# AGENDA <br> CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH <br> SPECIAL CITY COMMISSION MEETING \#2 - DOKA APPEAL CONTINUATION CITY HALL COMMISSION CHAMBER <br> TUESDAY, MAY 25, 2021-6:00 PM 

## ROLL CALL:

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: led by Vice Mayor Herman Robinson

## UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

A. Appeal by Alfred Malefatto, Esq. on behalf of Marlin Industrial Park Owners Association of PZB Project \# 20-01400035 commonly referred to as "Umdasch/Doka," which included site plan, sustainable bonus and conditional use approvals to allow for the construction of a +/-47,000 square foot distribution facility and repair and maintenance uses within the Industrial Park of Commerce (I-POC) zoning district

## ADJOURNMENT:

The City Commission has adopted Rules of Decorum for Citizen Participation (See Resolution No. 252021). The Rules of Decorum are posted within the City Hall Chambers, City Hall Conference Room, posted online at: https://lakeworthbeachfl.gov/government/virtual-meetings/, and available through the City Clerk's office. Compliance with the Rules of Decorum is expected and appreciated.

If a person decides to appeal any decision made by the board, agency or commission with respect to any matter considered at such meeting or hearing, he or she will need a record of the proceedings, and that, for such purpose, he or she may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based. (F.S. 286.0105)

# EXECUTIVE BRIEF SPECIAL MEETING 

## TITLE:

Appeal by Alfred Malefatto, Esq. on behalf of Marlin Industrial Park Owners Association of PZB Project \# 20-01400035 commonly referred to as "Umdasch/Doka," which included site plan, sustainable bonus and conditional use approvals to allow for the construction of a $+/-47,000$ square foot distribution facility and repair and maintenance uses within the Industrial Park of Commerce (I-POC) zoning district

## SUMMARY:

Alfred Malefatto, Esq. on behalf of Marlin Industrial Park Owners Association, is appealing a final order of the Planning and Zoning Board (PZB) to allow the construction of a $+/-47,000$ square foot distribution facility and repair and maintenance uses at 2209 7th Avenue North. The subject project was approved unanimously with conditions at the January 6, 2021 Planning and Zoning Board meeting for a major site plan with sustainable bonus and conditional use permit. The appeal was heard on May 11, 2021 at a special meeting of the City Commission, where the City Commission voted to continue the matter to May 25, 2021 so that the applicant and appellant could potentially negotiate a settlement prior to a final decision by the City Commission.

## PROJECT REVIEW HISTORY:

The subject property is currently vacant. The site was vacant and undeveloped until the 1950s when land was cleared on the southern end of the parcel and used as a landfill. The filling operations appeared to have ceased in the late 1970s and the property became overgrown and remained undeveloped until 2011. At that time, there was an expansion of the pond at the north end of the parcel. Since then, the property has remained undeveloped. The applicant, Lisa Reves of Saul, Ewing, Arnstein and Lehr, applied on behalf of Umdasch Real Estate USA, Ltd. for entitlement approval to develop the subject site with a $+/-47,000$ square foot distribution facility and repair and maintenance uses.
The application included the following:
1.) Major Site Plan for the development of an industrial building in excess of 7,500 square feet.
2.) Sustainable Bonus Program Incentive to gain an increase in increase in building height to 31 ft .
3.) Conditional Use Permit to establish "distribution facility" and "repair and maintenance major" uses greater than 7,500 square feet.
At the January 9, 2021 Planning and Zoning Board meeting, staff presented a summary of the attached staff report, which contained the review of the proposed plans, documentation and materials provided by the applicant for consistency with the applicable standards found in the

City of Lake Worth Beach's Land Development Regulations (LDRs), Comprehensive Plan and Strategic Plan. The PZB approved the project with a vote of 7-0 for approval with conditions.

## QUASI-JUDICIAL PROCESS:

Section 23.2-17(b) of the City's code outlines the process for appealing decisions of the Planning and Zoning Board and Historic Resources Preservation Board to the City Commission. It requires the appealing party to submit a basis of appeal, which the appealing party has done (it is attached). At the hearing, each party will be given 10 minutes to present its argument. Thereafter, the commission members may make comments, ask questions, request clarification and discuss the information presented at the PZB meeting. The Commission's decision upholding or overturning the decision should be based on competent, substantial evidence.
The courts have defined substantial evidence as that which will establish a substantial basis of fact from which the fact at issue can be reasonably inferred. It is such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind would accept as adequate to support a conclusion. Competent means that the evidence relied upon to sustain the ultimate finding should be sufficiently relevant and material that a reasonable mind would accept it as adequate to support the conclusion reached. See e.g., Village of Palmetto Bay v. Palmer Trinity Private School, Inc. 128 So. 3d 19 (Fla. 3d DCA 2012).

## POTENTIAL MOTIONS:

1. I find that the evidence presented in the application materials, presentations, testimony and the staff report was competent and substantial, and therefore move to uphold the decision of the Planning and Zoning Board approving major site plan, sustainable bonus incentive and conditional use approvals at 2209 7th Avenue North with conditions of approval as set forth in the development order.
2. I find that the evidence presented was not competent and substantial [based upon specified reasons], and therefore, move to overturn and reverse the decision of the Planning and Zoning Board approving major site plan, sustainable bonus incentive and conditional use approvals at 2209 7th Avenue North as set forth in the development order.

## ATTACHMENT(S):

PZB \#20-01400035 Development Order
January 6, 2021 PZB Meeting Minutes
Appellant's Basis of Appeal
Staff's Presentation on January 6, 2021
Applicant's Presentation on January 6, 2021
PZB \#20-01400035 PZB Staff Report
PZB Staff Report Attachment Site Plan Package
PZB Staff Report Attachment Supporting Documents

# ORDER OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH, FLORIDA 

PROJECT NAME: Umdasch/Doka, 2209 7th Avenue North, PZB 20-01400035
APPLICANT/OWNER: Lisa Reves of Saul, Ewing, Arnstein and Lehr/Umdasch Real Estate USA, Ltd.
APPLICANT'S ADDRESS: 515 North Flagler Drive, West Palm Beach, FL 33401
DATE OF HEARING: January 6,2021
APPROVAL SOUGHT: Major Site Plan with Sustainable Bonus and Conditional Use to construct a $+/$ 47,000 square foot distribution facility and repair and maintenance uses at 2209 7th Avenue North.

PROPERTY LOCATION: $22097^{\text {th }}$ Avenue North
PCN:
38-43-44-20-01-066-0010
$\qquad$ THIS MATTER came to be heard before the Planning and Zoning Board of the City of Lake Worth Beach, Florida, on the date of hearing stated above. The Board, having considered the application by the Applicant, the materials submitted by the Applicant, and the staff reports, and having heard testimony from the Applicant, members of the Lake Worth Beach administrative staff, affected parties, and the public, finds as follows:

1. Application for a Major Site Plan with Sustainable Bonus and Conditional Use was made by the Applicant in a manner consistent with the requirements of the Lake Worth Beach Land Development Regulations.
2. The Applicant
```
X HAS
__ HAS NOT
```

established by substantial competent evidence a basis for the approval requested.
3. The conditions for the Major Site Plan with Sustainable Bonus and Conditional Use, as presented by administrative staff, are set forth in the CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL, attached.
4. The Applicant's application for a Major Site Plan with Sustainable Bonus and Conditional Use is hereby
_X GRANTED, subject to the conditions referenced in paragraph 3 hereof.
_ DENIED
5. This Order shall take effect on the date signed by the chairperson.
6. All further development on the property shall be made in accordance with the terms and conditions of this Order.

CHAIRPERSON -On behalf of the BOARD


Anthony Marotta, Vice Chairperson

BOARD SECRETARY


Sherie Coale, City of Lake Worth Beach
Erin Sika, issislal Preston
Date: $\qquad$

## CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

## PZB CASE No. 20-01400035

## Electric:

1. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy:
a. The 10 -ft-wide electric easement will be needed and recorded prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.
b. The customer will be responsible for installing Lake Worth Beach's two $4^{\prime \prime}$ schedule- 40 gray electric conduits at a minimum of $42^{\prime \prime}$ deep.
2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit:
a. The electrical riser diagram and the load calculations will be needed.

## Planning:

1. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, all fencing on-site shall meet the applicable requirements of Sections 23.4-4 and Section 23.4-19.
2. The project is prohibited from generating noise levels that exceed regulations found in Section 15.24.

## Public Works:

1. The issuance of any permits shall comply with all provisions of the Lake Worth Municipal Code and all other applicable standards including but not limited to the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), and City of Lake Worth Public Works Construction Standards and Policy and Procedure Manual.
2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit:
a. the applicant shall contact the Lake Worth Drainage (LWDD) District's Engineering Department and obtain any required permit(s), if necessary, and furnish to the City. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall contact the South Florida Water Management District's (SFWMD) Engineering Department and obtain any required permit(s), if necessary.
b. the Applicant shall contact and meet with a representative from the Public Works Solid Waste and Recycling Division to confirm dumpster enclosure location, accessibility and demand on property and that it is compatible with the requirements of the Department of Public Works. Solid Waste and Recycling Division contact number is 561-533-7344.
c. the applicant shall provide architectural details for the dumpster enclosure to confirm the enclosure meets the standards of the Public Works Dept.
3. Prior to performing work in the right of way, the applicant shall apply for and receive issuance of a "Right of Way/Utility Permit" application
4. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy:
a. All conditions of approval must be satisfied under jurisdiction of the Department of Public Works
b. The Applicant shall ensure the entire surrounding off-site infrastructure inclusive of the roadway, sidewalk, curbing, stormwater system piping and structures, valve boxes, manholes, landscaping, striping, signage, and other improvements are in the same condition as prior to construction
c. The applicant shall fine grade and sod all disturbed areas with bahia sod
d. The applicant shall broom sweep all areas of the affected right of way and remove of all silt and debris collected as a result of construction activity
e. The applicant shall restore the right of way to a like or better condition. Any damages to pavement, curbing, striping, sidewalks or other areas shall be restored in kind
f. The trench patch for the utility crossing on 7th Ave North shall be restored in accordance with the construction standards of the Public Works Dept.

## Water \& Sewer:

1. Water \& Sewer Utility Plan:
2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit:
a. Center the 15 -foot-wide easement over the water main.
b. Add or move the in-line valve at the edge of the easement for the fire line. This will delineate the private/utility ownership.
c. Provide a valve at the southern watermain connection.
d. Note to engineer: The proposed watermain has been installed in 7th Ave N , the utility department will have the as-built plan shortly. If practical, the actual utility location should be referenced.
e. Move the water service parallel to the fire line or propose a location that minimize the easement extension and path under asphalt. Near the entrance or tapping the main off of 7th Ave N is an option since the meter can be set close to the property line.
f. Adjust the water main and/or slope of bank at the lake to provide a minimum of 10 feet flat space for maintenance access. Consider vehicles and equipment having to navigate around the lake bank at the southeast corner.
g. Capacity fees for water and sewer must be paid in full in accordance with the current City Ordinance.
h. The site shall permit through LWDD and/or SFWMD for the stormwater management and provide a copy to Water Utilities.
i. The following shall be provided:
i. At time of engineering submittal, provide a full drawing set including any updated drainage calculations, and any permits or permitting information from SFWMD and LWDD.
ii. Add all structure and utility conflict information on the plans.
iii. Complete water, sewer and drainage plans showing proposed pipe sizes, materials, structure sizes, utility crossing elevations, hydrants, manholes, as well as all pertinent site elevations.
iv. Permits from the PBC Health Department for the Watermain extension and the private lift station connection
v. If applicable, show irrigation service line/s up the meter and backflow RPZ device/s.
vi. Show water \& sewer services, drainage structures, and storm mains on landscape plan. Confirm minimum spacing between landscape and services per Public Services Detail 23, Typical Tree with Root Barrier.
vii. Fireflow calculations based on a recent hydrant test. Contact Pedro Segovia with Palm Beach County at psegovia@pbcgov.com
viii. Signed and sealed Drainage Calculations including a drainage statement from the engineer regarding floodplain management provisions for water quality and quantity shall be provided to the City.
ix. Provide geotechnical information for the determination of the hydraulic conductivity of the soil, and groundwater elevation.
x. An Erosion Control plan and with the BMPs and NPDES compliance practices shall be provided for the project site.
xi. Engineering plans shail include cross-sections along each property line and with grading showing the design storm ( $3 \mathrm{yr}, 1$ hour ( $2.6^{\prime \prime}$ )) runoff being maintained on site.
xii. Provide existing and proposed site grades.
xiii. Indicate vertical datum on all plan drawings with grades.
xiv. All applicable City of Lake Worth details.

## Lake Worth Drainage District:

1. This project will require a drainage outfall connection permit from this District if they will be draining to the E-4 Canal.

MINUTES<br>CITY OF LAKE WORTH BEACH<br>PLANNING \& ZONING BOARD REGULAR MEETING<br>CITY HALL COMMISSION CHAMBER<br>WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 06, 2021 -- 6:00 PM

ROLL CALL and RECORDING OF ABSENCES: Board members present in City Commission Chambers: Anthony Marotta, Vice-Chair; Mark Humm; Juan Contin; Daniel Tanner; Laura Starr. Virtual Board member attendance: Greg Rice, Chairman; Robert Lepa. Also present were: Andrew Meyer, Senior Community Planner; Erin Sita, Assistant Director for Community Sustainability; William Waters, Director for Community Sustainability; Pamala Ryan, Board Attorney; Sherie Coale, Board Secretary.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE Led by M. Humm
ADDITIONS / DELETIONS / RECORDERING AND APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA None APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
A. October 7, 2020 Meeting Minutes

Motion: M. Humm moved to accept the October 7, 2020 minutes as presented; J. Contin $2^{\text {nd }}$.
Vote: Ayes all, unanimous.

## CASES:

SWEARING IN OF STAFF AND APPLICANTS Christa Simmons, Notary-State of Florida, administered oath to those wishing to give testimony.

## PROOF OF PUBLICATION Provided in meeting packet.

1) $\mathrm{PZB} 20-01400035$

PZB/HRPB 20-03100008
WITHDRAWLS / POSTPONEMENTS None

## CONSENT None

## PUBLIC HEARINGS:

BOARD DISCLOSURE: M. Humm, J. Contin, A. Marotta and L. Starr all received calls and/or emails from attorney for applicant but did not return calls or speak with anyone. D. Tanner received calls from persons representing the applicant; R. Lepa did receive calls but referred the caller to city staff. G. Rice did not speak to anyone nor receive any calls.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: None
NEW BUSINESS:

Presiding Vice-Chair Anthony Marotta briefly read the following description of the proposed project, then mentioned the need to address, as a preliminary matter, the request of one of three (3) affected parties for a continuance to allow time to prepare his case.

Board Attorney Pamala Ryan states the Board is in possession of the written requests from Mr. Daniel Hiatt requesting an additional continuance. It was granted @ December 2, 2020. As the first continuance was granted, and according to the City Ordinance, any further requests would be at the discretion of the Board.

Affected Party: Mr. Daniel Hiatt

- Believes questionable notice was given in December 2020. Specifically he is unhappy with the notice period, that the USPS was not making deliveries in the four-day weekend holiday period including Thanksgiving Thursday, Friday, Saturday or Sunday; he discussed getting the meeting continued but heard rumor the Board could not reach quorum.
- Does not recall receiving notice of the continuance being granted. Sent the request for the continuance. Every affected party gets one continuance, this is exactly why the Ordinance is in place.
- The reason for this request being his attorney, Thomas Baird, on December 30 advised Mr. Hiatt he was not available for the January meeting and recused himself from the case. Mr. Hiatt was then referred to another attorney, who he was not able to "get up to speed" with him.
- In a December 5 email, the attorney for Doka, asked his position on the project. After responding to him, he never heard any community outreach until yesterday.
- Made it perfectly clear to PZ Board members of a new owner for the GSG Investments properties (Eastern Metal-tenant) in addition to contacting the attorney for the new owner, who was not interested in a continuance at that time and now suddenly is present in the zoom room for this meeting.
- Mr. Hiatt states that even if his continuance request is denied, due to inadvertently using up his continuance last month, Board cannot produce any authorization of that, perhaps either Mr. George Garamy or Seth Malamut (Stag Industrial) could be granted a continuance.

Assistant Director for Community Sustainability Erin Sita had a request from Mr. Malamut to speak on the issue. As of this afternoon he had not requested a continuance.
Seth Malamut- In-house counsel for Stag Industrial based in Boston- Acknowledges they are not filed as an affected party. Having recently acquired the properties, he would only request a continuance because he does not have enough information on the project to determine if the new owner should or should not be concerned with the project. He has received some information provided by staff but is still unclear as to what is going to happen on the property. He has not spoken with his tenant (Eastern Metal Supply), Stag Industrial is a professional landlord. It is unknown if Eastern Metal Supply, which does not have a fee interest in the property, would have concerns about the use of the property in question.
Attorney Lisa Reves of Saul Ewing, Arnstein \& Lehr, Co-Council for the applicant: - Mr. Hiatt received a continuance in December. Mr. Malamut should take up the issue with the seller. Umdasch-Doka property owners are ready to proceed and opposes the continuance request.

## Board Attorney:

- Regarding Mr. Malamut's request for a continuance: Project applications must be moved along under State law; stacked multiple individual requests to continually, indefinitely, postpone projects were not the intention of the Ordinance.
- Regarding Mr. Hiatt's allegation that he never received correspondence: Mr. Hiatt requested and received a continuance prior to the question of a quorum. As the continuance was granted, staff did not continue to push for another member to be physically present at the meeting.
- On December 2 Mr. Hiatt spoke with E. Sita informing her he needed the continuance to get an attorney. Now, coincidentally, this time his chosen attorney, Mr. Thomas Baird, informed Mr. Hiatt he could not represent him in January so this is the reason for this continuance request.

The purpose of the Ordinance was to allow affected parties time to retain representation not to run the clock out on a project. It is within the Board's discretion to grant another continuance if they see fit.
Board: A. Marotta- Please address Mr. Hiatt's statement of questionable notice.
Assistant Director for Community Sustainability - The noticing referred to by Mr. Hiatt as being questionable, met and exceeded all legal time requirements for courtesy notices. It was consistent with regulations. Notices were sent in November and Mr. Hiatt expressed concern the notice was sent over the Thanksgiving holiday period, that the USPS did not make deliveries until the following Monday. The courtesy notices, which are in fact courtesy notices not required notices, were postmarked 13 days prior to the meeting, exceeding the minimum required by 3 days. Site signs were simultaneously posted on the site and the project was noticed in the newspaper.

As the December meeting was not opened to vest (preserve) that notice, courtesy notices were again sent on December 10, 2020 (for this meeting), along with the placement of new site signage placed and re-noticing in the newspaper.

Seth Malamut requests proof the previous property owner, GSG investments, received notice.
Staff can confirm, with the certificate of mailing, that the notice was sent to the previous property owner.

Board: J. Contin -The due diligence period prior to the acquisition of the GSG Investments property would have revealed this action was in progress. Finds it to be surprising this information wouldn't have been found during that time period. He is familiar with and does quite a bit of due diligence work in the course of his own profession.

Seth Malamut states one can only get the benefit of the disclosure provided by the seller. The seller would be obligated to forward the notice if it were in their possession. It will not go unnoticed.

Presiding Vice-Chair queries Board members as to additional questions of the affected party, Mr. Daniel Hiatt.
L. Starr questions if Mr. Hiatt is objecting to the project or asking for the continuance?

Staff: The question of an additional continuance is being addressed at this time. Should that be denied, Mr. Hiatt will make a presentation.

Board: D. Tanner asks if the Board is obligated to continue the item or are they able to move forward?

Board Attorney: The Board is within its right to move forward if they so choose and are not obligated to continue the case. A motion to deny or grant a continuance should be made.

Board: J. Contin - questions for purposes of clarity, that December was considered a continuance.

Affected Party: Mr. Hiatt - does not consider it a continuance, states staff does not have any documentation of his commitment.

## Board Attorney:

- No documentation of a commitment is required. Mr. Hiatt never responded to the Board Attorney's emails. The fact that he did not respond does not mean the emails were not sent.
- The email to Mr. Hiatt stated December 16 or January 6 were dates being considered for the subsequent meeting giving him time to hire legal counsel. A formal response is not required. Once the continuance was granted, staff did not pursue getting a live quorum for the meeting.

Affected Party: Mr. Hiatt, in questioning the email, asks if the email mentions failing to get a quorum? Believes it is time to quit talking. If the Board is not in favor of granting a continuance at this time, how can it be explained that Mr. George Garamy requested and was denied a continuance? Let's close this out and give everyone some time. You can't kick everyone out. This is why the Ordinance was put in place, so this kind of nonsense would not happen. Who said what, what did they say. I am not responsible for making everybody happy.

Board Attorney: Staff did not pursue getting a live quorum after Mr. Hiatt requested the continuance. Prior to that staff was trying to get a live quorum.

Board: A. Marotta- please clarify the granting of the continuance was through that email.
Board Attorney: Yes, it was.
Board: L. Starr - When?
Board Attorney: On the day of the meeting December 2, 2020 @ 4:47 pm, she was forwarded the email from staff which questioned how Mr. Hiatt did not have notice when clearly the notice was sent. Around $4: 54$ pm when the Board Secretary, in place, was having difficulty getting a quorum, instead of having her continue to call and pursue getting a live quorum (all Board members have been witness to the practice before), and as the continuance request was in hand, the continuance was granted over the applicant's request to continue. The applicant still wanted to move forward.

Affected Party: Mr. Hiatt- States the email sent involved not having a quorum.
Board Attorney: The email stated you were granted a continuance.
Affected Party: Mr. Hiatt- Let's just say l'm disqualified, George Garamy, who never asked for a continuance in December, has also been denied a continuance at this time. The reason he (Mr. Hiatt) asked for the continuance was in November the notices are purposefully mailed by the applicant before a major holiday knowing the Post Office is not open in the days after a holiday. Since everyone has complained about that, the courtesy notice deadline has been
changed by the Ordinance too. Let's move on to George Garamy, stop wasting time on who said what.

Staff: E. Sita offers to shares the email on the screen.
Presiding Vice-Chair: Questions if Mr. Garamy's requested continuance was for the December meeting, or this meeting?

Assistant Director for Community Sustainability- spoke with Mr. Garamy and advised there is only one affected party ordinance for all affected parties. Otherwise it would cause indefinite postponements. This possibility and implications were discussed at City Commission.
Seth Malamut: Asks how Ms. Sita can advise the Board of the intent of the Ordinance?
Assistant Director for Community Sustainability states she was a co-author of the Ordinance and present during the City Commission discussion.

Staff: There is one 30-day continuance for all affected parties.
Board Attorney: The continuances do not stack allowing any issue to go on indefinitely. There is a State Statute on how long a project can be held up, this is belaboring the issue at hand.

Affected Party: Mr. Hiatt indicates in the email that Christina Morrison is solely a real estate agent with whom he is associated and managing a different portion of the Marlin Industrial Park when on November 25 she requested the staff report.

Board: D. Tanner - All told there was an additional 30 days to do the due diligence and build the case. D. Tanner motions to move forward with hearing the case. A. Marotta suggests denying the request for continuance.

Motion: D. Tanner moves to deny the request for a continuance; J. Contin $2^{\text {nd }}$.
Vote: L. Starr-Nay Greg Rice-Nay Bob Lepa - Nay Ayes- J. Contin, M. Humm, A. Marotta, D. Tanner. Motion passes 4-3.
A. PZB Project Number 20-01400035: Consideration of a Major Site Plan with Sustainable Bonus and Conditional Use Permit to construct a +/-47,000 square foot distribution facility and repair and maintenance uses within the Industrial Park of Commerce (I-POC) zoning district commonly referred to as "Umdasch/Doka" and located at 2209 7th Avenue North, PCN \# 38-43-44-20-01-066-0010.

Staff Presentation: A. Meyer provides an overview of the proposed request. The property is zoned Industrial Park of Commerce. From the 1950's-1970 there was a landfill near the southern boundary of the property. Currently it is a vacant lot and undeveloped. The City designated the area a brownfield on March 3, 2009 with the adoption of Resolution 03-2009. The applicant has begun remediation through Florida Dept. of Environmental Protection. Structures on the property would be comprised of three (3) buildings: an office of approximately 10,150 sq. feet, warehouse and maintenance shop of $26,617 \mathrm{sq}$ feet and an 11,160 sq. foot canopy totaling approximately 47,927 square feet. The nature of business would be a distribution facility with repair and maintenance for safety and protection systems, sale and rental of concrete form work and miscellaneous parts and materials to contractors throughout Florida. Inspection of returning rental equipment will occur under the canopy, while repair will occur inside the maintenance building. The storage of equipment will be stored east of the building. Employee parking would be to the west, truck circulation will be to the east of the buildings. The entrance would be secured with gates and not open to the public. A lake is proposed on the southern end for
buffering, as well as a six (6) foot concrete fence on the southern and western boundaries. The 200 -foot canal to the west provides buffering in addition to a six (6) foot concrete wall.
The Sustainable Bonus request for one additional foot will be to screen the rooftop equipment in the office portion of the building. The project was found to be in compliance with the City Comprehensive Plan, Strategic Plan and Land Development Regulations. Conditions of Approval are reviewed including those from Lake Worth Drainage District requiring bank stabilization.

Applicant: Louis Goldberg-Senior Facilities Manager for Umdasch USA dba as DOKA USA. It is crucial to have a good relationship with the neighbors. Similar to Lake Worth Beach, the Chicago site also borders residential neighborhoods. They provide concrete form systems, safety and protection systems both leased and sold. They would be relocating from Broward County. The project would bring approximately 50 jobs to just over 9.79 acres. A video of the Chicago facility is shown.
Attorney Lisa Reves of Saul Ewing, Arnstein \& Lehr, Co-Council for the applicant: Approval is recommended by staff. Will provide @ 50 well paying jobs on 9.79 acres. The north extent of the site will house the office, warehouse and maintenance shop; to the south side of the building an open canopy for returning equipment inspections. More intense uses are oriented toward the rear of the building. There will be three (3) access points from $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue North. The westernmost entrance is for passenger vehicles only. The architecture is generally Modern and faces $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue North. Buffering tools include a precast six (6) foot concrete wall to the south and west. The eastern boundary will have a chain link fence. Hedging is also included along the western edge of the property
In response, rebuttal to Mr. Hiatt's comments, she offers the following information as shown on an email:

- On October 19, 2020-When asked to meet, Mr. Hiatt mentioned there would be no point in meeting with the applicant as he would never approve. His interest would be in having a larger project that would increase the value of his property.
- December 4 - when questioned what the objections were;
- December 5 - she was informed that they don't want our type of mess on the western boundary.
- December 30- from Thomas Baird asking applicant to postpone this meeting. Ms. Reves has offered to meet with everyone up until the time of this meeting and has been rejected on each occasion.
- Displays a photo taken@ December 30 through the fence from Mr. Hiatt's southern property $369423^{\text {rd }}$ Ave S toward the Eastern Metal property depicting the exact use he is complaining about. Mentions there is an upcoming magistrate hearing with Mr. Hiatt's property on the docket.
- Displays a copy of the certificate of mailing showing both of Mr. Hiatt's properties received notification.

Presiding Vice Chair: Affected parties presentations shall now be heard.
Affected Party Mr. Hiatt: Having owned the property for 30 years, states the proposed use is not fitting in this Light Industrial area. It is a recycling center with dirty trucks in a small area. Pressure cleaning, sand and cement. Investigated the Pompano Beach site. Asked staff if they had driven down and investigated the Pompano site The presentation does not accurately reflect the activity west of I-95 in Pompano Beach, it is a mud pit. This property needs someone to
come in de-muck and clean up the soil contaminates and build some industrial buildings to generate tax base. They will most likely erect a lean-to, never generate any tax base, not planning on de-mucking just building over the dumpsite not going to properly develop. It all boils down to a truck stop and a garage. Small buildings, nothing but a nuisance. Going to need all the space 254 feet between his building and to the west to store all their junk. A six (6) foot fence cannot obscure a thirty (30) foot building. Did staff look at the site in Pompano or google the site in New Jersey which looks like a cesspool? They will do what they want. Believes the 50 jobs it is bringing is proportionally too small, in comparison to the 50 jobs in his buildings on less acreage. It is the last piece of prime industrial land and will become a nuisance. Mentions the Boutwell Road improvements and general improvement of the area. States they are buying at a discount because de-mucking is costly. The lake allows them to build what they want. Cleaning steel forms is messy and usually done with petrol based cleaning agents which will happen outside. Regarding his magistrate hearing, the city has suspended all code inspections on the interior and haven't gotten their annual thing. How will the pallets be secured prior to a hurricane? It would be better placed in the western communities of Palm Beach County or St. Lucie or Indian River counties.

Mr. George Garamy - States the aerial view of other sites do not correlate to the video. Does not show how the forms are cleaned. The traffic impacts will be enormous in addition to the cement dust and discharge into the canal. Eastern Metal takes everything inside during a hurricane, has concerns this might be difficult for the applicant to do, will it be taken in, strapped down or become flying missiles? It is incumbent upon the City to get the most bang for the buck for tax purposes, this development proposal seems to be less than half the potential. Is the discharge stormwater or treated water? Mentions to the northeast of the property, along Boutwell Road, new apartments are approved and anticipated to be built.

Christina Morrison - Manages the Marlin Commerce Center Condominiums to the east of the site. How can an accessory use (outside storage) be bigger than the structure, twice the size of the building? She and her tenants work very hard to keep their building clean and neat. Outdoor storage of that size in proximity to their building is concerning. It has not been disclosed what is being stored there. Outdoor storage typically involves run-off and trash. What are the activities? Regarding the cleaning of construction equipment, the applicants stated only water will be used but other sites use chemicals to clean the concrete off the equipment so why is this site different in that it will not use chemicals? How can damage be precluded or avoided? Joins the other affected parties in their concerns regarding dirt, dust and noise. This project limits the ability of the city to generate substantial taxes with an underdeveloped site. Does not meet the criteria for a conditional use approval in the City since these issues have not be addressed. The surrounding businesses are all clean, quiet businesses. Please deny the application.

Public Comment: Comments were received from the following and read into the record.
Carolyn Zara- 626 Koogle Road Mansfield Ohio, (no property owned in that name in Palm Beach County) - Expresses concerns against the proposal.

One Real Estate Investment LLC - 888 Brickell Ave. Miami, FL -Owners of Oakwood Apartments to the south of the proposed project - against the proposal.
Elise Crohn -402 Elizabeth Road - west of the proposed project - unincorporated Palm Beach County - against the proposal.

Speaking on their own behalf:

Robert Pouncey - President of Marlin Commerce Center Condominium the proposed height at 31 feet is not conducive to maintaining property values. The six (6) foot chain link fence will not help with the unsightly view from their second-floor windows when they have clients present. The video is impressionable but it doesn't reflect the businesses around these areas. Has concerns about the waterways. Not conducive for the businesses in his building. Please deny the site plan at this time, there are far more lucrative projects that could go at this location.

Seth Malumut - Does not know that he would object to the project but is in need of additional information. The Board should consider asking for additional materials/information such as traffic studies and to address the concerns that have been raised.

## Attorney Neil Schiller of Saul Ewing, Arnstein \& Lehr- Co-Council for the applicant:

Questions to A. Meyer:

- Is the parcel zoned Industrial?
A. Meyer confirms the zoning is Industrial Park of Commerce and the future land use is Industrial.
- Did staff find, after reviewing the staff reports and studies, that the proposal meets or exceeds all city requirements?
A. Meyer confirms that it is consistent with the City Land Development Regulations.

Questions to Louis Goldberg:

- Please explain how the forms are cleaned. Mr. Goldberg defers to Jared Wright, Southeast Operations Director.

Jared Wright - Oversees the owned facility in Atlanta and leased property in Pompano Beach. At the Pompano site, adjacent (unpaved) properties cause dust and/or mud runoff onto the asphalt resulting in a constant battle. In the DOKA owned facilities, the forms are cleaned indoors with the water captured in the recyclinator or discharged per local code.

- What is the difference between Pompano Beach and this facility?

Night and day, everything is exposed in Pompano, unlike the enclosed Atlanta facility which is how they like to operate.

- Talk about the New Jersey facility.

It is not a DOKA owned facility, that is also a leased facility. It is difficult to find land to purchase and develop in that area.

- Speak to the hurricane plan for this site.

Several days prior, everything lightweight is moved inside, heavier items are stacked on top of things that aren't moved inside keeping in mind that most items are well in excess of 100 lbs. With the four (4) hurricanes that have come through, there have been no problems or issues with things flying around.
Questions to George Balaban P.E. of Kimley-Horn

- Give your expert opinion about the drainage.

The facility will have over 2,000 linear feet of exfiltration trench all over the property prior to discharge into the canal. It is more than sufficient drainage. South Florida Water Management and Lake Worth Drainage District both require permits.
Questions to Jared Wright-

- Discuss the traffic in Pompano Beach and Atlanta and what will happen at this site. It takes nearly 45 minutes to unload a truck, at 10 trucks per day, that equates to a full day. On average they process about 10 trucks per day ( $5-6$ departing and 4 arriving), it could be as high as 15 but that would be extreme. That would be an entire full working day with two (2) crews.
- Since we've heard about serving as the hub for the entire state of Florida, is it still the same 15 trucks?

The site will serve primarily the areas from the Tampa/Orlando and south. The panhandle is served by Atlanta due to proximity, so the entire state will not be served by this site.

- How long have you been with DOKA?

Eighteen years.
Attorney Neil Schiller advised the Presiding Vice Chair that Jared Wright should be identified as an expert witness in the operations of DOKA.

Questions to Adam Kerr - Traffic Engineer of Kimley-Horn
Adam Kerr - Traffic study was prepared, utilizing the approved rates by Palm Beach County and City of Lake Worth it will not be a significant increase or impact. As the site is in the Industrial Park of Commerce, it is also a (TCEA)Traffic Concurrency Exception Area meaning impacts have already been taken into account.

For the record all the evidence presented tonight has been through competent substantial evidence, which is the standard in quasi-judicial hearings, expressed through the testimony of the witnesses and the staff report.
Questions to Mr. Hiatt-

- Is it not true we spoke on Monday? Response: Yes
- In the conversation to address your objections and concerns, is it not true we, along with the client, agreed to meet and speak before or after this meeting?
Mr. Hiatt: Don't lead me, here's what happened. I suggested a postponement.
Attorney Neil Schiller: Again, is it not true we agreed to meet and speak? Response: No Attorney Neil Schiller: Respectfully, that's not true. I did offer to meet with you.

Cross examination is leading. You will have your opportunity for the same.
Is it not true you also previously objected to projects on this site? Response: Yes

## Affected Parties Questions for applicant and staff:

Questions from Mr. Hiatt - Did anyone from City staff from William Waters all the way down, visit the Pompano Beach site?

Response: Staff did not travel to Pompano Beach, review was based on the submittal documents.

Did anyone do a Google earth search to view an aerial of the site?
Response: The application and materials including a traffic study, site plan, landscape plan and other technical requirements were the basis for the recommendation. It was based upon the technical analysis.

Does anyone know when the site was annexed into the City?
Director for Community Sustainability: It was annexed into the City about 2004-2006.
Mr. Hiatt: County zoning granted it light industrial park, original owners were told nothing would change and they would be protected from these types of uses. In looking at the Plat that was approved back in the late 80's, he understands now that it is annexed it may be different, but thought it would remain light industrial. Has carpet layers, electricians, antique restoration, service people who live and work in the city. States the Board members were present for the recycling center proposal and doesn't even know why they are considering approving this project.
Board: The Board hasn't taken any action yet.
Mr. Hiatt states he is referring to staff.
Director for Community Sustainability: Prior to 2013 the zoning was low traffic industrial with much more intrusive, and intense uses than what is now allowed. Following three (3) years of review, initiated in 2010, it was rezoned in August of 2013.

## Mr. Hiatt to Attorney Lisa Reves of Saul Ewing, Arnstein \& Lehr, Co-Council for the applicant-

- Regarding his code violations, states the city is not coming out for inspections.

Lisa Reves: asks if there is a question for her? It is credible to say she was merely bringing it to the Board's attention.
Mr. Hiatt questions the relevancy. L. Reves states it does have relevancy.

## Mr. Hiatt to Attorney N. Schiller-

Received a call about Monday noon from Mr. Schiller.
Attorney N. Schiller in returning his call at @ $4: 14 \mathrm{pm}$, apologizes if it was not as expedient as Mr. Hiatt had hoped. Everyone swore under oath, he'll take his word regarding who called who first and did not return calls. He did speak to the applicant (client) who stated they could not afford another thirty (30) day delay further informing Mr. Hiatt he would make himself and his clients available on Tuesday, Wednesday morning as well as after this January 6 meeting.
Mr. Hiatt acknowledges refusing the offer. The notice mailings and ordinance cause these problems. The Affected Party Ordinance took months to pass.
Attorney N. Schiller states the notice issue is an important issue however Mr. Hiatt was just shown he had knowledge in September and October when L. Reves reached out to him. She reached out twice before the hearing.
Director for Community Sustainability clarifies the process with regard to Compassionate Code - Use and Occupancy inspections have continued as usual, only the interior inspections are carried over to the next cycle. Exterior inspections remain the same.
Mr. Garamy questions to Jared Wright:
How large is the Lawrenceville Georgia site? Response: It is a six (6) acre lot with a similar size building without the canopy.
In observing the Georgia site, it does not have the amount of forms, but the New Jersey site has a lot of forms and framework. How can there be that many trucks with less forms?

Response: The Lawrenceville site stores overflow from the Atlanta site, the Pompano Beach site mirrors it in size and volume.

Are the procedures the same from facility to facility? Response: the procedures are the same, the environment is different.

Christina Morrison questions to applicant or staff-

- Will the Pompano Beach site be closing? Respons: Yes.
- Will the dust and dirt will be left in Pompano? Response: Yes, the difference being the buildings will not be open-air, they will be owning a fully enclosed property.
- Why is it not being proposed as outdoor storage when the building is less than a third of the size?

Attorney L. Reves- It is not the size of the outdoor storage that determines the primary use. The storage is secondary to the office, engineering, design, sales and management activities.
Ms. Morrison renews her concerns about the proximity to clean uses.
Mr. Pouncey would like to add/emphasize the unsightliness of the fence as well as traffic issues. All existing and additional traffic will be going to $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue North (without the benefit of a stoplight). The best would be to stay small, light industrial.

## Board members questions to applicants, affected parties and staff.

J. Contin- With regard to the repeated issue of water quality, have there been any reports submitted?

Staff: LWDD is a reviewer as well as SFWMD both requiring permits for discharge into the local waterways. City staff/ engineers have reviewed the plans for drainage. The exfiltration trench, in funneling into the lake will act as a secondary treatment which will then discharge to the waterway. Regarding PPM (parts per million) those entities are under the jurisdiction of the Florida Dept of Environmental Protection.
J. Contin- Is there anything other than water utilized for concrete removal (in general) Jared Wright confirms only pressurized water is utilized.
Staff: Staff has been notified by the State the applicant has agreed to remediate the existing brownfield site. The previous landfill will be remediated.
J. Contin - Is pleased the applicant is willing. Neil Schiller- Some of the cleanup has begun.
D. Tanner- how is the primary use determined? Is it based upon square footage?
W. Waters- There isn't a principal use of outdoor storage. Any outdoor storage regardless of size would be accessory to the principal use. For example, the parking of vehicles, whether employee cars or service trucks, would support and discharge the activities of the business thus making it an accessory use. Outdoor storage, in and of itself, does not occur on its own without a principal use.
Attorney Lisa Reves clarifies any misunderstanding regarding the primary use which is: engineered formworks kept on-site and then shipped to the job. The forms themselves are of no use without the engineering and design and office support.
D. Tanner - The engineering and office work could be done offsite. There is no direct connection between the office and the storage.

Attorney Lisa Reves -There is a direct connection. The engineering is performed here, the formwork is accessory to the main use of design and engineering work.
D. Tanner-Regarding the clarification of using the chemicals to clean the forms. Mr. Wright states only water is used, all materials are galvanized or steel.
D. Tanner - would the applicant be averse to increasing the barrier to minimalize the dust, noise or visual screening? A big concern is seeing what's taking place, not an opaque barrier but noticeably more buffer.

Neil Schiller inquires of Louis Goldberg, the applicant/client, if he would be willing to go above the minimum requirements?
Attorney Lisa Reves- The applicant has already gone above code with the six (6) foot concrete cast wall and landscaping in excess of code.
Staff- The Condition of Approval will require the chain link fence, as depicted on the site plan, be an opaque fence or wall 6-8 feet in height.
Staff- full shielding is not required per code.
D. Tanner-asks if the height of the stored materials will be six feet or less?

Mr. Wright states the allowed height is governed by the Fire Marshall. The height in Pompano is fifteen (15) feet and it is variable by county.
D. Tanner - What are the specific imposed requirements by LWDD and SFWMD?

George Balaban, P.E.- the total suspended solids and nutrients should be treated prior to discharge. Those activities occur throughout the exfiltration trench and lake.
D. Tanner - for concrete? George Balaban there is no specific mitigation for the concrete.
D. Tanner- is it similar to marble/granite cutting? Mr. Wright - It's captured in the inside trench i falls, dries and then is thrown away via roll off dumpsters.
L. Starr - Does the E-4 connect to LW Lagoon (Intracoastal)? - Response: Yes, they are interconnected.

George Balaban, P.E. - The trench is an $8 \times 6$ foot percolation trench, which also provides filtration prior to reaching the canal. There is triple the amount of filtration required.
L. Starr- Is it monitored? George Balaban: Yes, in addition to renewing permits every five 5 years, a report must be filed
L. Starr - would the applicant be willing to do it more often? George Balaban- This is standard practice.
L. Starr - What type of repair work is conducted? Mr. Wright- Forms are metal with wood face, dents are pulled/ removed as well as repair to any damaged forms.
L. Starr- Client is already remediating the site without owning? Response: Yes, with permissions of property owner
L. Starr- what is the projected time frame for the project?

Mr. Louis Goldberg - Environmental remediation- The plan is filed and proposed to the FDEP, realistically within 16-24 months. A lot of site work is required prior to construction, the property must be de-mucked, fill will be brought in and the canal banks will be stabilized with rip rap.
L. Starr - Has there been a lot of environmental analysis on the property?

Applicant Louis Goldberg- has spent a lot of money with testing and accessments.
George Balaban, P.E. - Groundwater modeling will be required to ensure compliance.

William Waters - Has received preliminary funding for Brownfield remediation. Was contacted by Chris Burroughs to set up an advisory committee including Ms. Christina Morrison and Mr. Daniel Hiatt. In which case they would have been advised as early as September of last year that the property was about to undergo changes.
Louis Goldberg wants to rehabilitate the site and for it to be as clean a site as possible and will take the steps to be in compliance. Based on what is found when clearing, that will determine how it is handled.

Board: L. Starr - Mr. Pouncey stated he had two (2) story units,
Mr. Pouncey - Marlin Commerce Center is condo type construction. In his unit the north building next to the property. Although the site is overgrown right now. Ms. Reves showed a six (6) foot concrete wall that did not come to the adjacent property line. With the windows in the second floor, the view could be impactful.
Neil Schiller states the Condition was already stated for an opaque fence of 6-8 feet per code with landscaping.
Mr. Pouncey- It does not cover even with 6-8 feet in height; does not want to look at the big open field, from his northside of the building it would be at most 12 feet of landscape and Marlin Commerce Center fence.

Lisa Reves states Laurel Live Oak Wax Myrtle and Cocoplum Hedge will compose the plantings in that area. There is a good bit of distance between that building and the storage.
Staff: Mr. Pouncey's building is situated roughly 100 foot east and 40 feet south of the property lines.

Board: A. Marotta - For the city attorney - should the Board factor in the claims for not being the best tax use? Response: No
The Sustainable Bonus is for just 1 foot in height to disguise the rooftop equipment.
Confirmed that this the same site seen by Board @ year ago.
Board: A. Marotta to the Applicant -Mr. Hiatt stated in testimony this is nothing but a recycling facility, please address the concern.
Neil Schiller-It is not a recycling facility, as he is attorney for Solid Waste Authority for PBC, he knows recycling. The dust and dirt are germane to the Pompano site due to the unique nature of the neighbors. It is a distortion of the truth to state it is a recycling center and an attempt to reflect negatively on the applicant and business.

Louis Goldberg- Heard it referred to as a trash dump/recycling center. They are an international organization. It is imperative to know where everything is, to have it neat and orderly, it becomes difficult to be a successful operation. To say otherwise is a fabrication of the truth.
Jonathan Haigh Landscape Architect for applicant- On the southeast property buffer there will be a hedge and smaller trees due to planting adjacent to power lines. Twelve feet in height at time of planting of Silver Buttonwood and Wax Myrtles. Please note the north wall of the building to the south is windowless and the sight cannot be seen from the building.
Board: A. Marotta asks about the noise. Mr. Wright responds- Forklift noise outside, the pressure washing and saw noise will be inside. The doors facing the storage yard will be open during hours. Louis Goldberg indicates the decibel levels will be well within City ordinance levels. Hours of operation will be 7-4:30 Monday to Friday occasionally on Saturday.

Presiding Vice-Chair: In 30 seconds or less from each of the affected parties, what type project on the site would they not object to?
D. Hiatt- supported Goodwill building; nice buildings everywhere up and down Boutwell;
G. Garamy - High-tech light industrial similar to what is in the Marlin Industrial Park. Increases tax base and protects his investment.
C. Morrison - more light industrial, small bay users. The highest demand at this time.
R. Pouncey - light industrial. This one takes up a lot of property and don't want to look at it.

Board: L. Starr -How many forklifts will be operating on the property? where will they be stored? Discuss the window view from Mr. Pouncey's building.
Mr. Wright- There will be eight to nine LP (not diesel) forklifts stored inside at night.
Jonathan Haigh, Landscape Architect - The adjacent building does not have windows on the north or west side of the building.
Board: L. Starr- Is that in reference to Mr. Pouncey's building? She thought she heard him say he could see from the second floor.
Mr. Pouncey - States he does not have a window in his unit. Other units face east and south. Cannot recall if there are windows on the northside. Perhaps Christina Morrison, Property Manager, can answer that question.
Board: G. Rice - Wishes the coconut telegraph would work better; although people are very passionate, there can be misinformation. The property does not belong to Lake Worth Beach, these are two (2) private entities. There is no CRA involvement so the tax dollars go to the city coffers. If the owner could get more money for he property he would certainly have done so. In the long run it will be for the betterment of Lake Worth Beach. They will certainly take care of their investment. Is confident the City will guard the wellbeing of the water as well as the Blueway Trail running the length of the county.
Board: R. Lepa - Regarding environmental follow up every five years. From the drainage standpoint it is 5 years. Environmental monitoring occurs every quarter for a minimum of one year after which as required by Palm Beach County thereafter. How many jobs will be created or will those jobs be moving north? The concrete that is washed off, is it recycled or trashed?
Mr. Wright- It will be trashed. They pay for removal (in roll off's) Warehouse and Office jobs will be locally sourced.
What will the tax base be once all is complete?
Lisa Reves - Total capital investment 16 million.
Board discussion: J. Contin -It is a positive move all things considered. Someone else would have already taken advantage of the site if there was interest. The brownfield cleanup is major plus as many do not have the means to do so.
M. Humm- A bird in the hand is worth a couple in the bush. It is not as dirty of an operation as it was originally seemed.
D. Tanner, L. Starr, G. Rice, B. Lepa ready to vote.
A. Marotta - To get a brownfield off the books is great. It is not within Board purview to dictate what goes there. As previously stated, someone else would have already taken advantage. It's not a skyscraper and might come down in 10-15 years and become something else.

Motion: D. Tanner moves to approve PZB 20-01400035 with staff recommended Conditions, with the project meeting the applicable criteria based upon the data and analysis in the staff report; G. Rice $2^{\text {nd }}$.
Vote: Ayes all, unanimous.

## 5 minute break 10:09 pm to reconvene.

B. PZHP 20-03100008 (Ordinance 2020-20): Consideration of an ordinance to Chapter 23 "Land Development Regulations" regarding changes to temporary uses, home occupations and several minor modifications related to development standards for parking and accessory dwelling units, and maintenance easements on zero lot line properties.

Staff: E. Sita presents an overview of the proposed changes to the Land Development Regulations. They include:
Access easements for zero lot lines, review standards and permit processes for Temporary Uses, modifications to the Use Table, Clarification of Standards, Home Occupations in Mixed Use zoning districts, and off-street parking for accessory dwellings and in lieu of fees.

Access easement for zero lot line lots allowing for a three (3) foot (Exhibit A \& G)
Temporary Use is a new section (Exhibit B) permits and administration. (Exhibit B)
Use tables has been modified to include that section. (Exhibit C)
Clarification of size and construction standards for accessory dwelling units. (Exhibit D)
Home Occupations in Mixed Use districts only- additional flexibility; Type11 (Exhibit E)
Clarifies the parking requirements for accessory dwelling units and the parking in lieu of fee is available for the City core ((only downtown (Exhibit F)).
Board: J. Contin-asks for specifics on changes to Home Occupations? W. Waters states it was propelled by Covid-19 in finding more creative ways to accommodate working from home. The norm is no clients in the home. This would allow more flexibility within the Mixed-Use zoning district only at this time with possible future changes to other districts but not likely for Single-Family zoned districts. It would come with restrictions and limitations including the maximum percentage (square footage, no more than $50 \%$ of the space) that could be utilized, would involve inspections. Examples: Accountant, Architect, Attorney, Media, Public Relations. Professional offices only, it is reflective of the current direction of the economy with regard to entrepreneurships who cannot afford a leased office. E. Sita adds that HOA's and property management companies would continue to approve/disapprove the business types.
L. Starr - Restrictions on signage for business vehicles? Staff: Although silent in this section, it is governed in other areas of the code.
A. Marotta - regarding exhibit D- size of accessory dwelling unit and parking standards.
W. Waters - The smallest size for a studio dwelling is 400 square feet. Housing code continues to prescribe minimum area size for sleeping and living areas. Accessory dwelling units are allowed everywhere except Single-Family zoning districts.

Street parking is currently allowed to be counted towards parcel parking and would be allowed to count for the home occupations as well. William - it is in mixed use districts is due to already existing parking. The changes are not intended to supercede a HOA
Motion: D. Tanner moves to recommend adoption of PZB 20-03000008 to City Commission; $J$. Contin $2^{\text {nd }}$.
Vote: Ayes all, unanimously.

PLANNING ISSUES: None
PUBLIC COMMENTS (3 minute limit) None
DEPARTMENT REPORTS: None
BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS: None
ADJOURNMENT: Motion to adjourn J. Contin; D. Tanner $2^{\text {nd }}$. 10:36 pm
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Reply To: West Palm Beach

February 14, 2021

William Waters, Director of the Community Sustainability Department City of Lake Worth Beach
7 North Dixie Highway
Lake Worth Beach, FL 33460

## RE: APPEAL BY AFFECTED PARTY MARLIN INDUSTRIAL PARK OWNERS' ASSOCIATION INC. PZB Project Number 20-01400035: Major Site Plan Approval, Bonus \& Conditional Use Permit

Dear Mr. Waters:

We have been retained to represent the Marlin Industrical Park Owners Association and its representatives, George Garamy, President and Daniel Hiatt, Vice President ("Petitioner" and "Petitioners"). Mr. Garamy has filed for this appeal on behalf of Marlin Industiral Park, which is located at $22097^{\text {th }}$ Avenue North in the City of Lake Worth Beach. Marlin Industrial Park is adjacent to the east side of the mixed-use project that is the subject of PZB Project Number 20-01400035 ("Project").

The Project was initially scheduled for a hearing on December 2, 2020 before the decision-making body, the City's Planning and Zoning Board ("Board"). Since the Board did not satisfy the quorum requirements for its December meeting, City staff postponed all items on the meeting agenda to the Board's next regularily scheduled meeting on January 6,2021 . The Petitioners were recognized by the City as affected parties and presented evidence at the January $6{ }^{\text {th }}$ hearing. The Board issued its written decision approving the Project on January 15, 2021. The Petitioner filed a Notice of Appeal within 14 days as required by the City's Code. This letter is the basis for the appeal, which is required 30 days after the Board issues its written decision.

As an initial matter, it must be noted that Umdasch Real Estate USA, Ltd. ("Applicant") has not met the requirements to do business in the State of Florida. Applicant is a foregin corporation based out of New Jersey. Section 607.1501(1), Florida Statutes requires all foreign corporations transacting business in Florida to obtain a certificate of authority from the state. There is no evidence in the record that the Applicant has received the required certificate of authority. It is a matter of public record that the Applicant is not listed as an active business on the Florida Division of Corporations website (Sunbiz.org). The Applicant submitted its application to the City on August 12, 2020. Therefore, the Applicant's communications with the City with respect to this application have exceeded 30 days and constitute the
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transaction of business within the meaning of the statute. Any further communciations between the City and Applicant must cease until Applicant obtains a certificate of authority from the State of Florida. For this reason alone, this application should be remanded to the Planning \& Zoning Board for a new hearing, but only unless and until Applicant has registered to do business in Florida, as required by the F.S. § 607.1501(1).

A summary of the basis of the Petitioner's appeal is as follows.

## 1. The Planning and Zoning Board's decision to deny the Petitioner's request for a continuance does not follow the essential requirements of the City's Code

The Board did not follow the required procedures for continuing a hearing as provided in section 23.216 "Quasi-judicial procedures" (as amended by Ordinance 2020-14). This section provides that the Board has the authority to continue a hearing and that hearings shall be continued by motion of the Board to a fixed time and place:
g) Continuance. The decision-making body may, on its own motion, continue the hearing to a fixed date, time and place. Also, the applicant or affected party shall have the right to one (1) continuance provided the request is to address neighborhood concerns or new evidence, or to hire legal counsel or a professional services consultant, or the applicant of affected party is unable to be represented at the hearing. The decision-making body will continue hearing to a fixed date, time and place. However, all subsequent continuances shall be granted at the sole discretion of the decisionmaking body. ...

On December 2, the Petitioner sent an email requesting a continuance of the hearing on this Project that was scheduled for the Board's December meeting. Petitioner is entitled to this continuance by right. Nevertheless, the City's Code requires the Board to continue hearings by motion. There is good reason for this requirement. When a board continues a hearing by motion, it creates a record of the requested continuance and provides notice to the public of the new hearing date.

Here, the hearing that was scheduled for December 2, 2020 did not take place because the Board did not meet the quorum requirements for its meeting. In response to its request for a continuance, the Petitioner received an email from the City Attorney advising the Petitioner that she consulted with Board members on their availability and that the hearing would be continued to the Board's regular January 6, 2020. (See e-mail attached as Exhibit A.) The City Attorney's e-mail does not meet the requirements for granting the Petitioner, an affected party, a continuance as required by the City's code as noted above. Furthermore, the letter does not include a fixed time and place as required by the City's code. The City Attorney's e-mail was merely an administrative rescheduling of the December 2 Board meeting which was cancelled for lack of a quorum. The fact that the hearing was postponed for lack of a quorum does not substitute for or satisfy Petitioners' right to a continuance under the City's Code.

However, despite the fact that the Petitioner was entitled to a continuance by right at the January $6^{\text {th }}$ Board meeting, the Board made a motion to deny the Petitioner's request for a continuance. Thus, it did not follow the essential requirements of the City's code. In addition, the Board's failure to grant

Petitioner a continuance as provided by the City's Code was a violation of the Petitioner's due process rights. For this reason, the Project approval must be rescinded, and the Project application must be remanded to the Board for a new hearing, where Petitioner will be properly represented by Counsel.

## 2. Site circulation and building placement will result in significant adverse impacts to the Petitioners' property which will reduce its value

The Applicant failed to meet its burden to show by competent substantial evidence that it meets all site design qualitative standards as required by Section 23.2-31 of the Lake Worth Beach Code. Specifically, it failed to provide sufficient evidence that the site design met the development standards that loading and vehicular circulation areas be located, designed and screened to minimize the impact of noise, glare and odor on the Petitioner's adjacent property as required by Section 23.2-31(c)(11). It also failed to provide sufficient evidence that the site design would not have a negative impact on the value of Petitioner's property as required by Section 23.2-31(c)(13).

Daniel Hiatt testified that the site design, which directed all large truck traffic to the interior roadway on the eastern edge of the Project, would result in significant adverse impacts to the Marlin Industrial Park which is directly adjacent to this interior roadway. He also testified that the proposed screening material on the eastern property line of the Project was not a sufficient buffer to minimize the noise and odors emitted by the large trucks anticipated to be circulating on the site. In fact, the Applicant's operations manager, Jared Wright, testified that the number of trucks entering the site would be up to 10 a day, which means that trucks would be passing behind the tenants who are renting out bays on Petitioner's property on an hourly basis.

The Applicant provided no evidence as to how it intended to mitigate the noise and odor from the great number of trucks anticipated to be used in their operations. The Applicant's representative Lisa Reves testified that a buffer was not required on the eastern property line since the noise would not be an issue for the Petitioner's tenants. Ms. Reves statement was based on an engineer's report attached to the Applicant's December $18^{\text {th }}$ letter to the City. (See attached as Exhibit B.) However, the engineer's report is limited to the sound of forklifts only. It does not address noise from the truck traffic. In fact, the noise thermometer attached to the engineer's report indicates that the noise resulting from a diesel truck accelerating is 114 dB , which is categorized as "extremely loud". Therefore, the Applicant's own evidence supports a finding that the site plan design does not provide sufficient buffer from the noise and odor anticipated from the truck traffic.

In addition, City staff did not provide sufficient evidence that the design of the site plan would help minimize the negative impacts to the Petitioner's property. City staff's analysis of the Project's impacts of noise, glare, odors, and property values was limited to the single-family and multi-family residences to the west and south of the Project. (See Staff report, Page 7.) City staff testified that a condition was added to the Project to require the Applicant to install fencing 6 to 8 feet in height made of opaque material on the eastern property line to screen the view of the outdoor storage area. However, City staff did not impose any conditions that would help buffer the noise and odor from the truck traffic, such as additional landscaping or a concrete wall consistent with screening materials added to the Project's western or southern property lines. The noise and odor from the constant procession of large trucks so close to the Marlin Industrial Park will significantly reduce the value of Petitioner's property.

## 3. Conditions imposed on the Conditional Use Permit are not sufficient to not mitigate the significant adverse impacts of the Project

The Applicant failed to meet its burden to show by competent substantial evidence that it meets all the required findings for approval of a conditional use permit as required by Section 23.2.-29 of the City's Code. The City's Code states that conditional uses are deemed to carry the potential for adverse impacts and can only be approved if all the required specific findings set forth in Section 23.2-29(e) have been met. Specifically, the Applicant failed to meet its burden to prove it met the required findings regarding the adverse impacts of noise and air pollution.

Code section 23.2-29(e)(3) requires that the conditional use will not produce significant air pollution emissions. Staff relied on the Applicant's statement that no fabrication or manufacturing would occur on site to conclude that the Project was not anticipated to produce significant air pollution emissions. (See Staff report, Page 11.) However, Petitioner George Garamy provided competent substantial evidence that the Applicant's operations are anticipated to produce air pollution in the form of excessive dust. Mr. Garamy testified that he had viewed satellite images of Applicant's similar operations in North America, including Pompano Beach, New Jersey, and Atlanta, and that these images showed that the pavement of the storage yards is covered with dust and that the dust is carried out to the surrounding roadways when the trucks leave the facilities. The fact that the dust was visible on a satellite image indicates that the amount of dust created by the Project operations is substantial. Neither City staff nor the Applicant refuted Mr. Garamy's testimony. In fact, the Applicant's operation manager, Jared Wright, admitted that its facility in Pompano Beach is "a mess". Instead of taking appropriate action to clean up the Pompano Beach facility, the Applicant simply stated that the proposed facility will be better. But in light of their poor performance in Pompano Beach, what assurance does the City have that operations in Lake Worth Beach will be any better? Absolutely none. Based on the testimony of Mr. Garamy and Mr. Wright, the Board could not have made a finding that the proposed use will not produce significant air pollution emissions.

Secondly, Code Section 23.2-29(e)(7) requires that the conditional use will not generate significant noise or will include conditions to mitigate the anticipated noise and meet all the requirements of the City Code related to unreasonable noise in Section 15.24. This section defines unreasonable noise as between 65 dba and 85 dba depending on the time and requires noise to be measured from the curb or property line closest to the source of noise with a 30 -second reading using an A-weighted filter or a C-weighted filter, constructed in accordance with the specifications of the American National Standards Institute. The engineer's report provided by the Applicant regarding the noise impacts (see above) is limited to forklift operations only and does not state whether the study conforms to the City requirements. In its analysis, City staff concluded that the Project was appropriately conditioned to prohibit generating noise levels that exceeded the levels required for unreasonable noise. (See City staff report, Page 12.) Yet, without an appropriate measurement as to the general level of noise to be generating from all of the Project's operations, not just forklift use, it would be impossible for staff to define conditions adequate to mitigate the anticipated noise.

## 4. The Project is not consistent with the goals of the City's comprehensive plan or strategic plan

The Applicant failed to meet its burden to show by competent substantial evidence that the Project was consistent with the goals of the City's comprehensive plan to create a quality industrial park in the area or with the goals of the City's strategic plan to create jobs and a stable tax base.

Mr. Hiatt testified that in his opinion as a commercial landowner in Lake Worth Beach, the Project site was underdeveloped and ultimately deprived the City of potential tax revenue. In support of his opinion, Mr. Hiatt stated that he owns multi-unit buildings that are between 15,000 and 20,000 square feet each. Each one of these buildings has 10 to 15 small businesses which contribute to the City's tax base. He also testified that he owns several one-acre sites that contain buildings approximately 15,000 square feet in size. There are approximately 50 to 60 people working in each of these buildings. Based on Mr. Hiatt's testimony, ten acres of industrially zoned land in the City can create up to 600 jobs when developed to its full potential. In contrast, the Applicant testified that the Project, which consists of a ten-acre site, would create only 50 jobs. This is much less than the site's potential. Therefore, the Project is not consistent with the City's goals to create jobs and a stable tax base.

For the reasons noted herein, the City Council should 1) rescind the Board's denial of the Petitioner's request for a continuance, 2) rescind the Board's Development Order for the Project, and 3) remand the Project application to a new hearing before the Planning and Zoning Board, at which Petitioners may be represented by the undersigned legal counsel and retain experts to further support the basis to deny the subject application.

Sincerely,

Alfred Malefatto, Esq. and Janice Rustin, Esq. Counsel for Petitioner

## EXHIBIT A

From: Pamala Ryan
Sent: Friday, December 4, 2020 1:54 PM
To: Erin Sita; Daniel Hiatt
Cc: Sherie Coale
Subject: RE: PBZ PROJECT \#20-01400035

Good afternoon. I have consulted with staff who has consulted with board members on availability and the hearing will be continued to the regular January 6, 2020 meeting. Please feel free to advise staff (or me through your attorney, if appropriate) if you have any questions regarding your status as an affected party.

Have a good weekend.

Pamala H. Ryan
Board Certified in City County \& Local Govt. Law

## TORCIVIA, DONLON \& <br> GODDEAU, P.A.

Northpoint Corporate Center
701 Northpoint Parkway, Suite 209
West Palm Beach, FL 33407
(561) 686-8700
(561) 686-8764 fax
pryan@torcivialaw.com
www.torcivialaw.com

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS TRANSMISSION IS ATTORNEY PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL. IT IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY NAMED ABOVE. IF THE READER OF THIS MESSAGE IS NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING OF THIS COMMUNICATION IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY BY TELEPHONE COLLECT AND RETURN THE ORIGINAL MESSAGE TO US AT THE ABOVE ADDRESS VIA THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE. WE WILL REIMBURSE YOU FOR YOUR EXPENSES. THANK YOU.

From: Pamala Ryan
Sent: Wednesday, December 02, 2020 6:05 PM
To: Erin Sita [esita@LakeWorthBeachfl.gov](mailto:esita@LakeWorthBeachfl.gov); Daniel Hiatt [danielhiatt@bellsouth.net](mailto:danielhiatt@bellsouth.net)
Cc: William Waters [wwaters@lakeworthbeachfl.gov](mailto:wwaters@lakeworthbeachfl.gov); Sherie Coale [scoale@lakeworthbeachfl.gov](mailto:scoale@lakeworthbeachfl.gov)
Subject: RE: PBZ PROJECT \#20-01400035

Mr. Hiatt, so that there is no confusion, the city is looking at advertising the hearing for either December 16, 2020 or January 6, 2020. We will advise you tomorrow but that gives you time to hire legal counsel. Thank you.

Pamala H. Ryan
Board Certified in City County \& Local Govt. Law

## TORCIVIA, DONLON \& <br> GODDEAU, P.A.

Northpoint Corporate Center
701 Northpoint Parkway, Suite 209
West Palm Beach, FL 33407
(561) 686-8700
(561) 686-8764 fax
pryan@torcivialaw.com
www.torcivialaw.com

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS TRANSMISSION IS ATTORNEY PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL. IT IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY NAMED ABOVE. IF THE READER OF THIS MESSAGE IS NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING OF THIS COMMUNICATION IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY BY TELEPHONE COLLECT AND RETURN THE ORIGINAL MESSAGE TO US AT THE ABOVE ADDRESS VIA THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE. WE WILL REIMBURSE YOU FOR YOUR EXPENSES. THANK YOU.

From: Pamala Ryan
Sent: Wednesday, December 02, 2020 5:54 PM
To: Erin Sita [esita@LakeWorthBeachfl.gov](mailto:esita@LakeWorthBeachfl.gov); Daniel Hiatt [danielhiatt@bellsouth.net](mailto:danielhiatt@bellsouth.net)
Cc: William Waters [wwaters@lakeworthbeachfl.gov](mailto:wwaters@lakeworthbeachfl.gov); Sherie Coale [scoale@lakeworthbeachfl.gov](mailto:scoale@lakeworthbeachfl.gov)
Subject: RE: PBZ PROJECT \#20-01400035
Mr. Hiatt,

The city is in receipt of your request. Are you stating that you did not get notice via US mail although courtesy notice was delivered in accordance with the city's code? It is my understanding that your property manager, Christina Morrison, was aware no later than November 25, 2020 when she sent an email to city staff requesting the staff report. Under the code, an affected party must give five days' notice.

Having said that the city will continue this case to no later than January 6, 2020. A date is being determined now and you will be notified expeditiously via email, mail and legal notice. The city will send you an affected party status form for either you or your attorney to fill out.

Thank you.

Pamala H. Ryan
Board Certified in City County \& Local Govt. Law

## TORCIVIA, DONLON \& GODDEAU, P.A.

Northpoint Corporate Center

701 Northpoint Parkway, Suite 209
West Palm Beach, FL 33407
(561) 686-8700
(561) 686-8764 fax
pryan@torcivialaw.com
www.torcivialaw.com

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS TRANSMISSION IS ATTORNEY PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL. IT IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY NAMED ABOVE. IF THE READER OF THIS MESSAGE IS NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING OF THIS COMMUNICATION IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY BY TELEPHONE COLLECT AND RETURN THE ORIGINAL MESSAGE TO US AT THE ABOVE ADDRESS VIA THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE. WE WILL REIMBURSE YOU FOR YOUR EXPENSES. THANK YOU.

From: Erin Sita [mailto:esita@LakeWorthBeachfl.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, December 02, 2020 4:51 PM
To: Daniel Hiatt [danielhiatt@bellsouth.net](mailto:danielhiatt@bellsouth.net)
Cc: Pamala Ryan [pryan@torcivialaw.com](mailto:pryan@torcivialaw.com); William Waters [wwaters@lakeworthbeachfl.gov](mailto:wwaters@lakeworthbeachfl.gov)
Subject: RE: PBZ PROJECT \#20-01400035
Thank you Mr. Hiatt, I received your request and have forwarded it onto our board attorney.

Erin F. Sita, AICP
Assistant Director | Community Sustainability Department


City of Lake Worth Beach
1900 Second Avenue North
Lake Worth Beach, FL 33461
V: 561-586-1617
esita@lakeworthbeachfl.gov
www.lakeworthbeachfl.gov

## Departmental Operating Hours

Monday - Friday 8:00 am - 4:00 pm
"We are LAKE WORTH BEACH. A hometown City that is committed to delivering the highest level of customer service through a commitment to integrity, hard work and a friendly attitude. We strive to exceed the expectations of our citizens, our businesses, our elected officials and our fellow employees."

From: Daniel Hiatt [danielhiatt@bellsouth.net](mailto:danielhiatt@bellsouth.net)
Sent: Wednesday, December 2, 2020 4:47 PM
To: Erin Sita [esita@LakeWorthBeachfl.gov](mailto:esita@LakeWorthBeachfl.gov)
Subject: PBZ PROJECT \#20-01400035
Caution: This is an external email. Do not click links or open attachments from unknown or unverified sources.

## Dear Ms Sita

I would like to apply for affected party status on the above named project ( PZB \# 20-01400035)

I also would like to request a minimum of a 30 day postponement on this matter.

My property is directly east of the subject property. Located @ $359923^{\text {rd }}$ Ave South, Lake Worth FI.
LOT \# 7 MARLIN INDUSTRIAL PARK.

Thank You Daniel W. Hiatt. 561-389-1989

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

EXHIBIT B

December 18, 2020

William Waters, Director<br>Community Sustainability<br>1900 Second Avenue North<br>Lake Worth Beach, FL 33461

Mr. Waters,
Thank you for forwarding the comments and concerns received from business owners and residents regarding Umdasch/Doka's development application. Upon review of those comments and concerns, it is apparent that there is a misconception about the proposed use of the site and I appreciate the opportunity to clarify the issues.

## USE OF SITE

Doka USA Ltd., is an international leader in developing, manufacturing and distributing formwork technology for use in all fields of construction. While the activities at our property have been outlined in our application, we appreciate the opportunity to elaborate on the activities proposed for the Lake Worth Beach facility. The proposed site utilization has three main components: office operations, yard operations and maintenance facilities.

The office operations houses our engineers, sales, operations, logistics and management staff. It is here that Doka engineers design formwork to accomplish our clients construction goals.

Once our engineers complete a design, yard operations utilize a forklift to gather and load the necessary equipment, from our storage yard onto trucks for transportation to construction sites. Trucks access the site from 7th Avenue North approximately 850 feet from the Oakwood Apartments to the south of the site and in excess of 510 feet to the properties to the west of the E-3 Canal. The loading and unloading of equipment can take up to an hour to complete. Therefore, truck engines are required to be turned off during the loading and unloading process. It is anticipated that this facility will load ten to fifteen trucks daily.

Once the construction is complete the equipment is received and inspected by yard operations. Items returning from a jobsite, are unloaded in a designated area near the warehouse where they are timely inspected and any maintenance, repair and/or cleaning of the formwork is performed within the warehouse before being returned to the storage yard.

This facility is not proposing a retail business, so there will be minimal foot traffic and vehicles accessing the site will be limited to employees and trucks transporting the formwork to and from jobsites.

## POLLUTANTS

A number of comments and concerns received, included the concern that the chemicals used for cleaning the formwork will runoff into the pond and drain into the E-3 Canal. Cleaning of the formwork does not include the use of chemicals only water and a pressure washer. Moreover, formwork cleaning, runoff, and drainage of any water will be done in strict accordance with the rules and regulations of the City of Lake Worth Beach, the Lake Worth Drainage District, Palm Beach County and the State of Florida. Doka's operation does not use or generate any hazardous substances.

Doka takes pride in its operations and that pride includes the cleanliness of our sites. Our facilities generate very little debris or refuse and all refuse is collected in trash receptacles (as noted on site plan) and collected per local trash collection regulations. Contrary to some of the comments and concerns received by the city, Doka has not become the international leader in formwork by running a "junkyard". To the contrary, it is imperative for Doka to run its operation and storage yard in a clean and orderly fashion, so material can be readily identified and loaded onto trucks.

The storage yard has a paved surface which allows the forklifts to operate efficiently and will keep dust levels to a minimum. Additionally, the inventory stored outside is neatly stacked in rows so that it is easily accessible for future jobs.

The following photographs are aerial of Doka's Baltimore and Houston facilities, respectively and demonstrate the standard by which Doka maintains its sites.



## NOISE

There should be very little noise intrusion from our operations. Forklifts will operate within required sound parameters set forth by the City of Lake Worth Beach. All maintenance is performed within the warehouse and will not impact surrounding properties. Further, attached hereto, is a memorandum from Jesse Cokeley, a licensed engineer, outlining his research regarding forklift operation and the noise created on site, all of which fall within the acceptable noise level range for the City of Lake Worth Beach.

## SITE LIGHTING

Doka is proposing business hours from 7:30 a.m. until 4:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and if needed Saturdays 7:30 a.m. until noon. Since the hours of operation are daylight hours there is not a need for a large amount of site lighting but, Doka is working with both an engineer and the city to design a lighting plan that will not be disruptive to the surrounding properties and will be acceptable to the City of Lake Worth Beach.

## CANOPY

The outdoor canopy area will be used for storage of items that require protection from inclement weather such as plywood and small parts. There will be some inspection of equipment that occurs in this area but, there will be very little work performed in the canopy area.

## SUMMARY

As stated in the staff report, the Doka facility/use will be a relatively low level of intensity. We are not operating at all hours of the day, our projected traffic amount is a fraction of what is permitted, there are no heavy industrial or manufacturing uses being employed, there is little noise, no chemicals and, we are going to install a beautiful buffer with trees and shrubs surrounding the property. We have several existing facilities in the United States which border residential neighborhoods and Doka maintains excellent relationships with all of those communities. We consider our relationships with our neighbors and the towns we work in extremely important, since we are a family-owned business which emphasizes involvement in the communities. In fact, it is our experience that residents in the surrounding communities are often our future employees. Therefore, maintaining a good relationship with the surrounding community is of paramount importance to the success of our business.

Sincerely,
/s/ Lisa A. Reves
Lisa Reves, Esq.
sb
Enclosures

Engineers

# MEMORANDUM 

## To: Louis Goldberg

From: Jesse B. Cokeley, P.E.
Date: $\quad$ November 30, 2020

## Re: Noise Attenuation Memo <br> MC Project No. 16002631A

Noise is typically measured in decibels. The noise level perceived by listener is related to the distance from the source of the noise. This is known as the inverse square law which simply means, for every doubling of the distance from a noise source the sound pressure will diminish by 6 dB .

The formula for Sound Attenuation is as follows:
$\mathrm{SPL}_{2}=\mathrm{SPL}_{1}-\left[20 \log _{10}\left(\frac{\mathrm{R}_{2}}{\mathrm{R}_{1}}\right)\right]$
Where:
$\mathrm{SPL}_{1}=$ Known sound pressure level $(\mathrm{dB})$ at the first location (typically measured data or equipment vendor data)
$\mathrm{SPL}_{2}=$ Unknown sound pressure level (dB) at the second location
$\mathrm{R}_{1}=$ Distance (ft.) from the noise source to location of known sound pressure level
$\mathrm{R}_{2}=$ Distance (ft.) from noise source to the second location

The average noise level for a forklift is 87 dB at the source. Therefore, $\mathrm{SPL}_{1}=87 \mathrm{~dB}$.

We assume the source point is at the center of a standard forklift. Therefore, $\mathrm{R}_{1}=2 \mathrm{ft}$.

| Distance from Source $\left(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}\right)$ | dB Level $\left(\mathbf{S P L}_{\mathbf{2}}\right)$ | Comparable Sound* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{5 0} \mathbf{f t .}$ | 59 dB | Microwave Oven, Dishwasher |
| $\mathbf{1 0 0} \mathbf{f t .}$ | 53 dB | Background Music or Rainfall |
| $\mathbf{2 5 0} \mathbf{f t .}$ | 45 dB | Refrigerator |
| $\mathbf{4 0 0} \mathbf{f t .}$ | 41 dB | Quiet Library/Office |
| $\mathbf{5 0 0} \mathrm{ft}$. | 39 dB | Quiet Library/Office |

*Comparable sounds and forklift sound level were taken from Honeywell Noise Thermometer Poster.

[^0]
## Honeywell

Howario

## Noise Thermometer

Sound Energy Doubles Every 3 dB
(Example: if a 90 dB noise is doubled, it measures 93 dB )

(EU Hearing Directive U Hearing Directive
2003/10/EC)


## city Of Lake worth beach Community Sustainability"

## New Business, Item A

- PZB 20-01400035: Consideration of a:
- Major Site Plan with Sustainable Bonus and
- Conditional Use
to construct a $+/-47,000$ square foot distribution facility and repair and maintenance uses within the Industrial Park of Commerce (I-POC) zoning district commonly referred to as "Umdasch/Doka" and located at 2209 7th Avenue North.


## Site Location



## Background/Proposal

| Applicant | Lisa Reves of Saul, Ewing, Arnstein and Lehr on behalf of Umdasch <br> Real Estate USA, Ltd. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Owner | LW Industrial LLC |
| General Location | South of the western terminus of 7th Ave N, east of the E-4 Canal |
| Existing PCN <br> Numbers | $38-43-44-20-01-066-0010$ |

## Background/Proposal

- Request to the Planning \& Zoning Board
- Major Site Plan for the development of an industrial building in excess of 7,500 square feet.
- Sustainable Bonus Program Incentive to gain an increase in increase in building height to 31 ft .
- Conditional Use Permit to establish "distribution facility" and "repair and maintenance - major" uses greater than 7,500 square feet.


## Existing Conditions



## Surrounding Properties

- North and East of the Project Location:
- Mixture of office and warehouse uses
- The proposed development is in harmony with these existing uses.
- South of the Project Location:
- Multi-Family Residential
- The site plan provides for a lake as well as a 6' precast wall and landscaping to buffer the site from the multi-family residential uses.
- East of the Project Location:
- Single-Family Residential
- The site plan provides for a 6' precast concrete wall and landscaping to buffer the site from the singlefamily residential uses.
- A 200 foot canal right-of-way separates the subject site from the single-family residential.
- Staff finds that the proposed development is in harmony with the existing warehouse and office uses, and provides buffering from the nearby residential uses which complies with the City's Land Development Regulations.



## Renderings



## Analysis

- Consistent with the Comprehensive Plan
- Consistent with the Strategic Plan
- Generally consistent with the City's LDRs
- Consistent with the Qualitative Development Standards (LDR Section 23.231(c))
- Consistent with the Community Appearance Criteria (LDR Section 23.2-31(I))
- Consistent with the review/decision criteria for all SBIPs (LDR Section 23.233(c)(2))
- Consistent with the specific standards for all conditional uses (LDR Section 23.2-29(e))
- Consistent with specific criteria for outdoor storage (LDR Section 23.4-19)


## Analysis

- Consistency with the City's LDRs
- Minimum required setbacks
- Maximum impermeable surface coverage
- Walls/Fences
- Lighting and security

| Development Standard | Base Zoning District | Provided |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lot Size (min) In square feet (sf) | 13,000 sf | 455,500 sf |
| Lot Width (min) | 100 | 400' |
| Front (min) | $20^{\prime}$ | $25^{\prime}$ |
| Sethacks Rear (min) | $10^{\prime}$ | 318' |
| Interior Side (min) | 0' | West: 82.5' / <br> East: 192’ |
| Impermeable Surface Coverage (maximum) | 65\% | 55\% |
| Structure Coverage (max) | 55\% | 10.3\% |
| Parking | 63 (25 office, 38 industrial) | 70 |
| Building Height (max) | $45^{\prime}$ under sustainable bonus | $31^{\prime}$ |
| Floor Area Ratio (FAR) (max) | 1.1 | . 10 |

## Staff Recommendation

- As the application meets the City's Land Development Regulations, staff is recommending that the Board approve the Major Site Plan, Conditional Use Permit, and Sustainable Bonus Incentive Program as conditioned.
- Conditions of Approval are located on pages 14-15 of the staff report.


## Conditions of Approval

## Electric:

- Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy:
- The 10 - ft -wide electric easement will be needed and recorded prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.
- The customer will be responsible for installing Lake Worth Beach's two 4" schedule-40 gray electric conduits at a minimum of $42^{\prime \prime}$ deep.
- Prior to the issuance of a building permit:
- The electrical riser diagram and the load calculations will be needed.


## Planning:

- Prior to the issuance of a building permit, all fencing on-site shall meet the applicable requirements of Sections 23.4-4 and Section 23.4-19
- The project is prohibited from generating noise levels that exceed regulations found in Section 15.24.


## Public Works:

- The issuance of any permits shall comply with all provisions of the Lake Worth Municipal Code and all other applicable standards including but not limited to the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), and City of Lake Worth Public Works Construction Standards and Policy and Procedure Manual.
- Prior to the issuance of a building permit:
- the applicant shall contact the Lake Worth Drainage (LWDD) District's Engineering Department and obtain any required permit(s), if necessary, and furnish to the City. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant
shall contact the South Florida Water Management District's (SFWMD) Engineering Department and obtain any required permit(s), if necessary.
- the Applicant shall contact and meet with a representative from the Public Works Solid Waste and Recycling Division to confirm dumpster enclosure location, accessibility and demand on property and that it is compatible with the requirements of the Department of Public Works. Solid Waste and Recycling Division contact number is 561-533-7344
- the applicant shall provide architectural details for the dumpster enclosure to confirm the enclosure meets the standards of the Public Works Dept.
- Prior to performing work in the right of way, the applicant shall apply for and receive issuance of a "Right of Way/Utility Permit" application
- Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy:
- All conditions of approval must be satisfied under jurisdiction of the Department of Public Works
- The Applicant shall ensure the entire surrounding off-site infrastructure inclusive of the roadway, sidewalk, curbing, stormwater system piping and structures, valve boxes, manholes, landscaping, striping, signage, and other improvements are in the same condition as prior to construction
- The applicant shall fine grade and sod all disturbed areas with bahia sod
- The applicant shall broom sweep all areas of the affected right of way and remove of all silt and debris collected as a result of construction activity
- The applicant shall restore the right of way to a like or better condition. Any damages to pavement, curbing, striping, sidewalks or other areas shall be restored in kind
- The trench patch for the utility crossing on 7th Ave North shall be restored in accordance with the construction standards of the Public Works Dept.


## Conditions of Approval

## Water \& Sewer:

- Water \& Sewer Utility Plan:
- Prior to the issuance of a building permit
- Center the 15 -foot-wide easement over the water main.
- Add or move the in-line valve at the edge of the easement for the fire line. This will delineate the private/utility ownership.
- Provide a valve at the southern watermain connection.
- Note to engineer: The proposed watermain has been installed in 7th Ave N , the utility department will have the as-built plan shortly. If practical, the actual utility location should be referenced.
- Move the water service parallel to the fire line or propose a location that minimize the easement extension and path under asphalt. Near the entrance or tapping the main off of 7th Ave N is an option since the meter can be set close to the property line.
- Adjust the water main and/or slope of bank at the lake to provide a minimum of 10 feet flat space for maintenance access. Consider vehicles and equipment having to navigate around the lake bank at the southeast corner
- Capacity fees for water and sewer must be paid in full in accordance with the current City Ordinance.
- The site shall permit through LWDD and/or SFWMD for the stormwater management and provide a copy to Water Utilities.
- The following shall be provided:
- At time of engineering submittal, provide a full drawing set including any updated drainage calculations, and any permits or permitting information from SFWMD and LWDD
- Add all structure and utility conflict information on the plans.
- Complete water, sewer and drainage plans showing proposed pipe sizes,
materials, structure sizes, utility crossing elevations, hydrants, manholes, as well as all pertinent site elevations.
- Permits from the PBC Health Department for the Watermain extension and the private lift station connection
- If applicable, show irrigation service line/s up the meter and backflow RPZ device/s.
- Show water \& sewer services, drainage structures, and storm mains on landscape plan. Confirm minimum spacing between landscape and services per Public Services Detail 23, Typical Tree with Root Barrier.
- Fireflow calculations based on a recent hydrant test. Contact Pedro Segovia with Palm Beach County at psegovia@pbcgov.com
- Signed and sealed Drainage Calculations including a drainage statement from the engineer regarding floodplain management provisions for water quality and quantity shall be provided to the City.
- Provide geotechnical information for the determination of the hydraulic conductivity of the soil, and groundwater elevation.
- An Erosion Control plan and with the BMPs and NPDES compliance practices shall be provided for the project site.
- Engineering plans shall include cross-sections along each property line and with grading showing the design storm ( $3 \mathrm{yr}, 1$ hour ( $2.6^{\prime \prime}$ )) runoff being maintained on site.
- Provide existing and proposed site grades.
- Indicate vertical datum on all plan drawings with grades.
- All applicable City of Lake Worth details.


## Lake Worth Drainage District:

- This project will require a drainage outfall connection permit from this District if they will be draining to the $\mathrm{E}-4$ Canal.



## city Of Lake worth beach Community Sustainability"

## Umdasch Real Estate USA, Ltd. 2209 7th $^{\text {th }}$ Avenue North Lake Worth Beach, Florida

| $\quad$ doka | Louis Goldberg, Senior Facilities and Property Project Manager <br> Jared Wright, Southeast Regional Manager <br> George Balaban, P.E. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Kimley»Horn | Adam Kerr, Traffic Engineer |
| Johnathan Haigh, PLA, ASLA Landscape Architect |  |
| $\frac{\text { SAUL EWING }}{\text { ARNSTEIN }}$ | Jaime Mayo, Architect |
| Manuel Rodriquez, Project Manager |  |
| Lisa Reves, Esq. |  |

## Boutwell Industrial Park of Commerce


9.79 Acre Site

Zoned I-POC with Industrial Future Land Use



## Main Entrance



West Elevation


South Elevation


Access/Buffers



## Request

- Major Site Plan Approval for Industrial Building.
- Conditional Use Approval to Construct:
- 26, 617 SF Warehouse/Maintenance Shop
- 10,150 SF Two (2) Story Office
- 11,160 SF Outdoor Open Canopy
- 104,342 SF Outdoor Storage Area
- Sustainable Bonus Incentive Program to Increase Building Height from 30' to 31 ' in Height for the Office Space ( $5,565 \mathrm{SF}$ ).


## Required Findings - Section 23.2-29(e) Conditional Use Criteria Items 1-8

| Criferia | Applicant Response | Stajf Response |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. The proposed conditional use will not generate traffic volumes or movements which will result in a significant adverse impact or reduce the level of service provided on any street to a level lower than would result from a development permitted by right. | Palm Beach County TPS letter indicates exemption from Traffic Performance Standards. | Meets Criterion. |
| 2. The proposed conditional use will not result in a significantly greater amount of through traffic on local streets than would result from a development permitted by right and is appropriately located with respect to collector and arterial streets. | The traffic generated from the proposed mixed-use development will not be significantly greater than that of adjacent uses and other anticipated uses in this area. | Meets Criterion. |
| 3. The proposed conditional use will not produce significant air pollution emissions, or will appropriately mitigate anticipated emissions to a level compatible with that which would result from a development permitted by right. | The distribution facility, repair and maintenance do not pose a pollution hazard to the nearby properties. | Meets <br> Criterion. |
| 4. The proposed conditional use will be so located in relation to the thoroughfare system that neither extension nor enlargement nor any other alteration of that system in a manner resulting in higher net public cost or earlier incursion of public cost than would result from development permitted by right. | The project is not anticipated to cause a higher net public cost or earlier incursion of public cost than what would result from a development permitted by right. | Meets Criterion. |

5. The proposed conditional use will be so located in relation to water lines, sanitary sewers, storm sewers, surface drainage systems and other utility systems that neither extension nor enlargement nor any other alteration of such systems in a manner resulting in higher net public cost or earlier incursion of public cost than would result from development permitted by right.
6. The proposed conditional use will not place a demand on municipal police or fire protection service beyond the capacity of those services, except that the proposed facility may place a demand on municipal police or fire protection services which does not exceed that likely to result from a development permitted by right.
7. The proposed conditional use will not generate significant noise, or will appropriately mitigate anticipated noise to a level compatible with that which would result from a development permitted by right. Any proposed use must meet all the requirements and stipulations set forth in Section 15.24, Noise control.
8. The proposed conditional use will not generate light or glare which encroaches onto any residential property in excess of that allowed in Section 23.4-10, Exterior lighting.

No adverse impact to infrastructure or public utilities is anticipated to occur as a result of this request.

The proposed development is not anticipated to place a demand on municipal police or fire protection service beyond the capacity of those services.

The proposed development is not anticipated to generate noise in excess of the noise control ordinance.

Photometric plan shows compliance with Section 23.4-3.

## Meets Criterion.

## Meets Criterion.

## Meets Criterion.

## Meets Criterion.

## Required Findings - Section 23.2-29(d) General Findings Relating to Harmony with LDRs and Protection of Public Interest Items 1-4

Crîerria

1. The conditional use exactly as proposed at the
location where proposed will be in harmony with the uses
which, under these LDRs and the future land use
element, are most likely to occur in the immediate area
where located. where located.
2. The conditional use exactly as proposed at the location where proposed will be in harmony with existing uses in the immediate area where located.
3. The conditional use exactly as proposed will not result in substantially less public benefit or greater harm than would result from use of the property for some use permitted by right or some other conditional use permitted on the property.
4. The conditional use exactly as proposed will not result in more intensive development in advance of when such development is approved by the future land use element of the Comprehensive Plan.

Applicant Response

The site contains a base zoning designation of I-POC and is adjacent to I-POC zoned property to the north and east, Mixed-Use West (MU-W) zoned property to the south, and residential land use to the west on the opposite side of the E-4 canal. Based on the intent of the I-POC zoning district, the types of uses most likely to occur in this district are the establishment and enlargement of office, manufacturing and light industrial uses. The subject proposal is consistent with the types of uses anticipated to occur within the I-POC district. In addition, the site is designed with features to help buffer the site from nearby incompatible uses; these are described in the below criterion. Therefore, the proposed project is compatible and harmonious with the existing and anticipated surrounding uses.
The subject site is surrounded by a mixture of warehouse, single-family, multi-family, and office uses. The property locates the warehouse building to the north of the site and away from the multi-family uses to the south of the site, reducing its impact on those properties.

The approval of this conditional use will provide urban infill development that is consistent with the intent of the I-POC zoning district and I future land use category and is not anticipated to result in less public benefit than other permitted or conditional uses.

The proposed project is utilizing the City's SBIP bonuses for an additional one (1) foot of building height. The increase in building height will allow for the screening of rooftop equipment located above the office portion of the proposed building. Staff's analysis of the SBIP can be found on page 8. The project is consistent with the goals, objectives, and polices of the City of Lake Worth Beach's Comprehensive Plan and will not result in a more intensive development than what the Plan anticipates.

## Meets Criterion.

## Meets Criterion.

## Meets Criterion.

## Meets Criterion.

## Required Findings - Section 23.2-31 (c) Qualitative Development Standards Items 1-15

## Griterioa

1. Harmonious and efficient organization. All elements of the site plan shall be harmoniously and efficiently organized in relation to topography, the size and type of plot, the character of adjoining property and the type and size of buildings. The site shall be developed so as to not impede the normal and orderly development or improvement of surrounding property for uses permitted in these LDRs.
2. Preservation of natural conditions. The natural (refer to landscape code, Article 6 of these LDRs) landscape shall be preserved in its natural state, insofar as practical, by minimizing tree and soil removal and by such other site planning approaches as are appropriate. Terrain and vegetation shall not be disturbed in a manner likely to significantly increase either wind or water erosion within or adjacent to a development site. Natural detention areas and other means of natural vegetative filtration of stormwater runoff shall be used to minimize ground and surface water pollution, particularly adjacent to major waterbodies as specified in Part II, Chapter 12, Health and Sanitation, Article VIII, Fertilizer Friendly Use Regulations. Fertilizer/pesticide conditions may be attached to development adjacent to waterbodies. Marinas shall be permitted only in water with a mean low tide depth of four (4) feet or more.
3. Screening and buffering. Fences, walls or vegetative screening shall be provided where needed and practical to protect residents and users from undesirable views, lighting, noise, odors or other adverse off-site effects, and to protect residents and users of off-site development from on-site adverse effects. This section may be interpreted to require screening and buffering in addition to that specifically required by other sections of these LDRs, but not less.
4. Enhancement of residential privacy. The site plan shall provide reasonable, visual and acoustical privacy for all dwelling units located therein and adjacent thereto. Fences, walks, barriers and vegetation shall be arranged for the protection and enhancement of property and to enhance the privacy of the occupants.
5. Emergency access. Structures and other site features shall be so arranged as to permit emergency vehicle access by some practical means to all sides of all buildings.

14

The site is organized so the most instense uses are oriented toward the industrial uses.

The site is a designated Brownfield area which Umdasch Real Estate USA, Ltd intends to rehabilitate.

The project proposes landscaping and permiter wall along the western and southern property line. Chain link with landscaping is proposed for the remainng property lines

The site provides a 6 ' wall with vegetation to buffer the site's impacts and provide additional residential privacy.

The building is oriented adjacent to the right-of-way for easy access by emergency vehicles.

Meets Criterion.

Meets Criterion.

Meets Criterion.

Meets Criterion.
6. Access to public ways. All buildings, dwelling units and other facilities shall have safe and convenient access to a public street, walkway or other area dedicated to common use; curb cuts close to railroad crossings shall be avoided.
7. Pedestrian circulation. There shall be provided a pedestrian circulation system which is insulated as completely as reasonably possible from the vehicular circulation system.
8. Design of ingress and egress drives. The location, size and numbers of ingress and egress drives to the site will be arranged to minimize the negative impacts on public and private ways and on adjacent private property. Merging and turnout lanes traffic dividers shall be provided where they would significantly improve safety for vehicles and pedestrians.
9. Coordination of on-site circulation with off-site circulation. The arrangement of public or common ways for vehicular and pedestrian circulation shall be coordinated with the pattern of existing or planned streets and pedestrian or bicycle pathways in the area. Minor streets shall not be connected to major streets in such a way as to facilitate improper utilization.
10. Design of on-site public right-of-way. On-site public street and rights-of-way shall be designed for maximum efficiency. They shall occupy no more land than is required to provide access, nor shall they unnecessarily fragment development into small blocks. Large developments containing extensive public rights-of-way shall have said rights-of-way arranged in a hierarchy with local streets providing direct access to parcels and other streets providing no or limited direct access to parcels.

The building fronts $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue North and the site has three (3) access points from the right-of-way.

The pedestrian circulation from the right-of-way to the office entrance avoids as much conflict with vehicular circulation as possible, with the pedestrian crossings located at the point where vehicles stop to turn on/off of $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue North. The pedestrian circulation does not cross through any vehicular circulation areas within the site and provides direct access to the building.

The project proposes accerss from $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue North and no negative impacts on adjacent properties are anticipated.

All common ways off the project site will circulate traffic internally on the site and will not connect with any other right-of-way as no such other rights-of-ways exist adjacent to the property.

Right-of-way dedication for $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue North is depicted on the site plan along the property's northern boundary to the E-4 Canal. Based on the nature of use and proposed traffic circulation on the site, no other on-site right-of-way is being dedicated. Therefore, this criterion does not apply.

## Meets Criterion.

## Meets Criterion.

## Meets Criterion.

## Meets Criterion.

## Meets Criterion.

11. Off-street parking, loading and vehicular circulation areas. Offstreet parking, loading and vehicular circulation areas shall be located, designed and screened to minimize the impact of noise, glare and odor on adjacent property.
12. Refuse and service areas. Refuse and service areas shall be located, designed and screened to minimize the impact of noise, glare and odor on adjacent property.
13. Protection of property values. The elements of the site plan shall be arranged so as to have minimum negative impact on the property values of adjoining property.
14. Transitional development. Where the property being developed is located on the edge of the zoning district, the site plan shall be designed to provide for a harmonious transition between districts. Building exteriors shall complement other buildings in the vicinity in size, scale, mass, bulk, rhythm of openings and character. Consideration shall be given to a harmonious transition in height and design style so that the change in zoning districts is not accentuated. Additional consideration shall be given to complementary setbacks between the existing and proposed development.
15. Consideration of future development. In finding whether or not the above standards are met, the review authority shall consider likely future development as well as existing development.

The site proposes three (3) points of ingress/egress. The western most ingress/egress point is for personal and regular-sized vehicles. The two (2) easterly points of ingress/egress will be for larger truck traffic. These have been located away from the single-family and multi-family residences to the west and south to minimize the impact of noise, glare and odor to these properties.

The site plan shows the refuse area is located toward the middle of the site and away from any existing property lines. The dumpster enclosure is also screened and opens toward the building and away from any adjacent properties, minimizing the impact of noise, glare and odor on adjacent property.

The elements of the site plan are arranged insofar as feasible to minimize negative impacts to property values of adjoining properties. The site provides landscaping and buffering from adjacent properties, orients building and site activities and circulation away from adjacent properties.

The project is located on the western edge of the Industrial Park of Commerce zoning district and along the city's western boundary following the E-4 Keller Canal. The project provides for a 6' pre-cast concrete wall and landscaping on the edge of the zoning district's boundaries with adjacent mixed-use and residential zoning districts. Yard operations and circulations are located away from these properties and setbacks are provided to minimize the impact.

The project as proposed does not anticipate any future development at the site. Any future proposed development not included as part of this application must go through the applicable land development process for full review. Overall, the project meets the intent of the Land Development Regulations and Comprehensive Plan.

## Meets Criterion.

## Meets <br> Criterion.

## Meets Criterion.

## Meets Criterion.

## Meets <br> Criterion.

## Required Findings - Section 23.2-31 (I) Community Appearance Criteria Items 1-4

Criteroia

1. The plan for the proposed structure or project is in conformity with good taste, good design, and in general contributes to the image of the city as a place of beauty, spaciousness, harmony, taste, fitness, broad vistas and high quality.
2. The proposed structure or project is not, in its exterior design and appearance, of inferior quality such as to cause the nature of the local environment or evolving environment to materially depreciate in appearance and value.
3. The proposed structure or project is in harmony with the proposed developments in the general area, with code requirements pertaining to site plan, signage and landscaping, and the comprehensive plan for the city, and with the criteria set forth herein.
4. The proposed structure or project is in compliance with this Section and 23.2-29, as applicable.

The design of the project reflects modern architectural styles generally associated with good taste and design. The office portion has large windows that face the right-ofway and allow natural light into the space, with more intense uses oriented toward the rear of the site, away from the right-of-way. The project provides architectural embellishments that are colored to match the business branding, however these are kept to a minimum and are in good taste and design.

The project utilizes industry standard materials that are neutral and generally compatible with the local environment.

The project uses a modern design aesthetic which is similar to and appropriate with other existing buildings and proposed projects which have been approved in the surrounding area.

The project's compliance with the community appearance and conditional use criteria is detailed above.

## Meets Criterion.

## Meets Criterion.

## Meets Criterion.

## Meets Criterion.

## Required Findings - Section 23.2-33 (c)(2) Sustainable Bonus Incentive Program Items a-d

Criteria $A$ Applicant Response $\quad$ Steff Response
(a) Is the award calculated correctly, consistent with the square footage and height requested and the value of the features and improvements included in the development proposal? (b) Do the proposed on-site features or improvements adequately provide
sustainable project enhancements beyond those otherwise required by these LDRs for the development proposal that are attainable and reasonable in the context of the proposed project?
(c) Do the proposed off-site improvements meet the priorities of the City for community sustainability?
(d) Do the proposed features, improvements or fees-in-lieu meet the intent of the SBIP?

The development proposal is consistent with the increase in height requested. The Applicant is asking for a bonus height of one (1) foot, for a total building height of thirty one (31) feet. The total square footage of bonus area is 5,565 square feet. Therefore, the total value of required improvements is $\$ 8,347.50$. The Applicant will be providing improvements above the code required minimums equivalent to $\$ 97,500$, which exceeds the requirements of the Sustainable Bonus and Planned Development Program.

The proposed on-site features and improvements provide enhancements that exceed the base requirements of the LDRs. The project will provide a wall on the west and south side of the property, which is above and beyond the minimum requirements of the code, and the difference in value between the fence and the wall meets the required valuation of the SBIP.

The project is not including off-site improvements toward the SBIP credit.

The proposed features and improvements are beyond the base requirements of the LDRs and provide additional amenities and an aesthetic improvement. Thus, the proposed development meets the intent of the SBIP.

## Meets Criterion.

## Meets Criterion.

Meets Criterion.

## Meets Criterion.

# Required Findings - Section 23.4-19 Outdoor Storage Items 1-5 

## Criterio

1. Outdoor storage in residential districts. Outdoor storage in residential districts for residential purposes shall be limited to domestic equipment and normal supplies necessary for residents. Storage shall not be permitted in any front yard.
2. Outdoor storage industrial. Outdoor storage in the I-POC industrial district shall be permitted only as accessory to an approved principal use. All such storage shall be completely screened from all public rights-of-way and any adjacent property that is zoned for residential or mixed use. Outdoor storage of equipment, vehicles, boats, parts, materials, or chemicals are required to be stored on an impervious paved surface to reduce pollutants in storm water runoff,
3. Outdoor storage in planned development and mixed use districts. Outdoor storage facilities shall be limited to the following
a. Outdoor storage of merchandise for sale within the establishment located on the site shall be limited to the area located between the front façade and the public right-of-way and shall only be outside of the building during hours of operation. However, this does not apply to the outdoor display of vehicles for sale or rent.
b. In any commercial planned development, all outdoor storage shall be expressly approved by the City Commission as part of the ordinance adopting the commercial planned development.
c. Approval of outdoor storage in a commercial planned development or mixed use district shall include mitigation measures to protect adjacent properties from the impacts of the outdoor storage.
4. The outdoor storage of all licensed vehicles that are being repaired must be screened from all public rights-of-way or stored completely within an enclosed structure. There shall be no storage of junk or unlicensed vehicles within the public right-of way at any time.
5. The outdoor storage of unlicensed vehicles and/or junked vehicles, boats, machinery, trucks, trailers, mobile homes and heavy equipment vehicles is prohibited, except in approved junk yards or the temporary storage of such vehicles on a lot or parcel approved and contairging an active business license for vehicle towing.

This project is not located in a residential district therefore this criterion does not apply.

The outdoor storage is accessory to the distribution facility, repair and maintenance uses. The outdoor storage areas are screened from the residential areas to the south and west.

The proposed project is not located within a planned development or mixed-use district, therefore this criterion does not apply.

There are no vehicle repair uses associated with the operations of the site, therefore this criterion does not apply.

There will be no unlicensed and/or junked vehicles stored on-site, therefore this criterion does not apply.

Not Applicable.
Meets Criterion.

Applicant Response
Staff Response

Not Applicable.

Not Applicable.

## Meet the Required Findings and Request Approval

Section 23.2-29(e) Conditional Use Criteria
Section 23.2-29 (d) General Findings Relating to Harmony with LDRs and Protection of
Public Interest

Section 23.2-31 (c) Qualitative Development Standards
Section 23.2-31 (I) Community Appearance Criteria
Section 23.2-33 (c)(2)Sustainable Bonus Incentive Program
Section 23.4-19(b) Outdoor Storage Industrial

## Development Team

## doka

Louis Goldberg, Senior Facilities and Property Project Manager Jared Wright, Southeast Regional Manager

Kimley»)Horn George Balaban, P.E.<br>Adam Kerr, Traffic Engineer<br>Johnathan Haigh, PLA, ASLA Landscape Architect<br>SAUL EWING<br>ARNSTEIN<br>\& LEHR<br>Jaime Mayo, Architect<br>Manuel Rodriquez, Project Manager<br>Lisa Reves, Esq.



## October 19, 2020 Conversation with Mr. Hiatt

```
From: Reves, Lisa <Lisa.Reves@saul.com>
Sent: Monday, October 19, 2020 2:36 PM
To:Goldberg Louis <louis.goldberg@daka.com>
Cc: Daniels,Steven L.<steven.daniels@saul.com>
Subject: [EXT] RE: Lake Worth Site Plan Application - Possible Opposition
Louis,
I spoke with Mr. Daniel Hiatt he owns 2 properties to the east of our site and is the Vice president of
Marlin Industrial Park Owners Association. I have attached 2 aerial and the sunbiz listing for your use.
He raised a number of issues and I thought I had won him over but, he closed the conversation with I
will never support this project. I will try again at a later date. Mr. Hiatt raised:
1. he was the primary developer of the industrial park (would like respect);
2. there is limited site access;
3. organic material on site;
4. He thinks you should pay more for the property (then asked how much you are paying);
5. You need to develop a larger project so you will pay more taxes.
6. He would like a project such as the one on the NW corner of Boutwell & 7th, a multi-bay
warehouse with 125,746 SF valued in excess of $27 million.
The bottom line is he wants his property values to increase.
I will call to discuss this issue.
Thank you,
Lisa
SAUL EWING
ARNSTEIN
\& LEHR"
Lisa A. Reves, Esq. | Attorney at Law SAUL EWING ARNSTEIN \& LEHR LLP 515 N. Flagler Drive, Suite 1400 | West Palm Beach, FL 33401 Tel: 561.650 .8465 | Fax: 561.828.6381 Lisa.Reves@saul.com I www.saul.com
```


# December 4, 2020 E-mail to Mr. Hiatt 

| From: | Reves, Lisa |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | "danielhiatt@bellsouth,net" |
| Bcc: | "DOKA USA LTD DOKA USA PURCHASE OF BROWARD COUNTY PROPERTY 377833 00001 Email" |
| Subject: | FW: Umdasch/Doka |
| Date: | Friday, December 4, 2020 4:02:27 PM |

Good Afternoon,
It is my understanding that you have objected to my clients project at 2209 7th Avenue North.
Would you please advise me of the nature of your objection?
Thank you,
SAUL EWING
ARNSTEIN
\& LEHR ${ }^{\text {w }}$

[^1]
# December 5, 2020 E-mail from Mr. Hiatt 



## December 30, 2020 E-mail from Mr. Baird

| From: | Barcd, Thones 1. |
| :---: | :---: |
| To: | Remes, ba |
| ce: | Pravel Hiatt |
| Subject | Undast/Voda/Projet $\$ 20001400035$ |
| Date: | Wedinestor, December 30, 2020 11:07:15 AM |
| Attachments: | mmome0ione |

before responding or clicking links/attachments.

Good morning, I hope you are well and are enjoying the holidays. I have been spt Dan Hiatt, who is retaining me to represent the Marlin Industrial Park POA. He is , Directors of the POA. The POA and the owners/tenants in the Park are affected pa respect to your client's Property. Dan forwarded to me your email of December 4 v

6 might be of benefit to both parties. Please give me a call at boworv (my direct line) so that we might discuss a postponement by the developer and a meeting with the POA in January. you inquired as to the "nature of his objections." I've read the LWB staff report an , rancer a such a dialogue doesn't have to occur at the public hearings. I believe given the number of objectors and their objections, a meeting between your client and mine before the January 6 might be of benefit to both parties. Please give me a call at $650-8232$ (my direct line) so that we might discuss a postponement by the developer and a meeting with the POA in January

Thomas J. Baird
Florida Bar Board Certified City, County and Local Government Attorney Jones Foster P.A.

5616508233 - D
5616505300 - F
5616593000 - 0
tbaird@ionesfoster.com
JONES FOSTER
4741 Military Trail, Suite 200
Jupiter, Florida 33458
ionesfoster.com



## Hiatt 3599 23 $^{\text {rd }}$ Avenue South



- Limited Site Access
- Orgainic Material Onsite
- Pay More for Site
- Larger Building
- Similar to $7^{\text {th }}$ \& Boutwell
- Increase Boutwell Tax Base
- Increase His Property Value

Hiatt 3694 23 $^{\text {rd }}$ Avenue South


## Notice of Special Magistrate Hearing

Lake Worth Beach. Florida. The Art of Florida Living. ${ }^{\text {sm }}$
Department for Community Sustainability
Code compliance division
1900 Seconce divisio
1900 Second Avenue North
Lake Worth Beach, FL 33461
561.586 .1652
CODE ENFORCEMENT SPECIAL MAGISTRATE NOTICE OF VIOLATION AND NOTICE OF HEARING

## 9/24/2020

DANIEL HIATT
NED WILLIAM H JR
030 S DIXIE HWY STE
WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33405
Case No: 20-00000390
RE: 3694 23RD AVE S, LAKE WORTH FL 3346
Legal Description: MARLIN IND PARK LT 10
Parcel Control Number: 38-43-44-20-19-000-010
Dear Property Owner
An investigation of your property was conducted and violation(s) of the City of Lake Worth Beach Code(s), listed on page (3) of this notice, were witnessed on the property. Pursuant to Chapter 2, Article VI, of the City of Lake Worth Beach Code of Ordinances, we request that y㲘
 what is required; or need additional time to correct the violation(s), please contact the Code

If you FAIL to correct the violation(s), by the time set for compliance above, a public

 located at 7 North Dixie Highway, Lake Worth Beach, Florida. If the violation(s) is/are corrected and then re-occurs; the case may be presented to the Special Magistrate, even if the violation has been corrected prior to the Hearing. If you fail to attend the hearing, the Special Magistrate may base the findings solely upon the testimony of the Code Compliance Officer. If you cannot attend the hearing and wish to have someone else appear on your behalf, you must complete and submit a Designation of Agent form, available from the Code Compliance Secretary, before the date of your hearing.

## Violation Detail

00010 BUS LIC REQ'D-UTLLITY SVC LWCO 14-3
062020 Location: Qty: 001
Violation Text
Please apply for and obtain a City of Lake Worth Beach Business License. Applications may be submitted to the Building Division located at: 1900 2nd Avenue North, Lak
Worth Beach. Florida 33461 or you may contact the Buildi Division directly at 561-586-1647. Please dial 561-586-1782 to schedule the required use \& occupancy inspection
To achieve compliance, an approved use \& occupanc ispection must be obtained.
DANIEL HIATT

## Violation Detail

00020 USE AND OCCUPANCY CERTIFI LWCO 14-3 Date Est February 06,2020 Location: Qty: 001

Violation Text

```
Please apply for and obtain a City of Lake Worth Beach Business License. Applications may be submitted to the Building Division locate Beach Florida 33461900 2nd Avenue North, Lat Division directly at \(561-586-1647\). Please dial 561-586-1782 to schedule the required use \& occupancy inspection To achieve compliance, an approved use \& occupancy inspetion must be obtained.
```


## Violation Detail

3030 GEN REQUREMENTS LWCO 2-75.6.2
Date Est: February 06, 2020 Location: Qty: 001
Violation Text
PLACE UNIT NUMBERS ON ALL BACK DOOR REMOVE COUCH AT BACK OF PROPERTY
Violation Detail
00040 LANDSCAPING LWCO 2-75.9
Date Est: February 06, 2020 Location: Qty: 001
Violation Text
REACE GROIND COVER IN DIRT AREA AROUND PLANTS AT FRONT O THE PROPERTY

## Violation Detail

O0050 DUPSTER REQMNTS LWCO 12-7
Date Est: February 06, 2020 Location: Qty: 001
Violation Text
REMOVE OR PLACE DUMPSTER ENCLOSURE FOR THE TWO EXTRA TRASH CANS AT PROPERTY IF PLACING DUMPSTER ENCLOSLRE, OBTAD PERMIT AND PASS ALL INSPECTIONS


## Officer Hicks' Confirmation Outstanding Violations

From: Bobby Hicks [bhicks@lakeworthbeachfl.gov](mailto:bhicks@lakeworthbeachfl.gov)
Sent: Tuesday, January 5, 2021 3:05 PM
To: Brown, Susan M. [Susan.Brown@saul.com](mailto:Susan.Brown@saul.com)
Subject: RE: Case No: 20-00000390
*ะEXTERNAL. EMAIL** - This message originates from outside our Firm. Please consider carefully
before responding or clicking links/attachments. before responding or clicking links/attachments.

The following businesses need ether need businesses licenses or inspection.

Daniel Hiatt needs inspection.
Unit 1 Renegade needs businesses licenses.
Unit 11 Flooring Dimensions needs Inspection.
Unit 4 Rodrigo Upholstery needs inspection.
Unit 6 Paul Bange roofing needs inspection.
Unit 7 Most Excellent Design businesses licenses.
If the tenants schedule their inspections at the same time, the inspector can do them all at once. We will only be inspecting the exterior at this time due to COVID.

If any of the businesses are no longer in business please let me know so we can remove them from our system.

There are three dumpsters on the property and only one has an enclosure. You will need to remove two dumpsters or have to dumpster enclosures installed, permits will be required. The one enclosure that is on the property will need to have doors installed at your convenience.

All the other violations have been corrected and are compiled in our system.

If you have any other questions call.
Bobly Hicks.

## Request for Affected Party Status

## From: Daniel Hiatt [danielhiatt@bellsouth.net](mailto:danielhiatt@bellsouth.net)

Sent: Wednesday, December 2, 2020 4:47 PM
To: Erin Sita [esita@LakeWorthBeachfl.gov](mailto:esita@LakeWorthBeachfl.gov)
Subject: PBZ PROJECT \#20-01400035

Caution: This is an external email. Do not click links or open attachments from unknown or unverified sources.

```
Dear Ms Sita
I would like to apply for affected party status on the above named project ( PZB # 20-01400035)
I also would like to request a minimum of a 30 day postponement on this matter.
My property is directly east of the subject property. Located @ 3599 23 'rd Ave South, Lake Worth Fl.
LOT # 7 MARLIN INDUSTRIAL PARK.
Thank You Daniel W. Hiatt. 561-389-1989
Sent from Mail for Windows }1
```


## STAMPED CERTIFICATION OF MAILING 3694 23 $^{\text {rd }}$ Avenue South 3599 23 $^{\text {rd }}$ Avenue South



| 38434420190000070 |
| :---: |
|  |
| 30305 ODAIL IVN STE 5 <br> WEST PALM BEACH FL 334051539 |



| PAPA Barner |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Location Address 3599 23RD AVE S 1 |  |
| Mumicipality LAKE WO | BEACH |
| Parcel Control Number 38-43-44-20-19-000-0070 |  |
| Subdivision MARLIN INDPARK |  |
| Official Reconds Book 05012 | Page1404 |
| Sale Date JUL-1986 |  |
| Legal Description MARLIN IND PARK LT 7 |  |
| Owners | Mailing address |
| HIATT DANIEL TR | 3030 S DIXIE HWY STE 5 |
| SNED WILIAM H J TR \& | WEST PALM BEACHFL 334051539 |
| Sales Date Price OR Book/Page | Sale Type Owner |
| JUL-1986 \$130,700 05012/01404 | RRANTY DEED SNED WILLIAM H JR T |

## Garamy 3550 23 $^{\text {rd }}$ Avenue South

- Traffic - Approximately 10-15 trucks a day; PBC TPS New Peak Hour Trips 40 AM 23 PM
- Under Utilization of Parcel - More onsite development, will incur more taxes and keep his taxes down
- Cement Dust -Dirt on the Ground


## Elise Crohn 402 Elizabeth Road



- Hours of Operation - M-F 7:30 a.m. until 4:00 p.m. Saturday until 12:00 p.m. if necessary.
- Location of Similar Facility - 3665 Benson Ave., Baltimore, MD 21227.
- Site Plan/Building Height Warehouse 27' HT.
- Landscaping 6' pre-cast concrete wall screened with a combination of Laurel Oaks, Silver Buttonwood, Wax Myrtle, and Green Buttonwood trees accented by a cocoplum hedge.
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November 19, 2020
Stephanie A. Kinlen, P.E.
Kimley-Horn and $\Lambda$ ssociates, Inc.
1920 Wekiva Way, Suite 200
West Palm Beach, FL 33411
RE: $\quad 22097^{\text {th }}$ Avenue N
Project \#: 201107
Traffic Performance Standards Review
Dear Ms. Kinlen:
The Palm Beach County Traffic Division has reviewed the $22097^{\text {th }}$ Avenue $\mathbf{N}$ Traffic Impact Statement, dated November 13, 2020, pursuant to the Traffic Development Code (ULDC). The project is summarized as follows:

## Municipality: <br> Location: <br> PCN:

Existing Uses:
Existing Uses:
Proposed Uses:
Lake Worth Beach
South side of $7^{\text {ib }}$ Ave N , west of $23^{\text {rd }}$ Ave S
8-43-44-20-01-066-0010
wo access driveway connections onto $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue N As used in the study and is NOT necessarily an approval by the County through this TPS letter)
Vacant
Gen. Office $=10,042 \mathrm{SF}$
Warehouse $=26,743 \mathrm{SF}$
Outdoor Storage $=2.4$ Acr.
New Daily Trips:
New Daily Trips:
New Peak Hour Trips: ${ }_{40}^{221}$ (35/5) AM; 23 (7/16) PM Build-out:
Based on our review, the Traffic Division has determined the nroposed development is located within the Lake Worth Park of Commerce 1ra Concurrency Exception Area (TCEA) and therefore, exempt from the Traffic
Performance Standards of Palm Beach County. Performance Standards of Palm Beach County.
Please note the receipt of a Traffic Performance Standards (TPS) approval letter does not constitute the review and issuance of a Palm Beach County Right-of-Way (R/W) Construction Permit nor does it eliminate any requirements that may be deemed as site related. For work within Palm Beach County R/W, a detailed review of the project will be provided upon submittal for a R/W permit application. The project is required to comply wilh all Palm Beach County standards and may include R/W dedication.

No building permits are to be issued by the City after the build-out date specified above. The County traffic concurrency approval is subject to the Project
tephanic A. Kinlen, P.E
Page 2
The approval letter shall be valid no longer than one year from date of issuance, unless an application for a Site Specific Development Order has been approved. an application for a Site Specific Development Order has been submitted, or the approval letter has been superseded by another approval letter for the same property.

If you have any questions regarding this determination, please contact me at 561-684-4030 or email QBari(apbcgov.org.
Sincerely,
Buay tnmar Barr
Quazi Bari, P.E., PTOE
Manager - Growth Managemen
Traffic Division

QB:HA:rb
Addressee
Erin Iitaugh Sita, AICP, Assistant Director-Planning, Zoning, \& Preservation Community
Sustainability Department, City of Lake Worth Beach



New Peak Hour Trips: 40 (35/5) AM; 23 (7/16) PM Build-out:

## $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue Frontage





Boutwell Business Center


Eastern Metal Supply


## Green Street Industrial



## DATE: <br> December 30, 2020

TO:
Members of the Planning and Zoning Board

FROM: Andrew Meyer, Senior Community Planner

THRU: William Waters, AIA, NCARB, LEED, AP BD+C, ID, SEED, Director for Community Sustainability

MEETING: January 6, 2021

SUBJECT: PZB Project Number 20-01400035: Consideration of a Major Site Plan with Sustainable Bonus and Conditional Use Permit to construct a $+/-47,000$ square foot distribution facility and repair and maintenance uses within the Industrial Park of Commerce (I-POC) zoning district commonly referred to as "Umdasch/Doka" and located at 2209 7th Avenue North, PCN \# 38-43-44-20-01-066-0010.

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The Applicant, Lisa Reves of Saul, Ewing, Arnstein and Lehr on behalf of Umdasch Real Estate USA, Ltd., is requesting approval of Umdasch/Doka, a project located at $22097^{\text {th }}$ Avenue North and consisting of the following:
1.) Major Site Plan for the development of an industrial building in excess of 7,500 square feet. (page 4)
2.) Sustainable Bonus Program Incentive to gain an increase in increase in building height to 31 ft . (page 8)
3.) Conditional Use Permit to establish "distribution facility" and "repair and maintenance - major" uses greater than 7,500 square feet (page 9)

Umdasch/Doka consists of an industrial building totaling 47,927 gross square feet in floor area. The building is composed of 3 sections; a 10,150 gsf office, a 26,617 gsf enclosed warehouse/maintenance shop, and 11,160 gsf canopy structure. In addition, a 104, 342 outdoor storage area is located east of the building. The facility will store formwork and conduct repair operations on construction equipment. According to the application, the facility will operate between 7:30 AM and 4:00 PM, Monday through Friday, and between 7:30 AM and 12:00 PM on Saturdays as needed.

## Staff Recommendation:

Staff has reviewed the documentation and materials provided, applying the applicable guidelines and standards found in the City of Lake Worth Zoning Code, Comprehensive Plan, and Strategic Plan. The proposed development meets the criteria of the Comprehensive Plan and LDRs. Staff recommends the Board approve the Major Site Plan, Conditional Use Permit, and Sustainable Bonus Program Incentive as conditioned on pages 14-15.

## PROPERTY DESCRIPTION:

| Applicant | Lisa Reves of Saul, Ewing, Arnstein and Lehr on behalf of Umdasch Real <br> Estate USA, Ltd. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Owner | LW Industrial LLC |
| General Location | South of the western terminus of $7^{\text {th }}$ Ave N, east of the E-4 Canal |
| Existing PCN Number | $38-43-44-20-01-066-0010$ |


| Existing Land Use | Vacant Lot |
| :--- | :--- |
| Zoning | Industrial Park of Commerce (I-POC) |
| Future Land Use Designation | Industrial (I) |

## ZONING MAP:



## BACKGROUND:

The subject property is currently vacant. The site has been vacant and undeveloped until the 1950s when land was cleared on the southern end and used as a landfill. The filling operations appeared to cease in the late 1970 s and the property became overgrown and remained undeveloped until 2011, when there was an expansion of the pond at the north end of the lot. Since that time, the property has remained undeveloped.

## ANALYSIS:

## Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and Strategic Plan

The project has a future land use of Industrial (I). Per Policy 1.1.1.10, the Industrial (I) FLU is established to provide for the establishment and enlargement of office, manufacturing and light to moderate industrial uses that would be incompatible in other areas of the city due to increased traffic generation. The implementing zoning district is I-POC. The proposed development will contain distribution facility and repair and maintenance uses which are moderate industrial uses and therefore is consistent with the intent of the I FLU. Furthermore, Policy 1.7.1.4 states that "the City shall encourage new development proposals within the LWPOC, with emphasis on those at the north and south entrance of the Park of Commerce along Boutwell Road, to be consistent with the goal to create a quality office/industrial park, as established in the LWPOC Conceptual Plan." This project is a new development proposal within the LWPOC with proposed use consistent with the future land use designation and strategic plan.

The City's Strategic Plan focuses on fostering safer neighborhoods, encouraging community pride, building a vibrant and diverse economy, planning for the future, and enhancing the natural, historic, and cultural environment of the City. Pillar I.A of the Strategic Plan states that the City shall ensure effective economic development incentive zones. Further, Pillars IV.A, IV.C, and IV.D of the Strategic Plan state that the City shall achieve economic and financial sustainability through a versatile and stable tax base, facilitate environmental sustainability through regional partnership and planning, and influence the supply and expansion of jobs. The proposed warehouse, maintenance, and distribution center is an economic development project that will increase local jobs within the City and contribute towards the City's tax base by developing a vacant 9.7-acre parcel. In addition, Umdasch Real Estate USA, Ltd. intends to enter into an agreement with the Florida Department of Environmental Protection for rehabilitation and redevelopment of the property, which is currently designated as a brownfield. As such, the use is consistent with Pillars I.A, Pillar IV.A, IV.C, and Pillar IV.D. The remaining Pillars in the Strategic Plan are not applicable to this application.

Based on the analysis above, the proposed development is consistent with the goals, objectives, and polices of the City of Lake Worth Beach's Comprehensive Plan and Strategic Plan.

## Consistency with the City's Land Development Requlations

The Department of Community Sustainability is tasked in the Code to review planned development applications in accordance with the City's LDRs (see analysis below) and to provide a recommendation for whether the application should be approved, approved with conditions, or denied.

Industrial Park of Commerce (I-POC) Per LDR Section 23.3-24(a), the I-POC zoning district is intended to provide for the establishment and enlargement of office, manufacturing and light industrial uses without restriction on traffic generating characteristics. The I-POC district is also intended to permit the establishment of certain other uses which are compatible with industrial operations. The proposed industrial development provides light industrial uses. As such, the proposal is consistent with the intent of the I-POC district.

The table below shows the proposed site features and its compliance with the Code, factoring in the Sustainable Bonus incentives:

| Development Standard |  | Base Zoning District | Provided |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lot Size (min) In square feet (sf) |  | 13,000 sf | 455,500 sf |
| Lot Width (min) |  | $100{ }^{\prime}$ | 400' |
| Setbacks | Front (min) | $20^{\prime}$ | $25^{\prime}$ |
|  | Rear (min) | $10^{\prime}$ | 318' |
|  | Interior Side (min) | 0 ' | West: 82.5' / East: 192' |
| Impermeable Surface Coverage (maximum) |  | 65\% | 55\% |
| Structure Coverage (max) |  | 55\% | 10.3\% |
| Parking |  | 63 (25 office, 38 industrial) | 70 |
| Building Height (max) |  | $45^{\prime}$ under sustainable bonus | $31^{\prime}$ |
| Floor Area Ratio (FAR) (max) |  | 1.1 | . 10 |

Building Height: The maximum building height by right for projects in the I-POC zoning district is 30 feet, with the potential to go to 45 feet by satisfying the requirements of the sustainable bonus incentive program. The proposed building height for this project is 31 feet, or 1 foot taller than the maximum building height by right. The extra building height is being sought in order to provide a parapet in order to screen rooftop equipment from adjacent properties. Staff reviewed the sustainable bonus incentive program applied for the extra building height, and found it to be consistent with the city's LDRs. Staff's analysis of the sustainable bonus can be found on page 8.

Landscaping: Overall, the development proposal complies with the City's landscape regulations. The project proposes Compact Firebush, Pigeon Plum, Dwarf Fakahatchee Grass, and Verawood along the entrance at $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue North. The project also proposes buffering the wall and site from the single-family to the west with Laurel Oak, Wax Myrtle, Silver Buttonwood, Green Buttonwood, and Southern Live Oak.

Walls/Fences: The site plan proposes a 6 ' high precast concrete wall along the southern and eastern boundaries of the site to provide buffering from the single-family and multi-family uses near the site. The wall will also be landscaped to provide extra buffering to these residential uses. In addition, the project also proposes an 8 ' high chain link fence along the eastern edge of the property. This chain link fence will be screened with landscape material for screening of the outdoor area. The material of the chain link fence has been proposed as galvanized. Section 24.4-4 of the City's LDRs require that chain link fencing be either black or dark green vinyl coated. Further, the fencing $10^{\prime}$ from the northern property line along $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue will need to be an opaque fencing type or be setback a minimum of $20^{\prime}$. A condition has been added to the conditions of approval requiring all fencing on site to be in conformance with Sections 23.4-4 and 23.419 ; fencing adhering to this condition will be in conformance with the City's LDRs. Fencing material modifications will be reviewed at building permit for consistency with these code sections.

## Master Development Plan (Major Site Plan):

A master site plan is required in conjunction with a mixed use urban planned development. The review criteria below are intended to promote safety and minimize negative impacts of development on its neighbors by establishing qualitative requirements for the arrangements of buildings, structures, parking areas, landscaping and other site improvements.

## Section 23.2-31(c): Qualitative Development Standards

1. Harmonious and efficient organization. All elements of the site plan shall be harmoniously and efficiently organized in relation to topography, the size and type of plot, the character of adjoining property and the type and size of buildings. The site shall be developed so as to not impede the normal and orderly development or improvement of surrounding property for uses permitted in these LDRs.

Staff Analysis: The project site is organized so that the most intense uses are oriented toward the north end of the site, closer to like industrial uses and away from the single-family and multi-family residential uses west and south of the site. The office portion of the building is oriented toward $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue North and contains large windows which positively contributes to the aesthetic of $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue North in this location. The building on the site contains overhead doors. The applicant has stated that the doors which face the residential area to the west will remain closed for most of the day and will be opened and closed 5-8 times per week total. In addition, these doors will be screened with native trees and a $6^{\prime}$ high pre-cast wall. The overhead doors located on the east side of the building will be opened and closed more frequently, and these have been oriented towards adjacent industrial zoned properties to minimize impacts. Meets Criterion.
2. Preservation of natural conditions. The natural (refer to landscape code, Article 6 of these LDRs) landscape shall be preserved in its natural state, insofar as practical, by minimizing tree and soil removal and by such other site planning approaches as are appropriate. Terrain and vegetation shall not be disturbed in a manner likely to significantly increase either wind or water erosion within or adjacent to a development site. Natural detention areas and other means of natural vegetative filtration of stormwater runoff shall be used to minimize ground and surface water pollution, particularly adjacent to major waterbodies as specified in Part II, Chapter 12, Health and Sanitation, Article VIII, Fertilizer Friendly Use Regulations. Fertilizer/pesticide conditions may be attached to development adjacent to waterbodies. Marinas shall be permitted only in water with a mean low tide depth of four (4) feet or more.

Staff Analysis: The lot as it exists today are completely vacant, and contain a mixture of Royal Poinciana, Ficus, Cabbage Palm, Southern Live Oak, Tropical Almond, and Mango Trees. The property is located in the Greater Lake Worth Park of Commerce Area, which the City designated as a brownfield area through Resolution Number 03-2009, approved on March 3, 2009. The city has been advised by Umdasch Real Estate USA, Ltd. That it intends to enter into a brownfield site rehabilitation agreement with the Florida Department of Environmental Protection for rehabilitation and redevelopment of the property. The proposed landscape plan depicts native tree species, such as Laurel Oak, Wax Myrtle, Silver Buttonwood, Green Buttonwood, and Southern Live Oak along all property lines. Staff has reviewed the landscape plan and finds the proposed landscaping meets the landscape code and sufficiently replaces the existing landscaping proposed to be removed from the site. Meets Criterion.
3. Screening and buffering. Fences, walls or vegetative screening shall be provided where needed and practical to protect residents and users from undesirable views, lighting, noise, odors or other adverse off-site effects, and to protect residents and users of off-site development from on-site adverse effects. This section may be interpreted to require screening and buffering in addition to that specifically required by other sections of these LDRs, but not less.

Staff Analysis: The project proposes landscaping along the perimeter of the property. Additional tree landscaping, along with a $6^{\prime}$ high pre-cast wall is also proposed along the western property line to provide buffering of the site from the existing single-family residences to the west. The trees comprising of this buffer include Laurel Oak, Wax Myrtle, Silver Buttonwood, Green Buttonwood, and Southern Live Oak. The precast concrete wall also continues along the southern edge of the site and buffers the site from the multi-family residences to the south. In addition, 71 bald cypress trees have been proposed between the lake and the precast wall along the southern property line adjacent to the multi-residential development. Meets Criterion
4. Enhancement of residential privacy. The site plan shall provide reasonable, visual and acoustical privacy for all dwelling units located therein and adjacent thereto. Fences, walks, barriers and vegetation shall be arranged for the protection and enhancement of property and to enhance the privacy of the occupants.

Staff Analysis: While the proposed industrial project does not contain any dwelling units, there are existing residential dwelling units to the west and south of the project site. The site provides a 6 ' wall with vegetation to buffer the site's impacts and provide additional residential privacy. Meets Criterion.
5. Emergency access. Structures and other site features shall be so arranged as to permit emergency vehicle access by some practical means to all sides of all buildings.

Staff Analysis: The building has been oriented on the lot to be closest to $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue North. This building is directly adjacent to the right-of-way to allow for ease of access by emergency vehicles. Meets Criterion.
6. Access to public ways. All buildings, dwelling units and other facilities shall have safe and convenient access to a public street, walkway or other area dedicated to common use; curb cuts close to railroad crossings shall be avoided.

Staff Analysis: The building fronts $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue North and the site has 3 access points from the right-of-way. The project is not nearby any railroad crossings. Meets Criterion.
7. Pedestrian circulation. There shall be provided a pedestrian circulation system which is insulated as completely as reasonably possible from the vehicular circulation system.

Staff Analysis: The pedestrian circulation from the right-of-way to the office entrance avoids as much conflict with vehicular circulation as possible, with the pedestrian crossings located at the point where vehicles stop to turn on/off of $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue North. The pedestrian circulation does not cross through any vehicular circulation areas within the site and provides direct access to the building. Meets Criterion.
8. Design of ingress and egress drives. The location, size and numbers of ingress and egress drives to the site will be arranged to minimize the negative impacts on public and private ways and on adjacent private property. Merging and turnout lanes traffic dividers shall be provided where they would significantly improve safety for vehicles and pedestrians.

Staff Analysis: As stated earlier, the site has 3 access points from $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue North. This portion of $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue North is currently not paved and will be improved as part of the construction of this project. No other properties obtain access from this portion of $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue North adjacent to the project site, and as such there is no anticipated negative impact on adjacent properties. Meets Criterion.
9. Coordination of on-site circulation with off-site circulation. The arrangement of public or common ways for vehicular and pedestrian circulation shall be coordinated with the pattern of existing or planned streets and pedestrian or bicycle pathways in the area. Minor streets shall not be connected to major streets in such a way as to facilitate improper utilization.

Staff Analysis: All common ways off the project site will circulate traffic internally on the site and will not connect with any other right-of-way as no such other rights-of-ways exist adjacent to the property. Meets Criterion.
10. Design of on-site public right-of-way. On-site public street and rights-of-way shall be designed for maximum efficiency. They shall occupy no more land than is required to provide access, nor shall they unnecessarily fragment development into small blocks. Large developments containing extensive public rights-of-way shall have said rights-of-way arranged in a hierarchy with local streets providing direct access to parcels and other streets providing no or limited direct access to parcels.

Staff Analysis: An additional right-of-way dedication for $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue North is depicted on the site plan along the property's northern boundary to the E-4 Canal. Based on the nature of use and proposed traffic circulation on the site, no other onsite right-of-way is being dedicated. Therefore, this criterion does not apply. Meets Criterion.
11. Off-street parking, loading and vehicular circulation areas. Off-street parking, loading and vehicular circulation areas shall be located, designed and screened to minimize the impact of noise, glare and odor on adjacent property.

Staff Analysis: The site proposes 3 points of ingress/egress. The westernmost ingress/egress point is for personal and regular-sized vehicles. The two easterly points of ingress/egress will be for larger truck traffic. These have been located away from the single-family and multi-family residences to the west and south to minimize the impact of noise, glare and odor to these properties. The loading and unloading of equipment and materials occurs east of the building, which helps minimize the impact of noise, glare, and odor to the single-family and multi-family residences on the opposite side of the building to the west. Meets Criterion.
12. Refuse and service areas. Refuse and service areas shall be located, designed and screened to minimize the impact of noise, glare and odor on adjacent property.

Staff Analysis: The site plan shows the refuse area is located toward the middle of the site and away from any existing property lines. The dumpster enclosure is also screened and opens toward the building and away from any adjacent properties, minimizing the impact of noise, glare and odor on adjacent property. Meets Criterion.
13. Protection of property values. The elements of the site plan shall be arranged so as to have minimum negative impact on the property values of adjoining property.

Staff Analysis: As stated earlier in this staff report, the elements of the site plan are arranged insofar as feasible to minimize negative impacts to property values of adjoining properties. The site provides landscaping and buffering from adjacent properties, and orients building and site activities and circulation away from adjacent properties. Meets Criterion.
14. Transitional development. Where the property being developed is located on the edge of the zoning district, the site plan shall be designed to provide for a harmonious transition between districts. Building exteriors shall complement other buildings in the vicinity in size, scale, mass, bulk, rhythm of openings and character. Consideration shall be given to a harmonious transition in height and design style so that the change in zoning districts is not accentuated. Additional consideration shall be given to complementary setbacks between the existing and proposed development.

Staff Analysis: The project is located on the western edge of the Industrial Park of Commerce zoning district and along the city's western boundary following the E-4 Keller Canal. The project provides for a 6 ' pre-cast concrete wall and landscaping on the edge of the zoning district's boundaries with adjacent mixed-use and residential zoning districts. Yard operations and circulations are located away from these properties and setbacks are provided to minimize the impact. Meets Criterion.
15. Consideration of future development. In finding whether or not the above standards are met, the review authority shall consider likely future development as well as existing development.

Staff Analysis: The project as proposed does not anticipate any future development at the site. Any future proposed development not included as part of this application must go through the applicable land development process for full review. Overall, the project meets the intent of the Land Development Regulations and Comprehensive Plan. Meets Criterion.

## Section 23.2-31(I): Community Appearance Criteria

1. The plan for the proposed structure or project is in conformity with good taste, good design, and in general contributes to the image of the city as a place of beauty, spaciousness, harmony, taste, fitness, broad vistas and high quality.

Staff Analysis: The design of the project reflects modern architectural styles generally associated with good taste and design. The office portion has large windows that face the right-of-way and allow natural light into the space, with more intense uses oriented toward the rear of the site, away from the right-of-way. The project also provides a lake on-site, as well as a pre-cast concrete wall and landscape buffering which shields and buffers the uses from the single and multifamily uses to the west and south of the project site. The project provides architectural embellishments that are colored to match the business branding, however these are kept to a minimum and are in good taste and design. Meets Criterion.
2. The proposed structure or project is not, in its exterior design and appearance, of inferior quality such as to cause the nature of the local environment or evolving environment to materially depreciate in appearance and value.

Staff Analysis: The project utilizes industry standard materials that are neutral and generally compatible with the local environment. Meets Criterion.
3. The proposed structure or project is in harmony with the proposed developments in the general area, with code requirements pertaining to site plan, signage and landscaping, and the comprehensive plan for the city, and with the criteria set forth herein.

Staff Analysis: The project uses a modern design aesthetic which is similar to and appropriate with other existing buildings and proposed projects which have been approved in the surrounding area. Meets Criterion.
4. The proposed structure or project is in compliance with this section and 23.2-29, as applicable.

Staff Analysis: The project's compliance with the community appearance and conditional use criteria is detailed within this staff report. Meets Criterion.

## Sustainable Bonus Incentive Program:

The City of Lake Worth Sustainable Bonus Incentive Program (SBIP) is intended to implement Objective 1.2.3 of the City's Comprehensive Plan which states the City shall establish incentives to help support the creation of a compact, sustainable, community-oriented development by implementing a Sustainable Bonus Incentive Program. The Program offers the opportunity to attain an option for increased height and/or FAR in exchange for the incorporation of sustainable design features, community-based improvements and overall design excellence as part of a development proposal.

Based on the calculation of the additional height as part of the SBIP, the Applicant is asking for a bonus height of 1 foot, for a total building height of 31 feet. This additional foot in building height is not for the entire building, but the office portion of the building. The total square footage of bonus area under Sustainable Bonus is 5,565 square which results in a value of required improvements for the Sustainable Bonus allowance of $\$ 8,347.50$ ( $\$ 1.50$ per square foot industrial bonus). Below is the Applicant's schedule of improvements to meet and exceed the requirements of the Sustainable Bonus and Planned Development.

| Improvement Detail <br> (type of amenity) | Valuation <br> Amount | Calculation Details |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Precast wall along <br> west property line | $\$ 97,500$ | Difference between pre-cast wall and minimum fencing required by code: <br> Precast Wall: $\$ 100$ per Linear Foot $\times 1,300$ Linear Feet $=\$ 130,000$ <br> Chain-link fence with screening: $\$ 25$ per Linear Foot $\times 1,300$ Linear Feet $=\$ 32,500$ |

Total Value of
Improvements/Design
Excellence Required: $\mathbf{\$ 8 , 3 4 7 . 5 0}$

## Total Value of Improvements/Design Excellence Provided: \$97,500

## Section 23.2-33(c)(2): Review/decision

(a) Is the award calculated correctly, consistent with the square footage and height requested and the value of the features and improvements included in the development proposal?

Staff Analysis: The development proposal is consistent with the increase in height requested. The Applicant is asking for a bonus height of 1 foot, for a total building height of 31 feet. The total square footage of bonus area is 5,565 square feet. Therefore, the total value of required improvements is $\$ 8,347.50$ ( $\$ 1.50$ per square foot for industrial bonus height of 5,565 square feet). The Applicant will be providing improvements above the code required minimums equivalent to $\$ 97,500$, which exceeds the requirements of the Sustainable Bonus and Planned Development program. Meets Criterion.
(b) Do the proposed on-site features or improvements adequately provide sustainable project enhancements beyond those otherwise required by these LDRs for the development proposal that are attainable and reasonable in the context of the proposed project?

Staff Analysis: The proposed on-site features and improvements provide enhancements that exceed the base requirements of the LDRs. The project will provide a wall on the west and south side of the property, which provides a greater degree of buffering than a fence required by code. The wall is above and beyond the minimum requirements of the code, and the difference in value between the fence and the wall meets the required valuation of the SBIP. Meets Criterion.
(c) Do the proposed off-site improvements meet the priorities of the City for community sustainability?

Staff Analysis: The project is not including off-site improvements toward the SBIP credit. Meets Criterion
(d) Do the proposed features, improvements or fees-in-lieu meet the intent of the SBIP?

Staff Analysis: As identified by the criteria above, the proposed features and improvements incorporated into the development proposal are beyond the base requirements of the LDRs and provide additional amenities and an aesthetic improvement beyond what is required by the LDRs. Thus, the proposed development meets the intent of the SBIP. Meets Criterion.

## Conditional Use Permit:

Conditional uses are those uses that are generally compatible with the other uses permitted in a district, but that require individual review of their location, design, structure, configuration, density and intensity of use, and may require the imposition of conditions pertinent thereto in order to ensure the appropriateness and compatibility of the use at a particular location and to prevent or minimize potential adverse impacts to the surrounding area. Conditional uses are required to be reviewed against the criteria in Section 23.2-29(d) and Section 23.2-29(e). The required analysis is provided below.

## Section 23.2-29(d): General findings relating to harmony with LDRs and protection of public interest

The proposed project is consistent with the general findings relating to harmony with the LDRs and protection of public interest, as follows:

1. The conditional use exactly as proposed at the location where proposed will be in harmony with the uses which, under these LDRs and the future land use element, are most likely to occur in the immediate area where located.

Staff Analysis: The site contains a base zoning designation of I-POC and is adjacent to I-POC zoned property to the north and east, Mixed-Use West (MU-W) zoned property to the south, and residential land use to the west on the opposite side of the E-4 canal. Based on the intent of the I-POC zoning district, the types of uses most likely to occur in this district are the establishment and enlargement of office, manufacturing and light industrial uses. The subject proposal is consistent with the types of uses anticipated to occur within the I-POC district. In addition, the site is designed with features to help buffer the site from nearby incompatible uses; these are described in the below criterion. Therefore, the proposed project is compatible and harmonious with the existing and anticipated surrounding uses. Meets Criterion.
2. The conditional use exactly as proposed at the location where proposed will be in harmony with existing uses in the immediate area where located.

Staff Analysis: The existing uses in the surrounding area are as follows:

| Direction | Future Land Use | Zoning District | Current Use |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North <br> (across $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue North) | I | I-POC | Distribution Warehouse, Office <br> (Boutwell Business Center) |
| South <br> (adjacent) | I/MU-W | I-POC/MU-W | Warehouse (Marlin Commerce Center)/Multi- <br> Family Residential |
| East <br> (adjacent to and across <br> the E-4/Keller Canal) | Residential High <br> Density (PBC) | Medium-Density <br> Residential (PBC) | LWDD ROW, and Single-Family Residences |
| West <br> (adjacent) | I | I-POC | Warehouse/Storage |

Per the Palm Beach County Property Appraiser, the subject site is surrounded by a mixture of warehouse, single-family, multi-family, and office uses. The property locates the warehouse building to the north of the site and away from the multi-family uses to the south of the site, reducing its impact on those properties. In addition, a $6^{\prime}$ concrete wall with landscaping faces the residential uses to the west and across the E-4 canal, which buffers the warehouse building from these uses. Staff finds that the use is in harmony with the surrounding industrial uses, and finds that the site provides adequate features which help buffer the proposed uses from adjacent, incompatible uses. Meets Criterion.
3. The conditional use exactly as proposed will not result in substantially less public benefit or greater harm than would result from use of the Property for some use permitted by right or some other conditional use permitted on the Property.

Staff Analysis: The approval of this conditional use will provide urban infill development that is consistent with the intent of the I-POC zoning district and I future land use category. As such, the proposal is not anticipated to result in less public benefit than other permitted or conditional uses. Meets Criterion.
4. The conditional use exactly as proposed will not result in more intensive development in advance of when such development is approved by the future land use element of the comprehensive plan.

Staff Analysis: The proposed project is utilizing the City's SBIP bonuses for an additional 1 foot of building height. The increase in building height will allow for the screening of rooftop equipment located above the office portion of the proposed building. Staff's analysis of the SBIP can be found on page 8 . The project is consistent with the goals, objectives, and polices of the City of Lake Worth Beach's Comprehensive Plan and will not result in a more intensive development than what the Plan anticipates. Meets Criterion.

1. The proposed conditional use will not generate traffic volumes or movements, which will result in a significant adverse impact or reduce the level of service provided on any street to a level lower than would result from a development permitted by right.

Staff Analysis: Based on the Florida Department of Transportation's $8^{\text {th }}$ Edition Trip Generation Table, the construction of a 47,927 gross square foot warehouse is anticipated to generate approximately 171 daily trips and 15 PM Peak trips. Typical uses permitted by right in the I-POC zoning district are under 2,500 square feet, and include gyms/fitness studios and administrative/professional services. If the property was subdivided or rented to individual, small, by-right tenants with uses less than 2,500 square feet and totaling 47,927 square feet, then the trips generated would be greater than the trips generated for the proposed use. For example, 47,927 square feet of individual gyms/fitness studios use would generate 1,578 trips in total, and 47,927 square feet of individual administrative/professional services use would generate 528 trips in total. As such, the proposed conditional use will not generate traffic volumes or movements which would result in a significant impact greater than a development permitted by right. In addition, a Traffic Performance Standards (TPS) Letter from the Palm Beach County Traffic Division indicates that the project is located within the Lake Worth Park of Commerce Traffic Concurrency Exception Area (TCEA) and is exempt from the Traffic Performance Standards of Palm Beach County. Meets Criterion.
2. The proposed conditional use will not result in a significantly greater amount of through traffic on local streets than would result from a development permitted by right and is appropriately located with respect to collector and arterial streets.

Staff Analysis: The I-POC zoning district allows for the establishment of industrial uses without restriction on traffic generating characteristics. As stated in the above criterion, only uses under 2,500 square feet are permitted by right in the I-POC zoning district. If these uses were developed individually on separate lots over time to an intensity equal in square footage to the proposed project, they would generate traffic in excess of the traffic generated by the proposed use. The site will not be open to the general public and will only be open to customers picking up rental equipment. There is no showroom or retail store. Therefore, the traffic generated from the proposed mixed-use development will not be significantly greater than that of adjacent uses and other anticipated uses in this area. Meets Criterion.
3. The proposed conditional use will not produce significant air pollution emissions, to a level compatible with that which would result from a development permitted by right.

Staff Analysis: The mixed-use project is not anticipated to produce significant air pollution emissions that are greater than that of a development permitted by right. The applicant states that no manufacturing or fabrication will occur on-site. The repair and maintenance of rented equipment will be done indoors. The proposed use of a distribution facility and repair and maintenance do not pose a pollution hazard to the nearby properties. Meets Criterion.
4. The proposed conditional use will be so located in relation to the thoroughfare system that neither extension nor enlargement nor any other alteration of that system in a manner resulting in higher net public cost or earlier incursion of public cost than would result from development permitted by right.

Staff Analysis: The project is not anticipated to cause a higher net public cost or earlier incursion of public cost than what would result from a development permitted by right. Meets Criterion.
5. The proposed conditional use will be so located in relation to water lines, sanitary sewers, storm sewers, surface drainage systems and other utility systems that neither extension nor enlargement nor any other alteration of such systems in a manner resulting in higher net public cost or earlier incursion of public cost than would result from development permitted by right.

Staff Analysis: The project will be utilizing the existing City utility lines installed in late 1980s/early 1990s. The sewer main is considered maximum size for an industrial area. No adverse impact to infrastructure or public utilities is anticipated to occur as a result of this request. Meets Criterion.
6. The proposed conditional use will not place a demand on municipal police or fire protection service beyond the capacity of those services.

Staff Analysis: The proposed development is not anticipated to place a demand on municipal police or fire protection service beyond the capacity of those services. In attempt to reduce the crime potential at this location, the application proposes controlling access to the site through the use of security gates that will restrict access to the site. Meets Criterion.
7. The proposed conditional use will not generate significant noise, or will appropriately mitigate anticipated noise to a level compatible with that which would result from a development permitted by right. Any proposed use must meet all the requirements and stipulations set forth in section 15.24, Noise control.

Staff Analysis: Unreasonable noise, which is defined in Section 15.24-1, is prohibited in the City when:

- Equal to or greater than 65 dba between 11:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m., Sunday through Thursday
- Greater than 85 dba between 8:00 a.m. and 11:00 p.m., Sunday through Thursday
- Equal to or greater than 65 dba between 12:00 a.m. and 8:00 a.m., Friday through Saturday
- Equal to or greater than 85 dba between 8:00 a.m. and 12:00 a.m., Friday through Saturday

Based on the uses being proposed, the project is conditioned to prohibit generating noise levels that exceed Section 15.24. Meets Criterion.
8. The proposed conditional use will not generate light or glare which encroaches onto any adjacent property in excess of that allowed in Section 23.4-3, Exterior lighting.

Staff Analysis: The proposed project will not generate light or glare that would negatively impact the surrounding properties. Based on the photometric plan submitted, the proposed development complies with LDR Section 23.4-3, Exterior Lighting. Meets Criterion.

## Section 23.4-19: Outdoor Storage

1. Outdoor storage in residential districts. Outdoor storage in residential districts for residential purposes shall be limited to domestic equipment and normal supplies necessary for residents. Storage shall not be permitted in any front yard.

Staff Analysis: This project is not located in a residential district, therefore this criterion does not apply.
2. Outdoor storage industrial. Outdoor storage in the I-POC industrial district shall be permitted only as accessory to an approved principal use. All such storage shall be completely screened from all public rights-of-way and any adjacent property that is zoned for residential or mixed use. Outdoor storage of equipment, vehicles, boats, parts, materials, or chemicals are required to be stored on an impervious paved surface to reduce pollutants in storm water runoff.

Staff Analysis: The outdoor storage as part of this proposal is accessory to the distribution facility and repair and maintenance uses seeking approval through this Conditional Use Permit. The outdoor storage areas are screened from the residential areas to the south and west, and conditions of approval have been added to ensure the areas are screened from all rights-of-ways in accordance with this section and Section 23.4-4. Meets Criterion.
3. Outdoor storage in planned development and mixed use districts. Outdoor storage facilities shall be limited to the following:
a. Outdoor storage of merchandise for sale within the establishment located on the site shall be limited to the area located between the front façade and the public right-of-way and shall only be outside of the building during hours of operation. However, this does not apply to the outdoor display of vehicles for sale or rent.
b. In any commercial planned development, all outdoor storage shall be expressly approved by the city commission as part of the ordinance adopting the commercial planned development.
c. Approval of outdoor storage in a commercial planned development or mixed use district shall include mitigation measures to protect adjacent properties from the impacts of the outdoor storage.

Staff Analysis: The proposed project is not located within a planned development or mixed-use district, therefore this criterion does not apply.
4. The outdoor storage of all licensed vehicles that are being repaired must be screened from all public rights-of-way or stored completely within an enclosed structure. There shall be no storage of junk or unlicensed vehicles within the public right-of way at any time.

Staff Analysis: There are no vehicle repair uses associated with the operations of the site, therefore this criterion does not apply.
5. The outdoor storage of unlicensed vehicles and/or junked vehicles, boats, machinery, trucks, trailers, mobile homes and heavy equipment vehicles is prohibited, except in approved junk yards or the temporary storage of such vehicles on a lot or parcel approved and containing an active business license for vehicle towing.

Staff Analysis: There will be no unlicensed and/or junked vehicles stored on-site, therefore this criterion does not apply. Meets Criterion.

## Public Support/Opposition:

Staff has received five letters opposing the petition. Mr. Daniel Hiatt, who is a property owner within 400 feet of the subject property, has requested to be an affected party.

## CONCLUSION:

The proposed request for a Major Site Plan, Conditional Use Permit, and Sustainable Bonus Program Incentive is consistent with the purpose, intent and requirements of the Comprehensive Plan, underlying zoning district, and surrounding areas as subject to compliance with staff's proposed conditions of approval. Therefore, staff recommends that the Board recommend approval of the proposed request with the conditions below:

## CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

## Electric:

1. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy:
a. The 10 -ft-wide electric easement will be needed and recorded prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.
b. The customer will be responsible for installing Lake Worth Beach's two 4 " schedule- 40 gray electric conduits at a minimum of $42^{\prime \prime}$ deep.
2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit:
a. The electrical riser diagram and the load calculations will be needed.

## Planning:

1. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, all fencing on-site shall meet the applicable requirements of Sections 23.4-4 and Section 23.4-19.
2. The project is prohibited from generating noise levels that exceed regulations found in Section 15.24.

## Public Works:

1. The issuance of any permits shall comply with all provisions of the Lake Worth Municipal Code and all other applicable standards including but not limited to the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), and City of Lake Worth Public Works Construction Standards and Policy and Procedure Manual.
2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit:
a. the applicant shall contact the Lake Worth Drainage (LWDD) District's Engineering Department and obtain any required permit(s), if necessary, and furnish to the City. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall contact the South Florida Water Management District's (SFWMD) Engineering Department and obtain any required permit(s), if necessary.
b. the Applicant shall contact and meet with a representative from the Public Works Solid Waste and Recycling Division to confirm dumpster enclosure location, accessibility and demand on property and that it is compatible with the requirements of the Department of Public Works. Solid Waste and Recycling Division contact number is 561-533-7344.
c. the applicant shall provide architectural details for the dumpster enclosure to confirm the enclosure meets the standards of the Public Works Dept.
3. Prior to performing work in the right of way, the applicant shall apply for and receive issuance of a "Right of Way/Utility Permit" application
4. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy:
a. All conditions of approval must be satisfied under jurisdiction of the Department of Public Works
b. The Applicant shall ensure the entire surrounding off-site infrastructure inclusive of the roadway, sidewalk, curbing, stormwater system piping and structures, valve boxes, manholes, landscaping, striping, signage, and other improvements are in the same condition as prior to construction
c. The applicant shall fine grade and sod all disturbed areas with bahia sod
d. The applicant shall broom sweep all areas of the affected right of way and remove of all silt and debris collected as a result of construction activity
e. The applicant shall restore the right of way to a like or better condition. Any damages to pavement, curbing, striping, sidewalks or other areas shall be restored in kind
f. The trench patch for the utility crossing on 7th Ave North shall be restored in accordance with the construction standards of the Public Works Dept.

## Water \& Sewer:

1. Water \& Sewer Utility Plan:
2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit:
a. Center the 15 -foot-wide easement over the water main.
b. Add or move the in-line valve at the edge of the easement for the fire line. This will delineate the private/utility ownership.
c. Provide a valve at the southern watermain connection.
d. Note to engineer: The proposed watermain has been installed in 7th Ave $N$, the utility department will have the as-built plan shortly. If practical, the actual utility location should be referenced.
e. Move the water service parallel to the fire line or propose a location that minimize the easement extension and path under asphalt. Near the entrance or tapping the main off of 7 th Ave N is an option since the meter can be set close to the property line.
f. Adjust the water main and/or slope of bank at the lake to provide a minimum of 10 feet flat space for maintenance access. Consider vehicles and equipment having to navigate around the lake bank at the southeast corner.
g. Capacity fees for water and sewer must be paid in full in accordance with the current City Ordinance.
h. The site shall permit through LWDD and/or SFWMD for the stormwater management and provide a copy to Water Utilities.
i. The following shall be provided:
i. At time of engineering submittal, provide a full drawing set including any updated drainage calculations, and any permits or permitting information from SFWMD and LWDD.
ii. Add all structure and utility conflict information on the plans.
iii. Complete water, sewer and drainage plans showing proposed pipe sizes, materials, structure sizes, utility crossing elevations, hydrants, manholes, as well as all pertinent site elevations.
iv. Permits from the PBC Health Department for the Watermain extension and the private lift station connection
v. If applicable, show irrigation service line/s up the meter and backflow RPZ device/s.
vi. Show water \& sewer services, drainage structures, and storm mains on landscape plan. Confirm minimum spacing between landscape and services per Public Services Detail 23, Typical Tree with Root Barrier.
vii. Fireflow calculations based on a recent hydrant test. Contact Pedro Segovia with Palm Beach County at psegovia@pbcgov.com
viii. Signed and sealed Drainage Calculations including a drainage statement from the engineer regarding floodplain management provisions for water quality and quantity shall be provided to the City.
ix. Provide geotechnical information for the determination of the hydraulic conductivity of the soil, and groundwater elevation.
x. An Erosion Control plan and with the BMPs and NPDES compliance practices shall be provided for the project site.
xi. Engineering plans shall include cross-sections along each property line and with grading showing the design storm ( $3 \mathrm{yr}, 1$ hour ( $2.6^{\prime \prime}$ )) runoff being maintained on site.
xii. Provide existing and proposed site grades.
xiii. Indicate vertical datum on all plan drawings with grades.
xiv. All applicable City of Lake Worth details.

Lake Worth Drainage District:

1. This project will require a drainage outfall connection permit from this District if they will be draining to the E-4 Canal.

## Board Actions:

I MOVE TO APPROVE OF PZB PROJECT NUMBER 20-01400035 with staff recommended conditions for a Major Site Plan, Conditional Use Permit, and Sustainable Bonus Program Incentive to construct a $+/-47,000$ square foot distribution facility and repair and maintenance uses commonly referred to as "Umdasch/Doka" and located at the subject site. The project meets the applicable criteria based on the data and analysis in the staff report.

I MOVE TO DENY PZB PROJECT NUMBER 20-01400035 for a Major Site Plan, Conditional Use Permit, and Sustainable Bonus Program Incentive to construct a $+/-47,000$ square foot distribution facility and repair and maintenance uses commonly referred to as "Umdasch/Doka" and located at the subject site. The project does not meet the applicable criteria for the following reasons [Board member please state reasons.]

## Consequent Action:

The Planning \& Zoning Board's decision will be final for the Major Site Plan, Sustainable Bonus, and Conditional Use Permit. The Applicant may appeal the Board's decision to the City Commission.

## ATTACHMENTS:

A. Site Plan Package
B. Supplemental Supporting Documents

## UMDASCH REAL ESTATE USA, LTD

2209 7th Avenue North Lake Worth Beach, Florida


## VICINTY MAP

ALL WORK TO COMPLY WITH THE FOLLOWING CODES:
THIS PROJECT IS TO BE BULITT IN ACCORDANCE WITH ALL CITY OF
AKE WORTH BEACH BUILING DEPARTMENT REOUREMENTS AND
LAKE WORTH BEACH BUILING DEPARTMENT REQUIREMEN
AMENDMENTS PALM BEACH COUNTY REQUIREMENTS AND
OLLOWING GCDES:

- 2017 FLIORIDA BUILDING CODE
- 2017 THE FLORIDA FIRE PREVENTION CODE
- NFPA-101, 2015 EDITITON W/ FLORIDA AMENDMENTS
- NFPA 1 UNIFORM FIRE CODE 2015 W/ FLORIDA AMENDMENTS
- florida administrative code


## NOTES

OWNER:
$\frac{\text { UMDASCH REAL ESTATE, USA, LTD }}{214 \text { Gates Road }}$
214 Gates Road
Little Ferry, NJ 07463
Little Ferry, NJ 07463
Contact: Louis Goldberg
Contact L- Louis Golda
T- 201-853-0594

- louis.goldberg@doka.com

ARCHITECT:
HNM ARCHITECTURE, LLC
Delray Beach, FL 33435
Contact: Jaime O. Ma
T - 501-733-2225

-     - imayo@hnm-architecture.com

CIVIL \& LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE:
$\frac{\text { KIMLEY-HORN }}{600 \text { North Pine Isla }}$
ne Island Road, Suite 450
Contact: George Balaban
T- $954-716-8824$
PROJECT TEAM

```
TTE DATA TABLE
    EXISTING ZONING DISTRICT: I-POC
    EXISTING FLU DESIGNATION: Industrial 
    REQUIRED LOT AREA: 13,000 SF
    PROPOSED LOT AREA 419467S
    REQUIRED LOT WIDTH: 100 FT
    PERMITTED BUILDING HEIGHT: 45 FT (with Sustainable Bonus Incentive Program)
    PERMITTED BUILDING HEIGHT: 45'0
    SETBACKS** REQURED PROVIDED
    SIDE (FRONT (%AST)
    M,
    Notes:
    ** Required Rear Setback is 20ft or 10% of Lot Depth. Lot Depth = 910'-0
    ***
        SITE STATISTICS
        NITE AREA:
        NET SITE AREA:
        gross bullding are
        42,002\textrm{qFt}
        419,467 Sq Ft or 9.63 acres
        ,
        MROPOSED LOT COVEAGE: 10.5% of Net Site Area
        MAX. ALLONED LOT COVERAGE: 55.00
        MROPOSED FLOOR AREA RATIO: 
        LANDSCAPE/PERVIOUS AREA: 167,409.42 Sq Ft or 39.9% of Net Site Area
        TOTAL IMPERVIOUS AREA: }\quad208,111.58 Sq Ft
        PROPOSED IMPERMEABLE AREA: 
                                $4.6.00% of Net Site Area
parkiNGStatS
    Parking Stals: }\quad\begin{array}{l}{9\times18'}\\{\mathrm{ Parking Reqd: }}\\{\mathrm{ Industrial 1 per 1,000 sf}}
    Totla Parking Required: 49 (48,217 sf @ 1/1,000)
    \mathrm{ Ootal Parking Provided: }80\mathrm{ (incld 2 HC)}
```
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#
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GONESLNOTES
C.04 DEMOLTTION & EROSION CONTROL PLAA
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GEOMETRY SIGNAGE AND STRIPING PD/A
DRAGNGE PLLN
l
PAVNGG GRDING, & DRAINAGEDETALS
MPAING, GRADING, & DRAINAGE DETAIS
UTILTTY PLAN
CITY OF LAKE WORTH SEWER DETAIL
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| dranage structure talle |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 析 | Stuctres tipe | Rm tev. | Inver levarow | Structre detals |
| s-1 |  | 10.50 | (183) 7.00 (sm) |  |
| s-2 | citat | 0.50 | (18)7 |  |
| s-3 |  | RMM $=10.50$ |  |  |
| s-4 |  | RMM $=1.50$ | ${ }_{\text {che }}^{(18)}$ | 5'-0" DIA. STRUCTURE BOTTMM W/ USF \#4155-6209 FRAME \& GRATE |
| s-5 | catar esan w' | RM $=10.50$ |  |  |
| s-6 |  | RM - 10.50 |  |  |
| ${ }^{s-7}$ | oramee mantole | N13 | ${ }^{(18)}$ | 4'-0" DIA. STRUCTURE BOTTOM W/ USF 170 RING TYPE H W/ THE WORD 'STORM' |
| s-8 |  | 0.50 |  |  |
| s-9 | oranace mantole | 1.87 |  |  |
| s-10 | Opanage mannole | - 42.20 | ${ }^{(189)}$ | 4'-0" DIA. STRUCTURE BOTTOM W/ USF 170 RING W/ THE WORD 'STORM' |
| s-11 | Opancos mannole | RM $=11.59$ |  |  |
| s-12 |  | 10.50 | ${ }^{(18)}$ | 5'-0" DIA. STRUCTURE BOTTOM W/ USF \#4155-6209 FRAME \& GRATE |
| s-13 |  | 0.50 | $)^{(18)}$ (18) 7.000 ( m$)$ |  |
| s-14 |  | RIM $=10.50$ |  |  |
| s-15 |  | Rm $=1.077$ |  | 6'-0" DIA. STRUCTURE BOTTOM W/ USF \#4155-6209 FRAME \& GRATE |
| Contractor shall proouce shop dramnos and ensure size of oranage <br>  baffles liearances As |  |  |  |  |
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## PIGGING AND CANNON FLUSHING
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## UNIVERSAL DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION DOKA

2209 7TH AVENUE NORTH REQUIRED DOCUMENATION

HAVE YOU UPLOADED ALL REQUIRED FILES?

SITE PLAN
USE
PROJECT INFORMATION

PROPERTY CONTROL NUMBER (PCN)
city of
Lake Worth Beach
FLORIDA

- SOUTH-RENDER-ELEVATION.jpg
- WEST-RENDER-ELEVATION.jpg
- Warranty-deed.pdf
- Universal-Development-Application.pdf
- survey.pdf
- Sign-Posting-Agreement-UMDASCH.pdf
- Project-Narrative.pdf
- Owners-consent-Reves-003.pdf
- NORTH-EAST-RENDER-ELEVATION.jpg
- Perspective-rendering-2.jpg
- Perspective-rendering-1.jpg
- EAST-RENDER-ELEVATION.jpg
- DOKA-LAKE-WORTH-BEACH-LANDSCAPE-SET.pdf
- A4-4_NORTH-EAST-ELEVATION.pdf
- Boundary-Survey-Drawing-LG.pdf
- A4-6_SOUTH-RENDER-ELEVATION.pdf
- A4-5_WEST-RENDER-ELEVATION.pdf
- AO-3.pdf
- AO-2.pdf
- AO-1.pdf
- AO-0.pdf
- A4-3.pdf
- A4-2.pdf
- A4-1.pdf
- A4-0.pdf
- A7-1.pdf
- Al-0.pdf
- AO-4.pdf
- 2020.08.19-Doka-Signage.pdf
- 37373730-v7-Doka-Signed-and-Notarized-Affidavit-of-Completeness-and-Accuracy.PDF - 2020.09.02-Doka-SS.pdf

Yes

- Major
- Administrative

PROJECT NAME
PROJECT ADDRESS

LEGAL DESCRIPTION

ZONING - EXISTING
ZONING - PROPOSED
I-POC
I-POC

| FUTURE LAND USE - EXISTING | I |
| ---: | :--- |
| FUTURE LAND USE - PROPOSED | I |
| PROPOSED USE | • Industrial |
| TOTAL ESTIMATED PROJECT COST | \$11,000,000.00 |
| DESCRIPTION OF WORK | TWO STORY 10,042 SQUARE FOOT SHOWROOM, 26,743 SQUARE <br> FOOT MAINTENANCE SHOP/WAREHOUSE 11,160 SQUARE FOOT <br>  <br> OUTDOOR OPEN AIR CANOPY STRUCTURE. |
| CONTACT INFORMATION |  |
| PROJECT MANAGER NAME | LISA REVES |
| PROJECT MANAGER COMPANY | SAUL EWING ARNSTEIN \& LEHR |
| PROJECT MANAGER EMAIL | LISA.REVES@SAUL.COM |
| PROJECT MANAGER PHONE | (561) 650-8465 |
| PROJECT MANAGER ADDRESS | 515 N FLAGLER DR |
|  | WEST PALM BEACH, Florida 33401 |
| APited States |  |

## Universal Development Application

This application is required for ALL applications submitted to the Planning, Zoning and Historic Preservation Division. If you have questions regarding this application, please make an appointment with planning staff.

1. Application Type (select all that apply)
a. Site Plan:Minor
MajorPlanned Development
Sustainable Bonus
b. Use:AdministrativeConditionalCommunity ResidenceGaming EstablishmentAdult Use
d. Approvals:
e. Amendments:VarianceMuralCert. of AppropriatenessAdjustmentText
f. Other:Subdivsion/Plat
ABT Signoff
■
Annexation
$\square$ Zoning Letter
Economic Investment \& Development Electricity Incentives

## 2. Project Information

a. Project Name: Doka
b. Project Location / Address: 2209 7th Avenue North
c. Legal Description: $\qquad$
d. Property Control Number (PCN): 38-43-44-20-01-066-0010
e. Zoning: $\qquad$ Proposed: I-POC
f. Future Land Use: Existing: I $\qquad$ Proposed: $\qquad$
g. Proposed Use:Residential; Units $\qquad$Commercial; $\qquad$ S.F. $\square$ Industrial; $\qquad$ S.F.
h. Total Estimated Project Cost:
i. Description of Work: 2 STORY 10,042 SF SHOWROOM, 26,743 SF MAINTENCE SHOP/WAREHOUSE 11,160 SF OUTDOOR OPEN AIR CANOPY STRUCTURE.

## 3. Contact Information

a. Project Manager / Contact Person: Lisa Reves

Company: Saul Ewing Arnstein \& Lehr
Address: 515 N Flagler Dr., Suite $1400 \quad$ City: West Palm Beach _ St: FL_Zip: 33401
Phone Number: 561-833-9300 E-Mail Address: lisa.reves@saul.com
b. Applicant Name (if different from Project Manager):

Company: Doka
Address: $\qquad$ City: $\qquad$ St: $\qquad$ Zip: $\qquad$
Phone Number: $\qquad$ E-Mail Address: $\qquad$
c. Owner Name: $\qquad$
Company: $\qquad$
Address: $\qquad$ City: $\qquad$ St: $\qquad$ Zip: $\qquad$
Phone Number: $\qquad$ E-Mail Address: $\qquad$

Property as described in this application and to all conditions that may be agreed to as a part of the approval of this application, which may be imposed by the decision making board. Owner hereby authorizes, Lisa A. Reves, Esq., agent for the Buyer to file this application and represent the Buyer, DokaUSA, Ltd, a New Jersey corporation, at any and all meetings and hearings required for the approval of this application.


Name/Title of Signatory:

## STATE OF <br> FLORIDA <br> county of Bloward

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this _12 day of Qu gust, 2020 by Bill Cuthbertson who is personally known to me or who produced a_N|A as identification. He/she did not take an oath.
(NOTARY SEAL)


Arlene D. Everett NOTARY PUBLIC STATE OF FLORIDA Comm\# GG138623 Expires 8/28/2021

(Signature of Notary Public)

(Name of Notary)

## 5. Affidavit of Completeness and Accuracy

Instructions: To be completed by the individual submitting the application (owner or authorized agent)
Project Name $\qquad$ Submittal Date: $\qquad$

## Statement of Completeness and Accuracy:

I hereby certify all property owners have full knowledge the property they own is the subject of this application. I hereby certify that all owners and petitioners have been provided a complete copy of all material, attachments and documents submitted to the City of Lake Worth relating to this application. I further certify the statements or information made in any paper or plans submitted herewith are true and correct to the best of my knowledge. I understand this application, related application material and all attachments become official records of the Planning, Zoning and Historic Preservation Division of Lake Worth, Florida, and will not be returned. I understand that any knowingly false, inaccurate or incomplete information provided by me will result in the denial, revocation or administrative withdrawal of this application, request, approval or permit. I further acknowledge that additional information may be required by Palm Beach County to process this application. I further acknowledge that any plans that I have prepared or had prepared comply with the Fair Housing Standards. I further consent to the City of Lake Worth to publish, copy or reproduce any copyrighted documents submitted as a part of this application for any third party. I further agree to all terms and conditions, which may be imposed as part of the approval of this application.
(Name - type, stamp, or print clearly)

## (Name of Firm)

$\times$
(Signature)
(Address, City, State, Zip)

## STATE OF

COUNTY OF $\qquad$
The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this $\qquad$ day of $\qquad$ 20 $\qquad$ by $\qquad$
who is personally known to me or who produced a $\qquad$ as identification. He/she did not take an oath.
(NOTARY SEAL)
$\times$
(Signature of Notary Public)

## 4. Owner's Consent

LW Industrial, LLC $\qquad$ ("Owner") certifies that it is the owner of the property located at 2209 7th Avenue North Lake Worth Beach ("Subject Property") and expressly consents to the use of the Subject Property as described in this application and to all conditions that may be agreed to as a part of the approval of this application, which may be imposed by the decision making board. Owner hereby authorizes, Lisa A. Reves, Esq. as agent, to file this application and represent Owner at any and all meetings and hearings required for the approval of this application.

Owner's Signature: ${ }^{x}$ $\qquad$ Date: $\qquad$

Name/Title of Signatory:
state of FLORIDA
COUNTY OF $\qquad$
The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this $\qquad$ day of $\qquad$ 20 $\qquad$ by $\qquad$ who is personally known to me or who produced a $\qquad$ as identification. He/she did not take an oath.
(NOTARY SEAL)
$\times$
(Signature of Notary Public)

## (Name of Notary)

## 5. Affidavit of Completeness and Accuracy

Instructions: To be completed by the individual submitting the application (owner or authorized agent)
Project Name: UMDASCH REAL ESTATE USA, LTD. Submittal Date:

AUGUST 2020

## Statement of Completeness and Accuracy:

I hereby certify all property owners have full knowledge the property they own is the subject of this application. I hereby certify that all owners and petitioners have been provided a complete copy of all material, attachments and documents submitted to the City of Lake Worth relating to this application. I further certify the statements or information made in any paper or plans submitted herewith are true and correct to the best of my knowledge. I understand this application, related application material and all attachments become official records of the Planning, Zoning and Historic Preservation Division of Lake Worth, Florida, and will not be returned. I understand that any knowingly false, inaccurate or incomplete information provided by me will result in the denial, revocation or administrative withdrawal of this application, request, approval or permit. I further acknowledge that additional information may be required by Palm Beach County to process this application. I further acknowledge that any plans that I have prepared or had prepared comply with the Fair Housing Standards. I further consent to the City of Lake Worth to publish, copy or reproduce any copyrighted documents submitted as a part of this application for any third party. I further agree to all terms and conditions, which may be imposed as part of the approval of this application.
LISA A. REVES, ESQ.
(Name - type, stamp, or print clearly)
SAUL EWING ARNSTEIN \& LEHR
(Name of Firm)

state of FLORIDA
county of PALM BEACH
The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 10
dapo AUGUST $20200 \%$ LISAA A. Reves
who is personally known to me or who produced a $\qquad$


KECOMDA KET UKNTO:

This Indenture made this 296 in day of October, 2008 between LAKE WORTH 10 ACRES, LLC, a Florida limited liability company whose post oftice address is 4801 Linton Blvd., \#11A, \#643, Delray Beach, FL 33445 of the County of Palm Beach, State of Florida, grantor, and LW INDUSTRIAL, LLC, a Florida limited liability company whose post office address is 720 S.W. 75 Terraee, Plantation, FL 33317 of the County of Broward, State of Florida, grantee*,

Witnesseth that said grantor, for and mensideration of the sum of TEN AND NO/100 DOLLARS (\$10.00) and other good and valuable considerations to said grantor in hand paid by said grantee, the receipt whereof is hereby acknowledged, has granted, bargained, and sold to the said gtantee, and grantee's heirs and assigns forever, the following described land, situate, lying and being in Palm Beach County, Florida, to-wit:

Tract 66 and the North 210.81 feet of Tract 81, Model Land Co. Subidivision of Section 20, Township 44 South, Range 43 East, according to the map or plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 5, Page 79, of the Public Records of Palm Beach Conty Florida.
and said grantor does hereby fully warrant the title to said land, and will defend the same against lawful claims of all persons whomsoever.

> * "Grantor" and "Grantee" are used for singular or plural, as context requires.

In Witness Whereof, grantor has hereunto set grantor's hand and seal the day and year first above written.
Signed, sealed and delivered in our presence:
 Countyof Browasd
The foregong instrument was acknowledged before me this 29 day of Octoper, 200 b by DONATO W. CASALE, Managing Member of LAKE WORTH 10 ACRES, LLC, a Florida limited liabilify company on behalf of said firm. He效 persomally known or [X] has produced a driver's license as identifcat on.


## \& LEHR ${ }^{\text {L® }}$

September 22, 2020

## Re: PROJECT NARRATIVE

$22097^{\text {th }}$ Avenue North, Lake Worth Beach, FL

## Nature of Use/Business Operations

Umdasch Real Estate USA, Ltd., the ownership entity, is developing the site for use by Doka USA Ltd., the operating entity. Doka USA Ltd., is an international leader in developing, manufacturing and distributing formwork technology for use in all fields of construction and is proposing to locate its newest location within the Boutwell Industrial Park of Commerce at 2209 $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue North. The site is zoned I-POC with corresponding Future Land Use of Industrial and includes 9.7916 acres of vacant land. This facility will house rental and sales services of formwork, construction equipment and safety systems. No manufacturing will occur at this facility. This site will conduct yard operations, maintenance operations, and office operations. Yard operations, loads equipment onto trucks for transportation to various jobsites. As the equipment returns, maintenance operations inspects and repairs the equipment. While office operations consists of various departments including but not limited to, the sales department, engineering department, operational and logistics department, and management. Doka is proposing business hours from 7:30 a.m. until 4:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and if needed Saturdays 7:30 a.m. until noon. This site is not proposed as a retail business so traffic will be limited to employees and trucks transporting the formwork to and from jobsites.

## Site Characteristics

Based upon information provided by Nutting Environmental of Florida, Inc., the subject site included several bodies of water but by 1973, the bodies of water on the eastern portion of the site were no longer visible. The site is listed in the Solid Waste activity directory (SWF/LF) databases, as the "Boutwell Road Trash Dump". The Environmental Risk Information System (ERIS) report, indicates this site formerly operated as a "trash and yard waste, unpermitted dump" which closed in the late 1970's early 1980's. In 2011, the property was cleared and has remained undeveloped.

## Surrounding Property Information

The proposed project is harmonious with uses in the surrounding area, which is comprised of industrial concrete and metal buildings. The property to the North, of the subject site, is vacant land which is zoned I-POC. To the east of the subject site is Marlin Industrial Park ("Park") zoned I-POC and includes three industrial buildings. The architectural style of these buildings are utilitarian and include store front door and window systems with rolling bays doors in multiple tenant bays. To the west of the site is the E-4 Canal in unincorporated Palm Beach County. The south side of the site is bordered by both the Marlin Commerce Center and

Oakwood Apartments. The apartment complex is zoned MU-W and comprised of nine (9), two (2) story multi-family buildings. The apartment buildings have gabled roofs with limited window and door openings. The Marlin Commerce Center includes three (3) buildings which house Office and Industrial structures within flat roof industrial style architecture.

## Compliance with Site Design Qualitative Standards of Section 23.2-31:

1. Harmonious and efficient organization. The proposed site improvements include a building located on the northwest portion of the site which houses a two (2) story ten thousand forty two $(10,042)$ square foot office space located along the south side of $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue North, a 26,743 square foot maintenance shop and warehouse, 11,160 square foot canopy shaded area and 104,342 square foot outdoor storage area, all are harmoniously and efficiently organized for the functional use of the property. The proposed improvements will not impede the normal and orderly development of surrounding property for uses permitted within the Land Development Regulations ("LDR")
2. Preservation of Natural Conditions. The subject property is vacant and due to the historical use of the property no natural communities remain.
3. Screening and buffering. Fences, walls, vegetation and lakes are utilized to protect neighboring properties from undesirable views, light, noise, or other adverse on-site effects. The 97,264 square foot lake is strategically located along the south portion of the site to provide the maximum possible separation from the multi-family community to the south.
4. Residential privacy is enhanced, not only by the strategic location of the lake but also by the Lake Worth Drainage District ("LWDD") 200 foot right of way for the E-4 Canal along the west of the subject site. The LWDD right of way and position of lake provide reasonable, visual and acoustical privacy for the dwelling units located adjacent to the site.
5. Emergency access. Site access is proposed from three locations on $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue North, all include 20 foot roll gates with knox-box access. The proposed structure is arranged in a manner which allows emergency vehicles access to all of the building facades from the right of way and the ingress/egress access aisles which surround the building.
6. Access to public ways. The proposed structure has safe and convenient access to the public street via the proposed concrete sidewalk within the $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue North right of way and the connecting internal walkways and crosswalks as depicted on the site plan.
7. Pedestrian circulation. The pedestrian circulation system is insulated as completely as reasonably possible from the vehicular circulation system as depicted on the site plan. Location of the internal walkways and crosswalks have been located in the safest possible manner in relation to the building location and vehicular circulation.
8. Design of ingress and egress drives. The site is accessed from the terminus of $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue North via three(3) proposed ingress/egress points. The access points are arranged to minimize negative impacts on public and private ways and on adjacent property.
9. Coordination of on-site circulation with off-site circulation. Site access and circulation is designed so that passenger vehicles parking and circulation will occur from the western access point and truck circulation will occur predominately on the east side of the property.
10. Design of on-site public right-of-way. The extension of $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue North is designed for maximum efficiency and to provide site access in a manner that is harmonious with existing conditions.
11. Off-street parking, loading and vehicular circulation areas. Off-street parking, loading, and vehicular circulation areas are located, designed and screened to minimize the impact of
glare, noise, and odor on adjacent property. The off-street parking is proposed on the western façade of the building and accessible from the west ingress/egress point to the site. The majority of truck access and circulation, is separated from passenger vehicle circulation and will occur from two acess points located east of the proposed building.
12. Refuse and service areas. Refuse and service areas are located, designed and screened to minimize the impact of noise, glare and odor on adjacent property and locating it on the west property line away from neighboring property owners.
13. Protection of property values. The elements of the site plan are arranged to minimize any potential negative impact on adjoining property and would improve the property values with the proposed improvements, fencing, screen walls and landscape improvement proposed for the site.
14. Transitional development. Not applicable.
15. Consideration of future development. The above standards are met and impacts to existing and future development have been mitigated.

## Compliance with Community Appearance Criteria Section 23.2-31(l):

1. The plan for the proposed structure is in conformity with good taste, good design, and in general contributes to the image of the City as a place of beauty, spaciousness, harmony, taste, fitness, broad vistas and is a high quality home of an international company.
2. The proposed structure is not, in its exterior design and appearance, of inferior quality such as to cause the nature of the local environment or evolving environment to materially depreciate in appearance and value.
3. The proposed structure is in harmony with the proposed developments in the general area, with code requirements pertaining to site plan, signage and landscaping, and the comprehensive plan for the City, and with the criteria set forth herein.
4. The proposed structure is in compliance with this section and 23.2-29, as applicable.

Best Regards,
Lisa A. Reves
sb

August 31, 2020

## Re: PROJECT NARRATIVE

$22097^{\text {th }}$ Avenue North, Lake Worth Beach, FL
Umdasch Real Estate USA, Ltd., the ownership entity, is developing the site for use by Doka USA Ltd., the operating entity. Doka USA Ltd., is an international leader in developing, manufacturing and distributing formwork technology for use in all fields of construction and is proposing to locate its newest location within the Boutwell Industrial Park of Commerce at 2209 $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue North. The site is zoned I-POC with corresponding Future Land Use of Industrial and includes 9.7916 acres of vacant land.

## Site Characteristics

Based upon information provided by Nutting Environmental of Florida, Inc., the subject site included several bodies of water but by 1973, the bodies of water on the eastern portion of the site were no longer visible. The site is listed in the Solid Waste activity directory (SWF/LF) databases, as the "Boutwell Road Trash Dump". The Environmental Risk Information System (ERIS) report, indicates this site formerly operated as a "trash and yard waste, unpermitted dump" which closed in the late 1970's early 1980's. In 2011, the property was cleared and has remained undeveloped.

## Surrounding Property Information

The proposed project is harmonious with uses in the surrounding area, which is comprised of industrial concrete and metal buildings. The property to the North, of the subject site, is vacant land which is zoned I-POC. To the east of the subject site is Marlin Industrial Park ("Park") zoned I-POC and includes three industrial buildings. The architectural style of these buildings are utilitarian and include store front door and window systems with rolling bays doors in multiple tenant bays. To the west of the site is the E-4 Canal in unincorporated Palm Beach County. The south side of the site is bordered by both the Marlin Commerce Center and Oakwood Apartments. The apartment complex is zoned MU-W and comprised of nine (9), two (2) story multi-family buildings. The apartment buildings have gabled roofs with limited window and door openings. The Marlin Commerce Center includes three (3) buildings which house Office and Industrial structures within flat roof industrial style architecture.

## Compliance with Site Design Qualitative Standards of Section 23.2-31:

1. Harmonious and efficient organization. The proposed site improvements include a building located on the northwest portion of the site which houses a two (2) story ten thousand forty two $(10,042)$ square foot office space located along the south side of $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue North, a 26,743 square foot maintenance shop and warehouse, 11,160 square foot canopy shaded area
and 104,342 square foot outdoor storage area, all are harmoniously and efficiently organized for the functional use of the property. The proposed improvements will not impede the normal and orderly development of surrounding property for uses permitted within the Land Development Regulations ("LDR")
2. Preservation of Natural Conditions. The subject property is vacant and due to the historical use of the property no natural communities remain.
3. Screening and buffering. Fences, walls, vegetation and lakes are utilized to protect neighboring properties from undesirable views, light, noise, or other adverse on-site effects. The 97,264 square foot lake is strategically located along the south portion of the site to provide the maximum possible separation from the multi-family community to the south.
4. Residential privacy is enhanced, not only by the strategic location of the lake but also by the Lake Worth Drainage District ("LWDD") 200 foot right of way for the E-4 Canal along the west of the subject site. The LWDD right of way and position of lake provide reasonable, visual and acoustical privacy for the dwelling units located adjacent to the site.
5. Emergency access. Site access is proposed from three locations on $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue North, all include 20 foot roll gates with knox-box access. The proposed structure is arranged in a manner which allows emergency vehicles access to all of the building facades from the right of way and the ingress/egress access aisles which surround the building.
6. Access to public ways. The proposed structure has safe and convenient access to the public street via the proposed concrete sidewalk within the $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue North right of way and the connecting internal walkways and crosswalks as depicted on the site plan.
7. Pedestrian circulation. The pedestrian circulation system is insulated as completely as reasonably possible from the vehicular circulation system as depicted on the site plan. Location of the internal walkways and crosswalks have been located in the safest possible manner in relation to the building location and vehicular circulation.
8. Design of ingress and egress drives. The site is accessed from the terminus of $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue North via three(3) proposed ingress/egress points. The access points are arranged to minimize negative impacts on public and private ways and on adjacent property.
9. Coordination of on-site circulation with off-site circulation. Site access and circulation is designed so that passenger vehicles parking and circulation will occur from the western access point and truck circulation will occur predominately on the east side of the property.
10. Design of on-site public right-of-way. The extension of $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue North is designed for maximum efficiency and to provide site access in a manner that is harmonious with existing conditions.
11. Off-street parking, loading and vehicular circulation areas. Off-street parking, loading, and vehicular circulation areas are located, designed and screened to minimize the impact of glare, noise, and odor on adjacent property. The off-street parking is proposed on the western façade of the building and accessible from the west ingress/egress point to the site. The majority of truck access and circulation, is separated from passenger vehicle circulation and will occur from two acess points located east of the proposed building.
12. Refuse and service areas. Refuse and service areas are located, designed and screened to minimize the impact of noise, glare and odor on adjacent property and locating it on the west property line away from neighboring property owners.
13. Protection of property values. The elements of the site plan are arranged to minimize any potential negative impact on adjoining property and would improve the property values with
the proposed improvements, fencing, screen walls and landscape improvement proposed for the site.
14. Transitional development. Not applicable.
15. Consideration of future development. The above standards are met and impacts to existing and future development have been mitigated.

## Compliance with Community Appearance Criteria Section 23.2-31(l):

1. The plan for the proposed structure is in conformity with good taste, good design, and in general contributes to the image of the City as a place of beauty, spaciousness, harmony, taste, fitness, broad vistas and is a high quality home of an international company.
2. The proposed structure is not, in its exterior design and appearance, of inferior quality such as to cause the nature of the local environment or evolving environment to materially depreciate in appearance and value.
3. The proposed structure is in harmony with the proposed developments in the general area, with code requirements pertaining to site plan, signage and landscaping, and the comprehensive plan for the City, and with the criteria set forth herein.
4. The proposed structure is in compliance with this section and 23.2-29, as applicable.

Best Regards,
Lisa A. Reves
sb


Department of Engineering
and Public Works and Public Works
P.O. Box 21229

West Palm Beach, FL 33416-1229
(561) 684-4000

FAX: (561) 684-4050
www.pbcgov.com

## Palm Beach County Board of County Commissioners

Dave Kerner, Mayor
Robert S. Weinroth, Vice Mayor
Hal R. Valeche
Gregg K. Weiss
Mary Lou Berger
Melissa McKinlay
Mack Bernard

County Administrator
Verdenia C. Baker

November 19, 2020
Stephanie A. Kinlen, P.E.
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
1920 Wekiva Way, Suite 200
West Palm Beach, FL 33411

Dear Ms. Kinlen:
The Palm Beach County Traffic Division has reviewed the $22097^{\text {th }}$ Avenue $\mathbf{N}$ Traffic Impact Statement, dated November 13, 2020, pursuant to the Traffic Performance Standards in Article 12 of the Palm Beach County Unified Land Development Code (ULDC). The project is summarized as follows:

| Municipality: | Lake Worth Beach |
| :---: | :---: |
| Location: | South side of $7^{\text {th }}$ Ave N , west of $23^{\text {rd }}$ Ave S |
| PCN: | 38-43-44-20-01-066-0010 |
| Access: | Two access driveway connections onto $7^{\text {th }}$ Avenue N (As used in the study and is NOT necessarily an approval |
|  | by the County through this TPS letter) |
| Existing Uses: | Vacant |
| Proposed Uses: | Gen. Office $=10,042 \mathrm{SF}$ |
|  | Warehouse $=26,743 \mathrm{SF}$ |
|  | Outdoor Storage $=2.4$ Acres |
| New Daily Trips: | 221 |
| New Peak Hour Trips: | 40 (35/5) AM; 23 (7/16) PM |
| Build-out: | December 31, 2021 |
| Based on our review, development is located Concurrency Exception Performance Standards of | the Traffic Division has determined the proposed within the Lake Worth Park of Commerce Traffic Area (TCEA) and therefore, exempt from the Traffic Palm Beach County. |
| Please note the receipt does not constitute the revi (R/W) Construction Perm deemed as site related. Fo of the project will be pro project is required to c include R/W dedication. | a Traffic Performance Standards (TPS) approval letter iew and issuance of a Palm Beach County Right-of-Way mit nor does it eliminate any requirements that may be r work within Palm Beach County R/W, a detailed review vided upon submittal for a R/W permit application. The mply with all Palm Beach County standards and may |

No building permits are to be issued by the City after the build-out date specified
above. The County traffic concurrency approval is subject to the Project
Aggregation Rules set forth in the Traffic Performance Standards Ordinance.
No building permits are to be issued by the City after the build-out date specified
above. The County traffic concurrency approval is subject to the Project
Aggregation Rules set forth in the Traffic Performance Standards Ordinance.
No building permits are to be issued by the City after the build-out date spec
above. The County traffic concurrency approval is subject to the Pr
Aggregation Rules set forth in the Traffic Performance Standards Ordinance.

## ``` RE: 2209 7 th Avenue N <br> Project \#: 

20110 <br> Traffic Performance Standards Review``` \\ RE: \(\quad 22097^{\text {th }}\) Avenue \(N\) Traffic Performance Standards Review} development is located within the Lake Worth Park of Commerce Traffic Concurrency Exception Area (TCEA) and therefore, exempt from the Traffic Performance Standards of Palm Beach County.

Please note the receipt of a Traffic Performance Standards (TPS) approval letter does not constitute the review and issuance of a Palm Beach County Right-of-Way (R/W) Construction Permit nor does it eliminate any requirements that may be deemed as site related. For work within Palm Beach County R/W, a detailed review of the project will be provided upon submittal for a R/W permit application. The project is required to comply with all Palm Beach County standards and may include R/W dedication.
"An Equal Opportunity Affirmative Action Employer"

Stephanie A. Kinlen, P.E.
November 19, 2020
Page 2

The approval letter shall be valid no longer than one year from date of issuance, unless an application for a Site Specific Development Order has been approved, an application for a Site Specific Development Order has been submitted, or the approval letter has been superseded by another approval letter for the same property.

If you have any questions regarding this determination, please contact me at 561-684-4030 or email QBari@pbcgov.org.

Sincerely,
Buyis thwor Bari
Quazi Bari, P.E., PTOE
Manager - Growth Management
Traffic Division

QB:HA:rb
ec: Addressee
Erin Fitzhugh Sita, AICP, Assistant Director-Planning, Zoning, \& Preservation Community Sustainability Department, City of Lake Worth Beach
Hanane Akif, E.I., Project Coordinator II, Traffic Division
Steve Bohovsky, Technical Assistant III, Traffic Division
File: General - TPS - Mun - Traffic Study Review
F:TTRAFFIC\HALMUNICIPALITIES\APPROVALS \(2020 \backslash 201107\) - 2209 7TH AVE.DOCXN

\section*{Sustainable Bonus Incentive Program}

All development proposals seeking increased height above two stories, or additional FAR, as each may be allowed in a zoning district, shall submit this Sustainable Bonus Incentive Program Application. The application shall accompany the standard City of Lake Worth Universal Development Application for the development proposal.

Two hard copies and one electronic copy of the following materials are required in order for a Sustainable Bonus Incentive Program Application to be deemed complete and sufficient to present to the decision making board.

The Sustainable Bonus Incentive calculations are based on the gross square footage of the bonus height or intensity requested. The additional gross square footage amount is multiplied by \(\$ 5\) per square foot ("Value Multiplier") in order to determine the value of the additional improvements to be provided for the project.
1. Please indicate whether the development proposal includes bonus height or bonus intensity:
a. Bonus Height
i. No. of Additional Stories: \(\qquad\) ("Bonus Height")
ii. Additional Gross Floor Area: 5,565 sf ("Bonus Area")
b. Bonus Intensity
i. Additional Floor Area Ratio: \(\qquad\) ("Bonus Intensity")
ii. Additional Gross Floor Area: \(\qquad\) ("Bonus Area")
2. Multiply the Bonus Area by the Value Multiplier to determine the value of required improvements.
a. \(\frac{5,565 \mathrm{sf}}{\text { Bonus Area }}\) square feet \(\times \$ 5=\$ \frac{\$ 8,347.50}{\text { Value of Required Improvements }}\)
3. Indicate the type and value of the community benefit proposed to qualify for the Bonus Area:
a. \(\square\) On-Site Features and Improvements; Value: \(\$ 130,000\)
b.Off-Site Features and Improvements; Value: \$
c.Fee In Lieu; Amount: \$
4. Attach to this application a separate sheet with a detailed description of the proposed improvement and valuation of the same.
-Cost for code minimum fencing w/ fabric mesh: 1,300 linear feet of vinyl coated chain link fence w fabric mesh \(\times \$ 25 / \mathrm{LF}=\$ 32,500\). Net Value of improvements above required \(=\$ 97,500.00\) Total Value Required 2). Above \(=\) \(\$ 8,347.50\) Net total of improvements: \(\$ 89,152.50\)

\title{
UMDASCH Real Estate USA, LTD Office and Industrial Facility
}

\author{
Drainage Report KHA PN: 143189000
}

\author{
Prepared for: \\ UMDASCH Real Estate USA, LTD \\ \(22097^{\text {th }}\) Ave \(N\) \\ Lake Worth Beach, FL 33461
}

\section*{Prepared by:}

Kimley-Horn \& Associates, Inc.
8201 Peters Road, Suite 2200
Plantation, FL 33324

\section*{Kimley»Horn}

\section*{Kimley»"Horn}

\title{
DRAINAGE REPORT
}

\author{
for \\ UMDASCH Real Estate USA, LTD \\ Office and Industrial Facility \\ \(22097^{\text {th }}\) Ave N \\ Lake Worth Beach, FL 33461
}

KHA Project No.: 143189000
November 2020

\footnotetext{
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\section*{PROJECT DESCRIPTION}

The subject site is located in Section 20, Township 44, Range 43 E within the City of Lake Worth Beach, Florida. The project consists of a single lot located at \(22097^{\text {th }}\) Avenue North in Lake Worth Beach, Florida, 33461. The parcel control number is 38-43-44-20-01-066-0010. The project consists of 9.63 net acres and proposes the construction of a \(26,617 \mathrm{SF}\) maintenance shop/warehouse, and a \(10,150 \mathrm{SF} 2\) story office. The site is located within the C-51 Basin of the South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD) and shall meet or exceed Sub-Basin 33 requirements of \(11.2^{\prime}\) (NAVD) max 100 year Stage with 35 CSM max 10 year Discharge Rate (approximately 0.53 cfs for the 9.63 acres of the project) The site is bounded to the north by \(7^{\text {th }}\) Avenue North, bounded to the south by Oakwood Apartments, bounded to the west by E-4 Canal (Keller Canal), and bounded to the east by industrial buildings (see Appendix A1, Project Location Aerial).

\section*{EXISTING CONDITIONS}

The existing site is heavily vegetated with an existing lake on-site. There is legal positive outfall to the Lake Worth Drainage District (LWDD) E-4 (Keller Canal). The site previously obtained a SFWMD Permit No. 50-09006-P (Application 080311-7) on May 14, 2009. Previously a conservation easement was required on-site (See Appendix E) recorded March 01, 2010. This conservation easement was later released on November 14, 2013 (See Appendix E).

\section*{OBJECTIVE}

The objective of this design is to provide a stormwater management system that will provide adequate flood protection for the proposed project and meet the environmental and regulatory requirements set forth by the federal, state, county, and local governmental agencies. These agencies include: the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), City of Lake Worth Beach, Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP), Lake Worth Drainage District (LWDD), and South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD).

\section*{REQUIREMENTS}

SFWMD and LWDD have jurisdiction over stormwater quality and quantity criteria. The following subsections outline the requirements set forth by these entities. The stormwater system must be designed to meet the most stringent of the aforementioned requirements.

\section*{Water Quality Criteria - Treatment Required}

Per SFWMD design criteria for industrial properties, water quality treatment is required. The water quality treatment volume shall be provided for the first inch of runoff from the developed project, or the total runoff of 2.5 inches times the percentage impervious, whichever is greater. The required water quality of \(1.15 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}\) will be met in the proposed exfiltration trench, which provide \(4.12 \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}\) of storage. (See Appendix B for detailed calculations).
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\section*{Water Quantity Criteria - Design Storm Events}

\section*{5-Year, 1-Day Rainfall}

The post-development runoff from a storm event with duration of 1 -day and 5 -year return frequency should be completely retained within the proposed stormwater system below the minimum inlet elevation.

\section*{10-Year, 3-Day Rainfall}

The post-development runoff from a storm event with duration of 3-day and 25-year return frequency regulates the discharge to the canal.

\section*{25-Year, 3-Day Rainfall}

The post-development runoff from a storm event with duration of 3-day and 25-year return frequency.

\section*{100-Year, 3-Day Rainfall}

The building finish floor elevation must be set at or above the peak stage of a storm event with duration of 3 -day and 100 -year return frequency. No discharge is accounted for.

\section*{Water Table}

The design water table elevation of 7.00 ft NAVD was obtained from Lake Worth Drainage District Canal Elevations Map (see Appendix A-8).

\section*{FEMA FLOOD ELEVATION}

The project is located in Community Panel Numbers 12099C0777F (Panel 777 of 1200) of the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), revised October 5, 2017. According to the National Flood Insurance Program the project is within Zone AE (Elevation 11' NAVD) as well as outside the 100-year flood zone in Flood Zone ' X ' (see Appendix A-3).

\section*{PROPOSED STORMWATER MANAGEMENT SYSTEM}

The proposed stormwater improvements will have the capability to manage the stormwater runoff produced by the proposed development through the use of 2,193 LF of exfiltration trench and one (1) lakes on-site. The project site will discharge via control structure on the southwest corner of the parcel to the E-4 (LWDD) Keller Canal. The control structure will include a rim elevation above the 10year-3-day discharge storm and will also include a 6 inch inverted triangle bleeder.

\section*{STORM ANALYSIS}

The storm analysis consisted of determining the rainfall amounts for the following storm events and executing Cascade drainage software to model and determine the stage and runoff of each event. The analysis was completed for the following storm events and rainfall depths:
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline Design Storm Event & Rainfall Depth (inches) \\
\hline 5-Year, 1-Day (Figure A-4) & 7.5 \\
\hline 10-Year, 3-Day (Figure A-5) & 10.5 \\
\hline 25-Year, 3-Day (Figure A-6) & 12.5 \\
\hline 100-Year, 3-Day (Figure A-7) & 16.3 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\section*{CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS}

The stormwater system satisfies the LWDD and SFWMD retention criteria for the required design storm events. The drainage analysis indicates that the proposed stormwater management system should be able to protect the site from flooding and prevent off-site discharge for the 1-day: 5 -year and 3-day: 10-year design storm events (see Appendix B, Drainage Calculations).
\begin{tabular}{||c|c|c|c||}
\hline \multirow{3}{*}{ DESIGN STORM } & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{ POST-DEVELOPMENT } \\
\cline { 2 - 4 } & \begin{tabular}{c} 
MAX. STAGE \\
ELEVATION \\
(FT, NAVD)
\end{tabular} & DESIGN ELEMENT & \begin{tabular}{c} 
PROPOSED \\
ELEVATION OF \\
DESIGN ELEMENT \\
(FT, NAVD)
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 5-Year, 1-Day & 8.07 & Lowest Rim Elevation & 10.5 \\
\hline 10-Year, 3-Day & 8.54 & Perimeter Berm & 9.0 \\
\hline 25-Year, 3-Day & 8.87 & - & N/A \\
\hline 100-Year, 3-Day & 10.51 & Finished Floor Elevation & 12.5 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{ STAGE/STORAGE COMPARISON (PREVIOUSLY SFWMD PERMIT VS PROPOSED) } \\
\hline Stage (ft) & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Previous SFWMD permit (ft, \\
NAVD)
\end{tabular} & Proposed stage (ft, NAVD) \\
\hline 7.0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 8.5 & 3.94 & 6.24 \\
\hline 9.5 & 6.77 & 9.51 \\
\hline 10.5 & 9.76 & 11.86 \\
\hline 11.5 & 13.81 & 15.41 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{REFERENCES}
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\section*{PROPOSED AREA BREAKDOWN}

\section*{EXHIBIT B-1}

PROPOSED AREA BREAKDOWN
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|}
\hline & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{ Total } \\
\hline Future Area Type & Square Feet & Acres & Percentage \\
\hline Pervious & & & \\
\hline Lake Bank & 25113 & 0.58 & \(6.0 \%\) \\
\hline Green (excluding lake bank) & 56874 & 1.31 & \(13.6 \%\) \\
\hline TOTAL PERVIOUS & 81987 & 1.88 & \(19.5 \%\) \\
\hline & & & \\
\hline & & 4.99 & \(51.8 \%\) \\
\hline Impervious & 217258 & 0.75 & \(7.8 \%\) \\
\hline Asphalt Pavement/ Sidewalk & 32702 & 5.74 & \(59.6 \%\) \\
\hline Building & 249960 & & \\
\hline TOTAL IMPERVIOUS & 87520 & 2.01 & \\
\hline & & & \\
\hline Lake & \(\mathbf{4 1 9 4 6 7}\) & \(\mathbf{9 . 6 3}\) & \(100.0 \%\) \\
\hline Water surface only & & &
\end{tabular}
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\section*{WATER QUALITY AND PRE-TREATMENT CALCULATIONS}

\section*{EXHIBIT B-2}

\section*{MINIMUM WATER QUALITY REQUIRED}
1) Compute the first inch of runoff from the developed site:
\[
\begin{aligned}
& =1 \text { in. } x \text { Site } \operatorname{Area} x\left(\begin{array}{l}
1 f t / 12 \text { in. }) \\
=1 \text { in. } x 9.63 \operatorname{arres} x(1 f t / 12 \text { in. })=\mathbf{0 . 8 0} \boldsymbol{a c}-\boldsymbol{f t}
\end{array} .=\right.\text {. }
\end{aligned}
\]
2) Compute 2.5 times the percentage of imperviousness.
a. Site area for water quality pervious/impervious calculations only:
\[
\begin{aligned}
& =\text { Total Project }-(\text { Water Surface }+ \text { Roof }) \\
& =9.63 \text { acres }-(2.01 \text { acres }+0.75 \text { acres })=6.87 \text { acres }
\end{aligned}
\]
b. Impervious area for water quality pervious/impervious calculations only:
\(=(\) Site Area for Water Quality \()-\) Pervious
\(=6.87\) acres -1.88 acres \(=4.99\) acres
c. Percentage of imperviousness for water quality:
= (Impervious Area for Water Quality/Site Area for Water Quality)x100\%
\(=(4.99\) acres \(/ 6.87\) acres \() x 100 \%=72.6 \%\)
d. For 2.5 inches times the percentage impervious:
\[
\begin{aligned}
& =2.5 \text { in. } x \text { Percentage Impervious } \\
& =2.5 \text { in. } x 72.6 \%=1.82 \text { in.to be treated }
\end{aligned}
\]
e. Compute volume required for quality detention:
\(=\) Inches to be Treated \(x\) (Total Site - Lake)
\(=1.82\) in. \(x(9.63\) acres -2.01\() x(1 \mathrm{ft} / 12 \mathrm{in})=.\mathbf{1} . \mathbf{1 5} \boldsymbol{a} \boldsymbol{c}-\boldsymbol{f t}\)

\subsection*{1.15 ac-ft (15.02 ac-in) of water quality volume is required as a minimum.}

\section*{MINIMUM PRE-TREATMENT REQUIRED}
1) Compute volume generated by \(1 / 2\) " of rainfall:
\[
\begin{aligned}
& =1 / 2 \text { in. } x \text { Site Area } x(1 f t / 12 \text { in. }) \\
& =1 / 2 \text { in. } x 9.63 \text { acres } x(1 f t / 12 \text { in. })=\mathbf{0 . 4 0} \boldsymbol{a c}-\boldsymbol{f t}
\end{aligned}
\]
0.40 ac-ft (4.82 ac-in) of pre-treatment is required as a minimum.
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\section*{EXFILTRATION TRENCH CALCULATIONS}

\section*{EXHIBIT B-3}

Minimum Exfiltration Trench Calculations
Exfiltration Trench Parameters
\begin{tabular}{|l|r|l|}
\hline Control Elevation (lowest rim elevation) & 10.50 & NAVD \\
\hline Water Table: & 7.00 & NAVD \\
\hline Top of trench & 9.00 & NAVD \\
\hline Bottom of trench & 5.00 & NAVD \\
\hline Pipe diameter & 18 & in. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\[
L=\frac{F S\left[(\% W Q)\left(V_{w q}\right)+V_{a d d}\right]}{K\left(H_{2} W+2 H_{2} D_{u}-D_{u}^{2}+2 H_{2} D_{s}\right)+\left(1.39 \times 10^{-4}\right) W D_{u}}(\text { Regular Formula })
\]

\section*{Exfiltration Trench Equation Parameters}
\begin{tabular}{|l|r|l|}
\hline FS, factor of safety & 2.00 & \\
\hline \%WQ, Water Quality Credit Percentage & \(50 \%\) & \\
\hline V(wq), Volume of Water Quality & 13.83 & \(\mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{in}\) \\
\hline V(add), Additional Storage Volume & 0 & \(\mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{in}\) \\
\hline K, Hydraulic Conductivity \({ }^{1}\) & 0.000704 & \(\mathrm{cfs} / \mathrm{ft}^{\wedge} 2-\mathrm{ft}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{2}\), Distance from Water Table to Control Elevation \({ }^{2}\) & 3.50 & ft. \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{u}}\), unsaturated trench depth & 2 & ft \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{s}}\), saturated trench depth & 2.00 & ft \\
\hline W, trench width & 8.00 & ft. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Required Exfiltration Trench
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|}
\hline Credited Volume (Actual): & 6.92 ac-in. \\
\hline Regular/Conservative: & Regular \\
\hline Trench Required & 356 \\
\hline Trench Required & 723 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Length of Trench Required \({ }^{3}\) :}
1. Refer to Appendix D for Geotechnical Report
2. H2 value is based on lowest discharge inlet connected to the exfiltration trench system
3. The conservative formula is required if the project meets one of the following criteria: 1) If the saturated trench depth \(\left(D_{s}\right)\) is greater than the non-saturated trench depth \(\left(D_{u}\right)\), or 2) If the trench width \((W)\) is greater than two (2) times the total trench depth.

\section*{Required Pretreatment}
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|}
\hline Site Area & 9.63 & acres \\
\hline \(0.5^{\prime \prime} \times\) Site Area & 4.82 & \(\mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{in}\). \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{EXHIBIT B-3}

\section*{Provided Water Quality Calculations}

Volume Provided in Exfiltration Trench
\begin{tabular}{|l|r|l|}
\hline Proposed Length of Trench & 2193 & LF \\
\hline Required Length of Trench & 356 & LF \\
\hline Additional Trench Provided & 1836.8 & LF \\
\hline Credited Volume Provided by Required Length & 1.15 & \(\mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}\) \\
\hline Volume Provided in Additional Trench (no credit applied) & 2.972 & \(\mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{ft}\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline Volume Provided by Exfiltration Trench: & 4.12 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\section*{SOIL STORAGE CALCULATIONS}

\section*{EXHIBIT B-4}

SOIL STORAGE (EXISTING CONDITIONS):
\begin{tabular}{|l|r|l|}
\hline Average Elevation of Existing Site: & 11.20 & NAVD \\
\hline Average Water Table Elevation: & 7.00 & NAVD \\
\hline Average Depth to Water Table: & 4.20 & ft. \\
\hline Soil Type: & Flatwoods & Compacted \\
\hline Available Storage*: & 6.75 & in. \\
\hline Percent Pervious (pervious area/total area): & 19.55 & \(\%\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Soil Storage \(=\) Cumulative Water Storage \(*\) Percent Impervious
\begin{tabular}{|l|r|r|}
\hline SOIL STORAGE: & 1.32 & in. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\section*{STAGE STORAGE CALCULATIONS}

\section*{EXHIBIT B-5}

\section*{STAGE-STORAGE TABULATION}

STAGE-STORAGE CALCULATIONS (POST-CONDITIONS)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \hline Area Type & Green & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Lake \\
Vertical
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Lake \\
Linear
\end{tabular} & Impervious & Building & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Exfiltration \\
Trench
\end{tabular} & Total \\
\hline Area (ac) & 1.31 & 2.01 & 0.58 & 4.99 & 0.75 & 4.125 & 9.63 \\
\hline Low Elev. & 11.0 & 7.0 & 7.0 & 10.5 & 100.00 & 7.0 & - \\
\hline High Elev. & 13.0 & & 12.0 & 13.0 & & 9.0 & - \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Stage (ft) \\
NGVD
\end{tabular} & Linear ac-ft & Vertical ac-ft & Linear ac-ft & Linear ac-ft & None ac-ft & Exfil Trench ac-ft & Total Storage ac-ft \\
\hline 7.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 \\
\hline 7.50 & 0.00 & 1.00 & 0.01 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 1.03 & 2.05 \\
\hline 8.00 & 0.00 & 2.01 & 0.06 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 2.06 & 4.13 \\
\hline 8.50 & 0.00 & 3.01 & 0.13 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 3.09 & 6.24 \\
\hline 9.00 & 0.00 & 4.02 & 0.23 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 4.12 & 8.37 \\
\hline 9.50 & 0.00 & 5.02 & 0.36 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 4.12 & 9.51 \\
\hline 10.00 & 0.00 & 6.03 & 0.52 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 4.12 & 10.67 \\
\hline 10.50 & 0.00 & 7.03 & 0.71 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 4.12 & 11.86 \\
\hline 11.00 & 0.00 & 8.04 & 0.92 & 0.25 & 0.00 & 4.12 & 13.33 \\
\hline 11.50 & 0.08 & 9.04 & 1.17 & 1.00 & 0.00 & 4.12 & 15.41 \\
\hline 12.00 & 0.33 & 10.05 & 1.44 & 2.24 & 0.00 & 4.12 & 18.18 \\
\hline 12.50 & 0.73 & 11.05 & 1.73 & 3.99 & 0.00 & 4.12 & 21.63 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Project Name: DOKA Lake Worth Beach
ALL ELEVATIONS IN NAVD
Reviewer:
Project Number: 143189000
Period Begin: Nov 12, 2020;0000 hr End: Nov 14, 2020;0000 hr Duration: 48 hr
Time Step: 0.2 hr, Iterations: 10

Basin 1: Site
Method: Santa Barbara Unit Hydrograph
Rainfall Distribution: SFWMD - 24 hr
Design Frequency: 5 year
1 Day Rainfall: 7.5 inches
Area: 9.63003 acres
Ground Storage: 1.32 inches
Time of Concentration: 0.1 hours
Initial Stage: 7 ft NGVD
Stage
(ft NGVD)
------
7.00
7.50
8.00
8.50
9.00
9.50
10.00
10.50
11.00
11.50
12.00
12.50
\begin{tabular}{c} 
Storage \\
\((\) acre-ft)
\end{tabular}
-------
0.00
2.05
4.13
6.24
8.37
9.51
10.67
11.86
13.33
15.41
18.18
21.63

Offsite Receiving Body: Offsite1
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Time & Stage \\
(hr) & (ft NGVD) \\
\(---------------1.00 ~\) & 7.00 \\
0.00 & 7.00
\end{tabular}

Structure: 1
From Basin: Site
To Basin: Offsite1
Structure Type: Gravity
Weir: Sharp Crested, Crest Elev \(=10.6 \mathrm{ft}\) NGVD, Length \(=3 \mathrm{ft}\)
Bleeder: Inv-Tri, Invert Elev \(=7 \mathrm{ft}\) NGVD, Height \(=0.5 \mathrm{ft}\) Width \(=0.5 \mathrm{ft}\)
Default Coefs: Weir Coef \(=2.5\), Orifice Coef \(=0.6\)
Pipe: Diameter \(=2 \mathrm{ft}\), Manning's \(\mathrm{n}=0.012\), Length \(=60 \mathrm{ft}\) US Invert Elev \(=3 \mathrm{ft}\) NGVD, DS Invert Elev \(=3 \mathrm{ft}\) NGVD, flap gate
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Time \\
(hr)
\end{tabular} & Cumulative Rainfall (in) & Instant Runoff (cfs) & Current Discharge (cfs) & Cumulative Discharge (acre-ft) & Head Water Stage (ft NGVD) & Tail Water Stage (ft NGVD) \\
\hline 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.00 & 7.00 \\
\hline 1.00 & 0.07 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.00 & 7.00 \\
\hline 2.00 & 0.15 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.00 & 7.00 \\
\hline 3.00 & 0.24 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.00 & 7.00 \\
\hline 4.00 & 0.34 & 0.09 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.00 & 7.00 \\
\hline 5.00 & 0.47 & 0.30 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.00 & 7.00 \\
\hline 6.00 & 0.62 & 0.58 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.01 & 7.00 \\
\hline 7.00 & 0.81 & 0.92 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.03 & 7.00 \\
\hline 8.00 & 1.03 & 1.28 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.05 & 7.00 \\
\hline 9.00 & 1.28 & 1.76 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.08 & 7.00 \\
\hline 10.00 & 1.60 & 2.38 & 0.01 & 0.00 & 7.12 & 7.00 \\
\hline 11.00 & 2.02 & 3.75 & 0.02 & 0.00 & 7.19 & 7.00 \\
\hline 12.00 & 4.92 & 45.46 & 0.30 & 0.01 & 7.59 & 7.00 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Time } \\
& (\mathrm{hr})
\end{aligned}
\] & Cumulative Rainfall (in) & Instant Runoff (cfs) & Current Discharge (cfs) & Cumulative Discharge (acre-ft) & Head Water Stage (ft NGVD) & Tail Water Stage (ft NGVD) \\
\hline 13.00 & 5.75 & 5.37 & 0.43 & 0.04 & 7.84 & 7.00 \\
\hline 14.00 & 6.14 & 3.24 & 0.45 & 0.08 & 7.90 & 7.00 \\
\hline 15.00 & 6.38 & 2.12 & 0.47 & 0.12 & 7.94 & 7.00 \\
\hline 16.00 & 6.60 & 2.12 & 0.48 & 0.16 & 7.98 & 7.00 \\
\hline 17.00 & 6.74 & 1.27 & 0.49 & 0.20 & 7.99 & 7.00 \\
\hline 18.00 & 6.87 & 1.27 & 0.49 & 0.24 & 8.01 & 7.00 \\
\hline 19.00 & 7.01 & 1.28 & 0.50 & 0.28 & 8.02 & 7.00 \\
\hline 20.00 & 7.14 & 1.28 & 0.51 & 0.32 & 8.04 & 7.00 \\
\hline 21.00 & 7.23 & 0.85 & 0.51 & 0.36 & 8.05 & 7.00 \\
\hline 22.00 & 7.32 & 0.85 & 0.51 & 0.41 & 8.05 & 7.00 \\
\hline 23.00 & 7.41 & 0.85 & 0.51 & 0.45 & 8.06 & 7.00 \\
\hline 24.00 & 7.50 & 0.85 & 0.52 & 0.49 & 8.07 & 7.00 \\
\hline 25.00 & 7.50 & 0.00 & 0.51 & 0.53 & 8.06 & 7.00 \\
\hline 26.00 & 7.50 & 0.00 & 0.51 & 0.58 & 8.05 & 7.00 \\
\hline 27.00 & 7.50 & 0.00 & 0.51 & 0.62 & 8.04 & 7.00 \\
\hline 28.00 & 7.50 & 0.00 & 0.50 & 0.66 & 8.03 & 7.00 \\
\hline 29.00 & 7.50 & 0.00 & 0.50 & 0.70 & 8.02 & 7.00 \\
\hline 30.00 & 7.50 & 0.00 & 0.49 & 0.74 & 8.01 & 7.00 \\
\hline 31.00 & 7.50 & 0.00 & 0.49 & 0.78 & 8.00 & 7.00 \\
\hline 32.00 & 7.50 & 0.00 & 0.49 & 0.82 & 7.99 & 7.00 \\
\hline 33.00 & 7.50 & 0.00 & 0.48 & 0.86 & 7.98 & 7.00 \\
\hline 34.00 & 7.50 & 0.00 & 0.48 & 0.90 & 7.97 & 7.00 \\
\hline 35.00 & 7.50 & 0.00 & 0.48 & 0.94 & 7.96 & 7.00 \\
\hline 36.00 & 7.50 & 0.00 & 0.47 & 0.98 & 7.95 & 7.00 \\
\hline 37.00 & 7.50 & 0.00 & 0.47 & 1.02 & 7.94 & 7.00 \\
\hline 38.00 & 7.50 & 0.00 & 0.47 & 1.06 & 7.93 & 7.00 \\
\hline 39.00 & 7.50 & 0.00 & 0.46 & 1.10 & 7.92 & 7.00 \\
\hline 40.00 & 7.50 & 0.00 & 0.46 & 1.13 & 7.92 & 7.00 \\
\hline 41.00 & 7.50 & 0.00 & 0.45 & 1.17 & 7.91 & 7.00 \\
\hline 42.00 & 7.50 & 0.00 & 0.45 & 1.21 & 7.90 & 7.00 \\
\hline 43.00 & 7.50 & 0.00 & 0.45 & 1.25 & 7.89 & 7.00 \\
\hline 44.00 & 7.50 & 0.00 & 0.44 & 1.28 & 7.88 & 7.00 \\
\hline 45.00 & 7.50 & 0.00 & 0.44 & 1.32 & 7.87 & 7.00 \\
\hline 46.00 & 7.50 & 0.00 & 0.44 & 1.36 & 7.86 & 7.00 \\
\hline 47.00 & 7.50 & 0.00 & 0.43 & 1.39 & 7.85 & 7.00 \\
\hline 48.00 & 7.50 & 0.00 & 0.43 & 1.43 & 7.84 & 7.00 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

STRUCTURE MAXIMUM AND MINIMUM DISCHARGES
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Struc & Max (cfs) & Time (hr) & Min (cfs) & Time (hr) \\
\hline 1 & 0.52 & 24.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

BASIN MAXIMUM AND MINIMUM STAGES
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Basin & Max (ft) & Time (hr) & Min (ft) & Time (hr) \\
\hline Site & 8.07 & 24.00 & 7.00 & 0.00 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

BASIN WATER BUDGETS (all units in acre-ft)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Basin & Total Runoff & Structure Inflow & Structure Outflow & \begin{tabular}{l}
Initial \\
Storage
\end{tabular} & Final Storage & Residual \\
\hline Site & 4.91 & 0.00 & 1.42 & 0.00 & 3.49 & 0.00 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Project Name: DOKA Lake Worth Beach
Reviewer:
ALL ELEVATIONS IN NAVD
Project Number: 143189000
Period Begin: Nov 12, 2020;0000 hr End: Nov 16, 2020;0000 hr Duration: 96 hr
Time Step: 0.2 hr Iterations: 10

Basin 1: Site
Method: Santa Barbara Unit Hydrograph
Rainfall Distribution: SFWMD - 3day
Design Frequency: 10 year
3 Day Rainfall: 10.5 inches
Area: 9.63003 acres
Ground Storage: 1.32 inches
Time of Concentration: 0.1 hours
Initial Stage: 7 ft NGVD
Stage
(ft NGVD)
------
7.00
7.50
8.00
8.50
9.00
9.50
10.00
10.50
11.00
11.50
12.00
12.50
\begin{tabular}{c} 
Storage \\
\((\) acre-ft) \\
-------- \\
0.00 \\
2.05 \\
4.13 \\
6.24 \\
8.37 \\
9.51 \\
10.67 \\
11.86 \\
13.33 \\
15.41 \\
18.18 \\
21.63
\end{tabular}

Offsite Receiving Body: Offsitel
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Time & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Stage \\
\((\) hr)
\end{tabular} \\
------ & (ft NGVD) \\
0.00 & 7.00 \\
120.00 & 7.00
\end{tabular}

Structure: 1
From Basin: Site
To Basin: Offsite1
Structure Type: Gravity
Weir: Sharp Crested, Crest Elev \(=10.6 \mathrm{ft}\) NGVD, Length \(=3 \mathrm{ft}\)
Bleeder: Inv-Tri, Invert Elev \(=7 \mathrm{ft}\) NGVD, Height \(=0.5 \mathrm{ft}\) Width \(=0.5 \mathrm{ft}\)
Default Coefs: Weir Coef \(=2.5\), Orifice Coef \(=0.6\)
Pipe: Diameter \(=2 \mathrm{ft}\), Manning's \(\mathrm{n}=0.012\), Length \(=60 \mathrm{ft}\) US Invert Elev \(=3 \mathrm{ft}\) NGVD, DS Invert Elev \(=3 \mathrm{ft}\) NGVD, flap gate
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Time \\
(hr)
\end{tabular} & Cumulative Rainfall (in) & Instant Runoff (cfs) & Current Discharge (cfs) & Cumulative Discharge (acre-ft) & Head Water Stage (ft NGVD) & Tail Water Stage (ft NGVD) \\
\hline 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.00 & 7.00 \\
\hline 1.00 & 0.05 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.00 & 7.00 \\
\hline 2.00 & 0.09 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.00 & 7.00 \\
\hline 3.00 & 0.14 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.00 & 7.00 \\
\hline 4.00 & 0.19 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.00 & 7.00 \\
\hline 5.00 & 0.24 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.00 & 7.00 \\
\hline 6.00 & 0.28 & 0.01 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.00 & 7.00 \\
\hline 7.00 & 0.33 & 0.04 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.00 & 7.00 \\
\hline 8.00 & 0.38 & 0.07 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.00 & 7.00 \\
\hline 9.00 & 0.42 & 0.09 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.00 & 7.00 \\
\hline 10.00 & 0.47 & 0.11 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.01 & 7.00 \\
\hline 11.00 & 0.52 & 0.13 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.01 & 7.00 \\
\hline 12.00 & 0.56 & 0.15 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.01 & 7.00 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Time } \\
& \text { (hr) }
\end{aligned}
\] & Cumulative Rainfall (in) & Instant Runoff (cfs) & Current Discharge (cfs) & Cumulative Discharge (acre-ft) & Head Water Stage (ft NGVD) & Tail Water Stage (ft NGVD) \\
\hline 13.00 & 0.61 & 0.17 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.01 & 7.00 \\
\hline 14.00 & 0.66 & 0.18 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.02 & 7.00 \\
\hline 15.00 & 0.71 & 0.20 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.02 & 7.00 \\
\hline 16.00 & 0.75 & 0.21 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.03 & 7.00 \\
\hline 17.00 & 0.80 & 0.22 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.03 & 7.00 \\
\hline 18.00 & 0.85 & 0.24 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.03 & 7.00 \\
\hline 19.00 & 0.89 & 0.25 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.04 & 7.00 \\
\hline 20.00 & 0.94 & 0.26 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.04 & 7.00 \\
\hline 21.00 & 0.99 & 0.26 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.05 & 7.00 \\
\hline 22.00 & 1.03 & 0.27 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.05 & 7.00 \\
\hline 23.00 & 1.08 & 0.28 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.06 & 7.00 \\
\hline 24.00 & 1.13 & 0.29 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.07 & 7.00 \\
\hline 25.00 & 1.20 & 0.44 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.07 & 7.00 \\
\hline 26.00 & 1.27 & 0.45 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.08 & 7.00 \\
\hline 27.00 & 1.33 & 0.46 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.09 & 7.00 \\
\hline 28.00 & 1.40 & 0.47 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.10 & 7.00 \\
\hline 29.00 & 1.47 & 0.48 & 0.01 & 0.00 & 7.11 & 7.00 \\
\hline 30.00 & 1.54 & 0.49 & 0.01 & 0.00 & 7.12 & 7.00 \\
\hline 31.00 & 1.61 & 0.50 & 0.01 & 0.00 & 7.13 & 7.00 \\
\hline 32.00 & 1.68 & 0.51 & 0.01 & 0.00 & 7.14 & 7.00 \\
\hline 33.00 & 1.75 & 0.52 & 0.01 & 0.00 & 7.15 & 7.00 \\
\hline 34.00 & 1.81 & 0.52 & 0.01 & 0.01 & 7.16 & 7.00 \\
\hline 35.00 & 1.88 & 0.53 & 0.02 & 0.01 & 7.17 & 7.00 \\
\hline 36.00 & 1.95 & 0.54 & 0.02 & 0.01 & 7.18 & 7.00 \\
\hline 37.00 & 2.02 & 0.54 & 0.02 & 0.01 & 7.19 & 7.00 \\
\hline 38.00 & 2.09 & 0.55 & 0.02 & 0.01 & 7.20 & 7.00 \\
\hline 39.00 & 2.16 & 0.55 & 0.03 & 0.01 & 7.21 & 7.00 \\
\hline 40.00 & 2.23 & 0.56 & 0.03 & 0.02 & 7.22 & 7.00 \\
\hline 41.00 & 2.29 & 0.56 & 0.03 & 0.02 & 7.23 & 7.00 \\
\hline 42.00 & 2.36 & 0.57 & 0.04 & 0.02 & 7.25 & 7.00 \\
\hline 43.00 & 2.43 & 0.57 & 0.04 & 0.02 & 7.26 & 7.00 \\
\hline 44.00 & 2.50 & 0.57 & 0.05 & 0.03 & 7.27 & 7.00 \\
\hline 45.00 & 2.57 & 0.58 & 0.05 & 0.03 & 7.28 & 7.00 \\
\hline 46.00 & 2.64 & 0.58 & 0.06 & 0.04 & 7.29 & 7.00 \\
\hline 47.00 & 2.71 & 0.58 & 0.06 & 0.04 & 7.30 & 7.00 \\
\hline 48.00 & 2.77 & 0.59 & 0.07 & 0.05 & 7.31 & 7.00 \\
\hline 49.00 & 2.85 & 0.66 & 0.07 & 0.05 & 7.32 & 7.00 \\
\hline 50.00 & 2.93 & 0.67 & 0.08 & 0.06 & 7.33 & 7.00 \\
\hline 51.00 & 3.02 & 0.81 & 0.09 & 0.07 & 7.35 & 7.00 \\
\hline 52.00 & 3.12 & 0.94 & 0.10 & 0.07 & 7.36 & 7.00 \\
\hline 53.00 & 3.25 & 1.22 & 0.11 & 0.08 & 7.38 & 7.00 \\
\hline 54.00 & 3.42 & 1.50 & 0.13 & 0.09 & 7.41 & 7.00 \\
\hline 55.00 & 3.61 & 1.79 & 0.16 & 0.11 & 7.44 & 7.00 \\
\hline 56.00 & 3.83 & 2.08 & 0.19 & 0.12 & 7.48 & 7.00 \\
\hline 57.00 & 4.09 & 2.52 & 0.26 & 0.14 & 7.52 & 7.00 \\
\hline 58.00 & 4.42 & 3.10 & 0.29 & 0.16 & 7.57 & 7.00 \\
\hline 59.00 & 4.85 & 4.54 & 0.33 & 0.19 & 7.64 & 7.00 \\
\hline 60.00 & 7.84 & 48.80 & 0.52 & 0.22 & 8.07 & 7.00 \\
\hline 61.00 & 8.70 & 5.65 & 0.60 & 0.27 & 8.33 & 7.00 \\
\hline 62.00 & 9.09 & 3.40 & 0.62 & 0.32 & 8.40 & 7.00 \\
\hline 63.00 & 9.34 & 2.22 & 0.63 & 0.37 & 8.44 & 7.00 \\
\hline 64.00 & 9.57 & 2.22 & 0.64 & 0.43 & 8.47 & 7.00 \\
\hline 65.00 & 9.71 & 1.33 & 0.64 & 0.48 & 8.48 & 7.00 \\
\hline 66.00 & 9.85 & 1.33 & 0.65 & 0.53 & 8.50 & 7.00 \\
\hline 67.00 & 9.99 & 1.33 & 0.65 & 0.59 & 8.51 & 7.00 \\
\hline 68.00 & 10.13 & 1.33 & 0.66 & 0.64 & 8.52 & 7.00 \\
\hline 69.00 & 10.22 & 0.89 & 0.66 & 0.69 & 8.53 & 7.00 \\
\hline 70.00 & 10.31 & 0.89 & 0.66 & 0.75 & 8.53 & 7.00 \\
\hline 71.00 & 10.41 & 0.89 & 0.66 & 0.80 & 8.54 & 7.00 \\
\hline 72.00 & 10.50 & 0.89 & 0.66 & 0.86 & 8.54 & 7.00 \\
\hline 73.00 & 10.50 & 0.00 & 0.66 & 0.91 & 8.53 & 7.00 \\
\hline 74.00 & 10.50 & 0.00 & 0.65 & 0.97 & 8.52 & 7.00 \\
\hline 75.00 & 10.50 & 0.00 & 0.65 & 1.02 & 8.50 & 7.00 \\
\hline 76.00 & 10.50 & 0.00 & 0.65 & 1.07 & 8.49 & 7.00 \\
\hline 77.00 & 10.50 & 0.00 & 0.64 & 1.13 & 8.48 & 7.00 \\
\hline 78.00 & 10.50 & 0.00 & 0.64 & 1.18 & 8.47 & 7.00 \\
\hline 79.00 & 10.50 & 0.00 & 0.64 & 1.23 & 8.45 & 7.00 \\
\hline 80.00 & 10.50 & 0.00 & 0.63 & 1.29 & 8.44 & 7.00 \\
\hline 81.00 & 10.50 & 0.00 & 0.63 & 1.34 & 8.43 & 7.00 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Time \\
(hr)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Cumulative \\
Rainfall \\
(in)
\end{tabular} & Instant Runoff (cfs) & Current Discharge (cfs) & Cumulative Discharge (acre-ft) & \begin{tabular}{l}
Head Water \\
Stage \\
(ft NGVD)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Tail Water \\
Stage \\
(ft NGVD)
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 82.00 & 10.50 & 0.00 & 0.63 & 1.39 & 8.42 & 7.00 \\
\hline 83.00 & 10.50 & 0.00 & 0.62 & 1.44 & 8.40 & 7.00 \\
\hline 84.00 & 10.50 & 0.00 & 0.62 & 1.49 & 8.39 & 7.00 \\
\hline 85.00 & 10.50 & 0.00 & 0.62 & 1.54 & 8.38 & 7.00 \\
\hline 86.00 & 10.50 & 0.00 & 0.61 & 1.59 & 8.37 & 7.00 \\
\hline 87.00 & 10.50 & 0.00 & 0.61 & 1.64 & 8.36 & 7.00 \\
\hline 88.00 & 10.50 & 0.00 & 0.60 & 1.69 & 8.34 & 7.00 \\
\hline 89.00 & 10.50 & 0.00 & 0.60 & 1.74 & 8.33 & 7.00 \\
\hline 90.00 & 10.50 & 0.00 & 0.60 & 1.79 & 8.32 & 7.00 \\
\hline 91.00 & 10.50 & 0.00 & 0.59 & 1.84 & 8.31 & 7.00 \\
\hline 92.00 & 10.50 & 0.00 & 0.59 & 1.89 & 8.30 & 7.00 \\
\hline 93.00 & 10.50 & 0.00 & 0.59 & 1.94 & 8.29 & 7.00 \\
\hline 94.00 & 10.50 & 0.00 & 0.58 & 1.99 & 8.27 & 7.00 \\
\hline 95.00 & 10.50 & 0.00 & 0.58 & 2.04 & 8.26 & 7.00 \\
\hline 96.00 & 10.50 & 0.00 & 0.58 & 2.08 & 8.25 & 7.00 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{STRUCTURE MAXIMUM AND MINIMUM DISCHARGES}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Struc & Max (cfs) & Time (hr) & Min (cfs) & Time (hr) \\
\hline 1 & 0.66 & 72.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

BASIN MAXIMUM AND MINIMUM STAGES
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Basin & Max (ft) & Time (hr) & Min (ft) & Time (hr) \\
\hline Site & 8.54 & 72.00 & 7.00 & 0.00 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

BASIN WATER BUDGETS (all units in acre-ft)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Basin & Total Runoff & Structure Inflow & Structure Outflow & \begin{tabular}{l}
Initial \\
Storage
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Final \\
Storage
\end{tabular} & Residual \\
\hline Site & 7.27 & 0.00 & 2.08 & 0.00 & 5.19 & 0.00 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Project Name: DOKA Lake Worth Beach

Project Number: 143189000
Period Begin: Nov 12, 2020;0000 hr End: Nov 16, 2020;0000 hr Duration: 96 hr
Time Step: 0.2 hr, Iterations: 10

Basin 1: Site
Method: Santa Barbara Unit Hydrograph
Rainfall Distribution: SFWMD - 3day
Design Frequency: 25 year
3 Day Rainfall: 12.5 inches
Area: 9.63003 acres
Ground Storage: 1.32 inches
Time of Concentration: 0.1 hours
Initial Stage: 7 ft NGVD
Stage
(ft NGVD)
--------
7.00
7.50
8.00
8.50
9.00
9.50
10.00
10.50
11.00
11.50
12.00
12.50
\begin{tabular}{c} 
Storage \\
\((\) acre-ft)
\end{tabular}
-------
0.00
2.05
4.13
6.24
8.37
9.51
10.67
11.86
13.33
15.41
18.18
21.63

Offsite Receiving Body: Offsite1
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Time & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Stage \\
\((\) hr)
\end{tabular} \\
------ & (ft NGVD) \\
0.00 & 7.00 \\
120.00 & 7.00
\end{tabular}

Structure: 1
From Basin: Site
To Basin: Offsite1
Structure Type: Gravity
Weir: Sharp Crested, Crest Elev \(=10.6 \mathrm{ft}\) NGVD, Length \(=3 \mathrm{ft}\)
Bleeder: Inv-Tri, Invert Elev \(=7 \mathrm{ft}\) NGVD, Height \(=0.5 \mathrm{ft}\) Width \(=0.5 \mathrm{ft}\)
Default Coefs: Weir Coef \(=2.5\), Orifice Coef \(=0.6\)
Pipe: Diameter \(=2 \mathrm{ft}\), Manning's \(\mathrm{n}=0.012\), Length \(=60 \mathrm{ft}\) US Invert Elev \(=3 \mathrm{ft}\) NGVD, DS Invert Elev \(=3 \mathrm{ft}\) NGVD, flap gate
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Time \\
(hr)
\end{tabular} & Cumulative Rainfall (in) & Instant Runoff (cfs) & Current Discharge (cfs) & Cumulative Discharge (acre-ft) & Head Water Stage (ft NGVD) & Tail Water Stage (ft NGVD) \\
\hline 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.00 & 7.00 \\
\hline 1.00 & 0.06 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.00 & 7.00 \\
\hline 2.00 & 0.11 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.00 & 7.00 \\
\hline 3.00 & 0.17 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.00 & 7.00 \\
\hline 4.00 & 0.22 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.00 & 7.00 \\
\hline 5.00 & 0.28 & 0.01 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.00 & 7.00 \\
\hline 6.00 & 0.34 & 0.05 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.00 & 7.00 \\
\hline 7.00 & 0.39 & 0.09 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.00 & 7.00 \\
\hline 8.00 & 0.45 & 0.12 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.00 & 7.00 \\
\hline 9.00 & 0.50 & 0.15 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.01 & 7.00 \\
\hline 10.00 & 0.56 & 0.18 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.01 & 7.00 \\
\hline 11.00 & 0.62 & 0.20 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.01 & 7.00 \\
\hline 12.00 & 0.67 & 0.22 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.02 & 7.00 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Time } \\
& (\mathrm{hr})
\end{aligned}
\] & Cumulative Rainfall (in) & Instant Runoff (cfs) & Current Discharge (cfs) & Cumulative Discharge (acre-ft) & \begin{tabular}{l}
Head Water \\
Stage \\
(ft NGVD)
\end{tabular} & Tail Water Stage (ft NGVD) \\
\hline 13.00 & 0.73 & 0.24 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.02 & 7.00 \\
\hline 14.00 & 0.78 & 0.26 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.03 & 7.00 \\
\hline 15.00 & 0.84 & 0.28 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.03 & 7.00 \\
\hline 16.00 & 0.90 & 0.29 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.04 & 7.00 \\
\hline 17.00 & 0.95 & 0.31 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.05 & 7.00 \\
\hline 18.00 & 1.01 & 0.32 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.05 & 7.00 \\
\hline 19.00 & 1.06 & 0.33 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.06 & 7.00 \\
\hline 20.00 & 1.12 & 0.34 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.06 & 7.00 \\
\hline 21.00 & 1.18 & 0.35 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.07 & 7.00 \\
\hline 22.00 & 1.23 & 0.36 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.08 & 7.00 \\
\hline 23.00 & 1.29 & 0.37 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.09 & 7.00 \\
\hline 24.00 & 1.34 & 0.38 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.09 & 7.00 \\
\hline 25.00 & 1.42 & 0.57 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.10 & 7.00 \\
\hline 26.00 & 1.51 & 0.58 & 0.01 & 0.00 & 7.12 & 7.00 \\
\hline 27.00 & 1.59 & 0.59 & 0.01 & 0.00 & 7.13 & 7.00 \\
\hline 28.00 & 1.67 & 0.61 & 0.01 & 0.00 & 7.14 & 7.00 \\
\hline 29.00 & 1.75 & 0.62 & 0.01 & 0.00 & 7.15 & 7.00 \\
\hline 30.00 & 1.83 & 0.63 & 0.01 & 0.00 & 7.16 & 7.00 \\
\hline 31.00 & 1.91 & 0.63 & 0.02 & 0.01 & 7.18 & 7.00 \\
\hline 32.00 & 2.00 & 0.64 & 0.02 & 0.01 & 7.19 & 7.00 \\
\hline 33.00 & 2.08 & 0.65 & 0.02 & 0.01 & 7.20 & 7.00 \\
\hline 34.00 & 2.16 & 0.66 & 0.03 & 0.01 & 7.21 & 7.00 \\
\hline 35.00 & 2.24 & 0.66 & 0.03 & 0.01 & 7.23 & 7.00 \\
\hline 36.00 & 2.32 & 0.67 & 0.04 & 0.02 & 7.24 & 7.00 \\
\hline 37.00 & 2.40 & 0.68 & 0.04 & 0.02 & 7.25 & 7.00 \\
\hline 38.00 & 2.49 & 0.68 & 0.05 & 0.02 & 7.27 & 7.00 \\
\hline 39.00 & 2.57 & 0.69 & 0.05 & 0.03 & 7.28 & 7.00 \\
\hline 40.00 & 2.65 & 0.69 & 0.06 & 0.03 & 7.29 & 7.00 \\
\hline 41.00 & 2.73 & 0.70 & 0.06 & 0.04 & 7.30 & 7.00 \\
\hline 42.00 & 2.81 & 0.70 & 0.07 & 0.04 & 7.32 & 7.00 \\
\hline 43.00 & 2.89 & 0.70 & 0.08 & 0.05 & 7.33 & 7.00 \\
\hline 44.00 & 2.98 & 0.71 & 0.09 & 0.06 & 7.34 & 7.00 \\
\hline 45.00 & 3.06 & 0.71 & 0.09 & 0.06 & 7.35 & 7.00 \\
\hline 46.00 & 3.14 & 0.71 & 0.10 & 0.07 & 7.37 & 7.00 \\
\hline 47.00 & 3.22 & 0.72 & 0.11 & 0.08 & 7.38 & 7.00 \\
\hline 48.00 & 3.30 & 0.72 & 0.12 & 0.09 & 7.39 & 7.00 \\
\hline 49.00 & 3.39 & 0.81 & 0.13 & 0.10 & 7.40 & 7.00 \\
\hline 50.00 & 3.49 & 0.82 & 0.14 & 0.11 & 7.42 & 7.00 \\
\hline 51.00 & 3.60 & 0.98 & 0.16 & 0.12 & 7.43 & 7.00 \\
\hline 52.00 & 3.72 & 1.15 & 0.17 & 0.14 & 7.45 & 7.00 \\
\hline 53.00 & 3.87 & 1.49 & 0.20 & 0.15 & 7.48 & 7.00 \\
\hline 54.00 & 4.07 & 1.83 & 0.25 & 0.17 & 7.51 & 7.00 \\
\hline 55.00 & 4.30 & 2.18 & 0.27 & 0.19 & 7.54 & 7.00 \\
\hline 56.00 & 4.56 & 2.53 & 0.30 & 0.22 & 7.58 & 7.00 \\
\hline 57.00 & 4.87 & 3.05 & 0.33 & 0.24 & 7.63 & 7.00 \\
\hline 58.00 & 5.26 & 3.75 & 0.36 & 0.27 & 7.70 & 7.00 \\
\hline 59.00 & 5.78 & 5.48 & 0.40 & 0.30 & 7.78 & 7.00 \\
\hline 60.00 & 9.34 & 58.51 & 0.59 & 0.34 & 8.30 & 7.00 \\
\hline 61.00 & 10.36 & 6.76 & 0.68 & 0.40 & 8.61 & 7.00 \\
\hline 62.00 & 10.83 & 4.07 & 0.70 & 0.45 & 8.69 & 7.00 \\
\hline 63.00 & 11.12 & 2.65 & 0.71 & 0.51 & 8.73 & 7.00 \\
\hline 64.00 & 11.40 & 2.65 & 0.72 & 0.57 & 8.77 & 7.00 \\
\hline 65.00 & 11.56 & 1.59 & 0.73 & 0.63 & 8.79 & 7.00 \\
\hline 66.00 & 11.73 & 1.59 & 0.73 & 0.69 & 8.81 & 7.00 \\
\hline 67.00 & 11.89 & 1.59 & 0.73 & 0.75 & 8.82 & 7.00 \\
\hline 68.00 & 12.06 & 1.59 & 0.74 & 0.81 & 8.84 & 7.00 \\
\hline 69.00 & 12.17 & 1.06 & 0.74 & 0.87 & 8.85 & 7.00 \\
\hline 70.00 & 12.28 & 1.06 & 0.74 & 0.94 & 8.85 & 7.00 \\
\hline 71.00 & 12.39 & 1.06 & 0.74 & 1.00 & 8.86 & 7.00 \\
\hline 72.00 & 12.50 & 1.06 & 0.74 & 1.06 & 8.87 & 7.00 \\
\hline 73.00 & 12.50 & 0.00 & 0.74 & 1.12 & 8.85 & 7.00 \\
\hline 74.00 & 12.50 & 0.00 & 0.74 & 1.18 & 8.84 & 7.00 \\
\hline 75.00 & 12.50 & 0.00 & 0.73 & 1.24 & 8.82 & 7.00 \\
\hline 76.00 & 12.50 & 0.00 & 0.73 & 1.30 & 8.81 & 7.00 \\
\hline 77.00 & 12.50 & 0.00 & 0.73 & 1.36 & 8.80 & 7.00 \\
\hline 78.00 & 12.50 & 0.00 & 0.72 & 1.42 & 8.78 & 7.00 \\
\hline 79.00 & 12.50 & 0.00 & 0.72 & 1.48 & 8.77 & 7.00 \\
\hline 80.00 & 12.50 & 0.00 & 0.72 & 1.54 & 8.75 & 7.00 \\
\hline 81.00 & 12.50 & 0.00 & 0.71 & 1.60 & 8.74 & 7.00 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Time \\
(hr)
\end{tabular} & Cumulative Rainfall (in) & Instant Runoff (cfs) & Current Discharge (cfs) & Cumulative Discharge (acre-ft) & \begin{tabular}{l}
Head Water \\
Stage \\
(ft NGVD)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Tail Water \\
Stage \\
(ft NGVD)
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 82.00 & 12.50 & 0.00 & 0.71 & 1.66 & 8.73 & 7.00 \\
\hline 83.00 & 12.50 & 0.00 & 0.71 & 1.72 & 8.71 & 7.00 \\
\hline 84.00 & 12.50 & 0.00 & 0.70 & 1.78 & 8.70 & 7.00 \\
\hline 85.00 & 12.50 & 0.00 & 0.70 & 1.83 & 8.69 & 7.00 \\
\hline 86.00 & 12.50 & 0.00 & 0.70 & 1.89 & 8.67 & 7.00 \\
\hline 87.00 & 12.50 & 0.00 & 0.69 & 1.95 & 8.66 & 7.00 \\
\hline 88.00 & 12.50 & 0.00 & 0.69 & 2.01 & 8.65 & 7.00 \\
\hline 89.00 & 12.50 & 0.00 & 0.69 & 2.06 & 8.63 & 7.00 \\
\hline 90.00 & 12.50 & 0.00 & 0.68 & 2.12 & 8.62 & 7.00 \\
\hline 91.00 & 12.50 & 0.00 & 0.68 & 2.18 & 8.61 & 7.00 \\
\hline 92.00 & 12.50 & 0.00 & 0.67 & 2.23 & 8.59 & 7.00 \\
\hline 93.00 & 12.50 & 0.00 & 0.67 & 2.29 & 8.58 & 7.00 \\
\hline 94.00 & 12.50 & 0.00 & 0.67 & 2.34 & 8.57 & 7.00 \\
\hline 95.00 & 12.50 & 0.00 & 0.66 & 2.40 & 8.55 & 7.00 \\
\hline 96.00 & 12.50 & 0.00 & 0.66 & 2.45 & 8.54 & 7.00 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{STRUCTURE MAXIMUM AND MINIMUM DISCHARGES}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Struc & Max (cfs) & Time (hr) & Min (cfs) & Time (hr) \\
\hline 1 & 0.74 & 72.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

BASIN MAXIMUM AND MINIMUM STAGES
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Basin & Max (ft) & Time (hr) & Min (ft) & Time (hr) \\
\hline Site & 8.87 & 72.00 & 7.00 & 0.00 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

BASIN WATER BUDGETS (all units in acre-ft)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Basin & Total Runoff & Structure Inflow & Structure Outflow & Initial Storage & Final Storage & Residual \\
\hline Site & 8.86 & 0.00 & 2.45 & 0.00 & 6.41 & 0.00 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Project Name: DOKA Lake Worth Beach Reviewer:
Project Number: 143189000
Period Begin: Nov 12, 2020;0000 hr End: Nov 16, 2020;0000 hr Duration: 96 hr Time Step: 0.2 hr, Iterations: 10

Basin 1: Site

Method: Santa Barbara Unit Hydrograph
Rainfall Distribution: SFWMD - 3day
Design Frequency: 100 year
3 Day Rainfall: 16.3 inches
Area: 9.63 acres
Ground Storage: 1.32 inches
Time of Concentration: 0.1 hours
Initial Stage: 7 ft NGVD
Stage (ft NGVD)
7.00
7.50
8.00
8.50
. 5
9.5
\(9.50 \quad 9.51\)
\(10.00 \quad 10.67\)
\(10.50 \quad 11.86\)
\(11.00 \quad 13.33\)
\(11.50 \quad 15.41\)
\(12.00 \quad 18.18\)
\(12.50 \quad 21.63\)

Offsite Receiving Body: Offsite1
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Time & Stage \\
(hr) & (ft NGVD) \\
\(---------------1.00 ~\) \\
0.00 & 7.00
\end{tabular}

STRUCTURE MAXIMUM AND MINIMUM DISCHARGES

Struc Max (cfs) Time (hr) Min (cfs) Time (hr)


BASIN MAXIMUM AND MINIMUM STAGES
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Basin & Max (ft) & Time (hr) & Min (ft) & Time (hr) \\
\hline Site & 10.51 & 73.00 & 7.00 & 0.00 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

BASIN WATER BUDGETS (all units in acre-ft)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Basin & Total Runoff & Structure Inflow & Structure Outflow & Initial Storage & Final Storage & Residual \\
\hline Site & 11.89 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 11.89 & 0.00 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
APPENDIX C: GEOTECHNICAL REPORT

\title{
REPORT OF PRELIMINARY GEOTECHNICAL EXPLORATION
}

\author{
PROPOSED PROCESSING FACILITY \\ 2209 N \(7^{\text {TII }}\) AVENUE \\ LAKE WORTH, FLORIDA
}

FOR
2209 N. \(7^{\text {TH }}\) AVENUE, LLC.
785 NE \(33^{\text {RD }}\) STREET
BOCA RATON, FLORIDA 33431
PREPARED BY
NUTTING ENGINEERS OF FLORIDA, INC.
1310 NEPTUNE DRIVE
BOYNTON BEACH, FLORIDA 33426
ORDER NO. 18648.1
APRIL, 2019
of Florida Inc.| Established 1967 Your Project is Our Commitment

April 11, 2019
2209 N. \(7^{\text {th }}\) Avenue, LLC.
785 NE \(33^{\text {rd }}\) Street
Boca Raton, Florida 33431
Attn: Mr. Jason Pepitone
954-650-1760 Email: harley1113@msn.com
Subject: Report of Preliminary Geotechnical Exploration
Proposed Processing Facility
\(22097^{\text {th }}\) Avenue North
Lake Worth, Florida
Dear Mr. Pepitone:
Nutting Engineers of Florida, Inc. (NE), has performed a preliminary Geotechnical Exploration for the proposed processing facility at the above referenced site in Lake Worth, Florida. This exploration was performed in accordance with the written authorization to proceed provided by you on March 18, 2019. This evaluation was performed to develop information regarding subsurface soil conditions at specific test locations which along with proposed construction information provided was used to develop opinions regarding earthwork procedures and foundations for support of the proposed construction. This report presents our findings and recommendations based upon the information examined at the time of this evaluation.

\section*{PROJECT INFORMATION}

We understand that plans include developing the site with a processing building initially covering approximately 38,003 square feet with a future phase to include approximately 38,003 square feet. There will also be an administration building covering approximately 4,500 square feet, a repair and maintenance building covering approximately 5,000 square feet. In addition to the buildings, asphalt paved parking and drive areas, a lake and retention area and ancillary structures (precast concrete wall, debris enclosures, etc.) will be constructed. No structural loading conditions or other specific details were provided to us at this time.

Currently, the site is wooded and overgrown with some low-lying (standing water) areas. Based on a review of historical aerial photographs, the site was cleared and earthwork operations were observed in 2011 and again in 2014.

We estimate that in general, two to possibly nine feet of fill may be required to bring the site up to construction grade; however, the final building pad elevation shall be determined by a professional architect, civil engineer, or other qualified party.

We should be notified in writing by the client of any changes in the proposed construction along with a request to amend our foundation analysis and/or recommendations within this report as appropriate.

\section*{GENERAL SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS}

\section*{Soil Survey Maps}

As part of the geotechnical exploration, we have reviewed available Soil Conservation Service (SCS) survey maps for Palm Beach County. These SCS maps provide information about potential general shallow soil conditions in the project vicinity. This information was derived from approximately 6 -foot deep manual auger borings, aerial photo and surface feature interpretation at some point in the past (mid 1980's to early 1970's). The SCS data may or may not reflect actual current site conditions.

A review of the Soil Survey for Palm Beach County revealed that at the time the survey was conducted, the soils encompassing the southern half of the site were described as Udorthents series. The Udorthents series consists of heterogeneous fill material, dredged from canals, which was placed over the natural mineral soils for urban development. Okeelanta Muck was encountered in the northern region of the site. This series consists of very poorly drained, organic soils that have sandy mineral material within a depth of 40 inches. It is in large fresh water marshes and small, isolated depressions. On the extreme eastern edge of the site at the time the survey was conducted, the soils were described as Immokalee fine sand. This series can be described as nearly level, poorly drained sandy soils in broad, flatwoods in the eastern part of the survey area. These soils were naturally formed in deep sandy marine sediment. Running along the canal on the western edge of the site the soils were described at Quartzipsamments, shaped. This unit consists of nearly level to gently sloping, well drained, deep, sandy soils. Cutting down ridges and spreading the soil over adjacent lower soils, by filling areas above the natural ground level and has altered these soils by filling and shaping soils for various development. We note that the maximum depth of the survey is six feet.

\section*{Subsurface Exploration}

Nutting Engineers of Florida, Inc. performed thirteen (13) Standard Penetration Test (SPT) borings (ASTM D-1586) to depths of ten to twenty-five feet below land surface. Fifteen test pits were also performed to better understand the soil conditions throughout the site. In addition, two (2) 'Usual Open-Hole' exfiltration tests were performed in accordance with South Florida Water Management District specifications, and three (3) double ring infiltration tests were performed at a depth of six inches.

The locations of the tests are indicated on the Boring Location Plan presented in the Appendix of this report. The boring locations were identified in the field using approximate methods; namely, a measuring wheel and available surface controls. As such the soil boring locations should be considered to be approximate.

\section*{Test Boring Results}

In general, the borings recorded very loose to medium dense fine sand and debris to depths of approximately four to six feet followed by soft fibrous peat to depths of approximately eight to thirteen feet below ground surface. Beneath this the borings encountered loose to medium dense fine sand to a depth of twenty-five feet, the maximum depth explored.

Please see the enclosed soil classification sheet in the Appendix of this report for additional important information regarding these descriptions, the field evaluation and other related information.

Note: Substantially different subsurface conditions may exist at intervening locations between soil borings. Buried debris may or may not be identified or adequately delineated by soil borings. Such conditions may be revealed during site development activities (e.g. proof rolling, utility and foundation excavation activities) or other related activities. Should additional assurance be desired by the client, further subsurface investigation could be performed.

\section*{Test Pit Excavation Results}

Test pits were excavated down to the suitable soils at fifteen locations within the reference area. The results of these excavations generally revealed a soil profile consisting of approximately four to seven feet of fine sand and debris (concrete, brick, wood, plastic, and metal) underlain by a layer of fibrous peat to approximately eight to ten feet, whereupon fine sand was encountered and the test pit was terminated.

\section*{Laboratory Testing and Results}

Soil samples obtained from the drilling operations were preserved in jars and visually classified in the laboratory by a geotechnical engineer to confirm the field classifications. Selected soil samples of the organic peat recovered from the borings were subjected to testing to determine natural moisture and organic contents to estimate the engineering properties of these soils. The tests were performed on a selected samples believed to be representative of the materials encountered. Results of the test are tabulated below:

\section*{LABORATORY RESULTS}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c||}
\hline \begin{tabular}{c} 
Test \\
Boring/Pit \\
\#
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Soil \\
Description
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Sample Depth \\
Interval \\
(Feet)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Moisture \\
Content \\
(\%)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Organic \\
Content \\
(\%)
\end{tabular} \\
\hline B-6 & Peat & \(6-8\) & 240 & 34 \\
\hline B-8 & Peat & \(4-6\) & 556 & 74 \\
\hline B-16 & Black Organic Silt & \(4-6\) & 76 & 19 \\
\hline B-17 & Peat & \(6-8\) & 327 & 34 \\
\hline B-20 & Black Peat \& Silt & \(10-12\) & 429 & 53 \\
\hline \hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Groundwater Information}

The immediate groundwater level was measured at the boring locations at the time of drilling. The groundwater level was encountered at approximate depths of half a foot to five and a half feet below the existing ground surface at the time of drilling. We note that some areas of the site were below the water table with as much as approximately five feet of standing water.

The immediate depth to groundwater measurements presented in this report will not provide a reliable indication of stabilized or more long term depth to groundwater at this site. Water table elevations can vary dramatically with time through rainfall, droughts, storm events, flood control activities, nearby surface water bodies, tidal activity, pumping and many other factors. For these reasons, this immediate depth to water data should not be relied upon alone for project design considerations.

\section*{Exfiltration Results}

Two 'Usual Open-Hole' exfiltration tests were performed to a depth of six feet below the existing ground surface. The tests were performed in order to determine the hydraulic conductivity of the in situ subsurface soils to evaluate drainage requirements for the project.

The hydraulic conductivity value was determined to be \(7.04 \times 10^{-4}\) cubic feet per second, per square foot, per foot of head. Detailed soil descriptions and flow rates are presented in the Appendix.

\section*{Infiltration Results}

Three double ring infiltration tests were performed in accordance with ASTM D3385 in order to analyze, by others, the drainage capabilities of the existing soils at the test locations to facilitate design of water retention areas. The tests returned an infiltration rate of 8.17 inches/hour. See the appendix for detailed flow rates and approximate test locations.

\section*{PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS}

The test borings and test pits performed for this project revealed variable soils conditions. The historical information along with the soil conditions discovered as part of this study indicated that the site was cleared and earthwork operations were observed in 2011 and again in 2014. The site appears to have been filled with various materials mainly consisting of construction debris (concrete, brick, wood, and steel). In addition, an organic peat layer of between one foot thick minimum, two to three feet median thickness, and four to six feet maximum thickness was generally encountered over much of the northern and central areas of the site and extended from a minimum of five feet to a maximum of thirteen feet below the existing ground surface. Additional subsurface studies will be needed prior to finalizing the design and permitting process as portions of the site were under water and inaccessible at this time.

As proposed, the building would be situated on soils that are characterized as being: Areas of buried construction debris; Areas of clean sand and limerock; areas of sand over varying thickness of peat, and areas that have as much as five feet of standing water.

Constructing the building on the existing soils using a shallow foundation system would result in excessive total and differential settlements. We considered several options for shallow support of the building (both conventional and mat foundation) and deep foundations including:
- Over-excavating the soils to remove the compressible organic soils and replace them with well compacted structural fill.
- Deep Dynamic Compaction or Vibro-Compaction after excavation and filling.
- Rigid inclusions.
- Mass Soil Mixing.
- We also considered supporting the building using a deep foundation system consisting of augercast piles.

Due to the presence of debris and organic soils, the potential for long term settlement, and costs, it is our opinion that the over-excavation and filling with well compacted structural fill should be considered as the most technically feasible alternative. This should provide an allowable soil bearing capacity of 2,500 pounds per square foot. If higher bearing capacities up to approximately 6,000 pounds per square foot may be more beneficial, vibro-compaction should be considered after the excavation and filling is completed. We can provide details of this soil improvement method once more design and construction details are available.

The decision as to which alternative is best for this project will depend on several factors including costs, scheduling, structural loading conditions, final design parameters and other considerations. We recommend that discussions be held with representatives of the design and specialty contractor firms to better evaluate these and possibly other alternatives.

The following sections present general information that we feel is important concerning our recommended approach for foundation design and provides general details for further discussion. Once the over-excavation operations are properly completed, it is our opinion that an allowable soil bearing capacity of 3,000 pounds per square foot may be used for the foundation design.

\section*{Over-Excavation Alternative}

It is our opinion that in order to properly prepare the site for a shallow foundation system consisting of conventional column and wall footings with a slab-on-grade, and using an allowable soil bearing capacity of 2,500 pounds per square foot, the building areas will need to be over-excavated to a maximum depth of approximately thirteen feet below existing grade to remove the organic soils, and to provide a uniform base beneath the building. Suitable soils above the organics and the inert construction debris may be stockpiled separately for use as backfill. We anticipate that some crushing of the construction debris material may be required to create a suitable structural fill material.

Fill placed below the natural groundwater level should consist of a well-graded mixture of sand and limestone/crushed concrete having a minimum Limerock Bearing Ratio (LBR) of 60. The maximum particle size should not exceed six inches and no more than 10 percent passing the No. 200 sieve for material placed below the water table. The fill may be placed in a loose state until reaching no more than two feet above the natural groundwater level.

Once the fill has been brought to two feet above the natural ground water table, the soils should be compacted with at least twenty passes (ten in the north/south direction, ten in the east/west direction) and until ground surface subsidence has been minimized, with a vibratory compacter with a minimum dynamic force of 20 tons operated at a slow walking pace. Also, the surface should be compacted until a density equivalent to at least 98 percent of the modified Proctor maximum dry density (ASTM D-1557) is achieved to a depth of at least 12 inches below the compacted surface.

Fill then placed above the proof rolled surface may consist of clean granular soils, free of debris and organics, and shall have no more than 10 percent passing the No. 200 sieve, with a maximum particle size of 3 inches. The fill should be placed in lifts not exceeding 12 inches in loose thickness. Each lift should be compacted until densities equivalent to at least 98 percent of the modified Proctor maximum dry density are uniformly obtained. Field densities should be taken at a frequency of one per 5,000 square feet of building area with a minimum of one density per 2,500 square feet at the final lift.

Following site and building pad construction as discussed above, the foundation area should be excavated and the footings formed. The bottom of foundation excavations should be compacted after excavation to develop a minimum density requirement of 98 percent of the maximum modified Proctor dry density, for a minimum depth of one foot below the bottom of the footing depth. The floor slab area should also be compacted in the same manner.

A representative from Nutting Engineers should be present at the site to observe that the subsurface conditions are as we have discussed herein, and that earthwork activities are in accordance with our recommendations.

\section*{Earth Pressure on Walls}

Below grade structures should be designed to resist lateral earth pressure from granular backfill, surcharge loads, and unbalanced hydrostatic forces. We anticipate that soils supported by any retaining walls, if required, for the project will consist of a limestone and sand mixture. We estimate these soils will have an effective friction angle within the range of 30 degrees. The maximum toe pressure should not exceed \(2,500 \mathrm{psf}\) for walls resting on compacted structural soil. A passive soil resistance equal to a uniform pressure of 300 psf may be used for undisturbed soil against the face of the base or a key below the base of the wall. The walls can be designed for a coefficient of friction between the base of the wall and the subgrade soils of 0.3.

Excessive compaction of the fill behind the wall should be avoided since it could result in the development of lateral pressures whose intensity exceeds that used for design. Slab or other load carrying element loads must be included in the design of the walls. For foundation or other buried walls that are not restrained during backfilling but are free to rotate at the top, active earth pressure should be used in design. Walls that are restrained should be designed assuming at-rest earth pressures.

Estimated design geotechnical soil parameters were developed from the results of the test borings. The following table summarizes our recommendations for the soil parameters and the lateral active and passive pressure coefficients to be utilized for construction. The design of the support system shall include hydrostatic pressure acting behind the wall at the highest anticipated water level during construction, and/or design life of the structure.

SUMMARY OF DESIGN GEOTECHNICAL PARAMETERS
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{DEPTH (FEET)} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
SPT N- \\
VALUE \\
RANGE \\
(Average)
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
SOIL UNIT WEIGHT \\
(PCF)
\end{tabular}} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{ANGLE OF INTERNAL FRICTION (DEGREES)} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{EARTH
PRESSURE
COEFFICIENT} \\
\hline & & SATURATED & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { SUB- } \\
& \text { MERGED }
\end{aligned}
\] & & \begin{tabular}{l}
AT \\
REST \\
(Ko)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
ACTIVE \\
(Ka)
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { PASSIVE } \\
& (K p)
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 0-7 & 2-30 & 115 & 57.6 & 30 & 0.5 & 0.33 & 3.00 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Passenger Vehicle Asphalt Parking Areas}

The following would apply within asphalt parking and drive areas. Any deleterious material encountered should be removed and replaced with suitable fill as specified in the "Site Preparation" section of this report. A stabilized subgrade having a minimum LBR of 40 shall be placed to a depth of at least twelve inches below the base course. The stabilized subgrade should be compacted to an equivalent density of 98 percent of the modified Proctor maximum dry density. The base course should be placed to at least eight inches below the asphalt and should have a minimum LBR of 100 . The base material should be compacted to 98 percent of the modified Proctor maximum dry density. The pavement material and thickness should be based on design requirements. It is our opinion that onsite materials may meet both of the LBR requirements, however, specific tests should be performed to confirm this.

At this time it appears that material will need to be imported in order to develop the subbase and base course sections at the site. We would require that the collection of bulk samples of both the imported base and sub-base course in order to determine their LBR values and suitability. When more engineering information is available pertaining to the pavement design we can provide more detailed input.

\section*{GENERAL INFORMATION}

Our client for this geotechnical evaluation was:
2209 N. \(7^{\text {th }}\) Avenue, LLC.
785 NE \(33^{\text {rd }}\) Street
Boca Raton, Florida 33431
Attn: Mr. Jason Pepitone
The contents of this report are for the exclusive use of the client and the client's design team for this specific project exclusively. Information conveyed in this report shall not be used or relied upon by other parties or for other projects without the expressed written consent of Nutting Engineers of Florida, Inc. This report discusses geotechnical considerations for this site based upon observed conditions and our understanding of proposed construction for foundation support. Environmental issues including (but not limited to), soil and/or groundwater contamination are beyond our scope of service for this project. As such, this report should not be used or relied upon for evaluation of environmental issues.

If conditions are encountered which are not consistent with the findings presented in this report, or if proposed construction is moved from the location investigated, this office shall be notified immediately so that the condition or change can be evaluated and appropriate action taken.

The vibratory compaction equipment may cause vibrations that could be felt by persons within nearby buildings and could potentially induce structural settlements. Additionally, preexisting settlements may exist within these structures that could be construed to have been caused or worsened by the proposed vibratory compaction after the fact. Pre- and post conditions surveys of these structures along with the vibration monitoring during vibratory compaction could be performed to better evaluate this concern. The contractor should exercise due care during the performance of the vibratory compaction work with due consideration of potential impacts on existing structures. If potential vibrations and impacts are not considered tolerable, then alternate foundation modification techniques should be considered.

Nutting Engineers of Florida, Inc. shall bear no liability for the implementation of recommended inspection and testing services as described in this report if implemented by others. Nutting has no ability to verify the completeness, accuracy or proper technique of such procedures if performed by others.

Excavations of five feet or more in depth should be sloped or shored in accordance with OSHA and State of Florida requirements.

The Geotechnical Engineer warrants that the findings, recommendations, specifications, or professional advice contained herein, have been presented after being prepared in accordance with general accepted professional practice in the field of foundation engineering, soil mechanics and engineering geology. No other warranties are implied or expressed.

We appreciate the opportunity to be of service on this project. If we can be of any further assistance, or if you need additional information, please contact us at your convenience.

Sincerely,
NUTTING ENGINEERS OF FLORIDA, INC.
Natalie Chanii/for.
Adrian Ramirez
Tuibulwherth 4/r/is
Engineering Intern
Attachments: Boring Location Plan - Figure 1
Test Pit Location Plan - Figure 2
Test Boring Logs
Test Pit Logs
Exfiltration Test Results
Double Ring Infiltration Test Results
Limitations of Liability
Soil Classification Criteria




Disclaimer Nutting Engineers of Floyida, Inc. accepts no liability for the consonuences of the independent interpretation of drilling laga by othars.


Disclaimer Nutting Enginears of Florlda, Inc. Accepts no liability for the conseopences of tho independent interpotation of drilling lags by others.


\footnotetext{
Disclalmer Nuting Engineers of Florida, Ino. ncoepts no liability for the conseguences of the indopendent interzrotation of drilling logs by others.
}


Disclaimer Nutting Enginears of Flovide, Inc. acconts no liability for the consequences of tho indepandont interpretation of drilling loga by others.


Disclalmer Nutting Enginears of Floridg Inc, necents no liability for the consequences of the indepondent intarpretation of driling loge by others.


Dlsclalmer Nutting Engineors of Floridn, Inc. accepts no hiability for the conseguences of the inderendent interprotation of drilling loga by others.


Disclaimer Nutting Enginaers of Florida, Inc, accepts no liability for the conseguonces of the independent interpretation of drilling loga by others.


Disclaimer Nutting Engineers of Florids Inc, accepta no liability for the consequonces of the independent interpretation of drilling legs by othors.


\footnotetext{
Disclaimer Nutting Enginegra of Flovid, Inc. accents no liability for the consoguences of the independent interpretation of drilling logs by others.
}

CLIENT 2209 N .7 th Avenue, LLC \(\qquad\) PROJECT LOCATION 2209 North 7th Avenue, Lake Worth, Florida
\(\qquad\) SURFACE ELEVATION REFERENCE Approx. © Road Crown LOGGED BY T. Donovan \(\qquad\) CHECKED BY C. Gworek GROUND WATERLEVELS: APPROXIMATE LOCATION OF BORING As located on aite plan


Discialmer Nutting Engineers of Florida, Inc, accopta no linbility for tho conseguences of the independent interpretation of drilling logs by othors.


Dlsclalmer Nutting Engineers of Flovida, Inc. nceapts no liability for tho consequences of the independont internetation of drilling logs by others.


\footnotetext{
Disclaimer Nutting Engineors of Florida, Inc, accopts no liability for the consequences of the independent interprotation of drilling loga by others.
}
BORING NUMBER B-22
PAGE 1 OF 1
PROJECT NUMBER 18648.1 PROJECT NAME Proposed Processing Facility lorida SURFACE ELEVATION REFERENCE Approx. © Road Crown GROUND WATERLEVELS: Zat TIME OF DRILLING 1.0 ft Z 1.0 ft
\(\qquad\)
APPROXIMATE LOCATION OF BORING As located on sito plan


\footnotetext{
Olsclaimer Nutting Engineors of Florida, Inc. nccopts no linbility for the conseguonces of tho indopendent intorpretation of drilling logs by athers.
}

\section*{Report of Exfiltration Test}

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{EXFIL NO. 1} & One Minute Increme & Pump Rate in \(\mathrm{Ga} / \mathrm{Min}\) \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\multirow[b]{3}{*}{Sample Location: Approx. as located on site plan.}} & 1 & 5.0 \\
\hline & & & 2 & 5.0 \\
\hline & & & 3 & 5.0 \\
\hline \multirow{7}{*}{Material:} & \multirow{7}{*}{\(0-6{ }^{\prime}\)} & \multirow{7}{*}{Gray to brown fine SAND, some debris (fill)} & 4 & 5.0 \\
\hline & & & 5 & 5.1 \\
\hline & & & 6 & 5.1 \\
\hline & & & 7 & 5.1 \\
\hline & & & 8 & 5.2 \\
\hline & & & 9 & 5.2 \\
\hline & & & 10 & 6.2 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\(K=7.04 \times 10^{-4} \mathrm{cfs} / \mathrm{ft}^{2} \mathrm{ft}\).head

\section*{Report of Exfiltration Test}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Client: & 2209 N. 7th Avenue, LLC & & Order No & 18648.1 \\
\hline Project: & Proposed Processing Facility & & Repor \(\mathrm{No}^{\text {O}}\) & \(\frac{1864.1}{2}\) \\
\hline Location: & 2209 7th Avenue North & & Date: & 3/26/19 \\
\hline & Lake Worth, Florida & & & \\
\hline Test: & Usual Open Hole Exilitration Test & & & \\
\hline Surface & & Water table from ground & & \\
\hline Elevation: & Approx. @ Road Crown & surface: & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Casing
Diameter:
Tube Depth: \(\qquad\)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{EXFIL NO. 2} & One Minute Increme & Pump Rate in \(\mathrm{Ga} / \mathrm{Min}\) \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\multirow[b]{3}{*}{Sample Location: Approx. as located on site plan.}} & 1 & 5.0 \\
\hline & & & 2 & 5.0 \\
\hline & & & 3 & 5.0 \\
\hline \multirow{7}{*}{Material:} & \multirow{7}{*}{0-6'} & \multirow{7}{*}{Gray to brown fine SAND and DEBRIS (fill)} & 4 & 5.0 \\
\hline & & & 5 & 5.1 \\
\hline & & & 6 & 5.1 \\
\hline & & & 7 & 5.1 \\
\hline & & & 8 & 5.2 \\
\hline & & & 9 & 5.2 \\
\hline & & & 10 & 5.2 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\(K=7.04 \times 10^{-4} \mathrm{cfs} / \mathrm{t}^{2} \mathrm{ft}\).head
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Cheral Mathe & : & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Date of Test: 4/1/2019 Tested By: Marc G.} \\
\hline Prieutiante &  & & \\
\hline Sto Ammes & \(\therefore\) Oblymay & Date of Test & \\
\hline Samplo Loction & & Tesled By: & MG \\
\hline Materal Description il & pea & Sampled By: & CG \\
\hline Materat Desumbath & \% & & \\
\hline Materal Descrifuch 13 & biack utganic sill & & \\
\hline Material Description H4: & peal & & \\
\hline Material Descriphon 115 : & black peal + sill & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{5}{*}{} & & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{Noisture Content} \\
\hline & & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\
\hline & Boring 4 & 1 H & 33 & 816 & B17 & 820 \\
\hline & Pepi? & 15 & 16 & \(4 \cdot 6\) & 6.8 & 10-12 \\
\hline & ¢in \(n\) & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\
\hline A Wretheght rea. & & -星 & 27148 & 265.07 & 272.95 & 252.19 \\
\hline ES Diy Weghic t Ud & & 13\% & 16030 & 197.59 & 162.02 & 153.27 \\
\hline C Tace Can & & \(13 \% 00\) & 135.57 & 108.42 & 128.06 & 130.22 \\
\hline Wet Weight Soil & \(=(A-C)\) & 130.94 & 13592 & 156.65 & 144.89 & 121.97 \\
\hline D Dry Veight Son & \(=(\mathrm{BC})\) & 1023 & 2073 & 89.17 & 33.96 & 23.05 \\
\hline E Werght ol Moisture & \(\therefore(A-B)\) &  & 115.19 & 67.48 & 110.93 & 98.92 \\
\hline \% Water Condent & \(=(60) \times 100\) & 2.10 \(50 \%\) & 556.67\% & 75.68\% & 326.65\% & 429.15\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{}} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{Organic Content} \\
\hline & & & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\
\hline \multicolumn{8}{|c|}{Gai} \\
\hline A & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Ory wount + brtuent} & \% & 15630 & 197.59 & 162.02 & 153.27 \\
\hline 13 & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Bum Wegha a} & 16:13 & 1406 & 180.47 & 150.65 & 141.13 \\
\hline C & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Tare Can} & 13.013 & 135.57 & 108.42 & 128.06 & 130.22 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{0} & Ory Weight & \(\because(A-C)\) & 4023 & 20.73 & 89.17 & 33.96 & 23.05 \\
\hline & Bum Weight & \(=(\mathrm{B} \cdot \mathrm{C})\) & 20.12 & 5.42 & 72.05 & 22.59 & 10.91 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{E} & Organc Weigh & \(\because(A \cdot B)\) & 169 & 15.31 & 17.12 & 11.37 & 12.14 \\
\hline & \% Organe finlle & \(=(10)\) & 3 \(33 \%\) & 73.85\% & 19, \(20 \%\) & 33.48\% & 52.67\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Nutting
Engineers
of Florida Inc.|Establlshed 1967

\section*{DOUBLE RING INFILTROMETER TEST - ASTM D3385}

CLIENT: \(\quad 2209\) N 7th Ave N, LLC
TEST : 1 TEST DATE: \(3 / 26 / 2019\) WEATHER: Sunny 80 Deg F
PROJECT: Proposed Processing Facility DRILLER: Travis 2209 7th Ave N Lake Worth, FL

SOIL DESCRIPTION: 0-1' Brown Fine Sand

NOTE: TEST PERFORMED AT EXISTING GRADE. GROUNDWATER DEPTH: Not Measured USING \(12^{\prime \prime} \& 24^{\prime \prime}\) DIAMETER RINGS

AREA: INNER RING: \(113.1 \mathrm{IN}^{2}\left(729.7 \mathrm{CM}^{2}\right)\)
ANNULAR RING: \(339.3 \mathrm{IN}^{2}\) (2189.2 \(\mathrm{CM}^{2}\) )
Testing was performed according to proceudres specified in ASTM D3385-09. Liquid used consisted of water with an approximate pH of 7.0.
As ASTM procedure recommends, data from inner ring was used to determine infiltration rate.
\begin{tabular}{lcccc} 
ELAPSED & \begin{tabular}{c} 
QUANTITY \\
OF WATER
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
RATE \\
INNER
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
QUANTITY \\
OF WATER
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
RATE \\
ANNULAR
\end{tabular} \\
(HR) & INNER \(\left(\mathrm{in}^{3}\right.\) ) & \begin{tabular}{c} 
(IN/HR) \\
ANNULAR \(\left(\mathrm{in}^{3}\right)\)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
AN/HR) \\
(IME
\end{tabular} \\
0.25 & 231 & 8.17 & 693 & 8.17 \\
0.5 & 231 & 8.17 & 693 & 8.17 \\
0.75 & 231 & 8.17 & 693 & 8.17 \\
1 & 462 & 16.34 & 1386 & 16.34 \\
1.5 & 462 & 8.17 & 1386 & 8.17 \\
2 & 462 & 8.17 & 1386 & 8.17 \\
3 & 924 & 8.17 & 2772 & 8.17 \\
4 & 924 & 8.17 & 2772 & 8.17 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

STEADY STATE INFILTRATION RATE \(=8.17 \mathrm{INCH} / \mathrm{HOUR} *\)

* As noted in Sec, 11.1 Precision and Blas of ASTM D338509 the recorded infiltration rate should be considered only as an index value

\section*{DOUBLE RING INFILTROMETER TEST - ASTM D3385}

CLIENT: \(\quad 2209\) N 7th Ave N, LLC
TEST : 2 TEST DATE: \(3 / 26 / 2019\) WEATHER: Sunny 80 Deg F
PROJECT: Proposed Processing Facility DRILLER: Travis
2209 7th Ave N Lake Worth, FL
SOIL DESCRIPTION: 0-1' Brown Fine Sand

NOTE: TEST PERFORMED AT EXISTING GRADE.
GROUNDWATER DEPTH: Not Measured USING 12" \& 24" DIAMETER RINGS
```

AREA: INNER RING: 113.1 IN N
ANNULAR RING: 339.3 IN }\mp@subsup{}{}{2}(2189.2 CM'

```

Testing was performed according to proceudres specified in ASTM D3385-09. Liquid used consisted of water with an approximate pH of 7.0 .
As ASTM procedure recommends, data from inner ring was used to determine infiltration rate.
\(\left.\begin{array}{lcccc}\text { ELAPSED } & \begin{array}{c}\text { QUANTITY } \\ \text { OF }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { RATE } \\ \text { IME }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { QUANTITY } \\ \text { OF WATER }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { RATE } \\ \text { INNER }\end{array} \\ \text { (HR) } & \text { OF WATER }\end{array}\right)\)

STEADY STATE INFILTRATION RATE \(=8.17 \mathrm{INCH} / \mathrm{HOUR}\) *

* As noted in Sec. 11.1 Precision and Bias of ASTM D338509 the recorded infiltration rate should be considered only as an index value

\section*{DOUBLE RING INFILTROMETER TEST - ASTM D3385}

CLIENT: \(\quad 2209\) N 7th Ave N, LLC
TEST : 3 TEST DATE: 3/26/2019
PROJECT: Proposed Processing Facility
WEATHER: Sunny 80 Deg F DRILLER: Travis 2209 7th Ave N Lake Worth, FL

SOIL DESCRIPTION: 0-1' Brown Fine Sand
NOTE: TEST PERFORMED AT EXISTING GRADE.
GROUNDWATER DEPTH: Not Measured USING \(12^{\prime \prime}\) \& \(24^{\prime \prime}\) DIAMETER RINGS
AREA:
INNER RING: \(113.1 \mathrm{IN}^{2}\left(729.7 \mathrm{CM}^{2}\right)\)
ANNULAR RING: \(339.3 \mathrm{IN}^{2}\left(2189.2 \mathrm{CM}^{2}\right)\)
Testing was performed according to proceudres specified in ASTM D3385-09. Liquid used consisted of water with an approximate pH of 7.0 .
As ASTM procedure recommends, data from inner ring was used to determine infiltration rate.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline ELAPSED
TIME
(HR) & QUANTITY OF WATER INNER( \(\mathrm{in}^{3}\) ) & RATE INNER (IN/HR) & QUANTITY OF WATER ANNULAR \(\left(\mathrm{in}^{3}\right)\) & RATE ANNULAR (IN/HR) \\
\hline 0.25 & 231 & 8.17 & 693 & 8.17 \\
\hline 0.5 & 231 & 8.17 & 693 & 8.17 \\
\hline 0.75 & 231 & 8.17 & 693 & 8.17 \\
\hline 1 & 462 & 16.34 & 1386 & 16.34 \\
\hline 1.5 & 462 & 8.17 & 1386 & 8.17 \\
\hline 2 & 462 & 8.17 & 1386 & 8.17 \\
\hline 3 & 924 & 8.17 & 2772 & 8.17 \\
\hline 4 & 924 & 8.17 & 2772 & 8.17 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{STEADY STATE INFILTRATION RATE \(=8.17 \mathrm{INCH} / \mathrm{HOUR}^{*}\)}

* As noted in Sec. 11.1 Precision and Bias of ASTM D338509 the recorded infilitration rate should be considered only as an index value

1310 Neptune Drive \(\circ\) Boynton Beach, Florida \(33426{ }^{\circ}\) (561) 736-4900 \(\circ\) Fax (561) 737-9975 Broward (954) 941-8700 \(\bigcirc\) Port St. Lucie (772) 408-1050 \(\bigcirc\) Miami Dade (305) 824-0060

\section*{LIMITATIONS OF LIABLILITY}

\section*{WARRANTY}

We warranty that the services performed by Nutting Engineers of Florida, Inc. are conducted in a manner consistent with that level of care and skill ordinarily exercised by members of the profession in our area currently practicing under similar conditions at the time our services were performed. No other warranties, expressed or implied, are made. While the services of Nutting Engineers of Florida, Inc. are a valuable and integral part of the design and construction teams; we do not warrant, guarantee or insure the quality, completeness, or satisfactory performance of designs, construction plans, specifications we have not prepared, nor the ultimate performance of building site materials or assembly/construction.

\section*{SUBSURFACE EXPLORATION}

Subsurface exploration is normally accomplished by test borings; test pits are sometimes employed. The method of determining the boring location and the surface elevation at the boring is noted in the report. This information is represented in the soil boring logs and/or a drawing. The location and elevation of the borings should be considered accurate only to the degree inherent with the method used and may be approximate.

The soil boring \(\log\) includes sampling information, description of the materials recovered, approximate depths of boundaries between soil and rock strata as encountered and immediate depth to water data. The log represents conditions recorded specifically at the location where and when the boring was made. Site conditions may vary through time as will subsurface conditions. The boundaries between different soil strata as encountered are indicated at specific depths; however, these depths are in fact approximate and dependent upon the frequency of sampling, nature and consistency of the respective strata. Substantial variation between soil borings may commonly exist in subsurface conditions. Water level readings are made at the time and under conditions stated on the boring logs. Water levels change with time, precipitation, canal level, local well drawdown and other factors. Water level data provided on soil boring logs shall not be relied upon for groundwater based design or construction considerations.

\section*{LABORATORY AND FIELD TESTS}

Tests are performed in general accordance with specific ASTM Standards unless otherwise indicated. All criteria included in a given ASTM Standard are not always required and performed. Each test boring report indicates the measurements and data developed at each specific test location.

\section*{ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS}

The geotechnical report is prepared primarily to aid in the design of site work and structural foundations. Although the information in the report is expected to be sufficient for these purposes, it shall not be utilized to determine the cost of construction nor to stand alone as a construction specification. Contractors shall verify subsurface conditions as may be appropriate prior to undertaking subsurface work.

Report recommendations are based primarily on data from test borings made at the locations shown on the test boring reports. Soil variations commonly exist between boring locations. Such variations may not become evident until construction. Test pits sometimes provide valuable supplemental information that derived from soil borings. If variations are then noted, the geotechnical engineer shall be contacted in writing immediately so that field conditions can be examined and recommendations revised if necessary.

The geotechnical report states our understanding as to the location, dimensions and structural features proposed for the site. Any significant changes of the site improvements or site conditions must be communicated in writing to the geotechnical engineer immediately so that the geotechnical analysis, conclusions, and recommendations can be reviewed and appropriately adjusted as necessary.

\section*{CONSTRUCTION OBSERVATION}

Construction observation and testing is an important element of geotechnical services. The geotechnical engineer's field representative (G.E.F.R.) is the "owner's representative" abserving the work of the contractor, performing tests and reporting data from such tests and observations. The geotechnical engineer's field representative does not direct the contractor's construction means, methods, operations or personnel. The G.E.F.R. does not interfere with the relationship between the owner and the contractor and, except as an observer, does not become a substitute owner on site. The G.E.F.R. is responsible for his/her safety, but has no responsibility for the safety of other personnel at the site. The G.E.F.R. is an important member of a team whose responsibility is to observe and test the work being done and report to the owner whether that work is being carried out in general conformance with the plans and specifications. The enclosed report may be relied upon solely by the named client.

\section*{SOIL AND ROCK CLASSIFICATION CRITERIA}

SAND/SILT
CLAY/SILTY CLAY
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
N-VALUE \\
\((\mathrm{bpf})\)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
RELATIVE \\
DENSITY
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \(0-4\) & Very Loose \\
\hline \(5-10\) & Loose \\
\hline \(11-29\) & Medium \\
\hline \(30-49\) & Dense \\
\hline\(>50\) & Very dense \\
\hline 100 & Refusal \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
N-VALEE \\
(bpf)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
UNCONFINED COMP. \\
STRENGTII (tsf)
\end{tabular} & CONSISTENCY \\
\hline\(<2\) & \(<0.25\) & v. Soft \\
\hline \(2-4\) & \(0.25-0.50\) & Soft \\
\hline \(5-8\) & \(0.50-1.00\) & Medium \\
\hline \(9-15\) & \(1.00-2.00\) & Soft \\
\hline \(16-30\) & \(2.00-4.00\) & v. Stiff \\
\hline\(>30\) & \(>4.00\) & Hard \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

ROCK
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
N-VALLE \\
(bpf)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l} 
RELATIVE \\
HARDNESS
\end{tabular} & \multirow{2}{*}{ ROCK CiARACTERISTICS }
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{llll}
\multicolumn{2}{c}{ PARTICLE SIZE } & DESCRIPTION MODIFI \\
\hline Boulder & \(>12 \mathrm{in}\). & \(0-5 \%\) & Slight trace \\
Cobble & 3 to 12 in. & \(6-10 \%\) & Trace \\
Gravel & 4.76 mm to 3 in. & \(11-20 \%\) & Little \\
Sand & 0.074 mm to 4.76 mm & \(21-35 \%\) & Some \\
Silt & 0.005 mm to 0.074 mm & \(>35 \%\) & And \\
Clay & \(<0.005 \mathrm{~mm}\) & &
\end{tabular}


APPENDIX D: PREVIOUSLY APPROVED SFWMD PERMIT FOR SITE

\title{
080311-7
}

\section*{DISCHARGE, FLOOD PLAIN ENCROACHMENT, AND WATER QUALITY CALCULATIONS FOR}

\section*{LAKE WORTH 10 ACRES, LLC}

Package Includes:

\title{
RECEIVED
}
1. Pre-development storage calculations based on C-51 Basin Criteria (Sub-basin 33)
2. Post development land use and grading
3. Post development stage storage curve 100 year - Zero Discharge stage
4. Cascade routing of 10 year -3 day storm


MAB - 0.32008

Prepared By:
David W. Harris, P.E. at HARRIS ENGINEERING, INC. 2743 NW 19 \({ }^{\text {th }}\) Street
Pompano Beach, Florida 33069
954-971-7200 Phone
954-971-8200 Fax

\title{
FLOOD ENCROACHMENT CALCULATIONS TRACK 66 AND PORTION OF TRACT 81 \\ AKA \\ LAKE WORTH 10 ACRES
}

February 2008

Project Size
Average existing grade (including existing wetland)
100-year Flood Stage per SFWMD C-51 Basin Study (sub-basin 33)
9.81 Acres
12.0 Ft. NGVD
13.6 Ft. NGVD

\section*{EXISTING CONDITIONS}
A. On site runoff
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Existing Impervious Coverage (wetland) & 2.69 Acres \\
Average existing grade & 12.0 Ft NGVD \\
Water Table Elevation & 9.5 Ft NGVD \\
(Reference: Marlin Industrial Park Permit) & \\
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Depth to Water Table
\end{tabular} & 2.5 Ft \\
Soil Storage & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Site has been previously cleared, therefore use \\
compacted soil storage numbers for coastal soils
\end{tabular} \\
&
\end{tabular}

Un-compacted Soil Storage
Compacted Soil Storage
Equivalent Site Soil Storage
100-Year, 72-Hour Design Rainfall Depth
Runoff (SCS Equation)
Volume
4.55 Inches
3.41 Inches
2.48 Inches
16.31 Inches
13.67 Inches
\(11.17 \mathrm{Ac}-\mathrm{Ft}\)

Volume Stored on site at 100-year flood stage of 13.6' NGVD
\[
(13.6-12.0) \times 9.81 \mathrm{Ac}=
\]
\[
15.7 \mathrm{Ac}-\mathrm{Ft}
\]

Volume Imported:
4.53 Ac-Ft

Project is an importer. Therefore, project design must accommodate runoff generated as a result of paving, plus 4.53 ac-ft of water from offsite in order to meet C-51 Flood Plain Encroachment criteria.

\section*{PROPOSED CONDITIONS AND PROJECT SUMMARY}

\author{
Building Footprints \\ Parking Areas \\ Walks \& Curbs \\ Landscaping/Buffers
}

Total Developable Area
(not including lake or slopes)
\% Impervious
75\%
(See attached water quality and stage storage calculations)
Note:
This project will require dry pre-treatment. It is intended to provide this pre-treatment within exfiltration trenches.

Water quality provided in exfiltration trenches \(=0.31 \mathrm{Acre-Ft}\)
100 year - Zero discharge storm event based on this proposed development requires 12.08 Acre-Ft of storage. Please note from the stage storage curve attached that this site also provides 17.38 Acre-Ft of storage at elevation 13.6. The stage storage table does not include storage in the proposed exfiltration trench.

This site therefore provides:
\(17.38+0.31=17.69\) Acre-Ft of storage at elevation 13.6
\(17.69-12.08=5.61\) Acre-Ft of imported storage available at elevation storage 13.6
Project meets all flood plain encroachment criteria
Allowable discharge based on C-51 Criteria sub-basin 33:
Allowable discharge is based on 10 year- 3 day storm of 35 CSM
This 9.81 Acre site has an allowable discharge of 0.54 CFS
Proposed control structure shall consist of a 3' sharp crested weir at elevation 10.8 and a minimum bleeder based on LWDD criteria ( \(6^{\prime \prime}\) inverted triangle) see attached cascade routing program which provides a peak \(10-\mathrm{yr}\), 3 -day elevation of 10.78 , with a peak discharge of 0.54 (Note: Cascade program was run utilizing bleeder criteria based on SFWMD. Actual discharge will be slightly higher).

\section*{WATER QUALITY AND STAGE ISTORAGE CALCULATIONS}
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
PROJECT: & LAKE WORTH 10 ACRES & \\
ENG. PROJECT\#: & 6156 & \\
ENG: & DWH & \\
DATE: & Feb 26,2008 & REVISED:
\end{tabular}

LAND USE AND SITE GRADING
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline DESCRIPTION & \begin{tabular}{c} 
AREA \\
\end{tabular} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{ GRADING } & \multirow{2}{*}{ REMARKS } \\
\cline { 3 - 4 } & (ACRE) & FROM & TO & \\
\hline & & & & \\
BUILDING & 2.04 & - & - & NO STORAGE \\
ROADS & 0.00 & 13 & 14 & LINEAR \\
WALKS \& DRVES & 0.20 & 13 & 14 & LINEAR \\
pakking & 3.25 & 12 & 14 & LINEAR \\
\hline \hline OTHERPERV & 0.00 & 12 & 13 & LINEAR \\
GREEN & 1.16 & 12.5 & 14 & LINEAR \\
SLOPES & 0.66 & 8.5 & 12.5 & LINEAR \\
LAKE & 2.50 & 8.5 & UP & VERTICAL \\
DRYRETENTION & 0.00 & 9.5 & UP & VERTICAL \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

TOTAL
9.81

\section*{SEE PAGE THREE FOR STAGE-STORAGE TABLE}

\section*{SOIL STORAGE}
A. AVERAGE PERVIOUS ELEVATION=
\(12.25^{\prime}\) NGVD
B. WATER TABLE ELEVATION=
\(8.50^{\prime}\) NGVD
C. DEPTH TO WATER TABLE=
3.75 ' NGVD
D. PERVIOUS AREA SOIL STORAGE FOR

FOR COMPACTED SOIL, PER SFWMD VOL IV 7.38 INCHES
E. SITE-WIDE SOIL STORAGE=S =
F. TOTAL PERVIOUS AREA =
G. TOTAL IMPERVIOUS AREA (INCLUDING LAKES) =
1.37 INCHES
1.82 ACRES
7.99 ACRES
H. \% IMPERV. (EXCLUDING ROOFS AND LAKES) =
\(65.46 \%\)

\section*{WATER QUALITY}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline VOLUME FROM 1 INCH OF RUNOFF FROM THE SITE = & 0.82 AC-FT \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
VOLUME FROM 2.5 INCHES OF RAINFALL \\
TIMES THE \% IMPERVIOUS SHOWN IN \((\mathrm{H})=\)
\end{tabular} & 1.34 AC-FT \\
\hline WATER QUALITY VOLUME USED & 1.34 AC-FT \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
WATER QUALITY STAGE (IF REQUIRED) \\
Does not include exfiltration trench
\end{tabular} & 9.03 NGVD \\
\hline VOLUME NEEDED FOR \({ }^{1 / 2} 2^{n}\) OF PRE-TREATMENT \(=\) IF PRE-TREATMENT IS REQUIRED THEN STAGE IN DRY REIENTION AREA TO MEET PRE-TREATMENT: does not include exfiltration trench WATER QUALITY VOLUME STORED IN EXFLLTRATION & \(0.41 \mathrm{AC-FT}\)
8.66 NGVD
\(0.41 \mathrm{AC-FT}\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

HARRIS ENGINEERING, INC.
Consulting Engimeers 2743 NW 19TH STREET POMPANO BEACh, FL \(33069-5232\)

RAINFALL
\begin{tabular}{lr:c} 
& \multicolumn{1}{c}{ 1-DAY } & 3-DAY \\
10-YEAR STORM & 7.50 & - \\
25-YEAR STORM & 9.00 & 12.23 \\
100-YEAR STORM & 12.00 & 16.31
\end{tabular}

RUN_OFF
\(\left.\mathrm{Q}=(\mathrm{P}-0.2 \mathrm{~S})^{2 /(P+0.8 S}\right)\)
WHERE P = RAINFALL (INCHES),
\(S=\) SITE WIDE SOIL STORAGE (INCHES), AND
\(Q=\) RUN - OFF (INCHES)
FOR 10-YEAR,1-DAY STORM
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\(\mathrm{Q}=\) & \(6.08^{\prime \prime}\) \\
\(\mathrm{V}=\) & \(4.97^{\mathrm{AF}}\)
\end{tabular}

FOR 25-YEAR,3-DAY STORM
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\(\mathrm{Q}=\) & \(10.73^{\mathrm{n}}\) \\
\(\mathrm{V}=\) & 8.77 AF
\end{tabular}

FOR 100-YEAR,3-DAY STORM
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\(\mathrm{Q}=\) & \(14.77^{\mathrm{n}}\) \\
\(\mathrm{V}=\) & 12.08 AF
\end{tabular}

\section*{STORM STAGE}

FROM THE STAGF-STORAGE TAZLE ON TEE NEXT PAGE THE STORMWATER STAGES ARE AS FOLLLOWS:
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline EVENT & DAYS & STAGE & REMARK \\
\hline 10-YR & 1-DAY & 10.22 & \\
25-YR & 3-DAY & 11.54 & BASED ON ZERO DISCHARGE \\
100-YR & 3-DAY & 12.54 & BASED ON ZERO DISCHARGE \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

STAGE-STORAGETABLE
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { STAGE } \\
(F T)
\end{gathered}
\]} & \multicolumn{9}{|c|}{STORAGE (AF)} \\
\hline & Onerr firv & Ofeen & watcs 4 derves & pabina & ronds & DRY ret & LAKE & suope stions & total \\
\hline 8.5 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 \\
\hline 8.8 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.25 & 0.00 & 0.25 \\
\hline 8.7 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.50 & 0.00 & 0.50 \\
\hline 8.8 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.75 & 0.01 & 0.76 \\
\hline 8.9 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 1.00 & 0.01 & 1.01 \\
\hline 9.0 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 1.25 & 0.02 & 1.27 \\
\hline 9.1 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 1.50 & 0.03 & 1.53 \\
\hline 9.2 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 1.75 & 0.04 & 1.79 \\
\hline 9.3 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 2.00 & 0.05 & 205 \\
\hline 9.4 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 2.25 & 0.07 & 2.32 \\
\hline 9.5 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 2.50 & 0.08 & 2.58 \\
\hline 9.6 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 2.75 & 0.10 & 2.85 \\
\hline 9.7 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 3.00 & 0.12 & 3.12 \\
\hline 9.8 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 3.25 & 0.14 & 3.39 \\
\hline 9.9 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 3.50 & 0.16 & 3.66 \\
\hline 10.0 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 3.75 & 0.19 & 3.94 \\
\hline 10.1 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 4.00 & 0.21 & 4.21 \\
\hline 10.2 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 4.25 & 0.24 & 4.48 \\
\hline 10.3 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 4.50 & 0.27 & 4.77 \\
\hline 10.4 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 4.75 & 0.30 & 5.05 \\
\hline 10.5 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 5.00 & 0.33 & 5.33 \\
\hline 10.6 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 5.25 & 0.36 & 5.61 \\
\hline 10.7 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 5.50 & 0.40 & 5.00 \\
\hline 10.8 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 5.75 & 0.44 & 6.19 \\
\hline 10.8 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 6.00 & 0.48 & 8.48 \\
\hline 11.0 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 6.25 & 0.52 & 6.77 \\
\hline 11.1 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 6.50 & 0.56 & 7.06 \\
\hline 11.2 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 6.75 & 0.60 & 7.35 \\
\hline 11.3 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.00 & 0.65 & 7.65 \\
\hline 11.4 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.25 & 0.60 & 7.94 \\
\hline 11.5 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.50 & 0.74 & 8.24 \\
\hline 11.6 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 7.75 & 0.79 & 8.54 \\
\hline 11.7 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 8.00 & 0.84 & 8.84 \\
\hline 11.8 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 8.25 & 0.90 & 9.15 \\
\hline 11.8 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 8.50 & 0.95 & 9.45 \\
\hline 12.0 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 8.75 & 1.01 & 9.76 \\
\hline 12.1 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.01 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 9.00 & 1.07 & 10.08 \\
\hline 12.2 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.03 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 9.25 & 1.13 & 10.41 \\
\hline 12.3 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.07 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 9.50 & 1.18 & 10.76 \\
\hline 12.4 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.13 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 9.75 & 1.25 & 11.13 \\
\hline 12.5 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.20 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 10.00 & 1.32 & 11.52 \\
\hline 12.6 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.29 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 10.25 & 1.39 & 11.93 \\
\hline 12.7 & 0.00 & 0.02 & 0.00 & 0.40 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 10.50 & 1.45 & 12.37 \\
\hline 12.8 & 0.00 & 0.03 & 0.00 & 0.52 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 10.75 & 1.52 & 12.82 \\
\hline 12.8 & 0.00 & 0.06 & 0.00 & 0.66 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 11.00 & 1.58 & 13.30 \\
\hline 13.0 & 0.00 & 0.10 & 0.00 & 0.81 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 11.25 & 1.65 & 13.81 \\
\hline 13.1 & 0.00 & 0.14 & 0.00 & 0.98 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 11.50 & 1.72 & 14.34 \\
\hline 13.2 & 0.00 & 0.19 & 0.00 & 1.17 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 11.75 & 1.78 & 14.90 \\
\hline 13.3 & 0.00 & 0.25 & 0.04 & 1.37 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 12.00 & 1.85 & 15.48 \\
\hline 13.4 & 0.00 & 0.31 & 0.02 & 1.59 & 0,00 & 0.00 & 12.25 & 1.93 & 10.09 \\
\hline 13.5 & 0.00 & 0.39 & 0.02 & 1.83 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 12.50 & 1.98 & 16.72 \\
\hline 13.6 & 0.00 & 0.47 & 0.04 & 2.08 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 12.75 & 2.05 & 17.38 \\
\hline 13.7 & 0.00 & 0.56 & 0.05 & 2.35 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 13.00 & 2.11 & 18.07 \\
\hline 13.8 & 0.00 & 0.65 & 0.06 & 2.63 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 13.25 & 2.18 & 18.78 \\
\hline 13.9 & 0.00 & 0.76 & 0.08 & 2.93 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 13.50 & 2.24 & 19.52 \\
\hline 14.0 & 0.00 & 0.87 & 0.10 & 3.25 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 13.75 & 2.31 & 20.28 \\
\hline 14.1 & 0.00 & 0.89 & 0.12 & 3.57 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 14.00 & 2.38 & 21.06 \\
\hline 14.2 & 0.00 & 1.10 & 0.14 & 3.90 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 14.25 & 2.44 & 21.83 \\
\hline 14.3 & 0.00 & 1.22 & 0.16 & 4.22 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 14.50 & 2.51 & 22.61 \\
\hline 14.4 & 0.00 & 1.33 & 0.18 & 4.55 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 14.75 & 2.57 & 23.39 \\
\hline 14.5 & 0.00 & 1.45 & 0.20 & 4.87 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 15.00 & 2.64 & 24.16 \\
\hline 14.6 & 0.00 & 1.57 & 0.22 & 5.20 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 15.25 & 2.71 & 24.84 \\
\hline 14.7 & 0.00 & 1.88 & 0.24 & 5.52 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 15.50 & 2.77 & 25.72 \\
\hline 14.8 & 0.00 & 1.80 & 0.26 & 5.85 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 15.75 & 2.84 & 28.50 \\
\hline 14.9 & 0.00 & 1.91 & 0.28 & 6.17 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 46.00 & 2.90 & 27.27 \\
\hline 15.0 & 0.00 & 2.03 & 0.30 & 6.50 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 16.25 & 2.97 & 28.05 \\
\hline 15.1 & 0.00 & 2.15 & 0.32 & 6.82 & 0.00 & 0,00 & 16.50 & 3.04 & 28.83 \\
\hline 15.2 & 0.00 & 2.26 & 0.34 & 7.15 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 18.75 & 3.10 & 29.60 \\
\hline 15.3 & 0.00 & 2.38 & 0.36 & 7.47 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 17.00 & 3.17 & 30.38 \\
\hline 15.4 & 0.00 & 2.49 & 0.38 & 7.80 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 17.25 & 3.23 & 31.16 \\
\hline 15.5 & 0.00 & 2.61 & 0.40 & 8.12 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 17.50 & 3,30 & 31.83 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
© 1999 David W. Hamtis, P.E.

Project Name: Lake Worth 10 Acres
Reviewer: DWH
Project Number: 6156
Period Begin: Jan 01, 2000;0000 hx End: Jan 05, 2000;0000 hr Duration: 96 hr
Time Step: 0.2 hr Iterations: 10

Basin 1: main
Method: Santa Barbara Unit Hydrograph
Rainfall Distribution: SFWMD - 3day
Design Erequency: 10 year
3 Day Rainfall: 10.2 inches
Area: 9.80999 acres
Ground Storage: 1.37 inches
Time of Concentration: 1 hours
Initial Stage: 8.5 ft NGVD
\begin{tabular}{c} 
Stage \\
(Et NGVD) \\
\hline 8.50 \\
10.00 \\
11.00 \\
12.00 \\
13.00
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{c} 
Storage \\
(acre-ft)
\end{tabular}
-0.00
3.94
6.77
9.76
13.81

Offsite Receiving Body: Offaitel
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Time & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Stage \\
(hr)
\end{tabular} \\
\hdashline 0.00 & 8.50 \\
120.00 & 8.50
\end{tabular}

Structure: 1
```

From Basin: main
To Basin: Offsitel
Structure Type: Gravity
Weir: Sharp Crested, Crest Elev = 10.8 ft NGVD, Length = 3 ft
Bleeder: Circular, Invert Elev = 8.5 ft NGVD, Diameter = 0.31 ft
Default Coefs: Weir Coef =0.6, Orifice Coef =0.6
Pipe: Diameter = 1.25 ft, Manning's n =0.024, Length = 90 ft
US Invert Elev = 6 ft NGVD, DS Invert Elev = 6 ft NGVD, flap gate

```
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Time } \\
& \text { (hx) }
\end{aligned}
\] & Cumulative Rainfali (in) & Instant Runoff (cfs) & Current Discharge (cfis) & Cumulative Discharge (acre-ft) & Head Water Stage (ft NGVD) & Tail Water Stage (ft NGVD) \\
\hline 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 8.50 & 8.50 \\
\hline 2.00 & 0.09 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 8.50 & 8.50 \\
\hline 4.00 & 0.18 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 8.50 & 8.50 \\
\hline 6.00 & 0.27 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 8.50 & 8.50 \\
\hline 8.00 & 0.37 & 0.03 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 8.50 & 8.50 \\
\hline 10.00 & 0.46 & 0.08 & 0.00 & 0.00 & B. 50 & 8.50 \\
\hline 12.00 & 0.55 & 0.12 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 8.51 & 8.50 \\
\hline 14.00 & 0.64 & 0.15 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 8.52 & 8.50 \\
\hline 16.00 & 0.73 & 0.18 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 8.53 & 8.50 \\
\hline 18.00 & 0.82 & 0.21 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 8.54 & 8.50 \\
\hline 20.00 & 0.91 & 0.23 & 0.01 & 0.00 & 8.56 & 8.50 \\
\hline 22.00 & 1.00 & 0.25 & 0.01 & 0.00 & 8.57 & 8.50 \\
\hline 24.00 & 1.10 & 0.27 & 0.01 & 0.00 & 8.59 & 8.50 \\
\hline 26.00 & 1.23 & 0.40 & 0.02 & 0.01 & 8.61 & 8.50 \\
\hline 28.00 & 1.36 & 0.44 & 0.03 & 0.01 & 8.63 & B. 50 \\
\hline 30.00 & 1.50 & 0.46 & 0.04 & 0.02 & 8.66 & 8.50 \\
\hline 32.00 & 1.63 & 0.48 & 0.06 & 0.03 & 8.68 & 8.50 \\
\hline 34.00 & 1.76 & 0.50 & 0.08 & 0.04 & 8.71 & 8.50 \\
\hline 36.00 & 1.90 & 0.51 & 0.09 & 0.05 & 8.74 & 8.50 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Cascade 2001 Version 1.0


STRUCTURE MAXIMUM AND MINIMUM DISCHARGES
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Struc & Max (cfs) & Time (hr) & Min (cfs) & Time ( hr ) \\
\hline 1 & 0.53 & 72.60 & 0.00 & 0.00 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

BASIN MAXIMUM AND MINIMUM STAGES
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Basin & Max (ft) & Time ( hr ) & Min (ft) & Time (hr) \\
\hline main & 10.78 & 72.60 & 8.50 & 0.00 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

BASIN WATER BUDGETS (all units in acre-ft)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Basin & \begin{tabular}{l}
Total \\
Runoff
\end{tabular} & Structure Inflow & Structure Outflow & \begin{tabular}{l}
Initial \\
Storage
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
Final \\
Storage
\end{tabular} & Residual \\
\hline main & 7.13 & 0.00 & 1.92 & 0.00 & 5.21 & 0.00 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}




APPENDIX E: CONSERVATION EASEMENT \& SFWMD RELEASE OF CONSERVATION EASEMENT

CEN 20140070763
OR BK 26636 PG 0070 RECORDED \(92 / 27 / 2014\) 13:14:45 Pale Beach County, Florida Sharon R. Bock, CLERK \& COMPTROLLER Pga 0070 - 72; (3pge)

\section*{SHUTHIGKIGA WATER MANAGFME AT DISTRICT}

\section*{Release of Conservation Easement}

This Release of Conservation Easement ("Release") is made this
day of \(\qquad\) . 20 \(\qquad\) by the South Florida Water Management District (District) having an address of 3301 Gun Club Road, West Palm Beach, Florida 33406, and a mailing address of Post Office Box 24680, West Pain Beach, Florida 33416-4680.

WITNESSETH:

Whereas, LW Industrial, LLC \(\qquad\) granted in favor of the District that certain Deed of Conservation Easement dated \(03 / 01 / 2010\) , and rec vial Record Book 23717 \(\qquad\) at Page 0608 of the fou County, Florida (hereinafter referred to as the "Conservation Easement") encumbering the real property described on Exhibit "A" attached hereto and made apart hereof (hereinafter referred to as the "Conservation Easement"); and

WHEREAS, the District has been requested to release the Conservation Easement, and
WHEREAS, the Conservation Easement may be released to the underlying fee owner, and

WHEREAS, the District is amenable to releasing the Conservation Easement.
NOW, THEREFORE, for good and valuable consideration, the adequacy and receipt of which is hereby acknowledged, the District hereby discharges, terminates and releases the Conservation Easement.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the South Florida Water Management District has caused this Release of Conservation Easement to be executed in its name and its official seal affixed hereto by its Governing Board on this \(\qquad\) day of Easement to be executed in its name


SOUTH FLORIDA WATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICT, BY ITS GOVERNING BOARD
(Corporate Seal)
ATTEST:


Legal form approved Office of Counsel, April 2007 STATE OF FLQRIDA Beach
COUNTY OF PG M

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this

\(\qquad\) \(20 \stackrel{1}{2}_{3}\).by Dan \()^{i f}\) en \(f\) en of Florida, on behalf of the corporation, who is personally known to me.


Form 1272 (042007)
\[
\text { Page } 1 \text { of } 3
\]


STATE OF FLORIDA cOUNTY OF Broward
\(\qquad\) identification.


Notary Public Bucurm antis


Form 1272 (04/2007)

Legal Description For Proposed Conservation Easement
A PORTION OF TRACT 66, "MODEL LAND CO. SUBDIVISION OF SECTION 20, TOWNSHIP 44 SOUTH RANGE 43 EAST", ACCORDING TO THE MAP OR PLAT THEROF, AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 5 PAGE 79, OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

COMMENCE AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF THE NORTH 210.81 FEET OF TRACT 81 OF THE AFOREMENTIONED PLAT; THENCE NORTH 23 DEGREES 12 MINUTES 47 SECONDS EAST ALONG THE WESTERLY BOUNDARY LINE OF SAID TRACT 81 AND TRACT 66, AND THE EASTERLY RIGHT OF WAY OF E-4 CANAL 428.41 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 66 DEGREES 47 MINUTES 13 SECONDS EAST 20.00 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING; THENCE NORTH 23 DEGREES 12 MINUTES 47 SECONDS EAST ALONG A LINE 20.00 FEET EASTERLY OF AND PARALLEL WITH AS MEASURED AT RIGHT ANGLES TO THE WESTERLY BOUNDARY OF SAID TRACT 66 AND THE EASTERLY RIGHT OF WAY OF E-4 CANAL 482.37 FEET TO A POINT OF CURVATURE: THENCE 11.99 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CURVE TO THE RIGHT, SAID CURVE HAVING A RADIUS OF 10.00 FEET, A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 68 DEGREES 40 MINUTES 44 SECONDS, A CHORD OF 11.28 FEET, A CHORD BEARING OF NORTH 57 DEGREES 33 MINUTES 09 SECONDS EAST: THENCE SOUTH 88 DEGREES 04 MINUTES 52 SECONDS EAST 81.87 FEET TO POINT 20.04 FEET SOUTH OF THE NORTH BOUNDARY LINE OF SAID TRACT 66; THENCE SOUTH 01 DEGREES 27 MINUTES 02 SECONDS WEST 19.96 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 38 DEGREES 10 MINUTES 14 SECONDS EAST 7.84 FEET: THENCE SOUTH 01 DEGREE 27 MINUTES 02 SECONDS WEST 440.24 FEET TO A POINT OF CURVATURE; THENCE 78.93 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CURVE TO THE RIGHT, SAID CURVE HAVING A RADIUS OF 50.00 FEET, A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 90 DEGREES 27 MINUTES 08 SECONDS, A CHORD OF 70.99 FEET, A CHORD BEARING OF SOUTH 46 DEGREES 40 SECONDS 36 MINUTES WEST TO A POINT OF TANGENCY; THENCE NORTH 88 DEGREES 05 MINUTES 50 SECONDS WEST 148.22 FEET TO A POINT OF CURVATURE; THENCE 54.43 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CURVE TO THE RIGHT, SAID CURVE HAVING A RADIUS OF 50.00 FEET, A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 62 DEGREES 22 MINUTES 17 SECONDS, A CHORD OF 51.78 FEET, A CHORD BEARING OF NORTH 56 DEGREES 54 MINUTES 41 SECONDS WEST TO A POINT OF TANGENCY; THENCE NORTH 25 DEGREES 43 MINUTES 33 SECONDS WEST 30.21 FEET; THENCE NORTH 66 DEGREES 47 MINUTES 13 SECONDS WEST 20.00 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING. SAID LANDS BEING AND SITUATE IN THE CITY OF LAKE WORTH, PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA. CONTAINING \(98,149.63\) SQUARE FEET, 2.25 ACRES MORE OR LESS.

BEARINGS MENTIONED ARE BASED ON PLAT MERIDIAN: CENTERLINE OF \(7^{\text {th }}\) AVENUE NORTH \(=\) SOUTH 88 DEGREES 07 MINUTES 00 SECONDS EAST.


\section*{SOIJTH FLORIDA WATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICT}

\section*{deedof conservation Easement}

Return recorded document to:so
South Florida Water Managemert fistict
3301 Gun Club Road, MSC 4210
West Palm Beach, FL 33406

THIS DEED OF CQNSERVATION EASEMENT is given this

LW INDUSTRIAL, LLC
10th of of
mailing
("Granior")
whose
is
720 SW 75 TERRACE
PLANTATION, FL 33317 "Grantor" shall include any and all heirs, successors or assigns of the Grantor, and all subsequent owners of the "Property" (as hereinatter defined) and the term "Grantee" shall include any successor or assignee of Grantee.

\section*{WITNESSETH}

WHEREAS, the Grantor is the owner of certain lands situated in Paim Beach County, Florida, and more specifically described in Exhibit " \(A\) " attached hereto and incorporated herein ("Property"); and

WHEREAS, the Grantor desires to construct Lake Worth 10 Acrec ("Project") at a site in fain Beach County, which is subject to the regulatory jurisdiction of South Florida Water Management District ("District"); and

WHEREAS, District Permit No. \(50-09006-\mathrm{P}\) ("Permit") authorizes certain activities which affect waters in or of the State of Florida; and
\(\Delta^{\circ}\)
WHEREAS, this Permit requires that the Grantor preserve, enhance, restore and/or mitigate wettands and/or uplands under the District's jurisdiction; and

WHEREAS, the Grantor, in consideration of the consent granted by the Permit, is agreeable to Grainting and securing to the Grantee a perpetual Conservation Easement as defined in Section 704.06, Florida Statutes, over the area described on Exhibit "B" ("Conservation Easement").

NOW, THEREFRRE, in consideration of the issuance of the Permit to construct and operate the pernfited activity, and as an inducement to Grantee in issuing the Permit, together with other good and valuable consideration, the adequacy and receipt of which are hereby acknonfedged, Grantor hereby grants, creates, and establishes a perpetual Conservation Easciment for and in favor of the Grantee upon the property described on Exhibit "B" whichishall run with the land and be binding upon the Grantor, and shall remain in full force ange effect forever.

The scope, nature, and character of this Conservation Easement shall be as follows:
1. Recitala. The recitals hereinabove set forth are true and correct and are hereby incorporated into and made a part of this Conservation Easement.
2. Purpose. It is the purpose of this Conservation Easement to retain land or water areas in their natural, vegetative, hydrologic, scanic, open, agricultural or wooded condition and to retain such arsas as suitable habitat for fish, plants or wildlife. Those wettand and/or upland areas included in this Conservation Easement which are to be enhanced or created pursuant to the Permit shall be retained and maintained in the enhanced or created conditions required by the Permit.

To carry out this purpose, the following rights are conveyed to Grantee by this easement:
a. To enter upon the Property at reasonable times with any necessary equipment or vehicles to enforce the rights herein granted in a manner that will not unreasonably interfere whth the use and quiet enjoyment of the Property by Grantor at the time of such entry, and
b. To enjoin any activity on or use of the Property that is inconsistent with.this Conservation Easement and to enforce the restoration of such areas or features of the Conservation Easement that may be damaged by any inconsistent activity or use.
3. Prohibited Uses. Except for restoration, creation, enhancement, maintenance and monitoring activities, or surface water management improvements, or other activities described herein that are permitted or required by the Permit, the following activities are prohibited in or on the Conservation Easement:

Construction or placing of buildings, roads, signs, billboards or other advertising, utilities, or other structures on or above the ground;

Dumping or placing of soil or other substance or material as landfill, or dumping or plicing of trash, waste, or unsighty or offensive materials;
c. Removal or destruction of trees, shrubs, or other vegetation, except for the removal of exatic or nuisance vagetation in accordance with a District approved maintenance plan;
d. Excelvation, dredging, or removal of loam, peat, gravel, soil, rock, or other material substance insith manner as to affect the surface;
e. Surface (4) except for purposes that permit the land or water area to remain in the natural or enhancerodeondition;
f. Activities deffiriantal to drainege, flood control, water conservation, erosion control, soll conservation, of finh and willifie habitat preservation including, but not limited to, ditching, diking and fencipe 5 .
g. Acts or uses detrimental to such aforementioned retention of land or water areas;
h. Acts or uses which are detrimental to the preservation of the structural integrity or physical appearance of sites or properties having historical, archaeological, or cultural significance.
4. Grantor's Reserved Rights. Grantor reserves all rights as owner of the Property, including the right to engage in uses of the Property that are not prohibited herein and which are not inconsistent with any District rule, criteria, permit and the intent and purposes of this Conservation Easement.
5. No Dedication, No right of access by the general public. to any portion of the Property is conveyed by this Conservation Easement.
6. Grantoe's Liablility. Grantes shall not be responsible for any costs or liabilities related to the operation, upkeep or maintenance of the Property.
7. Property Taxes. Grantor shall keep the payment of taxes and assessments on the Easement Parcel current and shall not allow any lien on the Easement Parced superior to this Easement. In the event Grantor fails to extinguish or obtain a subordination of such lien, in addltion to any other remedy, the Grantoe may, but shall not be obligated to, elect to pay the lien on behalf of the Grantor and Grantor shall reimburse Grantee for the amount paid by the Grantee, together with Grantee's reasonable attorney's fees and costs, with interest at the maximum rate allowed by law, no later than thirty days after such payment. In the event the Grantor does not so reimburse the Grantee, the debt owed to Grantee shall constitute a lien against the Easement Parcel which shall automatically relate back to the recording date of this

Easemen \({ }^{\circ}\) Grantee may foreclose this lien on the Easement Parcel in the manner provided for mortgages on real property.
8. 8. Eiforcement Enforcement of the terms, provisions and restrictions of this Conservation Easement shall be at the reasonable discration of Grantee, and any forbearance on behalf of Grantee to exercise its rights hereunder in the event of any breach hereof byGrantor, shall not be deemed or construed to be a waiver of Grantee's rights hereunder.
9. Assignman, Grantee will hold this Conservation Easement exclusively for conservation purposes? srantee will not assign its rights and obligations under this Conservation Easement axcopt to another organization or entity qualified to hold such interests under the applicatale state laws.
10. Severability, 1 (and provision of this Conservation Easement or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is found to be invalid, the remainder of the provisions of this Conservalition Easement shall not be affected thereby, as long as the purpose of the Conservation Hasement is preserved.
11. Terms and Restrictions, Grantor shall insert the terms and restrictions of this Conservation Easement in any subsequent deed or other legal instrument by which Grantor divests itself of any Interest in the Conservation Easement.
12. Writen Notice, All notices, consents, approvals or other communications hereunder shall be in writing and shall be deemed property given if sent by United States certified mail, return receipt requested, addressed to the appropriate party or successor-in-interest.
13. Modifications. This Conservation Easement may be amended, altered, released or revoked only by written agreement between the parties hereto or their heirs, assigns or successors-in-interest, which shall be filed in the public records in County.

TO HAVE AND TO HOLD unto Grantee forever. The covenants, terms, conditions, restrictions and purposes imposed with this Conservation Easement shall be binding upon Grantor, and shall continue as a servitude runring in perpetulty with the Property.

Grantor hereby covenants with said Grantee that Grantor is lawfully selzed of said Property in fee simple; that the Conservation Easement is free and clear of all encumbrances that are inconsistent with the terms of this Conservation Easement; and all mortgages and liens on the Conservation Easement area, if any, have been subordinated to this Conservation Easement; and that Grantor has good right and tawful authority to convey this Conservation Easement; and that it hereby fully warrants and defonds the fifte to the Conservation Easement hereby conveyed against the lawful claims of all persons whomsoever.


LW) InAPNSTRIAL GLC
(Granter) has hereunto set its authorized hand this \(\qquad\) day of

\(\qquad\) .2010 \(\qquad\) .
LW Tr
a Florida corporation IREAALLC

By :
(Signature)

\section*{(Print)}

Title: ReGistered Ament
Signed, sealed and delivered in our presence as witnesses.

By:


Name: TINA Becker.

\section*{STATE OF FLORIDA}

On this \(26^{\text {th }}\) day of Feb. . 2010 before me, the undersigned notary public, personally appeared Bill Cuthbertson. , the person who subscribed to the foregoing instrument, as the registered agent (title), of LW Industrial LIe (corporation), a Florida corporation, and acknowledged that he/she executed the same on behalf of said corporation and the he/she was duly authorized to do so. He/She is personally known to mg or has produced a \(\qquad\) (state) diver's license as identification.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I hereunto set my hand and official seal.
NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE OF FLORIDA



\section*{HORTGAGEE JONNDER, CONSENT AND SUBORDINATION}

For Ton Dollars ( \(\$ 10.00\) ) and other good and valuable consideration, the adequacy rend recaipt of which are hereby acknowledged,
the owner and holtier of a mortyage dated
in the original principal amount of \(\$\), given
by
("Grantor") to
("Mortgagee"), encumbering ithe real property described on Exhibit "A" attached hereto
("Property"). which in recorded in Official Records Book (together with that certain Assighment of Leases and Rents recorded in Official Records' Book
and those certain UCC-1 Financing Statement(s) recorded
in Official Records Book at Page
 ( \()\), at Page
\(\qquad\) ). all of the Public Records of County, Florida (said mortgage, assignment of leases and rents, and UCC-1 Financing Statements, as modified, are hereinafter referred to as the "Mortgage"), hereby joins in, consents to and subordinates the lien of its Mortgage, as it has been, and as it may be, modified, amended and assigned from time to time, to the foregoing Conservation Easement, executed by
in favor of the South Florida Water Manegement District applicable to the Conservation' Essement, as sald Conservation Easement may be modified, amended and assigned from time to time, with the intent that the Mortgage shall be subject and subordinate to the Conservation Easement.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, this Mortpagee Joinder, Consent and Subordination is made this
day of
20
By:


Name:
(Pint)
Title:
WITNESSES:


STATE OF FLORIDA COUNTY OF
The foregoing justrument was acknowledged before me this
day by
as
(print name),
(title) Grantor of the Conservation Fifasement). He/She is personally known to me or has produced a (state) driver's license as identification.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I hereunio set my hand and official seal.

NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE OF FLOKREA
\(\xrightarrow[2]{2}\)

\section*{(3 ioneluro)}

Name:
(Pint)
My Commission Expires:


\section*{EXHIBTT A}
[DESCRIPTIOA) OF PROPERTY]
5

 LOCATION NDDRESS THTAVEENE NORTM LAKE WORTH



\section*{LEGAL DESCRIPTION FOR PROPOSED CONSERVATION EASEMENT (C)}

A PORTION OF TKAGCT 66, "MODEL LAND CO. SUBDIVISION OF SECTION 20, TOWNSHIP 44 SOUTH, RANEE 43 EAST", ACCORDING TO THE MAP OR PLAT THEREOF, AS RECORDED IN PLAT GOOKK 5, PAGE 79, OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS'OF PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

COMMENCE AT THE SOUYHWEST CORNER OF THE NORTH 210.81 FEET OF TRACT 81 OF THE AFOREMENTIONED PLAT; THENCE NORTH \(23^{\circ} 12^{\prime} 47^{\prime \prime}\) EAST ALONG THE WESTERL Y BOUNDARY LINE OF SAID TRACT 81 AND TRACT 66, AND THE EASTERLY RIGHT OF WAY OF E-4 CAMAL 428.41 FEET; THENCE SOUTH \(66^{\circ} 47^{\prime \prime} 13^{\prime \prime}\) EAST 20.00 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING, THENCE NORTH 23¹2'47" EAST ALONG A LINE 20.00 FEET EASTERLY OF AND PARILLIGL WITH AS MEASURED AT RIGHT ANGLES TO THE WESTERLY BOUNDARY OF SAIG-TPACT 66 AND THE EASTERLY RIGHT OF WAY OFE-4 CANAL 482.37 FEET TO A POINTOE CURVATURE; THENCE 11.99 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CURVE TO THE RIGHT SACOCURVE HAVING A RADIUS OF 10.00 FEET, A CENTRAL ANGLE OF \(68^{\circ} 40^{\prime} 44^{\prime \prime}\), A CHORD OF 11.28 FEET, A CHORD BEARING OF NORTH \(57^{\circ} 33^{\prime} 09^{\prime \prime}\) EAST; THENCE SOUTH \(88^{\circ} 04^{\prime \prime} 52^{\prime \prime}\) EAST' 81.87 FEET TO A POINT 20.04 FEET SOUTH OF THE NORTH BOUNDARY LINE OF SAID TRACT 66; THENCE SOUTH \(01^{\circ} 27^{\prime} 02^{\prime \prime}\) WEST 19.96 FEET; THENCE SOUTH \(38^{\circ} 10^{\prime} 14^{\prime \prime}\) EAST 7.84 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 01027'O2" WEST 440.24 FEET TO A POINT OF CURVATURE; THENCE 78.93 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CURVE TO THE RIGHT, SAID CURVE HAVING A RADIUS OF 50.00 FEET, A CENTRAL ANGLE OF \(90^{\circ} 27^{\prime} 08^{\prime \prime}\), A CHORD OF 70.99 FEET, A CHORD BEARING OF SOUTH \(46^{\circ} 40^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}\) WEST TO A POINT OF TANGENCY; THENCE NORTH \(88^{\circ} 05^{\prime} 50^{\prime \prime}\) WEST 148.22 FEET TO A POINT OF CURVATURE; THENCE 54.43 FEET ALONG THE ARC OF A CURVE TO THE RIGHT. SAID CURVE HAVING A RADIUS OF 50,00 FEET, A CENTRAL ANGLE OF \(62^{\circ} 22^{\prime} 17^{\prime}\), A CHORD OF 51.78 FEET, A CHORD BEARING OF NORTH \(56^{\circ} 54^{\prime} 41^{\prime \prime}\) WEST TO A POINT OF TANGENCY; THENCE NORTH \(25^{\circ} 43^{\prime} 33^{\prime \prime}\) WEST 30.21 FEET; THENCE NORTH \(66^{\circ} 47^{\prime} 13^{\prime \prime}\) WEST' 20.00 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING. SAID LANDS BEING AND SITUATE IN THE CITY OF LAKE WORTH, PALM BEACH COUNTY, FLORIDA. CONTAINING 98,149.63 SQUARE FEET, 2.25 ACRES MORE OR LESS.

BEARINGS MENTIONED ARE BASED ON PLAT MERIDIAN: CENTERLINE OF 7th AVENUE NORTH \(=\) SOUTH \(8807^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime}\) EAST.

PROFESSIONAL SURVEYING ANO MAPPING
LANNES \& GARCIA, INC.
LE*2008
FRANCISCOOF FASARDO PSM \# 1767 ALCAZAR AVENUE, CORAL GABLES, FLORIDA 3313
PH (3G5) B66-7809 PH (305) 866-7809 FAX (305) 550-3002

\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|}
\hline & PROPOSED CONSERVATION EASEMENT & \\
\hline DATE:03-24-2009 & PROJECT: LAKEWORTH 10ACRES & EXHIBIT:B \\
\hline DRAWN BY: Mi PIO & PREPARED FOR: LW INDUSTRIAL, LLC. & SHEET: 2 OF 3 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}



\section*{Appendix A: SFWMD - ALLOWABLE DISCHARGE FORMULAS}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Canal & Allowable Runoff & Design Frequency \\
\hline C-1 & \[
\left.Q=\frac{(112}{\sqrt{A}}+31\right) A
\] & 10 year \\
\hline C-2 & \begin{tabular}{l}
Essentially unlimited inflow by gravity connections southeast of Sunset Drive: \\
54 CSM northwest of Sunset Drive
\end{tabular} & 200 year + \\
\hline C-4 & \begin{tabular}{l}
Essentially unlimited inflow by gravity connections east \\
of S.W. \(87^{\text {th }}\) Avenue
\end{tabular} & 200 year + \\
\hline C-6 & Essentially unlimited inflow by gravity connections east of FEC Railroad & 200 year + \\
\hline C-7 & Essentially unlimited inflow by gravity connection & 100 year + \\
\hline C-8 & Essentially unlimited inflow by gravity connection & 200 year + \\
\hline C-9 & \begin{tabular}{l}
Essentially unlimited inflow by gravity connection east \\
of Red Road; 20 CSM pumped, unlimited gravity with development limitations west of Red Road or Flamingo Blvd.
\end{tabular} & 100 year + \\
\hline C-10 & & 200 year + \\
\hline C-11 & 20 CSM west of 13A;40 CSM east of 13A & \\
\hline C-12 & 90.6 CSM & 25 year \\
\hline C-13 & 75.9 CSM & 25 year \\
\hline C-14 & 69.2 CSM & 25 year \\
\hline C-15 & 70.0 CSM & 25 year \\
\hline C-16 & 62.6 CSM & 25 year \\
\hline C-17 & 62.7 CSM & 25 year \\
\hline C-18 & 41.6 CSM & 25 year \\
\hline C-19 & 57.8 CSM & \\
\hline C-23 & 31.5 CSM & 10 year \\
\hline C-24 & 30.25 CSM & 10 year \\
\hline C-25 & \[
\left.Q=\frac{(47}{\sqrt{A}}+28\right) A \text { (Under Review) }
\] & 10 year \\
\hline C-38 & 31.1 CSM (subject to restrictions of Basin Rule) & 10 year \\
\hline C-40, 41, 41A & 35.4 CSM & 10 year \\
\hline Hillsboro Canal (east of S-39) & 35 CSM & 25 year \\
\hline North New River (east of S-34) & 70.8 CSM & 25 year \\
\hline Everglades Ag. Area (all canals) & 20 CSM & 5 year \\
\hline L-28 & 11.8 CSM & \\
\hline * C-51 & 35 CSM east of Turnpike; 27 CSM west of Turnpike (subject to restrictions of Basin Rule) & 10 year \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { C-100, 100A, 100B, } \\
& 100 \mathrm{C}, 100 \mathrm{D} \text { : }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\left.Q=\frac{(104}{\sqrt{A}}+43\right) A
\] & 10 year \\
\hline C-102 & \[
\left.Q=\frac{(119}{\sqrt{A}}+25\right) A
\] & 10 year \\
\hline C-103N, C103-S & \(Q=(\underline{107}+39) A\) & 10 year \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Table 39. Summary of Peak Stage Simulation Results for 2004 and 2015 Baseline
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Sub- & & Existing Rule & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{2004 100-yr, 72-hr Event} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{2015 100-yr, 72-hr Event} \\
\hline Basin ID & Area (acres) & Peak Stage \({ }^{2}\) (ft NGVD) & Peak Stage ft NGVD & Peak Flow (cfs) & Peak Stage Diff with Rule (ft) & Peak Stage ft NGVD & Peak Flow (cfs) & Peak Stage Diff with Rule ( ft ) \\
\hline 1 & 1253 & 14.2 & 14.2 & 48 & 0.0 & 20.8 & 48 & 6.6 \\
\hline 2A & 6663 & 13.3 & - & - & - & & -- & -- \\
\hline 2B & 843 & 14.0 & 13.8 & 50 & -0.2 & 15.4 & 66 & 0.9 \\
\hline 3 & 446 & 15.8 & 15.8 & 26 & 0.0 & 16.1 & 26 & 0.3 \\
\hline 4 & 500 & 16.6 & 16.6 & 29 & 0.0 & 17.1 & 29 & 0.5 \\
\hline & 1102 & & & & & & 107 & \\
\hline 5 & 1102 & 17.7 & 17.4 & 80 & -0.3 & 18.8 & \(465^{3}\) & \\
\hline & 674 & & & & & & 67 & \\
\hline 6 & & 19.2 & 19.2 & 67 & 0.0 & 18.8 & \(673^{4}\) & -0 \\
\hline & & & & & & & 84 & \\
\hline 7 & 4109 & 19.9 & 19.9 & 226 & 0.0 & 19.2 & \(3017{ }^{5}\) & -0.7 \\
\hline 8 & 4086 & 20.8 & 20.6 & 418 & -0.2 & 20.1 & 831 & -0.7 \\
\hline 9 & 69 & 18.0 & 17.6 & 38 & -0.4 & 18.8 & 57 & 0.8 \\
\hline 10 & 190 & 18.3 & 18.3 & 17 & 0.0 & 19.2 & 61 & 0.9 \\
\hline 11 & 7975 & 19.1 & 18.9 & 1424 & -0.2 & 19.2 & 2856 & 0.1 \\
\hline 12 & 74 & 17.9 & 17.5 & 52 & -0.4 & 19.2 & 93 & 1.3 \\
\hline 13 & 10486 & 16.7 & 16.6 & 406 & -0.1 & 17.0 & 894 & 0.2 \\
\hline 14 & 9235 & - & - & - & - & 17.0 & -- & \\
\hline 15A & 5161 & 18.2 & 18.2 & 1000 & 0.0 & 18.4 & 1482 & 0.2 \\
\hline 15B & 8605 & - & - & - & - & 20.2 & \(490{ }^{6}\) & - \\
\hline 16A & 920 & 17.1 & 16.8 & 508 & -0.3 & 18.4 & 427 & 1.3 \\
\hline 16B-1 & 1988 & & & & & \(20.2^{7 a}\) & 65 & 1.2 \\
\hline 16B-2 & 57 & 19.0 & 19.0 & 58 & 0.0 & \(20.4{ }^{7 \mathrm{~b}}\) & 8 & 1.4 \\
\hline 16B-3 & 302 & & & & & \(19.9{ }^{76}\) & 74 & 0.9 \\
\hline 17 & 1795 & 16.8 & 16.1 & 126 & -0.7 & 16.1 & 615 & -0.7 \\
\hline 18 & 2309 & 16.0 & 16.6 & 534 & 0.6 & 16.1 & 446 & 0.1 \\
\hline 20A & 1011 & 16.5 & 15.7 & 431 & -0.8 & 17.6 & 203 & 0.6 \\
\hline 20B & 2168 & 17.0 & 16.8 & 750 & -0.2 & 17.1 & 706 & 0.0 \\
\hline 21A & 3535 & 17.3 & 17.3 & 0 & 0.0 & 18.0 & 0 & 0.7 \\
\hline 21B & 4915 & 17.7 & 17.7 & 143 & 0.0 & 18.2 & 177 & 0.6 \\
\hline 22 & 7580 & 17.5 & 17.5 & 527 & 0.0 & 18.1 & 703 & 0.4 \\
\hline 23 & 4049 & 17.1 & 17.1 & 849 & 0.0 & 17.4 & 921 & 0.3 \\
\hline 24 & 5204 & 17.9 & 17.9 & 602 & 0.0 & 18.0 & 1421 & 0.0 \\
\hline 25A & 299 & 14.6 & 14.6 & 449 & 0.0 & 14.1 & 761 & -0.4 \\
\hline 25B & 721 & 14.7 & 14.7 & 391 & 0.0 & 14.2 & 566 & -0.5 \\
\hline 26 & 332 & 13.8 & 13.8 & 320 & 0.0 & 14.0 & 320 & 0.2 \\
\hline 27 & 753 & 13.2 & 13.2 & 320 & 0.0 & 14.3 & 320 & 1.1 \\
\hline 28 & 201 & 12.4 & 12.3 & 428 & -0.1 & 13.1 & 394 & 0.7 \\
\hline 29A & 1394 & 14.8 & 14.8 & 474 & 0.0 & 14.3 & 1245 & -0.5 \\
\hline 29B & 566 & 15.2 & 15.2 & 830 & 0.0 & 15.0 & 770 & -0.2 \\
\hline 30 & 1121 & 14.1 & 14.1 & 268 & 0.0 & 13.5 & 679 & -0.6 \\
\hline 31 & 1433 & 13.1 & 13.1 & 670 & 0.0 & 12.7 & 1134 & -0.4 \\
\hline 32 & 1804 & 13.0 & 13.0 & 527 & 0.0 & 12.9 & 639 & -0.1 \\
\hline 33 & 2091 & 13.6 & 13.6 & 546 & 0.0 & 12.7 & 1286 & -0.9 \\
\hline & & & 17.0 & 169 & 0.0 & 12.6 & 59 & -4.4 \\
\hline 34 & 740 & 17.0 & 17.0 & 169 & 0.0 & 12.6 & \(729^{8}\) & -4.4 \\
\hline 35 & 166 & 13.0 & 13.0 & 45 & -1.7 & 13.2 & 45 & 0.2 \\
\hline 36 & 607 & 14.0 & 14.0 & 158 & 0.0 & 14.1 & 225 & 0.1 \\
\hline 37 & 399 & 16.5 & 16.4 & 108 & -0.1 & 16.5 & 140 & 0.0 \\
\hline 38 & 1812 & 17.3 & 17.2 & 151 & -0.1 & 19.0 & 165 & 1.8 \\
\hline 39 & 552 & \(14.8{ }^{9}\) & --- & ---- & --- & 13.5 & 374 & --- \\
\hline Sect24 & 403 & -- & & & -- & 17.1 & -- & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
1. 2015 Revised Sub-basins Areas
2. Peak stages from 2004 Interim Guidance Memorandum
. Overbank flow from Sub-basin S 5 to \(\mathrm{M}-2\) Canal
. Overbank flow from Sub-basin S 6 to \(\mathrm{M}-2\) Canal
5. Overbank flow from sub-basin S 7 to sub-basin \(6 \& 10\)
6. ITID off-peak release with on-peak release of 200 cfs
\(7 \mathrm{a}, 7 \mathrm{~b}, 7 \mathrm{c}\). Sub-basin 16B was sub-divided into sub-basins 16a-1, 16B-2 and 16B-3
8. Overbank flow from sub-basin 34 to C-51 Canal
9. Sub-basin 39 was part of original sub-basin 29A














\title{
BEFORE THE STATE OF FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
}

\author{
IN RE: Umdasch Real Estate USA, Ltd. \\ Umdasch Real Estate Green Reuse Site aka Former Boutwell Road Trash Dump \\ \(22097^{\text {th }}\) Avenue North, Lake Worth Beach, Florida 33461 \\ Greater Lake Worth Park of Commerce Brownfield Area \\ Brownfield Area ID: BF500901000 \\ Brownfield Site ID: BF500901001 \\ FDEP Site/Facility ID: 94292 / ERIC_15315 \\ OGC Tracking Number: 20-1471
}

\section*{BROWNFIELD SITE REHABILITATION AGREEMENT PURSUANT TO §376.80(5), Florida Statutes (F.S.)}

WHEREAS, the Brownfields Redevelopment Act was enacted to reduce public health and environmental hazards on existing commercial and industrial sites by offering incentives to encourage responsible persons to voluntarily develop and implement cleanup plans; and

WHEREAS, the Department of Environmental Protection ("Department") is the administrative agency of the State of Florida having the power and duty to protect Florida's environment and to administer and enforce the provisions of Chapters 403 and 376, F.S., and the rules promulgated thereunder, Chapters 62-777 and 62-780, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), as amended; and

WHEREAS, the Department has jurisdiction over the matters addressed in this Brownfield Site Rehabilitation Agreement ("BSRA"); and

WHEREAS, the Department has the authority, pursuant to \(\S 376.81\), F.S., to establish by rule, criteria for determining the rehabilitation program tasks that comprise a site rehabilitation program and the level at which a rehabilitation program task and a site rehabilitation program may be deemed complete;

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual covenants and agreements hereinafter contained, it is agreed as follows:

This BSRA is entered into between the Department and Umdasch Real Estate USA, Ltd., hereinafter the Person Responsible For Brownfield Site Rehabilitation ("PRFBSR") (collectively referred to as the "parties"), for the rehabilitation of a brownfield site within a designated brownfield area pursuant to §376.80(5), F.S. The Department and the PRFBSR agree to the following:

\section*{1. DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION}

The Department is the agency of the State of Florida with authority and power to enforce the provisions of Chapters 376 and 403, F.S.
2. PERSON RESPONSIBLE FOR BROWNFIELD SITE REHABILITATION

Umdasch Real Estate USA, Ltd. is the PRFBSR as defined in §376.79(15), F.S., for the real property described in the map and legal description in Attachment A (the "Brownfield Site"), incorporated herein, that has been designated by the City of Lake Worth Beach in Resolution Number 03-2009, approved on March 3, 2009, as a brownfield area as defined in \(\S 376.79(5)\), F.S. Attachment A is a composite exhibit that includes: (a) the legal description and map of the Brownfield Site; and (b) the city resolution(s) with all attachments including the map of the designated brownfield area. The brownfield site consists of 9.79 acres.

\section*{3. PRFBSR'S DUTIES}

The PRFBSR agrees:
(a) to conduct "site rehabilitation" of any "contaminated site(s)" as defined in \(\S 376.79\), F.S., whose source originates on the real property described in Attachment A as the Brownfield site. If such contaminated site(s) extend(s) beyond the boundary of the Brownfield site, then PRFBSR agrees to conduct site rehabilitation to address the entire contaminated site;
(b) to conduct site rehabilitation and submit technical reports and rehabilitation plans in a timely manner according to the attached brownfield site rehabilitation schedule agreed upon by the parties, Attachment B incorporated herein;
(c) to conduct site rehabilitation activities under the observation of professional engineers or professional geologists, as applicable, who are registered in accordance with the requirements of Chapters 471 or 492 , F.S., respectively. Submittals provided by the PRFBSR must be signed and sealed by a professional engineer registered under Chapter 471, F.S., or by a professional geologist registered under Chapter 492, F.S., as applicable, certifying that the submittal and associated work comply with the laws and rules of the Department and those governing the profession. Upon completion of the approved remedial action, a professional engineer registered under Chapter 471, F.S., or a professional geologist registered under Chapter 492, F.S., as applicable, must certify that the corrective action was, to the best of his or her knowledge, completed in substantial conformance with the plans and specifications approved by the Department;
(d) to conduct site rehabilitation in accordance with Chapter 62-160, F.A.C., as the same may be amended from time to time;
(e) to obtain any local, state or federal approvals or permits required for the site rehabilitation work and to conduct the necessary site rehabilitation consistent with local, state, and federal laws, rules and ordinances. All site rehabilitation shall be consistent with the cleanup criteria in §376.81, F.S., the requirements of Chapters 62-780, F.A.C., Contaminated Site Cleanup Criteria, and 62-777, F.A.C., Contaminant Cleanup Target Levels;
(f) to allow access by the Department during the entire site rehabilitation process, as evidenced by the attached documentation, Attachment C, incorporated herein, establishing that such site access has been secured by agreement with the real property owner. Upon the transfer of any real property interest in any portion of the Brownfield Site before site rehabilitation is complete, the PRFBSR shall notify the Department within 15 days from the date that such an interest is effective. With notice the PRFBSR shall provide a copy of an access agreement in substantially the same form as that in Attachment \(C\) with any successor in interest to the real property owner of the Brownfield Site or with any party with a real property interest in the Brownfield Site after the effective date of this agreement, granting such access to the Department; and
(g) to consider appropriate pollution prevention measures and to implement those that the PRFBSR determines are reasonable and cost-effective, taking into account the ultimate use or uses of the real property described in Attachment A. Local pollution prevention programs as well as state pollution prevention programs are available to assist in determining pollution reduction measures. The Department recommends that the PRFBSR contact the Department's Waste Reduction and Registration Program or Hazardous Waste Program and Permitting at the following websites: https://floridadep.gov/waste/wastereduction and https://floridadep.gov/waste/permitting-compliance-assistance/content/hazardous-waste-management-main-page for recommendations on waste minimization and waste management and for assistance with pollution prevention measures. Such measures may include improved inventory or production controls and procedures for preventing loss, spills, and leaks of hazardous waste and materials, and include the goals for the reduction of releases of toxic materials.

\section*{4. CERTIFICATION}

The PRFBSR, in accordance with the provisions of § 376.80(5), F.S., certifies that it has consulted with the local government with jurisdiction over the brownfield area about the proposed redevelopment of the brownfield site, that the local government is in agreement with or approves the proposed redevelopment, and that the proposed redevelopment complies with applicable laws and requirements for such
redevelopment. Documentation that supports this certification is provided as Attachment D, incorporated herein.
5. SITE CONTRACTOR

The PRFBSR must ensure that the contractor who is performing the majority of the site rehabilitation program tasks pursuant to this BSRA or supervising the performance of such tasks by licensed subcontractors in accordance with the provisions of § 489.113(9), F.S., has provided certification to the Department that the contractor meets the requirements listed below. If the identity of the contractor is known at the time of the execution of this BSRA, a Brownfields Redevelopment Program Contractor Certification Form (CCF) shall be submitted as Attachment E to this BSRA, and incorporated herein. If the contractor has not yet been determined, the PRFBSR shall ensure that the CCF is submitted to the District Brownfield Coordinator and approved by the Department before the contractor begins performing any site rehabilitation tasks at the site.

The PRFBSR must submit to the Department documentation as Attachment F, incorporated herein, which shows a National Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program ("NELAP")-recognized authority has accredited the laboratory(s) that will perform the analyses required by this agreement.

Any contractor that performs site rehabilitation tasks at a contaminated site originating on the real property as described in Attachment A shall provide documentation in accordance with the provisions of the paragraph above and with Attachments E and F, if applicable, showing that any contractor that performs site rehabilitation tasks:
(a) meets all certification and license requirements imposed by law; and
(b) performs, or has laboratory analyses performed, pursuant to NELAP certification requirements and performs, or has field sampling work performed, in accordance with the Standard Operating Procedures provided in Chapter 62-160, F.A.C., as amended, if applicable to performance of site rehabilitation tasks.

\section*{6. CONTINUOUS COMPLIANCE}

During the entire site rehabilitation process, the PRFBSR agrees to ensure that the contractor continues to comply with the requirements of Paragraph 5 of this BSRA pursuant to the requirements of \(\S 376.80(6)\), F.S.

\section*{7. VOLUNTARY CLEANUP TAX CREDIT PROGRAM}

Not all activities that are approved or performed in association with a BSRA are eligible for the state's Voluntary Cleanup Tax Credit (VCTC). In accordance with § 376.30781 , F.S., only the costs of voluntary cleanup activity incurred and paid by the applicant that are integral to site rehabilitation or for solid waste removal are eligible for the VCTC. "Site rehabilitation" as defined in §376.79(19), F.S., means the assessment of site contamination and the remediation activities that reduce the levels of contaminants at a site through accepted treatment methods to meet the cleanup target levels established for that site. "Solid waste removal" as defined in \(\S 376.30781(3)\), F.S., means removal of solid waste from the land surface or excavation of solid waste from below the land surface and removal of the solid waste from the brownfield site.

Contamination assessment or remediation paid for by the State of Florida for a discharge that is eligible for a state-funded cleanup under the Drycleaning Solvent Cleanup Program (DSCP) or one of the Petroleum Restoration Program's (PRP) eligibility programs, may not be used to calculate a tax credit. Likewise, expenses incurred that are statutorily-required to participate in the DSCP (i.e., deductibles) or one of the PRP eligibility programs (i.e., deductibles, review fees, limited contamination assessment reports, and co-payments), are not eligible for the state's VCTC. Nothing contained herein is intended to limit the VCTC otherwise available to the PRFBSR under applicable law.

General information about the VCTC Program is available at https://floridadep.gov/waste/waste-cleanup/content/voluntary-cleanup-tax-credit
For specific questions regarding the VCTC Program, please contact the Department's Waste Cleanup Program at (850) 245-8958.

\section*{8. ADVISORY COMMITTEE}

The PRFBSR shall establish an advisory committee pursuant to the requirements of \(\S 376.80(4)\), F.S., for the purpose of improving public participation and receiving public comments on rehabilitation and redevelopment of the brownfield area, future land use, local employment opportunities, community safety, and environmental justice. The advisory committee should include residents within or adjacent to the brownfield area, businesses operating within the brownfield area, and others deemed appropriate. However, if an appropriate local advisory committee already exists, this committee may be used for requesting public participation and for the purposes of complying with this paragraph.

The PRFBSR shall provide the advisory committee a copy of the final proposed draft BSRA, including attachments, and a copy of the executed BSRA. When the PRFBSR submits a site assessment report or the technical document containing the proposed course of action following site assessment to the Department or the local pollution control program for review, the PRFBSR shall hold a meeting or attend a regularly
scheduled meeting to inform the advisory committee of the findings and recommendations in the site assessment report or the technical document containing the proposed course of action following site assessment.

The names, addresses, contact information and applicable affiliation for each advisory committee member is included as Attachment G, incorporated herein.

\section*{9. INDEMNIFICATION}

The PRFBSR shall save and hold harmless and indemnify the Department against any and all liability, claims, judgments or costs of whatsoever kind and nature for injury to, or death of any person or persons and for the loss or damage to any property resulting from the use, service, operation or performance of work under the terms of this BSRA and from the negligent acts or omissions of the PRFBSR or its employees, agents, contractors, subcontractors, or other representatives, to the extent allowed by law.
10. LIABILITY PROTECTION

The liability protection provided under §376.82, F.S., shall become effective upon execution of this BSRA and shall remain effective, provided the PRFBSR complies with the terms of this BSRA.
11. TERMINATION

Pursuant to \(\S 376.80(8)\), F.S., if the PRFBSR fails to comply with this BSRA, the Department shall notify the PRFBSR and allow 90 days for the PRFBSR to return to compliance with the provision at issue or to negotiate a modification to the BSRA with the Department for good cause shown. If an imminent hazard exists, the 90-day grace period shall not apply. If the project is not returned to compliance with this BSRA and a modification cannot be negotiated, the Department may terminate this BSRA.

The PRFBSR may terminate this BSRA at any time upon written notice to the Department.

Termination of this BSRA by either party will revoke the immunity provision of §376.82, F.S.

\section*{12. IMMINENT HAZARD}

Nothing herein shall be construed to limit the authority of the Department to undertake any action in response to, or to recover the costs of responding to, conditions at or from the real property described in Attachment A that require the Department to take action to abate an imminent hazard to the public health, welfare or the environment.

Umdasch Real Estate USA, Ltd.
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\section*{13. RELEASE OF LIABILITY}

Upon successful completion of this BSRA as evidenced by the issuance of a Site Rehabilitation Completion Order (SRCO) for each contaminated site originating from the real property described in Attachment A, the PRFBSR and his or her successors and assigns, shall be relieved from further liability for site rehabilitation as described in paragraph 3.a. of this BSRA to the Department and third parties and of liability in contribution to any other party who has or may incur cleanup liability for the contaminated site(s).

This release of liability is subject to the reopener provisions of \(\S 376.82(3)\), F.S.

\section*{14. GOVERNING LAW}

This BSRA has been delivered in the State of Florida and shall be construed in accordance with the laws of Florida and any applicable local regulations. Wherever possible, each provision of this BSRA shall be interpreted in such manner as to be effective and valid under applicable law. If any provision of this BSRA shall be prohibited or invalid under applicable law, such provision shall be ineffective to the extent of such prohibition or invalidity, without invalidating the remainder of such provision or the remaining provisions of this BSRA. Any action hereon or in connection herewith shall be brought in Palm Beach County, Florida.
15. SUBMITTALS

The PRFBSR shall submit one hard (paper) copy or one electronic (digital) copy of any certifications or documentation required in Paragraph 5 ("Site Contractor") above, and all data, reports, responses, addenda, or modifications to reports and plans required by this BSRA to:

Chris Burroughs, P.G.
Southeast District Brownfields Coordinator
3301 Gun Club Road, MSC 7210-1
West Palm Beach, Florida 33406
(561) 681-6651

Chris.Burroughs@floridadep.gov
The Department encourages the submittal of documents for review in an electronic format rather than the submittal of paper copies. All electronic copies of documents shall be in the format listed in Attachment H, incorporated herein. Time frames for the Department's review of technical reports and plans and submittal of documents by the PRFBSR shall be governed by the schedule in Attachment B. After final Department approval of each report or plan, an electronic copy shall be submitted to the Department within 30 days. The electronic copy of the report shall be submitted in the format listed in Attachment \(\mathbf{H}\).
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\section*{16. DOCUMENT REVIEW}

During the site rehabilitation process, if the Department fails to complete the review of a technical document within the time frame specified in this BSRA, with the exceptions of "no further action proposals," "monitoring only proposals," and feasibility studies, which must be approved prior to implementation, the PRFBSR may proceed to the next site rehabilitation task. However, the PRFBSR does so at its own risk and may be required by the Department to complete additional work on a previous task.

\section*{17. \(\underline{\text { ASSIGNMENT }}\)}

The PRFBSR shall not assign any rights or responsibilities under this BSRA to any other party without the written consent of the Department and the local government with jurisdiction over the real property described in Attachment A. However, the Department shall not withhold its consent to such an assignment if: (a) the proposed assignee meets all of the eligibility criteria under §376.82, F.S.; (b) the proposed assignee has agreed, in writing, to assume all obligations of the PRFBSR under the terms of this BSRA; and (c) the assignment of PRFBSR obligations under any agreement with the local government with jurisdiction over the real property has been approved, in writing, by the local government.
18. WAIVER

By entering into this BSRA, the PRFBSR waives its right to challenge the contents of this BSRA in an administrative hearing afforded by §120.569 and §120.57, F.S., or an appeal afforded by the terms of \(\S 120.68\), F.S. This BSRA does not deny the PRFBSR a right to challenge the Department's actions taken pursuant to this BSRA. No delay or failure to exercise any right, power or remedy accruing to either party upon breach or default by either party under this BSRA, shall impair any such right, power or remedy of either party; nor shall such delay or failure be construed as a waiver of any such breach or default, or any similar breach or default thereafter.

\section*{19. EFFECTIVE DATE AND ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING}

This BSRA (Order) is final and effective on the date of execution unless a timely petition for an administrative hearing is filed under \(\S \S 120.569\) and 120.57, F.S., within 21 days after the date of receipt of notice of agency action. Upon the timely filing of such petition, this BSRA will not be effective until further order of the Department. The liability protection for the PRFBSR pursuant to \(\S 376.82(2)\), F.S., becomes effective upon execution of the BSRA. The procedures for petitioning a hearing are set forth below.

Please be advised that mediation of this decision pursuant to \(\S 120.573\), F.S., is not available.

\section*{How to Request an Extension of Time to File a Petition for Hearing:}

For good cause shown, pursuant to Rule 62-110.106(4), F.A.C., the Department may grant a request for an extension of time to file a petition for hearing. Such a request shall be filed with (received by) the Agency Clerk of the Department in the Office of the General Counsel at 3900 Commonwealth Boulevard, Mail Station 35, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-3000, within 21 days of receipt of this BSRA. Petitioner shall mail a copy of the request to the PRFBSR at the time of filing. Timely filing a request for an extension of time tolls the time period within which a petition for administrative hearing must be made.

\section*{How to File a Petition for Administrative Hearing:}

A person whose substantial interests are affected by this BSRA may petition for an administrative proceeding (hearing) under \(\S \S 120.569\) and 120.57, F.S. The petition must contain the information set forth below and must be filed with (received by) the Agency Clerk of the Department in the Office of the General Counsel at 3900 Commonwealth Boulevard, Mail Station 35, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-3000, within 21 days of receipt of this BSRA. Petitioner shall mail a copy of the petition to the PRFBSR at the time of filing. Failure to file a petition within this time period shall constitute a waiver of any right to request an administrative proceeding under Chapter 120, F.S.

Pursuant to §120.569(2), F.S., and Rule 28-106.201, F.A.C., a petition for administrative hearing shall contain the following information:
1. The name, address, any e-mail address, and telephone number of each petitioner; the name, address, and telephone number of the petitioner's representative, if any; the PRFBSR's name and address; the Department's Brownfield Area and Brownfield Site Identification Numbers; and the name and address of the Brownfield Site; the name and address of each agency affected;
2. A statement of when and how each petitioner received notice of the Department's action or proposed action;
3. An explanation of how each petitioner's substantial interests will be affected by the Department's action or proposed action;
4. A statement of the disputed issues of material fact, or a statement that there are no disputed facts;
5. A concise statement of the ultimate facts alleged, including the specific facts the petitioner contends warrant reversal or modification of the Department's action or proposed action;
6. A statement of the specific rules or statutes the petitioner contends require reversal or modification of the Department's action or proposed action, including an explanation of how the alleged facts relate to the specific rules or statutes; and
7. A statement of the relief sought by the petitioner, stating precisely the action petitioner wishes the Department to take with respect to the Department's action or proposed action.

Because the administrative hearing process is designed to formulate final agency action, the filing of a petition means that the Department's final action may be different from the position taken by it in this BSRA. Persons whose substantial interests will be affected by any such final decision of the Department have the right to petition to become a party to the proceeding, in accordance with the requirements set forth above.

\section*{20. JUDICIAL REVIEW}

Except for the PRFBSR, any party has the right to seek judicial review of this BSRA under §120.68, F.S., by filing a notice of appeal under Rule 9.110 of the Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure with the Agency Clerk of the Department in the Office of the General Counsel at 3900 Commonwealth Boulevard, Mail Station 35, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-3000, and by filing a copy of the notice of appeal accompanied by the applicable filing fees with the appropriate District Court of Appeal. The notice of appeal must be filed within 30 days after this BSRA is filed with the clerk of the Department (see below).

\section*{21. CONTACTS FOR GENERAL AND LEGAL QUESTIONS}

Any questions about the content of this BSRA, the Department's review of the BSRA, or technical questions should be directed to the Department's District Brownfields Coordinator referenced in Paragraph 15 of this BSRA or to the PRFBSR's representative at:

\author{
Michael R. Goldstein, Esq. \\ The Goldstein Environmental Law Firm, P.A. \\ 2100 Ponce de Leon Boulevard, Suite 710 \\ Coral Gables, Florida 33134 \\ (305) 777-1682 \\ MGoldstein@goldsteinenvlaw.com
}

Questions regarding legal issues should be referred to the Department's Brownfields Program Attorney in the Office of General Counsel at (850) 245-2242. Contact with any of the above does not constitute a petition for administrative hearing or request for an extension of time to file a petition for administrative hearing.

\section*{22. ENTIRETY OF AGREEMENT}

This BSRA represents the entire agreement of the parties. Any alterations, variations, changes, modifications or waivers of provisions of this BSRA shall only be valid when they have been reduced to writing, duly signed by each of the parties hereto, and attached to the original of this BSRA, unless otherwise provided herein.
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IN WITNESS WHEREOF, each of the parties has made and executed this Brownfield Site Rehabilitation Agreement on the date set forth for each signature of each representative below: Jason Andreotta, Director, Southeast District, State of Florida Department of Environmental Protection, and Umdasch Real Estate USA, Ltd., the Person Responsible for Brownfield Site Rehabilitation, signing by and through Michael Barrese, its Secretary, duly authorized to execute same.
\(B y:\)


Date:
12-28-2020

Approved as to form and legality:
\[
\text { Ronda Moore } \begin{aligned}
& \text { Digitally sinned by Ponda More } \\
& \text { Date: } 2020.12 .21 \\
& 13: 575: 52-05000
\end{aligned}
\]

Ronni Moore, Brownfields Program Attorney

FILING AND ACKNOWLEDGMENT FILED, on this date, pursuant to \(\S 120.52\) Florida Statutes, with the designated Department Clerk, receipt of which is hereby acknowledged.


Clerk (or Deputy Clerk)
Date: 12-28-2020
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PERSON RESPONSIBLE FOR
BROWNFIELD SITE REHABILITATION
By: Umdasch Real Estate USA, Ltd., a New Jersey corporation


Date: December 21, 2020
Address: 214 Gates Road
Little Ferry, New Jersey 07643
Phone: (201) 853-0594
cc: Kelly Crain, FDEP Brownfields Program Manager
Justin Cross, FDEP Government Analyst II, Brownfields Program
Megan Johnson, FDEP Environmental Consultant, Brownfields Program Ronni Moore, FDEP Brownfields Program Attorney
Chris Burroughs, P.G., FDEP Southeast District Brownfields Coordinator
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\section*{Attachment A}

RESOLUTION NO. 03-2009 OF THE CITY OF LAKE WORTH, FLORIDA, designating the area within the boundaries of the greater lake WORTH PARK OF COMMERCE A BROWNFIELD AREA; AND PROVIDING AN EFFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the Florida Brownfield's Redevelopment Act, Sec. 376.77 through 376.85, Fla. Stat. (2008) (the "Act") provides for local governments to designate by resolution areas consisting of one or more Brownfield sites as "Brownfield areas" for the purpose of environmental remediation, rehabilitation and economic redevelopment; and,

WHEREAS, the Lake Worth City Commission desires to designate, pursuant to the Act, the Lake Worth Park of Commerce as delineated in the attached map (Exhibit A), prepared by the City of Lake Worth Community Services Department, as a Brownfield area to secure the benefits accruing under the Act; and,

WHEREAS, the Brownfield area designation will enable property owners to voluntarily use State Brownfield Programs for environmental remediation, rehabilitation and economic development; and,

WHEREAS, the City has complied with the procedures outlined in the Act and has provided notice as required by Sec. 166.041(3)(c)(2), Florida Statutes; and

WHEREAS, the owner of property located at 1926 10th Avenue North has requested that this property not be included in the Brownfield area designation.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LAKE WORTH, FLORIDA, that,

Section 1. The recital and findings set forth in the Preamble to this Resolution are hereby adopted into and are made a part of this resolution.

Section 2. Pursuant to the Act, the area depicted in Exhibit A, featuring the area within the boundaries of the Greater Lake Worth Park of Commerce, except for the property located at 1926 10th Avenue North, attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference, is hereby designated as a Brownfield area.

Section 3. The property located at 1926 10th Avenue North, legally described as the West half of Tract 5 , less the South 20 feet thereof, SAWYER'S SUBDIVISION of the West half of Section 21, Township 44 South, Range 43 East, as recorded in Plat Book 5, Page 12, Public Records of Palm Beach County, Florida, less the West 25 feet thereof deeded to the City of Lake Worth, Florida, by instrument dated December 20, 1982, recorded January 17, 1983 in Official Record Book 3862, Page 1086, Public Records of Palm Beach County, Florida, is not included in the Brownfield area designation.

Section 4. This resolution shall become effective upon its adoption.

Pg. 2, Reso. 03-2009

Section 5. The City shall notify the Florida Department of Environmental Protection of the decision to designate the Greater Lake Worth Park of Commerce as a Brownfield area.

The passage of this Resolution on first public hearing was moved by Commissioner Jennings, seconded by Commissioner Lowe, and upon being put to a vote, the vote was as follows:

Mayor Jeff Clemens
Vice Mayor Jo-Ann Golden
Commissioner Retha Lowe
Commissioner Cara Jennings
Commissioner Suzanne Mulvehill

AYE
AYE
AYE
AYE
AYE

The Mayor thereupon declared this Resolution duly passed on first public hearing on the 17th day of February, 2009.

The passage of this Resolution on second public hearing was moved by Commissioner Jennings, seconded by Commissioner Lowe, and upon being put to a vote, the vote was as follows:
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Mayor Jeff Clemens & AYE \\
Vice Mayor Jo-Ann Golden & AYE \\
Commissioner Retha Lowe & NAY \\
Commissioner Cara Jennings & AYE \\
Commissioner Suzanne Mulvehill & AYE
\end{tabular}

The Mayor thereupon declared this Resolution duly passed and adopted on second public hearing this 3rd day of March 2009.

\section*{LAKE WORTH CITY COMMISSION}


Pg. 3, Reso. 03-2009

\section*{CITY OF LAKE WORTH LWPOC BROWNFIELD DESIGNATION}



\section*{Legal Description}

Tract 66 and the north 210.81 feet of Tract 81, "Model Land Co. Subdivision of Section 20, Township 44 South, Range 43 East", according to the map or plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 5, Page 79, of the Public Records of Palm Beach County, Florida.

\section*{Attachment B}

\section*{Attachment B \\ Table I \\ Brownfield Site Rehabilitation Schedule}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Type of Report or Activity & PRFBSR Action or Submittal Time Frames & Department Review or Comment Time frames \\
\hline Notice of Interim Source Removal Action or Emergency Response Action situations. & Within 24 hours of initiation of the action. & No comment required. \\
\hline Interim Source Removal Proposal & When seeking approval before implementation of an alternative product recovery method, groundwater recovery, soil treatment or disposal technique (see Rule 62-780.525, F.A.C.) & Within 30 days of receipt. \\
\hline Interim Source Removal Plan & When seeking approval before implementation of an alternative product recovery method, groundwater recovery, soil treatment or disposal technique (62-780.525, F.A.C.) & Within 30 days of receipt. \\
\hline Interim Source Removal Status Report & Within 60 days of completion of source removal activities and every 60 days thereafter or when the field activity is terminated, whichever occurs first. & No comment required. \\
\hline Interim Source Removal Report & Within 60 days of completion of interim source removal activities. & Within 60 days of receipt. \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Site Rehabilitation Plan (SRP) or Combined Document; (Optional submittal) \\
(See Rule 62-780.450, F.A.C.)
\end{tabular} & Optional: SRP submitted within 270 days of executing BSRA. May include multiple tasks. & Within 60 days of receipt. \\
\hline Site Assessment Report (SAR) & SAR submitted within 270 days of executing BSRA. & Within 60 days of receipt. \\
\hline Risk Assessment Report (RAR) & Optional: (within 60 days of SAR approval.) & Within 90 days of receipt. \\
\hline No Further Action (NFA) Proposal & When the site meets the criteria for NFA (See Rule 62-780.680, F.A.C.). & Within 60 days of receipt. \\
\hline Well Survey and Sampling Results pursuant to paragraph 62-780.600(3)(h), F.A.C. & Within 60 days of discovery of contamination beyond the property boundaries & Within 60 days of receipt. \\
\hline Natural Attenuation with Monitoring (NAM) Plan & When the site meets the criteria for Natural Attenuation with Monitoring (See Rule 62-780.690, F.A.C.). & Within 60 days of receipt. \\
\hline Natural Attenuation with Monitoring (NAM) Report & Within 60 days of sample collection. & No comment required. \\
\hline Remedial Action Plan (RAP) & Within 90 days of approval of a SRP, SAR or RAR. & Within 60 days of receipt. \\
\hline As-Built Drawings & Within 120 days of initiating operation of the active remediation system. & No comment required. \\
\hline Initiate Operation of Active Remedial Action & Within 120 days of RAP approval. & No comment required. \\
\hline Proposals submitted pursuant to subsection 62-780.700(14), F.A.C. & Optional during active remediation & Within 60 days of receipt \\
\hline Remedial Action Status Report (Monthly or quarterly status reports may be required for submittal -depending on site conditions and Advisory Committee.) & Within 60 days of the anniversary date of initiating operation of active remediation system. & No comment required. \\
\hline Post Active Remediation Monitoring (PARM) Plan & When the site meets the criteria for NFA (see Rule 62-780.680) or Leveling-Off [see Rule 62-780.700(18)] & Within 60 days of receipt. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Type of Report or Activity & PRFBSR Action or Submittal Time Frames & Department Review or Comment Time frames \\
\hline Post Active Remediation Monitoring (PARM) Report & Within 60 days of sample collection. & No comment required. \\
\hline Leveling Off Determination & Within 60 days of sample collection. & Within 60 days of receipt. \\
\hline Post Active Remediation Monitoring (PARM) Plan resampling proposal (Rule 62-780.750(4)(e), F.A.C. & Within 60 days of sample collection. & Within 60 days of receipt. \\
\hline Site Rehabilitation Completion Report (SRCR) & Within 60 days of the final sampling event. If SRCR not approved then submit modifications, etc., within 60 days of Department's response. & Within 60 days of receipt. If the brownfield site meets the requirements of Chapter 62-780, F.A.C., for the issuance of an SRCO, then an SRCO will be issued. \\
\hline Pilot Study Work Plan & When seeking approval before implementation of a Pilot Study pursuant to Rule 62-780.700(2), F.A.C. & Within 60 days of receipt. \\
\hline Notices for Field Activities except for Start of Interim Source Removal or Emergency Response Action situations. & Within seven (7) days but not less than 24 hours prior notice to the Department to perform field activity. & No comment required. \\
\hline Submittal to the Department of addenda, responses, or modification to plans or reports, pursuant to Chapter 62-780, F.A.C. & Within 60 days of receipt of the Department's response. & Within the same time frame for review of the original submittal. \\
\hline Submittal of Form and Actual Notice required in subsection 62-780.220(2), F.A.C. & See text of rule for "Initial Notice of Contamination Beyond Property Boundaries" in subsection 62-780.220(2), F.A.C. & No comment required. \\
\hline Submittal of Actual and Constructive Notice required in subsection 62-780.220(3), F.A.C. & See text of rule for "Subsequent Notice of Contamination Beyond Source Property Boundaries for Establishment of a Temporary Point of Compliance (TPOC)" in subsection 62-780.220(3), F.A.C. & No comment required. \\
\hline Submittal of Notice required in subsection 62-780.220(7), F.A.C. & See text of rule for requirement that PRFBSR provide notice of Department's intent to approve site closure using institutional controls, institutional and engineering controls, or alternative cleanup target levels. & No comment required. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Attachment C}

\section*{SITE ACCESS AGREEMENT \\ PERMISSION TO ENTER PROPERTY BROWNFIELDS REDEVELOPMENT PROGRAM}
1. LW Industrial, LLC the real property owner ("undersigned" or "owner"), hereby grants permission to the State of Florida, Department of Environmental Protection ("Department") and its agents and subcontractors to enter the undersigned's property ("the property") located at \(22097^{\text {th }}\) Avenue North, Lake Worth Beach, Florida 33461, Parcel Control Number 38-43-44-20-01-066-0010 as described in Attachment \(\mathbf{A}\) attached to the Brownfield Site Rehabilitation Agreement ("BSRA") for the brownfield site assigned the Brownfield Site Identification Number BF500901001, beginning on the date of execution of the BSRA and ending on such date as deemed appropriate by the Department or the successful completion of the BSRA, whichever occurs first.
2. This permission is contemplated to be used for the following activities that may be performed by the Department, its agents, representatives or subcontractors:
a. Having access to areas where contamination may exist.
b. Investigation of soil and groundwater including, but not limited to, the installation of groundwater monitoring wells, the use of geophysical equipment, the use of an auger for collection of soil and sediment samples, the logging of existing wells, videotaping, preparation of site sketches, taking photographs, any testing or sampling of groundwater, soil, surface water, sediments, air, and other materials deemed appropriate by the Department and the like.
c. Removal, treatment and/or disposal of contaminated soil and water, which may include the installation of recovery wells or other treatment systems.
3. Upon completion of the investigation, the Department will restore the property as near as practicable to its condition immediately prior to the commencement of such activities.
4. The granting of this permission by the undersigned is not intended, nor should it be construed, as an admission of liability on the part of the undersigned or the undersigned's successors and assigns for any contamination discovered on the property.
5. The Department, its agents, representatives or subcontractors may enter the property during normal business hours and may also make special arrangements to enter the property at other times after agreement from the undersigned.
6. The Department acknowledges and accepts any responsibility it may have under applicable law (Section 768.28 , Florida Statutes) for damages caused by the acts of its employees acting within the scope of their employment while on the property.
7. In exercising its access privileges, the Department will take reasonable steps not to interfere with the Owner's operations, or the remediation and redevelopment activities pursuant to the BSRA.


Signature of Real Property Owner
Print Name: Bill Cuthbertson, Registered Agent, LW Industrial, LLC
Title, if applicable Manager

12/12/2020
Date
\(\frac{12 / 12 / 2020}{\text { Date }}\)


Print Name: RYAN E. WILLITS


Site Access Agreement
Brownfield Site ID \#: BF500901001
December 12, 2020
Page 2 of 2
Accepted by the Department by the following authorized agent:


Signature of Department representative
Print Name: Jason Andreotta

\section*{District Director}

Title of Department representative
\(\frac{12-28-2020}{\text { Date }}\)
12-28-2020

Date

\section*{Attachment D}

October 5, 2020

Mr. Chris Burroughs, P.G.
Brownfield Coordinator, FDEP Southeast District
3301 Gun Club Road, MSC 7210-1
West Palm Beach, Florida 33406

\section*{Re: Brownfield Site Rehabilitation Agreement for Property Located at 2209 7 \(^{\text {th }}\) Avenue N., Lake Worth Beach, Florida 33461 (the "Subject Property"); Located in Greater Lake Worth Park of Commerce Brownfield Area, BF500901000}

Dear Mr. Burroughs:
The City of Lake Worth Beach (the "City") has been advised by Umdasch Real Estate USA, Ltd. ("Umdasch"), that it intends to enter into a Brownfield Site Rehabilitation Agreement with the Florida Department of Environmental Protection for rehabilitation and redevelopment of the Subject Property. The Subject Property is located in the Greater Lake Worth Park of Commerce Area, which the City designated as a brownfield area through Resolution Number 03-2009, approved on March 3, 2009.

Representatives for Umdasch have further advised the City that it intends to redevelop the Subject Property for uses that include the storage, repair and rental of construction equipment. The Subject Property is currently zoned I-POC with a future land use designation of Industrial and is located in an area of the City with harmonious uses. In concept, the City is supportive of this redevelopment; nevertheless, Umdasch will be required to continue working with the City to obtain all of the necessary and applicable land use, design, and construction approvals, permits, and licenses.

As of this week, representatives from DOKA have submitted a major site plan and conditional use application to the city for review and processing. It is anticipated that the application will go before the City's Planning \& Zoning Board in December for entitlement approvals.

If you have questions or require additional information, please contact William Waters, Director, at wwaters@lakeworthbeachfl.gov (561-586-1634) or Erin Fitzhugh Sita, Assistant Director at esita@lakeworthbeachfl.gov (561-586-1617).

Sincerely,


Digitally signed by William Waters Date: 2020.10.05 13:43:17-04'00'
William Waters, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP BD+C, ID DCS Director
cc: Umdasch Real Estate USA, Ltd.

\section*{Attachment E}

\section*{CONTRACTOR CERTIFICATION FORM Brownfield Redevelopment Program}

Contractor Name Langan Engineering and Environmental Services, Inc. Date: September 17. 2020
Contractor Address: 110 E Broward Blvd., Suite 1500, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301
Contact Name: Manivannan Nagaiah, P.E.
Phone No.: (954) 320-1212
Fax No.: (954) 320-2101
Brownfield Site ID \#: BF500901001
CONTRACTOR CERTIFIES BY CHECKING ALL APPROPRIATE BOXES: \(\qquad\)
1. It meets all certification and license requirements imposed by law.
2. It performs or contracts laboratory analysis pursuant to National Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program certification requirements and performs or contracts field-sampling work in accordance with the Standard Operating Procedures for Field Activities pursuant to Chapter 62-160, Florida Administrative Code.
3. It complies with all applicable OSHA regulations.

区
4. Has the capacity to perform the majority of the site rehabilitation program tasks pursuant to a brownfield site rehabilitation agreement or supervise the performance of such tasks by licensed subcontractors in accordance with Section 489.113(9), Florida Statutes (F.S.).

The person named below by signing as an "Officer of the Company" hereby certifies to the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) that the Contractor named above meets the requirements for contractors participating in the Brownfield Redevelopment Program [Section 376.80(6), F.S.]:


Signature of Officer of the Company and Date Signed


Print Name of Officer of the Company
\(\qquad\)
Title of Officer of the Company
Contractors must immediately notify the FDEP (Brownfield District Coordinator, delegated local program) of any change in the above criteria. The FDEP may order a suspension or cessation of work for failure of a contractor to maintain their required certification.

\section*{Attachment F}


\section*{Attachment G}

\title{
Advisory Committee Members
}

\author{
Ellen Smith \\ Waste Management Inc. of Florida \\ Representative of Business Operating in the Brownfield Area \\ 2700 North West 48th Street \\ Coconut Creek, FL 33073 \\ (561) 312-0000 \\ esmith13@wm.com \\ \section*{Gary Hines} \\ Business Development Board of Palm Beach County \\ Local Government Official \\ 310 Evernia street \\ West Palm Beach, FL 33401 \\ (561) 835-1008 \\ ghines@bdb.org
}

\author{
William Waters, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP BD+C, ID, SEED
}

Community Sustainability Director, City of Lake Worth Beach
Local Government Official
1900 Second Avenue North
Lake Worth Beach, FL 33461
(561) 586-1634
wwaters@lakeworthbeachfl.gov

\section*{Attachment H}

\section*{ATTACHMENT H - - FORMAT FOR SUBMITTAL OF TECHNICAL DOCUMENTS}
1. One hard copy or one electronic copy of each report or proposal and final reports shall be submitted to the Department or to the delegated local program.
2. Where an electronic format exists of the records it shall be used to transmit the data, file, report, document, map, plans, picture, record, or any other object that may be available in an electronic format. Electronic records shall be kept in industry standard non-proprietary formats: TIFF, GIF, JPEG, PDF, or in Microsoft Word, Microsoft Excel, and Microsoft Access not older than one (1) release behind the current.
3. Data requested shall be transmitted using available media such as E-mail, Compact Disc (CD), or File Transfer via an FTP site. Additional formats may be considered at the time of the request.
4. After final approval of each report, an electronic copy and one hard copy shall be submitted within 30 days.
5. The media shall include a file directory and specify the "naming convention".
(a) Final reports (any text files) must be in one of the approved formats.
(b) Site maps and surveys shall be in TIFF, JPEG or ".pdf" format.
(c) Site-specific GIS data tables shall be in Excel or text (tab delimited) format.
(d) The cover of the media shall include the Site Name, Designated Brownfield Area, Date and Type of Report(s).
(e) The left inside cover of the media should list all the files located on the media.```
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