

memo

MARGATE COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

To: Chair and Members of the Board
From: Cotter Christian
CC: David Tolces, Kim Vazquez, City Clerk, City Manager
Date: 5/8/2017
Re: CONSIDERATION OF CITY CENTER SITE PLAN – ADDENDUM

The submittal of plans and letter dated May 4, 2017 from the Developer did not allow CRA Staff sufficient time for a complete review prior to the agenda deadline of May 4th for the May 10, 2017 CRA Board meeting. Further review has since occurred so this memo supplements the agenda backup. Comparing the latest submittal with the Development Agreement and Preliminary Development Plan (PDP), the following items are identified:

1. The bedroom mix does not comply with Paragraph 2.2(a) of the Development Agreement, which states that the total number of residential units shall be comprised of not less than 50% two bedrooms and 10% three bedrooms. The data presented on Sheet SP 11 shows these figures at 45.45% and 9.19% respectively. In addition, the required bedroom mix is not satisfied on a phase by phase basis, as there are shortfalls in phases 1 and 2.
2. The floor plan provided for Building type “A” is not consistent with the tabular data. The table shows that this building type each contains 12-one bedroom, 18-two bedroom and 6-three bedroom units. However according to the floor plan, the building is comprised of 24-one bedroom, 9-two bedroom and 3-three bedroom units (note Unit “F” could be considered either a 2BR + Den, or a 3 BR). Based on the floor plan, there are significantly less 2 BR and/or 3 BR than indicated by the data tables.
3. With respect to traffic circulation, the plan was revised to include the extension of NW 9th Court from Park Drive to Margate Blvd; however, there remains a variation in vehicular circulation and access to Building 22 (refer to General Comment #3 and Site Plan comment # 16). The PDP shows access to this building from NW 9th Court extension while the Site Plan provides for access directly from Margate Blvd.
4. Site Plan comment #3 noted that proposed angled parking (instead of parallel parking) throughout the site is not consistent with the PDP. The revised Site Plan reduces but does not eliminate the angled parking.
5. Comment #6 under Architectural Comments indicates that several smaller buildings shown on the PDP were merged into larger L-shaped buildings. The Developer

memo

responded that doing this creates “a more interesting and diverse building pattern....” and that “Building height and mass complies with the Development Agreement.”

If you have any questions or comments regarding the above, please don't hesitate to contact me.