



DRC COMMENT PACKAGE

CD18-21 PUD "OAK TREE PUD"
2400 Oak Tree Lane
DRC Meeting Date: June 20, 2019
City Commission Chambers
3650 NE 12th Avenue, Oakland Park, FL 33334

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: CD18-21 PUD
Discipline: Planning & Zoning Division
Reviewed by: Alex Dambach, AICP, Planning Supervisor
Review Date: 5/21/19
Phone: 954-630-4339
Email: alexander.dambach@oaklandparkfl.gov
Project Name: Oak Tree PUD – 2400 Oak Tree Ln

Comments Based on Plan Submittal: 3rd Submittal

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

This documents the current review and analysis from the Oak Tree PUD Planning Team of the revised rezoning application, which was submitted on April 29, 2019 for the City of Oakland Park Development Review Committee (DRC). It should be noted, the application cannot be approved by City Commission until the Land Use Plan Amendment (LUPA) is adopted. A boundary plat was also submitted January 25, 2019 and is under review.

The approximately 140.7 gross acre property is currently vacant and is zoned OS (Open Space/Recreation). The applicant requests a rezoning to a PUD (Planned Unit Development) District that would allow for the redevelopment of the Oak Tree property (property) with 405 residential units. The subject property is located on the northwest corner of the intersection of N.W. 21st Avenue and N.W. 44th Street; the property also has frontage along Prospect Road.

The proposed master plan would demolish any remaining existing structures from the site, now used as a closed golf course, and develop the property into a new residential community of a maximum of 405 residential homes. Bordering the site on the north are R-1 (Single Family Residential) and RM-16 (Medium Density Multi-Family Residential) zoned properties. On the south and west, the property is bordered by PUD-zoned properties.

An application for a PUD with rezoning requires the materials listed in the Land Development Code Sections 24-54 (PUD) and 24-163 (Types of Applications and Procedures). The review and analysis

below are based on Section 24-54 (F)(1) – (14) and Section 24-54 (H)(1)(a) – (q).

Section 24-54(3)(a): No minimum lot size shall be required within a planned unit development.

Applicant's Current Response: Applicant is proposing a lot configuration that is an alternative to staff's initial request. In this current proposal, the lot sizes will be reconfigured to provide a limitation and repositioning of the forty (40) foot lots that will utilize the five (5) foot minimum side yard setback. In certain locations, the forty (40) foot lots will utilize adjacent drainage easements or open space tracts to provide more space for side yard setbacks. In addition, the fifty (50) foot lots are increased to be fifty-three (53) feet wide while the 70 (70) foot lots have been reduced to sixty-seven (67) feet. These 53- and 67-foot-wide lots will have minimum six and a half (6.5) foot minimum side yard setbacks. The Planned Unit Development document, as well as, all details have been updated to indicate the larger side yard setback for the fifty-three (53) foot lots. Both solutions will result in large side yards being visible from the streetscape. With regard to the front porches, an Architectural Standards Checklist is attached to the PUD Document. This checklist requires that each of the townhomes have a minimum of one architectural feature / option on the front façade. Porches are one of the items. The porch front setback encroachment has been indicated within the PUD Document as well. See Section III.J.e.1.

Previous Submittal

Lot Size	Number of Lots	Minimum Side Yard Setback
40 Ft	139	5.0 feet
50 Ft	54	5.0 feet
70 Ft	80	7.5 feet
Townhomes	132	7.5 feet (end units)

Current Proposed

Lot Size	Number of Lots	Minimum Side Yard Setback
40 Ft	137	5.0
53 Ft	66	6.5
67 Ft	70	6.5
Townhomes	132	7.5 feet (end units)

DRC Comments for Submittal #3: The Applicant is proposing an alternative to staff recommendation. The updated lot plan included in this resubmittal includes a complete redesign of the lot arrangement and layout. The applicant has presented a plan that addressed the recommendations of Planning staff to vary the placement of the 40-foot and 53-foot lots within the blocks of the PUD, in order to avoid creating a monotonous condition. This improved lot plan has addressed this staff comment.

Section 24-54(3)(b): No minimum distance between structures shall be required within a planned unit development. The appropriate distance between structures shall be evaluated on an individual development basis, after considering the type of character of the current structure types within a development by the city commission upon recommendation of the planning and zoning board.

Applicant's Current Response: Resubmittal package has been updated to provide City staff with a revised lot and setback plan, as described above, as well as a complete set of revised architectural plan sheets in response to the request that architectural improvements such as increased front window area, front porches, or balconies be included.

The applicant has requested that the City review submitted facade designs, and the applicant will eliminate any that cause staff to take objection. Attached to the Justification Statement is an Architectural standard checklist. In conjunction with the anti-monotony language indicated within the Justification Statement and the minimum requirements within the checklist, the streetscape will result in a varied and interesting streetscape design. Upon approval of the submitted architectural plans, color elevations will be provided under a separate cover.

DRC Comments for Submittal #3: The Applicant is proposing an alternative to staff recommendation. The updated lot plan included in this resubmittal includes a complete redesign of the lot arrangement and layout. The applicant has presented a plan that considered the recommendations of Planning staff to limit the number of instances in which the minimum side setback of 5 feet is located to another parcel with a minimum side setback of 5 feet (resulting in 10 feet between such houses). The updated lot plan was redesigned to place the 40-foot lots at ends of blocks or adjacent to open space tracts and or dedicated lake access easements to lessen the occurrence of these minimum spacing instances. Further, the applicant has adjusted the size of the lots to increase the 50-foot lots to 53 feet, to allow increased side setbacks (from 5 feet to 6.5 feet) on these lots. In addition, the architectural standards checklist and approved elevations are to be included in the PUD Document, which along with a more balanced arrangement of the varied sized lots in each block, has alleviated staff's concerns that the homes would be too closely spaced and would create a monotonous condition along each of the blocks within the PUD.

This staff comment is satisfied.

Section 24-54(3)(c): Each dwelling unit or other permitted use shall have access to a public street either directly or indirectly via an approach, private road, pedestrian way, court or other area dedicated to public or private use of common easement guaranteeing access. Permitted uses are not required to front on a dedicated road. The city shall be allowed access on privately owned roads, easements and common open space to insure the police and fire protection of the area, to meet emergency needs, to conduct city services and to generally insure the health and safety of the residents of the planned unit development.

Applicant's Current Response: Applicant is proposing a forty (42') residential access street tract. Within this tract, there will be 20' feet of pavement as well as 2' of valley gutter, 4' of grass green space, and five-foot walkways on both sides of the streets. Applicant has met with the Fire Department and the Fire Department has no issue with the proposed lengths of dead end street, based upon the fact that the cul de sac widths will be 100' diameter, which exceeds minimum code requirements.

DRC Comments for Submittal #3: Staff acknowledges; this comment is satisfied.

Section 24-54(5): Maximum height of structures: No maximum height of structures shall be required within a planned unit development. The city commission upon recommendation of the planning and zoning board shall determine the appropriate height limitations on an individual development basis after considering the character of the surrounding area, the character of the proposed development, and the goals for community development as stated in the Oakland Park Comprehensive Plan.

Applicant's Current Response: Applicant accepts the requested height limitation for townhouses of 30 feet but requests that the maximum height for single family detached homes be 28 feet instead of the requested 25 feet. The PUD Document has been revised to indicate these height limitations. Please refer to Section III. F1 for height requirements, as well as height definition.

DRC Comments for Submittal #3: The applicant is proposing an alternative to staff recommendation: 28 ft max for single family detached and 30 ft max for Townhomes.

This amendment is satisfactory, but it should be noted that the "Sienna" model, sheet A2.1FM2A & B, is a 2-story single family detached unit measuring 28 feet, 3 inches in height. Heights of the Townhome units were not marked on the architectural plans. Please provide updated architectural plans with townhome heights identified.

Section 24-54(12) Internal circulation: An internal pedestrian and bicycle circulation system shall be provided within the planned unit development separate from each other and from vehicular circulation systems and at a distance sufficient to ensure safety. Such pedestrian and bicycle ways shall be surfaced with a durable and dustless material. The city may waive this requirement at the request of the applicant for design, safety or other good reasons.

Applicant's Current Response: Five (5) foot sidewalks are proposed on both sides of the street, unless a different width is indicated on the site plan (walks widen in certain locations at main entrance).

DRC Comments for Submittal #3: This is acceptable, but staff requests a graphic for submittals for public hearing depicting sidewalks widths in cross sections and denoted on plans where sidewalks would be of a different width than 5 feet.

Section 24-54(H)(1)(c) Master Development Plan Requirements.

(1) A master development plan shall accompany an application for rezoning to planned unit development and shall contain the following information:

(c) Boundaries of the property involved, all existing streets, buildings, watercourses, easements, section lines and other existing important physical features in and adjoining the property, as shown on a suitable current aerial photograph.

Applicant's Current Response: Staff had requested that information provided on Site Plan on Page 2 of CSP-1, the conceptual site plan with the aerial, have a different page number (e.g. CSP-1) than the conceptual site plan without the aerial (CSP-1). The applicant states that the information is provided and is also on the Boundary Plat. The second page with the aerial overlay is titled "FSPA.1 / FSP.2. This sheet title indicates "Final Site Plan Aerial #1 / Final Site Plan Sheet #2"

DRC Comments for Submittal #3: Staff acknowledges: this comment has been satisfied.

(h) Tabulation of ground cover by building type and height, number of buildings by building type and height, total building site area, building site coverage.

Applicant's Current Response: Staff requested that the total ground cover by building type be provided as required. In reviewing the Pulte Architectural Plans, the floor plan that has the largest first floor under roof square footage with all possible options added is with the Reverence plans at approximately 4,008 square feet which would occupy a lot with a minimum size of 8,777 square feet.

DRC Comments for Submittal #3: The ground cover by building type has been provided and is accepted.

(j) Typical landscaping plan showing typical landscaping for housing areas, streets, open space, canal areas, buffer strips, recreational and other areas.

Applicant's Current Response: Landscape comments were received from the City and this resubmittal addresses the latest City comments.

DRC Comments for Submittal #3: The Landscape plans were provided in this submittal. In order to further review them, a tabulation chart including how the counts are derived will be needed. Additional landscape comments are provided below.

(k) Typical elevations of housing, recreation and commercial buildings.

Applicant's Current Response: Resubmittal package has been updated to provide City staff with a revised lot and setback plan, as described above, as well as a complete set of revised architectural plan sheets in response to the request that each dwelling have either 30 percent window area on the front wall, a front porch with at least 60 square feet, or a balcony with at least 40 square feet. The applicant agreed that barrel tile roofs and asphalt shingle roof would not be used or permitted. Concrete flat tile and metal roofs are proposed for the home styles.

The applicant has requested that the City review submitted façade designs, and the applicant will eliminate any that cause staff to take objection. Attached to the Justification Statement is an Architectural standard checklist. In conjunction with the anti-monotony language indicated within the Justification Statement and the minimum requirements within the checklist, the streetscape will result in a varied and interesting streetscape design. Upon approval of the submitted architectural plans, color elevations will be provided under a separate cover.

DRC Comments for Submittal #3: The revised architectural plans were submitted with several façade choices for each dwelling type. Staff has reviewed the revised architectural plans and has identified the elevations to be permitted and the elevations to be eliminated as an attachment to this document. Further, staff requests additional architectural improvements to the single-family attached townhomes, specifically with regard to the front elevations.

(m) Number of vehicle trips expected to be generated from the project. Streets and arterial roadways expected to carry most project traffic. Expected levels of service on these streets and arterials at project completion both with and without project traffic.

Applicant's Current Response: Traffic study is included with the resubmittal package.

DRC Comments for Submittal #3: The Traffic Study was provided. Staff acknowledges and has provided a review in another section of this report.

(n) Schools which are expected to be affected by the project. Estimated number of pupils from the project expected to attend each school. For assistance, the applicant may refer to the Broward County School Board, Department of Pupil Accounting and Site Planning.

Applicant's Current Response: The applicant provided a School Consistency Review Report to the School Board of Broward County, initially dated September 13, 2018 and revised on September 20, 2018. However, the reviewer noted that the applicant should work with the School Board to address the mitigation agreement related to the previously approved LUPA PC 04-22.

The Applicant has had several meetings with the School Board and Broward County staff concerning the existing declaration. All parties agree that the declaration should be terminated because it is not consistent with current School Board and Broward County policies. The Applicant has submitted a

request to the School Board to terminate the declaration. This termination will occur prior to the issuance of any building permits. None of the schools that serve the property are overcapacity; therefore, no additional school mitigation is required.

DRC Comments for Submittal #3: Staff acknowledges; please provide documentation when received from the School Board.

(o) Areas proposed to be conveyed, dedicated or reserved for public streets, parks, parkways, playgrounds, school sites, public buildings and similar public and semi-public uses.

Applicant's Current Response: An exhibit is included within the Master Development Plan Set which highlights the easement areas to be reserved for City of Oakland Park access for municipal access, utility and emergency purposes. A public access easement will be provided for the Public Greenway Park along the east and south frontage of the property. Easement language will be submitted to the City for review prior to the first building permit issuance.

DRC Comments for Submittal #3: The applicant has provided an acknowledgment that easement language will be provided to the City. However, the final easement language shall be submitted and accepted by the City prior to issuance of the first building permit for site development work.

(p) A phasing plan which includes an appropriate timetable for development, including open space, if the development is to be platted or constructed in phases.

Applicant's Current Response: The Phasing Plan, sheet FSP.3 has been revised to indicate the distribution and timing of certain open space areas.

DRC Comments for Submittal #3: The applicant provided revising the phasing plan. It has been noted that the colors on the legend and the colors on the map are difficult to read. Please provide a clearer depiction of the phasing on the final plans. The phasing plan needs to also provide for phase one to have a secondary emergency access point for the area of the single family detached dwellings, the open space area that is to be dedicated to the neighborhood to the north, and a continuous linear walkway along NW 44th Street for the entirety of the property. In addition, construction the required roadway improvements for the subject section of NW 44th Street must be completed prior to the issuance of the first certificate of occupancy (excluding model homes).

(q) A discussion of the passive energy conservation measures incorporated into site design as required by this section in (F)(13).

Applicant's Current Response: The townhomes and single family detached housing types will adhere to the requirements of the 2018 Chapter 13 Florida Building Code. Homes will be constructed

with appliances that meet the Energy Star ratings for efficiency as required by Federal Government regulation. Window treatments and insulation will also meet the standards required within the 2018 Florida building Code Chapter 13. In addition, lot landscaping with palms and trees will be provided in order to shade residential buildings from heat impacts. In addition, native plant material will be incorporated into landscape designs to utilize sustainable design elements and low maintenance. Radiant heat absorption is addressed with the use of less pavement, within the community. Less pavement reduces the amount of heat reflection and also provides more opportunity for water recharge.

DRC Comments for Submittal #3: Requested information provided in the PUD Document. This comment is satisfied.

In addition to the above PUD requirements, the following should be addressed in the Master Plan Development:

Site & Compatibility Concerns:

1) The proposed PUD shall comply with the street, sidewalk and subdivision standards in Sec 24-96 of the City's Land Development Code including regulations for dead-end streets. This requires continued discussion.

Applicant's Response: Five (5) foot sidewalks are proposed on both sides of the street, unless as indicated on the site plan (walks widen in certain locations at main entrance).

DRC Comments for Submittal #3: Accepted, but please indicate on the site plan that all sidewalks are 5' wide or wider and provide clear delineation of any areas where sidewalk are a different width than 5 feet.

2) Dark Skies compliant lighting fixtures and dark skies compliant photometric plan. Applicant has stated that proposed photometric plan is dark skies compliant. The fixtures are dark skies compliant the lighting level is generally appropriate. However, the internal pedestrian scale lighting are installed at 16', which is at the top end of the range recommended for pedestrian scale lighting.

Applicant's Response: The lighting fixtures proposed are the standard FPL LED street lights. Pole heights are 15' in height and the overall dimension is at the center point of the light fixture. Light poles proposed are primarily roadway fixtures. LED specifications for light poles are energy efficient and reduce carbon footprint by being between 25% - 50% more energy efficient than high pressure sodium specifications. LED specification also provide for better light distribution and higher quality color rendition to improve visibility and safety for pedestrians and traffic. The better quality color rendition is significant for safety from a CPTED perspective. LED specifications also provide for fewer outages and lower maintenance costs.

DRC Comments for Submittal #3: Staff recognizes the applicant's efforts for energy conservation and the color temperatures of 3000K noted on the fixtures (Sheet PH-14).

3) FSP7 – the external pedestrian trails do not appear to provide connections to the sidewalk network that are paved and ADA compliant connections to cross walks at major intersections along Prospect Road. Discussion with staff required to determine requirements for required public improvements to ensure adequate and safe connections. Discussion on public bike lanes and sidewalk along Prospect or just intersection improvements required. Conditions of approval should begin to be established to capture required improvements related to project.

Applicant's Response: The Site Plan and Pedestrian Connectivity Plan has been updated in order to indicate the transitions to the existing walkways, especially at the southwest and northeast corners of the property. Pedestrian Connectivity Plan indicates the proposed walkways along Prospect, from the proposed Broward County Complete Streets program, and how they will transition with existing walkways.

DRC Comments for Submittal #3: The Site Plan and Pedestrian Connectivity Plan has been updated.

4) PUD Lot Land Development Regulations: The draft lot requirements for the PUD should be updated as follows:

a) Maximum impervious surface per lot should be provided and shall not exceed 70%;

Applicant's Response: The PUD document indicates the maximum impervious surface area of 70% in Section III.H.1.

DRC Comments for Submittal #3: Staff acknowledges this response and would like to add the following:

The 154.85 ac combined Oak Tree project and Oak Tree Estates site is in a land lock system. Developer's consultant designed the proposed stormwater management system as a self-contained system. Oak Tree Estates residential development on the north drains into the existing Oak Tree Golf course. Proposed development will provide and maintain the drainage storage for this development. This project will not make any off-site discharge. Building finish floors, parking lot and perimeter berms were proposed to comply with the relevant flood routing stages. Adjacent NW 44 St. sloped towards south and surface runoff from this road doesn't flow into this project site. 26.18 ac of lakes and 8.22 ac of lake banks were proposed. Both water quality and attenuation are met in the proposed lake systems. A surface water management permit application with Broward County EPGMD is under review process now for this project.

b) All setback and height maximums shall be included;

Applicant's Response: The PUD document indicates setbacks in Section III.J, as well as in Exhibits 3 – 7. Height maximums are defined and indicated in Section III.F.1. of the PUD document.

DRC Comments for Submittal #3: Staff acknowledges Exhibits 3-7 which are helpful in illustrating the lot standards. It would be more helpful if the setbacks for mechanical equipment could be included in the tables. The applicant is proposing an alternative to staff recommendation in regards to setbacks and heights. The PUD document should be updated to reflect the revised lot plan and corresponding setbacks.

c) A side setback shall be established for all at-grade improved surfaces of 2.5 ft;

Applicant's Response: The PUD document indicates setbacks in Section III.J. as well as within Exhibits 3 – 7. Driveway setbacks of 2.5 feet from the single family detached lot lines are indicated within the Exhibits 3 – 7. Other accessory structures, fences and equipment are also indicated in Section III.J and Exhibits 3 – 7.

DRC Comments for Submittal #3: Staff acknowledges Exhibits 3-7 which are helpful in illustrating the lot standards. The applicant is proposing an alternative to staff recommendation in regards to setbacks. The PUD document should be updated to reflect the revised lot plan and corresponding setbacks.

At-grade improved surfaces may include the concrete pad under mechanical equipment. Setbacks for air conditioning and/or swimming pool equipment should be 3 feet from side lots lines and 15 feet from rear lot lines. Generators shall only be permitted to the rear of a dwelling and shall comply with all yard setbacks for the dwelling. The side setback shall be included in notes for the final development regulations.

d) All accessory structures shall have the same side setback as the principal structure;

Applicant's Response: The PUD document indicates setbacks in Section III.J. as well as within Exhibits 3 – 7. Accessory structures are indicated as having the same side setbacks as the principal structure and a five (5) rear setback. See Section III J.1.d. and Exhibits 3 – 7.

DRC Comments for Submittal #3: Staff acknowledges Exhibits 3-7 which are helpful in illustrating the lot standards. The PUD document should be updated to reflect the revised lot plan and corresponding setbacks.

- e) **All allowable accessory structures shall be expressly listed and consistent; and**

Applicant's Response: The PUD document defines other accessory structures within the PUD document in Section III.J.1.d.

DRC Comments for Submittal #3: This section should be clarified by the applicant. Section III.D. lists the accessory structures permitted, but Section III.J.1.d. (where the accessory structure setbacks are located) indicates "such as". In addition, Section III.J.1.d. exempts mechanical equipment and fences from setback requirements. This section should be clearer to prohibit fences in the front yard and to address mechanical equipment.

- f) **Provide for clear fencing requirements (height/location/material), including pool fencing.**

Applicant's Response: Pool fencing maximum height is six (6) feet. Material will be aluminum rail. Location is typically around pool deck area or on residential lot line. Color may be black or bronze.

DRC Comments for Submittal #3: It is noted that the fencing standards are in the architectural standards checklist. In addition, please add fencing standards to the PUD Design Guidelines, Section J, Setbacks and Buffering. In addition, indicate the single fencing material permitted for residential lots and indicate that fences will not be permitted in the front yards. Several other design details in the 'architectural standards checklist' are not located anywhere else in the PUD Document. The final checklist should be incorporated into the adopting ordinances an exhibit.

The proposed fencing and gates at the emergency access points to the site as well as all other development perimeter fencing shall be tubular metal pickets and not chain link.

Traffic Concerns:

- 1) **Rezoning/PUD Traffic Study needs to be completely submitted for review.**

Applicant's Response: PUD Traffic Study is included within this resubmittal package.

DRC Comments for Submittal #3: Thank you for submitting a traffic study. A review of the study is provided elsewhere in this report.

- 2) **Staff is recommending additional traffic mitigation:**
- **Roadway improvements along NW 44th Street bordering the site.**

Applicant's Response: The Site Plan has been revised to show pavement widening and median on NW 44th Street for the purpose of traffic calming. See preliminary engineering plans for details.

DRC Comments for Submittal #3: Roadway improvements for NW 44th Street will be required to be constructed by the applicant. Construction of the required roadway improvements for the subject section of NW 44th Street must be completed prior to the issuance of the first certificate of occupancy (excluding model homes). The required roadway improvement design is included as an attachment.

Drainage:

1) Staff will provide technical drainage comments under separate cover.

Applicant's Response: See attached drainage comments and response letter from Schnars Engineering.

DRC Comments for Submittal #3: Staff acknowledges and would like to add the following:

The 154.85 ac combined Oak Tree project and Oak Tree Estates site is in a land lock system. Developer's consultant designed the proposed stormwater management system as a self-contained system. Oak Tree Estates residential development on the north drains into the existing Oak Tree Golf course. Proposed development will provide and maintain the drainage storage for this development. This project will not make any off-site discharge. Building finish floors, parking lot and perimeter berms were proposed to comply with the relevant flood routing stages. Adjacent NW 44 St. sloped towards south and surface runoff from this road doesn't flow into this project site. 26.18 ac of lakes and 8.22 ac of lake banks were proposed. Both water quality and attenuation are met in the proposed lake systems. A surface water management permit application with Broward County EPGMD is under review process now for this project.

2) The conversion of the golf course to a residential property could impact the City's CRS rating. This was not addressed in the drainage statement and no additional support documentation was provided. The applicant's CRS consultant is now beginning to work with the City's consultant in this area.

Applicant's Response: Pulte's CRS consultant is working with the City to mitigate impacts and indicate no net loss to City's CRS rating system. A financial contribution to the City of Oakland Park for the Repetitive Lost Area Analysis (RLAA) is proposed by the applicant to address mitigation impacts.

DRC Comments for Submittal #3: Staff acknowledges the coordination between the City's and Pulte's CRS Consultants. The applicant's proposal to mitigate the impact to the City's CRS rating by conducting the RLAA has been accepted by the City. The applicant will be required to make a one-time financial contribution of \$40,000.00, which will cover the City's cost for the initial RLAA in FY 19/20, a subsequent RLAA in FY 24/25 and required annual reporting for ten (10) years.

Open Space

1) The applicant is required to provide a justification under separate cover for requesting to use water towards the open space calculation. (Sec. 24-54.F.11)

Applicant's Response: A separate Open Space Justification Statement is provided within this resubmittal package.

DRC Comments for Submittal #3: In the Justification Statement, the Public Linear Greenway Park will allow the public to view the lake areas as the habitat observation/bird watching areas along the littoral planting open to the public. There is one public seating area along the greenway public (shown on FSP.16), and one viewing area for residents only (shown on FSP.17).

2) The shared use path in the greenway is 8ft in width, it should be 12 ft in width to accommodate both bike and pedestrian traffic safely.

Applicant's Response: The shared use path has been revised to 12 feet within the linear park along the south property line.

DRC Comments for Submittal #3: The Open Space Justification Statement indicates that the trail is 8 to 12 feet wide. Please correct the reference to 12 feet throughout all documents.

3) Technical comments on wildlife viewing areas, spacing and tree species are included in the landscape technical comments.

Applicant's Response: A bird watching seating area has been provided adjacent to the lake just west of the secondary entrance off of NW 44th Street.

DRC Comments for Submittal #3: Staff acknowledges that this comment is satisfied.

4) The applicant proposes to convey or allocate northern open space area for adjacent neighborhood. The applicant has not provided detail on the previously discussed clause that would allow for the property to revert to Oak Tree PUD if not maintained.

Applicant's Response: Pulte has amended its agreement with Oak Tree Estates to provide for the funding protection in the event of a maintenance deficiency.

DRC Comments for Submittal #3: Staff acknowledges that this comment is satisfied.

5) Oak Tree Estates POA board members are meeting with City staff for discussion.

Applicant's Response: Acknowledged.

DRC Comments for Submittal #3: Staff acknowledges that this comment is satisfied.

6) The applicant will include a statement and landscaping detail in the landscaping plans regarding low-maintenance plantings and treatment of the area.

Applicant's Response: Native plant material has been utilized throughout the project's open space areas including the perimeter buffers. The importance of using native material allows for less irrigation, fertilizer and pesticides to be used, protecting the quality of Florida's water bodies by reducing pollution. Additionally, these native plants lessen the negative impact on wildlife habitats and act as a food source, host and shelter for birds, butterflies, bees and small mammals.

DRC Comments for Submittal #3: Staff acknowledges; this comment is satisfied.

Changes to Plans & Support Documents:

1. PSP 3- The legend colors are not consistent with the map.

Applicant's Response: Phasing colors on plan match Legend below plan.

DRC Comments for Submittal #3: The phasing plan was revised. It has been noted that the colors on the legend and the colors on the map are difficult to read. Please provide in the final plans a clearer depiction of the phasing.

2. As plans are being reviewed digitally, please provide a bar scale on all plans.

Applicant's Response: All plans have a graphical scale. When printed full size graphical scales are to scale.

DRC Comments for Submittal #3: Staff acknowledges; this comment is satisfied.

3. Please see attached notes and edits on PUD Document.

Water/Wastewater Service Comments:

The applicant shall provide documentation from the water and wastewater suppliers that adequate raw water, treatment capacity and connections are available to service the proposed PUD.

Applicant's Response: A letter dated December 17, 2018 was provided with the last submittal from the City of Oakland Park, providing conditional water and sanitary sewer availability. A copy of this letter is provided with this resubmittal package.

DRC Comments for Submittal #3: Staff acknowledges; this comment is satisfied.

Landscape Architecture Plan Review

The applicant shall address each of the following comments:

1. A statement indicating material availability was not provided.
2. Berm width does not meet minimum requirement to create a 6 ft berm at a max of 3:1 slope.
3. Locations of sign features and walls seem to be located on the berm slope. Indicate how this will look and function. Clearly indicate where walls start and stop and picket fences start and stop.
4. Show grade lines where the berm crosses pedestrian paths.
5. More shrub masses along berms are recommended.
6. A landscape tabulation table was not provided for overall site or for home totals. Please provide.
7. Add shade trees along wildlife viewing areas which would provide for shelter and food source.
8. There are missing plant tags noted Sheet 16.
9. Tree inventory must also include disposition. Show calculations and how mitigations are being handled.
10. Additional comment from Kevin Woodall, City of Oakland Park: recommend the use of small shade trees in the planning areas in front of the 24' and 20' townhomes.
11. Additional landscaping needs to be added to screen the lift station visible from internal streets.

May 10, 2019

Review of Oak Tree Development Traffic Report

Reviewed by: Jose L. Rodriguez, P.E.

INTRODUCTION

The proposed project consists of the development by Pulte Group (Palm Beach Gardens) of 273 single family dwelling units and 132 multi-family dwelling units on a currently abandoned golf course located at 2400 Oak Tree Lane in the City of Oakland Park. As a condition for development, a traffic study was prepared for this project by the firm of McMahon Associates, Inc. of West Palm Beach. The report is dated March 26, 2019 and is signed and sealed by a Florida licensed Professional Engineer.

REVIEW

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION (Page 1)

REVIEWER Comments:

None

CHAPTER 2 EXISTING (2018) CONDITIONS ANALYSIS (Page 3)

Section 2.1 Roadway Characteristics (Page 3)

REVIEWER Comments:

1. The segment of NW 44th Street west of NW 29th Avenue should also be included in the description for NW 44th Street. This segment consists of a four-lane divided roadway.

2. Report text (Page 4) says there are no exclusive bike lanes along NW 31st Avenue. However, field review and Google Earth view dated 12/16/2018 show exclusive bike lanes along NW 31st Avenue. Please correct text as necessary.

3. Figure 2 Existing Lane Geometry (Page 5):

a. Eastbound approach of NW 44th Street at NW 31st Avenue is depicted as one exclusive right-turn lane, one thru lane and one shared right-thru lane. Actual configuration is one exclusive right-turn lane, one thru lane and one exclusive right-turn lane. Please correct figure and corresponding SYNCHRO 10 analyses.

Section 2.2 Data Collection – Turning Movement Counts (Page 4)

REVIEWER Comments:

1. The intersection of Commercial Boulevard and Prospect Road is included as one of the intersections where traffic movement counts were conducted. However, as per the approved methodology letter, this intersection was not included, and as such, does not need to be included in the text.

2. The data sheets for Prospect Road and Oak Tree are missing in Appendix B.

Section 2.3 Data Collection – Vehicular Queues (Page 6)

REVIEWER Comments:

None

Section 2.4 Traffic Volumes (Page 7)

REVIEWER Comments:

None

Section 2.4 Traffic Volumes (Page 7)

REVIEWER Comments:

None

Section 2.5 Intersection Capacity Analysis (Page 7)

REVIEWER Comments:

Please clarify what version (or versions) of the HCM modules of SYNCHRO 10 was applied at each intersection. Recommend using HCM 6th Edition unless specific conditions warrant use of other version. The differences in outputs may not be sufficiently significant to change LOS results but analysis should be consistent. Please revise as necessary. The adopted LOS for the City (D) should be stated in the text.

CHAPTER 3 EXISTING (2018) CONDITIONS ANALYSIS (Page 10)

Section 3.1 Background Growth Rate (Page 10)

REVIEWER Comments:

None

Section 3.2 Committed Development Traffic (Page 10)

REVIEWER Comments:

None

Section 3.3 Intersection Capacity Analysis (Page 10)

REVIEWER Comments:

Please see comments for Section 2.5. In addition, the signalized intersections should not be optimized for background conditions. The objective of the study is to compare conditions before and after the proposed project development. The exception would be any programmed intersection improvements not related to the proposed project. Please revise analyses to reflect operations based solely on background traffic without optimization or other improvements.

CHAPTER 4 TOTAL (2024) CONDITIONS ANALYSIS (Page 13)

Section 4.1 Project Trip Distribution (Page 13)

REVIEWER Comments:

None

Section 4.2 Project Driveway Access (Page 13)

REVIEWER Comments:

None

Section 4.3 Project Trip Distribution (Page 13)

REVIEWER Comments:

None

Section 4.4 Project Trip Distribution (Page 13)

REVIEWER Comments:

None

Section 4.5 Intersection Capacity Analysis (Page 18)

REVIEWER Comments:

Please see comments for Sections 2.5 and 3.3.

The signalized intersections should not be optimized. The objective of the study is to compare the background conditions and the conditions with the addition of the proposed project trips. Please revise analyses and LOS comparisons to reflect operations based solely on background traffic versus total traffic without optimization. Any mitigation, including lane additions and optimization, will be addressed in Chapter 5 Site Mitigation. A summary comparative table showing the LOS both without and with the proposed project is strongly recommended.

CHAPTER 5 SITE MITIGATION (Page 20)

Section 5.1 Recommended Modifications (Page 20)

REVIEWER Comments:

The mitigation efforts seem reasonable as presented. However, the following should be addressed:

1. Although a reduced graphic of the proposed improvements to the intersection of Prospect Road and NW 21st Avenue is embedded in the site plan (Appendix A), it is recommended that the full graphic be provided within Chapter 5. This should also include drawings of the improvements to the segment of NW 21st Avenue between Prospect Road and NW 44th Street.

2. It is our understanding that the Applicant has coordinated efforts with Broward County Traffic Engineering (BCTE) to provide the previously described mitigation. Please include documentation with respect to BCTE's review and/or approval of the proposed mitigations.

3. Conceptual layouts of the proposed improvements to the Prospect Road and NW 44th Street driveways should also be provided in more detail than shown in Appendix A.

4. There is no mention in this section of the two programmed roadway improvements that will coincide with the proposed mitigation. The two projects which are included in the Broward County Transportation Improvement Program are:

a. The Complete Streets project (managed by FDOT) along NW 21st Avenue from Oakland Park Boulevard to Commercial Boulevard. This project includes widening of NW 21st Avenue to provide bike lanes on both sides of the road; and

b. Addition of bike lanes along both sides of Prospect Road between Commercial Boulevard and Dixie Highway (managed by FDOT). How will these two projects be incorporated with the proposed mitigations?

Section 5.2 Intersection Capacity Analysis (Page 20)

REVIEWER Comments:

Please see Comments for Section 2.5.

CHAPTER 6 GATE QUEUING ANALYSIS (Page 22)

REVIEWER Comments:

This section presents a reasonably detailed calculation of the expected queue operations at the two site access driveways with gate controls. Other than a minor discrepancy in the calculation of the queue at Driveway B (to be corrected) and other noted item below, the section is relatively complete. Nonetheless, please provide gate driveway plans (at least conceptual) indicating driveway dimensions (for both Driveways A and B), especially the location of the gate arms relative to control box and end of queue.

Section 6.1 Gate Queue Methodology (Page 23)

REVIEWER Comments:

Queuing methodology is acceptable; however, please provide source materials and/or documentation of processing times for residents and visitors.

Section 6.2 Gate Queuing for Prospect Road at Driveway A (Page 24)

REVIEWER Comments:

None

Section 6.3 Gate Queuing for NW 44th Street at Driveway B (Page 25)

REVIEWER Comments:

Calculation of resident appears to be incorrect -- $(43 \text{ vehicles/hr.}) / (1 \times 240 \text{ process/hr.}) = .01792$. Please revise calculations accordingly.

CHAPTER 7 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS (Page 26)

REVIEWER Comments:

Overall, the traffic report provides a detailed assessment of the impacts of the proposed Oak Tree Development on the local roadway network. The conclusions and recommendations are consistent with the analysis as presented. However there are a few elements that have not been addressed in this report:

- 1. There is no mention of the Broward County Transit services within the immediate study area. Currently there is a stop for Route 11 on NW 21st Avenue just south of Prospect Road. Will this stop be enhanced as part of the proposed project? Here is a potential for a bus stop near the project's Prospect Road access. Has the Applicant approached BCT as part of the development process? Please provide documentation confirming BCT involvement and response.*
- 2. The City is currently looking at options to apply traffic calming along NW 44th Street. This project also involves the dedication of at least 40 feet of frontage along its entire length along*

NW 44th Street. The Applicant may be required to provide a speed study for NW 44th Street. The comments provided in this review are geared towards primarily towards clarification of several elements of the process and seeking supportive explanations and/or documentations. Final approval of the traffic report will be contingent on the completeness of the responses to our comments and other City requirements that maybe requested of the Applicant.

Please see attached notes and edits on PUD Document.

[We need to add in somewhere their promises that stated on the LUPA for the neighboring HOAs. I think one involved construction of a fence and something else]

CITY OF OAKLAND PARK

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PLAN REVIEW COMMENTS

Application: CD18-21PUD

Discipline: Broward Sheriff's Office

Reviewed by: Detective Debra Wallace

Review Date: May 23, 2019

Phone: 954-202-3131

Email: Debra_Wallace@sheriff.org

Project Name: Oak Tree PUD/Rezoning/Preliminary Plat Review

Comments Based on Plan Submittal:

_____	No comments
_____	Comments as follows or attached
_____X_____	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 FCPP

Debra_Wallace@sheriff.org

May 23, 2019

CD18-21 PUD

**"Oak Tree PUD/Preliminary Plat Review" Resubmittal
2400 Oak Tree Lane**

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 overlapping design guidelines, including Natural Surveillance, Natural Access Control, Territorial Reinforcement and Maintenance.

- *This is solely a preliminary review for the Preliminary Plat Review, as more in-depth plans and information is required for a complete CPTED review.*

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: CD18-21 PUD

Discipline: Fire Prevention

Reviewed by: Pam Archacki

Review Date: 5/23/19

Phone: 954-214-3240

Email: pama@oaklandparkfl.gov

Project Name: Oak Tree PUD

Comments Based on Plan Submittal: 3

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

Current Comments:

1. As condition of the PUD the HOA documents shall clearly state there is “NO on-roadway parking permitted” and the “HOA shall be responsible for towing of vehicles parked on paved roadways or in fire lanes, with zero tolerance”. It shall further state that “failure to enforce no parking on paved roadways”, other than for deliveries, “will result in civil proceedings and fines”. (Section 9.7 of HOA documents does not do so.)

2. Provide final concurrency status.

CITY OF OAKLAND PARK

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PLAN REVIEW COMMENTS

Application: CD18-21PUD

Discipline: Solid Waste

Reviewed by: Antwan Armalin

Review Date: 6/3/2019

Phone: (954)630-4457

Email: Antwana@oaklandparkfl.gov

Project Name: Oak Tree PUD / Preliminary Plat Review

Comments Based on Plan Submittal:

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

CITY OF OAKLAND PARK

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PLAN REVIEW COMMENTS

Application: CD18-21 PUD

Discipline: Structural

Reviewed by: Dave Spence

Review Date: May 6, 2019

Phone: 954-630-4413

Email: davids@oaklandparkfl.gov

Project Name: Oak Tree PUD/ Preliminary Plat Review

Comments Based on Plan Submittal: May 2, 2019

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

ATTENTION:

These plans have been reviewed for Development Review Council purposes only and are not released for construction activity of any kind. DRC plans are considered "NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION PLANS" and do not completely reflect the complete nature of all work to be completed under future plans that will be submitted for construction.

Be advised, that additional comments regarding Florida Building Code requirements may be rendered during the review process of construction documents submitted with building permit applications.

The plans submitted for DRC Plan Review are for rezoning review.

At this time for Oak Tree I do not have any critique comments.
Dave Spence