



CITY OF COCONUT CREEK

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE (DRC) REVIEW #1 – FEBRUARY 20, 2025

PROJECT NAME:	MainStreet CDD		
PROJECT NUMBER:	PZ-25020006		
LOCATION:	MainStreet		
APPLICANT/AGENT:	Billing, Cochran, Lyles, Mauro and Ramsey, P.A.		
REVIEW/APPLICATION:	Community Development District		
DISCIPLINE	REVIEWER	EMAIL	TELEPHONE
DRC Chair Urban Design & Development	Liz Aguiar – Assistant Director Sustainable Development	laguiar@coconutcreek.net	(954) 973-6756
Sustainability, Urban Design & Photometrics	Linda Whitman – Sustainability Manager	lwhitman@coconutcreek.net	(954) 973-6756
Urban Design & Signage	Natacha Josiah - Planner	njosiah@coconutcreek.net	(954) 973-6756
Transportation	Michael Righetti - Senior Project Manager	mrighetti@coconutcreek.net	(954) 973-6756
Building	Sean Flanagan – Chief Building Official	sflanagan@coconutcreek.net	(954) 973-6750
Engineering	Eileen Cabrera - Senior Engineer	ecabrera@coconutcreek.net	(954) 973-6786
Fire	Ryan Banyas – Fire Marshal	rbanyas@coconutcreek.net	(954) 956-1563
Landscape	Scott Peavler - Landscape (consultant)	speavler@craventhompson.com	(954) 739-6400
Police	Barbara Hendrickx - Police Department	bhendrickx@coconutcreek.net	(954) 956-6721
Public Works	Mike Heimbach- Project Manager	mheimbach@coconutcreek.net	(954) 956-1453
ALTERNATE REVIEWERS			
Engineering	Thamar Joseph - Engineer I	tjoseph@coconutcreek.net	(954) 973-6786
Engineering	Muayad Mohammed- Engineer I	mmohammed@coconutcreek.net	(954) 973-6786
Engineering	Steve Seegobin - Construction Supervisor	gseegobin@coconutcreek.net	(954) 973-6786

DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS

General Comments

1. The Director of Sustainable Development waives the requirement for a DRC meeting per Sec. 13-19(f).
2. Provide the CDD boundary legal description in a Microsoft Word document.
Provided.
3. Add page numbers and exhibit labels to document as applicable. **Included in the revised Petition to Establish.**

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.



4. Adjust the total acreage throughout document, Location Sketch, and Exhibit 2: Metes and Bounds based on the boundary changes mentioned in the boundary line adjustment comments: **See updated Exhibit 2 metes and bounds legal description and sketch.**

CDD Boundary Line Adjustments:

- Inclusion of the following rights of way is desired while acknowledging that there may be differences in which entity will ultimately maintain portions of these rights of way in the future:
- NW 54th Terrace.
 - Expand the boundary west to include the full ROW, roadway, streetscape, and the City's Lift Station from Cullum Rd to Wiles Rd. **The petitioner will propose a modification to the CDD boundary along NW 54th Terrace to the City for review.**
- Banks Road
 - Banks Rd along Al Hendrickson Toyota, expand CDD Boundary to the Half ROW Line. Al Hendrickson will buildout their portion of the streetscape and roadway as proposed in a redevelopment of the site under review by the City. **The proposed CDD boundary already extends to the half ROW line in this location.**
 - Banks Rd along 10 acres City-Owned Property, expand CDD Boundary to the Half ROW Line. City will build out our portion of the streetscape and roadway in future development of that property. **The proposed CDD boundary already extends to the half ROW line in this location.**
 - Banks Rd along Monarch High School, expand CDD Boundary to the east ROW line, north of City-owned property/Block 14 to Wiles Rd. **The petitioner will propose a modification to the CDD boundary along Banks Road to the City for review.**
- NW 40th ST
 - West of Banks Rd. expand the CDD Boundary south to the Half ROW Line and to the western Boundary of Block 7. **The proposed CDD boundary already extends to the half ROW line in this location.**
- Cullum Road
 - Cullum west of NW 54th Terr/North of Block 9, expand CDD Boundary to the north ROW line to the western CDD boundary of Block 9. **The petitioner will propose a modification to the CDD boundary along Banks Road to the City for review.**

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.



- Cullum Road east of Banks Rd to Lyons Rd, expand CDD Boundary to the north ROW line. **The petitioner will propose a modification to the CDD boundary along Banks Road to the City for review.**
- 5. Include exhibits for the Re-use water System, Stormwater System, and Roadway Network. **See attached these additional documents.**
- 6. Page 1, Item 1.: Verbiage in last sentence states the Home Depot lake “should” not be impacted by the District? What happens if there is an impact to the lake? **There is no impact to the lake by the mere existence of a CDD. This sentence is required because the property (lake) is owned by Home Depot is physically located within the boundaries of the CDD but will not be a part of the CDD. See Section 190.005(1)(a)1., Florida Statutes.**
- 7. Page 2, Item 6, 3rd sentence: Recommend we add “per the approved roadways plan” just after the roadway improvements verbiage. **Included in the revised Petition to Establish.**
- 8. Section 6, District Facilities and Services. It currently states that “petitioner presently intends for the proposed District to participate in the funding and construction..” Should this section also mention that there will be operations and maintenance responsibilities as well? **It is not required. This is included in Exhibit 8, Table 1, of the Petition to Establish.**
- 9. Section 7, Future Land Uses. The zoning district is PMDD, Planned Mainstreet Development District. The future land use is Regional Activity Center (RAC). **Included in the revised Petition to Establish.**
- 10. Exhibit 8, Table 1: revise the Re-use Water System to show ownership, operation and maintenance by both District and City. **Included in the revised Petition to Establish.**
- 11. Page 4, Item 11. d: Verbiage calls out the District as a perpetual entity. Are we sure there isn’t a conflict elsewhere for a sunset? Should there be in case the CDD does expire at some point? **There is no sunset or termination date for the CDD. A CDD is terminated by Section 190.046(10).**
- 12. Section 7.0 of the Estimated Regulatory Costs. It is our understanding that a POA will still be needed for this development. The way this is written may be confusing since it does not mention that actuality and appears to shine a negative connotation about them.. This section could be revised to say that although a POA will be formed, its purpose differs than that of the CDD. **This has been corrected in the revised Petition to Establish.**
- 13. Page 31, Statement of Estimated Regulatory Costs, Item 1.2: Minor discrepancy in totals. **This has been corrected in the revised Petition to Establish.**

Breakdown below are total per City Commission approved site plans:

Townhomes / Villas - TOTAL 484 versus 478 on Statement (difference of 6)

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.



- Block 1 48 townhomes / 56 villas = 104
- Block 5 84 townhomes
- Block 6 64 townhomes
- Block 8 60 townhomes / 92 villas = 152
- Block 9 80 townhomes

Multi-Family – TOTAL 1,172 versus 1,100 on Statement (difference of 72)

- Block 4 472 multi-family units
- Block 10 700 multi-family units per PMDD (site plan not approved)

Condos – TOTAL 296 - matches 296 on Statement

- Block 11 124 condominiums
- Block 15A 172 condominiums

Commercial – TOTAL SQ FT 78,417- versus 78,400 on Statement (difference of 17 sf)

- Block 2 9,317 sf restaurant & 3,900 sf retail = 13,217
- Block 3 8 buildings – 65,200 sf

Other - clubhouse not accounted for in Statement

- Block 15B 8,779 clubhouse