



### 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/82569682040> MINUTES

**Tuesday, August 26, 2025**

**10:00 a.m.**

City of Margate  
5790 Margate Boulevard  
Margate, FL 33063

### PRESENT:

Elizabeth Taschereau, Director, Development Services  
Andrew Pinney, AICP, Senior Planner  
Christopher Gratz, AICP, Senior Planner  
Paul Ojeda, Associate Planner  
Richard Nixon, Director, Building and Code Services Department  
Marc Young, Building Assistant Director Official  
Curt Keyser, Director, DEES  
Paula Fonseca, Engineer, DEES  
David Scholl, Fire Marshal  
Major Kevin Stransky, Police Department  
Gio Batista, Director, Public Works

### ALSO PRESENT:

Matthew H. Scott, Esq., Greenspoon Marder, LLP

The regular meeting of the Margate Development Review Committee (DRC), having been properly noticed, was called to order at 10:00 a.m. on Tuesday, August 26, 2025, at the City of Margate Commission Chambers, 5790 Margate Boulevard, Margate, FL 33063.

### NEW BUSINESS

- A) *ID2025-219*  
**DRC NO. 24-00400067** RECONSIDERATION OF A  
DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT FOR THE REDEVELOPMENT OF  
CAROLINA CLUB GOLF COURSE  
**LOCATION:** 3011 ROCK ISLAND ROAD  
**ZONING:** S-2 OPEN SPACE DISTRICT  
**LEGAL DESCRIPTION:** HOLIDAY SPRINGS EAST 133-49 B  
PARCEL "O-1" TOGETHER WITH 23-48-41 THAT PORTION K/A  
CAROLINA GOLF COURSE

### 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)

**PETITIONER:** MATTHEW H. SCOTT, ESQ., GREENSPOON MARDER, LLP, AGENT FOR ROSEMURGY ACQUISITIONS, LLC

B) *ID2025-220*

**DRC NO. 24-00400057** RECONSIDERATION OF A LAND USE PLAN AMENDMENT FOR THE REDEVELOPMENT OF CAROLINA CLUB GOLF COURSE

**LOCATION:** 3011 ROCK ISLAND ROAD

**ZONING:** S-2 OPEN SPACE DISTRICT

**LEGAL DESCRIPTION:** HOLIDAY SPRINGS EAST 133-49 B PARCEL "O-1" TOGETHER WITH 23-48-41 THAT PORTION K/A CAROLINA GOLF COURSE

**PETITIONER:** MATTHEW H. SCOTT, ESQ., GREENSPOON MARDER, LLP, AGENT FOR ROSEMURGY ACQUISITIONS, LLC

C) *ID2025-221*

**DRC NO. 24-00400056** RECONSIDERATION OF A REZONING FOR THE REDEVELOPMENT OF CAROLINA CLUB GOLF COURSE

**LOCATION:** 3011 ROCK ISLAND ROAD

**ZONING:** S-2 OPEN SPACE DISTRICT

**LEGAL DESCRIPTION:** HOLIDAY SPRINGS EAST 133-49 B PARCEL "O-1" TOGETHER WITH 23-48-41 THAT PORTION K/A CAROLINA GOLF COURSE

**PETITIONER:** MATTHEW H. SCOTT, ESQ., GREENSPOON MARDER, LLP, AGENT FOR ROSEMURGY ACQUISITIONS, LLC

Andrew Pinney, Senior Planner, advised that all three (3) items were for the same project and would be heard together. He introduced the items and advised that comments were published with the agenda. Staff had no additional comments or revisions.

Matthew H. Scott, Esq., Greenspoon Marder, LLP, agent for Rosemurgy Acquisitions LLC, provided a brief update on the project. He noted work continues to address details of the traffic study and shared that three (3) Zoom meetings had been held with the surrounding Homeowners Associations (HOA), and open house meetings were held on August 25 and scheduled for August 26 at the Holiday Springs Clubhouse. He stated the meetings were well attended and feedback would be incorporated.

Attorney Scott referenced Fire comments and noted two (2) potential locations for a future fire station were set aside. David Scholl, Fire Marshal, noted that the land should be included in the development agreement. He stated where and how much could be determined at a later time. Attorney Scott stated roughly an acre was shown on the Master Plan, but it would be added to the development agreement.

Attorney Scott referenced a Planning comment regarding a deed restriction on the Commercial Retail pod and asking why a deed restriction was not being provided for other areas. He stated the applicant was happy to do so, but because they are not changing the zoning in the southern portion of the project where lakes and walking trails were planned, the zoning itself would self-

limit. He noted they viewed the residential pods similarly but would be happy to provide separate deed restrictions if it would satisfy the comment.

Mr. Pinney stated the zoning districts proposed allow multi-family residential, which is what the concept plan shows, but it would also allow duplexes, single family, churches, government facilities, and a number of other things, so he was concerned about certainty as to what would happen in the future. He suggested a restrictive covenant would address this.

Attorney Scott asked if the development agreement addressed this concern. Mr. Pinney stated it did not for the residential pieces. Attorney Scott stated this would be addressed.

Attorney Scott highlighted Planning comment reference 23 relative to the rezoning application, as follows:

*The rezoning does not satisfy all of the criteria described in Sec. 40.303(B)1 ULDC  
c. Existing zoning district boundaries are illogically drawn in relation to existing  
conditions on the property proposed for change;*

Attorney Scott stated effectively he understood this to mean staff did not believe the rezoning met compatibility requirements. He sought additional feedback on this, noting there are all types of housing in Carolina.

Mr. Pinney reviewed the comment and stated under criterion c, it is the applicant's burden to show the zoning map was illogically drawn. He stated focusing on compatibility with the adjacent neighbors was discussed in the land use application comments and pointed out the applicant is proposing up to six (6) story midrise, and the pods abut single family development without an intermediary.

Attorney Scott asked if the existing apartments are legally nonconforming. Mr. Pinney stated the existing apartments are much lower developed and reviewed the existing heights. He explained two (2) and three (3) stories would be an acceptable intermediary to abut single family, but six (6) stories led to concerns with loss of privacy and sunlight. He noted the comments asked that this be addressed in the development agreement. Attorney Scott made note and stated they were on the same page.

Attorney Scott stated the applicant team had also met with the Master Association for Carolina, and they had similar concerns. He noted they had made a commitment to include in the development agreement a commitment to not exceed four (4) and five (5) story multifamily. He stated the proposal would be updated to reflect this commitment.

Attorney Scott noted Engineering comment 28 sought a commitment to privately owning facilities on property, and the applicant had no issues with that. He stated the language of the development agreement would be cleaned up to reflect this intent. He advised that traffic comments were technical and data-driven, so the appropriate team members would follow up to get that right. He

stated one (1) of the challenges with a project of this size was getting the methodology right as soon as possible. He stated the remaining comments were self-explanatory and suggested that the land use plan amendment and rezoning be separated for the purpose of a DRC recommendation at this time.

Mr. Pinney reviewed the authority of the DRC as stated in Section 40.322 of the Unified Land Development Code based upon compliance with applicable regulations and stated there were a number of unresolved comments. He asserted there was uncertainty with capacity reviews and similar, but they could be taken separately.

Mr. Pinney read the title of DRC application 24-00400067, the development agreement, and asked if the committee was ready to recommend approval of the agreement as written. Board members voted not to approve based on pending comments.

Mr. Pinney read the title of DRC application 24-00400057, the land use plan amendment (LUPA), and asked if the committee was ready to recommend approval based on the submittal. Board members voted not to approve based on pending comments.

Mr. Pinney read the title of DRC application 24-00400056, the rezoning, and asked if the committee was ready to recommend approval based on the submittal. Board members voted not to approve based on pending comments.

Curt Keyser, Director, DEES, noted that in the open comments for the rezoning application, Lindsay Murphy with the project engineer's office had responded referencing documents provided as part of the LUPA application. He advised the applications needed to stand on their own, and all documentation needed to be with the application rather than cross referenced. Attorney Scott confirmed this was understood.

Mr. Pinney stated the DRC was not ready to recommend approval of the applications, and reviewed options available to the applicant, including moving forward with negative recommendations or resubmitting to address comments. He stated in this type of application, the DRC serves as a recommending body but were unable to recommend approval at this time due to the nature and number of comments. Attorney Scott advised that the applicant team would review and let staff know, but he believed the plan was to move forward.

### GENERAL DISCUSSION

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 10:21 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Elizabeth Taschereau, Director of Development Services