

City Commission

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

City Manager

Douglas E. Smith

City Attorney

Douglas R. Gonzales

City Clerk

Joseph J. Kavanagh

REGULAR MEETING OF THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES

Tuesday, November 8, 2016 10:00 AM

City of Margate Municipal Building

PRESENT:

Andrew Pinney, Associate Planner
Tom Vaughn, Building Department
Kevin Wilson, Fire
Diane Colonna, CRA Executive Director
Dan Topp, Code Compliance Officer
Jeanine Athias, Engineering
Abidemi Ajayi (A.J.), Engineering
Lt. Paul Fix, Police Department
Michael Jones, Director of Parks and Recreation

ALSO PRESENT:

Charles Michelson, Saltz Michelson Architects

ABSENT

Ben Ziskal, AICP, CEcD, Director of Economic Development Abraham Stubbins, Utilities Sam May, Director of Public Works

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

1) NEW BUSINESS

1A) DRC NO. 11-16-01: CONSIDERATION OF A SITE PLAN FOR

EXPANSION OF THE MARGATE SPORTS COMPLEX

LOCATION: 1695 BANKS ROAD

ZONING: INDUSTRIAL PARK M-1A DISTRICT

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: LOT 1 OF HAIG & DUKE PLAT, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF, AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 175, PAGE 131, OF

THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA.

PETITIONER: CHARLES MICHELSON, SALTZ MICHELSON ARCHITECTS

Andrew Pinney introduced the item.

Economic Development Department

<u>Charles Michelson</u>, Saltz Michelson Architects, representing the City of Margate, explained that the project was an expansion to the existing sports park. He said the additional piece of property would include a covered play area of 39,000 square feet which encompassed most of the space and would protect the children from sun and inclement weather. He said the construction of a 1,200 square foot building would include public restrooms and a small concession area. He said the rest of the property would be fenced and secure with minor circulatory adjustments to the existing parking and driveways. Mr. Michelson said that the property would be rezoned so that its use fit the property.

DRC Comments:

<u>Tom Vaughn</u> told him to submit plans and permits.

Kevin Wilson had no comment.

<u>Diane Colonna</u> commented that it was a Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA) project and they had been working with the architect and Parks and Recreation for several months and they would continue to do so to facilitate the process.

<u>Michael Jones</u> said that Parks and Recreation had worked hand in hand on the design and development of the plan. He said he was satisfied with the plan, its use and the landscaping.

<u>Jeanine Athias</u> commented on the planned rezoning and advised that there were plat restrictions on the property and that they should check with Broward County for the conflicts. Ms. Athias offered the following additional comments:

- -the Drainage Calculations stated that the water table was at 6.5 feet; she said it was actually 9.5 feet because it was part of the Cocomar water district.
- -the Drainage Calculations stated they would use the 100 year 3 day event [Finished Floor Elevation] but the calculations showed the 100 year 3 day as 17.67 inches while the plans showed 13.5 inches for the bathrooms. She said that level for the bathrooms might be considered over design. She suggested they check the Code and noted that her recommendation for commercial properties was six inches above the crown of the road when not in a flood zone. She said they could use whichever was more stringent: the six inches above the crown of the road or the 13.5 inches.
- -referenced sheet C-1 and noted that there was a strip of property that was still owned by Minto. She advised that an easement would be needed on that portion.
- -advised that they needed to show the finished grade on all sides of the proposed grade around the property; also, advised that the canal slope should be four-to-one.
- -advised that the City had fiber optics along the property line on Banks Road and they needed to show it on the plans.
- -advised that a surface water management license from Broward County would be needed; she said it would be separate from the current one.
- -noted that there were trees shown in the same location that they placed a fire hydrant -commented that the sewer ran through the baseball field; she asked how they planned to set up their turf in the event there was a sewer break. Mr. Michelson responded that it was adjacent to the walkway and it was an artificial turf system. She noted that it would be easier to replace it if it were in strips or squares that could be lifted up.
- -advised that the water connection to the restroom was not shown on the plans.

- -asked if the irrigation would tie into existing system or draw from the canal. Mr. Michelson said it would be tied into the existing because it was only needed for the perimeter as the field was artificial turf.
- -advised that the impact fees would be approximately \$7,200.

Abidemi Ajayi (A.J.) made the following comments:

- -advised that the drainage showed it was connected to the outfall. He said there might not be enough capacity for the water to go through the outfall.
- -advised that a tree removal permit was needed.

Ms. Athias advised that an engineering permit was also needed. She clarified A.J.'s drainage comment and noted that their calculations would be changing.

<u>Dan Topp</u> had no comments.

Lt. Paul Fix had no comments.

<u>Andrew Pinney</u> acknowledged the petitioner's comment about rezoning and advised that the M-1A zoning district did not allow for the requested use. He recommended the S-1 district to match the adjacent Sports Complex.

Mr. Pinney also offered the following comments:

- -advised that plans note a 27-foot, two inch setback on the front but the Code required a 35-foot front setback due to the width of Banks Road
- -advised that the fence shown in the front yard was not permitted
- -noted that the signage was shown on the north elevation; advised that the eligible frontage would be on the east elevation which faced Banks Road as per the Sign Code
- -noted that they were under the 35-foot maximum height; he advised that the structure could be a little taller because an average elevation between the peak and the eve was used when dealing with hip or gable style roofs.
- -asked that they revisit their parking calculations. He said this use required one parking space for every five seats and bleachers required one seat for every 24 inches of bleacher.
- -noted that the parking calculation showed adequate parking with the assumption that were sharing parking with the Sports Complex. Mr. Michelson acknowledged the shared parking. -advised that the Code required a 12-foot by 45-foot loading space with a 14-foot vertical clearance for the requested use. Mr. Michelson asked if they would be able to take advantage of an existing one in the sports park as this project was an extension of the park. Mr. Pinney thought it could be worked out since parking facilities were being shared.
- Mr. Michelson commented that he would speak with City staff about a possible variance for the fence taking into consideration the use and safety of the children in proximity to Banks Road noting that the fence was really a safety issue.

Mr. Pinney advised that there was a Code requirement that any new City-owned or operated building must be L.E.E.D. certified. He noted that it was being built by the CRA and asked it would be operated by Parks and Recreation. Mr. Jones acknowledged that Parks and Recreation would operate it. Mr. Michelson asked if there was a minimum size requirement or whether the requirement was for occupied buildings. Mr. Pinney said he would send him the applicable section of the Code. Mr. Michelson said he was not sure how this type of structure

could be L.E.E.D. certified but he said he would do the research. He said Green Gloves might be an equivalent kind of certification that might apply to this situation.

Mr. Pinney advised that the 50 percent of the landscape strip between the facility and Banks Road needed to be planted with ground covers. He noted that an irrigation plan was missing and asked that they include it with the final site plan.

Mr. Pinney said the project was approved to move forward, subject to the comments herein, and submission of the final site plans and the rezoning.

1B) **DRC NO. 10-16-03**: CONSIDERATION OF AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE MARGATE ZONING CODE, ARTICLE XI COMMUNITY FACILITY CF-1 DISTRICT, SECTIONS 11.4 HEIGHT AND 11.5 LOT COVERAGE

LOCATION: 2801 NORTH STATE ROAD 7

ZONING: TRANSIT ORIENTED CORRIDOR (TOC)

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: COLONIAL PARK, PARCEL "A", ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF, AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 115, PAGE 14, OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA.

PETITIONER: CHRIS AKERS, LITTLEJOHN, AN S&ME COMPANY

<u>Andrew Pinney</u> explained that the ordinance was written to provide specific exceptions to maximum lot coverage and maximum heights for large hospitals on a campus of more than 20 acres and providing more than 200 beds for patient care.

DRC Comments:

Tom Vaughn had no comments.

Kevin Wilson had no comments.

Diane Colonna had no comments.

Michael Jones had no comments.

Dan Topp had no comments.

<u>Jeanine Athias</u> had no comments.

Lt. Paul Fix had no comments.

Mr. Pinney advised that the ordinance was approved to move forward to the Planning and Zoning Board meeting in December.

1C) **DRC NO. 11-16-02**: CONSIDERATION OF AN ORDINANCE TO PROVIDE REGULATIONS FOR NEW PUBLIC OR PRIVATE ELEMENTARY, MIDDLE, AND HIGH SCHOOLS.

<u>Andrew Pinney</u> explained the ordinance was written as a follow-up to a six-month moratorium on charter schools that had been previously passed by the City. Since that time, he said Staff

Andrew Pinney Associate Planner

reviewed Code regulations and siting requirements. He advised that under the new ordinance, the following would apply for any new public or private elementary, middle or high school:

- location requirements- the school could not be located on an arterial road due to traffic concerns and the need for a safe drop-off and pick-up of kids;
- siting requirements-the school must be located in a single use structure located on at least three acres. In each district that it was permitted, it would be permitted as a

| Special Exception use; time limitations-applications could be received no less than nine months from the start of the school year. |
|---|
| He said the intent of the ordinance was to address some of the past problems and to streamline the process moving forward. |
| DRC Comments: Tom Vaughn had no comments. |
| Kevin Wilson had no comments. |
| <u>Diane Colonna</u> had no comments. |
| Michael Jones had no comments. |
| <u>Dan Topp</u> had no comments. |
| <u>Jeanine Athias</u> had no comments but she said she would like to see the ordinance. |
| Lt. Paul Fix had no comments. |
| Mr. Pinney said the ordinance was approved to move forward to the Planning and Zoning Board meeting in December. |
| 2) GENERAL DISCUSSION |
| There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:19 AM. |
| Respectfully submitted, Prepared by: Rita Rodi |
| Date: |

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