CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE

PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT
700 NW 19 AVENUE, FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33311
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 2025 – 6:00 P.M.

~~**Board Members**~~	~~**Attendance**~~	~~**Present**~~	~~**Absent**~~
~~Patrick McTigue, Chair~~	~~P~~	~~6~~	~~0~~
~~Brian Donaldson, Vice Chair~~	~~P~~	~~6~~	~~0~~
~~Kevin Buckley~~	~~P~~	~~5~~	~~1~~
~~Hector DelaTorres~~	~~P~~	~~2~~	~~1~~
~~Whitney Dutton~~	~~P~~	~~5~~	~~1~~
~~Steve Ganon~~	~~P~~	~~6~~	~~0~~
~~Jacquelyn Scott~~	~~P~~	~~5~~	~~1~~
~~Alexander Spence~~	~~P~~	~~3~~	~~0~~

~~**Staff**~~
~~Ella Parker, Development Services Deputy Director~~
~~D'Wayne Spence, Interim City Attorney~~
~~Karlanne Devonish, Principal Urban Planner~~
~~Nancy Garcia, Urban Planner II~~
~~Jim Hetzel, Principal Urban Planner~~
~~Lorraine Tappen, Principal Urban Planner~~
~~Michael Ferrera, Urban Planner II~~
~~Yvonne Redding, Urban Planner III~~
~~Cija Omengebar, CRA Planner~~
~~N. Day, Recording Clerk, Prototype, Inc.~~

~~**Communication to City Commission**~~

~~None.~~

~~I. CALL TO ORDER / PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE~~

~~The meeting was called to order at 6:01 p.m. and the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.~~

~~II. DETERMINATION OF QUORUM / APPROVAL OF MINUTES~~

~~**Motion** made by Mr. Donaldson, seconded by Ms. Scott, to approve. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.~~

~~Development Services Deputy Director Ella Parker introduced the Staff members present.~~

~~III. PUBLIC SIGN-IN / SWEARING-IN~~

~~Any individuals wishing to speak on Agenda Items were sworn in at this time.~~

~~Chair McTigue advised that Vice Chair Shari McCartney has resigned from the Planning and Zoning Board. The Board will need to elect a new Vice Chair at tonight's meeting.~~

~~**Motion** made by Mr. Ganon, seconded by Mr. Buckley, to nomin~~ate ~~Brian Donaldson. In a voice vote, Mr. Donaldson was unanimously elected Vice Chair.~~

IV. AGENDA ITEMS

~~**Index**~~

~~**Case Number**~~	~~**Applicant**~~
~~1. UDP-T25009*~~	~~City of Fort Lauderdale~~
~~2. UDP-Z25002*~~	~~City of Fort Lauderdale~~
~~3. UDP-S24047**~~	~~1545 SE 15 Street Holding, LLC~~
~~4. UDP-S25024**~~	~~La Datcha, LLC~~
~~5. UDP-S25026**~~	~~Poliakoff, Becker,~~ & Streitfeld, LLP
~~6. UDP-S25015**~~	~~Gala Home, LLC~~
7. UDP-S25010**	Mario Caprini, Manager, Hall of Fame Partners, LLC
~~8. UDP-T25002*~~	~~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 determined that Items 1 and 2 would be presented together and voted upon separately.~~

1. ~~**CASE:** UDP-T25009~~
   ~~**REQUEST:** * Amend City of Fort Lauderdale Unified Land Development Regulations Article XIII, Additional Zoning Districts, Establishing Section 47-37C "Central City Mixed Use Zoning Districts," including subsections: List of Districts, Intent and Purpose, Applicability and General Regulations, List of Permitted and Conditional Uses, Table of Dimensional Requirements, Special Regulations; and Amend Section 47-18.8. Child Day Care Facilities, Section 47-18.31, Social Service Facility, Section 18.32, Social Service Residential Facilities (SSRF), Section 47-20, Parking and Loading, Section 47-21.13, Landscape Requirements for All Zoned Districts, Section 47-23.16, Affordable Housing Regulations, and Section 47-24, Table 1, Development Permits and Procedures; and Amend the City of Fort Lauderdale Code of Ordinance Section 23-94, Vending Prohibited~~
   ~~**APPLICANT:** City of Fort Lauderdale~~
   ~~**GENERAL LOCATION:** Business Zoning Districts within the Central City Community Redevelopment Area, generally located north side of Sunrise Boulevard between I-95 and Flagler Drive; NE 4 Avenue between East Sunrise Boulevard and NE 13~~

~~Street; NE 13 Street between NE 4 Avenue and Flagler Drive; NE 6 Avenue, and NE 7th Avenue to the Florida East Coast Railway.~~
~~**COMMISSION DISTRICT:** 2 – Steven Glassman, 3 – Pamela Beasley-Pittman~~
~~**NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION:** Lauderdale Manors Homeowners Association, South Middle River Civic Association, Middle River Terrace Neighborhood Association, Poinsettia Heights Civic Association, Lake Ridge Civic Association, Inc.~~
~~**CASE PLANNER:** Karlanne Devonish, AICP~~

~~**2. CASE:** UDP-Z25002~~
~~**REQUEST:** * Rezoning from Community Business (CB) District, Boulevard Business (B-1) District, General Business (B-2) District, and Heavy Commercial/Light Industrial Business (B-3) District to Central City - Corridor Mixed-Use (CC-CMU) District, Central City – General Mixed-Use (CC-GMU) District, and Central City-Neighborhood Mixed-Use (CC-NMU) District~~
~~**APPLICANT:** City of Fort Lauderdale~~
~~**GENERAL LOCATION:** Business Zoning Districts within the Central City Community Redevelopment Area, generally located north side of Sunrise Boulevard between I-95 and Flagler Drive; NE 4 Avenue between East Sunrise Boulevard and NE 13 Street; NE 13 Street between NE~~
~~4 Avenue and Flagler Drive; NE 6 Avenue, and NE 7 Avenue to the Florida East Coast Railway~~
~~**ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION:** Rezoning from Community Business (CB), Boulevard Business (B-1) District, General Business (B-2) District, and Heavy Commercial/Light Industrial Business (B-3) District to Central City - Corridor Mixed-Use (CC-CMU) District: Portions of the following plats: "Revised Plat of Lauderdale Manors" (29-46), "Amended Plat of Portions of Lauderdale Manors Addition and Block 158, Chateau Park, Section -B" (31-26), "Resubdivision, Tract B, Lauderdale Manors Addition" (44-41), "Resubdivision of Lots 1, 2, 10, 11 and 12 and Block 155, Chateau Park Section "B" (63-36), "Lauderdale Manors Addition" (1-352), "Chateau Park" (9-68), "Progresso" (2-18), "Re-plat of Lots 16 through 33, Block 194, Progresso" (62-38), "Supplemental Map of Progresso" (1, 107), "Re-plat of a Portion of Block 185, Progresso" (41-25), and "Home Depot Fort Lauderdale" (172, 92)~~

~~Rezoning from Community Business (CB) District to Central City – General Mixed-Use (CC-GMU) District: Portions of the "Progresso" (2-18)~~

~~Rezoning from Community Business (CB) District to Central City- Neighborhood Mixed-Use (CC-NMU) District: "Progresso" (2-18), "Lauderdale Warehouse Area" (34-24), "Buell" (31-11), portion of the SW quarter of Section 35, Township 49 South, Range 42 East more fully described by metes and bounds, "H.C. Brock's Subdivision" (3-24), Ergon/Moss Plat" (183-107)~~
~~**ZONING DISTRICT:** Community Business (CB) District, Boulevard Business (B-1) District, General Business (B-2) District, and Heavy Commercial/Light Industrial (B-3) District~~
~~**PROPOSED ZONING:** Central City – Corridor Mixed-Use (CC-CMU) District, Central City – General Mixed-Use (CC-GMU) District, and Central City- Neighborhood Mixed-Use (CC-NMU) District~~

LAND USE: Commercial
~~**COMMISSION DISTRICT:** 2 – Steven Glassman, 3 – Pamela Beasley-Pittman~~
~~**NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION:** Lauderdale Manors Homeowners Association, South Middle River Civic Association, Middle River Terrace Neighborhood Association, Poinsettia Heights Civic Association, Lake Ridge Civic Association, Inc.~~
~~**CASE PLANNER:** Karlanne Devonish, AICP~~

~~Disclosures were made at this time for Case UDP-T25009 and Case UDP-Z25002.~~

~~Principal Urban Planner Karlanne Devonish gave a presentation on the Items, which propose a text amendment to the City's Unified Land Development Regulations (ULDR) and rezoning of the subject area.~~

~~Ms. Devonish recalled that at the October 2025 meeting, Staff presented a proposal to create three new zoning districts accompanying the rezoning of commercial parcels within the Central City Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA). At that time, some of the Planning and Zoning Board (PZB) members expressed concerns regarding the implications of Florida's Senate Bill (SB) 180 for the proposed amendments and rezoning. SB 180 has been in effect since July 1, 2025 and restricts local governments from implementing any land development regulations that may be considered "more restrictive or burdensome" before October 1, 2027 within the areas impacted by Hurricanes Milton and Helene.~~

~~The proposed zoning change requires two actions:~~

- ~~Amendment to the ULDR to establish new regulations for the proposed zoning districts~~
- ~~Adoption of the proposed zoning districts as part of the City's zoning map to identify locations where those new regulations will apply~~

~~If the zoning map is not amended, no properties will be impacted by the new zoning districts.~~

~~Options considered at the October meeting included:~~

- ~~Adopt the text amendment with a provision to allow property owners to voluntarily opt into the rezoning of their properties; this would allow the City to adopt the regulations and remain in compliance with SB 180~~
- ~~Postponing the entire effort for both the text amendment and the associated rezoning until SB 180 expires on October 1, 2027~~
- ~~Adopt the new regulations and zoning districts with regulations that allow property owners to opt out of compliance requirements of those regulations and zoning districts~~

~~Ms. Devonish reviewed the proposed map, which was updated to exclude a parcel within a utility zoning district.~~

~~Key points of this discussion include:~~

- ~~City Staff has worked on this project with a consultant since 2018; the project has been through several iterations and reviews, although the intent to establish form-based regulations in a mixed-use zoning district has not changed~~

- ~~Streetscape designs and standards are intended to create a sense of place~~
- ~~Provide for a range of housing options while considering community impacts~~
- ~~The development review process will be streamlined to provide greater certainty for residents and developers~~
- ~~Residential uses will be added along with other permitted uses~~

~~Ms. Devonish reviewed dimensional requirements, which include:~~

- ~~Podium requirements~~
- ~~Tower setback~~
- ~~Tower separation~~
- ~~Floor plate size~~

~~The new zoning districts will lower the height from the current 150 ft. The Central City – Corridor Mixed-Use (CC-CMU), which runs primarily along Sunrise Boulevard and the FEC railroad tracks, will permit a height of 105 ft. by right, which may be extended to 125 ft. for affordable housing. Developers may request up to 150 ft. with conditional approval. The Central City – General Mixed-Use (CC-GMU) district, which runs along 4 Avenue, and the Central City – Neighborhood Mixed-Use (CC-NMU), which runs along 13 Street, will allow 80 ft.~~

~~Regarding podium height, the change proposes a minimum two-story podium for all three zoning districts, with a maximum podium height of 55 ft. or five stories. Tower setbacks on a primary street will be 12 ft. and will increase to 15 ft. when abutting residential development. Tower separation will require at least 30 ft. Maximum floor plate size would be 10,000 sq. ft. for residential development and 16,000 sq. ft. for non-residential use.~~

~~Additional highlights include:~~

- ~~Density: will remain the same as in existing zoning districts; density is dependent upon land use, which will be addressed in a different phase of the Central City effort~~
- ~~Streetscape designs: these include sidewalks of at least 7 ft. along secondary streets; primary street width will vary, but require at least 10 ft. and require at least 10 ft. to 12 ft. for travel lanes~~
- ~~Parking requirements: residential parking is proposed at 1.50 spaces per dwelling unit; existing regulations will remain, including approval of parking reductions through administrative review and counting on-street parking abutting a subject property toward that property's parking requirement~~
- ~~Design standards: include fenestration of at least 30%~~
- ~~Buffer requirements: these include buffer yards, walls,~~ and landscaping, as well as provisions for lighting to shield glares cast by vehicles

~~At this time Chair McTigue opened the public hearing.~~

~~Olga Zamora, private citizen, advised that she is a resident of the South Middle River neighborhood. She pointed out that the Central City CRA was not funded by Broward County tax increment financing (TIF) revenue, which means rezoning is the only mechanism to~~

~~revitalize the area. She concluded that over 50 public meetings were held to discuss changes to the area, and she was supportive of those changes.~~

~~Troy Liggett, president of the Middle River Terrace Neighborhood Association, emphasized that the Association supports the overall effort, and particularly the opt-in option, which would eliminate property rights concerns. He reviewed the intent of two of the proposed new zoning districts:~~

- ~~CC-CMU: the corridor will include tall buildings along Sunrise Boulevard and step down to 4 Avenue~~
- ~~CC-NMU: this area includes narrow streets close to residential neighborhoods~~

~~Mr. Liggett continued that the Association requests the Board's support on three issues:~~

- ~~Improve residential transition criteria~~
- ~~Reserve NE 13 Street as the area's main street~~
- ~~Neighborhood compatibility factors~~

~~Mr. Liggett pointed out that while the Central City rezoning is intended to encourage mixed-use development, the City is currently undertaking a similar effort City-wide. The City Commission has directed City Staff to consider residential transition areas and has held public meetings earlier in 2025 to discuss that plan.~~

~~Mr. Liggett referred the Board members to a map of the Central City area, pointing out the proximity of single-family homes to one another in the RM-15 zoning district. He suggested that some aspects of the City-wide plan be adopted in this area, including a setback size of 30 ft. rather than 15 ft. for properties bordering residential development. Another request addresses podiums facing residential areas: the City-wide plan requires the maximum height of these properties to match the maximum height of the residential area, which the Association requests for the Central City.~~

~~Mr. Liggett also addressed 13 Street, explaining that the Association's requests would enhance its character as the main street of the area. The street facing podiums in the CC-NMU are currently 55 ft. along 13 Street, with no front setback due to the narrow street width. He recommended that these podiums be reduced to 35 ft. With respect to tower height, the Association requests that the last 25 ft. of this height conditional. This would require developers to work with the neighborhood to demonstrate compatibility.~~

~~Mr. Liggett continued that the Association's final proposal would add to the City-wide factors considered for neighborhood compatibility. He explained that sound is an issue in the neighborhood and should be considered when reviewing properties located next to residential homes. He concluded that there may be legal issues with the Central City proposals, as the City's Comprehensive Plan relies on a CRA Plan which expired in 2023 and has not been updated. Residents of his neighborhood have requested that this CRA Plan be updated to reflect current transportation issues.~~

~~Mr. Ganon noted that the Middle River Terrace neighborhood's western border is 4 Avenue and the railroad tracks, and asked if anyone from an abutting RD-15 zoning district was present at tonight's meeting. Mr. Liggett explained that his intent had been to show where impacts of the proposed rezoning would occur.~~

~~Nikola Stan, private citizen, stated that he is a member of the Middle River Terrace Neighborhood Association and of the Central City Redevelopment Authority Board (CCRAB), and has participated in discussions of the proposed rezoning and amendments. He characterized the proposals before the Board as unfinished products of those negotiations, emphasizing that 13 Street is a highly debated area. While he was a proponent of the introduction of mixed-use development into the area, its impact on residential properties would be significant, as the zone is very narrow. He requested that the Board take feedback from neighborhood residents into account.~~

~~Dylan Buss, private citizen, stated that he is a business owner within the area and purchased his property with a height of 150 ft. by right. He felt the proposed changes would take rights away from property owners without compensation, and opposed any rezoning in support of these changes. He concluded that the current height of 150 ft. does not have "the numbers feasible for mixed use," and downzoning would lessen the possibility of future development.~~

~~Mr. Buckley asked if a property owner in Mr. Buss's position would be allowed to opt into the changes. Interim City Attorney D'Wayne Spence advised that this was part of the decision before the Board; if they are in favor of the opt-in option, Mr. Buss would be allowed to opt into the changes. If he did not opt in, he would continue to be able to develop to 150 ft.~~

~~Vice Chair Donaldson also addressed the opt-in option, requesting clarification of whether this option would be limited to the time period outlined in SB 180 or permanent. Attorney Spence explained that this has not yet been determined by the Board. He recalled that at the October meeting, he had informed the Board that the option would expire upon the expiration of SB 180's time limit; however, the Board may also choose not to attach an expiration or sunset date for the opt-in provision, and may approve it as one provision of an overlay zoning district.~~

~~Mel Lenet, private citizen, advised that he is a partner in a business operating on 13 Street, and recommended caution in restricting the rights of property owners in that area. He was in favor of incentivizing positive changes, and pointed out that in order to attract redevelopment, there cannot be too much restriction on property rights. He also noted that there is insufficient density in the subject area for many small businesses. He characterized the proposed height reductions as reductions of rights.~~

~~Ross Parker, private citizen, stated that he owns a business on 13 Street. He emphasized the importance of bringing retail and restaurant uses to the street in order to create a walkable district; however, greater density is required to maintain these businesses. He recommended that the Board carefully consider any restrictions to be placed on development in the area.~~

~~Jacob Schickler, secretary of the Middle River Terrace Neighborhood Association, reported that the community supports smart growth and redevelopment. He felt taller buildings~~

~~belonged on major roadways such as Sunrise Boulevard rather than abutting single family homes on 13 Street, and noted that several residents have expressed support for keeping the height limit at 55 ft. Residents also provided a petition in favor of maintaining an earlier version of the plan for the area. He concluded that allowing property owners to opt in or out of the proposed plan could result in spot zoning, and emphasized the importance of consulting residents of the subject area.~~

~~Mr. DelaTorres briefly left the dais from 6:53 p.m. to 6:57 p.m.~~

~~Mr. Spence briefly left the dais from 6:53 p.m. to 6:59 p.m.~~

~~Robert Hely, representing a property owner at 1400 Progresso Drive, explained that his client's property is currently zoned B-3, which allows for heavy commercial and light industrial development. Construction is underway for a storage facility to be developed on the subject property. The proposed zoning change to CC-NMU would not allow this facility.~~

~~Mr. Hely concluded that his client did not object to the proposed rezoning, but was supportive of the opt-in option due to the requirements of SB 180.~~

~~Marisa Valdez, private citizen, stated that she is a commercial property owner on NE 13 Street. She emphasized investment in the area by businesses, as well as the need for greater density. She felt mixed-use development would benefit residents, and was not in favor of restrictions that would place additional difficulty on businesses.~~

~~Jon Van Vlak, private citizen, advised that he supported the plan, which has involved significant compromise. He agreed with Mr. Liggett's recommendations as stated earlier, particularly with respect to podium height and maximum height. He proposed a maximum height below 80 ft. and a lower podium height for buildings facing 13 Street.~~

~~Courtney Crush, representing multiple business owners on 13 Street, reviewed maximum heights, stepbacks, and setbacks permitted under 13 Street's current zoning, which is Community Business (CB). She stated that a reduction in height to 80 ft. was palatable to the business owners in that area, as well as the reduced floor plate size and podium heights. They are supportive of a zoning district with these parameters, whether as a permanent opt-in or as an overlay district.~~

Ms. Crush emphasized that both the business and residential communities on and near 13 ~~Street have worked with City Staff to arrive at the proposed parameters and are supportive of them. She cautioned that establishing a conditional use height would defeat the purpose of the changes, and recommended providing the business community with certainty that there will not be additional criteria such as neighborhood compatibility.~~

~~Mr. Ganon requested clarification that Ms. Crush represented businesses on and near the 13 Street corridor and they are comfortable with the proposed zoning categories as they are written in the Staff Report. Ms. Crush confirmed this.~~

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

~~The Board members discussed the Items, with Vice Chair Donaldson pointing out that scale is a key component of the proposed changes, particularly for podium height facing 13 Street. He expressed concern that going from a 55 ft. building to an 80 ft. building would look out of scale, particularly for pedestrians on the sidewalk. He asked if there was Board consensus to recommend a change for the CC-NMU zoning district only which would lower the podium height from a maximum of 55 ft. to 35 ft., as well as how this might be executed.~~

~~Development Services Deputy Director Ella Parker replied that the Board may propose changes, although she noted that Staff was unlikely to recommend those changes due to the numerous discussions and community input that have taken place in relation to the two Items to date. She strongly emphasized the importance of building consensus throughout the process, which had led to the recommendations before the Board.~~

~~Mr. Ganon also referred to podium height, noting that mixed use would likely involve first-floor retail or other mixed use, as well as four levels of parking to support three residential stories above that. He felt that this proposal would be out of scale, with more podium height than necessary.~~

~~Ms. Parker explained that this would be the maximum podium height, and that the development is also dependent upon the building envelope and the programming proposed by developers. Staff had analyzed the uses, clarifying that some uses will have a higher parking requirement; other uses that require less parking would result in a smaller podium.~~

~~Mr. DelaTorres requested clarification of the intent behind the CRA's request for rezoning. CRA Planner Cija Omengebar explained that the Central City redevelopment plan suggests rezoning as a strategy to provide opportunities for redevelopment in the area, which is affected by slum and blight. The project began in 2018.~~

~~Ms. Omengebar continued that the major impetus behind recommendations for mixed-use development was to add more density within the area. The commercial corridors in the Central City area do not have sufficient pedestrian traffic, and few residents access commercial uses along the corridors. Additional density would provide for a mixture of uses and opportunities in the subject area.~~

~~Mr. DelaTorres asked why the proposed changes further restrict height from its existing limits. Ms. Parker replied that a great deal of community input focused on bringing in new uses while also protecting residential components and providing transition to residential neighborhoods. The discussion also addressed the types of uses residents wished to see along the corridor, as well as the areas they wished to protect.~~

~~Mr. DelaTorres again asked why the proposed changes would restrict property owners who can currently build to a height of 150 ft. Ms. Parker stated that the proposed plan was based on input from both the residential and business communities.~~

~~Mr. DelaTorres also asked for more information on the opt-in and opt-out options. Ms. Parker replied that these options would result in change over time, citing the Uptown area as a successful example that allowed developers to opt into more residential development. The proposed standards would be more prescriptive in order to define expectations for the community and developers.~~

~~Mr. DelaTorres requested clarification of what his incentive would be to purchase land and develop mixed use at a location which has been downzoned. Ms. Parker explained that the subject corridor is not a major thoroughfare; it is much smaller than other major corridors in Fort Lauderdale. There are also higher costs once a developer crosses the 150 ft. height threshold, which could also serve as an incentive for developers to build to a lower scale.~~

~~Mr. DelaTorres continued that his concern was for current property owners who have purchased properties in the subject area. He wished to hear more information on the opt-in and opt-out options, suggesting that these could be accompanied by additional conditions, such as whether the options are permanent or carry restrictions. He characterized downzoning as reducing the value of properties.~~

~~Vice Chair Donaldson suggested that the value could be realized through residential development rather than commercial. He pointed out that some of the existing businesses are in favor of the proposed changes, which would provide them with options to add a residential component.~~

~~Ms. Devonish clarified that the existing zoning districts provide for mixed use; however, residential development is currently permitted with conditional approval, which requires appearance before the PZB. The proposed changes would permit mixed-use development by right based on dimensional requirements.~~

~~Mr. Dutton requested clarification of whether the opt-in and/or opt-out components would be permanent in light of SB 180. Attorney Spence explained that he has evaluated opt-in options and identified one which may be amenable to the Board while still working the toward CRA and Staff goals of incentivizing individuals to opt in.~~

~~Attorney Spence suggested the Board adopt language recommending an overlay zoning district, which would create a boundary that lies over the existing zoning districts. Properties within that boundary would be designated with the underlying zoning category, but would also allow owners to opt in to the overlay district on a case-by-case basis.~~

~~Attorney Spence read the following proposed language for the opt-in option into the record:~~

> ~~If revisions of the Central City Mixed-Use Overlay District are established as an option alternative to standards and requirements, set forth in the underlying base zoning districts, a property owner wishing to develop or redevelop a parcel or parcels within the geographic boundaries as identified under the Central City Mixed-Use Overlay District shall formally indicate their intent to opt in during the submission of a development permit application, i.e. Site Plan approval or building permit application, to the Development~~

~~Services Division. This section shall be binding on all subsequent development proposals for that project unless otherwise stipulated.~~

~~Any project opting into the Central City Mixed-Use Overlay Zoning District shall utilize and adhere to all provisions, standards, and requirements specified in the Code.~~

~~Attorney Spence further clarified that under this proposal, the two Items before the Board would be consolidated into a single text amendment which outlines the boundaries of the overlay district and becomes part of Code. Developers would request to opt into the Central City Mixed-Use District that applies to their property when submitting a development permit application. The existing zoning would serve as the default position.~~

~~Mr. DelaTorres asked if the proposed overlay district would be permanent or restricted to a specific time frame. Attorney Spence replied that the overlay district would exist on a permanent basis, emphasizing again that it would not apply unless developers ask the City to apply it. The option would remain available unless Code is changed.~~

~~Attorney Spence continued that if the opt-out option recommended at the previous PZB meeting were adopted, the requirements would exist until SB 180 expires on October 1, 2027. With the proposed overlay districts, all properties would be zoned Central City Mixed-Use Overlay District, and the overlay would give property owners the option to opt into those development standards. The existing zoning districts would remain as the default zoning districts. The overlay zoning would run with the land itself.~~

~~It was requested that Attorney Spence further clarify the language on which the Board would be voting. Attorney Spence stated that Items 1 and 2 propose a text amendment and a change to the City's zoning map. His proposal would change the text amendment, amending Section 47-37C.3, Applicability and General Regulations, to create a Central City Mixed-Use Overlay District with a provision allowing for the optional use of development standards and requirements as outlined in the proposed Code language. If the Board adopts this change, they would not have to also adopt a change to the zoning map; the boundaries of the overlay district would be incorporated into its Section of Code. The underlying zoning of the properties in the district would not be changed.~~

~~Attorney Spence further clarified that his proposal would mean nothing changes for any of the properties within the community; instead, the Board would adopt an option which property owners may access.~~

~~Vice Chair Donaldson asked the Board members if they were interested in opening a discussion into some of the suggestions proposed for the NE 13 Street corridor, with the option of modifying Staff's proposals for this area. He expressed concern with the proposed podium height in relation to pedestrians on 13 Street.~~

~~Ms. Scott noted that parking is an issue for the proposed redevelopment. She did not wish to limit what can be done in the subject area.~~

~~Mr. DelaTorres asked if there will continue to be both a minimum and a maximum podium height. Ms. Devonish confirmed that the minimum would be two stories or 25 ft., while the maximum would be 55 ft. or five stories. These parameters apply across the board for all three proposed zoning districts.~~

~~Mr. Buckley expressed concern that a garage, which would include ramps and a sloped area, could not be built under the parameters proposed by the Middle River Terrace Neighborhood Association, which had recommended changing the maximum podium height from 55 ft. to 35 ft. It was clarified that Staff's proposal contemplates a maximum podium height of 55 ft.~~

~~Vice Chair Donaldson indicated his interest in moving to approve the opt-in position as an amendment to the proposed text amendment. Attorney Spence read the language for this motion into the record as follows:~~

~~**Motion** made by Vice Chair Donaldson, seconded by Mr. Buckley, to amend Section 47-37C.3, Applicability and General Regulations, to add a provision that states that the provisions of this Section shall apply to all development and redevelopment within the Central City Mixed-Use Overlay Districts as listed on the permitted list of permitted and conditional uses, Section 47-37C.4, that provisions of the Central City Mixed-Use Overlay Districts are established as an optional alternative to the standards and requirements set forth in the underlying base zoning districts; that a property owner wishing to develop or redevelop a parcel or parcels within the geographic boundaries identified in this Section for the Central City Mixed-Use Overlay Districts shall formally indicate their intent to opt in upon the submission of a development permit application; that any project opting into the Central City Mixed-Use Overlay Zoning Districts shall utilize and adhere to all provisions, standards, and requirements as provided in this Code.~~

~~Mr. Spence noted that there had been no Board discussion of the proposals presented by Mr. Liggett on behalf of the Middle River Terrace Neighborhood Association, such as sound requirements. Ms. Parker advised that the City's noise regulations are already addressed in Code and are enforced by Code Compliance.~~

~~In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 8-0.~~

~~Attorney Spence clarified that Item 2 was consolidated into Item 1, and requested that the Board make a motion incorporating the sketch and legal description of Case UDP-Z25002 into the text amendment for Item 1.~~

~~**Motion** made by Mr. Dutton, seconded by Ms. Scott, to incorporate the sketch and legal description of Case UDP-Z25002 into the text amendment for Case Number 1. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 8-0.~~

~~3. **CASE:** UDP-S24047~~
~~**REQUEST:** ** Site Plan Level III Review: Waterway Use, Yard Modifications for Five-Unit Residential Development~~
~~**APPLICANT:** 1545 SE 15 Street Holding, LLC.~~

~~**AGENT:** Annette J. Hatchard Fassi/TDC Architecture~~
~~**PROJECT NAME:** 1545 SE 15th Street Holding Condos~~
~~**ADDRESS:** 1545 SE 15 Street~~
~~**ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION:** Herzfelds Add Lot 25 Blk 2~~
~~**ZONING DISTRICT:** Residential Multifamily Mid Rise/Medium High Density District (RMM-25)~~
~~**LAND USE:** High Residential~~
~~**COMMISSION DISTRICT:** 4 – Ben Sorensen~~
~~**NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION:** Harbordale Civic Association~~
~~**CASE PLANNER:** Michael Ferrera~~

~~Disclosures were made at this time.~~

~~Annette Hatchard, architect for the Applicant, reviewed the site, explaining that the project proposes five units, with parking internalized on the site. Each unit will have two parking spots with the option for a third, which exceeds the parking requirement found in Code. The first floor is intended to be non habitable space used for parking. The second floor will include storage and back-of-house functions as well as one unit. The remaining units are above the second floor.~~

~~The Applicant requests a waterway use exception, which is common on the subject street. A pool is proposed for the back yard in addition to a landscaped area. Another request would allow the building's open awning to overhang a glass area in the back. There is also a request to change the side yard setback from half the height of the proposed building to 10 ft.~~

~~Ms. Hatchard reviewed the site's surroundings, pointing out that there are multiple buildings in the area which are taller than the proposed structure and have greater density. The request is for five units within the entire property. She also noted that many other properties in the area do not conform to the standard setback of half the building height.~~

~~The site was previously occupied by a triplex single-story building, with the entire front yard area taken up by an asphalt driveway. The Applicant proposes a driveway and sidewalk with shade trees. The proposed building height does not significantly affect the single-family homes located north of the canal, nor the adjacent buildings on each side.~~

~~At this time Chair McTigue opened the public hearing. As there were no individuals wishing to speak on the Item, the Chair closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.~~

~~Mr. DelaTorres commented that compressing the side setback would bring adjacent neighbors closer to the building than usual. Ms. Hatchard reiterated that the Applicant requests a 10 ft. side yard setback rather than a setback that is half the height of the building. She reviewed other buildings on the same street which do not have side yard setbacks at half their height.~~

~~Mr. DelaTorres asked if the Applicant has considered the potential effects on neighbors of cars accessing the property's parking garage, particularly at night. Ms. Hatchard replied that cars face the outside of the property on the north and south sides; however, the Applicant proposes heavily landscaped areas at any points where there are not solid concrete walls so headlights do not penetrate outside the garage.~~

~~**Motion** made by Mr. DelaTorres, seconded by Mr. Buckley, to adopt a Resolution approving the Site Plan Level III for Case Number UDP-S24047, based on the following findings of fact, the facts of the City Staff Report, and/or the testimony heard by the Applicant, the Board hereby finds that the Application meets the standards and requirements of the ULDR and criteria for the proposed use as cited in the Resolution.~~

~~Attorney Spence read the following Resolution into the record:~~

> ~~A Resolution of the Planning and Zoning Board of the City of Fort Lauderdale, Florida, approving a Site Plan Level III development permit for waterway use, and approving modifications to the requirements for the front yard, north side, south side, and rear yards for five residential units for the property located at 1545 SE 15 Street, Fort Lauderdale, Florida, in the Residential Family Mid-Rise Medium-High Density (RMM-25) district, Case Number UDP-S24047; providing for conflicts; providing for severability; providing for an effective date.~~

~~It was clarified that the **motion** and Resolution would also adopt any Staff conditions.~~

~~In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 8-0.~~

~~Ms. Scott left the meeting at 7:56 p.m.~~

~~The Board took a brief recess from 7:56 p.m. until 8:03 p.m.~~

~~**4. CASE:** UDP-S25024~~
~~**REQUEST:** ** Site Plan Level III – Waterway Use and Conditional Use Approval for a 5,047 Square-Foot Yacht Club~~
~~**APPLICANT:** La Datcha, LLC.~~
~~**AGENT:** Diana Moisei, Expediting & Consulting, LLC.~~
~~**PROJECT NAME:** Lauderdale Isles Private Yacht Club~~
~~**ADDRESS:** 2637 Whale Harbor Lane~~
~~**ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION:** Lauderdale Isles No 2-Blk 12 37-48 B Lot 22~~
~~**ZONING DISTRICT:** Parks Recreation and Open Space District (P)~~
~~**LAND USE:** Commercial Recreation~~
~~**COMMISSION DISTRICT:** 4 – Ben Sorensen~~
~~**NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION:** Lauderdale Isles Civic Improvement Association~~
~~**CASE PLANNER:** Yvonne Redding~~

~~Disclosures were made at this time.~~

~~Cyril Saiphoo, representing the Applicant, explained that the request is for reestablishment of the conditional use of a yacht club at the subject address. The property has operated as a yacht club from the 1950s through 2018. He showed aerial views of the site, noting that the main building includes a bar, lounge, reading room, and outdoor kitchen. The site includes two tennis courts, a pool, and dockage for three to four boats.~~

~~Mr. Saiphoo advised that the property is zoned Parks, Recreation, and Open Space (P), with an underlying land use of Commercial Recreation. The previous conditional use for the yacht club was abandoned or inoperable, which means the new owner must reestablish that conditional use and operation.~~

~~No physical changes to the property's buildings are proposed. The only changes will be from tennis to paddleboard courts. The club will be entirely private. The owner anticipates approximately 100 members, which is significantly smaller than either the Fort Lauderdale Yacht Club or Coral Ridge Yacht Club.~~

~~Mr. Saiphoo showed photos of the building from the 1960s and later, as well as photos of the current property. The owner has maintained the property internally. Changes are proposed in a Site Plan submitted to the City as part of the conditional use request.~~

~~Vice Chair Donaldson observed that the building is very run-down at present, and asked if the owner plans to enhance the property's western side, which is closer to public park access, if the conditional use is granted. Mr. Saiphoo replied that a Site Plan has been submitted. The owner plans to add dense landscaping and fencing, as well as improvements to the parking lot, tennis/paddleboard courts, and the interior of the building.~~

~~At this time Chair McTigue opened the public hearing.~~

~~Tony Ferreri, private citizen, asked for more information on the Applicant's plans for the property, expressing concerns with drainage as well as with plans for the tennis courts and the overall outside appearance of the property.~~

~~Vice Chair Donaldson suggested that Code Compliance work with Mr. Ferreri regarding his concerns with the state of the subject property.~~

~~Heather Wood, private citizen, stated that the Lauderdale Isles Yacht and Tennis Club was created when a group of neighbors purchased the property together and were active in the surrounding community. She reviewed the club's history, emphasizing that the club is separate from the property itself. She noted that the club's liquor license was not sold.~~

~~Dawn Hanna, private citizen, stated that she had concerns with the application and its backup materials. Her concerns included containment of lighting on the tennis courts, which she described as coming directly into neighboring windows. She requested that the Board make any recommendation of approval conditional upon removal of the current tennis court lighting, emphasizing its negative effect on neighbors.~~

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

~~Mr. Ganon asked if the Applicant will need to go through permitting for the site before the facility opens, as well as whether the permitting phase will review the site's lighting. Yvonne Redding, representing Urban Design and Planning, confirmed that the Applicant will need to obtain all proper permits prior to opening, including permits for re-striping, repaving, new lighting and equipment around the courts, interior renovations, and landscaping.~~

~~Vice Chair Donaldson asked if requirements for landscaping outside the wall will be similar to the requirements for a residential neighborhood, as the property is adjacent to residential development. Ms. Redding replied that many of the trees are in the public right-of-way and any maintenance of them will require permission from the City's Public Works Department. The Applicant will need to maintain the trees on their property.~~

~~Vice Chair Donaldson asked if the Applicant will be required to place shrubs in front of their wall in a similar manner to a residential home, or if they will be subject to different requirements as a commercial property. Ms. Redding replied that the Applicant will need to maintain the same setback for their existing wall.~~

~~Mr. Buckley asked if spillover lighting is addressed in Code. Ms. Redding replied that a one-half foot candle measurement to the property line for any site that is adjacent to residential property or right-of-way. The new lighting planned by the Applicant will need to meet this requirement, although the existing lights on the site do not.~~

~~**Motion** made by Mr. Dutton, seconded by Vice Chair Donaldson, to adopt the Resolution approving a conditional use permit, Case Number UDP-S25024, based on the following findings of fact, and the Board hereby finds that the Application meets the standards and requirements in the ULDR criteria for the proposed use cited in the Resolution.~~

~~Attorney Spence read the Resolution into the record:~~

> ~~A Resolution of the Planning and Zoning Board of the City of Fort Lauderdale, Florida, approving a Site Plan Level III conditional use development permit for waterway use and for a yacht club for the property located at 2637 Whale Harbor Lane, Fort Lauderdale, Florida, in the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space District, Case Number UDP-S25024; providing for conflicts; providing for severability; and providing for an effective date.~~

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

5. ~~**CASE:** UDP-S25026~~
   ~~**REQUEST:** ** Site Plan Level III: Conditional Use for Building Height above 90 Feet, Design Deviation Requests for Stepback, Shoulder Height, Floorplate Size, and Bicycle Parking in the Uptown Urban Village Area for 196 Affordable Housing Development Units, an Amendment to Previously Approved Site Plan Reducing Office Use from 37,562 to 6,525 Square Feet~~

~~**APPLICANT:** Poliakoff, Becker, & Streitfeld, LLP~~
~~**AGENT:** Tim Wheat, Pinnacle Housing~~
~~**PROJECT NAME:** Pinnacle at Cypress~~
~~**ADDRESS:** 6250 N Andrews Avenue~~
~~**ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION:** Pine Crest Isles 63-48B~~
~~**ZONING DISTRICT:** Uptown Urban Village – Northeast (UUV-NE)~~
~~**LAND USE:** Uptown Urban Village Transit Oriented Development~~
~~**COMMISSION DISTRICT:** 1 – John Herbst~~
~~**NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION:** N/A~~
~~**CASE PLANNER:** Jim Hetzel, AICP~~

~~Disclosures were made at this time.~~

~~Principal Urban Planner Jim Hetzel requested the following corrections to the Staff Report:~~
- ~~P.1: correct address to 6520 N. Andrews Avenue~~
- ~~P.5, paragraph 6: 10,515 sq. ft. is required, and the Applicant will provide 10,672 sq. ft.~~

~~Keith Poliakoff, representing the Applicant, advised that he is also the owner of the subject property. He explained that when the property was first purchased and developed in the 1980s, the company partnered with Keith and Schnars, who later sold their portion of the property to Fairfield Housing. That portion was developed for market-rate housing.~~

~~Mr. Poliakoff advised that he met with representatives of Pinnacle Housing to propose 196 units of affordable housing for senior citizens, with office space on the ground floor. Broward County, Fort Lauderdale, and the state of Florida have each agreed to provide some of the funding for this project. While Fairfield Housing originally objected to the use, the two entities have since resolved their issues.~~

~~Mr. Poliakoff added that Florida's Live Local Act was also helpful in moving the project forward. The subject site was originally zoned for commercial development, but has been rezoned so the project is now allowed by right.~~

~~Tim Wheat, representing Pinnacle Housing, explained that his company is based in Miami and develops affordable housing. He reviewed some of Pinnacle Housing's previous developments in Broward County, which include affordable housing as well as mixed-income and mixed-use developments.~~

~~Mr. Wheat reviewed the proposed project, which will proceed in two phases. The first phase will develop 100 units and is fully financed, using tax credits among its funding sources, with the intent of closing by the second quarter of 2026. Phase two will use a loan to leverage more tax credits for the development of 96 additional units. Phase one is proposed at eight stories, while phase two requests conditional use approval to reach 11 stories.~~

~~Mr. Wheat provided additional detail regarding the phases, including the development of office space as well as affordable senior housing during phase one. All units developed in the first~~

~~phase are one-bedroom units. Office space will be located on the first floor, while the second floor will include an active area with amenities for residents. Additional amenities within the building will include resident storage, open-air patios, and private activity areas.~~

~~Mr. Wheat advised that the project will be designated as an urban village, and worked with City Staff on its design. Units are built for long term durability. Both phases of the project will include controlled entry access, and units provide greater accessibility than required by the Fair Housing Act. Common area amenities include meeting space, fitness areas, a dog walk area between the two buildings, and active plaza open space along Andrews Avenue.~~

~~Mr. Wheat concluded that construction of phase one is expected to begin by June 2026 and to be complete by the end of 2027. Construction of phase two is expected to begin in January 2027.~~

~~Mr. Ganon requested additional information regarding the requested parking reduction. Mr. Hetzel explained that the Uptown area requires an increase in bicycle parking; the requested reduction is tied to vehicle parking, and would be mitigated by this increase in bicycle parking.~~

~~Vice Chair Donaldson noted that the Staff Report indicates a minimum parking requirement of 126 spaces, while the Applicant requests a reduction to 80 spaces. Mr. Hetzel advised that affordable housing projects require a minimum of one space per unit. The Applicant also has a parking agreement with Fairfield Housing, which is located to the north. These are both factors in the size of the requested reduction.~~

~~Mr. Ganon pointed out that the location map for the site includes both north and south parcels. Mr. Hetzel clarified that the Staff Report refers to the north and south parcels, which are reflected accordingly on the map.~~

~~At this time Chair McTigue opened the public hearing. As there were no individuals wishing to speak on the Item, the Chair closed the public hearing and brought the discussion back to the Board.~~

~~**Motion** made by Mr. Ganon, seconded by Mr. Buckley, to adopt the Resolution for the Site Plan Level III, Case Number UDP-S25026, based on the following findings of fact, and the Board hereby finds that the Application meets the standards and requirements in the ULDR for the proposed use as cited in the Resolution for a conditional use building height above 90 ft., design deviation request for setback, shoulder height, floor plate size, and bicycle parking in the Uptown Urban Village area for 196 affordable housing development units; and amendment to a previously approved Site Plan for office use of 37,562 to 65,026 sq. ft., and the address is at 6520 North Andrews Avenue, land use Uptown Urban Village Transit-Oriented Development Zoning District, Uptown Urban Village Northeast, and with the Staff conditions.~~

~~Attorney Spence read the following Resolution into the record:~~

~~A Resolution of the Planning and Zoning Board of the City of Fort Lauderdale, Florida, approving Site Plan Level III conditional use development for a building height above 90 ft.,~~

~~site deviation requests for setback, shoulder height, floor plate size, and bicycle parking, in the Uptown Urban Village for a 196 unit affordable housing development amendment to the Site Plan reducing office use from 37,562 to 65,525 sq. ft. and associated parking reduction to reduce the required parking spaces from 126 to 80 for the property located at 6250 North Andrews Avenue, Fort Lauderdale, Florida, in the Uptown Urban Village-Northeast district, Case Number UDP-S25026; providing for conflicts; providing for severability; providing for an effective date.~~

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

6. ~~**CASE:** UDP-S25015~~
   ~~**REQUEST:** ** Site Plan Level III Review: Conditional Use for an Indoor Firearms Range and Associated Parking Reduction~~
   ~~**APPLICANT:** Gala Home, LLC.~~
   ~~**AGENT:** Eugene Pierre, Manager of Top Shottas Gun Range, LLC and Ryan Abrams, Abrams Law Firm, P.A.~~
   ~~**PROJECT NAME:** Top Shottas~~
   ~~**ADDRESS:** 5233 N Powerline Road~~
   ~~**ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION:** LJB Plat 122-10 B, Parcel A~~
   ~~**ZONING DISTRICT:** Heavy Commercial/Light Industrial Business (B-3) District~~
   ~~**LAND USE:** Commercial~~
   ~~**COMMISSION DISTRICT:** 1 – John Herbst~~
   ~~**NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION:** N/A~~
   ~~**CASE PLANNER:** Nancy Garcia~~

~~Disclosures were made at this time.~~

~~Ryan Abrams, representing the Applicant, stated that the Applicant has operated an existing gun retail store at the subject location since 2020. There is another bay of vacant commercial space on the site. The Applicant seeks to expand his business into this bay with a shooting range, which would be complementary to the existing business.~~

~~There are two requests before the Board:~~

- ~~A conditional use application, as a shooting range is a conditional use in all Fort Lauderdale zoning districts; conditional uses are reviewed through the Site Plan Level III approval process~~
- ~~A parking reduction, as the property's existing layout cannot be changed; it provides 15 parking spaces where Code requires 45 spaces~~

~~Mr. Abrams advised that the Applicant has provided a traffic study, which has been reviewed by the City. The use requires approximately one parking space for every 1,000 sq. ft. Including storage space, this would equal a requirement of roughly 11 spaces. The 15 proposed spaces exceed this calculation.~~

~~The site is 0.6 acre in size and is located within the Heavy Commercial/Light Industrial Business district (B-3) and the future land use is Commercial. B-3 zoning is intended for uses~~

~~located on major thoroughfares, including warehouses, retail, and other uses. Mr. Abrams noted that shooting ranges are comparable to heavy business commercial use. Surrounding uses include a junkyard, warehouse/retail space, and additional retail, with the exception of a church located to the south which is a legal nonconforming use.~~

~~Mr. Abrams noted that several customers of the existing facility have provided signatures in favor of the Application. He reviewed parking for the site, pointing out that Code does not allow placement of parking spaces within 25 ft. of the entrance of the road. This resulted in the removal of some of the existing spaces, which led to additional parking in the rear of the site.~~

~~Mr. Abrams reviewed the floor plan for the site, noting that the entire building is less than 10,000 sq. ft. The Applicant proposes 10 shooting lanes. The perimeter of the building will be chemically protected and the walls will be treated to prevent noise from exiting the space.~~

~~The Applicant is seeking to improve the site's landscape plan. There are six trees on the site, four of which are small palms. The Applicant proposes 12 canopy trees, as well as landscaping along Powerline Road.~~

~~Mr. Abrams reviewed conditional use criteria, noting that all of these are met by the Application.~~

~~The proposed facility will provide educational training and employ safety range officers as well as certified firearm instructors. The property owner is also a certified firearm instructor. The site will not impact public safety.~~

~~Mr. Abrams noted that the Application must also meet the requirements cited in ULDR Section 47-18.18, which directly addresses indoor shooting ranges and clarifies what is necessary for their compliance. Staff has found that the proposed facility complies with all applicable requirements.~~

~~The requested parking reduction meets adequacy requirements, and a capacity letter from the City confirms there are no additional demands on water or sewer by the proposed use. Staff confirms no additional impacts to roadway infrastructure. A parking study dated May 27, 2025 considered uses at similar shooting ranges and gun stores, as well as peak demand hours, and found that only one parking space per 1,000 sq. ft. would be necessary.~~

~~Vice Chair Donaldson addressed the parking reduction request, noting that cars may access the site's parking lot on their way to Powerline Road. He requested clarification of the Applicant's plan to ensure other businesses do not encroach upon the subject property in this manner. Mr. Abrams replied that the Applicant does not plan to use an 18 ft. wide access easement near the site and anticipates no conflicts. All measurements of the parking area meet Code requirements, including drive aisle width.~~

~~At this time Chair McTigue opened the public hearing.~~

~~Raymond Wilburn, private citizen, spoke positively of the Applicant, his plans for the proposed use, and expansion of his business.~~

~~Kevin Nitsch, private citizen, advised that he was confident in the Applicant's professionalism and training, which he felt has been passed on to employees of the business as well.~~

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

~~**Motion** made by Mr. Dutton, seconded by Vice Chair Donaldson, to adopt the Resolution approving a conditional use permit, Case Number UDP-S25015, based on the following findings of fact and the facts of the City Staff Report and/or the testimony heard by the Applicant, and the Board hereby finds that the Application meets the standards and requirements in the ULDR and criteria, the proposed use cited in the Resolution; if conditions, state the approval of the Application subject to all conditions, included in the City Staff Report, and state any other applicable conditions on record.~~

~~Attorney Spence read the following Resolution into the record:~~

> ~~A Resolution of the Planning and Zoning Board of the City of Fort Lauderdale, Florida, approving a Site Plan Level III conditional use development permit for an indoor firearms range and a parking reduction to reduce the required parking spaces from 45 to 15 for the property located at 5233 North Powerline Road, Fort Lauderdale, Florida, Heavy Commercial/Light Industrial Business district, Case Number UDP-S25015; providing for conflicts; providing for severability; providing for an effective date.~~

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

7. **CASE:** UDP-S25010
   REQUEST: ** Site Plan Level IV Review: New Six-Story, 203,907 Square-Foot Multipurpose Building with 25,182 Square Feet of Event Space, 24,440 Square Feet of Museum, 17,052 Square Feet of Aquarium, and 7,027 Square Feet of Restaurant Use.
   APPLICANT: Mario Caprini, Manager, Hall of Fame Partners, LLC.
   AGENT: Michelle Chung, Hensel Phelps
   PROJECT NAME: International Swimming Hall of Fame - West Building
   ADDRESS: 501 Seabreeze Blvd
   ABBREVIATED LEGAL DESCRIPTION: International Swimming Hall of Fame Complex 138-19 B Parcel "A"
   ZONING DISTRICT: South Beach Marina and Hotel Area (SBMHA) District
   LAND USE: Central Beach Regional Activity Center
   COMMISSION DISTRICT: 2 – Steven Glassman
   NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION: Central Beach Alliance
   CASE PLANNER: Michael Ferrera

Disclosures were made at this time.

Stephanie Toothaker, representing the Applicant, stated that the project has been in development for some time and has gone through several iterations before coming before the Board for Site Plan Level IV approval for its west building. She showed views of the Swimming Hall of Fame site, noting that the Applicant has been working on the Site Plan at the same time as a comprehensive agreement with the City. This phase of the project was first brought forward as an unsolicited approval, which required several City Commission hearings.

The project is located within the City's Central Beach Regional Activity Center (RAC) and is zoned South Beach Marina and Hotel Area (SBMHA). Ms. Toothaker reviewed the project's history, which began in 2020 with an unsolicited proposal to develop the east and west buildings on the site. In 2021, an interim agreement was approved, followed by a comprehensive agreement in 2023. In March 2025, a new Site Plan was presented to the City Commission.

Ms. Toothaker reviewed the site, noting that work is complete on pools at the facility. Other aspects of the site have also already been built. Tonight's Application addresses the west building. She showed images of the project's phasing, which includes the following:

- Phase 1: Ocean Rescue headquarters and seawall improvements
- Phase 2: west building, which includes an aquarium, a museum, event and exhibit spaces, a rooftop restaurant, an expanded public promenade, and a parking garage

The site's east building will include retail space, a café, a dive grandstand, teaching pool, and public promenades to the north and south.

The proposed project exceeds most Code requirements. Its maximum building height is 85 ft. or six stories, and it has 109,000 sq. ft. of open space against a requirement of 44,000 sq. ft. It meets front and side setback requirements with no waiver requests.

The Application has gone through the City's Development Review Committee (DRC) process, and the Applicant has met with residents of the Venetian Condominium, the Greater Fort Lauderdale Chamber of Commerce, the Central Beach Alliance, and additional meetings with stakeholders to review the project's design. Ms. Toothaker showed visuals of the original and current proposals for the site, noting that the original plans included greater height as well as greater overall size.

Of the project's 209 parking spaces, 180 will be accommodated on-site. The Applicant will enter into an agreement with a City parking garage for 49 off-site spaces as one condition of approval. A second condition addresses vehicular access.

Ms. Toothaker reviewed additional aspects of the site, including the promenade. A parking study showed the number of available trips as 197, and the project meets water and sewer capacity requirements. The project will go before the City Commission at their December 2, 2025 meeting.

At this time Chair McTigue opened the public hearing.

John Burns, president of the Venetian condominium association, described the condominium as a neighbor to the proposed project. He noted that residents of the Venetian were not notified in October 2025 when the Applicant held a public participation meeting, and questioned that the Applicant has fulfilled its public meeting obligations.

Mr. Burns continued that the Applicant plans to place a variety of businesses onto a small lot and oversized building, characterizing the building as incompatible with the surrounding neighborhood and waterway. The project will result in the loss of open space along the waterway, in the pool areas, without which the proposed open space could not meet requirements.

Mr. Burns added that the project provides the bare minimum of landscaping and setbacks, and stated that a building of the proposed size should not be built in proximity to a waterway. He concluded that the full project should be presented to the public in a single package rather than in a piecemeal fashion, recommending that building and floor heights be reduced, outdoor spaces prohibit amplified sound, and the parking deck be properly screened.

John Roth, private citizen, suggested that access to the west of the peninsula be opened as soon as possible to Water Taxi and boat traffic, stating that the state of Florida plans to shut down at least a portion of the Las Olas Bridge for replacement. He also expressed concern with safety in and around the proposed project's pool area for emergency vehicles, and recommended that parking on the subject site be controlled.

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

Ms. Toothaker addressed some of the concerns raised during public comment, advising that Code requires notice be sent to all property owners within a 300 ft. radius of the subject property. She emphasized that this was done, and that the Applicant also made presentations to the Venetian and the Central Beach Alliance.

Motion made by Vice Chair Donaldson, seconded by Mr. Dutton, to recommend approval of Case Number UDP-S25010, based on the following findings of fact, the facts of the City Staff Report, and/or based on the testimony that we have heard here tonight, the Board hereby finds that the Application meets the applicable criteria of the ULDR cited in the Staff Report, and that the Board's recommendation of approval of the Application is subject to all the conditions included in the Staff Report and those mentioned by the Applicant's attorney.

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

~~8. **CASE:** UDP-T25002~~
~~**REQUEST:** * Amend City of Fort Lauderdale Unified Land Development Regulations, Article IV, Development Permits and Procedures, Section 47-24.1, Generally; Section 47-24.2, Site Plan Development Permits; Section 47-24.3, Conditional Use Permits; Section 47-24.4, Rezoning (City Commission); Section 47-24.6, Vacation of Right-of-Ways; Section 47-24.7, Vacation of Easements: To Align Development Review~~

~~Timeframes with Florida Statutes, Section 166.033, and Amend Section 47-3.5, Change in Use; Section 47-3.8, Termination of Nonconforming Status; Section 47-3.9, Reuse of Nonconforming Structure; Section 47-12.6, Central Beach Development Permitting and Approval; Section 47-13.20, Downtown RAC Review Process; Section 47-13.60, Permit Approval SRAC and NWRAC; Section 47-18.41, Urban Farms and Community Gardens;~~

~~Section 47-19.2, Accessory Buildings, Structures and Equipment, General; Section 47-19.3, Boat Slips, Docks, Boar Davits, Hoist, and Similar Mooring Structures; Section 47-20.3, Parking and Exemptions; Section 47-22.3, General Regulations, Signs; Section 47-23.6, Affordable Housing Regulations; and Section 47-26A.2, City Commission Request for Review: To Revise the City Commission Request for Review Period to Align Development Review Timeframes with Florida Statutes, Section 166.033~~

~~**APPLICANT:** City of Fort Lauderdale~~
~~**COMMISSION DISTRICT:** City-Wide~~
~~**CASE PLANNER:** Jim Hetzel, AICP~~

~~Jim Hetzel, Principal Urban Planner, explained that the proposed text amendments address the development review process in terms of compliance with state timelines. The amendments will bring the City's process into alignment with state law for the review of development applications within a certain time frame. They address the way applications are processed for determination of completeness through to the approval process. The proposed text amendments also address the City Commission's call-up period, which must also align with the state's time frame.~~

~~Depending upon the application threshold, there are two categories:~~

- ~~Non-quasi-judicial: this process allows 120 days for approval, denial, or approval with conditions~~
- ~~Quasi-judicial: this process allows 180 days for approval, denial, or approval with conditions~~

~~Mr. Hetzel advised that these are tight time frames, pointing out that many applications may be very complex. State law permits a mutually agreed-upon extension determined between the City and the applicant.~~

~~Most of the proposed changes would come under ULDR Section 47-24, which includes development review procedures. There are additional multiple sections throughout Code which deal with the City Commission's call-up period.~~

~~The proposed changes to Section 47-24 address the following:~~

- ~~Preliminary development meetings: while the City has conducted these meetings for years, they are not currently part of Code; Code will now include the intent and purpose of these meetings, which occur prior to formal submission of an application~~
- ~~Submittal requirements: these are now more specific, as they are a key determinant of whether an application is complete; nonspecific components in Code have now been formalized~~

- ~~Review process: state law requires a City to review applications within 30 days of original submittal and let the applicant know whether the applications are complete or deficient; if deficient, an applicant has 30 days to address those deficiencies and re-submit the application for another 30 days' review; if information is still missing after a third submittal, the City must meet with the applicant to review what is missing~~
- ~~Extension: a one-time extension period may be granted, which must be equal to the time of the close of the project; for example, if an application is subject to 120 days' review, it may receive an extension of 120 days; after that period, the applicant must submit a waiver if they have not completed the process~~

~~Mr. Hetzel added that if an applicant has not submitted a waiver for a quasi-judicial item which would come before the PZB, the City would need to place that item on an agenda for denial, as the applicant would have failed to meet the required time frame for approval. The City is required to take action by approving or denying the application.~~

~~Another aspect of the proposed amendments would apply to the public participation process. The amendment would change the way this language is presented in Code from text to a table, which can be easier for applicants to understand. There are also "cleanup" items, including removal of repetitive text based on the proposed changes.~~

~~Mr. Hetzel advised that the changes would result in the creation of a new development review flow chart, which includes the following:~~
- ~~Completeness review~~
- ~~Completeness determination~~
- ~~Technical review by DRC~~
- ~~Re-submittal review process~~
- ~~Approval process~~

~~Upon submittal of an application to the City, there is a 30-day review period in which it is determined whether the application is deficient or complete. If complete, the applicant receives a completeness letter from the City which indicates the application threshold, review, time frame, and completion date. This is followed by technical review, in which the DRC reviews the application. This full process must take place within the 120- or 180-day time frame required by the state.~~

~~If re-submittal is required, the City reviews the application once more. If approved, the application then moves through the approval process. This process is also included within the quasi-judicial or non-quasi-judicial time frames.~~

~~The City is required to monitor dates throughout the submittal process to ensure there is sufficient time to schedule placement of items on the PZB or City Commission agenda. This can be a complicated process for Staff. Additional requirements include updating all templates for consistency. For public~~ participation updates, Staff proposes a table that will be easier for applicants to understand.

~~Another component of the proposed amendments is the City Commission call-up period, which currently appears in multiple sections throughout Code. These sections will be changed from a 30-day call-up period to seven business days upon Commission notification.~~

~~Mr. Hetzel concluded that this Item will go before the City Commission in January 2026.~~

~~A question was asked regarding the seven-day Commission call-up period. Mr. Hetzel clarified that the Commission must notify Staff within this time frame if they would like to call up an item.~~

~~It was also noted that the process can be complex and costly, particularly for smaller developers. Mr. Hetzel advised that the review requirement is a state law which impacts the city regardless of developer operations, and is applicable to areas in which the approval processes can take much longer than in Fort Lauderdale.~~

~~Chair McTigue requested a motion to extend the meeting beyond 10 p.m.~~

~~**Motion** made by Vice Chair Donaldson, seconded by Mr. Buckley, to extend the meeting to 10:30. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.~~

~~**Motion** made by Mr. Dutton, seconded by Vice Chair Donaldson, to recommend approval of Case Number UDP-T25002, and the Board hereby finds that the text amendments of the ULDR consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.~~

~~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~~

~~None.~~

~~VII. VOTE FOR 2026 PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD MEETING DATES~~

~~Ms. Parker clarified that the proposed meeting dates are scheduled for the third Wednesday of each month as required by Code. No amendments to the 2026 dates were suggested.~~

~~**Motion** made by Vice Chair Donaldson, seconded by Mr. Dutton, to approve the calendar for the Planning and Zoning Board for~~ the third Wednesday of every month 2026. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

~~There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 10:00 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.]~~