



PLANNING & ZONING ADVISORY BOARD

Minutes of September 13, 2016

Meeting Called to order at 7:00 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL

P&Z Board Members

Table with 11 columns (MEMBERS, 09/14/16, 06/06/16, 05/02/16, 03/21/16, 03/07/16, 02/01/16, 12/07/15, 11/16/15, 10/26/15, 07/20/15) and 13 rows of attendance records for various board members.

* Reappointed ** Resigned *** New appointment

STAFF PRESENT: Matt Wood, Director; Jason Chockley, Planner; Jeanette Wofford, Arborist; Carlos Vega, Administrative Specialist

APPLICANT: Deborah Martohue, Martohue Land Use Law PA for T-Mobile; Steven P. Marquart P.E., Agent for Royal Estates of Cooper City

2. P&Z BOARD - MINUTES - WAIVE/APPROVE MINUTES OF 06/06/16: Motion to waive the reading of the minutes made by David Rouse and seconded by Bobby Jenkins. All ayes on voice vote. MOTION WAS APPROVED. Motion to approve the minutes made by Bobby Jenkins and seconded by Michael de Miranda. There were all ayes on voice vote. MOTION WAS APPROVED.

3. CORRESPONDENCE: None

4. NEW BUSINESS:

A. FPL Pole/T-Mobile Antenna Colocation located just west of Hiatus Rd. in FPL Easement.

- 1) Conditional Use #CU 6-1-16
2) Site Plan Amendment #SPA 6-1-16

Chairman Konhauzer turned the item over to Mr. Wood and he proceeded to read the Staff report for item 4A FPL Pole/T-Mobile Antenna Colocation located just west of Hiatus Rd. in FPL Easement Conditional Use #C 6-1-16 & and Site Plan Amendment #SPA 6-1-16 hereby summarized as follows: Item 4A1 & 4A2 is a petition seeking approval to collocate two T-Mobile wireless Antenna concealment canisters on an relocated and hardened FPL pole with a 104' overall height.

Chairman Konhauzer turned the meeting over to the Applicants to present their petition.

Debra Martohue introduced herself as the attorney for T-Mobile along with Monica Barnes attorney from FPL, Bruce Barber Project Manager from FPL, Amy O'Rourke Project Manager for T-Mobile, Marlene Garcia is the Expediter and Zoning Specialist from FPL and Patrick Keen Radio Frequency Engineer for T-Mobile. Ms. Martohue stated that they reached out to Rock Creek as advised by staff and provided them correspondence for the project and they received back a letter of objection from the Rock Creek attorney. She stated that they provided them about hundred and fifty pages worth of the projects pertinent relevant material. One of the objections from Rock Creek is related to why they are not going to facilities just to the east of Hiatus Rd which will be discussed by Patrick Keen. Ms. Martohue said that they concur with staff recommendation of their conditions, analysis and report.

Patrick Keen introduced himself as the Radio Frequency Engineer for T-Mobile. He stated that he wanted to discuss the coverage deficiencies they have in the area, some of the solutions they have tried in the past and what they feel is going to be a comprehensive solution for improvements in the area. Pointing to a presentation board Mr. Keen stated that they were propagation maps which are predictive models or a computer algorithm that generates predictive signal levels. Aside from just these models which are done on computers they also gather statistics by doing drop testing where vehicles have receivers in them and cell phones to take measurements and they also check databases such as 911 calls and a couple other different ways for them to tell how deficiencies are in the network or what they are. Mr. Keen pointing to the presentation board showed areas where they see deficiencies in the coverage area and where they have done extensive upgrades in the surrounding towers going back to 2008. He stated that in 2013 when Metro PCS and T-Mobile merged they made all efforts to try to improve the service in the area but even then they still had coverage gaps. Mr. Keen said the problem is when you get in doors especially during busy hours which is normally during rush hours. Reverting back to the presentation board and pointing to yellow areas he said that these people will have problems making a phone call, this promotes slow data speeds and as more and more people using their phones for more than just phone calls getting this coverage upgrade become more and more important for us. One of the most important things for them is 911 calls. He stated that according to the SCC website that about 70% of all 911 phone calls are made with cell phones. With an increasing number of people not using landline phone anymore this becomes even more important for them. After all the years of looking for different solutions they started working with FPL to determine if can they can locate in the FPL corridor. Mr. Keen pointing to a presentation board showing an aerial of different towers in the FPL corridor, said that originally they had a location on the east side of Hiatus Rd. but they determined that this was a better spot (pointing to the proposed location on the board) in terms of access and the construction of the site. Pointing to another presentation board showing results from the predictive testing they ran it showed the whole area in question now shows the area with good signal levels. With good signal levels you should be able to use the cell phone in your house, should have good data speed, and there shouldn't be any congestion issues during rush hours. Based on their analysis this is the comprehensive solution to improve the cell phone service in this area. Mr. Keen said that part of their due diligence they looked at existing towers in the area that weren't already being utilized including City owned properties. The City owned property that was within the area of concern is the Swim and Tennis Center. They ran a propagation study similar to the one they ran for the proposed tower and the results turned out to be 25% less population that would be covered at the good signal service level. That is a significant amount for them and they determined that would not be a comprehensive solution. Mr. Keen pointed to the presentation board showing other locations considered including an elementary school, park, and an existing T-Mobile tower. These locations either weren't available to them or didn't provide the amount of improvement they needed.

Ms. Martohue said she wants to emphasize and show pointing to the presentation board an aerial showing the magnitude and the number of rooftops that need to be served in this area. She said that there are no large parcels left that are not zoned residential. The only thing that they had access to was the FPL transmission corridor which was not a viable option back in 2008. This didn't become a viable option until 2012 with the passage of the Federal Pole Attachment Act. This required utility companies to work with communication companies to try to reach some of these residential areas that are otherwise difficult because they are large and monolithic and they don't have commercial parcels in them so the corridors allow us the ability to go in and still keep the utility type

nature of the transmission corridor and provide service to the residential areas. Ms. Martohue said as Mr. Wood described in the staff report they are taking down one dual cross brace set of poles. FPL is constructing dual monopoles and T-Mobile is collocating on top which is what their application is for. The existing poles are about 78-80FT in height and so the increase will be just an additional 22 feet in height. They felt that was a better solution than building two new towers maybe to the north or to the south.

Chairman Konhauzer said that this is a public hearing and opened the public hearing at 7:27pm.

John Heggy introduced himself as the president of Rock Creek Home Owners Association. He stated that Rock Creek Board did issue a letter of objection. Their biggest concern and they are not here to dispute coverage but they are there to discuss the visual impact of the tower. He states that they are going from a 78 to 104FT tower. In addition what really wasn't talked about at the base of the tower which will be in direct line of site will be there equipment that is mounted at about 20ft up the tower and a 8x12 ft square area that is going to house three cabinets. So for any of the homes that are along that southern corridor of that easement there are no landscaping there so those homes are going to directly stare at an additional 22 ft tower in addition to the equipment and vehicles coming in twice a month to service that location. Their biggest concern again is the visual impact because they didn't see or receive anything from T-Mobile addressing that. There were no mention of additional landscaping to buffer the home and no mention of any type of landscaping along Hiatus to buffer the view along Hiatus Rd of the tower and the equipment. Rock Creek has spent \$130,000 in the last 90 days to upgrade the infrastructure of the easement area. They plan on spending another \$25,000 to \$35,000 next year to finish the walking paths in the general vicinity of these towers. This is an active part of the Rock Creek Community. They want the applicant to put some effort into screening the installation. Mr. Heggy stated that they are not overly clear that the other locations were not a viable option like in Embassy Lakes. The comment given on that was because of access in construction and they are not really sure what that means, it's the same FPL easement.

Chuck Killingsworth introduced himself as the president of the East Landing Home Owners Association in Rock Creek. They want to register strongly their objection of putting this tower in its location. This tower will essentially be in our backyard. They have never seen an installation in a residential community of this type as close as this will be here. As mentioned before the area there is not just a utility area it's a recreation area as well. They have park benches, play grounds and other kind of things there. They don't want to look at it.

Susy Gardiner introduced herself as a resident in the Reflections community in Rock Creek. She enjoys the scenery and amenities this area provides. She stated she doesn't want this installation to spoil their view.

Hugo Sansberro introduced himself as the president of Reflection Home Owners Association. The area of where this tower is going to be built is one of the most popular places in Rock Creek. He stated that he doesn't understand why these towers are going into that location. He said he understands the power lines because they need power. The power lines come from east to west and they are all over the place but that he can't believe that there isn't any other location available in Cooper City for where these towers can be installed. He stated that probably because of the location and the triangulation that they need for cellular phones maybe this area is an ideal location for them but it's not a very ideal situation for the owners of Rock Creek. The towers are going to be installed next to two of the most expensive communities that Rock Creek has at the moment, East Landing and Poinciana. His concern is that this will affect prices and value of the homes in Rock Creek. He wants to know why they chose to put this in Rock Creek and not Embassy Lakes and would like some clarity on these issues.

Chairman Konhauzer closed the public hearing at 7:36pm.

Chairman Konhauzer turned it over to the applicant for any rebuttal regarding public concerns. Ms. Martohue stated that this project has been 8 years in the making and stated that they knew this would be a difficult project knowing that residents necessarily don't want wireless facilities near their homes but everyone wants their cell phones to work. We have E911 requirements with our FCC licenses with respect to location

criteria. In the past it use to be that within 500-750Ft you had to be able to identify someone calling from a cell phone now it's down to150FT. She stated with all due respect to the HOA's, they realize they're very powerful objections, they did not take this site lightly. They vetted it. The team vetted before they even brought it as an application to make sure that thru the merger with Metro PCS and all the technological upgrades that could go on every existing tower surrounding this site in Cooper City that it was done and as you can see we still have an issue. This is a very monolithic very large residential area that we cannot penetrate with any of the zoned commercial B3 or I1 properties that are allowed within this residential area, they simply do not exist. They realize that visual impact is always a concern to residents and that's why they are proposing to conceal these antennas. This is a major transmission corridor and they are proposing to not increase the number of poles. FPL is taking down a set of existing poles and putting up two monopoles and T-Mobile is collocating on that. That's a 20% height increase. With respect to the objections regarding the equipment, the equipment is mounted 7ft about the ground. That is for security, clearance and safety purposes. They don't want anyone being able to climb or hit their head as they know this is a recreational area of this HOA. T-Mobile still needs to maintain the equipment so they can't locate it 20 or 50FT above the ground. Ms. Martohue said she will have Bruce Barber from FPL confirm for you that they don't have an option of landscaping inside an FPL transmission corridor. They can't add trees or shrubs or really anything in their corridor. This is a utility land use and zoned PUD. They believe that they are consistent with that both from a comprehensive plan standpoint and a zoning stand point.

Monica Barnes introduced herself as Counsel Rep for FPL. She stated the issues as far as access that they have is that the easement agreement that they have does not allow FPL to go outside of this particular area.

Bruce Barber introduced himself being from FPL Fibernet. He stated that this one of their bigger transmission corridors it's 230 KV transmission line corridor. These are some of our taller poles in the system which is why this is an appropriate use and compatible with what is existing. In terms as far as the east side location vs. the west side location, the access to the east side is blocked by a massive hedge and forest of trees and that they didn't want to disturb that. The west side location is much more open, access is much easier and they wouldn't have to disturb anything.

Mr. Keen said that they proposed a two canister solution on this tower primarily to allow for more antennas. Due to the density of the residential areas and the busy roads, Flamingo is very busy, Sheridan is very busy and Hiatus is very busy during rush hour .There were capacity concerns so more antennas generally translate to more capacity so that was the primary reason to help our network congestion and capacity.

Ms. Martohue said that she spoke with the Rock Creek HOA attorney and manager in regards to the idea that they might damage their path ways. Rock Creek spent a lot of money on their improvements, they are aware of the burrowing owls and put forth a protection plan for the pathways and the burrowing owls and wanted to assure the residents that they respect that they use it as a recreational area but it's also a large transmission corridor. They are willing to work with the HOAs and if they damage something they will fix it.

Chairman Konhauzer asked if there was any discussion from the board.

Mr. de Miranda asked the FPL representative that he knows they stated earlier that they can't plant landscaping of hedges, bushes and shrubs but is there any other way to further conceal. He understands the canisters are camouflaged from the top but the equipment is installed 7FT off the ground could you install a small 8ft gated area with camouflaged planking on the outside to further hide the equipment. Is that possible?

Mr. Barnes responded saying they could look into it but they can't tell you right now if it will work. Generally they would not they just have the equipment mounted on the poles and there's really no mechanism to support a fence or slat fence around that structure.

Mr. de Miranda said this adds security for T-Mobile as far as the equipment as well.

Mr. Barnes said that the equipment is about 7Ft off the ground for safety and security.

Mr. Williamson asked if there is a zoning ordinance in which they can't plant palms, say like 20FT out.

Mr. Chockley said with that being an FPL easement they have the jurisdiction on what can go in that easement.

Mr. Williamson referred the same question then to the FPL representative.

Mr. Barnes said that generally in a transmission corridor FPL tries to keep the vegetation very low. The reason being that in an emergency access or anytime they need to get to those poles they can't go around trees or cut them down so they can look into it. He believes that 14ft is kind of the max for the right tree and right place requirements.

Mr. Jenkins said that his concern is that at 7FT he believes that kids will be climbing up on that canister. There has to be some kind of liability to make sure that doesn't happen.

Ms. Martohue said that they discussed security with staff extensively. Kids should not be climbing up on the equipment and she understood the concern but that's why the equipment is mounted at 7FT high so no one hits their head if they are riding a bike. Plus all the equipment is secured and locked down. Again this is a balance of being able to maintain and service that equipment and making sure it's not on the ground, unsecure and posing a safety hazard. Ms Martohue said in terms of landscaping she wants to emphasize that it is completely out of T-Mobile's control. They are collocating on FPL's poll and attaching T-Mobile canisters on FPL's poll. They can't control what FPL does, they have the right and staff understands that they can come in and build whatever they want to build to transmit their power in their corridor. Under the Federal Poll Attachment Act FPL needs to work with T-Mobile to collocate their canisters so that they can provide service to the residence. She stated that this is the only way they can get in this area without building a whole new structure.

Mr. Goulet asked how many customers are affected in this critical area.

Ms. Martohue said she doesn't know in this specific area but she said that T-Mobile in the south Florida market has more than 50% of the market share, millions of customers. That might not be in Cooper City but they service more than 50% of the market share from Palm Beach down to Miami.

MOTION: TO APPROVE AS STATED FPL POLE/T-MOBILE ANTENNA COLLOCATION LOCATED JUST WEST OF HIATUS RD IN FPL EASEMENT # CU 6-1-16 – MOTION MADE BY MATT WILLIAMSON AND SECONDED BY MICHAEL DE MIRANDA. THERE WERE 4 AYES AND 2 NAYES ON THE ROLL CALL VOTE. MOTION PASSED 4 TO 2 WITH BOBBY JENKINS AND MICHAEL DE MIRANDA DISSENTING..

MOTION: TO APPROVE AS STATED WITH THE RECOMMENDATIONS BY STAFF FPL POLE/T-MOBILE ANTENNA COLLOCATION LOCATED JUST WEST OF HIATUS RD IN FPL EASEMENT # SPA 6-1-16 – MOTION MADE BY MICHAEL DE MIRANDA AND SECONDED BY DAVID ROUSE. MOTION PASSED 5 TO 1 WITH BOBBY JENKINS DISSENTING.

4. NEW BUSINESS:

- B. Royal Estates: Z, SP, PA # 4-1-16**
 - 1) Rezoning #Z 4-1-16**
 - 2) Site Plan #SP 4-1-16**

3) Plat Amendment #PA 4-1-16

Chairman Konhauzer turned the item over to Mr. Wood and he proceeded to read the Staff report for item 4B Royal Estates Rezoning #Z 4-1-16, Site Plan #SP 4-1-16 and Plat Amendment #PA 4-1-16 hereby summarized as follows: Item 4B1, 4B2 and 4B3 is a petition to allow for rezoning from an E-1 (Broward County) to R-1B, Single Family District (Cooper City) in order to build 20 Single Family dwellings utilizing 10 flex units. The Site Plan and Plat Amendment accompany this petition which reflect all lots exceeding 13,770 square feet in size and the site plan reflect one and two story homes, all with air-conditioned floor areas averaging 4,700 square feet.

Chairman Konhauzer turned the meeting over to the Applicants to present their petition.

Daniel Dabakaroff introduced himself as the petitioner and Steven Marquart introduced himself as the Engineer of Record from Miller Legg. Mr. Marquart presented their Site Plan by stating that they redesigned the plan as they did not have a lake in the initial stage and now they were able to incorporate the lake in the front of the development to better accommodate the drainage from the site. He stated that they are currently in review at Central Broward as they've addressed all of their comments and they're under final review for the site plan and the plat. Mr. Marquart stated that Mr. Dabakaroff has worked with the neighbors to the north, Fox Run Ranch with a construction agreement as they are going to give them a hand building a separate driveway for them. He stated that Fox Run Ranch will do the construction and that they will do the engineering design.

Carlos Linares introduced himself as the Architect of the project with Randall Stofft Architects. Pointing at renderings they presented, he went into describing the different models they have designed. He stated the style of the architecture is contemporary with a West Indie style. He stated they have met all the criteria for setbacks, open spaces, height limitations, backyards and pools for each individual unit.

Chairman Konhauzer said that this is a public hearing and opened the public hearing at 8:14pm.

Natalie Cooke a resident at 10537 SW 53 ST asked where the entrance to development is.

Mr. Marquart pointing to the presentation board showed Ms. Cooke the proposed entrance near the Fox Run Ranch.

Ms. Cooke asked why the site plans aren't posted on the Cooper City Website.

Mr. Wood responded saying they are not posted until they go thru the development approval process. As this is part of the approval process and since they are not approved yet it wouldn't be posted on the city website yet.

Ms. Cooke asked about the traffic stating this is the 3rd development that is being built on 106th Ave. The traffic has gotten a lot worse and now another project is being proposed with larger homes, bigger driveways and more cars. She'd like to know what the calming measures are going to be for that area.

Didier Dupuy a resident at 5125 SW 105 Terrace said his concern is the increase in traffic, the widening 106th Ave and having to lose part of his property to accommodate for sidewalks and turning lanes. He stated that residents like to walk to the community park and the increase in residents with this development is going to impact 106th Ave as the proposed development has no recreation inside of it, they will need a way to walk to the community park. He strongly is concerned that this is going to affect and impact residents properties.

Ann Gensemer a resident at 5451 SW 106 Ave said one of their concerns is traffic. She stated that when Mill Creek was being built they expressed those concerns and were told there will be no impact. She said that if you ever drive down 106th Ave it's a speed zone. It's a residential area no one follows the speed limit and it's not a safe place to cross the street. They were told when Mill Creek was built, that residents can cross the street to go to the community park but that it's just not safe to cross. She stated that most of traffic that drives on 106th Ave

doesn't live there, they just use it to get thru to go somewhere else. Pointing to an Aerial on a presentation board Ms. Gensemer pointed to where her home is adjacent to the new proposed development and her major concern is what is the development going to do to protect them from being flooded. She stated that they currently are 4ft below Mill Creek and that the City approved a wall in the back of Mill Creek but then Cooper City came in and said they need drainage holes in those walls and holes were drilled into those walls so that they can drain into their property. She wanted to know how much higher Royal Estates will be than her property and what protection from flooding will they have.

Chairman Konhauzer closed the public hearing at 8:22pm.

Chairman Konhauzer turned it over to the applicant for any rebuttal regarding public concerns.

Mr. Marquart said regarding the traffic, there traffic study reports that there will be an additional 25 trips in the peak hours of both the morning and evening hours. He said that its 20 homes and about 239 total trips per day so it will add a little traffic to what is already there. He stated that certainly there development couldn't do anything about all the cut thru traffic. He said regarding the drainage, this project is designed with a larger lake than what is prorated in Mill Creek. The lake is in the front of the property which is next to the outfall so that the drainage can go from the back of the property to the lake and to the front door which is where the outfall is. The drainage system is designed to retain the 100 year onsite and it will over flow into the canal. The perimeter berm is designed in accordance with Central Broward Water Control district requirement and the City requirements and that is to retain the 25 year onsite. The drainage is designed to not discharge in any other direction except to the drainage canal and down the canal. As far as buffering, the landscape architect worked with the City staff and came up with how they will do the landscaping as there is a landscape easement around the perimeter and they will be putting trees back. The current land elevation is not conducive to build the drainage system and not add two or three feet of fill across the site so that we can drain back into the lake and meet the requirements of drainage. They are going to have to pay into the City tree fund for mitigation for whatever they can't pick up on site.

Chairman Konhauzer asked if there was any discussion from the board.

Mr. Rouse said that most of the new developments have had that right turn lane could you give some input on why that wasn't included in your plan.

Mr. Marquart said that they never had a right turn lane in there because there is a large S22 drainage canal which provides flood protection for the whole region. You would have to be filling that in to put in a right turn lane. He said the edge of the canal is right at the edge of pavement.

Mr. Rouse said logistically this has been done before.

Mr. Marquart said that another consideration is if you put a right turn lane on this property you're going to be covering the whole frontage of the property to the north which we are trying to maintain at the existing access point. Up until a few months ago when they started negotiating and communicating with the Perkins to the north at Fox Run Ranch they were going to be sharing the driveway and that's why they moved it back to where it was and came up with an alternate solution that they will help them build a new driveway north of where they are. If they try to put a right turn lane it will go across both driveways because there only going to be about 50ft away from them.

Mr. Goulet asked if potentially they are going to have cars backed up from the guard gate into 106th Ave.

Mr. Marquart pointing to a presentation board showed the area where the guard gate is located and said there is about 90 ft to the call box which is probably about 4 cars. He said that they are wide lanes with 15 ft of pavements on both side. All the residents will have clickers and they are not worried that this will back up traffic.

Chairman Konhauzer asked how far back are the gates.

Mr. Marquart said about 150 ft.

MOTION: TO APPROVE AS STATED ROYAL ESTATES REZONING # Z 4-1-16 – MOTION MADE BY BOBBY JENKNS AND SECONDED BY MATT WILLIAMSON. MOTION PASSED 5 TO 1 WITH DAVID ROUSE DISSENTING.

MOTION: TO APPROVE AS STATED ROYAL ESTATES SITE PLAN # SP 4-1-16 – MOTION MADE BY BOBBY JENKINS AND SECONDED BY DAVID ROUSE. THERE WERE ALL AYES ON THE ROLL CALL VOTE. MOTION WAS APPROVED.

MOTION: TO APPROVE AS STATED ROYAL ESTATES PLAT AMENDMENT # PA 4-1-16 — MOTION MADE BY MICHAEL DE MIRANDA AND SECONDED BY DAVID ROUSE. THERE WERE ALL AYES ON THE ROLL CALL VOTE. MOTION WAS APPROVED.

4. NEW BUSINESS:

**C. Proposed Code Change - Section 23-72(a)
Planned Commercial Development District**

Chairman Konhauzer turned the item over to Mr. Wood and he proceeded to read the Staff report for item 4C Proposed Code Change - Section 23-72(a) hereby summarized as follows: Item 4C, is a petition requested for discussion and Board recommendation to City Commission from Weingarten Realty Investors, Owners of the Embassy Lakes Shopping Center for a text amendment to Section 23-72(a) of the Zoning Code of Ordinance to allow "Personal Improvements Services in the PCD, Planned Commercial Development District. This change would allow shopping center to have prospective uses such as Yoga, Karate, and Dance Studios and Tutoring Services all of which are currently permitted in the B-1,B-2 and B-3 zoning districts.

Chairman Konhauzer asked if there was any discussion from the board.

Mr. Jenkins asked if every other mall or shopping center has this already and if this is the only one that doesn't.

Mr. Wood said yes.

Mr. Goulet asked if no Pawn shops or anything like that would be included.

Mr. Wood said no that would not be considered a personal improvement service.

MOTION: TO APPROVE PROPOSED CODE CHANGE - SECTION 23-72(A)– MOTION MADE BY BOBBY JENKNS AND SECONDED BY MATT WILLIAMSON. THERE WERE ALL AYES ON THE ROLL CALL VOTE. MOTION WAS APPROVED.

5. GROWTH MANAGEMENT DIRECTOR'S REPORT:

Mr. Wood turn it over to Mr. Chockley for any upcoming items for the next meeting.

Mr. Chockley said they have Sienna getting ready to come back thru for final approval which is the parcel just to the west of Monterra. They have been working thru all their issues with the Monterra HOA, landscape

requirements and the five year dedication as far as the wetlands. It looks like within the next two weeks they will submit and that will put them at either the second meeting in October or the first in November. There is also one other petition for the Griffin Rd piece Plaza San Michelle coming in for a conditional use but that has at least one more DRC so that may finish out the year probably for sometime in December.

6. BOARD MEMBERS' CONCERNS:

Chairman Konhauzer asked if there were any Board Member Concerns:

Mr. de Miranda asked if there were any way to put speed humps on 106th Ave.

Mr. Chockley said by City standard probably not. A traffic report and study is done to look at the warrant but one of the biggest requirements is that it cannot be for any sort of emergency access for EMS, Fire or PD and 106th will probably be that connecting corridor. A study could be done but based on the number of units that would be accessed thru but that probably wouldn't meet the requirements.

Mr. de Miranda said even if they asked BSO and ran speed traps there would be no place to pull them over.

Ms. Wofford said they have been pulling them over at the park.

Mr. Rouse said his concern with 106th Ave is the school pick up and drop off hours. You have parents that are pulling up to the front of the communities, parking in the swales, the kids are running back and forth particularly with developments on the west side the kids are running in-between traffic to get to their communities. They've already had one head on collision on 106th this year and they're going to have more and kids are going to get hit.

Mr. Goulet said his concern is that there will be traffic backing up from that guard gate into the street. If you have someone without an ID or they can't get a hold of the resident it's going to back up the traffic. Sooner or later they are going to have to widen that road and people are going to have to lose property, there is too much going on down that road.

Chairman Konhauzer asked if that is a possibility to widening.

Mr. Wood said yes, it's not anything that is planned or programmed at this time but particularly if this penny sales tax goes thru, the infrastructure or transportation, that might be one of the things that could be considered.

Mr. Goulet said in regards to the FPL/T-Mobile tower issue he was not pleased that they didn't know how many customers they had in that affected area that were actually being affected it could be 5 or 500.

Ms. Wofford said in regards to the FPL/T-Mobile Canister their concern during the DRC level was that the canisters originally were on the ground level and the concern of kids climbing the equipment and safety.

Chairman Konhauzer said that he lives in East Landing in Rock Creek and that he voted for this positively because of the usage people are using these days but also he voted for it because they have the right to do it.

Ms. Wofford said that the T-Mobile representative was very diplomatic in how she presented their petition.

Mr. Chockley said it's a delicate balance between the litigation that is going on and things that have passed legislation and resident concerns. They are backing up to what already is a massive transmission line with huge towers already.

7. ADJOURNMENT:

The Meeting adjourned at 8:44 p.m.