

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 9, 2004**

**1. ROLL CALL**

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. Committee members present were Chair Bob Breslau, Vice-Chair Julie Aitken, Jeff Evans and Sam Engel, Jr., (arrived at 4:06 p.m. and departed at 6 p.m.). Also present were Planning and Zoning Deputy Manager Marcie Nolan, Planners Chris Gratz and David Abramson and Secretary Janet Gale recording the meeting. James Aucamp, Jr., was absent.

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** June 22, 2004  
October 26, 2004

Vice-Chair Aitken made a motion, seconded by Mr. Evans, to approve the minutes of June 22, 2004, and October 26, 2004. In a voice vote, with Messrs. Aucamp and Engel being absent, all voted in favor. **(Motion carried 3-0)**

**3. SITE PLANS**

**3.1 SP 5-8-04, Strike Zone Plaza, 12425 Orange Drive (B-3, Commercial)**

Manny Sinalovski, Brett Zaroff and Nelly Williams, representing the petitioner, were present. Ms. Nolan summarized the planning report.

Vice-Chair Aitken inquired why the Broward County Greenway Multi-use Trail had not been depicted on the plans. Ms. Nolan indicated that she understood it would be located on the east side of Flamingo Road and since there was a conflict of understanding, Ms. Nolan stated that she would look into the issue.

Mr. Sinalovski responded to a recommendation made by staff in the planning report and submitted a revised lighting plan. Using renderings and a site plan, he provided a presentation to better clarify the intent of the project. Mr. Sinalovski noted that the site did not abut the Flamingo Road right-of-way as the property in between was a right-of-way belonging to the "drainage district." He advised Committee members that the renderings in their packets had been updated to include revisions recommended by staff; however, the plans had not been updated. When asked by Chair Breslau if he agreed to staff's recommendations, Mr. Sinalovski responded affirmatively.

Vice-Chair Aitken commented that she would prefer to see buildings placed closer to Flamingo Road rather than the huge expanse of parking lot. Mr. Sinalovski responded that he was keeping in line with the building to the north and that there were several landscaped buffers between the road and the parking lot.

Mr. Evans recalled that there were specific recommendations made regarding landscape screening for the loading areas on the "look-alike" building to the north and, therefore, indicated that those recommendations should be repeated for the retail building. Mr. Sinalovski stated that he was willing to duplicate the landscape plan.

Mr. Evans pointed out that the renderings displayed architectural details which had not been reflected in the floor plans. Mr. Sinalovski agreed that the plans needed to be revised to reflect the displayed rendering. Mr. Evans addressed a problem he observed with the entrance canopy and there was extended technical discussion regarding the issue. Ms. Williams stated that she was willing to explore making a modification and working with staff on a solution.

Mr. Engel observed a potential problem with the drive-thru teller isles, noting there would be less than a ten-foot width and a low overhead. Mr. Sinalovski recognized the problem and eliminated one of the stacking lanes and to modify the height of the roof canopy.

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Mr. Engel, to approve based on the planning report and the following comments: 1) that staff research the Broward County Greenways Plan and if there was anything to be modified in order to match the County's plan, then it needed to be addressed before presenting to Town Council; 2) on the bank building's entry canopy, the floor plan was to match the revised elevation and that element should either "die" into the other roof or make it a tower, to be worked

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 9, 2004**

out with staff; 3) eliminate one of the teller drive-thru lanes at the end in order to make a by-pass lane; 4) reduce the overhang over the by-pass lane so that there is no obstruction thereby allowing a 14-foot height for emergency vehicles or garbage trucks; and 5) on the shopping center portion, have the rear service area to match the same requirements as the “sister” retail building to the north insofar as landscaping and walls were concerned. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau – abstained; Vice-Chair Aitken – yes; Mr. Aucamp – absent; Mr. Engel – yes; Mr. Evans – yes. **(Motion carried 3-0)**

3.2 SP 2-4-03, Oak Scholar Academy Charter School, 3655 Shotgun Road (AG)

Jon Voigt, Mike Oliver and Jamee Kahn, representing the petitioner, were present. Ms. Nolan read the planning report.

Mr. Voigt provided a presentation using renderings and site plans which depicted the two phases of development. He indicated that the traffic circulation plan had been designed by Broward County Engineering. At Vice-Chair Aitken’s inquiry, Mr. Voigt confirmed that the property located to the south was planned to be developed as a public school site and that the County had approved both the site and the Charter school.

A lengthy discussion was devoted to the plan’s traffic flow with concerns regarding the vehicular stacking, blocked parking spaces, the length of the drive-thru lanes and the bus drop-off. Mr. Kahn explained that the start times would be staggered for different grade levels.

Other aspects of concern were that there be some kind of fence to designate the archeological site, that certain walkways be covered; the “prison” appearance of the architecture; the inadequate amount of dumpsters and its location in phase one; the cafeteria and its lack of a loading zone; the placement of a stop sign for school buses exiting the drop-off site; the need for a by-pass location at the northern parking area; pedestrian circulation; drainage; covered canopies; an elevator instead of a handicapped ramp; that the location of air conditioning units to be indicated on the plans; and the need for an architect to be present to answer questions.

It was the consensus of the Committee to table the item; however, recommendations continued to be forthcoming in order for the applicant to resolve the issues that were expressed. Mr. Voigt noted the recommendations which were capsulated in the motion.

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Mr. Engel, to table to December 21, 2004, in order for the applicant to address the drop-off canopy situation; the drainage in the courtyards for phases one and two; to make certain that the roofs have some type gutter system; that there be a break in the center of the driveway in order to be able to circle back around when there was no traffic; to address the dumpster situation as there appeared not to be enough dumpsters and that they were in the wrong locations; to look at the ramp situation in building two; add elevators instead of the ramp; address the 16-foot height on the single story buildings; look at the cafeteria regarding the service area and the access to it; locate the air conditioning units on the site plan; add a stop sign at the end of the bus lane; look at the handicapped parking spaces for direct access to the building; examine the ramp because a railing was needed on both sides wherever the ramp was more than six inches high; address sidewalks and covered walkways which did not connect between buildings; the height of the covered walks appeared to be too high and, therefore, unable to protect anyone; speed bumps should be added in the parking area; sidewalks need to be indicated on site plans; clarify the temporary and permanent cafeteria locations in phases one and two; add some sort of an architectural element to break up the length (monotony) of the building; provide board renderings at different angles; and have the architect and engineer present at the next meeting. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau – yes; Vice-Chair Aitken – yes; Mr. Aucamp – absent; Mr. Engel – yes; Mr. Evans – yes. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 9, 2004**

3.3 SP 5-10-04, West Park – East Parcel, 351 SW 136 Avenue (B-2)

Dan Feinstein, representing the petitioner, was present. Mr. Abramson read the planning report.

Mr. Evans indicated that he would abstain from voting as he was the architect of record for this project; however, he was available to answer questions.

Chair Breslau was concerned with the location of a Live Oak tree in the parking area and whether it would obscure the line of vision at one of the parking spaces. Mr. Evans agreed that he would work with staff to make sure that the tree and surrounding landscaping did not obstruct the view of the parking space.

There was a brief discussion about the dumpster location before concluding that it was in the only location possible without sacrificing parking spaces. Vice-Chair Aitken noted that the new sidewalk did not connect to the existing sidewalk at the northeast corner of the site. Mr. Evans stated he would rectify the omission. He also agreed to designate pedestrian crosswalks in the parking lot with cross-hatching.

Chair Breslau noted that the photometric plans for lighting near the building were far below normal and it had been agreed that the plans would be revised.

Mr. Engel made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Aitken, to approve subject to staff's notes and that the photometric plan should be corrected; that staff was to check that the tree and landscaping located in the western part of the parking lot did not interfere with the visibility of the last parking space; that the crosswalks on the east side into the building be marked with cross-hatching; and that a sidewalk be added at the northeast corner to join the existing sidewalk. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau – yes; Vice-Chair Aitken – yes; Mr. Aucamp – absent; Mr. Engel – yes; Mr. Evans – abstained. **(Motion carried 3-0)**

3.4 SP 6-7-04, Exxon Mobile, 2399 South University Drive (B-2)

Brett Nevryll, representing the petitioner, was present. Mr. Gratz summarized the planning report and emphasized that the applicant worked closely with neighbors in planning the project.

Mr. Nevryll provided elevations and a color sample board to clarify details of the site. Chair Breslau asked that the illuminated blue band around the canopy be replaced with a non-illuminated blue band. Mr. Nevryll agreed to have it changed.

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Aitken, to approve based on the planning report; that the comment for the wheel stops in the parking spaces be eliminated since the issue had been addressed on the site plan; and that the illuminated band on the gas canopy be a non-illuminated blue metal material like the rest of the canopy. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau – yes; Vice-Chair Aitken – yes; Mr. Aucamp – absent; Mr. Engel – absent; Mr. Evans – yes. **(Motion carried 3-0)**

3.5 SP 6-12-04, University Commons, 5251 South University Drive (B-3)

Lawrence Kramer, representing the petitioner, was present. Mr. Gratz summarized the planning report.

Using renderings and a site plan, Mr. Kramer clarified the details of the plan.

Vice-Chair Aitken noted some inconsistencies in the plans regarding sidewalks which Mr. Kramer explained. He agreed that the sidewalks and pedestrian crosswalks would be revised on the plans. Committee members expressed their satisfaction with the project and extended their compliments. Chair Breslau asked that the dumpster location be embellished with additional shrubs. Mr. Kramer agreed.

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Aitken, to approve based on the planning report and the following: 1) that the corner planter at University and the main access into the property should match the SP-5 plan; 2) to add crosswalk delineations on the site plan from building A to building C at both ends, from building D to building C, and from building C to building A; 3) that there would be no

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 9, 2004**

signage on the upper facade except for the address; and 4) to add additional landscaping around the dumpster area. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau – yes; Vice-Chair Aitken – yes; Mr. Aucamp – absent; Mr. Engel – absent; Mr. Evans – yes. **(Motion carried 3-0)**

3.6 SP 7-8-04, Chemin Des Palm II, 6103 SW 56 Street (R-2)

Gus Khavanin, representing the petitioner, was present. Mr. Gratz summarized the planning report.

Mr. Khavanin concurred with the planning report and added that he would be duplicating existing models.

Vice-Chair Aitken inquired why the sidewalk had been removed in front of the three houses. Mr. Khavanin explained that he had followed the Engineering Department's comments. After some analysis and in an effort to maintain consistency, Committee members recommended that the sidewalk should match the existing sidewalk on the north side of SW 56 Court and that it continue in front of the three houses to SW 61 Avenue. Mr. Khavanin agreed that he would install the sidewalk as the Committee recommended, but that it would be referenced as a recreational trail in order to be able to match the existing sidewalk. As there was neither a plot plan nor a landscape plan, the Committee decided that in order to move this project along, it would defer to staff and note it in the motion.

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Aitken, to approve; that a "recreational trail" be added to match the existing sidewalk and that it be extend to 61st Avenue; and that the plot plan and landscape plan be reviewed by staff prior to a permit. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau – yes; Vice-Chair Aitken – yes; Mr. Aucamp – absent; Mr. Engel – absent; Mr. Evans – yes. **(Motion carried 3-0)**

**4. OLD BUSINESS**

Mr. Gratz briefly provided an update on Mainguy Industries and indicated that the Code Compliance Division had been actively pursuing the issue. He also advised that he had been aware of the changes which had been made to the Davie Ale House and that the situation would be improved.

**5. NEW BUSINESS**

Vice-Chair Aitken advised that the Committee had the ability to reconsider applications such as in the case of the Montessori School. Ms. Gale confirmed that was correct; however, she believed it had to be raised at the next meeting following the discussion of the item.

**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 6:54 p.m.

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

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