



8" fire hydrants throughout the parking lot. Building does not have to be sprinkled. Building is non-combustible. They met with town staff. They have all the agency permits except FDOT. They will make application for driveway access and drainage exemption after Council approval.

Public Hearing opened:

Rolando Rodrigues is an attorney here in town. He thinks this projects fits nicely with Malabar's rural character and urges Board to act favorably. He has reviewed the plans and the package and commends applicant and his engineer for their good planning and design. He supports the project and hopes they approve site plan.

William Carmine, he also spoke with Mr. Milucky today and he had reviewed the plans and is very supportive. Milucky said that the drawings indicated they kept their word and did everything the Milucky's asked – not blocking view of river. Milucky asked him to convey his support with Board and let them know he will be at Council meeting. Carmine has also spoken with other neighbors and everyone is very supportive of the project.

No others to speakers. Public Hearing closed.

**Motion:** Abare / Foster: Recommend Council Approve Site Plan for Commercial Development for Route 1 Motor Sports as recommended by Attorney, Planner, Engineer and Building Official and acceptance of the "no parking" signage recommended by Brian Foster, 3<sup>rd</sup> party fire reviewer.

Discussion: Foster commended Carmine and Teimouri for the project development. Their willingness to accommodate the town on so many issues is commendable. It is well suited for the location he picked and will be attractive.

Ritter said the project went from a 10,000sf building to double that. She asked if they were bringing fill from top to down in front. No. She asked about the difference in elevations. What is the wall for – retention. It is a stem wall; typical building construction on a hill. Door on north side is for emergency exit. Portion in front of building is flat. Teimouri explained the retention plan and said the retention wall will not be visible from the north side. Ritter questioned the location of the dosing area. It is underground and per FDOT standards. She questioned if the 48' cul-d-sac was big enough with the concrete bump out intruding in the back. Teimouri said if it is big enough to have a tractor trailer turn around. Teimouri also said that access can be worked out before delivery. You have plans in place for delivery trucks and if they are followed then you have done your part. Even if you have 3 or 4 access points there can still be problems if the plans are not followed. Carmine stated the drivers call ahead of time now at current location. They have had no accidents in ten years. Have a plan and keep it clear. Combination of planning, instructing employees, being proactive and compliance.

Reilly asked about page L1, landscaping plan; he said the two trees on Hwy 1 – he would like them removed. The line of sight will determine if they should be moved/removed. If it not a requirement he would leave them out so the view of the river is not blocked. Reilly also asked about the distance between hydrants; did they need three. Teimouri said that the fire flow requirement is for 3000 gal per min for 3 hours. You are supposed to have redundancy. It has to do with pressure, not distance. It is very expensive to put three 8" wells with all the fittings. Ryan said in addition you can pull from the retention pond. No, it is dry retention. Water table is 20' down. Abare asked about how the size of retention is determined. Teimouri said there were two parts; first the size of the property and the amount of impervious is determined and a formula is used. The second part is detention – is development creating more runoff. Post construction cannot exceed pre-construction runoff.

Ryan stated the applicant went to the full 20% for the building size. And he is concerned with the 3<sup>rd</sup> party fire reviewer's comments. Teimori their site plan complies with all current codes of all agencies; there may be some things the reviewer would like to see done but they are not requirements. He has had problems with this reviewer in the past. If you take these recommendations and make them requirements, the project isn't feasible.

The Statute says "the agency having jurisdiction" which is Malabar and the site plan meets or exceeds Malabar code requirements. These are just the reviewer's comments.

Foster said they are exceeding the fire code requirement of 20' for driveway width and they have a 24' roadway proposed. Reviewer would like to see a 30' wide driveway. The wider you make the drive, the more drivers will be inclined to park there. Carmine added that water does not put out gas fires; it does not put out fiberglass fires. They designed the building to be non-combustible. The vehicles stored inside do not have gas or batteries in them. Teimori gave example of when car lots have big "sales" – you can't drive in there; those areas are full of parked cars parking in fire lanes and driveways, etc. They have taken all the necessary measures and more-so; they have met all the requirements.

Abare asked Denine if she and Building Inspector looked over all the plans – has applicant met all our requirements, county requirements. She said yes, county for septic and well, ours per code, storm water per SJRWMD. All outside agencies. Attorney Bohne said to make sure the minutes reflect whatever the recommendation and any conditions. He also said you can't impose a wish list on anybody.

Re: Engineer comment: the SW outlets were reversed on plan and that has been corrected. Teimori said they don't have problem with the "no-parking" signage, but they can't do the striping. Abare and Foster agreed to amend motion to reflect staff's recommendation and the one item from outside fire reviewer to put up "no parking" signage.

**ROLLCALL:** Foster, Aye; Abare, Aye; Ryan, Nay; Ritter, Aye; Reilly, Aye.  
Motion Carried: 4 to 1 (Ryan).

- F. ACTION:
- G. DISCUSSION:
- H. ADDITIONAL ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETING
- I. PUBLIC: none
- J. OLD BUSINESS/NEW BUSINESS:

Old Business: Denine said the ALF proposed on Highway 1 has contacted Palm Bay and there is some paperwork being recorded. It is still all very preliminary. Board asked if applicant the ALF was proceeding with waterline. Denine said this information just came in this week. ALF has not submitted a site plan.

New Business:

**K. ADJOURN**

There being no further business to discuss, MOTION: Ryan / Ritter to adjourn this meeting. Vote: All Ayes. The meeting adjourned 8:37P.M.

BY:

Patrick T. Reilly  
Patrick Reilly, Chair

3/23/2016

Date Approved: as corrected

Denine Sherear  
Denine Sherear, Board Secretary