SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
JANUARY 23, 2007

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, and James Aucamp, Jr. Also present were Planning and Zoning Manager Bruce Dell, Planners David Abramson, Lise Bazinet and Phil Bachers, and Secretary Janet Gale recording the meeting. Sam Engel, Jr. was absent.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: November 21, 2006

Ms. Aitken made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Evans, to approve the minutes of November 21, 2006. In a voice vote, with Mr. Engel being absent, all voted in favor. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

3. SITE PLAN MODIFICATION

3.1 SPM 9-5-06, St. Bonaventure Catholic Church, 1301 SW 136 Avenue (CF)

Father Edmond Prendergast, representing the petitioner, was present. Mr. Bachers summarized the planning report.

Vice-Chair Evans indicated that he would abstain from voting on this item as he was the architect for the project.

Using a rendering, Father Prendergast, explained the purpose of the canopy.

Chair Breslau asked if the canopy would have lighting. Father Prendergast indicated there would be lighting; however, the whole campus was closed down no later than 9:30 p.m.

Mr. Dell asked if there was screening of any kind on the northern perimeter. Mr. Aucamp indicated that there were hedges, a stockade fence and Oak trees separating the facility from the residents.

Ms. Aitken made a motion, seconded by Mr. Aucamp, to approve subject to the planning report. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau – yes; Vice-Chair Evans – abstained; Ms. Aitken – yes; Mr. Aucamp – yes; Mr. Engel – absent. **(Motion carried 3-0)**

4. SITE PLANS

4.1 SP 6-9-04, Davie Estates, generally located by SW 58 Street and SW 61 Avenue between Stirling Road and Griffin Road (R-1) **(tabled from November 21, 2006)**

Gary Bloom, Itzhak Orghad, Jimmy Socash and Ron Davidson, representing the petitioner, were present. Mr. Abramson read the recommendations which had been made at the last meeting. Those recommendations had been met by the petitioner; however, Mr. Abramson noted some new comments made by the Development Review Committee.

Chair Breslau asked that the Committee systematically review the previous ten recommendations in order to clarify their status with the petitioner. Mr. Bloom contended that all the recommendations had been met except for item two in which the Engineering Department had insisted that there be two entrances into the project.

A lengthy discussion ensued regarding the overlapping of a landscape buffer into a public right-of-way. Mr. Abramson was adamant about the landscape buffer being a separate dedicated parcel. He explained that it was allowed to overlap an easement, but not a public right-of-way. Mr. Bloom responded that it would be an easement and that the Town's Engineer had no problem with the plan. Following a lengthy discussion, the issue was resolved by the petitioner agreeing to reduce the 50-foot right-of-way to 45-feet thereby allowing a ten-foot landscape buffer with no overlap due to the extra five feet.

Ms. Aitken asked about backup from the public participation meetings. Mr. Bloom verbally reported that there were no negative comments from the participants and that notices were mailed to residents within a thousand-foot radius, the list having been provided by the Town.

Ms. Aitken recalled discussing the elimination of the SW 58th Avenue access as being a safety issue and that the Committee proposed having a stabilized foundation instead in order for emergency vehicles only to have access. Mr. Abramson recalled that discussion and he agreed with Ms. Aitken about it being a safety issue due to the condition of the road. Mr. Bloom corrected that the Town's engineer believed having the two accesses were necessary for safety purposes and not just an engineering criteria. Ms. Aitken indicated that she would like to hear from police and fire on that issue. Chair Breslau agreed that he would like to hear from those departments regarding the need for two accesses.

A lengthy discussion ensued regarding the entrance round-abouts, their landscaping and fountains, entrance signage, and the proposed retaining walls on the north and south perimeters.

Karen Stenzel-Nowicki, 5480 SW 55 Avenue, brought photos of the SW 58th Avenue canal which had been taken a day after a moderate rainstorm. The photos showed the flooding conditions and she asked that there not be an entrance onto SW 58th Avenue. Ms. Stenzel-Nowicki asked that the Committee consider having the emergency entrance located at the north or south easements from SW 61st Avenue instead of having an emergency entrance on SW 58th Avenue.

Ms. Aitken made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Evans, to approve subject to the staff report except for the part about the entrance on SW 58th Avenue; that there be one vehicular access on SW 61st Avenue and that there be an emergency access point on 58th Avenue to be composed of stabilized grass to replace the vehicular access and to be used for emergency vehicles only; the road right-of-way had to be reduced to 40-feet and maintain a landscape buffer at ten-feet with no overlap; the developer would be required to have a continuous retaining wall as per the detail drawings, however, it would be required that the petitioner obtain a waiver of the rural lifestyle from Town Council to enable them to have a continuous wall; and do a written summary report of the public participation meetings with backup including questions and responses before this went to Council. 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 – absent. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

4.2 SP 2-1-06, EFFCU – Lakeside Town Shops, generally located on the northeast corner of Stirling Road and University Drive (CC, Commerce Center)

David Roberts, Jeffrey Wanner and Daniel Sorrow, representing the petitioner, were present. Mr. Abramson summarized the planning report.

Chair Breslau went through the four staff recommendations with the petitioner to determine if he concurred. It was the consensus of the Committee to eliminate item two and the petitioner agreed with item one. Items three and four were open for discussion.

Mr. Aucamp reviewed the landscape plans and made recommendations to substitute certain species for more consistency in the plans. Mr. Sorrow agreed to make the changes.

Chair Breslau suggested that certain locations of the parking area and the entrance needed an increase in the candle-foot lighting to a minimum of 3.0. Mr. Roberts agreed with the suggestion. The canopy color of dark blue was determined to remain.

Vice-Chair Evans discussed the screening of the air conditioning units and it was resolved that the petitioner would readdress their plans for screening the mechanicals to try and reduce the size and locations as best they could.

Ms. Aitken made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Evans, to approve subject to the staff report and the staff's recommendation number one and the following conditions: 1) that the awning colors were maintained as shown; 2) that the applicant substitute the "High Rise Live Oaks" with Live Oaks and substitute the Madagascar Olives with Cassia Surattensis; 3) that the parking and main drive isles maintain a minimum lighting of three-foot candles and other areas may exceed three-foot candles;

and 4) minimize the size of the air conditioning screens and revisit the location of those units. 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 – absent. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

5. OLD BUSINESS

5.1 MSP 9-2-05, Saddle Bridge, south side of Griffin Road between SW 76 Avenue and SW 78 Avenue (University Drive Node) **[Deferred by Town Council]**

Scott Backman and Julian Bryan, representing the petitioner, were present. Mr. Abramson updated the Committee on Council's actions to explain why this item was being revisited. As this was a "conceptual" master site plan, it would be reviewed at a later date in more detail.

Mr. Dell explained the changes which the petitioner had made at the Council's recommendations: 1) the lake was moved away from Griffin Road to the southeast corner; 2) the residential units were moved further away from the existing single-family homes; 3) the buffer was enlarged for the 76th Avenue residents; 4) the 49th Street connection at 76th Avenue was eliminated and diverted traffic to University Drive; 5) the commercial component was to include office and retail uses; 6) the number of townhouse units was reduced as well as the height which went from three-stories to two-stories. Mr. Dell explained that before the project was taken to the next level, it was being shown to the Committee to see if it had any suggestions to make for Council.

Ms. Aitken asked if Council minded the extra access on SW 78th Avenue. Mr. Dell explained that SW 78th ran along the back of commercial properties and the intent was to keep traffic off SW 76th Avenue which was scenic.

Ms. Aitken felt that it did not make sense to move the lake as a buffer which affected only two or three single-family home sites. She believed that the former configuration of the lake was far more interesting and appealing. Ms. Aitken pointed out that by placing the lake in one corner of the site, it forced the townhouses to be lined up like barracks. Although she agreed that the lake should not take up vital commercial space on Griffin Road, she hoped there would be an alternative solution that would be more appealing than this one. Mr. Backman responded that in considering the impact on the property owners to the east, it was what drove the current site plan. Committee members agreed that the previous plan was more creative and that they would attempt to reach a consensus in order to make recommendations for Council.

Mr. Dell listed what some of the issues were when the Committee previously reviewed this item. Mr. Backman advised the Committee on how those issues had been addressed.

Vice-Chair Evans opined that the petitioner had become "gun shy" because of the experience with Willow Grove and the public's reaction to the three-story buildings. He maintained that the previous plan had some very good concepts and that the problem was the unit size. Vice-Chair Evans was concerned that a parking lot was the only separation between the commercial use and the two townhouse buildings on the north side of the lake. He believed a big improvement was made by reducing the scale of the buildings; however, he agreed with Ms. Aitken that the placement of the lake only benefited the SW 76th Avenue residents. Vice-Chair Evans was unhappy with the grided pattern of the two quads of townhouses. Mr. Backman agreed that it was a compromise since the corner of the site was cut out for the lake and the lake was required by Central Broward Water Management.

Mr. Aucamp agreed that the petitioner could make the project work with something in between the two site plans although it would be challenging. His concern was that the commercial use on Griffin Road should remain the same. Mr. Bryan pointed out the constraints which had to be considered.

Mr. Aucamp asked if at the public participation meetings, had the neighboring residents known that the three-story buildings had been eliminated. As Mr. Bryan indicated that they had not known of the change, Mr. Aucamp suggested that they may not be so opposed to having two-story townhouses built closer to SW 76th Avenue now, and that a solution may be obtainable.

Chair Breslau considered the previous plan to be a better design plan because of the staggered townhouses and undulating lake. His concern was that the product should be marketable and it appeared that rather than being a mixed-use complex, it was a residential project next to two office buildings. Chair Breslau made some suggestions which he believed would help increase the value of the commercial space. He asked how the petitioner fared with sales of the commercial/office units at Willow Grove and Mr. Bryan responded to his query. Chair Breslau opined that in order for the project to be successful, the petitioner should be allowed to have retail uses on the ground floor of the buildings.

As this was a conceptual site plan, the consensus of the Committee was to convey the following points to Council:

Chair Breslau believed that the old plan did a better job of staggering the buildings and it had an undulating lake broken up with a bridge. The new plan had two residential townhouse units sharing parking with commercial use and that they should be moved to the bottom of the lake. The lake could be scooted up closer to the office buildings. Chair Breslau also believed that the ground floors of the commercial buildings should be allowed to have retail uses in order for it to be more marketable.

Ms. Aitken recommended the irregular shaped lake and that it be more centered on the site with townhouses around it. She agreed that the commercial segment needed to stay, that roads should be curved and the townhouse clusters could be regrouped instead of the straight grid pattern.

Vice-Chair Evans' comments were that the lake along 76th Avenue benefited only the road and was not really a benefit for the new residents; on the new plan, the townhouses at the top should not have their parking on the office parking lot; that the townhouses were now on a grid without the lake amenity; that the roads were "grided;" to add retail to the commercial if possible, and if there was a requirement for a third level in order to permit the retail use, that requirement should be waived.

The Committee further declared that the previous plan was a better design to work from than the current plan that was being presented with the exception of the three-story units and the parking issues. Although the Committee respected the opinions of the adjacent neighbors, five or seven neighbors should not make for a case for throwing out a relatively good plan and replacing it with a relatively poor plan.

Chair Breslau offered to attend the Council meeting in order to clarify the Site Plan Committee's recommendations.

Mr. Aucamp expressed that if the bridge could be incorporated into the plan somehow, it would be much nicer although it definitely would be a challenge.

Karen Stenzel-Nowicki, 5480 SW 55 Avenue, indicated that she had attended the Council meeting when this item had been discussed and she conveyed some of the comments made by the Councilmembers.

For purposes of clarification, Chair Breslau offered to attend the Council meeting when this item was scheduled to be discussed.

Ms. Aitken made a motion, seconded by Mr. Aucamp, that the Committee would like the old site plan back with two-story townhouses and 40,000 square-feet of commercial use, and if it could be done without access onto 76th Avenue, they had no objections. In a voice vote, with Mr. Engel being absent, all voted in favor. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

6. NEW BUSINESS

Ms. Aitken recommended that any site plans from the Community Redevelopment District be reviewed by the Community Redevelopment Agency prior to being reviewed by this Committee. She explained that the Agency's vision for development in that district was specifically defined and this Committee would benefit from their comments.

7. COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

Mr. Aucamp announced his resignation effective immediately due to family and business obligations. He advised that Vice-Mayor Crowley was considering a very qualified replacement that also had a landscaping background. The Committee expressed that he would be missed and it appreciated the 12 years of service and advice he had provided.

Chair Breslau stated that he would not comment on the lack of progress being made to install a landscaped berm at the Mobil station on University Drive. He also advised that the Chevron station located in front of the Tower Shops on University Drive had not removed the illegal placard signs even though it had been a condition of approval for their site plan modification.

Chair Breslau indicated that the Nations Auto Rent located on State Road 84 had become Sun-Belt Rental and the entire building had been repainted a bright green color. Mr. Dell advised that his division had not received a color change application and, therefore, indicated that he would look into the situation.

Mr. Dell asked the Committee if they were familiar with the Burkhart building and if they had any objections to having the red stripe repainted green to match the John Deer logo. Committee members indicated that they would prefer the green stripe.

8. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business and no objections, the meeting was adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

Date Approved: _____ _____

Chair/Committee Member