

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
AUGUST 10, 2004**

1. ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. Committee members present were Chair Bob Breslau, Vice-Chair Julie Aitken, James Aucamp, Jr., and Jeff Evans. Also present were Redevelopment Administrator Will Allen, Planning and Zoning Supervisor Marcie Nolan and Secretary Janet Gale recording the meeting. Sam Engel, Jr., was absent.

2. SITE PLANS

2.1 SP 4-4-04, Davie Chamber of Commerce Parking Modification, 4185 SW 64 Avenue (B-2, Western Theme)

Jim Mullen, representing the petitioner, was present. Ms. Nolan read the planning report and stated the one condition which staff recommended.

Mr. Mullen agreed with the planning report and pointed out where the sidewalk was located for Chair Breslau's clarification. In the discussion which ensued, it was agreed that a walkway should be provided where the two parking lots interconnected for cross access.

Mr. Aucamp made a motion, seconded by Mr. Evans, to approve based on the planning report and subject to adding a sidewalk located in the rear of the first parking lot, between the two existing large trees by the middle of a parking stop. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau - yes; Vice-Chair Aitken - yes; Mr. Aucamp - yes; Mr. Engel - absent; Mr. Evans - yes. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

2.2 SP 5-7-04, Stonebrook Estates, 3400 West Stonebrook Circle (E-Estates) **(tabled from July 13, 2004)**

Randy Paigo, representing the applicant, was present. Ms. Nolan updated the Committee and read staff's recommendation.

Mr. Paigo indicated that the purchaser of the Grand Venetian model wanted to keep it as "old world" as possible. He clarified that these were two new models which he may or may not "ever sell again".

Mr. Evans made some architectural suggestions regarding the windows over the tub and Mr. Paigo was amenable to the suggestions. Insofar as the color pallet was concerned, Mr. Paigo explained that the "color out" was not done at this stage and only that stone material would be used.

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Aitken, to approve based on the planning report. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau - yes; Vice-Chair Aitken - yes; Mr. Aucamp - yes; Mr. Engel - absent; Mr. Evans - yes. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

2.3 SP 5-12-04, Blackhawk Ranches, 11113 Blackhawk Boulevard (A-1) **(tabled from July 13, 2004)**

Randy Paigo, representing the applicant, was present. Ms. Nolan went over the Committee's comments from the previous meeting regarding the Committee's intent to encourage the rural lifestyle initiative.

Mr. Paigo contended that while the features and elements which promoted an open and inviting entrance were offered, clients were not buying into it. Committee members suggested that rather than giving the clients the option, that the features be required instead. Mr. Paigo agreed that the model would be presented with the features that were discussed.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
AUGUST 10, 2004**

Vice-Chair Aitken made a motion, seconded by Mr. Evans, to approve subject to the planning report and subject to a compulsory entrance feature that was inviting as a communal outdoor greeting and seating area that would not be optional to the client and would consist of pavers and architectural features such as trellises, benches, or patio garden area in order to pull people out to the front of the house. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau - yes; Vice-Chair Aitken - yes; Mr. Aucamp - yes; Mr. Engel - absent; Mr. Evans - yes. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

2.4 SP 4-8-04, Palm Garden Park, 6575 SW 49 Court (RM-10)

Mark Engel, Gus Khavanin and Doug Amos, representing the petitioner, were present. Ms. Nolan summarized the planning report and noted that this was an "in fill" parcel.

Vice-Chair Aitken asked about the back-out parking and it was explained that the street was not a "thru" street, that it was a one-way and that it was allowed. Mr. Engel advised that the access street was a "meandering dirt road," and that Mr. Amos was dedicating an additional ten feet to make it 25-feet wide. Ms. Nolan indicated that eventually, "the Town's plan would be to pave the entire street."

Vice-Chair Aitken was disturbed by not having a rendering or side elevations and no color chart to help visualize the project. Mr. Amos circulated photographs of neighboring dwellings and Vice-Chair Aitken contended that this project would not serve to enhance the neighborhood. Mr. Amos maintained that he would be owning and renting these apartments and, therefore, was not constructing elaborate units which may be destroyed by renters. Later he added that as an investment, he wanted to keep the maintenance down and have it be "affordable housing". Vice-Chair Aitken contended that even though the neighborhood was modest, when something new was being built, it was an opportunity to make an improvement.

Mr. Evans disclosed that Mr. Amos had contacted him regarding this project; however, Mr. Evans indicated that he made no response. His major concern was access to the property as he had considered developing it himself in the past and was aware of its constraints. Mr. Evans advised that he was developing the property to the west and as it was conventionally the developer's responsibility, he was providing the roadway access, water, sewer, street lights, sidewalks and future sidewalk connections. Mr. Evans was also concerned with drainage and that there were no access roads indicated on the plans. Mr. Khavanin responded to the drainage issue by advising that the soil tested very well for percolation. Mr. Evans questioned who was providing the access roads as none were showing on the plans. Mr. Khavanin stated that it was his understanding that the Town had the plans to construct the road on the east and west sides of the project. Later in the meeting, Ms. Nolan clarified that the subject parcel had legal access and that eventually, when the vacant parcel to the south would be platted, it would be required to dedicate 25 feet thereby making it a two-way road.

A lengthy discussion ensued with suggestions being made for architectural details to improve the aesthetic appearance of the units. During the course of this discussion, Mr. Amos agreed to put a gate at the entrance between the two buildings with a half wall (wing wall) from each building leading to the gate; to shift the parking to the west so that the garbage placement for pickup would be on the southeast side; the installation of a dimensional shingle roof; and the implementation of an architectural element on the southern elevation involving "box outs" on either side of the bathroom windows with a hip roof above.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
AUGUST 10, 2004**

Mr. Aucamp suggested that at the next meeting, Mr. Amos provide color samples and renderings of the items which were agreed upon during the course of this review. Mr. Amos agreed. Vice-Chair Aitken expressed that she was unhappy with the caliber of the project. Mr. Evans indicated that he would like to see the access roads shown on a site plan.

Mr. Aucamp made a motion, seconded by Mr. Evans, to approve based on the planning report and agreements made by Mr. Amos to Mr. Evans to change the elevations to add the wall, the gated entrance, and the raised roof element on the south side of each building as agreed upon; to use dimensional roof shingles; all conditional upon bringing this back prior to the Town Council meeting; having Mr. Khavanin show the access road on the site plan; bringing back the color boards and a rendering as well as the site plan with the 15-foot access from 65th [Avenue] to 69th [Avenue] to be shown on the site plan. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau - yes; Vice-Chair Aitken - no; Mr. Aucamp - yes; Mr. Engel - absent; Mr. Evans - yes. **(Motion carried 3-1 with Vice-Chair Aitken being opposed.)**

3. OLD BUSINESS

3.1 SP 9-5-03, Camelot Estates, 3900 Joan's Way (A-1)

Nathan Chamberlain, representing the petitioner, was present. Ms. Nolan updated the Committee on the conditions previously recommended for this project.

Mr. Chamberlain made his presentation which consisted of changes to improve the entrance feature front environment.

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Aitken, to approve based on the planning report. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau - yes; Vice-Chair Aitken - yes; Mr. Aucamp - yes; Mr. Engel - absent; Mr. Evans - yes. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

4. NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business discussed.

5. COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

There were no comments and/or suggestions made.

6. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business and no objections, the meeting was adjourned at 6 p.m.

Date Approved: _____

Chair/Committee Member