

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE**  
**JULY 25, 2006**

**1. ROLL CALL**

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. Committee members present were Chair Bob Breslau, Vice-Chair Jeff Evans, Julie Aitken, James Aucamp, Jr., and Sam Engel, Jr. Also present were Councilmember Bryan Caletka (arrived at 4:02 p.m.) and Susan Starkey (arrived at 4:09 p.m.), Planning and Zoning Manager Bruce Dell, Planner David Abramson, and Secretary Janet Gale recording the meeting.

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: June 13, 2006**

Ms. Aitken made a motion, seconded by Mr. Engel, to approve the minutes of June 13, 2006. In a voice vote, all voted in favor. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

**3. SITE PLANS**

**3.1 MSP 7-1-05, The Courtyards at Rolling Hills, generally located at the intersection of Rolling Hills Boulevard and Rolling Hills Circle (PRD-6.3) (tabled from June 27, 2006)**

Chair Breslau advised that the petitioner had requested that this item be tabled to September 12, 2006.

Ms. Aitken made a motion, seconded by Mr. Aucamp, to table to September 12th. In a voice vote, all voted in favor. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

**3.2 SPM 3-3-06, 595 Corporate Park of Commerce, 10350 State Road 84 (CC, Commerce Center District)**

Stephanie Toothaker, Rosa Ramos, Brett Houston and Robert Lechter, representing the petitioner, were present. Mr. Abramson summarized the planning report.

Ms. Aitken noted that the landscape plan was not included in her backup material and asked if it had been changed. Mr. Abramson responded that it was the same as had been submitted some time ago and that the modifications were only to the exterior elevations and everything else was to remain consistent.

Ms. Toothaker indicated that there were no modifications to the plan from what had been previously approved with the exception of two items which were the name and the colors of the exterior elevations. She provided a Proclamation from the Town which proclaimed May 9, 2006 as the official launch date for the 595 Corporate Park of Commerce. Using elevations, renderings and an aerial, Ms. Toothaker provided a presentation which specified the color combinations for each of the building groups.

Vice-Chair Evans noted that the elevations had changed. Ms. Toothaker cleared the Committee's confusion by explaining that the exterior elevations had been upgraded from the originals along with the color changes. As the architect had been changed, the new architect, Ms. Ramos, was specific in addressing the details raised by Committee members as they compared the original plans with the current plans. It was discovered that the "layout" plans were incorrect, therefore, it took considerable time and the aid of the architect to point out which buildings were where and whether they were front loading or rear loading.

Vice-Chair Evans maintained that the architecture had to change since there was a new architect and that the plans would need more scrutiny. Ms. Toothaker indicated that they made every effort to stay as consistent as possible since this project had gone through many machinations in order to be approved the previous time. Vice-Chair Evans pointed out the differences between the elevations and plans for Building 16. Ms. Ramos clarified that the plans were not correct. Mr. Engel commented that the plans and elevations should match in order to know what was happening.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE  
JULY 25, 2006**

Mr. Houston updated the Committee on the change of architects and he indicated that the footprints and square footage of the buildings had not been changed. Chair Breslau explained that the Committee had concentrated on the front three buildings facing State Road 84 and that it currently appeared more like warehouse buildings rather than office/retail buildings. He suggested some features which would dress up the three buildings and the petitioner agreed that those details would be added. Chair Breslau asked that the lighting fixtures be upgraded for those three buildings and explained his reasoning. Again the petitioners agreed to add decorative lighting to the front exteriors.

Vice-Chair Evans considered what the views would be from different approaches to the project and was not comfortable with the changes. He expressed his perspective. Ms. Toothaker indicated that the petitioner had no objection to adding more articulation on buildings 15 and 17, on the front façade.

Mr. Aucamp could vaguely recall the original landscape plans and that the Committee had recommended several changes to it; therefore, he asked to review the revised landscape plans which may have included the Committee's recommendations or new landscape plans, whichever the petitioner preferred to submit.

Chair Breslau pointed out issues with the photometric plans, specifically at the main entrance on State Road 84, where the lighting was less than one candle-foot. He suggested that the lighting be brought up to a three candle-foot at that location.

Mr. Aucamp made a motion, seconded by Mr. Engel, to approve subject to the 2006 planning report and the following conditions: 1) to add Bahamas style shutters on the fronts of buildings one, two and three, specifically on the second floor windows; 2) to add decorative lighting on the front exteriors of buildings one, two and three; 3) to increase the photometric lighting to 3.0 average at the entrance of State Road 84; 4) in buildings 15 and 17, to add additional stand-out panels in the front of the buildings; 5) advised to revisit the landscaping plans and if not readdressed, Mr. Aucamp would want to see the landscape comments of a year ago; 6) have the renderings match the end product. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau – yes; Vice-Chair Evans – no; Ms. Aitken – yes; Mr. Aucamp – yes; Mr. Engel – yes. **(Motion carried 4-1)**

3.3 SPM 6-12-06, Rolling Hills Golf & Tennis Condo VI, 3100 West Rolling Hills Circle (PRD-6.3)

Whilma Williams, representing the petitioner, was present. Mr. Abramson updated the Committee.

Ms. Williams explained the situation with the contractor who was replacing the mansards with stucco. She had a sample of the product which the Committee had recommended and was told that her contractor could not finish the job with the new materials. This led to a brief discussion whereby the Committee advised Ms. Williams of her options.

Mr. Aucamp made a motion, seconded by Mr. Engel, to deny the stucco roofing and to approve the fiberglass dimensional shingle roofing of the same color with the intent to maintain dimensional shingle roofing throughout the Rolling Hills Golf & Tennis Condominium community. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau – yes; Vice-Chair Evans – yes; Ms. Aitken – yes; Mr. Aucamp – yes; Mr. Engel – yes. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

**4. OLD BUSINESS**

Chair Breslau advised that the landscape plans had been approved without the required berm for the Mobil gas station located on the northwest corner of University and Nova Drives. Mr. Abramson did not know how the oversight occurred and, therefore, would meet with Development Services Director Mark Kutney to see if there was a way to have the berm installed after the fact.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE  
JULY 25, 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**

There being no further business and no objections, the meeting was adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Date Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair/Committee Member