



City Commission

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

City Manager

Cale Curtis

City Attorney

Janette M. Smith, Esq.

City Clerk

Joseph J. Kavanagh

REGULAR MEETING OF THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE MINUTES

Tuesday, July 9, 2019

10:00 AM

City of Margate
Municipal Building

PRESENT:

Robert Massarelli, Director of Development Services
Andrew Pinney, Senior Planner
Dan Topp, Community Development Inspector
Tom Vaughn, Plumbing Chief
Kevin Wilson, Fire Marshal
Lt. Ashley McCarthy, Police Department
Pedro Stiassni, Engineer
Mark Collins, Public Works Director
Janette M. Smith, City Attorney

ABSENT:

Alberto Torres-Soto, Senior Engineer, DEES
Richard Nixon, Building Department Director

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 10:01 a.m. on Tuesday, July 9, 2019, in the City Commission Chambers at City Hall, 5790 Margate Boulevard, Margate, FL 33063.

1) NEW BUSINESS

ID 2019-304

- 1A) APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE HELD ON FEBRUARY 26, 2019; MARCH 12, 2019; AND APRIL 9, 2019.

Minutes for the February 26, 2019; March 12, 2019; and April 9, 2019 meetings were approved as written.

ID 2019-329

- 1A) CONSIDERATION OF A **SITE PLAN AMENDMENT** A AN ADDITION TO THE AUTONATION COLLISION CENTER
LOCATION: 5355 NW 24TH STREET
ZONING: M-1 LIGHT INDUSTRIAL
LEGAL DESCRIPTION: A PORTION OF TRACT "A" "SHERMAN PLAT", ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF, AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 144, PAGE 26, 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: JENNIFER RONNEBURGER, GO PERMIT, AGENT FOR ROBERT SHANE OLDHAM, PRESIDENT OF MULLINAX FORD SOUTH, INC.

Ms. Dulce Conde, Architect introduced herself and stated that the comments from the previous meeting have been addressed, and is now seeking approval for the exterior permit.

DRC Comments:

Tom Vaughn, commented that the tents will need engineered anchoring. Ms. Conde stated that she is aware of this and they have included the tents in this process. Mr. Vaughn stated that an expansion will require a Certificate of Occupancy.

Kevin Wilson, commented that the tents will require a flame spread rating and be approved by the Fire Marshal of California.

Dan Topp, had the following comments:

- Show on the landscape calculation chart that there are 50% natives throughout the site per 23-5 of the Margate Code of Ordinances.
- Guy wires are prohibited for tree stabilization per 23-5(B)(4). They are still noted in the general landscaping notes.
- There is a dead queen palm that is not shown as being replaced on the southeast corner of the property.
- *Shinus terebinthifolius* (Florida holly/Brazilian pepper) is a prohibited species per 23-5(A)(6) and considered a nuisance species per 23-17 of the Margate Code of Ordinances. All *shinus terebinthifolius* needs to be removed from the canal bank and throughout the property. Please show this on the landscape plans.

Andrew Pinney, commented on sheet A-1, referencing the loading zone on the west side, asking to confirm and verify the dimensions and to make sure there is enough clearance for vehicle traffic. He stated that the loading zone requires a fourteen-and-a-half-foot clearance to grade, in which on sheet A-301 it currently shows a fourteen-foot vertical clearance from the bottom of the canopy to grade. Mr. Pinney stated that he is concerned with the possibility of the dumpster enclosure being blocked which will hinder the garbage pick-up, suggesting to mark the location with a no parking zone sign. He also suggested installing bollards in the landscape island. Mr. Massarelli stated that the layout does not seem workable, particularly the northern most dumpster area, asking if the solid waste provider can submit a letter agreeing that they can service those dumpsters at that location. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Pinney continued with his comments stating that per code the dumpster enclosures require a three-foot irrigated landscape buffer surrounding three sides. He stated that there are inconsistencies with plan A-1.1 which shows landscape areas on the east side of the property and on the engineering plan C-1.0 shows this as proposed parking striping. He said that the new landscape areas will need to be curbed to protect from vehicle encroachment. Mr. Pinney asked what symbol is showing on the eastern drive aisle in front of the fence? Ms. Conde responded that it may be the automatic opener. Mr. Pinney asked to notate this on the plans. He then asked what the hours of operation will be? Ms. Conde stated that she believes that it is 9-5, but she will have to confirm this with the operator. Mr. Pinney stated that they will have to confirm due to light levels which fall below 2.0, which means that they will have to close by 7:00p.m. He referenced the photometric plan stating that the code limits the maximum minimum ratio as 10-1, however the table on the plan is showing 82.9, this will need to be revised. He addressed the calculation on the landscape plan, saying that the linear

measurement includes fractional portions, and on the interior landscaping the tree and shrub requirement is based on the amount of square-footage; he recommends revisiting the calculations. Mr. Pinney asked to confirm both the existing and post construction square-footage of the building. Ms. Conde responded that the existing building is 44,540 and the aggregate building which include the new is 52,819. Mr. Pinney stated that the square-footage will need to be counted in the parking calculation.

Mark Collins, stated that his previous comments have been addressed.

Pedro Stiassni, had the following comments:

- Preliminary impact fees calculation:
 - Water = \$72,799.30
 - Sewer = \$78,086.40
 - Fire and Police = \$ 14,530.32
 - The calculations for the Water and Sewer were based on the submitted background information provided by BETA JONES Group that is the Civil Engineering Firm on this project. The information provided was only for the carwash bays. One of the expansion areas were not described of the intended use. The applicant shall provide the intended use for all the new areas proposed in this project.
 - The calculation will be revised when additional information is provided by the applicant during the site plan approval and may be revised on the construction permitting process. If the applicant has credits based on the previous use, the information shall be submitted as part of the permit package.
- Site Plan:
 - Engineering plans do not match the architectural and landscaping site plans.
 - Provide the garbage and delivery trucks maneuvers on the site plan.
- Survey:
 - The elevations on the survey do not show the markers (+) that locates the elevation on a spot.
 - Provide easement for all the water main lines in the property.
- Drainage:
 - The water table 8.0 feet NAVD88 elevation for the dry season shall be provided on a correspondence between the engineer and the Cocomar Water District. Please provide a confirmation letter from Cocomar Water District.
- Provide the Erosion Sediment Control Plan that includes a turbidity barrier for the work close to the waterways and all the necessary requirements for the NPDES.
- Address the following in regards to Water and Wastewater:
 - How are the shavings residues (in example metal or body filler- "Bondo") will be removed from the sewage water?
 - The Safety Data Sheets provided is incomplete based on the list provided in the engineering plans.
 - The proposed building expansion is impacting the proposed water main line easement. Coordinate a meeting with our Engineering Division to discuss the water main line layout.
 - Provide on the plans for how the oil/water separator will be connected to the sewer line.

- Two different oil/water separator was provided on the details. Notate where the second unit will be installed
- Temporary carwash station requires temporary containment areas. Provide how the temporary containment will be achieved.
- Landscaping Plans:
 - A courtesy inspection will be required to verify the dead trees.
 - Provide canopy information on all the trees in sheet L100 and L101.
 - Provide canopy coverage of the trees per City Code.
 - Proposed Trees along the east property line are in conflict with the existing 8-inch water main line.
 - Show all the utilities on the landscaping plans.
- Trees that will be removed per plan will require a permit from the Engineering Department
- Paper copies of plans do not match the digital copies submitted

Mr. Luis Betalleluz, Engineer, Beta Jones Group, asked for clarification on the comments, wanting to know that if these were the previous (DRC) meeting comments? Mr. Stiasni replied that these are the most recent comments for his department. Mr. Betalleluz then asked about the survey not having specific points. Mr. Stiasni responded that the survey does not show the plat sign. Ms. Conde stated that it has been confirmed that there is no existing easement on the property, and that the plans show a proposed easement. Mr. Stiasni recommended setting up a meeting with Senior Engineer, Alberto Torres-Soto. Discussion ensued.

Robert Massarelli, recommended scheduling a meeting with DEES and that his intent is to approve this project subject to the final approval with DEES.

Ashley McCarthy, stated that there are no public safety concerns at this time.

Robert Massarelli, asked about the temporary tents. Ms. Conde stated that a notation has been made on the site plan in regards to removal. Mr. Massarelli commented that the southern live oaks in the parking lot as shown on the landscape plan may need to be readdressed, stating that there may not be enough room for them when they mature. Mr. Pinney read from the code, referring to Section 23-23 for alternate category one trees to plant. Mr. Massarelli referenced the irrigation plan asking to reevaluate a few areas that may require soaker hoses instead of sprinkler heads.

Mr. Massarelli recommended approval of the site plan conditioned upon the final meeting with DEES to address their comments, as well as the receipt of a letter from the waste service provider.

Ms. Conde asked if a permit is required to remove a tree that is dead? Mr. Stiasni replied that a courtesy tree inspection will need to be scheduled with the DEES department prior to obtaining a permit for removal.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Robert Massarelli spoke on the recent change in State Law and how it will affect the review process. He explained the thirty-day time limit to determine if the application is complete or not, as well as how the notification process works. Mr. Massarelli said that the department procedures have not been established yet, however he wanted to inform the board of these

pending changes. He then discussed the redevelopment process and the possibility to change the procedures in the future. Mr. Pinney shared his concern with the process. Mr. Massarelli stated that staff will thoroughly discuss the process, prior to implementing the changes. He concluded by stressing the importance of staff making the necessary decisions during the meetings.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:10 AM

Respectfully submitted,

Prepared by Melissa M. Miller

Robert Massarelli
Director of Development Services

Date: _____

DRAFT