



## REGULAR MEETING OF THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE

**Tuesday, March 8, 2016**

**10:00 AM**

City of Margate  
Municipal Building

### **PRESENT:**

Ben Ziskal, AICP, CEcD, Director of Economic Development  
Mary Langley, Building Director  
Kevin Wilson, Fire  
Lt. Paul Fix, Police  
Andrew Pinney, Associate Planner  
Jeanine Athias, Engineering  
Dan Topp, Code Compliance Officer

### **ALSO PRESENT:**

Peter Russo, Metro Design Group

### **ABSENT:**

Abraham Stubbins, Utilities  
Diane Colonna, CRA Executive Director  
Sam May, Director of Public Works  
Michael Jones, Director of Parks and Recreation

The regular meeting of the Margate Development Review Committee (DRC), having been properly noticed, was called to order by Benjamin Ziskal at **10:00 AM on Tuesday, March 8, 2016**, in the Commission Chambers at City Hall, 5790 Margate Boulevard, Margate, FL 33063.

---

### APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE JANUARY 26, 2016 DRC MEETING

The minutes for January 26, 2016 were approved as written.

2) NEW BUSINESS

2A. **DRC NO. 02-16-01** CONSIDERATION OF AN **AMENDED SITE PLAN** FOR FLORIBBEAN WHOLESALE, INC.

**LOCATION:** 5151 N.W. 17<sup>th</sup> STREET, MARGATE, FL 33063

**ZONING:** M1-A INDUSTRIAL PARK

**LEGAL DESCRIPTION:** CENTRAL PARK OF COMMERCE, LOT 6, BLOCK 3, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 119, PAGE 27 OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA.

**PETITIONER:** PETER RUSSO, METRO ARCHITECTURAL GROUP

### **City Commission**

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

### **City Manager**

Douglas E. Smith

### **City Attorney**

Eugene M. Steinfeld

### **City Clerk**

Joseph J. Kavanagh

Peter Russo, Metro Architectural Group, explained that the originally the Floribbean warehouse had been designed with a phase two when it had been approved 15-20 years ago. He said his firm was recently hired to work on phase two which would be predominantly building an addition for a walk-in cooler/freezer. He said there were also some minor modifications being made to the existing building, including the addition of a break room. Interior modifications to the existing cooler would allow them to perform some other functions in the processing of the fish he said. He said the extent of the processing done there included reappportioning and repackaging fish to send out to restaurants.

**DRC comments:**

Mary Langley commented that they were already in for permitting and she advised that the addition would require fire sprinklers. Mr. Russo asked for clarification and Ms. Langley said the fire sprinklers were required because the cooler was over 400 square feet. Mr. Russo asked if the original building would also need to have fire sprinklers. Ms. Langley said she did not think so but she said she would need to look at the floor plan. Mr. Russo said theoretically it made sense to sprinkle both buildings.

Kevin Wilson commented that they would see improved insurance rates if both buildings were sprinkled. He said it would not pay for them to tap the street lines and run a main into the building if they were not planning on doing both buildings. Mr. Wilson said he referenced the Florida Building Code in his written comments on the plans, and he noted the reason behind them pertained to the thickness of the walls of the cooler and the insulation inside the walls.

Andrew Pinney thanked Mr. Russo for clarifying the meaning of 'processing of seafood' that was written on their application. He stated that the property was in the M1-A district where fish processing and slaughtering were not permitted, but reappportioning and repackaging were acceptable. He noted that the following plans were missing and would be needed when submitting for final site plan approval: building elevations, floor plans, photometric plans, and an irrigation plan.

Mr. Pinney referenced the site plan and said that the Zoning Code did not require a loading zone for spaces less than 10,000 square feet. He noted that Floribbean fell under the threshold but since it was shown on the plans, he expressed a concern about truck maneuverability because he said it might impact the parking spaces on the east side of the parking lot when the truck exited. He asked that they take a look at it. Mr. Russo said he would speak to his client about it. Mr. Russo explained that the owner owned the adjacent property and he believed that they had created a pathway through the grass to exit out another gate. Mr. Pinney responded that it needed to be done the right way. Mr. Russo said he would speak to his client about having the area paved which would also be used for employee parking. Mr. Pinney said the landscaping plan lacked some details including the species, grade and size of the trees which would be required for final site plan approval. He advised him of the applicable sections of the Code: Section 23.4 for plan requirements; Section 23.6B for right-of-way perimeter buffer; Section 23.7 for other perimeters; and Section 23.8 for interior landscaping. Mr. Pinney said a requirement of the M1-A district was that any application for site plan review had to be accompanied by a sworn statement by the owner of the subject property which stated that the proposed uses would be operated in accordance with the performance standards. He gave Mr. Russo the form to use.

Jeanine Athias advised that there would be impact fees for the addition but more details were needed. She said the amount of the impact fees would be given when they submitted to the Building Department. Mr. Russo said they could get the details to them because they had submitted concurrently and they had already been through some plan review. She told him to submit the information to Leo in Engineering. Ms. Athias commented that the property was not in a flood zone, and she typically asked that the elevation of the building be 6-12 inches above the crown of the road with new construction. Understanding that they had an existing building, she said she was fine with the elevation; however, she said they would need to submit to Broward County and they would determine whether the building elevation was alright and whether a stormwater management license would be needed. Mr. Russo responded that they had a civil engineer who had already submitted the plans to Broward County. Ms. Athias suggested they consider paving the grassy area because employees should not be parking there. Mr. Russo said the employees just got in the habit of parking on the grass, but with the additional ten parking spaces, the issue would resolve itself. Ms. Athias suggested they stop parking there now because she said Broward County performed random inspections and they could fine the company.

Dan Topp commented that the gates on the dumpster enclosure located on the cul-de-sac were in poor condition, they needed new screening and they must be kept closed at all times except for loading and unloading.

Ms. Athias said she needed a copy of the paving and grading plans that they submitted to Broward County.

Lt. Fix had no comment.

Mr. Ziskal advised that once all the revisions were made, they needed to submit three finals signed and sealed packages through Andrew Pinney which would be circulated amongst the members for final signature. He said there would not be another hearing. He commented that from an economic development standpoint, having a small business stay and expand their operations in Margate was a great success story and great for the City's future.

### 3) GENERAL DISCUSSION

There was no discussion.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:17AM.

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