

**Comments On Application**

<u>Agency</u>	<u>Date Entered</u>	Comments and Responses Version 7 as on 8/9/2017 7:50:56 AM	Resolved	<u>Issue</u>
AIRPORTS	03/16/2017	1. The project reviewer is Wil A Hicks from the Airports, who can be contacted at 561-471-7462, Whicks@pbia.org to discuss these comments. <u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
BLDG	03/16/2017	1. The project reviewer is Brett Carlton from the Building Division, who can be contacted at 561-233-5098, BCarlton@pbcgov.org to discuss these comments. <u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	04/11/2017	No Comments	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	06/30/2017	2. In order to determine how many bathroom fixtures will be required, the building official is asking the DOR to submit the method used for calculating the occupant load for the surf lake. Please state the location of the location of the bathroom facilities. 2014 FBC 1004 2014 FBC Plumbing 403	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	07/31/2017	3. Accessible parking required at the training center 2014 FBC accessibility 208	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
ERM	03/16/2017	1. The project reviewer is Robert M Kraus from the Environmental Resources Management, who can be contacted at 561-233-2476, BKraus@pbcgov.org to discuss these comments. <u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	03/22/2017	No Comments	<input type="checkbox"/>	
FIRE	03/16/2017	1. The project reviewer is Pedro A Segovia from the Fire Rescue, who can be contacted at 561-233-0054, PSEGOVIA@pbcgov.org to discuss these comments.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	04/17/2017	2. Fire department access and water supply for fire protection.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
LANDDEV	03/16/2017	1. The project reviewer is Bobby P Jagoo from the Land Development, who can be contacted at 561-684-4079, SJagoo@pbcgov.org to discuss these comments. <u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	05/01/2017	2. The 25ft corner clip interior to the property is not needed since the actual 25ft corner is already dedicated as ROW. <u>Response:</u> Based on direction by land development, the plan has been revised accordingly.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	07/05/2017	3. Please verify that all easements along the north property line are accurately shown and labeled.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
LWDD	03/16/2017	1. The project reviewer is Anne Perry from the Lake Worth Drainage District, who can be contacted at , APERRY@LWDD.NET to discuss these comments. <u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	04/27/2017	2. This application has been reviewed by Anne Perry I can be reached at 561-819-5577 and aperry@lwdd.net. COMMENT <u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	04/27/2017	3. The following Lake Worth Drainage District (LWDD) comments are based on the information scanned April 24, 2017. COMMENT <u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	04/27/2017	4. This petition is located outside of LWDD's boundary and LWDD has no comments regarding the referenced petition. COMMENT <u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
PALMTRAN	03/16/2017	1. The project reviewer is Steve T Anderson from the Palm-Tran, who can be contacted at , SANDERSON@pbcgov.org to discuss these comments. <u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	04/04/2017	No Comments	<input type="checkbox"/>	
PARKS	03/16/2017	1. The project reviewer is Jean W Matthews from the Parks and Recreation, who can be contacted at 561-966-6652, JMatthew@pbcgov.org to discuss these comments. <u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	04/07/2017	2. The Palm Beach County Parks and Recreation Department supports the expansion of recreational opportunities in the count. <u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
PLAN	03/16/2017	1. The project reviewer is Francis Forman from the Planning, who can be contacted at 561-233-5335, fforman@pbcgov.org to discuss these comments. <u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	06/06/2017	2. Per Bryan Davis, Principal Planner, comments (if any) will be based on the finalized ULDC Language. <u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	06/06/2017	3. Awaiting status of NOPC, re: Park of Commerce DRI, from DEO/TCRPC. <u>Response:</u> The applicant has been working with DEO and will provide the correspondence	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue

PREM	03/16/2017	from DEO and TCRPC as part of the DRO follow up submittal. 1. The project reviewer is Peter K Banting from the Property Real Estate Management, who can be contacted at 561-233-0213, PBanting@pbcgov.org to discuss these comments.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	04/13/2017	<u>Response:</u> Acknowledged. No Comments	<input type="checkbox"/>	
SCHOOL	03/28/2017	No Comments	<input type="checkbox"/>	
SURVEY	03/16/2017	1. The project reviewer is Gary S Wheeler from the Survey, who can be contacted at 561-684-4056, GWheeler@pbcgov.org to discuss these comments.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	04/10/2017	2. The following Division/Department comments and/or certification issues are based on the documents dated 03/15/2017. It's the responsibility of your office to maintain either, a Title policy, Title Commitment, Title Report, Abstract or opinion of Title referenced on the Survey that is current to within one year during the application process.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	04/10/2017	3. No comments or certification issues.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	05/02/2017	4. The following Division/Department comments and/or certification issues are based on the documents dated 04/24/2017.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	05/02/2017	5. Provide the a Boundary Survey or create a Legal description and sketch to support the 1322.17 acre PIPD Master Site Plan for this Application.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	05/02/2017	6. Revise the Master Site Plan boundary to be in accordance with overall boundary survey or Legal and Sketch requested above.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	05/02/2017	7. Provide a Digital File of the Legal Description that supports the PIPD Survey for this Application in a 'Word' or 'Text' format.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	06/05/2017	8. The above un-resolved and following Division/Department comments and/or certification issues are based on the documents dated 05/26/2017.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	06/05/2017	9. Provide a Boundary Survey of the subdivided site in accordance with current Florida Standards of Practice that supports the PIA amendment request. Survey must support the final sub-division plan for this application and must reference the Title Policy/Abstract, Easement and Right-of-way status current to within one year. The boundary survey will require a vesting legal description for the overall site with an "Also Know as" Legal Description for the proposed east and west subdivision parcels that shows all information referenced in the new individual parcel Legal descriptions submitted, Label the new parcel Boundary's and provide a separate area for each on the map sheet of survey. Update the Site and Subdivision plan boundaries as necessary.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	06/30/2017	10. The above un-resolved and following Division/Department comments and/or certification issues are based on the documents dated 06/26/2017.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	06/30/2017	11. The Legal and Sketch does not appear to close based on the information referenced on the map sheet. Ran the closure twice and unable to determine area of misclosure. Please provide evidence of closure with the resubmittal.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	06/30/2017	12. The Master Site Plan Boundary Dimensions are inconsistent with the PIPD legal description and sketch. Revise the Dimension Along the North Line on the Master Plan.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	07/31/2017	13. The above un-resolved and following Division/Department comments and/or certification issues are based on the documents dated 07/24/2017.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	07/31/2017	14. The Boundary course Information listed in the Survey Inverse Closure Report provided as evidence of closure with this resubmittal is inconsistent with the 1322.17 acre PIPD Boundary information as shown on the Legal description and Sketch submitted on 06/26/2017. Provide a revised 1322.17 acre PIPD Legal and Sketch with boundary course information that closes. Update the Legal Descriptions and Revise the Master Site Boundary and acreage totals as required to completely address this issue.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	07/31/2017	15. The Revised Boundary survey requested above must show a dimensioned sub division line and identify leader and label with hatching the Conditional use area.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
TRAFFIC	03/16/2017	1. The project reviewer is Dominique Simeus from the Traffic Engineering, who can be contacted at , DSimeus@pbcgov.org to discuss these comments.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	04/28/2017	<u>Response:</u> Acknowledged. 2. Comments below are based on re-submittal dated April 24, 2017	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	04/28/2017	<u>Response:</u> Acknowledged. 3. Condition of approval will be added to construct the following turn lanes: a) A south approach right turn lane on Seminole Pratt at the project driveway. b) A westbound left turn lane for the outbound movement at the project's driveway.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	04/28/2017	<u>Response:</u> Acknowledged. 4. Condition of approval will be added to extend the north approach left turn lane at the intersection of Beeline Highway and Pratt Whitney to a minimum of 570 feet.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment

ZONING

	<u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.		
04/28/2017	5. Condition of approval will be imposed for the applicant to use deputies for traffic/crowd control during special events which shall be limited to three times per year in accordance to Article 4 Chapter B Section 1.124 of the Unified Land Development Code with a maximum of 5,000 attendees.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	<u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.		
07/03/2017	6. Comment below is based on re-submittal dated 6/26/2017	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
04/14/2017	1. The Project Manager for this application is Lorraine Fuster. Please contact her at 233-5240 or lfuster@pbcgov.org if you have any questions on the comments/certification issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	<u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.		
04/14/2017	2. RESPONSE: All responses to the DRO comment/certification issues must be provided by the applicant in a written form, electronically. The applicant must provide a copy of the Plans with the revisions or any additional changes made from the previous submittal. All these revisions must be clearly delineated or highlighted on the Plans.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	<u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.		
04/14/2017	3. CERTIFICATION/APPROVAL: All certification issues must be resolved prior to placement of application on the DRO Agenda for Final Approval or Certification for Public Hearing.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	<u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.		
04/14/2017	4. The Zoning Division recommends that Applicant(s)/Agent(s) contact neighborhood organizations at least sixty (60) days prior to ZC/BCC Hearings.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	<u>Response:</u> The applicant has already met with the Jupiter Farms Residents and will meet again to provide additional detail on the project.		
04/14/2017	5. ULDC AMENDMENT: The Agent is submitting for a PIA that will contain language for the specifics as related to the proposed project. Until Staff evaluates this request for consistency with the approved and final ULDC language, this application cannot be final approved, and/or at a minimum, certified for public hearing.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
04/14/2017	6. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW: Be advised that Arch Review Condition of Approval 1 requires the submittal of the elevations for all buildings at the time of final DRO approval.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comment
04/17/2017	7. PSP: The use requires access from a Collector or Arterial road. Demonstrate compliance with this requirement. (staff acknowledges that this is included in the proposed PIA).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comment
04/17/2017	8. PSP: Clarify the tier the property is located in.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comment
04/17/2017	9. PREVIOUS CERTIFICATION ISSUE: JUSTIFICATION STATEMENT: The Justification Statement indicates there will be solar energy provided for the facility which will be designed at the time of DRO. How and where will this equipment be and how does it affect the site design and layout? NOTE: If there is any changes the request will have to be process via full DRO.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comment
04/17/2017	10. WETLANDS: Has it been evaluated if the proposed stormwater detention area will affect the adjacent conservation area to the north? Will it cause a drawdown of groundwater into this area?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comment
04/17/2017	11. JUSTIFICATION STATEMENT: The Applicant is requesting to have the elevations reviewed at the time of Final DRO. Please be advised that this requirement is also an Architectural Condition of Approval that the elevations for the buildings be submitted at time of final DRO approval. The Justification Statement also indicates that the project is phased, however; the elevations of these buildings may have to be submitted at the same time.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comment
04/17/2017	12. PSP: The site data table indicates two parcels. When will a Subdivision Plan be submitted to divide the lots? Are you processing a revision to the Master Site Plan as well?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
04/17/2017	13. PSP: Re-label the CG and OG "Pods" to be CG and IG "Use Zones".	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comment
04/17/2017	14. PSP: There is a label that indicates mechanical equipment for the waves. How tall is this equipment and will there be a requirement to screen it?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
04/17/2017	15. ONGOING DISCUSSION: There is a tandem PIA submitted which is under review. Be advised that additional comments will be forthcoming based on any conflicting language as the review process of the Zoning Application moves forward.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comment
04/17/2017	16. ONGOING DISCUSSION-USE APPROVAL: There is a conflict on the use approval of a pool vs. lake vs. pond, etc. The reviewing Agencies are still reviewing the issue on the correct procedure for permitting of the use.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comment
06/07/2017	17. PREVIOUS CERTIFICATION ISSUE:PRP: Will you be providing a Preliminary Regulating Plan with the typical details for staff review during the public hearing review process? If you do, please include the buffer details, specifically, but not	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue

		limited to the Type III Incompatibility buffer as required per Code. Response: A PRP has been provide but the buffer detail has not been added awaiting the determination that has been made for a zoning interpretation in regard to the wall requirement as the 2006 approval which added this land area to the DRI did not require the wall.		
06/07/2017	18.	PREVIOUS CERTIFICATION ISSUE: ONSITE VEGETATION: All trees that are to be preserved in place must be shown on the PSP. Please revise accordingly. The tree disposition chart must be in the format approved by Staff. Please let me know if you need the template for the tree disposition chart. Response: EPT - Existing Tree Plan has been submitted which depicts the site plan overlaid on the tree survey. Further coordination will take place with ERM and Landscape prior to the next resubmittal.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
06/07/2017	19.	PREVIOUS CERTIFICATION ISSUE: ONSITE VEGETATION: There are a significant amount of native vegetation on site. Have you coordinated a meeting with ERM/Landscaping/Zoning for further evaluation of the site for vegetation preservation? All vegetative preserved will be subject to the Vegetative Protection Barricade conditions of approval. Response: ERM, Landscape and Zoning were all in attendance at the May 24, 2017 meeting. It is anticipated another meeting will take place after staff has had a chance to review the plans and engineering becomes further refined.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
06/07/2017	20.	PREVIOUS CERTIFICATION ISSUE: : PSP: Re-label the "Perimeter Buffer" to be a Type 3 Incompatibility Buffer". Response: At this time the applicant has elected to request an interpretation in this regard and will address with the next resubmittal. NOTE: The Type 3 Incompatibility Buffer is a ULDC requirement.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
06/07/2017	21.	PREVIOUS CERTIFICATION ISSUE: PSP and ULDC AMENDMENT: This application has a tandem ULDC Amendment that is under review by the Code Revision Section. Be advised that because the Zoning Application is being reviewed at the same time, that additional comments will be forthcoming as the project is reviewed alongside the ULDC Amendment. The Zoning Application cannot be certified for public hearing until it is compliance with the current ULDC and the proposed ULDC Amendment. Response: As discussed at the larger May 24, 2017 meeting with staff, it was confirmed this project will be processed concurrently with the Privately Initiated ULDC text amendment. The applicant understand additional comments may be forthcoming as the text amendment is further refined.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
06/07/2017	22.	PREVIOUS CERTIFICATION ISSUE: JUSTIFICATION STATEMENT: The Justification Statement indicates there will be solar energy provided for the facility which will be designed at the time of DRO. How and where will this equipment be and how does it affect the site design and layout? Response: The use of solar is a DRO approval and not part of this request as the final design has not yet been determined. This will be addressed in final DRO and the applicant understand this, along with the requirement to submit architectural elevations, will result in the Off the Board approval process not being available to the applicant. NOTE: Be advise that the use of solar panels may trigger the application to Public Hearing. Staff understands the final design is not completed, but applicant must include on propose site plan the solar equipment with screening details for proper review. If applicant can't address this issue at this moment, then all references to the solar energy equipment must be remove from the Justification Statement and all documents.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
06/07/2017	23.	PREVIOUS CERTIFICATION ISSUE: PSP: The site data table indicates two parcels. When will a Subdivision Plan be submitted to divide the lots? Are you processing a revision to the Master Site Plan as well? Response: A subdivision plan will be processed in the future to amend the current approved subdivision plan. A revised master plan accompanies this request.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comment
06/07/2017	24.	PREVIOUS CERTIFICATION ISSUE: PSP: There is a label that indicates mechanical equipment for the waves. How tall is this equipment and will there be a requirement to screen it? Response: The wave tract will be approximately 10 feet in height. However, the applicant is of the opinion that it does not qualify as mechanical equipment under the ULDC definition as it does not relate to water supply, drainage, heating, ventilating, electrical, air conditioning, etc. Additionally, it is anticipated with the setback of approximately 60 feet from the north property line and the required buffer planting material, as well as the amount of mitigation that is anticipated for the site, the tract will not be visible to the users of the natural area. All actual mechanical equipment to create the wave will be located within the mechanical buildings themselves. NOTE: May be require foundation planting around building.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
06/07/2017	25.	PREVIOUS CERTIFICATION ISSUE: JUSTIFICATION STATEMENT: The Justification Statement indicates that the Application will be seeking DRO Approval of a Type II Excavation based on the determination that this is a POOL. This must be re-evaluated depending on the findings and conclusion of the use. Because this "POOL" is still under review, the Type II Excavation may be considered a Type III Excavation which is a Class A Conditional Use approval process. Response: This	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comment

	was discussed with ERM at the May 24, 2017 meeting and they indicated they have reviewed the justification statement and had no comment on our request to remove more than 10% of the excavation of the storm water management lake from the site. Past discussions with ERM was that the 'digging' of the lake was not considered 'excavation'. Applicant acknowledges the building permitting and health dept. nomenclature in regard to the facility needs to be addressed and is working with a consultant to schedule a meeting.		
07/05/2017	26. PREVIOUS CERTIFICATION ISSUE: PRP: Please provide a Preliminary Regulating Plan for review. It should include the Tree Disposition Chart for the native vegetation on site. Response: A regulation plan has been submitted inclusive of the regulating plan. This also contains a typical sign detail and the proposed Alternative Roadway Section as discussed in the May 24, 2017 meeting with Land Development Staff. NOTE: The Tree Disposition Chart submitted is missing information. -Please note that it is a chart and it should not be called or added as a Tree Disposition Plan. -Please add a column to the chart for the common name of the tree and one for the scientific name. -Trees and Pines shall be measured using Diameter at Breast Height (DBH) in inches (DBH is measured at 4.5 feet above grade); - Palms shall be measured by height of trunk in feet, either Clear Trunk or Grey wood depends on the species of the palm. SEE Technical Manual Title 4.C.1, Tree Disposition Chart (Page 8)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
07/05/2017	27. PREVIOUS CERTIFICATION ISSUE: LETTER: Please provide written confirmation from TCRPC that the proposed changes are not a substantial deviation to the DRI. Response: Additional confirmation is being requested and will be provided in the follow up submittal.  <u>Response:</u> The applicant has been working with DEO and will provide the correspondence from DEO and TCRPC as part of the DRO follow up submittal.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
07/06/2017	28. PSP-1: Please label all 8 ft in front setback and in all documents.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
07/06/2017	29. PRP: Please indicate with an X in the Tree Disposition Chart the type of tree. ERM Tree: are under the jurisdiction of ERM pursuant to Art. 14; Zoning Tree: Trees that are under the jurisdiction of Zoning pursuant to Art.7;ERM or Zoning Tree. See Technical Manual, 4.C.1 Tree Disposition Chart (Page 8)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
07/06/2017	30. PRP: Verify the Tree Disposition Chart, Trees and Pines shall be measured using Diameter at Breast Height (DBH) in inches (DBH is measured at 4.5 feet above grade); and Palms shall be measured by height of trunk in feet, either Clear Trunk or Grey wood depends on the species of the palm. See Technical Manual, 4.C.1 Tree Disposition Chart (Page 8)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
07/06/2017	31. PRP: All preserve trees must be shown on the Site Plan.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
07/06/2017	32. PRP: All preserve trees must be shown on the Site Plan.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
07/06/2017	33. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW: Applicant must demonstrate compliance with the Code requirement of minimum lot Frontage.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
07/06/2017	34. ARCHITECTURAL: Please be advise of Barbed Wire, Exceptions and Regulations: The use of barbed wire is prohibited except in some particular instances. The County recognizes that barbed wire may be necessary to secure certain non-residential uses or structures. Please verify the use on the ULDC Article 5.B.1.A.2 Fences and Walls for compliance. SEE ULDC Article 5.B.1.A.2 (Page 15)  <u>Response:</u> No barbed wire is proposed.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
07/06/2017	35. TREE DISPOSITION PLAN: The Tree Disposition plan is not a requirement, all preserved trees on site must be shown on the Site Plan.  <u>Response:</u> The trees to be preserved are depicted on the plan.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
07/06/2017	36. PSP-3: Please provide in all documents, typical parking dimension an typical interior dimensions. Label all parking spaces.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
08/02/2017	37. SUBDIVISION PLAN: In previous meetings and emails with staff the Agent has acknowledge that a Subdivision Plan will be required as part of the full DRO review. A survey and legal descriptions supporting the subdivision plan will be required with the application as well.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
08/02/2017	38. PRP: All preserve trees must be shown on the Site Plan. Please revise the recreational pod side. Trees on the canal (south side of the property) must remain on site.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
08/02/2017	39. PSP: There is a label that indicates mechanical equipment for the waves. How tall is this equipment and will there be a requirement to screen it? Please provide a cross section.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
08/02/2017	40. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW: Applicant must demonstrate compliance with the Code requirement of minimum lot Frontage. (Frontage Reduction-On curving streets, such as cul-de-sacs, the required frontage for lots between the points of curvature may be reduced by 40 percent, provided the centerline radius of the contiguous street is 125 feet or less.) See ULDC Art. 3.D.1.C (page 120)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
08/02/2017	41. ONSITE VEGETATION: All trees that are to be preserved in place must be shown	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue

on the PSP. Please revise accordingly. The submitted document doesn't read properly, the labeling is too small. Revise the submitted site plan. Note: Staff has concerns with the vegetation on the south side of the property. What measures will be taken during construction of the project to protect the vegetation on the canal to the south of property.

08/02/2017	42. PSP: Pedestrian and vehicular cross-access points are required to balance the PIPD. Provide chronological history of previous approvals for the 80 acre parcel to clarify the cross access issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
08/02/2017	43. JUSTIFICATION STATEMENT: Please provide more information about special events and hours/ days of operations on site. Staff is seeking for more specific details. Please submit a schematic sketch on the Regulating Plan that shows the layout and functioning of the Special Events. Clarify the logistic and how the events will occur and operate on the site. Please note that staff would recommend Conditions of Approval under "Use" for the Special Events.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
08/02/2017	44. JUSTIFICATION STATEMENT: Staff has concerns about lighting in the area and noise. Please provide more information in the Justification Statement about the noise study and Lighting/Photometric study that the applicant has conduct on site. Be advise that this will be a condition of approval at time of final DRO.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
08/02/2017	45. JUSTIFICATION STATEMENT: Indicate in the Justification Statement, what level the water control elevation would be? Staff has request this information in previous meetings.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue