



City Commission

Mayor Joanne Simone

Vice Mayor Tommy Ruzzano

Joyce W. Bryan

Lesia 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, July 28, 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
Courtney O'Neill, Associate Planner
Dan Topp, Code Compliance Officer
Abraham Stubbins, Utilities

ALSO PRESENT:

Jeremy Anderson, Vice President, Hanlex Development, LLC
Jason Bullard, P.E., Hanlex Civil, LLC

ABSENT

Sam May, Director of Public Works
Michael Jones, Director of Parks and Recreation
Efrain Suarez, Police

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, July 28, 2015**, in the Commission Chambers at City Hall, 5790 Margate Boulevard, Margate, Florida 33063.

1) NEW BUSINESS

A. **DRC NO. 07-15-03** CONSIDERATION OF A SITE PLAN FOR **DOLLAR GENERAL**

LOCATION: SE CORNER OF STATE ROAD 7 AND SW 7th STREET

ZONING: TOC-C-CORRIDOR

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: TRACT B, SECTION 3, OF "SERINO PARK", ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF, AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 81, PAE 46, OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA.

PETITIONER: HANLEX MARGATE, LLC

Jeremy Anderson, said Hanlex was excited about the project because it was a new prototypical store, a "metro store", which had a smaller footprint suitable for urban settings. He explained some architectural differences which included the location of the vestibule in the front, the addition of split face block, use of multiple colors, and darkened windows.

Economic Development Department

5790 Margate Boulevard, Margate, FL 33063 • Phone: (954) 935-5330 • Fax: (954) 935-5304

www.margatefl.com • edevdirector@margatefl.com

Mr. Anderson said they had a lease with Dollar General Corporation. He showed a PowerPoint slide and pointed out where they would be doing a lot split along a platted parcel line and providing on-site storm water storage and full on-site circulation. He said they discussed the concept of a right turn lane with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) for which he said they were in agreement. He said they proposed to provide cross access at the right turn lane for the property to the south which would provide one access point that would serve two properties.

Tom Vaughn said the Building Department just needed for them to submit their plans and permits for construction.

Dan Booker asked if they would have fire sprinklers for insurance reasons even though they were under the square footage requirement. Mr. Anderson said they did not intend to have sprinklers.

Diane Colonna said she did not think the two dead end parking bays worked very well. She said it made more sense to have connectivity between the two bays for better traffic circulation. She commented that the location of one of the dumpsters was odd. She questioned whether they had explored utilizing the alley behind the property.

Courtney O'Neill said she shared the same concern that Ms. Colonna did about the parking bays. She suggested that they review the parking calculations, noting that they may be able to lose a few and gain connectivity. She commented that she liked that they were having the building face State Road 7.

Mr. Anderson said they would look into the dead end parking scenario. He said there was a balance between the City's requirements and what Dollar General wanted. He said they might consider a one-way circular pattern in the front.

Jeanine Athias commented that their plans and elevations needed to be in NAVD. She asked Mr. Anderson to show the proposed locations for the hydrant and utilities. She said it was not clear as to whether or not they planned to use the alleyway and that all their entranceways and exits should be on their property. She said the alleyway was meant for service vehicles and maintenance purposes.

Mr. Anderson said the concept was discussed in depth with Planning and Zoning and they had planned to share the driveway connection rather than have two separate driveways. He said they could design it differently but, when they met with the City, the City was concerned about having two driveways on top of each other. Ms. Athias said she thought the alleyway was closed off. She commented that S.W. 7th Street should be made one-way. Mr. Anderson said that would be difficult for them. Ms. Athias suggested they bring their ideas to the Engineering Department for further discussion. Ms. Athias asked that they check the plat restriction to ensure that they not exceed the square footage. Ms. Athias

commented they could not have the trees that were proposed for the swale on the east side of the property because of underground utilities. Mr. Anderson asked if there would be direction from City staff on the tree requirement. Ms. Athias noted that it would be through Planning and Zoning. Ms. Athias advised that water and sewer impact fees would be approximately \$8,000. She said Mr. Anderson could speak with Leo Zervas in Engineering to determine the exact amount. She told Mr. Anderson that the impact fees for the sprinkler system were based on the meter size of the sprinkler. She told Mr. Anderson that he would also need to get an engineering permit.

Abraham Stubbins referenced sheet DP-1 of the plans and said that they needed to show the type and size of connection and the type of piping material for the water line on SW 7th Street. Also, he said they would need to have a double connection so that the meter was on its own line and not on the fire line. Mr. Stubbins asked whether the sidewalk on State Road 7 was in the right of way or on private property and whether they were adding to the existing sidewalk. Mr. Anderson said they were adding on to it and it was on private property. Mr. Anderson acknowledged that an easement would be needed. Mr. Stubbins said an adjustment would be needed on the sewer connection shown on the plan and he explained what they should do. Mr. Anderson asked for clarification on the connections which Mr. Stubbins provided; Mr. Stubbins responded and also said they could provide a copy of the asbuilts if needed.

Dan Topp said the landscape plans should show a landscape buffer and urban greenway along south State Road 7 and S.W. 7th Street per Section 23-6 B2 of the Code.

Andrew Pinney said the plans they presented were a big improvement from their first meeting. He said he liked the incorporation of the rear alley as it reduced the size of the driveway connection on S.W. 7th Street and it made it more pedestrian friendly. He said he liked the idea of using the alley and that he would need to look to see if there were any easement restrictions. Ms. Athias said the use of the alley would require that it be accessible for all the public and it would need to be paved. She said that allowing public use of the alleyway would create an issue for them [Engineering].

Jason Bullard said they spoke with Kelly McAtee, DEES, and it was discussed that the alleyway could be used for full access if it were blocked off at a specific point that he pointed to on the slide. Ms. Athias disagreed that it could be blocked off.

Ben Ziskal interjected and stated that a bigger discussion needed to take place about the use of the alleyway. He pointed out that under the Transit Oriented Corridor zoning, the long range plan for all our State Road 7 was to eliminate the number of curb cuts and to create a rear alley system to connect properties. He said there might be conflicts between the various disciplines but using the alley was called for in the long range Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Pinney pointed out that the setback was not measured properly and he explained that the building would need to be shifted north a bit and they could get within eighteen inches of the 10-foot utility easement line. Mr. Pinney advised that a minimum frontage build-out of 70 percent was required and they were currently at 19-20 percent. He said they might need to pursue their concept with the Board of Adjustment. Mr. Pinney commented also that they should revisit the parking calculations noting that it was three per thousand of the non-storage area which would reduce the parking as required by City code. Mr. Pinney said he agreed with Ms. Colonna that the two dead end parking lots did not make sense. Mr. Anderson said they agreed and that they would revisit it. Mr. Pinney said their parking extended into the second lot layer which the City code discouraged and it also limited it to no more than 20 percent of the lot width. He said they were currently at about 29 percent. He said the Code required a five foot setback for driveway connections. Specifically, he said the driveway on State Road 7 needed to be moved north five feet and they needed to provide a landscape buffer consistent with Section 23.7. Mr. Bullard said that it went against the agreement they had with the adjacent property owner. Mr. Pinney asked if they had a cross access agreement. Mr. Bullard said that it was with the Purchase and Sale agreement but it had not been recorded yet. Mr. Pinney said they should look at the cross access agreement as they might be able to disregard that comment. Mr. Pinney stated, as Mr. Topp pointed out, that a landscape buffer relief was required in the urban greenway which was from the edge of the roadway to the other end of the sidewalk. On S.W. 7th Street, they would need to provide an eight foot landscape buffer and then a seven foot sidewalk. He said there was plenty of room in the drainage and retention area for the landscape on State Road 7. Mr. Pinney said that their landscape plans needed to be updated to demonstrate compliance, including the species, size, and grade. In addition, Mr. Pinney said the landscape plans also needed to include the code requirements calculation which showed a breakdown by landscape sector, i.e., urban greenway, right of way perimeter, other perimeter, etc., along with tables that showed the required amounts and provided amounts. Mr. Pinney said there was an eight foot wide sidewalk on the south side of the building and the pedestrian zone requirement required a four foot landscape relief between the sidewalk and the building. Also on the south side of the building, Mr. Pinney said wheel stops were required in all the parking spaces abutting the walkway. He said bicycle parking was also required per Section 9.12 E6. He said the site plan needed to show the calculation as well as the facilities. Mr. Pinney said the photometric plan showed lighting for level one activity which was good for a business closing at 7:00 p.m. If they were going to be open later than 7:00 p.m., they would need to bring the lighting up to a minimum of two foot candles in the vehicular use area. Mr. Anderson said the store hours were typically up to between 9:00-10:00 p.m., depending on the location. Mr. Pinney asked that they include a specification of the light fixtures on the photometric plan as the Code required fully shielded fixtures. Noting that their signs were conceptual at that time, Mr. Pinney said that the monument sign on the State Road 7 frontage needed to be set back at least ten feet from any interior property lines. Mr. Pinney said there were a few things missing in the landscaping buffer shown between the parking area and the sidewalk in between the lake and sidewalk; he said Section 23-6, paragraph B1 would have those requirements. Also, if the parking

reconfiguration remained in the second lot layer, he said a street screen was required which was defined in Section 2.2. Mr. Pinney asked that they add a detail of the dumpster enclosure which included heights, materials, etc., as well as an approval letter from Waste Management. Mr. Anderson asked if an email was acceptable; Mr. Pinney said it was. Mr. Pinney said, while not required by Code, his preference would be for them to do a solid pour on the State Road 7 urban greenway so that there would not be a seam running down the middle, if possible. Mr. Anderson said they would consider it. Also, Mr. Pinney asked if they could also include one small paved connection between the two parking lots which was in addition to the seven foot curb separation between the abutting parking that was required by Code. Mr. Anderson said they could do that.

Ben Ziskal said his overall comment was that the building took up a small portion of the property and almost one third of it was being used for a storm water pond. He said the small portion that was being built out really minimized the development on the City's major commercial corridor. He said that, in light of trying to move the parking away from State Road 7 and possibly using the alley, he would like to see if there was a way to build out the frontage a little more by making the building shallower and wider, moving the parking away from State Road 7 and reducing the storm water pond by considering an alternative way to capture water on the site. He said he would like to see the dumpster disguised behind the building if using the alleyway was feasible. He said that from a long range economic development standpoint, the development sold the property short. His recommendation was to look at what they could do to maximize the buildable area of the property. Mr. Ziskal asked if there was a plan to purchase the property to the south. Mr. Anderson said that they spoke to the seller about purchasing the southern parcel and they could not come to an agreement. Mr. Anderson said that the geometry of the building could not be changed. He said they recognized from day one that they would not be able to meet that section of the Code based on their use and that it was discussed with staff. He said they were inhibited by State, County and local standards but they would look at ways to reduce the pond area. He said he disagreed with Mr. Ziskal and that he thought the building and the landscaping would look real good.

Mr. Ziskal said that normally when the Development Review Committee (DRC) met and there were minor revisions that needed to be made, the recommendation was that petitioner make the revisions needed and get sign-offs from the individual departments. He said that this project required enough revisions from multiple departments that he recommended that they make the revisions and that this item would come back before the DRC so it could be reviewed collectively. He said the item was being tabled for revisions and they would be rescheduled to come back once the revisions were made. Mr. Anderson responded that it was a fair decision. Ms. Athias commented that they were welcome to meet with any of the departments as needed. Mr. Anderson said the only thing that had not been worked out was the connection related to the alleyway and they were looking for direction. He said their intent was to meet the City's vision on the connection point but they were open to doing something better. He asked about the process noting

that they were interested in keeping it going as fast as possible. He asked if they could proceed with the Board of Adjustment (BOA) to hear their determination. Mr. Ziskal said they could apply to the BOA but noted that when they ruled on a variance, it would be very specific. He recommended that they go back to their design team and make the major changes before they applied. He said the BOA met monthly and they had a few weeks to meet the deadline for the September meeting. He said since it was a resubmittal, he would work with them on a shorter lead time for coming back before the DRC. Mr. Anderson asked if they should wait until after BOA before they resubmitted their plan. Mr. Ziskal said they should submit the revisions to DRC and BOA concurrently. Mr. Anderson clarified that they would only have one item for BOA which was the percentage of the building facing State Road 7. Mr. Ziskal agreed unless they were not able to move the parking from the second lot layer. He said if there was anything else that they could not revise to meet Code, then a variance would be needed. Mr. Anderson agreed. Mr. Bullard commented that a variance would be required for the parking. Mr. Anderson asked if the comments made today would be distributed. Mr. Ziskal said they would be in the form of typed and approved minutes. He said a draft copy could be provided prior to the final version. Mr. Anderson thanked everyone and said they were happy to be working with the City.

2) GENERAL DISCUSSION.

There was no general discussion.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:40 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Prepared by: Rita Rodi

Date _____

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

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