TOWN OF SURFSIDE
PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
AMENDED AGENDA
APRIL 25, 2013
7:00 PM

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: January 31, 2013 (DEFERRED)
April 3, 2013 (ATTACHED)

4. PLANNING AND ZONING APPLICATIONS:

   A. Request of the Owner of Property located at 9341 Bay Drive
   The applicant is requesting to remove the existing Australian Pines surrounding the
   property and replace them with a six-foot hedge to be installed in the front/side of the
   property.

   B. Request of the Owner of Property located at 8925 Bay Drive
   The applicant is requesting to add a garage on the northeast side of their single family
   home.

   C. Request of the Owner of Property located at 8819 Byron Avenue
   The applicant is requesting to replace their existing asphalt shingle roof with new asphalt
   shingle roof.

   D. Request of the Owner of Property located at 9349 Abbott Avenue
   The applicant is requesting converting their garage to a storage room and extending their
   existing driveway.

   E. Request of the Owner of Property located at 8985 Bay Drive
   The applicant is requesting to maintain an existing six-foot privacy hedge along the
   northeast side of the property (parallel to Bay Drive). This request is a result of a
   courtesy notice of violation issued by the Town’s Code Compliance Department
5. PLANNING AND ZONING DISCUSSION ITEMS:

A. Discussion of Long Range Strategies by Town Manager Roger Carlton as requested by Chair Lindsay Lecour.

B. Review of preliminary Streetscape for Harding Avenue.

C. Discussion of Subway Building Renovation and Pass through from Abbott Lot to Harding Avenue.

D. Introduction to Grand Beach Surfside Sign Package [DEFERRED]

6. REPORT OF PERMITS ISSUED/REVENUE REPORT FOR MARCH 2013 [DEFERRED]

7. ADJOURNMENT

THIS MEETING IS OPEN TO THE PUBLIC. IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990, ALL PERSONS ARE DISABLED; WHO NEED SPECIAL ACCOMMODATIONS TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING BECAUSE OF THAT DISABILITY SHOULD CONTACT THE OFFICE OF THE TOWN CLERK AT 305-893-6511 EXT. 226 NO LATER THAN FOUR DAYS PRIOR TO SUCH PROCEEDING. HEARING IMPAIRED PERSONS MAY CONTACT THE TDD LINE AT 305-893-7936.

IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 286.0105, FLORIDA STATUTES, ANYONE WISHING TO APPEAL ANY DECISION MADE BY THE TOWN OF SURFSIDE COMMISSION, WITH RESPECT TO ANY MATTER CONSIDERED AT THIS MEETING OR HEARING, WILL NEED A RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS AND FOR SUCH PURPOSE, MAY NEED TO ENSURE THAT A VERBATIM RECORD OF THE PROCEEDINGS IS MADE WHICH RECORD SHALL INCLUDE THE TESTIMONY AND EVIDENCE UPON WHICH THE APPEAL IS TO BE BASED.

AGENDA ITEMS MAY BE VIEWED AT THE OFFICE OF THE TOWN CLERK, TOWN OF SURFSIDE TOWN HALL, 9293 HARDING AVENUE. ANYONE WISHING TO OBTAIN A COPY OF ANY AGENDA ITEM SHOULD CONTACT THE TOWN CLERK AT 305-861-4863.

TWO OR MORE MEMBERS OF TOWN COMMISSION OR OTHER TOWN BOARDS MAY ATTEND AND PARTICIPATE AT THIS MEETING. THESE MEETINGS MAY BE CONDUCTED BY MEANS OF OR IN CONJUNCTION WITH COMMUNICATIONS MEDIA TECHNOLOGY, SPECIFICALLY, A TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL. THE LOCATION 9293 HARDING AVENUE, SURFSIDE, FL 33154, WHICH IS OPEN TO THE PUBLIC, SHALL SERVE AS AN ACCESS POINT FOR SUCH COMMUNICATION.
1. **CALL TO ORDER**
   Chair Lecour called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

2. **ROLL CALL**
   Town Clerk Sandra Novoa called the roll with the following members present: Board Member Armando Castellanos, Board Member Jennifer Dray, Board Member Carli Koshal and Chair Lecour. Vice Chair Glynn was absent.

3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**
   - JANUARY 31, 2013 (DEFERRED)
   - FEBRUARY 28, 2013 (ATTACHED)
   Board Member Castellanos made a motion to approve. The motion received a second from Board Member Koshal and all voted in favor.

4. **QUASI-JUDICIAL HEARINGS:**
   Please be advised that the following items on the Agenda are Quasi-Judicial in nature. If you wish to object or comment upon an item, please complete a Public Speaker’s Card indicating the agenda item number on which you would like to comment. You must be sworn in before addressing the Board and you may be subject to cross-examination. If you refuse to submit to cross-examination, the Board will not consider your comments in its final deliberation. Please also disclose any Ex-Parte communications you may have had with any Board member. Board members must also do the same.

   A. **The Surf Club, Inc. Site Plan Amendment:**

   The Surf Club, Inc., ("Applicant") is proposing a site plan amendment for a 285 room condominium/hotel at 9011 Collins Avenue which was approved by the Town Commission on October 15, 2012. The amended site plan modifies the elevations of the building on the east side of Collins Avenue. No changes are proposed for the two building on the west side of Collins Avenue.

   Chair Lecour read the title of the resolution.

   Town Planner Shelly Eichner presented the item to the Planning and Zoning Board.

   Alexander Tachmes, Esq., Shutts and Bowen, presented the item on behalf of the Surf Club.
Architect Kobi Karp spoke on the item and showed a Power Point presentation to the Board.
Ree Stoppa spoke about the project and posed some questions about the parking and how many parking spaces the Surf Club will have and if the amendment will impact the traffic study. She also raised a question about potential development to the north of the Surf Club.

Mr. Tucker Gibbs, representing the Surf House, spoke in favor of the site plan amendment.

Town Manager Roger M. Carlton stated that there are no applications from the buildings to the north, however, interest in those buildings was very high for redevelopment.

Board Member Dray stated that she was satisfied with the easement on the hard pack and comfortable with the Town Manager’s explanation.

Michael Conaghan, from Fort Capital Management, answered questions from the Planning and Zoning Board members.

Board Member Castellanos stated that the project is beautiful and it will be good for the Town. His only concern is where the construction workers will park during construction. Architect Kobi Karp responded that construction workers will park on site and that the original approval by the Town Commission prohibited parking in the nearby single family neighborhood.

Board Member Castellanos made a motion to approve. The motion received a second from Board Member Dray. Motion passed 4-0.

5. PLANNING AND ZONING APPLICATIONS:

A. Request of the Tenant of Property located at 9531 Harding Avenue
The applicant is requesting to install a new sign with illuminated channel lettering.

Town Planner Shelly Eichner presented the item to the Planning and Zoning.
The applicant spoke in favor of the item.
Board member Dray made a motion to approve with staff recommendations and asked the applicant to tone down the color of the awning. The motion received a second from Board Member Koshal. The motion passed 3-1 with Madam Chair Lecour voting in opposition.

Board Member Dray made an amended motion to accept staff recommendation with the Town Manager’s condition to select a more compatible color for the awning. The motion received a second from Board Member Koshal and all voted in favor.

B. Request of the Tenant of Property located at 9477 Harding Avenue
The applicant is requesting to install a new sign with illuminated channel lettering.

Town Planner Shelly Eichner presented the item to the Planning and Zoning Board.
Mr. Daniel Tarrab representing the applicant spoke in favor of the item.
Pamela Lerne spoke on the item and stated that the Town let the previous owner have the etching on the glass. This etching cannot be removed and the signs on the glass cover the etchings which have the name of the previous tenant.

Board Member Dray stated that the proposed design is not creative and that the Planning and Zoning Board is trying to make downtown a nicer place and would like to have a more appealing art work instead of the same sign on all windows.

Board Member Castellanos asked where the air conditioning will be placed. Town Planner stated that it was part of the staff recommendation that the applicant could have it as long as the unit is not visible.

Board Member Koshal made a motion to approve staff recommendations approving the wall sign, Conditions 1, 3, 4, 5 and modifying Condition 2 to reflect that the lettering should only appear on the vinyl on the doors and the applicant will resubmit and come back to the board for what they would like to put on the windows understanding that the Board would prefer some type of artistic design. The motion received a second from Board Member Dray and all voted in favor.

6. PLANNING AND ZONING ORDINANCES:

A. Outdoor Dining Ordinance [Proposed Ordinance Attached]:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE TOWN COMMISSION OF THE TOWN OF SURFSIDE, FLORIDA AMENDING CHAPTER 90 “ZONING”, ARTICLE IV “DISTRICT REGULATIONS” AND SPECIFICALLY AMENDING SECTION 90-41 “REGULATED USES” OF THE TOWN OF SURFSIDE CODE OF ORDINANCES ADDING OUTDOOR DINING AS A PERMITTED USE IN THE SD-B40 ZONING DISTRICT; PROVIDING FOR INCLUSION IN THE CODE; REPEALING ALL ORDINANCES OR PARTS OF ORDINANCES IN CONFLICT HEREWITH; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE

Town Planner Shelly Eichner presented the item to the Planning and Zoning Board.

Board Member Dray made a motion to recommend approval to the Town Commission. The motion received a second from Board Member Castellanos and all voted in favor.

7. PLANNING AND ZONING DISCUSSION ITEMS:

A. Building massing related to new construction.
Vice Mayor Karukin presented the item to the Planning and Zoning Board and stated he was not looking for an action this evening due to the complexity of some of the issues. He just wanted to introduced the issue and request the Planning and Zoning Board to begin this discussion.

He spoke about the maximum frontage issue that for years was a maximum of 150 feet. It then became unlimited and in his opinion is not good because then you can have a 570 foot building. It then was recommended to put a limit and the Town was able to do that.
He explained that he would like the Board to look at the various items and consider how to mitigate the construction of large “massive” structures.

Mayor Dietch asked the Vice Mayor how he defines a “massive” building. Vice Mayor Karukin responded that a massive building to him is a 700 unit building that he was told could have been built on the Chateau or Surf Club sites but luckily it was not, something with a continuous wall frontage that takes an entire town block is a massive building and anything above the Town’s maximum height.

Board Member Dray made a motion to direct staff to work with the Planning and Zoning Board members and the Town Commission to schedule a workshop to discuss Vice Mayor’s Karukin’s concerns.

B. Parking Feasibility Study
   (I) Access from Abbott Lot to Harding Avenue
   Town Manager Roger M. Carlton presented the item.
   Architect Eddie Lamas representing C3TS presented the item with a Power Point presentation with the parking study and showed different parking solutions and ideas.

   Board member Castellanos stated that something needs to be done about the parking problem in the Town. He asked how long it will take to build a parking garage. Town Manager Roger M. Carlton responded that it would take about nine (9) months to design and about fifteen (15) months to complete. After some discussion Chair Lecour stated that after the presentation and the discussion she recommends this item to move forward to the Town Commission for determination.

   Board Member Koshal made a motion to forward this item to the Town Commission. The motion received a second from Board Member Dray and all voted in favor

8. REPORT OF PERMITS ISSUED/REVENUE REPORT FOR FEBRUARY 2013.

   Building Official Eddie Rojas spoke on the revenue report for February. He was requested to amend the chart to reflect the size of the columns that relates to the actual dollars.

9. ADJOURNMENT

   There being no further business to come before the Planning and Zoning Board, the meeting adjourned at 10:00 pm.

   Accepted this _____day of ____________________, 2013.
Attest:

Sandra Novoa, CMC
Town Clerk
MEMORANDUM

To: Planning and Zoning Board
Thru: Roger M. Carlton, Town Manager
From: Richard Cannone, Planning Administrator
CC: Linda Miller, Interim Town Attorney
Date: April 25, 2013
Re: 9341 Bay Drive - Hedges

The property located at 9341 Bay Drive has submitted a request to remove the existing Australian Pines surrounding the property and replace them with a six-foot hedge to be installed in the front/side corner yard of the property.

The property is a triangular lot located at the intersection of Bay Drive and Dickens Avenue (pictures attached). During a recent storm event the pine needles washed into the right of way and into a storm drain causing flooding in the immediate area. Staff from Public Works and Code Compliance visited the property owner and discussed the option of removing the Australian Pines to avoid future issues with the storm drain system. The property owner agreed to remove the Australian Pines provided a privacy hedge (six-foot Clusia requested) be planted as a replacement in order to provide privacy. Section 90-59.9 of the Town's Zoning Code prohibits hedges above four-feet without the approval of the Planning and Zoning Board (see below):

Sec. 90-56 Fences, walls and hedges.

90-56.9 Hedges shall be no more than four feet in height in the front yard and side corner yards and ten feet in height in the rear and interior side yards. Hedges may be higher if granted approval by the design review board, on a case-by-case basis.

The increased height of the hedge would not conflict with the Town's Corner Clearance requirements of Section 90-52., therefore, staff recommends approval subject to the conditions below.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval with the following conditions:

1. Applicant shall remove the existing chain link and wire fence and install a new fence on the property consistent with the requirements of 90-56.
2. Hedges shall be planted in front of the new fence and maintained at 6 feet in height (or less).
MEMORANDUM

To: Planning and Zoning Board
Thru: Roger M. Carlton, Town Manager
From: Richard Cannone, Planning Administrator
CC: Linda Miller, Interim Town Attorney
Date: April 25, 2013
Re: 8925 Bay Drive Garage Addition

The property located at 8925 Bay Drive is within the H30A zoning district. The applicant is requesting to add a garage on the northeast side of their single family home.

Staff has reviewed the current application for consideration by the Planning and Zoning Board. In this report Staff presents the following:

- Applicable Zoning Code regulations, along with the results of the review
- Applicable Design Guidelines standards, along with the results of the review
- Staff Recommendation
STANDARDS / RESULTS

Town of Surfside Zoning Code, Applicable Requirements

Sec. 90.43 Maximum building heights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H30A</td>
<td>30 feet</td>
<td></td>
<td>New garage - 9 feet, 11 inches. There is an existing second story on the southwest side of the home that is 18 feet, 5 inches.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sec. 90.45 Setback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setbacks</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary frontage</td>
<td>Minimum 20 feet</td>
<td>20 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary frontage (Corner only)</td>
<td>Minimum 10 feet</td>
<td>13 feet 5 inches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior side (lots over 50 feet in width)</td>
<td>Minimum 10% of the frontage</td>
<td>15 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear</td>
<td>Minimum 20 feet</td>
<td>20 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sec. 90.49 Lot standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Standards H30A</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pervious area</td>
<td>35% (minimum)</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum lot coverage</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35.24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sec. 90.50.1 Architecture and roof decks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unique Elevation</td>
<td>A unique elevation from the main buildings of the adjacent two (2) homes shall be created through the modulation of at least three (3) of the following architectural features: (a) Length, width and massing of the structure; (b) Number of stories; (c) Façade materials; (d) Porches and other similar articulation of the front façade; (e) Number and location of doors and windows; and (f) Roof style and pitch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall openings</td>
<td>10% for all elevations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof Material</td>
<td>(a) Clay tile; (b) White concrete tile; (c) Solid color cement tile which color is impregnated with the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Town of Surfside Adopted Residential Design Guidelines

**Transparency and Void Requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All elevations should provide for a minimum of 10% wall openings.</td>
<td>Minimum 10% wall openings provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New windows should be placed to avoid direct views into existing neighboring windows.</td>
<td>Applicant shall state if windows avoid views into existing neighboring properties.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wall Materials and Finishes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The same material should be used on all building elevations unless multiple materials are a legitimate expression of the particular style.</td>
<td>White stucco</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Roof Materials, Types, and Slopes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roof types and slopes should be generally the same over all parts of a single building.</td>
<td>Slope is similar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted materials for roofs are pre-determined in the Town's Building Code, which restricts roofing materials to: 1. Clay tile; 2. White concrete tile; 3. Solid color cement tile which color is impregnated with the same color intensity throughout, provided said color is first approved by the Planning and Zoning board; and 4. Metal.</td>
<td>White cement tile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Windows and Trims**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Window styles should always be consistent among all elevations of a building.</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame materials should never vary on a single building.</td>
<td>No variation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window, door and eave trim should be consistent on all elevations of the house.</td>
<td>Consistent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation**

Staff recommends approval with the following conditions:

1. Cement tiles shall be a solid color.
2. Driveway must be constructed of pavers subject to approval by the Town Manager and Town Planner.
3. New garage doors must have architectural design and color consistent with the house.
MEMORANDUM

To: Planning and Zoning Board
Thru: Roger M. Carlton, Town Manager
From: Richard Cannone, Planning Administrator
CC: Linda Miller, Interim Town Attorney
Date: April 25, 2013
Re: 8819 Byron Avenue Shingle Roof Replacement

The property located at 8819 Byron Avenue is within the H30B zoning district. The applicant is requesting replacing their existing asphalt shingle roof with new asphalt shingles. The applicant stated on their application that they cannot afford to replace the roof with tile.

Staff has reviewed the current application for consideration by the Planning and Zoning Board. In this report Staff presents the following:

- Applicable Zoning Code regulations, along with the results of the review
- Applicable Design Guidelines standards, along with the results of the review
- Staff Recommendation
Town of Surfside Zoning Code, Applicable Requirements

Sec. 90.50 Architecture and roof decks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Clay tile;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) White concrete tile;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Solid color cement tile which color is impregnated with the same color intensity throughout, provided said color is granted approval by the Design Review Board;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Architecturally embellished metal if granted approval by the Design Review Board; or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Other Florida Building Code approved roof material(s) if granted approval by the Design Review Board.</td>
<td>Asphalt shingle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roof Material

Town of Surfside Design Guidelines, Applicable Requirements

Roof Materials, Types, and Slopes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restricted materials for roofs are predetermined in the Town’s Building Code, which restricts roofing materials to: 1. Clay tile; 2. White concrete tile; 3. Solid color cement tile which color is impregnated with the same color intensity throughout, provided said color is first approved by the planning and zoning board; and 4. Metal.</td>
<td>Asphalt shingle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation

Staff recommends denial as the roofing material is not consistent with those materials enumerated in Section 90.50. However, 90.50(e) allows the Planning and Zoning Board the ability to approve alternative materials provided they are approved by the Florida Building Code; the asphalt shingles proposed meet that requirement (Miami Dade NOA included as part of the application).
MEMORANDUM

To: Planning and Zoning Board
Thru: Roger M. Carlton, Town Manager
From: Richard Cannone, Planning Administrator
CC: Linda Miller, Interim Town Attorney
Date: April 25, 2013
Re: 9349 Abbott Avenue Garage Conversion

The property located at 9349 Abbott Avenue is within the H30B zoning district. The applicant is requesting converting their garage to a storage room and extending their existing driveway.

Staff has reviewed the current application for consideration by the Planning and Zoning Board. In this report Staff presents the following:

- Applicable Zoning Code regulations, along with the results of the review
- Applicable Design Guidelines standards, along with the results of the review
- Staff Recommendation
**Town of Surfside Zoning Code, Applicable Requirements**

**Sec. 90.50.1(6) Converting Single-Family Attached Garages**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garage door or doors may be replaced by a solid exterior wall.</td>
<td>Solid exterior wall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one (1) window shall be provided.</td>
<td>Window provided (existing).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the garage entrance is located at the front or primary corner of the property, landscaping shall be provided along the base of the new exterior wall. When the installation of landscaping results in insufficient off-street parking, a landscaped planter shall be permitted in lieu of the required landscaping.</td>
<td>Landscaped area provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sec. 90.61.1 Paving in front and rear yards in H30 and H40 Districts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paving Yards</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front setback permeability</td>
<td>50% minimum</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front yard landscaped</td>
<td>30% minimum</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Curb Cuts</td>
<td>2 maximum</td>
<td>1 curb cut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb Cut side set back</td>
<td>5 feet minimum</td>
<td>5.15 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb cut width</td>
<td>18 feet width maximum</td>
<td>16 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Driveway Materials                  | Limited to the following 1. Pavers. 2. Color and texture treated concrete, including stamped concrete. 3. Painted concrete shall not be permitted. 4. Asphalt shall not be permitted. | Not provided. |

**Sec. 90-81.1 Off-Street Parking – Minimum Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Area</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking Area</td>
<td>9’x18’</td>
<td>8’x20’; Does not meet Standard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Town of Surfside Design Guidelines, Applicable Requirements

Transparency and Void Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All elevations should provide for a minimum of ten percent wall openings. Wall openings should be defined as either windows, doors or transitional spaces defined by porches, porticoes or colonnades.</td>
<td>The proposed application meets these requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-50.1(3) All elevations for single story additions to existing structures shall result in a zero percent net loss of wall openings including windows, doors or transitional spaces defined by porches, porticoes or colonnades.</td>
<td>No loss of wall openings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Driveway Treatments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town encourages the use of pavers</td>
<td>Not Provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wall Materials and Finishes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The same material should be used on all building elevations unless multiple materials are a legitimate expression of the particular style.</td>
<td>Stucco to match existing building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation

Site Plan as shown provides for a 16-foot wide driveway in order to satisfy the requirement of two parking spaces whereas Section 90-81.1 requires a minimum of 18 feet for two parking spaces. Staff recommends approval with the following conditions:

1) Driveway should be widened to eighteen (18) feet to meet zoning code requirements.
2) Provide updated site data table at time of permit for pervious area and lot coverage as a result of the additional two-feet of driveway.
3) Driveway must be constructed of pavers subject to approval by the Town Manager and Town Planner.
MEMORANDUM

To: Planning and Zoning Board
Thru: Roger M. Carlton, Town Manager
From: Richard Cannone, Planning Administrator
CC: Linda Miller, Interim Town Attorney
Date: April 25, 2013
Re: 8985 Bay Drive - Hedges

The property located at 8985 Bay Drive has submitted a request to maintain an existing six-foot privacy hedge along northeast side of the property (parallel to Bay Drive). This request is a result of a courtesy notice of violation issued by the Town’s Code Compliance Department.

The property is triangular lot located at the intersection Bay Drive and 90th Street (pictures attached). Section 90-59.9 of the Town’s Zoning Code prohibits hedges above four-feet without the approval of the Planning and Zoning Board (see below):

Sec. 90-56 Fences, walls and hedges.

90-56.9 Hedges shall be no more than four feet in height in the front yard and side corner yards and ten feet in height in the rear and interior side yards. Hedges may be higher if granted approval by the design review board, on a case-by-case basis.

The height of the hedge does not conflict with the Town’s Corner Clearance requirements of Section 90-52., therefore, staff recommends approval subject to the conditions below.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval with the following conditions:

1. Hedges shall be maintained at 6 feet (or less) in height.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Chair Lindsay Lecour and Members of the Planning and Zoning Board

FROM: Roger M. Carlton, Town Manager

SUBJECT: Some Thoughts for the Future As Requested by the Planning and Zoning Board

DATE: April 22, 2013

During the April 3, 2013 Planning and Zoning Board meeting Chair Lindsay Lecour requested that the soon to retire Town Manager prepare a “futurist” think piece for discussion during the April 25, 2013 meeting of this forward thinking group which also includes Peter Glynn, Armando Castellanos, Jennifer Dray and Carli Koshal.

This assignment is not easy to complete. To think into the future requires an understanding of the past, knowledge of contemporary issues and a vision for the future which the leadership of a community of many diverse interests will accept. The past thirty months have hopefully provided me with the ability to meet Chair Lecour’s request. Following are the predictions for the future and some suggestions on how to guide and capitalize on these challenges and opportunities.

- The demographics of Surfside will continue to reflect a much younger population, families with more children, greater ethnic diversity and higher median family income. Taken together this means that the demand for services provided by the Parks and Recreation Department will expand. There are many opportunities to meet these needs if the philosophy of isolation from our neighboring communities is modified and if the fear of non-residents use of our facilities is properly managed. For example, turning down major grants for park land acquisition or not engaging with Miami Beach to expand the Tennis Center will keep the 96th Street Park inadequate to meet current and future needs and will keep the Tennis Center too small to meet demand. The solution is not complex… develop rules of conduct for our recreational
facilities, provide adequate security and have a zero tolerance policy towards misbehavior including bullying. A community discussion should begin on this issue and thanks to Mayor Daniel Dietch for recently opening a dialog with the Mayors of Bal Harbour Village and Bay Harbor Islands.

- As the Town population grows more diverse, wealthier and younger, the thirst for knowledge will expand exponentially. The new Town website is a good beginning, however, we have not begun to capitalize on the amazing potential of social media. There is nothing to fear here from litigation due to open government and Sunshine rules. This red herring needs to be buried deep and the future needs to be embraced. Within the next few years the Town population will be nearly 100 percent wired. Our Channel 77 provides access to all key meetings, however, it is not interactive. Fiber optic conduit could be put in place if the utility underground project is implemented and this will attract many future content providers if the underground project is well planned. People want to pay their bills electronically. Surveys that are unbiased and avoid "push" questions can be helpful to developing policy.

- This Town Manager technological dinosaur, is in awe of the potential all this connectivity provides and believes that the annual budget should include a fixed percentage for technology upgrade. It is my hope that Vice Mayor Michael Karukin will continue his leadership role in technology development for the Town.

- As our population evolves, it should be the Town’s responsibility to collaborate with the religious institutions, academic facilities such as nearby FIU and St. Thomas and think tanks that have matured beyond divisive wedge issue behaviors and national organizations such as the Chataqua to raise the level of debate on issues of concern to a high level. High quality discussion amongst people that respect each other and share common goals always ends up in improved public policy.

Corollary to this advance in public policy debate is the need to foster leadership development. While it is a small item in the scheme of the past thirty months, one of my greatest failures was to not convince the Town Commission to fund the Surfside University in conjunction with FIU. This low cost high value program ($11,000) would have helped to develop a “bench” of folks ready to run for office or be appointed to vacancies on standing boards or ad hoc committees to advise on special needs. The election that we had where no one ran for a vacant seat was an extraordinary disappointment that could have been avoided. There is always a silver lining, however, and congratulations to Commissioner Michelle Kligman for winning that special election.

- Appreciation for the arts and incorporation of quality art in the public infrastructure is very important. While the Surfside Turtles may not be high art, the project is a watershed for so many reasons. The Ruth K. Broad K-8 turtle going to the Sandy Hook Elementary Memorial in Newtown Connecticut was a memory this Manager will never forget. The three street ends (95th, 94th, and 90th Streets) funded with voluntary proffers could put Surfside on the world class art map especially if the sculptures and the artistic brick pavers designs are implemented through worldwide design competitions. This program should be developed in conjunction with the TEDAC board.
due to its Tourism promotional value and the Town should work with local arts
advocacy groups such as the Knight Foundation to help with the funding.

- Green is good and the Town should review all programs to ensure maximum use
  of green initiatives such as solar power buildings, energy conservation (LEED) in building
  construction, energy saving retrofits funded through the PACE program, recycling of old
  building materials, and many other potential programs to reduce our carbon footprint
  and reach a reasonable program to address the inevitable impacts of global warming.
  The tree canopy in Surfside needs to be replaced and made universal. The Medjool
  palms to be installed as replacement for the downtown stick trees from 94th to 96th
  Streets on Harding Avenue is a good beginning. This needs to be continued the entire
  length of Harding and Collins Avenues and in the single family neighborhood. The
  single family neighborhood trees should be from a number of varieties to avoid the
  impact of a disease decimating entire populations such as the current white fly
  problem.

- The finances of the Town are in excellent shape with more resources to come.
  With more than $600 million of new construction already committed (60 percent
  increase in the taxable value) and the possibility of another $400 million (40 percent
  more) leading to a doubling of the tax base over a seven year period, the natural
  tendency will be to reduce the millage to pass thru savings to the residents and
  businesses. Before this discussion is held the Five Year Financial Plan must be updated
  not only as an analytical planning tool, but also, to involve the community in determing
  what capital and operational projects are of high priority. Amateur surveys and coffee
  table discussion do not get the public input job done in a manner that truly reflects the
  opinion of the Town residents and business owners. The cost of a professional survey
  devoid of biased questions and implemented to an appropriate survey population
  would be approximately $35,000 if done in the off season for pollsters prior to the Town
  election in March 2014. This would also go a long way to keeping the inevitable
  campaign rhetoric in check much like Politifact in the Herald analyzes a continuum of
  truth to falsehood. While on that subject, it is my fervent hope that the League of
  Women Voters will continue to provide their excellent Candidate Forum and that our
  citizens will attend and provide questions.

- From the stand point of infrastructure, the Parking Structure Study provides an
  opportunity to solve a real crisis with a parking structure (s) that do more than simply
  park cars. The three sites and their alternatives are all game changers for the Town.
  The DVAC parking subcommittee unanimously voted to move this study forward as did
  the Planning and Zoning Board. The Town Commission accepted the study and
  directed new Town Manager Michael Crotty to make specific recommendations. The
  discussion of the need for a referendum failed as a diversion tactic and staff was
  directed to develop a specific solution that could be expressed with clarity in the event
  a referendum became the policy of the Town Commission. This Town Manager has
  done all he can do by delivering the study with good public input helping to form the
  recommendations. It is now up to the downtown business operators and owners to insist
  that rapid responsible action be taken.
• The undergrounding utility project is a first of its kind in the State of Florida using the MGRUF tariff [surcharge on electric bills] to help fund the cost. As such it will require amendments to the tariff supported by both FPL and the Public Service Commission. The community has spoken on this project and FPL has taken its position which is largely in harmony with the Town’s. It will now be up to Michael Crotty and citizen advocates to bring the debate to closure, secure financing and develop a program to minimize the at grade visual impact of the transformers and switch gear.

• The second floor on the Community Center has adequate funding from the voluntary proffers to begin design. The selection process for the architectural firm should seek a world class architect. The process should provide a small compensation to each submitting firm that would show their conceptual design so as to enhance the look of the existing building. The best and most practical proposal could then morph into a full design contract.

If the community wishes to expand its imagination and future thinking, it should consider buying the Regent Palace next door to the north. That building is in play right now and if the Town does not acquire it, the Community Center will be surrounded by two 12 story buildings. If the economics of buying it don’t work, the Town should consider a public private partnership to co-develop the property with the needed expansion for the Community Center on the lower floors and residential above. To meet the needs of our elderly population the residential units could be developed as an adult congregate facility so that seniors could live near their children and grandchildren in Surfside. This is a bold idea that needs to be investigated before the building is sold. The suggestion is to start is with an appraisal of the land value which is not an expensive investment. Time is very short to address this opportunity.

• The classic process in government to look forward is to commission a study with an expensive consultant using a citizens advisory group to help the consultant understand local issues. None of the consultants we have used could be called “expensive” given the quality and quantity of their work. From the “futurist” standpoint, each study needs to develop an advocacy group and that group needs to work hard to keep the study off the shelf. Here are the studies that are ready for prime time or need a bit more work:

1. The Police Department is working on a study of camera surveillance of the entire Town to increase security. These cameras are a critical tool that helped bring rapid arrest in the Boston Marathon bombers case. The study needs to be completed and the funding needs to be found.

2. The Commission has accepted a Traffic Calming Study and directed Town Manager Michael Crotty to develop an implementation plan. This study establishes a model to review the individual and collective traffic impacts of future development projects on current levels of traffic, makes recommendations to improve key intersections including the 96th Street/Collins/Harding pair and provides a mix of potential traffic calming recommendations for the single family neighborhood. The procedure for implementation are governed by Miami-Dade County and the next step is
a series of neighborhood meetings similar to the meeting held for the upgraded traffic calming devices on 88th Street and Abbott/Byron Avenues. This study has the substance to ensure that development in Surfside and our neighbors to the north and south does not deteriorate the quality of life for our residents. The neighborhood meetings should begin as soon as possible.

3. There are two studies related to Tourism and Economic Development. The first is a Five Year Plan for Tourism which will prepare the Town for a massive influx of revenues from the 2 percent food/beverage and 4 percent bed tax that will start to flow in FY 14/15 as the new hotels go on line. The second is the Business Improvement District Study which will provide a vehicle for the downtown owners and tenants to organize and speak with a unified voice. The forces of dissent are already organizing to kill this study by labeling the BID Board as a “shadow government”. Nothing could be further from the truth and this red herring needs to be quickly buried. Hopefully Commissioner Michelle Kligman will continue her leadership in the BID process and many other downtown initiatives.

4. The Parks and Recreation Board has prioritized eight projects many of which are wholly or partially funded with voluntary proffers. This good work needs to be expanded to a Five Year Parks and Recreation Plan that details schedules, funding sources and operational expenses. To be bold once more, I believe that the Town is ready for a General Obligation Bond referendum for Parks and Recreation. The community feels good about itself, there is confidence in the Town’s ability to administer large projects, construction costs are starting to climb and interest rates will never be lower. A Task Force should be established quickly similar to the group that helped formulate the Utility Infrastructure Project and a proposal placed before the voters in the Spring 2014 election.

5. The Surfside Charter has grown duplicative and anachronistic in many ways. The good work of the previous Charter review group needs to be updated. Of particular importance is the term length and alternating terms of the Mayor and Members for the Town Commission. Three Charter amendments were passed by large margins during 2012 in part based on their content, but also, based on an effective value neutral information campaign. The much broader scope of a comprehensive Charter review requires commitment to “sell” the documents to the voters. The public information campaign costs should be included in the FY 13/14 budget.

6. The area around Town Hall is in need of long term planning that combines provision of parking, creating a public gathering place and the removal of the shops and garbage trucks to a site on the mainland. The possibilities of this area becoming another gathering place for the Town are worthy of engaging a design team to get the thinking going. The
project could include a sculpture garden and more efficient office space in a redeveloped shops area.

7. Finally, the need for an Assistant Town Manager is more and more apparent. The amount of work for the Town Manager is simply more than one person can do and ensure the quality that the Town Commission and community demand. Any organization that has broad and complex responsibilities similar to Surfside has a succession plan. The key element of a succession plan is having a bench of talent ready to go. The cost is small in relation to the gain.

I hope that this communication has helped set the stage for the community to think about the wonderful challenges and opportunities that need to be addressed. My purpose was to plant a garden as Beth and I ride off into the sunset. Whether or not to nurture the garden will be a decision made by Michael Crotty and the Town Commission. Good luck to you all and as always thanks for the opportunity to manage this wonderful community.
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