

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
JANUARY 25, 2005**

1. ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. Committee members present were Chair Bob Breslau, Vice-Chair Julie Aitken (arrived 4:04 p.m.), James Aucamp, Jr., Sam Engel, Jr., and Jeff Evans. Also present were Planning and Zoning Deputy Manager Marcie Nolan, Planners David Abramson and Chris Gratz and Secretary Janet Gale recording the meeting.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: January 11, 2005

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Mr. Aucamp, to approve the minutes of January 11, 2005. In a voice vote, with Vice-Chair Aitken being absent all voted in favor. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

3. SITE PLANS

3.1 SP 6-13-04, Broward Schools Credit Union, 3000 SW 64 Avenue (B-1) (tabled from December 21, 2004)

Michael Wood and Joseph Oliveri, representing the petitioner, were present. Mr. Abramson read the recommendations made by the Committee on December 21, 2004. He noted that all the recommendations had been completed by the petitioner.

Using an accurate rendering and paint chips, Mr. Wood confirmed the changes. Messrs. Engle and Evans noted that the drive-thru overhang was still an issue although it had been reduced somewhat by the petitioner. This led to a brief discussion and Mr. Oliveri indicated that he could manage reducing it another two feet.

Mr. Evans commented that the columns near the manager's office were close to the window. Mr. Wood indicated that the client was aware of the situation and was okay with it.

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Mr. Aucamp, to approve based on staff's comments and to cut back an additional two feet from the drive-thru overhang which was to be measured from the face of the column. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau - yes; Vice-Chair Aitken - yes; Mr. Aucamp - yes; Mr. Engel - yes; Mr. Evans - yes. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

3.2 SP 8-4-03, DiBenedetto Multi-Tenant Building, 5490 Griffin Road (Griffin Road Corridor/East Gateway/Zone 3)

Scott DiStefano and Veto DiBenedetto, representing the petitioner, were present. Mr. Gratz read the planning report and indicated the waivers which would be necessary to complete the project.

Using several renderings and site plans, Mr. DiStefano explained the intent of the project within the confines of the property. He indicated that the petitioner was willing to have deed restrictions in order to address parking requirements. Committee members were uncomfortable about the parking, specifically since one of the uses required that 25 parking spaces be available and only 15 were provided. Later in the meeting, it had been established that a month-by-month lease existed for the tenant that needed the 25 parking spaces. Mr. DiBenedetto indicated that he had no "ties" to a tenant's lease.

A lengthy discussion ensued regarding the following issues: the mansard roof and materials; minimal overhead coverage for pedestrians along the sidewalk; right-of-way to the residents south and west of the site; the loading zone; the cross-over uses and calculations; landscaping, specifically that the plant materials in front of the building on the east side mirror what was proposed for the west side of the building and generally, that the plant materials

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
JANUARY 25, 2005**

consist of what was recommended on the plant list for the Griffin Road Corridor theme; that there be one central stairway to allow for more landscaping; and that the petitioner needed to find out if the project met the drainage criteria set by the Central Broward Water Control District.

Committee members indicated that they had a problem with approving something where the existing use was in violation and did not obtain an occupational license since 1999. It was the consensus that this was a predicament and all the Committee could do was to make a recommendation for the Town Council to decide.

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Mr. Engel, to approve based on the planning report and 1) that the engineering and landscape plans be brought back before the Committee corrected and matching the site plan with consistent landscaping throughout the property; 2) that the drainage issues be addressed; 3) to reduce the number of stairwells to one stairway five-feet wide; 4) that the applicant apply for a parking variance; and 5) that the tabulations for parking reflect the daytime use and nighttime uses. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau - yes; Vice-Chair Aitken - yes; Mr. Aucamp - yes; Mr. Engel - yes; Mr. Evans - yes. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

3.3 SP 8-7-04, Aveda Institute, 4186 South University Drive (B-2)

Robert Locherie, Brett Petry, Tom Petrillo, Pete Strelkow and Alan Cooper, representing the petitioner, were present. Ms. Nolan summarized the planning report.

Mr. Locherie briefly described the intent of the institute and indicated that he concurred with the planning report. He provided a multitude of renderings, elevations and a color board for a better understanding of the project.

Mr. Engel asked about the dry retention area as it appeared to be small. Mr. Locherie indicated that the engineers would be going through the process with the Central Broward Water Control District regarding any drainage issues. Also at Mr. Engel's request, the architectural details of the arched roof were pointed out by the architect on the floor plan.

A lengthy discussion ensued regarding the following items: the graphics which were to be projected onto the front of the building; the landscape plans and intentions for the removal of existing "aggressive exotics"; that the landscape note would be changed to indicate "as many boots as possible"; the mason wall separating the site from residential property on the east; that the plans specify that the concrete bridge was to be less than 12-inches high, otherwise details for the bridge need to be provided; the possibility of installing a heavily landscaped berm instead of having a masonry wall. Ms. Nolan suggested that the homeowners be contacted to find out their preference. Mr. Aucamp provided the option of a chain link fence and berm which would provide security as well as aesthetics. Chair Breslau summarized that the Committee would recommend approval with the wall; however, if the homeowners were to prefer a berm, the applicant would work out those plans among staff and the homeowners and it would be acceptable.

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Mr. Engel, to approve based on the planning report and 1) that the graphics which were to be suspended on the front of the building be replaced when they begin to fade; 2) to provide details on the pedestrian bridge that crosses the entry if it was required; and 3) that on the east wall, work with staff on the design of it for another

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
JANUARY 25, 2005**

alternative material. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau – yes; Vice-Chair Aitken – yes; Mr. Aucamp – yes; Mr. Engel – yes; Mr. Evans – yes. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

Chair Breslau complimented the petitioner on the thoroughness of the presentation and the attractiveness of the project. It was the consensus of the Committee that the site would be an asset to the community.

4. OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business discussed.

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 5:30 p.m.

Date Approved: _____

Chair/Committee Member