



### City Commission

Mayor Tommy Ruzzano

Vice Mayor Arlene R. Schwartz

Antonio V. Arserio

Anthony N. Caggiano

Joanne Simone

### City Manager

Cale Curtis

### City Attorney

Janette M. Smith, Esq.

### City Clerk

Joseph J. Kavanagh

## REGULAR MEETING OF THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE VIRTUAL MEETING

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89977400344>

### MINUTES

**Tuesday, November 10, 2020**

**10:00 a.m.**

City of Margate  
Municipal Building

### PRESENT:

Elizabeth Taschereau, Director of Development Services, attended in person  
Andrew Pinney, AICP, Senior Planner, attended in person  
Alexia Howald, Associate Planner, attended in person  
Richard Nixon, Building Department Director, attended via Zoom  
David Scholl, Fire Code Official, attended via Zoom  
Lt. Ashley McCarthy, Police Department, attended via Zoom  
Mark Collins, Public Works Director, attended via Zoom  
Curt Keyser, DEES Director, attended via Zoom (at 10:17 a.m.)

### ALSO PRESENT:

Janette M. Smith, City Attorney, attended in person  
Michael Gai, Sun-Tech Engineering, Agent for Chris Willson, attended via Zoom  
Carlo S. Mendoza, RLC Architect, R.A., LEED AP  
Bruce W. Retzsch, RLC Architect, AIA  
Chris Willson, Manager, FR5355 Northwest 24<sup>th</sup> Street, LLC, attended via Zoom

### ABSENT:

Vacant, CRA Representative

The regular meeting of the Margate Development Review Committee (DRC) having been properly noticed, was called to order at 10:09 a.m. on Tuesday, November 10, 2020, in the City Commission Chambers at City Hall, 5790 Margate Boulevard, Margate, FL 33063. Board Clerk Carleen Steadman read a statement pertaining to the City's virtual public meeting pursuant to the Sunshine Law and the Governor's Executive Orders followed by roll call of the board members.

### 1) NEW BUSINESS

- A) *ID2020-430*  
CONSIDERATION FOR A SUBDIVISION RESURVEY TO  
FURTHER SUBDIVIDE A PORTION OF SHERMAN PLAT TO  
CONSTRUCT A 131,329 SQUARE FOOT WAREHOUSE

### Development Services Department

901 NW 66<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite C, Margate, FL 33063 • Phone: (954) 979-6213

[www.margatefl.com](http://www.margatefl.com) • [dsd@margatefl.com](mailto:dsd@margatefl.com)

DISTRIBUTION FACILITY ON A VACANT PORTION OF THE PARCEL.

**LOCATION:** NORTHWEST CORNER OF COPANS ROAD AND BANKS ROAD, MARGATE, FL 33063

**ZONING:** LIGHT INDUSTRIAL (M-1)

**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.

**PETITIONER:** MICHAEL GAI, SUN-TECH ENGINEERING, AGENT FOR CHRIS WILLSON

Andrew Pinney, Senior Planner, introduced the item. Michael Gai, Sun-Tech Engineering, Agent for Chris Willson, provided an overview of the application.

Lt. Ashley McCarthy, Police Department – No Comments.

David Scholl, Fire Department – No Comments.

Richard Nixon, Building Department – No Comments.

Mark Collins, Public Works – No Comments.

Andrew Pinney, Development Services – Mr. Pinney stated that the application was a development permit and therefore subject to the requirements set forth in the City's Code, Chapter 31. He explained the project was originally part of Tract A of the Sherman Plat, and 9.3 acres was being carved out for new development. Mr. Pinney stated Section 3.11 required a subdivision resurvey be submitted, subject to 31-18 and 31-19 of the Code, and that the subdivision resurvey be finalized before another development permit could be issued for the project. He noted the subdevelopment resurvey would need to be reviewed and approved by the Planning & Zoning Board (P&Z) as well as reviewed and approved by the City Commission.

Curt Keyser, DEES Director, joined the meeting at 10:17 a.m.

Mr. Pinney continued to read his comments, noting that the proposed subdivision resurvey was missing a spot for the mortgagee approval and did not identify adjacent plats, lots, and blocks to the east and to the south as required under Section 31-18. He stated the subdivision resurvey was missing the location sketch with Township and Range, also a requirement of Section 31-18. Mr. Pinney asserted that once the application was submitted to the P&Z, the subdivision resurvey would be routed to the applicable drainage district for review and comment. He noted the date on the subdivision resurvey needed to be updated, the names of the Mayor and DEES Director needed to be corrected on the document, and the City Commission seal block needed to be removed.

Mr. Pinney stated that staff found the application to be generally consistent with Policy 1.8 and Policy 5.2 of the Margate Comprehensive Plan Element 1, provided that any concurrency deficiencies which may be found are addressed in a manner consistent with the adopted Land Development Regulations.

Curt Keyser, DEES – Mr. Keyser stated that he had provided comments. Alexia Howald, Associate Planner, noted the comments had not been compiled and submitted to the applicant. She asked that Mr. Keyser review his high-level comments.

Mr. Keyser stated the City had capacity to serve potable water and wastewater. He noted no traffic impact statement had been provided, so the traffic impacts were not reviewed. Mr. Keyser stated that the adequacy of rights-of-way and easements for surface water management could not be evaluated because the information was not provided. He added that engineering and design of streets, sidewalks, and public places appeared to be existing, appear to be in good condition and do not appear to be in distress. He stated they were deemed to meet the minimum requirements set forth in Section 31.35.

Mr. Keyser stated the water distribution system appeared to be adequate, and connection charges and impact fees would be determined during review of the engineering permit. He noted the same applied to wastewater collection and transmission. Mr. Keyser added that it appeared no connection fees had been paid at this time, so those would be assessed based on whatever development was proposed.

Mr. Gai asked if a traffic impact statement was required, given the project was part of a previous plat. He stated the project was a reduction in traffic compared to the existing recorded plat and the fact that it was an automobile dealer at that time. Mr. Gai asked if there was a Code requirement to submit a traffic impact statement. Mr. Pinney explained the requirement was in Section 31.35.

Mr. Keyser noted the traffic impact statement did not need to be elaborate, it just needed to show whether the project would generate 500 trips per day. Mr. Gai responded that he would get the Traffic Engineer to submit the required document.

Mr. Pinney asked Mr. Keyser if he was comfortable moving the application to P&Z, or if he would prefer to wait for the results of the traffic impact statement. Mr. Keyser stated he would let it go forward.

Mr. Pinney asked if the Committee had any additional comments.

The Committee had no further comments.

The Committee recommended conditional approval on the subdivision resurvey and asked that the applicant connect with staff regarding notice requirements for the P&Z and City Commission reviews of the application.

B) *ID2020-364*

CONSIDERATION FOR A SITE PLAN TO CONSTRUCT A 131,329 SQUARE FOOT WAREHOUSE DISTRIBUTION FACILITY ON A VACANT PORTION OF THE PARCEL.

**LOCATION:** NORTHWEST CORNER OF COPANS ROAD AND BANKS ROAD, MARGATE, FL 33063

**ZONING:** LIGHT INDUSTRIAL (M-1)

**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.

**PETITIONER:** MICHAEL GAI, SUN-TECH ENGINEERING, AGENT FOR CHRIS WILLSON

Andrew Pinney, Senior Planner, introduced the item. Michael Gai, Sun-Tech Engineering, Agent for Chris Willson, provided an overview of the application. He stated the project was part of a master drainage plan and did have approval from Broward County.

Lt. Ashley McCarthy, Police Department – No Comments.

David Scholl, Fire Department – No Comments.

Richard Nixon, Building Department – No Comments.

Mark Collins, Public Works – No Comments.

Curt Keyser, DEES – Mr. Keyser stated that he had provided comments and did not have them. Mr. Pinney read Mr. Keyser's comments into the record as follows:

The site plan is not applicable to an MOT review, but for information only, DEES calculates that a 131,329 square foot building will have an approximate total of 58.96 equivalent residential connections (ERCs). Each ERC is valued at \$3,710, for a total of \$218,746. To this amount, DEES, will need to add water closets. Based on the irrigation plans, it appears the site plan is relying on well water, so no ERCs would be required for irrigation.

Upon further review, DEES did not see the reason to install all new fire hydrants, since there are three (3) existing on Banks Road and three (3) existing on NW 24<sup>th</sup> Street. If the applicant still feels the need for new fire hydrants, the applicant will need to add Protectus III meters on both ends of the loop and maintain the line and hydrants themselves.

On Banks Road, there are three (3) existing taps where the line cannot be serviced. Since the site plan does not describe how many tenants the building will have, staff does not believe that a one and a half (1 ½)-inch service line will be sufficient for the building. The sewer line must be a

lateral, and staff feels the City does not need to maintain a sewer line inside the property that is only serving one (1) tenant.

The parking study is acceptable with no further comments; however, the applicant needs to provide a traffic impact statement that will allow staff to determine if the traffic generated by the proposed development will be safely and efficiently handled by the regional transportation network and local streets.

Under floodplain management review, the finished floor elevation of 15.50 feet NAVD is acceptable.

The following information will be necessary during the engineering and building permit application permit process, but not limited to:

1. Provide Broward County traffic/transportation concurrency certificate
2. Provide Broward County environmental review approval certificate
3. Tree removal relocation permit application from the Engineering Department must be submitted
4. Engineering application permit must be submitted
5. Shop drawings must be submitted

Mr. Gai stated he had a few questions but would connect with Mr. Keyser to review.

Mr. Keyser asserted the big issue was utilities. He noted the easement and maintenance process and stated there was no reason for the City to maintain utilities on private property that service one (1) owner. Mr. Gai responded that he understood the position. Discussion ensued regarding hydrant access requirements.

Mr. Gai clarified that the plan included existing and new hydrants in order to provide access every 300 feet. He noted the building was 700 feet long.

Mr. Scholl asked whether Mr. Gai was considering less hydrants. He stated he would also like the Fire Department Connection (FDC) to be closer to the building.

Mr. Gai asked if the hydrants on Banks could be utilized to fight fire on the east side of the building. He stated that if that was an option, Mr. Keyser was correct that there was no need for additional hydrants. He stated that he would come up with a plan and run it by Mr. Keyser and Mr. Scholl to find something they could all agree to.

Mr. Keyser expressed concern regarding access to the utilities in case of problems requiring attention or repair.

Mr. Gai asked if extending the hydrants from Copans Road onto the site would work. Mr. Keyser and Mr. Scholl pointed to the applicable Code and asked Mr. Gai to come up with a plan and meet with the two (2) of them to discuss further.

David Scholl, Fire Department – No additional comments.

Andrew Pinney, Development Services – Mr. Pinney stated that the site plan was subject to the requirements set forth in the City's Code, Chapter 31. He noted that with the site plan application there was an underground wire waiver submitted. He stated the application was currently incomplete, as the underground wire waiver application required a detailed statement by a licensed professional engineer qualified with respect to utility issues explaining why, in the engineer's professional opinion, it is technically infeasible to locate such utilities underground. Mr. Pinney explained the underground waiver process ultimately had to be approved by the City Commission and may track parallel to the subdivision resurvey. He noted in addition to the statement, a cost estimate was required in order to present the application to the Commission.

Mr. Gai responded that he understood.

Mr. Pinney continued with his comments. He asked that setbacks be delineated on the site plan from two (2) points on each side of the building, and that measurements from the nearest points on the building to the property line be included.

Mr. Gai asked for further clarification on what was missing from the site plan. He stated he would add the missing dimensions.

Mr. Pinney stated the site plan needed the distances between all driveways along the roadway delineated. He noted the minimum spacing was 200 feet for a two (2) way and 80 feet for a one (1) way, as described in Section 23.6. He stated it looked as though the driveways were spread out from the last submittal, but the measurement needed to be shown on the plan.

Mr. Gai asked if the dimension was to the centerline of the driveway. He pointed to a dimension on 24<sup>th</sup> Street and asked if that was the information sought.

Mr. Pinney clarified that the dimension should be measured from the outer edge.

Mr. Gai stated he would make the correction.

Mr. Pinney stated he did not know if there was a nearby driveway on the adjacent property, but that spacing should be in sync, as well.

Mr. Pinney pointed to the parking along the east side and stated there was a road labeled as 81 feet long and also as 10 parking spots. He asked that the labeling error be corrected. Continuing, Mr. Pinney stated he had seen the addition of the proposed monument signs. He noted the spacing needed to be adjusted so that the signs conformed to Section 31.3 and pointed out that two (2) requirements were listed depending on location.

Mr. Gai stated he would review the Code and show the points on the site plan.

Mr. Pinney asked if one (1) dumpster enclosure would be sufficient for the size of the building. He noted that if it were some type of distribution center, there would be a lot of pallets and boxes broken down, and the recycling also required an enclosure.

Carlos stated that they would take a look at the section, but typically an enclosure that size was sufficient.

Mr. Pinney asked that examples of where it had worked in the past on that type of square footage and similar use be identified in the narrative. He noted that he was concerned due to the size of the building.

Mr. Gai stated they could send examples of previous site plans from other cities that had been built. He noted that it was larger than one (1) recently built in Pompano and there had been no issues there. He added that the setup was the industrial building standard.

Mr. Pinney pointed out the site had a number of loading zones, but they were shown as 10 feet wide and 70 feet long, while the Zoning Code Section 33.9 required that each loading zone be at least 12 feet wide for a building of this size and use. He noted the minimum of four (4) loading zones was met and exceeded.

Mr. Gai explained the 10-foot dimension was actually the size of the overhead door opening. He stated that they would note the correct width on the plan.

Mr. Pinney noted there were features missing from the Master Parking Plan. He stated Section 33.2F laid out the required features. He stated the pedestrian drop-off area, truck turning, and drainage structures were missing from the plan. Continuing, Mr. Pinney stated he would like to see detail for the spaces in the curve radius in the parking on the north side of the building, to make sure minimum widths were being met. He pointed to parking abutting the building and noted a shift in width was required to meet Code.

Mr. Pinney stated in the landscaping plan, he needed an adjustment to the tree and palm locations so that the canopies were at least 10 feet away from parking lot light poles. He noted an example on the Copans Road driveway and asked that the applicant review the condition throughout the landscape plan. Mr. Pinney stated that similarly, with the landscape material they needed to ensure there was adequate spaces and clearing around traffic control spaces such as the stop signs. He pointed to an example at the eastern driveway on NW 24<sup>th</sup> Street. Mr. Pinney noted the landscape data chart on LP1 incorrectly spelled Copans Road, and the required number of trees and shrubs was incorrectly listed based on the square footage.

Continuing, Mr. Pinney reviewed comments on consistency with the Comprehensive Plan. He stated the proposed use of warehouse and distribution is consistent with Policy 1.2 of the Comprehensive Plan and the M1 Zoning District. Mr. Pinney stated that staff found the application to be generally consistent with Policy 1.8 and Policy 5.2 of the Margate Comprehensive Plan Element 1, provided that any concurrency deficiencies which may be found are addressed in a

manner consistent with the adopted Land Development Regulations. He noted the traffic impact statement was outstanding. Mr. Pinney stated staff found the application consistent with Policy 5.1 of the Margate Comprehensive Plan Element 1. He noted the subject parcel was part of the Sherman Plat, recorded in plat book 144, page 26 of the public records of Broward County, Florida. He stated the plat was approved by the City Commission on October 14, 1987.

Mr. Pinney stated staff found the application consistent with Policy 13.2 of the Margate Comprehensive Plan Element 1. He stated the proposal to build a 131,329 square foot warehouse was within the maximum development intensity permitted within the Transit Oriented Land Use Category (TOC).

Mr. Pinney stated staff found the application nearly consistent with Policy 13.5, 13.6, and 13.12 of the Margate Comprehensive Plan Element 1. He stated the proposal provided two (2) paved connections to the sidewalk and onsite bicycle parking facilities. He stated staff recommended the applicant provide a third paved connection to the public sidewalk so that the site is connected to each adjacent public right-of-way. Mr. Pinney noted it looked like a good opportunity existed to run the sidewalk out to Copans Road on the south side of the building.

Mr. Gai responded that they would add a connection at the southeast corner.

Mr. Pinney asked if the Committee had any additional comments.

The Committee had no further comments.

Mr. Pinney asked Mr. Keyser and Mr. Scholl if they were comfortable working out the details of the water pipes and fire hydrants in the site plan scenario. Both stated that they were.

Mr. Pinney explained that the Code gave one (1) year from site plan approval to obtain a building permit. He stated the date utilized was that of recommended approval by the DRC, and noted the process moving forward and noted the pending subdivision rezoning would need to go through P&Z and the City Commission before the site plan could be signed off. Mr. Pinney asked if there were any questions regarding the timeline. Chris Willson, applicant, stated that there were no questions and thanked the Committee for their time.

The Committee recommended conditional approval on the site plan and stated staff comments would be compiled and sent to the applicant following the meeting. He noted those comments would need to be worked out in the final site plan, and a final site plan could not be approved until the subdivision resurvey was recorded.

## **GENERAL DISCUSSION**

Elizabeth Taschereau, Director of Development Services, stated that there had been quite a number of applicants calling the City Manager's office, Mayor, and Commissioners, so staff was looking to put together a DRC process that was more formal. She noted this would let the DRC



members know when their comments were needed and would allow staff to compile them ahead of time.

Mr. Pinney explained the process Development Services was recommending to improve coordination and communication amongst the DRC committee and with the applicant, including:

1. Contact a Development Services planner to set up appointment for application submittal
2. At the submittal appointment, planner will review application for completeness against application checklist
3. Planner will check for waiver to Florida Statue 136.033. If no waiver completed, planner will forward application to DRC for review both for completeness and sufficiency
4. Back and forth with applicant until complete
5. Schedule DRC meeting and pre-DRC meeting (Monday eight (8) calendar days before DRC meeting)
6. Comments forwarded to planner six (6) days prior to DRC meeting, planner consolidates comments and sends to applicant and DRC by Friday, four (4) calendar days prior to DRC meeting
7. Publish DRC staff comments with agenda and backup materials together

Mr. Pinney stated that under this process, the DRC meeting would be question and answer, as they applicant would already have the written comments ahead of time.

Richard Nixon, Building Department Director, stated his only suggestion would be to make it clear to the applicant that once they receive the initial comments, that is not an opportunity to go back and address the comments for review ahead of the meeting.

Mr. Pinney agreed that they would not be accepting revised plans within days of the meeting, it was more for clarification and working out possible solutions. He noted the process would be implemented with the next DRC cycle.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Elizabeth Taschereau, Director of Development Services