



City Commission

Mayor Anthony N. Caggiano
Vice Mayor Tommy Ruzzano
Antonio V. Arserio
Arlene R. Schwartz
Joanne Simone

City Manager

Samuel A. May

Interim City Attorney

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

City Clerk

Joseph J. Kavanagh

REGULAR MEETING OF THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES

Tuesday, March 12, 2019

10:00 AM

City of Margate
Municipal Building

PRESENT:

Robert Massarelli, Director of Development Services
Andrew Pinney, Senior Planner
Alexia Howald, Associate Planner
Ty Vassil, Division Chief, Fire Department
Dan Topp, Community Development Inspector
Lt. Ashley McCarthy, Police Department
Alberto Torres-Soto, Senior Engineer, DEES

ABSENT:

Mark Collins, Public Works Director
Richard Nixon, Building Department Director
Diana Scarpetta, CRA Project Specialist

The regular meeting of the Margate Development Review Committee (DRC) having been properly noticed was called to order and a roll call was taken by Robert Massarelli at 10:07 a.m. on Tuesday, March 12, 2019, in the City Commission Chambers at City Hall, 5790 Margate Boulevard, Margate, FL 33063.

1) NEW BUSINESS

ID 2019-080

- 1A) APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE ON OCTOBER 23, 2018; NOVEMBER 13, 2018; NOVEMBER 27, 2018; AND DECEMBER 11, 2018

Minutes for the October 23, 2018; November 13, 2018; November 27, 2018; and December 11, 2018 meetings were approved as written.

ID 2019-053

- 1B) RECONSIDERATION OF A **SITE PLAN** FOR A NEW TWO-STORY, 32,000 SQUARE FOOT MEDICAL OFFICE BUILDING.
LOCATION: 3215 & 3251 NORTH STATE ROAD 7
ZONING: TOC-C
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: A PORTION OF "MARGATE PLAZA NO. 1", ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF, AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 132, PAGE 50 OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA

Development Services Department

901 NW 66th Avenue, Margate, FL 33063 • Phone: (954) 979-6213
www.margatefl.com • dsd@margatefl.com

PETITIONER: TOM ADAMS, MANAGER OF KTJZ PARTNERS III, LLC
AGENT FOR MEDSPACE USA, LLC.

Anthony Brunetti, Project Manager for MedSpace USA, LLC, introduced himself and gave a brief description of the changes that have been made to the plan.

DRC Comments:

Ty Vassil, commented that the Fire Department approves the plan.

Dan Topp, had the following comments:

- Continuous hedge is required throughout the property.
- Ground cover height issue, some patterns are the same for two different ground covers and hedge.
- (Hedge) Area on the west-side of building which is now closed can have an opening.
- Urban greenway is required along State Road 7, ground cover and enhanced trees are required. Trees may not be any less than thirty feet

Mr. Brunetti, commented that at the last meeting it was stated that it was one for every forty feet. Mr. Topp clarified that this is a requirement for the urban greenway. Discussion ensued. Mr. Pinney referred to the landscape code section 23.6, stating that it talks about two buffers along the right-of-way, which includes the urban greenway and the first ten feet of private property. He said that ground coverage can be placed around the base of the trees with FDOT approval. Mr. Pinney stated that one of his comments is for the Royal Palms being shown on the private side, stating that they are classified as category 3 trees and code requires a shade tree every 40-feet, which is a category 1 tree. He suggests that the Royal Palms be supplemented with Category 2 trees to get the canopy equivalent. Mr. Tom Adams with KTJZ Partners, introduced himself and explained the reason why the tenant is moving to this location. He asked if there is flexibility in the code for clustering? Mr. Pinney responded that he believes the code allows for clustering on the private side buffer, but if FDOT does not allow the ground covering in the right-of-way, then the Margate code will have to yield to that. He THEN suggested bringing the cypress a little closer to the sidewalk, instead of being centered in the depression of the swale.

Mr. Topp continued with his final comment:

- Species replacement is required to be a specific number of tree species depending on number of trees removed.

Alexia Howald, commented on the need to be consistent with the landscape and photometric plan. She said that there were inconsistencies with light poles and the trees that are being placed, pointing out the locations of the inconsistencies on the plan. She then stated that there is a walkway with hedging shown on the landscape plan which blocks access, which will need to be clarified on the plan. Ms. Howald said she is concerned with the live oak covering the stop sign at the main drive aisle.

Alberto Torres-Soto, had the following comments:

- The ramp connecting the parking lot and the FDOT sidewalk does not comply with the ADA requirements. The slope is above 1:12 and it requires handrails.
- Drainage calculation, drainage plan and details (i.e., exfiltration trench) shall be revised. The water table (WT) for the dry season on the Cocomar Water District is 8-ft. Based

on the WT and the grading information the lowest catch basin rim elevation the H2 for the exfiltration trench calculations is 2.5-ft.

- Preliminary Impact fees calculation:
 - Water and Sewer = \$24,367.90
 - Fire and Police = \$58,782.80
- Easement for the fire line shall be updated if the south distance from the fire line is not 6 ft.
- Modify the 90-degree elbow on the fire line for two-45 degree elbows.
- Provide a separate Paving Grading and Drainage from the Utility Site Plan for the permit package.
- All permits from other agency (i.e. FDOT, County, SFWMD, etc.) shall be provided as part of the submittal of the construction plans review.

Ashley McCarthy, commented that there are no public safety concerns as this time

Robert Massarelli, commented that he appreciates all the design changes. He did ask that based on the tenant floor layout, it shows one of the tenants will be accessed from the west-side of the building. Mr. Brunetti said that the intention right now is for two tenants with a maximum of three. Mr. Massarelli asked to change and notate this information on the drawing, making it clear that if there will be a second tenant then the hallway will be constructed. Mr. Adams stated that this is all hypothetical until they have tenants for the building. Mr. Massarelli stated that he is concerned that if it does become an entrance it has a narrow sidewalk (with shrubs along the driveway), and he can see where people will be parking across the driveway and cutting through those shrubs. Mr. Adams said that the public will not have access to the tenant space from that side of the building. Mr. Massarelli said that it is fine if the entrance is limited to employees and service; however, if it becomes a main entrance to a tenant then his concern is the narrow sidewalk and the layout, which will not work well. Mr. Brunetti stated that there will be a main entrance with a main lobby, saying that it is clearly distinguished. Mr. Massarelli asked to clarify on the drawing with a note stating that tenants will access from the main entrance on the east side. He then discussed the loading zone, asking the petitioner how they see the loading zone being operated? Mr. Adams responded that the lead tenant would be receiving deliveries and/or supplies once or twice a week, and that this area is considered a private drive. Mr. Massarelli stated that there may be conflicts in the future and agreed that this is not a public road, but is not a private road either. He then continued with his comments stating that the dumpster needs to be angled slightly. Mr. Rhon Ernest-Jones responded with the reasoning for that location/angle. Mr. Massarelli stated that if it works then it can be left at that location. He then discussed the pedestrian crosswalk at the existing Penn Dutch area, which is shown as a striped area with curb stops, saying that they could become parking spaces. Mr. Adams said that they will remove any conflicts. Mr. Massarelli recommends placing "No Parking" signs. He then gave his final comment referencing the irrigation plan, stating that on sheet IR2 it shows a series of heads in the pedestrian crosswalk.

Andrew Pinney, began by complimenting the site plan. He then commented on the photometric plan which shows a number of areas below two foot candles saying that this is light level one, which means that all building operations will cease at 7pm. He stated that if later hours are needed then it would need to be brought up to two foot candles. Mr. Pinney asked for a fixture detail on the photometric plan. He mentioned the minimum planting requirements, saying that some of the trees selected are not on listed in Section 23-23; he recommends verifying minimum size of plantings in Section 23-5. He stated that parking blocks are not required in the following areas: Doctor's parking on north side of building, and anywhere there is a parking

space pulled into a curbed landscape area at least 7 feet wide. He then referred to the plan with Mr. Ernest-Jones. Mr. Pinney reminded the petitioner of the limitation of wall signs.

Mr. Massarelli stated that based on the comments and a few cleanup items as well as the comments from DEES prior to construction drawings, this item is approved to go forward. Mr. Pinney clarified the process for final site plan approval which is to submit three complete signed and sealed sets, he does recommending waiting until after the City Commission Meeting. If submitted now sign off will not be until after City Commission approval.

ID 2019-054

- 1B) RECONSIDERATION OF A **SUBDIVISION RESURVEY** FOR A NEW TWO-STORY, 32,000 SQUARE FOOT MEDICAL OFFICE BUILDING.
LOCATION: 3215 & 3251 NORTH STATE ROAD 7
ZONING: TOC-C
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: A PORTION OF "MARGATE PLAZA NO. 1", ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF, AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 132, PAGE 50 OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA
PETITIONER: TOM ADAMS, MANAGER OF KTJZ PARTNERS III, LLC
AGENT FOR MEDSPACE USA, LLC.

Anthony Brunetti, Project Manager for MedSpace USA, LLC, introduced himself and gave a brief description of the changes made on the subdivision resurvey.

DRC Comments:

Ty Vassil, commented that the Fire Department has no issues with the plan.

Dan Topp, had no comment.

Alexia Howald, had no comment.

Alberto Torres-Soto, commented that there was a utility easement that was never recorded previously, he said that if there was one then it will have to be recorded. Mr. Rhon Ernest-Jones responded that according to GIS it appears that the entire force main is located on Dr. Glick's property, he said that he knows where the easement is but is unsure if it was recorded. Mr. Torres said that he has no issues approving the subdivision but it is required to be recorded at the permitting process.

Ashley McCarthy, had no comment.

Andrew Pinney, had no comment.

Robert Massarelli, had no comment.

Mr. Torres-Soto, commented on the terms of the surface water license renewal, he said that he did not see anything embedded in the plans. He asked that they include the licensing information and the recertification of the operational license on the plans.

Robert Massarelli, said that based on the comments of the board it will now be forwarded to the Planning and Zoning Board.

2) GENERAL DISCUSSION

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:14 AM

Respectfully submitted,

Prepared by Melissa M. Miller

Robert Massarelli
Director of Development Services

Date: _____

DRAFT