

# memo

## MARGATE COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

To: Chair and Members of the Board  
From: Cotter Christian  
CC: David Tolces, Kim Vazquez, City Clerk, City Manager  
Date: 5/8/2017  
Re: CONSIDERATION OF CITY CENTER SITE PLAN – ADDENDUM

---

The submittal of plans and letter dated May 4, 2017 from the Developer did not allow CRA Staff sufficient time for a complete review prior to the agenda deadline of May 4<sup>th</sup> for the May 10, 2017 CRA Board meeting. Further review has since occurred so this memo supplements the agenda backup. Comparing the latest submittal with the Development Agreement and Preliminary Development Plan (PDP), the following items are identified:

1. The bedroom mix does not comply with Paragraph 2.2(a) of the Development Agreement, which states that the total number of residential units shall be comprised of not less than 50% two bedrooms and 10% three bedrooms. The data presented on Sheet SP 11 shows these figures at 45.45% and 9.19% respectively. In addition, the required bedroom mix is not satisfied on a phase by phase basis, as there are shortfalls in phases 1 and 2.

Section 5.5 provides:

*For purposes of this Agreement, a "Material Change" to the Site Plan means and refers to a requested change, alteration or modification that (i) increases or decreases the total number of residential units by greater than five percent (5%), (ii) changes the composition of Units (number of bedrooms) by greater than ten percent (10%), decreases the amount of square footage in the Commercial Component by greater than five percent (5%).*

That section allows a change in the bedroom mix by 10%. 10% of 10% results in a 9% threshold for 3 bedrooms, and 10% of 50% results in a 45% threshold for 2 bedrooms. We discussed this in detail with staff it was agreed we were in compliance. We are unclear as to what has changed. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the mix now exceeds 10% for 3 BR units and 50% for 2 BR units.

The development agreement requires the mix to be calculated for the project as a whole. There is no requirement that the mix be calculated on a phase by mix on Phase basis. Some variation by phase is to be expected based on site geometry.

2. The floor plan provided for Building type "A" is not consistent with the tabular data. The table shows that this building type each contains 12-one bedroom, 18-two bedroom and 6-three bedroom units. However according to the floor plan, the building is comprised of

# memo

24-one bedroom, 9-two bedroom and 3-three bedroom units (note Unit “F” could be considered either a 2BR + Den, or a 3 BR). Based on the floor plan, there are significantly less 2 BR and/or 3 BR than indicated by the data tables.

Adjustments have been made in the unit mix in various buildings, as mentioned above. Revised architectural sheets and a revised site data sheet are attached.

2. With respect to traffic circulation, the plan was revised to include the extension of NW 9<sup>th</sup> Court from Park Drive to Margate Blvd; however, there remains a variation in vehicular circulation and access to Building 22 (refer to General Comment #3 and Site Plan comment # 16). The PDP shows access to this building from NW 9<sup>th</sup> Court extension while the Site Plan provides for access directly from Margate Blvd.

Circulation is not seriously impacted. All public street circulation has been maintained. However, we have nonetheless connected the parking lot behind building 22 to NW 9<sup>th</sup> Ct. Revised sheets are attached. The design also provides for a possible future connection to the CRA owned parcel located to the west of Building 22, which would provide as many as 3 ways in and out of this relatively small parking lot.

3. Site Plan comment #3 noted that proposed angled parking (instead of parallel parking) throughout the site is not consistent with the PDP. The revised Site Plan reduces but does not eliminate the angled parking.

It is true that angled parking is provided in areas where site geometry makes it the best way to provide the maximum number of parking spaces in locations convenient to the buildings they serve. Angled parking is allowed by code and is not a material change. Angle parking was eliminated in the locations discussed in meetings with staff.

5. Comment #6 under Architectural Comments indicates that several smaller buildings shown on the PDP were merged into larger L shaped buildings. The Developer responded that doing this creates “a more interesting and diverse building pattern...” and that “Building height and mass complies with the Development Agreement.”

No response necessary.

If you have any questions or comments regarding the above, please don't hesitate to contact me.