



CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE

CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
CITY HALL – CITY COMMISSION CHAMBERS
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 19, 2019 – 6:00 P.M.

Cumulative

<u>Board Members</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	<u>June 2019-May 2020</u>	
		<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Catherine Maus, Chair	P	1	0
Mary Fertig, Vice Chair	P	1	0
John Barranco	P	1	0
Brad Cohen	A	0	1
Coleman Prewitt	P	1	0
Jacquelyn Scott	P	1	0
Jay Shechtman	P	1	0
Alan Tinter	P	1	0
Michael Weymouth	P	1	0

It was noted that a quorum was present at the meeting.

Staff

- Ella Parker, Urban Planning and Design Manager
- D'Wayne Spence, Assistant City Attorney
- Anthony Fajardo, Director, Department of Sustainable Development
- Linda Mia Franco, Urban Design and Planning
- Nick Kalargyros, Urban Design and Planning
- Randall Robinson, Urban Design and Planning
- Yvonne Redding, Urban Design and Planning
- Trisha Logan, Historic Preservation Planner
- Benjamin Restrepo, Department of Transportation and Mobility
- Jamie Opperlee, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communications to City Commission

~~Motion made by Vice Chair Fertig, seconded by Mr. Shechtman, that traffic analysis in the City is inadequate, [and that] current measurements of traffic impact should be investigated in terms of capturing opportunities in the development process to mitigate projects' impacts on the streets; and to also put additional emphasis on capturing amount of scooter and bicycle and pedestrian trips. In a roll call vote, the motion passed 6-2 (Mr. Tinter and Mr. Weymouth dissenting).~~

I. CALL TO ORDER / PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

~~their vote on the Item. Ms. Parker added that the Board had also received these documents via an email from Staff.~~

~~Mr. Shechtman advised that he would like the **motion** to directly address the issue of the Applicant providing 10 ft. of space on Birch Road. Mr. Tinter noted that this space is identified on the Site Plan, although it is not described as a dedicated right of way.~~

~~Vice Chair Fertig expressed concern that there are a number of "unknowns" associated with the project, as well as new information which has not yet been verified. She asked if other Board members wished to defer the Item until the July 17, 2019 meeting. Chair Maus pointed out that a **motion** for approval has been made.~~

~~Attorney Spence stated that if the current **motion** fails, this would result in denial of the project. The Board may defer if they feel there is insufficient evidence on which to base a decision. Should the **motion** fail, the Applicant could move forward to the City Commission with the recommendation for denial; alternatively, a motion to reconsider the Item could be made by a Board member who had been on the prevailing side of the vote.~~

~~In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 6-2 (Chair Maus and Mr. Shechtman dissenting).~~

9. CASE:	T19010
REQUEST:	Amend City of Fort Lauderdale Unified Land Development Regulations (ULDR) Section 47-20.3, Parking and Loading Requirements, Reductions and Exemptions, to provide parking reduction and exemption options for historic resources.
APPLICANT:	City of Fort Lauderdale
GENERAL LOCATION:	City-Wide
CASE PLANNER:	Trisha Logan

Trisha Logan, representing Urban Design and Planning, explained that this Item is included in Phase 2 of proposed Historic Preservation Amendments to the Unified Land Development Regulations (ULDR). This phase proposes amendments that can help incentivize property owners into redeveloping or rehabilitating their properties that have been designated as historic by the City.

The proposed amendments include parking reductions and exemptions for historic resources, such as:

- Allowing a residential property to include only one parking space per residential unit
- Allowing a commercial property to designate the first 2500 sq. ft. of the property to be exempt from parking requirements, with any square footage over this amount to be parked at 60% of its requirement

- Allowing any property within a RAC to be exempt from that district's parking requirements in addition to existing parking exemptions for resources located in H-1 zoning districts
- Allowing parking reduction requests for historic resources to go through Site Plan Level I review rather than Site Plan Level III

The Historic Preservation Board (HPB) has reviewed these proposed amendments. Because changing parking reduction requests to Site Plan Level I would not require nearby property owners to be notified of the request, the HPB asked Staff to look into this possibility.

Ms. Logan noted a verbal amendment to the proposed Ordinance: beginning on p.7 of the Staff Report, under Item E1, letter "C" would be changed to number "2." This item must stand on its own as it refers to the H-1 district. Parking exemptions are only related to adaptive re-use projects for historic resources. Attorney Spence added that Roman numeral "i" should also be changed to letter "a" for consistency in numbering.

There being no questions from the Board at this time, Chair Maus opened the public hearing. As there were no individuals wishing to speak on this Item, the Chair closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

Mr. Barranco commented that Staff should be able to address the proposed incentives rather than having property owners go through the more lengthy Site Plan Level III process as recommended by the HPB.

Mr. Tinter noted that p.8 allows for property owners to count on-street parking spaces toward the parking requirement for residential units in addition to on-site parking. He recommended that the reference to off-street parking be removed in order to provide a minimum of one parking space, with on-street parking to be counted separately.

Mr. Tinter continued that the reductions in parking requirements appear to be generous, particularly in residential developments that typically require two parking spaces per unit. This represents a 50% reduction in residential parking and a 40% reduction for non-residential development. Mr. Restrepo explained that the ITE parking generation manual for residential development in urban areas requires 0.77 space. The requirement for non-residential development mimics the Code requirement for RACs in the area, which can be a requirement of zero spaces within the Central City RAC and an exemption for the first 2500 spaces within the Northwest RAC. The number and total square footage of historic resources within those districts is also taken into consideration.

Mr. Tinter also observed that allowing reductions for these uses in conjunction with the shared parking analyses permitted for mixed-use development could result in providing mixed-use developments in historic districts with double opportunities for reductions. He recommended modifying the amendments' language to prevent further reduction for mixed-use development.

Mr. Shechtman pointed out that the goal of the incentive is not only to address existing historic resources in historic districts, but to encourage property owners to seek a historic designation for their properties in order to take advantage of the proposed parking reductions.

Motion made by Mr. Barranco, seconded by Vice Chair Fertig, to approve with the amendment to the section that [Mr. Tinter] was looking at, with the one minimum parking, taking off the designation of the off-street, and to also include the modifications that Staff suggested on the scriveners' corrections to the sections.

Mr. Tinter proposed the following **amendment** to the **motion**: to add a section C under the shared parking portion of the Ordinance that says in areas where the reduction has been associated with a historic designation, shared parking won't be permitted.

Mr. Tinter clarified that the intent of his **amendment** was for property owners taking advantage of the historic district parking reduction to have access to this reduction only, without access to any additional shared parking reduction. A homeowner may use one of these two options to reduce the parking requirement, but not both.

Mr. Barranco and Vice Chair Fertig accepted the **amendment**.

In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 7-1 (Ms. Scott dissenting).

~~VI. COMMUNICATION TO THE CITY COMMISSION~~

~~• Vote on communication proposed on May 15, 2019~~

~~Chair Maus recalled that at the May 15, 2019 meeting, she had introduced a discussion of parking, which resulted in the following motion to be communicated to the City Commission: that traffic analysis in the City is inadequate, [and that] current measurements of traffic impact should be investigated in terms of capturing opportunities in the development process to mitigate projects' impacts on the streets. However, the motion could not be communicated to the City Commission at that time, as the Board had not taken a vote to approve it.~~

~~Vice Chair Fertig stated she would make this **motion**, and Mr. Shechtman **seconded** it.~~

~~It was noted that at present, new development requires a traffic study. If that study shows the development generates fewer than 1000 trips, the applicant provides this study as a traffic statement. Mr. Tinter asserted that the Board's backup materials should include this study, as well as the City's approval or disapproval of this study, rather than the executive summary they currently receive. He proposed that one alternative to this could be expanding the executive summary so levels of service at intersections and roadway~~

~~segments are included in the documentation. This information would be provided whether or not the project generates 1000 or more trips.~~

~~Chair Maus advised that her original intent was to inform the City Commission that even if the Board is given this additional documentation, the members feel the current system of capturing traffic on the roads is not being measured adequately. Vice Chair Fertig added that the motion should also be intended to identify how a development can help address some of these traffic issues.~~

~~Mr. Shechtman added that the motion should also provide a sense of how many individuals may access a given development by alternative means of transportation, such as bicycles or scooters, using some of the local greenways and bicycle trails in which the City has invested.~~

~~Vice Chair Fertig and Mr. Shechtman accepted the following **amendment** to their **motion** and **second**: to also put additional emphasis on capturing amount of scooter and bicycle and pedestrian trips.~~

~~It was further clarified that this addition would refer to capturing data on the use of alternative means of transportation such as bicycle and scooter use.~~

~~In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 6-2 (Mr. Tinter and Mr. Weymouth dissenting).~~

~~VII. FOR THE GOOD OF THE CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE~~

~~Ms. Parker advised that there has been discussion of the possibility that the upcoming public hearing on changes to the City's Comprehensive Plan might not capture all public comment due to the summer season. Staff recommends that the special meeting on this topic scheduled for June 26, 2019 be kept, and that a public open house be scheduled for September 2019 in order to hear additional comment. The July 2019 Board meeting would be held in October 2019. The Board accepted this proposal by consensus.~~

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Any written public comments made 48 hours prior to the meeting regarding items discussed during the proceedings have been attached hereto.



Chair



Planning and Zoning Board
June 19, 2019
Page 26

Prototype

[Minutes prepared by K. McGuire, Prototype, Inc.]