

Current Project - Department Review Status

Pre-Application Comment Responses – September 13, 2022 - PZ22-13000004

DRC

| Rev Cycle | Group Name | Reviewer Name | Assigned By | Review Status | Review Comments |
|-----------|------------------------|---|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|
| 1 | | | | | |
| | UTILITIES | | Saul.Umana@copbfl.com | Assigned | |
| | ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT | David McGirr david.mcgirr@copbfl.com | Saul.Umana@copbfl.com | Authorized | No comments. 4-11-22 |
| | LANDSCAPE REVIEW | Wade Collum wade.collum@copbfl.com | Saul.Umana@copbfl.com | AuthorizedWithConditions | Comments will be rendered at time of site plan submittal. Provide landscape plans in accordance with 155.5203 for the entire site. Response: This submittal is to currently amend the approved PCD with no changes to the landscape within the original PCD. Full landscape plans for the new area have been submitted through the site plan. |
| | PLANNING | Jean Dolan Jean.Dolan@copbfl.com | Saul.Umana@copbfl.com | PendingResubmit | 1. The Planning and Zoning Board has expressed concern about the circulation at the Citi Centre Mall and consider it a problem that needs to be addressed. It is suggested that a very clear circulation drawing be prepared that shows directional arrows to and from each entrance to each outparcel and around the rear to identify how the circulation is intended to function. Perhaps the parking field between outparcels 3 and 4 could be modified to improve circulation to and among these outparcels. Consider way-finding signage that could help clarify the intent. Response: Please see added circulation/directional signage added to site plan. 2. The arrows showing circulation patterns between the western-most ingress/egress on Copans to the southern-most ingress/egress on Federal should be completed so it's clear how that access is intended to work. If the back-out parking on that access road can be removed, it might be something to consider. |

DRC

Current Project - Department Review Status

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | <p>Response: Please see add circulation/directional signage added.</p> <p>PZ22-13000004 03/01/2023</p> <p>3. Clarify boundary lines and other random line work that appear to dead-end. These are assumed to be showing internal outparcel and tenant boundaries but are very difficult to follow.</p> <p>Response: Please see updated boundary lines.</p> <p>4. On the site data table, specify that the SF column is building square feet and right justify the numbers.</p> <p>Response: Site data table has been updated.</p> <p>5. In your narrative provided with the DRC submittal (or in your deviations table), please explain why Lowe's garden center and the second floor of JC Penney and the office/stock areas are being lessed out of the building square footage calculations and parking calculations.</p> <p>Response: Applicant is using the same method which was approved in the original PCD.</p> <p>6. Provide a deviations page explaining what elements of the B-3 Code and other typical code requirements (parking, etc.) are being modified by this PCD.</p> <p>Response: This application intends to amend the PCD zoning to include a residential component and remove three parcels from the PCD that comprise approximately 12.3 acres that will replace the old Macy's building and a portion of the parking lot. This is consistent with the approved land use plan amendment adopted by the City on October 12, 2021 which changed the future land use designation on the proposed residential parcel from Commercial (City)/Commerce (County) to Irregular (29.5) Residential.</p> <p>7. The parking calculations method does not seem correct. Please revisit and clarify.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|

DRC

DRC

Current Project - Department Review Status

DRC

| | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|---|-----------------------|-----------------|---|
| | | | | | <p>Response: Parking calculations have been revised. A parking study has been provided to back up the calculations. PZ22-13000004 03/01/2023</p> <p>8. The survey labels on Sheet 3 showing the outparcel buildings don't match the PCD Plan labels for parcels 3 and G. This entire page of the survey does not appear to be beneficial to the submittal and probably could be eliminated. Sheet 5 also seems extraneous. Perhaps explain in the narrative the purpose to these "extra" pages in the survey.</p> <p>Response: We have removed this page from the survey.</p> <p>9. We will need a legal description in Word and a "sketch" of that boundary for Exhibit A to the rezoning ordinance. Please provide with your DRC submittal.</p> <p>Response: Please see attached.</p> <p>10. A Unity of Control document is required for this PCD.</p> <p>Response: See #9 of notes on the master plan.</p> |
| | BUILDING DIVISION | | Saul.Umana@copbfl.com | Assigned | |
| | CRA | | Saul.Umana@copbfl.com | Assigned | |
| | ZONING | Pamela Stanton pamela.stanton@copbfl.com | Saul.Umana@copbfl.com | PendingResubmit | <p>1. The proposal seeks to sever a portion of the property from the original master plan (Ordinance 2002-68). The new PD should replace the plan and include all of the items covered in the previous plan (uses, building area, open space, buffers, parking requirements, etc.).</p> <p>Response: The revised submittal includes all the items found in the original master plan.</p> <p>2. A rezoning may only be approved by the City Commission if the Applicant: (1) provides competent substantial evidences that the proposed amendment is consistent with the comprehensive plan (195.2-05 D.), and (2) compliance with the standards for the</p> |

DRC

Current Project - Department Review Status

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | <p>specific Planned Development (155.3602). The narrative does not address conformance with the comprehensive plan, does not respond to the general purpose of the PD (155.3601), nor does it explain how the proposed PD is compatible with the surrounding areas. Explain how the adoption of the zoning will be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">· Reducing or diminishing the inflexibility or uniform design that sometimes results from strict application of zoning and development standards designed primarily for individual lots;· Allowing greater freedom in selecting the means of providing access, open space, and design amenities;· Allowing greater freedom in providing a well-integrated mix of residential and nonresidential land uses in the same development, including a mix of housing types, lot sizes, and densities;· Allowing more efficient use of land, with smaller networks of streets and utilities, and thereby lowering development and housing costs; and· Promoting quality design and environmentally sensitive development that respects surrounding established land use character and respects and takes advantage of a site's natural and man-made features, such as trees, wetlands, floodplains, and historic features. <p>Response: Acknowledged.</p> <p>3. The PD Plan must include all of the information in 155.3602. The conceptual plan submitted illustrates a previously approved layout of the buildings, parking configuration & some site data. The PD narrative must include a list of the: permitted principal & accessory uses, pervious area, setbacks, parking requirements, signage, etc.</p> <p>Response: Please see updated narrative on page 1.</p> <p>4. The PD Plan must include all applicable uses permitted (principal & accessory) in the development. Refer to Appendix A, Consolidated use table & identify those uses that are permitted within the ZCD to select which uses will be permitted principal & accessory uses in this district.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|---|

DRC

PZ22-13000004
03/01/2023

DRC

PZ22-13000004
10/19/2022

Current Project - Department Review Status

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | <p>Response: The permitted uses are identified on sheet MP-1.</p> <p>PZ22-13000004 03/01/2023</p> <p>5. A unity of control document must be submitted for the this property, identifying the responsibility of the private property owners & that this development site is under a unified control. The development at large seems to be comprised of several owners, and if a master plan will be adopted/ enforced effectively, the unified owners must adhere to the adopted plan.</p> <p>Response: See #9 of notes on the master plan.</p> <p>6. Original Master Plan versus proposed PCD Standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Uses - the adopted master plan allowed "B-3 district" uses, plus medical offices, and a home improvement store with garden areas & outdoor sales. The new plan simply indicates the proposed uses are "mercantile/ business," which may render some uses non-conforming. Review the list of approved uses for this master plan. <p>Response: This application intends to amend the PCD zoning to include a residential component and remove three parcels from the PCD that comprise approximately 12.3 acres that will replace the old Macy's building and a portion of the parking lot. This is consistent with the approved land use plan amendment adopted by the City on October 12, 2021 which changed the future land use designation on the proposed residential parcel from Commercial (City)/Commerce (County) to Irregular (29.5) Residential. Additionally, the permitted uses are identified on sheet MP-1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Open Space - the adopted master plan required that 20% of the total site be landscaped. The proposed plan indicates that the "green space" is 11.9%. Clarify how the green space is not in conformance with the adopted master plan. <p>Response: The approved PCD provided 4.7% of Green Space. This application is just amending</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Current Project - Department Review Status

DRC

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | | <p>the prior approval, in which, the green space increases to 12%.</p> <p>PZ22-13000004 03/01/2023</p> <p>· Interior Landscaping & Perimeter buffers - the adopted master plan provided an amended formula for the required perimeter buffers and internal landscaping requirements. The proposed plan offers no amendment to the code, which would mean that the currently adopted landscaping & buffer regulations would apply for any redevelopment.</p> <p>Response: In the approved PCD, there is two delineations for “perimeter buffer”. Item (B), refers to internal perimeter, stating “due to the existing alignment of the “loop” road no additional perimeter buffering is required; except when new pavement is provided along the property line and adjacent to “bike path”. This buffer shall average 10 feet and be no less than 7 feet in width”. Our new buffers along the new ring road are wider than 7’, which is in compliance with the original PCD.</p> <p>· Building Setbacks & Heights - the adopted master plan provided unique setbacks & height regulations for the property, but none were provided on the proposed master plan.</p> <p>Response: This proposed plan was revised to include building setbacks and heights.</p> <p>· Parking - the adopted master plan provided that the desired parking ration should be 4.5 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet, thus requiring 4,681 parking spaces (this took into account a parking garage that was never constructed). The site plan indicates that there is total enclosed retail area of: 715,050 square feet, based on the adopted parking ratio, the required parking is 3,218. The adopted master plan, indicates that at grade, the parking provided is 3,322 parking spaces. Thus the parking garage was NOT required to be constructed to comply with the minimum parking spaces required. The proposed master plan suggests the same parking ration (4.5 per 1,000 square feet of retail), yet the plan seeks to remove a large portion of the surface parking. Given the fact that no retail area is proposed to be removed, the parking</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|

DRC

Current Project - Department Review Status

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | <p>spaces provided at grade is: 2,529 a deficit of 713 parking spaces. Clarify how the applicant will seek to comply with the required parking proposed by the PD Plan.</p> <p>Response: Please see attached parking study which demonstrates there will be sufficient parking to accommodate the existing uses after the removal of the retail and parking areas.</p> <p>· Outdoor Storage - the adopted master plan indicated that all outdoor storage from the home improvement store will be completely screened from public view, but there are no notes on the proposed plan.</p> <p>Response: Plan has been updated.</p> <p>· Screening - loading and mechanical equipment screening standards are provided on the adopted master plan, but not the proposed plan.</p> <p>Response: Plan has been updated.</p> <p>· Typical diagrams - diagrams of certain features (parking spaces, screening, signage) are provided on the adopted master plan, but not the proposed plan.</p> <p>Response: Plan has been updated.</p> <p>7. Provide detailed information pertaining to vehicular and pedestrian connectivity points between the Citi Centre Master Plan and the residential development.</p> <p>Response: Plan has been updated.</p> <p>The comments proffered at the pre-application conference are intended to provide guidance for submittals for Site Plan review by the Development Review Committee. The pre-application comments are preliminary and additional comments may be generated upon review of future submittals.</p> <p>Response: Acknowledged</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

DRC

PZ22-13000004

03/01/2023

DRC

PZ22-13000004

10/19/2022

Current Project - Department Review Status

DRC

| | | | | | |
|--|------------------|--|-----------------------|------------|---|
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | PZ22-13000004 09/01/2023 |
| | BSO | Patrick Noble Patrick_Noble@sheriff.org | Saul.Umana@copbfl.com | Authorized | <p>The services of an independent, and highly experienced, qualified and certified Security Crime Prevention/ CPTED Consultant are highly recommended to achieve and maintain objective credible security review integrity, and to expedite processing.</p> <p>DISCLAIMER: This safety and security review does not guarantee a crime will never occur; it is an effort to mitigate opportunities for crime and to help avoid any present and future security deficiencies, conflicts, threats, breaches, or liabilities that might occur without any review.</p> <p>Response: Acknowledged</p> |
| | FIRE DEPARTMENT | Jim Galloway jim.galloway@copbfl.com | Saul.Umana@copbfl.com | Authorized | <p>4/12/2022 This P&Z application is able to meet all of the Fire Department requirements at this time for REZONING ONLY. Site plan approval will be required, maintaining all proper fire department access and water supply requirements as per chapter 18 of NFPA 1 as amended from time to time. *Additional comments may follow throughout the remainder of the permitting process. The buildings shall be in compliance with All NFPA Standards prior to receiving Fire Department approval.</p> <p>Response: Acknowledged</p> |
| | WASTE MANAGEMENT | | Saul.Umana@copbfl.com | Assigned | |

DRC

PZ22-13000004
10/19/2022