SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 8, 2005

1. ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 4:03 p.m. Committee members present were Chair Julie Aitken, Vice-Chair Sam Engel, Jr., James Aucamp, Jr., and Jeff Evans. Also present were Planners Chris Gratz and David Abramson and Secretary Janet Gale recording the meeting. Bob Breslau was absent.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: September 27, 2005

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Engel, to approve the minutes of September 27, 2005. In a voice vote, with Mr. Breslau being absent, all voted in favor. **Motion carried 4-0.**

3. SITE PLANS

3.1 SP 1-4-04, Pine Island Estates, 5150 South Pine Island Road (R-3)

Gus Khavanin, representing the petitioner, was present. Mr. Abramson read the planning report. Chair Aitken asked what the status was regarding whether or not the Engineering Department's recommendations and streetscape landscaping had been completed. Mr. Abramson explained what had and had not been completed in the planning report.

Vice-Chair Engel asked about the turning radius for emergency vehicles noting that the Town required a 50-foot radius. Mr. Khavanin explained the proposal he had offered for the problem which had satisfied both the Engineering and Fire Departments.

Vice-Chair Engel commented on the street setbacks for the east sides of lots 1 and 28. Both Messrs. Abramson and Gratz explained why the side setback on the street sides of those lots was allowed to be ten feet wide. Mr. Khavanin elaborated noting that the Model 'D', which was 85 feet wid, could only be placed on lots 1 or 28; otherwise, the Model 'D' would have to go on two of the standard lots.

Mr. Khavanin provided several renderings of the various models and indicated that there were no plans to provide common amenities for the project. He advised that homeowners could have elevated pools installed in their backyards and they could encroach on the 22-foot drainage easement as long as the construction did not impact the drainage flow.

Mr. Evans discussed the lack of "simple architectural details" and Chair Aitken commented on the "featureless walls" for this project. She was particularly concerned with the lack of any amenities and after a lengthy discussion, Mr. Khavanin was asked to provide plans to include pool features which would comply with each of the floor plans. Mr. Gratz noted that during the lengthy course of the site plan process for this project, the drainage restrictions had become more severe.

Mr. Aucamp was not pleased with the landscape plans for the entrance feature. He also commented that the lot landscaping was "bare minimum." A lengthy deliberation ensued regarding the lack of any amenity, the lack of architectural details on the sides and back of the houses, and that the entrance feature lacked landscaping enhancements.

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Engel, to table this item to the next Site Plan Committee meeting in order for the applicant to address the landscape plan for the entrance feature on Pine Island Road; to provide a typical lot plan indicating how a pool would fit with each of the models; and to improve the architectural embellishments on all elevations,

all the way around. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Aitken – yes; Vice-Chair Engel – yes; Mr. Aucamp – yes; Mr. Breslau – absent; Mr. Evans – yes. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

3.2 SP 6-4-04, Medical Center, 3100 North University Drive (B-2)

Gene Bieber, representing the petitioner, was present. Mr. Abramson read the planning report.

Having renderings displayed, Mr. Bieber made a brief presentation.

Chair Aitken agreed with placing pavers at the truck turn-around point as recommended by staff. She would also like to see pavers used to delineate a crosswalk at the entrance at University Drive. Mr. Bieber responded that he would meet the recommendations providing that the Department of Transportation (DOT) would allow the paved crosswalk.

There was a lengthy discussion regarding the placement of the building on the site as well as having the entrance to the building facing south rather than facing west. Mr. Bieber explained his reasoning to the Committee's satisfaction. It then recommended that a stone wall build out be added to the western elevation to be used as a backdrop for the address to be explicitly displayed. Mr. Bieber was in full agreement with the recommendations.

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Mr. Engel, to approve based on the planning report; that a paver crosswalk be added across the entrance at University Drive; and that a raised keystone decorative element be added to the west elevation with the address numbers on it. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Aitken – yes; Vice-Chair Engel – yes; Mr. Aucamp – yes; Mr. Breslau – absent; Mr. Evans – yes. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

3.3 SP 1-1-05, Quality Homes Estates, 5151 SW 76 Avenue (R-3)

Jay Evans, representing the petitioner, was present. Mr. Gratz summarized the planning report and added a recommendation that would improve the appearance of the retention lake.

Chair Aitken noted the distance of the street trees from the street. Mr. Gratz responded that the problem was the underground utility lines which made it necessary to put the trees further back from the street.

Mr. Evans advised that ten trees would be planted just north of the northern property line to fulfill a request which had been made by neighboring residents. He explained that one house had been eliminated from the site in order to provide the wet retention lake preferred by the Central Broward Water Control District. Mr. Evans indicated that he would be widening the roadway on 78th Avenue and providing a guard rail on the other side. He advised that he matched up both the recreational and equestrian trails with the Target store to the south of the site.

In addressing the utility poles mentioned in the planning report, Mr. Evans stated that they were temporary and would be removed when the site was developed. He indicated that in response to Mr. Gratz's recommendation to improve the appearance of the retention lake, he was willing to petition the Central Broward Water Control District to put the landscape trees within the maintenance easement even if it meant applying for a variance.

Items discussed at length were the street gutters and drainage as well as the availability of 14-foot Holly trees and their ominous placement beneath power lines. Mr. Aucamp suggested that the Town take another look at the requirement for 14-foot trees at this particular site.

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Engel, to approve based on the planning report and to substitute the 14-foot Holly trees in the front with eight-to-ten foot tall Holly trees and make up the difference in the reduced heights by adding eight-to-ten foot tall Cypress trees in the retention area. If the Central Broward Water Control District did not allow the Cypress trees in the retention area, then the applicant would plant 16-foot tall Live Oak trees along the streetscape to make up the height loss. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Aitken – yes; Vice-Chair Engel – yes; Mr. Aucamp – yes; Mr. Breslau – absent; Mr. Evans – yes. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

3.4 SP 4-7-05, Pirtle Office Building, 5700 Griffin Road (Griffin Road Corridor East Gateway Zone)

James Pirtle, Aida Curtis and Michael McGuinn, representing the petitioner, were present. Mr. Abramson summarized the planning report.

Chair Aitken asked if the concrete wall around the lake was a Code requirement. Mr. McGuinn explained that the water retention had to be confined within the site. He went on to address each of the staff's recommendations. Mr. McGuinn advised that due to liability issues, there would be fencing and hedges separating the lake from the parking area. Using renderings and site plans, he further explained the intent of the project.

A lengthy discussion ensued with Committee members encouraging the applicant to make an effort with the property owners to the west for a shared access so that vehicles would be able to go west on Griffin Road.

Vice-Chair Engel and Mr. Evans offered architectural suggestions to the building in order to provide a covered walkway for pedestrians and, thereby, making it more compatible with the intent of the zoning district. Also discussed were the mixed-use issue and the Committee was satisfied with the present arrangement; the possibility of overhead roofing for portions of the northern and southern terraces with the applicant explaining about intent to have canopies and table umbrellas; and the use of awnings over the last three second level windows located on the east and west end of the northern face of the building.

Mr. Abramson advised of some of the suggestions made by the Development Review Committee regarding the screening of automobiles from Griffin Road. Ms. Curtis, the applicant's landscape architect, proposed a solution using hedge materials instead of a three-foot concrete wall for screening. The Committee preferred the landscape hedge screening and decided it would recommend to the Town Council that it consider waiving the requirement for the concrete wall.

Mr. Evans made a motion seconded by Mr. Aucamp, to approve based on the planning report and the following: 1) to add six awnings to the north elevation at each end above the second floor windows which were above the little balconies (three on each side); 2) that the applicant look into a cross-access agreement with the property owners to the west; 3) on the first floor north elevation, move the existing wall with four doors back five feet to the south to create an open covered walkway and that there be adjustments made to the openings as discussed in order to work with the parking beyond; 4) that the Committee recommended a waiver for a three-foot landscape screen to be provided adjacent to the parking areas on either

side of the building in lieu of the three-foot wall called for in the Code; 5) that the Committee approved the uses at this location (minus item number six in the planning report); and

6) that at the street line, there be a paver crosswalk if allowed by DOT, otherwise there should be crosswalk striping. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Aitken – yes; Vice-Chair Engel – yes; Mr. Aucamp – yes; Mr. Breslau – absent; Mr. Evans – yes. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

3.5 SP 4-9-05, Steak N' Shake, 5480 SW 70 Avenue (CC)

Tom Rice, Eduardo Careache and Rick Bartlett, representing the petitioner, were present. Mr. Abramson read the planning report.

Using elevations and renderings, Mr. Rice clarified features of this "out-parcel" to better explain the intent of the project.

There was a brief discussion regarding signage and the Committee suggested that a stone element on the west side of the building would be an ideal location for a sign. Mr. Rice agreed and indicated that if it were allowed, it would be his preference.

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Engel, to approve based on the planning report; that there be striping at all crosswalks on the site; on the west elevation, on the raised stone element, that it be made the main sign; and that the 14-to-16-foot tall double Alexanders in front of that stone element be substituted with a five-to-six foot double Phoenix Roebelenii. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Aitken – yes; Vice-Chair Engel – yes; Mr. Aucamp – yes; Mr. Breslau – absent; Mr. Evans – yes. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

4. OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business discussed.

5. NEW BUSINESS

5.1 November 22nd Meeting

It was the consensus of the Committee to defer the November 22nd meeting to November 29, 2005.

6. COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

Vice-Chair Engel expressed that he had a problem with the public participation meeting process. He explained that he had to send out 287 notices for the review of an office building project in which he was involved and not one person showed up for the meetings. Vice-Chair Engel suggested that items which were controversial should go through the process; however, he believed it was a waste of time and money to have every single project involved in the process where meeting rooms had to be rented even though there was no interest.

Mr. Gratz responded that the public participation meeting had to be held in a public place, not necessarily on Town Hall grounds. He added that there was no way of knowing what would be controversial, however, and they were trying to improve the system.

7. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business and no objections, the meeting was adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 8, 2005

Date Approved: _____ _____

Chair/Committee Member