

**PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
CITY HALL – CITY COMMISSION CHAMBERS
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 21, 2017 – 6:30 P.M.**

Cumulative

Board Members	Attendance	June 2017-May 2018	
		Present	Absent
Leo Hansen, Chair	P	1	0
Catherine Maus, Vice Chair (6:38)	P	1	0
John Barranco	P	1	0
Stephanie Desir-Jean	A	0	1
Howard Elfman	P	1	0
Steven Glassman	A	0	1
Rochelle Golub	P	1	0
Richard Heidelberg	P	1	0
Alan Tinter	P	1	0

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

Staff

Ella Parker, Urban Design and Planning Manager
D'Wayne Spence, Assistant City Attorney
Gus Ceballos, Assistant City Attorney
Eric Engmann, Urban Design and Planning
Jim Hetzel, Urban Design and Planning
Randall Robinson, Urban Design and Planning
Lorraine Tappen, Urban Design and Planning
Benjamin Restrepo, Department of Transportation and Mobility
Brigitte Chiappetta, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communications to City Commission

None.

I. CALL TO ORDER / PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Hansen called the meeting to order at 6:33 p.m. and all recited the Pledge of Allegiance. The Chair introduced the Board members present, including new members John Barranco and Alan Tinter, and Urban Design and Planning Manager Ella Parker introduced the Staff members present.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES / DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Motion made by Mr. Heidelberger, seconded by Ms. Golub, to approve. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Chair Hansen advised that the Applicant of Items 4 and 5 has requested they be deferred to the July 2017 meeting.

Motion made by Mr. Elfman, seconded by Mr. Barranco, to defer [Items] 4 and 5. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

III. PUBLIC SIGN-IN / SWEARING-IN

At this time all individuals wishing to speak on Agenda Items were sworn in.

IV. AGENDA ITEMS

Index

<u>Case Number</u>	<u>Applicant</u>
1. Z17004* **	HS 17 th Street, LLC
2. V16005**	HS 17 th Street, LLC
3. R16073* **	HS 17 th Street, LLC
4. V17001**	2980 Investments, LLC (deferred)
5. ZR17003* **	2980 Retail and Restaurant Building (deferred)
6. R17009**	Paul Vigil
7. L17002* **	Bridge Development LLC (Bridge Logistics)
8. T17003*	City of Fort Lauderdale

Special Notes:

Local Planning Agency (LPA) items (*) – In these cases, the Planning and Zoning Board will act as the Local Planning Agency (LPA). Recommendation of approval will include a finding of consistency with the City's Comprehensive Plan and the criteria for rezoning (in the case of rezoning requests).

Quasi-Judicial items ()** – Board members disclose any communication or site visit they have had pursuant to Section 47-1.13 of the ULDR. All persons speaking on quasi-judicial matters will be sworn in and will be subject to cross-examination.

It was requested that Items 1, 2, and 3 be presented together and voted upon separately. Assistant City Attorney Gus Ceballos advised that the criteria for each Item should be reviewed independently of the criteria for other Items.

Chair Hansen advised that individuals speaking on their own behalf are allotted three minutes of speaking time, and persons representing groups or organizations may speak for five minutes.

1. CASE: Z17006

REQUEST: * ** Rezone from Residential Office (RO) to Boulevard Business (B-1)

APPLICANT: HS 17th Street, LLC.

PROJECT NAME: 501 Seventeen Rezoning

GENERAL LOCATION: 501 17th Street

ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lot 4-12, Lots 15-21, and a portion of Lots 13 and 14, Block 64-L, Croissant Park, according to the plat thereof, as recorded in Plat Book 4, Page 28, of the public records of Broward County, Florida.

CURRENT ZONING: Boulevard Business (B-1) and Residential Office (RO)

PROPOSED ZONING Boulevard Business (B-1)

LAND USE: South Regional Activity Center (S-RAC)

COMMISSION DISTRICT: 4

CASE PLANNER: Randall Robinson

2. CASE: V16005

REQUEST: ** Right-of-Way Vacation

APPLICANT: HS 17th Street, LLC.

PROJECT NAME: 501 Seventeen Right-of-Way Vacation

GENERAL LOCATION: Alley west of Federal Highway, east of SE 4th Avenue, south of SE 16th Court, and north of SE 17th Street

ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION: A 15-foot alley lying within Block 64-L, East Avenue Section of Croissant Park, according to the plat thereof as recorded in Plat Book 7, Page 57, of the public records of Broward County, Florida.

ZONING DISTRICT: Boulevard Business (B-1) and Residential Office

LAND USE: South Regional Activity Center (S-RAC)

COMMISSION DISTRICT: 4

CASE PLANNER: Randall Robinson

3. CASE: R16073

REQUEST: * ** Site Plan Level III Review: Conditional Use for Mixed-Use Development with 244 Residential Units and 38,592 Square-Foot Grocery Store

APPLICANT: HS 17th Street, LLC.

PROJECT NAME: 501 Seventeen

GENERAL LOCATION: 501 17th Street

ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION: A portion of Lots 4-21, Block 64-L, Croissant Park, according to the Plat thereof, recorded in Plat Book 4, Page 28 of the Public Records of Broward County, Florida.

ZONING DISTRICT: Boulevard Business (B-1) and Residential Office (RO)

LAND USE: South Regional Activity Center (S-RAC)

COMMISSION DISTRICT: 4

CASE PLANNER: Randall Robinson

Disclosures were made at this time.

Robert Lochrie, representing the Applicant, explained that Item 1 deals with the rezoning of the subject parcel, while Item 2 requests an alley vacation and Item 3 requests Site Plan approval with conditional use. He showed an aerial view of the property, which consists of 3.2 acres located within the South Regional Activity Center (South RAC). This area is intended to serve as a mixed-use district encouraging high-quality commercial, retail, and multi-family development.

The proposal is for a mixed-use project including a ground-floor grocery store, with residential development above the store and on the property's west side. Parking will be located above the grocery store as well. Mr. Lochrie advised that this is the first such mixed-use project proposed for the South RAC in the last 11 years.

The parcel is currently divided into two different zoning districts: the east portion is Business (B-1), while the west is Residential Office (RO). The rezoning request would zone the entire property B-1 for consistency. The alley to be vacated presently serves an existing restaurant, which will be razed as part of the project, so the alley would no longer be necessary for public purpose. The Applicant accepts Staff's recommended conditions for the vacation Application.

The third Application, which is for Site Plan approval, requests a Whole Foods grocery store on the eastern half of the project, for which a 20-year lease has been executed. It includes a ground-floor lobby feature and escalators to move customers up to the parking area. Outdoor seating is included along Federal Highway, as well as landscape strips and a garage. The store's frontage along Federal Highway will be 45 ft. tall, with a tower portion of 82 ft. on the corner. B-1 zoning allows up to 150 ft.

The garage is lined with residential units, which are located above the grocery store. Mr. Lochrie showed a rendering of the Site Plan, noting that the storefront on Federal Highway is set back 34 ft. from the curb. A 10 ft. covered arcade includes seating and tables for dining, and a 4.8 to 4.6 ft. landscaped area includes planters. Pedestrian entrances to the site are located on its south side. A covered arcade, sidewalk, and landscape buffer are also located on the west side. A ramp from 17th Street moves

traffic directly up to the garage, where grocery store parking is on levels 2 and 3 and residential parking is above.

Mr. Lochrie noted that neighbors to the property had expressed concern with the ground floor parking proposed in an earlier Site Plan, as it could contribute to congestion. The dedicated ramp with no ground floor parking alleviates this issue. Another requested change is a raised traffic barrier, which requires outgoing traffic to move to the right on 17th Street. Street trees are located in the landscaped areas all around the project.

Moving toward 4th Avenue, the parcel has been enhanced to provide a larger pedestrian plaza than originally planned. It includes a water feature and a courtyard of the residential component, with a landscaped amenity area and pool.

The Applicant also made offsite improvements in the subject area by connecting the site to properties to the west, including those on Andrews Avenue. Sidewalk connections extend across 4th Avenue, where landscaping enhancements and street trees have been added. Pedestrian access connects the subject site with 17th Street and existing sidewalks.

Residential units along 16th Court will be ground-floor walk-up units, with entrances onto the street, landscape buffers, and 10 parallel parking spaces. The Applicant will also make drainage improvements along this street. Parking above the grocery store will be tiered back as it moves further west. In response to neighborhood concerns, a second entrance and exit onto the site, with a dedicated ramp, is located on 16th Court. Mr. Lochrie noted that this provides multiple ways to access, exit, and move through the site.

The Applicant also proposes three offsite traffic improvements:

- Intersection improvements at 3rd Avenue and 17th Street
- Change storage lanes along 17th Street approaching Federal Highway
- Change northbound Federal Highway at 17th Street

Mr. Lochrie explained that these improvements not only assist with the traffic generated by the project, but improve upon existing issues identified in the field. The Applicant's traffic consultant proposes allowing for a U-turn at 3rd Avenue and 17th Street, where there is sufficient right-of-way for this improvement. A dedicated turn lane to the west will improve storage of cars moving along 17th Street and turning left onto Federal Highway. The final improvement will enable a left turn on 3rd Avenue for cars moving northbound on 17th Street by adding 145 ft. of storage. Storage will also be added for traffic moving eastbound on 18th Street.

The Site Plan has been vetted by multiple City Departments for adequacy of infrastructure improvements, landscaping enhancements, park impact fees, and school capacity. The Applicant has met with the Poinciana Park Civic Association and has received a letter of support from this organization.

Chair Hansen observed that the prospective purchase of Whole Foods by Amazon, Inc. may result in Amazon goods being delivered to Whole Foods stores. He asked how this might affect the proposed Site Plan. Mr. Lochrie advised that while he could not speculate on this possibility at this time, the Whole Foods store is not designed to serve as an Amazon distribution center.

Mr. Tinter asked if proposed improvements near the site were vetted by the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT). Mr. Lochrie replied that the project's traffic report was reviewed by FDOT as well as the City and a third-party consultant. The Applicant's backup materials include a pre-application letter from FDOT.

Mr. Tinter also asked if there is a need for a right turn lane moving southbound near the project. Mr. Lochrie explained that this cannot be incorporated into the site due to the needs of the tenant; however, FDOT does not feel this lane is necessary. He noted that most southbound traffic will be able to enter the store from 16th Court. It was also clarified that the extension of an eastbound left turn lane has been deemed sufficient for storage and is not expected to interfere with queueing for the site's driveway.

Mr. Tinter moved on to address parking, pointing out that plans for the project seem to show that both entrances to the project are gated. He asked if the Applicant plans to collect parking fees from customers accessing Whole Foods. Mr. Lochrie stated that while this is unlikely, the site has been designed to allow this possibility. There are gates at the ground and third floor levels of the garage to ensure that parking for residents and grocery store customers are separated.

Mr. Tinter observed that because both ramps access the first parking level of the garage, both residents and Whole Foods customers may move through this area. He expressed concern that a resident could be held up behind a vehicle or vehicles that are paying for parking due to the lack of a bypass lane. He also noted that there is no turnaround area for vehicles that might access gates by accident. Mr. Lochrie replied that this would likely be addressed using the time stamp from a pay station receipt.

Mr. Tinter commented that there were more than 300 parking spaces for Whole Foods on the first three levels of the garage against a parking requirement of 193, while there are only 304 spaces in the residential parking area against a requirement of over 400. Mr. Lochrie replied that the residential component of the project appears to be "overparked" relative to its number of units, and the City considers the parking requirements as a whole rather than separately. It was noted that a secondary gate is located between the second and third levels of parking; the second level of parking for Whole Foods is intended to be shared between residential and commercial users.

Vice Chair Maus asked if the entrance/exit on 16th Court would accommodate trucks using the site. Mr. Lochrie clarified that trucks will have a separate entrance, exit, and driveway.

Mr. Barranco returned to the traffic devices used on the ramps, asking why a traffic control device would be necessary when accessing the first level of parking. Mr. Lochrie replied that this was included in the plan in the event that the Applicant determined it would be necessary. Part of the parking plan is intended to deter commercial customers leaving their cars at the site for longer-term parking.

Randall Robinson, representing Urban Design and Planning, stated that the Site Plan Level IV Application for right-of-way vacation between SE 16th Court and 17th Street must meet five review criteria:

- Right-of-way is no longer needed for public purpose
- Alternate routes are available if needed and cause no adverse effects
- Closure of right-of-way provides safe areas for vehicles to turn and exit
- Closure of right-of-way shall not adversely affect pedestrian traffic
- All utilities within the right-of-way have been or will be relocated

Mr. Robinson concluded that the Application has met all of these criteria.

Mr. Robinson next addressed the rezoning Application, which is also Site Plan Level IV. The request would rezone a 2.56 acre parcel of land between SE 16th Court and SE 17th Street from RO to B-1, allowing for a mixed-use project that incorporates a grocery store and 243 residential units. Review criteria for rezoning are as follows:

- Proposed zoning district is consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan
- Changes anticipated by the proposed rezoning will not adversely affect the character of development in or near the area under consideration
- The character of the area proposed is suitable for the uses permitted in the proposed zoning district and is compatible with surrounding districts and uses

Staff has found the Application to meet these criteria.

Mr. Robinson moved on to Site Plan Level III review, which is more complex than the other Applications, as it is for a mixed-use development with 243 residential units and 48,212 sq. ft. of retail use. Mixed-use development is permitted when a development site has a commercial land use designation to encourage diversity of compatible land uses on the same development parcel. These may include a mixture of residential uses and commercial, retail, sales, or office uses. The City may permit mixed-use development as a conditional use consistent with the provisions of the Land Use Plan. The permitted density for mixed-use development is 50 dwelling units per acre. The proposed development has a density of 49.2 units per acre.

For mixed-use developments with more than 100 residential units, 150 sq. ft. of open space is required per unit. A mixed-use development shall include a public plaza with pedestrian amenities such as landscaping, benches, and fountains. The plaza shall be a minimum of 1400 gross sq. ft. The subject project consists of 243 units, which necessitates a requirement of 36,450 sq. ft. of open space.

The criteria for conditional use in B-1 districts are as follows:

- Impact on abutting properties is evaluated under neighborhood compatibility requirements
- Consideration must be given to the design capacity of adjacent roadways
- Developer must show, and the reviewing body must find, that the location of the use or structure is not in conflict with the City's Comprehensive Plan

There being no further questions from the Board at this time, Chair Hansen opened the public hearing.

Richard Trodella, private citizen, expressed concern with the proposed project's effect on traffic flow in and out of the site. He did not feel the proposed ramps would be sufficient to keep traffic moving. He also requested more information about the proposed parking on the south side of SE 16th Court, for which a swale, sidewalk, and additional landscaping buffer are proposed. Mr. Trodella concluded by asking how many trucks are expected to enter and exit the subject site each day.

Mr. Lochrie responded that the existing right-of-way on 16th Court is 5 ft. short, which means an additional 5 ft. will be dedicated to the City by the Applicant. This will result in the addition of another 15 total ft. of infrastructure to the right-of-way on 16th Court, bringing the paved width of 16th Court to 50 ft. for drive aisles and parallel parking when improvements are completed. Each lane will be 11 ft. wide.

Mr. Lochrie continued that he did not know the estimated number of trucks that would be used to supply Whole Foods on a daily basis. Deliveries will not be accepted before 7 a.m. The store will be open from 8 a.m. to 10 p.m.

Scott Colunay, private citizen, stated that he owns and manages multiple properties in the subject area. He characterized the subject corner as blighted, advising that the proposed project is a good opportunity for the neighborhood and the City.

David Brandwein, private citizen, commented that the project will improve the subject area and surrounding neighborhood.

As there were no other individuals wishing to speak on this Item, Chair Hansen closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.

Mr. Barranco asked if the truck delivery time restrictions were conditions added by Staff to the Site Plan. Mr. Robinson replied that these were not Staff conditions, although the Board may add this condition if they wish.

Mr. Barranco also asked if the open space requirements were quantified strictly at the ground level. Mr. Robinson confirmed this, noting that the park located across the street

from the site, as well as the setbacks to the building and landscaping on the roof, are in addition to these requirements.

Ms. Golub noted that the Applicant has also stated that they met with the Harbordale and Lauderdale Harbors Civic Associations in addition to the Poinciana Park Civic Association. Mr. Robinson advised that Staff was not directly contacted by any neighborhood associations with regard to the project. Staff was satisfied with the Applicant's public outreach.

Chair Hansen also expressed concern with the delivery truck loading/unloading issue, pointing out that trucks will be backing onto the site from 16th Court with no turning radius. Mr. Tinter advised that the Application includes a diagram of the turning movement for delivery vehicles, which shows that the maneuvers will not interfere with the two ramps to automobile parking.

Motion made by Vice Chair Maus, seconded by Ms. Golub, to approve Item 1, rezoning, with Staff conditions. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 7-0.

Motion made by Vice Chair Maus, seconded by Ms. Golub, to approve Item 2, right-of-way vacation. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 7-0.

Motion made by Vice Chair Maus, seconded by Ms. Golub, to approve Item 3, Site Plan, with Staff conditions.

Mr. Tinter requested the addition of another condition to approval of Item 3: to construct the outside improvements that were recommended by [the Applicant's] traffic consultant. Vice Chair Maus and Ms. Golub accepted this amendment.

In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 7-0.

6. CASE:	R17009
REQUEST: **	Site Plan Level III: Conditional Use for 6-Unit Residential Cluster Development
APPLICANT:	Paul Vigil
PROJECT NAME:	Sailboat Bend Residential Development
GENERAL LOCATION:	1017 SW 4th Street
ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION:	Waverly Place 2-19 D Lot 7,9 Block 107
ZONING DISTRICT:	Residential Multifamily Low Rise/Medium High Density (RML-25)
CURRENT LAND USE:	Medium-High Density
COMMISSION DISTRICT:	2

Disclosures were made at this time.

Seth Yeslow, representing the Applicant, explained that the request is for a six-unit residential development in the Sailboat Bend neighborhood. The existing site includes two historic structures: a two-story single-family residence and a one-story accessory cottage. An existing shed structure and garage structure were added onto the two-story residence. These are scheduled to be demolished.

The project's goal was redevelopment of the site while preserving the existing historic structures and creating a project that felt like a single-family residential development. The six proposed units have been broken up into three separate buildings with two units each. The buildings will be on different areas on the site with different orientations, which allowed for greater setbacks on all sides of the site.

Another key feature of the project is its parking. While 16 spaces are necessary, only two previously existed for the two-story residence. Of the 14 new spaces, only four are located along SW 4th Street, which allows for preservation of the residential character, increased setbacks, and ample landscaping. Garage structures have been added to Building C, which is located on the site's northwest corner. A one-car garage structure was added to each unit, with a second space is located in front. The remaining spaces are coupled for each unit with a landscape buffer between them.

The building's architecture is in the West Indies style. Mr. Yeslow showed renderings of the project, noting features such as awnings and low sloped roofs, which are comparable in mass and scale to the existing two-story structure and other houses on nearby lots. There are additional setbacks on the middle two buildings, B and C, at the ground level, with minor setbacks of 3 ft. on their third level to meet setback requirements above the 22 ft. elevation.

The Applicant has worked closely with Staff on the approval process, and has met with the Sailboat Bend community, which expressed support for the project. The Applicant has also met with the Historic Preservation Board and received unanimous approval.

Mr. Robinson of Urban Design and Planning stated that the request is for Site Plan Level III review for a residential cluster development. The Applicant proposes a six-unit development in the Sailboat Bend Historic District. The project will consist of three three-story residential buildings with two units each.

The Application is subject to cluster development criteria, adequacy requirements, and neighborhood compatibility requirements. Mr. Robinson reviewed the cluster development criteria:

- A cluster building is defined as one or more cluster buildings and associated amenities located on the same development site
- The subject project must adhere to the minimum lot size required by the zoning district in which the cluster development is located
- The development must meet the same yard requirements as the zoning district in which it is located (RMM-25)
- A minimum of 25% of the front façade shall be set back a minimum of 5 additional ft. from the rest of the front façade, shall be centered on the building, and shall have a roof line that is a minimum of 5 ft. lower than the highest adjacent roof line
- Cluster buildings shall be designed in an architectural style compatible with and complementary to adjacent structures, with architectural features considered in the context of the site

The resulting concept incorporates a typical single-family residence while creating a pedestrian-friendly environment, with architectural features including gabled roof systems, asphalt shingles, exterior siding, trellis elements, and window awnings and shutters. The project is generally consistent with the height and scale of building types in its vicinity.

Mr. Tinter requested clarification of the use of the cottage on-site. Mr. Yeslow replied that it is a separate accessory structure and is not counted as a dwelling unit. It will be tied to the existing two-story residence or sold to one of the cluster unit owners.

Mr. Barranco expressed concern with the West Indies architectural style, pointing out that the existing structures are more similar to a “cracker” style. He was not certain the West Indies style was complementary to surrounding buildings, noting the maximum roof height and the pitch of the roof may not be compatible with nearby structures. Chair Hansen stated that he shared these concerns.

Ms. Golub observed that the existing historic residential structure is surrounded by an abutting deck, resulting in massing of cluster homes around the historic building, with little flow. She concluded that because an Applicant is permitted to build cluster homes to a certain height, this does not mean s/he should do so if the homes are not compatible with the neighborhood.

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

Mr. Heidelberger commented that he has previously served on the Historic Preservation Board, and advised that when a new structure is built, it should look very different from historic structures. He continued, however, that the historic cottage is only one story and has a low-pitched roof, while the new structures are built to the maximum allowable

height in order to include three floors. He concluded that he was disappointed by the proposed plan.

Mr. Tinter asked if the proposed project meets all zoning requirements, other than neighborhood compatibility, for cluster developments in the subject district. Mr. Robinson confirmed this. Ms. Golub added that while the intent of a cluster development is to provide shared amenities and create an environment, the project does not include sufficient spacing for circulation between the deck and the historic building. Attorney Ceballos advised that the Board is not legally bound to accept the approval of the project by the Sailboat Bend Civic Association and the Historic Preservation Board.

Mr. Barranco reiterated his concern with the project's architecture, stating that while he did not feel the Applicant is required to copy the existing architectural style, s/he may incorporate existing components such as the scale of the building or reduce the size of the buildings' top floors. He asked if the Applicant may be willing to address these concerns and consider requesting deferral.

Mr. Yeslow stated that he would like to hear additional input from Staff with regard to how the Planning and Zoning Board's concerns might affect the comments of the Historic Preservation Board (HPB).

Vice Chair Maus asked if the Application would be precluded from coming back to the Board at a later date if the Board does not vote in favor of it at this time. Ms. Parker replied that denial would not preclude the Item, and added that any changes to the plans would need to be presented once more to the HPB as well.

Motion made by Ms. Golub, seconded by Vice Chair Maus, to approve with Staff conditions.

Attorney Spence clarified that for quasi-judicial proceedings, a **motion** to deny must be made in the affirmative.

Ms. Golub **withdrew** the **motion** at this time.

Motion made by Ms. Golub, seconded by Mr. Heidelberger, to disapprove the project with Staff conditions.

Mr. Yeslow requested that the Item be deferred until next month. Ms. Golub agreed to table her **motion** pending further discussion of deferral.

Motion made by Vice Chair Maus, seconded by Mr. Barranco, to discuss the deferment.

Ms. Golub commented that the issue with potential deferral of the Item is with the concept of the Application rather than its details. If the Applicant chooses to amend this

concept, such as the project's layout, density, and height, this would result in an entirely new plan, which should be reviewed as such by Staff. Chair Hansen agreed, noting that the primary issue appears to be neighborhood compatibility.

The Board members also discussed the need for the Applicant to take a revised project back to other advisory entities, such as the HPB, for approval. This would require more time than one month. Ms. Parker advised that Staff would recommend deferral for more than one month so the Applicant could work with Staff on a revised Application, address the Planning and Zoning Board's comments, and show these revisions to the HPB.

Ms. Golub stated that the tone of the Board's discussion suggested withdrawal and resubmission of the Application would be more appropriate than deferral. Mr. Heidelberger noted that the primary issue for him is not neighborhood compatibility, but deals with the preservation of historic structures while allowing them greater economic viability through adaptive reuse.

It was determined that the Applicant would be willing to defer the Item if a **motion** was made to this effect.

In a roll call vote, the **motion** to deny the Application failed 3-4 (Vice Chair Maus, Mr. Barranco, Mr. Elfman, and Mr. Tinter dissenting).

Motion made by Vice Chair Maus, seconded by Mr. Elfman, to defer to the meeting in three months. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 7-0.

7. CASE:	L17002
REQUEST: * **	Land Use Plan Amendment: Amend City's Future Land Use Map from Community Facilities to Industrial Use
APPLICANT:	Bridge Development LLC (Bridge Logistics)
PROJECT NAME:	Bridge FLL Logistics
GENERAL LOCATION:	1300 SW 32 Court
ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION:	School Site 0410 147-39B Parcel A
ZONING DISTRICT:	Community Facility (CF)
CURRENT LAND USE:	Community Facilities
PROPOSED LAND USE:	Industrial
COMMISSION DISTRICT:	4
CASE PLANNER:	Lorraine Tappen

Disclosures were made at this time. Mr. Tinter recused himself from voting upon the Item.

Nectaria Chakas, representing the Applicant, explained that the Applicant, Bridge Development LLC, is the contract purchaser of the subject property, which is currently owned by the Broward County School Board. The proposal is for a warehouse distribution center, which requires a change to the property's land use designation. Tonight's meeting is the first of multiple public hearings related to this process, as the property will also need to be re-platted and rezoned.

Ms. Chakas continued that the property is a 10.1 acre site located within the area of the Edgewood Civic Association. The site's proximity to the airport, seaport, Turnpike, I-595, and I-95 make it an ideal location for a warehouse distribution center. It is bounded to the north and west by residential properties and to the east and south with industrial uses. The proposed land use amendment will "square off" the industrial area, which currently houses discarded portable facilities owned by the School Board.

Bridge Development LLC is proposing a 170,000 sq. ft. Class A industrial warehouse distribution center for the property. Ms. Chakas showed multiple views of the site, explaining that the site is presently designated Community Facility (CF) under the City's Comprehensive Plan.

There are two buildings on the site, with a large buffer area to the west. There is no access on the western portion of the property, and all parking is internalized. The proposed development will also internalize truck court areas in the space between the two buildings, with offices around the northern and southern perimeter of the site. This provides a larger buffer to the residential properties located to the north and west. Access will be limited to SW 12th Avenue, with no access to or from the residential neighborhood to the north. Roads will be closed with poles and reflectors. The Applicant has received a letter of support from the Edgewood Civic Association.

Lorraine Tappen, representing Urban Design and Planning, stated that the request will amend the City's Future Land Use Map to change the subject property from its current designation of CF to Industrial. Ingress/egress will be limited and no industrial traffic will traverse the adjacent residential neighborhood. Staff will work with the Applicant to preserve neighborhood access for residences on the property's west side.

Ms. Tappen advised that by allowing industrial uses on a former school site near major transportation facilities, the City will be supporting Future Land Use Element Policy 138.1, which encourages strengthening of the existing job base to sustain a competitive, diversified economy. It also supports Future Land Use Element Policy 120.2, which relates to setbacks, landscaping, and traffic patterns. While a full traffic study was not required of the Applicant, they provided a statement related to traffic impact.

Ms. Tappen noted that this Application will be the first step in the land use plan amendment process, which includes expedited State review and approval by the City Commission, Broward County Planning Council, Broward County Board of County

Commissioners, and State Department of Economic Opportunity. Once the Applicant has addressed comments made at the State level, the Application returns to the Broward County Board of County Commissioners as well as second reading before the City Commission. The process takes approximately one full year. Staff recommends approval of the Application.

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

Motion made by Vice Chair Maus, seconded by Ms. Golub, to approve. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 6-0. (Mr. Tinter recused himself. A memorandum of voting conflict is attached to these minutes.)

8. CASE: T17003

REQUEST: * Amend City of Fort Lauderdale Unified Land Development Regulations (ULDR) creating Section 47-20.3.I, Reductions and Exemptions; To allow on-street parking spaces abutting a development site to count toward guest parking requirements for Townhouse, Cluster and Coach Home Developments.

APPLICANT: City of Fort Lauderdale

PROJECT NAME: Townhouse, Cluster, Coach Home On-Street Guest Parking

GENERAL LOCATION: City-Wide

CASE PLANNER: Eric Engmann

Eric Engmann, representing Urban Design and Planning, stated that the City recently passed Neighborhood Design Criteria Revision (NDCR) amendments, which made small but significant changes to developments such as town homes, cluster homes, and duplexes. The City Commission has proposed changes to these amendments, including allowing on-street parking to count toward the number of required guest parking spots.

The original NDCR amendment passed by the Board provided that every unit in a project must have 0.25 spaces for guest parking; however, upon second reading, members of the public advised that they would prefer having on-street parking count toward this requirement. While this was adopted by the City Commission, it was determined that the change did not go through the proper advertisement process. To enact this portion of the Ordinance, it must now be proposed as a separate amendment.

The amendment proposes the same standards spelled out for development within the Northwest Regional Activity Center (Northwest RAC)/Flagler Village area. It states that on-street parking may be counted toward guest parking requirements if it abuts the subject site, is designed to engineering standards, has a significant sidewalk, is open for public use, and includes street trees.

Vice Chair Maus asked if on-street parking that meets the requirement for guest parking must abut or be connected to the subject site. Mr. Engmann confirmed this, further clarifying that these spaces may not be located, for example, across the street from the site.

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

Motion made by Vice Chair Maus, seconded by Ms. Golub, to recommend approval to the Commission. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 7-0.

V. COMMUNICATION TO THE CITY COMMISSION

None.

VI. FOR THE GOOD OF THE CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE

Ms. Parker recalled that a joint workshop was held between the Board and the City Commission the previous week. The Commission recommended that the Board schedule a joint workshop with the City's Affordable Housing Advisory Committee. She asked if the Board would like to hold a separate workshop and suggested that this workshop could alternatively be scheduled immediately prior to the Board's July 19, 2017 meeting, at 5 p.m. The Board agreed to hold the workshop as part of the July 19, 2017 meeting.

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 8:57 p.m.

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

Chair

Prototype

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