



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

**MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 20, 2009 SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING**

**Prepared by Timothy Sanford**

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

**A. Attendance**

LDRAB Members:

Industry: Scott Mosolf, Jeff Brophy,

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

**B. Discussion**

The LCC Subcommittee began at 2:05pm with Jon MacGillis asking all attendees if anyone had any comments pertaining to the minutes of the prior LCC meeting. Jon then proceeded to make a motion to adopt the minutes and agenda. Scott Mosolf seconded the motion. Jon wanted to go through the draft of the proposed LCC language page by page to address everyone's comments.

Monica Cantor spoke on usable open space and stated that the term is commonly used throughout the LCC language.

Jon stated that line 39-40 of Page 1 could be eliminated since the proposed open space definition is repetitive and already referred under usable open space.

Monica provided copies of the initially proposed density language and new language to be changed as Planning requested. The language was modified for the minimum required density from the maximum density of the PDDs understood as the 100 percent to be now just the 50 percent of the maximum density of the PDD. The requirement to be vertically or horizontally integrated did not change. In the new statement, Planning clarified the additional density language is applicable to the density above the required minimum 50 percent which shall be only vertically integrated.

Bill Cross asked Jorge the rationale on requiring the applicant to do vertical integration after the first underlying 50% of the residential density. Bill stated and as per Dodi's notes that density could be vertically or horizontally integrated and referred to the vertical integration requirement as too restrictive.

Jorge stated that the requirement was made to distinguish this development from TDDs, PDDs, and other types of developments.

Maryann Kwok spoke that the LCC language is more flexible by not requiring vertical integration after the minimum 50% integration.

Jon stated that he wanted to hear Planning's position with requiring vertical integration after the minimum 50%, but agreed that there is not much flexibility with Planning staffs' requirement.

Jeff Brophy made a comment that it is unlikely that anyone would go over the minimum 50% integration requirement. He said that a majority of his clients are looking for commercial square footage and that they would only do the minimum requirement of residential. Jeff further elaborated by stating horizontal integration is more appealing to developers than vertical integration due to overall demand.

Monica mentioned that she was going to correct the pedestrian amenities language to include comments from Dodi, more particularly to page 11 line 47 to make the rules of pedestrian circulation and interconnectivity not only applicable to large tenants but also to outparcel tenants.

Jon suggested to include "usable /" to the title of Open Space in order to leave the language consistent with the definition under Art. 1.

Bill made a comment that there has to be interconnectivity and vehicular connection to adjacent parcels on two or more sides of the subject property.

Scott Mosolf asked what would happen in the scenario when neighbors are opposed to interconnectivity.

Jorge responded by possibly making interconnectivity a condition if the property is vacant and coming in the future to be developed.

Monica read language proposed by Dodi under page 12 line 16 in which Planning did not find the language redundant. It was decided that the proposed language would remain in place.

Jorge requested the language pertaining to gates be included under the interconnectivity design principles for which Maryann stated that language could always be placed in the code to address that issue.

Jorge spoke on part C of Building Form and Design as per Dodi's comments were to not make it a requirement to have the main entrance on an arterial street. Dodi's proposed language was missing the main entrance where Jorge felt the main entrance on an arterial street is one of the key elements of an LCC.

Scott asked if the language stating that one main entrance to be oriented towards the arterial street was applicable to the every building, every tenant, blocks, etc. for which Maryann clarified that the requirement is to be per tenant.

On the perimeter frontage Scott was concerned about the language requesting facades of the building facing R-O-W to provide views of building entrances, display windows, plazas or squares. He mentioned a case when a site faces a canal, then the request did not make sense if the visibility or proximity of the building was not going to meet the intention. Jorge

commented that situation was not typical and in that case a waiver could take care of special cases for canals or dedicated areas where the perimeter frontage request is not feasible or did not make any sense. Maryann asked to add the waiver language for this type of cases.

Monica stated that even if that is not feasible, it is a requirement to have architectural features/designs to make it appear like the front or main entrance and avoid those sides of the building that look like the back.

Jorge made a comment regarding line 37 of Page 15 in that he would like to see language that would exempt any buffer requirements with the scenario of residential within an LCC adjacent to existing residential. There would not be any need to have a buffer between compatible uses.

Maryann stated that she would like to see the content of lines 42-56 of Page 13, Sidewalks, in a chart format in order to simplify.

Monica stated that one of Dodi's suggestions was to delete line 41 of Page 15, which is requiring an alley for vehicular access with horizontally integrated units. Dodi's comment recommended that decision be left up to the developer. Bill and Scott mentioned the Delray Marketplace multi-family scenario and found it not necessary to delete this line.

Monica spoke on parking and explained how the language provides 3 types of parking options. The intent is for a reduction in mass parking areas and to create pockets of parking.

Maryann stated that there are many similarities between the LCC and IRO. She also requested that all the comments be sent to Zoning, so by next meeting all aspects will be covered and all items agreed upon are finalized. In discussing the appropriate time for the next LCC Subcommittee meeting, Bill suggested allowing enough time for industry and staff to thoroughly review all comments. Bill recommended that Jeff have all the comments submitted to Zoning by September 3<sup>rd</sup> so Zoning can have enough time to address the comments for the next LCC meeting tentatively scheduled for September 8<sup>th</sup>. Maryann mentioned if by September 3<sup>rd</sup> the Zoning Division does not receive any comments, staff will assume no changes are needed.

The meeting adjourned at 3:53pm.