

**MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL
PLANTATION, FLORIDA**

April 29, 2015

The meeting was called to order by Councilmember Chris Zimmerman, President of the City Council.

1. Roll Call by City Clerk:

Councilmember:	Ron Jacobs Robert A. Levy Lynn Stoner Peter S. Tingom Chris P. Zimmerman
Mayor:	Diane Veltri Bendekovic
City Attorney:	Donald J. Lunny, Jr.

* * * * *

2. The invocation was offered by Councilmember Zimmerman.

The Pledge of Allegiance followed.

* * * * *

ITEMS SUBMITTED BY THE MAYOR

Mayor Bendekovic recognized six students from South Plantation High School. They ranked first in the 2015 NASA Florida Student Astronaut Challenge held at Kennedy Space Center Visitor's Complex. Christine Henshel, Principal, was present, along with the students.

Ms. Henshel introduced South Plantation High School's Astronaut Challenge Team; Ashley Cador, Ayla Kovner, Christopher Heinking, Brian AlvarezdelReal, Sean Tromans and Katrina Occhialini.

* * * * *

Mayor Bendekovic read a Proclamation designating May 3 - 9, 2015, as *Drinking Water Week* in the City of Plantation.

Steve Urich accepted the proclamation. He mentioned that as part of the program for conservation they work with other County agencies and one of them is Broward County, which has a toilet rebate program. If a resident replaces a toilet that is more than ten years old with one of high efficiency toilets they get a \$100 rebate. The program is at the regular customer service number which is 954-797-2290.

* * * * *

Sharon Kent, Assistant Director of Parks and Recreation, made the following announcements:

- Tinsel Town Cabaret is Friday night at Volunteer Park at 7:30 p.m.
- An Invitational Dive Meet will be on Saturday, May 2, 2015 at the Aquatic Complex at Plantation Central Park.
- A Mother's Day Buffet will be on Sunday, May 10, 2015 at the Plantation Preserve Golf Course and Club. Reservations are suggested; call 954-585-5031 between 10:00 a.m. and 2:30 p.m.
- Summer Camps are running from June 8, 2015 through July 31, 2015 and Kids Camp runs from August 3, 2015 to August 21, 2015. Day Camps for ages 5 through 11 are held at Central Park and Volunteer Park. Adventure Camp is also held at Central Park for ages 12 through 14. There is an on-site Day Camp at Jim Ward Community Center; no field trips are offered at this camp. Other available summer camps include the Veltri Tennis Camp and Pool for ages 6 to 16; Share A Pony Summer Camp at the Equestrian Center for ages 4 to 12; and Camp Elite at Volunteer Park for ages 7 to 12.

* * * * *

Mayor Bendekovic presented Service Awards to the following Employees:

*Officer Curtis Hampton	Police	30 years
Officer James Annin	Police	20 years
Officer Shawn Gilligan	Police	20 years
Officer Robert Rettig	Police	20 years
*Officer Peter Saglio	Police	20 years
Floyd Canteen	Parks & Recreation	15 years
*Stephen Green	Building	15 years
Alvin Lilly, Sr.	Public Works	15 years
*Robert Dashnaw	Parks & Recreation	10 years
Dr. Robert A. Levy	City Council	10 years
*Glen Waltrip	Parks & Recreation	10 years
Jennifer Bostwick	Fire/Rescue	5 years
*Tonia Colon	Police	5 years
*Miranda Downs	Fire/Rescue	5 years
*Marsha Hassan	Police	5 years
*Summer Stewart	Fire/Rescue	5 years

Mayor Bendekovic presented Firefighters Service Awards to the following Employees:

Firefighter Charles Simpkins	35 years
Firefighter John Sachs	30 years
Firefighter Peter Ayer	25 years
Firefighter Randall Pettit	25 years
Battalion Chief Heidi Cole	20 years
Battalion Chief Rodolfo Gabor	20 years
Firefighter Alexander Nualart	20 years
Lieutenant Dean Bullock	15 years
Lieutenant Vincent Cicione	10 years
Lieutenant Roger James	10 years
Firefighter David Kennedy	10 years

Firefighter Jeffrey Pine	10 years
Firefighter Eric Steinberg	10 years
*Firefighter Daniel Stearns	10 years
Battalion Chief Robert Villalon	10 years
Firefighter Kyle White	10 years
*Lieutenant Michael Austin	5 years
Firefighter Desiree Colon	5 years
Lieutenant Javier Colon	5 years
Firefighter Adam Colucci	5 years
Firefighter Daniel Ferrer	5 years
Firefighter Robert Green	5 years
Firefighter Jay Jenkins	5 years
Firefighter Ron Kessler	5 years
Firefighter William Lee	5 years
Firefighter Kevin Marley	5 years
Firefighter Cosme Perez	5 years
Lieutenant Edward Rottloff	5 years
Firefighter Robin Russell	5 years
Firefighter Steve Wade	5 years
Firefighter Ashley Zalewski	5 years
Firefighter Richard Zalewski II	5 years

*Unable to attend.

Congratulations were offered.

* * * * *

Mayor Bendekovic made the following announcements:

- The Independence Parade will be on July 4, 2015. For anyone who wishes to participate call 954-452-2506.
- The Teddy Bear Picnic will be on Saturday, May 2, 2015, between 11:30 a.m. and 12:30 p.m. at the Helen B. Hoffman Library.
- The Mayor’s Prayer Breakfast will be on Thursday, May 7, 2015 at 9:00 a.m. at the Renaissance. Call the Greater Plantation Chamber of Commerce at 954-587-1410.
- The Memorial Day Service will be held on Monday, May 25, 2015 at Veteran’s Park at 9:30 a.m.
- The Plantation Farmer’s Market is at Volunteer Park every Saturday between 8:00 a.m. and 2:00 p.m.

* * * * *

CONSENT AGENDA

As a Commissioner of the CRA, Mayor Bendekovic has a voting privilege on Item No. 13.

Item #4 was pulled for discussion.

Mr. Lunny read the Consent Agenda by title.

3. Second and Final Reading of **ORDINANCE #2526** of the City of Plantation pertaining to the subject of Code Enforcement; amending the process for appointment and reappointment of the City's Special Magistrates; amending provisions related to the period of service of Special Magistrates; clarifying the processes that apply when Special Magistrates are suspended, removed, or resigned, adding other provisions concerning Special Magistrates, providing findings; providing a savings clause; and providing an effective date therefor.
5. Second and Final Reading of **ORDINANCE #2527** of the City of Plantation pertaining to the subject of procurement; amending the numerical dollar thresholds concerning the purchasing process; providing definitions; providing a savings clause; and providing an effective date therefor.
6. Second and Final Reading of **ORDINANCE #2528** of the City of Plantation, Florida, pertaining to the subject of Storm Water Management; expanding the list of governmental entities that are exempt from paying the City's Storm Water Management Non-Ad Valorem Assessment so as to include municipal corporations other than Plantation; providing a savings clause; and providing an effective date therefor.

RESOLUTION No. 12048

7. Resolution of the City of Plantation, Florida, authorizing an amendment to the estimated revenues and expenditures for Fiscal Year 2015; providing for severability; and providing an effective date.

RESOLUTION No. 12049

8. Resolution of the City of Plantation, Florida, pertaining to the subject of litigation, authorizing the settlement of the litigation styled City of Sunrise, et. al. vs. Broward County, 17th Judicial Circuit Court Case No. CACE-013-015660 (commonly known as the Resource Recovery Board Asset Litigation); authorizing the Mayor to execute a settlement agreement with Broward County; authorizing the Mayor to execute a settlement proceeds distribution agreement with the settling municipalities; providing a savings clause; and providing an effective date therefor.

RESOLUTION No. 12050

9. **Resolution** of the City of Plantation, Florida pertaining to the subject of public health; abolishing the City of Plantation Health Facilities Authority; providing recitals; providing a savings clause; and providing an effective date therefor.

RESOLUTION No. 12051

10. **Resolution** approving the expenditures and appropriations reflected in the Weekly Expenditure Report for the period April 9, 2015 through April 22, 2015 for the Plantation Gateway Development District.

RESOLUTION No. 12052

11. **Resolution** approving the expenditures and appropriations reflected in the Weekly Expenditure Report for the period April 9, 2015 through April 2015 for the Plantation Midtown Development District.

RESOLUTION No. 12053

12. **Resolution** approving the expenditures and appropriations reflected in the Weekly Expenditure Report for the period April 9, 2015 through April 22, 2015.

RESOLUTION No. 12054

13. **Resolution** approving the expenditures and appropriations reflected in the Weekly Expenditure Report for the period April 9, 2015 through April 22, 2015 for the City of Plantation's Community Redevelopment Agency.

Motion by Councilmember Tingom, seconded by Councilmember Jacobs, to approve tonight's Consent Agenda as printed. Motion carried on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Jacobs, Levy, Stoner, Tingom, Zimmerman

Nays: None

Mayor Bendekovic voted on Item No. 13 affirmatively.

* * * * *

4. SECOND AND FINAL READING OF AN ORDINANCE PERTAINING TO THE SUBJECT OF COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING PROPERTY LOCATED AT 6901 WEST SUNRISE BOULEVARD – LUPA – TECH PARK - PP13-0030.

Mr. Lunny advised that Item #4 has been pulled and will not be considered at this hearing. The reason is because under State law, the City has 180 days to act on an application once all State Agency comments are submitted. It is the City's view that the applicant is always the one that monitors and decides whether and when to proceed with the application; however, in this case and in other cases, we found out that only the City gets these Notices; they do not seem to be going to the applicant from the State Agencies. This is one where under a law that became effective in 2011 the application lapsed. The City will need to have an agreement with the applicant considered to authorize an extension to the time period. It is the Administration's plan to ask the Council to consider that agreement at the next meeting and should the Council agree to allow the applicant to present the application, the application will then be re-advertised and placed on the agenda for June 27, 2015. In his considered view, unless there is opposition to the application amongst the elected officials, there is no reason why the City would not accommodate the applicant in this fashion. As a legal matter it cannot be considered at this hearing because it is deemed lapsed.

In response to Councilmember Stoner, Mr. Lunny indicated that it does not affect anything. He sent an email to Counsel for the applicant, who asked if there was a problem in at least proceeding this evening with Zoning and site plan. The answer is no; everyone is here and it has already been worked on and advertised. Whatever Council deems tonight would have to be contingent on the approval of the Land Use Plan. They were proposing to have the hearing on May 13, 2015, which is the next meeting; however, he said that the State Statute requires that the Council first approve this agreement and then provide Notice to the State and interested parties that the deadline has been extended. It cannot be considered for May 13, 2015; he believes it would have to be for June 27, 2015. He believes the process can be enhanced by the State giving the applicant all the Agency comments directly but he is not sure that is happening.

Councilmember Jacobs questioned whether the item needs to be continued to a date certain.

Mr. Lunny stated that Council can; however, it will have to be re-advertised because as a legal matter, the application is deemed withdrawn. Even if it were continued it will be re-advertised.

No action was necessary.

* * * * *

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

Mr. Lunny read Item #14.

14. REQUEST TO ACCEPT THE CITY OF PLANTATION COMPREHENSIVE ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT (CAFR) FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED SEPTEMBER 30, 2014.

A Memorandum dated April 29, 2015, to Mayor Bendekovic and Members of Council, from Anna C. Otiniano, Financial Services Director, Horace McHugh, Chief Administrative Officer, and Don Lunny, City Attorney, follows:

SUBJECT: 2014 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) Acceptance

Administrative Item for April 29, 2015 as follows:

COUNCIL ACCEPTANCE OF THE CITY OF PLANTATION COMPREHENSIVE ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT (CAFR) FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED SEPTEMBER 30, 2014.

Mr. William G. Benson, CPA, Partner will represent our auditors, Keefe, McCullough & Co., LLP at the City Council meeting to answer any questions pursuant to this subject audit report.

If any City Council Members have questions pertaining to, or want clarification to this report prior to the City Council meeting of April 29, 2015, please do not hesitate to contact me at your convenience.

Mr. Lunny advised that Keefe McCullough's information is present along with the CAFR.

Mayor Bendekovic indicated that William Benson was present to represent Keefe McCullough and Ms. Otiniano is also present to respond to the CAFR.

Dennis Conklin, resident, was present. He mentioned a typo on Page 17 in the CAFR. He referenced Page 11; the Financial Highlights. He mentioned Bullets .1 and .5 and noted that other pages mention the amount of debt but not specifically this year's debt of approximately \$52 million, up from last year's \$25 million because of the Bond.

Mayor Bendekovic clarified that it was a loan, not a Bond.

Mr. Conklin mentioned the Defined Benefit Pension Plans and again suggested going to the Defined Contribution Plan.

Motion by Councilmember Jacobs, seconded by Councilmember Tingom, to approve Item #14.

*Amended motion by Councilmember Jacobs, seconded by Councilmember Tingom, to accept Item #14.
Motion carried on the following roll call vote:*

Ayes: Jacobs, Levy, Stoner, Tingom, Zimmerman

Ayes: None

* * * * *

LEGISLATIVE ITEMS

Mr. Lunny read Item #15.

15. PUBLIC HEARING AND FIRST READING OF AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF PLANTATION, PERTAINING TO THE SUBJECT OF RETIREMENT; AMENDING THE COMPOSITION OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR THE GENERAL EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM SO AS TO ALLOW THE FIFTH MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE GENERAL EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM TO BE EITHER A RESIDENT OR A DEFINED KEY PERSON OF A BUSINESS ENTITY HAVING ITS PRINCIPAL STREET ADDRESS IN PLANTATION; PROVIDING A SAVINGS CLAUSE; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE THEREFOR.

A Memorandum dated April 15, 2015, to Mayor and Members of the City Council, from Donald J. Lunny, Jr., City Attorney, follows:

RE: Board of Trustees for the General Employees' Retirement System

This draft Ordinance is sponsored by the Administration, as part of its effort to increase the potential pool of candidates that may serve as the fifth member of the General Employees Retirement System Board of Trustees.

Pursuant to the Police Officers' Retirement System and Volunteer Firefighters' Retirement System, the fifth member of the Board of Trustees is selected by the other four (4) members, and such candidates are ratified by the City Council as a ministerial matter.

Currently, the fifth member of the Board of Trustees of the General Employees' Retirement System must be a resident of the City of Plantation. The Administration desires to allow the fifth member to be either a resident of the City or an Officer, Director, Manager, Member, Partner, or Limited Partner of a business entity having its principal place of business within Plantation, as disclosed by the electronic records maintained by the Division of Corporations of the Florida Secretary of State. This change would allow key persons of Plantation's local business community to serve on the General Employees' Retirement System Board of Trustees if the other four (4) members choose to nominate such a person for this purpose.

This draft is now ready for consideration at First Hearing.

Motion by Councilmember Tingom, seconded by Councilmember Levy, to approve Item #15. Motion carried on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Jacobs, Levy, Stoner, Tingom, Zimmerman
Nays: None

* * * * *

Mr. Lunny read Item #16.

16. PUBLIC HEARING AND FIRST READING OF AN ORDINANCE PERTAINING TO THE SUBJECT OF COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING; CHANGING THE FUTURE LAND USE DESIGNATION OF A PARCEL OF PROPERTY; SPECIFICALLY AMENDING CITY OF PLANTATION ORDINANCE NO. 1626, AS AMENDED, WHICH ADOPTED THE CITY'S FUTURE LAND USE PLAN AND MAP, TO REDESIGNATE A PARCEL OF LAND CONTAINING APPROXIMATELY 8+/- GROSS ACRES OF PROPERTY FROM "INDUSTRIAL" TO "COMMERCIAL" IN ACCORDANCE WITH POLICIES 1.8.3 AND 1.8.8 OF THE PLAN; SAID PARCEL MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS A PARCEL OF LAND IN THE EAST ONE-HALF OF SECTION 33, TOWNSHIP 49 SOUTH, RANGE 41 EAST, SAID PARCEL INCLUDING A PORTION OF PARCEL "A" OF MOTOROLA PLAT. ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 101, PAGE 14 OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA, GENERALLY LOCATED AT 8000 WEST SUNRISE BOULEVARD, AND BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED IN THE LEGAL DESCRIPTION IDENTIFIED AS "EXHIBIT A"; AND RE-ADOPTING SAID PLAN AND MAP AS THE MASTER LAND USE PLAN AND MAP, 1989, MAKING SAID PLAN AND MAP PART OF THE FUTURE LAND USE ELEMENT OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF THE CITY OF PLANTATION; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE THEREFOR.

A Staff Report dated April 29, 2015 to the City Council, from the Planning, Zoning, and Economic Development Department, follows:

REQUEST:

Land Use Plan Amendment (LUPA) to change the land use designation of approximately 8+/- gross acres from "Industrial" to "Commercial".

EXHIBITS TO BE INCLUDED: Planning and Zoning Division report; Ordinance, subject site map; development review application; Local Planning Agency meeting minutes of April 7, 2015; ad Review Committee meeting minutes of February 24, 2015.

REVIEW COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: NO OBJECTIONS to the project moving forward for further review (February 24, 2015).

LOCAL PLANNING AGENCY RECOMMENDATION: Approval (5-0) (April 7, 2015).

ANALYSIS:

The subject site is an approximately 8+- gross acre portion of an overall parcel zoned I-L2P (Large Light Industrial District), 77.5 acres in area, and developed with a million-square-foot industrial complex currently occupied by Motorola Mobility and Motorola Solutions. Sunrise Boulevard bounds the property on the north, residential uses on the south and east, and University Drive on the west.

The land use plan amendment, if approved, will change the land use designation of approximately 8+- gross acres located at the northwest corner of the site from "Industrial" to "Commercial".

A site plan (Plantation Pointe Phase 3) is under concurrent review and includes rezoning the 5.62 acres located at the northwest corner of the site from I-L2P to B-2P and the addition of four commercial buildings together with associated parking and landscaping. The four buildings include:

- A 16,510-square-foot Walgreens with liquor store at the northwest corner;
- A 6,800-square-foot multi-tenant commercial building to the east of the proposed Walgreens facing Sunrise Boulevard; and
- Two 5,000-square-foot multi-tenant commercial buildings to the south of the proposed Walgreens facing University Drive.

STAFF COMMENTS:

PLANNING AND ZONING:

1. This request must undergo a local concurrency review for water, sewer, streets drainage, and solid waste. The standard single-page form is available in the Planning and Zoning Department. The applicant must present the form to the appropriate City departments for sign off prior to City Council approval.
2. The applicant is responsible for payment of City impact fees prior to issuance of any development permits.
3. Comprehensive Plan Policy 1.16.1 requires the City consider the following policy considerations, in addition to all other appropriate policy considerations stated elsewhere in this Plan, when making a decision on whether to change the zoning classifications for a parcel of property or change the future land use designation on a parcel of property. The applicant's response to each criteria is followed by the PZED staff response.

- (1) Whether there is a change in population, socioeconomic factors, or physical development of property nearby or affecting the subject property, which change was unforeseen or unanticipated, and which change has created a present problem or opportunity that justifies a change of land use designation or zoning classification on the subject property; and further, the extent to which the proposed land use or zoning would result in action towards mitigating any problem, or capitalizing on any opportunity identified above (the established character of predominately developed areas should be a primary consideration when a change of zoning classification or of further land use designation is proposed);

Staff Response: *The applicant states that on-site commercial uses are necessary to attract large office tenants (50,000 sq. plus) to a building that is not fully occupied. Staff concurs with the concept but has not yet formulated a recommendation regarding the proposed conditional uses, including but not limited to, high turnover restaurant or the package liquor store associated with the proposed Walgreens.*

Applicant's response: The current I-L-2P Zoning District was created for the subject property at the time the site was developed as a secure site used only by Motorola. Motorola has reduced its operations on the property and no longer requires occupancy of the entire site. As a result, Motorola has consolidated its operations into Buildings 1 and 3 and sold the property to 8000 West Sunrise LLC. The remaining property contains buildings of substantial value that need to be leased to major tenants wishing to occupy large spaces. The property was developed in 1972 as a single-user industrial plant at what is now a viable commercial intersection. The amendment brings the site up-to-date as a mixed use business park. Prospective tenants that desire campus-like locations prefer a setting that provides the convenience of shopping for daily needs and eating on the same property as the workplace. The proposed redevelopment of the arterial frontage represents an opportunity to meet these needs, complete the commercial node, and adapt the overall 77-acre property to a 21st Century development paradigm. (See also the Applicant's Response to sub-part 9) of Policy 1.16.1.

2. The impact of development permitted by the proposed land use or zoning on existing public facilities and services, including schools, police and fire, potable water, sanitary sewer, local or regional roads, parks and open spaces, and drainage;

Staff Response:

- *Schools: This is a non-residential project and should have no direct impact on schools.*
- *Police and Fire: Site plan issue.*
- *Water and Sewer: Site plan Issue.*
- *Local Roads, Drainage: Engineering Department site plan issue.*
- *Regional Roads: Curb cut location both an Engineering and FDOT issue.*
- *Parks and Open Space: This is a non-residential project and will not create a demand for additional parks and recreation facilities.*

Applicant's response:

- The proposed land use does not have a substantial impact on any City services. As a non-residential use, the new development on the site will not increase demand for schools or parks.
 - The City has adequate potable water supply capacity and treatment capacity for both potable water and sanitary sewage.
 - Stormwater drainage requirements will be met on-site via a relocated Stormwater detention lake.
 - The amendment will generate approximately one-third of a million dollars in transportation impact fees for area transportation system improvements. (*Staff Clarification: Applicant refers to County Transit impact fees that are spent at the County's discretion. The City collects no traffic impact fees and cannot verify County transit impact fees.*)
3. Whether development permitted by the proposed land use or zoning will be compatible with development permitted under the land use and zoning of property surrounding the subject property;

Staff Response: *Agreed with respect to non-residential commercial uses at intersection of University Drive and Sunrise Boulevard. Compatibility with residential neighborhood to the south, a function of Engineering Department's comments re: Marcano Road access.*

Applicant Response: The proposed amendment is compatible with, and will compliment, the surrounding commercial and industrial land uses and designations.

4. The extent to which the proposed land use or zoning designation is consistent with the Goals, Objectives, and Policies of the Neighborhood Design Element where the property is located. (The City has an optional Neighborhood Design Element which effectively splits the City into five (5) different regions for future land use comprehensive planning purposes. Each of these five (5) regions is a discrete unit, unique in character and has special Goals, Objectives, and Policies. In evaluating any proposed change of a land use or zoning designation, the Goals, Objectives, and Policies of the affected flexibility zone Neighborhood Design Element should be given a primary importance.)

Staff Response (Flex Zone 75): *The LUPA is consistent with Objective 1.1 generally and Policy 1.1.1 more specifically. This includes improved pedestrian amenities, circulation, and building design for the “Commercial Parcel”. The LUPA is located at the intersection of Sunrise Boulevard and University Drive and is located approximately 1,300 feet from the nearest single-family subdivision.*

Applicant Response: Flex Zone 75 Objective 1.1 states “the basic current land use pattern of the area should be continued.” The amendment supports this objective as commercial land uses exist on all other sides of the intersection where the amendment site is located.

NDE Policy 1.1.1 promote the improvement of pedestrian amenities in existing and future shopping and office centers along Sunrise Boulevard near University Drive, through a combination of public and private improvements. The Plantation Pointe Phase 3 Site Plan for the amendment site includes a landscaped sidewalk connection directly to the intersection of Sunrise Boulevard and University Drive.

The site plan also provides sidewalks and crosswalks that connect the amendment site in several locations to the adjacent business park campus via a large pedestrian plaza.

NDE Policy 1.1.2 directs the City to refine its development code and to prepare schematic plans to accomplish better buffering from commercial uses, better pedestrian circulation connections among sub-areas and more design features. The Plantation Pointe Phase 3 Site Plan for the amendment site is designed in conformance with the City’s development code and plans or guidelines that the City has established. The site plan is part of a commercial intersection and a larger business campus, with immediately adjacent residential area. Therefore, integration instead of buffering is the property treatment. Accordingly, walkways interconnect the buildings within the amendment site and several crosswalks connect the amendment site to the large plaza within the business park campus that is immediately adjacent to the amendment site.

5. The extent to which development permitted under the proposed land use or zoning is consistent with the Goals, Objectives, and Polices of the Future Land Use Element and the other Elements of the Comprehensive Plan. (A land use or zoning change is consistent if it is “compatible with” and “furthers” the Goals, Objectives, and Policies of the Comprehensive Plan. The term “compatible with” means that the proposed change is not in conflict with the Goals, Objectives, and Policies. The term “furthers” means that the proposed change takes action in the direction of realizing the Goals, Objectives, or Policies. For purposes of determining consistency of a land use or zoning change with the elements of the Comprehensive Plan, the Comprehensive Plan shall be construed as a whole and no specific Goal, Objective or Policy shall be construed or applied in isolation of all other Goals, Objectives, or Policies in the Plan.);

Staff response: *The “Commercial” designation is generally consistent with Policy 1.8.3 of the Future Land Use Element. Commercial uses at this location provide walk-to availability for the on-site 1M sq. ft. office/assembly facility, residential areas in Flex Zone 75, and employees of nearby businesses. The property is located at the intersection of two major roadways. Open space, design consideration, and conditional use review will take place concurrent with the Phase III site plan review by the Planning and Zoning Board and City Council.*

Applicant response: Please refer to the consistency analysis that precedes the Policy 1.16.1 responses.

6. Whether the project as proposed offers significant benefits not otherwise available to the City if the changes were not made (for example, does the planning, design, and development of the property exceed the minimum otherwise required land development requirements in terms of reserving appropriate open space, development themes, taking advantage of natural and manmade conditions or intensifying landscape or providing landscape contributions to the City, improving or maintaining public infrastructure or infrastructure improvements or maintenance, exceeding setbacks and building separations where appropriate, and reflecting an orderly and creative arrangement of buildings and land uses as appropriate.

Staff Response: *The LUPA benefits the City in that allows for a repurposing of a 35+ year old under-utilized single-use facility into a multi-use employment center, intended by the applicant to facilitate 95% occupancy in two years.*

Applicant response: The proposed amendment benefits the City by providing additional shopping and dining options for adjacent neighborhoods and employment center, generating additional property tax revenue, and by combining with retail on the other three quadrants of the arterial intersection to “frame” the intersection with retail and dining amenities. The proposed amendment will modernize and add value to the overall 77-acre Plantation Pointe/Motorola development site. None of these benefits can be obtained without the proposed land use change.

7. The extent to which the proposed land use or zoning would contribute to enhancing the tax base, adding employment, and providing other positive economic impacts;

Staff response: *Agree with respect to expanding tax and employment base.*

Applicant’s response: The amendment will convert undeveloped land into commercial tax revenue generating uses, which can be expected to increase the value of the adjacent business park by virtue of the retail and dining convenience. The configuration of the site with quality urban design with retail and dining uses that “completes” the commercial node at the intersection may also enhance the value of the adjacent commercial parcels.

8. The extent to which the subject property has potential to be developed in a desirable manner under its present land use and zoning scheme;

Staff Response: *The LUPA will expand the tax and employment base of the primary office/industrial building.*

Applicant's response: The amendment site will not be redeveloped under the existing industrial land use designation.

9. The future land use and zoning needs of the community;

Staff response: *The LUPA, by facilitating the repurposing of the existing underutilized office/assembly, can increase employment and taxable value of the primary building.*

Applicant's response: The proposed land use responds to changing development paradigms by evolving the 77-acre Plantation Pointe/Motorola site from an obsolete single-occupancy industrial plant to a mixed-use business park. In order to maintain the viability of this important facility, it must evolve to attract additional businesses. The amendment is a necessary step in the property's adaptation to changed conditions. The current zoning does not allow those supportive uses to attract major tenants to the property.

10. Such other policy considerations that may not be set forth above but which are nonetheless considered by the City governing body to be reasonable and appropriate under the circumstances;

Staff Response: *Additional considerations at the discretion of City Council.*

Applicant's response: Not applicable.

11. The proposed future land use or zoning of the property does not and will not result in contamination of ground water sources used to supply potable water; and

Applicant's response: Retail and dining uses do not pose a contamination threat to ground water sources.

12. The proposed future land use or zoning of the subject property does not cause the City's water demands to exceed the City's water supply availability or consumptive use permit.

Staff Response: *The Utilities Department will require during site plan review that the LUPA site will not exceed City water supply availability or the consumptive use permit.*

Applicant's response: The proposed land use will not cause the City's water demands to exceed the City's water supply availability or treatment capacity.

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT:

Engineering Department staff reviewed the applicant's revised LUPA information received from PZED on Tuesday, February 17, 2015, regarding traffic impacts and level of service submitted to the City of Plantation. Staff also reviewed LUPA information submitted to the Broward County Metropolitan Planning Council staff. The information is consistent in both submittals. The Department has no objections to the information submitted. Please note Broward County Planning Council staff will separately analyze traffic impacts resulting from the proposed LUPA.

TRAFFIC CONSULTANT: See Engineering.

DESIGN, LANDSCAPE & CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT:

No objections to the request for land use plan amendment; all City Landscape codes must be adhered to at time of site development. (Landscape review part of Phase II Site Plan review).

BUILDING DEPARTMENT: No objection.

FIRE DEPARTMENT: No objection as to this land use plan amendment request.

POLICE DEPARTMENT: No objection to the amendment. (Possible Phase II site plan issues; ie. Lighting).

UTILITIES: No objection.

O.P.W.C.D.: No comment.

WASTE MANAGEMENT:

Waste Management has no objection in terms of ability to service the site. Staff review of the "site specific" waste collection and removal functionality will be addressed during the site plan review process.

In response to Councilmember Tingom, Councilmember Jacobs indicated that the motion did not include the signage, just the item which is the zoning.

Motion by Councilmember Jacobs, seconded by Councilmember Levy, to approve Item #16. Motion carried on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Jacobs, Levy, Stoner, Tingom, Zimmerman
Nays: None

* * * * *

QUASI-JUDICIAL CONSENT AGENDA - None.

* * * * *

QUASI-JUDICIAL ITEMS

Councilmember Zimmerman referred to the guidelines for those addressing the Council as witnesses having been sworn in.

All witnesses intending to testify on quasi-judicial items during tonight's meeting were sworn in by Susan Slattery, City Clerk.

* * * * *

Councilmember Zimmerman noted that this item was moved into the Quasi-Judicial section.

NOTE: Items #17 and #20 were heard together.

Mr. Lunny read Items #17 and #20.

17. PUBLIC HEARING AND FIRST READING OF A ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF PLANTATION, FLORIDA, REZONING A PARCEL OF LAND FROM "IL-P" (LIGHT INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT) TO "PRD-15.7Q" (PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT); IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CITY OF PLANTATION COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE, CHAPTER 27-681; PROPERTY LOCATED AT 6901 WEST SUNRISE BOULEVARD WITHIN THE CITY OF PLANTATION, FLORIDA; AND DESCRIBED AS A PARCEL OF LAND IN THE NORTHEAST ¼ OF SECTION 34, TOWNSHIP 49 SOUTH, RANGE 41 EAST, SAID PARCEL INCLUDING PARCEL A AND PARCEL B. ACCORDING TO THE S.O.E. PLAT AS RECORDED IN PLAT BOOK 180 AT PAGE 131 OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS OF BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA; PROVIDING FINDINGS, PROVIDING A SAVINGS CLAUSE; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE THEREFOR.
20. REQUEST TO APPROVE SITE PLAN, ELEVATION, AND LANDSCAPE FOR BROADSTONE AT PLANTATION LOCATED AT 6901 WEST SUNRISE BOULEVARD AND ZONED I-LP. (LIGHT INDUSTRIAL) PP14-0024.

A Staff Report dated April 29, 2015, to the City Council, from the Planning, Zoning and Economic Development Department, follows:

REQUEST #1: Consideration of a request for rezoning from I-LP (Light Industrial) to PRD-15.7Q (Planned Residential Development).

REQUEST #2: Consideration of a request for site plan, elevation, and landscape plan approval for a 250-unit multi-family apartment building.

WAIVER REQUESTS:

1. From: Section 27-689(c), which requires buildings to be setback from all property lines equal to 1 ½ times the building height.
To: Reduce the required setback along the north property line.
 - From 95'-5" to 77'-3" for the five-story residential building; and
 - From 22'-4" to 5' for the detached garages; andTo: Reduce the required setback along the south property line.
 - From 67'-6" to 35' for the three-story residential building; andTo: Reduce the required setback along the east property line.
 - From 95'-5" to 81'-9" for the five-story residential building.
 - From 22'-4" to 12'-8" for the detached garages.To: Reduce the required setback along the west property line.
 - From 22'-4" to 5' for the detached garages.
2. From: Section 27-635(b)(1), which requires a minimum building to building separation of 30 feet;
To: Reduce the building separation from 30' to 26'11" between the clubhouse and building #5.

3. From: Section 27-743(2)(a)(1), which requires 551 parking spaces for the residential use;
To: Reduce the required parking to 445 parking spaces (a 19.2% reduction or an overall average of 1.79 spaces per unit).
PZED staff recommends denial of the 19.2% requested waiver. PZED will consider an alternative waiver to allow 475 spaces or an approximately 14.8% reduction. The Planning and Zoning Board motion to approve this waiver failed (3/3). See parking comments in body of report.
4. From: Section 27-689(a), which allows a maximum floor area ratio of 0.3 for one-story construction;
To: Increase the allowable floor area ratio to 0.64.
5. From: Section 27-689(b), which allows a maximum lot coverage of 30% for one-story construction;
To: Increase the allowable lot coverage to 64%.
6. From: Section 27-229, which requires one-bedroom apartments be a minimum of 750 square feet in area;
To: Reduce the minimum one-bedroom apartment area to 655 square feet.
7. From: Section 27-747(d)(2), which requires five off-street loading zones.
To: Eliminate the requirement for off-street loading zones.
8. From: From Section 13-41(a)(b)(c). Pedestrian zones along building facades. Landscape pedestrian zones shall extend the full width of each façade that abuts a parking or vehicular use area; the minimum width of such landscape zone shall relate to the adjacent structure's wall height.
Building 2:
 - a. 14'-3" lpz is required along the northern façade – 10'-7" has been provided.
 - b. 14'-3" lpz is required along the eastern façade – 9'-7" has been provided.
 - c. 14'-3" lpz is required along the western façade – 13'-1" has been provided.Building 3:
 - a. 14'-3" lpz is required along the northern façade – 12'-4" has been provided.
 - b. 14'-3" lpz is required along the eastern façade – 12'-10" has been provided.
 - c. 14'-3" lpz is required along the western façade – 10'-5" has been provided.Building 4:
 - a. 14'-3" lpz is required along the southern façade – 11'-3" has been provided.
 - b. 14'-3" lpz is required along the eastern façade – 13'-10" has been provided.Building 5:
 - a. 23'-9" lpz is required along the northern façade – 11'-8" has been provided.
 - b. 23'-9" lpz is required along the eastern façade – 14' has been provided.
 - c. 23'-9" lpz is required along the western façade – 21' has been provided.Building 6:
 - a. 23'-9" lpz is required along the northern façade – 11'-1" has been provided.
 - b. 23'-9" lpz is required along the eastern façade – 9' has been provided.
 - c. 23'-9" lpz is required along the western façade – 12'-2" has been provided.Building 7:
 - a. 23'-9" lpz is required along the northern façade – 6' has been provided.
 - b. 23'-9" lpz is required along the eastern façade – 13'-8" has been provided.

9. From: Section 13-41(a)(c). Pedestrian zones along building facades.
One tree shall be installed in this zone per each 30 lineal feet, or fraction thereof, of façade width.
- Building 2:
a. Three trees required along the eastern façade – two trees provided.
- Building 3:
a. Three trees required along the western façade – two trees provided.
b. Three trees required along the eastern façade – two trees provided.
- Building 4:
a. Three trees required along the southern façade – one tree provided.
b. Four trees required along the eastern façade – two trees provided.
- Building 5:
a. Six trees required along the northern façade – five trees provided.
- Building 6:
a. Six trees required along the northern façade – four trees provided.
b. Three trees required along the western façade – two trees provided.
- Building 7:
a. Six trees required along the eastern façade – five trees provided.
b. Three trees required along the southern façade – two trees provided.
10. From: Section 13-41(a)(f). Pedestrian zones along building facades:
For all trees required 25% of the required trees must be a minimum of 10' – 12' installed height; the remaining 75% of the required trees must be of installed heights relating to the adjacent wall structure height, as defined in City landscape codes.
- Building 1:
a. 75% of the trees should be a minimum height of 14'-15' x 8'/palms 18'-22'-OA – required tree heights are not met on the northern LPZ.
- Building 2:
a. 75% of the trees should be a minimum height of 14'-16' x 8'/palms 18'-22'-OA – required tree heights are not met on the eastern LPZ.
- Building 7:
a. 75% of the trees hold be a minimum height of 16'-18' x 8'/palms 22'-28'-OA – required tree heights are not met on the northern LPZ.
11. From: Section 13-37(1). Required landscaping adjacent to public rights-of-way.
A minimum of one tree is required every 40 lineal foot, or fraction thereof, (three palms = one tree).
- a. 23 trees required along the northern perimeter – 16 trees have been provided.
b. 11 trees required along the western perimeter – 8 trees have been provided.
Existing trees in poor condition do not count towards City code requirements.
12. From: Section 13-40(a)(b)(c)(3). Interior landscaping for parking areas:
Islands shall be provided to separate parking bays from major internal access drives and shall have a minimum width of 10', not including curbing.
- a. 10' required in all terminal islands throughout the site - < 10' provided in several instances throughout the site.

13. From: Section 13-40(a)(b)(c)(5). Interior landscaping for parking areas:
Where multiple perpendicular or angular parking spaces are provided to driveways, landscape islands will be preserved in green so as to break up the monotony of such parking and to minimize the hazards created thereby providing visual breaks to assist in seeing other pedestrian and vehicular traffic every fifth space for multi-family residential properties.
 - a. One island required every fifth space – one island provided, on average, every sixth space.
14. From: Section 13-40(a)(b)(f). Interior landscaping for parking areas:
Large shade trees shall be installed in all parking areas at a maximum spacing of 40' center to center.
 - a. One shade tree is required in all islands – there are six islands without City Code required trees.
 - b. One tree required in each island every fifth space – one tree provided, on average, every sixth space provided.

EXHIBITS TO BE INCLUDED: Planning and Zoning Division report; subject site map; development review application; Planning and Zoning Board meeting minutes March 3, 2015; Landscape Planning and Review Board meeting minutes of March 3, 2015; Review Committee meeting minutes of October 28, 2014; Review Committee meeting minutes of January 8, 2015; and Review Committee meeting minutes of January 27, 2015.

PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD RECOMMENDATION: Site plan was approved subject to staff comments (6/0; March 3, 2015). Parking waiver (19% parking reduction) failed 3/3.

LANDSCAPE PLANNING AND REVIEW BOARD RECOMMENDATION: **APPROVED** subject to staff comments (5/1; March 3, 2015).

REVIEW COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: No objections to project moving forward for review by Landscape Planning and Review Board and Planning and Zoning Board (January 27, 2015).

REVIEW COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Consensus to defer the project to the January 27, 2015 meeting (January 8, 2015).

REVIEW COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Submission incomplete. Reschedule for consideration at a future meeting (October 28, 2014).

ANALYSIS:

The subject site is approximately 11.76+/- acres in area. The property is bound on the north by a 100-foot canal, on the east by light industrial uses, on the south by Sunrise Boulevard, and on the west by a residential care facility.

The applicant requests approval to rezone the property from I-LP (Light Industrial) to PRD-15.7Q (Planned Residential District) to redevelop the site into a multi-family residential community consisting of four (4) garden style three-story buildings and three mid-rise four-story/five-story buildings containing a total of 250 dwelling units.

The requested PRD-15.7Q zoning will allow 250 apartments as proposed on the site plan. The companion land use plan amendment requests Irregular (19) Residential. Irregular 19 allows 304 units, 54 more units than proposed on the site plan. Staff supports Medium (16) Residential, which is consistent with the PRD-15.7Q zoning designation and submitted site plan.

STAFF COMMENTS:

PLANNING AND ZONING:

Planning:

1. See companion LUPA application PP13-0030.
2. If approved, the applicant shall pay City impact fees (\$1,833 per unit) to the Building Department prior to issuance of development permits.
3. This request must undergo a local concurrency review for parks, water, sewer, streets, drainage, and solid waste. The standard single-page form is available in the Planning and Zoning Department. The applicant has presented the form to the appropriate City departments for sign off prior to City Council approval.
4. The Broward County School Board will require payment of school station (impact) fees at time of Platting. Please contact the School Board directly.

Zoning:

In General:

1. The site includes three parcels under separate ownership. The applicant shall convey the properties to a single owner or prepare a unified control document approved by the City Attorney and recorded prior to issuance of a development permit. Staff recommended the applicant address this issue at Review Committee meetings dated October 28, 2014 and January 8, 2015 and at the Planning and Zoning Board meeting dated March 3, 2015. *This item has not yet been resolved. PZED requires the document to be approved by the City Attorney and recorded prior to issuance of any development permits.*
2. The analysis of the latest plan indicates 14 waivers, of which a \$6,500 fee has been paid. An additional \$500 fee is required. Fees shall be paid prior to scheduling the site plan/rezoning/LUPA 2nd Reading for City Council consideration.

Easements:

3. The site plan proposes the vacation of an FP&L easement (O.R.B. 2938, Pg. 686 B.C.R.). Please contact the City Engineering Department regarding the vacation process.

Elevations/Floor plans:

4. Provide shutters on all second and third floor windows for Building Types I, III, and V and all fourth and fifth floor windows for Building Type IV as shown on the submitted 3D rendering. Shutters are provided at Broadstone Cypress Hammocks in Coconut Creek. (See photo). Revise plan accordingly.

Lighting:

5. Only a partial detail of light poles are shown, and then at a small scale. A complete, clear and legible light pole detail shall be submitted and approved by PZED prior to issuance of any development permits. Revise plans accordingly.
6. Revise photometric plans to provide three-foot candles at building entrances. (Police Department requested five-foot candles).
7. Proposed light poles I front of building Type IV are located in the trash staging areas. Revise the plan accordingly prior to issuance of any development permits. **PLEASE NOTE:** Light pole locations cannot conflict with proposed tree location as shown on landscape plans.
8. Zoning Department concurs with Police Department recommendation of two-foot candles in recreational areas (tot lot, playing field, pool patio, lake pavilions, etc.). Staff has previously requested this information be added to the photometric. Revise the plan accordingly prior to issuance of any development permits.
9. Increase photometric foot candle font size along retention pond. Revise permit plans accordingly.

Parking:

10. PZED staff does not support the waiver for a 19% parking reduction (equivalent to 1.789 overall spaces per unit). Staff recommends a minimum of 1.9 spaces per unit (475 parking spaces) on the proposed unit mix based on the following:
 - a. Based on the City parking code and the unit mix in Broadstone, 551 parking spaces are required. This is equal to an overall average of 2.2 spaces per unit.
 - b. The proposed 1.78 spaces/unit standard is less than the generally accepted 1.80 – 1.85 spaces per unit in Midtown. Midtown is distinguishable in that every apartment building is adjacent to or part of a shopping center where supplemental parking is available during peak residential periods; after 9:00 p.m. weekdays or all weekend. Broadstone is a freestanding apartment building with no adjacent supplemental parking. As such, residents or guests not finding a parking space will most likely park in a designated fire land or in a landscape area.
 - c. The applicant built a garden style apartment in Coconut Creek with a mix of one, two and three-bedroom apartments similar to the Plantation site plan. Broadstone Cypress Hammocks in Coconut Creek provides 1.9 spaces per unit consistent with PZED staff recommendation.

Details:

1. Prior to building permit submittal, please obtain an approved “Paint Color Approval Agreement” form from the Planning and Zoning Department.
2. The applicant has provided a dog park along Sunrise Boulevard, approximately 24 feet from the roadway. PZED staff does not recommend placing a dog park next to a major six-lane roadway. However, due to the high net density (21 units/acre) of this project and the large retention area, there is no other location without significant site plan revisions. Approval or denial at the discretion of City Council.
3. The site plan appears to indicate metal picket fencing enclosing part of the dog park area. The applicant indicates that the lower two feet of metal picket fencing will have no more than a two-inch gap. Provide fence details for both the dog park metal picket fence and metal picket fence used elsewhere on permit drawings.

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT:

1. Please update the signing and marking plans.
 - a. Stop bars must be shown at a minimum of four feet behind the crosswalk. Sheet SP-3 has them at three feet, while SE3 of four shows four feet. Please correct site plan. **04-09-15: Comment not addressed. Please revise as requested.**
 - b. Emergency Only access is just signed at the exit, not the entrance. There is nothing shown on the plans to prevent residents/visitors from using this access. If there is a gate system, please call it out and show it on both the site plan and civil plans. **04-09-15: Additional “Do Not Enter” signs will be added near the roadway, the gate will be called out per phone conversation with the applicant’s engineer.**
 - c. Please provide signing and marking (on both the site plan and civil plans) for the merge of resident and visitor vehicles at the entrance. **04-09-15: Comment not addressed, plans still do not match. Please revise.**
2. Please provide the plans and FDOT permit for the proposed turn lane. This will be reviewed at time of permitting. The plans provided will be shown as an off-site improvement along with the permit from FDOT. **04-09-15: Comment remains until plans are provided at time of permitting.**
3. The garages do not allow for visibility of oncoming vehicles. A form of indemnity for the City will need to be provided. The form will be provided at time of permitting. **04-09-15: The applicant responded that this item will be discussed “with our JV partner and construction lender.”**

4. The site plan and the civil plans (comment #1 and #7) do not match, please revise. **04-09-15: Plans still do not match. Please revise as requested.**

Permit Comments:

Note: A detailed review of the civil drawings has not been performed at this time. If the site plan application is approved by City Council, a thorough engineering review will be performed at the time of application for construction permits.

1. The owner/developer will be required to coordinate with the Engineering Department *prior to application for construction permits*, to set up a trust account with a \$1,000 minimum starting balance.
2. An erosion and sedimentation control plan will be required and reviewed at time of permitting. A NOI will be required.
3. A Maintenance of Traffic (MOT) plan will be required. Please meet with Engineering to discuss.
4. Drainage calculations will need to be submitted, signed and sealed by a professional engineer registered in the State of Florida.
5. Surface Water Management permit(s) through Old Plantation Water Control District (OPWCD) and/or SFWMD may be required and a copy(s) provided to the Engineering Department at the time of permit review.
6. The applicant will be required to execute a developer agreement and post security for all engineering and landscape related improvements at the time of permitting.
7. **A copy of FEMA approved CLOMR-F will be a condition of permitting and a FEMA approved LOMR-F as a condition for CO (per e-mail correspondence between Engineering and Winningham & Fradley dated 10-29-14).**

TRAFFIC CONSULTANT: See Engineering.

DESIGN, LANDCAPE & CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT:

- The site plan, as it is currently laid out, proposed a very dense residential development with little usable open space or community amenities and significant waiver requests.
- Every effort should be made to preserve the existing trees on site by incorporating them in the development project to minimize the amount of trees to be removed as per City Landscape codes. (i.e. The Tree Disposition Plan calls for the removal of Cypress trees 1008, 1009 and 1010 rated as “good” condition to be removed).
- All site plan and planting plan comments from the Department of Design, Landscape and Construction Management must be responded to in writing before this project will be released from this department to proceed to City Council.
- When responding to staff comments, please bubble plan changes and specify the page number corrected in the written responses.
- The applicant will be required to execute a development agreement and post security for all engineering and landscape related improvements at time of permitting.
- Tree/palm removal and relocation permits as well as mitigation fees must be obtained directly through the Design, Landscape & Construction Management Department at the time of permitting. Please contact Diana at 954-797-2248 directly to obtain required permits.

Site Plan:

1. The photometric lighting plan is difficult to read and is inconsistent with the locations of light poles on the landscape plan. (i.e. the landscape plan shows light poles in the drive isles to the garages attached to the apartments while the photometric plans show the light poles in the adjacent trash staging area for the units). Please correct all inconsistencies throughout the site.
2. Proposed light poles in front of the buildings Type 4 conflict with the access to the tuck under garages and cannot be located in the adjacent islands. Revise accordingly.
3. One planting island is required every fifth space in multi-family residential developments. (Planting islands with hydrants do not count towards City code requirements). **Waiver required.**
4. Islands separating parking bays from major internal access drives (terminal islands) shall have a minimum width of 10', not including curbing. (i.e. The island at the NWC of Building 1 is 9' wide; the planting island on the NEC of Building 5 is 9'; etc.) **Waiver required.**
5. Code requires landscape pedestrian zones (lpz) to extend the full width of each façade abutting a parking or vehicular use area; the minimum width shall be measured from the base of the building and shall relate to the adjacent structure's wall height. (Paved areas in the lpz may not constitute more than 5' of required lpz).

Building 2:

- a. 14'-3" lpz is required along the northern façade – 10'-7" has been provided.
- b. 14'-3" lpz is required along the eastern façade – 9'-7" has been provided.
- c. 14'-3" lpz is required along the western façade – 13'-1" has been provided.

Building 3:

- a. 14'-3" lpz is required along the northern façade – 12'-4" has been provided.
- b. 14'-3" lpz is required along the eastern façade – 12'-10" has been provided.
- c. 14'-3" lpz is required along the western façade – 10'5" has been provided.

Building 4:

- a. 14'-3" lpz is required along the southern façade – 11'-3" has been provided.
- b. 14'-3" lpz is required along the eastern façade – 13'-10" has been provided.

Building 5:

- a. 23'-9" lpz is required along the northern façade – 11'8" has been provided.
- b. 23'-9" lpz is required along the eastern façade – 14' has been provided.
- c. 23'-9" lpz is required along the western façade – 21' has been provided.

Building 6:

- a. 23'-9" lpz is required along the northern façade – 11'-1" has been provided.
- b. 23'-9" lpz is required along the eastern façade – 9' has been provided.
- c. 23'-9" lpz is required along the western façade – 12'-2" has been provided.

Building 7:

- a. 23'-9" lpz is required along the northern façade – 6' has been provided.
- b. 23'-9" lpz is required along the eastern façade – 13'8" has been provided.

Waiver required.

6. Light poles must be a minimum of 15' from any planting to avoid interference as the tree/s mature. (i.e. There is a proposed light pole within 10' of existing trees 3062 and 3068, etc.)
7. There are six islands throughout the site without code required trees; (i.e. NEC Building 4; SEC Building 4; NWC Building 6; NEC Building 2; SWC Clubhouse; etc.). **Waiver required.**

Planting Plan:

1. Every effort should be made to preserve the existing trees on site by incorporating them in the development project to minimize the amount of trees to be removed as per City landscape codes.
2. One tree shall be installed throughout the landscape pedestrian zones per each 30 lineal feet, or fraction thereof, of façade width.

Building 2:

- a. Three trees required along the eastern façade – two trees provided.

Building 3:

- a. Three trees required along the western façade – two trees provided.
- b. Three trees required along the eastern façade – two trees provided.

Building 4:

- a. Three trees required along the southern façade – one tree provided.
- b. Four trees required along the eastern façade – two trees provided.

Building 5:

- a. Six trees required along the northern façade – five trees provided.

Building 6:

- a. Six trees required along the northern façade – four trees provided.
- b. Three trees required along the western façade – two trees provided.

Building 7:

- a. Six trees required along the eastern façade – five trees provided.
- b. Three trees required along the southern façade – two trees provided.

Waiver required.

3. Large shade trees, Wild tamarind, Indian tamarind, Live oak, etc., shall be installed in all planting islands and terminal islands as per codes. (i.e. NEC Building 4, SEC Building 4, NWC Building 6, NEC Building 2, SWC Clubhouse, parking island north of Building 2, parking island east of Building ;4, etc.)

Waiver required.

4. Required tree/palm heights, spread, and caliper have not been met throughout the landscape pedestrian zones (lpz) – 25% of the required trees must be a minimum of 10’ – 12’ installed height; the remaining 75% of the required trees and palms must be of installed heights relating to the adjacent wall structure height, as defined in City landscape codes.

Building 1:

- a. 75% of the trees should be a minimum height of 14’-15’ x 8’/palms 18’-22’-OA – required tree heights are not met on the northern LPZ.

Building 2:

- a. 75% of the trees should be a minimum height of 14’-16’ x 8’/palms 18’-22’-OA – required tree heights are not met on the eastern LPZ.

Building 7:

- b. 75% of the trees hold be a minimum height of 16’-18’ x 8’/palms 22’-28’-OA – required tree heights are not met on the northern LPZ.

Waiver required.

5. Staff requests the planting of aquatic plants throughout the littoral zone of the proposed retention pond.
6. All trees shall be field grown/balled and burlapped (fg/bb); container grown trees are not acceptable; under specifications on the Plant List please make a note to this effect.
7. Please clarify how you calculated the mitigation value of the existing trees to be removed as well as those to be relocated. There are still inconsistencies throughout. (i.e. Gumbo limbo #3051 is ranked at 55%, with a caliper of 8” having a value of \$200 while Gumbo limbo #3053 is ranked at 55% with a caliper of 8” having a value of \$275). *Please correct all inconsistencies throughout the tree disposition plan.* Please use the FL Chapter ISA Rule Chapter 14-40.030 of the FL Administrative Code.
8. Staff does not support the placement of a light pole within five feet of existing tree #3058.
9. Please clarify why you are proposing palms in poor condition with a rating of 5% to remain (#248 and #249) while you propose palms in good condition to be removed (#101).
10. Please note the disposition of all trees/palms (i.e. #265, #266, #267, etc.)
11. Staff does not support the removal of good Sabal palms.

12. Staff is concerned with the number of large trees in poor condition (i.e. #205, 10%, etc.) noted to remain – all hazardous and/or irreparably damaged trees should be removed from this residential site.
13. Please clarify the comment “unable to locate” on palms #254, #255, and #260.
14. Please clarify the percent ratings given on existing trees – there are still inconsistencies throughout the tree disposition plan (i.e. Gumbo limbo, #3058, is ranked at 60% in good condition, Gumbo limbo, #3111, is ranked at 68% in fair condition, Gumbo limbo, #3114, is ranked at 62% in poor condition, and Gumbo limbo, #3115, is ranked at 40% in fair condition. ***Please correct all inconsistencies throughout the tree disposition plan.***
15. A root barrier system shall be installed in situations where a tree or palm is planted within 10’ of a paved surface or infrastructure. Please include root barrier details on landscape plans submitted as well as installation locations.
16. All landscape areas shall be provided with an automatically-operating underground irrigation system; with a minimum of 100% coverage, with 50% minimum overlap in ground cover and shrub areas. The rain sensor must be installed as well as a rust inhibitor if applicable. Irrigation plans must be submitted at time of permitting.
17. Please provide additional shade trees at the tot lot; only two Gumbo limbo trees are proposed in this area which will not provide much shade during our hot summer months.
18. Staff has a concern with the proposed new curbing (planting area) being installed within 7’ from an existing mature Live oak tree, Tree #1061 (Sheet LP-1).
19. Please make sure the caliper for the existing trees on the tree disposition plan are accurate, (i.e. trees #1076, #1080 and #1081 are shown to have a caliper of 20’, 24’ and 17’ respectively).
20. The installation of curbing/paved areas, along the eastern perimeter, within 5’ of existing trees will compromise the integrity of the existing trees. (i.e. Tree #3065 existing 10’ C Gumbo limbo; #3069 existing 6’ C Live oak; #3068 existing 8” C Gumbo limbo; #3052 existing 10” C Gumbo limbo; etc.)
21. All proposed trees to be removed or relocated require ISA appraisals based on Rule Chapter 14-40.043 of the Florida Administrative Code. Staff will confirm data submitted.
22. At time of permitting performance bonds are required on all trees to be relocated as per City codes.
23. At time of permitting all proposed trees to be removed must be mitigated for as per City codes; tree mitigation will be above and beyond code required trees on the property.
24. City staff will verify the condition and disposition of all trees to be removed remain, and/or relocated s there are numerous trees and Sabal palms listed to be removed throughout the site (***of the ~250 existing trees/palms on site only 70 are to remain/be relocated.***)
25. A minimum of one tree is required every 40 lineal foot, or fraction thereof, along the perimeter (three palms = one tree).
 - a. 23 trees required along the northern perimeter – 16 trees have been provided.
 - b. 11 trees required along the western perimeter – 8 trees have been provided.

Existing trees in poor condition do not count towards City code requirements.
Waivers requested.

BUILDING DEPARTMENT: No objection.

FIRE DEPARTMENT:

COMMENTS FROM PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD STAFF REPORT OF 03/03/2015

The following comments have not been answered or submitted plans contradict previously complied:

1. Fire sprinkler system shall be hydraulically calculated based on City of Plantation drought standard of 45-PSI static, 40-PSI residual, at 1100-GPM flow.

Applicant Response: Noted and shall be calculated accordingly.

Fire Department reply: Shall be compliant with current NFPA-13.

2. All aspects of fire and life safety shall comply with Florida Fire Prevention Code 5th Ed for any permit applied on or after December 31, 2014.

Applicant Response: Noted.

Fire Department reply: Complied.

Fire Department re-comment: Submitted plan A-0.1 "Applicable Codes" contradict applicant response; shall state Florida Fire Prevention Code 5th Ed with 2012 NFPA-1 Fire Code and 2012 NFPA-101 Life Safety Code.

3. A sign, matching the specifications of the City of Plantation Fire Lane Signing & Marking standard, but with the following or like wording, shall be posted on each side of the entrance at Sunrise Boulevard, "NO PARKING IS PERMITTED ON ANY NON-DESIGNATED PARKING SPACE".
4. Wording, approved by the Plantation Fire Department, shall be included in a document signed by the lessee that reflects the following: vehicles must be parked in a designated parking space at all times; parking of vehicles on the street, along non-parking curbs, in front of garage buildings, blocking access to dumpsters enclosures, and on signed "NO PARKING" rea, is not permitted; guests of lessee are bound by same rules; any vehicle violating these rules will be removed (towed) from property.
5. All curbs adjacent to any fire hydrant and/or fire department connection and any straight curb over 4' shall be designated "FIRE LANE".

POLICE DEPARTMENT:

THE PURPOSE OF THIS SURVEY IS TO PROVIDE SOME SECURITY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR YOUR BUSINESS/PROPERTY. THIS REPORT IS ONLY ADVISORY AND IS NOT INTENDED TO IDENTIFY ALL OF YOUR SECURITY WEAKNESSES OR TO IN ANY WAY WARRANT THE ADEQUACY OF ALL PRESENT OR FUTURE SECURITY MEASURES YOUR BUSINESS/PROPERTY MAY TAKE, WHETHER OR NOT RECOMMENDED.

External Lighting.

Parking lots, vehicle roadways, pedestrian walkways and building entryways should have "adequate" levels of illumination. The American Crime Prevention Institute recommends the following levels of external illumination:

- Parking Lots 3-5-foot candles.
- Walking Surfaces 3-foot candles.
- Recreational Areas 2-3 foot candles.
- Building Entryways 5-foot candles.
- These levels may be subject to reduction in specific circumstances where after hours use is restricted.
- Use metal halide exterior lighting.
- A system of lighting fixture identification should be developed.
- The lighting fixture identification system should enable anyone to easily report a malfunctioning fixture.
- Exterior lighting should be controlled by automatic devices (preferably by photocell).
- Exterior lighting fixture lenses should be fabricated from polycarbonate, break-resistant materials.
- Plant materials, particularly tree foliage, should be trimmed and cut back around fixtures.
- Light fixtures below 10' in grade should be designed to make access to internal parts difficult (i.e. Security screws, locked access panels).

- All switches, breakers and electrical panels that control lighting should be inaccessible to the public.
- If exterior lights are not being used at night exterior motion-detection lighting should be installed to detect the presence of intruders.

UTILITIES:

1. No objection to the conceptual plan; however, plans are incomplete and if approved, a full Utility review will be required prior to permitting which could generate additional comments. In addition, all proposed mains MUST be shown on Landscaping and Drainage plans and all offsite improvements must be completed prior to permitting.

O.P.W.C.D.:

1. Old Plantation Water Control requires an acceptable drainage plan with retention and runoff calculations and a construction drawing prior to issuance of a building permit. Calculations are to include the master storm water system and include an as-built of the existing features.
2. Acceptance of as-built drawings and Certified Storm Water Inspection Report will be required prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

WASTE MANAGEMENT:

1. The gates on the compactor need to open up to 180 degrees with gate stoppers, so that we can safely service the compactor.

EXHIBIT “A”

Section 27-690 PRD Criteria Analysis

6901 West Sunrise Boulevard, Plantation, Florida 33313

Rezoning Request I-LP (Industrial) to PRD-15.7Q (Residential)

1. That the project is so located with respect to arterials or major streets as to provide direct access to said thoroughfares, without encouraging excessive traffic along minor streets in residential districts or areas outside the PRD; that the streets proposed within the project are suitable and adequate to carry anticipated traffic; that pedestrian and vehicular traffic have been suitably separated whenever practicable with the project;

Applicant’s response: The project is located on Sunrise Boulevard, which is a major arterial street, and exclusively accesses same. The site plan provides for both pedestrian and vehicular circulation in a safe and convenient manner, with parking facilities encircling the site as an “outer ring”, and pedestrian circulation adjacent to the buildings, forming an “inner ring”.

Staff Response: Staff shall review separation of the pedestrian and vehicular traffic as part of site plan review.

2. That the proposed PRD is not incompatible with the surrounding area;

Applicant's response: The Sunrise Boulevard corridor west of the subject property is largely multiple-family residential in character. The proposed PRD-Q would anchor the east end of this corridor with compatible three-story buildings fronting Sunrise Boulevard behind substantial landscaping. The Plantation Technology Park is located east of the subject property, separated by NW 69th Avenue. The PRD-Q will not comingle residential traffic with business traffic on NW 69th Avenue, and its buildings will be separated by an adequate distance of between 210 and 250 feet from the nearest Technology Park buildings. Multiple-family dwellings are also compatible with the high school to the south opposite Sunrise Boulevard, and the residential area in Sunrise to the north, separated by a 100-foot-wide canal right-of-way and distance of approximately 200 feet to the nearest residences.

Staff Response: The City Council has determined that multi-family use is compatible with the adjacent industrial area. Council conditioned first reading approval upon Council acceptance of the site plan, building plans, and landscape plan.

3. That the proposed PRD meets all general requirements of the subdivision regulations required of any zoning district comparable usage as to utility services such as sanitary sewers, water lines, storm and surface drainage systems, and other utility systems and installations, including those required for firefighting services, that extension or enlargement of such systems to comply with the PRD uses will require no higher public costs than for projects generally permitted under existing residential zoning classifications in the City, unless the developer applicant provides equivalent private facilities.

Applicant's response: The PRD-Q does not involve the subdivision of land, as the entire parcel will be developed, owned and maintained by a single entity, with no internal rights-of-way or lots. The PRD-Q will comply with all requirements for utility services, storm water drainage, including any necessary improvements required of the developer, noting that the PRD-Q represents an infill development project.

Staff Response: To be determined by Utility Department.

4. That any waiver of standard zoning requirements serves public purposes to a degree at least equivalent to the general provisions of the ordinance establishing comprehensive zoning regulations and other application City ordinances and regulations or the actions, design and solutions proposed, and although not in accord with a literal interpretation with the zoning and other applicable regulations and ordinances, satisfy public purposes to at least an equivalent degree.

Applicant's response: All waivers associated with the PRD-Q site plan are necessary to achieve the public benefits of the development. Public benefits include the deep landscape buffer abutting Sunrise Boulevard, which is typically more than 40 feet in depth, amenities such as enclosed parking and covered parking, separate vehicular and pedestrian circulation systems, a large central lake amenity, and limiting most of the buildings to three stories while eliminating a public eyesore and invigorating the dated Sunrise Boulevard corridor east of University Drive with its first residential redevelopment in decades.

Staff Response: The applicant proposes approximately 16 units per gross acre (21 units per net acre) using a combination of three and five-story buildings. While the applicant meets the minimum 30% open space requirement, the site plan provides very little usable open space. The site plan also

proposes a 19% reduction in parking that cannot be justified for an auto-dependent suburban apartment complex.

5. That open space is being provided for the occupants of the PRD according to this article, that desirable natural features are preserved, that open space linkage from one (1) project to another project is encouraged in accordance with City programs and criteria.

Staff Response: See No. 4.

Councilmember Tingom commented that after reviewing the plans he believes this is a positive step to this piece of property. He expressed concern and suggested that one point of ingress for the entire complex of 250 units is not sufficient to handle the traffic. He believes that the security gate on the east side of the property should be public access because there should be two entrances and exits to the property. He mentioned parking, which is at 1.7 units. He does not think that is enough parking for the complex and noted that perhaps there should be an adjustment with the landscape or find some other way to provide additional parking. Another concern with parking is that most garages in Florida are used for storage. He does not know that the number of parking spaces is going to be reduced due to the fact that people will not be parking inside of the covered garages located on the north and west sides of the property.

Councilmember Levy stated that he wants the best landscaping possible; he does not think landscaping should be given up for paved lots. He believes there can be a compromise such as an area that can be designated as used for parking but still be green. He would like to keep the islands and landscaping that we have. He mentioned the garages and questioned how many there are.

Mr. Leeds responded that the garages constitute 24% of parking on site.

Councilmember Levy indicated that he is not going to consider the garages as storage due to the fact that you cannot legislate what people are doing with their garage; he has to consider it as parking; therefore, it helps alleviate some of the parking concerns. He would like to consider that 24% as part of their parking requirements and that it is being provided to people to park their cars.

Mr. Leeds clarified that it is considered part of their required provided parking.

Emerson Allsworth, attorney, was present on behalf of the applicant, along with Robert Hall from Alliance Residential out of Boca Raton, Beatriz Hernandez, architect; Jeff Katims, planner; Carey Winningham, engineer, and Bill Laystrom, attorney.

Mr. Allsworth explained that when he and Bill Murphy, the owner, appeared before the Council, they were proposing to change this from industrial to residential. The Council was very specific. They thought this was an appropriate change in the land use plan because they wanted a high end product. This high end apartment complex is an upgrade of the neighborhood. There is no residential opposition. In 2007/2008 the Council changed this to residential and when the recession hit it went back to industrial; it was never built. In the meantime, the property has never moved and has an old derelict warehouse building. This improvement will had about \$42 million to the tax base of Plantation compared to the rather modest assessment on the existing property. Alliance Residential is among, if not the largest apartment builder in the United States. They presently own/manage 82,000 units nationwide. Their Fort Lauderdale project is ahead of this project; they are in for permits that have already been approved and the parking is less than the ratio requested.

Mike Ging was present. He provided a brief overview of the site plan and noted the following:

- 250 units on 11 acres.
- Mix of one, two and three-bedroom apartments.
- Seven different buildings; three of which are five stories at the highest point stepping down to four stories.
- 156 units in the three buildings on the lake.
- Four three-story garden buildings that contain 94 units.
- There are a total of 77 garages; 30 of which are attached to the buildings and 47 detached garages around the perimeter of the building.
- Site amenities include a tot lot, dog park, a resort style pool that has a 600-square-foot outdoor pavilion, a fireplace, a flat screen television, a pool table and seating areas. There are also cabanas by the pool.
- The project will feature gated access, a trash compactor, paver entry driveways and sidewalks, a 5,600-square-foot clubhouse that will include their leasing and management team, a fully equipped fitness center with a boxing area, a yoga studio, a demonstration kitchen, a mini theater and some pool and foosball tables.
- Buildings are concrete construction with stucco exterior and flat cement tile roofs.
- The units are luxury with nine-foot ceilings, granite countertops, steel appliances, full size washers and dryers, walk in closets, stand up showers, and island kitchens.
- The rental range will start at \$1,288 for the smallest one bedroom up to approximately \$1,350 for the largest one bedroom. Two bedrooms will be in the range of \$1,450 up to \$1,750 and three bedrooms starting at 1,969. The average rent is approximately \$1,525 a month.
- There are 1.78 parking spaces per unit.
- With 445 spaces there are 35 spaces over the number of spaces per bedroom, which is about 8.5% of the 410, which are available for guest parking.

Mr. Ging indicated that in doing additional research with regard to parking and consulting with some other nationally recognized agencies, it was determined that for a low to mid-rise apartment community, which is comparable to what they are doing, the average number of parking spaces is 1.61 per dwelling unit and for more urban infill such as Midtown products the average is 1.52 per unit. Parking data was also gathered around Dade, Broward and Palm Beach Counties including a total of 11,000 units and the average for the projects in Broward County was 1.8 per unit and in Palm Beach County it was 1.7 per unit. An independent count was done on a Wednesday evening between 6:00 p.m. and midnight on a project that is currently 95.5% occupied; there are 396 apartments on that project. At midnight they had 501 spaces occupied, which meant there was a total of 138 vacant spaces, which works up to 1.56 spaces per unit that were occupied. He feels that 1.78 per unit is an adequate amount of parking for this project. He mentioned the garages and storage and provided a copy of a lease addendum used for all of their projects. It says, "The Declaration of Covenants and Restrictions shall include that garages and a residential portion of the development shall be used exclusively for parking of motor vehicles and shall not be converted into any use which would prevent the use of the garage for purposes other than parking a motor vehicle." There is also the right to terminate the resident's lease and take back the garage and terminate that portion of the lease. They do have the ability to enforce that and if there ever was an issue they would verify that everyone was using their garage for parking of vehicles.

Mayor Bendekovic referenced Engineering staff comments and questioned whether they saw those. There is a comment after every one and the fourth one says, "The site plan and the civil plan comments #1 and #7 do not match; please revise. Plans still do not match; please revise as requested." There are quite a few comments and

she wanted to make him aware of them. He questioned whether these comments were discussed with Engineering.

Mr. Ging responded that they did see the comments.

Mr. Winningham commented that from what he saw they are mostly drafting corrections; the site plan has to incorporate from the Engineering plan.

Mayor Bendekovic mentioned one comment that says, "Do Not Enter signs will be added near the roadway; the gate will be called" per phone conversation with the applicants Engineer.

Mr. Winningham thought that was added to the construction plans and stated that he will cover that when he submits the plans to Engineering.

Mayor Bendekovic mentioned comment C-1, "Not addressed. Plans still do not match; please revise."

Mr. Winningham advised that they do accept the comments; there is not a problem.

Brett Butler, City Engineer, was present. He mentioned Councilmember Tingom's concerns about having adequate access to the site and his suggestion to modify or allow the access that exists off of 69th Avenue to function as additional ingress and egress for general use purposes. Staff would recommend strongly against that based upon how the site and access is designed today. If you look at the site plan the access is proposed to be restricted by way of a gate and that gate is located about 25 feet from the thru-lane at 69th Avenue. If it operates in a restricted manner as is currently proposed and it is suggested that it operates for visitor and resident parking, it will provoke a queueing or stacking issue that will back out onto a public corridor. If the perception is strong staff can only support the proposal if that access is completely unrestricted; it cannot be gated. The way it is currently designed there is no way to control the potential stacking that will occur based upon the present site geometry. If they were to redesign that and create an internal throat before you can break into parking areas where you can queue internally, then you can talk about possibly gating it. The way it is currently designed staff would strongly recommend against it functioning any other way than what is currently proposed on the site plan unless it is unrestricted.

In response to Councilmember Tingom, Mr. Winningham indicated that there are 396 units on their Coconut Creek property. There are two points of access; there is a main entrance on Hillsboro Boulevard, which is ingress and egress for visitors and residents, and on the eastern most side of the property there is a resident only ingress and egress gate that also functions for emergency access as well.

Councilmember Tingom questioned whether there was a traffic study showing that is enough space with one access point to get in and out.

Mr. Winningham advised that a traffic study was done over three years ago. He stated there have never been any issues with adequacy of either ingress or egress to the project and very few people use the emergency or resident only access point. The stacking distance they have available coming in is similar to this, maybe a little longer, but there has never been an issue. Their company is the seventh largest property management firm in the nation for apartments; they manage 82,000 units. They are the largest development firm in the country. To have one ingress and egress for up to 300 units generally works well with their experience.

Councilmember Jacobs made a Jennings Disclosure. He met with the applicant to discuss this project. They showed the project and what they planned to do and one of the things discussed was parking. He noted that this will not affect his decision tonight.

Councilmember Stoner made a Jennings Disclosure. She met with the applicant and his attorney and reviewed the project. It will not affect her decision.

Councilmember Zimmerman made a Jennings Disclosure. He met with the owner, client and their attorney and reviewed the project. It will not affect his decision.

Councilmember Tingom made a Jennings Disclosure. He met with the owner and the attorney and it will not affect his decision.

Councilmember Levy made a Jennings Disclosure. He met with them and it will not affect his decision. He appreciates a \$42 million investment in our community.

Mayor Bendekovic made a Jennings Disclosure. She meets with most of the applicants. She does not think she will be voting but if she does it will not impact her vote one way or the other.

Mr. Lunny indicated that the Council has done a consolidated hearing. Motions and votes on the ordinance and companion site plan application will be subject to the Council both approving an agreement with the applicant, setting a future hearing for the land use amendment that is necessary for construction to proceed, as well as the ordinance being approved at the adoption hearing for such land use plan amendment.

Motion by Councilmember Jacobs, seconded by Councilmember Stoner, to approve Item #17. Motion carried on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Jacobs, Levy, Stoner, Tingom, Zimmerman
Nays: None

Councilmember Jacobs commented that it comes down to the parking and whether we want to grant such a large waiver. When he met with the applicant he discussed a compromised position of adding a few more spaces and the cost of adding a few more spaces would be that something would have to be lost. He requested that look at possibly modifying the landscape in some way or the islands in the parking lots or something. If we can pick up 15 more spaces then the ratio would be 1.84 and the average in the County is 1.8. All of the parking spaces may not be filled up every night at midnight there are times when there will be more than just the residents, especially on holidays. His experience in the City, we do not want to have a new development that does not have enough parking. He questioned whether they thought about getting a few more spaces and whether it was feasible.

After further discussion regarding parking, Councilmember Levy stated that he would not object to additional parking with the caveat that the trees will be moved to other areas around the lake as Councilmember Jacobs previously said.

Mr. Winningham advised that there are areas around the perimeter of the site, especially along the rear of the site, where there is a canal and no visibility from the street. Trees could come out of those islands and go someplace where they would have more impact and be more visible around the lake or enhancing other green

spaces or buffer areas around the rest of the site. They are not trying to get them off of the site, they are just moving them around.

Councilmember Zimmerman commented that he was not in favor of losing any islands. There is some real design criteria and you have to be aware of the heat that the asphalt projects. Islands and trees really do shade the site and keep it cool. That is part of the new sustainability in design. There are already not enough islands with the garages in the rear and taking those islands out, especially on the north side, will leave strips of parking with six trees and he does not think that is the Tree City that Councilmember Levy was talking about.

Councilmember Jacobs reiterated that the islands can be taken from somewhere else.

Councilmember Zimmerman stated that this is an enclosed site. His concern comes with how this project affects the perimeter neighborhood and what people see. There are some concerns with the garages along the access road to the Industrial Park butting straight up against that road. The fence is close to the building and he does not know how some of that landscape will be maintained if there is only four feet between the fence and a building along the canal. Some of the maintenance needs a closer look so that it stays maintained along the perimeter of the site.

Mr. Winningham advised that he discussed this with the landscape architect. As to the five feet between the fence and the back of the garages, he felt that it was sufficiently wide enough to have a two-foot hedge with a three-foot walk area to maintain. If it would be better, they could connect the fence to the sides of the garage and the landscape would basically be behind the fence.

Councilmember Zimmerman mentioned the visibility people are going to see from the roadways which is the back of the garages that have a stucco face.

Mr. Winningham indicated that they are not concerned about negatively impacting the neighbors; their project is a big benefit to what is currently there. He does not think they need more parking; it is believed that the 1.78 is adequate.

Councilmember Zimmerman commented that there are a lot of trees missing and there are a lot of waivers for trees. We have had discussions about how it is calculated. If you look through all of the waivers in the staff report there is a shortage of trees according to our zoning code depending on how it is interpreted.

Mr. Winningham advised that the landscape architect had several meetings with landscape staff. The difficulty is the minimum tree separation for the 24-foot canopies. There are also issues with fire hydrants in certain aisles where trees are not allowed. There are issues with overhanging powerlines. The landscape architect has worked hard to put in as much landscaping trees as possible.

Councilmember Zimmerman indicated that this site has been developed so tightly that it is requiring us to give a lot of waivers and a lot of changes. When you say there is no room that is because of the design you chose. There is a marketing perspective to this. He understands there is a return on investment and there are units and prices; however, the design is dictating all this reconsideration on our part.

Mr. Winningham stated that they are adding far more trees than what currently exists and there is far more open space than the property will ever have. It is a balance to provide for the lake and other landscaping. They have tried to manage the various requirements the best they can.

Councilmember Tingom commented that sometimes when we require so many trees they are put in places where we have utilities and it causes a problem 20 years later. He questioned whether that has been considered in the plan.

Mr. Winningham stated that as far as electrical, everything will be underground on site. As far as the water and sewer lines go, the sewer is private and it is in the pavement so it is not conflicting with any trees. The water lines are also in the pavement and they have an easement and where the easement crosses any green areas there are no trees.

Councilmember Tingom mentioned the canal and noted that the garages and landscape will be a definite improvement. Activities along there will be a lot better with a fence and landscaping.

Mayor Bendekovic referenced Fire comments on the staff report and questioned whether Chief Stearns would be all right to get a truck in there for a five-story building.

Chief Stearns stated that he was all right.

In response to Councilmember Zimmerman, Mr. Winningham advised that the units are fully sprinkled and they are all concrete as well.

In response to Mayor Bendekovic Mr. Winningham advised that they allow larger dogs; up to 80 pounds. There is almost 12 acres and people walk around the lake, the sidewalk and other parts of the neighborhood. They do not allow any vicious breeds; that is the only restriction.

Mr. Winningham referenced Page 5; the Zoning section, Item #4; elevations and floor plans. The comment mentioned that staff would like them to include shutters on all second and third floor windows for types #1, #3 and #5 and on fourth and fifth floor windows for type #4 buildings. They took photographs of their Coconut Creek project to show what is currently on the plans. In Coconut Creek they do not have shutters on all second, third and all fourth and fifth floors. Architecturally it can get a little busy. He showed a few examples and questioned if they can stick with the shutter detail design they have as it is a better look.

Councilmember Jacobs advised that he would add that to the motion; that we will accept a shutter detail as presented.

Mr. Winningham stated that the only other area they had some difficulty with is with regard to the photometrics; the lighting plan. He referenced Page 6 under lighting; Items #6 and #8. He noted that they are looking to provide an average of three-foot candles or an average of two. The difficulty is that some places are actually too bright and get offensive to the residents.

Mr. Leeds explained that this is the recommendation of the Police Department; it is at the low end. If you go to the back of the report the Police Department does a CEPTID review. This is based on the American Crime Prevention Institute's recommendation that the following levels of external illumination. Parking lots should have three to five-foot candles; walking surfaces should have three-foot candles; rec areas should have two to three-foot candles; and building entryways should have five-foot candles. Since waivers are being granted these can be included as part of the motion. Staff recommended three-foot candles at building entrances; actually dropping down what is recommended by the Police Department. That is the only comment made and he does not think that is an onerous position. He responded to the second part of the motion in terms of the shutters;

clarifying that the plan will be approved as submitted. It sounds like the applicant wants the plan approved as is.

Councilmember Jacobs suggested making sure that the applicant is all right with that.

Councilmember Zimmerman commented that we are going to keep what staff has recommended and that the applicant is in agreement with regard to the lighting.

Mr. Winningham agreed.

In response to Councilmember Zimmerman, Mr. Leeds mentioned a photograph of a project with shutters that is in the backup; it is a Broadstone Alliance project. Staff is requesting the same quality as in Coconut Creek. The photo shows one face of one building; he does not know how the other buildings look. The recommendation is in certain locations for certain buildings; it is not everywhere. From an architectural standpoint, he thinks that is very fair especially since they are being given a significant parking waiver and significant landscape waivers. It is a tight site and he feels it is a fair sort of trade off. He interprets the motion plan as is. He cannot have a motion subject to a photograph and now he will have to drive around the project in Coconut Creek and take photos.

Councilmember Jacobs advised that was not his intent to approve it to a photograph; it was to the plans.

Mr. Leeds indicated that he is a little concerned when the applicant brings photographs; they have not been presented to him and there was an opportunity to discuss this. He has never seen the photographs before. He has not had an opportunity to review it. The applicant has also mentioned ITE traffic data. Again, that is something he has not had an opportunity to review.

Mr. Winningham brought a few examples of the condition of the shutters. They have tried to stay true to the same design on this project and on all of their other buildings. The same basic pattern of shutters is provided on various building types. Their concern is that too many is too busy.

Councilmember Zimmerman questioned shutters or awnings and whether they are referring to awnings that eject out over the top of the windows; shutters are on the side.

Mr. Winningham clarified that they are awnings but noted that they are called shutters. He reiterated that if there are too many awnings it gets a little too busy.

Councilmember Levy questioned whether the awnings are retractable.

Mr. Winningham advised that they are hurricane straight; they are anchored to the wall. They are made out of aluminum and are painted; they are fixed and louvered.

Councilmember Jacobs questioned if the plans differ from the elevations.

Mr. Winningham stated that everything in the package and the photographs are an exact duplicate.

Mr. Leeds emphasized that he has not had an opportunity to confirm whether that statement is correct.

Councilmember Zimmerman commented that he had some concerns about the height when he first saw this. These are higher buildings than in Coconut Creek. He was a little concerned about some of the articulation. Some of the stone was discussed and about getting a little higher, especially on the rear elevations. He does not know that staff's comment is not appropriate.

Mr. Winningham indicated that they can add shutters as staff requests.

Councilmember Jacobs clarified that the two items, lighting and shutters, are not part of the motion; they are going to agree with staff regarding lighting and shutters or awnings.

Motion by Councilmember Jacobs, seconded by Councilmember Tingom, to approve Item #18, granting all of the waivers, including the parking waiver, and subject to staff comments. Motion carried on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Jacobs, Levy, Stoner, Tingom, Zimmerman

Nays: None

* * * * *

NOTE: Items #18 and #19 were heard together.

Mr. Lunny read Items #18 and #19.

18. REQUEST TO APPROVE SITE PLAN AMENDMENT FOR PHASE 2 OF PLANTATION POINTE (MOTOROLA) LOCATED AT 8000 WEST SUNRISE BOULEVARD. (LARGE LIGHT INDUSTRIAL) PP14-0033.

A Staff Report dated June 24, 2015, to City Council, from the Planning, Zoning and Economic Development Department, follows:

REQUEST: Site plan amendment approval to construct entry features for Buildings I and IV together with site circulation and parking lot modifications.

WAIVER REQUEST:

1. From: Section 27-655, which requires a 40-foot buffer from parking stalls along University Drive.
To: Reduce the landscape buffer along University Drive to 23 feet.
2. From: Section 27-657, which requires a 40-foot wide landscape buffer along Sunrise Boulevard
To: Reduce the landscape buffer along Sunrise Boulevard to 38 feet.
3. From: Section 13-40(a)(b)(c)(2)(c). Interior landscaping for parking areas:
Islands in parking bays shall have a minimum size of 8' in width and 16' in length, not including curbing.
To: Reduce the required 8' wide islands – 7'5" – 7'9" provided in several instances.

4. From: Section 13-40(a)(b)(c)(4)(c). Interior landscaping for parking areas:
Medians shall be provided between double parking bays, shall be curbed and shall have a minimum of 8' in green area, not including curbing.
To: Reduce the required 8' wide median – 4' has been provided in two locations. (Sheet A101.2 & A101.4). *Note: The 2' overhang does not count towards requirement; paved pedestrian pathways do not count towards requirement.*
5. From: Section 13-40(a)(b)(c)(3). Interior landscaping for parking areas:
Islands shall be provided to separate parking bays from major internal access drives and shall have a minimum width of 10', not including curbing.
To: Reduce the required 10' wide terminal islands throughout – 7'6" – 9'3" provided in ~13 islands.
6. From: Section 13-40(a)(b)(3). Interior landscaping for parking areas:
Medians shall be provided to separate parking bays from major internal access drives and shall have a minimum width of 10', not including curbing. 2' vehicle overhang does not count towards code required dimensions; paved sidewalks do not count towards code required dimensions.
To: Reduce the required 10' wide median – 7' width proposed (Sheet A101.3).
Note: The 2' vehicular overhang does not count towards requirement; paved pedestrian pathways do not count towards requirement.
7. From: Section 13-40(a)(b)(f). Interior landscaping for parking areas:
Large shade trees shall be installed in all parking areas at a maximum spacing of 40' center to center.
To: Substitute the large shade trees required to be installed in all planting islands as well as planting medians – there are several areas throughout the site where medians and islands are < 8' in width and therefore, are not appropriate planting spaces for large shade trees; a medium tree must be planted in these areas.

EXHIBITS TO BE INCLUDED: Planning and Zoning Division report; subject site map; development review application; Planning and Zoning Board meeting minutes of March 3, 2015; Landscape Planning Review Board meeting minutes of March 3, 2015; and Review Committee meeting minutes of January 27, 2015.

PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD RECOMMENDATION: **APPROVED** subject to staff comments (6/0; March 3, 2015).

LANDSCAPE PLANNING REVIEW BOARD: **APPROVED** subject to staff comments (6/0); March 3, 2015).

REVIEW COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: **NO OBJECTION** to the project moving forward to further review (January 27, 2015).

REVIEW COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Reschedule for consideration at a future meeting (October 28, 2014).

ANALYSIS:

The subject site is zoned I-L2P (Large Light Industrial District), 77.5 acres in area, and developed with an 839,898-square-foot industrial complex currently occupied by Motorola and Motorola Solutions. Sunrise Boulevard bounds the property on the north, residential uses on the south and east, and University Drive on the west.

On August 13, 2014, City Council approved a parcelization plan with associated waivers separating the site into two parcels of 23.37 and 54.13 acres, respectively. On December 17, 2014, City Council approved relocation of the two existing retention ponds and a temporary reduction in the required parking to allow a medical use to occupy the previous day care building (Building VI).

The proposed site plan amendment includes:

- Addition of a northbound right in only entrance from University Drive approximately 450 feet south of Sunrise Boulevard.
- Construction of entrance canopies on the north side of Building II and the east side of Building IV.
- Removal of an existing covered driveway on the east side of Building IV and V.
- Installation of new parking areas north of Buildings II and IV (fronting Sunrise Boulevard), east of Building V, and west of Building VI (fronting University Drive).
- Installation of a recreation area and fitness trail around the relocated retention pond.
- Reconfiguration of the pedestrian/outdoor seating area at the northwest corner of the cafeteria building.
- Addition of a standby generator on the south side of Building VI (the proposed medial use).
- Addition of a standby generator on the east side of Building II.
- Installation of a loading zone and dumpster enclosure between Buildings II and IV.
- Landscape renovations.

There are three concurrent applications in review with this application. The applications are:

- PD15-0002 – a land use plan amendment to convert roughly six acres at the northwest corner of the site from industrial to commercial.
- PP15-0001 – an application that includes rezoning the same six acres from I-L2P (Large Light Industrial District) to B-2P (Central Business District), and a site plan for three commercial outparcels.
- PP15-0010 – a sign special exception package for the entire campus.

STAFF COMMENTS:
PLANNING AND ZONING

Planning: No objection.

Zoning:

In General:

1. Note: The existing wellness center and the cafeteria are currently considered accessory to Motorola and have not been included in the required parking calculation. Changes in the occupancy of these buildings may require parking waivers not included in this review. If the cafeteria is or becomes open to the public, required parking must be added to the overall parking calculation. The applicant has indicated in the response to staff comments that there are no current plans to change the use of either building.

2. Note: For future renovations to existing buildings, Section 27-653 requires that all rooftop equipment be screened by a screening material that is as high or higher than the rooftop equipment and of similar material and color to the building. The applicant has indicated that all new development will comply with this requirement. However, Section 27-653 applies to all existing and new buildings.

Site Plan:

1. Section 27-655 requires a 40-foot landscape buffer along University Drive. The applicant is proposing 23 feet. The applicant is requesting a waiver.
2. Section 27-657 requires a 40-foot wide landscape buffer along Sunrise Boulevard. The applicant is proposing 38 feet. The applicant is requesting a waiver.
3. There still are several areas that show improvements that have not been included in the scope of work. Correct the scope of work line to include these areas. The areas are:
 - a. Page A101.2 and A101.4 to the east of the building connection between Building V and Building IV. Handicap spaces have been re-distributed and at least one island has been added.
 - b. On sheet A101.4, there is a row of existing parking on the architectural site plan and the landscape plans that reflects a median 8 feet in width. A site visit has verified that the median is approximately 13 feet in width, which agrees with the survey. The area is below. Please correct in future submittals of Phase 3 and permitting. The area is depicted accurately on the civil plans.

Details:

1. Note: All generators – existing and proposed must be labeled on the plans and comply with Section 27-647 regarding screening and Section 16-1 regarding noise.
2. Dumpsters shall be kept inside a dumpster enclosure. The applicant has agreed to repair the enclosures as necessary. Staff recommends all gates on existing dumpster enclosures be replaced with a solid gate material.

Signage:

1. Note: Signage is not part of this review. However, a separate sign special exception package has been submitted for City Council review April 29, 2015. (PP15-0010)

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT:

1. Please provide complete signing and marking plans. A meeting was held with the applicant's engineer on February 5, 2015 to discuss this comment. All concerns discussed in the meeting should be addressed and will be reviewed at the next submittal.

04-03-15 – Not all of the comments discussed in the meeting with the applicant's engineer appear to be addressed. They are listed as follows:

- a. The entrance/exit to Building 2 is still shown as 24 feet wide on both sides. This will enable two vehicles to enter/exit at the same time with no clear markings. It was requested that these access points be revised to one lane or striped for two. Please pick one and revise.
- b. The island at this location does not have dimensions. Please revise.
- c. It was requested that in order for vehicles not to back out over the crosswalk there needs to be a minimum 10-foot separation between the parking space and the crosswalk. The Landscape Department's suggestions for the sidewalk are acceptable so long as the 10-foot separation is maintained. Please revise.
- d. Stop bars are missing at intersections that were previously discussed.
- e. Crosswalk locations have not been revised.
- f. Mid-block crosswalks must be signed as such and have advance warning signs as well.
- g. Sheet C401.4 shows parallel parking being called out as standard 16' parking and parallel parking. It also shows the last space encroaching into the drive aisle, leaving only eight feet of the lane.

- h. Sheet C401.4 also has some other striped spaces and an existing bike storage next to the parking that encroach into the drive aisle. Please remove or revise.
 - i. Sheet C401.4 shows disabled parking at 18 feet with no wheel stop and the sign in the space. Please provide disabled parking according to the standard City detail. It must be either 16 feet with a landscape curb area or 18 feet with a wheel stop and then the sign is two feet from that. There is not enough room as shown.
 - j. Sheet C401.4 shows disabled parking with a sidewalk in front of it. Please show the sign locations for these spaces.
2. Please provide all of the corrected signing and marking on the site plan as well as the civil plans. **04-03-15: The site plans and the civil plans do not match with regard to dimensions and there is no signing and marking on the site plan as previously requested. Please revise both sets of plans.**
 3. The fire truck radius does not make all of the turns as shown in the plan. For example, it cannot make the turn from the main drive aisle to the drive aisle next to the proposed retail building as shown. The radius needs to be shown as 50-foot outside, 38-foot inside. Please revise to show that the truck turns can be made or revise the path of the truck for sufficient Fire Department access for life safety. **04-03-15: Sheets in the C501 series show some of the fire truck radii pieced together so they cannot actually make the continuous turns. Please revise/verify that the fire truck can actually make all of the turns shown on the plans.**
 4. Sheet C03.1 shows a truck wash at an entrance that has not been constructed yet. All truck washes must be a minimum of 25 feet back from the edge of any roadway. Please provide the plans for the roadway connection and in which phase they will be done in. **04-03-15: Comment not addressed. This entrance is also not yet permitted by FDOT and will not be an access point until that time. Please revise as requested.**
 5. Please provide more detail for the construction of the turn lane entering the site off of University Drive with regard to the erosion and sedimentation control plans and Maintenance of Traffic (MOT) plans. **04-03-15: Comment not addressed.**
 6. Please provide the plans and FDOT permit for the proposed turn lane and new access entrance off of University Drive. **04-03-15: Comment response states that once the FDOT permit is obtained it will be provided to the City.**
 7. **04-03-15:** The disabled parking spaces do not show complete ramp access to the sidewalks on both the site plan and civil plans.
 8. **04-03-15:** There are multiple sets of plans containing the same sheets. Please consolidate the plan sets for the site plan that contains the requested items. It is very confusing with so many sets of plans, some of which contain the same sheets while also including additional different sheets.
 9. **04-03-15:** Additional comments may be generated based on the submittal for permitting.

Traffic Engineering:

The access off of North Marcano Boulevard was modified so as not to allow right turns into the site.

Permit Comments:

Note: A detailed review of the civil drawings has not been performed at this time. If the site plan application is approved by City Council, a thorough engineering review will be performed at the time of application for construction permits.

1. The owner/developer will be required to coordinate with the Engineering Department, *prior to application for construction permits*, to set up a trust account with a \$1,000 minimum starting balance.
2. An erosion and sedimentation control plan will be required and reviewed at time of permitting. An NOI will be required.
 - a. The truck wash areas must be set 25 feet back from the edge of pavement.

- b. Please provide the erosion and sedimentation control plan on the existing conditions and not the proposed site plan. The erosion control is set up prior to construction and that will need to be reflected in the plans.
3. A Maintenance of Traffic (MOT) plan will be required. Please meet with Engineering to discuss.
4. Drainage calculations will need to be submitted, signed and sealed by a professional engineer registered in the State of Florida.
5. Surface water management permit(s) through the Old Plantation Water Control District (OPWCD) and/or SFWMD will be required and a copy(s) provided to the Engineering Department at the time of permit review.
6. The applicant will be required to execute a developer agreement and post security for all engineering and landscape related improvements for each phase at the time of permitting.

TRAFFIC CONSULTANT: See Engineering.

DESIGN, LANDSCAPE & CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT:

The City appreciates the efforts made to minimize the impact this project will have on the existing tree canopy. Staff is working closely with the applicant to resolve all outstanding landscape comments/concerns and has no concerns with this project moving forward.

- All site plan and planting plan comments from the Department of Design, Landscape and Construction Management must be responded to in writing at time of permitting.
- When responding to staff comments, please bubble plan changes and specify the page number corrected in the written responses.
- The applicant will be required to execute a developer agreement and post security for all engineering and landscape related improvements at time of permitting.
- Tree/palm removal and relocation permits as well as mitigation fees must be obtained directly through the Design, Landscape & Construction Management Department at the time of permitting. Please contact Diana at 954-797-2248 directly to obtain required permits.

Site Plan:

1. There are inconsistencies between the site plan, landscape plans, and signage and marking plans (i.e. the site plans dimension the planting islands to be 8' backside curb to backside curb while the Signage and Marking plans dimension the planting islands to be 8' face of curb to face of curb.) Please correct all inconsistencies.
2. Section 27-655 requires a 40-foot landscape buffer along University Drive. The applicant is proposing 23 feet. A waiver is required. ***Waiver requested.***
3. Section 27-657 requires a 40-foot wide landscape buffer along Sunrise Boulevard. The applicant is proposing 38 feet. ***Waiver requested.***
4. Planting islands in parking bays should be a minimum of 8' wide inside curb to inside curb (several islands are between 7'5" and 7'9" wide). ***Waivers requested.***
5. Islands separating parking bays from major internal access drives (terminal islands) shall have a minimum width of 10', not including curbing (13 islands are between 7'6" and 9'3"). ***Waivers requested.***
6. Medians separating parking bays from major internal access drives shall have a minimum width of 10', not including curbing. 2' vehicle overhang does not count towards code required dimensions. Paved sidewalks do not count towards code required dimensions. Sheet A101.3 – 7' width proposed. ***Waivers requested.***
7. Do not place fire hydrants or associated equipment in planting islands where trees are required by code; there are several instances throughout the site where this occurs. (i.e. There is a fire hydrant in the

planting island on the NEC or the existing cafeteria (sheet C301.1) with a proposed Live oak tree (sheet LA-1). Fire Department requirements must be followed with regard to the placement of trees in the immediate vicinity of required trees.)

8. In lieu of the sidewalk bisecting the large planting islands in the parking area to the north of Building II staff requests shifting the sidewalks to the edge of the planting island (see Figure 1) – this will allow the maximum amount of growing space for the proposed tree while minimizing damage to the sidewalk damage as the tree matures.

Planting Plan:

1. The planting plan is very difficult to read (figure 2); there is a lot of information on the plans (patterns, wording, tag lines, numbers, utilities, trees to be removed, trees to be relocated, symbols, etc.). Staff requests the removal of layers not applicable to the planting plan.
2. Please remove all trees/palms from the proposed planting that are not being planted in those locations (i.e. tree/palm #237, #229, #231, #209, #210, etc.) as these trees are in the middle of drive isles, parking lots, planting medians, etc.)
3. Large shade trees are required in all parking islands – islands < 8’ in width (inside curb to inside curb) cannot accommodate a large shade tree; therefore, waivers are required. **Waivers required.**
4. Please use large shade trees in lieu of the proposed Satin leaf trees in the terminal islands 8’ or greater in width. Staff does not support the planting of Satin leaf trees in these areas. (i.e. Sheet LA-1 – north of the existing cafeteria).
5. Please use category 2 (medium trees) in lieu of category 1 (large shade trees) in planting spaces < 8’ in width.
6. City codes require large shade trees in parking medians – medians should be a minimum of 10’ – the proposed median on Sheet LA-8 is only 7’ wide and cannot accommodate the proposed Yellow Poinciana trees; please use category 2 trees in lieu of the Yellow Poinciana trees. **Waivers required.**
7. A large shade tree is required in the planting island north of Building VI; the plans propose the planting of groundcover (sheet LA-8).
8. The Plant List proposed 9 CS2 (Satin leaf trees) throughout the parking area; there are only 2 CS2 (Satin leaf trees) on the Planting Plan. Please make sure the Planting Plan is consistent with the Plant List.
9. Trees/palms are on the planting plan but not on the tree disposition plan (i.e. #237, #229, #231, #209, etc.); please make sure all trees are on the tree survey/disposition plan.
10. Trees should be a minimum of 10’ from any paved areas; please address all areas throughout the site where trees are either being relocated to areas within 10’ of paved areas or where new pavement is being proposed within 10’ of existing or new trees. *Staff will work with the applicant regarding this matter.*
11. Please limit the use of Silver Buttonwood hedge – this species does not perform well on commercial sites (1,234 have been proposed).
12. Please confirm the availability of 56, FL #1, Yellow Poinciana trees. All trees are to be field grown/balled & burlapped.
13. Please confirm the availability of 58, FL #1, Verawood trees. All trees are to be field brown/balled & burlapped.
14. Please include tag lines for all proposed plant material, (i.e. Sheet LA-2 trees in the planting islands on the northern perimeter, trees in the islands on the north side of Building II, etc.)
15. Staff does not support the placement of Royal palms in the immediate vicinity of pedestrian walkways and/or parking spaces as the palm fronds are very heavy when they drop, (i.e. 3 Royal palms are proposed in the planting median northwest of Building II).
16. Plans submitted show new curbed/paved areas within 5’ of large, existing trees – this will compromise the root systems of these trees. *Staff will work with the applicant regarding this matter.*

17. Sides of industrial structures not oriented to residential or public view must provide a foundation planting area; foundation plantings in these non-pedestrian areas shall include low, mid, and upper level landscaping (i.e. the west side of Building I, etc.)
18. Landscape is required on the east side of the proposed enclosure next to the proposed loading zone.
19. All proposed trees to be removed or relocated require ISA appraisals based on the Florida Administrative code Rule Chapter 14-40.030. *Staff is working closely with the applicant on this matter.*
20. Performance bonds are required on all trees to be relocated as per City codes. *Staff is working closely with the applicant on this matter.*
21. All proposed trees to be removed must be mitigated for as per City codes; tree mitigation will be above and beyond code required trees on the property. *Staff is working closely with the applicant on this matter.*
22. City staff will verify all trees proposed to be removed, remain, and/or relocated. *Staff is working closely with the applicant on this matter.*
23. City staff will verify all trees proposed to be removed, remain, and/or relocated. *Staff is working closely with the applicant on this matter.*
24. Please include a watering schedule to be followed for palm and tree relocation.
25. All landscape areas shall be provided with an automatically-operating underground irrigation system; with a minimum of 100% coverage, with 50% minimum overlap in ground cover and shrub areas. The rain sensor must be installed as well as a rust inhibitor if applicable. Irrigation plans must be submitted at time of permitting.

BUILDING DEPARTMENT:

1. Page C501.3 – Cannot access the north end of the parking lot at the fitness center.
2. Page C501.3 – Cannot egress around the parking lot south of Building 6.
3. Page C103.1 – Silt fence blocks egress throughout the complex. Cannot block egress from buildings. Still have an issue with the northwest entrance.
4. Page 103.1 – Northwest entrance to property off of University Drive must remain outside of construction fence area and be open at all times.
5. Underground work throughout the property must be phased to provide Fire Department access to the entire building at all times. Need a phasing plan.
6. All fire hydrants on private system shall be removed. Main fire hydrants shall be removed.

POLICE DEPARTMENT:

1. Extend the coverage area for the additional parking with uniformed lighting.

UTILITIES: No objection.

1. Prior to a Building Permit or Occupational License being issued, the following must be provided:
 - a. BCHD and BC EPD Permits must be approved.
 - b. Utilities Agreement must be executed.
 - c. Utilities Performance Bond must be posted.
 - d. Utility Easements must be executed.
 - e. Utility Inspection fees must be paid.
 - f. Capacity charges must be paid in FULL if applicable.
2. The existing Trust account must be maintained during the entire project.
3. Maintain all utilities and utilities easements for water and waste water system access.

4. Full Utilities plan review and approval is required prior to permitting. No plans are for construction until marked "FINAL".
5. No structures allowed in Utility easements.
6. Contact: Danny Pollio if you have any questions, 954-797-2159.

O.P.W.C.D.:

1. Old Plantation Water Control requires an acceptable drainage plan with retention and runoff calculations and a construction drawing prior to issuance of a building permit.
2. Acceptance of as-built drawings and Certified Storm Water Inspection Report will be required prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

WASTE MANAGEMENT: No objection to these changes.

19. REQUEST TO APPROVE SIGN SPECIAL EXCEPTION FOR PLANTATION POINTE/MOTOROLA LOCATED AT 8000 WEST SUNRISE BOULEVARD. PP15-0010.

A Staff Report dated April 29, 2015, to the City Council, from the Planning, Zoning and Economic Development Department, follows:

ANALYSIS:

The subject site is zoned I-L2P (Large Light Industrial District) and occupied by the original Motorola Plant comprising 840,000 square feet on 77.5 acres. Motorola will continue to maintain a significant presence while the remaining tenant spaces will be leased out to employment intensive large (>150,000 square feet) businesses. The applicant also proposes an additional 33,000 square feet of retail uses at the intersection of Sunrise Boulevard and University Drive.

The applicant has two applications currently in review:

- PD15-0002: Land use plan amendment to change six net acres (eight gross acres) at the northwest corner of the site from "Industrial" to "Commercial".
- PP15-0001: (Phase 3) Rezoning six net acres from I-L2P (Large Light Industrial District) to B-2P (Central Business District) and a site plan for three commercial buildings.
- On April 29, 2015, City Council approved eight of the twelve requested sign special exceptions, which included: Five interior directional signs;
- Four ground/directory signs for the existing industrial/office buildings;
- An increase in the number of wall signs for the office/industrial buildings; and
- Canopy signs for the office/industrial buildings

Due to site circulation issues, the applicant has chosen to defer the Walgreens site plan and sign special exception to a subsequent City Council Meeting.

New Retail Component:

The applicant proposes 33,000 square feet of retail/restaurant uses at the northwest corner of the site, currently an existing retention area. The City Council has approved the relocation of the retention area to the southeast corner of the site to allow development of the new retail buildings.

The sign code defines the retail component as a “*center establishment*” and permits one-square-foot of wall sign area for each lineal foot of store frontage up to a maximum area of 60 square feet. The code allows the retail tenants a second wall sign equal to ½ the size of the front wall sign. Logos are permitted as part of the allowable sign area, but are limited to a maximum of 10% of the overall allowable sign area.

In addition to size, the code limits the number of colors allowed within a center based on the number of tenant spaces. For six tenant spaces (excluding Walgreens), two wall sign colors are permitted.

RETAIL STORE SIGN SPECIAL EXCEPTIONS: The design, building orientation, and setbacks of the retail stores (excluding Walgreens) are similar to other shopping centers in Plantation. However, staff can distinguish the retail component of Plantation Point from any other retail center based on the following:

- a) The retail component of Plantation Point is necessary to attract and retain very large office and technology uses. Loss of productivity is significant for large companies if their employees have to leave campus every day for lunch or go to the drugstore.
- b) Large companies often limit lunch hours (40 minutes in some hospitals) or require employees to stay on-site. While cafeterias are often provided (Westside, Kaplan, and Amex), additional on-site dining or retail options provide employees a choice.
- c) On-site facilities allow employees to save gas and take a short walk during lunch.
- d) The repurposing of the former 800,000-square-foot Motorola facility is intended to employ 3,000 persons within the next 18 – 24 months. Retaining this 70-acre site as an employment/technology center is critical to maintaining Plantation’s tax base and increasing employment levels.
- e) No city grants, loans, or any other incentives were required to attract the developer to Plantation.

OFFICE/TECHNOLOGY BUILDING SPECIAL EXCEPTIONS: The design, building orientation, setbacks, and vehicular access of office/technology center is unique in the City such that staff can support the special exceptions.

SPECIAL EXCEPTION REQUESTS AND STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Center Establishment Sign Criteria (Three new retail buildings at the NW corner of the site):

- 1) From: Section 22-35 (e) which allows two ground directory signs limited to 48 square feet in area for the retail component.
To: Allow both ground directory signs (one fronting University Drive and one fronting Sunrise Boulevard) to be 49 square feet in area.
Staff: The applicant is proposing two ground directory signs (one on each street frontage) and a minimal increase in sign area for both of the proposed ground signs. Staff has no objection to the “de minimus increase” in area for both of the permitted ground signs.
- 2) From: Section 22-35(g), which allows:
 - (a) Wall signs on the front of each tenant, one square foot of wall sign area per one lineal foot of tenant frontage, and
 - (b) A second wall sign on the rear of each tenant, not to exceed half the size of the permitted front wall sign.To: Allow all rear wall signs to be equal in size to the allowable sign area on the storefront for the three multi-tenant buildings.
Staff: No objection to the request.

Overall Site Sign Criteria (Retail and Office/Technology Buildings):

- 3) From: Section 22-20(b), which states that wall signs where a property has several building sites, the entire property must have matching sign attributes (i.e. colors, fonts, etc.) and limits the number of sign colors for centers having between four and ten tenants to two colors.
To: Allow three color selections and unlimited fonts for the retail buildings.
Staff: No objection to the request.
To: Allow unlimited color selections and unlimited fonts for the office/industrial buildings.
Staff: No objection to the request.
- 4) From: Section 22-20(g), which limits the size of the logos to 10% of the allowable sign area.
To: Allow logos up to 40% of the allowable sign area for the entire complex (the proposed retail and existing office/industrial buildings.).
Staff: No objection to the request.

STAFF COMMENTS:

PLANNING AND ZONING:

1. Staff recommendations are noted above in italics.

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT:

1. Commercial Monument Sign # 2 is located in a FPL easement. Please provide approval from FPL for the sign to be located there. The other sign locations are acceptable.

TRAFFIC CONSULTANT: See Engineering.

DESIGN, LANDSCAPE & CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT:

1. Staff has no objections to the Sign Special Exception for the wall-mounted signs for buildings VII & IX.
 - a. Please make sure the proposed location for the wall signs are not obstructed by City code required landscape throughout the landscape pedestrian zones

FIRE DEPARTMENT: No comments.

UTILITIES:

1. The proposed sign locations along Sunrise Boulevard appear to be in direct conflict with an existing water main which runs the entire length of the property. There is also a potential for conflict with existing lines on the N. University Drive locations that cannot be determined until the proposed sign locations are placed on a survey showing existing and proposed water and sewer lines as well as existing and proposed Utility easements and reviewed by this Department. If approved and prior to permitting, Utilities will complete a permit plan review and determine if there is a conflict with the existing mains in the desired location. If there is a direct conflict, Utilities will not be able approve the sign permit. The Building Permit will not be approved by Utilities and a new sign location must be determined. No structures are allowed to be installed in Utility easements.

Mr. Lunny advised that the site plan application is fairly straight forward and is adequately explained in the staff report. There are special exceptions for the signs that are explained on several pages. Staff agrees with many of the exceptions and some staff does not.

Mr. Leeds explained that there are two sets of special exceptions. He and Barbara Hall had a meeting and discussed a few things. Staff is supporting all of the special exceptions that relate to the primary office complex. The reason is because this building is unique in the City. It is 850,000 square feet of building that will repurpose for large scale employment intensive office. Because it is so unique there are special circumstances that support the special exception. In terms of retail, a different picture. The applicant is allowed two monument signs, each approximately 50 square feet. One on University Drive and one on Sunrise Boulevard for the retail. The applicant has requested a third one, which would bring the total signs to eight, at the intersection of Sunrise Boulevard and University Drive for a Walgreens and an identification. The applicant has agreed to remove that application from what is seen tonight. Also discussed was that we did not see any building elevations or examples of the signs the client wants to put up for retail. He looked at the submittal, which will get to Council in June; it is Phase 3. Currently there are conceptual plans. Ms. Hall has agreed to defer discussion of the retail items to June 24, 2015. The site plan for Phase 2 is basically the additional parking relating to the principle building. There are some minor comments. Staff does not object to the reduction in buffers along University Drive and Sunrise Boulevard. Previously the City Council allowed the applicant to relocate the retention pond and it is a trade-off. To a certain extent, this building and these tenants require on-site walkable restaurants, a drug store and perhaps something else. This is so the employees for these very large businesses stay on the property without getting in their cars and driving off to lunch. A lot of large companies consider this to be where a lot of productivity is lost. It will draw from the road but it is also intended to provide an amenity to the large scale applicants. At this time he cannot support the retail and is requesting that Council support all of the special exceptions for the regional establishment. He is requesting Council defer all of the other items until June.

Councilmember Zimmerman requested discussion on Item #18 because Item #19 has to do with signage. He understands that Item #18 has to do with the site plan and Phase 2 and that Mr. Leeds and the applicant are in agreement to the comments.

Mr. Leeds advised that he is in agreement and asked the applicant to confirm.

Barbara Hall, Attorney, was present. She stated that all of the office and industrial property is now fully leased. In addition to Sheridan Healthcare, they also have another confidential technology user that is going to be leasing 260,000 square feet. The site will be completely leased so getting the parking they are requesting in order to move those tenants in is going to be very important. She noted that that the architects have a four-minute presentation that takes you around the entire site.

Councilmember Jacobs made a Jennings Disclosure. He met with the applicant two times and discussed various things. It will not affect his decision.

Councilmember Zimmerman made a Jennings Disclosure. He met with the applicant and was informed of the project. It will not affect his vote.

Councilmember Tingom made a Jennings Disclosure. He met with the applicant and it will not affect his vote.

In response to Councilmember Jacobs, Ms. Hall indicated that she understood that staff does not have any issues with the waivers as written in Item #18.

Mr. Leeds advised that staff has no issues with the Planning and Zoning waivers in Item #18. There are additional waivers relating to landscaping.

Ms. Hall believes that Landscaping was supporting all of the waivers because in doing this development they have agreed to relocate, preserve and place every healthy tree. They are engaged in a massive effort to save trees on the property and to move them to appropriate locations. She thinks the Landscape staff is extremely pleased with the effort and they have considered the waivers minor.

Danny Ezzeddine, Director of Design, Landscape and Construction, was present. He stated that they have been working with the applicant and they are moving a large number of trees and making a good effort to comply with landscape requirements. They have no objection.

Mr. Butler referenced Engineering Comment #3 on Page 5 of the staff report. He is relying upon the applicant to realize the importance of this; this is a life safety type of comment. It has to do with fire truck radii. He wants this on the record that this has not yet been completely addressed to their satisfaction and they will be holding them to this.

Ms. Hall agreed.

Motion by Councilmember Jacobs, seconded by Councilmember Tingom, to approve Item #18. Motion carried on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Jacobs, Levy, Stoner, Tingom, Zimmerman

Nays: None

Councilmember Zimmerman mentioned Item #19 and stated that the concern came with the retail versus the main complex.

Ms. Hall stated that with regard to the monument signs, they have agreed to remove the sign at the corner that staff was objecting to. With regard to all of the retail wall signs, they think they are more appropriately discussed during the site plan for the commercial and would like them deferred until that time.

Councilmember Jacobs questioned whether this has to be continued to a date certain or whether we approve pieces of it and then they will have to reapply.

Mr. Lunny advised that it should be deferred to a date certain. There are parts that can be pulled and approved at this hearing. It is not staff's intent to force them to reapply for anything.

Mr. Leeds indicated that he would like to identify the number of each special exception.

In response to Councilmember Jacobs, Mr. Leeds stated that the following are items he is recommending for approval: Page 3; #1, #2, #3, and Page 5; #6. The code requires the applicant to apply for building permits and then get rejected by building before applying for a sign special exception. Due to the complexity of the project; the size, it is recommended to waive #6. He would also recommend waiving #12 and #11 except for Walgreens.

Councilmember Jacobs clarified that Page 3, waivers #1, #2 and #3 will be addressed along with Page 5, #6; Page 6, #11 except as it applies to Walgreens; and #12 will be waived.

In response to Ms. Hall, Mr. Leeds went back to Page 9. The applicant requested a special exception to not provide address numbers on the proposed seven ground signs or on the amended ground sign count. This is

really a Fire Department issue and they do not have jurisdiction over this. He could not answer the question and would like to hear whether the Fire Department has reviewed this and if not, he would like to defer because it is up to them.

In response to Councilmember Stoner, Ms. Hall stated that the numbers are on the building.

Mr. Leeds indicated that they are on the building and he will defer to whatever the Fire Department wants. He has seen numbers on signs.

In response to Councilmember Jacobs, Ms. Hall was agreeable to approval subject to the Fire Department. She noted that the address is on the buildings because of the different frontages.

Chief Stearns stated that whatever is in the code is what they go by.

Mr. Leeds commented that he could support #4. A special exception is not needed for the third retail sign so this will apply to only the two retail monument signs permitted by code.

Ms. Hall agreed to defer the item.

Motion by Councilmember Jacobs, seconded by Councilmember Levy, approve waivers #1, #2, #3, #6, #9 subject to Fire Department approval, #11 except for the Walgreens site, and #12. Item #19 will be continued to June 24, 2015. Motion carried on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Jacobs, Levy, Stoner, Tingom, Zimmerman

Nays: None

* * * * *

Mr. Lunny read Item #21.

21. REQUEST TO APPROVE SIGN SPECIAL EXCEPTION FOR CYPRESS SQUARE LOCATED AT 6900-6926 CYPRESS ROAD. PP15-0009.

A Staff Report dated April 29, 2015, to City Council, from the Planning, Zoning and Economic Development Department, follows:

SPECIAL EXCEPTION REQUEST:

- 1) From: Section 22-20(p) which limits the height of freestanding signs on a two lane roadway to 5 feet.
To: Increase the allowable height from 5 feet to 7 feet.

EXHIBITS TO BE INCLUDED: Planning and Zoning Division report; subject site map; Development Review application; and sign details.

ANALYSIS:

The subject site is a 2.2-acre parcel located on the southwest corner of NW 69th Avenue and Cypress Road. The site includes an 18,979-square-foot single-story multi-tenant commercial building with surface parking. The applicant requests approval to construct a 7-foot high ground sign with tenant panels located adjacent to NW 69th Avenue.

The shopping center, under new ownership, has recently undergone renovations including exterior painting, awnings, uniform signage, and parking lot improvements. If approved, the proposed sign will match the architectural style of the building and require removal of one parking space.

The applicant indicates the 7-foot sign height is needed due to blocked visibility caused by shrubs having a height of 4 to 4.5 feet located in the NW 69th Avenue right-of-way adjacent to the site. In addition, the site abuts a very wide swale requiring the sign to be setback approximately 20 feet from the edge of pavement.

STAFF COMMENTS:

PLANNING AND ZONING:

1. As discussed with the Design, Landscape, & Construction Management Department, the applicant may reduce shrub height to 3 feet in this area. Given this, staff recommends the requested increase in sign height be limited to 6 feet.



The proposed monument sign is located about 50’ to the left of temporary real estate sign and must be located on the opposite (parking lot) side of the shrubs.

2. If approved, the parking spaces adjacent to the sign shall maintain a minimum width of 9 feet.
3. Any future tenants must first obtain a building permit prior to the installation of any tenant panels.
4. Applicant is permitted to relocate sign 15’ feet in any direction to avoid conflicts with existing utilities and easements provided the sign is not located any closer to the roadway and provided the site complies with site triangle visibility requirements if applicable.

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT: No objections.

TRAFFIC CONSULTANT: No objections.

DESIGN, LANDSCAPE & CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT: Staff has no objections to the request for the Sign Special Exception.

At time of permitting please address the following:

1. Please include a palm staking detail.
2. There is a dead Foxtail palm on the northeast corner of the building. This palm must be removed and replaced according to City landscape codes. Tree removal permits are required prior to the removal of the dead Foxtail palm. Please contact Diana Berchielli at 954-797-2248 regarding this matter.

UTILITIES: Survey should be included in package showing existing water and sewer lines as well as easements. Providing no water, sewer lines and easements exist, Utilities would not have an issue with the proposed location. Exact utility line locations cannot be determined until the proposed sign locations are placed on a survey showing existing and proposed water and sewer lines as well as existing and proposed Utility easements and reviewed by this Department. **If approved and prior to permitting, Utilities will complete a permit plan review and determine if there is a conflict with the existing mains in the desired location. If there is a direct conflict, Utilities will not be able approve the sign permit. The Building Permit will not be approved by Utilities and a new sign location must be determined. No structures are allowed to be installed in Utility easements.**

Ron Kall, architect, was present on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Kall explained that this site is very unique in reference to the sidewalk, its hedge and the swale area from the edge of pavement to the property, which as stated in the report is approximately 20 feet. It is actually 31 feet plus the four-foot for the sidewalk so from the edge of pavement and if you are in a car it is 35+ feet to see a sign. They are requesting an additional foot; not for the letters to be larger. The uniqueness of this site is that typically there is a five or seven-foot landscape area and then parking. In this case parking comes up to the sidewalk and in addition to the large swale there is a hedge. For line of site in a car you are at four feet and it causes a problem. This is one of the few Centers that is not on a major road; it is behind a very large Center. It is important to see the sign in that area. They would like to have the sign at the entrance to the property; typically they are in an island where you ingress and egress. They do not have that ability and are hampered by being off the site.

Mr. Leeds stated that the request is from five to seven feet and staff agreed to six feet providing the applicant trims the hedge from its 4.5 feet to 3 feet regulation height. You are supporting special exception to allow a six-foot tall sign.

In response to Councilmember Zimmerman, Mr. Kall advised that they are asking for seven feet. They are not asking for a larger sign or letters, just for the additional foot.

Councilmember Zimmerman indicated that is a two-foot extension of what the code allows for a five-foot sign.

Mr. Kall stated they that they are looking to get the base up higher. The address is at the bottom of the base and with having a three-foot hedge and reducing the sign to six feet the base would only be around 24 inches. He knows the Fire Department likes to see addresses of the building. If the base is at 24 inches the tenant will be behind the hedge. They would like to get the base up to at least three feet and that will bring up the sign so you can see it 36 feet away.

Councilmember Jacobs clarified that the sign is the same height; you just want to add two feet to the base.

Mr. Kall indicated that they are meeting all of the other regulations, they just want to raise the base.

Councilmember Jacobs mentioned that if you consider the base and sign it is going to be seven feet.

Mr. Kall added that they have no objection to replacing the palm tree that staff requested. He noted that residents own this Center and they intend to keep the standards and aesthetics.

In response to Councilmember Tingom, Mr. Kall advised that there will be a light shining up to the sign in the evening but it is not lighted internally.

Motion by Councilmember Levy, seconded by Councilmember Jacobs, to approve Item #21, allowing the two feet to raise the sign so it is more visible since the sign itself is not changing in size and the applicant trimming the hedge. Motion carried on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Jacobs, Levy, Stoner, Tingom, Zimmerman

Nays: None

* * * * *

COUNCILMEMBERS' COMMENTS

Councilmember Jacobs mentioned the Historic Preservation Board and questioned the current status. He also questioned whether the Mayor and Administration is working on members or do they have to go out and find members.

Mr. Lunny advised that a memo was sent to the Council to remind them that anyone can nominate anyone. Nothing to his knowledge has happened.

Councilmembers Levy and Tingom stated that they had someone to nominate.

Mr. Lunny explained that Councilmember Jacobs is asking that some search process be undertaken.

Mayor Bendekovic indicated that she would bring this back to Council on May 13, 2015. We need to get an application and put it on the website for anyone that needs to apply and then any nominations that Councilmembers want to make.

* * * * *

Councilmember Tingom thanked all of the residents who participated in Relay for Life. He is in the process of contacting appointees and will be making appointments to the Advisory Committees.

* * * * *

Councilmember Levy welcomed Plantation's newest resident, Anthony Vanella, to the world; he was born this evening.

* * * * *

Mayor Bendekvoic made the following comments:

- This was Mr. McHugh's first official meeting.
- There are two appointments on the Police Pension Board and former Councilmember Fadgen is one of those appointments. She questioned whether Council would like to have a replacement for the former Councilmember in that position. If anyone would like to be on the Police Pension Board instead of the Board you are sitting on then the Council will have to vote on it or if you would prefer us to resurrect those applications again and look at those that can be done. She needs to know if Council would like a replacement because you have to approve the appointment.

In response to Councilmember Jacobs, Mayor Bendekovic advised that the term expires when you want it to expire. It is usually a four-year term.

Mr. Lunny indicated that any elected official that is appointed to Police or Fire serves ex-officio but is actually appointed as a resident and serves at the pleasure of the Council.

Councilmember Jacobs' point was that if the position is up then the person should apply to be appointed again. If the period of time the individual would have normally served is being cut short, that is a different question. He noted that there is a term and then they have to be reappointed. He questioned when the term is up and noted that would be part of his decision.

Councilmember Stoner suggested making an inclusive decision; let's find out term and bring back the other applicants so we can decide.

Mayor Bendekovic believes that former Councilmember Fadgen was replacing former Councilmember Moody and that was a replacement of two years.

Councilmember Stoner clarified that the term would be over because Councilmember Moody was in the middle of her term.

Councilmember Jacobs mentioned that we need to solicit applicants for that seat and if former Councilmember Fadgen wants to apply he should do so.

Mr. Lunny stated that he would find out and get back to Council with the actual answer.

Mayor Bendekovic commented that she knows it is the end of the term. Before soliciting others she questioned whether any of the Councilmembers would consider moving to the Police Pension Board.

- The Mayor's Interfaith Prayer Breakfast is next Thursday, May 7, 2015.

* * * * *

PUBLIC REQUESTS OF THE COUNCIL CONCERNING MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

Barbara Hall, attorney, was present.

Councilmember Jacobs stated that we need to make a motion to reconsider an item.

Motion by Councilmember Jacobs, seconded by Councilmember Tingom, to reconsider Item 19. Motion carried on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Jacobs, Levy, Stoner, Tingom, Zimmerman
Nays: None

Ms. Hall referenced Item #19 and advised that waiver #10 requires a monument sign to be a portion so that 50% has the name of the Center and the rest is where the tenants are. They are requesting not to be required to have it portioned that way but to be able to have the panel saying Plantation Pointe and to be whatever size it is in the signage face. The rest of the signage will comprise more than 50% and staff recommended approval.

Mr. Leeds indicated that the recommended approval. He had a condition but still approval of this recommendation. It is subject to staff review of ground directory signed permit plans. Ground directory sign plans do not match the current plan. If approved, it may require re-approval by PAC. Subject to that condition they support #10.

In response to Councilmember Jacobs, Mr. Lunny stated that the motion should be to approve an additional waiver, that being #10.

Motion by Councilmember Stoner, seconded by Councilmember Levy, to approve an additional waiver, #10, the monument sign, on Item 19. Motion carried on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Jacobs, Levy, Stoner, Tingom, Zimmerman
Nays: None

* * * * *

SEALED COMPETITIVE SOLICITATIONS – None.

* * * * *

WORKSHOP – None.

* * * * *

Meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

* * * * *

Councilmember Chris Zimmerman, President
City Council

ATTEST:

Susan Slattery
City Clerk

RECORD ENTRY:

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the Original of the foregoing signed Minutes was received by the Office of the City Clerk and entered into the Public Record this _____ day of _____, 2015.

Susan Slattery, City Clerk