

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
JANUARY 8, 2008**

1. ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 4:03 p.m. Committee members present were Chair Jeff Evans, Vice-Chair Sam Engel, Jr. (departed at 5:00 p.m.), Bob Breslau, Casey Lee and Harry Venis. Also present were Planning and Zoning Manager David Quigley, Acting Deputy Planning and Zoning Manager David Abramson, Chief Landscape Inspector Chris Richter, Urban Forester Timothy Lee and Secretary Janet Gale recording the meeting.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: November 13, 2007

Mr. Venis made a motion, seconded by Ms. Lee, to approve the minutes of November 13, 2007. In a voice vote, all voted in favor. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

3. SITE PLANS

Master Site Plans

3.1 MSP 10-3-06, Blackstone Creek/Diamond Creek, SW 154 Avenue, 400-feet South of SW 31 Street (A-1)

Bill Laystrom, representing the petitioner, was present. Mr. Abramson updated the Committee on the status of the application which was a request for re-approval of a 2003 site plan which included the rural lifestyle initiative design.

Mr. Laystrom explained the circumstances which led to this request for re-approval and answered the Committee's questions for clarification.

Mr. Breslau noted that the lighting at the entranceway was less than adequate and suggested a minimum of one-foot candles at that location. Mr. Laystrom indicated it would be done and they would provide the photometric plans to staff.

Mr. Breslau asked about a structural plan for the entrance wall. It was explained that since the plans for the entrance structure needed to be updated, the details were in progress and, therefore, would have to be brought back to the Committee for review. Mr. Venis asked if the entrance wall would be typical of other Southern Homes entrances along Orange Drive as he believed they were attractive and well done. Mr. Laystrom responded that it would be very similar.

Mr. Breslau made a motion, seconded by Ms. Lee, to approve subject to the staff report and that the applicant would review with staff the photometric plan to make sure that the lighting was adequate at the main entrance; and that the applicant would come back with an architectural plan of the entrance for the Committee to review. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Evans – yes; Vice-Chair Engel – yes; Mr. Breslau – yes; Ms. Lee – yes; Mr. Venis – yes. **(Motion carried 5-0)**

3.2 MSP 7-1-07, Saddle Bridge, 7655 Griffin Road (Griffin Road Corridor – University Drive Node)

Scott Backman, Julian Bryan, Bill Gallo and John Keats, representing the petitioner, were present. Mr. Abramson advised that there had not been many changes to the latest conceptual master plan and that this was a more detailed submittal. He pointed out two significant changes which were the elimination of an access point on the southwest corner and an emergency only access on the east side.

Ms. Lee asked for clarification on what had been approved by the Committee and what had been approved by Town Council. Mr. Abramson provided that information.

Using previous and current site plans and elevations, Mr. Backman provided a presentation to better explain the revised project.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
JANUARY 8, 2008**

Ms. Lee disclosed that she had met with the applicant and Mr. Lee on site in order to evaluate and identify trees and discuss landscaping plans. She, therefore, scrutinized the landscape plans to be sure that the trees they had spoken about were preserved and protected as planned. Ms. Lee opined that it was a well thought-out plan with great materials to be installed. She added that a lot of trees would be mitigated as well as preserved. Ms. Lee asked that it be added to the record that she preferred the first original site plan.

Mr. Breslau asked for a materials board which had been provided. He commented on the loading areas, lift station and the location of the dumpsters. Mr. Breslau offered alternative locations for those items and stated his reasoning. Mr. Bryan explained that the parking space count was the reason why he had placed the dumpsters in the center between the two buildings; however, he acquiesced to Mr. Breslau's suggestion provided that he would not lose too many parking spaces. Mr. Breslau noted that at the parking island between the two office buildings, shade tolerant ground cover should be planted. It had been his experience that because of the two-foot overhang created by vehicles parked on both sides of the island, whatever vegetation ended up under the vehicles had died. Mr. Bryan took note of the recommendation.

Mr. Breslau commented that the elevations on the office buildings were an improvement; however, he preferred the original site plan and believed it was far superior to the current one. He believed that lining up townhouses on a grid was the wrong way to design a project and ultimately, the people who ended up living there had an inferior plan.

As Mr. Venis had not been on the Committee when the original conceptual site plan had been approved and then changed by Council, he asked what the reasons were for Council to have required those changes. Mr. Backman provided a historical synopsis in which he deduced that the pressure was placed on the Council by some neighborhood opposition more interested in preserving SW 76th Avenue rather than improving it. Vice-Chair Engel supposed that there was an inequity when professionals developed a good design and had to eliminate it because of six or seven very vocal residents. Chair Evans and Mr. Breslau concurred and surmised that someday, people would look back on this project and think that something better could have been made. The Committee decided that the best way to continue was to indicate to Council that since this was the plan Council wanted, the Committee would make recommendations appropriately.

Chair Evans pointed out that partially due to a tight turning radius, a driver entering the project may inadvertently swing into the western loading zone. He asked how the developer planned to keep that from happening and suggested that the radius be widened. Mr. Keats explained that the drive for the loading zone served two purposes, the second of which was for the lift station and there had been specifications required by Davie Utilities to accommodate their trucks. He intended to install two-foot valley gutter curbing and apply road striping and signage to delineate the driveway and keep vehicles from going in that direction. A discussion continued regarding the radius of the western entrance off Griffin Road and what could be done to improve it.

Chair Evans discussed some architectural features to improve the roof lines for the two office buildings by building "box-outs." Mr. Gallo agreed to add some articulation on the back walls under the roof features. There were several other architectural features discussed which the developer agreed to make on the façade of the office buildings as well as the townhouses which, later in the meeting, would be incorporated in the motion.

Mr. Breslau made a motion, seconded by Mr. Venis, to approve subject to the staff report and with the following comments: 1) that the applicant should reexamine relocating the dumpsters to the opposite sides of the commercial buildings if they could swap parking for the dumpster enclosures;

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
JANUARY 8, 2008**

2) the applicant would reexamine the entrance radiuses on the main driveway off of Griffin Road to see if it was at all possible to go from a 20-foot radius to a 30-foot radius and potentially add signage on the landscape island by the loading area to help direct traffic into the project rather than into the loading dock area; 3) that the applicant would add xeriscape in the island between the office buildings where the 16-foot spaces overhang the landscaping; 4) on the commercial buildings, to add some articulation on the wall under the roof features where the peaks were on the south side of the commercial buildings to create shadows under those peaked areas and also add architectural features and a balcony rail engaged to the wall over the windows on the second floor; 5) on the south side of the commercial buildings, add awnings over the windows on the first floor and louvers over the windows on the second floor; 6) on the residential elevations of all the buildings, the applicant would make an effort to change the flat planes on the roof lines, have alternate color palates for different buildings, add architectural and design elements to the elevations to break up the monotony of the elevation, add scoring and banding, provide alternate roof colors so that not all the roofs were identical in color; and 7) that the applicant could move forward to Council for approval after which they would come back to the Committee to review the changes for adequacy. 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)**

Mr. Breslau asked staff how to go about informing Council of the Committee’s concerns regarding the inequities in having a few residents determine the intricacies of a site plan. Although the Committee acknowledged the direct concerns of neighbors which must be taken into account, it was also apparent that there was an imbalance which impacted the function and aesthetics of the project, of the Town, and of the future homeowners within the project. It was the consensus of the Committee that this was the wrong decision, the wrong plan, and that the good of a few residents should not outweigh what a project of this size should be.

Mr. Abramson suggested that the Committee’s concerns be incorporated into the site plan application as a “planner’s note” which would state that there was a discussion and based on technical review and that discussion, this was how the Committee felt about the site plan.

Mr. Breslau asked that there be a show of hands of those who supported that there be a planner’s note in the report to indicate that it was the opinion of those who showed their hands, that the original plan which the applicant had submitted was a better plan with regard to overall planning, design, livability and neighbors; however, should Council want to proceed with the current plan, the Committee had provided comments that it believed would make it the best possible plan available at that point. The applicant had done a great job in making compromises to try to bring the project to that point. In a show of hands, with Vice-Chair Engel being absent, Chair Evans, Mr. Breslau and Ms. Lee were in favor. Mr. Venis refrained as he had not seen the original plan and, therefore, could not make that judgment.

4. OLD BUSINESS

4.1 SPM 9-3-07, Rolling Hills Residence, 3501 West Rolling Hills Circle (CF and CR)

John Santulli and Tommy Laubenthal, representing the petitioner, were present. As this was a review to see that the applicant had completed the recommendations made at the November 14, 2007 meeting, the Committee addressed those specific issues.

Ms. Lee and staff had been satisfied with the landscape plans except for the south side of the tennis courts. Mr. Laubenthal advised that it was the applicant’s intention to “up the canopy” and increase the buffer by creating a secondary mid-level buffer on the southern edge of the tennis courts.

A Committee recommendation had been that the light-fixtures for the tennis courts be shown on the plans. As that item had not been shown on the plans, Mr. Breslau asked about the intended light fixtures and if they would be shielded. Mr. Santulli responded that they would put a note in the plans designating the fixtures once they finalized their selection.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
JANUARY 8, 2008**

Chair Evans noticed that there were no closets provided in the floor plans. Mr. Santulli explained the reason they had been eliminated and assured that other means of storage would be provided.

Mr. Santulli supplied a color board for the Committee's review and since the colors were custom blended, they were identified by the following names: Baked Clay, Monastery Brown, Light Gray, Pearl and Chocolate Mousse.

Ms. Lee asked if something could be done about the landscaping at a nearby site owned by the applicant and which was part of the Academical Village, located by the Ford Dealership on University Drive. She noticed that the landscaping was "pathetic" and hoped that it could be brought up to standard simultaneously with this project. Mr. Santulli understood where Ms. Lee spoke of and he indicated that Mr. Laubenthal would be able to improve the site.

There was no action expected of the Committee since it agreed with the color selection and the applicant had complied with its previous recommendations.

5. NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Abramson introduced the Town's new Planning and Zoning Manager David Quigley. He was welcomed by the Committee.

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 5:49 p.m.

Date Approved: _____

Chair/Committee Member