

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE  
OCTOBER 10, 2000**

**1. ROLL CALL**

The meeting was called to order at 4:05 p.m. Committee members present were Chair Jeff Evans, Vice-Chair James Marcellino, James Aucamp, Jr. (departed 5:45 p.m.), Sam Engel, Jr., and Councilmember Judy Paul. Also present were Planner Scott McClure, Planning Aide Geri Baluss, Board Secretary Janet Gale and Board Clerk Jenevia Edwards recording the meeting.

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: August 8, 2000 (tabled from September 26th)**

Councilmember Paul advised that she had recalled commenting on the Car Wash and Quick Lube Facility for Gene Mirvis which had not been reflected in the minutes. She had requested that Ms. Gale review the tapes to see if a specific comment was audible. Ms. Gale had indicated to her that upon reviewing the tapes, that comment was not audible and, therefore, was not included in the minutes. Mr. Aucamp stated that he recalled that Councilmember Paul had voted in opposition of the project and acknowledged that he understood that she had been concerned that the site was too small for what had been proposed. Councilmember Paul indicated that although her comment had not been audible and made part of the September 26th minutes, that it be noted as part of this record that she had expressed her concern.

Vice-Chair Marcellino made a motion, seconded by Mr. Aucamp, to approve the minutes of August 8, 2000. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Evans - yes; Vice-Chair Marcellino - yes; Mr. Aucamp - yes; Mr. Engel - yes; Councilmember Paul - no. (Motion carried 4-1)

**3. SIGNAGE MODIFICATION**

**3.1 S 9-2-00, 595 Park of Commerce, 11850 West State Road 84 (CC)**

Sam Jazayri and Robert Monje, representing the petitioner, were present. Mr. McClure stated that the planning report was not accurate and provided a summary of the petitioner's request. He concluded by indicating that staff had no problem with approving the front building configuration with the new letter design. Mr. McClure commented that the petitioner was wanting to illuminate and increase the letter size on the rear buildings and that staff wanted it to remain with what originally had been approved, leaving it at a maximum of 15 square feet for each bay. He further indicated that staff had no objection to the channel letters being green in order to be consistent with the front building.

Mr. Monje stated that the signage had conformed to the Code and had been permitted by the Building Division. Mr. McClure clarified that the permit had been "signed off" in error and that although the front building conformed to the Code, staff did not support the sizable letters for the rear buildings. Mr. Monje indicated that certain tenants had indicated signage criteria in their leases and that contractual commitments had been made.

Chair Evans exclaimed that the building appeared to be a billboard. He recalled having approved what the petitioner had requested; however, what presently existed, although it may conform with the Code, was not what this Committee had approved.

Mr. Jazayri clarified that he was requesting that only the east side of the complex, which was facing the canal and the shopping center, have similar signage as the front building. A discussion ensued regarding the mistake that was made in permitting the existing signage.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE  
OCTOBER 10, 2000**

Vice-Chair Marcellino made a motion to approve the signage based on the Committee's discussion of the rear buildings and that they be limited to a green, unlit channel letter not to exceed 15 square feet, and that the corner units would have to meet this criteria as well.

Planning Aide Geri Baluss explained the technical problem with this motion as it related to the excessive signage in front of the building.

Vice-Chair Marcellino amended his motion to stipulate that the end unit, because of the limitations in signage square footage, would not be able to have a sign on the side.

Chair Evans pointed out that that the entrances on the sides were separate tenants. Ms. Baluss requested that it be clarified that each tenant was allowed a maximum of 15 square feet of signage no matter how it was distributed.

Vice-Chair Marcellino amended his motion, seconded by Mr. Aucamp, to approve the signage based on the Committee's discussions for the rear buildings and that the signage be limited to green, unlit channel letters; that there be a restriction of no signage on the west side of the building; and to specify that no one tenant will have signage in excess of 15 square feet. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Evans - no; Vice-Chair Marcellino - yes; Mr. Aucamp - yes; Mr. Engel - yes; Councilmember Paul - yes. **(Motion carried 4-1)**

**4. SITE PLAN MODIFICATION**

**4.1 SP 5-6-00, Home Depot/Tower Shops, 2300 South University Drive (B-3)**

David Herren, representing the petitioner, was present. Mr. McClure read the planning report (Planning and Zoning Division's recommendation: approval subject to the conditions as outlined in the report).

Chair Evans inquired if staff's recommendation that the petitioner come back to review the paint colors related to the fact that the Home Depot did not match the entire center. Mr. McClure responded affirmatively and indicated that Home Depot had agreed to repaint to match the rest of the center and that staff would be working with the architect on this issue.

Mr. Herren inquired on the relocation of a Gumbo Limbo tree situated near the handicapped pathway. Mr. McClure indicated that it could be relocated; however, he did not want the sidewalk on top of it as it was presently. Councilmember Paul inquired on the handicap spaces commenting that they were not clearly indicated, that it appeared that they were reduced in number, and that the walkway was not directly tied into the front of the building. Mr. Herren replied that they were being revised to meet new standards. Mr. Engel made a suggestion regarding the placement of handicapped spaces and the suggestion was discussed with the petitioner. Vice-Chair Marcellino indicated that for the purpose of safety and at the expense of a tree, the handicapped parking plan needed to be reworked. Mr. Engel recommended that since changes were being made, it may as well be done correctly.

Councilmember Paul indicated that she was concerned about safety issues with the substantial addition of the tool rental center and its impact on an already congested traffic flow. Mr. Herren responded that this plan worked successfully at another store location. Mr. Engel inquired on the size and type of equipment to be rented as the door opening was three feet wide. Councilmember Paul expressed that loading any heavy equipment further exacerbated the traffic problem. Mr. Herren listed the equipment noting that large equipment would not be stored outside. Chair Evans mentioned that items were sometimes displayed on the sidewalk which minimized the walking area. Mr. McClure stated that that was a Code Enforcement issue.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE  
OCTOBER 10, 2000**

Vice-Chair Marcellino made a motion, seconded by Mr. Aucamp, to approve based on staff's recommendations specifically making a point that there be no outside storage for equipment; to restrict outdoor displays on the sidewalk to ease up the congestion for traffic; and that this was being approved based on the contingency that the architect rework the handicapped space placement allocation so that all handicapped spaces are limited to the two central islands so that all handicapped persons are able to access the egress from the parking area to the front of the building without having to go behind cars or meander their way through the parking lot. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Evans - yes; Vice-Chair Marcellino - yes; Mr. Aucamp - yes; Mr. Engel - yes; Councilmember Paul - no. **(Motion carried 4-1)**

**5. SITE PLAN**

**5.1 SP 4-2-00, Armadillo Square, Southeast Corner of SW 64 Avenue and Griffin Road  
(Griffin Corridor District)**

Bill Laystrom, representing the petitioner, was present. Mr. McClure read the planning report (Planning and Zoning Division's recommendation: denial)

Chair Evans commented that these plans had been reviewed once before and questioned staff on the minimal changes which subsequently had been made. Mr. McClure responded that the changes were the elimination of a parking row along Davie Road and that four-sided architectural features had been added to the building. Chair Evans noted that he had offered to meet with the applicant to help develop a site plan that would be more acceptable and his offer had been declined. He indicated that he had worked on the site plan on his own and he was able to design a plan that met with most of the terms of the Code. Chair Evans inquired if the applicant had met with staff at any time between meetings. Mr. McClure responded negatively.

In response to Chair Evans' comments, Mr. Laystrom stated that he was new to the project, had not made the original presentation, and when the project was accepted by his office, there were approximately 25 comments that had to be resolved. He further indicated that he was not aware of Chair Evans' gesture, and he went back to Walgreen's and redid the site plan with the things he thought were going to bring the project closer to conformance. Mr. Laystrom specified that the three issues to be discussed were: the habitable verses nonhabitable second floor; the design of the front roadway; and the distance of the setback. He commented that everything else on the staff report had been agreed with.

In the interest of time, Mr. Laystrom addressed the items noted on staff's addendum list and clarified which items had been eliminated and which needed further attention. Although a dumpster detail had been provided, Mr. McClure indicated that it needed a "section" detail to show the screening element and its height. Mr. McClure commented that the lighting detail was not what staff had in mind with regard to its "character" and conformance with the Community Redevelopment Agency's recommendations. Mr. Laystrom stated that he would provide the section detail of the dumpster and noted the remarks regarding the lighting.

Using an elevation of the building and site, Mr. Laystrom pointed out the compromises which had been made. The building had been moved closer to the road, a row of parking had been eliminated, all four sides of the building appeared to have a second floor, and the drive-thru was screened by landscaping. Mr. Laystrom explained the problems with the site and summarized that these compromises were made in order to comply with the spirit of the Griffin Road Corridor while balancing those problems with the site location.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE  
OCTOBER 10, 2000**

Chair Evans expressed his point of view that when designing a project, first you address the Code. Upon being asked, he explained the design he had drafted which was closer to the Code. Chair Evans maintained that Walgreen's was interested in building in its own traditional set standard on a nontraditional site and zoning classification.

Councilmember Paul remarked that other Walgreen's projects had been built in a nontraditional theme and believed that if it had been done before, an exception could be made for this location as well. Mr. Laystrom acknowledged that there were previous exceptions; however, he maintained that from a marketing standpoint, the question was if Chair Evans' proposal would succeed. He expressed that considering the cost factors, Walgreen's had come up with a two-story look that they could work with from a retail standpoint.

Vice-Chair Marcellino inquired why the second floor had to be habitable. Mr. McClure responded that it was one of the requirements of the ordinance in order to create mixed uses on both floors. This issue was debated and it was agreed that allowances should be made when certain terms created a hardship and that the appearance of a second floor, in this case, was acceptable. Vice-Chair Marcellino stated that he understood that the intent of the Code was to create a "certain look" and he realized that there were certain hardships with the lot site. He indicated that he was in favor of "pushing the limits of the Code" to accommodate their needs as he felt this project would be a great addition to the downtown.

Councilmember Paul recalled the work effort of the residents in establishing the Griffin Road Corridor Plan. She maintained that there were a lot of residents to answer to in this Committee's decision on the first building to be built following those parameters. Councilmember Paul remarked that this was a "prime corner" and that everything possible should be done to meet the Code. Mr. Engel questioned Chair Evans on whether the single lane roadway was included in his draft. Chair Evans responded negatively and indicated that he did not see the necessity of it nor the loading zone. Mr. Engel was in agreement.

Development Services Director Mark Kutney apologized for not being able to provide the plan for the Committee's review. He reiterated Councilmember Paul's remarks regarding the year long efforts of residents and staff in creating and adopting the Griffin Road Corridor Plan. Mr. Kutney updated the Committee on the history of this application and the intentions of staff. Mr. Engel stated that he was considering that this issue be tabled in order to review Chair Evans' draft. Mr. Laystrom interjected that it was the applicant's intention to move forward with the plan and that the applicant would not be able to work with the suggestion that was made in Chair Evans' draft to flip the building.

Vice-Chair Marcellino made a motion, seconded by Councilmember Paul, to deny. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Evans - no; Vice-Chair Marcellino - yes; Mr. Aucamp - no; Mr. Engel - yes; Councilmember Paul - yes. **(Motion carried 3-2)**

A revote was called as Committee members immediately realized that some members misunderstood the motion. Vice-Chair Marcellino clarified that his motion was to deny the application based on staff's recommendations, seconded by Councilmember Paul. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Evans - yes; Vice-Chair Marcellino - yes; Mr. Aucamp - yes; Mr. Engel - yes; Councilmember Paul - yes. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

Mr. McClure advised that Christina Rodriguez, the petitioner, was present to provide the building materials and colors for her project known as SP 7-4-00, Heritage Building, 5220 Davie Road.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE  
OCTOBER 10, 2000**

Ms. Rodriguez displayed the tiles to be used for the decorative windows at the top of the building and presented samples of the building colors which were briefly discussed. The Committee expressed no objections to the selection and Ms. Rodriguez updated them on the status of her progress in the approval process. She also provided a set of plans which were signed and sealed by an architect as there had been some question about an engineer's stamp on a previous set of plans.

**6. OLD BUSINESS**

Chair Evans advised that he had surveyed the handicapped parking situation at Shenandoah Square and indicated that he agreed they had been moved. Councilmember Paul stated that she had inquired about the changes and it had been explained to her that the spaces were made wider and doubled up in areas; however, the amount of spaces remained the same.

The Committee briefly discussed the loading practice of Walgreen's at this shopping center noting that they had never observed the loading facilities being utilized. It had been observed, however, that in the fire lane located at the front of the store, one could witness loading on a daily basis.

**7. NEW BUSINESS**

No new business was discussed.

**8. COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS**

There were no comments and/or suggestions made.

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

There being further business and no objections, the meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Date Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair/Committee Member