



## **CITY OF MARGATE**

### **DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE (DRC) REVIEW #1**

**October 12, 2021**

**Meeting Location:**

**Building Department**

**901 NW 66<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Margate, FL, 33063**

<b>PROJECT NAME:</b>	Redeeming Lighthouse (sanctuary)		
<b>PROJECT NUMBER:</b>	2021-352		
<b>PROJECT LOCATION:</b>	7452 Royal Palm Boulevard		
<b>APPLICANT/AGENT:</b>	Apostle Dr. Gillian Thompson-Biscette, Redeeming Lighthouse Of God Int'l Ministries.		
<b>REVIEW/APPLICATION</b>	Change of Occupancy		
<b>DISCIPLINE</b>	<b>REVIEWER</b>	<b>EMAIL</b>	<b>TELEPHONE</b>
DRC Chairman	Elizabeth Taschereau – Director	<a href="mailto:etaschereau@margatefl.com">etaschereau@margatefl.com</a>	(954) 884-3686
Planning	Andrew Pinney – Senior Planner	<a href="mailto:apinney@margatefl.com">apinney@margatefl.com</a>	(954) 884-3684
Planning	Alexia Howald – Associate Planner	<a href="mailto:ahowald@margatefl.com">ahowald@margatefl.com</a>	(954) 884-3685
Building	Richard Nixon – Building Official	<a href="mailto:rnixon@margatefl.com">rnixon@margatefl.com</a>	(954) 970-3004
Engineering	Curt Keyser – Director	<a href="mailto:ckeyser@margatefl.com">ckeyser@margatefl.com</a>	(954) 884-3631
Engineering	Randy L. Daniel – Assistant Director	<a href="mailto:rdaniel@margatefl.com">rdaniel@margatefl.com</a>	(954) 884-3633
Fire	David Scholl – Fire Department	<a href="mailto:dscholl@margatefl.com">dscholl@margatefl.com</a>	(954) 971-7010
Public Works	Mark Collins – Director	<a href="mailto:mcollins@margatefl.com">mcollins@margatefl.com</a>	(954) 972-8126
Public Works	Gio Batista – Assistant Director	<a href="mailto:gbatista@margatefl.com">gbatista@margatefl.com</a>	(954) 972-8123
CRA	Cale Curtis – Executive Director	<a href="mailto:ccurtis@margatefl.com">ccurtis@margatefl.com</a>	(954) 935-5300
Police	Cpt. Joseph Galaska – Police Department	<a href="mailto:jgalaska@margatefl.com">jgalaska@margatefl.com</a>	(954) 935-5429
Police	Sergeant Paul Frankenhauser – Traffic	<a href="mailto:pfranken@margatefl.com">pfranken@margatefl.com</a>	(954) 972-7111

**Any questions regarding the DRC comments, please contact the appropriate department.**

**Applicant is required to provide a response to EACH DRC comment and to revise plans accordingly (*acknowledgements are not corrections*).**

**ALL corrections must be provided in ONE submittal package at the time of the submittal appointment with a DSD planner.**

**DRC comments follow.**

**NOTE: Please email city staff with names, title and companies from your team that will be in attendance at the DRC meeting and indicate if they will be attending in-person or by zoom.**

## DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS

### BUILDING

1. In order to ensure the parking calculations are accurate, the Designer of Record is required to provide an occupancy load calculation for the proposed use based on table 1004.5 of the FBC.

### FIRE

1. No comments.

### PUBLIC WORKS

1. No comments.

### POLICE

1. Florida State Statute 316.1945(1)(b-2), requires a 15 foot clearance from the hydrant. Revise plans accordingly.

### CRA

1. No response.

### ENGINEERING

The Director of the Department of Environmental and Engineering Services, or his qualified designee, has conducted a review of the submitted documentation in accordance with Article IV, Chapter 31 of the City of Margate is Code of Ordinances and finds the following:

#### PREAMBLE

The applicant is seeking to convert 1,870 sf currently used as a fitness center to a 60 seat sanctuary (actual number to be verified) that will be used by Redeeming Lighthouse of God Int'l Ministries. The space is within the Royal Palm Court retail center that consists of 23,680 square feet and has a total of 104 parking spaces, that includes 5 designated as ADA and 13 for employees and/or service vehicles.

The Traffic Engineer has not presented the maximum requirements neither for 1,870 sf of sanctuary space nor for the expected maximum number of seats that could be accommodated in the sanctuary. The Parking Analysis is therefore deemed incomplete.

#### A. TRAFFICWAYS

No impact.

#### B. PARKING

Of 104 spaces that were counted toward available parking, 13 are located behind the building away from the main lot and appear to be dedicated for use by employees or service vehicles. If these 13 spaces are deducted, the remaining available spaces is 91. The Traffic Engineer does not demonstrate that 91 spaces satisfy the parking demands of the new sanctuary, during the days and times that the sanctuary is in use. In other words, parking demand for the sanctuary ought to be superimposed on current parking requirements of retail use in the shopping center, to determine if 91 spaces would be sufficient.

Parking demand shall be determined based on the maximum number of seats and floor area, and the more restrictive outcome used in the analysis.

### **C. TRAFFIC CIRCULATION**

From the Master Parking Plan, the Fire Truck does not appear to clear the curbs when entering and exiting the property. Provide site modifications to allow a Fire Truck to maneuver around the property.

### **D. POTABLE WATER**

Potable water service is available to serve the needs of the proposed sanctuary. The water treatment plant has sufficient available capacity to satisfy the potable water needs of the proposed development, other developments in the service area which are occupied, available for occupancy, for which building permits are in effect, or for which potable water treatment capacity has been reserved.

The determination that potable water service is available shall not be construed as reservation of capacity for the development submitted unless a developer's agreement is executed with the city specifically reserving water capacity.

### **E. WASTEWATER**

Wastewater treatment and disposal service is available to serve the needs of the proposed sanctuary. The wastewater treatment plant has sufficient capacity to provide for the wastewater treatment and disposal needs of the proposed development, other developments in the service area which are occupied, available for occupancy, for which building permits are in effect, or for which wastewater treatment and disposal capacity has been reserved.

This determination shall not be construed as a reservation of capacity for the development unless a developer's agreement has been executed with the City specifically reserving wastewater treatment and disposal capacity.

### **F. DRAINAGE**

The applicant has indicated that work will not change the area of the current space and therefore no change in site runoff is expected.

Accordingly, applicant shall submit calculations to demonstrate that there shall be no change to site run-off.

### **G. SOLID WASTE**

The City has hired a private vendor for collecting solid waste. There are four categories for collection of solid waste and the subject project is more closely aligned with the requirements of commercial developments. The developer shall make arrangements with the approved vendor(s) for the waste streams that are associated with their operations.

### **H. LIGHTING**

A letter signed by a Professional Engineer from Kimley Horn and Associates (KHA), was submitted to certify that lighting fixtures have been constructed in substantial compliance with the City of Margate Code of Ordinances. This letter is insufficient and does not meet the requirements of Article XXXIII Section 33.2(E)(8) of the Margate Zoning Code.

The letter needs to address the current illumination for Level 2 activity, in accordance with the Code, and shall also certify that lighting facilities are in functional compliance with Section 33.2(E) of the Margate Zoning Code.

The photometric certification letter shall be resubmitted.

## I. ERC / ERU

Houses of worship w/o kitchen facilities are categorized as 3.0 gpd per seat  
The sanctuary will have 60 seats (number of seats to be verified)  
 $60 \times 3 = 180 \text{ gpd divided by } 335 \text{ gpd} = 0.5373 \text{ ERU}$

1 ERU is the minimum. The cost of 1 ERU is \$8.25.

## ERC

$1,870 \text{ SF divided by } 2,382 \text{ SF} = 0.7851$

For Commercial use, 1 ERC is minimum.

Water and Sewer connection fees =  $1 \times (\$1,790 + \$1,920) = \$3,710$

## J. RECREATION

Not Applicable.

## DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

After review of the above referenced DRC application, the Development Services Department has provided the following comments and advisory notes. Comments require a written response from the applicant and correction(s) to the application. Advisory notes do not require correction.

**ADVISORY NOTE 1:** This application is for a building permit, as defined in Section 31-33 of the Code of the City of Margate (“CCM”), which involves a change in the occupancy group of a building. The term ‘development permit’ is defined in Section 31-33 CCM to include any building permit as defined therein. Thus, this application for a change of occupancy group is therefore a development permit subject to the requirements of Chapter 31 of the Code of the City of Margate.

### **Sec. 31-35. - Determinations required prior to approval of a development permit.**

A determination that adequate services will be available to serve the needs of the proposed development shall be made when the following conditions are met:

(1) *Director of development services.* The director of development services determines:

- a. That the proposed development is consistent with the Margate Comprehensive Plan.
- b. That the proposed development is in conformity with the Margate Zoning Code.
- c. In the case of site plans, that the proposed development is in conformity with the provisions of [chapter 23](#) of this Code.

Based on the above Code section, Development Services staff must compare the application to the adequacy determinations described in Section 31-35 of the Code of the City of Margate.

### **Subject Property:**

Applicant proposed to operate a church at 7452 Royal Palm Boulevard, which is a ~1,870 sq. ft. tenant space within the Royal Palm Court shopping center (Subject Property). The subject property is a 2.25-acre site

located on the south side of Royal Palm Boulevard, approximately 1,100 feet west of Rock Island Road. The subject property is bounded to the north by Royal Palm Boulevard, bounded to the east by Royal Sun Plaza, and bounded to the south and west by Parkside at Royal Palm (single-family homes). The subject property appears to enjoy vehicular cross-access with the Royal Sun Plaza, located to the east.

The subject property has a land use designation of (C) Commercial, and is located within the B-1 Neighborhood Business district. The subject property is not located within the Margate CRA boundary.

## **I. CONFORMITY WITH CODE**

**ADVISORY NOTE 2:** Applicant's requested use is permitted within the B-1 zoning district. Section 21.3 of the Margate Zoning Code ("MZC") lists all permitted uses, including the following:

Church, synagogue, and similar congregations of other religion and denominations, subject to the following:

- (1) That same shall not exceed seven thousand (7,000) square feet in gross area.
- (2) That bingo and other similar games of chance are operated only as an accessory use.
- (3) There shall be no academic parochial school on the subject site.
- (4) There shall be no associated residence on the subject site.
- (5) That a safe and adequate pedestrian circulation system has been provided.

**COMMENT 1:** The Master Parking Plan ("MPP") contemplates a church sanctuary of 1,327 square feet, however, this dimension only represents a portion of the church. The entire church space is 1,870 square feet (83' 9" X 22' 4").

**COMMENT 2:** The Master Parking Plan statement includes, "The proposed conversion of 1,327 square feet within the Royal Palm Count retail center will not result in the material loss of parking spaces **as all work is expected to remain interior** to the subject store front." (emphasis added) The sketch included with the MPP depicts two new landscape islands, several places where new traffic control signage and striping will be installed, and the realignment/restriping of a number of parking spaces. Please coordinate professionals and proposed scope of work.

**COMMENT 3:** The Master Parking Plan statement indicates that the subject property has a loading zone along the south side of the property, however, the MPP sketch does not depict any such loading zone.

**COMMENT 4:** The Master Parking Plan statement describes the proposed use as a 50-seat worship center. The DRC application form describes the proposal/request as "Church sanctuary with 60 seats (non fixed)." The floor plan provided with the application shows 48 seats in the sanctuary. Have the designer of record provide an occupant load calculation for the proposed use based on the table provided in 1004.5 FBC. Make all representations consistent based on the calculation provided by the designer of record.

**COMMENT 5:** Either revise the Master Parking Plan statement or include a rationale to explain why the proposed church use was included in the shopping center parking calculation based on ITE land use code

(820). The ITE Parking Generation Manual (5<sup>th</sup> Edition) land use description for shopping centers makes no reference of churches being typically part of shopping centers, and includes separate land use codes and parking rates for Church (560), Synagogue (561), and Mosque (562).

**COMMENT 6:** The Master Parking Plan sketch depicts two new landscape islands that appear to conflict with existing parking lot light poles. The proposed curbing surrounding the islands appear in the same place as, or very near, the existing light poles. Address conflict.

**COMMENT 7:** The Master Parking Plan sketch indicates three pedestrian drop off areas, to be located within striped ADA accessible routes, each designed and provided to serve an abutting ADA parking space. Accepting these as pedestrian drop off areas would either occupy the ADA parking spaces for passenger loading and unloading (whether disabled or not), or would have vehicles stop traffic in the main circulation route of the shopping center in order to load or unload passengers. Please find a safe alternative that does not exhaust ADA resources or disrupt traffic flow.

**COMMENT 8:** The new landscape island depicted in the MPP sketch, proposed for the eastern side of the parking field, does not appear to contemplate improvements on the adjoining property. Please review for traffic flow.

**COMMENT 9:** The property survey prepared by Kenneth Osborne, dated July 1, 2021, provided with this application does not accurately depict site conditions.

**COMMENT 10:** Dumpster enclosures are required to be installed per code requirements when an application for a change of occupancy group is filed with the Development Review Committee (DRC). The subject property has two enclosures, and staff observed three dumpsters on site (Exhibit 1). All dumpsters must be within an enclosure. The easterly of the two existing dumpster enclosures only provides a landscape buffer along two walls. Section 23-9 CCM requires a 3-foot wide irrigated landscape bed surrounding three sides of a dumpster enclosure.

**COMMENT 11:** The landscape and irrigation plans do not address the new landscape areas proposed in the MPP sketch. Please coordinate professionals and proposed scope of work.

**COMMENT 12:** The “Landscape Calculations” chart on the landscape plan does not correctly apply landscape requirements.

**COMMENT 13:** The landscape plan does not address deficiencies of the property. Section 23-3 CCM provides that the provisions of the landscaping code regarding the installation of new landscaping material shall apply when there is a change in the occupancy group of a building, as described in the Florida Building Code.

**COMMENT 14:** Property Maintenance, See Section 40.4 and 40.8 of the Margate Zoning Code (Exhibit 1, 2,3,4).

**COMMENT 15:** Staff observed two existing signs from businesses that are no longer in operation (Exhibit 5, 6). Section 39.11, Any sign advertising a commodity or service previously associated with vacated or abandoned premises or a sign structure no longer displaying a sign advertising a commodity or service currently or previously associated with a premises shall be removed from the premises by the responsible

party as defined in section 39.18(A) no later than sixty (60) days from the time said activity ceases to exist at the premises.

- (1) Removal shall include any sign structure and/or foundation.
- (2) The facade or property shall be restored to original condition following removal of a sign, sign structure and/or sign foundation pursuant to this section.
- (3) In the event that the sign is a cabinet sign in a multi-tenant center, the panel advertising the previous business or use shall be removed and a blank panel shall be installed.

## **II. CONSISTENCY WITH COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

**ADVISORY NOTE 3:** The subject property has a “Commercial” land use designation. The proposed use as a church is consistent with this land use designation, per Policy 1.1.2 of Element I Future Land Use, of the Margate Comprehensive Plan.

Policy 1.1.2 The permitted uses, densities and intensities contained in the land development regulations shall not exceed those listed below for each land use category found on the Future Land Use Map. The City’s land development regulations with respect to uses, densities and intensities may be more restrictive than those shown in this section.

### b) Commercial

1. Neighborhood, community, and regional retail uses.
2. Office and business uses.
3. Commercial uses, including wholesale, storage, light fabricating and warehousing.
4. Hotels, motels, and other tourist accommodations.
5. Parks, recreation, and commercial recreation uses.
6. Community facilities.
7. Medical facilities, specifically doctors’ offices, clinics, surgery centers, and hospitals.
8. Municipal buildings, parks, and playgrounds.



*Exhibit 1. Dumpster Enclosure*



*Exhibit 2. Missing Curb*



*Exhibit 3. Broken Wheel Stop*



*Exhibit 4. Faded Striping*



*Exhibit 5. Vacated Business - Munchy's*



*Exhibit 6. Vacated Business - Fit 5*