



CITY OF COCONUT CREEK

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE (DRC) REVIEW #1

06-24-19

| PROJECT NAME: | Cocomar | | |
|--------------------|---|--|----------------|
| PROJECT NUMBER: | 19060004 | | |
| LOCATION: | Northwest Corner of Lyons Road and Atlantic Boulevard | | |
| APPLICANT/AGENT: | Greenspoon Marder | | |
| REVIEW/APPLICATION | LUPA | | |
| DISCIPLINE | REVIEWER | EMAIL | TELEPHONE |
| DRC Chair | Liz Aguiar – Principal Planner | laguiar@coconutcreek.net | (954) 973-6756 |
| Planning | Linda Whitman – Senior Planner | lwhitman@coconutcreek.net | (954) 973-6756 |
| Planning | Natacha Josiah – Planner | NJosiah@coconutcreek.net | (954) 973-6756 |
| Building | Sean Flanagan – Deputy Building Official | sflanagan@coconutcreek.net | (954) 973-6750 |
| Engineering | Eileen Cabrera - Engineer II | ecabrera@coconutcreek.net | (954) 973-6786 |
| Engineering | Mohammed Albassam- Engineer I | malbassam@coconutcreek.net | (954) 973-6786 |
| Fire | Jeff Gary – Fire Marshal | jgary@coconutcreek.net | (954) 973-1563 |
| Landscape | Scott Peavler - Landscape (consultant) | speavler@craventhompson.com | (954) 739-6400 |
| Police | Ryan Marken - Police Department | rmarken@coconutcreek.net | (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.

Staff reserves the right to review and provide comments upon re-submittal of this application and to further review and comments of additional applications.

ENGINEERING

HOLD

1. Pending confirmation letters from City of Margate for Water and Wastewater service analysis.
2. Provide a Traffic study analysis for the proposed project.

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

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

Staff reserves the right to review and provide comments upon re-submittal of this application and of any additional applications.

PLANNING AND ZONING

HOLD

General Comments

1. Applicant shall be prepared to discuss this application and make a PowerPoint presentation, or at a minimum, include details of this application into the overall project presentation, at all related Planning and Zoning Board and City Commission meetings.
2. Prior to the Planning and Zoning Board meeting, applicant shall provide the following to the City;
 - A. **Digital:**
 - One complete set of LUPA document including exhibits in color (as applicable).
 - One complete set of PowerPoint (see comment #1).
 - One complete set of EACH round of DRC applicant response document.
 - B. **Prints: (each set individually bound/stapled)**
 - Twelve complete sets of LUPA document including exhibits in color (as applicable).
 - Twelve complete sets of PowerPoint (see comment #1) no larger than 11"x17" in size.
 - Twelve complete sets of EACH round of DRC applicant response document.
 - C. Copies are required only when revisions have been made and application is determined by the city to be in compliance with applicable code requirements and has been scheduled for a public meeting by the City.
3. 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.
4. "Acknowledgements" to DRC comments may not always demonstrate compliance. Corrections shall be made through plan, graphics and/or notes revisions. Document corrections shall be done in a strike-thru and underlined format as applicable. Written responses to DRC comments shall identify appropriate sheet(s) or page(s) where corrections have been made by the applicant.
5. Be advised, this project will be subject to:
 - a. Police and Fire Impact Fees, Sec.13-118 through 13-126, Ordinance 2006-017.
 - b. Undergrounding Utilities, Sec.13-142, Ordinance 2005-032.
 - c. Green/Sustainable Elements, Sec.13-320.
 - d. Public Sites and Open Spaces, Sec.13-267.

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.



- e. Preservation, Sec.13-140.
6. Additional comments may be provided at DRC meeting and/or upon review of revised application.

LUPA

7. Staff does not support the conversion of commercial property to residential. Further, the application and narrative fails to address critical issues such as loss of a commercial tax base, property values or increased public safety demands such as police and fire rescue.
8. Throughout the document, reference is made to acres, density, number of units, etc. Staff acknowledges that LUPA application does not include property outside the City. However, the references are used as data and analysis that *does* include proposed development outside the city. Provide details to clarify this issue. Ensure data is consistent. The number of units proposed varies between 260, 301 and 305.
9. Page 3, Sec.3C - Detail how the net and gross acreage has been determined including methodology used for ROW, as applicable.
10. Page 3, Secs.3C & 4A - Ensure language clearly states how density *shall* be calculated.
11. Page 4, Sec.D - Ensure language clearly identifies number of residential units for subject and adjacent property. Refer to comment #8.
12. Page 10, Sec.D5 – Ensure % drainage meets Cocomar Drainage District/SFWMD requirements.
13. Page 11, Sec.F1 / Exhibit K - Ensure residential units used for analysis are consistent throughout the LUPA application. Refer to comment #8. Respond accordingly or revise Exhibit.
14. Page 13, Sec.H1 – Provide School Board Concurrency form / application for review and comment.
15. Page 16, Secs.F & G – An environmental assessment was conducted. Submit copy for review and comment.
16. Exhibit D – Revise map to be consistent with proposed number of dwelling units per acre. (Refer to Page 3, Sec.4.A.)
17. Ex F – Provide letter from City of Margate for potable water service. Letter to Margate should have stated “change of land use designation” not “an increase to residential density”.
18. Ex G – Provide letter from City of Margate for sanitary sewer service.
19. Ex H – Provide letter from Republic Services for solid waste service. Letter to Republic should have stated “change of land use designation” not “to increase residential density”.

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.



20. Ex I – Provide letter from Broward County for drainage service. Letter to Broward County should have stated “change of land use designation” not “to increase residential density”.
21. Ex K – 305 single family homes is the figure used for analysis. Respond accordingly or revise analysis. Refer to comment #8.
22. Ex L – Provide letter from Broward County Transit for mass transit service. Letter to County should have stated “change of land use designation” not “to increase residential density”.
23. Ex N – Local Area of Particular Concern (LAPC) graphic provided is illegible. Please address.
24. Ex O - Staff does not support the conversion of commercial property to residential. The conceptual site plan has been used only to review proposed uses, however, there has been no demonstration that an acceptable site plan can be developed. This LUPA application does not grant the applicant any specific development and does not preclude the applicant from complying with all applicable regulatory codes. Site design shall be reviewed upon site plan application submittal to the City for consistency with the City’s Land Development Code including aesthetic criteria.
25. If approved, proposed Land Use Designation of 6.5 DU/Ac is applicable to that portion designated as residential in the City of Coconut Creek and does not grant a specific number of units.

POLICE

APPROVED

Staff reserves the right to review and provide comments upon re-submittal of this application and other additional applications.