



Minutes of September 19, 2011

Meeting Called to order at 7:03 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL

P&Z Board Members

Table with 12 columns (MEMBERS, 9/19/11, 8/29/11, 7/18/11, 6/20/11, 5/16/11, 4/25/11, 4/4/11, 3/7/11, 2/7/11, 1/18/11, 1/3/11) and 13 rows of member names and attendance status.

* Reappointed ** Resigned *** New appointment

STAFF PRESENT: Matt Wood, Director
Jason Chockley, Planner
Ro Woodward, Administrative Coordinator
Jeanette Wofford, City Arborist

APPLICANTS: Hope Calhoun, Esq., Ruden McClosky, Monterra
Jose Acosta, Chen Moore
Jill Cohen, JBC Planning,
Jimmy Wright, CCDEVCO

2. P&Z BOARD - MINUTES - WAIVE/APPROVE – AUGUST 29, 2011 MOTION TO WAIVE READING OF MINUTES OF 8/29/11: Motion to waive the reading of the minutes made by Mr. Roper and seconded by Ms. McCoy. All ayes on voice vote. APPROVE: Motion to approve made by Mr. Valenti and seconded by Mr. Roper. There were all ayes on voice vote. Motion was approved.

3. CORRESPONDENCE: None.

4. NEW BUSINESS:

A. MONTERRA – POD 2F1 – CASCADA ISLES AND SOLANO AVENUE CROSS SECTIONS – LOCATED BETWEEN STIRLING ROAD AND SHERIDAN STREET

1. *PUBLIC HEARING - VARIANCE PETITION # V 6-1-11

Mr. Wood explained that this item is a variance application which, if approved, would facilitate approval of the accompanying preliminary/final site plan for Cascada Isles, reflecting a 146-unit townhome complex on Parcel 2f-1 of the Monterra PMUD development. The request is to deviate from Section 25-44(e)(1) of the Code which requires a landscaped street buffer to include a minimum 36 inch berm to be constructed along 75 percent of the buffer strip adjacent to each

street. The request is to reduce the 75 percent requirement down to 15 percent along both sides of the adjacent roadway (Solano Avenue).

The applicants justify the variance requests based on a number of considerations including the following:

1. The applicant proposes to create a unique design for the Solano Avenue corridor in the vicinity of the multi-family units in this part of the Monterra development. The proposed design includes pedestrian walkways, parallel parking and a tree canopy on both sides of Solano Avenue to create a pedestrian friendly urban environment.
2. The City Code was developed to create a more traditional suburban environment. This requirement for a large berm adjacent to all roadways is not compatible with the new urbanism principles envisioned by the creation of Monterra.
3. The variance requested would improve accessibility for residents and visitors between their units and the parallel parking and pedestrian walkways along Solano Avenue.
4. Granting the variance would be beneficial to the community because it accommodates a pedestrian friendly environment and improves connectivity between the multi-family and commercial components in the Monterra PMUD (Planned Mixed Use District).

Mr. Wood concluded that Staff has determined that the application meets all the submittal requirements for review and processing of a variance petition and may be recommended for approval based on the following findings:

1. Granting the variance would not be detrimental to the public or injurious to properties in the general vicinity; the variances are expected to accommodate a more urbanized component of the Monterra PMUD while enhancing pedestrian connectivity in the vicinity of the multi-family developments proposed for Pods 2f1 and 2f2.
2. Special and unique conditions exist which are peculiar to the petitioner's case as this area of Monterra makes up a majority of the multi-family component of the PMUD and is adjacent to the proposed town center commercial parcel. Given this unique location, deviating from the berm requirement to accommodate parallel parking and a more pedestrian friendly environment along this segment of Solano Avenue is justified as it pursues a more sustainable urban design principle consistent with the Monterra mixed-use concept.

Ms. Hope Calhoun introduced herself as representative for the applicant. She pointed out they agree with the Staff Report. She commented that they are creating a new urbanism feel on Solano Avenue. By doing the reduced buffer as proposed they feel like they are creating that.

Mr. Aronson then opened the Public Hearing at 7:08 p.m. and seeing no one to speak closed the Public Hearing at 7:09 p.m.

Ms. Keirnan referred to the parallel parking and wanted to know if this meant this was going to increase any of the parking spaces.

Ms. Calhoun responded they are talking about areas that have not been constructed yet and this doesn't address any other parking discussion. She explained that they will be discussing one of the parcels in 2F which is impacted by this improvement.

Mr. Roper wanted to know if this was the only place where there will not be a berm.

Ms. Calhoun responded there will be a smaller berm.

Mr. Wood commented that on parcel 2F-1 as well as the future parcel 2F-2 which is to be developed for garden apartments, both sides of Solano Avenue would be subject to the variance.

Mr. Roper then wanted to know about the north side and the south side of 2F and what was that going to be.

Mr. Wood responded that was not subject to the variance and would have to meet the full berm requirements in the area north and south of this.

Mr. Roper commented that when they originally required them to put in the 36" berm it was put in primarily because of sound and privacy with regard to the home that would be backing up and facing on the roadways.

Ms. Calhoun remarked that Solano Avenue is a very key Avenue in Monterra. Eventually it will lead to the commercial component that was once considered the Towncenter. What they are doing with Solano Avenue specifically in the 2F pod is creating that new urbanism concept. The berm created as they have proposed here is that the intent is to invite people to use the sidewalks and the walkways and the parallel parking that will be discussed further. That is why they are asking for the berm to be reduced. The original Monterra concept was a little bit different and what they are proposing is inviting people in this multi-family section to use the sidewalks to use the parallel parking and if they create tall berms throughout it inhibits that feel of that area. That is why they are requesting this variance and feel that it will add to the character of the neighborhood and the residential section of Monterra here. She mentioned they have satisfied all of the variance criteria in accordance with the code.

Mr. Roper expressed his concern that this will be a well traveled road. If they are going to University or the Towncenter they would use the road. He remarked that he understands the concept they are looking at, but that concept is entirely different from the rest of Monterra.

Ms. Calhoun responded that was intentional. So that this is not your typical suburban single family area and this is a multi family area where people will live differently. These are not single story homes, but multi level developments where people aren't necessarily going to be living on one floor, walking in off of the street into a single family home. It is multi-level development and is intended to be different so people can walk around and interact with each other.

Mr. Wood directed the Board to the very last page in their packet and explained this was the berm exhibit and indicated where the berm locations were going to be provided. The berm locations were indicated in dark green and pointed out that Cascada Isles (2F-1) was located on the left side of Solano Avenue. And where the berm areas were being reduced down to 15% and that it also shows the location of the parallel parking spaces.

Ms. Calhoun pointed out those areas to the Board. She also commented that it was not a great deal of change that will be impacted by this application.

Ms. McCoy commented that there will still be 36" berm height, so what is it going to be if it's not 36". Would it be zero?

Mr. Wood responded that there will be a full 20 foot wide buffer on the entire length. The buffer width is not being reduced. It is just the amount of berming within that buffer.

Ms. Calhoun commented that one of the reasons they are proposing doing this is because they are going to have on street parallel parking. When they discuss the site plan for item # 4, you would want the reduced berm because people will have the parallel parking and also have the ability to walk into and access the multi-family developments there. If you create a 36" berm there it would take away from what the concept is for this area. It is very different from what has been done here. It is very different from what is existing and that was the whole intent of creating the Monterra PUD so they could create a sense of place within Cooper City and Monterra. You have a single family along with the multi-family development and it is intended to be different.

Ms. McCoy remarked that it is still kind of confusing to her and that you have 20 feet on each side and 75% of that area is supposed to be a 36" berm, and they are reducing that 75% down to 15% of the area so that the dark green areas are the 15% of the total that is being changed.

Mr. Wood pointed out that the light green shows that they will be providing the full 20 foot wide buffer along the entire length. So you can see that the brown sidewalks within that 20 foot landscape buffer will be included so it creates a pedestrian environment. These units will have front doors which front Solano Avenue. It lends itself to that parallel parking. Someone could park and walk with immediate access to the door of their unit. It allows for a more pedestrian orientation to those units.

Ms. McCoy remarked that the landscaping itself is going to be contained it is just the berm that is going to be less.

Mr. Konhauzer commented that this is more of an urban look than what they are used to being residential and that is why they are all having a hard time picturing this. He stated that he actually invites that change so we don't have the same thing over and over again. It creates excitement in the City as long as the parallel parking doesn't become a safety issue. In terms that because it's interactive that it blocks where children might be crossing and it might inhibit the view and also inhibit paramedics, etc.

Mr. Aronson commented that this is much more in context to new urbanism and the problem that we try to impose the “baby boomer” style of living on “generation x and y” and they don’t care to live like we live. This is far more attractive to them. He stated that he likes this, but doesn’t know how it fits in Cooper City.

Ms. Calhoun remarked that sales have been going very well there and it’s because people want to live in Cooper City, and want this style of living. Minto is pretty much sold out in 2H and moving on to 2F1 because people like it. It is very different than what we are used to. It is what Monterra was intended to be, with that new urban walk-able, pedestrian friendly community. With the berms the way that they are proposing just invite that kind of walk-ability and pedestrian activity along the street. Solano Avenue will be well traveled and that is what the intent is to have in Monterra.

Mr. Roper commented that what was originally put in was for privacy and sound. That was the reason that the whole berm system within Monterra was established.

Ms. Calhoun responded that this corner has changed over the course of development and again, the intent was always to create a new urban type of development. The single family homes are segregated from the multi-family so in this area that is what they are looking for and creating that pedestrian feel that they have always talked about with connectivity from neighborhood to neighborhood street to street and this does that and creates an inviting atmosphere.

Ms. McCoy expressed that she was not a fan of parallel parking. She said that she sees that a lot. She asked if those parking spaces were being counted for parking requirements on either of the residential developments.

Ms. Calhoun responded no they are not counted as part of the parking requirement.

MOTION: TO APPROVE MONTERRA POD 2F1 – CASCADA ISLES AND SOLANO AVENUE CROSS SECTIONS VARIANCE PETITION # V 6-1-11. MOTION MADE BY MS. KEIRNAN AND SECONDED BY MR. KONHAUZER. On roll call there were five aye votes and two no votes made by Mr. Roper and Ms. McCoy. Motion was approved.

2. *PUBLIC HEARING - REZONING – DESIGN GUIDELINES PETITION # Z 6-1-11

Mr. Wood commented that this item is a rezoning request for the Monterra development. Although the Planned Mixed Use Development (PMUD) zoning district designation is not proposed to be changed, because the Master Plan and Design Guidelines are a function of the zoning district, the changes technically are a rezoning.

Mr. Wood explained that the portion of the Monterra development from Pine Island Road east to University Drive changed ownership and the new developer changed the approved Master Plan and Design Guidelines with approval by City Commission in January 2010 and most recently in July 2011. The developer now proposes to make additional changes to the design guidelines and master plan. Although changes to the design guidelines apply to the entire development, changes

would be effective for the vicinity of pod 2f, and that portion of Solano Avenue adjacent to Pod 2f; but the changes would not alter the site plans for the remainder of the development.

The land use was established while it was unincorporated. The designation is irregular as it includes both commercial and residential at a specific density. The density was approved by Broward County at 3.663 units per acre for a total of 1,800 residential units with an additional 110 units to be available through flex rules. The previous rezoning reduced the units from the 1,645 units to 1,638 units. Under this request the units would be increased from 1,638 to 1,652.

The exhibit entitled “MODIFICATIONS TABLE FOR MONTERRA DESIGN GUIDELINES” shows an overview of the changes to the development. Although there are a few additional minor changes proposed for the design guidelines, the major changes can conceptually be included in the following seven categories of changes and are more specifically described in the backup material to this staff report in an exhibit entitled “MODIFICATIONS TABLE FOR MONTERRA DESIGN GUIDELINES:

1. **The Master Plan** – The request is to change the unit count in Pod 2f-1 from 132 to 146 townhomes and change in total unit count from 1,638 to 1,652 (+14).
2. **Site Plan Information**
 - a. Neighborhood Phasing Plan - Consistent with the Master Plan exhibit, this request is to change the unit count in Phase 5 (Pods 2f-1 and 2f-2) from 132 to 146 townhomes and changing the total number of units in Phase 5 from 384 to 398.
 - b. Neighborhood Density Study – Project density and gross density updated from 3.28 units/acre to 3.31 units/acre and from 3.11 units/acre to 3.14 units/acre respectively. Total units changed from 1,638 to 1,652. The total townhomes changed from 280 to 294.
3. **Circulation: Vehicular and Pedestrian** – Cross section U.3 was added (reflects Solano Avenue Roadway between Pods 2f-1 and 2f-2 at landscape island locations).
4. **Interior Cross Sections**
 - a. The Multi-family Buffer to Residential Lots (M-2) text and cross section was revised to include a solid six foot wall.
 - b. Solano Avenue cross sections between Parcels 2f-1 and 2f-2 and related text were modified to:
 - i. Differentiate between locations with parallel parking and locations with landscape islands.
 - ii. Change the 5’ concrete walk to a 5’ paver walk to allow the sidewalk to partially overlap the 10’ utility easement.
 - iii. Reflect a 90’ typical building separation and a 20’ typical setback.
 - iv. Change the fence reflected from a 6’ picket and pilaster fence to a 42” minimum aluminum fence.

- v. Reduce the landscape area between Solano Avenue and the sidewalk from 7.5 to 6' because the curb was changed from a 6" Type D Curb to a 2' Type F Curb.
 - c. The Commercial Parcel Entry Roadway text was revised to remove the 5' landscape zone that no longer exists in the cross section.
- 5. Project Perimeter Treatment along University Drive**
- a. A 4' berm was added within the 20' landscape buffer.
 - b. The 6' high pilaster and picket fence was changed to a 6' high aluminum rail fence and moved to the east edge of the berm.
 - c. A 10' utility easement was added within the 20' landscape buffer.
 - d. The 20' parking between parking islands within the Buckeye Pipeline easement was modified to 18 feet; with a 16' deep paved parking space and a 2' overhang.
 - e. The roadway within parcel 2f-2 was modified to be an inverted crown roadway; the valley gutter between the roadway and the parking was removed.
- 6. Project Perimeter Treatment abutting Church Property**
- a. The 20' parking between parking islands within the Buckeye Pipeline easement was modified to 18 feet.
 - b. The roadway within parcel 2f-2 was modified to be an inverted crown roadway; the valley gutter between the roadway and the parking was removed.
- 7. PMUD Building Standards Table** – Added standards specific to the proposed 3-story garden apartments to be developed in Pod 2f-2.

Mr. Wood explained that the PMUD district allows an applicant to make specific requests for City Commission to approve variations. Specific deviations for buffers, parking, and landscaping were approved with the ordinance to rezone from A-1 to PMUD. The proposed changes would not involve any new deviations.

Mr. Wood commented that the rest of the recommendations talk about consistency with the adopted plan, landuse compatibility and traffic impacts.

Mr. Wood concluded that as the applicant has met the submission requirements for consideration of the rezoning petition to amend the master plan and design guidelines, the Planning and Zoning Board may recommend approval of the request subject to a finding that the applicant has adequately addressed the above-mentioned standards for approval.

Ms. Calhoun mentioned there were a number of consultants and developer representatives present to answer any additional questions. She explained these are modifications to the PMUD Guidelines, which they have gone through a few times before. Again, there is a new developer who has made some changes in order to respond to market demand and in some cases there are some items that would be considered clean-up items. She explained that the plat allows for 1800 residential units. From this change they are still way below that. This change is to accommodate the townhouse development that is being proposed in parcel 2F1. With regard to the site plan information this change is consistent with what they are proposing with 2F1 which reflects the

change to the phasing plan to reflect the townhome development. The original density was approved at 3.66 and they are still below that at 3.31. With regard to vehicular and pedestrian access and circulation those references are made in Exhibit U-3 in the backup packet and are talking about Solano Avenue and that they are trying to create that new urban feel with landscaping, sidewalks, parking on street and then the buildings. She commented that interior cross section changes and one of the key changes is the decrease of the height of the aluminum fencing and again the intent is to create a neighborhood feel. They have created brick pavers so people are invited onto an attractive area that welcomes them as opposed to concrete and still accommodates the utilities that are in place. The perimeter treatment in accordance with the staff report there are changes that are needed to be made specifically item "d" with regard to parking they are making a correction in the design guidelines so that it would be consistent with the code. Minor modifications are being made to the engineering standards for consistency with the plan. She remarked these are minor changes overall and the intent is to create a project and product that Cooper City and the developers can be proud of. She thought that Staff was satisfied with the changes they have made and they continue to work very with them.

Mr. Aronson opened the Public Hearing at 7:33 p.m. and seeing no one to speak closed the Public Hearing at 7:34 p.m.

Ms. McCoy wanted to know where in the backup was a diagram of what the new fence was going to look like versus the pilaster version.

Mr. Jimmy Wright introduced himself as being with CCDEVCO. He commented that the fencing they are proposing for this area is the same style of fencing that is between the pilasters and is the same square aluminum rail. He thought it was part of the site plan for each of the pods as they come through it will be showing on the site plan. To be consistent it will have multiple top rails and is decorative black aluminum fencing. It is without the concrete columns. There will be significantly more gates in this area because you have access from the parallel spaces into the units so there would have been so many columns with gates there would have been columns everywhere.

MOTION TO APPROVE MONTERRA POD 2F1 – CASCADA ISLES AND SOLANO AVENUE CROSS SECTIONS REZONING DESIGN GUIDELINES PETITION # Z 6-1-11. MOTION MADE BY MR. KONHAUZER AND SECONDED BY MS. KEIRNAN. There were all ayes on roll call vote. Motion was approved.

3. PLAT AMENDMENT PETITION # PA 6-1-11

Mr. Wood explained that this plat amendment entails revising the note to reflect the proposed change in the number of residential units for Pod 2f as well as the amount of commercial square footage with the Monterra development. More specifically the note would change from the following as the latest approved by the City Commission:

This plat is restricted to 149 single-family detached units on Parcel A; 648 single family detached units, 148 townhouse units, 500 garden apartments on Parcel B; 300 low income garden apartments (96 one-bedroom, 156 two-bedroom and 48 three-bedroom) on Parcel B-1; 36,000 square feet of government offices and 14,000 square feet of fire station on Parcel B-2; 15,000

square feet of commercial use on Parcel C-1; 170, 000 square feet of commercial use and 70,000 square feet of office use on Parcel C-2, and 15,000 square feet of commercial use on Parcel C-3.

The plat note is proposed to be amended to: This plat is restricted to 149 single-family detached units on Parcel A; 657 single family detached units, 294 townhouse units, 252 garden apartments on Parcel B; 300 low income garden apartments (96 one-bedroom, 156 two-bedroom and 48 three-bedroom) on Parcel B-1; 36,000 square feet of government offices and 14,000 square feet of fire station on Parcel B-2; 23,000 square feet of commercial use on Parcel C-1; 162,000 square feet of commercial use and 70,000 square feet of office use on Parcel C-2, and 15,000 square feet of commercial use on Parcel C-3.

The effect of the plat note amendment is to increase the number of single family units from 648 to 657 and to redistribute (but not increase) the commercial square footage between Parcels C-1 and C-2. The plat amendment is required in order to be consistent with Monterra Master Plan and Design Guidelines changes previously approved by the City Commission.

Mr. Wood concluded that the Development Review Committee has reviewed the plat and found it to be in conformance with applicable code and comprehensive plan requirements and the pre-annexation agreement. The DRC recommends approval.

Ms. Calhoun commented that as stated in the Staff Report, the proposed plat note amendment is to be consistent with proposed development. She commented that overall residential density is still below that which is permitted. Under the landuse and the existing note they haven't increased overall what is allowed on the plat. They are, in some instances namely the commercial moving the square footage allocation around.

Ms. McCoy asked what does it mean that the commercial C-1 and C-2 that they are redistributing the commercial square footage.

Ms. Calhoun responded that when you go to the County to pull a building permit they look at the note to see how much you can build and they look at how much the square footage can be built on that parcel of the plat. The overall commercial square footage in Monterra has not increased, but is being shifted between C-1 and C-2 parcels.

MOTION: TO APPROVE BASED ON THE STATED REQUIREMENTS. MONTERRA POD 2F1 – CASCADA ISLES AND SOLANO AVENUE CROSS SECTIONS PLAT AMENDMENT PETITION # PA 6-1-11. MOTION MADE BY MR. KONHAUZER AND SECONDED BY MS. KEIRNAN. There were all ayes on roll call vote. Motion was approved.

4. SITE PLAN PETITION # SP 7-1-11

Mr. Wood explained that this item is a Preliminary/Final Site Plan Petition for pod 2f-1 and Solano Avenue within the Monterra development. The request for Preliminary/Final Site Plan approval is consistent with the pre-annexation agreement on the property. The Site Plan is consistent with the Master Plan and Design Guidelines amendment petition for the Monterra development submitted concurrently with this site plan.

There is one variance requested for this development that is also being processed concurrently with this request.

The pod for this site plan previously received Monterra Master Plan approval for 132 townhome units. This site plan proposes 146 villa style townhome units consistent with the accompanying rezoning/design guidelines amendment petition. That was just recommended for approval.

The multi family product reflected in the plans is a combination of the four-unit courtyard villa currently approved and being built at Cascada (Pod 2h) and a five-unit courtyard villa. These units range from over 1400 to over 1700 square foot of air-conditioned living area. Every unit additionally has a covered porch area as an aspect of the urban design with architectural elevations offered in a Palm Beach style or a Santa Barbara style. Although this type of development provides less open space than if developed with mid-rise units, the proposed site plan exceeds the open space requirement. A portion of the open space is achieved through the use of “mews” where some of the buildings have units with front doors and porches facing the front doors and porches of an adjacent building with landscaped area in between along with pedestrian pathways. The mews occur in the two center groups of buildings and are connected with the similar open space mew that runs through the center of the community in an east/west direction. The landscaping in the mews and other areas is influenced by the urban characteristics of the site plan and the closeness of the buildings. Also included is a pool and bath house area which would be used exclusively by the residents of this pod.

This community would have its own association and individual homeowners’ association (HOA) documents. This pod would also have its own gate at its entrance. In addition to the single entrance/exit available to residents and guests at the gate, an emergency access is provided at the rear west end of the development. Pedestrian access is provided throughout the development with sidewalks and pathways around the perimeter of the pod.

The buildings around the perimeter of the pod have front doors and porches which face out from the pod. For those units along Solano Avenue, this will create a more pedestrian friendly atmosphere along this segment of the Avenue while accommodating parallel parking spaces with immediate access to the entrances to the units. The garages for these perimeter buildings are along the internal loop roadway. Every unit would include a two car garage.

The Solano Avenue package of plans includes the roadway, pavement marking and signage, engineering and landscape plans. They reflect the limits of the roadway as it meanders in a northeasterly direction from Sheridan Street on the south to University Drive on the east. Solano is a two lane roadway with 12’ through lanes and parallel parking at select locations adjacent to the multi-family Pods 2f-1 and 2f-2. The brick paver sidewalks on both sides of Solano range in width from 8’ at the south end of the corridor to 5’ adjacent to the proposed multifamily communities. As discussed in the accompanying variance petition, berm requirements in this portion of the avenue are being deviated from in order to accommodate parallel parking and a more pedestrian friendly environment. This is in pursuit of a more sustainable urban design principle consistent with the Monterra mixed-use concept.

The preliminary/final site plan has been reviewed by the DRC for conformance with the applicable district regulations of the proposed zoning, pre-annexation agreement, Master Plan and Design Guidelines which apply to the property, and have been determined to be in conformance with those standards subject to the conditions listed in the staff report.

Mr. Wood concluded that the Development Review Committee recommends approval of the Preliminary/Final Site Plan subject to those conditions.

Ms. Calhoun commented that this project is Cascada Isles. As stated in the Staff Report the proposal is for 146 multi-family residential units. This Board previously approved Parcel 2H by Minto. This is an improvement on that. The developer heard all those concerns raised by this Board and the City Commission during that project so they made improvements.

She remarked that they worked hard with Staff to meet those expectations and demands. She commented that sales have been great in 2H and is one of the reasons they are going with 2F now. She explained that one of the concerns in the previous submission was parking because they had the shorter parking spaces facing the longer spaces on one side and they don't have that situation here. All units have the same length of parking drives. Parking is satisfied. They are required to have 438 parking spaces and they have provided 438. She pointed to the display maps and said that in addition to the parking that is within every unit which is one parking space in the garage, one space they can count in the driveway and one additional space in the driveway, which they officially can't count, but is still there because a car fits. They also have parallel parking spaces on the street, but do not count toward their parking and are over and above. The reason they did this is because on Solano Avenue and in this area in accordance with the variance that the Board just approved and changes to the PMUD Guidelines, they are trying to create a feel here. What they hope people will do is use those parallel parking spaces on Solano Avenue and park on the street to visit their friends and walk in off of Solano Avenue to go into the neighborhood to visit. There were some concerns about parallel parking and how we are not used to that in South Florida. She commented that she was not a parking official or expert, however, she said that she does understand that parallel parking actually serves as a traffic calming device. As people drive and see the cars parked visually they tend to slow down and understand that it is not a speedway. She also mentioned they have worked very closely with the City Arborist and the landscaping in the islands which is interspersed with the parallel parking doesn't interfere with the parallel parking spaces. They won't be too high and won't obstruct people's vision. They worked with BSO to safely providing landscaping so people can see even though there is landscaping interspersed with the parallel spaces. She mentioned that the entrance is off of Solano Avenue and is gated. There is no guard and it is safe. She stressed again that this is very different and people like this product and want to be in Cooper City.

Ms. Kiernan commented that the community is gated but we are letting guests park in parallel spaces and then walk into the development, so do they have to go into a gate to get into where the parallel spaces are or are the parallel spaces right on Solano Avenue and if so, how are they getting into a gated community.

Ms. Calhoun responded that the parallel spaces are on Solano Avenue and a pedestrian could walk into a gate to visit a unit.

Ms. Keirnan reiterated that it is not a locked gate, just a gate.

Ms. Calhoun responded that was correct.

Mr. Konhauzer wanted to confirm that the width of the main roadway was 12 feet wide.

Ms. Calhoun responded the roadway was 24 feet or 12 and 12 feet wide.

Mr. Konhauzer then wanted to know the size of the parallel parking off of that.

Mr. Jill Cohen, JBC Planning responded that it was 18 feet wide.

Ms. Calhoun corrected her previous comment and that the gate on Solano Avenue is locked and is secure so a visitor must be let in by a resident.

Ms. Keirnan asked if it was one car garage or two car garages.

Mr. Jeff Sutor, EDSA representing Minto responded that each unit has a 2 car garage the same as Cascada. They are full size garages which meet the City code and intent. There will be two spaces interior and one space in the driveway. In the driveway qualifications the way it reads is that they can only count one, but each driveway will accommodate 2 cars. In addition in the interior of the property are 14 more spaces that are placed throughout the community starting with the pool cabana for the mail drop-off and then what they are calling a linear park, or pocket park there are parking spaces there. There are 27 additional parking spaces on Solano and those act as a supplemental parking on the exterior of the property. If you have guests that would like to park there, there is a total of 12 different spaces that will have a locking mechanism that someone could let you in through that gate. If you are a resident you would have your own key that would allow you access throughout the site.

MOTION: TO APPROVE BASED ON RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STAFF REPORT MONTERRA POD 2F1 – CASCADA ISLES AND SOLANO AVENUE CROSS SECTIONS SITE PLAN PETITION # SP 7-1-11. MOTION MADE BY MS. MCCOY AND SECONDED BY MR. VALENTI. There were all ayes on roll call vote. Motion was approved.

5. OLD BUSINESS:

None.

6. GROWTH MANAGEMENT DIRECTOR'S REPORT:

Mr. Wood explained that the next regularly scheduled Board meeting would be Monday October 3rd and explained the upcoming agenda items.

7. BOARD MEMBERS' CONCERNS:

Ms. Keirnan commented in all the years she was a police officer and working many accidents, she sees areas where there could be problems and there are two areas she has noticed that could pose a problem. She explained that if you are going west on Griffin Road, west of SW 90th

Avenue if you are going to turn into Regent's Bank or the Farm Store you cannot see the east bound traffic if you are in the left turn lane to turn into the plaza, because the bushes have grown too high. Also coming out of the Stirling Town Center looking onto Stirling Road there is a lot of vision impairment. A lot of those bushes are too high on the berm.

Ms. Wofford responded that the issue on Griffin Road is a City maintenance issue, and Stirling Town Center would be a code issue. She said that she would look into both issues.

Mr. Roper remarked that he will not be at the next meeting, but requested that somewhere within the sign ordinance they include religious institutions and are specific to say religious institutions. He commented they have been putting it off for years. Because of it our hands are tied, we can't do anything and nobody touches anything. It's hard to let them get away with it and everybody else has got to be codified.

Mr. Aronson asked if that would that be a separate ordinance.

Mr. Wood responded that it would probably be a separate ordinance. He explained that the Commission directive was to address political signs and the City Attorney's office said that you just can't address political signs you have to address other temporary signs, because political signs are considered temporary signs. That would have to be handled as part of the permanent sign code changes.

Mr. Roper wanted to know if it could be included in the temporary sign code because they have already mentioned it.

Mr. Wood responded that right now those signs are illegal and they are code issues now and it's just a matter of enforcement.

Mr. Roper remarked that they have been around and around on signage and unless they get very specific they are going to continue to ignore the problem. It is not fair to other religious institutions to have some that are doing what they want to because they can and then others don't do it. He said that he would like to do something about this to have more continuity in the City.

8. ADJOURNMENT:

The Meeting adjourned at 8:01p.m.