



# CITY OF COCONUT CREEK

## DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE (DRC) REVIEW #1

07/30/19

<b>PROJECT NAME:</b>	Leder Office Space		
<b>PROJECT NUMBER:</b>	19070005		
<b>LOCATION:</b>	4161 West Hillsboro Boulevard		
<b>APPLICANT/AGENT:</b>	Keith and Associates, Inc.		
<b>REVIEW/APPLICATION</b>	Rezoning		
DISCIPLINE	REVIEWER	EMAIL	TELEPHONE
DRC Chair	Liz Aguiar – Principal Planner	<a href="mailto:laguiar@coconutcreek.net">laguiar@coconutcreek.net</a>	(954) 973-6756
Planning	Linda Whitman – Senior Planner	<a href="mailto:lwhitman@coconutcreek.net">lwhitman@coconutcreek.net</a>	(954) 973-6756
Planning	Natacha Josiah – Planner	<a href="mailto:NJosiah@coconutcreek.net">NJosiah@coconutcreek.net</a>	(954) 973-6756
Planning	Michael Righetti- Senior Project Manager	<a href="mailto:mrighetti@cococnutcreek.net">mrighetti@cococnutcreek.net</a>	(954) 973-6756
Building	Sean Flanagan – Deputy Building Official	<a href="mailto:sflanagan@coconutcreek.net">sflanagan@coconutcreek.net</a>	(954) 973-6750
Engineering	Eileen Cabrera - Engineer II	<a href="mailto:ecabrera@coconutcreek.net">ecabrera@coconutcreek.net</a>	(954) 973-6786
Engineering	Mohammed Albassam- Engineer I	<a href="mailto:malbassam@coconutcreek.net">malbassam@coconutcreek.net</a>	(954) 973-6786
Fire	Jeff Gary – Fire Marshal	<a href="mailto:jgary@coconutcreek.net">jgary@coconutcreek.net</a>	(954) 973-1563
Landscape	Scott Peavler - Landscape (consultant)	<a href="mailto:speavler@craventhompson.com">speavler@craventhompson.com</a>	(954) 739-6400
Police	Ryan Marken - Police Department	<a href="mailto:rmarken@coconutcreek.net">rmarken@coconutcreek.net</a>	(954) 956-6721

Pursuant to the requirements of Section 166.033, Florida Statutes, be advised that this development permit (application) is incomplete and the areas of deficiency have been identified herein. The requirements of Section 166.033 further provide that the applicant has 30 days to address the deficiencies by submitting the required additional information. If such a response is not provided in a timely manner, the application shall be deemed withdrawn unless the applicant wishes to waive any or all of the requirements of Section 166.033, Florida Statutes, in which case a request for waiver must be submitted to the City prior to the expiration of the 30 day response period identified above. The City's waiver form is available upon request.

## DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS

### BUILDING

APPROVED

This approval shall not imply full compliance with the Florida Building Code. Submittal of a building permit application and plans are required for review for a building permit.

### ENGINEERING

HOLD

Applicant is required to address **EACH** comment and to revise plans accordingly (*acknowledgements are not corrections*). **ONLY COMPLETE SIGNED AND SEALED DIGITAL PACKAGES WILL BE ACCEPTED.** Applicant does not need to resubmit application or previously submitted documents. Additional comments may be provided at DRC meeting and/or required upon review of any revised plans. Refer to **e-Plan User Guide** for instructions, found under resources on the Development Review web page.



1. Provide correspondence from Broward County verifying that the projected capacity and demand for potable water due to the proposed amendments will be met.  
**Letter has been requested verifying capacity.**
2. Provide correspondence from Broward County verifying that the projected plant capacity and demand for the proposed amendments will be met.  
**Letter has been requested verifying capacity.**
3. Provide a traffic study analysis with the estimated total daily vehicle trips at build out.  
**The PCD provided three traffic tables based on ITE rates that analyzed daily trip generation and AM and PM peak hour generations of both the existing phase I and the proposed Phase II. The site has three turn lanes providing access to the project which can adequately provide acceptable service levels. FDOT reviewed the project at preapplication review and had no concerns and issued an approval letter which is attached.**

#### FIRE

APPROVED

#### LANDSCAPING

HOLD

1. 25' perimeter landscape setback for PCDs are not being met for this project. See Zoning for additional comments.  
**The PCD is requesting to amend the requirement based on the site circumstances which include: a solid wall abutting residential areas that will provide the necessary buffer and the portion of the east property abuts a natural area making additional buffer unnecessary. The north property line will contain adequate landscaping to buffer off-site impacts.**
2. Distance between building and parking, requires 10' not including overhang or sidewalk along with required foundation planting. Proposed plans do not meet this requirement.  
**Plan has been revised to incorporate a 5 ft sidewalk and 13 feet wide planting areas along the front of the building and 10'-6" planting areas along the east side.**

#### PLANNING AND ZONING

HOLD

##### General Comments

1. Prior to the Planning and Zoning Board meeting, applicant shall provide the following to the City;
  - A. PCD package:
    - 1) Twelve (12) complete printed sets, 11"x17" in size, each set individually bound/stapled.
    - 2) The final submission will include a final strikethrough and underline to highlight all changes from the original PCD document. The final submission shall also include a clean copy to send to the P&Z Board.
  - B. PowerPoint:
    - 1) One (1) complete copy of presentation in digital format.
    - 2) Twelve (12) complete printed sets, no larger than 11"x17" size, each set individually bound/stapled.

Applicant is required to address **EACH** comment and to revise plans accordingly (*acknowledgements are not corrections*). **ONLY COMPLETE SIGNED AND SEALED DIGITAL PACKAGES WILL BE ACCEPTED.** Applicant does not need to resubmit application or previously submitted documents. Additional comments may be provided at DRC meeting and/or required upon review of any revised plans. Refer to **e-Plan User Guide** for instructions, found under resources on the Development Review web page.



- C. Public outreach:
  - 1) One (1) complete set in digital format.
  - 2) Twelve (12) complete printed sets, each set individually stapled.
- D. Each set of DRC response document:
  - 1) One (1) complete set in digital format.
  - 2) Twelve (12) complete printed sets, 8.5"x11" in size, each set individually stapled.

**Required copies will be provided for PZ once DRC has approved the submittals. power Point will also be provided. Leder Team will be meeting with adjacent HOA prior to hearings and will provide update.**

- 2. Working corrections shall be made to plans and/or documents in Microsoft Word using a strikethrough and underlined format "addressing" and "correcting" each comment and re-submitted per digital submittal requirements. Acknowledgements may not be considered corrections. Written responses to comments shall be provided that also guide staff to the appropriate sheet(s), page(s) or detail(s) where corrections have been made. Additional comments may be provided upon review of any revised plans.

**Strikethrough and underline will be provided as requested.**

- 3. Additional comments may be provided at DRC meeting and/or upon review of any revised plans.

**Understood that additional comments may be provided during the review process and will addressed.**

- 4. Sec.13-81(14)b. – Any DRC application continued or inactive for more than six (6) months will be considered null and void and will be treated as a new application with applicable fees.

**Leder Team plans to respond quickly and avoid any delays.**

- 5. The City has retained professional services to conduct landscape review of all Development Review Applications. Per Sec.13-80(b) of the City's Land Development Code, the cost for these services shall be billed to the applicant on a cost recovery basis. Please acknowledge and provide contact information of person(s) responsible for payments to the City.

**4161 Leder Hillsboro, LTD. Will be responsible for all consultant review fees.**

- 6. Applicant shall make every effort to ensure public participation as part of this project review. Provide an itemized accounting and/or correspondence demonstrating efforts including any mailed notices, resident or HOA meetings, site postings, correspondence etc.

**Leder Team will provide a written recap of public outreach, and will provide proof of site postings, correspondence and provide required lists for public notices to city.**

- 7. Rezoning approval may be subject to additional conditions imposed by the Planning & Zoning Board and/or City Commission.

**Understood conditions might be placed upon project during approval/ hearing process.**

#### **PCD General**

- 8. Sec.13-355(d)(4)b. – A setback of not less than twenty-five (25) feet is required next to the boundary of the PCD. No portion of such setback may be used for parking or other vehicular use area except for access ways.

**An 16 feet landscape buffer is proposed along the north perimeter which will contain adequate landscaping. Parking is proposed within the 25 feet which will be screened from off-site with landscaping. The east property line has two different situations; there are a few residential units on the north end which will be buffered by a 6 feet**

Applicant is required to address **EACH** comment and to revise plans accordingly (*acknowledgements are not corrections*). **ONLY COMPLETE SIGNED AND SEALED DIGITAL PACKAGES WILL BE ACCEPTED.** Applicant does not need to resubmit application or previously submitted documents. Additional comments may be provided at DRC meeting and/or required upon review of any revised plans. Refer to **e-Plan User Guide** for instructions, found under resources on the Development Review web page.



wall and the southern portion is a natural area providing a buffer. Between the wall and parking is a minimum 10 feet landscape buffer. In addition, the parking on the north end which will be the less frequently used spaces are proposed to be grass. The southern buffer exceeds the requirements and the western boundary is internal.

9. Sec.13-355(d)(4)e. – Twenty-five-foot perimeter setbacks shall be fully landscaped with berms and plant material in accordance with buffer requirements of the landscape code.
10. Sec.13-357(1) – Provide legal documents demonstrating unified control of the overall PCD.  
**Unified documents will be provided prior to approval.**

#### **Justification**

11. Perform “spell check” on document.  
**Spell check performed.**

#### **PCD Document**

12. The document shall be submitted with strikethrough and underline, without comments/tracking.  
**Document will be provided with strikethrough and underline without tracking.**
13. Run “spell check” through entire document.  
**Spell check performed.**
14. Verify that all site calculations are consistent between applications.  
**Site plan and PCD have been checked to be consistent.**
15. Page 7, D. Proposed Development – Reword the first sentence. Also, the applicant may wish to expand the cross parking to all sites.  
**Wording was modified and additional reference was included on cross parking.**
16. Page 8, Table 1 – Office/Retail, Phase II, 55,269 SF in table but cover letter states 55, 259. Verify all site information are consistent between applications. Footnote under table has a spelling error.  
**Figures have been check and corrected to be consistent. Spelling error fixed.**
17. Page 9, B. Existing Conditions – Be advised that the wall noted does not currently extend to the east proposed office property. See Site plan comments for wall requirement and revise this PCD section to reflect existing and proposed wall.  
**The Phase II of the PCD is proposing an alternative to the wall which exists on Phase I by providing an adequate landscape buffer in Phase II that provides an enhanced visual upgrade of landscaping to buffer the residential to the east.**
18. Page 10, C. Future Land Use and zoning – The Phase 1 site is zoned PCD, not B-3. Revise Exhibit G accordingly  
**Has been changed to reflect updated zoning.**
19. Page 10, A. Proposed Uses – Revise the language to reflect existing and proposed as they are today  
**Section revised to reflect existing approved phase I and proposed phase II.**
20. Page 10, Table II – Remove table and refer to the Master Business List.  
**Reference is made to Master Business List and table removed.**
21. Page 14, B. Development Standards, Min PCD size – Verify total acreage; does not match previous information.  
**Approved acreage is 5.96 and phase II is 2.91 which totals 8.87 acres**
22. Page 14, B. Development Standards, Table III, Section 13-355(d)(4)b – The proposed site does not meet the north or east required 25’ setback. Of particular concern is the north eastern side of the property abutting the Crescent Creek community.

Applicant is required to address **EACH** comment and to revise plans accordingly (*acknowledgements are not corrections*). **ONLY COMPLETE SIGNED AND SEALED DIGITAL PACKAGES WILL BE ACCEPTED.** Applicant does not need to resubmit application or previously submitted documents. Additional comments may be provided at DRC meeting and/or required upon review of any revised plans. Refer to **e-Plan User Guide** for instructions, found under resources on the Development Review web page.



23. Page 14, B. Development Standards, Table III, Section 13-355(d)(4)e – The proposed site does not meet the north or east required 25' setback. Of particular concern is the north eastern side of the property abutting the Crescent Creek community.  
**The building has been situated the greatest distance possible from residential to reduce off site impacts. The PCD is requesting that the setback allow for parking in the setback with a minimum 10 feet of landscape and a wall adjacent to residential.**
24. Page 15, B. Development Standards, Table III, Section 13-344(c)(12) – foundation landscaping is required.  
**Foundation planting has been added to the site plan and modified in table.**
25. Page 15, B. Development Standards, Table III, Section 13-344(c)(1) Building height– Indicate Phase I maximum height and Phase II maximum height.  
**Existing phase I added and phase II labeled.**
26. Page 16, D. Landscape Standards – Phase II landscape buffer is within the required 25' PCD perimeter buffer. Of particular concern is the north eastern side of the property abutting the Crescent Creek community.  
**The building has been situated the greatest distance possible from residential to reduce off site impacts. The PCD is requesting that the setback allow for parking in the setback with a minimum 10 feet of landscape and a wall adjacent to residential.**
27. Page 16, D. Landscape Standards - The PCD states that the plan will maintain the same landscape standards as the City code. See landscape comments.  
**Except for the 25 feet buffer the PCD complies with the landscape code requirements.**
28. Page 17, Table V, Phase II parking – Parking stall size requirements are 10' x 20', or 10' x 18' with a 2' overhang.  
**Parking stall size is proposed to be reduced to align more closely with current practices in the region. The stall size is 9x18 with a 2' overhang.**
29. Page 18, A Signage and Lighting Standards – Part of the previous PCD language that was overlooked, lighting must be addressed at the time of the site plan review. Revise language and submit a photometric plan.  
**A photometric plan is being submitted with the site plan. Lighting will comply with lighting standards and light trespass.**  
  
**Signage standards for both Phase I and II are being proposed for both monument and building signage. Attached are examples of area signage sizes that this PCD would like to utilize based on similar site constraints.**
30. Page 20, C Green Building – Revise as necessary to reflect proposed elements (i.e. charging station quantity)  
**A charging station with dual capabilities is proposed in the covered parking area.**
31. Page 20, C Green Building 3 b ii – Phase I did not take this route. Update to reflect EV charging station and seating/charging station on the north end of the project. Additionally, include Phase II elements.  
**A charging station for vehicles is proposed and a solar charging station with seating on the north end of the site.**
32. Page 21, Green Plan Action Items, Action 1.6 – The proposed Phase II conspicuous display of green technology is not adequate. Provide additional green technology  
**Green technology is evidenced in the seating/charging area by solar on Hillsboro.**

Applicant is required to address **EACH** comment and to revise plans accordingly (*acknowledgements are not corrections*). **ONLY COMPLETE SIGNED AND SEALED DIGITAL PACKAGES WILL BE ACCEPTED.** Applicant does not need to resubmit application or previously submitted documents. Additional comments may be provided at DRC meeting and/or required upon review of any revised plans. Refer to **e-Plan User Guide** for instructions, found under resources on the Development Review web page.



33. Page 21, Green Plan Action Items, Action 1.6 - Phase I did not take this route. Update to reflect EV charging station and seating/charging station on the north end of the project.  
**Site plan includes these items.**
34. Exhibit D, PCD Master Plan – The community on the east side of the subject property is “Crescent Creek”, not Crescent Park.  
**Correction made to name.**
35. Exhibit E, Existing Land Use – The community on the east side of the subject property is “Crescent Creek”, not Crescent Park.  
**Correction made to name**
36. Exhibit G, Zoning Map –Phase I of the PCD is zoned PCD and not B-3.  
**Correction made to map.**
37. Exhibit H, Open Space Plan – Add the open space calculations to this exhibit.  
**Calculations added**

**POLICE**

APPROVED



# CITY OF COCONUT CREEK

## DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE (DRC) REVIEW #2

10/21/19

<b>PROJECT NAME:</b>	Leder Office Space		
<b>PROJECT NUMBER:</b>	19070005		
<b>LOCATION:</b>	4161 West Hillsboro Boulevard		
<b>APPLICANT/AGENT:</b>	Keith and Associates, Inc.		
<b>REVIEW/APPLICATION</b>	Rezoning		
DISCIPLINE	REVIEWER	EMAIL	TELEPHONE
DRC Chair	Liz Aguiar – Principal Planner	<a href="mailto:laguiar@coconutcreek.net">laguiar@coconutcreek.net</a>	(954) 973-6756
Planning	Linda Whitman – Senior Planner	<a href="mailto:lwhitman@coconutcreek.net">lwhitman@coconutcreek.net</a>	(954) 973-6756
Planning	Natacha Josiah – Planner	<a href="mailto:NJosiah@coconutcreek.net">NJosiah@coconutcreek.net</a>	(954) 973-6756
Planning	Michael Righetti- Senior Project Manager	<a href="mailto:mrighetti@coconutcreek.net">mrighetti@coconutcreek.net</a>	(954) 973-6756
Building	Sean Flanagan – Deputy Building Official	<a href="mailto:sflanagan@coconutcreek.net">sflanagan@coconutcreek.net</a>	(954) 973-6750
Engineering	Eileen Cabrera - Engineer II	<a href="mailto:ecabrera@coconutcreek.net">ecabrera@coconutcreek.net</a>	(954) 973-6786
Engineering	Mohammed Albassam- Engineer I	<a href="mailto:malbassam@coconutcreek.net">malbassam@coconutcreek.net</a>	(954) 973-6786
Fire	Jeff Gary – Fire Marshal	<a href="mailto:jgary@coconutcreek.net">jgary@coconutcreek.net</a>	(954) 973-1563
Landscape	Scott Peavler - Landscape (consultant)	<a href="mailto:speavler@craventhompson.com">speavler@craventhompson.com</a>	(954) 739-6400
Police	Ryan Marken - Police Department	<a href="mailto:rmarken@coconutcreek.net">rmarken@coconutcreek.net</a>	(954) 956-6721

## DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS

### BUILDING

APPROVED

This approval shall not imply full compliance with the Florida Building Code. Submittal of a building permit application and plans are required for review for a building permit.

### ENGINEERING

HOLD

1. Pending correspondence from Broward County verifying that the projected capacity and demand for potable water due to the proposed amendments will be met.  
**Attached find availability letter from County**
2. Pending correspondence from Broward County verifying that the projected plant capacity and demand for the proposed amendments will be met  
**Attached find availability letter from County**

Applicant is required to address **EACH** comment and to revise plans accordingly (*acknowledgements are not corrections*). **ONLY COMPLETE SIGNED AND SEALED DIGITAL PACKAGES WILL BE ACCEPTED.** Applicant does not need to resubmit application or previously submitted documents. Additional comments may be provided at DRC meeting and/or required upon review of any revised plans. Refer to **e-Plan User Guide** for instructions, found under resources on the Development Review web page.



**FIRE**

APPROVED

**LANDSCAPING**

PASSED WITH CONDITIONS

See zoning comments.

**PLANNING AND ZONING**

HOLD

**General Comments**

1. The applicant will be required to enter into a public access agreement for the meandering sidewalk.  
**Understood that the sidewalk that moves off the ROW will need to be in a sidewalk easement.**
2. Pending items required prior to the Planning and Zoning Board meeting;
  - A. PCD package:
    - 1) Twelve (12) complete printed sets, 11"x17" in size, each set individually bound/stapled.
    - 2) The final submission must include final strikethrough and underline to highlight all changes from the original PCD document. The final submission shall also include a clean copy to include as part of P&Z Board agenda package.
  - B. PowerPoint:
    - 1) One (1) complete copy of presentation in digital format.
    - 2) Twelve (12) complete printed sets, no larger than 11"x17" size, each set individually bound/stapled.
  - C. Public outreach:
    - 1) One (1) complete set in digital format.
    - 2) Twelve (12) complete printed sets, each set individually stapled.
  - D. Each set of DRC response document:
    - 1) One (1) complete set in digital format.
    - 2) Twelve (12) complete printed sets, 8.5"x11" in size, each set individually stapled.

**All requirements will be provided once notice to proceed to PZ is received.**

**PCD General**

3. Sec.13-355(d)(4)b. – Sec.13-355(d)(4)e. – PCD Buffer Requirement: Appropriate justification has not been made to modify this requirement, particularly due to the excess onsite parking proposed. Staff recognizes that the FDOT retention site along the southern portion of the east property line provides additional buffering. However, the remainder of the east property line shall and the north property line shall meet the 25' perimeter requirement.  
**The required 25 feet buffer has been modified to include the length of the residential zoning. The excess parking has been removed to provide room for the buffer.**
4. Sec.13-357(1) – Pending legal documents demonstrating unified control of the overall PCD.  
**Attached please find control documents.**

**PCD Document**

5. Page 11, B. Existing Conditions – There is a wall existing along the entirety of the north property line starting with the NW corner of Phase I. It's reasonable that Phase II should



continue the wall as a buffer to the residential area to the north. Further, the site plan denotes a 6' wall along the north property line.

**The existing wall has been continued along the north side to provide a continuous appearance.**

6. Page 16, B. Development Standards, Table II, Section 13-355(d)(4)b and Section 13-355(d)(4)e – Staff recognizes the justification for a reduced buffer adjacent to the FDOT drainage area. However, given that the site provides parking in excess of code requirement, the inability to meet the 25' buffer is not justified. The 25' buffer under this requirement shall be met on the north and east up to the adjacent retention area.

**The grass parking has been revised and turned into the requested landscape buffer.**

7. Page 18, D. Landscape Standards – Provide the north and east (up to the adjacent retention area) 25' PCD buffer with landscape as required.

**The 25 feet buffer on the east has been included up to the retention area. The buffer on the north has been revised to include a wall matching the existing in phase 1 with revised landscape in both areas.**

8. Page 18, D. Landscape Standards - Landscape islands shown at 10' wide are required to be 12'. Revise PCD document accordingly.

**Terminal landscape islands are 12 feet with islands between spaces at 10 feet.**

9. Page 18, Table IV, Phase II parking – Parking stall size requirements for commercial use are 10'x20' or 10'x18' with a 2' overhang. Justification for the proposed reduction has not been provided. Revise plan accordingly.

**Size is reduced to provide additional green area. Office spaces have less turnover and need for larger spaces is not as necessary as retail establishments.**

10. Page 20, A Signage and Lighting Standards – A meeting with staff is recommended to discuss signage for Phase I and Phase II. PCD shall be revised accordingly.

**Applicant has met with staff to discuss plans. The phase 2 monument sign will match the phase 1 plans in for permit.**

11. Page 21, Green Plan Action Item, 1.6 – Add language for the proposed solar charging elements placed on Phase I and proposed on Phase II.

**Solar Pavilions (charging/seating areas) for each phase have been added.**

12. Page 21, Green Plan Action Item, 1.6 – Remove the following language, as this technology was not used in Phase I: *“Finally, the design of a green enhanced art work element including (PV Panels) will be incorporated in the landscape buffer along Hillsboro Blvd. The electrical power generated with this project will produce enough electrical power to offset the power needed to light the sign, bollards and parking lot lights located in the street buffer”*. Further, clearly note that a solar seating/charging station was added to the north side of the existing buildings on Phase I and to the south side of Phase II. (Site plan does not match the landscape or civil plans. Revise note to reflect the final location of the Phase II solar charger).

**Wording has been removed and solar pavilions added**

13. Page 23, Green Plan Action Item, 6.2 – Staff suggests placing an additional bike rack on the south side of the building to facilitate the retail patrons. Modify PCD accordingly, if applicable.

**Bike parking has been located by solar feature adjacent to the sidewalk on Hillsboro Blvd.**

14. Page 23, Green Plan Action Item, 6.4 – The grass parking stalls are not permitted unless the property is parking for school or church uses. Revise PCD accordingly.

**Grass parking has been removed.**

**POLICE**

APPROVED



## CITY OF COCONUT CREEK

### DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE (DRC) REVIEW #3 12/23/19

<b>PROJECT NAME:</b>	Leder Office Space		
<b>PROJECT NUMBER:</b>	19070005		
<b>LOCATION:</b>	4161 West Hillsboro Boulevard		
<b>APPLICANT/AGENT:</b>	Keith and Associates, Inc.		
<b>REVIEW/APPLICATION</b>	Rezoning		
DISCIPLINE	REVIEWER	EMAIL	TELEPHONE
DRC Chair	Liz Aguiar – Principal Planner	<a href="mailto:laguiar@coconutcreek.net">laguiar@coconutcreek.net</a>	(954) 973-6756
Planning	Linda Whitman – Senior Planner	<a href="mailto:lwhitman@coconutcreek.net">lwhitman@coconutcreek.net</a>	(954) 973-6756
Planning	Natacha Josiah – Planner	<a href="mailto:NJosiah@coconutcreek.net">NJosiah@coconutcreek.net</a>	(954) 973-6756
Planning	Michael Righetti- Senior Project Manager	<a href="mailto:mrighetti@cococonutcreek.net">mrighetti@cococonutcreek.net</a>	(954) 973-6756
Building	Sean Flanagan – Deputy Building Official	<a href="mailto:sflanagan@coconutcreek.net">sflanagan@coconutcreek.net</a>	(954) 973-6750
Engineering	Eileen Cabrera - Engineer II	<a href="mailto:ecabrera@coconutcreek.net">ecabrera@coconutcreek.net</a>	(954) 973-6786
Engineering	Mohammed Albassam- Engineer I	<a href="mailto:malbassam@coconutcreek.net">malbassam@coconutcreek.net</a>	(954) 973-6786
Fire	Jeff Gary – Fire Marshal	<a href="mailto:jgary@coconutcreek.net">jgary@coconutcreek.net</a>	(954) 973-1563
Landscape	Scott Peavler - Landscape (consultant)	<a href="mailto:speavler@craventhompson.com">speavler@craventhompson.com</a>	(954) 739-6400
Police	Ryan Marken - Police Department	<a href="mailto:rmarken@coconutcreek.net">rmarken@coconutcreek.net</a>	(954) 956-6721

## DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS

### BUILDING

APPROVED

This approval shall not imply full compliance with the Florida Building Code. Submittal of a building permit application and plans are required for review for a building permit.

### ENGINEERING

PASSED WITH CONDITIONS

1. Please note that comments provided are based on a preliminary engineering review and the project is subject to further review for compliance with the City's Code of Ordinances and the Utilities & Engineering Standards Manual at Final Engineering review.

**RESPONSE: understood that final plan review are subject to additional comments.**

### FIRE

APPROVED

### LANDSCAPING

Applicant is required to address **EACH** comment and to revise plans accordingly (*acknowledgements are not corrections*). **ONLY COMPLETE SIGNED AND SEALED DIGITAL PACKAGES WILL BE ACCEPTED.** Applicant does not need to resubmit application or previously submitted documents. Additional comments may be provided at DRC meeting and/or required upon review of any revised plans. Refer to **e-Plan User Guide** for instructions, found under resources on the Development Review web page.



APPROVED

## PLANNING AND ZONING

HOLD

### General Comments

1. Pending receipt of application packages prior to the Planning and Zoning Board meeting.  
**RESPONSE: Required packages will be submitted along with site plan once approved by DRC.**

### PCD General

2. Pending consideration and approval by the City Commission.  
**RESPONSE: understood Planning and Zoning and Commission need to approve application.**

### PCD Document

3. Section II Project Development, B, Development Standards Table II – Label Column 1 as “Land Development Code”. Label column 2 as “LDC Standard”. Label column 3 as “PCD Standard”.  
**RESPONSE: table has been modified.**
4. For row labeled “Max Floor Area Ratio”, change to read, “None. Set by PCD”, to provide additional clarification.  
**RESPONSE: modification has been made to chart.**
5. Section II Project Development, D, Landscape Standards, Bullet number 3 – Change language to reflect proposed parking added back into project.
  - a. Ensure language clearly identifies the proposed landscape buffer on the eastern property line adjacent to the FDOT retention parcel which is heavily vegetated creating a natural buffer. Detail the installation of the proposed 6ft wall and required landscaping north of the FDOT property and adjacent to the four single family residences.  
**RESPONSE: parking has been modified on plans and language enhanced on buffer.**
6. It appears that an existing water line on the west side of the building may conflict with the ability to plant required trees which must be addressed as part of the site plan and rezoning process.  
**RESPONSE: Landscape plans have been revised and no trees are in the area of the easement or building on the west side to avoid conflicts.**
7. Ensure that each exhibit is included when re-submitting the PCD document.  
**RESPONSE: all exhibits have been included in PCD**

## POLICE

APPROVED