



December 17, 2021

1210 Hillsboro Mile
Hillsboro Beach, FL 33062

**RE: 1177 Hillsboro Mile
Application No. 21-4197; KHA Project No.: 044800015
Response to Comments**

This letter is in response to the comments for the above-mentioned project. The original comment has been provided for your reference with the response in **bold**.

ENGINEERING COMMENTS

1. Please provide a response letter for following comments. Please give specific responses to the open issues, not generic responses such as "see plan" or "corrected".

Response: Acknowledged.

2. Please provide Site Plan with sufficient detail, and dimensions for all onsite and offsite features.
2nd Review: Dimensions were added, but sufficient detail is not provided at entrances to show that the site can meet the FDOT requirements for width and throat depth in the presubmittal letter for all three connections to the roadway.

Response: Additional dimensions were added the horizontal control, pavement marking and signage plan sheets (C2.01-C2.04) for onsite features.

3. Please provide Engineering plans with sufficient details and dimensions for all onsite and offsite features.
2nd Review: Although additional information was provided there is still information that is missing to determine constructability of the site as designed. Please provide additional information as indicated in further comments below and as shown on the attached plan comments.

Response: See attached revised civil plans with additional details and dimensions.

4. Please provide Water & Sewer Utility plans with sufficient details, standard details, specifications, pavement restoration etc.
2nd Review: Although additional information was provided there is still information that is missing to determine constructability of the site as designed. Please provide additional information as indicated in further comments below and as shown on the attached plan comments.

Response: See attached revised sheets C4.01-C4.04 and C4.10-C4.11 for the addition of utility details/ specifications and revised utility plans.

5. Please delineate the Flood Zones on the civil plan sheets.
2nd Review: OK

Response: Acknowledged.

6. Confirm code section Sec. 12-268. – Seawalls has been met.
2nd Review: East of A-1-A there is a VE 12, VE 9 and X from east to west respectively; west of A-1-A, there is zone X from the road west to the existing seawall and an AE 5 west of the seawall. Please verify which floodplain governs the construction elevation of the seawall. Existing seawall is at 9.0' NAVD, this is a replacement, please confirm if there is an existing permit for this seawall which may aid in determining if it may remain at that elevation.
The AE 5 appears to govern the seawall in the SW and NW // west quadrants. If the AE 5 does govern, then the code indicates that the maximum height of the seawall should be 7.0 ft, NAVD. Please discuss with your land use attorney to ensure conformance to code.

Response: Seawall has been confirmed to be meeting the code section. The seawall is being rebuild at the same elevation of 9' NAVD, which is above the minimum 5' NAVD. The easterly site is under a flood zone X with, and it is not restricted by the ORD-2020-05.

7. Please add the proposed Finished Floor Elevation.
2nd Review: Looks like FFE for both sides of roadway are lower than the existing grade. Sections do not appear to indicate how the proposed conditions will tie into the existing conditions.
As the summary tables with the proposed elevations for both Basin A and Basin B do not match the output for the same events obtained in Cascades, it is difficult to determine whether the FFE proposed would meet the determined criteria.
Please clearly indicate FFE on the building sections so that we may confirm that the stormwater criteria has been met.

Response: See revised plan set, Finished Floor Elevation callouts have been added on plan view and sections. Sections have been revised for clarity.

8. Please provide Pavement Marking and Signage Plan with sufficient details.
2nd Review: There appears to be some inconsistencies with dimensions in the parking areas. See comments on the plans.

Response: See the addition of the horizontal control, pavement marking and signage plan sheets C2.01-C2.04.

9. Raised sidewalk and ADA curb ramps shall be provided along north of Compass Way and Alley intersection. Please call out on the plans.

2nd Review: OK, but additional information will need to be provided at building permit to ensure compliance with maximum slopes.

Response: Acknowledged.

10. Please provide Stormwater Pollution Prevention plans with sufficient details.
2nd Review: Double row silt fence required along conservation areas and seawall.
Construction entrances need to be shown to roadway. Wheel cleaning will be required.

Response: As requested, double row of silt fence has been added to plans.

11. All dimensions and horizontal controls shall be shown on Site Plan and Engineering Plans.
2nd Review: Dimensions were added, but sufficient detail is not provided at entrances to show that the site can meet the FDOT requirements for width and throat depth in the presubmittal letter for all three connections to the roadway.

Response: See the addition of the horizontal control, pavement marking and signage plan sheets (C2.01-C2.04).

12. Please provide cross sections along all sides of the subject property and driveways to demonstrate driveway slope, sidewalk cross slope (2% maximum), landscape areas cross slope (4:1 maximum).
2nd Review: Cross sections do not appear to properly depict the plan grades as shown in the plan views. I have marked up the sheets with additional information. This is not a final design, but additional information should be provided to show that the project can be constructed as proposed.

Response: See sheets C3.10-C3.11 for the revised cross sections along all sides of the property, driveways, and landscape areas.

13. Please identify all ADA ramp and ramp type, accessible route, curb ramp, curb ramp type on site plan and PGD plans (onsite and offsite). Apparently, sidewalk curb ramps are missing at the corners of the property.
2nd Review: If no connection is proposed and no sidewalk is required along A1A, why are there sidewalks ending on the southern portion of the west side?

Response: Sidewalk has been removed and no connection to A1A is being made.

14. Please show the proposed dumpster location if applicable on the Site Plan and Engineering Plans. Demonstrate waste management trucks accessibility.
2nd Review: The east side appears to function for rear load trucks if there are no raised center islands. If there are raised center islands, how will this function? Also, it appears that on the northside of the building the slope on the cross section for the service access is 4:1 to tie into existing, how will this function for emergency vehicles?

Response: Please see attached revised maneuverability plan and revised cross sections for clarification. Please see sheets C3.10 and C5.00.

15. Water meter shall be placed at R/W limits or utility easements.
2nd Review: Are existing water services properly sized for the western services to be converted to double services?

Response: Water services have been revised for a new connection to the new west site plan. Please see sheets C4.01-C4.0.

16. Any road Cuts for utilities connections, curb cuts and/or others within the ROW shall be restored.
2nd Review: MOT plans will need to be submitted under building permitting.

Response: Acknowledged.

17. Please provide water and sewer details.
Is there adequate depth on the existing sewer laterals to accommodate extension to and through the buildings? Also, are there adequate hydrants for fire suppression for both parcels?

Response: The sanitary connection has been revised for the new site plan. Existing fire hydrants have been identified on the utility plans. Please see sheets C4.01-C4.0.

18. Please provide projected water, sewage and solid waste generations amounts in tabular format. Please provide water/sewer availability letter from utility providers.
2nd Review: Please provide availability letter(s) from utility providers.

Response: Availability letters have been requested and will be provided upon receipt.

19. Please show sight triangles for applicable driveways on Site plan and engineering plans.
2nd Review: Please dimension triangles and show how the dimensions were calculated.

Response: As requested, sight triangles have been dimensioned see sheets C2.01-C2.04.

20. Please indicate the parking spaces dimensions for all parking spaces Site Plan and Engineering plans.
2nd Review: There are a few issues with the site plan as dimensioned. Please clarify areas indicated on the plans. ARQ to ensure dims are shown inside the garage.

Response: See horizontal control, pavement marking and signage plan sheets (C2.01-C2.04) for parking spaces dimensions on the west parcel. Refer to the architectural plans for the parking dimensions in the garage in the east parcel.

21. Please demonstrate compliance with ADA and accessibility code for all Sidewalk locations onsite and offsite with sufficient grades and slope requirement.

2nd Review: There will need to be additional information provided at Building permit to show that ADA can be met as there is not sufficient information to show that the requirements are being met on this plan.

Response: Acknowledged.

22. Please clarify if irrigation is proposed.

2nd Review: Is a single 2" meter of adequate size to serve the parcels? Primarily on the western parcel?

Response: Western parcel has been revised per new site plan and a 4" meter is being proposed. Please see attached revised utility plans (sheets C4.01-C4.0).

23. Please confirm the existing drainage patterns.

2nd Review: OK

Response: Acknowledged.

24. Please provide the drainage report.

2nd Review: Additional grading details and elevations will need to be provided to show that the 25-yr 3-day event can be contained within each basin prior to any discharge leaving the site. The cross sections don't contain adequate information to show the berm location and any offsite flows. Details on the drainage wells will need to be provided to ensure that the calculations included are correct and additional information will need to be provided to show the extent of the drainage improvements.

Response: Additional grading has been provided to match the drainage report. Also, Cascade models of drainage wells result in 25yr-3day stages well below pre-development stages and below existing and proposed elevations, therefore, berms are not required for either site.

25. Additional comments may follow.

Response: Acknowledged.

ADVISORY COMMENT:

1. All outside agency approvals such as South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD), Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP), etc. will be required prior to the issuance of the building permit.

Response: Acknowledged.

TRAFFIC COMMENTS

1. Please be advised that A1A, within the limits of the proposed project, is part of the Broward County Trafficway Plan and a Plat Note Amendment Application needs to be filed with Broward County Planning and Development Management Division to request the amendment of the plat recorded in Broward County Public Records for the proposed permanent access driveways crossing the Non-Vehicular-Access Line (NVAL). Please provide a copy of the NVAL amendment documents for the Town's review. If the NVAL amendment agreement documents have already been approved and recorded by Broward County, please provide a copy for the Town's records.

CGA Response 11/15/21: Please be advised that no application and/or sketch and legal descriptions were received with this submittal

Response: The subject application and sketch/legal descriptions are attached.

2. Please provide a copy of the driveway connection approval letter from FDOT District 4 for the proposed driveways connections to A1A for the east and west parcels.

CGA Response 11/15/21: Satisfied. Please note that no Attachment X was found on the submittal package, but the FDOT letter was located.

Response: The pre-application letter is attached.

3. Please provide a detailed narrative of the operations (ingress/egress) for the proposed access gates for service vehicles in the full traffic impact study. Narrative must include a detailed explanation of how the service vehicles will be handled by the proposed gates, largest size of the expected service vehicle, gate operations, service vehicles frequency, etc. Site must provide enough inbound vehicle reservoir for the service vehicles. Vehicles are not permitted to be queued on the public right of way of an external roadway system.

CGA Response 11/15/21: Partially addressed. The 36' of storage for service vehicles along the east side of A1A includes the 10' of roadway easement. Please relocate the gates to accommodate sufficient stacking for a delivery truck. The inbound reservoir area shall not include the stacking distance beyond the roadway easement.

Response: The site plan/gate location has been revised to provide 30' of storage between the gate to the outer edge of the easement line consistent with the length of a SU-30 design vehicle. Note that largest expected vehicle to use the delivery area is an SU-30.

4. Please show the distance from the ultimate ROW line to all proposed gates on the site plan. Vehicles are not permitted to be queued on the public right of way of an external roadway system.

CGA Response 11/15/21: Partially addressed. The 36' of storage for service vehicles along the east side of A1A includes the 10' of roadway easement. Please relocate the gates to

accommodate sufficient stacking for a delivery truck. The inbound reservoir area shall not include the stacking distance beyond the roadway easement.

Response: The site plan/gate location has been revised to provide 30' of storage between the gate to the outer edge of the easement line consistent with the length of a SU-30 design vehicle. Note that largest expected vehicle to use the delivery area is an SU-30.

5. The Town of Hillsboro Code of Ordinances defines a stacking space as 12 feet wide by 22 feet in length. Please revise the entry gate analyses provided in Appendix G, based on the number of stacking spaces calculated from the first stopping (either a gate or a card reader point, etc) to the right of way line.
CGA Response 11/15/21: Satisfied

Response: Note that development plan/site plan has been revised since the previous submittal. The traffic study and associated entry gate analysis has been updated consistent with the current plans and is included in this resubmittal.

6. Please provide the average daily traffic volume to be expected by the two proposed sites. These volumes will help determine the proposed main access driveways design criteria to be used.
CGA Response 11/15/21: Satisfied

Response: Note that development plan/site plan has been revised since the previous submittal. The traffic study and associated daily trip generation has been updated consistent with the current plans and is included in this resubmittal.

7. Please modify table shown on page 54 of the study dated 7.27.21. Only 48-hour traffic volume counts were requested for this analysis. Also, please verify the volumes listed, table provided does not reflect data collected for the site or the appropriate count station number. Please modify other tables or appendices as necessary.
CGA Response 11/15/21: Satisfied

Response: Acknowledged.

8. Page 17 of the study under the "Future Total Traffic", refers to Volume developmental worksheets for the study intersections. However, there were no intersections studied as part of this TIA. Please revise the section of the study.
CGA Response 11/15/21: Satisfied

Response: Acknowledged.

9. Page 95 in Appendix F, refers to Volume developmental worksheets for the study intersections, please modify the title of the worksheet. Also, please identify somewhere on the table the AM and PM peak hours utilized for the develop volumes.
CGA Response 11/15/21: Satisfied

Response: Acknowledged.

10. According to the valet analysis provided, both parcels will have access to the proposed valet services on the east parcel, please indicate this in the study under the Valet Operations Analysis section.
CGA Response 11/15/21: Satisfied

Response: Acknowledged.

11. Please update the copy of the site provided in Appendix A, after the following review comments have been addressed.
CGA Response 11/15/21: Satisfied

Response: Note that development plan/site plan has been revised since the previous submittal and has been included in the updated traffic impact study.

12. Please provide sufficient back out area for the southernmost parking stall at the proposed 2,850 SF townhouse (West side of A1A)
CGA Response 11/15/21: No response provided and not addressed.

Response: Surface parking stalls and below grade garage stalls have been revised to provide adequate backout parking on both the east and new west sites. See architectural sheets A1-01, A1-02 and A1-07 and A1-07.1 along with civil sheets C2.00 thru C2.04 for details.

13. Please provide sufficient back out area for the easternmost parking stall along the south side of the proposed parcel B Underground parking -Lower & Upper Level (East side of A1A)
CGA Response 11/19/21: No response provided and not addressed.

Response: Surface parking stalls and below grade garage stalls have been revised to provide adequate backout parking on both the east and new west sites. See architectural sheets A1-01, A1-02 and A1-07 and A1-07.1 along with civil sheets C2.00 thru C2.04 for details.

14. Please provide sufficient back out area for the two parking stalls shown below, just south of the proposed terrace. (East side of A1A)
CGA Response 11/19/21: No response provided and not addressed.

Response: Surface parking stalls and below grade garage stalls have been revised to provide adequate backout parking on both the east and new west sites. See architectural sheets A1-01, A1-02 and A1-07 and A1-07.1 along with civil sheets C2.00 thru C2.04 for details.

15. Please clarify and differentiate between the Lower and Upper Levels of Underground Parking. Plan Sheets A1-01 and A1-02 have the same call-out labels along the parking drive-aisle that read "UNDERGROUND PARKING -LOWER LEVEL" however, both of these call-outs have different parking calculations and each plan sheet has a different name. Please address this issue.
CGA Response 11/19/21: No response provided and not addressed.

Response: A1-02 has been revised to state “Upper Level” of the garage while A1-01 indicates “Lower Level”.

16. Please be advised that plan sheet C4.00 depicts the maneuverability of a WB-40 truck, the design vehicle, for the east and west side parcels. The turnaround movement for the truck along the east parcel shows the truck going over “ART” as well as the designated pedestrian area along the lobby floor. Please address this issue.

Response: The arrival court for the east parcel has been revised and now allows for emergency vehicles to navigate around the arrival court/lobby drop off area. See autoturn sheet C5.00 for that analysis.

17. Plan sheet C4.01 Maneuverability Plan Ground, shows three different truck access scenarios going in but there are none demonstrating that the same truck can go out. Site should be able to provide complete access (egress and ingress) for the design vehicle. Please address this issue.

CGA Response 11/19/21: Partially addressed. Egress maneuvers have been included. Note: The fire truck entering the east parcel is shown going over the curb entering the driveway. Additionally, this vehicle was not fully shown exiting the driveway.

Response: See revised sheets C5.00-C5.03 for the updated autoturn exhibits.

18. The paving and Grading plan does not identify the “Beach Path (Limited Service Access)” , northern portion of the east parcel, as being proposed to be paved. However, plan sheet C4.01 provides a scenario of a WB-40 truck driving through the Beach Path. Please provide a paved surface for truck accessibility along the Beach Path.

Response: The revised PGD plan sheet C3.03 is showing the path to be stabilized surface. This is for emergency access and limited town use only. A paved surface is not permitted within DOT ROW nor the conservation/dune area.

19. Provide dimensions of proposed standard and parallel parking stalls in accordance with Town of Hillsboro Beach Code of Ordinances Section 12.49.

CGA Response 11/19/21: Partially addressed. Dimensions for the east parcel parking spaces were not provided.

Response: See attached sheets C2.01-C2.04 for the dimensions of the parking stalls on the west parcel and architectural plan sheets A1-01, A1-02, and A1-07, A1-07.1 for dimensions of stalls within the garage structure.

20. Please provide a pavement marking and signage plan prepared by a registered professional engineer in the State of Florida should be provided for review and comments.

CGA Response 11/19/21: Partially Satisfied. See Comments 25 to 30 bellow. Additionally, please provide a signing and striping plan for the upper and lower parking garage floors.

Response: See attached sheets C2.01-C2.04 for the pavement marking and signage plans.

21. Please ensure 8 feet of clear trunk for the following two trees adjacent to the site distance triangles by the southern access gate for the west parcel.

CGA Response 11/19/21: No response was provided, partially satisfied. The north tree canopy does not encroach in the sight triangle any longer. However, according to the plant list, the south tree QV provides 4' of Clear Trunk.

Response: 8' of CT will be assured for the two trees adjacent to the site distance triangles by the southern access gate for the west parcel. The CT for these trees is noted as 8' in the Ground Level Tree Plan, sheet L1-12.

22. Please ensure 8 feet of clear trunk for the proposed palm tree by the guest parking lot for the west parcel.

Response: 8' of CT will be assured for the two trees adjacent to the site distance triangles by the southern access gate for the west parcel. The CT for these trees is noted as 8' in the Ground Level Tree Plan, sheet L1-12

23. Additional comments may be provided after the submittal of the revised traffic impact study and the signing and pavement marking plan.

Response: Noted.

24. Provide sufficient back-out area for the redesigned parking-lot north pf the Tennis Courts on the west parcel.

Response: Applicable changes to the updated plans have been incorporated, see civil sheet C2.00 thru C2.04.

25. Provide Dead End Signage According to MUTCD Chapter 2C (See enclosed, red-lined mark-up)

Response: This dead-end condition has been removed.

26. Provide a "Keep Right" Sign to face vehicles coming out of the parking-lot (See enclosed, red-lined mark-up)

Response: See civil sheet C2.01 for revised signage to encourage travel around roundabout.

27. 24' is wide enough for two-way traffic; since this is a small traffic circle, modify the diameter of the circle with pavement marking to discourage travel on both directions along the east side of the circle. (See enclosed, red-lined mark-up)

Response: See civil sheet C2.01 for revised pavement marking and signage to encourage travel around roundabout. Additional detail may be required once specific pavement material is identified and will be provided during building permit review.

28. Modify the 6" white to YELLOW, also Diagonal crosshatch markings that are utilized to discourage travel on certain paved areas shall slant away from traffic. Please modify the direction. See MUTCD Chapter 3(See enclosed, red-lined mark-up)

Response: See civil plan sheets C2.00 thru C2.04 for updated striping plans.

29. Diagonal crosshatch markings that are utilized to discourage travel on certain paved areas shall slant away from traffic. Please modify the direction. See MUTCD Chapter 3(See enclosed, red-lined mark-up)

Response: See civil plan sheets C2.00 thru C2.04 for revised crosshatch at entrance.

30. Please provide a Stop Bar and Stop Sign at the exit of the parking garage to the access street on the east parcel. (See enclosed, red-lined mark-up)

Response: See civil plan sheet C2.04 for added stop bar and sign exiting the garage structure.

Please feel free to contact me at (561) 404-7240 or josh.horning@kimley-horn.com should you have any questions.

Sincerely,



Joshua Horning, P.E.
Associate