. That fire protection is adequate to serve the needs of the proposed development.
- e. That police protection is adequate to serve the needs of the proposed development.
- f. That floor elevations are at or above the minimum prescribed by the National Flood Insurance Program.
- g. That the traffic generated by, the proposed development will be safely and efficiently, handled by the regional transportation network and local streets.

h. That a surface water management system meeting or exceeding the design criteria of the South Florida Water Management District is provided by the proposed development.

i. That, adequate areas for local parks and recreation have been provided to meet the needs of the proposed development.

j. That the proposed development is consistent with the design criteria specified in Policy 2.6 and elsewhere in the land development regulations of the City of Margate.

COMMENT 27: Staff finds the application *is nearly consistent* with Policy 13.6 and Policy 13.12 of the Margate Comprehensive Plan, Element I. The site plan includes a high level of pedestrian connectivity, an open space area with decorative brick pavers and bench seating, and ample bicycle parking throughout. However, a paved walkway and gate through the perimeter fence to conveniently connect Building #4 with the transit stop on Banks Road is necessary to be consistent with these policies.

[COMMENT ONGOING: 6/8/2021] Paved path and gate noted. Please tie in paved path to decorative pedestrian crossing at trash enclosure/maintenance building.

Policy 13.6 The redevelopment and development within the TOC shall ensure that all parcels of land have sidewalk connects leading to transit stops. Such connections shall be required as part of the land development regulations adopted to implement the TOC land use category. Street connections and sidewalk locations shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the SR7/441 Corridor Master Plan.

Policy 13.12 The City shall require, as part of the development review process and consistent with the design of the SR7/441 Corridor Master Plan, internal pedestrian and transit amenities to promote alternative modes of transportation. These amenities shall include, but not be limited to: seating benches or planter ledges, shade, light fixtures, trash receptacles, information kiosks, and bicycle parking. Additional amenities incorporated into the street pattern shall include, but not be limited to: clocks, fountains, sculptures, drinking fountains, banners, flags and food and refreshment vendor areas. All such required amenities shall be reviewed as part of the land development review process and shall be consistent with the land development regulation adopted to implement the TOC land use category.