



#### City Commission

Mayor Anthony N. Caggiano  
Vice Mayor Tommy Ruzzano  
Antonio V. Arserio  
Arlene R. Schwartz  
Joanne Simone

#### City Manager

Cale Curtis

#### City Attorney

Janette M. Smith, Esq.

#### City Clerk

Joseph J. Kavanagh

## REGULAR MEETING OF THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES

**Tuesday, September 10, 2019**

**10:00 AM**

City of Margate  
Municipal Building

#### **PRESENT:**

Robert Massarelli, Director of Development Services  
Andrew Pinney, Senior Planner  
Dan Topp, Community Development Inspector  
Richard Nixon, Building Department Director  
Kevin Wilson, Fire Marshal  
Lt. Ashley McCarthy, Police Department  
Ken Griffin, Director, DEES  
Alberto Torres-Soto, Senior Engineer, DEES  
Janette Smith, City Attorney

#### **ABSENT:**

Mark Collins, Public Works Director

The regular meeting of the Margate Development Review Committee (DRC) having been properly noticed was called to order and a roll call was taken by Robert Massarelli at 10:09 a.m. on Tuesday, September 10, 2019, in the City Commission Chambers at City Hall, 5790 Margate Boulevard, Margate, FL 33063.

#### **1) NEW BUSINESS**

*ID 2019-459*

- 1A) CONSIDERATION OF A **LAND USE PLAN AMENDMENT** TO CONVERT 142 ACRES OF COMMERCIAL RECREATION TO R (3) RESIDENTIAL AND R (4) RESIDENTIAL, IN ORDER TO BUILD 126 SINGLE FAMILY HOMES AND 204 TOWNHOUSES ON THE CAROLINA GOLF CLUB  
**LOCATION:** 3011 NORTH ROCK ISLAND ROAD  
**ZONING:** S-2 OPEN SPACE DISTRICT  
**LEGAL DESCRIPTION:**  
**PETITIONER:** KEN TUMA, URBAN DESIGN KILDAY STUDIOS, AGENT FOR MICHAEL NUNZIATA, FLORIDA REAL ESTATE VALUE FUND III, LP

Robert Massarelli introduced the item and made a statement to the public. He explained that this meeting is open to the public, however it is not a public hearing. Mr. Massarelli stated that this board does not make any decisions in regards to the approval or disapproval of applications, and that the responsibility of the Development Review Committee is to make a finding of compliance with the code and the Comprehensive Plan. He further explained the process of the item being presented to the Planning and Zoning Board who will serve as the

#### **Development Services Department**

901 NW 66<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Margate, FL 33063 • Phone: (954) 979-6213  
[www.margatefl.com](http://www.margatefl.com) • [dsd@margatefl.com](mailto:dsd@margatefl.com)

Local Planning Agency for this item, who will then give their recommendation to the City Commission, who will hold a public hearing and they will therefore be the final decision maker. Mr. Massarelli stated that today's meeting is to go over the technical aspects of the Land Development Code and the Comprehensive Plan. He explained that based on the review he does not expect any decisions and/or findings to be made today, with an additional DRC Meeting scheduled in the future. He said that today's meeting will work a little different, excusing the board members that have no comment and asking the members that have comments to stay for the entire meeting. The following comments will be for both the Land Use Plan Amendment and the Rezoning.

**DRC Comments:**

Richard Nixon, commented that based on the today's discussions the Building Department has no comment.

Kevin Wilson, said that based on today's applications the Fire Department has no comment.

Ashley McCarthy, stated that the Police Department has no public safety concerns at this time.

Mr. Massarelli then asked the applicant if they had any comments for the board.

Mr. Dennis Mele, 200 E Broward Blvd, Fort Lauderdale introduced himself and spoke on behalf of the applicant. He stated that they are only interested in hearing the boards comments and questions.

**DRC Comments (con't):**

Alberto Torres-Soto, had the attached comments titled "Exhibit A"

Dan Topp, had no comments

Andrew Pinney, had the attached comments titled "Exhibit B"

Robert Massarelli, had the attached comments titled "Exhibit C"

Alberto Torres-Soto, had an additional comment, recommending that the applicant contact the county in regards to the drainage for this project; stating that the letter will need to come from the Surface Water Management Division.

Robert Massarelli asked the applicant to resubmit based on the comments today.

*ID 2019-460*

- 1A) CONSIDERATION OF A **REZONING** TO CONVERT 142 ACRES OF S-2 OPEN TO PRC PLANNED RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITY, IN ORDER TO BUILD 126 SINGLE FAMILY HOMES AND 204 TOWNHOUSES ON THE CAROLINA GOLF CLUB

**LOCATION:** 3011 NORTH ROCK ISLAND ROAD

**ZONING:** S-2 OPEN SPACE DISTRICT

**LEGAL DESCRIPTION:**

**PETITIONER:** KEN TUMA, URBAN DESIGN KILDAY STUDIOS, AGENT FOR MICHAEL NUNZIATA, FLORIDA REAL ESTATE VALUE FUND III, LP

Andrew Pinney, had the attached comments titled "Exhibit A"

Kenneth Griffin, had the attached comments titled "Exhibit B"

Alberto Torres-Soto, had the attached comments titled "Exhibit C"

Robert Massarelli, had the attached comments titled "Exhibit D"

Robert Massarelli asked the applicant to resubmit based on the comments today.

### **GENERAL DISCUSSION**

Robert Massarelli stated that this is a major project and the timing will depend upon the response by the petitioner. He then informed the board that he is continuing to work on the Comprehensive Plan, which will be brought to the committee for review and comments.

Mr. Pinney commented that complete packages will be required for resubmittal.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:14 AM

Respectfully submitted,

Prepared by Melissa M. Miller

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Robert Massarelli  
Director of Development Services

Date: 3/19/2020

*Andrew Pinney*  
*Interim Director of Development Services*

EXHIBIT A: COMMENTS MADE BY ALBERTO TORRES-SOTO, SENIOR ENGINEER, DEES  
ITEM # 2019-459

Comments ID 2019-459:

1. Potable Water:

- a. The City will request the applicant that the water allocations not to be used for this project are moved to the City.
- b. The calculation of the water demand must be revised due to incorrect building "type use" selected to calculate the townhomes, clubhouse and pool water used. Please contact the engineering division if you require any assistance to calculate the equivalent residential connections (ERCs).
- c. Specify the source of the irrigation activity. Per code, the size of the meter and the number of meters will determine the total water use for the irrigation based on the ERCs per meter.
- d. A new letter from the Water Plant Manager will be provided. That letter will include the permitted maximum annual allocation per the South Florida Water Management District. *(The City provided the letter to the applicant before the end of the meeting)*

2. Sewer:

- a. The calculation of the wastewater flow rates must be revised due to incorrect building "type use" selected to calculate the townhomes, clubhouse, and pool. Please contact the engineering division if you require any assistance to calculate the equivalent residential connections (ERCs).
- b. Provide an engineering analysis for the existing sewer system to determine if the City's infrastructure requires upgrades to convey used water for this project.

3. Drainage:

- a. Section 11-3 of the City Code shall be considered as part of the finish floor elevation requirements for this project.
- b. The document shall include that the amendment area is located within the C-14 canal watershed and that part of the drainage servicing the area is the City of Margate drainage system.
- c. Provide drainage analysis as part of the next submittal.
- d. Provide approval from the Surface Water Management License (SWML) Division (Johana Narvaez [JNARVAEZ@broward.org](mailto:JNARVAEZ@broward.org) or Carlos Adorisio [CADORISIO@broward.org](mailto:CADORISIO@broward.org) ). The person who reviewed the drainage for the LUPA is from the Broward County Management Division and not from the SWML Division.

EXHIBIT B: COMMENTS MADE BY SENIOR PLANNER ANDREW PINNEY  
ITEM # 2019-459

Carolina Club LUPA

9/10/19 DRC

- 1) This application is located within a dashed line area on the Future Land Use Map and consists of converting a golf course into a residential development. Part 7 of Element I of the Margate Comprehensive Plan provides a description of the Future Land Use Map and a description of how to interpret and enforce the map. This section addresses dashed line areas of the map, and provides the following language, "The use designations within the dashed lines are binding. However, the City may approve a rearrangement of uses or densities, which does not increase the total number of dwelling units or **decrease the amount of recreational land** or increase the amount of commercial land." Because the golf course is a recreational use, and it currently has a land use designation of Commercial Recreation, this application must include a request for a text amendment to the Comprehensive Plan in order to facilitate the requested redevelopment.
- 2) Revise requested map amendment. The current request is to convert 142 acres of Commercial Recreation to 52.407 acres of R(4) and 89.6 acres of R(3), with a description that 100 acres will remain as open space, and homes will be built on 42 acres. Revise request so that 100 acres have an Open Space land use designation, and show the actual density of the development areas.
- 3) The rationale provided states that 100 acres of the 142 acres will be preserved as open space, and then refers to the conceptual plan provided with the application. The conceptual plan has proposed roadways shaded green, the same color as the open space. Roads are not open space, please refine the conceptual plan.
- 4) Include in the rationale approximately what percentage of the preserved open space will be usable land and what percentage will be lakes/drainage.
- 5) The conceptual plan shows a brown line meandering through some of the proposed development and some off site areas with no legend or description of the brown line. Please identify.
- 6) If approved, this project will have to re-plat the property. The conceptual plan has no indication of the park dedication described in Section 31-19(E) of the Margate Code of Ordinances.
- 7) The existing Carolina development maintained separations between single family and multi-family developments. This proposal shows areas where single family and multi-family abut, which raises compatibility concerns with the existing neighborhood.
- 8) Sound Study:
  - a. The test sites are inconsistent with the Conceptual Plan, and some sites were not tested.



EXHIBIT B: COMMENTS MADE BY SENIOR PLANNER ANDREW PINNEY  
ITEM # 2019-459

- b. Please clarify methodology, were the sound readings manually recorded or recorded using data logging equipment? Why was the sound read once a minute rather than continuous?
  - c. The results give the amount of time the sound was over 65 dBA, but the specific time(s) of day. Include this information.
- 9) Page 18 of 34 of the BCPC application, question #3 asked for any planned drainage improvements, including year, funding sources and other relevant information. The response did not identify any improvements.
- 10) Pages 18/19 of 34 of the BCPC application, question #5 asked if the area did not meet LOS and if there are no planned improvements by the unit of local government or drainage district to address deficiencies. The question then asks the applicant to provide an engineering analysis which demonstrates how the site will be drained. The response is unacceptable because it does not provide the requested information and analysis.
- 11) Pages 20/21 of 34 of the BCPC application, question #5 asks the applicant to address Policy 2.5.4 regarding the preservation of open space and Policy 2.5.5 regarding preservation of golf courses and open spaces, including the language, "The loss of open space must be mitigated through provision of parks and open space to serve the surrounding neighborhood." The response describes a number of lakes added to the property to buffer the development and offset a loss of recreational land. The lakes are not truly recreational in nature, merely drainage structures, unless improvements such as docks, bridges, gazebos, etc are included. The description of a multi-use trail with pocket parks is quite vague. Please provide additional details.
- 12) Page 24 of 34 of the BCPC application, question #2 asks the applicant to describe how the proposed amendment furthers or supports mass transit use. The response addresses adding residential to area currently served by transit and adding pedestrian linkages. Please provide a map showing the referenced transit lines and the pedestrian links described. The neighborhood design shown on the Conceptual Plan includes dead ends/cul-de-sacs which inhibits connectivity and transit access.
- 13) Page 25 of 34 of the BCPC application, Section H Public Education Analysis involves public school concurrency requirement. The response mentions a Public School Impact Application. Please provide a copy of the SCAD resulting letter.
- 14) Pages 29/30 of 34 of the BCPC application, question 10 asks whether the site is located in a redevelopment area and gives the examples of CRA or CDBG. The applicant response only addresses the CRA. This area has 51% or more persons with Low and Moderate income, so the area may be eligible for CDBG funding. Research and confirm.

EXHIBIT B: COMMENTS MADE BY SENIOR PLANNER ANDREW PINNEY  
ITEM # 2019-459

- 15) Pages 30-33 of 34 of the BCPC application, question #12 asks for demonstration of consistency with highlighted policies of the Broward County Land Use Plan. In response the Policy 2.20.9, the applicant states that extensive community outreach has taken place. Please provide records of the outreach efforts such as advertising of the outreach, minutes or summary of the meetings, photos, receipts, etc... Attach as an exhibit to the application.
- 16) Page 33 of 34 of the BCPC application, question 13.B asks for any proposed voluntary mitigation or draft agreements. The response references drafting agreements to limit the number and type of permissible units. Provide a draft copy as an exhibit.
- 17) Exhibit K, Phase 1 Environmental Assessment for Carolina Club identifies site contamination and a recorded Declaration of Restrictive Covenants which restricts the use of land to a golf course, and specifically prohibits residential use. Provide a rationale for the how the contamination will be mitigated and the restrictive covenants addressed.
- 18) Exhibit O, Carolina Club Property Environmental Assessment provides a table on pages 4 and 5 but does not provide a legend to identify the coding used in the table.

EXHIBIT C: COMMENTS MADE BY ROBERT MASSARELLI, DIRECTOR  
ITEM # 2019-459

Development Services Department  
Director's Review Comments on Land Use Plan Amendment Carolina Club  
13<sup>th</sup> Floor

A. Page iv

Has there been any changes to the members of the Consultant Team, Environmental Resource Planning, or Economic Analysis? If so, what are those changes.

B. Page 2 of 34, Dash-Line Areas

The quote is from the County's comprehensive plan. Include the language from the City's comprehensive plan regarding dash-line areas.

C. Page 3 of 34, first full paragraph, second sentence

Please provide a copy of the "standard County policy".

D. Page 7 of 34, first full paragraph, second sentence

A recreation pod is reference. Such a pod is not reference on any of the maps. Please locate the recreation pod and the size of the pod. Adjust the table at the top of page 10 of 34 to reflect the recreation pod.

E. Page 7 of 34, first full paragraph, last sentence

Document the current flooding issues within the Carolina Club. Describe how the application will "help" address those problems. Be specific, current flooding is caused by X volume of water. That water will be move to X location.

F. Page 7 of 34, second full paragraph, first sentence

Describe in detail the "much needed improvements to the infrastructure and appearance of the community."

G. Page 7 of 34, second full paragraph, ninth sentence

This sentence references to connection to the City's proposed greenway trail. Please describe if and how a connection to the greenway trail proposed by the County along the canal on the Margate/Coral Springs boundary can be accomplished.

H. Page 14 of 34, third full paragraph

What are the plans for permit #06-000210W? Will this permit be retained by the applicant and the water used for irrigation? If so, will water from this system be made available to the residential units to be constructed? Open space areas?

I. Page 14 of 34. #3

The question is not answered. This application needs to stand alone from the rezoning request.



EXHIBIT C: COMMENTS MADE BY ROBERT MASSARELLI, DIRECTOR  
ITEM # 2019-459

J. Page 15 of 34, #3

The question is not answered. This application needs to stand alone from the rezoning request.

K. Page 17 of 34, #3

The question is not answered. This application needs to stand alone from the rezoning request.

L. Page 18 of 34, top of the page, last sentence

Provide details as to how best management practices will be used, not just that they should be used.

M. Page 18 of 34, #4

Provide details of the proposed modifications to permit #06-00733-S.

N. Page 19 of 34, first paragraph

Are all level of service standards set current met?

O. Page 19 of 34, #2

The question is not answered. This application needs to stand alone from the rezoning request.

P. Page 19 of 35, #3

The question is not answered. This application needs to stand alone from the rezoning request.

Q. Page 20 of 34, #4

Provide details supporting data used, not just a reference.

R. Page 20 of 34 #5, Policy 2.5.4

Who is included in the Carolina Club?

What entity is responsible for the maintenance of the proposed open space, walking trail, benches, gardens and pocket parks?

If this is an existing entity, have they agreed to be responsible for the maintenance?

If this is a new entity, what are its powers and duties?

What are the projected expenses and revenues for maintenance?

S. Page 21 of 34, Policy 2.5.5, last sentence in response to a.

Provide a detail description of "dense landscape buffer." This should be in the form of performance standards.

T. Page 21 of 34, Policy 2.5.5, first paragraph response to b.

A drainage analysis needs to be provided. The analysis should clearly show the storm water retention provided by the current conditions and under the development conditions.

EXHIBIT C: COMMENTS MADE BY ROBERT MASSARELLI, DIRECTOR  
ITEM # 2019-459

U. Page 21 of 34, Policy 2.5.5, first paragraph response to c.

The response states that there are no documented aquifer recharge areas. Page 7 of the Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment states that the Biscayne Aquifer extends from the ground surface to a depth of more than 300 feet. Aquifer recharge to the Biscayne Aquifer occurs locally.

V. Page 22 of 34, top of the page.

The last sentence states that "the proposed redevelopment will positively impact the existing land through the mitigation of pollutants associated with over 25 years of golf course fertilization." Identify all pollutants, their location, concentrations, and proposed mitigation actions.

W. Page 22 of 34, response to d.

When will the Phase II Environmental Assessment be completed?

X. Page 22 of 34, response to e.

A recreation pod is reference. Such a pod is not reference on any of the maps. Please locate the recreation pod and the size of the pod.

Please describe if and how a connection to the greenway trail proposed by the County along the canal on the Margate/Coral Springs boundary can be accomplished.

Y. Page 22 of 34, F. Traffic Circulation Analysis

Has the MPO be contacted? If so, what information has the MPO provided?

Z. Page 23 of 34, top of the page

The question is what roadways are impacted by the proposed amendment. The response is limited to roadways in the vicinity of the project. Please identify what roadways are impacted by the project.

AA. Page 24 of 34, G. Mass Transit Analysis

Provide a map of all bus routes and bus stops.

How many residential units existing and existing with the project are with ¼ and ½ mile of the bus stops? Measurement shall be as a pedestrian would walk, not as the crow flies.

BB. Page 25 of 34, H. Public Education Analysis

When will the PSIA be submitted. That information is needed for the evaluation of this application.

CC. Page 28 of 34, response to 7. Affordable Housing

While it is agreed that this policy does not apply, will there be any affordable housing provided in this project?

EXHIBIT C: COMMENTS MADE BY ROBERT MASSARELLI, DIRECTOR  
ITEM # 2019-459

DD. Page 30 of 34, 11. Intergovernmental Coordination

Provide a copy of the IUPA application to Coral Springs now. Margate will benefit receiving comments from Coral Spring's perspective.

EE. Page 30 of 34, 12. Describe consistency with highlighted regional issues and policies of the Broward County Land Use Plan.

Provide details how the application will "maximize the efficient use of land and create a place to shop, work, and play."

Provide details how the application "promotes the principles of "Smart Growth".

FF. Page 31 of 34, Policy 2.1.2, first sentence of the response.

The policy addresses compatibility of existing and future land uses. The response addresses consistency. Please provide a detailed response to the compatibility of the land uses.

GG. Page 31 of 34, Policy 2.1.2, last sentence of the response.

On page 21 of 34 the response provides for a dense landscape buffer, not "screening and buffering". Provide a detail description of "dense landscape buffer." This should be in the form of performance standards.

HH. Page 33 of 34, Top of the page, last sentence

The City wants commitments not "endeavors". Provide details regarding the commitments to "the utilization of environmentally friendly and energy efficient principles and methods."

II. Page 33 of 34, 13 Additional Support Documents, B

When will the reference agreement be completed?

JJ. Appendix A

In the northeast corner of the property, near the intersection of Sample Road and Rock Island Road, a portion of the existing parcel is not included. It appears that none of the property covered by the application has frontage along Sample. Why was this property excluded and what is the proposed use of the property?

KK. Appendix D

In the northeast corner of the property, near the intersection of Sample Road and Rock Island Road, a roadway is shown connecting the project to Sample Road, yet this property is not included in the application. Either the roadway needs to be removed of the application revised to include that property.

LL. Appendix E

Portions of the project are located within the floodplain. Provide details as to how water that currently flows into these areas will be managed to mitigate the loss of the floodplains without adversely impact other areas.

EXHIBIT C: COMMENTS MADE BY ROBERT MASSARELLI, DIRECTOR  
ITEM # 2019-459

MM. Appendix Q, page 3 of 11

The population estimate is inconsistent with others in the application. Revise the application for consistency.

NN. Appendix Q, page 4 of 11

Include current revenues in Table A

OO. Appendix Q, page 10 of 11

Are these all the municipally-owned golf courses in Broward County?

What about Palm Beach County?

Are there any that are profitable?

PP. General

The application does not address consistency with the goals, objectives and policies of the City of Margate Comprehensive Plan. Provide a detail analysis of the applications consistency or lack of consistency with the City's plan.

EXHIBIT A: COMMENTS MADE BY SENIOR PLANNER ANDREW PINNEY  
ITEM # 2019-460

Carolina Club Rezoning

9/10/19 DRC

- 1) This application for rezoning is contingent upon approval of a land use plan amendment.
- 2) The third paragraph on the first page of the rezoning request summary prepared by Urban Design Kilday Studios states that 128 detached single family homes are requested. All other documentation indicates 126 SFH.
- 3) The concept of detached single family homes with 5ft side yards on each side described in the rezoning request summary prepared by Urban Design Kilday Studios is inconsistent with the PRC zoning district.
- 4) Page 5 of 10 of the rezoning request summary prepared by Urban Design Kilday Studio, question #3 asks about the suitability of the land for uses permitted by the district. The response makes no mention of the ground contamination or the restrictive covenants.
- 5) Page 5 of 10 of the rezoning request summary prepared by Urban Design Kilday Studio, section d. Parks and Open Space describes the City's adopted park LOS and implies a projected 815 new residents as a result of the development. This conflicts with Exhibit Q submitted with the land use application which projects 1,089 new residents in the development. Further, the City is currently analyzing the Park and Open Space inventory, so the 2011 version submitted as Exhibit I is subject to change.



**From:** [Pedro Stiassni](#)  
**To:** [Melissa Miller](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Carolina Club Rezoning - Traffic Impact Analysis Review  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 10, 2019 9:17:45 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)

---

FYI

**Pedro Stiassni, MS, CLSSGB**

Engineer  
City of Margate  
Dept. of Environmental & Engineering Services



---

**From:** Kenneth Griffin  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 10, 2019 9:15 AM  
**To:** Robert Massarelli <[rmassarelli@margatefl.com](mailto:rmassarelli@margatefl.com)>; Andrew Pinney <[apinney@margatefl.com](mailto:apinney@margatefl.com)>; Alberto Torres-Soto <[atorres-soto@margatefl.com](mailto:atorres-soto@margatefl.com)>; Pedro Stiassni <[pstiassni@margatefl.com](mailto:pstiassni@margatefl.com)>  
**Subject:** Carolina Club Rezoning - Traffic Impact Analysis Review

The Traffic Impact Analysis dated January 31, 2019 for the Carolina Club Rezoning Application does not provide recommended improvements that will result in the intersections in the project vicinity to operate at the City's requirements for Level of Service (LOS), C or D, as applicable. With the proposed project, a number of the intersections would operate at level of service E, although it is not clear in the analyses if even these unacceptable LOSs are achieved with the addition of second left turn lanes as proposed. It does appear that the traffic impact analyses incorporates signal timing optimizations.

The applicant should clearly specify the traffic improvements and modifications that the applicant will include as part of the project and clearly identify by traffic impact analyses with text, that the City's requirements for LOS are met for each of the project and project area intersections and turning movements. From the analysis presented in the Traffic Impact Analysis date January 31, 2019, it appears that the City's standards for LOS are not met for a number of intersections and turning movements and that significant additional improvements need to be proposed by the applicant to ensure that the City's LOS requirements are satisfied.

**Ken Griffin, PhD, PE, F.I.TE**  
Director of Environmental & Engineering Services  
City of Margate  
Department of Environmental & Engineering Services  
901 NW 66th Ave., Suite A  
Margate, FL 33063

[kgriffin@margatefl.com](mailto:kgriffin@margatefl.com)

Main: (954) 972-0828

Fax: (954) 978-7349

*Please Note: The City of Margate is a public entity subject to Chapter 119 of the Florida Statutes concerning public records. Under Florida law, e-mail addresses are public records. If you do not want your e-mail address released in response to a public records request, do not send electronic mail to this entity. All e-mail messages sent and received are captured by our server and retained as public records*

EXHIBIT C: COMMENTS MADE BY ALBERTO TORRES-SOTO, SENIOR ENGINEER, DEES  
ITEM # 2019-460

Comments ID 2019-460:

1. Same comments provided on the LUPA for the Potable Water, Sanitary Sewer and drainage are applicable to the Rezoning application.
2. Impact fees applicable to this project are the following:
  - a. Fire and Police - Sec-9-25 and Sec. 9-26
  - b. Water and Waste Water - Sec. 39-73. - Connection charges
  - c. Drainage - Chapter 34 - Storm water Management Utility

**EXHIBIT D: COMMENTS MADE BY ROBERT MASSARELLI, DIRECTOR  
ITEM # 2019-460**

Development Services Department  
Director's Review Comments on Rezoning Application Carolina Club  
13th Floor

- A. Rezoning narrative prepared by Urban Design Kilday Studios, page 1 of 10, Last paragraph, first sentence

Provide detail documentation of the "future decline".

- B. Rezoning narrative prepared by Urban Design Kilday Studios, page 5 of 10, #2

The question addresses compatibility of existing and future land uses. The response addresses consistency. Please provide a detailed response to the compatibility of the land uses.

- C. Rezoning narrative prepared by Urban Design Kilday Studios, page 5 of 10, #3

There is a current deed restriction for the use of the property to be limited to a golf course and no residential development is allowed due to contamination of the property, a physical limitation. Provide detailed information as to how this contamination will be addressed.

- D. Rezoning narrative prepared by Urban Design Kilday Studios, page 5 of 10, #4

The City's comprehensive plan provides for over 5,000 dwelling units that have not been constructed. A more detailed justification for this application is required.

- E. Rezoning narrative prepared by Urban Design Kilday Studios, page 6 of 10

Is the water distribution system adequate to provide treated water from the water plant to the project? What improvements, if any, will be required?

What impact will the project have on fire flow?

What water conservation measures, above those currently required, are being taken to reduce water demand?

What alternative water supply sources are being used to reduce potable water demand.

- F. Rezoning narrative prepared by Urban Design Kilday Studios, page 7 of 10

Is the wastewater collection system including lift stations, adequate to bring wastewater from the project to the wastewater treatment plant?

- G. Rezoning narrative prepared by Urban Design Kilday Studios, page 8 of 10, d. Parks and Open Space

Parks and open space is not limited to "public" open space and parks. Document all parks and open space that exists within the project and detail the amount of parks and open space.

Using the population figures from the Annual Local Government Revenue analysis of the 13<sup>th</sup> Floor Investment Real Estate Development in Margate, Florida report contained in the Land Use

EXHIBIT D: COMMENTS MADE BY ROBERT MASSARELLI, DIRECTOR  
ITEM # 2019-460

Amendment application, the net impact is 3.267 acres of Community Parks. Explain the discrepancy.

- H. Rezoning narrative prepared by Urban Design Kilday Studios, page 9 of 10, e. Public Schools.

Provide a School Capacity Adequacy Determination from the Broward County School Board.

- I. Rezoning narrative prepared by Urban Design Kilday Studios, page 10 of 10, 8.

The response states that there are no documented aquifer recharge areas. Page 7 of the Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment states that the Biscayne Aquifer extends from the ground surface to a depth of more than 300 feet. Aquifer recharge to the Biscayne Aquifer occurs locally.

Identify all pollutants, their location, concentrations, and proposed mitigation actions.

- J. Appendix A.

In the northeast corner of the property, near the intersection of Sample Road and Rock Island Road, a portion of the existing parcel is not included. It appears that none of the property covered by the application has frontage along Sample. Why was this property excluded and what is the proposed use of the property?

- K. Appendix B.

Portions of the project are located within the floodplain. Provide details as to how water that currently flows into these areas will be managed to mitigate the loss of the floodplains without adversely impact other areas.

- L. Appendix C.

In the northeast corner of the property, near the intersection of Sample Road and Rock Island Road, a portion of the existing parcel is not included. It appears that none of the property covered by the application has frontage along Sample. Why was this property excluded and what is the proposed use of the property?

- M. Appendix D.

In the northeast corner of the property, near the intersection of Sample Road and Rock Island Road, a portion of the existing parcel is not included. It appears that none of the property covered by the application has frontage along Sample. Why was this property excluded and what is the proposed use of the property?

In the northeast corner of the property, near the intersection of Sample Road and Rock Island Road, a roadway is shown connecting the project to Sample Road, yet this property is not included in the application. Either the roadway needs to be removed of the application revised to include that property.

- N. General

Detailed information needs to be provide regarding the use of reclaimed water for irrigation.



EXHIBIT D: COMMENTS MADE BY ROBERT MASSARELLI, DIRECTOR  
ITEM # 2019-460

Rezoning is required to be consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan. Provide a detail analysis of the applications consistency or lack of consistency with the City's plan.