

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 21, 2006**

**1. ROLL CALL**

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. Committee members present were Chair Bob Breslau, Vice-Chair Jeff Evans, Julie Aitken, James Aucamp, Jr., and Sam Engel, Jr. Also present were Councilmember Caletka (departed at 6:00 p.m.), Planning and Zoning Manager Bruce Dell, Planners David Abramson, Lise Bazinet and Phil Bachers, and Secretary Janet Gale recording the meeting.

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: October 24, 2006, (tabled from November 7, 2006)**

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

**3. SITE PLAN MODIFICATIONS**

**3.1 SPM 2-2-06, Calvary Free Will Baptist Church, 8530 Stirling Road (Community Facility)**

Chair Breslau advised of a request to table this item to December 12th. Mr. Engel so moved, seconded by Mr. Aucamp. In a voice vote, all voted in favor. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

**3.2 SPM 10-4-06, Villa Nova, 6700 Nova Drive (RM-16)**

Murray Rigosi, representing the petitioner, was present. Mr. Abramson summarized the planning report.

Mr. Rigosi concurred with the planning report. Chair Breslau clarified which items needed approval and it turned out to be the color selection. With no color board provided, the Committee did not disapprove what they saw on the PowerPoint presentation.

Chair Breslau acknowledged that there was a considerable improvement in the appearance of the project. He suggested that if there were no comments or objections, that a motion be made for approval subject to staff obtaining the actual details on the paint colors as shown.

Ms. Aitken so moved, seconded by Mr. Engel. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau – yes; Vice-Chair Evans – yes; Ms. Aitken – yes; Mr. Aucamp – yes; Mr. Engel – yes. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

**4. SITE PLANS**

**4.1 SP 6-9-04, Davie Estates, generally located by SW 58 Street and SW 61 Avenue between Stirling Road and Griffin Road (R-1)**

Gary Bloom, Itmar Goldenholtz, Jimmy Socash and Itzhak Orghad, representing the petitioner, were present. Mr. Abramson summarized the planning report.

Ms. Aitken asked if public participation meetings had been suggested by staff since the application had been submitted prior to the ordinance being initiated. Mr. Abramson responded that he could not recall if this applicant had been advised since it had been submitted over two years ago; however, because of interest currently expressed in the project, they had recently been advised to hold public participation meetings.

Chair Breslau asked that Mr. Abramson clarify which of the Development Review Committee's comments had not been addressed and which ones were addressed. Mr. Abramson complied.

Chair Breslau stated that it had been brought to his attention that members of the general public wanted to speak on this item and he advised them of the procedure.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 21, 2006**

Mr. Bloom provided historical information and explained the intent of the project. He responded to item three in the planning report in which the entrance wall was not to exceed a three-foot height. Mr. Bloom indicated that he could not agree to that comment. Mr. Dell asked that Mr. Abramson research how the three-foot height maximum for the entrance wall evolved while the meeting continued.

Mr. Bloom spoke of the 30-foot right-of-way which had been given up for the project and how the developer replaced a utilities "old force main" located on "58th which supplied the whole city."

Ms. Aitken spoke of the purpose and benefits of holding public participation meetings. Staff indicated that it would provide Mr. Bloom with a list of the residents to whom notices should be sent. Mr. Bloom responded that he would take his chances with Council. Ms. Aitken was aware that residents were concerned about the impact to 58th Avenue as the road was not capable of handling more traffic. She could not see the need for two entrances for 19 homes. Mr. Bloom indicated that police and fire officials as well as staff had recommended the two entrances; however, he had no problem with removing the 58th Avenue access. Mr. Abrams was asked to research the issue regarding the need for two entrances.

Chair Breslau pointed out that on site plan SP1A, a correction needed to be made to indicate that a gazebo would be installed instead of a fountain; that the driveways for lots 13 and 14 needed to be situated as far away from the access entrance as possible; and that the driveway access points for the corner lots 11, 16, 1 and 7, be the furthest away from the radius of the turn as possible. Assuming that the access on 58th was to stay in place, Chair Breslau had a problem with lot four which was situated at an "interchange" within the site. He recommended a circular drive for lot four in order to avoid backing out into that traffic situation. As the plans did not show a detail of the lift station, Chair Breslau asked that one be provided to staff and that it should also indicate the fence and landscaping. Mr. Bloom agreed with these recommendations.

Chair Breslau asked about a lift station generator for emergencies and recommended that the developer obtain one. Mr. Bloom asked why engineering issues were being discussed at Site Plan. Mr. Abramson reminded him that civil engineering plans were required and had not been included in the packet. Chair Breslau asked if there was any other information regarding the gazebo other than what had been provided. Mr. Goldenholtz indicated that the roofing material would be split cedar shakes. Chair Breslau asked that if the split cedar shakes were not available, would the developer agree to the Monet concrete with the split shake design. Mr. Goldenholtz agreed to that condition.

Chair Breslau indicated that he would like to see some kind of relief on the entry walls and made a couple of suggestions; however, he deferred to the architects on the Committee for further details on that issue.

Mr. Aucamp discussed the landscape plan with Mr. Socash and it was established that the Royal Palm trees would be located on the interior side of the entrance walls. This led to a discussion regarding the entrance walls, the wall height, and signage on the walls. Ms. Aitken explained that the three-foot high wall restriction had been devised to promote rustic fencing such as a split rail, dry stone or post and rail. Chair Breslau summarized that for the purpose of achieving approval, the petitioner had agreed to remove all entry walls, provide signage to comply with Code, and redraw the entrance feature as discussed with some type of hardscape that met the intent of the rural lifestyle. He asked that the developer come back to this Committee for a final okay on those items after going through the Town Council.

Mr. Bloom asked that the issue of double access be researched in order for it to be resolved. Mr. Engel advised that the second access could be for emergency vehicles only and would require a compact surface for a fire truck to drive through. Mr. Bloom asked that the second access be left as subject to the Fire Department's review and that the entrance and all associated improvements on 58th Avenue would be removed, and if the Fire Department required an emergency access point at that location, the developer would provide it.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 21, 2006**

Vice-Chair Evans was concerned with the level of privacy afforded to the development by the minimal landscaping buffers at the entrance and around the perimeter of the site. Mr. Aucamp agreed that the landscaping needed enhancement along 58th and 61st Avenues. They discussed berm heights and undulating patterns and it was determined that the maximum berm height would be one-and-a-half feet.

After a lengthy discussion, it was determined that there was enough room on all perimeters to provide plusher landscaping. Mr. Bloom indicated that they would address any drainage issues concerning the neighbor to the south who was situated at a lower elevation.

Ms. Aitken questioned the dimensions of the lots. Mr. Bloom stated that there was a minimum width of 125-feet. As the plans showed some smaller lot sizes, a lengthy discussion ensued regarding the interpretation of frontage widths for corner lots. Later in the meeting, Mr. Engel read the section of the Code pertaining to this issue and it was determined that each portion of street frontage needed to be a minimum of 125-feet.

Chair Breslau invited public participation.

Bryan Caletka, 6332 SW 39 Court, was concerned that there had not been two public participation meetings. He was led to believe that the developer was considering holding the meetings; however, when Councilmember Caletka heard that they would take their chances with Council, he was discouraged. It was obvious to him that the developer was going to ignore the Committee's recommendations. Councilmember Caletka's primary concern was that there not be an exit onto SW 58 Avenue since it was already an extremely overloaded road. Regarding a generator for the lift stations, he advised that Council was very adamant on that issue and he hoped that the developer would consider providing one before it was reviewed by Council.

Karen Stenzel-Nowicki, 5480 SW 55 Avenue, advised that 58th Avenue was an "old muck road" and she provided historical information for the Committee to consider. Ms. Stenzel-Nowicki emphasized her opinion that 58th Avenue could not tolerate additional traffic and was dangerous at the Griffin Road and Stirling Road intersections. She distributed published articles which denoted the accidents and fatalities which have occurred at those locations. Ms. Stenzel-Nowicki asked that the Committee, as well as those responsible for public safety, consider not having an access on 58th Avenue.

Ms. Aitken asked that if the Committee was to recommend not installing an access on 58th Avenue, would it be making a recommendation that opposed the Code. Mr. Abramson opined that by having pedestrian and emergency vehicle access on 58th Avenue, it would meet Code.

Mr. Bloom advised that the developer was willing to hold public participation meetings and assured that they would be advertised. Mr. Dell informed Mr. Bloom that staff would provide a list names and addresses within a 1,000-foot radius in order to send out notices.

Mr. Aucamp made a motion, seconded by Mr. Engle, to table this item until the following discrepancies could be resolved: 1) that the gazebo would be a gazebo and not a fountain; 2) to eliminate the entrance at SW 58 Avenue if possible, and if public safety agreed that it could be eliminated; 3) that the gazebo roof be made of cedar shakes, and if unable to be cedar shakes, then simulated cement tile wood shake and provide a color sample board; 4) that the petitioner would come back with a perimeter landscape design not only for SW 58th Avenue and the SW 61st Avenue entrance designs, but the perimeter design for the wall and fence landscaping potentially with a berm as well as the lift station; 5) that the lift station be shielded with landscaping and the petitioner would look into obtaining a generator for the lift station; 6) note that there were no electronic gates for the entrance; 7) that the petitioner would look at the north and south perimeters because the sections on the plans did not work; 8) remove sheet A-1 from the plans; 9) check all of the lot widths that they should be a minimum of 125 feet; and 10) that the landscaping on the north and south property lines have an undulating pattern. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau – yes; Vice-Chair Evans – yes; Ms. Aitken – yes; Mr. Aucamp – yes; Mr. Engel – yes. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 21, 2006**

4.2 SP 10-3-05, Boy Scout Camp Seminole, 3301 SW 142 Avenue (CR, Commercial Recreational)

Chris Zimmerman and Art Hawkins, representing the petitioner, were present. Mr. Bachers summarized the planning report.

Ms. Aitken did not find any indication of an equestrian/recreational trail on 142nd Avenue; however, in the planning report it stated that the petitioner acknowledged that it had to be done and she questioned what that meant. Mr. Zimmerman indicated that the required equestrian/recreational trail had been installed on the west side of the property. He added that there was no request by staff for an equestrian trail on the east side because of the one on the west side. Mr. Zimmerman explained that the development to the west had provided the equestrian trail. Ms. Aitken believed that there should be two equestrian trails. As this issue could not be resolved because of a lack of data, Chair Breslau suggested that in the motion, it should be recommended that staff and the petitioner work together to examine the horse trail issue.

Vice-Chair Evans inquired if the lake was meant for swimming. Mr. Zimmerman advised the Committee of the plans to revitalize the lake. Both Vice-Chair Evans and Mr. Engel complimented the petitioner on the presentation as an accurate rendering had been provided for every building.

Mr. Aucamp extended his compliments on the landscaping plans as they matched the renderings. Because of the enormity of the project, he asked if there was enough funding to complete it. Mr. Zimmerman explained the financing and assured that enough money had been earmarked to complete the project.

Mr. Dell asked about the safety precautions taken for the BB-gun and archery ranges. Mr. Zimmerman explained the berm and fence arrangements to protect neighbors as well as participating youths.

Chair Breslau asked about the radiuses in the parking areas and if trailers were able to manage parking in the designated areas. Mr. Zimmerman stated that they would reexamine the plans in order to insure that trucks and trailers were able to make it. Another concern of Chair Breslau was how to control the speed of vehicles traveling on the newly paved road which extended throughout the site. Mr. Zimmerman pointed out the gate which would allow specific limited access. Chair Breslau requested that speed limit signs of the standard school zone type also be posted and Mr. Zimmerman responded affirmatively.

Mr. Engel made a motion, seconded by Mr. Aucamp, to approve subject to the staff's report and the following: 1) check the radius in the parking areas for trucks and trailers; 2) install speed control devices on the roadways; and 3) coordinate the equestrian and recreational trail system on SW 142nd Avenue. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau – yes; Vice-Chair Evans – yes; Ms. Aitken – yes; Mr. Aucamp – yes; Mr. Engel – yes. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

4.3 SP 2-5-06, Pine Island Commercial, 8501 Orange Drive (B-2)

Jay Evans, Frank Costoya and Douglas Krawczyk, representing the petitioner, were present. Lise Bazinet summarized the planning report.

Ms. Aitken asked that the sidewalk crosswalks at both entrances be delineated with striping so that it would be obvious that there were pedestrian crossings.

Mr. Engel commented that while the ratio of one parking space for every 300 square-feet was the new Code requirement, in reality the ratio was not practical or efficient.

Mr. Aucamp suggested that because of the height of the building, the height of the Royal Palms should be increased accordingly.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 21, 2006**

Chair Breslau asked how the backflow pipes for the water meters, which were located by the stairwells, could be hidden. Mr. Evans explained the constraints required by utilities which were to have a five-foot clearance at those locations. Messrs. Evans and Costoya agreed to look into a means of screening the unsightly meters and pipes.

Chair Breslau pointed out a potentially dangerous situation where vehicles entering the site at the Pine Island entrance may be traveling too fast for the vehicle that may be trying to back out of the first parking space closest to that entrance. He wondered if there was a way to slow down those vehicles entering the parking lot. A discussion ensued and Chair Breslau suggested that the developer confer with Engineering to come up with a solution for the problem. Messrs. Costoya and Evans agreed that they would address the problem with the Town's Engineering Department.

Mr. Aucamp made a motion, seconded by Mr. Engel, to approve based on the planning report and the following comments: 1) that there be crosswalks marked at both entries; 2) increase the Royal Palm trees to ten-foot of grey wood, 35-feet overall height; 3) screen as best as possible the "backflow preventers;" 4) provide some sort of speed control device coming off Pine Island; and 5) relocate the tree at the first parking space off the Pine Island entrance to somewhere at the front of the site. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau – yes; Vice-Chair Evans – yes; Ms. Aitken – yes; Mr. Aucamp – yes; Mr. Engel – yes. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

4.4 SP 5-2-06, Orangemen Warehouse, 4041 SW 47 Avenue (M-3)

Carlos Gonzalez, representing the petitioner, was present. Mr. Abramson read the planning report.

Mr. Gonzalez concurred with the staff report and advised that he addressed all of the recommendations.

Ms. Aitken identified a mistake in the landscaping plans whereby trees were indicated to be placed in the gated access drive. Mr. Gonzalez agreed to make the correction.

Vice-Chair Evans commented that the building was very long. He drew a design of step-out panels with a raised center panel and showed it to the applicant. Mr. Gonzalez agreed that it would look better; however, he was concerned that the market would not bear the additional expense. Mr. Gonzalez expressed that the economy of the design was key to the success of the project.

Mr. Engel indicated that he had a problem with the amount of compact parking spaces because most vehicles at this location would be extended pick-ups and vans as was typical of the trades.

Vice-Chair Evans indicated that the step-out suggestion was a very simple change that would be a minimal cost. Mr. Gonzales suggested that a compromise be made by increasing the height of the center panels. As there was a restriction in paint colors, Chair Breslau asked if the darker color could be applied only to the middle, taller panels in order to break up the wall length. Mr. Gonzalez agreed to the paint color recommendation.

Mr. Engel also agreed that the step-out design was a good solution for the wall length and that it would not be too costly as it would only involve lengthening a few joists for the stepped out panels. Mr. Gonzalez agreed to the changes and asked that since changes were being made, could he increase the height of the overhead doors to 12-feet in the back of the building. The Committee agreed to that change.

Vice-Chair Evans made a motion, seconded by Mr. Engel, to approve based on the planning report and the following changes: 1) that the rear, overhead doors go from ten-feet to 12-feet; 2) that on the front of the building, that there be four panels that bump out eight inches and were to be raised two feet; 3) that the two center panels be raised four feet; and 4) that the landscaping plan needs to be corrected by removing the trees from the walkway. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau – yes; Vice-Chair Evans – yes; Ms. Aitken – yes; Mr. Aucamp – yes; Mr. Engel – yes. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE  
NOVEMBER 21, 2006**

**5. OLD BUSINESS**

There was no old business discussed.

**6. NEW BUSINESS**

The Committee discussed and decided on having only one meeting for the month of December.

**7. COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS**

There were no comments and/or suggestions made.

**8. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business and no objections, the meeting was adjourned at 7:33 p.m.

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

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