

SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
AUGUST 7, 2007

1. ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 4:02 p.m. Committee members present were Chair Jeff Evans, Vice-Chair Sam Engel, Jr., and Bob Breslau. Also present were Acting Planning and Zoning Manager Marcie Nolan (departed 5:50 p.m.), Chief Landscape Inspector Chris Richter, Urban Forester Tim Lee (departed 6:55 p.m.), Acting Deputy Planning and Zoning Manager David Abramson, and Secretary Jenevia Edwards recording the meeting.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: July 10, 2007

Mr. Breslau made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Engel, to approve the minutes of July 10, 2007. In a voice vote, with Ms. Lee and Mr. Venis being absent, all voted in favor. **Motion carried 3-0**

3. SITE PLANS

Modification

3.1 SPM 4-3-07, Emerald Isles West Phase One, Inc., 4850 SW 63 Terrace (RM-16)

Frank Costoya, representing the petitioner, was present. Mr. Abramson advised of the modifications that were to be made.

Mr. Costoya advised that the change in the railing was more of a safety issue rather than an aesthetic one; however, they would be cleaning up the site, painting the building, and replacing rotted wood. He explained that there had been hurricane damage to the balconies and detailed the structural repairs that needed to be made to restore them. Mr. Costoya provided a color board and spoke of the landscape embellishments.

Vice-Chair Engel remarked that it was quite an improvement. He commented that the four-by-four posts needed to be pressure treated. Mr. Costoya responded that they would be at the very least and he was considering four-by-four steel pipe columns.

Chair Evans remarked on the need for landscaping and that this was the time for those requirements to be fulfilled. Mr. Costoya assured that the landscaping would be done in sequences as the first thing would be the building repair and lighting because of safety issues, and lastly the landscaping would be accomplished.

Vice-Chair Engel made a motion, seconded by Mr. Breslau, to approve. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Evans – yes; Vice-Chair Engel – yes; Mr. Breslau – yes; Ms. Lee – absent; Mr. Venis - absent. **(Motion carried 3-0)**

Site Plans

3.2 SP 6-7-06, Falcon Tire Center, 2600 Davie Road (M-4, County) **(tabled from July 10, 2007)**

Chair Evans advised that the petitioner requested to be tabled to September 11, 2007.

Mr. Breslau made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Engel, to table to September 11, 2007. In a voice vote, with Ms. Lee and Mr. Venis being absent, all voted in favor. **(Motion carried 3-0)**

3.3 SP 11-6-05, Nissan-Volvo Dealership, 3650 – 3660 Weston Road (BP)

Dennis Mele and Boyd Bundy, representing the petitioner, were present. Mr. Abramson summarized the planning report.

Vice-Chair Engel asked if any more public parking areas would be provided. Mr. Abramson responded that what was being added would be utilized for storage and vehicle sales only. Since the square footage of the building had not been increased, additional public parking was not required.

Mr. Mele provided historical information regarding the southeast parcel. He conveyed the plan to keep the west parcel for commercial while the east parcel would be made into a lake for water retention which had received “resounding” approval from the Central Broward Water Control District.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
AUGUST 7, 2007**

Mr. Mele asked that staff's recommendation for a deed restriction be excluded since drainage easements had been given to the District and the archeological area would be dedicated to the protection of Broward County. He also addressed staff's second recommendation regarding the installation of perimeter canopy trees along the northern property line. Although Mr. Mele agreed to do it, he explained that there would be no benefit since the vegetation on the adjacent street was taller and the trees would not be visible. Regarding the bridle path, he used graphics to show where it would be re-routed in order to comply with staff's third recommendation.

At Mr. Breslau's inquiry, Mr. Abramson indicated that staff would be comfortable in deleting its first recommendation regarding a deed restriction; however, he clarified the second recommendation regarding the perimeter trees. Mr. Mele understood that the exotic trees needed removal; however, since most of the exotics were in the right-of-way of South Post Road, a permit from the County would be required. As long as he could obtain the necessary permits to remove the exotics, Mr. Mele agreed to it. A lengthy discussion ensued regarding the installation, irrigation and maintenance of trees for an area that was to be used for water retention and which was to be kept as natural looking as possible. Later in the meeting, Chair Evans agreed that this was a landscaping and irrigation issue that no one would see. Mr. Abramson maintained that for any type of development, street trees were required by Code. Mr. Mele argued that this was a retention area and that additional landscaping did not make any sense at that location. The issue was resolved with the petitioner agreeing to calculate how much the recommended landscaping would cost and then contribute that amount of money to the Town in order for the trees to be planted elsewhere.

Mr. Breslau noted that the photometric plans appeared to be excessive and asked that they be reduced to general industry standards. Mr. Bundy explained that the lighting in the new area was designed for greater efficiency and more uniform light levels with less energy use. Mr. Breslau detailed his suggestions in an effort to reduce the light levels on the perimeter as well as overall. A compromise was reached with the petitioner agreeing to reduce the size of the bulbs to those which would not produce more than 25-foot candles. Mr. Mele clarified the recommendation to mean that other than the spaces abutting the light fixture, the other spaces would not exceed 25-foot candles and the plans would be adjusted accordingly to be sure that they met the criteria.

Mr. Breslau made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Engel, to approve subject to the following conditions: 1) with regard to staff's recommendation number one, that it be deleted; 2) that staff's recommendation number two, in lieu of the trees being planted, the applicant should pay the Town the actual costs that was going to be spent on that requirement and pay it at the time of building permit issuance, and the Town would be able to use that money at its discretion for planting elsewhere in the Town; 3) that the applicant has agreed to staff's recommendation number three; and 4) that the applicant has agreed to the modification of lighting levels in the new parking lot area only, not to exceed 25-foot candles in any parking space area unless it abuts a light pole. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Evans – yes; Vice-Chair Engel – yes; Mr. Breslau – yes; Ms. Lee – absent; Mr. Venis – absent. **(Motion carried 3-0)**

3.4 SP 2-6-06, Russell Commons, 7800 Davie Road Extension (B-2)

Ralph and Melinda Russell, the owners, were present. Mr. Abramson summarized the planning report.

Mr. Russell explained the intent of the project.

Vice-Chair Engel noted that one of staff's recommendations was to relocate the loading zone and he understood that it would be difficult to get into; however, he could not determine where to relocate it. Mr. Russell indicated that he would be willing to sit down with staff to find out where it should be placed.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
AUGUST 7, 2007**

Vice-Chair Engel asked about the handicapped access and when it was pointed out, he was satisfied. He commented that the petitioner did a good job of disguising the existing old building and tying it in with the new building.

Mr. Breslau commented that this was a huge improvement to the neighborhood and appreciated the job that was done on the elevations. He understood that while the loading zone would be difficult to access, he believed moving it to the 78th Avenue side of the building would be equally difficult. Mr. Breslau pointed out where widening the mouth of the opening would help trucks get in and out of the loading zone.

Upon finding out that the units were to be rentals, Vice-Chair Engel offered advice regarding the amount of water meters and how the utilities may be handled. A lengthy discussion ensued regarding parking spaces and the types of uses for the rental units which would impact the amount of parking spaces required. This discussion led to a change in the wording of staff's recommendation number two where the word "would" was changed to "may" to read as follows: ...medical office and beauty salon use ~~would~~ may not allow the proposed site plan to meet the minimum parking requirements...

Chair Evans added that he thought they did a terrific job in a center that had originally been "sub grade."

Mr. Breslau made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Engel, to approve subject to the following changes to the staff's recommendations: 1) recommendation one and recommendation three were deleted; 2) in lieu of numbers one and three, the applicant should modify the truck loading dock to open up the entrance to a wider radius opening and review the change with staff prior to submitting for building plans; and 3) that staff recommendation number two shall be modified to read as follows: Staff recommends that the petitioner places a note on the site plan indicating that both medical office and beauty salon uses may not allow the proposed site plan to meet the minimum parking requirements as per the Land Development Code, Section 12-208 (A)(29)(a). In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Evans – yes; Vice-Chair Engel – yes; Mr. Breslau – yes; Ms. Lee – absent; Mr. Venis – absent. **(Motion carried 3-0)**

3.5 SP 9-3-06, Doral Campus Office Park, 3501 South University Drive (B-2)

Peter Gallo and Jim Santiago, representing the petitioner, were present. Mr. Abramson summarized the planning report.

Mr. Breslau asked if staff had reviewed the public participation notes with the applicant since they were extensive. Mr. Abramson responded that the comments from the general public had been incorporated as backup in the packets and he assumed that the applicant had met with the general public and amended the site plan as much as possible to comply with the residents' concerns.

Mr. Gallo indicated that they had tried to incorporate all of the public's issues into the site plan as presented. He provided an introduction and concurred with the staff report.

Vice-Chair Engel compared the renderings with the plans in order to figure out some of the details. Mr. Gallo agreed to adjust the drawings in order to depict the column caps and awnings. There was also discussion regarding handicapped access to the buildings and it was decided that the petitioner would install double-doors at the central entrance by the elevators for easy access.

Mr. Breslau questioned the location of the dumpster and Mr. Gallo explained it was placed close to the building in order to appease the neighbors. It was, therefore, determined that the decorative stamped-concrete would be extended around the dumpster for connectivity of the walkways. The perimeter lighting was discussed and the words "cut-off and/or "shielded" were to be added to the plans regarding the perimeter lighting.

A discussion ensued regarding the size of the elevations that had been submitted. Mr. Abramson researched the issue and while plans had a designated minimum size, the elevations could be drawn at any scale.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
AUGUST 7, 2007**

Chair Evans noted that if the petitioner should eventually install a rear access into the center of the building, then a sidewalk would have to be added to the island in the parking lot. Mr. Gallo agreed to that stipulation. For architectural definition, Chair Evans recommended that the columns be brought out a minimum of eight inches and Mr. Gallo agreed it would be done.

Mr. Breslau made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Engel, to approve subject to staff recommendations as well as the following: 1) applicant needed to note on page A-4.0, the existence of the awnings and column caps; 2) on sheet A-2.0, to add openings with double doors from main entrance into the lobby elevator that would be accessed from the main entrance next to the handicapped parking; 3) add decorative stamped-concrete walkways in front of the dumpster to match the other walkway parking areas, and eliminate the decorative walkways that connect to the adjacent building; 4) all perimeter lighting should be noted that all light fixtures would be shielded of cut-off type; 5) make spelling corrections where required on SP-1, most notably the wall; 6) note that mansard roofs show on all four sides of all the buildings on all the plans; 7) awning material to be provided so that it matches the rendering; 8) if applicant adds rear doors in the future, then a sidewalk would need to be added in the center of the 15-foot island to the rear parking areas; 9) all exterior columns of the building should have a minimum of eight-inch projection or relief; 10) the color rendering that was provided today should be reproduced and made an exhibit to the site plan package for the Council and for the final. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Evans – yes; Vice-Chair Engel – yes; Mr. Breslau – yes; Ms. Lee – absent; Mr. Venis – absent. **(Motion carried 3-0)**

Master Site Plan

3.6 MSP 10-01-06, Broward County Vista View Park Expansion, 4001 SW 142 Avenue (RS)

Bob Zuccaro, Georgiana Lopez-Lage and Martin Gross, representing the petitioner, were present. Mr. Abramson summarized the planning report.

Mr. Zaccaro used aerials and other graphics to better explain the intent of the project.

Mr. Breslau was concerned with the simplicity of the buildings and questioned if they had been allowed only because it was a park. Vice-Chair Engel commented that if it was not a park, he doubted it would have gotten this far. Mr. Breslau agreed it would never had made it as far if it had been a commercial enterprise.

Mr. Breslau's other concern regarded the landscaping. The problem was that while it appeared there would be a great wall of landscaping along the scenic corridor, it would take tens of years before it filled in. He pointed out where a 50-foot canopy had been illustrated when in reality, the tree that was to be planted had a five-foot canopy. Mr. Breslau indicated that this was a very sparse landscape plan when it was put to scale correctly. He believed that the amount of foliage was inadequate and not nearly what was needed for the buffering of the Orange Drive Scenic Corridor site. A lengthy discussion ensued and Ms. Richter advised what was required by Code. It was acknowledged by all that it would be 30 years before anyone would see the canopy as indicated on the plans. Mr. Breslau asked that perhaps trees could be relocated to build the scenic corridor buffer or at least brought forward and incorporated under plantings. He was personally aware that developers had gone above and beyond Code requirements in buffering the Orange Drive Scenic Corridor and believed this should not be an exception.

Chair Evans was disappointed in the lack of architecture and pointed to obvious deficiencies. He believed that the County was trying to stretch a minimal budget to do the entire park rather than doing it in phases and doing it properly. Although Committee members had no problem with the park design and believed the overall theory was fantastic, they had a problem with the building architecture and inadequate landscaping along the scenic corridor portion.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
AUGUST 7, 2007**

Bob Suero, a resident of Riverstone, wished to ask some questions about the project. Although pedestrian access had been indicated into the park from his development, he had hoped that it would be gated for security purposes. Mr. Zuccaro stated that the park would be closed at night and the gates would be locked. Mr. Suero advised that Riverstone was a gated community with no public access and he would like to speak with his homeowners' association for a majority opinion regarding the plans that were being proposed. His second concern regarded connectivity to a public sidewalk from Riverstone and along a dangerous curve on Orange Drive. This issue had been the second recommendation made by staff and a lengthy discussion took place to clarify the details in order to specify a recommendation for a motion. Mr. Suero expressed that he personally would settle for a minimal park which was obtainable rather than have the site remain as it was because it became too expensive to develop. Chair Evans advised that it would be up to Council to decide; however, the Committee was obliged to bring up the points that it saw as deficient.

Mr. Breslau made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Engel, to approve subject to the Council's approval of the waiver request on the Orange Drive Scenic Corridor with the exceptions as noted: 1) that the Committee did not approve the landscape plan on Orange Drive and requested that the plan come back to the Committee with revisions as they believe it to be an inadequate buffer that was inconsistent with similar buffers on Orange Drive in that neighborhood; 2) the Committee did not approve the architecture of the buildings as presented and requested that they be revised and resubmitted back to the Committee for approval; 3) the Committee requested that the applicant provide connectivity on Orange Drive from the existing sidewalk which terminates at Riverstone subdivision, running down Orange Drive and connecting in with the existing path/trail on the south side of Orange Drive adjacent to the proposed horse trail/event parking driveway. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Evans – yes; Vice-Chair Engel – yes; Mr. Breslau – yes; Ms. Lee – absent; Mr. Venis – absent. **(Motion carried 3-0)**

4. OLD BUSINESS

Mr. Breslau advised that there may be a Code Compliance issue regarding a nursery located on Flamingo Road which had installed a dirt driveway to create a new traffic pattern which infringed on the scenic corridor of Flamingo Road. Mr. Abramson thought that they may have an agricultural exemption which meant that they may make improvements to the site without staff review.

5. NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Abramson advised that there would be a Council Workshop scheduled for August 20th, at 7:00 p.m. to discuss the Master Plan for the Regional Activity Center.

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 7:18 p.m.

Date Approved: _____

Chair/Committee Member