

## SITE PLAN COMMITTEE

APRIL 12, 2005

### 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, Jim Aucamp, Jr. (departed at 5:20 p.m.), Sam Engel, Jr., and Jeff Evans. Also present were Planning and Zoning Deputy Manager Marcie Nolan (departed at 5:28 p.m.), Planner David Abramson and Secretary Janet Gale recording the meeting.

### 2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: March 22, 2005

Vice-Chair Aitken made a motion, seconded by Mr. Evans, to approve the minutes of March 22, 2005. In a voice vote, all voted in favor. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

### 3. SITE PLANS

Chair Breslau announced that if there were no objections, item 3.4 would be addressed first. There were no objections.

#### 3.4 SP 1-3-05, Pine Island Park, 3801 Pine Island Road (RS)

Norman Schwartz, representing the petitioner, was present. Mr. Abramson summarized the planning report.

Color samples were provided and Mr. Schwartz indicated that the intent was to match the colors of the existing buildings. There were comments from the Committee regarding the east elevation which faced Pine Island Road. It was expressed that the expanse of building lacked any architectural detail and appeared to be a "little box." When asked if the sparseness was due to budget constraints, Parks and Recreation Director Dennis Andresky responded affirmatively.

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Mr. Aucamp, to approve based on the planning report. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau – yes; Vice-Chair Aitken – yes; Mr. Aucamp – yes; Mr. Engel – yes; Mr. Evans – yes. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

#### 3.1 SP 3-5-04, Admiral's Boys & Girls Club @ McFatter Technical Center, 6500 Nova Drive (CF)

Alex Garcia, representing the petitioner, was present. Mr. Abramson summarized the planning report.

Vice-Chair Aitken pointed out that on the rendering, shutters were on all four sides of the building; however, the plans only showed shutters on the front windows. Mr. Garcia explained that subsequent to the rendering being made approximately two years ago for a "fund raiser," some elements have been removed due to the rising cost of materials. He believed that the substantial savings did not detract from the integrity of the building's architecture. Mr. Engel commented that the placement of the shutters was just low enough to interfere with lawn maintenance people and he suggested that they be raised to the top of the windows. Mr. Garcia agreed that it would be no problem to raise the front five shutters.

Vice-Chair Aitken pointed out where crosswalk markings needed to be indicated in the parking area. Mr. Garcia agreed to marking the crosswalk.

Mr. Engel pointed out another incongruity between the rendering and the site plans, specifically, the drive-under canopy. Mr. Garcia explained that the change in the plans was made by the project engineer; however, the elevations which were displayed matched the plans. Mr. Evans recommended that the rendering be corrected prior to the Council meeting as it was misleading and confusing. Mr. Garcia took the suggestion under advisement.

Ms. Nolan interjected that since the building was to be used for a "not-for-profit" purpose, staff had suggested that instead of putting money into making a new rendering, the money should go into the building. While the Committee agreed with the practicality, it recommended that the rendering be eliminated entirely and only the elevations be used for the Council meeting so as not to be misleading.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE  
APRIL 12, 2005**

Chair Breslau asked about the roll-up doors where boats would be worked on after they were backed into the building on trailers. He noticed that there was no protection at the corner of the building and pointed out the area for Mr. Garcia who indicated that it was an excellent observation and he would provide some sort of protection.

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Aitken, to approve based on the planning report and the following: 1) that the shutters on the north side of the building be raised to be above the windows rather than at midpoint as shown on the elevation; 2) that a crosswalk marking be added at the main entrance where the walkway crossed the road; and 3) to add a bollard at the northwest door at the gym to protect it against any vehicles backing into it. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau – yes; Vice-Chair Aitken – yes; Mr. Aucamp – yes; Mr. Engel – yes; Mr. Evans – yes. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

3.2 SP 10-1-04, Rickell-Say's Plaza, 6650 Stirling Road (B-3)

Gus Aguirre, Phillip Aguirre and Freddy Roye, representing the petitioner, were present. Mr. Abramson summarized the planning report.

Vice-Chair Aitken asked for clarification on staff's recommendation to remove plant material from the north side of the two-story building. Mr. Abramson explained the reason for staff's recommendation. Mr. G. Aguirre expressed that he had no objection to extending the sidewalk thereby eliminating the landscape strip.

Chair Breslau noticed that the walkway between buildings one and two were different on the site plan than on 'E-1' and asked that Mr. G. Aguirre clarify which was correct. Mr. G. Aguirre replied that the site plan was accurate and that the 'E-1' would be corrected.

A brief discussion ensued regarding the inadequacy of two single dumpsters as well as their locations. It concluded with Mr. G. Aguirre agreeing to double up on the two dumpsters. Later in the meeting, Mr. Roye explained that it was his policy to have the trash removed several times a week if necessary; however, the Committee decided it preferred to have more receptacles at the onset and that trash could be removed more often in order to keep the area clean. In discussing the dumpster issue, Mr. G. Aguirre confirmed that there would be no "food uses" on the site. Committee members expressed their concerns that in order to have as much square footage as possible and meet with parking requirements, the developer was restricting himself to the types of uses which were possible at that location. The developer expressed indifference in this matter.

Another item discussed at length regarded the walkway through building one. It was suggested that it be extended to five feet or eliminated altogether. Mr. G. Aguirre indicated that he had no problem with eliminating the walkway since there was no practical need for it as it led to a dry retention area.

Chair Breslau discussed the subject of the sod which was located in the two-foot car overhang in the parking area. He indicated that it had been his experience that the sod did not fare well when subjected to those conditions. It was concluded that the area of concern would be inspected one year following installation and if the sod was dead or in poor condition, it would be replaced with decorative stone. Mr. G. Aguirre agreed to the arrangement.

Mr. Engel discussed specific details regarding the handicapped ramp stemming from the sidewalk by the handicapped parking and pointed out the problem to Mr. P. Aguirre. Other technical issues with the handicapped bathroom stalls were explained by Mr. Engel and these problems were taken under advisement by Mr. P. Aguirre.

Mr. Engel expressed his disapproval with the appearance of the south elevation of building one, area 'A'. It was his opinion that the long expansive building needed some relief as it would be viewed from Stirling Road. Mr. P. Aguirre responded that the owner specifically requested that there not be back doors on that part of the building as it contained small bays that were not deep.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE  
APRIL 12, 2005**

Mr. Aucamp made several landscaping recommendations which Mr. G. Aguirre indicated he would accommodate. He also recommended that the inspection of the sod under the car overhangs be reduced to six months. The Committee agreed with the time reduction.

Committee members reiterated their concern regarding the square footage of the buildings which forced the limited parking, which eliminated the possibility of a food use on the site. Mr. Evans offered an alternative which was to remove the second story and redistribute the parking which would allow for food uses and/or restaurants. Chair Breslau indicated that he would like it to be mentioned in the motion that the Committee determined that although the parking met Code, it would still be problematic given that amount of space subdivisions in the project.

Mr. Evans pointed out where doors could be installed in the back of certain bays in order to take advantage of the deck area and Mr. P. Aguirre was amenable to the idea. He also suggested that in back of both buildings one and two, to continue banding in a color change to make it more attractive.

Colors were discussed with the consensus being that the red and green needed to be toned down. Mr. G. Aguirre indicated that he understood and agreed to submit a separate pallet of colors for review.

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Mr. Engel, to approve based on the planning report and the following: 1) that stucco bands be added on the west side of building two and on the south side of building one; 2) on plans E-1, adjust the walkway to match SP-1; 3) add two dumpsters, one in the front and one in the rear; 4) to look at the office/retail uses, as it appeared there was not enough parking; 5) to eliminate the five-foot wide walk-thru area; 6) to bring back the color samples at another time; 7) revisit where the handicapped ramp approached the sidewalk; 8) if the second floor areas were to be kept, then on bays 36, 37, 38, 29, 30 and 31, doors be added to the back terraces; 9) on the south area of building two, add three eight-foot Cassias; 10) on the northwest, change the trees to Oaks; 11) on Stirling Road, line up the two Oak trees at the main entrance so that they are parallel and the same distance to the road; 12) that in six months, the two-foot landscaping under the car overhang be inspected to see if it is a problem; and 13) that everyone on the Committee agreed that the parking was not sufficient for the area, that it be noted in the report, that the item be moved forward; however, it was the applicant's business. 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)**

3.3 SP 11-2-04, Wachovia-Lakeside, 5700 South University Drive (UC)

Chair Breslau indicated that he would abstain from voting as he had a conflict.

David Roberts, Jay Matteson and Brian Gates, representing the petitioner, were present. Mr. Abrams summarized the planning report.

Mr. Roberts summarized the intent of the project noting that the building was to be painted in matching colors with the other buildings.

Mr. Engel relayed that before Mr. Aucamp left the meeting, he saw no problems with the landscape plans. Mr. Engel, however, did point out where corrections were needed for the handicapped parking signage. Mr. Matteson indicated that he understood what Mr. Engel was showing him on the plans.

Vice-Chair Aitken noted that crosswalk striping was needed on the west side of the building. Mr. Engel showed Mr. Matteson how a realignment of the sidewalk would work better and would lead to the crosshatching Vice-Chair Aitken referenced.

Chair Breslau indicated that Mr. Evans had architectural comments to make which expressed the consensus of the Committee.

Mr. Evans stated that he was stunned with the minimalism of the building, especially since it was to be in a strategically visible location in the center. He elaborated, noting that the building was not in character with Wachovia, Lakeside, the Town, and University Drive.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE  
APRIL 12, 2005**

Chair Breslau suggested that the applicant be given some feedback as to what was expected by the Committee. Mr. Roberts indicated that he was somewhat surprised by the comments since the project met Code and he meant no offense. Vice-Chair Aitken referenced other projects which were submitted under expectations and that the recommendations made by the Committee benefited the applicant as well as the community.

There was a brief discussion regarding how soon the modifications could be made to the elevations so that the applicant could be reviewed and move forward. Mr. Roberts indicated that he would be able to have his part done for the next meeting. The Committee clarified some of the details that it was looking to incorporate in the redesign. Speaking for the Committee, Mr. Engel indicated that a “black line” would be acceptable and that a new rendering was not necessary. However, a new rendering was recommended for the upcoming Council meeting.

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Mr. Engel, to table to April 26th in order for the applicant to resubmit an architectural design. 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)**

**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 6:13 p.m.

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

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