



**REGULAR MEETING OF
THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE
MINUTES**

Tuesday, July 25, 2017

10:00 AM

City of Margate
Municipal Building

City Commission

Mayor Tommy Ruzzano

Vice Mayor Arlene R. Schwartz

Anthony N. Caggiano

Lesla Peerman

Joanne Simone

Interim City Manager

Samuel A. May

City Attorney

Douglas R. Gonzales

City Clerk

Joseph J. Kavanagh

PRESENT:

Reddy Chitepu, Acting Director of Economic Development/Director of D.E.E.S. (arrived 10:15 a.m.)

Andrew Pinney, Associate Planner

Andy Dietz, Associate Planner

Richard Nixon, Building Department

Kevin Wilson, Fire Inspector

Dan Topp, Community Development Inspector

Lt. Paul Fix, Police Department

Lt. Joe Galaska, Police Department

Jeanine Athias, Engineer

Abidemi Ajayi (A.J.), Engineer

ALSO PRESENT:

Dale Meaux, API Group, Inc.

Bharat Shah, Shah, Drotos & Associates

ABSENT:

Abraham Stubbins, Utilities Inspector

Ronald Eyma, Assistant Director of DEES

Director of Public Works

Kim Vazquez, Project Manager, Margate Community Redevelopment Agency

The regular meeting of the Margate Development Review Committee (DRC), having been properly noticed, was called to order by Andrew Pinney at 10:02 AM on **Tuesday, July 25, 2017** in the City Commission Chambers at City Hall, 5790 Margate Boulevard, Margate, FL 33063.

1) **NEW BUSINESS**

1A) **DRC NO. 07-17-04** CONSIDERATION OF A SITE PLAN FOR ST. VINCENT CATHOLIC CHURCH

LOCATION: 6350 N.W. 18th STREET

ZONING: R-1 RESIDENTIAL

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: ALL OF PARCEL "A" OF "ST. VINCENT PLAT,"

Economic Development Department

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

www.margatefl.com • edevdirector@margatefl.com

ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 85, PAGE 12, OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA.

PETITIONER: DALE MEAUX, API GROUP, INC.

Dale Meaux, API Group, representing St. Vincent Church, displayed the site plan on the Mondopad and he pointed out the locations of the church, classrooms and meeting hall, chapel, offices, maintenance building, and retention area. He said their intent was to rehabilitate the site plan to improve the parking, traffic flow, drainage, and to provide landscaping and lighting that was up to Code. He pointed out the areas that would have new paving for road widening and increased parking, including handicapped parking. He pointed out a retention area in the back of the property, and mentioned there would also be some restriping and reorganization of the landscape aisles.

DRC Comments:

Abidemi Ajayi asked the reason for the addition of retention areas. Mr. Meaux responded that they were increasing the paving and changing some of the water flow. Mr. Ajayi said they would need drainage calculations that would need to be submitted to Broward County. Mr. Ajayi said that an engineering permit would also be needed since they would be paving and a building permit would be needed for the striping.

Lt. Paul Fix had no comment.

Richard Nixon commented that they needed to ensure that the restriping and handicapped parking spaces were in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act. He added that a building permit would be required as well.

Kevin Wilson had no comment.

Dan Topp had no comment.

Andrew Pinney commented that he had met with Mr. Meaux a few times prior to their submittal and he said it was good to see how it had progressed and the planned improvements to the property were substantial. He clarified that they were not required to meet the full extent of the landscape code because their submittal was for a site plan amendment; however, they were required to add trees or shrubs that were missing. He said a full landscape code would be applicable if they were planning a full redevelopment of the property.

Mr. Pinney asked if the islands in the parking lot were being used for drainage. Mr. Meaux said they planned to drain through and across them because they had a lot of surface drainage; he noted that they planned to drain across some of the landscape islands that had no curbs. Mr. Pinney said that curbed landscaped medians were normally required, but he said he saw their note on the plans for parking wheel stops which were for drainage.

Mr. Pinney said there were some conflicting labels on the site plan with the parking counts per lot; he asked that they be removed or made consistent prior to their final site plan submittal.

Mr. Pinney asked that they add the dimensions to the new landscaped areas and a width dimension on the buffer area by the new parking lot to meet Code. He asked that they show

the spacing from the existing driveway to the new driveway connection on N.W. 63rd Avenue so it could be verified; he also asked that they show the width of the new driveway connection.

Mr. Pinney referenced the landscaping plan, and provided the following general comments:

- Shade trees referenced in the Code specifically referred to category 1 trees, a list of which he said could be found in Section 23.23.
- If substituting for a smaller species tree, i.e., category 2 or 3, the canopy value would be less and additional category 2 or 3 trees would be needed to equal the shade equivalent of a category 1 tree.
- Palm substitutions for a shade tree were limited to no more than 35 percent.
- At least 50 percent of the landscaping materials had to be native.
- The minimum shrub height was 24-inches.
- Asked that they add a planting detail on the landscape plans.
- Asked that they include an irrigation plan with a rain sensor on it with the final site plans.

Mr. Pinney advised that the lighting values were too high along the property lines which abutted residential on the west and south sides. In those areas, he said the Code required no more than one-half of a foot candle measured six foot above grade. He said he did not see the new parking lot reflected on the photometric plan; he asked Mr. Meaux to verify it prior to submitting the final site plans.

Andy Dietz recommended that the applicant take a second look at the walkway circulation in those areas where the walkways directed people through the parking areas. He said he noticed a few areas where a sidewalk terminated at the curb along one of the drive aisles and there was no clear destination which might result in people walking through the landscaping or down the middle of the drive aisle. He pointed out the subject areas on the site plan.

Mr. Dietz also recommended, where possible, bumping the sidewalk in front of the drive aisle stop line so as to create less of a hazard for pedestrians crossing. He pointed out an example of a walkway termination that needed to be corrected.

Mr. Pinney said the application was approved subject to the comments and conditions provided. He asked that they turn in three final site plans for final site plan approval after which time they could go for permitting.

2B) **DRC NO. 07-17-05** CONSIDERATION OF A SITE PLAN FOR JM LEXUS

LOCATION: 5350 WEST SAMPLE ROAD

ZONING: B-2A COMMUNITY BUSINESS

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: PARCELS A, B, AND C, "WESTWOOD PLAZA", ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF, AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 140, PAGE 31, OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA.

PETITIONER: BHARAT SHAH, P.E., SHAH, DROTOS & ASSOCIATES

Bharat Shah, Shah, Drotos & Associates, consulting engineer for the JM Lexus site, showed the site plan on the Mondopad and he pointed out the area that he said they proposed beautifying. He showed where they proposed additional parking and landscaping and minor improvements at the entranceway off the perimeter road.

DRC Comments:

Abidemi Ajayi asked Mr. Shah what the shaded area that looked like a roadway represented. Mr. Shah said it showed the direction the fire trucks would travel and the turning radius. He said there were no proposed changes. Mr. Ajayi advised that they would need to submit for an engineering permit.

Lt. Paul Fix had no comment.

Richard Nixon had no comment.

Kevin Wilson had no comment.

Dan Topp had no comment.

Andrew Pinney pointed out a typo on the application. He said the reference to N.W. 24th Avenue should read N.W. 54th Avenue.

Mr. Pinney asked that they show a dimension for the setback of the parking to show the distance from the property line when they submit the final three site plans. He advised that the parallel parking spaces that were being proposed were slightly too small. He said Code required 9-foot wide spaces while the plans showed them at 8.85 foot. He gave Mr. Shah a copy of Table P. He advised that a "no parking" area was needed in front of the first parallel parking space. He also asked that they add a dimension to show the drive aisle widths around the new parking areas. Mr. Pinney said that site plan modifications were minor and the process could move forward with the three final site plans. He said that the lighting and landscaping would be handled with their larger application which was scheduled to go before the Development Review Committee on August 22, 2017. He said they should try to get this item done and permitted as soon as possible.

Mr. Pinney said the item was approved subject to the conditions provided. He asked the petitioner to submit three final site plans with the conditions incorporated and they would be circulated for approval and then they could be permitted.

3) GENERAL DISCUSSION

There was no discussion.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Prepared by: Rita Rodi

Reddy Chitepu
Acting Director, Economic Development Department
Director, Environmental and Engineering Services Department

Date: _____