

SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
JUNE 21, 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, 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.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: May 24, 2005

Vice-Chair Aitken made a motion, seconded by Mr. Aucamp, to approve the minutes of May 24, 2005. In a voice vote, all voted in favor. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

3. SITE PLANS

3.1 SP 8-8-04, Regency Plat Parcel A, 4900 SW 148 Avenue (County PUD) (tabled from May 24, 2005)

Charles Putman and Wayne Vensel, representing the petitioner, were present. Mr. Gratz reminded the Committee that this item had been tabled in order to allow the petitioner time to make architectural embellishments and to provide the correct floor plans.

Mr. Putman provided a brief overview of the project. Using a rendering of the two-story building, Mr. Vensel reviewed the architectural changes which had been made.

A lengthy discussion ensued regarding the loading dock, dumpster adequacy and locations, the cross access agreement with the shopping center, correcting the landscape plans to meet the previous landscaping recommendations, changing the sidewalks to tie into the buildings, painting the corner features another color; a color board for the materials; and using the keystone around the entries.

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Mr. Engel, to approve based on the planning report and 1) that the previous landscape comments be addressed and corrected; 2) that the sidewalks be corrected so that they access the buildings in the right locations to doors; 3) to add a sidewalk from building 'C' to the dumpster; 4) to introduce a third paint color on the corner elements and possibly the elements around the entrances; 5) remove the keystone around the base recessed areas and add it to the entrance areas to make them a little nicer; and 6) when the color board is revised, present it to staff for review before final approval. 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 1-4-04, Pine Island Estates, 5150 South Pine Island Road (R-3)

This item was not addressed as Mr. Gratz advised that the applicant had not provided plans in time for review.

3.3 SP 12-1-04, Flamingo Ranch Estates, SW 14 Street, between SW 121 Avenue and SW 118 Avenue (A-1)

Gus Aguirre, representing the petitioner, was present. Mr. Gratz summarized the planning report. He noted a correction to the report stating that a proposed recreational trail on the south side of SW 14th Street was a six-foot wide trail rather than ten-foot wide. Mr. Gratz advised that through the public participation process, neighbors determined that they wanted a berm and hedge separating the site from their back yards.

Vice-Chair Aitken asked if the project had been approved by the Central Broward Water Control District. Mr. Gratz responded affirmatively. She read a statute from the Rural Lifestyle Initiative regarding a ten-foot, mid-walk access for street block lengths exceeding 600 feet. The interpretation was debated considering that the project consisted of one block. Vice-Chair Aitken indicated that she did not understand the need for a second road which ate up much of the property. Mr. Aguirre explained how he

SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
JUNE 21, 2005

wanted to develop the site; however, he indicated that the Engineering Department determined the design in order to comply with the Rural Lifestyle Initiative.

Since the site had been platted lot specific with custom built homes, Mr. Gratz explained that the petitioner chose to submit an anti monotony plan rather than having each model reviewed. He clarified that the Committee's purview was for perimeter landscaping for the buffers and determining driveway locations.

Vice-Chair Aitken expressed that in this case, she believed that an exception should have been made for a cul-de-sac in order not to have a road behind and in front of the homes on the north side of the site. There was a discussion regarding the 40-foot right-of-way that had to be designated for 14th Street and Ms. Nolan stated that the plan resulted in the most efficient use of the site.

In discussing the southern property line, Mr. Aguirre was committed to provide an earth berm detail described as being 50% on the Flamingo Ranch Estates side and 50% on the Old Bridge Run side; that a five-foot vinyl clad fence be installed two feet in on the Flamingo Ranch Estates side of the property line and a Ficus hedge placed between the property line and the fence. Mr. Aguirre stated that he had a letter to this effect and that the Old Bridge Run homeowners would maintain the hedge. Mr. Aucamp was satisfied with the landscape plans.

Vice-Chair Aitken pointed out where she believed a pedestrian pathway should enjoin a horse trail on the northeast corner of the site. Mr. Aguirre stated that he had no objection as that had initially been the plan; however, he was told to remove the sidewalk. Vice-Chair Aitken believed the sidewalk should continue although it would be up to the Committee. She pointed out where cross-hatching should be applied to mark the trails crossing on 14th Street. Vice-Chair Aitken pointed out other major crossings on the west side which needed to be marked in a safe manner and Mr. Aguirre indicated that he had an understanding of the recommendations.

The Committee reverted back to the issue of a mid-walk access for street block lengths exceeding 600 feet and asked Ms. Nolan for her interpretation. Ms. Nolan was in accord with having some kind of break or pathway and knew that Mr. Aguirre could not accommodate it because of the swales. She stated that staff would have to address how to revise the site plan. Mr. Engel took issue, stating that it did not make sense for one block.

Using the back yards for dry retention was viewed as a disadvantage for homeowners who would not be able to accommodate any structures nor could they use the space for half the year. Ms. Nolan agreed that the problem with water retention located in the back was that it limited the ability of the homeowner to use the full lot and the only way around it would be to limit the amount of units to be built on the site. Mr. Aguirre pointed out where the catch basins were located and that the exfiltration trenches and pipes would lead the water to the canal.

There was further discussion regarding 14th Street and if it were to continue east, and how it would impact the juxtaposition of the northern row of homes.

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Mr. Engel, to approve based on the planning report and 1) to address the issue of the Rural Lifestyle Code 12.2.982, "of the six-hundred-foot block" [the actual block length was approximately 1,200 linear feet] regarding a required pathway into a community; 2) on the south property line, install a chain-link fence and a hedge on petitioner's property, however, the hedge was to be maintained by the property owners to the south; 3) on the recreation trail connection at the east, to be continued northeast and connect up to the horse trail which crossed the canal and continued east again, as it crossed 14th Street, that it be marked as a crossing; and 4) at the trails on SW 121 Avenue and 14 Street, that the proper markings be made to make safe crossings on both those roads. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau – yes; Vice-Chair Aitken – no; Mr. Aucamp – yes; Mr. Engel – yes; Mr. Evans – yes. **(Motion carried 4-1)**

SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
JUNE 21, 2005

Chair Breslau stated that the following comments should be conveyed to Council:

Vice-Chair Aitken objected to the way this item was presented to the Site Plan Committee as a “fait accompli” with a ‘lot specific’ plat which prevented altering or making any suggestions to the design plan. She objected to having dry retention in back yards which prohibited owners from having horses or barns in the back yard which was contradictory to the rural lifestyle. Vice-Chair Aitken indicated that having two roads where only one was necessary was wasteful and eliminated at least 4,000 square feet from each of the six northern lots.

4. OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business discussed.

5. NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Engel addressed the public participation procedure and told of his client’s experience. He suggested that it be refined somehow as his client provided renderings, aerial photographs, site plans, floor plans, mailed out 240 copies of the proposal and no one showed up for the two scheduled meetings at Town Hall. Mr. Engel indicated that if the item was not controversial, it was a waste of money and time.

Ms. Nolan and Mr. Gratz expressed that they had no way of determining if an item was controversial. Ms. Nolan advised that staff had recommended exemptions to the ordinance; however, they were stricken by Council. The only exemption was for a single home. Chair Breslau suggested that another exemption should be that if no one shows up for the first meeting, you should not have to hold a second meeting.

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 5:32 p.m.

Date Approved: _____

Chair/Committee Member