

[Flags] Control No: 1981-00190

Project Manager: LFUSTER

Application No: ZV/DOA/CA-2017-00572

Comments On Application

<u>Agency</u>	<u>Date Entered</u>	Comments and Responses Version 6 as on 7/12/2017 11:35:02 AM	Resolved	<u>Issue</u>
AIRPORTS	03/16/2017	1. The project reviewer is Wil A Hicks from the Airports, who can be contacted at 561-471-7462, Whicks@pbia.org to discuss these comments. <u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
BLDG	03/16/2017	1. The project reviewer is Brett Carlton from the Building Division, who can be contacted at 561-233-5098, BCarlton@pbcgov.org to discuss these comments. <u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	04/11/2017	No Comments	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	05/01/2017	2. 5 accessible spaces required at learning center parking lot 2014 FBC accessibility table 208.2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	06/30/2017	3. In order to determine how many bathroom fixtures will be required, the building official is asking the DOR to submit the method used for calculating the occupant load for the surf lake. Pease state the location of the location of the bathroom facilities. 2014 FBC 1004 2014 FBC Plumbing 403	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
ERM	03/16/2017	1. The project reviewer is Robert M Kraus from the Environmental Resources Management, who can be contacted at 561-233-2476, BKraus@pbcgov.org to discuss these comments. <u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	03/22/2017	No Comments	<input type="checkbox"/>	
FIRE	03/16/2017	1. The project reviewer is Pedro A Segovia from the Fire Rescue, who can be contacted at 561-233-0054, PSEGOVIA@pbcgov.org to discuss these comments. <u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	04/17/2017	2. Fire department access and water supply for fire protection. <u>Response:</u> Response from last submittal: Based on verbal communication with Pedro Segovia, the PSP has been revised to provide for a fire department turn around area at the eastern portion of the site near the maintenance building. Additionally, a secondary access and loop route which will meet the fire department's requirements as a stabilized base is provided. Finally, the Civil Engineer has provided a fire hydrant exhibit. Please note the PSP has been revised to depict the industrial land area Future Development which is permitted to be processed via the Development Review Process in the future. Thus, that portion of the fire hydrant exhibit was previously provided for informational purposes only.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
LANDDEV	03/16/2017	1. The project reviewer is Bobby P Jagoo from the Land Development, who can be contacted at 561-684-4079, SJagoo@pbcgov.org to discuss these comments. <u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	05/01/2017	2. The 25ft corner clip interior to the property is not needed since the actual 25ft corner is already dedicated as ROW. <u>Response:</u> The site plan has been revised to remove the angled line.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	06/05/2017	3. The 20ft DE parallel to the south property line is label incorrectly on PSP-2.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	06/05/2017	4. The 20ft Access easement along the north property line is not clearly defined. Please use the same line type for the north limit of the easement and show the east termination point.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	06/05/2017	5. The revised traffic volumes does not warrant turn lanes but if the applicant are still proposing them the right turn lane from the site must be a min of 280ft plus a 50ft taper.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	07/05/2017	6. Please verify that all easements along the north property line are accurately shown and labeled.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
LWDD	03/16/2017	1. The project reviewer is Anne Perry from the Lake Worth Drainage District, who can be contacted at , APERRY@LWDD.NET to discuss these comments. <u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	04/27/2017	2. This application has been reviewed by Anne Perry I can be reached at 561-819-5577 and aperry@lwdd.net. COMMENT <u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	04/27/2017	3. The following Lake Worth Drainage District (LWDD) comments are based on the information scanned April 24, 2017. COMMENT <u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	04/27/2017	4. This petition is located outside of LWDD's boundary and LWDD has no comments regarding the referenced petition. COMMENT <u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
PALMTRAN	03/16/2017	1. The project reviewer is Steve T Anderson from the Palm-Tran, who can be contacted at , SANDERSON@pbcgov.org to discuss these comments. <u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	04/04/2017	No Comments	<input type="checkbox"/>	
PARKS	03/16/2017	1. The project reviewer is Jean W Matthews from the Parks and Recreation, who can be contacted at 561-966-6652, JMatthew@pbcgov.org to discuss these comments. <u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.	<input type="checkbox"/>	

	04/07/2017	2. The Palm Beach County Parks and Recreation Department supports the expansion of recreational opportunities in the count. <u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
PLAN	03/16/2017	1. The project reviewer is Francis Forman from the Planning, who can be contacted at 561-233-5335, fforman@pbcgov.org to discuss these comments. <u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	06/06/2017	2. Per Bryan Davis, Principal Planner, comments (if any) will be based on the finalized ULDC Language. <u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	06/06/2017	3. Awaiting status of NOPC, re: Park of Commerce DRI, from DEO/TCRPC. <u>Response:</u> The applicant is still discussing the use with DEO and will provide additional documentation in the follow up submittal.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
PREM	03/16/2017	1. The project reviewer is Peter K Banting from the Property Real Estate Management, who can be contacted at 561-233-0213, PBanting@pbcgov.org to discuss these comments. <u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	04/13/2017	No Comments	<input type="checkbox"/>	
SCHOOL	03/28/2017	No Comments	<input type="checkbox"/>	
SURVEY	03/16/2017	1. The project reviewer is Gary S Wheeler from the Survey, who can be contacted at 561-684-4056, GWheeler@pbcgov.org to discuss these comments. <u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	04/10/2017	2. The following Division/Department comments and/or certification issues are based on the documents dated 03/15/2017. It's the responsibility of your office to maintain either, a Title policy, Title Commitment, Title Report, Abstract or opinion of Title referenced on the Survey that is current to within one year during the application process. <u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	04/10/2017	3. No comments or certification issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	05/02/2017	4. The following Division/Department comments and/or certification issues are based on the documents dated 04/24/2017. <u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	05/02/2017	5. Provide the a Boundary Survey or create a Legal description and sketch to support the 1322.17 acre PIPD Master Site Plan for this Application. <u>Response:</u> These are being included in this submittal.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	05/02/2017	6. Revise the Master Site Plan boundary to be in accordance with overall boundary survey or Legal and Sketch requested above. <u>Response:</u> The master plan has been revised to be consistent with the legal and sketch included in this submittal.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	05/02/2017	7. Provide a Digital File of the Legal Description that supports the PIPD Survey for this Application in a 'Word' or 'Text' format. <u>Response:</u> The legal description in word is included with this submittal.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	06/05/2017	8. The above un-resolved and following Division/Department comments and/or certification issues are based on the documents dated 05/26/2017. <u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	06/05/2017	9. Provide a Boundary Survey of the subdivided site in accordance with current Florida Standards of Practice that supports the PIA amendment request. Survey must support the final sub-division plan for this application and must reference the Title Policy/Abstract, Easement and Right-of-way status current to within one year. The boundary survey will require a vesting legal description for the overall site with an "Also Know as" Legal Description for the proposed east and west subdivision parcels that shows all information referenced in the new individual parcel Legal descriptions submitted, Label the new parcel Boundary's and provide a separate area for each on the map sheet of survey. Update the Site and Subdivision plan boundaries as necessary. <u>Response:</u> A boundary survey was submitted with the original submittal. A revised subdivision plan will be processed after the zoning entitlements are obtained through the DRO process. The applicant submitted legal descriptions of the proposed lots as requested with the last submittal.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	06/30/2017	10. The above un-resolved and following Division/Department comments and/or certification issues are based on the documents dated 06/26/2017.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	06/30/2017	11. The Legal and Sketch does not appear to close based on the information referenced on the map sheet. Ran the closure twice and unable to determine area of misclosure. Please provide evidence of closure with the resubmittal.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	06/30/2017	12. The Master Site Plan Boundary Dimensions are inconsistent with the PIPD legal description and sketch. Revise the Dimension Along the North Line on the Master Plan.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
TRAFFIC	03/16/2017	1. The project reviewer is Dominique Simeus from the Traffic Engineering, who can be contacted at , DSimeus@pbcgov.org to discuss these comments. <u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment

	04/05/2017	2. If there will be special events, please provide information on those (frequency, timings, attendance, trips, traffic mitigation plans, etc.)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	04/28/2017	3. Comments below are based on re-submittal dated April 24, 2017	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
		<u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.		
	04/28/2017	4. Condition of approval will be added to construct the following turn lanes: a) A south approach right turn lane on Seminole Pratt at the project driveway. b) A westbound left turn lane for the outbound movement at the project's driveway.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
		<u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.		
	04/28/2017	5. Condition of approval will be added to extend the north approach left turn lane at the intersection of Beeline Highway and Pratt Whitney to a minimum of 570 feet.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	04/28/2017	6. Condition of approval will be imposed for the applicant to use deputies for traffic/crowd control during special events which shall be limited to three times per year in accordance to Article 4 Chapter B Section 1.124 of the Unified Land Development Code with a maximum of 5,000 attendees.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	05/31/2017	7. Provide detailed description of the estimate of special events spectator/traffic and how the traffic would be handled, including parking for the spectators.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	06/02/2017	8. When properly rounded the values to the nearest whole number, the SBL turn lane at the intersection of Beeline Hwy and Pratt Whitney should be extended by 570 feet not 490 feet. Please revise the study to make the correction accordingly.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	07/03/2017	9. Comment below is based on re-submittal dated 6/26/2017	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	07/03/2017	10. The proposed storage length as stated on page 3 of the study should be 570 feet minimum not 500 feet.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
ZONING	04/14/2017	1. The Project Manager for this application is Lorraine Fuster. Please contact her at 233-5240 or lfuster@pbcgov.org if you have any questions on the comments/certification issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
		<u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.		
	04/14/2017	2. RESPONSE: All responses to the DRO comment/certification issues must be provided by the applicant in a written form, electronically. The applicant must provide a copy of the Plans with the revisions or any additional changes made from the previous submittal. All these revisions must be clearly delineated or highlighted on the Plans.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
		<u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.		
	04/14/2017	3. CERTIFICATION/APPROVAL: All certification issues must be resolved prior to placement of application on the DRO Agenda for Final Approval or Certification for Public Hearing.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
		<u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.		
	04/14/2017	4. The Zoning Division recommends that Applicant(s)/Agent(s) contact neighborhood organizations at least sixty (60) days prior to ZC/BCC Hearings.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
		<u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.		
	04/14/2017	5. ULDC AMENDMENT: The Agent is submitting for a PIA that will contain language for the specifics as related to the proposed project. Until Staff evaluates this request for consistency with the approved and final ULDC language, this application cannot be final approved, and/or at a minimum, certified for public hearing.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
		<u>Response:</u> As of Friday, June 23, 2017, the applicant was still in discussions with staff and the direction to date is that the area for the use should be designated as a Recreation Pod within the PIPD and the application has been revised in that regard. It is anticipated that refined revisions to the proposed text changes will be included in the follow up submittal for this request.		
	04/14/2017	6. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW: Be advised that Arch Review Condition of Approval 1 requires the submittal of the elevations for all buildings at the time of final DRO approval.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
		<u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.		
	04/17/2017	7. PRP: Please provide a Preliminary Regulating Plan for review. It should include the Tree Disposition Chart for the native vegetation on site.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	04/17/2017	8. PRP: Will you be providing a Preliminary Regulating Plan with the typical details for staff review during the public hearing review process? If you do, please include the buffer details, specifically, but not limited to the Type III Incompatibility buffer as required per Code.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	04/17/2017	9. ONSITE VEGETATION: All trees that are to be preserved in place must be shown on the PSP. Please revise accordingly. The tree disposition chart must be in the format approved by Staff. Please let me know if you need the template for the tree disposition chart.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	04/17/2017	10. ONSITE VEGETATION: There are a significant amount of native vegetation on site. Have you coordinated a meeting with ERM/Landscaping/Zoning for further evaluation of the site for vegetation preservation? All vegetative preserved will be subject to the Vegetative Protection Barricade conditions of approval.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	04/17/2017	11. JUSTIFICATION STATEMENT: Please include the responses to the requirements of Article 3, PDD's for the exemplary design and design objectives. Clearly indicate what you are proposing to comply with these requirements.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	04/17/2017	12. PSP: Re-label the "Perimeter Buffer" to be a Type 3 Incompatibility Buffer".	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue

04/17/2017	13. PPP: Please provide a Preliminary Phasing Plan for the phases outlined in the PSP. The project indicates that there are two phases. The phasing plan should clearly outline the improvements proposed for each phase.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
04/17/2017	14. PSP: The plans indicate that both 50,000 sq. ft. buildings are to be all flex space (100,000 sq. ft. total). Where in the ULDC does it indicate that all the square footage can be used for flex space?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
04/17/2017	15. PSP and ULDC AMENDMENT: This application has a tandem ULDC Amendment that is under review by the Code Revision Section. Be advised that because the Zoning Application is being reviewed at the same time, that additional comments will be forthcoming as the project is reviewed alongside the ULDC Amendment. The Zoning Application cannot be certified for public hearing until it is compliance with the current ULDC and the proposed ULDC Amendment.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
04/17/2017	16. PSP: The use requires access from a Collector or Arterial road. Demonstrate compliance with this requirement. (staff acknowledges that this is included in the proposed PIA).	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	<u>Response:</u> At the aforementioned meeting, it was determined that the parcel will plat and provide an 80 foot collector roadway, which the use will access from. However, the PIA may also address this code requirement for clarity and currently proposes to do so.		
04/17/2017	17. PSP: Clarify the tier the property is located in.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	<u>Response:</u> The Park has historically been treated as if in the U/S tier due to the LUSA designation.		
04/17/2017	18. PREVIOUS CERTIFICATION ISSUE: JUSTIFICATION STATEMENT: The Justification Statement indicates there will be solar energy provided for the facility which will be designed at the time of DRO. How and where will this equipment be and how does it affect the site design and layout? NOTE: If there is any changes the request will have to be process via full DRO.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
04/17/2017	19. LETTER: Please provide written confirmation from TCRPC that the proposed changes are not a substantial deviation to the DRI.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
04/17/2017	20. JUSTIFICATION STATEMENT: The Justification Statement indicates that the Application will be seeking DRO Approval of a Type II Excavation based on the determination that this is a POOL. This must be re-evaluated depending on the findings and conclusion of the use. Because this "POOL" is still under review, the Type II Excavation may be considered a Type III Excavation which is a Class A Conditional Use approval process.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
04/17/2017	21. JUSTIFICATION STATEMENT: The Justification Statement indicates that a minimum of 10 percent of the excavated material will be removed form the site. Is there a maximum?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
04/17/2017	22. WETLANDS: Has it been evaluated if the proposed stormwater detention area will affect the adjacent conservation area to the north? Will it cause a drawdown of groundwater into this area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	<u>Response:</u> The project engineer has been coordinating with ERM in this regard and has not identified any drawdown issues.		
04/17/2017	23. PSP: Please cross check the dimensions of the property with the dimensions as contained in the approved Master Site Plan. There appears to be some discrepancies, therefore; please revise accordingly.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
04/17/2017	24. JUSTIFICATION STATEMENT: The Applicant is requesting to have the elevations reviewed at the time of Final DRO. Please be advised that this requirement is also an Architectural Condition of Approval that the elevations for the buildings be submitted at time of final DRO approval. The Justification Statement also indicates that the project is phased, however; the elevations of these buildings may have to be submitted at the same time.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
04/17/2017	25. PSP: The site data table indicates two parcels. When will a Subdivision Plan be submitted to divide the lots? Are you processing a revision to the Master Site Plan as well?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	<u>Response:</u> Per the May 24, 2017 meeting, it was determined that the parcel will be subdivided. This will be done via an amendment to the approved final subdivision plan through the DRO process. It's the master plan has not historically been required to depict subdivision plats, however, if bearings and distances are required to be depicted as part of the administrative final subdivision plan process, the master plan will be revised in conjunction with that process.		
04/17/2017	26. PSP: Clearly indicate the foundation planting areas and the total areas for both required and proposed for each building.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
04/17/2017	27. PSP: There is a 20 ft. Fire Access along the drainage easement. Is this a stabilized area? Confirm that there are no conflicts with this access being along the easement.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
04/17/2017	28. PSP: Re-label the CG and OG "Pods" to be CG and IG "Use Zones".	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	<u>Response:</u> Now labeled as Recreation Pod per current code language.		
04/17/2017	29. PSP: Clearly indicate the setback of all buildings to the nearest property lines. In some cases, some of the buildings may require the setback to be shown on two sides of the building when adjacent to two close property lines.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
04/17/2017	30. PSP: There is a label that indicates mechanical equipment for the waves. How tall is this equipment and will there be a requirement to screen it?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue

	<u>Response:</u> In addition to our previous response to this comment, the site plan has been amended, including the cross-section detail of the buffer north of the lagoon. The lagoon will now be constructed with a retaining wall type foundation and in addition to the five foot wide compatibility buffer for the Recreation Pod, 20 additional feed of landscaped area is proposed adjacent to/immediately north of the lagoon to provide additional buffering.		
04/17/2017	31. ONGOING DISCUSSION: There is a tandem PIA submitted which is under review. Be advised that additional comments will be forthcoming based on any conflicting language as the review process of the Zoning Application moves forward.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	<u>Response:</u> Acknowledged.		
04/17/2017	32. ONGOING DISCUSSION-USE APPROVAL: There is a conflict on the use approval of a pool vs. lake vs. pond, etc. The reviewing Agencies are still reviewing the issue on the correct procedure for permitting of the use.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	<u>Response:</u> Acknowledged - although the request reflects the facility as a 'lagoon'.		
06/07/2017	33. PREVIOUS CERTIFICATION ISSUE: ULDC AMENDMENT: The Agent is submitting for a PIA that will contain language for the specifics as related to the proposed project. Until Staff evaluates this request for consistency with the approved and final ULDC language, this application cannot be final approved, and/or at a minimum, certified for public hearing. Response: Please see latest PIA submittal made to the Code Revision Section on May 8, 2017. A meeting was held on May 24, 2017 which may result in changes to the approach as directed by staff. Any revisions to the text amendment request will be included in the next zoning application submittal. However, as they are not final, the justification statement submitted herewith continues to contain the original CG Pod approach.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
06/07/2017	34. PREVIOUS ISSUE: PRP: Please provide a Preliminary Regulating Plan for review. It should include the Tree Disposition Chart for the native vegetation on site. Response: A regulation plan has been submitted inclusive of the regulating plan. This also contains a typical sign detail and the proposed Alternative Roadway Section as discussed in the May 24, 2017 meeting with Land Development Staff. NOTE: The Tree Disposition Chart submitted is missing information. -Please note that it is a chart and it should not be called or added as a Tree Disposition Plan. - Please note that Palms should be measured by Clear Trunk or Gray Wood not by DBH therefore another column should be added to the chart. -Please add a column to the chart for the common name of the tree and one for the scientific name.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
06/07/2017	35. PREVIOUS CERTIFICATION ISSUE:PRP: Will you be providing a Preliminary Regulating Plan with the typical details for staff review during the public hearing review process? If you do, please include the buffer details, specifically, but not limited to the Type III Incompatibility buffer as required per Code. Response: A PRP has been provide but the buffer detail has not been added awaiting the determination that has been made for a zoning interpretation in regard to the wall requirement as the 2006 approval which added this land area to the DRI did not require the wall.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
06/07/2017	36. PREVIOUS CERTIFICATION ISSUE: ONSITE VEGETATION: All trees that are to be preserved in place must be shown on the PSP. Please revise accordingly. The tree disposition chart must be in the format approved by Staff. Please let me know if you need the template for the tree disposition chart. Response: EPT - Existing Tree Plan has been submitted which depicts the site plan overlaid on the tree survey. Further coordination will take place with ERM and Landscape prior to the next resubmittal.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
06/07/2017	37. PREVIOUS CERTIFICATION ISSUE: ONSITE VEGETATION: There are a significant amount of native vegetation on site. Have you coordinated a meeting with ERM/Landscaping/Zoning for further evaluation of the site for vegetation preservation? All vegetative preserved will be subject to the Vegetative Protection Barricade conditions of approval. Response: ERM, Landscape and Zoning were all in attendance at the May 24, 2017 meeting. It is anticipated another meeting will take place after staff has had a chance to review the plans and engineering becomes further refined.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
06/07/2017	38. PREVIOUS CERTIFICATION ISSUE: : PSP: Re-label the "Perimeter Buffer" to be a Type 3 Incompatibility Buffer". Response: At this time the applicant has elected to request an interpretation in this regard and will address with the next resubmittal. NOTE: The Type 3 Incompatibility Buffer is a ULDC requirement.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
06/07/2017	39. PREVIOUS CERTIFICATION ISSUE: PSP and ULDC AMENDMENT: This application has a tandem ULDC Amendment that is under review by the Code Revision Section. Be advised that because the Zoning Application is being reviewed at the same time, that additional comments will be forthcoming as the project is reviewed alongside the ULDC Amendment. The Zoning Application cannot be certified for public hearing until it is compliance with the current ULDC and the proposed ULDC Amendment. Response: As discussed at the larger May 24, 2017 meeting with staff, it was confirmed this project will be processed concurrently with the Privately Initiated ULDC text amendment. The applicant understand additional comments may be forthcoming as the text amendment is further refined.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
06/07/2017	40. PREVIOUS CERTIFICATION ISSUE: JUSTIFICATION STATEMENT: The Justification Statement indicates there will be solar energy provided for the facility which will be designed at the time of DRO. How and where will this equipment be and how does it affect the site design and layout? Response: The use of solar is a	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue

		DRO approval and not part of this request as the final design has not yet been determined. This will be addressed in final DRO and the applicant understand this, along with the requirement to submit architectural elevations, will result in the Off the Board approval process not being available to the applicant. NOTE: Be advise that the use of solar panels may trigger the application to Public Hearing. Staff understands the final design is not completed, but applicant must include on propose site plan the solar equipment with screening details for proper review. If applicant can't address this issue at this moment, then all references to the solar energy equipment must be remove from the Justification Statement and all documents.		
06/07/2017	41.	PREVIOUS CERTIFICATION ISSUE: PSP: The site data table indicates two parcels. When will a Subdivision Plan be submitted to divide the lots? Are you processing a revision to the Master Site Plan as well? Response: A subdivision plan will be processed in the future to amend the current approved subdivision plan. A revised master plan accompanies this request.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
06/07/2017	42.	PREVIOUS ISSUE: PSP: Re-label the CG and OG "Pods" to be CG and IG "Use Zones". Response:Per the recent ULDC changes, they are now referred to as "Pods" and the plans reflect such.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
06/07/2017	43.	PREVIOUS CERTIFICATION ISSUE: PSP: There is a label that indicates mechanical equipment for the waves. How tall is this equipment and will there be a requirement to screen it? Response: The wave tract will be approximately 10 feet in height. However, the applicant is of the opinion that it does not qualify as mechanical equipment under the ULDC definition as it does not relate to water supply, drainage, heating, ventilating, electrical, air conditioning, etc. Additionally, it is anticipated with the setback of approximately 60 feet from the north property line and the required buffer planting material, as well as the amount of mitigation that is anticipated for the site, the tract will not be visible to the users of the natural area. All actual mechanical equipment to create the wave will be located within the mechanical buildings themselves. NOTE: May be require foundation planting around building.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
06/07/2017	44.	PREVIOUS CERTIFICATION ISSUE: JUSTIFICATION STATEMENT: The Justification Statement indicates that the Application will be seeking DRO Approval of a Type II Excavation based on the determination that this is a POOL. This must be re-evaluated depending on the findings and conclusion of the use. Because this "POOL" is still under review, the Type II Excavation may be considered a Type III Excavation which is a Class A Conditional Use approval process. Response: This was discussed with ERM at the May 24, 2017 meeting and they indicated they have reviewed the justification statement and had no comment on our request to remove more than 10% of the excavation of the storm water management lake from the site. Past discussions with ERM was that the 'digging' of the lake was not considered 'excavation'. Applicant acknowledges the building permitting and health dept. nomenclature in regard to the facility needs to be addressed and is working with a consultant to schedule a meeting.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
07/05/2017	45.	PREVIOUS CERTIFICATION ISSUE: PRP: Please provide a Preliminary Regulating Plan for review. It should include the Tree Disposition Chart for the native vegetation on site. Response: A regulation plan has been submitted inclusive of the regulating plan. This also contains a typical sign detail and the proposed Alternative Roadway Section as discussed in the May 24, 2017 meeting with Land Development Staff. NOTE: The Tree Disposition Chart submitted is missing information. -Please note that it is a chart and it should not be called or added as a Tree Disposition Plan. -Please add a column to the chart for the common name of the tree and one for the scientific name. -Trees and Pines shall be measured using Diameter at Breast Height (DBH) in inches (DBH is measured at 4.5 feet above grade); - Palms shall be measured by height of trunk in feet, either Clear Trunk or Grey wood depends on the species of the palm. SEE Technical Manual Title 4.C.1, Tree Disposition Chart (Page 8)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
07/05/2017	46.	PREVIOUS CERTIFICATION ISSUE: LETTER: Please provide written confirmation from TCRPC that the proposed changes are not a substantial deviation to the DRI. Response:Additional confirmation is being requested and will be provided in the follow up submittal.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
07/06/2017	47.	PSP-1: Please label all 8 ft in front setback and in all documents.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
07/06/2017	48.	PRP: Please indicate with an X in the Tree Disposition Chart the type of tree. ERM Tree: are under the jurisdiction of ERM pursuant to Art.14; Zoning Tree: Trees that are under the jurisdiction of Zoning pursuant to Art.7;ERM or Zoning Tree. See Technical Manual, 4.C.1 Tree Disposition Chart (Page 8)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
07/06/2017	49.	PRP: Verify the Tree Disposition Chart, Trees and Pines shall be measured using Diameter at Breast Height (DBH) in inches (DBH is measured at 4.5 feet above grade); and Palms shall be measured by height of trunk in feet, either Clear Trunk or Grey wood depends on the species of the palm. See Technical Manual, 4.C.1 Tree Disposition Chart (Page 8)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
07/06/2017	50.	PRP: All preserve trees must be shown on the Site Plan.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
07/06/2017	51.	ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW: Applicant must demonstrate compliance with the Code requirement of minimum lot Frontage.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
07/06/2017	52.	ARCHITECTURAL: Please be advise of Barbed Wire, Exceptions and Regulations: The use of barbed wire is prohibited except in some particular instances. The	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment

County recognizes that barbed wire may be necessary to secure certain non-residential uses or structures. Please verify the use on the ULDC Article 5.B.1.A.2 Fences and Walls for compliance. SEE ULDC Article 5.B.1.A.2 (Page 15)

07/06/2017	53. TREE DISPOSITION PLAN: The Tree Disposition plan is not a requirement, all preserved trees on site must be shown on the Site Plan.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
07/06/2017	54. PSP-3: Please provide in all documents, typical parking dimension an typical interior dimensions. Label all parking spaces.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue