



**REGULAR MEETING OF
THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE**
<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86849281206>
MINUTES

Tuesday, March 12, 2024

10:00 a.m.

City of Margate
901 NW 66th Avenue
Margate, FL 33063

PRESENT:

Elizabeth Taschereau, Director of Development Services
Andrew Pinney, AICP, Senior Planner
Christopher Gratz, AICP, Senior Planner
Paula Fonseca, Engineer, Department of Environmental and Engineering Services (DEES)
Todd Schepers, Chief Electrical Inspector, Building Department
Todd Belback, Community Development Inspector
David Scholl, Fire Marshall

ALSO PRESENT:

Matthew H. Scott, Esq., Dunay, Miskel & Backman, LLP
Karl Peterson, Traffic Engineer, Traftech Engineering/KBP Consulting
Michelle Latte, PLA, ASLA, Landscape Engineer, Kimley Horn
Teresa Cillalon Camacho, P.E., Civil Engineer, Kimley Horn
Austin Bouchard, Civil Engineer, Kimley Horn
Erick Ramires, Landscape Engineer, Kimley Horn (via Zoom)
Anette McSwain, Design Manager, MSA Architects
Amanda Martinez, President, Martinez Planning Associates, LLC
Saul Perez, Managing Member, Rez Se Land, LLC

The regular meeting of the Margate Development Review Committee (DRC) having been properly noticed, was called to order at 10:11 a.m. on Tuesday, March 12, 2024, at the City of Margate Commission Chambers, 5790 Margate Boulevard, Margate, FL 33063.

City Commission

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

City Manager

Cale Curtis

City Attorney

Weiss Serota Helfman
Cole & Bierman

City Clerk

Jennifer M. Johnson, MMC

Development Services Department

901 NW 66th Avenue, Suite C, Margate, FL 33063 • Phone: (954) 979-6213
www.margatefl.com • dsd@margatefl.com

NEW BUSINESSA) *ID2024-069***DRC NO. 23-00400043** THE FOREST APARTMENTS PLAT NOTE AMENDMENT**LOCATION:** 777-787 S. STATE ROAD 7**ZONING:** GATEWAY DISTRICT**LEGAL DESCRIPTION:** PARCEL "A", 441 SOUTH, LTD., II, AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 124, PAGE 41, OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA.**PETITIONER:** MATTHEW H. SCOTT, ESQ., AGENT FOR REZ SE LAND LLC.

Christopher Gratz, Senior Planner, introduced the item and explained the process to be followed. He outlined the resubmittal process briefly and asked whether the applicant had questions or needed clarification regarding the comments.

Matthew H. Scott, Esq., Dunay, Miskel & Backman, LLP, Agent for Rez Se Land LLC, stated it appeared there were only two (2) unresolved comments on this application. Mr. Gatz confirmed.

Attorney Scott read Engineering reference 21, "show updated road alignment easement." Saul Perez, Managing Member, Rez Se Land, LLC, advised that the update has been received.

Mr. Perez noted the reference to TOC in error. Mr. Gratz advised that it was not an error, and technically it was still correct, but from a presentation standpoint the words had been removed from the Code. He stated the application was still subject to the Code at the time it was submitted as it was written, but due to the elimination of the acronym, he had thought it best to eliminate it from the conversation.

Mr. Perez asked whether future insertions and references should also include removing the TOC. Mr. Gratz confirmed.

B) *ID2024-071***DRC NO. 23-00400044** THE FOREST APARTMENTS SITE PLAN**LOCATION:** 777-787 S. STATE ROAD 7**ZONING:** GATEWAY DISTRICT AND B-2, COMMUNITY BUSINESS DISTRICT**LEGAL DESCRIPTION:** A PORTION OF PARCEL "A", 441 SOUTH, LTD., II (PLAT BOOK 124, PAGE 41, B.C.R.) AND PARCEL "A", THE FOREST (PLAT BOOK 129, PAGE 16, B.C.R.); THE EAST 265', PARCEL "A", THE FOREST (PLAT BOOK 129, PAGE 16, B.C.R.); AND PARCEL "B", MINI MART DEVELOPMENT CORP. SUBDIVISION (PLAT BOOK 81, PAGE 49, B.C.R.).**PETITIONER:** MATTHEW H. SCOTT, ESQ., AGENT FOR REZ SE LAND LLC.

Mr. Gratz read the title of the item and stated this was the site plan for the office park. He noted this was DRC approval only, and no other public appearance process is required. He asked whether the applicant had questions or needed clarification regarding the comments.

Mr. Perez stated an additional parking field was being added to the back, and noted he wanted to make sure that was coordinated as some of the parking spaces will be used by the office as part of a shared parking agreement. He advised that Karl Peterson, Traffic Engineer, would address this in his parking statement.

Attorney Scott noted he had a question regarding CRA reference 55. Mr. Pinney stated the issue may have been a labeling error. He commented that the crosswalk was in an interior pedestrian zone, so there are no criteria for it, but it did not make sense that the width of the sidewalk dropped from seven (7) feet to five (5) feet.

Mr. Gratz noted there had been a discussion among staff as to it making more sense for the sidewalk to go the full width rather than having the landscape buffers on each side. Discussion continued. Mr. Perez stated he appreciated the suggestion and thought it was a good one. He noted the landscaper added the buffer to try to beautify the entrance, but they would investigate.

Attorney Scott highlighted Engineering reference 34, as follows:

Transportation: as FDOT pre-approval letter indicates, include evaluation of any needs for improvements at the intersection of SW 7th Street and SR-7 due to project traffic.

Karl Peterson, Traffic Engineer, Traftech Engineering/KBP Consulting, stated the intersection had been analyzed. He explained it is currently operating at Level of Service A, and would continue working at Level of Service A/B in the future. He advised it would be fair to say that from an operational standpoint, the intersection is functioning well. He noted there are side street delays, but that is customary on State Road 7 (SR-7), because Broward County has made a policy decision to emphasize traffic on SR-7.

Mr. Peterson pointed to Engineering reference 34, as follows:

Transportation: FDOT conducted a Road Safety Audit along SR-7/US-441 from Kimberly Boulevard/SW 11th Street to NW 31st Street. The report provided recommendations for improvement of SW 7th Street/SR-7 intersection. The developer shall review these recommendations and coordinate implementation with FDOT.

Mr. Peterson stated he was not familiar with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) report and asked if a copy could be made available for review. Staff agreed.

Mr. Gratz pointed out there is not a left turn arrow at the light. Mr. Peterson advised the lack of turn arrow is probably because the County does not want to run a split phase, because it would degrade the operation and drive up the delay on the intersection. He noted that would be a Broward County decision.

Mr. Gratz stated that looking at the numbers, it did not appear there were a lot of people going straight through. He noted a benefit of this project to the residents would be the ability to make a

left to go north on SR-7 as opposed to having to go out to the entrance and do a U-turn to go north. He asked if it would make more sense for one (1) lane to be right and straight and the other to be left only.

Paula Fonseca, Engineer, DEES, advised that her comment included any improvements recommended in the FDOT report. She asked whether there was a recommendation for a change to the signal speed based on the evaluation. Mr. Peterson stated there was not.

Mr. Peterson stated something to consider in relation to reassignment of lanes would be the geometric alignment and ensuring the receiving side was within the permissible offsets. Mr. Gratz projected a map of the intersection for further discussion.

Mr. Peterson advised that this was a philosophical difference in the traffic engineering field, and his personal preference is to keep throughs and lefts together because with a small number of vehicles going through, it is less likely to impede right turns. He reviewed the traffic counts briefly.

Mr. Pinney asked whether, instead of repurposing lanes, the stacking capacity of the dedicated turn lanes that already exist could be increased. Mr. Peterson stated he had looked at that, and the northbound left has more than twice what is needed, and the southbound right has no delay, but the eastbound right turn storage is relatively short with high demand. He noted the argument could be made to extend the eastbound right turn lane; however, it is an existing condition the project is not contributing to due to the location of the driveway.

Mr. Peterson read Engineering reference 35, as follows:

Transportation: Evaluate U-turn alternatives at SW 8th Court and Santa Catalina Lane going southbound on SR-7.

Mr. Peterson stated they had taken into consideration that rather than going to the signal at 7th Street to go north, some traffic would come out of the site and make a U-turn at 8th Court. He noted they had not anticipated many vehicles would go all the way to Santa Catalina Lane, though he saw that it would provide more distance to get across three (3) lanes of traffic. He commented that he knows the area well and there are a lot of breaks in traffic that would provide an opportunity to get across lanes, but it would not happen all the time. He stated the estimates were for 13 people to make the U-turn maneuver in the morning and seven (7) in the evening.

Mr. Pinney stated he did not predict anyone would do that maneuver during peak hour, as it is congested southbound at that intersection. Mr. Peterson agreed it would not be frequent, and noted they did not want to gloss over the option, because people will do it.

Mr. Peterson explained the turn lane at 8th Court has a storage capacity of 375 feet. He stated there were no counts conducted at that location, but he does not believe there will be a problem. He noted if there is an existing condition he is unaware of, he would review further.

Ms. Fonseca asked Mr. Peterson if he thought people were more likely to use Santa Catalina Lane because that the U-turn at 8th Court required getting across traffic fast. Mr. Peterson pointed out that the total predicted number could be divided between the two (2) intersections and not make much of an impact on operations. He stated he would elaborate on this point in the response to the comments.

Mr. Peterson read Engineering reference 53, as follows:

Transportation: Traffic study only references signal timing optimization at the Atlantic/SR-7 and Southgate/Rock Island Rose intersections; however, it fails to provide further details to optimize it.

Mr. Peterson stated when optimizing signals in a coordinated corridor like SR-7, the key is to hold the cycle length constant to allow for progression of traffic through the corridor. He noted what changes are the individual splits on the side streets, and those details can be highlighted in the response to the comments. He advised that optimization is being done based on today's conditions and projections, and once it is operational Broward County can be asked to review again and make changes based on conditions at that time.

Attorney Scott summarized that City staff would send the applicant the FDOT Road Safety Audit, and the applicant would check the project to ensure consistency with that report. Ms. Fonseca stated the report was for the greater area, but there were recommendations for the intersection at SR-7 and SW 7th Street.

Mr. Peterson left the meeting at 10:42 a.m.

Austin Bouchard, Civil Engineer, Kimley Horn, referenced Engineering reference 56, as follows:

The objective of DEES is to eliminate publicly owned utility infrastructure within private property. Utility plans will be reviewed during permitting process to achieve the aforementioned objective.

Mr. Bouchard stated they were trying to use the same system, and the applicant would like to vacate everything on site, if possible. Ms. Fonseca explained the main concern was accessing private property to repair breaks and maintain pipes.

Attorney Scott asked for clarification that the office side stays as-is, and the new development side has to be private. Mr. Bouchard stated it would require a master meter of some sort. Ms. Fonseca confirmed.

Attorney Scott commented on Zoning reference 19, an information-only comment, as follows:

The portion of the parking lot being purchased to serve the development must be joined either by the subdivision resurvey or with a Unity of Title to receive final site plan approval,

the parcel line is crooked, and the landscape buffer requirement between the properties is not being met on these plans.

Attorney Scott stated his understanding is that the Code permits off-site parking via an agreement which the City approves, not Unity of Title or subdivision resurvey.

Mr. Perez added that the intention is to combine the property with the parking lot so eventually it is treated as one (1), which was the reason they were trying to avoid the landscape buffer. Mr. Gratz asserted that at the end of the day, the two (2) properties need to become one (1) property, or they would need to comply with setback requirements on each. Attorney Scott reiterated that if this were an existing parking lot next to a new development, they would have to put in the buffer and could have an agreement.

Mr. Perez asked if they could make the agreement a requirement to pull the building permit, since they first have to subdivide the lot. Mr. Gratz stated it would be on final site plan approval.

Mr. Perez explained the back parcel is four (4) acres and needs to be subdivided into two (2) parcels. Mr. Gratz confirmed they were doing a subdivision resurvey, and they would be fee-simple parcels. Mr. Perez stated that needs to take place before the covenants are filed and asked that the sequencing be kept in mind.

Attorney Scott asked if the plan was to unify. Mr. Perez stated he would do as the City was asking and provide a document tying the properties together.

Mr. Gratz stated he understood the concern and asked that the response to the comment include the request to allow permits to be issued for the parking lot and make it a condition of the permit for the apartments.

Mr. Gratz asked if a landscape buffer was planned all the way around the parking lot property. Michelle Latte, Landscape Engineer, Kimley Horn, confirmed it was.

Attorney Scott advised that the air conditioning units needed to come off, as conceptually it needed to look like a parking lot to get approval on its own. Mr. Perez noted the project has a new engineering team with Kimley-Horn, and they have elected to place the air conditioning units on the roof.

C) ID2024-072

DRC NO. 23-00400045 THE FOREST APARTMENTS SUBDIVISION RESURVEY

LOCATION: 777-787 S. STATE ROAD 7

ZONING: GATEWAY DISTRICT AND B-2, COMMUNITY BUSINESS DISTRICT

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: A PORTION OF PARCEL "A", 441 SOUTH, LTD., II (PLAT BOOK 124, PAGE 41, B.C.R.) AND PARCEL "A", THE FOREST (PLAT BOOK 129, PAGE 16, B.C.R.); THE EAST 265', PARCEL "A", THE FOREST (PLAT BOOK 129, PAGE 16,

B.C.R.); AND PARCEL "B", MINI MART DEVELOPMENT CORP. SUBDIVISION (PLAT BOOK 81, PAGE 49, B.C.R.).

PETITIONER: MATTHEW H. SCOTT, ESQ., AGENT FOR REZ SE LAND LLC.

Mr. Gratz read the title of the item and advised that he had a comment to add, noting the title in the lien description on the subdivision resurvey needed to be corrected.

Mr. Perez stated Amanda Martinez was spearheading this issue and asked whether she had questions related to the comments. Ms. Martinez had no questions.

Attorney Scott read Engineering reference 24, as follows:

Code asks for "public access easement" as opposed to sidewalk easement shown on the subdivision resurvey plan. The landscaping and benches proposed on the site plan pose an issue being in an easement that is named sidewalk easement. The dimension of this easement needs to be closely coordinated with the site plan.

Mr. Gratz clarified that the name of the easement on the document needed to be changed to reflect its use.

D) *ID2024-073*

DRC NO. 23-00400046 THE FOREST APARTMENTS SITE PLAN

LOCATION: 787 S. STATE ROAD 7

ZONING: GATEWAY DISTRICT

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: SOUTH HALF OF PARCEL "A", 441 SOUTH, LTD., II (PLAT BOOK 124, PAGE 41, B.C.R.)

PETITIONER: MATTHEW H. SCOTT, ESQ., AGENT FOR REZ SE LAND LLC.

Mr. Gratz read the title of the item and shared the site plan on the screen.

Attorney Scott read Engineering reference 55, which asked for the location of the bus shelter to be provided. Mr. Perez advised that the proposed bus stop as suggested by the City would be placed in the same location where the bus stop currently is.

Ms. Fonseca stated there was information regarding the bus shelter, but no location shown on the site plan. Ms. Martinez noted the existing bus shelter was labeled and asked for direction as to correcting the issue. Mr. Gratz suggested "to be replaced" be added.

Mr. Gratz asked whether the applicant wanted to address the site plan and special exception together or separately. Attorney Scott asked that they be discussed together.

E) *ID2024-074*

DRC NO. 23-00400047 THE FOREST APARTMENTS SPECIAL EXCEPTION

LOCATION: 787 S. STATE ROAD 7

ZONING: GATEWAY DISTRICT**LEGAL DESCRIPTION: SOUTH HALF OF PARCEL "A", 441 SOUTH, LTD., II (PLAT BOOK 124, PAGE 41, B.C.R.)****PETITIONER: MATTHEW H. SCOTT, ESQ., AGENT FOR REZ SE LAND LLC.**

Mr. Gratz read the title of the item and stated the site plan would be heard simultaneously with the special exception application. He stated the site plan is an attachment to the special exception and must meet the criteria of the Code.

Attorney Scott pointed to Planning reference 26, an information-only comment, and advised there seems to be a disconnect between what the applicant is providing relative to the enlarged landscape plan. Ms. Latte stated the enlargement requested was on page LP-21, and asked if it was inadequate. Mr. Gratz asked for the addition of the setback distances from the curb, pavement, and right-of-way.

Mr. Perez advised that once it is finalized, the document would be colored, and full renderings would be provided that depict what the project will look like.

Ms. Latte asked about the reference to bike racks. Mr. Perez stated the applicant agrees with the City and will provide some sort of shelter to better protect the bike racks. He noted it would likely be a combination of indoor and outdoor, and advised that they are looking into several options. Discussion continued regarding how people store their bikes.

Mr. Gratz asked whether the Code requires that bike racks be outdoors. Mr. Pinney stated he believes it just needs to be close to the entrance and easy to use. Mr. Gratz advised it would be nice to have more green area and trees versus a bike rack nobody is using. He suggested finding a balance.

Attorney Scott commented on Zoning reference 42, which addresses trash chutes. He stated in his experience and in Mr. Perez's experience, apartment building would not have two (2) trash chutes. He noted that would be premium luxury product.

Mr. Perez stated the team was doing this type of luxury garden product in several communities, and typically there is a single trash chute for waste. He noted the intent is to operate with valet service, which would be optional but encouraged. He added that two (2) chutes is not being seen in the market, even in the highest-end condominiums.

Attorney Scott advised that the costs are enormous, and asked if the request was made because it is the intent of the City to encourage recycling. Mr. Pinney asked if there was any way to do the two (2) chutes next to each other and divert at the bottom. Mr. Perez stated he would be happy to provide numbers, but each chute ends up costing more than \$500,000.

Mr. Pinney stated what he has seen is that no one recycles when there is only one (1) chute, it all goes to the trash, and that is not the direction the City is headed. Mr. Perez responded that is not

how they foresee it. He noted with the valet trash system, there are two (2) bags for trash and recycling, and they don't expect people to throw away their own trash. Attorney Scott stated they would look at it but want to be up front that it is a challenge to comply with the request.

Mr. Gratz pointed out that one (1) of the requirements was the amount of recycling. Mr. Perez asserted that they believed they were meeting that. Ms. Martinez shared that each building has its own trash and recycling room, which will be managed by an experienced team handling the valet trash.

Mr. Pinney asked whether this level of detail was included in the narrative to explain solid waste service plans. Attorney Scott stated it was not. He noted the comment was received and would be addressed.

Mr. Perez advised that the community would be actively managed, with a staff of at least seven (7) ensuring it does not go into disrepair. He discussed an example in Plantation.

Mr. Gratz noted there were trash rooms, dumpsters, and a compactor on the plans and asked for clarification on the system. Anette McSwain, Design Manager, MSA Architects, advised that the item identified as dumpsters was actually transformers and stated she would make sure they were labeled. She explained that on trash day, the bin would be wheeled out of the building to the loading area for pickup and then wheeled back inside.

Mr. Pinney asked what happens with bulky trash, like a broken sofa or similar. Mr. Perez advised that typically, the tenant would have one (1) of the building's services remove it. He posited whether a compactor is needed if each building needs its own trash chute. He stated that area could be used as a gate area for bulk trash. He noted most of the bulk trash is associated with move outs. Discussion continued regarding how trash would be managed.

Attorney Scott stated the narrative would be updated and commented that the expectation from the applicant is that would be a building maintenance issue that ownership would maintain. Mr. Perez added that they would speak with Republic Services and staff to come up with solutions.

Mr. Pinney asked how the compactors were accessed by a truck. Mr. Perez that the Republic truck would go from building to building and pick up the bins in the loading areas. He noted he had confirmed this with Republic.

Mr. Pinney stated the trash chute keeps trash out of the elevators, but if recycling is picked up by a valet, it would go into the elevator. Mr. Perez agreed that the trash and recycling would go into the elevator. He noted residents can put trash and recycling out for pickup every day.

Attorney Scott shared that he had lived in a building that had a trash chute in a room, and in that room, there were recycling bins which building maintenance would come to pick up. He noted this might be a middle ground. Mr. Perez advised that he would analyze and report back.

Mr. Perez asked that they address landscaping briefly. He stated the City had provided a comment regarding the location of the park and he agrees it would be better to have the park on the north side because it is a better feature for the building and would be better design. He noted the park would be smaller due to space available on the north side, but more space than required was being provided and the south area would still be landscaped heavily to shield the equipment.

Mr. Pinney stated a nice meandering sidewalk was shown on the south side of the driveway, so they may be able to continue it and have a linear park concept. Mr. Perez confirmed that was the intent and asked if that should be shown in the calculations. Attorney Scott asked that the sketch be emailed to staff and discussed ensued briefly regarding working together to address large items prior to resubmission.

Mr. Scholl left the meeting at 11:20 a.m.

Attorney Scott asked that the next topic be the design. Mr. Perez stated the comments were based on the elevations, which are typically not indicative of the architecture. He highlighted that the applicant had listened to the City on special treatment of the first floor, but that would be more apparent in the building images.

Ms. McSwain shared actual images from another project, as well as renderings. Mr. Perez stated they were trying to work with the City to create a product everyone would be proud of.

Ms. McSwain reviewed options the team had developed in the past and asked for direction on what staff was interested in, such as more modern or classic. She noted the comments reflect the base, height, and mid-point of the building, and advised that she would break that down further in the next round of comments. Mr. Gratz stated the comments were based on CRA guidelines.

Mr. Perez pointed to images of the Casero Apartments, a project of the applicant in another community. He stated this project was designed by the same team and was commensurate with the finish level planned. He explained the plan was for two (2) elevators, one (1) for regular service and the other for use on moving days. Mr. Gratz stated colors and articulations should match South Florida. He noted decorative architectural elements are great but he does not like things that feel real and are not.

Attorney Scott commented that he doesn't like the false items either, but it is a way to break up walls. He asked if it was a preference, or something the City does not want. He noted the color comments were well taken. Discussion continued regarding the design examples provided.

Mr. Pinney asked about the balcony depths. Mr. Perez advised that the balcony depths vary but are useable. Ms. McSwain reviewed drawings and explained the standard depth was approximately five (5) feet and depending on the location it would have a slider or a door.

Mr. Gratz asserted there was no reason to provide a balcony if it is not large enough to use. He stated it must be comfortable and fit people. Mr. Perez stated they would look into it, but they do

not want to do anything that would impact the structure or become too expensive. He noted they will expand and vary where they can, but do not want to take away from living rooms. Attorney Scott stated there may be some level of agree to disagree if it was not a Code issue.

Mr. Gratz pointed out on C1, that when submitted, the den/office does not count for a parking space, as the Code had recently been changed.

Mr. Perez commented that the doors open inward due to corridor depth requirements, which would make the building wider and less efficient. Elizabeth Taschereau, Director of Development Services, stated Building Department Director Richard Nixon had pointed out the open corridors were allowed under the Building Code, but he wanted the applicant to check the Code related to placement of doors. Mr. Perez noted the example buildings shown all have open corridors.

Mr. Perez stated there is security in the community and it is actively managed with a concierge present 24 hours a day. He asked if the doors were a requirement. Todd Schepers, Chief Electrical Inspector, Building Department, advised this would be a question for Mr. Nixon. Ms. Taschereau stated the team would follow up with Mr. Nixon.

Ms. McSwain explained that one (1) of the reasons they decided to have six (6) foot corridors and the doors swinging in was because the site is tight due to parking and landscaping, and this allows for reduction in the overall width of the building. Ms. Taschereau suggested the team reach out to Mr. Nixon.

Mr. Perez asked if it would be helpful to submit formal renderings with the next package. Ms. Taschereau suggested they first have a conversation regarding the Building Code issues.

Attorney Scott stated the Building Code issues are easy because they are black and white. He noted what Mr. Perez was referencing was that there were clearly concerns from staff regarding the design, and renderings show it is much nicer than the elevations depict. Mr. Gratz asked that they show exactly what was planned. Discussion continued regarding the renderings.

Ms. McSwain pointed to comments regarding overall access from SR-7 to the preserve. She highlighted two (2) gates to allow accessibility but still have a safe neighborhood. Mr. Perez stated the plan was to program the gates to be fully open during the day, with signage to allow access during park hours. Mr. Gratz advised that was exactly what he was looking for. He noted the preserve is a huge benefit to the community and he wanted to make sure that was maintained.

Mr. Bouchard stated the applicant is working with Broward County regarding the drainage agreement, but the process may not be complete prior to DRC approval. Ms. Fonseca responded that staff understands it is a longer process, but they will not be issuing engineering permits until that is in place.

Attorney Scott stated he had no further questions. He asked for clarification of the next submittal deadline. Mr. Gratz stated there were many moving parts to work out, and advised the deadline

for review by the Planning and Zoning Board and Commission was in August. He discussed the opportunity for flexibility in scheduling.

Mr. Perez advised that the goal was to make the next submission in about 30 days. He noted they would rather get it right than to do it twice.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 11:47 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "E. Taschereau", is written above a horizontal line.

Elizabeth Taschereau, Director of Development Services