Legislation Details (With Text)

File #:	ID 2017-259 **Version:** 1	**Name:**	
Type:	Discussion and Possible Action	**Status:**	Agenda Ready
File created:	4/6/2017	**In control:**	Community Redevelopment Agency
On agenda:	4/12/2017	**Final action:**	
Title:	CONSIDERATION OF MARGATE CITY CENTER SITE PLAN		
Sponsors:			
Indexes:			
Code sections:			
Attachments:	1. PREDEVELOPMENT PLAN, 2. SITE PLAN		

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result

TO: Chair and Members of the Board

FROM: Diane Colonna, Executive Director

DATE: April 12, 2017

CONSIDERATION OF MARGATE CITY CENTER SITE PLAN

BACKGROUND: The Margate CRA and New Urban Communities LLC entered into a Development Agreement for the Margate City Center project, effective July 19, 2016. Pursuant to the original Critical Path schedule contained within the Agreement, New Urban was to submit their site plan application to the City and CRA by March 16, 2017. This date was later extended to August 7, 2017 by the CRA Board, through a Second Amendment to the Agreement. New Urban submitted the site plan package on the original deadline date, March 16th.

The Critical Path provides sixty (60) days for the CRA to review and act on the site plan. Section 5.3 of the Agreement states that that the Developer is to submit to the CRA the proposed Site Plan, preliminary civil engineering, design elements, etc. It states further that "The CRA shall approve the foregoing if they are substantially consistent with the Pre -Development Plan attached hereto as Exhibit B."
The Pre-Development Plan is not at the level of detail as a site plan submission, and it was understood at the time that the Agreement was drafted and approved that the actual Site Plan may contain some deviations. In order to allow for some flexibility in the design, Paragraph 5.5 of the Agreement identified elements that would be considered a significant or "Material Change" to the approved plan. That section states as follows: "…….a **'Material Change'** to the Site Plan means and refers to a requested change, alteration or modification that (i) increases or decreases the total number of residential uses by greater than five percent (5%), (ii) changes the composition of Units (number of bedrooms) by greater than ten percent (10%), decreases the amount of square footage in the Commercial Component by greater than five (5%), (iii) eliminates any improvement constituting the Civic and Community Component, or, in the aggregate with all other changes, alterations and modifications decreases the square footage of open space, building size, landscaped area or any other common areas by five percent (5%) or more, (iv) decreases the height of any building to below 20' or increases the

height of any building above 60', (v) deletes any amenities, (vi) significantly modifies traffic circulation on the site as determined by the CRA Executive Director and/or (vii) significantly alters the Architectural Scheme from that previously approved by the CRA, as determined by the CRA Executive Director."

CRA staff has conducted a thorough review of the Site Plan for the purposes of determining its consistency with the Pre-development Plan (PDP) and the terms of the Development Agreement, and to identify any changes that would be classified as Material under the previously cited section. The comments herein are not intended to address Site Plan compliance with City Code and requirements of other Governmental Authorities, which shall occur through separate review by the applicable agencies, including, but not limited, to the City of Margate staff.

The CRA preliminary staff comments have been reviewed with the Developer. Many of the comments were relatively minor or were requests for clarification, so in the interest of efficiency, they are not listed herein. The more significant comments are provided below.

General Comments

1. Clarification is needed regarding the building types shown on the Site Plan and the bedroom mix for each building type. Each building on the Site Plan should be labeled by the corresponding typical building floor plans (Building "A", "B", "C", etc.) as shown on the architectural drawings. Based on our review, the proposed bedroom mix as indicated by the typical floor plans and the Site Plan is not consistent with the tabular summary provided on sheet SP 11. The Developer should address this inconsistency, which could constitute a Material Change if not resolved.

2. The PDP included a public green space entitled "Green with Art (Public)" fronting SR 7 in the northern portion of Phase 2. This space has been replaced with a private pool and cabana or clubhouse for apartment residents. This constitutes a Material Change under the Agreement and must be approved by the Board.

3. Internal circulation has been modified in a few places within the project, with access from streets to parking lots moved to accommodate some building reconfiguration. The most notable example of this occurs in Phase 3, adjacent to the Park Drive Properties (which may be added to the Project at the CRA's option under paragraph 6.12 of the Agreement). The PDP requires that the Developer extend NW 9th Court over the Park Drive Properties, connecting Park Drive to Margate Boulevard. As currently configured, the Site Plan would not allow for the construction of this roadway. This classifies as a Material Change.

Site Plan Comments

1. The Phase I Site Plan (Sheets SP 3,4,5) shows the existing edge of water in the canal outside of the 40' recorded drainage easement and within areas to be developed. The Site Plan and Engineering drawings indicate that the proposed edge of water is to be relocated "by CRA" to within the easement and also shows a proposed sea wall, "by CRA." Although the CRA is required to construct a boat launch and "canal walk" as a part of the Civic and Community Component, there is no contractual obligation for the CRA to relocate the existing edge of water or construct a sea wall as indicated by the Site Plan.

2. Developer should confirm that setbacks from SR 7 are consistent with potential improvements as discussed with Broward MPO.

3. New public streets should be clearly labeled within the City Center.

powered by Legistar™

4. (SP 3)Paved area north of building #5 was shown as open space on the PDP.

5. Indicate on Site Plan the location of rental office(s) serving the apartments.

6. Label and describe any structures for clubhouses, cabanas and other apartment amenities. These will also be subject to future architectural review if elevations cannot be provided at this time.

7. Consideration should be given to service vehicle access to community center (SP 3 & 4).

8. Specify acreage and dimensions for Phase 1 Civic sites (community center, amphitheater and Town Square).

9. Future parking garage by CRA should be noted on plan (SP 4 & 5). Building 11 appears to be designed to abut a future parking garage; however buildings 10, 12 & 13 will require reconfiguration if they are to abut the garage.

10. Commercial square footage is different for buildings 8 (8,800 sf) and 12 (10,000 sf) although they appear to be the same dimensions (SP4)

11. Angled parking throughout Site Plan (SP 4,5,7,8 & 9) is inconsistent with PDP and generally not desirable. The angled parking at the entrance to Phase 1 appears to widen the required paved area, thereby reducing the width of the Town Square.

12. Small parking lot between buildings 12 & 13 is inconsistent with PDP and appears to result in the reduction of the size of commercial building # 13. (SP 4&5)

13. Explain the 1,000 sf mezzanine in buildings 13 and 18. Is there a typical floor plan and elevation for this building? (SP 5 and 6).

14. There is a reduction in the number of townhouse units from the PDP (SP 5).

15. Site Plan shows one curb cut between buildings 16 & 17 vs. two on PDP (SP 6). See comment #3 under General comments.

16. (SP 7) Circulation modified from PDP - reduced access to extension of NW 9th Ct. from building 22 parking and Margate Blvd. See comment #3 under General comments.

17. Gated access proposed in multiple locations, inconsistent with PDP (SP 9).

18. PDP showed that hotel had some SR 7 frontage that has been eliminated on Site Plan (SP 10).

19. Parking provided exceeds required parking under TOC-CC code, however, there are concerns over whether parking is adequate, particularly the 1 space/residential unit (SP 11). Due to the amount of residential relative to other uses, the full benefits of shared parking envisioned by the TOC code may not be achievable.

Architectural Comments

1. Building elevations and typical floor plans have not been provided for several building types, including buildings 13, 18,20,29,30 and 32.

2. In general, the project architecture is consistent with a market-level apartment complex comparable to other new projects in Margate and surrounding area. The architecture is generally compatible within the City Center.

3. The use of arcades (rather than awnings) should be increased for the ground floor retail frontage in mixed use

buildings.

4. More architectural detail, including specifications and material samples will be subject to further CRA review and approval at the Construction Documents stage.

5. Further architectural diversity among buildings and phases is desirable.

6. Smaller residential buildings in the PDP have been merged into proposed "L-Shape" buildings (Buildings 6,21,22,27 and 28). This results in an increase in building mass (or the perception thereof) as compared to the PDP.

Irrigation Comments:

1. Coordinate and provide irrigation service to Civic and Community Component sites.

Photometric Plan Comments:

1. Developer should investigate using specialty fixtures and poles. Developer indicated willingness to match City's lighting in City Center area.

RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended that consideration of the Site Plan should be continued until the CRA Board meeting on May 10, 2017 to allow Developer time to respond to all comments by CRA staff and additional comments from the CRA Board. If continued, the time remains within the 60 day window for CRA review.

FISCAL IMPACT: The revenues and expenditures arising from the implementation of the Development Agreement are addressed in the current and projected fiscal year capital budgets. Extensive discussion of overall economic benefits of the project was provided at the time of selection of Developer (July 2015) and approval of the Development Agreement (July 2016).

CONTACT PERSON: Diane Colonna, Executive Director and Cotter Christian, Project Manager

powered by Legistar™