

EXCERPT FROM DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING 5/10/16

1D) **DRC NO. 05-16-04:** CONSIDERATION OF A **SITE PLAN** FOR CONSTRUCTION OF SENIOR HOUSING APARTMENTS

LOCATION: N.W. 31ST STREET AND NORTH STATE ROAD 7

ZONING: TRANSIT ORIENTED CORRIDOR-GATEWAY (TOC-G)

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: A PORTION OF PARCEL "A", INFANTE II, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF, AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 168, PAGE 11, OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA.

PETITIONER: JAY HUEBNER, HSQ GROUP, INC., AGENT FOR HTG ARBOR VIEW, LLC

Jay Huebner, HSQ Group, explained the project was a 100-unit affordable senior housing complex situated on 2.5 acres located at the northeast corner of State Road 7 and N.W. 31st Street. He said it would have one six-story building with many amenities including pools, an exercise path, a dog park, shuffleboard courts, etc.

Mary Langley, Building Department, advised them to get the necessary permits.

Kevin Wilson, Fire Department, provided the following comments:

-advised that hydrants would need to be put on the site

-advised that the check valve on N.W. 31st Street would need to be brought into the complex and be within 50 feet of a fire hydrant.

-advised that a loop system with hydrants would be needed.

Mr. Huebner commented that they thought it would be easier for the Fire Department to service from the exterior. Mr. Wilson said water was needed inside to fight a fire in a six-story building.

Mr. Wilson asked if there would be an access gate off of State Road 7. Mr. Huebner responded that they were trying to do so and that they had a meeting with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) where they asked for emergency access only onto State Road 7, but FDOT denied them. Mr. Huebner said there was a variance process that they had started but he could not guarantee that they would obtain the access. Mr. Wilson replied that the Fire Department needed to have more than one way into the complex.

Alan Tinter, Tinter Traffic, said they had been looking at ways to obtain the additional access out to State Road 7. He explained that there were two separate processes through which they needed to go. First, he spoke to the County about the non-vehicular access line (NVAL) that was on the plat and he said they were fine with having an emergency access across it as long it was access for the rest of the unit. He said, however, that there was a limited access line imposed by the federal government on State Road 7 at the Sample Road interchange, similar to that used on the interstate system. He said that in order to vacate the limited access line for the emergency access only, they needed to continue the process that they started with FDOT as it would take them through the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) in Atlanta to obtain permission. He said it would require appraisals of the property with and without the opening in the limited access line. Since the original property owner had received compensation from the FHWA when the limited access line was imposed, he said a determination would have to be made as to the value of the opening and reimbursement made to the federal government. He said it was a lengthy and costly process. He said they also looked at the other residential developments in the area including Celebration Pointe which had about 600 units but had only a single access onto State Road 7; also, the two Merritt Preserve developments of a similar size

had only a single access point. He also noted that they would have a divided driveway on N.W. 31st Street so emergency vehicles could still enter if one side were blocked. In consideration of the problems that were encountering trying to obtain the access onto State Road 7, he said they felt the single access point on N.W. 31st Street adequately met the needs of the site. Mr. Wilson responded that the property was 55 years and older and they expected a high call volume for medical transports. Mr. Wilson noted that it was a sprinkled building and that although a fire would be unlikely, they still needed to have a second lane. Mr. Tinter responded that the driveway volumes would be relatively low during peak hours and entrance through the single access point should not be a problem. In consideration of the time, effort and expense, he asked Mr. Wilson if he would take another look at the site and consider just a single access point with a divided driveway. Mr. Wilson said that he would, and Mr. Tinter said he would be happy to meet with him to discuss. Mr. Tinter said a letter was sent to FDOT three weeks ago and there has been no response to it or their phone calls. He said he anticipated the process might take nine months to a year to accomplish. There was a brief discussion about an opening in the NVAL in the northern end of the property but it was noted that it was still blocked by the limited access line. Mr. Tinter said that FDOT acknowledged that they should not have done it, but they did and now it was necessary to go through the process.

Dan Topp, Economic Development, had no comment.

Andrew Pinney, Associate Planner, had the following comments:

- the parking tabulation showed that the site was under-parked. Code required one and on-half parking spaces per unit plus an additional 10 percent for guest parking. He said their 100-unit development would require 160 parking spaces.
- a seven-foot curbed landscape median was required when parking stalls abutted one another in the parking lot under the new Code. Mr. Huebner responded that parking would be tight. Mr. Pinney said it was designed to fit using the same dimensions as the old design with the wheel stops.
- Site Data table showed the building height at six foot; asked that he add a measured dimension to the building height that would limit it to 94 feet.
- advised that the City had recently passed an ordinance that allowed a reduction of wheel stops in those instances where parking spaces abutted a sidewalk that was at least seven foot wide and was elevated six inches higher than the parking lot; wheel stops would be required in those instances he said.
- advised that wheel stops would not be needed on the perimeter parking spaces if curbed.
- asked that the width of the sidewalk be shown for the urban greenways on State Road 7.
- advised that an eight-foot wide landscape buffer and a seven-foot sidewalk needed to be shown on N.W. 31st Street. Mr. Huebner said they encountered an issue with the sidewalk because it was up against the curb currently. He asked if they had to dedicate right-of-way if the sidewalk was on their property. Also, he said a change would conflict with their overall design which included a meandering exercise path. Mr. Pinney said they could discuss it after the meeting.
- asked that they provide the frontage build-out along State Road 7 on the Site Data chart. He advised that Code required 70 percent build-out but acknowledged that the property was challenging to work with because of the panhandle on the north end.
- asked that they add the percentage of native plants, percentage of palm tree substitutions, and the total new canopy square footage being planted to the calculation table. Also asked they

add a new row for the street tree requirement as described in Section 23.6 (B)(2), as well as the percentage of sod coverage.

-asked for a detail of their perimeter fence, dog park fence and dumpster enclosure. Mr. Huebner said the dumpster enclosure was internal for the building and it would have the dual recycling and trash.

Mr. Tinter commented on the parking requirements. He said he looked at the City Code and found it confusing. He said they interpreted Section 9.11 of the Code to mean that residential parking in a shared parking area applied to the entire Transit Oriented Corridor-Gateway (TOC-G) zoning district and not to each individual site which meant that 100 parking spaces or one parking space per unit adequately met the Code requirement; they were providing 127 spaces. He pointed out another section of the Code that related to age-restricted housing which he said indicated that if the units were restricted to ages 62 and over, then one parking space per unit plus one parking space for every five units for visitors were required, or 127 parking spaces. He noted that this development was age restricted to 55 years and older (not 62) but the purpose of the age restriction was the same. He said they also looked at the Institute of Transportation Engineers which had parking generation rates for adult living facilities and those rates were much lower than the City's at .59 spaces per dwelling unit on average and 85th percentile was .66. Mr. Tinter said they designed the site to meet the TOC-G zoning district code requirements which required 100 parking spaces and they would be providing 127 parking spaces.

Andrew Pinney responded that the parking calculations shown in the section of the Code that Mr. Tinter referenced relative to age restriction, Section 33.3, did not apply to TOC properties. In Section 9.12, he said the table and the text were conflicting. While the table showed one parking space per unit, he said the text indicated that the requirement was 1.5 spaces per unit for all TOC units. He referenced another section in Article III that addressed conflicting sections of the Zoning Code which indicated that the more strict provision applied.

Mr. Tinter said that documentation other than the City's for age-restricted units, as well the developer's experience with other similar facilities, supported their belief that 127 parking spaces was more than adequate. He said if the City disagreed, they would request a waiver and submit a parking study. Mr. Pinney agreed that they should apply to the Board of Adjustment.

Jeanine Athias, Engineering, provided the following comments and advised that they should meet with them if they needed more detail:

- asked them to check the flood zone information shown on their survey as it seemed incorrect.
- advised them to delineate the preserve area on the north side and speak to Broward County about its location. She said the City would need their approval in writing. Mr. Huebner said they had already started the process with them.
- advised that they would need a utility permit and right-of-way permit. She said we [City] believed there was outfall that ran under State Road 7 and into the wetlands. Mr. Huebner questioned the depth of it, noting that it did not appear to be doing anything.
- advised they would need a compound master meter and a re-metering agreement if they planned to submeter.
- advised documentation of the estimated trips for the site was required to determine the need for a traffic study. Mr. Huebner said they already had it.
- advised that some of the details were missing from their site plan, i.e., control structures, bike paths, etc.

- advised that the City had new recycling requirements: 95 gallons per eight units, or 1,188 gallon capacity once a week. She said the required capacity could be reduced with more frequent trips to the site.
- advised that a tree permit would be required for any tree removals.
- advised any easement agreements would be needed.
- commented that they might need a booster pump, noting that the 60 psi might drop to 35 when it reached the sixth floor.
- advised the need to evaluate lift station 45 for additional capacity as it was already near capacity.

Abraham Stubbins, Utilities, made the following comments:

- referenced the Site Plan and asked if they planned to tie into the service meter on the north end of the site. Mr. Huebner responded that they would run the water service from the building.
- pointed out that the Landscape Plan showed landscaping between the proposed seven-foot sidewalk and the property line along U.S. 441, but the Site Plan showed the sidewalk against the property line.
- referenced the Utility Plan at the entrance of N.W. 31st Street, and advised that it needed to show additional elevations at the entrance to indicate that the drainage flowed back into the site at the property line instead of onto N.W. 31st Street.
- advised a loop system would be needed that preferably connected the 18-inch one on U.S. 441 that tied back onto N.W. 31st Street.
- advised that the backflow on the 4-inch master meter must be an RPZ and it must be above grade. Mr. Huebner said it would likely be moved on-site.
- advised the back flow on the proposed fire line must be a double detector check.
- advised that if the hydrant on U.S. 441 needed to be relocated due to the new sidewalk, they would need to replace it with the same hydrant.
- pointed out some discrepancies between elevations shown on the drainage schedule compared to those shown in their plan [site plan], specifically, structure D-7 and D-1. He said there were also some conflicts between the inverts and elevations on their detail sheet.
- asked the purpose of the sewer line that was shown by the pool area. Mr. Huebner said there would be a pool. Mr. Stubbins advised that they needed to discharge into the drainage system, not the sewer.
- noted that no pipe sizes were shown on the drainage schedule for structures D-2 and D-3.
- advised that the fence line on the north end of the property near the dog park needed to connect to the existing wall.

Jeanine Athias advised that their Equivalent Residential Connections (ERC's) for water and sewer were \$220,000; for police, \$37,000; for fire, \$42,000. She suggested they add a separate water meter for the pool.

Diane Colonna, Community Redevelopment Agency, had no comment.

Lt. Paul Fix, Police Department, had no comment.

Ben Ziskal, Economic Development, made the following comments:

- advised that a letter was required from Waste Management that gave approval of their arrangements for trash and recycling. Mr. Huebner said one had already been submitted.
- commented on a note that appeared on the Site Plan about a black picket fence that did not appear on the elevation and asked if the note was correct. If there was going to be a black

picket fence, he asked how it tied into the dog park. Mr. Huebner acknowledged that there would be a black picket fence with columns running along US. 441 that wrapped around N.W. 31st Street. He said it was not a gated community and the fence was meant to provide a buffer between the public sidewalks and U.S. 441 and the internal exercise path. Mr. Ziskal said he saw the connection on the north side of the building and he asked that they add a second one near the bus stop so that pedestrians had a clear pedestrian connectivity to the bus stop. Mr. Huebner said there was not a door from the building to the bus stop so he did not think it made sense to add a sidewalk connection.

-asked what their proposal was for fencing for the dog park noting that the Code in the TOC district prohibited chain link fencing. Mr. Huebner said they would look at it.

-noted that there were royal palm trees shown on the landscaping plan that appeared to be placed within the proposed sidewalk area on State Road 7; he asked if they planned to move them. Mr. Huebner said they would look at it.

Mr. Ziskal said that the City Commission had approved a plat note amendment and they would be asking for the allocation of 100 TOC housing units. He said the allocation would be approved administratively. He explained that since this was proposed as an affordable housing unit, in order to give them the 100 units from the pool of affordable units in the TOC, and to have them count as affordable units, the City required a copy of the agreement they had with the State and the declaration of restrictive covenant that showed that the development would remain affordable for the duration of at least thirty years. Mr. Ziskal asked them to work out all the design details discussed at that day's meeting and then submit three final site plans back to staff that would be circulated for approval. He said if there were no major changes, they would not need to come back before the Committee.