

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
MARCH 8, 2011**

1. ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 4:01 p.m. Committee members present were Chair Michael Crowley (departed at 5:30 p.m.), Vice-Chair Bob Breslau, Gus Khavanin, Casey Lee and Harry Venis. Also present were Redevelopment Administrator Will Allen, Deputy Planning and Zoning Manager David Abramson, Planner Lise Bazinet, and Secretary Janet Gale recording the meeting.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: February 8, 2011

Vice-Chair Breslau made a motion, seconded by Mr. Venis, to approve the minutes of February 8, 2011. In a voice vote, all voted in favor. (Motion carried 5-0)

Ms. Bazinet distributed a Builders Checklist which was created by the Green Energy and Environmental Advisory Committee to encourage "green initiatives." She asked that Committee members fill it out on their own time and email their comments to her.

3. SITE PLANS

Modifications

3.1 SPM 1-7-10, Pet Paradise Resort, 10401 Orange Drive (A-1) (tabled from February 8, 2011)

Ms. Bazinet advised that the applicant had provided a letter which listed the conditions that had been made by the Committee and to which the applicant had responded.

Nectaria Chakas, Rick Giles, Bill Joel, Brian Kientz, Allan Iosue, Robert Allen Connor, Alan Tinter and Bob Andres, representing the petitioner, were present. Ms. Chakas provided a brief overview of the project using PowerPoint graphics. She advised that the request made by the Committee for the applicant to hold a public participation meeting, had been accomplished. Ms. Chakas stated that the project met all the standards of the A-1 zoning district in the Land Development Code and in the Comprehensive Plan. Item by item, she went over the Committee's list of recommendations which had been made at the last meeting. Ms. Chakas concluded with the last condition which was to construct a six-foot wall along the perimeter on the berm. She explained that the rural lifestyle regulations did not permit a six-foot wall; however, a picket or split-rail fence was allowed and included in the site plan along with the enhanced landscape plan. Color renderings were provided which displayed the improvements which had been made to the addition's western façade.

Chair Crowley asked Ms. Bazinet if a wall would be permitted to separate a commercial use from residential in the rural lifestyle district. She responded affirmatively; however, the site was categorized as animal use which was permitted in the A-1 district.

Ms. Lee asked if the applicant would be able to apply for a variance in order to install a six-foot wall. Ms. Bazinet responded affirmatively.

Mr. Khavanin was concerned about the landscaping having been located within the utility easement. Ms. Chakas acknowledged that it would be at the petitioner's expense if the Town needed to uproot the landscaping in order to utilize the easement. His second concern regarded an eight-inch water line to be installed from Orange Drive to the northern boundary of the site.

Ms. Chakas responded that it was an issue which they were in the process of discussing and researching with the Town and to which she could make a commitment at this time. She further explained that as a tenant, she would need permission from the property owner. Mr. Khavanin reiterated that it was in the Town's interest to have a "loop system" which was lacking at the time.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
MARCH 8, 2011**

Ms. Lee addressed the landscape plan and asked that the 319 Wax Myrtle plants be switched for Logustrum, 15-gallon and “five-by-five.” Mr. Iosue responded affirmatively. She suggested that the Juniper plants which were to be installed in the drainage easements, be eliminated. Again, Mr. Iosue agreed with the suggestion. It was further clarified that the area at the north end of the property would remain the same and the retention area would have Bahia or Saint Augustine sod.

Chair Crowley pointed out that there was only two feet to work with for landscaping before a four-to-one slope. Ms. Lee agreed that there was no way for the landscape plan to work with those conditions. A technical discussion ensued which resulted in the recommendation of a retaining wall in order to recover roughly eight-feet of planting area from the slope and to provide a foundation for landscape materials. Mr. Iosue maintained that the shrubs that were designated for the slope would survive and grow rapidly as he had done it in the past. The elevations on the east side were questioned as the plans were not consistent.

Mr. Venis recalled that at the last meeting, it was the consensus of the Committee that a wall be constructed plus landscaping for the purpose of sound containment. Although the site had not been designated as commercial, it was possible that 220 dogs would be housed at any given time and a picket or split-rail fence would not do the job. He felt it was very important to work-out the wall issue.

Ms. Chakas reiterated that the sound expert opined that the wall would not be needed and that the sound would be contained within the structure of the addition. The landscaping and fence was meant to be a visual buffer, but the wall was not allowed in the rural lifestyle district and Ms. Chakas did not want to provide a plan that did not comply with the Town’s code.

Mr. Khavanin indicated that he had two more technical engineering issues regarding the berm on the east side of the site which he discussed and pointed out. Mr. Kientz responded that he would be able to move the berm in order to accommodate the change in grade for minimum separation from the top of the berm to the property line. It was realized that the same problem existed on the west side. The problem would be resolved by either moving the building and parking lot eight feet or by building a retaining wall.

Chair Crowley asked if anyone from the public wished to speak for or against this item.

Michael Bartlett spoke in opposition of the project as he viewed it as a commercial project housing hundreds of dogs and requiring trucks, traffic, dumpsters, exhaust fans, and noise and exhaust fans. He believed it was an inappropriate use in a residential area. Mr. Bartlett provided a petition signed by approximately 20 residents who were directly impacted by the project and opposed to it.

Keith Short spoke in opposition and had attended the public participation meetings in which his neighbors supported the same viewpoint. He likened it to a 4,500 square-foot warehouse with dogs in it and it was not appropriate for the neighborhood.

Drew Gregg spoke in opposition.

Judy Chmielarz spoke in opposition.

James Bateman spoke in opposition.

Christina Pellicane spoke in opposition and provided background information regarding the previous owner and the original intentions for the use.

The public speaking was closed.

Mr. Khavanin asked about the storm water structure and if the applicant intended to elevate the catch basins. Mr. Kientz responded affirmatively.

Ms. Lee asked if the petitioner had agreed to remove all invasive species from the property and Ms. Chakas responded affirmatively.

Chair Crowley indicated that his opinion had not changed and stated his concerns.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
MARCH 8, 2011**

Mr. Khavanin agreed that there was a need for corrections, specifically those that separated the property line to the edge of the pavement. He stated that it would impact the road, the location of the building, and impact everything within the site.

Ms. Chakas indicated that her engineer contended that the problems Mr. Khavanin mentioned could be resolved by installing a retaining wall which they would amend the plans to show. She was willing to commit to that if the Committee wished to make it a condition. Mr. Khavanin responded that he would rather see it in the plans first.

Mr. Venis did not change his position and was uncomfortable about the new corrections that needed to be made. He was particularly unhappy about not having resolved the wall issue.

Mr. Venis made a motion, seconded by Ms. Lee, to deny. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Crowley – yes; Vice-Chair Breslau – no; Ms. Lee – yes; Mr. Khavanin – yes; Mr. Venis - yes. **(Motion carried 4-1)**

3.2 SPM 1-1-11, Regency Square, 4801-4995 SW 148th Avenue (B-3, Planned Business Center District)

Wayne Vensel, the petitioner, was present. Ms. Bazinet summarized the planning report.

Mr. Vensel provided background information and indicated that the façade renovations were to give the shopping center a common design.

Vice-Chair Breslau indicated that he had visited the property, reviewed the plans, and thought it was a great job.

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

3.3 SPM 2-2-11, Army-Navy Store, 4130 SW 64th Avenue (RAC-TC, Commercial/Retail Building)

Mr. Abramson summarized the planning report. He advised that the project would be approved administratively; however, the Committee's comments and recommendations were required.

Mr. Allen introduced Tara Klein and Pat Givney of Craven, Thompson and Associates, Inc., and Ty Ernst who was the tenant at the northern most bay of the complex. He spoke of the reduction of curb cuts and the funding which would be provided by the Community Redevelopment Agency.

Chair Crowley advised that he was on the CRA Board and the project had his full support.

Mr. Khavanin believed this was an excellent program for Downtown Davie. He recommended that the parking spaces on Davie Road be moved a couple of feet to the west into the landscape area and make a "saw-tooth" pattern in order to clear the drive lane. Mr. Khavanin asked about the landing area for the handicapped parking on the east side. Mr. Ernst indicated that the curbing would be removed from the plans as that was an error.

A discussion ensued regarding the drainage and fire hydrant. All parties were satisfied with those plans.

Ms. Lee asked about an irrigation system for the front and back of the building and commented that irrigation was required by code. Ms. Klein understood that irrigation needed to be installed.

Vice-Chair Breslau questioned the route to the building for the handicapped. Mr. Givney explained that it was the safest route and agreed to add signage for direction. A note was made for the plans to have the back door of the restaurant (northeast corner) handicapped accessible and linked to the handicapped parking space.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
MARCH 8, 2011**

Mr. Venis made a motion, seconded by Mr. Khavanin, to approve with the following recommendations: 1) that the parking spaces shown on the west side of the property would be redesigned with a “saw tooth” design into the landscaping; 2) to remove curbing on the flat landing area by the handicapped space on the eastern side; 3) to have the property irrigated pursuant to code; 4) to add directional signage for handicapped visitors to direct ingress via the sidewalk on Davie Road, across the driveway to the five-foot sidewalk; and 5) that the rear door on the northeast corner facing east, should be ADA accessible. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Crowley – absent; Vice-Chair Breslau – yes; Mr. Khavanin – yes; Ms. Lee – yes; Mr. Venis - yes. **(Motion carried 4-0).**

3.4 SPM 2-6-11, Southern Homes, 2601 SW 142nd Avenue (A-1)

Nanette Plesga, Gabriela Esis and Jorge Ruiz, representing the petitioner were present. Mr. Abramson provided historical information regarding the semi, custom-built homes and that there had been modifications throughout the years based on the economy and sales trends. He indicated that the variations continued to meet the rural lifestyle.

Ms. Plesga explained what was to be removed from each of the models in order to cut costs. She added that the changes were basically in the materials which were to be used on the facades as the scoring of stucco and a variation in paint colors would give the models the same image.

After a lengthy discussion, and since back and side elevations were not included in the backup, Committee members asked Mr. Abramson if he was comfortable with the changes. He responded affirmatively.

Vice-Chair Breslau recalled the time that had been spent at previous meetings making sure that the banding and relief on the buildings was incorporated into the plans. He was okay with the changes on the other models; however, not with Model D. Vice-Chair Breslau pointed out that the Del Mar model had approximately a 140-foot length wall on one side with nine windows and he believed it needed the relief of raised banding. Ms. Esis understood his request and agreed to keep the raised banding on that model.

Mr. Venis made a motion, seconded by Ms. Lee, to approve subject to two conditions: 1) the petitioner would bring back to staff the plans for scoring and painting of the models affected and presented this evening; and 2) on Model D only, to keep the banding. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Crowley – absent; Vice-Chair Breslau – yes; Mr. Khavanin – yes; Ms. Lee – yes; Mr. Venis - yes. **(Motion carried 4-0).**

4. OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business discussed.

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 5:56 p.m.

Date Approved: _____

Chair/Committee Member