



### City Commission

Mayor Arlene R. Schwartz  
Vice Mayor Antonio V. Arserio  
Anthony N. Caggiano  
Tommy Ruzzano  
Joanne Simone

### City Manager

Cale Curtis

### City Attorney

David Tolces

### City Clerk

Jennifer M. Johnson, MMC

## REGULAR MEETING OF THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86211625545> MINUTES

**Wednesday, November 12, 2025**

**10:00 a.m.**

City of Margate  
5790 Margate Boulevard  
Margate, FL 33063

### PRESENT:

Andrew Pinney, AICP, Senior Planner  
Elizabeth Taschereau, Development Services Director  
Christopher Gratz, AICP, Senior Planner  
Paul Ojeda, Development Services Office Manager  
David Scholl, Fire Marshal  
Paula Fonseca, Engineer, DEES  
Curt Keyser, DEES Director  
Richard Nixon, Building Code Services Director  
Gio Batista, Public Works Director  
Lieutenant Mary Crabtree, Police Department  
Sergeant Scot Sawyer, Police Department  
Lisa S. Bernstein, Traffic Consultant (via Zoom)

### ALSO PRESENT:

Matthew H. Scott, Partner, Greenspoon Marder LLP  
Fabio Rodriguez, VP of Development, White Oak Development  
Mike Troxell, Civil Engineer, Thomas Engineering Group  
Beatriz Hernandez, Founding Principal, RA, LEED BD+C, Bizi Arq.  
Andrew Sykes, Senior Project Manager, Witkin Hults + Partners  
Chris Heggen, Kimley Horn (via Zoom)

The regular meeting of the Margate Development Review Committee (DRC), having been properly noticed, was called to order at 10:08 a.m. on Wednesday, November 12, 2025, at the City of Margate Commission Chambers, 5790 Margate Boulevard, Margate, FL 33063.

### NEW BUSINESS

- A) *ID2025-315*  
**DRC NO. 25-00400043: COCOGATE SITE PLAN**  
**LOCATION: 1308-1350 NORTH STATE ROAD 7**

### Development Services Department

901 NW 66<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite C, Margate, FL 33063 • Phone: (954) 979-6213  
[www.margatefl.com](http://www.margatefl.com) • [dsd@margatefl.com](mailto:dsd@margatefl.com)

**ZONING: G, GATEWAY DISTRICT****LEGAL DESCRIPTION: FOLIO NUMBER: 4842 30 01 0160****PETITIONER: MATTHEW SCOTT, GREENSPOON MARDER LLP**

Christopher Gratz, Senior Planner, advised the four (4) items on the agenda were all related to the same item. He introduced the first item and stated that the purpose of this meeting was to go over comments that were unresolved. He outlined the process briefly.

Attorney Matthew H. Scott, Greenspoon Marder, introduced himself and the team present on behalf of the applicant. He asked for clarification on Reference 15, and stated his interpretation was that Richard Nixon, Building Code Services Director, was requesting ADA parking for every amenity, but because this was a mixed-use project, the common spaces were only serving the multi-family units. He asserted the ADA spaces provided for multi-family use would similarly be serving the amenities associated with it.

Mr. Nixon commented that the ADA parking spaces should be in a reasonable proximity to the amenities. He discussed trash disposal and dog parks as examples. Attorney Scott stated he wanted to ensure the issue was being addressed and was not a continuing issue. Mr. Nixon confirmed it had been previously discussed. Discussion ensued briefly regarding the numbering of the comments.

Attorney Scott pointed to Reference 33 and asked for clarification on how to address the request for cross-access. Mr. Gratz stated he and Andrew Pinney, Senior Planner, had both made this comment. He advised that staff recognizes that they cannot force the neighboring property to allow access to their property as it currently is, but the expectation is that this property be designed for future cross-access so that when the other side comes in for redevelopment, a connection can be required. Mr. Pinney noted a similar situation with the development of WaWa and Culver's.

Mr. Gratz stated he would not be opposed to the site being set up with parking spaces that have to be removed in the event of future cross-access, as long as this was accounted for in the plan. Attorney Scott asked if a note on the plan indicating the site of future cross-access would suffice. Mr. Gratz clarified that this would be appropriate if it was a drive aisle or parking spaces, but not something like a dog park.

Attorney Scott noted Reference 38, which discussed Section 3.1: Arcades and Colonnades of the Margate Community Redevelopment Agency Building Design Regulation (CRA BDR). Beatriz Hernandez, Bizi Arq, stated the team felt that from a retail perspective, providing arcades was not the most effective solution for this application. She advised they would look at options such as increasing the canopy overhangs to provide more shade and shelter and noted an argument had been provided in the previous response to comments.

Mr. Pinney asked for clarification on what material would be used to extend the canopies. Ms. Hernandez stated the canopies would be metal. She pointed out that because of the size of this retail space and not knowing what the end use would be, they wanted to provide enough flexibility

in the design to give visibility to the building. Mr. Pinney stated his comment was in the interest of making the design consistent with the CRA BDR guidelines. Discussion continued as to whether the guidelines require arcades specifically.

Ms. Hernandez stated if fabric awnings were now allowed, other materials could be reviewed. She asked if she could send images as an example. Mr. Pinney advised the photographs should be included in the resubmittal. Attorney Scott suggested a Zoom meeting to discuss the changes prior to resubmittal. Ms. Hernandez and Mr. Pinney agreed. Mr. Gratz clarified that a Zoom meeting would be helpful, but receiving records via email would not be, as it creates an issue with public record requests.

Attorney Scott asked for clarification on Reference 42. He asked if the City Code speaks to inconsistencies between the CRA BDR guidelines and the Code. Mr. Gratz stated this was an issue missed during a recent Code update. He advised that his opinion was that the Code was more restrictive and should be applied, but the process should document that the CRA BDR guidelines were not being met.

Attorney Scott stated the applicant's preference was to follow the City Code, as this was more consistent with what they had designed to meet. Mr. Gratz agreed. Mr. Pinney noted the CRA comments were all backed up by a single Code section, so this could be addressed during the variance request process. Discussion continued.

Attorney Scott commented on Reference 81 and stated the access to Coconut Creek Parkway had also been discussed in the comments made by Lisa S. Bernstein, Traffic Consultant. He stated Broward County had approved the design in the preliminary review, and asked for feedback on the design, noting it was for resident access only. Mr. Gratz stated if a vehicle accessed the driveway incorrectly and there was someone behind them, they would be basically stuck. Ms. Bernstein noted there was no signage to indicate access was resident only, and the back out area was only 11 feet from the gate. She reiterated that if someone was in the wrong spot and another vehicle pulled in behind them, there was no place to turn around. She stated she had requested signage, but she felt it was not a good design and did not appear safe.

Mr. Pinney asked if the access had been gated when it was submitted to Broward County. He stated the approval was shocking. Ms. Bernstein agreed and asked if this was in writing. Attorney Scott asked if this would resolve the issue. Ms. Bernstein stated she still felt it was a safety issue. Attorney Scott stated a turning diagram had been provided to document how the movements would work, showing a modified three (3) point turn. He advised that he would follow up.

Curt Keyser, Engineering Department Director, commented that both the City of Margate and Broward County have authority in this situation, so both entities would need to approve. He noted most drivers who would be impacted were not present at the meeting to hear the explanation, so signage would be needed to avoid unsafe situations. Attorney Scott confirmed this was understood.

Attorney Scott asked for clarification on how to address Reference 50, 51, 52, 53, and 54, related to the City's hydraulic evaluation. Paula Fonseca, Engineer, DEES, stated there were questions from the report that needed to be clarified, including voids in the information provided.

Attorney Scott asked whether questions should be emailed to the City's consultant. Mr. Keyser stated they should reach out to Ms. Fonseca, and she would communicate with the consultant.

Attorney Scott noted it might make sense to remove the comments. Ms. Fonseca stated the comments needed to be reflected as resolved. She advised that if the information was provided, once staff agreed they would provide the report to the applicant. Mr. Keyser clarified that in order to get rid of assumptions and the use of should, the consultant may need data from the applicant regarding the project to resolve the comments.

Chris Heggen, Kimley Horn, asked to revisit the discussion on the access to Coconut Creek Parkway. He advised that a pull-out space was being provided for the turnaround to occur, as this had been part of the discussion with Broward County. He noted this was completely separated from the traffic stream, and stated signage could also be reviewed. Ms. Bernstein stated she did not know what it looked like at night, but there was approximately 60 feet of space, and if the car pulled in too close to the gate, she questioned how they would cross exiting traffic to get into the space on the opposite side. She advised that it seemed congested for the turn-around maneuver.

Mr. Heggen noted very little traffic was expected, as it was a right-in, right-out driveway. He stated more of the resident traffic would be oriented toward 441, as they could come from north or south and there was a median limiting access on Coconut Creek Parkway. Discussion continued as to how to address the turning maneuver safely.

Attorney Scott highlighted Reference 19 and stated that multiple preapplication meetings were held to discuss the requirements for the project, and it was confirmed that a traffic study would not be required because the threshold was not triggered. He stated Ms. Bernstein had now asked for a traffic study because the shopping center was closed, and this had become a source of conflict at this stage. Mr. Heggen added that there had also been a comment requesting a Vested Rights Determination and asked if this was all that was needed to resolve the question. Mr. Pinney stated this made sense, but staff was not authorized to request this, it must come from the applicant to the City Attorney's office.

Attorney Scott asserted the purpose of the pre-application meetings was for staff to tell the applicant what was required, and it had been agreed that a traffic study would not be required. He asked if another application would be required. Mr. Pinney stated it would be a letter to the City Attorney's office and pointed out the Traffic Consultant was not at those preliminary meetings. He stated it was best to follow the Code requirement to get the Vested Rights Determination. Attorney Scott stated he would follow up. He noted a new State law which would address requirements of pre-application meetings.

Mike Troxell, Civil Engineer, Thomas Engineering Group, noted Reference 58 related to drainage and stated he believed the property referenced had a separate outfall, so he was not sure what staff was trying to address. Ms. Fonseca stated the GIS files showed a connection from the adjacent property to the stormwater system which drains to the canal north of the property.

Mr. Troxell advised that he would double check, but the shopping center plans showed discharge to a separate outfall. Ms. Fonseca asked if the applicant had the survey or elevations for the catch basin in question. Mr. Troxell stated he did not believe the surveyor had picked this up, but if it was necessary they could add it. Ms. Fonseca advised this would solve the problem.

Mr. Keyser asked if staff had shared the GIS information with the applicant. Ms. Fonseca stated she did not think she had, but she would send it to Mr. Troxell.

Attorney Scott noted in Reference 59, solid waste comments and concerns were discussed. He sought clarification on what was requested and asked whether the days waste collection takes place is usually determined once a project is online.

Ms. Fonseca asked if the project would have its own franchise agreement with the provider. Ms. Hernandez stated pickup four (4) to five (5) days a week was typical in multi-family developments this size. She stated they were coordinating with Waste Management and would clarify the trash management plan in the narrative on resubmission. She asked for clarification on what section of Code contained the recycling comments. Ms. Fonseca referred the applicant to Chapter 19.

Ms. Hernandez added that they had worked with a consultant who also handles recycling calculations, and they would review further to ensure changes in trash management were addressed and clarified. Ms. Fonseca stated if this information was provided in the narrative in a clear manner, and if a franchise agreement was to be entered, this would address the comments.

Attorney Scott read Reference 77 and noted there had been a spirited discussion in the pre-application meetings regarding the greenway requirements and putting trees over utilities. Ms. Fonseca confirmed they wanted to avoid putting trees on top of the existing system. Mr. Gratz stated his comment was meant to be about dimensional requirements, and not in reference to materials. Ms. Hernandez stated the applicant's understanding was that Coconut Creek Parkway would require a 16-foot greenway, not the wider greenway as required on 441. Mr. Gratz stated it was an arterial road so would have the same classification. He reviewed the requirements.

Ms. Hernandez noted Reference 44 talked about the design of the open space as one (1) contiguous area and asked if staff's position was that it could not be T-shaped. Mr. Gratz advised that he could not tell from the drawings whether the contiguous area was the only thing counted. He stated it needed to be contiguous, not segmented around parts of the building. Ms. Hernandez noted the regulations only require the open space is contiguous and stated her understanding was that it was met. Discussion continued regarding the definition of contiguous. Ms. Hernandez stated she would provide an updated exhibit.

B) *ID2025-316*

**DRC NO. 25-00400044:** COCOGATE PLAT

**LOCATION:** 1308-1350 NORTH STATE ROAD 7

**ZONING:** G, GATEWAY DISTRICT

**LEGAL DESCRIPTION:** FOLIO NUMBER: 4842 30 01 0160

**PETITIONER:** MATTHEW SCOTT, GREENSPOON MARDER LLP

Attorney Scott advised that there were no further questions regarding the DRC comments. He asked for clarification on the process for approval of the plat. He noted the City Commission was reviewing a new process, and he wanted to be prepared. Mr. Gratz stated at this point that was still being worked out. He advised this application would be processed with the Development Services Department and would be signed off by the DEES Director, but it would not be included in a public hearing process.

Mr. Pinney added that the State had provided for a shorter review, but the applicant was proceeding at their own risk as dimensional conflicts with the Code would need to be addressed later in the process. Attorney Scott confirmed.

C) *ID2025-317*

**DRC NO. 25-00400045:** COCOGATE SPECIAL EXCEPTION

**LOCATION:** 1308-1350 NORTH STATE ROAD 7

**ZONING:** G, GATEWAY DISTRICT

**LEGAL DESCRIPTION:** FOLIO NUMBER: 4842 30 01 0160

**PETITIONER:** MATTHEW SCOTT, GREENSPOON MARDER LLP

None.

D) *ID2025-318*

**DRC NO. 25-00400046:** COCOGATE UNDERGROUND WIRING WAIVER

**LOCATION:** 1308-1350 NORTH STATE ROAD 7

**ZONING:** G, GATEWAY DISTRICT

**LEGAL DESCRIPTION:** FOLIO NUMBER: 4842 30 01 0160

**PETITIONER:** MATTHEW SCOTT, GREENSPOON MARDER LLP

None.

## GENERAL DISCUSSION

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 11:05 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

 *12-4-2025*

Elizabeth Taschereau, Director of Development Services