

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
MAY 24, 2005**

1. ROLL CALL

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

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: May 10, 2005

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Mr. Aucamp, to approve the minutes of May 10, 2005. In a voice vote, with Chair Breslau being absent, all voted in favor. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

3. SITE PLANS

3.1 MSP 8-1-04, Regency Plat, 4900 SW 148 Avenue (County PUD)

Charles Putman, Wayne Vensel, Werner Vaughan, Michael Petrow, Bill Laystrom, Manny Gutierrez and Russell Demorrow, representing the petitioner, were present. Mr. Gratz summarized the planning report. He also highlighted the specifications pertaining to parcels A, B, and C of this project.

Using aerials, renderings and a master site plan rendering, Mr. Putman explained the intent of the project.

Vice-Chair Aitken noted that the crosswalks needed brick pavers. Mr. Putman agreed that the crosswalks would be marked with brick pavers. He also agreed to the recommendation by staff in the planning report which was to renovate the landscaping of the entire center with appropriate new materials for anything that was dead or dying. Later in the meeting, Mr. Petrow discussed all the technicalities, materials and methods of updating the landscaping for entire center.

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Mr. Aucamp, to approve the master plan based on the one comment in the planning report and with the addition that crosswalks of concrete pavers be placed at each of the four entrances. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau – absent; Vice-Chair Aitken – yes; Mr. Aucamp – yes; Mr. Engel – yes; Mr. Evans – yes. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

3.2 SP 8-8-04, Regency Plat Parcel A, 4900 SW 148 Avenue (County PUD)

Using several renderings, Mr. Putman provided a brief presentation and then introduced Mr. Vensel as the architect for the buildings in parcel A.

Mr. Aucamp noticed that there was only a five-foot distance between the building and the sidewalk for the Ligustrum plantings. He believed that the plants would not do well in that space and recommended Crape Myrtle, ten-foot height, around the building instead. Mr. Petrow agreed with the suggestion.

Mr. Evans asked about the roofing materials. Mr. Vensel confirmed that these roofs would be metal to match the Outback restaurant and that the plans would be corrected to reflect the metal roofs.

Mr. Evans noted the lack of detail on the one-story buildings and commented that it became particularly obvious on the two-story building. Mr. Vensel responded that since the building was not built for a specific client and the buildings were to be sold, they were kept simple with interior hallways similar to a residence. Mr. Engel commented that they may be easier to sell if they were carried through with more design.

Messrs. Evans and Engel indicated that the two-story building needed architectural elements and was too generic for this complex. Vice-Chair Aitken agreed that it was too simple.

A discussion ensued regarding access to the second floor, the need for floor plans and improvements on the architectural features of the outside of the building. The Committee agreed that a tabling would allow time for a redesign of the two-story building.

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Mr. Engel, to table to June 21st. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau – absent; Vice-Chair Aitken – yes; Mr. Aucamp – yes; Mr. Engel – yes; Mr. Evans – yes. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

3.3 SP 8-9-04, Regency Plat Parcel B, 4900 SW 148 Avenue (County PUD)

Mr. Gutierrez indicated that he was the architect for parcels B and C and although the buildings appeared to be similar, he pointed out subtle differences to reflect the requests of two separate owners. He agreed to comply with all of staff's comments in the planning report.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
MAY 24, 2005**

Mr. Evans had questions regarding the trusses and the roof over the drop-off canopy and he recommended the installation of gutters to alleviate a problem. Mr. Gutierrez agreed with the solution and stated that he would incorporate the gutters into the plans.

Committee members indicated that they were pleased with the design of the buildings in parcels B and C. A discussion ensued regarding the landscaping and Mr. Petrow agreed with the recommendations made by Mr. Aucamp.

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Mr. Engel, to approve based on the planning report and 1) to add gutters to the drop-off canopy and the end of the walkway leading to the drop-off canopy; 2) to change the 14 "ROY" trees to 14 Fox Tail Palms, 14-foot overall height, matched; and 3) to change the 15 single Alexanders to five triple Alexanders, 14-foot overall height, subject to the planning staff's approval. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau – absent; Vice-Chair Aitken – yes; Mr. Aucamp – yes; Mr. Engel – yes; Mr. Evans – yes. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

3.4 SP 11-1-04, Regency Plat Parcel C, 4900 SW 148 Avenue (County PUD)

As stated earlier, Mr. Gutierrez was representing the petitioner.

Vice-Chair Aitken noted that the same design of the drop-off canopy existed and that it too would need gutters.

Mr. Aucamp went over the details of the landscaping plans and made specific recommendations to which Mr. Petrow agreed.

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Mr. Engel, to approve based on the planning report and 1) that gutters be added to the drop-off canopy and the end of the attached walkway; and 2) that at the northeast corner, the three Sabal Palms be changed with Chinese Fan Palms, 14', 16', and 18-foot overall height, staggered. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau – absent; Vice-Chair Aitken – yes; Mr. Aucamp – yes; Mr. Engel – yes; Mr. Evans – yes. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

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