



Subject: The Oaks at Palm Aire
Flex Allocation DRC Comment Responses

Case No: 23-05000007

RESPONSE DATE: January 3, 2024

Planning Division – Jean Dolan | jdolan@copbtl.com

Narrative Comments:

1. The reference to 154.62 in the narrative is not correct (flex is legislative so we don't use the words "competent and substantial evidence" and that section applies to nonresidential flexibility which does not apply to the Oaks project). Remove this reference from the narrative. The correct reference is: 154.61 (D) Application review standards.
Response: The narrative has been revised to remove the reference to Section 154.62 and replace it with Section 154.61(D).
2. You don't mention parcel C anywhere in the narrative. Include some description of the purpose and need for that parking lot given the relatively small size of the Clubhouse.
Response: We have revised the clubhouse plan to accommodate sufficient parking to meet code requirements and additional operational demand during peak-season. Additionally, subject to confirmation from staff during the next site plan review period, it is Applicant's intention to remove the overflow/valet lot and eliminate Parcel C from the site plan and plat.
3. The narrative does not include the current and proposed square footage of the Clubhouse and if the former Clubhouse has the same size restaurant so net change is not clear. The traffic study shows a 30,342 SF reduction in the size of the clubhouse (current = 37,504 SF and proposed = 7,162 SF.) This is a significant reduction in size (81% smaller) that should be mentioned and does not match the Clubhouse SF noted on the tabular data on site plan. Please include in the narrative if the existing Clubhouse contains a restaurant and the net change in size of that facility with this project. You may want to mention what is being eliminated from the existing, much larger, clubhouse facility.
Response: The narrative has been revised to include the square footage and use breakdown of the existing and proposed clubhouse.

Traffic Study Comments:

4. This is not presented in a manner that is understandable or reassuring to the public. The conclusion that "As shown in this analysis, both Oaks Clubhouse Drive and W Palm Aire Drive currently operate at LOS 'C' and will continue to operate at LOS 'C' after the Oaks at Palm Aire project is fully built." should be right after the tables showing the V/C ratio and a column should be added to that table for the LOS standard the V/C ratio represents.
Response: Traffic Impact Analysis has been revised accordingly.

5. A further explanation of the traffic counts, when they were taken and how and what those numbers mean to the lay person would be a good addition to the study.

Response: Traffic Impact Analysis has been revised accordingly.

6. The average daily and AM/PM peak hour tables are not clear. The reduction in trips from the previous Clubhouse due to its smaller size and whether or not the proposed restaurant reduces the trip reduction of the smaller Clubhouse should be presented in the analysis even if it is not included in the traffic impact as it's likely that clubhouse was not fully utilized and generating more traffic than expected from the newer facility.

Response: According to the 11th Edition (latest) of the Trip Generation Manual from the Institute of Transportation Engineers, Clubhouse is not a Land Use associated with a trip generation rate/equation. Clubhouses are considered accessory uses associated to Golf Courses where trip generation rates/equations for golf courses are calculated based on the number of holes or the number of acres associated with the golf course. Therefore, for trip generation purposes and according to the latest ITE Trip Generation manual, the size of the clubhouse does not change the number of trips associated with the golf course. Consequently, for simplification purposes, as part of a conservative analysis and to make it easier to understand, the traffic analysis assumes that having a smaller club house will not generate less trips. Exhibit 2 includes a copy of the ITE trip generation rates/equations for Golf Courses showing that trip generation for golf courses is calculated based on number of holes or acreage and not based on the size of the clubhouse.

7. The Daily Traffic total should be shown in Table 1 not Table 2.

Response: The Daily Traffic total is not shown in Table 1, it is shown in Table 2. Table 1 shows Daily, AM and PM trip generation rates from the latest edition (11th Edition) of the trip generation manual from the Institute of Transportation Engineers used to calculate the trip generation of the proposed development. Table 2 shows the net Daily, AM and PM peak trips potentially generated due to the proposed development.

8. Table 2 should have the peak hour trip generation rates (0.37 per unit AM and 0.39 per unit PM) with the total math before the In/Out split. Without that, you can't back out the math.

Response: Traffic Impact Analysis has been revised accordingly to show the total peak hour traffic before the In/Out split and to show the math calculating the number of trips potentially generated by the proposed project.

Zoning Division - Pamela Stanton | pamela.stanton@copbfl.com

1. See site plan submittal PZ 23-12000017 for all site plan comments.

Response: Acknowledged.

2. No objection to the allocation of Flex units.

Response: Acknowledged.

Landscape Division - Wade Collum | wade.collum@copbfl.com

1. Comments will be rendered at time of site plan submittal. Provide landscape plans in accordance with 155.5203.

Response: Acknowledged.

Engineering Department - David McGirr | david.mcgirr@copbfl.com

1. No Comments.

Response: Acknowledged.

Fire Department - Jim Galloway | jim.galloway@copbfl.com

1. This P&Z application is able to meet all of the Fire Department requirements at this time for FLEX REQUEST APPROVAL 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.

Response: Acknowledged.

2. Review Status: Review Complete pending Development Order.

Response: Acknowledged.

*Additional comments may follow throughout the remainder of the permitting process. The buildings shall follow All NFPA Standards prior to receiving Fire Department approval.

Solid Waste & Recycling - Beth Dubow | Beth.dubow@copbfl.com

1. The Environmental Services Department has no objections to the proposed flex request. The site plan submitted with this application appears to have multiple issues with regard to garbage collection.

Response: Acknowledged.

Building Division - James DeMars | james.demars@copbfl.com

1. No response necessary.

Response: Acknowledged.

BSO- Anthony Russo | Anthony_Russo@sheriff.org

1. Review Complete pending Development Order.

Response: Acknowledged.

*** ATTENTION IMPORTANT ***

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.

Response: Acknowledged.

*** 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.

Response: Acknowledged.

*** Attention important ***

As per code 155.2407.e.9., at the time of site plan submittal, the CPTED security strengthening drawing plan and separate CPTED security strengthening drawing plan narrative shall both be submitted as part of the requirements for site plan review and approval.

Response: Acknowledged.

Plan Reviewer: Kimberly Vazquez | kimberly.vazquez@copbfl.com

1. This project is not within the CRA District.

Response: Acknowledged.

Utilities

Reviewer- Nathaniel Watson

1. Review Complete pending Development Order

Response: Acknowledged.

2. Please note that additional comments may be forthcoming based on the site plan review process.

Response: Acknowledged.

3. The City of Pompano Beach Utilities Dept. has no comment at this time with regard to the requested flex allocation for the subject property.

Response: Acknowledged.