

SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
APRIL 25, 2006

1. ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 4:05 p.m. Committee members present were Chair Julie Aitken (departed at 6:05 p.m.), Vice-Chair Sam Engel, Jr., James Aucamp, Jr., (departed at 6:25 p.m.), Jeff Evans and Bob Breslau. Also present were Vice-Mayor Crowley, Planning and Zoning Manager Bruce Dell, Deputy Planning and Zoning Manager Marcie Nolan, Planner David Abramson, and Secretary Janet Gale recording the meeting.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: April 11, 2006

Mr. Breslau made a motion, seconded by Mr. Evans, to approve the minutes of April 11, 2006. In a voice vote, all voted in favor. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

3. SITE PLANS

Chair Aitken advised that the petitioner for SP 11-4-05, Long Key Natural Area, was present to bring back a rendering and color samples as directed at the April 11th meeting.

Mr. Breslau made a motion, seconded by Mr. Aucamp, to address this item first. In a roll call vote, all voted in favor. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

Alan Fertel, Gretel McLausland and Shobhan Smart, representing the petitioner, were present. Chair Aitken listed the recommendations made by the Committee at the April 11th meeting.

Mr. Fertel distributed the color samples and Mr. Aucamp did not recall having discussed a maintenance building at the previous site plan review.

Chair Aitken asked staff if the maintenance building had been part of the application as the Committee members who were present could not recall discussing it at the previous presentation. Although an elevation of the maintenance building was provided, there had been no discussion about it. Chair Aitken expressed that the location was unsuitable as it faced residential homes.

A lengthy discussion ensued in an effort to settle on another location for the maintenance building. Although several alternatives were suggested, Mr. Smart explained why each suggestion would not work. Committee members agreed that they would need to see the whole site in order to evaluate the prospect of moving the maintenance building to a less conspicuous area further away from residences.

Mr. Breslau made a motion, seconded by Mr. Aucamp, to table to the next available meeting [May 9, 2006], in order for the applicant to come back to the Committee with alternative locations for the maintenance building as well as to bring a survey and aerial photos of the entire Kapok Tree property including the parking lot. In a voice vote, all voted in favor. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

Mr. Abramson advised that the petitioner from Flamingo Village (MSP 7-4-05), was present with roof samples for the Committee's review as directed on April 11th.

Gus Khavanin, representing the petitioner, was present. Committee members expressed their satisfaction with the roof sample provided.

Vice-Chair Engel made a motion, seconded by Mr. Breslau, to approve the tile sample as presented, to be used as the roof material for the project. In a voice vote, all voted in favor. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

Mr. Aucamp made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Engel, to address item 3.2 before item 3.1. In a voice vote, all voted in favor. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
APRIL 25, 2006

3.2 MSP 9-1-05, Westridge Oaks, northeast corner of Flamingo Road and Orange Drive (AG)

Messrs. Breslau and Evans disclosed that they would abstain from voting on this item as they had conflicting interests in the project.

Dennis Mele and Jill Cohen, representing the petitioner, were present. Ms. Nolan summarized the planning report.

Chair Aitken asked what the difference was between an access point and an access drive since both were located in the scenic corridor buffer. Ms. Nolan responded that staff's interpretation of the Code was that access points were allowed in the buffer but not access drives. At Chair Aitken's request, Ms. Nolan showed her how the scenic buffers were measured and it was agreed that the southern access road created another lane of traffic.

Chair Aitken questioned if the petitioner were to obtain all the waivers and variances it was requesting, would the project meet Code. Ms. Nolan responded affirmatively and clarified that nothing in the planning report prohibited them from bringing the application forward and that typical items could be worked out. When Chair Aitken asked about flex units and the County's authority, Ms. Nolan explained that they were looked at by the Planning Council to see that they complied; however, the granting of the flex units would be at the discretion of the Town Council.

Having an assortment of aerials, renderings and elevations, Mr. Mele provided a presentation to clarify the intent of the project. He spoke of the input from public participation meetings, particularly from the residents of Laurel Oaks, and how the project was designed to accommodate as many of their requests as possible. Mr. Mele emphasized that a Declaration of Restrictive Covenants had been prepared to prohibit any objectionable uses in the designated B-2 zoning district which was the eastern most portion of the project. He advised that the reason for the R-1 rezoning at the northern portion of the site was to set a precedent for the vacant properties north of this project. Mr. Mele indicated that the project went before the Central Broward Water Control District to apply for a variance on the lake maintenance easement which had been granted. He submitted evidence of that action by the District.

In his presentation, Mr. Mele advised that the renderings were computer images taken from architectural drawings which had no distortion in appearance. He explained why a variance was needed for the square footage of the office buildings since the zoning was reduced to comply with neighbor's requests. However, since they were allowed to develop in a more liberal zoning category, they would be requesting the square footage ratios designated in the less restricted category. Mr. Mele went through all the renderings, pointed out the attributes of the proposed community, and answered questions posed by the Committee members. He showed the differences between keeping the 100-foot scenic corridor on Flamingo Road and the variation which he was proposing. Mr. Mele also explained the variance request he was making for the Orange Drive scenic corridor. It was his interpretation of the Code which allowed for an access way which provided him with the validation for the variance request. Chair Aitken argued that if a definition for "access way" was not explicit in the Code, then the "intent" should be followed.

Mr. Mele proceeded to show the public gathering and open space areas which were created by redesigning parking patterns. Ms. Cohen explained that having fewer but larger landscape areas was "horticulturally" better for the planted material.

Mr. Mele went through the list of staff's recommendations in the planning report and took issue with items number five and eight. He explained the reasoning for his position on those issues.

Mr. Aucamp reviewed the landscape plans with Ms. Cohen and made several recommendations. Ms. Cohen explained her choices of materials and indicated her agreement with Mr. Aucamp when applicable.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
APRIL 25, 2006**

Chair Aitken expressed that her major concerns regarded the scenic corridors, access ways, the height of the office building, and the increase in residential density. She offered an alternative traditional direction which involved toning down the scale of everything in order to achieve the intent of the two major rural scenic corridors in the Town. Chair Aitken did not understand why this item was being presented to the Committee prior to the Planning and Zoning Board since so much of the plan was predicated upon approval of requests which had not been obtained.

Vice-Chair Engel advised that he researched the Code regarding scenic corridors and it did indicate that roadways were allowed. He had no other concerns to add; however, he was curious how item five of staff's recommendations would be resolved.

A lengthy discussion ensued with regard to burying the power lines. Mr. Mele clarified that he was being asked to burry the power lines that were located in the right-of-way on Flamingo Road and Orange Drive. He contended that while it was the intent to bury the power lines on the site, he was being asked to do what had not been applied to any other developers near him and along the same corridors, neither had it been in the Code, and it was brought up at the "eleventh" hour.

Mr. Breslau advised that the power lines in question were major transmission lines that serviced thousands of people in the neighborhood. Although they would agree to pay their fair share when FP&L would decide to bury their power lines, to bare the cost for a major transmission line for everyone else when no one else would be participating in that cost, was an enormous expense they could not afford. Mr. Mele described the technical aspects involved in burying transmission lines which helped to explain why it was so costly.

Mr. Dell asked that the petitioner clarify how he would address outdoor seating for restaurants and what would be done to reduce the noise produced by such establishments or to prevent the noise from impacting neighboring residences. Mr. Mele indicated that restaurant seating would be limited to the west facing establishments in order to block the noise by the buildings themselves.

Chair Aitken wondered why a more traditional site plan was not utilized for the site. Messrs. Mele and Evans explained how the site evolved due to the bequests of the neighbors. Mr. Evans recalled that from the public participation meetings, the neighbors wanted the townhouses to serve as a buffer between the single family residential and the commercial and he was told that they should be four-to-five unit carriage homes, two-story in nature and large. He added that given that criteria, the lake was split and placed along Orange Drive in an effort to place a nice feature along the scenic corridor. Although Chair Aitken was pleased with the architecture and placement of the townhouses, she indicated that they were too dense and there may have been a better way to work the lakes. Mr. Mele advised that the placement of the lakes was as much for the passer-by as it was for the people who lived next to them.

Mr. Aucamp made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Engel, to approve based on the planning report with number five – the power line issue being unresolved; that the two Phoenix Reclinata 16-foot overall be replaced with one specimen Phoenix Reclinata, 28- to 30-foot overall, twelve stem minimum; substitute Mahogany Trees with Pigeon Palms; to provide two [landscape] plans for the townhouses; change the six Live Oaks flanking the entrance from 16-foot overall to 22-foot overall. In a roll call vote the vote was as follows: Chair Aitken – no; Vice-Chair Engel – yes; Mr. Aucamp – yes; Mr. Breslau – abstained; Mr. Evans – abstained. **(Motion carried 2-1 with Chair Aitken being opposed; therefore, subject to Resolution R-2001-209, this item was automatically tabled to the meeting of May 9, 2006.)**

3.1 SP 8-5-05, Parc 64 Plaza, south of Stirling Road on Davie Road Extension (B-2)

Jay Evans, Graham Geraldts and Herbert Stanley, representing the petitioner, were present. Mr. Abramson summarized the planning report.

SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
APRIL 25, 2006

Mr. Evans responded to the staff's recommendations in the planning report. When he addressed the dumpster situation, Vice-Chair Engel asked if he had obtained approval from Waste Management regarding the location of the dumpsters. Mr. Evans replied affirmatively. Mr. Abramson confirmed that there had been no comments from Waste Management to indicate that the dumpsters were inappropriately placed.

Vice-Chair Engel commented on the radius indications and Mr. Evans understood what needed to be fixed. It was noted that stop signs should to be installed at various locations on the site to which Mr. Evans agreed would be done.

In observing the parking calculations, Vice-Chair Engle commented that the ratio of one parking space for every 300 square feet of office space did not work very well. Mr. Breslau wanted to be certain that the calculations were based on "pure, dry office space". Mr. Evans responded that he understood and was zoned only for professional office space and not retail or medical.

Mr. Breslau commented that the light poles needed to be lowered since there was nothing to screen the light from the nearby residences, and Mr. Evans agreed to take a look at modifying their height. Mr. Breslau added that shields should be used on the light poles for the rear parking up against residential sites. Again Mr. Evans agreed.

Mr. Breslau asked about the railing around a hard formed retention pond. Mr. Evans described the railing and agreed that a fountain would be placed in the middle of the pond. He also agreed, at Mr. Breslau's recommendation, to select an accent paint color for the columns and caps on the eight-foot perimeter concrete wall. Based on the photometric plan, Mr. Breslau pointed out low levels of lighting and asked that the foot-candle levels in the main drives be reviewed by the petitioner. Mr. Evans agreed to do so. Mr. Breslau commented that the buildings were very square, very plain and generic. He deferred to Committee member Evans for architectural comments and advice on how to inexpensively make them more interesting.

Committee member Evans asked about signage. Mr. Evans described the monument plaques and suite number system that would be used in lieu of building signs. Committee member Evans agreed that the buildings needed some ornamentation in order to break up the huge expanse of walls. Other issues discussed at length were the metal tile roofing material which Committee members did not recommend; that the second-floor walkway would be covered with more detail on the canopy; that the panel at the center section in the rear of the two-story building be "boxed out about eight inches" and have a decorative element; that the rear windows have the same treatment as the windows on the sides and front of the building; that the front windows have a decorative element above them similar to the single-story building; and that the changes be brought back to the Committee on May 9, 2006.

Mr. Breslau made a motion, seconded by Committee member Evans, to approve subject to the staff report numbers one and three and the following: 1) correct all the radiuses as shown on the plan; 2) add all stop bars and traffic signage at intersections and crosswalks and indicate them on the plans; 3) reduce the height of the light poles to 25-feet and include shielding for those light poles located in the rear parking area on both sides of building 'C'; 4) applicant would add a fountain to the lake; 5) use accent paint colors on the columns and post caps of the rear, eight-foot high concrete wall; 6) the applicant would review the foot-candles in the main driveways and resubmit the photometric plan; 7) on the one-story building, continue the decorative treatments on the side and rear windows the same as were on the front windows; 8) add a "pop-out" building treatment on the rear of the building that matches the front; 9) on the two-story building 'C', on the back, pull the center out eight inches, raise it and make it a decorative treatment and also add decorative treatments to those rear windows; 10) add decorative insets on the top bands of all buildings; 11) roof tile samples and colors should be brought back to this Committee; 12) verify on the plans that on the two-story building walkway, that second-story walkway was to be covered; 13) that all the changes were to be brought back to the Committee on May 9th;

SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
APRIL 25, 2006

and 14) to work with staff and the adjacent landowner to create a cross access agreement that was mutually agreeable to both parties. In a roll call vote the vote was as follows: Chair Aitken – absent; Vice-Chair Engel – yes; Mr. Aucamp – absent; Mr. Breslau – yes; Mr. Evans – yes. **(Motion carried 3-0)**

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 7:10 p.m.

Date Approved: _____

Chair/Committee Member