



CITY OF COCONUT CREEK

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE (DRC) REVIEW #4

07-31-14

RESPONDED 08-20-14

PROJECT NAME:	Midtown Residences at Coconut Creek		
PROJECT NUMBER:	PZ-13120005		
LOCATION:	Berber Plat – Sample Road		
APPLICANT/AGENT:	Beatriz Hernandez		
REVIEW/APPLICATION	PMDD Site Plan		
DISCIPLINE	REVIEWER	EMAIL	TELEPHONE
Building	Sean Flanagan - Chief Structural Inspector	sflanagan@coconutcreek.net	(954) 973-6750
Engineering	Albert Demercado - Engineer II	ademercado@coconutcreek.net	(954) 973-6786
Fire	Rodney Zancanata - Fire Marshal	rzancanata@coconutcreek.net	(954) 973-1563
Landscape	Scott Peavler - Landscape (consultant)	speavler@coconutcreek.net	(954) 973-6756
Police	Kathryn Markland- Police Sergeant	kmarkland@coconutcreek.net	(954) 956-1541
Zoning	Liz Aguiar – Senior Planner	LAguiar@coconutcreek.net	(954) 973-6756

DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS

BUILDING

The Building Department approves this application.

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

Engineering Conditions Of Approval:

1. Provide location and verification of adequacy for capacity of City pump-station receiving sewerage from the development. The location and name of same existing pump-station shall be clearly identified. The Design engineer need to document existing flow into the affected City pump-station and show calculations for proposed flow from new development. The design capacity should also be shown and the determination whether the capacity of the existing station is sufficient should be clearly stated based on the difference in capacities. Shall be addressed at the time of final engineering plans review.

Response: Information was requested to City Staff. Only pressure information was provided. Detailed design coordination will be performed prior to Engineering Plans Review Submittal.

2. Propose pump station shall be designed with sufficient capacity to service both Midtown Residences and Village of Marbella developments. Future connection from pump station to Village of Marbella development shall be provided. Proposed pump station shall have size of 30' x 30' and driveway minimum 20 feet long.

Response: Proposed pump station has been designed for sufficient capacity to service both projects. Future connection has been provided. Proposed pump station contains 30' x 30' easement. Detailed design coordination will be performed prior to Engineering Plans Review Submittal.

Applicant is required to address **EACH** comment and to revise plans accordingly (*acknowledgements, are not corrections*). **ONLY COMPLETE & BOUND PACKAGES WILL BE ACCEPTED**, no inserts, along with one (1) digital copy on disk which will include complete signed/sealed plan sets, responses & any requested or outstanding documents. Applicant does not need to resubmit application or previously submitted documents. Applicant will be advised as to how many plan sets will be needed. Additional comments may be provided at DRC meeting and/or required upon review of any revised plans.



3. Clearly show horizontal separation between footer of adjacent building and proposed pump-station and it appurtenances. Pump station easement to be minimum 30ft x 30ft with a 20ft long driveway.
Response: The distance from footing foundation to the pump station has been depicted on Sht A1.1
4. Provide 2 additional stop bar/double yellow striping at four-way intersection between parking deck, Bldg. 2, 3 and parking stalls to improve circulation safety.
Response: See revised sht C-1
5. Provide additional stop bar/double yellow striping of three-way intersection between Bldgs. 6, 7 & parking deck to improve circulation safety.
Response: See revised sht C-1
6. On sheet C-6, note 3 shall read "All 2" water service shall be SDR9 PE. Correction can be made at the time of final engineering plans review.
Response: See revised sht C-6
7. Provide storm drainage calculations clearly showing the design event for Minimum road elevation, Minimum discharge elevation and Minimum finish floor elevation and how each were calculated with all design information and complying with Broward County Environmental Protection and Growth Management Department (B.C.E.P.G.M.D.) requirements.
Response: Minimum road elevation, Minimum discharge elevation and Minimum finish floor elevation are at or above the Cocomar Master Drainage Permit and the site lake area is consistent with the requirements of this Master Permit. As noted on prior re-submittals, drainage calculations will be provided at time of Engineering Plan Review Submittal.
8. Provide storm water pollution prevention plan prior to engineering plans approval including but not limited to location of construction entrance and silt fence, tree protection, concrete wash out area and location of other BMP's for ensuring SWPPP compliance with City NPDES & FDEP. Use City storm-water management guidelines.
Response: As the comment states, SWPPP Plans will be provided at time of Engineering Plan Review Submittal.
9. Provide details of all outfall connections at the time of final engineering design plans review.
Response: See Sheet C-2 for labels of all FDOT outfall connections. As per our telephone discussion, labels will suffice at this submittal stage and details will be provided at Engineering Plan Review Submittal.
10. Clearly show minimum first floor elevations on final engineering design plans. Clearly show all buildings identification (ex. Building A).
Response: See Sht C-2
11. Resolve all drainage conflicts and crossings with utilities and landscape.
Response: No conflicts are shown at this time. See Sheet C-6 for elevations of top and bottom of crossings
12. Provide correspondence from South Florida Water Management District for all irrigation system draws from a well, lake or canal stating whether or not a permit is required.
Response: A letter has been requested and shall be provided prior to P&Z hearing. If a permit is required, applicant shall do so accordingly.
13. All requirements for storm-water drainage and surface water management shall be satisfactorily addressed at the time of Final engineering design plans review.
Response: Noted



14. New water/wastewater agreement is needed and 100% ERU's paid prior to building and engineering permit review.

Response: Noted

15. Clearly show all finish floor elevations on the plans. All elevations shall be shown as NAVD1988.

Response: Both NGVD to NAVD references are noted on Engineering Plan and on Architectural site notes.

16. Trees not to be located in proposed utility easements. All trees to be a minimum of seven (7) feet away from all proposed/existing City utilities. Provide for an effectively maintained root barrier with a minimum horizontal separation of 6 inches outside of utility easements.

Response: Root barrier note is located on sheet LP-9 per City standards.

17. Note: Final engineering design plans submittal shall include six complete sets of final engineering plans satisfying all City requirements, with complete engineering scope of work on design engineers letter head (separately...one original copy required with submittal), a transmittal letter and final engineering design review fee of \$875.00 (check payable to City of Coconut Creek). Submittal shall be to the engineering division located at 5295 Johnson Road, Coconut Creek, Florida 33073.

Response: Noted

FIRE

Fire is placing a Hold on this account. Please see the following comments:

- 1) Show fire truck turn radius to the front of building 1
Response: Additional info has been depicted on fire access plan Sht A-0.3
- 2) All FDC's shall be located within 15' of the fire hydrant
Response: Pursuant to telephone discussion with Rodney Zancanata dated 8/7/14 (Thurs) regarding this comment, the FDC locations are acceptable as depicted on plans.
- 3) Move one of the Fire Hydrants between building 5 & 6 to the east median
Response: Pursuant to telephone discussion with Rodney Zancanata dated 8/7/14 (Thurs) regarding this comment, the FH locations are acceptable as depicted on plans.
- 4) Move fire hydrant and FDC to the Southwest corner of building 3
Response: Pursuant to telephone discussion with Rodney Zancanata dated 8/7/14 (Thurs) regarding this comment, the FDC & FH locations are acceptable as depicted on plans.
- 5) Move fire hydrant and FDC to the South side of building 1
Response: Pursuant to telephone discussion with Rodney Zancanata dated 8/7/14 (Thurs) regarding this comment, the FDC & FH locations are acceptable as depicted on plans.
- 6) Building 4 has a dead-end the needs either an fire department access road or a turnaround
Response: The access road is less than 150'-0" in depth and has been dimensioned to depict less than 150'-0" depth of driveway on the enlarged site plan sheets in previous submittals. This dimension has also been added to the fire access plan.
- 6) Page C-6 and Page A-.03 fire hydrants do not match
Response: Both pages have been coordinated and now match
- 8) Knox switch shall open all entrance and exit gates
Response: Noted on fire access plan Sht A-0.3

Applicant is required to address **EACH** comment and to revise plans accordingly (*acknowledgements, are not corrections*). **ONLY COMPLETE & BOUND PACKAGES WILL BE ACCEPTED**, no inserts, along with one (1) digital copy on disk which will include complete signed/sealed plan sets, responses & any requested or outstanding documents. Applicant does not need to resubmit application or previously submitted documents. Applicant will be advised as to how many plan sets will be needed. Additional comments may be provided at DRC meeting and/or required upon review of any revised plans.



GREEN

Green Plan

1. The adopted a City Green Plan outlines city-wide “green” goals. Staff acknowledges applicants response. Staff has further clarification and recommendations as listed below.
2. Action 1.1: Achieve LEED® Certification for all buildings in the MainStreet Project Area with at least 15% at Silver, Gold, or Platinum level.
No later than at time of first building permit submittal, applicant shall register the project with USGBC. Documentation demonstrating registration shall be provided prior to building permit issuance. Proof of certification must be provided to the City no later than 18 months from final certificate of occupancy for the project, as is required by code. Be advised, this condition will be included in the site plan ordinance approving the project. **NOTED & LEED Checklist shall be provided at time of building permit.**
3. Action 5.1: Increase recycling throughout the City by 25% by 2014 and 50% by 2020.
The City has single stream recycling. Separate bins for recyclables is not required.
Response: The applicant will provide separate bins for recycling to satisfy LEED principles and criteria.

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

Sheet A-0.1:

1. Sheets states 14 future on-street parking spaces, but plans don’t show any parallel spaces.
Response: Future parking spaces have been removed from the project data sheet and are not proposed at this phase of the site plan approval process. Please refer to proposed Street Type “A” Street section Sht A-0.5 for proposed offsite R/W improvements

Sheet SP-1:

2. Light pole located in ADA ramp access at SE corner of clubhouse.
Response: ADA ramp conflict has been resolved
3. Show first floor parking deck layout on plans to show access to ground floor.
Response: 1st floor parking plan has been depicted on the site plans
4. No pedestrian access to parking deck or handicap space on ground floor of parking deck.
Response: Pedestrian and ADA access has been provided from parking area on the east and west.
5. Parking spaces on north side of bldg.1 conflicts with transformer and easement.
Response: Conflict has been resolved. Transformer has been shifted.
6. Pedestrian gate on south side of bldg. 3 is not aligned with wall and doesn’t allow for pedestrian access within the complex.
Response: Pedestrian gate has been reconfigured to align with gated access
7. Parking space at east side of entrance adjacent to emergency exit conflicts with sidewalk and could create a tripping hazard.
Response: Entry drive has been shifted to the West to remove conflict and potential for trip hazards.
8. Light pole locations along Street Type “A” is not consistent down the length of the property.



Response: Light pole locations have been adjusted to be consisted throughout the length on Street Type A.

9. Recommend providing additional benches at lake overlook.

Response: Two (2) additional double sided benches have been added to both internal lake overlooks.

10. Check color of chain-link fence throughout the property. Some have green others state black.

Response: Color of chainlink fence is black as noted on landscape dwgs.

11. Bldg. 1 sidewalk on west side does not extend far enough for the handicap access aisle.

Response: Sidewalk has been extended.

Sheet A-1.1:

12. Handicap space within single garage unit looks to be very narrow to allow for handicap access with wheelchair.

Response: Garage space dimension meets ADA requirements

13. recommend moving bike rack at clubhouse to an area that is deeper. The bikes look to overhang into the sidewalk and with the addition of a handicap sign, clear access along the sidewalk will not be provided.

Response: Bike racks have been relocated to the north side of the bldg. and out of the sidewalk

14. Check all light locations for conflicts with hardscape, buildings, and easements.

Response: All light locations have been checked and coordinated

Sheet A-2.4:

15. Floor plan of garage-type II does not match what is shown on site plans. Ingress and egress for handicap garage is different.

Response: This plan has been coordinated with what is depicted on the enlarged site plan sheets.

Sheet A-2.6:

16. Consider use of roof top planter boxes to allow for proposed landscape to hang down for greenscreen locations. Will help fill in proposed greenscreen wall.

Response: Additional "green screen" elements have been added to allow for the planter box landscape material to hang down. Refer to landscape for planting materials to be used for green screens

Sheet TS-1:

17. Provide mitigation calculations for sabal palm canopy removal and what is proposed to replace it. There should be no loss of canopy square footage.

Response: One sickly Sabal Palm is being removed but over a dozen new Sabals are being provided.

Sheet LP-2:

18. Proposed Live Oaks adjacent to parking garage are too close and do not allow for proper canopy growth. Switch tree species to a smaller one or possibly a palm for a more vertical element.

Response: Live Oaks have been replaced with Green Buttonwood Trees which are more vertical in growth habit.

19. Only sod is allowed in the fire hydrant clear zones. Replace decorative peanut with sod.

Response: All plans have been updated to reflect this specification.

20. Possible issues with proposed Live Oaks and 8' concrete sidewalk on north perimeter. Look into alternative methods of planting adjacent to hardscapes to allow for root growth with minimal to no damage to walkways. Structural soil is only one possibility.



Response: Where Oaks were too close to walk half tree grates have been provided to alleviate root issues. See grate ADA compliant detail.

Sheet LP-3:

21. Label greenscreen locations on parking garage.

Response: This has now been provided on the upper parking deck plan.

22. What plant material is specified for the greenscreen on the parking garage? Couldn't find any plant callouts.

Response: The tag is there and it is TJC – Confederate Jasmine

23. Plans show proposed planting on what looks to be the second level. Show ground level on the plans and provide a second plan view of the second floor with proposed planting.

Response: Separate Plan view of parking garage upper deck is now also provided on sheet LP-3.

24. Show what is to be done with area from trees wells and the bold dashed line (property line) along Street Type "A".

Response: These areas are to be sodded and sod notes have been added to areas accordingly.

Sheet LP-4:

25. Shift two Gumbos out of 15' light setback between garages south of bldg. 6.

Response: Completed

Sheet LP-5:

25. Transformer on north side of bldg.1 is missing some screening. Three sides are to be screened.

Response: Screening has been provided along with a typical detail sht LP-8

26. Provide detail of decorative wall feature in round-a-bout.

Response: See sht LP-10 for detail

27. Terminal islands between clubhouse and bldg.2 are missing trees or palms. Look into smaller trees or palm clusters for the limited space.

Response: Solitaire Palms have been added to these islands

Sheet LP-7:

28. Limited space on the west side of lift station, recommend replacing with a smaller tree or palm cluster to alleviate any possible problems in the future.

Response: Veitchia palms are now being used in confined area.

29. Look at light pole locations within plaza space at SE corner. One is located within middle of walkway, but could be intended for that location.

Response: Light poles have been relocated to provide better pedestrian traffic while still providing the required foot candle lighting.

Sheet LP-8:

30. Revise fire hydrant detail to read "Sod Only".

Response: Revised as noted

31. With the revisions to the tree and shrub totals the plant quantities and native calculations should have changed. Landscape data table is to be updated per all the revisions.

Response: Duly noted

Sheet LP-9:

32. Provide color of aluminum fencing on site plan detail.

Response: The aluminum perimeter and pool fence shall be bronze as noted in the detail provided in this sheet.



33. Confirm color of chain-link fencing throughout the site. Civil has green for the lift station, others have black for the site.

Response: Black will be the color used for the chain-link fence on site

Sheet E.1:

35. No detail is provided for the transformer pad and fencing as called out on the site plans.

Response: There is no fencing proposed around pads but landscape screening is provided. See landscape detail for typ transformer pad.

36. Decorative light pole doesn't look to match the City standard decorative light pole called out in the landscape set.

Response: The decorative light pole depicted in the landscape dwgs have been deleted.

Furthermore, the decorative pole City standard represents a style and cut sheet for compact fluorescent or 70W MH and does not allow for the LEED design using LED lighting, efficient spread, full cut off, and cost effective layout with coordination of trees. The project is working on achieving compliance with the Main Street Guidelines, LEED compliance, lighting levels, and energy efficiency compliance.

The proposed fixture in our set, necessarily deviates from the City standard. The elevation and type shown on the E-1.2 dwg indicates an LED fixture that complies with the Main Street Guidelines LEED requirements and the Main Street elevations pictured on the manual. (see attached)

If the City standard style is followed, the use of LED lighting source is not possible, the number of poles more than doubles, the uniformity decreases, LEED energy efficiency target is not achieved.

PLANNING AND ZONING

Will be emailed separately.

POLICE

Approved