



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

Tuesday, March 13, 2018

10:00 AM

City of Margate
Municipal Building

PRESENT:

Reddy Chitepu, Acting Director of Economic Development/Director of DEES
Andrew Pinney, Senior Planner
Tom Vaughn, Chief Plumbing Inspector, Building Department
Kevin Wilson, Fire Inspector
Dan Topp, Community Development Inspector
Alberto Torres-Soto, Senior Engineer, DEES
Abidemi Ajayi (A.J.), Engineer, DEES
Lt. Paul Fix, Police Department
Cotter Christian, Project Manager, DEES

ALSO PRESENT:

Antonio Quevedo, P.E., President, HSQ Group, Inc.
Donna C. West, PSM Director of Surveying, HSQ Group, Inc.
Robert Cambo, Managing Partner, Alliance XVI, LLC

ABSENT:

Lt. Joe Galaska, Police Department
Ronald Eyma, Assistant Director of DEES
Abraham Stubbins, Utilities Inspector
Michael Jones, Director, Parks and Recreation
Director of Public Works
Margate Community Redevelopment Agency

The regular meeting of the Margate Development Review Committee (DRC) having been properly noticed was called to order by Reddy Chitepu at 10:00 AM on Tuesday, March 13, 2018, in the City Commission Chambers at City Hall, 5790 Margate Boulevard, Margate, FL 33063.

ID 2018-072

- 1A) APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETING ON JANUARY 23, 2018.

The minutes for the January 23, 2018 meeting were approved.

- 2) **NEW BUSINESS**

Development Services Department

901 NW 66th Avenue, Margate, FL 33063 • Phone: (954) 979-6646
www.margatefl.com • dsd@margatefl.com

City Commission

Mayor Arlene R. Schwartz
Vice Mayor Anthony N. Caggiano
Lesa Peerman
Tommy Ruzzano
Joanne Simone

City Manager

Samuel A. May

Interim City Attorney

Goren, Cherof,
Doody & Ezrol, P.A.

City Clerk

Joseph J. Kavanagh

ID 2018-066

- 2A) **DRC NO. 03-18-01** CONSIDERATION OF A REPLAT OF 7.554 ACRES TO CONVERT A PORTION OF A SHOPPING CENTER TO 220 UNIT APARTMENT COMPLEX
LOCATION: 5203 COCONUT CREEK PARKWAY
ZONING: TOC-C CORRIDOR
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: A PORTION OF 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 OF HSQ GROUP, INC. FOR ROBERT CAMBO OF ALLIANCE XVI, LLC

Antonio Quevedo gave a brief overview of the project, stating that they had previously come in front of DRC with the same site plan and made some tweaks based on the DRC comments that they were given. He went on to say that they wanted to submit the plat so that they may go to the County, clarifying that this is a boundary plat. He pointed out a few items that they will be changing on the site plan, including the existing building in the middle which will be going away. He said they will be demolishing all the commercial in the platted portion which will then become the residential area, this will clear up most of the issues that they previously had. He stated that the outparcel which is currently a funeral home will remain on the plat. He stated that what they are doing today is to get the plat going through to the county, by receiving comments from DRC and then resubmitting with all the changes pending the plat and the concurrency report.

DRC Comments:

Tom Vaughn had no comment

Kevin Wilson had no comment

Dan Topp had no comment

Andrew Pinney mentioned that he was glad for the explanation that Mr. Quevedo gave clarifying the inconsistencies given on the plat submitted and the site plan submitted. He then stated that on the proposed plat it does not show the 15-foot wide utility easement on the front of the property, which is on the existing plat. He went on to say that one of the TOC requirements is an urban greenway with a landscape buffer plus the wide sidewalk, typically this encroaches into the front of the property and the property owner ends up dedicating a portion of private property for public use. Mr. Pinney is recommending a meeting with Broward County to find out how they will handle permitting trees in the right-of-way and how much space they require, then add on the 12-foot-wide sidewalk and find out where that lands in the property, at that point the City can determine the easement while the plat is still "liquid". Mr. Quevedo responded that they will meet with Broward County for the landscaping, but the revised site plan does have the expanded sidewalks on both Banks Road and Coconut Creek Parkway. Mr. Pinney stated that he was aware of this but wanted to mention that there was no easement on the front, saying that this is normally an issue with TOC properties. He asked

them to work out where the sidewalks will fall and have the easement in place on the plat. Mr. Quevedo stated that he believes that on Coconut Creek Parkway those sidewalks will fall 100% within the right-of-way, but the easement that is required will have a bit of an overlap onto the property. Mr. Pinney asked if they checked with Broward County on their tree permitting requirements, because that has a tendency to change things. Mr. Quevedo answered that they will.

Mr. Pinney went on to state that on the plat there is no provision for a rear alleyway system or a cross access to the shopping center. Mentioning that one of the goals of the TOC is to have a rear alleyway system and it is cited in the Code that there needs to be connectivity and currently the Charter School is using that Banks Road connection for their drop-off routing. Mr. Quevedo stated that they will be rerouting this internally, within the site and along the west they are bringing the rear of that area around and back out to Coconut Creek. He said that he will provide an overall site plan showing the proposed improvements and minor modifications to the end of that commercial. He asked if there should be vehicular access between the two properties. Mr. Pinney responded that access into the community can be controlled but there still needs to be rear access so that the shopping center can get to Banks Road. He stated that building it like this would create a dead end and force all the trips on to Coconut Creek Parkway. Mr. Quevedo mentioned that their traffic study took this into consideration and asked if the City really wanted a commercial use coming through the residential? Mr. Pinney explained that on a rear alleyway system it would not go through the development, it would be a separate dedicated alley that would come out to Banks Road. He stated that this is a code requirement for the TOC. Mr. Quevedo said that he would like to show the overall shopping center and how they are arranging the circulation. Mr. Pinney said that they can meet to further discuss this.

Mr. Pinney referred to the concurrency report submitted with the plat application and noted that on page 6 the report states that 92 garden apartments are already entitled. He went on to say that the TOC units are on a first come first serve basis and they have not yet been assigned to that property, so they are not yet entitled. He stated that they have been requested, but are not yet approved. Mr. Quevedo said that they will reword this by saying that they will be available to the site. Mr. Pinney mentioned that section 9.10 provides certain criteria that has to be met before those TOC units are assigned to the property, he also stated that their application had been submitted in June 2017.

Mr. Pinney commented on the traffic study that was provided which relies on 5-year old data for the trip counts, stating that there has been a lot of development since that 2013 study. He would like to use newer data for the traffic counts and the traffic study. Mr. Pinney is recommending that they add headings on the columns in "traffic Appendix A". He also stated that as a new platting requirement, any new development will be responsible for undergrounding all the overhead utility lines, meaning that if approved the developer will be responsible for putting those existing lines underground. He said that for the concurrency report, the parks and rec level of service will need to be addressed, since the request is for 128 flex units. He explained that as a platting requirement and since this is under 60 acres the developer will be required to pay 5% of the value of the property to the parks and rec trust fund. Mr. Pinney is requesting a statement on acreage to be able to maintain the parks level of service.

Cotter Christian had no comment

Alberto Torres-Soto mentioned that all the easements, both existing and recorded shall be there, but noticed that there is more information submitted on the site plan which is not included in the plat. He stated that the design for the site plan does not contemplate the design for the proposed plat. There is more area and parking and in relation to that it will be better to plat the whole thing and assign the use. He asked when the other area is demolished whether the parking would be a part of the community. Mr. Quevedo replied that the one in the middle is going to be totally gone, and the out-parcel is going to stay and will no longer be a part of the development with no plans to demolish in the future, it will actually be in use. Mr. Torres asked if there is a ride-out entrance? Mr. Quevedo replied "yes". Mr. Torres stated that there is no way that the provided design will stop the vehicles from making a left turn, and that it will have to be rearranged on the design, because this will eventually be a big issue with traffic.

Abidemi Ajayi had no comment

Paul Fix had no comment

Mr. Chitepu addressed the concurrency report in Section 2 Planning and Zoning, stating that Mr. Pinney addressed the allocation issue in which the exhibits that were referred to had the wrong reference number and will need to be corrected. On page 6 of the Storm Water Management and the South Florida Water Management District the C14 basin elevation is noted at 6 ½, he states that it looks lower than what it actually is and it will need to be verified. Mr. Chitepu also mentioned that West Broward's storm water license is still open, this permit will need to be closed with the County, and then we can close our construction permits. They are still on a TCO, with some outstanding issues. Mr. Quevedo, stated that he did meet with the County originally because they were going to incorporate in the existing permit. Mr. Chitepu reiterated the fact that the engineering permit is still open and will need to be closed.

Mr. Chitepu referenced page 7 Section C, Storm Water Management, existing and proposed drainage information stating that if this is going to be parceled and platted out separately, in the future there is a potential that this can be sold as a separate entity. He went on to say that the design for drainage is combined, so there will need to be a way to identify ownership and how that ownership will be recorded. This way in the future it will not be an issue with the City or the County. Mr. Quevedo remarked that the way they have done things in the past with these types of mixed-use projects is that they enter in some kind of drainage maintenance agreement because the systems will be tied together. After meeting with the County they were told that they will not be allowed to put another one in and that they will have to use the existing in the NW corner, requiring a maintenance agreement between both parties. Mr. Chitepu asked if this will be recorded as part of the plat. Mr. Quevedo responded that this usually happens with the modifications with the County on the existing surface water license.

Mr. Chitepu indicated that under the water and sewer section, the platted easements that are already there are not shown on this plat. Those easements will need to go back onto this plat because there is a water line on the south side along Coconut Creek Parkway that is in the easement. There is a water and sewer line shown in the middle of the property, this means that they are recorded easements and not platted, which will need to be shown on the plat as well.

Mr. Chitepu mentioned the lift station which will service this property and the need to look at the capacity of the lift station to see if they can handle the 220 units. He stated that if upgrades are needed then the developer is required to upgrade it.

Mr. Chitepu stated that on the traffic concurrency, there are quite a few issues with the traffic. The consultant is using the "PM Peak" traffic study which is the standard in the industry. This roadway is unique and is an educational corridor and there are more trips in the morning than in the evening. The traffic engineer did not address the a.m. traffic, he took the position that the design elements and the analysis are standard for p.m. peaks, in this situation it will not work. He will need to go back and look at the a.m. peak trips and design it and do the analysis based on the a.m. trips. Mr. Chitepu then stated that there is a typo under general office in Table 5 of the traffic report. Under the proposed, the remaining general office should be 20,000 square-feet, currently it is showing a 5, 000 square-feet number. He went on to mention the basis for proposed trip generation with the apartments, the schools, and the general office which will be the remaining portion on that plat. He said that he is not sure where the numbers came in for the students for the private schools, but those students should match the approved max for that school, because if that school gets maxed out then the traffic generation will be different. When looking at the school board sufficiency letter, they specified numbers that were much higher than in the traffic report. He went on to mention the distribution of the traffic on the links which is very subjective, they will need more detail as to how those distributions were made. Mr. Chitepu is requiring that they reach out to Coconut Creek because this will impact their streets and their intersection and to make sure that they sign off on the traffic report and the analysis. He went on to state the conclusions on the traffic report are based on the p.m. peak and meets the criteria, but there are impacts on the a.m. peaks. The trips are going to be positive instead of negative. The traffic report will have to come up with mitigation for those extra trips. He stated that if there is mitigation required then City Commission will need to approve it before the plat is recorded.

Mr. Chitepu said the notes on the original existing plat, Central Park of Commerce, will need to be amended first or simultaneously with this plat. He recommended that they receive input from the County, otherwise if that note is not adjusted then the underlying plat will maintain those notes and they will not qualify for that type of development on the original plat. The City will require clarification from the County on this. Mr. Chitepu requested clarification on the cover sheet from Marquesa Plat, stating that it will need to show the original plat, to show where this portion (the re-plat) is coming out of. He also mentioned that the signature panels on the cover sheet need to say City Engineer in place of City of Margate Community Development Services.

Mr. Chitepu addressed what Mr. Torres mentioned earlier in regards to the right-turn only on the plat at the NE corner. The current plat has a 50-foot opening and the proposed is a 60 ft opening, will need clarification on this. There could potentially be a traffic conflict at that intersection.

Mr. Chitepu mentioned the FEMA map with an aerial of the flood zones. He recommends that they overlay the flood zone map onto the building layout map, so that it doesn't intersect with any of the buildings that will require maintaining flood insurance.

Mr. Chitepu asked if there would be two separate district water use permits. Mr. Quevedo stated that this will probably be separate if they can.

Mr. Pinney wanted to clarify that with this plat application the developer is applying for 128 flex units and with the site plan the developer is applying for 92 TOC units. He went on to say that he reached out to Broward County and they require an official action from the City for an allocation of flex units, which could be the resolution approving the plat. Mr. Pinney wanted to make them aware that the process would involve DRC, the Planning and Zoning Board, and final action by the City Commission.

Mr. Torres-Soto also wanted to add that the Broward County surface water license has an RAI that still needs to be addressed. Mr. Quevedo said that he will check with Broward County on the status and will get it taken care of.

Mr. Chitepu said that with the traffic issue and the easement issues this is not ready to go forward. He recommends that these comments be addressed and to bring this item back for reconsideration.

ID 2018-068

- 2B) **DRC NO. 03-18-02** RECONSIDERATION OF A SITE PLAN FOR MARQUESA TO REDEVELOP 8.113 ACRES OF A SHOPPING CENTER TO 220 UNIT APARTMENT COMPLEX
LOCATION: 5203-5281 COCONUT CREEK PARKWAY
ZONING: TRANSIT ORIENTED CORRIDOR-CORRIDOR (TOC-C)
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: A PORTION OF 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 OF HSQ GROUP, INC. FOR ROBERT CAMBO OF ALLIANCE XVI, LLC

Antonio Quevedo stated that the original presentation given covered this item, therefore he would like to leave it to staff for comments.

DRC Comments:

Tom Vaughn had no comment

Kevin Wilson stated that the site needs a second entrance. There is one exit that is already showing at an 18-foot width, and has to be converted into an entry/exit with a minimum of 14 feet travel lane width. He also mentioned that all the fire hydrants must be functional before going vertical with construction. Mr. Wilson then said that they will need Knox key switches for the gates because all the gates need to open simultaneously when the key switch is turned. He is recommending that they reconsider access to the school through a travel lane on the north side of the property. Mr. Quevedo responded that they have not eliminated access on the east side of the property. Mr. Quevedo also questioned the 18-foot access, and if this refers to the main entrance? Mr. Wilson responded that this is the one exit that they have and it will need to be converted into an entry/exit, with each travel lane being 14-feet wide. Mr. Quevedo then asked if the secondary access could be through the existing funeral home. Mr. Wilson responded that when he reviews an overall plan he will address it at that time.

Dan Topp requested that they show the percentage of natives in the landscape calculation chart per 23-5A1, of the Margate Code of Ordinances. He then mentioned indicating on the landscape calculation chart the six shrubs and one Category 2 tree required for each unit per 23-11B. Mr. Topp also requested to notate on the chart the required interior landscaping within vehicular areas per 23-8. An urban greenway is required along both Coconut Creek Parkway and Banks Road, where there is an 8-foot planning strip and a 12-foot wide sidewalk, this will need to be clarified. Amenities including benches, public seating, waste receptacles, and bike racks will need to be addressed and is required per 23-6B2. Those requirements will need to be shown on the landscape calculation chart. The minimum landscape dimension is 7-foot per 23-8A, some islands do not have the landscape strip at all, they should all be a minimum of 7-foot.

Andrew Pinney mentioned that per the discussion during the plat comments, the property lines shown on the site plan do not match the plat. He then said that there is no rear alley connectivity into the shopping center and that there are two sections in the TOC which require and identify this as a main objective. The rear alley way system is needed to ease traffic congestion and improve mobility throughout the City. There will have to be a redesign to accommodate this, the developer will be allowed to fence off the plaza but the rear alley connection will be required. Mr. Pinney went on to mention the property line and phase line symbols are the same and that they will need to be distinguished somehow. Mr. Pinney then addressed comments that were previously mentioned by Mr. Topp, he stated that the urban greenway on Coconut Creek Parkway is showing a 12-foot wide sidewalks right up to the travel lanes. There needs to be at least an 8-foot wide landscape buffer between the sidewalk and the travel lanes. The 8-foot wide minimum is the City minimum; the County may require a bigger greenspace to accommodate the trees that our code requires. The applicant is responsible to reach out to the County to find out if any easements are needed along the front. Mr. Pinney then mentioned the existing curb cut on Banks Road that will be closed off. The site plan still shows the driveway apron in the swale. Mr. Pinney said that this will need to be filled in so that it is continuous again, this is part of the landscape buffer on Banks Road. He then stated that the parking calculation will need to be redone with the different acreage, right now it relies on a 5% transit credit for the bus-stop on Banks Road, and that presently there is only a bench and a pole in the ground which qualifies for a 2% credit. Mr. Quevedo thought that a shelter qualified them for 10% and everything else was 5%. Mr. Pinney clarified that the credits are 2%, 5%, and 7%, and that the developer could build a shelter for the highest credit. Mr. Pinney mentioned that since the funeral home is staying there they will need to revisit the phasing plan to ensure that there is parking available as these buildings come online. The parking configuration will need to be redone to make sure that there is enough parking in there. He then stated that at the NW corner where there is interlocking parking with wheel-stops, the city code requires at least a 7-foot wide curbed landscape area. He asked to include a detail on the gates for the property and if there will be a fence to please include the location of the fence and the fence detail on the site-plan. He stated the recycling shown on the plan does not meet minimum requirements. Presently there are five bins and the code requires at least either (28) twenty-eight (95) ninety-five gallon carts that are serviced once a week or (14) fourteen, (95) ninety-five gallon carts that are serviced twice a week; or (2) two (8) eight-yard dumpsters that are serviced once per week, or (1) one eight-yard dumpster that is serviced twice per week. Those recycling facilities must be in place on the site plan. Mr. Pinney then mentioned burying the overhead power lines that are adjacent to the property, even though they are in the right-of-way it will still need to be done. He stated that the developer will need an architectural review for this site plan and noted that on the photometric plan some areas fall below the

minimum one foot candle. In addition, some of the light poles are too close to trees. There needs to be at least a 10-foot separation from the edge of the canopy to the light fixture.

Robert Cambo Stated that there may be a possibility that FPL may not allow the lines to be buried. He wanted the City to understand that this may be driven by FPL and not by them. Mr. Pinney responded that the Code has a procedure for those instances, but for right now the requirement is to underground them. Mr. Quevedo stated that they will contact FPL and will let the City know what they say.

Christian Cotter commented that the proposed site plan is not in conflict with the current CRA plan as last modified in 2017.

Alberto Torres-Soto asked that at submittal to please provide the correct site plan with the information with all the storm sewer system and the grading plan. In addition, as a part of the DRC site plan checklist, the City will need the drainage calculation and how both sites will work together. He asked if the 128 units have been applied for yet and if that is still under review? Mr. Quevedo answered "yes". Mr. Torres then stated that it is still 92 units and that you will need to modify the calculation for trash once they approve all the units.

Mr. Pinney stated that the buffer between residential and commercial is required to be at least 15-feet wide have a 6-foot masonry wall. He also said that providing paved connections from the bike racks to the public right-of-way and including gates where the paved connections cross the perimeter fence will improve functionality of those facilities.

Mr. Torres-Soto stated that he will need to verify that the comments from the previous review from Broward County are taken care of and completed. There is a TCO in place and the RAI is still open. He then mentioned that the intersection between the two communities on Banks Road, we will need to verify the right turn only and how this will be addressed. In addition to this we will need a letter from Waste Management stating that they will be servicing the location and to specify the capacity they require. The applicant will also need a letter from Wheelabrator to confirm that they have sufficient capacity to process the waste from this development. He then said that they could verify the grading plan once new site plan was submitted. He asked that at the next submittal, the grading plan should include how the site will manage the existing elevations around the property, so that staff can understand how the water is going to run through the other side.

Abidemi Ajayi said that impact fees that will apply. Additionally, the existing water and sewer needs to be revised to provide a maximum of three water taps. The water must be looped in that area. Mr. Quevedo asked why they are allowing 3. Mr. Ajayi said the idea is to loop it in that area and limit how much you are disrupting the system. Currently you have multiple just for hydrants. Mr. Quevedo stated that they are all wet taps and they will not be shutting off the utilities at all. Mr. Ajayi responded that this is under the comments and there are some areas where size on size taps are proposed, which not permitted. Mr. Quevedo indicated that the plans will be corrected.

Mr. Ajayi mentioned the sewers behind buildings 1 and 2 are showing manholes. He said that these will be very hard to maintain and asked the applicant to relocate those manholes. Mr. Quevedo mentioned that this is where the sewer goes and that they will have to tie-in. Mr. Ajayi responded that they can be moved to the street and that they will need to be moved

away from behind the building. He also mentioned that because of the building layout, there will be multiple utilities that will have to be either reworked or abandoned, and that the applicant will need to provide a plan showing what will be abandoned. He said that there are several sewer and water lines, including under buildings 1 and 4. The plan will need to show the water to be abandoned, the sewer, the easements, and to include drainage. A finished floor elevation was shown at 13.5, and since there are no drainage calculations the applicant will need to show how that (number) was chosen. Mr. Ajayi stated that the applicant will need to show all tree being removed, and a tree removal permit is required. For trees that are considered specimen trees per Chapter 23, those trees will need to be replaced based on value. Conflicts between utilities and tree must be resolved.

Paul Fix had no comment

Mr. Chitepu stated that most of the comments have been made on the site plan with some general comments. These include showing the general traffic circle issue for the entire development, and to know how the school traffic will be moving around. He said to also address the Fire Marshall's comments. He requested a demolition plan to address the demolishing of the buildings, water, sewer, vacating of the easements and avenue easements, this should all be shown on one plan. He concluded that with the plat comments and by not having the updated site plan staff will want to reconsider this again. Mr. Chitepu recommended meeting with staff to address all of the comments before resubmitting.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION

Manny Lugo, 1129 E. River Drive, spoke in regards to the parking configuration and the site plan, saying that this is a disservice to the community. He stated that the City Commission is directing the staff to alter the ordinance to improve parking to show more consideration to drivers and people that will be living in Margate. He stated that there may be a possible conceptual change on the basis of parking spaces, instead of being based on units they should be based on bedrooms. He is asking that the developer take this into consideration when they come back again.

Charlie Artner, 6631 NW 22nd Court, had a general question regarding the TOC-C asking why the city allows residential buildings in the TOC-C?

Mr. Pinney responded to his question by explaining the interpretation of the TOC, stating that it comes from the Comprehensive Plan. He said that Policy 13.3 of the Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan states residential use is a required principal use of the TOC with allocations to a number of TOC units with guidance as to where those units shall be applied within the TOC corridor. He also referred to the Zoning Code, Section 9.9 permits mixed-use and Section 9.10 provides the process for allocating residential units within the TOC. This is applied to all three TOC districts. Mr. Artner responded that this is in conflict to what the definition of the TOC-C states, and stressed that this restricts the use of the TOC-C from residential use.


3) GENERAL DISCUSSION

There were no comments.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:01 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Prepared by Melissa M. Miller



Andrew Pinney, Senior Planner
Development Services Department