



SPECIAL MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION ON OCTOBER 7, 1996

changes to tie beam and maximum roof height, he believes a 32' maximum height on a one story home should be reduced to 24'-28'. He stated that he was trying to package elements that the community would be comfortable with and while some are in the range of typical and desirable, some may be out of range. He stated that the supplement would be applicable to all districts with the exception that the additional setback requirement would not apply to neighborhoods 3 (Beach Cottage) and 5 (Small Lots).

Vice Chairman Ford requested clarification if the supplement was revised to 5 neighborhoods. Mr. Skokowski replied that he was proposing to combine neighborhoods 1 and 2 and then neighborhoods 3 and 5 and retain neighborhood 4 as its own area, thereby creating 3 types of neighborhoods.

Earl Jones suggested adding the front and rear setbacks to the draft, if it becomes a supplement. Mr. Jones asked Mr. Skokowski his opinion of where he would feel comfortable with the height of a one story home. Mr. Skokowski replied that he felt that a 12' tie beam and a 24'-28' maximum height would be in his comfort range. Mr. Skokowski recommended that the maximum roof elevation be limited to 1 1/2 times the elevation of the first floor.

Bruce Gimmy questioned how the Town originally came up with 32' height for single story indicating that there must have been a reason behind it.

Gary Lanker, Building Official, inquired as to the necessity of having a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) if these recommendations were imposed on the dimensions of the outside of the house. He illustrated that items such as counting area on first floor with height over 15' counting as double diminishes the size of the house. He suggested that by controlling the outside dimensions, the FAR may not be necessary.

Continuing his presentation Mr. Skokowski addressed the item regarding the percentage of window and door coverage. He suggested that 15% be made the minimum and 30% the maximum coverage. Mr. Jones stated that in all previous discussions, 40% was a maximum suggestion and questioned the decrease to 30%. Mr. Skokowski explained that most people build in the 15%-30% range.

Mr. Skokowski shifted the discussion to solid walls. He explained the tool that he developed on a scale of doubling the human scale aspect. He stated that a solid, unarticulated wall or portion of a wall with an area of 8' x 16' would not be permitted thus disallowing the massing of walls. Mr. Lanker asserted that the State Energy Code calls for the ideal house to have no windows and that this might be a conflict to which Mr. Skokowski replied that he would research the

SPECIAL MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION ON OCTOBER 7, 1996

code.

Mr. Skokowski then explained the proposed regulations on window size. He suggested that the height and width not exceed 8' and total area not exceed 32 square feet. He explained that he knew there would be situations where someone would want a front, feature window. He proposed that a square footage limit be placed on one potential feature window.

Mr. Lanker questioned the applicability of glass block in regards to being included as a window as an architect would have to know. Vice Chairman Ford agreed that they would have to determine the applicability.

Earl Jones questioned the proposed 8' door height of and width of 3' stating that it seemed out of proportion. Mr. Skokowski illustrated that there would normally be a door opening around it that would help to keep it in proportion although he did not see a problem with allowing for a wider width on a single door. He explained that the doorway is one way of keeping the scale element under control.

Mr. Skokowski explained page 5 of the handout regarding roof elevation height. He stated that the intention is to preclude houses with roofs that go straight up with no break. This problem would be controlled by the 1 1/2 to 1 ratio of maximum roof elevation to first floor elevation.

Mr. Jones asked Town Clerk Hancsak if she could investigate the reason behind the decision to have a 32' maximum height and 15' tie beam.

Mr. Skokowski proceeded to page 6 of the handout regarding first and second floor area limits. Mr. Skokowski explained that limiting the second floor area would disallow someone to build a massive box like two story house. This would ultimately reduce the mass of the structure.

Mr. Jones questioned the window issue in houses that have double frontage and suggested that these houses identify which side of the house is the front. Mr. Skokowski stated that this could be corrected by fine tuning the language.

Town Attorney Nicoletti suggested the possibility of rezoning the South end from RMM to RSF in that there is quite a bit of rebuilding in that area and that no one is rebuilding multi-family.

Mr. Skokowski mentioned the fourth neighborhood (acre lots concealed

SPECIAL MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION ON OCTOBER 7, 1996

by landscaping) and questioned the applicability to what people can not see from the road. He explained that generally it would still be applicable because there is the possibility that the landscaping could change in the future. Mr. Nicoletti suggested that credits be given for certain types of landscaping.

Mr. Jones suggested a final review of the items that they wanted changed which were the maximum height for single story, the maximum window/door coverage from 30% to 40%, the exceptions for feature windows, and wider door width for single doors.

- V. Final Draft Re: Amendments to Chapter 14 - Building and Building Regulations by establishing a new Article V, Building Standards; to be entitled "Minimum Property Standards," to include a definitions section; maintenance and appearance standards, provisions for unsafe dwelling units, and other structures; allocation of maintenance responsibilities, enforcement and inspections in ordinance form

Town Attorney Nicoletti stated that this would be considered in final draft form ready to submit to the Town Commission unless there were any questions. Gary Lanker questioned the applicability to empty lots and conservation areas. Mr. Nicoletti directed everyone to look at the purpose and scope of the ordinance which is geared toward building structures and not lots.

Bruce Gimmy made the motion to present the amendments to Chapter 14 in Ordinance form to the Town Commission, second by Earl Jones.

Motion Carried - Yea 3.

VI Continue discussions on Amendments to Landscaping Code

Town Attorney Nicoletti began the discussion by stating that the Commission made the decision that single family homes and duplexes be exempt from Xeriscape. Mr. Jones suggested that the Amendments be sent to a Landscape Architect for a professional opinion.

The discussion resumed at the section regarding tree permits which would make it unlawful to remove or destroy a tree without complying with the ordinance. Mr. Jones asked if in the section regarding Rights-of-Way and easements if the clarification of specimen trees was a judgment call. Mr. Nicoletti suggested changing "specimen trees" to "all trees" except those which are considered exempt through the list in section #4 (Prohibited and Exempt Tree Species). He explained that this list of trees was taken straight from the South Florida Water Management.

SPECIAL MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION ON OCTOBER 7, 1996

Mr. Gimmy concurred with Mr. Jones in obtaining a professional opinion from a landscaping architect.

Mr. Nicoletti summarized pg 12, Item E (Application without development order review) by stating that Minor Site Plans would be approved administratively by the Town Manager as opposed to Major Site Plans which would still require a Landscaping Plan.

Mr. Nicoletti commented that a good definition of historic and specimen trees should be included in the Code.

Mr. Nicoletti noted that pg 15, Item K (Issuance of permits and conditions) was very straight forward and that appeals would go before the Town Commission. He concluded by stating his intention to clean up the typos and redraft in a tighter ordinance form.

Mr. Nicoletti stated that the Town Commission directed him to locate a Hearing Officer and that he hoped he would have an appropriate candidate by the end of the year. He expressed his belief that a Hearing Officer would be better than having to go to Court at every instance and that appeals would then be taken to the County. He furthered stated that this is a strong tool in that non-compliance with a Hearing Officer could result in a \$250 a day fine (\$500 for repeat offenders) which could be liened and a foreclosure could occur within 30 days.

Mr. Nicoletti also notified the Commission that he had received an Ordinance from Coral Springs on telecommunication towers. He stated that he would take it before the Town Commission and see what their thoughts are on the matter.

It was decided that the next meeting would be held sometime in the last week in October. Mr. Nicoletti also suggested a joint workshop with the Town Commission to explain the reasons for their changes in the review of the Landscaping Code.

SPECIAL MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING  
COMMISSION ON OCTOBER 7, 1996

VII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 AM.

\_\_\_\_\_

Vice Chairman Ford

\_\_\_\_\_

Commissioner Jones

Attest By:

\_\_\_\_\_

Commissioner Gimmy

\_\_\_\_\_  
Town Clerk