



## VILLAGE OF VIRGINIA GARDENS

# MINUTES

### PLANNING & ZONING BOARD THURSDAY, FEB. 27, 2020 AT 6:30 PM

Members present were; Chairperson Virginia Howard, Lisa Fratarcangeli, Mayda Miranda, and Member Emilio Guerra. Members absent were Mary Cabeza. Personnel present; Village Architect Manuel Perez-Vichot, and Administrative Assistant Tracy Byrd. Village Attorney Guillermo Cuadra. In addition, owners and representatives for Waterstone Capital, 5911 nw 36 street were present.

#### **Approval of Minutes:**

Meeting Called to order at 6:25pm.

Meeting of MARCH 14, 2019 were approved. Motion was made by member Miranda. Second by member Fratarcangeli. Passed unanimously.

#### **Old Business**

1. NONE

#### **New Business**

1. Annual election of chairperson

No nominations made therefore Chair Howard remains in place.

2. Variance Request

#### **ADDRESS OF PROPERTY:**

5911 NW 36 STREET, VIRGINIA GARDENS, FL 33166

**OWNER** – WATERSTONE CAPITAL LLC

THE FOLLOWING VARIANCES HAVE BEEN REQUESTED BY APPLICANT WITH RESPECT TO CHAPTER 16, SECTION 6 OF THE VILLAGE OF VIRGINIA GARDENS CODE:

1. *Section 1 of Development Agreement Approved by Resolution No. 895 – Variance to allow an increase in the number of hotel rooms from 108 to 133.*
2. *Section 6.6.2 - Variance to allow 145 parking spaces where 160 are required (Existing Variance allowing 132 parking spaces).*
3. *Amendment of Development Agreement Approved by Resolution No. 895 – Variance to allow addition of Limited Assembly Space to Development Program.*
4. *Section 6.2.1 - Variance to allow a rear setback of twelve (5') feet, where twenty-five (25') is required (Existing Variance allowing rear setback of twelve (12') feet).*
5. *Section 6.6 – Variance to maintain parking within rear yard and side yard setback.*
6. *Section 7.1.4(A) - Variance to allow Two (2) wall sign each having a single face with area of 169.5 square feet (Existing Variance approved under Resolution No. 932) (Amendment to Section 2 of existing Development Agreement Approved by Resolution No. 895).*

7. **Section 7.1.4 Variance to allow Single Monument Sign on a pedestal and two (2) Faces of 78.7 Square Feet each.** (Existing Variance approved under Resolution No. 932) (Amendment to Section 2 of existing Development Agreement Approved by Resolution No. 895).
8. **Section 7.1.4 Variance to allow one (1) Wall Mounted Sign with a face area of 32 Square Feet.** (Variance requested to allow for exceeding face area requirements)

Chair Howard introduces the variances. Chair Howard decided to address the requests individually and opens the floor to the representatives for opening explanation.

Attorney Daniel Espino for Waterstone Capital, Richard Wasserstein and Mauricio Bello takes the podium. He introduces the owners and the architect Freddy Perez.

Mr. Espino gives a broad overview of the variance requests and why these are being requested. He explains that the original plan was always to include 2 towers. He goes over the process that has been going on since the completion of the first hotel tower. He also explains how the Holiday Inn Express flag came into being and how some variances deal with the specifics required by that flag company.

Member Guerra asks to speak. He wants clarification on the request for increase in the number of hotel rooms from 108 to 133. He wants to know how the extra rooms are accommodated.

Mr. Espino explains the individual rooms will be smaller on the same number of floors.

Richard Wasserstein takes the floor, owner of Waterstone Capital and speaks. He explains that when they first proposed the second tower, they did not know what flag they would have. The 108 rooms was merely an estimate. Once they got the Holiday Inn Express flag they got the specs for the room size and this changed the interior footprint of the hotel tower.

Mr. Espino also explains the number of parking spaces increases.

Mr. Wasserstein explains that parking availability is a big concern for them. They cannot have guests show up and not have parking that would reflect poorly on their hotel. He explains that they studied the parking and capacity of the existing site.

Attorney Cuadra explains to the board that within these requests are new variances, modifications to old approved variances, and amendments to the existing development agreement.

Village architect Manuel Perez-Vichot asks for clarification of the assembly room shown on the plan and whether parking for that has been included.

Freddy Perez (Architect for Waterstone) explains they calculated the assembly area with and additional 25 units and the parking for that would be 9 more spaces and that is included in the parking calculation.

The restaurant on site will be for guests only. No outside visitors so there will not be additional parking for that.

Additional discussion of the parking issues with the Village.

Chair Howard notes that the first 3 items have been discussed and voting will be at the end. Chair Howard introduces item 4 regarding rear setback. The current development agreement grants a rear setback of 12 feet they are requesting for a rear setback of 5 feet. Chair Howard asks if it would be possible to provide additional feet in the back from the sidewalk.

Mr. Espino explains that this request is in order to provide the additional parking with the mechanical lifts. He also explains that the 5 feet would be for the parking only not the building structure.

Member Guerra asks if notification was sent out to the surrounding areas. He was informed notices were sent and the requests were advertised. The clerk did not receive any letters opposing or supporting the requests.

Mr. Perez-Vichot expresses the need for additional metal screening for the parking. Mr. Perez (waterstone) shows the metal that they are suggesting to use.

The details of the mechanical parking lifts are discussed along with screening options.

Differences between the two types of hotels are discussed extended stay versus more transient/quick stays.

Member Cabeza asks about non guest parking in the hotel parking lot. What issues do they see arising from that issue? Discussion regarding parking throughout the Village.

Discussion over whether the Holiday Inn express in Miami Springs will remain open next to the IHOP. Additional explanation over parking on site.

Mr. Perez-Vichot suggests requiring final landscape and screening review go through the beautification board to ensure it meets the standards desired.

Member Fratarcangeli points out how many residents have had to put out “lollipops” in their swales to stop overflow parking from businesses in front of their properties.

Mr. Espino points out that there is a scrivener's error in the materials under item 2 the notice says 145 parking paces it should say 154 parking spaces. Discussion over parking availability at current hotel and about how not having enough parking for guests would be a problem for the holiday inn business.

Variations regarding purposed signage on site are introduced and read by Chair Howard. Mr. Espino introduces the signs and shows the locations.

Mr. Espino corrects the record regarding the sign square footage. There were errors in the calculations they requested more than they actually require. There is a reduction in the amount. See corrected sign calculations (Attachment A).

. The board opens up for additional discussion regarding the variance requests. Discussion of the sign that will extend partially above the roof line.

Discussion of the sign for the restaurant PRIME 36 – Village architect explains that with the corrected calculation they do not need to ask for a variance for the restaurant signage.

Village attorney explains that all the requests have been discussed and reminds the board that they wanted to add that the landscaping and screening details go before the beautification committee.

Chair Howard reminds the crowd that this is a recommendation committee and that the council will decide.

Member Guerra says he has concerns regarding the set back and parking requests.

Chair Howard says they will vote on the requests one at a time.

Variance #1 – number of rooms

Chair Howard asks for a vote – passes unanimously

Variance #2 – parking

Motion made member Miranda second by member Cabeza. Pass unanimously

Variance #3 – amendment to development agreement/limited assembly – passes unanimously

Variance #4 – setback

Member Guerra makes a recommendation that the council and beautification look at this one. Discussion regarding the setback ensues. Village architect points out that the parking variance and setback variances go hand in hand. You cannot approve the parking increase without granting the setback to create the parking. The parking is contingent on the setback variance.

Attorney Cuadra reminds the board about what types of motions can be made and the approvals and rejections should be consistent. He points out the fact that parking and setback variances need to be consistent. “You cannot recommend additional parking if you are not recommending the five foot setback.”

Architect for Waterstone Mr. Perez points out that they were able to go over the required landscape ration even with the 5 foot setback, instead of only 10% they have 15%.

Member Guerra makes a motion to reconsider section 2 regarding parking. Second member Miranda. Pass unanimously

Variance 2 is now back in front of the board. Member Guerra makes a motion to consider section 2 and section 4 together. Member Guerra’s motion to recommend to the council to analyze section 2 and 4.

Attorney Espino asks for clarification on if this is a “transmittal without a recommendation”. Member Guerra says yes to let the council to decide.

Attorney Cuadra recommends to include variance 5 in with variance 2 and 4 as they are all tied together.

Member Guerra agrees and amends the motion. Second member Miranda. Mr. Espino requests to discuss their requests and explains the thought process behind the original agreement. Motion passes unanimously. No recommendation made on items 2,4, and 5.

Variance #6 – wall mounted sign for hotel

Motion to approve by member Miranda second member cabeza. Passes unanimously.

Variance #7 – Monument sign

Motion to approve member Fratarcangeli. Architect Perez-Vichot asks that they confirm that the 10 ft setback is not from the base of the sign. Attorney Espino says they can make that a condition and it can be confirmed prior to building permits. Motion passes unanimously

Variance #8 – restaurant sign

Motion to approve member Fratarcangeli, second member Miranda, pass unanimously.

Meeting ends 8:35 PM