## 23-007-TRC

Site Plan Review Staff Report


Applicant| Park Street Okeechobee, LLC Parcel Identification | 2-15-37-35-0A00-00009-0000, 2-15-37-35-0A00-00009-A000, 2-15-37-35-0A00-00010-0000


Prepared for The City of Okeechobee

## General Information

Owner: William R. Grigsby, Jr.
Applicant: Park Street Okeechobee, LLC
Primary Contact: John Herbert IV, PE, johnny@americancivilengineering.com, (407)-376-1777
Parcel Identification: 2-15-37-35-0A00-00009-0000, 2-15-37-35-0A00-00009-A000, 2-15-37-35-0A00-00010-0000

Note: For the legal description of the project or other information relating this application, please refer to the application submittal package which is available by request at City Hall and is posted on the City's website prior to the advertised public meeting at: https://www.cityofokeechobee.com/agendas.html

## Future Land Use, Zoning, and Existing Use of Subject Property

|  | Existing | Proposed |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Future Land Use | Commercial | Commercial |
| Zoning | Heavy Commercial | Heavy Commercial |
| Use of Property | Vacant | Automated Carwash |
| Acreage | 1.581 Acres (Replat, Lot 1) | 1.581 Acres |

## Future Land Use, Zoning, and Existing Use of Surrounding Properties

|  | Future Land Use | Zoning | Existing Use |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| North | Commercial | Heavy Commercial (CHV) | Vacant |
| East | Commercial | Heavy Commercial (CHV) | Vacant, proposed Culver's <br> restaurant |
| South | Commercial | Heavy Commercial (CHV) | SR-70, post office, service <br> commercial |
| West | Commercial | Heavy Commercial (CHV) | Gas station/convenience store |

## General Description

The request for consideration by the City's Technical Review Committee is an application for site plan approval of a car wash facility. A special exception application (23-002-SE) has also been submitted for approval of the car wash use in the CHV district. The subject site is Lot 1 of the recently approved Park Street Commerce Park plat (23-003-TRC). Please see application 23-003-TRC for more information related to the replat and associated infrastructure plans. The site plan includes:

- 3 vehicle entry lanes, each with a menu board for customers to select car wash options and make payment
- a $4,596 \mathrm{sq} / \mathrm{ft}$ automated carwash building
- 5 spaces intended for employees
- 19 vacuum spaces

The applicant is requesting that the TRC approve a parking reduction as part of the site plan approval. The LDC requires 31 parking spaces for the 4,596 . Staff analysis of the submitted application and plans is provided below. Areas of deficiency or concern are highlighted in yellow.

## Adequacy of Public Facilities

Potable Water and Sewer: OUA has provided a letter indicating the water and sewer plants have available remaining capacity and that any extensions or upgrades necessary due to the designs or demands of the proposed project will be at the owner's expense.

Traffic Generation: A Traffic Impact Study has been provided within the submittal package, completed for an automated car wash. The Traffic Study, which utilized ITE 11 land use code 948 and Gross Floor Area to determine the average daily trips, indicates an estimated PM peak of 33 trips, and an average 375 daily trips generated by the car wash.

Access and Internal Circulation: The site plan indicates that two access points are proposed.

- Access is provided by a cross-access easement on the eastern property boundary, providing through-access to the adjacent property, which connects to proposed NE $13^{\text {th }}$ Ave.
- Direct access to SR-70 is proposed.

One item of note is that one of the vehicle entry lanes is proposed at only 8.8 ft wide. The other two lanes are $9^{\prime}$ and $10.2^{\prime}$ wide. While $8.8^{\prime}$ is a fairly narrow lane, it is not a city code compliance issue and the travel speed should be low as vehicles approach the menu boards.

Additionally, the applicant has provided a queuing analysis with the special exception application. The analysis demonstrates that the site contains sufficient vehicle stacking capacity to accommodate peak demand without causing vehicle stacking to exceed the boundaries of the site.

## Service Vehicle Access and Egress:

A. Fire Truck

Sufficiency of fire truck access and egress to be addressed by the Fire Department.
B. Loading Zone

No Loading zones are required, and none are proposed.
C. Dumpster Location and/or Trash Collection

The site plan depicts a dumpster within a $10^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}$ enclosure with direct access via the cross access easement/roadway on the north side of the site. Sufficiency of the dumpster enclosure and location will be addressed by Okeechobee Public Works dept.

## Consistency and Compatibility with Adjacent Uses

The subject property is located in an area of the City with existing commercial uses along SR-70 which is considered one of the City's commercial corridors. The site is located with a recently platted commercial park where other commercial uses are anticipated. The proposed carwash provides a consumer service along SR-70, a Major Arterial roadway. The proposed use is consistent with the comprehensive plan and the zoning code, contingent on approval of the concurrent Special Exception Application, and is compatible with surrounding uses.

## Compliance with Land Development Code

| Regulation | Requirement | Provided |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Permitted Special Exception Uses §90-283 | Car wash is not an outright permitted use in the CHV district. However, it may be allowable special exception use. | Approval of the proposed site plan is contingent on the approval of a special exception for a car wash. |
| Minimum Lot Area §90-196(1) | 6,250 sf for all uses | 1.581 acres ( $68,868.4 \mathrm{sq} / \mathrm{ft}$ ). |
| Minimum Lot Width §90-285(1) | 50 ft | 216 ft |
| Min front yard setback §90-285(2)(a) | 20 ft to buildings; 10 ft to parking and driveway | In compliance |
| Minimum Required Side Setbacks $\S 90-285(2)(a)$ | 8 ft ; 20 ft abutting residential zoning district | In compliance |
| Minimum Required Rea Yard §90-285(2)(a) | 10'; 20' abutting a residential zoning district. | In compliance |
| Max lot coverage §90-285(3) | 50\% | 8\% proposed. |
| Max impervious surface §90-285(3) | 85\% | 60\% proposed. <br> In compliance |
| Max height §90-285(4) | 45 ft | 26 ft |
| Parking spaces location §90-511(a) | Required off-street parking and loading spaces shall be located on the same parcel as the primary use, unless approved by TRC upon submittal of written agreement to ensure continued availability | In compliance |


| Min parking space dimensions §90-511(b) | $9^{\prime}$ by $20{ }^{\prime}$ | All spaces meet minimum $9^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}$ dimensions. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Loading Space Requirements §90-511(c) | Minimum $10^{\prime}$ wide by $30^{\prime}$ long with $14^{\prime}$ vertical clearance | No loading spaces required, none proposed |
| Min parking access width $\S 90-511(\mathrm{~d})(2)$ | a. Parking spaces between $75^{\circ}$ and $90^{\circ}$ to the driveway: $24^{\prime}$ <br> b. Parking spaces angled from $60^{\circ}$ up to but not including $75^{\circ}$ to the driveway: 20' <br> c. Parking spaces any other angle to the driveway: $16^{\prime}$ | Parking aisles $24^{\prime}$ wide for 90 degree parking and two-way access. |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Paving } \\ & \S 90-511(\mathrm{e})(1) \end{aligned}$ | Each parking and loading space shall be paved | Access from SR-70 and cross access paved with asphalt. Remainder of site paved with concrete |
| Parking and loading space layout §90-511(e)(2) | Each parking space shall be designed to permit access without moving another vehicle. | In compliance |
| Parking and loading space layout §90-511(e)(3) | Buildings, parking and loading areas, landscaping and open spaces shall be designed so that pedestrians moving between parking areas and buildings are not unreasonably exposed to vehicular traffic hazards. | In compliance |
| Parking and loading space layout §90-511(e)(4) | Paved pedestrian walks shall be provided along the lines of the most intense use, particularly between building entrances to streets, parking areas, and adjacent buildings. | In compliance |
| Parking and loading space layout §90-511(e)(6) | For new construction, no parking space accessed via a driveway from a public road shall be located closer than 20 feet from the right-of-way line of said public road. | In compliance |
| Min number of parking spaces §90-512(2) | 1 space per $150 \mathrm{sq} / \mathrm{ft}$ of floor area $4,596 / 150=31$ | 19 vacuum spaces and 5 employee spaces proposed for total of 24 spaces <br> Applicant is requesting parking reduction per 90-483 |
| Parking Reduction Requests §90-483 | Applicants that submit site plans for review by the technical review committee may request approval of parking reduction concurrently with site plan approval | Applicant has provided examples of other car washes throughout the state, identifying number of spaces at each site. No other information (i.e. facility dimensions or operational |


|  | Applicants shall demonstrate that the <br> parking reduction request is <br> appropriate, justified and in the public <br> interest | metrics) are provided. <br> Additionally, the requested <br> reduction exceeds the amount <br> allowed per city code. The |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Landscaping Requirements for Parking and Vehicular Use Areas §90-533(4) | A minimum two feet of landscaping shall be required between vehicular use areas and on-site buildings and structures, except at points of ingress and egress. | 8.4' buffer provided |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Landscaping Requirements for Parking and Vehicular Use Areas §90-533(5) | The minimum dimension for any required landscaped area within a parking or vehicular use area shall be four feet except for that adjacent to on-site buildings and structures. | In compliance |
| Landscaping Requirements for Parking and Vehicular Use Areas §90-533(6) | A landscaped island, minimum five feet by 15 feet and containing at least one tree, shall be required for every ten parking spaces with a maximum of 12 uninterrupted parking spaces in a row. | 15 uninterrupted spaces proposed. |
| Landscaping Requirements for Parking and Vehicular Use Areas §90-533(7) | The remainder of a parking landscape area shall be landscaped with grass, ground cover, or other landscape material. | Bahia sod proposed for all disturbed areas |
| Landscape buffer areas §90-534(1) | Minimum width of buffer along street frontage shall be ten feet and on other property lines, two feet. | In compliance |
| Landscape buffer areas §90-534(2) | At least 1 tree and 3 shrubs for each $300 \mathrm{sq} / \mathrm{ft}$ of required landscaped buffer <br> 216 linear ft of north property line requires 432 sf of landscaped area with 2 trees and 5 shrubs <br> 295 linear ft of non-driveway east property line requires 590 sf of landscaped area with 2 trees and 6 shrubs <br> 192 linear ft of non-driveway frontage on SR70 requires 1,920 sf of landscaped area with 7 trees and 19 shrubs <br> 319 linear ft of west property line requires 638 sf of landscaped area with 2 trees and 7 shrubs | 4 trees and 6 bushes <br> 4 trees and 23 bushes <br> 7 trees and 24 bushes <br> 6 trees and 6 bushes |
| Landscape buffer areas §90-534(3) | Trees may be planted in clusters, but shall not exceed $50^{\prime}$ on centers abutting the street | In compliance |


| Landscape buffer areas §90-534(4) | The remainder of a landscape buffer shall be landscaped with grass, ground cover, or other landscape material. | Bahia sod proposed for all disturbed areas |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Landscape design and plan §90-538(a) | Proposed development, vehicular and pedestrian circulation systems, and site drainage shall be integrated into the landscaping plan. | In compliance |
| Landscape design and plan §90-538(b) | Existing native vegetation shall be preserved where feasible, and may be used in calculations to meet these landscaping requirements. | Native vegetation is not preserved on the proposed landscape plan. |
| Species diversification §90-538(c) | When more than ten trees are required to be planted, two or more species shall be used. | 4 tree species proposed. |
| Tree spacing from utility structures §90-538(d) | Trees and shrubs shall not be planted in a location where at their maturity they would interfere with utility services | In compliance |
| Landscape design and plan §90-538(e) | Trees should maximize the shading of pedestrian walks and parking spaces. | In compliance |
| Landscape design and plan $\S 90-538(f)$ | Landscaping ground covers should be used to aid soil stabilization and prevent erosion. | Bahia sod proposed for all disturbed areas |
| Landscape design and plan §90-538(g) | Landscaping shall be protected from vehicular encroachment by means of curbs, wheel stops, walks or similar barriers. | In compliance |
| Drought tolerance §90-540(b) | At least 75 percent of the total number of plants required shall be state native very drought tolerant species as listed in the South Florida Water Management District Xeriscape Plant Guide. However, when a landscape irrigation system is installed, at least 75 percent or the total number of plants required shall be state native moderate or very drought tolerant species. | In compliance |
| Min tree size §90-540(c) | Trees shall be at least ten feet high and two inches in diameter measured four feet above ground level at the time of planting. | In compliance |
| Utility Corridor Requirements §90-543(b) | No tree shall be planted where it could, at mature height, conflict with overhead utility lines. Larger trees (trees with a mature height of 30 feet | In compliance |


|  | or more) shall be planted no closer <br> than a horizontal distance of 30 feet <br> from the nearest overhead utility line. <br> Medium trees (trees with a height of <br> 20 to 30 feet) shall be offset at least 20 <br> feet horizontally from the nearest <br> overhead utility line. Small trees (trees <br> with a mature height of less than 20 <br> feet) shall not be required to meet a <br> minimum offset, except that no tree, <br> regardless of size shall be planted <br> within five feet of any existing or <br> proposed utility implement. |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sidewalks shall be provided along <br> each right-of-way. | The site plan indicates a <br> proposed pedestrian walkway <br> connecting the subject property |  |
| Sidewalks <br> §8-36 | Pedestrian access shall be provided <br> from the development to the ROW <br> facilities. | to the existing sidewalk, which is <br> in the ROW. |

## Recommendation

Based on the foregoing analysis, we recommend approval with the following conditions:

1. Plans must be consistent with final plat approval and all conditions of that approval.
2. Provide at least 25 parking spaces, which is the minimum that may be permitted after granting of parking reduction request.
3. Provide a landscape island consistent with 90-533(6).
4. Provide an additional bush within the eastern landscape perimeter buffer.
5. Revise landscape plan to depict all proposed plantings in appropriate locations. (current landscape plan depicts a tree in parking space)
6. Approval of this site plan is contingent on approval of special exception request 23-002-SE.
7. Approval of this site plan is contingent upon obtaining all necessary approvals related to the proposed SR-70 access point.
8. No building permit may be issued until all conditions of approval of $23-003-$ TRC have been met.

Submitted by:


Ben Smith, AICP
Director of Planning
November 8, 2023
Okeechobee Technical Review Committee Hearing: November 16, 2023

Supplemental Exhibits


Exhibit A: Future Land Use Map


Exhibit B: Zoning Map


Exhibit C: Existing Land Use Map
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Application for Site Plan Review
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| 17 | Number and description of phases: Phase I: Construction of the car wash. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 18 | Source of potable water: OUA. Existing 12" watermain, north SR 70. |
| 19 | Method of sewage disposal: Proposed lift station into county manhole south of SR 70 as part of Park Street Commerce Center. |
|  | ATTACHMENTS REQUIRED FOR ALL APPLICATIONS |
| 20 | Applicant's statement of interest in property |
| 21 | One (1) copy of last recorded warranty deed |
| 22 | Notarized letter of consent from property owner (if applicant is different from property owner) |
| 23 | Three (3) CERTIFIED BOUNDARY and TOPOGRAPHIC surveys, (one to be no larger than $11 \times 17$; scale not less than one inch to 20 feet; North point) containing: <br> a. Date of survey, surveyor's name, address and phone number <br> b. Legal description of property pertaining to the application <br> c. Computation of total acreage to nearest tenth of an acre <br> d. Location sketch of subject property, and surrounding area within one-half mile radius |
| 24 | Two (2) sets of aerials of the site. |
| 25 | Two (2) copies of sealed site plan drawings (see attached checklist for details of items to be included) |
| 26 | Two (2) copies of drawing indicating facades for all buildings, including architectural elevations. |
| 27 | Two (2) copies of landscape plan, including a separate table indicating the number of trees and shrubs by type and showing both the official and common name of each type of tree and shrub. |
| 28 | Two (2) copies of photometric lighting plan (see Code of Ordinances \& LDR's Section $78-71$ (A) (5)). |
| 29 | Two (2) copies of sealed drainage calculations. |
| 30 | Attach a Traffic Impact Study prepared by a professional transportation planner or transportation engineer, if the rezoning or proposed use will generate 100 or more peak hour vehicle trip ends using the trip generation factors for the most similar use as contained in the Institute of Transportation Engineers most recent edition of Trip Generation. The TIA must identify the number of net new external trips, pass-bay calculations, internal capture calculations, a.m. and p.m. peak hour trips and level of service on all adjacent roadway links with and without the project. |
| 31 | USB flash drive of application |
| 32 | Nonrefundable application fee: $\$ 1,000.00$ plus $\$ 30.00$ per acre. <br> NOTE: Resolution No. 98-11 Schedule of Land Development Regulation Fees and Charges - When the cost for advertising, publishing and mailing notices of public hearings exceeds the established fee, or when a professional consultant is hired to advise the City on the application, the applicant shall pay the actual costs. |
| NOTE: Submissions will be reviewed by the General Services Coordinator and City Planner for all necessary documentation. The Applicant will be notified at least 10 days prior to the TRC meeting whether or not additional information is required to proceed or if the review will be rescheduled to the next TRC meeting. |  |
|  | Confirmation of Information Accuracy |
|  | I hereby certify that the information in this application is correct. The information included in this application is for use by the City of Okeechobee in processing my request. False or misleading information may be punishable by a fine of up to $\$ 500.90$ and mprisonment of up to 30 days and may result in the summary denial of this application. <br> 8/14/23 <br> Date |

For questions relating to this application packet, call the General Services Dept. at (863) 763-3372, Ext. 9820 Rev. 08/23

## CITY OF OKEECHOBEE

# Application for Site Plan Review 

City of Okeechobee
Checklist for Site Plan Review

|  | REQUIRED INFORMATION |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Completed application (1) |
| 2 | Map showing location of site (may be on the cover sheet of site plan) |
| 3 | Two (2) copies of sealed site plan drawings prepared at a scale no smaller than one inch equals 60 feet, or in the case of small projects, the largest scale that can accommodate the entire site and all areas within 50 feet of the project boundary, and the scale, legend, and author block all on one $24^{\prime \prime}$ by $36^{\prime \prime}$ sheet. The site plan drawings shall include the location of all existing and proposed improvements, including, but not limited to: |
|  | 3.1 Water courses, water bodies, floodplains, wetlands, important natural features and wildlife areas, soil types, protected trees and vegetation or environmentally sensitive areas |
|  | 3.2 Streets, sidewalks, property lines and rights-of-way |
|  | 3.3 Utility lines/facilities, fire hydrants, septic tanks and drainfields |
|  | 3.4 Bridges, culverts and stormwater management facilities |
|  | 3.5 Buildings and structures and their distances from boundaries of the property, streets, and other structures |
|  | 3.6 Setback lines and required yards |
|  | 3.7 Ingress and egress to the site and buildings |
|  | 3.8 Vehicular use areas including off-street parking and loading areas |
|  | 3.9 On-site recreation and open space |
|  | 3.10 Landscaping, screens, buffers, walls, and fences, |
|  | 3.11 Method of solid waste collection and locations of and access to dumpsters |
|  | 3.12 Lighting and signs |
| 4 | Drawing notes and tabulations showing the following information shall be included along with the plan: |
|  | 4.1 Name, address and phone number of the owner |
|  | 4.2 Name, address and phone number of any agent, architect, engineer and planner |
|  | 4.3 Compete legal description of the property |
|  | 4.4 Future land use designation, current zoning and existing land use of the property and all abutting properties |
|  | 4.5 Total acreage of the property (square footage if less than two acres) |
|  | 4.6 Total \# of dwelling units, by bedroom size; square footage of nonresidential uses by type of use (and/or seating, etc. as necessary to indicate the intensity) |
|  | 4.7 Number of off-street parking spaces provided (including handicapped spaces) and loading spaces and the calculation of, and basis for, the number of such spaces required by the Land Development Regulations |
|  | 4.8 Impervious surface calculations showing: the square footage and as $a \%$ of the total site for existing impervious surfaces, additional proposed impervious surfaces and the resulting proposed total impervious surfaces |



Department of Slate / Division of Corporations / Search Records / Search by Entity Name I
Detail by Entity Name
Florida Limited Liability CompanyPARK STREET OKEECHOBEE, LLC
Filing Information
Document Number L22000487870
FEI/EIN Number ..... 92-3774303
Date Filed ..... 11/14/2022
State ..... FL
Status ACTIVE
Principal Address
603 EAST FORT KING STREET
OCALA, FL 34471
Mailing Address
603 EAST FORT KING STREET
OCALA, FL 34471
Registered Agent Name \& Address
RAMSAY, ADAM
603 EAST FORT KING STREET
OCALA, FL 34471
Authorized Person(s) Detail
Name \& Address
Title MGR
RAMSAY, ADAM P
603 EAST FORT KING STREET
OCALA, FL 34471
Annual Reports
Report Year Filed Date
2023 04/28/2023

## Document Images

04/28/2023 - ANNUAL REPORT

| View image in PDF format |
| :---: |
| View image in PDF format |

# SITE PLANS OF: <br> <br> PARK STREET CARWASH 

 <br> <br> PARK STREET CARWASH}

LOCATED IN SECTION 15; TOWNSHIP 37 SOUTH; RANGE 35 EAST

PARCEL ID: $2-15-37-35-0 A 00-00009-A 000 ;$
$2-15-37-35-0 A 00-00009-0000 ; 2-15-37-35-0 A 00-00010-0000 ;$
LEGAL DESCRIPTION
LOT 1, PARK STREET COMMERCE CENTER, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT
THEREOF, AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK
??, PAGE ??, OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF OKEECHOBEE COUNTY, FLORIDA.
(Plat created by 1.23 -0030TRC under city review)




Svireor:



VICINITY MAP

| SANITARY SEWER: | OKEECHOBEE UTLLTY AUTHORITY <br> (863) 763-9460 |
| :---: | :---: |
| WATER DISTRIBUTIIN: | OKEECHOBEE UTILITY AUTHORITY (863) 763-9460 |
| Electrical power: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { FPL } \\ & \text { (863) } 763-6441 \end{aligned}$ |
| telephone: | CENTURY LINK <br> (855) 263-9576 |
| FIRE: | OKEECHOBEE FIRE DEPARTMENT (863) 763-4423 |
| garbage: | WASTE MANAGEMENT <br> (866) 909-4458 |


| INDEX OF SHEETS |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| SHEET | DESCRIPTION |
| C1.0 | cover Sheet |
| C2.0 | GENERAL Notes |
| С3.0 | SWPP PLAN |
| C4.0 | SITE PLAN |
| C5.0 | GRADING PLAN |
| C6.0 | CROSS SECTIons |
| C7.0 | UTILTY PLAN |
| C8.0 | detall hheet |
| c9.0 | UTLITY DETALLSI |
| C10.0 | UTLITY DETALLS II |
| C11.0 | FIRE PLAN |
| LS1.0 | LANDSCAPE PLAN |
| LS2.0 | LANDSCAPE DETAILS |
| S1.0 | SURVEY |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  | Cerrr. of athiorration No. 8729 |
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SECTION A




CONCRETE WHEEL $\underset{\text { NTSP }}{\text { STOP }}$

$\xrightarrow[\text { TYPICAL STORM DRAIN CLEANOUT DETALL }]{\text { NTS }}$




SIDEWALK/PAVEMENT STEP-UP DETALL


Note: (HANOICAP SIGN ONLY)



one sign reguried for each parkng space.


TYPICAL RESERVED PARKING
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HANDICAP PARKING STRIPING $\frac{\text { FOR MULTPLE SPACES }}{\text { NTS }}$
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TYPE D

note:
THIS STMEOL TO 日E WHTE D.O.T. THERMOPLASTIC
TYPICAL PAVEMENT SYMBOL FOR HANDICAPPED PARKING

$\frac{\text { CURB DETALS }}{\text { Fnor Monex } 500-001}$
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## 

| OTHER PIPES | HORIZONTAL SEPERATION | CROSSING (1) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STORM SEWER, STORMWATER FORCE MAIN RECLAIM WATER ( 2 ) |  |  |  |
| vacums santary |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Troviris smage | 10 ¢F. Mmmom | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
| EKEECHOBEE UTLTTY AUTHORITY COTSSTRUCTOTON STANDARDS \& DETALS |  |  |  |
| Revsson | WATER | - SAANTAR Sewer | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { PAGE No } \\ \text { D16 } \end{gathered}\right.$ |





| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pipt } \\ & { }_{0}^{01} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | vertical sag |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DEGREE OF BEND |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 11 |  |  |  | $21^{1 / 2}$ |  |  | 45 |  |  |  | 96 |  |
|  | "wn | " |  |  | w' | " | $-$ | "w" | " |  |  | "w" |  |  |
| $6^{6}$ | $6^{*}$ | ${ }_{36}$ | - |  | ${ }^{6}$ | ${ }^{36}$ | - | $18^{88}$ | ${ }^{36}$ |  |  | $24^{4}$ |  |  |
| $8^{\circ}$ | ${ }^{8}$ | ${ }_{36}^{36}$ | - |  | ${ }^{11^{20}}$ | ${ }_{3}{ }_{3}$ | - | ${ }_{4}^{24^{\circ}}$ | ${ }_{36}$ |  | - | ${ }_{55^{\circ}}$ | ${ }^{36}$ |  |
| $\frac{11^{2 \prime}}{18^{\prime \prime}}$ | ${ }^{188^{\circ}}$ | ${ }_{36}{ }_{36}$ | - |  |  | ${ }^{38^{3}}$ | - | 60 | ${ }_{60}^{42}$ |  |  |  | ${ }^{48^{\circ}}$ |  |
|  | $48^{8}$ | $4{ }^{4}$ | - |  | ${ }^{60}$ | $5^{54}$ | - | ${ }_{78}$ | ${ }_{78}$ |  | - | ${ }_{96}$ | ${ }^{96}$ |  |
| ${ }_{36}$ | $6^{\circ}$ | ${ }_{54}$ |  |  | ${ }^{84}$ | ${ }^{78}$ |  | ${ }_{96}$ | ${ }_{96}$ |  |  | ${ }_{120}$ | 20 |  |






Notes:

1. AL PRPNM Is wetres sze
2. 




(1/2 HiC WTH wot AT Least $1 / 2$ THE wal micnesss




OKEECHOBEE UTLITY AUTHORITY CONSTRUCTION STANDARDS \& DETALS | REVSION |
| :---: |
| OCT. 2015 | standard manhole (Concentric cone)

| Revicilin | standard manhole frame and cover | $\begin{gathered} \text { PAGE No } \\ \text { D25 } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |


| ma |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OTHER PIPES | horizontal SEPERATION | CROSSING (1) | JOINT SPACING @ CROSSINGS (FULL JOINT CENTERED) |
| STORM SEWER, STORMWATER FORCE MAIN RECLAIM WATER (2) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Tomste smace | 10 or. munw | --- | --- |












|  | VERTCAL CREST |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DEGRREE Of bend |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $1{ }^{1 / 4}$ |  |  | $21 / 2$ |  |  | ${ }^{45^{\circ}}$ |  |  |  | ${ }^{90}$ |  |  |
|  | w" | , | "H" | "w" | "L" | " ${ }^{+}$ | w |  |  | "н" | "w" |  |  |
| ${ }^{6}$ | ${ }^{36}$ |  | ${ }^{188}$ | 36. | 24 | $24^{4}$ | 480 |  |  | ${ }^{30}$ | ${ }^{54}$ |  |  |
| $8^{\circ}$ | $48^{8}$ | ${ }^{\circ}$ | ${ }^{20}$ | $4{ }^{48}$ | ${ }^{30}$ | ${ }^{24}$ | 5. |  |  | ${ }^{36}$ | ${ }^{60}$ |  |  |
| $\stackrel{12}{ }$ |  |  | 30 |  | ${ }^{36}$ | $4{ }^{40}$ | 6 |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |
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TREE PROTECTION DETAL

# PARK STREET OKEECHOBEE, LLC 

## VIA EMAIL

August 11, 2023
City of Okeechobee / General Services Department
Attention: Patty Burnette
55 S.E. $3^{\text {rd }}$ Avenue, Room 101
Okeechobee, Florida 34974
Re: Park Street Commerce Center - Statement of Interest in Property
Dear Ms. Burnette:
On behalf of Park Street Okeechobee, LLC ("Applicant"), this letter constitutes Applicant's Statement of Interest in the following property (collectively, the "Property"):

- Parcel \#1: 2-15-37-35-0A00-00011-0000
- Parcel \#2: 2-15-37-35-0A00-00009-0000 Pottes - Parcel \#3: 2-15-37-35-0A00-00009-A000 AlL
- Parcel \#4: 2-15-37-35-0A00-00010-0000
- Parcel \#5: 3-15-37-35-0210-00010-0010

Applicant is purchasing the Property via that certain vacant land contract between Applicant (as successor-by-assignment to WGT, Inc.) and William R. Grigsby, Jr. ("Seller") dated September 2, 2022 (the "Contract"). Applicant intends to develop the Property into a commercial real estate project to be commonly known as the Park Street Commerce Center ("Project") consisting of five separate parcels (as more particularly described in Applicant's site plan and other related documents) with portions of shared common area infrastructure, including without limitation, roadways, drainage, lift station, utility lines, project signs, entrance features, outfall pipe, sewer connection, and all other real and personal property (or interest therein) intended by Applicant for the common use and enjoyment of all lot owners within the Project (collectively, "Common Area Infrastructure").

The Common Area Infrastructure will be governed by that certain Declaration of Covenants, Conditions, Easements, and Restrictions for Park Street Commerce Center ("Declaration") of which Applicant (or its assignee) shall be the "Declarant" under the Declaration. The Declaration shall include, without limitation, provisions addressing the design, permitting, construction, maintenance, and repair of the Common Area Infrastructure, and provisions for sharing of the costs thereof by the lot owners of parcels within the Project. All easements, water management system, and other rights related to the Common Area Infrastructure will be incorporated into the Declaration. Notwithstanding the foregoing, Applicant intends to dedicate certain items constituting the Common Area Infrastructure such as the roadways, lift station, sewer connection, and outfall pipe to the City of Okeechobee ("City"), the County of Okeechobee ("County"), and/or other governmental authorities, respectively.

Applicant is hereby submitting Applicant's master site plan and preliminary plat for the Project in order for Applicant to obtain approval of said site plan, including multiple individual lot site plans and related special exception applications pertinent to Applicant or as jointly submitted by Applicant and a third-party future owner / user of a specific lot within the Project ("Co-Applicant," and as further described below, if applicable), and plat from all governing authorities, including approval of the vacation of any existing recorded plat ("Site Plan Approval"). Subject to Applicant obtaining Site Plan Approval, Applicant will enter into a development agreement with the City which shall grant Applicant all rights necessary to develop the Project. More specifically, Applicant desires to enter into separate development agreements with the $\mathrm{C}^{i}{ }^{+\mathrm{v}}$ for the following lots within the Project in order to develop said lot for the uses described below:

- Lot 1: Express Car Wash Facility

Page 2
Park Street Commerce Center - Statement of Interest in Property

- Lot 2: Culver's Restaurant with Drive-Thru

Applicant sincerely looks forward to working with the City to develop this exciting project and making a large investment in the City's future and that of its residents, local businesses, and others in the surrounding community. Please direct all questions regarding the Project to Scott Winch at swinch@kinghux.com and/or (386) 527-6729.


Cc: Gary Ritter, City Administrator (via email)

Prepared By and Return to
John D. Cassels, Jr. Esq.
Cassels \& McCall
P.O. Box 968

Okeechobee, Florida 34973
Parcel ID Numbers:
2-15-37-35-0A00-00009-A000
2-15-37-35-0A00-00009-0000
2-15-37-35-0A00-00011-0000
2-15-37-35-0A00-00010-0000
3-15-37-35-0210-00010-0110
3-15-37-35-0210-00010-0080
3-15-37-35-0210-00010-0040
3-16-37-35-0210-00010-0010

SHAROH R DOBGB FGG 1345
SHAROH EORERTSOA, CLERK DF CIRCUIT CDURT
OKEECHOEEE COUNTY, FL
RECORDED O6/20/2006 04:34:38 PM
RECORDING FEES 18.50
DEED DOC $18,433.80$
RECORDED EY B Parrish
Pgs 1345-1346\% (2pgs)

## WARRANTY DEED


#### Abstract

THIS WARRANTY DEED made this $20^{\nsim}$ day of June, 2006, between GREAT LAKES HOLDINGS, LLC, a Florida limited liability company, whose mailing address is $410 \mathrm{SE} 2^{\text {nd }}$ Avenue, Okeechobee, FL 34974, hereinafter called the GRANTOR, to WILLIAM R. GRIGSBY, JR., whose mailing address 518 Bear Road, Lake Placid, FL 33852, hereinafter called the GRANTEE:


(Wherever used herein, the terms "Grantors" and "Grantees" include all the parties to this instrument, and
the heirs, legal representatives and assigns of individuals and the successors and assigns of corporations).

## WITNESSETH:

That the GRANTOR, for and in consideration of the sum of $\$ 10.00$ and other valuable considerations, receipt whereof is hereby acknowledged, hereby grants, bargains, sells, aliens, remises, releases, conveys and confirms unto the GRANTEE, all that certain land situate in OKEECHOBEE County, Florida, to-wit:

PARCEL 1 (PER O.R.B. 527, PGS. 869-870):
THE WEST HALF (W $1 / 2$ ) OF THE EAST HALF (E $1 / 2$ ) OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER (SW 1/4) OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER (SE 1/4) LYING NORTH OF STATE ROAD NO. 70 (FORT PIERCE ROAD), IN SECTION 15, TOWNSHIP 37 SOUTH, RANGE 35 EAST, LESS THE FOLLOWING:

BEGINNING AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF THE EAST HALF (E 1/2) OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER (SW 1/4) OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER (SE 1/4) OF SAID SECTION 15, RUN NORTH 594 FEET, EAST 186.3 FEET, SOUTH 594 FEET; WEST 186.3 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

ALSO LESS THE NORTH 50 FEET WHICH IS RESERVED FOR ROAD PURPOSES.
ALSO LESS: A STRIP OF LAND 7 FEET WIDE SITUATE ADJACENT TO AND NORTHERLY OF THE EXISTING 66 FOOT RIGHT OF WAY OF STATE ROAD 70, LYING, WITHIN THE WEST $1 / 2$ OF THE EAST $1 / 2$ OF SW $1 / 4$ OF SE $1 / 4$, SECTION 15 , TOWNSHIP 37 SOUTH, RANGE 35 EAST, LESS THE WEST 186.3 FEET THEREOF; CONTAINING . 02 OF AN ACRE, MORE OR LESS.

PARCEL 2 (PER O.R.B. 528, PGS. 1342-1343):
ALL OF LOTS 1 THROUGH 12, INCLUSIVE, LYING NORTH OF NORTH PARK STREET (A/K/A S.R. 70 F/K/A FORT PIERCE ROAD) AS NOW CONSTRUCTED, IN BLOCK 4, PRICE ADDITION TO OKEECHOBEE CITY, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 2, PAGE 17, PUBLIC RECORDS OF OKEECHOBEE COUNTY, FLORIDA.

PARCEL 3 (PER O.R.B. 528, PGS. 1342-1343):
COMMENCE AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF THE SOUTHWEST ONE-QUARTER OF THE SOUTHEAST ONE-QUARTER OF SECTION 15, TOWNSHIP 37 SOUTH, RANGE 35 EAST, THENCE RUN SOUTH $00^{\circ} 18^{\prime} 26^{\prime \prime}$ EAST ALONG THE EASTERLY LINE THEREOF, 668.71 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING: THENCE CONTINUE SOUTH $00^{\circ} 18^{\prime} 26^{\prime \prime}$ EAST, 276.28 FEET TO THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF PRICE ADDITION TO OKEECHOBEE CITY ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 2, PAGE 17; THENCE RUN SOUTH 89 ${ }^{\circ} 50^{\prime} 34^{\prime \prime}$ WEST, ALONG THE NORTHERLY LINE THEREOF, 336.76 FEET TO THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID PRICE ADDITION; THENCE RUN NORTH $00^{\circ} 17^{\prime} 46^{\prime \prime}$ WEST, ALONG THE WEST LINE OF THE EAST ONEHALF OF THE EAST ONE-HALF OF THE SOUTHWEST ONE-QUARTER OF THE SOUTHEAST ONEQUARTER OF SAID SECTION 15, A DISTANCE OF 273.38 FEET; THENCE RUN NORTH $89^{\circ} 20^{\prime} 47^{\prime \prime}$ EAST AND PARALLEL WITH THE NORTHERLY LINE OF PREVIOUSLY MENTIONED SOUTHWEST ONE-QUARTER OF THE SOUTHEAST ONE-QUARTER, A DISTANCE OF 336.71 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

PARCEL 4 (PER O.R.B. 528, PGS. 1342-1343):
THE ALLEY IN BLOCK 4, PRICE ADDITION TO OKEECHOBEE CITY, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 2, PAGE 17, PUBLIC RECORDS OF OKEECHOBEE COUNTY, FLORIDA, LYING BETWEEN LOTS 1-6 AND 7-12.

PARCEL 5 (PER O.R.B 528, PGS 1342-1343:
THE STREET KNOWN AS NORTHEAST $2^{N D}$ STREET (F/K/A CENTER STREET) AS IT RUNS EAST FROM NORTHEAST $12^{\mathrm{TH}}$ AVENUE TO NORTHEAST $13^{\mathrm{TH}}$ AVENUE, PARTICULARLY LOCATED NORTH OF BLOCK 4, PRICE ADDITION TO OKEECHOBEE CITY, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 2, PAGE 17, PUBLIC RECORDS OF OKEECHOBEE COUNTY, FLORIDA.

PARCEL 6 (PER O.R.B 554, PG 338):
ALL THAT PART OF THE NORTH 668.71 FEET OF THE E $1 / 2$ OF THE E $1 / 2$ OF SW $1 / 4$ OF SE $1 / 4$ OF SECTION 15, TOWNSHIP 37 SOUTH, RANGE 35 EAST, LESS AND EXCEPT THE NORTH 50 FEET THEREOF.

Subject to those easements in favor of Florida Power and Light recorded in O.R. Book 109, Page 983 and O.R. Book 23, Page 524 and matters contained on the Plat of Price Addition to Okeechobee City recorded in Plat Book 2, Page 17, all being in the Public Records of Okeechobee County, Florida.
and said grantor does hereby fully warrant the title to said land, and will defend the same against the lawful claims of all persons whomsoever.

* Singular and plural are interchangeable as context requires.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the said GRANTOR have executed this Deed the day and year first above written.

Signed, Sealed and Delivered in our presence:


GREAT LAKES HOLDINGS, LLC, a Florida


STATE OF FLORIDA
COUNTY OF OKEECHOBEE
Signed and sworn to (or affirmed) before me this $\stackrel{\sim 1}{ } 0^{4}$ day of June, 2006, by D. ROBERT WILLSON, as Managing Member of GREAT LAKES HOLDINGS, LLC, a Florida limited liability company, who is personally known to me.


# City of Okeechobee <br> 55 SE $3^{\text {RD }}$ Avenue <br> Okeechobee, FL 34974 

Tele: 863-763-3372 Fax: 863-763-1686

## LAND USE POWER OF ATTORNEY



In WITNESS WHEREOF THE UNDERSIGNED HAVE SET THEIR HAND AND SEALS THIS 13


OWNER


WITNESS

## STATE OF FLORIDA <br> COUNTY OF <br> 

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me by means of $\underline{V}$ physical presence or _online notarization, this $/ 3$ day of Feb_, 2023 , by William R. Grigsby, Jr. (Name of Person)
who is personally known to me or produced Florideci.D. as identification.



# Park Street Commerce Center 

## Master Storm System

Storm Report by



# American Civil Engineering Co. 

## Stormwater Summary

## Park Street Commerce Center

5/24/2023
SJRWMD \#:
Basin Size: 16.65 AC (Total Site)
Special Basin Criteria: Lake Okeechobee ( $+50 \%$ treatment over standard SFWMD criteria)
Wetlands: \#56-00002-M Bluefield Ranch Mitigation Bank
Hydraulic Soils: Manatee \#6 Type B/D (77\%), Immokalee \#11 Type B/D (23\%)
Impervious Area: 0.05 AC existing, 6.80 AC Total Impervious Area
Treatment Volume Required: 1.5 " over basin or 2.5 " $\times \%$ impervious plus $50 \%$
Peak Design Storm: $100 \mathrm{Yr}-72 \mathrm{hr}$
Pre vs Post Discharge: S-133 Basin $15.6 \mathrm{cfs} / \mathrm{SM}$ for 25 YR- 72 HR storm or 0.36 cfs , proposed 0 cfs
Pond Volume: Dry Pond 4.938 AF (22 Top, 17.60 Bottom) , Wet Pond 4.07 AF (20 Top, 15 NWL)
Pond Recovery: 72 hours
Seasonal High Groundwater Elevation: 14.50 elv. (See Geotech Report)
FEMA: Zone X (12093C0480C-7/16/2016)
Slopes: 4:1 Dry pond
Maintenance Berm: 10 ft
Fencing: No fence proposed

## American Civil Engineering Co.



# American Civil Engineering Co. 

## Site Location / Existing Conditions:

The project is 16.65 acres in size and located on 1000 East S.R. 70 in the City of Okeechobee, Florida. The site is currently undeveloped apart from an unoccupied house in the back northeast corner. A man-made drainage swale has been cut through the center of the site emptying into Taylor Creek in the north. Several isolated wetlands are present on the property. Topography of the site flows from higher elevations in the east to lower elevations in the west, ultimately discharging north into the creek. During geotechnical investigations organic muck layers were discovered in portions of the site (approx. 27\%) that correlated with higher water tables relative to the borings without muck.

## Proposed Conditions:

Project proposes four individual commercial lots and city-controlled roadway created with master stormwater. Lot 1 ( 1 AC impervious) is proposed carwash, Lot 2 ( 1.5 AC impervious) is Culver's restaurant, Lot $3 \& 4$ have no current planned development but are still allotted 1.75 AC of impervious area each in the master system. The proposed roadway is allotted 0.80 AC of impervious in the same shared system.

## Water Quality:

The site requires nutrient loading be met for Lake Okeechobee basin and includes $50 \%$ additional treatment volume over the standard requirements. SFWMD criteria of $1^{\prime \prime}$ over basin or $2.5^{\prime \prime}$ over percent impervious area (less roofs \& wet ponds). The system is designed to exceed the required $2.13 \mathrm{AC}-\mathrm{FT}$ of dry retention over the basin providing $3.58 \mathrm{AC}-\mathrm{Ft}$ before discharging into the wet pond. All required treatment is met within the dry pond, additional treatment is provided in the wet pond further surpassing the requirements.

## Water Quantity:

Rainfall tables used from SFWMD regarding the 10 year -1 day ( $5^{\prime \prime}$ ), 25 year -3 day ( $9^{\prime \prime}$ ) and 100 year 3 day ( $10^{\prime \prime}$ ) storm events were used to set the final elevations of roads and buildings via ICPR routing simulation. The proposed storm system maintains the 100 Year storm event with additional freeboard. No outfall is proposed.

|  | Dry Pond (elv) | Wet Pond (elv) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| No Outfall - 100 YR - 72 Hour storm : | 21.57 | 18.95 |
| No Outfall - 25 YR - 72 Hour storm : | 21.30 | 18.09 |
| No Outfall - 10 YR - 24 Hour storm : | 19.76 | 15.53 |

## American Civil Engineering Co.

## Water Discharge:

No discharge is proposed, all storm events held within proposed storm system.

## System Recovery:

Drawdown of the storm pond was performed using a 3-day recovery via groundwater with percolation rates at half rate given in geotech report. The dry pond holds 3.58 AC-FT at elevation 20.95 before discharging into the wet pond at the rear of the site for attenuation. The required treatment volume of 2.13 AC-FT recovers within the required 72 hour simulation with total recovery in 72 hour window equaling recovers $2.32 \mathrm{AC}-\mathrm{FT}$

## Operation \& Maintenance:

Lots $1-4$ will be owned and operated by separate entities. The proposed roadway, storm easement and rear pond will be owned and operated by City of Okeechobee.

| Dry Pond Stage/Storage |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stage (ft) | Area (sf) | Area (ac) | Volume (ac-ft) | Notes |
| 17.6 | 37,464 | 0.860 | 0.000 |  |
| 18.0 | 41,429 | 0.951 | 0.362 |  |
| 19.0 | 45,499 | 1.045 | 1.360 |  |
| 20.0 | 49,670 | 1.140 | 2.452 |  |
| 21.0 | 54,134 | 1.243 | 3.644 |  |
| 22.0 | 58,598 | 1.345 | 4.938 |  |
| Rear Dry Pond |  |  |  | TOP |
| Wier Elevation |  |  |  |  |
| Design Wier Elevation = |  |  | 20.95 |  |
| Treatment Volume Provided = |  |  | 3.584 |  |

Wet Pond Stage / Storage

| Stage (ft) | Area (sf) |  |  | Area (ac) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 7,866 | 0.181 | 0.000 |  |
| 6.0 | 8,677 | 0.199 | 0.190 | Notes |
| 7.0 | 9,534 | 0.219 | 0.399 |  |
| 8.0 | 10,440 | 0.240 | 0.628 |  |
| 9.0 | 11,401 | 0.262 | 0.879 |  |
| 10.0 | 12,423 | 0.285 | 1.152 |  |
| 11.0 | 13,519 | 0.310 | 1.450 |  |
| 12.0 | 28,332 | 0.650 | 1.931 |  |
| 13.0 | 33,541 | 0.770 | 2.641 |  |
| 14.0 | 38,878 | 0.893 | 0.000 | Waterline (2.641 AF vol) |
| 15.0 | 44,343 | 1.018 | 0.955 |  |
| 16.0 | 49,929 | 1.146 | 0.000 |  |
| 17.0 | 55,619 | 1.277 | 1.212 |  |
| 18.0 | 61,409 | 1.410 | 2.555 |  |
| 19.0 | 70,882 | 1.627 | 4.073 |  |
| 20.0 |  |  |  | TOP |

Wier Elevation
No Outfall on Pond

| Development Drainage Basin A |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Basin | Area (AC) | \% impervious | Cover | CN | Imperv (AC) |
| Commerical | 13.940 | 49\% | Impervious | 98 | 6.800 |
|  |  |  | Drained Pervious (Type B Soil) | 40 |  |
|  |  |  | Roof |  |  |
|  |  |  | Sub-Total CN | 68 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals | 13.940 | 49\% |  | 68 | 6.800 |


| Development Drainage Basin B |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Basin | Area (AC) | \%Water | Cover | CN | Imperv (AC) |
| Wet Pond / FPL | 2.71 | 33\% | Water | 100 | 0.000 |
|  |  |  | Pervious (Type 8 Soil) | 60 |  |
| Totals | 2.71 | $33 \%$ |  | 73 | 0.000 |
| Total Site | 16.65 | 41\% |  |  | 6.800 |

Time of Concentration
Assume Minimum 15 minimum for all basins

Treatment Volumes


Impervious Area Accounted

| Lot 1 | 1.00 AC |
| :--- | :--- |
| Lot 2 | 1.50 AC |
| Lot 3 | 1.75 AC |
| Lot 4 | 1.75 AC |
| Roadway | 0.80 AC |
| Total | 6.80 AC |

## American Civil Engineering Co.

## PRE-BASIN MAP




American Civil Engineering Co.

## POST-BASIN MAP





American Civil Engineering Co.

FEMA MAP
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American Civil Engineering Co.

SOIL MAP


## USDA SOILS SURVEY

6-Manatee loamy fine sand, frequently ponded, 0 to 1 percent slopes 11-Immokalee fine sand, 0 to 2 percent slopes

## American Civil Engineering Co.

## ICPR

Node Max Conditions [Recover]

| Ment Menit: | Smax mine | Wraming stigeth | Mer mere 13 | whinse betristet: 4 | Me:s beta milowites | Mesertiy Shetixymet | Matwhirere <br>  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Groundwater | Recover | 14.50 | 14.50 | 0.0000 | 4.06 | 0.00 | 0 |
| Recover | Recover | 23.00 | 20.95 | -0.0010 | 0.00 | 4.06 | 53921 |

Node Max Conditions [Scenario1]

| Morte Manc | STM Werite | Werine Stricht | Mhy hrde <br> 54 | 4BITMET: tetredixiti 4 | 4me ritit miovitatit | Mextwhe Evinty | [4]s shrite Tatitht |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| POST WET POND | 100YR-72HR | 20.00 | 18.95 | 0.0010 | 15.34 | 0.00 | 64129 |
| Post Dry Pond | 100YR-72HR | 22.00 | 21.57 | 0.0010 | 47.00 | 10.97 | 56689 |
| Pre- Node | 100YR-72HR | 20.00 | 14.00 | 0.0000 | 27.00 | 0.00 | 0 |
| POST WET POND | 10YR-24HR | 20.00 | 15.53 | 0.0003 | 5.46 | 0.00 | 42298 |
| Post Dry Pond | 10YR-24HR | 22.00 | 19.76 | 0.0010 | 23.63 | 0.00 | 48646 |
| Pre-Node | 10YR-24HR | 20.00 | 14.00 | 0.0000 | 7.23 | 0.00 | 0 |
| POST WET POND | 25YR-72HR | 20.00 | 18.09 | 0.0010 | 8.46 | 0.00 | 58643 |
| Post Dry Pond | 25YR-72HR | 22.00 | 21.30 | 0.0010 | 40.69 | 6.65 | 55482 |
| Pre- Node | 25YR-72HR | 20.00 | 14.00 | 0.0000 | 22.73 | 0.00 | 0 |

```
Simple Basin: ROST-BASIN DRY
            Scenario: Scenario1
                        Node: Post Dry Pond
    Hydrograph Method: NRCS Unit Hydrograph
    Infiltration Method: Curve Number
Time of Concentration: 15.0000 min
    Max Allowable Q: 0.00 cfs
            Time Shift: 0.0000 hr
            Unit Hydrograph: UH323
            Peaking Factor: }323.
                    Area: 13.9400 ac
            Curve Number: }68.
            % Impervious: 0.00
                    % DCIA: 0.00
                    % Direct: 0.00
            Rainfall Name:
```

Comment:


| Scenario: | Scenario1 |
| ---: | :--- |
| Node: | POST WET POND |
| Hydrograph Method: | NRCS Unit Hydrograph |
| Infiltration Method: | Curve Number |
| Time of Concentration: | 15.0000 min |
| Max Allowable Q: | 0.00 cfs |
| Time Shift: | 0.0000 hr |
| Unit Hydrograph: | UH323 |
| Peaking Factor: | 323.0 |
| Area: | 2.7120 ac |
| Curve Number: | 72.0 |
| \% Impervious: | 0.00 |
| \% DCIA: | 0.00 |
| \% Direct: | 0.00 |
| Rainfall Name: |  |

## Comment:

|  |  |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Scenario: | Scenario1 |
| Node: | Pre- Node |
| Hydrograph Method: | NRCS Unit Hydrograph |
| Infiltration Method: Prfe-BASIN | Curve Number |
| Time of Concentration: | 45.0000 min |
| Max Allowable Q: | 0.00 cfs |

$\qquad$

| Time Shift: | 0.0000 hr |
| ---: | :--- |
| Unit Hydrograph: | UH323 |
| Peaking Factor: | 323.0 |
| Area: | 16.6500 ac |
| Curve Number: | 58.0 |
| \% Impervious: | 0.00 |
| \% DCIA: | 0.00 |
| \% Direct: | 0.00 |
| Rainfall Name: |  |

## Comment:



## Comment:



Scenario: Recover
Type: Stage/Area
Base Flow: 0.00 cfs
Initial Stage: 20.95 ft
Warning Stage: 23.00 ft

| Skethtemen | Fristres | Whanded |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 17.60 | 0.8600 | 37462 |
| 18.00 | 0.9510 | 41426 |
| 19.00 | 1.0450 | 45520 |
| 20.00 | 1.1400 | 49658 |
| 21.00 | 1.2430 | 54145 |
| 22.00 | 1.3450 | 58588 |

## Comment:

| Node: POST WET POND |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Scenario: | Scenario1 |
|  | Type: | Stage/Area |
|  | Base Flow: | 0.00 cfs |
|  | Initial Stage: | 15.00 ft |
|  | Warning Stage: | 20.00 ft |


| Stage [ft] | Area [ac] | Area [ft?] |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 15.00 | 0.8930 | 38899 |
| 20.00 | 1.6270 | 70872 |

## Comment:

$\qquad$

Node: Post iny Pond

| Scenario: | Scenario1 |
| ---: | :--- |
| Type: | Stage/Area |
| Base Flow: | 0.00 cfs |
| Initial Stage: | 17.60 ft |
| Warning Stage: | 22.00 ft |


|  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 17.60 | 0.8600 | 37462 |
| 18.00 | 0.9510 | 41426 |
| 19.00 | 1.0450 | 45520 |
| 20.00 | 1.1400 | 49658 |
| 21.00 | 1.2430 | 54145 |
| 22.00 | 1.3450 | 58588 |

## Comment:



## Comment:







$\qquad$

## Simulation: 10YR-24HR

Scenario: Scenario1
Run Date/Time: 5/24/2023 11:28:59 AM
Program Version: ICPR4 4.07.08

| Run Mode: Normal | Generol |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Year | Month | Day |

$\qquad$


Energy Switch (1D): Energy

## Comment:




| Yeal | Manda | Day | Fiour fhri | Time increment iminy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0000 | 15.0000 |
| Surface Hydraulics |  |  |  |  |
| Year | Month | Day | Hour lim | Time increment [min] |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0000 | 15.0000 |


$\qquad$
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Mailing
P.O. Box 78-1377

Sebastian, FL. 32978
Phone: 772-589-0712
C.A. \# 5693

KSMengineering.net
Workspace Collective
December 30, 2022
Adam Ramsay
603 E. Fort King Street
Ocala, FL 34471

Re: 1000 State Road 70<br>Okeechobee, Florida<br>KSM Project \#: 2210339-b\&p

Dear Mr. Ramsay:
As requested, KSM Engineering \& Testing has performed a preliminary subsurface investigation at the referenced site. The purpose of this investigation was to determine the general nature of the subsurface conditions at the subject property and to offer preliminary guidance on the development of the property for its intended use. Presentation of the data gathered during the investigation, together with our geotechnical related opinions, are included in this report.

## Scope of Work and Professional Service Agreement:

The scope of work and the agreement to perform a geotechnical exploration was provided by KSM's October 27, 2022, proposal to Workspace Collective, in care of Mr. Adam Ramsay. The agreement was signed by Mr. Ramsay on November 4, 2022 and was returned to KSM thereafter.

## Summary of Findings and Conclusions:

The following is a summary of the principal findings and conclusions that are contained in this report, based on the results of KSM's subsurface exploration and analytical laboratory testing:

- Within the depth of exploration, the property was underlain by generally weak (very loose to loose) near surface layer of granular material with an organic content varying from less than $5 \%$, which is the typically accepted limit before a soil is considered problematic for construction, to $10.9 \%$. When inherently problematic soils were encountered they were typically at the surface with an estimated thickness of 1 foot however several borings encountered problematic soil deposits to depths ranging from 1 to 6 feet below grade. Below the organic layer deposits of loose to medium dense cohesionless fine sand underlain by loose to medium dense clayey/silty fine sand were discovered.
- The recorded depth to the surface of the groundwater body was very shallow and KSM
- The discovered subsurface conditions are expected to negatively impact the development of this property in that creation of a stable subgrade for support of the proposed dwellings and roadways will be difficult due to the combined effect of the expected shallow position of the groundwater surface, the excessive organic content and weak nature of the upper zones of soil. Specifically, we anticipate that the excavation and backfill of near surface organic deposits and the compaction of very loose subgrade soils may be difficult due to the shallow water table position. Consideration should also be given to scheduling the earthwork operations to be performed during the seasonally dry winter and spring months to decrease the amount of anticipated dewatering that will be required.
- The installation of buried utility lines (i.e., stormwater piping, water supply lines, power lines, and telecommunication lines) are likely to involve excavation of trenches below the groundwater surface. Accordingly, dewatering of the trench excavations is likely to be necessary to enable the installation to be performed in dry conditions.
- Given the existing weak nature of the subgrade soils, the foundations that support the new structures on this property should bear at elevations that are as shallow as practical, in order to contain the stress transmitted by the foundations within the compacted engineered fill soils that will be placed during the mass grading operations. Monolithic slab foundation systems are generally better suited to this situation than are conventional shallow spread footings and a separate slab-on-grade systems.

The nature and extent of earthwork methods that would best suit this property will depend to a great extent on the details of the proposed grading and drainage plan. The development of the land into a retail development would benefit from the raising the land surface above the existing landform, by installation of structural fill, in order to enable the streets and structures to be supported above the seasonal groundwater levels, upon engineered fill materials. This report offers preliminary recommendations that assume that the landform will be raised a height of not less than 5 feet above the existing land surface.

## Site Description:

Location \& Physiography - The project site was located in Okeechobee, Florida, on State Route (SR) 70. At the time of the investigation, the site was found to have a generally flat topography. Vegetation on the site consisted mostly of light ground surface cover vegetation and many trees.

## Project Description:

The following information is based, in part, on our review of the Conceptual Sizing Plans for "Park Prime Retail (22.10.10)" and "Plan Park Street Commerce Center (12.14.22)" by American Civil Engineering Co. Due to the preliminary nature of this project, it is our understanding that the development site plan has not been finalized. Please contact KSM to provide the most recent plans, so we can make any adjustments and review this report accordingly.

Overall Development - It is our understanding that the proposed site may be developed with
for the purpose of stormwater management on the site. Typical pavement areas will consist of driveways and parking areas.

## The Scope of KSM's Study Included:

1. Performed soil borings within the approximate limits of the proposed structures and pavement areas, as well as in the proposed pond locations.
2. Measured the encountered groundwater level at each boring.
3. Reviewed the soil samples and field soil boring logs (by a geotechnical engineer) in our laboratory and assigned analytical laboratory testing to selected samples.
4. Performed the assigned analytical laboratory tests on the selected soil samples.
5. Evaluated the discovered subsurface conditions with respect to the construction of the proposed structures and roadways.
6. Prepared this preliminary report to document the data that was gathered, to present our findings and to present our preliminary recommendations.

## Site Investigation:

Limitations - The preliminary opinions and recommendations are based on the discovered subsurface conditions in the locations of the performed tests.

Subsurface Testing - KSM's site investigation program consisted of performing the following tests:

- Twenty-nine (29) Standard Penetration Test (SPT) Borings, terminated at approximate depths ranging from 10 to 15 feet below the existing ground surface, were performed within the limits of the site.
- Fifteen (15) Hand Auger (HA) Borings with corresponding Static Cone Penetrometer (SCP) Soundings, terminated at an approximate depth of 6 feet below the existing ground surface, were performed within the limits of the proposed pavement areas.
- Two (2) SPT borings, denoted as PB, terminated at an approximate depth of 20 feet below the existing ground surface, were performed within the limits of the proposed stormwater management areas.

SPT Borings - The SPT borings were performed in general accordance with procedures described in ASTM D1586.

HA Borings - The HA borings were performed using a bucket auger tool to advance the borehole and to return disturbed samples of the soils. The drilling was performed in general accordance with the procedures delineated in ASTM D1452.

SCP Soundings - Execution of a SCP sounding consists of pushing a thin steel shaft, with an
attached proving ring with a calibrated gauge. The value of the bearing pressure exerted by the cone point has been correlated with the relative soil density. The relationship of the SCP reading to the relative density is listed in the table below:

| Static Cone Penetrometer |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Relative Density | Static Penetrometer Reading |
| Very Loose or Soft | $<15$ |
| Loose | $15-40$ |
| Medium Dense | $40-70$ |
| Dense | $>70$ |

Soil Classification - The field soil boring logs and recovered soil samples were transported to KSM's office from the project site. Following the completion of the field exploration activities, visual and tactile examination of the soil samples was performed by a geotechnical engineer to identify the engineering classification of the soil samples that were obtained in the field exploration. The visual classification of the samples was performed in general accordance with the current United Soil Classification System (ASTM D2487).

General Subsurface Soil Classification Summary - The following table outlines the general subsurface conditions encountered during our investigation. Refer to the boring logs and location map for specific information regarding our interpretation of the field boring logs.

| Generalized Soil Profile |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Approximate Depth Below Grade (Feet) | Discovered Subsurface Conditions |
| 0 to 5 | Variable near surface soil conditions include: <br> - Very loose sand with organic material (problematic soil deposits) generally within 1 foot of the surface however some borings revealed problematic soil deposits to depths of 5 feet below grade; <br> - Very loose to medium dense fine sand |
| 6 to 15 | Loose to medium-dense fine sand, slightly clayey/slightly silty sand, and clayey sand |

Observed Groundwater Table - Following the completion of each soil boring, the groundwater was allowed to attain an equilibrium level and the approximate depth to the surface of the groundwater was measured from existing ground elevation and recorded in the field log. The typical observed water table was encountered at approximate depths ranging from at or above the existing grade to depths of 5.3 feet below existing grade. These values were recorded at the time of investigation, which took place between the dates of November 21, 2022, and December 15, 2022.

## Analytical Laboratory Testing:

Natural Moisture Content - Testing was performed in general accordance with procedures described in ASTM D2216-19.

Fines Content - Testing was performed in general accordance with procedures described in ASTM D1140-17.

Organic Content Tests - Testing was performed in general accordance with procedures described in ASTM D2974-20e1.

| Analytical Laboratory Testing Results |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Boring | Sample <br> Depth <br> (ft) | Soil Description | Moisture <br> $\%$ | Fines <br> $\%$ | Organic <br> Content <br> $\%$ |
| B-1 | 2 | Gray Clayey Sand | $19 \%$ | $24 \%$ |  |
| B-3 | 13 | Brown Clayey Sand | $22 \%$ | $29 \%$ |  |
| B-9 | 6 | Dark Gray Slightly Clayey Sand | $26 \%$ | $5.2 \%$ |  |
| B-10 | 2 | Dark Brown Sand with Organics | $34 \%$ |  |  |
| B-11 | 6 | Light Gray Sand | $24 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ |  |
| B-19 | 6 | Gray Slightly Silty Sand | $35 \%$ | $5.5 \%$ |  |
| B-19 | 13 | Gray Clayey Sand | $25 \%$ | $23 \%$ |  |
| B-22 | 2 | Gray Sand | $17 \%$ | $3.1 \%$ |  |
| B-24 | 2 | Dark Gray Sand | $34 \%$ | $3.7 \%$ |  |
| B-24 | 13 | Brown Clayey Sand | $2 \%$ | $33 \%$ |  |
| B-25 | 4 | Brown Sand | $31 \%$ | $4.9 \%$ |  |
| B-26 | 1 | Dark Gray Sand with Traces of <br> Roots | $27 \%$ |  |  |
| B-29 | 2 | Brown Sand | $22 \%$ | $2.5 \%$ |  |
| B-29 | 13 | Brown Slightly Clayey Sand | $29 \%$ | $11 \%$ |  |
| HA-2 | 1 | Dark Gray Silty Sand with <br> Organics | $47 \%$ |  | $7.9 \%$ |
| HA-9 | 1 | Dark Gray Silty Sand with <br> Organics | $45 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $8.0 \%$ |
| HA-12 | 1 | Dark Gray Sand, Slightly Silty <br> with Organics | $49 \%$ |  | $10.9 \%$ |

Analytical Laboratory Testing Results (Continued)

| Boring | Sample <br> Depth <br> (ft) | Soil Description | Moisture <br> $\%$ | Fines <br> $\%$ | Organic <br> Content <br> $\%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PB-1 | 3 | Light Gray Slightly Silty Sand | $27 \%$ | $5.8 \%$ |  |
| PB-1 | 5 | Grayish Brown Sand | $24 \%$ | $3.7 \%$ |  |
| PB-1 | 10 | Grayish Brown Sand | $25 \%$ | $2.2 \%$ |  |
| PB-1 | 12 | Gray Slightly Clayey Sand | $23 \%$ | $9.8 \%$ |  |
| PB-2 | 3 | Light Gray Sand | $25 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ |  |
| PB-2 | 5 | Dark Gray Sand, Slightly Silty | $24 \%$ | $11 \%$ |  |
| PB-2 | 7 | Light Gray Sand | $25 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ |  |
| PB-2 | 12 | Gray Clayey Sand | $22 \%$ | $33 \%$ |  |
| PB-2 | 16 | Light Brown Clayey Sand | $27 \%$ | $19 \%$ |  |
| PB-2 | 18 | Light Gray Clayey Sand with | $13 \%$ | $12 \%$ |  |

Based on the information obtained from this site investigation, we are pleased to offer the following evaluation:

Limitations - Due to the preliminary nature of this project, KSM recommends that additional testing is performed within the development features once the final locations are known. The following information is preliminary and based on the initial conceptual site layout and may not correspond to the final design site layout.

Seasonal Groundwater Fluctuation - The following table indicates the recorded measurement taken from the existing grade to the encountered groundwater table for each test location along with our estimated depth normal wet season water table and normal dry season water table depths (below existing grade) for the test locations. The measurements were taken after the borings were performed and the groundwater table was allowed to stabilize.

| Estimated Normal Season Groundwater Table Fluctuation |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Test Location <br> (See Location <br> Plan) | Depth (feet,') Below Existing Grade |  |  |
|  | Measured <br> Encountered <br> Groundwater Table | Estimated <br> Normal Wet Season <br> Water Table | Normal Dry Season <br> Water Table |
| PB-1 | $1.0^{\prime}$ | $0.3^{\prime}$ | $3.3^{\prime}$ |
| PB-2 | $2.4^{\prime}$ | $1.0^{\prime}$ | $4.0^{\prime}$ |

featured deeper groundwater surface depths were likely to have been drilled at locations where the land surface altitude was above boring locations that featured shallower groundwater surface depth measurements, or that the range and depth of the water table elevation may be affected by the proximity of man-made or natural drainage features. Accordingly, as part of the design phase geotechnical studies, KSM recommends that the land surface elevation of the borings be surveyed to determine the approximate altitude of the groundwater surface, at the time that the measurements were made. Using that data, KSM can provide a more precise estimate of seasonal groundwater levels.

Dewatering - Given the normal wet season groundwater surface level estimates, and assuming that KSM's estimates of the height of the fill stated in the "Project Description" section is accurate, it is KSM's preliminary opinion that the position of the groundwater table is unlikely to affect either the design or the installation of the shallow foundations that will support the dwellings constructed on this property. Conversely, KSM anticipates that the earthwork stage of site development will require the compaction and/or excavation of soils located below the groundwater surface. Additionally, excavations that are made to install buried utility lines could also require excavations below the groundwater surface. Accordingly, the earthwork contractor should recognize that temporary dewatering of excavations that penetrate below the prevailing groundwater surface will be necessary to allow the earthwork operations to be performed in dry conditions and plan his operations accordingly.

Analysis and Opinions: Fill Suitability - Based on the discovered soils in the locations of PB-1 and PB-2, KSM offers the following recommendations on the suitability of fill deposits that will be used to rough grade the property in preparation for the installation of the roadway and utility networks and for the construction of the individual dwellings.

- Fine sands deposits, which feature less than 5 percent "fines", are considered to be best suited as a structural fill source because they drain freely when excavated below the water table and are not as moisture sensitive as material that contains higher fines.
- The slightly clayey/silty fine sands containing between 5 and 12 percent fines, are suitable as structural fill, but may require extra effort to be properly moisture conditioned and compacted. These soil deposits drain fairly well but will require more effort than the fine sand deposits above to create optimum moisture conditions in order to avoid compaction issues. Thinner lifts not exceeding 6 inches in loose thickness may be required for placement and compaction of these soils.
- Clayey and/or silty fine sand deposits, (i.e., sand deposits that contain more than 12 percent fines, by weight) are typically not considered desirable for structural fill, due to their poor workability characteristics in comparison with sand deposits that feature fewer fines. Due to the moisture sensitive nature of these materials a substantial amount of time and effort would be required in order to improve their workability. The discovered clayey sand deposits may be more suitable for use as fill material in nonstructural areas outside the building pad and within the pavement area footprint, and potentially as a stabilized subgrade component in the roadway pavement cross
necessary to moisture condition and densify such soil deposits. Such efforts could include draining/drying of saturated soils before attempting compaction, reduction in the thickness of lifts that are compacted, and the use of non-vibratory compaction machinery.
- Soil deposits that featured organic contents greater than 5 percent should not be considered suitable soils for structural fill.

Borrow Source Suitability Opinions - KSM assumes that the soil that is excavated to create the stormwater management basin will be used as a source of fill in creating the landform of the developed property. Based on the results of the field investigation, together with the analytical laboratory testing of the selected soil samples, KSM offers the following opinions:

- From the surface to an approximate depth of 10 feet below existing grade - Deposits of fine sand and slightly clayey/silty sand were discovered. These granular, low fines content deposits can be considered suitable for structural fill.
- From a depth of approximately 10 to 15 feet below existing grade - Deposits of clayey/silty sand were discovered. We anticipate that most of the excavated soils within this depth interval will feature fines contents that exceed 12 percent. These soil deposits are expected to be moisture sensitive soils, given their elevated fines content and the estimated shallow position of the surface of the wet season groundwater table. To avoid compaction-related issues during construction, it is KSM's opinion that excavated soils with elevated fines content should not be considered suitable as structural fill for building pads or in pavement areas. In no case should these materials be used in areas that are expected to contain septic drain fields, due to their expected low internal permeability.
- From a depth of approximately 15 to 20 feet below existing grade - Deposits of fine sand with shell and slightly silty/clayey sand were encountered. These granular, low fines content deposits can be considered suitable for structural fill.

The contractor and civil engineer should coordinate to determine the appropriate methods for borrow source excavation. It is important to segregate the low-fines soil deposits from the near-surface clayey and silty sand deposits.

Preliminary Utility and Storm Sewer Opinions - Due to the expected very shallow seasonal depth to the surface of the groundwater, we believe that difficulties may arise when installing any utility that will require trenching and/or that will rely on gravity flow. Trench excavations that encounter very loose subsurface materials may require over-excavation, typically to a depth of 1 foot below the utility subgrade elevation, backfilled with $3 / 4$-inch stone compacted to produce a firm, unyielding surface. Any excavated materials with elevated fines content will likely prove to be problematic if intended to be used as backfill. Blending of the excavated material with dry, clean fine sand may be necessary, but due to the time and effort required to properly blend these materials, for ease of construction and scheduling considerations, it may

Analysis and Opinions: Preliminary Subgrade Opinions - Based on our experience in the area, the results of the borings, and KSM's understanding of the project, we believe that the current conditions of the near surface soils are problematic for development due to the high degree of variation between borings, elevated organic content, to the elevated fines content, to the very loose to loose condition of the near-surface soil deposits, and to the anticipated shallow depth to the groundwater table. Excavation of problematic soils and backfill of the exposed areas to create a stable platform for the expected fill deposits will require that temporary dewatering systems be installed to depress the groundwater level. Please note that estimating the vertical and horizontal limits of any problematic material was as part of our scope for this investigation. KSM recommends that a design level geotechnical investigation is performed on this site to aid in the development of design plans.

Preliminary Minimum Roadway Opinions - It is our preliminary opinion that the discovered subsurface conditions are generally problematic to support a roadway subgrade. It appears that prior to the installation of the proposed roadway section, improvement of the existing subgrade can be achieved using a proper excavation and backfilling techniques. Additionally, the cost of dewatering should be considered. Provided that the subgrade is properly prepared and that the building pads are properly installed, it is KSM's opinion that the improved subgrade can support the proposed roadway section.

The pavement should be designed for the anticipated axle weights, vehicle velocities, traffic mix and frequencies. Please refer to the following table for the minimum recommended pavement section.

A minimum of 16 inches of separation should be maintained between the bottom of the base and the high-season water table.

| Minimum Pavement Section |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pavement <br> Type | Material | Layer Thickness (in) |  |
|  |  | Standard Duty | Heavy Duty |
|  | Florida DOT Asphalt Type 3 | Base Course* (Min. LBR of 100) <br> Cemented Coquina Rock | 1.5 |
|  | Stabilized Subgrade* (Min. LBR of 40) | 6 | 10 |

* Compacted to minimum 98 percent of its modified dry Proctor value (AASHTO T180)

Preliminary Foundation Opinions - In order for a shallow foundation to perform satisfactorily, it must be able to support the structural loads while limiting both total and differential settlement to tolerable values. It is our preliminary opinion that the discovered subsurface conditions are generally problematic to support a building pad subgrade. It appears that prior to the installation of the proposed buildings pads, improvement of the existing subgrade can be achieved using a proper excavation and backfilling techniques. Additionally, the cost of dewatering should be considered. Provided that the subgrade is properly prepared and that

For more precise building area site and roadway preparation recommendations, as well as recommendations pertaining to foundation design and settlement calculations, we recommend performing a design level investigation. KSM should be provided with the civil construction drawing set as well as the structural plans for review. Please see the section titled "Future Studies" for additional information.

## Estimated Aquifer Parameters:

Limitations - Due to the preliminary nature of this project, KSM recommends that additional testing is performed within the proposed stormwater management features once the locations and elevations are better defined. The following information is preliminary and based on the initial stormwater management layout and may not correspond to the proposed stormwater management layout.

Factor of Safety - KSM has not applied a factor of safety to the estimated aquifer parameters within this report. The Engineer of Record is responsible for applying the appropriate factor(s) of safety to the estimated aquifer parameters contained within this report for use in their design. For any stratum where the estimated flow rate exceeds 10 inches per hour ( 20 feet per day), we recommend that a design flow rate equal to $10 \mathrm{in} / \mathrm{hr}$ ( $20 \mathrm{ft} /$ day) is used.

In-Field Testing - At the test location, Usual Condition Test was performed in general conformance with the South Florida Water Management District described procedures for the 'Usual Open-Hole Test' method.

| Estimated Aquifer Parameters - In-Field Testing |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Test Location | Estimated Hydraulic Conductivity <br> (CFS/SF- Ft Head) |
| P-1 | $2.5 \times 10^{-5}$ |
| P-2 | $7.6 \times 10^{-5}$ |

Laboratory Testing and Professional Judgement - Selected samples obtained from our site investigation were tested in our laboratory in general accordance with ASTM D2434, ASTM D1140-17 and ASTM C136.

| Estimated Aquifer Parameters - Laboratory Testing |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Test Location | Stratum Depth <br> Range <br> (ft) | Horizontal <br> Saturated Flow <br> Rate (in/hr) | Vertical <br> Saturated Flow <br> Rate (in/hr) |
|  | $0.8-1.8$ | 1.9 | 0.9 |
| 2 P-2 | $1.8-4.2$ | 3.2 | $2.2^{\dagger}$ |

$\dagger$ Fstimation: reduction of estimated horizontal saturated flow rate annlied.

Restrictive Stratum - Based on the results of our soil borings and the laboratory testing, in boring PB-1 we encountered a stratum which we estimate exhibit restrictive flow rates relative to the overlying stratum, and are described below:

- Deposits of Dark Gray Silty Sand with Organics encountered at an approximate depth range from the surface to 0.8 feet below grade.


## Future Studies:

Design Phase Geotechnical Explorations - KSM recommends that a design-phase geotechnical exploration be performed to determine whether individual structures are underlain by any organic soil deposits or inherently problematic soils and to generate the subsurface data that is necessary to provide site specific foundation design and earthwork recommendations. Upon request, KSM will provide a detailed scope of work and cost proposal to address these features, based on the preliminary plan documents.

## Closure:

Based upon KSM's subsurface investigation at the above-mentioned project location, the reliance of the preliminary opinions and recommendations presented within this signed and sealed report is predicated on KSM being engaged to perform design-basis geotechnical explorations and testing. The opinions and recommendations given in this report are preliminary and should not be used to create final plan documents and specifications.

This report has been prepared in accordance with generally accepted soil and foundation engineering practices based on the results of the borings and the assumed loading conditions. No warranties, either expressed or implied, are intended or made. This report does not reflect any variations which may occur between the borings. If variations appear evident during construction, it will be necessary for you or your representative to engage KSM to perform any supplementary studies and to re-evaluate the recommendations made in this report.

Environmental conditions, wetland delineation, karst activity, water quality, and municipal requirements were not a part of this study.

KSM is pleased to have been of assistance to you on this phase of your project. When we may be of further service to you or should you have any questions, please contact us.

Respectfully,

$$
\text { Curatophen } \angle e \theta_{\text {reus }}
$$



# AMERICAN CIVIL ENGINEERING CO. 
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## Stormwater Letter

To: City of Okeechobee
General Services Department
55 S.E. $3^{\text {rd }}$ Avenue, Room 101
Okeechobee, FL 34974

Regarding: Stormwater Carwash - Portion of Park Street Commerce Center
Storm water for the carwash is met as part of the co-submitted master storm report for the infrastructure of Park street Commerce Center. The master report allows for up to 1.00 AC , the site proposed at 0.94 AC meets this criteria and is fully accounted for in the master permit.

|  | Impervious Area Accounted |
| :--- | :---: |
| Lot 1 | 1.00 AC |
| Lot 2 | 1.50 AC |
| Lot 3 | 1.75 AC |
| Lot 4 | 1.75 AC |
| Roadway | $\underline{0.80 \mathrm{AC}}$ |
| Total | $\frac{6.80 \mathrm{AC}}{}$ |

Please contact me directly on my cell phone 407-376-1777 regarding any questions.

Thank you,

# PARK STREET COMMERCE CENTER TRAFFIC STUDY 

OKEECHOBEE COUNTY, FLORIDA

July 2023


## BUCKHOLZ TRAFFIC



## BUCKHOLZ TRAFFIC

3585 KORI ROAD
JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA 32257
(904) 886-2171 jwbuckholz@aol.com

July 11, 2023

Mr. Johnny Herbert IV, P.E.
American Civil Engineering Company
207 N. Moss Road / \#211
Winter Springs, Florida 32708

## Re: Park Street Commerce Center, Revised Traffic Study

Dear Mr. Herbert:
Attached is the revised traffic study. If there are any questions or comments regarding this study, please contact me.

Sincerely,


Jeffrey W. Buckholz, P.E., PTOE
Principal

This item has been digitally signed and sealed by Jeffrey W. Buckholz, P.E. on the date indicated on the seal. Printed copies of this document are not considered signed and sealed and the signature must be verified on any electronic copies.

## INTRODUCTION

This proposed mixed-use development will include a 4600 sf automated car wash, a 5000 sf fast food restaurant with drive-thru window, a 100 room hotel, 52 apartment units, and 10,000 sf of retail space. The fast food restaurant will open at 10 AM and the car wash will open at 9:00 AM. The development will be located in the northwest quadrant of the NE Park Street/SE $13^{\text {th }}$ Avenue intersection in Okeechobee, Florida. A cul-de-sac road that extends $13^{\text {th }}$ Avenue to the north will be installed on site property and access will be provided to the various land uses from this road. NE Park Street (SR 70) is a four lane divided urban major arterial with an FDOT access management classification of 7 and a posted speed limit of 35 mph . SE $13^{\text {th }}$ Avenue is a two lane undivided local road with a posted speed limit of 25 mph .

Figure 1 shows the site location and surrounding road network while Appendix A contains the proposed site plan. The development is expected to be complete and fully occupied by the end of 2024. Consequently, 2024 was chosen as the design year for this study.

## EXISTING TRAFFIC VOLUMES

Weekday peak period manual turning movement counts were conducted by Buckholz Traffic personnel at the intersection of NE Park Street with SE $13^{\text {th }}$ Avenue and with the Hampton Inn driveway located west of SE $13^{\text {th }}$ Avenue. These counts, which are provided in Appendix B, were conducted during the weekday AM peak period (6:45-8:45 AM) and the weekday PM peak period (3:45-6:00 PM) with school in session. The data was recorded at 15 -minute intervals and includes a separate tabulation for trucks and pedestrians. Figure 2 graphically summarizes the AM and PM peak hour traffic counts.

Appendix C provides daily traffic volumes from two nearby FDOT traffic count stations on SR 70. The existing average daily traffic on NE Park Street in the vicinity of the site is about 29,000 vehicles per day.

## TRIP GENERATION

Trip generation calculations were carried out using the 11th edition of ITE's Trip Generation Manual by referencing land use codes 948 (Automated Car Wash), 934 (Fast Food Restaurant with Drive-Thru Window), 312 (Business Hotel), 220 (Low Rise Multifamily Housing) and 822 (Strip Retail Plaza). Tables 1 through 5 contain the daily, AM peak hour, and PM peak hour trip generation calculations. During an average weekday the development is expected to generate 4424 trips ( 2212 entering and 2212 exiting) with 87 trips ( 36 entering and 51 exiting) occurring during the AM peak hour and 369 trips ( 193 entering and 176 exiting) occurring during the PM peak hour.

## SITE TRIP DISTRIBUTION AND TRAFFIC ASSIGNMENT

Weekday AM and PM peak hour site trips for this commercial development were directionally distributed based on engineering judgment after reviewing the trip distribution percentages used in the 2020 traffic study for the nearby RaceTrac commercial development. The results are provided in Figures 3 and 4.

## FUTURE TRAFFIC VOLUMES

The expected weekday 2024 peak hour background (No Build) traffic volumes and total (Build) traffic volumes at intersections of interest are graphically depicted in Figures 5 through 8. The No Build traffic volumes were obtained by multiplying the existing traffic volumes by the appropriate FDOT seasonal adjustment factor ( 0.96 ) and then by an annual growth rate. A linear regression analysis of FDOT daily traffic counts in the area (see graphs C-1 and C-2 in Appendix C) indicates that daily traffic volumes have been increasing at an average annual rate of $1.5 \%$ over recent years. The 2024 Build traffic volumes were obtained by adding the traffic generated by the new development to the 2024 No Build traffic volumes.

## TURN LANE EVALUATION

A formal analysis was made to determine if a right turn lane is warranted on westbound NE Park Street at the two new roadways: NE $13^{\text {th }}$ Avenue and NE $12^{\text {th }}$ Avenue. The methodology contained in NCHRP Report 279 was used to conduct this analysis. As is indicated in Figures 9 and 10, right turn volumes under expected 2024 Build conditions will be high enough to warrant an exclusive right turn lane at NE $13^{\text {th }}$ Avenue but will not be high enough to warrant an exclusive right turn lane at NE $12^{\text {th }}$ Avenue. However, NCHRP Report 420 - which requires 110 right turns per hour to warrant a right turn lane on a multi-lane roadway with a posted speed of 45 mph or less - does not support the installation of an exclusive right turn lane at either location.

## UNSIGNALIZED INTERSECTION CAPACITY ANALYSIS

The NE Park Street/13th Avenue intersection and the NE Park Street/Hampton Inn Driveway/NE $12^{\text {th }}$ Avenue intersection were analyzed using the two-way stop control methodology contained in the year 2023 version of the Highway Capacity Software. The supporting calculations are provided in Appendix D. Table 6 summarizes the capacity analysis results under existing conditions while Table 7 summarizes the capacity analysis results under 2024 Build conditions.

All minor movements currently operate at level of service C or better during both weekday peak hours at the NE Park Street/SE $13^{\text {th }}$ Avenue intersection with minimal queuing and a volume-to-capacity ratio well below one. Under 2024 Build conditions at the new NE Park Street/ $13^{\text {th }}$ Avenue intersection with dual directional median opening all minor movements are expected to continue to operate at level of service C or better during both peak hours with minimal queuing and a volume-to-capacity ratio still well below one.

At the NE Park Street/Hampton Inn Driveway intersection all minor movements currently operate at level of service B or better during both weekday peak hours with minimal queuing and a volume-to-capacity ratio well below one.

Under 2024 Build conditions all minor movements at the NE Park Street/Hampton Inn Driveway/NE $12^{\text {th }}$ Avenue intersection are expected to operate at level of service C or better during both weekday peak hours - with one exception. The westbound left turn is expected to operate at level of service F during the PM peak hour. However, only moderate queuing and a volume-to-capacity ratio below one are expected for this movement movements.

## BUCKHOLZ TRAFFIC



## FIGURE 1
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2024 BUILD TRAFFIC
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NOMOGRAPH FOR RIGHT TURN LANES
SOURCE: TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH BOARD NCHRP REPORT \#279
[ WEEKDAY AM PEAK HOUR

| $V_{A}$ | 1158 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $V_{R}$ | 18 |

O WEEKDAY PM PEAK HOUR

| $V_{A}$ | 1284 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $V_{R}$ | 84 |


| NCHRP 420 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| MULTI-LANE $\leq 45 \mathrm{MPH}$ |  |

18 \& $84<110$ REQUIRED


## NOMOGRAPH FOR RIGHT TURN LANES

SOURCE: TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH BOARD NCHRP REPORT \#279

- WEEKDAY AM PEAK

| HOUR |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $V_{A}$ | 1188 |
| $V_{R}$ | 0 |

- WEEKDAY PM PEAK $\bigcirc$

| $V_{A}$ | 1310 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $V_{R}$ | 21 |


| NCHRP 420 |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| MULTI-LANE | $\leq 45 \mathrm{MPH}$ |

FIGURE 10

RIGHT TURN LANE
ANALYSIS

## TABLE 1

## TRIP GENERATION CALCULATIONS

```
AUTOMATED CAR WASH
Land Use Code 948
T = Number of Vehicle Trip Ends
X = 4600 GSF = 4.6
```



Estimated Using ITE Hourly Percentages from LUC 949

## TABLE 2

## TRIP GENERATION CALCULATIONS

```
FAST-FOOD RESTAURANT WITH DRIVE-THRU WINDOW
Land Use Code 934
T = Number of Vehicle Trip Ends
Size of Building = 5000 ( }\textrm{X}=5.0
\begin{tabular}{ccccccc} 
& TOTAL & TOTAL & & & TOTAL & TOTAL \\
& TRIP GENERATION & TRIP & PERCENT & PERCENT & TRIP ENDS & TRIP ENDS \\
TIME PERIOD & EQUATION & ENDS & ENTERING & EXITING & ENTERING & EXITING \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
AVERAGE WEEKDAY
\begin{tabular}{lcccccc} 
Daily & \(T=467.48(X)\) & 2338 & \(50 \%\) & \(50 \%\) & 1169 & 1169 \\
AM Peak Hour & & & NOT OPEN & & & \\
PM Peak Hour & \(T=33.03(X)\) & 165 & \(52 \%\) & \(48 \%\) & 86 & 79
\end{tabular}
SOURCE: Institute of Transportation Engineers, "Trip Generation", 11th Edition (2021)
```

| NEW TRIPS |  | NEW |  |  | NEW | NEW |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | TRIP | PERCENT | PERCENT | TRIP ENDS | TRIP ENDS |
| TIME PERIOD | PERCENT NEW TRIPS | ENDS | ENTERING | EXITING | ENTERING | EXITING |
| AVERAGE WEEK |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Daily | 52\% | 1216 | 50\% | 50\% | 608 | 608 |
| AM Peak Hour | 50\% |  | NOT OPEN |  |  |  |
| PM Peak Hour | 55\% | 91 | 52\% | 48\% | 47 | 44 |

## Estimated Value

## TRIP GENERATION CALCULATIONS

```
BUSINESS HOTEL
Land Use Code 312
T = Number of Vehicle Trip Ends
X= Rooms = 100
```

|  | TOTAL | TOTAL |  | TOTAL | TOTAL |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TRIP GENERATION | TRIP | PERCENT | PERCENT | TRIP ENDS | TRIP ENDS |
| TIME EERIOD | EQUATION | ENDS | ENTERING | EXITING | ENTERING | EXITING |

AVERAGE WEEKDAY

| Daily | $T=2.90(X)+151.69$ | 442 | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ | 221 | 221 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| AM Peak Hour | $T=0.30(X)+6.94$ | 37 | $39 \%$ | $61 \%$ | 14 | 23 |
| PM Peak Hour | $T=0.21(X)+12.03$ | 33 | $55 \%$ | $45 \%$ | 18 | 15 |
| SOURCE: Institute of Transportation Engineers, "Trip Generation", 11th Edition (2021) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## TABLE 4

## TRIP GENERATION CALCULATIONS

```
MULTIFAMILY HOUSING (LOW-RISE)
Not Close to Rail Transit
Land Use Code 220
T = Number of Vehicle Trip Ends
X = Number of Dwelling Units = 52
\begin{tabular}{ccccccc} 
& & & & TOTAL & & TOTAL \\
& & & \\
& TRIP GENERATION & TRIP & PERCENT & PERCENT & TRIP ENDS \\
TIME PERIOD & EQUATION & ENDS & ENTERING & EXITING & ENTERING & EXITING \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
WEEKDAY
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Daily & \(T=6.74\) & (X) & 350 & 50\% & 50\% & 175 & 175 \\
\hline AM Peak Hour & \(T=0.40\) & (X) & 21 & 24\% & \(76 \%\) & 5 & 16 \\
\hline PM Peak Hour & \(T=0.51\) & (X) & 27 & 63\% & 37\% & 17 & 10 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

SOURCE: Institute of Transportation Engineers, "Trip Generation", 11th Edition (2021)

## TABLE 5 <br> TRIP GENERATION CALCULATIONS

```
STRIP RETAIL PLAZA (Less Than 40,000 gsf)
Land Use Code 822
T = Number of Vehicle Trip Ends
Size of Buildings = 10,000 gsf -----> X 10.0
```



NEW TRIPS


## Estimated Value

NE PARK STREET / SE 13TH AVENUE

|  | WEEKDAY AM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | LOS | Delay | V/C Ratio | 95th \% Queue <br> (vehicles) |
| Eastbound U-Turn | C | $21.9 \mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}$ | 0.02 | 1 |
| Westbound Left Turn | B | $11.0 \mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}$ | 0.01 | 1 |
| Northbound Approach | C | $15.6 \mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}$ | 0.03 | 1 |


|  | WEEKDAY PM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | LOS | Delay | V/C Ratio | 95th \% Queue <br> (vehicles) |
| Eastbound U-Turn | C | $20.8 \mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}$ | 0.02 | 1 |
| Westbound Left Turn | B | $13.7 \mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}$ | 0.08 | 1 |
| Northbound Approach | C | $16.6 \mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}$ | 0.06 | 1 |

NE PARK STREET / HAMPTON INN DRIVEWAY

|  | WEEKDAY AM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | LOS | Delay | V/C Ratio | 95th \% Queue <br> (vehicles) |
| Westbound Left Turn | B | $10.4 \mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}$ | 0.01 | 1 |
| Northbound Right Turn | B | $12.3 \mathrm{sec} /$ veh | 0.03 | 1 |


|  | WEEKDAY PM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | LOS | Delay | V/C Ratio | 95th \% Queue <br> (vehicles) |
| Westbound Left Turn | B | $12.7 \mathrm{sec} /$ veh | 0.04 | 1 |
| Northbound Right Turn | B | $14.9 \mathrm{sec} /$ veh | 0.05 | 1 |

TABLE 7
UNSIGNALIZED INTERSECTION CAPACITY RESULTS 2024 BUILD CONDITIONS

NE PARK STREET $/ 3^{\text {TH }}$ AVENUE

|  | WEEKDAY AM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | LOS | Delay | V/C Ratio | 95th \% Queue <br> (vehicles) |
| Eastbound Left Turn | C | $15.1 \mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}$ | 0.07 | 1 |
| Westbound Left Turn | B | $11.3 \mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}$ | 0.01 | 1 |
| Northbound Approach | B | $13.7 \mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}$ | 0.02 | 1 |
| Southbound Approach | C | $15.4 \mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}$ | 0.15 | 1 |


|  | WEEKDAY PM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | LOS | Delay | V/C Ratio | 95th \% Queue <br> (vehicles) |
| Eastbound Left Turn | C | $18.9 \mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}$ | 0.30 | 1.3 |
| Westbound Left Turn | B | $14.9 \mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}$ | 0.09 | 1 |
| Northbound Approach | C | $15.5 \mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}$ | 0.05 | 1 |
| Southbound Approach | C | $18.1 \mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}$ | 0.34 | 1.5 |

NE PARK STREET / NE $12{ }^{\text {TH }}$ AVENUE / HAMPTON INN DRIVEWAY

|  | WEEKDAY AM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | LOS | Delay | V/C Ratio | 95th \% Queue <br> (vehicles) |
| Westbound Left Turn | C | $17.6 \mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}$ | 0.11 | 1 |
| Northbound Right Turn | B | $12.5 \mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}$ | 0.03 | 1 |
| Southbound Right Turn | B | $14.0 \mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}$ | 0.00 | 1 |


|  | WEEKDAY PM PEAK HOUR |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | LOS | Delay | V/C Ratio | 95th \% Queue <br> (vehicles) |
| Westbound Left Turn | $\mathbf{F}$ | $68.7 \mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}$ | 0.72 | $\mathbf{4 . 3}$ |
| Northbound Right Turn | C | $15.9 \mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}$ | 0.05 | 1 |
| Southbound Right Turn | C | $15.2 \mathrm{sec} / \mathrm{veh}$ | 0.12 | 1 |

## APPENDIX A

## SITE PLAN






## APPENDIX B

TURNING MOVEMENT COUNTS


> TABLE B-1
> NE Park Street (SR 70) / Hampton inn Driveway TURNING MOVEMENT COUNTS - ALL VEHICLES

Monday, February 13, 2023

|  | NE PARK STREET |  |  | HAMPTON INN DRIVEWAY |  | All |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EB RightTurn | WB U-Turn | WB Left Turn | NB Left Turn | NB Right Turn |  |
| 6:45-7:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 7:00-7:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7:15-7:30 AM | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| 7:30-7:45 AM | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 |
| 7:45-8:00 AM | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 8 |
| 8:00-8:15 AM | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| 8:15-8:30 AM | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 |
| 8:30-8:45 AM | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 |
| AM PEAK PERIOD: | 7 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 18 | 32 |
| AM PEAK HOUR: | 2 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 13 | 21 |

Monday, February 13, 2023

|  | NE PARK STREET |  |  | HAMPTON INN DRIVEWAY |  | All |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EB RightTurn | WB U-Turn | WB Left Turn | NB Left Turn | NB Right Turn |  |
| 3:45-4:00 PM | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 12 |
| 4:00-4:15 PM | 4 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 5 | 17 |
| 4:15-4:30 PM | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 8 |
| 4:30-4:45 PM | 3 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 9 | 17 |
| 4:45-5:00 PM | 13 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 12 | 31 |
| 5:00-5:15 PM | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 15 |
| 5:15-5:30 PM | 7 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 16 |
| 5:30-5:45 PM | 14 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 23 |
| 5:45-6:00 PM | 9 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 5 | 22 |
| PM PEAK PERIOD: | 63 | 1 | 44 | 0 | 53 | 161 |
| PM PEAK HOUR: | 38 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 18 | 76 |
| 5:00-6:00 PM |  |  |  |  |  |  |

JW BUCKHOLZ TRAFFIC ENGINEERING INC
DAY: MONDAY MANUAL TURNING NOVEMENT COUNTS
DATE: 02/13/23
NE PARK STREET @ SE 13TH AVENUE
Site Code : 44444444

WEATHER: CLEAR \& DRY
OKEECHOBEE COUNTY, FLORIDA
Start Date: 02/13/23
File I.D. : 021323AM
Page : 1
AUTOMOBILES, COMMERCIAL VEHICLES



Peak Hour Analysis By Entire Intersection for the Period: 07:15 to 08:15 on 02/13/23

| Peak start | 07:15 |  |  |  | 07:15 |  |  |  | 07:15 |  |  |  | 07:15 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| volume | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 1160 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 916 | 4 | 4 |
| Percent | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1\% | 99\% | 0\% | 0\% | 22\% | 0\% | 78\% | 0\% | 0\% | 99\% | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Pk total | 0 |  |  |  | 1167 |  |  |  | 9 |  |  |  | 924 |  |  |  |
| Highest | 06:45 |  |  |  | 07:45 |  |  |  | 08:00 |  |  |  | 08:00 |  |  |  |
| volume | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 332 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 246 | 1 | 0 |
| Hi total | 0 |  |  |  | 334 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 247 |  |  |  |
| PHF | . 0 |  |  |  | . 87 |  |  |  | . 75 |  |  |  | 94 |  |  |  |

JW EUCKHOLZ TRAFFIC ENGINEERING INC
DAY: MONDAY MANUAL TURNING MOVEMENT COUNTS
Sice Code : 44444444
DATE: 02/13/23
NE PARK STREET Q SE 13TH AVENUE
Start Date: 02/13/23
OKEECHOEEE COUNTY, FLORIDA
File I.D. : 021323AM
Page : 1

## AUIOMOBILES


$\qquad$

| 06:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 186 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 174 | 1 | 1 | 364 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 07:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 143 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 208 | 1 | 1 | 357 |
| 07:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 195 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 176 | 0 | 1 | 376 |
| 07:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 266 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 177 | 1 | 2 | 449 |
| Hr Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 790 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 735 | 3 | 5 | 1546 |
| 07:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 288 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 201 | 1 | 1 | 494 |
| 08:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 237 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 197 | 1 | 0 | 438 |
| 08:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 177 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 143 | 0 | 1 | 323 |
| 08:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 179 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 195 | 0 | 0 | 375 |
| Hr Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 881 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 736 | 2 | 2 | 1630 |



Peak Hour Analysis By Entire Intersection for the Period: 07:15 to 08:15 on 02/13/23

| Peak start | 07:15 |  |  |  | 07:15 |  |  |  | 07:15 |  |  |  | 07:15 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 986 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 751 | 3 | 4 |
| Percent | 0\% | 0\% | $0 \%$ | 0\% | 1\% | 99\% | 0\% | $0 \%$ | 29\% | 0\% | 71\% | 0\% | 0\% | 99\% | O 0 | 1\% |
| Pk total | 0 |  |  |  | 992 |  |  |  | 7 |  |  |  | 758 |  |  |  |
| Highest | 06:45 |  |  |  | 07:45 |  |  |  | 08:00 |  |  |  | 07:45 |  |  |  |
| volume | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 288 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 201 | 1 | 1 |
| Hi total | 0 |  |  |  | 290 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 203 |  |  |  |
| PHF | . 0 |  |  |  | . 86 |  |  |  | . 58 |  |  |  | .93 |  |  |  |

DAY: MONDAY
DATE : 02/13/23
WEATHER: CLEAR \& DRY BEGIN TIME (MILITARY):06:45 Hrs

JW BUCKHOLZ TRAFFIC ENGINEERING INC
manual turning movement counts
NE PARK STREET @ SE 13TH AVENUE
Site Code : 44444444
Start Date: 02/13/23
File I.D. : 021323AM
page : 1

COMMERCIAL VEHICLES


| *TOTAL* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 326 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 335 | 1 | 0 | 669 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Peak Hour Analysis By Entire Intersection for the Period: 07:15 to 08:15 on 02/13/23

| Peak start | 07:15 |  |  |  | 07:15 |  |  |  | 07:15 |  |  |  | 07:15 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| volume | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 174 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 165 | 1 | 0 |
| Percent | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1\% | 99\% | 0\% | $0 \%$ | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | $0 \%$ | 1\% | 99\% | 1\% | $0 \%$ |
| Pk total | 0 |  |  |  | 175 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 167 |  |  |  |
| Highest | 06:45 |  |  |  | 08:00 |  |  |  | 07:15 |  |  |  | 08:00 |  |  |  |
| volume | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 0 |
| Hi total | 0 |  |  |  | 57 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 49 |  |  |  |
| PHF | . 0 |  |  |  | . 77 |  |  |  | . 50 |  |  |  | . 85 |  |  |  |

# JW BUCKHOLZ TRAFFIC ENGINEERING INC 

DAY: MONDAY MANUAL TURNING MOVEMENT COUNTS
DATE: 02/13/23
ne park street a se 13 TH avenue

Site Code : 44444444
Start Date: 02/13/23 File I.D. : 021323AM
page : 1

## pedestrian \& bicycle



| 06:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 07:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 07:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Hr Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1. |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 07:45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| 08:00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 08:15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 08:30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Hr Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 |





AUTOMOBILES, COMMERCIAL VEHICLES


| *TOTAL* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 | 2593 | 2 | 7 | 12 | 0 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 2729 | 35 | 12 \| | 5473 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Peak Hour Analysis By Entire Intersection for the Period: 17:00 to 18:00 on 02/13/23

| Peak star | 17:00 |  |  |  | 17:00 |  |  |  | 17:00 |  |  |  | 17:00 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 1183 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 1281 | 15 | 5 |
| Percent | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | $0 \%$ | $3 \%$ | 97\% | 0\% | 0\% | 11\% | 0\% | 89\% | 0\% | 0\% | 98\% | 1\% | 0\% |
| Pk total | 0 |  |  |  | 1217 |  |  |  | 19 |  |  |  | 1301 |  |  |  |
| Highest | 15:45 |  |  |  | 17:45 |  |  |  | 17:45 |  |  |  | 17:00 |  |  |  |
| Volume | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 311 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 375 | 1 | 2 |
| Hi total | 0 |  |  |  | 319 |  |  |  | 8 |  |  |  | 378 |  |  |  |
| PHF | . 0 |  |  |  | . 95 |  |  |  | . 59 |  |  |  | . 86 |  |  |  |

JW BUCKHOLZ TRAFFIC ENGINEERING INC
DAY: MONDAY
MANUAL TURNING MOVEMENT COUNTS
NE PARK STREET @ SE 13TH AVENUE
Site Code : 02132023
OAEECHOSEE COUNTY FLORTDA
Start Date: 02/13/23
File I.D. : 021323PM
Page : 1
AUTOMOBILES



Peak Hour Analysis By Entire Intersection for the Period: 17:00 to 18:00 on 02/13/23

| Peak start | 17:00 |  |  |  | 1 | 17:00 |  |  |  | \| | 17:00 |  |  |  |  | 17:00 |  |  | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Volume | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 31 | 1074 | 0 | 2 |  | 2 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1153 | 15 | 51 |
| Percent | 0 \% | 0\% | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |  | 3\% | 97\% | 0\% | $0 \%$ | 1 | 11\% | 0\% | 89\% | 0\% | 1 | 0\% | 98\% | 1\% | 0\% 1 |
| Pk total | 0 |  |  |  | 1 | 1107 |  |  |  | 1 | 19 |  |  |  | I | 1173 |  |  |  |
| Highest | 15:45 |  |  |  | 1 | 17:00 |  |  |  | 1 | 17:45 |  |  |  |  | 17:00 |  |  |  |
| volume | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 11 | 279 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 |  | 0 | 337 | 1 | 2 |
| Hi total | 0 |  |  |  | 1 | 290 |  |  |  | 1 | 8 |  |  |  |  | 340 |  |  |  |
| PhF | . 0 |  |  |  | 1 | . 95 |  |  |  | \| | . 59 |  |  |  |  | . 86 |  |  |  |




Peak Hour Analysis By Entire Intersection for the Period: 17:00 to 18:00 on 02/13/23

DAY: MONDAY MANUAL TURNING MOVEMENT COUNTS

DATE: $02 / 13 / 23$ NE PARK STREET GE 13 TH AVENUE

Site Code : 02132023
Start Date: 02/13/23 File I.D. : 021323 PM
page : 1

PEDESTRIAN \& BICYCLE



Peak Hour Analysis By Entire Intersection for the Period: 17:00 to 18:00 on 02/13/23

| Peak star | 17:00 |  |  |  | 1 | 17:00 |  |  |  | 17:00 |  |  |  | 17:00 |  |  | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| volume | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 01 |
| Percent | 08 | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 1 | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \% 1$ |
| Pk total | 6 |  |  |  | 1 | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 1 |
| Highest | 37:45 |  |  |  | 1 | 15:45 |  |  |  | 15:45 |  |  |  | 15:45 |  |  | 1 |
| volume | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 01 |
| Hi total | 3 |  |  |  | 1 | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 1 |
| PHF | . 50 |  |  |  | 1 | . 0 |  |  |  | . 0 |  |  |  | . 0 |  |  | 1 |

## APPENDIX C

## FIDOT TRAFFIC DATA



BUCKHOLZ TRAFFIC
SITE： 0007 －SR 70，WEST OF SR 710／EAST OF OKEECHOBEE
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## APPENDIX D

## CAPACITY CALCULATIONS UNSIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS



## AM PEAK HOUR

| General Information |  | Site Information |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyst | J. Buckholz | Intersection | NE Park Street / SE 13th Avenue |
| Agency/Co. | BUCKHOLZ TRAFFIC | Jurisdiction | Okeechobee County |
| Date Performed | 2/14/2023 | East/West Street | NE Park Street |
| Analysis Year | 2023 | North/South Street | SE 13th Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | Weekday AM Peak Hour | Peak Hour Factor | 0.86 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | \#23-1820 |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| Movernent | $u$ | 1 | T | R | $u$ | L | T | R | U | 1 | T | R | $u$ | L | T | R |
| Priority | 10 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 40 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration | U |  | T | TR |  | L | T |  |  |  | LR |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 4 |  | 879 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 1114 |  |  | 2 |  | 7 |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 14 |  |  |  | 0 |  | 29 |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Tum Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type / Storage | Left + Thru |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Critical and Follow-up Headways

| Base Critical Headway (sec) | 6.4 |  |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  | 7.5 |  | 6.9 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Critical Headway (sec) | 6.40 |  |  |  |  | 4.38 |  |  |  | 6.80 |  | 7.48 |  |  |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | 2.5 |  |  |  |  | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | 2.50 |  |  |  |  | 2.34 |  |  |  | 3.50 |  | 3.59 |  |  |  |  |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service




## Hes wo Way Stop Control Rerort

| General Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Site Information |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyst | J. Buckholz | Intersection | NE Park Street / SE 13th Avenue |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agency/Co. | BUCKHOLZ TRAFFIC | Jurisdiction | Okeechobee County |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Date Performed | $7 \cap 7 / 2023$ | East/West Street | NE Park Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Year | 2024 | North/South Street | SE 13th Avenue |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hr. BUILD Traffic | Peak Hour Factor | 0.86 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description | \#23-1820 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Lanes


Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | $L$ | T | R | U | $L$ | T | R | U | 1 | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 10 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 U | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Configuration |  | L | T | TR |  | L | T | R |  |  |  | R |  |  |  | R |
| Volume (veh/h) | 4 | 18 | 917 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 1133 | 18 |  |  |  | 9 |  |  |  | 51 |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0 | 2 |  |  | 0 | 14 |  |  |  |  |  | 29 |  |  |  | 2 |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| Right Tum Channelized |  |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left + Thru |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Critical and Follow-up Headways

| Base Critical Headway (sec) | 6.4 | 4.1 |  |  |  | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  | 6.9 |  |  |  | 6.9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Critical Headway (sec) | 6.40 | 4.14 |  |  |  | 4.38 |  |  |  |  |  | 7.48 |  |  |  | 694 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | 2.5 | 2.2 |  |  |  | 22 |  |  |  |  |  | 3.3 |  |  |  | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | 250 | 2.22 |  |  |  | 234 |  |  |  |  |  | 3.59 |  |  |  | 332 |

Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service


## HCS Two-Way Stop-Control Report

| General Information |  | Site Information |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Analyst | J. Buckholz | Intersection | NE Park St. / Hampton Inn / NE 12th Ave. |
| Agency/Co. | BUCKHOLZ TRAFFIC | Jurisdiction | Okeechobee County |
| Date Performed | $7 / 7 / 2023$ | East/West Street | NE Park Street |
| Analysis Year | 2024 | North/South Street | Hampton Inn Drive / NE 12th Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | AM Peak Hr. BUILD Traffic | Peak Hour Factor | 0.86 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | $\# 23-1820$ |  |  |

## Lanes



Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments


## Critical and Follow-up Headways

| Base Critical Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  | 6.4 | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  | 6.9 |  |  |  | 6.9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Critical Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  | 6.44 | 4.14 |  |  |  |  |  | 6.94 |  |  |  | 6.90 |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  | 2.5 | 2.2 |  |  |  |  |  | 3.3 |  |  |  | 3.3 |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) |  |  |  |  | 2.52 | 2.22 |  |  |  |  |  | 3.32 |  |  |  | 3.30 |

## Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



## PM PEAK HOUR

| HCS Twu-MIay Stop-Control Report |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General Information |  |  |  |  |  |  | Site Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analyst | J. Buckholz |  |  |  |  |  | Intersection |  |  |  | NE Park Street / SE 13th Avenue |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agency/Co. | BUCKHOLZ TRAFFIC |  |  |  |  |  | Jurisdiction |  |  |  | Okeechobee County |  |  |  |  |  |
| Date Performed | 2/14/2023 |  |  |  |  |  | East/West Street |  |  |  | NE Park Street |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Year | 2023 |  |  |  |  |  | North/South Street |  |  |  | SE 13th Avenue |  |  |  |  |  |
| Time Analyzed | Weekday PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  | Peak Hour Factor |  |  |  | 0.91 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West |  |  |  |  |  | Analysis Time Period (hrs) |  |  |  | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description | \#23-1820 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lanes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\sqrt{2}+1+d x d x$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| Movement | U | L | $T$ | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 1 U | 1 | 2 | 3 | $4 \cup$ | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration | U |  | T | TR |  | L | T |  |  |  | LR |  |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) | 5 |  | 1230 | 14 | 2 | 31 | 1136 |  |  | 2 |  | 16 |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 3 |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left + Thru |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Critical and Follow-up Headways |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Critical Headway (sec) | 6.4 |  |  |  | 6.4 | 4.1 |  |  |  | 7.5 |  | 6.9 |  |  |  |  |
| Critical Headway (sec) | 6.40 |  |  |  | 6.40 | 4.16 |  |  |  | 6.80 |  | 6.90 |  |  |  |  |
| Base Follow-Up Headway (sec) | 2.5 |  |  |  | 2.5 | 2.2 |  |  |  | 3.5 |  | 3.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Follow-Up Headway (sec) | 2.50 |  |  |  | 2.50 | 2.23 |  |  |  | 3.50 |  | 3.30 |  |  |  |  |
| Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flow Rate, v (veh/h) | 5 |  |  |  |  | 36 |  |  |  |  | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capacity, c (veh/h) | 234 |  |  |  |  | 449 |  |  |  |  | 329 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{C}$ Ratio | 0.02 |  |  |  |  | 0.08 |  |  |  |  | 0.06 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 95\% Queue Length, $\mathrm{Q}_{95}$ (veh) | 0.1 |  |  |  |  | 0.3 |  |  |  |  | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Delay (s/veh) | 20.8 |  |  |  |  | 13.7 |  |  |  |  | 16.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level of Service (LOS) | C |  |  |  |  | B |  |  |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach Delay (s/veh) | 0.1 |  |  |  | 0.4 |  |  |  | $16.6$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approach LOS | A |  |  |  | A |  |  |  | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| General Information |  | Site Information |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Analyst | J. Buckholz | Intersection | NE Park Street / Hampton Inn Driveway |
| Agency/Co. | BUCKHOIZ TRAFFIC | Jurisciction | Okeechobee County |
| Date Performed | 2/14/2023 | East/West Street | NE Park Street |
| Analysis Year | 2023 | North/South Street | Hampton Inn Driveway |
| Time Analyzed | Weekday PM Peak Hour | Peak Hour Factor | 0.91 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | \#23-1820 |  |  |

Lanes


Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments

| Approach | Eastbound |  |  |  | Westbound |  |  |  | Northbound |  |  |  | Southbound |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Movement | U | L | T | R | U | 1 | T | R | U | $L$ | T | R | U | L | T | R |
| Priority | 10 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 40 | 4 | 5 | 6 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| Number of Lanes | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Configuration |  |  | T | TR |  | 1 | T |  |  |  |  | R |  |  |  |  |
| Volume (veh/h) |  |  | 1232 | 36 | 0 | 19 | 1123 |  |  |  |  | 17 |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Heavy Vehicles (\%) |  |  |  |  | 0 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| Proportion Time Blocked |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Right Turn Channelized |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Median Type \| Storage | Left Only |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Critical and Follow-up Headways



Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service



Hes wo Wey Stop Cantral Report

## General Information

| Analyst | J. Buckholz | Intersection | NE Park St. / Hampton Inn / NE 12th Ave. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agency/Co. | BUCKHOLZ TRAFFIC | Jurisdiction | Okeechobee County |
| Date Performed | 7/7/2023 | East/West Street | NE Park Street |
| Analysis Year | 2024 | North/South Street | Hampton Inn Driveway / NE 12th Avenue |
| Time Analyzed | PM Peak Hr. BUILD Traffic | Peak Hour Factor | 0.91 |
| Intersection Orientation | East-West | Analysis Time Period (hrs) | 0.25 |
| Project Description | \#23-1820 |  |  |

Lanes

Vehicle Volumes and Adjustments


Critical and Follow-up Headways


Delay, Queue Length, and Level of Service






OKEECHOBEE UTILITY AUTHORITY
100 SW 5th Avenue Okeechobee, Florida 34974-4221

November 29, 2022

Mr. Johnny Herbert IV, P.E.
American Civil Engineering Co.
207 N. Moss Road, Suite 211
Winter Springs, Florida 32708

## Ref: Water Capacity Request

Parcel ID: 2-15-37-35-0A00-00009-0000
2-15-37-35-0A00-00009-A000
2-15-37-35-0A00-00010-0000
2-15-37-35-0A00-00010-0010
2-15-37-35-0A00-00011-0000

Dear Mr. Herbert:

In reference to a request for the availability of water capacity to the subject property, I submit the following information for your use in meeting the potable water demand requirements for the project.

The Okeechobee Utility Authority owns and operates two water treatment plants with a combined treatment capacity of 6 MGD. During the twelve month period from June 2021 to May 2022, the maximum daily flow was 3.86 MGD, or about $64 \%$ of capacity. At the present time, the OUA has excess capacity at the treatment plants. The OUA does have a potable water distribution main in the State Road 70E right-of-way. Any upgrade requirements to the water main infrastructure due to the design or demands of the proposed project will be at the property owners' expense.

Should you have any questions, comments or concerns with regards to the water system capacity, please contact the OUA at 863-763-9460.

Sincerely,


Executive Director
Okeechobee Utility Authority

# OKEECHOBEE UTILITY AUTHORITY 

100 SW 5th Avenue
Okeechobee, Florida 34974-4221

November 29, 2022

Mr. Johnny Herbert IV, P.E.
American Civil Engineering Co.
207 N. Moss Road, Suite 211
Winter Springs, Florida 32708
Ref: Wastewater Capacity Request

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Parcel ID: } & 2-15-37-35-0 A 00-00009-0000 \\
2-15-37-35-0 A 00-00009-A 000 \\
& 2-15-37-35-0 A 00-00010-0000 \\
& 2-15-37-35-0 A 00-00010-0010 \\
2-15-37-35-0 A 00-00011-0000
\end{array}
$$

Dear Mr. Herbert:

In reference to a request of the availability of wastewater capacity to the subject property, I submit the following information for your use in the permitting for the above referenced project.

The Okeechobee Utility Authority owns and operates one regional wastewater treatment plant with a FDEP permitted capacity of 3.0 MGD.

During the twelve month period from June 2021 to May 2022, the annual average daily demand was 0.956 MGD, or about $32 \%$ of the current 3.0 MGD treatment capacity. The OUA has wastewater service near the subject property. Any extensions or upgrade requirements to the wastewater system due to the designs or demands of the proposed project will be at the project owner's expense.

Should you have any other questions, comments or concerns with regards to the wastewater system capacity, please contact the OUA at 863.763.9460.

Sincerely,


SEC 90-483 Modification of Parking Requirements
Per Code 90-512(2) 1-space per 150SF
$4,600 / 150=31$ spaces
Max reduction allowed per 90-483 in CHV zoned 20\% $24 / 31=0.77$
Proposed spaces = 24
justification based on equivalent peers throughout state

|  | Spaces |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EXH | Vacuum | Employee |
| 1 | 13 | 5 |
| 2 | 14 | 0 |
| 3 | 16 | 1 |
| 4 | 19 | 0 |
| 5 | 18 | 1 |
| 6 | 20 | 4 |
| 7 | 17 | 2 |
| 8 | 19 | 6 |
| AVG | 17 | 2.4 |
|  |  |  |
| PROPOSED | 19 | 5 |
|  |  |  |

Proposed carwash exceeds the peer average in both vacuums and employee parking.


EXH \#1


14 vacuum spaces
0 employee spaces

EXH \#2



EXH \#4


EXH \#5


One Way Traffic
20 vacuum spaces
4 employee spaces


EXH \#7


One Way Traffic
19 vacuum spaces
6 employee spaces
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