

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
DECEMBER 12, 2006**

1. ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 4:02 p.m. Committee members present were Chair Bob Breslau, Vice-Chair Jeff Evans, Julie Aitken, James Aucamp, Jr., and Sam Engel, Jr. Also present were Planning and Zoning Manager Bruce Dell, Planners David Abramson and Phil Bachers, and Secretary Janet Gale recording the meeting

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: November 7, 2006

Ms. Aitken made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Evans, to approve the minutes. In a voice vote, all voted in favor. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

3. SITE PLAN MODIFICATIONS

**3.1 SPM 2-2-06, Calvary Free Will Baptist Church, 8530 Stirling Road (Community Facility)
(tabled from November 21, 2006)**

Michelle Mendez, David Thomas, Jerry Clawson and Malcolm Miller, representing the petitioner, were present. Mr. Bachers summarized the planning report.

Using graphics which included a site plan and renderings, Ms. Mendez provided a presentation to better explain the intent of the project.

Chair Breslau had the applicant clarify the kiosk structure which was excluded on the site plan and included in the A1 drawing and rendering. Mr. Clawson indicated that the A1 drawing was accurate.

Chair Breslau pointed out a problem in the curbing at a specific parking space and Ms. Mendez advised that the curbing existed that way and would have to be modified.

Mr. Aucamp asked about the hedges on the east and west property lines and if they had been existing on the site since they had not been labeled on the plans. Mr. Miller confirmed that they had been existing and he informed Mr. Aucamp of their species.

Vice-Chair Evans asked about a non-concurrent parking agreement since there would not be adequate parking if the new hall and church had simultaneous functions. Ms. Mendez took note.

Vice-Chair Evans was concerned that the air conditioning units were protruding above the parapet walls and were not adequately screened. Mr. Clawson indicated that either the parapet would be raised or the roof lowered; however, the issue would be addressed so that the mechanicals would not be visible.

Vice-Chair Evans made a motion, seconded by Mr. Aucamp, to approve subject to the planning report and the following: 1) to provide a letter regarding the parking; 2) that the air conditioning units be screened either by raising the parapet or lowering the roof; 3) modify the curb at the first parking space directly in front as you enter the site; and 4) show the kiosk on the site plan. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau – yes; Vice-Chair Evans – yes; Ms. Aitken – yes; Mr. Aucamp – yes; Mr. Engel – yes. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

3.2 SPM 12-4-05, Lorson Professional Campus, 5355 SW 76 Avenue (CC)

Manny Synalovski and Jose Saye, representing the petitioner, were present. Mr. Abramson summarized the planning report.

Ms. Aitken asked about the surrounding zoning and uses which was clarified by Mr. Abramson.

Using PowerPoint, several renderings and a color chart, Mr. Synalovski provided a presentation to better explain the intent of the project.

Ms. Aitken asked if the developer had agreed to the installation of an equestrian trail and paved sidewalk on the eastern boundary of the property to the north (FP&L). Mr. Synalovski indicated that they agreed to that recommendation.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
DECEMBER 12, 2006**

Ms. Aitken asked about the improvements to the road which were part of the Engineering Department's comments. Mr. Synalovski clarified that the developer had agreed to improve only that portion of the road that ran the length of the subject property from north to south. Mr. Dell explained that the Town was being forced to improve its own roads as the funding from Broward County was going to transit only.

Mr. Engel spoke of the poor condition of 76th Avenue road and although he liked the project very much, he believed it was in the wrong location. Mr. Aucamp agreed that 76th Avenue was a sub-standard road for access. Ms. Aitken expressed that the road was her concern as well and a lengthy discussion ensued regarding who would make improvements to the road.

Chair Breslau pointed out where the photometrics needed greater candle-foot lighting and Mr. Synalovski agreed to readdress that issue and improve the lighting.

Mr. Aucamp critiqued the landscape plan and suggested that taller Royal Palm trees were needed in front of the building. He recommended that the size be increased to 10- to- 12-foot of grey wood, 30-feet overall. Mr. Synalovski understood that this would benefit the appearance of the tall building and agreed with the recommendation. Another recommendation Mr. Aucamp made regarded the canopy trees on the north property line. He believed that the power lines which ran the width of the property to the north, were too low for the canopy trees indicated in the plans. Mr. Aucamp recommended a more suitable species for that location and Mr. Synalovski agreed to ask his landscape architect to make the necessary changes. A lengthy discussion ensued regarding the landscaping for the project.

Vice-Chair Evans made a motion, seconded by Ms. Aitken, to approve subject to the planning report and the following: 1) that the road improvements along 76th Avenue for the length of the site have been agreed upon with the Engineering Department; 2) that the sidewalk and equestrian trail on the eastern side of the property be continued and extend north 330-feet within the existing right-of-way and with the approval from Florida Power and Light; 3) that the photometrics at the entrance and in the parking areas be increased to a minimum of 1.5-candle foot; 4) that the two Royal Palm trees in front of the building be increased to 12-foot of grey wood; 5) that the trees located on the north property line must meet the Florida Power and Light requirements and be compatible with their code so it may be necessary to make some revisions in the tree selection; and 6) that the roof color be less orange than shown on the reproduction sample and be more compatible with the rendering elevations. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau – yes; Vice-Chair Evans – yes; Ms. Aitken – yes; Mr. Aucamp – yes; Mr. Engel – yes. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

The Committee was in consensus of sending the following note to Council: that the issue regarding the equestrian trail and sidewalk to be installed by this developer on the Florida Power and Light property had not been agreed to by the developer; however, it would be considered by the petitioner and they would have an answer prior to the January 3rd Council meeting.

3.3 SPM 11-7-06, Camelot Estates, Lot 9, 10500 North Camelot Circle (A-1)

David Berman, representing the petitioner, was present. Mr. Abramson updated the Committee on the conditions of approval that Camelot Estates had been required to have the elevations of all the custom homes individually approved and that they met the rural lifestyle section of the Code. He summarized the planning report.

The Committee agreed that although the architecture was not within the Florida vernacular, the elements did meet the rural lifestyle requirements.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
DECEMBER 12, 2006**

Mr. Engel made a motion, seconded by Mr. Aucamp, to approve. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau – yes; Vice-Chair Evans – yes; Ms. Aitken – yes; Mr. Aucamp – yes; Mr. Engel – yes. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

3.4 SPM 11-8-06, Camelot Estates, Lot 19, 10401 North Camelot Circle (A-1)

Ken Nolan, representing the petitioner, was present. Mr. Abramson indicated that the requirements were the same as for the previous item and although the architecture was not in the Florida vernacular, it did meet the rural lifestyle elements.

Mr. Engel indicated that he would abstain from voting as he was the architect for this item.

Ms. Aitken questioned a room on the plans which had no windows. Mr. Nolan explained that it was specifically designed that way to provide a hurricane safe room.

Vice-Chair Evans suggested an architectural element for the garage window and Mr. Nolan agreed to implement that recommendation.

Vice-Chair Evans made a motion, seconded by Ms. Aitken, to approve subject to the planning report and adding a “box out” for the garage window and a raised roof over that window. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau – yes; Vice-Chair Evans – yes; Ms. Aitken – yes; Mr. Aucamp – yes; Mr. Engel – abstained. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

4. SITE PLAN

4.1 SP 6-8-06, Paradise Promenade/Commerce Bank, SW 58 Avenue and Stirling Road (B-2)

Neil Schiller, Erik Wilczek, Marvin Scharf and Brock Daniels, representing the petitioner, were present. Mr. Abramson read the planning report.

Chair Breslau inquired if the petitioner agreed with the recommendations made by staff. Mr. Schiller responded positively; however, he explained why he was not certain that he could provide landscaping around the monument sign. As the petitioner did not own the property in question, he agreed to put forth his best efforts to gain permission from the owner in order to install the landscaping.

Using several renderings, Mr. Schiller provided a presentation to better explain the intent of the project. He also provided historical information regarding the Commerce Bank and spoke of a customized mural which would represent the Town and would be applied in the building as was the tradition of the bank.

Vice-Chair Evans admitted that he was stunned by the amount of parking spaces that was provided and asked what their thought process was regarding this. Ms. Aitken commented that the Committee had become accustomed to the typical “crammed in” parking facilities and this was a welcomed change. Chair Breslau advised that this project had been two “out parcels” that had been combined and, therefore, allowed for more than ample parking.

A lengthy discussion ensued in which Chair Breslau pointed out several recommendations for the parking and crosswalk locations in order to improve access in and out of the building as well as to and from the building to vehicles. Landscape islands were moved and parking spaces rearranged in order to provide pathways to the front doors. Messrs. Schiller and Scharf agreed with the recommendations, especially the “U” shaped sidewalk.

Chair Breslau commented on the excessiveness of the lighting, specifically for the residential neighborhood down the street. While he agreed that the standard needed to be high for security purposes, he pointed out locations where the photometrics should be reduced. The developer agreed to readdress the photometrics.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
DECEMBER 12, 2006**

Vice-Chair Evans was concerned that the air conditioning units on the roof would be visible. Mr. Wilczek explained why they should not be visible. Chair Breslau indicated that the issue would be included in the motion in order to assure that the air conditioning units were adequately screened.

In order to insure that large vehicles or vehicles pulling trailers would be able to clear the canopy extending outward over the drive-up windows, it was suggested that the north, rear drive aisle be widened.

Mr. Aucamp asked if staff was requesting that the petitioner was to plant a tree every 40-feet into the existing landscape. Mr. Dell responded that maybe the trees were supposed to be there and were missing; therefore, the petitioner was being required to replace what was missing. Committee members agreed with Mr. Dell's extrapolation. The petitioner agreed that the landscaping in front of their area would be brought up to Code including the existing plan.

Vice-Chair Evans made a motion, seconded by Mr. Engel, to approve based on the planning report and the following items: 1) that the petitioner would make their best efforts to do the off-site landscaping listed in the report; 2) to change the parking in order to allow access to the front doors with an access aisle from the driveway aisle to the front doors as well as a sidewalk to the drive aisle on the west side connecting up to the drive aisle, and two sidewalks in front of the east and west parking areas adjacent to the building; 3) to make certain that the air conditioning units on the roofs were screened; 4) to look at the photometric plan and try to average three to five-foot candles overall; 5) increase the turning drive radius on the north side of the drive-up canopies to allow for a fire truck to clear the turning radius; and 6) to move the access walkway to Stirling Road to align with the new access aisles to the front door. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Breslau – yes; Vice-Chair Evans – yes; Ms. Aitken – yes; Mr. Aucamp – yes; Mr. Engel – yes. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

5. OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business discussed.

6. NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business discussed.

7. COMMENTS AND/OR SUGGESTIONS

There were no comments and/or suggestions made.

8. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business and no objections, the meeting was adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Date Approved: _____

Chair/Committee Member