

SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
SEPTEMBER 25, 2012

1. ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 4:03 p.m. Committee members present were Chair Michael Crowley, Bob Breslau, Vice-Chair Gus Khavanin, and Casey Lee. Also present were Councilmember Susan Starkey (arrived 4:13 p.m., departed 4:42 p.m.), Town Administrator Richard Lemack (arrived 4:17 p.m., departed unknown), Urban Forester Tim Lee, Landscape Inspector Jose Jimenez, Planning and Zoning Manager David Quigley, Deputy Planning and Zoning Manager David Abramson, and Secretary Janet Gale recording the meeting. Harry Venis was absent.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: September 11, 2012

Mr. Breslau made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Khavanin, to approve the minutes of September 11, 2012. In a voice vote, with Mr. Venis being absent, all voted in favor. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

3. SITE PLANS

Modification

- 3.1 SPM 12-151, Forest Ridge Master Association, generally located on the West side of Pine Island Road, between Southwest 24th Street and Southwest 36th Street (PRD-Planned Rural Development)

John Harris, representing the petitioner, was present. Chair Crowley asked if the petitioner elected to waive the quasi-judicial procedure. Mr. Harris responded affirmatively. There were no members of the public present at this meeting.

Mr. Abramson summarized the planning report and indicated that the applicant was to replace the Ficus hedge which had been destroyed by White Fly.

Mr. Harris advised that the changes being made would be following "Water-Wise Principles" regarding Florida native foliage. He added that it was an improvement through the Forest Ridge Master Association which would eventually be paid for by the savings incurred from their annual maintenance budget.

Ms. Lee commended Town's staff for the job they did and believed that this would be the first such project of many. She advised that the Association planned to diversify the species for the five miles of hedges so that if an insect invaded, it would only destroy a portion rather than the entire hedge.

Mr. Breslau made a motion, seconded by Ms. Lee, to approve. There was a brief discussion regarding the planting method and schedule, and Mr. Harris estimated that it may take a year. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Crowley – yes; Vice-Chair Khavanin – yes; Mr. Breslau – yes; Ms. Lee – yes; Mr. Venis - absent. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

Site Plan

- 3.2 SP 11-135, McDonald's at Shenandoah Plaza, 13600 State Road 84 (B-2)

Chair Crowley advised that the applicant had waived the quasi-judicial procedure and there were no members of the public present to be declared an intervenor.

Craig McDonald and Jerry Zamora, representing the petitioner, were present. Mr. Abramson summarized the planning report.

Mr. Breslau had it clarified by staff that the project met Code insofar as fulfilling the required parking spaces.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
SEPTEMBER 25, 2012**

Using site plans and renderings, Mr. McDonald better explained the project and pointed out that a variance request would be required since it would be the third contiguous out-parcel in the shopping center.

Mr. Breslau indicated that he was primarily concerned about establishing a safe pedestrian access through the parking lot to the building. He discussed several options with Mr. McDonald to improve the situation such as speed calming raised humps in the driveway, “extreme” lighted signage to warn drivers of pedestrian crossings, and having well-marked pathways for pedestrians. Mr. Breslau indicated that he would include those recommendations in a motion and leave the provision that the applicant could review and modify with staff.

A different problem Mr. Breslau was concerned about was the location of the dumpster. He expected that when the dumpster was being unloaded, the drive would be blocked and vehicles would not be able to leave through that access. Mr. Breslau was unsure that the garbage truck could negotiate the radius provided and asked that Mr. McDonald meet with Waste Management to confirm that they would be able to “make the movements” to collect garbage from the dumpster. Since staff had a similar concern, it was agreed that the issue be included in the recommendations. It was also agreed that if the first dumpster location did not work, a second alternate location was selected.

Mr. Breslau commented on the photometrics and noted that the 20-foot candles were extremely bright. He suggested that the lighting be dramatically reduced and that the applicant work with staff on it.

Mr. Breslau asked that the elevation which contained the drive-thru windows, have some kind of brick feature in order to break-up the monotony of the wall. He provided a rendering from another McDonalds Restaurant and asked if the applicant would duplicate the feature. Mr. McDonald responded positively.

Vice-Chair Khavanin declared that he “agreed 100%” with the issues which Mr. Breslau had noted. He pointed out that the plans showed an inverted drive, although the cross-section showed a straight drive. Vice-Chair Khavanin indicated that the plans and cross-section needed to match. On page C-1, he pointed out where the northern sidewalk needed to conform to ADA standards and Mr. Zamora responded that it would be no problem. There was another discussion regarding gutter slopes which was resolved without changes.

Mr. Breslau declared that his motion would contain recommendations to ensure the safety of pedestrians going to and from the building. He emphasized that it would be the responsibility of the applicant to work with staff to accomplish that objective.

Mr. Breslau made a motion, seconded by Ms. Lee, to approve subject to the following: 1) that the applicant would do the following pedestrian safety modifications to the site plan:

a) raise the paver area in the main drive aisle south of the property line so it would be a raised shelf with pavers as well as raising the sidewalk connecting to the sidewalk near the building, should be raised as well;

b) additionally, pedestrian signage would be placed at every access point from the landscaped island in the main parking field, for both directions of the main drive aisle, as well as multiple signs in the driveway for the customers in the drive-thru lane including but not limited to signs with electrified lights (solar or electric) which would notify vehicle drivers that pedestrians would be crossing through the drive-thru lanes; and

c) that the applicant would submit the plan to staff for approval and would not need to come back to Site Plan Committee;

2) the applicant would meet with Waste Management and provide evidence to staff that the current location of the dumpsters was adequate for full truck movement to make pick-ups; if for any reason the garbage trucks cannot make the maneuver, the applicant would work with staff to move the dumpsters to the northwest corner and switch the parking spaces with the dumpsters to provide for the access;

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
SEPTEMBER 25, 2012**

3) the applicant has agreed to add a stone accent feature on the east wall between the drive-up windows which would be similar to the Hiatus Road store and shall work with staff to make that modification; 4) the applicant would correct sheet C-3A or sheet C-2 so that they match cross-sections (or the other way around); 5) the applicant and staff would review the photometric plan to ensure that it meets code and to reduce any over-lighted areas such as where it showed 20- and 22-foot candles; 6) correct on page C-1 to make sure that the north sidewalk meets ADA standards; 7) review and correct cross-sections BB and CC to match site plan page C-2; and 8) the applicant would replace the pavers between the angled parking and the 90-degree parking on the west side of the parking field with landscaping and curbing. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Crowley – yes; Vice-Chair Khavanin – yes; Mr. Breslau – yes; Ms. Lee – yes; Mr. Venis - absent. **(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 4:58 p.m.

Date Approved: _____

Chair/Committee Member