SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
OCTOBER 21, 2008

1. ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 4:03 p.m. Committee members present were Chair Harry Venis, Vice-Chair Casey Lee (arrived at 4:16 p.m.), Bob Breslau, Sam Engel, Jr., and Jeff Evans. Also present were Public Works/Capital Projects Director Manny Diez, Recreation Coordinator Terry Roberts, Planning and Zoning Manager David Quigley, Deputy Planning and Zoning Manager David Abramson, Chief Landscape Inspector Chris Richter, Urban Forester Tim Lee, Planner Lise Bazinet, and Secretary Janet Gale recording the meeting.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: September 23, 2008

Mr. Breslau made a motion, seconded by Mr. Engel, to approve the minutes of September 23, 2008. In a roll call vote, with Vice-Chair Lee being absent, all voted in favor. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

3. SITE PLANS

Modification

3.1 SPM 1-5-08, Norwegian Seamen's Church/Scandinavian Center, 2950 South Flamingo Road (A-1) (tabled from September 23, 2008) **(Request to table to November 18, 2008)**

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Mr. Engel, to table to November 18, 2008. In a voice vote, with Vice-Chair Lee being absent, all vote in favor. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

Site Plan

3.2 SP 3-4-06, Town Center Townhomes, 6651 SW 41 Street (RM-16)

Mr. Evans advised that he would abstain from voting on this item as he was the Architect of Record; however, he was obliged to answer questions and participate in the discussion. Also representing the petitioner were Maria Fernandez and Antonio Quevedo. Ms. Bazinet summarized the planning report.

Mr. Quevedo concurred with the planning report and provided a color/materials sample board for the Committee's review.

Mr. Breslau asked about two variations on the site plans indicating the sidewalk approaches to the community pool and which of the two was correct. Mr. Evans explained that the incorrect plan was LA.1 as the Code required there be a change in the pool setback which effected where the sidewalk would be located.

Mr. Breslau noted that guests who may be visiting the project for the first time and parked in the guest parking area by the pool may not realize that they had to exit on a one way. He, therefore, suggested that an additional one-way sign be placed on the radius so it would be obvious to guests or anyone visiting the project for the first time. Mr. Quevedo agreed with the suggestion. Mr. Breslau mentioned that as there was no detail for the concrete entrance wall, he asked the petitioner if they were willing to do something more decorative and in conjunction with the style of the complex. Mr. Evans indicated that he understood and agreed to enhance the entrance wall.

Vice-Chair Lee disclosed that she had spoken with Mr. Evans two times during this day. She advised that the Slash Pines did not transplant well to any changes in grade elevations. She asked for assurance that if they did not survive, they would be replaced or mitigated. Mr. Quevedo agreed to the terms and had been aware of the plants sensitivity to grade changes. Vice-Chair Lee applauded their efforts to salvage and relocate some of the foliage. She suggested that in the case of a large Live Oak tree located on the property that they hire a reputable tree relocation company who knew what they were doing.

Vice-Chair Lee appreciated that the petitioner would be making a contribution to the Town's Tree Preservation Fund in the amount of $6,260.00. She asked that the tree protection barrier be in place prior to any clearing and grubbing on the site.

Vice-Chair Lee and Mr. Breslau noted that the west wall of building one was a long, massive area of bare wall space with a hedge. Mr. Quevedo explained that the plans for landscaping the west wall originally matched the east side and they were told to remove the foliage since it was a retention area. He did agree that it may be possible to plant a few accent trees such as Crepe Myrtles or Jasmine which did not take up much "root space." Vice-Chair Lee agreed that the hedge row with the addition of three small accent trees would work.

Mr. Engel noted that electrical meter boxes were placed at each of the units' front doors. He advised that a meter bank may be allowed to be installed on the end of the building for up to six units without the need for a meter room. Mr. Evans agreed that the proposed arrangement was not the best solution and he would find out from Florida Power & Light if the meter banks would be allowed.

Mr. Breslau made a motion, seconded by Vice-Chair Lee to approve subject to the following comments and conditions: 1) that the entry wall would have decorative features placed on it and would be consistent with the design of the project; 2) that a one-way-only sign should be placed on the radius curb facing the two compact spaces in order to prevent people who leave the compact spaces from going the wrong way; 3) to change drawing LA.1 to show the sidewalk to match the main site plan drawing; 4) that the applicant agreed if the Slash Pines did not survive the re-grading, they would be mitigated and replaced; 5) the tree protection barriers would be in place before the project work starts; 6) to add three accent trees on the west wall of building one; and 7) if permitted by Florida Power & Light, to use "meter banks" at the end of each building. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Venis – yes; Vice-Chair Lee – yes; Mr. Breslau – yes; Mr. Engel – yes; Mr. Evans – abstained. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

4. OLD BUSINESS

4.1 Site Plan Review Process for Capital Projects

Mr. Diez was present to discuss any issues with the Committee. Chair Venis, Mr. Quigley and Mr. Breslau provided background information to help clarify the issue. In the past, there had been sporadic applications by the Town to the Site Plan Committee. There were projects that had and had not been reviewed by the Committee. There were times when the Town had submitted projects which were not consistent with what the Committee had required of private individual developers. An example was the SW 26th Street round-about in which there had not been a landscape plan nor a design plan – both items which were required of anyone else whether public or private.

Committee members believed that there should be a regulation of some kind whereby the Town should adhere to the same standards that the Committee imposed on private individuals and/or private landowners. Then they asked that if there were such a regulation, would that hold things up or slow things down, was it a problem, was there a reason why it should not be done, and were there projects that should be excluded from site plan review. Mr. Breslau clarified that the Committee did not want to review the equipment room for a water treatment plant; however, if the Town were to build a water treatment plant that would be visible to the roadways and neighbors, the Committee would be an excellent resource for the architectural aesthetics, site plan and landscaping.

Mr. Quigley advised that this issue had gone to Council and the feedback was that the Committee should address the issue with Mr. Diez to see what concerns he and staff had regarding what level of review should be and if they had any issues or concerns.

Mr. Diez responded that there were two distinctly different types of projects. Examples of site development projects were the Fire Administration/Public Works building and the administrative addition to the Pine Island Park Multi-Purpose building which had been reviewed today. To his knowledge, every site plan that his department put together went through the Committee in order to pull permits. If they had not in the past, they would be in the future.

Mr. Diez explained that the second type of project, such as the round-about on SW 26 Street, was a right-of-way project which he believed should not be brought before the Committee. He undrstood that when these projects were being developed, they should be going through the local community in which they would have an impact to find out what they want, what their issues were, what their interests were, and then try to develop something that was consistent with that community. These findings would be reported to Council and he would advise of any conflict. Other issues taken into consideration of a right-of-way project were issues with recovery zones, curbing and drainage that were probably outside the purview of the Committee.

Vice-Chair Lee believed that "not enough eyes have looked at some of the things that have taken place on the Town's properties" and she spoke of the lack of long-term planning for landscape development and maintenance. She disagreed with Mr. Diez and pointed out that one merely needed to look at the medians or parks to know that the professionals on the Site Plan Committee did not have an opportunity to give their input.

Mr. Diez understood Vice-Chair Lee's perspective and advised that Urban Forester Timothy Lee would be joining the Public Works Department and would be a huge asset. He was interested in enhancing the rights-of-way within the constraints of the budget and spoke of the improvements on Flamingo and Griffin Roads. Mr. Diez reiterated that for site plans, he would come through this Committee without question; however, there were other issues associated with rights-of-way which should not be held to the same standard as a building. Committee members disagreed and spoke of the City of Plantation where every project both major and minor was reviewed by its Landscape Architect Jeff Siegel and that was why it looked good. Mr. Diez contended that the proper maintenance of buffers and medians was responsible for the appearance of the landscape. He believed it was a "man-power" issue which should not be compared to the City of Plantation as its Public Works Department employed 100 people and were not responsible for the parks, whereas his department had 65 employees and were responsible for 40 parks.

Mr. Evans interjected that the problem was that the Town did not have to meet its own landscape plans. He believed that the Town should meet the same standards as any developer and used the 26th Street round-about as an example since it had no landscaping. Mr. Diez did not disagree with the statement that the Town should meet with the same standards. He explained that in the case of the 26th Street round-about, the paving contract did not include landscaping as it was intended to be landscaped separately. Although Mr. Breslau did not want to belabor the round-about project, he spoke of the many requirements that the Committee had made of other developments such as cross-walk pavers for pedestrians and lighting. He agreed that the Committee should not be involved in the engineering; however, it should be involved in the aesthetics, lighting and landscaping. Mr. Breslau understood that when a recommendation was made for Council to consider, it may not agree because of budgetary issues, and that was okay as the Committee was an advisory board. He maintained, however, that even for rights-of-way projects, the Committee should be involved regarding non-engineering issues such as landscaping, aesthetics, lighting and signage.

Vice-Chair Lee spoke of the benefits which could be gleaned by running those projects by the Committee – that in the end, having the right plant in the right place was not only aesthetically pleasing, it could save a lot of tax dollars on maintenance, irrigation and replacement.

Discussion continued in an exchange of viewpoints and in an attempt to achieve resolution. Mr. Diez explained that Council directed him by the way it directed his budget and there were limitations. He had to concentrate on the primary functions before considering aesthetics.

Chair Venis asked if the Committee wished to make a recommendation, vote on it and forward it to Council at this time.

Expressing the consensus of the Committee to be forwarded to Council, Mr. Breslau made the following recommendation: that all projects including site plan related new development, new construction, rights-of-way projects and redevelopment projects by the Town should be reviewed by the Site Plan Committee for recommendations. The recommendations should be conveyed to the Public Works Department and Council so they would have options as to how it related to the aesthetics of rights-of-way as well as the normal site plan review and aesthetic review that the Committee did on typical projects.

Chair Venis asked that all those in favor of putting this recommendation forward, say aye. In a voice vote, the ayes were unanimous.

4.2 Reconsideration of SPM 6-4-08, Pine Island Park, 3801 South Pine Island Road (RS, Recreation and Open Space District)

Earlier in the meeting, Mr. Roberts displayed two renderings for the proposed administrative wing at the existing multi-purpose center at Pine Island Park. One rendering was of a triple-wide trailer of which this Committee had previously recommended denial. The other was the original proposal which had been recommended for approval by the Committee and ultimately had been approved by Council.

Mr. Breslau made a motion, seconded by Mr. Engel, to approve the previous building addition which was not the modular, but the permanent addition based on the rendering provided at this meeting. In a roll call vote, the vote was as follows: Chair Venis – yes; Vice-Chair Lee – absent; Mr. Breslau – yes; Mr. Engel – yes; Mr. Evans – yes. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

5. NEW BUSINESS

5.1 Visual Preference Survey

Mr. Abramson explained that the purpose of the survey was to get a consensus of opinion on architectural design in order to create a pattern for the Regional Activity Center. He distributed a pictorial design booklet for each member to review and rate the pictures according to their individual preference.

At the completion of the survey, Mr. Abramson asked for comments. Mr. Breslau suggested that before giving the survey, it should be stressed that the architecture would need to fit into a highly dense and urban setting.

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 5:37 p.m.

Date Approved: _____ _____

Chair/Committee Member