

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
SEPTEMBER 25, 2001**

1. ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 4:02 p.m. Committee members present were Chair Jeff Evans, James Aucamp, Jr., Michael Crowley and Sam Engel, Jr., Also present were Planner Scott McClure and Committee Secretary Janet Gale recording the meeting. Vice-Chair Judy Paul was absent.

2. SITE PLAN MODIFICATIONS

2.1 SP 7-2-01, David Posnack Community Center, 5850 Pine Island Road (CF)

Howard Zimmerman, representing the petitioner, was present. He requested a tabling of this item as the architectural drawings were not in his possession.

Mr. Engel made a motion, seconded by Mr. Crowley, to table to October 9, 2001. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Evans - yes; Vice-Chair Paul - absent; Mr. Aucamp - yes; Mr. Crowley - yes; Mr. Engel - yes. (Motion carried 4-0)

2.2 SP 9-1-01, DSW Shoe Warehouse, 2112 South University Drive, Bay #52 (B-3)

Gene Kessler, 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).

Mr. Engel inquired on a planting area which was referenced in the report to which Mr. Kessler responded by pointing out its location on a rendering. Mr. Engel noted that the location was impeding the entrance and suggested that the replanting be placed on either side of the doors instead. Mr. Kessler agreed with the suggestion and indicated that he would comply with the conditions as noted in the report. Chair Evans had Mr. Kessler confirm that the color scheme was consistent with the shopping center.

Mr. Engel made a motion, seconded by Mr. Aucamp, to approve subject to the conditions as noted in the report. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Evans - yes; Vice-Chair Paul - absent; Mr. Aucamp - yes; Mr. Crowley - yes; Mr. Engel - yes. (Motion carried 4-0)

3. SITE PLANS

3.1 SP 11-3-00, Floridian Community Bank, 5601 South University Drive (B-2)

Itamar Goldenholz, 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).

Mr. Goldenholz provided a history of the development of the site and indicated that the process was lengthy due to a plat note amendment. He explained that the site plan was unchanged during that process and provided color renderings. Mr. Aucamp's questions regarding landscaping plans were explained by Mr. Goldenholz to his satisfaction.

Mr. Aucamp made a motion, seconded by Mr. Engel, to approve subject to the planning report. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Evans - yes; Vice-Chair Paul - absent; Mr. Aucamp - yes; Mr. Crowley - yes; Mr. Engel - yes. (Motion carried 4-0)

3.2 SP 5-4-01, University Commons, 6555 Nova Drive (M-4)

Malcolm Butters, 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 planning report).

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
SEPTEMBER 25, 2001**

Mr. Butters indicated his agreement with the conditions listed in the report. He explained what was meant by the phrase "multi-tenant" and how it applied to meeting ADA regulations in the future. Mr. Butters confirmed his plans to rezone the property to a more appropriate Town zoning designation within one year of site plan approval.

Committee members asked for clarification of item six in the report which regarded the installation of Royal Palms. Planning Aide Geri Baluss addressed the issue and advised of a commitment which had been made by the petitioners. A lengthy discussion ensued in which Mr. Aucamp emphasized the consequences of inadequate irrigation and the need for uniformity in the size of the Royal Palm trees to be planted on Nova Drive.

Chair Evans noted that the east and west entrances were to be shared and that there would not be any detail on the side of building that faced the proposed Publix. Mr. Butters confirmed Chair Evans' observations and explained the logic involved in the design. Chair Evans commended Mr. Butters on the placement of the buildings which by facing one another, obscured the visibility of the "dirty" part of the buildings as well as providing security.

Mr. Crowley expressed his concern regarding street drainage on Nova Drive and indicated that the project was on the border line between Central Broward Water Control District and Tindall Hammock. He assured Mr. Butters that if it were located in the Central Broward District, street drainage would be required and explained why it was necessary. Mr. Crowley advised that staff should check with Engineering as his observations had been that flooding occurred at that area.

Mr. Engel made a motion, seconded by Mr. Crowley, to approve subject to the staff's report; subject to a staff member coordinating that all the Royal Palm trees be the same size on Nova Drive; subject to looking into the street drainage on Nova Drive and how that should be handled; and subject to providing irrigation for the Royal Palm trees on Nova Drive in front of the petitioner's property. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Evans - yes; Vice-Chair Paul - absent; Mr. Aucamp - yes; Mr. Crowley - yes; Mr. Engel - yes. (Motion carried 4-0)

4. OLD BUSINESS

Reconsideration of Building Elevations

4.1 SP 8-7-00, South Post, Inc./Imagination Farms West, north of Orange Drive, east of I-75 (E)

Howard Zimmerman and Larry Cott, representing the petitioner, were present. He clarified that the purpose of this reconsideration was to demonstrate that the plans had been revised to include borders, edges and trims on the side windows in all of the elevations. Mr. Zimmerman indicated that although he had received a fax consisting of more elaborate architectural details, his client was not prepared to make those changes. He maintained that the quality of the product to date had been well accepted in the community and that the Committee's initial suggestion had been incorporated as a standard as indicated in the plans. Mr. Zimmerman reviewed the three elevations offered for each of the models as well as the color coordinates from which the purchaser could make a selection.

Chair Evans advised that he had provided the "mark up" which had been faxed to the builder in order to clarify what the Committee was seeking in its previous recommendations. Mr. Engel concurred with Chair Evans and he expressed his disappointment in that the revisions on the sides were not consistent with the fronts and that there appeared to be nothing done to improve the backs of the models.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
SEPTEMBER 25, 2001**

Mr. Zimmerman contended that the banding was supposed to be the same size on the sides and that the plans did not accurately depict what was intended. Chair Evans reiterated his point that due to the nature of the site plan and the visibility of the sides of the homes, this was an opportunity to add a minimalistic architectural detail in order to provide a nicer elevation. Mr. Cott addressed the issue from a marketing prospective and asserted that his product, as presented, met the demands of the purchaser and sold well in his experience.

A discussion followed and Chair Evans concluded that there were opposing views on the issue of esthetics. Mr. Condit agreed and indicated that he would provide banding in the rear of the house around the windows to be consistent with the sides. Mr. Engel expressed his opinion that whatever theme that was on the front of the house, be carried around the rest of the house. Mr. Cott indicated that he understood Mr. Engel's precept.

Mr. Crowley made a motion, seconded by Mr. Aucamp, to approve subject to providing eight inch bands on the sides and rear of the models to match the bands on the front of the buildings. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Evans - no; Vice-Chair Paul - absent; Mr. Aucamp - yes; Mr. Crowley - yes; Mr. Engel - yes. (Motion carried 3-1)

5. NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business discussed.

6. COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

There were no comments and/or suggestions made.

7. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business and no objections, the meeting was adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Date Approved: _____

Chair/Committee Member