CITY OF
MARGATE
Together We Make It Great

City Commission
Mayor Tommy Ruzzano
Vice Mayor Arlene R. Schwartz
Anthony N. Caggiano
Lesa Peerman
Joanne Simone

Interim City Manager
Samuel A. May

City Attorney
Douglas R. Gonzales

City Clerk
Joseph J. Kavanagh

REGULAR MEETING OF THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES

Tuesday, May 9, 2017
10:00 AM
City of Margate
Municipal Building

PRESENT:
Ben Ziskal, AICP, CEcD, Director of Economic Development
Andrew Pinney, Associate Planner
Richard Nixon, Building Director
Kevin Wilson, Fire Inspector
Dan Topp, Community Development Inspector
Lt. Paul Fix, Police Department
Lt. Joe Galaska, Police Department
Abraham Stubbins, Utilities Inspector
Abidemi Ajayi (A.J.), Engineer
Ronald Eyma, Assistant Director of DEES

ALSO PRESENT:
Jay Huebner, HSQ Group, Inc.
Dennis Mele, Greenspoon Marder
Mike Covelli, Covelli Design Associates Inc.
Jonathan Linker, Jonathan-Thomas Developers

ABSENT:
Timothy Finn, Senior Planner
Jeanine Athias, Engineer
Michael Jones, Director of Parks and Recreation
Director of Public Works
Executive Director of Margate Community Redevelopment Agency

The regular meeting of the Margate Development Review Committee (DRC), having been properly noticed, was called to order by Ben Ziskal at 10:00 AM on **Tuesday, May 9, 2017** in the City Commission Chambers at City Hall, 5790 Margate Boulevard, Margate, FL 33063.

1A) APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING ON MARCH 28, 2017.

1B) APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING ON APRIL 11, 2017.

DRAFT

The meeting minutes were approved as written.

2) **NEW BUSINESS**

2A) **DRC NO. 05-17-06** CONSIDERATION OF AN AMENDMENT TO AN EXISTING PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT
LOCATION: 2850 NORTH STATE ROAD 7
ZONING: PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (PUD)
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: A PORTION OF TRACT "A" OF "CELEBRATION POINTE" ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF, AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 178, PAGE 68 OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA.
PETITIONER: JAY HUEBNER, HSQ GROUP, INC.

Dennis Mele, representation for Lennar Homes, explained that the amendment would take the undeveloped portion of the Celebration Pointe property and instead of continuing with the proposed apartments which were shown in the original PUD as three story garden apartments homes, they would move forward with 160 for-sale townhomes instead. He said the townhomes would reflect a significant reduction in density. Mr. Mele further explained that item 2B was the site plan that related to the same project. Mr. Mele stated that the architect, landscape architect, engineer and the client were all present to answer any questions.

DRC Comments:

Richard Nixon had no comment.

Kevin Wilson mentioned that between building five and six there was what appeared to be a fire hydrant but it was not labeled as such. It was then brought to Mr. Wilson's attention that this question would be addressed when the site plan was discussed later in the meeting as listed in item 2B.

Dan Topp had no comment.

Andrew Pinney had the following comments for the record:
- The PUD document referenced the perimeter setback. Code required a 25 foot peripheral setback, but the project was previously granted a variance (BA-08-2013) to reduce the peripheral landscape buffer to 10 feet with the condition of providing a connection to Coral Gate Park and increasing the amount of landscaping provided in Phase II.
- Page 11 there was a note regarding parking calculations for the north half of the site, "dependent upon final site plan" which could be stricken out.
- Parking requirements for the south half were referred to as apartments and should be replaced with townhouses.
- Page 12 there was a conflict with the open space calculation code requirements. Specifically, where it mentioned green area including buffers and yards 8.68 acres count 100% and Section 19-11 which stated "Any privately maintained or owned exterior open space adjacent to and for the exclusive use by the residents of an individual dwelling units enclosed or partially enclosed by fences walls or hedges may be considered towards meeting the total open space requirement provided that the total area contained therein does not exceed 5% of the gross

area of the PUD nor decrease the amount of ground level common open space below 30% of the gross area of the PUD." Mr. Pinney further explained that there were a number of townhouses that backed up to that buffer and there was an option shown on the plans where the purchaser could fence in the yard or use a screen enclosure for that owner's private use. Therefore, he said the applicant would need to revisit the open space calculation. Mr. Mele asked if the only concern was specifically those properties that backed up to the open space or if all of them were a concern. Mr. Pinney answered that it would depend on Mr. Huebner's open space calculation because he line itemed them as green area including buffer and yards 8.86 acres. He said the calculation currently showed 2.6% over and it would need to be recalculated.

Lt. Paul Fix had no comment.

Abidemi Ajayi had the following comments for the record:
- Asked where garbage carts would be located at there was no language about their location Mr. Huebner answered that there would be curbside pick-up and confirmed that he would add that language to the PUD.
- Page 13, item 2, sanitary sewer analysis, PUD document showed the current demand was 7.5mgd and bad language that said annual average daily flow, which needed to be corrected.
- Page 13, item 4, language needed to be revised. Mr. Ajayi offered to share the mock-up but indicated that it was a lot of information to go over.
- Page 14, item 2 the potable water analysis showed the plant had a rated capacity of 20mgd, and needed to be corrected to read "design capacity" and the language updated to show that the daily average flow was 7.0mgd not 10mgd.
- Page 14, item 5 needed to be updated to show the same language as potable water.
- The drainage analysis currently said that it was based on five-year rate intensity but needed to be updated to three-year rate intensity.

Abraham Stubbins had no comment.

Ben Ziskal had the following comments:
- The calculation for the persons per household was based on previous bedroom mix for apartments and was calculated based on 3.5 persons per three bedroom units, 2.5 for a two bedroom unit and 1 person for a one bedroom unit. He said those calculations provided an average of 1.8 persons per household. Now that the apartments have been eliminated and changed to a townhouse community, he said he wanted to ensure that the overall population projection was accurate. Mr. Ziskal asked the applicant to review the calculation to see if it was a true reflection since the number of persons per household would then be used to calculate the impacts on open space and recreation space.
- Mr. Mele asked if the persons per household numbers were noted in the Margate Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Ziskal answered that he believed that it was based on an independent calculation and that it was not in the City's Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Mele said they would create a new estimate based on the developers experience with townhomes of this nature. Mr. Ziskal noted that since there were no longer any one-bedroom dwellings, the total number would probably be increased for the overall project. Mr. Ziskal went on to say that the City would accept any best practice or generally accepted methodology i.e., what the Broward County School Board used to do their student generation rates would be acceptable as well.
- Page 9 there was a statement that indicated that flexibility provisions were not used in the application. He said that statement needed to be revised to state that the overall PUD did

receive flex units and as a part of this amendment and by reducing the total number of units, there would be flex units returned to the City. He asked that language be added to the PUD document that stated that the previously allocated flex units would be returned to the City.
- For the record, Mr. Ziskal stated that at a City Commission meeting held last week, there was a plat note amendment that had been applied for and was approved by the City Commission and would proceed to the County. The plat note amendment would provide a restriction of 168 townhouses. The current proposal for 160 was a discrepancy of 8 units and there was a condition put on the plat note amendment that a subsequent note amendment would be required to reflect the true unit count once the project was built. He said if it truly was 160 townhomes, it would need to be amended and the 8 units would need to be returned to the City. Mr. Mele pointed out that normally during plat note amendments the applicants were brought before the City Commission but that the County would accept a plat note amendment based on a letter from the Economic Development Director. Mr. Mele asked if the necessary adjustment was something that could be handled administratively. Mr. Ziskal answered that he would verify with the City Attorney that he would be able to do so, but that for now they would proceed to the County with the 168 count and come back after construction to reduce it to 160.
- Mr. Ziskal closed by saying that with those revisions made, the item would be moved to the Planning and Zoning Board scheduled for June or July.

2B) **DRC NO. 05-17-07** CONSIDERATION OF A SITE PLAN FOR CELEBRATION POINTE SOUTH
LOCATION: 2850 NORTH STATE ROAD 7
ZONING: PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (PUD)
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: A PORTION OF TRACT "A" OF "CELEBRATION POINTE" ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF, AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 178, PAGE 68 OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA.
PETITIONER: JAY HUEBNER, HSQ GROUP, INC.

DRC Comments:

Richard Nixon had no comment.

Kevin Wilson said that his previous question regarding the fire hydrant had been answered. He asked that the entry gate be a minimum of 14 feet wide.

Dan Topp mentioned that part of his job was to check out the site to make sure that there were no code violations. He said the current condition of the lot was very overgrown and needed to be mowed, particularly the canal that abuts the commercial property on the south.

Andrew Pinney had the following comments:
- The setback variance was reflected on the plan, but at that time the Phase II design was for garden apartments and the setback variance was for the additional drive aisle and parallel parking. Now the site plan showed structures within 15 feet of the property line, therefore the variance would need to be revisited with the Board of Adjustment to see the new design of the proposed development. Mike Covelli said that it was addressed in earlier meetings and there were three places where there were encroachments or reduced setbacks, those being in the northwest corner, the southwest corner which backed up to the commercial and in the

southeast corner which backs up to a big open space to the east. When it was discussed earlier, he said there didn't seem to be an issue because it wasn't encroaching on any other structures. Mr. Pinney responded that he also noticed that in the PUD code section there was no minimum space between buildings but the plans showed 20-foot gaps between each building; he asked if there was any flexibility regarding that design. Mr. Covelli answered that it was a possibility but that the 20-foot gap helped with things like drainage, so he would prefer to move forward with the variance and keep the space between the buildings. Mr. Mele asked to look at the specific language in the variance that was approved to see if it was specific or general. Mr. Pinney agreed.

- The site plan showed five-foot wide sidewalks throughout, but Section 19.11 read, "The area contained in the continuous open space pedestrian system consisting of permanently maintained walks and trails not less than six-feet wide leading to a natural amenity, recreation facility or a commercial use offering internal pedestrian walkways that was divorced from roads and streets may be included as open space." If the intent was to count the pass throughs between the buildings or the walk around the lake, then the five foot sidewalk should be widened to six feet so it was consistent with Section 19.11.
- This project was previously granted a parking variance to count garages towards the parking requirement (BA-16-2015) when Phase II was 252 garden apartments. He said it also related to the parking requirement for multi-family, providing two parking spaces plus one for every five units as guest spaces. That variance was granted to meet the minimum of two per unit which was provided now because each townhouse had a two-car driveway. This meant the site plan was four spaces short on surface parking to meet the code requirement. The City Commission had already expressed a high value towards adequate parking and Mr. Pinney suggested rerouting the sidewalk around the clubhouse or shifting building 5 in order to accommodate four more guest spots. Thus, the parking requirement could be met without the need for any variance. Mr. Huebner answered by confirming that the intent of doing so would be to present a development to the City Commission that met all the parking requirements without counting the garages. He asked if the Commission would look favorably on this component of the PUD amendment. Mr. Pinney confirmed.
- On sheet LP1 of the landscape plan, there was a notation in the plant key "rear lot tree selection by owner" that was put in to meet Section 23-11(B); it showed 160 trees all of which were level 2 and met the code requirement except for the 32 crape myrtles which were category 3. He said crape myrtles could still be used as long as they were queen crape myrtles or any other tree on the category 2 list. Mr. Covelli said it would not be a problem to make that change. Mr. Pinney pointed out the unit owner's tree in the far corner in the same backyard planting, and noted that they left a ten-foot wide planting strip for the buffer that would have a category 1 tree for the units abutting the perimeter. He said, in some cases, the category 1 would be five feet from the category 2 tree so they might to consider relocating the few unit trees to provide room for growth in the future. Mr. Huebner said they could shift them around.
- Section 23-11 required non-deciduous tree species and there were a number of mahogany trees that would need to be replaced with a non-deciduous species.
- The site plan showed several walkways with paved crossings throughout, but on the east and west side of the road it looked like there was a paved crossing that did not connect to anything. Mr. Huebner explained that those were a visual tool for speed control. Mr. Pinney asked if it was elevated like a speed hump and Mr. Huebner answered in the negative, saying that it was just a feature to break up the long strip of asphalt.

Lt. Paul Fix had no comment.

Abidemi Ajayi had the following comments:
- Near building 17 along the west side, there was a 6-inch A/C pipe that ran north to south that should be an 8-inch pipe. Mr. Ajayi directed the applicant to use an 8 x 18 measurement instead of what was proposed in the site plan.
- On the south side near building 17 it was proposed to put a cap with a blow off but instead of ending the line right there, Mr. Ajayi asked that it be connected to the existing 8-inch pipe and said he could provide a document to show what needed to be done.
- He requested that more valves be added to the system so it could be isolated better.
- He requested that a detailed foot connection for the sewer system by building 18.
- He requested verification of the wall height, as it was listed as 1-inch which was not accurate.
- He requested that fence gates be added to the south fence for maintenance.
- He reminded the applicant that it was required to provide easements for the sewer and water.
- He advised that impact fees would apply with a credit for what was previously paid.

Abraham Stubbins mentioned that as far as the easements were concerned, on this project the City would only maintain the main line on the sewer and not the laterals from the main line. As far as the water line, the City would maintain up to the meters. Also the hydrant locations with category 1 trees near those areas would need to use a smaller species with a smaller root system, something other than the proposed oak trees for those areas. Mr. Covelli asked if a root barrier would be acceptable around those areas and Mr. Stubbins answered no. Mr. Stubbins also mentioned that in the areas where the waterline would be located that the applicant would need to provide a removable panel in case the City needed access to that line.

Ben Ziskal had the following comments:
-In looking at the sidewalk around the lake, Mr. Ziskal said he noticed there were several benches provided intermittently with the exception of the east side near building 8. He directed the applicant to look at those two green spaces to possibly add another bench or two.
- On some of the driveway connections the apron between the sidewalk and the road was narrower than the overall driveway and he directed the applicant to look into angling that connection or providing some kind of taper so the car was not driving off into the grass and over the sidewalk.
- As far as the trash and recycling, Mr. Ziskal asked the applicant to double check their dimensions to ensure that the trash cans and recycling bins would have enough room to fit either inside the garage or on the side of the garage.

Andrew Pinney added the following comment to his previous comments regarding the rear lot tree selection as far as timing was concerned. He explained that on a construction project before a Certificate of Occupancy (CO) could be issued, the City received a landscape inspection report and that that tree was a required tree. He said although it was great to offer the owner the option to select their own tree, it might affect the timing of the issuance of the CO. Mr. Covelli acknowledged that the tree would need to selected early but he did not think it would be that critical of a timing issue. Mr. Covelli said they were dealing with this on another project where they had five species to choose from and part of the reason for that was availability that allowed them to have some options.

Ben Ziskal closed by saying that the next step in this item wss to go back and make revisions. He said another hearing before the Development Review Committee was not necessary and

that the three final site plans, signed and sealed would need to be submitted to the Economic Development Department. The plans would then be routed to each of the review agencies and any additional comments or final signatures would be given at that time.

2C) **DRC NO. 05-17-01** CONSIDERATION OF AN ORDINANCE TO PROVIDE UPDATED SPECIAL EXCEPTION CRITERION AND PUBLIC NOTICE REQUIREMENTS
PETITIONER: CITY OF MARGATE, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Andrew Pinney explained that currently Special Exception submittal requirements, review criteria, and procedures were contained in the B-2 Zoning District and all other districts referenced that district for requirements. Also, currently the only public notice that the City Code required was to post a public hearing sign on the property. He said this ordinance looked to take the criteria and procedure out of the B-2 Zoning District and put it into Chapter 31 of the City Code of Ordinances where it established the Development Review Committee. He said it also modified the current procedure. He said in the current B-2 provision, the procedures for Special Exception consisted of the Development Review Committee meeting and recommendation followed by moving straight to City Commission. He said this ordinance would start with the Development Review Committee and would then include the Planning and Zoning Board as another recommending body before it went to City Commission. Mr. Pinney explained that the public notice procedure would be enhanced. He said that in addition to the sign, there would be two types of signs, a small and a large one, as well as the addition of a public mailing to all property owners within 500 feet of the subject property. He said the criteria and procedures had been established within the proposed ordinance.

DRC Comments:

Richard Nixon had no comment.

Kevin Wilson had no comment.

Dan Topp had no comment.

Lt. Paul Fix had no comment.

Abidemi Ajayi had no comment.

Ben Ziskal asked to add an evaluation of existing similar businesses to the list of standards for review. He said this would allow the City to determine the need for that particular business or to determine a threshold/proliferation, noting that it was not in our current Code. Mr. Ziskal further stated that a Special Exception should be viewed on the basis of a particular business coming into a particular location in a particular business climate in the City. He said if the City were to get to a point where certain uses or certain business were not allowed in other cities and the City of Margate were to see a huge influx in a particular type of business, it was imperative that the City take into consideration the other existing businesses.
Mr. Ziskal closed by saying that this ordinance would move on to the Planning and Zoning Board and then to the City Commission for their consideration.

2D) **DRC NO. 05-17-03** CONSIDERATION OF AN ORDINANCE TO PROVIDE

UPDATED REGULATIONS FOR WALKWAY CAFES
PETITIONER: CITY OF MARGATE, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Andrew Pinney explained that currently the Code allowed restaurant and food service businesses to have a walkway café accessory to the business. The current code allowed 400 square feet or smaller walkway cafes as a permitted used and anything larger than 400 square feet was a Special Exception. He said there were also other use and operational restrictions on the walkway cafes that this proposed ordinance would change. He said this ordinance proposed allowing televisions inside a walkway café which was a very common feature and amenity throughout South Florida. The ordinance would also increase the size of a permitted café from up to 400 square feet to up to 1,000 square feet, and it would still be a permitted accessory to the restaurant with no change in the parking requirements. He said another proposed change would allow the display of logos. He said currently the Code restricted any display of logos on awnings or umbrellas, but the proposed ordinance would permit the awning to have a similar sign as provided in the sign code 39.6 and any umbrellas in the walkway café could display up to a four square foot logo.

Mr. Pinney asked that the following correction be made:
- Page 6 the reference to a parking calculation for a special exception use, walkway café over 1,000 square feet needed to be revised. He said it referenced the older business district parking requirement whereas most of the restaurants would be located within the TOC (Transit Oriented Corridor). Mr. Pinney said it would be best to use the TOC restaurant parking calculation or at least reference it in the proposed code depending on where the business was located.

DRC Comments:

Richard Nixon had no comment.

Kevin Wilson had no comment.

Dan Topp had no comment.

Lt. Paul Fix had no comment.

Abidemi Ajayi had no comment.

Ben Ziskal had no comment and closed by saying that the revisions would be made and the ordinance would move on to the Planning and Zoning Board and then to the City Commission for their consideration.

Public Comments:

Jonathan Linker, on behalf of Annemaries Pizza Company Inc., asked what the approximate timeframe was for going before the Planning and Zoning Board. Mr. Ziskal said that it would appear before the Planning and Zoning Board and would then it required two readings by the City Commission. He said that due to the summer schedule, the City Commission meetings

DRAFT

would be held in the very beginning of July and the end of August, so it would ultimately be adopted by the end of August.

Mr. Linker said he had been working with Mr. Pinney to submit a variance. He asked if he should proceed with the variance and spend the money to do so if the timeframe for the ordinance approval and adoption would be relatively the same. Mr. Ziskal said a little bit of time might be saved by applying for the variance and if an application were received that day or that week, it could be heard in July and he could save a month or a month and one-half. It depended on how much that month and one-half was worth versus the cost of the variance procedure.

2E) **DRC NO. 05-17-05** CONSIDERATION OF AN ORDINANCE TO PROVIDE REGULATIONS AND PROCEDURES TO REVIEW TEMPORARY USE PERMITS
PETITIONER: CITY OF MARGATE, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Andrew Pinney advised that this ordinance looked to revise the process for approving outdoor events in the City which was all contained in Section 3.24 of the Zoning Code. He said all of the old language would be struck and a new term, Temporary Use Permit (TUP), would be introduced in place of Outdoor Event. He explained that currently all outdoor events where the public was invited were required to attend the Development Review Committee (DRC) for approval, whether it was a small grand opening with a little table setup for giveaways or a large outdoor event with thousands of prospective attendees. For the smaller events, he said the DRC was burdensome to the business community so this ordinance looked to provide an administrative approval process where DRC would no longer be required. He said that the fees would also be reduced for the administrative review and approvals, and there would be much clearer criteria for when and what type of events would have to appear before the City Commission for approval. He said currently the code read that any time the DRC found that an event would have significant impacts to the City, it recommended the item go before the City Commission. He said this ordinance looked to add specific criteria for when an event would go before the City Commission which included specific types of events such as carnivals, fairs, circuses and other outdoor events held on non-City owned property that had anticipated attendance of more than 500 people at any given time, as well as any type of fireworks display and show, any type of residential block party, etc.

Mr. Pinney had the following comments based on his review of the proposed ordinance:
- Page 5, it would be beneficial to include the term *outdoor* when describing the permit required. It should read "all *outdoor* temporary uses which are not otherwise allowed…"
- Page 6, the list of outdoor activities that can be approved administratively should include promotional events for businesses.
- All of the zoning districts referenced promotional outdoor events as special exceptions which would need to be updated to be consistent throughout the code.
- Page 7 lists the specific events that would need to go to City Commission and Mr. Pinney suggested adding any type of marathon or 5K run event that would a road to be shut down for the event.
- Page 7, line 13 mentioned carnivals, fairs, circuses, with language that mentions "events held on non-city owned property". Mr. Pinney said he wanted to include language that explained that the event was not operated by the City or the CRA, so it was clear that it was an outside petitioner that had to go before City Commission.

DRAFT

- Page 7 also introduced time limits for these events but there were no time limits listed for food trucks, farmers markets and community garage sales that were mentioned earlier in the ordinance. This would need to be fixed by adding general language or adding line items for each.
- Page 8 General Criteria and Limitations – number 4 (a), line 34, the language for owner permission is unclear and needs to be revised. Mr. Pinney suggested having it read,"an affidavit from the owner granting permission…" so it was clear that the affidavit was from the property owner and not just the applicant swearing that they got permission.
- Page 9, line 4, referenced a site plan. Mr. Pinney asked to add language to provide a detailed description of the event setup.
- Page 9, item (5), line 20, it simply listed the word "insurance" without having any reference to the additional insured requirement. Mr. Pinney as if losing that language was intentional since it seemed as though we would be giving up protection for outdoor events.
- Page 10, in the alcohol section, where outdoor alcohol service was permitted and events approved by DRC were struck out so now it implied that all events with alcohol service had to be approved by the City Commission. He said if that was the intent, then it should be listed in the criteria previously mentioned. If it was not the intent, then it should reference administrative approval for TUP as well.

DRC Comments:

Richard Nixon had no comment.

Kevin Wilson had no comment.

Dan Topp had no comment.

Lt. Galaska asked if the ordinance indicated any kind of time limits for how late an event could go. Mr. Pinney said he did not see any time of day restrictions but there were some time limitations for the duration of an event, specifically how many times per year an event could be held. Mr. Pinney asked if the Police Department had a recommendation. Lt. Galaska mentioned an ordinance that was currently in place regarding noise and time limits. Lt. Galaska further stated that it would be wise to add similar language with a cut off time for events that drew a large crowd so as to not create any noise ordinance violations.

Lt. Galaska brought up automatic renewals, stating that if approval was granted, the City would need to make sure that there were at least 30 days of advanced notice that the event would be held again which would ensure that the Police Department had time to notify staff. Mr. Pinney agreed that they were both good points and that the City could add specific the time limits based on the district. Mr. Pinney advised that as far as the automatic renewals, that option/language would be removed with this ordinance and all events would require a new application.

Mr. Pinney further noted that the timeline for the application was changing. He said that applications for the larger events, like fairs, circuses, etc., that went to City Commission for approval would need to be turned in 90 days prior to the event.

Abidemi Ajayi had no comment.

DRAFT

Ben Ziskal wanted to clarify the process for small events that required some road closures. He asked the Police Department how often the City received requests for residential block parties and road closure events. Mr. Ziskal said he wanted to avoid putting people in the position where they were having events without the proper approvals and proper security or the requirements for approval were so cumbersome that they could not have the events in their neighborhood because City Commission approved events required a 90-day application deadline. Lt. Galaska stated that road closure events, like a marathon, that were held on roads that were governed by the Department of Transportation required their approval as well. As far as communities having block parties, he said there needed to be some kind of approval process, but a simple one so that it is not cumbersome for the resident. He said both the Police and Fire Departments had the same concern in that they needed to be able to move barricades to get access in and out. He said if barricades were used they needed to be a temporary set-up and the roads could not be blocked with vehicles.

Mr. Ziskal mentioned that there was a provision in the Code that required someone having a parade to seek a parade permit from the City Manager's Office. He said it might make more sense to have those of events included in with those that went through the administrative review instead of receiving approval from the City Manager's Office to ensure that the other departments would see them and the appropriate life safety measures were reviewed. He said it would be added into the procedure, noting that there would be Planning and Zoning Board review and the City Commission for ultimate direction.

Mr. Ziskal asked if the recommended cutoff time would be 10:00 p.m. He mentioned the recent Cinco de Mayo event that was held at La Bamba as an example and asked if they were done by 10:00 p.m. Lt. Galaska confirmed that they were closed down by 10:00 p.m. Mr. Ziskal recognized that it was difficult to come up with a time cutoff that worked for every event but he said if 10:00 p.m. was the consensus, then it would be drafted into the ordinance. Mr. Pinney suggested a 10:00 p.m. curfew for the events with the administrative approval but when a larger event went before the City Commission, they would have the ability to extend the time as they saw fit. Mr. Ziskal concurred to draft it that way saying that it currently read, "Commission may approve the application by resolution and may impose reasonable conditions as necessary to ensure public safety and welfare." He said he assumed that they would also have the ability to use their discretion to extend the hours for the large events. Mr. Ziskal closed by saying that the revisions would be made and the ordinance would move on to the Planning and Zoning Board and then to the City Commission for their consideration.

3) **GENERAL DISCUSSION**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:00 AM

Respectfully submitted, Prepared by: Leslie E. Hoff

Mr. Benjamin Ziskal, AICP, CEcD Date: _____
Director, Economic Development Department

DRAFT