

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE  
FEBRUARY 24, 2009**

**1. ROLL CALL**

The meeting was called to order at 4:02 p.m. Committee members present were Vice-Chair Casey Lee, Bob Breslau, Sam Engel, Jr. and Jeff Evans. Also present were Planning and Zoning Manager David Quigley, Deputy Planning and Zoning Manager David Abramson, Planner Lise Bazinet, Chief Landscape Inspector Chris Richter, and Secretary Janet Gale recording the meeting. Chair Harry Venis was absent.

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** February 10, 2009

Mr. Breslau made a motion, seconded by Mr. Evans, to approve the minutes of February 10, 2009. In a voice vote, with Chair Venis being absent, all voted in favor. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

**3. SITE PLANS**

*Modification*

3.1 SPM 12-7-07, Forest Lawn South Memorial Gardens Mausoleum 4, 5, & 6, 2401 SW 64 Avenue (CF)

Larry Justice, David Schopp, Bruce Cummings and Robert Cambo, representing the petitioner, were present. Mr. Abramson summarized the planning report.

Messrs. Breslau and Engel asked about the roofing material for the mausoleums as they were aware of problems with maintaining the tile roofs through hurricanes. Mr. Justice indicated that standing metal seam would be the roofing material for the four mausoleums and that all of them would match materials and colors of the latest mausoleum to be built. He agreed that the plans needed to indicate the correct roofing materials.

Mr. Evans noticed that there were no pedestrian accesses from the center structure to the various mausoleums and asked that pathway connectivity be installed. Mr. Schopp indicated that sidewalk or pathways using pavers would be installed.

Vice-Chair Lee had a lengthy discussion with Mr. Cummings regarding perimeter landscaping, the installation of sod around the buildings and/or wherever there was "just plain dirt;" enhancing the landscaping with specimen trees around the circular entrance feature; and the replacement of the Ficus hedge with a Cocoplum hedge in the buffer on State Road 84. In discussing a time line, Mr. Schopp agreed that the perimeter landscaping for phase one would be completed before the building permit for the mausoleum would be issued and the second phase of landscaping would be installed prior to the certificate of occupancy for the mausoleums.

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Mr. Breslau, to approve subject to the following: 1) that it be clarified on the plans that the roofs would be metal to match the last mausoleum that was built; 2) that the petitioner would add pedestrian access down the center of the six crypts with a connection to each one and that it may meander a bit around trees; 3) to add sod around all the buildings when they were finished; 4) to remove the existing Ficus hedge on State Road 84 and replace with a Cocoplum hedge (approximately 675 linear feet along State Road 84) which was to continue along the entire length of the property, past the entrance, to the southeast corner of the property on Davie Road; and 5) to add landscaping to the internal median and circular drive which would be done in the first phase for Town staff to review. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Venis – absent; Vice-Chair Lee – yes; Mr. Breslau – yes; Mr. Engel – yes; Mr. Evans – yes. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE  
FEBRUARY 24, 2009**

*Site Plan*

3.2 SP 10-3-08, Griffin Road Charter School & Commercial Center, 8150 – 8180 Griffin Road (B-2)

John Voigt, Peter Gallo and Rafael DeAraozza, representing the petitioner, were present. Ms. Bazinet summarized the planning report.

Mr. Breslau asked if the Committee was to review the overall site plan. Ms. Bazinet responded affirmatively. Mr. Voigt interjected that the site would be developed in two phases although it was an overall review.

Mr. Voigt provided a brief overview of the project. Mr. Gallo provided a more detailed overview.

Mr. Breslau cautioned the applicant about the restricted kinds of uses they were allowed in the commercial building since 80 parking spaces had been provided. Mr. Voigt responded that the petitioner was aware of the limited uses.

Mr. Breslau indicated that he had a “tremendous issue” with the ability for retail/office traffic to travel through the school traffic paths. Although Mr. Gallo doubted that such traffic would want to mix in with school traffic or travel that route, there had been no deterrents placed along that path to prevent that from happening. As this was a concern to other Committee members, a lengthy discussion ensued regarding a possible solution. Mr. Gallo suggested that strategically placed gates may be the solution; however, it would be left to the schools operations to determine when the gates would be opened and closed and how that would be accomplished.

Another traffic issue which was a concern was that the stacking of buses and cars would impede the fire lane accesses and Mr. Quigley indicated that he would ask the Fire Department to re-review that issue.

Mr. Breslau pointed out that that the loading designations for the commercial area on SP-1 and FR-1 did not match. The striping for those loading areas had not been indicated on SP-1. It was understood that the plans needed to be corrected.

Mr. Breslau asked if pipe bollards could be installed to protect the radius at a specific location. Mr. Gallo did not believe the bollards would be necessary as there was a six-inch curb. Mr. Breslau requested that three bollards be placed on the curb of the bus parking (the inside radius where #4 bus was stacked on SP-1). There was no reply from the petitioner.

Mr. Breslau requested that the fence be raised from six to eight-feet at the back of the basketball court in order to help prevent the basketball from being tossed into a wet retention area. Mr. Gallo indicated that it would be done.

Mr. Breslau raised the issue of dumpsters as it was the Committee’s opinion that they were inadequate and should include a recycling feature. Mr. Engel pointed out where an additional dumpster could be placed and Mr. Breslau suggested where a walkway needed to be installed for access to the dumpsters. There was no reply from the petitioner. Later in the meeting, Mr. Breslau commented that a second dumpster should be added for the retail/office building and Mr. Gallo indicated he could place a second dumpster next to the first one.

Other points that Mr. Breslau discussed were that a “do not enter” sign was needed at a location he pointed out to the petitioner; that the plans FR-1 and PM-1 needed to match SP-1 for the striping of loading zones; that a crosswalk designation for pedestrians needed to be made from the parking islands to the main sidewalk of the school; and that the lighting needed to be increased to 3.0 foot-candles at all the entrances and in the parking area for the retail/office building. Mr. Gallo indicated that he had no problem complying with those issues.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE  
FEBRUARY 24, 2009**

Mr. Evans asked if the petition had been reviewed by the Central Broward Water Control District. Mr. Gallo responded that he had conversations with some of the District's members regarding calculations for the project, but had not been reviewed. Mr. Evans believed that there would be drainage issues and cautioned the petitioner. Later in the meeting, the Committee advised that Council preferred that application be reviewed by the District before presenting to Council.

Mr. Evans pointed out areas on the site plan where radiuses may be increased in order solve the problem for turning emergency vehicles. Mr. Gallo indicated he would work with Fire Chief Joe Montopoli, to see if there was an issue with those corners.

Mr. Engel pointed out that the loading area to the west and behind the retail/office building, had not been drawn accurately and that a drafting mistake had been made regarding a "Fire Lane" sign. Mr. Gallo indicated that those corrections would be made.

Vice-Chair Lee was comfortable with the landscape plans; however, she wanted to be assured that the submitted specifications would be met by the petitioner. She, therefore, stated that the Landscape Architect of Record needed to meet those specifications. Vice-Chair Lee indicated that all the perimeter landscaping should be completed whether or not the project would be built in phases. She went over the landscape plans with the petitioner to clarify what needed to be completed. Another point Vice-Chair Lee made was that the landscape plans may change when the project was reviewed by the District, in which case, she wanted to be able to review the revised plans. Vice-Chair Lee emphasized that the entire site perimeter buffer was to be properly maintained as one. Mr. Gallo indicated that he understood.

In discussing the architecture of the school, it was the consensus of the Committee that it was "simple, minimalist, and plain Jane." Mr. Breslau commented that the Committee had never approved a building with so little detail. Mr. Gallo explained that it was a "collegiate/gothic," design with the entrances as the only focal points. A lengthy discussion ensued regarding the architecture and suggestions were made to enhance the tilt-wall structure. Mr. Gallo spoke of the financial constraints he had been dealing with in order to construct the school.

A tabling of the item was discussed in order to allow the applicant time to adjust the plans accordingly based on the feedback and comments of the Committee. Mr. Quigley advised that by taking no action, the petitioner would be able to come back before the Committee without time restraints being imposed. The suggestion was amenable to both the Committee and the petitioner.

Before completing the review, the Committee reiterated that the petitioner needed to resolve the problem with the retail/office traffic using the school access driveways. Mr. Gallo indicated that he understood.

**4. OLD BUSINESS**

Mr. Evans spoke of Pinnacle Cleaners located on Nob Hill Road. He reminded the Committee that the building was to be repainted in order to comply with a Code Compliance mandate. Mr. Evans estimated that it had been approximately two years since the Committee made its recommendation not to approve the orange/yellow color, and it still remained. Mr. Quigley responded that he would check into the issue.

Mr. Evans asked if Code Compliance had been apprised that the Car Wash on Davie Road had painted its monument sign a bright yellow without having submitted an application. Mr. Abramson explained why he could send Code Compliance out on that issue; however, he did send letters requesting that the sign be repainted back to the original color. A discussion ensued regarding the regulations for free-standing signage.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE  
FEBRUARY 24, 2009**

Since the Griffin Road Charter School and Commercial Center site plan required an inordinate amount of revisions, Committee members asked staff if there was any way to forewarn petitioners that if their projects did not meet the Committee's standards, they would not get a positive recommendation. Vice-Chair Lee recalled how tough staff had been with applicants when she had been employed with the Town. She remarked that the entire Committee agreed that the school "looked like a jail" and it would be located on a major corridor of the Town. Vice-Chair Lee encouraged staff to be "tough" on applicants as it had been in the past.

Staff maintained that they could not ask for more than what was required by Code. Mr. Quigley expressed that having come from a background in which development had been strictly regulated, he was impressed how the Committee was able to gain voluntary compliance in a way that could not be achieved through codes.

As Committee members had as much experience presenting applications to boards as they had serving on this board, they discussed ways in which staff could convey to the applicants that more was expected of them and that the Committee would be dissatisfied with their projects. Viewpoints were exchanged and Mr. Quigley indicated that the subject would be discussed among staff to see what could be resolved. His concern was the distinction between Code compliance issues and suggestions although both were made at the Development Review Committee meetings.

Mr. Breslau commented that he would prefer for the staff report to indicate in some way that the applicant had been informed by staff that the Committee would not be satisfied with the project. Presently, the staff report conveyed only that staff found the application to be complete and suitable for review. Mr. Quigley asked for time to figure out a way to improve the situation.

Vice-Chair Lee noticed that the landscaping had been improved at the Dunkin Donuts at Pine Island Ridge and asked what had happened. Mr. Abramson responded that he had Code Compliance cite them.

**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 6:44 p.m.

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

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