

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 12, 2008**

1. ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. Committee members present were Chair Jeff Evans, Bob Breslau, Casey Lee and Harry Venis. Also present were Planning and Zoning Manager David Quigley, Deputy Planning and Zoning Manager David Abramson, Planner Lise Bazinet, Chief Landscape Inspector Chris Richter, Urban Forester Timothy Lee and Secretary Janet Gale recording the meeting. Vice-Chair Sam Engel, Jr. was absent.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: January 8, 2008
January 22, 2008

Mr. Breslau made a motion, seconded by Mr. Venis, to approve the minutes of January 8th and January 22, 2008. In a voice vote, with Vice-Chair Engel being absent, all voted in favor. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

3. SITE PLAN

3.1 SP 12-8-06, Tuscan Villas, 1380 South Flamingo Road (R-4)

Jay Evans, representing the petitioner, was present. Ms. Bazinet summarized the planning report.

Mr. Evans provided a brief presentation in which he pointed out that the project was surrounded by road rights-of-way which limited the amount of units to nine whereas 15 were allowed.

Mr. Venis asked if amenities were planned such as a playground or pool. Mr. Evans responded that since there were just nine single-family homes and not enough room, none had been provided.

Chair Evans asked why they decided on the single-family homes instead of the higher density attached housing. Mr. Evans responded that it was a marketing decision.

Mr. Breslau asked about the entry features and was concerned that the ingress traffic may be problematic for a vehicle backing out of the driveway on lot five. Mr. Evans agreed that the driveway for that lot would be placed on the eastern half of the property in order to avoid the problem.

In a brief discussion about the fountain for the lake, Mr. Evans agreed to have it illuminated. He also explained about the problem he encountered with the photometric plans that had been presented and Mr. Evans assured he would provide a set of photometric plans to meet the Code requirements.

Ms. Lee asked about the placement of street trees and if they would interfere with the driveways. Mr. Evans showed her how the driveways would be accommodated and stated that there would be some field adjustments. She also noticed that on the plant list, the CAG-14 had not been identified. Mr. Evans indicated that the correction to the plans would be made.

Ms. Lee proposed that the entrance be augmented with three Royal Palm trees on each side of the aisle. Mr. Evans agreed with that plan. Later in the meeting, however, it was agreed that six, double-trunk Veitchia Montgomerianas were more suitable than the six Royal Palm trees.

A lengthy discussion ensued regarding the Flamingo Road buffer and how to better screen the development from the view of passing traffic. Mr. Evans indicated that a berm was not possible. Ms. Lee, therefore, suggested that they double the amount of trees and work with staff to strategically cluster the landscaping to obscure the view into the project as well as enhance the buffer. Mr. Evans asked that the cost for the additional 23 trees be deducted from the amount of money to be paid into the tree mitigation agreement. The Committee agreed that the request was a fair one and that Mr. Evans should work with staff on that matter.

Ms. Lee was disappointed that the landscape architect was not present to discuss the plans. She understood that the applicant's sub-contractors from the various fields were supposed to attend the meeting. Mr. Breslau commented that they were supposed to attend. Staff agreed and indicated that applicants were always advised of it.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY 12, 2008**

Mr. Breslau made a motion, seconded by Ms. Lee, to approve subject to the staff's report and the following: 1) that the applicant should add lighting to the fountain in the lake; 2) that the applicant would correct the photometric plan to reflect the correct Code requirements; 3) that the driveway of lot five should only be located on the eastern half of that lot; 4) that the tree placement for lot five should be adjusted on the plans to allow for the driveway alignment when the driveway was identified; 5) identify CAG-14 on the plant list; 6) the entry landscaping should be supplemented by an additional six, double-trunk Veitchia Montgomerianas; and 7) regarding the landscaping on the frontage of Flamingo Road, the applicant would double the tree count from 23 to 46 and work with staff to place those trees in clusters and to negotiate with staff to reduce the amount of money to be paid into the tree mitigation agreement to cover the cost of those additional trees. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Evans – yes; Vice-Chair Engel – absent; Mr. Breslau – yes; Ms. Lee – yes; Mr. Venis – 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

Ms. Lee asked that if possible, the meetings be condensed so that there would be several items in one meeting rather than several meetings with one item.

Chair Evans responded that it was probably reflective of the applicants as they came through the process. Mr. Quigley agreed that it was unfortunate; however, once the applicant went through the Development Review Committee, they were usually eager to proceed.

Mr. Breslau contended that today was a good example in that he could not imagine a couple of weeks impacting a project of a few years. He could understand that there may be times when a couple of weeks would make a difference, and in those cases there should be no delays in bringing an item forward.

Ms. Bazinet explained that there was only one item planned for the month of February and since the applicant was ready, she did not think it fair to put them off for another month.

Although Ms. Lee was in favor of condensing the meetings, she did not want applicants detained for a month; however, she asked that whenever possible, to consider condensing the meetings which was the consensus of the Committee.

Mr. Quigley offered to ask applicants if they would mind delaying their reviews so that there may be a few items together in one meeting.

7. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business and no objections, the meeting was adjourned at 4:49 p.m.

Date Approved: _____

Chair/Committee Member