

Mayor
Lesa Peerman

Vice Mayor
Joanne Simone

Commissioners
Brian Donahue
Tommy Ruzzano
Frank B. Talerico



City Manager
Jerry A. Blough

City Attorney
Eugene M. Steinfeld

City Clerk
Joseph J. Kavanagh

REGULAR MEETING OF THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE

January 16, 2014

PRESENT:

Ben Ziskal, Director of Economic Development
Kelly McAtee, Engineering Manager
Dan Booker, Fire Inspector
Abe Stubbins, Engineering Inspector I
Andrew Pinney, Associate Planner
Dan Topp, Code Compliance Officer

ALSO PRESENT:

Jay Huebner, HSQ Group, Inc., agent for
Celebration Pointe North, LLC
Omar Fonte, Manager, Celebration Pointe
North, LLC

ABSENT:

Chris Cotler, Building Official (excused)
Sam May, Director of Public Works
Lt. Charles Konecke, Police

The regular meeting of the Margate Development Review Committee (DRC), having been properly noticed, was called to order by Benjamin Ziskal, Director of Economic Development at 9:33 AM on Thursday, January 16, 2014, in the Commission Chambers at City Hall, 5790 Margate Boulevard, Margate, Florida 33063.

1) Approval of January 2, 2014 DRC meeting minutes.

Ben Ziskal stated that since there were no comments on the minutes, they would be approved as written.

2) DRC NO. 01-14-02. PETITION: Consideration of a **plat note amendment**, in order to change the current restriction of the bedroom mix for 580 garden apartments. (Tabled from 1/2/14)

LOCATION: 2850 North State Road 7

ZONING: PUD Planned Unit Development District

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Tract A, of "CELEBRATION POINTE PLAT," as recorded in Plat Book 178, Page 68, of the public records of Broward County, Florida.

PETITIONER: Jay Huebner, HSQ Group, Inc., agent for Celebration Pointe North, LLC.

Jay Huebner explained that the original plat note was based on the first site plan for a bedroom mix of 580 units. He added that the previous developer sold this property to a new developer who had made minor modifications to the site plan to include changes to the buildings and bedroom mix; however, the total unit count is the same.

DRC Comments:

Andrew Pinney remarked that a revised SCAD letter is required for the new bedroom mix.

3) **DRC NO. 01-14-03. PETITION:** Consideration of a PUD (**planned unit development amendment**), in order to change number of dwelling units from 290 to 282, change the bedroom mix of the dwelling units, change the size of the dwelling units, and provide a new club house layout and design for Phase I of Celebration Pointe. (Tabled from 1/2/14)

LOCATION: 2850 North State Road 7

ZONING: PUD Planned Unit Development District

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Tract A, of "CELEBRATION POINTE PLAT," as recorded in Plat Book 178, Page 68, of the public records of Broward County, Florida.

PETITIONER: Jay Huebner, HSQ Group, Inc., agent for Celebration Pointe North, LLC.

Jay Huebner stated that modifications were made to the original PUD which are reflected in and attached to the new site plan. He noted that based on the last DRC meeting and comments from the Planning and Zoning Board, they updated this plan's calculations and came up with additional language for the garage parking. He said that Management will monitor the vehicular parking with tenants who have two cars; residents may utilize a stall in the driveway and a space in the garage.

DRC Comments:

Andrew Pinney had the following remarks:

- A minor correction on the cover page should be made to reflect the year 2014.
- Page 6, bullet point B, shows the overall acreage of the entire PUD which includes Phase I & II. Just below that, only the acreage for Phase 1 is shown. The acreage should be clarified.
- Also on page 6, the overall sidewalk acreage is shown as .9 acres; however, Phase I alone shows .94 acres. The acreage on the open space should be verified, as well.
- On page 7, the surrounding areas for land use and zoning should be updated
-
-

- On page 9, correct the required formula for the parking calculations. Reference the variance (BA-19-2008) that was granted for this property and what the City Commission had approved for minimum parking.
- On page 15, bullet point B, the school enrollment data needs to be updated to reflect the current year. Currently, you are showing 20 day enrollment data reflecting the 2007-2008 enrollment year. Towards the back of the PUD amendment, page numbers are missing.
- On the page with bullet point E, noting landscaping standards, item number 2 references a 6 foot high decorative fence that would be provided along commercial projects. Currently, there is no contiguous 6 foot high decorative mason wall between this property and the commercial property; one would have to be provided. I recommend that you try to tie into the existing wall to avoid gaps.
- The language should be updated from "fence" to "decorative mason wall".

Kelly McAtee had the following comments:

- On page 3, replace Reddy Chitepu with Ben Ziskal as the local government contact.
- Water and sewer service is now calculated per capita, per bedroom and is based off of ERC's. Apartments are rated at 0.66 ERC's per unit for sanitary sewer and 0.537 ERC's for water; its 335 gallons per day per ERC. The City has plenty of capacity but be sure to follow the Code.
- On page 12, the referenced Water Withdrawal Permit is set to expire in 2008; this should be updated to reflect the current year.
- The traffic calculations for the change from town homes to apartments now reflect a slight increase in peak hour traffic; are you going to address that with the County?

Jay Huebner stated that the traffic calculations have been addressed with the County and are reflected in the Land Use Plan Amendment; changing the total units from 412 to 580.

Ben Ziskal added the following:

- On page 13, item 3, the existing land use isn't changing; the word "land" is a very technical term so it should be omitted.
- Does this amendment change anything that you are doing or does the increase from 412 to 580 units have to be referenced? I don't think the 412 units are necessary to reference now.
- You should reflect the current impact that hasn't already been mitigated. Include a statement to reflect the additional impact that the solid waste will have on the additional units; to be consistent, reference the 580 units.
- The next page mentions a contribution to the Parks & Recreation Trust Fund; if the mitigation based on a population of three acres per thousand hasn't been paid yet, the analysis of the number of people added should be based on 255 units to 580 units instead of from 412 units to 580 units. We want to make sure we reference the correct impact so that the mitigation amount is accurate.

- In item 3, "quantify the change in need for park acreage resulting from this amendment", to be clear include language that will refer to payment of this amount in phases. The first would use the 255 units already credited.
- Item 17 references the existing zonings within a mile of this site; get together with Mr. Pinney to obtain the current zoning districts for your table.
- On the last page, Zoning Statement Phase I, there is a reference to townhouse projects; remove that reference to keep it consistent throughout.
- Because this will go to the City Commission for a public hearing, provide a summary statement referencing the purpose for the change of the bedroom count, the clubhouse and all of the items in the title.

Jay Huebner said that they have updated everything to reflect the 580 units. He explained that each level of service has to be reviewed independently and that solid waste isn't an issue because there would be no mitigation; it's pay as you go. He stated that they have a solution for the Parks and Recreation Trust Fund fees; not to pay for the 580 units up front, but to pay for the phases as they are built.

Omar Fonte suggested that they could continue the solid block wall on their side of the property to match the neighboring commercial property. He said that instead of the appearance of the wall jogging and not matching up, they could connect a chain link fence, covered in hedges, to make the wall appear contiguous. He noted that it would look clean and that nobody would be able to tell that the block wall wasn't actually connected throughout the property line.

Andrew Pinney agreed that this was a reasonable solution and that the petitioner should include this detail in their plans.

4) DRC NO. 01-14-04. PETITION: Consideration of a **site plan amendment**, to permit a reduction in the number of dwelling units from 290 to 282, a reduction in the perimeter buffer, and modifications to the parking lot and building foot prints of Phase I of Celebration Pointe. (Tabled from 1/2/14)

LOCATION: 2850 North State Road 7

ZONING: PUD Planned Unit Development District

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Tract A, of "CELEBRATION POINTE PLAT," as recorded in Plat Book 178, Page 68, of the public records of Broward County, Florida.

PETITIONER: Jay Huebner, HSQ Group, Inc., agent for Celebration Pointe North, LLC.

Jay Huebner stated that they were making a revision to currently approved site plan which includes minor modifications to the buildings; however, the site will remain the same. He explained that they were doing this to match the new blueprint.

DRC Comments:

Andrew Pinney was concerned that the gate access for visitors has no turnaround and would leave nowhere for the guest to go if the homeowner doesn't open gate for them.

Jay Huebner said that this was discussed at the last meeting and that they still don't have a solution.

Omar Fonte explained that they could have an escape button installed with a secondary gate inside. He said that this would allow a guest to enter the community through the first gate and then turn around before the second gate; which would remain closed.

Jay Huebner thought that this may work for passenger cars but not for larger vehicles.

Andrew Pinney had the following comments:

- The perimeter wall has a separate landscape buffer requirement. Since our last DRC meeting, the City had adopted some changes which include maximum sod areas. Revisit your landscape calculations again.
- Provide a table on the landscape plan that illustrates provided landscape, as well as required landscape.
- On your tree species list, there were 6 species that were not identified in the City Code. Could you substitute these for another species or have your landscape architect meet with me so I can assign a value to these? You may swap these trees for trees that are listed on the City's approved list.
- Sheet L-2 shows a table; however, it's grayed out and illegible.
- Sheet L-1 doesn't match the rest of the site plan. It still shows the 25 foot perimeter buffer, meandering internal walks and its missing the trash compactor in the NW corner.
- You received a variance to reduce the 25 foot perimeter buffer; provide a detailed pedestrian connection, including the gate access, to Coral Gate Park.

Dan Topp noted that there were some open cases with Code Compliance. He acknowledged that some work had been done on this property but that there were still some trash and debris issues. He said that there was a lot of work done at the entrance; however, a broken fence, leaning wall and a sign frame still need to be addressed. He remarked that upon an inspection of the perimeter, a part to the north of the canal had some trees laying in it.

Omar Fonte said that he had spoken with Code Compliance Officer Trappberger and has scheduled a meeting with her this coming Tuesday to work on these issues. He noted that upon Code's suggestion, they have already removed a monument wall. He also said that the broken fence is on the commercial property and not theirs.

Abe Stubbins had the following comments:

- The proposed lift station and it needs to be installed before removing old one.
- On sheet CE-1, what is the additional manhole outside of the existing one being used for?
- The City may want to salvage the old lift station parts when you abandon it.
- What is the timetable till you break ground on Phase II?

- Plans show filling in that canal on the east side of the property; however, other properties, such as the condos adjacent to this property in Coral Gate, drain into that canal. The drain lines go into that system.
- You will need an agreement from the Coral Gate Homeowners Association for access on the NE portion of the property.
- There are no grading elevations shown for the drainage around the proposed building. The City may suggest adding some yard drains. We need to know where water will flow.
- Regarding the easement around the lake, is this a private lake, and if so, who will maintain it?

Jay Huebner addressed Mr. Stubbins' comments. He explained that the existing lift station serves the adjoining commercial property and that they will install a temporary bypass between the property and the lift station. He stated that the existing sewer runs through a proposed lake and that the manhole that is now there connects to the commercial property heading east. He added that they'll install another manhole to create a temporary bypass using pumps and a force main; which will then serve as the Phase II sewer manhole. He explained that this whole process will then allow them to have a bypass in place so that they could demo the rest of the property for the north portion of the shopping center. He added that they will not touch the south shopping center at this time; as that will be part of Phase II. He noted that they will have an emergency pump and vac trucks on hand, and after it's certified, they will be able to run the new system. He agreed that the City may salvage the old lift station parts; however, they won't be available for at least 18 months until Phase II breaks ground. Mr. Huebner stated that he didn't think that the hard pipe drained into the canal because it wasn't showing that way for them. He explained that they could pick it up, if necessary, and noted that the other ditch/canal going into Phase II would be left alone since the land is heavily wooded. He remarked that they had obtained an agreement from the Coral Gate HOA in 2006 and would reconfirm that with them; as they were happy at that time to have another access to their property for emergency purposes. He noted that the flowage of water would be addressed on the final engineering plans. He said that the easement around the lake would be maintained by the apartment complex and that the County requires a lake maintenance agreement.

Omar Fonte confirmed that Allstate Resource Management had been hired and is currently onsite maintaining this lake.

Kelly McAtee inquired as to why the PUD application states that the lake would be maintained by the Cocomar Drainage District, when in fact, the complex will maintain it. He asked that the PUD be updated to reflect that fact.

Abe Stubbins had the following comments:

- The plans should reflect a 10 inch force main, rather than a 12 inch, at the entrance.
- An FDOT permit will be required for working in the right of way.
- The plans should detail the leased property on the west side, by 441 at the entrance, which has access to the North and South shopping centers.
- There should be crosswalks across the driveways for pedestrians.

- There is an existing easement at the lift station that needs to be vacated before the C.O. will be issued.

Jay Huebner replied that they are in the process of getting the portion of property in question transferred from the DOT to the City of Margate. He didn't believe that the existing easement affected them because it doesn't seem to encroach into any building paths.

Kelly McAtee stated that there are additional easements for the gravity lines in the shopping center and Phase II and that as long as the City maintains Lift Station 5, they would need an easement agreement. He acknowledged the hardship that this may have on the petitioner and said that the City may be able to grant a temporary easement agreement so that work could proceed.

Abe Stubbins said that the water line connection at the entrance needs to have a loop installed because, if there's a break, the whole system would have to be shut down. He explained that if a break were to occur north of 441 and the existing meter, water wouldn't flow to the east side of the property unless the line was looped. He said that the line shown connecting to the north is not tied into anything; the City line dead ends there. He suggested disconnecting the line at the entrance.

Kelly McAtee had the following comments:

- Code states that if a building has sprinklers, there must be a fire hydrant within 50 feet. Not all of the buildings in your plan meet this requirement. The spacing between hydrants in this zoning district is 300 feet maximum.
- Any meters 2 inches or greater must be compound meters and a bypass.
- On your drawings, to the east of where you're tying in to the 12 inch City line, you show a reducer symbol for the water main; but later on there are callouts for 4 x 12 "T's" to serve the FTC's. This reduction is not clear; is it an 8 inch or 10 inch line? Use the reducer symbol and callouts where applicable.
- On the drive aisle going from north to south, just to the east of the reducer, you moved some water lines. A "T" connection is shown; however, it doesn't connect to the water main. A drafting correction needs to be made.
- If you choose to use sub meters for units instead of master meters, the City requires yearly reports and mandates that it remain non-profitable.
- Are you using lake or City water for irrigation? If you are using lake water, you will need to obtain a water use permit.
- On Sheet CE-2, the sidewalks are labeled as both 4 feet and 5 feet wide; however, the PUD application lists 6 feet wide sidewalks. The labeling should be consistent. I think 5 feet is the minimum width.
- On Sheet CE-3, there's a concrete valley gutter detail; we can't tell where it's being used. The plan shows grass on one side of the valley gutter and pavement on the other side; we couldn't determine which is being used.
- Before paving, rock as-builts are required.
- Most of the sheets list 2.28 acres for the lake size, which matches the PUD application; however, some sheets show 2.31 acres.

- Maintain drainage easements throughout the entire property.
- There is one location on the easternmost island in the parking area that shows a tree directly over the 6 inch force main coming from the new lift station. I recommend that you relocate that tree.
- Check with Engineering for standards and any changes that may have been made before you start erecting the new lift station. We can provide information on pressures along 441 so that the pumps can be sized correctly. Pressures can change as we upgrade our force mains throughout the City.
- We are under the impression that there was some damage to the existing private sewer lines in that area because we getting a lot of infiltration in that basin. In your final engineering plans, we need you to work with us to limit filtration. The damage to the pipes needs to be addressed because when you tie into the City line at Phase 2 in the future, bypassing the sewage from the north down to the south, could affect the flow to the lift station and we don't want to have additional water infiltrate in or lose sewage.
- The light pole locations on the photometric and landscape plans need to be tweaked for illumination levels. Some light pole locations don't match. You may need to move a tree due to its close proximity to a pole.
- On the plans, there are only two garbage and recycling locations listed on the property. This is not a Code requirement, but the City would like you to consider providing more locations for more convenient access to all of the residents.
- Historical data shows that no more than eight rental units could use a single 96 gallon recycling bin. You are showing only six bins of that size; which may fill up quick. It is recommended that you provide more recycling bins since residents will likely utilize the trash bins if all of the recycling bins are full.
- The City can't provide exact impact fees at this point because the new Developer's Agreement is being worked on at this time.
- Tree removal permits are required from DEES.

Jay Huebner stated that they would install a 12 inch loop between the water plant and State Road 7. He said that on the drawings, the reducer symbol refers to a reduction from the east of a 12 inch to an 8 inch line. He confirmed that they would be using lake water for irrigation. He explained that the sidewalks are 5 feet and 6 feet wide, depending on where they are located. He confirmed that the concrete valley gutter detail was being used at the roundabout. He said that there was a discrepancy in the measurement of the acreage because they weren't sure if the DOT or the City owned the small piece of property in the front; he will adjust it to 2.28 acres. He also said that all the sewers that will not be used in Phase 2 will be plugged at the manholes and that they probably do have some infiltration in them.

Abe Stubbins asked if the petitioner was going to keep the 6 inch a/c water lines in place. He expressed that there may be a problem with the wall being installed too close to the lines.

Kelly McAtee suggested that columns could be used.

Abe Stubbins asked if removable panels could be an option.

Omar Fonte expressed that they could install an aluminum picket fence, if that's okay with the City. He said that they have done that with other projects and that it's easy to move when necessary by removing just four tap-cons. He suggested that they could also erect a precast or block wall for that particular section.

Ben Ziskal had the following closing comments:

- He would look into the fencing issue and decide upon the best alternative.
- The site plan stops here and it will not have to go on to the Planning & Zoning Board or the City Commission.
- The Developer's Agreement is being reviewed by the City Attorney.
- Replacement of the pipe connecting into Coral Gate Park and improvements to the entrance should be addressed.
- You can submit the plat application to our department and then it will go to the City Commission. Mr. Pinney will give you the additional applications that you need
- To save some time, you are encouraged to submit preliminary permits to Building Department. Make the suggested corrections and submit back to us as three final signed and sealed plans.

Jay Huebner added that they would like to change the name into the community from Rancho Boulevard to Celebration Pointe.

5) General Discussion

There was no general discussion.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:47 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Prepared by:
Alyson Morales

Benjamin J. Ziskal, AICP
Director of Economic Development

cc: Mayor and City Commission, City Manager, City Attorney, Associate City Planner, Petitioners, Committee Members.