

**This is an excerpt from the January 22, 2015 DRC meeting/am**

**3) DRC NO. 01-15-02 CONSIDERATION OF AN ORDINANCE TO REVISE PORTABLE STORAGE CONTAINER REGULATIONS.**

Andrew Pinney explained that this ordinance was drafted by Staff after noting that numerous Building permits were rejected for single family homeowners with single driveways. He said that currently, homes with single driveways aren't able to have a portable storage container under current regulations. He stressed that this modification loosens the regulations; while keeping safety issues in mind.

**DRC Comments:**

Ken Reardon asked if a driveway has one parking space, can the resident have a POD. He inquired as to whether a parking plan would need to be submitted to the City or if street parking would be allowed.

Andrew Pinney replied that if the Commission approves this ordinance, it would be okay to park on the street; depending on whether or not there are curbs, swale or street parking would be permissible. He noted that these portable storage containers are temporary and this change would make it easier for residents.

Ben Ziskal said that the City is just trying to provide the same opportunity for all residents. He concluded that this ordinance would go to the February Planning and Zoning Board meeting; then onto the City Commission for approval.

**Public Comment:**

Mitch Pellecchia, 6890 NW 9 Street, liked the revision and noted that on Margate Boulevard, especially in the Paradise Gardens neighborhood, most homes have single car driveways. He said that when a POD is placed on their driveway, they can't park on Margate Boulevard, so they have to park elsewhere and suggested that language be added to this ordinance to assure that drivers always park their cars in a legal space. He noted that he has observed vehicles parked illegally along double yellow lines by intersections; which creates safety hazards for other vehicles on the road from turning the corners onto these streets.

Ben Ziskal noted that Mr. Pellecchia had a great comment and that the City could add a clause to comply with all applicable parking regulations before this moves on to the Planning and Zoning Board. Staff was in agreement.

## **5) DRC NO. 01-15-04 CONSIDERATION OF AN ORDINANCE TO REVISE OUTDOOR EVENT REGULATIONS.**

Courtney O'Neill explained that this ordinance was to clarify some of the Outdoor Event regulations pertaining to definitions and other terminology. She noted that the first change was to give a better description of what the 15 event business days are. She said that they are 15 consecutive business days of operation. She added that each event could now be allowed three days prior and three days after the event for set-up and tear-down; to allow for a maximum of 21 days total for the event. She confirmed that the City Commission could now add an additional event and that City Administration could grant up to seven additional calendar days for the event; in the event of unforeseen circumstances. For the second change, Ms. O'Neill stated that they have added a clause for a new regulation for turning in applications to the DRC; which added for expedited applications handed in 14 days prior to the first day of an event. A couple of comments she had were whether the verbiage should read expedited applications *must* be received or *may* and if the applications are supposed to be received 14 days prior to event or prior to the DRC meeting.

### DRC Comments:

Andrew Pinney commented about page 2; where it talks about one additional event being granted by the City Commission. He inquired that when there's an event on CRA property, and it's their fifth consecutive event, is the property owner going back to the Commission again for the fifth approval for the same type of event; after the property owner goes to the CRA and the DRC for approval? He asked that if not, could the language be changed to allow an additional event to be approved by the City Commission or the CRA Board. He also suggested that the limit be changed from one additional event to additional events in order to give the City more discretion. He suggested that the submission deadlines should reflect calendar days and not business days.

Kim Vasquez expressed that she is in agreement with Mr. Pinney's proposals. She said that the clarification of the event days is a good thing and that the CRA is aware of the extra days it takes for set-up and take-down. She asked if the expedited application would still go before the DRC because it would still need to go before the CRA for permission to use the property; adding that this may cause confusion or conflict in approving the application within 14 days.

Ben Ziskal explained that the City has enacted an ordinance limiting the number and length of events for recurring events a few years ago as a result of some businesses wanting to have events on a frequent basis. He said that some of the proposals were actually part of an ongoing use for the business; rather than an event. He noted that this ordinance would apply to all properties in the city; not exclusively to CRA properties. He explained that a lot of the carnivals try to capture two or three

weekends and there is some confusion about the total days of the event; so he just wants to clarify the language. For instance, he said that with a three week event, the practice has been to count that event as two events. He explained that being able to allow the Commission to approve this ordinance would make it one event. Mr. Ziskal noted that the recommendation of this ordinance was discussed with the City Manager and City. He said that regarding the 14 day expedited review, they could amend that going forward, since it's not codified; currently, there is 30 day submission deadline for everything. He remarked that they see a lot of events coming before the Committee too soon before the actual event, and as a result there is not enough notice for posting and review. He suggested that if no inspections are required and there are no objections for an event, then it may not be necessary for it to be submitted 30 days before. Mr. Ziskal reiterated that anything that occurs on CRA property needs CRA approval and would require more time to plan and schedule; probably more than 14 or 30 days before.

He added that if the event is the fifth one, and the same event, it would need Commission approval; however, the DRC wouldn't need to review again.

Andrew Pinney noted that a lot of times on CRA properties, an event may be the same type, but not conducted by the same operator; which would trigger a different review. He suggested that the verbiage of this ordinance include "granted by the City Commission or the CRA" because they include the same members.

Ben Ziskal explained that the CRA is only approving the event on their property; they have their own policy, which is not in the City Code; however, they would still need City Commission approval for the fifth event. He said that after some necessary revisions, this would move on to the Planning and Zoning Board.