



**LIFESTYLE COMMERCIAL CENTER (LCC)
A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE LAND DEVELOPMENT REGULATION ADVISORY BOARD (LDRAB)**

MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 8, 2009 SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

Prepared by Timothy Sanford

Eighth Meeting of the LCC Subcommittee began at 2:05pm

A. Attendance

LDRAB Members:

Industry: Dodi Glas, Jeff Brophy,

County Staff: Maryann Kwok, Bill Cross, Jan Wiegand, Monica Cantor, Timothy Sanford, Bryan Davis, Jorge Perez

B. Discussion

The LCC Subcommittee began at 2:05pm with Jeff Brophy making a motion to adopt the minutes from the previous LCC meeting on 8-20-2009. Monica seconded the motion to adopt the minutes. Jeff recommended going through everyone's comments and clarifying any remaining questions/issues.

Maryann Kwok stated that she wanted to clean up the definition on Line 59 of page 1, Work/Live Space by spelling out the Florida Building Code and also eliminating the use of acronyms.

Bryan Davis spoke on a concern that Isaac Hoyos had regarding work/live units. Bryan stated that Isaac's main issue is that live/work units are mainly residential with some commercial use and was concerned how density would be tied to it based on the proposed definition on page 1.

Maryann spoke on Work/Live Space and Live/Work Units and stated that there need to be some limitations in place for these units. Bill stated that work/lives units would have restrictions on the square footage and would be counted towards FAR. Maryann wanted limitations set forth by the Florida Building Code.

For the additional density Jorge mentioned that unless a site maxes out the PUD density, only 20 percent has to be vertically integrated. Dodi recommended including a waiver to be used in cases such as small scale LCCs adjacent to existing residential single family, senior housing or small multi-family and the residential component of the development would be transitional horizontally integrated only. Bill recommended that Planning locates the Comprehensive Plan language that dictates vertical integration as a requirement. He wanted to see the specific language that referred to vertical integration or Zoning would unlikely support the requirement. Jorge mentioned that Planning's goal for the LCC is to have vertical and horizontal integration even though the Comprehensive Plan language is broad and only mentions horizontal and vertical integration.

Maryann suggested setting up criteria for when vertical integration would be required and when vertical integration would be desired.

Dodi inquired about having an Electric Car-Service station use in the matrix. Bill stated that low-speed electric vehicle charging stations could be added to next year's amendments.

Jeff spoke on the use matrix for LCCs and suggested putting an 'S' for Special Permit under the Security/Caretakers Quarters in order to be consistent with other districts. Jeff also inquired why convenience stores are a requested use for LCCs when they are permitted in other Zoning districts.

Bill agreed that the Security/Caretaker Quarters should have an 'S' for Special Permit and that convenience stores should be changed to be a permitted by right use in CH and CL FLU for LCCs. Convenience Store with Gas Sales use is going to be subject to the BCC approval in the CL FLU designation as well as Indoor Theaters and Hotel, Motel, SRO, Rooming, and Boarding.

Jeff also inquired about Vocational Schools. Under general consensus Vocational Schools will be a requested use under CL FLU and permitted by right under CH FLU. Hospital or Medical Center and Schools, Elementary, or Secondary were included also as requested uses under CL FLU. Jeff asked why Laboratory Research under LCCs was not either a permitted or a requested use in the matrix for Commercial Low (CL). The change was done to the Laboratory Research in the CL FLU to be a requested use.

Dodi mentioned that on page 11, under Purpose and Intent, the language of variety of uses such as commercial, residential, etc, is missing office use. Bill clarified that office is classified under commercial, such as Medical, Dental, and Professional which all fall under commercial uses.

Jeff asked for clarification on the location of parking for freestanding buildings because the language on page 12 is stating that parking is only permitted on the side and rear of the building. Monica clarified that language could be added such as "or as stated hereby otherwise" which will allow additional parking fronting buildings as it is intended for the provision of freestanding buildings under page 16.

Bill clarified that an entrance to a freestanding building could face the parking lot but the frontage of the building shall be fronting a street so truly the parking would be in the side and rear. Bill added that big-box buildings and all freestanding buildings need to be connected to the street and pedestrian network.

Maryann replied that parking was going to be allowed in the front of the freestanding buildings since Jon MacGillis allowed freestanding tenants in the LCC district. The buildings still need compliance with the architecture and some kind of exposure to the street. Maryann thinks that Jon's intent was to allow the majority of the LCC to be on a main street but a certain percentage could be freestanding buildings with parking in the front.

Bill stated that at the time of approval of the conceptual site plan for the FLU change for the Panatoni site on Lake Worth Rd, Planning allowed a large building placed to the back of the development with a large parking area fronting it. Dodi commented that large parking areas fronting the large freestanding building in the Panatoni site were intended to be more pedestrian oriented and provide an opportunity to be something different other than just parking. She explained that this project was not meant to be another City Place, but rather more of a hybrid type development.

Maryann stated that the 200 parking spaces restriction is to allow large tenants to have parking by the front of the building and the remaining number of parking spaces are to be located to the side, rear or some where else in the development.

Bill clarified that Zoning does not want to have large buildings located at the back of the parcel against low residential unless approved by the BCC at time of Land Use amendments. Dodi replied that no simple design standard is going to make a project. She felt it is a combination of various factors, where the conceptual plan would be general in nature and used to indicate the relationship of how to get to the property and reflect in-fill.

Maryann mentioned interconnectivity and spoke on scenarios when interconnectivity would be required and when it would be encouraged. Interconnectivity would most likely be required for LCCs when they are adjacent to existing commercial sites and would be encouraged when LCCs are adjacent to existing residential. Monica clarified that Planning has always requested interconnectivity on least two sides. Jorge spoke on interconnectivity and clarified that Planning wants LCC developments to not always connect but when an existing site does not have a connecting street then a requirement could be in place to deed the interconnectivity at the LCC property line. He also stated that interconnectivity can be at the pedestrian level.

Dodi asked about the request to provide one main entrance per tenant on those buildings facing the arterial street. Jorge replied that in the last meeting discussions took place that required every tenant facing Arterial Street to provide an entrance point. Dodi responded by stating she did not feel that requirement was necessary. She also said that in a situation when one tenant is facing arterial and main street the entrance is going to be on the main street and not on the arterial street. She indicated that in an LCC the relationship of the pedestrian is with the main street not with the arterial street. Jorge suggested in those particular cases to have the entrance on main street and side facing arterial to provide clear windows.

Dodi suggested that all buildings within an LCC fronting an arterial would be required to provide architectural façade treatment and pedestrian oriented features. Bill said that specific portion was taken out because it can only be placed there if it is defined. Maryann suggested establishing some criteria for when an entrance would be required or explain how to address it when large canals or unique situations are present. Bryan suggested making the side of the building facing the arterial look real not fake by providing pedestrian elements that make the pedestrian use such entrances. Bill concluded by stating that the entrance requirement is going away but the side of the building facing the arterial shall provide a pedestrian system and allow Article. 5.C. to take care of the design elements.

Jeff stated that the R-O-W buffers requirement is contradictory to the request of providing visibility and architectural features to the perimeter frontage resulting in the landscape buffer hiding the building from the R-O-W. Jeff suggested a waiver as a solution. Bill stated that when the perimeter building is built in compliance with the main street standards then the R-O-W buffer could be waived.

Dodi thought the language was confusing on requesting how much of a main street shall be included on a site. The language needs to clarify how the percentage relates to the length and width of the parcel.

Dodi stated she understood the intent behind the block structure; however she felt that it could be problematic. She stated that there numerous challenges associated with designing such as taken into account existing conditions and requirements of different agencies. Maryann mentioned that the block structure was introduced to limit the size of the buildings and access points to streets. Bill suggested including a secondary street and limited access points for parking lots. Maryann stated that maybe it is not correct to call this portion of the code "block structure" but something else related to circulation.

Maryann stated that she had an issue with the chart for sidewalks on page 14 (Table 3.E.8.C). Maryann did not want to include outdoor seating in the chart. She outlined three essential elements for the chart: 1) covered sidewalks, 2) open sidewalks, 3) and areas for trees/benches. Jorge asked if we did not agree in previous meeting on having the outdoor dining areas to be within the footprint of the building. Bill suggested have 6 feet in width for the sidewalk in addition to 5 feet for trees, light poles and street furniture. Jorge asked what about when a retail use is converted to a restaurant, how will outdoor dining be provided. Dodi asked if the 6 feet clear zone was going to be regardless if arcade was provided or not. Maryann concluded to say that sidewalks on the main street are to be 6 feet wide, plus 5 feet for trees and streetscape. Bill clarified that because of the 15 feet setback there are still 4 feet remaining that could be under the arcade or shaded areas that can be utilized. Jeff requested clarification on the width of the sidewalks outside of the main street and secondary streets. He recommended a reduction of the sidewalk to 4 feet wide.

Bryan asked if the language limiting the frontage of the large tenants has to be limited to 200 feet or could it be deleted since large tenants can have 65,000 or more square feet. He explained the result would be buildings being too narrow.

Jeff raised a question regarding large tenants having to be designed as multi-tenant or actually be a multi-tenant building since the language is confusing. Bill responded by stating the large tenants shall only appear as multi-tenant buildings, where the language will be modified in the draft.

Under open space Dodi asked if the standard related to the shaded area was for the shade within the open space or if the 75 percent was related to the front of the building. She clarified that if it is applicable to the elevations, the language shall be somewhere and not under open space. Dodi suggested deleting the word "main" from plaza since it is not used or defined anywhere else in the code language.

Jeff asked for clarification on the parking structure. Monica replied stating that LCC is using the maximum parking standards from PDD regulation which is 1 parking space per 166.66 square feet of GFA. If the development goes above that limit then a parking structure would be required.

Dodi requested for parking spaces to have limited access, connected to pedestrian pathways and have a landscape perimeter. Bryan stated that the parking language needs to be revised. The parking areas could be limited with architectural screening, low fences, etc and allow pedestrians to mobilize between parking areas. Dodi requested allowing creative elements with parking.

Jeff commented if a building façade is in compliance with the frontage or perimeter frontage requirements and it is against the R-O-W buffer, then the R-O-W buffer requirements shall be waived or could allow a different treatment.

Jeff and Dodi supported recommendations to the LDRAB as amended.
The meeting ended at 4:33 pm.