



### City Commission

Mayor Arlene R. Schwartz  
Vice Mayor Antonio V. Arserio  
Tommy Ruzzano  
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/82715913560>

### MINUTES

**Tuesday, June 8, 2021**

**10:00 a.m.**

City of Margate  
Municipal Building

### PRESENT:

Elizabeth Taschereau, Director of Development Services  
Andrew Pinney, AICP, Senior Planner  
Alexia Howald, Associate Planner  
Curt Keyser, P.E., DEES Director  
Randy L. Daniel, P.E., DEES Assistant  
Richard Nixon, Director, Building Department  
David Scholl, Fire Marshal/Code Official  
Mark Collins, Public Works Director  
Gio Batista, Public Works Assistant Director  
Lt. Ashley McCarthy, Police Department

### ALSO PRESENT:

Janette M. Smith, City Attorney  
Antonio Quevedo, P.E., HSQ Group, Agent for TC MC Margate Apartments, LLC  
Dennis Mele, Agent for TC MC Margate Apartments, LLC  
Jimmy Socash, Landscape Architect  
Robert Cambó, Managing Partner, Alliance XVI, LLC, Applicant  
Thomas A. Hall, President, Thomas A. Hall, Inc.

The regular meeting of the Margate Development Review Committee (DRC) having been properly noticed, was called to order at 10:04 a.m. on Tuesday, June 8, 2021, in the City of Margate Municipal Building, 901 NW 66<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Margate, Florida 33063.

### 1) NEW BUSINESS

- A) 1D2021-222  
CONSIDERATION OF A SITE PLAN FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION OF A 220-UNIT MULTI-FAMILY DEVELOPMENT IDENTIFIED AS MARQUESA.  
**LOCATION:** 5203-5231 COCONUT CREEK PARKWAY, MARGATE, FL 33063

### 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)

**ZONING:** TRANSIT ORIENTED CORRIDOR – CORRIDOR (TOC-C)

**LEGAL DESCRIPTION:** A PORTION OF PARCEL “A”, “CENTRAL PARK OF COMMERCE, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 119, PAGE 27, OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA

**PETITIONER:** ATTORNEY ANTONIO QUEVEDO, P.E., HSQ GROUP, INC., AGENT FOR TC MC MARGATE APARTMENTS, LLC.

Andrew Pinney, Senior Planner, introduced the item and explained the process to be followed. He noted the applicant had been sent the comments the prior week and comments were attached to the agenda for reference.

Attorney Dennis Mele reviewed a series of comments, beginning with Engineering Comment C. Traffic Impacts.

Curt Keyser, DEES Director, asked for clarification on the licenses held by the traffic consultant. He expressed concern with the response to comments prepared by consultant Tom Hall and asked that a traffic impact statement be prepared by a licensed professional engineer which satisfies the requirements of 31-35(2)c of the City of Margate’s Code of Ordinances. He stated he did not want a submission, which co-signed on something prepared by Tom Hall.

Robert Cambó asserted that when the application was originally submitted in December 2019, the DEES Director at the time accepted Mr. Hall’s rationale.

Mr. Keyser responded that he could not speak for the director at the time, but he would not be accepting the rationale. He stated that he could not perpetuate unlicensed activity and needed a traffic study from a licensed Professional Engineer (PE).

Mr. Mele stated that the traffic study would be completed by a licensed PE. He reviewed Engineering Comment D. Surface Water Management requirements.

Antonio Quevedo, P.E., HSQ Group, stated his understanding of the comment was to handle the original notice of violation on existing property improvements separately. He explained that they had contacted Broward County and were approved to divide the stormwater management issues into two Surface Water Management Licenses and come into compliance.

He noted that he wanted to be clear about the request and stated there would not be a need for a drainage agreement because each of the sites would be handled separately with a stand-alone stormwater management license. Mr. Quevedo added that they had provided preliminary counts to a prior staff member and could provide them again, but typically the stormwater management license part of the process would not happen until moving forward with engineering plans.

Mr. Keyser confirmed that he would not hold up the DRC process for the license, but he would like to review and sign off on the preliminary counts.

Mr. Quevedo confirmed that the comments regarding the turn lane and curb returns were self-explanatory and they would make the requested changes prior to resubmitting. He noted that he

understood and agreed with the comment. He stated he would make the changes and send a PDF to Mr. Keyser to make sure they were on the same page before proceeding with notes.

Mr. Keyser noted that there was a gap between the limits of the work in the demolition plan and the site plan. He asked that the issue be clarified to address or resolve the gap.

Mr. Quevedo responded that they would make sure it was coordinated but work west of the property limit was limited to elimination of the existing drive, a change, which was a previous DRC comment.

Mr. Quevedo explained there was a much more detailed package that was submitted for the shopping center, which was not approved. He noted it may just be a matter of getting Mr. Keyser a copy of that package or affected sheets.

Mr. Keyser stated that he did not need full engineering plans, just enough detail to understand what was going on and to make sure the plans are consistent.

Mr. Mele pointed to Engineering Comment F and thanked Mr. Keyser for being willing to work with them despite the water distribution system not being done the way he wanted it to be. He asked Mr. Quevedo if he was comfortable getting the utility crossing profiles addressed during development of the construction drawings.

Mr. Quevedo stated he did not have a problem with meeting the request during the permit approval process.

Mr. Keyser responded that there were ways to address the issues in the plan with forethought, but he was not comfortable shutting down water service to paying customers multiple times as contemplated. He stated he wanted to do the work all at one (1) time.

Mr. Quevedo stated that he understood, and they would design the plan to allow for as minimal interruption as possible.

Mr. Keyser added that he needed detail on the crossings and asked Mr. Quevedo to demonstrate they were not conflicting. Mr. Quevedo clarified that the issue could be handled during final engineering.

Mr. Keyser agreed that was correct. Mr. Quevedo explained the planned submission.

Mr. Keyser pointed out Engineering Comment H, solid waste and recycling. He stated he was not certain Waste Management would be willing to work with the plan as presented and asked that approval be obtained from the company.

Mr. Quevedo stated that he would double check and then connect with Mr. Pinney outside of the meeting to clarify the plan discrepancies mentioned in his comments.

Mr. Quevedo asked Mr. Pinney for clarification on Development Services Comment 7 (b) regarding monument sign setback. He stated that the sign on the plan was intended as a placeholder, as his understanding was they had agreed to approve the signage separately. He added that he did not think the monument sign had been designed.

Mr. Pinney agreed this was how it had been done in the past but explained that when they did it that way with the Tuscana project, the new builder who took it over asserted the signage had been previously approved. Mr. Pinney asked that if the sign was going to be shown on the plans, it be shown in the right spot with the correct setback reflected.

Mr. Quevedo stated he would show the setback but did not want to show dimensions because they did not know what they would ultimately look like. He added that he understood the sign had to comply with Section 39.5 of the Margate Zoning Code, but he did not yet have the details.

Mr. Pinney suggested he could also label the space as future monument sign. He noted that to the level of design provided, it should be correct.

Mr. Quevedo stated he would add the five (5) foot setback and the comment that the monument sign would comply with Section 39.5 as cover for now. He further stated sign details would be part of the final construction permitting.

Mr. Mele asked for clarification on Development Services Comment 8. Parking. He asked Mr. Quevedo if the comment could be addressed.

Mr. Quevedo responded that he would do a blow-up of the parking along the dumpster. He stated that even though it is on a curve, the parking spaces do meet the minimum requirements.

Mr. Pinney stated a separate detail was not required, just a few dimensions at the narrow side to make clear that the parking spaces were at least nine (9) feet in the tightest spot. He added that he had noticed the detail showed wheel stops, which was a discrepancy from the site plan.

Mr. Quevedo stated he would correct the detail.

Mr. Pinney pointed out that for the monument sign, it was not necessary to reference the Code section in the response. He stated that the Code was being refined and the number may not match in the future.

Mr. Mele asked for clarification on the ongoing comment regarding loading spaces.

Mr. Pinney responded the Master Parking Plan did not reflect the loading spaces and added that the spots were in a precarious position on the parent parcel where there was a two (2) way road that changed to one (1) way with no signage or striping to indicate the change in traffic pattern. He stated he thought they could work with the spot, tying in a little sidewalk, signage, and adding striping to delineate it as loading.

Mr. Quevedo asserted he understood it was a requirement, but the loading space was never contemplated previously, so they tried to locate it in a usable spot. He stated they would add signage, and sidewalk access should not be a problem. He noted that he thought they could accommodate what staff was asking for as long as they were willing to work with it in that spot.

Mr. Pinney agreed it looked like a good spot, it just needed to be refined more. He noted the truck radius for the garbage trucks also went through the loading zone.

Mr. Mele stated the other thing to consider was that the loading zone in an apartment complex

was typically used for move-ins and move-outs, and as those are scheduled with management, management can work with the trash hauler to make sure they are not blocking the way.

Mr. Mele discussed additional comments regarding the traffic study, which stated that a qualified traffic engineer or American Institute of Certified Planners (AICP) certified planner was required. He noted he was a 30-year member of the AICP and stated he had authored the cover letter but was not sure it had made it to staff for review, because he did not see it in the package.

Mr. Quevedo responded that he was unsure if it was a part of the resubmittal.

Mr. Mele stated that comment could be taken care of. He asked for additional clarification on the substance of the remainder of the parking study comments.

Mr. Pinney explained additional detail on student loading for Ascend Career Academy was needed. He stated that school hours would be helpful and asked that the parking calculation be reviewed for guest parking and evening non-concurrent event parking. He noted he thought there was enough parking, but it needed to make sense when reading the documents.

Mr. Mele read a line from the comments, which asked if the 71 parking spaces reserved for use by Marquesa would be identified. He explained that once a person passes the background check required for move-in; they would be provided with a welcome package, which would include a parking map. He stated they did not want to label the spaces with signage or striping, because it would cause confusion for those using the spaces during the day during school.

Mr. Pinney responded that he was fine with that. He noted that a recorded agreement regarding the shared parking was needed.

Mr. Mele stated clarification was needed on Development Services Comment 14, landscaping. He asked Jimmy Socash, Landscape Architect, to outline his questions. Mr. Socash stated he had reviewed the Code and needed help to understand where the formulas were incorrectly transcribed or applied.

Mr. Pinney explained the notes below the comment (in red) were intended to help clarify which Code needed to be addressed. He discussed each note.

Mr. Socash responded that he thought that they complied, but it was a matter of not transcribing the information properly. Mr. Pinney stated there were a few things left off. He pointed to the right-of-way buffer as an example.

Mr. Socash asked if it was possible to modify the plan and have Mr. Pinney look at it before they redo it. Mr. Pinney offered to get on a Zoom call to highlight areas which needed to be addressed. Mr. Socash stated his team would do some homework first, then reach out to set up a Zoom call. He asked about the tree count and asserted the problem was that meeting a higher number of trees would require the trees to be smaller.

Mr. Mele continued reviewing the landscaping comments, asking about an issue with lighting. Mr. Pinney stated the issue might be the layer from the photometric plan. He noted there were poles on the plan that were unclear. Mr. Socash stated they may need to have the lighting plan resent from the consultant. Mr. Quevedo added that it appeared they may just need to provide the building label information.

Mr. Mele pointed to comments regarding sidewalks and asked for additional clarity regarding what part of the property the issue was on.

Mr. Pinney stated this comment went hand-in-hand with an Engineering comment asking for a drop-in turn lane. He noted the curb would need to be pushed out from the driveway to meet that requirement, and it could then be filled in with trees. He showed the place being discussed on the image of the plans.

Mr. Quevedo responded that he understood and could make the change with additional planters, though he did not know the exact dimensions.

Mr. Keyser noted that they should be sure not to plant in the sight triangles. Discussion ensued regarding the location and taper of the turn lane.

Mr. Mele asked Mr. Pinney what other applications were pending with the City for the project. Mr. Pinney responded that in addition to the site plan, the pending applications included the re-plat, plat amendment, and underground wiring waiver. Mr. Mele asked which application went with the allocation of residential units. Mr. Pinney confirmed that would happen as part of the re-plat. He stated the plat and plat amendment have to go to the Planning and Zoning Board prior to the City Commission.

Mr. Mele stated the applicant recognizes changes are needed on the drawings to be compliant, including revisions to the Master Parking Plan and traffic study. He noted he understood the plan could not be signed off on until all of those things were done, but they would like to get the plat and amendment on the agenda for the Planning and Zoning Board.

Mr. Quevedo confirmed that the change contemplated would not impact the plat. He reminded the Committee that the applicant was seeking approval from the City to go back to the County with resubmittal of the original application.

Mr. Pinney stated the plat included a right-of-way dedication on Coconut Creek Parkway, along with Banks Road improvements.

Mr. Quevedo responded that there were improvements in the right-of-way, but in his opinion, there would not be changes to the existing plat as submitted.

Mr. Pinney stated that he thought traffic was the big variable.

Mr. Mele asserted that the conclusions of the traffic study were not incorrect, it was just written by the wrong person, and they would get that taken care of right away.

Mr. Keyser stated that he had another item to add. He noted that the survey did not show easements, and it would be helpful if it did.

Mr. Quevedo responded that he would have his survey department double check, but the submission showed the existing easements on the site.

Mr. Keyser asked if a title search was done to confirm the easements. Mr. Quevedo pointed to the information in the plan. Mr. Keyser asked him to verify.

Mr. Pinney asked for clarification on shading reflected on the site plan. He pointed to the sheet labeled SP-1 and asked what was being communicated by the shading in the canal. Mr. Quevedo stated the shading overlap was a mistake on his part and he would correct it.

Mr. Keyser asked if there were existing utilities that were not in easements, what made the reviewer confident they were not private utilities. He stated he would have to look at the atlas, as he was not looking to take on ownership of utilities which had been maintained privately for the past 30 years. Mr. Keyser asserted that there were other ambiguities on the plan as far as linework and shading that made it difficult to follow. He stated that he was surprised that all the easements on the plan were proposed, not existing.

Mr. Mele referenced the comments and stated Mr. Keyser had already indicated the City would not own or maintain any new sewer components on private property.

Mr. Keyser clarified that the applicant needed to be clear on what was public and what was privately owned. He indicated the sewer lines on the plan image.

Mr. Quevedo stated he did not have a problem changing, but the plan matched the mark-up worked out in a meeting with Mr. Keyser.

Mr. Keyser responded that he had asked that they get rid of the manholes and do cleanouts, but they could leave them as long as they were maintained privately. He stated if the City currently owns the line and does not have an easement, that would be another thing. He stated that he would research the issue.

Mr. Quevedo stated they would do another title search and confirm whether there was an easement. He noted that he wanted to be consistent but did not care if they took off the sewer

easement. He stated with the water, they wanted to provide a utility easement and have City services for the building instead of having a master meter system.

Mr. Mele asked that Mr. Keyser let the applicant know what he determined from the utility atlas so that adjustments could be made appropriately.

Mr. Pinney pointed out a labeling issue with the dog park.

Mr. Mele asked that staff consider moving the plat and plat amendment forward to Planning and Zoning Board scheduling.

Mr. Pinney stated that they would revisit the re-plat once they received the updated traffic.

Mr. Mele responded that they would get that done right away.

Mr. Keyser asked that enough time be given for the traffic engineer to fully consider what he was signing and sealing.

Mr. Mele assured that they would. He stated the work was pretty straight forward, using the formulas for a shopping center of a certain size and comparing it with the formula used for a certain number of residential units. Mr. Mele shared a story from working with Deerfield Beach regarding traffic issues. He stated he understood the request.

Mr. Keyser discussed the ethical guidelines of working with a certified PE or not in looking out for the health, safety, and welfare of the public.

Elizabeth Taschereau, Director of Development Services, asked if any of the applications on the list could be done simultaneously.

Alexia Howald, Associate Planner, explained that when the applicant resubmitted all four (4) applications, there had been a timeline discussed. She stated the product of that conversation was that Mr. Keyser had substantial comments, so would have to review the application before it was moved forward to Planning and Zoning.

Mr. Pinney added that it came back to the traffic.

Ms. Taschereau stated that staff would review and resend the email reviewing the applications and timelines, then connect with the applicant.

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

The Committee had no further comments.

The Committee recommended resubmittal of the application for a future DRC meeting.



## **GENERAL DISCUSSION**

Mr. Pinney called for any general discussion.

Richard Nixon, Building Department Director, stated that when applicants are resubmitting plans, the old sheet should remain in the submittal and there should be information clearly labeling the changes so that staff could easily follow. He noted that the Building Department had issues in the past with things being added into the plans and not necessarily brought to staff attention and outlined ways in which highlighting the changes would expedite the process.

Mr. Pinney stated he heard what Mr. Nixon was saying and understood that would function well in the Building Department, but the practice would require collecting multiple sets of plans from DRC members which were sometimes as thick as a phone book and putting them together in physical space. Mr. Pinney stated that a change to note requirements might help.

Discussion continued regarding potential adjustments to the resubmittal process and placing responsibility on the applicant.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 11:27 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Taschereau, Director of Development Services