



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

**Tuesday, October 24, 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:**

Andrew Pinney, Associate Planner  
Andy Dietz, Associate Planner  
Richard Nixon, Building Department  
Dan Topp, Community Development Inspector  
Abidemi Ajayi (A.J.), Engineer  
Lt. Joe Galaska, Police Department  
Lt. Paul Fix, Police Department  
Kim Vazquez, Project Manager, Margate Community Redevelopment Agency

**ALSO PRESENT:**

**ABSENT:**

Reddy Chitepu, Acting Director of Economic Development/Director of DEES  
Kevin Wilson, Fire Inspector  
Michael Jones, Director, Parks and Recreation  
Ronald Eyma, Assistant Director of DEES  
Abraham Stubbins, Utilities Inspector  
Jeanine Athias, Engineer  
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 10:02 AM on **Tuesday, October 24, 2017**, in the City Commission Chambers at City Hall, 5790 Margate Boulevard, Margate, FL 33063.

- 1A) APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING ON JUNE 27, 2017.

The minutes for the June 27, 2017 meeting were approved as written.

- 2) **NEW BUSINESS**

*ID 2017-691*

- 2A) **DRC NO. 10-17-01** CONSIDERATION OF AN ORDINANCE TO REVISE WINDOW SIGN REGULATIONS AND PROVIDE AN AMORTIZATION DATE.

**Economic Development Department**

5790 Margate Boulevard, Margate, FL 33063 • Phone: (954) 935-5330 • Fax: (954) 935-5304  
[www.margatefl.com](http://www.margatefl.com) • [edevdirector@margatefl.com](mailto:edevdirector@margatefl.com)

Andrew Pinney provided some background on the item. He explained that several months prior the City Commission had raised some concerns about window signs in the City, and they asked that an enforcement initiative be started. Prior to starting the initiative, he said staff recommended reviewing the regulation to ensure that it was what was wanted. He said a City Commission Workshop was held on August 23, 2017 to obtain feedback on the regulations, and the ordinance before them that day was created based on the comments provided.

He highlighted the following changes to the ordinance:

- eliminated content based regulations such as the striking out of a pricing restriction;
- provided additional design flexibility by striking out letter height restrictions;
- changed the illumination requirement from no more than 50 percent of the total window area per window to no more than 50 percent of the total window area of each frontage, including glass doors;
- added new language which prohibited convenience stores and massage businesses from blacking out the windows. He said the same tint limitations that applied to vehicles was adopted which would make it easier to enforce. He said the verbiage regarding massage services would be modified to provide a medical office exemption for the blackout restriction when massage was an accessory use in a medical office.
- added an amortization date of on or about July 31, 2018 for all businesses to come into compliance with the regulation;
- added the requirement that a building permit must be obtained for a permanent window sign as a means for a business to protect its investment by ensuring that the sign being installed met Code and there would not be any issues.

#### **DRC Comments:**

Richard Nixon asked about the building permit requirement. Mr. Pinney said section 39.16 of the Sign Code included a section that provided a list of signs that were exempt from permitting. He said the language was being changed so that temporary window signs would not require a permit but a permanent window sign installation would require a permit. He said there was also language regarding permits for illuminated signs whereby illuminated window signs that were not battery operated would need to have a permanent power source that was professionally installed and permitted by the Building Department to prevent safety hazards.

Dan Topp clarified that the 50 percent window coverage would make it easier for a business to put all of their signs in two windows while the rest would need to be blank.

Abidemi Ajayi had no comment.

Paul Fix had no comment.

Kim Vazquez questioned why the verbiage on page two that read, "Sign shall be kept in a condition that will maintain their original aesthetic appearance," had been deleted. Mr. Pinney explained that the ordinance was also being revised to eliminate any duplicate language in other areas of the Code. He said many of the provisions were also provided for under Prohibited Signs, and similar language was in the Property Maintenance chapter of the Zoning Code for the verbiage that was being deleted.

Mr. Nixon asked if the signs would also require Zoning approval. Mr. Pinney responded that Zoning review was critical on any type of sign permit because the Sign Code was so detailed. Mr. Nixon asked whether Zoning would also request that inspections be done. Mr. Pinney said the process for such was not currently in place, but it was something that could be changed for the future.

Mr. Pinney said the item was recommended for approval and it would be scheduled to move forward to the Planning and Zoning Board meeting based on the availability of the minutes.

3) **GENERAL DISCUSSION**

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

Respectfully submitted,

Prepared by: Rita Rodi

\_\_\_\_\_  
Andrew Pinney  
Senior Planner, Economic Development Department

Date: \_\_\_\_\_