

Community Development Department

1601 NW 136 Avenue, Building A, Sunrise, FL 33323

Phone: (954) 746-3271 Fax: (954) 746-3287

AskZoning@sunrisefl.gov



MINUTES

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE (DRC) MEETING

DATE: April 7, 2021

Due to the COVID-19 emergency, the public may attend the above meeting by telephone by using GoToMeeting Conference Calling utilizing the details below:

VIRTUAL VIA GOTOMEETING

GOTOMEETING DIAL-IN NUMBER: 1 877 309 2073

ACCESS CODE: 680-439-933

LOCATION:

IN-PERSON

Osprey Conference Room
Community Development Department
1601 NW 136 Avenue, Building A
Sunrise, FL 33323

PROJECT INFORMATION:

1. **Approval of DRC Minutes** January 6, 2021 minutes were approved unanimously.

2. **Sunrise Foundry AKA Project Lion / Plat** **PLAT-39-2021**

Applicant Name: Pryse Elam, Foundry Commercial Acquisitions, LLC
Agent Name: Elizabeth Tsouroukdissian, Pulice Land Surveyors, Inc.
Proposed Use: Warehouse
Current Zoning: I-1 (Light Industrial District) and B-3 (General Business District)
Location: West side of Hiatus Road, between NW 50 Street and NW 44 Street
Planner: Marianne Q. Edge

The applicant, developers and DRC members (see below contact info list) discussed comments for the proposed Plat.

Ms. Jane Storms asked to discuss comment 2A (page 2). Mr. Carr noted at the easement is required by Broward County for wetlands impacted by the easement. Mr. Koeth asked which agency is involved, and if the applicant has any documentation to confirm that the proposed easement is adequate. Mr. Joe Arenal noted that they would follow up on that. Mr. Koeth asked that they provide the backup from the County in the response to comments. Ms. Storms added that they can provide the recording number if it is recorded before the resubmittal.

Regarding comment D.3 (page 5), Ms. Storms noted that the plat submitted does meet the County requirements, as it was already submitted for the County review. Mr. Koeth asked that the response to the comment state this information. Ms. Storms inquired about Engineering comment A.1 (page 6) and noted that the proposal was based on meeting Broward County requirements. She noted that the trafficway is no longer 100'. 53' had to be dedicated. The applicant is concerned that 55' feet may not be necessary. Ms. Ley responded that with regard to the proposed Site Plan, it did not appear that all proposed improvements would fit within the 53'. We understand that is the County requirement, but are also reviewing for consistency with the proposed Site Plan and note that it does not appear to fit. Ms. Storms confirmed they will review the Site Plan for consistency and verify if everything will fit. Regarding Engineering Comment A.24.e.(page 10), Ms. Storms asked if 200' is a standard requirement, or if the design can retain a smaller dimension, such as 120 x 75. Ms. Ley responded that a larger-than-necessary dimension is preferred in order to provide room if it is needed for future adjustments without having to revise the Plat. Mr. Carr confirmed he did not have an objection.

3. Project Lion / Site Plan SP-39-2021

Applicant Name: Pryse Elam, Foundry Commercial Acquisitions, LLC
Agent Name: Joe Arenal, Foundry Commercial, LLC
Proposed Use: Warehouse
Current Zoning: I-1 (Light Industrial District) and B-3 (General Business District)
Location: West side of Hiatus Road, between NW 50 Street and NW 44 Street
Planner: Marianne Q. Edge

The applicant, developers and DRC members (see attached contact list) discussed comments for the proposed Site Plan.

Mr. Carr asked to discuss comment Planning B1a(c) (page 5). Ms. Marianne Edge responded that building height stated on the plans need must be consistent with the code section, including the base of elevation the building, and that any reference to a code change must be removed.

Ms. Shannon Ley added that a code amendment is not part of this application. There is no application for a code change.

Mr. Carr referenced Planning comment B1a(f) and noted that they plan to provide parking at a ration of 1/1200 for the areas where no business is conducted. Ms. Edge responded that the plans need to be clear and consistent in order for staff to evaluate them. Ms. Ley added that at this point, we need more detail. The code specifies the parking requirement, and the 1/1200 ratio is not how we interpret the code, nor how any other Amazon facility operates. Mr. Jim Koeth noted that to even consider the portion at 1/1200 that we would need information about the utilization of this space. Mr. Carr noted that they would intend to provide the office space areas with a ratio of 1/250, and the warehouse at 1/1200. Mr. Matthue Goldstein added that the 1/1200 ratio is intended for areas of storage only, not areas in active use and not areas used by personnel. Ms. Ley noted that she is hearing the applicant requesting to use the 1/1200 ratio for much of the building, but that is not the way the code is written. Mr. Carr stated that some areas may be provided with the 1/600 ratio.

Mr. Carr asked to discuss Planning comment B.7. (page 7). He noted that the intend to provide continuous curb, but not wheel stops for the truck spaces. Ms. Edge noted that per the code, wheel stops are required.

In reference to Planning comment B.12. (page 8), Mr. Carr noted that they'll need to discuss the options for internal wayfinding and muster signs. Ms. Ley stated that a Uniform Signage Plan is a separate application process and must include a comprehensive program of all signs. The Ordinance that would approve a Uniform Signage Plan requires 2 readings at City Commission. An analysis would have to be done to clarify what signs are requested and show

what allowances above code are necessary. Staff may not be supportive of all of the signs they may ask for. She added that for the Site Plan submittal, the applicant may not include references to signage that is not compliant with the code.

Ms. Edge added that as part of that process, the applicant should clarify what signs they really need. Ms. Ley asked for clarification about the "Visitor" signs shown on the plan. Mr. Carr responded that they are spaces reserved (not for employees to park in) for people who may be visiting staff, or visiting the property for maintenance, etc. He noted they may remove the "customer parking" signs, as they are not used for this type of operation. Ms. Ley asked if the employee spaces are assigned or marked, and Mr. Carr said no.

In regard to Planning comment B.13. (page 9), Mr. Carr discussed the muster area signage. Ms. Ley asked the applicant to clarify if these areas are for emergency only, or if these are areas where staff or drivers receive work or route assignments.

Mr. Carr acknowledged Planning comment C.3. (page 11) noting that they will add screening walls around the equipment.

Mr. Carr discussed Planning comment C.6 (page 12), and Ms. Edge noted that the bollards should be decorative.

In regards to Planning comment C.7 (page 12), Ms. Ley noted that the bust stop shelter needs to be provided at both bus stops. Ms. Edge added that the interior "drop off" shelter can be any design, and that the details should depict it. Mr. Carr stated that they do not have the new standard bus detail. Ms. Ley responded that we will provide it if we have it, otherwise the applicant can just provide appropriate labels that the shelters will be the City standard design.

Mr. Carr discussed Planning comment C.8 (page 12), stating that trucks must idle in front of the gate as they check in. Mr. Koeth asked if there are options in which there are not long lines of trucks idling. He added that the proposed plan should include more signage prohibiting idling throughout the loading areas. Mr. Bernard Kinney stated that he is aware the applicant cannot guarantee how many trucks might be idling at a given time, but that some reasonable information about idling should be included in the CADNA model. The idling noises need to be accounted for, as well as air brake release, back up noises, etc. Mr. Koeth added that if there will be any information provided to driver about idling if they're sitting for a long time, that such information may be provided.

Regarding comment D.3.a (page 14) Mr. Carr stated that the applicant is not yet aware of what the artwork will be, but the note will be amended to clarify that art is to be installed. Ms. Ley asked they also clarify that information in the applicant letter.

Mr. Carr asked to discuss the secondary truck entrance, including Planning comment D.4. (page 14). He noted that the secondary guardhouse will be removed, leaving a gate only.

He noted that a secondary access is necessary in the event the main access is blocked by a fire or broken-down truck, or similar emergency.

Ms. Ley asked what assurances will be provided that the gate will only be used in such circumstances, and not left open for regular use? Is there an operational plan for this?

Mr. Carr noted that regular use of two access points is not a good way to secure a site. They can also provide an operational plan.

Ms. Kelsey Trujeque inquired about Landscaping comment B.9.a. (page 65), and noted that the western landscape buffer for the project is set to the east of the 100' conservation easement. Mr. William Byrnes said the plans show the trees in the wetland conservation area as "wetland mitigation" but sheet L-3 does not indicate the species of the trees in the conservation area, and does not include them in the mitigation calculation. Mr. Byrnes asked if the landscape in the wetland conservation area is to be included in the perimeter landscape requirements. Ms. Trujeque noted that the proposed buffer is set inside the wetland area. Ms. Ley noted that under this design the perimeter landscape would be quite far from the project's perimeter. Mr. Mele said that the circumstances of the site may necessitate a reasonable interpretation of the code. Mr. Nichols added that the proposed wetland location was identified based on specific regulation criteria from Broward County. Mr. Byrnes noted that once the tree counts and species information is provided it may be possible for the wetland area to satisfy the perimeter landscape code requirements. Ms. Trujeque said she would review this area.

Ms. Trujeque asked if the perimeter landscape buffer could be setback a certain distance from the overhead powerlines in order to include taller tree species, which they believe are preferred by adjacent property owners. Ms. Ley responded that all existing-to remain features should be shown on the plans, including showing the power lines on the Landscape plans. She noted that minimum code requirements must be met, and the tree species and locations would be evaluated for conflicts.

Mr. John Dolehanty asked to speak about the noise study. Mr. Bernard Kinney noted that many projects of this size would have half a dozen or more receptor sites included in the study. The study provided did not appear to include enough receptor sites. Mr. Dolehanty stated that receptor of the nearest "worst-case" receptor was show, but acknowledged that residents may be interested in projected impacts at different locations. Mr. Kinney noted that the study should provide all tabulations for evaluation, but also a few more points represented visually for a lay-person to understand.

Mr. Kinney explained that the responses to comments appeared to refer to data that was not provided in this submittal. An updated study was not included so the comments were provided for the study dated May 11, 2020. Mr. Dolehanty noted that the study was updated in January 2021 with 24-hour ambient data.

Mr. Dolehanty and Mr. Kinney discussed Noise Consultant comment A.3.a (page 91). regarding the LMax descriptor. Mr. Kinney noted that plans did not clearly show Lmax levels. Mr. Dolehanty stated that he isn't sure if the levels can be determined and provided. Mr. Kinney stated that the applicant should review the City's noise ordinance, including the provisions that allow for noise 5 decibels over existing ambient noise. The noise study should state the ambient noise levels for 1-hour intervals. He noted that the study should provide max noise levels, not average. He added that the study should account for all noises and mitigation features, including the perimeter wall, which must be documented in the study as consistent with the wall should in the Site Plan set. Mr. Mele stated that the wall height has changed since the previous submittal, so the next submittal will include the updated information.

Mr. Dolehanty asked about measuring the noise levels once the site is operational. Mr. Kinney noted that the site must maintain compliance with the Code, and the study will be used to establish current conditions and projected noise levels to evaluate compliance.

Ms. Edge summarized that the plan must include all background and noise sources, show maximum noise levels, and comply with code. The report should include more receptor points and be consistent with the plan drawings.

M. Carr asked if the Conceptual Engineering comments (pages 52-61) and Engineering comments (pages 28-51) are different. Ms. Resta responded that the Conceptual Engineering plans and Site Plan are separate submittals. She noted that the applicant may submit Engineering Plans for preliminary Engineering review, not another

“Conceptual” submittal. Mr. Carr asked if the Engineering Plan review will now split from the Site Plan review, and Ms. Resta affirmed they will but the data should remain consistent. Ms. Ley noted that the applicant team has submitted another project for grading, which is not something the City normally does, and may affect what can be done.

Meeting adjourned at 12:47 p.m.

For further information, please contact E. Gabriela Ruiz at (954) 746-3286 or eruiz@sunrisefl.gov

NOTES:

If a person decides to appeal any decision made by the board, agency, or commission with respect to any matter considered at such meeting or hearing, he or she will need a record of the proceedings, and that, for such purpose, he or she may need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is based F.S.S. 286.0105.

The City does not tolerate discrimination in any of its programs, services or activities; and will not exclude participation in, deny the benefits of, or subject to discrimination anyone on the grounds of real or perceived race, color, national origin, sex, gender identity, sexual orientation, age, disability/handicap, religion, family or income status. In compliance with the ADA and F.S.S. 286.26, any individual with a disability requesting a reasonable accommodation in order to participate in a public meeting should contact the City’s ADA Coordinator at least 48 hours in advance of the scheduled meeting. Requests can be directed via e-mail to hr@sunrisefl.gov or via telephone to (954) 838-4522; Florida Relay: 711; Florida Relay (TIY/VCO): 1-800-955-8771; Florida Relay (Voice): 1-800-955-8770. Every reasonable effort will be made to allow for meeting participation.

If you plan to distribute written documents at the meeting, you must contact the Board Liaison prior to the meeting to determine the correct number of copies to bring

DRC Meeting Contact Information

Division / Agency / Business Name	Name	Title	Phone	E-Mail Address
Community Development	Shannon Ley	Director	954-746-3288	SLey@sunrisefl.gov
Planning	Jim Koeth	Assistant Director/City Planner	954-746-3279	JKoeth@sunrisefl.gov
Planning	Matt Goldstein	P&Z Manager	954-746-3291	MGoldstein@sunrisefl.gov
Planning	Marianne Q Edge	Assistant City Planner	954-236-2117	MEdge@sunrisefl.gov
Planning	Deyman Rodriguez	Assistant City Planner	954-746-3238	DRodriguez@sunrisefl.gov
Engineering	Ashley Resta	City Engineer	954-746-3285	AResta@sunrisefl.gov
Engineering	Ravi Ramgulam	Assistant City Engineer	954-236-2111	RRamgilam@sunrisefl.gov
Utilities	Rodrigo deCastro	Deputy Director	954-888-6071	RdeCastro@sunrisefl.gov
Engineering (Landscaping)	William Byrnes	Urban Forester	954-746-3272	WByrnes@sunrisefl.gov
Fire	Steve Felicetti	Fire Marshal	954-746-3466	SFelicetti@sunrisefl.gov
Utilities – Public Works	Mark Winslow	Civil Engineer	954-572-2390	MWinslow@sunrisefl.gov
Traffic	Karl Peterson	Traffic Consultant	954-560-7103	Karl@traftech.biz
Traffic	Joaquin Vargas	Traffic Consultant	954-582-0988	Joaquin@traftech.biz
Noise	Bernard Kinney	Noise Consultant	772-336-2047	BernardKinney@aol.com
Greenspoon Marder	Dennis Mele	Partner, GM Law	954-527-2409	Dennis.mele@gmlaw.com
Foundry Commercial	Joe Arenal	Director of Project Management	561-208-7978	Joe.arenal@foundrycommercial.com
Langan Engineering	Maximo Polanco	Civil Engineering	954-320-2100	mpolanco@langan.com
Langan	Michael Carr	Senior Project Manager	954-320-2120	Mcarr@langan.com
Langan	John Kim	Senior Project Manager	954-320-2116	Jkim@langan.com
Macgregor Associates Architects	Duane Behne	Senior Project Manager	770-432-9400	dbehne@maamail.com
Macgregor Associates Architects	Elizabeth Donoho	Project Coordinator	770-432-9400	edonoho@maamail.com
Witkin Hults + Partners	Kelsey Trujeque	Managing Principal	954-923-9681	Kelsey@witkindesign.com
M. J. Nichols & Associates, LLC	Mike Nichols	Owner	561-753-0554	mike@mjnicholsLLC.com
Robert Anderson Group	John Dolehanty	Vice President	517-886-9379	johndolehanty@robertandersongroup.com
Pulice Land Surveyors	Jane Storms	Director of Platting Services	954-572-1777	jane@pulicelandsurveyors.com
Pulice Land Surveyors	Elizabeth Tsouroukdissian	Platting Assistant	954-572-1777	Elizabeth@pulicelandsurveyors.com