

[BOND]Control No: 1984-00152

Project Manager: WNHERNAN

Application No: DOA-2011-01165

Comments On Application

Agency	Date Entered	Comments and Responses Version 2 as on 7/11/2011 10:38:53 AM	Resolved	Issue
ARCHREV	06/08/2011	No Comments	<input type="checkbox"/>	
ATTY	05/27/2011	The project reviewer is Susan Taylor-Arens, Paralegal, who can be contacted at 561/355-3388 or staylor@pbcgov.org to discuss the following comments.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	05/27/2011	Need consent from Mizner Trail Golf Club, Ltd. Does operating agreement state which General Partner can bind LP? If not, have each GP sign a consent form as follows: Mizner Trail Golf Club, Ltd. by: Compson Mizner Trail, Inc., its General Partner by: (President, VP, or CEO); and Mizner Trail Golf Club, Ltd. by: Mizner Trail Golf Club, Inc., its General Partner by: (President, VP, or CEO) Need back up showing that Robert Comparato and Philip Bliss are either President, Vice-President, (or CEO) of corporation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	05/27/2011	Need Mizner Trail Golf Club, Ltd. to sign disclosure form for "Owner."	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
BLDG	06/06/2011	No Comments	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	07/06/2011	No comments	<input type="checkbox"/>	
ERM	05/24/2011	No Comments	<input type="checkbox"/>	
FIRE	06/15/2011	Needs to show dimension on the plans for entry ways and culdesac	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
		<u>Response:</u> See revised Regulating Plan and Site Plans for dimensions for Entry Ways and cul-de-sacs		
LANDDEV	05/31/2011	This application has been reviewed by Bobby Jagoo. He can be reached at (561)684-4079 and Sjagoo@pbcgov.org.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	06/07/2011	Show connection between Rec site and Pod 64B.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	06/07/2011	90 degree turns or road bends within Pods 64B and 64C are not acceptable.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	06/07/2011	Remove "Landscape Screen" symbol from site plan.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	06/07/2011	Show all gate locations.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	06/07/2011	Pod 64A needs ROW dimensions.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	06/07/2011	One lot in Pod 64A does not have frontage.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	06/07/2011	Number all lots.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	06/07/2011	Intersection with Canary Palm Drive should be at 90 degrees.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	06/07/2011	Identify unlabeled space on east side of Pod 64A.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	06/07/2011	Label adjacent Pods.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	06/07/2011	Identify all unlabeled areas in all Pods.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	06/07/2011	Show 10' UE and 5' LAE along all ROWs.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	06/07/2011	Dimension all ROWs.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	06/07/2011	Show that minimum throat distances have been met.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	06/07/2011	Provide 25' corner clips for both external intersections in Pod 64C.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	06/07/2011	Modify Pod 64E median to be useable and include drive lane widths.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	06/07/2011	Align entrance for Pod 64F with entrance across the street.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	06/07/2011	Show Military Trail dimensions for pavement for Pod 64F.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	06/07/2011	Dimension Pod 64F entrance at canal.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	06/07/2011	Add ROW at 18th Street and Camino Del Mar for right turn lane.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	06/07/2011	Corner clips required at Military and 18th and Camino Del Mar and 18th.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	06/07/2011	Corner clip required at Palm d'Oro and Camino Del Mar.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	06/07/2011	Provide access for dry retention area in Pod 64G.		Issue

			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	06/07/2011	Further comments may be forthcoming pending the review of the revised site plan.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	06/07/2011	Please provide the necessary rights-of way and corner clips for an expanded intersection of two thoroughfare roads per Palm Beach County typicals for pavement markings, signing and geometrics, No. T-P-10-001 (corner of 18th St. and Military Trail.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
LWDD	06/01/2011	This application has been reviewed by Anne H. Perry; I can be reached at 561-819-5577 and annehperry@lwdd.net. COMMENT <u>Response:</u> Noted.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	06/01/2011	The following Lake Worth Drainage District (LWDD) comments are based on the site plan and other documents scanned May 18, 2011. COMMENT <u>Response:</u> Noted.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	06/01/2011	This petition is located on the south side of LWDD's L-49 Canal, the west side of the E-3 Canal, and the north side of the L-50 Canal and is adjacent to all three canals. COMMENT <u>Response:</u> Noted.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	06/01/2011	Prior to site plan approval LWDD will require the three (3) LWDD Canals be shown on the Site Plan and Survey and all three canals must be labeled, tied to a horizontal control, either sectional or plat, and dimensioned as well as all recording information referenced above be shown on the Site Plan. DRO: LWDD-ENG (still pending) <u>Response:</u> Noted.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	06/01/2011	Prior to site plan approval LWDD will require all recording information per ORB 2217 PG 311, ORB 2217 PG 314, and ORB 2336 PG 998 to be shown on the Survey and Site Plan. DRO: LWDD-ENG (still pending) <u>Response:</u> Noted.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	06/01/2011	Prior to site plan approval LWDD will require signed and sealed canal cross-sections for E-3, L-49 and L-50 Canals. The cross-sections must extend 50 feet beyond both sides of top of bank, and they are to be tied to an accepted horizontal control, either sectional or plat. The cross-sections shall delineate all features that may be relevant, (i.e. buildings, edge of pavement, curbs, sidewalks, guardrails, grade breaks etc.). The cross-sections shall be a maximum of three hundred feet apart, and a minimum of three cross sections is required. The cross-sections are to be plotted at 1"=10', both horizontal and vertical for small canals, and 1"=20' for large canals. All tract and/or lot lines, block lines, sections lines and easements shall be clearly depicted showing existing LWDD right of way. Elevations shall be based on the NGVD (29) datum, with a conversion factor to NAVD (88) must be shown. The cross-sections will be used to determine if LWDD will need to have the applicant convey an easement back to LWDD. DRO: LWDD-ENG (still pending) <u>Response:</u> Noted.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	06/01/2011	The three Conditions listed by LWDD on November 1, 2010 are still pending. They need to be addressed prior to Site Plan approval, Master Plan approval and Subdivision Plan approval. COMMENT <u>Response:</u> Noted.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	06/01/2011	LWDD has no objection to the certification of this petition. COMMENT <u>Response:</u> Noted.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
PALMTRAN	06/03/2011	No Comments	<input type="checkbox"/>	
PARKS	06/15/2011	Based on the proposed 291 dwelling units 1.74 acres of onsite recreation is required. The plan submitted indicates there will be 2.88 acres of recreation provided, therefore, the Parks and Recreation Department standards have been addressed. <u>Response:</u> Noted.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	06/15/2011	Correct tabular data for required and provided recreation.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	06/15/2011	Add a note to the plans the recreation area is private and for the exclusive use of Boca Del Mar residents.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
PLAN	06/07/2011	The site is located within the Urban/Suburban Tier and has a future land use (FLU) designation of High Residential 8 units per acre (HR-8).	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment

	<u>Response:</u> Noted.		
	06/07/2011 The Planning Division has reviewed the request to modify the master plan, add 291 units, modify the Recreation Parcel, add access points and has found it to be consistent with the Land Use designation of the comprehensive Plan.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	<u>Response:</u> Noted.		
	06/07/2011 Revise the Master Plan and Justification Statement to discuss the Workforce Housing requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	<u>Response:</u> The WFH units are discussed in the Justification Statement. Additional, they are noted on the site plan.		
	06/07/2011 Provide a letter from Michael Howe regarding the Workforce Housing Requirement for the subject request.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	<u>Response:</u> A letter has been requested from Michael Howe.		
	06/07/2011 Within one mile of and the future annexation area of: City of Boca Raton.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	<u>Response:</u> Noted.		
PREM	06/03/2011 No Comments	<input type="checkbox"/>	
SCHOOL	05/24/2011 The project reviewer is Michael C. Owens from The School District of Palm Beach County and he can be contacted at 561.434.8962 to discuss the following comments/certification issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	<u>Response:</u> Noted.		
	05/24/2011 The following School District comments/certification issues are based on the documents dated 5/18/11.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	<u>Response:</u> Noted.		
	05/24/2011 The Preliminary Site Plan, dated 5/18/11, shows two (2) 10' X 15' school bus shelters.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	<u>Response:</u> Noted.		
	05/24/2011 In accordance with adopted school concurrency, a Concurrency Determination for 291 residential units (49 single-family, 242 multi-family) had been approved on May 24, 2011 (Concurrency Case #11052401C). The subject property is located within Concurrency Service Area 21 (SAC 341B).	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	<u>Response:</u> Noted.		
	05/24/2011 Please be advised that school age children may not be assigned to the public school closest to their residences. School Board policies regarding levels of service or other boundary policy decisions affect school boundaries.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	<u>Response:</u> Noted.		
SURVEY	05/24/2011 No Comments	<input type="checkbox"/>	
TRAFFIC	05/25/2011 The project reviewer is Allan Ennis who can be contacted at 561-684-4101. The following comments and/or certification issues are based on the documents dated May 2011.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	<u>Response:</u> Noted.		
	05/31/2011 Table 4 in the Traffic Study appears to have some errors regarding the number of signalized intersections per mile: Palmetto Park from Boca Rio to Powerline has 1.5 instead of 1 Palmetto Park from Military to I-95 has 1 instead of 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	05/31/2011 The class of roadway for purposes of entering the FDOT Generalized Tables should be based upon a calculation of signalized intersections per mile from one major intersection to another (as defined by TPS).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	05/31/2011 Note that proposed layouts of individual pods have not been reviewed as part of this application. Changes to the entrance layouts and street dimensions (and other issues) may be required at final DRO to meet minimum design standards for local residential streets. These changes may dramatically affect the layout of the pods, including the number of lots that can be accommodated within each pod.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	<u>Response:</u> Refer to revised site plan for the requested information. It will be submitted at a later date.		
	05/31/2011 The proposed driveways for each pod must comply with minimum design standards: they must meet minimum throat distances, must intersect the main road within 10 degrees of perpendicular, and must align with existing roadways or meet PBC access management standards for driveway separation.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	05/31/2011 Pod 64A entrance may not be within 10 degrees of perpendicular to Canary Palm Drive. Please dimension this line.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue

	05/31/2011	Pod 64C entrance does not meet minimum throat distance.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	05/31/2011	Pod 64E entrance may not be within 10 degrees of perpendicular to Camino del Mar. Please dimension this line.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	05/31/2011	Pod 64F entrance to Camino Del Mar must align with Palm D'Ora Road.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	05/31/2011	Show the Parkside Drive entrance on Military Trail on the conceptual master plan and proposed site plan for Pod 64F-North and dimension the separation to the Pod 64F entrance to demonstrate that the proposed full median opening for Pod 64F complies with PBC access management standards.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	05/31/2011	The property owner will be conditioned to convey expanded intersection ROW from Pod 64F-South for the intersection of SW 18th Street at Military Trail.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
		<u>Response:</u> Noted.		
	05/31/2011	The property owner will be conditioned to construct the site related turn lanes identified as necessary in the traffic study and convey additional ROW as necessary for their construction.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
		<u>Response:</u> Noted.		
	05/31/2011	Show 25-ft corner clips at the intersections of all rights of way.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	05/31/2011	The site plan for POD 64B should show a pedestrian connection to the adjacent Recreation Area (Pod 69). Otherwise, a resident of Pod 64B would have to drive as much as 1.25 miles along Canary Palm Drive, Palm D'Oro Road, and Camino Del Mar in order to go to the Recreation Area.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	05/31/2011	What year count was used for Powerline Road from Camino Real to Palmetto Park Road? The Traffic Division website does not show any 2010 year count for this segment because it was under construction just as the Broward County Line to SW 18th St and Canary Palm Dr to Camino Real segments were. However, historically the daily volumes on the Camino Real to Palmetto Park Rd segment has been about 25% higher than the Canary Palm Dr to Camino Real segment, yet Tables 6 and 7 show existing peak hour volumes on the Camino Real to Palmetto Park segment that are 10-20% lower than the Canary Palm Dr to Camino Real segment.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	07/08/2011	For the HCS intersection analysis at Palmetto Park Road/Powerline Road [PP/P], the third thru lane southbound will not be fully utilized as a thru lane since it terminates into a right turn lane into the shopping center about 700 feet south of the intersection. In a certification issue for the previous traffic study, it was recommended that only 1/6 of the total through traffic (instead of the 1/3 that normally would be assigned to each of the 3 through lanes) should be allocated to this lane based upon our guidelines". Instead of showing the laneage as 3 thru/right lanes, the right turn lane could be treated as an exclusive right (per the CMA analysis) or the lane utilization factor could be tweaked to produce the same result. The arterial analysis should then be rerun using the resultant delay associated with the PP/P intersection.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
WUD	06/07/2011	No Comments	<input type="checkbox"/>	
ZONING	06/08/2011	General: The project reviewer is Wendy Hernandez, who can be contacted at 561-233-5218 to discuss the following comments.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
		<u>Response:</u> Noted.		
	06/10/2011	General: The Zoning Division recommends that the agent or applicant contact the adjacent property owners and neighborhood organizations a minimum 60 days prior to the first public hearing.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
		<u>Response:</u> Noted.		
	06/10/2011	General: The following Zoning comments are based on the site plan (s) and supporting documents dated May 18, 2011. This application is being reviewed for compliance with ULDC Ordinance 2003-067, as amended. If not certified at the July13, 2011 DRO meeting, then substantial site plan and document changes are due by NOON on July 25, 2011 for the August 10, 2011 DRO meeting. Additional staff comments may result from the revised documents and/or site plans.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	06/10/2011	General: For this application to be placed on the July 13, 2011 DRO Agenda, staff must be notified by NOON on July 8, 2011 at DROAGEND@PBCGOV.COM requesting to be placed on the DRO agenda.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	06/10/2011	General: Per ULDC Article 2.A.1.I.3.a, all responses to the DRO	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment

comment/certification letter shall be in written form, and highlight all changes on the relevant Master, Site and Regulating Plan(s).

Response: Noted.

06/10/2011 Application: The Concurrency request is for 291 units. Outstanding for: Land Development (Legal Positive Outfall), Traffic, Utilities (Water/Sewer) or Health Department, and Mass Transit. Issue

Response: Ongoing.

06/10/2011 Application: In accordance with Article 3.E.1.E.3, The applicant shall provide documentation of all efforts to inform association membership of the proposed golf course reconfiguration. Minutes of any association membership meeting, including the results of any vote concerning the applications request, as may be required by the Association, shall also be provided to the Zoning Division for inclusion in ZC and BCC staff reports. Issue

Response: Please refer to Justification Statement for updated documentation.

06/10/2011 Application: Update your Project History document to include Application 2010-1728. Issue

06/10/2011 Application: Site Master/Site Plan comment. Form 13a- may need to be updated based on this comment. Issue

Response: Please refer to updated application.

06/10/2011 Application: Form 4 appears to include a mix of numbers for the overall development and for the affected area. Please clarify the numbers for Open Space to include overall development. Issue

Response: The tabular data sheet notes which items refer to the affected area.

06/10/2011 Application: Form 4 indicates 1 new access point, where the justification and Plans indicate 7 new access points. Issue

Response: The one access point is external to the PUD. The 7 additional are interior to the PUD. The request is for one additional external entrance from Military Trail. If staff feels it should be a request for 8 access points, we will update the request.

06/10/2011 Application: At time of platting Unity of Control will be required to tie these Pod's together for the purposes of recreation calculation if shared. Comment

Response: Noted.

06/10/2011 Preliminary Master Plan and Site Plan: Please describe how you determined the creation of the POD's. Example Pod D has been revised since Application 2010-1728 and now includes no units. What is the use of this Pod and could it be combined with another? This same question for Pod's A and B. This comment may also effect Application forms and Site Tabular Data. Issue

Response: The pod layouts have remained the same as the previous, withdrawn application. The applicant felt this made it easy to compare the applications. Applicant is willing to combine pods but wishes to discuss further with staff and receive their direction.

06/10/2011 Preliminary Master Plan and Site Plan: Revise the Site Data to include the application number 2011-1165. Issue

06/10/2011 Preliminary Site Plans: As commented on prior application 2010-1728-Provide an analysis of the proposed subdivision plans. Though they are only required for informational purposes, this development has had a lot of history and it is imperative that the Subdivision and Site plan extend beyond the 100 feet to truly indicate how compatibility issues are being addressed. Issue

Response: Applicant has prepared an exhibit to all staff to view proposed site plan on a high resolution aerial. The existing surrounding conditions are shown. Applicant would like to discuss with staff additional information that may help staff with their analysis.

06/10/2011 Preliminary Master Plan: Revise to include the Use and Type for Pod D. Issue

Response: Refer to revised plans.

06/10/2011 Preliminary Master and Site Plans: Clarification- Pod 69A is the Recreation Pod for Pods A-G? Need clarification if the recreation areas contained within the individual Pods are counted for Recreation Pod or for Neighborhood Park requirements. They may not overlap. Issue

06/10/2011 Preliminary Site Plans: Staff is concerned about the number of cul-de-sacs and the plans ability to meet the requirements of exemplary standards for minimizing trips, cross connectivity, Issue

	logical street placement, the enhancement of the built environment, and its minimization of the impacts on the surrounding area.		
06/10/2011	Preliminary Master/Site Plans: Staff has concerns that the proposed design does not meet the design objectives to locate and design buildings, structures, uses, pathways, access, landscaping, etc that minimize the potential for any adverse impacts on adjacent properties.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
06/10/2011	Preliminary Site and Regulation Plan: Focal Points should be dispersed and not limited to cul-de-sacs. The applicant is proposing infill and should have an impact not only for the proposed, but for the existing development in their locations.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
07/11/2011	The following comments are based on Plans dated June 27, 2011. The application is being reviewed for compliance with ULDC, Ordinance 2003-067, as amended (Supplement 10). If not certified at the July 13, 2011 DRO Meeting, then substantial plan and document changes are due by noon on July 25, 2011 for the August 10, 2011 DRO Meeting.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
07/11/2011	Application: Land Use and Zoning - Current Zoning and Proposed Zoning should be revised to indicate AR with a Conditional Use for a PUD.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
07/11/2011	Preliminary Master/Site Plans: Staff has concerns that the proposed design does not meet the design objectives to locate and design buildings, structures, uses, pathways, access, landscaping, etc that minimize the potential for any adverse impacts on adjacent properties.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
07/11/2011	Preliminary Site/Subdivision and Regulating Plans: Applicant's justification statement indicated 15% of teh cul-de-sacs are provided with focal points; however, additional focal points or layout of these focal points could be more evenly distributed throughout the proposed pods, and not just limited to cul-de-sacs/"islands/eyebrows". Demonstrate how these proposed amenities/focal points satisfied Art.3.E.C.2.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
07/11/2011	All plans submitted on June 27, 2011 must comply with the Technical Manual requirements. Show graphically the first 100 feet of the adjacent properties. The Preliminary Master Plan must be revised to either 1) show first 100 feet of adjacent existing residential unit layouts and the proposed residential units in full layout or 2) show only pods with no residential layout. All Preliminary Site/Subdivision plans must show first 100 feet of adjacent residential properties and the full layout of proposed residential units from Pods 64B through G.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue