

branding isn't needed. Service stations have come a long way in their designs and the board has come a long way in what is requested for design approval.

Mr. Balint asked if the foot candles underneath the canopy could be regulated by the board. He said that there was a gas station that provided much more lighting than was actually needed.

Ms. Stanton stated that this analysis did not cover foot candles.

Mr. Elroweny stated that he thinks that connecting the canopy to the building and the column treatments are nice. Connecting the canopy is a challenging thing to do design-wise, but in south Florida in the summer it is a nice feature.

Ms. Aycock stated that the connection of the canopy to the building and the matching the roof pitch of the structure may not enhance what the design of the building is. She thinks the two points should be encouraged, but not required.

Mr. Zbikowski stated that he feels that the requirements are a step in the right direction, but the guidelines should allow for flexibility. Some of the requirements may be better as strong suggestions. It should be noted that there will be push-back from the Architectural Appearance Committee if the product is not architecturally pleasing. It takes up a lot of time at the meetings to work out what can be done to make the gas stations an aesthetically pleasing product.

Ms. Stanton stated that staff will be working with the applicants before they submit to the AAC to encourage them to bring more than the bare minimum in design. The changes in the code that based on this analysis will allow staff to have higher standards for the applicants to begin with.

Mr. Elroweny stated that staff could suggest the improvement of the canopy as part of a superior design in order to seek relief in other areas.

Ms. Aycock added that she likes the adaptive uses that canopies that are not brand-specific can provide.

## **6. SUPPLEMENTAL CRITERIA**

Staff has prepared a comprehensive update to the 1998 Supplemental Criteria. The revisions reflect current terminology, and language that reflect trends in architecture, site design and associated technology that is focused on sustainability. Staff is seeking feedback from the Architectural Appearance Committee on the Supplemental Criteria, which requires adoption by the City Commission.

Ms. Stanton stated that the name "Architectural Appearance Committee" denotes a committee that only looks at appearances of buildings. The board now discusses elements such as sustainability and the function of the development. She asked how the board feels about adding sustainability to the supplemental criteria. The section of the Supplemental Criteria does not have a 'Superior Design' section. That is because the term 'Vernacular Alternative' is in the Zoning Code and will need to be changed before it is changed in the Supplemental Criteria.

Ms. Aycock stated that one element of sustainability is adaptive reuse. The section that states that a mural can be used to break up a long blank wall should mention that a mural can be applied to any wall.

---

NOTE: Any person who decides to appeal any decision of the ARCHITECTURAL APPEARANCE COMMITTEE with respect to any matter considered at this meeting will need a record of the proceedings and for such purpose may need to insure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based. // MRE // 5.25.2016

Mr. Balint asked if there was anything in the Supplemental Criteria to encourage pavers or improved entry features.

Ms. Stanton read the section that references entry features. The section is very broad.

Mr. Balint stated that the landscape section should include a mention of enhancing the appearance of the entry point.

Mr. Elroweny stated that he likes the idea that there could be concessions for more than ten parking spaces in a row if the landscape islands are enlarged.

Ms. Aycock stated that there are some code sections that may be confusing between zoning requirements, landscape requirements, and CPTED.

Ms. Stanton stated that the applicants that feel that they cannot meet certain sections of the code as it relates to building design can apply for an approval based on a Vernacular Alternative. The Supplemental Criteria denotes what part of the applicants proposal the committee should be looking for. This proposal must be substantial in nature.

The Committee requested more time to review the proposed changes. Staff will incorporate their feedback into the final proposal.

## **7. STAFF DISCUSSION OF POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

The City and State rules and requirements concerning ex-parte communication was discussed.

### **G. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business before the Committee, **MOTION** by John Pancoast and seconded by Salah Elroweny to adjourn the meeting. Meeting adjourned at 7:40 PM.

Approved at the meeting held on April 28, 2016.

---

Robert H. Zbikowski  
Chairman  
Architectural Appearance Committee