



DRC COMMENT PACKAGE

**CD18-23 RZ/P/Z “Ceiba Groupe Multifamily Development”
July 9th, 2018**

CITY OF OAKLAND PARK

**ENGINEERING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
5399 North Dixie Highway, Oakland Park, Florida 33334
Office 954-630-4333 Fax 954-630-4353
www.oaklandparkfl.gov**

CITY OF OAKLAND PARK

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PLAN REVIEW COMMENTS

Application: CD17-23 RZ/P/Z
Discipline: Planning & Zoning
Reviewed by: Alex Dambach, AICP
Review Date: 7/6/18
Phone: 954-630-4339
Email: alexander.dambach@oaklandparkfl.gov
Project Name: Ceiba Groupe Multifamily Development
Comments Based on Plan Submittal:

_____	No comments
XX _____	Comments as follows or attached
_____	Approved with Comment

General Comments

1. Please indicate on the plans and/or project narrative any site or building design methods being used to conserve energy and/or water.

REPEAT COMMENT: This is still not notated on plans.

Minimum Site Development Plan Requirements

2. Provide self-latching gates for the compactor enclosure.
3. Consider relocating the pool and recreation building to a central location for access and convenience for all residents.

Pool and Recreation Center not relocated.

Minimum Architectural Plan Requirements

4. Add more architectural elements to the building elevations.

This is still pending.

Development Concurrency Review

5. Local Street & Road Access – Adequate capacity determination to be made based on traffic impact analysis. Availability determination will be made upon possible upgrade of nearby local roadways.

Pending. See traffic review report.

Solid Waste Concerns*


6. The distance between the trash compactor and many of the units is too great. Some units are as far as nearly a ¼ mile from the compactor. This must be mitigated to avoid future problems in the development including residents transporting garbage bags on top of their cars, residents allowing garbage to accumulate near their units to avoid long trips to the garbage area, and the risk of garbage bags breaking during the long trips to this compactor. There are many possible solutions to this issue, and the following could be considered:
- a. Trash valet service for all residential units to be provided through an agreement that is reviewed and acceptable to the City to transport trash from units to the compactor.
 - i. This is the preferred mitigation strategy of staff.
 - ii. This eliminates the potential from litter during the transporting of refuse from dwelling units to the trash compactor.
 - iii. On-site management would need to coordinate and schedule pick-ups from the units.
 - b. Multiple dumpsters throughout the development. City of Oakland Park Solid Waste will service these weekly.
 - i. Refuse collection trucks could service the development and would need to use the exit along NE 9th Avenue.
 - ii. This would reduce the length of trips residents would need to take to dispose of their garbage allowing them to avoid using a motor-vehicle to transport their refuse.
 - iii. There would still be the risk of litter when residents transport trash to the dumpsters.
 - iv. Each dumpster would require coordinated maintenance.
 - c. Cart service provided for each dwelling unit.
 - i. This is not preferred by staff. There is little to no room for cart storage in the front of each dwelling unit, and parking spaces would likely wind up being used for storage of carts on collection days.
 - ii. The property management would need to coordinate with the Solid Waste Division to have a recycle bin and trash bin allocated for each dwelling unit.

**Solid waste comments provided in collaboration with the Solid Waste Foreman Antwan Armalin.*



MEMORANDUM

To: Alexander Dambach, Planning Supervisor
City of Oakland Park

From: Ali N. Hanes, P.E. 

Date: July 6, 2018

Subject: Ceiba Groupe Multi-Family – Traffic Impact Study
Review Comments

Per your request, we have completed our review of the subject submittal. Based upon the traffic impact study dated March 22, 2018, this project proposes a residential development containing 111 multi-family residential units. We offer the following comments on the traffic impact study:

1. The introduction states that the access along NE 9th Avenue is for emergency vehicle access only. However, the site plan shows it as “emergency access & exit only”. Confirm if this access is intended to serve exiting residents/visitors. If so, the report text and analysis need to be revised to reflect exiting vehicles at this access point. If not, the site plan should be revised accordingly.
2. Traffic volume figures for the existing, future background, and future total conditions should be provided. Although the volumes are included in Tables 1 and 2, the requested figures are a clearer way of representing the volumes consistent with the distribution and assignment figures.
3. The growth rates in Appendix B appear to be calculated based on 5 years of growth. Although the growth rates consider 5 years of data, there are only 4 years of growth between 2012 and 2016. The growth rate calculations should be revised to reflect 4 years of growth. For example, for count station 867079, the annual compound growth rate should be 9.2%.

Additionally, utilizing FDOT's Traffic Trends Analysis Tool spreadsheet with historic volumes is an accepted method for determining the background growth rate rather than simply using the data from the most recent year and 4 years prior. This method should be utilized for future traffic impact studies.

4. All analyses for Background Traffic Conditions and Total Traffic Conditions should be updated to reflect the revised growth rate per Comment 2.
5. The turn lane length values in Tables 3 and 4 for the northbound and southbound left-turn lanes at the intersection of Andrews Avenue and NE 56th Street appear to have been switched.

6. The queue length values in Tables 3 and 4 for stop-controlled intersections appear to be based on a vehicle length of 20 feet. These values should be revised to reflect a vehicle length of 25' to account for spacing between vehicles.
7. The splits entered into Synchro should match what is provided in the Broward County signal timing sheets and should not be optimized. It is understood that the signals are actuated and will adjust splits based on traffic demand. However, Synchro algorithms account for this as the "Actuated Effective Green". Therefore, the splits should not be optimized. The splits in the Synchro analyses should be revised to reflect the splits provided in the Broward County signal timing sheets at the following intersections: Commercial Boulevard & Dixie Highway, Andrews Avenue & NE 56th Street, and Dixie Highway & NE 56th Street.
8. The offsets in the Synchro analyses should be revised to reflect the offsets provided in the Broward County signal timing sheets at the following intersections: Commercial Boulevard & Dixie Highway, Andrews Avenue & NE 56th Street, and Dixie Highway & NE 56th Street.
9. The signals at the intersections of Cypress Creek Road & Dixie Highway and NE 56th Street & NE 6th Avenue are not part of the coordinated system. Therefore, the Synchro analyses should be revised to reflect "Actuated Uncoordinated" for these signals.
10. Per direction from Broward County Traffic Engineering Division, a Recall Mode of "C-Max" should be used for coordinated phases at coordinated intersections and a Recall Mode of "C-Min" should be used for major street through movements at free intersections. The Synchro analyses should be revised accordingly.
11. The report states that the distribution was determined by a review of existing traffic volumes and knowledge of the local roadway network. Documentation/calculations of how the distribution was determined should be provided. The distribution to/from the east (20%) appears low considering approximately 35% of the existing traffic volumes entering the intersections along Dixie Highway are from the east. The distribution should be revised accordingly.
12. The report text provides an explanation as to why the distribution did not assign any trips to NE 9th Avenue between NE 58th Street and Cypress Creek Road. Although the intersection of NE 9th Avenue at Cypress Creek Road is right-in/right-out only, vehicles entering the site from eastbound Cypress Creek Road and exiting the site destined for eastbound Cypress Creek Road would likely utilize this intersection as the simplest access route. Additionally, as the adjacent school's hours are from 9:15 A.M. to 3:45 P.M., the associated delay from the school zone is primarily outside of the peak hours of the adjacent intersections. The distribution should be revised accordingly.
13. The project driveway(s) should be included in Figure 4 – Project Trip Assignment.
14. Figure 4 – Project Trip Assignment includes several inconsistencies between adjacent intersections. For example, there are 20 inbound trips at the intersection of Cypress Creek Road and Dixie Highway during the P.M. peak hour, but there are 21 southbound inbound trips

- at the next intersection of NE 58th Street and Dixie Highway. Additionally, there are 16 inbound trips at the intersection of NE 56th Street and Dixie Highway during the P.M. peak hour, but there are 14 northbound inbound trips at the next intersection of NE 58th Street and Dixie Highway.
15. The traffic impact analysis appears to report the Synchro level of service/delay results and not the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) reports for the signalized intersections. The report should be revised to include the HCM results and provide the output reports in the Appendix.
 16. The "Vehicle Extension" times in the Synchro analyses should be revised to match the "Gap Ext" times included in the Broward County signal timing sheets.
 17. The turning movement counts do not reflect pedestrian counts. This data should be included and pedestrian conflicts and pedestrian calls should be included in the Synchro analyses.
 18. The "Walk" and "Flash Don't Walk" times in the Synchro analyses for the intersection of NE 56th Street and NE 6th Avenue do not match the "Walk" and "Ped Clearance" times included in the Broward County signal timing sheets. The Synchro analyses should be revised accordingly.
 19. At the intersection of Dixie Highway and NE 58th Street, the eastbound approach delay increases by 174% and the eastbound approach queue increases by 122% during the P.M. peak hour when compared to background conditions. This degradation of operations may result in aggressive, unsafe maneuvers at this intersection. The applicant should propose appropriate mitigation measures to address this issue which may include the construction of a eastbound left-turn lane at subject intersection.
 20. The daily roadway capacity values were obtained from the MPO's *Roadway Capacity and Level of Service for 20013 and 2035 Report*. These numbers need to be updated based on the most recent version of the report (2017). The spreadsheet can be download from the following website: <http://www.browardmpo.org/index.php/data>

K:\FTL_TPTO\043291105-Ceiba Groupe Oakland Park Multifamily\Memos\07 06 18 dambach memo Ceiba Groupe Multifamily.docx

CITY OF OAKLAND PARK

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PLAN REVIEW COMMENTS

Application: CD17-23 RZ/P/Z

Discipline: Broward Sheriff's Office

Reviewed by: Detective Debra Wallace FCCP FCP

Review Date: June 7, 2018

Phone: 954-202-3131

Email: Debra_Wallace@sheriff.org

Project Name: Ceiba Groupe Multifamily Development(Resubmittal)

Comments Based on Plan Submittal:

_____	No comments
<u> X </u>	Comments as follows or attached
_____	Approved with Comment

**BROWARD SHERIFF'S OFFICE
OAKLAND PARK DISTRICT**

5399 N DIXIE HIGHWAY
OAKLAND PARK, FL 33334



CRIME PREVENTION THROUGH ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN (CPTED)

Detective Debra Wallace FCCP FCP

Debra_Wallace@sheriff.org

June 7, 2018

CASE #CD17-23RZPZ

**“Ceiba Group Multifamily Residential Development”
RESUBMITTAL**

Crime Prevention (CPTED) is the proper design and effective use of a built environment, which can lead to a reduction in the fear and incidence of crime. There are four important CPTED design guidelines, including Natural Surveillance, Natural Access Control, Territorial Reinforcement and Maintenance.

The applicant is requesting rezoning 7.4 acres zoned B-2 and BP, business parking to RM-16 to permit a multi-family residential development consisting of 114, 2 story multi-family units. This will be a gated development comprised of a mixture of 3 and 4 bedroom units including carports, and interconnected pedestrian pathway system and an amenity Center. This is a

proposed rental multi-family development. This is the critical time to have CPTED incorporated into the design process, to reduce the opportunities for crime and anti-social behavior. Although a few CPTED designs are incorporated in this plan (8' perimeter wall, one way ingress/egress), this development needs additional items addressed.

1. Natural Surveillance: Nature surveillance is the organization of physical features, activities and people in a manner as to maximize visibility. Keep all public areas well lit; a well-coordinated lighting system is a very effective way of establishing a sense of security. A clear line of sight should be clear from both inside and outside in public and private spaces. This would also include the landscaping. Criminals do not like to be seen or possibly recognized. This principle is based on the basis that criminal activity is generally reduced when an area is being monitored casually by others who are present or nearby.

- Although the City doesn't have an Ordinance regulating site lighting on residential property, non the less, lighting is extremely important in CPTED.. This is important for identification. More lighting fixtures with lower wattage instead of higher wattage with fewer fixtures help reduce shadows and reduce glare Note the lighting fixtures on the plans as stated in your reply. The FC in the Pool area is extremely low, needs increased. The Florida Administrative Code suggests 3 FC for public pools.
- What are the hours of the pool/Clubhouse? How is it to be accessed once the office closes?
- The dog park renderings show benches, are these to be included? Include some type of shade for these benches. What is the fencing? Include a legend.
- Although you state this is a gated community, it is not manned and the renderings show arm gates. This is not a secured community. Is this incorrect, as I did not see this included on a legend. How will the guests gain access to residents? How will the management operations monitor access as stated? Please clarify.

2. Natural Access Control: Take the control out of the criminal hand. Criminals like settings where they can enter and leave without being observed. This objective is the perception of risk to the criminal and denies access to targets. Nature Access control is the physical guidance of people entering and exiting a space by the sensible placement of entrances, exits, signs fencing, landscaping and lighting. Natural access control places users of space in areas where natural surveillance exists. This development defines this concept quite well, through the one way ingress/egress/landscaping and fencing. Include the following in your development.

- Include locations of CCTV on the site plans
- Include the doggie stations locations on the site plans
- Is all mail/delivery only delivered to the office?

Territorial Reinforcement: This principle's purpose is to define public to private property. Legitimate occupants have a sense of ownership and will notice people who don't belong. The property has excellent definition from public to private from the roadway to the entrance, fencing and the landscaping

- Is all mail/delivery only delivered to the office? What are staff hours? As some delivery's come later than normal office hours
- How are the 3 gates accessed on the perimeter (walk through gates?) Is the one on NE 9th Ave for residents? Include on a legend.

3. **Maintenance:** This is an important aspect, if the property is not maintained in pristine condition crime and vandalism will soon follow. This relates to safety as well as pride.

The property needs patrolled a daily for violations and/or trash.

Additional questions and or concerns.

- Is the complete property to be maintained by a property management, including the mowing? How will they gain access to the rear of some of the townhouses?
- Will this development be required to have residents obtain an annual Residential Rental Certificate of Use as with Broward County and other Cities? If not, the City needs to address this issue. As this is necessary to proactively obtain compliance with proper home maintenance and community standards which address not only life, health, and safety issues but also the negative results of inadequate maintenance in rental properties. This directly impacts the Calls for Services for all departments and property values.
- **ADDITIONAL PARKING** spaces are needed. I see you responded that you have an additional 21 spaces. I only located 7 on the interior with 2 of these for the dog park, 12 for the pool area/club house/office and 2 which I perceived as for the residents to temporarily stop to deposit their trash in the compactor. And 1 of those spaces is over 2 manholes, which are not permitted. Additionally you have parking spaces in the setbacks.
- How many parking permits will be given to each unit?
- Please provide a copy of the Community parking rules.
- The handicap parking spaces are not located in appropriate areas on the interior. The one on the SE corner should be moved.
- Have a lease with a towing company and post signs throughout the community.
- Have trespass affidavit with BSO and post No Trespassing signs in common areas.
- Will this development meet City Ordinance 24-175, 176 and 177 requirements to include Police Services? Please clarify how you have satisfied this requirement on Police Services.

This security survey has been conducted as a public service of the Broward Sheriff's Office CPTED Deputy. The information contained herein is based on guidelines set by the Florida Crime Prevention Training Institute and the observations of the Individual Deputy conducting the survey. This survey is intended to assist you in improving the overall level of security only. It is not intended to imply the existing security measures or proposed security measures are absolute or perfect.

All new construction or retrofits should comply with existing building codes, zoning laws and fire codes. Prior to installation or modifications the proper licenses and variances should be obtained.

CITY OF OAKLAND PARK
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PLAN REVIEW COMMENTS

Application: CD17-23RZ/P/Z

Discipline: STRUCTURAL

Reviewed by: Dave Spence

Review Date: July 6, 2018

Phone: 954-630-4413

Email: davids@oaklandparkfl.gov

Project Name: Ceiba Group

Comments Based on Plan Submittal: May 29 2018

_____	No comments
_____	Comments as follows or attached
__XX__	Approved with Comment

Separate Plans and Permit shall be required for each Building.

PROVIDE A FEMA CONSTRUCTION DRAWINGS ELEVATION CERTIFICATE

SECTION C REQUIREMENT BUILDING ELEVATION INFORMATION (SURVEY REQUIRED)

ALSO SHOW COMPLIANCE WITH:

(Ord. No. O-2013-015 § 2, 10-2-13)

Sec. 24-139.1. - Flood resistant development—Building and structures.

(B) *Specific methods of construction and requirements.* Pursuant to Broward County Administrative Provisions for the Florida Building Code, in addition to the requirements for the elevation of new buildings, new construction, and substantial improvements specified in the Florida Building Code, the elevation of the top surface of the lowest floor shall be the highest of:

1. One (1) foot above the base flood elevation; or
2. The 100-year flood elevation as determined by the Broward County 100-year flood criteria map; or
3. a. Twelve (12) inches above the highest adjacent road crown for residential buildings; or
b. Six (6) inches above the highest adjacent road crown for non-residential buildings.

FBC 1612.4 Flood Resistant Design and construction. The design and construction of buildings and structures located in flood hazard areas shall be in accordance with Chapter 5 of ASCE 7 and with ASCE 24. CITY ORDINANCE CHAPTER 24, ARTICLE X, SEC. 24-139.1. - FLOOD RESISTANT DEVELOPMENT—BUILDING AND STRUCTURES. Specific methods of construction and requirements. Pursuant to Broward County Administrative Provisions for the Florida Building Code, in addition to the requirements for the elevation of new buildings, new construction, and substantial improvements specified in the Florida Building Code, the elevation of the top surface of the lowest floor shall be the highest of:

1. One (1) foot above the base flood elevation; or
2. The 100-year flood elevation as determined by the Broward County 100-year flood criteria map; or
3. a. Twelve (12) inches above the highest adjacent road crown for residential buildings; or
b. Six (6) inches above the highest adjacent road crown for nonresidential buildings.

FLOOD

Provide Base Flood Elevation

5th EDITION (2014) FBC, Broward County Amendments, Section 107.2.1.1:

Attach to each set of plans a survey showing the finish floor elevation of the building and the crown of the road or an elevation certificate showing the finish floor elevation and a statement of the highest crown of the road so we can determine if the building meets FEMA requirements.

F.B.C. BC 107.6.4 & F.B.C. 2017 1612

Site Work Plans and (Separate) Permitting,

Drainage Plumbing

Site Lighting Photometric Permit

Paving and striping, ADA parking

Parking spaces and access aisles shall be level with surface slopes not exceeding **1:48 (2.0%)** in all directions. Indicate this on the plans at the accessible parking spaces. 502.4

The minimum number of accessible parking spaces shall comply with the table referenced within section 208.2 of the "2014 Fifth Edition Florida Building Code". Table 208.2

Call out compliance with the Florida Building Code Fifth Edition (2014) ACCESSIBILITY.

Provide an accessible route from public sidewalk to the accessible entrance with the required detectable warnings. 206.2.1

Sidewalks need curb ramps to follow for site accessibility and internal circulation. 206.2.2

Handicap Ramp per FDOT INDEX 304.

Handicap PAVEMENT marking PER FDOT INDEX 17346

High Emphasis Crosswalk (TYP.) 6' Wide per FDOT INDEX 17346

All Separate Permits Required.

Landscaping a separate Permit.

Irrigation plan a separate Permit.

Well a separate Permit.

Fence or fences, Perimeter Walls a separate Permit.

Temporary Construction fence a separate Permit.

Dumpster's location and enclosure a separate Permit.

Each Sign requires a separate Permit.

Signage ADA, Directional (if applicable)

Shopping cart storage (if applicable)

Site Tringles PER Oakland Park Ordinance's

CITY OF OAKLAND PARK

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PLAN REVIEW COMMENTS

Application: CD17-23RZ P Z
Discipline: Engineering & Utilities
Reviewed by: Dennis Shultz, P.E.
Review Date: 06/04/18
Phone: 954-522-1004
Email: dshultz@flynnengineering.com
Project Name: Ceiba Group MF Residential Development
Comments Based on Plan Submittal:

<input type="checkbox"/>	No comments
<input type="checkbox"/>	Comments as follows or attached
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Approved with Comment

-
1. Deep well injection box detail on plan C-3 still references 600 gpm drainage wells (3,000 gpm with 5' of head). Please revise to match the 425 gpm /ft referenced in the drainage calculations.

CITY OF OAKLAND PARK
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PLAN REVIEW COMMENTS

Application: **CD 17 – 23 RZ/P/Z**

Discipline: Landscape

Reviewed by: Kevin Woodall

Review Date: 06/08/2018

Phone: (954)630-4397

Email: kevinw@oaklandparkfl.gov

Project Name: ***Ceiba Groupe Multifamily Development***

Comments Based on Plan Submittal:

_____ No comments
 X Comments as follows or attached
_____ Approved with Comment

1. In "General Planting Specifications" #3 Item "D", please remove the use of "Cypress" mulch. Cypress mulch is prohibited for use the City.
2. In "General Planting Specifications" #2 Item "C", please change "Fancy No. 1 or better" with "Florida Grade #1 or better".
3. City code requires that minimally 50% of total trees on a project shall be native. Only 41% of trees proposed are native. Please make changes to "Trees and Palms" list to meet the 50% native requirement.
4. City code requires that minimally 40% of total shrub and ground cover materials on a project shall be native. Only 19%of shrubs and ground cover materials are native. Please make changes to "Shrub and Groundcover" list to meet the 40% native requirement.
5. Recommend the use of "root barriers" for all "Quercus virginiana"(Live Oak) proposed to be planted in landscape islands to prevent uplifting of hardscapes or change Live Oaks to a small/medium tree variety that do not such aggressive root systems.

CITY OF OAKLAND PARK

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PLAN REVIEW COMMENTS

Application: CD17-23 RZ-P-Z

Discipline: Fire Prevention

Reviewed by: Pam Archacki

Review Date: 6/15/18 **Comments Revised** 7/09/18

Phone: 954-630-4555

Email: pama@oaklandparkfl.gov

Project Name: Ceiba Groupe Multifamily Development

Comments Based on Plan Submittal: 2

<input type="checkbox"/>	No comments
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comments as follows or attached
<input type="checkbox"/>	Approved with Comment

1. Show inside turn radius at NE 9th Ave and Bldg. 14.

2. On-street parking at this development may obstruct fire department access in the event of an emergency. All roadways in the development are Fire Department Access Roads and shall be marked with "No Parking Fire Lane" and "No Roadway Parking" signage. BSO requirements for parking and access shall also be complied with.