

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
JANUARY 24, 2006**

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. (departed at 6:35 p.m.), Bob Breslau and Jeff Evans. Also present were Planning and Zoning Manager Bruce Dell, Planners David Abramson and Chris Gratz, and Secretary Janet Gale recording the meeting.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: December 27, 2005
January 10, 2006

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Mr. Aucamp, to approve the minutes of December 27, 2005. In a voice vote, all voted in favor. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Mr. Breslau, to approve the minutes of January 10, 2006. In a voice vote, all voted in favor. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

3. SITE PLANS

Chair Aitken advised that staff had requested that item 3.4 to be addressed first.

Vice-Chair Engel made a motion, seconded by Mr. Breslau, to address item 3.4 first. In a voice vote, all voted in favor. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

Modification

3.4 SPM 1-5-06, Pirtle Office Building, 5700 Griffin Road (Griffin Road Corridor East Gateway Zone)

Michael McGuinn, representing the petitioner, was present.

Mr. Abramson summarized the status of the application and listed the six modifications which had been requested of the petitioner. He advised that the applicant would seek a waiver from Council regarding the amount of parking spaces required because it had been Council's suggestion to eliminate the first-floor parking area in order to reduce the height of the building. Although it had been Council's preference to have a two-story building, Mr. McGuinn stated that other factors were considered as well in reducing the height and width of the building.

Mr. Breslau asked if the parking issue was within the purview of the Committee. Mr. Gratz responded that Council would be interested in the Committee's opinion.

Mr. McGuinn produced a set of the old site plans so that the Committee would be able to compare the changes. He pointed out the differences as well as the similarities.

Mr. Breslau commented that the waiver was not unreasonable considering that there would be a single tenant on the second floor.

A lengthy discussion ensued regarding the following: the location of compact spaces; the recommended uses for the tenants; how and where to pick up extra parking spaces by reducing the size of specific parking spaces; and that the waiver would work only if there was a single tenant on one of the two floors.

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Mr. Aucamp, to approve subject to the planning report and that the compact parking spaces be moved to the east parking area on site; that the applicant deed restrict the uses to office only, no medical or retail uses; and a note that the parking may be a problem, however, having the one tenant on the second floor as a deed restriction may resolve that problem and that this recommendation was based on the current site plan. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Aitken – yes; Vice-Chair Engel – yes; Mr. Aucamp – yes; Mr. Breslau – yes; Mr. Evans – yes. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
JANUARY 24, 2006**

3.1 SP 3-5-05, Rodeo Village, east of University Drive and south of Griffin Road (A-1 and R-10)
John Voigt and Jill Cohen, representing the petitioner, were present. Mr. Gratz summarized the planning report.

Chair Aitken was interested to see plans for the stables as there had been nothing included in her packet.

Mr. Voigt made a presentation and explained why the stables were located further to the east on the site. Discussion ensued regarding the condition of the access road to the stables, specifically for delivering supplies and removing waste from the barn. Chair Aitken offered advice on the design of the stables by eliminating the central aisle which would then allow some small space for paddocks. She requested detailed drawings of the barn as nothing could be discerned from what had been provided. Chair Aitken also made recommendations on the landscaping foliage because of its proximity to the barn.

Mr. Breslau was concerned about the ability to slow down traffic entering the community because of the location of the first townhouse driveway. It was decided that a "raised table" consisting of pavers would help to minimize the danger at that location. Mr. Breslau also pointed out the location of two garages which were only 18-foot wide instead of the 20-foot as required by Code and he was concerned about the practicality of the guest parking which was placed a distance from the townhouses.

Following several simultaneous conversations, Mr. Breslau commented that he would not be able to support the project with the guest parking as indicated on the plans. He offered a solution which was to remove the separation space between certain buildings in order to provide random guest parking throughout the complex. Mr. Breslau acknowledged that there may be another solution and that it was not the function of the Committee to redesign the parking for the applicant; however, he did emphasize that he believed it to be a problem.

Discussions continued and Mr. Evans offered advice on the placement of sidewalks. He suggested that rather than have the sidewalk and then the six-foot swale to the street, move the sidewalk closer to the street and curb it. Mr. Evans stated that this method helped to preserve the six-foot swale area which ultimately got destroyed by vehicles parking in it.

Mr. Evans agreed that there were too many issues to address and that this item needed to be tabled in order for the applicant to resolve the problems. The Committee provided directions for the applicant which were: 1) to do something better than ten-foot wide garages; 2) find a way to move guest parking spaces throughout the project; 3) move the townhouses further away from University Drive; 4) create a sense of entry to the larger units; 5) correct the size of the powder rooms in the smaller units; and 6) extend the stairway to accommodate the ten-foot high ceilings for the first floor.

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Mr. Aucamp, to table to March 7, 2006. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Aitken – yes; Vice-Chair Engel – yes; Mr. Aucamp – yes; Mr. Breslau – yes; Mr. Evans – yes. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

3.2 SP 4-10-05, Hollywood Video / Wendy's, 11200 State Road 84 (B-2)

Mark Davies, representing the petitioner, was present. Mr. Gratz summarized the planning report and reminded the Committee that the site had once been pre-approved for a McDonald's restaurant.

Mr. Breslau had it clarified that as a leased "out building", there would be a cross-parking agreement on the 23 needed parking spaces.

Mr. Evans showed Mr. Davies how to move the landscape island to improve traffic circulation on the south side of the site. Mr. Davies agreed that it was something he could do.

Also discussed was the situation with the drop-off box and Mr. Davies indicated that while it would remain at the same location, he would provide a walkway to it.

Mr. Breslau questioned the use of the color red and it was explained that red was the corporate color for both businesses and matched the shopping center colors.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
JANUARY 24, 2006**

Mr. Breslau noted that several video stores had wrapped the inside of their windows with neon lighting and he asked for assurances that it wouldn't happen here. Mr. Davies agreed that he did not intend to do that, nor would he have video graphics covering the windows.

Mr. Breslau pointed out an area leading from the back entrance to the dumpsters and asked that it be paved as a crosswalk for the convenience of the employees. Mr. Davies agreed to have the crosswalk indicated at that location and through the landscaping.

Mr. Aucamp asked that the landscaping feature be improved at the entrance to the shopping center off of Hiatus Road. Mr. Davies understood that it was the "common" entrance to the plaza; however, he agreed to embellish it if he was allowed.

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Engel, to approve based on the planning report and the following: 1) move the drop-off box for the Hollywood Video to an area outside the green landscape areas or provide a "hardscape" through the landscape area to the drop-off box; 2) move the sidewalk from the south parking area to the south connector to the Wendy's up against the end parking space and create an island landscape area instead; 3) place the restriction that there would be no interior neon lighting provided on the windows; 4) the windows would not be blocked off with films or graphics; 5) provide a paver or a striped crosswalk going from the rear access service area of Wendy's to the dumpster area; 6) make the little "finger" area a paved area as well since landscaping would not fit into it due to the crosswalk; and 7) enhance the landscaping with shrubbery at the common entrance feature. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Aitken – yes; Vice-Chair Engel – yes; Mr. Aucamp – yes; Mr. Breslau – yes; Mr. Evans – yes. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

3.3 SP 7-10-05, Scarborough Professional Building, 10650 State Road 84 (B-2)

Peter Gallo, Jaime Plana and Jim Santiago, representing the petitioner, were present. Mr. Gratz read the planning report.

Mr. Breslau indicated that the site was well done; however, he requested to see a color board since he questioned the intensity or brightness of the colors. Mr. Plana provided the exact colors and indicated that the orange and red could be toned down. Mr. Breslau suggested that the applicant submit the toned down color chips to staff for an opinion on the orange and red.

Mr. Aucamp commented that the Royal Palms located at the front should be increased to ten-foot of grey wood. Mr. Santiago responded affirmatively.

Mr. Evans noted that the rendering did not quite match the plans and pointed out the discrepancies. This resulted in Mr. Plana agreeing to increase the width of the columns and having them line up with the windows.

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Engel, to approve based on the planning report and the following: 1) that the size of the Royal Palms be changed to ten-foot of gray wood; 2) that the parking was based on the restriction of 11,000 square-feet of medical office and the rest was to be general office space; 3) that the first-floor perimeter columns along the outdoor covered walkway be increased to more columns at a smaller width from each other, spaced between the windows; 4) correct the actual column pattern around each of the main entrances to reflect the rendering; and 5) adjust the colors to reduce the intensity of the red and orange and have the new color board available for the Town Council. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Aitken – yes; Vice-Chair Engel – yes; Mr. Aucamp – absent; Mr. Breslau – yes; Mr. Evans – yes. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

4. OLD BUSINESS

Mr. Dell updated Mr. Breslau on the Town's attempts to correct the landscaping situation at the Davie Ale House.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
JANUARY 24, 2006**

5. NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business discussed.

6. COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

There were no comments and/or suggestions made.

7. ADJOURNMENT

Vice-Chair Engel motioned to adjourn. As there were no objections, the meeting was adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

Date Approved: _____

Chair/Committee Member