

SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

1. ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 4:02 p.m. Committee members present were Chair Michael Crowley, Vice-Chair Gus Khavanin (arrived 4:05 p.m.), Bob Breslau, and Casey Lee. Also present were Councilmember Starkey (arrived 4:20 p.m.), Planning and Zoning Manager David Quigley, Deputy Planning and Zoning Manager David Abramson, and Secretary Janet Gale recording the meeting. Harry Venis was absent.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: August 9, 2011

Mr. Breslau made a motion, seconded by Ms. Lee, to approve the minutes of August 9, 2011. In a voice vote, with Vice-Chair Khavanin and Mr. Venis being absent, all voted in favor. **(Motion carried 3-0)**

3. SITE PLAN

Master Site Plan

3.1 MSP 11-106/MSP 5-3-11, Toscana, 2990 Davie Road (RAC-RTE)

Hope Calhoun, Roger Fry, Andy Burnham and Chad Edwards, representing the petitioner, were present. Mr. Abramson summarized the planning report which included three staff recommendations.

Chair Crowley noted that very little building footage fronted Davie Road; however, future projects may have more exposure to the road. His concern was that as projects developed south of this one along Davie Road, that they should be somewhat consistent with this variation request. Chair Crowley requested that staff monitor and follow future development.

Ms. Calhoun advised that the wall/fence was consistent with the project to the north; however, she could not speak for future development to the south and how it would be developed. With regard to the signage on the wall, it would be shared with the commercial parcel adjacent to this project and Ms. Calhoun imagined that the property immediately south would be consistent with this project. She better explained the shared entrance.

Ms. Calhoun addressed staff's recommendation number one regarding 2.5 foot candles at internal driveway intersections. She believed that it would be too bright and would create spotlights in a residential setting that should be evenly illuminated. Regarding staff's recommendation number two for a stone veneer at the base of the buildings fronting the main driveway, Ms. Calhoun believed it would not be beneficial because the landscape hedges would obscure the stone. She was surprised to see staff's recommendation number three regarding back-up parking. Ms. Calhoun explained that this item had been addressed and the plan was safe, effective and efficient.

Vice-Chair Khavanin explained that his major concern regarded the plat and that the road easement was in conflict with the foundation of the building. He believed that the plat needed to be amended before the site plan could be approved. Ms. Calhoun stated that they were in the process of amending the plat; however, they were not aware of any easements which directly interfered with buildings. Vice-Chair Khavanin pointed out on sheet A-0.2.0, building 13, the north line and road easement were one line; however, the building had a foundation which would encroach into the easement. Mr. Fry indicated that it was a mono-footing and it would be a couple of inches off the line. Vice-Chair Khavanin responded that from a legal viewpoint, he did not believe he could approve the site plan which was not consistent with the recorded plat. Following a technical discussion with Mr. Edwards, Vice-Chair Khavanin stated that the easement was a legal issue which needed to be verified in order to be sure whether or not it could be approved. Chair Crowley noted the issue and recommended that staff bring it to the attention of the Town's legal counsel for an opinion prior to the Council meeting when the item was to be reviewed.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
SEPTEMBER 13, 2011**

There was a discussion regarding handicapped parking and access abilities; therefore, it was recommended that the motion include the statement that “the plans meet all ADA requirements for all spaces.” Vice-Chair Khavanin pointed out a mistake in the typical stall detail on page A-6.1 which involved the wheel stop. The applicant agreed to make the correction.

Ms. Lee clarified that an irrigation plan would be submitted and that a tree protection detail be included on the plans for the relocation of 45 trees. The applicant agreed and explained how they intended to store the trees prior to their relocation. She asked if they had mitigated with the Town for the loss of canopy and caliper for 183 trees which were to be removed. Mr. Edwards indicated that if they had under-calculated, they would mitigate.

Ms. Lee recommended that in staking the trees, black Wellington tape should be used instead of Guy wire. Mr. Edwards agreed to use the tape she recommended. She cautioned them about having Mahogany trees in the parking lot and explained that the nuts they dropped could be a liability.

Mr. Breslau pointed out where two parallel parking spaces were located within a curve in the road which was the main drive. His concern was that the landscaping treatment to the west of those spaces be treated as a “sight-triangle.” Ms. Lee reviewed the plans and determined that the plantings would not interfere.

Other issues which were discussed and resolved were the paver crosswalks which were to be used as traffic calming devices, and the system for trash removal and dumpster/compactor locations. Regarding the photometric plan, Mr. Breslau understood Ms. Calhoun’s point regarding lower lighting throughout the internal residential area; however, he maintained that it should be at least 2.5 foot-candles at the main entrance. It was agreed that a 2.5 foot-candle average at the main entrance would be acceptable.

In order not to have the monotony of 17 identical buildings, Mr. Breslau requested that the applicant add two or three colors within their color palette for trimming variation. It was explained by the applicant that they did plan to introduce another color in the top attic space, recessed breezeways and the banding. Mr. Breslau reiterated that they do these features with a variation of color and the applicant agreed.

Regarding the stone veneer, Mr. Breslau asked that some stonework be applied to the first building facing Davie Road as it would be the focal point to the entranceway. The applicant agreed to do a stonework façade on two walls containing the entrances of building one and pointed it out on the plans.

The applicant spoke of the improvements they would make to Davie Road. Chair Crowley asked about a bus shelter. Mr. Quigley advised that the County planned to build several bus shelters and he believed that one of them would be located by this site.

Ms. Lee noted that along Davie Road, on both sides of the road, Royal Palm trees had been evenly planted and spaced “on center like soldiers” from Nova Drive to SW 39 Street. She asked if the applicant would be willing to replace any empty spots or damaged trees along the road. The applicant responded that they would be relocating seven Royal Palm trees due to the configuration of the entranceway, and those seven could replace some of the trees. Ms. Lee asked, if needed, would they be willing to replace two or three more. The applicant responded that they “would look at it.”

Mr. Breslau made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Khavanin, to recommend approval with the following conditions: 1) with regard to staff’s recommendations number one, that the 2.5-foot candle recommendation would only be on the main entrance which extends past building one, and that would be a 2.5-foot candle average; 2) that number two of staff’s recommendations was not required;

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
SEPTEMBER 13, 2011**

3) that number three of staff's recommendations to remove back-up parking areas adjacent to driveway intersections was not required; 4) all handicapped ramps would be per ADA requirements and noted as same on all plans; 5) the parking stall details on page A-6.1, the distance was to be correctly noted to be two feet from the front of the wheel stop; 6) the irrigation plans would be submitted prior to building permit; 7) on the relocation of the trees, a tree protection detail would be added on sheet LA-13; 8) on sheet LA-13 also note that black Wellington tape would be used in lieu of wires; 9) that one to three colors would be added to the existing palette in order to vary the building accent colors to be decided by staff and applicant; 10) to add stone veneer facades on the two entrance features of building one where it faces Davie Road; and 11) staff was to verify that the plat was amended before going to Town Council for approval. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Crowley – yes; Vice-Chair Khavanin – yes; Mr. Breslau – yes; Ms. Lee – yes; Mr. Venis - absent. **(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 5:00 p.m.

Date Approved: _____

Chair/Committee Member