

SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
APRIL 7, 2009

1. ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 4:01 p.m. Committee members present were Chair Harry Venis, Bob Breslau, Sam Engel, Jr. and Jeff Evans. Also present were Planning and Zoning Manager David Quigley, Deputy Planning and Zoning Manager David Abramson, Chief Landscape Inspector Chris Richter, and Secretary Janet Gale recording the meeting. Vice-Chair Casey Lee was absent.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: March 10, 2009

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

3. SITE PLANS

Modifications

3.1 SPM 12-3-08, Fred Hunter Memorial Services, Inc., 2401 South University Drive (B-2)
(tabled from March 10, 2009)

James Downey and David Quinn, representing the petitioner, were present. Mr. Abramson advised that the petitioner had addressed all of the Committee's comments made at the March 10th meeting.

Mr. Downey proceeded to go through each of the items which the Committee had recommended. The plans matched the elevations; design work had been done to the rear of the building which could be viewed from Nova Drive; stone based materials were added to the building façade and column bases; a cypress tongue and groove soffit was added to the porte cochere; and the landscape plans reflected the connection of two islands with a berm, new ground cover and four additional trees. Mr. Downey advised that the four new trees to be placed on the southern property line had not been identified. Mr. Breslau requested that they be Live Oaks to be consistent with what existed unless the Chief Landscape Architect Chris Richter thought another species would be more suitable. Mr. Quinn agreed that there would be no problem specifying Live Oak trees.

Committee members expressed that they were pleased with the changes.

Mr. Breslau made a motion, seconded by Mr. Evans, to approve subject to the agreement by the applicant that the shade trees drawn on the plans be specified as Live Oaks unless agreed to by the applicant and the Town to be something else. 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)**

3.2 SPM 12-7-08, Lincoln Park Center, 6800 thru 6888 Stirling Road (B-2) **(tabled from March 10, 2009)**

Lawrence Cramer, representing the petitioner, was present. Mr. Abramson summarized the planning report.

Mr. Cramer provided a brief presentation of the project which would be accomplished in phases. He indicated that they would start with structural repairs, replace the wooden sign fascia, add a standing metal seam room, and redo the landscape. Because of financial circumstances, Mr. Cramer indicated that changing the site lighting would be in the long-term plans.

Mr. Evans discussed technical architectural details and pointed out that the corner elements looked nicer than the center feature. He suggested that the central tower circle be a louver instead of plain stucco and Mr. Cramer agreed to it.

Mr. Breslau asked about the lighting fixtures and Mr. Cramer responded that at this point in time, all they could do was repaint the light fixtures. Following a brief discussion, Mr. Cramer agreed that he probably could replace the light fixtures in the parking area within three years.

SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
APRIL 7, 2009

Mr. Evans made a motion, seconded by Mr. Engel, to approve subject to the following three items: 1) to add a louver on the façade of the main raised tower in the center; 2) that the applicant agreed to change out the site lighting fixtures within 36 months after pulling the first permit and that the lighting would meet the new lighting ordinance; however, at this time, the applicant would paint the existing lighting fixtures to be consistent with the architecture of the building; and 3) to add no less than four to six benches. 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)**

3.3 SPM 7-1-08, Summit-Questa Montessori School, 5451 Davie Road (CF)

Ilija Moss crop and Judith Dempsey, representing the petitioner, were present. Mr. Abramson summarized the planning report.

Mr. Breslau asked staff that if by the Committee’s review and recommendation, would it mean that Council would interpret the Committee as being a proponent of modular buildings becoming permanent. In the past, the Committee had turned down modular buildings for the park and the Committee wanted to be consistent. Mr. Abramson responded that the Committee would be judging the aesthetics of the building.

Chair Venis asked Mr. Abramson to clarify whether or not this site plan modification would be reviewed by Council. Mr. Abramson responded affirmatively.

One of staff’s recommendations was that the applicant remove the tent coverings for the outdoor seating area. This concerned Mr. Breslau because of shade for the students so he asked staff if the problem was that it did not meet Code. Mr. Abramson replied that he requested something more permanent that would not blow away in a storm.

Mr. Moss crop addressed staff’s comments regarding the shade structures for the kids and indicated that he would be willing to build something more aesthetically pleasing and which could be removed before a hurricane; however, he preferred not to build a permanent structure which would have to withstand a hurricane.

Mr. Engel pointed out that the ramp railings would not meet Code. Mr. Moss crop indicated that he would be able to meet the “four-inch rejection” requirement by installing the trellis treatment along the railings and landing much the same as had been done on the bottom of the modular. He assured that the building had gone through the entire permitting procedure, drainage, fire safety, structural and tie-down. Mr. Moss crop stated that the architect of record designed the structure as though they were permanent buildings, the only difference being that they were moveable.

The Committee’s concern was in setting a precedent with this application since it had rejected permanent modular buildings consistently in the past. Mr. Moss crop countered that it should be considered on a case-by-case basis and he pointed out that the building would not be seen from any existing rights-of-way and the neighbors were okay with it. Committee members pointed out that on the southern side of the complex, the land had not been developed and those future neighbors would have to look at the site with the air conditioners. Mr. Moss crop expressed that the owners were willing to increase the landscaping for screening purposes as well as devising a solution for the air conditioning units. He explained that due to budget costs, they were trying to make the most of the existing modular.

Mr. Abramson advised that there had been a temporary use permit for the modular while a permanent multi-purpose building was being built. Due to the expansion of student enrollment, both buildings were being utilized; however, the temporary use permit for the modular had expired.

SITE PLAN COMMITTEE

APRIL 7, 2009

A lengthy discussion ensued regarding the situation of the expired temporary use permit, the pros and cons of modular facilities which were temporary solutions, and the limits of the Committee regarding making a recommendation for an extension of the temporary use permit. Committee members expressed that the cost to fix up the modular in order to make it acceptable would be far greater than anticipated. By applying for an extension for another three years, the petitioner could re-evaluate their funding and perhaps build a permanent structure in the future.

Ms. Dempsey spoke of the financial pressures she was facing due to the construction of the new multi-purpose building. The modular building was safe and working well and that was why she considered making it permanent. Mr. Breslau reiterated that if the Committee were to review the building as a permanent structure, they would have to apply architectural standards the same as they would any other permanent building. It would “wash away” the economical feasibility of the project.

Mr. Abramson advised the petitioner of the special permit process in applying for a 36-month extension. The application would be presented to Planning and Zoning and then to Council for review.

Mr. Breslau made a motion, seconded by Mr. Engel, to deny the application with the following recommendation to Town Council: that the Committee recommended that the applicant reapply for a three-year special use permit for this building. If in the event that Council would approve this as a permanent structure, the Committee recommended that the petitioner return to the Site Plan Committee for a full architectural review. 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)**

4. OLD BUSINESS

4.1 SPM 12-6-08, Flashback Diner and Coffee House, 4125 SW 64 Avenue (RAC-TOS, Regional Activity Center - Transit Oriented Street District) (clarification of the motion made March 10, 2009)

Mr. Abramson referenced the minutes of March 10, 2009, in which the motion for approval had been subject to the staff’s report. The staff’s report contained one recommendation which was for the screening of the air conditioning units and during the meeting; the petitioner had explained that due to mechanical issues, they were unable to comply with that recommendation. Committee members accepted an offer to compromise and have the air conditioning units painted instead thereby eliminating the recommended screening. Committee members Breslau, Evans and Engel recalled the discussion and agreed that the motion be amended in order to remove the “subject to staff’s report” from the motion.

Mr. Engel made a motion, seconded by Mr. Breslau, to remove item one, subject to staff’s recommendation for screening, from the motion for approval. In a voice vote, with Vice-Chair Lee being absent, all voted in favor. **(Motion carried 4-0)**

Mr. Quigley brought up the issue regarding the poor quality of architecture in site plans which were being submitted for review and which the Committee had discussed at a prior meeting. Although staff had to deal with compliance issues at the development review level, he could have them advise the applicants early on and tell them what they were in for should they submit a plain elevation or omit landscape plans and other details. Mr. Quigley advised that he did not have a problem with staff making aesthetic requests on behalf of the Site Plan Committee as long as it was clear that they were not code compliance issues.

5. NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business discussed.

**SITE PLAN COMMITTEE
APRIL 7, 2009**

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 5:21 p.m.

Date Approved: _____

Chair/Committee Member