



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

Tuesday, June 13, 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:

Ben Ziskal, AICP, CECd, Director of Economic Development

Andrew Pinney, Associate Planner

Timothy Finn, Senior Planner

Tom Vaughn, Building Department

Dan Booker, Fire Chief

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:

Delilah Olivera, TNT Fireworks

Antonio Quevedo, HSQ Group, Inc.

Robert Cambo, Alliance XVII, LLC

Jimmy Socash, JFS Design Inc.

ABSENT:

Abraham Stubbins, Utilities Inspector

Ronald Eyma, Assistant Director of DEES

Kim Vazquez, Project Manager, Margate Community Redevelopment Agency

Michael Jones, Director of Parks and Recreation

Director of Public Works

The regular meeting of the Margate Development Review Committee (DRC), having been properly noticed, was called to order by Ben Ziskal at 10:03 AM on **Tuesday, June 13, 2017** in the City Commission Chambers at City Hall, 5790 Margate Boulevard, Margate, FL 33063.

1) **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

1A) APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING ON APRIL 25, 2017.

1B) APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING ON MAY 9, 2017.

Economic Development Department

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

www.margatefl.com • edevdirector@margatefl.com

The meeting minutes were approved as written.

2) **NEW BUSINESS**

- 2A) **DRC NO. 06-17-01** CONSIDERATION OF AN OUTDOOR EVENT FOR TNT FIREWORKS SPARKLER SALES JUNE 26-JULY 4, 2017.
LOCATION: 5555 WEST ATLANTIC BOULEVARD (LAKEWOOD MALL)
ZONING: TRANSIT ORIENTED CORRIDOR (TOC)
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: A PORTION OF "MARGATE REALTY NO. 1", ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 42, PAGE 42, TOGETHER WITH A PORTION OF TRACT "A", "LAKEWOOD COMMERCIAL", ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 120, PAGE 27, BOTH OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF BROWARD COUNTY.
PETITIONER: DELILAH OLIVERA, TNT FIREWORKS

Delilah Olivera proposed a sparkler sale saying the setup would be the same as years past with a container to store the product, a generator, and a 20x40 tent.

DRC Comments:

Dan Booker asked if a sparkler permit was already submitted to the Fire Department. Mrs. Olivera confirmed.

Tom Vaughn asked if permit applications had already been submitted. Mrs. Olivera confirmed.

Andrew Pinney asked that the Hold Harmless Agreement be updated to include all event dates. Mr. Pinney also explained that in the future an event of this nature may follow a different approval process known as a Temporary Use Permit.

Jeanine Athias had no comment.

Lt. Joe Galaska explained that if they wanted to hire the Police Department for security they could, but that it was not required.

Ben Ziskal reinforced the points that all permits would need to be secured, all the appropriate inspections scheduled and Hold Harmless Agreement updated.

Mrs. Olivera asked Mr. Pinney if she should go to the Building Department to update the Hold Harmless Agreement. Mr. Pinney said it should be submitted as a correction to the permit application.

- 2B) **DRC NO. 06-17-02** CONSIDERATION OF A SITE PLAN FOR MARQUESA DEVELOPMENT
LOCATION: 5203-5281 COCONUT CREEK PARKWAY
ZONING: TRANSIT ORIENTED CORRIDOR-CORRIDOR (TOC-C)
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: PARCEL "A" OF CENTRAL PARK OF COMMERCE, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF, AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 119, PAGE 27, OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA.

PETITIONER: ANTONIO QUEVEDO, HSQ GROUP, INC.

Antonio Quevedo presented a site plan showing the existing shopping center at the northwest corner of Banks Road and Coconut Creek Parkway including two existing outparcels and parking lot area. He said there would be some demolition on the east side of the Charter school which would be done in two phases. Mr. Quevedo presented an overall site plan as well as a phase one plan including the two out parcels because of the current lease agreements. Mr. Quevedo said he is currently petitioning for the units for the first two buildings and will then pursue other approvals to finalize the development as a whole. Mr. Quevedo said there are existing utilities that will need to be relocated throughout the property. He further stated that the plans presented included a conceptual engineering plan.

DRC Comments:

Dan Booker said that Kevin Wilson reviewed the plans and had the following comments

- The fire department connections for building one and three would need to be within 50 feet of the fire hydrants.
- The exit gate was shown to be 12 feet wide but should be a minimum of 14 feet wide.
- The entrance gate would need to have a Knox key switch and siren yelp for backup
- The north end of the entry island that separates the resident and visitor entrance would need to be shortened to allow the proper turning radius for fire apparatus.

Tom Vaughn said plans and permit applications would need to be submitted to the Building Department for review.

Andrew Pinney said that the development would be carving out a little over eight acres from an existing shopping center to create a new residential development. The code requires a new plat to be filed for the parcel that will be created which is over five acres for multi-family structures. Mr. Quevedo asked if that was required per the City code and Mr. Pinney confirmed that City Code Section 31.15 requires that the parcel must be platted. Mr. Pinney said the site plan has the primary frontage on Coconut Creek Parkway and the building is placed correctly on the build to line but asked for a percentage of the frontage buildout to be added to the site data table. Mr. Pinney pointed out that just east of the building on Coconut Creek Parkway the plan showed an area for parking in the second lot which the City Code discourages and asked Mr. Quevedo to relocate or shift them back. Mr. Pinney stated that as of now there are 93 TOC units available to allocate in that part of the City and he asked how they plan on acquiring the remaining 127 units to complete the project. Mr. Quevedo said he met with Ben Ziskal and they discussed contacting the County to see if they were able to file a land use plan amendment for the additional units. Mr. Quevedo explained that as of now they were presenting the overall site plan to get an idea of what the property will look like but were seeking approval for Phase I. Mr. Pinney asked for confirmation that Phase I will be built with TOC units and to complete Phase II they will plan on requesting a land use plan amendment to request flex units. Mr. Quevedo confirmed. Mr. Pinney said that the parking design showed several abutting walkway and said that they had two options to meet the code requirement by either adding wheel stops to each parking space or the preferred option would be to widen the 5-foot-wide side walk to 7-foot-wide and at least six inches above the asphalt. Mr. Quevedo said he would make that recommendation to the client. Mr. Pinney mentioned that the site data parking calculation identified a bus bay on Banks Rd. and he asked for verification as to the type of bus stop. Mr.

Quevedo said it was a bus stop with a bus pad and a sign post. Mr. Pinney advised that if it is a pole bus stop it would give a 3% parking credit rather than a 5% parking credit for a bus stop that included a shelter. Mr. Quevedo asked if it was possible to look into upgrading to a shelter type bus stop if they were short on parking. Mr. Pinney confirmed saying that was the intent of the code to upgrade the transit facilities. Mr. Pinney asked for clarification regarding the proposed method for mail delivery; stating that the trend is building a centralized mail kiosk but it was not on the site plan. Mr. Quevedo said they would determine if it would be a separate centralized mail kiosk or if it would be part of the clubhouse and that it would be added to the site plan. To help improve functionality, Mr. Pinney asked that paved connections be added from the bike racks to the public sidewalks along the Coconut Creek Parkway and Banks Road. Mr. Pinney said he saw vehicle gates but nothing to indicate if the community would be fenced or walled in. Mr. Quevedo said that it has not been worked out yet but the intent was for it to be a gated community with a perimeter fence and that it would be shown on the revised site plan with fencing detail. Mr. Pinney asked that the petitioner keep in mind that in the TOC no chain-link fences are permitted. Mr. Quevedo said more than likely it would be a picket column style fence. Mr. Pinney mentioned that Section 23-11 of the landscaping code requires a 15 feet wide buffer with a six-foot masonry wall to separate any property line that directly abuts non-residential property. Mr. Pinney asked why there was no connectivity from the parking lot to the shopping center. Mr. Quevedo said they had discussed it and they planned to have some type of connectivity to the shopping center and the school. Mr. Pinney said that the City Code pushes for the rear alleyway connection and if connected it would be lined up with the building.

Jimmy Socash, landscape architect or JFS Design, Inc., asked if the 15-foot buffer between the residential and commercial property applied to this project stating that the Code usually applies to the commercial property and not the residential property due to the hierarchy. Mr. Socash further explained that if required to build a 15-foot buffer wall that would result in the loss of parking spaces along the west side. Mr. Pinney responded saying that normally the burden is placed on the commercial property, however, since the commercial property existed first the Code then passes the requirement to the new residential development that will be built next to the existing commercial location. Mr. Socash asked for clarification as to whether the wall is to be in lieu of the 15-foot green area or in addition to the green area. Mr. Pinney said the wall is to be located inside the 15-foot green area. Mr. Quevedo asked if the wall could be built along the property line as long as there was 15 feet behind it and Mr. Pinney said as long as the intent of the Code is met so that there is a wall and a landscape buffer it would be agreeable but that they would need to take a closer look at the Code Section before moving forward. Due to the project being a redevelopment of the site Mr. Pinney said the applicant would need to provide the TOC Urban Greenway consisting of an eight-foot landscape buffer coming off the edge of the travel lane/curb as well as a 12-foot-wide sidewalk on Coconut Creek Parkway which would result in an overall measurement of at least 20, which may encroach into the front of the property. Banks Rd. is a local road and therefore the Urban Greenway would only be 15 feet wide with an eight-foot landscape buffer and a seven-foot sidewalk. Mr. Quevedo asked if the greenway needed to be in the public right-of-way or if they could dedicate an easement. Mr. Pinney said they could dedicate an easement if they needed room. Mr. Pinney explained that the City adopted recycling requirements which could be found in Section 19-10 such that for every eight dwelling units one 95-gallon recycling cart is required. Mr. Pinney went on further explain the options to meet this requirement for 220 units. Either 28 95 gallon carts to be serviced once per week or 14 95 gallon carts to be serviced twice a week or two eight yard dumpsters serviced once a week or one 8-yard dumpster serviced twice a week. In regards to

landscaping, Mr. Pinney requested that two additions be made to the calculation table on L2. First, to show that the street trees noted in section 23.6B for the landscape buffer are on the private side which is required where there is not a building on the build to line. Secondly, the street tree requirement as part of the urban tree greenway in the swale area. Mr. Pinney asked that the applicant update the landscape plan to also include the multifamily tree requirement of section 23.11B for a category 2 tree or canopy equivalent for every dwelling unit as well as a shrub requirement. Mr. Socash asked if there was a street tree and a perimeter landscape requirement for both Banks Rd. and Coconut Creek Pkwy. Mr. Pinney said that Coconut Creek Pkwy. would be exempt from the perimeter landscaping where the building is, but where there is not a building on the build to line the perimeter buffer is required. Mr. Socash said he didn't think they would be able to plant street trees in the swale because Coconut Creek Pkwy. is a DOT road and there is a deceleration lane. Banks Rd. does not have a lot of room in the swale and there is an overhead powerline on both sides. Mr. Pinney said that could be worked out through Broward County permitting stating that the City of Coconut Creek has worked with Broward County in the past to plan the swales and that they may have to select different species but that the Code would allow for an exchange of a smaller species when there are overhead powerlines. Mr. Socash said that what was shown on the plan were smaller species due to the powerlines being overhead. Mr. Pinney asked that the shrub and hedge requirement be included in the table as well as the maximum sod allowed per district or section. He also asked that on the bottom of the planting list that the percentage of native species be added. Mr. Pinney's final comment was that the plans were missing photometric plans and an irrigation plan. Mr. Socash said that the irrigation plan would be created once the site plan was settled since there would still be modifications. Mr. Quevedo asked if the greenway was on both Coconut Creek Pkwy. and Banks Rd. Mr. Pinney confirmed saying they were different sizes, Coconut Creek Pkwy. would have 20 feet overall with 8-foot landscaping and 12-foot sidewalk and Banks Rd. would 15 feet overall with 8-foot landscaping and 7-foot sidewalk.

Jeanine Athias said that since there would be updates to the plat to keep in mind that the square footage would need to be updated as well. There was a recent update to the commercial plat that placed it at approximately 200,000. Mr. Quevedo said they have always had the intent to do a plat note amendment. Mrs. Athias said the vehicular driveways on the plat show a right turn only but the site has a left turn at the northern side that will need to be updated on the plat. Mr. Quevedo said they would do a non-vehicular access on the amendment. Mrs. Athias said a survey would be needed to show the X flood zone which would provide a finished floor elevation to meet the requirement of 18 inches above the crown of the road. The survey needs to be in NAVD. A drainage plan with grading, paving and drainage with elevations as well as calculations for storm water plans will also need to be submitted to Broward County. Mr. Quevedo asked if they must have the paving and drainage and the calculations heard before the DRC. Mrs. Athias said they would like to see those items ahead of time to provide comments before getting to the point of permitting. A traffic study would be needed to provide a trip count. Mrs. Athias requested that the utilities plan be updated to differentiate the varying layers. Calculations will need to be provided to determine if an updated capacity will be needed for the lift station. As far as the flood zone was concerned, most of the property is X zone but some of the other areas are in a special flood hazard area and the building location should be checked to keep them out of those areas.

Andrew Pinney stated for the record that the applicant had been in touch with the School Board for a capacity analysis. The multifamily development does not count garages towards the required parking.

Abidemi Ajayi made the following comments

- There are multiple easements on the property that will need to be vacated and new additional easements will be required for water and sewer.
 - Since a wall will be installed there will need to be a 5-foot setback for the utilities.
 - Impact fees will apply; the initial estimate is \$650,000 for Police, Fire, water and sewer.
 - Since the project will be completed in phases, it is required that the first phase be looped and the materials will need to be DIP (ductile iron pipe).
 - On the site plan, between building 1 and 2 there is a water line configuration that makes a U shape, change it to be a straight connection.
 - On Banks Road the connection should be 6 x 12 and not 8 x 12
 - There are a few locations where the hydrant extends more than 100 feet and needs to be looped.
 - Need to show size for the water meter that is proposed.
 - Landscape plan conflicts with utilities and will need to be revised.
 - Utility line weights will need to be addressed. Mr. Quevedo said those would be removed and the water and sewer lines would be split.
 - Behind building 2 use a 90 elbow instead of a TEE connection. Mr. Quevedo said it was a logistical move that they will look into.
 - The drainage plan does not show an existing connection to the outfall which will need to be updated.
 - Mr. Ajayi asked about the plans for the driveway with a turn lane on Coconut Creek Pkwy. that appears to turn into the back of a building. Mr. Quevedo said the lane will remain during phase 1 and later be removed and closed off during phase 2.
- Robert Cambo had two questions regarding impact fees. He stated that Broward County said they had impact fee credits for the 80,000 square feet of commercial space that was already built and they would be demolishing. Secondly, phase 1 only allows for 92 units and phase 2 will require completing the flex process to allow for the full amount of 220 units. Mr. Cambo wanted to ensure that the impact fees would be prorated. Mr. Ajayi confirmed stating that this was an estimate and later a revised calculation based on the portion that is being demolished would be provided. A notice of reassignment fees would need to be provided and the water sewer fees would be recalculated.

Lt. Paul Fix asked if the current driveway access to Banks Rd. on the northeast corner which is now used for school pick-up and drop-off would be a comingled use. Mr. Quevedo said there would not be any drive thru or vehicular access connection and that part of the reconfiguration of the site plan is to reconfigure the school access to another location on Coconut Creek Pkwy. Lt. Fix asked if there would be a buffer on the west property line between the development and the existing school. Mr. Quevedo said that there would be a 15-foot buffer with a wall as requested earlier by Mr. Pinney.

Ben Ziskal said that due to the elimination of the entrance off of Coconut Creek Pkwy. during phase two, that the swale would need to be filled in. The landscape plans showed landscaping in the area of the 20-foot emergency access drive on Banks Rd. and would need to be updated to make sure that the area will be kept clean and free. Mr. Ziskal asked what material would be used there. Mr. Quevedo said they would mimic what was done at Toscana and use road rock and sod on top. Mr. Ziskal asked for confirmation that it would always remain just emergency access. Mr. Quevedo confirmed. Mr. Ziskal said staff would be available to meet to discuss the

process for the plat on phase one amendments as well as the allocation for units which would involve the TOC units to be received administratively and for phase two, City Commission or potentially Broward County approval for the flex units. Mr. Quevedo asked if there were 92 or 93 units available. Mr. Ziskal said there were 93 units available. Mr. Quevedo asked if it was possible to revisit the re-platting requirement to get a letter from the County. Mr. Pinney said as far as the phasing, worst case scenario, and if phase 2 were never built there would still be a required buffer. Mr. Pinney reminded the petitioner of the timeline for site plan approval stating that they have one year from today's date to have a building permit issued in order to vest the site plan. Then, one year from the issuance of the last CO for phase one, you will have one year to obtain a building permit for phase two. If at that time, for any reason, phase two cannot be built the requirement for the buffer will still stand. Mr. Cambo asked if the commercial outparcels were to remain, as they expect they would, he didn't think it would be possible to build a wall buffer. Mr. Pinney said it would be placed around the buildings. Mr. Cambo asked if the existing sidewalks along Coconut Creek Pkwy. and Banks Rd. right at the property line would need to be demolished and widened. Mr. Pinney answered saying that it depends on the permitting agency and what they will allow. Mrs. Athias said Coconut Creek Pkwy. is a Broward County road but for City roads it is preferred to have the sidewalks demolished so there is no joint.

3) **GENERAL DISCUSSION**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:41 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Prepared by: Leslie E. Hoff

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

Date: _____