

**LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY**  
**AUGUST 24, 2005**

**1. ROLL CALL**

The meeting was called to order at 7:07 p.m. Board members present were Chair Mike Bender, Vice-Chair Scott McLaughlin, Marlon Luis, John Stevens and Mimi Turin. Also present were Town Attorney Monroe Kiar, Planning and Zoning Manager Bruce Dell, Deputy Planning and Zoning Manager Marcie Nolan, Planner Ingrid Allen and Board Secretary Janet Gale recording the meeting.

**2. PUBLIC HEARING**

2.1 A RESOLUTION OF THE TOWN COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF DAVIE, FLORIDA, ADOPTING THE DRAFT EVALUATION AND APPRAISAL REPORT FOR THE TOWN OF DAVIE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN; STATING THE INTENT OF THE TOWN COUNCIL TO AMEND THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN BASED UPON RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE REPORT; AND APPROVING TRANSMITTAL OF THE REPORT TO THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS FOR INITIAL REVIEW IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 163.3191, FLORIDA STATUTES. **(tabled from August 10, 2005)**

Ms. Allen reminded Agency members that the reason this item had been tabled was in order to give them time to review the document.

Chair Bender asked if anyone wished to speak for or against this item. As no one spoke, the public hearing was closed.

Ms. Turin commented that the Town did a very comprehensive analysis and was impressed with the amount of detail in the report. She also appreciated the presentation which was made at the last meeting as it had been concise and informative. Ms. Turin was most focused on roadway quality and the need to calm traffic as much as possible in order to help maintain the semi-rural qualities of the Town. She was pleased to see that this issue had been addressed in the report.

Mr. Stevens agreed that the Town did a good job in preparing the report and he saw no problems with it.

Mr. Luis was curious about the tax base and the percentage of difference in tax revenue between commercial use and residential use properties.

Chair Bender responded that this was a good question as he had been waiting since 1996 for that answer. It had been his experience that commercial developers would say their projects bring in more money and residential developers would make the same claim. He stated that the bottom line was that each project had to be considered individually and how it impacted the area it was going into. Mr. Dell responded that typically it was more a matter of cost savings as residential costs were higher since it used more services than commercial. Chair Bender commented that at the retail location where he worked, he noted that the police services were needed a few times a week as opposed to the street where he lived and where he seldom saw the police on a call. Mr. Dell indicated that schools were a significant cost factor that had to be considered in residential use.

Mr. Luis asked why the Flamingo Road horse trails were being addressed for safety upgrades when in his experience, University Drive and Griffin Road had the most dangerous trails with no signage. He also asked about horse trail easements on residential property where he was aware that fences had been installed in the right-of-ways. As his fence was on his property line, he had a personal interest in whether or not there were plans to enforce the trail easements and eventually move the fences. Chair Bender thought that it was a case-by-case

**LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY  
AUGUST 24, 2005**

issue depending on what was being developed next to his property. There were no definitive answers to his questions.

Mr. Stevens suggested that an objective of the Town may be to ask that developers contribute to the continued maintenance and upkeep of the trails as a condition for building in the Town. He thought that the prospect might be considered in the report. Having the consensus of the Agency, Ms. Allen indicated that she would add that as a recommendation. There was a brief discussion about setting up a "Trail Fund" so that monies could be disbursed on any trail in the Town which needed work rather than to a specific project. Vice-Chair McLaughlin spoke of the need to connect and map the trails as they truly existed. It was agreed that this was something to look at.

Chair Bender reiterated that this was an excellent report. He believed that how the money was spent was most significant. Chair Bender believed that the "workforce housing" issue needed to be implemented although it was a complex issue.

Vice-Chair McLaughlin made a motion, seconded by Mr. Stevens, to approve and move it forward. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Bender – yes; Vice-Chair McLaughlin – yes; Mr. Luis – yes; Mr. Stevens – yes; Ms. Turin – yes. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

**3. OLD BUSINESS**

There was no old business discussed.

**4. NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business discussed.

**5. COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS**

Chair Bender missed the last Council meeting and asked if anyone who attended knew why the Oak Scholar Charter School had been denied. Vice-Chair McLaughlin filled him in on the reasons that had been discussed at the meeting. They exchanged opinions on what may have made the project acceptable.

**6. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business and no objections, the meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chair/Agency Member