

Comments On Application

Agency	Date Entered	Comments and Responses Version 4 as on 11/5/2010 1:16:27 PM	Resolved	Issu
ARCHREV	08/13/2010	The following comments are based on plans prepared by Urban Design Kilday Studios, dated July 21, 2010.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
		<u>Response:</u> Noted		
	08/13/2010	The Architectural Review Project Manager for this project is D.G. McGuire. Please contact your Mr. McGuire should you wish to review these comments. Mr. McGuire's direct dial telephone number is 561-233-5222.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
		<u>Response:</u> Noted		
ARCHREV	08/13/2010	Additional comments and/or approval issues may be forthcoming pending the review of additional materials and/or re-submittals.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
		<u>Response:</u> Noted		
	08/13/2010	As the individual buildings do not trigger the thresholds, the proposed request is not subject to Article 5.C Architectural Review of the Unified Land Development Code (ULDC).	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
		<u>Response:</u> Noted		
ATTY	08/03/2010	The contact for the County Attorney's Office is Lil Walesky - paralegal; phone (561) 355-3676; email ldwalesk@pbcgov.org	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
		<u>Response:</u> Noted		
	08/03/2010	No certification issues.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
		<u>Response:</u> Noted		
BLDG	08/04/2010	FYI comment - Project may be subject to Fair Housing Code for Multi-family dwellings depending on designs and Accessibility code for clubhouse/pool (if applicable). These will be reviewed on subdivision plan application. Reviewer - Joe Rosselot 561-233-5117	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
		<u>Response:</u> Noted		
	10/07/2010	No comments based on 9/27/10 re-submittals.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
		<u>Response:</u> Noted		
BLDG	11/02/2010	No new comment based on 10/25/10 re-submittal. Reviewer - Joe Rosselot 561-233-5117	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
		<u>Response:</u> Noted		
ERM	08/03/2010	No Comments	<input type="checkbox"/>	
LANDDEV	08/09/2010	This application has been reviewed by Bobby Jagoo. Bobby can be reached at (561)684-4079 and Sjagoo@pbcgov.org.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
		<u>Response:</u> Noted		
	08/09/2010	According to the drainage statement, "no lakes or canal are proposed to be filled". After review of the conceptual site plan it appears that there are portions of the L-49 canal and some onsite lakes will be affected by the lot configuration.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
		<u>Response:</u> A revised drainage statement was submitted on September 27, 2010 to address this issue.		
	09/29/2010	Property will have to be Replatted according to article 11 of the ULDC.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
		<u>Response:</u> Noted		
	09/29/2010	Show traffic counts at the entrances on the site plan.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
		<u>Response:</u> The Subdivision / Site Plans currently show the proposed ADT's at each of the proposed pod entrances.		
	09/29/2010	If gated show the location of the gates, in conformance with Land Development Standards.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
		<u>Response:</u> UDKS has revised the Site Plan to show proposed gate locations.		
09/29/2010	Please provide a detail plan 1:100 scale for the master plan or 1:60 scale for the DRO site plan, that shows turning radii. ROW lines, dimensions etc.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue	
	<u>Response:</u> The Master Plan is a modification to a previously approved Master Plan. Per the direction of the Zoning Division, UDKS is proposing to use the existing format of the drawing. The Site Plans and Subdivision Plans are currently shown at 1:100 scale. These drawings are submitted as "informational purposes" drawings during the DOA application process. Upon submittal for Final Site Plan / Subdivision Plan approval, they be modified to meet the Technical Manual Requirements.			
09/29/2010	Further comments may be forthcoming pending review of revised siteplan.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment	
	<u>Response:</u> Noted			
09/30/2010	Show traffic counts at the intersections of SW 18th St & Camino Del Mar, Camino Real & Camino Del Mar and SW 18th St & Military Trl.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue	

		<u>Response:</u> This information will be provided at Final DRO.		
	09/30/2010	Show street centerline radii conforming to Land Development minimum standards based on the width of the proposed right of way.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
		<u>Response:</u> This information will be provided at Final DRO.		
LWDD	08/05/2010	This application has been reviewed by Anne Perry; I can be reached at 561-819-5577 and anneperry@lwdd.net. COMMENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	08/05/2010	The following Lake Worth Drainage District (LWDD) comments are based on the site plan and survey scanned July 21, 2010. COMMENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	08/05/2010	This petition is located on the south side of LWDD's L-49 Canal, the west side of the E-3 Canal, and the north side of the L-50 Canal and is adjacent to all three canals. COMMENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	11/01/2010	This application has been reviewed by Nicole Smith; I can be reached at 561-819-5577 and nicolesmith@lwdd.net. COMMENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	11/01/2010	The following Lake Worth Drainage District (LWDD) comments are based on the site plan and other documents scanned September 27, 2010. COMMENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	11/01/2010	Prior to site plan approval LWDD will require all recording information per ORB 2217 PG 311, ORB 2217 PG 314, and ORB 2336 PG 998 to be shown on the Survey and Site Plan. DRO: LWDD-ENG	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	11/01/2010	Prior to site plan approval LWDD will require the three (3) LWDD Canals be shown on the Site Plan and Survey and all three canals must be labeled, tied to a horizontal control, either sectional or plat, and dimensioned as well as all recording information referenced above be shown on the Site Plan. DRO: LWDD-ENG	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	11/01/2010	Prior to site plan approval LWDD will require signed and sealed canal-cross Sections for E-3, L-49 and L-50 Canals. The cross-sections must extend 50 feet beyond both sides of top of bank, and they are to be tied to an accepted horizontal control, either sectional or plat. The cross-sections shall delineate all features that may be relevant, (i.e. buildings, edge of pavement, curbs, sidewalks, guardrails, grade breaks etc.). The cross-sections shall be a maximum of three hundred feet apart, and a minimum of three cross sections is required. The cross-sections are to be plotted at 1"=10', both horizontal and vertical for small canals, and 1"=20' for large canals. All tract and/or lot lines, block lines, sections lines and easements shall be clearly depicted showing existing LWDD right of way. Elevations shall be based on the NGVD (29) datum, with a conversion factor to NAVD (88) must be shown. The cross-sections will be used to determine if LWDD will need to have the applicant convey an easement back to LWDD. DRO: LWDD-ENG	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	11/01/2010	LWDD has no objection to the certification of this petition. COMMENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
PARKS	10/01/2010	Do not include the landscape buffers in recreation area acreage calculations.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	10/01/2010	Do not include landscape buffers, canal easements, dry retention areas in neighborhood park acreage calculations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	10/01/2010	Provide an aerial showing each individual pod within Boca Del Mar, labeling the project name, number of dwelling units, resolution number, and recreation acreage and amenities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
		<u>Response:</u> Per ongoing discussions with Zoning Staff, UDKS has revised the Boca Del Mar Master Plan to include site data, which depicts required and provided recreation area for the overall PUD.		
PLAN	09/30/2010	The site is located within the Urban/Suburban Tier and has a future land use (FLU) designation of High Residential 8 units per acre (HR-8).	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
		<u>Response:</u> Noted		
	09/30/2010	The Planning Division has reviewed the request to modify the master plan, add 390 units and add access points and has found it to be consistent with the Land Use designation of the comprehensive Plan.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
		<u>Response:</u> Noted		
	09/30/2010	Within one mile of and the future annexation area of: City of Boca Raton.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
		<u>Response:</u> Noted		
	10/27/2010	Revise the Justification Statement and the site plan to identify which one of the available 3 options for the WHP will be utilized per ULDC Article 5.G.1.C. (Page 64) Development Options.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
PREM	07/30/2010	No Comments	<input type="checkbox"/>	

SCHOOL	07/26/2010	The following School District comments and/or certification issues are based on the documents dated 07/21/2010.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
		<u>Response:</u> Noted		
	07/26/2010	The project reviewer is Michael Owens from the School District's Planning Department and he can be reached at 561-434-8962 to discuss the following comments.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
		<u>Response:</u> Noted		
	07/26/2010	Please be advised that school age children may not be assigned to the public school closest to their residences. School Board policies regarding levels of service or other boundary policy decisions affect school boundaries.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
		<u>Response:</u> Noted		
SURVEY	08/12/2010	The project reviewer is Glenn Mark from Survey, who can be contacted at 561-684-4054 to discuss the following comments.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
		<u>Response:</u> Noted		
	08/12/2010	The Survey Staff relies on the Zoning Division to verify that a paper copy of each digital Survey to be reviewed by this office is signed, sealed and filed prior to being attached to ePZB.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
		<u>Response:</u> Noted		
	08/12/2010	Provide and legal description and sketch of the overall Boca Del Mar PUD to support the Master Plan for this project.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	08/12/2010	Master Plan and Site Plan boundaries must be completely dimension in accordance with the legal description requested and the boundary survey provided.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
		<u>Response:</u> The boundary information has been added to the Master Plan based on the sketch and legal description. The Site Plan references the survey information.		
	08/12/2010	The acreage referenced on the Site Plan does not agree with the Boundary Survey.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	08/12/2010	The items of conflict noted in the Surveyor's Report (Item 2B, C, D & E) must be resolved prior to any approval from this office.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	08/12/2010	Bearing Base Reference must refer to a well-established monumented line shown on the map sheet of the Survey. Identify the control point or position being used on the cited line and label the bearing as "grid" or "assumed".	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	08/12/2010	Identify the control point or who's position is being held at all of the Government Corners shown on the map sheet of the Survey. "Found Brass Disk in Cutout", who's brass disk?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	08/12/2010	Show or note a comparison between field measured directions and distances with plat directions and distances on the map sheet of the Survey.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	08/12/2010	Identify, leader and label the existing right-of-way record information for the adjacent roadways and canals on the map sheet of the Survey.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	08/12/2010	Provide direct line ties between the Tracts and to the Government Corners shown on the Survey. Also identify, tie and label a pair of PRM's from the parent plat on the map sheet of the Survey.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	08/12/2010	Due to the number and nature of these Certification Issues additional Certification Issues or Comments may be forthcoming.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
		<u>Response:</u> Noted		
	10/01/2010	The above un-resolved and following Division/Department comments and/or certification issues are based on the documents dated 09/27/10.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	<u>Response:</u> Noted			
10/01/2010	No revised documents for the site were provided for this office to review. We are currently looking at an interim legal description and sketch for the overall PUD and will have comments shortly.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment	
	<u>Response:</u> UDKS has submitted revised Surveys on 10-25-10.			
11/01/2010	The Master Plan has dimensions missing along the most southwesterly parcel line north of the Hillsboro Canal (S 89 30' 38"W 1366.67') and the northerly line of that parcel adjacent to Power Line Road. (S 89 28'02"W, 993.74')	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue	
11/01/2010	The legal and sketch provided for the overall Boca Del Mar PUD specifically on sheet 10 of 15 shows the correct shaded less out property as determined by the zoning official at our interim meeting. However, the acreage indicated on the sketch for the Southeast Quarter of the North Half of Section 35 is incorrect. Please revise accordingly.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue	
11/01/2010	The acreage totals on the Survey Sketch and Legal for the overall PUD appear to be rounded to the nearest tenth of an acre. Revise acreage totals to the nearest hundredth of an acre. Also make sure that the Master Plan area is consistent with the revised Survey.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue	

TRAFFIC	08/11/2010	On Traffic Study Figure 6, provide TOTAL turning movement volumes at internal intersections, Canary Palm Drive/Powerline Rd, Camino Real/Camino Del Mar, SW 18th St/Camino Del Mar, and propose Project access/Military Trail. Since these are primary access points to the external thoroughfare system from the subject area of Boca Del Mar, intersection analyses (signalized, unsignalized, and signal warrant studies if appropriate) should be provided.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
		<u>Response:</u> Please refer to the revised Traffic Statement dated 10-25-10. This includes the turning movement counts and Intersection Analyses that are contained in Appendix D. Figure 3 that summarizes all field data collection, while Table 17 summarizes control delay for all approaches.		
	08/11/2010	On Traffic Study Figure 6 (Driveway Volumes), the access to Military Trail is shown as a right turn in/right turn out only. Please confirm that this is correct. If, however, a directional or full median opening is being requested, then it would be preferable for the access to line up with the existing Parkside Avenue on east side of Military Trail. This location may also be more beneficial to the development since it is more likely that a future traffic signal could be warranted in this location.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
		<u>Response:</u> A full median opening will be requested at the location indicated on the Site Plan. Please refer to the revised Traffic Statement dated 10-25-10 for the revised Driveway Volumes figure and is now Figure 7.		
	08/13/2010	Traffic Study Figure 4 Traffic Assignment for Pods C and G do not show any traffic from these pods using the roadway thru Pod F to access the proposed new Military Trail access. However, it is likely that some traffic from other pods destined for Military Trail would use this new access point to bypass the busy intersections of SW 18th St/Camino Del Mar and SW 18th St/Military Trail. Please adjust traffic assignment and Figure 6- Driveway Volumes accordingly.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
		<u>Response:</u> Please refer to the revised Traffic Statement dated 10-25-10 for the revised distribution and assignment figures.		
	10/07/2010	The lane geometry in the CMA for the north approach at Palmetto Park Road/Powerline Road intersection is shown as 3 through lanes. However, the third through lane ends as a right turn lane turning into the shopping center only 700 feet south of the intersection. Consequently, this lane will not have full utilization as a through lane. Only 1/6 of the total through traffic (instead of the 1/3 that normally would be assigned to each of the 3 through lanes) should be allocated to this lane based upon our guidelines.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	10/14/2010	The following Division/Department comments and/or certification issues are based on the Traffic Study with revision date 9/22/2010. The "Driveway Volumes" section of the Study needs to be COMPLETELY revised. The TOTAL turning movement volumes had been previously requested --- however, the consultant only provided the increment for the additional development associated with conversion of the golf course in Figure 7. Turn lane requirements at intersections are based upon TOTAL traffic, not incremental traffic. The proposed Project is part of the larger Boca del Mar development and must use the same internal collector roads/intersections to access the external thoroughfare system.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	10/14/2010	Given the change (in the latest traffic study dated 9/23/2010) to the Pod F Military Trail access from a right turn in/right turn out only to include a left turn in, this access will be even more attractive to traffic from other Pods (including existing Pods), so there should be a greater assignment of traffic to this access point. Because of the vehicular speeds on Military Trail, there should be a left turn lane for the left turns into this access.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
		<u>Response:</u> Please refer to the revised Traffic Statement dated 10-25-10.		
	11/02/2010	The incentive for pods c,d,e, and g to use the new pod F access to Military Trail to avoid left turns, congested intersections, and more circuitous routes is not adequately reflected by the 7% assignment to Military north and the 2% assignment to Military south of the new Project access. For project traffic destined south on Military Trail or east on SW 18th St, it would be easier to go directly to Military and making a right turn rather than having to make a left turn at the unsignalized intersection of SW 18th St/Camino Del Mar. Also, for project traffic going north on Military, it is more direct to go straight to Military instead of using Camino Del Mar to access Camino Real or SW 18th St and then having to make a left turn at Military Trail.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	11/02/2010	The statement is made at the end of the "Driveway Volumes" section		Issue

		of the Traffic Study that "...additional turn lanes are not required". However, Figure 7 shows in excess of 75 peak hour WB right turns at both the SW 18th/Camino Del Mar intersection and at the SW 18th/Palm D'Oro intersection. Also, there are more than 30 SB left turns at the SW 18th/Camino Del Mar intersection but no left turn lanes. In addition, there are no turning movements provided at the internal intersection of Palm D'Oro/Camino Del Mar to determine if left turn lanes on the Palm D'Oro approach and on the NB Camino Del Mar approach are needed, especially since the Pod F access will add a leg to this intersection. Likewise, left turn lanes are not present on the WB and NB approaches to the Canary Palm/Via De Sonrisa intersection but no turning movement information is provided to determine need. I had previously requested turning movement information at "internal intersections". Also, given the volumes at the Camino Real/Camino Del Mar intersection, would signalization be required with projected traffic? Because this new Pod 64 is being retrofitted into the existing Boca Del Mar development that was approved without consideration of the possibility of golf course conversion into residential units, the adequacy of the entire traffic network for the development must be reexamined.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	11/04/2010	The link of Military Trail from SW 18th St to Camino Real should have been addressed under Test 1 - Part Two - Links because it has 1.19% significant Project traffic during the PM peak hour as shown in Table 5 of the Traffic Study.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	11/04/2010	Table 18 in the Traffic Study shows 0% Project traffic on the link of Canary Palm Drive between Via de Sonrisa and Palm Doro Rd. However, the Pod 64B conceptual site plan shows an access point onto this Canary Palm Drive segment. Please revise table accordingly.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	11/04/2010	The peak hour turning movement count at the SW 18th St/Military Trail appears somewhat low and will be verified by Palm Beach County next week.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
WUD	08/12/2010	No Comments	<input type="checkbox"/>	
ZONING	08/12/2010	The project reviewer is Wendy Hernandez who can be contacted at 561-233-5218 to discuss the following comments.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
		<u>Response:</u> Noted		
	08/12/2010	The Zoning Division recommends that the agent or applicant contact the adjacent property owners and neighborhood organizations a minimum 60 days prior to the first public hearing.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
		<u>Response:</u> Noted		
	08/12/2010	Per ULDC Article 2.A.1.1.3.a, all responses to the DRO comment/certification letter shall be in written form. (COMMENT)	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
		<u>Response:</u> Noted		
	08/12/2010	Confirm acreage and units with the approved plats. Notation in application documentation states there are discrepancies.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
		<u>Response:</u> Please refer to the second page of the Master Plan for detailed tabular data, which summarizes the acreage and units for each pod per previously approved Master Plan, the Plat and the approved Site or Subdivision Plan.		
	08/13/2010	Revise and Ensure the Master and Regulating Plans are meeting the Technical Manual requirements for layout.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	08/13/2010	Pursuant to ULDC Article 3.E.1.C.2.a.5), a maximum 25% of local streets shall terminate in a cul-de-sac or dead-end. The Master Plan/Site Plan indicates that ___ of the ___ proposed streets (OR ___%) will terminate in either a cul-de-sac or dead-end. Staff recommends that an alternative circulation program be provided in lieu of the waiver request in light of the proposed site design and configuration.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	10/08/2010	The following Zoning comments are based on the site plan(s) and supporting documents dated 09-27-2010. This application is being reviewed for compliance with ULDC Ordinance 2003-067 as amended. If not certified at the 10/13/2010 DRO meeting, then substantial site plan and document changes are due by NOON on 10/25/2010 for the 11/10/2010 DRO agenda. Additional staff comments may result from the revised documents and/or site plans.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	10/08/2010	For this application to be placed on the 10/13/2010 DRO Agenda, staff must be notified by NOON on 10/8/2010 at DROAGEND@PBCGOV.COM requesting to be placed on the DRO agenda.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	10/08/2010	General Application: Concurrency: The Concurrency request is for 2.89-acres of recreation and an additional 390 residential units. Outstanding for Concurrency: Land Development (Legal Positive Outfall), Traffic, Utilities (Water/Sewer), and Mass Transit. Health	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue

has signed off on the request. Note: in conversation with City of Boca Utility Rep (water/sewer), agent has not submitted a concurrency request for the 390 units to them to date.
(CERTIFICATION)

10/08/2010	Regulating Plan 8/12/2010 Provide documentation on the calculation for recreation for the PUD. Some of the previous approved Pods accounted for the golfcourse as their recreation area and were granted reductions. Ensure the conversion of the golf course will not render the existing Pods non-conforming. 10/8/2010 Parks still has open issues. PM will review with them. It appears based on the number of units and the current calculation for parks that the entire PUD meets rec requirements with the use of the existing parks at 62.+ acres.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
10/08/2010	Regulating/Master/Plat/Subdivision Plans 8/12/2010 Clarify the discrepancy in acreages between the plan and the site plan. 10/8/2010 Staff has reviewed the tables. Consulting with Management if we need any additional notations to finalize correct numbers staff will approve. Surveys were not resubmitted in order to confirm acreage issues with the affected parcel.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue
	<u>Response:</u> Surveys have been submitted.		
10/08/2010	General Application 8/12/2010 Confirm any Protective Covenants, for the Boca Del Mar Development. Previous Code (1973) required preservation of uses of land as indication by the plan. The overall Maintenance Association is the governing body of the development. If such body exists, that they have given approval of such change, or that if documents are recorded, that they do not conflict with the proposed change. 10/8/2010 Staff is consulting with Co Atty office on response, as well as the Code requirement for the Protective Covenants in the 1969 and 1973 Codes, when this development was originally approved.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
10/08/2010	General Application 8/12/2010 Please review previous conditions of approval, specifically Resolution 85-288. Condition # 7 had a requirement to reduce the number of units for the Boca Del Mar Master Plan. Your application documentation does not request changes to conditions of approval, and this condition is affected by your request. 10/8/2010 As discussed in previous meetings. The Conditions of approval in the above resolution were not carried forward. Applications documents, forms and justification need to be revised to address those conditions of approval.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
10/08/2010	General Application/Request 8/12/2010 Please meet with staff to go over the number of roads for the variance. There are some exceptions that may remove the number proposed. 10/8/2010 Street plan was submitted with % indicated that no variance is required for the cul-de-sacs, however the application documents were not revised to remove the request for the variance. Additionally, the street layout plan as repeated numbers, please correct so they aren't repeated.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
10/08/2010	General Application: 10/8/10 Ensure ALL application forms are updated to remove unnecessary requests. Staff still has forms from 7/21 with request for Variances I and II; Monitoring time ext, etc.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
10/08/2010	Justification Statement 9/10/2010 Page 3 of 15- Clarify statement regarding the surrounding communities adjacent to the subject site having a 10.2 du/acre. Are you referring to the adjacent developments outside of Boca Del mar or the Pods directly adjacent to the affected area of the request? 10/8/2010 Analysis provided however unclear as to which developments are not part of Boca Del mar already. (La Joya??) This is a PUD in its entirety with different densities. What are you trying to analyze if you are only including the PUD?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
10/08/2010	Justification Statement 9/10/2010 Describe the Phasing and Development and include a Phasing Plan 3.E.1.J (page 119). 10/8/2010 Documentation not provided in resubmittal.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
10/08/2010	Justification Statement: 9/10/2010 Variance Justification and 7 standards to be revised upon finalization of research regarding the cul-de-sacs. As discussed previously, variance for cul-de-sac based on entire PUD. 10/8/2010 Variance has been removed from justification, however forms have not been updated. Should have a statement at beginning of document stating that you revised your plans so the variance would not be needed anymore.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
10/08/2010	Justification Statement 9/10/2010 Provide documentation of the annexation of the 40.67 acres into the City of Boca Raton. 10/8/2010 Statement revised including an Ordinance 4795. Staff to find and review document as was not provided.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
10/08/2010	Master Plan/Regulating Plan 9/10/2010 Master Sign Plan- Only one sign is depicted on the plan. Need confirmation that the proposed sign is consistent with the existing signage. Article 3.E.1.C.2.I allows	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue

	for way finding signs. Are any proposed with this submittal? Ensure your MSP complies with Article 8. 10/8/2010 Two sign details were added to plan. MSP needs to comply with Article 8. Still need documentation on previous signs.		
10/08/2010	Master Plan/Regulating Plan 9/10/2010 Concurrency notation will need to be fixed upon final determination of number of existing with the proposed units. 10/8/2010 As stated earlier, will review numbers with management. Still waiting on survey to complete acreage reviews.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
10/08/2010	Master Plan/Regulating Plan 9/10/2010 Recreation Pods and locations, as previously discussed, need to be identified on the MP to ensure the PDD meets the current code regulations, ensuring no increase, if any, in non-conformity. Recreation area shall be designated on the MP as recreation Pod. 10/8/2010 Previously stated. Parks has not closed out comments. It appears the development meets code for Recreation. 69A-redevelopment of the rec club house will be labeled as a Rec Pod, however will speak with Parks to confirm agreement with compliance.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
10/08/2010	Master Plan/Regulating Plan 9/10/2010 Describe or indicate on plan how people access the neighborhood park. 10/8/2010 Park adjacent to Pod 71 and 72 is not labeled on the Master Plan, nor indicated how one would access it. Additionally, the Regulating plan chart for uses indicates a Pod 38 as Golfcourse, but is not labeled on the Plan, or labeled as use in the chart. There are a few other uses in the chart which need to be reviewed as they are labeled as N/A.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
10/08/2010	Site Plan/Subdivision Plans 9/10/2010 Appears the recreation area is overlapping the Pod Boundaries. This would need to be revised. 10/8/2010 Master Plan and site plan indicates the acreage for the rec pod as 2.85 acres and 3.05 acres, however this conflicts with the tabular data and plat information provided on the regulating plan. Numbers need to be consistent. Also note, that at final site plan review staff will be reviewing details of parking and landscaping, etc. Info appears to be non-conforming.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
10/08/2010	Site Plan/Subdivision Plan 9/10/2010 Majority of the neighborhood park appears to be retention areas. Staff question the use of this parcel as a park and it's accessibility to the entire community. 10/8/2010 Comment not address. Staff will speak with the Parks Dept.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
10/08/2010	Master Plan/Site/Subdivision/Street Plans 9/10/2010 Staff is concerned about the number of cul-de-sacs and the plans ability to meet the requirements of exemplary standards for minimizing trips, cross connectivity, logical street placement, the enhancement of the built environment, and its minimization of the impacts on the surrounding area.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
	<u>Response:</u> Noted		
10/08/2010	Street layout Plan 10/8/2010 Please meet with staff to discuss the street layout plan. Duplicate numbers on plan. Proposed streets end in cul-de-sacs but are not counted. ??? Indicate on the plan which streets are exempted. Code requires explanation of number of streets.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
10/08/2010	Visual Impact Analysis 9/10/2010 Revise your impact analysis to include a seal by an architect, engineer, landscape architect or surveyor registered in the State of Florida per 3.E.1.E.3.c (page 118). Highlight the seal or shade it when copying on to the required CD 10/8/2010 Plans submitted do not have the seal.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Issue
10/29/2010	The following Zoning comments are based on the site plan(s) and supporting documents dated 10/25/2010. This application is being reviewed for compliance with ULDC Ordinance 2003-067 as amended. If not certified at the 11/10/2010 DRO meeting, then substantial site plan and document changes are due by NOON on 11/22/2010 for the 12/08/2010 DRO agenda. Additional staff comments may result from the revised documents and/or site plans.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
10/29/2010	For this application to be placed on the 11/10/2010 DRO Agenda, staff must be notified by NOON on 11/08/2010 at DROAGEND@PBCGOV.COM requesting to be placed on the DRO agenda.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment
10/29/2010	10/8/2010 General Application: Concurrency The Concurrency request is for 2.89-acres of recreation and an additional 390 residential units. Outstanding for Concurrency: Land Development (Legal Positive Outfall), Traffic, Utilities (Water/Sewer), and Mass Transit. Health has signed off on the request. Note: in conversation with City of Boca Utility Rep (water/sewer), agent has not submitted a concurrency request for the 390 units to them	<input type="checkbox"/>	Issue

to date. (CERTIFICATION) 10/29/2010 Letter received from City of Boca stating they have capacity, however they don't reserve it. Palm Tran signed off 7/30. Remaining: Land Development and Traffic.
