

Minutes of the Development Review Committee

March 6, 2013 **DRAFT**

Planning Director, Don Craig called the Development Review Committee Meeting of March 6, 2013 to order at 10:00am at Old City Hall, in the antechamber at 510 Greene Street, Key West.

ROLL CALL

Present were: Planning Director, Don Craig; Interim Forestry Manager, Karen DeMaria; ADA Coordinator, Diane Nicklaus; Sustainability Coordinator, Alison Higgins; Engineering, Karen Olson; Fire Department, Jason Barroso.

HARC Planner, Enid Torregrosa; General Services, Elizabeth Ignaffo; Building Official, John Woodson.

Also in attendance were Planning Department staff: Brendon Cunningham, Nicole Malo and Karen DeBerjeois.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

DISCUSSION ITEMS

New Business

1. **Development Agreement Modification - 3800, 3820, 3824, 3840, 3850 and 3852 N. Roosevelt Blvd (RE# 00064940-000000, 00064950-000000, 00065060-000000, 00065530-000000, 00065540-000000 and 00065550-000000) – Request for a Modification to a Development Agreement for property located in the General Commercial (CG) zoning district per Section 90-689 of the Land Development Regulations of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Key West.**

Sustainability Coordinator Comments (Alison Higgins):

- As the City has committed to reducing by 15% the carbon footprint of our entire community (including tourists) and this project is essentially the entryway to Key West, with a significant footprint, it is important that this project be as sustainable as possible.
- I would like to see a commitment to this in the Land Development Agreement, which gives the minimum standards that the project will meet.
- I request that the minimum standards be:
 - Green Lodging designation for all hotels.
 - All existing cisterns to be utilized for irrigation
- Comp Plan Issues
 - I will be emailing them a list of sustainability items from the new Comp plan that they should be aware of.
 - Their two LEED team members will receive it on Friday and I will cc appropriate planning staff as well.
- Site Plans
 - Please include a sustainability summary narrative and LEED project score sheet (marked unofficial) for each hotel.
 - Include estimates on water/energy saved due to upgrades.

(Comments by other DRC members will be forwarded to the Planner).

2. **Major Development Plan Modification- 3800, 3820, 3824, 3840, 3850 and 3852 N. Roosevelt Blvd (RE# 00064940-000000, 00064950-000000, 00065060-000000, 00065530-000000, 00065540-000000 and 00065550-000000) - Request for a Modification to a Major Development Plan approval for property**

Minutes of the Development Review Committee

March 6, 2013 **DRAFT**

located in the General Commercial (CG) zoning district per Section 108-91(C.)(3) of the Land Development Regulations of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Key West.

Fire Department comments (Jason Barroso): At the time of the meeting the Fire Marshal office received a civil set of plans on Tuesday March 5, 2013 for our review. The requirements listed below only reflect that information. We have requested a full set of plans including a life safety plan and will be able submit additional requirements for DRC once I have had an opportunity to review them.

- The Fire Marshal office will require a complete set of plans for each project including a life safety plan.
- Each bldg. will be brought into compliance with all NFPA codes, local codes, FBC codes.
- Each bldg. will be fully sprinklered and supervised by a monitored fire alarm system.
- Need to provide alternative source of power (stand by power source generator) for fire pumps and sprinkler system where required by NFPA, local codes, and FBC.
- Developers and their representatives will coordinate with the Fire Marshal's office in reference to the new fire hydrants location.
- Developers and their representatives will coordinate with the Fire Marshal's office in reference to being able to quickly identify the different bldgs. for emergency responders.
- Developers and their representatives will coordinate with the Fire Marshal's office in reference to providing access only for emergency responders through an access gate in the rear of the properties.

Urban Forester comments (Karen DeMaria, Interim Urban Forestry Manager):

- Reviewing the plant lists, I do have objections to some of the plant material proposed to be planted. I emailed a copy of Florida Keys Native Tree list that we give to members of the public when they are inquiring about trees to plant to the applicants. This list better represents what species we are looking for in landscape plans. Particularly, I object to the planting of loblolly bay, youpon holly, and live oak into the area as these trees do not naturally occur in the Florida Keys. This is the entrance to Key West and we want the landscaping to represent the Florida Keys.
- What is the percentage of true native plant species in the landscape plan? Our code requires 70%. A lot of the plant species listed on the plans are not native plants or plants commonly seen to the Florida Keys. My office will work with the applicant in reviewing their landscaping plan with the understanding that there are trees that are common in Key West that are not native that they may want to use.
- I need a list of the trees being removed from the properties (name, size and condition), a list of any trees being rescued/relocated (name and size), and a list of trees that are remaining onsite in-situ (Sec 108-511).
- The plan, as presented, is overwhelming to review. It would be helpful to color code those trees that are remaining on-site and are part of the new landscape and the trees being removed.
- Do you have an irrigation plan and a plan to protect existing trees on-site? These are both required items for final approval.
- Tree Commission Conceptual approval of the landscape plan represents only those properties in Phase 1 A. The two properties in Phase 1 B (3800 and 3840 N. Roosevelt Blvd) are not presently included in our discussions.

FDOT Comments for 3800, 3820, and 3824 N Roosevelt Blvd:

- These properties are included in the reconstruction of N Roosevelt Blvd plans. All three properties have signed easement agreements with FDOT to allow for the building of an ADA regulation sidewalk curbside. There are current FDOT plans in place for driveway curb cuts and any change of these curb cuts should be discussed with Dave Romano, FDOT, at 786-387-3758. The remainder of the properties are not included in this project.

Minutes of the Development Review Committee

March 6, 2013 **DRAFT**

ADA Coordinator comments (Diane Nicklaus):

- Although this is a renovation of existing rooms, I will remind you that 20% of the cost of the job should be delegated to ADA compliance. In hotels of 50 or more rooms or suites, additional accessible sleeping rooms or suites that include a roll-in shower shall also be provided. For hotels with 101 to 150 rooms there shall be 5 accessible rooms, 1 of which shall have a roll-in shower.
- Visual signal appliances shall be provided in buildings and facilities in each of the following areas: restrooms and any other general usage areas (meeting rooms, hallways, lobbies, and any other area for common use).
- Swimming pools must meet the lift requirements of the ADA regulations taking effect in March, 2012, delayed to January 31, 2013.
- Final comments will be issued during the Plan Review process when building plans are submitted.

FEMA Coordinator comments (Scott Fraser):

Immediately prior to the Development Review Committee meeting, the City's FEMA Coordinator met informally with the Applicants to gain a better understanding of the proposal. As a result, only two points needed to be voiced during the meeting:

- Applicant has yet to submit property appraisals showing the market value of the existing buildings to be improved. Until such appraisals are received, staff is proceeding under a presumption that certain buildings won't exceed Substantial Improvement thresholds. However, City staff won't be able to make such a determination until it receives the appraisals and validated Cost of Improvement Affidavits. That information has the potential to dramatically change what may or not be permissible upon these sites.
- Each independent structure will need its own review, requiring appraisals that specifically identify the market values of each structure, along with separate Elevation Certificates, improvement cost affidavits and any other review requirements.
 - Cost of Improvement Affidavits need to be identified separately for each structure. Any costs claimed to be exempt from Substantial Improvement calculations should be tallied in a separate column adjacent to non-exempt costs.
- "Site D" was recently issued an unsafe building notice by the City's Chief Building Official and another by the Fire Marshal's office. However, those notices didn't specify what the structural deficiencies with that building. The specific existing hazards need to be identified by the City's building officials, so determinations can be made regarding what improvement costs may be exempt from Substantial Improvement threshold calculations.

Comments exchanged with the Applicants prior to the formal meeting are as follows:

- General comments for all buildings
 - A standard numbering system for buildings would make it much easier to identify specific buildings
 - This reviewer established an ad-hoc numbering system for these buildings simply for the purpose of this review; which is attached to this document.
 - Pool bars may very well equate to structures and need to be considered as such for FEMA compliance.
 - Although the site plans and property appraiser's office may have combined separate buildings for their own convenience, for floodplain management purposes, each structurally independent building needs to be reviewed upon its own merits. The continuation of a roof line or breezeway between buildings doesn't create a merger wherein multiple buildings are considered one structure.
- Site "A"
 - Where is the pool side bar to be located? Answer: Identified and numbered as building "A5."
 - Applicant advises no intent to Substantially Improve this structure.

Minutes of the Development Review Committee

March 6, 2013 **DRAFT**

- Building “A1”: Design Flood Elevation (DFE) for newly constructed building “A1” is one foot higher than the required Base Flood Elevation (BFE).
 - Was this height intentional (albeit commendable)? Answer: Yes.
 - Is the building’s base to have a filled enclosure with an elevated slab? Answer: yes
 - The plans should note this, since flood vents aren’t shown (nor required with an elevated slab).
- Site “B”
 - Where is the pool side bar to be located? Answer: in an existing structure identified and numbered as building “B7.”
 - Questioned whether Building “B1” might have an unpermitted downstairs enclosure used as retail space. Answer: Floodproofing indicators are present on the structure, which would have allowed its permitting.
 - The floodproofing for this section will need to be reviewed as part of this approval process.
 - Buildings identified herein as “B4e,” “B4w” & “B5” appear to be structurally independently buildings, yet the site plans shows them as a single building. Each building needs to be reviewed on its own merits.
- Site “C”
 - Applicant’s Scope Narrative
 - Should clarify that building #C1 is to be partly demolished, with the remaining portion rehabilitated.
 - Doesn’t mention demolition of buildings #C5
 - Building “C1”
 - Pool Bar
 - Where is the pool side bar to be located? Answer: in a newly constructed structure identified and numbered as building “C6.”
 - According to the site plan, one corner of this structure crosses into the next higher regulated flood zone, therefore the entire structure must meet the higher regulatory standards. Applicant may wish to revisit placement of this structure.
 - A detached food prep and mechanical storage building is proposed for demolition and rebuilding. Where on the site is it located? Answer: Identified and marked as Building “D5.”
 - Haven’t seen any plans for this structure as of yet.

Note - Ad-hoc building numbering system:

- Where possible, building numbers already assigned by the Monroe County Property Appraiser's office were utilized.
- In some instances, buildings appear on the existing site plans/surveys that don't show on the Property Appraiser's records. In those instances the numbering sequence was simply continued.
- In other instances, it seems the Appraiser's staff combined separate buildings for the convenience of their efforts. However, for floodplain management purposes, each structurally independent building needs its own review. In these instances, these combined buildings were separately identified as "B4e" & "B4w" for their east and west orientations.
- On the proposed site plans, where existing buildings are to be demolished and others constructed in their place, the demolished building's number was reused for the new building.

(Comments by other DRC members will be forwarded to the Planner).

**Minutes of the Development Review Committee
March 6, 2013 **DRAFT****

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 11:23am.

**Respectfully submitted by,
Karen de Berjeois
Administrative Assistant II
Planning Department**