CITY OF
MARGATE
Together We Make It Great

City Commission
Mayor Joanne Simone
Vice Mayor Tommy Ruzzano
Joyce W. Bryan
Lesa Peerman
Frank B. Talerico

City Manager
Douglas E. Smith

City Attorney
Eugene M. Steinfeld

City Clerk
Joseph J. Kavanagh

REGULAR MEETING OF THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE

Tuesday, August 25, 2015
10:00 AM
City of Margate
Municipal Building

PRESENT:
Ben Ziskal, AICP, CEcD, Director of Economic Development
Tom Vaughn, Interim Building Director
Diane Colonna, CRA Executive Director
Dan Booker, Interim Fire Chief
Jeanine Athias, Engineer
Andrew Pinney, Associate Planner
Dan Topp, Code Compliance Officer

ALSO PRESENT:
Jay Huebner, HSQ Group, Inc.
John D'Eri, Rising Tide Car Wash

ABSENT:
Sam May, Director of Public Works
Michael Jones, Director of Parks and Recreation
Efrain Suarez, Police
Abraham Stubbins, Utilities

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, August 25, 2015**, in the Commission Chambers at City Hall, 5790 Margate Boulevard, Margate, Florida 33063.

---

1) APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE MAY 26, 2015, JUNE 9, 2015, AND THE JULY 7, 2015 DRC MEETINGS.

The minutes for May 26, 2015 and July 7, 2015 were approved as written.
In the minutes for June 9, 2015, Jeanine Athias stated that there was a typographical error in a comment she made, as well as corrections needed to comments made by Abe Stubbins. She said she would email the corrections.

2) OLD BUSINESS
   A. **DRC NO. 08-15-01** CONSIDERATION OF A PLAT AMENDMENT FOR CELEBRATION POINTE
   LOCATION: 2850 N. STATE ROAD 7
   ZONING: PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (PUD)
   LEGAL DESCRIPTION: A PORTION OF TRACT "A", OF "CELEBRATION POINTE", ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF, AS RECORDED IN PLAT

BOOK 178, PAGE 67, OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA.
PETITIONER: JAY HUEBNER, HSQ GROUP, INC.

Jay Huebner, engineer and planner for Celebration Pointe with HSQ Group, stated that phase one of the project was underway and that the same developer purchased property on the south portion of the site for phase two. As such, they were coming in with a site plan and PUD amendment. He explained that phase two would be a higher end product with a different bedroom mix than was originally planned. He said phase two would have less units and a different bedroom mix, resulting in a need to modify the plat note amendment.

Tom Vaughn had no comments.

Dan Booker had no comments.

Andrew Pinney asked that they attach narrative to their application that indicated the change in unit mix on the note, i.e., existing note and proposed note.

Jeanine Athias concurred with Mr. Pinney's comments.

Dan Topp had no comments.

Diane Colonna had no comments.

Ben Ziskal commented that they would need to coordinate with the School Board and make them aware of the new bedroom count mix.

After receipt of the requested narrative, Mr. Ziskal said the item would move forward to Planning and Zoning and then on to City Commission.

B. **DRC NO. 08-15-02** CONSIDERATION OF REZONING FOR CELEBRATION POINTE.
LOCATION: 2850 N. STATE ROAD 7
ZONING: PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (PUD)
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: A PORTION OF TRACT "A", OF "CELEBRATION POINTE", ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF, AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 178, PAE 67, OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA.
PETITIONER: JAY HUEBNER, HSQ GROUP, INC.

Ben Ziskal read the item title.

Jay Huebner, planner and engineer for HSQ Group, explained that the property was already zoned Planned Unit Development (PUD) and that under the PUD guidelines there were specific details that referenced the actual development of the project. The PUD allowed them to have flexibility in their design to customize the project. He explained that initially the PUD was written for the development of phase one but now

there were two phases. He said that much of phase two was written exactly as phase one but there were some customized items in phase two that they detailed separately as best as possible. He said that overall it was one site and one PUD.

Thomas Vaughn had no comments.

Dan Booker had no comments.

Andrew Pinney's comments included the following:

- He asked that they provide information on the parent company of Celebration Pointe South in the Business Summary page of the PUD Application, noting that they were a new corporation formed for the development of phase two.
- He referenced page 10, parking calculation, and said that 555 spaces were required but garage spaces in a multi-family structure could not be counted. He said a variance similar to what was required for phase one would be needed if they planned to use the same type of design.
- On page 11, the parking spaces were described as 9 feet wide by 16 feet deep with a two foot overhang on a 7 foot sidewalk. Mr. Pinney said the Code required wheel stops any time a parking space abutted a sidewalk and does not allow overhang. Mr. Huebner asked if it required a variance; Mr. Pinney said he would look into it after the meeting.
- On page 11, he asked if the sidewalk described for pedestrian circulation could be widened to more than four feet. Mr. Huebner said that phase two did not have any sidewalks at four foot; there were a few areas in phase one that had the four foot minimum. He said phase two had a five foot minimum and most were seven foot wide.
- On page 11, he asked that they separate the open space requirements for phase one and phase two for a clearer distinction.
- On pages 12 and 14, sanitary sewer and potable water references, he said the density numbers need to be updated to reflect the current density of 580 allowed in the land use plan.
- In section 18 E, landscaping, he asked it be updated from chapter 12-1/2 to chapter 23. Also, in 18E, 5, he said he thought the 10-foot perimeter landscape buffer was for phase one only. Mr. Huebner responded that they were previously advised to do the buffer for the entire site. Mr. Pinney said he would check the minutes.

Jeanine Athias had no comments.

Dan Topp had no comments.

Diane Colonna had no comments.

Ben Ziskal had no further comments. Once changes were made, the item would move forward to Planning and Zoning he said.

C. **DRC NO. 08-15-03** CONSIDERATION OF SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR CELEBRATION POINTE
LOCATION: 2850 NORTH STATE ROAD 7
ZONING: PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (PUD)
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: A PORTION OF TRACT "A", OF "CELEBRATION POINTE", ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF, AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 178, PAGE 67, OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA.
PETITIONER: JAY HUEBNER, HSQ GROUP, INC.

Jay Huebner, HSQ Group, planner and engineer for Celebration Pointe, explained that the phase two project was designed to be an upscale development with larger units and other distinctions to set it apart from the phase one project. He described a new feature whereby the stairway went from the ground floor up to the third floor and each unit had its own individual entrance. He said a large lake was put in to meet drainage requirements. He said they put in a walkable trail around the lake, a club house and amenities. He spoke about how there would be two entrances: the main entrance for residents and visitors, the club house, and rental office; the secondary entrance would be for residents only. He said there would be two means of egress into the project. He pointed out a dead end area and said that they would provide an emergency cross access at the gated entrance for exit purposes. He said they were originally going to build 290 units but decided to build 252 larger units. He said the units would have garages for the individual unit owners unlike the common area garages built for phase one. The parking spaces would be mandated for parking use only. Like phase one, he said they would have a ten-foot landscape buffer around the perimeter. Also, he said the existing walls along the western property line would be extended and they would maintain them. He said residents to the south side of the property would have access to the canal. He said they would maintain a very good buffer along the eastern property line.

Tom Vaughn had no comments.

Dan Booker commented that the radiuses on the plan looked good; he asked that they check that the FDC's were within 50 foot of the hydrant. He also asked that the underground and fire department access be in place before they started trussing. Mr. Huebner asked if they could get together after the meeting.

Andrew Pinney had the following comments:

- Section 19.7E required a 25 foot buffer. He said he would check to see if the variance that was given was for the whole project or just phase one and he would respond back to Mr. Huebner.

- He said he noticed that the project was well lit with levels as high as 8.3 foot candles. He said they might want to consider reducing the light levels slightly. Mr. Huebner acknowledged that the light levels were high and were probably in the range of 50-60 foot candles. He said the issue had to do with the placement of the light poles due to the road design and the allowable options

for their placement. He said it resulted in more light than needed but he would see if they could reduce it.

- Noted that the dimensions for the parallel parking spaces on the west property line were bigger than Code required but they were missing the nine foot pull-out at the front spot. He noted it might be a striping issue but the nine foot pull-out needed to be shown.

- Advised there was a setback requirement for monument signs of ten foot from an interior property line. Mr. Huebner said there was no room to move the sign back. He questioned whether it applied since it was on the interior of their property and not up against any property lines. Mr. Pinney said it might be meant for an adjoining property that had different ownership so they might be some leniency on the requirement.

- Asked that they check to make sure there was clearance between the dumpster/trash compactor in the southeast corner because it appeared to hang over the handicapped parking stall.

- Noted the site plan showed a fence along the west property line but Code required a six foot masonary wall to divide the residential and commercial properties.

- Asked that they add a few more location measurements on the site plan for the building placements to facilitate permitting.

- On landscaping plans L-1 and L-3, he said the Code required a non-deciduous category one tree every 25 foot on the western property line in a staggered pattern. He asked to have the spacing adjusted and add a label to identify the trees.

Jeanine Athias made the following comments:

- Advised that they speak to Leo in DEES to obtain the impact fees. Asked that they add additional valves to ensure water to all buildings in case of a break.

- Noted there was no utility connection shown for Building #3 and advised there should be two taps per building (sprinkler and meter).

- Asked that they consider more than one location for the dumpster or change the location to be centralized for all the units.

- Noted that some of the landscaping conflicted with the utility locations.

- Advised that a main line easement was needed. She said the plan showed a 24- foot easement but only a 12-foot was needed. Mr. Huebner said it might be because they had the water and sewer running parallel.

- She said they would need to vacate the existing easement at the end of the project as it would be in the middle of the lake. Prior to vacating it, they needed to give them a new easement so they could service the lift station and other utilities. Mr. Huebner acknowledged that they would need to coordinate to maintain sewer connections to commercial buildings as they did for phase one.

- Asked that they check their hydrant spacing on the north and east sides to ensure it did not exceed the maximum of 300 feet.

- Advised they would need to amend their construction plans for phase one to reflect a change that was made to the entrance at the roundabout for phase one.

- Advised that they would need an engineering permit.

Dan Topp had no comments.

Diane Colonna had no comments.

Ben Ziskal commented that the PUD document referenced a possible phase three development that could utilize the 46 units that were not being built in phase two. He said if the 46 units were not going to be used, the City would need to get the units back so they could be used on another project. Mr. Huebner agreed to meet with Mr. Ziskal to discuss further.

Dan Booker asked whether each unit would have its own stairwell access. Mr. Huebner responded that the third floor would be accessed via a separate stairwell; the second floor would have an internal sidewalk that was accessed from a first floor stairwell. Mr. Booker asked that they confirm what was required under the fire prevention code in terms of emergency and exit signs and possibly the fire alarm system.

Omar Fonte, Celebration Pointe South, said that residents on the first floor would enter directly from the garage; access to the second floor was through the interior stairwell on the first floor. Mr. Fonte said that they were looking to offer the project as a "for sale" product and the intent would be to offer a valet service for waste services.

Mr. Pinney reminded them that a vesting verification letter from the School Board would be needed as part of the site plan process for phase two.

Ben Ziskal advised them [Celebration Pointe] to work with the respective departments to make the necessary revisions, and that they would not need to come back before DRC.

3) NEW BUSINESS

A. **DRC NO. 08-15-04** CONSIDERATION OF A SPECIAL EXCEPTION FOR MIAMI GRILL
LOCATION: 619 NORTH STATE ROAD 7
ZONING: TOC-C CORRIDOR
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: LOTS 8, 13, 14 & 15, BLOCK 2, SECTION 2, OF "HAMMON HEIGHTS", ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF, AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 34,PAGE 46, OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA.

No one from Miami Grill was present at the meeting. Ben Ziskal advised that the item would be tabled until the next meeting.

B. **DRC NO. 08-15-05** CONSIDERATION OF A SPECIAL EXCEPTION USE FOR RISING TIDE CAR WASH
LOCATION: 2970 NORTH STATE ROAD 7
ZONING: TOC-C CORRIDOR
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: A PORTION OF PARCEL "A", OF "PLATTS PLAT", ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF, AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 138, PAGE 48, OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA.
PETITIONER: JAY HUEBNER, HSQ GROUP, INC.

Ben Ziskal read the item title.

Jay Huebner, civil engineer and planner for HSQ Group, explained that the project was to be a car wash located on a vacant parcel at the corner of State Road 7 and 29th Street. He said they had been working with the office/condo personnel on the project and they had worked out the issues concerning utilities, storm water, and access. He said the main access to the car wash would be off State Road 7 onto 29th Street, through the existing access at the office complex and then a right turn into the car wash area. He said they would have dual lane roads and plenty of stacking for cars during busy times. Mr. Huebner explained the car wash process. He said they would be stubbing out from the utilities, water and sewer drainage that were already to the site. He said they had drainage on site and they had coordinated with the adjacent neighbor to provide easements that allowed them to discharge. He said the entire complex discharged into Celebration Pointe. Mr. Huebner said parking would not be an issue; the parking they would use would be short term for cleaning the cars. He said they worked closely with City staff to meet the new look for State Road 7 which had the building up close to the road with a 12-foot sidewalk.

Tom Vaughn had no comments.

Dan Booker had no comments.

Andrew Pinney provided the following comments:

- Add bicycle parking calculation and bicycle rack facilities as required by Code.

- Notate driveway connections on east side of property; Code limited one way driveways to no more than 14 feet. Mr. Huebner commented that one he pointed out already existed; Mr. Pinney said he would look at it further.
- Specify the degree of the angled parking. Mr. Huebner responded that they were bigger than what Code required.
- Limit the number of signs to one per wall. Mr. Pinney advised that signage would be handled separately and would not hold up the site plan.
- Verification of the spacing of the trees on the State Road 7 frontage. He said spacing for category two should be every 18 feet. Also, he said the Florida
- Department of Transportation (FDOT) staff architect preferred the Tuskegee or the Tuscarora varieties of crape myrtle. He said 64 square foot of ground cover was needed around every category two tree in the urban greenway.
- Asked that they double check that the minimum dimension for interior landscaping met the width requirement of seven feet.
- Add a four foot landscape buffer off the base of the building and make sure the sidewalk was at least eight foot wide along the required pedestrian zone which was the entranceway on the south side of the building.
- Have the landscape architect add a calculation table to show the amounts required and provided by sector.
- Reminded them to submit irrigation plan with final site plans.
- Requested a detail of the dumpster enclosure and have the vacuum wall be shown.
- Noted a lack of plantings in the green area on the north side. He said Code required a right-of-way buffer planting. Also, on local streets such as 29th Street, he said a reduced greenway of 15 feet wide in total was required: an eight foot landscape buffer and a seven foot wide sidewalk.

Jeanine Athias provided the following comments:

- Advised that a car wash usage required a license from Broward County.
- Stated that both the City and County would need to know whether they would be recycling water, the amount, the percentages, and the mechanisms used in order to determine their impact fees. Mr. Huebner said that they would be using recycled water.
- Advised that the trip generation for the business would be needed.
- Noted there was a jumper location for the water which she said was not allowed. Mr. Huebner responded that it was temporary to pressure test the system. She asked them to notate it as temporary.
- Commented that the water main was in their lanes and said that DEES preferred that they tied in on the south side so that future repairs would not require a disruption in the business. Mr. Huebner said it would be a problem as they did not own the property nor did they have easements. She said they would need to discuss it further.
- Requested they move the meter to the east near the service road and have separate fire lanes. Mr. Huebner suggested that they could provide the meter at the same tap location being used for the fire line which would become a private line not maintained by the City. The water service would be a meter which would be their responsibility; the City would not have any easements or responsibility within their property. Ms. Athias said they would give it some thought.

- Requested they show the manholes as four foot instead of four inches.
- Asked that they check some of their inverts to allow for more accurate drainage calculations.
- Noted that the cut out FFU dimensions did not match the site plan.
- Advised that a FDOT utility permit would be needed since it was in FDOT's right of way and they would be moving the sidewalk. Mr. Huebner said he thought it would be a general permit.
- Advised that permission from FDOT would be needed to install trees in the right-of-way. She said the sidewalks had been on private property but the City would need an access easement for the public. She said Planning might want to look into it for future projects.

Mr. Huebner asked who would be responsible for maintaining the trees that they would be adding into the right-of-way on State Road 7 and on 29th Street. Mr. Pinney responded that the City had an agreement with FDOT where the City assumed responsibility but, within the City Code, the burden was put on the property owners to maintain the adjacent swale.

Dan Topp had no comment.

Diane Colonna asked whether people exited their cars or stayed in them when having them washed. Mr. Huebner responded that people stayed in their cars unless they went to the full service station where they would get out of their car and enter the building to wait.

John D'Eri, Rising Tide, said they did not take control of a client's vehicle at any time. Ms. Colonna asked if there was outdoor seating. Mr. Huebner said it was not shown but there would be outdoor seating.

Ben Ziskal reiterated that City staff had worked with the developer on the project. He said both the CRA plan and the City's Comprehensive Plan had policies to move away from auto-oriented development toward pedestrian-friendly development and it specifically stated that such uses should be discouraged unless they were designed according to the Transit Oriented Corridor guidelines. He noted how they [Rising Tide] had done everything they could to meet the intent of the Code and the vision while still getting an auto-oriented use. He also pointed out that there was a non-profit, a public service, and a medical component to the project as the business would be employing individuals with autism and some of the office space would be used for family members with autism to speak to counselors. He said the location was chosen in part due to its proximity to the medical offices and hospital. He said he recommended approval as this item moved forward to the City Commission.

C. **DRC NO. 08-15-06** CONSIDERATION OF A SITE PLAN FOR RISING TIDE CAR WASH
LOCATION: 2970 NORTH STATE ROAD 7
ZONING: TOC-C CORRIDOR

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: A PORTION OF PARCEL "A", OF "PLATTS PLAT", ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF, AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 138, PAGE 48, OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA.
PETITIONER: JAY HUEBNER, HSQ GROUP, INC.

Ben Ziskal explained that the Special Exception item for Rising Car Wash had just been approved and that many of the comments made by staff were related to the design and site plan. He asked if there were any additional comments.

Dan Booker asked what the time frame was for the development.

Jay Huebner, civil engineer and planning for Rising Tide Car Wash, said they hoped to break ground by February and be operational by mid-summer.

Mr. Ziskal asked Mr. Huebner to work with the individual departments to make the needed changes and resubmit the final site plans which would go to the DRC committee members for final sign off.

4) GENERAL DISCUSSION

There was no general discussion.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:02 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Prepared by: Rita Rodi

Benjamin J. Ziskal, AICP, CEcD,
Director of Economic Development

Date 24 Nov 15

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