

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE**  
**AUGUST 21, 2001**

**1. ROLL CALL**

The meeting was called to order at 4:07 p.m. Committee members present were Chair Jeff Evans, Vice-Chair Judy Paul, James Aucamp, Jr., Michael Crowley and Sam Engel, Jr., (departed at 5:45 p.m.). Also present were Planner Scott McClure and Committee Secretary Janet Gale recording the meeting.

**2. SIGNAGE**

2.1 S 7-4-01, Carwash - Lube, 2800 Davie Road (M-4, County) **(tabled from August 7, 2001)**

Chair Evans advised that this item no longer needed review by this Committee.

Mr. Engel made a motion, seconded by Mr. Aucamp, to remove item 2.1 from the agenda. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Evans - yes; Vice-Chair Paul - yes; Mr. Aucamp - yes; Mr. Crowley - yes; Mr. Engel - yes. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

**3. SITE PLANS**

3.1 SP 8-7-00, South Post, Inc./Imagination Farms West, north of Orange Drive, east of I-75 (E)

Chair Evans indicated that he wanted to move item 3.1 to the end of the agenda so that a staff member could be present during the review of this item.

Mr. Engel made a motion, seconded by Mr. Aucamp, to move item 3.1 to the end of the agenda and to amend the agenda to be taken in the following order: 3.3, 3.4, 3.2 and 3.1. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Evans - yes; Vice-Chair Paul - yes; Mr. Aucamp - yes; Mr. Crowley - yes; Mr. Engel - yes. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

3.3 SP 6-1-01, St. Bonaventure Catholic Church, 1301 SW 136 Avenue (CF)

Chair Evans indicated that as architect of this project, he would not participate in the discussion and would abstain from voting.

Father Edmond Prendergast, representing the petitioner, was present. Mr. McClure read the planning report (Planning and Zoning Division's recommendation: approval subject to the conditions as outlined in the report).

Father Prendergast provided renderings and explained a history of the development of the property and progression of buildings. He stated that the intent was to have a structure and campus that complemented the surrounding neighborhood. A lengthy discussion ensued regarding overflow parking, the bell tower, drainage and the bridle path.

Mr. Engel made a motion, seconded by Mr. Crowley, to approve subject to staff's recommendations. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Evans - abstained; Vice-Chair Paul - yes; Mr. Aucamp - yes; Mr. Crowley - yes; Mr. Engel - yes. **(Motion carried 4-0 with Chair Evans having abstained)**

3.4 SP 6-5-01, Shoppes of Flamingo Commons, corner of Orange Drive and Flamingo Road (B-3)

Carlos Gonzalez, representing the petitioner, was present. Mr. McClure read the planning report (Planning and Zoning Division's recommendation: approval subject to the conditions as outlined in the report). He advised that conditions one and two in the report had been satisfied.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE**  
**AUGUST 21, 2001**

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE  
AUGUST 21, 2001**

Mr. Gonzalez stated that he agreed with the remaining conditions in the report. He provided a large site plan and indicated that the infrastructure and landscape buffers had been approved under the master plan. Mr. Gonzales advised that the roadways from Orange Drive and Flamingo Road had been approved and that the site plan met and exceeded the requirements of the Code.

A lengthy discussion ensued regarding the placement of Carpentaria trees, the function of the entrance road from Orange Drive, the use of a parapet to obscure the vision of the air conditioning units, the placement of hedge material to enhance the appearance of the back of the buildings, dumpster locations, and the equestrian trail.

Mr. Aucamp made a motion, seconded by Mr. Engel, to approve based on the planning report and adding 15 additional Podocarpus hedges, six feet tall, three feet on center; changing the "ten foot on center" Carpentarias to "ten foot overall height" Carpentarias; changing the designation of the dumpster gate to nine feet eight inches wide by six foot high; and changing the rear parapet over the service doors to a sloped tiled mansard similar to the two ends. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Evans - yes; Vice-Chair Paul - yes; Mr. Aucamp - yes; Mr. Crowley - yes; Mr. Engel - yes. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

Vice-Chair Paul requested that when the applicant brought this item before Council, he provide more detailed renderings with changes and more information on the master plan.

3.2 SP 5-3-01, The Tower Group, Inc./Florida Fruit Lands Company Subdivision #1,  
405 SW 148 Avenue (M-1)

Bill Laystrom, Mike Aguirre and Al Perrera, representing the petitioner, were present. Mr. McClure read the planning report (Planning and Zoning Division's recommendation: approval subject to the conditions as outlined in the planning report plus the pending determination from the Town Administrator regarding the 30-foot buffer requirement).

Mr. Laystrom spoke of the history of the site and stated that the original intent was industrial, but now it was for an office building that was going to be the headquarters for a new business. He believed that the correct interpretation of the declaration was that "it was supposed to be thirty feet from the road" and that the applicant would be allowed to proceed with regard to the Town Administrator's determination. Mr. Laystrom stated that he had no objections to staff's recommendations. He indicated that he was looking forward to meeting with the residents of Vista Volare in order to address their concerns.

A lengthy discussion ensued regarding the alignment of the entrance to Vista Volare, parking calculations, and zoning procedure relative to a Declaration of Restrictions to be made by the applicant.

Architect Jimmy Socare provided a summary of the landscape plans in which he noted particular attention was paid to the residential community to the east. Vice-Chair Paul proposed that some paved parking areas be used for grass parking as this site was prone to flooding and the applicant had more parking than was necessary. Mr. Laystrom stated that the applicant would not object to grass parking; however, it would require a variance. He indicated that the spaces could be designated as green spaces and in the event that additional parking would be needed on a regular basis, the spaces could be paved. Mr. Laystrom stated that this option, if chosen, could be accomplished in an agreement between the developer and the Town.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE  
AUGUST 21, 2001**

Mr. Aucamp made a motion, seconded by Mr. Engel, to approve based on the planning report and subject to resolution approval of the Declaration of Restrictions. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Evans - yes; Vice-Chair Paul - yes; Mr. Aucamp - yes; Mr. Crowley - yes; Mr. Engel - yes. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

3.1 Dennis Mele and Jason Eppy, representing the applicant, were present. Mr. McClure read the planning report (Planning and Zoning Division's recommendation: approval subject to the conditions as outlined in the report).

Mr. Mele provided two graphics, one being the master plan. He stated that the property had been rezoned and he referred to a buffer along the northern property line, which was the topic of discussion with the surrounding neighborhoods about having a recreational trail as part of the buffer. Mr. Mele stated that the residents in the area had requested that there be no paving in this 40-foot area and he described the landscaping to be installed there. He made a complete presentation of the project and indicated that staff's recommendations 1, 2, 5, 8, 9, and 11 were acceptable and addressed those that were not. In the lengthy discussion which ensued, Planner Geri Baluss was called upon to help clarify some issues regarding easements for private roads and recreational trail improvements.

Mr. Mele referred to condition six regarding "two means of ingress and egress." He explained that when this issue arose, it was pointed out that there were more homes on the east property with one ingress/egress and that there had been no problems. Mr. Mele stated that there were other communities in the Town that had more homes and one ingress/egress and he was not sure why this was an issue as there were no engineering standards or Code requirements that indicated this as a necessity. He referred to a traffic study that concluded there was no need for an additional access driveway. Mr. Mele pointed out that the Town's public safety departments had not indicated that an additional access was necessary.

Mr. Mele referred to condition seven regarding swales and drainage. He explained that this subdivision would include a valley gutter paralleling the roadway and the swale, which would take all water into the drainage structures. Mr. Mele stated that the Town's Engineer had directed the applicant to make this section part of the right-of-way rather than part of the drainage swale. He explained that this had nothing to do with the physical property. Mr. Mele explained that if this was included as a right-of-way and part of the road, it would throw off all calculations for all components of the plan. He clarified that the Town Engineer wanted the valley gutter in the other easement. Mr. Mele referred to a letter written by the Town's Engineer that had indicated that Imagination Farms had agreed to this. He corrected that it had been agreed that the valley gutters would be included, but not the ingress/egress easement. Mr. Mele stated that the applicant was given no explanation as to why this was a concern.

Vice-Chair Paul felt that no changes should be made because the Town Engineer was not present to explain his remarks. There was a discussion regarding the pros and cons of the valley gutter verses the swale, which included landscaping, drainage infrastructure and parking. Mr. Mele indicated that both easements would be maintained by the Homeowners' Association.

Mr. Mele referred to condition ten regarding archeological sites. He pointed out the archeological site, which was located on the northwest corner of the property and which was less

## SITE PLAN COMMITTEE

AUGUST 21, 2001

than one-tenth of an acre. Mr. Mele stated that Archeologist Bob Carr reviewed the site. He referred to a letter from Scott Lewis from the Historical Commission, who concurred with

Mr. Carr's findings. Mr. Mele explained that Phase II recovery and removal would be conducted by Mr. Carr and that the site did not have to be preserved.

Condition eight regarded the alternative design to eliminate the required masonry wall around the perimeter of a residential gated community. Mr. Mele indicated that the petitioner did not propose to add a masonry wall around the site and he referenced Long Lake Ranches property where the same issue came up. He clarified that the issue was to determine the best way to treat the perimeter of the site as both the east and west sides of the property were bordered by recreational trails. Chair Evans asked if there was a rendering that depicted what would be in place of the masonry wall. Mr. Mele responded that renderings were not yet available.

The landscaping plan was discussed at length with the applicant emphasizing that additional trees would be included for more impact and at 90-inch calipers, the quality was above Code. Mr. Mele agreed to Mr. Aucamp's recommendation that the Oak trees located by the entranceway be 16 feet high. Howard Zimmerman, the petitioner, stated that in his experience over the years, mistakes had been made with adding too many trees to the landscaping plan and the end result was the high cost of removing trees, which became cumbersome and negatively affected the landscape design. Mr. Mele stated that a landscape plan would be developed before this application went to Council. Mr. Aucamp recommended that the applicant meet with Mr. McClure to develop a landscape plan for the berm that would be acceptable to all parties and be in compliance with Code.

Vice-Chair Paul had concerns regarding the landscaping and ground cover on the north side of the property. She indicated that there was a plan to stagger the landscaping so that pedestrians and equestrians could pass through without destroying the plants. Mr. Zimmerman indicated that this was part of the original plan; however, staff had directed him to change it. He stated that it might be necessary to have a meeting with residents and staff to plan the landscaping on the north side and that he was willing to do whatever was proposed, as long as it complied with Code.

There was discussion regarding the exact number of trees, their species, and their spacing, which was later specified in Mr. Aucamp's motion. Vice-Chair Paul asked that a resident be invited to meet with the applicant and Mr. McClure to finalize the landscaping plan. It was agreed that there would be approximately 600 shrubs on the northern buffer.

Vice-Chair Paul asked if Cypress trees could be added to the islands. It was indicated that there would be Cypress trees and Red Maple trees on the islands. She asked if Osprey poles could also be installed on the islands. It was suggested that they be added to the northern perimeter buffer.

Vice-Chair Paul asked that the staff's recommendations remain, especially condition ten regarding the archeological site, so that when Council heard this application, the Town Engineer could be present to answer questions. It was stated that there no longer was a Town Engineer. Mr. Mele stated that if the Town wanted to hire a consulting engineer, the applicant would reimburse the Town for the consultant's fees. He also suggested that the Town Engineer meet with the applicant prior to the Council meeting so that the conditions set forth by staff could be

## SITE PLAN COMMITTEE

AUGUST 21, 2001

resolved. Vice-Chair Paul requested that more visuals of the entranceway and the berm be brought to Council.

Architectural features of the houses were discussed at length with Chair Evans expressing the opinion that since all sides could be seen from the street, the sides and back deserved more attention and detail. Mr. Zimmerman debated the issue based on cost and past sales experience. The discussion continued regarding the five models and the color selections that were offered.

Chair Evans stated that he wanted to see architectural improvements in the next rendering before it was approved. Mr. Mele requested that this site plan be passed along to Council with recommendations rather than being tabled. Chair Evans adamantly reiterated that he wanted to see the architectural details and color schemes in the site plan before making a recommendation. Vice-Chair Paul felt this item should be tabled until the applicant could bring color renderings which depicted all of the proposed amenities. Mr. Aucamp did not understand what would be gained by tabling this item because Council would make the final decision.

Vice-Chair Paul made a motion, seconded by Chair Evans, to table until September 11, 2001, where the applicant could provide detailed renderings of the site plan and where the Town Engineer could address the conditions in the planning report, including the request for two entranceways.

Development Services Director Mark Kutney advised that staff would be requesting a special meeting on September 4th regarding the Walgreens property and he suggested that this issue could be added to that agenda.

Vice-Mayor Paul amended the motion to table until September 4, 2001, seconded by Chair Evans. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Evans - yes; Vice-Chair Paul - yes; Mr. Aucamp - no; Mr. Crowley - no; Mr. Engel - absent. **(Motion did not carry 2-2)**

There was further discussion regarding the Town Engineer's recommendations and the need for bringing the detailed renderings before this Committee prior to the Council meeting. Vice-Chair Paul was dismayed that site plans were moved along because the developer had a schedule, and that this defeated the purpose of this Committee.

Vice-Chair Paul made a motion to deny. The motion died for lack of a second.

Mr. Zimmerman stated that he did not disregard the wishes of the Town; however, he had been attempting to process this application since September 2000. He felt it was not fair to prolong the process any further.

Mr. Aucamp made a motion, seconded by Mr. Crowley, to approve based on the planning report; adding that the Live Oak trees at the entranceway be upgraded from 10 feet to 16 feet; to show the Committee a landscape plan before the next Town Council meeting which indicates an increase of 90 caliper inches in trees flanking the main entranceway; additional hedges, approximately 600, placed in the north buffer; would like Council to see the landscape plan with the eliminated ground cover and the additional trees previously mentioned; would like the applicant to come back before the next Council meeting with the layout of the north buffer providing that the homeowners could agree on that plan, and if they could not agree, someone would make a decision and have it done before the Council meeting; to come back before this

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE**

**AUGUST 21, 2001**

Committee to address Chair Evans' concerns on the architectural features and provide color renderings, samples of the roof tiles, paint color samples, entrance feature of gate [guard] house, and all architectural features/samples by September 4th; and provide an Osprey platform. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Evans - yes; Vice-Chair Paul - yes; Mr. Aucamp - yes; Mr. Crowley - yes; Mr. Engel - absent. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

**4. OLD BUSINESS**

There was no old business discussed.

**5. NEW BUSINESS**

Ms. Gale advised that the second meeting in December fell on the 25th and the Committee needed to cancel or reschedule that meeting.

Mr. Aucamp made a motion, seconded by Mr. Crowley, to cancel the December 25, 2001 meeting. In a voice vote, with Mr. Engel being absent, all voted in favor. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

Vice-Chair Paul made a motion, seconded by Mr. Crowley, to add a special meeting on September 4, 2001. In a voice vote, with Mr. Engel being absent, all voted in favor. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

Vice-Chair Paul asked if applicants were made aware of what documentation they were expected to bring before this Committee. Mr. Kutney responded that the applicant made it appear as if staff was being difficult; however, he clarified that staff was doing as Council had directed, which was to assure that the applicant meet all the requirements before requesting approval from this Committee. Vice-Chair Paul recommended that if the developer was not prepared, then this Committee should not approve the application and it had every right to table the item before discussion ensued.

**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 8:08 p.m.

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

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