

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
JANUARY 9, 2007**

1. ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 4:02 p.m. Committee members present were Chair Bob Breslau, Vice-Chair Jeff Evans, Julie Aitken, James Aucamp, Jr. (departed at 5:05 p.m.), and Sam Engel, Jr. Also present were Planners David Abramson and Lise Bazinet, and Secretary Janet Gale recording the meeting.

2. SITE PLAN MODIFICATION

2.1 SPM 12-4-06, Woodbridge Ranches, Diamond Creek, Mill Creek Ranches, Blackstone, and Grove Creek, 2800 Jockey Circle, 12731 Orange Drive, 3155 SW 154 Avenue, and 14500 SW 26 Street (A-1 Residential)

Tom Pagnotta, representing the petitioner, was present. Ms. Bazinet read the planning report.

Mr. Pagnotta explained that the two issues being reviewed were that a four-car garage was added to the 'F' model home, and there was a reduction in the sizes of models 'A', 'B', 'D', and 'G'. He explained that the purpose of the size reduction was in order to sell the product for under \$1,000,000.

Vice-Chair Evans noted that the "roof slip" had been lowered from a "6 in 12 to a 5 in 12" and other than the size change of the models, they were pretty much the same.

Chair Breslau had it clarified that the roof selection was the same as had previously been presented. Mr. Pagnotta responded affirmatively.

Mr. Abramson had it clarified that since the original models were lettered, these smaller models needed to be distinguished from the originals. Mr. Pagnotta agreed that these models would have the word "modified" preceding the letters.

Vice-Chair Evans made a motion, seconded by Mr. Engel, to approve subject to the planning report and that these models be called Modified A, Modified B, Modified D, Modified F, and Modified G. 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)**

3. SITE PLANS

3.1 SP 5-2-05, Three Oak Business Center, 5951 Orange Drive (B-2)

Iraj Shojaie, Scott Gorlow and Robert Loss, representing the petitioner, were present. Mr. Abramson read the planning report.

Ms. Aitken asked if the applicant had agreed to all of staff's recommendations. Mr. Abramson indicated that the applicant had except for item three since they had just been informed of the recommendation. Mr. Shojaie agreed to provide compatible light fixtures to the north and south elevations as requested by staff in item three.

Mr. Aucamp asked if it was the intention of the applicant to move the trees slated for relocation one time and that they be protected from "construction disease" which usually befalls many trees. Mr. Shojaie indicated that it was their intention to move the trees once and that they would be protected from being damaged during construction.

Mr. Engel commented on the limited number of doors opening out from the north bays. He asked that they be increased and explained how much better that would function. Mr. Shojaie agreed to add a couple of doors with landings on the north side of the building.

Chair Breslau noticed that on the photometric plan, the lighting was very low by the handicapped spaces and he asked that the applicant achieve a consistent lighting level to average 3.0 candle-foot across the front row parking spaces. Mr. Shojaie agreed it would be done.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
JANUARY 9, 2007**

Vice-Chair Evans commented on the renderings which showed build-outs; however, they were not indicated on the plans. Mr. Shojaie responded that it was just raised stucco on the vertical elements. Vice-Chair Evans indicated that more needed to be done in order to be an architectural element and suggested that the build-outs be a minimum of four inches.

A discussion ensued regarding whether or not the screening was adequate for the air conditioning units on top of the buildings. It was resolved with Mr. Shojaie assuring that the roof deck would be low enough so that the mansard would hide the air conditioning mechanicals.

Boardmembers questioned the vividness of the red standing metal-seam roof and asked if the applicant would be able to match the color in the rendering. Mr. Shojaie indicated that he would try to find a more toned down red color and submit it to staff for approval.

Ms. Aitken made a motion, seconded by Mr. Engel, to approve subject to the staff report and all staff's recommendations plus the following: 1) that there be pavers on all sidewalks and crossings which connect the outer sidewalks and across the vehicular access points to be included; 2) that the existing trees would be removed one time only and all proper protection would be provided to them during construction; 3) on the north side of the building, add additional doors with landings onto the pavement; 4) that on the photometrics, increase lighting on the front of the building to an average of 3.0 candle-foot; 5) build-out vertical architectural details on the front of the building to a minimum of four inches and correct plan A-2 accordingly; 6) the top of the mansard roof must be a minimum of five-feet above the deck on all elevations in order to screen the air conditioning units; 7) on page A-3, correct the height of the top of beam on the east and west elevations; and 8) tone down the roof color and present choice for staff's approval. 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)**

3.2 SP 9-4-06, Regency Commons, 5351 South University Drive (B-3)

Ike Alweiss and Gus Aguirre, representing the petitioner, were present. Ms. Bazinet read the planning report.

It was clarified that the site plan application had expired although it had been approved and, therefore, the applicant was asking for re-approval. Mr. Alweiss explained the reasons for the delays and that they were prepared to move forward at this time.

Chair Breslau recalled that on the previous approval, there had been too many compact spaces located around building 'C' which was a problem for customer parking. He suggested that the less used spaces further away be converted to compact spaces. They worked on the site plan for some time before figuring out where to place the compact parking spaces. Mr. Engel noted that a mistake was made in the calculations for medical use parking. Mr. Alweiss agreed to make the correction which meant the addition of two parking spaces.

Mr. Engel observed that the dumpster location by building 'C' would be impossible to be approached by a garbage truck. He offered a solution which the applicant agreed to do. Mr. Alweiss advised that two dumpsters were to be added to the site and he pointed out their locations.

Ms. Aitken made a motion, seconded by Mr. Engel, to approve subject to the staff report and all staff's recommendations and the following: 1) to reduce the number of compact parking spaces from 54 to 42 on SP-1; 2) change the two rows of parking on the east and south sides of building 'C' to full size, ten-foot parking spaces; 3) relocate the compact parking spaces to abut the north and/or south property lines; 4) recalculate the parking calculations for medical use utilizing one space for 200 square-feet as opposed to one space for every 210 square-feet as shown; 5) relocate both dumpster enclosures by building 'C' to the north property line and adjust the parking accordingly; 6) turn the dumpster enclosure to the west of building 'E' to a 90-degree angle; 7) the top of the parapet must be a minimum of five-feet above the roof deck on all of the buildings; and 8) add two dumpster enclosures,

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
JANUARY 9, 2007**

one at building 'A' and one at building 'B' and provide plans to staff for their approval. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau – yes; Vice-Chair Evans – yes; Ms. Aitken – yes; Mr. Aucamp – absent; Mr. Engel – 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 5:27 p.m.

Date Approved: _____

Chair/Committee Member